

XKP



FADAK IN HISTORY

Martyr Mohammad Baqir As Sadr

Chapter 1

Introduction

By: Dr. Sharara

In the Name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful
Praise be to Allah, the Lord of the universe and blessing and peace be on the master of the prophets and messengers, Prophet Muhammad, and on his pure progeny and his excellent companions.

About the author and the book:

Fadak in History was the firstling scholarly work by the martyred Imam Muhammad Baqir as-Sadr. It was really, according to the historical period, in which it was written, a unique study because it relied on modern scientific methods in investigating the details and the documents related to the case.[1] It engaged the reader in a debate that was profound, logical and exact.

If you examine the studies published at that time-half a century ago or in the later period, concerning such sensitive subjects, you will realized what a scientific antecedence and a historical achievement the martyred Imam had achieved in this study. It was no wonder, for the martyred Sayyid as-Sadr's genius gushed out when he was too young. His talents developed rapidly to equip the Islamic library with his original studies in different fields of knowledge and the Sharia. He was a devoted jurisprudent, a pious mujtahid and a nonesuch brilliant. He enriched the Islamic thought and supplied it with the elements of vitality.

In fact, it may not be an exaggeration to say

[1] It is the case of Fadak, which will be explained in details later on.

that Imam as-Sadr was a living thesis of the revived Islam. He assumed intellectual and jihad responsibilities that no one did like him except very few others along the history of Islam. He was in continuous jihad and persevering effort in order to free the thought of the umma from the disbelieving west's thesis and to free its future from the hegemony of

the universal arrogants and their agents until his holy life was crowned with martyrdom in the way of Allah and Islam.

The Method of the Book

The martyred Sayyid used a scientific method in this book *Fadak in History*. He thought that he had to use this method in such historical studies that had political concepts. This method depended on objectivity, which he referred to by saying (to be impartial), examination and scrutiny (deliberateness in judgment) and then to be free in thinking. Imam as-Sadr considered these things as basic conditions to build a compact historic construction concerning the ancestors' cases to give a fair image about their real lives as they already knew about themselves or as it was well known by the others at that time. He thought: "that construction must contain a wide scrutiny of every subject of that past time historically and socially according to the general and private life in order to be the matter of the research such as the religious, moral, social and political life." [1]

If this would be the aim of such historical studies, which would be its general frame, so Imam as-Sadr drew the attention to the necessity of "that this scrutiny must be acquired from the real life of

[1] See chap.3.

people and not from a world invented by affection and fanaticism or by blind worshipping and imitation". Then he put a condition for that scrutiny not to depend on a deviate imagination to raise the bad to the top and to issue incorrect results according to that. Then the martyred Sayyid confirmed the necessity of keeping to the essence of the scientific research and leaving away our emotion and bad inheritance. He drew the attention to a dangerous fact in the field of the historical studies, which would make a historian as a novelist deriving from his own mind not from the historic events.

The aspects of this method showed the Sayyid's early deep conscience of the fundamentals and basic conditions of the scientific research. I found him going into this research arming himself with the scientific logic, being enthusiastic about the truth and clinging to what he could derive from the real events. In all of that he depended on what the historians had related and what the historical documents had recorded. Then he concluded according to the accurate fundamentals and principles.

A Summary About the Chapters of the Book

Imam as-Sadr discussed the case of Fadak according to the Fatimite[1] perspective, which referred to its ramified dimensions in relation to the aspects of the Islamic life and the later ages. So he considered it (the case of Fadak) as comprehensive revolution. He discussed the background of the case according to the thoughts rankling in Fatima's mind and the great memories of her father, Prophet Muhammad (s), circuiting in her

[1] *Concerning Fatima, the prophet's daughter (s).*

mind. Then she came to a bitter phenomenon surging with unlimited ordeal and sedition. All that motivated her to squawk and to announce her start to confront. Then Sayyid as-Sadr moved to the second chapter (*Fadak in its real meaning and symbolic meaning*). He defined Fadak and moved with it through the successive historical periods since it was extorted from Fatima (s) until what became of it at the last days of the Abbasid reign. Then he moved to the third chapter (*the history of the revolution*), in which he talked about the revolution, defining the conditions of the research and the method of writing the biography of the individuals and the umma. He commended the first Islamic age and its great achievements. Then he discussed al-Aqqad's[1] book *Fatima and the Fatimites*. He criticized al-Aqqad for his futile treatment of the case of Fadak and his attempt to limit it in a narrow corner according to the logic of unthoughtful worship and blind imitation of the bad inherited traditions without using his mind.

After that the Sayyid tried to explain the dimensions of Fadak that it was not a dispute about a certain matter or an extorted property but it was much greater than that. He said: "We feel, if we study the real history of the case of Fadak and its disputes, that it had aspects of a revolution, whose motives were available. We notice that those disputes in their reality and motives were as revolution against the ruling policy..." Then he gave a logical justification by saying: "If you study whatever you like of the historical documents about this case, will you find that there was a dispute about a property? Or will you find a disagreement

[1] *An Egyptian Writer.*

about Fadak in its limited meaning of possession or yields of a piece of land? Certainly not! It was the revolution against the reign and the

outcry, by which Fatima (s) wanted to pluck up the cornerstone, on which history was built after the day of Saqeefa[1]...” Here Sayyid as-Sadr began to observe the events happened before the day of Saqeefa. He discussed them focusing on the hidden corners whether related to the situations or to the persons. He expressed Imam Ali’s situations, which he had done loyally for the sake of Islam.

In another chapter Imam as-Sadr discusses Fatima’s address before the public. He analyzes and condemns the purposes of the opponents and through that he shows Imam Ali’s characteristics and situations, which made him the only one, who deserved the first ruling position and the intellectual and political authority over the Islamic umma.

Then he concludes the book with a chapter titled with *the court of the book*, in which he discusses the case of Fadak showing its details and ambiguities. He provokes the deep paradoxes, on which those, who prevented Fatima her certified right, depended. He depends in all of that on the holy Quran and the Sunna and according to the logic of truth and fairness.

This was a summary about the chapters of the book, in which the reader will find a well-versed analysis and sedate arguments in an eloquent method with keeping to the conditions and

[1] It was the day when the Prophet (s) died and the companions gathered in the saqeefa (shed) of Beni Sa’ida to choose the caliph, in fact to seize the caliphate hurriedly as long as the Hashimites (the Prophet’s family) were busy with the procedures of the burial.

requirements of the impartial research.

A Word on the Case

The case of Fadak according to Fatima's opinion was not just a matter of a gift extorted from her hand because of some reasons fabricated and justified by the state, but it was much more serious than that. It formed a dangerous initiative in the fate of the Islamic state and in the life of the newborn Islamic experiment, which the Prophet (s) had striven bitterly to build on the right Sharia and the bases of justice, that state and experiment, which the Prophet (s) wanted to spread all over the world and along the ages.

The gravity was when the elite statesmen, who were supposed to be responsible to safeguard this new experiment, went hurriedly towards the instantaneous gains and tried to seize the leading positions without paying any attention to the established principles and the true traditions. That led, before all, to open the door widely in front of the opportunists and the covetous persons or as Aa'isha, the Prophet's wife, said: "The caliphate, then, will be gained by everyone, whether he was pious or dissolute." [1] Therefore az-Zahra' [2] confronted this matter in order not to let such feared results happen.

Hence the aim of evoking the case of Fadak was to enlighten the umma, the leaders and the public on the terrible dangers that would occur if they kept on this way. She declared that by saying: "By Allah, it [3] was impregnated so wait until it bears then milk its blood...then they will perish who say

[1] Refer to as-Sayouti's book *ad-Durr al-Manthoor* vol.6, p.19.

[2] One of Fatima's surnames.

[3] She referred to the situation of the rulers and the public.

false things and the successors will know what bad the earlier ones have established. Be at ease and wait relaxedly for the sedition. Rejoice at a sharp sword, general commotion and despotism, which will make your victuals so insignificant and your gathering separate..." [1]

In the light of that, we can see the enthusiasm that Sayyid as-Sadr has and the serious feeling that is moved inside him when he analyzes, discusses and concludes (according to the Fatimite thought) out of his care for the purity of Islam.

The martyred Sayyid, along the research, prays Allah to bless the companions and appreciates their exploits for the sake of Islam, but at the same time he does not ignore their defects and faults. We do not see any

objection in that because the most important thing and the worthier to be regarded is the safety, the genuineness and the purity of the Islamic experiment. If someone wants to protest-and he has the right to do so- he will not oblige us to submit. Besides, he will be against the truth. Let us here, for example, remind of the saying of the caliph Omar about Khalid bin[2] al-Waleed related to the case of Malik bin Nuwayra. The Caliph Omar said to Abu Bakr: "Khalid killed a Muslim man and took his wife (for himself)..."[3] Abu Bakr interpreted an excuse for Khalid's crime but that did not convince Omar, who preserved it in his mind until he became the caliph then he deposed Khalid according to that very case.

So we are not obliged to accept every interpretation. Specifying the faults, recording the events and examining them will, undoubtedly, keep

[1] Refer to *ibn Abu Tahir Tayfoor's book Balaghat an-Nissa'*, p.33.

[2] (*bin*) means: (*the son of*) and (*bint*) means: (*the daughter of*).

[3] *At-Tabari's Tareekh*, vol.2, p.280.

us away from the bad results. That will be for the benefit of the umma and the genuineness of Islam.

This was exactly the aim of the martyred imam as-Sadr. It was the same aim, which led us to do the scientific inquiry for this study. We found that every hint, saying, analysis or conclusion mentioned in this study was according to the reality of the famous events, the reliable sources and the conducts of those certain companions.

It will be clear for the reader through this inquiry that there is no rashness in a saying, no discrimination in a thought and no any conclusion without evidences.

My Role in this Revision

The book *Fadak in History* was published twice; the first edition was by al-Haydariyya press that was owned by the pious sheikh Muhammad Kadhim al-Kutubi in holy Najaf in 1374 AH/1955 AD, which was a good edition and had few mistakes and the second was published some years later by Dar at-Ta'aruf in Beirut. I did not find any other editions. Because the Haydariyya edition was more accurate and Sayyid as-Sadr himself had read it, so I depended on it as the source.

I checked and verified the verses and the traditions against their sources and I documented the references of Sayyid as-Sadr and post-fixed them with the word "the martyr" to distinguish them from the references, notes and additions, which were required by the verification that I thought they were fit to be mentioned. In all of that, I referred to the reliable books and sources of our Sunni brothers in order to confirm that the facts which were quoted were based on those sources. After that I had to declare that the truthfulness of analysis and keeping to the scientific method in presentation, discussion and conclusion were among the characteristics of the martyred sayyid's approach in this study.

Finally, whilst thanking Allah for granting me success to do this work, I pray Him to make it exclusively for His sake and I pray Him to grant success to those, who work in al-Ghadir Centre of the Islamic Studies to serve our dear Islam and the teachings of the Prophet and his family (s).

Praise be to Allah firstly and finally.

