FOREWORD

*Bismillahir Rahmanir Rahim*

Al- Hamdulillahi Rabbi l-'Alamin. Peace and blessings be upon Muhammad and his family and the chosen companions. As thereafter, the *Book of Baghdad Ulama’ Congress* is the writing of Thiqat al-Jalil Abi al-Hijaa’ Syibl al-Daulat Muqaatil bin' 'Atiyyah ibn Muqaatil al-Bakri. He was among those who attended the congress of the Sunni and Shia in Madrasah Nizamiyyah in Baghdad in the month of Sha'ban (before the 12th day of Ramadan, 485 H) which is noted as the date of Nizam al-Mulk’s death. It is a possibility that this conference was held in the month of Sha'ban in the same year; 485 H.

The conference was under the auspices of Sultan Malik Syah Saljuqi and was maintained by his vizier, Khawajah Nizam al-Mulk Abu al-Hasan al-Khurasaani. The scripture of *Baghdad Ulama’ Congress* was printed by Hajjatu l-Islam al-Mustarhami Hidatatullah Sayyid al-Isfahani al-Jarquuni in Qum in 1399 H (printed on 3 / 4). This manuscript was found in Maktabah King Mahmud Abad in the year 1300H with author’s calligraphy: Muqaatil bin Atiyyah which was originally a Hanafi, but then converted to the Shia of the Twelve Imam sect.

This book has been given a foreword by Ayatullah al-'Uzma Abi al-Mu'aali al-Sayyid Shihab al-Din al-Husaini al-Mar'asyi al-Najafi. In the foreword, he had mentioned: If the Sunni read this with realization, thus they would be get benefit from it".

Finally he said:

"I hope from my brothers among the Shia of the Prophet's families read it and take the enlightenment of the lights, May Allah protect them from any illness and provide guidance to them for religious knowledge and Islamic law"

Muqaatil said: "I attended the conference and the dialogue in Baghdad. I have written everything that happens in congress, but I put out things that are not necessary and now I present [you] what happened in congress in this book.

The Congress was held for three days, represented by ten scholars of Sunni and ten scholars of Shia who specialize in history, traditions, interpretation and debate. Nizam al-Mulk was the head of the congress. It was held on conditions mutually agreed by both the Sunni and the Shia. The congress was attended by Malik Syah, the army chiefs, scholars and others for three consecutive days.

The Congress was held at the insistence of Malik Syah who is dissatisfied with a Sunni scholar who regard a Shi'ite scholar named al-Husain bin Ali al-'Alawi as an infidel, because to him, both Sunni and Shia are Muslims. Malik Syah was a person with an open mind and always wanted to know the truths. In addition, he spent his free time with some games and hunting activities.

At the end of the congress, after the dialogue, he declared himself as a Shia, leaving behind the Sunni (Hanafi) sect despite his ancestors being Sunnis. He was confident that the truth resided in the Shia.

At the same conference, Nizam al-Mulk (the writer’s father-in-law) also declared himself a Shia, because of the strong arguments and evidence (dalil) by the Shia. He was then followed by other attendees. Nevertheless, there are scholars who remain with the sect of the Sunni since they follow their previous ancestors. The open minded Malik Syah and Nizam al-Mulk did not force them to follow the Shi'ite sect, because it is up to their needs to follow what sects.

Because of fanaticism and malice, the Sunni had planned to kill them both, because according to the Sunni, both of them are the factor of the massive exchange of sectarian from the Sunni sect to the sect of The Twelve Imams in Baghdad.

They succeeded in killing Nizam al-Mulk in the 12th of Ramadan 485 H, possibly a few weeks after the conference held at the Madrasah Nizamiyyah. Then, they killed Malik Syah Saljuqi. Both of them were killed in the way of Allah, because they followed the truth of the Shia sect, the sect of Ahl al-Bayt of Rasulullah p.b.u.h. May Allah bless their soul. The translation of this book is specifically for those who adhere to The Twelve Imams sect or the Ja'fari sect ONLY.

Translator:

10th Sept, 2011.
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FIRST PART

*Bismillahir Rahmanir Rahim*

**Introduction, The Background of Malik Syah and Nizam al-Mulk, Causes that triggered the dialogue, King’s dialogue with his vizier About the Shia, Proposal to Establish a Dialogue between the Sunni and the Shia, For The Truth, The Conditions of the Dialogue, and Others.**

**Introduction**

Praise be to Allah, peace and blessings be upon Muhammad, sent to us as a mercy to the World and his family and his loyal companions.

*Wa ba'du*, and after that, then this book of Baghdad Ulama Congress is a result of the dialogue between the Sunni and Shia that have been organized by the respected king Malik Syah Saljuqi and under the supervision of a respected scholar who is also the vizier Nizam al-Mulk .

**Background of Malik Syah and Nizam al-Mulk**

Indeed, Malik Syah was not a blind fanatic, as his fathers and grandfathers who follow blindly with the feeling of “asabiah”. In fact, he was a young man with an open mind, love for knowledge and the scholars. At the same time he was also preoccupied with games and hunting activities.

His vizier Nizam al-Mulk was a wise man and ascetic, had a strong desire, love kindness and other of its kind. He always wanted to know the reality of things. He really loved the Prophet's family. He was the one who founded the Madrasah Nizamiyyah in Baghdad. He gave monthly salary to the scholars. And he has mercy on the poor and needy.

**The Reason that Sparked the Dialogue**

One day a famous scholar named al-Husain bin Ali al-'Alawi, a Shia scholar leaders came to Malik Syah. While he was out of sight of Malik Syah, one of the audiences mocked and glared at him, Malik Syah said: Why do you mock him? The man said: Do you not know, O king, that he was among the heathen, where God irate and curse them? King said in wonderment, why? Isn’t he a Muslim?

The man said: No, he is a Shia!

The king said: What is the meaning of Shia? Isn’t Shia a group of Muslims?

The man responded: No, they do not admit caliphate of Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman.

The king said: Are there Muslims who do not acknowledge the leadership of the three of them?

The man said: Yes, they are the Shia.

The king said: If they do not acknowledge the leadership of the companions, why do people call them Muslims?

The man answered: That is why I say to you that they are infidels ..., so the king then starts pondering seriously, and then said: Vizier Nizam al-Mulk must come to settle this matter.

**The king’s dialogue with his vizier about the Shia**

The king ordered Nizam al-Mulk to come to him and asked him about the Shia: Are they Muslims?

Nizam al-Mulk said: Sunnihad a disagreement, some of them say that the Shia are Muslims, as they declare that "There is no god but Allah and Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah, they also pray and fast. Some others said that the Shia are infidels.

The king said: How many of them? Nizam al-Mulk said: I do not count their number exactly, but they represent about half the number of Muslims *(taqriiban)[[1]](#footnote-1).*

The king said: Were half of the Muslims population infidels? *(Fa-hal nisfu muslimin kuffaar).* Vizier said: The scholars assumed they were infidels, but I did not regard them as infidels.

**Proposal to Establish Dialogue between Sunni and Shia**

King said: Do you, O vizier, could gather together the Shia and Sunni scholars so that we can know the real truth?

Vizier said: This is a difficult matter; I am concerned of king and the country's safety.

King said: Why?

**Nizam al-Mulk Refusal to Hold Dialogue**

Vizier said: Because the question of Shia and Sunni is not a simple matter, after all it is a question of right and wrong. Indeed, the blood has been spilled because of it, many libraries were burned because of it, women are captured because of it, and lots of books written for it and war were started because of it.

**King Malik Syah's insistence that there should be dialogue**

The young King was surprised about this, and he pondered seriously over this, then said: O Vizier, surely you know that Allah has given us a big government, a great number of military people, that is why we are obligated to be grateful and thankful to Allah for the blessings and our gratitude is to know the real truth; we have to show people who strayed to the right path.

**For the sake of the truth**

Definitely one of the two groups is on the truth and the other on a falsehood, we must know the truth and follow it, and we must know the faults and wrongness, then we leave. Therefore, you must grant, O vizier, this kind of conference with the attendance of the Shia and Sunni scholars, the presence of military leaders, writers and all the governors. When we see that it is the truth with the Sunni, then we enter the Shia to the Sunniwith strength.

Vizier said: What if the Shia do not want to enter the sect of the Sunni, what will you do?

King said: We kill them!

Vizier said: Is it possible to kill half the number of Muslims?

**Alleviation and solution?**

The king said: What is the cure and solution?

Vizier said: You leave this matter.

The dialogue between the king and his wise vizier has ended, but the king had spent one night thinking seriously about it without sleep until sunrise. How can this important subject are not complied with? In the morning, the king called for Nizam al-Mulk and said to him: Let's call the two groups of scholars, we will see during the discussion between the two parties, which sect holds the truth. When the truth is with the Sunni, we call on Shia with wisdom, good advice and we encourage them with wealth and rank as the Prophet did to those whose hearts were tamed (a convert). Thus we can serve Islam and Muslims.

**Nizam Al-Mulk’s concerns to hold the Conference**

Vizier said: Your opinion is good, but surely I am worried about this conference!

King said: Why do you worry?

Vizier said: I feared that the Shia will beat the Sunni and their arguments will overcome our arguments, therefore, people will fall in doubt and ambiguity!

The king said: Is it possible?

Vizier answered: Yes, because the Shia has decided evidence (dalil)s, the arguments are marked in the Qur'an and hadiths that show the truths of their sect and the truth of their faith![[2]](#footnote-2)

**The preparation of Dialogue in only fifteen days**

The king is not satisfied with the reply of his vizier, and said to him: It is inevitable for a dialogue to be done between the two parties so that the truth is revealed to us and we can distinguish it from falsehood. Then the vizier asked for a month of postponement to carry out his order, but the young king did not accept the postponement. And so the king determines the preparation for the dialogue between the two sects in just fifteen days.

In fifteen days, vizier Nizam al-Mulk has collected ten men among the great scholars of Sunni, experts in the fields of history, jurisprudence, hadith, Usul and debate. Just as he collected ten great scholars among the Shia.

**Conditions for the Dialogue**

The dialogue was held in the month of Sya'ban[[3]](#footnote-3) in Madrasah Nizamiyyah in Baghdad and he has determined that the conference was held with the following conditions:

First: The discussion continues from morning until evening excluding the time of prayers, meals and rest.

Second: The discussion must be based on trusted references and books which were venerated, not by what people say or propaganda.

Third: The discussion that occurred at this conference should be written.

**Opening of the Congress**

On the appointed day, the king, his vizier and military leaders sat down at one place while the scholars of Sunnisit at their right, while the Shia scholars sat on their left. Vizier Nizam al-Mulk officially started the conference with Bismillahir Rahmanir Rahim, blessings upon Muhammad and his family and companions. Then he said: The dialogue must be clean, and the goal is to find the truth. Therefore, do not mention a companion of the Prophet with insults or evil.

**Dialogue about the companions**

One of the head of ulama of the Sunni scholars called Sheikh al-'Abbasi said: I cannot speak to the sect who insults all the prophet’s companions.

