

WHEN
TIJANI
WAS MISGUIDED

How Tijani Was Misguided

Exposing Al-Tijani's Lies in His Book: "Then I was Guided"

- First: Answering Al-Tijani's Libels against Abu Hurayrah
-

Exposing Al-Tijani's Lies in His Book: "Then I was Guided"

By Abu Sulaiman

First: Answering Al-Tijani's Libels against Abu Hurayrah

Abu Hurayrah, *may Allah be pleased at him*, is the master of retainers and endurance, and the companion of Prophet Muhammad *peace be upon him*. He was with the Prophet *peace be upon him* in his dwellings and travels. His name is Abdulrahman bin Sakhr. Abu Hurayrah transmitted a lot of knowledge from the Prophet *peace be upon him*. Not even him was saved from the tongue of this hating person who accused Abu Hurayrah of lying on Prophet Muhammad *peace be upon him* by making up fabricated *hadeeths*. I will present his doubts about this companion and I will refute them by the permission of Allah.

- **Tijani's claim that Abu Hurayrah narrates fabricated *hadeeths* and the answer to this claim:**

Al-Tijani says: "Perhaps they assigned the second half of the religion to Abu Hurayrah, who told them what they wanted to hear, so they bestowed on him various honors: they gave him the governorship of al-Medinah, they gave him al-Aqiq palace and gave him the title of "Rawiat al-Islam" - the transmitter of Islam. He made it easy for the Umayyads to create a completely new religion which took whatever pleased them and supported their interests and power from the Holy Qur'an and the tradition of the Prophet."^[1]

He also says: "Then I read "Abu Hurayrah" by Sharaf al-Din and Shaykh al-Mudira" by Shaykh Mahmud Abu Rayyah al-Misri, and learnt that the Companions who changed after the departure of the Messenger of Allah were two types. The first, changed the rules. because of its power and authority. The

second, changed the rules by attributing false *Hadiths* to the Messenger of Allah.”[2]

And again he says: “The virtues of Abu Bakr were also mentioned by Amr ibn al-'As, Abu Hurayrah...”[3]

And I will answer his lies as the following:

1. About his sayings that Abu Hurayrah told the Ummayyads what they desired to hear, therefore the Ummayyads bestowed on him various honors, that they gave him the governorship of Al-Madinah, that they gave him Al-Aqiq palace when he had nothing, and that they gave him the title “*Rawiat Al-Islam*” (The Narrator of Islam) is a plain lie for the following reasons:
 - a. Abu Hurayrah was not with any of the two warring factions. He secluded himself from the battle and did not fight with anyone. Moreover, Abu Hurayrah narrated some seclusion *hadeeths* from the Prophet *peace be upon him*. An example, Abu Hurayrah narrated that the Prophet *peace be upon him* said: “There will be afflictions (in the near future) during which a sitting person will be better than a standing one, and the standing one will be better than the walking one, and the walking one will be better than the running one, and whoever will expose himself to these afflictions, they will destroy him. So whoever can find a place of protection or refuge from them, should take shelter in it.”[4] To be secluded was also the opinion of grand Companions.
 - b. Abu Hurayrah was not a destitute and his governorship of Al-Medina was not the first! But what could we say about an ignorant who monkey with history? In his caliphate, Omar bin Al-khattab *may Allah be pleased at him* gave Abu Hurayrah the governorship of Al-Bahrain, and Abu Hurayrah had the money. Muhammad bin Sireen says: “Omar handed Abu Hurayrah the governorship of Bahrain, and Abu Hurayrah came to Omar with 10,000 Dinars. Omar said to him: “O’ you the enemy of Allah and the enemy of His book! You took exclusive possession of this money?” Abu Hurayrah answered: “I am not the enemy of Allah nor the enemy of His book, but I am the enemy of who take enmity against them.” Omar asked: “Then from where did you get this money?” Abu Hurayrah answered: “I got this money by breeding my horses, my slave labors, and by getting consecutive gifts.” They examined his claim and found him saying the truth. Then Omar asked Abu Hurayrah to take the governorship, but Abu Hurayrah refused. Omar said: “You hate to work while a better person than you was seeking it i.e. Yusuf *peace be upon*

him?” Abu Hurayrah said: “Yusuf is a prophet, a son of a prophet who was a son of another prophet and I am Abu Hurayrah the son of Umaymah and I am afraid of three things that have 2 folds each.” Omar asked: “Why would not you say five?” Abu Hurayrah answered: “I am afraid to speak without knowledge, to quell without clemency, afraid that my back would be beaten, that my money would be taken, and that my honor would be insulted.”[5]

- c. The reason that the Ummayyads gave Abu Hurayrah the governorship of Al-Medina was because Abu Hurayrah was one of the grand Companions who were left in the Medina and other cities. He was one of the prominent signs in Medina especially if we knew that he was asked to advance in prayer at the time of Ali and Mu’awiyah. If other than the Ummayyads ruled, they would certainly give Abu Hurayrah the governorship of Medina. He was the best candidate, and why not if he was asked to govern by a better person i.e. Omar?
- d. This escapee tries to portray Abu Hurayrah as the person who adheres to life and its lust. He tries to picture him as the sycophant to the rulers who lies in order to get instinctive benefits! Is this what should be said about Abu Hurayrah and he is the one who narrated from the Prophet *peace be upon him*: “There are three persons whom Allah will not look at on the Day of Resurrection, nor will he purify them and theirs shall be a severe punishment. They are ... a man who gave a pledge of allegiance to a ruler and he gave it only for worldly benefits. If the ruler gives him something he gets satisfied, and if the ruler withholds something from him, he gets dissatisfied.”[6] And how could he ask for something and he narrates from the Prophet *peace be upon him*: “One would rather cut and carry a bundle of wood on his back than ask somebody who may or may not live him.”[7] Muslim narrates in his *Saheeh* that Abu Zar’ah says: “Abu Hurayrah and I entered Marwan’s house. Abu Hurayrah saw some pictures so he said: “I heard the messenger of Allah *peace be upon him* saying that Allah asked: “who is more wrong than a person who tries to create something like my creatures? Let them therefore create an atom, a seed or a barley.”[8] Al-Hakim narrated in his *Mustadrik* that Abu Maryam, the slave of Abu Hurayrah, says: “Once, Abu Hurayrah passed by Marwan while Marwan was building his house, which is located in the middle of the city. So I set near him while the workers are working. Abu Hurayrah said: “Build strongly, aim for far, and die nearly.” Marwan said: “Abu Hurayrah, you are talking to the workers, what are you telling them?” Abu Hurayrah answered: “I told them to build strongly, aim for far, and to die nearly. O’ people of Quraysh! Remember three times how you were yesterday and how you are today.

Before you used to serve your Persian and Roman masters. Eat today the semolina bread and the fat meat, but do not eat each other and do not hate and malice each other's as the hackneys do. Be small today and tomorrow you would be big. By Allah, none of you will rise a level save that Allah will bring him down at Judgement Day.”[9] Look my dear brother to the clear truth and do not give attention to the holder of an obvious lie and a slandering desire.

1. Tijani's allegation that Abu Hurayrah narrates what people desire, that Abu Hurayrah narrates fabricated stories about the virtues of the Companions, especially Abu Bakr – and that Al-Tijani became more sure of this when he read books about Abu Hurayrah by Sharaf Al-deen and Mahmoud Abu Rayyah, I say refuting his weak arguments:
 - a. The Companions agreed unanimously about the virtue, reliability, and good memorization of Abu Hurayrah. The Companions agreed also that Abu Hurayrah possessed the most knowledge about the Prophet's *hadeeths*. Ibn Omar says to Abu Hurayrah: “Abu Hurayrah, you were the most adhered to the Prophet and the most memorizing of his sayings than anyone of us.”[10] It was said to Ibn Omar: “Do you deny anything that is said by Abu Hurayrah? Ibn Omar answered: “No, but he had the courage and we lacked it.”[11] Ash'ath bin Saleem narrated from his father who says: “When I came to the Medina, I saw Abu Ayyub narrates from Hurayrah who narrated from the Prophet *peace be upon him*. I asked him how he could do that and he is the companion of the Prophet? He answered: “To hear and narrate from Abu Hurayrah who narrated from the Prophet *peace be upon him* is more beloved to me than to narrate directly from the Prophet *peace be upon him*.”[12] Mu'awiyah bin Abi A'ysh Al-Ansari narrates that once he was sitting with Ibn Al-Zubair when Muhammad ben Eyas ben Al-Bakee came and asked about the religious verdict of a man who divorced his wife three times before sexual intercourse. So Ibn Abi Ayash sent the man to Abu Hurayrah and Ibn Abbas who both were with Aysha. The man left and asked Abu Hurayrah and Ibn Abbas the same question. Ibn Abbas asked Abu Hurayrah: “Here you got an enigma, give him an answer Abu Hurayrah.” Abu Hurayrah answered: “The first divorce makes your wife a Bayyinah divorcee, and the third one makes her forbidden on you.” Ibn Abbas said the same thing.[13] Therefore, is it possible to call a man as a liar when Ibn Abbas – the companion of Ali – have trust in him, behave with respect to him and ask him to give the religious verdict?

- b. The reason that Abu Hurayrah narrates a lot from the Prophet *peace be upon him* is because he was with the Prophet *peace be upon him* in his travels and stays. A work or a wife did not occupy Abu Hurayrah, because he did not have a job or a wife. So Abu Hurayrah took good care to accompany the Prophet *peace be upon him* to wherever the Prophet *peace be upon him* goes; whether to pilgrimage or to war (jihad). Abu Anas Malik bin Abi A'amir says: "Once a man came to Talha bin Ubaydillah and said: "O' father of Muhammad! Do you know this Yamani – Abu Hurayrah –? Is he more knowledgeable about the Prophet's *hadeeth* than you? Because we hear things from him that we do not hear from you. Or does he narrate what the Prophet did not really say?" Ibn Ubaydillah answered: "That Abu Hurayrah heard from the Prophet *peace be upon him* what we did not hear then there is no doubt about it. Let me tell you about it. We always had to take care of our houses, goats and works. We used to visit the messenger of Allah *peace be upon him* at the two folds of daylight and Abu Hurayrah was there and poor. He was a guest at the Prophet's house, and had nothing in his hands. Therefore we do not doubt it that he heard from the Prophet what we did not hear, and you would never find a man who has goodness in his self that he would say what the messenger of Allah did not say." [14]
- c. In addition to his numerous collaterality with the Prophet that made him the most Companion narrator from the Prophet, in addition to that, his strong memorization, and accuracy through the teaching of the Prophet *peace be upon him* characterized Abu Hurayrah. Al-Bukhari narrated from Al-Zahari who says: "Narrated Abu Hurayrah: You people say that Abu Hurayrah tells many narrations from Allah's Apostle and you also wonder why the emigrants and Ansar do not narrate from Allah's Apostle as Abu Hurayrah does. My emigrant brothers were busy in the market while I used to stick to Allah's Apostle content with what fills my stomach; so I used to be present when they were absent and I used to remember when they used to forget, and my Ansari brothers used to be busy with their properties and I was one of the poor men of Suffa. I used to remember the narrations when they used to forget. No doubt, Allah's Apostle once said, "Whoever spreads his garment till I have finished my present speech and then gathers it to himself, will remember whatever I will say." So, I spread my colored garment which I was wearing till Allah's Apostle had finished his saying, and then I gathered it to my chest. So, I did not forget any of that narrations." [15]

- d. I have to document the opinion of one of the Shia Imami Imams about Abu Hurayrah and the Imam's trust in him. This Imam is the fourth Imam, Zayn Al-A'abideen Ali bin Al-Hussein. Abu Al-Hasan Al-Ardabili narrated in his book "Kashf Al-Ghimmah" that Sa'eed bin Marjanah says: "Once I was with Ali bin Al-Hussein and I said: "I heard Abu Hurayrah saying: "The Messenger of Allah said that whoever frees a believer Allah will free part by part of him from the Hellfire. Even Allah would free a hand by a hand, a leg by a leg, and hole by hole" Ali alayhi al-salam said: "You heard that from Abu Hurayrah?" Sa'eed answered by a yes. Ali bin Al-Hussein said to his slave: "To my most intelligent slave boy -Abdullah bin Jaffar proposed to buy this slave by one thousand Dinar, but Ali bin Al-Hussein refused – you are free for the sake of Allah." [16] Did you see my dear brother the truth and faithfulness of Abu Hurayrah in the eyes of Imam Ali bin Al-Hussein to a degree that the Imam would execute what Abu Hurayrah narrates without hesitation? Therefore, it is not strange that one of the Shia Imamiyah scholars authenticated Abu Hurayrah and reckoned him one of the praised men in *hadeeth*. Abu Dawood Al-Hillay says: "Abdullah Abu Hurayrah is a known person and one of the Companions of the Prophet." [17] And here Ibn Babaweeh Al-Qumi take Abu Hurayrah's *hadeeths* as arguments in different places in his book "Al-Khisal" [18] and the examiner of the book (*Muhaqqiq Al-Kitab*) Ali Akbar Ghufari does not criticize Abu Hurayrah in that book although Ghufari criticized a lot of men. In addition, the person who narrates many *hadeeths* from Abu Hurayrah is the husband of his daughter; Sa'eed bin Al-Museeb one of his most famous pupils, and the one who narrated from Abu Hurayrah the *hadeeth* of the Prophet's teachings to Abu Hurayrah on memorizing *hadeeths*. Al-Kashshi –one of the grandest Shia scholars in the Science of Men- says about Sa'eed bin Al-Museeb: "Sa'eed bin Al-Museeb was raised by the Prince of Believers alayhi al-salam." [19] Al-Kashshi also narrates that Abu Jaffar says: "Sa'eed bin Al-Museeb the most knowledgeable person among people in the oldies and the most understandable person at his time." [20] Hence, I say to the "guided" Tijani that if Ali raised Sa'eed bin Al-Museeb "then did not Ali tell ibn Al-Museeb his opinion about Abu Hurayrah and ibn Al-Museeb was raised by him? And how could Ali permit ibn Al-Museeb to marry the daughter of the most lying person and Ali was his guardian and trustee?" [21] And how could Zayn Al-A'abideen trust his knowledge and he was one of most special pupil of the most lying person and his inherited? Answer us you the owner of this said guidance!

1. And his saying: “The virtues of Abu Bakr were also mentioned by Amr ibn al-'As, Abu Hurayrah, Urwa and Ikrima, and all of them hated Ali and fought him either with arms or by plotting against him and attributing virtues to his enemies...”[22] I say:
 - a. In relation to Omro bin Al-a's, his fight against Ali is true. But Ibn Al-A's only fought Ali when Ali and his soldiers started fighting them. His participation in the affliction was not because of his enmity against Ali. No but because he thought that he was fighting to defend the truth and to abolish the falsehood. But that Ibn Al-A's was making up virtues for Ali's enemies is true! Ibn Al-A's was one of the narrators of the *hadeeth*: “Ammar would be killed by the aggressor party!” He also narrated from the Prophet *peace be upon him*: “His (Ammar's) killer and the stealer of his belongings are in hell.” And when someone objected on him for fighting Ammar: “It was said to Omro: “Here you are fighting him (Ammar)?” Omro answered that the Prophet *peace be upon him* said that his (Ammar's) killer and the stealer of his belongings (are going to hell, not his fighter)” [23] Look dear brother to this plotting and fabrication to the virtues of Ali's enemies! But Ibn Al-A's only real charge is that he asked the Prophet *peace be upon him*: “Who is the most beloved person to you?” He said, “ 'Aisha.” I asked, “Among the men?” He said, “Her father.” I said, “Who then?” He said, “Then 'Umar bin Al-Khattab.” He then named other men.” [24] This only *hadeeth* is enough to slander against Ibn Al-A's!
 - b. In relation to Abu Hurayrah, Abu Hurayrah isolated himself from the affliction between Ali and Mu'awiyah. Therefore, Abu Hurayrah was not biased. The prejudapears by plotting and fabricating virtues for Ali's enemies as he narrated from the Prophet *peace be upon him* at the Day of Khaybar: “I would give this banner to a man who loves Allah and His messenger, Allah will open by his hands ... Then the Messenger of Allah called Ali bin Abi Talib and gave him the banner.” [25] Not only this, but Abu Hurayrah also narrated that the Prophet *peace be upon him* said: “Who loved them both (Al-Hasan and Al-Hussei

1. Muhammad Al-Tijani Al-Samawi, "Then I was Guided" p. 120
2. Muhammad Al-Tijani Al-Samawi, "Then I was Guided" p. 131
3. Muhammad Al-Tijani Al-Samawi, "Then I was Guided" p. 142
4. Saheeh Al-Bukhari, Book of the "Fitān" (Afflictions), chapter: "There will be afflictions (in the near future) during which a sitting person will be better than a standing one." Number 6670-6671
5. Al-Thahabi. "Sayr A'alam Al-Nubala'a," Vol.2 p.612 – the Examiner said that the narrators are trustworthy.
6. Saheeh Al-Bukhari, book of "Al-Musaqah" (Distribution of Water), Chapter: Preventing the wanderer from water, Number 2230 vol.2
7. Saheeh Al-Bukhari, Book of "Al-Biyoo'a" (Sales and Trade), Chapter: A man's reward and work is by his hands, Number 1964
8. Saheeh Muslim with explanation, Book of "Al-Libas and Al-Zeenah" (Clothes and Adornment), Number 2111
9. Al-Hakim, Al-Mustadrik Vol.4 p.563
10. Sunan Al-Turmidhi Vol.3, Book of "Manaqib Abi Hurayrah" (Virtues of Abu Hurayrah) Number 3836
11. Al-Thahabi, "Sayr A'alam Al-Nubala'a," Vol.2 p.608
12. Al-Thahabi, "Sayr A'alam Al-Nubala'a," Vol.2 p.606
13. Al-Thahabi, "Sayr A'alam Al-Nubala'a," Vol.2 p.607
14. Al-Thahabi, "Sayr A'alam Al-Nubala'a," Vol.2 p.605-606
15. Saheeh Al-Bukhari, Book of "Al-Biyoo'a" (Sales and trade) Number 1942
16. Al-Ardabili, "Kashf Al-Ghimmah," Vol.2 "Virtues of Imam Zayn Al-A'abideen," p.290
17. "Rijal Ibn Dawood Al-Hillay," p.198
18. Al-Qummi, "Al-Khisal," p.31, 38, 164, 174, 176 etc
19. Rijal Al-Kashshi, Number 54, p.107
20. Rijal Al-Kashshi, Number 54, p.110
21. Abdulmun'eim Al-Ali, "Aqbas min Manaqib Abu Hurayrah," (Lights in the Virtues of Abu Hurayrah) p.147
22. Al-Tijani, "Then I was Guided," p.142
23. Musnad Ahmad, Vol.6 Number 17791, Saheeh Isnad
24. Saheeh Al-Bukhari, Book of "Fada'el Al-Sahabah", (Virtues of the Companions) Number 3461
25. Saheeh Muslim, Book of "Fada'el Al-Sahabah", (Virtues of the Companions) Number 2405
26. Musnad Ahmad, "Fada'el Al-Sahabah", (Virtues Companions), Number 1359; Saheeh Isnad
27. Musnad Ahmad, "Fada'el Al-Sahabah", (Virtues Companions), Number 1371; Saheeh Isnad
28. Al-Thahabi, "Sayr A'alam Al-Nubala'a," Vol.4 p.433
29. Al-Tijani, "Then I was Guided," p.142
30. Quran (26:227)
31. Al-Tijani, "Then I was Guided," p.104
32. Al-Tijani, "Then I was Guided," p.143
33. Al-Tijani, "Then I was Guided," p.72

Second: Answering Al-Tijani in his claim that the four Sunni Imams learned knowledge from Imam Jaffar Al-Sadiq

Al-Tijani, when he was about to discuss some kids (as he mentioned) , says:

“One of the boys asked me, "Which Madhhab (religious school) is followed in Tunis'?" I said, "The Maliki madhhab." And noticed that some of them laughed, but I did not pay much attention. He asked me, "Do you not know the Jafari Madhhab?" I said, "What is this new name? No we only know the four Madhahibs, and apart from that is not within Islam."

