

Who Killed Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه ?

An Investigation from the Books of the Shia

*Adapted and Translated from:
Taḥdhīr ul Muslimīn an Kayd al-Kādhībīn*

Maulānā Allāhyār Khān

Translated by:

Mufti Abdullah Moolla

MAKTABAH AL-IMAM AL-GHAZALI

Title: Who Killed Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ﷺ?

Adapted and Translated from:
Taḥdhīr ul Muslimīn an Kayd al-Kādhībīn

Author: Maulānā Allāhyār Khān

Translated by: Mufti Abdullah Moolla

Published by: Maktabah Al-Imam Al-Ghazali

First Edition: Muḥarram 1445 | July 2023



CONTENTS

HISTORY IS NOT A YARDSTICK TO JUDGE THE ŞAḤĀBAH ﷺ	4
THE VIRTUES OF SAYYIDUNĀ ḤASAN ﷺ AND SAYYIDUNĀ ḤUSAYN ﷺ	9
THE SHIA: KILLERS OF SAYYIDUNĀ ḤUSAYN ﷺ	14
MĀTAM FOR SAYYIDUNĀ ḤUSAYN ﷺ	41
WHO WERE THE KILLERS OF SAYYIDUNĀ ḤUSAYN ﷺ?	44
CAUSE FOR THE DOWNFALL OF THE ISLAMIC EMPIRES	45



History is not a Yardstick to judge the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ

بِسْمِ اللّٰهِ الرَّحْمٰنِ الرَّحِیْمِ

In Islām, we look at four sources for our belief structure, juristic principles and rulings, as well as for guidance that will help us live as upright and righteous believers. These four sources are:

1. The Noble Qur'ān
2. The Blessed Aḥādīth
3. The Ijmā' (consensus) of the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ, the Tābi'in, and the jurists
4. Qiyās (analogical deduction)

In this resolute system, history, and more so, fabricated historical reports, have no standing at all.

Authentic History helps us to understand the lives of people that have passed on, it teaches us lessons in life, highlights the achievements and pitfalls of bygone nations and helps us draft a better way forward when making decisions in our lives.

History, as the name suggests, is 'his story', i.e., whatever the historian wrote, is the picture that he saw, heard, or was conveyed to him. History does not enjoy the status of the revealed words, i.e., the Noble Qur'ān, or the inspired word, i.e., the Blessed Aḥādīth of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. It was never written with the consensus of the pious predecessors, nor is any ruling drawn from it, where the need for analogy would arise.

Bearing this in mind, it is of utmost importance to look at history with the correct understanding of its status and rank amongst the various sciences and fields of study. One must know that history was never and can never be used to judge the status, rank, and position of any personality, especially the great and lofty companions of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. It is through the medium of History and fabricated reports, especially by the Rāfiḍī narrators, that the enemies of Islām, have targeted their attacks and spewed their poisonous venom towards the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ and the Ahl-ul-Bayt ﷺ.

The question that arises is how do we look at and analyse weak historical reports and fabricated tales that paint the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ in a bad light? How do we come to some conclusion when we read history reports that show enmity and fighting between the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ and the Ahl-ul-Bayt ﷺ?

In *Aḥkām-ul-Qur’ān*, vol.4 p.274, the following piece of valuable advice is given to the Muslim Ummah. Let us study it with an open heart, and the desire to seek the truth. Inshā Allāh, this will be a means of dispelling doubts and will serve to protect us from falling into the traps laid by the Rawāfiḍ for the unwary Muslim.

‘When you have seen in the verses of the Noble Qur’ān and the authentic Aḥādīth of Rasūlullāh ﷺ that all the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ (and the Ahl-ul-Bayt ﷺ) are just and their errors have been forgiven – even though mistakes and slips might have occurred from them – and the consensus of the Ummah to speak only good about them, then do not be deceived by the reports in the History books, like those from Ṭabarī, Ibn Athīr, and the like. This is because these reports are not free from distortions and fabrications that have been inserted by the Rawāfiḍ and the Khawārij.

Whoever has insight in the field of reports and narrations will certainly know that the Islāmic History books, although they can be relied upon in general incidents, they are not merited to base any article of faith on them, or any action worthy to practice upon. It is necessary to have a chain of narration for a report in order to gauge its reliability and authenticity. For

this purpose, the books of Aḥādīth and the Sunnah have been compiled and codified completely separate from the books of History. Many of the scholars of Ḥadīth penned works in History, just as they worked on Ḥadīth compilations. For example, Imām Bukhārī ؑ has a work in Ḥadīth, known as the most authentic work after the book of Allāh, he also has a work in History – upon which ‘Aqīdah and practices cannot be based – even though these narrations can be relied upon in general incidents or events.

This is especially important regarding the incidents that occurred during the battles and differences between the Ṣaḥābah ؑ. Amongst the collections of reports and narrations, there are distortions and fabrications from the Rawāfiḍ, the Khawārij, and the hypocrites. They inserted whatever they wanted to in the narrations. Therefore, in these matters, nothing of it can be used to establish a belief or practice, because of the doubts and dubiousness in these narrations.’

One must know, understand, and have full conviction that the Ṣaḥābah ؑ are not simply historic figures, but they are Qur’ānic personalities – whose purity and forgiveness have been attested to by Allāh ؑ. A significant number of verses of the Noble Qur’ān laud their praises, many verses were

revealed upon their questions, and these benefitted the generations that followed. Most importantly, Allah ؑ declares His everlasting pleasure for them in the Noble Qur'ān [Sūrah Al-Bayyinah: 8], and this was whilst they were still living, Subḥānallāh!

It is the duty of every Muslim to find out, check, and verify the sources of the information he or she receives, especially regarding the Ṣaḥābah ؑ, because of the current climate in which the Rawāfiḍ spread lies and falsehood about all those beloved to Allāh ؑ and His Rasūl ؑ.



