

A review on the Interview with Mr. Vae`zzadeh Khorasani

Hozah Journal 01

Thursday April 10th, 2008

Mr. Huseini Ghazvini

In our previous 6 sessions, we discussed the questions and misgivings put forward by Othman al-Khamis, a Wahhabi leader, of which 4 sessions remained. Indeed, he is the one who has presented the most fundamental anti-Shiite questions which we realized that we are to deal with the newest 4 core issues and come to a sound conclusion up until the end of this academic year. We hope to release our discussions and answers to those questions in both Farsi and Arabic soon, as we receive calls from Iran and abroad for answers.

However, since there are fresher issues in Hozah, we need to refer to them as they seem more urgent. By now, we skip Othman al-Khamis's questions and go to the new problems which have concerned the religious authorities.

There is an interview with Mr. Vae`zzadeh Khorasani in Hozah Journal No. 141, affiliated with the Islamic Preaching Organization. Those awful things in attacking the holy Quran and Ahlol-Beit and praising Bani Omayya ached my heart and one of the great religious figures asked me to answer them. Studying the interview, I was taken aback because of both the content and the clergy who had mentioned them, someone who was one of us!

There is a radical line of Shiites believing in defending Ahlol-Beit evidently and swearing at the caliphis. While there is another subscribing to the view that there

should be more interaction with the Sunnis and even more retreating on some of our fundamentals. Mr. Vae`zzadeh Khorasani in *Nahjol-Balagha Magazine*, No. 4 and 5 directly stated:

“To unite with our Sunni brothers, there is no other way but to approve of legitimacy of Sheikhin and to withdraw the leadership of Amir-al-Momenin Ali (AS) based on the Prophet’s will”.

This is not certainly deserving of Shiites and Islamic schools, nor is it anything to be endorsed by the Shiite authorities during these 14 centuries. As Motahari puts it in his *‘Imamat and Leadership’*, p 21, although we need to prioritize union as an issue of Islam, we are not willing to barter Shiite beliefs for peace. *“We are Shiites honored by the victory of Imams; but we are not ready to move away from a small Mustahabb (religiously advised) act and Makruh (religiously forbidden) act for the sake of being united”.* This is our criterion. He then continues: *“To unite, we must not say things to injure the emotions of Sunnis. Science requires rationality not feelings”.*

But some like Vae`zzadeh Khorasani believe in the aforesaid ideas. In 2001, he expressed some of his unfounded beliefs which were against Shiism in *Haft-Aseman Magazine*, No. 10 and 11, which was answered in the following issue by the great Shiite authorities.

A year after in *Nahjol-Balagha Magazine* he went on: *“The leadership of Sheikhin was legitimate and if the holy prophet (PBUH) appointed Imam Ali as the leader, he was not precise enough; that’s why we need to look for the reasons of their legitimacy”.*

My complete answers came in the issue number 6. The publishers had to summarize them but printed 30 major pages, which was appreciated.

After a while, *Hozah Magazine* interviewed Vae`zzadeh Khorasani who extolled Bani Umayya in the best way ever. He equals their victories in wars to Islam asserting that they are nothing but sheer Islam:

“Sticking to the Holy Quran is acceptable but neglecting Sunnat (the Prophet’s style of life) and the sayings in the Sunnis’ books is the sign of dogmatism in Islamic schools, which must be broken down.”

Good God! Is it possible to say let us forget about our Shiite certainties and omit “*Ashhadu anna Alian Valio Allah*” (I bear witness that is Ali the companion of God) and “*Hayya 'ala-khayrelamal*” (Hurry to the best of work) from Adhan and put “Prayer is better than sleeping” instead?! Is it possible to reverse the orders of washing for prayer and pray hands clipped and little by little disregard the blood of those who were martyred for Islam?!

When I contacted Mr. Rabani, the director of the Islamic Preaching Organization, he insisted on a complete answer to be printed in later issues. The management of Hozah in Qom promised to put it in Ofogh Magazine provided that the answer was perfect. But pressed for time, I had to provide this short answer that needs to be elaborated on in a couple of days at least.

Mr. Vae`zzadeh Khorasani has discussed in three major parts:

- Praising Bani Umayya

“Travel to Spain and you will see Islam; it was Bani Umayya who captured it in the first and second Hejra centuries and built the highest Islamic civilization there. They made it possible by accepted wisdom, strong belief, and selflessness. ... There is a town near Ghortabeh called Madinatozahra, named

after one of Bani Umayya leader's wife, which is an important manifestation of Islamic civilization and honor for all Muslims”.

Answer 1

I have to ask if there is or there is not any homogeneity between building mansions, or even erecting grand mosques, and the philosophy of the rise of the holy Prophets. They considered themselves as the successors of the Prophet responsible of spreading his culture. Did the holy prophets, from Adam to Muhammad, come in order to spread culture in buildings? Didn't they have any other missions which needed to be followed by their successors? The Holy Quran in Sura Al-Jumu`ah, verse 2 states the philosophy of prophethood:

هُوَ الَّذِي بَعَثَ فِي الْأُمِّيِّينَ رَسُولًا مِنْهُمْ يَتْلُوا عَلَيْهِمْ آيَاتِهِ وَ يُزَكِّيهِمْ وَ يُعَلِّمُهُمُ
الْكِتَابَ وَ الْحِكْمَةَ وَ إِنْ كَانُوا مِنْ قَبْلُ لَفِي ضَلَالٍ مُبِينٍ

“It is He Who has sent amongst the Unlettered a messenger from among themselves, to rehearse to them His Signs, to sanctify them, and to instruct them in Scripture and Wisdom,- although they had been, before, in manifest error”.

The philosophy is for them to come and relieve human from the darkness of ignorance, worshiping idols, and sins and guide them through in light of heavenly direction.

In Al-Hadid, verse 9, we read:

“It is He who sends down upon His Servant [Muhammad] verses of clear evidence that He may bring you out from darkness into the light. And indeed, Allah is to you Kind and Merciful”.

About Moses, Allah says:

*“And We certainly sent Moses with Our signs, [saying], "Bring out your people from darkness into the light and remind them of the days of Allah”. Indeed in that are signs for everyone patient and grateful”.*¹

And more obviously He says:

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا اسْتَجِيبُوا لِلَّهِ وَ لِلرَّسُولِ إِذَا دَعَاكُمْ لِمَا يُحْيِيكُمْ.

The aim of sending the prophets is clear: the spiritual livelihood of the society and uplifting it to the peak of spirituality. Thus, the purpose was not to erect grand buildings and mosques so that it took Bani Umayya’s courage to gain victory.

Answer 2

That they named a town after his wife means the honor of Muslims, according to Vae`zzadeh! A look at historic books like Mojamolboldan, Ansab, etc. reveals some things. Zahabi, a Sunni scientist, deceased in 748 AH, upon visiting the town, says:

و أنشأها مدورة ، و عدة أبراجها ثلاث مئة برج ، و شرفاتها من حجر واحد ،
و قسمها أثلاثا : فالثلث المسند إلى الجبل قصوره ، و الثلث الثاني دور
المماليك و الخدم ، و كانوا اثني عشر ألفا بمناطق الذهب ، يركبون
لركوبه ، و الثلث الثالث بساتين تحت القصور. و عمل مجلسا مشرفا على

¹ Ibrāhīm, verse 5

البساتين ، صفح عمده بالذهب ، و رصعه بالياقوت و الزمرد ، و اللؤلؤ ، و
فرشه بمنقوش الرخام ، و صنع قدامه بحرة مستديرة ملأها زئبقا ...¹

“The town was built in circles by the Umavi caliph in which there were towers and porches out of monolithic stone and divided the city into three parts, one near the mountain as his own palace to enjoy himself in it. The second part was devoted to a residential area for the slaves who numbered to 12 thousand and had golden belts on accompanying the Ruler as he mounted his steed. The third was the garden with gold-covered pillars decorated by gems the floor of which was covered by marble. It had a circular lake in front of it in order to complete his merrymaking...”

Is it fair for a Shiite clergy to consider this Madinat-al-Zahra as the Muslims’ honor?! It is while the Sunnis themselves take it as a disgrace and denounce the Caliph because of it.

Zerekli, a prominent Wahhabi figure, in his book, al-Alam, writes:

أول من تلقب بالخلافة من رجال الدولة الأموية ، في الأندلس

*“The first to receive the title of Khalifat-orasul (the successor of the Prophet) was Naser Umavi”.*²

He then continues by saying that the Caliph ruled the city for 50 years and 6 months and was fond of ruling over people:

“His son, Abdullah, became enthusiastic for ruling and he had his son and a number of his followers arrested. In 339 A, on the Ied of Qurban(Feast of Sacrifice), he himself decapitated his own son. Then he said, ‘people, it was my

¹ . Sire al-Nabavi, Vol, 8, page 267.

² . Khairuddin Alalam Alzarkly, vol 3, p 324.

sacrifice on the Ied, you too can select a sacrifice from his followers'. And they killed them all as their sacrifice."

This is the founder of Madinat-o-zahra! Is it really fair to praise an Umavi ruler who lacked humane features?!

Homavi, the author of the book Mojamol-Boldan, one of the most renowned Sunni authorities, on reaching the city cites:

أنفق في عمارتها من الأموال ما تجاوز فيه عن حد الاسراف¹

"In building the town, they spent the government money extravagantly which was beyond imagination".

The Sunnis call him filth in the history of Islam and then a Shiite clergy calls it the honor of Islam! If one does not know history, it would be more logical to ask and study. Not every clergyman has enough time to sift through it and if they recite Vae`zzadeh's argument in gatherings, how can they answer in front of our holy Imams on the resurrection day?

Answer 3

As he points out, they had strong beliefs! I doubt that Bani Umayya, from Abusofyan and Mo`avia to Marvan-Alkhemaresh, had in fact any 'strong beliefs'.

Amir-al-Momenin Ali (AS) in his great book, Nahjol-Balagha, teaches us straightforwardly; when he talks about them referring to the fact that on the day of Mecca conquest, they had to convert to Islam upon seeing the swords, the great Imam said:

فوالذي فلق الحبة و برأ النسمة ما أسلموا و لكن استسلموا و أسروا
الكفر، فلما وجدوا أعوانا عليه أظهره²

¹ . Mojamol-Boldan,

² . Nahjol al-Balagha, Letter 16.

“I swear to Allah who pierced the seed and created man, these people did not convert to Islam but pretended; they concealed their blasphemy within. Now, in Sefeyn war, when they recruit for their blasphemy, they unveil it.”

Ironically, the great Sunni figures quote Ammar Yasser as saying that the Prophet said about him:

“Ammar is just and wherever he is, there is justice.”

تقتله الفئة الباغية، عمار يدعو إلى الجنة و يدعوهم إلى النار¹

“He will be killed by a tyrant group. Ammar will invite them to the Heaven but they will invite him to the Hell.”