He smiled and said, "The Jafari Madhhab is the essence of Islam, do you not know that Imam Abu Hanifah studied under Imam Jafar al-Sadiq? And that Abu Hanifah said, "Without the two years al-Numan would have perished." I remained silent and did not answer, for I had heard a name that I had never heard before, but thanked Allah that he - i.e. their Imam Jafar al-Sadiq - was not a teacher of Imam Malik, and said that we are Malikis and not Hanafis. He said, "The four Madhahibs took from each other, Ahmed ibn Hanbal took from al-Shafii, and al-Shafii took from Malik, and Malik took from Abu Hanifah, and Abu Hanifah from Jafar al-Sadiq, therefore, all of them were students of Jafar ibn Muhammad, who was the first to open an Islamic University in the mosque of his grandfather, the Messenger of Allah. and under him studied no less than four thousand jurisprudents and specialists in Hadith (prophetic traditions)."

I say:

1. The claim that Abu Hunayfah was taught by Jaffar Al-Sadiq is a lie that is known to anyone who read something about the life of Abu Hunayfah. What is known and famous is that Abu Hunayfah was taught by some of the grandest scholars at his time, most notably Isma'el bin Hammad Abu Sulayman Al-Kufi who was one of the most distinguished teachers of Abu Hunayfah. In

addition, Abu Hunayfah was taught by Ebraheem bin Muhamed Al-Muntashir, Ebraheem bin Zayd Al-Nakh'ei, Ayyob Al-Sikhtiyani, Al-Harith Al-Hamadhani, Rabee'ea Al-Madani, Salim bin Abdullah bin Omar bin Al-Khattab, may Allah be pleased at him, Sa'eed bin Masrooq the son of Sufyan Al-Thuwayr, Sulayman Al-Hilalay, A'asim bin Kaleeb and many others.

2. Even if Jaffar Al-Sadiq taught Abu Hunayfah, then the matter will not be more than that Abu Hunayfah took knowledge from Al-Saddiq and it does not mean that Abu Hunayfah became a Jaffari. I am saying this as a supposition, otherwise it is confirmed that Abu Hunayfah used to give religious verdicts at the time of Abi Jaffar, the father of Jaffar Al-Sadiq! And Al-Tijani's saying that the four famous Sunni schools follow the Jaffari school is a degraded saying. Ahmed did not read for al-Shafi'ei (read for him hadeeths' strengths as a student), but sat with him. Al-Shafi'ei read "Al-Muwti" on Malik and the book has only 9 hadeeths that are narrated by Jaffar Al-Saddiq. And no one said that Malik was one of the students of Abu Hunayfah, but they said that Malik was contemporary with Abu Hunayfah.
3. The Shia themselves narrate in their most trustworthy books what proves that Abu Hunayfah was never a pupil of Abi Jaffar, let alone Jaffar Al-Sadiq. Instead, the Shia claim that Abu Hunayfah was their enemy! Here, their master Al-Kulayni narrates in their most trustworthy book which equals Al-Bukhari for us, "Usool Al-Kafi":

"Sadeer said: "I heard Abu Jaffar, peace be upon him saying, while holding my hand and exiting then he stood in front of the house: "O' Sadeer, the matter of the people is that they come to these rocks and go round them and then they come to us and let us know their *wilayah* for us and it is Allah's saying: "I am the most forgiver for those who repented, believed, and did good deeds and then were guided." Abu Jaffar pointed to his chest and said: "Guided to our *wilayah*." Then he said: "O' sadeer, let me show you those who hinders the religion of Allah." Then he looked to Abu Hunayfah and Sufyan Al-Thuwayr at that time and they were in a circle in the mosque. Abu Jaffar said: "Those are who hinders the religion of Allah without guidance from Allah and without an obvious book. If those dirties sat in their houses, then the people who would look for someone to tell them about Almighty Allah

and about His prophet would come to us and we would tell them about the almighty Allah and about His prophet.”

4. And what Al-Tijani says that Jaffar Al-Sadiq taught more than four thousands jurisprudents and specialists in *hadeeth* is a very normal thing I say! And why not when the Shia narrates: “Some people from around the city asked for the permission of Jaffar Al-Sadiq to enter. Al-Saddiq allowed them to enter. They entered and asked him, in one sitting, thirty thousands questions and he, peace be upon him, answered them and he was only ten years old.” Then what is the value of the knowledge of the four Sunni Imams in comparison to these scholars!

Answering Al-Tijani's allegations against Mu'awiyah bin Abi Sufyan

It is taken for granted that Mu'awiyah bin Abu Sufyan, may Allah be pleased at him, was among the most prominent who fought Ali bin Abi Talib, may Allah be pleased at him, about the murder of Uthman. Mu'awiyah represented the leadership of the opposing party against Ali at the battle of Saffeen. Therefore, Al-Tijani had nothing more than pouring his anger on Mu'awiyah and accusing him of oppression and aberration. I will represent Al-Tijani's libels against this companion and I will refute these allegations against Mu'awiyah to defend the writer of the revelation whom the Prophet peace be upon him said about: "O' Allah, make him guided, a guider, and guide people through him." [Sunan Al-Turmidhi, Book of "Virtues," Chapter of "Virtues of Mu'awiyah," #3842, see also Saheeh Al-Turmidhi #3018]

Al-Tijani says: "Umar bin al-Khattab, who was well known for his strictness towards his governors whom used to dismiss them on mere suspicions, was quite gentle towards Mu'awiyah bin Abi Sufyan and never disciplined him. Mu'awiyah was appointed by Abu Bakr and confirmed by Umar throughout his life, who never even rebuked him or blamed him, despite the fact that many people complained about Mu'awiyah and reported him for wearing silk and gold, which was prohibited to men by the Messenger of Allah. Umar used to answer these complaints by saying, "Let him be, he is the Kisra (king) of the Arabs." Mu'awiyah continued in the governorship for more than twenty years without being touched or criticized, and when Uthman succeeded to the caliphate of the Muslims, he added to his authority further districts and regions, which enabled him to a mass great wealth from the Islamic nation and to raise armies to rebel against the Imam (Leader) of the nation and subsequently take the full power by force and intimidation. Thus he became the sole ruler of all Muslims, and later forced them to vote for his corrupt and alcohol drinking son Yazeed, as his heir and successor. This is a long story so I will not go into its details in this book." ["Then I was Guided" p.93-94]

I say:

1. It seems that Al-Tijani, in his representations, cannot forsake some of his prominent characteristics that he enjoys; ignorance is one of these characteristics! Al-Tijani claims that Abu Bakr gave the governorship of Al-Sham to Mu'awiyah and Omar confirmed it all of his life! It is widely known for anyone who read the biography of the four caliphs that Abu Bakr gave the governorship of Al-Sham to Yazeed bin Abi Sufyan, and at the caliphate of Omar, Yazeed was still the governor of Al-Sham and Omar confirmed him. When Yazeed died, Omar gave Mu'awiyah bin Abi Sufyan, Yazeed's brother, the governorship of Al-Sham.

2) What does prove that Omar was lenient with Mu'awiyah, and never put Mu'awiyah accountable for anything? And from where does Al-Tijani get his allegations? Are not there any references he can guide us to? Otherwise, I would tell him as the poet said: If you did not prove your claims, then the owner of these claims is a claimant! But the fact is contrary to that. Ibn Al-Katheer says in Al-Bidayah: (Once, Mu'awiyah entered upon Omar and Mu'awiyah was wearing a green garment. The Companions looked at this garment. When Omar saw that, he jumped to Mu'awiyah with a stick beating him. It made Mu'awiyah saying: "O' Commander of the faithful! Fear Allah for my sake!" Then Omar returned to his sitting. The people asked Omar: "Why did you beat him O' Commander of the Faithful? And there is no one like him among your people?" He answered: "By Allah, I saw nothing but goodness from him, and I was told nothing about him but goodness. If I was told something other than that, then you would see something different to you (Mu'awiyah), but I saw him - he pointed by his hand - and wanted to put down what has gone up in himself.") [Al-Bidayah wa Al-Nihayah, vol.8 p.128]

3. Al-Tijani says: (Despite the fact that many people complained about Mu'awiyah and reported him for wearing silk and gold, which was prohibited to men by the Messenger of Allah. Umar used to answer these complaints by saying, "Let him be, he is the Kisra (king) of the Arabs.") I say:

- a. Reality and history belie Tijani's saying that many people complained about Mu'awiyah. Mu'awiyah ruled Al-Sham for forty years, and his relationship with Al-Sham's people was a relationship of love and loyalty to a degree that the people of Al-Sham agreed strongly with him when Mu'awiyah wanted to avenge Uthman's murder.
- b. I please the author to direct us to the reference he got the lie that Omar said that Mu'awiyah was the Kisra of the Arabs when Omar knew that Mu'awiyah wore gold and silk! It is so strange that Omar beats Mu'awiyah just because he wore a lawful green garment, but says nothing when Mu'awiyah wears the forbidden gold and silk?
- c. The story about Omar is the one that is narrated by Ibn Abi al-Dunya from Abi Abdulrahman Al-Madani who says: (If Omar bin Al-Khattab sees Mu'awiyah he used to say: "This is the Kisra of the Arabs.") [Al-Bidayah wa Al-Nihayah vol.8 p.128]

3. Then Al-Tijani says: "Mu'awiyah continued in the governorship for more than twenty years without being touched or criticized, and when Uthman succeeded to the caliphate of the Muslims, he added to his authority further districts and regions, which enabled him to a mass great wealth from the Islamic nation," I answer:

- a. Giving the governorship of Al-Sham to Mu'awiyah is not considered a slander against Omar or Uthman. It is proven that the Prophet peace be upon him gave the governorship of Najran to his father, Abu Sufyan until the prophet died. Even more, a lot of the prophet's governors were from the Ummayyads: "The prophet gave the governorship of Makkah to Attab bin Asyad bin Abi Al-A'as bin Ummayyah, gave the governorship of San'a'a of Yemen to Khalid bin

- Sa'eed bin Al-A'as in addition to take care of Mudh'haj charities, and Khalid was the governor until the prophet peace be upon him passed away. The prophet gave the governorship of Tayma'a, Khaybar, and Qura Areenah to Omro bin Al-A'as, and gave the governorship of Al-Bahrain, land and sea, to Aban bin Sa'eed bin Al-A'as when the prophet dismissed Al-Ala'a bin al-Hadrami. Aban ruled Al-Bahrain until the Prophet peace be upon him passed away, and before that the Prophet sent him as a commander on some detachments, including a detachment to Najd" [Minhaj Al-Sunnah, vol.4 p.460]
- b. When Mu'awiyah took the governorship of Al-Sham, his policy with his people was one of the best policies. His people loved him, and he loved them too: (Qubaysah bin Jabber said: "I never saw a person greater in clemency, more intelligent, far in patience, good in easy sayings, more known to do good deeds than Mu'awiyah. Some said: "A man said to Mu'awiyah very bad words, then it was said to Mu'awiyah to punish him. Mu'awiyah answered: "I am ashamed from Allah that my patience would not include the bad deeds of my people." In another version, a man said to him: "O' Commander of the faithful! What a patience you have!" Mu'awiyah answered: "I am ashamed to see the crime of any one of you greater than my patience.") [Al-Bidayah wa Al-Nihayah, vol.8 p.138] Therefore, his people supported him when Mu'awiyah wanted to take Uthman's revenge. They gave him allegiance on that and promised him that they will spend their lives and money for the cause of Uthman, take Uthman's revenge, or Allah take their souls before that. [Ibid. p.131]
- c. It is one of the biggest lies Al-Tijani's claim that Mu'awiyah stole the Islamic nation, raised armies to rebel against the Imam (Leader) of the nation and subsequently took the full power by force and intimidation. Mu'awiyah did not want to rule, nor refused the leadership of Ali bin Abi Talib, may Allah be pleased at him, but Mu'awiyah requested from Ali was to give in Uthman's murderers, and only after that he would obey him Ali. Al-Thahabi narrated in "Sayr A'alam Al-Nubala'a" from Ya'ali bin Ubayd from his father who says: (Abu Muslim Al-Khulani and some others went to Mu'awiyah and asked him: "Do you dispute Ali or are you equal to him? Mu'awiyah answered: "By Allah no. I know he is better than I am, and he has the right to rule, but do not you know that Uthman was killed as an innocent? And I am his cousin and the seeker of his revenge? Therefore go to Ali and tell him to send me Uthman's murderers then I will obey him." They went to Ali and talked to him, but Ali refused to hand in Uthman's murderers to Mu'awiyah.) [Sayr A'alam Al-Nubala'a, vol.3, p.140, the examiner of the book said that its narrators are trustworthy] Many times Mu'awiyah emphasized that by saying: "I did not fight Ali but in the matter of Uthman." Ali also confirms this even from the Shia sources. Al-Shareef Al-Ridi narrated in Nahjul Balagha a speech delivered by Ali where Ali says: "In the beginning of our matter, the people of Sham and us met. It is obvious that our God is one, our Prophet is one, and our call in Islam is one. We do not see ourselves more in faith in Allah or more in believing His messenger than them, nor they do. Our matter is one, except for our disagreement in Uthman's blood, and we are innocent from his murder." [Nahjul Balagha, vol.3, p.648] Hence, Ali is confirming that the conflict between him and Mu'awiyah is about the murder of Uthman, not for the sake of leadership or to take control of the Muslims as Al-Tijani claims.

3. It is a plain lie when Al-Tijani says that Mu'awiyah forced the Muslims to vote for his impious and alcohol drinking son Yazeed. Mu'awiyah did not force people to give allegiance to his son Yazeed, but he intended to make Yazeed as a crown prince, and he succeeded. People gave allegiance to Yazeed as a crown prince, and only Al-Hussain bin Ali and Abdullah bin Al-Zubair refused. Mu'awiyah passed away and he did not force the last two to give the allegiance to Yazeed. It is also a lie that Yazeed was an alcohol drinking person. We will let Muhammad bin Ali bin Abi Talib to answer this claim because Muhammad knew Yazeed the best because he lived with him for a while. Ibn Katheer says in Al-Bidayah: (When the people of Al-Medina returned from Yazeed, Abdullah bin Mutee'a and his companions walked to Muhammad bin Al-Hanafiyah. They wanted Muhammad to agree to dismiss Yazeed, but Muhammad refused. Ibn Mutee'a said: "Yazeed drinks alcohol, does not pray, and ignores the rule of the Book." Muhammad answered them: "I never saw what you are saying about him. I came to him, and stayed with him for a while and I saw him taking care of his prayers, looking for goodness, asking about jurisprudence, and clinging to the Sunnah." They said: "He was acting like that!" Muhammad answered: "And what did he scare from me or please so that he shows piety to me? Did he show you what you saying about drinking alcohol? If he did, then you are his partners, but if he did not, then it is not lawful for you to testify what you do not know." They said: "It is the truth for us even if we did not see it." Muhammad said: "Allah refused that on the people of witness, Allah says: "Except for those who testified with truth and they know," and I have nothing to do with you anymore." They said: "Perhaps you did not like someone to take control rather than yourself, therefore, we give you our leadership." He said: "I do not make this fight lawful for me, either as a leader or as a follower." They said: "But you fought with your father!" He answered: "Give me someone like my father to fight the like of what my father fought." They asked: "Then, order your sons Abu Al-Qassim and Al-Qassim to fight with us." He answered: "I would have fight if I ordered them." They said: "At least join us to urge people to fight." He said: "Praise be the Lord! Do you want me to order the people to do what I do not do and do not accept? I would not then advised Allah's slaves for the sake of Allah." They replied: "Hence, we will force you." He said: "Then I will order the people to fear Allah and do not make a creature happy at the expense of the Creator's anger." Then Muhammad left to Makkah." [Al-Bidayah wa Al-Nihayah for IbnKatheer, vol.8, p.236]

Second: Al-Tijani's claim that Mu'awiyah ordered to insult Ali, and that Mu'awiyah is not a writer of the revelation and the answer to these claims:

Al-Tijani says: "I looked for the reasons which led those Companions to change the Sunnah [the tradition] of the Messenger of Allah (saw), and found that the Umayyads (and most of them were Companions of the Prophet) and Mu'awiyah ibn Abi Sufyan (writer of the revelation, as he was called) in particular used to force people to swear at Ali ibn Abi Talib and curse him from the pulpits of the mosques, as most of the historians have mentioned in their books. Muslim, in his Sahih, wrote in a chapter entitled, "The virtues of Ali ibn Abi Talib", the following: Mu'awiyah ordered his governors everywhere to take the curse [of Ali ibn Abi Talib] as tradition, and that all the speakers must include it in their speeches." [Then I was Guided, p106-107] He also says: "How could they judge him as a man who had worked hard to promote Islam and to reward him, after he forced the people to curse Ali and Ahl al- Bayt, the Family of the chosen Prophet." [Then I was Guided, p.121] And: "He was the one who forced people to curse Ali and Ahl al- Bayt, the offspring of the Prophet, in every mosque, so that it became a followed tradition for sixty years." [Then I was Guided, p.169] And: "And how could they call him "The writer of the Revelations" since the revelation came upon the Messenger of Allah (saw) for twenty-three years, and Mu'awiyah was a polytheist for the first eleven years of them, and later, when he was converted to Islam, did not live in Medina (for we could not find any historical reference to support that), whereas the Messenger of Allah (saw) did not live in Mecca after al-Fath [the conquer of Mecca by the Muslims]? So how could Mu'awiyah manage to write the Revelation?" [Then I was Guided, p.170]

I say:

1) It is a lie that Mu'awiyah ordered to insult Ali from the pulpits. There is no rightful or clear evidence about that. Mu'awiya's biography and manners refuses this accusation. What some of the historians mention about that has no value because when these historians presents these words about Mu'awiyah, they do not differentiate between true or false stories. In addition, most of these historians are Shia. But some of the Historians narrated in their books sound stories and false stories, but they are excused when they attributed these stories to their narrators so that we could judge these stories, whether to accept them or reject them. Among these historians is Al-Tabari, who lived in a time of Shia's growing power. Al-Tabari says in the introduction to his history: "Let the person who reads through our book know that my reliance on whatever I recorded is on news and history with attribution to their narrators, without using intellect except in rare occasions. The knowledge of what had happened before, and what is going to happen at present time, is not reached to those who did not see and their time did not allow them for it without being told by people and without the interference of intellect. Therefore, whatever news you find in my book about history that the reader may deny it, or the listener may abhor it because he did not find it truthful according to him, then let him know that we did not present it ourselves, but it came from some of the people who narrated the story to us. We just presented what we have been told." [Tareekh Al-Tabari, Introduction, p.13] Then, it is a must on Al-Tijani, when he takes the historians as an argument, to mention the story that shows that Mu'awiyah ordered to insult Ali from the pulpits. Then let him cry and shout as he wishes.