The Virtues of Sayyidunā Ḥasan ﷺ and Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ﷺ

وعن أبي سعيد قال : قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم : " الحسن والحسين سيدا شباب أهل الجنة " . رواه الترمذي

Sayyidunā Abū Sa'īd ﷺ narrates that Rasūlullāh ﷺ said, "Ḥasan and Ḥusayn are both the leaders of the youth in Jannah." [Tirmidhi]

وعن ابن عمر أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم قال : " إن الحسن والحسين هما ريحاني من الدنيا " . رواه الترمذي وقد سبق في الفصل الأول

Sayyidunā Ibn 'Umar ﷺ narrates that Rasūlullāh ﷺ said, "Ḥasan and Ḥusayn are my two flowers of this world." [Tirmidhi]

وعن أسامة بن زيد قال : طرقت النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم ذات ليلة في بعض الحاجة فخرج النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم وهو مشتمل على شيء ولا أدري ما هو فلما فرغت من حاجتي قلت : ما هذا الذي أنت مشتمل عليه ؟ فكشفه فإذا الحسن والحسين على وركيه . فقال : " هذان ابناي وابنا ابنتي اللهم إني أحبهما فأحبهما وأحب من يحبهما " رواه الترمذي

Sayyidunā Usāmah bin Zayd ﷺ narrates that I went to Rasūlullāh ﷺ for a need one night and he came out in the condition that he was folding something and I do not know what it was. When I mentioned my need I asked, "What is that which you have folded?" he opened it and I saw that Ḥasan

and Ḥusayn were on his hips (i.e. he took them into his lap and wrapped them in a shawl). Then he said, “These are my sons and the sons of my daughters. Allāh, I love them, so you also keep them beloved and love every person that loves them.” [Tirmidhi]

وعن سلمى قالت : دخلت على أم سلمة وهي تبكي فقلت : ما يبكيك ؟ قالت :
: رأيت رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم - تعني في المنام - وعلى رأسه ولحيته
التراب فقلت : ما لك يا رسول الله ؟ قال : " شهدت قتل الحسين آنفا " رواه
الترمذي وقال : هذا حديث غريب

Sayyidah Salma narrates that she went to Umm al-Mu'minīn Sayyidah Umm Salamah ﷺ and saw that she was crying. I asked, “Why are you crying?” she replied, “I saw Rasūlullāh ﷺ (in a dream) that his head and beard were dusty.” I then asked, “O Rasūl of Allāh, why are you dusty?” he said, “I was now in the place where Ḥusayn was martyred (that is why I am dusty).” [Tirmidhi]

وعن أنس قال : سئل رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم : أي بيتك أحب إليك ؟
قال : " الحسن والحسين " وكان يقول لفاطمة : " ادعي لي ابني " فيشمهما
ويضمهما إليه . رواه الترمذي وقال : هذا حديث غريب

Sayyidunā Anas ﷺ narrates that Rasūlullāh ﷺ was asked that who is the noblest and most beloved of your household. He said, “Ḥasan and Ḥusayn.” Rasūlullāh ﷺ said to Sayyidah

Fāṭimah ﷺ, “Call my two sons. Then he smelled them and hugged them.” [Tirmidhi]

وعن بريدة قال : كان رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم يخطبنا إذ جاء الحسن والحسين عليهما قميصان أحمران يمشيان ويعثران فنزل رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم من المنبر فحملهما ووضعهما بين يديه ثم قال : " صدق الله [إنما أموالكم وأولادكم فتنة] نظرت إلى هذين الصبيين يمشيان ويعثران فلم أصبر حتى قطعت حديثي ورفعتهما " . رواه الترمذي وأبو داود والنسائي

Sayyidunā Buraydah ﷺ narrates that (one day) Rasūlullāh ﷺ delivered a sermon before us when suddenly Sayyidunā Ḥasan ﷺ and Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ﷺ came. They were wearing red clothes and they were falling on the ground when walking. Subsequently, Rasūlullāh ﷺ came down from the pulpit and took them into his lap, he let them sit by him and said, “Allāh spoke the truth ‘indeed your wealth and your children are a trial’, I saw these two children falling and coming, so I could not have patience and I stopped my talk and came down from the pulpit and took them into my lap.” [Tirmidhi, Abu Dawud, Nasa’i]

وعن يعلى بن مرة قال : قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم : " حسين مني وأنا من حسين أحب الله من أحب حسيناً حسين سبط من الأسباط " رواه الترمذي

Sayyidunā Ya’la bin Murra ﷺ narrates that Rasūlullāh ﷺ said, “Ḥusayn is from me and I am from Ḥusayn and he who loves

Ḥusayn he has love for Allāh, he is a handsome grandson from the grandsons.” [Tirmidhi]

وعن علي رضي الله عنه قال : الحسن أشبه رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم ما بين الصدر إلى الرأس والحسين أشبه النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم ما كان أسفل من ذلك . رواه الترمذي .

Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷺ narrates, “Sayyidunā Ḥasan is very similar to Rasūlullāh ﷺ, from the chest to the head and Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ﷺ is very similar to Rasūlullāh in those limbs that are from below the chest.” [Tirmidhi]

وعن حذيفة قال : قلت لأمي : دعيني آتي النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم فأصلي معه المغرب وأسأله أن يستغفر لي ولك فأتيت النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم فصليت معه المغرب فصلى حتى صلى العشاء ثم انفتل فتبعته فسمع صوتي فقال : " من هذا ؟ حذيفة ؟ " قلت : نعم . قال : " ما حاجتك ؟ غفر الله لك ولأمك إن هذا ملك لم ينزل الأرض قط قبل هذه الليلة استأذن ربه أن يسلم علي ويبشرني بأن فاطمة سيدة نساء أهل الجنة وأن الحسن والحسين سيदा شباب أهل الجنة " رواه الترمذي وقال : هذا حديث غريب

Sayyidunā Ḥudhayfah bin Yamān ﷺ narrates that (one day) I said to my mother, “Permit me today to perform the Maghrib ṣalāh with Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Then I shall request Rasūlullāh ﷺ to make Du’ā’ of forgiveness for me and you.” Subsequently, I came to Rasūlullāh ﷺ and performed Maghrib ṣalāh with him. He performed nawāfil until he performed ‘Ishā and when he completed ṣalāh and went home then I also walked behind

him. He heard my sound and subsequently asked, “Who is this? Is it Ḥudhayfah?” I replied, “Yes.” He then asked, “What do you want? May Allāh forgive you and your mother. This is an angel that did not descend before this night to earth. He took permission from his Rabb to come to earth and give me salām and give me the glad tidings that Fāṭimah is the leader of the women of Jannah and Ḥasan and Ḥusayn are the leaders of the youth in Jannah.” [Tirmidhi]