Dr. Abdul Jabbar Sharara
Doctorate in Islamic and Religious Studies

Chapter 2

The Author's Foreword

Dear reader:

This is a work that I seized the opportunity of one of our holidays in our splendid university-the University of Holy Najaf-to apply myself to study one of the Islamic history problems. It was the problem of Fadak and the historical dispute that took place between Fatima az-Zahra' (peace be on her) and the first caliph (may Allah be pleased with him). Many themes and conclusions formed in my mind. I wrote them down on separate pieces of paper. When I finished studying the documents and the narrations of the case besides its environments, I found that what was written on those pieces of paper was fit as draft for a sufficient study for the case. I began to refine it and organize it into chapters, which became as a small book. I decided to keep it as a memorandum to refer to when I would need it. It remained with me for many years as a point of my intellectual life and as reminder of the date, in which I started to write it down, until the virtuous Sheikh Muhammad Kadhim al-Kutubi, the son of Sheikh Sadiq al-Kutubi, asked me to give it to him to print. I submitted to his wish appreciating his favors on the Arabic and Islamic library. Here it is now before you.

The author

Chapter 3

On the Scene of the Revolution

Here it is before you. Take it as if it is prepared for you. It will dispute with you on the Day of Resurrection. What a fair judge Allah is on that day and the master is Muhammad and the appointment is the Day of Punishment, on that Day shall they perish who say false things.

Fatima (s)

Preface

She[1] stood up with no doubt about what she endeavored to prove and with no fear in her great situation. No hesitation crossed her mind, for she was very serious about what she had decided to do. No obsession of worry or confusion occurred to her. Here she was now on the top with her noble readiness and her courageous stability on her ambitious plan and her defensive way. She was between two doors with no time to hesitate. She had to choose one of them and she did. She chose the more tiring way, which was challenging for a lady to walk on, due to her physically weaker

[1]Fatima (s).

nature. For it was full of difficulties and stress and required courage, effective oratory power, and the ability to formulate the essence of the revolution into words.

Indeed it required a great skill to show the indignation and to criticize the existing conditions in a way that gives the words a meaning of life and a chance of eternity to make the words as the soldiers of the revolution and its eternal support in the history of the faith. It is the faith and the death defiance for the sake of the truth that make the weak souls great and give power to the frustrated spirits without any hesitation or febleness.

Hence this revolutionary lady chose this way, which fitted her great soul and her determined personality towards reserving the truth and striving for its sake.

She was surrounded by her maids and fellow-women like the scattered stars gathering in disorder. They were all together with the same zeal and the same anxiety. Their leader was among them reviewing what a noble rising she would attempt to do. She was trying to prepare the equipments and the supply for that. As she went further in her review, she became more steadfast and the power of her right became stronger and stronger. She became bolder in her movement and in her rush to defend the robbed rights. She became more active in her advance and more courageous in her great situation as if she had borrowed her great husband's heart to face her difficult circumstances and what the fate brought to her with. Rather it was what Allah had decided to try her with that terrible tragedy that could shake the great mountains.

She was, at that terrible moment when she played the role of the defensive soldier, like a ghost under a cloud of bitter sorrow. She was pale, frowning, broken hearted, depressed, faint, weak, exhausted but in her soul and mind there was a glimpse of happiness and remnant of comfort. Neither this nor that were for enjoying a smiling hope or calmness with a sweet dream or expecting a good result. That glimpse was a glimpse of content with the thought of revolution and that comfort was confidence of success. In the instantaneous failure there might be a later great success. Exactly it was. A nation rose to sanctify this revolution and to imitate this great lady's stability and courageousness.

Her thoughts in that situation took her to the near past, to the happy life where her father was still breathing and her house was the centre of the state and the steady pole of glory that the world obeyed and submitted to.

And perhaps her thoughts led her to remember her father hugging her, surrounding her with his sympathy and showering her his kisses, which she was accustomed to and were her sustenance every morning and evening.

Then she came to be faced with a different time. Her house that was the lantern of light, the symbol of prophethood and the shining ray soaring towards the Heaven was threatened from time to time. Her cousin, the second man in Islam, the gate of the prophet's knowledge,[1] his loyal vizier[2] and his

[1] According to the famous prophetic tradition (I am the city of knowledge and Ali is its gate). Refer to Abu Na'eem's Hilyatul-Awliya', vol.1, p.64, As-Say-outi's Jami'ul-Jawami', At-Tarmithi's Sahih and refer to at-Taj aj-Jami' lil-Usool fee Ahadeeth ar-Rasool of Sheikh Mansour Ali Nassif, ol.3 p.337.

[2] With reference to the tradition (This-referring to Ali-is my brother, my vizier and my successor among you...). Refer to the full tradition in at-Tabari's Tareekh, vol.3 p.218-219 and Tafseer

promising Aaron,

[1] who would not separate with his pure beginning[2] from the blessed beginning of the Prophet and who was the Prophet's supporter at the beginning and his great hope at the end, finally would lose the caliphate after the Prophet (s). His morale, which the Heaven and the earth confessed, was demolished and his great deeds became irrespective according to some criteria fabricated at that time.

Here she cried bitterly. Her crying was not of that sort that appeared on the lineaments. It was the agony of the conscience, the suffering of the soul and the tremor of the regrets in the bottom of the heart. Tears flowed from her gloomy eyes.

Her stop did not last long. She rushed like a flaming spark surrounded by her companions until she reached the struggle field. She stopped her eternal stop and declared her war, in which she used whatever she was allowed to use as a Muslim woman. Her fresh revolution was about to devour the caliphate but the circumstances were against her and the obstacles increased in front of her.

The Environments of the Event

That was the veracious Fatima, the daughter of the Prophet, the delight of his eye, the example of

al-Khazin, vol.3 p.371.

[1] *Regarding the true tradition (O Ali, are you not pleased to be for me as Aaron was to Moses, except that there is no a prophet after me). Refer to al-Bukari's Sahih, vol.5 p.81, Muslim's Sahih, vol.4 p.1873 and at-Taj aj-Jami' of Sheikh Mansour Ali Nassif, vol.3 p.333.*

[2] *Refer to Nahjul Balagha, sermon no.192 p.300-302, checked by Dr. Subhi as-Salih. Imam Ali said: (You have known my position to the Prophet in close relation and special rank. He put me in his lab when I was a child...where there was no a single house having Muslims except that house, which gathered the Prophet, Khadeeja (the Prophet's first wife) and me. I saw the light of the angel and smelt the scent of the prophethood...)*

infallibility, the radiant halo and the remainder of the Prophet among the Muslims, on her way to the mosque. She lost the father, who was the best at all in the history of mankind, the most sympathetic, the most compassionate and the most blessed.

This was a calamity that could make the one, afflicted with, taste the bitterness of dying and find dying sweet and delightful hope.

Thus was Fatima when her father left to the better world and his soul flew to Paradise pleased (with Allah) and (Allah) well-pleased (with him).

The bitter events did not cease. She faced another calamity, which had a great effect on her pure soul and it moved her sorrow and grief. It was not less than the first calamity. It was the lost of the glory, which the Heaven had granted to the Prophet's family along history. That glory was the leadership of the umma. The Heaven had decided that Muhammad's family was to rule his umma and his Shia because they (Muhammad's descendents) were his examples and derivatives. But the opposite account turned the leadership and the rule away from the real possessors and appointed caliphs and emirs instead. [1]

[1] *The heaven had decided that Ali and the other pure members of the Prophet's family were to have the leadership and the imamate of the umma. There was a big step of educational and intellectual preparation for such leadership and caliphate. In fact there was a clear method that its steps succeeded in this way. It*

was confirmed by the holy Quran and the Sunna that did not let any way of doubt. Refer to The origin of the Shiism and the Shia by Imam as-Sadr and edited by Abdul Jabbar Sharara. We proved by numbers, evidences and texts this fact with reference to the reliable sources and true traditions of our Sunni brothers.

Also refer (for example) to at-Tabari's Tareekh vol.3 p.218-219, as-Sayooti's Tareekh al-Khulafa' (History of the caliphs), p.171, ibn Hajar's as-Sawa'iq al-Muhriqa, p.127 and the Summary of Ibn Assakir's Tareekh by ibn Mandhour, vol.17.p.356 and following pages.

With this and that Fatima (s) lost the holiest prophet and father and the most eternal chiefdom and leadership in an overnight. So her grief-stricken soul sent her to the war and its fields and made her undertake the revolution and keep on it.

Undoubtedly, anyone else who had the same principles and beliefs could not have done what she did or striven in jihad like her without being an easy prey for the ruling authority that had reached at that time the peak of subdual and severity. There was blame for waving, accusation for saying and punishment for doing.[1] It was not different from what we nowadays might refer to as martial laws. That was necessary for the rulers in those days to support their base and to fix their structure.

But since the defending rebel was the daughter of Muhammad (s), a piece of his soul[2] and his flourishing image, she would be kept safe undoubtedly because of the holy prophethood of her father and also the respect and other aspects of woman in Islam that safeguarded her from harm.

The Tools of the Revolution

Fatima (s) flew by the wings of her sacred thoughts to the horizons of her past and the world of her great father, which turned, after her father joined his Lord, to a shining memory in her soul. It supplied her every moment with feelings, sympathy and education. It roused in her joy and ease. Even if she was late after her father in the account of time,

[1] Refer to the event of al-Saqeefa in al-Tabari's Tareekh vol.2 p.244 and see what had happened on that day. One was the saying of the second caliph (Omar): "Kill Sa'd bin Obada..."

[2] The Prophet said: "Fatima is a part of me. Whoever hurts her, surely hurts me..." Refer to at-Taj al-Jami' lil-Ossool vol.3 p.353, al-Bukhari's Sahih vol.5 p.83 tradition no. 232 and Muslim's Sahih vol.4 p.p/.1902 tradition no.2493.

she did not separate from him in the account of soul and memory.

So she had inside her an inexhaustible power, a motive for a sweeping revolution, which never went out, lights from the prophethood of Muhammad and the soul of Muhammad lighting her way and guiding her to the right path.

Fatima (s) deserted the worldly life when the revolution of her soul ripened and turned with her feelings towards the memory that still lived inside her soul to take from it a torch of light for her difficult situation. She began calling:

Come back to me O scenes of happiness, from which I woke up to find unhappiness that I cannot tolerate....

Come back to me O you the dearest and the most beloved one to me. Talk to me and shed on me some of your divine light as you used to do with me before.

Come back to me, my father. Let me converse with you if that will relieve you. Let me reveal to you my griefs as I always used to do. Let me tell you about those shades, which preserved me from the flame of this world. Now I no longer have any.

