

**The Fierce Lashings
in Exposing the Deceptions
of the Author of Al-Murāja`āt**

(Al-Siyāt-ul-Ladhi`āt fi Kashf Kadhib wa Tadrīs Sāhib-il-Murāja`āt)

by

`Abdullah bin `Abshan al-Ghamidi

Translated by:

Hani Al-Trabulsi

In the name of Allah, the Most Gracious, the Most Merciful

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents	6
Introduction	8
Part one	14
Chapter one: the reality of the book “al-Muraja`at”	15
Chapter two: the general Shiite methodology and ‘abdul-Ḥusayn’s Methodology when quoting Sunni sources	20
PART TWO: Disgraceful Sections in “al-Muraja`āt” that Cause the Academic Value of the Book to Collapse	25
Chapter one: Sections that contain deceptive attributions	26
Chapter two: Sections that contain alterations.	50
Chapter three that are quoted out of context.	65
Chapter four: Sections that are outright lies	90
Chapter Five: Sections that contain deceptions	108

Chapter six: Sections that have had important information omitted . 141

Chapter seven: Sections that include his contradictions 172

Chapter eight: Sections that include condemnations of companions . 181

Conclusion 194

Introduction

Praise belongs to God who created the heavens and the earth and appointed the shadows and light; then the unbelievers ascribe equals to their Lord. None can count his blessings nor can those who praise him thank him sufficiently, his greatness is immeasurable. I bear witness that there is no god except Allah, and that Muhammad (peace be upon him) is His trusted slave and messenger, he delivered the message and revealed the truth, he advised this nation and erased their sadness, and he struggled in Allah's path against the pagans, worshipping his Lord until the end. So may Allah's peace be upon the master of messengers, his pure household, his righteous companions, his purified wives, the mothers of believers and upon those who followed them in goodness until the Day of Judgment.

The partisans of falsehood continue throughout the ages to create their corrupt version of history, building castles from sand, in a long series of schemes and deception. Similarly our Lord still sends his soldiers of truth to demolish their falsehood and their fake glory; sometimes they fight them with their bows and the tips of their spears, and at other times with their tongues in debates, through these

constant battles Allah reveals the truth and elevates it, and he extinguishes falsehood and humiliates it.

Allah has authorized in his book these struggles when he said: {O Prophet! Strive against the disbelievers and the hypocrites, and be stern with them. Hell will be their home, a hapless journey's end} [66:9].

The scholars have fulfilled this task perfectly as they knew that this battle between truth and falsehood is an eternal one until the coming of the hour.

Ever since I started reading the books of the Rāfidah¹, I realized the extent of their ignorance, the danger they pose, their sly trickery and the weakness of their position when facing their opponents. They would shift their positions and change colors like a chameleon until it became their slogan, by God how many beliefs did they corrupt and how many people did they misguide?! But Allah continues to create generation after generation, men whose purpose is to expose their scandalous falsehood and weaknesses.

1. Plural of “Rāfidhi”, it is a Derogatory term used by Muslims to describe extremist Shiites. It literally translates to “rejectionists”.

The book al-Muraja`āt , authored by `Abdul-Ḥusayn Sharaf-ul-Din al-Mūsawi², who perished in (1377 AH), continues to be an important reference that he produced in place of the devil, claiming that it is a summary of the messages he exchanged with Shaykh-ul-Azhar Salim al-Bishri (rah). The path of lying has never been a new thing for them; it is from their oldest and most beloved paths, but what is odd is how the followers of al-Mūsawi accept this silliness!! Do they not reflect?!

{What is amiss with these people that they can hardly understand a statement?} [4:78]

Or maybe they have been exposed so they banded together to hide their shame. The least that we can say to describe Mūsawi's book is that it is more impure than the meat of a pig served on a golden plate, and regardless of all the calamities and embarrassments found within his book yet it still sold millions and continues to be distributed to Sunnies and Shiites worldwide.

Dear respected reader, you will discover the reality of al-Mūsawi

2. Born in Kadhimiyah in `Iraq in (1290 AH), studied in Najaf and Samarra' then returned to Lebanon at 32 years of age, he journeyed to several countries.

and his book simply by browsing through the pages of our own. You shall see that it is nothing more than a trick where he manipulates the events and forges them without any hint of objectivity, you will also see al-Mūsawi's ignorance, his lies and his deception, qualities that no God-fearing believer should have.

This refutation of whatever al-Mūsawi used as Qur'anic evidence and narrations and proofs for `Ali's (ra) superiority and leadership does not mean that we are covering up his virtues or those of his household; many virtues have been established for them in a way that they do not require the lies of `Abdul-Ḥusayn and his claims. However, Ahlul-Sunnah possess an advanced methodology of criticizing texts and analyzing them, far from the emotional and biased approach that disregards the scientific foundations.

The reader may notice harshness in my speech against this author, but my excuse for this will be that I have seen things in this book that no Muslim can stand. This Rāfidhi and his people have slandered the companions of Muhammad (peace be upon him) and they accused them in their loyalty and religion although they were the guardians of the religion and the holy book may Allah be pleased with them;

Allah from above seven heavens has revealed in their praise what will continue to be recited until the Judgment Day.

I do not claim that these papers are all my own, nor would I dress myself in a garment that isn't mine, but they are `Iraqi papers written by Yemeni hands, and knowledge is a thing that ties up the scholars, with this knowledge and the strong arguments we defend ourselves, as opposed to those who defend themselves by chaotic screams, because you cannot wash away impurity with impurity, and I have called this book "The Fierce Lashings in Exposing the Deceptions of the Author of Al-Murāja`āt" (al-Siyāt al-Lādhi`āt fi Kashf Kadhib wa Tadrīs Sāhib-il-Murāja`āt).

Finally, I say that it is not unlikely that the reader will come across some errors in this book and I do not claim to have perfected it, but I wished through it to reform and to do good, as much as I could.

I know that most of what we do in this world is mixed with desires and lusts, still I hope that whatever is in this book is sincerely for Allah's cause, that I may succeed in the after-life through the rewards that I will need from Allah. Success is only from Allah and on him I

rely.

Written by:

`Abdullah bin `Abshan al-Ghamidi

On the `Asr of Friday 11/3/1425 AH.

Aaggcom@hotmail.com

PART ONE

Chapter One:

The Reality of the Book “al-Muraja`āt”

Chapter Two:

The General Shiite Methodology and `Abdul-Ḥusayn's Methodology when Quoting Sunni Sources

CHAPTER ONE

The Reality of the Book “al-Muraja`āt”

The book al-Muraja`āt has captured the interest of Shiite preachers to the extent where they made it a means to fool the laypeople, or to fool their Shiite followers to be more exact since Ahlul-Sunnah knew nothing about this book until very recently when those preachers started printing many copies and distributing it in poor Sunni areas that are filled with ignorance for the sake of spreading Tashayyu`. This book is composed of a series of letters between al-Mūsawi and Salim al-Bishri³ the Shaykh of al-Azhar at the time, and ends with al-Bishri admitting defeat and declaring the victory of the Rāfidhi Madhab and the corruption of the way of Ahlul-Sunnah!

There is no doubt of course that this book is forged and attributed to Shaykh al-Azhar, the signs forgery and the lies are apparent, we present a few below:

1- The book is composed of a series of hand-written letters between

3. Salim al-Bishri, the Shaykh of al-Azhar mosque, Maliki jurist, learned and taught at al-Azhar, head of the Maliki Niqabah, passed away in Cairo (1335 AH). Al-A`lam 3/119.

al-Mūsawi and al-Bishri. However, this book was only published through the side of al-Mūsawi. Nothing reached us from the other side to affirm the legitimacy of the content. Al-Mūsawi published his book without any authentication or documentation proving the issuance of those so-called letters by Shaykh al-Azhar, there weren't even any pictures of Bishri's original letters which were 65 out of a total of 112 in this book. Are we supposed to believe all 65 disappeared without a trace?!

2- This book was never published until after twenty years of al-Bishri's death; he died in 1335 AH, whereas the first print of this book was released in Sidon the year 1355 AH.

3- The style of writing in these letters is identical, not one of the letters carries the style of al-Bishri's writing. This exposes al-Mūsawi's scheme without a doubt as he was not able to fabricate letters with Bishri's writing which is something he himself was forced to admit when he said that he wrote the opponent's letters in his own style:

“I do not claim that these papers are confined to the original texts of those letters that were shared between us at the time; all of these statements were written by my pen.” He also added another scandal by admitting that he even altered them: “With some necessary additions called forth by counsel and guidance”.⁴

4- As for the texts of the book itself, they are the biggest evidence proving the lies of its author. For example, Shaykh Salim al-Bishri who at the time was the greatest scholar at al-Azhar in knowledge and station, accepts al-Mūsawi’s esoteric interpretations of Allah’s book, interpretations that would be rejected by the smallest students of knowledge let alone Shaykh al-Azhar, he submits to al-Mūsawi’s letter that contained calamities by responding: “Concerning your latest letter, its torrent has been overflowing, overbrimming, supported by perfect verses and worthy proofs... Whoever challenges you is bad in argument, stubborn, arguing about falsehood, and is acting like the ignorant.”⁵ In addition, al-Mūsawi writes that al-Bishri ac-

4. Introduction to al-Muraja`āt , pages 5 & 6.

5. Al-Muraja`āt 13/49 – First number refers to the letter or “Muraja`ah” while the second to the page according to the Arabic version, published by “Dar-ul-Qari”, 6th print, 2009.

cepts certain narrations as mutawātir (massively transmitted) while those narrations are either weak or fabricated according to the books of Ahlul-Sunnah; this is popularly known by the smallest students of knowledge so how can the head of al-Azhar University not know this?

Al-Mūsawi goes even further to picture the head of al-Azhar as an ignorant man who is incapable of finding narrations in the books of Ahlul-Sunnah; we see al-Bishri writing a letter and saying: “You have repeatedly referred to the Ghadīr incident. Please narrate its story from Sunni sources so that we may look into it, Wassalam.”⁶ And “Please narrate to us the hadith of inheritance as transmitted by Sunnis, Wassalam.”⁷ Is Shaykh al-Azhar ignorant of these popular reports? If so, is he not then capable of researching it knowing that he has access to all those libraries? Could he not have asked or tasked any of his students to find out or does he truly believe a Shiite is trustworthy in transmitting Sunni narratives?!

It is our right to ask:

6. Al-Muraja'āt 53/177.

7. Ibid 65/209.

Since Salim al-Bishri was very easily submitting to everything al-Mūsawi said as if he was a young student, and he behaves as if he's learning from `Abdul-Ḥusayn al-Mūsawi and agrees with his arguments constantly, then why didn't he just embrace Tashayyu`?! Why was it not reported by any of his family members or students that he did accept al-Mūsawi's beliefs and ideas?! Until these questions are answered, we can only marvel at al-Mūsawi's honesty and truthfulness in this book.

CHAPTER TWO

The General Shiite Methodology and `Abdul-Ḥusayn's Methodology when Quoting Sunni Sources

Whoever looks into the books of the Shia, whether old or new, will come across a giant amount of texts backing their beliefs which they claim to have quoted from Sunni sources, through such texts they attempt to convince some of their lost followers who doubted Ta-shayyu`. The Shiite scholars have several ways of doing this that were documented by our scholars; we will point out some of their ways {That perhaps Allah will restrain the might of those who disbelieve. And Allah is greater in might and stronger in [exemplary] punishment.}[4:84]

The discreet methods in which they laid their evidences upon Ahlul-Sunnah, which were pointed out by scholars include:

- 1- Some of their scholars have learned the sciences of Hadith and heard the narrations of the trustworthy Sunni scholars of Hadith.

Then the Shiite narrators began to narrate the authentic Sunni reports but they included in them false additions to support their Shiite Madhab, this led to the confusion of many laypeople and even scholars but thankfully Allah has graced us with men who were able to uncover these lies.

2- Another scheme, is that they look into the names of the major Sunni scholars and then check for Shiites who hold similar names and titles and attribute the narrations to them in order to trick the people. Examples include: al-Suddi, there are two men with this name: al-Suddi al-Kabir and he is a reliable Sunni and al-Suddi al-Saghir who is an extremist Rāfidhi Shiite known for fabrications. Ibn Qutaybah is also the name for two individuals: `Abdullah bin Qutaybah and he is a deviant Rāfidhi Shiite and `Abdullah bin Muslim bin Qutaybah who is a reliable Sunni scholar, he authored a book and called it “al-Ma`ārif” so the Rāfidhi also authored a book and gave it the same name. We mention also Muhammad bin Jarīr al-Tabari, there are two: One is the famous Sunni historian and the other is called Muhammad bin Jarīr bin

Rustum al-Tabari and he is a Rāfidhi Imami, there is also abu Ja'far Muhammad al-Tabari a sixth century Imami Shiite scholar. There are also two named: Ibn Batah, one being Sunni while the other is a Shiite called Ibn Butah.

3- They like to attribute certain books, ones that criticize the Companions and the Sunni Madhab, to big Sunni figures, such as the book “Sirr-ul-‘Ālimīn” which they have falsely attributed to al-Ghazali, and the history book “al-Imamah wal-Siyasah” that was falsely attributed to Ibn Qutaybah al-Dinawari.

4- They quote texts that attack the Companions or the Sunni Madhab from books which they attribute to big figures in Sunni Islam although those books do not exist and are lost, or they quote from rare books attributed to Ahlul-Sunnah but such books cannot be found anywhere in order to verify the information, and often do not contain what was quoted.

5- From the most popular methods in their books is to quote a very popular report but manipulate its text and add to it what suits them, and one of the most important example of this is Hadīth Al-Ghadīr.

6- From their ways is that they quote Sunni narrations with all of their chains and texts and the names of the scholars who reported it without specifying each scholar's version of that text; this gives the illusion that the narration is found in Sunni books with this text that they had quoted and that it's authentic because they agreed on it.

7- They will quote Zaydi or Mu` tazili scholars and claim they are strict Sunni scholars to advertise for their deviances.

8- They will author books about the virtues of the four Caliphs and then when they reach the part about `Ali bin Abi Tālib, they

include in it narrations that attack the first three, and thus the reader will be confused and will think that Sunni books criticize the three Caliphs.

9- They gather their arguments from sources that contain weak and fabricated reports then claim to have collected them from reliable Sunni sources, they even claim at times the agreement of Ahlul-Sunnah over these texts but the truth is otherwise.

10- They will quote only a part of the verse or narration without including the rest of the context that clarifies it. In this way they manipulate texts to agree with their beliefs.

In addition to plenty of other tricks and ways but we have only mentioned a few here to warn the nation so that we may counter the caravan of slander, division, hatred, and Fitnah that we thought had subsided. Unfortunately, it seems to have returned in a much worse state; a vile series of lies that these folks utilize to misguide their followers.

PART TWO

Disgraceful Sections in “al-Muraja`āt” that Cause the Academic Value of the Book to Collapse

Chapter One: Sections that Contain Deceptive Attributions

Chapter Two: Sections that Contain Alterations

Chapter Three: Sections that are Quoted out of Context

Chapter Four: Sections that Contain Outright Lies

Chapter Five: Sections that Contain Deceptions

Chapter Six: Sections that have had Important Information Omitted

Chapter Seven: Sections that Include his Contradictions

Chapter Eight: Sections that Include Condemnations of the Companions

Chapter One

Sections that Contain Deceptive Attributions

These are sections that contain unfound claims, like that a hadith exists when it doesn't, or similar claims:

1- Al-Mūsawi said in his book [57/188]: “The consecutive reporting of the Ghadīr hadith is necessitated by the natural laws which Allah has created.”

He said this to reply to al-Bishri who said that Hadith al-Ghadīr was not mutawātir, consecutively reported, or transmitted on a massive scale. This statement of al-Mūsawi was based on an objection he imagined, although in reality everyone who has the least bit of knowledge concerning Hadith knows for a fact that Ghadīr is mutawātir, but what is meant by this are the words “Man Kuntu Mawlāhu `Aliyun Mawlāhu,” and not the other additions which al-Mūsawi has included in his book.⁸ He had previously said in his book: “And you know that thirty Companions cannot all agree upon one lie, this is rejected

8. Check letters 54 and 56, especially his inclusion of Qur'anic verses [5:67] and [5:3] into the Hadith of Ghadīr.

by the intellect...” Since when did the Shiites give any weight to the consensus of the Companions?! Don’t they write in their books that they all apostated and abandoned Islam after the death of the Prophet (peace be upon him) except for a few?!⁹ Why didn’t al-Mūsawi and his likes accept the consensus of the Companions when it came to appointing the first three Caliphs?! Or this due to cherry-picking?! Why didn’t the intellect play any role in the issues he raised?! Or is it the intellectual domination that these Mullas exercise on their followers?! Those who understand these people’s methodology of debate from the books of their opponents have already understood the truth.

2- We will now look at another example of `Abdul-Ḥusayn’s lies, and while it isn’t disgraceful to not be acquainted with all the lies and falsehoods, it is disgraceful to not be able to tell the difference between truth and falsehood when it comes to narrations. This is dilemma of al-Mūsawi and his followers who accepted the lies and were pleased with them.

9. Al-Kafi 2/244, Bihar al-Anwar 22/345,351,352,440, Kitab Sulaym bin Qays 74,75, al-Ikhtisas 4,5, Rijal al-Kashi 6,11 and others.

The deceiver quotes [62/199] forty texts which he called the “Forty Ahadith”. Then, he wrote in the footnotes this prophetic narration: “Whoever teaches my nation forty ahadith related to its faith, Allah will resurrect him on the Day of Judgment in the company of the faqihs and the learned.” And this Hadith is weak although it comes from numerous chains. What is important here is that al-Mūsawi stole al-Nawawi’s research for the chains and routes of this report, but what al-Mūsawi did at the end is that he excluded al-Nawawi’s grading of the Hadith which he described as weak by saying: “And the people of Hadith have agreed upon its weakness even though its chains are numerous.”¹⁰

There is no doubt that al-Mūsawi stole al-Nawawi’s research for the following reasons:

Firstly, he never mentioned any other narrator than those mentioned by Nawawi without adding anything to it.

Secondly, he used the same expressions as Nawawi and in the same order and presentation, he never even announced `Ali’s version of the text and he couldn’t as al-Nawawi never did so. Since when did

10. Al-Arba`oun al-Nawawiyyah 11.

the Shia quote abu Hurayrah, abu Sa`īd, Anas, and Ibn `Umar?! It's only his own bankruptcy that led him there.

3- Al-Mūsawi says in his book [70/121-122]:

We cannot accept their argument just because it is based upon what al Bukhari and others have said. They quote Talḥah bin Masrif saying: "I asked `Abdullah bin Abi `Awfa: `Did the Prophet leave any will at all?' He answered: `No.' ... Regardless of that, the sahihs of the purified progeny are mutawātir regarding the issue of the will; so, let all texts which disagree with them be discarded.

Isn't this just pure stubbornness on the part of al-Mūsawi?! How can it not be when he criticizes the Hadith of Ibn abi Awfa?! If the goal here is to quote what supports Tashayyu` from Sunni sources then how can we claim this narration isn't authentic in their books?!

4- The simpleton mentioned in his book [34/144] the narration of brotherhood or “Occasion of Fraternity” between Jibril and Mika'il during the night when `Ali slept on the bed, and he said in the footnotes: “This was reported by the authors of the Sunan in their respective works.” This is a lie of course and we challenge all Shiites to bring forth a single book by one of the authors of the four Sunan who narrated this fabrication. This is why al-Mūsawi never referred to any of those books rather he referred to Tafsīr al-Razi only and was satisfied; although al-Razi mentioned it in summary and never mentioned a chain, he simply wrote: “It is narrated...”¹¹ The people of knowledge know well what is implied when a scholar uses this expression. Al-Razi had also mentioned two narrations before this one which were more reliable, but al-Mūsawi disagreed with their content, so he ignored them due to his extremism. Furthermore, his statement: “The authors of the Sunan in their compilations” is ignorance that causes ants and bees to laugh in their hives and colonies.

11. Tafsir al-Razi 5/204.

5- Al-Mūsawi wrote in the footnotes of [44/160] a report taken from Kanz-ul-`Ummal which says: “You, folks of Quraysh, shall never cease feuding till Allah sends you a man with the sincerity of whose faith. He has tested to strike your necks with his sword.”

He commented on it by saying: “This was reported by many of the authors of the Sunan.” Is this man not ashamed of such lies? As for this text it has many issues and one can smell the scent of fabrication all over it, so we challenge him and his followers again to refer us to one of the authors of the Sunan who included it in his books.

6- The man then quotes this narration: “He, peace be upon him and his progeny, has said: Consider my Ahl al-Bayt among you as you consider the head of the body, and the eyes in the head.” Then he says in the footnotes of [10/31]: “Recorded by a group from the authors of the Sunan,” which is false. Not one of the authors of Sunan has recorded this, not al-Tirmidhi, nor abu Dawoud, nor Nasā`ī, nor Ibn Majah, nor al-Darimi, nor Ibn Mansour or the others. This was recorded by al-Tabarani from Salman al-Farisi and it was Salman’s

own words which he never attributed to the Prophet (peace be upon him). Al-Haythami commented on this tradition saying: “It includes Ziyad bin al-Mundhir and he is abandoned.”¹² And this “Ziyad” is the infamous abu al-Jaroud the extremist Rāfidhi, and leader of the Jaroudiyyah sect. He was described as a liar by Ibn Ma`in and Ibn Hibbān.¹³ As a result this narration falls and so does the reliability of al-Mūsawi.

7- Al-Mūsawi writes: “And the “guides” about whom He says: {You are a warner, and for each nation there is a guide}.” Of course he is explaining the guides here to mean the Shiite Imams. He writes in the footnotes of [12/38]: “Explaining this verse in Al-Tafsīr al-Kabir, al-Tha`labi quotes Ibn `Abbas saying: “When this verse was revealed, the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) put his hand over his chest and said: `I am the warner and `Ali (as) is the guide, and through you, O `Ali, guidance is achieved.”” Many scholars of exegesis and authors of books of Sunan quoted it from Ibn `Abbas.”

This is another lies upon the authors of the Sunan, and if al-Mūsawi

12. Majma`-ul-Zawa'id 9/57.

13. Al-Majrouhin 1/384, Mīzan al-I'tidal 3/137, al-Tahdhīb 1/654.

wi and his followers do not know who they are, we shall educate them by telling them that whenever a scholar says: “This tradition is quoted by the authors of the books of Sunan,” then this expression refers to the authors of the four books of Sunnah: Abu Dawoud, Tirmidhi, Nasā’ī and Ibn Majah. As for the report, Ibn Kathir describes it by saying: “It is extremely munkar,”¹⁴ meaning that the narration’s chain, as well as its text, is corrupt. The chain is full of weak transmitters, whose status is similar to Al-Mūsawi’s. As for the text then Shaykh-ul-Islam has clarified its issues in al-Minhaj¹⁵ so refer to it for further reading.

8- Al-Mūsawi returns with another bald-faced lie on [12/40] when he says: “Have you noticed what your Lord did with the person who openly denied their authority saying, O Allah! If this Message is truly from Thee, then let stones fall upon us.” He writes in the footnotes: “Al-Hākim narrates it in (the chapter of) Tafsīr al-Ma`arij in his Al-Mustadrak.” This is a lie that is known to anyone who reviews al-

14. Tafsir Ibn Kathir 2/660.

15. Minhaj-ul-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah 7/138,143.

Hākim's Mustadrak¹⁶ and it contains nothing other than the narration of Sa`īd bin Jubayr: {A questioner asked for a punishment bound to happen}[70:1] He said: The questioner is al-Nadir bin al-Ḥarīth bin Kuldah, he said: "O Lord, if this was the truth you have brought us then make it rain down stones from the sky." This is what al-Hākim wrote and it is exactly what Ibn Jarīr reported¹⁷ as a cause of revelation. As you saw, there was no mention of `Ali or his household, but it seems that al-Mūsawi is imaginative and fallacious.

