

Shia and Shiaism, their Genesis and Evolution

By Allama Ehsan Elahi Zaheer

• The Origin of Shiaism	Page 3
• Shiaism and Sabai	Page 24
• Shia's Allegations on Caliph	Page 45
• The Sabai's Period	Page 82
• Shia Sects	Page 84
• Shia's of Ithna-e-Ashriyya	Page 151
• Ithna-e-Ashriyya and Sabai's Belief	Page 178

The Origin of Shiaism

The word "Shia" is applied to the workers of a political party. In Arabic language there is an expression. It means that such man is a follower or supporter of such and such man. Allama Zubaidi is of opinion that the word Shia stands for all those people who evolve a consensus on a particular issue and for any person who joins the group or party of another person as a token of support and assistance. He is included among his Shias. The word Shia in fact derives from which means obedience and submission. In Islam the word was employed in its real and actual sense. It was also applied to those political groups and parties that entertained a difference of opinion on different martyrdom of Hazrat Usman (r.a) when serious differences developed between Hazrat Ali (r.a) and Hazrat Muawiyah (r.a). The people who belonged to the party of Hazrat Ali (r.a) were known as 'Shia of Ali'. They believed that Hazrat Ali (r.a) was the fourth Caliph and had a better claim over the Caliphate as compared to Hazrat Muawiyah (r.a). Therefore they supported Ali during the battle waged between him and Muawiyah (r.a). The Shia and Muawiyah (r.a) held a diametrically opposite opinion. They believed that the murderers of Caliph Hazrat Usman (r.a) had joins Ali's (r.a) party and secured asylum under his strong wing. Besides, the Shias of Muawiyah (r.a) did not recognize the claim of Hazrat Ali (r.a) over Khilafat. However, they promised to return to Ali (r.a) and acknowledge him as the Caliph if he avenged the murder of Hazrat Usman (r.a) by executing his murderers. The historians have reported that when Hazrat Ali (r.a) sent 'Adi bin Sayyada bin Hafsa to persuade Muawiyah (r.a) to pledge his surrender and submission, he replied: "you have invited me to join the party and pledge my submission (to him). As far as the party is concerned I have no reservations about its support for me. But as far as submission is concerned, (tell me) how can I submit myself to a person who is accused s an accomplice in the murder of Hazrat Usman (r.a). He denies his involvement in the murder and I do not accuse him of murder either. But he has furnished refuge to the murderers of Hazrat Usman (r.a). If this is not so, he should hand over the murders of Hazrat Usman (r.a) to use so that we may take our revenge by putting them to death. If he is willing to agree to our proposal, we are also willing to obey him and to join his party".

Muawiyah (r.a) had given the same reply to Abu Aldarda (r.a) and Hazrat Abu Umamah (r.a) when Hazrat Ali (r.a) dispatched them on a similar mission:

"Go and tell Mr. Ali that he should take revenge from the murderers of Hazrat Usman (r.a) and impose Qisas on them. Then I'll be the first among the Syrians to pledge fealty to him".

At the early stage of negotiations Hazrat Ali (r.a) had sent Jarir bin Abdullah to invite Muawiyah (r.a) to take the oath of allegiance at his hand. Hazrat Muawiyah (r.a) called for Hazrat Umro bin Aas (r.a) and other Prominent Syrians to seek their advice on the matter. They refused to acknowledge the over-lordship of Hazrat Ali (r.a) until he excited the murderers of Hazrat Usman (r.a) or handed the killers over to them.*

The historians also report that on their return Hazrat Abu Aldarda (r.a) and Hazrat Abu Umamah (r.a) conveyed Muawiyah message to Hazrat Ali (r.a). He replied:

"Both of you can see these people-he pointed towards a number of people who had gathered there-All of them acknowledge that they are the murderers of Hadhrat Usman (r.a). If any one has the might, (I challenge him) to take Qisas".

But the object in hand is not to enumerate the factors that precipitated a chain of wars between Hadhrat Ali (r.a) and Hazrat Muawiyah (r.a). The main object is that these two grand parties of the Muslims-the Prophet Muhammad (s.a.w.w) had described these parties grand in the context of Praising Hadhrat Hassan (r.a) had developed a serious cleavage of opinion and openly supported one or the other personage. Their loyalties were clearly divided and they made no effort to hide their preferences. And they never doubted for a second that they were in the wrong. Each party insisted on its correct and righteous stand. One of these parties was called the 'Shias of Ali' and the other party was called 'Shias of Muawiyah (r.a)'. The difference between these parties was purely of a political nature. One of them believed in the Khilafat of Hadhrat Ali (r.a). They considered him the lawful Caliph because he had been elected through the mutual consultations of the refugees (Muhajireen) and the natives (Ansar). The other believed that Khilafat was the inalienable right of Hadhrat Muawiyah bin Abi Sufiyan (r.a) because he wanted to avenge the blood of the persecuted Imam, the Imam who was the son-in-law of the holy Prophet (s.a.w.w) and the Khalifa of the Muslims. The Prophet (s.a.w.w) himself had secured the pledge from the people to avenge his murder. The pledge later on acquired the epithet. "Bait-e-Rizwan" and God Himself had concurred with those who had pledged at the hand of the holy Prophet (peace be upon him) to take revenge for the murder of Hazrat Usman (r.a).

Shias of the house of Muhammad and Shias of the house of Umayyad:

The word Shia in the phrasal construction "Shia Aal-e-Muhammad" is applied to an exclusively political party which had emerged through the combined efforts of Banu Ali and Banu Abbas and which was opposed mainly to Bani Ummayia. The actually referred to the expression of political opinion. It related to the current debate among the supporters of the two main contestants for the Khilafat. The debate boiled down to the fundamental issue:

who should rule the state or who has a better claim to be the ruler of the state? A Shia writer Sajstani has cited an excerpt from "Kitab-uz-Zinah" to dispel the clouds of confusion and ambiguity:

"When Hadhrat Muawiyah (r.a) and his companions pressed Hadhrat Ali (r.a) for the revenge of Hadhrat Usman (r.a) murder after his martyrdom and gained the sympathies of a large party of Muslims, his followers were known as "Hadhrat Usman (r.a)" and the followers of Hazrat Ali (r.a) were know as "Alviyyah" while each one of them also carried the epithet Shia. This convention was widely observed even during the Banu Ummayia rule".

The writer has also quoted from the Shia heralds of Halab:

"Any nation that develops consensus on a specific issue and its members display mutual respect towards one another is called a Shia. The Shias of a person are his followers and supporters. When the Shias supported these people and held specific views about them, they came to be known as the Shias. When Khilafat passed on from Banu Hashim to Banu Ummayia, any Hazrat Muawiyah (r.a) occupied the Khilafat one after the other in linear succession, a large number of refugees and natives had a better claim over Khilafat as compared to Banu Ummayia, and when they reserved their support and friendship only for them, they came to be known as "Shian-e-Aal-e-Muhammad". At that time there was no opinionative or religious

difference between Banu Abbas. But when Banu Ummayyah, the devil created a rift between Banu Abbas and Banu Ali. Banu Abbas committed certain lapses Banu Ali which turned a group of the Shias against them."

Nature of their difference:

I have consciously stressed the word politics again and again. Actually I mean to drive home the fact that no serious religious difference existed between them that could be dubbed a difference between belief and disbelief. Hadhrat Ali (r.a) himself acknowledged the absence of a religious difference between the two parties. He had addressed his army to enlighten them to Muawiyah (r.a) and his army:

"O creature of the Lord! I exhort you to cultivate piety. The best counsel we can give one another is that we should continue to fear God. Piety is ultimately the best of all acts in the eyes of Gods. I regret to say that war has started between the "Ahl-e-Qibla" (followers of the same direction).

Hadhrat Ali (r.a) had explained the matter at greater length and with sharper clarity in a letter that was widely circulated in all the cities. He gave details of what had transpired between him and the resident of Safeen. He also issued a clear verdict about those who had indulged in sword-playing and arrow shooting against him. He observes in defense of his stand on the issue:

"We and the residents of Syria waged wars against each other in this world. But we in the same God, we follow the same prophet and we extend the same invitation to people about Islam. We have faith in Allah and His Prophet. Neither they claim to have stronger faith than us nor do we claim to be superior Muslims to them. We have consensus on all issues. The only difference is about the murder of Hadhrat Usman (r.a) but we are absolved from it".

This is the reason that during the days of the battle of Safeen, Hazrat Ali (r.a) had ticked off his companions and strictly forbidden them to lampoon the residents of Syria and the companions of Hadhrat Muawiyah (r.a). He said:

"I dislike you to become abusers and lampooners. If you can't help talking about them, you should talk about their acts and deeds-that is, you should say that they are unjustified in fighting with us. This is both nearer to virtue and justice . Therefore, instead of indulging in invective, you should say: Oh Allah! protect us against mutual blood shedding and straighten out our affairs" (Ibid, p. 323.) .These words are reinforced by a Shia Hadith recorded by Muhammad Bin Yaqoob Kulayni in his 'Al-Kaafi' which he attributes to Jaffar bin Muhammad Baqar who is the sixth innocent Imam of the Shias. He observes: "In the early part of the day a drummer drums out that verily Hadhrat Ali (r.a) and the Shias of Ali and the Shias if Ali are the victorious and the elevated; (al-Kamil fil furu vol. 8, p.209)

Abu al-Aliyyag had embraced Islam during the reign of Abu Bakr Siddiq (r.a). Siddiq (r.a) though he had directly witnessed the prophetic era during his adolescence. Abu Khaldah has reported from him : I was young during the reigns of Hadhrat Ali (r.a) and Hadhrat Muawiyah (r.a) , I preferred brave feats on the battlefield to delicious food (on the table). I thoroughly prepared myself for jihad and I went over to them. I saw that there were two giant parties which were immeasurably stretched across the battlefield. When one party came out with the slogan of 'God is great' , the other party retaliated with the articulation of the same slogan, and when one party

chanted out 'there is no God but Allah', the other party chanted back the same words with the same intensity. When I witnessed the spectacle I wondered which party should I pronounce to be a party of disbelievers, and who has forced me to participate in the battle ? So before evening I left them and returned home ". (Sair ' alam-un-nabla' by zahabi, vol. 4, p. 210, tabaqat ibn saad: vol, 7, p.114.)

I also do not deny the fact that there were people who had been influenced by Jewish perversities and un-Islamic ideologies. They had strayed away from the straight path and, in their state of perversion, they had launched a campaign to put a religious complexion on this fundamentally non-religious difference. Among them the Sabais were in the fore-front who had fallen into the trap of anti-Islamic Judaism. These were the people who never allowed the fires of war to be extinguished; When ever the flames of war died down, they again prodded the half-dead ambers and fanned them into a bright blaze. This matter shall be discussed at length in the appropriate context. However it was an exception rather than a rule because the common people did not confirm to this pattern of behavior.

Shias of Ali:

I have traced the origin of the word Shia and explained its genesis. Originally its application was general and its range was wide. But subsequently its sense was restricted and it was applied to a person who was a helper and a supporter of Had Ali and his children and who held beliefs and convictions derived from the perverse practices of Abdullah bin Saba and his Jewish accomplices wanted to demolish the structure of Islam and to disfigure Islamic beliefs and convictions, as is endorsed by Ibn Aseer in "Nihayah".

The word Shia actually used for a specific group of people. It carries the same meaning, irrespective of number and gender. Later on, its use was restricted to a person who was a helper and a supporter of Hadhrat Ali (r.a) and his family until it came to be exclusively reserved for them. Now when we say that such and person is from among the Shias, when we refer to an issue in the Shia religion, we mean by it the Shias of Ali. The plural of the word is and it is derived from and it means obedience and submission". (Ibn Kathir:An-Nihayah:Vol.2,P.244) Anyone who insists on the currency of the word 'Shia' in the Prophetic era has no evidence to support his claim. Muhammad Hussain observes in his book "Asl-ush-Shia wa Usuluha":

"It was the Prophet himself who first sowed the seed of Shiaism on the soil of Islam, i.e., the origin of Shiaism coincided with the origin of Islam. The one who had sown (the seed of) Shiaism kept on nourishing and guarding it until the seed transformed itself into a towering tree during his very life. (They have tried to argue on the basis of some weak and false traditions. Not one of these traditions. Not one of these traditions carries the stamp of authenticity. For example, (Verily Ali and the Shia of Ali are triumphant.) The most highly regarded Shia Ibn-ul-Hadid has publicly affirmed that the false traditions have been fabricated by the Shias and therefore lack the insignia of reliability. Initially they had to coin these traditions to glorify their Imams and downgrade their enemies (Sarah Nahj-ul-Balaghah:Vol. 1, P.783). The most amazing thing is that even a man of his stature is blurting out a lie without being embarrassed and is putting a genuine complexion on a false tradition. The fact is that this tradition has no existence. Muhammad Amen, Muhammad Hussain Zayn and Al-i-Kashif Ghata are guilty of the same miss-statement. They affirm that the companions of the Prophet (peace be upon him) were regarded as the Shias of Ali during Prophet (peace be upon him). I don't know how they react to the traditions

recorded in their own books which they prove that, beside Salman, Abu Zar and Miqdad and all the companions of the Prophet (may God forbid) had turned apostate the situation amusing. It mean that they were apostates and the Shias of Ali at the same time. One may also ask why did Hadhrat Salman (r.a) accept the offer of an office from Hadhrat Umar (r.a). (Majlisi: Hayat-ul-Qulub:Vol.2,P.780). It may be noted that Hadhrat Salman (r.a) was one of the army commanders dispatched by Hadhrat Umar to conquer Madain. (Ibn Kathir: Vol.7,P.67). However, it bore fruit after his death. (Asl-ush-Shia wa Usuluha: P.87.)

Another writer also toes his line:

"The emergence of Shiaism materialized in the Prophetic era. The Prophet (peace be upon him) , Hadhrat Ali (r.a) and the Ahl-e-bait nourished it with their words. They often insisted on strengthening the belief in the hearts and minds of Muslims and to act according to it ". (Muhammad Hussain Zayn: Ash-Shia fit Tarikh.)

The Shia author Al-Muzfari remarks:

" The invitation to Shiaism was launched on the day when Hadhrat Muhammad, the greatest liberator of mankind had proclaimed 'Kalma Tayyabah' among the hills and valleys of Makkah. He had invited people not only to witness the presence of God but also to endorse the Shiaism of Ali." (Muhammad Hussain Muzfari: Tarikh-ush-Shia, pp.8-0 published in Qum.)

The absurdity in this statement is obvious to any person who possesses even a grain of rationality. It implies that the Prophet (s.a.w.w) had not invited people to Islam, unity of God, his prophet hood, love and brotherhood, but he had invited them to grouping, sectariansim and the Shiaism of Hadhrat Ali (r.a). On the basis of Muzfari's claim, the Prophet (s.a.w.w) had made Hadhrat Ali (r.a) a regular partner in his prophet hood and apostle hood, though there is not a shred of evidence in the divine revelation to support this perverse claim. On the contrary, Quran enjoins upon the people to obey God and His Prophet (s.a.w.w) and to act according to the Quran (perhaps this the main reason that the Shias deny the) and the Sunnah and to eschew all other epithet except the word Muslim as a token of their identity. The authentic Ahadith also comprise similar injunctions and Quran has based a number of its observations on the clarification and confirmation of these Ahadith. (It is highly amazing that the Shias denied the most authentic traditions simply because they come directly from the Prophetic companions who, in their view, had one to all turned apostate; but they also seem to believe in their traditions. It is a strange and obvious contradiction. I don't know that these are the figments of their own diseased imagination. Their motive is only to confuse people and to drag them into the mire of darkness in which they themselves are stuck. (Sarah Al-Anfal: 20. Surah Muhammad: 33).

"Obey Allah and the Messenger that you may be shown mercy". (Surah Al-i-Imran:132.)

"Take what the Apostle assints to you, and deny yourselves that which the withholds from you". (Surah Hashr:7)

"If anyone contends with the Apostle even after guidance has been plainly conveyed to him, and follows a path other than that becoming to men of faith, we shall leave him in the path he has chosen and land him in hell what an evil refugel". (Surah An-

Nisa:15)

"It is not open to a believing man or a believing women, when Allah and his Messenger have decided a matter, to exercise their own choice in deciding it". (Surah Al-Ahzab:36.)

" But by your Lord, they can have no (real) faith until they make you judge in all disputes between them, and find in their souls no resistance against your decisions, but accept them with unqualified conviction". (Surah An-Nisa:65.)

"And hold fast all together by the rope which God (stretches out for you), and be not divided among yourselves; and remember with gratitude God's favour on you; for you were enemies and he joined your hearts in love, so that by his grace you became brothers". (Surah Al-i-Imran:103.)

"And fall into no disputes, lest you lose heart and are stripped of your glory". (Surah Al-Anfal:46.)

"And verily this brotherhood of yours is a single brotherhood, and I am your Lord and cherisher: therefore fear me (and no other)". (Surah Al-Mominun:52.)

"And be not of those who ascribe partners to Allah, those who split up their religion and became divided into sects". (Surah Al-Rum:32.)

"Surely the true religion in the estimation of Allah is Islam, that is, complete submission to him, and those who were given the book disagreed only, out of mutual envy, after knowledge had come to them. Whoso rejects the signs of Allah should remember that Allah is swift at reckoning". (Surah Al-e-Imran)

"If anyone desires a religion other than Islam (submission to god), never will it be accepted of him, and in the hereafter he will be in the ranks of those who have lost (all spiritual goods)". (Surah Al-i-Imran)

In the end god has informed the people the people that he has blessed his last prophet (peace be upon him) with the same message that he had transmitted through other prophets and messengers. Therefore God commanded him to declare on His behalf:

"Tell them: I am no innovator among messengers, nor do I know what will be done with me or with you. I only follow that which is revealed to me; and I am but a plain Warner". (Surah Al-Ahgaf)

" He has prescribed for you the religion which he enjoined on Noah, and which we have revealed to you and which we enjoined on Abraham, and Moses and Jesus, that is: be who worship other things than god, hard is the way to which you call them. God chooses to himself those he please and guides to himself those who turn (to Him)". (Surah Shura):

"God explains the purpose of revelation through the manifestative presence of his messengers:

"Not an Apostle did we send before you without this inspiration sent y us to him: that there is no god but I; therefore worship and serve Me". (Surah Al-Ambiya)

God has referred to the apostle hood of each prophet at various places in the holy Quran which has been endorsed by the saying of the Prophet (peace be upon him) As well.

"But what God has declared and his Messenger has endorsed go against the grain of the Shia psyche. The Shias hold a contrary opinion. They believe they each messenger was sent to invite people to accept Ali (r.a) as a partner in divinity and this was their main assignment though they were assigned and this was their main assignment though they were assigned certain secondary roles as well. The traditions which the Shias adduce to support their contention are baseless both in terms of their historical relevance and logical validity. They are historically irrelevant because the reporters of these traditions are all Shias who are notorious for telling lies and twisting facts; they are logically invalid because they not only flout the basic principles of logic and human reasoning but also clash with the fundamental tenets of Quran and Sunnah. they also lack rational cogency because human reason believes in the formulation of general principles human reason belies in the formulation of general principles to evaluate human conduct and not in the projection of certain individuals by elevating them to the position of demy-gods, by declaring them superior to other people demy-gods, by declaring them superior to other people without any rational justification, and by treating them as the arbiters of hell and heaven. Their amounts to a usurpation to divine attributes and is therefore a clear violation of Quranic injunctions. Quran categorically affirms that love of the Lord alone is not enough to ensure success and victory:

"Announce: if you love Allah then follow me, Allah will then love you and forgive you your faults". (Surah Al-i-Imran)

Virtuous acts are those which conforms to the general pattern laid down by god and his prophet (s.a.w.w) and acts which violate this pattern can not, by any stretch of imagination, be called virtuous acts: God has declared:

"Those who believe and work righteousness will be guided by their Lord because of their faith. Rivers Shall flow calling: O Allah! You are the Holiest; and their greeting will be; peace. The end of their prayer will be: all praise belongs to Allah, the Lord of the Worlds". (Surah Younas).

He further declares:

"Those who believe and work righteousness will have gardens beneath which rivers flow. That is the great triumph". (Surah Al-Buruj:11.)

The opinion of the Shias themselves is divided on the origin and development of Shiaism . Imam Nau Bakhti believes that Shiaism originated after the death of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) . He writes:

"The Prophet (s.a.w.w) died at the age of sixty-three in the month of Rabi-ul-Awwal, 10.A.H. The period of his priesthood stretched over twenty-three years. His mother is Amina bint Wahb bin Munaf bin Zahra bin Katab bin Murrah bin K'aab bin Lo'wi. The Muslim community split up into three sects: One sect was known as 'Shia' sect. The Shia are in fact the Shia of Ali bin Abi Talib (r.a). The other sects of Shias have also sprouted from this origin sect. One of the sect claimed the right to rule and demanded the appointment of S'aad bin Ubadah Khazraji as their ruler. This sect

comprised the natives. The other sect was inclined towards Abu Bakr Siddiq (r.a) bin Abi Qahafah and wanted to pledge fealty as his hand. They argued that the Prophet (s.a.w.w) had not specified any particular person to replace him as his successor but left it entirely to the Muslim community to elect his successor. One of the groups in this sect also bolsters up its argument with the fact that the Prophet (peace be upon him) had commanded Hazrat Abu Bakr (r.a) to lead the prayers during the night of his death. This phenomenon furnishes a direct proof of Abu Bakr Siddiq (r.a) superiority over others and establishes his claim to Khilafat. Since the Prophet (peace be upon him) had chosen him to perform a religious act, they also choose him to manage their worldly affairs. When this sect clashed with a sect of the natives on the issue, they all went over to Thaqifah Bani sa'idah. Hazrat Abu Bakr Siddiq (r.a), Hazrat Umar (r.a), Hazrat Abu Ubaidah bin Jarrah (r.a) and Hadhrat Mughirah Shobi Thaqafi (r.a) also accompanied them. the natives invited the people to pledge fealty at the hand of S'aad bin Ubadah Khazrafi and asserted that he had a better claim to Khilafat. When the conflict intensified between the Quraish and the Ansar, the Ansar put forward that one Ameer should be elected from each sect but the Quraish did not concur with the proposal and refuted it with the argument that the Prophet (peace be upon him) had stated:

i.e., the Imam and the Khalifas will be from among the Quraish. Some of them supplied another version of the Prophetic statement :

"Only the Quraish are suited to Caliphate".

In the light of these reasoning the Ansar and their supporters acknowledged the Khilafat of Hadhrat Abu Bakr Siddiq (r.a), But S'aad bin Ubadah (r.a) and some of his family members did not acknowledge him as the Khalifa and left for Syria. The Romans killed Hadhrat S'aad bin Ubadah (r.a) at Huran in Syria while some of the people believed that he had been killed by the Jinns. They have reasoned on the basis of a verse supposedly composed by a Jinn:

(We have killed S'aad bin Ubadah (r.a) , the chief of Khazraj and the two arrows we shot at him stuck in his heart and did not miss the heart as their target).

This statement borders on absurdity because normally the Jinns do not kill human beings with the help of arrows. But what the apparent absurdity seems to pin-point is the reality that the majority of people sided with Abu Bakr Siddiq (r.a). After him, Hadhrat Umar (r.a) also enjoyed the support of the people. The masses evolved a consensus around these two honorable men and all of these people were pleased with them". (Ibn Nadim is actually Muhammad bin Ishaq Nadim who was an extremist Imami Shia scholar and the author of "Kitab-ul-Fehrist". He was born in 297 A.H. and died in 385 A.H. (Qummi: Al-Kina wal-Alqab: Vol. 1.pp. 425-426). My learned friend Maulana Muhammad Ishaq Bhatti who is associated with the Islamic culture Institute, Lahore has translated "Kitab -ul- Fehrist" into Urdu.)

Ibn Nadim Sh'i-i (Ibn-un-Nadim:Al-Fehrist p.249.) believes that Shiaism popped its head on the day of the battle of Jamal The details furnished by him are as follows:

"When Talha and Zubair opposed Hadhrat Ali (r.a) and insisted on the revenge of Hadhrat Uthman (r.a)'s blood (to the total exclusion of all other concessions), Hadhrat Ali (r.a) decided to fight against them till they returned to the divine command. Accordingly, the people who supported the contention of Hadhrat Ali (r.a) on that day were known as the Shias". (khuwansari: Raudhat-ul-Jannat, p.88.).

Some other Shia writers hold the opinion that the term Shiaism gained currency on the day of the battle of Safeen (Al-Fasal fil Malal wal Ahwawan nahi, Vol. 4, p.79.) . The Shia historians ibn Hamza and Abu Hatim also share the same opinion. It also reinforces my stand on the issue. Imam Ibn Hazm among the early Shias in Al-Fasl (Fajr-ul-islam, p.266. eight edition.) and Ahmad Amin among the later Shias, in addition to a host of other scholars, have attested the veracity of the statement . A contemporary Shia author observes:

" the martyrdom of Hadhrat Hussain stabilized the term arguing the origin of Shiaism because, after the martyrdom of Hussain, Shiaism had emerged prominently with all its distinctions and peculiarities". (Mustafa Shaybi:As-Shlah bayn-ut-Tasaqqaf wat-Tashi-ul-kamil: p23.)

This is perhaps the reason that Mohsin Amin was forced to state: "whether the term was applied during the life of the Prophet (s.a.w.w) or after the battle of Jamal, one factor remains constant-the superiority and support of Hadhrat Ali (r.a) and this is what Shiaism means.

The concept prevailed during the Prophetic period and it has continued to prevail down to the present times:. (Ayyan-ush-Shia: section one, part one, p.13.).

Muzfari is also compelled to acknowledge: " Shiaism was publicly proclaimed during the days of Hadhrat Uthman (r.a)". (Muhammad Hussain Muzfari; Tarikh-ush-hia, p.15.)

And this is the correct position because labels do not precede the phenomena they serve to depict. the phenomena appear first and the labels follow them, Similarly the parties don not precede the differences which ultimately split them .When differences develop, and different views contended with one another over a specific issue, a particular party takes up the gauntlet of challenge which is obviously prejudiced against the other parties. This prejudiced party activates the emergence of other parties which are equally adamant to establish their own identity and challenge the bona fides of the other party. before the martyrdom of Hadhrat Uthman (r.a) no differences prevailed among the Muslims, nor was there any group prejudice among them. But the martyrdom of Hadhrat Uthman (r.a), the consequences that followed in its wake and after the appointment of Hadhrat Ali (r.a) as Amir-ul-Momineen, frictions appeared among the Muslims. Some people were on the side of Hadhrat Ali (r.a) and his companions, while others supported Talha and Zubair and later on Hadhrat Muawiyah (r.a) and his companions. This was the time when two grand political parties emerged among the Muslims. One of them was known as the 'Shias of Ali' and the other was known as the 'Shias of Muawiyah'. they held divergent views about the state and the Khilafat though they practiced the same faith and shared the same beliefs as has already been stated.

Differences before the Martyrdom of Hadhrat Uthman (r.a):

Some differences prevailed before the martyrdom of Hadhrat Uthman (r.a). As a matter of fact, his martyrdom was a logical climax of these spats. But this tiff operated mainly between the Jewish and the gullible people who had fallen into the trap of Jewish deceit, or it operated between the Muslims and their Imam as will be subsequently explained in another chapter. Besides, there were some other petty snip-snaps but they were of a transient nature and disappeared as soon as they

appeared. When the second sect, as announced in the Holy Quran:

For instance, a difference had cropped up between the natives and the refugees on the day of safe, but the natives discarded their opinion and acknowledged the refugees' stand as valid and reasonable, and all the Muslims collectively and united took the oath of allegiance at the hand of Hadhrat Abu Bakr Siddiq (r.a). This fact is acknowledged by the Shias themselves. There was no other party to the tangle except the natives and the refugees and no other name for the candidature of Khilafat had floated about except the names of Hadhrat Abu Bakr Siddiq (r.a) and Hadhrat S'aad bin Ubadah (r.a) . When the natives and the refugees had resolved the matter between themselves, no vestige or trace of any conflict or disagreement was left behind (to mar their lives). Therefore Hadhrat Ali (r.a) had also witnessed it when he looked dejected after the conquest of Egypt and 'Umro bin hamaq, Hajr bin 'Adi, hubbah 'Arni, harith Aor, and Abdullah bin Saba had come to see him and , according to tradition, Abdul Rehman bin Jandab (r.a) had asked him : " tell us frankly what is your opinion about Abu Bakr Siddiq (r.a) and Umar (r.a)" ? he replied " Do you have time for these things ? We have conquered Egypt no doubt, but so many of my Shias have been killed. I place before you a letter which will contain a reply to your question, and I beg you to protect my right which you are squandering aimlessly. Read out this letter of mine to the " Shias of Ali' and be the helpers and supporters of what is right . "

The letter was addressed from Amir-ul-Momineen Ali, the creature of God, to each and every believer and Muslim who happened to read it. The letter ran as follows:

"Please accept my salutations. First of all I praise the Lord who has no rival, and after praising Him, I submit that God had made Hadhrat Muhammad (s.a.w.w) the model of excellence for both worlds, the bearer of divine revelation and a manifestation of the will of God (to steer the Muslim community). O Arabs! at the juncture of his apostle hood your fatih was in a sorry state and your country was in moral decay ; you used to kneel before statues of wood and stone, snakes and serpents, and the thorns scattered haphazardly on the footpaths. You sipped dirty water and guzzled impure food. You shed blood, butchered your children and executed your near and dear ones most ruthlessly. You misappropriated one another's goods. The paths were dangerous . Statues were installed every where. Sin was in your blood. Most of the people attributed partners to God even when they believed in His unity.

Thus God raised the Prophet (s.a.w.w) from among his own people , and he spoke the language they spoke. They are the first Muslims. The Prophet (s.a.w.w) taught them the Book of Allah and instilled in them an awareness of their and obligations. He told them to show mercy, stop shedding blood, improve their conduct, return the trust to their owners, keep promises, stick to their oaths and patronize love, goodness, affection and mercy. he further prohibited them to loot (property), indulge in cruelty and jealousy, drink liquor, give short measure, commit adultery, change interest 9on money), appropriate the goods of the orphans, create dissonance on earth, follow the path of the rebel because God does not like the rebels and insurgents. each good deed brings you close to paradise and takes you away from hell: God has therefore exhorted you to perform good deeds. each evil deed takes you away from paradise and brings you to hell :God has, therefore, exhorted you to eschew evil.

When the Prophet (s.a.w.w) parted from this mortal world, a clash of opinion

developed among the Muslims over the issue of the Khilafat. By God ! I could not even imagine for the flash of a second that the Arabs, after the death of the Prophet (peace be upon him) , would elevate any one to the position of a Caliph except those who belonged to the House of Muhammad (s.a.w.w) . But when I saw people rallying round Hadhrat Abu Thaqafi :Alakr Siddiq (r.a) in increasing numbers and taking the oath of allegiance at his hand, I did not pledge fealty to him because I believed I had a better claim to it. I remained in this state of psychic shock for some time. But when i saw that people were turning apostate and were active in dismantling the foundation of the divine faith and the religion of Muhammad (s.a.w.w), I had apprehensions that if I did not extend the helping hand to the Muslims at that time, the structure of Islam will simply collapse 9and the debris of its past glory will evoke only important nostalgia). The Khilafat was only a temporary affair and it ends like an optical mirage or simply rolls away like dense clouds. Under the circumstances, i went over to see Abu Bakr Siddiq (r.a) and took the oath of allegiance at his hand and participated in quashing rebellion. it liquidated the evil and added to the glory and eminence of the divine faith .

Hadhrat Abu Bakr (r.a) discharged his duties as a Caliph and he administered the country moderately and elegantly . Out of a feeling of sheer good will I kept up my association with him and spared no effort whatsoever to extend him unqualified submission and obedience ". (Thaqafi: Al-Gharat,Vol.1, pp.302-307. It is also recorded in Sharh Nahj-ul-Balaghah and Majma-ul-Bahar by Majlisi: For details on the relevant issue see my book "Shias and the House of Ali").

Abul Hassan Ash'ari has raised a similar issue in his book "Maqalat-il-Islamiyyin": He observes that the first difference that emerged between the Muslims after the death of the Prophet (s.a.w.w) related to Imamah. When the Prophet (peace be upon him) died, the natives gathered at Saqifah Bani Sa'idah and decided to make Hadhrat S'aad bin Ubadah (r.a) their Imam. When Hadhrat Abu Bakr and Hadhrat Umar (r.a) came to know about their decision, they also joined their meeting along with a group of the refugees. Hadhrat Abu Bakr (r.a) explained that only the Quraish were suited to Imamah, as the Prophet (s.a.w.w) himself had stated:

When the natives came to know about the Prophetic saying, they gave up their stand and acknowledged the truth . Only sometime back they had been insisting :

Hadhrat Abu Bakr (r.a) discharged his duties as a Caliph and he administered the country moderately and elegantly. Out of a feeling of sheer good will I kept up my association with him and spared no effort whatsoever to extend him unqualified submission and obedience".

Abul Hassan Ash'ari has raised a similar issue in his book "Maqalat-il-Islamiyyin": He observed that the first difference that emerged between the Muslim after the death of the Prophet (peace be upon him) related to Imamah. When the Prophet (peace be upon him) died, the natives gathered at Saqifah Bani Sa'idah and decided to make Hadhrat S'aad bin Ubadah their Imam. When Hadhrat Abu Bakr and Hadhrat Umar (r.a) came to know about;

Their meeting along their decision, they also joined their meeting along with a group of the refugees. Hadhrat Abu Bakr (r.a) explained that only the Quraish were suited to Imamah, as the Prophet (s.a.w.w) himself had stated:

When the natives came to know about the Prophetic saying, they gave up their stand

and acknowledged the truth. Only sometime back they had been insisting: if you do not acknowledge the Imam of Saad bin Ubadah, then Ubadah, then you should at least concede our demand that one Amir should be elected from among us and the other Amir should be elected from among you. Similarly Hubab in Munzir taking his sword out of the sheath and brandishing it in the air, had said: I am a perfect swordsman, is there any one who would dare to fight with me? In order to support S'aad bin Ubadah, his son Qais bin S'aad also stood up but Umar Farooq (r.a) snubbed and silenced him. However, when the natives heard the Prophetic decree, they bowed their heads in submission and then all of them unanimously placed the crown of Khilafat on the head of Hadhrat Siddiq Akbar (r.a), pledged fealty at his hand and assured him of their loyalty.

When the Prophet (s.a.w.w) had launched Jihad against the disbelievers, Hadhrat Abu Bakr launched the against the apostates in the same spirit. God blessed him victory the apostates who're-embraced Islam. In this way the victory of the right was insured.

After the death of the Prophet (s.a.w.w) the only sore spot between the Muslim related to the Khilafat issue. No other difference raised its ugly head during the period of Siddiq (r.a) and Farooq (r.a). But in the last days of Usman (r.a) some of the people had unnecessarily criticized a few of his acts. The dissension still persists in the Muslim world but it is all due to some of the evil geniuses who wanted to reduce to shreds the splendor of Islam. Hadhrat Usman (r.a) received martyrdom on account of conspiracy among the Muslims. The contention of the Sunnis is that the deeds of Hazrat Usman (r.a) were acts of piety. The cruel people shed his holy blood without any justification. Other people held a different opinion, and this difference still persists among the Muslims.

After the martyrdom of Usman (r.a) people pledged fealty at the hand of Hadhrat Ali (r.a). Some of them were deadly against Hadhrat Uthman (r.a). They denied his Imam and Khilafat. But there were others who were his staunch supporters. The schism has persisted through history down to the present times.

Opinion was divided on the war between Hadhrat Ali (r.a) and Talha (r.a) and Zubair (r.a); and opinion was equally divided on the war between Hazrat Ali and Hazrat Muawiyah (r.a) at Safeen.

Besides, a number of other petty differences leapt to the eye. For example, people disagreed about the burial place of the prophet and a rift between the Muslims showed its colors on the issue of Jihad but these differences were amicably resolved in the light of the evidence furnished by Quran and Sunnah. But the difference that persisted, like the over-stay of an unwelcome guest, and the clash of opinion that smashed the Muslim community into bits and pieces and pulverized its unity countless particles and established a permanent 'broiler' among the Muslims in the form of two equally formidable parties, was the difference between Hadhrat Ali (r.a) and Hadhrat Muawiyah (r.a) . But I would like to re-emphasize my point that these two personalities neither founded a new religion rotted in new convictions nor denied the straight path charted out by the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.w) and after him kept in good gear by his pious Caliphs Abu Bakr (r.a), Umar (r.a) and Usman (r.a). None of the two parties carried any particle of jealousy or malice against the early natives and refugees as is reflected in the conduct of the present-day Shias, nor did they fan the flames of racial and tribal prejudice. I would like to point out with due apology that Hadhrat Ali and his companions did not hold the views and beliefs held by our

contemporary Shias, on the basis of which Shias have cultivated a deeply-ingrained feeling of spite against the pious Caliphs and the pure wives of the Prophet (s.a.w.w); on the same basis they deny the Quran in its present form and they also deny the Sunnah of the prophet of the Prophet (peace be upon him). The Shia have actually borrowed all these beliefs either from Abdullah bin Saba or from the cursed Judaism as I propose to discuss at length in a subsequent chapter and sort out the chaff from the grain.

The companions of Hadhrat Ali (r.a) loved the native companions of the prophet (s.a.w.w) who included Hadhrat Abu Bakr (r.a), Umar (r.a), Hadhrat Usman (r.a) and the pure wives of the prophet. They obeyed them and followed in their footsteps. Hadhrat Ali (r.a), the fourth pious caliph, also loved them from the core of his heart. Whenever any of the companions died, Hadhrat Ali (r.a) looked a picture of agony. He always tried to follow the companions; he did not like a person who differed with them; he punished anyone who ridiculed or insulted them. He was also actively engaged in liquidating the ingredients of Judaism and Sabaism that were making deep inroads into the hearts and minds of his companions and friends and he never willingly sought the company of a person whom he suspected of entertaining and practicing these devilish beliefs and convictions.

The Shias themselves have attested to the fact that Hadhrat Ali (r.a) also named his sons after the three pious caliphs: Abu Bakr (r.a), Umar (r.a), and Usman (r.a). His sons Hassan (r.a) and Hussain (r.a) too, kept up the practice of their father and named their sons as Abu Bakr (r.a), Umar (r.a). Similarly Hadhrat Ali's (r.a) other sons and sons of Hadhrat Hussain (r.a) gave these pious names to their sons and practically demonstrated their love and regard for the hallowed companions of the prophet (s.a.w.w).

As far as their love and obedience of these people are concerned, I have already discussed the matter in detail in my book "Shias and the house of Ali" and to repeat it would be an exercise in sheer tautology. Any one who is interested in the details is advised to turn to the relevant book. But here I would like to cite an excerpt from a book by Mulla Baqir Majlisi, Iran, who is the worst enemy of the Sunnis and who is notorious among the Shias for possessing the vilest tongue and the filthiest mouth, on whom the Shias have conferred the title of Khatimat-ul-Muhaddiseen and who has compiled the most voluminous collection of Ahadith in Shia literature. He writes in his book "Jila-ul-Ayoun fee hayaat wa masaib "arba" ashhr masuma". Hadhrat Hassan bin Ali bin Abi Talib (r.a) has patched up with Hadhrat Muawiyah bin Abi Sufiyan (r.a) on the condition that he will deal with the people in the light of Quran and Sunnah and the practice of the pious caliphs, that he will not appoint any caliph after him (as his successor), that he will let the people live in peace whether they were from Syria, Iraq, Arab or Yemen, and that he will protect the life, property, wives and children of the companions and the Shias of Ali bin Abi Talib (r.a). Hadhrat Hassan (r.a) had signed a contract on oath for the fulfillment of these conditions⁶⁰.

This clearly indicates that one of the conditions of the of the contract spelled out by Hadhrat Hassan (r.a) was that Hadhrat Muawiyah will follow the practice of the pious Caliphs and it is obvious that the pious Caliphs are no other than Abu Bakr (r.a), Umar (r.a) and Uthman (r.a). He had imposed this condition simply because he had great faith in their inherent decency, virtue and piety and because he believed that the lives of these people were unconditionally modeled on the life of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.w).

This is only one example of its kind, but one can gather a number of these examples⁶¹ through a detailed study of the lives of Hadhrat Ali (r.a) and his sons. I may point out again that difference between Hadhrat Ali (r.a) and Hadhrat Muawiyah (r.a) was not a religious difference nor did it lead to a permanent incision in their mutual relations nor were they the victims of mutual spite and animus. The myths the Shias have concocted in this connexion are baseless. The facts do not support them; in fact alone carry enough dynamite to explode these myths. Each one of the two groups was deeply convinced of the religious sincerity and integrity of the other group. Each group placed the maximum premium on peace; peace group sincerely craved unity and premium on peace; each group sincerely craved unity and solidarity. This is the reason that Hadhrat Hassan (r.a) had patched up with Hadhrat Muawiyah (r.a) and had pledged fealty to him. Had Hadhrat Hassan (r.a) considered Hadhrat Muawiyah (r.a) outside the fold of Islam, he would never have seen eye to eye with him, patched up with him and pledged fealty to him nor would he have commanded his brother Hadhrat Hussain (r.a) and Qais bin S'aad, the commander of his army, take the oath of allegiance at his hand. All these facts are narrated in the books by Shia scholars as well: kashi writes: "jibra'il bin ahmad and abu ishaq hamdoya and ibrahim both are the sons of nasir-said that they had been told by Muhammad bin Abdul Hamid al-atar al-kufi through younits bin y'aqub through fazal ghulam Muhammad bin Rashid that I heard Abu Abdullah saying: Hadhrat muawiyah dispatched a letter to Hassan bin Ali (r.a), inviting him, his brother Hussain (r.a) and the companions of Ali (r.a), inviting him, his brother Hussain (r.a) and the companions of Ali (r.a). Accordingly all of them reached Syria. Qais bin s'aad bin Ubadah Ansari also accompanied them. As they landed in Syria, Hadhrat Muawiyah (r.a) immediately sent for them. (when they arrived there) Hadhrat Hassan (r.a) addressed Qais: Qais! Get up and pledge fealty (to him). On hearing this Qais looked towards Hadhrat Hussain (r.a): what is your command for me? He replied: Qais, Hassan (r.a) is my leader"⁶²

His father, Hadhrat Ali bin Abi Talib (r.a) who is regarded as the first innocent Imam by the Shias had also dispatched a letter to Hadhrat Muawiyah on similar lines:

We had developed close links with you on basis of traditional superiority and impregnable prestige and honor and we gorged inter-marital ties on the basis of equal status"⁶³

Had there existed a religious difference between them, Hadhrat Ali (r.a) would never have married Sayyidah Rimlah to Muawiyah bin Marwan bin Hukm.⁶⁴ Rimlah bint Ali was the mother of S'aid bin Urwah bin mas'ud thaqafi.⁶⁵ Khadeja, another daughter of Ali, was married to Abdul Rehman bin Amir Amwi.⁶⁶ Abdul Rehman's father Amir bin Kuraiz Amwi was the governor of Basra appointed by Muawiyah (r.a) and had sided with Talha (r.a) and Zubair (r.a) against Hadhrat Ali (r.a) in the battle of Jamal. Hadhrat Khadeja (r.a) was the daughter of a slave maid as has been referred to by Tabrisi in "Al-'Ilam"⁶⁷ and by Muffed in Al-Irshad".⁶⁸ Similarly another daughter of Hadhrat Ali (r.a) had entered into wed-lock with Amwi Caliph Abdul Malik bin Marwan.⁶⁹

Similarly, the daughters of Hadhrat Hassan and Hussain entered into marital contracts with the Amwis and the daughters of Amwis married the Hashmis, especially the children of Hadhrat Ali (r.a). Details of the inter-marital ties between banu Ummayah and banu Hashim are given in my book "Shias and the house of Ali". For example, among the daughters of Hadhrat Hassan (r.a) and Hussain (r.a), and number of them were married to non-Hashmis. The daughter of Hadhrat Hussain

(r.a) and the grand-daughter of Hadhrat Ali (r.a), Sakina (r.a) was married to Zaid bin "Umro bin Uthman (r.a) , the grandson of Hadhrat Uthman (r.a), Hadhrat Sakina (r.a) was still in his wed-lock when he died. She received her share of the heritage.⁷⁰ Similarly the daughter of Zaid bin Hassan bin Ali (r.a), Hadhrat Nafisah (r.a), married Waleed bin Malik bin Marwan, the Amwi caliph. A famous Shia genealogist has referred to this marriage but has clamped a lousy interpretation on it.

"Nafisah (r.a) was on of the daughters of Zaid bin Hassan bin Ali (r.a). She had eloped with Waleed bin Abdul Malik bin Marwan and gave birth to his children. She passed away in Egypt. Zaid used to visit Waleed frequently. Waleed held him in great reverence and made him sit on his bed beside himself. He revered him because his daughter was living with him. Once Waleed had paid in great reverence and make him sit on his bed beside himself. He revered him because his daughter was living with him. Once Waleed had paid him thirty thousand dinar"⁷¹

it is not worthy that this Zaid bin Hassan was also present at Karbala with his uncle Hadhrat Hussain was also present at kabala with his uncle Hadhrat Hussain. Similarly Zainab Bin Hassan mithna, the grand daughter of Hadhrat Hassan, was also in the wedlock of walled bin Abdul Malik Amwi her father Hassan mithna was present at kabala with his uncle and father-in-law Hadhrat Hussain where he was seriously wounded. I would like to stress the point that the seriously wounded. I would like to stress the point that the six grand-daughters of Hadhrat Hassan, who were the children of his different sons, had married Amwi chief and leaders of his different sons, had married Amwi chiefs and leaders when the genealogist made a count of such relationships, their number exceeded even the figure of twenty. And the interesting pat of it is that all these weddings were solemnized after differences⁷² had peeped out between Hadhrat Ali and Amir Muawiyah and after the wars of Jamal and safin.⁷³similarly a number of Hashmis also married Amwi girls. Hashmis and Amwi visited one another frequently and exchanged gifts as well. The imams and their families had established extremely pleasant relations with the Amwis. With the sole exception of Hadhrat Hussain, none of them had ever waged a war against the Amwis or tried to wrest power form them. Of course, tehvars between his father Hadhrat Ali and Hadhrat muawiyah are to well-know to be glossed over, and the matter of Hadhrat Hassan's patch-up with him is equally famous and no one in his senses has the audacity or the stubbornness to deny it.

Kulayni,--who possesses the status of imam Bukhari among the Shias-has imputed a tradition in his "Sahih' to Ali bin Hussain (imam Zain-ul-Abideen). Muhaddith sha nuri Tabrisi comments on Kulayni's book:

"it is one of the four books which see as the fulcrum of the Imamiyah sect. The worth of "Kaafi" among these books is like the worth of the sum among the stars. Whenever a just man examines its contents, he will derive a rare satisfaction form them. Their very incorporation in "Kaafi' is the greatest proof of their validity"⁷⁴

it is recorded in this top-ranking book of the Shias that Ali bin Hussain (imam Zain-ul-Abideen) said to Yazeed bin muawiyah:

"I am a helpless slave: you can keep me with you if it pleases you, or you can sell me out if it pleases you"⁷⁵

other people who lived in the Ummayah period shared the same propensities people

who lived in the Abbasi period shared the same propensities people who lived abbasid period did not press a different button either: they just followed the ruts of precedent. But there were posers from people who waged wars and also tried to wrest power from the incumbents but victory never kissed their feet. They faced either defeat or martyrdom on the battle-field: there was no third option for them. The Shias also had ruptured relations with their Imams, because they not only had given them up but hurled allegations of apostasy at them. The poor Imams were, therefore, sandwiched between two layers of hostility: on the one hand were the disbelievers with whom they had to fight; on the other hand were their own friends who leveled allegations of disbelief against them. The Shias believed that:

"A man who claims Imamatus and does not deserve it is a disbeliever"⁷⁶

Hussain bin Mukhtar has reported: I asked Abu: Abdullah: who are the referents of the verse?

(And on that you shall see the people who imputed lies to God). He replied: it means any person who claims to be an Imam but, in fact, is not an Imam. I inquired even if he is a Fatimi or an Alvi? He replied : yes, even if he is a Fatimi or an Alvi.

The gist of the entire discussion is that early Shiaism had not yet evolved a set or system of specific beliefs and ideas and the early Shias served only as the agents only as the agents of a political party. The Shias served Hadhrat Ali against Muawiyah during his Caliphate, switched their sympathies towards Muawiyah after the martyrdom of Hadhrat Ali and the abdication of Hadhrat Hassan. They even pledged fealty readily to Hadhrat Muawiyah (As readily as Hamlet's mother Gertrude marries his uncle Claudius and her brother-in-law after the mysterious death of his father). Their conscience never pricked them because they did not have a conscience the way they buttoned off their loyalties proved that they had no convictions because people with convictions do not change in such a melodramatic manner. Their Imam Hassan his brother Hadhrat Hussain and the leader of the army Qais bin S'aad also pledge fealty to Hadhrat Muawiyah. There was no such religious clash between them, nor did they have a dispute about Qibla. No racial or tribal prejudice spite them nor did they have a dispute about Qibla visits between them and even prayed behind one another. Hadhrat Hassan and Hussain who were the sons of Hadhrat Ali and Fatima and the grandson of the prophet often visited Hadhrat Muawiyah who always welcomed them with open hands as is attested by Hafiz Ibn Kathir:

"When Hadhrat Muawiyah ruled the roost Hadhrat Hassan often visited him with his brother Hadhrat Hussain. Hadhrat Muawiyah made every effort to accord them a red-carpet treatment. At every and loaded he gave them two lac dinar in lump and said to them please accept it from Ibn Hind. No one has ever made you the present of such a huge amount and no one shall ever do so after. Hadhrat Hussain replied By God! You the people who preceded you and the people who will follow you will never come across a person whose worth exceeds ours. After the death of Hadhrat Hassan Hadhrat Hussain kept up the round of his visits to Muawiyah. Every year he gave him present and always treated him with great reverence".

In the same vein Majlisi has reported from Jaffar bin Baqir, (who is the sixth innocent Imam of the Shias) that Imam Hassan once told Imam Hussain and Abdullah bin Jaffar

That they will receive some presents from Muawiyah on the first day of the next month. The goods arrived precisely on the specified day. Hadhrat Hassan was under heavy debt. First of all he paid his family, his relatives and his workers. Imam Hussain, after the payment of debts, divided the goods into portions. He distributed one portion among his close friends and associates and gave the other two portions to his family and relatives. Abdullah bin Jaffar also followed the same practice"⁷⁸

Kulayni reports that Marwan bin Hukm has also fixed a stipend for Ali bin Hussain (imam Zain-ul-Abideen) as it was fixed for other young people of Madina, Kulayni says:

"Muawiyah appointed Marwan bin Hukm the governor of Madina and ordered him to fix stipends for the young people. Imam Zain-ul-Abideen says that when he went over to see him in this connexion he asked: you name? I replied: Ali bin Hussain! And he fixed my stipend also"⁷⁹

Similarly Hussain's uncle and Hadhrat Ali's brother Hadhrat Aqeel bin Abi Talib also frequently visited Hadhrat Muawiyah and accepted gifts and presents from him. Once he made him a present of one lack dirham".⁸⁰

The famous Shia scholar Ibn Abul al-Hadid has acknowledged this fact. He says:

"Muawiyah is the first person on earth who disbursed millions of presents. His son Yazeed is the first man who doubled the number of presents (his father gave). He used to pay one lack dirham to Hassan and Hussain individually. Similarly he paid the same amount to Abdullah bin Abbas and Abdullah bin Jaffar".⁸¹

Abu Mikhnaf, a staunch Shia writer, admits:

"Hadhrat Muawiyah, besides assorted presents, used to send Hadhrat Hussain one million dinar every year."⁸²

These hallowed figures of the Quraish tribe also offered their prayers behind Muawiyah officials. Jaffar bin Muhammad Baqir related on the authority of Imam Zain-ul-Abideen that Hadhrat Hassan and Hussain used to offer their prayers behind Marwan and did not repeat them; on the contrary they regarded them flawless."⁸³

Abban bin Uthman was the governor of Madina appointed by Abdul Malik bin Marwan Amwi. Once he arrived for prayer before Ali who was also known as Muhammad bin Hanfiya. Abu Hashim bin Muhammad bin Ali said to him:

"We are well aware that the Imam has a better claim to lead prayer. If this were not so, we would never have asked you to lead us. So he moved forward and led the prayer."⁸⁴

He also led the funeral prayer of Abdullah bin Jaffar Tayyar, the nephew of Hadhrat Ali.⁸⁵

Similarly his father led the funeral prayer of Hadhrat Abbas bin Abdul Mutlib, his grandfather and the uncle of Hadhrat Ali (r.a) and the Prophet (peace be upon him). Hadhrat Abbas died on Friday, 12th Rajab, 32 A.H. Some traditions make in the month of Ramzan in place of Rajab. He had stepped into the eighty year of his life at

that time . Hadhrat Uthman (Radiallahu Anhu) bin affan had led his funeral prayer and he was buried in Baqi." Hadhrat Ali (Radiallahu Anhu) and the Prophet (peace be upon him). Hadhrat Abbas died on Friday, 12th Rajab, 32 A.H. Some traditions make in the month of Ramzan in place of Rajab. He had stepped into the eighty year of his life at that time . Hadhrat Uthman (Radiallahu Anhu) bin affan had led his funeral prayer and he was buried in Baqi."

(Al-Bidayah Wan Nahayah Vol. 7, p. 162 , Al-Istiyab, vol. 3, p. 100.)

Innumerable example support the enviable bonds of mutual relationship that existed between the Amwis and the Hashmis. But after the passage of the early era, the Shias experienced a sea change: A radical change marred the complexion of Shiaism as it was deeply influenced by the speculative encroachments of Judaism, Zoroastrianism and Christianity. The Shias fell into the subtle traps laid by Jewish conspiracies and Zoroastrian perversities. They were easily annoyed with the Muslim officials but were gullibly impressed by those who had donned Islamic robes as a cover-up for their lousy plans and unholy practices. One factor that accomplished this ugly transformation of the Shia psyche was their free mixing with the Persians and the Babylonians as well as their informal association with the slaves who disliked the Arabs because they had conquered their territories and were lording over as their masters. The ring leader of this conspiracy and the chief preacher and propagator of these beliefs and ideas was Abdullah bin Saba who was the Jewish spy and agent with the Islamic badge and whose main mission was to sow the seeds of 'shemozzle' among the Muslims in the grab of a Muslim. He fanned the flames of rebellion against the Amir-ul-Momineen-who was unanimously elected and who was the companion of the prophet (peace be upon him), the husband of two of his daughters, the Prophet'' cousin and a mountain of charity and generosity. This issue shall be discussed in detail and with illustration in the next chapter.

There is no doubt that a large number of Sabais, Zoroastrians, Jews and Christian had penetrated the ranks of Hadhrat Ali (Radiallahu Anhu)'s army under false labels as their undisguised entry could have been easily detected. Some of these people had also wangled their way into the army of Hadhrat Muawiyah, though they were , in fact, neither the Shias of Ali nor the Shias of Muawiyah. On the other hand, they were the agents of an intractable rebel group which had its own specific convictions and objectives. Whenever the parties came on the verge of reconciliation, they started a fresh rumpus and fanned the flames of war. Kharjis were an off-shoot of this group who treated Hadhrat Ali (Radiallahu Anhu), Hadhrat Uthman (Radiallahu Anhu) and Muawiyah as infidels. Their object was much more heinous. They, in fact, wanted to decimate the Islamic empire by snapping away the almost seamless chain of Muslim conquests. This is the reason that when they had achieved success in provoking the masses, in created fracas among the Muslims and in being instrumental in shedding the blood of the third pious Caliph, they had created almost identical circumstances during the rein of Hadhrat Ali (Radiallahu Anhu), a fact which only a stubborn person can deny, or one who lacks knowledge and insight and has strayed away from the path of virtue and justice.

There is also absolutely no doubt that the early sincere Shias of Ali were exempt from the provocative stance which was adopted by the later Shias. Their leader was also exculpated from the burden of guilt . On the contrary he snubbed them and even executed them for their heretic approach towards religion. But it is almost certain that the Shias of Ali were victims of chronic lethargy, cowardice, lack of

determination, stability and ingratitude but the Shias of Hadhrat Uthman (Radiallahu Anhu) and Muawiyah were made of a sterner stuff. Similarly the Shias of Ali were also deficient in loyalty, sincerity, trust and truthfulness. Hadhrat Ali (Radiallahu Anhu) always complained against them and suffered heavily at their hands on account of his immeasurable strength and legendary bravery and valour. He often snubbed them in words which no man with even a grain of self-respect could stand and which had little effect on his followers:

"O you who resemble men, though you are not men ! you are immature as far as your reason is concerned. You argue and think like women. I wish I had not seen you and recognized you. By God ! I repent it. May God ruin you ! You have saddened my heart and you have filled my chest with anger.

You disobeyed me and always differed with my opinion. The Quraish even said that ibn Abi Talib does not know how to fight. May God bless them ! is there any one who exceeds me in the art of fighting, in courage and valour ? I was hardly twenty years of age when I had the first taste of war and now I am in my sixties, Yes a person who is disobeyed is supposed to have no opinion." (Nahj-ul-Balaghah, p-67.)

By comparing his Shias with the Shias of Muawiyah, he said :

"I swear by Him who has my life in His hands ! These people will surely prevail over you, not because their stand is more righteous than yours, but because they do not hesitate to approve and support even the false contention of their companions but you hesitate to support even my true contention. The nations (usually) fear persecution at the hands of their rulers: but I am a ruler who fears persecution at the hand of his nation. I told you to come out for Jihad but you stayed put. I want to communicate to you what I thought and felt but you paid no attention. I called you out secretly and openly but you cared two hoots (for may call). I had your welfare on my mind but you declined my offer. Can presence be like absence and can slaves be like master ? I read out to you my command but you take to your heels. I exhort you and admonish you but you don't budge. I try to prepare you for Jihad against the rebels but you disperse even before I wind up my speech. You return to your meetings and do not listen to advice. I pack you off in the morning but you return by the evening.

"O people you are present here with your bodies but your minds are absent. Your desire are different. Your officers and leaders are victims of tension and on account of you. Your Amir obeys Allah but you disobey him. The Amir of the Syrians disobeys Allah but they obey Him. By God ! I would like Muawiyah to exchange our companions at the rate that exists between a dinar and dirham : He should take away ten of my companions and give me in return one of his companions.

"O residents of Kufa ! I have twenty three complaints against you. You can hear but you are deaf; you can speak but you are dumb you have eyes but you are blind. During war you are false and fickle fighters and during adversity you are unreliable brothers. Alas ! you are like the camels whose shepherd has disappeared and if they are humped in at one end, they hump out at the other end. By God ! when the fire is raging you will leave me and keep aside as a woman (leaves her man)".

The way the Shias of Ali disgraced and humiliated Hadhrat Ali (Radiallahu Anhu) has no precedent in Islamic history. One is almost compelled to believe that they held an ingrained grudge against him. Perhaps Ali's extraordinary valour and super-human

feats of bravery made his Shias conscious of their inferiority and worthlessness. Ali's bluntness and candidness only served to place under an unfavorable spot their cringing diplomacy. The malingering slobs can hardly appreciate the eagle-like flight of their great leaders and, instead of flapping their wings to fly towards them, they try to bring them down. The great man, therefore, invariably negotiates a solo flight as is proved in the case of Hadhrat Ali. The Shias not only tortured and humiliated him but left him on all vital occasions. The worst example of this treatment is that Hadhrat Ali (Radiallahu Anhu)'s own brother and one of his most trustworthy companions Hadhrat Aqeel, left him and joined hands with Hadhrat Muawiyah and even fought against Hadhrat Ali (Radiallahu Anhu) under his banner. This fact is attested by a reliable Shia historian.

"Aqeel left his real brother Ali during his caliphate and ran away to Hadhrat Muawiyah and he was with him during the war of Safeen." (Umdaht-ul-Talib fee Ansab Ali-I-Talib, p. 15, published in)

The treatment the Shias of Ali had extended to Hadhrat Hassan and Hadhrat Hussain is a historical reality which can not be smudged with the among of Islam justification and misguided interpretation. The discussion will become unnecessarily long if I go into all the glaring details. Imam Jaffar bin Baqir has himself admitted (and he has a reputation for candor and truthfulness) that the Shias of Ali were depleted of trust, truthfulness and sincerity. When one of his pupils referred to Abdullah bin Yafur, he commented:

" I submitted to Abu Abdullah that I survey the situation by mixing with the people . I am surprised to learn that some persons who are not your friends but are the friends of such and such person possess trust, truthfulness and loyalty, but those persons who claim to be your friends, are drained of these attributes. On hearing this Abu Abdullah sat up in his seat and accosted me in a state of anger : a person has no faith who obeys an Imam not sent by God is immune to all punishment". (Asool Kaafi, vol. 1, P .237)

Shiaism and Sabai

A number of evils had crept into the lives of the early Shias. Their capacity for truth had considerably dwindled; their enthusiasm for defending the right had deplorably diminished ; their love and support of Hadhrat Ali had diluted even though he was their Imam and leader. They had turned into charlatans, reeking with the stench of chicken-heartedness, insincerity, greed, cowardice and equivocation. They now put greater premium on the luxuries of the world than on the acquisition of divine pleasure. They had become greedy -guts and lazy-bones. Hadhrat Ali had himself once addressed them in these words:

"By God ! believe these people will have an edge over you, because they are united over falsehood while you are disunited over truth: you disobey your leader even though he is in the right ; they obey their leader even though he is in the wrong. They render their trusts (back to people) while you embezzle them. They live in peace in their areas while you squabble with one another. If I trust one of you with the lid, I am afraid he will carry away the pot as well".

In spite of these evils, they did not differ from other Muslims in their beliefs and convictions. They neither denied the sanctity of the Quran nor believe in its textual change and mutilation. They did not disacknowledge the superiority of the Prophet (peace be upon him) nor did they discredit the companions of the Prophet (peace be upon him) and his three pious Caliphs. They acknowledged their superior status on account of their close association with the prophet (peace be upon him). They had not invented a separate religion for themselves but shared the same Islamic faith with other Muslims. They did not adopt specific modes of prayer either. They prayed behind their Imams like other Muslims, and like them they performed the obligatory Hajj and discharged other duties: They intermarried with the Muslims - both before and after the wars, as has already been stated and will be discussed at greater length in the pages that follow. However, there was a percentage of people who had been influenced by un - Islamic modes of thought, Jewish 'soi-distant' and the hypocritical Sabais. They outwardly professed Islam but inwardly condemned it. They had in fact suppressed their identity and sailed under false colors. These people had drifted away from the straight path as well as from the party of Hadhrat Ali. for example, Sabais and Kharijis, who had completely deviated from the straight path and had snapped all links with the Islamic faith and with whom Hadhrat Ali and his family had broken all ties, fabricated the most fantastic tales in the name of religion which had neither been revealed in the Quran nor mentioned by the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him).

The paten of life of the early people was identical with that of the Muslims and it remained unchanged till the martyrdom of Hadhrat Hussain. But after the martyrdom of Hadhrat Imam Hussain, other modes of thought and beliefs had encroached into their lives. Those were, in fact, the fundamentals of Sabaism whose poisonous effects were being spread by Jewish, Zoroastrian and other defocused sects of Islam. The Shias of Ali also followed these false and disreputable beliefs, and the degree of their humiliation and stupidity varied in proportion to the strength of the grip with which they had the anti-Islamic convictions. Similarly they disbanded into many splinter groups. Those who exceeded all limits and flouted all restraints were known as extremists, and those who charted a middle course for themselves in their pursuit of the evil, were known as middle-of-the-road or semi-extremist Shias, and those who had only a brush with the devil and were not dyed deeply in the devil's ideology,

were known as moderates. But one common bond linked them together : they were tied to the apron-strings of the demoniacal Abdullah bin Saba and the notorious Judaism. Each one of these sects had assimilated the hoax in proportion to its capacity. But there were others who had completely dissociated themselves, both outwardly and inwardly, from the reprehensible Jews and Sabais and thus wriggled out of the clutches of their tainted philosophy. However the Shias of Ali took umbrage at their act of disaffiliation and discarded them on account of their claim of exemption.* These views and beliefs had percolated to the supporters of Hadhrat Ali* as a result of some calculated conspiracy which had been hatched by the Jews of Yemen in collusion with Abdullah bin Saba and other Jews. Its object was to knock the unity of the Muslims into a cocked hat, sap the foundations of their faith, create dissension among the Muslims, stoke up the fires of loot and murder, disembowel their faith, preach atheism and to introduce changes into the inviolate pattern of divine revelation. Therefore Isfraini * sums up an account or survey of the Shia sects with a highly pertinent comment :

"All these sects of the Imamiyah were based on the negation of the Prophetic companions. They claim that Quran no longer exists in its original shape. The companions of the Prophet introduced changes in it. Therefore the Quran and the traditions attributed to the Prophet are not reliable. They also claim that there is a special clause in the Quran about the Imamah of Hadhrat Ali which had been deleted by companions of the Prophet. They also have no faith in the Shariah as it is being administered by the Muslims. They are anxiously awaiting the arrival of an Imam called Mehdi who will teach them the Shariah. At present they have no links whatsoever with the divine faith. Their main object is to cut up the shackles of Shariah root and branch. They like to confer lawful status on all the prohibited acts, citing earlier changes as precedents for their radical transformation. They claim that there is no such thing as pristine faith, as Shariah had been tinkered with and the Quranic text had been meddled with by the companions of the Prophet".*

The purpose of what I have stated and what I propose to state in the subsequent pages is to establish the fact that changes were introduced in early Shiaism because Abdullah bin Saba succeeded through his iniquitous efforts to intermit Jewish, Zoroastrian and Sabai belief into the framework of early Shiaism. The main purpose of the unconscionable efforts of the Sabais was to generate discord and to inject un-Islamic beliefs into the minds of ignorant and half-witted people. Therefore it seems quite in order to give an objective account of the flagitious efforts of the Sabais and the discussion that follows shall be basically related to Abdullah bin Saba, Sabaism and their beliefs and convictions.

Abdullah bin Saba and Sabaism:

Abdullah bin Saba was a Jew of San'a (Yemen). His mother called Sauda'. Abul Hassan Ash'ari observes:

"This Abdullah bin Saba was a Jew. He nurtured an intense rage in his heart against the new faith which had squelched the Jewish domination and over-lordship of the Arabs of Madina and Hijaz. He embraced Islam during the reign of Hadhrat Uthman. he traveled through the cities of Hijaz. He also visited Basra, Kufa, and Syria. Wherever he went, he tried his best to bring round the half-witted people of that area to his point of view. But he could not realize his impeachable intentions. he left for Egypt and became a permanent resident there. He launched his campaign to disenchant people with their faith by cosmeticizing his vicious designs as elegant and

palatable realities. He found the climate of Egyptian opinion highly congenial for the realization of his scurvy intentions. His pet line of reasoning ran into the following grooves: I am really surprised by your attitude. You attest to the return of Christ, son of Maryam, to the world, but you deny the return of Muhammad to this world ! He kept on hammering his point of view into the minds of people until some weak-willed persons fell into his trap and started believing in the notion of the Prophet's return. He was the first man who sowed the seed of 'return' on the 'tabla rasa' of the Muslim mind. The second canard he spread among the people was that each Prophet has an executor or a preceptor who executes or administers his will. The most cruel person is he who tries to decelerate or prevent the implementation of his will. The chief target of his oppressive measures is the executor as he deprives him of his right to execute the will of the Prophet. O people ! Uthman usurped the right of Hadhrat Ali and victimized and persecuted him. Therefore rise against (the verdict of the oppressors) and return the right to those who are its lawful claimants. Criticize your rulers and deny what they profess and stand for. In this way you will win over the hearts of people. Ibn Saba had also organized a brigade of his friends and companions to propagate his heretic views and asked them to fan out in different cities. They also corresponded with one another to keep themselves abreast of the latest mercurial rise on the thermometer of public opinion and their vicious campaigning finally claimed the life of the Caliph before whom the pages of the Book of Allah lay open at the time of his martyrdom. The rebels and insurgents had attacked his residence and terminated his life. Perhaps, this was the divine verdict !"*

The earliest historian Tabri has sketched out the details in these words:

"Abdullah bin Saba was a Jew and lived in Sana. His mother was called Sauda. He embraced Islam during the period of Hadhrat Uthman. He roamed through the Muslim cities and tried to seduce the Muslims from the straight path. He launched his diabolical campaign from Hijaz and then visited Basra, Kufa and Syria. None of the Syrians cooperated with him. On the contrary, they drove him out of Syria. Thus he moved over to Egypt and settled down there permanently. He started drumming into the minds of the Egyptians that it was strange they believed in the return of Christ and denied the return of Hadhrat Muhammad (peace be upon him). God himself had declared:

Therefore he has a better claim to return to the world in comparison with Christ. He fabricated the concept of the 'return' or resurrection and the Egyptians turned in into a hot debating issue.

Later on he floated the idea that there had been one thousand prophets and each one of them had an executor who implemented his will on earth. Hadhrat Ali was the executor of Hadhrat Muhammad (peace be upon him). Hadhrat Muhammad was the last of the Prophets and Hadhrat Ali was the last of the executors or preceptors. There is no greater oppressor than a person who interferes with the implementation of the will of Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) , persecutes his executor and assumes the role of a self-styled administrator. Then he started bleating out that Uthman had usurped the Khilafat. The executor of the Prophet (peace be upon him) is here: Arise and activate him. Launch your campaign by criticizing the rulers and back out of your religious commitments. In this way, the people will incline towards you from the core of their hearts. Wake up, and invite the people to join your campaign. He spread out his workers in different cities and he kept up his links with them through correspondence. The movement went underground but it was very

active. Outwardly they gave the impression of keeping ablaze the twin slogans of 'Amr bil Maruf' and 'Nahi 'Anil Munkir'. They also dispatched letters to the residents of different cities. These letters picked holes in their rulers. Their companions also corresponded on similar lines. Madina was the focal point of their mischief's and they stretched the nets of their conspiracies far and wide. They never revealed their true intentions and their appearances were invariably deceptive. They kept abreast of the latest developments in all the cities as news pouted in from their planted sources and the network of their conspirators and the possession of the latest information gave them an edge over others. They sent for Muhammad and Talha and told them to go to Hadhrat Uthman and ask him : O Amir - ul - Momineen ! Have you received the news about people that we have received ? He replied : By God ! I have received the news that all is well. But they said: We have received these news, and then they recounted all the news which had been conveyed to them by the mischievous lot.

Hadhrat Uthman said : If you have evidence against my companions and believers, then you should also suggest a way out. They replied : we advise you to send your trusted men to different areas who should examine the situation there. He dispatched Muhammad bin Musalma to Kufa, Usama bin Zayd to Basra, 'Ammar bin Yasser to Egypt and Abdullah bin Umar to Syria. Besides, he dispatched a number of people to other areas. All of them returned except Hadhrat 'Ammar. Their verdict was unanimous. They said : O People ! We have witnessed nothing unusual nor have we witnessed any thing which the Muslim masses or the rulers dislike. All of them jointly affirmed that Muslims enjoyed a position of superiority in those areas. The rulers dispensed justice to the people and saw to it that their rights were not violated. People keenly felt Hadhrat Ammar's delay. They apprehended that he had been murdered by mistake. After some time they were handed a letter from Abdullah bin Saad bin Abi Sarah in which he informed them that the Egyptians had drawn Ammar towards themselves and Abdullah bin Sauda', Khalid bin Maljim, Saudan bin Hamran And Kinan bin Basher were always with him".*

Ibn Kathir and Ibn Athir have commented on it on similar lines and Allama Ibn Khaldun has also written about it :

"Abdullah bin Saba, who was popularly known as Ibn Sauda, was a Jew. He had left his country during the tenure of Hadhrat Uthman but he had not embraced Islam from the core of his heart. When he was honked out of Basra, he left for Kufa from where he made a bee - line for Syria. The Syrians also whipped him out of their country and he left for Egypt. He made Hadhrat Uthman the special butt of his critical remarks and secretly invited people to institute the Khilafat of the Ahl - i - Bait. He pressed upon people to launch the campaign and he spared no opportunity to criticize the rulers. Some of the people openly sided with him. They had come from different cities and therefore they kept up their links through correspondence. Khalid bin Maljim, Saudan bin Hamran and Kinana bin Basher supported the campaign launched by Abdullah bin saba. They had also persuaded Ammar not to return to Madina. Ammar was one of those people who had openly lambasted Hadhrat Uthman for first turning Hadhrat Abu Zar out of Syria into Madina and then for pushing him out of Madina towards Abzah, though, under the circumstances, the action of Hadhrat Uthman was justified. Hadhrat Abu Zar, out of the intensity of his piety and austerity, used to force people to lead their lives on similar lines and to learn to face the hardships of life. He persuaded people to stock for themselves not more than a day's ration. He also illustrate ed with reasoning the undesirability of hoarding gold and silver. Ibn Saba used to instigate Hadhrat Abu Zar against Hadhrat Muawiyah by stressing that he supported the distribution of goods among

the people. Hadhrat Abu Zar started condemning Hadhrat Muawiyah. Hadhrat Muawiyah coaxed him a little and told him : I'll also harp on the same turn that all goods belong to Allah.