Shia scholars chiefs called al-Husain ibn Ali, known as al-'Alawi said: Who was it that regard mengkafirkan all the companions as infidels?

Al-'Abbasi said: It is you, the Shia, who calls all the Companions as infidels (*yukaffiruuna kulla al-Sahabat).*

Al-'Alawi said: Your words are against the statement. Isn’t that among the companions were Ali a.s, al-`Abbas, Salman Ibn 'Abbas, al-Miqdad, Abu Dhar and others, did we the Shia called them infidels?

Al-'Abbasi said: What I meant with all the companions were Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthman and their followers.

Al-'Alawi said: You have been in conflict with yourself, don’t the Mantiq scholars determined that (mujibat juz'iyyah) is contrary to (saalibat Kulliyyah), you said at one point that Shia calls all the companions as infidels but then you said that the Shia only calls some of the companions as infidels.

**The Vizier wants to Intervene**

Here the Nizam al-Mulk wants to talk, but a devout Shia did not let him, he said: O noble vizier, no one has the right to speak except when we have weak answers. If not, it will be mixed with the discussions and produce an out of place speech, without any results.

Then, a devout Shia said: Obviously, O al-’Abbasi, which you say that the Shia calls all companions as infidels, is a clear lie.

Al-'Abbasi could not answer, so then his face turned red with shame, then say: Leave us out of this subject, but do you Shia insulted Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman?

Al-'Alawi said: Among the people of Shia, there are some people who do and do not revile them.

Al-'Abbasi said: And you, O al-'Alawi, from which side?

Al-'Alawi said: I am among those who did not berate them, but I think that those who are belittling the companions talk with their logic. And their lashing the three of them did not lead to anything, not infidels, not a transgressor, not even a small sin[[4]](#footnote-4).

Al-'Abbasi said: Have you heard, O king, what is being said by the man?

**Al-'Abbasi try getting support from the king**

Al-'Alawi said: O al-'Abbasi, for a conversation you pointed out towards the king was wrong, because the king gathered us here to discuss by arguments and evidence (dalil), not with weapons and power penalties.

King said: What is said by al-'Alawi is correct, what is your answer, O al-'Abbasi?

Al-'Abbasi said: It is clear that anyone who insults the companions are infidels.

Al-'Alawi said: It is clear by your side and not on my side, what is the evidence (dalil) of infidelity on who insults the companions based on ijtihad and evidence (dalil), do you admit that the person condemned by the Prophet can be condemned?

Al-'Abbasi said: I admit it.

**The prophet reprimand Abu Bakr and Umar**

Al-'Alawi said: The prophet had reprimand Abu Bakr and Umar.

Al-'Abbasi said: Where did the prophet reprimand them? This is a lie against Rasulullah.

Al-'Alawi said: Historians among the Sunnihave mentioned that the Prophet was preparing the army under the leadership of Usamah and he has made Abu Bakr and Umar to be in it and said: “Allah will curse those who resigned from the army of Usamah "(*La'ana llahu man takhallafa 'an jaisyi Usamah*) Then Abu Bakr and Umar backing off[[5]](#footnote-5) from the army of Usamah. Thus, the Prophet’s reprimands include both of them. Thus, anyone who was reprimanded by the Prophet, the Muslims has the right to reprimand him as well.

Here al-'Abbasi shook his head without saying anything.

**King Request Clarification**

The king said to the vizier: Is what al-'Alawi said is true?

Vizier said: The Tawaarikh has mentioned it[[6]](#footnote-6).

Al-'Alawi said: If reprimanding the companions is illegal, why do you not call Mu'awiyah bin Abi Sufyan an infidel, you did not punish his evil and wickedness, for he has been cursing Imam Ali bin Abi Talib a.s for forty years. Then will the reprimanding continued to seventy years[[7]](#footnote-7).

**King Request Change of Title**

King said: Cut the conversation and talk about other topics.

**Al-Qur'an**

Al-'Abbasi said: Among your bid’ah, Shia, is that you did not acknowledge the Quran!

Al-'Alawi said: In fact, your bid’ah , you Sunni, is that you do not acknowledge the Qur'an. For evidence (dalil) you said: Verily the Qur'an was compiled by Uthman, was the Prophet ignorant of what Utman has done; the prophet did not compile the Qur'an together until Uthman came and compile them, then he said: How is it that the Quran was not compiled at the time of the Prophet when he ordered his people and his companions to *khatam(during the Prophet’s time, khatam means to finished the Qur’an by memorizing)* the Qur'an and said: Whoever has *khatam the* Qur'an will be given reward". Is it possible that the Prophet ordered the people to *khatam* the Qur'an while it has not been compile yet, and were the Muslims at lost until Uthman save them[[8]](#footnote-8)?

**King Request Clarification**

The king said to his vizier: Is it true the words of al-'Alawi that the Qur'an was compiled by Uthman?

Vizier said: So that is what the Tafsir and Tawaarikh say[[9]](#footnote-9).

Al-'Alawi said: Know, O king, for Shia believe that the Qur'an was compiled at the time of the Prophet as you see it now, not lesser than even a letter, without the addition of even a single letter. Moreover Sunnisaid: Verily the Qur'an was added and reduced, preceded and put. The prophet does not compile the Qur’an, but Uthman was the one who compile when he held the position of caliph.

**PART TWO**

**Khalifah, King Requesting Clarification, Following Those Earlier (ancestors), The Caliph of the Prophet, King Requesting Change of Title, Distortion of the Quran, the Nature of God, Muhkamah and Mutasyaabihah, and Others**.

**The Caliphs**

Al-'Abbasi said: (He took the opportunity): Did you have heard, O King, verily this man did not name Uthman, a caliph, but a leader only.

Al-'Alawi said: Yes, Uthman was not a caliph.

King said: Why?

Al-'Alawi said: The Shia believes on the falsehood caliphate of Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman!

King said: (In doubt and obscurity) why?

Al-'Alawi said: Uthman were supposed to elected by all the six members of the shura council set by Umar. All six members of the syura[[10]](#footnote-10) council did not appoint Uthman, he was only appointed by two or three of them. Therefore, the validity depends on Umar. And Umar has the power given by the will of Abu Bakr. Therefore, Umar’s validity depends on Abu Bakr. Abu Bakr has been given the authority appointed by a small group run by the sword and strength. Thus, the validity of the caliphate of Abu Bakr depends on strength and weapons. Therefore, Umar said of his rights: The public allegiance to Abu Bakr was by *faltatan* jahiliyah[[11]](#footnote-11). God will take care of the evil in Muslims. Anyone who returns to him, then you may kill them.

Abu Bakr himself said: Fire me off, because I am not the best of you since you have Ali. Therefore, the Shia believed that the caliphates of the three of them are fundamentally wrong.

**King Request Clarification**

The king said to the vizier: Is it true what al-'Alawi said about the words of Abu Bakr and Umar?

Vizier said: Yes, that is what the historians say![[12]](#footnote-12)

**Following the ancestors**

King said: Why do we honour the three of them?

Vizier said: Because following our ancestors is good character (*al-Salaf al-Salih*)!

Al-'Alawi said to the king: O king, say to the vizier: Is the truth more worthy to be followed or the ancestors (al-Salaf al-Salih)? Do not follow the ancestors (the Salaf) which violate the truth is contained in the commandments of Allah in Surah al-Zukhruf (43): 23 *"We found our fathers following a certain religion, and we will certainly follow in their footsteps.”*

**Caliphs of the Prophet**

King said: (Addressed to al-'Alawi) If it were to be that the three of them were not the caliphs of the prophet, who then?

Al-'Alawi said: The Caliph of The Prophet is Imam Ali bin Abi Talib.

King said: Why is he the caliph?

Al-'Alawi said: Because the prophet himself has set it for him as the next caliph. The prophet has given signs of Ali’s caliphate in various places. Among them is a place between Mecca and Medina called Ghadir Khum[[13]](#footnote-13). The prophet raised Ali’s hand and said to the Muslims: Whoever has made me his lord, then Ali is his lord, O Lord, honor the people who make him his guardian and fight the people who are hostile to him, help the people who help him, insult the people who insults him. "

Then the prophet walked down from the pulpit and said to the Muslims - their number exceeds to one hundred and twenty thousand people- “*Give greetings to Ali for the leadership of the Muslims”.* They came to Ali, one by one and said to Ali: *Al-Salamu 'alaika ya Amir al-Mu 'Minin*. Then Abu Bakr and Umar came and greeted Ali as the Muslim’s leadership. Umar said: How propitious you are, O Ibn Abi Talib, you are to be my lord and the lord of all believers[[14]](#footnote-14). Therefore, the legitimate caliph of the prophet is Ali bin Abi Talib.

**King Request Clarification**

The king said to his vizier: Is what al-'Alawi said true?

Vizier said: Yes, that is what the historians and commentators mentioned before.

**King Request Change of Title**

King said: Leave this topic and talk about other topics.

**The Distortion of the Quran**

Al-'Abbasi said: Indeed Shia has said about the abuses of the Qur'an (tahriif).

Al-'Alawi said: In fact it was famous before you, O Sunni, you had a say about the abuses of the Qur'an![[15]](#footnote-15)

Al-'Abbasi said: This is a clear lie.

Al-'Alawi said: Did you not narrate in your scriptures that indeed the verse of al-Gharaaniq has descended on the Prophet, then it is removed and discarded from the Qur'an?

The king said to the vizier: Is it true of what was claimed by al-'Alawi?

Vizier said: Yes, such was mentioned by members of the Tafsir.

The king said: How to hold or to believe that the Qur’an was manipulated?

Al-'Alawi said: Know this, O king, we do not say this. Surely this is the opinion of Ahl al-Sunnah. Thus, the Qur'an before us can be trusted, but we cannot hold on to the Qur'an before the Sunni!

Al-'Abbasi said: Is there any hadiths from your books or your scholars?

Al-'Alawi said: The Hadiths, firstly: Little, secondly: It is *mauduk* and forged in which the enemies of Shia have created to tarnish the image of Shia. Thirdly: The narrators and the *sanads* are not true. And so what is transferred from the scholars, it cannot be held. Indeed, our great scholars in whom we hold on to their opinions, they did not say about the abuses of the Qur'an (*tahriif*). They did not mention the verses of the Qur'an on praises to idols as you mention that you said: He said[[16]](#footnote-16):

*That is the high al-Gharaaniq*

*From it comes hope for syafaat*

**King Request Change of Title**

King said: Leave this topic and talk about other topics.

**Nature of God**

Al-'Alawi said: Sunnirelates God to things that are not eligible to His greatness.

Al-'Abbasi said, like what?

Al-'Alawi said: For example, they say: Allah has mass similar to human laughter and crying, and for His hands, feet, eyes, genitalia and the entry of his feet to the hell-fire on the Day of Resurrection[[17]](#footnote-17),indeed, He came down from heaven to the sky of the world on His donkey!