9- Al-Mūsawi says on [12/41, 42]: "And they are the people of al-A`raf {and on [its] elevations are men who recognize all by their mark.}[7:46]" And he wrote as footnote: "Al-Hākim, too, has quoted `Ali (as) saying: "We shall stand, on the Day of Judgment, between Paradise and Hell, and we shall recognize those who support us by their mark and would let them enter Paradise, and we shall recognize those who hate us also by their marks." Salman al-Farisi is quoted saying: "I have heard the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him and his progeny, saying: `O `Ali! You and the appointed ones from your

16. Mustadrak al-Hākim 2/545.

17. Tafsir al-Tabari 9/152.

descendants are on the A`raf.”” This is what al-Mūsawi fabricated. As for the narration of Salman that he claims to have quoted from the Mustadrak, then it isn’t found in the book he claims to have quoted it from.¹⁸ Due to this, he did not mention a reference page. Is this man a reliable source? Or is this how one becomes a leader? It surely is no stretch from the ordinary for such a man to fabricate these letters. I add, what virtue is there for `Ali and his household in counting them from the people of A`raf?! The people of A`raf are those who are detained by the walls between heaven and hell after all the people had already went to their destinations, this is because their deeds do not entitle them to enter heaven but they are also not from the dwellers of hell, Allah says about them: {And between them will be a partition, and on [its] elevations are men who recognize all by their mark. And they call out to the companions of Paradise, “Peace be upon you.” They have not [yet] entered it, but they long intensely. - And when their eyes are turned toward the companions of the Fire, they say, “Our Lord, do not place us with the wrongdoing people.”}[7:46-47] So I ask, isn’t this an insult to `Ali and his family?

18. Al-Mustadrak 2/350.

10- Al-Mūsawi said in his book describing Ahlul-Bayt: “They are the men of truth about whom He says: {Among the Believers are men who fulfilled their promise unto Allah}.” He writes in the footnotes: “Al-Hākim, while interpreting this verse as quoted in al-Tibrisi’s *Majma`ul Bayan fi Tafsīr al-Qur’an*, cites `Umar bin Thābit quoting Abu Ishaq quoting `Ali, peace be upon him, saying: “On our own behalf was this verse revealed.” This also is in Letter 12 where he presents Qur’anic evidence. Those who checked the chain would already know how weak this narration is. It’s literally loaded with weak narrators. As for his claim that al-Hākim reported it, then, this is another lie and al-Hākim’s book only contains the narration of Talḥah bin `Ubaydullah who is one of the people mentioned in the verse.¹⁹

What further proves that this was not found in al-Hākim’s book, is that the man never even quoted it from his book, rather he quoted it from *Majma`-ul-Bayan* which is a Imami Shiite Tafsīr book written by al-Tabrasi (d. 548 AH). Al-Mūsawi was supposed to bind Sunnis from what is from their own books, as he said he would in his intro-

19. Al-Mustadrak 2/450.

duction, but this is the deceptive path that he chose to take, one that is taken by those from his sect.

11- He says in the same letter: “They (Ahlul-Bayt) are those who exalt Him in the verse {His name be mentioned therein; exalting Him within them in the morning and the evenings}[24:36].” In the footnotes he writes a report by Dahyah al-Kalbi:

{And when they see trade or amusement, they rush to it, leaving you standing (for prayers alone)}[62:11], thus: “Dahyah al-Kalbi once came from Syria on a Friday with a merchandise of foodstuff ... People, therefore, rushed to him, leaving the Prophet (peace be upon him) standing on the pulpit preaching with only `Ali, al-Ḥasan, al-Ḥusayn, Fatimah ... had it not been for the presence of these persons, He would have set the city on fire and hurled stones at its inhabitants as He did with the people of Lut.””

Al-Mūsawi’s ignorance knows no bounds as he continues with his

chaotic methodology and here is the reply to what he said: First of all, what does the cause of revelation of Surat-al-Nour have to do with the last verse of Surat al-Jumu`ah?

If a man speaks outside his field then he brings upon himself a shame that cannot be washed away by water or sand! This is the answer to his lie:

As for this report, we have no clue from where he got it from?!

This tradition is without a source, and thus his attribution to Ibn `Abbas is useless and raises suspicions, why else would he not mention its source?! This is no doubt a lie attributed to him. How could it be anything else when Ibn `Abbas narrated something else instead?! We also found nothing in relation to this in the chapters of al-Nour and al-Jumu`ah.

Al-Mūsawi who made it a habit of his to quote from the book of al-Wahīdi seems to have avoided doing so this time, simply because it contains a narration that mentions Abu Bakr and `Umar being from amongst those not distracted by commerce.²⁰ If al-Mūsawi was the

20. Asbab-ul-Nuzoul 448,449.

least bit honest, he would have returned to our original sources, such as Bukhari²¹ and Muslim²² to read about how Abu Bakr and `Umar remained with the Prophet (peace be upon him) instead of al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn who weren't born at the time! Fatimah, was also incorrectly inserted into the narration, for it talks about men praying the Friday Prayer! The proof of this is the verse itself which says {Men whom neither commerce nor sale distracts from the remembrance of Allah}[24:37] The verse clearly addresses “men”, not women.

I add that if anyone deserves to be set on fire and that stones be hurled on him that would be the Shiites, since unfortunately a lot of them do not pray the Friday Prayer,²³ some Shiites even leave the Friday Prayer out of fear that it may lead to usurping the right and position of the hidden Imam.²⁴

12- In [26/127] regarding Hadith-ul-Dar, where the Prophet (peace be upon him) invites his household for a feast, al-Mūsawi attributes

21. Sahih al-Bukhari, Kitab-ul-Tafsir 4899.

22. Sahih Muslim with Sharh Nawawi , Kitab-ul-Jumu`ah 6/151.

23. In `Iraq today it is only al-Shaykh al-Khalisi in Masjid al-Safawi in al-Sahn al-Kadhimi who establishes Friday prayers for the Shiites.

24. Muftah-ul-Karamah, Kitab al-Salat, 2/69.

it to Ahmad, al-Nasā'ī in his al-Khasā'is, and al-Hākim, he then said: “And others from the authors of Sunan (reported it) with generally accepted avenues.” These are clear lies, and there is no agreement on its acceptance as opposed to what he stated, nor is it in any of the Sunan, rather it isn't authentic at all and reaches us through a weak chain in addition to it being munkar (rejected). We also like to point out a part that al-Mūsawi had removed from the text as it opposed his views, thus cementing his unreliability, because when he mentioned `Ali sleeping in the bed of the Prophet (peace be upon him) on the day of Hijrah (immigration), he removed the part that mentions Abu Bakr accompanying the Prophet (peace be upon him) to the cave alone, a merit that none of the other Companions received. This is stated clearly: “...Then he slept in his place while the pagans stoned him (until) And the Messenger left to the conquest of Tabouk...” Al-Mūsawi knew that this was a merit that `Ali shared with others so he crossed out all virtues for the Shaykhayn and the rest of the Companions whom he and his people curse. However, the caravan progresses while the dogs bark away!

13- Al-Mūsawi quoted `Ali in [34/144]: “He has also said: “By Allah! I am his brother, wali, his cousin, and the inheritor of his knowledge; who else is more worthy of it than me?”” He said in its footnotes: “It is quoted by al-Dhahabi in his Talkhīs, where the author does not dispute its authenticity.” This is another one of his usual lies. Al-Hākim himself did not authenticate it so that al-Dhahabi may dispute it or not, both men were silent and never commented on this Hadith.²⁵ What al-Dhahabi did was weaken the narration; we read in al-Mīzan²⁶ that he said: “And this Hadith is munkar.” Are you now aware of the reliability of al-Mūsawi’s quotations now?!

14- He wrote in [48/169]: “Consider his statement, peace be upon him and his progeny, ‘O Fatimah! Are you not pleased that Allah, the Unique, the Sublime, has looked unto the inhabitants of the earth and chose from among them two men: one of them is your father and the other is your husband?’” The traitor then wrote in the footnotes: “This is quoted by al-Hākim in his authentic Al-Mustadrak, and it is narrated by many authors of books of Sunan, all testifying to its au-

25. Mustadrak al-Hākim with al-Talkhis 3/136.

26. Mīzan al-Itidal 5/309.

thenticity.” Another great lie as this was not reported by the authors of the four Sunan nor any of the other authors of Sunan nor did anyone authenticate it except al-Hākim²⁷ whose authentications in his book al-Mustadrak are unreliable due to his old age. Al-Hākim himself has accused its narrator - who is also one of al-Hākim’s teachers - Abu Bakr ibn abi Darim of lies, thus showing that his authentication of it was an error on his part. In addition, since when was al-Hākim’s book referred to as a “Sahih”? Or is it only the empty wishes of al-Mūsawi? He then says, “Many authors of Sunan,” as if they are by the hundreds. Could he not name a few authors who mentioned it?!

15- He said in [48/171]: “Among those who have admitted that `Ali is the one who is acquainted with the secrets of all prophets combined is the Shaykh of all men of knowledge, namely Muhiyud-Din ibn al-`Arabi, as quoted by the learned al-Sha`rani.” And it is as if this deviant was praising himself in the mirror, since Ibn `Arabi is known for his great deviancy in his books such as al-Fusous and al-Futouhat Al-Makiyyah, and he would say things like: “The Awli-

27. Al-Mustadrak 3/140, Dhahabi said: “Fabricated and attributed to Surayj.”

ya' are better than the Prophets and the seal of the Awliya' is better than the seal of the Prophets, and because `Ali was a wali then he is better than the prophets.” Therefore, a deviant like al-Mūsawi praising the heresy found in the books of a philosopher holds no weight, and Allah describes such men in his Book: {Devils from mankind and jinn, inspiring to one another decorative speech in delusion. But if your Lord had willed, they would not have done it, so leave them and that which they invent.}[6:112] Then Allah described those who will listen to them by saying: {And that the hearts of those who believe not in the world to come may incline to it, and that they may be well-pleased with it, and that they may gain what they are gaining.}[6:113]

16- The desperate man mentions in the footnotes of [50/176]: “Suffices you for a proof that `Ali’s soul is akin to that of the Prophet (peace be upon him) to study the verse of Mubahala according to the explanations stated by al-Razi in his exegesis entitled Mafatih al-Ghayb.” This is a lie against al-Razi, since al-Razi in his inter-

pretation of the verse of Mubahalah²⁸ quotes from a Rāfidi Shiite called Mahmoud bin Ḥasan al-Himsi, who resided in al-Ray, that he preferred `Ali over all prophets except Muhammad (peace be upon him), and he used the verse of Mubahalah from Surat Aal-`Imran to back-up his deviancy. Then al-Razi refuted the Rāfidhi. Al-Mūsawi being the sly Rāfidhi that he is, quoted the words of his Shiite companion Mahmoud and attributed them to al-Razi the popular and respected scholar. We say to the Shiites: Is this your leader? With this corrupt methodology and trickery a man becomes a leader and an Ayatullah in your sect?! Instead, you should renounce yourselves from him.

17- So al-Mūsawi claims that the cause of the verse {A Questioner asked}[70:1] was al-Ḥarith bin al-Nu`man al-Fihri who doubted `Ali's Wilayah. He says about this story: "Its authenticity is accepted by many Sunni scholars as a common fact." Then he writes in the footnotes [56/190] as a source: "Refer to what al-Halabi has quoted of the narratives related to the Farewell Pilgrimage in his well-

28. Tafsir al-Razi 8/81.

known biography Al-Sira al-Halabiyya.” Yet, al-Halabi has rejected this story in his book of Sīrah describing it as “a lie”.²⁹ Also who are these “many Sunni scholars” that he speaks of? Wouldn’t it be proper to mention a few to back-up your ridiculous claims?!

18- He quotes, in the letter [74/227], while trying to attack those whom Allah called “mothers of believers”, the Prophet’s (peace be upon him) death from al-Bukhari:

When the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him and his progeny, became seriously sick, he went out ... reclining on two persons; one of them was `Abbas bin `Abdul Muttalib and another man ... I informed `Abdullah bin `Abbas about what `A’ishah had said, and he responded ... `Do you know the name of the man whom `A’ishah did not name?’ I said: `No.’ he said: `He was `Ali bin Abi Tālib.

This was the authentic report found in Bukhari and it doesn’t con-

29. Sirah al-Halabiyyah 3/309.

tain much material that al-Mūsawi can work with, so he found one version of it that contains a corrupt addition which suites his taste.³⁰

That addition states according to al-Mūsawi: “The narrator continues to say that `A’ishah does not wish `Ali any good.” We notice three things about this addition:

A- He claimed that the authors of the Sunan reported this addition and none of them did so, meaning he’s a liar.

B- He said about the addition that “Reporters of this Hadith are considered trustworthy according to the consensus of scholars,” and he is not aware that trustworthiness of the narrators is not enough to claim authenticity without the remaining conditions. This is an addition by Ma`mar’s and Yunus’ narrations from Al-Zuhri that cannot be found in other narrations from Al-Zuhri.

C- His accusation of al-Bukhari when he said: “... Al-Bukhari omitted it and wrote only what preceded it from this Hadith as is his habit.” How odd is this liar, he thinks all people are like him and his

30. Al-Tabaqat al-Kubra 2/29.

people, although as you know by now, `Abdul-Ḥusayn has done this plenty of times already; what does he even know about al-Bukhari and his scientific methodology?! Whoever looks into al-Kafi, the Shiite book that equals al-Bukhari's in value according to the Rafidah, will realize the blessings.

19- Al-Mūsawi says in [80/243]:

It is a fact well-known by those who research the events that prevented the members of the Prophet's household (as), the custodians of the Message, from attending the allegiance [inauguration] ceremony. They were detained at `Ali's house together with Salman, Abu Dharr al-Ghifari, al-Miqdad bin al-Aswad al-Kindi, `Ammār bin Yasir, al-Zubayr bin al-Awwam, Khuzaymah bin Thābit, Ubay bin Ka`b, Farwah bin `Amr bin Wadqah al-Ansari, al-Bara' bin `Azib, Khalid bin Sa`d bin al-`As al-Amawi, and many others. So, how can it be said that there was a

consensus?’’

No doubt that upon reading this, anybody with the slightest knowledge about the Prophet's life will be certain that: Either that he, along with all Rafidha, are from the most ignorant of people about the lives of the Companions; they do not take care about the Prophet's (peace be upon him) biography, since they [don't] know about his closeness to his Companions, or that he has an exceptional audacity when it comes to lying, just like all of his Rāfidhi comrades, who copy blindly from their ancestor's books; they take whatever suites their desires and dismiss the rest. Every man he had listed as having abandoned their pledge of allegiance to Abu Bakr has been wrongly accused of this.

As for this giant list of names, then it is most certainly not accurate at all nor was any of this nonsense established, rather the only man who was authentically documented to not have given Abu Bakr a pledge of allegiance was Sa`d bin `Ubadah al-Ansari. He then mentions `Ali's pledge to Abu Bakr from al-Sahihayn and that it took place after six months, and that he only gave it when he found it necessary for the well-being of Islamic society in those rough circumstances.

However, this analysis is from al-Mūsawi's pocket and nothing in it is backed by evidence nor did he point to any sources, rather the Sa-hihayn's narration shows that `Ali was on very good terms with Abu Bakr. Also, it was authentically reported by al-Bayhaqi³¹ that `Ali's pledge to Abu Bakr was given in the first or second day.

31. Al-Bidayah wal-Nihayah 6/306 attributing it to al-Bayhaqi.

Chapter Two

Sections that Contain Alterations

These are the sections in which Al-Mūsawī quotes a text and alters it, which is a form of deception.

1- Al-Mūsawī said in letter [12/45]:

About their triumph in many trials and the magnitude of their patience, the Almighty says: {Among people is one who sells his life in return for Allah's Pleasure; Allah is Clement towards His servants.}[2:207]

Then he says in the footnote:

“Al-Hākīm quotes Ibn `Abbas saying: “Ali has bartered his own life and has, indeed, put on the Prophet's garb.” Al-Hākīm testifies to the authenticity of this hadith according to the endorsement of both Shaykhs, although the latter did not narrate it them-

selves. In his *Talkhīs al-Mustadrak*, al-Dhahabi admits the same.

This is another shameful distortion as al-Hākim never said: “Authentic according to the endorsement of the two Shaykhs.” He only said, “Its chain is authentic,”³² and al-Dhahabi agreed with this. Those that are ignorant are not aware of the differences between an authentic chain and “authentic upon the conditions of both Shaykhs”. The latter is stronger than the former. As for the reality of the matter, it is a weak narration, but this is not our purpose in this book, as we only wish to show the lies and calamities that this man has brought upon the readers.

2- Al-Mūsawi says in the biography of Isma`il bin Khalifah al-Malla'i [16/54]: “And abu Hatim considered his Hadith to be good.” Whereas if we return to the source we find that abu Hatim said: “His words cannot be quoted as evidence and his Hadith is good,”³³ but this thief manipulated the text as he pleased.

32. *Al-Mustadrak* with *Talkhis* 3/143.

33. *Mīzan-ul-Ītidal* 7/327, *al-Tahdhīb* 1/149.

3- Al-Mūsawi says in the biography of `Ammār bin Zurayq [16/97]: “Al-Sulaymani counted him among the Rāfidah as stated by al-Dhahabi in the status of `Ammār in al-Mīzan.” Whereas, in reality, al-Dhahabi said in al-Mīzan: “I have not seen anyone weaken him even if slightly except al-Sulaymani’s words: ‘He is from the Rāfidah’ and Allah knows best about the reliability of this statement.”³⁴ Al-Mūsawi distorted the text to make it appear as if al-Dhahabi was such an extremist that he agreed with al-Sulaymani’s words, but the truth is otherwise.

4- Al-Mūsawi continues his parade of lies until he exposes himself in front of all humanity. He says in the biography of `Ammār bin Mu`awiyah [16/97]: “I do not know anyone who criticized him except al-`Uqayli and there is not a single criticism against him except for being a Shiite.” Al-Mūsawi’s words are very exaggerated as is apparent, in addition to his lie against al-`Uqayli whom he claimed had weakened him because of his Tashayyū`. Al-Dhahabi clarified it in his Mīzan when he wrote: “Abu Bakr ibn `Ayyash asked him: ‘Have

34. Mīzan 5/199.

you heard from Sa`id bin Jubayr?’ He said: ‘No’”³⁵ So al-`Uqayli criticized him for this disconnection in his reports from Sa`id, not as Al-Mūsawi claimed, but this is a distortion that suits his desires.

5- In letter [34/141, 142] he distorted al-Hākim’s commentary on the narration of calling `Ali’s sons with the names of the children of Haroun, where he said that al-Hākim as usual said: “Its chain is authentic”³⁶ and never said “By the endorsement of the two Shaykhs”. Though, the chain has several defects that the unqualified ignorant preachers, such as al-Mūsawi, could never spot.

6- Al-Mūsawi shamelessly said about the narration of Ibn `Umar “You (O `Ali) are my brother in this world and the after-life,” so he wrote in the footnote [34/142]: “Al-Hākim has quoted it ... his Al-Mustadrak as narrated by Ibn `Umar from two authentic sources and endorsed by both Shaykhs. Al-Dhahabi has also quoted it in his Talkhīs, taking its authenticity for granted.” Although al-Dhaha-

35. Mīzan 5/206.

36. Mustadrak 3/183.

bi had commented on both chains, saying: “Jumay` is accused and al-Kahili is terrible in narrating.”³⁷ Let the Shiites judge their own leader `Abdul-Ḥusayn al-Mūsawī, for he has no honor because of the great amount of lies he preaches. Al-Albani has also judged this narration for fabrication narrations in his *Silsilah Da`ifah* #351, so you may check that if you wish.

7- He said in [34/142-143]: “When the mistress of all the women of the world was wed to the master of the Prophet’s progeny (as), the Prophet, peace be upon him and his progeny, said: “O’ Umm Ayman! Bring me my brother.”” He wrote in the footnotes: “Al-Dhahbi, too, has quoted it in his *Talkhīs*, admitting its authenticity.” This is a lie no doubt, since al-Dhahabi rejected it by saying: “This narration is corrupt since Asma’ was in Abyssinia the night of Fatimah’s wedding.”³⁸ Where is this admittance you talk about?! Or is it only your delusions?!

37. Ibid 3/16.

38. Mustadrak 3/173.

8- We continue with al-Mūsawi in his dirty book in which he quotes abu Dharr's Hadith: "...Whoever obeys `Ali has obeyed me and whoever disobeys him has disobeyed me." He lied as is his habit when he wrote in [48/166-167]: "Both authors have relied on the authority of both Shaykhs to endorse this hadith." On the contrary, al-Hākim simply said, "Its chain is authentic," and al-Dhahabi agreed,³⁹ for nobody authenticated it on the conditions of the two Shaykhs, al-Bukhari and Muslim. The Hadith is actually weak for those who wish to know but we will not delve into this matter for our purpose is to expose the lies of this slanderer in his treason towards knowledge.

9- Al-Mūsawi quoted in the letter [48/167] the Hadith of Umm Salamah: "Whoever abuses `Ali has abused me." He comments on it: "Recorded by al-Hākim at the beginning ... Al-Mustadrak as ascertained by both Shaykhs." This isn't true and he never recorded it on the condition of both Shaykhs.⁴⁰

39. Ibid 3/131.

40. Ibid 3/130.

10- The compulsive liar al-Mūsawi when commenting on the story of Yahya bin Ma`in and abu al-Azhar who narrated from `Abdul-Razzaq [48/168]: “O `Ali, you are a master in this life and a master in the after-life...” He wrote in the footnotes that Yahya “inquired about the Nisaburi writer who quotes `Abdul-Razzaq,” But what is actually written by al-Khatib in his Tarikh as recorded by al-Ḥafidh in al-Tahdhīb⁴¹ and by al-Hākim, that he said: “Who is the Naysaburi liar who quotes `Abdul-Razzaq?” This is an intentional fabrication by Al-Mūsawi, for it is clear that this is a statement of rejection by Yahya bin Ma`in, which is why Al-Mūsawi tampered with it. Then he went further in the same footnote and wrote at the end that Ibn Ma`in accepted the report: “Yahya bin Ma`in then believed him and apologized to him.” In reality, Ibn Ma`in told abu al-Azhar: “You are not a liar and the fault in this narration is from someone else (in the chain).” This shows that the narration is a lie as opposed to what al-Mūsawi tried to suggest.

41. Tahdhīb 1/14, Mustadrak 3/138.

11- The Khashabi⁴² author wrote in letter [54/177] about Zayd bin Arqam's Hadith in Tabarani regarding Ghadīr: "With an authentic chain by consensus." Then, he claimed that Ibn Ḥajar authenticated it in the footnote. The truth, however, is that Ibn Ḥajar al-Haytami only quoted a general text for Hadith al-Ghadīr in his book al-Sawa`iq⁴³ and it isn't the version quoted by al-Mūsawi from al-Tabarani, not even close. The deceiver took this opportunity to quote a version of Hadith al-Ghadīr that is much exaggerated and claim that Ibn Ḥajar and the rest agreed on its reliability. The Rafidha, along with al-Mūsawi, add and subtract from narrations, according to their desires, in order to deceive their followers and support their sect.