When Ibn Saba repeated the same thing to Hadhrat Abu Aldarda and Hadhrat 'Ubadah bin Samat, they snubbed him strongly; Hadhrat Ubadah rather caught him by the scruff of his neck and brought him to Hadhrat Muawiyah and told him that he had instigated Hadhrat Abu Zar against him".*

Hafiz ibn Hajr has related on the authority of Tarikh Abi Asakar :

"He belonged to Yemen. He was a Jew, but he had donned the guise of Islam and roamed through the Muslim cities to lead the Muslims astray and dissuade them from the obedience of their Imams and to sow dissension among them. He also visited Damascus with this end in view".*

Allama Isfraini has also commented on it in a similar vein : Ibn Sauda was a Jew who had donned the gown of Islam to addle the faith of the Muslims".*

Tabri has given a detailed account in his history to let the readers in on the true facts of the case. He refers to him by saying that one day he spent in Basra and the next day he spent in Kufa, some day he was in Egypt and the other day he was seen mooching around at another place. Tabri has also referred to Hakim bin Jiblah on similar lines:

"When three years of Ibn 'Amer's rule had elapsed, he received the news that a person called Hakim bin Jiblah was staying with the family of Abdul Qais. This Hakim bin Jiblah was thief. When the armed forces returned, he hid himself in a corner. He continued his reproachable practices even on the soil of Iran. He threw a spanner among the Zimmis, created discord among the people and always achieved his target. Both the Zimmis and Muslims complained against him to Hadhrat Uthman. He dispatched a letter to Abdullah bin Amir to arrest him and blocked all channels of his bonafides. Ibn Amir arrested him and blocked all channels of his escape. When Ibn Sauda came, he stayed with him. Besides, another party also came to stay with them. Ibn Sauda placed before them a problem in hints but did not explain it. These people accepted his proposal and welcomed him with open arms. He replied: I am from the Ahl-i-Bait. I love Islam and I like to live near about you. Ibn Amir replied : I have received bad reports about you. Therefore you better leave here. He left for Kufa. When he was driven out from there, he settled down in Egypt and kept in touch with his companions through correspondence and they also paid frequent visits to one another".*

"He stayed in Egypt until he left it in the company of people who had killed Hadhrat Uthman. The natives of Egypt had come out in four caravans, led by four of their chiefs. Some estimate their number at six hundred, others at one thousand. The leaders of these caravans were Abdul Rehman bin Adis Bal-wi, Kinanah bin Basher Laythi, Sakuni. Ghafiqi bin Harb 'Aski was leading the entire nation. They did not dare to unfold to the people that they were marching to fight. They pretended to be pilgrims. Ibn Sauda' also accompanied these reprobates".*

Ahmad Amin Misri observes: "This Ibn Sauda' also came to see Hadhrat Abu Ad-Darda' and Hadhrat 'Ubadah bin Samat but they sent him away with a flea in his ear. On the contrary Hadhrat Ubadah caught hold of him and took him to Hadhrat

Muawiyah. He said : By God ! He has stirred up Hadhrat Abu Zar against you. We know that Ibn Sauda was the by -name of Abdullah bin Saba. he was a Jew from Sana who had only put on the mask of Islam during the reign of Hadhrat Uthman. He tried to tamper with the faith of the Muslims. He disseminated a number of his beliefs in Hijaz, Basra, Kufa, Syria and Egypt. It is possible he imbibed his beliefs from the Mazdakis of Iraq or Yemen".*

Ahmad Amin adds:

"He is the person who had provoked Hadhrat Abu Zar to invite people towards communism. He played the most heinous role in muddying the climate of opinion against Hadhrat Uthman. A study of his life reveals that he formulated a compendium of his own teachings to raze the house of Islam to the ground, he established a secret organization to propagate his teachings. He used the name of Islam to cover up his own flaws. After professing himself (to be a champion of Islam) he came to Basra and launched a propaganda campaign to popularize his views. The ruler of Basra extradited him. He came to Egypt where some people rallied round him".*

Before I enumerate the factors which he exploited to create rift in the Muslims, smash their unity and stir up repulsion against Hadhrat Uthman, the Amir-ul-Momineen, companion and son-in-law of the Prophet (peace be upon him), I would like to refer to those Jewish beliefs whose poison this maligned and cursed man tried to inject into the people by using the name of Hadhrat Ali. The Shias further strengthened and consolidated these beliefs. They derived many subsidiary beliefs from these basic principles which led to the formation of different Shia sects. Each sect adopted the beliefs that suited it and shaped its code of action in the light of these derivative beliefs".

Hidden Jewish beliefs:

I have already stated that Ibn Sauda had taken over his beliefs from the Jews who had hated the guts of the Prophet (peace be upon him) and held in spite his community and loathed the Shariah they practiced. They were the staunch enemies of the Prophet of Islam and of the Muslims. And they had launched their campaign of hatred and jealousy against the Prophet (peace be upon him) the day he substituted the name of Yathrib for Madina and put a full stop to the lordship of Jews of Qinqa, Banu Nadhir, Banu Mustalaq and Khyber. Abu Muhammad Hassan bin Musa has unraveled these secrets. He is the earliest Shia historian who has given an account of the Shia sects. He is one of the most famous Shias of the third century A.H. He writes:

"Saba-is are the companions of Abdullah bin Saba. Abdullah bin Saba made faces at Hadhrat Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthman and other companions of the Prophet (peace be upon him) and disaffiliated himself from them and he imputed his acts to the command of Hadhrat Ali. When Hadhrat Ali caught hold of him and asked him about it, he confessed to it. After his confession, he ordered him to be executed. On hearing the order, (quite a few people) made a humble submission to Hadhrat Ali: O Amir-ul-Momineen ! You have ordered the execution of a person who professes your friendship and the love of your Ahl-i-Bait. Hadhrat Ali complied with the submission and exiled him to Madain.

A group of scholars among the companions of Hadhrat Ali has stated that Abdullah

bin Saba was a Jew. He outwardly professed Islam and was on friendly terms with Hadhrat Ali. During the period of Judaism he used to claim that Y'osha bin Nun was the Caliph after Moses, and after embracing Islam he insisted that Hadhrat Ali was the Caliph after the Prophet (peace be upon him). Ibn Saba is the first person who popularized the concept of Hadhrat Ali's Imamah, disaffiliated himself from his enemies and publicly proclaimed his hostility towards his opponents. This is the point that has forced the opponents of Shiaism to state that the real source of Rafidhism is Judaism.

When the news of Hadhrat Ali's death was conveyed to Abdullah bin Saba in Madain, he told the messenger: you are lying. If you wrap u Hadhrat Ali's brain in seventy sacks and offer seventy veracious witnesses as evidence of his martyrdom, I will not believe you. he can neither die simply nor as a martyr unless he is the monarch of the entire earth".*

Abu Umro bin Abdul Aziz Kashi, who was one of the scholars of the fourth century, has given an account of the life of Abdullah bin Saba, some of his traditions and his beliefs and ideas in his book that is supposed to be the earliest on the subject. A few of these beliefs are given below:

(Muhammad bin Qaulwiyyah, Saad bin Abdullah, Yaqoob bin Yazeed and Muhammad bin Isa through Ali bin Mahzyar, Fadhalah bin Ayyab Azdi) report it from Abban bin Uthman. I have heard from Abu Abdullah:

"May God curse Abdullah bin Saba ! He had staked out the claim of God-head for the Amir-ul-Momineen, though, by God, Amir-ul-Momineen was a humble creature of God. There is nothing but ruin and ravage for a person who blurts out lies on our behalf. Some people attribute to us words we have never uttered about ourselves. We express our disaffiliation with these people before God and, by the grace of God, we are exempt (from the false allegations of) these people".

Through Yaqoob bin Yazeed, through Ibn Abi Umair and Ahmad bin Muhammad bin Isa through his father and Hussain bin Said, through Ibn Abi Umair Hasham bin Salim and Abu Hamza Thamali, Hadhrat Ali bin Hussain is reported to have said:

"May God curse him who tells lies about us. When I recalled the words of Abdullah bin Saba, the hair all over my body stood on end. He staked out a bi claim. My God malign him ! By God, Hadhrat Ali was a pious creature of God and the brother of the Messenger of Allah ; whatever honor and prestige he gained, he gained out of his submission to the will of the Lord and His Messenger (peace be upon him); and whatever honor and prestige the Prophet (peace be upon him) and his family gained, they gained out of their submission to the will of the Lord".

Through Muhammad bin Khalid Tiyalsi, through Ilen Abi Najran, Abdullah bin Sanam is reported to have said : Abu Abdullah stated : We Ahl-i-Bait are on the right but we are not immune to fabrication : any liar can impute lies to us, and damage our veracity by telling lies to people against us. The Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) was the greatest truth-teller among the people and the most righteous person on earth. But Musalma, the liar, used to impute lies to him. Similarly, Hadhrat Ali ranked next to him in the uninhibited articulation of truth but Abdullah bin Saba spread lies about him. He tried to replace his true words by false assertions and relied on hyperbole in his praise.

"Some scholars have mentioned that Abdullah bin Saba was a Jew. After donning the robes of Islam, he started cultivating friendship with Hadhrat Ali. During the Jewish period he praised Hadhrat Y'osha bin Nun out of all proportion and openly declared that he was the exactor of the will of Moses. After draping himself in Islamic robes he insisted that after the Prophet (peace be upon him) Hadhrat Ali was the executor of his will: First of all he spread the self-fabricated concept of Hadhrat Ali's Imamah, disaffiliated himself from his enemies; He told his enemies without mincing matters that he opposed them and considered them infidels. That is why some of the Shias in the opposite camp believe that Rafidhism and Shiaism are derived from Judaism".*

Similarly Hassan bin Ali writes in his famous book on the study of men :

"Abdullah bin Saba was inclined towards the denial of belief. His views were extremist. He claimed himself to be a prophet and regarded Hadhrat Ali as Allah. For three days Hadhrat Ali insisted that he should recant. But he did not recant. Hadhrat Ali thus burned him alive along with the other seventy persons who had made similar claims on his behalf".*

One of the later scholars Ma-Maqani in his book "Tanqih-ul-Maqal" has plucked out the same issue* and another Shia historian of Iran observes in his book in Persian language :

"When Abdullah bin Saba came to know that there was a burgeoning opposition to Hadhrat Uthman bin 'Affan, he went to Egypt to capitalize on it. He started preaching piety and the pursuit of knowledge. When he secured for himself an intimate niche in the hearts of people, he switched back to the propagation of his ideology and faith that each Prophet has an executor and a preceptor. No one except Hadhrat Ali can be the executor and preceptor of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) because he possesses knowledge and wisdom, magnanimity and bravery, integrity and piety. The Muslim community committed excesses against him and usurped his right to rule. Therefore it is obligatory for them that they should get ready to help and support him and back out of the obedience and pledge of Hadhrat Uthman. A large number of Egyptians were impressed by his views and beliefs and they revolted against Hadhrat Uthman".*

The famous Shia biographer Istra-badi has also endorsed it :

"Abdullah bin Saba claimed that Hadhrat Ali is Allah and he is his Prophet. When the news reached the Amir-ul-Momineen, he sent for him and asked him about it. He owned it and insisted that he is really the one (who is the referee of his claim). The Amir-ul-Momineen said : The devil has seduced you. Therefore you should repent at once. But he refused to repent and he put him behind the bars for three days. When he did not repent even after three days, he burned him alive".*

The exegete of Nahj-ul-Balaghah, and a fanatic and M'otazili Shia Ibn Abi Hadid rejects the claim that Hadhrat Ali had punished him by burning him alive because, in his view, Abdullah bin Saba had claimed Hadhrat Ali as God after his death. Some of the people started practicing his views and beliefs and they were known as Sabais".*

Sheikh Abdul Qadir Baghdadi among the Ahl-i-Sunnat has supported this view. He thinks that on account of the fear of Syrian in-urgency, Hadhrat Ali did not burn him alive. He explains in the context of Ibn Saba and Sabaism.

"The followers of Abdullah bin Saba are called Sabains. Ibn Saba relied on exaggeration about the status of Hadhrat Ali and claimed that he was a prophet. Then, relying on further exaggeration he claimed that he (Hadhrat Ali) was God and he invited a party of the Kufi rebels to adopt these beliefs. When the news reached Hadhrat Ali, he had some of these people thrown into two pits of fire, as has been hinted at by a poet :

(If the vagaries of circumstances have not hurled me into these two pits, they may throw me any where--i.e., to be thrown into the pits of fire was the worst punishment and any other punishment was comparatively milder).

Hadhrat Ali did not burn the rest of them in view of the danger of Syrian opposition. Besides the fear of the Syrians, he also dreaded the difference of opinion of his own companions. Therefore he exiled Ibn Saba to the Jewish tribes of Madina. When Hadhrat Ali was martyred, he claimed that the martyred man was not Hadhrat Ali but the devil who had revealed himself in the guise of Hadhrat Ali. Hadhrat Ali was whisked away towards the skies as Hadhrat Isa bin Miriam had been whisked away. Just as the Jews and the Christians had relied on fibs in their claim about the murder of Christ, similarly these people saw a slain person who resembled Hadhrat Ali ; they at once claimed that he had been murdered, though Hadhrat Ali ; they at once claimed that he had been murdered, though Hadhrat Ali had ascended towards the heavens and would soon reappear to avenge himself ".

Some people believe that Hadhrat Ali lives among the clouds. The thunder is his voice, the lightening is his whip and when these people hear the clap, they shout out : O Amir-ul-Momineen ! peace be on you".

Amir bin Shurahil S'hobi reports : When Ibn Saba was told that Hadhrat Ali had been murdered, he replied : Even if you bring to me his brain in a bag, I will not confirm his death unless he descends from the skies and rules the entire earth.

This group also believes that the awaited Mehdi is none else but Hadhrat Ali. Ishaq bin Suwaid Adiv has composed a few verses in which he has dissociated himself from Khawarij, Rawafidh and Qadiryyah. The verses are reproduced below:-

(I dis-associate myself from Khawarij, their Gahazali and Ibn Bab, I have no links with them whatsoever).

(But I love the Messenger of Allah-peace be upon him and Hadhrat Abu Bakr form the depths of my heart. I know that it is true and I will be rewarded for holding this view).

S'hobi has stated that Abdullah bin Saba wasted no opportunity to anchor the tenets of Sabaism. Ibn Saba was actually a Jew of Hira who had masqueraded to win the masqueraded himself as a Muslim and was determined to win the leadership of the Kufi's. Therefore he started conditioning their minds with fantastic notions. He told them he had read in the old Testament that each prophet has an executor who executes his will ; and Hadhrat Ali is the executor of Hadhrat Muhammad (pace be upon him). Just as the Prophet (peace be upon him) is superior to all the prophets, Hadhrat Ali is superior to all the executors. When the Shias of Ali heard these views, they told Hadhrat Ali that he was his friend. Accordingly he honored him and made him sit with him near the steps of the pulpit. But when he came to know about his views and beliefs, he decided to murder him. But Hadhrat Ibn Abbas restrained him

by saying that if he murdered him, it would create a rift among his own companions. Since he had made up his mind to fight against the Syrians, it was necessary that he should keep his companions in good humor. When he realized the mischief his murder might spark off, which Hadhrat Ibn Abbas had also pointed out, he exiled him to Madain. But after the martyrdom of Hadhrat Ali, the shepherds of Madain fell into his trap. Ibn Sauda told them : two springs will bubble up for Hadhrat Ali in the Kufa mosque : One of them will flow with ghee and the other with honey and the Shias of Ali will drink them.

The Sunni research scholars re of the opinion that Ibn Saba was a worshipper of Judaism but he tried to damage the faith of the Muslims by spreading cooked-up tales about Hadhrat Ali and his children so that Muslims may hold the same views about Hadhrat Ali as were held by Christians about Christ. When he found that the Rafidhis were the easiest to lead astray, he merged Sabaism with Rafidhism and tried to conceal his own ignorance behind the smokescreen of naive interpretations".*

All the Shia scholars have given an account of Ibn Saba, his views and beliefs and his party ; Syed Qummi (who died in 301 A.H.*, Sheikh Taifah Tusi*, Tastri in Qamus-ur-Rijal*, Abbas Qummi in Tohfah-ul-Ahbab*, Khu Ansari in Raudhat-ul-Jannat*, Sabhani in Nasikh-ut-Tawarikh and the author of Raudhat-us-Safa, have all mentioned him and his party".*

Among the Ahl-i-Sunnah, Baghdadi has touched the issue in his book "Al-Firq Bain-ul-Firq" as has been stated earlier. Similarly, Isfraini in his book Kitab-ut-Tabsir* and Ibn Hazn in Al-Fasl have also mentioned him. Shahrastani writes under the heading of Sabaism:

"Sabais are the followers of Abdullah bin Saba who had told Hadhrat Ali: you are you i.e., you are God, but he had extradited him to Madain The historians suggest that he was actually a Jew, but he had tacked on to himself the label of Islam. During the Jewish phase, he used to claim that Hadhrat Y'osha bin Nun was the executor of Moses. Similarly after apparently embracing Islamic faith, he claimed about Hadhrat Ali that he was the executor of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him). He is the person who first spilled out the concept of Hadhrat Ali's Imamah. The extremist Shia sects have fattened mainly on the calories provided by the views and beliefs of Ibn Saba. Therefore these hard-boiled Shias believe that Hadhrat Ali was not martyred : he is alive. He has godly qualities in him. No other man can become a ruler in his presence. He reveals himself in the clouds. The thunder is his voice and the lightning is his lash. When he descends soon, he will fill with justice the earth that is reeking with tyranny and oppression. It should be noted that Ibn Saba had articulated these views after the martyrdom of Hadhrat Ali".*

Ibn Asakar has cited a tradition of Hadhrat Jabir in his history :

"When the oath of allegiance was taken at the hand of Hadhrat Ali and he delivered his address, Abdullah bin Saba stood up and said: you are "Dabat-ul-Ardh"

Hadhrat Ali replied : fear God. Ibn Saba said : you are the king. Hadhrat Ali replied : fear God. Ibn Saba said again : you have created mankind and you have blessed them with food and means of subsistence. At this Hadhrat Ali ordered him to be executed. But the Rafidhis intervened and asked him to spare him and exile him to the tribes of Madain".*

Allama Al-Wasi has quoted from Ibn-ul-Hakim Ad-Dehlvi :

"Sabaism is associated with people who made companions of the Prophet (peace be upon him) the target of their spite and venom with the exception of Salman Farsi, Abu Zar, Miqdad and Ammar bin Yasir. They call them disbelievers and dissociate themselves from them. Some of them also believe that on the day of the festival of Ali when the Prophet had nominated Hadhrat Ali as his successor, all of them had turned apostate, and after the death of the Prophet (peace be upon him) they backed out of their commitment to the Prophet and did not pledge fealty to Hadhrat Ali. On the other hand they had pledged fealty to someone else. On account of the scandalous deeds of Abdullah bin Saba, this sect had raised its head during the tenure of Hadhrat Ali".*

Finally I quote the words of Ahmad Amin in support of Ibn Saba and his party : A secret organization had gained wide currency during the last phase of Hadhrat Uthman's tenure. They invited people to remove Hadhrat Uthman and appoint some one else in his place as Caliph. Some of them wanted to install Hadhrat Ali as the Caliph, of whom Abdullah bin Saba was the most active. He was a Jew from Yemen and was wearing the badge of Islam. He roamed through Basra, Kufi, Syria and Egypt. His message always focused on the point that each prophet has an executor and Ali is Muhammad's executor. No one is more cruel than a person who prevents the implementation of the will of Allah's Messenger and usurps the right of his Executor. He was the ring leader of all those rebels who had put out their heckles against Hadhrat Uthman until he fell a martyr to their conspiracies".*

"He chalked out plans to dismantle the house of Islam, and established a secret organization to propagate his views and beliefs. He used Islam only as a smoke-screen for his hideous intentions. After professing Islam he came to Basra and launched a campaign to publicize his movement out the ruler of Basra drove him away. Then he moved to Kufi but he was also driven out from there. And then he turned towards Egypt. The people rallied round him and he started airing his views about resurrection and preceptor hood. He had already fabricated his notion of the role of the executor which provided the basis for the Egyptian revolt against Hadhrat Uthman. He had propagated the claim that Hadhrat Uthman had usurped the Khilafat of Hadhrat Ali. He had also picked a number of holes in Hadhrat Uthman's personality. He initiated his campaign for return or resurrection by suggesting that the Prophet (peace be upon him) would soon reappear in the world. He expressed a sense of outrage about a person who affirmed the return of Christ but denied the return of the Prophet (peace be upon him). But then suddenly he changed his gear and asserted that Hadhrat Ali would come back to the world.

Ibn Hazm believes that, after the martyrdom of Hadhrat Ali, Abdullah bin Saba had said that he would not confirm his death even if they brought his brain packed in a bag because he could not die until he flooded the world, full of tyranny and oppression, with justice and equity. The idea of return or reappearance Ibn Saba had taken over from Judaism because the Jews believed that Hadhrat Elias had ascended the heavens and would soon return to the earth to restore law and order. The initial phase of Christianity also centre around this notion".*

This is the identity of Abdullah bin Saba and these are the views and beliefs he had taken over from Judaism. The enemies of Allah and His Messenger, the enemies of Islam and Muslims, and the enemies of the soldiers and champions of the Muslim

community spread the poison of these bogus views and beliefs among the Muslims in the name of Islam. I shall shortly prove how the Shias adopted these beliefs, how changes appeared in the fabric of early Shiaism and how the Shias of Ali fell into the trap of these spurious speculations which are discarded by Hadhrat Ali himself, and how those people sneaked into the Shia community whom Hadhrat Ali had not only snubbed and punished but also expressed his public dissociation from them and who were also cursed and maligned by his sons and their children.

Before delving into details, I deem it necessary to point out that some people born in the fourteenth century, especially the Shias, deny the very existence of this crooked Jew. Their des-acknowledgement is not, however, backed by any cogent reasoning and substantive evidence. This denial is like denying the sun when it is at its maximum blaze because this Abdullah bin Saba is not mentioned only by a handful of his supporters or detractors, but he is mentioned also by each and every person who has spilled the ink on biography, history, character analysis and the theme of the evolution of sects as I have already established with reference to the scholars functioning in their respective fields, I have presented a post-mortem of these high-sounding claims along with a highly reasoned, logical, and thoroughly substantiated analysis of issues involved in my book "Shias and the House of Ali". I would only like to ask if anybody has ever denied his existence before the advent of the fourteenth century, even if that person happens to be a Shia? Then how will you explain the formidable quantity of books riddled with overt references to his personality, his attributes and the nature of his beliefs and convictions, and display and element of unapologetic convergence of opinion on the nuts and bolts of the Sabai suit?

If they deny because denial is their second nature, they can also deny the existence of Hadhrat Ali and Hadhrat Muawiyah and the differences that led to an out-break of hostilities between them. A contemporary Shia scholar, in spite of his prejudice, has come out with a candid statement. Giving a historical account of the degree of factional extremism he observes :

"When Amir-ul-Momineen was elevated to the office of Khilafat, there were some people who placed his Khilafat on the highest platform of divinity, obliterating the distinction between two absolutely non-identical positions. When Hadhrat Ali was apprised of their intentions, he condemned them in the most severe accents and those who persisted in their heinous extremism and perversion were burnt alive by him." On the face of it, it appears that Abdullah bin Saba did not practice his extremist beliefs. This is perhaps the reason that he managed to escape the punishment of fire. Ibn Abi Al-Hadid has supported it by remarking that he kept it a secret for at least a year. Then he suddenly appeared on the scene in his true colors and a party of people danced to his tunes. These were the people who were labeled the practitioners of Sabaiism.

Shahrastani has also endorsed it that "Ibn Saba expressed his true beliefs after the death of Hadhrat Ali", but also opposing them he comments: "Abdullah bin Saba claimed to be a prophet. He believed that the Amir-ul-Momineen was Allah. When he came to know about it, he sent for him. As he came over, he asked him about it. Confessing it he said: you are the one (you are the god-head). He replied: the devil is playing pranks with you. Therefore recant your statement and repent. He had him arrested for three days. And when he did not recant and repent after a passage of three days, he burned him alive".

It is not far-fetched to assume that Ibn Abi Al - Hadid is nearer the truth and Ibn Saba was not burned alive as he expressed his intentions after the death of Hadhrat Ali.

Allama Shahristani has also agreed with it though he remarked earlier that Ibn Saba had told Hadhrat Ali: you are you i.e. you are God ! and Hadhrat Ali had extradited him to Madain.

Allama Shahristani's later statement does not contradict his earlier statement as it is quite possible that he must have said about Hadhrat Ali : "you are you" but kept it a guarded secret during his life and during the days of his own exile and articulated it in a year, or even less than a year, after his death.

Nevertheless it is a fact that Ibn Saba existed in flesh and bone and blurted out the heretic extremism, though some people doubt his existence and regard him as a fiction who had been created as a result of personal compulsions. But I have no doubt whatsoever about his existence and about the heresies he blabbed out. We believe that Ibn Saba committed an unpardonable outrage against the Islamic faith and his innovatory speculations affected a massive party, made rapid strides in its incipient phase, and instead of believing in the divinity of one individual, it posited the divinity of two, three, four and even more individuals from among the Ahl-i-Bait.*

Among the later Shia scholars Muzfar has also affixed the seal of his approval on the existence and corporeality of this individual in his book "Tarikhush-Shia". Similarly one of their veteran scholars Sayyid Mohsin Amin in his encyclopedia*and a host of other people have acknowledged the reality of his existence.

This was Abdullah bin Saba and these were the beliefs he had spread among the Muslims, rather among the Shias, because the Shias proved the most fertile soil for the nourishment of this seed. Ibn Saba's expectations had come true because the Shias responded to his plans the way he had visualized it. He had also expected to flare up their feelings of jealousy by exploiting the name of their leader. he had practical success in diverting most of them towards his crackpot convictions and gaseous beliefs, especially after the death of the innocent Imam Hadhrat Uthman, he broke out of the leash and galloped in all directions, without any check or restriction. he cooked up a number of stories to bolster his new - fangled faith.* He carved out a secret organization to propagate the belief that Hadhrat Ali was the executor and legate of the Prophet (peace be upon him). The members of this secret organization believed in the divinity of Hadhrat Ali and they vested him with divine attributes to give a practical shape to their beliefs. All of these people had interpenetrated the ranks of Shias of Ali and had rallied under their banner and they were actively engaged in spreading the contagion of their poison -- flavored beliefs among their friends and companions. Some of them were simply influenced, others muffled the truth and still others gave a free rein to their views. Hadhrat Ali inflicted severe punishments on those who had articulated themselves openly and publicly. Some of them were exiled, some were beheaded while others were burnt alive. He came out with a public declaration that he was an obedient creature of God. If he came to know about any one who had links with the Sabais, he would be burnt alive, and if he came to know about any one that he drew inspiration from the Sabais and preferred them to Hadhrat Abu Bakr and Hadhrat Umar or used abusive language about them, he would be publicly flogged in proportion to the quantum of his offence.

Zaid bin Wahb reports that once Suwaid bin Ghafalah came over to see Hadhrat Ali during his reign. he told him : I happened to pass by a knot of ment. They were talking about Hadhrat Abu Bakr and Hadhrat Umar and they insisted that I should share their opinion about them. Abdullah bin Saba was the most vocal among them and this Ibn Saba was the first man who had given vent to these views. Hadhrat Ali replied: I have nothing to do with this reprobate and he added: I seek God's protection if I conceal anything in my heart about Siddiq and Farooq. I have a very good opinion of them. Then he conveyed his message to Ibn Saba and exiled him to Madain. He told him not to settle down in the town where he lived. Later he ascended the pulpit to deliver the sermon. When people had crowded out, he lavished the highest praise on Hadhrat Siddiq and Farooq, and he capped the sermon with the words: if I ever come to know about a person that he regards me superior to these two pious persons, I shall inflict on him as many lashes as are inflicted on a person as Had who levels false allegation against another person.*

Hamdani Motazili has also mentioned his tradition. It is in a way exceptional as it contains certain pointers not found in other traditions. I would also like to cite it to illuminate my thesis. He writes: This Ibn Saba used to tell his companions that Amir -ul- Momineen had confided in him that he will go to Damascus and reduce their mosque to a shambles. His might will prevail over the entire earth. He will un-veil the secrets and reveal to the people that he is their creator. How could people like Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman be elevated to such to position ?

Suwaid bin Ghafalah came over to see Amir -ul- Momineen. He was one of his respected and closest associates. He said: O Amir -ul- Momineen ! I bumped into a party of Shias who were lambasting Hadhrat Abu Bakr and Hadhrat Umar. And they said that you have the same thing tucked away in a corner of your heart what they were ventilating openly. He repeated twice. May God protect me ! May God protect me ! that I should conceal anything against them in my heart. I act out what I have in my mind. May God curse him who harbors any thing in his heart against them except a good thing. Both of them were the brothers, companions and advisers of the prophet (peace be upon him). May God shower His blessings on them ! Then he rose from his seat. His eyes were wet with tears He was holding Suwiad,s hand as he entered the mosque and ascended the pulpit. He was grasping his white beard in his hand until the mosque was packed with people. He stood up and delivered a condensed but highly eloquent sermon:

"What has happened to some of these people that they talk on these lines about the two Quraish chieftains and the forefathers of the Muslims. I am not only exempt from what they say but I'll also punish them for what they have said. I swear by the Power who nurtured the seed and created the soul ! Only a pious and virtuous person can love them and only an impious and vicious person can be jealous of them. They spent their days truthfully and sincerely in the company of the Prophet (peace be upon him). They commanded people; they prohibited them as well; they announced decisions as well as punished the culprits, but whatever they did, they never violated the advice of the Prophet (peace be upon him). The Prophet (peace be upon him) also preferred their opinion to the opinion of other people. He never loved any one else the way he loved them. When the prophet (peace be upon him) left the world, he was pleased with them to the roots of his hair. When they left the world, all the believers were pleased with them. The Prophet (peace be upon him) commanded Hadhrat Abu Bakr to lead the prayer during his life time when he fell ill. When God called His Prophet back to Him, who also preferred the next world to this

world, the believers appointed him to the highest office. He was also appointed to supervise the system of Zakat because the highest administrative office and the disbursement and collection of Zakat are concomitant. Then the Muslims readily and willingly took the oath of allegiance at his hand (and elected him formally as their Caliph). I was the first person among Banu Mutlib who had paved the way for his well - being though he did not like it. It was his strong wish that some one else should be appointed to the highest office though he surpassed all others in piety and in his loyalty to Islam. The Prophet himself had identified him with Michael on the basis of his leniency and mildness and with Hadhrat Ibrahim on the basis of his sense of dignity and capacity for forgiveness. He followed in the foot - steps of the Prophet (peace be upon him) till his death. He handed over the office of the Caliphate to Hadhrat Umar after consultation with the Muslims. Some of the people were pleased with him while others were annoyed with him. But when he died, even the displeased ones were pleased with him. He also followed the footprints of the Prophet during his tenure. He followed the Prophet (peace be upon him) as the offspring of a she-camel follows its mother. By God ! He showered mercy on the weaklings among the Muslims; he supported the believers against the oppressors and tyrants. He did not flinch from any sacrifice for the sake of Allah. God had empowered his tongue to speak out what was right; truth was a part and parcel of his life. It seemed as if an angel spoke in his voice. God honored Islam by his conversion, strengthened the faith with his migration and He infused the hearts of the believers with his love and filled the hearts of the disbelievers and the hypocrites with his awe. The Prophet (peace be upon him) identified his sense of determination in the face of enemies with that of Hadhrat Noah. Even during prosperity he was keenly aware of his obligation and gratitude towards God and always preferred submission to arrogance. May God shower the flowers of His blessings on him ! Do you find any one like him ? May God give us the power to follow his footprints ! The status and position he achieved can be achieved only by loving him and following his practice. Therefore anyone who claims to love me should also love them. Any one who does not love them, it seems, he has some spite against me and I am exempt from what he does. If I have apprised you of these things earlier, I would have inflicted severe punishment on any one who dared to abuse them. Listen ! From today onward if any such person is brought to me, I shall inflict on him the most severe punishment which is inflicted on all those who exceed the limits.

You should note it that after the holy Prophet (peace be upon him), Hadhrat Abu Bakr and Hadhrat Umar were the best people in the community. And God alone knows where virtue and goodness reside after them"*

A number of Shia and Sunni scholars have endorsed the contents of this tradition and its veracity is further established by the words of the Shia scholar Nau Bakhti that he had made up his mind to punish all those who ridiculed or abused Hadhrat Abu Bakr and Hadhrat Umar as has been stated in the preceding pages.

The Sabais wrapped up their movement in the blanket of secrecy. They were secretly active and went about their business in a clandestine manner. They put on the veil of dissimulation and did not let the cat out of the bag.*

Hadhrat Ali tried to protect his followers against the incursions of Jewish and Zoroastrian beliefs, but as soon as he drank the cup of martyrdom at the hands of Ibn Maljim Kharijis, Sabaism paraded the streets in its false splendor and Abdullah bin Saba threw all secrecy to the winds and came out in his truly hideous colors. He said to the messenger who conveyed to him the news of his martyrdom :

"O enemy of God ! you are lying. By God ! Even if you bring his brain in a sack and produce seventy reliable and fair witnesses to confirm his martyrdom, I'll not believe your words. I know he has neither died nor has he been martyred. He will not die until he subjugates all the Arabs and rules over the entire earth like a king. Then begged permission to enter the house as if they were convinced that Hadhrat Ali was alive and they were about to see him shortly.

When his relatives, children, friends and companions sized up their condition, they spoke out : God be praised ! Don't you know that the Amir-ul-Momineen has been martyred ? They replied : We know that he has not been martyred and he will not die until he drives the Arabs with his sword and whip them the way he had guided them with reason and argument. He can hear the whispers and can recognize what is hidden under the coarse cloth and he glitters in the dark like a polished sword".*

This depraved and unprincipled party, whose ring leader was Abdullah bin Saba, also claimed that the Prophet (peace be upon him) had borrowed all of his teachings from Hadhrat Ali and his beliefs and convictions were derivative because they were based on these teachings. Many historians and biographers have stressed this point and it is further endorsed by Nau Bakhti who has quoted Abdullah bin Saba saying that Hadhrat Ali in his own life time had enjoined upon his followers to malign both Hadhrat Abu Bakr and Hadhrat Umar.*

A large number of Shias of Ali were enticed away by Ibn Saba and adopted his self-fabricated views and beliefs. This brought about a change in early Shiaism and in the early Shias. Shiaism was formerly restricted merely to a political party, but now it had transformed itself into a religious faith; the Shias of Ali were formerly the workers of a political party, but now they were the members of a full-fledged religious party. The transformation has been substantiated by Wellhausen, an orient list. He observes :

"The Shias of Ali did not belong to a political party. They represented political opinion in an Islamic state. All the natives of Iraq, especially the residents of Kufa, in spite of their mutual disparity, were included among the Shias of Ali, and it was not confined to individuals alone but encompassed tribes as well as their chieftains: If at all any difference existed among them, it related mainly to their respective grading of Shiaism. In their eyes, Hadhrat Ali was a symbol of the lost leadership of their town. It is, in fact, the beginning of the glorification of Hadhrat Ali and his house which had no reality during his life. Shiaism had actually started worshipping his personality behind the smokescreen of a secret religious faith"*

And this is the factual state of affairs. Not a single tradition has been imputed to Hadhrat Ali in which he has considered himself or his family a class apart from Hadhrat Abu Bakr, Hadhrat Umar and Hadhrat Uthman. On the contrary, he considered them superior to himself and his children. He modeled his conduct on the conduct of the first three Caliphs and administered the state on the lines laid down by them. In a letter addressed to Amir Muawiyah, he writes:

"The people, who pledged fealty at the hands of Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman, have also pledged fealty at my hand and on the same terms and conditions on which they had pledged fealty to them. I cannot assert the authority of some thing that is present nor contradict what is absent (i.e., I can operate within my limitations only and can not get away with their violation) Only the natives and the refugees are

vested with the right of Shoora. If they unanimously elect some one as their leader, God is pleased with him. If some one out of malice or innovation sets out on a course different from the course of Muslims, he will be made to retreat to his original position. If he denies it, Jihad will be launched against him as a punishment for deviating from the path of the believers and God will turn his face in the direction he wants to turn

By God ! O Muawiyah if you look at me through the lens of reason and not through greed and prejudice, you'll find me innocent of the murder of Hadhrat Uthman and you'll find for yourself I have no link with it at all. But if you are pre-determined to declare me guilty, then you can do what you like"*

Well hausen writes in support of Hadhrat Ali's contention:

"The old helpers and supporters of Hadhrat Ali regarded him of the stature of other pious Caliphs: He also followed the footprints of Hadhrat Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman. His period of Caliphate was a link in the same chain. It was based on justice and equity. Against the Amwi usurpers of the Caliphate, his rule will always go down in history as based on the Shariah. No one could doubt his right to the Caliphate because he was placed not only among the most venerated companions of the Prophet (peace be upon him) but he also headed the list of these pious personages. The natives of Madina took a formal oath of allegiance at his hand, and he was not entitled to Khilafat just because he happened to be a member of the Prophet's family".*

And it is a fact which only an untutored ignoramus can deny. It was also part of the strategy of these Shias and the Sabais to weaken the authority of Hadhrat Hassan in all matters in order to give a boost to their spurious faith. To achieve their nefarious ends it was imperative to keep strict tabs on the party of his father and to implement the clandestine and calculated plans which they had mutually agreed upon. These were, in fact, the conspiracies hatched by Judaism and Zoroastrianism which they had temporarily pushed behind the smoke-screen of Islam and which they had spawned, bout of sheer spite and jealousy, to impede the flow of the aggressive march of the soldiers of Islam because the Muslims had pulverized their old glory and splendor into the particles of dust. Iranis were also opposed to the Muslims because the latter had inflicted on them humiliating defeats one after the other and almost decimated their culture and civilization. The other nations who had suffered similar humiliations at the hands of the Muslims also piped out the same tune of opposition to the superiority of the Muslims as they were also itching to take their revenge against the conquerors. They were against the Muslims because they delivered mankind from the clutches of idolatry and persecution. Since they persisted in the old ruts of colossal ignorance, they could not appreciate the life-stirring message of Islam and, instead of embracing it from the core of their hearts, they started chalking out secret strategies to wriggle out of its grasp and return to their immoral ways of life.

Hadhrat Hassan lacked the power and authority to check the spread of these pernicious views among his followers and the sincere companions of his venerated father, especially at a time when they were split by doubt and imbecility, and had acquired a notoriety for their cowardice and lack of integrity. it was a time when fibs were foisted on people in the name of the members of the house of Ali to facilitate a mushroom growth of un-Islamic beliefs and convictions. The famous Shia scholar Syed Mohsin Amin has based his conclusions on the observations made by a Shia

Imam.

"Syed Ali Khan writes in his book "Ad-Darajat ar Rafiah fee Tabaqat-ul-Imamiyah min ash-Shia" that it is related on the authority of Abu Jaffar Muhammad bin Ali Baqir who told some of his companions: O such and such ! We and our helpers and supporters suffered at the hands of the Quraish and put up with their overwhelming might though the Prophet (peace be upon him) had declared us superior to all other people. But the Quraish overpowered us and ignored our right to superiority without any logic or reason though they had stressed our right before the natives. Then the Quraish succeeded to Khilafat until it landed in our hands. But soon the pledge to us was broken and we were embattled. The ruler faced many complications and impossible situations until he was martyred. Then people pledged fealty to his son Hadhrat Hassan, made promises with him but they also betrayed him. The natives of Iraq, after embracing Islam, attacked him by driving a dagger into his side. His army was looted and the ornaments of his wives were snatched. He gave up his opposition to Muawiyah and patched up with him and he put a stopper to his bloodshed and that of his family though they themselves were limited in number. Then twenty thousand Iraqis took the oath of allegiance at the hand of Hadhrat Hussain and they betrayed him and revolted against him. The flap of fealty to him still hanged from their necks but, brushing it aside, they martyred him also. They kept on humiliating us ; they trampled over our rights; they striped us of our credentials; they persecuted and murdered us. We suffered from constant fear and danger; we were scared for our own lives and for the lives of our supporters. It was a golden opportunity for the liars and the fabricators. They ingratiated themselves with the rulers through lies and false accusations. Each city has its quota of evil rulers. They related to them self-concocted traditions about us that had no direct or indirect link with us, neither at the verbal nor at the practical level. The only object of imputing baseless traditions to us was to discredit us in the eyes of the people".*

The liars and falsifiers kept up a study of the hot buns of lies and propagated self-manufactured tales to bolster up their bogus statements and beliefs though Hadhrat Ali and his pious children were completely innocent of these allegations. The Sabais were in the vanguard of this brigade of liars, fibbers and forgers and their ring-leader was Abdullah bin Saba. These reprobates had achieved a reasonable measure of success in their negative tactics and were able to dissuade a considerable number of Muslims from the straight and unalloyed Islam through a series of well-calculated moves. They should them into the quagmire of a strange religion in place of the religion of God. These Muslims, who believed in a simple and straight Islam, who were allergic to all forms of idolatry, who were the flag bearers of the unity of Allah, whose badge of distinction was their love of intellectual freedom, who fought in the cause of Allah, democracy, justice and equity; Muslims who were inspired with the love of man as man, who did not divide human beings on the basis of their race, status and power, fell victim to the perjury committed by the enemies of Islam. The Sabais disenchanting the Muslims with he hallowed and time - tested principles and traditions of their own faith and made them dance to a set of philosophical convictions which wee a loosely-concatenated blend of Jewish speculation, Zoroastrian idolatry and in-exhaustible mazes of Christian complication. The Muslims shed away their sense of consistency and uniformity and fell victims to a sense of disparity and division which were in fact the staple of un-Islamic forces and ideologies. They believed in family pride and racial superiority. In their view a person was superior because he was the sprig of a superior family though he was other-wise a morally bankrupt individual. And a person was inferior because he was born in a low family even though he possessed remarkable qualities of head and heart. These

criteria were totally un-Islamic because Islam did not preach any form of discrimination: It stressed the essential equality of all human beings and it judged their superiority on the basis of their deeds alone. The only inference we can draw is that each Shia sect is historically linked with the Sabais and the views and beliefs of all the Shias, irrespective of their denomination. The only difference that exists among them relates to the degree of their borrowing from Sabatism and Ibn Sauda. But it is a cinch that there is not a single Shia sect which can claim its absolute disaffiliation from Sabatism and boast of a total break with its convictions. You will directly witness these realities in the chapter which deals with various sects of the Shia community. Hakim Dehlvi makes a reference to the early Shias in the context of his discussion of Shia sects:

"The other group is that of hypocrites with weak faith. These were the murderers of Hadhrat Uthman and the followers of Abdullah bin Saba. These people abused companions of the Prophet (peace be upon him). These people had penetrated the army of Hadhrat Ali and counted themselves among his supporters. Their sole object was to cover up their hideous acts and to immunize themselves against punishment. Some of them had buttered up their way to close affiliation with Hadhrat Ali and were looking forward to grabbing high offices in the administration. Dreams of a secure future made the present cushier and more comfortable. But in spite of their enviable position, they did not hesitate to unleash the malice and filth which they harbored in their hearts and minds against Hadhrat Ali. They never responded positively to his invitation but persisted in opposing him. They indulged in embezzlement when they were appointed to high offices; they committed excesses against the humble creatures of God and usurped their rights; they also abused companions of the Prophet (peace be upon him). This sect includes the illustrious forefathers of the Rafidhis which reflects a similar configuration of thought. They have also based the foundation of their faith on the statements and traditions of these hypocrites. Therefore what they have imputed to Hadhrat Ali has come to them enroute these malicious people. The historians have also explained why did these double-nozzle hypocrites choose the backdoor channel. They have stated that before the incident of Tahkim these people did not carry much weight in the army of Hadhrat Ali on account of the over-whelming presence of his Shias. The Shias of Ali out-stripped them in numbers and strength. But after the episode of Tahkim, and they were disappointed with the administrative functioning of the Khilafat, as it was drawing to the close of its tenure, they early Shias began to return to their countries from Domat-ul-Jandal (Tahkim). They had lost hope in the triumph of their faith and they elected to ensure the victory of their faith through Quranic instruction and interpretation and the propagation of traditions and dissemination of the wisdom contained in them. Hadhrat Ali also returned to Kufa and dedicated himself to similar assignments. Only those among the early Shias stayed with him who were the residents of Kufa. The situation had tremendous potential for these deviates to launch their campaign of subversion. Therefore they openly ventilated their beliefs which they had kept hidden in the past. Similarly they lambasted his living and dead companions. At the same time, they also wanted to grab high offices as Iraq, Kharasan, and Iran and other territories adjoining them still formed part of his state. Hadhrat Ali extended them the same treatment as they had extended to him or as Moses had extended to the Jews and the Prophet (peace be upon him) had extended to the hypocrites".*

Nau Bakhti has also acknowledged it in these words: "They split up into various sects after the martyrdom of Hadhrat Ali. Their common basis was their faith in his Imamate. They divided into three sects. One of these sects claimed that Hadhrat Ali

was neither martyred nor had he died. He can never die nor achieve martyrdom until he rules over the whole of Arabia and fills the entire tyranny-riddled earth with Justice and equity. This is the first sect in Islam which gave expression to extremism and transgression for the first time after the death of the Prophet (peace be upon him). It is known as the Sabai sect because Abdullah bin Saba was its ring leader. He cursed and reviled Hadhrat Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthman and other companions of the Prophet (peace be upon him) and justified the chiding act by saying that he was following the dictates of Hadhrat Ali. When Hadhrat Ali caught hold of him and asked him about it, he confessed his fault. Hadhrat Ali ordered him to be executed. The people protested violently against the decision. They said; O Amir-ul-Momineen ! you are ordering the execution of a person who is a helper and supporter of your family, and who is publicly opposed to your enemies. Therefore don't execute him and extradite him to Madain.

A group of scholars among the companions of Hadhrat Ali has expressed the opinion that Abdullah bin Saba was actually a Jew. He tagged on to himself the label of Islam and became a close associate of Hadhrat Ali. During his Jewish phase, he used to say that Y'osha bin Nun was the executor and successor of Moses, and during his Islamic phase he gave vent to similar sentiments about Hadhrat Ali, that he was the executor and successor of the Prophet (peace be upon him). He was the first person to propagate the Imamate of Hadhrat Ali. He dissociated himself from his enemies and publicly opposed them. This is the reason the opponents of Shias believe that Judaism is the fountainhead of Rafidhism. When Abdullah bin Saba received the news of the martyrdom of Hadhrat Ali, he snubbed the messenger by saying : you are lying. I'll not confirm his martyrdom even if you bring to me his brain wrapped in seventy sacks and offer seventy just witnesses who attest to his martyrdom. He is not dead and he will not die until he subjugates the entire earth".*

Sabaism and its beliefs, which it had received as part of its Jewish heritage, will be discussed in another chapter. At the same time, it should be noted that some of the early Shias, in spite of the Jewish on-slaught, remained passionately attached to their real beliefs and convictions. There was not a streak of difference between their beliefs and the beliefs of the Muslims of that period. The people who headed the list of genuine Shias included the sons of Hadhrat Ali, Hassan, Hussain, Muhammad, Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthman, Abbas and other children. The sons of Hadhrat Abbas, the rest of the Hashimis, Aqeel, Jaffar, Talib, the children of Hasnain's aunts and the children of the uncle of his father also shared the same set of beliefs and convictions.

In the next chapter, I will critically survey the bogus allegations, hideous accusations and a host of diverse charges the Sabais had cooked up in the oven of their malice to polish off the Islamic state of Hadhrat Uthman. The people who succeeded the early Shias were gullible enough to lap up the spurious veracity of these beliefs as genuine truth and followed a path that diverged from the teachings of Hadhrat Ali and those of the Ahl-i-Bait. They made the innocent Imam the butt of their vile tongues and villainous pens who was ultimately forced to quaff the cup of martyrdom at their bloody hands. These facts have a vital bearing on the topic of my discussion as the people, who had initially helped and supported Sabaism and clung to its fake beliefs, were actually the murderers of Hadhrat Uthman and their lousy supporters. These beliefs and opinions fanned the revolts, flamed the mutual rancour and grudge, deepened the chasm between them, filled their hearts and minds with agonizing nostalgic reverberations, sprinkled salt on festering wounds, scratched old scars and ranked up the buried skeletons of irrational loathing and revulsion.

Shia's Allegations

Before I touch on the topic, I would like to unveil the facts which are hidden not only from the common run of people, but also from the will-informed persons. One of the facts is that 'suppressio veri', suppression of truth or lying is a Shia way of life. They have elevated 'suggestio falsi' to the level of a full-fledged faith. They have sanctified a mere tissue of lies by conferring on it the label of "Taqiyyah"; but a lie is always a lie whether one presents it baldly or wraps it up in multi-coloured gift paper. To identify a self-concocted prescription with divine revelation is simply inconceivable and only a psoturemaster or a Jack pudding could conceive such an equation. No

sensible or sensitive person or group of people can transform sheer flap-doodle into religious faith because it lacks both divine sanction and rational expectance. But the Shias have performed this impossible feat by turning their Punic faith into a divinely guaranteed philosophy of life which relies mainly on the projection of lies and 'supercherie', quackery and charlatanism, bluff and mummery. Their attitude towards "Taqiyyah" is characteristic of their whole mentality: it is a reflection of the collective Shia psyche which is suffering from a chronic moral and spiritual jaundice. The Shias observe (any one who does not observe Taqiyyah – adopts dissimulation as a way of life – is not a believer). And the painful irony of it is that, as a practical demonstration of their penchant for dissimulation, these stool-pigeons have imputed the statement to Imam Muhammad Baqir.

Hadhrat Ali and his family members protested almost invariably against the Shia propensity towards falsification and equivocation. These Imams expressed their displeasure at the Shia habit of misrepresenting facts and always complained against their clap-trap charlatanism. Kashi, one of the most distinguished Shia experts of human psychology, has related on the authority of Ibn Sanam:

"Abu Abdullah remarked that there is no doubt that we Ahl-i-Bait are in the right but we are not immune against the lies of the impostors who may impute some bouncer to us and damage our veracity by spreading humbug about us as the Prophet (peace be upon him) was the most truthful among mankind but Musailmah Kazab attributed lies to him. Similarly, after him, Hadhrat Ali was the most truthful among mankind but Abu Abdullah Hussain bin Ali. Then he mentioned Harith Shami and Banan and pointed out that they blurted lies about Ale bin Hussain. Then he cursed Mughirah bin S'aid, Bazigha, Siri, Abul Khatab, Mu'amar, Bashar-ul-Ashari, Hamza Yazidi, and S'aid Nahdi and said: we are not immune against these liars; they impute fabrications to us. May God protect us against the evil of each liar and send him to hell".

The other fact is that the people, who roll the rosary of allegations and accusations against Hadhrat Uthman, were in fact the people who caused his martyrdom and flung open the gate of dissension among the Muslims. The majority of these traditionalists are Shias. They have magnified microscopic details and transformed Lilliputian realities into Brobdignagian monsters, and the historians have further doubled up the confusion by uncritically accepting the packet of lies handed down to them through the prejudiced traditionalists. The result is that it is almost a Sisyphian labour to sort out fact from fiction and reality from phantasy. The writers and historians have followed a highly whimsical line of action; they have included every insignificant and cooked-up detail genuineness of their borrowed plumes; but they have ignored and excluded even the significant details that clash with their highly volatile priorities and scoff at their spurious thesis.

The third fact is that these traditionalists have not based their perverse findings on the evidence of the direct or firsthand witnesses. They are mostly based on derivative evidence and they have reproduced mere hear-say and baseless observations without caring to test their veracity, creating a jumble of unassorted evidence. Some of the examples are glaring violations of ten years between the events and the reporters of these events. The matter will be discussed at length in the subsequent pages.

The fourth fact is that these impassioned blankety-blank defenders of their putid

faith make no effort to hide their partisan stance in the projection of events. They ignore the claims of truth and side with the group of people who set ablaze the fires of dissension among the Muslims by blowing into the ash of half-dead embers. It is clear that these people are working for the mission of the rebel group and are actively engaged in keeping alive the flames of disunity flared up initially by their forefathers. Therefore it is morally binding on every person who likes to dig out truth that he should not accept their statements blindly and uncritically. He should especially find out for himself if these statements are also endorsed by more trustworthy and reliable reporters which is not unanimously supported by Abu Mikhnaf, Waqdi and the two Kalbis.

It is, however, unfortunate, that their account of companions of the Prophet (peace be upon him) is generally considered reliable through they are the worst successors of their ancestors. They were leaders of the rebels and agents of Judaism and Zoroastrianism. It is possible that they had fallen into their trap against their better judgement and had adopted their convictions as a consequence of unconscious deception. They were thoroughly steeped in their scampish beliefs. They strictly followed the strategy practised by Goebbels in the last days: they juggled and embroidered facts in such a shameless manner and they increased the volume and quantum of lies to such a stupendous degree that people almost started lapping up their spoofy interpretations as unvarnished truth. They in fact crossed all bounds and limits of exaggeration and misrepresentation and out-heroded Herod in their wily and devilish misprojections.

Since my 'modus operandi' is to rely on facts alone, and to prove my point of view on the basis of logical reasoning and substantive evidence and to quote only those sources whose authenticity is irreproachable, therefore I would like to substantiate my statements with the help of following arguments.

Abu Mikhnaf: Mohsin writes in his book "Ayyan-ush-Shia" in a chapter on Shia writers: "Abu Mikhnaf is Lut bin Yahya Azdi Ghamidi. Najashi believes that he was one of the historians of Kufah. He compiled a number of books. The most noteworthy books are the ones dealing with the conquests of Syria, Iraq, Khorasan, Jamal, Safin, Nahr and Gharat and the book dealing with the murder of Hussain. Ibn Nadim in "Al-Fehrist" has recorded the comments of Ahmad bin Harith Khazzaz who thinks that Abu Mikhnaf is more well-informed than others about the conquest of Iraq, Madaini is more well-informed about Kharasan, India and Persia while Waqidi excels them in his grasp of facts about Hijaz and a psychological understanding of people. The information about Syria is evenly distributed among them and they can not claim any edge over one another. But it should be noted that two of these three i.e., Abu Mikhnaf and Waqidi are Shias".

As is well known, Najashi has rated him among the Shia authors and, besides the list furnished by Mohsin, he is also supposed to have compiled the following books: "Kitab-us-Saqifah", the book of Shura, the book on the murder of Uthman, Kitab-ul-Hikmin, the murder of Amir-ul-Momini, the murder of Hussain, the murder of Hajr bin Adi, Akhbareul-Mukhtar, Akhbar-uz-Ziyat, Akhbar Muhammad bin abi Bakr and the murder of Muhammad etc. He has also mentioned that he was one of the distinguished historians and writers of Kufah. He derived a great deal of consolation from relating his traditions. He has also borrowed a number of traditions from Jafar bin Muhammad.

Tusi is of the opinion that his father was included among the companions of Hadhrat Ali. Tusi has therefore mentioned him in his study of men. Hilli states in *Thaqat* that his father was one of the companions of Baqir and he himself was one of the companions of J'afar.

Qummi refers to him in his book: "Lut bin Yahya bin S'aid bin Mikhnaf bin Salim Azdi was a tutor of historians in Kufah. He died in 157 A.H. Hishman Kalbi attributes it to Imam J'afar that his grand father Mikhnaf bin Salim was a companion of the Prophet (peace be upon him) who was one of the companions of Hadhrat Ali during the battle of Jamal and he was carrying the flag of the tribe of Azd. He drank the cup of martyrdom in the same battle in 36 A.H. Abu Mikhnaf was one of the most distinguished Shia historians. Though he had a gook reputation among the Shias, Tabri and Ibn Athir, the two Sunni scholars, have also acknowledged the credibility of his reporting. Abu Mikhnaf has written a number of books on history and biography of which the murder of Hussain is especially noteworthy. Therefore, even the most distinguished scholars have reported from it and relied on its veracity".

Thus the Shia scholars themselves have confirmed his existence and the list of books provided by Najashi clearly establishes his Shiaism and extremism.

Abu Mikhnaf and Sunni Scholars:

Hafiz Ibn Hajr Asqalani has summed up the attitude of Sunni scholars towards Abu Mikhnaf. He observes that he is an uncultured, unreliable and unvaracious historian. Imam Abu Hatim etc. have called him obsolete and outdated. Imam Dar Kutni calls him a weak source. Yahya bin Mu'in considers him unauthentic and disparages him as if he is a nonentity. Ibn 'Adi regards him an extremist Shia and a historian. Hafiz Ibn Hajr is of the opinion that he has followed his authority. He died before the advent of the year 170 A.H. Abu Ubaid Ajri relates that when he asked Abu Hatim about him, he rubbed his hands and said that there was hardly any need to inquire about him (which reflected his insignificance as a reporter). 'Uqaili has placed him among the weak sources of information.

Allama Zahbi in his book "*Mizan*" has mentioned him in the same strain and in the abridgement of "*Minhaj-us-Sunnah*" by Shaikh-ul-Islam Ibn Yaimiyah which is known as "*Muntaqa*", he has identified him with those who are notorious for palming off fibs. He has also referred to a statement by Ashhab bin Abdul Aziz Qaisi which he made in response to a question put to Imam Malik about the Rafidhis. He replied that they should neither be conversed with nor reported from because they are liars. Hurmilah bin Yahya has quoted Imam Sharfi'I that he never found anyone who excelled the Rafidhis in cooking up the evidence. Momil bin Wahab Ribī is reported to have heard from Yazid bin Harun that, with the exception of Rafidhis, the traditions of each innovator can be recorded as long as he does not force or persuade people to accept his innovation. The traditions of Rafidhis cannot be recorded because they speak lies. Muhammad bin S'aid Isfahani heard it from Sharik bin Abdullah Nalhfi that knowledge should be gained from each and every person except the Rafidhis. Knowledge should not be gained from them because they invent the traditions and raise them to the level of hadith. Abu Mu'awiyah is reported to have heard from Amash that people generally regarded the Rafidhis as liars. Then, following the authority of Shaikh-ul-Islam, he believes that any one who cares to study well-reasoned and cogently-argued books on the subject will be automatically led to the conclusion that the Shias are comparatively greater liars than other groups and sects. When a Rafidihi stresses Yaqiyyah, he indirectly confesses his lie".

These are the opinions of the leading scholars about Abu Mikhnaf. These scholars have made a comparative study of the sources of information and have backed up their conclusions with logic and reasoning. And similar and the views of the traditionists and religious scholars about the reliability of the Shias as vehicles of information.

The gist of the matter is that both Shias and Sunnis believe that Abu Mikhnaf was a Shia, that he was untruthful and untruth-worthy and Qummi's words that Tabri and other Sunni scholars have relied on him in spite of his being a Shia, are nothing but a basket of bubbles and it is quite consistent with their nature which finds its exclusive nourishment in stringing up lies and fibs. Any one who had studied Tabri knows that he has nowhere indicated the option to stress only the truthful traditions. It is a mixed bag and he has explained the hodge-podge complexion of the book in his preface:

"There are certain traditions in this book which have come down to us from people who are disliked by the readers and the audience alike. These traditions are neither valid nor have they any link with reality. It should, however, be noted that these traditions are not invented by us but have been reported by people who have conveyed them to us. We have recorded them verbatim without making any alterations in them, and as they have been communicated to us".

Ibn Athir has also explained in the preface of his book that he has reported them from Tabri and relied on his authority: He observes:

"I have collected materials in my book that lay scattered and was not accessible in the form of a single book. Any one who cares to reflect will soon grasp the truthfulness of my statement. First of all I have picked up "Tarikh-I-Kabir" written by Imam Abu Jafar Tabri because all people depend in this book and they revert to it when differences crop up among them, and I have relied on all the various translations and left out not a single one of them".

This is the reality behind the trust of Tabri and Ibn Athir on Abu Mikhnaf. As far as Waqidi is concerned, the comments of Mohsin Shi'i about him are highly pertinent:

"Referring to Muhammad bin Umar Waqidi, Ibn Nadim has commented that he was a Shia and declared Taqiyyah obligatory for them. He has originated the tradition that Hadhrat Ali was the miracle of the Prophet (peace be upon him) as the rod was the miracle of Moses and raising the dead was the miracle of Christ. Waqidi was a scholar of social convulsions, conquests and history. When he died, he left behind six hundred bags packed with books, Two persons could barely lift each one of the bags, though some time back some of his books had been sold for a sum of two thousand dinar. Two of hired slaves wrote books for him day and night. Among his writings are Ar-Tarikh-ul-Kavir, Al-Maghazi, Al-Mabath, Akhbar Makkah, Futu-ush-Sham, Futuh-ul-Iraq, Al-Jamal, Maqatal-I-Hussain, and a number of books on men and history".

Qummi has mentioned this fact in the following words:

"Abu Abdullah Muhammad bin Umar bin Waqidi was a scholar of international repute. He wrote a number of books dealing with intellectual controversies and conquests of cities. He is also the author of Kitab-ur-Ridah. He is rated Al-Mughazi' and his other interpretations have also been dubbed in English. His scribe

Muhammad bin Saad and many other scholars have pointed out that, in spite of his extensive knowledge and scholarship, he could not memorize the holy Quran. It is related that once Mamun asked him to lead the Friday prayer. He apologized and tried to wriggle out of it. But when Mamun insisted, he explained: By God! O Amir-ul-Mominin, I can't lead the prayers because I have not been able to memorize even half of Surah Juma. Mamun told him to commit it to memory. But when he memorized the first part, the second part slipped out of his memory, and when he memorized the second part, the first part slipped out of his memory. When Mamun asked Ali bin Sabah to help him commit it to memory, he also replied that it was beyond his capacity to memorize it. Mamun said to him: Go and lead the Friday prayer and recite whatever Surah you like. Anan reports that he also offered the Friday prayer behind Waqidi and he recited the last two verses of Surah Ali.

He was a practising Shia. He declared Taqiyyah obligatory and believed that Hadrat Ali was the miracle to the Prophet (peace be upon him) as he had been the miracle of Christ, He had also concocted a number of other lies and traditions".

Khu Ansari in his book has conferred on him the title of "the most leading scholar". Thus the Shias have themselves acknowledged that Waqidi was a Shia, that he had the worst possible memory, that he lacked a sense of restraint and self-discipline and both his mind and heart were allergic to Quran.

Waqidi and the Sunnis.

Now I shall try to reproduce the views of the Sunni scholars and biographers about Waqidi invented the traditions".

"He used to relate inverted and dubious traditions from authentic traditionalists. Ahmad bin Hanbal controverted him and Ali bin Madini declared that waqidi invented traditions".

Zahbi believes that the scholars have unanimously rejected him. Imam Nisai declared that he cooked up the traditions. Hafiz ibn Hajr Hajr has compiled the whole gamut of views and opinions about him in the form of a book. He relates on the authority of Imam Bokhari that Waqidi was a madani, he lived in Baghdad and his traditions are obsolete. Ahmad Ibn Mubarik, Ibn Numair and Ismail bin Zikriyyah have declared him out of use and circulation. Mu'awiyah bin Saleh reports Imam Ahmad bin Hambal to have said:

"Waqid is a liar"

Yahya bin Munin Stated:

"He is weak"

Sometimes he declared,

"He is nothing" (he is a nonentity-he does not carry any weight) Ibn Madini said:

"Haitham bin 'Adi is more reliable to me than Waqidi and as a reporter of traditions he possesses greater popularity and credibility".

Imam Shafi'i affirms:

"All the books of Waqidi are bundle of lies ".

Imam Nisai comments in his book "Adh-Doafa".

"Four liars are notorious for imputing bogus traditions to Prophet (peace be upon him) (1) Waqidi in Madinah (2) Muqati in Kufah (3) Muhammad bin Said Maslub in Syria and then he also mentioned the forth one:

Ibn `Adi asserts:

"The traditions reported by him are untrust-worth".

Ibn Madini declares:

"I know twenty thousand traditions which are baseless (which have no authentic origin). Ibrahim bin Yahya is a liar also but he is better than Waqidi in my view".
Imam Abu Daud declares:

"I neither record any tradition reported by him nor do I relate it nor have I any doubt about his capacity for inventing traditions". Binder says:

"In my view he is one of those who cooked up tradintions".

Ibn-ul-`Arabi has cited a statement made by Imam Shafi'i.

"There were seven persons in Madinah who invented traditions: one of them was Waqidi"

Imam Abu Zar, Abu Bashir Dulabi and Uqaili are collectively of the opinion that "his traditions were obsolete"

Imam Abu Hatim Razi remarks:

"The scholars in Madinah disacknowledge the validity of his traditions".

Ibn Jauzi has quoted the statement made by Abu Hatim Razi:

"He fabricated the traditions".

Hafiz Ibn Hajr has related an episode which revels the extent of his audacity in telling lies. Umro Naqid told me that he asked Waqidi: Do you remember any hadith about the curse of visiting graves through Thauri, through Ibn Khaitham, through Abdur Rahman bin Nabhan, through Abdur Rahman bin Hitham bin Thabit? He replied in the affirmative and qoted Sufiyan as its source. I asked him to dictate it and he started dictating it on the authority of Abdur Rahman bin Thauban. I said: all praise is to God Who has made you slip! you claim to be an expert on the geneo-logy of Jinns but you don't remember its authentic source! Safi is of the opinion that it refers to a tradition which other people besides him have reported from Sufiyan.
Imam Navi says;

"By the unanimous opinion of Muhaddithim, Waqidi is weak"

Allama Zahbi writes in Mizan:

"A consensus has been achieved on Waqidi's weakness" Imam Dar Qutni says:

"His hadith reflects weakness"

Jauzani remarks:

"He did not reply on moderation in inventing hadith"

These are the opinions of the Sunni scholars about Waqidi. The Shias have themselves acknowledged that he is not just a plain Jane of a Shia but is also one of those hard-shell Shias who declare lying obligatory as part of their Taqiyyah and for whom the art of lying is a sure passport to salvation!

Mohsin Amin has included a reference to Muhammad bin Saib and his son Hisham in his grading of Shia historians. Ibn Nadim, who is himself a Shia, has mentioned him in his "Fehrist" Najashi comments on Hisham bin Muhammad:

"Hisham bin Muhammad bin Saib bin Bashir bin Zaid bin Umro bin Harith bin Abdul Harith bin Azzi bin Umra-ul-Qais Amir bin N'oman bin Amir bin Abdu bin 'Auf bin Kinanah bin Auf bin Zaid-ul-lat Raqidah bin Thaur bin Kalb bin Vibra Manzir was a genealogist and a historian. He was a distinguished scholar in his field and was a sincere follower of our faith. Once he was suffering from a serious illness. As a result of the disease he lost his memory and knowledge. Then he sought the kind patronage of J'afar bin Muhammad who made him quaff a tumbler of knowledge which restored his memory and scholarship. Abu Abdullah also patronized him. He composed a number of books of which Mathalib-Thaqif, Mathalib-i-Hussain, and Kitab Akhbar Muhammad bin Hanfiyyah are especially not worth.

Imam Daud Hilli has stated in the first part of his study of men that his father was one of the companions of Imam Baqir. He has also observed that his son Hisham was much patronized by Imam J'afar Tusi has included Muhammad bin Saib among the companions of Sadiq and Baqir. He was an extremely fanatic Shia and his lapses are immeasurable.

The Shia scholar, Abbas Qummi observes:

"Kalbi, who is also known as Ibn Kalbi, was a genealogist. His name was Abul Manzir Hisham bin abi Nafr Muhammad bin Saib bin Bashr Kalbi Kufi. He was an expert in tracing pedigree. Some of the knowledge relating to the genealogical tree he had obtained from his father Abu Nafr Muhammad bin Saib who was one of the companions of Sadiq and Baqir. Abu Nafr had gathered information about Quraish pedigree from Saleh who had collected it from 'Aqil bin abi Talib. Ibn Qatibah observes that Bashr was his grandfather, and his two sons Said and Ubaid-ur-Rehman had participated in the battles of Jamal and Siffin on Ali's side. Saib received martyrdom along with Musab bin Zubair and Muhammad bin Saib Kalbi participated in many battles along with Ibn Rashat. He was a genealogist and an exegete. He died in Kufah. Samani, in an account of Muhammad bin Saib, writes that he was an exegete. He was a native of Kufah and believed in the return'. His son Hisham was a man of high stature and was an extremist Shia. It is recorded in "Ar-Rijal-ul-Kabir" that Hisham bin Muhammad bin Saib Abul Manzir was a genealogist of international

fame. He was paragon of knowledge and scholarship, and a historian of great reputation. He was a true devotee of our faith. It is also recorded that once he fell into the clutches of sanguine disease. As a consequence, his memory was completely washed out. He approached J'afar bin Muhammad (to seek and antidote against the disease). J'afar offered him a glass (of some liquid) to drink which totally restored his knowledge and memory. Abu Abdullah patronized him a great deal. He was also an enviable semasiologist and, on account of his stupendous memory, had memorized the holy Quran within a span of only three days. And three is nothing to feel dazed about. A man who quaffs a glass (of any liquid etc.) at the hands of Imam Sadiq, and memorize the Quran within the span of even less than three days". Kalib died either in 206 A.H. or in 204 A.H.

I believe that the account of Hisham and his father Muhammad is quite adequate and which is enough to establish his credentials as a Shia of old vintage.

Kalbi and Sunni Scholars:

Imam Ibn Asqalani has mentioned the views of Sunni scholars about Kalbi in his account of Muhammad bin Saib. He refers to a statement made by Mu'amar bin Suleiman. His father had stated that there were two liars in Kufash. One of these liars was Kalbi. Layth bin S'add has endorsed the view and said that the other liar was Sudu. Dauri relates on the authority of Imam Yahya bin Mu'in that it is flimsy and lacks the ballast of reality. Mu'awiyah bin Saleh reports from Imam Yahya that it is a weak tradition. Abu Musa says he has no evidence that either Yahya or Abdurrahman had heard it from Sufiysn. Imam Bokhari is of the opinion that Yahya and Ibn Mehdi have declared it obsolete. Dauri relates it on the authority of Yahya bin Yala Muharibi: When Zaida was asked why had not he reported from Ibn abi Layla, Jabir J'ofi and Kalbi, he replied he did not remember much about Ibn abi Layla but Jo'fi was a liar and believed in the 'return': I also visited Kalbi off and on but I heard from him that his mind had been drained of all knowledge as a result of some disease but was eventually restored through the pouring of some liquid into his mouth by one of the descendants of Muhammad, I gave him up and stopped visiting him.

Asma'I reports from Abu Awanah: I had heard certain things from Kalbi which turn a believer into an infidel but when I asked him about it, he simply back-tracked. Abdul Wahid bin Ghiyyath relates on the authority of Ibn Mehdi that abu Jaz' came over and sat with us at Abu Umro bin 'Ila's gate and declared: I witness that Kalbi is an infidel. When I mentioned it to Yazid bin Zuray, he also confirmed he had heard him saying that Kalbi was an infide. When he was asked to explain it, he replied: I have heard him saying that once Gabriel came over to the Prophet (peace be upon him) to reveal to him the divine message. The Prophet went out to do some errand. Hadhrat Ali was sitting there at that time. So Gabriel conveyed the divine revelation to him. Yazid does not confirm hearing it from him but he witnessed that he used to beat his chest with his hands and repeatedly declared: I am a Sabai, I am a Sabai. Uqili believes that Sabais are a group of Rafihis and are the companions of Abdullh bin Saba. Fudhail reports from Mughirah'. Zayd Habab has heard from Thauri That he doubted the sanity of a person who relied on Kalbi as a source of his information.