1. It is a lie also what al-Tijani says that Muslim narrated in his Saheeh a similar incident in "Ali's Virtues" Chapter. The story that Al-Tijani is meaning is the story which is narrated by A'amir bin Sa'ad bin Abi Waqqas who narrated from his father who says: (Mu'awiyah bin Abi Sufyan ordered Sa'ad and asked him: "What prevented you from insulting Abu Turab (Ali bin Abi Talib)?" Sa'ad answered: "The prophet peace be upon him said three things to him (Ali bin Abi Talib), so I would not insult him because to have one of these three things is more beloved to me than Humr Al-Nni'am (a kind of best camels). I heard the prophet peace be upon him saying to appoint Ali as a leader when the prophet used to go to Jihad (Holy War). Ali then would say to him: "O' Messenger of Allah, you left me with the women and children?" The prophet peace be upon him answered him: "Would not you be pleased if you were for me as Haroon was for Mousa? Except there is no prophecy after me." And I heard the prophet saying at the day of Khaybar: "I would give this banner to a man who loves Allah and His Messenger and who Allah and His Messenger love him too." He said: "Then we were looking for this honor." Then the Prophet said: "Call Ali." Ali was brought and he had sore eyes. So the prophet peace be upon him spitted in his eyes and gave him the banner. Then Allah granted victory to the Muslims by the hands of Ali. And when this verse revealed: "Come, let us gather together, our sons and your sons," the messenger of Allah called Ali, Fatima, Hasan, and Hussain and said: "O' Allah, they are my family.") [Saheeh Muslim with Explanation, Book of "The Companions," Chapter of "Virtues of Ali," #2404]

This hadeeth does not mean that Mu'awiyah ordered Sa'ad to insult Ali. But, as it is obvious, Mu'awiyah wanted to know the reason that prevented Sa'ad from insulting Ali. Therefore, Sa'ad gave him the reason, and we do not know that when Mu'awiyah heard Sa'ad's answer got angry with him or punished him. Mu'awiyah's silence is a correction for Sa'ad's opinion. If Mu'awiyah was despotic; forcing people to insult Ali as Al-Tijani claims, then Mu'awiyah would not be quiet and would force Sa'ad to insult Ali, but nothing of that happened. Hence, it is known that Mu'awiyah did not order to insult Ali nor was pleased by that. Al-Nawawi says: "Mu'awiyah's saying does not declare that he ordered Sa'ad to insult Ali, but asked him for the reason that prevented him from insulting. As if Mu'awiyah was saying to him: "Have you refrained from insulting Ali as a result of piety, fear or anything like that? If it was as a result of piety and veneration to refrain from insulting, then you are rightful and if it were other than that, then there would be another answer." Or it might be that Sa'ad was in a group of people who insults Ali and he did not insult Ali with them, and could not prevent them and controverted them so Mu'awiyah asked him this question. They said: "And it may have another explanation, that what prevented you from making Ali wrong in his thought and opinion, and to show to people our good opinion and thought and that Ali was wrong?" [Ibid. p250-252]

3) It is so strange that this Tijani objects on insulting Ali but he does not abstain from insulting the best of the Companions i.e. Abu

Bakr, Omar and Uthman! Their (the Shias) books are full of that and among them is Al-Tijani's book itself. Therefore, I have to say: "These Rafidites, who claim to be believers, have ignominy and lowness. Ignominy is fixed on them wherever they go except with a rope from Allah and a rope from the people." [Minhaj Al-Sunnah, vol.4, p.498]

4. It is a firm thing that Mu'awiyah was among the writers of the revelation. Muslim narrated in his Saheeh from Ibn Abbas that Abu Sufyan asked the prophet peace be upon him for three things: (He (Abu Sufyan) said to the prophet: "O' Prophet of Allah, give me three things." The prophet said: "yes." ... Abu Sufyan said: "Mu'awiyah, make him a writer (of the revelation) under your hands." The prophet answered: "Alright.") [Muslim with explanation, Book of "Virtues of the Companions," Chapter of "Virtues of Abu Sufyan," vol.17, p.2501] Ahmad narrated in his Musnad, and Muslim from Ibn Abbas who says: (Once I was a kid playing with other boys when I looked behind and I saw the prophet peace be upon him coming towards us. So I said: "The prophet did not come to anyone but to me." So I went behind the door to hide. I did not feel until the prophet found me, grasped my neck, and pressed my shoulders gently. The prophet said: "Go and call Mu'awiyah for me." And Mu'awiyah was his writer (of the revelation). So I went looking for Mu'awiyah and told him: "Go and answer the prophet of Allah peace be upon him because he needs you.") [Musnad Ahmed, vol.1, Musnad Ibn Abbas #2651, and Muslim with explanation, Book of "Al-Birr wa Al-Silah," #2604] These two hadeeths prove that Mu'awiyah was one of the writers of the revelation.

5) Al-Tijani says that revelation came down on the prophet peace be upon him for twenty-three years during which Mu'awiyah was a mushrik (disbeliever) for eleven years! I already said that Abu Sufyan asked the prophet peace be upon him to make Mu'awiyah as a writer of the revelation and the prophet peace be upon him accepted that and Mu'awiyah went on writing the revelation for the prophet peace be upon him for complete four years, is this something hard to believe? Then in delirium, Al-Tijani says: "When he (Mu'awiyah) was converted to Islam, did not live in Medina (for we could not find any historical reference to support that), whereas the Messenger of Allah (saw) did not live in Mecca after al-Fath [the conquer of Mecca by the Muslims]?" I say: Is the preceding story does not prove that Mu'awiyah lived in Medina? Al-Turmithi narrated from Abu Majliz who says: (When Mu'awiyah was about to leave, Abdullah bin Al-Zubair and Ibn Safwan stood for him when they saw him. Mu'awiyah said to them: "Set down, I heard the messenger of Allah peace be upon him saying: "Whoever is pleased that men stand for him in respect, then let him take his seat in hell.") [Al-Turmithi, Book of "Taking Permission," #3755, see also Saheeh Al-Turmithi #2212] Does not this hadeeth prove it too? But it seems that the prophet peace be upon him ordered Ibn Abbas to call Mu'awiyah from Mecca!! I will not rebuke Al-Tijani for saying, "We could not find any historical reference to support that," because if he sought it, he would have found it, but we ask Allah for a cure for his fairness complex!

Third: Al-Tijani's claim that the reason Mu'awiyah killed Hijr bin Uday was because Hijr refused to insult Ali and the answer to this claim:

Al-Tijani says: "When some of the Companions protested very strongly against such a rule, Muawiah ordered their killing and burning. Among the famous Companions who were killed at the order of Muawiah were Hijr ibn Adi al-Kindi and his followers, because they protested and refused to curse Ali, and some of them were buried alive." [Then I was Guided, p.107] He also says in another place: "How could they judge him as a promoter of Islam when he killed Hijr Ibn Adi and his companions and buried them in Marj Adhra in the Syrian desert because they refused to curse Ali ibn Abi Talib?" [Then I was Guided, p.121]

So I say:

1. People disagreed on the companionship of Hijr bin Uday (the famous!). Al-Bukhari and others counted him as a follower (Tabe'ei), and some others as a companion.

2) Mu'awiyah did not kill Hijr because he refrained from insulting Ali, and this is calumny. What the historians mentioned about the reason behind killing Hijr bin Uday was that Ziyad, the ruler of Al-Kufah appointed by Mu'awiyah, once gave a prolonged speech. So Hijr bin Uday called for the prayer, but Ziyad went along with his speech. So, Hijr and his group threw stones at Ziyad. Ziyad wrote Mu'awiyah telling him what Hijr did and Ziyad reckoned that as corruption on earth. Hijr used to do this with the governor of Al-Kufah who preceded Ziyad. Mu'awiyah ordered that Hijr be sent to him. When Hijr reached there, Mu'awiyah ordered to kill Hijr. Mu'awiyah's severity in killing Hijr was because Hijr tried to transgress against the Islamic nation and to break the bond of the Muslims and Mu'awiyah considered it as an endeavor to corrupt the earth especially in Kufah where some groups of the affliction first appeared against Uthman. If Uthman were lenient in this matter, which ultimately lead to his death and lead the Islamic nation to the greatest affliction and caused blood to run like rivers, then Mu'awiyah wanted to cut this affliction from its roots by killing Hijr. Strange is this Al-Tijani when he cries and mourns for the death of Hijr and at the same time does not object on Ali when Ali fought the rebels against his caliphate at the battle of The Camel and Saffeen, which caused the death of the best Companions and in addition, the death of thousands of Muslims, although the reason was one i.e. rebelling against the ruling of the caliph!

Fourth: Tijani's claim that Al-Hasan Al-Basri slandered Mu'awiyah and the answer to this claim:

Al-Tijani says: "Abu al-Aala al-Mawdudi wrote in his book "Caliphate and Kingdom": Abu al-Hasan al-Basri said: Muawiah had four features, and if he had only one of them, it would have been considered a great sin:

1. Making decisions without consulting the Companions, who were the light of virtues.
2. Designating his son as his successor. His son was a drunkard, corrupt and wore silk.
3. He claimed Ziyad [as his son], and the Messenger of Allah said, "There is offspring for the honorable woman, but there is nothing for the whore."
4. His killing of Hijr and his followers. Woe unto him from Hijr and the followers of Hijr." [Then I was Guided, p.107]

I answer:

1. Abu Makhnaf narrates this story. Abu Makhnaf's full name is Loot bin Yahaya Al-Azday Al-Koufay [Tareekh Al-Tabari, vol.3, p.232, and year of 51H]. Al-Thahabi and Ibn Hajar said about him: "Ekhbaray Talif" (This is a phrase for the Scholars of hadeeth. Ekhbaray is the person who narrates stories, and talif is the one who lies when he narrates stories) [Meezan Al-E'tidal by Al-Thahabi, vol.3, p.419 #6992 and Lisan Al-Meezan by Ibn Hajar, vol.4, p.492] Abu Hatim and others did not take him, and Al-Darqutnay said: "He is weak," Ibn Mu'een said: "Not a trustworthy," Marrah said: "He is nothing," and Ibn Uday said: "A burned Shia!") [Meezan Al-E'tidal, vol.3, p.419-420] and Al-Aqeelay accounted him as a weak [Al-Du'afa by Al-Aqeelay, vol.4, p.18-19 #1572]. Therefore, this story is false and hence is not an argument.
2. Even if we supposed that Al-Hasan really said that, then it would have no slander against Mu'awiyah. To claim that Mu'awiyah became the leader without consultant (Shoura) is false because Al-Hasan bin Ali abandoned the caliphate for Mu'awiyah and all the people gave the allegiance to Mu'awiyah and none of the companions refrained in giving him the allegiance! Making Yazeed as the successor to him was done by people's allegiance and among them was Abdullah bin Omar and only Al-Hussain bin Ali and Abdullah bin Al-Zubair refrained. To refuse giving the allegiance does not cancel the allegiance itself and does not represent a slander against Mu'awiyah. Muhammad Al-Hanafiyah, the son of Ali, who adjourned at Yazeed, belied that Yazeed was a drunkard who wears

gold and silk. Muhammad Al-Hanafiyah found Yazeed as the opposite of what they claim.

Fifth: Answering Tijani's ill understanding of the happenings of the affliction between Mu'awiyah and Ali:

Al-Tijani says: "When we ask some of our scholars about Muawiah's war against Ali, who had been acknowledged by al-Muhajireen and al-Ansar, a war which led to the division of Islam into Sunnis and Shiites and left it scarred to this very day, they simply answer by saying, "Ali and Muawiah were both good Companions, and both of them interpreted Islam in his own way. However, Ali was right, therefore he deserves two rewards, but Muawiah got it wrong, therefore, he deserves one reward. It is not within our right to judge for them or against them, Allah-the Most High - said: "This is a people that have passed away, they shall have what they earned and you shall have what you earn, and you shall not be called upon to answer for what they did" (Holy Qur'an 2:134).

Regrettably, we provide such weak answers that neither a sensible mind nor a religion, nor indeed a law would accept. O Allah, I am innocent of idle talk and of deviant whims. I beg You to protect me from the devil's touch.

How could a sensible mind accept that Muawiah had worked hard to interpret Islam and give him one reward for his war against the leader of all Muslims, and for his killing of thousands of innocent believers, in addition to all the crimes that he committed? He was known among the historians for killing his opponents through feeding them poisoned honey, and he used to say, "Allah has soldiers made of honey."

How could these people judge him as a man who worked hard to promote Islam and give him a reward for that, when he was the leader of a wrong faction? There is a well known Hadith of the Prophet, and most of the scholars agree its authenticity, "Woe unto Ammar .. he will be killed by the wrong faction." And he was killed by Muawiah and his followers.

The question crops up over and over again. Which faction was right, and which faction was wrong? Either Ali and his followers were wrong, or Muawiah and his followers were wrong, and the Messenger of Allah (saw) explained everything. In both cases, the proposition of the righteousness of all the Companions does not hold ground and is incompatible with logic." [Then I was Guided, p.120-121]

I say:

1) I said that Mu'awiyah did not fight Ali except for the matter of Uthman. Mu'awiyah saw himself as the guardian of Uthman's blood, and Uthman was one of his relatives, and Mu'awiyah relied on some prophetic hadeeths that show and clear that Uthman would be killed as an innocent and describes the rebels as hypocrites. Al-Turmithi and Ibn Majah narrated from Aysha who says: (The prophet peace be upon him said: "O' Uthman! If Allah one day gave you the leadership of this nation, and the hypocrites wanted you to remove your clothes which Allah had gave you, then do not do it." The prophet said that three times.) [Sunan Ibn Majah, Book of "Virtues of the Companions of the Prophet peace be upon him," #112. See also Saheeh Ibn Majah #90] Ka'ab bin Murrah testified for Uthman's innocence once in front of Mu'awiyah's army, and said: (If it were not for a hadeeth that I heard from the prophet peace be upon him, then I would not have taken a stand (did not support Mu'awiyah to punish Uthman's murderers) and the prophet mentioned the afflictions and acknowledged them. Then a masked man passed by so the prophet peace be upon him said: "This guy at these (affliction) days is on guidance." So I went to the masked man and he was Uthman bin Affan. I took Uthman to the prophet and asked him: "This one?" The prophet answered: "Yes.") [Al-Turmithi, Book of "The Virtues," #3704. See also Saheeh Al-Turmithi #2922] Also, Abdullah bin Shaqeeq bin Murrah says: (The prophet peace be upon him said: "Afflictions would agitate on earth as the horns of cows" Then a masked man passed by and the prophet peace be upon him said: "This guy and his companions at these (affliction) days would be on the right path." So I went to this guy and unmasked him and took him to the messenger of Allah peace be upon him and I asked: "O' Messenger of Allah, is he the one?" The prophet said: "He is." He was Uthman bin Affan.) [Musnad Ahmad, Book of "Virtues of the Companions," vol.1, p.449-450, #720. The Examiner of the book said that this hadeeth has a true attribution.] Mu'awiyah and his companions thought they were right according to this and that they were on guidance especially when we know that the hypocrite rebels against Uthman were in the army of Ali. Hence, Mu'awiyah and his companions thought them on astray and therefore they made it lawful for themselves to fight Ali and his faction.

1. In addition, Mu'awiyah's supporters would say: "We cannot give allegiance to anyone except the one who would act with justice and does not oppress us. If we gave allegiance to Ali, then we would act unjustly with his party as Uthman was oppressed. Besides, Ali is unable to act justly and we do not have to give allegiance to such a person. Uthman's murders are in the army of Ali, and these murders are unjust. Uthman's murders want to kill us as they killed Uthman, so we will fight them to defend ourselves. Therefore, it is lawful to fight them, and we did not start the fight, they did."

3) Moreover, authentic traditions from the prophet peace be upon him says that to leave the fight was better for both parties. The fight was neither mandatory nor preferable. Although Ali was more deserving and closer to right than Mu'awiyah was, if Ali left the fight, a great goodness would happen and the shedding of the blood would be spared.

Hence, Omran bin Haseen, may Allah be pleased at him, banned the selling of weapons at the time of afflictions. He says: "Weapons are not supposed to be sold in the affliction." The same saying was shared by Sa'ad bin Abu Waqqas, Muhammad bin Muslimah, Abdullah bin Omar, Osamah bin Zayd, and many other of the first believers from the muhajireen and Al-Ansar who isolated themselves from the affliction and did not partake in the fight. Therefore, many Scholars from Ahl Al-Sunnah say: "It is not conditioned to start fighting the aggressor party. Allah did not order to start fighting them. Instead, He ordered that if two parties fought, then peace should be done between them. Then if one of the two parties transgresses on the other, then the transgressor should be fought." [Minhaj Al-Sunnah, vol.4, p.391] It is plain lie Tijani's claim that Mu'awiyah ordered to start the fight against Ali.