Al-'Abbasi said: What keeps the matter is being explained in the Qur'an in Surah al-Fajr (89): 22 "And thy Lord cometh, and His angels, rank upon rank," Allah says in Surah Al-Qalam ( 68): 42 " the shin shall be laid bare, and Allah states in Surah al-Fath (48): 10 "the Hand of Allah is over their hands. Hadith have been told that Allah entered one of His feet in hell!

Al-'Alawi said: It is that the Hadith is wrong on our side, lies and fiction, as Abu Hurayrah, and the like were deceiving the Prophet (s.a.w) until Umar forbade Abu Huraira from moving the hadith and prevent it[[18]](#footnote-18).

**King Request for Clarification**

The king said to the vizier: Is it true that Umar forbade Abu Huraira to transfer the hadith?

Vizier said: Yes, he was against it, as in the books Tawaarikh.

The king said: How can we hold on to the hadiths of Abu Hurairah?

Vizier said: Because scholars have held to the hadiths.

King said: If it is so, scholars must be more pious than Umar, because Umar had forbidden Abu Huraira from transferring the hadith because of his lie towards the Prophet, but the scholars still take the hadith of a liar!

Al-'Abbasi said: Behold, O al-'Alawi, if the hadiths about Allah is not true, but what do you do with the verses of the Qur'an then?

**Muhkamah and Mutasyaabihah**

Al-'Alawi said: Al-Qur'an has verses of *Muhkamaah* which can be named the *Ummu al-Kitab,* and there are some verses of Mutasyaabihaah, there are literal and non-literal. Thus, the verses which appear as Muhkamah are practiced by the literal meaning. As for that, the verse of Mutasyaabihah was revealed in the form of *majaaz* and *kinaayah*. If not, then the interpretation is not valid in reasoning and *syarak* (legislation). For example when you carry the meaning of the word Allah in Surah al-Fajr (89): 22 "And thy Lord cometh, and His angels, rank upon rank,upon its literal meaning, then you are opposed to reason and syarak (legislation), for reason and legislation judge the existence of Allah in every place and every place is not free from him forever. This verse shows that Allah has mass and the mass is counted in space and place. This means that if Allah is in heaven (sky), so He is not here on earth. If He were on earth, then He is not in heaven, this is not true by reason and legislation (syarak).

Al-'Abbasi was nervous confronting this logic and was much taken aback to answer. Then he said: I can not accept this conversation and it is obligatory upon us to take the literal meaning from all verses in the Qur'an.

Al-'Alawi said: What you do with verses of *Mutasyaabihah*? You can not really take the actual meaning of all the verses of the Qur'an, if not; your companion sitting on your side named Sheikh Ahmad Uthman (A blind scholar, among the ten representatives of the Sunni) might be a member of hell?

Al-'Abbasi said: Why?

Al-'Alawii said: Because Allah says in Surah al-Israa '(17) 72 "But those who were blind in this world, will be blind in the hereafter, and most astray from the Path (the truth)." Sheikh Ahmad is a blind man in the world, and so he would be blind in the Hereafter, and more astray from the truth, are you contented with this, O Sheikh Ahmad?

Sheikh Ahmad said: Nay, surely what is meant by the blind (*al-A'maa*) in the verse: People who strayed from the truth.

Al-'Alawi said: If that is so, then it is proven that man cannot make do with only the literal meaning of all the verses of the Qur'an.

**King Request Change of Topic**

From here the debate around the literal meaning of the Qur'an had been heated. Al-'Alawi defeated al-'Abbasi using strong evidence (dalil) and arguments until the king said: Leave this topic and switch to the other topic.

**The Indiscretion and Mistake of Sunni**

Al-'Alawi said: Among your indiscretion and faults -Sunni- about Allah that you say: 'He forced His servants to commit evil and unlawful things, and then He punish them for it?

Al-'Abbasi said: This is true, as Allah says in Surah al-Nisaa '(4): 88 "Why should ye be divided into two parties about the Hypocrites? Allah hath upset them for their (evil) deeds. Would ye guide those whom Allah hath thrown out of the Way? For those whom Allah hath thrown out of the Way, never shalt thou find the Way, and in Surah Al-Taubah (9): 93 "Allah hath sealed their hearts”.

Al-'Alawi said: As you say that it is in the Qur'an, then the answer is: Indeed, the Qur'an has its *majaaz* and its *kinayaat*. So what is meant by al-Dhalaal (blunder) that Allah leaves the wretched human and abandon them until they felt lost, as in our words: Indeed, the government has damaged the people. "This means that the government has left them with their state of affairs without concern for their fate, this is the first and second: Did you not hear the word of Allah in Surah al-A'raf (7): 28 "Nay, Allah never commands what is shameful ", saying in Surah al-Insaan (76): 3 "We showed him the Way: whether he be grateful or ungrateful (rests on his will), and the sayings in Surah al-Balad (90): 10 "And shown him the two highways." Third: It does not make any sense that Allah commands to do evil and than punish the perpetrator. This is a far cry from the public to do and for Allah, the Most Just and Most High. Glory to Allah than what was being said by the polytheists and wrong-doers.

King said: No, no, no way is Allah forcing human to do evil, then punishing them, this is unjust. Verily, Allah is free from tyranny and evil. Allah has mention in Surah Ali Imraan (3): 182 "For Allah never harms those who serve Him, but I do not think that the Sunni believed in the words of al-'Abbasi?

**King Requesting for Clarifications**

Then the king turned to his vizier, saying: Does the Sunni hold on to this opinion?

Vizier said: Yes, it is prominent among the Sunni that they hold to it!

The king said: How can they say with what is contrary to common sense?

Vizier said: For their interpretation and evidence (dalil)s.

King said: Even though there are exegesis and evidence (dalil), it does not make sense and I do not agree with it beside the opinion of Sayyid al-'Alawi that Allah does not force someone to infidelity and evil, and punish him on the matter.

**The Prophet being doubtful of his prophethood**

Al-'Alawi said: Then the Sunnihas mentioned that the Prophet himself had doubt in his prophethood.

Al-'Abbasi said: This is a clear lie.

Al-'Alawi said: Do you not see in the scriptures that mentioned that Rasulullah has said: Gabriel's not too late on me but once I thought that he should have went down to Ibn al-Khattab "(*Ma abta'a Gabriel 'alayya marratan illaa wa zanan-tu anna-hu nazala 'ala Ibn al-Khattab*), while there are several verses in the Qur'an which shows that Allah took the covenant of the Prophet Muhammad on his prophethood?

**King Request for Clarification**

The king said to the vizier: Is it true what al-'Alawi says that this hadith is in the books of Sunni?

Vizier said: Yes, it is in several books of Sunni[[19]](#footnote-19).

The king said: This is a direct infidel (*al-Kufr'Aini bi-hi*).

**Reprimanding the Prophet**

Then the Sunni said in their reprimanding that the Prophet has brought 'Aisyah on his shoulders in order to see the musicians; is this qualified with the Prophet’s tomb and his position?

Al-'Abbasi said: It is not harmful to [him][[20]](#footnote-20).

Al-'Alawi said: Will you be doing that when you're just a normal man, will you bring your wife on your shoulders for her to be able to see the musicians?

**King Interjected**

King said: People who have some shame and jealousy will not be pleased with this, what about the Prophet who is the example of "shyness and jealousy" and faith. Is it true that these things are in the books of the Sunni?

Vizier said: Yes, it is in some parts of books of the Sunni!

The king said: How can we believe in a prophet who doubts his own prophethood?

Al "Abbasi said: Should the narration be *takwil*?

Al-'Alawi said: Does this narration qualify to be takwil? Do you know, O king that the Sunni believes in superstitions and fabrications?

Al-'Abbasi said: By which absurdity, superstition and fabrication you mean?

**Absurdity of Sunni**

Al-'Alawi said: I have explained to you that you, the Sunni had said:

1. Surely God is like Man of his hands, feet, movement and silence.

2. Indeed, the Qur'an has been distorted and there has been some addition and deficiency of it[[21]](#footnote-21).

3. Indeed, the Prophet do things not done by ordinary people like bringing 'Aisyah on his shoulders.

4. Indeed, the Prophet has doubted his own prophethood.

5. Indeed, those who came before Ali was leaning on sword and strength to uphold themselves without a legitimate backup for them.

6. Indeed, their books are narrated by Abu Hurairah and the likes who are made among those who fabricated the hadiths, they are among the devils and the other member of faults.

**King Request Change of Title**

King said: Leave this topic and switch to another topic.

**Relating Things that are ineligible**

Al-'Alawi said: Then indeed the Sunni relates the Prophet to things that do not qualify even for ordinary people!

Al-'Abbasi said: Like what?

Al-'Alawi said: As they say: 'Surah 'Abasa (80): 1-2 "(The Prophet) frowned and turned away, because there came to him the blind man (interrupting)” had been revealed about the Prophet[[22]](#footnote-22)!

Al-'Abbasi said: What prevented it?

Al-'Alawi said: What prevented it is the word of Allah in Surah Al-Qalam (68): 4 "And thou (standest) on an exalted standard of character. And his word in Surah al-Anbiya '(21): 107 "We sent thee not, but as a Mercy for all creatures. Does it make sense that the Prophet who is characterized by Allah as a great character and a mercy to the universe commit inhuman acts against the blind believer?

**King Interjected**

King said: It is absurd that this act was of the Prophet’s; he is of humanity and mercy. If it is so, O al-'Alawi, to who is this verse addressed for?

Al-'Alawi said: The authentic hadiths from the family of the Prophet in which the Qur'an descended upon their house say: 'Indeed the verse was revealed about Uthman bin' Affan. It occurs when Ibn Ummi Maktum met the Prophet, thus Uthman went against this, and turns his back on him.

Here, Sayyid Jamal al-Din; a Shia scholar who are present at the conference said: It occurs to me about the narrative with this surah that one of the scholars of Nasara say to me: Indeed, our Prophet is better than your prophet, Muhammad (s.a.w). I say: Why?

He said: Indeed, your prophet has bad manners; he is not pleasant to those who are blind, and turns his back to them. While our prophet Isa has a good character; he heals the blind and those with diseased skin.

I said: O Masihi, know that we are Shia, we believe that the surah was revealed about Uthman bin' Affan and not the Prophet. Indeed, our Prophet Muhammad s.a.w’s good moral character is exemplary as Allah says in Surah Al-Qalam (68): 4 "And thou (standest) on an exalted standard of character, and his words in Surah al-Anbiya '(21): 107 "We sent thee not, but as a Mercy for all creatures.

The Masihi people said: Indeed, I have heard these words from a preacher in Baghdad!

Al-'Alawi said: What is prominent before us is that some evil narrators had related this story to the Prophet to let Uthman ibn 'Affan off. Hence, they related a lie to Allah and His Messenger until they clean their caliphs up!

**King Request Change of Title**

King said: Leave this topic and talk about other topics.