12- This evil man accused `A'ishah of following her desires, he then called upon his readers to free themselves from the shackles of emotions and to judge her life in an unbiased manner. If these words were from other than him then maybe his words would have some weight, but hearing this from a slanderous Rāfidhi, a man whose

42. Khashabi: Plural of which is Khashabiyyah, meaning "wooden people" it is a derogatory term used to describe some of the early Shiites since they preserved the piece of wood Zayd bin `Ali was crucified on as a holy relic.

43. Al-Sawa`iq al-Muhriqah 1/106 and he authenticated it.

comrades are enemies to the Companions and decedents of Zoroastrians is definitely another story, rather the last person to talk about being freed from the shackles of emotions is this Rāfidhi. He pointed in the footnote of [67/232] to what was written in Sharh-ul-Nahj by Ibn abi al-Hadid and it's all lies invented by the Rafidah about how `A'ishah opposed `Uthman, `Ali, Fatimah, Ḥasan, and Ḥusayn so we challenge them to bring forth one authentic chain proving any of this silliness; how can this be an argument against Ahlul-Sunnah O ignorant ones?! He said:

It is well known, that if the mother of a man's daughter passes away then her father married another, there would be some tension between the daughter and her step-mother... And it just so happened that the Prophet (peace be upon him) leaned towards `A'ishah and loved her a lot which increased Fatimah's distance from her...

These are the words of one of their knights and leaders, where he confesses `A'ishah's value in the heart of the Prophet (peace be upon him), also proving her innocence from having enmity towards Fati-

mah and explaining that this was only a race to win the love of the Prophet (peace be upon him). This has cut `Abdul-Husayn's tongue and I would think that they would use Taqiyyah as an excuse as is their habit throughout the times.

13- Al-Mūsawi brought up something he thought would lower from the status of `Umar bin al-Khattab. He said in [76/235]:

Whenever `Umar bin al Khattab was asked about anything regarding these matters (meaning the death of the Prophet (peace be upon him), he would say nothing other than: “Ask `Ali, since he is the one who can handle it.” Until he reported from Jabir that Ka`b al-Ahbar once asked `Umar: “What were the last words of the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him and his progeny?” `Umar answered: “Ask `Ali.”

And this is certainly a weak fabricated report but what matters to us most here is not to study these narrations but to expose al-Mūsawi for the extremist liar that he is. What he did was that he crossed out

the words of Ka`b al-Ahbar to `Umar: “O Amir-ul-Mu`minin,” and whoever reviews the text in Ibn Sa`d’s book and al-Kanz⁴⁴ will know this, especially since al-Mūsawi quoted it from these books. This devilish behavior shows nothing, but extremism and hatred stored in this man’s heart towards Amir-ul-Mu`minin `Umar bin al-Khattab. This is similar to how the devils flee from `Umar, as the Prophet (peace be upon him) stated, and this action is but proof of him being a minion of the devil. The second thing he did was that he removed the author of al-Kanz’s commentary on this narration, because he weakens it by saying: “and its chain is weak.” But al-Mūsawi concealed this from his readers, since it doesn’t serve his devilish purpose.

14- `Abdul-Ḥusayn al-Mūsawi sunk himself even lower when he accused `A’ishah of bearing a grudge against Mariyah al-Kubtiyyah, and that she accused her of indecency. He says [76/232]:

It suffices for you, as a proof, how sentimentality tempts some people into misbehaving, what we have cited regarding the masters of conspiracy and

44. Al-Tabaqat 2/201, Kanz-ul-`Ummal #18789.

purgery, out of animosity towards Lady Mariyah [the Copt, consort of the Prophet] and her son Ibrāhīm, peace be upon him, till Allah, the Almighty and the Exalted One, cleared them of such unjust accusations at the hands of the Commander of the Faithful (as), in a manner that is tangible and clear.

Relying on the narration of al-Hākim⁴⁵ when Māriyah was accused of having a relation with one of her cousins, and that `A'ishah was from those who spread this rumor. We say: Whoever has the least bit of knowledge about the science of transmission of Hadith, knows that in the chain of this report is Sulayman bin al-Arqam and he is very weak by consensus,⁴⁶ and nobody pays attention to the narrations of these abandoned narrators except those whom Allah decided to misguide. Finally, the narration in al-Mustadrak that he referred us to has nothing to do with the commander of the faithful `Ali bin Abi Tālib, nor did he contribute anything to proving her innocence.

45. Mustadrak 4/41.

46. Mīzan 3279/, Tahdhīb 283/, Majrouhin 1413/.

15- On the footnote of [76/235] he quoted the narration of Ibn `Abbas in which he replies to `Urwah bin al-Zubayr: "...By Allah, the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) passed away while leaning on `Ali's chest and he washed him..." He attributed this to Ibn Sa`d⁴⁷ and to Kanz-ul-`Ummal whose author commented by saying: "Its chain is weak."⁴⁸ `Abdul-Husayn hid this weakening away from the eyes of the readers, even though this weakening is an understatement, since the narrations comes from al-Waqidi who is terribly weak, as well as other unknown narrators. So notice how the leader of the lost herd lies, curses, attacks, authenticates the weak, and weakens the authentic, in a long list of actions that the rational person would avoid, and yet, he his book is still a respected source, when it should be used as footwear instead.

16- The sloth continues to enter the domain of knowledge, when knowledge is free from him. He is like a bat that lies and flees without proving evidences from his claims, inspired by the devil. He claims in the footnote of [82/249] that: "Their threat to `Ali to burn his house

47. Tabaqat 2/202.

48. Kanz-ul-`Ummal #18791.

is proven by absolute tawatur (a multitude of reports). Consider what Imam Ibn Qutaybah has said... And al-Shahristani who quotes al-Nizam while discussing the Nizami group in his book Al-Milal wal-Nihal.” This was actually mentioned by al-Shihristani 1/72 from al-Nadham in the eleventh issue from those which set him apart from the Mu`tazilah, and that is his leaning towards the Rāfidah and his attacks against the senior Companions, then al-Shihristani mentions some of the man’s corrupt beliefs. This shows that al-Shihristani did not accept this story rather he quoted what the deviant man said and then rejected all of his deviancy, so do we still trust `Abdul-Ḥusayn who tried to make it appear as if al-Shihristani was from those who wrote the story and propagated it?! Why don’t the Shiites take an honorable stance for once against the deception of their Shaykhs?!

17- Al-Mūsawi then alters another text in [86/255]: “some saying ‘Come close and watch the Prophet writing you something,’ while others repeated what `Umer had said,’ i.e. ‘The Messenger of Allah is delirious.’” This is truly the peak of deception and corruption, for whoever reviews the narrations knows that when the expression:

“While others repeated what `Umar said,” did not come until after they mentioned what `Umar said: “The Prophet of Allah (peace be upon him) is overcome by pain.”⁴⁹ Then this cheater replaces it with another expression! In the end it is as they say: If you have no shame, then do as you wish!

49. Sahih al-Bukhari in many locations.

Chapter Three

Sections that are Quoted out of Context

These are sections in which he cut took quotes out of context, since the context could be used against him, and this was done by him even with Qur`anic verses.

1- Al-Mūsawi writes in [6/21] that al-Ḥasan said to the people: “Fear Allah regarding us, for we are your rulers.” And he had greatly summarized this report terribly; in reality al-Ḥasan was addressing his followers and those who call themselves “Shiites” because they had attempted to kill him as well, so he said: “O people of `Iraq! Fear Allah with regards to us, for we are your rulers and guests.” As for his words: “We are your rulers”, since he was their ruler, so he was stating the obvious. This is all assuming that it is established because Ibn Ḥajar in Al-Sawa`iq never clarified what his chain was.⁵⁰ So look at how Al-Mūsawi markets his goods through lies in order to deceive his people about the correctness of their faith.

50. Al-Sawa`iq 2/410.

2- Al-Mūsawi wrote in letter [10/32] the narration: “The knowledge of the progeny of Muhammad brings salvation from the Fire, and loving Ahl al-Bayt is walking on the Straight Path. Allegiance to the progeny of Muhammad is a security against the torture.” Then he followed it by this footnote: “This is quoted by the judge `Iyad in a chapter explaining the fact that to venerate the Prophet (peace be upon him) and be worthy of pleasing him is to please his progeny and descendants.” However, the trickster left out a part of what is written by al-Qadi `Iyad, who wrote in his book: “...to please his family, progeny, and the mothers of believers, his wives.”⁵¹ But al-Mūsawi, due to his desires, did what no self-respecting author would dare do. Is such a person to be trusted in his quoting? To them, he is one of their great scholars.

3- Next, the ignoramus hallucinates while trying to show Qur’anic evidence for the greatness of the household. He writes [12/40]:

There is no room to wonder any longer, then, especially when we discern the fact that their authority

51. Al-Shifa 2/46.

has been sanctioned by Allah unto people through His prophets, providing proofs and arguments for it, as indicated by the explanation of His saying: {And ask the Messengers whom We sent before thee}[43:45].

How terrible is his argument and how thick is his head?! He selectively quotes what he wishes and dismisses the rest corrupting Allah's words, his examples is like that of those who forbid prayer by quoting {Woe to those who establish prayer} [107:4] without revealing the rest of the verse. Here is the rest of the verse he quoted {And ask those we sent from our messengers before thee: Have we made gods to be worshipped alongside the Merciful} [43:45]. This is the second part which shows the intention of that question, it is the great cause for which prophets were sent, books were revealed, and people were split between the joyful and the wretched: It is to worship Allah alone. Yet, this man corrupts the meaning to the love of Ahlul-Bayt.

4- The pitiful child then plays around with Ibn Ḥajar's words in [12/41]: "Allah does not expose them to torture,' for they are the security of the inhabitants of earth and mankind's means towards Him." In the footnote he intentionally does not mention Ibn Ḥajar's words, he simply writes: "Refer to Al-Sawa`iq al-Muhriqa by Ibn Ḥajar who interprets the verse of the Almighty: {Allah would not torment them...} as verse 7 of those revealed in their honor ... the author endorses our own view stated here." Here is what Ibn Ḥajar said in that same location: "And regarding this are many narrations, from them is: 'The stars are a safety for the dwellers of the sky just as my household are a safety for my nation,' as reported by a group of scholars with a weak chain. Then in another weak report: 'My household are a safety the dwellers of the earth.'"⁵² This is the level of trustworthiness of Al-Mūsawi.

5- Al-Mūsawi said in [12/41]:

They are the ones of whom people are jealous and
about whom Allah says: {Should they feel jealous

52. Sawa`iq 2/445.

of them because Allah Has granted them His favors} [4:54]? They are the ones who are “deeply grounded in knowledge,” about whom He says: {Those who are deeply grounded in knowledge say: We believe} [3:7].

Observe al-Mūsawi’s confusion as he cuts and pastes random parts of Qur’anic verses. Regarding the second one it says:

{It is He who has sent down to you, [O Muhammad], the Book; in it are verses [that are] precise - they are the foundation of the Book - and others unspecific. As for those in whose hearts is deviation [from truth], they will follow that of it which is unspecific, seeking discord and seeking an interpretation [suitable to them]. And no one knows its [true] interpretation except Allah. But those firm in knowledge say: We believe in it; all [of it] is from our Lord. And no one will be reminded except those of understanding.}[3:7]

Where does it state that this general verse is restricted to the house-

hold when its context is well known?! The first verse's context speaks about the people of Ibrāhīm (as):

{Or do they envy people for what Allah has given them of His bounty? But we had already given the family of Abraham the Scripture and wisdom and conferred upon them a great kingdom. - And some among them believed in it, and some among them were averse to it. And sufficient is Hell as a blaze.}

[4:54-55]

So is it correct for al-Mūsawi to claim that those people are Ah-lul-Bayt when Allah describes them saying {some among them believed in it, and some among them were averse to it}?! The people of Ibrāhīm here even encompasses the Jews so how would he tackle this issue exactly?!

6- Al-Mūsawi proceeds in revealing his level of knowledge in [12/47]. He said:

They have the right dues as the Qur'an has stated:

{And give the near in kin his dues}[17:26] and they have the fifth: nobody's responsibility will be cleared until he defrays it: {Know ye this: whatever ye obtain of spoils, its fifth goes to Allah, the Messenger, and the kinfolk} [8:41]. They are the ones upon whom Allah's favors have been bestowed as implied in this verse: {And what Allah restored to His Messenger from the people of the towns - it is for Allah and for the Messenger and the relatives}[59:7]

How corrupt argument is when he bases it on those verses! What a clear sign it is of his ignorance! What connection is there between the Khums and Fay' with leadership and superiority?! Even orphans, needy, and travelers can also quote these verses to prove their superiority and leadership as they have a share in all of these verses! Will a wise man accept this?! Allah had said in the first verse: {And give to the close relative his due right, and the poor and the stranded traveller and do not be wasteful} And a similar verse can be found in [al-Roum:38] Then the other verse: {Know that whatever you obtain of war booty then to Allah is its fifth and to the messenger, and the close

relative, and the orphan, and the poor, and the stranded traveler}. So why did al-Mūsawi exclude the poor and needy and those who were mentioned in this verse?! As for the third: {And what Allah restored to His Messenger from the people of the towns - it is for Allah and for the Messenger and for near relatives and orphans and the [stranded] traveler - so that it will not be a perpetual distribution among the rich from among you.} Look at al-Mūsawi's crime and how he corrupts and cuts the texts while excluding whatever he wishes from them! Where is the accuracy and honesty when dealing with Allah's book?! Can we still trust this man as a religious figure?!

7- He said in [12/47] while commenting on the verse {Peace upon Elia-seen}[37:130]: “They are the family of Yasin whom Allah greets in the Glorious Qur'an thus: {Peace be unto the family of Yasin}[37:130].” So in the footnote he writes concerning Ibn Ḥajar's position:

“This is the third verse of the ones enumerated by Ibn Ḥajar in Chapter 11 of his AlSawa'iq al-Muhriqa.

The author goes on to say that a group of scholars of exegesis have quoted Ibn `Abbas saying: “The implication of this verse is to send salutations unto Muhammad’s Progeny (as).” Ibn Ḥajar says that al-Kalbi, too, has given it the same meaning, then he adds: “Al-Fakhr al-Razi has stated that the Prophet’s Progeny constitutes his [ʿAli’s] peer in five instances.”

What al-Mūsawi did here, as usual, is that he copied whatever suites his beliefs from the words of the scholar and left out the rest. Here is what he left out from Ibn Ḥajar’s words: “...But the majority of the scholars of Qur’anic exegesis say that what was intended here is Prophet Elias (as) and that is clear from the context.”⁵³ So praise be to Allah who has unveiled al-Mūsawi’s distortions for all to see.

8- He wasn’t any more honest when he used the verse {Allah and His angels send greetings unto the Prophet} [33:56] for he said at [12/47]: “Learned men have included the verse quoted above among others

53. Al-Sawa`iq 2/436.

in their praise. Ibn Ḥajar has listed it in part 11 of his Al-Sawa`iq al-Muhriqa among verses in their praise.” We see Ibn Ḥajar including the wives into the Aal, and he mentioned the narration in al-Sahihayn with regards to this, he said: “They said: ‘How do we send greetings upon you?’ He (peace be upon him) replied: ‘O Lord send greetings upon Muhammad and his wives and progeny as you have sent it upon Ibrāhīm...’”⁵⁴ Al-Mūsawi never mentioned it in his footnote, but he was simply satisfied with the narration of Ka`b bin `Ujrah in the Sahihayn, and not the report of Abi Humayd al-Sa`idi that was mentioned by Ibn Ḥajar because it spoke of the mothers of believers. Indeed, this type of report demolishes all that Al-Mūsawi had built when he excluded the wives from the blessed greeting: {Say, “Die in your rage. Indeed, Allah is Knowing of that within the breasts.”} [3:119]

9- In the biography of al-Ḥarīth bin Ḥasirah [16/61] al-Mūsawi quoted abu Hatim’s words regarding him from al-Mīzan, but he removed an important part. He had said: “He is from the old Shiites, if

54. Al-Sawa`iq 2/430, Bukhari #3369,6360, Muslim #407.

al-Thawri hadn't narrated from him he would have been abandoned.” He removed the part about al-Thawri proving his weakness. We do not intend to make a judgment on this narrator because the people of knowledge have done so, but we only wish to expose al-Mūsawi's condition. In fact, if Ibn `Adi had seen what we have seen from al-Mūsawi he would have surely described him as he described al-Ḥarith: “From those who are flowing with extreme Tashayyu`.”

10- In the biography of al-Ḥasan bin Ṣaliḥ bin Ḥay [16/64] al-Mūsawi quoted Ibn Sa`d's words about him: “He was trustworthy, with many correct narrations, and he was Shiite.” Why does al-Mūsawi, in this case, accept Ibn Sa`d's authentication of al-Ḥasan bin Ṣaliḥ? Didn't he previously criticize Ibn Sa`d; accusing him of being hostile towards Shiite narrators? Why then did he authenticate al-Ḥasan as quoted by al-Mūsawi? We remind the reader of what al-Mūsawi said in [16/63] when discussing al-Ḥarith: “Among those who bore grudge against al-Ḥarith was Muhammad bin Sa`d who included al-Ḥarith's biography in Volume 6 of his *Tabaqāt*, saying that al-Ḥarith speaks ‘maliciously.’ He does not do al-Ḥarith, nor any other Shī`a notable,

any justice even when it comes to knowledge or feats.” But why was al-Ḥasan bin Ṣaliḥ not weakened for his Tashayyu`?! And just so that we can further humiliate al-Mūsawi and his cult, we found in Sunan abu Dāwūd a narration by al-Ḥasan where he confirms wiping the Khuffayn and this contradicts the general Shiite opinion. This shows that al-Ḥasan was never an extremist like al-Mūsawi. Also, if one were to check the footnotes of al-Muraja`āt, one will discover that the author often quotes Tabaqāt Ibn Sa`d, so why would the double standards?!

11- In [16/68] he quoted Ibn Sa`d's statement about Khalid bin Makhlad and crossed out the part he dislikes. Ibn Sa`d said: “He was an extreme Shiite; they wrote from him out of necessity.”⁵⁵ Al-Mūsawi quoted Ibn Sa`d to have said, “He was a Shiite.” By doing so, proving that he isn't trustworthy. As for this Khalid whom al-Mūsawi claims was from his party, al-Bukhari had narrated from him a narration in the virtue of al-Zubayr from `Uthman's narration.⁵⁶ Can he still consider Khalid a Shiite?!

55. Tabaqat 6/372.

56. Sahih al-Bukhari #3717.

12- In the biography of Salamah bin al-Fadl al-Abrash, he crossed out what he dislikes and presented to his readers what suites his Madhab. The statement of the scholars in al-Mīzan and al-Tahdhīb were removed. As for abu Zur`ah's words, he tampered with them. Abu Zur`ah says, as quoted by al-Dhahabi: "The people of opinion avoided him because of his bad opinions and oppression."⁵⁷ However, al-Mūsawi in all dishonesty removed the words "and oppression" for the man was a judge in that area and it seems they saw acts of oppression by him so they disliked him for this, in addition to his Shiite innovations. Instead, al-Mūsawi wrote [16/71]: "Actually, their attitude is due to their own views regarding all followers of the household of the Prophet (peace be upon him)." al-Mūsawi has truly exposed his lack of intellect in this book.

13- Al-Muraja`āt insists on sinking deeper from darkness to darkness when it discusses the biography of Sulayman bin Qarm. Its author removed the statement of Ibn Hibbān quoted by al-Dhahabi and al-Ḥafidh: "He was an extreme Rāfidhi who used to tamper with the nar-

57. Mīzan 3273/, Tahdhīb 276/.

rations.”⁵⁸ Al-Mūsawi in [16/73] removed the part about tampering with narrations to give his readers the impression that the man was only rejected because of his Tashayyu`. In reality, Ibn Ḥibbān’s statement is counted as Jarh-Mufassar⁵⁹ which is given precedence over whoever has praised the man. Not only that, but al-Mūsawi hid from his followers what Sulayman narrated from a member of Ahlul-Bayt called `Abdullah bin al-Ḥasan. He said: “I asked `Abdullah bin al-Ḥasan: ‘Are there disbelievers among the people of the Qiblah?’ He replied: ‘Yes, the Rāfidah.’”⁶⁰ This narration represents the reality of the beliefs of Sulayman and he is far from the Rafidah! Al-Mūsawi’s cheap tactics would not help us reach truth nor dispel falsehood.

14- In the biography of `Abdul-Razzāq al-San`āni [16/85], the author removed the words from al-Dhahabi in his refutation of the weakening of `Abdul-Razzāq by al-`Abbas bin `Abdul-`Adhim. Al-Dhahabi says: “On the contrary, most of the scholars of Hadith and Imams of knowledge take his (`Abdul-Razzāq’s) words as legitimate evidence

58. Mīzan 3310/, Tahdhīb 2105/.

59. Jarh-Mufassar: Criticism of a narrator may be unexplained (Mubham) or explained (Mufassar).

60. Mīzan 3/310.

except for only a few rejected reports from his vast narrations.”⁶¹ This corruption by the untrustworthy Al-Mūsawi is explicit; he thinks that by doing so nobody will go back to the original text and uncover what this confused person quoted. Al-Mūsawi also left out the part about the manakir or the rejected narrations that `Abdul-Razzāq has narrated. Then, later on, when quoting one of these Manakir in which `Abdul-Razzāq narrates a Hadith that criticizes `Umar bin al-Khattab,⁶² al-Mūsawi intentionally ignores al-Dhahabi’s declaration that the Hadith was weak!

15- In the biography of `Atiyyah bin Sa`d al-`Awfi [16/91], al-Mūsawi decides to remove Ibn Sa`d’s statement that implies the man’s weakness. Ibn Sa`d said: “He was reliable and had some good narrations but some of the scholars do not accept his words as evidence.”⁶³ Al-Mūsawi, due to his dishonesty and hypocrisy, removed the last part.

16- Similarly, when talking about `Ali bin Ghurab [16/95], he also

61. Ibid 4/343.

62. Ibid 4/344.

63. Tabaqat 6/305.

removed Ibn Sa`d's words: "He is honest but has some weakness."⁶⁴ He didn't even count him as being from the Shiites, but al-Mūsawi had the audacity to hide all of this.

17- Also when it came to `Ali bin Qadim al-Khuza`i al-Kūfi, he cut-out a part of Ibn Sa`d's statement. Ibn Sa`d described him saying, "He was mumtani` and munkar in Hadith and extreme in his tashayyu`."⁶⁵ Al-Mūsawi removed the first two descriptions condemning the man and left only the last part. Yet his Shiite followers still refer to him as a great Imam even after all his manipulation of religious texts.

18- When discussing al-Fudhayl bin Marzouq [16/99] al-Mūsawi removed a part of al-Dhahabi's words that he disliked. Al-Dhahabi said: "He was known for his Tashayyu` but he never abused the Companions."⁶⁶ This clearly shows al-Mūsawi's love to curse and abuse the Companions, may Allah be pleased with them. Why else

64. Ibid 6/363.

65. Ibid 6/371.

66. Mīzan 5/440.

would this part bother him so much that he had to remove it?!

19- Al-Mūsawi thinks that by deleting texts he had concealed the truth from people's eyes, it is as our predecessors said: "They only record what suits them."