وعن ابن عباس قال : كان رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم حاملا الحسن بن علي
على عاتقه فقال رجل : نعم المركب ركبت يا غلام فقال النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم
: " ونعم الراكب هو " . رواه الترمذي

Sayyidunā Ibn ‘Abbās ؑ narrates that (one day) Rasūlullāh ؑ let Sayyidunā Ḥasan bin ‘Alī sit on his shoulders when a person said, “O fortunate one, what an excellent mount do you have?” Rasūlullāh ؑ said, “And the rider is also good.” [Tirmidhi]



The Shia: Killers of Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ﷺ

The Oppressed Imām:

Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ﷺ gave his life, forlorn, far away from home. The great sacrifice that he gave and made his family give their lives cannot be found in the history of humanity. What must be observed is that, from whom did these difficulties come upon this great son of Islām, whose hand was stretched out towards him and why?

The eye-witness to this incident was either the killer or those who survived. This is because a simple method of research and investigation is to enquire from the oppressed, “Who was your killer?” and the group of killers should be asked, “What is your response to the claim?” After the claim is made, if the accused attests to his crime, then there remains no need for any testimony. After the accused attests to the crime, he does not remain accused, but he will be classified as a criminal.

Subject Matter:

Who were the killers of Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ﷺ? *Shia* or *non-Shia*?

Preamble to the Answer:

1. Who is the claimant?
2. Who is the defendant, i.e. against who is the claimant making the claim?
3. Who are the witnesses?
4. Are they eye-witnesses or did they hear the testimony of the witnesses?
5. If this testimony corresponds to the explanation of the claimant, then the claim will be proven. If it contradicts, then the incident should be studied and scrutinized in the light of these statements.

Preamble 1:

The claimant is Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ؑ, his household and his companions. They were oppressed. Bear in mind that according to the *Shia*, the Imām is infallible, i.e. he is pure from major and minor sins and it is compulsory to obey him.

Preamble 2:

The defendants are all those people who called the Imām and killed him oppressively.

Preamble 3:

In the light of the law, the witness should be someone not from the claimants or defendants.

Preamble 4:

There was no eye-witness who could narrate the incident because Karbala was an open and plain field. There was no habitation around. Therefore, whichever witness will present his case; his testimony will be what he heard.

Preamble 5:

Because the testimony is heard from someone else, it must be studied whether the witness narrates it from the mouth of the killer, or from the mouth of the killed. Whichever one is taken, it must be scrutinized and seen if the testimony of the claimant is in harmony with the claim. If so, it will be accepted, otherwise rejected. If the testimony contradicts the explanation of the claimant, then it will necessitate that the witness belies the claimant and why should the testimony of someone who belies the infallible Imām be accepted? Therefore, any narration or information that comes from any narrator, mentioned in any book will necessarily be rejected.

After this research, whoever is proven to be the criminal, it will be binding on every Muslim to take him to be the criminal, otherwise the following verse will apply to him,

وَمَنْ يَكْسِبْ حَظِيئَةً أَوْ إِثْمًا ثُمَّ يَرْمِ بِهِ بَرِيئًا فَقَدِ احْتَمَلَ مُهْتَمًا وَإِثْمًا مُبِينًا

But whoever earns an offense or a sin and then blames it on an innocent [person] has taken upon himself a slander and manifest sin.¹

Detail of the Claim:

1. Explanations of the Claimants:

1.1 Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ؑ addresses the army of the enemy in the plain of Karbala

“O people of Kufa, woe be to you, have you forgotten your letters and promises which you wrote to us, making Allāh a witness that the *Ahl-ul-Bayt* should come and you will sacrifice your lives for them? Woe be to you, we have come upon your call and you have handed us over to Ibn Ziyād. You have stopped the water supply from the Euphrates to us. Definitely, you have gone against Rasūlullāh ؑ, you deal with his family in this way. May Allāh not quench you on the Day of *Qiyāmah*.”²

Two things are proven from the explanation of Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ؑ:

¹ [Sūrah an-Nisā: 112]

² Dhabḥ Adhīm from Nāsikh ut Tawārikh p.335

1. The people of Kufa wrote letters to Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ؑ, called him to Kufa and promised him their help, stating that they are ready to give their lives.
2. Those who wrote letters to him, calling him to Kufa, had closed off the water supply and handed him over to Ibn Ziyād to be killed.

Now, let us see whether those who called Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ؑ were *Shia* or non-*Shia*.

Qādī Nūrullāh Shostarī (*Shia*), writes in *Majālis ul Mu'minīn* p.25, Majlis Awwal,

‘There is no need for any proof to show that the people of Kufa were *Shia*. It goes against the original (aşal) to state that the Kufans were Sunni. This is in need of proof, although Abū Ḥanīfah was a Kufan.’³

In accordance to the testimony of the *Shia* scholar, the *Shia* status of the Kufans is clearer than the sun. Despite this, we present two more proofs.

³ Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ؑ was not a Shia. He was very far from Tashayyu' and everything associated with it. This is the statement from the Shia source. Hence, readers must not get confused or mixed-up. There definitely was a great amount of Shia in Kufa, but not the entire population comprised of Shia. - Translator

1. When Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ؑ got news of the martyrdom of Muslim at Ziyālah, he said, “Our *Shia* have disgraced us.”⁴

2. *Jilā ul ‘Uyūn* (Urdu) transmits the narration that Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ؑ addressed the *Shia* at the battle in Karbala and said, “May you and your intentions be cursed. O treacherous ones, you called us to help you in your tumult of desperation. When I took your word and came to help you and guide you, then you drew out the sword of malice against me. You supported our enemy and helped them and have abandoned your friends.”

From these explanations it is proven that the *Shia* called Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ؑ. They stopped the water supply and they are the ones who handed him over to Ibn Ziyād to be killed.