**Shia discards the three caliphs’ faith**

Al-'Abbasi said: Indeed, the Shia discard the faith of the three caliphs, this opinion is not true, because even if they are not believers, why would the Prophet have had marital relations with them (*musaaharah*)?

Al-'Alawi said: Shia believes that they are not believers in terms of hearts and souls (qalban wa baatinan) even if they disclose their Islamization by their tongue and outwardly.[[23]](#footnote-23)

The noble prophet has accepted Muslim to anyone who clarified that although he is a true hypocrite, but the prophet treated them like he treat the Muslims. Thus, that is how the marriage of the Prophet’s relatives with them occurs (*musaaharah al-Nabi la-hum*) and their relationship with the prophet is from this chapter!

**PART THREE**

**Evidence (dalil) of Abu Bakr as a non-believer, The King interrupted, Evidence (dalil) of Umar as a non-believer, King Requesting Clarification, Al-'Abbasi tries preventing the King changing sects, The time when things got bad for Al-'Abbasi, King Request for Clarification and Other Details.**

**Evidence (dalil) of Abu Bakr as a non-believer**

Al-'Abbasi said: What evidence (dalil) that show Abu Bakr as a non-believer?

Al-'Alawi said: There are many strong evidence (dalil). Among them: He had betrayed the Prophet in many places. Among them: His flight from the army of Usamah and his betrayal against the prophet’s command in the matter. Al-Qur'an al-Karim has denied the faith of every person offending the Prophet, Allah says in Surah al-Nisaa '(4): 65 "  But no, by the Lord, they can have no (real) Faith, until they make thee judge in all disputes between them, and find in their souls no resistance against Thy decisions, but accept them with the fullest conviction.

Abu Bakr had betrayed the order of the Prophet (s.a.w) and wronged him, and so he is included in the sentence that was denied their faith for going against the prophet.

And moreover that the Prophet (saw) cursed those who fled or left the army of Usamah. We have mentioned earlier that Abu Bakr had indeed escaped from the army of Usamah: Did the Prophet curse a believer?

Of course, not.

**King interjected**

The king said: If it is so, then what al-'Alawi said about Abu Bakr being a non-believer is true!

Vizier said: The Sunni has exegesis of the flight of Abu Bakr from the army of Usamah.

The king said: Does exegesis able to reject what is prohibited, if we open this chapter, every criminal would be exegesis (takwil) for every crime committed?

The thief will say: I stole because I am a fakir. The alcoholic said: I had been drinking since I have a lot to grief and the adulterer will say ... etc…the rules would be impaired, people will dare to disobey, no, no ... exegesis will not benefit us.

Al-'Abbasi’s face turned red; he becomes bewildered, he did not know what to say. Finally ... he said: What evidence (dalil) that show Umar as a non-believer?

**Evidence (dalil) of Umar as a non-believer**

Al-'Alawi said: There are many evidence (dalil) of Umar as a non-believer, among them: He himself has explained that he was not a believer!

Al-'Abbasi said: Where did he say?

Al-'Alawi said: Umar said: I do not suspect the prophethood of Muhammad (PBUH) as I doubt on al-Hudaibiyyah[[24]](#footnote-24) (*maa syakaktu fi nubuwwati Muhammad mithla syakki yauma al-Hudaibiyyah).* His word shows that: He always doubted prophethood upon our Prophet Muhammad, but his doubt and suspect on al-Hudaibiyyah is deeper and larger than the doubt of the former, O al-'Abbasi, tell me in the name of your God: Are the people who suspected the prophethood of Muhammad (PBUH) can be counted as a believer?

Al-'Abbasi did not answer; he went silent and he shook his head in shame.

**King Request Clarification**

The king said to the vizier: Is it true the words of al-'Alawi that Umar had said this?

Vizier said: This has been told by several narrators!

King said: This is astounding ... very astounding, indeed I thought that Umar was one of the faction that had had obtain Islam, his faith was pointed as exemplary faith, but it is clear now that the basis of his faith is doubt and complicity!

**Al-'Abbasi try preventing the King of Changing Sects**

Al-'Abbasi said: Wait, O king, please remain in your conviction, you should not be fooled by al-'Alawi, the liar.

King opposed al-'Abbasi with his facial expression and said in anger: Lo vizier Nizam al-Mulk said that: al-'Alawi is true in his words and the words of 'Umar is written in several books and the fool - al-'Abbasi-said: al-'Alawi is a liar. Isn’t this a form of plain stubbornness?

The atmosphere went quiet and scary. The king was fuming and was not happy hearing the words of al-'Abbasi ... al-'Abbasi and scholars of Sunni bowed down, the vizier went silent. But al-'Alawi raised his head looking towards the king to observe the consequences?

**When the moments got bad for Al-'Abbasi**

The moments of solidity were felt by al-'Abbasi, he imagined that the earth was split in two below him enough to make him vanish, or that the angel of death came to take his life immediately, because of the deep embarrassment and in a difficult atmosphere. Indeed, his sect’s faults had been highlighted before him. His sect’s superstitions were prevailed before the king, his vizier and all the scholars and leaders of the army... but what he will do? Indeed, the king had invited him for a questioning session to distinguish between the truth and the false. Thus, he gathered all his strength and lifted his head and said: What is your opinion, O al-'Alawi, about Uthman as a non-believer, but how can the Prophet had married him off with his two daughters? Ruqayyah and Ummi Kalthum?[[25]](#footnote-25)

**Evidence (dalil) of Uthman as a non-believer**

Al-'Alawi said: Evidence (dalil) on Uthman as a non-believer are substantial and enough about this matter: Indeed, the Muslims- friends among them- had gathered against him, and they killed him. And you believe that the Prophet said: My Ummah did not gather upon the offense. Are they Muslims - including their friends- gathered together to kill a believer? 'Aisyah has equalized them with the Jews, planning to kill him and said: Kill Na'lathan - a Jewish name, because he has rejected the teaching of Islam, kill Na'lathan, and so, Allah kill him[[26]](#footnote-26).

Verily Uthman had beat up Abdullah bin Mas'ud, a companion of honor until he suffered from hernia, lying on the runner and died.

Uthman had chased out Abu Dhar al-Ghiffari, a noble companion friend in which the Prophet said: “*Between heaven and earth, indeed it is difficult to find someone who is true-spoken as Abu Dhar”*. He chased Abu Dhar out and remove him from Medina to Syam once or twice then to Rabdhah - The dry land between Mecca and Medina until Abu Dhar died of hunger and thirst in Rabdhah whilst Uthman divide the material goods of the Muslims to his kin of the Umayyads and the Marwans[[27]](#footnote-27)!

**King Request Clarification**

The king said to the vizier: Are the words of al-'Alawi true?

Vizier said: Historians have mentioned it before.

The king said: How can Muslims make him as a caliph?

Vizier said: By *syura*.

Al-'Alawi said: Wait, O vizier, do not say what you do not know!

The king said: What are you saying, O al-'Alawi?

**Become Caliph by Umar’s Will**

Al 'Alawi said: Indeed, vizier was mistaken in his words, surely Uthman did not get the position of caliph but by the will of Umar and only got three votes from the hypocrites (*munafikin*). They are Talhah, Sa'd bin Abi Waqqas and 'Abd al-Rahman bin' Auf. Were these three hypocrites enough to represent all Muslims?

Then the Tawaarikh have mentioned that those who had appointed Uthman had abscond from Uthman when they witness his wickedness, his disloyalty to the Prophet’s companion, meeting on affairs of the Muslims with Ka'b al-Ahbar (a Jew), and the distribution of Muslims property to Bani Marwan. Therefore, it is not of a surprise when the three of them encourage people to kill Uthman!

**King Request Clarification**

The king said to the vizier: Is what al-'Alawi said true?

Vizier said: Yes, it was mentioned before by the historians!

The king said: How can you say that Uthman became caliph by *syura*?

Vizier said: What I meant by *syura* was the three of them!

The king said: Were the choice of the three people allows *syura*?

Vizier said: The three of them had been promised by the Prophet with Heaven.

**Hadith of the Ten People Guaranteed Heaven is False**

Al-'Alawi said: Wait, O vizier, do not say what is not true, for the hadith "ten people guaranteed heaven" is a lie and just a design against the Prophet (PBUH)!

Al-'Abbasi said: How do you say that it was a lie when it was reported by reliable narrators?

Al-'Alawi said: Many evidence (dalil) show this hadith is flawed and a lie. I will mention only three propositions for you:

First: How can the Prophet guarantee Heaven to the person who had upset him, Talhah? Indeed, some members of tafsir and historians say that Talhah has said: If Muhammad died, we will marry his wives after him, or I would marry 'Aisyah. Thus, the Prophet felt aggrieved by the words of Talhah and thus, Allah revealed Surah al-Ahzab (33): 53 *Nor is it right for you that ye should annoy Allah’s Messenger, or that ye should marry his widows after him at any time. Truly such a thing is in Allah’s sight an enormity.*

Second: Indeed, Talhah and al-Zubair had fought Imam Ali bin Abi Talib, and verily the Prophet had said about the right of Ali as: *O Ali, verily your war is my war, and your peace is my peace*[[28]](#footnote-28). And the prophet also said: Whoever *obeys' Ali, he obeys me and whoever betrays Ali, he betrays me*[[29]](#footnote-29). “The prophet (PBUH) said: *Ali is with the Quran and Quran is with Ali, both of each does not separate until both returned to me.”* The prophet (PBUH) said: “*Ali is with the truth and the truth is with Ali, in which the truth turns with Ali together”*.[[30]](#footnote-30) Will those who clashes against the prophet and betrayed him able to be in heaven? And, are those who were against the truth and the Quran can be called a believer (mukmin)?

Third: Indeed, both Talhah and al-Zubair had planned to kill Uthman, therefore, is it possible for Uthman, Talhah and al-Zubair, all be in heaven. Some of them fight one another despite the fact that the Prophet has say: Both the murderer and the murdered will be in hell-fire”.

**King Request Clarification**

King asked the Vizier with conjecture: Is what al-'Alawi saying be true?

Vizier keeps his silence without saying anything. Similarly, al-'Abbasi and his team also hold their tongue without saying anything.

**Does Satan Forgive Those Spoke the Truth?**

What do they say? Are they telling the truth? Does the devil forgive those who acknowledge the truth? Does the desire of *ammarah* which also knows evil have the will to submit to the truth and reality? Do you think that admitting the truth of the matter is simple and easy?

No! Indeed, it is quite difficult, as it had to pull out the *jahiliyah asabiah* and wrongful desires, although men are the followers of their own desires and faults other than the mukminin for which the number of them are very small.

**Al 'Alawi Ready to Bring Reference Books**

Al-'Alawi broke the veil of silence, he then said: O king, verily the vizier, al-'Abbasi and the scholars has known the truth by my words and my speech, and also the facts of our hadith. Even if they reject my words, verily that in Baghdad, the scholars witnessed the truth of my words. Indeed, among the treasures of this Madrasah, our books that had witness the truth of my words, the authentic references which highlighted and showed the plain truth to mark my words.... If they acknowledge my words, then this is what is required. If not, then I am ready now, now bringing to you the books, references and witnesses!