Ibn abi Hatim says: I asked my father why did Thauri report from Kalbi? He replied: His object is not to report from Kalbi but to vent his sense of shock and outrage by quoting his statements, but the audience have mistaken it for a tradition.

Ali bin M'asher reports from Abu Janab Kalbi that Abu Saleh had declared on oath he had not learnt the art of exegesis from Kalbi at all. Abu Asim attributes to Sufiyan Thauri that Kalbi had told him to discount whatever he had reported from Abu Saleh who had in this turn reported it on the authority of Ibn Abbas because it was web of lies and therefore should not be passed on as authentic tradition.

Asam'I reports from Qurrah bin Khalid the opinion of the enlightened scholars who believed that he was a liar. Yazid bin Harun relates that when Kalbi grew up, he fell a prey to amnesia. Abu Harim is of the opinion that people had unanimously discarded his hadith. His traditions are not reliable and can not be entertained by any sane and sensible person. Ibn 'Adi states that, in addition to what has been already expressed, some good traditions have been ascribed to him, especially the ones he had reported from Abu Saleh. He had carved a name for himself in the art of explication. No one has compiled a longer exegesis than him. Some confirmed traditionists have also relied on his reports. He is a likeable figure in the field of exegesis but he is notorious for his excesses in the field of hadith. His hadith can, at least, be relied upon as it is reputed to walk on crutches.

Ibn abi Hatim states that Imam Bokhari has recorded somewhere that Muhammad bin Bashr heard from Umro bin Abdullah J'afar who passed it on to Muhammad bin Ishaq. Ibn Hatim has confirmed him to be Kalbi. Muhammad bin Abdullah Jafri states that he died in Kufah in 146 A.H. Ibn S'aad has traced his lineage down to Kalb bin Vibrah. His grandfather was Bashr. His sons Saib, Ubaid and Abdur Rahman had fought in the battle of Jamal on Ali's side. Muhammad bin Saib also appeared in Jamajam with Ibn Ash'at. He was an exegete, a historian and an expert on Arab pedigree. He died in Kufah in 146 A.H. I have gathered all this information from his son Hisham. The scholars call him a nonentity and his traditions are lame ducks.

Ali bin Junaid, Hakim, Abu Ahmad and Imam Dar Qutni declare his traditions obsolete. Jouz-Jani identifies them as a bag of fibs. Ibn Haban believes that his lie is so glaringly obvious that it hardly needs any gloss or commentary. He has reported his exegetical explications from Abu Saleh but Abu Saleh's dependence on Ibn Abbas has not been confirmed. Therefore his exegesis is utterly unreliable.

Saji again beats out the drum of his out-datedness and unreliability. On account of his hideous extremism, his traditions are reduced to paper props. The scholars unanimously condemn his reports as obsolete. Imam Abu Abdullah Hakim says that he has reported the traditions from Abu Saleh".

The status of Kalbi has been amply substituted by the views and opinions of the scholars and he is found to be a fabricator of the lowest brand whose fibs and fictions spin out like the devil's intestine. As far as his son Hisham is concerned, he is also stamped with the same insignia of concoction. Therefore he is also a Rafidhi and a liar as has been attested by Zahabi and other scholars of his status who specialize in the art of comparison based on logic and reasoning. This Kalbi has also churned out a book on the companions which has been referred to by Ibn Mathar Hilli in this book "Minhaj-ul-Karamah".

Shaikh-ul-Islam, Imam Ibn Taimiyah has mentioned him in his book and has also quoted the views of the distinguished Imamas to support his findings:

"Hisham Kalbi was the most scabby liar. He belonged to the Shia community. He relied for his reports on his father and Abu Mikhnaf Lut bin Yahya. Both of them are

obsolete and are crusty liars. Imam Ahmad is of the opinion that nobody can rely on his reports because he was only a genealogist and a teller of fictitious tales. Imam Dar Qutni states that he was out of circulation. Ibn 'Adi remarks that he usually indulged in fantasy and had no role in the compilation of hadith. His father was also a spat on liar and therefore thoroughly unreliable. Zaida, Layth and Sulaiman Tamimi have called him a tale-teller and a shammer. Yahya has labeled him a trickster and an impostor. Ibn Haban states that his legerdemain is obvious that it hardly needs any explanation.

These are the four traditionists on whom the historians have based their conclusions. They appeared during the reign of Hadhrat Uthman. They have given a detailed account of the battles fought between them and Hadhrat Ali and they insisted on the revenge of the blood of Hadhrat Uthman. The historians have depended on these discredited, disgraced, grovelling and spurned reporters for recording events right up to the martyrdom of Hussain and the conclusions based on these events. These four spivvish reporters had looked at events through their prejudice-tinted goggles and relied on the support and backing of history to disseminate Sabaism and to propagate their catchpenny views. At first these mealy-mouthed swindlers played false with the people in the name of people's love of the Ahl-i-Bait and then opened a new conduit to shoot the arrows of their spite and malice at the pious and virtuous companions of the Prophet (peace be upon him) to insinuate the measly innovations of Abdullah bin Saba into the faith of the simple and innocent Muslims. That is why I have unfolded the background of these reporters before I actually embark on the events and circumstances which they exploited for their insidious purposes. The object is to help the readers gauge the veracity of the episode in relation to the credibility of its reporter. It need hardly be stressed that any episode on which the Sabais have built a consensus is spurious and unreliable.

How I would like to submit that these ignominious people had spread a network of caddish conspiracies to create rift among the Muslims, shatter their unity into bits and pieces, scramble their sense of collectivity, dismantle the impregnable fort of Islam and to polish off the Islamic Caliphate.

First of all they spread alien, un-Islamic and Jewish beliefs and views among the Muslims, and then circulated false and self-invented rumours about the rulers. I would like here to reaffirm the words of Ibn Jarir Tabri which I have reality of the allegations they had levelled against Hadhrat Uthman bin Affan, the third Caliph of the Messenger of Allah. It was the same Uthman who valued self-respect above everything else, who was an embodiment of magnanimity, piety and modesty, who was the son of the Prophet's aunt, who was the husband of two of the Prophet's daughters and who was all praise for the Ahl-i-Bait, for Ali for Ali's children.

I'll try to explain why a net-work of conspiracies was spread against him, who were the people who prepared the wrap and woof of the net-work and who were those hideous creatures who stoked up the embers of hatred and dissension against him. Tabri's comments are pertinent to a resolution of the tangle woven by these questions. According to him, Abdullah bin Saba was a Jew among the natives of Sana who was the son of a jet-black slave-maid. He put on the mask of Islam during the reign of Hadhrat Uthman and he roamed through various cities to lead the Muslims astray. He launched his campaign from Hijaz and then visited Basrah, Kufah and Syria. When the Syrians cold-shouldered him and drove him out of their country, he left for Egypt. His pet slogan revolved around the issue of the Prophet's return. He was shocked by the attitude of people who affirmed the return of Christ but denied

the return of the Prophet (peace be upon him).

(Hadhrat Muhammad has a better claim over resurrection than Christ). His slogan spread like an epidemic and he gave birth to the concept of 'return' or resurrection: And then he started parroting out that there had been at least one thousand prophets who were each blessed with an executor or a successor. In the same way Hadhrat Ali was an executor of the Prophet (peace be upon him). Later on he insisted that if Hadhrat Muhammad was the last prophet, then Hadhrat Ali was the last executor. He added further spice to his over-peppered slogan that no one could be a bigger tyrant and a greater oppressor than the one who blocked the execution and implementation of the Prophet's will and persecuted his executor and successor and took over the reins of power in his own hand. Explaining his thesis he proposed that Hadhrat Uthman was a usurper. He had illegally possessed the Khilafat because the executor of the Prophet was alive. Therefore he prompted the people to raise against him and to mobilize their energies in order to throw away his unlawful regime. He instigated them to cast aspersions on their rulers and dissociated themselves from their acts in order to attract the sympathies of the people. In order to achieve his heinous objective, he spread his agents throughout the country and dispatched letters to the insurgents in different cities. He carried on his conspiracies clandestinely. In his letters he peeked at the Muslim rulers. His companions also followed him and initiated an almost unending chain of letters criticising the Muslim officials. The agents in various cities were in touch with one another to pick up the latest information. They read out these letters to the residents of each city and kept them abreast of the new developments. Their nefarious activities ultimately spread to Madina. Their exteriors never betrayed their intentions. They never let out their real feelings and the outward appearance always clashed with the inward reality. The citizens of each town claimed that they were free from the troubles faced by people in other towns. Only the residents of Madina enjoyed comparative immunity. They dispatched Muhammad and Talha to Hadhrat Uthman. They said to him: O Amir-ul-Mominin! Have you received the news from people which we have received? He replied in the negative and added: I have received only good news. They said that they had received certain news and then they conveyed the news to him which they had fabricated themselves. He replied: you are my companions, you know the state of the believers. Therefore you should advise me what to do under the circumstance? They replied: We advise you to despatch trustworthy and reliable persons to different places to size up the state of affairs and submit their reports in the light of their findings. Accordingly he dispatched Muhammad bin Muslimah to Kufah, Usamah bin Zayd to Basrah, Ammar bin Yasir to Egypt and Abdullah bin Umar to Syria. Besides them, he also despatched a number of other people to survey the situation in different parts of the country. All of them returned with the exception of Hadhrat Ammar and reported: O people! We have not come across any unpleasant incident or circumstance which is disliked by the ordinary or the extra-ordinary persons. The situation is completely in the control of the Muslims. The rulers are dispensing justice to the people and are helping them in the realization of their rights. The people severely felt the delay of Hadhrat Ammar and apprehended that he had been martyred. Meanwhile a letter from Abdullah bin S'aad bin abi Sarh was received which conveyed the news that the people in Egypt had brainwashed Ammar and they had rallied round him. Among them Abdullah bin Sauda', Khalid bin Malhim, Saudan bin Himran and Kinanah bin Bashr are in the vanguard.

Tabri has related the response of Hadhrat Uthman to this episode which I am citing below for the enlightenment of my readers.

"Then Hadhrat Uthman despatched a letter to various cities. In the letter he wrote: whenever the administrators come to see me during the period of pilgrimage, I hold them to the process of accountability. Since my induction into the office of Khilafat I have made the positive virtues prevail over the negative vices and established the superiority of right over wrong, justice over injustice and good over evil. Wherever complaint is registered against me or my officials will not go unheard. Neither my family nor myself have complained to me that some of them are abused and beaten up some one. If any excess has been committed against anyone, he should come to me during the season of the pilgrimage and secure his right to forgive, and if you forgive, your reward is certainly with God.

When Hadhrat Uthman's letter was read out to the people, they burst into tears in a surge of excitement. They said the nation seemed to be in for some inauspicious time. Hadhrat Uthman called his officers from different places. Thus Abdullah bin Amir, Mu'awiyah and Abdullah bin Saad came over to see him. He also called Sa'id and Umar for consultations with them. He said: what is the nature of the complaints that are pouring in against you. I fear these complaints may turn out to be true to me discredit. They replied: Didn't you send us away to size up the situation in different places and didn't we submit the reports to you on our return that no one had raised any protest or lodged any complaint in the face-to-face dialogue? By god! The people who bring to you such news are neither pious nor righteous. These things have no basis in reality. You catch hold of any one of them, and he will not be able to substantiate his complaint. These are mere rumours and it is unjust to believe in them. Hadhrat Uthman then sought their advice to resolve the complication.

Sa'id bin As replied: It is a well-calculated conspiracy which has been clandestinely hatched. The innocent people fall prey to it who, on account of their ignorance, talk in this strain in various gatherings. Uthman : What remedy do you suggest? Sa'id replied: Any one who talks on these lines should be called and examined, and if found guilty, should be duly penalized.

Abdullah bin Saad suggested that to concede people their rights and to induce them to do good was better than calling them over. Hadhrat Mu'awiyah proposed: you have made me the administrator and you'll always hear of good news from the areas administered. But there are two persons who harbour separatist ideas. Hadhrat Uthman asked: what should be done about them. I suggest that they should also be treated fairly and leniently. Then he asked: Umar, what is your opinion? He replied: your attitude is too soft. You are just being lazy. You have beaten even Hadhrat Umar Faruq in doing out concessions to them. I would suggest that you should follow the policy of your former companions. You should be stiff where softness is required. It is quite in order to treat a person harshly who spares no effort to harm and torture others, and it is equally in order to treat others gently and affectionately. But you treat everyone softly.

Then Hadhrat Uthman stood up, praised the Lord and said: I have listened to your views. Each matter has some door, and the matter about which the entire nation has apprehensions has an ominous ring about it. It is mildness, fair treatment and kindness alone that have kept the door locked so far. Of course, I am quite strict in imposing the divine limits and no man is justified to relax or tone down their severity. But it is my soft attitude alone that has kept the door of dissension jammed in the past. But, by God, the door is bound to fling open though no one will have a solid cause against me. God knows I have always banked on good wishes and pious motives and have treated people with utmost affection and kindness. By God! The

wheel of sedition I revolving. It would be most fitting for Uthman to die than to escalate the movement to seditious wheel. Try to restrain people, concede them their rights and condone their lapses but you should not make any concessions to those who trample over the rights of Allah".

Later, Hadhrat Uthman counted the allegations one by one that the Sabais had levelled against him and in his famous address he refuted all these charges, a fact unanimously recorded by all the historians.

"These people have raised certain objections against me though they know the reality as much as you know it. But they talk about these things to the innocent people and like to taint the climate of public opinion against me. One of their objections is that I offer full prayer is not offered during a journey. The fact is that I went to a city where my family lives. There I offered a full prayer. Am I not telling the truth? All of them chanted: yes! Another objection is that there are special pastures special which had been declared special before me. I swear by God that I have declared only those pastures special which had been declared special before me, and I ordered them to tone up only those pastures which carried the consensus of all the natives of Madinah. I never stopped anyone to graze animals and converted them into gifts for the Muslims to prevent any dispute between the people and the superintendent of a pasture. I did not check any one not to push out any one except those who were guilty of bribe. At this time there are only two camels in my possession. I own neither a she-camel nor a goat, though at the time of my accession to the Khilafat, I owned the largest number of camels and goats in whole of Arabia. But today I own neither a camel nor a goat. There are only two camels left which I use during pilgrimage. Isn't it correct? All of them replied. Yes, it is correct.

They also accuse me of assembling the Quran, which comprised many volumes, into one volume. The only answer to the objection is that it is the same Quran which has been revealed from God and I have only followed the practice of my former companions: Isn't it true? All of them replied: yes, it is quite true. They not only endorsed his statement but also demanded that the insurgents, who had levelled false allegations against him, should be properly penalized.

Similarly they accuse me of recalling Hakam. The fact is that the Prophet (peace be upon him) had himself extradited him. Hakam was a native of Makkah. The messenger of Allah had exiled him to Taif and later he himself had called him back. It means the Prophet (peace be upon him) had extradited him and then recalled him. Isn't it true? The people replied: yes, undoubtedly.

One of their objections is that I have appointed young men as my administrators. The plain answer to this objection is that I have appointed only those men as administrators who are competent, popular and cool-minded. Ask the people they administer and who live in the cities they rule. A young man had been appointed administrator in the early days. When the Prophet (peace be upon him) appointed Usamah as the administrator, people shot at him a greater volley of objections than they have raised against me. Didn't it happen exactly as I have said? The people replied: yes, undoubtedly. Ah! These people pop objections they cannot prove.

Then he pointed out an other objection they had raised against him. They have objected that I have made a special present to Ibn abi Sarh out of the spoils. The answer to this objections is that I gave him one-fifth out of the fifth portion of the spoils as a reward which amounted to one tenth of a million. Hadhrat Abu Bakr and

Hadhrat Umar had initiated the practice (and I was only following a precedent established by them). But when the army did not like it, I recovered the amount from him and distributed it among them, though they could not claim it as their right. Isn't it the factual position? All of them replied: yes, undoubtedly, it happened the way you mention it.

Another reason they snipe on me is that I love the members of my family and parcel out rewards among them. It is a fact that I have never tortured anyone on account of my love for my family. I concede them only their rights and make presents to them out of my personal possessions. I believe the property of the Muslims is not lawful for myself or for any one else. Even during the period of the Prophet (peace be upon him), Hadhrat Abu Bakr and Hadhrat Umar I disbursed considerable charity out of my personal property, though I was young at that time and tended to be rather niggardly and financially stringent. But now when I have grown old and my life is fast eroding and I am leaving all my belongings to the members of my family, these heretics have started imputing to me such baseless motives. By God! I have never acquired any spare possessions in any town to trigger the adverse comments of the people against me. The fact is that I always returned to them the extra goods and kept for myself only the fifth portion, and even out of that I never kept anything exclusively for myself. The Muslims distributed the goods among the people of the area and I did not claim any share in it. Therefore not a penny was aimlessly squandered out of the goods of Allah and I eked out an existence purely on my personal possessions.

Another objection hurled at me is that I have conferred land on some people as a gift. The simple answer is that this land was distributed among the natives and the refugees who had conquered it. Therefore any one who was physically present at the time of those conquests is virtually an owner of the conquered lands. But the land of those, who had returned to their families, was not transferred. I therefore deliberated on this form of property and, with the consent of the actual owners, it was exchanged with Arab land. Thus these lands are in their possession and do not belong to me.

Just distribution of land:

Hadhrat Uthman distribute his lands and possessions among the members of Banu Umayyah and his children had a share in them like other members of the tribe. He initiated the distribution with the sons of Abul 'As and gave ten thousand to each one of the children of Hakam. Thus, collectively, they had received one-tenth of a million. He apportioned the same amount of money among his own sons. Besides, he distributed his goods among Banu al-As, Baun al-Is, and Banu Harb also.

Mild treatment

However, Hadhrat Uthman treated those provocateurs mildly, though the Muslims generally opposed it and favoured a harsh treatment of the seditionist. But Hadhrat Uthman insisted that they should be pardoned. Therefore they returned, but as they returned, they warned that they would come back to fight in the guise of pilgrims. On their return they wrote on e another to gather in the precincts of Madinah in the month of Shawwal.

Leadership of four rebel chieftains:

When the month of Shawwal dawned in 35 A.H., the natives of Egypt set off in the shape of four caravans. They were being led by four rebel chieftains. Their minimum number was six hundred and their maximum number was one thousand. The ring-leaders of these insurgents were as follows: (!) Abdur Rahman bin 'Adis Balvi (2) Kinanah bin Bashr Laythi (3) Saudan bin Himran Sukuni and (4) Qatirah bin Fatan Sukuni. The leader-in-chief of these caravans was Ghafiqi bin Harb'Aski.

Participation of Abdullah bin Saba:

They lacked the courage to warn the Muslims directly that they were marching to fight with them. They pretended that they were going to perform pilgrimage. Ibn-us-Sauda' (Abdullah bin Saba) also accompanied them.

Caravan of the natives of Kufah:

The natives of Kufah also came out in four caravans. They were being led by the following persons: (1) Zayd bin Saudan Abdi (2) Ashtar Nakhfi (3) Ziyad bin Nadhr Harithi and (4) Abdullah bin Asm who belonged to the family of Amir bin Sasa. Their number equalled that of the Egyptians and their commander-in-chief was Umro bin Asm.

Basrah rebels:

The rebels of Basrah also set out in four caravans. They were being led by the following: (1) Hakim bin Jiblah Abdi (2) Zarig bin Ibad Abdi (3) Bashr bin Shairh al-Hatm bin Dhaba Qaisi and (4) Ibn-ul-Mahrish bin Abd Umro Hanafi. Their number also equalled the number of the Egyptians and their leader-in-chief was Marqus bin Zubair S'ad. Some other people also joined them on the way.

Groups of diverse views:

The Egyptians supported Hadhrat Ali; the natives of Basrah were with Hadhrat Talha and the natives of Kufah took the side of Hadhrat Qubair. They unanimously opted for rebellion though they shared divergent views. Each group was convinced of its victory and the defeat of other groups.

Rebel Centres:

All of these insurgents marched towards Madinah. When Madinah was only three stages away, some of the people of Basrah stayed at Zukhasb. A few of the natives of Kufah stayed at Aus. Some Egyptians also joined them. They had left their companions at Zul-Marwah. Ziyad bin Nadhr and Abdullah bin Asm came over to the Egyptians and the Basris and told them: You should neither show impatience yourselves nor should you compel us to be impatient and act snappily. As soon as we enter Madinah, we'll inform you. We have learned that the people in Madinah are organizing themselves to fight with us. By God! If the natives of Madinah have grown suspicious of us and have declared it lawful fight with us even when they are unaware of our real intentions, they will turn into our deadly enemies when they learn about our real designs and our entire plan will crumble into the dust. If they don't want to fight us. And the information we have received is incorrect, then let us fetch back the correct information.

Meeting with prominent people:

They left them go and fetch back the latest information. Both of them reached Madinah and held meetings with the pure wives of the Prophet (peace be upon him), Hadhrat Ali, Hadhrat Talha and Hadhrat Zubair. They expressed support of his family and wished that the caliph should suspend some of the administrators. That was the main object of their visit and they enjoyed the approval and support of the Muslims. But each one of them refused to cooperate with them and opposed it and declared chicks could not be hatched out of addled eggs.

Meeting with their Candidates:

Some of them met Hadhrat Ali. A few persons from Basrah came over to see Hadhrat Talha while the Kufis came to Hadhrat Zubair. Each group insisted that if the other parties did not pledge fealty to their leader, it would launch a campaign of conspiracy against those parties and dissociate itself from them.

Meeting with Hadhrat Ali:

The Egyptians came over to see Hadhrat Ali. He was camping near Ahjar-uz-Zayt. He wore red Yemeni scarf and a sword dangled from his neck. He had dispatched Hadhrat Hassan to a gathering arranged by Hadhrat Uthman. Thus Hassan was with Hadhrat Uthman and Ali was in the vicinity of Ahjar-uz-Zayt. The Egyptians saluted Hadhrat Ali and placed before him their submission, but he lost his temper with them and pushed them out of the place. He said all the pious people knew that the Prophet (peace be upon him) had cursed the armies of Zulmarwas and Zu Khushb. He told them to return and seek divine protection against their company. They responded positively and left the place.

Hadhrat Talha's response:

The natives of Basraah approached Hadhrat Talha. He was also camping with another party not far from Hadhrat Ali. He had despatched both of his sons to Hadhrat Uthman. The Kufis saluted him and placed their submission before him. He, too, lost his temper and shoved them away. He said the Muslims know that the Prophet (peace be upon him) had cursed the armies of Zul Marwah, Zu Khushb and Aus.

Snap Siege:

All of them returned and pretended that they were retracing their steps. They pushed away from the spots of Zu Khushb and Aus and reached their army camps which were three stages away from Madinah. These rebels waited for the natives of Madinah to disperse. After their dispersal they would return and attack them. At last things happened the way they had planned. The natives of Madinah dispersed as they saw them beating a retreat. When they had reached their homes, the rebels staged a come-back and landing in Madinah they startled the residents with their sudden and unexpected slogans. The besieged Hadhrat Uthman on all sides and settled down by erecting camps. They promised protection to people who did not wield weapons against them.

Reasons for return:

Hadhrat Uthman led the prayers for a few days and the Muslims were mainly confined to their homes. They did not shut down the door of negotiations. Some of the people including Hadhrat Ali came over to the rebels. They told them that they had changed their minds and gone back. What had made them return? They replied they had intercepted a letter carried by a messenger which contained orders for their execution. Hadhrat Talha also came to them and the natives of Basrah spoke in the same strain. Hadhrat Zubair came to see them and the natives of Kufah stressed the same reason. The natives of Kufah and Basrah jointly promised that they would help and protect their brothers.

Uniform reply:

It seemed they were carrying out a pre-planned conspiracy. At this Hadhrat Ali said: O natives of Kufah and Basrah! How did you come to know the Egyptians after you had covered a number of stages and turned to us? I swear by God that this plan has been hatched in Madinah. They replied: You may look at it from any angle you like. We don't need a person who keeps on cheating us. It is in his interest that he should leave us.

Fare-well to the natives of Madinah:

These people clamped an impregnable siege around his house. When Hadhrat Zubair along with their sons came forward to defend him, he addressed them in these words:

"O natives of Madinah, I entrust you to God and pray to Him that He should bless you with a pious Caliph after me. I shall not come to any one of you from today until God decides otherwise about me. I shall not have any links with these people nor with those who are lurking behind my gate. And I shall not suggest to them anything which they may exploit for worldly religions benefit. But let God decide whatever He prefers."

Command for return:

He commanded the natives of Madinah to return. They followed his command and went back to their homes. However Hassan bin Ali, Muhammad bin Talha and Ibn Zubair etc kept watch at the gate in accordance with the commands of their parents. Hadhrat Uthman confined himself within the house.

Opposition to battle:

Hadhrat Uthman remained besieged for twenty two days. Then the rebels burnt down the gate. At that time a number of persons were present in the house which also included Abdullah bin Zubair and Marwan. They were pressuring him to allow them to fight with the rebels. But he replied: The Prophet (peace be upon him) had told me something to which I am patiently clinging. These people are not, in fact, burning the gate but are demanding something even greater. Therefore I forbid you to fight. At this all those people left his house.

Recitation of Quran:

He asked someone to bring the Quran and started reciting it. At that time Hadhrat

Hassan was with him. He said to him: your father at this time is involved in some stupendous affairs. Therefore I swear to you that you must leave.

Protection of Bait-ul-Mal:

He commanded Abu Karb, a member of the Hamadam tribe, and a native of Madinah to keep watch at the gate of Bait-ul-Mal and safeguard it. At that time the Bait-ul-Mal treasured only two sacks filled with silver coins.

Abdullah bin Zubair and Marwan put up a resistance to the enemies. Muhammad bin Abi Bakr threatened them and marched into the house. When they reached Hadhrat Uthman, both of them took to their heels.

Muhammad bin abi Bakr's insolence:

As Muhammad bin abi Bakr comes close to Hadhrat Uthman, he gripped his beard. He said: let go of my beard. Your father never clutched at it. At this he loosened his grip on the beard. Then a number of people filtered in. Some of them hit him with the sword, the others just beat him up. Another picked up a spear and attacked him with it.

Martyrdom:

The blood gushed out and spilled over the Quran. In spite of it, they were scared of murdering him. On account of his advancing years, he fell unconscious as blood dripped from the wounds. Meanwhile, some more reprobates thundered in. When they found him unconscious, they clasped him by the foot and dragged him (on the floor). At this Hadhrat Naila and her daughters screamed and wailed. Tujaibi pulled out his sword and tried to jab it into his belly. But Hadhrat Naila parried the blow, as a result of which her fingers were snipped off. Then the lout struck the sword against his chest and Hadhrat Uthman drank the cup of martyrdom before sunset.

Looting the Bait-ul-Mal:

At that time some one proclaimed that he should neither be killed nor his property be looted. But these butchers looted every thing. Then they marched towards the Bait-ul-Mal. Both the guards threw away the keys and ran away. Then someone shouted: "run, run", and this is what they wanted.

Gate-crashing:

Abdur Rahman bin Muhammad reports that Muhammad bin abi Bakr climbed the wall of Hadhrat Uthman's house from the side of Umro bin Hazm's house. He was accompanied by Kinanah bin Bashr, Saudan bin Himran and Umro bin Hamaq. They found Hadhrat Uthman besides his wife Naila. The Quran was spread before him and he was reciting Surah Baqarah. Muhammad bin abi Bakr moved forward and caught hold of Hadhrat Uthman's beard and said: "O old and stupid person, Allah has disgraced you". Hadhrat Uthman replied: I am not old and stupid. I am God's creature and Amir-ul-Mominin. Muhammad bin abi Bakr taunted: Muawiyyah and others are not of any help to you. Hadhrat Uthman said: O my nephew! Let go of my beard as even your father never clutched at it. Muhammad bin abi Bakr replied: If my father had witnessed your deeds, he would have definitely disliked them, and now what we intend to do with you will be even severer than the act of gripping your

beard. Hadhrat Uthman said: I seek only Gods help against your evil designs:

Further details of Martyrdom:

Then Muhammad bin abi Bakr inflicted a blow on his forehead with his lance and Kinanah bin Bashr shoved it into his throat through the ear, and martyred him with the sword.

Another tradition:

Abdur Rahman relates: I have heard from Abu Aun that Kinanah bin Bashr inflicted a blow on his forehead and the front part of his head with an iron bar. He fell down on his forehead as a result of the blow on his forehead as a result of the blow. As he fell down, Saudan bin Himaran Maravi struck him another blow and martyred him.

Muhammad bin Umar states that Abdur Rahman bin abi Az-Zanad told him on the authority of Abdur Rahman bin Harith that he received martyrdom at the hands of Kinanah bin bashr bin Itab Tujaibi. The wife of Manzur bin Ziyar Fazari relates that they were on pilgrimage and were absolutely unaware of the martyrdom of Hadhrat Uthman until they reached Arj and heard some one reciting the verse (undoubtedly, the man who was the best after the Prophet (peace be upon him) Siddique and Faruq has been martyred by Tujaibi who had come from Egypt).

Stupidity of Umro bin Hamaq:

Umro bin Hamaq climbed over Hadhrat Uthman's chest. He was still struggling between life and death. This damned person inflicted nine blows on his chest with a spear. And, on top of that, the rascals used to boast that he had inflicted three wounds for the pleasure of God and the other six wounds to extinguish the raging fire of jealousy in his chest!

Success of Sabai movement:

This is the story of Hadhrat Uthman's martyrdom which I have reproduced from Tabri's history and from "Muruj-uz-Zahb" by Masudi,, a Shia writer, without any lexical or semantic modification or alteration. From this account of the martyrdom of the third Caliph one can easily gauge the success of the Sabai movement in tearing into shreds the unity of the Muslims and in creating a permanent wedge among them which may stick out like a sore thumb till the end of the world, and which is attested by the words of Hadhrat Uthman himself. Addressing Ashtar he had predicted:

"By God! If you murder me, you will never live in peace and amity after me, you will never offer your prayers together and you will never be in a position to wage Jihad under one leader."

The Sabais succeeded in their mission. I have entered these details because they have a direct bearing on the theme of our discussion. They reveal the nature of the allegations the Sabais had levelled against Hadhrat Uthman in order to manipulate and maneuver administrative changes to their own advantage. A list of these allegations is furnished by Ibn Mathar Hilli who was a sprig of the lousy Sabais.

Allegations against Hadhrat Uthman:

Hadhrat Uthman had entrusted the affairs of the Muslims to people who lacked the competence and the ability to dispense them. Some of them were not only incompetent, but also corrupt and dishonest. He had distributed the high administrative offices among his friends and relatives. He was reprimanded a number of times but he persisted in his calculated whimsicality. He appointed Walid bin Uqbah as the governor though he was a boozier and had once led the prayers in a state of intoxication. He appointed S'aid bin As as the governor of Kufah but the natives of Kufah drove him out of their city on account of some of his hideous deeds. He appointed Abdullah bin abi Sarh as the ruler of Egypt and he committed heinous excesses against the Egyptians. When the Egyptians protested against his highhandedness he, in a clandestine letter, pressed him to tighten his grip over Egypt, though in the letter meant for public consumption, he had snubbed him. He also ordered him to execute Muhammad bin abi Bakr.

Similarly Hadhrat Uthman appointed Mu'awiyah as the ruler of Syria and the number of rows he kicked up are public knowledge. He appointed Abdullah bin Amir as the chief administrator of Iraq whose outrageous acts had broken all previous records. Marwan was his closest favourite who seemed to preside over all the affairs of the state. He had entrusted him even with his ring. He was the root cause of his martyrdom as he fanned the flames of an unprecedented dispute among the Muslims. He preferred to distribute the funds of Bait-ul-Mal, which were exclusively reserved for the Muslims, among his blood relations. He had distributed four lac dinars out of the public treasury to his Quraishi sons-in-law. He also doled out once one million dinar to Marwan. Ibn Mas'ud used to criticize and condemn him for his foul deeds. He beat him black and blue until he expired. He clapper-clawed Hadhrat Ammar to the extent that his belly ripped apart and he ignored the words of the Prophet (peace be upon him) who had called him the darling of eyes. He had predicted that he would be martyred by a rebel party which would lose his recommendation on the day of judgement. Hadhrat Ammar also used to criticize him.

The Prophet (peace be upon him) had extradited Hadhrat Uthman's uncle Hukm bin Abi al-As and Marwan out of Madinah; and they remained in exile during the period of the Prophet (peace be upon him) Abu Bakr and Umar Faruq. But when Hadhrat Uthman took over as the Caliph, he recalled them to Madinah. Not only that, he appointed Marwan as his scribe and closet advisor which was a clear violation of the Quranic injunction:

(People who believe in God and in the Last Day, you will never find them be-friending those who are the enemies of God and His Messenger).

Similarly, he extradited Hadhrat Abu Zar to Rabzah and beat him to a jelly, though the Prophet (peace be upon him) had remarked that the earth and the sky had not seen a blunter man than Abu Zar. He had also added: God has revealed to me that He loves four persons among my companions and He has also commanded me to love them. People asked him: O Messenger of Allah! Who are those four persons? He replied: (1) Ali, who is the leader of these four persons (2) Salman (3) Miqdad and (4) Abuzar.

Hadhrat Uthman also failed to observe the limits imposed by God. He failed to impose the Hadd on Ubaidullah bin Umar though he had killed Hurmazan, a slave of the Amir-ul-Mominin, after he had embraced Islam. Amir-ul-Mominin had called him to impose Qisas on him but he escaped it by seeking Mu'awiyah's protection.

Similarly Hadhrat Uthman suspended the Hadd imposed on Walid bin Uqbah until it was reimposed by the Amir-ul-Mominin who stressed that the Hadd of Allah could not be waived or quashed as long as he was on the scene. He made certain additions in the Adhan of Friday though it was an unwelcome innovation which has now acquired the stature of Sunnat though all the Muslims opposed it till he was martyred.

This is the heritage of the Sabais which the Shias have claimed without any break in the chain of continuity. The present-day Shias have shaped their religion on the lines laid down by their children. Their over-professed and overstressed love of Ali and his family is only a hoax to throw dust into the eyes of the gullible people as will shortly be demonstrated in the following pages.

The rebuttal of these allegations and exportations framed by the Sabais had been made by Hadhrat Uthman himself which I have already explained with reference to Tabri's account and the statements of other scholars and historians. Some of these inculpations are so baseless that they are like anchorless fantasies woven by diseased imagination. They have no roots in reality and the sap of fact runs dry in them. These accusations and inoculations have been vociferously reputed by a large number of Muslim historians and scholars who have a reputation for unjaundiced objectivity. For example Shaikh-ul-Islam Ibn Taimiya has offered a well-reasoned and highly cogent condemnation of these nebulous charges. Allama Zahbi, who has abridged his book "Minhaj-us-Sunnah", has also knocked the bottom out of these charges. Similarly, in addition to Abu Bakr Bin al-Arabi, a host of other scholars and jurists have shown the fallacy of their baseless concoctions. They have clearly established that the cock of the Sabais won't fight as it is a paper cock and synthetic doll and instead of genuine spurs, it is fitted with fake hooks and counterfeit projections.

Even in the Indo-Pak sub-continent, a large number of scholars have given the charges of the Sabais a set-down. They have exposed the petti-fogging quiddity of their reasoning and proved that they are reasoning in a circle. Their arguments are only the meshes and cobwebs of sophistry and they are trying to cut blocks with a razor. The services of Hadhrat Shah Wali Ullah Dehlvi (among whose writings "Hujjat-Ullah al-Baligahah", "Qurrat-ul-Aynain fi Tafdhilush-Shaykhin" and Azalat-ul-Khafa' and Khilafat-ul-Khulafa' are particularly note-worthy) and if his son Hadhrat Shah Abdul Aziz Muhaddith Dehlvi whose book has been abridged by Allama Alusi junior, are highly commendable. These people are not only stubborn liars but also insist on their strategically ploys to tell lies with epidemic frequency so that the innocent people are over-whelmed and flabber-gasted by the sheer rush of the propagandistic tide and eventually fall into their evil clutches.

Sabai Objections and out refutations

I have already discussed the conceptual basis of Sabaism and the Shia sects which have sprung from it and I have stated that the views and beliefs of present-day Shias do not derive from their early ancestors but from the Sabais. Now I would like to take up the objections the Sabais and raised against Hadhrat Uthman. I'll try to expose the fallacious base of these imputation in my characteristic style, relying exclusively on the data and statistics available in the literature of the Shias themselves. My main object is to perform the sacred task of defending Islam and the companions of the Prophet (peace be upon him) and to win the pleasure of the Lord that invariably accompanies the performance of all sacred acts. I love the companions of the Prophet (peace be upon him) from the core of my heart because

the Prophet himself loved them immeasurably and they in turn loved him with the same intensity. May God enable me to perform the deed to His total satisfaction and accept it as humble token in His service.

The first objection of the Sabais against Hadhrat Uthman was that he preferred his close blood relations over others. The well-known Shia historian Y'aqubi has pointed it out:

"In the sixth year of Hadhrat Uthman's Khilafat, the people started picking holes. They said he preferred his close blood relations to others".

The objection should be analysed to determine whether Hadhrat Uthman had distributed public offices among his relatives or it was just a flagrant mis-statement against him? It was in fact a pure and unadulterated fabrication of the Sabais and the Shias have never doubted its veracity as a practical demonstration of their loyalty to the Sabais and as an expression of their loyalty to the Sabais and as an expression of their undiluted support of the rebellion staged traitors Hadhrat Uthman had appointed in different parts of the country.

"Hadhrat Uthman appointed Yala bin Ummayyah Tamimi as the governor of Yemen, Abdullah bin Umro Hadhrame of Makkah, Jarir bin Abdullah Bajli of Hamadan, Qasim bin Rabi Thaqafi of Taif, Abu Musa Ashari of Kufah, Abdullah bin Amir Kariz of Basrah, Abdullah bin S'aad bin abi Sarh of Egypt and Mu'awiyah bin abi Sufiyan bin Harb of Syria".

Tabri and Ibn Athir have also mentioned the names of other officials who held high offices during his tenure. They observe:

"He appointed Abdur Rahman bin Khalid bin Walid in Hams, Habib bin Musalma in Qanserin, Abu Umur Sulama in Jordan, Iqummah bin Hukm Kinani in Palestine, Abdullah bin Qays Fazari in Bakr, Abul Darda in Syria, Jabir bin Falan Mazni for tax and revenue, Q'aq'a bin Umro for defense, Jarir bin Abdullah Bijli in Qarqisiyyah, Ashath bin Qays Kundi in Azerbaijan, Utaibah bin Nihah in Hulwan, Malik bin Habib in Mah, S'aid bin Qays in Ri, Saib bin Iqra in Isfaham, Hubaish in Masabzan, Uqbah bin Amir for the public exchequer and Zayd bin Thabit as chief justice".

During pilgrimage, once Hadhrat Abdur Rahman bin Auf acted on his behalf while during his last year Hadhrat Abdullah bin Abbas acted in this capacity, as has been stated by Y'aqubi in his history". Ibn Saad in "Tabaqat", Ibn Kathir and Ibn Athir in their respective "history", Ibn Abdul Bar in "Istiyyab" and other historians have also mentioned these appointments.

A bird's eye view of this list exposes the lie of the Sabais whether they are the unashamed and uninhibited practitioners of Sabaism or happen to be its invisible followers who hide their true faces behind masks to escape disgrace and humiliation. Though the world is clogged with lies, truth has its own sparkle and its glittering rays ultimately penetrate even the thickest mask of posture and pretense and reveal its hideous curves and contours in the flood of its sheer luminosity and fluorescence.

The list of various offices and the persons who held these offices is in front of you. Their offices are clearly spelled out. History and Sabai and Shia literature bear testimony to the names of the persons who were appointed to these offices. A break-

down of the important offices during his Khilafat is as follows:

Office of the Chief Justice:

None of his relatives was ever appointed to this august office. It was held by Hadhrat Zayd bin Thabit Ansari, a person of the highest integrity of character.

Public exchequer:

Uqbah bin Amir was the chief executive of this office.

The ministry of Hajj:

Hadhrat Abdullah bin Abbas held the port-folio of Hajj.

Taxation:

The department of tax and revenue collection was entrusted to Jabir, Muzni and Samak Ansari.

Defence:

Q'aq'a bin Umro was the minister of defence.

Police:

Some historians have pointed out that the port-folio of police was held by Abdullah bin Qunfuz who belonged to the tribe of Tim.

These are six of the highest public offices to which neither a member of the tribe of Umayyah nor a close relative of Hadhrat Uthman was ever appointed.

Officers appointed in different areas

The list of a large number of officers appointed in different parts of the country included only three persons who belonged to Banu Umayyah and even one of these three had been appointed by Hadhrat Abu Bakr and not by Hadhrat Uthman. Hadhrat Umar also retained him in office though he was more inclined towards shuffling officers. The officer was Hadhrat Mu'asiyyah bin abi Sufiyan. It should be noted that the Shia historian Y'aqubi has also included him among the governors of Hadhrat Umar. Hadhrat Abu Bakr had conferred on him the office as a successor of his brother Yazid bin Abi Sufiyan who had been appointed by the Prophet as the governor of Tima'. Again it was the Prophet himself who had appointed his father Hadhrat Abu Sufiyan as the governor of Hanjran.

The other two governors were (1) Abdullah bin Saad bin abi Sarh and (2) Abdullah bin Amir bin Kuraiz. It is to be noted that Abdullah bin Saad bin abi Sarh was not a member of the tribe of Umayyah; on the contrary he is related to Bani Amir. The only factor that linked him with Hadhrat Uthman was that his mother had suckled Hadhrat Uthman. But even if they are closely related to him, does it provide his critics with any reasonable base to fling dirt on him? The presence of just two relatives among a host of non-relatives is just like a sprinkling of salt in a tub of flour.

Is it illegal from the point of view of Shariah for a Caliph to entrust any one of his relatives with a high office when his competence, efficiency and impeccability of character make him the most suitable person for the office? Is there any prescription to the contrary in the Quran and the Sunnah? Have the companions of the Prophet, (peace be upon him), the Ahl-i-Bait, Hadhrat Ali or his children ever barred the relatives of a Caliph from holding high offices? Besides, it defies all laws of logic and rationality. If the function of a viable administration is to dispense justice and promote decency, it becomes the moral obligation of the chief executive to appoint only those persons to the highest offices whose integrity is unquestionable. Their family background is quite immaterial as Islam also stresses the actual worth of the individual and not his potential family status. These prejudiced critics in a way did a disservice to Islam by restraining the hands of Hadhrat Uthman. Had they given him a free option, he would have come out with a better collection of administrators? He would not have hesitated to select officers from his own tribe who were second to none in competence and intelligence and who would perhaps have made better administrators.

But if this is really objectionable, then Hadhrat Ali also falls within its ambit because during his tenure he had appointed Quthm bin Abbas as the governor of Makkah and Abdullah bin Abbas as the governor of Yemen. He had also appointed Ubaidullah bin Abbas as the governor of Basrah and Muhammad bin abi Bakr as the governor of Egypt. Similarly he appointed his nephew and son-in-law J'ad bin Hubairah as the governor of Khorasan and his son Muhammad bin Hanafiyyah as the commander-in-chief of the army.

Abdullah bin Abbas in 36 A.H., Quthm bin Abbas in 37 A.H. and Ubaidullah bin Abbas in 38 A.H. acted as leaders of the pilgrims of his behalf.

In the light of these irrefutable historical facts I publicly condemn those who raised objections against him that he had exclusively reward his kinsmen in the distribution of high public offices. The facts reveal that their objection is a transparent lie. The interesting thing is that their argument in favour of Hadhrat Ali's succession is based on the logic of consanguinity, and the succession of Ali's children to their father is also similarly based and defended. These lie-lickers and fib-furbishers are therefore the victims of their own perverse reasoning as the loop-holes and flaws in their argumentative procedure are quite obvious and can not escape the attention of any discernible reader.

If I were not facing spatial constraints, I would have established with incontrovertible facts and irrefutable arguments that acts performed by Hadhrat Uthman were closer to the practice of the Prophet (peace be upon him) than the acts of those who followed him. This is the main reason that none of the Prophetic companions raised even the slightest objection against his administration and administrators. Neither Hadhrat Ali himself, nor any one among the Hashimis, nor even the inhabitants of the towns ruled over by his officers had ever raised the finger of objection against them as has been amply substantiated by the documented evidence of history. This is the most whopping objection which right from the times of the Sabais down Hadhrat Uthman. In the old days the Sabais rolled this baseless allegation and in the contemporary world the Shias are venting it out with the maximum of carbonized air in their lungs, but I have already elucidated the nature of this objection and the feather weight it carries.

Below are cited the words of Allama Zahabi with reference to "Ali-Muntaqa" which serve to refute the objection raised by these people.

"the governor appointed by Hadhrat Ali indulged in greater disobedience and embezzlement as compared to those appointed by Hadhrat Uthman. Some of them had even hobnobbed with Hadhrat Mu'awiyah. Hadhrat Ali had appointed Ziyah bin abi Sufiyan abu Ubaidullah bin Ziyah—who subsequently proved to be the murderer of Hadhrat Hussain – and Ashtar as his governors. Similarly he had appointed Muhammad bin abi Bakr as one of his administrators though Hadhrat Muawiyah excelled them all. It is pretty strange that the Shias make Hadhrat Uthman the butt and target of these lapses which were found in greater quantity in Hadhrat Ali. Those people object that Hadhrat Uthman had conferred high offices on his close relations in the tribe of Umayyah, but the same objection applies to Hadhrat Ali as well. Isn't it true that Hadhrat Ali had distributed some of these offices among his paternal and maternal relatives: his cousins Abdullah bin Abbas, Ubaidullah bin Abbas, Quthm bin Abbas, and Thamamah bin Abbas? Similarly he had appointed Muhammad bin abi Bakr-whom he had brought up as a son-the governor of Egypt. The son of Um Hani', his nephew, also served as one of his administrators. The Imamiyyah rather claim that Khilafat is restricted only to the children of Hadhrat Ali. If the appointment of cousins to public offices is a condemnable act, the appointment of one's children is even more condemnable. If Hadhrat Ali's acts are justifiable, then Hadhrat Uthman's acts are even more justifiable because he was committing only an act of 'Ijtihad' by following the precedent established by his predecessors.

"Hadhrat Uthman's mode of action in appointing officers from among his own tribesmen (Members of Banu Umayyah) was quite compatible with the practices of the Prophet (peace be upon him) because he had appointed Atab bin Usaid Amwi as the governor of Makka and Abu Sufiyan among the Arabs. He pointed toward a young man standing beside him that she should give it to him (This young man was S'aid bin As who is a fighter as well as a conqueror but the fountongued Rafidhis accuse Hadhrat Uthman of appointing him the governor of Kufah). If the Rafidhis don't put much premium on the fact that he had helped in hand-printing the Quran at the time of its compilation, they surely should have no hesitaion in crediting to his account the evidence of the Prophet (peace be upon him) that he is the most respectable of all the Arabs. His only fault was that he was one of those who had liberated Iran from the clutches of Zoroastrianism and brought it within the fold of Islam. History vociferously proclaims that he is the conqueror of Tabristan and he headed the army in the battle of Jirjan which include a number of veteran companions of the Prophet (peace be upon him).

The traditions relating to Hadhrat S'aid bin As are found in Sahih Muslims, Sunan Nisai and Jami Tirmizi but the Rafidhis attach no importance whatsoever to Sahih Muslim and other collections of traditions because they exclusively depend on "Al-Kafi", an absolute hot-plate of lies. Another matter of pride for S'aid bin As (and which gives hiccups of jealousy to the Rafidhis) is the tradition related by Imam Tabrani" routed through Muhammad bin Qani, bin Jabir bin Mutam. He attributes it to his father and grandfather Jabir bin Mutam who say the Prophet (peace be upon him) consoling S'aid bin As during his illness and massaging him with a piece of cloth"

Some of them have diverted it to his grandfather S'aid bin As because his name was also S'aid bin As. But this is possible only if the episode had taken place in the Makki period before the migration, as the grandfather of Hadhrat S'aid bin As a disbeliever;

that is, if it is proved authoritatively that the Prophet (peace be upon him) had made a display of his affection towards the grandfather of S'aid bin As Amvi who was a disbeliever, it would be interpreted as an expression of affection for the close relations because both of them belonged to Bani Abd Munaf.

Rafidhis' castigation of Amvis from among the members of Abd Munaf is an expression negation of the practice of the Prophet (peace be upon him) which stresses a display of affection towards close relations. It has already been discussed that the Prophet (peace be upon him) used to offer gifts and presents to Abu Sufiyan during his period of ignorance out of family affection. The narration of the shawl episode also stresses the same reality. When a lady companion of the Prophet (peace be upon him) vowed that she would give the shawl to the person who was the most respectable among the Arabs, the Prophet (peace be upon him) had commanded her to give the shawl to S'aid bin As who a young man at that time. The tradition forms part of the Prophetic signs. The Prophet (peace be upon him) had discovered in the light of the divine illumination that S'aid would soon beat all the Arabs in respectability. Ibn abi Khaithama has related through Yahya bin S'aid that Muhammad bin 'Aqil bin abi Talib once asked his father: who is the most superior among the people? He replied: Me and the one who is my brother from the mother side. Yes, S'aid bin As is the most superior of all the persons. Hadhrat Mu'awiyah has stated that S'aid bin As is the most respectable among the Quraish. He was well-known for his piety and generosity. When a needy person solicited something from him at a time when he didn't have it, he used to write it down for his (so that he could claim it later). When he died, he was in dept for eight thousand dinar on account of his over-generosity. The dept was paid by his son Umro Ashdaq. It was this mountain to respect and courage whom the Rafidhis used as a pretext to tear a strip off Hadhrat Uthman because he had appointed him the governor of Kufah. Hadhrat S'aid bin As died at Aqiq in his palace in 53 A.H.

The relations between S'aid bin As and Hadhrat Ali

The nature of relationship between S'aid bin As and Hadhrat Ali is quite illuminating. Hadhrat S'aid often sent presents to Hadhrat Ali which he accepted out of love and affection. Ibn S'aid remarks in "Tabaqat".

"Hadhrat S'aid bin 'As came over to Madina to pay respects to Hadhrat Uthman. He despatched a number of gifts to the refugees and the natives. He also despatched a number of gifts to Hadhrat Ali which he willingly accepted."

If Sabais and Shias are correct in their surmise, then there is hardly any point in Ali's acceptance of these gifts. The significance of gifts is enhanced when we learn that this S'aid bin As sent his marriage proposal to Um Kulthum bint Ali who was born out of the pure womb of Fatimat-uz-Zohra and had been married to Hadhrat Umar which she accepted".

Allama Zahbi has very appropriately portrayed the generosity and magnanimity of the officers of Hadhrat Uthman:

"When S'aid bin As his marriage proposal to Um Kulthum bint Ali after the martyrdom of Hadhrat Umar and also despatched a sum of one lac for her, her brother Hadhrat Hussain came over to her and with tears in his eyes requested her not to marry him. But Hadhrat Hussain intervened and said: I am in favour of this marriage. Therefore you should make the preparation. When all the people had

gathered for the wedding ceremony, Hadhrat Hassan replied: I alone am sufficient. He said: Perhaps he doesn't like this wedding. When Hadhrat Hassan replied in the affirmative, he explained that he would not do a thing that he had disliked. On saying this he returned and did not get back a farthing out of what he had give her".

Abdullah bin Amir:

Hadhrat Abdullah bin Amir was the governor of Iraq appointed by Hadhrat Uthman. He was brought to the Prophet (peace be upon him) when he was just a child. The Prophet (peace be upon him) commented: This child resembles me. He recited some verses over his saliva and Abdullah swallowed the Prophet's saliva. Then he remarked: this will prove beneficial for you. Whenever you dig up the soil, water will gush out of it. The prediction of the Prophet (peace be upon him) came true.

Ibn S'aad has also recorded the words:

"Among all of you this son of ours resembles me the most".

The Prophet (peace be upon him) referred to him as his son because his paternal grandmother, daughter of Abdul Mutlib bin Hashim, was the Prophet's aunt".

Hadhrat Abdullah bin Amir was a generous and couragous person who treated the members of his family as well as the individuals of his community with deep affection. He was highly popular among the people and his heart over-flowed with the milk of humanity. He was appointed the governor of Iran at the age of twentyfive. He conquered the whole of Khorasan and also vanquished Persia, Sajistan, Kirman, Zablistan and some of the adjoining territories. He despatched his armies to Komas, Nassa, Abr Shahr, Jam, Tus, Isfrain, Sarkhas, Marv, Bu Shanj and Zar Naj as well. He murdered Kisra in his own country. He also despatched his forces to Karian, Fishajan, Nashib, Buhrat, Bayhaq, Takharistan, Januzjan, Farian, Taliqan, Balakh, Khawrzam, Badghis, Isbahan and Hulwan. All these towns were made to kiss the dust under his command and by his soldiers. He is the first administrator who ordered the construction of water-tanks in 'Urfah', made springs gush out of the soil and improved water-supply in the area under his jurisdiction. The arrangements he made have survived the vagaries of time. That is why Shaikh-ul-Islam has remarked:

"No one can deny the good deeds of Abdullah bin Amir, and the immensity of love people have for him in their hearts".

No one among the Shias can out-rival and out-class him in the field of Jihad, battles conquests, humanity, good deeds and doling out presents to others.

Marvin:

I'll give myself a little more latitude to discuss the character of Marvan on account of the frequency and intensity with which he has been criticized. He has not been spared by any Sabai and Shia. They have showered on him the arrows of their spite and malice without applying themselves any brakes and without realizing the sheer monstrosity of their unreasonable attack.

He is generally blamed for abusing Hadhrat Ali, for misappropriating one-fifth or the soils of Africa, for extraditing his father and for dashing off a forget letter to

Muhammad bin abi Bakr etc. But all these traditions have come to us through Waqidi, Muhammad bin Saib Kalbi, Hisham or Abu Mikhnaf Lut bin Yahya. I have already discussed at length that these emperors of lies are in fact the unashamed spokesmen of the Sabais and the Shias and their traditions also display a streak of discontinuity as they had never met the people from whom they are supposed to have heard these traditions nor is there any indirect testimony to affirm the veracity of their reports. Therefore these traditions deserve no attention as they are the concoctions of a febrile imagination. Tabri and Ibn S'aad have recorded these traditions from Hisham Kalbi and Ibn Mikhnaf, and the other historians, too, have relied on these bogus and unreliable Sabai and Shia reporters. This is the reasons that Qadhi Abu Bakr bin al-Arabi, Ibn Hajr Haithmi, Ibn Taimiya and Zahabi have remarked:

"Most of the traditions bearing on this issue are self-fabricated and none of them is valid and viable".

The experts on Hadith have also clarified that the traditions relating to Hadhrat Muawiyya Umro bin As, Banu Umayyah, Walid, Marvan are all self-concocted because they have been invented by the unprincipled Machiavellian Shias, whose religion is tissue of lies and who have conferred on lying and fib-telling the highest form of sanctity. Mulla Ali Qari has explained it in his "Kitab Maudhuat... Those who like to seek further clarification on th issue are advised to refer to "Al-Israr al-Munif fis Sahi was Saqim" by Ibn Qaym etc.

These are one set of allegations leveled against Marvan. The other set of allegations are rebutted by the historians themselves. For example, they have come out with a rebuttal of the allegation that Marvan wrote a letter on behalf of Hadhrat Uthman and then affixed his seal on it to give it an air of authenticity, which he kept in his own possession. The historians have refuted it publicly and regarded it as a bogus charge against the companion of the Prophet (peace be upon him). The historians observe:

"All these letters are a packet of lies. They have been erroneously (viciously) imputed to the companions of the Prophet, as a numberr of letters had been erroneously imputed to Hadhrat Ali, Talha and Zubair".

Ibn Khaldun writes:

After they had gone over a short distance, the Sabais and the Balwais turned on their heels. They carried a self-fabricated letter with them. They claimed that they had snatched the latter from a messenger who was carrying it to the governor of Egypt. The letter contained the message that all of them should be executed. Hadhrat Uthman swore that he had written no such letter. They insisted that, if he had not written the latter, he should hand over Marvan to them because he was his scribe. Marvan also swore that he had not inscribed the letter. Hadhrat uthman explained that nothing more could be done about it as Marvan had taken the oath that he had not inscribed the latter".

Hadhrat Ali had also pointed out the spurious nature of these baseless letter and it was a measure of his understanding and intelligence that he had sized up the tricks and strategies of the Sabais and had no illusions about them as I have already qquoted his words which I am reproducing here, not to pad up my thesis but to drive home Ali's wisdom to those who underrate his intelligence, either out of malice or

out of a sense of self-aggrandizement.

"O natives of Kufah and Basrah! How did you come to know the designs of the Egyptians while you had covered a great deal of distance and now you have jointly come to me. By God! It is a conspiracy hatched against the residents of Madinah. The Sabais replied that he could interpret it as he liked but it was their wish that he should give up the Khilafat."

These words are quoted by way of explanation and clarification. But as far as the authenticity of the allegation is concerned, it is impossible that a man of dubious credentials could serve as Hadhrat Uthman's scribe and escape the piercing glance of companions of the Prophet (peace be upon him), the flag-bearer of the Messenger of Allah on the day of Khyber. These companions also included S'ad bin abi Waqas, the conqueror of Iran, Hadhrat Zubair, the cousin and supporter of the Messenger of Allah, Talha who had protected the Prophet (peace be upon him) by breaking the intensity of the arrows of the disbelievers at his hand and a number of other venerated Muslims. If Marvan had answered the image painted by the Sabais and the Alvis, the companions would never have remained dumb spectators as it was absolutely inconsistent with their character.

If Marvan had really fitted the mould into which his enemies had cast him, it is sensible to presume that Hadhrat Hassan and Hussain would not have asked their father to put in a word to him for a prisoner. The details of this episode have also been mentioned by the Shias.

"Marvan bin Hukm had arrested a man. Hadhrat Hassan and Hussain asked the Amir-ul-Mominin to recommend him to Marvan to secure his release. He recommended him to Marvan and he released him".

All these three personalities, Hadhrat Ali and his sons Hadhrat Hassan and Hadhrat Hussain, are innocent in the eyes of the Shias, and Hadhrat Ali held the status of God for the Sabais, therefore can God make a recommendation about a prisoner to a person who is an embodiment of all the negative virtues the Shias have ascribed to him out of spiteful exaggeration!

A great Shia scholar Majlisi has recorded a tradition of Imam J'afar on the authority of Musa bin J'afar in his book that Hassan and Hussain offered prayer behind Marvan bin Hukm. People asked Musa or J'afar if their father repeated the prayer when he returned home! They replied: No, he never repeated the prayer. Ibn Kathir has endorsed it in his exegesis and Imam Bukhari has quoted the tradition of Shur-jail bin S'ad who saw Hassan and Hussain offering their prayer behind Marvan.

Do these clarifications and substantiations leave further scope for any doubt that these are false allegations invented by vested interests? If there had been even a grain of truth in these allegations, Hadhrat Ali and his family would not have retained the contact with Marvan which I have already pointed out, and which is recorded in the books by Shia experts and scholars. The historians have recorded a number of similar episodes which contradict the much-professed vulgarities and obscenities of the Sabais. The historians have mentioned that Hadhrat Ali bin Hussain who is popularly known as Zain-ul-Abidin and who is the fourth innocent Imam of the Shias – Borrowed six lac dinar and one lac dirham from Marvan, but Marvan told his son Abdul Malik not to claim even a penny out of the loan Ali bin Hussain had taken from him.

It is also a fact that Hadhrat Ali's daughter Ramlah was married to Marvan's son. A number of genealogists and pedigree specialists have referred to this marital alliance. A writer of the Quraish tribe remarks:

"Ramlah, daughter of Ali, was married to Abul Hiyyaj Hashmi Abdullah bin Sufiyan bin abi al-Harith bin Abdul Mutlib. She gave birth to children but the children of Sufiyan bin Harith are no more. After the death of Abul Hiyyaj Hashmi, this lady was married to Mu'awiyah bin Marwan bin Hukm".

Similarly Zainab, daughter of Hassan, was married to Walid bin Abdul Malik, the grandson of Marwan. This lady was Hassani on father's side and Hussaini on mother's side. Her mother was Fatimah bint Hussain bin Ali. A number of genealogists have mentioned this marriage. Allama Zubairi remarks:

"Zainab bint Hassan bin Hassan bin Ali was married to Walid bin Abdul bin Marwan while he was the Caliph."

Another lady with Hashmi and Alvi bona fides was also married to Walid bin Abdul Malik. She was Nafisah bint Zaid bin Hassan bin Ali bin abi Talib. Nafisah's mother was Lubabah bint Abdullah bin Abbas bin Abdul Mutlib. A well-known Shia genealogist has pointed out this marriage:

"Zaid had a daughter whose mother's name was Nafisah who had gone to Walid bin Abdul Malik bin Marwan. She also gave birth to his children."

Similarly there are a number of other links and contractual bonds which have been mentioned by experts of the family tree. It is the stentorian testimony of history which is reinforced equally clamorously by the testimony of the Shias themselves who unmincingly state that the Fatimi and Alvi women had married the sons and grandsons of Marwan.

Now, the question is if Marwan's picture had fallen into the slot created by the lying Shias, then these material links and bonds do not make any sense. I ask these tricksters if they have any evidence to refute these irrefutable facts!

People with judicious temperaments at once presume that these foundationless tales invented by the Sabai knaves and sharpers have no roots in reality. If Marwan had been as the Sabais have made him out to be, the children of Ali would never have married their daughters to the sons and grandsons of Marwan!

Patronage of relatives:

The Sabais had accused Hadhrat Uthman of distributing the goods in the public exchequer among his relatives. It is, however, a lame duck as it is not supported by facts and is without the legs of truth to stand upon. Hadhrat Uthman refuted this allegation the day it was hurled against him. He explained as has been quoted earlier: "These people say I distributive wealth and good among the members of my family. The fact is that I give them gifts and presents out of my own belongings, because I believe what belongs to the Muslims is unlawful for others (whether it is me or my relatives). I used to give presents out of my personal goods even during the period of the Messenger of Allah, and that was the period of my youth. And now I have grown old and I am heading into decline and leaving all my capital for the

members of my family".

Even his opponents acknowledged the truth of his statement when he told them in his address:

"When I was appointed the Caliph, I owned the largest number of sheep, goats and camels among the Arabs. But now I own nothing excepts two camels which I use during the pilgrimage. Isn't it true? The people replied: yes".

In the face of these facts, the allegations of the Sabais are nothing but webs of lies. These Sabais are not only accustomed to lying but also insist on the truthfulness of their lies to propagate the fire of spite and malice against the humane companions of the Prophet (peace be upon him), his sons in law, his friends, his pupils, and his relatives.

It should be noted that these baseless charges have been circulated by those who imputed similar spineless statements to the companions of the Prophet (peace be upon him). They have derived these traditions from Waqidi, the notorious Rafidhi historian, and from Lut bin Yahya, Abu Mikhnaf, the Shia historian. They have not relied on any authentic reporter among the Sunnis as I have stated in the beginning of the book: The credibility of these historians is dubious; they are completely unreliable. Therefore their bogus and cooked-up traditions do not carry any weight.

Hadhrat Uthman had not committed any foul deed, neither in the beginning of his career nor towards the end of his tenure. The companions of the Prophet (peace be upon him) had not committed any foul deed either. Therefore any rumour or statement that tends to malign these pious people is inspired by jealousy and revulsion and lacks even the tiniest particle of truth. Hadhrat Imam Bukhari has related a tradition of Hadhrat Hassan bin Ali:

"Hadhrat Uthman spent the twelve years of his khilafat in a way that no one could dare raise his fingers against any of his acts."

Muhammad bin Muslimah, Usamah bin Zayd, and Abdullah bin Umar bore testimony to the fact that none of his acts triggered any objection. Whatever happened was the results of a conspiracy which Abdullah bin Saba, the Jew, had hatched against him in complicity with Khalid bin Malhim, Saudan bin Harman, and Kinanah bin Bashr etc. These conspirators had secured the support of those unconscientious opportunists who had turned against the government of the times on account of personal frustrations. They felt frustrated because they had failed to wangle for themselves the jobs or the officers they coveted. They also managed to win the support of those who were smoldering with jealousy and had joined the bunch of conspirators on account of scarcity of faith, fragility of conviction, and preference for the temporary over the eternal world.

It is worth mentioning that Hadhrat Umar during his tenure consciously avoided Saudan bin Hamran and Khalid bin Maljim. When he was asked about them he replied that they appeared to him the most hideous of all the Arabs.

The allegation that he beat up Ibn Masud and Ammar and extradited Hadhrat Abu Zar is absolutely baseless. He had, of course, a difference of opinion with Ibn Masud. Hadhrat Uthman wanted to forge the entire nation into an impermeable unity over one Quran but Hadhrat Ibn Masud was opposed to the proposal. The entire nation,

headed by the companions of Prophet (peace be upon him) was on the side of Hadhrat Uthman. But no authentic and reliable reported has related that he beat Hadhrat Ibn Masud to death. Even the Sabais have no dwelt upon this repulsive allegation; it is in fact the exclusive invention of the Shias.

The historians relate that a diference cropped up between Hadhrat Ammar and Abbas bin Utbah bin abi Lahb. Hadhrat Uthman imposed on them a slight punishment to fulfil certain legal requirements. But he had no personal grouse against Hadhrat Ammar. This is the reason that Hadhrat Uthman had dispatched Hadhrat ammar to Egypt on a fact-finding mission as has already been stated. Obviously he could not have trusted an enemy with the delicate assignment.

The Sabais, of course, zeroed in on his presence and rallied round him and tried to convert him to their point of view. When he returned to Madinah, Hadhrat Uthman expressed his displeasur at his inclination towards the Sabais. He said:

"O Abu Alyaq Zani I have punished you as I have punished Ibn abi Lahb. You are annoyed with me just because I have returned you right to you and their right to them. O Allah! I shall impose your Hudud on every one. I don't care who that person might be and I seek your pleasure and approval by implementing your Hudud".

Hadhrat Abu Zar:

An excerpt from Ibn Kahldun's history will serve to clarify the misunderstanding related to Hadhrat Abu Zar: One of the alleagations against Hadhrat Uthman was that he first extradited Hadhrat Abu Zar to Syria and then from Madinag to Rabzah. What had actually compelled Hadhrat Uthman to take such a drastic action was Hadhrat Abu Zar's stark piety, his readiness to induce people to face hardships and his missionary zeal to force people to lead the life of a recluse in this world of noise and bustle. It was one of his pet lines that no one was entitled to hoard more than a day's stock of previsions. He used to deliver fire and brim-stone sermons against hoarding silver and gold. His harangues were based on virtue and piety but Ibn Saba capitalized on his simplicity. He visited him frequently and provoked him against Hadhrat Mu'awiyah. He used to din into his ears Hadhrat Mu'awiyah's catch-phrase that everything belonged to Allah was only a diplomatic ploy to grap goods for personal use and to wriggle out of his commitment to spend them on the Muslims. Hadhrat Abu Zar snubbed Hadhrat Mu'awiyah and objected to his slogan. He apologized and promised that in future he would replace it by the slogan that all goods belonged to Muslims. Hadhrat Abu Zar snubbed Hadhrat Mu'awiyah and objected to his slogan. He apologized and promised that in future he would replace it by the slogan that all goods belonged to Muslims. Ibn Saba also tried to poison the mind of Hadhrat Abu Aldard and Hadhrat Ubadah bin Samit but they reprimanded him. Hadhrat Ubadah caught hold of him and took him to Hadhrat Ubadah caught hold of him and took him to Hadhrat Mu'awiyah and told him that he was the man who had provoked Hadhrat Abu Zar against him. When Hadhrat Abu Zar intensified his maligning campaign against Hadhrat Mu'awiyah, he lodged a complaint with Hadhrat Uthman who summoned him and told him: What's the matter? The natives of Syria complain against you. After Abu Zar had tendered his explanation, Hadhrat Uthman said: People cannot be force to live like recluses. It is my duty to arbitrate among them in accordance with divine commands and to persuade them to lead moderate lives. Hadhrat Ahu Zar replied: I'll be pleased with the affluent only when they spend all their wealth on good deeds, treat their Muslims brothers and neighbours humanely and show mercy to them. On hearing this K'aab Ahbar replied

that anyone who fulfilled his duties in fact fulfilled his obligations. At this Abu Zar clubbed him so harshly that his head was injured. He also said to him: O son of a Jewish woman! What do you know about these matters? Hadhrat Uthman apologized to K'aab and begged him to condone the injury which he readily condoned. Then Hadhrat Abu Zar sought Hadhrat Uthman's permission to leave Madinah and explained that the Prophet (peace be upon him) had commanded him to leave Madinah when the buildings in the town extended as far as the mountain of Sila.

Hadhrat Uthman gave him permission to leave. He confined himself to a spot at Rabzah and constructed a mosque there. Hadhrat Uthman despatched him a number of camels and appointed two slaves to serve him, and also fixed from the public exchequer a stipend for him. Hadhrat Abu Zar also visited Madinah off and on. This is the reality but the Sabais have given it the complexion of an allegation against Hadhrat Uthman.

The details illuminate different facets of the problem:

. Hadhrat Abu Zar fell into the trap laid by Abdullah bin Saba on account of his piety and simplicity and became susceptible to provocation at his hands.

Hadhrat Abu Zar invited people to do things which had been done neither by the companions of the Prophet (peace be upon him) nor by Muslims rulers. Even Hadhrat Ali during his tenure failed to act out these eccentricities. In other words, Hadhrat Abu Zar was asking people to do the impossible.

Hadhrat Uthman always treated him mildly and at a friendly level.

The views and opinions of Hadhrat Abu Zar were marked by a rare degree of violence. A practical demonstration of his violent nature was the amount of beating he inflicted on K'aab Ahbar.

Hadhrat Uthman intervened and asked K'aab not to demand the Qisas for the thrashing he had received.

Hadhrat Abu Zar himself had sought Hadhrat Uthman's permission to leave Madinah to implement the command of the Prophet (peace be upon him).

Hadhrat Uthman had not extradited him but he had willingly left Madinah to settle down at Rabzah.

It has been propagated by the adversaries that Rabzah was a jungle or a desert, but it is not so. Rabzah was in fact inhabited area where he also constructed a mosque.

Hadhrat Uthman gave him a drove of camels and two slaves to serve him. He also fixed a stipend for him from the public exchequer.

Hadhrat Abu Zar was not living in exile but visited Madinah occasionally.

It is noteworthy that Rabzah was not situated at a remote distance from Madinah. There was only a distance of three miles between the two towns. Yaqut is of the opinion that Rabzah was the best spot on the way to Madinah. Abu Bakr bin al-Arabi writes that Hadhrat Uthman had not extradited Hadhrat Abu Zar. He had left of his

own sweet will. No one had forced him because no one could dare force him to do so on account of his most venerated stature. Zahabi relates on the authority of Hassan Basri that it was simply inconceivable for Hadhrat Uthman to turn Hadhrat Abu Zar out of Madinah. His wife also endorses it by swearing that Hadhrat Uthman had not forced Abu Zar to lead the life of an exile in Rabzah.

Ubaidullah bin Umar:|

The Shias have charged Hadhrat Uthman that he had failed to receive Qisas from Ubaidullah bin Umar for his murder of Hurmuzan. It is a strange allegation shooting forth from the mouths of the Shias who do not tire of boasting their loyalty to Hadhrat Ali and who have condemned almost every person who insists on the Qisas of Hadhrat Uthman's murder. Therefore the allegation raised by the Shias is hardly rooted in principle and is simply the product of their irrepressible hatred for Hadhrat Uthman.