Ammar says:

و الله ما أسلموا و لكن استسلموا و أسروا الكفر فلما رأوا عليه أعوانا
أظهروه²

“I swear to Allah, Bani Umayya did not convert to Islam but concealed blasphemy.”

Considering Ibrāhīm Sura, verse 28:

أَلَمْ تَرَ إِلَى الَّذِينَ بَدَّلُوا نِعْمَةَ اللَّهِ كُفْرًا وَ أَحَلُّوا قَوْمَهُمْ دَارَ الْبَوَارِ

“Have you not considered those who exchanged the favor of Allah for disbelief and settled their people [in] the home of ruin?”

Sayoti quotes the second Khalifeh, Umar Ibn Khatab:

عن عمر بن الخطاب رضي الله عنه في قوله: ألم تر إلى الذين بدلوا نعمة الله
كفرا، قال: هما الأفجران من قريش، بنو المغيرة و بنو أمية؛ فأما بنو
المغيرة: فكفيتموهم يوم بدر و أما بنو أمية: فمتعوا إلى حين³

¹ . Bokhari, vol 3, p 207

² . Majma Alzvyayd Haitham, vol 1, p 113.

³ . Daralmsor, vol 4, p 84 - Tabari, vol 13, p 46 - Fath Albary Ibn Hajar Vol, 7, pp. 235 - Fath Shvkany Qadir, vol 3, p 111 - Alatdal of Zahabi, Vol 3, p 295.

“The verse intends the two tribes of Quraysh: Bani Moghayreh and Bani Umayya. You eradicated Bani Moghayreh forever in the Badr War. But Bani Umayya will be a nuisance to Muslims.”

To reject Mr Va`zzadeh’s argument, I would like to say they had neither strong beliefs nor a belief in Islam.

Surprisingly, he, in his interview, refers to Motahari as the apotheosis Hozah intellectual. Let’s see what our intellectual has to say about Bani Umayya:

“Abusofyan’s blasphemy is evident; he directly opposes ‘La Elaha Elallah’, and sang praise to the Hobal Idol. But, Mu’awiya is the same as Abusofyan in methods and aims but his motto is Imam Ali’s and sometimes seems more enthusiastic over monotheism, Islam, and Quran.¹”

Is it really fair to defend Bani Umayya system on the head of which there is Abusofyan and Mo`avia and the foundation of which undoubtedly is to destroy Islam and Quran? Motahari continues:

“Imam Ali says: the greatest conspiracy I am afraid of after my death is the black conspiracy of Bani Umayya; that is equal to putting people in a murky situation so that they cannot realize anything...”

This is what Amir-al-Momenin Ali (AS) says, contrary to supporting their victories, selflessness, and strong beliefs. It is shameful to hear these things from someone who has Hozah thoughts.

Answer 5

This one deals with Bani Umayya from the viewpoint of Quran. Let’s forget about the three above answers and listen to Quran only, which orders for following it and the Sunnah not Etrah. Referring to all the Sunni interpretations on Isra Surat, verse 60,

¹ . Panzdah Goftar Shahid Motahari, P132, Sadra Publication, the 7th Edition.

وَمَا جَعَلْنَا الرُّؤْيَا الَّتِي أَرَيْنَاكَ إِلَّا فِتْنَةً لِلنَّاسِ وَالشَّجَرَةَ الْمَلْعُونَةَ فِي الْقُرْآنِ وَنُحَوِّفُهُمْ فَمَا يَزِيدُهُمْ إِلَّا طُغْيَانًا كَبِيرًا

“And [remember, O Muhammad], when We told you, "Indeed, your Lord has encompassed the people." And We did not make the sight which We showed you except as a trial for the people, as was the accursed tree [mentioned] in the Qur'an. And We threaten them, but it increases them not except in great transgression.”

One will come to the conclusion that the occasion of the verse revelation was that the holy prophet (PBUH) dreamed some monkeys (the symbol of deception, according to Motahari) go up and down his pulpit, which saddened the Prophet, until Gabriel revealed this verse and said the meaning of ‘the accursed tree’ was Bani Umayya, who will rule the people for one thousand months after him.

Strangely, Fakhr Razi, the great Sunni interpreter of Quran says:

إنما هذه الرؤيا هي أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم كان يرى بنى أمية ينزون على منبره نزو القردة، فاغتم لذلك، وما إستجمع ضاحكا من يومئذ حتى مات صلى الله عليه وسلم. فنزلت الآية مخبرة أن ذلك من تملكهم و صعودهم يجعلها الله فتنة للناس و إمتحانا¹

“In his dream, the Prophet saw Bani Umayya go up and down his pulpit like monkeys and he was sad. After this dream until his death, the holy prophet (PBUH) was never seen happy again. This verse bears the news for him that Bani Umayya go up the government ladder and cause trouble for people.”

So ‘the accursed tree’ is Bani Umayya which is unanimously agreed by the Sunni historians and interpreters. Motahari in his ‘Fifteen Sayings’, page 293, says:

¹ . Doralmnsor, vol 4, p 191 - Interpretation Qortby, vol 10, p 283 - Interpretation Thalabi, vol 6, p 111 - Interpretation Alvasi, vol 15, p 107 - Dalael Alnabovh Bayhaqi, vol 6, p 509 – Interpretation of Razi, vol 20, p 236 and Vol, 32, p 31.

“Briefly, the Quran shows the Prophet dreams and goes unhappy; in fact, it was a divine dream, that is to say, a truth was presented to the Prophet. The interpretations say the Prophet saw in his dream that while Muslims circled his pulpit, some monkeys, which are notorious for trickery, mounted his pulpit and sit in his chair. The Prophet was sad and realized his religion was going to be harmed. It was not an external pressure from the pagans.... The truth of Islam is the real belief in Allah, the Islamic society, justice, and humanity which were never found in the acts of Bani Umayya; in contrast, they did everything to remove them from Islam so that it remains like a hollow shell which would fade away after a while.

Another point is that Quran introduces Bani Umayya as the manifestation of blasphemy.

This one deals with Bani Umayya from the viewpoint of Hadiths. Sayoti and others quote that the Prophet said:

فتجدونهم أرباب سوء¹

“There will be impudent rulers ruling you.”

Heythami says in his Majmao- Zavaed:

“Bani Umayya are the most tenacious, hated foes to the Prophet and the most vulgar tribe.”

They started killing Ahlol-Beit; the Prophet said:

أشد قومنا لنا بغضا بنو أمية و بنو المغيرة و بنو مخزوم. هذا حديث صحيح الاسناد و لم يخرجاه.

“Bani Umayya are the most hostile to my Ahlol-Beit.”

They were cursed by the Prophet. They were tyrant, too. The holy prophet (PBUH)said:

¹ . Doralmnsor, vol 4, p 191 - Fath Qadir Shvkany, vol 3, p 240 - Interpretation of Alosi, vol 15, p 107

“Ammar will be killed by a tyrant group, Ammar will invite them to the heaven but they will invite him to the hell.”

Bani Umayya have always been a stain on the history of Islam so that everyone, including the fair Sunnis, abhors them. They cannot defend them due to the cruelties they carried out in Jamal, Sefeyn, and Nahravan War, for which they are responsible. In every crime committed in the history of Islam there are fingerprints of Bani Umayya.

Is it really fair to praise them?

Dr. Seyed Muhammad Hussein Ghazvini

A review of the Interview with Mr. Vae`zzadeh Khorasani

Hozah Journal 02

Thursday April 17th, 2008

Mr. Hoseini Ghazvini

In this session, we are to discuss about the conquests achieved by Bani Umayya and in general during the ruling of Kholafa. This is what the Sunnis and Wahhabis mostly boast about and that they consider lack of conquests during the ruling of Amiral-momenin as a weak point. In this respect, I would like to open the file of the conquests to see through the aims and the conducts of the commanders in order to realize if there is any homogeneity with the body of Islam and Shariah or if these conquests are by themselves a weak point and a cause of mistrust on the part of orientalist and indeed an obstacle to the spread of Islam towards the East and the West.

Mr. Va`zzadeh said:

“If we neglect these conquests and argue that they are not a part of Islam, what can be considered as Islam, then?”

The different angles of these conquests need to be discussed. The first point here is that the Prophet’s aim was not to capture by sword in order to export the call of monotheism throughout the world. The holy Quran says directly to the Prophet that:

“Invite to the way of your Lord with wisdom and good instruction, and argue with them in a way that is best. Indeed, your Lord is most knowing of who has strayed from His way, and He is most knowing of who is [rightly] guided.”¹

And in Al-Baqarah, verse 256:

¹ Surat Al-Nahl, verse 125

“There shall be no compulsion in [acceptance of] the religion. The right course has become clear from the wrong. So whoever disbelieves in Taghut and believes in Allah has grasped the most trustworthy handhold with no break in it. And Allah is Hearing and Knowing.”

And in Ash-Shuraa, verse 48:

“But if they turn away - then We have not sent you, [O Muhammad], over them as a guardian; upon you is only [the duty of] notification. And indeed, when We let man taste mercy from us, he rejoices in it; but if evil afflicts him for what his hands have put fourth, then indeed, man is ungrateful.”

In fact, it says to the prophet if people turned away from Islam, he is not people’s guardian or legal representative but a notifying messenger. That is, if even people turned away, it is not within the responsibility of the Prophet to reconvert them to Islam and bring Islam in their towns and homes by force. The holy prophet (PBUH) fought in more than eighty defensive wars (both Ghazvah and Seryeh) the casualties of which, as history proves, do not exceed one thousand.

The holy Quran in Al-Baqarah, verse 190, says:

“Fight in the way of Allah those who fight you but do not transgress. Indeed. Allah does not like transgressors.”

And in Al-Momtahanah, verse 8, it says:

“Allah does not forbid you from those who do not fight you because of religion and do not expel you from your homes - from being righteous toward them and acting justly toward them. Indeed, Allah loves those who act justly.”

This is the Islamic and Quranic logic, the logic the Prophet deployed and the people converted into Islam in groups:

“And you see the people entering into the religion of Allah in multitudes.”¹

¹ An-Nasr, verse 2

But taking a look at the conquests during the reign of Kholafa, one would see that they are in conflict with the spirit of Islam and Quran completely; that's why Amiralmomentin did not continue that trend after coming into power, because they can be useful only when Islam is transported to various cities and countries, the spirit and orders of Islam which should be inside people's hearts go by; otherwise, just saying La Elaha Elallah and not believing in it from the heart is not Islam, it can be just about anything else. Moreover, after the holy prophet (PBUH) passed away, some newly converts who knew not much about Islam but a few simple basic things started transporting Islam to other places: what else can one expect in this situation?

There is an absolute narration which is really significant. It can be used in many instances and I would say it should be memorized like Hamd and Surah.