**King Request Clarification**

The king said to the vizier: Are the words of al-'Alawi is true that the reference books showed the truth about what he said and that he was speaking the truth?

Vizier said: Yes.

King said: Why do you remain silent at the beginning?

**Cursing the Companions**

Vizier said: I hate cursing the Prophet’s (pbuh) companions!

Al-'Alawi said: Strange! You hate the matter when Allah and His Messenger did not hate it, because God has introduced some of the companions who were hypocrites and ordered His Messenger to struggle against them as he saw jihad against the infidels and the Prophet himself had cursed some of his companions!

**Words about all companions are Just is a lie**

Vizier said: Did you hear the words of scholars: Indeed, all companions are fair?

Al-'Alawi said: I heard those words, but I know that those words are lies and fiction, as how can all the companions be just and fair when they are part of the curse of Allah, the Prophet has cursed some, the companions also cursed among them, fight with each other, cursing each other and kill each other?

**How Muslims take them as the Caliph and Follow them?**

Here al-'Abbasi found the door closed in front, so he comes from another door and said: O king, say to al-'Alawi that if the three caliphs were not believers (mukminin), how did the Muslims take them as their Caliphs and followed them?

Al-'Alawi said: Firstly: Not all Muslims take them as the caliph, only the Ahl al-Sunnah.

Second: Those who believe the caliphate falls into two categories: Those who are ignorant and stubborn (mu'aanid). As for the ignorant, he does not know of the caliphs‘ flaws and their facts, they described them as good people and believers (mukminin). As for the stubborn, they do not make use of the evidence (dalil)s, and so they were stuck on being disobedient. Allah has mentioned in Surah al-A’raaf (7): 146 *"Even if they see all the signs, they will not believe in them.”*Surah al-Baqarah (2): 6 *"As to those who reject Faith, it is the same to them whether thou warn them or do not warn them; they will not believe.”*

Third: Indeed, those who chose them as the Caliph was wrong in their selection just like the Nasara made in theirs, they say, "Christ is the son of Allah “. The Jews say: 'Uzair is a son of Allah” in Surah Al-Taubah) 9): 30. Human are obligated to obey Allah and His Messenger. It is an obligatory for people to obey the truth, and not obeying the people over their errors and faults. Allah commands: 'Obey Allah and His Messenger ... Surah al-Nisaa' (4): 59.

**King Request Change of Title**

King said: Leave this topic and switch to another title.

**The Ambiguity of the Sunni**

Among the ambiguity of Sunni and their mistake is leaving Ali bin Abi Talib (a.s) and followed the opinions of those earlier.

Al-'Abbasi said: Why?

Al-'Alawi said: Because Ali was chosen by the Prophet (s.a.w)[[31]](#footnote-31) while the three of them were not chosen by the Prophet. Then he said:

O king, for if you choose someone to be in your place or to be your caliph, is it obligatory for ministers and members of the government to comply with you? Or will they be able to dismiss your chosen caliph and replace another in your place?

King said: In fact, it is mandatory for them to comply with the caliph that I had chosen myself; they must comply and obey my order on it.

**Shia follows the Prophet’s Caliph**

Al-'Alawi said: That is done by the Shia, they followed the Prophet's chosen caliph by the command of Allah, Ali bin Abi Talib, and they left the others besides him.

**The reason for Ali to be not qualified as the Caliph**

Al-'Abbasi said: But Ali does not qualify because he was still young[[32]](#footnote-32), whilst Abu Bakr was an elder[[33]](#footnote-33). In addition, Ali has killed the leaders of the Arab and has destroyed their army[[34]](#footnote-34). Thus, the Arab did not accept it. Similarly, Abu Bakr also did not accept it!

**The Public Knows More Than God and the Prophet?**

Al-'Alawi said: Did you hear it, O king that al-'Abbasi said: Some people are more knowledgeable than Allah and His prophet in determining the best (*al-Aslah*), al-'Abbasi did not take heed of the word of Allah and His Prophet in the election of Ali bin Abi Talib, but he takes the words of the public to the importance of Abu Bakr. This means that Allah, the Knower and the Wisest does not know the most qualified and best until the ignorant (jahil) came by, and choose the most qualified person? Doesn’t Allah has stated in Surah al-Ahzab (33): 36 "It is not fitting for a Believer, man or woman, when a matter has been decided by Allah and His Messenger to have any option about their decision: if any one disobeys Allah and His Messenger, he is indeed on a clearly wrong Path.”

Doesn’t Allah stated in Surah al-Anfaal (8): *24 " O ye who believe! Give your response to Allah and His Messenger, when He calleth you to that which will give you life”.*

Al-'Abbasi said: No, I am not saying that people are more knowledgeable than Allah and His Prophet.

Al-'Alawi said: If so, then your words have no meaning. If Allah and His Prophet have chosen a particular person being a leader, then you must comply whether the people accepted it or not!

Al-'Abbasi said: But the eligibility of Ali bin Abu Talib was small?

Al-'Alawi said: First: The meaning of your words that Allah does not know Ali bin Abi Talib fully, and so Allah does not know his qualifications are small, hence He make him the caliph. This is the real blasphemy.

Second: Actually the qualifications for being a caliph fits Ali bin Abi Talib a lot. While others did not have much qualifications!

Al-'Abbasi said: What qualifications?

PART FOUR

**Qualification of Ali A.S. Becomes Caliph, King Requesting Clarification, Umar Resistance Against Prophet, King Requesting Clarification, King interjected, King Intrigued About Mut'ah, King Asking The Audience to also Engage And Others.**

**Qualification of Ali A.S. Becomes Caliph**

Al-'Alawi said: Indeed his qualifications are many, the first is the determination or selection is from Allah and His Prophet.

Second: Ali bin Abi Talib was the most pious companions. Hence, the Prophet said: *“The most knowledgeable in the matter of law among you is Ali”* 'Umar ibn al-Khattab said:' Ali is the most pious among us in the judiciary[[35]](#footnote-35)". The Prophet (pbuh) said: *I am the city of knowledge and Ali is the door. Anyone who requires the city or wisdom, have to come through to his door"*[[36]](#footnote-36).

Ali a.s said: Verily the Prophet has taught me a thousand chapters of knowledge where he had opened the door of every thousand chapters for me[[37]](#footnote-37)".It appears that pious people are more preferred than the Gentiles (jahil). Allah states in Surah al-Zumar (39): 9 *"Are those equal, those who know and those who do not know? It is those who are endued with understanding that receive admonition”.*

Third: Ali a.s did not wish from others, while others wish from him[[38]](#footnote-38). Didn’t Abu Bakr have said: Fire me, because I am not the best for you and Ali is with you. Didn’t Umar said for more than seventy times: If Ali is not there, Umar would perish[[39]](#footnote-39)”. "Possibly Allah does not keep me with the predicament where you do not have it, O Abu al-Hasan[[40]](#footnote-40)". "Do none of you issue a fatwa while Ali was in the mosque".[[41]](#footnote-41)

Fourth: Indeed, Ali bin Abu Talib never betrays God and he has never worshiped other than Allah, he never bows down to idols throughout his life, while the three had betrayed Allah and worshipped other than Allah and worshipped idols. Allah says in Surah al-Baqarah (2): 124 *"But My Promise is not within the reach of evil-doers."* It is clear that the traitor is someone who is in the wrong; therefore, he is not entitled to the promise of Allah which is the prophetic and caliphate (*khilafah)*.

Fifth: Indeed, Ali bin Abu Talib has the peace of mind and high intellect, his exact opinion is based on Islam, whilst others have shallow, devil-driven opinions. Abu Bakr said: “Verily, Satan seduces me”. Indeed Umar was against the Prophet in many places. Uthman has a weak intellect; his family gave him adverse side effects such as: Marwan bin al-Hakam was mentioned by the Prophet as Wazagh bin al-Wazagh (lizard the son of lizard)[[42]](#footnote-42). The Prophet (pbuh) has cursed Marwan and his descendants other than believers (mukmin), but their numbers are little. This also goes to Ka'b al-Ahbar the Jews and others!

**King Request Clarification**

The king said to the vizier: Is it true that Abu Bakr said: 'Satan seduces me? "

Vizier said: This is in the books of history[[43]](#footnote-43).

The king said: Is it true that Umar was against the Prophet?

Vizier said: We will seek clarification from al-'Alawi on what he meant by his words?

**Umar’s defiance against Prophet Muhammad**

Al-'Alawi said: Yes, the scholars of Sunni have mentioned it before form their authentic scriptures that indeed 'Umar has been against the Prophet (PBUH) in several places, including:

First: When the Prophet wants to pray for 'Abdullah bin' Ubayy, indeed Umar was against the Prophet with a hard resistance (*qaasian*) until the Prophet feel aggrieved, consequently, Allah said in Surah al-Taubah (9): 61 *" But those who molest the Messenger will have a grievous penalty”.*

Second: When the Prophet ordered the separation between *'Umrah tamattu'* and ‘*Haji Tamattu’* and make it a requirement for the husband to approaches his wife in between' umrah and hajj. Then 'Umar went against this and said with harsh words: Are we doing *ihram*, while we are still producing semen "(*a-nuhrimu wa mazaakiiru-naa taqturu maniyyan*). Thus the Prophet (saw) said: Surely, you will not have faith in these things forever. “By saying this means that the Prophet knew that Umar was among those who have faith in some [*hukm*] and not having faith (*kafir*) with some [*hukm*].

Third: Umar did not believe in mut'ah marriage. When he ruled, and grab the caliphate’s position, he said: Two mut'ah was halal at the time of the Prophet, but I have make it haram and forbid it, and I punished on both [the perpetrators] "(*Mut'ataani kaanataa 'ala' ahdi Rasulillah wa ana uharrimu - huma wa u'aqibu 'alai-himaa)* whereas the Qur'an states in Surah al-Nisaa' (4): 24 *"And the wives you have derive benefits among them. Give them their due dowries."* The members of tafsir have mentioned that the verse was revealed to state the real hukm on mut'ah. And this is the practice of the Muslims until the reign of Umar. Since Umar forbid it, adultery and evil among Muslims have increased. Therefore, Umar has suspended the law of Allah and His Prophet, and so the numbers of those committing adultery and evil were large! Thus, he was mentioned in the word of Allah in Surah al-Maa'idah (5): 44. 45, 47 *"If any do fail to judge by (the light of) what Allah hath revealed, they are (no better than) Unbelievers.” “And if any fail to judge by (the light of) what Allah hath revealed, they are (No better than) wrong-doers”. “If any do fail to judge by (the light of) what Allah hath revealed, they are (no better than) those who rebel”.*

Fourth: In the Battle of al-Hudaybiyyah as has been mentioned that Umar has suspected Muhammad's prophethood. In another place Umar was against him and hurt the prophet with offensive words to the Prophet!