From the above narration of *Jilā ul ‘Uyūn*, the words ‘sword of malice’ is worthy of scrutiny, i.e. the Kufan *Shia* had some old hatred in their hearts. Therefore, with the objective of taking revenge, they played this trick. In terms of history, what else could be the reason for this terrible enmity other than the fact that the representatives of Islām and companions of Rasūlullāh ؑ caused the people of Kufa to leave their ancestral religion and adopt the treasure of Islām? They also

⁴ Khulāsatul Maṣā’ib p.49

caused a centuries' old empire to fall at the feet of the Arab Muslims. At the end, it was national and religious fervour and fanaticism that came to the fore.

Findings:

In accordance to the explanation of claimant 1, the killers of Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ؑ were the *Shia* of Kufa, no one else.

Explanation of Claimant 2: Imām Zayn ul 'Ābidīn ؑ

“O people, I take an oath in the name of Allāh and ask you, do you not know that you wrote letters to my father and deceived him? You made resolute promises and promised allegiance, and then you killed and disgraced him. Destruction is for you for what you have sent forth for yourselves and destruction is for your evil opinion. With which eye will you look at Rasūlullāh ؑ when he will tell you, ‘You killed my children, you dishonored me. You are not of my ummah.’”

They started crying aloud and began cursing each other, “You are destroyed and you have knowledge of it.”⁵

From this explanation it is established that he addressed those who called Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ؑ, and they were the killers. In response, their confession is also present.

⁵ *Ihtijāj Tabrasī* p.159, Iran

‘When Zayn ul ‘Ābidīn was coming with the women folk from Karbala, whilst ill, the women of Kufa tore their clothing and the men were crying. In a soft tone, Zayn ul ‘Ābidīn said, “Because of illness, I have become weak. The people of Kufa are crying but tell me, who killed us besides them?”⁶

Mullā Bāqir Majlisī writes in *Jilā ul ‘Uyūn* p.503, ‘Zayn ul ‘Ābidīn said in a low voice, “You are wailing and mourning over us, but tell me, who killed us?”

The answer is veiled in the question and his tone

Findings from the Explanation of Claimant 2:

1. The people of Kufa wrote the letters
2. The people of Kufa deceived the Imām
3. The people of Kufa killed the Imām
4. The people of Kufa were *Shia*
5. The Kufan *Shia*, the killers of Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ﷺ are not part of the ummah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ
6. The killers of Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ﷺ cried and their women tore their clothing and established their own practices.

Bear in mind that (according to *Shia* thought), both claimants are infallible. Therefore, they are true in their claims.

⁶ Ibid p.158

Explanation of Claimant 3: Sayyidah Zaynab bint Alī ﷺ, sister of Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ﷺ

When the prisoners of Karbala returned from Karbala and entered Kufa, then the men and women of Kufa began to cry and beat themselves. Upon this, Sayyidah Zaynab bint Alī ﷺ said, “After praising Allāh and salutations upon Rasūlullāh ﷺ, O people of Kufa, O oppressors, O treacherous ones, O those who disgrace, very evil is that which you have sent forth for yourselves, Allāh is displeased with you and you will remain in punishment forever. You cry, yes, you cry, because this is what behooves of you. Cry in abundance and laugh less. What reply will you give to Rasūlullāh ﷺ tomorrow when he asks you, “You are the last ummah, how did you deal with my family and children after me? You captured some of them and returned some of them to dust and blood.”

Bāqir Majlisī translated this address in *Jilā ul Uyūn* p.503 in the following way,

“O people of Kufa, O treacherous plotters, you cry and wail upon us, whereas you are the ones who killed us. Our crying has not stopped from your oppression and our pleas have not stopped from your trouble and difficulty. You have sent forth very evil provision for yourselves in the hereafter and have made yourselves worthy of eternal damnation to hell. You cry and wail over us, whereas you are the ones who killed us. Your

hands will be cut off. O people of Kufa, destruction be for you, you have killed the beloved of Rasūlullāh ؑ and have unveiled the veiled *Ahl-ul-Bayt*. How have you shed the blood of the son of Rasūlullāh ؑ and destroyed his honor.”

Findings:

1. The people of Kufa called the Imām through their schemes and plots
2. They were treacherous to the Imām and killed the *Ahl-ul-Bayt*
3. After doing all this, they began to cry and beat themselves
4. They were given glad tidings of hell
5. The killers were those who called him, the *Shia*. They were the ones who did the crimes and the *Shia* were the ones who were classified as worthy of eternal residence in hell

Explanation of Claimant 4: Sayyidah Fāṭimah ؑ, daughter of Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ؑ

Iḥtijāj Ṭabrasī p.157 states,

“O people of Kufa, O plotters and treacherous ones, you have belied us and taken us to be disbelievers. You have taken our blood to be permissible to shed and have taken our wealth as booty, as you have done with the progeny of the Turks and the people of Kabul. As you have killed our grandfather

(Sayyidunā ‘Alī ؑ) yesterday, your swords are dripping with our blood. On account of your previous malice, your eyes have been cooled, your hearts are pleased, you were bold against Allāh and plotted and schemed and Allāh will punish you severely for this.”

Findings from the explanation of Sayyidah Fātimah ؑ:

1. The *Shia* of Kufa classified the *Ahl-ul-Bayt* as disbelievers and made their blood permissible to shed
2. The Shia had old enmity for the *Ahl-ul-Bayt*
3. They killed the *Ahl-ul-Bayt* and were pleased with their deed
4. Their crying and beating was only an act

Explanation of Claimant 5: Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm ؑ, sister of Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ؑ

When some women started giving the children of the *Ahl-ul-Bayt*, dates from charity, then the wet nurse said, “Charity is forbidden for us.” Hearing us, the Kufan women started crying and hitting themselves.” Upon this, the wet nurse said, “O people of Kufa, charity is forbidden for us. O women of Kufa, your men killed our men. They imprisoned us, the *Ahl-ul-Bayt*, so why are you crying?”⁷

⁷ Jilā ul Uyūn p.507

The Findings are clear:

The explanations of all 5 claimants mention the same points as counted hereunder:

1. The people of Kufa called Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ؑ, they wrote letters to him
2. Those who invited were *Shia*
3. The *Shia* who called and invited had killed the Imām (Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ؑ), they captured the *Ahl-ul-Bayt* and looted their belongings
4. The wives of the killers of Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ؑ tore their clothing
5. The killers of Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ؑ i.e. the *Shia*, are out of the ummah of Rasūlullāh ؑ

Look at the explanation of another personality, who can also be termed as a claimant and a witness. Imām Bāqir ؑ. He must have heard the incident as narrated to him by his father, Imām Zayn ul Ābidīn ؑ, and according to the *Shia*, he is also infallible.