It is now an established fact that Hurmuzan was one of those persons who had prepared the dastradly conspiracy to kill Hadhrat Faruq-i-Azam. Hadhrat Abdur Rahman bin abi Bakr Siddique relates the events of the morning when Hadhrat Umar was attacked with a lancet. Last evening I passed by Abu Lulu'. Jufainah and Hurmuzan were sitting with him and they were talking in whispers to look to their heels. One of their daggers fell down. It had two heads and the blade was stuck in the middle. So you can see the daggers with which Hadhrat Umar has been wounded. The members of Banu Tamim went out in search of Abu Lu'lu'. He caught hold of Abu Lu'lu' and murdered him, and came back with the dagger that Hadhrat Abdur Rahman had mentioned.

Qumazban bin Hurmuzan had pardoned Ubaidullah for the murder of his father Hurmuzan. It is supported by Abu Mansur's account: I heard Qumazban relating the episode of his father's murder. Feroz, a non-Arab, happened to meet my father. He held the dagger used by others. My father took it from him and asked him why did he need the dagger in that town? He explained. It was spotted by another person as well. When Hadhrat Umar was attacked, the other man told the people that he had seen the dagger in Hurmuzan's hand and he had given it to Feroz. On hearing this, Ubaidullah had killed Hurmuzan. When Hadhrat Uthman was elected the Caliph, he sent for me and furnished me the opportunity to take revenge. He said: my son! Here is the murderer of your father. His case is now in your hand. All the people are with me but they demand that I should take revenge against him. I replied: please wait. I shall have him murdered. The people replied: We will wait. They also started abusing Ubaidullah. I said: Can't you stop it! But the people refused and kept on abusing him. I left them but they picked me up and I arrived home perched on the heads and arms of people.

Hadhrat Uthman paid his blood-money from his own property and said: I am his legatee; therefore I pay

the blood money out of my own goods. Is there any doubt left after this explanation?

Second Azan on Friday:

The allegation of the second Azan by the Shias against Hadhrat Uthman is not a new allegation. It had been parrotted out by their forefathers, the Sabais and rehearsed with mechanical regularity by their successors, the Shias. I would like to ask: if this

was objectionable, had Ali put an end to it during his tenure? The fact is that the second Azan was issued through the entire period of Hadhrat Ali's Caliphate. The question is why did Hadhrat Ali keep quiet or connive at it if the Azan was unlawful, and if this is objectionable then why should Hadhrat Uthman alone be made the butt of their criticism when Hadhrat Ali is equally guilty of the crime? (if it is a crime at all!) Allama Zahbi writes:

"When he added the second Azan of Friday, Hadhrat Ali was one of those who had agreed with him on the issue. Therefore it continued to be practised during his tenure as well, though it was far easier to terminate the Azan than to pick up a fight with Hadhrat Mu'awiyah. If it is objected that Hadhrat Ali did not terminate the Azan because the people were opposed to its termination, I would like to cite it as an argument for people's agreement with Hadhrat Uthman on the issue, though these people included among others Hadhrat Ammar, Sahl bin Hanif and the former as well as the latter ones. If anyone did object to it, he was within his legal rights because it was essentially a problem related to Ijtihad".

These were the objections of the Sabais which they raised against the innocuous personality of Hadhrat Uthman, and made him the target of their villainous attacks. They provoked the people against him until they killed him through deceit, duplicity and betrayal, though Hadhrat Ali, Hassan, Hussain, Talha, Zubair, Zayd bin Thabit, Abdullah bin Umar, Abu Hurairah, Abdullah bin Zubair and a large number of companions of the Prophet (peace be upon him) were determined to fight on his side and defend him. Hadhrat Zayd bin Thabit went to him and submitted: the natives are at your door and they insist that they are once again ready to play the role of the natives of Allah". Hadhrat Uthman replied: "I don't need it. Therefore I ask you not to fight".

Ibn abi Hadid, a Motazili Shia, has recorded:

"Hassan bin Ali, Abdullah bin Zubair, Muhammad bin Talha, Marwan, Sa'id bin As and a group of the sons of the natives tried to restrain the insurgents but Hadhrat Uthman replied that he did not need their help, and told them to go away. However, that group of loyal followers refused to leave".

Hadhrat Ali, before the martyrdom of Hadhrat Uthman, ticked off the Egyptians and others and told them not to kill him. He held them up with his hand, snubbed them with his tongue and dispatched his children to help and defend him against the evil of the insurgents.

The Shia historian Mas'udi has spelled out some of the details of this episode which I have already mentioned. I requote his words at the end of the discussion as they are pregnant far-reaching implications.

When Hadhrat Ali came to know that the Sabais wanted to kill Hadhrat Uthman, he despatched both of his sons, Hadhrat Hassan and Hussain, as well as some of his slaves to Hadhrat Uthman. They were laced with arms and Hadhrat Ali had sent them with the express command to defend Hadhrat Uthman against the insurgents. Hadhrat Zubair despatched his son Abdullah, Talha despatched his son Muhammad, and following their example, a number of companions of the Prophet (peace be upon him) also despatched their sons to help and assist Hadhrat Uthman. They pushed the rebels away from the residence of Hadhrat Uthman but the rebels rained down arrows on them and a pitched battle started. Hadhrat Hassan was wounded, Qumbar

received a head injured, Muhammad bin Talha also sustained some injuries. They were scared lest a fight should break out between Banu Hashim and Banu Umayyah. So they stole away, leaving the insurgents fighting at the door. Some of them sneaked into the house of a native. The insurgents now had an easy access to Hadhrat Uthman. The first persons to reach him were Muhammad bin abi Bakr and two others. His wife was with him. The members of his family as well as his slaves were busy outside fighting with the rebels. Muhammad bin abi Bakr caught hold of his beard as he approached him. He said" I swear by God, O Muhammad, if your father sees you in this condition, he would not like it. On hearing these words his grip on the beard loosened and he ran out of the house. The other two men, who had entered the house with him, murdered him. At the time of the martyrdom the Quran lay open before him and he was reciting it. After his martyrdom, his wife climbed the roof of the house and wailed and shouted at the top of her voice to tell the people that the Amir-ul-Mominin had been martyred. Hadhrat Hassan and Hussain and some members of Banu Umayyah came into the house and saw that he had expired. At this sight all the people started crying profusely. When Hadhrat Ali, Talha, Zubair, S'aad and other refugees and natives heard the news, they were simply stunned and recited

When Hadhrat Ali came to his house, he looked extremely sad and crestfallen. He asked Hadhrat Hassan and Hussain how did the rebels manage to murder the Amir-ul-Mominin when they were posted at the door. He even slapped Hadhrat Hassan and struck at Hadhrat Hussain's chest, abused Muhammad bin Talha and cursed Abdullah bin Zubair.

Won't these people give up their stubbornness after learning these facts! Alas!

(If you were addressing a living person, you could have certainly conveyed your meaning to him. But the person you are addressing is drained of life and what can be done about him?)

At the end of the chapter I would like to reproduce a tradition which Imam Bokhari has cited through Hadhrat Ans. Once the Prophet (peace be upon him), Hadhrat Abu Bakr, Hadhrat Umar and Hadhrat Uthman climbed the mountain of Uhd. The mountain started rocking. He commanded: Uhd, stop trembling. On you stand at this moment one Prophet, one truthful and two martyrs".

Another hadith is recorded in Bokhari and Muslim which is reported by Abu Musa Ashari: I was with the Prophet (peace be upon him) in a garden of Madinah. Somebody knocked at the door. He commanded: open the door and give the visitor the glad tiding of his entry into paradise. When I opened the door, I found Hadhrat Abu Bakr standing there. I gave him the tiding of his entry into paradise in accordance with the command of the Prophet (peace be upon him). As Hadhrat Siddique heard the tiding, he thanked God for it. Then another man came. He also knocked at the door. For him he repeated the same words, commanded me to open the door and convey to him the tiding of his entry into paradise. When I opened the door, I found Hadhrat Umar Faruq standing there. According to the Prophetic command I also communicated to him the tiding of his entry into paradise. He, too, thanked God for it. Then another man knocked at the door. He said: open the door and give him the glad tiding of his entry into paradise but he will be in trouble in this world. According to the Prophetic command I conveyed to him the tiding of his entry into paradise as well as a premonition of the trouble he would face in the world. He thanked God for the tiding of his entry into paradise and when he heard the warning

about trouble he declared that God was his protector.

To wrap the discussion, I would like to quote a tradition which Tirmizi and Ibn Majah have reported from Marrah bin K'aab. I heard the Prophet talking about seditions. He said that the period of seditions was about to set in. Meanwhile a person passed by him who was wrapped up in a sheet of cloth. He said: this man will be truly guided in the age of sedition. I stood up and looked at the man. He was Uthman bin Affan. I asked the Prophet (peace be upon him) if he was referring to Uthman. He said: yes.

I have offered a sketch of Hadhrat Uthman who was highly praised by no less a person than the Prophet (peace be upon him) himself. The treatment he received at the hands of the Sabais, the insurgents and the misguided people has already been sketched out at length. The bogus charges they raised against him have been discussed. The main purpose of these allegations and accusations was to put in jeopardy the Islamic system of administration that was based on the principles of justice and equity, create dissension among the Muslims, distort and disfigure their true beliefs and convictions, disrupt the chain of their conquests and place barriers and speed-breakers in the path of the enlightenment that Islam was spreading in the darkest niches and corners of the world. They achieved success in the first phase of their seditions campaign and put an end to the glowing career of Amir-ul-Mominin. They smashed the unity of Muslims into million smithereens by throwing a spanner among them. In the second phase of their campaign they set a chain of internecine wars among the Muslims by sowing the seeds of suspicion and dissension among them. Then they brainwashed the Muslims of true Islamic beliefs and convictions and filled their hearts and minds with un-Islamic views and opinions. They braced success in the second phase as well. The Muslims drifted into the jungle of conflict and war. Instead of fighting for the pleasure of God against the infidels, they chopped off one another's necks and alas! the Muslims who performed impossible feats of bravery in their holy war against the citadels of ignorance, oppression, idolatry and infidelity started shedding their own blood. In the next chapter I will take up the issue that not an inch of territory was added to the boundaries of the Islamic state during the tenure of Hadhrat Ali while its limits were immeasurably extended during the Siddiqui, Faruqi and Uthmani periods. Hadhrat Ali regrets the shrinkage of the Islamic empire and raises a wail of protest bordering on sheer agony against the pathetic state of affairs:

"O creatures of God, I advise you to adopt piety and this is the best advice. God also likes it most of all. But alas! now the door of war is flung wide open between you and the Ahl-i-Qiblah".

Alas! The swords of the Muslims, which were meant for use against the enemies of Islam, started shedding their own blood, and this is what the damned and cursed jews had planned. The measure of success they achieved in their plans was reward of their consistent efforts to stigmatize Islam and malign the Muslims in the eyes of the world. The next chapter will deal with the anti-Islamic jewish designs and the extent to which they were crowned with success.

The Sabai's Period

The purpose behind the composition of this book is not to string along historical events in a sequence of links and chains but to arrange the history of Sabaiism in a rational and logical order. My object is to expose their indecencies and obscenities, to unveil the crimes and mischiefs they committed and the plans and conspiracies they hatched. but in order to record the history of the rebel group which had intomitted some of its specific into the body of Islamic faith and given brith to a rash of mushroom sects, I was compelled to rely on the crutches of history, especially on those historical events which grew out of the womb of sabaism. the fact is that these events would never have popped into the liemlight if the sabais had not been active on the negative front. I intend to write a saparate book exclusively focussed on these accidents and episodes but completely strained from the legendary material that has crept into them through the prejudice of the enemies of Islam.

Now I like to focus my engeries only on those incremental details which are directly relevant to the topic and exclude those details which have only an indirect or marginal link its genesis and envolution. This selective procedure is dictated mainly by spatial restrictions.

After the mattyrdom of the innocent imam, madinah suffered an administrative

vacuum. It was without a legal chief executive. In other words, during these five days, Madinah was being administered by Ghafiqi bin Harb, one of the murderers of Hadhrat Uthman. The Sabais and the murderers of Hadhrat Uthman had rallied round him. A difference of opinion had cropped up among them about the nomination of the new Caliph. Hadhrat Ali was the hot favourite of the Sabais because they wanted to sanctify their heinous act by actively seeking his patronage, though he was completely absolved of the charge and had no share in the conspiracies of the Sabais. It has already been discussed that the vixenish Abdullah bin Saba, who was the chief engineer of these conspiracies, was aggressively active among the Egyptians. After the martyrdom of Hadhrat Uthman, pandemonium broke out among these rebels and mean rescalers on the selection of the new Caliph. Some of them favoured Talha, others supported Hadhrat Zubair while still others expressed their preference for Hadhrat Ali. Some people, out of sheer mischief, opposed any one who was tipped as the Caliph. This was in tune with the conspiracy they had already worked out to dismantle the fort of Islam and to terminate the Islamic state which was spreading fast to the remote corners of the earth and which had taken gigantic strides during the golden period of Hadhrat Uthman. The number of battles and conquests that marked this period is simply un-paralleled in the history of the Muslims. At first the Sabais concentrated on the three figures of Talha, Hadhrat Zubair and Hadhrat Ali as possible candidates for the Caliphate but subsequently they switched their priorities. They first proposed the name of Saad bin abi Waqas and then the name of Abdullah, the son of Hadhrat Umar Faruq but the response of these two latter ones echoed the response of the three former ones. The earliest historian Tabri has mentioned it and his statement is reinforced by Ibn Kathir, Ibn Athir, Ibn Khalbun etc:

"Muhammad bin Abdullah, Talha bin Alam Abu Haritha and Abu Haitham have related that after the martyrdom of Hadhrat Uthman Ghafiqi bin Harb acted as the Amir of Madinah for five days. These people were putting in their maximum effort to persuade some one to take over as the Amir of Madinah but every one worth any weight declined their offer. The Egyptians pressurized Hadhrat Ali but he hid himself in the gardens of Madinah; and if at all they bumped into him, he would send them diplomatically away. He also expressed his complete disaffiliation from them and refused to toe their line. The Kufis exerted pressure on Hadhrat Zubair but he evaded them. They despatched messengers to him but he also refused to follow their tracks.

Shia Sects

After the martyrdom of Hadhrat Ali, the Shias clustered around his son Hadhrat Hassan and appointed him as their Imam on the third day of his death. Qais bin Saad bin 'Ubadah was the first person to take the oath of allegiance at his hand.

The Sabais had now come out into the open with complete fanfare. They dropped the old apologetic posture and paraded their fictitious wares with aggressive

flamboyance. They tore away the diplomatic veil they had donned in the past to camouflage their hideous intentions because they were too scared of Hadhrat Ali to be caught with their trousers down: it would be even more true to say that their sulking posture was motivated more by diplomacy than by fear. It goes to their credit that they never under-estimated Hadhrat Ali. In fact, they were deeply impressed by his shrewdness and readiness to act. They knew down in their hearts that if they expressed their bogus beliefs publicly, he would wipe them out root and branch and give them out root and branch and give them a spanking they would never forget. A Shia historian records that the first not of transgression about the exaggerated powers of Hadhrat Ali was played by the Sabais during his own reign: it was obviously an exercise in negative innovation which is quite inconsistent with the hallowed traditions of reporting and positive transmission of information. Once Hadhrat Ali happened to meet a bunch of people who were eating during daytime in Ramadham. He asked them if they were travellers or patients.

Sabais: We are neither travelers not patients

Hadhrat Ali: Are you from among the people of the Book or are you non-Muslims.

Sabais: No, we are not from among the people of the Book.

Hadhrat Ali: Then why are you eating during daytime in the month of fasting?

Sabais: You are you.

In this way the Sabais were pointing to his Godliness. He told them to repent and gave them to repent and gave them some time for repentance. He elicited from them the promise that they would convey their repentance to him within a certain span of time. But these rascals clung to their spurious faith. Hadhrat Ali lumped them together in a pit and fumigated them. He warned them to back out of their rickety convictions, otherwise they would be burned alive. But when they persisted in their deviation, they were consigned to the flames. At that occasion he recited the verse:

(When I detected something indecent, I kindled the fire and called for Qanbar).

He himself was present when they were being broiled in the leaping flames and he stayed there till they were charred to cinders and ashes. They went into hiding or under cover for about a year and put the lid on this episode but Abdullah bin Saba suddenly jumped into action after the death of Hadhrat Ali. As has already been pinpointed, he was a jew who paraded himself as a Muslim. Those who pledged at his hand and yielded to the flotsam and jetsam of his jumbled and scrambled beliefs are know as Sabais. They openly denied the death of Hadhrat Ali.

NauBakhti, who is the earliest authority on the genesis and evolution of Shia sects, supports this view:

"After the martyrdom of Hadhrat Ali, his followers who believed in his leadership as part of divine obligation, split into three sects. One sect believed that Hadhrat Ali had neither been murdered nor had he died, nor would he be ever murdered or die. He will drive the Arabs with his rod and fell the entire world with justice and equity when

it is choked with tyranny and oppression. It is the first sect in the Muslim community which cooked up the concept of legacy and banked on exaggeration and distortion as propaganda ploys. This sect is known as the Sabai sect and its adherents were the followers Abdullah bin Saba. He is the first man who grinned at Hadhrat Abu Bakr, Hadhrat Umar, Hadhrat Uthman and other companions of the Prophet (peace be upon him) and dissociated himself from them and he claimed that his acts carried the sanction and support of Hadhrat Ali. When Hadhrat Ali was apprised of the situation, he asked him about it but he came out with a blunt confession. He ordered him to be executed. But the people vociferously protested against it and told Hadhrat Ali that he had ordered the execution of a person whose heart spilled over with the love of his children, who took pride in his friendship and who had de-linked himself with his enemies. Therefore he deported him to Madain.

A scholarly off-shoot of the companions of Hadhrat Ali has stated that Avdullah bin Saba was a Jew who had donned the cloak of Islam, pretended to love Hadhrat Ali and during his Jewish period he held similar belief about Hadhrat Ali that he was the executor of the Prophet (peace be upon him). The same Jew propagated first of all the obligatory nature of Hadhrat Ali's Imamah, dissociated himself from his enemies and waged war against his opponents. That is why those who are against the Shias believe that Shiaism is derived from Judaism. When the news of Hadhrat Ali's death was conveyed to Abdullah bin Saba in Madain, his instant reaction was categorical denial. He said to the messenger: You are lying. I will not believe it even if you bring to me his brain wrapped in seventy covers and offer seventy reliable persons as witnesses not has he been murdered because he can not die until he is the lord of the entire earth.

Other people, who are directly or indirectly concerned with recording the genesis and evolution of Shia sects, hold similar opinions. It is immaterial whether they are Sunnis or Shias as there exists a broad consensus between them. This point has been established in the preceding pages with special reference to books written by Shia scholars.

The reappearance of Sabaiism after the martyrdom of Hadhrat Ali and the 'ben trovato' beliefs it projected and propagated, has also been dealt with at length by the Sunni scholars. Abdul Qadir Baghdadi in his "Al-Firq bayn-ul-Firq" Ash-'ari in "Maqalat-ul-Islamiyyin. Razi in "Iraaqadat Firq-ul- Muslimin wal Mushrikin" Asfraini in "Tafsir" Shahrastani in "Al-Milal Wan Nihl", Ibn Haxm Zahiri in 'Al Fasl". Abdul Hassan Balti in "At-Tanbih" Jirjani in "At-Tafrifat: and Maqrizi in "Khatat" have made reference to them.

All of these historians have expressed that after the martyrdom of Hadhrat Ali, Abdullah bin Saba returned from the place where he had lived as an exile. On his return he spelled out his specific beliefs about Hadhrat Ali. Asfraini writes:

"Hadhrat Ali was scared of incinerating the rest of the Sabais on account of the Syrian opposition. Besides a rift had developed between his friends and companions on the issue. Ibn Saba persisted in belief that the man who had been murdered was not Hadhrat Ali".

Shahrastani also supports him: "Abduallah bin Saba articulated his specific beliefs after of Hadhrat Ali and his party thronged around him on the vasis of these beliefs"

Hadhrat Hassan followed in the tracks of his father and waged a war against his

thoughts and beliefs. The Shia writer Ibn abi al-Hadid writes:

"Abdullah bin Saba appeared after the death of Hadhrat Ali. He was, in fact a Jew but wore the badge of Islam. His followers are called "Sabais". These people believed that Hadhrat Ali had not died but he was still alive among the skies. The thunder is his voice and the lightening is his glitter. Whenever they heard the clap, they uttered

(Peace on you, O Amir-ul-Mominin!)

These cruel people talked of the Prophet (peace be upon him) in extremely unrefined and indecorous language, accused him of baseless motives and publicly claimed that he had suppressed ninety percent of the divine revelation. The Sabai belief about the revelation has been discarded by Hassan bin Ali bin Muhammad bin Hanifiyyah in a letter in which he mentions "Arja". The contents of this letter have been communicated by Sulaiman bin abi Shaikh through Haitham bin Muawiyyah, Abdul Aziz bin Abban and Abdul Wahid bin Aiman Makki. Makki relates that he was with Hassan bin Ali bin Muhammad bin Hanifayyah when he was dictating the letter. He dictated that, according to the Sabais, they had been blessed with a revelation which the people had rejected, that they had been blessed with knowledge which was hidden from other people. These lousy people believe that the Prophet (peace be upon him) had suppressed ninety percent of the divine revelation, though if the Prophet (peace be upon him) had really suppressed revelation, he would have blotted out the verses relating to the wife of Hadhrat Zayd or he would have suppressed the contents of the following verse:

(Do you desire the willing support of your wives?)

Hadhrat Hassan could not wage war against them in the style of his father. On the contrary the Sabais enjoyed great latitude during his tenure and spread the message of friction and disunity without much restraint. They intensified their efforts to inject the poison of dissension into the veins of the Muslim body. When the Shias were disenchanted with Hadhrat Ali, they fell an easy prey to the Sabai conspiracy. Some of them felt inclined towards Hadhrat Muawiyyah and some of them joined the Kharijis. Hadhrat Hassan had almost lost his grip over them. These developments have been sketched out by Mufid, Urbili, Majlisi etc. in their respective books. They have referred to Hadhrat Muawiyyah's advance towards Iraq:

"Hadhrat Muawiyyah marched towards Iraq to secure a point of vantage, but when he reached Jasr Manbaj, Hadhrat Hassan also moved into action. He sent a message to his officials to make preparation for a confrontation and also asked the people to come out in the name of Jihad. The people felt that the call of Jihad was too heavy a burden for them to carry. But some of them responded to the call and an assortment of people joined him. Some of them were his shias and the shias of his father. Others believed that war must be waged against Hadhrat Muqwiyyah at any cost. There were still others who relished mischief as well as the spoils of war. Some of them were the victims of skepticism, others of fanaticism. They were the willing slaves of their chedftains and were the least attached to their faith. He set out with these people until he arrived in Hamam Umr. Then passing through Dir Ka'ab, they camped at Sabat in the low-lying area of Qantarhah. They spent the night there. In the morning he tried to test the loyalty of his companions to discriminate between friends and foes and to wage a purposive and better-conducted war with Hadhrat Muawiyyah and the Syrians. He commanded all of them to rally at a specific spot. When they had assembled, he addressed them:

By God! I believe that by the grace of Allah I am a person with the best motives and intentions as I bear malice towards none, nor do I intend to entertain evil towards anyone in future. Remember, it is always better to express your dislikes while remaining within the party than expressing them while you are split and splintered. Keep it in mind, my friends, that I desire your welfare even better than your own selves. Therefore you should neither oppose me nor contradict my opinion. May God forgive us all, and may He enable you to seek His love and pleasure!"

They looked with amazement at one another when they heard his address and gave vent to wild speculation: What do you think are Hadhrat Hassan's intentions? They concluded: By God! We guess that he intends to negotiate with Muawiyah and hand over the affairs of Khilafat to him. They added: these people will turn infidels if he does so. Then they attacked his tent, looted his goods and even pulled the prayer mat from under him. Abdur Rahman bin Avdullah bin Jaal Azdi assaulted him, whisked away the shawl from his shoulders. He sat down shawlless on the ground, the sword dangling from his neck, then called for his horse. But his Shias and special companions surrounded him on all sides and protected those he wanted to punish. He told the people to call Rabi and Himlan. When they came, they pushed the people away and he set out on his journey again. He was accompanied by a number of other people as well. When he passed through Muslims Sabat, Jarrah bin Sanan of the Asad tribe attacked him. He held the bride of his horse. He carried a long pointed missile in his hand. He said: God is great! O Hassan, you have committed infidelity as your father had done before you. Then he inflicted a blow on his thigh with a spear. The spear tore through the thigh and penetrated down to the bone. Hadhrat Hassan grappled with him and both of them tumbled to the ground. Meanwhile one of the Shias of Hassan leapt towards them. His name was Abdullah bin Khatal Tai. He snatched the spear from Jarrah's hand and jabbed it into his belly. An other man Zibiyyan bin Ammarah also pounced at him and chopped off his nose. He died instantly. The other man with him was also caught and killed. Hadhrat Hassan was brought to Madain on a cot, and he stayed at the residence of Saad bin Masud Thaqafi who officially represented the Amir-ul-Mo-minin in Madain. Hadhrat Hassan had also retained him in the same office. In Madain he devoted his attention towards his treatment. Meanwhile a number of chieftains secretly wrote to Muawiyah that they were ready to pledge to him. They strongly persuaded him to come to them. They assured him that they would either hand over Hadhrat Hassan to him as soon as he reached there or kill him. Hadhrat Hassan also came to know about their secret plan. He received a letter from Hadhrat Qays bin Saad. He had dispatched him to Abdullah bin Abbas on his return from Kufah to meet Hadhrat Muawiyah and to prevail upon him to keep off Iraq. He had also appointed him the leader of the party and told him that in case of his martyrdom Qays bin Saad would act as the leader. Qays informed him in the letter that they had invited Muawiyah to a settlement called Hububiyyah. On the other side Hadhrat Muawiyah sent for Ubaidullah bin Abbas. He fixed a sum of one million dirham as surety. Half of the amount was to be shelled out immediately while the remaining half would be paid in Kufah. Ubaid Ullah moved towards Muawiyah's army with his special companions during the night. When the people found their leader off the scene, Hadhrat Qais bin Saad led the prayers and acted on his behalf. Hadhrat Hassan realized that the people were determined to humiliate him. He felt that they had switched their loyalties. They ridiculed him as a result of the twist in their motives, accuse him of infidelity, looted his property and legitimized his murder. Most of the people around him were mischief-mongers. They were all out to harm and humiliate him. His own Shias and the Shias of his father were too few to put up a meaningful and effective resistance to the Syrian on-

slaught. Hadhrat Muawiyah dispatched a letter of conciliation to him. He also mentioned in his letter the letters of his companions in which they had expressed their intention of either handing him over or killing him. He offered a package of terms and conditions to bring about a reconciliation, and to agree to these terms was what the times clearly dictated, but Hadhrat Hassan did not trust him and mistook his gesture of sincerity for an ill-conceived pretense, though, on account of the treachery and disloyalty of his companions, the best course for him was to accept his offer of conciliation. I have already stressed the fact that his companions were a bunch of rogues. They were scoundrels and seemed determined to install some one else as their Amir in his place. Most of them wanted to spill his blood and hand him over to his adversaries. His own cousin was also against him and he wanted to degrade him and pass him over to his opponents. The majority of his companions were inclined towards earthly benefits and rewards and had grown indifferent towards the punishments of the next world. However, Hadhrat Hassan secured the trust and confidence of Hadhrat Muawiyah. He raised all the objections that could possibly be raised. One of the conditions was that the Amir-ul-Mominin will not be persecuted. During prayers he will not be condemned; the Shias of Ali will not be maltreated and justice will be done to everyone. Hadhrat Muawiyah accepted all the terms and pledged to fulfil them.

Ibn abi al-Hadid adds: When Hadhrat Hassan decided to leave Madain, he addressed the people: You have pledged to me that you will be reconciled to those with whom I am reconciled and you will fight those with whom I fight. By God! At this moment I bear no malice towards any member of my community whether he lives in the east or in the west. You dislike grouping, peace and reconciliation but these are better than rift, fear, spite and enmity which you appear to relish. My father Hadhrat Ali used to say that we should not look down upon the leadership of Muawiyah because if we discard him, it will be like the irreversible chipping of heads off the shoulders that carry them.

Then he climbed down the pulpit. The people said to him: You have uttered these words because you want to resign and dish out the Khilafat to Hadhrat Muawiyah. Therefore they flared up, rejected his contention, looted the goods, snatched away his shawl and pounced upon the slave maid who was with him and they splintered into different groups. One group clearly played his tunes while the majority of people supplied the discordant notes. He said:

(O Allah! I need your help)

He ordered the people to march and they marched away. Somebody brought his horse to him and he jumped on it. Some of his friends surrounded him but the others protected him and the march continued. Sanan bin Jarah Asadi accompanied him to Muzlim Sabat and stayed with him. He came closer to him and spoke to him in rather confidential tones. Then he struck his spear at his thigh with such force that it almost touched the bone. He became unconscious and his friends caught him, trying to excel on another.

Shia historians have elucidated that the people who had forced Hadhrat Hassan, looted his property and wounded him, belonged to Sabat Madian, the spot to which Hadhrat Ali had exiled Abdullah bin Saba. They were deeply impressed by the views and beliefs of Ibn Saba and were actively engaged in their dissemination and publicity. They also included Mukhtar bin abi Ubaid Thaqafi, a victim of Sabatism, who subsequently gained immense reputation and became the self-styled

spokesman of the views preached by the dissembling Jew, Ibn Saba. The historian has mentioned that when Hassan ibn Ali landed in Madain in a wounded state, Mukhtar knew the whole state of affairs. Mukhtar asked him: do you need wealth and status? He inquired: how is it possible? Mukhtar replied: you should arrest Hussain ibn Ali and dispatch him to Muawiyah as a prisoner. Hadhrat Hassan replied: may God disgrace you and curse your words! Do you expect me to betray the grandson of the Messenger of Allah?

When Hadhrat Hassan perceived that the Sabai threat had acquired ominous proportions, his own Shias were degrading and humiliating him and human blood was spilling all over, he found reconciliation the only way out of the intractable situation. The Shia historian Yaqubi relates that Hadhrat Hassan had lost a large quantity of blood when he was brought to Madain. The malady had taken a serious turn. The people had left him. Hadhrat Muawiyah came to Iraq and took over the reins of Khilafat. When Hadhrat Hassan realized that he didn't have the strength to fight and his friends had deserted him and were absolutely unwilling to collide with him, he patched up with Hadhrat Muawiyah. He ascended the pulpit, praised the Lord and then addressed the people: you were rewarded with God's blessing on account of our ancestors but you shed one another's blood on account of our descendants. Therefore I have patched up with Hadhrat Muawiyah and handed over the Khilafat to him and I can't say whether it is a test of your faith or a source of benefit for a limited period.

Hadhrat Hassan went even a step further. He not only handed over the Khilafat to Hadhrat Muawiyah, but also pledged fealty at his hand along with his brothers and commanders of the army as Kashi has reported from Jafar bin Baqir:

"Muawiyah wrote to Hadhrat Hassan: you, Hadhrat Hussain and the companions of Ali should come to see me. Thus when they came to Syria, Qays bin Saad bin Ubadah Ansari was also with them. Hadhrat Muawiyah gave them permission to enter. He had already churned up an address for the occasion. Muawiyah said to Hassan: handed over the Khilafat to him and I can't say whether it is a test of your faith or a source of benefit for a limited period"

Hadhrat Hassan went even a step further. He not only handed over the Khilafat to Hadhrat Muawiyah, but also pledged fealty at his hand along with his brothers and commanders of the army as Kashi has reported from Jafar bin Baqir:

"Muawiyah wrote to Hadhrat Hassan: you, Hadhrat Hussain and the companions of Ali should come to see me. Thus when they came to Syria, Qays bin Saad bin Ubadah Ansari was also with them. Hadhrat Muawiyah gave them permission to enter. He had already churned up an address for the occasion. Muawiyah said to Hassan: come and pledge to me. Hadhrat Hassan pledged at his hand. Then he asked Hadhrat Hussain: get up and pledge to him. He also stood up and pledged at his hand. Then he addressed Qays: come and pledge to him. He looked towards Hadhrat Hussain for orders. He said: pledge at his hand because he (Hadhrat Hassan) is my Imam".

These facts have been endorsed by the fanatic Shia Majlisi in his book "Jila-ul Uyyun: written in Persian language; Among the Shia Mugaddithin Abbas Qummi has mentioned them in his "Muntah-il-Amal": it is also written in Persian. Ibn abi al Hadid, too, has recorded it in his book "Sharh Nahf-ul-Balaghah".

Some other Shia sects sprang out of this episode. Nau Bakhti observes that when Hadhrat Muawiyah, they made him the butt of their spiteful criticism, backed out of their belief in his Imamate and affirmed their faith in the will of the people, but the rest of his companions supported his claim to Imamate till his martyrdom. When he had withdrawn himself from a confrontation with Muawiyah and had landed in Muzlim Sabat, Jarah bin Sanan attacked him. He held the bridle of his horse in his hand and shouted: God is great! O Hassan! you have committed infidelity – as you father had done before you, and then he inflicted such a heavy blow on his thigh with a spear that his thigh bone was fractured. Hadhrat Hassan also gunned on to him until both of them slumped on the ground. The people pounced at Jarah and squashed him under their feet. They brought Hadhrat Hassan to Madina but the spear-wound was a constant source of pain and torture. He restrained his anger and bore the pain and grief with fortitude caused by his own followers until he died by the end of Safar in 47 A.H. at the age of forty five years and six months. Some of the scholars opine that he was born during Ramadhan in 3 A.H. and the tenure of his Khilafat stretched over six years and five months.

After the patch-up a group of Shias still supported his stand. Therefore, riding on his band-wagon, they also pledged fealty at the hand of Hadhrat Muawiyah and never wavered in their loyalty and sincerity toward him from 41 A.H. to 60 A.H. The most prominent among this group of Shias were the children of Hadhrat Ali, the children of his children and his wives, Hadhrat Hussain, Muhammad bin Hanifiyyah, Abdullah bin Abbas, the sons of 'Aqil and Jafar' and other distinguished Hashimis who shared and identity of beliefs with the general run of Muslims and the companions of the Prophet (peace be upon him). They believed that no one should be charged with infidelity and apostasy, that they should make a practical demonstration of unity and solidarity, that they should paper over their differences and avoid collision and confrontation, that they should strengthen the bonds of mutual love and affection and establish inter-marital relations as has been copiously illustrated in the preceding pages.

One of the groups had detached itself from Hadhrat Hussain and Hussain and affirmed its faith in the Imamate of Muhammad bin Hanifiyyah. This group came to be subsequently known as Kaisaniyyah. Hadhrat Hassan's pacification with Hadhrat Muawiyah reinforced its strength and stature. The views and beliefs of this sect resembled those of the Sabais. It evolved with remarkable rapidity and it expanded beyond the expectations and calculations of the people and it provided both encouragement and nourishment to other Shia sects which directly hatched out of its womb as will be explained later on in greater detail. Nau Bakhti include it among those sects which sprang up after the martyrdom of Hadhrat Ali and he regards it as one of the sects which flourished during Hadhrat Hassan's tenure. Nau Bakhti believes that the group who clung to his Imamate after the martyrdom of Hadhrat Ali split into three sects: (1) Sabaiyyah (2) the sect who believed in the Imamate of Muhammad bin Hanifiyyah because on the day of Basrah he, instead of his other brothers, held his father's flag. This sect was known as Kaisaniyyah. The source of its nomenclature is that the chief of the sect was Mukhtar bin abi Ubaid Thaqafi and his surname was Kaysan. He demanded revenge for the blood of Hadhrat Hussain bin Ali and put to sword a number of Hussain's killers and he claimed that he had simply carried out the orders of Muhammad bin Hanifiyyah who obviously was the Imam after his father. Mukhtar was called Kaysan because it was the name of his chief of police whose patronym was Abu Umrah. He praised Mukhtar in both words and deeds beyond all human expectation. He used to assert that Muhammad bin Hanifiyyah was the executor of Hadhrat Ali bin abi Talib and he was also the Imam.

Mukhtar was his convenor and administrator. He declared that Ali's predecessor Claiphs, the residents of Jamal and the residents of Safin were all infidels. He also declared that Gabriel brought him the revelation from Allah but they could not see him. Some scholars have reported that Kaisan was the name of one of Hadhrat Ali's slaves whom he had released from bondage. He had provoked him to spill Hussain's blood and identified his killers. He was also his confidant, adviser and ruler.

Shahristani has also endorsed the point. He observes that those who believed in a clear specification of Imamate adopted a different course of action after the martyrdom of Hadhrat Ali. Some of them openly suggested that there existed a clear indication about the Imamate of Hadhrat Ali's son Muhammad bin Hanifiyyah. These people were called Kaisaniyyah. Those who did not believe in the Imamate of Muhammad bin Hanifiyyah affirmed that the Imamate was restricted to Hadhrat Hassan and Hussain alone. Qadhi Noman Shi'i supports this view. People, however, differ about his identity. It is not absolutely clear whether he belonged to the Fatmi sect or the Ithna Ashriyyah. The opinion of the scholars on the issue is clearly divided. Some of them think

(He is our Imam and executor after Hadhrat Ali. They think that Hassan and Hussain are mutes.)

(Then, relying on exaggeration and mis-statement they propose that he did not die, and he is present in "Sab-i-Ridhwa.")

(He is among the lions he is deputed to supervise and he declares that he receives his subsistence from them)

Among the Sunnis Baghdadis in "Al-Firq Bain-ul-Firq." Ashari in "Maqalat-il-Islamiyyin", Malti in "At-Tanbih", Tazi in "Itiqadat Firq-ul-Muslimiyyin wal Mushrikin", Isfraini in "At-Tabsir", Ibn Khuldun Ibn Hazan in "al-Fasl" and Mirqizi etc. have referred to the Kaisaniyyah sect of Shias.

At the juncture of conciliation between Hadhrat Hassan and Hadhrat Muawiyyah one of the sects had absolutely discarded Shiaism and never subsequently included themselves among the Shias. Nau Bakhti observes that when Hadhrat Hassan and Muawiyyah committed themselves to patch-up and Hadhrat Hassan accepted the goods dispatched to him by Hadhrat Hassan accepted the goods dispatched to him by Hadhrat Muawiyyah, these people started lambasting him. They opposed him, damned his Imamate and concurred with the opinion of the populace.

Sabaism had spread most shabbily during this period. A Shia historian acknowledges its wide-spread impact. He observes that this worst innovation first permeated among some of the Iraqis like an epidemic. He has also enumerated the factors that contributed to its wide-ranging influence and in this he has relied on the authority of Ibn abi al-Hadid. They were people of limited vision. Therefore it was not unexpected of them to be over-impressed by the miracles performed by Hadhrat Ali and to be led astray. They easily formed the belief that the divine essence had been injected into Hadhrat Ali. It is generally said that they had heard from their forefathers the God often penetrated the mortal frame of His prophets. Therefore they held a similar belief about Hadhrat Ali. It is also possible that this view was deliberately propagated by some atheists who wanted to inject their atheistic beliefs into the flesh and soul of Islam.

Shias during the period of Hadhrat Hussain:

After the death of Hadhrat Hassan, the Shias flocked round his brother Hadhrat Hussain. The most stupendous event and the most glorious episode that occurred during his tenure was his rebellion against Yazid. Yaqubi, one of the extremist Shias, observes that when Yazid was appointed Caliph after the death of his father, he wrote to Walid bin Uqbah bin abi Sufiyyan, the governor of Madina, to secure the pledge of Hussain bin Ali. When Walid pressured Hadhrat Hussain to pledge fealty to Yazid, he left for Makkah where he stayed for a few days. Meanwhile the citizens of Iraq dispatched a number of letters to him which assumed the form of an unbroken series of messages. The last letter he received was from Hani' bin abi Hani' and Said bin Abdullah Khithami. The letter is reproduced below:

"We begin with the name of Allah! To Hussain bin Ali from his Muslim Shias. You should come immediately. Everyone is waiting for you. They do not acknowledge anybody else as their Imam. Therefore you should come as soon as possible".

Another Shia historian Masudi writes:

"When Hadhrat Muawiyyah died, the residents of Kufah dispatched innumerable letters to Hadhrat Hussain bin Ali that they had disciplined themselves to take the oath of allegiance at his hand. They wrote: We would prefer to die than to pledge fealty at the hand of some one else. That is why we do not participate in the Friday and congregational prayers". Another letter contained the following message:

"The gardens are just green and the fruits have ripened. Therefore you can come whenever you like. The army awaits your arrival".

When the letters piled up and the Kufi demand turned into an insistent refrain, Hadhrat Hussain sent Muslim bin 'Aqil bin abi Talib to Kufah. He also dispatched a letter to the residents of Kufah and told them that the letter was a prelude to his visit. When Muslim arrived in Kufah, the people swarmed round him and pledged fealty to him. They gave their word of honour that they would extend their maximum help and co-operation to Hadhrat Hussain".

Mufid adds:

"All the Kufis pledged to Muslim while crying and the number of these people exceeded eighteen thousand".

After a few days Hadhrat Hussain received a letter from Muslim:

"One lac people are ready to pledge at your hand. Therefore don't delay".

Hadhrat Hussain set out towards Kufah after receiving the letter. But Hadhrat Abbas called on him. Hadhrat ibn Abbas was a spring of the Banu Hashim, he was the commander-in-chief of the armed forces of Hadhrat Ali, he was an experienced man and had a better grasp of the psychic make-up of the Shias of his times, as has been attested by Masudi: Hadhrat ibn Abbas said to him: "O my cousin! I have come to know that you intend to visit Iraq. Don't you know that these people are traitors? They are inviting you to fight but you shouldn't make haste. If you want to fight with this tyrant and do not like to stay in Makkah, you should better go to Yemen. It is off the main route and you'll also find a number of helpers and supporters there. Stay

there and seek the good will of the people. From there you should write to citizens of Iraq out their Amir. If they have the power to extradite him and there is no one to oppose you, then you are welcome to go there. I don't rule out their treachery. If they don't act up to your wishes, then you should stay put and await divine verdict. The place is riddled with castles and valleys. Hadhrat Hussain replied: O my cousin! I know you are my will-wisher and sympathizer. But Muslims bin 'Aqui has sent me a letter in his own hand that all the people there are agreed to take the oath of allegiance at my hand. Therefore I have decided to visit them. Ibn Abbas explained: I know these people to the roots of their hair. I have tried and tested them. What they did to your father and brother is not hidden from you. They will conspire against you in complicity with their Amir and pack you off straight to martyrdom—Ah! how truly Ibn Abbas had spoken! How sympathetic was he towards Hadhrat Hussain and how well-informed about the designs of the Kufis! – If you march in this direction, and Ibn Ziyad comes to know about your departure, he will mobilize his army and seek an open confrontation with you. The people who have dashed off letters to you will turn into your implacable enemies. If you don't agree to my proposal and are determined to leave for Kufah, then, for God's sake, don't take your wife and children along. By God! I apprehend that you may be martyred as Hadhrat Uthman was martyred and his wife and children remained passive spectators".

These were the explicit words of Hadhrat Abdullah bin Abbas and the amount of prestige he enjoyed in the eyes of Hadhrat Ali is no secret. Mufid comments: "Amir-ul-Mominin dined with Hadhrat Hassan one night, with Hadhrat Hussain the next night and with Hadhrat Abdullah bin Abbas the night after.

He constantly suffered at the hands of the Shias who spared no opportunity to humiliate him. They tortured him so much that he was forced to confess: I wish Muawiyah could exchange you with his men as dinar are exchanged with dirham. He should take ten of you and give me one of his men in exchange.

Abu Bakr Hisham also endorsed the views of Hadhrat Ibn Abbas that the Shias were dishonest and traitorous. Therefore he should not fall into their trap. According to Masudi Abu Bakr bin Harith bin Hisham called on Hadhrat Hussain and said to him: O my cousin! I like to sympathize with you but I don't know how to express my sympathies! Hadhrat Hussain replied: Abu Bakr! You are one of those who could not be labeled dishonest or insincere. Therefore you are welcome to express your views. Abu Bakr said: your father was among the early Muslims who had embraced Islam. After entering the fold of Islam, he left behind a pleasant and favorable impression. He always launched a tempestuous attack (on the enemy). People attached great expectations to him and had evolved a consensus around him. When he marched towards Muawiyah, every one had supported him except the Syrians. Even otherwise he enjoyed a better status than Muawiyah but in spite of all this the people degraded and disgraced him. They were reluctant to wage Jihad; greed and lechery overpowered them. They not only pricked and annoyed him but also opposed him tooth and nail until he quaffed the cup of martyrdom. Then the treatment they extended to your elder brother after the death of your father is not hidden from you either. You are a direct witness to these happenings and yet you are ready to go to them who opposed your father and brother. You want to fight against the residents of Syria and Iraq and the person who wields greater power than you and who is fully laced with arms. People fear him more and expect more from him. If come to know that you have set out towards them, they will bribe the people with wealth and goods. People are creatures of flesh. Those who have promised to help and support you will turn against you. Those who seem to love you at present are

the ones who will insult you later. Therefore fear God and don't go there.

Hadhrat Hussain replied: O, my cousin! May god bless you! Your opinion has come the hard way. Whatever God has decided, must be implemented.

Abu Bakr said: O Abu Abdullah! We expect reward from Allah. Then Abu Bakr, Harith bin Khalid bin 'As bin Hisham Mukhzuma called on the governor of Makkah. They were reciting the verse

(There are so many advisers who are disobeyed and the one who can guess hidden things equates advice with trash and bilge).

I reproduce below the whole episode from books written by Shia scholar and historians to expose the treachery and cowardice of the Shias. Masudi remarks that the news of Muslim's arrival in Kufah had been passed on to Yazid also. He appointed Ubaidullah bin Ziyad the governor of Kufah. Ubaidullah marched from Basrah at a hurricane speed and arrived in Kufah soon after noon. When he sneaked into Kufah, he was wearing a black tiara which covered up his face. He was riding a mule. People were expecting the arrival of Hadhrat Hussain. When Ibn Ziyad saluted the people, they responded with slogans of welcome until he reached the palace. Noman bin Bashir was also inside the palace. He sat down near him and then turned his attention towards him. He asked: O son of the Messenger of Allah! what is your command? Why have you preferred my city to others? Ibn Ziyad replied: you have been too much in the dark and then he drew aside the cover from his face. He recognized him and opened the gate. People exclaimed: he is Ibn Marjana. And then they threw pebbles at him. He ignored them and entered the palace. When Muslim heard the news of his arrival, he hid himself in the house of Hani' bin Urwah Muradi. Ziyad sent Muhammad bin Ashath bin Qais to fetch Hani'. When he was brought to Ziyad, he asked him about Muslim, but he gave a blank reply. When Ibn Ziyad spoke to him a little bluntly and ruthlessly' Hani' said" I am under obligation to your father Ziyad and I would like to pay it back. Would you like a piece of good advice? Ibn Ziyad asked: What is that? Hani' replied: pack up your wealth and goods and make a straight dive for Syria along with your family and children before any harm comes to you: Now the right has arrived: one who has a better claim to rule than you has arrived. On hearing this, Ibn Ziyad said: bring him closer to me. When he was brought closer, he applied the stick he was holding in his hand on his face with such force that his nose snapped and he received a wound on his forehead. The flesh on his face flaked off and he broke the stick on his head and face. Hani' tried to snatch a policeman's sword but someone pushed him and widened the distance between him and the sword. Hani's companions kicked up a roar at the door, clamouring the death of their companion. Ibn Ziyad threatened them and locked up Hani' in a side-room. He sent out Qadhi Shrahk to tell the people that Hani' had not been murdered. Consequently, they left for their homes. When Muslim came to know that Ziyad had maltreated Hani, he came out with the slogan "Ya Mansur" which was immediately taken up by the residents of Kufa and eighteen thousand people instantly rallied to his call. Muslim also marched towards Ibn Ziyad but his companions locked him up inside the place. By evening not even a hundred people were left with him. When he realized that the people were slipping away, he moved towards the carved gate. He had hardly reached the gate that he was left with only three companions; and when he came out of the gate, not a single man accompanied him. He was in a real quandary. He did not know where to go. There was no one to guide him. He climbed down his horse and roamed through the streets of Kufah in a state of utter stupefaction. He was absolutely in a fix as he was stranded. He kept

on walking until he reached the house of the slave-maid of Ashath bin Qais. He asked for water and she gave him some water to drink. When she asked him what had happened, he reeled off to her the entire gamut of events. She suddenly softened towards him and provided him shelter where he could hide himself. When his son came home, he found out that he was hiding there. Next morning he conveyed the news to Muhammad bin Ashath who conveyed it to Ibn Ziyad. Ziyad murdered him. He also murdered Hani' bin Marwah when he was calling out the children of Murad for help. He was the chieftain of the tribe. When he rode on his horse, four thousands armoured people and eight thousands footmen accompanied him. If his enemy Banu Kandah had responded to his call, the number of his armoured companions would have risen to twenty thousands. But all of them displayed nauseating cowardice and chicken-heartedness and failed to heed the call of their leader.

Meeting with Hur in Qadsiyyah:

When Hadhrat Hussain arrived in Qadisiyyah, he happened to meet Hur Yazid Yamimi who asked him: O grandson of the Messenger! Where are you heading? He replied: I am heading towards this city. Hur informed him that Muslim had been martyred. He also gave him details of his torture and agony Muslim had suffered at the hands of the Kufis and the functionaries of the stated. He advised him to return as Kufa hardly held any hope of better prospects of him. He found Hur's advice reasonable and pragmatic and decided to retrace his steps. But Muslims' brother, out of righteous anger, became intransigent and swore not to return until they avenged the murder of his brother or received martyrdom in the process. Hadhrat Hussain replied there was hardly any point in living after they had all died.

Hadhrat Hussain's address:

Under the circumstances, he gathered all the people and addressed them:

"O people! I have received horrifying news. Muslims bin Aqil, Hani' bin 'Urwah and Abdullah bin Yaqtar have embraced martyrdom. Our Shias have betrayed and humiliated us. Therefore any one who likes to leave us is welcome to do so. I'll not be offended in the least".

When people heard his words, they started slinking on the right and on the left until, within a short span of time, only those people remained who had set off from Madinah with him. Those who had joined him on the way disappeared into thin air. Only a sprinkling of these people held on to the hem of his companionship. He had consciously uttered these words to off-set the false expectations of a party of Baddus who had joined his ranks simply to live in clover in a town whose citizens obeyed the Imam unconditionally. Thus they looked forward to Kufah as veritable paradise where they would laze and roll away their time in utter luxury. They were the least inclined to face the ordeal of a rough and ready life. Hadhrat Hussain did not like to keep them in the dark by letting them in on the true nature of his sojourn.

Umor bin Lozan:

When the morning came, he commanded his companions to take their animals to water. The animal drank to their bladder's content and they set out on their journey. When they reached Batn-i-'Aqbah, they encamped there. He met Umro bin Lozan, a chief of Banu Akrimah. He asked him: which way are you heading? Hadhrat Hussain

replied: I am heading towards Kufah. The chief said: I make you swear by God that you should go back. You are not going to Kufah but you are going to face the points of spears and the blades of swords. If these people, who have dashed off letters to you, side with you during the battle and furnish you with arms and weapons, it'll be in the fitness of things for you to go there. But as things stand, the situation is replete with danger and your visit will be most inexpedient. He replied: O God's creature! I am not unaware of it either but no one can prevail over divine plans.

Departure towards Kufah:

Then he marched towards Kufah. On the way he chanced to meet a person who informed him about the betrayal and cowardice of the Kufis and told him bluntly that he did not have a single supporter and helper. He added that in-stead of helping him, the Kufis might turn against him.

When the armed forces of Kufah intercepted him, he realized that the actual situation clashed with the promises of help and the assurances of support with which their letters were cluttered and clogged. They had taken a complete volte face. He asked one of his companions to bring him the two bags containing their letters. He brought the bags and poured out their contents right in front of them.

At Karbala:

The Kufis disowned both the letters and the messages. He continued the march till he landed in Karbala. When massive armies rallied against Hadhrat Hussain, he was convinced that there was no shelter for him. He raised his hands for prayer: O Allah! arbitrate between us and this nation who had invited us to help us but who have waged war against us.

Hadhrat Hussain fought bravely and spiritedly until he quaffed the cup of martyrdom. The people who fought against him on the battlefield or who put him to martyrdom were all Kufis. There was not a single Syrian who had taken part in the fray.

The Shia historian Yaqubi—who, in the opinion of Well-hausen, was highly fanatic and extremely partisan—mentions that when the Kufis martyred him, they plundered his goods and belongings and escorted the ladies to Kufah. When the ladies entered Kufa, the women of that town came out of their houses screaming and beating their chests. Hadhrat Ali bin Hussain remarked: if they are mourning for us, then who has murdered us? I would like reproduce here the words of the German historian Well-hausen, who has a soft corner for the Shias:

"The populace in Kufah did not want to help the Government, but inspite of their disinclination to help, they did not join the ranks of the enemy. Even those people who had dispatched letters to Hadhrat Hussain, sworn their loyalty and sincerity, kept away during the hour of trial and did not extend the hand of cooperation towards him. The maximum that they did for him was to watch the grue-some spectacle of his martyrdom from a distance and shed crocodile tears over the gory out-come. People who stayed with him till the end could be counted on fingers: for instance, Abu Thamamah Saidi, the treasurer of the public exchequer, Ibn Aosjah etc fought beside them on the battle field. Some of them had joined them on the way, and there were others who had supported them till the last hour out of a feeling of

human sanctity, though they had neither any links with them nor did they happen to be among their Shias. The historians have especially under-scored the discrepancy between the followers who did not flutter a feather (in support of the Imam) and the non-followers who went the whole hog to help him and put his followers to shame. More painful is the fact that not only the Quraish but the Ansar as well had drawn themselves away from Hadhrat Hussain. When he left Madinah, not one of them accompanied him. Among the Shias of Kufah, very few people actively supported him. The 63 A.H. revolution was not caused by Ali's progeny and Hadhrat Ali bin Hussain had no link with it at all. The people who came out against these insincere and lily-livered rulers were the overt enemies of Shias and had served the Umayyids as their most humble servants. It means the war was not waged out of religious considerations.

Baghdadi observes: The Rafidihis of Kufah are notorious for their meanness and treachery. These two flaws have become almost proverbial. It is generally stated: "Abkhal min Kufi" (that person even beats the Kufis in spite) and "Aghdar min Kufi" (that person is even more treacherous than the Kufis).

Three treacheries of the Kufis:

After the martyrdom of Hadhrat Ali, they submitted allegiance to his son Hadhrat Hassan, but when he set off to fight against Hadhrat Muawiyah, they betrayed him at Sabat Madain. Sana J'afi forced him down his horse with a spear-blow at his thigh. This episode was one of the reasons which compelled Hadhrat Hassan to patch up with Hadhrat Muawiyah.

The second treachery was that they scribbled letters to Hadhrat Hussain bin Ali and invited him to visit Kufah. Their express purpose was to seek his support against Yazid bin Muawiyah. He was deceived by their overt intentions and set out towards them. When he landed in Karbala, the Kufis betrayed him and, instead of supporting him, they supported Ubaidullah bin Ziyad. The result was that Hadhrat Hussain and his kinsmen died on the sunbaked sand of Karbala in a state of abject misery and utter helplessness. The fourth person they played the hoax on was Yazid bin Ali bin Hussain bin abi Talib. They supported him against Yousaf bin Umar, but snapped out of their allegiance to him, and in the thick of battle, handed over Yazid bin Ali to his enemy who put him to death.

These were the Shias! the Shias of Ali, Hassan and Hussain and this is the treatment they had extended to their Imams and forefathers. I have deliberately discussed it at length because Shiaism underwent a radical change after this accident. The change related to the new complexion they put on the hoodwink the people. Previously, it was a purely political group: but now it donned a religion mask. They had actually supported Hadhrat Ali and his progeny against Hadhrat Muawiyah and Banu Umayyah. Wellhausen has clearly stated in reference to the martyrdom of Hadhrat Hussain and the subsequent revenge taken by Mukhtar that Shiaism at that time dressed itself in new robes in Kufah. It had its roots in Iraq and was restricted to political alignments only. At first there was no distinction between the elite and the non-elite and they stood in the same row though the elite acted as their leaders. But when dangers surrounded them on all sides, they turned over a new leaf and softened their attitude as a result of the persuasion of Amwis in Syria. Then their services were utilized against the Shia movements and this was the time when they detached themselves from the Shia of Ali which resulted in a further circumscription of the Shia objectives. Later on, Shiaism graduated towards its transformation as a

religious group though they had a standing political dispute with the leading members of various tribes. After the martyrdom of distinguished people, it transformed itself into a specific movement. The helpers and supporters of Sulaiman bin Sard were against the movement of the distinguished personages of different tribes. Mukhtar was, of course, the first person who parasitically instilled new life into the movement. He included the Mawalis in the movement as well. Their inclusion was relatively easier on account of their inclination towards religious matters. They also virtually ignored national and communal prejudice though the Arabs still practised it. Similarly, these people (the Mawalis) disliked those who harboured any malice against the Arab chieftains.

When the association of the Shias grew deeper with these insurgents, they were stripped of their Arab and national identity. Though the basis of their association was Islam it was not early Islam but an entirely different brand.

Now Shiaism started assimilating alien views and beliefs. Besides, it split up into different groups and sects. Each person who entertained malice against Islam drew his nourishment from Shiaism. Thus Jews, Christians, Zoroastrians and Hindus, who were keen to intrude their views into the speculative framework of Islam, relied on the crutches of Shiaism. Besides, people who wanted to stabilize their particular religion and rebel against their incompetent rulers, found solace in the seductive innovations of Shiaism. All of them utilized their spurious love of the house of Ali as a label for the completion of their nefarious interests. The Jews injected the concept of return of resurrection into the body-frame of Shiaism and the Shias had declared the fire of hell unlawful for their community. And if any Shia was thrown into hell, he would stay there only for a few days. They actually parroted out the views of the Jews who believed that they would stay in the flames of hell only for a few days. Under the influence of Christian beliefs they held that Imam enjoyed with Him. Imam is the converging point of divine and non-divine attributes. Prophethood is interminable. A Prophet is the receptacle of divinity. He develops an inalienable union with the God-head and their separation becomes impossible. Shiaism also encouraged and publicized the concepts cherished by Brahmins, philosophers and pre-Islamic Zoroastrians became the *raison d'être* of Shiasim. Some of the Persians also put on the mask of Shiaism and revved up their activities against Banu Umayyah. The fact was that they loathed the Arab rule and wanted to strengthen their own rule.

Maqrizi observes that the Persians had an edge over all other nations. They over-estimated themselves at least in their own eyes. This is attested by the fact that they attached to themselves meliorative epithets while they conferred on others pejorative labels. They strongly believed in the master-slave dichotomy, reserving the first half of the polarity for themselves and distributing freely the second half among the people of the world. When the Arabs defeated them, though ironically, they regarded them the least dangerous, it had a devastating impact on Persians and they magnified their humiliation beyond all proportion. Therefore on various occasions, they floated the balloon of their conspiracy against Islam but each time the Muslims, by the grace of God, pricked it and it burst in the mid air scattering haphazardly its synthetic shards. When they had been frequently frustrated in direct and overt confrontations, they found it more effective and convenient to rely on indirect and underhand strategies. Therefore, some of them slipped into Islamic garbs and under the pretext of love of the Ahl-i-Bait and by openly stressing the innocence of Hadhrat Ali, they attached the Shias towards themselves and ultimately derailed them by taking them through different routes.

I have already stated how the Shias humiliated and disgraced those whom they apparently professed to love. Now I propose to take up the issue of their alignments and differences. The Shias splintered into three sects after the martyrdom of Hadhrat Hussain as has been mentioned by Nau Bakhti. The details of these sects are as follows:

Kaisaniyyah:

After the martyrdom of Hadhrat Hussain a group of his friends and supporters was simply dazed by the whirl of circumstances. They had witnessed two precedents one after the other. The first precedent was established by the conduct of Hadhrat Hussain. Both of them held the stature of Imams for them. Therefore they were at a loss to evaluate their conduct. On the one hand was Hadhrat Hassan who, in spite of the overwhelming number of his companions, had refused to battle with Hadhrat Muawiyah and offered him the reins of power on a platter; on the other hand was Hadhrat Hussain who, in spite of the heavy odds against him, had refused to knuckle under and preferred to resist the force of tyranny and oppression. Hadhrat Hussain clearly knew that the forces of Yazid outnumbered his men but he did not bend under their numerical pressure and embraced martyrdom along with his companions on the battle field. He obviously preferred the chess board of war to the negotiation table of humiliating peace. If Hadhrat Hassan was justified in his stand, the conduct of Hadhrat Hussain was unjustified either as he felt more crippled and handicapped compared with his brother. And if Hadhrat Hussain's action was justified it would automatically invalidate the action of Hadhrat Hassan. On account of this fundamental complication, the Imamate of the two brothers became suspect in their eyes. Some of them squirmed out of the commitment to their Imamate and started piping the tunes called out by other people. But the rest of Hadhrat Hussain's companions clung to their faith in his Imamate as they had done in the past.

After Hadhrat Hussain, these people split into three groups. One of the groups believed in the Imamate of the thesis that after Hadhrat Hassan and Hussain there was nobody who could be closer to Amir-ul-Momineen than Muhammad bin Hanafiyyah as Hadhrat Hussain was more entitled to the Imamate after the death of Hadhrat Hassan, Muhammad bin Hanafiyyah is most deserving of the Imamate. Thus he is our Imam.

The second group believes that Muhammad bin Hanafiyyah is Imam Mehdi, and Hadhrat Ali has predicted about him. No one among the Ahl-i-Bait can either oppose him or deny his Imamate nor can he draw his sword out of the sheath without his permission and then handed over the Khilafat to him in the same way. Similarly, Hadhrat Hussain's war with Yazid also carried his sanction. If Hadhrat Hassan and Hussain had acted without a green signal from him, they would have been derailed and destroyed because any one who opposed Muhammad bin Hanafiyyah was an ingidel and a disbeliever. It was Muhammad who had appointed Mukhtar bin abi Ubaid as the governor of Iraq and Syria and ordered him to avenge the blood of Hussain by killing his murderers, and to dig them out from their hiding places. He also named him "Kaisan" on account of his intelligence and his followers are called Mukhtariyyah or Kaisaniyyah.

I have earlier stated that Kaisaniyyah came into the limelight after the martyrdom of Hadhrat Ali and later on acquired the label of Mukhtariyyah. A number of Shia offshoots and sub-groups sprang out of Kaisaniyyah: for example, Karabiyyah,

Harbiyyah, Razarmiyyah, Bayaniyyah, Rawindiyyah, Abul-Mulammiyyah, Hasmiyyah, Haritiyyah and many other sects.

The common denominator among these sects is the Imamate of Muhammad bin Hanifiyyah and the network of beliefs churned out by Abdullah bin Saba. All these sects believe in back-biting, resurrection and transmigration. One of their poyes says:

(The Imams of Quraish are the supporters of right: they are four and all of them are of equal stature)

(One of them is Hadhrat Ali, and the three are his sons who are grandsons of the Messenger of Allah and all the people know them)

(One of the grandsons is a paragon of virtue and piety and the other disappeared at Karbala)

(and the third grandson will not die until he leads the armies with a flag fluttering in front)

(They have vanished into the lap of luxury (Ridhwa) and will remain invisible for a certain period. They have honey and water at their disposal)

Baghdadi in his book "Al-Firq Bain-ul-Firq" has answered these verses. A Kaisani poet says:

(O people! Go to the man who lives in the valley of Ridhwa, visit his house and pay homage to him)

(Can any damage be done to this group from our sides who made him the ruler and conferred on him the title of Khalifah and imam)?

(They waged war with all the residents of the earth on his account though he lives at a distance of seventy years of travel)

(He lives in seclusion in the heart of the valley of Ridhwa and the angels chat him up)

(Ibn Khawla has not tasted death nor has the earth hidden his bones)

(On account of his virtues, he is furnished with the best residence and company, and his companions treat him with tremendous regard). Baghdadi has retaliated in the language.

(You have wasted a whole life span waiting for a person whose bones are hidden in the earth)

(There is not a single Imam in the valley of Ridhwa whom the angels chat up)

(He has neither honey nor water at his disposal, nor any other syrup that could substitute for food)

(The son of Khawla tasted death as his father had tasted it)

(If social superiority and religious piety were the guarantee of an eternal life, then the Prophet (peace be upon him) would be blessed with immortality.)

It is noteworthy that Imamah had been transferred to Banu Abbas from Kaisaniyyah. Some of its sects believed that the Imamah had passed on to Muhammad bin Ali bin Abbas from Abu Hashim bin Muhammad bin Hanifiyyah, from him to his son Ibrahim, from Ibrahim to Abul Abbas and from Abdul Abbas to Abu J'afar Mansur who was the founder of the Abbasiyyah dynasty.

Of all the Shia sects, the sect of Mukhtar bin abi Ubaid Thaqafi enjoyed the best reputation and attracted the largest number of followers. It gained the widest circulation because it came out with the unequivocal call to avenge the blood of Hadhrat Hussain. Kashi has reported in his book "Rijal" through Muhammad bin Masud, Ibn abi Ali Khiza', Khalid bin Yazid Umri and Hassan bin Zaid, It is attributed to Umar bin Ali that Mukhtar dispatched twenty thousands dinar to Ali bin Hussain which he accepted and repaired his own house and the house of 'Aqil bin abi Talib that were in a dilapidated condition. Later, he sent him forty thousands dinar which he declined to accept because he had by that time articulated his beliefs.

Mukhtar was the person who persuaded people to acknowledge the Imamah of Muhammad bin Hanifiyyah. Those who responded to his invitation were called Mukhtariyyah or Kaisaniyyah, by virtue of which the surname of "kaisan" was appended to his name. Some people suggest that the surname Kaisan was conferred on him on him by Maula bin abi Talib. He prompted him to avenge the murder of Hussain and he also identified the murderers to facilitate his vengeance. He was his confidant but also had an edge over him. Whenever he came to know that an enemy of Hussain was hiding in some house, he would rush to the place, raze it to the ground and kill all the living things in it. The dilapidated houses of Kufah were reduced to a shambles by him. As a matter of fact, he acquired the status of proverbial figure among the Kufis. Whenever they found someone in a state of misery and penury, they at once imputed it to the evil act of Abu Umrah. A poet wrote:

(He is the devil. You can't expect anything good from him. He will provoke you to rebellion but he will not dole out even a crumb of food.)

Wellhausen has given maximum space to him in his book. I would like to reproduce below his words to piece together a picture of Mukhtar which the German orientalist has drawn so pains-takingly.

"It is generally stated about Mukhtar that he is a magician (Tabri Vol. 2, P. 730), that he is anti-Christ (Tabri, P. 686). He is generally dubbed as a liar. All these epithets were showered on him not because he was a self-styled spokesman of Muhammad bin Hanifiyyah, but because he claimed himself to be a prophet thought he had done it only surreptitiously. But some of his acts clearly betrayed his intentions and reflected his prophetic pretensions. When he spoke, he gave the impression as if he was sitting in the presence of the Lord and knew the hidden secrets of the universe. His linguistic versatility and eloquence also helped in the projection of his image as an extraordinary person. His main object was to impress the people and he achieved a reasonable measure of success objective, but the majority of people who were impressed by his objective, but the majority of people who were impressed by his rhetoric and tactics generally belonged to the illiterate masses or were known for their

stupidity. However, as his reputation increased, the strategies of the Muslims grew more subtle and comprehensive to beat him at his own game. And when he was finally defeated, the whole world turned against him, and after his murder his memories fell prey to the arrows of convention and ritual. In the initial phase he was condemned alright but no attempt was made to disfigure him. But in the later phase a regular campaign of character-assassination was launched against him which created a distorted impression of his personality on the minds of the future generations: The attempt at disfigurement was motivated mainly by spite and jealousy. Dozy in his book "Maqallh fi Tarikh-ul-Islam" has also relied on these traditions. It was he who had ordered the flight of white pigeons. He had also invented the concept of "Bada" about God to justify his whimsical sides from one religion to the other and stripped his followers of any right to criticise his religious jumps and shuffles. Tabri's account has played a considerable role in his projections along these lines.

If we want an answer to the question whether he was a genuine prophet or an imposter, we'll have to first established the fact whether he was sincere or in-sincere in his efforts. It seems he used prophethood as an instrument or his socio-political elevation and the same argument is applicable to the modus vivendi adopted by Muhammad. It should also be kept in mind that islam is a political religion and each Muslims prophet is justified in elevating his political status. But even more pernicious and dangerous is the fact that he camouflaged himself behind an imaginary personality and nothing was know about him or perhaps no attempt was made to probe into his reality. Therefore it is certain that there was come flaw in his sincerity, on this count at least. It is another story that the circumstances did not permit him to rely on a specific appellation but packaged himself in abstract terms as the nucleus of truth. Mukhrat had derived his beliefs from Sabaism, an innovatory sect (designed mainly to scoop away the concrete form the foundation of Islam). Sabaism held tremendous appeal especially for the elite of various tribes, and under its influence, the Shias had adopted an obscene and aggressive posture against the Sunnis which brought into the limelight Shia-Sunni differences. Sabaism is also known as Kaisaniyyah. Kaisan was simultaneously the chief of Mawalis and Sabais which obviously leads one to the conclusion that Mawalis and the Shias were one and the same (P. 623, 1.14; P. 651, 1.2).

Banking on this conclusion, some people are inclined to believe that Shiasm has its religious roots in Iran because majority of Kufh Mawalis hailed from Iran. Dozy writes in his book (ff. 20) that the Shias are in fact a Persian sect. This clearly explains the difference between Arabic and Persian genus. The Arabs love freedom and independence; the Persians love slavishness and humility. The election of a Caliph after the Prophet was something unexpected for them which they found extremely gritty to swallow or digest. They believed only in the law of inheritance as it was compatible with their servile outlook. It was, therefore, part of their conviction that as long as Muhammad lived, none on his sons could replace him. Hadhrat Ali also favoured his appointment as Caliph. Therefore it was essential that Khilafat should circulate only among Ali's also favoured his appointment as Caliph. Therefore it was essential that Khilafat should circulate only among Ali's progeny as part of an inviolate heritage. That is why they declared all the Caliphs, with the solitary exception of Hadhrat Ali, as usurpers and openly expressed that their obedience was not binding on them. Their belief was strengthened by the fact that they disliked the overlordship of the Arabs and their eyes were rivetted on the wealth and opulence of their chiefs. They were also used to the rule of those who had sprung out of the backs of their secular lords. Thus they transferred their notion of honour and prestige

to Ali and his progeny. Therefore it was their greatest obligation to prescribe absolute submission to any Imam who happened to be an Alvi sprig. A mere discharge of this obligation could render a man immune to all sin and evil, without any qualm of compunction. The Imam, in fact, was all that they cared for. He was God in the garb of man. This blind attachment and indifference to one's duties and obligations was the foundation of their religion.

Muller has also expressed similar views in the relevant book (Vol. 1, P. 327) with the addition that the Persians were deeply and extensively influenced by Hindu views on account of their centuries old association with one another. As a result of this influence, they believed that the king was the light of the divine soul which is transferred from kings to their successors who are in the direct line of lineage.

It is beyond doubt that Shia views and beliefs have close affinity with the views and beliefs of Iranis but to suggest that the former have branched out of the latter is an exercise in building sandcastles and lacks the ballast of reality.