4) Even if we supposed that the people who fought Ali were insurgents and not depending on personal interpretation of texts, then it would not be considered as a slander in their belief and their deservance in entering heaven. Almighty Allah says: "If two parties among the Believers fall into a quarrel, make ye peace between them: but if one of them transgresses beyond bounds against the other, then fight ye (all) against the one that transgresses until it complies with the Command of Allah; but if it complies, then make peace between them with justice, and be fair: for Allah loves those who are fair (and just), The Believers are but a single Brotherhood: so make peace and reconciliation between your two (contending) brothers; and fear Allah, that ye may receive Mercy." [Surat Al-Hujarat, verses 9 and 10] Allah described the two parties by faith and made them brothers despite the fact they fought each other and transgressed on each other. Then what about if one of them transgressed on the other thinking he is right? Does it prevent him from being an interpreter, wrong or right? Therefore, Ahl Al-Sunnah ask Allah for mercy for the two parties, as Allah says: "And those who came after them say: "Our Lord! Forgive us, and our brethren who came before us into the Faith, and leave not, in our hearts, rancor (or sense of injury) against those who have believed. Our Lord! Thou art indeed Full of Kindness, Most Merciful." [Surat Al-Hashr, verse 10]

5) Authentic traditions prove that both parties have the same claim and seek the truth they believe. These authentic traditions also declare that the two parties are innocent from looking for caprice and following falsehood. Al-Bukhari narrated in his Saheeh from Abu Hurayrah who says: (The Messenger of Allah peace be upon him said: "Judgement Day will not come until two parties fight with similar claims.") [Saheeh Al-Bukhari, Book of "Virtues," Chapter of "Signs of Prophecy in Islam," #3413] This hadeeth, as you see, proves that the two parties have the same demand and the same religion. Muslim narrated in his Saheeh from Abu Sated Al-khudari who says: (The messenger of Allah peace be upon him said: "Renegades will pass through a group of Muslims. They would be killed by the more deserving party of truth.") [Muslim with Explanation, Book of "Zakkat," Chapter of "The Kharijites and their characteristics," #150] This hadeeth clears that both parties ask for the truth and fight for it. Meaning that the two parties were intending the truth and requesting it. This hadeeth also shows that the truth lies with Ali because he was the one who fought these renegades i.e. the Kharijites at Al-Nahrawan. Al-Nawawi says: "It is a declaration that both parties are believers and fighting each other does not cancel their faith and they should be not called impious." [Ibid. vol.7, p.235]

3. About Mu'awiyah's transgression, it is either Mu'awiyah thought that the truth lies with him or that he was deliberate in his transgression. In both cases, Mu'awiyah is not infallible from mistakes. Ahl Al-Sunnah do not refrain him from falling in sins, but they say that sins have reasons, and these sins could be removed by asking for forgiveness and repenting, or other than that. Ibn Katheer mentioned in Al-Bidayah from Al-Musawir bin Makhramah when Musawir entered upon Mu'awiyah: (I entered upon him and Mu'awiyah asked me: "Why do you slander against the leaders O'Musawir?" I answered: "Save us from his leader, and give us a leader that we want." Mu'awiyah said: "Tell me what is in your heart." So, I told him every single bad thing about him. Mu'awiyah said: "You are not exempted from guilt either. Did you commit any guilt that you are afraid to be doomed if you were not forgiven?" I answered: "Yes, I did commit guilts that may cause my doom if I am not forgiven." Then Mu'awiyah said: "Then what makes you more deserving for Allan's forgiveness than I? By Allah, I have done good deeds for my people, established Islamic Law, went to Jihad for the sake of Allah, and a lot of great things I did that only Allah can count, but we do not count them more than our mistakes. And I am a believer in a religion where deeds are accepted, either rewarded by good, or rewarded by a guilt that Allah may forgive us. By Allah, if I were to choose between two matters, between Allah and anything else, I would choose Allah." I thought of what he said, and I knew he defeated me.") Then Musawir after that, always used to supplicate good things for Mu'awiyah. [Al-Bidayah wa Al-Nihayah, vol.8, p.136-137]

7) About the Hadeeth: "Ammar would be killed by the transgressor party." This hadeeth is one of the greatest evidences that the truth lies with Ali but Mu'awiyah interpreted the meaning of the hadeeth differently when Ammar's death shocked Omro Bin Al-A'as and his son. Omro and his son got astound. Ahmed narrated in his Musnad from Abu Bakr bin Muhammad bin Omro bin Hazm from his father who says: (When Ammar bin Yaser was killed, Omro bin Hazm entered upon Omro bin Al-A'as and said: "Ammar was killed and the Prophet peace be upon him said that Ammar would be killed by the transgressor party." Omro bin Al-A'as stood fearing and vomiting until he entered upon Mu'awiyah. Mu'awiyah asked him: "What is the matter?" Omro answered: "Ammar was killed." Mu'awiyah asked again: "So what if Ammar was killed?" Omro answered: "I heard the messenger of Allah saying that Ammar would be killed by the transgressor party." Mu'awiyah told him: "... were we the ones who killed him? Ali and his comrades killed him. They brought him (to the war) and threw him into our lances (or swords).") [Musnad the people of Syria from Musnad Al-Imam Ahmed, vol.2, Musnad Omro bin Al-A'as, #957, p.163. The Examiner of the book said the narrators of the story are trustworthy]. Then the people used to say: "The one who killed Ammar is the one who brought him." Therefore, Mu'awiyah returned the confidence to his army. Mu'awiyah said that because he could not imagine that Uthman's murderers were the right people in the light of the hadeeths which prove that Uthman would be killed as an innocent and that his killers are the oppressors. No doubt then, as Mu'awiyah was thinking, that the transgressor party is the one within the army of Ali. But the truth that should be said is that these thinkings are definitely false and that the truth is with Ali. But Mu'awiyah's party are excused in their interpretation because they wanted the truth but did not get it.

This what pushed Omro bin Al-A'as to suggest to raise the Quran to stop the war because he had some of that hadeeth in his heart.

8) If Al-Tijani insisted on making Mu'awiyah a despotic, then Al-Nasibah [The ones who hate the household of the Prophet peace be upon him] would answer that Ali was despotic too because Ali fought the Muslims for nothing but for the sultanate. Al-Nasibah would also say that Ali was the one who started fighting and shedding blood without a benefit for the Muslims. Then Ali retreated - as Al-Nasibah would say - and made a peace with Mu'awiyah. Then Al-Tijani and his Shia would not be able to answer this. If Al-Tijani took the hadeeth of Ammar as an argument, then he would be answered that Allah did not put it a condition to fight the transgressor party except when the transgressor party starts to fight. But Ali was the one who started the fight, so what is the answer of Al-Tijani? Many pages have been written by the Kharijites and Mu'tazilah slandering Ali. What important to know is that for every argument Al-Tijani gets against Mu'awiyah, there would be a similar argument from other parties. Ahl Al-Sunnah are pleased by the two parties, and do not consider them impious. Ahl Al-Sunnah say that the truth is with Ali may Allah be pleased at him, and answer all the arguments that are presented from different sects which defames Ali or Mu'awiyah because Ahl Al-Sunnah's way is straight, not like the Shia, and many thanks to Allah.

9) It is taken for granted for anyone who read something about the Imamiyah sect that they attribute kufr to Mu'awiyah because he fought Ali. However, the fact is that Al-Hasan bin Ali - and he is one of the infallible Imams according to the Shia, therefore whatever he says is truth - made peace with Mu'awiyah - as Al-Tijani admits, refer to "Then I was Guided, p.171" and gave him allegiance. So, did the "infallible" Hasan made peace with a kafir and gave him the leadership?? Or he made peace between two parties of Muslims as the Prophet peace be upon him says: "My son is a master, and Allah may use him to make peace between two parties of Muslims." [Saheeh Al-Bukhari, Book of "Afflictions," #6629, vol.6] I please Al-Tijani to give an answer?!

10) It is of great ignorance and lie Tijani's allegation that Mu'awiyah committed numberless crimes, and that he was known by historians to kill his opponents by his famous way; giving them poisoned honey and Mu'awiyah saying: "Allah has soldiers made of honey." I want from Al-Tijani to guide us to these historians so that we could make sure of this obvious allegation, otherwise talk is easy.

11) The strange is that Al-Tijani dismisses Abu Bakr's fighting against the people who did not give Zakkat even though the war happened by the consensus of the Ummah. And on the other hand, you see Al-Tijani standing with Ali in his fight against Mu'awiyah which the companions disagreed about, did not give the hoped results, and caused the death of thousands of Muslims! Perhaps the reason is his said fairness and his said intelligence!

12) I can give the answer to Al-Tijani's repeated and insisted question by saying that the party of Ali was right, and Mu'awiyah was not a despotic, nor a caller to falsehood, but he searched for the truth and did not find it. Therefore, Mu'awiyah is rewarded for his religious interpretation. None of the two was an oppressor or impious. To fall in guilt, does not slander the justice of the guilty person. Anyway, the justice of the companions, all of them without exception, is taken for granted through the Quran, Sunnah and consensus, and it goes smoothly with rightful logic but it does not, of course, goes smoothly with the false logic which is found in Al-Tijani!

13) If Al-Tijani haven't had enough of this, then I would be compelled to give him something from his guides, the Imamiyah, what proves that Ali and Mu'awiyah are both rightful in their interpretation. Al-Kulayni mentioned in his book, Al-Rawdah min Al-Kafi - which represents the basis and branches of the Imamiyah sect - from Muhammad Bin Yahya who says: (I heard Abu Abdullah peace be upon him saying: "Disagreement of Bani Al-Abbas is unavoidable, the calling is unavoidable, and the coming of the twelfth Imam is unavoidable." I said: "And how is the calling?" He answered: 'Someone will call from the heaven in the beginning of the day: "Ali and his party are the winners."' He also said: "And someone will call in the end of the day: "Uthman and his party are the winners!'"') [Al-Rawdah min Al-Kafi, p.177, vol.8] And here is Ali bin Abi Talib makes a resolution that Uthman and his party are people of Islam and faith, but the case is a matter of interpretation, every person seeing himself on the right path in the matter of Uthman. Al-Shareef Al-Ridi mentions in your book "Nahjul Balagha" that Ali said: "In the beginning of our matter, the people of Sham and us met. It is obvious that our God is one, our Prophet is one, and our call in Islam is one. We do not see ourselves more in faith in Allah or more in believing His messenger than them, nor they do. Our matter is one, except for our disagreement in Uthman's blood, and we are innocent from his murder." [Nahjul Balagha, vol.3, p.648]

Sixth: Al-Tijani's allegation that Mu'awiyah poisoned Al-Hasan, and the answer to this claim:

Al-Tijani says: "How could they judge him a just Companion when he killed al-Hasan, leader of the Heaven's youth, by poisoning him?" [Then I was Guided, p.121] And he also says: "How could they judge him like that when he was the one who poisoned al-Hasan ibn Ali, leader of Heaven's youth? Perhaps they say, "This was an aspect of his ijtihad [interpretation], but he got it wrong!" [Then I was Guided, p.169]

I say: This claim is false for several reasons:

1. It is not proven, nor there is a clear evidence that Mu'awiyah poisoned Al-Hasan. If Al-Tijani has an authentic narration narrated by just people, then let him guide us to it, otherwise he should not charge a Companion without giving a prove for his claim.
2. At those days, people were in an affliction, and their desires leading their instincts, each sect attributing bad things to other sects. If a story was told about that, then we ought not to accept it unless just and trustworthy people narrated it.
3. It is said that the person who poisoned Al-Hasan was not Mu'awiyah but Al-Hasan's wife. It is also said her father, Al-Ash'ath bin Qays ordered her to do that. It is also said that it was Mu'awiyah who ordered her and some say it was Yazeed. These contradictory stories about who poisoned Al-Hasan weaken these stories because they lack the trustworthy narrators. Al-Tijani did not like anyone of them except Mu'awiyah although he was the furthestmost of the rest from this charge!
4. Intellect would accept Al-Tijani's arguments in a situation where Al-Hasan refuses to make peace with Mu'awiyah and wanted to fight Mu'awiyah for the leadership. But the truth is that Al-Hasan made peace with Mu'awiyah, and gave him the leadership and the allegiance. Therefore, for what reason would Mu'awiyah poison Al-Hasan? For these reasons I say that Al-Tijani's argument has no basis for truth.

Seventh: Al-Tijani's claim that Mu'awiyah changed the caliphate from Shoura to a hereditary one, and the answer to this claim:

Al-Tijani says: "How could they judge him as being correct after he had forced the nation to acknowledge him as a caliph and to accept his corrupt son Yazid as his successor, and to change the Shurah [consultative] system to a hereditary one?" [Then I Was Guided, p.121]

Also: "After Ali, Muawiya took over the caliphate and changed it to a hereditary system within Bani Umayya, and after them came Bani al-Abbas where the caliphs succeeded one after the other either by personal nomination [from the previous caliph] or by means of force and

seizure of power. From the beginning of the Islamic era until Kamal Atatürk - who abolished the Islamic caliphate - there has been no correct acclamation except that for the Commander of the Believers Ali ibn Abi Talib." [Then I Was Guided, p.145]

And: "How could they judge his Ijtihad, when he was the one who took the nation's acclamation for himself by force, then gave it to his son Yazid after him, and changed the Shura system to a hereditary one." [Then I Was Guided, p.169]

I say:

1) Mu'awiyah did not take the caliphate by force, but it was given to him by Al-Hasan bin Ali after peace occurred between them. Al-Bukhari narrated in his Saheeh that Al-Hasan Al-Basri says: "Narrated Al-Hasan Al-Basri: (By Allah, Al-Hasan bin Ali led large battalions like mountains against Mu'awiyah. Amr bin Al-As said (to Mu'awiyah), "I surely see battalions which will not turn back before killing their opponents." Mu'awiyah who was really the best of the two men said to him, "O 'Amr! If these killed those and those killed these, who would be left with me for the jobs of the public, who would be left with me for their women, who would be left with me for their children?" Then Mu'awiyah sent two Quraishi men from the tribe of 'Abd-i-Shams called 'Abdur Rahman bin Sumura and Abdullah bin 'Amir bin Kuraiz to Al-Hasan saying to them, "Go to this man (i.e. Al-Hasan) and negotiate peace with him and talk and appeal to him." So, they went to Al-Hasan and talked and appealed to him to accept peace. Al-Hasan said, "We, the offspring of 'Abdul Muttalib, have got wealth and people have indulged in killing and corruption (and money only will appease them)." They said to Al-Hasan, "Mu'awiyah offers you so and so, and appeals to you and entreats you to accept peace." Al-Hasan said to them, "But who will be responsible for what you have said?" They said, "We will be responsible for it." So, whatever Al-Hasan asked they said, "We will be responsible for it for you." So, Al-Hasan concluded a peace treaty with Mu'awiyah. Al-Hasan (Al-Basri) said: I heard Abu Bakr saying, "I saw Allah's Apostle on the pulpit and Al-Hasan bin 'Ali was by his side. The Prophet was looking once at the people and once at Al-Hasan bin 'Ali saying, 'This son of mine is a Saiyid (i.e. a noble) and may Allah make peace between two big groups of Muslims through him." [Saheeh Al-Bukhari, Book of "Peacemaking," vol.2, #2557]

2) Mu'awiyah was eager for people's agreement to give allegiance to his son Yazeed. He resolved to take allegiance to Yazeed as a crown prince. So he consulted the grandest companions, the masters of the people and the district's governors. They all accepted. Delegations from the districts came with acceptance to give allegiance to Yazeed. Many Companions gave him the allegiance as well. Al-Hafedh Abdulghani Al-Maqdisay says: "His (Yazeed's) caliphate is rightful, sixty of the companions of the prophet peace be upon him gave him the allegiance. Ibn Omar was one of them." [Qayd Al-Shareed min Akhbar Yazeed, by Ibn Khaldoun, p.70]

It is proven in Saheeh Bukhari that Ibn Omar gave allegiance to Yazeed and when the rebellion against Yazeed happened in Al-Medina, Ibn Omar gathered his family and warned them from revolting against Yazeed. Narrated Nafi': (When the people of Medina dethroned Yazid bin Muawiya, Ibn 'Umar gathered his special friends and children and said, "I heard the Prophet saying, 'A flag will be fixed for every betrayer on the Day of Resurrection,' and we have given the oath of allegiance to this person (Yazid) in accordance with the conditions enjoined by Allah and His Apostle and I do not know of anything more faithless than fighting a person who has been given the oath of allegiance in accordance with the conditions enjoined by Allah and His Apostle , and if ever I learn that any person among you has agreed to dethrone Yazid, by giving the oath of allegiance (to somebody else) then there will be separation between him and me.") [Saheeh Al-Bukhari, Book of "Afflictions", vol.7, #6694]

Ibn Al-Zubair and Al-Hussain disagreed on this allegiance but it does not defame this allegiance because it must have some objectors. From this we know that Mu'awiyah was eager to have the acceptance of the Ummah in giving the allegiance to Yazeed. If Mu'awiyah wanted to oppress and take the allegiance to Yazeed by force and coercion, as Al-Tijani claims, then Mu'awiyah would be sufficed by one allegiance and impose it forcibly on people. This Mu'awiyah did not do. Whoever wanted to refuse objected and Mu'awiyah did not force them to give the allegiance.

1. Perhaps the reason that pushed Mu'awiyah to take allegiance to Yazeed was to push away the disagreement and to be one in this crucial time at which the Ummah lived and where a lot of people claimed the caliphate. Hence, Mu'awiyah thought that by giving the leadership to Yazeed would be a good thing for the Ummah and it would prevent another affliction of happening by the agreement of Ahl Al-Hil wa Al-A'qd (A group of people with a degree in religion, manners, and knowledge of people's situations. They are also called the people of Choosing, people of Shoura, People of Decision, and they are responsible for choosing a leader for the Ummah instead of the common people. Islamic Scholars put some certain conditions to be eligible for this position) on Yazeed.
2. Mu'awiyah did not invent a new system for the caliphate by inheriting the leadership to his son Yazeed. Abu Bakr was the first to do it when he gave the leadership to Omar bin Al-Khattab and Omar did the same when he limited the leadership in six Companions. If Al-Tijani disputed that leadership was not to sons at the time of Abu Bakr and Omar i.e. hereditary Kingdome, then I would say that the first person to do it was Ali when he gave the leadership to his son Al-Hasan. Al-Kulayni mentioned in his book "Usool Al-Kafi" from Saleem bin Qays who says: "I eye-witnessed the will of the Commander of the Faithful peace be upon him when he gave the leadership to his son Al-Hasan peace be upon him. As witnesses, Ali took Al-Hussain and Muhammad (Al-Hanafiyah) peace be upon both of them and all of this sons, leaders of his party

and his household. Then Ali gave Al-Hasan the Book and the weapon..." [Usool Al-Kafi, vol.1, p.236, bab "Al-Esharah wa Al-Nas ala Al-Hasan bin Ali alayhima Al-salam"]

3. The Imamiyah Shia originally refuses the idea of Shoura, and claim that the leadership should be stated by the prophet peace be upon him with a clear declaration. Al-Tijani himself repudiated the caliphate of Abu Bakr, Omar, and Uthman. Therefore, why is he crying on the system of Al-Shoura which he himself rejects, and disputes what Mu'awiyah did by giving the leadership to son Yazeed? If Mu'awiyah made the leadership a Shoura, would Al-Tijani and his Rafidites brothers accept it? Or it does not matter? The answer is that they will not accept it even if it was a Shoura from all the Muslims. So why this uproar and the fabricated piety from Al-Tijani on the principle of Al-Shoura? The strangest thing in this matter is that Al-Tijani refuses Mu'awiyah giving the leadership as an inheritance to his son Yazeed yet the greatest doctrine of the Imamiyah Rafidites is their belief that the leadership is a hereditary in the sons of Ali bin Abi Talib by the father giving the leadership as an inheritance to his son! Is it allowed for them and forbidden on others?