The narration was made by Ayeshah who asks the Prophet:

“Ya Rasulallah, is the stone of Ismail a part of Baytollah?”

“Yes,” said the Prophet.

“So, why, unlike other houses, the door is on a high elevation?” she asked, “And why don't you order for the door to be brought down so that the stone would go in the house?”

“I would do that if it were not for your tribe who have not left their prejudices behind and did not escape Islam.” answered the Prophet.

This shows that the Prophet did not trust the leaders as they were not familiar with Islamic knowledge and the spirit of Islam had not set in their soul; they are the ones who made those conquests possible.

We will analyze the aims of their wars which happen to be discussed in the reliable books written by the Sunni authorities. History is the best source to seek truth in and the fairest judge. They started massacre by the excuse of extending the borders

of Islam, I think that's why many orientalists, even Christians, claim that Islam could spread owing to these wars and conquests.

Motahari says:

“And what really made this Umavi political party so active and dominant on the Islamic government? First I need to say a newly formed society cannot be homogeneous even though they have a strong factor for unity. Here, it can be said that it could be a better idea to let Islam go freely not by force and so hastily. The consequence of such haste becomes directly evident in these gaps and disagreements. The holy prophet (PBUH) did not order for these conquests in his will. But conquest comes really sweet in taste by nature but not necessarily approved of by rationality. One wonders if Ali would consent to these conquests if he had come into reign. Instead, after becoming the leader of Muslims, Amiral-momenin started reforming from within. On the other hand, the conquests became the source of corruption among the Arabs; therefore, this haste made an incongruous society and corrupted Arabs.”

So, if Va'ezzadeh concurs with what Motahari says as a religious intellectual, this is his opinion. Is it fair to say they are Islam?

On the conquests, according to Motahari that said: “these conquests could not reach Islam to people but corrupted Arabs and made the society incongruent,” I have to say it is significant that the conducts of the commanders and conquerors; let's see if they were the honor of Islam or a stain in the history.

The first point: wars

1. Man-cooking Conquerors

A Sunni figure, Qarshi, who is a great Egyptian man of knowledge, in his ‘Conquering Egypt and the News’, tells about Andalusia conquest:

“When they entered Andalusia, they came upon the Christians whose occupation was to farm grapes called Karamiin. The commander ordered to off with his head,

cut the body into pieces, cook it on fire, and throw it away. When the troops arrived, they pretended they served it as their meal and the people in different parts of the city were terribly afraid as the rumors of cannibals went around.”

Did the Prophet do these things, really? Is it really an Islamic conduct to kill and cook a Christian? Will people enter Islam with ease of mind inner peace?

Va'ezzadeh should not say the Shiites made Andalusia collapse but it was such cruel acts as they showed a terrifying face of Islam and when the Christians came to retrieve it, the people welcomed them. Are these really an honor for Islam?

2. Zatuloyun

Khaledebne Valid, upon reaching the city Anbar, faced a resistance and ordered skillful archers to hit the enemies' eyes as a result of which one thousand were blind.

One has to ask those who eulogize the Kholafa's conquests and conquerors whether these tragedies took place at the time of the Prophet himself. Did these deeds make people accept or reject Islam? Can one find such an instance even during Jaheliat right before Islam when there were 200-300-year wars?

3. Taleghan War

In the city Teleghan, Iran, after the collapse, they made people to stand in a 22-kilometer line and beheaded all one after another.

Is this really Islamic victory and credit? These things have not been forgotten in history and surprisingly the story is told by the famous Sunni historian, Ibne Athir.

4. Gorgan War

Saidebne Aas, the commander seizing Gorgan, Iran, maintained peace just after the people paid two hundred thousand dinars. After that he went to Taniseh, the city by the sea where the people would accept Islam provided that they did not kill. And

they promised not to kill one. After the people opened up the city gate, Aas ordered to kill everybody but one: he had meant he would not kill only one!

5. Palestine War

On the collapse of Palestine, there were some rebels who had resisted but surrendered. They cut the rebels' limbs and sent the limbs to the capital city of Bani Umayya, Damascus, where they hung them from the top of the mosque entrance.

This shows their bravery! Now, one can compare these wars with those carried out at the time of the Prophet. When the holy prophet (PBUH) conquered Mecca, he secured Abusofyan's house; he was the one who had been hostile to Islam for seven complete years. Another thing which made 95 percent of the people in Mecca turn in Islam was the amnesty given by the Prophet to the Qoraysh in spite of their cruelties. When the Prophet entered Mecca, he had around ten thousand warriors with him; they were the people who were able to fight and if we add twenty thousand to them as their women and children, the estimated number of Muslims would reach thirty thousand. They were the holy Prophet's 21-year endeavor. However, it is often said that when the Prophet deceased, there was a population of 116 thousand composed of his Sahabe. That makes 90 thousand Muslims during the ninth and tenth century Hijri. All historians are united in one belief: that the Prophet's good temper and conduct were the greatest factors of attracting people to Islam. It was the Islamic kindness and mercy that absorbed the groups from around Mecca and Medina to Islam; indeed, it was the Prophet's style and that was that of the conquerors.

6. Hizan

Zahabi writes when they arrived in Hizan, they requested peace but the Muslims in the area did not agree. Afterwards, they started a mass murder leaving only one and a dog alive. In fact, they wanted him to tell the people in other areas that these Muslims have such an Islamic mercy: they are nice to both dogs and only one man among those many.

These are some instances of their anti-humane and anti-Islamic conduct. It depicts that these conducts were not Islamic but carried out in the name of Islam to reach booty, beautiful women, etc.

The other point is that Va'ezzadeh claims the conquests made during the ruling of Bani Umayya are those foreseen and annunciated by the holy Prophet.

According to Motahari, as mentioned above:

“The holy prophet (PBUH) did not advise extending borders after him even though he advised on many things. However, it may not be approved by rationality. Furthermore, it is not evident that Ali would give credit to such conquests, as he started internal reformation.”

But Va'ezzadeh says “they were foreseen by the Prophet. In Khandagh War when Muslims were digging the moat, they came across a hard stone. The Prophet hit it using a pickax then flinched and said ‘I was inspired for conquering Rome and Persia’”.

That means hitting the stone was an introduction to these wars according to the Prophet. Va'ezzadeh quotes this Hadith from Ayati's book ‘The History of the Prophet of Islam’, cited by Sirat Ibnehesam. Sunnis themselves believe that this book is replete with lies and we expected that our colleagues take more caution in their quoting based on reliable sources. As a matter of fact, this Hadith was quoted

by Salman Farsi directly and there is no proof or evidence and any kind of liaison to see whether it is reliable or not; it lacks narrative validity.

Interestingly, Va'ezzadeh says: "by praying for Mujahidin in his Sahife Sajadieh, Imam Sajad means the Bani Umayya conquerors! If we are Ahlol-Beit followers, we need to follow Imam Sajad. It is a shame to say Imam Sajad prayed for a bunch of hard-hearted! In contrast his prayers involve those border guards who defend the country of Islam and not the conquests. Thus, Va'ezzadeh misreports the holy Imam.

He also says Imam Ali followed these wars, too! Hearing it from a Wahhabi is not surprising but not from a Shiite. Motahari says:

"Imam Ali did not refrain from expressing and demanding his right freely. He did not accept any post assigned by Kholafa, be it a chief commander, a governor, or the management of Hajj; as accepting one is equal to avoiding his absolute right."

Imam Khomeini in his Ketabolbei, vol. 3, p. 70-75, directly talks about the captured lands of Alonvah. It is argued as to whether such conquered lands as Iran and Iraq without the permission of Imams can be taken as Islamic government property or not. Imam Khomeini's answer is as follows:

"What is certain is capture without Imam's consent which is not validated on the basis of Shariah. That we can deploy evidence as to support the fact that there was indeed Imam's consent, which is as claimed Sheikh Ansari, is an ill-founded justification. One thing is clear: the conquests were not ordered or endorsed by Imam."

Afterwards Imam Khomeini states clearly that:

“Certainly, Imam Hassan did not participate in those wars. Amar and others’ participation does not necessarily entail Amirmomenin’s approval. Actually, they could not avoid them, as Taqiah (hiding beliefs as a result of danger) necessitated.”

Another point is that after Umar’s death, the Shora (parliament) proposes that Imam Ali be the leader of Muslims provided that he would act upon the Book, the Prophet’s Sunnah, and the Sirah of Sheikhain, and the latter was rejected by the holy Imam. The aim was for the Imam to express or even pretend that he would assent their deeds where he could act upon pure Islam or to implement Uthman’s ideology. But Imam says he is not willing to go according Sheikhien which means he was not in line with them. So it is nonsense to say Imam Ali backed those victories.

The two books ‘Mosnad Ahmad’ and ‘Fatholbari’ quote from Asemebne abi Vael that:

“I asked Abdorahman ibn Uf why they left Ali and supported Uthman. He said it was not their fault as Ali did not accept the Sirah of Sheikhain but Uthman did.”

But after Sefeyn War, Imam prepares for Nahravan War and Beyat from the people who shake hands with him in groups asserting that the Imam would act upon the holy Quran and the holy Prophet’s Sunnah, since the story of Hakamein (the two judges) in Sefeyn War had trembled some people’s beliefs in Ali:

“They came to Ali and said they would shake hands with him if he acted upon the holy Quran and the holy Prophet’s Sunnah. But one of them, named Rabiah Khathami, came up and said he would shake hands if Ali implemented Abubakr and Umar’s Sirah. The Imam cried, ‘if they went against the Book and the Sunnah, they reverted from the right path’. And he too shook hands.”

This shows Amiralmomentin was never satisfied with the Sirah of Sheikhien and Uthman. Khotbah Shaghshaghiah sheds light on this issue.

Dr. Hussein Ghazvini

A Criticism on the Interview with Mr. Vae`zzadeh Khorasani

Hozah Journal 03

Thursday May 1st, 2008

Mr. Hoseini Ghazvini

During the last two sessions we discussed Va`ezzade's argument under the title of Hozavi intellectualism. As mentioned, we answered his praise of Bani Umayya which is neither a sign of intellectualism nor acceptable in Hozah. His extolling their conquests was also rejected, as history shows they are stains on the history of Islam and they were mainly carried out for booty and women. But if orientalist announce the spread of Islam owing to sword, we hereby reject it as it was against the holy Quran and the Prophet's Sunnah. Motahri also asserted that those conquests were not accredited by Imam Ali but he participated bravely in all the defensive wars during the Prophet's reign.

A heartbreaking statement of Mr. Va`ezzadeh is as follows:

“The greatest obstacle to this intellectualism is to linger dogmatically on Itrat and to neglect Sunnah quoted by Sunnis in their books. Overlooking this Sunnah and sticking solely to Itrat is the first obstacle to thinking in the area of Fiqh.”