She said after the death of her father:

There were after you conflicting news and misfortunes,

If you were here, no misfortune would happen.[1]

Come back to me O memories of my dear past to tell me your attractive speech and make me hear every thing to announce my war with no leniency against those, who ascended-or the people made them ascend-

the minbar and the position of my father and they did not pay any attention to the

[1] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha of ibn Abul Hadeed, vol.16 p.312.*

rights of the Prophet's family or to the sanctity of the holy house to prevent it from burning

[1] and from being destroyed. Remind me of my father's scenes and battles. Did not he tell me of the kinds of heroism and jihad[2] of his brother and son-in-law (Ali), his superiority on all his opponents and his steadfastness beside the Prophet (s) in the most difficult hours and the most violent fights, from which so and so had fled and the brave desisted[3] to break into? Was it right after that to put Abu Bakr on the minbar of the Prophet and to bring down Ali from what he deserved?!

O my father's memories, tell me about Abu Bakr. Is not he the one, whom the divine inspiration did not entrust with the announcing of a verse to the polytheists[4]

and chose Ali for the task? Did that

[1] *With reference to the threat of burning the house of Fatima (s). Refer to al-Imama wes-Siyasa by ibn Qutayba p.12, at-Tabari's Tareekh vol.2 p.233 and Sharh Nahjul Balagha by ibn Abul Hadeed vol.6 p.47-48. They mentioned that Omar bin al-Khattab came to the house of Fatima with a group of Ansar (the people of Medina, who believed and assisted the Prophet in his mission when he and his companions emigrated from Mecca to Medina) and Muhajireen (the Prophet's companions, who emigrated from Mecca to Medina) and said: "I swear by Him, in Whose hand my soul is, either you come out to pay homage (to Abu Bakr) or I will set fire to the house with whoever inside it".*

[2] *Refer to at-Tabari's Tareekh vol.2 p.25 and 65-66, when Imam Ali (s) killed Talha bin Othman the bearer of the polytheists' banner...and killed all the bearers of the banner. The prophet (s) saw a group of polytheists. He said to Ali: "Attack them!" Ali attacked them, scattered them and killed Amr aj-Jumahi. The Prophet saw another group of polytheists. He said to Ali: "Attack them" Ali attacked them, scattered them and killed Shayba bin Malik. Gabriel said to the Prophet: "O messenger of Allah, it is this the real assistance." The prophet said: "He is from me and I am from him". Gabriel said: "And I am from you both..."*

[3] *Refer to the tradition narrated by Sa'd bin Abu Waqqas mentioned in Muslim's Sahih, vol.4 p.1873, at-Tarmithi's Sahih vol.5 p.596 and ibn Hajar's as-Sawa'iq al-Muhriqa. They all confirmed this meaning.*

[4] *With reference to the story of sura of Bara'a. Refer to Imam*

mean but that Ali was the natural representative of Islam, who was to undertake every task that the Prophet might not be free from his many duties to do himself?

I remember well that critical day where the agitators agitated when my father appointed Ali as emir of Medina and he went out for war. They put for that emirate[1] whatever interpretations they liked. But Ali was steadfast like a mountain. The riots of the rioters did not shake him. I tried to make him follow my father to tell him what people fabricated. At last he followed the Prophet. Then he came back beaming brightly and smiling broadly. Happiness carried him to his beloved spouse to bring good news to her not in the worldly meaning but in a meaning of the Heaven. Ali told how the Prophet received him, welcomed him and said to him: "You are to me as Aaron was to Moses but there will be no prophet after me." [2] Moses' Aaron was his partner in the rule, the imam of his umma and was prepared to be his successor. And so Muhammad's Aaron had to be the wali of the Muslims and the caliph after Muhammad (s).

When she arrived at this point of her flowing thoughts, she cried out that this was the reversal, of which Allah had warned in His saying: (And Muhammad is no more than an apostle; the apostles have

Ahmad's Musnad vol.1 p.3 and az-Zamakhshari's Kashshaf vol.2 p.243. It was mentioned that: "While Abu Bakr was on his way (towards Mecca) in order to inform of the sura of Bara'a, Gabriel came down and said to the Prophet: "O Muhammad, no one is to inform of your mission but a man of your family. So you send Ali..." Also refer to at-Tarmithi's Sahih vol.5 p.594.

[1] At-Tabari's Tareekh vol.2 p.182-183 and al-Bidayeh wen Nihayeh of ibn Katheer ad-Damaski vol.7 p.340 for more details.

[2] At-Taj aj-Jami' lil-Ossool of sheikh Mansour Ali Nassif vol.3 p.332, Muslim's Sahih vol.4 p.1873 and an-Nassa'ei's Khassa'iss p.48-50.

already passed away before him; if then he dies or is killed will you turn back on your heels? 3:144) Soon the people turned back on their heels and were overcome by the pre-Islamic thinking, which the two parties (the Muhajireen and the An-sar) exchanged in the Saqeefa[1] when one of them said: "We are the people of glory and strength and more in number." The other replied: "Who will dispute with us about the rule of Muhammad while we are his assistants and family?" [2] The holy book and the Sunna failed in front of those criteria. She began to say:

O principles of Muhammad, which flowed in my veins since I was born, like the blood in the veins. Omar, who attacked you (principles) in your house in Mecca, which the Prophet had made as a centre for his mission, attacked the family of Muhammad in their house (in Medina) and set fire to it or was about to do so...[3]

O my great mother's soul, you have taught me an eternal lesson in the life of the Islamic struggle by your great jihad beside the master of the prophets. I will make myself as another Khadeeja for Ali in his present ordeal.[4]

Here I am, my mother. I hear your voice in the

[1] A big shed, in which the Muhajireen and the Ansar gathered in after the death of the Prophet (s) to decide who would be the caliph after the Prophet.

[2] Refer to at-Tabari's Tareekh vol.2 p.234 and the following pages and Sharh Nahjul Balagha by ibn Abul Hadeed vol.6 p.6-9.

[3] Refer to at-Tabari's Tareekh vol.2 p.233. He mentioned that ibn Hameed had said: "Omar bin al-Khattab came to Ali's house and there were some men of Muhajireen inside it and said: "I swear by Allah that I will burn the house with you or you come out to pay homage..."

[4] Relating to the situation of Khadeeja (the Prophet's wife), in which Allah had glorified her when she assisted the Prophet in his ordeal with Quraysh when they considered him as liar.

depth of my soul prompting me to stand against the rulers. I will go to Abu Bakr to say to him: "You have done a monstrous thing. Here it is before you. Take it as if it is prepared for you. It will dispute with you on the Day of Resurrection. What a fair judge Allah is on that day and the master is Muhammad and the appointment is the Day of Punishment"[1] and to draw the attention of the Muslims to the bad ends of their doing and the dark future they built with their own hands and to say to them: "It was impregnated so wait until it bears then milk its blood...then they will perish who say false things and the successors will know what bad the earlier ones have established."[2] Then she rushed into the field of action having in her soul the principles of Muhammad, the spirit of Khadeeja, the heroism of Ali and great pity for the umma that it might face a dark future.

The Route of the Revolution

The way, which the revolutionary lady took, was not long because the house, from which the spark and the flame of the revolution were emitted, was the house of Ali. It was called, according to the Prophet (s), the house of the prophethood. It was attached to the mosque.[3] Nothing separated them except one wall. So she might enter the mosque from the door, which was between them (the mosque and the house) and leading to the mosque

[1] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha vol.16 p.212.*

[2] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha vol.16 p.212.*

[3] *As it was mentioned by Ahmad bin Hanbal in his Musnad vol.4 p.369 and ibn Katheer in his Tarekh vol.3 p.355 that some of the Prophet's companions had doors (of their houses) opened to the mosque. The Prophet ordered to be closed except the door of Ali's house.*

directly or she might enter from the general gate of the mosque. It is not so important for us which way she passed, whereas I think it was the general gate of the mosque because the historical description of her revolutionary movement feels of that. Her entering from her special door did not let her walk in the mosque or to pass a way between her house and the mosque so how could the narrator describe her gait that it was exactly like the gait[1] of the Prophet? If we supposed that she had walked in the mosque itself, so her walk would not lead her to the caliph but it would begin from there because if some one came into the mosque, it would be said that he came in to those, who were in the mosque even if he walked in the mosque, while the narrator considered her coming in to the caliph after her walking. This confirmed what we thought.

The Women

The narration showed that Fatima was accompanied by her maids and some of her fellow women.[2] She came with the women in order to draw the attention of people and to make them notice her passing that way with that number of women to gather in the mosque and to crowd where her destination was to be to know what she wanted to say or to do. Hence the trial would be open in front of the public in that disturbed milieu.

A Phenomenon

It was mentioned that the gait of Fatima (s) was exactly the same as her father's gait.

We have the opportunity to philosophize this accurate imitation. It might be her nature without

[1] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha vol.16 p.211.*

[2] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha vol.16 p.211.*

any affectation or a special intent. It was not unlikely for she accustomed to imitating her father in sayings and doings. Or she might do that on purpose when she imitated the exact gait of her father to provoke the feelings of people and the sentiments of the public to get their minds back to the near past, to the holy reign of the Prophet and the smiling days, which they spent under the shadow of their great Prophet. By that she tried to soften their feelings and to pave the way for their hearts to accept her glaring invitation and to give some success to her desperate or semi-desperate try.

Hence you see that the narrator himself was moved by this case knowingly or unknowingly and that his affection prompted him to record accurately the gait of Fatima (s).

It was a blessed cry by Fatima that was looked after by the Heaven. It was, at its beginning, the point at which the slaughtered right was focused and the desperate try around which smiles of hope spread and then turned, after its end, to bitter gloom, rigid despair and surrender imposed by the people's lives in those days.

Unlike the other revolutions, it was a revolution that the rebel did not want an immediate result for as much as to be recorded as a revolution by itself and to be mentioned by history in prominent lines. And it was! It expressed the intent completely with no defect. Indeed this was what happened that we think it succeeded even apparently it failed as we will explain later in one of the chapters of this book.

Chapter 4

Fadak In its Real and Symbolic Meaning

Yes, Fadak was in our hands out of all what was under the sky but some people felt greedy for it and others withheld themselves from it.

*(Fatima's husband)
Amirul Mu'mineen[1]*

The Location

Fadak was a village in Hijaz. Between Fadak and Medina there was a distance of two days and it was said three days. It was a Jewish land in the beginning of its history.[2] It was inhabited by some Jews until the seventh year of hijra when Allah cast terror into their hearts and they made peace with the Prophet by giving him a half of Fadak. Also it was mentioned that they gave him the entire Fadak.[3]

[1] Nahjul Balagha; Arranged by Subhi as-Salih, p.416

[2] Mu'jamul Buldan by Yaqout al-Hamarwi, vol.4 p.238-239.

[3] Refer to Futoohul Buldan by al-Balatheri p.42-46 to see that the people of Fadak had made peace with the Prophet for the half of Fadak and that it was a pure property of the Prophet because he did not get it by war to be considered as booty for the Muslims. In page 46 the author said: "In two hundred and ten of hijra the Abbasid caliph al-Ma'moon bin Haroon ar-Rasheed paid it back to the Fatimites. He wrote to his wali of Medina Qathm bin Ja'far ordering him to do that..."