After listing Ibn `Abbas's Hadith which contained "Ten virtues exclusively for `Ali", the Prophet (peace be upon him) said at the end: "Whomsoever considers me his mawla then `Ali is his mawla." [26/128] Al-Mūsawi found this sufficient but the trickster had removed the following part that comes after it: Ibn `Abbas said:

Allah has told us in the Qur'an that he was pleased with the Companions at the tree, He knew what was in their hearts and He never said that he was angry at them after it. The Prophet (peace be upon him) had told `Umar when he asked for permission: "Permit me to strike his neck!" He (peace be upon him) replied: "Would you? Maybe Allah had favored the people of Badr and said: 'Do as you wish I have par-

done you.’”

This was the part that was taken out by the criminal, the part that announces the virtues of the people of Badr and those who pledged under the tree, like Abu Bakr, `Umar, and `Uthman who was the main reason this event even occurred, to avenge him after rumours of his death had spread, so may Allah be pleased with the Companions of our Prophet (peace be upon him). These virtues will remain a thorn in the throats of innovators and a reason for the guardians of faith to rejoice while their opponents perish in their rage.

20- When writing the footnote in [32/137], he quoted from Ibn `Abdul-Bar his words concerning the Hadith of Zayd bin Abi Awfa where he said: “However, in the chain there is weakness.”⁶⁷ But al-Mūsawi concealed this information. Not only that, but he also did the same for a part of the narration of fraternity, not because of its length, but because it contains explicit praise for some Companions such as Abu Bakr, `Umar, `Uthman, `Abdul-Raḥmān, Talḥah, and al-Zubayr,

67. Al-Isti`ab 1/595.

like in Al-Mu`jam Al-Kabeer Al-Tabarani.⁶⁸ We say to the Shiites: If you truly believe in the authenticity of this narration then return to the original source and read the complete text that contains within it what is sufficient to destroy the faith of your sect.

21- During his presentation of the narrations concerning Amir Al-Mu`mineen `Ali bin Abi Tālib being the city of knowledge, he wrote in the footnote of [48/165]: “This is quoted by al-Tirmidhi in his Sahih, in addition to Ibn Jarīr, and from them it is quoted by several authorities such as al-Muttaqi al-Hindi... He quotes Ibn Jarīr saying: ‘This is a tradition of which’s authenticity we are quite sure of.’” Al-Mūsawi hid parts of the statement of Ibn Jarīr al-Tabari, who was not sure about its authenticity and even cited reasons for its weakness. He said: “This report has an authentic chain, but it is weak according to the methodology of other scholars for two defects...”⁶⁹ So al-Mūsawi removed the rest of the man’s commentary to give the illusion that al-Tabari had no doubt over the authenticity. As for al-Tirmidhi, al-Mūsawi wrote as we saw above: “This is

68. Al-Mu`jam al-Kabir lil-Tabarani #5146.

69. Tahdhīb al-Athar (Musnad `Ali) 173.

quoted by al-Tirmidhi in his Sahih.” Now anyone reading this will most certainly think al-Tirmidhi considers it authentic right? However, al-Mūsawi left out al-Tirmidhi’s commentary where he says: “This narration is odd and rejected.”⁷⁰ The quoting of it by al-Muttaqi al-Hindi does not mean that it becomes authentic for us, nor is al-Muttaqi qualified to make these judgments, and his book contains both the precious and the worthless, for it is more of an index. As for this ignoramus’ statement: “Al-Tirmidhi reported it in his Sahih,” we ask: Since when did al-Tirmidhi have a “Sahih”?!

22- `Abdul-Ḥusayn in letter [48/172] lists forty narrations suggesting `Ali’s superiority and right to acquire leadership. He quotes the narration of abu Dharr that the Prophet (peace be upon him) said: “By the One who holds my soul in His hand, among you is a man who will fight the people after me over the interpretation of the Qur’an just as I have fought for its revelation.” The Rāfidhi quoted it from Kanz-ul-`Ummal #32969 but he intentionally and maliciously removed the words, “Although they bear witness that there is no god

70. Sunan-ul-Tirmidhi #3723.

except Allah.” This confirms their Islam even though they fought `Ali, yet al-Mūsawi out of deep hatred and extremism decided to follow in the footsteps of the Jews and corrupt the texts. We add that this narration he quoted could even be referring to Abu Bakr al-Sid-dīq since he fought those who withheld alms for their interpretation of the Qur’an. It was he who said to `Umar, “I will continue to fight those that distinguish between the prayer and the alms.”

23- The slanderer then went on to insult the servant of the Prophet (peace be upon him) Anas bin Mālik [56/185] by saying: “There may have been others who hated to testify, such as Anas bin Mālik and others who received their due punishment in lieu of the prayers of the Commander of the Faithful,” This is exactly the type of hypocrisy that the Prophet (peace be upon him) described when he said: “The sign of the hypocrites is their hatred for the Ansar.”⁷¹ The narration he quoted in the footnotes is where Anas refrains from testifying to `Ali is corrupt and non-authentic. Whoever returns to the book al-Ma`arif by Ibn Qutaybah al-Dinawari will find out the truth: “He,

71. Sahih al-Bukhari in the merits of the Ansar #17.

peace be upon him, said to him: ‘Why don’t you stand with other companions of the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) and testify to what you heard of him then?’ He answered: ‘O Commander of the Faithful! I have grown old, and I have forgotten it.’ `Ali said: ‘If you are telling a lie, then may Allah strike you with a white [disease, i.e. leprosy] which your turban cannot conceal.’ Abu Muhammad said: This report is baseless.”⁷² As you can see dear reader, Ibn Qutaybah rejects the report, as it is a baseless fabrication, but al-Mūsawi did not feel like quoting his commentary although he found this narration in his book! As for his claim that Anas was struck by the prayer of `Ali, it is inaccurate to say the least. Al-Mūsawi writes: “A testimony for its authenticity exists when Imam Ahmed bin Hanbal quotes: ‘They all, except three men, rose to testify; and those three fell under the effect of his curse.’” The reader should know that they never announced who those three men were but maybe `Abdul-Ḥusayn went back with a time machine to find out their identities and include Anas! What is sillier is that al-Mūsawi himself has quoted from al-Suyuti at [56/189] that Anas was from the narrators of this Hadith, so he contradicted himself when he claimed he was from

72. Al-Ma`arif 194,195.

those who concealed it. Do note that the narration in Musnad Ahmad has a weakness as well.

24- In footnote of letter [69/215-216] he attributed a lie to al-Imam al-Sindi when quoting his commentary on `A`ishah's Hadith: "It is quite obvious that such a Hadith [by the mother of the believers] does not rule out the existence of the will prior to her statement, nor does it prove that he (peace be upon him) had died suddenly without being able to leave a will or could have thought of doing so, since he came to know that his end was approaching even before falling sick." These words by al-Sindi had a continuation that was not written down by al-Mūsawi's cursed pen. He adds:

Yes, he might leave `Ali a will concerning the Qur'an and the Sunnah and this is because the will with regards to these two is not restricted to `Ali, but it is a general one for all believers, but if this will was about wealth then he left behind no wealth so that he may write a will concerning it, and Allah knows best.⁷³

73. Hashiyat al-Sindi `ala al-Nasa'i 6/551.

Al-Mūsawi's did not include this text since it did not show an appointment for `Ali. Ironically, Al-Mūsawi was correct in saying: "If you scrutinize this statement, you will find it quite strong."

25- The scholars used to say: "Whoever writes a book, then it is as if he placed his brain on a plate for all to see." Al-Mūsawi's rotten plate contains more deception in [80/242] when mentioning the sermon of the commander of the faithful `Umar bin al-Khattab at the end of his reign where he discusses important matters pertaining to the appointment of Abu Bakr as recorded by al-Bukhari.⁷⁴ al-Mūsawi as usual removes parts and by doing so deforms whatever text he quotes: "And none of you were revered and admired by the people as much as Abu Bakr was." However, the Rāfidhi will not tolerate any praise for this man. It is strange how the people of his sect trust his tamperings after he has proven that fraud is his profession.

26- The foolish Khashabi⁷⁵ continues his barrage of hatred against

74. Sahih al-Bukhari #6830.

75. Khashabi: Plural of which is Khashabiyah, meaning "wooden people" it is a

the Companions of Muhammad (peace be upon him). He writes in [94/275]:

The Prophet (peace be upon him) has said: “This is the first horn [of the devil] coming out in my nation. Had you killed him, no two men would have disputed with each other. The children of Isra’eel split into seventy-two groups, and this nation shall split into seventy-three groups all of which, except one, will go to Hell.”

The pathetic man left out the rest of the narration as expected. It continues: “We said: ‘O Prophet (peace be upon him)! Which group?’ He said: ‘al-Jama`ah⁷⁶’. Yazīd al-Raqqashi said to Anas: ‘O Aba Hamzah, who are the Jama`ah?’ He repeated twice: ‘Those who gather and unite around the chief.’” This is the description of the Jama`ah and they are the furthest people from the Rāfidah who left the nation, divided into sects, and rejected the chiefs.

derogatory term used to describe some of the early Shiites since they preserved the piece of wood Zayd bin `Ali was crucified on as a holy relic.

76. Jama`ah: In Islamic terminology means the united majority of Muslims, not the rebels or isolationists or sects.

Chapter Four

Sections that Contain Outright Lies

These are the sections that contain lies in claims and not simply the manipulation of quotes:

1- `Abdul-Ḥusayn Sharaf-ul-Din al-Mūsawi cannot find evidences for his goals, for his tongue is winder than his mind. He deceptively states in the footnote of letter [8/24] when researching the chains of Hadith al-Thaqalayn: “Imam Ahmed includes it among the Ahadith narrated by Zayd bin Thābit from two authentic chains one of which is stated at the beginning of page 182, and the other at the conclusion of page 189, Vol. 5.”

The only thing he was right about was that Ahmad included it,⁷⁷ but what he lied about was that it had two chains, when in fact it has only one single chain (from Shareek from al-Rukayn from Qasim from Zayd bin Thābit) that was repeated in two locations. Furthermore, it

77. Musnad Ahmad 35/456,512 numbers 21578 & 21654.

isn't authentic as he claimed, and since when did he know anything about authenticity?! Revise their books of Shias to learn the value of the chains of transmission in their eyes.

2- Al-Mūsawi while baselessly arguing for the sake of arguing writes about the Wilayah of `Ali and the Imams in [12/44]: “And He said concerning them and their followers {Indeed, they who have believed and done righteous deeds - those are the best of creatures} [98:7].” Then he followed it by this footnote: “Suffices you for proof the fact that Ibn Ḥajar has admitted its revelation in their own honor, counting it among the verses in their favor...”⁷⁸ This is a lie since Ibn Ḥajar never admitted anything, he only quoted it without any commentary in a long list of reports he was writing, some of which he weakened, and others that he simply never commented on. The entire purpose of that chapter in Ibn Ḥajar’s book was to collect any narration that states that a certain verse was revealed concerning Ah-lul-Bayt, but not to establish and confirm it. It is only his delusions and those of his comrades’; for when they felt they couldn’t bring up

78. Al-Sawa`iq 2/467

even one verse to prove `Ali's appointment and that of his children, they lied upon Allah and corrupted the texts to further misguide their followers.

3- Another lie is when he said that Ahlul-Sunnah accept the legitimacy of `Abdullah bin Maymoun al-Qaddah and authenticate him. None of the scholars have authenticated this man. On the contrary, there is consensus on his weakness. As for what he wrote in [16/85] that "Tirmidhi relied upon him." This is incorrect, he did narrate from him, but that is very different than to consider him a Hujjah as he said, and to rely on his Hadith. Tirmidhi actually wrote: "Abdullah ibn Maymoun, his Hadith is rejected."⁷⁹ How does Al-Mūsawi dare to claim that Al-Tirmidhi relied upon him?!

4- He lies again when implying that Ahlul-Sunnah authenticate Nufay' bin al-Ḥarīth, although nobody reported that this man's narrations were acceptable.⁸⁰ Mūsawi wrote [16/108]: "Sufyan, Hammam,

79. Tahdhīb 2/442.

80. Mīzan 746/, Tahdhīb 4239/.

Sharīk and a group of the most renowned scholars of such caliber have all quoted him. Al-Tirmidhi relies on him in his own Sahih.” Since when has the narration of the scholars from certain people become equal to authenticating them?! They used to take narrations from everyone and only then pick out the good narrations from the bad, or narrate the bad in order to identify those who narrated them. Who narrated a hadith with a chain is free of any blame and the narration of a reliable narrator from a weak one is not a form of authentication. As for al-Tirmidhi, he did not rely on the man, as Al-Mūsawi claimed falsely, but only narrated from him, and that does not mean that he relied upon him or accepted him.

5- When talking about Hisham bin Ziyad al-Basri, al-Mūsawi ignored the words of the major scholars of Hadith science about his weakness as quoted by al-Ḥafidh in al-Taḥdhīb,⁸¹ and he found it enough to tell his readers [16/109]: “Refer to his Hadith in Tirmidhi’s Sahih and other works...” Since when did Al-Tirmidhi write a book for only authentic narrations?! Furthermore, al-Tirmidhi says about

81. Taḥdhīb 4/270.

him: “Hisham abu al-Miqdam is weakened.” Take note that al-Tirmidhi with all of his well-known lenience still found the guy to be weak and unreliable. So where is evidence of this claim by Al-Mūsawi that he is reliable in the view of Ahlul-Sunnah.

6- In the footnote of letter [34/142] when talking about the narration: “You are my brother in this world and the hereafter.” He says: “Al-Hākim has quoted it on page 14, Vol. 3, of his Al-Mustadrak as narrated by Ibn `Umar from two authentic chains and endorsed by both Shaykhs. Al-Dhahabi has also quoted it in his Talkhīs, taking its authenticity for granted.” The truth is that this was reported by al-Tirmidhi and al-Hākim⁸² and in the chain is Jumay` bin `Umayr al-Taymi who narrates from Ibn `Umar. This Jumay` is accused, Ibn Hibbān said: “He was a Rāfidhi fabricator.”⁸³ Ibn Numayr said: “From the biggest of liars.” And this man is found in both chains in al-Hākim’s book. As for the second chain, it contains another calamity that goes by the name of Ishaq bin Bishr al-Kāhili.⁸⁴ That’s as far

82. Sunan Tirmidhi #3720, Mustadrak with Talkhis 3/16.

83. Majrouhin 1/258, Tahdhīb 1/315.

84. Mīzan 1/337, al-Du`afa’ 1/114.

as the “Two authentic chains” that al-Mūsawi told us about go. It turns out they’re not authentic nor are they even two distinct chains. Now we direct our attention to al-Dhahabi; he said about him: “Dhahabi has also quoted it in his Talkhīs, taking its authenticity for granted.” However, al-Dhahabi says: “Jumay` is accused and al-Kahili is a liar.” We add: May the curse of Allah be upon the liars! Let the Shias judge their leader for themselves.

7- In the narration of Asma` bint `Umays about `Ali’s marriage from Fatimah, the Prophet (peace be upon him) says: “O Umm Ayman, call my brother...” In the footnote we read [34/143]: “Al-Hākim has quoted it ... Al-Dhahabi has also quoted it in his Talkhīs, taking its authenticity for granted.” In reality, al-Hākim never authenticated it and al-Dhahabi actually rejected it and said, “This is incorrect since Asma` was in Abyssinia with her husband Ja`far.”⁸⁵ `Ali’s marriage was in the second year of Hijrah, after Badr, and Asma` was in Abyssinia with her husband Ja`far, so when she says: “I attended Fatimah’s wedding,” this proves the report is corrupt. Then al-Mūsawi says:

85. Mustadrak 3/173.

“All those who wrote about the wedding of al-Zahra’ have, without any exception, mentioned it.” And we challenge him to prove that one of them mentioned it with an authentic chain.

8- Similarly, he said in [34/145]: “‘Umar bin al-Khattab has narrated an authentic Hadith on the condition of both sahih books wherein he says: ‘‘Ali bin Abi Tālib was granted three tokens...’’” This is a lie as we expected, and al-Hākim, even with all the deficiency in his gradings in al-Mustadrak, only said: “Its chain is authentic.” So al-Dhahabi replied saying: “No, ‘Abdullah bin Ja`far al-Madīni is weak.”⁸⁶

‘Abdullah is the father of the popular scholar of Hadith ‘Ali ibn al-Madīni but he was weak even according to his own son.⁸⁷ Dhahabi said there was consensus on his weakness in al-Mīzan. Al-Mūsawi then points to what Ahmad reported in al-Musnad from Ibn ‘Umar but he never wrote the full text. His pen stopped just as it reached the truth he loathed. Ibn ‘Umar actually said in that report: “In the time of the Prophet (peace be upon him) we used to say: ‘The Messenger (peace be upon him) was the best of humanity, then came Abu Bakr,

86. Ibid 3/135.

87. Tahdhīb 2/315.

then `Umar, and `Ali was given...”⁸⁸ He left out this part out hatred for them, as Allah said: {so that Allah may enrage by them the disbelievers.}[48:29]

The same occurs when Al-Mūsawi writes: “Sa`d bin Mālik, as quoted in an authentic hadith, once mentioned a few unique merits of `Ali and said: ‘The Messenger of Allah turned out everyone from the mosque, including his uncle al-`Abbas and others.’” In the footnote, he attributed it to al-Hākim and claimed it was from the authentic Sunan, which is a lie. Even al-Hākim himself, with the deficiency of his gradings in al-Mustadrak, never claimed this. We say, if al-Mūsawi was asked to prove its authenticity, he would never be able to do so. It’s simply a part of his savage ways to throw claims left and right without any evidence. Al-Hākim had reported it from Muslim al-A`war al-Malla’i, from Khaythamah bin Abdul-Raḥmān that he said: “I heard Sa`d bin Mālik...” Al-Hākim never authenticated it and remained silent, al-Dhahabi commented on it: “Al-Hākim remained silent concerning it and Muslim is an abandoned narrator.”⁸⁹

88. Musnad Ahmad 8/416, al-Arna’out said: “Weak Hadith, but the first part of it is authentic.”

89. Mustadrak with Talkhis 3/126.

Where did al-Mūsawi get its authenticity from?!

9- Al-Mūsawi writes in letter [52/177]: “Do you not see how we do not argue by quoting the texts narrated only by our own sources? On the contrary, we base our arguments on their own narrations regarding events such as the Ghadīr incident or the like.” Of course, nobody is incapable of making such a lie, but that doesn’t mean he’ll get away with it. Al-Mūsawi wants to tell us that he had placed a condition upon himself to only argue against us from our own sources, yet we see him breaking this rule and not sticking to it all throughout his book. He will quote from Shiite books (that do not equal the wing of a mosquito in value) because he won’t find what he desires in Sunni books, not even in books that collected fabrications. So you see him quoting Kulayni’s Kafi, Tafsīr al-Qummi, Tafsīr al-Safi, al-Tusi, al-Saduq, and other useless Shiite material against Ahlul-Sunnah. We’ve collected (39) locations in his book where he broke this imaginary rule of his.

10- `Abdul-Husayn said:

But we have scrutinized the texts pertaining to these virtues recorded by their sources, and we could not find any clues in them opposing such caliphate, nor do they contain anything suggesting it; therefore, they have not been relied upon by anyone to prove the legitimacy of the caliphate of the three righteous caliphs.

We wonder if the Rāfidhi was thinking straight when he made such a claim. He either lied when he claimed to have closely observed these texts, because anyone with a shred of intelligence would realize that these texts are pointing toward Abu Bakr's appointment, and the same can be said for `Umar and `Uthman's merits. Al-Mūsawi's claim is that of a person who doesn't feel shame when openly lying and saying that Ahlul-Sunnah do not have texts proving the leadership of Abu Bakr, `Umar, and `Uthman, and their superiority over `Ali. He even boasts that nobody has ever quoted such texts as evidence, as if he ever read any of the books of Sunan, ideology, and books of merits. Rather, it is known by necessity that all Muslim

sects who oppose Ahlul-Sunnah from the Jahmiyyah, the Mu'tazilah, the Murji'ah, and the rest, all establish the Caliphate of the three except those who followed the devils and branded the Companions as heretics. It is our intention to inform the reader that this statement by `Abdul-Ḥusayn is that of a dumb fool who doesn't understand what words he utters or a liar who doesn't even know the titles of the books of Sunan let alone their contents as we've seen in many locations. We have seen him say: Sahih Al-Tirmidhi – Sahih Al-Nasā'ī – Sahih Al-Bayhaqi – Narrated by Al-Dhahabi. These are mistakes that schoolchildren would not commit.

11- Al-Mūsawi says in [58/193-194]: “The Prophet (peace be upon him) dispatched `Ali to Yemen twice, the first took place in 8 A.H. It was then that scandal mongers spread rumors about him, and some people complained about him ... The second time took place in 10 A.H.” This is not correct, the narrations about the people's complaints about `Ali were all during his trip in Ramadan of the 10th year, then his return to meet the Prophet (peace be upon him) at the last

pilgrimage as agreed upon by the historians and biographers.⁹⁰ It is also what was established by the expert scholars of Hadith such as al-Bukhari who wrote a chapter in his book “Sending `Ali bin Abi Tālib and Khalid bin al-Walid before the farewell pilgrimage.”⁹¹ Then the scholars mention the story of the complaints of the people about `Ali to the Prophet (peace be upon him) under these chapters. From this we can now clearly see `Abdul-Ḥusayn’s lie, when he claimed that nobody complained about `Ali after his return to the Prophet (peace be upon him) around the time of Hijjat-ul-Wada`, then his words, “he sent `Ali to Yemen twice,” claiming that the first was in the eighth year. This, of course, is not backed by any proof, and he couldn’t find any source to support his claim therefore we have no doubt it is a lie as how can he send `Ali when Yemen hadn’t entered Islam yet?! The scholars of biographies only mentioned it in the ninth year, after the conquest of Tabuk, when the Arab delegations came from all over the peninsula. Do not be surprised by al-Mūsawi’s ignorance about the prophetic biography, since his likes have no reliable book when it comes to it, as they know that the Sīrah is filled with great praise

90. Refer to Tarikh al-Tabari 3/149, Sirat Ibn Hisham 4/250.

91. Sahih al-Bukhari Kitab-ul-Maghazi.

for the Companions.

12- In [80/244] when commenting on `A'ishah's narration in the Sa-hih on how Fatimah was upset because about Fadak, he says: "This hadith, as you can see, does not mention anything about his swearing the oath of allegiance to them." Although this is not true and whoever returns to the text of the narration in Sahih Muslim will find this explicit statement: "Then he went to Abu Bakr and offered him the pledge of allegiance."⁹² What type of a shameless liar are we dealing with here?! `Ali's allegiance to Abu Bakr is mutawātir. Not even the Rāfidha reject it; they only make excuses for it. In the footnote, the hopeless one quotes Sharh Nahj-ul-Balaghah by Ibn Abi al-Hadid who is a Mu`tazili Shiite although this book carries no weight in the eyes of Ahlul-Sunnah. He lies are so horrendous that he says in his footnote after mentioning Bukhari and Muslim, "You will find it in detail there." What over-confidence is this?!

92. Muslim with Nawawi's commentary 12/80 #1759.

13- In the footnote of [82/249] he writes: “Their threat to `Ali to burn his house is proven by absolute Tawatur.” It is truly unbelievable that not only would he claim this story to be an established historical fact, but on top of it he claims absolute Tawatur. We know that there is no way he can actually prove Tawatur, seeing as though he attributed this story to Shiite books like Mas`oudi’ Murouj Al-Thahab, abu Mikhnaf in his books about Al-Saqīfa, Sharh Nahj Al-Balagha, and al-Imamah wal-Siyasah.⁹³ All of these books except al-Tabari don’t even mention a chain for what they wrote. In response we challenge him to prove only one authentic chain for this story before jumping to wild claims like Tawatur.