King said: In fact I am not pleased with the mut'ah marriage!

Al-'Alawi said: Do you admit that it is the Islamic law or not?

King said: I do not testify.

Al-'Alawi said: What is the meaning of Surah al-Nisaa '(4): 24 *"And the wives you have derive benefits among them. Give them their dowries "*. And what is the meaning of the words of Umar: Two mut'ah was lawful at the time of the Prophet, but I forbid it, and I will punish on both [the perpetrator] "? Is not the words of Umar showed that mut'ah marriage is permissible and there at the time of the Prophet, at the time of Abu Bakr and some during the reign of Umar. Then, he was against it and ban it?

In addition to the many evidence (dalil), O king, indeed Umar himself do mut'ah with women[[44]](#footnote-44) and Abdullah bin al-Zubair was the son by mut'ah!

**King Request Clarification**

The king said: What do you think O’ Nizam al-Mulk?

Vizier said al-'Alawi argument is strong and true, but because 'Umar forbade it, it must be on us to follow.

Al-'Alawi say: Allah and His Prophet are more worthy to be followed or Umar? Did you not read, my vizier, the word of God in Surah al-Hasyar (59): 7 *"So take what the Messenger assigns to you…”.* Allah states in Sura al-Nisa '(4): 59 *"Obey the Messenger ... "*Allah states in Surah al-Ahzab (33): 21" *Ye have indeed in the Messenger of Allah a beautiful pattern (of conduct) for any one whose hope is in Allah and the Final Day”*, and the famous hadith: *Muhammad’s halal is halal until the Day of Judgement, and Muhammad’s prohibitions (haram) is haram until the Day of Judgement "?*

**King interjected**

King said: I believe in all Islamic law, but I do not understand the reason for mut'ah to be lawful, does anyone of you willing to give his daughter or sister to a man so that he does mut'ah of marriage for an hour or a few moments, isn’t this wrongful?

Al-'Alawi said: What do you think, O king: Do people want to marry his daughter or sister off with a *daim* contract (normal marriage) to a man knowing that the man would divorce her after an hour or some time after having fun with them ?

King said: I do not want to.

Al-'Alawi said: Sunni admitted that *daim* *akad* is true, the divorce (talak) after the mut’ah is also true, then there is no difference between the mut'ah contract (munqati ') and *daim* contract other than the mut'ah contract ended with a set time, while the *daim* contract will end when the divorce take place or in other words: Akad mut'ah is like hire-purchase contract (al-Ijarah) and *daim* contract is just like property contract where the rental contract will expire with the end of time and the ownership will end with the sale of property!

Thus, the legislation of mut'ah is harmony and true, as it is to fulfill the desires of the body, the same goes to the legislation of *daim* marriage; it is perpetual and true, for it is also to fulfill the desires of the body.

Then I want to ask you, O king, what do you think of widows or single mothers with children - the absence of their husbands - and no one comes to ask their hands in marriage. Isn’t mut'ah marriage is one way to keep them from evil?

Isn’t it by applying the mut'ah, they got to earn some property for their spending and their orphans.

What do you think of young men and boys, where their conditions denied them of mutual (*daim*) marriage, isn’t mut'ah a solution for them to release them from strength of a violent sex! Keeping them from malice?

Isn’t mut'ah better than adultery, sodomy and masturbation?

Indeed, I believe, O king, the crimes of adultery, sodomy or masturbation occurred among Muslims during the reign of Umar. Umar was the cause of the sin because he prevented the Muslims from doing mut’ah! There was much news that shows that adultery has been increasing among the community since Umar forbade it!

As you say, O king, 'I do not want to (*La arghabu*) ... Verily, Islam does not force anyone to do it as Islam does not force you to marry your daughter to a man whom you know will divorce your daughter after an hour or more during the marriage. The denial of you or the people against something is not evidence (dalil) on its banning, because the law of God is constant, not changing with desires or opinions!

**King intrigued about Mut'ah**

The king said to the vizier: Al-'Alawi’s argument on mut'ah as permissible is strong.

Vizier said: But the scholars have followed the opinion of Umar.

Al-'Alawi said: First: Those who followed Umar were the scholars of Sunni only, not all scholars.

Second: The law of God and His Prophet are more worthy to be followed or the opinion of Umar?

Third: Indeed, your scholars are in conflict with each other about Umar and his legal opinions.

Vizier said: How?

Al-'Alawi said: Because Umar said: Two mut'ah was lawful at the time of the Prophet, but I had forbid them: Mut'ah of hajj and mut'ah of women. If Umar’s opinion is correct, why didn’t the scholars follow his opinion on the mut'ah of hajj? Indeed, your scholars have been against Umar and said: Mut'ah of Hajj is true even though Umar forbade it!

If the opinions of Umar were wrong, why did the scholars followed his opinion on the ban of mut’ah and then agreed on the mut'ah?

The vizier went silent and said nothing.

**King Ask the Audience to Also Engages in the Dialogue**

The king said to the audience: Why don’t you answer al-'Alawi?

One Shia scholar named syeikh Hasan al-Qasimi said: Doubts are to Umar and ‘his followers’, that is why they do not have the right are to answer Sayyid al-'Alawi, O king.

**King Request Change of Title**

The king said: If so, leave this topic and talk about other topics.

**Opening of Umar**

Al-'Abbasi said: 'Shia has thought that there is no advantage to Umar even though he has opened several states.

Al-'Alawi said: On our side, we have several answers:

First: The rulers and kings are able to open new states because of the expansion of their colonized land; can these be counted as advantages?

Second: Even if we accept the opening as an advantage, but can the opening able to allow him snatch the position of caliphate? Even for a fact that the Prophet did not pick him as caliph. Verily that the prophet has make Ali bin Abu Talib as the caliph…If it was you, O King, pick a caliph to be in your place, and then, somebody else came and took the place of the one who you have picked , furthermore, he opened a number of states and doing good deeds, will you let him go or will you be upset with him, of grabbing a position not meant for him without your consent?

**The king reprimand Umar’s Opening and the like**

King said: In fact, I will reprimand him and even the opening he did will not eliminate his misdemeanor!

Al-'Alawi said: That is why Umar’s opening is an offense with negative results and is a reversal, because the Prophet did not do violence to anyone, furthermore, the prophet’s wars are wars of defense. Thus, people want to enter Islam, the religion of Allah in crowds, because they know that Islam is a religion of peace and security. As for Umar, he attacked the state and integrated them into Islam by sword and strength, not with logical religion and civilization. Thus, it resulted to the increasing of the enemies of Islam. Thus, the opening of Umar has tarnished the image of Islam and give negative results, and reverse.

If Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman did not snatch the position of caliphate from the valid person: Ali bin Abi Talib, and if Imam Ali accepted the caliphate directly, then he surely will follow the Prophet’s teachings, performing the prophet’s correct *manhaj*. And this will cause many people to enter Islam and Islam will be able to extend around the earth!

But: *La haula wa la quwwata illa bi llahi al-'Aliyyi al-'Azim.*

Here Sayyid al-'Alawi took a long and deep breath, expressed his feelings, and struck his own hand over the on what has happened to Islam after the death of the Prophet (pbuh) due to the confiscation of the caliphate’s position from the valid owner: Imam Ali ibn Abu Talib a.s.

**The King asked Al-'Abbasi to answer**

The king said to al-'Abbasi: What is your answer to al-'Alawi?

Al-'Abbasi said: Indeed, I have never heard a conversation like this before!

**Follow the Real Caliph of the Prophet**

Al-'Alawi said: Now that you have heard about this and thus the truth has been unveiled. Therefore, leave your caliphs and just follow the Prophet’s rightful caliph: Ali bin Abi Talib a.s. Then, al-'Alawi said: Your business is quite strange, O Sunni, you forget and leave the base and only take the branches.

Al-'Abbasi said: How so?

**The opening of Ali Bin Abu Talib**

Al-'Alawi said: Because you mentioned the opening of Umar, but you forget the opening of Ali bin Abi Talib!

Al-'Abbasi said: What is the opening of the Ali bin Abi Talib?

Al-'Alawi said: Most of the opening that has been achieved by the Prophet is through the hands of Imam Ali bin Abi Talib, such as Badr, Hunayn[[45]](#footnote-45), Uhud, al-Khandaq and others. If the openings were not there; it is the foundation of Islam, thus Umar would not exist, and neither would there be Islam and Iman. The proof is indeed Prophet has said when Ali fought with 'Umru bin' Abd Wuddin on the day of al-Ahzab (al-Khandaq): *The fight of faith as a whole with the worshipper of idols as a whole, O Lord, if You wish that you are not worshiped, so you are not worshipped ".* That is if Ali was killed, thus the idolaters have the courage enough to kill me and kill all the Muslims. Therefore, there will not be Islam and Iman after. The prophet said: *Ali’s hit in the days of al-Khandaq is better than the ibadah of the jinns and mankind "*(*Dharbatu 'Ali yauma al-Kahndaq afdhal min 'Ibadati al-Thaqalaini*)[[46]](#footnote-46). Hence, we may say that Islam is of Muhammadiyyun in existence, of ‘Alawiyyun in terms of abiding. Indeed, every benefit is because of Allah and Ali only in the terms of abiding!

Al-'Abbasi said: If we say just as your words that Umar is guilty and a snatcher, he had alter, and change, that's right, but why do you hate Abu Bakr?

**The Reasons of Hatred to Abu Bakr**

Al-'Alawi said: We hate him due to several reasons: First: Of what he did to Fatimah al-Zahraa', daughter of the Prophet, the women’s leader of the universe.

Second: He has removed the limit on the punishment of criminal and adulterer: Khalid bin al-Walid.

**King Request Clarification**

King said in amazement: Is Khalid ibn al-Walid, a criminal?

Al-'Alawi said: Yes.

The king said: What is his crime?

**Crime of Khalid Bin Al-Walid and his committing adultery**

Al-'Alawi said: His crime is that he was sent to Malik bin Nuwairah, a noble companion, where the Prophet had gave glad tidings to him that he was one of the member of heaven. Abu Bakr had ordered Khalid to kill Malik bin Nuwairah and his people. Malik was outside Medina when he saw Khalid came with a few soldiers, thus he ordered his people to carry weapons. Then they carry weapons.

When Khalid came to them, he lied to them and swore to them by Allah that he did not mean evil to them, saying: 'We have not come to fight you, but we are your guest tonight, and so Malik was confident with his words, as Khalid had swear by Allah. Then Malik and his people laid down their weapons, furthermore, at that time was the time for prayer, and Malik and his people stood up to pray. Suddenly, Khalid and his group attacked them, and they tied Malik and his people togerher, then the criminal, Khalid[[47]](#footnote-47) killed them. Then Khalid got greedy for Malik’s wife (as she was seen as beautiful) and thus committed adultery with her in the evening her husband was killed. Then Khalid put Malik and his people’s heads on the stoves. He cooks "the food of adultery," and he and his companions ate the food!