Fadak in Its First Stages

The Islamic history of Fadak started from that when it became a property of the Prophet (s) because it was not possessed by war.[1] Then the Prophet donated it to Fatima.[2] It remained in Fatima's possession until her father died. Then the first caliph (Abu Bakr) snatched it from her according to the author of *as-Sawa'iqul Muhriqa*[3] and became as part of the general finance and source of the state's income. When Omar became the caliph, he gave Fadak back to the heirs[4] of the Prophet (s). It remained in the Prophet's heirs' hands until Othman became the caliph. He took it from its real possessors and gifted it to Marwan bin al-Hakam.[5] Then history ignored the matter of Fadak after Othman without mentioning anything about it. But the true fact was that Imam Ali recovered it from Marwan among all the other things that the Umayyads had plundered during the reign of their caliph Othman.

During the Rule of Imam Ali

Some of those, who defended Abu Bakr concerning the matter of Fadak, mentioned that Imam Ali did not recover Fadak and he left it for the Muslims following the same way of Abu Bakr, so if Imam Ali knew that Fatima's allegation (of Fadak) was true, he would not do that!

I do not want to wide-open, in this answer, the

[1]According to the holy Quran: (And whatever Allah restored to His Apostle from them you did not press forward against it any horse or a riding camel) 59:6.

[2] Futoohul Buldan, p.44.

[3] Refer to page 38.

[4] Sharh Nahjul Balagha by ibn Abul Hadeed, vol.16 p.213.

[5] Futoohul Buldan p.44 and Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol.16 p.216.

door of taqiyya[1] and to try to find an excuse for Imam Ali's doing, but I never believe that Imam Ali had followed the way of Abu Bakr. History did not show anything of that, but in fact it showed that Imam Ali thought that Fadak was the Prophet's heirs'. Imam Ali recorded this clearly in his letter to Othman bin Hunayf[2] as you will see in a next chapter.

Perhaps Imam Ali intended that the yields of Fadak concerned Fatima and her heirs, who were her children and husband, and so the news did not need to be spread because Fadak was in its legal possessors' hands, who were him and his children. And probably that he spent its yields in the interest of the Muslims out of his and his children's content[3] or they might dedicate it and made it as charity.

During the Reign of the Umayyads

When Mu'awiya bin Abu Sufyan became the caliph, he went too far in sarcasm and slighting relating to the wronged right (Fadak). He gifted one third of Fadak to Marwan bin al-Hakam, one third to Omar bin Othman and the last third to his son Yazeed. It was still circulated[4] among them until it was totally possessed by Marwan during his rule. Finally it came to Omar bin Abdul Aziz bin Marwan. When Omar became the caliph, he paid it back to the Fatimites. He wrote to his wali of Medina Abu Bakr bin Amr bin Hazm ordering him to give Fadak back to the Fatimites. Abu Bakr bin Amr wrote to

[1] To hide one's true beliefs when life is in danger.

[2] Sharh Nahjul Balagha by ibn Abul Hadeed, vol. 16 p.208.

[3] This was the most acceptable possibility because the first was rejected by the letter of Imam Ali to Othman bin Hunayf when he said: "and others withheld themselves from it..." and the third was rejected by the acceptance of Fadak by the Fatimites.

[4] Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol.16 p.216 and Futoohul Buldan p.46.

the caliph Omar bin Abdul Aziz: "Fatima has sons (grandsons) from the family of Othman and so and so. To whom would I give it?" The caliph wrote to him: "If I ordered you to slay a cow, you would ask about its color! If my letter reached you, divide Fadak among Fatima's Sons (grandsons) from Ali." [1]

The Umayyads became angry with Omar bin Abdul Aziz and blamed him for that. They said to him: "You distorted the rulings of the two sheikhs (Abu Bakr and Omar)". It was mentioned that Omar bin Qayss came to the caliph with a group of the people of Kufa and blamed him for that. He said to them: "You ignored while I perceived, you forgot but I remembered. Abu Bakr bin Muhammad bin Amr bin Hazm told me from his father from his grandfather that the Prophet (s) had said: "Fatima is a part of me. Whatever displeases her displeases me and whatever pleases her pleases me." [2] Fadak was in Abu Bakr and Omar's possession during their reigns until it reached Marwan, who gifted it to my father Abdul Aziz. I and my brothers inherited it. I asked them to sell me their shares. Some of them sold me and some gifted me their shares. When I had it all, I decided to give it back to the Fatimites." He (Omar bin Qayss) said to him: "If you ought to do that, then keep it but divide its yields" and he did so. [3]

Then Yazeed bin Abdul Melik seized it again from the Fatimites and it remained in the family of Marwan's hands until their state (the Umayyad state) declined.[4]

[1] *Sarh Nahjul Balagha*, vol.16 p.278.

[2] *At-Taj aj-Jami' lil Osool*, by Mansour Ali Nassif, vol.3 p.353.

[3] *Futoohul Buldan* p.46 and *Sharh Nahjul Blagha* vol. 16 p.278.

[4] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha* vol.16 p.216.

During the Abbasid Reign

Abul Abbas as-Saffah, the first Abbasid caliph, gave Fadak back to Abdullah bin al-Hassan bin al-Hussayn bin Ali bin Abu Talib. Then Abu Ja'far al-Mansour seized it during his reign from al-Hassan's family. Al-Mahd bin al-Mansour gave it back again to the Fatimites, whereas Musa bin al-Mahdi seized it again from them.[1]

It remained in the Abbasids' hands until al-Ma'moon came to the caliphate in 210 AH and gave it back to the Fatimites. He wrote to his wali of Medina Qathm bin Ja'far: "Amirul mu'mineen (al-Ma'moon) in his position to the religion of Allah and the caliphate of the Prophet and his kinship with him is worthier to obey the Prophet's Sunna and to carry out his orders. He has to submit to those, whom the Prophet had donated or gifted with gifts or charities. Amirul mu'mineen looks forward to the blessing of Allah and His safeguard and to be able to do what may bring him closer to Allah. The Prophet had given Fadak to Fatima and that was a very well-known matter without any doubt about it among the Prophet's family. She kept on claiming that Fadak was hers and she was the worthiest to be believed. Amirul mu'mineen thinks that he has to give it back to Fatima's heirs approaching to Allah by achieving His justice and to the Prophet by carrying out his order and donation. So he (al-Ma'moon) ordered this matter to be fixed in his books and to be sent in letters to his walis. If it was announced in every season (of hajj) after the death of the Prophet (s) that whoever had a charity, a gift or he was promised of that, he was to mention that and to be granted what he was promised of, so

[1] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol.16 p.216-217.*

Fatima was worthier to be believed in her claim about what the Prophet had granted her. Hence amirul mu'mineen writes to al-Mubarak at-Tabari ordering him to give Fadak back to the heirs of Fatima, the daughter of the Prophet, with all of its limits, rights, slaves, yields and others relating to it. It is to be given to Muhammad bin Yahya bin al-Hussayn bin Zeid bin Ali bin al-Hussayn bin Ali bin Abu Talib and Muhammad bin Abdullah bin al-Hassan bin Ali bin al-Hussayn bin Ali bin Abu Talib, whom amirul mu'mineen entrusts with to be responsible of it and to hand it over to its possessors. Know well that this is the opinion of amirul mu'mineen and this is what Allah has inspired him with obeying Him and to be closer to Him and to His messenger (s). Try to

inform of it and treat Muhammad bin Yahya and Muhammad bin Abdullah as you treated al-Mubarak at-Tabari before. Help them to repair it and to improve its yields inshallah. With my salaam.”[1]

When al-Mutawakkil became the caliph, he seized Fadak from the Fatimites and gave it to Abdullah bin Omar al-Baziyar. It had eleven date-palms planted by the holy hands of the Prophet himself. Abdullah bin Omar al-Baziyar sent a man called Bishran bin Abu Umayya ath-Thaqafi to Medina. He cut off those date-palms. When he came back to Basra, he was afflicted with hemiplegia.[2]

The relation between the Fatimites and Fadak ended in the days of al-Mutawakkil when he donated it to Abdullah bin Omar al-Baziyar.[3]

This was a summary account about the confused history of Fadak, which was woven by the

[1] Futoohul Buldan p.46-47.

[2] Sharh Nahjul Balagha vol.16 p.217.

[3] ibid.

inclinations and formed by the fancies according to what was required by the covetousness and the temporary policies. In spite of that, history did not miss moderation and fairness in some different times and circumstances where Fadak was given back to its real possessors. It was noticeable that the problem of Fadak took a great importance in the Islamic society and the rulers’ attention. Hence you see that its solution differed according to the different policy of the state and submitted to the mainstream of the caliph towards the Prophet’s family directly. If the caliph had a fair look and a moderate thought, he would give Fadak back to the Fatimites but if he was not so, seizing Fadak was on the top of the caliph’s list of priorities.

The Symbolic and Material Value of Fadak

One of many things that led us to know the symbolic value Fadak had in the Islamic account was a poem said by the famous poet Di'bil al-Khuza'iy, which he composed when al-Ma'moon (the Abbasid caliph) gave Fadak back to the Fatimites. Here is its opening verse:

*The face of the time smiled,
When Ma'moon gave back Fadak to the Hashimites.[1]*

In the end, a point worth noting; Fadak was not a little piece of land or a small field as some people thought. What I am certain of is that Fadak yielded a great sum generating important wealth to the possessors. I do not have to quantify its outcome although it was mentioned in the historians' books that it was very great sums.

Here is some of what confirmed the high material value of Fadak:

[1] The descendents of Hashim, Prophet Muhammad's grandfather. For the poem refer to Sharh Nahjul Balagha vol.16 p.217

First: Omar (as you will see later) prevented[1] Abu Bakr from leaving Fadak to Fatima (s) because of the failure in the finance of the state, which was in need of support because of the wars against the apostates and the revolts of the mutinous polytheists.

It is clear that such a land, which was considered so important to assist the finances of the state in the difficult circumstances like wars and revolts, must be of a great production.

Second: the saying of Abu Bakr to Fatima in a dialogue between them: "This property was not the Prophet's but it was for the Muslims, with which the Prophet equipped the soldiers and spent for the sake of Allah." [2] Equipping the soldiers would not be possible except with great sums of money required to be expended on the army.

Third: once Mu'awiya divided Fadak into three thirds[3] and gave a third to each of Yazeed, Marwan and Amr bin Othman. It showed clearly the great production of this land. It must be great wealth to be divided among three emirs, who were very rich and wealthy people.

Fourth: considering it as village[4] and estimating some of its date-palms as much as the date-palms of Kufa in the sixth century of hijra.[5]

[1] As-Seera al-Halabiya vol.3 p.391 and Sharh Nahjul Balagha vol.16 p.234.

[2] Sharh Nahjul Balagha vol.16 p.214.

[3] Sharh Nahjul Balagha, p.216.