Our holy Prophet, our holy Imams, and great religious leaders have emphasized on the significance of Quran and Itrat in the real sense of the words for 1400 years. Is it under intellectualism right to say Quran and Sunnah suffice and Itrat is

dogmatism? That means trampling on what our holy Prophet, our holy Imams, and great Shiite religious leaders have said for 14 centuries. But it is a real shame to read such things in a reputed magazine of Hozah. What he said is against the ideas of the holy Prophet, Imam Khomeini, and the great leader Khamenei.

What the prophet said in his Thaghalayn Hadith is nothing to be passed by easily:

“I am one who leaves you two things: the Book of Allah and Itrat of my household, if you join them, you will not go astray after me, and they are inseparable forever.”

This Hadith is one of the most reliable ones stated in both Shiite and Sunni’s books. Even there are some Sunni religious leaders who subscribe to the view that it is so frequently quoted that we cannot refute it.

About this Hadith Ibn Hojr Macchi in his anti-Shiite book *الصواعق المحرقة*, page 122, says:

“Narrated from the Prophet, peace be upon him and his family and thirty Sahabia, and that many of his ways are true or good.”

Also, Ibn Kathir Dameshghi Salafi in his ‘Albedayah wa Anahayah’, vol. 5, p. 229, says:

“Said Sheikh Abu Abdullah Zahabi and this Hadith is proper.”

There are some other such narrations from the Sunni figures. The holy prophet (PBUH)said:

“The only ship of salvation is my Ahlalbeyt, one who goes aboard shall be safe and one who does not will drown.”

In another instance he says:

“٣- النجوم أمان لأهل الأرض من الغرق و أهل بيتي أمان لامتي من الاختلاف؛ فإذا خالفتها قبيلة من العرب اختلفوا، فصاروا حزب إبليس. (هذا حديث صحيح الإسناد و لم يخرجاه) ^١
So separating from Ahlalbeyt is joining the Satan.

The holy prophet (PBUH) was asked how he would see the society without Ahlalbeyt. He compared it to a donkey without a back.

Our holy Imams advised us to refer to the Sunnis' narrations, but why? In order to see if that narration is true or fabricated.

The Imam was asked which one to choose if two pieces of reliable news came from them. ‘The one that is for the book of Allah and the Prophet’s Sunnah and against the Sunnis, in which there is guidance’, answered Imam.”

In the Sunnis' narrations, there are derisions to some tribes and cities, which is completely against Quran and Sunnah. The holy Quran says:

“O mankind, indeed We have created you from male and female and made you peoples and tribes that you may know one another. Indeed, the most noble of you in the sight of Allah is the most righteous of you. Indeed, Allah is Knowing and Acquainted.”²

These narrations were made by Bani Umayya in order to belittle Ahlalbeyt among people. There are so many advantages of Isfahan narrated to the point where one would confuse Isfahan with Mecca. These narrations are connected to the Prophet and they want to disdain the Prophet in the society. Thus, as Imam says the way to test the validity of a narration is to check if they are in line with Sunnis, in this case we should ignore them. But Va'zzadeh says referring to Sunni books is a sign of intellectualism!

² Al-Hujurat, verse 13

Another point is that extracting religious knowledge from sources other than Ahlalbeyt is betraying Allah and the holy Prophet. In a narration, Ali ibn Sovayd talks about the questions he had asked Imam Kazem who was in prison. Imam sent him a letter saying:

“Do not obtain religious knowledge from sources other than Shiism; otherwise, you have received it from betrayers to Allah and his Messenger.”

What is really valuable to us is the Masum’s statement and nothing else.

Sheikh Ansari in his Faraedol Usul, vol. 1, p. 305, Agha Zia Araqi in his Nahayatolafkar, vol. 3, p. 133, Borujerdi in his Taqirrat, p. 274, Sayed Mohsen Hakim in his Haqaeqol Usul, vol. 2, p. 133, and Khoie in his Mesbahol Feqaha, vol. 1, p. 71, among dozens of others, all assert this narration.

Sheikh Sadugh in Ma`aniol Akhbar, p 399, quotes a beautiful narration:

“Imam Sadegh says: he is a liar who claims he is bestowed with knowledge on us but to obtain religious knowledge goes to other than us.”

Thus, what Va`ezzadeh says is in direct conflict with the holy prophet (PBUH)and the Imams’ fiats. The monopoly of sciences is in the hands of Imamat. There are around 20 narration in this regard out of which two are as follows:

Salme ibn Kahil and Hakam ibn Atibeh are two great Sunni Faghihs. The former died in 121 Hijri who was a Sunni leading scientist and the latter died in 115 Hijri and was a contemporary of Imam Baqer; it is often said that Sunni thinkers owed much of their knowledge to him. According to Ibn Hajar:

“Sunni scientists in the time of Hakam ibn Atibeh owed much to him.”

“Imam Baqer says to Hakam ibn Atibeh and Salme ibn Kahil if they traversed all through the east and the west, they could not find the correct science but from Ahlalbeyt.”

And:

“If Hakam searches through the left and right on earth, I swear to Allah he will not be able to attain the correct knowledge _ inspired by Jebreil _ except from us.”

Is it fair to hear this from Imam Baqer and say we should refer to Sunni books alongside Ahlalbeyt? Is it right to say that the Quran and Itrat suffice is dogmatism? Is it acceptable to say referring to Sunni narrations is equal to intellectualism?

These narrations are a bunch of lies directing the Prophet and some of them even ridicule some certain groups of people; indeed, all of them go back to Abu Rabi Shami and are rootless and Morasal (falsely accredited to Muhammad).

I strongly assert that in all through Fiqh, from Taharat to Diah (Islamic compensation), one cannot find an instance where a given Faqih would release Islamic fiat based on Sunni narration. Statements made by Faqihs in the past assert this fact, too. And even if there is no narration from Imams on an issue, we will go to practical issues not Sunni narrations. So far, we have not observed a Sunni narration becoming the ground and criterion for an Islamic fiat. However, some of the narrators were Sunni and then converted to Shiism or some have malicious intentions, they are exceptions. Sheikh Ansari does his best to validate a narration and opposes Nabavi narrations (those which are narrated by Sunnis).

During recent decades, religious authorities in Egypt, Algeria, the United Arab Emirates and other countries have declared that in dealing with Fiqh issues they

would have to refer to Ahlalbeyt Fiqh. For instance, in Egypt the problem of Reza`a (suckling another's baby) they quote from Ayesheh in Sahih Bokhari that even one drop of a mother's milk given to another's baby boy makes him Mahram (intimate) to that mother, but Sheikh Shaltut and other are on the belief that the modern science rejects the idea; however, narrations by Imam Baqer and Imam Sadegh argue that he needs to suckle as much as it would go in his bones and flesh and brings about growth, an issue which is both tenable and scientific. Another example is related to female offspring inheritance where if a man with only a daughter dies, she will inherit nothing of the property. Yet, they opposed this case and their Majlis passed a legal act for them to benefit from the left property. Interestingly, the argument was centered on the fact that narrations were endorsed by Imam Baqer and Imam Sadegh, so they were reliable.

I know of around forty legal acts approved in Islamic and Arab nations by Ahlalbeyt narrations; I even made a list of them with complete details including the number of the act and the year it was passed. Dr. Gharzavi, the director of the International Organization of Islamic Scientists, says Sunnis emphasize on stoning in Hajj (Ramy Jamarat) to be done only in the afternoon. On the 11th-13th of Zihajjah, it is mandatory that Hajies/pilgrims do the stoning, but doing it in the afternoon only makes a great stampede where dozens are killed every year. Gharzavi says he has himself seen the Shiite narration which allows for stoning to be carried out from dawn to dusk; he stresses to follow Shiite narration, this way there is more time left which causes less trouble. They are approaching Shiism and Ahlalbeyt but we are approaching them! Parallel Fiqh states Sunni and Shiite arguments and compares them by giving reliable Islamic reasons to support the Shiite ones and reject the Sunni ones. One cannot find a single instance in books like Khalaf by Sheikh Tusi, Naseriat by Sayed Morteza, and Tazkerah by Allameh

where, in cases of disagreement, the idea of Sunnis would be accepted while that of Shiites would be rejected.

Hence, Va`zzadeh's statement is against Thaghalayn Hadith, the Imams' narration, and the ideas put forward by Imam Khomeini and Khamenei. According to Imam Khomeini:

“I hereby implore the Muslim nations to follow Ahlalbeyt and their political, social, economic, and martial culture wholeheartedly and not to deflect from the right path of traditional Fiqh which is a clear mirror of Resalat and Imamat and the cause of growth and uplift in nations encompassing both primary and secondary fiats; they shall not be deceived by the enemies of right and religion. It is necessary that religious teachers not turn aside from the relevant lessons of Fiqh handed down from our great religious authorities; this is the only way to keep Islamic Fiqh safe. They are advised to attempt to increase the amount of Islamic knowledge by sifting through theories and innovating. Right now, Islam and the Islamic Republic have many enemies who will use any means to make Islam collapse. One of their most important ways is to enter Hozah in order to make a bad impression of Islam by doing wrong and in the long run these frauds will reach up to higher levels of the government and they can harm Islam badly as they have access to Islamic knowledge. So, I would strongly recommend Hozah to develop strong systems in order to keep it as safe.”

Imam Khomeini says we should stick to Ahlalbeyt and not go to other sources. Also Ayatollah Khamenei in many manifestos and lectures emphasized that we need to refer to Ahlalbeyt and transport their culture throughout the world. In the International Assembly of Ahlalbeyt on August 19th, 2006, he said:

“Your most important job is to introduce the school of Ahlalbeyt to the world of Islam and even throughout the world, since today the world is thirsty of morality which is found comprehensively in the Islam of Ahlalbeyt. The holy Imams were always under tyranny. We should make great efforts in order to introduce this school, unite the Imams’ followers, and actualize their aims. In fact, the real knowledge of Islam has emerged in the school of Ahlalbeyt.

Dr. Sayed Muhammad Hoseini Ghazvini

A Criticism on the Interview with Mr. Vae`zzadeh Khorasani

Hozah Journal 04

Thursday May 8th, 2008

Mr. Hoseini Ghazvini

We discussed Va`ezzadeh’s interview for three sessions and came to where he had said:

“The greatest obstacle to this intellectualism is to linger dogmatically on Itrat and to neglect Sunnah quoted by Sunnis in their books. Overlooking this Sunnah and sticking solely to Itrat is the first obstacle to thinking in the area of Fiqh.”