Eighth: Al-Tijani claims that there had never been a correct allegiance in the history of Islam from the era of the Rightly Guided Caliphs until the era of Kamal Atatork who ended the Islamic Caliphate except the Caliphate of the Commander of the Faithful Ali Bin Abi Talib:

I say: this saying is only said by the least person in understanding, the highest person in ignorance, and the most blindfolded. I would say to this Tijani: What supported your false claim? And what are the conditions of a correct allegiance? If you said that the consensus of people is necessary for a correct allegiance, then I would say: Ali bin Abi Talib was the furthest of the three caliphs from consensus. A lot of people disagreed on the caliphate of Ali, a lot more than who disagreed on the caliphate of the early three caliphates. Wars had been risen between Ali and his opponents and Ali died before achieving Muslim's unity on allegiance. If you said that the caliphate of the three caliphs was by force, I would say: this is of the biggest lies, and history proves you wrong. You by yourself said that the caliphate

was Shoura until Mu'awiyah turned it into a hereditary system. If the opponents of Ali said that Ali wanted the caliphate by force, then their argument would be stronger than yours would because Ali fought for his caliphate until thousand of Muslim bloods were shed. If you claimed that the caliphate of Ali is correct because it is proven through hadeeths, then I would say: this is a lie too, all of the evidences you represented do not prove that the leadership should be given to Ali. If that were true, then Ali would not give allegiance to the three rightly guided Caliphs. The hadeeths, which prove Abu Bakr as a caliph, is much stronger and more obvious in making the Abu Bakr the successor of the prophet. All of Al-Tijani arguments are plain and clear false. It is strange that Al-Tijani who denies the existence of a correct caliphate except for Ali, admits the truth in a way he does not know by saying: "From the era of the Rightly Guided Caliphs until Kamal Atatork - who abolished the Islamic caliphate" Praise be the Lord how the truth appears from their tongues for the sake of Mu'awiyah. By now, I guess I had answered all of the allegations that Al-Tijani represented. Thanks are due to Allah, the Lord of the worlds.

Al-Tijani's Allegations against the Mother of Believers Aisha (may Allah be pleased at her)

Allah has honored Aysha, the Mother of Believers by making her the wife of the best of Allah's creatures i.e. Prophet Muhammad *peace be upon him*. Even she got from this liar the worst slanders and the greatest of all. Here I will present these slanders and answer them to protect the most favored woman on earth of whom the *Prophet peace be upon him* says: "The superiority of 'Aysha over other women is like the superiority of rice over the rest of meals." [1] I say and by Allah is the success:

Al-Tijani's allegations against Aysha in the Affliction (Fitnah) and the answer to that:

Al-Tijani says: "We may ask a few questions about the war of al-Jamal, which was instigated by Umm al-Mumineen Aishah, who played an important role in it. How could Umm al-Mumineen Aishah leave her house in which Allah had ordered her to stay, when the most High said: "And stay in your houses and do not display your finery like the displaying of the ignorance of yours" (Holy Quran 33:33). We may also ask, how could Aishah allow herself to declare war on the caliph of the Muslims, Ali Ibn Abi Talib, who was the master of all Muslims? As usual, our scholars, with some simplicity, answer us that she did not like Imam Ali because he advised the Messenger of Allah to divorce her in the incident of al-Ifk. Seemingly these people are trying to convince us that that incident - if it was true - namely Ali's advice to the Prophet to divorce Aishah, was sufficient for her to disobey the orders of her God and her husband, the Messenger of Allah. She rode a camel that the Messenger of Allah forbade her from riding and warned her about the barking of al-Hawab's dogs, she travelled long distances from al-Medinah to Mekka then to Basrah, she permitted the killing of innocent people and started a war against the commander of the believers and the Companions who voted for him, and she caused the deaths of thousands of Muslims, according to the historians [51]. She did all that because she did not like Ali who advised the Prophet to divorce her. Nevertheless the Prophet did not divorce her ..."[2] I say:

1. That Aysha ignited the Battle of the Camel is a plain truth. That is because Aysha did not come out to fight, but to reform between Muslims. Aysha believed in an advantage in her departure, but then she discovered that if she did not depart would have been better, therefore she regretted her departure. It is proven that Aysha said: "I wish I were a fresh branch and did not take this march." [3] And even if Aysha, along with Talha and Al-Zubair, fought Ali, then this fight would be as Allah described: "If two parties among the Believers fall into a quarrel, make ye peace between them: but if one of them transgresses beyond bounds against the other, then fight ye (all) against the one that transgresses until it complies with the Command of Allah; but if it complies, then make peace between them with justice, and be fair: for Allah loves those who are fair (and just). The Believers are but a single Brotherhood: so make peace and reconciliation between your two (contending) brothers." (49:9-10) Allah assured faith to these believers although they fought each other. If these believers are included in this verse, therefore the believer Companions should be included.
2. And Al-Tijani's saying: "How could Umm al-Mu'mineen Aishah leave her house in which Allah had ordered her to stay, when the most High said: "And stay in your houses and do not display your finery like the displaying of the ignorance of yours," as an answer to that, I say:
 - a. Aysha *may Allah be pleased at her* by her departure did not display her finery like the displaying of the ignorance times!
 - b. Ordering to stay at houses does not contradict leaving the house for an ordered benefit as when the woman leaves the house to go to *hajj* or *omrah*, or leaves with her husband in a travel. This verse came down in the life of the Prophet *peace be upon him* and the prophet *peace be upon him* traveled with his wives afterwards, as the prophet *peace be upon him* traveled with Aysha and others to *Hijjat Al-Wida'a*. Also, the Prophet *peace be upon him* sent Aysha with Abdulrahman, her brother ... *Hujjat Al-Wada'a* happened before the Prophet's demise by less than three months after the revelation of this verse. Therefore, prophet's wives were going to *hajj* in the Caliphate of Omar and others as they used to with the Prophet and Omar gave Uthman or Abdulrahman bin Owf the leadership of the prophet's wives' caravans. Accordingly, if it is allowed for the prophet's wives to travel for a benefit, then Aysha thought that by her departure a reformation for the Muslims could happen. She interpreted in that matter." [4]

1. And his allegation that Aysha only fought Ali bin Abi Talib because she did not like him because Ali suggested to the Prophet to divorce Aysha at the incident of Al-Ifk, and that was the answer of Ahl Al-Sunnah's scholars! I say:
 - a. If this was the answer of Ahl Al-Sunnah scholars, then may you O' Tijani give us one sentence from one of them? Or your lies had exceeded the highest barriers so that you do not mention a cause without adding falsehood and aspersion to it?
 - b. In a section of the incident of Al-Ifk - which Allah acquitted Aysha from the seven heavens – in a section of it, the Prophet *peace be upon him* requests the suggestions of some of his Companions in leaving Aysha. Ali gives his suggestion by saying: “O Allah's Apostle! Allah does not impose restrictions on you; and there are plenty of women other than her. If you however, ask (her) slave girl, she will tell you the truth.” [5] Ali by his saying did not point to the prophet to leave Aysha because there was something wrong with her – may God forbid - but when Ali saw how the prophet was in intense agitation and worry, he sought the prophet's comfort. Hence, Ali suggested that to the Prophet and he knows that the Prophet could take her back after making sure of her innocence or either by asking the girl slave because that would be a comfort for the Prophet and Ali did not dogmatize to the prophet to leave her, and it is very clear from Ali's words, *may Allah be pleased at him*. Therefore, Ibn Hajar says: “The reason that Ali said those words was to favor the prophet's side when Ali saw all these worries and sorrows in the prophet because of the talk that was said. The prophet *peace be upon him* was a very jealous person. So Ali thought that if the Prophet leaves Aysha, then the prophet's worries would be calmed until her innocence is proven. Then the Prophet could take her back. It was benefited that the least pain of two was happened, because the harder pain was left.” [6] Al-Nawawi says: “This what Ali, *may Allah be pleased at him*, said was the right thing for the Prophet's sake. That is because Ali saw a benefit and an advice for the Prophet *peace be upon him* in his believe ... Because he saw prophet's discomfort and worries about this matter so Ali wanted to comfort his feelings, and that is more important than anything else.” [7] Sheikh Abu Muhammad bin Abi Jamrah says: “Ali by his suggestion did not assure the Prophet to leave her, because right after that, Ali said: “ask (her) slave girl, she will tell you the truth.” Therefore, Ali delegated the matter to the prophet's foresight as if Ali were saying: “if you wanted a quick comfort, then leave her and if you wanted other than that then look for the truth until her innocence

appears.” That is because Ali was sure that Bareerah (the slave girl) would say nothing but what she knows, and she did not know anything about Aysha but the mere innocence.” [8]

1. Al-Tijani says: “Seemingly these people are trying to convince us that that incident - if it was true - namely Ali's advice to the Prophet to divorce Aishah, was sufficient for her to disobey the orders of her God and her husband, the Messenger of Allah. She rode a camel that the Messenger of Allah forbade her from riding and warned her about the barking of al-Hawab's dogs [50], she travelled long distances from al-Medinah to Mekka then to Basrah, she permitted the killing of innocent people and started a war against the commander of the believers and the Companions who voted for him, and she caused the deaths of thousands of Muslims, according to the historians.” Then Al-Tijani refers us in the footnote to these historians: “Al-Tabari, Ibn Al-Atheer, Al-Mada’eeni, and other historians who chronicled the incidents that happened in 36 years after the Hijrah.” [9] And I say answering that:
 - a. If we refer to Tareekh Al-Tabari who chronicled the incidents that occurred in 36 years after the *Hijrah*, then we would not have find Al-Tabari narrating this incident as Al-Tijani is saying although Al-Tabari mentions a lot of stories that talk about the Battle of the Camel. Al-Tabari narrates differently than what Al-Tijani is saying and Al-Tabari proves that Aysha came out with Talha and Al-Zubair for reformation only. Al-Tabari says that Ali sent Al-Qi’a’qa’a bin Omro to the people of Al-Basrah asking them why they are leaving: “Al-Qi’a’qa’a left and reached Basrah. He started with Ayshamay Allah be pleased at her and made salam to her and said: “O’ Mother, What moved you and pushed you to this country”? She answered: “O’ Son, to reform between people.” Al-Qi’aqa’a said: “Send for Talha and Al-Zubair so that you hear my words and their words.” Aysha sent for them and they arrived. Al-Qi’aqa’a said: “I asked the Mother of Believers what brought and pushed her here and she answered to reform between people, what do you say you both? Do you agree or disagree?” They two answered: “We agree.” [10] And Al-Tabari assures that the people who are responsible for the deaths of thousands of Muslims are the murders of Uthman: “When people came together and became in ease, Ali, Talha and Al-Zubair came out, agreed, and talked in the matters they disagreed with each others. They did not find a better solution than peace and to end the war when they saw the matter is started to be cleared and not achievable through war. They departed from each other agreeing on their resolution.

Ali came back to his barracks and Talha and Al-Zubair went back to their barracks. In the evening, Ali sent Abdullah bin Abbas to Talha and Al-Zubair who sent Muhammad bin Talha to Ali in a job to talk to their comrades. They all said yes for a peace. At night – that was in Jamadah Al-A'akhirah – Talha and Al-Zubair talked to the leaders of their comrades, and Ali talked to the leaders of his comrades except those people who ate Uthman. They ended up on peace and they slept in a night that they never had before because of the goodness they are near to and because they got away from what some people desired and embarked on whatever they embarked on. And the people who provoked the matter of Uthman had the worst sleep ever because they came close to be doomed. They were discussing their plight the whole night until they agreed to ignite the war in secret. They took that as a secret so that no one would know what evil they were planning. They woke up at dusk and while their neighbors did not feel them, they (the agitators) sneaked to do the dirty job in the darkness ... they laid swords in the believers. Then the people of Al-Basrah got angry and every people fought his comrades who were stunned" [11] Al-Tabari says: (And Aysha said: "Ka'ab, leave the camel and advance with book of Allah and call them to it." And she gave him a *mushaf*. The people came and the Saba'iyah were in front of them fearing of a peace to happen. Ka'ab received them by the *mushaf* and Ali behind them trying to hold them back but they rejected anything but to continue the war. So when Ka'ab called them, the Saba'iyah threw him with lances. He was killed. Then they started throwing Aysha with lances while she was on her camel. Aysha said, "O' my children! The rest of you, the rest of you, - then her voice increases in tone – Allah Allah, remember Allah and Judgment Day." But the Saba'iyah refused anything but to fight. So the first thing Aysha said when the Saba'iyah refused to stop, "O' people, curse the killers of Uthman and their friends." And then she went on supplicating. Then the people of Basrah started supplicating. Ali bin Abi Talib heard the callers. He said, "What is this noise?" His army answered, "Aysha is calling and her army is calling with her against the killers of Uthman and their friends." Ali started calling and said, "O' Allah, curse the killers of Uthman and their friends.") [12] This is also what Ibn Al-Atheer documented in his history. I did not find the book of Al-Mada'en. This truth is strengthened by true *hadeeths*, which proves that neither Aysha, Al-Zubair, Talha, nor Ali wanted to fight each others. Therefore, Aysha regretted on her walk and said, "I wish I was a fresh branch of a tree and never walked this walk." [13] ... if Aysha wanted to fight instead of making peace, then why the regret?

Then Al-Tijani says, “So why all this hatred towards Imam Ali? History has recorded some aggressive stances against Ali that could not be explained and these are some of them. When she was on her way back from Mekka Aishah was informed that Uthman was killed, so she was delighted, but when she learnt that people had voted for Ali to succeed him she became very angry and said, "I wish the sky would collapse on the earth before Ibn Abi Talib succeeds to the caliphate." Then she said, "Take me back." Thus she started the civil war against Ali, whose name she never liked to mention, as many historians agree. Had Aishah heard the saying of the Messenger of Allah (saw): Loving Ali is believing, and hating him is hypocrisy?. To the extent that some of the Companions used to say, "We recognized the hypocrites by their hatred of Ali." Had Aishah not heard the saying of the Prophet: Whoever accepts me as his master, then Ali is his master? Undoubtedly she heard all that, but she did not like it, and she did not like mentioning his name, and when she learnt of his death she knelt and thanked Allah.” [14]

I answer:

1. The lie that Aysha was delighted when she knew that Uthman was killed only shows Al-Tijani's exact lies. No one of history scholars said that, instead all of them proved that Aysha only came out to punish Uthman's murderers. And I wonder, if Aysha was delighted for the death of Uthman, then why she would go after Uthman's murderers? Did she come out to prevent Ali from taking the Caliphate? Al-Tijani says yes! And if Al-Tijani was asked for the reason, he would say that Aysha hated Ali because Ali advised the prophet *peace be upon him* to divorce her?! So I tell him, if Aysha hated Ali, then how would you explain the fact that thousands of people followed her? Does Al-Tijani has any logical reason for this? Or these thousands hate Ali too? If Al-Tijani said yes, then I will ask why? Had Al-Tijani has the answer, then he is welcomed, otherwise I herald him as the most lost man.
2. Al-Tijani claims that the historians mentioned Aysha as not wanting to mention the name of Ali. And I ask him, which historians? Can you tell me exactly so that we know the liar from the truth teller? And on which references did you depend? But the truth is that Aysha mentioned Ali by her full mouth. Shareeh Bin Hane'e says, (I asked Aysha about washing (the feet in ablution). She said, "Go to Ali, he is more knowledgeable than I." So I went to him and asked him about the wash. Ali said, "The messenger of Allah used to order us to wash our feet at day and night, and the traveler should do it three times.") [15] Muslims also narrated the same story from Shareeh bin Hane". Shareeh says, (I went to Aysha

and asked her about washing the feet (for prayers). She said, “Go to Ali bin Abi Talib and ask him.” ...) [16]

3. Then Al-Tijani mentions two *hadeeths* about the virtues of Ali, where he says, “Had Aishah not heard the saying of the Prophet: Whoever accepts me as his master, then Ali is his master? Undoubtedly she heard all that, but she did not like it, and she did not like mentioning his name, and when she learnt of his death she knelt and thanked Allah.”!!
 - a. I said earlier that Aysha does not hate Ali but she argued with him about the blood of Uthman. She did not leave her house to fight Ali, but to make peace between people after people desired her to go. Ibn Al-Emad in *Shathrat Al-Thahab* says, “When Ali arrived at Basrah, he went to Aysha and said, “May Allah forgive you.” She answered, “You too, I only wanted reformation.”” [17] Ibn Al-Arabi explains that, “And her present in the battle of the Camel was not for war, but people clanged to her and complained to her what happened of the affliction. They hoped her blessing in the reformation, and they wanted that the fighting factions would be ashamed when she is present with them and stop fighting. She also thought that. So she left her house to represent what Allah says “If two parties among the Believers fall into a quarrel, make ye peace between them”) [18] Ibn Habban narrated, “Aysha wrote Abu Mousa – and he was the governor of Kufah appointed by Ali-, “You know what happened to Uthman, and I came out to reform between people. Therefore, tell your people to stay at their house, and to be content until they get what they love i.e. the reformation of the Muslims’ matter.” [19] This is why Aysha left her house, not because she hated Ali. This is a plain lie, which does not stand on any correct evidence.
 - b. Al-Tijani says, “and when she learnt of his death she knelt and thanked Allah.” Then he gave us in the footnotes the name of historians he took as references. These are his references, “AL-Tabari, Ibn Al-Atheer, Al-Fitnah Al-Kubra, and all historians who documented the incidents of the year 40 after the immigration of the prophet peace be upon him.” [20] So, I went back to Al-Tabari and Ibn Al-Atheer for the stories of the year 40. And guess what! I did not find any trace for this claim! What a liar he is!