[4] Mu'jamul Buldan by al-Hamawi vol.4 p.238 and Futoohul Buldan p.45 that Surayj bin Yunus said: Isma'eel bin Ibrahim told from Ayyoub from az-Zuhri about the saying of Allah: (*..you did not press forward against it any horse or a riding camel*) he said: they were some Arabic vil-lages for the Prophet (s); Fadak and so and so...

[5] Sharh Nahjul Balagha vol.16 p.236.

Chapter 5

The History of the Revolution

*There were after you conflicting
news and misfortunes,*

*If you were here, no misfortune
would happen.*

*Some men showed us what there
was hidden in their hearts*

*When you left and the grave kept
you away from us.*

**Sharh Nahjul
Balagha 16:212**

*Many misfortunes were poured on me
If they were poured on days, they
would turn into nights*

*I had been merry under the shade of
Muhammad*

*He was my happiness, with whom I
did not fear any wrong*

*But today I submit to the villain
And try to defend myself against my
oppressors with my garment.*

Fatima (s)

The Method of Studying History

If impartiality in one's emotions, scrutiny in judgment and freedom in thinking were conditions for the productive intellectual life and for the tactful skill in every intellectual study in whatever field and on whatever subject it was, they would be the most important basic conditions for a compact historical structure for our forefathers' cases, in which the lines of their lives, which became as ownership of history, would be expressed clearly and the components of their personalities would be declared as they themselves knew or people knew about them then.

History would be widened for general pondering on every subject of that past time, which would be defined according to the historical and social aspect and according to the real value in the account of the public life or according to the private life the researcher involved in to be the theme of his research like the religious, moral and political life or any other side of the human society provided that those ponderings would be derived from the real world of people not from an imaginary world created by one's emotions and thoughts or by blind adherence and imitation or by winged imagination flying with the insipidities and absurdities to the top and basing on them results as one liked and without putting restrictions that the researcher could not free himself from in order to think and ponder according to the honest scientific methods.

But if we came to history not to record the reality whether good or bad it was, not to bind our study to the pure scientific research methods and not to collect all the possibilities and suppositions that could be prospected to leave away what might deserve leaving and to keep what might deserve noticing and appreciating but to obey our emotions and inheritances to record the history of our forefathers, then it would never be a history of those persons, who lived on the earth one day and were like the other human beings affected by different feelings and emotions and the good and bad tendencies quivered inside them. In fact it would not be a history but a biography of persons lived in our minds and our souls flew with them to the high horizons of imagination.

If you want to be free in your thinking and to be a historian of the world of the human beings and not a novelist deriving from your mind what you write, put your emotions aside or if you like fill yourself with them for they are yours with no disputer and exclude your thinking from them when dealing with research. Your mind is no longer your own property when you take the responsibility of dealing with history. Promise yourself to be honest in order that your research satisfies the

scientific conditions according to the right bases of thinking and conclusion.[1]

The reasons that restrict the historians' freedom in what they criticize are many. The historians, or more accurate, most of the historians were accustomed to be limited to certain sides of life that they historized. They were accustomed to form the history in a way to be attractive when the researchers detailed their impressions about the subject concerned. But in many times it came to be pale having nothing to do with the meanings of the people's lives, activities, movements and labors. Later you will see some examples on the subject at hand with regard to the critical time we are studying in these chapters. I mean the time after the death of the Prophet (s) where the essential matter in the Islamic history was decided unchangeably, that was the kind of the government, which had to undertake the Muslims' affairs.

Appraising the History of the First Islamic Age

All of us wish that the Islamic history of the

[1] You can clearly notice the aspects of the scientific method that Imam as-Sadr defines whether in his reading or writing history and the steps he defines here are required for the historical research. Refer to The Historical Research Method by Dr. Hassan Othman.

bright first age to be completely pure and innocent from what inter-mixed with the human life of evil and slips of fancies. It was the age of high idealities. It was issued by the greatest of the issuers of the human ages in the history of this planet at all. The divine faith rose to the highest point where the divine thought did never rise in the world of philosophy and knowledge. The Prophet Muhammad had reflected his soul into the soul of that age. The age was affected by the Prophet's soul and his great divine morals. In fact the choice of the Muhammadans melted into his soul and they did not have any direction except towards the Great Creator, from Whom the lights of the existence shone, and for Him they would go back, as the existence melted in front of their great teacher's eyes at the moment when the divine mission descended on him. He did not see or hear anything save the divine voice emitting from every side, every direction and every site of the universe announcing to adorn him with the greatest badge.

It was the age, in which the material differences were cancelled at all. The ruler and the ruled were equal in front of the law and its execution.[1] It was the age that made the moral value and the dignity in fearing Allah,[2] which was the spiritual purification, to safeguard the conscience and to raise the soul to the horizons of the high ideality. It was the age that forbade respecting the rich just because they were rich and forbade insulting the poor just because they were poor. It did not differentiate between people except according to the productive power: (... for it

[1] Refer to the famous case of Imam Ali relating to the judgements as in Sharh Nahjul Balagha vol.16 p.269.

[2] With reference to the Quranic verse: (surely the most honourable of you with Allah is the one among you most careful (of his duty) 49:13.

is (the benefit of) what it has earned and on it (the evil of) what it has wrought. 2:286) It was the age that encouraged hurrying up to jihad for the sake of the benefit of mankind, which did mean to cancel the personal happiness in this world and to make it away from the account of one's deeds.[1]

The age that had all those prides was worthier of sanctification, veneration, admiration and appreciation. But what made me exceed in this matter that I did not want to? I had not to waste the time beside the important subject that I tried to discuss in details but it was the enthusiasm to that age that pushed me to that. No doubt it was the best of the ages in spirituality and straightness. I understand this well and agree on it zealously.[2] But I do not understand why it was forbidden to get through scientific study or historical test of any subject of those days or why it was banned for us to research on the case of Fadak on the basis of that one of the opponents was wrong in his situation according to the criteria of the Sharia or to notice that the story of the caliphate and the thought of Saqeefa was not improvised nor it was the product of its day if we noticed the events then and the

[1] With reference to the readiness for sacrificing every thing for the sake of Islam, fighting injustice and helping the weak as Allah said:(Say: If your fathers and your sons and your brethren and your mates and your kinsfolk and property which you have acquired, and the slackness of trade which you fear and dwellings which you like, are dearer to you than Allah and His Apostle and striving in His way, then wait till Allah brings about His command) 9:24.

[2] Notice the accurate evaluation of the Islamic aspects in the first Islamic age and the age of the four caliphs and the extent of high appreciation for the virtues of that age. Nevertheless Imam as-Sadr did not want to be under the effect of dazzlement and admiration of that age and to ignore the paradoxes happened in that age, which were in need to be studied, researched, inquired and analyzed to get the possible true facts.

nature of the surrounding circumstances.

The most possible justification is that many people think, when justifying the virtues of that age, that the men of that age especially Abu Bakr, Omar and their likes, who were the guides of the public life at that time, could not be criticized or charged to be judged because they were the builders of that age, who established the golden lines of its life. So their history was the history of the age and excluding them from their virtues

means excluding the very age from its ideality, which every Muslim believes in.

I want to leave here a word on this subject that has a matter fitting to a long research and a glimpse of an important study that I may discuss in a book at another opportunity. But for now I just ask about the reality of this thought!

It is true that Islam at the time of the two caliphs (Abu Bakr and Omar) did dominate, the conquests were continuous and the life was full of goodness and flourishing with the comprehensive spiritual revival besides the bright world of the Quran. But should we conclude that the only reason of that was because Abu Bakr and Omar were the rulers?[1]

The full answer to this question takes us far from our subject but we know that the Muslims in the day of the two caliphs were at the peak of their enthusiasm for their religion and were zealous to defend their belief. History recorded for us that: (One day Omar ascended the minbar and asked the people: "If we lead you from what you believe in to what you deny, what will you do?" A man answered

[1] Putting forth such a supposition is considered to be logical and it fits the scientific method in order to give an accurate interpretation for that historical stage.

him: "We will ask you to repent. If you repent, we will accept you". Omar said: "If I do not do so?" The man said: "We will cut your head off". Omar said: "Praise be to Allah that made in the umma people, who, if we deviate, will reform our deviation."[1]

We know also that the opposite party-I mean Imam Ali's companions-was lying in wait for the caliphate and if any slip or deviation happened to distort the face of the rule at that time, it would be enough for them to turn it upside down as they did with Othman when he bought a palace, when he appointed his relatives as walis and when he deviated from the Sunna of the Prophet[2] although the people at the time of Othman were nearer to mildness and tameness and were feeble in their religion[3] unlike the people in the days of the first two caliphs.

Hence we understand that the rulers were in a strict situation that did not let them change some of the bases of the policy and its sensitive points if they wanted to because they were under the watch of the general Islamic consideration, which was very sincere to the principles and being the supervisor of the rule and the rulers. As for the rulers-if they did something objectionable-would face a great opposition from the party

that still believed that the Islamic rule must be impressed with the pure Muhammadan impression and that the only one, who could keep this holy impression, was Ali, the Prophet's heir and the guardian of the believers after the Prophet.[4]

[1] *This case is famous in the biography of Omar bin al-Khattab.*

[2] *At-Tabari's Tareekh vol.2 p.651.*

[3] *The complete collection of Taha Hussayn's works vol.4 p.268.*

[4] *At-Tabari's Tareekh vol.3 p.218-219, Tafseer al-Khazin vol.3*

As for the Islamic conquests, they had the priority among the events of those days but that would not score a glory in the historical account of the government of the two caliphs (Abu Bakr and Omar) whereas every affair of the war was prepared by a collective action of the umma that expressed the entire personality of the umma and not the ruler, who had not been exposed to even one spark of the flame of the war and that the decision was not his own. He did that by an order, which he had no share of. The caliph at that time, whether during the conquest of Sham[1] or Iraq and Egypt, did not show by the word of the war the power of his government or the ability of himself to be ready for that word, but he announced of the strength of the Prophet's word, which was a strict promise about conquering the countries of Kasra[2] and Caesar[3] therefore the hearts of the Muslims shook zealously and hopefully, more correctly they shook faithfully and believingly.

History mentioned that many of those, who retired from the practical life after the Prophet's death, did not break their retirement and came back to the fields of action except when mentioning this prophetic tradition. It was, besides the faith deep-rooted in the hearts, the power that prepared for the war all its circumstances, men and accessibilities. Another thing that prepared the means of victory in the battles of jihad, which had nothing to do with the government of Shura (the government of the caliphs), was the good fame of

p.371, al-Khassa'iss by an-Nassa'ei p.86-87 and al-Mustadrak vol.3 p.126.

[1] *Syria, Jordan, Lebanon and Palestine.*

[2] *King of Persia.*

[3] *At-Tabari's Tareekh vol.2 p.92*

Islam that the Prophet had spread throughout the world and in every corner of the earth. The Muslims did not go to conquer a country unless

they would find another army of propagation advocating for their mission and principles.[1]

In the matter of the conquests there was another thing that was the only thing concerning the duty of the rulers alone away from the rest of the Muslims, who prepared all the affairs. It was to spread the Islamic spirit after the conquest, to concentrate the Quranic idealities in the conquered countries and to root the moral and religious feelings in the people's conscience, which came after the shahada. And I do not know whether we can record for the two caliphs some thing of that or to doubt entirely about it as many researchers did and as it was clarified by the history of the conquered countries during the Islamic life. All circumstances helped the two caliphs in forming the productive military life that succeeded during their reigns and in issuing the special political life they adopted.