What is strange is that the Rāfidah greatly exaggerate the strength of `Ali in many of their stories and write about his courage and prowess to the extent where they say that Islam was not established except by his sword. On the other hand, they also propagate stories of how he was forced to give an oath to the Caliph out of fear of being burned, that he offered his daughter in marriage to `Umar out of fear of hav-

93. The attribution of the book al-Imamah wal-Siyasah to ibn Qutaybah al-Dinawari is rejected by the expert scholars and researchers. Refer to “Kitab-ul-Imamah wal-Siyasah fi Mīzan al-Tahqiq al-`Ilmi” by `Abdullah `Usaylan.

ing his hand cut, that he named his sons by their names out of fear of their wrath, and so on and so forth. Do they really not reflect?!

14- We have not seen a book containing such a high density of lies throughout its pages. Here is al-Mūsawi talking about the regiment of Usamah and claiming that Abu Bakr and `Umar were in this army, through this he seeks to prove that the Prophet (peace be upon him) wished to keep Madinah empty so that no one may dispute against `Ali's leadership. What kind of an insult is this to the Prophet (peace be upon him) and his religion?! He writes in the footnote [90/265]: “Authors of books of tradition and history have unanimously accepted the fact that Abu Bakr and `Umar, may Allah be pleased with them, were enlisted in the same army.” As far as this claim, we say it is a lie and his ancestor Ibn al-Mutahhar al-Ḥilli wrote a similar thing but was refuted by Ibn Taymiyyah who said: “This is a pure lie by consensus of the scholars of biographies. None of the scholars reported that the Prophet (peace be upon him) had sent Abu Bakr or `Uthman in this army, it was only mentioned about `Umar. How can he even claim that the Prophet (peace be upon him) sent Abu

Bakr when he had appointed him to lead the Muslims in prayer as is known to all?”⁹⁴ He then continued his web of deceit [90/266]: “Refer, therefore, to any book which contains information about this particular expedition...” And he mentioned Tarikh al-Tabari as one of these sources; this is a lie since when referring to volume three of that book⁹⁵ in the section where he mentions the expedition -in the events of the 11th year, he never writes anything about Abu Bakr being in the army. Therefore, al-Mūsawi lied when he claimed that the historians had a consensus, and he lied again when he referred his readers to al-Tabari’s book while fully knowing they won’t actually go back and verify his statements.

15- The compulsive liar writes about `Ali’s writer `Ubaydullah bin Abi Rāfi`: “This `Ubaydullah authored a book dealing with the Sahabah who fought the Battle of Siffin on `Ali’s side, from which Ibn Hajar quotes extensively in his own Isabah.” And below it in the footnote of [110/306] he refers to the biography of Jubayr bin al-Habbab bin al-Mundhir in al-Isabah. As usual Mūsawi lied; whoever refers to

⁹⁴. Minhaj-ul-Sunnah 5/486.

⁹⁵. Tarikh al-Tabari 3/184,342.

al-Isabah will that Ibn Ḥajar never quoted from it and never saw it. He only wrote: "...Mutayyan mentioned him as part of the Sahabah saying: 'He is in the Siyar of `Ubaydullah ibn Abi Rāfi` among the names of the Sahabah who witnessed Siffīn alongside `Ali.' This is reported by al-Baroudi and al-Tabarani from al-Mutayyan..."⁹⁶ So where it is exactly that Ibn Ḥajar quotes a lot from this book, assuming it even existed?!

16- The delusional al-Mūsawi claimed that their Imami Shiite Madhab was wide-spread in the time of the Tabi`īn [110/308]: "Muslims, in the aftermath of that catastrophic incident, entered a new era in which they rushed to support Imam `Ali bin al-Ḥusayn Zayn-ul-`Abidīn (as), referring to him in their quest for answers regarding the roots and branches of the faith, and to all Islamic sciences derived from the Book and the Sunnah." With all due and deserved respect for our Imam `Ali Zayn-ul-`Abidīn, yet we ask: Where is the evidence for this, you lying lowlife?! The man was a container of knowledge and piety, yet unlike the Shiites, we don't limit knowl-

⁹⁶. Al-Isabah 1/569 #1090.

edge to one man. There were a good number of men in his era that had a great amount of knowledge and piety such as Sa`id bin al-Musayyab, al-Qasim bin Muhammad, Salim bin `Abdullah, `Urwah bin al-Zubayr, and many others that we will not bother listing, for our purpose is to simply show that Zaynul-`Abidīn did not have what they didn't, but they were all Imams that we look up to.

Chapter Five

Sections that Contain Deceptions

These are sections that in which unclear wordings are taken advantage of to suggest an untrue view:

1- `Abdul-Ḥusayn in letter [10/29] quotes the Hadith: “Whoever is pleased by living like I live and dying like I die and inhabit Eden’s Paradise which my Lord cultivated should take `Ali as his master after me...” This is a fabricated narration as al-Albani wrote; al-Mūsawi got it from Kanz-ul-`Ummal while deceptively pointing towards its inclusion in Musnad Ahmad, which it is not in. Then he skipped the commentary of al-Muttaqi, the author of the Kanz, who pointed out its weakness to hide the truth. Al-Albani pointed out the ignorance of al-Mūsawi, his lack of trustworthiness, his deception, and his outright lies. It is suggested for further reading, for it is valuable.⁹⁷

97. You may refer to al-Silsilah al-Da`ifah 2/295,299 to see how al-Albani warns from the deception of al-Mūsawi.

2- Similarly, the narrations of Ziyad bin Mutarrif and Zayd bin Arqam mentioned separately by him in [10/30] are in reality one single fabricated narration; he had quoted it from Kanz-ul-`Ummal and Muntakhab-ul-Kanz. He did this to deceive the reader into thinking they are two reports supporting one another, and he also never mentioned what the author of al-Muntakhab wrote that “it is extremely weak.”⁹⁸ Instead, he relied on al-Hākim’s statement, “Its chain is Sahih,” which is what he quoted in the next hadith by Zayd bin Arqam, and they are one hadith, as stated previously. Al-Dhahabi commented: “How can this be authentic, when al-Qasim is abandoned and his teacher al-Aslami is weak, add on top of that the wording is pathetic linguistically so it’s closer to being fabricated.”⁹⁹ Al-Albani had exposed al-Mūsawi’s attempt of cheating, when al-Mūsawi took advantage of a slip of Ibn Ḥajar’s pen; what happened was that Ibn Ḥajar wrote in al-Isabah “...Al-Muharibi is very weak...”¹⁰⁰ but this is a mistake as he actually intended to write “Al-Aslami is very weak,” so al-Mūsawi used this to deceive the readers into thinking that the narrator of the Hadith is the trustworthy al-Muharibi.

98. Muntakhab-ul-Kanz 5/32.

99. Al-Mustadrak 3/139.

100. Al-Isabah 2/485.

3- Al-Mūsawi quoted [12/38] Allah's words {And whoever opposes the Messenger after guidance has become clear to him and follows other than the way of the believers - We will give him what he has taken and drive him into Hell, and evil it is as a destination.}[4:115] He desires to prove with this verse that only the Shiites are the believers!! What a miserable and banal understanding is that of al-Mūsawi!! What interests us is the attribution he made in the footnote to Ibn Mardawayh's Tafsīr: "Ibn Mardawayh reported in his Tafsīr of this Chapter, that {... to argue with the Messenger} in this context means to dispute with him regarding `Ali..." Let al-Mūsawi actually tell us where it is that Ibn Mardawayh mentioned such a thing in his Tafsīr, for Tafsīr Ibn Mardawayh was never printed nor does anybody possess it, for the book has been lost for centuries. So where is the chain for this statement?! Perhaps he found a copy with his hidden Imam when he met him secretly.

4- He deceives the readers again when talking about Hadith [40/155-156]: "'Ali is the leader of the pious, the annihilator of infidels..." He said: "Refer to it as published in Nasā'ī's Sahih." We still do not

understand why this person doesn't know the names of the books of Hadith, he insists on calling "Sunan al-Nasā'ī" as "Sahih al-Nasā'ī". What is obvious is that he is doing so to give strength to his arguments and give the impression that whatever he narrates is authentic and accepted.

5- He does the same for "Sunan al-Tirmidhi" which he calls it "Sahih-ul-Tirmidhi" in [16/54, 58-59] although it isn't an authentic collection nor do people know it as a Sahih book.

6- Al-Mūsawi writes about the deviant Shiite narrator Jabir al-Ju`fi [16/58-59]: "In spite of that, both al-Nisa'i and Abu Dawoud rely on his authority. Refer to the hadith which he narrates concerning accidental prostrations in both their Sahihs." This is what the ignoramus said, although the act of narrating from a person does not imply the acceptance and authentication of the man's narrations. Also what he wrote implies that abu Dawoud greatly relies on the man, whereas in

reality he only narrates from him once in his entire book.¹⁰¹ The even greater calamity is that abu Dawoud actually weakens the man. He says about him: “I do not consider him strong in narrating.” And he says: “In my book there are no narrations from Jabir al-Ju`fi except this one.” As for al-Nasā`ī, he said: “He is an abandoned narrator.”¹⁰²

7- In all stupidity, he says while commenting on the biography of Sulayman bin Mihran al-A`mash [16/74]: “...I think that al-Mughirah’s statement: ‘Abu Ishaq and your A`mash have rendered Kufah to destruction’ is said due only to these men’s Shiite beliefs.” This is what his intellect led him to, even though he has no intellect, and this statement had nothing to do with tashayyu’. Al-Dhahabi wrote in al-Mīzan¹⁰³ that what is meant here is the Tadrīs of these two men, meaning to narrate from someone without being clear whether the narrator heard from him or not. This is the reason that al-Mughirah and other spoke negatively of al-A`mash and Abu Ishaq. Mūsawi repeats the same non-sense in the biography of Abu Ishaq al-Sabi`i

101. Sunan abu Dawoud ma` `Awn-il-Ma`boud 3/246.

102. Al-Tahdhīb 1/284,285.

103. Mīzan 3/316.

[16/97].

He quotes in al-A`mash's biography the statement of Ibn `Abdul-Barr from Jami` Bayan-ul-`Ilm in the chapter of: "The statements of the scholars about each-other." After quoting the words of al-A`mash concerning abu Ḥanifah (that are opposed by the praise of al-A`mash for abu Ḥanifah) and these words were quoted by Ibn `Abdul-Barr to show that they are dismissed and ignored, he said:

This is an issue that a lot of people made mistakes in, and a group of young ignorant folks were confused by it. The correct position is: That the scholar whose justice, knowledge, reliability and expertise were established cannot be criticized by the words of any man except by solid clear evidence...¹⁰⁴

This was not clarified by al-Mūsawi as his intentions were to support his cause even though Ibn `Abdul-Barr has clarified it all.

8- In the biography of `Ammār bin Zurayq al-Kūfi [16/97]: "Al-Su-

104. Jami` Bayan-ul-`Ilm 2/1093.

laymani counted him among the Rāfidah as declared by al-Dhahabi in al-Mīzan in the part on `Ammār's condition..." This is what al-Mūsawi told us, but the truth is that al-Dhahabi has refuted al-Sulaymani's position and rejected it.¹⁰⁵

9- In the biography of Hisham bin `Ammār bin Nusayr [16/110]: "Like other Shias, Hisham bin `Ammār believes that the Qur'anic diction is created only by Allah Almighty." This is a lie, Hisham never believed the entire Qur'an was created, he actually says: "The words Jibril and Muhammad - peace be upon them - in the Qur'an are created." As stated by al-Dhahabi in his biography in al-Mīzan.¹⁰⁶ Although al-Mūsawi copies it from al-Mīzan, yet he cheats by not mentioning this, and there is a difference between the belief of Hisham and the belief of the Rafidha, even though his belief is also corrupt, but our purpose is to expose the deceptions of the traitor al-Mūsawi.

10- The traitor when researching the narration of al-Dar [20/121]

105. Al-Mīzan 5/199 referring to him as Ruzayq.

106. Ibid 7/87.

writes:

Many of those who have learned the prophetic legacy by heart have reported the Hadith above verbatim as such. Among them are: Ibn Ishāq, Ibn Jarīr, Ibn Abu Hatim, Ibn Mardawayh, Abu Na`im, al-Bayhaqi in his book Al-Dala`il, both al-Tha`labi and al-Tabari in their exegeses...

I don't know what is the difference between Ibn Jarīr and al-Tabari for they are same person: Ibn Jarīr al-Tabari. So why deceive your readers just to make it seem that a bigger number of scholars reported this?!

11- At [22/124] he writes:

You will read this hadith as narrated by Aswad bin `Amir from Sharīk, al-A`mash, Minhal, `Abbad bin `Abdullah al-Asadi, from `Ali (as) chronologically. Each one of these men in the chain of narrators is an authority in his own right, and they all are reliable

traditionists according to the testimony of the authors of the Sahih books without any dispute.

Then in the footnote he comments on `Abbad: “His full name is `Abbad bin `Abdullah bin al-Zubayr bin al-`Awwam al-Qurashi al-Asadi.” What the trickster tried to do is give the illusion that this man is `Abbad bin `Abdullah bin al-Zubayr, the reliable narrator, but this is actually `Abbad al-Asadi al-Kūfi the weak narrator. The first man doesn't have any narrations from `Ali nor did al-Minhal narrate from him unlike the second man, so review their biographies in Tahdhīb¹⁰⁷ where Ibn Ḥajar had differentiated between them. Notice how this fool tampers with texts like the Jews (who tampered with their Holy Books).

12- Al-Mūsawi says: “Consider his statement, peace be upon him and his progeny, on the day of `Arafat during Hijjatul Wada` [the farewell pilgrimage]: `Ali is of me, and I am of `Ali.” He writes in the footnote [48/165-166]: “Whoever studies this Hadith in Ahmad's Musnad will come to know that it was said during the Farewell Pil-

¹⁰⁷. Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb 2/279.

grimage which shortly preceded the departure of the Prophet, peace be upon him and his progeny, from this vanishing world.” This is what the devil had whispered to al-Mūsawi because whoever reviews the texts will know that it wasn’t uttered by the Prophet (peace be upon him) at `Arafat or anywhere else in Hujjat-ul-Wada`. The truth of the matter is that the teacher of Imam Ahmad ibn Hanbal in that narration was Yahya bin Adam. He narrated it by saying: “From Ḥubshi bin Junadah” then he said: “And he was from those who witnessed the day of Hujjat-ul-Wada`,”¹⁰⁸ and Adam’s statement was simply to introduce Ḥubshi to his students, as he was not a well-known individual, so he informed them of his Companionship. Al-Mūsawi also wrote: “Narrated from various authentic sources by Junadah.” We of course do not take Mūsawi’s words seriously anymore, especially when he claims authenticity. It’s sufficient that he wrote in his footnote something foolish like, “reported by Tirmidhi and Nasā`ī in their Sahihs.” If he means various chains linking up to Ḥubshi then it isn’t correct, as only Abu Ishaq al-Sabi`i narrates it from him, and it was only narrated by three paths up to Abi Ishaq, all of which are weak. If you wish you can review how al-Albani exposes al-Mūsawi

108. Musnad Ahmad 29/49.

when it comes to this narration in Al-Sahihah.¹⁰⁹

13- One of the pre-mentioned tactics of the Shiite Rāfidah is to mention an authentic narration from the books of the Sunnis and mix with it what is weak and fabricated, then make it seem as if that entire bundle is authentic and accepted. What the Rāfidhi did here was exactly that, when he mentioned the popular report of Ghadīr, “Whosoever takes me as his mawla then `Ali is also his mawla.” Then wrote next to it [56/188]: “There is no doubt about its being consecutively reported through Sunni sources.” Now, you see what `Abdul-Ḥusayn had done when he deceived readers by previously mentioning the corrupt texts for al-Ghadīr, and now stating that the texts are mass-transmitted in the books of the scholars although they only mass-transmitted the part saying “Whomever I am his mawla then `Ali is also his mawla.” However, `Abdul-Ḥusayn only mentioned this after those corrupt additions which he selected to fool us into believing that they were authenticated by scholars. He had done similarly before and to Allah we raise our complaints.

109. Al-Silsilah al-Sahihah 4/633,636.

14- Al-Mūsawi then debates with ghosts as he mentions in [60/196] that the meaning of the word “Wali” is leader and chief, that Ah-lul-Sunnah had submitted to this explanation, and that their last resort was to say that this Imamah announced in Ghadīr was to take place in the future and not immediately after the passing of the Prophet (peace be upon him). Al-Mūsawi then goes on to prove that it isn’t futuristic but it’s an immediate Imamah that had to be implemented the moment it was uttered. We say regarding the heroics al-Mūsawi and his wooden sword, that this entire chapter was fruitless since Ah-lul-Sunnah never interpreted the word “Wali” to mean an appointed leader in the first place, rather they firmly believe as stated in all their books that it means closeness, love, friendship, and support. Review the books of Ibn Ḥajar,¹¹⁰ al-Halabi, and others to see how they refuted the opponents and gave solid interpretations.

15- Al-Mūsawi, the descendant of Ibn al-`Alqami said in [82/248]:

Their consolidation in supporting al-Siddīq, and their
providing him with counsel in secrecy and in public,

110. Al-Sawa`iq 1/105.

is one thing; the validity of the consignment of the Caliphate through consensus is quite another, they are not correlated judged by reason or tradition.

Al-Mūsawi's words hold clear signs of deception for what aren't tied are supporting the Caliph - whoever he may be - and advising him because he is deserving of Caliphate, but what will Al-Mūsawi use his own corrupt intellect and religion to arrive at rulings?! A corrupt intellect or that whispers falsehood alongside the religion of Ibn al-'Alqami that permits the spilling of the Caliph's blood as well as that of the Muslims?! He then lies by saying: "Ali and the infallible leaders from his children have a well-known policy of supporting those in authority and it is the same policy to which we adhere and worship through." We comment: As for 'Ali and his purified household, then yes, but not for al-Mūsawi and the Shiites, by Allah! History testifies to this and the fall of Baghdad twice. Then he contradicted himself by admitting the legitimacy of the Caliphate of the less qualified leader when he said: "Rather, the nation has got to treat him -even if he were a slave - the way Caliphs are supposed to be treated and offer him taxes..." What he just confessed here is proof

of the validity of the Caliphate of those who don't even deserve it, or those who are less qualified to handle it, and this is the belief of Ahlul-Sunnah when they say that they believe in the legitimacy of the Caliphate of the inferior man even in the presence of the superior one. What is odd is that al-Mūsawi had previously stated that `Ali only gave allegiance when threatened by the sword and the fire! What what kind of state was al-Mūsawi when he write this?

16- Al-Mūsawi continues his slander and accusations against Abu Bakr al-Siddīq when he claims that the only reason the Ansar gave him allegiance is because he threatened them and they got scared. He described the Ansar that they “succumbed unwillingly, yielding to pressure ... dictated by the fear of the sword or the burning by the fire.” [82/249] We ask by Allah: How is it that two thousand warriors from one big tribe, warriors whose valor and courage was tested countless times when they fought all Arabs for eight consecutive years, suddenly got scared from Abu Bakr and the two men - `Umar and Abu `Ubaidah - who accompanied him in Saqifah?! Surely, this is but a lie from the Rafidha, and it is a poison upon Islam, an exposed

fabrication to every rational person that knew of the Arabian balance of power at the time. We ask: What political and military might did Abu Bakr possess so that he may over-power Banu Hashim and Banu al-Umayyah, let alone al-Aws and al-Khazraj? Even his own little tribe of Banu Taym couldn't even protect him when he first embraced Islam so he had to seek protection from Ibn al-Daghinah against Quraysh. Unless, his power was the power of truth and the love and respect they all held for him which led the Muslims to say: "The Messenger was satisfied by him for our religion, so shouldn't we satisfied with him for our worldly life?" It furthermore prevented them from superseding a man who was: {The second of two as they were in the cave} [9:40]. So think before you judge!

Al-Mūsawi again returns to quote al-Habab bin al-Mundhir on the day of Saqifah, but doesn't write the text, as he knew it would be against his faith, even though he praised this man greatly in the footnotes! Since when do the Rafidah even praise the Companions?!

It is when al-Habab said: "From us a chief and from you a chief O' Quraysh," which was hidden by al-Mūsawi who commented saying: "He said other much stronger statements, and we thought it would

be wiser to refrain from quoting them here.” If the man’s words were in support of your argument then why avoid them?! Or do his words demolish this faith?!

17- Al-Mūsawi then writes about the regiment of Usamah [90/266, 267] and unjustly accuses all Companions of objecting to it and dismissing the orders of the Prophet (peace be upon him). Then he mixes his own words and commentary into the narration to confuse readers until he reached the part: “Usamah took the tied flag and handed it to Buraydah, and then he camped at Jurf.” This is the text of the narration according to the sources listed in al-Mūsawi’s footnotes, but he added to it: “Even there, they slackened and did not leave, in spite of all the clear statements of the Prophet (peace be upon him) urging them to expedite the campaign.” But as we said, these are his own words and opinions and they aren’t in any of the sources. In addition, he himself said that Usamah was reluctant due to the Prophet’s (peace be upon him) illness and kept visiting him repeatedly instead of going to war. So why didn’t the Prophet (peace be upon him) punish Usamah and those with him for their “reluctance”?!

18- In the same letter he says that some folks objected to the leadership of Usamah just as they objected to the leadership of his father before him. What he's implying is that the pious Companions are the ones who objected, which technically includes `Ali and his family as there is no evidence to exclude them in this case. He then wrote: "Review all books that discuss this regiment." From those sources, he listed al-Tabari, although al-Tabari has specified those who objected only in two narrations. The first from abu Muwayhibah the servant of the Prophet (peace be upon him) and it says: "So the hypocrites objected to it but the Prophet (peace be upon him) responded back to them..." The second is from Ibn `Abbas: "...And the hypocrites had greatly opposed Usamah's leadership..."¹¹¹ This clarifies that the Companions may Allah be pleased with them are innocent of the accusations of this hypocrite.

19- In [92/271] he cheats by making it appear as if Ahlul-Sunnah now submit to his previous accusations about the reluctance of the Companions, he writes while presenting evidences as fragile as a

111. Tarikh al-Tabari 3/184,186.

spider’s web: “You have, may Allah Almighty protect you, admitted that they lagged behind Usamah’s regiment and were at Jurf reluctant to proceed in spite of being ordered by the Prophet (peace be upon him) to rush and expedite. You also admit that they did, indeed, raise questions about the [Prophet’s] wisdom in appointing Usamah...” I wish that he would list for us the name of one scholar who “admitted” this and accepted it. In fact, this reluctance was also a product of Usamah’s own Ijtihad and reasoning. It was for a noble reason that is quite clear for those whose hearts are not blinded by hate. We also saw that the objections were raised by the hypocrites, not the believers, which is what al-Mūsawi tried to hide.

20- Al-Mūsawi continues to attempt to destroy the foundations of the religion, but Allah prevents those who attempt to block His light. He continues his lies with another lie when he mentioned in [110/304] that `Ali was the first to collect the Qur’an, as he disliked attributing this great merit to `Uthman. He writes:

The first writing of the Commander of the Faith-

ful was the Book of Allah, the Exalted, the Praiseworthy Having finished the rituals pertaining to the preparation for the departure of the Prophet (peace be upon him) from this world, `Ali (as) decided not to dress except to either say the prayers or compile the Qur'an. He, therefore, compiled it arranged in the order of its revelation. He pointed out its general and specific meanings, absolute and restrictive...