Then Al-Tijani piffles and says, “The same question crops up again. Who was right and who was wrong? Either Ali and his followers were wrong, or Aishah, Talha, al-Zubair and their followers were wrong. There is no third possibility. But I have no doubt that the fair researcher would take Ali's side and dismiss Aishah and her followers who instigated the civil war that devastated the nation and left its tragic marks to the present day. For the sake of further clarification,

and for the sake of my own satisfaction I mention here what al-Bukhari had to say in his book about the civil war. When Talha, al-Zubair and Aishah travelled to Basrah, Ali sent Ammar Ibn Yasir and al-Hasan Ibn Ali to al-Kufah. On their arrival, they went to the mosque and addressed the congregation, and we heard Ammar saying, "Aishah had gone to Basrah ... and by Allah she is the wife of your Prophet in this life and the life hereafter, but Allah, the Most High, is testing you to know whom you obey: Him or her." [21]

I say:

- a. In matter of fact, there is a third possibility. The third possibility is that the two warring factions tried to reach to the truth, and none of the two factions was an oppressor because the death of Uthman divided the Islamic nation to two parties. One party sees to kill the killers of Uthman immediately, and they are Talha, Al-Zubair, and Aysha. The other party sees also to kill the killers of Uthman but wait for the moment until they reach to their goals because these killers had tribes that would defend them. Ali and his companions shared the second opinion. These killers are the responsible for the battle of the Camel, and none of the two parties had any responsibility to ignite the battle as I clarified earlier.
- b. The story that Al-Tijani was happy about and narrates it from Saheeh Al-Bukhari, is one of the greatest evidences on the virtue of Aysha! But what would you say about an ignorant who takes arguments against Ahl-Sunnah and does not realize that these arguments is against him and his Shia? In the *hadeeth*, Ammar testifies for the Mother of Beleivers that she is the wife of the prophet *peace be upon him* in this life and the life hereafter! Meaning in heaven! And is there any virtue beyond that? And did she get this virtue but through the pleasant of Allah of her? And His messenger *peace be upon him*? Ammar was a supporter of Ali bin Abi Talib *may Allah be pleased of him* and wanted to trigger people to fight with Ali. But these people were hesitant because the Mother of the Beleivers was in the opposing party. So Ammar clarified for them that the truth is with Ali, because he is the Caliph, and he must be obeyed as Allah ordered them before seeking revenge from the killers of Uthman as the Mother of the Beleivers sees. There is no doubt that Aysha, Talha, and Al-Zubair were seeking the killers of Uthman before obeying to Ali as an obeisance to Allah. Aysha says to Uthman bin Haneef when he was sent to ask about her present, "By Allah, I am not the person who does secret things, and does not give her sons the news. The mobs from the cities and the lowest tribes invaded the house of the messenger of Allah *peace be upon him* and did whatever they wanted. They housed al-

muhaditheen, therefore they deserved the curse of Allah and His messenger as they killed the leader of the Muslims without an excuse. They shed the holy blood, stole the holy money, and stayed at the holy land in the holy month. They tore honors and skins, stayed between people who hated their stay. They were harmful, never beneficial nor pious. They are not to be trusted. So, I left my house to the Muslims telling them what these people did before us and that the Muslims should reform the situation... we want to reform as Allah and His messenger *peace be upon him* ordered the young and old, male and female to reform. These are our matter, calling you to a reform, banning an enormity and urge you to change the enormity.” [22] And we mentioned earlier that the people who gave allegiance for Ali were these mobs in the first place, and they were in the army of Ali. From here, we can see that each side thought the truth lies with him/her and interpreted the mistake of the other party differently. Both parties came out to reform as I said, and none of the two parties wanted to fight, but it happened. Allah has the matter in His hands, before it, and after it.

Then Al-Tijani fabricates a lie and says, “Also al-Bukhari wrote in his book in the chapter of Al-Shuroot (Conditions) section of “what went on in the houses of the Prophet's wives”: Once the Prophet (saw) was giving a speech, and he pointed towards the house where Aishah was living, then said, "There is the trouble ... there is the trouble ... there is the trouble ... from where the devil's horns come out.” [23]

I say:

1. I opened Al-Bukhari on the chapter of “The Conditions,” and there was no section called “What went on in the houses of the Prophet’s wives”! but the *hadeeth* is present in sections about Al-Khums (one-fifth), and this shows that this suspicion was taught to him!
2. And Al-Tijani takes this *hadeeth* as an argument that Aysha is the source of afflictions? This claim is obviously false because the prophet *peace be upon him* meant the east. If the prophet *peace be upon him* was meaning the house of Aysha, then he would say “to”, not “towards.” Muslim narrated from Ibn Omar, “The Messenger of Allah *peace be upon him* came out from Aysha’s house and said, “The head of disbelief comes from here, where the horn of the devil arises.” Meaning the east.” [24] Ibn Omar also said, “that he heard the Messenger of Allah – while being in front of the east - saying, “Here is the affliction, here is the affliction, where the horn of the devil arises.” [25] And to be more sure, I will mention the story from Muslim that Ibn Omar said that the

prophet *peace be upon him* stood in front of Hafsa's door (in the *hadeeth* of Obaydillah bin Sa'ad: the prophet *peace be upon him* stood in front of Aysha's door) and said while his hands pointing towards the east, "Here is the affliction where the horn of the devil arises." The prophet said it twice or thrice. [26] I believe truth had been revealed, and the friends of the devils were exposed!

Then Al-Tijani says, "Al-Bukhari wrote many strange things in his book about Aishah and her bad manners towards the Prophet to the extent that her father had to beat her until she bled. He also wrote about her pretention towards the Prophet until Allah threatened her with divorce... and there are many other stories but we are limited by space." [27]

I say:

1. It is of cheap lies what Al-Tijani says that Bukhari narrated in his Saheeh stories about the bad manners of Aysha towards the prophet *peace be upon him*, and that Abu Bakr beat her until she bled! Otherwise, let him show us where in Saheeh Bukhari there is such a narration, and only after that let him show the hatred inside of his heart.
2. In Al-Tijani's saying, "wrote about her pretention towards the Prophet until Allah threatened her with divorce," I answer:
 - a. I said more than once that every man is not infallible. Instead, every person is exposed to fall in small and big sins except the prophet *peace be upon him*. So, if anyone committed a sin, whether Aysha or others, then it would not be strange, because no one is infallible. It is not accepted nor understandable that Al-Tijani accounts Aysha badly because she fell in a guilt and repented from that guilt. Al-Tijani also slanders against her as if she did something really awful. Exactly as when Ali bin Abi Talib *may Allah be pleased at him* wanted to marry the daughter of Abi Jahl while he had Fatima as a wife. The prophet *peace be upon him* got angry and said, "Bani Hashim bin Al-Mughirah asked for my permission to marry their daughter to Ali bin Abi Talib. I do not permit, and I do not permit, and I do not permit. Unless the son of Abi Talib wants to divorce my daughter and marry their daughter..." [28] This is a warning from the prophet *peace be upon him* to Ali to divorce his wife if he married the daughter of Abi Jahl. It is not acceptable to make this matter as a slander against Ali!! Except for the most ignorant people!
 - b. It is not true that Allah warned Aysha by divorce and to give Muhammad *peace be upon him* a better wife than her. Al-Bukhari

narrated in his Saheeh from Omar *may Allah be pleased at him* who said, “The wives of the prophet *peace be upon him* gathered to be jealous on him. So I told them, “Perhaps Allah will divorce you all, and He may give him (the prophet) better wives than you. And this verse revealed.” [29] As it is obvious, the verse is not a warning, but a choice Allah gave His messenger of divorcing them. Therefore, this verse was called the Verse of Choice. Plus the verse does not pertain to Aysha only, but also to the rest of the prophet’s wives. Even if we assumed that this verse is pertained to Aysha only, and that Allah threatened her with divorce, I say, is there any slander against Ali when the prophet *peace be upon him* threatened Ali with divorce? If it was like that, then whatever slander you have against Aysha will be against Ali as well. But if you say that Ali was mistaken and later repented, and there is no slander against him, then Aysha is the same! Hence, choose whatever you want Al-Tijani!

And Al-Tijani continues in his illusion, “After all that I ask how did Aishah deserve all that respect from the Sunnis; is it because she was the Prophet's wife? But he had so many wives, and some of them were better than Aishah, as the Prophet himself declared (in the footnote, Al-Tijani mentions: Sahih al Turmidhi, al Istiab, Ibn Abd al Barr, Biography of Safiyya) Or perhaps because she was Abu Bakr's daughter! Or maybe because she played an important role in the denial of the Prophet's will for Ali, and when she was told that the Prophet recommended Ali, she said, "Who said that? I was with the Prophet (saw) supporting his head on my chest, then he asked me to bring the washbowl, as I bent down he died, so I cannot see how he recommended Ali.” [30]

I say to this hateful person:

1. Aysha deserved all this respect, regard, and more from Ahl Al-Sunnah because she is the wife of the pure prophet *peace be upon him* which he chose to be his wife because she is pure too. Allah Almighty says, “Women impure are for men impure, and men impure for women impure and women of purity are for men of purity, and men of purity are for women of purity: these are not affected by what people say: for them there is forgiveness, and a provision honorable.” (Surat Al-Noor, 26). (Mujahid, Ata’a, Sa’eed bin Jubair, Al-Sha’abi, Al-Hasan Al-Basri, Habeeb bin Abi Thabit, and Al-dahhak said, “This verse is revealed into Aysha and the people of lie. Ibn Jareer Al-Tabari choosed that.”). [31] ‘ And Allah’s saying, “these are not affected by what people say,” meaning they are far away from what the people of lie are

- saying.’ [32] And when Al-Tijani tries to prove that Aysha is impure, does not this considered one of the greatest slander against the prophet *peace be upon him*? And why not when Allah says, “Women impure are for men impure”??? And we value her because she is our mother in faith. Allah says, “The Prophet is closer to the Believers than their own selves, and his wives are their mothers.” (Al-Ahzab, 5)
2. Al-Tijani says, “Is it because she was the Prophet’s wife? But he had so many wives, and some of them were better than Aishah, as the Prophet himself declared.” Then Al-Tijani in the footnotes mentions Al-Turmithi, Al-Esti’ab, and Al-Isabah as references [33]. So, I opened Sunan Al-Turmithi and went throughout the Chapter “The Virtues”, Section of “Virtue of Aysha,” and found this hadeeth: (Aysha said, “people used to give gifts to the prophet whenever he is with Aysha. Then one day the prophet’s wives gathered with Umm Salamah and told her, ‘Umm Salamah, people only give gifts to the prophet whenever he is with Aysha. We need goodness, as Aysha does. Therefore, ask the prophet *peace be upon him* to order the people to give gifts wherever he is.’ So Umm Salamah mentioned that to the prophet, but he said nothing. He left and came back, and she told him again, ‘O’ Messenger of Allah, your wives mentioned that people only give you gifts whenever you are with Aysha. Therefore, order people to give you gifts wherever you are.’ When Umm Salamah mentioned that for the third time, the prophet *peace be upon him* said, ‘Umm Salamah, do not say bad things about Aysha. I perceived revelation when I was in the blanket of another woman.’) [34] Omro bin Al-A’as said, ‘Once the prophet *peace be upon him* used me as a leader for an army. I went to him and said, “O’ Messenger of Allah, who is the most beloved to you?” He answered, “Aysha.” I said, “What about men?” He replied, “Her father.”” [35] Anas said, ‘Someone asked the prophet, “Who is the most beloved to you?” He answered, “Aysha.” And someone then asked, “From men?” He replied, “Her father.”’ [36] Abdullah bin Ziyad Al-Asadi said, ‘I heard Ammar bin Yaser saying that she (Aysha) is his (the prophet’s) wife in this life and the life hereafter.’ [37] Anas Bin Malik said, “the messenger of Allah *peace be upon him* said that the virtue of Aysha upon women is just like the virtue of rice over the rest of foods.” [38] Aysha said, “The messenger of Allah *peace be upon him* told me that Jibreel is reciting peace on me. I answered wa alayhi al salam wa rahmat Allah.” [39] Abi Mousa said, “if we –the companions of the prophet *peace be upon him*– ever had trouble understanding a *hadeeth*, and asked Aysha, we would find knowledge from her.” [40] Mousa bin Talha said, “I never saw a person more eloquent than Aysha.” [41] Then I opened the section about

the virtues of the wives of the prophet *peace be upon him* and I found this *hadeeth* which is narrated by Sufayyah bin Hayee, who said, “Once, the messenger of Allah *peace be upon him* entered upon me and I heard something from Hafsah and Aysha. I told the prophet about that. The prophet said to me, ‘You should have said: How could you be better than I could and Muhammad is my husband, Haroon is my father, and Mousa is my uncle?’ As if Sufaya heard that Hafsah and Aysha said that they are more honored by the prophet than she was. And also said that they were the wives of the prophet *peace be upon him* and his cousins.” [42] There are the *hadeeths* that talk about the virtues of Aysha and Safiyyah. I say:

- a. There is no doubt that Aysha is the best among the wives of the prophet *peace be upon him* because all true narrations indicate such a thing. Examples are found in Saheeh Bukhari and Muslim.
- b. About Safiyya’s *hadeeth*. It says nothing that she is better than Aysha or Hafsah because the prophet *peace be upon him* said that to her to make her pleased as a result of what Aysha and Hafsah said about her. Nevertheless, many obvious *hadeeths* are presented where the prophet *peace be upon him* proves the virtue of Aysha over the rest of his wives.
- c. I was assuming the correctness of the previous *hadeeth*. Therefore, I said what I said. But the true is that this *hadeeth* is weak in its attribution. Al-Albani says, “This is a strange *hadeeth*. We do not know it except from Hashim Al-Koufi and the attribution is not like that.” [43] In the book of Al-Esti’ab (a book that talks about the Muslim men and women who lives at the time of the prophet), only this *hadeeth* was mentioned as a virtue for Safiyya [44]. But when the book talked about Aysha, the author presented a lot of her virtues. The author proved her being the most knowledgeable among the prophet’s wives. The author narrates from Al-Zahari, “If the knowledge of Aysha is collected, and compared to the knowledge of all the prophet’s wives and the knowledge of all the women, then we would find that the knowledge of Aysha is better.” [45] Then the author proved that Aysha is the most beloved and the best to the prophet *peace be upon him* in the previous two *hadeeths* which were narrated by Omro Bin Al-A’as and Anas [46]. No *hadeeth* is found in the book of Al-Isabah that says that Safiyya is better than Aysha except for the previous one. [47]

1. Al-Tijani says, "Or maybe because she played an important role in the denial of the Prophet's will for Ali ... etc"

I say:

- a. Aysha did not play a big role in denying the prophet's *peace be upon him* will as Al-Tijani claims. If the prophet *peace be upon him* really wanted to make a will for Ali, then Aysha could not deny it in front of the *Ummah*. Aysha said what she knows that the prophet got sick and passed away when he was with her and she heard nothing about the will.
- b. If the prophet *peace be upon him* wanted to make a will, then he must have done it in front of people, not only mentioning it to his wife. Al-Tijani claims that the evidences that the prophet *peace be upon him* gave the caliphate to Ali is abundant and Al-Tijani mentioned some of these in his book. And Al-Tijani claims that these evidences are clear to give the caliphate to Ali. Then how comes he says that Aysha played a big role in denying the will for Ali?
- c. Aysha *may Allah be pleased at her*, the *Siddeqah* (the always truth teller), the daughter of *Al-Siddeq* (Abu Bakr) cannot deny the will of the prophet *peace be upon him* for Ali, if it was true. She is the pure, the wife of the pure in this life and the life hereafter. She is the best of his wives, and the most beloved to him. She deserved this status because she is the best woman on earth. So how come we believe Al-Tijani who is expert in lying who shows a true narration and belies it, and shows a false narration and believes it! And accuse the best of people as the worst of people, and claims that the worst people are the most guided ones. What can we do about a man like that? Should we believe him and belie the best Mother of Believers?

Then Al-Tijani says, "Or is it because she fought a total war against him and his sons after him, and even intercepted the funeral procession of al-Hasan - Leader of the Heaven's youth - and prevented his burial beside his grandfather, the Messenger of Allah, and said "Do not allow anybody that I do not like to enter my house." She forgot, or maybe ignored the Messenger of Allah's sayings about him and his brother, "Allah loves those who love them, and Allah hates those who hate them," Or his saying, "I am at war with those who fight against you, and I am at peace with those who appease you." And there are

many other sayings in their honor. No wonder, for they were so dear to him!" [48] And Al-Tijani says in a different location, "Fatimah al-Zahra, as I mentioned earlier, stated in her will that she should be buried secretly, therefore, she was not buried beside her father. But what about her son, al-Hasan, why was he not buried beside his grandfather? Aisha (Umm al-Mu'mineen) prevented that. When al-Husayn brought his brother to bury him by his grandfather, the Messenger of Allah, Aisha rode a mule and went around saying, "Do not bury someone I do not love in my house." Then, the houses of Bani Umayya and Hashim stood opposite each other ready to fight, but al-Husayn told her that he would only take the coffin of his brother around the grave of their grandfather then he would bury him in al-Baqi'. That was because Imam al-Hasan requested from his brother, that no blood should be shed for his sake. Ibn Abbas said a few verses regarding this event:

"She rode a camel, she rode a mule, if she had lived longer, she would have ridden an elephant, you have the ninth of the eighth, and you took everything." [49]

I say:

1. What are the sources of these lies? And what is their validity? If Al-Tijani was courageous enough, then let him show us from where did he get this non-sense. Otherwise, every stupid can say anything of delusion about the best of people.
2. There is no doubt in the falsehood of these stories about the Mother of Believers. Indeed, all stories in this section of Al-Tijani books are lies against her. I did not find any of what he said in any Sunni books. In matter of fact, I found the opposite. Ibn Al-Atheer narrated about the death of Al-Hasan bin Ali *may Allah be pleased at both of them*, that "Al-Hussain asked for Aysha's permission to bury his brother. She gave him the permission." [50] In Al-Este'ab, "When Al-Hasan passed away, Al-Hussain went to Aysha to ask her to bury his brother. She said, "Certainly yes." [51] In Al-Bidayah, "Al-Hussain sent someone to ask Aysha to let him bury his brother. She accepted." [52] Look dear brother to the plain truth, and look how Al-Tijani ignores that, and then claims objectivity and justice. *La Hawl Wala Quwwat Ela Bil Allah*.
3. The real enemies of Al-Hasan bin Ali, *may Allah be pleased at both of them* are the ones who claim to be their Shia, or party. They are the most corrupted and degraded people by the confession of the twelver Shia! Abi Mansoor Al-Tousi, one of their scholars says that Al-Hasan bin Ali said, "By Allah I see Mu'awiyah is better for me than the people who claim to be our supporters! These people wanted to kill me, stole

whatever I had, and took my money. By Allah, if I make a peace with Mu'awiyah that would spare my blood and save my family is better than these people (the people who call themselves Shia) kill me and make my family get lost"!!!! [53] Those are the enemies of Al-Hasan Bin Ali, not Aysha!!! And from the books of the guided people we prosecute you O'Al-Tijani!

1. Then Al-Tijani claims that Ibn Abbas said two verses of poem about the Mother of Beleivers. Although the two verses are weak in structure, it is contradicted what Ibn Abbas said about her when she was about to die. Ahmed narrated in the Chapter of "Virtues" that Thikran, the slave of Aysha, "asked for Aysha's permission to let Ibn Abbas enter at the time of her death. Abdullah bin Abdulrahman, the son of her brother was present also. Thikran said, "Here is Ibn Abbas asking for your permission to enter. He is the best of your sons." She said, "Let me off from Ibn Abbas and his justification and purification." Abdullah bin Abdulrahman told her, "He is a reader of the Book of Allah, and is knowledgeable in the religion of Allah. Let him in to give a salam to you, and to say goodbye." Aysha answered, "Let him in if you want to." Abdullah said, "I will give him the permission." So Ibn Abbas came in, made salam, and had a seat. He said, "O' Mother of Beleivers, be happy. By Allah, there is nothing between the removal of pain and lie and the meeting of the beloved ones, Muhammad and his Companions except that your soul leaves your body." Aysha said, "What else?" Ibn Abbas answered, "You were the most beloved wife to the messenger of Allah *peace be upon him*. He loved none but purity. Allah Almighty revealed your innocence from the seven heavens. There is no mosque on earth that does not recite the verses that proves your innocence day and night. One day your necklace was dropped, so the prophet *peace be upon him* got caught with the people in the house. And when they wanted to pray, they did not have water. So Allah revealed the verse of Tayamum. It was a permission for people came through you. By Allah, you are holy. She said, "Leave me O' Ibn Abbas from this. By Allah, I wish I was forgotten." [54] And when Ibn Abbas argued with the Kharijites who Ali bin Abi Talib fought, he told them, "And your saying that Ali fought and did not take slaves or money. Do you want to take your mother Aysha as a slave? And you make it allowable to take from her what you make it allowable to take from others, yet she is your mother? If you said that you make it allowable to take from her what you make it allowable to take from others, then you became disbeliever! And if you said that she is not your mother, then you became disbeliever! Because

Allah Almighty says, “The Prophet is closer to the Believers than their own selves, and his wives are their mothers.” (Al-Ahzab, 5) You are in a circle around two deviations. Go and find a way out.” [55] These true narrations answer this ignorant verses of poem, which might be of Al-Tijani’s lies.