We are going to criticize this argument from another perspective. He presents a fallacy in the concept of Sunnah: there is large gap between the concept of Sunnah in Shiism and Sunnism. According to Shiism, Sunnah is the words, acts, and writing of Masum (completely innocent) and that we consider the holy prophet, Hazrat Fatemah, and the twelve Imams as Masum; this idea is unanimously agreed by all Faqihs and Usuliun and there is no doubt in it. We believe the words, acts, and writing of Masum as Hujah (the true statement that is completely correct). The Imams' Hujah comes not because of their being narrators. Mozafar in his Usulol Fiqh says:

“The Imams are not the narrators of the Prophet’s quotes according to Shiism to consider their words as Hujah, but Sunnis subscribe to the view; they are assigned by Allah to express real fiats.”

However, Sunnah according to Sunnism is as follows:

“Everything accredited to the holy prophet (PBUH) be it before or after Bethah”.

This definition is a matter of disagreement between Shiism and Sunnism and that Sunnis take the acts of Kholafa Rashedin (the leaders who act properly) as Sunnah, too. They quote from the Prophet that:

“{Following} my Sunnah and after me the Sunnah of Kholafa Rashedin are mandatory to you.”

Ibn Taymiah falsifies this Hadith because in the time of the holy Prophet, there was no such a thing as ‘Kholafa Rashedin’; they say the Prophet did not appoint any successor, either Rashed (going the right path) or not Rashed. Another point is that Sunnis regard the act of not only Kholafa Rashedin but also that of Sahabah (the Prophet’s followers) as Sunnah. Shatebi goes:

“The Sunnah of Sahabah is practicable and referable.”

Also, Sarakhsi, one of the greatest Hanafi Faqihs, says:

“In our opinion, the act of the holy prophet (PBUH) and Sahabah is Hujah.”

Next, ironically, after Bani Umayya, one of the common Sunnah acts was to swear Imam Ali to the point where according to Zamakhshari:

“During the time Bani Umayya was in power, over 70 thousand pulpits swore Imam Ali.”

Umar ibn Abdolaziz was going to start to swear Imam Ali, but from the corner of the mosque there was shouting:

“Why do you swear Ali? State something else instead” and the people shouted why they wanted to leave Sunnah.”

I believe Va`ezzadeh should reconsider the consequences of his thoughts! So, that he says we ought to rely on the written Sunnis' Sunnah is totally ill-founded and against Shiite culture, as in our view Sunnah is the words, acts, and writing of Masum but in Sunnism everything accredited to the holy prophet (PBUH) be it before or after Bethah is called Sunnah. And when Sahih Bokhari says: “the Prophet used to urinate while standing in the street”, in an area in Afghanistan today some Sunnis do the same once a year in order to follow the Prophet!

As mentioned before, in order to test the validity of a Hadith, in cases where there are two correct narrations from Imams, the one which is against Sunnis is correct and there is good in it. If the way Va`ezzadeh proposes were plausible, the great religious authorities in the past would test it. He is protesting the current situation; that is to say, if we do with Quran and Itrat, it will be considered dogmatism. He

believes our religious schools should keep away from this dogmatism. Since the time of Sheikh Mufid and Sayed Mortaza, the strong reasoning is to prove or reject the Sunni narrations. If we want to see whether a narration was made really or on the basis of Taqiah, we will refer to Sunni books; this is not challenged in Fiqh. Everyone with the basic knowledge of Shiism knows if a narration is against the spirit of other ones, it has been released based on Taqiah.

The interviewer asks Mr. Va`ezzadeh:

“The emphasis on Itrat made by Shiite Faqihs may be because of the Prophet’s using the word in his Hadith. What do you think?”

It shows the interviewer has realized his mistake. And he answers:

“Certainly, in narrations there have been both ‘Sunnah’ and ‘Itrat’.”

The question here is as follows: has he been able to find correct narrations with the word ‘Sunnah’ from the Prophet? Has he found any frequent narration? He’d better mention one before claiming that. If he has been inspired, he should tell us as he is so firm in his view! Sunnis themselves even believe the word ‘Sunnah’ is a lie fabricated by Bani Umayya, but Va`ezzadeh says the word ‘certainly’ has been mentioned in narrations.

I have collected samples of Sunni narrations from early times until now, which is the incomparable product of my 100-hour research. Hekem Neshaburi died in 403 Hijri and was really a great Mohadeth (narratologist) who could assess the validity of a narration instantly. He brings the narration of the book of Allah and Sunnah and clearly states that:

“This Hadith is correct on the basis of Sahih Bokhari and Sahih Moslem.”

Reaching upon the narration of the book of Allah and Sunnah, he goes:

“Stating ‘Sunnah’ in this narration is unfamiliar and irrelevant”.

The word ‘unfamiliar’ is used when the narration is rejected and against the norms of scientists and narratologists.

The Sunni thinker Abu Muser Mesri in his ‘Azahratol Itrat fi Hadithel Itrat, p. 41, says:

“The narration of the book of Allah and Sunnah is not correct.”

Saghaf, the prominent Sunni Jordan contemporary, says:

“This famous narration among people and the lecturers is fake and forged by Bani Umayya and their followers in order to keep people away from Itrat and close to Sunnah.”

Consider that he is a Sunni not a Shiite scientist, who asserts that this is a fake narration concocted by Bani Umayya. It is really strange to see a Shiite clergy stating that it is an undoubted fact. The Sunni Soyuti believes that the narration is feeble quoted by Malek from a Kathir ibn Abdollah about whom Abu Davud says:

“He is one of the liars”.

Ibn Abdolbar says:

“That he is feeble is unanimously agreed among Sunnis”.

Dozens of others have acclaimed that the narration of the book of Allah and Sunnah is fake and invented by Bani Umayya with feeble narrators.

I do not blame Va`ezzadeh as he has had much trembling in his thoughts and statements; I'd say the Organization of Islamic Preaching is responsible for releasing the interview.

Another point is that even if 'the book of Allah and Sunnah' has been stated in correct narrations, there is no conflict between 'the book of Allah and Itrat' and 'the book of Allah and Sunnah'. In that case, is it right to say Amiralmomenin goes according to the Jewish Sunnah but Umar and Abubakr go according to the Prophet's Sunnah, or Imam Sadegh is on Bani Israel Sunnah but Abuhorayrah and Abuhanifah are on the Prophet's Sunnah? It is totally false to put Itrat in challenge with Sunnah.

According to Ibn Hojr Macci in his Sava`eghol Moharaghah, vol. 9, p. 439, wherever there is talk of 'the book of Allah and Sunnah', it means the words of Ahlalbeyt reflecting the Prophet's Sunnah:

"The aim is to say Ahlalbeyt is to know completely of 'the book of Allah and Sunnah.'"

And the aim of what the Prophet said: "do not overtake the book of Allah and my Itrat, you will perish, do not fall behind them, and do not teach those two things as they know much more than you", was to assert that Hujah is 'the book of Allah and Itrat' precisely. And even if there is Sunnah, the one which is stated by Imam Ali and his offspring is taken into account.

In various narrations, Sunnis quote from the Prophet that:

"O Ali, you are my heir."

"What do I inherit?" asked Ali.

“The thing the Prophets bequeathed”, answered the Prophet.

Imam Ali asked again: “what have they bequeathed?”

“The book of Allah and their Prophet’s Sunnah” said the holy Prophet.

But the most important is the story of Umar ibn Khatab in his last gasps where there are folks like Imam Ali, Ibn Abas, Talhe, Zobeyr, and others; he is about to select the Khalife to hold power after him and goes:

“The one who most merits Khelafah after me to direct people toward the book of Allah and the prophet’s Sunnah has to be Ali”.

If we collect all the narrations of the three Sahihs from Sunnis, they are almost equal to half of the narrations in Kafi Books, so we do not need to refer to them.

Borujerdi in the introduction of his *Albadrozaher fi Salatel Musafar* says:

“The Imams’ narrations have supervised those of Sunnis not the other way around”.

That means Bani Umayya and Baniabas quoted Ali in an opposite way, even there is book called *في ما خالف الائمة الأربعة علي بن ابيطالب* which clearly shows all the disputes the four Sunni Imams had with Aamiralmomenin. Bani Umayya signed a resolution requiring people to issue a counter-narration upon facing one from Ahlalbeyt.

Sheikh Ansari says:

“They asked Abuhanife whether to open or close eyes in Sajdah. He answered, ‘I don’t know. If I knew which one is Imam Sadegh’s Fatwa, I would tell you to do the opposite; for now, I would say open one and close the other to certainly go against Imam Sadegh.’”

The method of our Faqihs since Sheikh Tusi up to has centered on this and what Borujerdi says is nothing new. Sheikh Tusi wrote the book Khalaf for the same purpose. Alameh wrote his Tazkareh for this as for Masalek by Shahid Thani. That Sahib Javaher rejects Sunnis' ideas and then supports Shiite idea in his discussions goes back to this philosophy. This has always been the method employed in Shiite Hozah and Fiqh. In this there is no intellectualism or dogmatism involved. Moreover, his Sunnah is not in conflict with Itrat as the latter introduces the former.

Amiralmomenin is the follower of the Prophet's Sunnah and according to Umar he is the only one who merits leading and strengthening it. The great Imams state clearly that whatever they say is based on the holy Prophet's Sunnah not from them directly. Imam Sadegh says:

“If we narrate on our own, we will perish; yet, our Fatwa is based on the works of the Prophet.”

Moreover, Jaber ibn Yazid asks Imam Bagher to present the evidence of a narration upon releasing it. “All the Hadiths I cite come from my father Imam Sajad, from his father Imam Hussein, from his father Imam Ali, from the holy Prophet, from Jibrael, and from Allah; that is the evidence of what we say”, says Imam.

I have in mind that Ayatollah Borujerdi in the first volume of his ‘Collection of Shiite Hadiths’ gives out 72 narrations from Imams with various evidences supporting the fact that whatever Imams say is the word of the Prophet. It means when Imam Askari states a fiat, it goes without saying that he quotes from the Prophet. Considering this, when we refer to the Imams' narrations, we are following the Prophet's Sunnah, which is connected to the clear, everlasting spring

of Wahy (inspiration). The holy prophet (PBUH) emphasized that if we joined it, we would not go astray. Thus, there is no contradiction between ‘the Book of Allah and Itrat’ and ‘the Book of Allah and Sunnah’. However, in order to support the contradiction, one need refer to Sunni sources. So what happens if to obtain a fiat, one would search through Shiite narrations from one hand and Sahih Bokhari and Sahih Moslem from another? Let’s see if the Sunni books deserve referring to. First of all, because Sunni narrations have been cited by Sahabah not by Imams are distorted from different angles and cannot be referred to. All through the book Sahih Bokhari, the most correct book after Quran, one single narration from Imam Hassan and Imam Hussein as well as Imam Bagher and Imam Sadegh (the two contemporaries of Muhammad Bokhari) cannot be found. It bears only one narration from Hazrat Fatimah, while there are 260 from Ayesah. Amiralmomentin, who is considered as their fourth Caliph, is quoted 29 narrations compared to ten times of that from Abuhorayrah.