Jilā ul Uyūn p.326 states,

‘When he pledged allegiance to *Amīr ul Mu’minīn*, he then turned away from his pledge and drew out his sword. *Amīr ul Mu’minīn* was always at loggerheads with him and got lot of

difficulty from him, to the extent that he martyred him. He pledged allegiance to his son Imām Ḥasan ؑ and after pledging allegiance; he went against him and plotted. He wanted to hand him over to the enemy. The people of Iraq came in front and showed their daggers. They looted the tents to the extent that they removed the jewellery that was on the feet of the women and troubled and taunted them, until they made a treaty with Mu'āwiyah and protected the blood of the *Ahl-ul-Bayt*. The numbers of the *Ahl-ul-Bayt* were few. So, a thousand Iraqī men pledged allegiance to Imām Ḥusayn ؑ and those who pledged allegiance were the same ones who used their sword against him. The yolk of the pledge was on their necks when they martyred the Imām.”

The matter is clear from this explanation

Proofs for the Old Malice:

Sayyidah Fāṭimah bint Ḥusayn ؑ explains the old malice, history records her words,

1. *Jilā ul Uyūn* p.230 states that Abdur Raḥmān Ibn Muljim had pledged allegiance to Sayyidunā 'Alī ؑ. He pledged allegiance and then martyred him.

It is said that he was a *Khārijī*. However, we do not find this mentioned in the history books that the *Khawārij* pledged allegiance to Sayyidunā 'Alī ؑ. He was totally opposed to

Sayyidunā ‘Alī ؑ and he would not even make *taqiyya*. When Ibn Muljim pledged allegiance to Sayyidunā ‘Alī ؑ, he was part of the *Shī’ān Alī*, i.e. the killer of Sayyidunā Alī ؑ was also a *Shia*.

2. *Ihtijāj Tabrasī* p.150, Iran states that Sayyidunā Ḥasan ؑ said, “By Allāh, I feel that Mu’āwiyah is better than my *Shia*. They claim to be my *Shia* and they wanted to kill me and loot my wealth.”

From these quotations it is clear that the *Shia* killed Sayyidunā ‘Alī ؑ, they wanted to kill Sayyidunā Ḥasan ؑ and loot his wealth and they killed Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ؑ. This is most probably the reason why Sayyidunā ‘Alī ؑ had the hope of giving ten of his *Shia* in exchange of one man of Sayyidunā Mu’āwiyah ؑ.

In *Nahj ul Balāgha* vol.1 p.189, Sayyidunā ‘Alī ؑ said, “So take ten from me and give me one of them.”

It is as though the companions of Mu’āwiyah ؑ are so able in faith and trustworthiness that Sayyidunā ‘Alī ؑ was ready to give ten of his *Shia* in exchange of one of his men.

The Qur’ān speaks about the link between one and ten,

إن يكن منكم عشرون صابرون يغلبوا مأتين

It is possible that Sayyidunā ‘Alī ؑ made a comparison and considered this.

Sayyidunā Ḥasan ؑ and Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ؑ had great reliance on Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah ؑ and he even protected both of them. Both of them pledged allegiance to Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah ؑ and they would take a stipend from him. Contrary to this, the Shia wanted to kill one brother and they killed the other.

Now we must study the response given by the defendant. If the defendant confesses to the crime, then there is no need for testimony. If the defendant denies, then a witness will be necessary.

Explanation of the Defendant:

In *Majālis ul Mu'minīn*, Qāḍī Nūrullāh Shostarī explains,

‘Now we want to regret over our evil deeds. Repent. Probably Allāh will have mercy on us and accept our repentance. From this group, whoever went to Karbala to kill the Imām, as part of the army of Ibn Ziyād, they should all present their excuse. Sulaymān Ibn Surad said, “There is no way out except that we destroy ourselves in the plain like the *Banī Isrā'īl* killed each other, as Allāh ؑ says, ‘You have oppressed yourselves...’ Saying this, all the *Shia* repented and fell to their knees.’

Note: Sayyidunā Sulaymān Ibn Surad ؑ was the same person in whose house the *Shia* had gathered to prepare the invitation for Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ؑ to come to Kufa.

The defendant has confessed to the crime and repented, but what is the benefit?

The defendant confessed to the crime and it has been proven that the killers of Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ؑ were the Kufan *Shia*, those who called him and then killed him mercilessly. However, for sake of caution, we should investigate further. It is possible that the hand of someone else is also in this.

Khulāṣatul Maṣā'ib p.201 states,

‘Among the killers of Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ؑ, there was no Shāmī or Hijāzī, but all of them were Kufī.’

It is clear that the people of Kufa were the *Shia* and they called Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ؑ to Kufa. However, it is astonishing to note that there is a strange *fatwa* from the *Shia* with regards to those who killed the Imāms, *Jilā ul Uyūn* p.413 states, ‘In many Aḥādīth, it is narrated from the pure imāms that the messengers and their *ausiyā*’ and their progeny are not killed except by bastards and no one intends to kill them except those born out of wedlock. May the curse of Allāh be upon them all till the day of judgement.’

The claimants had given the Kufan *Shia*, the glad tidings of hell. Now in the light of this *fatwa* from the imāms, their religious standing has also been specified. It is possible that this *fatwa* has not reached the *Shia* of Kufa. However, the

ruling does not change in the case of ignorance. After all, this is a *fatwa* of the pure imāms, not that of any normal person.

One matter that deserves thought is that, well and good, it has been proven that the *Shia* of Kufa are the killers of the imām. However, there is definitely a share of it in it for Yazid because he was the ruler of the time. Regarding this, let us ask the defendant. Probably, they will count him in.