**Umar wants to kill Khalid, Abu Bakr prohibits**

When Khalid returned to Medina, Umar wants to kill in response (retaliation) to Khalid for the murder of the Muslims and want to do hudud because he has committed with Malik's wife, but Abu Bakr (mukmin!) prohibits loudly that hudud were not to be conducted on Khalid[[48]](#footnote-48). This act of Abu Bakr wasted the blood of Muslims and also destroyed Allah’s hudud!

**King Request Clarification**

The king said to the vizier: Is it true what al-'Alawi said about the rights of Khalid and Abu Bakr?

Vizier said: Yes, that has been mentioned by the historians[[49]](#footnote-49).

King said: Why do some Muslims call Khalid as *Saifullah al-Maslul* (a drawn sword of Allah)?

Al-'Alawi said: He is the sword of the devil who is paralyzed, but because he is an enemy of Ali bin Abi Talib, and with Umar in the burning house of Fatimah al-Zahraa 'a.s, then part of the Sunnicalled him by the name of the Saifullah (sword of Allah) !

PART FIVE

**Sunni-The enemies of Ali Bin Abu Talib?, Abu Talib was a believer (mukmin), King Requesting Clarification, Al-'Abbasi Acknowledging Abu Bakr was Guilty, King was astonished, Abu Bakr and Umar dispossess Fatima’s Land of Fadak, The Truth is with the Shia, and Others.**

**Sunnis - The enemies of Ali Bin Abu Talib?**

The king said: Are the Sunni enemies of Ali bin Abi Talib?

Al-'Alawi said: If they are not the enemies of Ali, why did they praised those who had taken other people’s rights and within the vicinity of its enemies (Ali a.s), they deny its value and its *manaaqib* until the feeling of envy and hostility got over the people and they said: Abu Talib had died as an infidel. But, it is a fact that Abu Talib was a believer. He has helped Muslims in bitter situation and also protected the Prophet in his treatise!

**Abu Talib was a believer**

The king said: Was Abu Talib a Muslim?

Al-'Alawi said: Abu Talib never was a pagan until he entered Islam, but he is a believer who hid his faith. When the Prophet (pbuh) was sent to us, Abu Talib had disclosed himself a Muslim in his hands; he is the third person to embrace Islam. First: Ali bin Abi Talib, the second: Khadijah Binti Khuwailid; the prophet’s wife and third: Abu Talib (r.a).

**King Request Clarification**

The king said to the vizier: Is it true the words of al-'Alawi on the rights of Abu Talib?

Vizier said: Yes, it was mentioned by some historians[[50]](#footnote-50).

King said: Why would it have been prominent among the Sunni that Abu Talib died as infidel?

**Sunni’s feelings of envy against Ali Bin Abu Talib**

Al-'Alawi said: Because Abu Talib was the father of the Amir al-Mukminin, Ali a.s. Therefore, the jealousy of Sunni to Ali bin Abi Talib makes them say: Indeed his father died as infidel, just as the feelings of jealousy of Sunni to Ali makes them killed his two sons, al-Hasan and al-Husain; young prince of the heaven. The Sunni who attended the Karbalaa' to kill al-Husain said: We fight you because of our anger to your father and what he did to our sheikhs on Badr and Hunain day! *(Nuqaatilu-ka bughdhan li-abii-ka-wa maa abii fa'ala bi-asyyaakhi naa yauma Badrin wa Hunain!)*

**King Request Clarification**

The king said to the vizier: Are these words uttered by the killers of al-Husain?

Vizier said: Historians have said that they had said the words to al-Husain!

The king said to al-'Abbasi: What is your answer regarding the anecdote of Khalid ibn al-Walid?

Al-'Abbasi said: 'Abu Bakr saw deception in this matter!

Al-'Alawi said: Strange! Glory to Allah! Which ploy that brings Khalid bin al-Walid to the killing of innocent people, committing adultery with their women, and then released without punishments and any retaliation, furthermore was subject to be in the military leadership. Abu Bakr said to him that he is the drawn sword of Allah. The "sword of Allah" should kill the infidels or the believers? And should the "sword of Allah" protect the chastity of the Muslim women or commit adultery with them?

**Al-'Abbasi Acknowledging Abu Bakr was Guilty**

Al-'Abbasi said: O al-'Alawi, indeed Abu Bakr was guilty *(akhta'a)*, but Umar was able to understand it!

Al-'Alawi said: If Umar had understand the matter, he should impose *hudud*, the punishment on Khalid for committing adultery and killing the innocent Mukmin, but Umar did not do so, so Umar was also guilty as Abu Bakr .

**King interjected**

The king said: Surely you, O al-'Alawi said at the beginning of the conversation that Abu Bakr was evil to Fatimah al-Zahraa 'Binti Rasulullah (s.a.w), so what kind of evil did he do to Fatima?

Al-'Alawi said: Verily Abu Bakr after he took the baiah for himself out of allegiance to the people with violence, sword, intimidation and power *(al-Irhaab wa al-Saif al-Tahdiid wa al-Quwwati*), he sent Umar, Qunfudh, Khalid ibn al-Walid, Abu Ubaidah and other groups-from-the munafikin- to the home of Ali and Fatimah (a.s). Umar had collected firewood and placed them in front of the door of Fatimah’s home (the door where the Prophet once stood up and said: *Al-salamu 'alaikum ya Ahla Bait al-Nubuwwah* and the Prophet would not enter it except after asking permission), and Umar burned the door with fire[[51]](#footnote-51).

While Fatima came from behind the door against Umar and his group, Umar had pushed Fatimah between the wall and the door so hard until the fetus was loss and the nail of the door got to her chest, then Fatimah cried out: O my father, O Messenger of Allah, see what we face after you [go] from Ibn al-Khattab and Ibn Qahafah! Then Umar turned to those around him and said: Strike Fatimah, so canes, sticks and staffs get to her body until she was covered in blood all over!

The effect of the hard push and the hard clash pervades through her body, she falls ill causing her death, she died after a few days of her father’s death, Fatimah died as martyrdom in the house of prophethood. Fatimah was killed because of 'Umar ibn al-Khattab![[52]](#footnote-52)

**King Request Clarification**

The king said to the vizier: Was what mentioned by al-`Alawi can be true?

Vizier said: Yes, what al-‘Alawi said, I have read them in the books of Tawaarikh.

Al-'Alawi said: This is among the reasons of Shia’s hatred to Abu Bakr and Umar!

**Fatimah a.s scolded Abu Bakr and Umar**

Al-'Alawi said: As evidence (dalil) of the crime of Abu Bakr and Umar, the historian has said that Fatimah had died in a rebuke of Abu Bakr and Umar. Indeed, historians have mentioned some hadiths of Fatimah: Surely Allah is pleased with Fatimah’s pleased and angered when Fatimah was angered". And you, O king, don’t you know, what is the result of those who angered Allah!?

**King Request Clarification**

The king said to the vizier: Does this Hadith true? Is it true that Fatimah had died in a rebuke of Abu Bakr and Umar?

Vizier said: Yes, the hadiths and historians have mentioned it[[53]](#footnote-53).

Al-'Alawi said: As a proof of my words: Verily, Fatimah has requested Ali bin Abi Talib a.s by a will, to not show her remains to Abu Bakr, Umar and those who had ill-treated her. Therefore, they did not perform prayer for her; they did not attend the funeral rituals. And Ali concealed her grave so that they do not come to her grave. And so Ali (a.s) has carried out her will!

**King felt strange**

The king said: This is strange, was this carried out by Fatimah and Ali?

Vizier said: It has been mentioned by historians!

**Abu Bakr and Umar took Land of Fadak from Fatimah**

Al-'Alawi said: Abu Bakr and Umar had hurt Fatimah in some other things.

Al-'Abbasi said: What are they?

Al-'Alawi said: It was that they had taken her rights (Land of Fadak).

Al-'Abbasi said: What is the evidence (dalil) (dalil) that they had taken the Land of Fadak?

Al-'Alawi said: Tawaarikh have mentioned that the Prophet (s.a.w) had given Land of Fadak to Fatimah. Land of Fadak belonged to her at the time of the Prophet. When the Prophet died, Abu Bakr and Umar removed the Fatimah’s workforce from Land of Fadak by force, swords and violence. Fatimah started arguing against Abu Bakr and Umar, but both of them did not listen to her. In fact they were both rebuked and stopped her from talking[[54]](#footnote-54). Hence, she did not talk to them until her death in the state which she was still angry with them!

Al-'Abbasi said: But Umar ibn' Abd al-'Aziz has returned the Land of Fadak to the children of Fatimah at the time of his reign?

Al-'Alawi said: What use is there? If a man has robbed you and driven you from home, and then another person came after you die, and return your home to your children, could the action swept away the culprits’ sin?

**King interjected**

King said: It was clear in both of your conversation - O al-`Abbasi and al-'Alawi – Do all agreed that Abu Bakr and Umar had took the Land of Fadak?

Al-'Abbasi said: Yes, history has mentioned it[[55]](#footnote-55).

King said: Why did they do it?

Al-'Alawi said: Because they both wanted to take the place as caliphate. They both knew that the Land of Fadak was still in the hands of Fatimah, and they assumed that she would spend and divide as a product of many (one hundred and twenty thousand gold dinars) to the people. Therefore, people would gather around Ali a.s. This was what Abu Bakr and Umar hated!

The king said: If these words are true, then their conduct is bizarre! When the caliphates of the three were void, who is to become the Prophet's caliph?

**The prophet appointing the next Caliph as his successor**

Al-'Alawi said: Indeed, the prophet himself had appointed - by the order of Allah-the next caliph after him. In a hadith the Prophet said: *“The Caliphs after me are twelve people, same as the total number of Bani Israel’s Nuqabaa and all them are of the Quraysh"[[56]](#footnote-56).*

**King Request Clarification**

The king said to the vizier: Is it true that the Prophet had said so?

Vizier said: Yes.

The king said: Who are the twelve?

Al-'Abbasi said: Four of them are famous, they are: Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthman and Ali.

The king said: Who else?

Al-'Abbasi said: *Khilaf* among the scholars.

King says: Name them.

Al-'Abbasi went silent.

**Names of the Twelve Imams**

Al-'Alawi said: O king, shall I now say to you their names according to the books of the scholars of Sunni, they are: Ali, al-Hasan, al-Husain, Ali, Muhammad, Ja'far, Musa, Ali, Muhammad, Ali, al-Hasan and al-Mahdi a.s.

Al-'Abbasi said: Hear, O king: Indeed, Shia said: al-Mahdi is still alive in this world since the year 255 AH, and does this make sense? And they said: He will be apparent in the last day to fill the earth with justice after it was filled with malice and cruelty.

**King Request Clarification**

The king said to al-'Alawi: Is it true that you believe that?

Al-'Alawi said: Yes, it’s true, because the Prophet had said so. It has been reported by the Shia and Sunni.

**How People Can Stay Alive In A Long Time?**

The king said: How can people live in such a long time?