Then he dismisses everyone else by saying: "Several companions who could read took pains to compile the Holy Qur'an, but they could not compile it in the order of its revelation." We ask those that are lost: Where is this superior Qur'an you speak of and why hasn't Allah preserved it for the nation?! What benefit is it for us to know that such a great version existed centuries ago when we can't derive one real benefit from that existence today?! Rather, it was Allah that prevented the consensus to come around any compilation except for that by the rightly-guided caliph `Uthman, may Allah be pleased with him.

Al-Mūsawi's words, in reality, are a hidden attack against Allah's

book, intended to lower its value and importance. They also greatly resemble the blasphemy found in the Shiite book al-Kafi, in the chapter “That no one collected the entire Qur’an except the Imams,” the narration says: “Jabir al-Ju`fi said: I heard aba Ja`far (as) say: ‘Nobody from among the people claims to have collected the entire Qur’an as it was revealed except a liar. No one collected it and preserved it as it was revealed except `Ali bin Abi Tālib and the Imams after him.’”¹¹² Do they think the religion was exclusively revealed for `Ali and his sons aside from the rest of the nation?! Or did Allah decide to misguide us according to them by depriving us of this knowledge because two or three individuals decided to reject `Ali’s version hundreds of years ago?! Allah has promised to spread His religion and preserve his religion, whether the disbelievers liked it or not! The truth shall prevail if these questions are pondered.

21- The deviant then writes about Fatimah’s Mushaf in [110/304-305]: “Having finished working on the Book of the Dear One, he authored a book which he dedicated to the Mistress of the Women

112. Al-Kafi 1/228.

of Mankind. It came to be known to her purified sons as “Mushaf Fatima,” Fatima’s book, which contained axioms, pieces of wisdom and counsel, morals, historical events and unique occurrences, written as a solace for her.” And this book in reality is a greater version of Allah’s book that Jibril (as) revealed upon `Ali and Fatimah after the Prophet’s (peace be upon him) death as the foolish Shiites claim. They wrote in al-Kafi, in a narration from their Imam: “We possess Fatimah’s (as) Mushaf. Abu Basir asked: ‘What is Fatimah’s (as) Mushaf?’ He replied: ‘A Mushaf similar to this Qur’an of yours but three times its size, it contains nothing from which this Qur’an of yours contains, not even a letter!’”¹¹³ These fairytales include that `Ali (as) wrote it from the mouth of an angel who was revealing it to Fatima may Allah be pleased with her, along with some other laughable details.

Al-Mūsawi being the deceitful man that he is, did not wish to reveal the true nature of this myth so he mentioned that Mushaf as if it’s some random book of literature of wisdom and morals. In truth, this is a ridiculous book that is claimed to contain everything humanity

113. Ibid 1/238.

ever needs in full detail. They described it in al-Kafi: “In it is what people need from us and that (is because) we do not have any need of anyone. In it is even the whole lash, half lash and the quarter lash, even the indemnity for scratching (someone).” What is intended by the knowledge of the unseen is to bestow a type of godhood upon their Imams and whoever learned the science of punishments and penalties in Islamic law will know that this is a hidden attack suggesting that religious law is incomplete. We also say to this liar: Where was this Mushaf mentioned in the books of Ahlul-Sunnah?! As for the Rafidah they mention it when discussing the belief in Tahrif that their sect is afflicted with.

Al-Mūsawi feels no shame, so he mentions this evil matter proudly, as if they were the first to transmit written knowledge. However, the reality is that they are the first to lie against Allah and His messenger.

22- Al-Mūsawi mentions his deluded ancestor Hisham bin al-Ḥakam who was the servant of the tribe of Kindah. This shady character was also a contemporary of al-Sadiq and the Shiites agree on the man's

reliability and high status. Al-Mūsawi, due to his ignorance, or in an act to deceive his readers – which is more likely - says in [110/312-313]: “He was first a Jahmi¹¹⁴ then he met al-Sadiq (as) and came to see the light of guidance through him.” This is a lie since nobody ever mentioned in the books of sects that the man was a Jahmi, rather he was famous for his opinions of anthropomorphism. These desperate attempts by Al-Mūsawi to polish his sect fail and the misguidance of his predecessors silences him.

Al-Mūsawi tries to defend Hisham by saying:

“Those who desire to put out Allah’s light, out of envy of Ahlul-Bayt (as), and out of malice, accused him of saying that the Almighty has a physical form, and of other serious charges. We are most knowledgeable of his sect. We have within our reach reports of his life-style and norm of speech. He has written works defending our sect as referred to above; so, nothing of his speech can be known to others and not to us, since he is among our ancestors.”

114. Jahmiyyah: A group who deny God’s attributes completely under the pretext of elevating God above creations.

We answer the hypocrite by saying: You praise a man who says that God is measured in inches and that He is composed of physical body-parts.¹¹⁵ Al-Mūsawi, being from his descendants or from the same sect as Hisham does not give him a privilege to know him more than the classical expert scholars of sects and opinions, as those scholars were renowned in their fields and possessed a great amount of early lost books and knew of the various stances of each group and their debates. We also wish to ask al-Mūsawi: Is your big scholar al-Kulayni from the haters of Ahlul-Bayt?! Al-Kulayni in al-Kafi mentions six narrations that explicitly announce Hisham's deviant beliefs in anthropomorphism, refer to the chapter "Prohibition of attributing a body or image."¹¹⁶

Al-Mūsawi shamelessly writes: "Nobody among our ancestors has found any proof of what the opponent attributes to him." Although all of those Shiite narrations clearly show the man's beliefs and the hatred of al-Sadiq and al-Kadhim for this deviant, to the extent where the giant Shiite scholar al-Mamaqani admitted in his book¹¹⁷ that the

115. Al-Milal wal-Nihal 1/216, al-Farq bayn al-Firaq pg.71.

116. Al-Kafi 1/104-106.

117. Tanqih al-Maqal 3/264-301.

narrations that attribute Tajsim to Hisham are too many, from them are his words: “Allah is an eternal body of everlasting light.” So when is it that they will open their eyes to the truth?!

Al-Mūsawi insists on deceiving his readers and creating illusions as he concludes with this: “If we suppose that it is proved that Hisham believes as such, this could be before his going back to the true guidance [through Imam al-Sadiq (as)]. You have come to know that he used to believe like the Jehmis, then he saw the light of guidance through Muhammad’s progeny.”

As we presented above, this either shows extreme ignorance or deception and lies, for whoever has the slightest knowledge about sects and groups knows the great distance between the Jahmiyyah and Tajsim, and that the foundation of Jahmiyyah is built upon rejecting Tajsim and all descriptions, so how could this little fool dismiss the attribution of Tajsim to Hisham by referring to his early Jahmi Madhab? What do the Shiites of today say about their predecessor Hisham bin al-Ḥakam after his Tajsim was established? I add: What is their position from the modern-day “Musaylamah” al-Mūsawi who included Hisham in their ranks? Will they not answer?

This wasn't enough for al-Mūsawi, he lies again: "None of our predecessors found anything from what our opponents attributed to him ... although we spent much time and energy in researching this." We are astonished at the stubbornness and deception of this man. Did he really not know what al-Kafi contains from narrations about Hisham? Or does he not know its contents? Or is it simply the fact that he's a liar? We know that these are only empty words just for the sake of claiming victory but he will never achieve it, rather, he's stuck between a rock and a hard place:

Either he admits the misguidance of the early Imami scholars and that they went astray with Tajsim, or that those who deny the descriptions from the late Imami scholars are astray, as it is established by necessity that one of the two groups is misguided in their monotheism.

23- In the letter [16/52-114] al-Mūsawi wrote the names of a hundred narrators relied upon by Ahlul-Sunnah (as he claims). He referred to them as a "hundred isnads" due to his ignorance! They are

not isnads but an isnad is a group of narrators! To this we respond by the following:

i. If these men are truly reliable Shiites as you claim and you say that Ahlul-Sunnah rely on the narrations of these men, then why don't you accept their Sunni narrations? If anything, this proves the justice of Ahlul-Sunnah and their fairness when they narrate from anyone who is trustworthy regardless of their sect and opinion. On the other hand, the Shiites will never consider a narration to be "Sahih" if it contains anyone who isn't of their sect. Perhaps even consider narrations by those who are better than them in the eyes of Allah and his Messenger: The Companions. Unfortunately, this is the difference between Ahlul-Sunnah and the people of desires.

ii. If a scholar narrated from a narrator, this is not considered a form of authentication nor does it mean that he relies on him or trusts him as is known to all students of knowledge. That only applies for the Saheehain.

iii. Al-Mūsawi mentions certain individuals in this list that aren't

even Shiite, nor did anyone describe them as such. He attributes Tashayyu' to individuals based on weak evidence and extremely unreliable sources that hold no weight in scholarly circles.

iv. Most of those whom al-Mūsawi listed are men who possess small amounts of innovations or “a light innovation”, nothing too major that they may be abandoned or dismissed.

v. Al-Mūsawi claims for certain narrators that they were relied upon by Ahlul-Sunnah when in reality they are extremist Shiites. How could Ahlul-Sunnah rely on those who believe in Raj'ah,¹¹⁸ cursing the Shaikhain and the companions, and the corruption of the Qur'an?! Ahlul-Sunnah would quote these men's narrations not because they relied on them, but to show how ridiculous their narrations are and how bad their condition is in Hadith transmission.

vi. Shiites never took care of the chains of transmission and they began to formulate certain rules for Hadith in the seventh or eighth centuries as their scholar al-Hurr al-'Amili says: “The benefit of

118. They define it as: The resurrection of the dead to life before the Day of Judgement during the time of Al-Mahdi for the purpose of revenge against the enemies of Ahlul-Bayt like Abu Bakr.

mentioning a chain is to defend ourselves against the criticism of the `Amah (Sunnies) who say that Shiites have no chains and they only copy from the foundations of their ancestors.”¹¹⁹ This means that the chain of transmission played no significant role in this sect and only made an appearance whenever they'd receive criticism from their opponents.

119. Wasa'il al-Shi'ah 20/100.

Below are the names of some of the narrators from al-Mūsawi's list whom he claimed share his beliefs although we will see that what is known about them conflicts with his beliefs:

#	Narrator's Name	What he narrates as opposed to Twelver Shiite beliefs
2	Ibrāhīm bin Yazīd	Narrated from `Umar "The Messenger (peace be upon him) used to spend his nights alongside Abu Bakr discussing the affairs (...) And I (meaning `Umar) used [to join them." [Tirmidhi 169, Ahmad 175
16	Ja`far bin Sulayman	Narrated: "The Messenger (peace be upon him) died without having appointed a successor." [Mīzan 2/138
19	Al-Ḥarith al-Hamdani	Narrated: "Abu Bakr and `Umar are the masters of the seniors of paradise." [Tirmidhi 3666
21	Al-Ḥasan bin Ṣaliḥ	Narrated a Hadith proving the validity of wiping on the leather socks (Khuffayn). [[Abu Dawoud 156
22	Al-Ḥakam bin `Utaybah	Narrated a Hadith proving the validity of wiping on the leather socks (Khuffayn). [[Abu Dawoud 157
25	Khalid bin Makhlad	Narrated a Hadith in praise of al-Zubayr. [[Bukhari 3717
28	Zayd bin al-Ḥabbab	Narrated a Hadith proving the validity of [wiping of the Khuffayn. [Ibn Majah 555
30	Salim bin Abi Ḥafsah	Narrated: "The people of high status are seen by those below them as the shining star, Abu Bakr and `Umar are like them [and even better." [Tirmidhi 3658

36	Sulayman bin Şurd	This is a Companion so how can he even !?be a Twelver
38	Sulayman bin Arqam	Accepted the Kufr of the Shiites. [Mīzan 3/310
39	Sulayman al-A`mash	Narrated reports in praise of Abu Bakr and [Mu`awiyah [Tirmidhi 3658, Tabarani 691
40	Sharīk the Judge	Narrated that he prefers Abu Bakr, `Umar, [and `Uthman over `Ali. [Tahdhīb 3/372
43	Tawous bin Kaysan	Narrated and took his religion from Abu Hurayrah, Ibn `Umar, `A`ishah, and Zayd. [[Tahdhīb 2/235
44	Dhalim bin `Amr	Narrated and took his religion from `Umar, Mu`adh, Ibn Mas`oud, and Zubayr. [[Tahdhīb 4/481
45	Amir bin` Wathilah abu al-Tu-fayl	Said to be the last Sahabi to die. Narrates Hadith from Abu Bakr, `Umar, and other [Sahabah. [Tahdhīb 2/272
49	Abdullah` bin Abban	Narrates from his uncle the reason why `Uthman was given the prestigious title of [Dhun-Nourayn. [Bayhaqi 7/73
50	Abdullah` bin Lahi`ah	Narrates virtues for `Amr bin al-`As [Tir- [midhi 3844
52	Ab-`	He said: “The best of this nation after its Prophet (peace be upon him) are Abu Bakr [and `Umar.” [Mīzan 4/290
53	Ab-` dul-Razzāq al-San`ani	He preferred the first three over `Ali in his [books. [Mīzan 4/344
60	Alqamah` bin Qays	Narrates and takes his religion from `Umar, `Uthman, Sa`d, Khalid, and [`A`ishah. [Tahdhīb 3/140

67	Ali bin` al-Mundhir	Narrated the Hadith of Jibril (as) sending his greetings of peace upon `A'ishah. [Tirmidhi 2693
71	Amr bin` `Abdullah	From the narrators of "If I were to take a beloved friend (Khalil) I would have taken [Abu Bakr." [Tirmidhi 3655
73	Al-Fadl bin Dukayn	Narrates the validity of wiping on the [Khuffayn. [Bukhari 204
74	Fudayl bin Marzouq	Narrates from `Ali that the Prophet (peace be upon him) praised Abu Bakr and `Umar and recommended his appointment as successor. [Bazzar 783
76	Mālik bin Isma`il	Narrates a Hadith in praise of Abu Bakr [Tirmidhi 3670, Bukhari 3719
77	Muham- mad bin Khāzim	Narrated `Umar's Hadith: "The messenger (peace be upon him) used to spend his nights with Abu Bakr and I accompanied [them" [Tirmidhi 169, Ahmad 175
78	Muham- mad bin `Abdullah al-Hākim	Lists the virtues of al-Siddīq in his Mustadrak 3/64,86, and the agreement on calling him the Prophet's (peace be upon him) .successor
80	Muham- mad bin Fudayl	Narrates a report in praise of Abu Bakr [[Tirmidhi 3652
83	Mu`awiyah bin `Am- mār	.No one claimed he was a Shiite
94	Hisham bin `Ammār	Narrated a report in praise of Abu Bakr [[Bukhari 3661
96	Waki` bin al-Jarrāh	He said: "Whoever claims the Qur'an is created has apostate." [Tadhkirat-ul-Huffadh 1/306] And it opposes Shiite beliefs

98	Yahya bin Sa'id	He said: "Whoever says that: '{Say he is God the one and only}' is created,' is therefore, a heretic." [Tadhkirat-ul-Huffadh [1/298
100	Abu `Abdullah al-Jadali	Narrates from `A'ishah and Mu`awiyah. [[Tahdhīb 4/547

Those are the Shiite narrators, as al-Mūsawi claimed. So if they were as he says, then let him adopt their beliefs, since seeking truth is wiser than diving deeper into corruption, or were they practicing Taqiyyah?!

Chapter Six

Sections that have had Important Information Omitted

These contain sections in which words were omitted which should not be withheld:

1- `Abdul-Ḥusayn Sharaf-ul-Din al-Mūsawī quoted the book al-Sawa`iq al-Muhriqah where Ibn `Abbas says, “We Ahlul-Bayt are the prophetic tree...” as written in the footnote of letter [6/20]. Of course the author of al-Sawa`iq has saved us the time of refuting him because what he actually wrote was, “And it was reported through a weak chain by Ibn `Abbas...”¹²⁰ But al-Mūsawī resorted to deception and hid this fact. He did the same in the narration of `Ali: “We are the virtuous; our descendants are the descendants of Prophets...” But Ibn Ḥajar again saves us time since what he wrote was: “...reported from `Ali with a weak chain...” As we can see, Ibn Ḥajar weakens this, so we ask al-Mūsawī: Where is the evidence and who authenticated these narrations?

120. Al-Sawa`iq 2/680.

2- In [8/27] al-Mūsawi quoted al-Hākīm's narration: "The stars protect the inhabitants of earth against drowning..." But preferred to not mention al-Dhahabi's commentary in this case because al-Dhahabi said, "I say, 'It is a fabrication.'"¹²¹

3- Al-Mūsawi quotes this narration: "Whoever dies upon the love of the progeny of Muhammad (peace be upon him) dies a martyr," and in his footnotes [10/32-33] he attributes it to al-Tha`labi and al-Zamakhshari's books of Tafsīr. This however, is a corrupt narration as stated by al-Ḥafidh in his study of al-Kashaf¹²² who said: "Al-Tha`labi narrated it in its length and the signs of fabrication emanate from it. Muhammad bin Muslim and the narrators above him are trustworthy, so the defect in this chain lies in the narrators between al-Tha`labi and Muhammad bin Muslim." As for al-Zamakhshari he mentioned it in his book without a chain or source.¹²³ Therefore, the attribution is faulty and al-Tha`labi, as well as his student al-Wahidi (often quoted by Mūsawi), are described by al-Katani as such: "Nei-

121. Mustadrak with Talkhis 3/162.

122. Al-Kashaf 4/220.

123. Ibid 5/405.

ther him nor his teacher al-Tha`labi had any knowledge in Hadith. Moreover, their books of Tafsīr (especially Tha`labi's) are filled with fabricated narrations and corrupt stories.” Ibn Taymiyyah described him in the introduction of the Tafsīr on page 19: “He was like a night-shift lumberjack (one that collects accidentally collect harmful object along with wood).” As for al-Zamakhshari, he was the speaker of the Mu`tazili sect and their flag-bearer so how can he be quoted as evidence against Ahlul-Sunnah?! {What is [wrong] with you? How do you make judgement?}[37:154] And his condition in Hadith isn't any better than al-Tha`labi's. This narration was also mentioned by Ibn Hajar in al-Sawa`iq where he criticized it saying: “Al-Hafidh al-Sakhawi said: ‘The signs of fabrication emanate from it as our teacher said.’”¹²⁴ Al-Mūsawi, of course, never cared to share any of this information, and so the caravan of lies continues onward.

4- Al-Mūsawi says: “Have you not witnessed what your Lord had done to those who openly rejected their Wilayah on that day...” He commented in footnote [12/40] about this fairy-tale that we previ-

124. Al-Sawa`iq 2/664.

ously discussed by saying: “The story is very popular, for Al-Halabi mentions it at the conclusion of his chapter on Hijjatul Wada` ... of his book Al-Sīrah al-Halabiyyah.” Yes, it’s true that he mentioned it, but it should be noted that he also refuted it in more way than one and rejects it while saying: “Al-Ḥafidh al-Dhahabi said, ‘This is a much denounced (Munkar) narration.’” Al-Halabi said, “True, it’s a lie.”¹²⁵ It’s obvious at this point that the methodology of al-Mūsawi is to pick and choose what suits his desires, and this is the difference between the people of knowledge and the people of ignorance.

5- Al-Mūsawi at [16/58] hid the words of the scholars of Hadith narrators concerning Thuwayr bin abi Fakhitah. He chose what pleases himself, ignoring what the learned ones said about him as reported by al-Dhahabi in al-Mīzan and al-Ḥafidh in al-Taḥdhīb¹²⁶ when they rejected his narrations and weakened his status. Al-Mūsawi assumed that we would not check up on his claims, like those from his sect.

125. Al-Sirah al-Halabiyyah 3/309.

126. Al-Mīzan 2/98,99, Taḥdhīb 1/278.

6- In the biography of Ja`far bin Sulayman al-Dab`ī, [16/60] he quoted `Uqayli's statement: "With a chain to Sahl bin Abi Khadwathah who said: I told Ja`far bin Sulayman: 'I heard that you abuse Abu Bakr and `Umar?' He replied: 'As for abuse then no, but I detest them a lot.'"¹²⁷ Although it seems he may have abandoned his position since he narrated reports in their praise and he is from those who narrated, "The Prophet (peace be upon him) died without appointing anybody." This has been clarified by more than one scholar who specialized in judging narrators that he didn't intend the Shaykhayn, otherwise Ahlul-Sunnah would not have relied on him as is known, since the narrations of such men are rejected. However, Ja`far was talking about his two neighbors Abu Bakr and `Umar who've hurt him as was stated by al-Dhahabi in al-Mizan from Ibn `Adi. Al-Dhahabi commented by saying: "I say: This isn't unlikely; for Ja`far had actually narrated reports in the virtues of the Shaykhayn." But Al-Mūsawi was not honest in his quotations because he omitted all of this for to fool us into thinking the man cursed the Shaykhayn. May Allah's curse be upon those who wish to insult them. Al-Mūsawi had quoted Ibn `Adi's words from al-Mizan, but he skipped the narration

127. Al-Du`afa' 1/205.

in praise of the two, Ibn `Adi said: "... He narrated also in the virtues of the Shaykhayn." In fact he was the man who narrated: "The Messenger (peace be upon him) passed away without appointing any successor." How will al-Mūsawi and his people answer this?! Is Ja`far still a Shiite according to them?! He picked whatever part he likes just like a fly picks what it likes from a pile of trash.

7- In the biography of al-Ḥarīth bin `Abdullah al-Hamdani [16/62] we see that al-Dhahabi had weakened him, but al-Mūsawi hid this intentionally. He from the best of followers as he claimed, rather, was simply a scholar of mathematics and inheritance laws. No Sunni scholars relied on his narrations unlike what he claimed. Al-Sha`bi wasn't the only man to accuse him of lying. He was accused by more than one scholar from al-Mūsawi's list of Shiites, such as Ibrāhīm al-Nakha`i, abu Ishaq al-Sabi`I, and Jarir bin `Abdul-Hamid. Unfortunately, al-Mūsawi remains a prisoner of his confused brain and blurry vision.

8- In the biography of Sa`d bin Turayf [16/70] he intentionally hid the scholarly opinions about him. Al-Dhahabi in his Mīzan as well as al-Ḥafidh in his Tahdhīb have both listed sufficient criticisms to render his narrations unusable, though al-Mūsawi never mentioned any of this even though he quoted al-Mīzan. Did Allah blind his vision? Why only mention the weakening of al-Fallas and leave the rest? As for al-Tirmidhi's narration from him, then the narration of a trustworthy man from a weaker one does not make him reliable, how so when al-Tirmidhi himself describes him as: "Weak"? What did al-Mūsawi imagine when listing this man as reliable according to Ahlul-Sunnah?

9- Al-Mūsawi [16/85-88] ignored the statements of how `Abdul-Razzaq al-San`ani became confused and forgetful at the end of his life around the time he was struck with blindness.¹²⁸ He did this simply to avoid weakening some of the man's narrations which support his hateful Madhab. At the same time, he never mentioned the man's actual beliefs. `Abdul-Razzaq says: "By Allah, my heart would not be

128. Tahdhīb 2/573.

at ease if I preferred `Ali over Abu Bakr and `Umar, may Allah have mercy on Abu Bakr, `Umar and `Uthman. Their hater is no believer.” And he said: “My love for them is certainly from my best deeds.”¹²⁹ However, al-Mūsawi due to his burning hatred hid this as well.