Mahmud Abu Riah, the prominent Egyptian scientist, is astonished by the sheer volume of narration from Abuhorayrah who has been in the company of the holy prophet (PBUH) for only 17 months, while Imam Ali who grew up by the Prophet and accompanied him in all journeys and wars except in Tabuk War, has such a small share! It clearly proves that Sunnis forgot all about Ahlalbeyt.

Abuhorayrah is quoted in Sahih Bokhari that:

“My immigrant brothers were busy transacting in the bazaar while I was in the company of the Prophet. Whatsoever quoted from the Prophet is buried in my chest; do not refer to others as they were engaged in the dealing in the market.”

It is clear that Sahih Bokhari approves that Sahabah did not care for narrations. They quote from the Prophet as saying “obtain half your religion from Ayeshah” and in some instances it says ‘one-third of your religion’.

When a narration enters the culture, it enters automatically the lexicon books. Also Abuhorayrah states that Ayeshah was not into narrations but make-ups and flirting with the Prophet; in fact, Ayeshah and narrations were two worlds apart! Once she invited Abuhorayrah over and asked: “What are these Hadiths you are scattering among? Have you heard or seen things other than what we have?” “O Mother,” said Abuhorayrah, “you were busy having a mirror in one hand and gears in another, making-up your face, I was busy, too and my job was collecting Hadiths”.

According to Hakem Neyshaburi, this narration is correct based on Sahih Bokhari and Sahih Moslem; but they have not stated it. Zahabi also approves it.

Sunnis believe any narration accredited by Zahabi and Hakem Neyshaburi is bound to be correct and is taken as if it were stated in the two Sahihs. Thus, the Sunnis’ Hadiths come from Sahabah who did not care for narration and Ayeshah was what Abuhorayrah testified.

Secondly, Abubakr collected all the narrations quoted by the holy prophet (PBUH) which came up to 500; at night asked Ayeshah for fire and burned them all. Then, he ordered:

“No one can quote any narration from the Prophet; to obtain fiats, refer to the holy Quran, no need for Sunnah” (Zahabi, Tazkeratol Hifaz, vol. 1, p.3).

So Abubakr does not believe in Sunnah and says Quran suffices.

Before the holy prophet (PBUH) passed into stillness, he asked for paper and pen to write guidance for his nation, but Umar expressed that pain had overwhelmed the Prophet and that Quran would be enough for them (Sahih Bokhari, vol. 1, p.37).

Umar also annulled quoting from the Prophet and imprisoned such narrators as Abdullah ibn Masud and others to kill narrations. Uthman too renewed the resolution of the two preceding him and announced narrating from the Prophet was forbidden unless it had been from the time Umar was in power (Sahih Moslem, vol. 3, p.95, Mosnad Ahmad, vol. 4, p.99, Tebrani, Mojam Kabir, vol. 19, p.370, and 'The History of Damascus', vol. 274, p.29).

A contemporary Egyptian Sunni figure, Imam Muhammad Abu Zahw, goes:

“The first Islamic century was over and the Prophet’s Hadiths were not collected. Kholafa did not order the men of letters to do that either and put it on memorizing them. This long time let those Sahabah and Tebein (followers) who had memorized them die.”

After a century the holy Prophet’s narrations were not collected in any kind of book; it was not until the time Umar ibn Abdolaziz that it was achieved and writing narrations began around thirty years of his death.

Thirdly, after one hundred years of banning quotation of Hadith, the hot market of narrations in the Islamic society ensued to a point where the writer of Sahih Bokhari, Muhammad ibn Ismail Bokhari, after compiling his Sahih expressed that he had not done the job easily, he had scoured 600 thousand Hadiths out of which he had picked up only 2700. “You have to appreciate it”, he requested people. Indeed, the job he did is easy in words but not in action.

Moslem also says he has selected the narrations in his Sahih out of 300 thousand ones. Ahmad ibn Hanbal who has collected 30 thousand narrations in his Mosnad says he has selected them from among one million. Interestingly, Yahya ibn Moin, one of the outstanding Sunni figures and Rejaliyun says:

“Which of the compilers has not quoted one thousand lies as Hadiths?” (The History of Baghdad, vol. 1, p. 43).

Zahabi quotes from Shobah:

“No one has ever analyzed the science of Hadith as much as I did and I came to the conclusion that three-fourths of what we have in our books are just lies”, (Zahabi, ‘ vol. 7, p. 226).

They themselves assert three-fourths of what they have in their books are just lies and we assert that we’d better check Sunni books alongside Ahlalbeyt! It is interesting to note that Ghotni, the author of Sonan/Customs, who is a prominent Sunni figure, says:

“A correct Hadith among fake ones is like a white fur of a black cow” (). Can we really find any better and clearer evidence than this?

Fourth is the fact that Sunnis say some of the Christians and Jews who were newly-converts to Islam brought in Israeliat to a great extent. Ibn Khaldun writes:

“The narrations in our interpretations are mostly adapted from the Bibles” (Ibn Khaldun, ‘The History of Ibn Khaldun’, vol. 1, p. 439).

In Sahih Moslem, there is a narration from Abuhorayrah:

“Allah created the earth and sky in seven days, He made the earth on Saturday and on Sunday ... and created Adam on Friday afternoon and that was the end of creation” (Moslem, Sahih Moslem, vol. 8, p. 127).

But the holy Quran says:

“Indeed, your Lord is Allah, who created the heavens and earth in six days.”¹

The interpreters of Sahih Moslem are surprised at this narration as it is often called ‘the most correct after Quran’, and that it is in direct contradiction to Quran.

Ibn Kathir upon reaching this narration goes:

“This Hadith is among the wonders of Sahih Moslem which comes from the Jewish Cabol Ahbar; as a matter of fact, Abuhorayrah heard it from him but was confused and then accredited it to the Prophet” (Ibn Kathir Interpretations, vol. 1, p. 72).

Referring to the Sunni books, one will see protests against people like Cabol Ahbar and others due to the many lies they scattered. Abuhorayrah, Ibn Abas, Abdollah ibn Umar, and others narrated many Haiths from him; he is the one who converted into Islam when Umar was the leader of Muslims, but surprisingly he had around 30 thousand students who accredited these lies to the Prophet in his classes. Here, there is an instance of referenced Israeliat:

1. Abu Yala quotes from Ibn Abas:

The holy prophet (PBUH)says when he went to Meraj/the Heavens, he saw Allah in the body of a young man without beards with curly hair, very handsome.

¹ Al-A`raf, verse 54

Such a shame! This is a Sunni narration and we are not intellectuals if we don't refer to them!

2. The heaven moans due to the heavy bulk of Allah (Heythami, 'Majmaozava`ed', vol. 1, p. 84).

3. The holy prophet (PBUH)has forgotten Quran.

The Prophet was in the mosque when someone recited a verse from the holy Quran. "Allah blesses you; if you had not recited that, I would have forgotten whereabouts in Quran this verse belonged" cried the Prophet (Sahih Bokhari, vol. 3, p. 152).

4. The holy prophet (PBUH)pray while in Jenabat (has not taken a shower after an intercourse).

The holy prophet (PBUH)came in the mosque for prayer; prior to saying Takbiratolehram, he remembered he had not washed for Jenabat and tells people to wait. He goes and comes back while drops of water were pouring down from him (Sahih Bokhari, vol. 1, p. 73).

5. The holy prophet (PBUH)prays without Wuzu.

عن ابن عباس رضي الله عنهما قال بت في بيت خالتي ميمونة فصل رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم العشاء ثم جاء فصلى أربع ركعات ثم نام ثم قام فجئت فقمت عن يساره فجعلني عن يمينه فصلى خمس ركعات ثم صلى ركعتين ثم نام حتى سمعت غطيته أو قال خطيطة ثم خرج إلى الصلاة.

(Sahih Bokhari, vol. 1, p. 171).

6. The holy prophet (PBUH)intends suicide because there has been a break in transmitting Vahy.

He went up the mountain to perish himself when Jebrail came upon him and cried: "What are you doing? Such a thing is far from you!" the holy prophet (PBUH)regretted but repeated it several more times ((Sahih Bokhari, vol. 8, p. 68).

7. The holy prophet (PBUH) was in the nude in public.

ان رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم كان ينقل معهم الحجارة للكعبة و عليه ازاره فقال له العباس عمه يا ابن أخي لو حللت ازارك فجعلت على منكبيك دون الحجارة قال فحله فجعله على منكبيه فسقط مغشيا عليه فما روى بعد ذلك عريانا.

(Sahih Bokhari, vol. 1, p. 96).

8. Ayeshah narrates that Zeyd ibn Harethah came back home from a journey and it was long he had not seen the Prophet. When he came over, the Prophet was in bed naked and shook hands and kissed him without dressing. She continues she didn't see the Prophet naked any more ever since.

The holy prophet (PBUH) goes to bed with 11 of his wives just in one hour. They asked Anas ibn Malek if the holy prophet (PBUH) was able to do that. "He could do as much 30 men", answered Anas ((Sahih Bokhari, vol. 1, p. 71, Beyhaghi, 'Sunan Kobra', vol. 7, p. 54).

Are these considered Sunnah? Shall we refer to these narrations? Has the holy prophet (PBUH) stated them himself? Is there any wise man to reveal his love affairs with his wife? Have the Prophet's wives stated these things? Or perhaps Anas was a peeping Tom!!! Unfortunately, they narrate this Hadith in their first-hand not second or third-hand books.

Now consider this case. Sunnis say imagine a man say in the US marries a woman say in China and they do not see each other for a few years. After some years the man goes to see his wife and realizes she has children; as a matter of fact, they are 'his' children because the marriage vow suffices even though they were not in any direct contact!!!

According to Bokhari's Fatwa if a baby boy and a baby girl drink milk from the same cow, they become siblings!!!

Abdolhamid Sherwani, a great Sunni Faqih, says:

“If a man cuts his penis in halves and penetrates one half in a woman and the other in another woman, taking a shower (Ghosl) will be mandatory for the man but not for those two women”!!! (Sherwani, ‘An Annotation on Tohfato Muhtaj’, vol. 1, p. 260).

This is the Fatwa released by their Faqihs. Israeliat and the narrations extracted from sources other than Wahy (the things that are produced in Abuhorayrah’s factory of narrations) bear no fruit but these Fatwas, which are prevalent in their books; these Fatwas make the face of Islam in international arenas ugly and they will laugh at us. Taking this into account, can we say gentlemen in Hozah will become intellectuals by reading them? We cannot consider every kind of Sunnah as Hujah but the one with reliable evidence is acceptable. Imam Khomeini believes the points in Nuri’s Mostadrak look more like kidding than reality. Our Faqihs do not act upon any narration. The ones that are double checked for reliability, narrated by Imam, and passed through filters are admitted.