The other beliefs held by these people are recorded at length in other books bearing on the issue. Here the beliefs are discussed keeping in view the constraints of space and the restraints of relevance. Since these issues have a built-in propensity to slide out of hand, every effort relatively larger space to this Shia group and its ring leader because it is a legacy of Sabaiism. The Shias who appeared on the scene later derived their views and beliefs from this nucleus sect. Consequently, true Shiaism started melting away and the early Shias were on the wane. They soon went out of circulation because they could not cosmeticize their wares. The progeny of Ali and Banu Hashim topped the list of the genuine Shias who were receding fast into the limbo of oblivious. The Sabai views were no invested with sufficient strength to elbow them out, and had overtly aggressive designs towards all the genuine Shias. But the martyrdom of Hadhrat Hussain dampened their devilish enthusiasm by creating a soft corner in the hearts of people for Hadhrat Ali and his children. Those who demanded revenge for the blood of Hussain felt a sense of deep frustration. Their blood simply boiled when they reflected on the murder of Hussain. They wanted to dismantle the entire administrative structure that carried the stigma of Hussain's blood. Some of them denigrated everything that was even remotely connected with the Government; they openly condemned and fluted their beliefs and edicts. When these people realized that the rulers respected Hadhrat Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthman, companion of the Prophet (peace be upon him) and the wives of the Prophet, they disaffiliated themselves from them and started lambasting the pious personalities. They did not condemn them out of principle or because they had any difference of opinion with them. It was out of sheer stubbornness and a sense of deep-rooted indignation that they declaimed any statement or slogan that rose from the pulpit because, in their purblindness, they equated the voice of the priest with the voice of the administrators. It is indeed a reflection of their radicalism that had seeped into their hearts and minds as a consequence of the martyrdom of Hadhrat Hussain. Therefore Allama Zahadi and Ibn Taimiy have stated that all the early Muslims shared on unqualified convergence of opinion on the superiority of Hadhrat Abu Bakr and Hadhrat Umar. Even the Shias of Ale held the same conviction. Ibn Batah attributes it to his Shaikh who is more popularly known as Abul Abbas bin Masruq (the tradition is filtered through Muhammad bin Hamid, Jaria, Suffiyan and Abdualh bin Ziyad bin Haider that Abu Ishaq Sabi'i came to Kufah. Shimr bin Atiyyah persuaded us to call on him. When we went over to see him, he said to us: when I left Kufa, there was not a single person who doubted the superiority of Hadhrat Abu Bakr and Hadhrat Umar. Now when I arrived here, I have found people talking

against them. By God! I fail to guess what are they talking about!

Zamura quotes Said bin Hassan who is reported to have heard from Layth bin Salim: I have lived in the period of early Shias and I know from my experience that they did not prefer anyone to Hadhrat Abu Bakr and Hadhrat Umar in status.

Imam Ahmad bin Hanbal (through Suffiyan bin 'Uyyinah and Khalid bin Salmah) attributes it to Masruq who reportedly laid special stress on the love and status of Hadhrat Abu Bakr and Hadhrat Umar and raised it to the level of a tradition. It should be noted that Hadhrat Masruq is considered one of the distinguished Kufi successors of the companions of the Prophet (peace be upon him). Hadhrat Taus has also endorsed him. Hadhrat Masud, too, expresses similar views. It was obviously binding on the early Shias to show respect to these pious personages because Ali's words have come down to us with unbroken continuity that Hadhrat Abu Bakr and Umar are the most superior persons in the Muslim Ummah after the Prophet (peace be upon him). This tradition is frequently and repeatedly attributed to him, and as a stamp of its certification, it exists in eighty authentic versions.

Imam Bokhari has supported it in his "Sahih" with special reference to his Hadith "Ba-Tariq Hamadaniyyin" (the people who were Hadhrat Ali's closest associates). Rather, he himself often expresses:

(If I am serving as a porter at any one of the gates of Paradise, I would tell the Hamadains to enter Paradise sagely and fearlessly). Imam Bokhari attributes a tradition to Suffiyan Thauri who is a Hamadiani and he has ascribed it to Muhammad bin Haniyyah. He said: I asked my father who was the best person after the Prophet (peace be upon him)?

Hadhrat Ali: don't you know my son!

Muhammad: No, I don't.

Hadhrat Ali: Abu Bakr is the best man.

Muhammad: And who after him?

Hadhrat Ali: after him, Hadhrat Umar.

Since it was a person to-person dialogue between Hadhrat Ali and his son, it would not be fair to assume that Hadhrat Ali was dissimulating at that time and trying to hide his true feelings in the interest of expediency. And then the reporter also happens to be his own son who proclaimed it from the pulpit to obviate the possibility of any skeptical reaction to the truth of its contents. Hadhrat Ali himself openly stated that if any person was brought before him who declared him superior to Hadhrat Abu Bakr and Hadhrat Umar he would flog him the way he flogged a back-biter and a transgressor.

Muhibbuddin Khatib has noted in the margin of "Al-Muntaqa" that it provides a chronological line of demarcation to isolate early Shiaism from later Shiaism. Abu Ishaq Sab'i was a distinguished scholar of Kufah. He was born during the Caliphate of Hadhrat Uthman and three years before his martyrdom. He died in 127 A.H. He was only a child during Hadhrat Ali's tenure as Caliph. He himself says that his father lifted him and he saw Hadhrat Ali delivering the sermon. At that time both his head

and beard were grey. If we ever find out the exact date he left Kufah, we could come closer to what actually happened in that period in which the Shias of Kufah were Alvis and, like their Imam, believed unconditionally in the superiority of Hadhrat Abu Bakr and Hadhrat Umar. We would also come to know when did the Shias actually oppose Hadhrat Ali on this issue: It is very strange that both the Khwarjis and the Abbasis clung to the old belief and honoured their commitment with Hadhrat Ali but the Shais in the very first century disobeyed their own Imam by raising their promises in the last days of Abu Ishaq Sabi'i.

The change brought a radical shift in Shia beliefs. At first they had challenged only the peripheral issues. But now they questioned the very basis of their beliefs on account of their hatred of the rulers and the administrators. In their fury they identified the beliefs with those of the administrators. They forgot that the convictions were divinely oriented while the rulers had their human flaws and shortcomings and their weaknesses did not nullify the validity of the convictions. But men do get disoriented and slide off the rails in a state of anger. And the Shias were no exception the worst aspect of their detracking was that they raised a mere prejudice into a philosophy which could neither be substantiated by convention nor bolstered by logic. They became so splenetic that they started denigrating the Quran, which is the main bulwark of the faithful against the rampancy of evil, and the Sunnah of the Prophet (peace be upon him) which is an explanation and clarification of the Quranic injunctions.

After the martyrdom of Hadhrat Hussain, the Shias fell a frequent prey to all sorts of obscenities and vulgarities which often assault a faithless community or a group of people who consciously and wilfully opt for the evil way. The early Shias felt chessed off by their evil practices and tried to raise barricades against the proliferation of their devilish views but their efforts proved futile. However, when they realized that the Shias had reached a point of no return and were absolutely disinclined to give up their sinful way of life, they bade farewell to Shiaism. Their decision to give a parting kick to Shiaism was not an emotional decision. It was a gall-out of their conviction that the Shias could not wriggle out of the quagmire of corruption into which they had sunk on account of greed and lechery. When Mukhtar had settled himself comfortably at the steering – wheel of the Honda Accord of Shiaism, Ibrahim refused to join him as an accomplice in dismantling the fundamentals of Islam. This refusal has been attested to by Wellhausen, the distinguished German orientalist. Ibrahim bin Ashtar was the head of the Nakha off-shoot of the Mizhif tribe. He was a shred and highly opinionative person. Like his father, he was a sincere admirer of Hadhrat Ali. He had good relations with Muhammad bin Hanifiyyah, though he did not like the brand of Shiaism that was in vogue in those days. He neither associated himself with Sulaiman Sard nor did he display any interests in Mukhtar's improvisations. The other people also failed to rope him in. At last he received a letter from Muhammad bin Hanifiyyah in which he had been asked unequivocally to acknowledge the personality of Mukhtar bin Ubaid. But what really terrified him was the fact that Ibn Hanifiyyah had used the by-name "Mehdi" in his letter, though, as far as he knew, he had never attached any extra epithet or label to his original name. This unexpected change led him believe that the letter had been forged. But the messengers who had brought the letter confirmed its genuineness. Later Mukhtar himself attested to its authenticity. However, two persons attracted his attention, presumably for their own safety. They were 'Amir bin Sharahil Shobi—reporter, Jurist and Muhaddith and his father Sharahil. He drew Amir aside and asked him about the reliability of the witnesses who had attested to the authenticity of the letter. Amir told him that they were among the distinguished people of Egypt and Arabia, and therefore they were

generally considered trustworthy and dependable. In view of the reputation they enjoyed, they could not have possibly doctored the evidence. (Tabri 612/2). Ibn Ashtar asked them to write down their names. He consequently wrote a brief review bearing on these events. When he was convinced about the unadulterated contents of the letter, he extended it the honour it deserved and reserved himself for the service of Mukhtar bin abi Ubaid.

But when Mukhtar took a somersault and dabbled unashamedly in the propagation of his latent Sabai views, which lambasted the companions of the Prophet (peace be upon him) and preached open enmity against the Prophetic views and way of life, people twirled their whiskers against him. They condemned him for his heretic and blasphemous ideas. They accused him of usurpation of power. They said that he had installed himself into the highest executive seat without the consent and command of Ibn Hanigiyyah and he and his Sabatism had introduced an innovation into the body-politic of Islam which was mainly designed to debunk and disown their illustrious and pious forefathers.

These elderly people took control of the important centres of Kufah. They dumped Mukhtar into the palace and disconnected him with the world outside. He tried to bamboozle them with a cleverly devised plan. He suggested that two independent delegations should be dispatched to Ibn Hanigiyyah for investigating the state affairs. One would represent him and the other delegation would represent them. The delegates would find out whether Ibn Hanigiyyah had extended his support to him or not. But his plan did not materialize and he failed to pull a rabbit out of his magic bag.

Wellhausen adds: "Mukhtar was at the zenith of power, but the pits of destruction also lay before him. The old Arab Shias did not trust him. That is why they had disposed him and quarantined him from power".

The details are sufficient to establish a profile of the changes that appeared in the conduct of the early Shias and their later manifestation. After the change, Shiaism was trimmed down to a set of obscene and vulgar exercises as it was drained of its galvanizing spirit. They believed that the white pigeons were angels. They also held strange beliefs about prophethood and the unknown. A new wave of dissension hit the Shias after the murder of Mukhtar. One of the sects came out with the proposal that Ali bin Hussain was their Imam. He had two patronyms: one was Abu Muhammad and the other was Abu Badr, which was relatively more popular. This sect clung to their faith in his Imamate till his death in 94 A.H. in the month of Muharram. He was fifty years old when he died. He was born in 39 A.H. His mother was known as Salafah but was called Jahan Shah before she acquired the status of a slave-maid. She was the daughter of Yazdjard bin Shahr yar bin Kisra Abr Wiz bin Hurmuz. Yazdjard was the last king of Iran.

Another sect believed that after Hadhrat Hussain the chain of Imamate broke down. There were only three Imams whom they mentioned by their names. They were appointed by the Prophet (peace be upon him) and acted as his executors. They followed him one after the other and their obedience was binding on every one. But they did not specify any one as their successor. Still another sect believed that after Hadhrat Hassan and Hussain. They shared the Imamate among themselves as it was specified for them only. Any one of them who invites the people to follow him their Imam and it is binding on them to obey him. He acts on behalf of Hadhrat Ali. Therefore it is a divine obligation of the people to acknowledge him as their leader.

Any one who opposes him is an infidel. And any one who claims himself to be an Imam and then disappears within the walls of his house is also an infidel, and any one who obeys him and acknowledges his Imamt is an infidel too.

Some other Shia sects:

Besides, there are number of other Shia sects. Some of them are of the opinion that the portfolio of Imamt is held by the children of Hadhrat Hassan. Other sects entertain other views. Some of them believe that the chain of prophethood continues after the death of the Prophet (peace be upon him) and they do not hesitate either to ascribe partners to God, as Ibn Hazm has stated in his book "Fasl".

The Shias who believe in the continuation of prophethood after the Prophet (peace be upon him) are further subdivided into many sects. One of these sects is known as Gharabiyyah. It is their conviction that the Prophet (peace be upon him) had the same resemblance with Hadhrat Ali as a crow (gharab) has with another crow. God had actually sent down Baviel with the revelation to Hadhrat Ali but by mistake he brought it to the Prophet (peace be upon him). One of these groups believes that Hadhrat Ali is a prophet. An other group believes that Hadhrat Ali, Hassan, Hussain, Ali bin Hussain, Muhammad bin Ali, Jafar bin Muhammad, Musa bin Jafar, Ail bin Musa, Muhammad bin Ali, Hassan bin Muhammad and Imam Muntazir bin Hassan were all prophets.

Qaramatah:

One of the Shia sects is convinced only of the prophethood of Muhammad bin Ismail bin Jafar: it is called Qaramtah. Another sect believes in the prophethood of Hadhrat Ali and his three sons Hassan, Hussain and Muhammad bin Hanfiyyah. This sect is an off-shoot of Kaisaniyyah. Mukhtar was also on the verge of staking out his claim to prophethood. He decked out his kiosk with many inconceivable wares and scared the people to their roots by palming off bogus revelations. Quite a few of the damned Shia groups, who believed in the Imamt of Muhammad bin Hanfiyyah, were his ardent followers.

One of the sects expressed its belief in the prophethood of Mughirah bin Said. Another sect believe in the prophethood of Mansur Ajli and they often repeated the Quranic verse:

(If they see a piece falling from the sky). It was also known as 'Kasf'.

There are other Shia sects who believe that divinity is a limited company or a corporate organization with many partners of equal status. On the top of the list are the followers of Abdullah bin Saba Humairi (may God curse him) who had the audacity and the impudence to express in front of Hadhrat Ali: "you are Him". He asked: Who? The rogues replied: We mean to say that you are Allah. He was terribly indignant when he heard their outrageous words and he hurled them alive into the raging fire. When they were being thrown into the fire, they were saying: we are convinced now that you are Allah because it is only Allah Who punishes by fire. Hadhrat Ali recited a verse bearing on the episode:

(When I realized that it was an absolutely wicked thing, I had the fire lighted and called for Qambar. Qambar was the name of his slave. He gripped them one by one and dumped them into the fire. Hadhrat Ali's companions behaved towards him in

the same way as the companions of Jesus had behaved towards him. This sect had a wide circulation. A large number of Shias are attached to it, and it has survived down to the present days of sophisticated technology and intellectual enlightenment, and it openly flaunts its beliefs. Ishaq bin Muhammad Nakhfi Ahmar Kufi belonged to this sect. He was one of its prominent members. He has also written a book called "Al-Sirat" on the beliefs of the sect. Bhinki and Fiyyaz have refuted his claims in their books. These rascals used to say that Hadhrat Muhammad (peace be upon him) is the messenger of Hadhrat Ali. One of the Shia sects is called Muhammdiyah who believe that Muhammad (peace be upon him) is Allah. an other sect believes that Hadhrat Adam was God, and all the prophets down to Hadhrat Muhammad (peace be upon him), who followed him, were all Gods. Similarity Hadhrat Ali was also a God. Hadhrat Hassan, Hadhrat Hussain, Muhammad bin Ali, Jafar bin Muhammad were Gods too. Then they kept off these blasphemies and apostasies for a while but the Shia sect Khtabiyyah, during the period of Isa bin Musa bin Muhammad bin Ali bin Abdullah bin Abbas believed that Jafar is God. Thus numerous parties of these Shias came out of their houses in the early part of the day, wearing Ihram and gathered in Azrawaridiyyah and proclaimed in loud accents

(welcome Jafar! Welcome Jafar).

Ibn Ayyash etc say that they were watching the spectacle when Isa bin Musa went up to him and picked up a fight with him. He also retaliated violently and made a massive massacre of them. Then another sect declared that Muhammad bin Ismail bin Jafar bin Muhammad was God. Qaramtah held on to this belief. Some of the adherents of this views also believed in the divinity of Abu Said Hassan bin Behram Jabai and after him in the divinity of his sons. Some of them believed that Abul Qasim Najar was God. He was popularly known as Mansur and he resided in Yemen and Balad Hamadan. A number of other people ascribed divinity to the highest executive office of the State. One of the sects professed the divinity of Abu Khatab Muhammad bin abi Zainab Mau'al bani Asad. This group had a numerical edge over many other sects and its adherents ran into thousands. They believed in his divinity as well as the divinity of Jafar bin Muhammad but the former was superior God. They also claimed that all the sons of Hadhrat Hassan are the sons and darlings of God and are still alive in the skies. Another sect transformed Momar, the wheat-seller into a God-head. Momar was one of the companions of Abul Khatab.

One of the sects believed in the divinity of Hassan bin Mansur Hallaj, the cotton-ginner. He was hanged during the period of Muqtadir through the efforts of Wazir bin Hamid bin Abbas. Another sect attributes divine essence to Muhammad bin Ali bin Shalmaghani Katib. He was murdered in Baghdad during the tenure of Razi. They believed in women-swapping. Another sect conferred divinity on Shabash who was buried alive in Basrah. Still another sect vests Abu Muslim Siraj with divine attributes. A third sect attributes divine qualities to squint-eyed, short-statured Miqna. He tried to avenge the murder of Abu Muslim. His name was Hashim and he was executed during the tenure of Mansur. A public proclamation was made about his murder and Mansur himself murdered him and his companions.

The Ranudiyyah sect affirmed the divinity of Abu Jafa Mansur. An other sect worshipped Abdullah bin Kharb Kundi Kufi as God. The followers of this sect believed in the transmigration of souls. Nineteen prayers were obligatory for them. Each prayer was divided into fifteen units (Rakat). When one of the 'Sifriyyah Mutakalimin' held a discussion with him and explained to him the fundamentals of Islamic faith, he re-embraced Islam and bade farewell to his former beliefs and convictions. He

conveyed the fact of his conversion to his companions as well and expressed his unqualified penitence in their presence. All of his companions turned against him. They not only dissociated themselves from him but also launched a vicious campaign against him. Then they elected Abdullah bin Mu'awiyah bin Abdullah bin Jafar bin abi Talib as their Imam. Abdullah bin Kharb remained a loyal adherent to Islam and to the Safri faith as long as he lived. His party has survived the vagaries of change and is known by the label of Hizbiyyah. Nasriyyah is one of the Sabai sects which believes in the divinity of Hadhrat Ali. The adherents of this sect are settled in Syria and Jordan and are especially concentrated in the city of Tabriyyah. They believe that people who curse and malign Fatima, daughter of the Messenger of Allah and Hassan and Hussain are devils in human guise. They believe that Abdu Rahman bin Maljim Kuradi, the murderer of Hadhrat Ali—though Hadhrat Ali himself had cursed him—will be the most superior person in the next world because he had severed the divine soul from the constricting clutches of the flesh. This belief is sheer lunacy and unpardonable perversity. All people who try to flout divine injunctions and indulge in such irrational frenzies should fear the wrath of God because the punishment he inflicts on disobedient and arrogant humans can neither be contained nor cured even by their most ingenious remedies. Even the cleverest man is helpless against a divine calamity.

All of these sects which specialize in holding and relishing anti-Islamic beliefs and convictions which it categorically denies and negates. As a matter of fact, their beliefs are a set of negations. They are framed in express violation of the positive injunctions of Islam. Some of the Sufis hold the beliefs that the injunctions of Sharia no longer apply to a person who develops an intimate association with God. Others add that he is coupled with God and is inalienably linked with him. I have heard that there is a person in Naishapur known by the patronym of Au Said and Abul Khair. Some-time he wears woollen clothes and sometimes he dresses himself in silk togs which men are forbidden to wear. Sometimes he offers one thousand rakat in one day and sometimes he even refuses to offer the obligatory prayer. His conduct is a clear-cut violation of Islamic prescriptions and regulations. Islam is not a capricious religion nor does it permit any whimsical indulgence. None of its adherents can play a blind man's buff with its fundamentals and interpret its basic principles to suit the fluctuations of his erratic temper. A true Muslim does not play ducks and drakes with his faith. He is simply over-awed by its splendour and sublimity and he can not even imagine trivializing it or interpreting it in the hazy glow of his swinging moods. For him it is a source of immediate consolation as well as eventual salvation. Therefore anyone who values his moods more than the rules of the faith is not its true adherent. As a matter of fact, by catering to his misguided moods, he works against its essential spirit which calls for unqualified obedience and unmodified loyalty.

Ashari, Baghdadi, Malti, and Asfraini etc have also mentioned a number of Shia sects in their books. Most of these sects germinated during the period of Hadhrat Ali bin Hussain who is generally known by the name of Zain-ul-Abidin.

Shias after Ali bin Hussain:

Ali bin Hussain remained loyal to Banu Umayyah rulers and lost the sympathies of all those in Makka and Madinah who had any plans to oppose these rulers.

Zaidiyyah:

Hadhrat Ali bin Hussain left a large progeny behind him. One of them was

Muhammad known by the patronym of Abu Jafar Baqir. One of his sons was called Zaid and another carried the name Umar. There was a difference of opinion among the Shias about Muhammad bin Ali and Zaid bin Ali. Some of them expressed allegiance to Muhammad while others declared adherence to Zaid. One of the Shia historians observes: Zaidiyyah believe in the Imam of Hadhrat Ali, his son Hassan and his brother Hussain. After him they believe in the Imam of his son, Zain-ul-Abidin and his son Zaid bin Ali and their sect is known by his name. He invited the people in Kufah to express allegiance to him as their Imam. He was murdered and guillotined to Kinasah. After Zaid's martyrdom, his followers elected his son Yahya as their Imam who was murdered at Jozfan on his way to Khorasan. He had expressed the desire that after his death Muhammad bin Abdullah bin Hassan bin Hassan Sabt should be appointed their Caliph but he was put to death in Hijaz. He had willed the appointment of his brother Ibrahim as Caliph after him. He declared his Imam in Basra with the support of Isa bin Zaid but the armed forces of Mansur challenged them and ultimately executed both of them to death. The Zaidiyyah also believed that Yahya's brother Isa was entitled to Imam after him and therefore they transferred the Imam to his children. Some others believed that Idris was entitled to Imam after the death of his brother Muhammad bin Abdullah. But he escaped towards the west where he eventually died. After him his son Idris took up the gauntlet and laid the foundation of the city of Fas. Some of his sons became the rulers of the west. One of his sons had the distinction of ascending the royal throne of Tabristan as king. His brother Muhammad also shared the regal distinction. Then Nasir Al-Hurush in Dilam succeeded them and a large number of people expressed their allegiance to him. Nau Bakhti writes:

"Zaidiyyah was split into two groups; a strong group and a weak group. The followers of the weak group were known as Ajiliyyah. Those were the companions of Harun Said Ajli. One of these Sects is called Behriyyah. This sect was headed by Kathir Nava', Hassan bin Salih bin Hi, Salim bin abi Hifsah, Hukm bin Utaibah, Salmah bin Kusail and Abdul Miqdam Thabit Hadad. They invited the people to acknowledge the over lordship of Hadhrat Ali and then muddled it with that of Abu Bakr and Umar. The people generally considered it superior to all other sects because its adherents believe in the superiority to all other sects because its adherents believe in the superiority of Hadhrat Ali and they also profess the leadership of Hadhrat Abu Bakr. They negate Hadhrat Uthman, Talhe and Zubair. They think that they should support each one of Ali's children and they regard it as an inalienable part of their conviction. They cling to the belief that Imamt circulates only among the children of Hadhrat Ali even if any one of them surrenders or forgoes his right to rule, it goes not mean the termination of his rule. All children of Ali have equal status in their eyes irrespective of the womb that has engendered them.

The stronger sect of Zaidiyyah is steered by Abul Jarud, Abu Khalid Wasti, Fudhail Rasan and Mansur bin abi Al-Aswad. The Zaidiyyah sent which is known by the designation Hussainiyyah believes that any member of the progeny of Muhammad (peace be upon him) who invites people to obey God, deserves to be obeyed by the people. But Hadhrat Ali was the Imam par excellence. Hadhrat Hussain was the Imam when he defied the powers of oppression and when he had dissociated himself from Muawiyah till the incidence of his martyrdom. Zaid bin Hassan, who had been murdered in Kufah, was also the Imam. His mother was Um Wald. Muhammad bin Abdullah bin Hassan was also the Imam. His mother was Hind bint abi Ubaidah bin Abdullah bin Zima bin Aswad bin Mutlib bin Asad bin Uzabin Qasi. In fact, any one of the progeny of Muhammad (peace be upon him) who invites people to obey God is an Imam.

at Kinasah, a place in Kufah and Hisham bin Abdul Malik was the one who had put him to death, while the Amir of Jazijan had ordered the execution of Yahya bin Zaid in his own town, located in Kharasan. Imam Muhammad was murdered by Isa bin Maham in Madinah and Imam Ibrahim was murdered in Basrah. Both of them had been executed on the orders of Mansur. The Zaidiyyah sect kept on drifting in a whirlpool of instability as it had lost stabilizing edge through the murder of its distinguished leaders. Then Nasir Atrush appeared in Khorasan. He was hounded all over the country by the murderers but he went underground. Then he left for Dilam and Jabal where he invite people to embrace the faith preached and practised by Zaid bin Ali. People rallied round him and the Zaidiyyah brand of Islamic religion flourished almost unhampered in this area. Their Imams appeared successively and provided religious guidance to the people. They opposed their cousins in the formulation and interpretation of day-to-day matters relating to the Islamic faith. Later on , a large number of its followers backed out of their commitment to the Imamate of the less superior people and, like the Imamiyyah, they slipped into a lambasting criticism of the companions of the Prophet (peace be upon him). On the basis of their attitude towards the Prophet and his companions, they are divided into three types.

The sects of Salihyyah and Behriyyah shared the same set of religious convictions.

Jarudiyyah Sect:

This sect comprised the friends and companions of Abul Jarud. The adherents of this sect believe that the specification issued by the Prophet (peace be upon him) about Hadhrat Ali was a qualified specification. It did not spell out the name clearly and left the designation deliberately ambiguous. Therefore, Hadhrat Ali was entitled to Imamate after him but the people displayed deplorable imperciency in grasping the significance of this obvious lack of specification and failed to estimate the proper worth of Hadhrat Ali. Exercising their rights, they elevated Hadhrat Abu Bakr to the office of the Khalifah. Thus they turned infidels by virtue of their blindness and recalcitrance. Abul Jarud's belief is a clear violation of the beliefs held by his Imam Zaid bin Ali who did not believe in the specification.

There is a difference of opinion among the adherents of the Jarudiyyah sect about the continuity or discontinuity of Imamate. Some of them believe in the continuity of Imamate from Hadhrat Ali down to Hadhrat Hassan, Hadhrat Hussain, Ali bin Hussain Zain-ul-Abidin, and to Zaid bin Ali. They hold the view that the Imamate further continued down to Imam Muhammad bin Abdullah bin Hassan bin Hussain. Those who believe in the Imamate of Muhammad bin Abdullah are also divided in their opinion. Some of them propose that he was not executed and is still alive. He will rebel against the existent system of exploitative values and fill the earth with justice and equity. There are others who openly subscribe to the fact of his death and they extend the Imamate down to Muhammad bin Qasim bin Ali bin Hussain bin Ali. He was imprisoned during the tenure of Mutasim who incarcerated him within the precincts of his house where he eventually died.

Some of them are inclined towards the Imamate of Yahya bin Umar of Kufah. He protested against the status quo and invited the people in his campaign of purgation and restoration of the true Islamic order of values. A large number of people swarmed round him in response to his call for the purification of the stinking elements that had infected the entire social structure. But Yahya was beheaded during the period of Mustain and his chopped head was offered to Muhammad bin

Abdullah bin Zahir on a platter. An Alvi poet has versified about it.

(I have murdered the most distinguished person among those who are accustomed to riding. Now I have come to you and I insist on a mild conversation).

(It is extremely annoying from me that I am meeting you under circumstances when there is no sword-blade stuck between us)

It may be recalled that murdered man was Yahya bin Umar bin Yahya bin Hussain Zaid bin Ali. Abul Jarud was called Sarhub and Abu Jafar Muhammad bin Ali Baqar had given him this name. Sarhub is the blind devil who lives in the sea. Qadhi Noman had referred to the Zaidiyyah sect in some of his verses

(The Zaidiyyah sect has expressed a statement which is not liked by the people)

(They have announced that any one of the children of Hussain bin Ali and Hassan bin Ali who invites people to march forward with the sword in his hand is the Imam and one who does not do so is not an Imam)

(And any one of them who goes into hiding is also not an Imam)

(According to their self-arranged priorities they obeyed Zaid and placed their services unconditionally at his disposal)

(But when Zaid was executed and Hussain claimed Imamt, these people sided with him)

(When Yahya bin Zaid Tahir appeared on the scene, they obeyed him, and after him they elected Muhammad as their ruler)

(Muhammad is in fact Muhammad bin Abdullah who was one of the children of Hadhrat Hassan but all of them had been executed)

(They are regarded by them as their Imams and after them those who stand for the nation are also the Imams)

(All other people except them are the subject and are of equal status as members of the same nation).

Shias of Kufah:

Before I wind up the discussion of their various sects, I would like to pinpoint the chronic cowardice and degradation of the Shais of Kufah. The Shias have fabricated a number of traditions about Kufah and attributed them to Hadhrat Ali. One of the traditions is:

"O Kufah! I can anticipate that you will be pulled and stretched as leather is pulled and stretched for tanning. You will be the centre of calamities and the battlefield of accidents and catastrophes. But I know that any rebel who approaches you with evil intentions, God will either make him face some calamity or he will become the target of a murderer's shot.

According to another tradition, he is presumed to have expressed:

Seventy thousands people will be raised from Kufah on the doomsday. Their faces will be shining like the moon. He added: This is our town, our street and the residence of our Shias.

Another tradition is imputed to Jafar bin Muhammad:

O Allah! you should throw arrows at him who throws arrows at it and show enmity towards him who shows enmity towards it. Still an other traditions runs:

"It is a land which loves us and whom we love also"

Given below are the words of two great Shia Imams. Masudi has recorded that when Zaid bin Ali bin Hussain—who was executed either in 121 or 122 A.H.—consulted his brother to visit Kufah, he advised him to keep away from Kufah because its residents were traitors and crooks. He reminded him that his grandfather Hadhrat Ali received martyrdom there, his uncle Hadhrat Hassan was attacked with a spear and his father was executed, and it was in Kufah and its surroundings that they were cursed and maligned.

The second statement has been recorded by Mufid. He has commented in reference. To Zaid bin Zli that any nation who holds in disfavour kthe blade of the sword ultimately humiliated. When he reached Kufah, its residents thronged around him and they kept on badgering him until they elicited from him the promise to wage war. But they broke the promise and handed him over to his enemies. They murdered him and hung him on the cross for four years. But none of the Kufis either resented it or helped him with the hand or the tongue.

This is an accont of Zaidiyyah and of the people who were aligned with these sects

Some Other sects:

There are some other sects in addition to the Zaidiyyah sect which gave birth to many other groups and branches. One of these sects believe in the Imamate of Abdullah bin Muhammad bin Abdullah bin Hassan Mithna bin Ali bin abi Talib who was martyred by his oppontnts. They credited him with the status of Imam Mehdi. They believe that he is still alive and is residing on a mountain called Almiyyah. This mountain is located on the way to Makkah and Najd. On the way to Makkah it functions as a barrier. It is a huge mountain and he lives inside it and he will stay here until he rebels against the prevailing system. The Prophet (peace be upon him) has stated the name of Mahdi resembles my name and his patronym resembles my patronym. His brother Ibrahim bin Abdullah bin Hassan launched a movement in Basrah to invite people to acknowledge his Imamate. He achieved extraordinary success in his mission. But Mansur dispatched his army to take him to task. He gave a good account of himself on the battlefield but ultimately succumbed to death after fighting a number of battles with the armed forces of Mansur. Mughirah bin Said has stated that when Abu Jafar Muhammad bin Ali died and he gave vent to his views, the Shia companions of Abu Abdullah Jafar bin Muhammad expressed their disaffiliation with him, gave up his obedience and were known there-after as Rafidhis. He had conferred the new designation on them and hten he appointed one of the companions of Mughirah bin Said as the Imam, and he justified his act as the implementation of the will of Hussain by Ali and Ali bin Hussain. He added that it was also the will of Abu Jafar Muhammad bin Ali. Therefore he would be recognized and

obeyed as the Imam till the appearance of Imam Mehdi. But the Shias denied the Imamate of Abu Abdullah Jafar bin Muhammad and explained that after the death of Abu Jafar Muhammad bin Ali, the children of Ali bin abi Talib were no longer entitled to Imamate, it would circulate among the children of Mughirah bin Sa'id till the re-emergence of Imam Mehdi. In their opinion Muhammad bin Abdullah bin Hassan bin Hassa is the Mehdi who is alive. He neither died nor had he been martyred. This sect is known as Mughiriyyah on account of its affiliation with Mughirah. Mughirah went a step further and declared that he was a messenger and a prophet and Gabriel visited him with divine revelation. When Khalid bin Qisri asked him about it, he confirmed the rumour and also invited him to acknowledge his prophethood. Khalid advised him to recant his heretic opinion but he bluntly refused to switch over. So Khalid had him hanged. He also claimed to raise the dead. He believed in the transmigration of souls and his followers still practise that belief.

One of the Shia sects believes that the Imamate belongs by right to Muhammad Baqir bin Ali Zain-ul-Abidin. He succeeds his father as Imam and there is specific indication of his Imamate adequately backed by the words of his own father.

In 114 A.H. Shias trusted around Jafar after the death of his father Muhammad Baqir. The majority of the people clung to his Imamate and never doubted his authenticity as Imam but some of them pulled their muscles the other way round and disacknowledged his Imamate. Nau Bakhti has stated that some of the people remained steady as far as the Imamate of Hadhrat Ali, Hassan and Hussain was concerned and did not back out of their submission to them. After them they acknowledged the Imamate of Baqir Abu Jafar Muhammad bin Ali bin Hussain. With the exception of a fraction of people, all the others never flickered in their loyalty to him as their undisputed Imam. They heard Umar bin Siyyah saying that once he asked Abu Jafar to explicate an issue which he did to his satisfaction. The next year he asked him to explain the same problem again but he came out with a diametrically opposite reply. He said to him: Your present explanation contradicts your earlier explanation. He replied: sometimes I practise dissimulation and mask my true intentions and hide my inner feelings, i.e., sometimes I adopt 'Taqiyyah' as a mode of expediency. The explanation did not satisfy him and he grew skeptical about the genuineness of his personality as well as his Imamate. He therefore recounted the whole episode to Muhammad bin Qays to quell his nagging suspicions. He said: God knows my question was motivated by my earnest desire to act in accordance with the injunctions of my faith. When he knew my interrogation was based on sincerity, he has no justification to exercise Taqiyyah. Qays replied: It is possible somebody among the audience compelled him to exercise dissimulation. He explained: No, it is not true because on both occasions when I asked about the issue, there was no one else except the two of us. It seems it went completely out of his mind that I had asked his opinion about the same issue last year. He therefore backed out of his belief in his Imamate and justified his act of reversal by the explanation that a person who issued incorrect and illogical edicts could not possibly be designated an Imam. Similarly a person whose explication clashed with divine injunctions and were motivated by expediency or dissimulation could hardly be vested with the insignia of an Imam. Also any one who muffled himself in insular wraps, went into hibernation and shuttered up his doors to block motivated by expediency or dissimulation could hardly be vested with the insignia of an Imam. Also any one who muffled himself in insular wraps, went into hibernation and shuttered up his doors to block public contact did not fulfil the requirements which transform ordinary human beings into Imams. It was the fundamental obligation of an Imam to affirm unequivocally the divine unity, encourage the articulation of truth

and crush and quash the expression of falsehood.

Shias during the period of Jafar bin Baqir:

The period of Imam Jafar witnessed the completion and finalization of the process of transformation of Shia convictions. It was the era of total revolution as it had gripped almost every Shia within its tentacles. The revolution had set in after the martyrdom of Hadhrat Imam Hussain through the instrumentality of the Sabais of the Sabais who served as the revolutionary vanguard in completely brain-washing the Shias. The Sabais clinched their victory ninety years after the origin of their fake religion and sixty years after the martyrdom of Hadhrat Imam Hussain. They succeeded isolating and derailing a party of Muslims as far as the larger chunk of their faith was concerned and in attaching to it the permanent tag of an independent sect who had the audacity to impute their makeshift brand of religion to Hadhrat Ali and his children. It is strange and puzzling that in spite of the inherent disparities of a fundamental nature among the various sects of Shias, they have tried to trim down their amorphous in-consistencies to a tenuous consistency by making them spring from the personality of Hadhrat Ali and his progeny. But the apparently innocuous puzzle has been deliberately and perversely engineered to pile up confusion on confusion and to make their religion look like an intricate puzzle. They provoked the Sabais to indulge in fissiparous practices, wage wars against the rulers and revolt against them by fanning the flames of sedition and murder. Their overt acts of rebellion presented only the tip of the ice-berg and did not include the covert conspiracies which they hatched to snuff out the unadulterated splendour of Islam. They also excluded their intellectual perversities which they had developed under the infectious impact of alien ideologies were spun out by the nations who had been vanquished by the Muslims and were smouldering under the wounds of disgrace and humiliation. The Jews were against the Muslims because they had received a severe battering at their hands. Besides, the remnants of ancient cultures and civilizations who took pride in their rapidly dwindling glory also threw in the towel to the Muslims. Therefore it was their dire need in order to disrupt the system of law and order and create a chaotic situation in the country. They wanted to patch up an articulate assembly of people to denigrate the entire administrative machinery, to oppose the beliefs and convictions held by the ruling class and to stigmatize the steps they took to glorify Islam. As a result of these visible and invisible conspiracies, Shiaism was cast into an absolutely novel mould. The Shias divorced themselves from the rulers and forged an identity of their own in the form of a permanent group which consciously cultivated and propagated a clash with the mores and priorities floated and sanctified by the ruling community. A tradition attributed to Imam Jafar is an endorsement of their perverse mode of speculation. He declared as part of their manifesto that they would adopt all the rules which were against the interests of the masses and discard all the regulations which served their interests. Somebody asked him: what would be your verdict if the rule is derived from Qu'ran and Sunnah by two Jurists: which of the two traditions would you accept if one is in favour of the masses and the other clashes with their interests?

Imam Jafar: It is better to adopt the rule that works against the interests of the masses

Questioner: What if both the traditions serve their interests?

Imam Jafar: When we'll have to find out which way the masses, the rulers and

their judges are inclined so that we may discard it and act on the other options.

When matters come to such a pass, the emergence of differences is inevitable. In these circumstances people can afford to discard Quarn and Sunnah but they can ill-afford to plug their rifts and cleavages. Since the Sabai views were self-concocted, they were not even remotely linked with Islam. But since these vies sprang from sources which prided in their direct affiliation with Hadhrat Ali, it was binding on them to acknowledge and practice these convictions. They also welcomed them for the reason that they clashed with the beliefs held by the common rut of people.

Now the Shias had shed away the mask of reserve and diplomacy, and emboldened by their numerical strength and the shot of new serum they had received into their silted veins, they came out with an unbridled expression of their real convictions. They no longer felt the strain of old constraints and they openly started recasting their beliefs in the light of Sabai views and ideas. Since they had completely gone off their rocker, they invented new problems and imputed them to their Imams to authenticate their spuriousness. They wanted to shape up a new religion with its own set of rules and regulations to draw it as far apart as possible from the religion introduced by the holy Prophet (peace be upon him). He had invited mankind to acknowledge the authenticity and divinity of his religion, which his companions had readily accepted as a token and proof of their unqualified faith in the personality of the Prophet (peace be upon him). They not only adopted it themselves but propagated its pure and all-embracing message among other people as well. It was part of their commitment to spread the golden words and sayings of the Prophet (peace be upon him) to the near and remote corners of the world. Shiaism was based on the statements and practices of the people and they never bothered about the fact whether these people had actually issued those statements and performed those acts which they had the impudence to attribute to them. For them the act of attribution is more important than the truthfulness of the attribution. They derive consolation from the presumption that the words and statements have been attributed to the Imams. They are simply swept away by the intensity of their self-generated rhetoric and do not worry about their compatibility or incompatibility with the emotional and psychic frame of the figures to which they ascribe these views. If they are inconsistent with the hallowed personalities of the Imams, they impute them to the inescapable necessity of dissimulation (Taqiyyah), and if they are in conflict with Quranic injunctions, they do not condemn their own views but blame them on the mutilated nature of the Quarn. They accuse the reporters of distortion and apostasy and affirm the unreliability of Quran and Sunnah. That is why the good people among them had warned the children of Hadhrat Ali that the people who did not tire of boasting their love for them, were in fact liars of the first water. A tradition is attributed to Jafar bin Baqir, the sixth innocent Imam of the Shia:

"Those who claim to love us are in fact our worst enemies"

He added: We, the Ahl-i-Bait, are the truth-tellers: But we are not immune against the liars who may attribute lies to us and pass on these lies to the people as authentic statements made by us. Through the utterance of these lies, they may suspend our credibility. The holy Prophet (peace be upon him) was the greatest

among the truth-tellers but Musailmah used to impute fake statement to him. After the Messenger of Allah Hadhrat Ali was the greatest truth-teller among human beings, but Abdullah bin Saba—may God curse him—imputed lies to him. Mukhtar was a source of constant torture for Abu Abdullah Hussain bin Ali. Then he mentioned Abu Abdullah Harith Shami and Banan and added that he placed many fibs at the door of Ali bin Hussain. Then he referred to Mughirah bin Said, Bazi, Sari, Abul Khatab, Momar, Bashar Ashari, Hamzah Yazidi and Saib Nahdi. They were among his friends and companions but the showered curses on them because they imputed lies to them. He added: We are not immune against liars. May God protect us against their evil and pack them off to hell.

It is attributed to his grandson Ali Radha who is the eighth innocent Imam in the eyes of the Shias. He said that Banan imputed lies to Ali bin Hussain, May God send him to hell! Mughirah bin Said imputed lies to Ibn Jafar: May God send him to hell! Muhammad bin Bashr imputed lies to Ibn Hassan Ali bin Musa Radhi: May God send him to hell! Abul Khatab imputed lies to Abu Abdullah: May God send him to hell! And Muhammad bin Farat is the one who imputes lies to me.

Abu Jafar Muhammad Baqir is reported to have said: "May Allah curse Banan! He used to impute lies to my father. I affirm that my father was a pious man".

The Imams of the Ahl-i-Bait had probed into the real identity of these liars. They had served their links with them and pressed upon their followers to eschew their company and gatherings because they acted not only against the fundamental essence of Islam which condemns in the strongest terms all kinds of lying and backbiting. Kashi has reported from Jafar: once the name of Jafar bin Waqid came up before him during a chat. Abdul Khatab and a number of other friends were also mentioned. He used to visit him and he was the one who remarked about him "He is God on earth and in the skies and he is also the Imam". When Abu Jafar heard these words, he replied; "No, by God, it's not true. From now onward you will never find me and him in the same place together. These people are even worse than Jews, Christians, Zoroastrians and disbelievers. By God! The glory of Allah has never diminished to the level to which they have tried to lower it. Referring to Hadhrat Uzair they claim that what the Jews expressed about him had penetrated down to his heart and God had deleted his name from the list of prophets. I swear if Christ had acknowledged and lapped the remarks of the Christians about him, God would have turned him into a deaf creature. Similarly if I had been swept off my feet by the over-flattering views of the Kufis about me, the earth would have squeezed me in its grasp. I am a creature and slave of God and I exercise no authority over the good and evil consequences of any act.

Muhammad bin Masud, Ali bin Muhammad, Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Yahya have reported through Muhammad bin Isa, Zikriyyah, Ibn Makan, Qasim Sairifi: I have heard Abu Abdullah saying that some people believe I am their Imam. By God! I am not their Imam. May God curse them! Whenever I make a statement, they contradict me and put on it an entirely different complexion. I act as Imam only for the person who obeys me.

In spite of all these reservations and qualifications, all the sincere efforts to pull the Shias out of their religious quagmire did not materialize and the Shias moved up and up on the scale of conspiracies, mischiefs and revolts, because there was no dearth of liars in the era who, out of pretentious love, validated the bogus claims of Abu Khatab, Abu Basir Muradi, Zararah bin Ain, Javir Jafi, Mughirah bin Said, Hashamain

and Abu Jarud. Therefore the Shias splintered into many groups on account of the irreconcilable diversity of their views and speculation and even exceeded the Sabis in the irrational extremism of their convictions. Some of them clung to the Sabai views like cheap gum and preferred conservatism to radicalism. A Shia historian has attested to the intractable situation in these words:

Under the incogneial circumstance that marked the appearance of the Zaidiyyah sect, it was not possible for Imam Jafar Sadiq to carry out a disputation with them. He did not relish disputations and was scared. If the agents and spies of the kings of his era. They had spread their net all over the country. In spite of his unpublicized movements, Mansur had somehow managed to make him attend his court. He said: God may kill me if I don't kill you. Are you trying to create dissension in my country? Imam Sadiq replied: By God! I haven't done any thing nor do I have such intentions. If you have received any news of this kind, it must have been communicated to you by a reporter.

People who initially differed with Imam Jafar and criticized him during his life have been pointed out by Nau Bakhti:

There is an other group of the companions of Abu Jafar Muhammad bin Ali who had acknowledged the Imamate of Abu Abdullah Jafar bin Muhammad and remained loyal to him throughout his life. But there were also a few among them who refused to acknowledge him Imamate. Their refusal was triggered by the fact that Imam Jafar had anticipated the Imamate of his son Ismail after him. But when he died during his life, they grew skeptical of his Imamate. They accused him of hoisting on them a pure fib. They bolstered their skepticism with the logic that he could not have articulated a lie if he were a genuine Imam. In their eyes, the lie about his son had nullified his Imamate. The Imam does not tell lies nor does he utter anything that does not come pat to his utterance, that is, there is no incompatibility between articulation and action in the case of an Imam. His explanation to cover up the unfulfilled prediction further strengthened their suspicions. He explained that the unrealisation of his Imamate was the result of some divine confusion which divested them of their faith in the omniscience of God and they openly denied the very concept of Bada' and divine backtracking. To hold such views about the Lord was rather a disservice to divine over-lordship and instead they subscribed to the views of the Behtiyah sect and adopted the beliefs of Sulaiman bin Hurair. On the concept of Bada', Sulaiman had the opportunity to impress upon his followers that the Imams of the Rafidhis had invented a set of two beliefs to cover up their lies: One was the concept of Taqiyyah and the other was the concept of Bada. Both concepts were cleverly devised strategies to muzzle the truth permanently and to tantalize and puzzle their followers. Presumably, as these people suggested, the Imams were the victims of a feeling of insecurity. They felt that exposure of truth would result in the loss of a large number of their followers and the fabrication of the twin lies helped them in keeping a tight grip over their gullible companions.

The notion of Bada' was sparked by a feeling of self-aggrandizement. When the Imams elevated their knowledge to the level of Prophetic knowledge, they had to invent supporting evidence to justify the equation. The Imams claimed that they possessed knowledge about the coming events. When their predictions about the future came true, they at once took the credit and attributed the preknowledge of the happenings to their special relationship with God, a status that was on par with that of the Prophets. But if the events did not follow the predicted course, they squirmed out of the embarrassing predicament by relegating the unexpected

occurrence to predestination. Thus they explained them away through the concept of Bada'.

The concept of Taqiyyah is also the result of a similar dilly—dallying with religion and divine injunctions. When the Shias probed their Imams about what is lawful and what is forbidden in their religion, the Imams answered their questions to the best of their knowledge and ability. The Shias memorized all the answers and preserved them for future reference. But the Imams themselves had not been dished out in the course of a single but spread over many years. Besides the contextual factors also varied. Thus the same question on different occasions elicited a contradictory response from these Imams; some times they issued identical explanations for different problems. When the Shias realized the pervasive contradiction and inconsistency in the explanations of the Imams, they had recourse to their Imams and asked them to throw some light on their explanatory ramblings. The Imams wriggled out of an embarrassing situation by cashing in on the notion of Taqiyyah. And it was their privilege to answer them as they pleased because they knew best what was in store for them. They always kept their interests in view and the answers they designed for them actually catered to their interests and were motivated by the demands of expediency. Whatever they did was in their interests and was motivated by the demands of expediency. Whatever they did was in their interest and was motivated by the demands of expediency. Whatever they did was motivated by the demands of expediency. Whatever they did was in the interest of their survival, and the strategies they evolved to resist inimical forces were backed by the feeling of love and concern they had for their followers and admirers.

They played ball so cleverly and meticulously that it was virtually impossible for their Shias to sift truth from falsehood and to bring their erring Imams to account. On account of these camouflaged somersaults one of the groups of Abu Jafar's companions switched its loyalties to Sulaiman bin Jarir and discarded the Imamate of Jafar.

The claim of two persons during the period of Jafar

Two other members of the Ahl-i-Bait claimed Imamate during the period of Jafar. One of them was Abdullah bin Hassan bin Hassan bin Ali. His mother was Fatima bint Hussain bin Ali. He used to claim that the Prophet (peace be upon him) had engendered him twice. The Shia writer Asfahani is of the opinion that Abdullah bin Hassan was a Shaikh of Banu Hashim and held a distinguished position among his tribesmen. He was a paragon of virtue, knowledge and magnanimity.

The other claimant was Muhammad bin Abdullah bin Hassan whose by-name was Nafs-i-Zakiyyah. Asfahani observes:

Muhammad bin Abdullah bin Hassan was the most superior person among his Ahl-i-Bait. He was also the eldest among them. He enjoyed the highest status by virtue of his knowledge and memorization of Quran, his interpretation of religion, his bravery, generosity and the other positive virtues. On account of his qualities of head and heart no one had any doubts about his being the Imam Mahdi. The rumor generally went the rounds among the masses that he was in fact the (promised) Imam Mahdi. All members of the tribe took the oath of allegiance at his hand i.e., the children of Abi Talib, the children of Abbas and the other members of the tribe of Bani Hashim.

Kulaini in his book "Kafi" has also referred to the claim of these two persons during

the period of Imam Jafar. He adds that they had also invited Jafar to acknowledge their Imamt. According to Kulaini, Abdullah bin Hassan called on Jafar bin Baqir and said to him:

"You know I am older than you in years. In your community there are people even older than me but God has invested you with exceptional status and prestige. I have come to you because I completely rely on your virtue. I know all of your followers will support me if you decide to extend your acknowledgement to me. And then not even a couple of persons, whether they are Quraishis or non-Quraishis, will dare oppose me. But he replied: you'll find the others more compliant than me. You should not expect much from me, (mainly on two counts). First, I have plans to move into the jungle (to live like a recluse) and secondly I intend to go on the pilgrimage (Hajj) which involves tremendous labour and effort. Therefore you should go to someone else and place your demand before him. Don't tell any one about your visit to me. Abdullah said: the necks of the people are deflected towards you. If you accept my demand, no one else would dare oppose it. In this way you'll be spared the ordeal of war and nothing will be done that displeases you or goes against your grain. Meanwhile a throng of people clustered round him and our dialogue was disrupted. But my father asked: what is it that you were saying. He replied: God willing, I'll see you tomorrow. He asked: Wouldn't we talk on the lines I like. He replied: yes, it will be conducted on the pattern you prefer. Abu Abdullah said: O my cousin! I seek God's protection and advise you to withdraw from your apparently intractable position. I apprehend danger for you. The dialogue continued between them until it assumed a form none of them had visualized before. He asked: On what basis Hadhrat Hussain had a better claim over Hadhrat Hassan? Imam Jafar replied: May God have mercy on Hadhrat Hassan and Hussain! Why have you skidded into a reference to them? I have raised this issue purposively. If Hadhrat Hussain had been just, the most becoming act on his part would have been to hand over Imamt to the eldest son of Hadhrat Hassan. On hearing this my father pulled at his shawl in a state of anger and stood up. Abu Abdullah also positioned himself behind him snappily and he said: Let me tell you that I heard from your uncle that you will fight with your brother. If you obey me, you'll reap a good reward. I swear by the most sacred Power who is the only and the real creator, who is benevolent and merciful, who is the most superior in the entire universe, I prefer to sacrifice myself and my children and the one in my family I love most over you. I prefer no one else over you. Therefore please don't let this enter your head that I am trying to deceive you. But in spite of hearing all this, my father left in a state of anger and sorrow.

Then Muhammad bin Abdullah bin Hassan came and informed that his father and uncles had been murdered (Abu Jafar has murdered them). Hassan bin Jafar, Taba Taba, Ali bin Ibrahim, Sulaiman bin Daud, bin Hassan and Abdullah bin Daud had escaped death. At this juncture Muhammad bin Abdullah appeared on the scene and invited people to pledge fealty to him. I was the third person to pledge at his hand. People huddled round him in innumerable clusters and took the oath of allegiance at his hand. No member of the Quraish tribe, whether he was a native or a refugee, had resisted the pledge at his hand. Isa bin Zaid bin Ali Hussain who was Muhammad's chief adviser and an officer in the armed forces advised him to send some of the people to his relatives to secure their pledge. He added: if you invite them mildly, they will not pledge at your hand. You should be a little harsh with them. (It would be better) if you hand over the matter to me. Muhammad replied: I delegate full power to you and you can do with them as you please.

He said: First send your men to the chief and eldest member i.e., Imam J'afar Sadiq.

When you treat him harshly, people will understand that you will also treat them the way you have treated Abu Abdullah (Imam J'afar Sadiq). Musa said that after a while Muhammad and Isa called on the Imam and told him to swear allegiance to Muhammad. They explained: This will guarantee the security of your life. He addressed Muhammad in these words: Have you created a new prophethood after the death of the holy Prophet (peace be upon him)? He replied: I have not created a new prophethood but you will have to swear allegiance to protect your own life as well as the lives of your children, and you will also be spared the bother of fighting. Hadhrat J'afar explained. I don't want to fight anyone nor do I have the strength to fight. Whatever I had to say I have already conveyed to your father. I tried to scare him of the dangers that surround him but people in power do not scare easily. O my cousin! Pick up the young people for this purpose and leave out the elderly ones. Muhammad said: There is not much difference between you and me in terms of years. He replied: I expect nothing from you nor do I have any intention to fight with you. Actually I intend to leave the city and settle down in a jungle (to lead the life of a recluse) but I find it extremely burdensome to leave here. My family members repeatedly asked me to go out of this place in search of my livelihood but my old age is the real bottle-neck. For God's sake have pity on me! Leave me alone and spare me the torture of your excesses. Muhammad said: O Abu Abdullah! Mansur Daqanqi is dead (and now it is the period of my rule). He replied: What would you do with me even though he is dead? He said: I like to enhance your prestige. The Imam replied: But your intention will be frustrated. I swear by God that Mansur Dawanqi is not dead. His death is like sleep i.e., the rumour of his death is a false rumour. Muhammad insisted: By God! you will have to pledge at my hand. It is up to you whether you do it willingly or by force. But no body will praise you if you do it under pressure. When he forcefully refused (to take the oath of allegiance) he ordered him to be imprisoned. Isa bin Zaid explained: The prison cell is in disarray. We can't lock it properly. I fear he might run away from the prison house. On hearing this he burst into a laugh and said: do you really want to put me behind the bars? He replied: yes! I swear by the Power that conferred prophethood on Muhammad (peace be upon him) and blessed us with honour, I'll throw you into the jug and treat you harshly. Isa said: He may be imprisoned in Makhba'. At present it is the strongest prison house. He responded: what I utter at this moment will be confirmed:-

Isa bin Zaid growled: if you say a word now, I'll simply batter your mouth. Abu Abdullah said: I can imagine that you are looking for holes to hide yourself (in the war to be). You are not one of those who are missed and glorified by the future generation for performing feats of valour on the battlefield. You are such a lily-livered fellow that if someone just claps behind you, you will take to your heels like a fast-running camel. Muhammad felt cheated off by his refusal. He had him imprisoned and left standing instructions that he should not be spared any torture. He retaliated: By God! I see you coming out of Siddah Ashj'a into the Batan valley and you have been attacked by a rider who carries a spear in his hand. He is half white and half black and is riding a horse with a white forehead. He will strike you with the spear but it will not harm you. Then you will strike the brain of the gorse with your spear and he will crumble down on the ground. Then another man will attack you. He will emerge from the street of Al-i-abi Ammar Diilin. He will have two twined tresses and dense moustaches. By God! He will be your murderer. May God have no mercy on his rotten bones! Muhammad said: O Abu Abdullah! you have made an error of calculation. Then Saraqi bin Salakh Hant slapped on Abu Abdullah's back and locked him up in the cell, and confiscated his goods and the goods of his relatives who had not supported his rebellious act

These are the details of rift, cleavage and dissension which appeared among the Shias during the period of J'afar bin Baqir and split them into different groups and sects.

Shias after J'afar:

The death of J'afar in 148 A.H. created a deep fissure in the Shia community. The Shias split into many groups and sects. Nau Bakhti is the first Shia writer who has expressed his views about the genesis of Shia sects. He is of the opinion that after the death of Abu Abdullah J'afar bin Muhammad the Shias branched off into six sects -- He was buried in the same grave in Baqi in which his father and his grand father had been buried. His mother is Um Firoh bint Qasim bin Muhammad bin abi Bakr and her mother is Asma bint Abdur Rahman bin abi Bakr. The details of the six sects mentioned by Nau Bakhti are as follows:

Na-vusiyyah:

The adherents of this sect believe that J'afar bin Muhammad is alive. He never died and will not die until he first reappears and rules over the people. He is also the Imam Mehdi. They claim on the basis of his own words that even if his head is hurled at them from a mountain, they should not confirm it because he is one of their companions. He also said: If somebody informs you that he has nursed me during my illness and that he was present at the time of my death and that he gave me the bath and wrapped me in the coffin, even then you should not confirm it because I am your companion with the sword. This sect is known as Navusiyyah. It is named after the leader of the sect who was a resident of Basrah and whose surname was An-Navus.

Some of them believe that what had appeared was not J'afar but some one else in the image of J'afar. A group of the Sabais also joined this sect. They claimed that J'afar was thoroughly steeped in the intricacies and mysteries of religious knowledge. When some one asked the members of the sect about their conception of the Qur'an and about other peripheral issues relating to their faith, they replied that they held the same opinion as was held by Imam J'afar Sadiq. They in fact followed him blindly. It clearly proves that Shias had divided into various groups and sects during the life of Imam J'afar Sadiq.

Simtiyyah or Shamitiyyah:

The second sect is called Simtiyyah or Shamitiyyah. The followers of this sect believe that after the death of Imam J'afar his son Muhammad bin J'afar holds the port-folio of Imamate. Imam J'afar had expressed his will about him when he was still a child. He often claimed that his son resembled his father Muhammed Baqir and his grandfather, the Messenger of Allah. These people acknowledge the Imamate of Muhammad bin J'afar and after him that of his son. It derives its name from its association with Yahya bin abi as-Samit or abi ash-Shamit.

It is note worthy that this Muhammad bin J'afar made his appearance during Mamun's reign and invited the people to pledge at his hand. The residents of Madinah took the oath of allegiance at his hand. The residents of Madinah took the oath of allegiance at his hand in his capacity as Amir-ul-Mominin. A number of battles were fought between his army and the army of Mamun. The armed forces of Mamun were commanded by Harun bin Musayyih. Then Harun dispatched a brigade

which surrounded him on all sides. It was almost an invulnerable spot and access to it was extremely difficult. The siege continued for three days. When their rations and water zeroed out, his companions scattered away in all directions. He sought amnesty for his companions and Harun readily agreed. Mufid has stated that, like the Zaidiyyah sect, they believed in rebellion with the sword. This is one of the reasons that a number of adherents of the Zaidiyyah Jarudiyyah sect were also converted to this sect.

Fathiyyah:

Kashi says that the followers of this sect believe in the Imamate of Abdullah bin J'afar bin Muhammad. The person after whom it is named had a clumsy head. According to an other version he had bent feet. The third explanation is that it was called Fathiyyah on account of its association with Abdullah bin Fatih, a Kufi chieftain. Most of the scholars and jurists of this group believed in his Imamate, but when they were handed down the tradition from their Imams that the Imamate would be transferred to the eldest son of an Imam on his death, they fell prey to doubts and suspicions. Abdullah himself died seventy days after the death of his father and with the exception of very few people, most of them believed in the Imamate of Abul Hassan Musa. They now clung to the belief that the Imamate would be distributed among the two brothers.

Nau Bakhti, the Shia writer, believes that a large number of Shia scholars and jurists were inclined towards this sect. They had no doubts whatsoever about the Imamate of Muhammad bin J'afar and they were convinced that it would pass down to his children as part of their inheritance, but when Abdullah died, he did not leave any son behind to claim Imamate.

Mufid writes that after Ismail, Abdullah bin J'afar was the eldest among his brothers but his father preferred other brothers over him. One of the charges levelled against him was that he did not see eye to eye with his father. It is also stated that he had relations with Hashwiyyah and was also inclined towards Marhaba. When he claimed Imamate after the death of his father, he based his claim on the fact that he was the eldest among the brothers. Therefore one group among the companions of Abu Abdullah pledged at his hand, but later on when they discovered that his claim was propped on fragile crutches and the claim of Abul Hassan was based on stronger arguments, they backed out of his Imamate and acknowledged Abul Hassan as their Imam. Only a limited group of his followers remained loyal to him through the spate of fluctuations that marked his career. The sect that believed in the Imamate of Abdullah bin J'afar was known by the appellation of Fathiyyah. Urbili has mentioned them in "Kashf-ul-Ghummah". This sect is also called Amariyyah as Ashari has described in his "Maqalat-I-Islamiyyin". This designation originated in its association with a person named Amar. It is noteworthy that according to the Shia Imams--who are innocent in their eyes -- Imamate is the right of the eldest son. Kulaini writes:

"It is attributed to Abu Abdullah that the eldest son is chosen Imam if he has no defect or flaw".

On the basis of this tradition he claimed Imamate for himself. He bolstered his claim with the argument that he was the eldest among his brothers. That is why a bunch of Abu Abdullah's companions had endorsed his claim with the argument that he was the eldest among his brothers. That is why a bunch of Abu Abdullah's companions had endorsed his claim and declared their allegiance to him. But one fails to

understand why they suddenly backed out of their commitment though he was free of any defect or flaw. They, of course, stress the fact that his beliefs conflicted with the beliefs of his father. An other point to be noted here is J'afars son Muhammad also denied the Imamatus of his father and opposed his views and beliefs as has been stated by Tabrisi and Mufid.

Fourth Sect:

This sect subscribed to the Imamatus of Musa bin J'afar and denied the Imamatus of Abdullah. He staunchly believed that his father held erroneous and flawed convictions. A detailed account of this sect will be found in reference to Musa Kazim.

Ismailiyyah Sect:

The fifth and sixth sects are jointly called Ismailiyyah. First I shall reproduce the opinions of Shia writers about this sect. Nau Bakhti entertains the notion that according to one Shia sect Ismail bin J'afar is entitled to Imamatus after the death of his father J'afar bin Muhammad. They came out with a categorical denial that Ismail had died during the life of his father. They believe that his father had only staged a dress rehearsal of his death as he was scared of him. So he very cunningly and diplomatically made him invisible. They hold the opinion that Ismail will not die until he rules over the world and leads the entire mankind as their Imam. He is also the Imam Qaim because his father had hinted at his Imamatus. He made it binding on every one to acknowledge his Imamatus and spelled out clearly that he would be his successor and whatever the Imam says is based on truth. And when his death was revealed, we at once grasped the truth of his statement that he was the living Imam and had not died. This sect carries the exclusive tag of Ismailiyyah.

It is further divided into a number of other sects. I will only make a brief survey of these sects to highlight their salient features. Mufid has mentioned under the heading "Abu Abdullah's children, their number, names and an account of their lives" that Ismail was the eldest among his brothers. Abu Abdullah loved him deeply. A group of his companions was convinced of his succession on account of his age, and the inclination of his father towards him. He also held him in deep affection. But he died at Ariz during the life of his father. From there, the people carried his dead body over their heads and brought it to Madinah where he was buried at Baqi.

It is reported that Abu Abdullah made a lot of hue and cry over his death and gave people the impression as if the world had come to its end. He advanced towards the hearse without his shoes and sheet of cloth and ordered the hearse to be placed on the ground many times before the burial. He repeatedly uncovered his face and gazed at it again and again. He did so consciously because he wanted to assure the people who believed in his Imamatus that he had actually died. In this way he wanted to quell their doubts in his own life time. Those who held the belief that Ismail would replace his father after his death as Imam, back - tracked in their belief after the confirmation of his death. Only a few of them still tagged on to the conviction that he had not died but was still alive. These people were only remotely linked with his father and were not considered among his close associates and companions.

When Sadiq died, one of the groups felt inclined to believe in the death of Musa bin J'afar. The people rather split into two groups. One of the groups squirmed out of its belief that Musa bin J'afar was alive. They inducted his son Muhammad bin Ismail into Imamatus. They believed that his father was the Imam and after his death his son

had a better claim to Imamatus than his brother. The other group remained unshaken in its belief that Ismail was alive. These people can be counted on one's fingers and it is extremely difficult to find now even a single survivor of this group. Both these groups bear the tag Ismailiyyah. The central prop of their faith is the continuous and uninterrupted circulation of Imamatus among his children as part of their heritage.

The other Shia books, e.g., "Sharah Ibn abi al-Hadid", "Ayyan-ush-Shia" and "Ash-Shia fit Tarikh" also endorse this belief. Among the Sunni scholars Ashari Baghdadi, Asfraini, Razi, and Shahrastani etc. have also mentioned it. Ibn Khaldun observes:

Ismailiyyah sect believes in the Imamatus of Ismail. He substantiates this statement with the help of a specification made by his father, though he had expired before his father. But this specification restricts the Imamatus to his children as is established by the example of Harun and Musa. The adherents of Ismailiyyah sect believe that Imamatus was transferred from Ismail to his son Muhammed Maktum and he is the first of the hidden Imams. It is part of their conviction that Imams occasionally slip under cover when they are not accorded the requisite quantum of honour and recognition and are temporarily replaced by their claimants as a make-shift justification of their presence. But when they are publicly recognized and honoured, they appear along with their claimants. They believe that after Imam Maktum Imamatus passed on to J'afar Sadiq and from him it slipped into the hands of Muhammad Habib who was the last of the hidden Imams. He was succeeded by his son Abdullah Mehdi whose presence was first formally publicized by Abu Abdullah Shi'i in Katamah and the people swarmed around him to pledge at his hand. Then he brought him out of Sajlamasah and he was crowned king of Qairwan and the West. Later, his son was made the king of Egypt. This fact is recorded in the book of history. Since they acknowledge the Imamatus of Ismail, they are known by the epithet Ismailiyyah. They are also known as Batiniyyah on account of their affiliation with the hidden or veiled Imam, and on account of their heresy they are also called heretics. The articles of their faith represent a blend of primitivism and modernism: By the end of fifth century Hassan bin Muhammad Sabah invited people to follow the Ismailiyyah Imams. He captured a number of forts and castles in Syria and Iraq, but when calamity clipped his over-grown wings, his forts were divided among the Kings of Turkey and Iraq.

Shahrastani observes that, according to Ismailiyyah, Ismail succeeded J'afar as Imam. There is a specification to this effect arrived at through mutual consensus. But there is a difference of opinion among them about his death. Whether he died during the life of his father or not is a moot point. Some of them are of the opinion that Ismail had not actually died. His death was publicized only as an act of dissimulation to bamboozle Banu Abbas. The governor of Mansur in Madinah was made a witness to Ismail's death. Others believe that he had died but the specification is irreversible: it can not be wrenched back. Therefore, according to the specification, Imamatus will circulate only among his children and will not be claimed by any one outside his family. According to them Muhammad bin Ismail was the Imam after his father Ismail. This sect is called Mubarkhiyyah. Again some of them believe in the discontinuity of Imamatus after Muhammad and believe that he will reappear after his disappearance, while others extend the chain of Imamatus of those who appeared after them.

Shahrastani has reproduced the Shia arguments in support of Ismail's Imamatus. Ismail bin J'afar was the eldest son of his father. There was an explicit indication of his Imamatus. As long as his mother lived, Imam Sadiq neither married an other lady nor

any slave girl. He acted on the Prophetic Sunnah because the Prophet (peace be upon him) did not marry any other lady during the life of Hadhrat Khadijah. Hadhrat Ali also followed the same precedent as he did not enter into any other marital alliance during the presence of Hadhrat Fatima. The difference of opinion relating to his death during the life of his father has already been pointed out. Some people believed that his death was a cinch and the "Nas" or specification transferred the Imamate especially to his children, as on account of the specification of Musa, Imamate had been transferred to the children of Harun because Harun had died during the life of his brother Hadhrat Musa. Since "Nas" is irreversible, the Imamate passed down to his children and remained confined to the members of his family. And the application of "Bada" to the clause of specification sounds absolutely impossible because an Imam singles out only that son among his children about whose Imamate he has heard from his forefathers. It is obvious that Imamate can not be determined on the basis of doubt and ignorance. It presupposes definite knowledge and authentic information on the part of the Imam who comes out with the specific anticipation.

Some of them were of the opinion that Ismail had not died but his death was paraded as a diplomatic charade so that no one would think of his murder. There are many arguments in support of this statement. One of the arguments is that Ismail's younger brother Muhammad (he was his brother from the mother side) came over to the bed on which he was sleeping. He pushed aside the sheet with which he had covered himself. He looked at Ismail who had opened his eyes. Muhammad got the jitters and came running to his father and said to him: "my brother is alive! my brother is alive". On hearing this J'afar said that the children of the Messenger of Allah always ended up that way; but he has also raised eyebrows at the desirability of witnesses to testify the death of Ismail. When the news was conveyed to Mansur that Ismail bin J'afar had been spotted in Basrah and he had prayed for a cripple whose healthy was immediately restored, he sent a message to Sadiq confirming that Ismail was alive. The testimony of the administrators of Madina also supported the view that he had not died.

Shias believe that after Ismail, Imamate passed on to his son Muhammad who is the seventh Imam. His Imamate completed the round of seven Imams of the Shias and triggered a new round of invisible Imams. These Imams visited the towns secretly and their visible agents propagated on their behalf. It is their conviction that the world has never been stripped of the existence of a living Imam as it is consistent with its very genesis and development. Whether the Imam is visible or invisible, his signs and the persons who implement these signs must be made apparent. It means that a form of "transparent secrecy" must govern the conduct of an Imam. It is also of their faith that the Imams revolve around the number seven, as there are seven days in a week, seven skies and seven constellations. The injunctions of Naqaba revolve around the number twelve. That is why Imamiyyah grew skeptical about the absolute number of the agents of Imams. Mehdi will appear after the invisible Imams. The Shias believe that any one who dies without recognizing the Imam of his times dies in fact the death of ignorance. Similarly if some one dies without the band of his Imam round his neck also dies the death of ignorance. The most popular epithet is the conviction of its adherents that each external appearance has an internal correlative, each visible act has an invisible motive and each divine injunction is matched by a corresponding interpretation which manifests itself in the form of a concrete exemplification. The members of this sect are also known by the titles of Qiramtah, Mazdakiyyah and Mulhidiyyah though they have never admitted the relevance of these titles to their system of belief. They pride in calling themselves Ismailiyyah because it distinguishes them from other sects -- but their modern

successors relinquished their tactics. Hassan bin Sabah could not satisfactorily contradict the objections of his detractors. He sought the help of the people for the accomplishment of his mission and locked himself up in his fort. But on his way to the fort he died in Shaban 483 A.H. He had migrated towards the region of his Imam and had imbibed from him the art of converting people to their brand of religion. On his return he impressed upon the people the necessity of determining the place and position of the true Imam. He added that their sect differed from other sects on the basis of a unique set of priorities and their Imam was unique because he was not the Imam of other people and exclusively belonged to them.

Qiramtah:

Ismailiyyah gave birth to a number of sects of which Qiramtah is the most famous. This sect is affiliated to Hamadan Ashat who was popularly known as Qarmat because he was short-statured and had very small feet and he walked with short steps (Such a person is called Qirmitah in Arabic language). This man appeared on the soil of Kufah in 264 A.H. His religion spread in Iraq. Mudathir Matuq appeared in Syria while Abu Said Janab was propagating his views in Bahrin. He and his sons ruled over a sprawling kingdom until they clashed with the armies of Abbasi Caliphs and captured the territories of Baghdad, Syria, Egypt and Hijaz, and their agents spread out in large numbers in different parts of the territory.

A party of the people accepted their invitation. They were impressed by their knowledge of the heart and the mind. Their psychological approach to religion was fairly developed and they explicated the injunctions of Islam and Sharia in the light of their inner illumination. They shuffled the injunctions of Sharia out of their chartered course and clamped highly capricious interpretations on them. They were not only themselves out of focus, but also defocused those who followed them.