10- In the biography of abu Nu`aym al-Fadl bin Dukayn [16/98], al-Dhahabi clarified that this man’s Tashayyu` was without extremism or abuse.¹³⁰ These facts were omitted by al-Mūsawi due to his dishonesty. Ibn Ḥajar wrote in his biography that he used to say: “The guardians of Hadith have never recorded about me that I ever cursed Mu`awiyah.”¹³¹ He wished for this matter to be known about him. How could be one, when he narrated two narrations in al-Bukhari about wiping on the Khuffayn, for this opposes the view of the extremists from the Shiites as is known? Will al-Mūsawi still say after all this that al-Fadl is Shiite?! This is only a result of his unstable mental condition that clings to anything that would beatify its ugliness.

129. Ibid.

130. Mīzan 5/426.

131. Tahdhīb 3/390.

11- The liar writes in [16/102] about al-Hākim, author of al-Mustadrak: “All learned Sunni scholars who could not achieve as much as he did envy him. He is one of the Shiite heroes, a protector of the Islamic law.” This is the exaggerated introduction al-Mūsawi gave al-Hākim, although he failed to mention that the man is no Rāfidhi or Imami. He was simply an average Shiite as stated by al-Dhahabi.¹³² Al-Hākim had narrated a lot in praise of the first three Caliphs and preferred them over `Ali. It is also unlikely that he preferred `Ali over `Uthman, for he mentioned `Uthman in his Mustadrak before `Ali.¹³³ This proves that al-Mūsawi is a liar, and if al-Hākim were to hold the same corrupt beliefs as al-Mūsawi, no one would even hear or narrate from him.

12- In the biography of Hisham bin `Ammār [16/109] he writes: “I say: al-Bukhari quotes him directly ... And his chapter on the attributes of the companions of the Prophet (peace be upon him).” What he failed to mention, was that this Hadith is actually a Hadith in praise of Abu Bakr, thus showing that Ibn `Ammār was not a Shi`ee,

¹³². Mīzan 6/216.

¹³³. Mustadrak 3/84.

or that he is one that prefers Abu Bakr may Allah be pleased with him. So if al-Mūsawi still considers him reliable, then he should accept this report from him: That the Prophet (peace be upon him) said from the hadith of Abi Al-Darda': "I was sent by Allah to you folks but you said I lied. However, Abu Bakr believed me, comforted me, and supported me with his wealth, so will you not leave my companion alone?!" Nobody ever harmed or annoyed Abu Bakr after this."¹³⁴ Did al-Mūsawi not catch glimpse of this hadith?!

13- Al-Mūsawi said about Wakī` bin al-Jarraḥ [16/111]: "Ibn al-Madīni said in his Tahdhib: Waki` has some Tashayyu`." But he hid al-Dhahabi's words in al-Mīzan when he spoke of how minor his Tashayyu` is. This is clear even in Ibn al-Madīni's words: "He had no Rafd in him." If this were to be attributed to him then it would certainly lower his status; moreover, Ibn Ma`īn had rejected the words of anyone who attributed Rafd to Wakī` as Al-Mūsawi himself quoted and it is the biggest proof that he isn't one of al-Mūsawi's kind. Al-Dhahabi mentioned in the biography of Wakī` in Tadhkirat

134. Sahih al-Bukhari #3661.

al-Ḥuffadh his words: “Whoever claims the Qur’an was created has apostated.” How will al-Mūsawi claim now that Wakī` is from their cult? Either they reject Wakī`’s Tashayyu` or reject their own belief.

14- In the biography of Yazīd bin Abi Ziyad al-Kūfi [16/113], al-Mūsawi said: “In spite of all this, many have assaulted him, preparing against him all means of belittling and charging due to the fact that, relying on Abu Barzah or maybe Abu Bardah, he has narrated one Hadith stating the following: ‘We were in the company of the Prophet (peace be upon him) when some singing was heard. Then `Amr bin al-`As and Mu`awiyah came singing.’ The Prophet (peace be upon him) said: ‘O Mighty Lord! Involve both of these men in dissension, and hurl them in Hell-fire.’” This illogical Hadith was invented by these lowlife predecessors of this liar and it is from the denounced reports by this Yazīd. Al-Dhahabi commented on this Hadith by saying: “Odd and denounced narrative.”¹³⁵ Therefore, al-Mūsawi cannot use this as an argument when he’s actually quoting from the same book al-Mīzan that weakens it. Then, he ignores it. Isn’t this due

135. Mīzan 7/242.

to his lack of trustworthiness? As for the scholars of Hadith falsely accusing him, this isn't true as they all agreed on his weakness and shakiness in narrating. Finally, as for Muslim relying on him, this isn't true as the learned readers know because Muslim quoted his narration only in support of another one as declared by al-Dhahabi in al-Mīzan. So ponder on the ignorance of this author to know who the people of truth are.

15- The Rāfidhi quotes the narration of Umm Sulaym, that the Prophet (peace be upon him) told her: "O Umm Sulaym, `Ali's flesh is my own and his blood is my own and he is to me as Harun was to Musa." Then in [32/138] he writes in the footnote that he found it in Kanz-ul-`Ummal and Muntakhab-ul-Kanz. However, he doesn't mention the weakening of this book's author who copied it from `Uqayli's Du'afa', which is a book that specializes in collecting the weakest of reports. Al-Muttaqi al-Hindi wrote in Kanz-ul-`Ummal that whatever he quotes from `Uqayli is automatically considered weak.¹³⁶ He said after mentioning al-`Uqayli, Ibn `Adi, al-Khatīb and Ibn `Asakir

136. Al-Kanz 1/10.

in the introduction of his book: “All that was attributed to those four as well as al-Ḥakim al-Tirmidhi... Then it is weak and it is sufficient for me to attribute it to one of them to suggest its weakness.” This is why al-Mūsawi refrained from mentioning the sources listed by al-Muttaqi and kept the truth concealed.

16- Our opponent al-Mūsawi writes:

“When death approached him, may both my parents be sacrificed for him, he said: ‘Fetch me my brother.’ They called `Ali in. He said to him: ‘Come close to me.’ `Ali did. He kept whispering in his ears till his pure soul departed from his body. `Ali even caught some of the Prophet’s (peace be upon him) saliva.”

And he references it in [34/143] to Ibn Sa`d in his *Tabaqat* while mentioning that the author of *al-Kanz* quoted it as well. However, the author of *al-Kanz* attributed it to Ibn Sa`d saying, “Its chain is weak.”¹³⁷ This was intentionally left-out by al-Mūsawi because it

137. Ibid #18790.

doesn't suit his devious plans, may Allah bring upon him what he deserves for his deceit. As for the narration, it is loaded with defects; the narrator is none other than al-Waqidi who is abandoned and considered to be a liar by some. It is also disconnected because Muhammad bin `Umar bin `Ali never met his grandfather `Ali. It's also established that the Prophet (peace be upon him) died in `A'ishah's room but these folks would love nothing more than to erase every virtue for the Companions.¹³⁸

17- Al-Mūsawi quoted this amusing narration: "It is written on the gate of paradise: No god except Allah, Muhammad is his messenger, `Ali is the brother of his messenger..." Then in the footnote, [17/143] he references al-Tabarani in al-Awsat, al-Khatib in al-Mutafiq wal-Muftariq as written in Kanz-ul-`Ummal and Muntakhab-ul-Kanz.¹³⁹ al-Mūsawi omitted what points to its weakness when he left out the fact that al-Muttaqi attributed it to al-Wāhiyat by Ibn al-Jawzi.¹⁴⁰ If anything, this shows that this Rāfidhi Imam and his

138. Bukhari #1389.

139. Kanz #33043, Muntakhab 5/35.

140. Al-Wahiyat is from the books that specialize in collecting very weak reports.

entire sect are a deceitful god-forsaken cult based on deception to achieve their twisted means.

18- Al-Mūsawi said:

“Zayd bin Arqam has said: ‘A few companions of the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) used to have the doors of their houses overlooking the mosque. The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him and his progeny, then said: ‘Close down all these doors except `Ali’s.’ Some people did not like it, and they talked about it.”

And he wrote in the footnote [16/145] that it’s reported by Ahmad in the Musnad¹⁴¹ and by al-Diya’ just as is written in Kanz al-`Ummal. As for Ahmad, he reported it from the path of Maymun abu `Abdillah the Basri servant of `Abdul-Raḥmān bin Samurah; al-Ḥafidh said in al-Taqrīb: “Weak,”¹⁴² and more than one Imam weakened him

141. Musnad 32/41 and al-Arna’ut said: “Its chain is weak and the text is denounced.”

142. Al-Taqrīb #7100.

including Ahmad himself who said, “His reports are denounced.”¹⁴³ This shows that Ahmad’s inclusion of certain reports in his Musnad does not imply his acceptance as some ignorants claim. Ibn al-Jawzi said about these types of reports in al-Mawdou`at: “All similar reports are fabricated by the Rāfidah to counter the authentic agreed upon narration: ‘Close all doors except Abu Bakr’s door.’”¹⁴⁴

19- Al-Mūsawi said:

Al-Bazzaz has likewise indicated that the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him and his progeny, took `Ali’s hand and said: “Musa had prayed his Lord to purify His mosque through Harun, and I have prayed my Lord to purify mine through you.” He then sent a messenger to Abu Bakr ordering him to close down his door which overlooked the mosque, and Abu Bakr responded expressing his desire to honour the Prophet’s command. Then he sent another messenger

¹⁴³. Tahdhīb 4/200.

¹⁴⁴. Mawdou`at 1/366.

to `Umar to do likewise, and another to al-`Abbas for the same purpose. Then he, peace be upon him and his progeny, said: “It is not I who has closed down your doors, nor have I kept `Ali’s door open out of my own accord; rather, it is Allah Who has opened his door and closed yours.”

And in its footnote [16/147] he pointed to its existence in al-Kanz but left out the fact that the author weakened this when he said: “And its narrator is abu Maymunah who is unknown.”¹⁴⁵ Al-Dhahabi had also mentioned similarly in al-Mīzan from al-Daraqutni: “He is unknown and should be abandoned.”¹⁴⁶ And he is different from abu Maymunah al-Farisi the reliable narrator. Al-Haythami also weakened it in Majma’ Al-Zawa`id by saying, “In this chain are those that I do not know.”¹⁴⁷ May the Shias be aware of this man’s deceptions.

20- He wrote in letter [36/151] `Ali’s narration: “I have prayed for Allah to grant me five wishes concerning you, and He granted me

145. Kanz #36521.

146. Mīzan 7/434.

147. Majm’a Al-Zawa`id 9/115.

four and denied the fifth. He continues to say: ‘He has granted me that you are the Wali of the believers after me.’” This one is also fabricated as is clear from the reference al-Muttaqi quoted and it is al-Wāhiyat by Ibn al-Jawzi.¹⁴⁸ Al-Mūsawi never felt like including this since his mission is to fool readers into believing in the authenticity of whatever he quotes. We had previously seen that the author of al-Kanz finds it sufficient to refer to certain books to prove a narration’s weakness and this is one of them. A question arises: Why do the Shiites attribute every virtue the Prophet (peace be upon him) possesses to `Ali? Or virtues that exceed those of the Prophet (peace be upon him) at times? It is because if he acquired this by marrying his daughter, then others also shared this honor, and if it was because of his blood relation to the Prophet (peace be upon him), then there were other relatives who shared the honor! We observe that they do not glorify `Ali due to his ties with the Prophet (peace be upon him), on the contrary, they glorify the Prophet (peace be upon him), due to his closeness to `Ali. This is why according to them, anyone who loves `Ali or supports him becomes the greatest of personalities and you can refer back to the Shiite narrations to discover the truth of

148. Kanz #36411.

what we say.

21- Al-Mūsawi said in [48/162]: “Consider the statement of the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him and his progeny, while holding `Ali’s neck, ‘This is the Imam of the righteous, the slayer of the debauchees; victorious is whoever supports him, forsaken (by Allah) is whoever abandons him.’” It is reported by al-Hākim as stated by the author of al-Kanz. This is a fabrication by abu Ja`far Ahmad bin `Abdullah bin Yazīd. Ibn `Adi said about him, “He used to sit in Samarra’ and fabricate narrations.”¹⁴⁹ Al-Mūsawi then mentions al-Hākim’s grading but doesn’t mention al-Dhahabi’s commentary on it because he says: “By Allah it is fabricated and Ahmad is a liar, so how ignorant can you be in spite of the vastness of your knowledge?!”¹⁵⁰ In turn, we say to al-Mūsawi: How dumb and thick-headed can you be in addition to your lack of honesty and religion?! Al-Albani also weakened this one so refer to his book if you may.¹⁵¹

149. Mīzan 1/249.

150. Mustadrak ma` al-Talkhis 3/140.

151. Al-Silsilah al-Da`ifah 1/532 #357.

22- He quoted the Prophet (peace be upon him) saying: “It has been revealed to me that `Ali has three exclusive merits: that he is the chief of the Muslims, the Imam of the righteous, and the leader of those whose foreheads radiate with the mark of faith.” Then attributed it to al-Hākim and in the footnote [48/163] to al-Kanz. Al-Hākim disgraced himself and his book by including this narration in it and authenticating it, may Allah forgive him. Though, as usual, al-Mūsawī hid the comment of al-Dhahabi on al-Hākim’s report which he considered a lie and hid al-Muttaqi’s comment in the Kanz which was the following: “Ibn Ḥajar said: ‘Very weak and disconnected’ ... al-Dhahabi said: ‘I believe it is fabricated.’ Ibn al-`Imad said: ‘This is extremely denounced and it appears to have been created by extremist Shiites as these are the descriptions of the Messenger (peace be upon him) not `Ali.’”¹⁵²

Ibn Taymiyyah said:

This is a fabricated report in the eyes of those who have the slightest knowledge of narrations and it’s forbidden to attribute it to the Messenger (peace be

152. Kanz #33010.

upon him). We do not know anyone who is “Masters of the Muslims, Leader of the righteous and the chief of those whose foreheads radiate with the mark of faith” except for our Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him).¹⁵³

Al-Albani also weakened this report.¹⁵⁴

23- Al-Mūsawī quoted his statement peace be upon him in [48/164]: “Shall I lead you to that which, as long as you adhere to it, you shall never go astray? It is `Ali; love him as you love me, and respect him as you respect me...” And he references it to al-Tabarani’s Kabir although he copied it from Kanz-ul-`Ummal as is his habit and hid the author’s commentary, “Ibn Kathir said, ‘This is a denounced report.’”¹⁵⁵ Al-Mūsawī then makes a silly comment that suits his simple intellect: “Look and see how he has made their right guidance conditional upon upholding `Ali; thus, those who do not do so would certainly stray.” Did we not tell you O readers that they venerate

153. Al-Muntaqa 497.

154. Al-Da`ifah #353.

155. Kanz #33007.

`Ali more than the Messenger (peace be upon him)?! And that they accuse the nation of being misguided disbelievers?! Does one grasp onto `Ali or the Qur'an or the Sunnah or the Prophet (peace be upon him)? Allah said to his Messenger: {So adhere to that which is revealed to you. Indeed, you are on a straight path. - And indeed, it is a remembrance for you and your people, and you [all] are going to be questioned.} [43:43-44] Or is the religion of the Lord of the Worlds is simply about following a Muslim from amongst the Muslims? Where is the Messenger?! Where is the Qur'an?! The Messenger (peace be upon him) said in the authentic narration: "I left amongst you that if you grab onto you will not be led astray after me: The Book of Allah and my Sunnah." So look onto these two parties and choose one of these two paths, for truth is clear.

Also note that al-Mūsawi included Ibn Abi al-Hadid's Sharh-ul-Nahj as a source for this, which isn't a Sunni book.

24- In another example of omission and deception [48/169] al-Mūsawi quotes the narration of Abu Bakr al-Siddīq: "According to one

Hadith narrated by Abu Bakr, ‘My hand and `Ali’s are equal when it comes to justice,’” referencing to Kanz-ul-`Ummal, but the big scandal is that he hid the author’s commentary, because he attributed it to Ibn al-Jawzi’s book al-Wahiyat, thus exposing its corruption and weakness. Can this man still be counted as a leader among them in spite of all this apparent deception?!

{And they will say, “Our Lord, indeed we obeyed our masters and our dignitaries, and they led us astray from the [right] way.} [33:67]

25- The evil man then attacks the mother of believers `A’ishah bint al-Siddīq and accuses her of following her desires and taking part in forbidden actions:

Do not also forget her yielding to sentiment when Asma’ bint al-Nu`man was wedded to the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him and his progeny. She said to her: When the Prophet (peace be upon him) weds a woman, he likes to hear her say: “I seek refuge with Allah against you,” aiming thereby to turn the

Prophet, peace be upon him and his progeny, against his wedding altogether and make him hate the poor woman.

May Allah curse those that curse the Mother of the Believers. This dishonest lie was quoted by `Abdul-Ḥusayn in [76/232] from al-Hākim and Ibn Sa`d from the narration of abi Usayd al-Sa`idi and its chain is “terribly weak” as al-Dhahabi described it in al-Talkhīs.¹⁵⁶ The Dajjal hides this reality and hides that the report comes through the path of Hisham bin Muhammad bin al-Sa`ib al-Kalbi. Al-Daraqutni says about him: “Abandoned.”¹⁵⁷ Ibn `Asakir says: “Unreliable Rāfidhi.” Al-Dhahabi said: “He is not trusted.”¹⁵⁸ In fact, if you return to this fabricated story you will realize that the person who said this could either be `A`ishah or Ḥafsaḥ, so where did he conclude that these were `A`ishah’s words?! As for Ibn Sa`d’s report, from another path, shows that this was uttered by one of the Prophet’s (peace be upon him) wives without specifying. Al-Kalbi narrates this from his father who is also accused of lying, so the tale is dropped altogether,

156. Mustadrak ma` Talkhis 4/39.

157. Tahdhīb 3/570.

158. Al-Mīzan 6/159-161.

and it has no basis of truth.

26- Al-Mūsawi claims constantly that al-Siddīq was included in the army of Usamah which we previously refuted, but what interests us here is to prove the man's lies when he claimed consensus. If he meant the consensus of the Rāfidah then maybe he's right but it has no weight in our eyes. However, if he means the consensus of the legitimate scholars, then there is no such thing. He writes [90/265] in his so called list of "sources" that al-Halabi admits this in his Sīrah. Although, al-Halabi actually writes this:

And he exempted Abu Bakr and ordered him to lead the prayer, so there is no contradiction between saying that Abu Bakr was in the regiment and saying that he stayed behind. This is because he was a part of it at first and then he remained by orders of the Prophet (peace be upon him). This way we have refuted the argument of the Rāfidah who attack Abu Bakr by accusing him of abandoning the regiment of Usamah

as you know that the reason was a prophetic order to lead prayer.¹⁵⁹

Ahmad bin Zayni Dahlan said similarly in his *Sīrah*¹⁶⁰ and al-Mūsawi knew this when quoting both sources, but chose to keep silent.

27- Al-Mūsawi said in [90/268]: “According to Shihristani’s fourth Introduction to his book *Al-Milal wal Nihal*, the Prophet (peace be upon him) is quoted saying: ‘Draft in Usamah’s army; may Allah curse its draft dodgers.’” His purpose from quoting this is clear as he only intends to attack Abu Bakr and `Umar may Allah be pleased with them.

As for this narration, it has no foundation, nor is it accompanied by a chain, nor is Al-Shihristani a source for narrations. Furthermore, he did not attribute it to anyone nor authenticate it.¹⁶¹ As for al-Halabi, that he often likes to quote, he says: “The saying of the Rāfidah that

159. *Al-Sirah al-Halabiyyah* 3/208.

160. *Al-Sirah al-Nabawiyah* 2/363.

161. *Al-Milal wal-Nihal* 1/30.

those who dodged it were cursed is rejected as it was never mentioned in any valid report to begin with.” Ibn Dahlan said the same but al-Mūsawi refrained from quoting them here since they do not support his devilish agenda.

28- Al-Mūsawi claimed that the main intention of the Messenger (peace be upon him) from sending Usamah’s army was because he:

Desired that they should leave the capital in order to clear the way for the establishment of the caliphate for the Commander of the Faithful Ali bin Abi Tālib peacefully and quietly. So, when they would come back, such caliphate would have already been established and settled down for `Ali, and there would have been no chance for them to dispute or question it. [90/269]

We say to al-Mūsawi: If he decided to proceed in this twisted method, simply to keep them away from the capital as a favor for `Ali, why then did he leave Abu Bakr as the Imam of prayer instead of

`Ali?! This action alone (placing Abu Bakr in his own position) is without a doubt one of the biggest evidences for Abu Bakr's legitimacy as Caliph. Anyone who abandons extremism can see this. Even al-Dahlani, who is oft quoted by al-Mūsawi, admits this in al-Sīrah , though al-Mūsawi chose to ignore this. He said when speaking of `Usama's draft and Abu Bakr's prayer: "And in this is a sign for Abu Bakr's Caliphate after him."¹⁶² This is another omission by al-Mūsawi who continues to manipulate texts.

If the Prophet (peace be upon him) truly intended to appoint `Ali as his successor then he would have been supported by divine protection and he would have ascended the throne in spite of the feeble attempts of a few individuals with no power or authority. `Ali furthermore had more of a supportive position if he wanted such a role to be his. Will not the Shiites use their heads for a while and abandon their blind emulation of this Mūsawi?! He then writes in his book the following text painting an ugly early Islamic society:

He (peace be upon him) had selected Usamah, who was seventeen years old, to be their commander

162. Al-Sirah 2/362-365.

simply in order to subdue the stiff necks of some of them, and out of his own desire to contain the ambition of others, and also as a safeguard for protecting the peace in the future against the dispute of those who were obviously ambitious and hopeful, had he chosen one of them instead. But they were intelligent enough to be aware of what he (peace be upon him) was planning; so, they questioned the appointment of Usamah, reluctantly refused to accompany him.

What greater criticism towards his person can you find?! Al-Mūsawi described him as a trickster and a schemer, although this better fits the Shiite scholars than it fits the divinely chosen prophets who are the most truthful and loyal of individuals. Unfortunately, the Rāfidah like to attribute their own flaws to others and think that everyone is as corrupt as they are! Do we believe the Lord of the worlds who said {Merciful towards each-other}[48:29] or al-Mūsawi and his teachers?!

29- Al-Mūsawi wrote more lies about how some Companions objected to Abu Bakr's leadership: "Suffices here to cite the book of arguments by imam al-Tabrasi in which he quotes statements made by the Umayyad Khalid bin Sa'id bin al-'As." His source in [106/292] was *Tabaqat Ibn Sa'd* where he quoted what serves his filthy view and omitted the rest of what opposes it. This narration¹⁶³ is not remotely acceptable as it is narrated by al-Waqidi from Ja'far bin Muhammad bin Khalid bin al-Zubayr bin al-'Awwam and we know that al-Waqidi is abandoned and Ja'far's narrations are denounced¹⁶⁴. In addition, we say that this narration, in spite of its weakness, doesn't have much to offer since it only Khalid objected to Abu Bakr's leadership for three months, then realized his mistake and returned to him willingly to offer a pledge of allegiance. It states:

And Khalid remained for three months without offering his pledge of allegiance. Abu Bakr then passed him by at noon while he was at his house and greeted him, so Khalid said: "Would you like to receive my allegiance?" Abu Bakr said: "I would like for you to

¹⁶³. *Tabaqat Ibn Sa'd* 4/73.