Al-'Alawi said: Now the age of Imam al-Mahdi has yet to reach a thousand years[[57]](#footnote-57). Allah has stated about Noah in Surah 'Ankabut (29): *14 "We (once) sent Noah to his people, and he tarried among them a thousand years less fifty”.* Is Allah incapable to keep people alive during this time?

Wasn’t Allah responsible in determining the death and life of all things, doesn’t He has the power over all things? Then the Prophet had said so, then it is true and reliable.

**King Request Clarification**

The king said to the Vizier: Is it true that the Prophet had told about al-Mahdi as what has been said by al-'Alawi?

Vizier said: Yes[[58]](#footnote-58).

The king said to al-'Abbasi: Why do you deny the facts that have been surrounding us the Sunni?

**Al-'Abbasi Worried that the Public will turn to Shia!**

Al-'Abbasi said: Because I worried that the belief of the people will be unstable and their hearts will be inclined to Shia!

Al-'Alawi said: If so, you, O al-'Abbasi, are included in the commandment of Allah in Surah Al-Baqarah (2): 159 *"Those who conceal the clear (Signs) We have sent down, and the Guidance, after We have made it clear for the people in the Book,-on them shall be Allah’s curse, and the curse of those entitled to curse”.* Hence, the curse of Allah includes you...

Then al-'Alawi said: O king, ask al-'Abbasi this: Is it obligatory on the pious to guard the Book of Allah and the words of His Messenger, or is it obligatory to guard the belief of the people which have diverted from the Book and the Sunnah?

Al-'Abbasi said: Indeed, I guard the belief of the people so that their hearts are not inclined to the Shia, because Shia is a member of Bid’ah!

Al-'Alawi said: Indeed, authentic scriptures tell us that your imam; Umar was the first to introduce *bid’ah* in Islam. He himself clearly says: The best of *bid’ah* is this. ‘This’ is referring to the story while he ordered people to do Taraawih prayer in congregation. He knows that Allah and His Prophet have forbidden the Sunnah prayers to be done in congregation. Therefore, Umar‘s *bid’ah* is openly against God and His Prophet.

Then: Didn’t Umar make bid’ah on the azan by removing the words "*Hayya 'alaa khairi al-'Amal*" and added the word "*Al Salaat Khairun mina al-Naum*"[[59]](#footnote-59)?

Didn’t Umar do bid’ah by abolishing the shares of the converts, is against Allah and His Messenger?[[60]](#footnote-60)

Didn’t Umar do bid’ah by abolishing the mut'ah of hajj, is against Allah and His Messenger?[[61]](#footnote-61)

Didn’t Umar do bid’ah by abolishing the women’s mut'ah, is against Allah and His Messenger?[[62]](#footnote-62)

Didn’t Umar do bid’ah by repealing the *hudud* (punishments) of adultery on the adulterers: Khalid bin al-Walid went against Allah and His Messenger by making it compulsory for the sentence of limits to be carried out on the adulterers and murderers?

And your other bid’ah by Umar.

So, are you the member of bid’ah or us, the Shia?[[63]](#footnote-63)

**King Request Clarification**

The king said to the vizier: Is what was mentioned by al-'Alawi on Umar’s bid’ah (innovations) be true?

Vizier said: Yes, a group of ulama have mentioned it in their books!

The king said: How can we follow a person who has done bid’ah over our religion?

Al-'Alawi said: Therefore, it is forbidden to follow a man like this, because the Prophet (saw) has said: “*Every bid’ah is misguided, and every misguidance is towards hell"* So those who followed Umar in his bid'ah-while knowing-hence they are member of Hell-by verdict-!

**The Imam of Four Sects**

Al-'Abbasi said: But the Imams of Sunni has admitted the doings of Umar.

Al-'Alawi said: This is another bid’ah, O king!

King said: "How so?”

Al-'Alawi said: Because the imam of the sects: Abu Hanifa, Malik ibn Anas, al-Shafi'i and Ahmad ibn Hanbal, did not live during the time of the Prophet (s.a.w), however they came in about two hundred years-after. Are the Muslims during the time of the Prophet and the time of the four of them are in falsehood and blunder? What is the measurement to limit these four sects and to not follow all the *fakih*? Did the Prophet state anything about it?

The king said: What do you think, O 'Abbasi?

Al-'Abbasi said: They are more knowledgable than them!

King said: Will science and knowledge be dry without them?

**Ja'fari sect**

Al-'Abbasi said: But, the Shia also follows a sect (Ja'far al-Sadiq)?

Al-'Alawi says: We follow the sect of Ja'far, because his sect is the sect of the Prophet, as he is from Ahl al-Bait which was stated by Allah in Surah al-Ahzab (33):33 *“And Allah only wishes to remove all abomination from you, ye members of the Family, and to make you pure and spotless”*. If not, we might have followed each of the twelve imams, but because of Imam al-Sadiq (a.s) got to spread his knowledge, tafsir, and his noble hadiths; more than other Imams (because there is freedom in his time) until his teachings were attended by over four thousand students, hence, Imam al-Sadiq was able to renew the symbol of Islam after the Umayyads and Bani 'Abbas eliminated it. Therefore, Shia was called as al-Ja'fariyyah attributed from Ja'far al-Sadiq a.s.

The king said: What is your answer, O 'Abbasi?

Al-'Abbasi said: We, Sunni usually follow according to the Imam of the four sects!

Al-'Alawi said: In fact, some authorities forced you to adhere to the sect of the four[[64]](#footnote-64). You have to follow them blindly, without argument and evidence (dalil)!

Al-'Abbasi went silent.

**Die as an Ignorant**

Al-'Alawi said: O king, I bear witness that al-'Abbasi is a member of Hell, if he dies in this state.

The king said: How can you know that he is a member of hell?

Al-'Alawi said: Because the Prophet said: Whoever died and he did not know the Imam of his day, he died as an Ignorant "*(Man maata wa lam ya'raf imaama zamaani-hi maata maitatan jaahiliyyatan).* Thus, al-'Abbasi then was asked by the king, who is the imam in the time of al-'Abbasi?

Al-'Abbasi said: There is no hadith about it.

**King Request Clarification**

The king said to the vizier: Is there a hadith from the Prophet about this matter?

Vizier said: Yes, there is a hadith about it.

King said in anger: I thought that you, O al-'Abbasi, can be relied on (*thiqah*), now your lies are exposed!

Al-'Abbasi said: Indeed, I know the imam of my time!

Al-'Alawi said: Who is he?

Al-'Abbasi said: The king!

Al-'Alawi said: You should know, O king, that he is lying, he only say that to win your heart!

King said: Yes, I know that he lied, I know myself that I did not qualify as the imam of the time, because I do not know anything. I just spend my time with hunting and managing the office!

Then the king said: O al-'Alawi, in your opinion, who is the imam of this?

Al-'Alawi said: From my opinion and my belief, the imam of our time is Imam al-Mahdi a.s as in the previous hadith of the Prophet. Therefore, if anyone knows, he will die as a Muslim and he is a member of the heaven. And those who do not know, he died as an ignorant, he is in hell together with the ignorant.

**The truth is with Shia**

Here, the king’s face goes radiant and it reflects the effects of happiness, and so, he turned to the audience and said:

Know, O pilgrims, indeed I feel happy and convinced of this dialogue (for three days). I have learned and I am convinced that the truth is with the Shia in all of what they say and everything they believe in. Indeed, the sect of Sunni is wrong, and their faith is absurd.

**The king declare himself as a Shia**

Indeed I am among them who when the truth prevail, will subject to it and admit it. I am not a member of the mistaken in this world and hell in the hereafter. Thus, for this I declare to you that I am a Shia (*tasyayyu '*). Therefore, those who like to be with me should be of the Shia on the blessings of Allah and His good pleasure, he should take himself out of the darkness of falsehood to the light of truth!

**Vizier Declare Himself as a Shia**

Vizier Nizam al-Mulk said: I have known that the Shia is true. Indeed, the true sect is the sect of Twelve Imam only since the days of my schooldays. Therefore, I declare that I am also a Shia.

Thus most scholars, ministers and military chiefs present at the congress (the number is almost seventy) has entered the sect of Shia.

The news of King Malik Syah, Vizier Nizam al-Mulk, the ministers, the military chiefs and the writers have entered the Shia sect has spread throughout the country, and a large number of people have held to the Shia sect and Nizam al-Mulk - the father of my wife- ordered that the teachers teach about the sect of Shia in the schools of Nizamiyyah in Baghdad! [[65]](#footnote-65)

**Some of them stay with their sect**

But some scholars who insist on falsehood, remain on their sect as in the word of Allah in Surah al-Baqarah (2): *74 " Thenceforth were your hearts hardened: They became like a rock and even worse in hardness”.*

**The Evil Plan**

They started making evil plans[[66]](#footnote-66) against Malik Syah and Nizam al-Mulk. They make Nizam al-Mulk responsible on the things that happened, as he is the mind that governs the country - until those guilty hands was extended to him – from the opponents - Sunni.

**The death of Nizam al-Mulk and Malik Syah**

Then, they kill Nizam al-Mulk on the 12th of Ramadan 485 Hijri. And after that they killed Malik Syah Saljuqi. [[67]](#footnote-67)

*Fa- innaa li-llah wa innaa ilai-hi raaji'uun*. Indeed, both were killed in the way of Allah, for truth and faith, so congratulations to them and to all those who were killed in the way of Allah, for truth and faith.

**A Qasidah**

Indeed, I wrote a qasidah to lament for Nizam al-Mulk (my father-in-law) included:

Vizier Nizam al-Mulk is a priceless pearl

Carved by the Most Gracious, out of grandeur

The days do not know the values of his excellence

Returned because of jealousy of his skin

He chose the sect of truth in the dialogue

Producing reality of the evidences (dalil) that has been exposed

Religion predisposition is a truth without

Its pride

Apart from it is a cunning liar delusion

But they did it out of suppressed envy

He spent the night under the bright moon in the faint shadows

Onto him a thousand salam of Allah followed

Bless his eternal soul

**I Attended the Congress and I Wrote This Book**

I have attended the conference and the dialogue. Indeed I have written everything that happens in the congress, but I put out the things that are not necessary and now I present [to you] what had happened at the congress in this book.

All praise to Allah alone, peace and blessings be upon Muhammad, his good family and his intelligent companions.

I have written this book in Madrasah Nizamiyyah in Baghdad.

Author:

Muqaatil ibn 'Atiyah bin Muqaatil al-Bakri
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23. Ali a.s stated in his sermon: "The Caliphs before me have done acts that intentionally violated the Prophet. They violated their promises to him by changing the Prophet’s *Sunnahhs*. Now if I force them to leave it and return to the situation similar to the time of the Messenger, then, my army will scattered away, leaving me alone or only some acquaintance among my Syi'ah who knew of my benefits, and *imamah* me by the book of Allah and the Sunnahh of His Messenger will stay with me. What do you people think, if I place Ibrahim’s Mausoleum in the place where the Prophet is placed.
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