There are other statements also bearing on the appearance and nomenclature of this sects. According to Witwat he appeared in Kufah in 278 A.H. during the caliphate of Motamid. His eyes were deep red on account of which he was awarded the epithet Qirmitiyyah. Since this word was rather uneasy to articulate, they clipped its extra syllables and chiselled it down to a disyllabic structure Qirmitah. Then he mentions his vicious teaching and ugly innovations. He adds that Moaz Farimi and the commander of his armed forces Jauhar had fought many bloody battles with Qiramtah in 362 A.H.

Ibn Khalkan writes that Qirmitah is ascribed to Qirmitah who lived in Kufah. He was affiliated to a religious cult that was more notorious for its devilish practices than it was famous for its saintly indulgences. He appeared during the Caliphate of Motamid in 281 A.H. According to an other tradition he appeared in 278 A.H.

Abul Fida' holds the opinion that he appeared in the same year (278 A.H.) in Kufah, and the man he invited to acknowledge his religion was a Shaikh who pretended to be ill in a settlement of Kufah. One of the residents of that area who was popularly known as Kirmitiyyah on account of the redness of his eyes, as Kirmitiyyah is the Nabati word to designate this ophthalmic condition, invited him to his residence. When the Shaikh recuperated from his illness, he was also known by the name of the person who had provided him shelter and treated his illness. Then out of purely abbreviational considerations he came to be called as Qirmitah. He attracted a number of stupid and irrational villagers towards his perverse brand of religion who turned into his zealous supporters without much thought.

I am not concerned with the issue whether the person who extended the invitation to Qiramatah was Qiramat himself or someone else who had acquired the same identity and functioned as his surrogate. I am concerned only with the date of appearance of this sect in order to determine its appearance or non-appearance during the period of the Imams of Ahl-i-Bait. As already stated, there are a number of conflicting versions about the time of their appearance. But the most probable conclusion seems to be that they appeared in 278 A.H. after the termination of the period of Imams and during the Sifra period.

In the opinion of Ashari, Qiramatah believe that the Prophet (peace be upon him) specified the Imamatus of Hadhrat Ali; he specified the Imamatus of his son Hadhrat Hassan who indicated the succession of his brother Hadhrat Hussain. He specified Ali bin Hussain as his successor who predicted the Imamatus of his son Muhammad bin Ali. He specified his son Jafar as the Imam after him who reserved Imamatus for his son Ismail who passed it on to his son Ismail who passed it onto his son Muhammad. They also believe that Muhammad bin Ismail is still alive and he will not die until he rules over the entire earth as its undisputed king. In their eyes he is also the Mehdi about whom there exists an unequivocal specification. They have tried to reason out their stand on the basis of the precedents set by their forefathers who had clearly spelled out that the seventh Imam would be the "Qaim" Imam.

Another important off-shoot of Qiramatah is the Mubarikiyyah sect which gave birth to many other sects. Three of these sect out-matched others in public esteem and recognition.

Agha Khaniyyah or Nazadiyyah sect which follows Agha Khan

Bohra sect which is also known as Mustaliyyah.

Sulaimaniyyah sect.

Each one of these sects has its own permanent set of beliefs and convictions. Some of them hold identical opinions while others hold diametrically opposed opinions. I have compiled a separate book in which I have discussed the historical background and evolutionary divergence of these sects. I have also discussed at length the principles on which they have raised the structure of their views and convictions in order to relate their quantum of deviation to the essence of its matrix. I have critically reviewed the opinions and comments of orientalist as well as of Egyptian, Ismaili, Suri and Hindi writers bearing on the topic. I have conducted a thorough post mortem on the maimed and mangled bodies of their gaping mistakes, and outrageous historical and conceptual lapses. The book is replete with oven-fresh information on the real beliefs of these sects. Some of this information is culled from their old books but the information is filtered through the strainer of a rare sensitivity and understanding which is absolutely necessary for the balancing act on interpretation. Both the original and the published materials have been tapped to enhance the value of my research. I have pointed out objectively and unmaliciously the blunders made by great personages in the field and pricked the bubble of their false reputations by underscoring their obvious lapses and thus proving the evanescence of their frame. Even the top-ranking scholars who claim to be experts on the views and beliefs of the Ismailiyyah sect and regard themselves as its undisputed care-takers have committed grave errors of perception and interpretation. Since I have devoted an independent book to the rankling issue, I would like to eschew

further discussion on the subject and confine myself to quoting excerpts from the books by Shia and Sunni writers who have written on the genesis and evolution of Shia sects.

Duruzi Sect:

This sect derives from the Ismailiyyah sect and shares many of its basic beliefs. It sprang up during the period of Fatimi Caliph Hakim who had taken over as the governor of Egypt in 390 A.H. after the death of his father. At that time he was only eleven years old. The murder of one of his chief opponents in 390 A.H. lent stability to his otherwise doddering regime.

His disloyal and fair-weather companions tried to capitalize on his lack of experience and other pursuits of the flesh, including his penchant for culinary feats. The people who surrounded him like a halo and pretended to sanctify even his most outrageous acts, were in fact the atheistic claimants of the Ismailis who had been especially sent by the Persians and the Zoroastrians to keep tabs on the inexperienced and debauch king. He was completely under their influence and they kept up the façade of his divinity with great ingenuity and packaged him in highly cosmeticsed colours. Of these atheists, those in the vanguard were Hamzah bin Ali Ahmad Zozni, Muhammad bin Ismail Durzi, Hassan bin Haidrah Farghani and another person known by the title of Ukhrum or Ajda.

These people had reached a point of no return in their deviation from religion. The historians suggest that a systematic campaign for the affirmation and acknowledgement of Hakim's divinity was launched in the beginning of 408 A.H., and it was the most fundamental article of their faith. Duruzia were sworn to offer the following prayer:

"I believe in Allah. My creator is Hakim who is superior and sublime. He is the lord of the east and west. He is the God of origins. He has created beings with and without speech. He possesses perfect shape on account of his inner light. He lives in the highest sphere and is seated on Empyrean heights. Then he descended and came closer. I have faith in him and I have to return to him. For him is this world and the next world and his is both the appearance and the reality"

"I also believe the Prophets who were men of determination and who possessed inner illumination, who are the enlightened souls and God's blessings are decked out around them. I also believe in the eight angels who carry God's throne. I also believe in all the restrictive clauses of my faith. I acknowledge whatever comes to me from my master, whether it is a positive posture or a negative gesture. I now only believe in it but also act on it. I have entrusted my self, life, property my inner self and outer self to my master, and I pledge that I will wage Jihad in the way of the master both verbally and practically, psychologically and physically, with my self, property, children and with whatever else I possess. And my confession is witnessed by whatever appeared in the east and by whatever died in the west.

"My covenant controls and guides my self and my soul and I make this statement in a state of complete sanity. I also confess at this juncture that nobody has forced me to do so nor am I a hypocrite. My witness is my master. He guides those who follow him and punishes those who disobey him and turn apostate i.e., Hamzah bin Ali Ahmad who set the sun of beginning into motion and made the cloud of blessing burst. I dissociate myself from all the old and new religious and convictions and

affirm faith only in the commands of my master Hakim and I'll never assign any partner to him and I'll worship him alone".

They also believed in transmigrating and metempsychosis. When someone dies, his soul is transferred into the body of a newborn. Similarly invisibility and resurrection are also crucial ingredients of their faith. It means that Hakim disappeared as part of divine preordination and will reappear near Kaaba. This is a common denominator among the various Shia sects. Ibn Taimiya observes: "Druzes are the followers of Hashtkin Duruzi who was one of the slave-lords of Hakim whom he had despatched to the people Tim-Ullah bin Thalbah. He invited them to acknowledge Hakim's divinity. They addressed Hakim as Alam and swore by his name. They also belong to the Ismailiyyah sect. They believe that Muhammad bin Isamil had nullified the Sharia of Muhammad bin Abdullah. They outrival all the extremist sects in the outrageousness of their infidelity. They deny the basic Islamic sanctities and disacknowledge the accountability of the next world. They also belong to Qiramtah and Batiniyyah and exceed even the Jews, the Christians and the disbelievers of Arabia in the pervasiveness of their infidelity. They admire Aristotle and other philosophers of his vintage and they are also deeply cast in the Zoroastrian dye. They express their Shiaism not as a matter of faith but only as a tactical measure to create rift among the Muslims.

Shaikh-ul-Islam condemns their heretic views and underscores the Muslims consensus in their joint condemnation. Any one who doubts their infidelity is in fact himself an infidel. They are even worse than the people of the Book. They are outright infidels and are completely out of balance. It is prohibited to dine with them. Their women can be converted into slaves and their goods can be confiscated. They are infidels and apostates. They are not even allowed to repent because their repentance is unacceptable. Wherever they are caught, they should be immediately executed and they should be cursed and maligned. It is also unlawful to employ them as watch-keepers, gate-keepers and as body-guards. It is equally permissible to murder their saints and scholars so that they may not misguide other people. It is prohibited to sleep with them in their houses, to be friendly with them, to keep their company and to participate in their burials, and it is prohibited for the Muslim rulers to violate Quranic injunctions about them.

These were the sects that came into existence during the period of Jafar bin Baqir and drew their nourishment from the general climate of opinion. They express a difference of opinion with other Shias in spite of their heritage of Sabai views:

Shia Sects during the period of Musa Kazim:

People who believed in the Imamate of Musa bin Jafar split into various groups during his life and after his death. Nau Bakhti says: People who followed Musa bin Jafar had no difference of opinion about his Imamate. They stuck to their belief in him even though he had been arrested and imprisoned twice. But after his second term of imprisonment they developed doubts about his Imamate and launched a questioning campaign about his credentials as Imam. He had died in Harun's prison and those who believed in his Imamate disbanded into five factions. It happened in 183 A.H.

One of these factions is of the opinion that he died as a captive of Sindi bin Shahak. Yahya bin Khalid Barmiki sent him some poisoned grapes and dates and he died as a result of eating them. And after Musa, Ali bin Musa Radha is the Imam. This sect is

called Qatiyyah because it holds a definite and irrefutable belief in the death of Musa bin Jafar and after him in the Imamate of his son Ali. Their belief is absolute and definitive and is not marked by any streak of doubts and suspicion.

The second faction believes that Musa bin Jafar did not actually die: he is still alive, and he will not go off the hook until he rules over the entire world and relieves it of the burden of oppression and inequity. They also believe that Musa is also Mahdi. He had come out of the prison cell in broad daylight but no body could spot him out nor did any one know about his whereabouts. The king and his companions claimed in sheer desperation that he had pegged out while he was languishing in jail. In this way they hoisted a lie on the innocent people. The fact was that he had gone under cover and become invisible to the people. They have also related a number of traditions which are attributed to his father. For example, he stated that Musa is eternally present. He confirmed the news that even if he hurls his head from a mountain, you should not believe in it because he is the standing Imam. This faction is also called Muswiyyah on account of its perennial vigil for Musa bin Jafar. Its other designation is Mufadhilah on account of its affiliation with the name of its chief Mufadhil bin Umar who enjoyed an enviable status among them. They are also known as Manturiyyah. This designation derives from the fact that when they articulated their specific beliefs, some of the people told them that they were "Kalab Mamturah" i.e., the dogs who had been thoroughly drenched by rain. Since their views were extremely disgraceful, they were adorned with the ugly title. The other explanation is that people avoided their company and snubbed them openly on account of their dirty and swinish beliefs and turned them away like dogs drenched in rain. Ibn Hazm has mentioned them in "Al-Fasl".

They are of the views that Musa is the standing Imam and he is dead and until he reappears, no one can lay any claim to Imamate. He will re-emerge as "Qaim" Imam. They also believe that he has been resurrected after his death but he is leading a veiled existence. He is still alive and actively though invisibly engaged in acts of piety. His companions not only perceive him but also hold meetings with him. They have reported a number of traditions from his father which confirm that he is "Qaim" because he will rise after his death.

The third faction holds on to the opinion that he has popped off and that he is also the "Qaim" Imam. They add that he resembles Christ and has not been resurrected as yet. However, he will be resurrected on the day of judgement and redeem the world full of oppression and injustice. His father had expressed that he resembled Christ and he would die at the hands of the children of Abbas. And he was murdered by them.

The fourth faction is not sure whether he is dead or alive as there are a number of traditions which attest to the fact that he is the "Qaim" Imam and the promised Mehdi. Thus they think it is sheer bad manners to contradict all these traditions. Since they believe in the validity of the traditions about his forefathers, they also do not like to show aversion or revulsion to the traditions about him because these traditions are explicit, popular and continuous. Therefore their contradictions flout all rules of propriety and decency. Death is inevitable and God does whatever He chooses to do. Therefore they would like to suspend their judgement as far as acknowledgement of his life and death is concerned. They also believed in his Imamate and they genuinely desired to sort out fiction from reality and compare his claim with the claim of the person who pretended to be the active Imam i.e. Ali bin Musa Radha. If his Imamate was valid as was his father's and it was established on

the basis of arguments that he had acknowledged his Imamatus as well as the death of his father, they would believe him. It was not possible to trust the traditions of his companions. The issue needed further proof and justification.

Similarly Razi in "Itiqadat Firq al-Muslimin wal Mushrikin", Ashari in "Maqalat-ul-Islamiyyin" Maltin in "at-Tabsir", Isfraini in "At-Tabsir", Baghdadi in "Al-Firq Bain-ul-Firq", Mufid in "Al-Irshad" and Shahrastani "al-Milal wan Nihal" Have made reference to it.

This fifth sect is "Bashriyyah". Nau Bakhti says that they are the companions of Muhammad bin Bashir who was the lord of Banu Asad in Kufah. This sect believes that Musa bin Jafar has not shuffled off this mortal coil. He had not been imprisoned either. He is alive, invisible, eternal and he is also the Mehdi. When he was about to disappear, he appointed Muhammad bin Bashir as his Caliph and made him his executor. He entrusted all the affairs to him and appointed him as his preceptor. It obviously means that Muhammad bin Bashir is the Imam after him. Muhammad bin Bashir at the time of his death proposed his son Sami bin Muhammad bin Bashir to be his successor. Thus he is the Imam after him and it is binding on the Ummah to obey him till the reappearance of Musa. The people are expected to discharge their financial obligations towards him and seek God's pleasure through him as he is the bonafide Imam. They believe that Ali bin Musa and other self-styled Imams among his children had a tainted birth. They have negated their credentials and called them infidels on account of their false and unjust claims to Imamatus. People who subscribe to their Imamatus are also infidels and it is lawful to appropriate their Imamatus are also infidels and it is lawful to appropriate their lives and properties. They also believe that God has prescribed only five prayers and fasting during Ramadhan. They deny Zakat, pilgrimage and other obligatory acts. They think it is lawful to marry women who have been declared unlawful by the Quran and the Sunnah and they possess a soft corner for homo-sexual and lesbian practices, and they bolster their perverse belief with the help of the following Quranic verse which is a further illustration of their perversity

(Or He blesses them with both sons and daughters) 42:50 Besides they are convinced of the inevitability of transmigration and in their opinion all the Imams are in fact physical extensions of the same body who are involved in a continuous process of transference from one corporeal form to another. Therefore it is binding on every one to respect and obey them. Whatever they proposed or desired is in fact intended for the consumption of Sami bin Muhammad and his legal successors.

Kashi observed in his "Rijal" in reference to Muhammad bin Bashir that when Abul Hassan gave up the ghost and a period of stasis followed, Muhammad bin Bashir appeared on the scene to fill up the vacuum. He had a great reputation for legerdemain. He behaved like a chameleon and was adept in varying his poses to suit the exigencies of the occasion or the nuances of the moment. He staked out the claim that Imamatus had ceased with the appearance of Musa bin Jafar. He was an entity of flesh and bone. Every body could see him and had access to him. But he could change himself instantly. To the enlightened and pious people he appeared as a man overflowing with piety but to the prejudiced and the impious he appeared as an embodiment of flesh. The folds and layers of secrecy intervened between the entire universe and his personality and he became impenetrable to the physical range of the human eye. That is, though he is eternally present, people can not perceive him as a physical entity as they used to do in the past.

This Muhammad bin Bashir was one of the lords of Banu Asad in Kufah. His companions cherish the notion that Musa bin Jafar has not hopped the twig, and he was not clapped behind the bars either but he simply disappeared and went under cover. He is also the Imam Mahdi. At the time of his disappearance he nominated Muhammad bin Bashir as his successor. He formally made him his executor also. He gave him his ring, his knowledge and whatever else his people were in need of. He entrusted all the affairs to him, religious as well as worldly matters and made him his preceptor. It means that after him Imam Muhammad bin Bashir is the bona fide Imam. Those who profess the Imamate of others are infidels in their eyes and for them their goods and belongings are lawful. It is part of their conviction that only those who express allegiance to Muhammad are the genuine followers; the others are a breed of bogus pretenders. Muhammad is the creator and he enters into the body of each one of his followers. He is nobody's father nor is he any one's son and he is hidden among the folds and layers of secrecy. In addition to this sect, Mukhsimah, Aliyawiyyah and the companions of Abul Khatab believe that any one who professes allegiance to the children of Muhammad (peace be upon him) professes a false allegiance. They go even further and declare that he professes false allegiance to God also and indulges in a while articulation of lies. And these are the Jews and the Christians who are the addressees of the following Quranic verse:

(The Jews and the Christians claim that they are the sons and darlings of God. Then why does He punish you on account of your misdeeds? You are of course like other human beings among His creatures)

Muhammad, according to Khitabiyyah religion, and Ali, according to Aliyawiyyah religion, are also among the people who have been created by God but actually their claim is false because they believe that Muhammad and Ali are the creators who have neither been engendered by any one nor have they engendered any one.

Muhammad bin Bashir's murder:

Besides being a trickster he was also one of those who believed in the discontinuity of Imamate after Ali bin Musa. He believed in Musa's divinity and claimed himself to be a prophet. He made an effigy of Abul Hassan and dressed it in silk robes. He guilded it with the help of medicines and sculpted it in such a manner that it looked like a living replica of the dead man. It was a folding effigy. When he wanted to display his sleight-of-hand, he filled it with the air in his mouth. When the statue was fully blown, it resembled a living human being. He told his companions that Abul Hassan was staying with him and if they wanted to have a glimpse of him as well to confirm that he was his prophet, they could visit him and see him at his residence. When the people visited him at his house, he folded the statue before he called them in. Then he would ask them if they spotted anyone else except him and themselves. Later he asked them to slip out while he hid himself behind the curtain. Then he placed the statue before them and pushed aside the curtains. They found themselves face to face with a living human being who perfectly resembled Abul Hassan. The resemblance was so perfect that their sense of familiarity was not outraged. He also came over from behind the curtain, stood beside them and assured them through his magical tricks that they were conversing in whispers with Abul Hassan himself. Then he gestured them to leave. Before they went too far away, he hung a curtain between himself and the statue and when they looked back, they found nothing. He knew many magical tricks and people were simply swept away by his ingenuity. He kept on dabbling in his tricks until the news reached the Caliph of the times. Probably it was the reign of Harun or his immediate successor. The Caliph wanted to

put him to death but he said: O Amir-ul-Mominin! don't kill me because I can make a number of things for you which the kings are quite fond of. The king released him. First of all, he set the planks of the well in order and placed mercury between the planks. He filled the pails with water and the planks with mercury. When the mercury travelled from the planks towards the pails, they expanded in girth even when there was no one to supervise the process. In this way water easily reached the garden. It pleased the king immensely. Besides, he made a number of other things as well. He tried to vie with God by creating paradise. The Caliph welcomed him and elevated his stature. But one day the planks came apart and the mercury spilled out of them which crippled the entire system. Thus his house of cards collapsed and his tricks were exposed to his utter consternation.

During the same period, two of his cousins also staked out their claim for Imamate. One of them was Hussain bin Ali bin Hassan bin Hassan Mithna bin Hassan bin Ali. His mother was Zainab bint Abdullah bin Hassan bin Hassan bin Ali. He claimed Imamate during the reign of the Abbasi Caliph Abu Musa Hadi who also happened to be the grandson of Abu Jafar Mansur.

Yahya, Sulaiman, Idris (sons of Abdullah bin Hassan bin Hassan), Abdullah Hassan Aftan, Ibrahim bin Ismail Taba Taba, Umar bin Hassan bin Ali bin Hassan bin Hussain, Abdullah bin Jafar bin Muhammad, Abdullah bin Jafar bin Baqir, Abdullah and Umar (who were the sons of Ishaq bin Hassan bin Ali Zain-ul-Abidin) had pledged at his hand as their Imam.

Asfahani states that with the exception of Hassan bin Jafar bin Hassan Mithna, all the Talibin had pledged fealty at his hand. He did not force him into allegiance because he had offered his apologies. Besides, Musa bin Jafar bin Muhammad who is the seventh Imam of the Shias-also declined to swear allegiance to him. Uniza Qasbani writes: I saw that late in the evening Musa bin Jafar came over to see Hussain of Fiskh. He knelt before him and said to him: Since I lag behind others in my pledge, I would like it very much if I am set free. Hussain kept his head low for a long time and did not utter a word. Then he raised his head and said: you are at liberty.

Kulaini in his 'Kafi' has related in the context of this episode on the authority of Abdullah bin Mufdhil Maula Abdullah bin Jafar bin abi Talib that when Hussain bin Ali had revolted in Fiskh and besieged Madinah, he invited Musa bin Jafar to pledge fealty at his hand. He called on him and said to him: O my cousin! don't torture me the way your cousin had tortured Abu Abdullah so that I may not react in a way I have never intended to react, the way Abu Abdullah had reacted though he had absolutely no intention to do so. Hussain replied: I have only placed my proposal before you. You can accept it if you like, and if you don't like it, I'll not force you into it.

The other man, who came out with his claim to Imamate, was Yahya bin Abdullah bin Hassan al-Mithna. Kulaini has also mentioned him:

He wrote in his invitation to Musa bin Jafar: tell me who are the people who, in spite of your disgraceful attitude, have come to me because they are sincerely interested in the propagation of God's religion. I have kept my invitation under cover as your father had kept it under cover. You over-publicized and over-exposed yourself though you have fulfilled none of the promises (you made to the people). You misguided them and I am warning you against it. God Himself has warned people

against the pursuit of selfish ends. Abul Hassan Musa bin Jafar wrote back: you say that I have created disaffection against you among the people because I covet your Imam. I warn you against the wrath of the Caliph and request you to obey him. I also ask you very humbly that you should seek protection for yourself before you are driven into a tight corner and find no outlet to escape, except the mild attitude of the Caliph through divine intercession. May God keep him alive and he may allow you to live in peace and security and spare you on account of your geneological link with the Prophet (peace be upon him).

It is believed that Harun Rashid took him along when he returned to Madinah after the performance of Umrah, and he was still in his personal custody when he left for the pilgrimage. And when he returned through Basrah, he handed him over to Sadi bin Shahak as his prisoner and he died in Baghdad on 25 Rajab 183 A.H. during imprisonment. At the time of his death, he was fifty-four or fifty-five years of age and he was buried in the Quraish graveyard.

Shias during the period of Ali bin Musa Radha:

Ali bin Musa Radha was the father-in-law of Mamun's daughter. After his death, the shias who clustered round him, were divided in their opinions. One sect among them believed that after him his brother Ahmad bin Musa bin Jafar was the Imam because he had specified his Imam. They believed that both brothers were bonafide Imams and, as a result of their conviction, they acknowledged Ali bin Musa as the Imam.

One of these sects was known as Muhaddithah. They had faith in the sanctity of hadith, and therefore, out of conviction, they acknowledged the Imam of Musa bin Jafar. After him, they conferred Imam on Ali bin Musa. The fact is that they had no firm faith in Shiaism. They adopted it only out of pretense and diplomacy. Therefore when Ali bin Musa died, they conveniently switched back to their former belief which was a hotch-potch of superstition and expediency.

Another sect was Zaidiyyah which comprised people with greater conviction and insight. They pledged at the hand of Ali bin Musa when Mamun had publicly acclaimed him as a pious man. They pledged at his hand only as a formality and as a show of false loyalty because inwardly they held on to their own beliefs. For a period of time they persisted in their pretense and expressed their loyalty to him, but, as soon as he died, they returned to their old convictions.

Another sect is of the opinion that Ali bin Musa his son Muhammad bin Ali is the acknowledged Imam. In his presence no one else was entitled to Imam. There were some other sects also which expressed allegiance to a group of Talibin who had claimed Imam during the period of Radha and invited people to endorse their claim. Muhammad bin Ibrahim bin Ismail bin Ibrahim bin Hassan Mithna bin Hassan bin abi Talib, who was popularly known as Ibn Taba Taba, also belonged to this sect. Besides Muhammad him Yahya bin Yahya bin Zaid bin Ali bin Hussain bin Ali, Muhammad bin Jafar (Ali Radha's uncle), Ibrahim bin Musa bin Jafar (Ali Radha's brother) and Hussain bin Hassan bin Ali bin bin Ali Zain-ul-Abidin etc also boasted of their adherence to the sect.

Asfahani in his "Maqatil-ut-Talibin" and Masudi in his "Muruj-uz-Zahb" have mentioned all of these sects, their beliefs, their revolt against Mamun, their capture of some towns and areas, and their confrontations on the battlefield with the Abbasi armies. I will give a

brief account of the revolt of Alvis and their claim to Imamatus basing it chiefly on Masudi's observations.

In 199 A.H. Abu As-Saraya Sari bin Mansur revolted in Iraq. He gathered a large number of people about him and carried substantial weight in the eyes of his opponents. Ibn Taba Taba had also extended his support to him. In Madinah Muhammad bin Sulaiman bin Daud bin Hassan bin Ali had revolted and in Basrah his example was paralleled by Ali bin Muhammad bin Jafar bin Muhammad bin Ali bin Hassan bin Ali and he was supported by Zaid bin Musa bin Jafar bin Muhammad bin Ali bin Hussain bin Ali and they captured Basrah as a result of their successful revolt.

Ibn Taba Taba died the same year. After his death Abu As-Saraya came all out with his support for Muhammad bin Muhammad bin Yahya bin Zaid bin Ali bin Hussain bin Ali. The same year in Yemen (119 A.H.) Ibrahim bin Musa bin Jafar bin Muhammad bin Ali Hassan bin Ali appeared while during the tenure of Mamun Muhammad bin Jafar bin Muhammad bin Ali Hussain appeared in the suburbs of Makkah and Hijaz. It happened in 200 A.H. He invited people to express their allegiance to him. The Shia sect Sibtiyyah reinforced his invitation and acknowledged his Imamatus. Later they themselves split into a number of sects. They only varied in the degree of their transgression and followed essentially the course charted by Imamiyyah. I have referred to the number of Talibin who appeared during the reign of Banu Abbas in my book "Al-Maqalat fi Usul ad-Deyanat' and "Akhbar-uz-Zaman." It is also stated that Muhammad bin Jafar extended Ibn Taba Taba's invitation to the people in the initial stages, especially during his period of bloom, but after the death of Ibn Taba Taba he stuck out his own claim to Imamatus and became the self-styled Amir-ul-Mominin. There is not a single person among the children of Muhammad (peace be upon him) except this Muhammad bin Jafar who acquired the label of Amir-ul-Mominin. He was called "silk" on account of his physical charm and attraction. Ibn Aftas also appeared in Madinah during the reign of Mamun. In the beginning he invited people to embrace the Imamatus of Taba Taba but after his death he changed the gear and invited people to embrace his own Imamatus. Then he left for Makkah and contacted people when they were at Mina. Daud bin Isa bin Musa Hashmi was Amir-ul-Hajj in that year. Daud took to his heels when he heard the news of his arrival. People left for Urfah and from there they left for Muzdilfah. At that time they were without an Imam. Ibn Aftas visited Mukaf during the night and from there he made a dash for Muzdilfah. Since the people were still without Imam, he led the prayers and they prayed behind him. Then he left for Mina. He offered a sacrifice there. He then entered Makka and disrobed the house of Allah (Bait-Ullah) leaving only the white cover untouched.

It is worth mentioning that Mamun had appointed Ali bin Musa as his heir-apparent. Mufid has stated that Mamun had deputed two of his ministers Hassan bin Sahl and Fadhal bin Sahal to place before Ali bin Musa his offer to appoint him as his successor. But Ali declined the offer. However he finally accepted it on the repeated insistence of the ministers. Mamun was immensely pleased. On thursday Fadhal bin Sahl came out of the court and announced to the people outside Mamun's decision to appoint Ali bin Musa as the heir apparent who had also conferred on him the epithet Radha. He added that Mamun had ordered them to wear green dress and come to the court on the following thursday to take the oath of allegiance at his hand, and to collect their annual stipends. Thus on the stipulated day, the officers, the courtiers and the justice etc came to the court wearing green robes and settled down in their seats. Mamun also took his seat. Two giant-size pillows were placed for Radha and

they were almost adjoined to Harun's seat. Radha was ensconced against the two pillows in his green apparel. He was wearing a turban on his head and a sword dangled at his hand first of all the persons. Then the people followed suit and swore allegiance to him. The speakers and the poets then showered praises on Radha. Mamun asked him to stand up and address the people. Radha first praised the Lord and then stressed his claim over them. He emphasised mutual rights that existed between him and the people. If they fulfilled their rights and discharged their obligations, he would also respond by fulfilling his rights and discharging his obligations. And he asserted that his claim was justified on account of his link with holy Prophet (peace be upon him). Mamun ordered his name to be engraved on the coins. Ishaq bin Musa bin Jafar spliced him to the daughter of his uncle Ishaq bin Muhammad. He was appointed Amri-ul-Hajj the same year and sermons were delivered in every town to highlight the fact of Radha's succession. But he died during the life of Mamun before he could take over the reins of Khilafat.

Mamun tried to conceal his death for twenty four hours. Then he sent for Muhammad bin Jafar Sadiq and a party of the progeny of Ali Talib who were present on the occasion. When they reached there, he informed them about the death of Radha. While delivering the news of his death he broke into a torrent of tears and expressed immeasurable grief. Then he led them to Radha's corpse which was in perfect condition. Mamun addressed the dead body and said: O my brother, it is excruciating for me to see you in this state. I expected to kick the bucket before you but God's will prevails over our wishes. Then on Mamun's orders he was given the final bath and wrapped in a coffin after performing the necessary rites. Mamun also gave the funeral his shoulder and accompanied it to the spot where he lies buried today. This spot is known as Dar Hamid bin Qahtibah which is actually called the settlement of Sanabad at Nau Qan in Tus. The graves of Harun Rashid and Abul Hassan are also located in this area.

As far as I know Ali bin Musa Radha left behind him only Imam Abu Jafar Muhammad bin Ali. At the time of his father's death he was only seven years and some months old. It should be noted that he died in Safar 203 A.H. when he entered the fifty-five years of his life. His mother was Um-ul-Banin.

Shias during the period of Muhammad bin Ali:

A serious rift came to surface among the Shias about the Imamate of Radha's son Muhammad bin Ali who was known by the title of Jawad or Taqi, because he had not entered the age of puberty at the time of his father's death, as is already stated. They drew themselves away from him and insisted that puberty was a necessary pre-requisite of Imamate. If God had commanded us to obey an adolescent, He would have also ordered the adolescent to obey His injunctions. Just as it is unlawful to declare a non-adult as "Mukallaf", similarly he is not legally empowered to arbitrate among people. He can not grasp the subtleties and intricacies involved in the solution of problems; he is not fully conversant with religious injunctions and the rules and regulations of Sharia. The Sharia introduced by the holy Prophet (peace be upon him) which is the basic need of the Ummah till the arrival of the doomsday is obviously beyond the range of an adolescent's comprehension. If a non-adolescent can handle these complicated and sensitive issues, then we can also expect a child who is in his cradle and swings to the rhythms and melodies of nursery rhymes, to show an awareness of these issues and to suggest solutions to dis-entangle their knots. But it all sounds absurd because adolescence is not the same things as non-adolescence and a child can not rationally be expected to behave like a grown-up

person. The perceptions and reflections of the former do not operate at the same wave lengths as those of the latter.

People who are convinced of the Imamatus of Abu Jafar Muhammad bin Ali differ on the state of his knowledge during the non-adolescent phase. Some of them suggested that only a scholar could claim himself to be an Imam. Abu Jafar was a non-adult. His father had died. Therefore they wondered how he had imbibed the knowledge he laid claim to. They countered their cat-like curiosity with the suggestion that it was not necessary for him to have acquired his knowledge from his father because he was only four years old when his father was taken to Khorasan and a child of his age obviously lacks the capability to grasp the minor and major issues of his faith. Therefore, at the time of his puberty, God injected into him knowledge of problems and issues through various channels: for example inspiration and prophecy, true dreams, dialogue with the angels etc. All these channels of information are established through convention and it is not proper to refute or contradict them.

There were still others who subscribed to the view that the right to Imamatus was exclusively his. It is established by the confirmation of his Imamatus before the age of puberty. The pre-adolescent confirmation carried the divine guarantee that he would receive the necessary knowledge at the time of his induction into the age of adolescence. Since the chain of revelation has been snapped after the death of the holy Prophet (peace be upon him) and this belief is supported by the consensus of the entire Ummah, therefore information alone is no solution to the immensity of the problem. Revelation is a consequence of reflection on the reality of things and not of the mere accumulation of factual information. Facts go only part of the way and they do not touch the strings of the heart and the spirit. Though inspiration has priority over information no one can learn the rules and injunctions of Sharia through inspiration. One who has a reflective disposition is blessed with an enlightened heart, possesses sound reason, and has an active mind, will obviously fail to grasp religious problems and issues if he has not been properly indoctrinated into them. Through reason and rationality alone he can not arrive at the conclusion that the noon prayer has four, the evening prayer has three and predawn prayer has two obligatory units (rakat). These problems can not be solved through the perfection of reason and the instrumentality of reflection because they belong to the realm of instruction and information. Thus it sounds absurd that these problems can be discovered through the agency of revelation. Therefore I affirm that Abu had received the necessary knowledge at the time of his adolescence as part of the heritage that had come down to him in the form of books and relevant guide lines. Some Shia sects believe that the Imam is innocent and his surmises and guesses possess the stature of rules and regulations. He is immune to the lapses and errors of ordinary human beings on account of his extraordinary status. But the stand of these Shias only reflected their helplessness because there was no other way to justify the acceptable level of instruction of their non-adolescent Imam.

There are still others who believe that the Imam is adult by definition even if he is physically a minor because he embodies the justification of divine presence. He can also imbibe knowledge through inspiration, reason, angelic discourse etc. Thus Abu Jafar received knowledge through these channels. His forefathers had acquired knowledge through similar sources because they were also the embodiments of divine justification on earth. They have specifically mentioned the name of Hadhrat Yahya bin Zikriyyah. God had blessed him with knowledge during his childhood. They also quote Isa bin Miriyam and the child who had verbally intervened in the affair

between Yousaf and the king's wife. They cite the example of Sulaiman bin Daud as well that God had blessed him with the power to understand and resolve complicated issues without the crutches of acquired knowledge. They intend to prove that God conferred special status on them even though they were not adolescents in the eyes of people.

Muhammad bin Ali was born in Madinah in 195 A.H. and died in Baghdad in 220 A.H. It means he left the world at a very young age of twenty five. His mother was Nobiyah though she was popularly known as Samibah and he was married to Um-ul-Fadhl, Mamun's daughter, which means out of the two sisters one was married to the father and the other to the son.

During his period a Hussaini also came out with his claim to Imamatus. He was Muhammad bin Qasim bin Ali bin Umar bin Ali Zain-ul-Abidin bin Hussain bin Ali bin abi Talib. According to Masudi, a large crowd of people leaped towards him to pledge fealty at his hand. On account of the flesh of his popularity Abdullah bin Zahir kidnapped him and produced him before Mutasim who imprisoned him in a big house that was built in a garden of "Sur man Ra'i". Some people believe that he was prisoned. Others believe that some of the Taliqani Shias wangled their appointment as gardeners in that garden. They used ropes as ladders, broke into the house and dragged him out. They kidnapped him and what followed is wrapped in mystery. A large number of followers of Zaidiyyah sect are also convinced of his Imamatus. This happened in 322 A.H. Many of them believe that he is not dead but alive and he is a regular recipient of the divine bounty and when he revolts again, he will relieve the world of tyranny and oppression and fill it with justice and equity. He is also the Mehdi of the Ummat. The majority of people who hold these beliefs are settled in the suburbs of Kufah, and the hills of Tabristan and Dilam as well as in Kharasan.

Shias during the period of Ali bin Muhammad:

When Muhammad bin Ali died, he left behind two sons, Ali and Musa. According to the Shias the elder son was not more than eight years old. Their father deputed Abdullah bin Masawar to look after their wealth and property till they acquired the age of puberty. There is a difference of opinion among the Shias about their Imamatus. Some of them believe in the Imamatus of Muhammad bin Ali while others acknowledge Musa bin Muhammad as their Imam.

Nasiriyyah Sect:

A shia sect emerged during the life of Abul Hassan Ali bin Muhamad Hadi which believed in the prophethood of Muhammad bin Nasir Numeri. The adherents of the sect claimed that he had been appointed by Abul Hassan Askari as the prophet. They believe in the transmigration of souls and ascribed divinity to Abul Hassan. This sect permitted marriages among persons who were not allowed to marry one another by law i.e., it conferred legal sanctity on unlawful marriages; it legalized wedding among spouses and encouraged homosexual marriages. It stressed especially that God had not forbidden these marital alliances. In this way they attached divine sanctity to what had been declared illegal by religious convention. Muhammad bin Musa bin Hassan bin Farat was one of the special associates of Numeri. When Numeri was asked on his deathbed to designate his successor, he had mentioned the name of Ahmad but the people could not discover the identity of the man named by him. On this issue the split into three groups: One of the groups believed that Ahmad actually meant his own son; the second group held that it stood for Ahmad bin Musa

bin Hassan bin Farat; the third sect believed that the reference pointed towards Ahmad bin abi al-Hussain Muhammad bin Muhammad bin Bashir bin Zaid. Their difference assumed a serious form and they could not forge a consensus on the issue. Since they upheld the prophethood of Abu Muhammad, therefore they are also known by the label of Numeriyyah or Hasiriyyah.

Shahristani has commented on the beliefs of the Nasiriyyah sect in his book "Milal". It is part of their belief that God manifests Himself in the form of different individuals. Since no one excels Hadhrat Ali after the holy Prophet (peace be upon him) and no one is superior to him barring the Prophet (peace be upon him) and after him his children are the indisputed embodiments of excellence, therefore God manifested and articulated Himself through them and supported them through the vagaries of their temporal existence. This is the reason they clamp divinity on them and acknowledge Hadhrat Ali as God because he enjoyed the divine support and the secrets of the unknown were revealed to him. The Prophet (peace be upon him) decided only in the light of external evidence and God alone possessed knowledge of the internal evidence. That is why the Prophet (peace be upon him) waged wars against the disbelievers while Hadhrat Ali fought against the hypocrites. They also compared Hadhrat Ali to Christ and added that they would have come out with a stupendous statement about him if they could get rid of the apprehension that people would ascribe to him what they had ascribed to Jesus Christ. The shias also regarded Hadhrat Ali as a partner in Prophethood. According to them the Prophet had predicted that one of them could fight with the hypocrites on the issue of interpretation as he had fought with the disbelievers on the issue of revelation and he was the one who had patches on his shoes. He had learnt the art of interpretation, fighting with the hypocrites, conversing with the Jins and uprooting the Khyber gate and he possessed this knowledge not on the basis of his physical strength. It is, in fact, a proof of his divinity. His extraordinary courage and his superior knowledge are a proof of the fact that God manifested Himself through him. He created with his hand and spoke with his tongue. The Shias add that Hadhrat Ali was present even before the creation of the earth and the heavens. According to him he was standing in the shade on the right side of God's canopy. He praised the Lord and the angels also praised God in response to his overture. Therefore these shades are a reality and are lighted up with divine radiance. The light is an inseparable part of Hadhrat Ali and will not leave him whether he is in this world or the next world. He further adds that the one he is praising is radiant like the light. It means there is no difference between the two forms of radiance. The only difference is that the first light is the cause and the second light its consequence. The Nasiriyyah sect is inclined to believe that he is a part of divinity while the Ishaqiyyah sect is inclined to believe that he is a partner in prophethood.

Razi thinks that the adherents of this shia sect are settled in the suburbs of Halab and Syria. The fact is that this sect was not only confined to Razi's times but is still found in Suriyyah and Turkey and is known by the title of Alwiyyah.

The Nasiriyyah sect sticks to the belief that Muhammad bin Nasir Numeri did not claim to be a prophet; he only served as the gateway to the Imam of Hassan Askari, the eleventh innocent Imam of the Shias. They also believe that Abu Yaqub Ishaq bin Muhammad Nakhfi had a tussle with him and it is he who had staked out his claim as the gateway to Hassan Askari.

The gist of the discussion is that these people believe in the divinity of Ali and it is their conviction that the Messenger of Allah was in fact the messenger of Hadhrat Ali.

Their conviction is based on the authority of Jabir bin Yazid Jofi: Hadhrat Ali dispatched him on a mission. When he arrived at his destination, he found Hadhrat Ali seated in a chair flooded with the radiance. Sayyid Muhammad (peace be upon him) was sitting on his right and Sayyid Salman (Hadhrat Salman Farisi) was sitting on his left. When Jabir looked at his back, his eyes were greeted by the same sight; and when he looked at his right and lifted his eyes towards the sky, he found the angels praising him and prostrating before him. They have composed a separate Quran for themselves:

After the above verses they frame a number of verses which celebrate the omnipotence and omniscience of Hadhrat Ali.

I witness that no one is to be worshipped except Ali bin abi Talib. There is no intermediary except Sayyid Muhammad and he is his most intimate associate. There is no gateway except Sayyid Salman Farisi and he is the ideal of their reflection *The Sacred Five (Panjtan Pak) are the greatest angels. Sayyid and Shaikh Hussain spread religion in all the regions of the world. His opinion is therefore to be rated above the opinion of everyone else. I witness that the shape who appeared in the robe of flesh and spread light and radiance all around and who alone is to be worshipped, he is Ali bin abi Talib. His power can not be defined; his glory can not be confined; his intelligence cannot be circumscribed; he can not be perceived with the naked eye. I witness that I am Nasiri by virtue of my faith, Jandibi by virtue of my opinion and views, Jinbilani by virtue of articulation, Maimuni by virtue of religion, Jalli by virtue of articulation, Maimuni by virtue of Fiqh. I am the expression of what he concealed and the manifestation presence of Ali bin abi Talib, the form in which he emerged from Ain-i-Shams'. He controls all living beings. He is under Shiran holding a sword in his hand. The angels are at his back and Sayyid Salman is in front of him. Water is gushing out of his feet. Sayyid Muhammad is shouting repeatedly: O people! He is Ali bin abi Talib, your lord and master. Recognize him, and pay your respects to him and sign paeons of praise to him. He is your creator and sustainer. O my community! don't deny him. You are my witness that this is my faith and belief. This is what I trust and this is what sustains me and when I die, I'll die as an adherent to the belief that Ali bin abi Talib is alive and will never die. He controls fate and predestination. Each one of our organs, the ear, the eye, the heart etc will be questioned about him.

And there are also a number of other absurdities and perversities which they have incorporated in their Quran. Ali bin Muhammad died in Rajab in 254 A.H. at Sur Man Rai with the help of Yahya bin Aksam. Thus he along with his mother was confined to this spot.

A number of other Alvis also proclaimed Imamatus during his period and many Shias and members of Ali's family had pledged fealty at their hands. The most noteworthy among them is Yahya bin Umar bin Hussain bin Zaid bin Ali Zain-ul-Abidin. He had seized the territory of Kufah and its suburbs but when he was murdered during the tenure of Mustain, the Abbasi Caliph, many poets composed elegies composed over the death of Yahya excelled the number of elegies written over the murder of other people during the Abbasi period. Ibn Athir has endorsed Asfahani's claim in his book "Al-Kamil". Similarly, Hassan bin Zaid bin Muhammad bin Ismail bin Hassan Mithna also publicized his Imamatus during this period. He appeared in Tabristan and after a spate of battles he managed to capture Tabristan and Jirjan. Hussain bin Muhammad bin Hamzah bin Abdullah bin Hussain bin Ali also drummed out his claim to Imamatus in 251 A.H.

Shias during the period of Hassan bin Ali Askari:

The Shias chipped away into various factions after the death of Abul Hassan bin Ali Hadi. One of these factions believed in the Imamate of his son Muhammad who had died at Sur Man Rai during the life of his father. But the Shias believe that he is still alive and his death was only an illusion. They bolster their claim with the argument that his father had vaguely indicated his Imamate after him. Since the Imam can neither lie nor rely on Bada', it is evident that Muhammad had only visibly died; invisibly he was still alive. His father had made him vanish on account of fear. He is also the "Qaim" Mehdi. The views they hold about Muhammad are exactly the ones held by the followers of Ismail bin Jafar about him.

The interesting aspect of the whole episode is that Muhammad, whose patronym is Abu Jafar, is the executor of his father and is also the caliph after him. This is the run-of-the-mill belief of the Shias about him. But when he died during the life of his father and before he became the Imam, the Shias fell into suspicion about his Imamate and the Imamate of his father. In order to quell their doubts his father Abul Hassan Hadi explained that God had fallen into Bada' about Abu Muhammad after Abu Jafar which he could not anticipate as a similar Bada' had materialized about Musa after Ismail. I still stick to what I said even though the worshippers of falsehood do not like it. My son Abu Muhammad is my successor after me. He possesses knowledge of all that he needs. He is also in possession of the instrument of Imamate.

Another faction believes in the Imamate of Jafar bin Ali—although the Shias generally remember him by the title of Jafar the liar. The adherents of this sect believe that after the death of Muhammad his father had indicated his succession as Imam. They believed in his Imamate because it had been authenticated by his own father. Thus they discarded the Imamate of his brother Muhammad. They interpret the indication of Muhammad's Imamate by him only as a defensive gesture as the Imam in fact is Jafar bin Ali.

Still another section believes in the Imamate of Abu Muhammad Hassan Askari bin Ali. Mufid writes that after Abu Jafar his son Abul Hassan Ali bin Muhammad was the natural heir to Imamate because he possessed all the attributes in the maximum degree of excellence which rendered him the most suitable for the highest spiritual office. None of his brothers could claim to approach the heights scaled by his father. Besides there was a clear specification about his Imamate and his father had in fact indicated his Khilafat. He died on Friday in 260 A.H. while he was born in Madinah in the month of Rabi-ul-Awwal 232 A.H. He was buried in his own house at Sur Man Rai. His father was also buried there. His mother was known by the name of Haditha and he was only twenty eight at the inopportune time of his death. Nau Bakhti remarks that his mother is simultaneously known as Isfahan and Salil. Sometimes she is called by other epithets as well. Thus the confusion about her real name is quite obvious though there is perhaps no confusion about the identity of the person. Abu Isa bin Mutawakkil led his funeral prayer. During his period of Imamate Motiz was king for a few months. He was followed by Mohtadi who ruled for eleven months and twenty eight days. He was succeeded by Ahmad Motamid Ali Allah bin Jafar who ruled the roost for twenty years and eleven months.

A number of Alvis professed Imamate during his tenure, among whom Ali bin Zaid bin Hussain Alvi is particularly noteworthy. The other claimants are mentioned by Asfahani in "Maqatil-it-Talibin" and Masudi in "Muruj-uz-Zahb". All the Sunni

historians have mentioned them too.

Shias after Askari's death:

Hassan Askari had not left any off-spring behind to claim succession. Therefore, as Nau Bakhti writes, when he left the world, he did not leave behind any living token of his identity. Therefore his heritage was parcelled pre-requisite for Imamatus is the presence of a male off-spring and the specification made by the incumbent Imam about his successor who is supposed to supervise his funeral rites and other affairs related to his final disposal. The difference of opinion appeared among the Shias in the absence of any indication by the former Imam and the indication of course could not possibly be made in the absence of successors, as the prediction of succession can be made only when there is someone to succeed. Thus the Shias relied on absurd interpretations because after the death of their eleventh Imam they were in the midst of a moral and spiritual after his death. Besides, their fragmentation also betrayed the extent of their deviation from the origins of their faith and it clearly stressed the triumph of greed and selfishness over principles and convictions. The Shia divided into fourteen factions. Their views and beliefs are given below:

The first faction believes that Hassan bin Ali is still alive. He had not died but simply disappeared. He is also the Qaim' Imam. He can never die because he is apparently without an issue and the world can not survive without the presence of an Imam.

The second sect gives credit to the notion that Hassan bin Ali had actually died, but he was resurrected after his death and he is the Imam Mahdi. According to a tradition the word "Qaim" means that he will rise again after his death and he will rise in his own person because he has no issue of his own. Since Imamatus is preserved for the children of an Imam, and he is without a child nor has he specified any one else as his successor, therefore he is the "Qaim" Imam and it is beyond all doubt.

The third sect gives credence to the surmise that Hassan bin Ali passed away and was replaced by his brother Jafar as Imam whose succession he himself had indicated. When it was brought to their notice that throughout their life Hassan and Jafar were at daggers drawn, and the malicious treatment he had extended to his brother was also an open secret as well as the war of succession that ensued after his death, the nomination of Jafar as Imam appeared rather dubious and contrary to rational expectations. Their answer is that all these squabbles and wrangles were only superficial and the shell of their inner unity could possibly be cracked by the hammer-blows of outer dissension. Ali bin Tahir Khazaz was the person who strengthened Jafar's Imamatus and proved the king-pin in channelizing the sympathies of the people towards him. He was quick on the uptake and possessed the gift of the gab. Both these qualities helped him in launching a campaign of sustained publicity for his Imam. Besides he won the cooperation and active support of the sister of Faris bin Hatim bin Mahwiyyah Qazwini.

The fourth sect cherishes the notion that Jafar is the Imam after Hassan and the Imamatus is transferred to him from his father and not from Hassan. Hassan was a fake claimant because the genuine Imam does not die until he has specified his successor, and he is also survived by a son to stake out his claim to Imamatus. No one can claim to be an Imam who is not survived by a son in the visible and physical sense. Similarly after Hassan and Hussain, two brothers cannot put up their claims to Imamatus as has been reportedly stated by Jafar. Only one of the brothers is the genuine Imam and the Imamatus of the other brother must be rooted in cooked-up-

credentials.

The fifth sect is inclined toward the Imamatus of Hassan's brother, Muhammad bin Ali. They foster the idea that the claims of both Hassan and Jafar to Imamatus were bogus. Jafar was notorious for his immoral practices. He publicly encouraged evil and made no effort to keep himself away from perverse acts. He never tried to cloak his sins but publicized them maximally to satisfy his exhibitionistic inclinations. A man like him could not be accepted as a reliable witness even in the fraud of a dirham, not to talk of his reliability as the standing Imam of the Prophet (peace be upon him). As far as Hassan is concerned, his bonafides are invalidated by the fact that he was not survived by a son.

The sixth sect is wedded to the belief that Hassan bin Ali had a son named Muhammad who was born many years before the death of Hassan but remained invisible. He slipped under cover because he was scared of Jafar.

The seventh sect holds on to the conviction that this son of Hassan was born eight months after his death and those who claim that he was born during his life are liars. Their claim is absolutely bogus because if the child was born during his life, he had no need to conceal his identity out of fear or a feeling of insecurity. The general consensus also supports the views that at the time of his death he was without a son, and if there had been one, his identity could not be concealed. However, the fact of pregnancy was generally confirmed. On top of all, it enjoyed royal endorsement. That is why his heritage remained undivided. The child was born eight months after his death and named Muhammad according to his will. He is also the invisible Imam Muhammad.

The eighth sect holds the belief that Hassan had no son. They have conducted thorough investigation into the whole affair and come out with the conclusion that they have not been able to find any trace of the identity of his son. They further justify their stand that if they presume Hassan had no visible son but had an invisible son, then they will have to lend credibility to similar claims relating to all the dead people. They will have to acknowledge that the Prophet (peace be upon him) was also blessed with an invisible son who was a prophet and an apostle, that Abdullah bin Jafar bin Muhammad had also left behind an invisible son who was a prophet and an apostle, that Abdullah bin Jafar bin Muhammad had also left behind an invisible son, that Abul Hassan Radha had given to posterity three sons in addition to Abu Jafar, out of whom one was entitled to Imamatus. It is a confirmed fact that the Prophet (peace be upon him) had left behind no male issue at the time of his death. Similarly it is a confirmed fact that God had not blessed Abdullah bin Jafar with any male offspring and Radha also did not have four sons. As far as the fact of pregnancy is concerned, it is true that one of his slave maids was pregnant. He had predicted that she would give birth to a male child. It was not proper that an Imam should die without leaving behind a male heir as it negates the concept of Imamatus and invalidates divine presence.

Those who believe in the pre-presence of the child tell them that they are denying something of which they are actually convinced. Then they accuse them of even a greater irrational twist in their reasoning i.e., they believe in the fact of pregnancy but deny the birth of the child. If their investigations have led to a denial of fact of delivery, the investigations of the adherents of this sect have equally led to a denial of the fact of pregnancy. They seem to conclude that if there was no birth, there was no conception either. Therefore they believe that their claim is based on sounder

reasoning. The fact of delivery explains the reality better than the fact of pregnancy, because if the child is born, though invisibly, during the course of time, he might render himself visible while pregnancy is at best only an abstraction and conception does not always culminate in the birth of a child. Possibilities of abortion or miscarriage can not be eliminated either. Besides a conception does not last indefinitely; its maximum span is nine months. And it is endorsed both by biological evidence and the precepts of the Imams. Therefore they reject the thesis of the adherents of this sect and claim that it is based only on a series of absurdities. Members of the ninth sect believe that it is true that Hassan bin Ali, his father, his grandfather and other ancestors all died. Just as the news of his death is incontrovertibly established, similarly the fact that Hassan died without a successor is equally firmly established. Thus the earth is without an Imam today and it is barren of specific divine presence which is manifested through the embodiment of the Imam. But God, Almighty as He is, can appoint any one among the children of Muhammad (peace be upon him) as Imam and revitalize the dead land with a fresh dose of His essence, just as He appointed Muhammad (peace be upon him) as the last prophet even though the chain of prophethood had snapped.

The tenth sect believes that Abu Jafar Muhammad bin Ali had slipped his cable during the life of his father and according to his father's will he was the bonafide Imam; but he had specified the Imamate of a child named Nafis who had served him mostly loyally when he was alive. The child, after his death, had transferred the tag of Imamate to Jafar the invisible Imam and this is unlawful.

The eleventh sect believe that the entire affair is wrapped in doubt and suspicion. They are not sure about the identity of the Imam and they are fumbling in the dark on account of lack of definite information. Though they believe that the earth can not be emptied of the presence of an Imam, they are uncertain about the identity of the contemporary Imam. Therefore they have decided to wait till the picture becomes more clear.

The twelfth sect eschews the articulation of opinions and views expressed by other sects as it amounts to a distortion of reality. They however believe that the earth can at no time be drained of the presence of an Imam. If the Imam is not there, the earth can explode into flames and fly into smithereens. But it is not fair that they should trace the presence of an Imam who is hidden among folds and layers and discuss the intangible issues of his identity and nomenclature as well as spy on his location. For them all efforts and discussions to trace and establish the presence of the invisible Imam are unlawful.

The supporters of the thirteenth sect believe in fact that Hassan bin Ali had turned up his toes. He was the Imam after his father and after him Jafar bin Ali is the Imam just as Musa bin Jafar succeeded Abdullah bin Jafar as Imam. According to convention, after the death of the Imam, Imamate is transferred to his eldest son. On the authority of Sadiq it is established that no two brothers could claim Imamate after Hassan and Hussain. This is the only authentic tradition. All other traditions are fake and seem to be the invention of perverse imagination. This concept is not operative when the real son of the incumbent Imam is present. In this case Imamate is not transferred to his brother but circulates among his children in adherence to the hierarchical principle. But when the Imam hands in his checks, then Imamate is transferred to his brother in pursuance of the concept of necessity. These are the meanings with which the members of the sects have robbed the skeletal tradition expressed by Imam Jafar Sadiq.

Similarly they believe in the tradition that only an Imam gives the final bath to a dead Imam. Therefore they acknowledge that Musa gave the bath to Jafar bin Muhammad. They claim that Abdullah had ordered him to give him the bath because he was the Imam after him. They are adherents of the Fathiyyah sect which legalizes the Imamate of two brothers. It is possible only when the elder brother dies without a male issue. In the light of this interpretation and on the basis of the law of necessity they have acknowledged the Imamate of Jafar bin Ali.

In the opinion of the fourteenth sect Muhammad is the Imam after him, and he is also the "Muntazar". However it is equally true that he has also paid the debt to nature but he will reappear after his death, wield the sword and transform the tyranny-ridden world into a cradle of justice and equity.

These are the well-known Shia sects whose beliefs I have discussed in the light of Shia literature. References to Sunni literature are adduced, not to support the argument, but only as a quantitative factor to add to the massive evidence furnished by the books of Shia scholars. The Sunni experts on Shia sects have mentioned a number of other Shia sects in addition to the ones described above. For example, Biyaniyyah, Jinahiyyah, Rizamiyyah, Miqniyyah, Hilmaniyyah, Hilabiyyah, Izafirah etc but I don't like to delve into them first because these sects are now non-existent and secondly because they are not recorded in the Shia books. I'll not touch upon them to block the objection that these factions are unheard of and have not been mentioned in the books by Shia writers, that their names are self-fabricated to serve the purpose of ridicule and invective. These designations are without their corresponding designates and reflect only the prejudice of those who have coined these labels. None of the historians has referred to them to validate their authenticity. The relevant Shia writers have not mentioned them either. For instance, Shaikh Abu Muhammad Hassan bin Musa Nau Bakhti who belongs to the fourth century and who is considered to be an authority on the genesis of Shia sects, has not pointed out these sects anywhere in his book.

The sect that remains to be discussed is the Ithna Ashriyyah or Jafriyyah or Imamiyyah, though it has been incidentally referred to in the context of the fourteen sects which came into existence after the death of Hassan Askari: But this sect enjoys a special status in the eyes of the Shias as compared to other sects and the detailed discussion has been conducted mainly to highlight the views and beliefs of this sect. When the word Shia is used in its absolute sense the mind is instantly switched on to this sect. This is the reason I have decided to devote a separate chapter to this beliefs of this sect, its history, its relationship with Sabaiism and the fake views and beliefs of other extremist and fanatic Shia sects which have filtered into its fundamental corpus and disfigured its original complexion. The chapter will also include the sects which have mushroomed out of it and added to pot-pourri of beliefs and convictions which have reduced Shiaism to an amorphous heterogeneity of scrambled opinions and prejudices. A reference will be made to these off-shoots because they still hover over the Shia horizon and carry a weight of their own.

Only a bird-eye view is enough to convince the reader of the massive Sabai infiltrations into its basic frame-work of beliefs and convictions. Besides it has received heavy doses of Zoroastrian, Christian, Hindu, Babylonian and other beliefs which have muddled up its real complexion. Another factor that links the splintered Shia factions is their inalienable belief in return or resurrection, invisibility, overlordship, dissociation or dis-affiliation from those who do not share their bogus

beliefs and acknowledgement of beliefs embodied in the old Testament because these views had been endorsed and disseminated by Abdullah bin Saba and the bunch of rascals who followed him, and thereby stressed their validity and authenticity as indispensable tenets of the doctored faith.

Shia's of Ithna-e-Ashriyya

The Imamiyyah sect believes in the impalpable Imamate of Muhammad bin Hassan Askari. Allama Samani observes in "al-Insab" "Imamiyyah is a phalanx of extremist Shias. The genesis of its nomenclature is that it restricts Imamate to Hadhrat Ali and his progeny. It is their belief that people must be led by an Imam in every historical period. They are also expecting an Imam who will appear during the terminal era".

This clique is also known as Ithna "ashriyyah because its adherents believe in the existence of twelve imams: hadhrat ali, hadhrat hassan, hadhrat hussain, hadhrat zain-ul-abidin, muhammad bin ali baqir, jafar sadiq, musa kazim, ali bin musa radha, Muhammad bin Ali jawed, Ali bin Muhammad had, Hussein bin Ali asker, and Muhammad bin Hussein media, the third designation clamped on the 'Camarillo' is that of jafriyyah. It originated in the fact that its devotees follow the religious model introduced and perpetuated by imam jafar in all collateral matters and large clump of their religious principles are derived from his practice. Besides these labels. It carries the unwhole-some burden of the tag of rafidhiyyah or ruzfidh. The acquisition of this label is rooted in the fact of history. At a certain juncture these shias had openly shuffled out of their commitment to the imams and spared no effort to demonstrate their insincerity towards imams and spared no effort to demonstrate their insincerity and disloyalty towards them. Hadhrat Ali once remarked:

"If I intend to discriminate between my shias and others, I would find my shias experts in the art of exaggeration and in spinning out yarns; if I put them to a test, I would find them apostates; and if I try to determine their sincerity during an ordeal, I would find not even one out of a thousand sincere" imam zain-ul-abidin also accused them of a similar back-tracking. He observed that the shias of Hussein had turned apostate on account of their timidity and pusillanimity. There were only five exceptions who did not shake in their shoes and refused to follow the pack. They were abu khalid kabli, yahya bin um tavi, jabir bin muti, jabir bin abdullah and shabkah, hussain's wife. The others had backed out of their allegiance. Shias are notorious for leaving their imams in the lurch on critical junctions and for leaving them alone to fight the raging fires of war which they leaving them alone to fight the raging fires of war which they themselves had kindled. This fact has been repeatedly stressed in the preceding pages. Those whose curiosity is not muffled by these details and are determined to indulge in further intellectual adventurism are advised to study to study asfihani's book "maqatil-it-talibin". This book is packed with information about ali's progeny. A number of them climbed imamat but the shias degraded and humiliated them. The term 'rafidhi' sprang up as a result of their unblushing disobedience. When zaid bin ali bin hussain came out with a few commendatory words about hadhrat abu bakr and umar, the shias were stung to the roots and disowned him publicly. Hadhrat zaid commented (they have today) this is the reason they were called rafidha".

Razi has also explained its origin. When zaid bin ali bin ali bin hussain bin ali bin abi talib revolted against hisham bin abdul malik, his army openly criticized and ridiculed hadhrat abu bakr. He snubbed them and asked them to leash their tongues. But the shias, instead of acting on his advice, dumped him until only two hundred men of the cavalry stood by him. Zaid bin ali asked them: have you left me? They replied: yes. From that day they received the epithet rafidhi.

There are people who believe that rafidhis are those who give precedence to hadhrat ali over other imams. The word is more or less used in the sense of revenge and shias are unhesitatingly dubbed as rafidhis in an outburst of their vengeful intensity.

This is, however, based on lack of information or sheer ignorance because the shias have persistently tried to escape the unpalatable epithet which has become their permanent of bokhari in the eyes of shias) that muhammad bin sulaiman has related on the authority of his father: I submitted before abu abdullah jafar-the six innocent imam of the shias-the allegations that are hurled on us have broken our backs and deadened our hearts. According to a certain tradition the rulers consider it lawful to

shed our blood. Abu abdullah asked: are you referring to rafidha. When I replied in the affirmative, he said: I swear, this name has not been imposed on you by your opponents but it is god who has conferred on you this label."

They also believe that they are extraordinary people while others are ordinary. This is the height of their prudery and prudism. But the irony is that their priggish and niminy-piminy attitude is hardly justified by their general behaviour. Their practical conduct does not establish their superiority or extraordinariness. In many cases they are even worse than the sweepings of humanity they so lackadaisically seem to persiflage. In fact what they badinage anthers is found in massive doses in themselves. Therefore the myth of their exceptionality is an other invention of their diseased of their chronic inferiority complex and the sense of guilt which has bombarded their consciousness as a consequence of their tinkering with hallowed traditions and tampering with the fundamental tenets of faith, thought they do not confess it. The prunes and prisms displayed by the Shi community are a visible proof of their of their guilt. Since they lack moral courage they do not have the guts to admit that their faith and the entire spectrum of values they seem to profess are in fact embedded in falsehood and a blatant deviation from the right track. It is their sheer stubbornness and priggishness which compel them to perpetuate a lie sustaining it through fresh shots of malicious invention and perverse addition. However, their simpering and spanking attitude reflects only the hollowness of their pretensions. They resemble the jews in their coxcombry and 'mauvaise honte'. Like them they indulge in namby-pamby and la-di-da platitudes! they are conceited, up-stage, high hat, good-goody people who have elevated a fake and worthless series of cliches into a philosophy of sanctity but they have failed to paper over the ugliness that blinks behind the rattle of their empty words. they believe in the emergence of the very fundamentals of their faith. since they have propped up the existence of their imam on a mere supposition, they are under great stress to establish him as a man of flesh and blood as it is not easy to dress one's purley imaginary flights in the apparel of reality. thus it is an extremely uphill task the clouds of suspicion not only in the minds of others but opinions about the intangible imam and the clash and jumble of their supposition. some of them even subscribe to the view that when his father died, he had left behind neither a specification about his successor nor any son to continue his heritage.

some of them cling to the belief that one of his slave maids was pregnant but the pregnancy had resulted in miscarriage and not in the birth of a child. kulaini has related a tradition attributed to ahmad bin ubaidullah bin khaqan: when hassan askari died, a roar burst out in 'surman rai' the king dispatched one of his officials to his residence who combed the entire house and sealed all the goods. he conducted a thorough investigation to find out a son was expected or not. he sent for a few women who were well versed in the problem related to conception and pregnancy. these women examined all of his slave maids. some one told them that one of the maids was pregnant. thus she was quarantined in a special room and some eunuchs, her companions and other ladies were appointed to guard her. all of them kept a steady watch over her till it was finally confirmed that pregnancy was only an imaginary figment.

There are others who believe that the child was born eight months after hassan's death while many others float the idea that he was born two years before his death i.e., he was born in sur man rai' on 23rd ramadhan in 258 A.H. some of them place his death within the year 56 A.H. while others believe that the birth of the child had

taken place five years before hassan's death and he had come into the world on 15 shaban, 255 A.H.

a similar difference of opinion exists among the shias about the name of the slave-maid who is supposed to be the mother of the impalpable imam. some of them have named her nargis, others call her saqil or saiqal. she has also been named hakimah etc.

ibn hazm remarks that in the opinion of imamiyyah rafidha, muhammad bin hassan is alive. he has not died and he will continue to live until he has wiped out tyranny and injustice. the shias also call him muhammad bin hassan mehdi muntazar. one of the shia groups holds the opinion that the birth of this imam-though he was never born and his existence is a mere supposition as he exists only in the minds of the shias-took place in 260 A.H., i.e., he was born the same year his father died. another group flouts this hypothesis and entertains the equally fictitious belief that he was born many years after the death of his father. still another group believes that he came into the world during the life of his father. they have attributed this tradition to hakimah bint muhammad bin ali bin musa who was present on the occasion of his birth. she heard him speaking and reciting the quran soon after his birth. his mother was called nargis. the jamhur shias believe that her name was saqil. another group calls her sosan but all these hypotheses are illustrations of their psychic perversions. they indicate their loose and tenuous grip on facts. they in fact are living in a world of illusions and the worst part of it is that these illusions are self-induced and reflect a conscious attempt of these shias to lead astray an entire community of believers. it also shows that they have no scruples whatsoever and are willing to sacrifice reality for illusion, not because they are contributing to philosophical theorizing or other positive which is engendered more by the spleen than by the mind. therefore all of their suggestions are packs of absurdities because hassan committed by the shias and their other stupidities spring directly from it. this, in fact, provides the key to their grotesque philosophy. though it sounds trivial, its long-range repercussions for the cohesion of the islamic faith are absolutely catastrophic.

then a plethora of yarns and cock-and-bull stories were spun out to celebrate the birth of a child who was never born, to explain his invisibility not only from people outside the fold of the family but the family members themselves who remained completely in the dark about his birth and then it was sprung upon them as the biggest surprise to their lives, these unbelievable tales relate not only to his birth but also to his growth and development, how he reached the age of imam, how he acquired the knowledge and information which is one of the essential prerequisites of imamat in the eyes of the shias. in fact, shias have invented the most fantastic explanations to justify their illusions. but illusions are illusions and cannot be transformed into realities through the flawed will of a gaggle of ducklings, even if they rely on a formidable battery of evidence to give credence in the following pages to expose their lie and to give credence to my thesis that their religion is propped up on an illusion which has no roots whatsoever in reality. i would like to discuss the belief of this group at comparatively greater length because its adherents claim to be the true representatives of the shias and embody the shia faith in its unadulterated essence. they believe that they are the apricots, not the onions, of the shia religion. my belief is that their claim is bogus and is negated by facts as its total structure is raised on the existence of a human personality who never saw the light of the day. these inflated balloons' and puffed-up tubes; are actually filled out with the air of pure insubstantiality and are absolutely devoid of the concrete of corporeality.

One of the shia exegetes who is never tired of flaunting this intergrity is abu tabrisi. he belonged to the sixth century a.h. he relies on babwi qummi who has relied on hakimah bint muhammad ali through the mediation of muhammad bin hassan bin wail, muhammad bin ali sent word to me: o mt auntie, you should pray with me to night because it is the fifteen night of shaban. god will reveal one of his mediators who will function as the divine intercessory on earth. i asked: who will be his mother? he replied: nargis. i submitted: nargis does not carry any such indication. he replied:it hardly matters whether there is any indication or not but whatever i am saying shall certainly come to pass. when i wanted to seat down, nargis leaped towards me and beganto take off his socks. she said to me:how are u, O Sayyidah? i replied: is it you who is my Sayyiahand the Sayyiah of my Ahl-i-bait. my words surprised her and she said:what are you saying? i told her: mt daughter,tonight god will bless you with a child who will be the 'Sayyid' not only in this world but also in the world to come. on hearing this she felt a sense of shame and guilt. When I finished my night, i had my meals and tehn reeled off to sleep. i stood up for my prayers, nargis was stil in her night and when i finished my prayers, nargis was still in her senses and nothing had happened to her. i sat there for a while then slumped to bed. whne i woke up again i found that nargis was asleep. then she woke up, offered her prayers tehn ent back to sleep again. hakimah adds: i came out of th ehouse to find if it was day break or not. it wasn't dawn yet and nargis was still asleep. doubts and suspicions cropped up in my mind. but abu muhammad shouted at the to of his voices: auntie dont rush, the time has arrived. i sat up and stated recitng the Quran. i recited Surah Sajidah and yasin. i was still busy in recitation that nargis startled out her sleep. i at once leapt towards her and asked her: may god protect you ! are you feeling anything? she replied : yes. i said: compose yourself and dont lose heart. what i had told you is about to happen.

then nargis and myself became drowsy with sleep. i woke up as i heard the foot-steps of my master. i flicked away the piece of cloth covering nargis and saw the new born imam prostrating on the gorund. i lifted him and dandled him against my breast. he was a clean, bonny baby. abu muhammad shouted: auntie, bring my child over to me. i took teh child over to him. he placed both of his hands under the head nad back of the child and pressed his feet fondly against his chest. he put his tongue into his mouth, rubbed his hand over his eyes, ears adn other parts of his body adn said to him: speak, my son. the son came out with thee words: i witness that god has no rivals or partners and that muhmmad is his messenger. then the child sent salutations on amir-ul-mominin and other imams, talked about his father and had his milk.

abu muhammad said: auntie, take him to his mother so that he my pay er his regards and then bring him back. he said: auntie, come after seven days. hakimah adds: i came over in the morning to pay him my courtsies. i drew away the curtain to have a glimpse of my sayyid but i found that he was not there. i submitted to sbu muhammad: may i be sacrificed for you, where is my sayyed? he replied: i have placed him in the trust of a person to whom um-e-musa had entrusted her child. hadkimah further adds: i called on him after the seventh day. i greeted abu muhammad. he said: bring my son over me. i picked up my sayyid who was wearing a robe make of patches nad shreds. he repeated what he had done on the first day. he put his tongue inside: speak, my son. the child uttered the words: i witness that god has no rivals or partners. he sent salutations on hadhrat muhammad (peace be upon him), amir-ul--mominin ali and other imams, and he paused as he mentioned his father. then he recited the following verse:

"And we desired to oblige the people who had grown weaker in the country, to confer on them leadership, to make them inherit their country, to give them power them power within the country and to unravel to pharaoh and haman of which they were scared"

this tradition has been reported by muslla baqir majlisi with a heavy sprinkling of fresh spices and additions from kulaini, ibne babwi qummi, tusi and sayyed murtadha etc. who is popularly known by the epithet of iim-ul-huda. this episode has also been related by rijali, the shia historian and by the muntahil-amal.

the shias have tried to wrap up the fantasy in the authentic robes provided by their scholars like babwi qummi and tusi etc. but the fantasy appears to be even more grotesque because the authenticity of their sources is equally dubious. this is, in fact the general pattern of their reasoning. they first invent an obscenity and then rely on a battery of cooked-up evidence to sanctify and then rely on a battery they let an opportunity slip to indicate their logical approach, expose the malice at the bottom of their fake reasoning and expose the malice at the bottom of their intentions. their with startling innovations. the yarns they spin out to bamboozle and coherence. And they are such shameless creatures evidence and dressing up their are such shameless creatures evidence and dressing up their have packed their moral scruples. And this is quite understandable, if one is aware of the different levels of their perversity. if they can lambast and lampoon the companions of the prophet (peace be upon him), the fabrication of lies and fantasies is hardly expected to give them an un-easy feeling.

hakimah also states in the same yarn: i started reciting and the child inside the womb also followed suit: he repeated my words. He also greeted me from inside the belly of his mother. I was scared as i heard the voice of the child coming from the womb. abu muhammad shouted: don't be surprised by what god has revealed. god in his infinite wisdom blesses us with the power of speech when we are children and when we grow up, we become divine representatives on earth. He had not yet completed his explanation that nargis disappeared. it seemed a screen had interposed between us. i ran towards abu muhammad screamingly. He said: auntie, please go back. You'll find Nargis at the same spot. I had not yet turned about that the curtain that had interposed between us was suddenly raised. My eyes were dazzled by the paragon of light. I saw that the child was in a state of prostration. He lifted his fore-finger towards the sky and said: i witness that there is no deity to be worshipped except allah. My grand-father is the messenger of allah and my father is amir-ul-mominin. then he counted all the imams down to himself. later he prayed: o god! fulfil the promise you have assigned to me. Don't let me falter (in my mission) and transform the world into a cradle of justice and equity through my agency. Abu muhammad said to me: auntie, bring the child over to me. when i took him there he stood on his feet in front of his father and greeted him affectionately. hassan took him away from me. I saw birds were fluttering over the head of the child. He was assisting him in sucking his tongue. It seemed as if he was quaffing some syrup from him. Hassan said: take him to his mother so that she may feed him milk. then bring him back to me. I took him to his mother. She suckled him and sent him back to abu Muhammad. the birds were still flapping over his head. One of the birds screamed out: pick him up, take good care of him and bring him over to us once in every forty days. the bird held him in his claws and flapped away into the skies: my child, I trust you to the same entity to whom um-e-musa had entrusted her child. Nargis started crying at this sight. abu muhammad told her to be quiet. the milk of other women is unlawful for this child. Therefore, he will soon be returned

to you as musa was returned to his mother. god himself says: "I returned musa to his mother; so that she might cool her eyes to see her son and escape frustration and grief".