I do not know what their situations would be if they exchanged their circumstances with Imam Ali. That's to say Abu Bakr and Omar were to be in Imam Ali's situation at that circumstances, which encouraged building a new policy, a new system of rule and a life full of luxury and ease. Would they opposite those circumstances as Imam Ali did? He had given the highest example of sincerity to the doctrine and the highest example of honesty to the rule.

I do not mean to say that the two caliphs were obliged unwillingly to have prudent conduct in the rule and to be fair in politics and life, but I mean

[1] Futoohul Buldan p.44 and Sharh Nahjul Balagha vol.16 p.210.

that the circumstances surrounding them imposed that on them willingly or unwillingly.

I do not want to deprive them of their effects in history. How can I do that and that they themselves, who wrote, on the day of Saqeefa, the lines of all the Islamic history? But I mean that their effects were weak in building the history of their days especially and of that flourishing life that was effortful and virtuous.

With al-Aqqad in His Study

As I write this, before me is the book *Fatima and the Fatimites* by Abbas Mahmood al-Aqqad, which I came to eagerly to see what he had written about the dispute between the caliph (Abu Bakr) and Fatima az-Zahra' (s) and I was sure that the days of worshiping the companions' deeds blindly[1] and considering them right at all had gone for ever and that the days of prohibiting the others to go deeply in studying the human intellectual matters concerning religion, beliefs, history or anything else had gone with what had gone of the history of Islam after passing centuries.

Perhaps the first caliph was the first, who announced this creed when he shouted at someone asking him about the human freewill and fate and he threatened him.[2] But had not Allah relieved us of this creed, which distorted the soul of Islam? I was to expect an attractive research about the dispute in full details that al-Aqqad would present us with but it was the opposite. His word about the subject was

[1] That is to say imitating and following a blind method in studying and appreciating the persons or the historical events without scientific research or evidence have no longer any value or respect in the view of science especially we live in an age submitting every thing to the scientific examining and researching.

[2] Ad-Darimi's Sunan p.53-54.

short and too short that I would permit myself to quote it and show it to you without wasting your time. He said: "The speech about the case of Fadak is one of those that will not end to an agreed on result but the truth is that Fatima was loftier than to ask for something not hers and Abu Bakr was loftier than to dispossess her of her right, which she had evidences proving it. One of the silliest sayings is that it was said that Abu Bakr deprived her of Fadak lest Ali spent from its yields to instigate people to his side when asking for the caliphate. Abu Bakr, Omar, Othman and Ali became caliphs and no one heard that someone had paid homage in return for money. It was mentioned neither in propaganda nor in true news. We did not find an acquittance concerning the rule at the reign of Abu Bakr clearer in evidence than his judgment in the case of Fadak. He gained contentment by the contentment of Fatima and the companions became content by her contentment. He did not get anything from Fadak for himself as some claimed but it was the critical point

or the most critical point of the rule in this case between these truthful and believable opponents. May Allah be pleased with them all.”[1]

We notice before all that al-Aqqad liked to consider the research on the case of Fadak as a kind of dispute that had no base and would not get to a decisive result. Then he apologized for not keeping on studying the case. I think that in criticizing the book, you will find the answer to his opinion. We notice too that after he decided that the talk about the case of Fadak would not lead to an agreed on result, he found it had two facts that did not allow

[1] Refer to *Fatima and the Fatimites* by Abbas Mahmood al-Aqqad.

disputing or arguing:

The first: that Fatima was loftier than to be accused of lying.

The second: that Abu Bakr was loftier than to dispossess Fatima of her right, which was proved by evidence. If there was no argument on the correct situation of the caliph and its agreement with the law, so what was the argument that had no base for?! And why did not the case of Fadak end to an agreed on result?!

I understand that the author has the freedom to record his opinion about any subject as he likes and as his thinking leads him after he clarifies to the reader the evidences of his opinion and after putting all the possibilities of that subject in his account to get to a clear result, but I do not understand when the author says that the case is subject to be researched and then he does not give but an opinion lacking evidences and needing much explanation, researching and pondering. If Fatima was loftier than any accusation so what did she need an evidence for? Did the Islamic legislations prevent the judge to give his judgment according to his knowledge?[1] If it was so, did that mean it was possible according to the religion to dispossess the owner of his property? These are some questions and there are others about this case needing scientific answers and a research according to the method of conclusion in Islam.

I want to be free, so I ask the professor al-Aqqad to permit me commenting on his speech. Discharging the caliph and Fatima at the same time was impossible. If the matter of their dispute was

[1] *Al-Bayhaqi's Sunan vol.10 p.142 and Tangheeh al-Adilla fee Bayan Hukm al-Hakim ..by sayyid Muhammad Reza al-Hussayni al-A'raji.*

exclusive to the asking of Fatima for Fadak and the refusing of the caliph to give it to her because of the lack of the legal evidences, according to which he would judge, and the end of the claim at this point, we might say that Fatima had claimed that Fadak was hers and the caliph refused her claim because she had no legal evidence then she gave up because she knew that she did not deserve Fadak according to the judicial laws and the Sharia. But we know well that the dispute between Fatima and the caliph took different shapes until it reached an extent that Fatima accused the caliph frankly and swore to cut off relations with him.[1]

Then we are between two things; the first that we are to acknowledge that Fatima asked insistingly for what she did not deserve according to the Islamic judicial laws and the system of the Sharia even if what she asked for was her own indeed. The second that we are to blame the caliph that he dispossessed her of her right that he had to give it to her and to judge that it was hers. Exalting Fatima above asking for something, which was against the laws of the Sharia and raising the caliph above preventing her her right, which the Sharia confirmed its ownership for her, were two things that could never meet together unless the contraries would agree with each other.

Let us leave this to another discussion. The professor considered the decision of the caliph concerning the case of Fadak as the clearest evidence of purifying the caliph and his firmness in the way of truth and that he did not transgress the limits of the Sharia because if he had given Fadak to

[1] *Al-Bukhari's Sahih vol.3 p.1374, Sharh Nahjul Balagha vol.16 p.281 and A'lamun Nissa' vol.4 p.123-124.*

Fatima, he would content her and would content the companions (because of her content). Let us suppose with him that it was the Islamic laws, which imposed on him to decide that Fadak was as charity, but what prevented him to cede his share to Fatima and the shares of the companions, who would be content if Fatima was content as the professor declared? Was that prohibited according to the religious laws? Or he was inspired not to do that? What did prevent him to give Fadak to Fatima after she had promised him definitely to spend its yields for the sake of the commonweal?

As for what the author considered as silly justification for the decision of the caliph, we will know in this chapter if it was really silly.

If we knew that people's opinions were not inspired by the Heaven to be sanctified above doubts and arguments and that studying the affairs of the first companions was not blasphemy, atheism or doubting in the signs of the prophethood as they used to say, we might ask that what led Fatima to begin her dispute about Fadak in that violent way that did not acknowledge or did not want to acknowledge any dignity for the dominant authority or a glory for the ruling power that would preserve the rulers from the rising flame and scattering sparks. That dispute would show to history the naked truth of the rule without any covering. In fact the beginning of the dispute and its later stages were a warning of a sweeping revolution or a revolution indeed when it was completed in its final form having all what this meaning had of preparations and results without febleness or hesitation.

What was the aim of the ruling authority or in fact the caliph himself to stand against Fatima? Did not it come to his mind that his plan would open for him a door in history adding to his precedents the dispute against the Prophet's family? Was he content with that sincerely so that he withstood to keep on his bad situation? Or did he submit to the law and keep to all of it as they said and that he did not want to trespass the limits of Allah by much or little? His odd situation against Fatima (s) had a connection with his situation in the Saqeefa. I mean by that the same purpose or the meeting of the two purposes in one point.[1] In fact he wanted to stand on one wide circle as wide as the state of the Prophet (s) with smiling hopes and waves of dreams, for which the caliph laughed too much and strove too much.

The Incentives of the Revolution

We perceive clearly, when we notice the historical circumstances, which surrounded the Fatimite movement, that the Hashemite[2] house, which was distressed by the loss of its great chief, had all the incentives of a revolution against the contemporary situations to change them and to establish them anew. Fatima had all the possibilities for the revolution and the attainments for the opposition, which the oppositionists decided to be a

[1] Ibn Abul Hadeed mentioned in Sharh Nahjul Balagha vol.16 p.284 that: "I asked Ali bin al-Fariqi, the teacher of the western school in Baghdad: Was Fatima true? He said: Yes. I said: Then why did he not give her Fadak whereas she was true? He smiled and said some pleasant words: If he gave her Fadak today just for her claim, she would come to him tomorrow claiming the caliphate for her husband and would move him from his place and he could not apologize or agree about anything because he would confirm that she was true in whatever she claimed without a need for evidences or witnesses". Ibn Abul Hadeed said: This is true.

[2] Concerning Hashim, the Prophet's grandfather.

peaceful dispute[1] whatever it would cost.

We feel if we study the historical reality of the case of Fadak and its dispute, that it was affected by the revolution and we feel clearly that the dispute in its reality and motives was a revolution against the policy of the state, which Fatima found that it was different from the rule she was familiar with (during the time of her father). It was not just a dispute about something of the financial affairs or the economic system, which the government of Shura followed; even it sometimes seemed to be so.

If we want to catch the threads of the Fatimite revolution from the beginnings, we have to look with a deep comprehensive look at two close events in the Islamic history; one was the echo and the natural reflection of the other. They both extended in their first roots and threads together so that they might meet at a shared point.

One of them was the Fatimite revolution against the first caliph, which was about to shake his political entity and to throw his caliphate into the waste-basket of history.

The other was an opposite situation, in which Aa'ishah,[2] the caliph's daughter stood against Ali the husband of Fatima, who rebelled against

[1] *Imam Ali had great insistence on the peacefulness of the opposition and not to exceed the limits of protesting and refuting the others' excuses although it led him to be pulled from his house to pay homage unwillingly and that the pure house was liable to the threat of setting fire to it. It was noticeable that when Abu Sufyan came to Imam Ali and said to him: "If you want, I will attack them with my knights and men". Imam Ali chided him and refused his suggestion. Refer to Sharh Nahjul Balagha vol.6 p.47-49 and p.17-18 and at-Tabari's Tareekh vol.2 p.233 and 237.*

[2] *With reference to the battle of (the camel) against Imam Ali, whose leaders were az-Zubayr, Talha and Aa'isha in thirty-six AH that happened in Basra. Refer to at-Tabari's Tareekh vol.3 p.476.*

Aa'isha's father.