Taking a look at Anvar Nomaniah by Sayed Nematollah Jazayeri, one will see in the footnote of the second volume Angaji says things that I believe reading them is totally forbidden/Haram.

Dr. Sayed Muhammad Hoseini Ghazvini

A Criticism on the Interview with Mr. Vae`zzadeh Khorasani

Hozah Journal 05

Thursday May 15th, 2008

Mr. Hoseini Ghazvini

To criticize Va`ezzadeh, we discussed in 4 sessions out of which two were printed in brief in Hozah Ofogh Magazine. We hope our discussion on Thaghalayn will be released in one or two issues.

Today, we are going to continue the same discussion. The interviewer asks him:

“You referred to some flaws in Hozah intellectualism through an Islamic confluence. What do you think are the obstacles on this field that need to be cleared away by precision?”

He answers:

“The greatest obstacle to this intellectualism is to linger dogmatically on Itrat.”

Of course, we contacted the publisher and requested that they reflect criticisms to our ideas if there are any, as we don't consider ourselves as all-knowing. And if there are any mistakes or flaws in our discussions, we will correct them in the following issue. Since yesterday, a number of venerable teachers called and expressed gratitude asserting the talks were handled as politely as possible.

In a meeting with some teachers it was said that one thing has been left undone and that is the word ‘dogmatism’ he used. It is said that using this word is disrespecting Ahlalbeyt; it is a term used in a negative not a positive sense. To put it in a polite form, one would use ‘insisting on Ahlalbeyt’. He also continued: “and to neglect Sunnah quoted by Sunnis in their books”. In his view, this insisting is a sign of anti-intellectualism and “overlooking this Sunnah and sticking solely to Itrat is the first obstacle to thinking in the area of Fiqh.”

As a matter of fact, what he claims is far from a Shiite clergy. As mentioned, Thaghalayn is sure to urge that we ‘insist’ on Itrat and obtain religious knowledge directly from the Book and Itrat. Moreover, there are such narrations as Safinah and others that reckon that as betraying Ahlalbeyt. Imam Kazim said:

“Those who look for religious knowledge from sources other than us are betrayers to Allah, the holy prophet (PBUH) and Ahlalbeyt”.

The third point mentioned was that religious knowledge is in the monopoly of Ahlalbeyt and according to Imam Sadegh:

“If you traverse all through the east and the west, you could not find the correct science but from Ahlalbeyt, we are the ones who were inspired by Jebrail.”

This is clearly obvious and there is no doubt in it. Another point he emphasizes in his talks is “certainly, in narrations there have been both ‘Sunnah’ and ‘Itrat’.” If one claims that the message of Thaghalayn is to obtain religious knowledge from Ahlalbeyt, the holy prophet (PBUH)said ‘the Book of Allah and Itrat, in one instance and ‘the Book of Allah and Sunnah’ in another. We stated that saying ‘Sunnah’ is being more Catholic than the Pope. Sunni men of knowledge assert that ‘the Book of Allah and Sunnah’ is but a fabricated, feeble lie.

The knowledgeable Jordan Maleki, Saghaf, says:

“This famous narration among people and the lecturers is fake and forged by Bani Umayya and their followers in order to keep people away from Itrat and close to Sunnah.”

A Sunni authority looks at the issue that way but unfortunately a Shiite from Hozah proclaims that! This is so unkind to hear such a thing. However, in the last session we came to the point that Sunni narrations do not deserve referring to as they consider the words of Sahabah as Sunnah and do not care for narrating Hadiths; as mentioned Abubakr burnt down all the Hadiths and forbid quoting and referring to them. It was a tradition followed by during the time of the second and the third Caliph were in power.

Thus, Sunnis did not make any attempts to register Sunnah. It was a century and a half after the holy prophet (PBUH)when they realized what mistake they had made

and started collecting Hadiths and the Prophet's Sunnah where they made a dirty market of fake narrations produced in houses. It came to a point where Muhammad ibn Ismail Bokhari, the author of Sahih, says he compiled the book of his 2700-narration book out of 600 thousand narrations. Moslem also says he selected 4 thousand from among 300 thousand narrations. Ahmad ibn Hanbal to collect his Mosnad admits that he scoured through one million narrations to reach his 30 thousand ones. It was just a recap of what we discussed earlier and now today's discussion:

The first point is that Sunnis themselves admit that they lack any kind of Sunnah that can be derived from religious knowledge especially in the field of Fiqh; however, Va`zzadeh insists there is something. The Shafei leader, Muhammad ibn Edris Shafei, dead in 204 Hijri, goes:

“The number of all the narrations handed down to us in the principles of fiats/Ahkam (beliefs, morals, etc.) does not exceed 500.”

While in Kafi, there are 16 thousand narrations from Ahlalbeyt and in Vasa`eloshiah, Sheikh Hor Ameli has developed 36 thousand narrations from Ahlalbeyt. Nuri in his Mostadrak, on the other hand, has narrated the 23 thousand ones which do not come in Vasa`eloshiah. And owing to this bulk of narration which is connected to Vahy, I am surprised when somebody claims we need to refer to Sunni texts to be considered intellectuals!

Ahmad ibn Hanbali, the leaders of Hanbalis who died in 241 Hijri, says:

“The number of all the narrations handed down from the holy prophet (PBUH)to us (in Fiqh, beliefs, morals, interpretations, and history) does not exceed 2200.”

That is, all the other 27.800 narrations compiled in his Mosnad are but worth being disposed. Further, Ibn Khaldun believes: “all the correct narrations that Malek had at hand come up to only 300”. Abuhanifah, the leader of Hanafi branch, who constitute approximately 50 percent of Sunni population, passed away in 179 Hijri. Again Ibn Khaldun says about him, “all the correct narrations that Abuhanifah had at hand come up to only 17”. Khatib Baghdadi asserts with some exaggeration that: “The number of the narrations found and quoted by Abuhanifah does not exceed 150 half of which were incorrect {but he thought they were correct}.”

According to Ahmad ibn Hanbal:

“There are three rootless, concocted, fake books: the narrations on the holy Prophet’s Ghazvah, the narrations on the conflicts and conspiracies among Sahabah and Tabein, and the narrations in interpretations.”

In conclusion, according to the leaders of the four branches of Sunni the number of their Hadiths does not exceed 500, 150, or 17; thus there would be nothing left to rely on or to refer to!!!

The second point of our discussions for today deals with the fact that Sunnis and the four leaders emphasize that no one has the right to imitate them. This is really an interesting discussion which perhaps many of you have not come across. Sunnis can be classified into four groups. Hanafis following Abuhanifah, dead in 150 Hijri, that means he was born a century after the holy prophet (PBUH)and died 13 centuries ago and his followers believe in what he says not anything else before or after him. Malekis believe whatever stated by Malek, dead in 179 Hijri, is correct. In fact, he was born two hundred years after the holy prophet (PBUH)and died 12 centuries ago; they alike do not accept anyone before and after him. Shafeis and

Hanbalis follow respectively Muhammad ibn Edris Shafei (dead in 204 Hijri) and Ahmad ibn Hanbal (dead in 241 Hijri).

“Once the followers of an Imam Jama`ah declared their Imam possessed foreknowledge. Some became curious to know about it and went to him and he refuted the idea. However, the followers claimed he was wrong and they knew better than him.”

Once Abuhanifah told one of his most prominent students, Abu Yusof, who was the distributor of his thoughts:

“Do not quote anything from me. Swear to Allah, I really do not know if what I said was correct or incorrect.”

Mozahim ibn Zafr says he asked Abuhanifah:

“Are the Fatwas you made in your books or stated correct and can they be relied on?” “I swear to Allah, I do not know; they may be absolutely incorrect” he answered.”

In the same book and the same page also it reads:

“Abuhanifah sees one of his students scribbling his words and cries, “do not copy what I say as tomorrow I may reject what I say today and the day after that I may say something else.”

Now it is shocking that Abuhanifah does not believe in himself but his followers believe in him only!

On the other hand, Malek ibn Anas soes:

“I am a human sometimes releasing a correct and sometimes an incorrect Fatwa. Sift through my Fatwa and see if it is in line with Quran and Sunnah or not. In that case you can act upon it.”

The narrator went to see Malek and it was his last days and saw him crying. “Why are you crying?” he asked. “Why shouldn’t I? Who deserves crying more than me?” Malek replied, “I wish they had whipped me upon giving those Fatwas and now I am going to Allah with a heavy burden of Fatwas”.

Ibn Hazm Anodolosi in Alahkam says:

“Once Malek asked his students to erase his fiat on divorce being annoyed that they took everything he said as Quran. “{You have left the holy Quran and put my words into practice} and you do not see tomorrow I change the Fatwa I released today” he went on.”

This clearly shows that Malek would not let them imitate him. Shafei also has statements similar to those made by Abuhanifah and Malek:

“I revert from any fiat against Sunnah; I will correct it if I am alive or in the after-life.”

Muhammad Taghi Jafari is said to have dreamed of seeing Allamah Amini, the compiler of Alghadir who emphasized on working for Imam Ali as much as they can. According to Jafari’s dream, Amini said the dead in the after-life can’t simply do anything for Imam and that he regretted it that he can’t defend Imam’s innocence. Also Allamah Jafari’s son told me when his father was in hospital in London before his death, he had seen his father crying; since he couldn’t hear him, he had gone close enough to hear him that he had been saying he would have liked

to live much longer in order to cry for Imam Ali and his innocence. Jafari had told about his wish earlier in Shiraz and I have the recording.

Imam Ali is the one who says:

“I swear to Allah innocence was with me since I was born. I remember my brother Aghil had pains in his eyes but did not let my mother drop medicine in his eyes, so they dropped it in my eyes so that he would concent.”

He has words in Nahjolbalaghah that are very painful:

“People, in all governments, people have groaned owing to the tyranny of their rulers. But I groan owing to the tyranny of the nation and I ask Allah to give me to the people better than them and give them to a ruler worse than me.”

Thus, on the 19th of Ramadan, when the sword touches his head, the first thing he utters is “I swear to Allah of Kabah, now I feel fine”.

These people clearly acknowledge that no one can imitate them and what they say is not worth referring to but a man from us suggests opening a store called Sunnah beside our Itrat and analyzing the narrations quoted by Abuhorayrah, Ayesah, and others besides the ones cited by Imam Sadegh in order to extract our fiats. Isn't it a pity?

The third point is not very frequent and many may not have heard either. As mentioned before, Imam Sadegh said:

“If you traverse all through the east and the west, you could not find the correct science but from Ahlalbeyt, we are the ones who were inspired by Jebrail.”