Hakimah says: I asked him about the bird. He replied: The bird is the sacred soul who is a permanent companion of the up on a definite pattern. The child was returned after forty dys. I saw that the face of the chld was inclined towards my nephew. He called me. When i went near him, is saw that the child was waling in front of his father. I submitted: O sayyid! The chld appears to be two years old. he smiled and replied: the childern of the prophets who are imams in the making grow by more raped strides than other children. My child has gorwn in one month to the size that other children take at least a year to grow up to. Our children speak while they are in the bellies of their mohters, they recite the quran and they pray to god in thier state of conception and infancy and the angels greet them day and night.

I saw the child after every forty days until a few days before the death of abu Muhammad he had grown into a handsome young man. I could not reconginse him and i asked my nephew: who is he before whom you have asked me to unveil myself? he replied: he is the son of Nargis and after me he will be my khalifah. after a short while, you'll not find me but you should contiune to obey my words"

tabrisi has also endorsed it in "IIam-ul-wara" with the following addition. Nasim, one of the servants, told me when he visited him teh night after the birth of the heirapparent, he sneezed. He said: When i was over-joyed to hear his comment, he said: Shall i inform you about the significance of your sneeze? I said; please do. He replied. it means i shall stay alive for three days.

Ibn fatal observes: when the sayyed was born, his father sent for abu amro. When he came, he told him to distribute ten thousand packs of bread and ten thousand packets of meat. Ali bin hashim remarks that countless goats were sayyed was born, a light beamed out of him which reached the horizon'. I saw white birds descending fomr the sky who touched the head, the face adn teh entire body of the newborn with their feathers and then fluttered up into the sky. when we recounted it to his father, he burst into laugh and get his blessings and when he appears on the earth as imam, these angels will be his helpers and supporters.

A Question: A sensible person would naturally like to ask why is he scared and hiding himslef in a cave if the angels are his helpers and supporters? and if hassan's son ispresent in ingly raped peace, then any further investigation about him is a pointless exercise. if this heir-apparent fo hassan was present, then how his borthe Ja'far managed to usurp his heritage?

The fourth note-worthy point is that the status of the grandsons of teh prophet (peace be upon him) is an open secret. No one is unaware of the superiority enjoyed by hassan and hussain. If their superirity is acknowledged on all hands, then the facts of thier normal and natural gorwth obviously subtracts something form their exceptional status and tarnishes their superiority. this especially applies to hadhrat hussain who is considered to be the father of all the succeeding imams by the shias and the presence of the prophet (peace be upon him) was obviously an additional factor. The traditions of teh shias are eloquent about the fact that at the time of teh death of the prophet (peace be upon him) hadhrat hussain was still a child adn he had not crossed over into the adolescent phase with any miraculous or supernatural speed. Leaveing hadhrat hassan nad hussain aside, it is not at all possible to indicate

any imam who might have broken the natural barrier of growth to achieve adolescence far in advance of the normal ripening age.

The fifth obvious point is that no sensible person is willing to lap up the quantum of exaggeration and distortion contained in these fantasies. One naturally pities the person who manufactured these bungle because he pathetically lacks the art of a skillful inventor, it reflects his stupidity and total lack of finesse in invention.

The fable of the birds and the yarn of the disappearance of Nargis are absurd tales which are often related by the storytellers in informal gatherings and coffee-house. They are hopelessly deficient in truthfulness and seem to be the products of an inexplicable sense of malice or members of the Hashimi and Alvi tribes were completely in the dark about their reality though these members included persons of the stature of Um-i-Hassan, Hassan's brother and on top of the list as the navel of Ahmad bin Abdus-Samad, popularly known as Tumar, who also maintained a register showing the names of Alvi children. When a person in 302 A.D. claimed that he was Muhammad bin Hassan Askari and the news reached Muqtadir, the Abbasid Caliph, he sent for Abitabib's herald to investigate the matter. He also sought the advice of other experts to sort fact from fiction. All of them unanimously condemned him as a liar as Hassan Askari had died without leaving behind an issue. The claimant was a person falling into his trap.

These yarns and perversities are in themselves an eloquent proof of the fact that the Shias have hopelessly failed to establish the truth of their claim. Besides the Shias are also deeply divided on this issue and the majority of Askari's son because no son was born to him, they obviously fell victim to a wide cleavage of opinion.

Finally, I would like to record a tradition whose veracity is simply unquestionable in the eyes of the Shias and which has been recorded in al-Kafi, their most authentic book. Kulaini, had related it on the authority of Ahmad bin Ubaidullah bin Khaqan who is an enthusiastic supporter of the Imamate of Hassan Askari. The tradition runs as follows: when Hassan Askari fell ill, he informed his father of the capital. He returned immediately and he was accompanied by five servants of the Amir-ul-Mominin. They were all tried and loyal servants. Nahrir was one of them. He commanded all of them to remain with Hassan and to keep tabs on his movements and to inform him about what happened inside his house. He also sent word to a batch of medical practitioners to visit him and nurse him day and night. He was apprised after two or three days that Hassan had grown considerably weaker. He commanded the doctors to stay by his bed and keep him under constant care. He also sent word to the chief justice. When he arrived, he commanded him to pick out ten reliable persons among his companions who had distinguished themselves on the basis of piety, trustworthiness and faith. He dispatched them to Hassan's house and commanded them to stay inside the house. These people stayed there until he breathed his last. Hassan's death generated a squall of cries and wails in 'sur man rai'. The king dispatched some of his officials to his house who surveyed and examined all the objects at his residence and sealed all the goods. They also looked into the possibility of the birth of a child who could claim succession after him. In this context they utilized the services of women who had any information about a potential pregnancy and who possessed expertise in the relevant field. These women conducted a medical examination of the slave maids of Hassan Askari. Some of them were of the opinion that one of the slave maids was pregnant. She was, therefore, quarantined in a separate room and Nahrir, the servant, his companions and some of the women were appointed to guard and serve her. Later all of them

became busy in Hassan Askari's funeral rites. The streets and bazars of the town were closed down. Banu Hashim, Banu Qawas, Banu Abi and others participated in the funeral ceremonies. It seemed as if hell had broken loose in Surman Rai'. When the dead body had broken loose in Surman Rai. When the dead body had been washed and wrapped in the coffin, the king asked Abul 'Isa bin Muta-wakkil to lead the funeral prayers. When the coffin was placed on the ground for prayers, Abu Isa took away the cloth from his face and invited Banu Hashim, the lives, the Abbasis, the leaders, the lawyers and the judges to have a final glimpse of his face. He told them while showing the face: Here lies Hassan bin Ali Muhammad bin Radha who died on his death bed. Such and such among the reliable and trustworthy servants of the Amir-ul-Mominin, such and such judges and such and such medical experts were present. Then he covered his face again. He ordered the funeral to be carried away and he was buried in the same house his father was buried.

After the performance of the funeral rites the king as well as other people tried to find out if he has left behind any issue. They knocked at each and every door for this purpose. The division of his heritage was suspended. The people who have been appointed to guard the slave maid kept up their watch until it was established beyond doubt that the pregnancy was only an illusion. After the myth of pregnancy had been exploded, his heritage was distributed between his mother and his brother J'afar. His mother filed claim relating to the will which was established in the court.

All Shia historians, writers and muhaddithin have related this tradition. For instance, Mufid in "al-Irshad" Tabrisi in "Ilam-ul-wara Urbili in "Kashaf-ul-ghummah, Mulla Baqir Majlisi in Jila-ul-uyyun, the author of Fusul in "al-Fusul al-mohmah " and Abbas Qummi in "Muntahil-amal have reproduced the tradition in the same words.

This tradition has demolished the entire structure of the birth and Imamate of the twelfth extinct Imam which is raised on a foundation of the twelfth extinct Imam which is raised on a foundation of yarns and self-imagined concoctions.

A number of distinguished Shia scholars have themselves acknowledged the irrefutable fact that Hassan Askari was not blessed with a son during his life nor did the people find any clue to any one of his sons after his death. Therefore, Imamate passed on to his brother J'afar who confiscated his entire belongings and tried to secure the same position among the Shias as his brother and achieved.

Why did they spin the birth-yarn of the extinct Imam?

The Shias have tried to invest this imaginary figure with a corporeal frame because they wanted to escape the questions posed by their adversaries, they wanted to evade the pits which they have dug out themselves, they wanted to cover the self-fabricated myths about their own Imams through the equally fabricated invention of the extinct Imam. It is axiomatic that lies hatch lies, they do not hatch chickens or rabbits. The lies pile on one another, until they acquire a complex tissue of lies and what kind of a religion it is whose very foundations are raised on the fragile cement of lies. For example, the Shias invented the principle that an Imam does not die unless he has specified his successor and he does so only if he is blessed with a son. Kulaini has attributed it to Jafar that an Imam does not die without an intimation about his successor and until he has indicated his Imamate in his will.

Their second principle about Imamate was that it is transferred through succession. Kulaini has attributed it to J'afar that Imamate will not be conferred on two brothers

after hassan abd hussain ali bin abi talib, and according to the divine injunction imam will now circulate only among the children of ali. similarly kulaini has attributed an other tradition purporting to the restricted circulation of imam to isa bin abdullah bin umaion ali bin abi-talib. I asked abu abdullahy who should i entrust with imam in case an accident happens? he pointed towards his son Musa. i asked what should be done in case an accident happened to musa? he replied in that case his son should be appointed the imam. i again submitted: what should be done in case his son is i again submitted: what should be done in case his son is involved in an accident and he has left behind an elder brother and a younger son? he replied his son should be appointed the imam and then the son of his son should be appointed the imam and the succession should pass on from son to son. you should always appoint the son of a son as imam.

They have ascribed a tradition to ali bin musa radha to lend further substance to the principle of succession of imam among the sons. he was asked if imam could be transferred to a paternal uncle or a maternal uncle? he replied in the negative. he was asked again if it could be transferred to a brother. he again replied in the negative. he was asked once again who would be the recipient of imam after him though he has not yet been blessed with a son. what he meant was that the birth of his son was a necessary pre-requisite of imam because both are concomitant in fact. The presence of a son validates the transfer of imam. It remains lame-dock and invalidated otherwise. The third point to note is that imam is transferred only to the eldest son. Kulaini has spelled out certain indications of imam on the authority of ali bin musa. One of the specified indications is that he should be the eldest son of his father. he also is entitled to imam unless he is marred by some flaw or is entitled to imam unless he is marred by some flaw or defect when ali bin musa bin j'afar was asked to pin-point the principal indication of imam, he replied that to be the eldest son was its chief indication.

the fourth point relates to the shia conviction that only an imam gives the final bath to an imam. They have confirmed it on the authority of ali radha that the imam receives his final bath from an other imam. the fifth indication of an imam is that the prophet's armour fits him. Accordingly they have attributed it to imam baqir that one of the evident signs of an imam is that when he wears the prophet's armour, it fits him to dot, and if some one else of greater or smaller height wears it, it will exceed his height by the length of a hand. similarly ibni babwi qummi has related on the authority of ali bin musa radha, the eighth imam of the shias, that the armour of the prophet (peace be upon him) invariably fits an imam. J'afar bin baqir had argued in favour of the imam of his son musa on the same basis as has been endorsed by abdur rahman bin hajjaj. He said to imam j'afar; may i be sacrificed for your sake, you know my visits to you have been pretty much curtailed. Therefore, please tell me who will be the imam after you? he replied musa had worn the armour and it fitted him.

The sixth indication of an imam is that he is also in possession of the prophet's weapons. Kulaini has attributed it to ali bin musa bin j'afar has stated that imam is recognized by three attributes which are exclusive; (1) He should be the closest to indicate his imam in his will, and (3) he should be in possession of the prophet's weapons.

The seventh sign of an imam is that he should excel others in the quality of his knowledge. Kulaini substantiates this attribute through the words of Abul Hassan.

"All the Imams are equal in knowledge and valour". Hur Amili has attributed it to Ali bin Musa bin J'afar. Imam is unique in his times. No one can match him in excellence; no scholar can excel him in knowledge, no one can act as his substitute, no one can be his equal. God confers on him special attributes through his blessings. Ibn Babawaiqummi also ascribes it to Ali bin Musa bin J'afar that Imam has many attributes. One of these attributes is the superior orientation of his knowledge as compared to the knowledge of others and he is also braver than others and his valour is not circumscribed by the pleasantness or unpleasantness of a situation; it is marked by an unfluctuating consistency.

The eighth attribute of an Imam is that an Imam is immune to ejaculation and wet dreams. The Shias have confirmed this attribute on the authority of Ali bin Musa bin J'afar.

The ninth principle credits the Imam with a knowledge of hidden secrets. The secrets of the universe unfold before the Imam on account of his exceptional status and this is what distinguishes him from other people. He possesses knowledge of all the revealed books and the linguistic variations do not hinder his understanding of their contents. They have mentioned a number of other qualifications. Ibn Babawaiqummi spells out on the authority of Ali bin Musa bin J'afar that an Imam possesses a number of attributes: He is the most learned among the people; he possesses the qualities of justice, piety, humility, valour, magnanimity and righteousness in the superlative degree; he is pure and virtuous by birth, he is blessed with both retrospective and prospective future. He is without a shadow. When he is in his mother's womb, he raises both of his hands and witnesses the uniqueness of God as the creator and the apostle-hood of Muhammad (peace be upon him). He does not have wet dreams or nocturnal discharge. His eyes sleep but his heart keeps awake; he is also a muhaddith. The prophet's armour fits him. His faeces cannot be seen because it is the divine duty of the earth to swallow it. His smell is superior to that of camphor. He is greater well-wisher for the people, even more than themselves; he is more affectionate towards them, even more than their parents. His attitude is most complaisant towards God. He himself practises or eschews what he commands or forbids others to do and his deeds of commission or omission are marked by exceptional attachment or detachment. His prayers are readily recognized and "robed as destinies". If he prays against a rock, it splits into two halves in the flash of a second. He possesses the weapons and the sword of the prophet (peace be upon him). He has a book in which are entered the names of his followers who are likely to be born till doomsday; similarly, he has a book in which are entered the names of his enemies who are likely to be born till doomsday. He also possesses a book which is seventy hands long and contains a reference to all human needs and contingencies. He has a special leather on which are recorded all the branches of knowledge and scholarship; he is also in possession of a page of Fatima's Quran.

An other hadith testifies to his closest affiliation with God. Between him and God are some pillars of light through which he can have a look at the deeds of all human beings. Imam J'afar is supposed to have commented that the world will be ruined and devastated if it is drained of the presence of an Imam. It is also attributed to him that if only two persons survive on earth, one of them will be the divine agent. These are foundation principles on which the Shias raised the structure of Imamate. But when the life-style of many of their Imams nor are they capable of embodying and many of their Imams nor are they changed the facts to harmonize with fiction which was purely a product of their monition with fiction which was purely a product of their

over-fertile fancy. for example, some of teh imams were not the eldest sons of their fathers, musa kazim and hassain askri are the obvious examples; some of them wre not given teh final bath by any of the imams: ali bin musa bin j'afar was gieven teh final bathe by his son jawad who was hardly eight years old at that time. similarly musa bin j'afar did not receive the bath from his son because he was not present at thejuncture of his death. he happended to be in madina at that time.

It is also not clearly established wheather zain-ul-abidin had been able to manage the inal bath of his father hadhrat hussain with his own hands. The doubt crops upits ugly head on two counts; first he was bed-ridden, and second the armed forces of ibn mobilty. There were also some of the imams whom the prophet's armor did not fit at all. For instance, Muhammad bin ali radha was hardly eith years old at teh time of his father's death. similarly when he died his son ali bin Muhammad was of a tender age. Again some fo the imams did not possess the prophet's weapons. if muhammad had possessed these weapons, his brother zaid would not had have picked up a quarrel with him, similarly adullah aftah etc, would not have taken up teh cudgels against musa bin j'afar. some of the imams were only moderate scholars and did not live on the summit of knowledge which is considered to be the hallmark of an imam by teh shias, How can a mere child be the greatest scholar of histimeslteh shias themselves have stated that their child imams hadto imbibe knowledge and learing under the supervisoin adn gudance of other people. the shias wre also skepticla about the quantum of knowlege possessed by some of their imams j'afar skeptcism has not spared even j'afar bin baqir. Imam j'afar himself supports, raather connives at the skiptical attitude.

"May god bless zurarah bin ain. if persons like zurarah had not been there, teh sayings of my father would have been destroyed. zurarah has also commented on imam j'afar and his father in these words.

"May god bless abu j'afar. My heart is not satisfied on his count.

He has also added:

"This companins of your lacks in-sight abut matters relating to rijal (study of men)

Similar views have been circulated about the knowledge of is son musa. abu baisr muradi is ont one of the most dependable shia reprters. j'afar bin muhammad had anticipated his entry into paradise. Kashi has reported from shoaib aqr qufi aoubt the same abu basir. When abul hassn was mentioned inteh presence of aub basir, he remared; in my opinion the wisdom adn understanding of our companion is compainion is not yet complete. one of the traditions gives a more blunt complexion to is comments; in my opinion the knowledge of our companion is imperfect.

As far as valour is concerned, the shias rank Hadhrat Hussain the hightest among the Imams whose valour is almost proverbial and it is their conviction that no other Imam can match him in courage and bravery. What has been recorded about the bravery of other Imams is in fact grounded in fiction and fantasy because none of had the guts to defy and resist the ruler of his times. On the contrary some of them expressed thier alleginace to them. some of the imams kept themselves aloof form those of thier cousins who raised them even their moral support. some of them were extra as has been related in teh last chapeter. all these facts are shias aoubt the role played by hadhrat hassan are standard fare and any attempt to tone them down or gloss them over is like denying sunshine on a hot summer day

The facts also contradict the thesis that the imams possessed knowledge of past and the future. If this had been the case, their answers to the question posed by their followers would not have been riddled with contradictions and inconsistencies. The imams were aware of the facts that the people who asked questions were their sincere followers and not their inveterate enemies. Nau Bakhti has singled out the case of Umar bin al-Bayhaq. He asked Abu Ja'far a question which he answered apparently to the best of his knowledge. Next year he asked the same question but he came out with an entirely different explanation. He humbly submitted to the revered imam that his second explanation was obviously out of step with his first explanation though the question was identically phrased on both occasions. He however tried to justify the glaring incompatibility by suggesting that sometimes his replies were based on dissimulation (ta'iyyah) or conscious distortion and the degree of dissimulation is dictated by the exigency of the occasion. His companions, God knows that when I had asked him the question, it was my sincere intention to act on his edict because I could not possibly doubt his explanation as it carried in my eyes the stature of a religious injunction. When my loyalty to him was absolutely unqualified, he has no reason whatsoever to rely on dissimulation. It seems both the answers were based on improvisation. Therefore, he did not remember the answer he had given me last year. Later Umar bin al-Bayhaq publicly deposed his imam and proclaimed that an imam who issued incorrect edicts could not possibly be an imam.

Kulani has related in his *Kafi* on the authority of Zararah bin An. I asked Abu Ja'far a question. He answered it. Then someone else asked him the same question. But the other man came over and he also posed the same question but the answer he gave this time clashed with the first two. Both of them belong to Iraq and your confirmed followers but you have given them different answers, though the questions they posed were identical.

Abu Ja'far: Zararah, it is good for us. This mode of action is good for our survival and for your survival. If you agree among yourselves, people, will give credibility to your views about us and this will endanger our mutual survival. You shun the points of your lances or burn them alive in the fire, they will always leave you in a state of rift and division". But he responded to it the way.

The linguistic versatility of the imams is also a myth and melts away instantly on the hot-plate of reality. But for the Shias their fantasies have hardened into facts and they are finding it increasingly hard to get out of the shell of myths fabricated by their own fertile imagination.

When Hassan Askari was left stranded without a male issue, the Shias felt the skyscraper of their faith crumbling. Therefore, they spun out the yarn of an extinct child to escape the burst of unpalatable questions in the coming times. Their failure to invent a plausible excuse would have landed them into a two-pronged danger. On the one hand it would have inflicted a fatal blow on their view and ideas, and on the other hand, it would have thrown into suspicion the Imamate of Hassan Askari who could have thrown into suspicion the Imamate of Hassan Askari. Not only affected his own Imamate but it also had an adverse effect on the validity and authenticity of other imams who had formulated the principles of Imamate. It is of course another tale that these principles were mostly observed in the breach and the imams themselves often violated them. It served to invalidate their spurious predictions which are supposed to be rooted in perfect knowledge. The imams are immune to errors and lapses of knowledge. The imams are immune to errors and

lapses and articulate only what is revealed to them. Nau Bakhti is an extremely prejudiced Shia. He is one of their leading figures; his religious observations are mixed with a dash of philosophical speculation. On the basis of his views he is included among the Shias of the Imamiyyah sect. He states without mincing matters that after the death of Hassan Skri the Shias fell prey to umpteen doubts and suspicions and split into various sects. One of the sects believed that Hassan was still alive; he had not died but simply disappeared and he is the standing Imam. This view is supported by the Shia conviction that he cannot die unless a child born to him as the earth cannot afford the vacuum created by the absence of an Imam.

The second sect held the view that Hassan bin Ali died alright but he remained alive even after his death. If he had left behind a child, the news of his death would have been the presence of his son on the Imamate would have been reserved for his successor. But he had not drawn his will in favour of any one.

The third sect declares that J'afar, and not Hassan, was the Imam because Hassan died issueless and an Imam does not die without drawing his will and specifying his successor.

The fourth sect believes that J'afar could not possibly replace Ali as Imam because he did not enjoy good reputation on account of his perverse way of life. Hassan cannot lay claim to Imamate either because he died issueless and an Imam who dies without leaving an issue behind is a contradiction in terms. Therefore, Ali's son Muhammad was the bonafide Imam after Ali, who had died during the life of his father.

The fifth sect believes that Hassan was the Imam after Ali and after him Imamate passed on to J'afar, and J'afar's saying that rules out the circulation of Imamate between two incumbent Imams is blessed with a son. In case he is without a son then his brother is entitled to Imamate under the law of necessity.

Thus the Shias invented the fiction of Hassan's son to flesh out their own convictions but the fiction proved even more intricate as, instead of eliminating suspicions, it further compounded them. The question to be raised obviously relates to the Imamate of a person who fulfills some of its essentials but dies issueless. One of the sects has Hassan and the followers of this sect claim that their contention is supported by exhaustive research. If it is assumed that he has an invisible son, then such a claim can be stuck out about any issueless corpse. If our minds operate on these lines, we can also claim that the prophet (peace be upon him) had left behind a son. Besides Abu J'afar, Abu Radha had left behind three sons. Besides Abu J'afar, Abu Radha had left behind three sons, one of whom was a bonafide Imam. Hassan's issueless death falls into a pattern: the prophet (peace be upon him) had not left any sons behind at the time of his death, Abdullah J'afar had not left behind any at the time of his death, Abdullah J'afar had not left behind any son either, nor had Radha been blessed with four sons. Therefore the myth of the son is absolutely fake. But it is quite true that one of his slave-maids was pregnant and the child delivered by her would be a boy and an Imam because an Imam cannot die issueless as it would rob the earth of divine presence.

Another sect has contradicted it. Those who believe in the birth of the child accuse others of self-contradiction but the fact is that they themselves are the victims of an outrageous inconsistency because their belief borders on sheer absurdity and is an exercise in stupendous irrationality. Besides their insistence on the validity of their

belief further compounds the the outrage. they justify their research with a rare degree of arrogance and the outcome of their investigation is the mere discovery of pregnancy if not the establishment of the actual fact of delivery. The followers of this sect do not disown delivery but disacknowledge pregnancy. they stress the invisibility of the child and his later discovery. this phenomenon is endorsed by conventional and biological evidence. Therefore they claim that their belief more is more reasonable as compared to the belief of others.

Still another sect is of the opinion that hassan's child was born eight months after his death and those who claim his birth during his life time are liars. Their claim is bogus because if the child had been born he would not have remained invisible. but it is true that pregnancy was witnessed by the king and other people. This is the reason his heritage was not the king and other people. This is the reason his heritage died. he ordered the child to be named muhammad though he was hidden and still invisible. His father had at the same time indicated his succession also.

Finally, the twelfth shia sect imamiyyah believes that all other sects are in the wrong. it is true that god will engender an off-spring from the children of hadhrat hassan bin ali; it is also true that the imamat will not operate between two brothers after hasan and hussain because if it so happens it will affix the seal of approval on the statements of the companions of ismail bin j'afar and validate their brand of religion; it also furnishes a confirmatory proof of the imamat of muhammad bin j'afar; it is also not possible that the world should be stripped of the presence of an imam because in that case its destruction is guaranteed. They admit that hassan had died and that a son would be born to him who is invisible. but they believe it is unlawful for the people to claim the unveiling of a phenomenon that has been kept secret by divine choice. it is equally unlawful to make reference to his name, to interrogate the venue of his birth and conduct investigation into his origins and reality. Therefore any probe into his identity is absolutely forbidden.

Thus the shias were motivated by this insupportable compulsion to invent the existence of a son for hassan, and it is quite understandable that in their inventive quest they discarded all logical and rational hurdles and relied on the most fantastic explanation to pad out the filial myth.

How to prove the validity of their imams?

On the one hand is the state of affairs discussed above: on the other hand these people have miserably failed to establish and specify. They claim that the predecessor imam must indicate the imamat of his successor and they have dedicated a number of chapters in their books to highlight the crucial significance of the clause of specification. Kulaini etc have especially concentrated on this clause in a systematic manner and have frequently referred to the imamat of their self-styled imams. But the irony is that shia traditions of their self-styled imams. But the irony is that the shia traditions seem to disacknowledge the evidence furnished by their imams to establish the viability of their spiritual office. In many cases they have completely brushed aside the qualifications which are considered essential by the shia community for the personality of an imam and for his actual elevation to the highest spiritual office, for example, specification in the will, seniority in age, fitness for the prophet's armour, the presence of his weapons, the final bath of predecessors, by succeeding imams, exceptional valour, knowledge of the unknown etc. are supposed to be the attributes of an imam. These attributes have been enumerated and

discussed in the preceding pages. But experience tells us that the imams have given short shrift to these qualifications. Instead they have relied on magical tricks and syllogistic sophistries and there are plenty of shia traditions to substantiate the unsavoury practice of their imams. If they were in possession of signs and specifications, they would not have taken the support of magic and sleight of hand. The shias adduce the example of an old woman among the followers of Ali, Hassan and Hussain who called on Ali bin Hussain Zain-ul-Abdin. She observed: I called on Ali bin Hussain. I was shivering all over on account of old age as I was one hundred and thirteen years old. I found the imam absorbed in a state of kneeling and prostration. Since he was quite disappointed. But he pointed towards me with the help of his forefinger which restored my youth.

Similarly they have narrated another episode. When Hadhrat Hussain received martyrdom, Muhammad bin Hanfiyyah sent the followers message to Ali bin Hussain: your father has been martyred but he has not appointed any one his executor. I am your uncle, the brother of your father, the son of Ali and I am older than you in years. (Ali bin Hussain replied): let's go to Hajr-i-Aswad to seek its verdict in the matter. Thus both of them went to Hajr-i-Aswad. Ali bin Hussain said to Muhammad bin Hanfiyyah: first you should pray to God and request him to give power to speech to the stone and then you can ask it to give its verdict. Thus Muhammad first cried his heart out and prayed to God as he had been directed. He then called the stone but Hajr-i-Aswad gave no reply-then Hussain prayed-there was a flicker of movement in Hajr-i-Aswad. The movement quickened into a steady wave and it was possible that the stone might shuffle its moorings, but instead it spoke in eloquent Arabic: by God, the Imamate is the right of Ali bin Hussain.

They have also related on the authority of Musa bin J'afar that when a clash popped up between him and his brother Abdullah who was J'afar's eldest son-Musa ordered a pile of fuel to be placed in the middle of the house and sent for his brother Abdullah. When he came over, a large party of Imamiyyah shias had already called on Musa who were now comfortably settled in their seats. When Musa sat down he ordered the heap of fuel to be lighted. The fuel had completely burnt out but the people were still unaware of the purpose behind the whole show. When the entire pile turned into glowing coals, Musa stood up and sat down amidst the fire with his cloths on and talked with people for some time. Then he stood up, dusted his cloths on and talked with people for some time. Then he stood up, dusted his clothes and returned to the people who had gathered there. He said to his brother Abdullah: if you claim that you are the imam after your father then you should sit on the fire as I have done.

Kulaini has narrated another episode to establish the confirmation of Musa bin J'afar Imamate and the superiority of his claim over that of his brothers. Somebody asked Musa bin J'afar: who is the imam? He replied: if I tell you who the imam is, will you take my word for it? He said: yes. Musa replied: I am the imam. He said: I must have a proof of it. Musa said: go to this tree-he pointed towards a tree and tell him that Musa bin J'afar commands it to move over to him. The man says: I saw that the tree moved and stood before Musa. Then he signed with his hand and the tree returned to its original position.

They have also related a story in proof on the Imamate of Muhammad bin Ali Radha. Somebody called on him and said to him: I would like to ask you a question but I feel very shy to ask it. He told him: I can tell you intend to ask. Do you want to ask me about the imam? He replied: by God! That is the question I wanted to ask. He replied: I am the imam. He submitted: do you have any proof of your Imamate? The

stick he held in his hand at once spoke out: My master is the imam of the times and he is also the hujjat.

these episodes obviate the principle that imamat is established through specification (Nas) alone, that the successor imam must be indicated by the predecessor imam. the difference that occasionally cropped up a consequence of the absence of indication which eventually forced the shias to seek the crutches of outrageous inventions and absurd explanations.

the situation is pretty symptomatic and revelatory; it reveals the hollowness of the principles framed by the shias about imamat. Their claims are not just claims, they are not supported by proof and argument. Ibn hazm has refuted the 'Nas' claim of the shias in his "Fasl". Addressing the shias, he remarks: There are two conditions which are essential to prove the imamat of your imams and all of your sects agree on the presence of these conditions. first, there is a clear indication of his succession: and second, people need him badly for the exposition and articulation of sharia because imam is the only one who possesses complete knowledge of the sharia. No one else excels the imam in knowledge. then tell me how did Muhammad bin ali bin hussain have a better claim to imamat than his other brothers zaid, umar, abdullah, ali and hassain? if they claim to have derived the 'Nas' either from his father or the prophet (peace be upon him), it is not an innovative presumption on their part, nor is their claim more valid than that of the kaisaniyyah sect which claimed the imamat of muhammad bin hanfiyyah. if they claim that was superior to his brothers, their claim remains equally unsupported by arguments because man's external conduct does not always mirror his internal condition and the noble appearance of a person can not be made a definite measure of his superiority. sometimes the inner reality is in conflict with the outer facade. here i would also like to ask the shias what made musa bin j'afar more superior to his brothers muhammad or ishaq or ali to stake out his claim to imamat? I am sure they have no argument in their bag of tricks except the impalpable claim. Similarly i would like to pose the question what special factor clinched the imamat for ali bin musa when seventeen of his brothers flaunted their wares with an equal fan-fare. but again they have no argument except the argument of the insubstantial claim.

And there are a number of other questions which can be shot at them. for instance why did they prefer the claim of muhammad bin ali bin musa over that of his brother ali bin muhammad bin ali bin musa over that of his brother ali bin ali, ali bin muhammad and the claim of hassan bin ali bin muhammad bin ali bin musa over the claim of his brother j'afar bin ali? and the claim is advanced by those people whose capacity for lies is unlimited. Similarly if some body tries to claim imamat for other revered figures among ali's progeny or for some other hallowed figure among the banu umayyah, he will also be committing an act of sheer stupidity as no sensible person can afford to indulge in this form of blind-man's buff. It is the occupation of people who are drained of all sense of decency and decorum and whose stubble of the specification (Nas) clause is intended only to hoodwink the innocent people and it does not carry any divine endorsement. the divine will functions consistently and it does not operate in spasmodic jerks.

Besides imamiyyah, ithna ashriyyah, jafriyyah or rafidh also believe in the immunity of the imam from errors and lapses. he is directly appointed by god and he does not wear the band of allegiance to any one around his neck. The reference to the innocence of imams is further elaboration here is simply an exercise in tautology.

But the clause that an imam should not wear the tag of obedience to any one else needs elaboration. Kulaini observes that Hisham bin Salim called on Musa bin J'afar after the death of his father. He found Musa in a state of anxiety. He was also crying. He was literally on the horns of a dilemma and did not know what to do and where to go. He was not sure whether he should seek the support of Marhaba Qadriyyah, Zaidiyyah, Motazillah or Khwarij. Hisham asked Musa: Who will be our imam after your father? He replied: You, I'll soon come to know about it. Hisham adds: I asked him: Are you the imam? He replied: I don't claim so. Hisham further adds: I thought to myself I had not phrased my question properly. I submitted again: Is there any imam whom you follow? He replied: No, I was deeply impressed by his dignity, a feeling I had experienced in the presence of his father.

A large number of Shia books attest to the fact that any one who wears the band of allegiance of someone else cannot claim to be an imam. The Imamate of such a person is absolutely fake and does not carry divine sanction. In order to wind up the discussion I would like to take a bird's eye view three-dimensional exposition.

THE INNOCENCE OF IMAMAS:

The innocence* of Imams over-publicized by the Shias is hardly a settled affair. It is in fact as debatable and controversial as other attributes of the Imams. Though the Shias believe that their Imams are innocent, their own acts and deeds negate such a surmise. For instance, Hadrat Ali, who in the eyes of Shias, is the first innocent Imam, and Hadrat Hassan, who is the second innocent Imam, did not see eye to eye with each other on certain issues. He had disagreed with his father when he was receiving people's allegiance after the martyrdom of Hadrat Uthman. Hadrat Hassan had also disagreed with him when he decided to take up arms against those who were demanding revenge for Uthman's blood. (The relevant details are given in the second chapter of this book.) The difference between the first innocent Imam and the second innocent Imam proves that one of them was in the right and the other in the wrong. And this has been historically established that after the battle of Jamal Hadrat Ali had endorsed Hadrat Hassan's opinion and regretted the fact that he had not acted on his advice.

The second point to note is that Hadrat Ali himself believes in his fallibility. He has himself admitted that he is not immune to error. Therefore, he had made it clear to the people that they should not hesitate to advise him on any issue to promote the cause of justice because, left entirely to himself, he could not rule out the possibility of error.*

The third point has been stressed by the historians as well. When Hadrat Hassan decided to patch up with Hadrat Muawiyah, Hadrat Hussain along with other people opposed him. The Shias believe that both the Imam are innocent but Hadrat Hassan took no notice of Hadrat Hussain's opinion and patched up with Hadrat Muawiyah. Hadrat Hussain often expressed revulsion about the patch-up and told the people that he would have felt less degraded if his nose had been snipped off. It is obvious that one of them was in the right and the other in the wrong. There are numerous examples of opinionative clash between the Imams though they are all supposed to be innocent.

Appointment by God.

The claim of the Shias that an imam is appointed by God is a hollow claim. It is not

supported by facts and arguments. As long as the chain of revelation remains interrupted and Gabriel's interlocation is suspended any one can claim that he has been appointed by god.

Absence of allegiance to another imam.

It is essential for an imam that he should not wear the band of allegiance to another imam. But it is an established fact right from hadhrat ali down to hassan askari that no imam appears to have fulfilled this condition. But it can be definitely stated about the insubstantial, extinct and unborn imam that imams are concerned, it is now a fact of history and it is to the imams and caliphs of their times. Their allegiance is written. The shias also admit that hadhrat ali is the first innocent imam who swore allegiance to hadhrat abu bakr, is the second innocent imam, pledged fealty to hadhrat ali also took the oath of allegiance at the hands of hadhrat Muawiyah. Ali bin hussain pledged fealty to Yazid and in Hussain (Zain-ul-Abidin) is the fourth innocent imam in the eyes of the shias. This applies invariably to all the imams who took the oath of allegiance at the hands of others and lowered their exceptional status as imams. The conditions laid down by shias as essential for imam are fulfilled by none of their imams. Their confessions and acknowledgements on the other hand serve to negate the relevance of these conditions.

Why is imam necessary?

The shias believe in the necessity of imam which is in fact vicegerancy of the prophet (peace be upon him) Imam is a directorate of secular and religious affairs. It is necessary because it is a favour and a blessing. It is almost like prophethood. It is a favour and a pleasure that when people obey a person who eliminates oppression, encourages good deeds, discourages evil practices, they will draw closer to virtue and away from vice. and this is something certainly to be enjoyed. What in fact holds for prophethood, also holds, for imam.

Sayyid zain remarks that imam is obligatory because imam is a deputy of the prophet (peace be upon him) He guards the islamic sharia, guides the muslims sustains the role of law, explicates difficult verses and traditions, interprets subtleties and distinguishes between relevance and irrelevance.

Hilli observes that an imam should be the protector of sharia as the chain of revelation has been suspended after the death of the prophet (peace be upon him) and the Quran and sunnah are not in a position to issue detailed injunctions on the earth. Therefore, it is necessary that an imam should be appointed by god. It is the need of the world and there is no harm in it either. Since the world is a battlefield of disputes and dissensions, it needs an imam to resolve its tangles. The disputes might multiply in the absence of an imam. The appointment of the imam is therefore compulsory to keep the entire machinery of the earth in good gear.

In order to confirm the authenticity of their imams they have quoted reasons and arguments which in fact negate the imam of most of their imams. With the sole exception of hadhrat ali, all of them negate the very basis of their imam. These imams have never been elevated to the highest public office to tone up secular and religious matters; they were never invested with the power to keep off the oppressor: the Shia traditions bear testimony to the fact that they never had the courage to condemn evil and applaud virtue. One of these imams is not even born. Even if we presume his birth, he never had the spunk to make himself visible as he

was too can he undertake the onerous responsibility of guarding Islamic sharia, and sustaining a just application of its injunctions. The eleventh imam was so young at the time of his imamat that some persons were appointed to protect his belongings because he lacked the power to protect his possessions himself. Therefore others were entrusted to run his affairs. If he could not take care of his own affairs, how could he be expected to take care of the vast religious and worldly affairs whose resolution required equally vast knowledge and experience.

The Shia literature waxes eloquent about the fact that most of the imams issued edicts against divine and prophetic injunctions to save their own necks. This point was brought up in reference to Imam J'afar and his father Baqir. They had converted the unlawful into the lawful and vice versa. Kulaini has reported in his "Al Kafi" from Musa bin Hashim: I was sitting with Abu Abdullah. Somebody asked him about a Quranic verse and he gave his explanation of the verse. Then another person came who also asked him to explain the same verse. The second explanation differed from the first explanation. I felt a strange sensation. I felt that someone was scratching at my heart. I said to myself: Abu Qatadah in Syria never confused even a single letter or sound and here is a man whose entire explanation is twisted and out of key. I was still lost in the maze of my reflections that another man called on him and asked him about the same verse and (to my total surprise) his explanation clashed with the first two explanations.

Kulaini attributes it to Muhammad bin Muslim: I called on Abu Abdullah. At that time Abu Hanifah was with him. I submitted: I've had a strange dream. He said: narrate it as the interpreter of dreams is with us and he pointed with his hand towards Imam Abu Hanifah. I submitted that I seemed to have entered my house. My wife came out and broke a few to have entered my house. My wife came out and broke a few to have entered my house. My wife came out and broke a few nuts and threw them at me. The dream has perplexed me and I don't know what it portends. He said, that I am kicking up a great row to obtain my wife's heritage and I'll achieve my purpose after a great deal of struggle. When Abu Abdullah heard the interpretation, he shouted instant approval and admired his sensitivity. When Abu Hanifah left I told him that I found his interpretation. Therefore the correct interpretation is entirely different. I said: you had shouted approval of his interpretation and admired his correct diagnosis on oath, though he was obviously on the wrong track. He replied: my approval on oath actually meant disapproval and what I meant was that he had discovered his mistake.

I would like to remind you of another tradition reported by Kulaini from Zurarah and which has been presented in the preceding pages. Can we affirm on the basis of the available evidence that they are protectors of the injunctions of Sharia and are competent to effect their balanced implementation? Then some of the imams and willingly surrendered their imamat. Hadhrat Hassan is an obvious example who had handed over his imamat on a platter and he had entrusted his personal affairs and the affairs of his followers to those before whom he had surrendered. There were others who willingly expressed their allegiance to others. This is the example of Imam Zain-ul-Abidin. Their traditions clearly endorse it. Some of the imams failed to secure worldly power in spite of their struggle. Hadhrat Hassan is an embodiment of this failure. Ibn Hazm believes that the imams of the Shias are quite non-committal about the relevance of imamat to the explanation and implementation of Sharia injunctions. The Shias seem to thrive on claims only which are absolutely shorn of substance and are triggered by rhetoric alone. And they also lack consensus on crucial issues as is the case with other sects. On the contrary, the differences among Shia

sects are much worse. The other people who have followed their imams, for instance hanafis, shafiis, malikis and hamblis have recorded the thoughts and views of their respective leaders abu hanifah, shafii, malik and ahmad through the distinguished scholars of their schools of thought but shias related the views of their imams directly without the filter of the third medium; they have obviated the necessity of scholarly intervention in their stubborn arrogance and their comparisons and inferences lack conviction and one fails to be convinced that a statement attributed to musa bin j'afar, ali bin musa, hammad bin ali bin musa, ali bin muhammad or hassan bin ali is actually made by these hallowed personalities. The situation becomes even more dubious after hassan bin ali and its perversity acquires threatening proportions. The juristic issues attributed to hadhrata hassan and hussain hardly run into ten pages and their accretion is associated with the fertility of shia imagination rather than with reality.

Hadhrat hussain was the only imam after his father who publicly preached piety and was willing to face the gravest risks and hazards in the path of virtue. I have examined the various meliorative statements the shias have attributed to their imams and found them hollow and without substance. The imams are found to be empty kettles and the shias have tried to create and perpetuate the illusion that there is something brewing in them. What they possessed in abundance, of course, was plenty of air and vapour but as far as genuine courage and the willingness to put all at stake is concerned, they gave a poor account of themselves. Therefore the high falutin claims of the shias about the valour of their imams have no basis in reality and are backed by the chronic fantasy on which the very genesis of their faith is based; it also reflects the perversity of their mode of thought. These imams of the shias were, in fact, either ordered to wear the cloak of silence or they had the liberty to express their views. The truth lies between these two positions. If they were ordered to assume silence and they succumbed to it, it would mean they agreed to perform and act absolutely incompatible with their high spiritual status. It would be tantamount to the commission of an act of incongruous circumstance, assumes even more urgent proportions. For a truly pious man the degree of urgency and immediacy is directly proportional to the quantum of threat and challenge that intends to muzzle it. To break through the layers and whirls of suppression and come out with a clear and daring articulation of faith is the primary duty of a clear and daring articulation of faith is the primary duty of the imam and to be a party to the crime, no matter what the motive, is a dastardly act and no amount of leniency or blinking can condone it. And if they had the liberty to propagate their faith and they maintained either diplomatic silence or were distracted by other considerations, they were also guilty of violation of the covenant they had signed with god through election or succession. This act nullifies their imamat because it is equivalent to divine disobedience. When they were asked about the validity of their imams, they tried to wriggle out of the impasse by suggesting that the concept of imamat was grounded in inspiration and revelation. But it was only parrying the real issue. One could gather from their and impalpable explanation that any one could come out with a claim to imamat and justify it on the flimsiest grounds and they may not be able to reject his claim or cast reasonable doubt on the authenticity of his claim. Then some of the fathers of these imams died while how did they acquire the old. One would like to ask them how did they acquire the knowledge of the subtleties and complexities of sharia at such a tender age because their own father could not be expected to help that these imams had imbibed knowledge through revelation, it would be like flying in the face of established realities as revelation is only a prophet's prerogative and the Imams do not enjoy this concession or privilege. Such a belief is an absolute violation of fundamentals of islam.

Shaikhiyyah:

Subsequently, the shias split into ithna 'ashriyyah and other sects, of which the most important sect is shaikhiyyah which derived its name from shaikh ahmad bin zain-ul-din bin ihsai bahrani (he was born in 1166 93 A.H. and died in 122394 A.H.)

Khuwansari has praised him in the highest terms. He calls him one of the greatest theologians and philosophers of his times who was fascinated by the exteriors of objects as well as the interiors of things. The phenomenal world attracted him as much as the ontological world, he championed both the world of becoming and the world of being. He was in fact an enviable complex diverse attributes; his depth of scholarship and beauty of conduct blessed him with exceptional status. He was unrivalled in eloquence and with exceptional status. He was unrivalled in eloquence and in his love of the ahi-e-bait. Some scholars have accused him of extremism and fanaticism but their views are reflections of their own prejudice and are not supported by objective evidence. He was a man of immeasurable dignity and nobility. He spent his time mostly at the place of worship in Yazd. Then he left for Isfahan where he stayed for a long time.

When he was returning to his place of origin which was was! Hussain and arrived in Qarim in on his way to his home town which was located in Bin, Hohammad Ali Mirza bin Sultan Fathe Ali Swah Qachar, who was a just and self-respecting ruler, insisted on his stay in his town. He complied with his request and stayed there till the death of the Amir. His death unleashed a rash of bloody tussles in his kingdom. From there he left for Hair Sharif to spend the remaining years of his life in the propagation of generally believed that he was well versed in different fields generally believed that he was well versed in different fields of knowledge. Some people crack him up for his encyclopaedic information. He had formally studied medicine, the art of recitation, arithmetics and astrology. He also claimed to possess knowledge of industry, numerology, magic and other esoteric disciplines. It is believed that he compiled approximately one hundred books. Some of the historians claim that the number of his books exceeded even the hundred figure. His disciple, Syed Kazim Rushti remarks: our master one night saw that Hadhrat Hassan placed his branches of knowledge with the help of the sacred saliva which tasted sweeter than sugar and honey and smelled bathed in divine radiance. The house was filled with the presence of God and he grew indifferent to everything that smacked of worldly attachment, and right at the moment when he had surrendered himself to Hadhrat Ali, his belief in God grew so intense that he became absolutely indifferent to eating, drinking and other necessities of life.

In addition to books he delivered many lectures in Karbala, Tus and other overwhelmingly Shia areas in which he expressed his views and convictions without restraint. He claimed that God has distributed his light among Hadhrat Ali and his eleven sons. All of them are reflections of Allah. They possess divine attributes. They are the most honourable Imams. Though they differ in appearance, in reality they are identical.

Ihsai used to claim that the Imams are an affective justification of divine presence on earth, manifestations of the will of Lord and physical embodiments of God's purpose and intention. God would not have created anything if he had not created the Imams. Whatever God performs, he performs for the sake of the Imams. In themselves they do not possess any power but through them the divine power is mediated and filtered and assumes a palpable shape. Since God's power can not be demarcated

and human reason is not in a position to draw up the lines of divine resource-fulness, god created the imams to rovided of his infinity to the finite creatures. No one can obtain divine proximity without first obtaining proximiyt to the imams who are his visible representations. One who misunderstands the imams in facts misunderstands god himself. The guarded tablet is teh heart of the imam which telescopes teh heavens tablet is teh heart of teh imam which telescopes the heavens adn the theheart of the imam which telescopes the heavens and teh earth. The imams are teh fist cratures adn they have supriority over all other cratures.

His views about teh twelvth imam are enumerated below for teh enlightenment of the readers.

(1) He is dead. The invisible mehide whose arivla s avidly awaite by the shia community is aresient of the world of spirits and has no commexion with the world of flesh adn bone. He is also known by the epithets jabi laqa' and ja bi-rasa. This imam, whom i love enven more than my won life, left this world and entered paradise when he felt of his enemies.

(2) The returnig imam will not be teh son of askri, but some one eles into whom be infused teh soul fo hassan askri. he adds that he will return to the world in teh guise of another sperson adn hisbirth will take place like the birth of an ordinary person.

(3) this peson will be imam muhammad bin hassan askri even though he si born into the house of his new parents. Similarly imam Mehdi will appear in a corporeal frame, nad not in an insubstantial form.

(4) he is also called qaim because he will stand up again after he dies. When he was asked if he would stand up form his grave, he replied: yes form his grave, i.e. he will come out form the belly of his mohter jablisa and jabliqa is his place of residence in the heavens. this place is not located on earth as some people erroneously suppose.

He does not believe in the immortality of flesh. since the body is composed of the four basic ingredients which dissolve after the disinteration of the body and do not leave even a trace behind, therefore the human body is permanantly destroyed. What survives and is re-invested with a formal shape is the litght spiritual frame which he calls the quintessence or the essence of essences: "jauhar-ul-jawahir it is a frame tht will be raised again. the other ingredients of the body return to their orininal elements. Water blends with water and earth blends with earth. the crude portions of teh soul are also destroyed adn it survives only in its most refined form.

One of the series of beliefs propagated by ihsai is that imam mehdi is not circumscribed by space adn time. He can appear at any time and at any place in the guise of a perfect believer or a saint adn it is obligatory to repose faith in him. He believes in the following four pillars of religion. since ihsa was the perfect man of his times, he was also known as Rukn rabin-bab. According to him, 'bab' is a person into whom the soul of 'bab' is transfused, and mehdi is a person into whom teh soul of mehdi is transfused. Similarly an imam and a prophet. All these persons differ in appearance but in reality they are identicl. they are all incarnations of divine essence which is absolutely unitary.

Ihsai denied both physical and spiritual ascension. he believed that teh propet (peace be upon him) is present every where. therefore it wounds aburd that first he was on the earth and then he ws lifted towards the skies. he is in fact not limited by the

constraints of space and time. if someone finds him in the sky, he will find him there with all the heavenly accompaniments and appurtenance.

After his death Ihsai succeeded by his disciple sayyid kazim rushti in 1242 as the head of the shaikhiyyah sect. he followed him to the dot and elevated himself above the other disciples, even those who had an edge over him in terms of years. he excelled them in spiritual concentration and in the quality of his exceptional experiences denied to others. He also anticipated the early arrival of imam mehdi.

The shaikhiyyah sect is grounded in a fundamental tension between form and substance. the tension is resolved only through spiritual contemplation and it also mainly contributes to the vicissitudes of the phenomenal world. The essence is immutalbe: it is a reflection of divinity. But the substance is mutalbe by virtue of its inherent composition. the essence also contains the accidental-and adventitious retrospectively true but carries a prospective relevance. In creation, it will affix the stamp of limitation even on the hell and heaven. But these concepts are perennially operative as one enters heaven through love of the imams and ahl-i-bait of the prophet (peace be upon him) and both hell and heaven are a consequence of man's own deeds.

Khu ansari has mentioned in his book that he was inalienably attached with Ihsai as the shirt is attached to the body and cultivated in himself all the precious qualities of head and heart which endeared him to his illustrious teacher and made him excel his other disciples. Sayyid kazim bin amir sayed qasim hussaini jilani rushti kept the candle of his ideas burning and served as a torch-bearer for his followers for a long time to come.

He spread the views and convictions of his mentor with exceptional zeal. he managed to attract a number of people to his views propagated by Ihsai and as a result of fresh conversions, a new sect was the light of the day which included people from iran, arab, iraq, azerbaijan and kuwait. Rushti was followed by Muhammad karim khan kirmani bin zahir-ul-daulah, the ruler of kirman, muhammad khan, his son his brother zain-ul-bidin and then his son qasim khan ibrahimi who ruled as caliphs one after the other in a continuous line of succession. It may be noted that Ali mhammad shirazi was also one of the disciples of sayyid qasim rushti. he was obviously aligned with the views of the shaikhiyyah sect. therefore all those who embraced his invitation were also included among the shias of the shaikhiyyah sect.

It is interesting that most of indo-pak shias of the ithna ashriyyah sect hold the views propagated and practiced by Ihsai and rushti, though they do not openly confess their alignment with these views. But on the basis of their convictions they belong to the shaikhiyyah sect as is publicly affirmed by some of their scholars. They have established their centres in different parts of the country. Multan and karachi in pakistan are especially patronized by them. they receive financial and cultural assistance from kuwait. this group has acquired wide publicity and its following is also quite extensive. I don't like to discuss the sect in further detail as I intend to devote a separate book to the origin and beliefs of this sect which is expected to contain some untapped information.

Nur bakhshiyyah sect.

this sect is found in the valleys of himalayans, kohistan and baluchistan adjacent to chinese tibet. the shias of ithna ashriyyah claim it as an off-shoot of their own sect.

the followers of this sect call themselves nur bakshiyah shias. this sect derives from the name of Bakhsh, the founder who was born in 795 A.H. in Kohistan. They believe that he was born in Qavin, a village in Kohistan and his father had migrated there from Ihsa'. According to another view his father Abdullah was born in Ihsa and his grandfather Muhammad was born in Qatif.

Muhammad Nur Bakhsh was a disciple of Khawaja Ishaq Khatlani who was a disciple of Wayyid Ali Hamadani. Khawaja was impressed by his performance and conferred on him the appellation Nur. Muhammad Nur Bakhsh claimed that he was Imam Mehdi and the prophet (peace be upon him) had predicted that he would appear during the terminal period, his name would be Muhammad and his father's name Abdullah. The prophetic prediction matched his credentials. His patronym is also consistent with the prophetic anticipation. One of his sons was named Qasim. His followers addressed him by the appellation of Imam Adn Khalifah-tul-Muslimin. He often stated that in the past he self-articulation had arrived to steer the people toward their final destination through their spiritual crisis and to make them aware of the ultimate inspiration.

He launched a massive revolutionary movement against the Iran government of the times, and was consequently arrested. On his release he left for Kurdistan where he spread his message among the people. The natives of Kurdistan responded to his invitation with exceptional enthusiasm. A visible proof of their religious fervor appeared in the form of coins which carried his impress.

He was re-arrested but, during his state of imprisonment, he announced on the pulpit of Harat on Friday in 840 A.H. to discard his claim to Khilafat and to give up his anti-state activities. Then he was packed off to Kaylan and from there to Ray where he breathed his last in 869 A.H. At the time of his death, the cities of Iran and Iraq were packed with a large number of his followers.

The bird's eye review of Muhammad Nur Bakhsh reveals that he did not belong to Ithna 'Ashriyyah because this sect identified the supposed son of Hassan Askari as Mehdi while Nur Bakhsh regarded himself as the promised Mehdi. He was in his book rebutted the arguments of those who identify Hassan Askari's sons as Mehdi. He writes: some people are of the opinion that Muhammad bin Imam Askari is the promised Mehdi but it is not true. The prophet (peace be upon him) himself has stated that his name, his patronym and the names of his parents, and the name of this Mehdi is Muhammad. Besides none of the other names comes parallel to the prophetic specification.

The fact is that Muhammad Nur Bakhsh did not share the beliefs of Ithna 'Ashriyyah shias. He believed in the unity of being pronounced and practiced by the Sufis. It was his programme to transform all the prophets into mystic lords. Instead of "Tanasik" he floated the term "Baruz". The soul that is infused into the child when he has spent four months in the mother's womb, he identifies it as human resurrection. At this juncture the human entity and the real entity (The divine essence) blend into each other. His thoughts indicate that he believes in the philosophy of "radiance" (Ishraq), spiritual conditioning of his followers through remote control, and kind of telepathic communication. Dr. Muhammad Ali Aburiyan also supports this view, though he has no cogent reasons to confirm his hunch. Some verses from the Ghazals of Nur Bakhsh express his faith in the unity of being.

An english rendering of these verses is produced below: whether we are hadi or mehdi, we are all equal. If we struggle persistently, we are mehdi, we are all equal. If we struggle persistently, we are mehids we are a drop of the ocean of being. We have unlimited potential for inspiration. O Lord! When shall i return form my status as drop? O Lord! send me to the ocean of radiance.

Nur Bakhsh expresses his concept of love in teh same strain as Muhammad bin arabi has expreses in the following verse:

(I am aligned with the religion of love, irrespective of its demands and compulsions because love alone is my religion and faith)

A translation of some of his verses is given below:

The day i reconginzed the faze of my love, i felt elevated above teh entire creation .

I grew indifferent to faith and religion.

I am disafiliated form the community and i am not attaced to any religion.

He was so deeply imersed in the love of being that he totally lost a sense of personal identity. During his state of absorption he often asked: Am i nur bakhsh or am i someone else?

I dont not, of course, deny that when iran fell under the sway of the safvis and they wielded the sword with unprecedented barbarity to force the conversion of people to shiaism, the nur bakhshis also declared their allegiance to shiaism. when ismail safvi conquered tatar and asked people about their faith, he did not spare thse who claimed to be the followers of nur bakhs.

Thus a large number of his followers escaped to india and settled among the hills and other far-flung areas of the country, and tenaciously clung to the fundamental tenets or their faith. an other argument that supports the independent sectarian status of nur bakhshis is their separate fiqh, their separate identity and their sparate places of instruction. It is, nevertheless, true that they seem to exemplify some of the ithna ashri characteristics: they mourn the death of imam hussain with the same show of passion and enthusiasm as is displayed by teh shias of teh ithna ashriyyah sect. But they have some extremely vital differences as well. an other factor that supports their non-shia status and establishes their independent identity is that form the point of view of mysticism and the mystic chain they are appended to suhrwardi, junaid baghdadi and siri saqti, and none of these sufis was a shia. Muhammad bur bakhsh has described his shufis was a shia. Muhammad nur bakhsh has described his chain of mysticism as teh zahbiyyah chian. I reproduce below verbatim fom his book:

"Muhammad nur bakhsh, khawja ishaq khatlani, hadhrat amir kabir sayyed ali mamidani, hadhrat shaikh muhammad mazd qani, hadhrat shaikh alauddaulah samnani, hadhrat shaikh abdur isfrani, hadhrat shaikh abu najib shohrwardi, hadhrat shaikh ahmad ghazali, hadhrat shaikh abu bakr nisaji, hadhrat shaikh abu ali kalibi, hadhrat shaikh abu ali rudbari, hadhrat shaikh junaid baghdadi, hadhrat shaikh siri saqti hadhrat shaikh maruf karbhi, hadhrat imam ali radha.

Muhammad nur bakhsh has explicitly stressed some points which arque against his shia identity. for example, he surveys the scene after the death of the prophet

(peace be upon him) and concludes that both the natives and refugees had unanimously agreed to take the oath of allegiance at the hand of hadhrat abu jakr because the prophte (peace be upon him) and himself appointed him to lead the prayers during his illness. since it was prophetetic commmand, all of his companions had expressed thier instant concurrence, as prayer is the pillar of the faith. It is attributed ot hadhrat ali that whenever the azan invited the people to prayer, the prophet (peace be upon him) asked the people to request abu bakr to lead the prayer on his behalf. When the prophet (peace be upon him) died, I thought that prayer is the flag and the pillar ofr faith. if the prophet (peace be upon him) chose him for the important pillar of faith, we also chose him to lead us in worldly affairs and we pledged at his hand.

On the day of the prophet's death when hadhrat ali found the companions squabbling among themselves in saqifah bani saidah on teh issue of khilafat, he took the ring off teh prophe's hand, gave it to hadhrat abu bakr and said to him: go to the people and pacify them and see to it that htye agree on your leadership. hadhrat bu bakr accompanied by hadhrat umar went over to the people. hadhrat umar argued with the poeple persuasivley. they were easily convinced and voluntariilly pledged at his hand. with the help of the prophet's ring and hadhrat ali's planning, all the people agreed on his imamat.

thus it is not correct to presume that this sect is an offshoot of shiaism. It is an independent sect and , inspite of its, minor resemblances with the shia faith, its major differences mark if off as a separate brand.

Akhbariyyah and usuliyyah:

Another major rift developed among the followrs of ithna ashriyyah in the last few centuries. this rift is popularly known as the between akhbaris and usulis. the rift split the ithna Ashriyah into tow rival groups. the diference was not restricted only to verbal exchange but often assumed physically menacing dimensious; it actually fractured the unity of their faith and generated an ugly spate of allegations and counter-allegations in its wake. the tow sects did not any oportunity slip to malign each other, The differences, if fact intensified byound the limits of sanity. the akhbaris accused the usulis that they had been expelled form the fold real original shiasim. books were written and magaiznes were published to fan the difference nd to create more ripples inthe pool of factionalism. the akhbaris believed in teh manifest traditions. It did not matter whether they were literally true or metaphorically true. What mattered was their apparent validity and in that they followed teh views of thier forefathers.

It may be clerly understtod that teh akhbairs acknowledge the manifest and the experssed traditions while the usulis believe both in the manifest and the non-manifest raditions.

In simple phraseology it down to teh fact that teh akhbais treat only the quran adn teh sunnah as primary sources. All other sources are adventitious in their evaluation. A hadith in the eyes of a sia is a statement afftributed either to the prophet (peace be upon him) or to any one of their innocent imams. this derviation is obligatory for teh authenticity of a shia hadith, otherwise it remanis an ambiguous entity and ambiguity in religions matter is easily exploitable both for virtuous and vicioud ends. hadith i this sense is an obligation for them. Therefore whatever is ascribed sense is an obligation for them. therefore whatever is ascribed to teh prophet (peace be upon

him) and to the innocent imams is obligatory for the shias because it possesses the status of a divine to be the insinuations of uncertainty. Simultaneously immune to the included in their 'usul arba', then they accept its validity without reservation and qualification. The authentic books of rules and principles of the shias are those which were compiled and composed by the companions of their imams. When the companions of imams derive traditions from their imams, these traditions are vested with a halo of unquestioning authenticity and no one can possibly raise even his little finger against their inherent credibility. Both the substance of a tradition and the mode of its narration are directly attributed to the imam. Therefore, to pick holes in these traditions means to pick holes in their imams which would be sheer heresy on the part of the shias. According to Muhammad Baqir, the fifth infallible imam of the shias, human reason is incapable to grasp the total significance of the sayings of the imam. The sayings of the children of Muhammad are not easy to understand: they are too subtle for ordinary human mind because they are formulated under special circumstances, often in angelic presence and with prophetic consent. God facilitates their comprehension by the true believers because their hearts are spiritually tuned to the people: the sayings of the children of Muhammad (peace be upon him) should be readily believed when they reach you, are able to identify them. You should believe them. You should acknowledge any saying that softens your hearts. And if your hearts don't accept it, you should return it to God, His messenger and the children of Muhammad (peace be upon him). A man will be destroyed who hands down a tradition without firmly believing in it and if he fluctuates in its expression. It should be noted that denial is tantamount to disbelief.

Musa Kazim, the seventh infallible imam of the shias, once told Ali bin Suwaid Sai to invite only those people towards God who were ready to embrace to invitation. He added: You should acknowledge the leadership of the progeny of Muhammad (peace be upon him) and whatever comes to you from us or whatever has been attributed to us, you should not reject it as a lie even if you are aware of the apparent truth. You don't know our motive behind it and you don't know the manner in which we have phrased it. Therefore believe in what I say and don't ask me about what I conceal from you.

Thus, on the basis of this principle, it is sheer ignorance and meanness to rely on human reason in order to understand their sayings. They advise the suspension of inference or judgement in the absence of a definitive argument and the conclusion may be delayed till one discovers the presence of an authentic argument or explanation. It is attributed to Jafar bin Baqir: he was asked what a person should do who is faced with two alternatives on a religious issue, when one of the alternatives is positive and the other is negative. He replied: he should wait till someone comes to him to apprise him of the true state of affairs.

Ibn Babawai Qummi has reported from Ali bin Musa, the eighth infallible imam of the shias, what you don't find in the early sharia, you should entrust it to us because we are the early sharia, you should entrust it to us because we are more qualified to explain it. Don't form your opinion about it. It is better for you to pause (and suspend your judgement) and you should continue your efforts and investigations unless you receive its definite interpretation from us.

If someone adopts some other course of action, he will not only lead himself astray but also misguide others.

Ithna-e-Ashriyya and Sabai's Belief

A details discussion of sabaism and its founder Abdullah bin Saba' has filled some of the preceding pages of this book. But I deeply realize that the matter needs further discussion and more detailed treatment as it is a crucial matter and has great relevance for the contemporary Muslims. The beliefs propagated and practiced by these people need a dispassionate reevaluation. They were strictly condemned and

disowned by Hadhrat Ali and his pious progeny. But their resistance finally caved in and these views permeated the very structure of Shiaism to the point that Sabaism became synonymous with Shiaism. It is an established fact, though, that Hadhrat Ali and his children remained immune to the stigma of Sabaism due mainly to the integrity of their faith and the immaculacy of their character.

The need for reevaluation is motivated largely by religious compulsions. Our faith does not believe in compromises and alliances based on half truths or sheer hypocrisy. Therefore it is in the interest of the integrity of our faith that the water of lies and fibs should be separated from the milk of truth and purity. The shell of ugly lies should be cracked as soon as it is formed, otherwise it might find prolonged shelter under the warm fluff of a clucky hen and hatch an entire brood of grotesque lies. But even now it is not too late to mend the damage and it is my utmost desire to place things in their true perspective and to take the hump out of the perverse reasoning of the shias. The shia lie must be exposed as otherwise it can misguide an entire community. Enough damage has already been done either through conniving silence or sheer lack of courage to call a spade a spade. But religious issues, especially when they happen to be of such a vital nature, should not be taken lightly or tinkered with like a toy or a mechanical contraption. It is a serious issue and needs to be dealt with seriously. It is my desire to establish the true identity of the shias, especially those who preen themselves as the followers of ithna ashriyyah. These Shias call themselves moderate but their moderation is only a façade to disguise their real posture of immoderacy and fanatic extremism. The innocent people are easily impressed by their posture of balance and equipoise and fall prey to their manipulated sincerity. The fact is that all these are wolfish tricks to seduce the gullible lambs, and to ultimately devour them once they fall into the trap. They are actually the descendants of those who were not only misguided themselves but who led astray others as well. They are the recipients of the heritage of the Sabais which is based on a shameful and dastardly violation of the fundamental Islamic tenets preached and spread by the Prophet (peace be upon him) which had been revealed to him through Gabriel's instrumentality and bore the divine impress. These people replaced divine injunctions by self-prompted fabrications in order to create a rift among the Muslims and dismantle the unity of Islamic faith.

But, it must be stressed, retaliation is not my objective. I hold no personal grudge against the Shias and I don't like to be unfair to them either. I only believe in the dispensation of justice and in the rectification of mistakes, especially when the mistakes are of such gigantic proportions. I shall not add anything of my own but try to judge the Shia convictions in the light of their own statements and observations to lend objectivity to my conclusions. My purpose is purely scientific and therefore I will shed as much of the rhetoric as is possible, keeping in view our linguistic constraints. I shall not impute to them any statement which they have not uttered themselves, and I shall not make them account for any thing that is not found in their own literature. By the grace of God, objectivity is my *modus operandi* which I try to uphold even under the most tempting circumstances which might liquidate my neutrality and provoke my passions.

I shall not rely here on textual reproduction but offer only condensed abstracts and resumes of the views of shia scholars and experts in support of my contention. Since the views were originated and disseminated by Abdllah bin Saba' , a detailed analysis of Sabaism and the beliefs it introjected into early Shiaism will be presented without the slightest distortion. These views will subsequently be compared with the views held by the Shias of ithna Ashriyyah to identify compatibilities or incompatibilities of faith between Sabaism and Shiaism. I would like to make the following initial

submission in this connexion to serve as a prologue to the main body of discussion that follows:

1. The Jews exploited the name of Islam and laid the foundations of Sabaism by launching secret organizations under the supervision of Abdullah bin Saba
2. They publicly expressed their love and friendship of Hadhrat Ali and his children, openly proclaimed their faith in them and wangled their way into Hadhrat Ali's party.
3. They were jealous of the companions of the Prophet (peace be upon him) and disaffiliated themselves from the first three orthodox caliphs, Hadhrat Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman. They openly lambasted them and accused them of blasphemy and apostasy.
4. They instigated the people against Hadhrat Uthman. They levelled baseless allegations against him to spread rift and disunity among the Muslims. They also ridiculed the Muslim rulers and soldiers who had performed deeds of valour on and off the battlefield and contributed to the rapid propagation of Islamic faith.
5. They disseminated Jewish, Christian and Zoroastrian beliefs which did not have even the remotest link with the teaching of Islam. These beliefs had neither been mentioned in Holy Quran nor had they surfaced in the Prophetic way of life, for example, rule by succession indicated in the will, innocence, concepts of return, elimination of death, kingdom of the earth, transfusion of soul, unity, identity between divine and creature attributes, continuation of Prophethood after the holy Prophet (peace be upon him) as well as of revelation. These are absolutely unrelated to Islamic teachings.

These Sabai views are extracted from the statements made by the Shias and their Imams. They invited the people to embrace these beliefs. The details have been enumerated in the second chapter of the book. Here I shall try to keep my presentation as condensed as possible.

1. The secret organizations functioning under the supervision of Abdullah bin Saba need no elaboration as they have been mentioned not only by sunni scholars but also by the Shia scholars. They were founded mainly to create dissension among the Muslims.
2. The Shias have over - flaunted their love of Hadhrat Ali and his children. Most of it is hog wash as it is based on fake sentiments. There is hardly a streak or stripe of genuine emotion in it. But outwardly they make a great show of it. For them the love of Hadhrat Ali and his children is the main pillar of their faith; it carries the highest priority on their scale of religious values to eclipse all other values. The Quran and the Sunnah have secondary significance in their eyes : they furnish only adventitious sources of their faith. The primary source of faith is the love of Hadhrat Ali and his progeny. Faith in the Quran and Sunnah carries low priority ; similarly faith in Allah and the Messenger of Allah is a casual affair. They obey neither Quranic injunctions nor approve of Prophetic practice. For them virtuous acts and deeds of piety have no reality ! They attach to them no special significance. The worst maxim which is the main staff and support of their faith is "love is religion and religion is love"* and to

add to their cheek, they place the formulation of this maxim at the door of Imam Abu Jafar.