1. *Iḥtijāj Ṭabrisī* p.162 states that Imām Zayn ul Ābidīn ؑ asked Yazīd, “I have heard that you had an intention to kill my father.” Yazid replied, “May Allāh curse Ibn Ziyād. By Allāh, I did not instruct him to kill your father. If I was present in the battlefield at Karbala, I would never have killed him.”

The defendant has cleared the name of Yazid. However, this only does not suffice. We should study the circumstances.

2. *Khulāṣatul Maṣā'ib* p.304 states that when Shimr brought the head of the imām in front of Yazid and requested a reward, then Yazid looked angrily at Shimr and said, “May Allāh fill your saddle with fire. Destruction is for you. When you knew that he was the most virtuous of the creation, why did you kill him? Be away from me, there is no reward for you.”

3. According to the *Shia*, Sayyidunā ‘Alī ؑ made *taqiyya*. He made *taqiyya* and pledged allegiance to the first three *khulafā'* and was also rewarded. In fact, he saved nine tenths of

religion and saved his own life. Why did Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ؑ not make *taqiyya*? He would have followed the *sunnah* of his father and he would have got reward too. His life would have been saved and the *Ahl-ul-Bayt* would have been saved from calamity.

The discussion on the virtue of *taqiyya* is very long. However, we feel it appropriate to mention some of them here:

1. *Usūl Kāfi*, Chapter on *Taqiyya* p.482, has the statement of Imām Ja'far as-Sādiq ؑ, 'O Abū Umar, indeed nine tenths of religion is *taqiyya*. He who does not do *taqiyya*, he has no religion.'

2. *Tafsīr Imām Hasan Askarī*, Iran p.129 states, 'Rasūlullāh ؑ said, "The example of the believer who leaves out *taqiyya* is like a body that has no head."

It is apparent that just as a body is useless without a head, in the same way, faith is of no use without *taqiyya*.

3. *Tafsīr Imām Hasan Askarī*, Iran p.129 states, 'Imām Zayn ul 'Ābidīn said, "Allāh will forgive all the sins of a believer and he will leave the world clean and pure...except two sins, which will not be forgiven. First is abandoning *taqiyya* and second is to destroy the rights of one's brothers.'

It is clear that 'all the sins' states that polytheism and killing the imāms are also worthy of being forgiven. Yes, there is no

salvation for one who abandons *taqiyya*. It is as though the people of Kufa had killed the imām and let him leave the world pure from sin. The imām gave his life and did not get anything because abandoning *taqiyya* is a sin that cannot be forgiven! It remained on him. Oh, the imām who has been doubly oppressed. The irony is that these are the words of the sons of the oppressed imām.

It is for this reason that Abdul Jabbār Mu'tazilī in his book, *Mughnī*, asked a question to the *Shia*, that it is the belief of the *Shia* that *taqiyya* is permissible at the time of every need. If there is fear of losing one's life, then *taqiyya* becomes obligatory. In such a case, the person who does not do *taqiyya* and he is killed, he dies an accursed death. He went against the command of Allāh ؑ. However, in Karbala, Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ؑ not only gave his life, he got the *Ahl-ul-Bayt* martyred too. The harm is directed to him, as the original reason is that Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ؑ did not do *taqiyya*. If he did *taqiyya* and pledged allegiance to Yazid, then he would not have been 'disobedient' to Allāh ؑ and he would have saved his life. However, Sayyidunā Ḥasan ؑ made *taqiyya* and pledged allegiance to Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah ؑ. Sayyidunā 'Alī ؑ made *taqiyya* and pledged allegiance to the first three *khulafā'*. Therefore, what do you, O *Shia*, say with what type of death did Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ؑ experience?

Abū Ja'far Tūsī in *Talkhīs Shāfi* p.471, narrates this question as follows,

‘When Ibn Ziyād gave safety to Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ؑ on condition that he pledges allegiance to Yazid, then why did the imām not accept? He would have saved his life and the lives of his associates. Why did he throw these lives into destruction by abandoning *taqiyya* whereas his brother Sayyidunā Ḥasan ؑ handed over rule to Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah ؑ without any fear. How can the actions of the two brothers be reconciled?’

The answer has been given on behalf of Sharīf Murtaḍā and Abū Ja'far Tūsī:

‘When the imām saw that there is no way of returning to Madīnah Munawwarah, nor is there any way of entering Kufa, he headed for Shām, in order to go to Yazid. In this way he would probably be saved from the calamity that was coming from Ibn Ziyād and his men. He started off and Umar Ibn Sa'd came in front of him with a large army, as was mentioned. Therefore, how can it be said that the imām placed himself and his companions into destruction? This is when it is mentioned in a narration that the imām said to Ibn Sa'd, “I shall choose one of three options; either let me return to Madīnah, or let me go to Yazid so that I can put my hand into his hand, he is the son of my uncle. He will treat me in

accordance to his opinion. Alternatively, let me go to the borders of the Islāmic Empire, I shall join the Muslims in waging *Jihād*. I shall be a partner to them in their benefit and loss.”

From this explanation it is clear that Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ﷺ was happy to pledge allegiance to Yazid but the army came in front of him and stopped him. We learn that Ibn Ziyād and the others had captured him and wanted to take him so that they could get a reward.

Another thing we learn is that the *Shia* of Kūfa made *taqiyya* and fought against the imām. It is as though two forms of *taqiyya* clashed. The only difference is that the imām was ready for *taqiyya* and the army did practical *taqiyya*.

Talkhīs Shāfi p.471 points out to this reality,

“The army that gathered against Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ﷺ, they had love in their hearts for him and they desired to help him. Apparently, they were with the enemy.”

Sharīf Murtaḍā and Tūsi gave the reply to Abdul Jabbār Mu’tazilī but there was another problem. *Mukhtaṣar Baṣā’ir ud Darajāt* p.7 states, “The imām did not know of the calamity that was coming and he did not know the result of it. The imām is not a Nabī, nor is he the proof of Allāh over the creation.’

The imām had knowledge of the pending calamity. He accepted death by his choice, when he knew, why did he go to Karbala? So, the objection of Abdul Jabbār, ‘why did he put himself into destruction?’ still stands. This is because *taqiyya* would be of benefit if he did it before heading to Karbala. This was not the time to make *taqiyya*, and it seems to be made up.