The fate made those two rebellious women fail with a difference between them relating to the share of contentment of each of them with her revolution and the internal comfort with the right or wrong situation of each of them and the chance of victory according to the account of the truth, which had no crookedness. It was certain that Fatima failed after she had made the caliph cry and say: "Depose me[1] and break my homage" but Aa'isha failed and wished if she had not gone to the war[2] and to break the obedience.

These two revolutions were close in subject and persons so why did they not end to close reasons and similar motives?

We know well that the secret, behind the change occurred to Aa'isha when she was told that Ali became the caliph, belonged to the first days of the life of Ali and Aa'isha when the competition for the Prophet's heart was between his wife and his daughter.

This competition could expand in its effects to create different feelings of rage and dissension between the two competing ones and to reach the friends and the assistants around each of them. It expanded indeed on one side and happened what happened between Aa'isha and Ali and hence it had to expand on the other side to include those, against whom Aa'isha tried her best in the Prophet's house.

Yes, the reversal of Aa'isha was inspired from

[1] *A'lamun Nissa' vol.4 p.124, at-Tabari's Tareekh vol.3 p.353 where Abu Bakr said: "I do not regret from the life except three things I had done that I wished if I had not ...I wished that I had not exposed Fatima's house to anything". Refer to Sharh Nahjul Balagha vol.6 p.41.*

[2] Ibnul Atheer's Tareekh vol.3 p.111 and Tathkiratul Huffaz by Sibte bin al-Jawzi p.80-81.

the memories of those days when Imam Ali counseled the Prophet to divorce her in the famous story of Ifk (lie).[1]

Ali's counsel showed his discontentment with her and her competition with his wife. The dispute between the Prophet's wife and his daughter (Fatima) expanded to include Ali and other than Ali of those, who took care of the results and the stages of that competition.

The Incentives of the First Caliph's Situation

We know that the circumstances inspired the caliph with a certain feeling towards Fatima and her husband. Let us not forget that he asked the Prophet for the hand of Fatima but the Prophet refused and when Ali proposed to her, the Prophet responded to his proposal.[2] That refusal and this response gave the caliph a feeling of disappointment and at the same time a feeling of envy towards Ali and that Fatima was the cause of that competition between him and Ali that ended with his opponent's winning.

Let us notice too that Abu Bakr was the one, whom the Prophet (s) had sent to inform the unbelievers of Mecca the sura of Bara'a then he sent Ali after him telling him to turn back and to be deprived of this honor[3] for nothing but because the divine inspiration wanted to put in front of him again his competitor of Fatima, who won her instead of him.[4]

[1] Refer to the details of the event in *al-Bukhari's Sahih vol.3 p.24*, *at-Tabari's Tareekh vol.2 p.113*.

[2] *As-Sawa'iq al-Muhriqa* by *ibn Hajar p.249*.

[3] *Ahmad's Musnad vol.1 p.3*, *as-Sawa'iq al-Muhriqa p.32*, *al-Khassa'iss of an-Nassa'iy p.90-91*.

[4] It was mentioned in *as-Sawa'iq al-Muhriqa p.143* that Anass had said: "While I was sitting with the Prophet (s) the angel visited him. When he left, the Prophet (s) said: "My God ordered me to marry Fatima to Ali..".

No doubt that the caliph watched his daughter (Aa'isha) during her competition with Fatima for the priority near the Prophet (s) and was affected by her emotions as it was natural for fathers with their children.

He might think at a time that Fatima prompted her father to go to lead the prayer in the mosque when Aa'isha paved the way for her father, whom she worked for from inside the Prophet's house, to lead the prayer when the Prophet was ill.[1]

We cannot expect history to explain every thing clearly but it was reasonable to assume that a man meeting circumstances like the circumstances surrounded the caliph from Ali and Fatima, would behave just like what he did in his famous historical situation and that a woman facing what Fatima faced of competitions during the days of her father even a quarrel between Aa'isha and Fatima's father, would not be silent when the opponents tried to deprive her of her legal right.

The Political Dimensions of the Case of Fadak

This was the Fatimite revolution in its sentimental aspect, which was composed of many aspects. The clearest and most dominant one was the political aspect.

When I say that, I do not mean by politics the widespread notion among the public nowadays, which concentrates on crookedness and fabrication but I mean the real straight notion. He, who scrutinizes the steps of the dispute and its successive forms, does not understand it as a case of asking for a piece of land, but he perceives a mission further than that calling for an ambitious

[1] *Ibn Hisham's Seera vol.3/4 p.653.*

aim that prompts to revolt in order to regain a stolen throne, a lost crown and a great glory and to revive the inverted umma.[1]

Hence Fadak was a symbolic meaning representing a great notion and not that seized piece of land in Hijaz. This symbolic meaning of Fadak transferred it from an ordinary dispute shrunken in a limited circle to a big revolution with a wide horizon.

Try to study whatever you like of the true historical documents about the case, will you find it a dispute about a property or a disagreement about a piece of land with its yields however much they were?

Certainly not! But it was the revolution against the bases of the rule and the outcry, by which Fatima wanted to pluck out the cornerstone, on which history was built after the day of the Saqeefa.

It suffices to read the speech that Fatima made in the mosque before the caliph and the crowd of the Muhajireen and the Ansar. Most of it was about praising Ali and his eternal situations for Islam. She recorded the right of the Prophet's family that she

[1] *With reference to the Quranic verse: (And Muhammad is no more than an apostle; the apostles have already passed away before him; if then he dies or is killed will you turn back on your heels? And whoever turns back on his heels! So, he will by no means do harm to Allah in the least and Allah will reward the grateful) 3:144.*

Refer to the tradition talking about the apostasy of people (after the Prophet's death). The Prophet (s) said: "I precede you to the pond (on the Day of Resurrection). Some men, whom I know, will be brought but they will be prevented from me. I say: They are my companions. It is said: You do not know what they did

after you. Then I say: Away with him! Away with him, he, who distorted (the Sunna), after me..." Refer to al-Bukhari's Sahih vol.8 p.86, al-Kashshaf by az-Zamakhshari vol.4 p.811 and at-Tabari's Tareekh vol.2 p.245.

considered as the means between Allah and His people and as Allah's choice, His sign of holiness, His argument among people and the heirs of the prophets for the caliphate and the rule. She warned the people of their bad fate because of their unsuccessful choice, their deviation, selecting an eligible one for the rule, the sedition[1] they fell into and the motives that led them to leave the Quran and to oppose its commandment concerning the caliphate and the imamate.

The matter was not a matter of inheritance or donation except to the account relating to the policy of the state. It was not a claim about a property or a house but it was, according to Fatima's opinion, (a matter of belief and unbelief, faith and hypocrisy and a matter of dictate and Shura).[2]

We also notice this political style in her talk with the women of the Muhajireen and the Ansar. She said: "Whereto did they move it from the position of the mission, the bases of the prophethood and the place of descent of Gabriel, who is aware of life and religion's affairs? That was the great loss. What did they deny from Abul Hassan (Ali)? Yes, they denied the beating of his sword, his forcefulness, his strict punishing and his venturing for the sake of Allah. By Allah, if they

[1] Refer to the case of the Saqeefa in at-Tabari's Tareekh vol.2 p.235 and the following pages. It was mentioned that: "The homage of Abu Bakr was a slip..."

[2] This was according to the Fatimite's thought about the case. She said in her speech: "...you claimed that you fear a sedition to happen..then she recited this verse: (Surely into trial have they already tumbled down, and most surely hell encompasses the unbelievers). 9:49. Refer to the full discussion of (The Dictate and the Sura) by the martyred Imam as-Sadr in his book (The origin of the Shiism and the Shia) edited by Dr. Abdul Jabbar Sharara.

turned away from the rein, which the Prophet had handed over to him (to Imam Ali), he would catch it tenderly and he would move without harm or worry. He would lead them to a fresh flowing fount and would return them with satiety while he himself would not profit of anything but a little just to break his acute thirst and hunger. If they did so, they would be granted blessings from the Heaven and the earth[1] and they would be rewarded by Allah according to their deeds. Come on and

listen! Whatever you live, you will see wonders, whose astonishment would last as long as you live! To what refuge they resorted and to what tie they clung! Evil certainly is the guardian and evil certainly is the associate and evil certainly is this change for the unjust! By Allah, they replaced the good with the bad and the just with the unjust. Disgrace be for people, who think they do well. Surely they themselves are the mischief makers, but they do not perceive. Woe to them! *(Is He then Who guides to the truth more worthy to be followed, or he who himself does not go aright unless he is guided? What then is the matter with you; how do you judge? Quran 10:35)*"

History did not mention that the Prophet's wives disputed with Abu Bakr about their inheritance. Were they more indifferent to the vanities of life and closer to the Prophet's aspects than his daughter Fatima? Were they busy with the great misfortune (the Prophet's death) and his daughter was not?! Or that the political circumstances separated them and made Fatima the

[1] Her speech means: (If they let Imam Ali be the caliph, as the Prophet had ordered, he would rule with justice and fairness. He would never burden them with more than their abilities. He would make them live in luxury and ease while he himself would live in asceticism).

oppositionist away from the Prophet's wives, who were not disturbed by the situations of the rule.

It might be certain that Fatima found that her husband's followers and his best companions, who did never have any doubt about her truthfulness, would add their witnesses to Ali's and so the evidence would be clear to the caliph. Did not that show us that the high aim of Fatima, which was known well by the all, was not to prove the donation or the inheritance but to do away with the results of the Saqeefa?[1] That would not be by giving the evidence about the case of Fadak, but to give the evidence to all of the people that they had deviated from the right way.[2] This was exactly what Fatima wanted to do by her struggling plan.

Let us hear the caliph's speech after Fatima finished her speech and left the mosque. He ascended the minbar and said:

"O people, what is this attention to every saying! Were these wishes available at the time of the Prophet (s)? Let every one say whatever he

[1] Refer to *Sharh Nahjul Balagha vol.16 p.236*. It seemed that the caliph realized that, so he prevented it. It seemed clear by the argument between the second caliph (Omar) and Ibn Abbas. It was mentioned by at-Tabari in his *Tareekh vol.2 p.578* that Omar said: "O ibn Abbas, do you know why they prevented your people-the Hashimites-(from the caliphate) after Muhammad (s)? Ibn Abbas said: I hated to answer him and said with myself if I did not know, amirul mu'mineen would tell me. Omar said: They hated that both the prophethood and the caliphate would be for you-the Hashimites-so they boasted against you. Quraysh chose for itself and succeeded. I said: Would you allow me to talk? He said: O Ibn Abbas, talk! I said: As for your saying that (Quraysh chose and it succeeded)...if Quraysh chose as Allah had chosen, it would be the right choice no doubt...and as for your saying (they hated that the prophethood and the caliphate both being for you) Allah had described some people by hating when He said: (That is because they hated what Allah revealed, so He rendered their deeds null) 47:9.