In simple words it means that love is religion while prayer, Zakat, Hajj, fasting and other forms of worship declared obligatory by God are not a vital part of religion. It means submission to the rules of Sharia, pious living, and discharge of one's obligations towards relatives, children, neighbours etc are not the essence of religion. Their brand of faith puts the lowest premium on those acts which have been traditionally cherished by the Muslims and whose performance has been repeatedly stressed by Allah and His Messenger. They identify religion with love and they claim that faith is just another label for love. They ascribe to their fifth Imam Abu Jafar Muhammad Baqir the following statement : "It is faith if you love us; and it is lack of faith if you show jealousy toward us".*

It boils down to the obvious conclusion that it is not faith to obey the Quranic injunctions and to act on the Sunnah of the Prophet (peace be upon him) but it is faith to love the Imams and their children. The Shias claim as a matter of conviction that all the revealed books and all the Prophets have invited people to love Hadhrat Ali and his progeny. The Prophets in their respective eras and the revealed books in their specific contexts have stressed the primacy of love over other components of faith. Therefore, according to them, love is superior even to the five fundamentals of Islamic faith. Love is more spontaneous while the basics of Islam are marked by a restricted flow of emotion, and for them emotion has an edge over reflection, contemplation and action.

Bahrani, a well-known Shia exegete, has reported the words of Hadhrat Ali in his "Tafsir Kabir" through Habbah 'Aufi, one of his companions: Amir - ul - Mominin said : When God invited people to acknowledge my rule on earth and in the heavens, some of them submitted to it while others declined to accept it. Hadhrat Younis was one of those who refused to acknowledge it. Therefore, he was imprisoned inside the belly of a fish and was not released until he confessed to my rule.*

A tradition of Muhammad bin Muslim is recorded in "Basair" : I heard it from Abu Jafar that God secured a promise from all the Prophets to acknowledge Ali's kingdom which was in the shape of a formal covenant.*

To compound the confusion, a statement written in the hand of Shaikh Tusi, is reproduced in "Kanz -ul- Fawaid" in the book "Masail -ul- Buldan". Jabir Jafi has in fact attributed it to one of the companions of Amir -ul- Mominin: Salman asked Hadhrat Ali about himself. He replied: Salman ! All the nations have been invited to obey me. The nation that opposed the invitation to obey me. The nation that opposed the invitation was packed off to hell by God, I am the controller of Hell. Salman, it is true that any one who is closely affiliated to me will also be blessed with my fate. God had secured a pledge from the people about me. Some of the people kept the pledge while others backed out. On hearing this Salman said: old Testament bears witness to what you say and New Testament also endorses your words. O martyr of Kufah ! May my parents be sacrificed for your sake ! You are the "Hujjat-Ullah" who helped in the acceptance of Adam's repentance by God. It is on account of you that Yousaf was pulled out of the well and Ayyub underwent the ordeal". Amir -ul- Mominin added: "Salman, do you know the reality behind the ordeal of Ayyub?" Salman submitted: "Allah and the Amir -ul- Mominin know better". He replied : Ayyub had expressed doubts about my sovereignty and called it a big favour to me. Allah commanded: Ayyub, you are expressing doubt about something that I have

created. I put Adam through the test, and when he acknowledged Ali as Amir -ul- Mominin I condoned his lapses and accepted his repentance. When I did not spare Adam you are too small a fry to express skepticism about his kingdom and hope that you can get away with it. I swear by my honour that you will have to suffer for it or you better repent and give me your word that you will obey the Amir -ul- Mominin. It was his sheer good luck that he repented in time and escaped my punishment by agreeing to obey Hadhrat Ali.*

Besides, it is recorded in "Sarair Ibn Idris" through Baznati through Sulaiyman bin Khalid: I heard Abu Abdullah saying that there is not a prophet, man, Jin or angel on the earth or in the skies who is not under divine obligation to obey us. God has not engendered any creation whom he has not invited to acknowledge our rule and commanded them to accept us as His presence on earth. Therefore all the creatures whether they live on the earth or in the skies are either believers because they have faith in us or they are disbelievers because they do not repose their faith in us.*

Finally, another tradition bearing on this issue is reproduced with reference to "Manaqib Ibn Shahr Ashob". The tradition has originally been related by Muhammad bin Hanfiyyah. Amir -ul- Mominin said: God presented my trust to the skies in the shape of reward and punishment. They said: O God! Don't offer this burden of trust with the qualification of reward and punishment: we bear it without any reservation. Then God placed my trust and kingdom before the birds. The first among them to believe in it were () and the first among them who declined to believe in it were the owl and the phoenix. May God curse them. God inflicted his punishment on the owl and as a result he cannot fly during day time because the birds hate him. The phoenix vanished into the seas and he has not left a trace behind. Similarly God placed me before the earth as trust. He purified and blessed the portion of the earth which accepted my rule and leadership, filled its fruits and vegetables with delicious juices and gave special vigour and mineral vitality to its waters; and the portion of the earth which declined to acknowledge me as its ruler, God made it barren and uninhabitable, loaded its trees with bitter and tasteless apples and turned its saters saltish and sour.*

Kulaini, who has the status of Imam Bokhari among the Shias, ascribes the following tradition in his "Sahih" to Abu Abdullah Jafar, the sixth innocent Imam of the Shias:

"Our kingdom is in fact the divine kingdom that God conferred on every prophet".*

His father, Abu Jafar, is reported to have stated:

"By God ! There are seventy thousand rows of angels in the skies which can not be counted by the collective strength of human beings on earth and all of these angels acknowledge our leadership and our kingdom".*

He added: "God secured the pledge from our Shias to acknowledge our rule while they were like ants in the world of spirits".*

At the end Kulaini reproduces the words of the innocent Imam Abu Hassan:

"The Imamate of Hadhrat Ali is indicated in all the books revealed to the Prophets".*

Salim Hinat has stated: I submitted the following Quranic verse to Abu Jafar for interpretation:

"The truthful soul has come down (with this Quran). (He has) transfused it into your heart so that you are one of those who warn people (through the divine faith) and (this Quran) is revealed in plain and clear Arabic."

He explained that the verse referred to the rule of the Amir_ul-Mominin.* Similarly Abu Jafar's opinion was sought on the following Quranic verse:

"And he establishes the rule propagated through the old Testament or the New Testament or through whatever has been revealed by God". He explained that the verse referred to Ali's rule.* His son Jafar remarked that Ali's rule was an unchallenged fact.

"It is present even in the former revelations made to Abraham and Moses".*

Kulaini has reported a divine revelation from Abu Jafar through Somali:

"Hold firmly on to what has been revealed to you. You are undoubtedly on the right path."

It means that he believes in Ali's sovereignty. He also believes that Ali is the straight path.* If a person has not squared his account about Ali's rule, he will not be questioned about other things but packed away to hell straight away. Bahrani writes:

"God did not confirm the appointment of a Prophet until he confessed the love of the Ahl-i-Bait. The sole purpose of their assignment was the expression of their love for the Ahl-i-Bait".*

The love of Ahl-i-Bait is the passport to Paradise and the guarantee of immunity from hell. The entry into Paradise and the release from hell do not depend on acts of piety. Any one who loves Ali and his progeny is an inmate of paradise and any one who does not love them is an inmate of hell. The punctuality of prayer and the rigour of fasting can not release him from the clutches of hell. Abu Jafar has stated: "Any one who opposes the Ahl-i-Bait is undoubtedly an inmate of hell, an inmate of hell, and it is immaterial whether he prays and fasts regularly or commits theft and adultery".*

They have imputed a bogus tradition to the Prophet (peace be upon him) who is supposed to have told Hadhrat Ali.

"Any one who loves you will enjoy the company and the status of the Prophets and any one who dies in a state that he is jealous of you, then it is immaterial for him whether he winds up in the lap of Judaism or Christianity."*

Similarly the greatest truth - teller of the Shias--who in fact is their greastest liar -- has stated: The Prophet said: "cheer up, O Ali, because God has forgiven you, your Ahl-i-Bait, your Shias, those who love your Shias and those who love the people who love your Shias".*

Ayyashi has reported from Abu Abdullah Jafar in his Tafsir: "Those who believe in Hadhrat Ali shall stay in Paradise for ever irrespective of their evil deeds".*

People claim that the love of Ali is a virtue that liquidates the effects of evil.* But even virtue loses its efficacy if it is blended with malice towards Ali.* They have similarly imputed a fake tradition to the holy Prophet (peace be upon him.) He is reported to have stated: I have heard God saying that Ali is my presence among my creatures, my light in the universe and the trustee of my knowledge. Any one who manages to seek his close affiliation will not be packed off to hell even if he happens to be dis-obedient; but any one who refuses to seek such affiliation will not be allowed to enter paradise even if he happens to be obedient otherwise".*

\ Thus for the Shias the obedience or disobedience of God is immaterial; it is only a marginal affair. What really matters is the love of Ali. It is the central fact from which other issues spring. Ali's love, therefore, has precedence over Quranic and prophetic injunctions. Any sensible person can guess that it is an upside-down religion based on the inversion of religious values. Instead of emphasizing piety and good deeds, it stresses Ali's love and claims that his love eclipses all other matters and transcends the restrictions imposed by Sharia. In other words it cancels out conventional impositions by asserting their irrelevance and their complete subordination to the all-embracing love of Hadhrat Ali. It clearly flouts the Quranic injunction.

"The most virtuous man in the eyes of Allah is the pious man".* Quran also declares:

"Paradise will be brought nearer to the pious and hell will be taken out and brought nearer to the misguided"* It adds:

"The believers must eventually win through. Those who humble themselves in their prayers, who avoid vain talk, who are active in deeds of charity, who abstain from sex, except with those who are joined to them in the marriage bond or (the captives) their right hands possess-for in their case they are free from blame. But those whose desires exceed these limits are transgressors. Those who faithfully observe their trusts and their covenants, and who strictly guard their prayers, these will be the heirs who will inherit paradise: they will dwell there (for ever) It further adds:

"Then shall any one who has done an atom's weight of good, see it! And any-one who has done an atom's weight of evil shall see it"*

It declares at another place:

And no one shall carry the burden of other's sins (on his shoulders)*

God further declares:

"So he who gives (in charity) and fears (God) and (in all sincerity) testifies to the best-We indeed make smooth for him the path to bliss. But he who is a greedy,, miser and thinks himself self -- sufficient and gives the lie to the best -- We will indeed make smooth for him the path to misery, nor will his wealth profit him when he falls head-long (into the pit)

Quran makes it clear in another context:

"Every soul will be (held) in pledge for its deeds, except the companions of the right

hand. (They will be) in gardens (of delight): they will question each other and (ask) of the sinners "what led you into hell-fire"? They will say: "We were not of those who prayed, nor were we of those who fed the indigent; But we used to indulge in vanities with frivolous talkers; and we used to deny the day of judgement until there came to us the hour that is certain. Then will no intercession of (any) intercessors profit them."*

It is an incontrovertible fact that the Sharia does not discriminate between human beings on the basis of status and pedigree. Abu Lahb will not enter Paradise because he is the Prophet's uncle; and it is not considered sufficient just to announce his entry into hell but the fact is plainly embodied in the words of the Quran that Abu Lahb is damned and he is accorded no exceptional latitude on account of his blood relationship with the Prophet (peace be upon him). The Quran clearly ordains:

(When Abu Lahb had cursed the Prophet, he could not hurt him at all. On the contrary), both of his hands snapped and he died a natural death. Neither his goods were of any use to him, nor could he avail himself of his wealth. He will soon enter the raging fire of hell and his wife will also accompany him who instigated people against one another. A rope of rush grass will be round her neck".*

The Sharia did not discriminate against Hadhrat Bilal or against any other human being who was similarly placed. The fact that he was a negro carried no value in the eyes of Sharia. His personal nobility and good deeds endeared him to the people. The Prophet (peace be upon him) liked him for his performance rather than his back - ground and so he communicated to him the news of his entry into Paradise.

People who believed in God, the Prophet (peace be upon him), the book revealed to the Prophet (peace be upon him) and stressed good deeds as the criterion of proximity to God and His Messenger and as a passport to Paradise were exceptionally blessed people. They prayed during the night, fasted during the day, and held the flag of Islam firmly in their hands to conduct Jihad for the pleasure of the Lord. The divine help and support kissed their feet, and the angels came down from the heavens to assist them. Paradise lived in the shadows of the swords they pulled out to perform feats of valour for the dominance of truth over falsehood and for the glorification of the divine faith. They shook the foundations of the palaces of Kaiser and Kisra and took the hell out of self-conceited kings, emperors, tyrants, rebels and atheists. They put to the sword infinitely superior armies of the Christians and the Zoroastrians and turned the battlefield into their funeral place. But the unholy conspiracy was unhatched against these pious souls to disenchant them with the purifying injunctions of Sharia, which sends a wave of life through the dead corpses, and infuses a new spirit into lifeless frames. They conspired to disillusion the brave and courageous nation with their faith and with the genuine teachings of Islam. They in fact chalked out their heinous plan to crush the valiant community systematically and the first step in their crushing plan was to alienate them from the invigorating springs of pious deeds, sustained struggle, Jihad and the other valuable features of their religion to pave the way for the eventual negative conversion. Therefore they propagated the philosophy that a rigorous mode of living did not necessarily ensure Paradise : it was rather irrelevant to one's spiritual salvation. The redemption of human beings depended on the expression and demonstration of their love for a few hallowed personalities and on the acknowledgement of their rule over them and over the rest of creation. They achieved a few successes in their unholy designs and some innocent people fell into their hideous trap because they exploited the names of pious people for the realization of their ugly ends. Instead of

emphasizing the primacy of prayer and other central issues, they emphasized purely marginal issues and completely inverted the structure of their faith by foregrounding nominal concerns and frivolous matters. Abul Hassan, their eighth Imam, observes:

"Each man will be asked first of all about his love for us, the Ahl-i-Bait".*

This is the reason that they underplay the role of prayer, Zakat etc and place maximum emphasis on the love of Ahl-i-Bait and the acknowledgement of their overlordship. Kulainin observes in "Al-Kafi" with reference to Abu Jafar:

"Islam is based on five principles (1) prayer (2) Zakat (3) fast (4) Hajj (5) sovereignty or guardianship. But sovereignty carries for greater importance than others".*

Their main objective is the love and friendship of the house of Ali. In order to justify their whimsical contention they have manufactured a number of traditions and imputed them to the pious people to confer on them the appearance of veracity. One of these traditions is imputed to the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) . According to it, the Prophet (peace be upon him) said: Gabriel came over to me and said: O Muhammad! your God sends you regards and commands that He has made prayer obligatory but the patient is exempted (from the obligation); that He has made the fast obligatory but the patient and the passenger are exempted; that He has made Hajj obligatory but the poor or starving man is exempted; that He has made Zakat obligatory but a person falling short of the minimum level of monetary specification is exempted; But I have made the love of Ali bin abi Talib obligatory without any provision of exemption or latitude.*

This is perhaps the reason that for them love of Ali (hub-i-Ali) is the yardstick to measure belief and disbelief.

The suggestions advanced by some of the contemporary Shias* that the belief in sovereignty is not obligatory and a disbelief in it does not excommunicate a person from the fold of Islam is unadulterated deception. These deceptions are consciously designed to hoodwink the innocent people. The facts speak eloquently against their deceitful posture and the facts have been established with documentary evidence in the preceding pages. The Imams of the Shias have condemned the heresies and blasphemies of their own followers and what could be a more cogent and authentic proof to their totally fallacious stand. It clearly proves that the Shias have tried to convert their whimsical reflections into religious statements.

Sayyid Bahrani has explained this concept which is basically a Jewish concept and is the calculatingly wicked invention of Abdullah bin Saba. The concept preaches the suspension of Sharia to effect the spiritual alienation of the Muslims from their moorings and is therefore anti-Islamic. It reflects the Jewish ire and malice against the Muslims and their well-orchestrated efforts to undermine Islamic unity. Bahrani supports the view and calls it the fulcrum of Shia faith. Any one who denies it can not be rated a believer. Mufid also writes in support of it:

Imamiyyah agree that any one who denies the Imamate of an Imam or refuses to obey him which is a divinely obligated duty, is a dis-believer, a misguided person and a permanent inmate of Hell. It is unlawful for the believers to give bath to a person or join in his funeral prayer who opposes the right of sovereignty.* Babwi Qummi,

Tusi, Mulla Baqir Majlisi, Syed Sharif Murtadha and a number of their Imams and religious leaders have endorsed this view without the slightest twinge of shame or the faintest tweak of compunction.

Malicious criticism of the Companions:

The malice of Shias against the companions of the Prophet (peace be upon him) knows no bounds. It operates like an unlimited company. The Shias are remarkable batsmen on the turf of spite but their performance on the matting of virtue is lamentable. They score in fours and sixes when they are batting against the companions but when they have to speak in their favour, their score is zero. The hatred of the companions is now a permanent feature of the Shia faith and they give vent to it so naturally and effortlessly that they don't have to feel apologetic about it. An apology usually follows a feeling of outrage. Since the Shia act of hatred is not outrageous in their eyes, it hardly needs the formality of an apology. There is not a single book of the Shias which does not brag about its maltreatment of the companions. Whenever the Shias mention their names and their deeds, they do it with a feeling of extreme loathing and revulsion. Their attitude receives an amplified exposure in the first chapter of my book "Ash-Shia was-Sunnah" and it is accorded similar treatment in the second chapter of my book "Shias and the House of Ali". I don't like to repeat the contents of these chapters here mainly for two reasons: first it will spin out the discussion to unmanageable proportions, and secondly repetition is tantamount to impropriety: it invariably culminates in the bluntness of the readers' attention and in many cases an agonized dwindling of their interest. Those who are interested in the details may refer to the other books where the Shias are exposed in their true colours. Here I would like to confine myself to an analysis and dissection of what the contemporary Imam of the Shias-Syed Khomeni--has recorded in his book "Kashf -ul- Israr" --Khomeni is a political figure and a politician is normally expected to qualify his stand with a certain amount of flexibility and respects the sentiments of others out of sheer courtesy, even though it happens to be a sophisticated form of diplomacy. But Khomeni has cast off the slough of political reservation and has expressed his views with exceptionally insistent clarity which almost borders on a kind of stubbornness: He writes:

"Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman were not the Khalifahs of the Messenger of Allah, but they changed the divine injunctions, muddled up the concepts of what is lawful and what is forbidden and persecuted the children of the Prophet (peace be upon him). They were ignorant of divine laws and religious injunctions.*

After this Khomeni expresses his own views about Imamate and explains the belief of the Shias. He writes under the caption: "Why isn't the name Imam explicitly mentioned in the holy Quran? He asserts that according to reason and the Quran Imamate is one of the established fundamentals of Islamic faith and this fundamental component has been mentioned at various places in the Quran. One may naturally ask why isn't the name of the Imam explicitly indicated in the Quran when it carries such vital significance. The unambiguous indication of the name would have obviated the outbreak of wars between the Muslims and saved them from unnecessary torture and agony. There are many answers to this question but I would like to express straightaway that all the differences that cropped up between the Muslims were a consequence of the day of Saqifah; if the day had not dawned on the earth, the differences would not have seen the light of the day. I believe the dispute would not have whimpered away even if the name of the Imam were clearly mentioned in the Quran. The people who had embraced Islam to gain political power would never have

reconciled to Quranic specification if it clashed with their express expectations and they would have tried to twist its meanings to suit their preconceptions. They could easily sacrifice Quranic injunctions at the altar of their selfish designs. On the contrary, the presence of a specification would have added immensely to the stockpile of their crooked objectives. They would have sought ways and means to demolish the very foundations of Islam and done incalculable damage to its survival. They in fact cared two hoots for Islam. All that they cared for was their personal well-being. They could not relinquish their vested interests but they could barter away Islam without the least amount of hesitation. They would not have hesitated to wage war against Islam, and if they had done so, Ali bin abi Talib could not stand aside as a silent spectator and let them play havoc with the structural foundations of Islam. Thus it is clearly established that the absence of the name of Imam in the holy Quran reflects infinite divine wisdom. It was in the interest of Muslim community and the survival of Islam. The lack of specification, therefore, in no way devalues the stature of the Imam. On the contrary, it carries an implicit divine sanction of the inherent element of sacrifice that is normally associated with the personality of an Imam. It was sheer divine expediency not to make an explicit reference to Ali bin abi Talib in the Quran.

Even if his name were mentioned in the Quran, these people for whom Quran was an instrument to gain political power, would have mutilated the relevant verses and destroyed the Book of Allah.

If they were restrained to do so through divine intervention or some other consideration, then they would have imputed fake statements to the Prophet (peace be upon him) that God had suspended the prophethood of Ali bin abi Talib and had ordained to resolve the issue of Khilafat through mutual consultation.

It is also improper to say that if the name of the Imam was indicated in the Quran, the tribal chiefs would not have opposed Hadhrat Ali, and even if they have opposed him in the face of Quranic specification, the Muslims would have condemned them, they would have even waged war against them. But I do not subscribe to this view because it is a historical fact that they publicly expressed their disapproval of Quranic injunctions but the people did not condemn them: On the contrary, they stamped the seal of their approval on their opposition to Quran.*

Khomeni has also enumerated a number of instances to establish the opposition of Hadhrat Abu Bakr and Hadhrat Umar to the inviolability of the Quran. Under the captions of "Hadhrat Abu Bakr and his opposition to Quranic specifications" and "Umar and his ipposition to the Quran revealed by the Creator" Khomeni has tried to underscore the obviousness of the issue.*

After the self-manufactured opposition, Khomeni remarks: Abu Bakr and Umar used to oppose the Quran in the presence of Muslims but the people attached no value to their inimical posture and supported them unreservedly. They were members of their group, endorsed their policies and sought their help and assistance on all occasions. All these details reveal the undeniable fact that these powerhungry people would never have relinquished their self-acquired offices even if there had been the name of the Imam in the Quran because, in their intoxicated state, they would have felt no scruples in flouting the specific divine injunctions, and in brushing aside the claim of Hadhrat Ali as the Prophet's successor. Abu Bakr, who was exceedingly hypocritical, disinherited the daughter of the Prophet (peace be upon him) of the heritage of her own father. Both the Quran and the human reason are witness to this heritage but

he invented a bogus tradition to prove his point. It was equally expected of Umar to have condemned the divine irrelevance in case God or Gabriel or the Messenger of Allah had mentioned the name of the Imam. The people would not have condemned him even if he had discarded the Quran and forbidden them to implement its injunctions. They would have followed Umar's prescription without the least resistance. They had already accepted unquestioningly the alterations Umar had introduced into the Islamic faith. It was quite possible because they preferred Umar's opinions and proposals even to Quranic injunctions and the sayings and observations of the Prophet (peace be upon him).*

Khomeni has come out with a number of similar statements which provide a clear reflection of the attitude of the Shias towards Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthman and the companions of the Prophet (peace be upon him). I have discussed these attitudes with reference to a political figure who is regarded by the Shias as the invisible Imam and whom some of the Sunnis also treat as the harbinger of good luck. These Shia beliefs are an exact replica of the views they have inherited from Abdullah bin Saba and the Sabais. The beliefs of the non-political Shia scholars also fall into the same pattern.

The way these Shias have maligned the character of Hadhrat Uthman is too well known to be slurred over. The Shia malice towards him has been discussed in the first and second chapter of this book. The discussion is properly documented with quotations and excerpts from the books by Shia scholars. For further details the readers are advised to refer to my books "Ash-Shia was Sunnah" and "Ash-Shia wa Ahl-ul-Bait". There is not a single Shia book which does not contain the allegations levelled by the Sabais against the character of Hadhrat Uthman and his administration. There is not much difference between the Sabai and Shia allegations. The Shias have rather outstripped the Sabais in their malice by adding more charges to the formidable list. The concepts of specification through will, invisibility and return are actually the concepts floated and practised by Abdullah bin Saba and the bunch of rogues who followed him. The other concepts are taken over from the Christians and the Zoroastrians and are therefore anti-Islamic in their conception. The identification of creatures with the creator, the elevation of human beings to divine stature, the concepts of transfusion of souls into one another, transmigration, the continuation of prophethood after the holy Prophet (peace be upon him), the mode of revelation and other matters relating to the Book of Allah have been transferred to the Shias from the Christians and Zoroastrians.

Mamaqani observes in his book "Tanqih-ul-Maqal":

"What was considered extremism or fanaticism in the past is now one of the fundamental needs of religion".*

Mamaqani's observations are quite valid because the early Shias condemned all forms of extremism and fanaticism. And if at all these attitudes were there, they did not highlight them. But the Shias have imported these views from the Sabais and have elevated them to the status of beliefs and have padded out their books with the imported stuff. As a consequence, they believe that Hadhrat Ali was the executor of the Prophet (peace be upon him) and they have invented a number of traditions to prove their point. Kulaini in his "Kafi" has attributed a tradition to J'afar :

"When Aminah bint Wahb was about to give birth to the Prophet (peace be upon him), Fatimah bint Asad and wife of Abu Talib called on her and stayed with her till

his birth. One of them said to the other: do you see what I am seeing She replied : yes I am also seeing the light that has spread between the east and the west. They were busy in conversation when Abu Talib came in and asked them: what's the matter ? What are you wondering at? Fatimah told him about the light she had perceived. Abu Talib said: Shall I tell you a good news? Fatima said: please do. Abu Talib replied: you'll give birth to a child who will be the executor of this newborn"*

They have invented another tradition by propping up the lie on a Quranic verse. When God declared:

"Warn your close relations against (divine punishment)" the Prophet (peace be upon him) called his relatives and offered them food. But the food remained intact (though they had their fill)--However their finger prints were visible on the food they had consumed. They were about forty in number. Similarly they were offered a bowl of soup which proved enough for all of them. Some of the soup was rather left over. When all of them had finished their meal, he addressed them: I swear by God that no young Arab can bring you better than what I have brought for you. Is there any one of you who would like to be my right hand, and he will be my brother, my executor and your Caliph? On hearing this all of them were silent, but Ali stood up and said: O Messenger of Allah! I'll be your helper. The Messenger of Allah caught hold of him by his neck and said: he is my brother, executor and Khalifah: you should listen to him and obey him. They were on their feet laughing. They said to Abu Talib: you have been commanded to listen to your son and obey him.*

Then they repeated exactly what Abdullah bin Saba had stated but imputed it to Abu Jafar Muhammad Baqir. "I swear by Allah that Gabriel and the angels came down to Adam with the Prophetic message on "the precious night", and by God Adam had not breathed his last till the nomination of his executor; and each prophet who came after Adam also had an executor, and by God the night the revelation came to the Prophet, he was commanded to nominate his executor; and this has been the practice from Adam down to Muhammad (peace be upon him).*

Again it s related on the authority of Jafar that Musa nominated Yosha bin Nun as his executor, Yosha bin Nun appointed his son Harun as his executor, and ultimately succession passed down to Hadhrat Muhammad (peace be upon him).

When God appointed Muhammad his prophet (peace be upon him) those who believed in him turned Muslims but there were many others also who did not believe in him. However, he continued the propagation of the divine message and waged wars for the dissemination of the divine religion. Then God sent down the revelation that he should declare the superior status of his successor but he submitted to the Lord: Oh, Allah! the Arabs are a harsh-tempered nation. They are without a book and they have not been graced with the presence of a prophet either. They are unaware of the superiority and status of the prophets. Therefore if I anticipate the superiority of my progeny, these people will not believe in me. God replied: don't worry and tell them; May God bless you! you'll soon come to know. Thus he mentioned the superior status and precedence of his successor over others but it split the people. The Prophet (peace be upon him) sized up their true intentions. God declared:

"We know that there is a burden on your chest on account of what they say. But the fact is that they are not condemning you but denying the divine commandments."

These people denied His commands without justification. The Prophet (peace be upon him) loved them and always impressed upon them the need to help one another and occasionally referred to the superiority of his successor until the revelation of the Surah which condemned the attitude of the companions and equated it with downright sacrilege. When the news of his death was conveyed to them, they used it as an argument against him. God declared in the Surah

"Pray with concentration and focus all your energies (of head and heart) on your Creator"

That is, when you get rid of adventitious issues, you should brace yourself and announce your successor and proclaim his superiority over others. In pursuance of the Quranic verse he observed:

"Ali is also the master of those who have accepted me as their master. Oh Allah, you should be friendly with those who are friendly with Ali and you should be friendly with those who are friendly with Ali and you should show enmity towards those who show enmity towards Ali--he repeated it three times--I shall and down the person who loves Allah and His Messenger and Allah and His Messenger love him in return. He will not seek the way of escape so that he may be included among those who believe in the return or resurrection. He will love his companions and his companions will love him".

He also added:

"Ali is the chief of all believers".

He further added:

"Ali is the pillar of faith and after him he will keep people on the right track with the help of the sword. The right is always with Ali, no matter which way he is inclined"*

It is also attributed to him that the succession had come down to the Prophet from the heavens in the form of a book but it was revealed to him in a sealed form. Gabriel had told him. O Muhammad! your children will be your successors for your community. He replied: O Gabriel which of my children? Gabriel explained: We shall pray to God on their behalf and on behalf of their children that He should appoint you the guardian of the knowledge of prophethood as He had made Abraham the guardian of prophethood. His heritage is intended for Hadhrat Ali and your children have also come out of his loins. Ali opened the first seal and acted according to the instructions contained in it. Hadhrat Hassan opened the second seal and acted on its prescription. After the death of Hadhrat Hassan, Hadhrat Hussain opened the third seal; it contained the message: wage war, shed blood, die as a martyr and prepare some other people for martyrdom also because they will die as martyrs along with you. Therefore he acted accordingly and handed the heritage over to Ali bin Hussain before his martyrdom. He opened the fourth seal and it bore the prescription: when the knowledge is veiled, you should be quiet and keep your head low. At the time of his death he handed it to Muhammad bin Ali. When he opened it he found the message: explain the Book of Allah, confirm the message of your father, make your son your successor, treat the nation well, defend the rights of Allah, speak truth in the midst of fear or peace and don't be scared of any one except Allah. He acted accordingly and then passed the seal to the next Khalifah.*

And finally Kulaini has related another tradition attributed to Abu Jafar: When Hadhrat Muhammad (peace be upon him) completed his Prophetic tenure and his life cycle on earth, then God revealed to him: O Muhammad! you have completed your Prophetic tenure and earthly sojourn, therefore you should hand over your knowledge, faith, heritage and other signs of prophethood to Ali bin abi Talib among your Ahl-i-Bait as I'll not discontinue the circulation of these things among your children the way I had not discontinued them among the children of prophets.*

These are exactly the things propagated by Abdullah bin Saba and which are central to Sabaism: Yosha bin Nun was the executor of Musa and Ali is the executor of the Messenger of Allah and Ali's Imamatus is declared obligatory by Allah.*

Absence or Invisibility:

The concepts of invisibility and return are also taken over by the Shias from the Sabais. They had assimilated these concepts when the early Shias had expired and Shiasim had incorporated into its conceptual frame the views and beliefs preached by Sabaism. Right from Hadhrat Ali down to their impalpable Imam--who is not even born--the Shias have nourished this concept in relation to all of their Imams. These factors have been discussed at length in the preceding chapters and here I would like to confine myself to the views of Ithna 'Ashriyyah Shias about the invisible Imam.

They claim that a son was born to Hassan Askari. They further claim that this son of Hassan Askari disappeared and became invisible, and his disappearance falls into a two-fold pattern.

(1) The major absence (ghaibat-i-Kubra)

(2) The minor absence (ghaibat-i-Sughra),

and in order to make their point authentic, they have imputed another fake tradition to Imam Jafar:

There are two aspects of the absence of Imam Qaim (1) ghaibat-i-Saghirah and (2) ghaibat-i-Tavilah. The place of the first disappearance is known only to the elite Shias while the place of the second disappearance is known only to special friends.*

It is also attributed to him: The disappearance of the Imam is of two kinds. He comes back after one form of disappearance and about the second form of disappearance it is said that he dies no matter which valley he is living in. I asked what should we do when we face such a state of affairs. He replied: when some one comes out with such a claim, you should put to him questions about certain things. If he answers correctly, his claim is valid, but his claim is invalid if he answers incorrectly.

A similar tradition is imputed to his father.

"Ghaibat-i-Sughra" is a form of disappearance in which the disappearing Imam leaves behind a definite consensus and a nimbus of plausibility. Those members of the Imamiyyah, who believe in the Imamatus of Hassan bin Ali, do not disagree about his bonafides. Among the disappearing Imams are included Abu Hashim Daud bin Qasim Jafri, Muhammad bin Ali bin Bilal, Abu Umro Uthman bin Said Samman, his

son Abu Jafar Muhammad bin Uthman, Umra Howazi, Ahmad bin Ishaq, Abu Muhammad Wajnani. Ibrahim bin Mohzyar, Muhammad bin Ibrahim and some other people who will be mentioned subsequently in the context of traditions relating to their disappearance. The period of this form of absence was seventy four years. Abu Umro Uthman bin Said Umri received it from his father and grandfather and other people received the insignia of privilege from him. He performed a number of miracles. When he died, his son Muhammad acted as his successor on account of his specification. He also died by the end of Jamadi-ul-Akhir in 304 or 305 A.H., and Abul Qasim Hussain bin Ruh- who belonged to Banu Nau Najt acted as his successor on account of the specification made by Abu Jafar Muhammad bin Uthman. He died in Sh'aban; Abul Hassan Ali bin Muhammad Umri acted as his successor on account of his specification who died in the month of Shaban in 328 A.H.

Abu Muhammad Hassan bin Ahmad Maktab has reported. The year Ali bin Muhammad Samri died, I was in Medinah. I called on him a few days before his death. He came out and placed before the people a signed document. It contained the following message: Bismillah ! O Ali bin Muhammad Samril ! May God bless your brothers with a stupendous reward on your count. You'll expire within six days but you should not specify any one as your successor. The chain of invisibility is about to start. Therefore no one will appear without divine consent. The phenomenon of appearance will take a long time to materialize especially when the hearts are hardened and the world spills over with tyranny and oppression. Some people will call on my Shias and claim that they have observed the phenomenon, but any one who makes such a claim before the rebellion of Sufiyani and Sayha is a liar and a spinner of yarns.

We noted down the contents of the document and left the place. When a period of six days elapsed we called on him who was present there, and submitted to him: Who is your successor? He replied: this matter is in the hands of God. These were the last words he uttered and died immediately after. Then the era of long absence (ghaibat-i-Tula) set in through which we are still passing. But by the grace and wisdom of God, the troubles will simply roll away by the end of this era.*

Where does the invisible Imam live and what does he do are moot points. The Shias believe that the invisible Imam lives in Sardab Samra'. Qutub Rawindi has reported: The Abbasis despatched an armed batallion. When the soldiers entered the house, they heard the recitation of Quran from Sardab. They all gathered at the entrance of the cave and posted a heavy guard around it so that he could neither climb up nor climb down. The leader of the batallion was also there, waiting for the entire force to arrive. The invisible Imam also came out and stood at the entrance of the cave and then he walked past them. When he disappeared again, the leader ordered his men to go inside the cave. But the soldiers told him that he had walked past him. The leader replied: I haven't seen him. Why did you spare him when he was giving us the slip? They said: We thought you were watching him.*

The Shias also claim that he has disappeared in Madinah.* According to another version he is hiding in Makkah.* The third version locates him in Ridhwa. Ridhwa is a mountain on which Muhammad bin Hanfiyyah disappeared. This is at least what the Shias believe. A Shia poet, Syed Humeri says:

"He disappeared in Ridhwa and has been invisible for a long time. He has (in-exhaustible reservoirs of) honey and water.*

Some people believe that he is hiding in Zi Tuwa. Nuri Tabrisi has referred to a famous Shia prayer which he has attributed to their Imams. It is known as "Nadbah". They are commanded to offer it on all the four Eids. The prayer is addressed to the invisible Imam and embodies an equally veiled desire to know his whereabouts:

"I wish I knew your place of residence and the spot where you are hiding-Ridhwa Zi Tuwa or some other place".*

According to another version he has disappeared in Shamruk, a valley in Yemen, or probably he has disappeared on the island of Khidhra.*

Jazairi has come out with a fantastic tale. He refers to a cluster of islands where the distance between the cities takes a whole year to be covered. Only the pious Shias live in these areas. All of them believe in Ali's sovereignty. Their kings are the children of their Imams. They rule justly and command others to dispense justice and equity to people as well, and they are the largest in number.* There are still others who believe that the Imam is residing in Ja-Bilaqa or Ja-Bilasa. In short, they have invented innumerable obscenities to establish the reality of what appears to be a purely imaginary entity.

What does the invisible Imam do? There are also a number of fantastic explanations about the engagements of the invisible Imam. The Shias claim that he comes during the season of pilgrimage; he can see the pilgrims but the pilgrims can not see him.* They rely on the experience of the maidservant of Ibrahim Bin Abdah whose words bear testimony to the visible presence of the invisible Imam: I was standing beside Ibrahim in Safa. Meanwhile the invisible Imam came over and stood beside Ibrahim. He took the book of Manasik from him and told him a number of things.*

Another Shia, whose lie is quite obvious, says that once he saw the invisible Imam near Hajr-i-Aswad. People were drawing towards him but the imam kept repeating that they were not commanded to do so.*

Still another Shia claims to have undergone a similarly fantastic experience: Just now I saw Sayma--a courtier--In Sur Man Rai that he broke the gate of my house. I went over to him and found that he had two (planks) in his hand. I asked him: what are you doing in my house? Sayma replied: your father had died issueless. If this is your house, then I would leave and on saying this he left the house.*

An-other Shia spins out an-other interesting story: He says: I went to perform Hajj along with a friend of mine. When we reached Muqif, we saw a young man squatting there who had covered himself with a shawl and a length of cloth. He was wearing yellow shoes. The shawl and the length of cloth were roughly priced at one hundred and fifty dinar. He did not carry any traces of travel either (he did not look tired). A beggar came over to us but we pushed him back. Nevertheless he moved closer to the young man and begged him and it seemed as if the earth had picked up some thing and handed it over to him. The beggar prayed hard and long for him. The young man stood up and disappeared. We asked the beggar what had he given him. He showed us gold pebbles which roughly weighed twenty Mishqal. I told my companion that our master was beside us and we did not even feel his presence. Then we set out in his search, we combed the entire area of Muqif but we could not trace him. When we asked the residents of Makkah and Medinah they replied that a young Alvi performed Hajj every year.*

A tradition is attributed to Ali Radha who is supposed to have remarked: The body of the invisible Imam can not be seen nor can his name be mentioned.* Similarly Hassan Askri is reported to have observed: you can not perceive him as a physical entity. It is unlawful to utter his name. People asked how should they remember him. He replied: you should call him "Hujjat-i-Al-i-Muhammad" instead of calling him by name.* Urbili writes: He is present and alive. He keeps appearing and disappearing. And when he tours different parts of the world, the servants and courtiers with horses, tents, marquees' etc accompany him. Then he has related the story narrated by Shams-ud-Din Harquli: My father told me that during his youth a sore appeared on his left thigh which was as big as a man's fist. The sore burst every year and blood and puss oozed out of it. The pain that accompanied it kept him away from his daily chores. Those days he was staying at Harqul. One day he came to Hullah and attended the 'Majlis' of Said Radhi-ud-Din and told him about the intense pain caused by the sore and expressed his desire to have it permanently treated. He sent for all the medical experts of Hullah. when they gathered there, he showed them the sore spot. They diagnosed the sore as 'Tautha'. They said that it was right on the femoral vein and its treatment was quite hazardous. They apprehended that an incision into the abscess might puncture the vein and result in his death. Said Radhi-ud-Din told them: I am on my way to Baghdad. It is possible the medical experts there are in a better position to treat the sore. Thus he took me along to Baghdad. He consulted the medical experts and they endorsed the opinion of experts in Hullah. As he heard their opinion, his chest constricted. Said said to him: The Shariah has allowed you to offer your prayers in these clothes. However you should be on your maximum guard and try not to be self-deceived as it is prohibited by Allah and His Messenger. At this my father said to him: When things have come to such a pass and i happen to be in Baghdad, it would be better for me to visit Mashhid and return home. He appreciated my father's suggestion. Thus he left his cloths and other articles with Said Radhi-ud-Din and set out for Mashhid.

My father adds: When I entered mashhid, visited the Imams and slipped into the basement, I prayed hard to God and to the imam. I spent a part of the night in the basement and stayed in mashhid till thursday. Then I went towards Dajlah. There I had a bath, put on clean clothes, filled the pot with water and turned about on my way back to Mashhid. All of a sudden I saw four horse riders coming out of Bab-i-Sor'. A tribe of noblemen lived in the suburb of Mashhid who also grazed their goats in that area. I presumed them to be the noblemen of that tribe. When i came face to face with them i found two of them were quite young. One of them was just a boy. His face was covered with swords. The third was an old man who carried a lancet and the other carried a sword. The old man with the lancet stood on the right side of the path and he pitched his lancet into the ground. Both the young men stood on the left side of the path. The fourth man stood before my father in the middle of the path. then the others greeted him and he returned their greetings. He said to my father: Are you going back to your family tomorrow? He replied: yes, (it's true). He said: come a little closer so that I may have a look at the sore spot. I did not like him touching me and I thought to myself that the Badvi people perhaps did not flinch from filth. I have just come out of the water and my shirt is wet all over. Any way I moved closer to him. He caught hold of my hand and clasped me to him self. He started probing me from my shoulder till his hand touched the sore and he squeezed it with his hand which caused me considerable pain. Then he joined his group. The old man said to me: Ismail, you are successful. I wondered how did he know my name! I said: We are all successful by the grace of God. The old man said: do you know that he is the Imam? I moved towards him, clasped him and kissed his thigh.

Then he moved on. I also moved along. He said to me: you'd better go back now. I said: I'd like to be with you all the time. He explained: it's better for you if you go back. I repeated what I had said earlier. The old man said: Ismail, you should feel ashamed of yourself. The old man said: Ismail, you should feel ashamed of yourself. The Imam has repeated it twice and you are opposing it. And he struck at my forehead. I stood there and they moved a few steps ahead of me. The Imam turned towards me and said: When you reach Baghdad, Abu Jafar, i.e., Khalifah Mustansir will call you to his court. When you call on him, he will try to palm something off to you but you should not take anything from him. Ask my son Radhi to give you a letter for Ali bin Aodh because I have indicated it in my wil that he should give you what you really crave for. Then he walked away with his companions until all of them vanished out of sight. I felt my separation from the Imam rather deeply and for a while I sat glued to the ground. A few people gathered round me. They said: you look pale. Are you in pain? I replied: no, I'm not in pain. They asked me again: Have you had a tiff with someone. I replied: no, not at all. On the contrary I would like to ask you if you have seen the horse-riders who passed by you. They said: they are respectable people and are the owners of goats. I replied no, no, he was in fact the Imam. They inquired: Was it the old man or --? I replied: he himself placed his hand on the spot and it caused me some pain too. But when my foot was exposed I saw that the disease had not left even a trace behind. Out of sheer terror I thought that the sore was perhaps on the other leg. When I bared the other leg, I did not see anything on it either.*

Another story is related about Abu Atwah who was suffering from testicular enlargement. He belonged to the Zaidiyyah sect and did not like that his children should show any inclination towards the Imamiyyah views. He told them: I'll believe neither in you nor will I adopt your religion until Imam Mehdi appears and cures me of this disease. He repeated it many times. Once we had gathered at the time of night prayers that my father screamed at the top of his voice and called us. When we reached near him he said: meet your Imam; he has just been to see me. We came out but we did not see anything. on our return, we asked our father about it. he explained. A man came to me just now and said: Atwah! I asked: who are you? He replied: I am the Imam of your children and I have come to relieve you of this pain. He brought his hands forward and squeezed my testicles and moved away. When I moved my hand forward I could find nothing. The story gained wide publicity. I asked other people about it and they also confirmed it.

There are many traditions about the invisible Imam. A large number of people have visited him. There were others who had lost their way and were put back on the tracks by their Imam.*

Return (Rijat): The Shias of Ithna Ashriyyah also believe in the concept of return or resurrection as preached by Abdullah bin Saba, the founder of Sabaism. The difference between their positions is that while Abdullah bin Saba believed in the return of Hadhrat Ali, the Shias believe in the return of their invisible and incorporeal Imam. It is noteworthy that this concept has been operative in all Shia sects and in all eras, except in the era of early Shias who were totally allergic to such obscenities and vulgarities and who practised unadulterated Islam. At present the concept of return is one of the operative principals of the Shia faith, especially the faith that is professed by the followers of Ithna Ashriyyah who gloat over it in spite of the fact that their pious forefathers gave it the cold shoulder it deserved.

The Shias do not simply believe in the return of the invisible imam but they believe

in the return of a host of other irrelevancies. For example, they believe that the other Shias and their Imams, as well as their enemies, will also return. Thus they have minted a number of fake stories and traditions to concretize their lie. They have also dashed off full-length books to give credibility to the baseless myth. I would like to make reference to some of the absurdities to underscore the amorphous make-up of Shia faith and to emphasize the extent and magnitude of their revulsion for the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) , his wives, his companions and the members of his family. It is also intended to pinpoint their insult and desecration of the Holy Quran whose divinity is unquestionable and whose reverence is absolutely binding on every Muslim because a Muslim is not a Muslim if he does not respect and follow the injunctions of the Holy Quran. Besides if he does not respect the Quran, he can hardly be expected to respect God who is its originator and the Prophet (peace be upon him) who is the communicator of its message. And when a Muslim does not believe in Quran, God and the Prophet (peace be upon him) as he should and yet calls himself a Muslim, I believe he is even worse than the infidels.

Mulla Baqir Majlisis observes in his "Bihar-ul-Anwar"

"O brother! I hope now that you have no doubts and reservations about the concept of return which I have established through my stretched-out prelude and which has been practised by Shias in all times. The consensus of the Shias on this issue is as clear as the sun at its meridian. How can a believer who believes in the integrity and truthfulness of his pure Imams deny the two hundred unambiguous traditions, especially when they happen to be continuous and have been recorded by the Imams and scholars in more than fifty books and manuscripts.*

Shias have imputed the following tradition to Hussain bin Ali:

"If there is just one day left in the extinction of the world, God will stretch it out to such a length that one of my children will give birth to a person who will fill the oppressed and persecuted world with justice and equity"*

They have similarly imputed a bogus tradition to the Prophet (peace be upon him).

"The Qaim who is born out of my children will resemble me in name. His patronym will be like my patronym, his habits will be like my habits and his Sunnah will be my Sunnah. He will impress upon the people to follow my practice and invite them to embrace the Book of Allah. Whosoever obeys him in fact obeys me; and whosoever disobeys him in fact disobeys me. One who denies invisibility in fact denies my reality. One who maligns him in fact maligns me, and one who attests his truth in fact attests my truth. I'll complain to God against those people who doubt my words about him and I'll protest to God against those who deny my glorification of him and tend to misguide my nation.

Who will be the Mehdi?

When Hadrath Hassan bin Ali patched up with Hadhrat Muawiyah, some of the people condemned his conciliatory step and strongly disapproved of his allegiance to Hadhrat Muawiyah. But the words he used to refute his critics appear to have been cooked up by the Shias. He is supposed to have replied: Alas! you don't know the reality of what I have done. By God! what I have done is in the best interests of the Shias. Don't you know that I am your Imam and it is obligatory for you to obey me. And according to the indication made by the Messenger of Allah I am one of the

chiefs of the youngest inmates of Paradise? All of them replied: why not. What you say is absolutely correct. He added: do you know when Khidhar broke the boat, murdered the child and repaired the wall, Moses got annoyed with him because he did not know that each one of us carries the band of allegiance to a rebellious person of his times. Only the Qaim is an exception. Isa bin Miriyam will pray behind him. God will keep his birth a secret, and he will remain invisible so that he is not forced into allegiance of any such person. When the ninth Imam is born out of the children of my brother Hussain, God will give him a long life during his state of invisibility and then reveal him in the guise of a young man even less than forty years in age to prove that nothing can defy God's supervision and His will prevails over the will of others.*

A similarly fake tradition is attributed to Imam Jafar "If some one acknowledges all the Imams and denies Imam Mehdi, it means he acknowledges all the prophets and denies Muhammad (peace be upon him). People asked him: O son of the Prophet! who among your children will be Mehdi? He replied: the fifth who will be the son of the seventh but he will remain invisible; therefore it will not be proper for you to mention his name.*

His position and status:

They rely on the tradition of Ali bin Hussain to determine the position and status of this Imam: "whosoever among us is blessed as Imam Qaim will embody in himself the Sunnahs of six prophets; one of these Sunnahs will be Noh's, the second will be of Ibrahim, the third of Moses, the fourth of Ayyub, the fifth of Christ and the sixth Sunnah will be the Sunnah of Hadhrat Muhammad (peace be upon him). Noh's Sunnah will symbolize long life, Ibrahim's Sunnah will reflect secrecy of birth and segregation from people, Moses' Sunnah will spell out absence and invisibility, Christ's Sunnah will stand for the difference of opinion among the people about his reality, Ayyub's Sunnah will usher in comfort after calamity and the Sunnah of Hadhrat Muhammad (peace be upon him) will appear with the force of the sword -- the birth of this Qaim will be kept secret from people. The people will say that he is not yet born that he should revolt. Besides he will not wear the band of his allegiance. The period of his invisibility will be blessed with the rewards conferred on the martyrs of Badar and in his case the reward will be multiplied a thousand times.*

N'omani has related it on the authority of Ali bin Hussain that Mehdi will recline against Baitullah and he will say:

"I am Adam's remainder, Noh's treasure, Ibrahim's nominee, and Muhammad's selectee".*

"I am Allah's remainder (baqih) and His Khalifah and Hujjat for you".*

"Gabriel will always be with him".*

Shias also discuss it in a lighter vein occasionally. When Musa bin Imran read about the honour and distinction reserved for Qaim among the children of Muhammad (peace be upon him) in Safar I, he prayed to God: Oh Allah! Make me the Qaim among the children of Muhammad. God replied: he will be among the children of Ahmad. Musa looked it up in Safar II but he found the same answer. He made the same submission and again received the same reply. Then he consulted Safar III, but found an identical explanation and repeated his prayer to God again he received

the same reply.*

When will the invisible Imam appear?

Kulaini in his "Kafi" reports from Asbagh bin Nubatah: I called on Amir-ul-Mominin. I saw that he looked worried, and out of worry he was scratching the ground. I submitted: Amir-ul-Mominin, what's the matter? Are you in love with the earth? He replied: I am in love neither with the earth nor with any thing that is of the world. But I am thinking about the child who will be born out of my children. He will be the Mehdi and transform the world of oppression and persecution into a cradle of justice and equity. His absence will be rather strange and as a result many people will go astray and others will return to the fold. I asked: O Amir-ul-Mominin! how long will be the period of his absence? He replied: six days or six months or six years. I inquired: Is it really about to happen? He replied: yes, yes. As he is about to be born, similarly his disappearance is also about to occur. Asbagh, don't get lost. They are the best people because they will live among the best people of the nation.*

It is also attributed to Abu J'after Baqir:

O Thabit! God had decided to reveal him in seventy but when Hadhrat Hussain was martyred, God's wrath descended on the inmates of the earth and he postponed it to one hundred and forty. When I told you about it, you made it public and tore away all the folds (of secrecy). Then God waived aside the time clause altogether. Allah effaces any one He likes and keeps alive any one He likes and He has with him the Un-ul-Kitab.*

It is also attributed to his son Jafar:

"The year one hundred and forty had been fixed for him but God postponed it because you had made it public".*

He has also reported a tradition attributed to Abu Jafar. "The maximum span between Qaim and Nafs Zakiyyah will be over fifteen nights".*

His son Jafar is reported to have observed:

"When the wall of Kufah mosque adjacent to Ibn Masud's house collapses, that will be the moment of the Kingdom's decline and at that time the Qaim will make his appearance".*

It is clear as day light that Nafs Zakiyyah was murdered and many thousand nights have elapsed since his murder. Similarly hundreds of years have passed since the wall of Kufah mosque collapsed but the impalpable Imam has not appeared yet.

Ishaq bin Ammar is supposed to have stated: Abu Abdullah told me that the matter has been postponed twice".*

There is no doubt that the Shias were persistently seduced by false hopes and expectations of the appearance of their Qaim and the return of their Mehdi and they are still the victims of these illusions and delusions. It has been attested by their seventh Imam Musa bin Jafar and endorsed by Kulaini in "Kafi" and Nomani* in "Kitab-ul-Ghaibah". The main object of these attestations and endorsements is to strengthen the beliefs of the Shias in these spurious traditions so that they do not

back out of their commitment to Shiaism. Yaqtin reportedly told his son Ali bin Yaqtin: our situation is rather funny: what was conveyed to us has been implemented, but what was conveyed to you had not been implemented, that is, the promise made by Bani Abbas. Ali replied: what was conveyed to you and us had the same objective. The only difference is that your affair has now ripened and it has materialized as was promised to you. Our affair has not matured yet and we are still being seduced by hope. It will harden our hearts if we are told bluntly that the affair will mature after two or three hundred years and the people might turn away from Islam. Therefore you should say that the time of the appearance of the Imam is pretty close, that he is just about to appear and people will draw consolation from it.*

Jazairi relates on the authority of Majlisi that during the period of Safawi kings he anxiously awaited the appearance of the Imam on the basis of three traditions. He says that all the traditions bearing on this issue are intact. The reporters have recorded them without alteration or modification and have not explained the subtleties involved in them. Since they are not fake traditions, it is not proper to reject them out of hand. No one before Majlisi had tried to offer their explanation. But when Majlisi appeared on the scene, he focussed his attention on their interpretation. Some of the traditions he related to the establishment of the Safawi kingdom and others he appended to the appearance of Alif Salam. First I'll reproduce these traditions as they are and then I'll make reference to the interpretation offered by Majlisi.

First tradition:

Muhammed bin Ibrahim Nomani observes in his book "Kitab-ul-Ghaibah": "I saw a few people who had appeared in the east. They were in pursuit of truth but the truth evaded them. But when they saw him, they placed their swords on the shoulders. In that state whatever they demanded was given to them, but they did not accept it until they stood up (on their feet) nor were they ready to give it to any martyrs".

Majlisi has explained that the people, who are blessed with special insight, are aware of the fact that those who appeared in the east belonged to the Safawiyyah chain. The leading light of this chain was Shah Ismail. The words of the tradition "they were not ready to give it to any one else except your Imam" refer to the Imam Qaim. The tradition carries a clear pointer that the Safawi rule and the rule of Mehdi are concurrent. It means that the Safawis will hand over the rule to Imam Mehdi on his appearance without any dispute.

Second tradition:

This tradition is also recorded by Nomani in the same book with the requisite amount of certification. Once Amir-ul-Mominin was relating events which will occur after him till the appearance of Mehdi. Hadhrat Hussain asked him: Amir-ul-Mominin ! When will God purify the earth of tyrants? He replied: It will not happen until the blood of uncountable people is unlawfully shed on the face of the earth. Then he recounted at great length the details relating to the rule of Banu Umayyah and Banu Abbas which the reporter has condensed. Amir-ul-Mominin said: When Qaim appears in Khorasan, over-powers Fan and Malkan and crosses the island of Bani Kavan and moves into Jailan, he will accept the invitation of Abr and Dilam. (At that time) the flags of the Turks will appear for my son who will spread in different countries. Barah will be completely ruined and then a leader will appear. Similarly he related an other long

story and then said: When there will be thousands arrayed in impregnable rows, the ram will kill the kids and then the second one will appear. The avenger will take his revenge and the infidel will be annihilated. Then the expected Qaim will appear and reveal to the people what is kept hidden from them. Hussain ! he will be one of our children and he will be an exceptional son. He will appear between the pillars of Yamani and Hatim with a small bunch of people at Thaqalain and he will not spare any dastardly fellow on earth. How lucky are the people who will live in his era and witness his rule! Majlisi has explained in his tradition that the island of Bani Kawan is in the vicinity of Astrabad. Dilam are the people who live in Qazvin and in the areas adjacent to it. Hurrat are the sacred spots. The ruin of Basrah refers to wars and other calamitous events. The cumulative impact of these natural and unnatural phenomena will be the total decimation of Basrah. Qaim stands for Mehdi. The two pillars are the pillars of Kabah i.e., Rukn and Hatim and this is the place of the Imam's appearance. Zar Yasir means a small party of people whose number will equal the number of the martyrs of Badr. Thaqalain implies both Jinn and human beings. It means he will overwhelm both of them. They are referred to as Thaqalain because they have added to its burden though they live on it; or it is because they are superior among the earthly creatures and the Arabs use the word Tahaqal in reference to a respectable person or because the various hardships they face have hardened them. The dastardly people are tyrants and infidels.

Allama Majlisi further explains that the rebels of Khorasan are the Turkish rulers like Changez Khan and Hulaku Khan. The one who will revolt in Jailan is Shah Ismail. That is why he declared him as his son. The chief executive is either the mentioned king or any one of the Safawi kings. "The ram will kill the kids" is pregnant with historical allusion. It refers perhaps to Safi Mirza because he had murdered his father Shah Abbas (1), and he had avenged his blood, and the one who murdered him had also murdered his father Safi Mirza. "Then the awaited Qaim will appear" refers to the merger of Safawi rule with the rule of Mehdi.

Third tradition:

This tradition is recorded by Muhammad bin Masud Ayyashi in his Kitab-ut-Tafsir. He is one of the most reliable traditionists. He has reported it from Abu Lubaid Fakhruhi who has reported it from Baqir: He remarked in the context of the excesses committed by the Banu Abbas administration; Abu Lubaid! Some of the distinctive letters of the Quran are packed with infinite knowledge. When Allah revealed the Prophet (peace be upon him) stood up until his light became apparent and the divine articulation was established, though when he was born, one hundred and three years had elapsed out of the seventh thousand. He added: Whenever you count them without repetition, you will find a reference to him in the distinctive letters of the Book of Allah. When anyone of these letters is a terminal letter, its termination will be an indication of the fact that someone from the Banu Hashim will stake out his claim as the Qaim. He further added: means one , thirty and forty , means ninety and they add up to one hundred and sixty one. was the beginning of Hussain bin Ali's appearance. When he completed his tenure, then at the occasion of Al-Mas , a Qaim from among the children of Abbas appeared and when come to its end, a Qaim from among us will appear. Try to grasp all these details and explanations and keep them secret.

Majlisi explains that from to seven implies the initial point of Adam's creation. Besides, this tradition contains many figures and I have offered various interpretations in my book "Bihar-ul-Anwar". Here I'll confine myself to only one

interpretation but even this interpretation needs a prelude and a preface. Every one knows that in the authentic books of mathematics, various terms have been coined for the alphabetical letters but the mathematical figures contained in this tradition rely for their interpretation on the Western terminology. In the former times Arabs had made considerable progress in the field of mathematics. Thus stood for the figure of sixty, for ninety, for three hundred, for eight hundred, for nine hundred, for one thousand and the remaining letters carried the conventional sense.

When you grasp the preface you will arrive at the date of birth of the Prophet (peace be upon him) through a survey of the Surahs in case the repetitive letters are not taken into account for analytical purposes. For example and etc are repeated but they will be counted only once in the mathematical calculation. Similarly etc will be counted only three times. When you count these letters tot up to one hundred and three from the creation of our father Adam down to the birth of the Prophet (peace be upon him) and in the light of the tradition this period adds up to six thousand one hundred and three years (plus three years of). Each thousand starts with a date, and out of seven thousand one hundred and three years, the initial period of each year has already expired as is formerly established. The number of these letters is also one hundred and three. Thus which is at the beginning of Surah Baqrah, refers to the birth of the prophet (peace be upon him). The explanation of Amir-ul-Mominin that when any one of these letters terminates, its terminal period will give birth to a Qaim among Banu Hashim makes sense in the light of this calculation. It means that the rule of Banu Hashim starts with Abdul Matlib and a period of seventy one years links the rule of Abdul matlib and the rule of the prophet (peace be upon him), and it covers all the figures of . The arrangement of in the Surahs Baqrah and Al-Imran points to the appearance of Hadhrat Hussain as a period of seventy one years links his appearance and the beginning of the Prophetic rule. It points towards the arrival of Banu Abbas on the basis of arrangement of Quranic Surahs because the Banu Abbas are also Hashimis, though their claim to rule was dubious and the period from the birth of the Prophet (peace be upon him) to the establishment of Banu Abbas rule though it was much longer if counted from the date of their allegiance.

It is also possible that the beginning of its date coincides with the revelation of Surah 'Iraf. If this is the case, then it will be coterminous with the time of allegiance. If it is calculated from another angle, it will actually provide the basis of the tradition recorded in "Kitab ma'ani-ul-Akhbar" and by the grace of God I shall discuss it at a later stage. Occurs at five places in the Quran and the Amir-ul-Mominin did not hesitate to explain it as he had hesitated to explain . From the beginning of its composition, its aggregate comes up to one thousand one hundred fifty five years because it is the year 1078 A.H. It means (seventy seven), years are still left in the appearance of the imam. And if these dates are calculated from the date of birth, the total period tot up to sixty five years. This is an abridged version of majlisi's explanation.*

Now the fifty five years as well as the seventy seven years have passed; rather as in-ordinately long period has expired but it is regrettable that the time of the return of their invisible Imam has not yet arrived nor there appears to be any sign of its arrival. A poet has remarkably stated:

"The time for the basement has not yet arrived to give him birth whom you have invested with the human shape in your fancy.

"Your rational faculties are to be pitied as you have added a third entity to the phoenix and the ghost.

How and where will he come?

The Shias base their beliefs on Jafar's statement that the twenty-sixth of the month of Ramadhan will be called the day of the Qaim and it will be the day of Ashurah, the day on which Hadhrat Hussain was martyred: It means I find him standing between the Rukan and the place of Ibrahim on the 17th of Muharram. Gabriel is standing in front of him and speaking loudly: O people ! come and pledge your allegiance. On hearing these words the Shias from all corners of the world will rush madly to take the oath of allegiance at his hand. Distances will shrink to facilitate their arrival. God, on account of His Qaim imam, will turn the oppressed world into a cradle of justice and equity".*

Then he related how the Shias will gather to pay homage to Imam Qaim: When the Imam calls the people to prayer, he will call out the name of God in Hebrew language.* Then three hundred and thirteen of his companions will be elected. People will scramble towards him companions will be elected. People will scramble towards him like autumn leaves with flags in their hands. Some of them will be picked up from their beds and despatched to Makkah overnight. Some people would be seen flying among the clouds during day time, and their names, the names of their fathers, their marks of identification and their social and racial status will also be made public. I submitted: may I be sacrificed for your sake! Who will be the greatest believer among them? He replied that the man with the strongest faith would be seen flying among the clouds during day time----- There will be the missing people and the following revelation obviously applied to them:

"Whereever you are, God will bring you (here)".*

Shaikh Taifah Tusi states that a herald will proclaim the name of Qaim from the skies. The proclamation will be heard from the east to the west. The people will wake up on hearing it. Those who are standing will slump on the ground and those who are sitting will rise in a state of stupefied anxiety because it will be the voice of Gabriel.*

Nomani has added that all the creatures will hear the voice. It will wake up the sleeping people and rally them in the courtyards of their houses. Qaim will appear and revolt on hearing the voice as it will be Gabriel's scream.*

Similarly they have attributed a tradition to Mufdhil bin Umar: I asked Jafar bin Baqir: In which area of the world will the Mehdi appear? He replied: when he appears, each eye will catch a glimpse of him. He will disappear on the last day of 226 A.H. and no one will see him until every one can see him. He will appear in Makkah. By God! O Mufdhil; it seems as if he is in Makkah and I am looking at him. He is wearing the prophet's length of cloth. He has a turban on his head and he is wearing his patched shoes. He has his stick in his hand and he will enter Makkah driving the emaciated goats with it. No one will recognize him when he enters Makkah. Mufdhil asked: Sir, in that case, how will he make his appearance? He replied: He will appear alone, and move towards the House of God alone until the night spreads, the eyes sleep and the silence of the night prevails. Then the rows of angels along with Gabriel and Michael will come down. Gabriel will say: O Master!

Your word is about to be received by people and your orders are about to be obeyed. The Imam will brush his hand against his face and say:

"I thank God who has fulfilled His promise and made us inherit the Paradise so that we may live in it wherever we like. There is infinite reward for those who do good".

And then he will shout at the top of his voice from a spot between the Rukan and the place of Ibrahim: O my friends, my special people! and O all those people whom God has created to witness my appearance, come to me professing my allegiance. This voice will reach all the people while they are asleep on their beds in the east and the west and it will reach them simultaneously. They will come leaping towards you and will assemble in front of you on the spot between the Rukan and the place of Ibrahim. Then God will command a beam of light to spread vertically from the earth towards the skies and each believer on the face of the earth will benefit from its radiance till it enters the house of the believers which will send a wave of joy into their hearts. Though the believers will not be consciously aware of the Qaim's presence, they will unconsciously assemble before him and they will be three hundred and thirteen in number, equal to the number of the companions who took part in the battle of Badar.*

Imam Qaim will address the people reclining against the House of God: O people! any one who likes to see Adam and Shayth can see them now. I am Adam and Shayth standing right in front of you ; any one who likes to see Ibrahim and his son can see them: I am before you in the form of Ibrahim and Ismail; if any one likes to see Isa and Shamun, can see them now: I am Isa and Shamun ; any one who likes to see Muhammad and Amir-ul-Mominin can see them now: I am Muhammad and Amir-ul-Mominin; one who likes to see Hassan and Hussain can see them now: I am Hassan and Hussain; any one who likes to see the Imams born among the children of Hussain can see them now: I am Hassan and Hussain ; any one who likes to see the Imams born among the children of Hussain can see them now: I am the aggregate of all Imams. Obey me and I'll tell you which you have already been told and I'll also tell you which you have not been told. Any one of you who recites the books should listen to me and then consult the books God revealed to Adam and Shayth. The followers of Adam and Shayth will say. By God! These are the true books because we have seen in them what we did not know. We have come to know what was declared irrelevant in them or the modifications and alterations made in them. Then the Imam will read out to them the true and genuine books of Noh and Ibrahim. He will also read out to them the old testament, the Bible and the New Testament. Their followers will spontaneously react and say: by God! This is the comprehensive Testament and that is the perfect Bible. And these books will be in inexhaustible quantity. Then the Imam will recite the Holy Quran and the Muslims will utter: by God! This is the comprehensive Testament and that is the perfect Bible. And these books will be in inexhaustible quantity. Then the Imam will recite the Holy Quran and the Muslims will utter: by God! this is the true and complete Quran which is without change or mutilation.*

This Imam will appear in the shape of a thirty-year old graveful young man. Accordingly, the Shias have imputed a fake tradition to imam jafar. He is supposed to have anticipated that even if the Qaim does appear, people will not recognize him as he will return in the shape of a graceful young man. Only the people from whom God had secured the pledge will remain steady in their conviction. According to an

other tradition the Qaim, like Ibrahim Khalil, will enjoy a long life tenure of one hundred and twenty years. Then he will disappear for a short spell and reappear in the form of a thirty-year old lovely young man.*

First of all Gabriel will pledge allegiance to him as has been stated by Tabrisi etc. Gabriel will come to him and ask him about the nature of his invitation. The Qaim will answer him. Gabriel will say : First of all I pledge fealty to you. Therefore he will bring his hand forward and then Gabriel will place his hand over his hand.*

Bahrani says that Gabriel will descend on a drain pipe in the guise of a white bird and among all the creatures he will be the first one to take the oath of allegiance at his hand.* They also dash it with the spice of addition: Gabriel visited the prophet (peace be upon him) to enquire after his health, sent salutations on him and said: It is my last day to descend on earth. they also quote the tradition of Ata bin Yasar that Gabriel visited the Prophet (peace be upon him) at his death - bed and said: O Muhammad ! I am flying towards the skies and I shall never return to the earth. It is also attributed to Abu Jafar that Gabriel addressed the prophet (peace be upon him) on his death-bed and said: O Muhammad! it is my last descension on earth because I had to descend on earth only to see you.*

On the other hand they claim that Gabriel will come down and pledge allegiance to him. Not only Gabriel but the other angels will also come down and swear fealty to him as Jazairi has reported from Jafar: He will be reclining against Haram. He will stretch his hand forward and it will be lighted without any pain and he will say: it is the hand of Allah. First of all Gabriel will kiss his hand, then all the angels will pledge fealty to him and they will be followed by Najib among the Jinns and Naqib among the believers.*

This is endorsed by Mufid, Tabrisi, Ibn-ul-Fatal, Bahrani, Nomani etc who have imputed a bogus tradition to Muhammad Baqir: It seems I am looking at Qaim in Najf-i Kufah. He is leaving Makkah in the company of five thousand angels. Gabriel is on his right side, Michael is on his left side and the believers are in the vanguard and they will distribute the armies among the various cities.*

Not only five thousand, but an extra force of thirteen thousand, three hundred and thirteen angels will also descend on him. I asked: Will all of them be angels? He replied: yes, they will all be angels who were with Noh on his raft, they were with Ibrahim when he jumped into Nimrod's fire; they were with Moses when the river split for the sake of Bani Israel; they were with Jesus when he ascended to the heavens; four thousand angels who were with the Prophet (peace be upon him) as "Musawimin", one thousand "Murdafin" and three hundred thirteen "Badriyyin", and four thousand angles who wanted to fight along with Hadhrat Hussain but he had not permitted them. All of these angels had anxiously awaited the arrival of Qaim and are looking forward to his rebellion.*

Nomani has also recorded it in his "Kitab-ul-Ghaibah" with the addition* that Gabriel will be holding his flag on that day and it will be vertically pointed like the perpendicular shapes of the divine canopy.* The four thousand angels who wanted to fight on the side of Hadhrat Hussain but he had not permitted them to do so, will stay around his grave till doomsday in a miserable state and with dishevelled hair. The leader of these angels is Mansur and they welcome any one who visits the grave, and bid farewell to anyone who leaves the grave after the visit. They enquire after sick people and take part in the funeral of a dead man.*

What will he do? One of the worst characteristics of Shias is their shameless propensity for lies. They have obviously inherited it from the Jews and the Zoroastrians who tarnished the glory of Muslim rule and Islamic grandeur through their hideous conspiracies. Out of sheer malice the Shias spread the rumour that first of all the Qaim will kill the Quraishis and crucify them and put the Arabs to sword. Accordingly they have attributed a false tradition to Abu Jafar:

If the people come to know that, after his appearance, the Qaim will massacre them, the majority of them would prefer not to see him. He will initiate his campaign with the mass murder of Quraish and wield his sword with such ruthlessness that most of the people would say he is not a member of the Prophet's progeny, because if he had been one of his children, he would have been compassionate.*

Mufid and Tabrisi relate on the authority of Jafar: When the Qaim among the children of Muhammad (peace be upon him) makes his return, he will order five hundred members of Quraish to stand up and then he will chop their necks off; he will again order five hundred more members to stand up and will chop their necks off; and then another five hundred and he will repeat the operation six times. I asked: Will the Quraishis be in such numbers at that time? he replied: yes, Quraishis and their Mawalis will make the number.*

He will prove himself the cutting (edge of the) sword for the Arabs; he will think only of the sharp sword as far as Arabs; he will think only of the sharp sword as far as Arabs are concerned and he will not accept any body's repentance."*

They have placed a similar tradition at Jafar's door-sill as well:

"When Qaim appears, the only thing between him and the Arabs will be the sword. He will not agree on anything except the sword. Then why are they keen on the appearance of the Qaim? He is the sword and death lurks under the shadow of the sword".*

This reflects their malice against the Arabs in general, and Quraish in particular. It proves unmistakably the Jewish and Zoroastrian heritage of the Shias and difinitively establishes the infiltration of Jewish beliefs into the Shia faith.

For More Books on Shiaism:

<http://sunnairan.wordpress.com>

<http://kr-hcy.tk>

<http://shiacult.webnode.com>

<http://ansar.org>

<http://gift2shias.wordpress.com>