The Shia sometimes give the answer that this narration is present in the books of debate, it is not mentioned in the books of hadīth, so it is not a proof.

The statement is correct. However, why did their seniors not think of it? Why did Sharīf Murtaḍā and Abū Ja’far Ṭūsī give place to this narration in their books? When it came to the question of *Tahrīf ul Qur’ān*, they hold onto Ṭūsī, why is he classified unreliable here? So, we learn that the blemish of Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ؑ abandoning *taqiyya* cannot be dealt away with. The question still remains, according to your principles, what kind of death did Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ؑ experience?

The principle of the death of the imāms being in their control demands that Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ؑ liked his death by his choice. The lovers of Ḥusayn ؑ should also hold beloved that which he held beloved and give their lives in his remembrance, they should not cry and beat themselves.

At this point, it is appropriate to mention a few more points:

1. The *Shia* say that the imām died thirsty with his companions, but in *Jilā ul Uyūn* p.454, it is written, ‘When he did not get water, then the imām hit a spade behind his tent and a spring of water gushed forth. The imām drank to his fill and he also gave to his companions.’

2. The *Shia* say that the corpse of Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ﷺ was trampled by the horses, but *Usūl Kāfi* and *Jilā ul Uyūn* p.503 state, ‘A lion came and sat on the body of the imām and it did not let anyone go close to his body.’

Can you please search for the truth in these conflicting reports?

3. Mullā Bāqir Majlisī explains that the body of the imām was lifted to the heavens after his demise and the angels made *tawāf* of it. So, when the body went to the heavens, who trampled the body on the ground? Whose Rauḍah has been made in Karbala? Who is buried in this Rauḍah? Who do you visit in Karbala? If the Rauḍah in Karbala was made without the body, then what is the problem in making a Rauḍah everywhere else?

Definitely, it is not within the ability of man to solve the contradictions of the explanation of the *Shia*. There is one more question regarding this, the *Shia* say, “We killed the imām. The hand of Yazid was not in it.” So, it is astonishing to note that if the imām was *Shia*, then why did the *Shia* kill him?

We learn that it is actually the other way around. The imām was an Imām of the *Ahl us Sunnah*. His religion was the same as the rest of the Arabs. It is for this reason that the *Shia* of Kufa deceived him, invited him over and killed him. The imām knew that they were *Shia* but he went to reform them. The old malice that the *Shia* had for the imāms was already discussed.

The accepted belief of the *Shia* is that the imāms have very great knowledge; they have knowledge of what happened and what will happen. Looking at this, a person must think that when Sayyidunā ‘Alī ؑ had knowledge that Sayyidunā Ḥasan ؑ will hand over rule to Sayyidunā Mu’āwiyah ؑ Sayyidunā Mu’āwiyah ؑ was going to give it over to Yazid and the army of Yazid was going to kill Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ؑ, then who is the original guilty party? Sayyidunā ‘Alī ؑ or Sayyidunā Ḥasan ؑ or Yazid?

We find the answer to this question in *Uṣūl Kāfī* p.278, it is narrated from Imām Taqī, ‘The imāms permit whatever they want and forbid whatever they want.’ This means that Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ؑ permitted his killing and the killing of his companions, Sayyidunā Ḥasan ؑ permitted the killing of his brother. The result of this is that the person who killed is not the criminal because the one who permits a deed is deserving of reward, not to be a criminal.

Regarding this matter, one more thing is said, that the ṣaḥābah ؑ had left Rasūlullāh ؑ by the disbelievers on a few occasions, yet the *Ahl us Sunnah* take them as complete and perfect believers. If the *Shia* did this once to the imām, have they become disbelievers? It is a very grave matter but there are plenty of discrepancies.

1. There is not a single incident from history that proves that the ṣaḥābah ؑ left Rasūlullāh ؑ in the clutches of the disbelievers and fled. Therefore, this claim is wrong.

2. Allāh ؑ Himself states that the ṣaḥābah ؑ had perfect imān. Therefore, the one who says that Allāh and His Rasūl ؑ are not reliable, he is free, he can say what he wants.

3. The *Ahl us Sunnah* do not have the right to call anyone a disbeliever. However what will be the response to the following;

a. Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ؑ said, “Our *Shia* have disgraced us.”

b. Imām Zayn ul Ābidīn ؑ said, “Destruction be for you, very evil is what you have sent forth for yourselves, you are not from my ummah.”

c. Sayyidah Zaynab bint ‘Alī ؑ said, “You will remain in punishment forever.”

d. Imām Bāqir ؑ says, “Those who pledged allegiance were the same ones who drew out their sword against Sayyidunā

Ḥusayn ؑ and the yolk of the pledge to Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ؑ was on their necks when they killed him.”

The people of knowledge and understanding can decide for themselves as to who are the ones who deceived the imām, those who are out of the ummah of Rasūlullāh ؑ, those for whom there is eternity in hell.

4. There is an accusation upon the ṣaḥābah ؑ that they left Rasūlullāh ؑ in the clutches of the disbelievers and fled. However, the matter here reaches very far. They deceived the imām and called him. They promised to join him and fight Yazid. When the imām came, they turned their eyes away. They joined the army of Yazid, stopped the water supply and mercilessly martyred the imām. They disgraced the *Ahl-ul-Bayt*, looted their wealth. Therefore, where is the accusation and where is the reality? *The irony is that after doing all this, they come out as lovers of the Ahl-ul-Bayt and beat themselves, whereas Jilā ul Uyūn p.519 and p.527 states that crying and beating started off from Yazid and his house! Therefore, if this is done in following the way of Yazid, then it is correct, otherwise it is apparent and clear that the grief experienced by the relatives of the deceased, is never experienced by anyone else. We do not find any proof that the Ahl-ul-Bayt had mourning sessions, julūs and other forms of expressing grief like beating themselves collectively. If this is a form of worship, then*

it is apparent that there are no greater worshippers than the imāms and the Ahl-ul-Bayt. Why have they left out this form of worship?