Then Al-Tijani says, “...either by his daughter Aisha, whose position vis-a-vis Ali is well documented, and she tried hard to support her father, even by fabricating sayings.” [56]

I say:

1. O’ Al-Tijani! Do you know what a fabricated *hadeeth* is? A fabricated *hadeeth* is a *hadeeth* where its narrator is accused of being a liar. And because the narrator from the prophet *peace be upon him* is his wife Aysha *may Allah be pleased at her*, then is she also accused of lying? If you said so, then you lack evidence! Because all the Quranic, Sunnah, and her biography prove otherwise, that she cannot lie on her husband the messenger of Allah *peace be upon him* by fabricating *hadeeths* about the virtues of her father! Nothing is left to judge that Al-Tijani is a liar. There is no doubt that this won’t bother him because he knows that the greatest characteristic of the Rafidites Shia is the character of lie and falsehood.
2. If Aysha narrates fabricated *hadeeths*, then how come you take the *hadeeths* that she narrates as arguments? For example, Aysha’s saying that the Purification Verse was revealed in Ali, Fatima, and their sons [57], her narration for the story of the people who kept away from what the prophet *peace be upon him* allowed to them [58]; the story where Fatima asks for her inheritance from her father, which is narrated by Aysha [59]; or the *hadeeth* where she denies that the prophet *peace be upon him* gave a will for Ali [60]. How can you say that Aysha fabricates *hadeeths* when you take all the previous *hadeeths* as arguments, and true stories, while Aysha narrated all these stories? And how come the grand scholar of the Shia, Ibn Babaweeh Al-Qumi take Aysha’s *hadeeths* as valid in his book Al-Khisal [61]? Praise be the Lord! See how Allah shows the truth on their tongues!

Then Al-Tijani ends his lies with this, “The person who is involved with the investigation about this issue will inevitably sense the undoubtable recommendation for the succession of Ali despite all the attempts to cover it or to remove it. Al-Bukhari cited it in his Sahih in a chapter entitled "Al-Wasaya" [The Legacies or the Recommendations], Muslim also cited it in his Sahih and

said that the Prophet recommended Ali for the succession in the presence of Aisha . Look how Allah shows His light even if the oppressors try to cover it.... If Aisha, the mother of the faithful, could not bear mentioning the name of Ali and could not wish him any good - as Ibn Sa'd writes in his *Tabaqat*, and al-Bukhari in his *Sahih* in a chapter entitled "The illness of the Prophet and his death", and if she prostrated herself to thank Allah when she heard the news of Ali's death, then how can we expect her to mention the recommendation in favour of Ali, when she was known, publicly and privately, for her animosity and hatred towards Ali and his sons and towards all the Family of the Prophet.” [62]

I say:

1. What really seems is that the smell of lying – which Al-Tijani had mastered – had spread, and filled his book!
2. The *hadeeth* that Al-Bukhari and Muslim narrates, which Al-Tijani claims that the prophet *peace be upon him* made a will for Ali is the *hadeeth* of Aysha when she was told that the prophet *peace be upon him* made a will for Ali and she denied it, saying that the prophet *peace be upon her* passed away when he was with her and did not make a will. And she is the truthful in that. It is strange that Al-Tijani takes this *hadeeth* as an argument for him, not against him. By Allah, I do not know what kind of argument could be found in this *hadeeth*. Is it an argument when someone says that the prophet *peace be upon him* made a will for Ali without a clear evidence from the prophet *peace be upon him*? How come, and the argument is more obvious than the sun taking the form of Aysha's answer! Praised be the Lord! Look how Allah shows His light even if the oppressors try to cover it!?
3. I answered previously Al-Tijani's claim that Aysha could not handle mentioning the name of Ali, and praise is due to Allah. There is nothing in *Tabaqat* Ibn Sa'ad of what Al-Tijani claims that Aysha could not handle mentioning the name of Ali. And in Al-Bukhari, Al-Tijani is talking about the *hadeeth* where he claims that the prophet *peace be upon him* gave a will to Ali by name. Go back to the book of Al-Tijani where he mentions the same *hadeeth* [63]. And praise is due to Allah in the beginning and in the end.

References:

1. Saheeh Al-Bukhari, Chapter of the Virtues of the Companions, section "The Virtues of Aysha," #3559
2. Then I was Guided, p.117
3. Musnaf Ibn Abi Sheibah, vol.8, the Book of the "Camel" in the departure of Aysha, p.718
4. Minhaj Al-Sunnah, vol.4, p.317-318
5. Part of a hadeeth narrated by Bukhari in the Book of "Tafseer", Surat Al-Nour, #4473, vol.4
6. Fath Al-Bari, vol.8, p.324, Book of Al-Tafseer
7. Muslim with Explanation, Book of Repentance, p.162-163
8. Fath Al-Bari, vol.8, p.324, Book of "Al-Tafseer"
9. Then I was Guided, p.117
10. Tareekh Al-Tabari, vol.3, p.29, year.36H, ALSO Ibn Al-Atheer vol.3, p.122-123, year.36H
11. Al-Tabari, vol.3, p.39, year.36H
12. Ibid. vol.3, p.43, year.36H
13. Musnaf Ibn Abi Sheibah, vol.8, the Book of the "Camel" in the departure of Aysha, p.718
14. Then I was Guided, p.117-118
15. The Virtues of the Companions, by Imam Ahmed, vol.2, #1199, p.702
16. Saheeh Muslim with Explanation, Book of Purity, #276
17. Shatharat Al-Thahab, vol.1, p.42
18. Ahkam Al-Quran by Ibn Al-Arabi, vol.3, p.1536
19. Book of the Trustworthy, by Ibn Habbab, vol.2, p.282
20. Then I was Guided, p.118, in the footnote
21. Then I was Guided, p.118-119
22. Tareekh Al-Tabari, vol.3, p.14, year.36H
23. Then I was Guided, p.119
24. Muslim with Explanation, #2905, Book of "Afflictions," Section "The affliction comes from the east where the devil horn rises, vol.18
25. Muslim with Explanation, #2905, AND Saheeh Al-Bukhari, Book of "Afflictions," #6680
26. Ibid. and refer to the rest of the *hadeeths* that talk about this issue.
27. Then I was Guided, p.119
28. Saheeh Al-Bukhari, Book of Marriage, #4932
29. Saheeh Al-Bukhari, Book of Al-Tafseer (Al-Tahreem), #4632
30. Then I was Guided, p.119-120
31. Tafseer Ibn Katheer, vol.3, Surat Al-Nour, p.288
32. Ibid. p.289
33. Then I was Guided, p.119
34. Sunan Al-Turmithi, vol.5, Book of Virtues, Section of Virtues of Aysha, #3879
35. Sunan Al-Turmithi, #3886, AND Bukhari, #3462
36. Ibid. p.3890
37. Ibid. p.3889
38. Ibid. p.3887
39. Ibid. p.3882
40. Ibid. p.3883, AND Saheeh Al-Turmithi by Al-Albani, #3044
41. Ibid. p.3884, AND Saheeh Al-Turmithi, by Al-Albani #3046
42. Ibid. p.3892
43. The Weakness in Sunan Al-Turmithi, by Al-Albani, #816
44. Al-Esti'ab, vol.4, p.1872
45. Ibid. p.1883
46. Ibid.
47. Al-Isabah, vol.7, p.739-742
48. Then I was Guided, p.120
49. Ibid. p.139-140
50. Al-Kamil, by Ibn Atheer, vol.3, p.315, year.39H
51. Al-Esti'ab, vol.1, p.392
52. Al-Bidayah wa Al-Nihayah, by Ibn Katheer, vol.8, p.46, year.49H
53. Al-Ehtijaj, by Al-Tabrasi, vol.2, p.290
54. Virtues of the Companions, by Ahmed, vol.2, #1639, with a strong attribution

55. The Characteristics of the Commander of the Faithful, by Al-Nisa'ei, #185, with strong attributio
56. Then I was Guided, p.141
57. Ibid. p.115
58. Ibid. p.92
59. Ibid. p.114
60. Ibid. p.164
61. Al-Khisal, by Al-Qummay, p.69-71
62. Then I was Guided, p.164
63. Ibid. p.119-120

Fifth: Answering Al-Tijani's Libels against Uthman Ibn Affan

Uthman bin Affan, the man of two lights, his wives were Ruqayyah and Umm Kalthum, the two daughters of the Prophet peace be upon him, and the brother-in-law of Ali bin Abi Talib, may Allah be pleased at him. He was the title of generosity and charity. He prepared the army of Al-Essrah, and bought the will of Romah and made it free for Muslims. Not even this man had escaped from Al-Tijani's allegations who tried to alter the true history by slandering this respected Companion.

Al-Tijani says,

And when you ask them why the caliph of the Muslim's Uthman was murdered, they would say: It was the Egyptians - and they were not believers - who came and killed him, thus ends the subject with two words.

When I had the opportunity to carry out research into history, I found that the main figures behind the killing of Uthman were the Companions themselves, and that Aishah led them, calling for his death publicly and saying: "Kill Na'thal (the old fool), for he was not a believer."

Also we know that Talhah, al-Zubayr, Muhammad ibn Abi Bakr and other famous Companions besieged him in his house and prevented him from having a drink of water, so that they could force him to resign. Furthermore, the historians inform us that they did not allow his corpse to be buried in a Muslim cemetery, and that he was finally buried in "Hashsh Kawkab" without washing the corpse and without a shroud.

O Allah, praise be to you, how could they tell us that he was unjustly killed, and that those who killed him were not Muslims. This is another case similar to that of Fatimah and Abu Bakr: Uthman was either unjustly treated, therefore we may pass judgment on those Companions who killed him or those who participated in his killing that they were criminal murderers because they unlawfully killed the caliph of the Muslims, and threw stones at his funeral, and humiliated him when he was alive and then when he was dead; or that the Companions killed him because he committed certain deeds which were not compatible with Islam, as the historical sources tell us.

There is no third option, unless we dismiss the historical facts and accept the distorted picture that the Egyptians, who were not believers, killed Uthman. In both cases there is a definite rejection of the common belief that all the Companions were right and just, without exception, for either Uthman was unjust or his killers were not just, but all of them were Companions, and hence our proposition becomes void. Therefore we are left with the proposition of the followers of Ahl al-Bayt, and

that is that some of the Companions were right and some others were wrong. [Then I was Guided, p. 116-117]

- Answering Al-Tijani's lies:

1) Every sane man would have no doubts that the killers of Uthman were not the Companions. The Companions, may Allah be pleased at them, did not participate in this murder, nor did they approve of it. On the contrary, the Companions defended him and stood by Uthman's side. However, Uthman feared affliction, so he prevented the Companions from defending him, and he knew that he would be killed unjustly as the Prophet peace be upon him informed him. Abdullah bin Omar may Allah be pleased at him narrated from the Prophet peace be upon him that the Prophet said, "And this man – Uthman- (in the affliction) would be killed unjustly." [Sunan Al-Turmithi, Book of Virtues, #3708, look also Saheeh Al-Turmithi # 2924] Al-Bukhari narrated in his Saheeh that Abu Mousa Al-Ash'ari narrated that the Prophet peace be upon him said, "Let him (Uthman) in, and give him the glad tidings of entering Paradise after a calamity that befalls him." [Saheeh Al-Bukhari, Book of the Virtues of the Companions, Chapter the Virtues of Uthman bin Affan # 3492]

The grand Companions participated in defending Uthman, and they declared their anger for his murder. AbdulRahman bin Layla said, "I saw Ali holding up his hands and saying, 'O ' Allah, I declare to you my innocence from participating in the murder of Uthman.'" [Virtues of the Companions, by Ahmed bin Hanbal 1/452] Omayrah bin Sa'ad said, "We were with Ali on the shores of Ephrates when we saw a ship with rising sails. Ali said, 'Allah almighty says, "And His are the Ships sailing smoothly through the seas, lofty as mountains," (55, 25) I swear by the One who made the ships sail in one sea of His seas that I did not kill Uthman nor did I encourage his killing.'" [Virtues of the Companions, 1/458] Jabbir bin Abdullah said, "Ali sent a letter to Uthman saying, 'I have 500 man, so give me the permission to defend you from these people, otherwise things would happen that they would kill you.' Uthman answered, 'May Allah reward you for your good intentions, but I do not want blood to be shed for my cause.'" [Tareekh Damascus, p.403] Moreover, the sons of Ali and the sons of the Companions participated in the defense of Uthman. Muhamed bin Sireen said, "Al-Hasan, Al-Hussain, Ibn Omar, Ibn Al-Zubair, and Marwan rushed to the house of Uthman raising their swords. Uthman told them. 'I order you to go back home, put your swords in their shields, and stay at home.'" [Tareekh Khaleefah Al-Khayyat, p.174]

Kunanah, the slave of Safiyah, said, "I witnessed the murder of Uthman. Four young men from Quraysh were taken out from Uthman's house. These young men were covered by blood, and they were defending Uthman may Allah be pleased at him; Al-Hasan bin Ali, Abdullah bin Al-Zubair, Muhamed bin Hatib, and Marwan bin Hakam." [A'asr Al-Khilafah Al-Rashidah by Akram Diya'a Al-Umari, p.390. Al-Umari said that the hadeeth was narrated in Al-Estia'ab with a good authentication]

Salamah bin Abdulrahman said that Abu Qutadah Al-Ansari along with another man from Al-Ansar entered upon Uthman while he was surrounded. Abu Qutadah asked for the permission to go to Hajj, and Uthman gave them the permission. The two men asked,

“What should we do if these people attacked you?” Uthman answered, “Be with the majority.” The two men asked again, “What if the majority was with these people?” Uthman answered, “Stay with the majority, wherever it is.” Then the two men left Uthman’s room, and when they were about to leave the house, they saw Al-Hasan bin Ali entering. So they followed Al-Hasan wanting to know what Al-Hasan wanted. When Al-Hasan entered upon Uthman, he said, “O’ Commander of the Faithful! I am under your command, so order me as you wish.” Uthman answered, “My dear brother’s son! Go back, and stay in your home until Allah carries out His order. I do not need the shedding of blood.” *[Musnad Ahmed, Virtues of the Companions, #753]*

Ibn Abi Sheibah narrated in his Musnad that Abdullah bin Al-Zubair said, “I said to Uthman at those days, ‘Come out and fight them! Allah had given victory to people with less than your men, and I swear by Allah that it is lawful to fight them.’ But Uthman refused.” *[Musnaf Abi Sheibah, vol.8, Book of Affliction]*. In another version of the same story, Abdullah bin Al-Zubair said, “Allah have made it lawful for you to fight them!” and Uthman answered, “No, by Allah I will never fight them.” *[Tabaqat Ibn Sa’ad, vol.3, p.70]*. Also in Tabaqat Ibn Sa’ad, “And the son of Omar wore his shield twice at that day and held his sword. However, Uthman ordered him to leave the house for fear of being killed.” *[Ibid]*

Al-Khayyat narrated that Abu Hurayrah said to Uthman, “Today, to be killed with you is a nice thing.” But Uthman answered him, “I order you to leave the house!” *[Tareekh Khaleefah Al-Khayyat, p.147, with authentic narrators]*. Ibn Abi Sheibah narrated that Ibn Sireen said, “Zaid bin Thabit entered upon Uthman and said, ‘Here are the Ansars at the door.’ And the Ansars said, ‘If you wish for us to be Ansar [helpers] to Allah twice.’ Uthman said, ‘No fighting.’” *[Al-Musnaf, vol.8, Book of Afflictions, p.682, with authentic narrators]*

Khalid bin Rabee’a Al-Absi said, “We heard that Huthayfah was sick. Abu Masoud Al-Ansari went to visit him in Al-Mada’en along with some other people including me. Then we talked about the killing of Uthman. Abu Masoud said, ‘O’Allah! I was not present at that day! I did not kill him [Uthman] nor was I pleased by his murder.’” *[Ibid p.683]*. Ibn Katheer in Al-Bidayah wa Al-Nihayah narrated that Abi Bakrah said, “To fall from the sky is more beloved to me than to participate in the murder of Uthman.” *[Ibn Katheer, vol.7, p.203]*

Abu Mousa Al-Ash’ari said, “If the murder of Uthman were a good deed, then good things would have happened to our Ummah. But it was a bad deed, and so the Ummah received blood.” *[Tareekh Dimashq, p.388]* Osama bin Zaid said to Uthman, “If you would like, we will drill a hole in your house so you may come out to a safe place. And then, the people who obeys you will fight the people who disobeys you.” *[Tareekh Al-Madinah Al-Munawarah, Ibn Shubbah, vol.3, p.1211]* Al-Harithah Bin Nu’oman, who witnessed the battle of Badr, said to Uthman, “If you wish, we will fight in behalf of you.” *[Al-Bukhari, Al-Tareekh Al-Sagheer, vol.1, p.76]*. Abdullah bin Salam said [to the rebels], “Do not kill Uthman! If you do, then your prayers will no never be accepted.” *[Musnad Ahmad, vol.1, p.474, with authentic narrators]*.

After bringing up all these narrations for the position of the Companions regarding the killing of Uthman, we come to the conclusion that the Companions did not participate in the killing of Uthman nor were they pleased about it. We can also notice the integrity that Al-Tijani enjoys when he claims that he had read the history and found that the Companions were the killers of Uthman! May Allah curse the liars! Let me mention some Shia's narrations that indicate the Companions' defense for Uthman, especially Ali bin Abi Talib and his sons Al-Hasan and Al-Hussain, may Allah be pleased at all of them.