¹⁶⁴. *Al-Majrouhin* 1/250, *Al-Mīzan* 2/146.

be with the rest of the Muslims in this matter.” He replied: “I meet you tonight and offer you my loyalty.” So he came on that night while Abu Bakr was on the pulpit and offered his allegiance and Abu Bakr had always thought well of him and always had great respect for him.¹⁶⁵

This was the part that al-Mūsawi omitted since it did not suit his beliefs. If he wanted to use it as evidence, then he should accept it completely along with what can be used against the Rafidha and himself together. As for him quoting al-Tabrasi, then we do not care about it, since he is a Rāfidhi Shiite scholar, and since when did Rāfidhi sources become binding upon Ahlul-Sunnah.

So praise be to Allah who granted us success in our journey to reveal the truth and expose the fakeness of this man and his corruption.

¹⁶⁵. Tabaqat 4/73.

Chapter Seven

Sections that Include his Contradictions

These contain sections where he claims something, then contradicts himself, or praises someone, then condemns him, etc:

1- `Abdul-Ḥusayn Sharaf-ul-Dīn al-Mūsawī writes about the Wilayah (authority) of Ahlul-Bayt in letter [12/39]: “Is it not the ‘pleasure’ concerning whom Allah the Sublime has said, {Then you will surely be asked that Day about pleasure}[102:8].” Then he writes in another location that it’s something else: “Isn’t their Wilayah part of the ‘trust’ about which the Almighty says: {We offered the trust unto the heavens, the earth, and the mountains, but they all refused to bear it out of extreme fear, then man bore it: he is most unjust, most ignorant}[33:72].” Observe the contradiction; at one point he says it’s the “pleasure” and at another he says it’s the “trust”. I ask, if their Wilayah was the “pleasure” then why in the name of all that is good would the heavens, the earth, and the mountains refuse to accept it

and instead feared it?! It's important to know that Allah did not reprimand them or punish them, and if their leadership was bliss as he claimed, then it entails their ignorance and Allah's disapproval. In addition, that Allah had described all humankind with ignorance and oppression when they accepted the burden, so if it was their leadership and it was bliss, then would it be logical for Allah to accuse humankind of ignorance and oppression for accepting his bliss?! Truly, the ignoramus is exposed by his ignorance.

2- Al-Mūsawi He contradicted himself again in [14/50] when he claimed that al-Bukhari relies on their Shiite narrators, rather, relied on the extremist Shiites who cursed and hated Abu Bakr and `Umar: "Among Bukhari's mentors are Shiite men who have been charged with being "Rāfidhi" and stamped with hatred; nevertheless, this has never made Bukhari nor others doubt their fair-mindedness. The latter relied upon them even in the Sahih books feeling very comfortable with doing so." At another location [22/125] he claims that Al-Bukhari was a hater of Ahlul-Bayt and their Shia and that he doesn't narrate anything from them or their merits. If the matter was

as al-Mūsawi describes then Bukhari wouldn't have specific chapters in his book for the virtues of `Ali and others from Ahlul-Bayt.¹⁶⁶

3- In the biography of al-Ḥasan bin Ḥay [16/64] al-Mūsawi quoted Ibn Sa`d's words about him: "He was trustworthy, with many correct narrations, and he was Shiite." How come al-Mūsawi accepted Ibn Sa`d's authentication to al-Ḥasan bin Ṣaliḥ in this case? Didn't he previously criticize Ibn Sa`d while accusing him of being hostile towards Shiite narrators? Why then did he authenticate al-Ḥasan as quoted by Al-Mūsawi? We remind the read of what al-Mūsawi said in [16/63] when discussing al-Ḥarith: "From those who conspired against al-Ḥarith was Ibn Sa`d who wrote his biography in the sixth volume of al-Tabaqāt saying: 'He has a corrupt opinion' so he neglected the man's right as is his habit when it comes to Shiite narrators, he never treats them fairly in their deeds and knowledge..." But why was al-Ḥasan not weakened for his Tashayyu`?! And just so that we can further humiliate al-Mūsawi and his cult, we found in Sunan

166. Sahih al-Bukhari, chapters on `Ali's virtues, on Ja`far's virtues, of `Abbas's virtues and the chapter on virtues of the close family of The Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him). Narrations #3701 to #3716.

abu Dāwūd a narration by al-Ḥasan where he confirms wiping the Khuffayn, and this contradicts the Shiite opinion which shows that al-Ḥasan was never an extremist. Also if one were to check the footnotes of al-Muraja`āt he will discover that the author often quotes Tabaqāt Ibn Sa`d so why would he contradict himself like this?!

4- Similarly in the biography of Dawoud bin Abi `Awf [16/67], al-Mūsawi said: “No harm, indeed, can reach Dawoud from these Nasibis since both Sufyans quote his Ahadith.” As for the accusation of Nasb, he means Ibn `Adi who criticized Dawoud by saying: “He is not relied upon in my opinion, he is a Shiite and most of what he narrates are virtues for Ahlul-Bayt.”¹⁶⁷ What’s important here is that al-Mūsawi’s statement suggests that he only authenticated Dawoud because Sufyan narrated from him so we ask in this case: Why doesn’t al-Mūsawi abide by Sufyan’s criticisms on other narrators in his list that include those that Sufyan accused of lying?! Is this due to stubbornness or due to his desires?!

¹⁶⁷. Al-Mīzan 3/30.

5- In the biography of al-Fudayl bin Marzouq [16/100] he wrote: “Zayd bin al-Habab has in fact lied regarding what he attributed to him of Hadith dealing with the appointment of `Ali...” He’s talking about the narration Zayd bin al-Habab narrated from Fudayl, but to show you the utter stupidity of al-Mūsawi we remind you that Zayd was actually number 28 of the “100 Shiite Narrators” in al-Mūsawi’s list!! He mentioned Ibn `Adi’s statement: “He is from the top Kufan narrators and no one doubt his honesty.” Al-Mūsawi listed him as a Shiite, so it’s only natural he believes in his reliability, but he then returns here to accuse him of lying! Isn’t this ironic and pathetic of al-Mūsawi? Isn’t he deserving of the popular statement “More astray than his family’s donkey?” We say: Yes, he is.

6- Al-Mūsawi said about Bukhari: “Whoever knows the way al-Bukhari thought, his own attitudes towards the Commander of the Faithful (as), and towards all Ahlul-Bayt (as), will come to know that Bukhari’s pen falls short of narrating texts regarding them, and his ink dries up before recounting their attributes.” And he said: “The reason why both Shaykhs [Bukhari and Muslim], and their likes,

have not quoted this Hadith is due to the fact that it did not agree with their own personal views regarding the issue of succession. This is why they have rejected a great deal of authentic texts for fear the Shiites may use them as pretexts...” [22/125] Al-Mūsawi here claims something nobody else did, not even the Prophet (peace be upon him) knew what the hearts concealed. How could al-Mūsawi then know al-Bukhari’s secrets?! Then he contradicted himself at [14/50] when saying that al-Bukhari had reported from Rāfidah who hate Abu Bakr and `Umar. This is the case with all innovators. They only care about rejecting the truth, even if they fall into apparent contradictions. Al-Mūsawi is referring to the narration of al-Dar, which was not reported by Al-Bukhari and others, for it which is a weak report, and we’ve already seen al-Bukhari and others report `Ali’s authentic virtues.

7- Al-Mūsawi says: “Consider his statement, peace be upon him and his progeny, on the day of `Arafat during Hijjatul Wada` [the farewell pilgrimage]: ‘`Ali is of me, and I am of `Ali, and nobody pays my debts other than I or `Ali.’” He then commented in [48/165]:

“Whoever studies this hadith in Ahmed’s Musnad will come to know that it was said during the Farewell Pilgrimage.” But in the same footnote he also wrote that this took place when Abu Bakr was appointed to lead the pilgrims and `Ali followed him to Hajj in order to recite the verses. However, according to the expert scholars this event was during the ninth year of Hijrah, therefore it wasn’t at the farewell pilgrimage!! It truly is amazing how the devil fools his party, blinding them, and causes them to falter into sin.

8- Al-Mūsawi wrote [82/249]: “So, do you consider the actions dictated by the fear of the sword or the burning by the fire as a belief in the consignment of the allegiance?” He’s insinuating that people only gave Abu Bakr pledge of allegiance due to fear not conviction; that he threatened them with the sword, and that this is why they followed him. These statements conflict with his previous statement in [82/246]: “`Ali and all the infallible Imams from his descendants (as) have a well-known policy in supporting the Islamic authority.” This last one shows that `Ali offered his pledge of allegiance out of conviction, not out of fear of death. It truly astonishes the amount of

lies in this book by al-Mūsawi. He lied so much that by the time he arrived at the end of his book, he forgot about his earlier lies.

9- Al-Mūsawi wrote about the paper that the Prophet (peace be upon him) wished to write during his sickness [88/263]: “It is possible that `Umar feared the hypocrites might cast doubts about the authenticity of such writing, since it would be written during the Prophet’s sickness, and that it would be a cause for dissension.” Then, he dismissed this possibility saying: “Such an insinuation is impossible since the Prophet, peace be upon him and his progeny, had stated: ‘you shall never go astray’ thus clearly stating that such writing would bring them security against straying.” Although before this he said in [86/258]: “He (peace be upon him) repealed his order to them due to their statement with which they surprised him [that he’s delirious], forcing him to change his mind, since after uttering it there would be no effect for his writing them anything other than dissension and dispute.” And he wrote: “His marvelous wisdom decreed that he, peace be upon him and his progeny, should forget about such writing for fear those opposing his wish and their followers might open a door

to casting doubts about Prophet-hood.” This sophistry by al-Mūsawi has nothing to do with academia. Children would laugh at it before adults due to the continuous contradictions that come so close to one another. He is either a complete fool or a compulsive liar and we have brought evidences of both.

10- In another devastating contradiction, al-Mūsawi writes [110/305]: “After that (authoring Fatimah’s Mushaf), he (‘Ali) authored a book dealing with blood monies which he titled Al-Sahīfa.” He narrates this even though ‘Ali denied having any secret text that was given to him by the Prophet (peace be upon him) or any book that he reads. Al-Mūsawi himself quoted: “I have witnessed ‘Ali, peace be upon him, telling people from the pulpit: ‘By Allah! We have nothing to recite for you other than the Book of Allah the Exalted, and this Sahīfa,’ which he was attaching to his sword.” This statement contradicts their claim of Mushaf Fatimah, their claim of other mythical books, and many other ridiculously large books that they attribute to ‘Ali like a Qur’anic exegesis. This is another of Al-Mūsawi’s clear contradictions.

Chapter Eight

Sections that Include Condemnations of the Companions

This section contain his attacks on specific Companions as well as the Companions in general:

1- `Abdul-Ḥusayn al-Mūsawī the Saba`ī¹⁶⁸ attacks the best of creations after the prophets, the Companions of the Messenger of Allah may peace be upon them. He writes in letter [8/23]: “The Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him and his progeny, to which we referred whereby he struck an awe in the heart of the ignorant, calling upon the indifferent... saying: O people! I am leaving with you the Book of Allah and my household...” This expression he used shows his belief and the belief of his sect concerning the Companions; that they were ignorant and indifferent except for `Ali. This statement was never used by the Christians or the Jews to describe the companions and disciples of their own prophets. Truly, it is a

168. Saba`i: A term describing the Saba`iyyah, a sect who follows the teachings of `Abdullah ibn Saba` the Jew who was the original father of the concept of Imamah.

view that ultimately leads to attacking the Prophet (peace be upon him) himself. It is as our pious predecessors described: “Those folks attack the Companions of the Messenger (peace be upon him) so that he (in turn) may be accused of corruption. People will say: A corrupt man; if he were among the righteous he would have had righteous companions.”

The relationship between the Prophet (peace be upon him) and those who accompanied him is strong; it is a bond that was revealed from the heavens, threaded by the Praised One (peace be upon him) and acted upon his students (may Allah be pleased with them). There is no room for the hypocrites and their students here.

2- Al-Mūsawi writes in the footnote [8/26]: “Then ask him how he came to prefer to the descendants of the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him and his progeny, the descendants of lizards?!” This just shows a portion of the hatred this man has in store for the Awliya’ of Allah in his heart and Allah says: {Hatred has already appeared from their mouths, and what their breasts conceal is greater.}[3:118]

However, we say in return that the purity of the vast oceans shall not be spoiled if a handful of mud is thrown into it.

3- Al-Mūsawi attacks the three Caliphs in [10/34] when he says: “The Almighty, has preferred them over all others, making sending prayers unto them part of the obligatory prayers, albeit if the one saying his prayer were a Siddīq or Faruq, with one light, or two, or with numerous lights.” There is no doubt in the heart of the Muslim that this was led to him by Satan. Al-Mūsawi here abandons his wretched Taqiyyah¹⁶⁹ and exposes his innermost hatred towards the rightly guided successors. The question is: Why all this hatred?! Is it because Islam was strong in their time and it spread through the lands by their efforts? Is it because the Muslims were in a state of glory and peace, and they enjoyed Allah’s blessings during their reign? Is it because they broke the back of the Persians and Romans and extinguished the fire of the Majus?! As for us, we say as all Muslims say:

{And those who came after them (into faith), say, ‘Our Lord, forgive

¹⁶⁹. Taqiyyah: A Shiite practice enabling them to hide their true beliefs and intentions from others and to present to others something other than what they conceal in their hearts in order to fool them. This practice is mainly utilized by them in our days to trick Muslims into joining their sect.

us and our brothers who preceded us in faith and put not in our hearts [any] resentment toward those who have believed. Our Lord, indeed You are Kind and Merciful' } [59:10].” Thus, our love towards them, after our faith in Allah and His Messenger, is from our best deeds.

4- Al-Mūsawi writes about the caliph Mu`awiyah bin Abi Sufyan [28/137]: “Mu`awiyah was the leader of the oppressive gang. He stood in enmity against the Commander of the Faithful (as), fought him, cursed him from Muslims’ pulpits and ordered people to do likewise.” We say: The one who is really insolent in his hostility is none other than al-Mūsawi, for Mu`awiyah was a writer of revelation and the brother in law of the Prophet (peace be upon him). His battle against `Ali was due to his own reasoning and judgment of the situation although `Ali was upon truth in that battle. However, Mu`awiyah will receive a reward for his Ijtihad (reasoning). He is, furthermore, qualified to make such judgments, as the people of his era have testified. As for Mu`awiyah and his comrades being the transgressing party, then this does not make them disbelievers or impious as is known to all men of knowledge. As for `Ali being cursed

on the pulpits; this was started by Marwan bin Al-Ḥakam, and it continued until `Umar bin `Abdul-`Aziz who banned it. As for Mu`awiyah's words to Sa`d, "What prevents you from abusing aba Turab?" This was only a question and there is nothing explicit in it to suggest that he was the one giving the order as clarified by al-Nawawi.¹⁷⁰

5- Al-Mūsawi wrote: [64/207]: "Those who concealed their grudge, and hid their animosity, from the party of Pharaoh during the early epoch of Islam, worshippers of authority and domination." Al-Mūsawi here is condemning the first generation of Islam, even though he refers to them as the first generation. They are those whom the Messenger (peace be upon him) described as the best of generations. So may Allah's curse be upon this oppressor who threw all of Allah's praise for those men against the wall and clung to his sectarian hatred and tribal grudges!! This cult is exactly as Allah describes in his wise book: {And they rejected them, while their [inner] selves were convinced thereof, out of injustice and haughtiness. So see how was the end of the corrupters.}[27:14] The vendor of poison continues:

170. Sharh al-Nawawi `ala Muslim 15/175.

“You know that the texts related to leadership, and the promises of succession, are held with apprehension by those who fear that such texts may jeopardize their thrones or undermine the very foundations of their governments.” No doubt, his words encompass all those who ruled from Abu Bakr until the last caliph to ever receive authority. It is truly mind boggling how al-Mūsawi’s followers still see him as an icon while reading all of these calamities in al-Muraja`āt! It is as the Prophet (peace be upon him) said: “The cattle suffering from a disease should not be mixed up with the healthy cattle.” It is best to keep his likes in an asylum as they: “Locking one up for the benefit of the religion is more worthy than locking him for the benefit of the bodies.”

6- Al-Mūsawi attempting to slander the mother of believers `A`ishah in [72/224]: “She probably thought of herself as being superior to all others, and the Prophet, peace be upon him and his progeny, did not agree with her self-assessment.” He then continues: “Whoever traces the mother of the believers `A`ishah in her deeds and statements will find her as we indicate here.” Al-Mūsawi tries to act as if

he is respectful with all the sweet talk, yet if we revise the narrations of `A'ishah we will find the opposite of what he says. `A'ishah said about herself when Allah proved her innocence in the Ifk incident: "By Allah, I never imagined that revelation would descend for my sake, I am much too insignificant for Allah to have mentioned me in his revelation."¹⁷¹ Al-Mūsawi fills his book with nonsense as he praises the scum of the earth and every devilish lowlife and raises them to the highest status, while simultaneously attacking the greatest of men and women to ever walk God's green earth. So what fairness does he present us here?! Certain letters in his book such as the 74th and 76th are loaded with the ugliest of thoughts, the wildest assumptions and the most disgraceful lies. If he were truly a believer he would have behaved as Allah advised:

{When you received it with your tongues and said with your mouths that of which you had no knowledge and thought it was insignificant while it was, in the sight of Allah, tremendous. - And why, when you heard it, did you not say, "It is not for us to speak of

171. Sahih al-Bukhari #2661 book of testimonies.

this. Exalted are You, [O Allah]; this is a great slander”? - Allah warns you against returning to the likes of this [conduct], ever, if you should be believers. - And Allah makes clear to you the verses, and Allah is Knowing and Wise. - Indeed, those who like that immorality should be spread [or publicized] among those who have believed will have a painful punishment in this world and the Hereafter. And Allah knows and you do not know.}[24:15-19]

7- The Saba’ī accuses `A’ishah of lying when she narrated that the Prophet (peace be upon him) had passed away while resting on her lap, he then mocks both her and the Prophet (peace be upon him) together in [76/237] as he says: “If a shepherd dies on his wife’s chest, between her chin and navel, or on her thigh, while ignoring to care for his herd, he would surely be labeled as reckless and irresponsible.” He then plays innocent by saying: “May Allah forgive the mother of the believers. I wish that she, while denying `Ali such a will, had attributed the denial to her father, whom she thinks is more

worthy of such a will.” This is the epitome of idiocy from al-Mūsawi. He accuses the Prophet (peace be upon him) of being irresponsible and that he never took care of the message entrusted onto him simply because he died in his house on his beloved wife’s lap. Dying in your bedroom does not mean that you misguided your nation, does it?! We know full well that he entered the house on the day he died while being comforted after having witnessed his nation praying together in congregation behind Abu Bakr. Did al-Mūsawi wish for `A’ishah to lie like himself and to attribute this virtue to her father?! Do you see the amount of honesty and its value in al-Mūsawi’s eyes? He criminalizes the people of truth so we congratulate the Rāfidah on such leadership!

If anyone were to read al-Mūsawi’s books he would realize the man is devoid of any integrity, morals, and academic subjectivity.

8- The disgraceful Rāfidhi returns to attack the Companions of the Prophet (peace be upon him) in letter [100/279-281]: “There are many such traditions which quite a few Companions did not imple-

ment; nay, the latter's actions contradicted their injunctions in preference of their own desires since they sought their own self-interest.” And he wrote: “You know very well that there are many Companions who hated `Ali and were his enemies. They deserted him, hurt him, cursed and wronged him, opposed him, fought him...” Truly as Allah says {Or do those in whose hearts is disease think that Allah would never expose their [feelings of] hatred?}[47:29] Remember, we do not intend to refute his shaky arguments but only to expose him, so here we ask: Where is the bravery and strength of `Ali? Haven't you folks fabricated loads of narrations about his exceptional powers and courage? Rather, history testifies that it was you Shiites who did all of this to the man, and his sermons in your own books prove this rather clearly when `Ali complained about the people of al-Kufah: “O Lord, they are disgusted of me and I am disgusted of them. They are annoyed of me and I am annoyed of them. Replace them for me with better followers and replace me for them with a worse man.”¹⁷² And `Ali described the Shiites by saying:

May Allah deal with you! Is there not a religion

172. Nahj-ul-Balagha pg.66,67 Sermon 25.

which may unite you, nor sense of shamefulness that may sharpen you? Is it not strange that Mu`awiyah calls out to some rude low people and they follow him without any support or grant, but when I call you, although you are the successors of Islam and the (worthy) survivors of the people, with support and distributed grants, you scatter away from me and oppose me?¹⁷³

`Ali's son al-Ḥasan also described the Shiites similarly: "By Allah I believe that Mu`awiyah would be better towards me than these folks. They claim to be my Shiites (followers) in spite of attempting to murder me and stealing my money."¹⁷⁴ He also said about al-Mūsawi and his likes: "I know now what the people of Kufah have been afflicted with. I disown whoever of them is corrupt. The Kufans have no loyalty. They do not keep their word nor are they trusted in their actions..."¹⁷⁵ Do you now see dear readers who are the ones who follow their desires and serve their personal interests? It is known

173. Ibid pg.258,259 Sermon 180.

174. Al-Ihtijaj by al-Tabrasi 148.

175. Ibid 149.

by necessity that you folks are deceitful cheaters that shift positions constantly. Even your Shiite scholar Jawad Muhaddithi said: “The people of Kufah have been historically famous for back-stabbing and turning back on their words. Either way, Islamic history does not paint a good picture of the Kufans in that they do not keep their words and oaths.” He continues: “From the psychological aspects that the Kufans were known for is that they have double-standards, they practice trickery, they care only to serve their interests, they have bad morals, are greedy, and have tribal extremism...”¹⁷⁶ As for the Shiite scholar Ḥusayn al-Kourani, he says about them: “The faith of the people of Kufah can be characterized by the following: Firstly, they abandon Islam when it is in need of support. Secondly, they love wealth. Thirdly, they constantly shift positions based on their interests.”¹⁷⁷

We seek the judgment of the intelligent and wise individual. If a man were to confess something about himself, then this would be the clearest of evidences. Have you not seen the extent to which al-Mūsawi lies and distorts facts? How disappointing it must be af-

176. Mawsou'at 'Ashoura' pg.59.

177. Fi Rihab Karbala' pg.53.

ter all that effort?! If he were honest in his previous claim, he would have mentioned a source for his words to establish its authenticity, so we challenge them to bring forth even one authentic chain proving the fallacies of their devil `Abdul-Ḥusayn, and they will not find it!

Conclusion

{And as for those who came after them, they say, ‘Our Lord, forgive us and our brothers, who preceded us in belief, and put Thou not into our hearts any rancour towards those who believe. Our Lord, surely Thou art the All-gentle, the All-compassionate.}[59:10]

Dear reader, we are certain that after our brief presentation above, you now know of the magnitude of the calamities that `Abdul-Ḥusayn’s book “al-Muraja`āt” contains, which are sufficient to render it useless, in the eyes of the sincere academic.

It was also made apparent to you that the author of this book has no academic integrity, nor honesty, as opposed to what was claimed about him by his Shiites and fans since long ago. This book has now dispelled this myth just as Musa’s (as) stick exposed the magicians of Pharaoh.

The Shiites of our days can now see for themselves the deeds of their scholar and leader, so what are they to say? Will they blindly follow their masters once again and hand them their brains? Will they dis-

own them on the day of judgement when regret benefits no one? Or will they have another opinion?

{And if they answer thee not, then know that what they follow is their lusts. And who goeth farther astray than he who followeth his lust without guidance from Allah. Lo! Allah guideth not wrongdoing folk.}[28:50]

...and may Allah's peace be upon Muhammad and his family and companions and all praise be to the Lord of the Worlds.