Summary:

1. With regards to the killing of Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ؑ, the infallible imāms are the claimants and the *Ahl-ul-Bayt*. They claim that the *Shia* killed them.
2. The killers, the *Shia* of Kufa, confess to the crime.
3. The witness is Imām Bāqir ؑ.

If someone claims contrary to this; then,

1. They should present the claim of the imāms and the *Ahl-ul-Bayt*
2. They should present the testimony of Imām Ja'far ؑ and Imām Bāqir ؑ

Without this, useless talk has no weight.

Mātām for Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ؑ

The *Shia* trace this ‘worship’, *mātām* for Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ؑ to the time after his martyrdom. Therefore, we present a number of realities with regards to this martyrdom from the books of the *Shia*. In *Tirāz al-Madh-hab*, Tehran vol.1 p.281, we find an address of Sayyidah Zaynab ؑ,

‘O deceiving plotters, O people of Kufa, you cry. You have sent very evil provisions forth to the hereafter. May curses and destruction be upon you.’

From this statement of Sayyidah Zaynab ؑ we learn one more thing. The people of Kufa plotted and were treacherous in their killing. Then they began to cry and beat themselves. Despite this, they were still worthy of curses and prayers of destruction.

Nāsikh ut Tawārīkh vol.1 p.301 has the statement of Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm ؑ, daughter of Sayyidunā ‘Alī ؑ and wife of Sayyidunā Umar Ibn al-Khattāb ؑ,

‘O people of Kufa, evil is for you, what happened to you? You deceived Ḥusayn ؑ, you killed him and looted his wealth. You imprisoned his wives. Now you cry. May you be destroyed. Do you know whose blood you have spilt? What a great burden of sin you have taken upon your backs and whose wealth have

you looted? You have killed the most beloved of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. You have no mercy in your hearts. Listen well, only the people of Allāh will be successful and the group of *Shaytān* will be in loss.'

Besides the plotting, scheming and treachery of the people of Kufa, we learn of a complaint regarding these people from the explanation of Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm ﷺ. After they killed Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ﷺ, they looted the wealth of the *Ahl-ul-Bayt* and divided it amongst themselves like inheritance.

From these excerpts it has become clear that the people of Kufa, the Shia, had written letters to Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ﷺ. When he came, they were treacherous and abandoned him. Even worse was that they joined the enemy and killed him. Not only this, they looted the wealth of the *Ahl-ul-Bayt* and divided it like inheritance.

Nāsikh ut Tawārīkh p.208 also states that Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm ﷺ said, "O people of Kufa, your men killed us and your women cry over us. Well, Allāh will decide between us on the day of judgement."

The same book on p.311 says, 'Abū Judaylah Asadī was very surprised when he saw the women of Kufa tearing their clothing and beating themselves. When he asked, he was told, "They saw the blessed head of Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ﷺ and cried."

However, the question is that when their men severed the head of Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ؑ without any feeling, so how did the enthusiasm for grief and sorrow come into the hearts of the women? The answer is the same, they killed also and they put the blame on someone else.

Who were the Killers of Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ﷺ?

The detail of the discussion has passed and it has been proven that:

1. According to the clear explanations of the infallible claimants, the *Shia*:

- ❖ Invited the imām to Kufa
- ❖ Opposed the imām after his arrival in Kufa
- ❖ Stopped the water supply
- ❖ Slaughtered the imām mercilessly on the hot sands
- ❖ Looted the tents of the *Ahl-ul-Bayt*
- ❖ Divided the wealth amongst themselves as booty
- ❖ Cried and hit themselves in a show of grief

After the explanation of the claimants, the confession of the defendant was presented from the reliable book of Shahīd Thālith Nūrullāh Shostarī, *Majālis ul Mu'minīn* vol.2 Majlis 8

2. The most important point is that when the infallible imāms clearly state that the killers were the *Shia* and the criminal has confessed to the crime, why does the third person want to belie this accepted reality?

Cause for the Downfall of the Islamic Empires

The *khilāfat ar-rāshida* was that great rule by means of which Islāmic law and the boundaries of the *Shari'ah* were established. It was the scheme of Ibn Sabā to tarnish the biography of the third *khalīfah* and incite the masses to rebel against him. Together with causing a revolution in thought, he also brought about a change in actions and he cause reliance upon the *khilāfat ar-rāshida* to be removed. These rebels made Sayyidunā 'Uthmān ؑ their target and the *Khawārij* targeted Sayyidunā 'Alī ؑ. The objective of both of them was the same, to tarnish the lofty standard of the *khilāfat ar-rāshida*.

History bears testimony that after this also; the cause behind the downfall of the Islāmic Empires was mostly the *Rawāfid* (*Shia*). Subsequently, Maulānā Anwar Shāh Kashmīrī ؑ writes, 'History bears testimony that the *mujāhidīn* were always from the *Ahl us Sunnah*. Without them, no-one got the divine ability to do *Jihād* and most of the Islāmic Empires were destroyed at the hands of the *Rawāfid* (*Shia*).'⁸

⁸ Fayḍ ul Bārī

The *fitnah* of the Tartars was described as ‘Tāmmatul Kubrā’. Allāmah Ibn Qayyim has written that the hand of Naṣīr ud Dīn Tūsī, from the senior *Shia*, was in this *fitnah*. He was the minister of Hulagu Khan. With the authority he had, he destroyed Masājid. In place of the Qur’ān, he gave vogue to *Ishārāt* of Ibn Sinā. He sternly instructed that the Qur’ān was for the masses. *Ishārāt* is the ‘Qur’ān’ for the elite. His effort was to destroy Islām and to bring the teachings of the philosophers, astronomers and magicians into vogue.

On the other side, the minister of the Abbasid *khalīfah* was Ibn Alqamī, a *Shia*. He paved the way for the success of Hulagu Khan. The fall of Baghdad is a painful event in the History of Islām, an empire that was 650 years old had come to an end and the greatest share in this was that of the two *Shias*.

In short, the martyrdom of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ﷺ was not an effort to end the life of one person, but it was a lengthy plan to destroy the foundations of Islāmic thought and practice. Because Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ﷺ was a symbol of Islāmic thought and practice, that is why he was made the target of abuse. Every person has to die one day, but the harm that was caused to Islām through this plan and conspiracy has not ended to this day.