Al-Masoudi, the Shia historian, narrates in his book *Murooj Al-Thahab*, "When Ali was told that they [the rebels] wanted to kill him [Uthman], he sent his two sons Al-Hasan and Al-Hussain along with his slaves with weapons to Uthman to support him. Ali ordered them to defend Uthman. Al-Zubair sent his son Abdullah, Talha sent his son Muhamed, and the vast majority of the Companions' sons were sent by their fathers. They prevented the rebels from entering the house." [*Murooj Al-Thahab*, vol.2, p.344]

2. However, the people who rebelled against Uthman are of two kinds:

- a. The followers of Abdullah bin Saba'a the Jew. Ibn Saba'a tried to misguide Muslims. He traveled to Hijaz, Basrah, Kufah, until he was expelled from Al-Sham. Then he got into Egypt. He lived there and established the doctrine of Raja'ah. He claimed that the successor to the Prophet peace be upon him was Ali. Lots of people in Egypt were misguided because of him. Then Ibn Saba'a sent his missionaries to different parts of the Islamic world. He also wrote secret letters to some people to collaborate on killing Uthman, and they are the second kind.
- b. The Bedouins, and the scums of the Arabs who were originally among the renegades after the demise of the Prophet peace be upon him. Ali said to Talha and Al-Zubair, "O' Brothers! I am not ignorant of what you know! But what can I do to people who rule us and we don't rule them? Here they are, and your slaves rebelled with them and the Bedouins as well." [*Tareekh Al-Tabari*, vol.2, p.702, Year 35 Hijri]. The Shia Imam Al-Nowbakhti has a similar point of view. He says, "Some Muslims became disbelievers and left Islam. The tribe of Banu Hunayfah accepted the prophecy of Musaylimah who claimed prophecy at the time of the Prophet peace be upon him. Abu Bakr sent the armies headed by Khalid bin Al-Waleed bin Al-Mugheirah Al-Makhzomi to fight them. Khalid fought them and killed Musaylimah. Some were killed and others accepted Islam again and were called the People of Apostasy. And the People of Apostasy were united until they got angry with Uthman for inventing things. (At the affliction of Uthman) some were involved in the killing and some did not object it. The only supporters to Uthman were his family and few others." [*Firaq Al-Shia*, p.4]

The leaders of the expedition of the rebels were the ones who came from Egypt headed by Al-Ghafiqay bin Harb Al-Akbay – who became to be known as The Egyptians. However, Al-Tijani denies that, for, as he claims, he had read history! But

history books and other books agree unanimously that the killers of Uthman were the Egyptians! Please refer to Tareekh Al-Tabari [vol.3, p.36], Tareekh Ibn Al-Atheer [vol.3, p.46, Year 35 Hijri], Al-Tamhid wa Al-Bayan [By Muhamed bin Yahya Al-Maliqani, p.109-118], Murooj Al-Thahab [By Al-Masoudi, vol.2, p.343], Al-Bidayah wa Al-Nihayah [By Ibn Katheer, vol.7, p.177, Year 36 Hijri], Tabaqat ibn Sa'ad [vol.3, p.64], Explanation of Nahjul Balagha by Ibn Abi Al-Hadeed [vol.1, p.162-167], Al-Esti'ab by Ibn Abd Al-Bir [vol.3, p.1037-1053], Al-Tareekh Al-Islami [By Mahmoud Shakir, vol.3, Chapter of Uthman], and Al-Futooh by Ibn Al-A'atham [vol.1, p.44]. After all, I wonder what history did Al-Tijani read? I truly believe he read the history, but the history of fools and idiots!

3) Then Al-Tijani claims that Aysha was among the first who called for Uthman's murder, "I found that the main figures behind the killing of Uthman were the Companions themselves, and that Aishah led them, calling for his death publicly and saying: "Kill Na'thal (the old fool), for he was not a believer.'" Then Al-Tijani attributes that to Al-Tabari, Ibn Al-Atheer, Al-Aqd Al-Fareed, Lisan Al-Arab, and Taj Al-Aroos. I say:

- a) This story was narrated by Nasr bin Muzahim. Al-Aqeeli says about Nasr bin Muzahim, "He tends to be a Shia, and his narrations are filled with confusions and mistakes." [Al-Du'afa by Al-Aqeeli, vol.4, p.300, #. 1899]. Al-Thahabi says about him, "A hardcore Rafidhi (Shia), and his narrations are not taken as authentic. Abu Khaythamah said, 'He was a liar.' Abu Hatim said, 'Weak narrator, and is not taken as an argument.' Al-Darqutni said, 'His narrations are weak.'" [Al-Mizan by Al-Thahabi, vol.4, p.253, #. 9046]. "Al-Jowzani said, 'Nasr was a fake person and far away from truth.' Salih bin Muhamed said, 'Nasr bin Muzahim narrated ugly stories from unreliable narrators.' Al-Hafudh Abi Al-Fath Muhamed bin Al-Hussain said, 'Nasr bin Muzahim goes excess in his denomination.'" [Tareekh Baghdad by Al-Baghdadi, vol.13, p.283]. Therefore, this story is not reliable and is not true. The story also contradicts the authentic narrations.
- b) True and authentic stories show that Aysha was in pain for the murder of Uthman and she also prayed against his killers. Masrooq – a trustworthy Tabi'ei – said that Aysha said, "You left him (to die) just like the dirt-clear cloth, and you came closer to kill him as a sheep is slaughtered." Then Masrooq told her, "This is the result of your work. You encouraged people to rebel against him." Aysha answered, "By the One who believers believe in and the disbelievers disbelieve in, I did not write them a single word." Al-A'amash said, "It is to be known that words were written in her name (and she did not know about it)." [Al-Bidayah wa Al-Nihayah, by Ibn Katheer, vol. 7, p. 204, with authentic chain of narrators].

Ahmed narrates that Aysha said (regarding the murder of Uthman), "I wish I was forgotten. And about what happened to Uthman, by Allah, I never wanted anything bad to happen to him unless it happened to me too. So if I wanted him to be killed, then I shall be killed too." [Virtues of the Companions, by Ahmed, vol. 1, p. 462, with authentic chain of

narrators]. Talaq bin Hushan asked Aysha, “How was Uthman, the Commander of the Faithful, killed?” Aysha answered, “He was killed as an innocent man. May Allah curse his killers.” *[Al-Tareekh Al-Kabeer by Al-Bukhari, vol. 4, p. 358]*

It is a very well known fact for the historians that Aysha marched to seek revenge for the blood of Uthman. Then how could you reconcile between that and Aysha’s saying, “Kill Na’thal, for he was not a believer.”? Unless if the latter saying was a lie.

4) Al-Tijani says, “Also we know that Talhah, al-Zubayr, Muhammad ibn Abi Bakr and other famous Companions besieged him in his house and prevented him from having a drink of water, so that they could force him to resign.”

I answer:

- a) For Muhamed bin Abi Bakr to be a famous Companion is a very well established fact considering the reality that he was the Prophet’s companion for four months only!!! For the Prophet peace be upon him passed away and Muhamed bin Abi Bakr’s age was only four months! How famous of a Companion he is!
- b) It is an obvious lie that Talha and Al-Zubair surrounded Uthman and prevented him from reaching to water. Where is the authentic attribution? And what reference did Al-Tijani rely on? I challenge him to bring to light one single authentic reference about that!
- c) Authentic narrations show that Talha and Al-Zubair were anguished for the death of Uthman. They even tried to defend him; Abi Habeebah said, “Al-Zubair sent me to Uthman to deliver a message while he was surrounded. I entered upon Uthman in a clear day and he was sitting on a chair. Al-Hasan bin Ali, Abu Hurayrah, Abdullah bin Omar, and Abdullah bin Al-Zubair were all present too. I said, ‘Al-Zubair bin Al-Awam had sent me to you. He sends you his greetings and says, ‘I am under my allegiance to you. I did not change my allegiance nor did I break it. If you wish, I will join you and be one of your men, and if you wish, I will stay too. The tribe of Umro bin Owf had promised me to be under my command, and they would carry out what I order them.’ When Uthman heard the message, he said, ‘Allahu Akbar! Thanks are due to Allah for He who had saved my brother. Send him my greetings and tell him, “If you joined me, then you will be one of my men, but I like you to stay where you are at now....”’ When Abu Hurayrah heard the message, he said, “Do you want me to tell you what my ears heard from the Messenger of Allah peace be upon him?” They answered, “Yes!” Abu Hurayrah said, “I bear witness that the Messenger of Allah peace be upon him said, ‘When I am gone, afflictions and troubles will occur.’ So we asked, ‘How could we save ourselves from that O’ Messenger of Allah?’ He answered, ‘Adhere to the faithful man and his party,’ and he pointed towards Uthman bin Affan.” The people who were present at Uthman’s house stood up and said, ‘Now we see clearly. Give us the permission to wage Jihad!’ Uthman answered, ‘I order whoever gave allegiance to me not to fight.’” *[Virtues of the Companions, Ahmed bin Hanbal, vol. 1, p. 511, with authentic chain of narrators]*.

Al-Darqutni narrated, “Uthman entered the mosque and saw Talha sitting on the east side of the mosque. Uthman said, “O’ Talha!” Talha answered, “Yes!” Uthman said, “Do you know that the Messenger of Allah peace be upon him said, ‘Anyone who would buy this piece of land to add it to the mosque?’ and I bought it with my own money?” Talha answered, “O’ Allah, I do know.” ... Uthman said again, “I call you by the grace of Allah, do you know that I supported the army of Al-Esrah just like a hundred men?” Talha answered, “O’ Allah! I do know.” Then Talha said, “O’ Allah! I know nothing of Uthman except that he is an innocent man!”” *[Mawaqif Al-Sahabah fi Al-Fitnah, vol. 2, p. 24]*

- d) No one disagrees that Talha and Al-Zubair were among the first people who sought justice for the blood of Uthman. They solely marched for this reason. Then how come they would encourage the killing of Uthman and surround him and yet fight against their own partners in the crime?

5) Then Al-Tijani says, “Furthermore, the historians inform us that they did not allow his corpse to be buried in a Muslim cemetery, and that he was finally buried in "Hashsh Kawkab" without washing the corpse and without a shroud.” And he also says, “It became clear to me what the historians meant when they said that he was buried in "Hash Kawkab," which was Jewish land.” I answer:

- a) Al-Tijani wants to picture the Companions as a group of savages and barbarians who kill each others, and then prevent the grandest Companions to be buried just like the rest of Muslims, then put him in his grave without washing and without enshrouding him!! However, I do not find this to be strange since it came from this Guided one. Al-Tijani never experienced love in his heart for the Companions of the Prophet peace be upon him. I would like to inform him that these actions that he is trying to attribute to the Companions of the Prophet peace be upon him suite the Shia’s actions and attributes better. And why not? Are not they the grandchildren of Abdullah bin Saba the Jew, the one who is responsible for the first affliction?
- b) Al-Tijani’s claim that the Companions did not allow his corpse to be buried in Muslim cemeteries, and so he was buried in Hashsh Kawkab, which is a Jewish piece of land, his claim only shows his complete ignorance and lack of knowledge. Hashsh Kawkab is not a Jewish land. Hashsh means garden [in Arabic] and Uthman bought the land from an Ansari man named Kawkab! *[Tahtheeb Al-Asma wa Al-Lughat by Al-Nawawi, vol. 1, p. 323 and Al-Ma’alim Al-Atheerah fi Al-Sunnah wa Al-Seerah by Muhamed Hasan Sharab p. 101]* And when Uthman passed away, he was buried in his own garden, which he bought by his own money! Is there something wrong in that?

Al-Tijani says, “It became clear to me what the historians meant when they said that he was buried in "Hash Kawkab," which was Jewish land, because the Muslims refused to bury him in the Baqi' of the Messenger of Allah. When Muawiya seized power, he bought that land from the Jews and included it in al-Baqi', so that it contains the grave of

his cousin Uthman. He who visits al-Baqi' today will see this fact very clearly.” *[Then I was Guided, p.139]*

If you asked a child in the primary level whether the Jews were present in the city of the Messenger of Allah peace be upon him – Al-madinah Al-Monawarah – in the era of the Four Rightly Guided Caliphs, then the child would answer calmly with a no, because the Jews were expelled from the Madinah by the Prophet peace be upon him and later on, Omar bin Al-Khattab expelled them from the whole Arabic peninsula! Praise be Allah! And the Shia say that Al-Tijani has a doctorate degree??

Then Al-Tijani says,

It is worth mentioning here a story related to the subject of inheritance that has been cited by many historians: Ibn Abi al-Hadid al-Mutazili said in his commentary on Nahj al-Balagha: Aisha and Hafsa came to see Uthman, during his caliphate, and asked him to give them their shares of what they had inherited from the Messenger of Allah (saw). Uthman was stretched on the sofa, so he sat up and said to Aisha: You and that woman sitting next to you brought a man who cleansed himself with his urine and testified that the Messenger of Allah (saw) said, "We, the prophets, do not leave an inheritance." If the Prophet truly did not leave any inheritance, why do you ask for it now, and if he left an inheritance, why did you deprive Fatimah of her legal share? After that, she left him feeling very angry and said: Kill Na'thal, for he has become an unbeliever.” *[Then I was Guided, p. 140]*

I say:

I referred back to Sharh Nahjul Balagha vol. 16, p.220-223 – as Al-Tijani wrote in the footnote – and I did not find any trace for this story! However, I found this other story where Aysha said, “When the Prophet peace be upon him passed away, his wives and family wanted to send Uthman bin Affan to Abu Bakr to ask Abu Bakr for their inheritance or their eighths share. I told them, ‘Did not the Prophet peace be upon him say, “We do not inherit. What we leave behind us is for charity.”’” *[Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol. 4, p. 82 under subtitle “The stories of Fadak.” The edition that Al-Tijani relied on is different than my edition. However, I referred back to his edition of Sharh Nahjul Balagha, but could not also find a trace for the story.]* The same story was also narrated in Saheeh Bukhari and Saheeh Muslim. And as you can see, this story contradicts Al-Tijani’s story.

Al-Tijani’s mere reference to Sharh Nahjul Balagha by Ibn Abi Al-Hadeed is of no significance value. Ibn Abi Al-Hadeed is not a knowledgeable person in Hadeeth. He adds authentic and fabricated hadeeths in his books. Even so, I could not find the story Al-Tijani was talking about at the supposed location. I fear that it is one of the makings of Al-Tijani. In general, the authentic stories and the life of Aysha and Uthman belie such a story wa al-hamdulillah.

Then Al-Tijani says,

When Uthman came to power after Umar, he went a long way in al-Ijtihad, and did more than any on his predecessors had done, until his opinions started to affect political and religious life generally, thus leading to the revolution, and he paid with his life as a price for his Ijtihad. *[Then I was Guided, p. 167]*

This is an obvious lie. The Bedouins rebelled against Uthman for the sickness in their hearts, and they were not right in their claims. In addition to the acts of Abdullah bin Saba the Jew in starting the affliction, the Bedouins were responsible for this affliction and not Uthman. This was clarified when all of the Companions stood beside Uthman in the affliction. I will not forget to mention the evidences that Uthman was right and the rebels were the people of the affliction.

Al-Hakim narrated in Al-Mustadrak and Ahmed narrated in Al-Fada'el that Abu Hurayrah asked for permission to talk in front of Uthman when Uthman was surrounded. Uthman gave him the permission. Then Abu Hurayrah stood up, praised Allah, and said, "I heard the Messenger of Allah peace be upon him saying, 'After I am gone, you will suffer afflictions and differences.' One of the men asked the Prophet peace be upon him, 'What we ought to do then O' Messenger of Allah?' The Prophet peace be upon him answered, 'Stay close to the faithful man and his companions.' And the Prophet peace be upon him meant Uthman." *[Virtues of the Companions, By Ahmed bin Hanbal, vol. 1, p. 451, with an authentic chain of narrators]*

When Uthman was about to enter upon the Prophet peace be upon him, the Prophet peace be upon him asked Abu Mousa Al-Ash'ari, "Go open the door for him and give him the glad tidings of entering heaven after an affliction that befalls him." So Abu Mousa opened the door and it was Uthman, and he told Uthman what the Prophet peace be upon him had just said. Uthman said, "O' Allah! Grant me patience." *[Sunan Al-Turmithi, hadeeth # 3710, Saheeh Al-Bukhari # 3492]*

Ahmed also narrated in his book that the Messenger of Allah peace be upon him mentioned a great affliction. Then a masked man in a piece of clothe passed by. The Prophet peace be upon him said, "This man – the masked man – will be on the true side (in that affliction)." Ka'ab bin Ojrah ran fast and caught the masked man from behind and said, "Is this the man you are talking about O' Messenger of Allah?" The Prophet peace be upon him answered, "Yes." And that man was Uthman bin Affan. *[Virtues of the Companions, by Ahmed, vol. 1, p. 450, with an authentic chain of narrators]*. And after all this, does Al-Tijani think that Uthman's Ijtihads were false? And they were the reasons for the rebellion? Al-Tijani presided with the affliction people against Ahl Al-Sunnah.

In the end, let me mention some of the virtues of Uthman from Shia books. Abu Al-Fath Al-Arbali – a major Shia scholar – mentions in his book Kashf Al-Ghummah the story of the marriage of Ali to Fatima and how Uthman helped Ali in his marriage. Ali said, "Then the Messenger of Allah peace be upon him told me, 'Abu Al-Hasan! Go now and sell your armor and come back with its value so I may prepare what is good for you and Fatima.' So I went and sold my armor to Uthman bin Affan for 400 Darhams. When the money was in my hand and the armor was in his hands, Uthman said to me, 'Abu Al-Hasan! Don't you need the armor more than I do and don't you need the money more than I do?' I answered with a yes. So he said, 'Then take back the armor. It is a gift from me to you.' So I took back the armor and the money and went to the Messenger of Allah peace be upon him. I handed the armor and the money over to the Messenger of Allah peace be upon him and I told him what happened between Uthman and me. The Prophet then asked Allah goodness for Uthman." *[Kashf Al-Ghummah, by Al-Arbali, vol. 1, p. 368 under the subtitle of "A Chapter in his marriage to Fatima alayha Al-salam"]*

Another story narrated by Al-Arbali, "Then some people from Iraq entered upon him (Al-Imam Zayn Al-Abideen Ali bin Al-Hussain) and said some bad things about Abu Bakr, Umar, and Uthman. When they were done, Ali bin Al-Hussain told them, 'Tell me,

Are you the (Muhajirs, those who were expelled from their homes and their property, while seeking Grace from Allah and (His) Good Pleasure, and aiding Allah and His Messenger: such are indeed the sincere ones)? They answered, 'No!' Then Ali bin Al-Hussain said, 'So, are you (those who, before them, had homes (in Medina) and had adopted the Faith, show their affection to such as came to them for refuge, and entertain no desire in their hearts for things given to the (latter), but give them preference over themselves, even though poverty was their (own lot))?' They answered, 'No!' Ali bin Al-Hussain said, 'Therefore, you disassociated yourselves from being one of these two groups and I bear witness that you are not the ones (who came after them say: "Our Lord! Forgive us, and our brethren who came before us into the Faith, and leave not, in our hearts, rancor (or sense of injury) against those who have believed. Our Lord! Thou art indeed Full of Kindness, Most Merciful.") Get out of here, may Allah curse you!"' [*Ibid*, vol. 2, p. 291, under the subtitle of "Virtues of Al-Imam Zayn Al-Abideen"]

And after all these evidences from Sunni and Shia books, does Al-Tijani dare to claim that Allah had guided him to slander the Companions?

For More Books on Refutation of Shiism, Visit

<http://Ansar.Org>

<http://shiacult.webnode.com>

<http://kr-hcy.tk>