Today, at the time of advanced technology and developed society, we have faced new problems that cannot be solved by the 14-centruy fake narrations fabricated by

AbuHorayrah, Ayesah, Kabolahbar, and others that permeate in Sunni countries today but certainly by the Fiqh of Ahlalbeyt. And that is something that can keep pace with the modern science and fight against the derisions of orientalists and enemies of Islam. I hereby point to some of these referenced problems; one of the problems facing the Sunni world today that comes from the Fiqh of AbuHorayrah and Ayesah is as follows:

“Even one drop of a mother’s milk given to another’s baby boy makes him Mahram (intimate) to that mother and a sibling member to that family”.

All the Faqihs of the four religions say one drop of milk does not make the rule of Reza`a mandated. They came to nowhere this way and the modern science did not back up. Sheikh Shaltut, the dean of the Egyptian University of Alazhar and the great Mufti of the country, released the Fatwa that:

“I personally consider the Shiite idea stronger and hereby release my Fatwa based on Shiite Fiqh as ك (your milking mothers who nursed you) in the holy Quran involves a period so that motherhood is actualized concerning the child and one drop does not. Imam Sadegh says the milk must be enough for the child to grow, the child must not eat anything in 24 hours but drink milk, or the child must drink milk for 15 times until it gets full”.

He believes this Shiite Fiqh rising from the school of Imam Sadegh is more akin to the science of the day.

The next case is related to divorce for three times. Sunnis believe if a man in one statement says to his wife ‘I divorce you three times’, the woman is Haram to him and he cannot go back to her forever; here there is a need for a Mohallel (a man who breaks this disconnection) to whom she can marry, goes to bed with, gets the divorce, and then can come back to her first husband. This is so ugly and rude. Of

course, in the past some women liked the Mohallels better than their husbands and did not go back to their husbands. In Tehran, there was a blind Mohallel and as he could not see anything, there was no problem. This issue made the Egyptians to think it over and came to the conclusion that one-statement-three-divorce bears trouble. They were looking for solutions when they realized Ahlalbeyt Fiqh did not approve of that and that it says one must divorce three times and come back three times to reach the stage of Mohallel. In 1950, the Egyptians passed a law and implemented the Shiite Fatwa and the same went in Jordan. In the United Arab Emirates, the law says consecutive divorces and several ones in one statement are taken as one. Right now, the Sunni world seeks solution from Ahlalbeyt and that is the same thing Imam Sadehg stated. Then we would say referring to Ahlalbeyt is dogmatism and we need to be intellectuals.

The third instance is the period of pregnancy. The four religions believe the child can remain in its mother's womb for 4 years, even some like Zohri says for 7 years. This rule allowed some prostitutes to impute the child to the rich through which they could extort them when the Supreme Court of Egypt referred the case to forensics which was based on Ahlalbeyt Fiqh. They passed the law that said the period of pregnancy is from 9 to 11 months.

The fourth is related to signing a will where they believe the dying person cannot set a will even he is willing to spend the money for good causes. They consider all the wills against Quran and Sunnah, but they had to go according Ahlalbeyt and passed the required law that allowed the person to put one-third of his/her possession in the will.

The fifth is Ramy Jamarat. As you know, the 10th of Zilhajjah when Hajis go to Mena, it is mandatory for them to sacrifice a sheep and stone the Satan 7 times.

Sunnis believe this must be done after the noon's Azan which made people be pressed for time and stampede. Some stoned improperly and even other Hajjis. Last year they built another deck which was good somehow. But they had to accept Shiite ideas and that everyone could do the stoning from morning until evening. Abusoleyman, one of the great scientists of Saudi Wahhabi in his book, *مجلة البحوث*, *الفقهية المعاصرة*، شماره ٤٩، سال ١٣، ص ١٢٢، الشوال و ذي القعدة و ذي الحجة سال ١٤٢١ هجري، states there is no way but to accept what Imam Bagher says about stoning in order to avoid casualties. Allamah Sheikh Zargh says the problem is that they do not allow for stoning to be done in a longer span and that can cause casualties; but according to Imam Bagher it can be done during the whole day and it is mandatory for Haji to follow one of the reliable religions one of which is Shiite.

I have a lot to say in this regard, and I can extend this very discussion to the 5 following sessions. During this century, the world has experienced technological growth and Sunni Faqihs and Wahhabis have come to the conclusion that the only salvation is Ahlalbeyt.

I am going to cover the fourth and the last point here. The other night, I called Ayatollah Moghtadai and asked him to react properly to some new currents in Hozah as it seems some clergymen are being trapped by American Islam and I suggested that they need to follow the system of Jame Modaresin. Everybody remembers when the woman on a TV interview declared the good pattern for today's life is Ushin (the Japanese character of the popular family TV serials) but not Hazrat Fatimah, Imam Khomeini ordered for the killing of her and punishing the TV officials of the time.

We like Jame Modaresin which is a role model for us to react and release manifestos regarding not only politics and elections but also these plights.

The other day, somebody gave me a CD and I watched it and had headaches until night; I hope they will react against this person who had lectured in Jame`atozahra which was reacted properly by the religious authorities, Jame Modaresin, and the Board of Administrators. The person in the CD said:

“Imam Khomeini talked about Mo`aviah in Paris for a few times. When he came back to Iran, Ayatollah Khamenei suggested him not to talk badly about Mo`aviah as we have around 700 million Muslims in China, India, etc. who show respects for him. And that was the last time Imam told those things about him.”

It was really painful to me then. I believe when somebody expresses their ideas freely, as in the case for Va`ezzadeh, and they can be criticized freely, too. But it is terrible to refer to a great figure like Imam Khomeini or Ayatollah Khamenei! Anyhow, I asked one of my friends to search through Sahifah Nur, which contains all the words of Imam Khomeini, in order to find everything related to Mo`aviah. He did it in a few days and the results are as follows:

Before the Revolution, on the 16th of December, 1978, he says:

“The logic of President Carter is that of the cruel, profane Mo`aviah.”

Among the Sepah Commanders after the Revolution, on the 24th of September, 1979, he says:

“Although Sunnis do not like the idea of talking badly about Mo`aviah, I have to say he has lost face among Muslims and nobody likes him.”

In an interview with an American professor on the 28th of December, 1979, he says:

“Baniomayah, especially Mo`avia, intended to bring Islam back to the era of Jaheliah.”

Among the clergy and teachers of the city Karaj in the ceremony of the martyrdom of Motahari on the 30th of May, 1979, he says:

“During the time of Mo`avia and his son, they were about to make the face of Islam ugly and endanger it.”

On Fajr Ceremony, the 5th of February, 1987, he says:

“The predecessors of our enemies are the cursed Baniomayah.”

To meet the families of the Martyrs of Ghazvin, on the 1st of March, 1988, he says:

“Mo`avia had made the Muhammad’s Islam into a monarchy.”

The political and divine will of Imam Khomeini with its on-line version says on the first page:

“?”

And then that gentleman on Friday Prayer says he would abolish the curse in Ziarat Ashura! It is painful to say that when Imam Khomeini came to Iran, he stopped talking about Mo`avia; I reckon this as betraying Shiite culture and the good ideas of Imam Khomeini. Now that we have seen Imam Khomieni and Ayatollah Khamenei is still alive, we hear such things, Allah knows what they are going say in one or two centuries’ time. Interestingly, Imam Khomeini in his will in the complement section says:

“I hereby require my son, Ahmad Khomeini, or the President to recite my will to people after my death. This will comes in 25 pages. Now that I am alive, there are some false accusations attacking me, which may swell after me. I hereby assert that

they are false unless there is my verified voice, hand-writing, or signature in them or I said anything on TV”.

Thus, I respectfully urge such people not to refer to great figure like Imam Khomeini, who is loved by perhaps 95% of the Muslims in the world, when they have plans to reach something against the method of our Faqihs.

Dr. Sayed Muhammd Husseini Ghazvini

A word with Va`ezzadeh Khorasani

After the grand victory of the Islamic Revolution, as you mentioned, there were ideas regarding the concept of Velayat which were so unbelievable and it could not be imagined that someone trained in Jafari school of thought could have such ideas far from truth. It was hard to see someone, with the excuse of unity, ignoring the

1400-year-old genuine culture of Velayat and on any grounds disregarding the unavoidable ruling of Amiral-momenin which was the foundation of Imamiah religion and was the line between right and wrong, legitimating the ruling of those who founded their government on attacking the holy prophet (PBUH) and started their reign by invading the house of Hazrat Fatimah and being a nuisance to the owner of Velayat.

However, reading all those ill-founded words of yours in Haft Aseman Magazine which were pains in the heart of religious authorities and the teachers in Hozah as well as the avid of Velayat school of thought, I made certain that those things I had heard came true.

??? After the publishing of my answers, I imagined your doubts, if any, would clear away; however, regrettably your interview in the quarterly Nahjolbalaghah shattered my imagination and I felt the situation was far graver than I thought.

To write answers to your questions I had doubts but owing to the dream of a great figure that has great reputations among people about Imam Reza, I made up my mind to put pen to paper for some confabulation.

1. Is the eligibility of the ruler obtained by shaking hands (Bei`at)? It is something you asserted several times. What do you mean by ‘ruler? Are you talking about the one who has occupied the position without observing Islamic criteria and founded his ruling on tyranny? The holy Quran has annulled such a government by “And whoever does not judge by what Allah has revealed - then it is those who are the disbelievers” (Alma`edah, 44). Interestingly, the opponents of Uthman, the third Caliph, in the very beginning proved his illegitimacy based upon this same verse and killed him. Ibn Abelhadid and Sayed Mortaza believe:

“

But when it comes to the leader, legitimacy is derived by Allah:

“Indeed, I will make you a leader for the people.”¹ And “indeed, we selected a leader for you on earth to rule among people by justice.”

Or as Shiite Fiqh requires the leader receives legitimacy from the innocent Imams:

“”

???

Thus, the Islamic leader is appointed by Allah be it based on people’s approval or disapproval, whether there are conditions to start a government or there are not.

As long as the society resists government that can cause obstacles to start government, it is not mandated upon the ruler but as soon as the obstacles are removed, he will start the government.

It is clear that people’s shaking hands and approval are the signs of clearing the obstacles but it does not signify legitimacy. After the holy prophet (PBUH) and even during the times of the three Caliphs, Imam Ali is the one appointed by the holy prophet (PBUH) ordered by Allah and is the only person superior to and from the people. And if he opposes on the path of Allah then, he does it to save the religion of Allah; in fact, he does it in order to shoulder the responsibility within the limits to battle against corruption. In his Nahjolbalahah, he says:

“ ”.

It is really a grave mistake made by thinkers that Imamatus is equal to government but the truth is that government is only one aspect of Imamatus.

¹ Al-Baqarah, 124

As guiding people, keeping Shariah safe, acting as the medium of delivering the good from the cosmos to people, and spreading justice are among but many of these aspects. All of these aspects but the latter were respective to Imam Ali in that time but spreading justice depended on people's approval and demand which was actualized after the death of Uthman.