[2] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha vol.16 p.236*.

heard and tell of whatever he saw. He[1] is not but a fox, whose witness is his tail. He keeps to every sedition. It is he, who says: "Bring it back as it was before (sedition and commotion)!" (They) ask for the help of the weak and of women. He is like Umm Tihal,[2] whose family was delighted with her prostitution. If I wanted to say, I would say and if I said, I would reveal but I am silent as long as I am not provoked".

Then he turned to the Ansar and said:

"O people of Ansar, I have heard the saying of your foolish people. You were the best of those, who kept to the Prophet's obligations. He came to you and you sheltered and helped him. I do not want to punish or scold whoever does not deserve that (from us)".[3]

This speech uncovers for us some aspects of the caliph's personality and sheds a light on Fatima's dispute with him. What important for us now is that what this speech shows about the dispute and the caliph's impression about it. He perceived well that the protest of Fatima was not about the inheritance or the donation but it was a political war, as we would call nowadays, and complaining about the wrongdoing to her great husband, whom the caliph and his companions wanted to keep away from his natural position in the world of Islam. So he did not talk except about Ali. He described him as a fox, the cause of every sedition, (umm Tihal) and that Fatima was his tail that followed him. He did not mention anything about the inheritance.

Let us notice the tradition mentioned in the *Sihah* (Sunni books of Hadith) that Ali and his uncle

[1] *He means Imam Ali!*

[2] *A name of a famous prostitute in the pre-Islamic age.*

[3] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol.16 p.214-215.*

al-Abbas disputed about Fadak during the reign of Omar. Ali said that the Prophet (s) had donated it to Fatima. Al-Abbas denied that and said that it was the Prophet's ownership and that he (al-Abbas) was the heir. They went to Omar to judge between them. Omar refused to judge between them and said: "You are more aware of your affairs and as for me, I have given it to you".[1]

We understand from this tradition-if it was true-that the decision of the caliph was a temporary political decision and that his situation was one of the necessities of the rule at that critical time, otherwise why did Omar ignored the tradition of Abu Bakr and put it aside to give Fadak to al-Abbas and Ali? His situation with them showed that he considered Fadak as a part of the Prophet's inheritance and nothing else, because if it was but so, Ali and al-Abbas would not dispute about it whether it was a donation from the Prophet (s) to Fatima or a part of his inheritance that his heirs deserved.

What was the importance of this dispute if the caliph (Omar) thought that Fadak was the Muslims' wealth and that he entrusted them (Ali and al-Abbas) with it to take care of it? Could not he end the dispute between them and tell them that he did not think it was a part of the inheritance or it belonged to Fatima and that he entrusted them with

[1] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha vol.16 p.221. Refer to the traditions confirming that Ali was the guardian, the heir and the caliph after the Prophet (s). Refer for example to The history of Damascus by ibn Assakir vol.3 p.5 to see the saying of the Prophet: "Every prophet had a guardian and an heir. Ali is my guardian and heir". Refer to the famous tradition of ad-Dar mentioned in at-Tabari's Tareekh vol.3 p.218, al-Khazin's Tafseer vol.3 p.371 about the interpretation of the verse: (And warn your nearest relations) and Ahmad's Musnad vol.2 p.352.*

it just to take care of it instead of him? He did not decide to give Fadak to Ali alone that he was not certain if the Prophet had donated it to

Fatima or not. So there was no way to justify his giving it to Ali and al-Abbas except by considering it as inheritance.

Hence the case had two possibilities;

The first: that Omar accused Abu Bakr of fabricating the tradition of denying the inheritance.[1]

The second: that he interpreted the tradition and understood that it did not object to bequeathing but he did not mention his interpretation and did not discuss it with Abu Bakr when the latter told of it. Whether this or that was true, the political side was clear in this case, otherwise why did Omar accuse the first caliph of fabricating the tradition if it did not concern the policy of the government at that time? And why did he (Omar), who did not hesitate in declaring his objection to the Prophet and the first caliph in many cases, hide his interpretation?

It was clear that Fatima claimed for her inheritance after the ruling party seized it because it was not common for people to ask the caliph's permission in order to receive their inheritances or to give inheritances to the possessors. So Fatima did not have to consult with the caliph and was not in need of his opinion where he was unjust[2] and that he leapt on the throne as she thought. Hence her asking for her inheritance must be the echo of the

[1] With reference to the tradition narrated by Abu Bakr alone when he said that the Prophet had said: "We, the prophets, do not bequeath. What we leave is to be as charity". Refer to as-Sawa'iq al-Muhriqa p.34 and Sharh Nahjul Balagha vol.16 p.223.

[2] Refer to the dialogue between the second caliph and Ali and al-Abbas bin Abd al-Muttalib as mentioned in Sharh Nahjul Balagha vol.16 p.222.

nationalization-as we say nowadays-of the inheritance as a pretext to seize it.

I say: if we knew that Fatima did not ask for her rights before they were extracted from her, we would find that the circumstance of her claim encouraged, to a far extent, the oppositionists to seize the opportunity of the case of the inheritance to resist the ruling party in a peaceful manner required for the commonweal at that time and to accuse it of plundering, altering the bases of the Sharia and dealing with the law carelessly.

The Case of Fadak in the Objective Circumstances

If we wanted to understand the forms and the reasons of the dispute in the light of the circumstances surrounding it, we had to explain those circumstances even in short to give a clear image about that reverse age as much as concerning our aim.

I do not mean by the reversal when I describe the reign of the first caliph except its real meaning applying to the changeability of the ruling authority that had to acquire the public form, to take its power from the electing groups and to incline to the first form, which took its power and authority from the Heaven

That moment, when Basheer bin Sa'd[1] patted the hand of the caliph (Abu Bakr), was a point of change in the history of Islam that put an end to the best of the reigns and announced another reign, which we let history to give judgment about.

The Death of the Leader; the Prophet

It was the day that had the last hour of the history of prophethood, which cut the holiest

[1] *At-Tabari's Tareekh vol.2 p.243.*

connection between the Heaven and the earth and cut the most blessed welfare and amenity and the best educating for humankind when the master of the human beings breathed his last and his soul flew towards the Exalted Companion and was at a distance of but two bow-lengths or (even) nearer. People hurried to the honored house of prophethood, which used to shine with its bright lights, to farewell the blissful Muhammadan age and to escort the prophethood that was the key of the glory of the umma and the secret of its greatness. They gathered around him being pelted with different ideas and memories about the splendor of prophethood and the loftiness of the great Prophet. They thought that those ten years, in which they enjoyed the care of the best of prophets and the kindest of fathers, was as a nice dream they enjoyed a moment of the time and the humanity flourished with in a period of their life and here they woke to face the worst of what a waking sleeper would face.

While people were in this prevailing distress and the terrible silence, no one uttering a word, satisfying themselves in bewailing this great departed soul with tears, regrets, reverence and memories, they were surprised by a voice rattling in the space to cut the silence that overcame the meeting grief-stricken people. It was announcing that the Prophet did not die and he would not die until he made his religion prevail over all religions and that he would come back to cut the hands and the legs of some men, who spread false rumors about his death: "If I hear a man saying that the Prophet has died, I will strike him with my sword." [1]

[1] *At-Tabari's Tareekh vol.2 p.232-233 and al-Milal wen-Nihal by ash-Shahristani vol.1 p.29*

The eyes turned towards the source of the voice to identify the speaker. They found it was Omar bin al-Khattab standing among the people rattling his idea firmly that did not accept any argument. People refreshed again and the speech of Omar began to pass from mouth to mouth and some people gathered around him.

Perhaps many of them denied his saying and found it strange. Some of them tried to argue with him about his saying but he remained clinging to his saying. People increased gathering around him astonished until Abu Bakr, who was at his home when the Prophet died, came. He said: "If you worshiped Muhammad, then Muhammad is dead. And if you worshiped Allah, Allah is alive and never dies. Allah said: (*Surely you shall die and they (too) shall surely die*) and He said: (*if then he dies or is killed will you turn back on your heels?*)" When Omar heard that, he gave in and believed that the Prophet had died. He said: "It is as if I hear this verse for the first time now".[1]

We did not see in this story-as many researchers had seen-that the caliph (Abu Bakr) was the hero of that wonderful circumstance and that he deserved the caliphate because of his situation against Omar's opinion. The matter was not so important and that history did not mention even one man supported Omar in his opinion. It was but a personal opinion that had no effect or danger to be put down.

To be sincere to the research, I have to clarify that the expression of the caliph (Abu Bakr) about the situation (the Prophet's death) was pale to a degree that it did not have any of the burning feelings of the Muslims in that day. In fact he did

[1] *At-Tabari's Tarekh vol.2 p.232-233.*

not add anything when expressing the disaster than to say: "Whoever worshipped Muhammad, then Muhammad is dead". That difficult situation required Abu Bakr, if he wanted to present himself as a leader in that moment, to show a suitable affection about the great departed leader corresponding with the agitated sentiments of people with grief and regret on that day.

And who worshipped Muhammad that he said: "Whoever worshipped Muhammad, then Muhammad is dead"? Was there in Omar's speech something showing that he worshipped the Prophet? Was there a wave of apostasy and blasphemy among those faithful people, who could not help their tears and patience because of the deep-rooted faith, to make him declare for them that religion was not limited to the life of the Prophet (s) because he was not a worshipped god?

So the speech of Abu Bakr had no any relation to the condition of people nor to Omar's idea nor to the sentiments and affairs of the Muslims on that day. In fact he was preceded in that by those, who tried to argue with Omar as you will see later.

The Case of Saqeefa and Imam Ali's Situation

At the same time there was another meeting held by the Ansar at the Saqeefa of Beni Sa'ida led by Sa'd bin Obada, the chief of al-Khazraj.[1] He invited them to choose him as the caliph and they agreed.[2] They discussed the matter among them and supposed: "If the Muhajireen refused and said that they were the Prophet's tribe and people, we would say: An emir from us and an emir from you." Sa'd said: "This is the first sign of weakness."

[1] *One of the two great tribes of Medina.*

[2] *At-Tabari's Tareekh vol.2 p.233.*

When Omar knew of this meeting, he came to the Prophet's house and sent for Abu Bakr to come out. Abu Bakr said that he was busy. Then Omar sent him a message that something had happened and he had to attend. He came out. They, with Abu Obayda, went to the Saqeefa. Abu Bakr made a speech, in which he mentioned the close relation between the Muhajireen and the Prophet and that they were his tribe and assistants. Then he said: "We are the emirs and you are the viziers. We will not opionate without your counsel or decide any matter without you." Al-Hubab bin al-Munthir bin al-Jamooth stood up and said: "O people of Ansar, keep to your opinion. The people are with you. No one will dare to object to you or to oppose your opinion. You are the people of power and glory. You are the majority with courage and valor. People look forward to what you do. Do not be in disagreement lest you spoil decision. If these people (Muhajireen) refuse but their opinion, so it will be one emir from us and one emir from them".

Omar said: "How Far! Two swords never meet in one sheath. By Allah, the Arabs do not accept to give you the caliphate whereas the Prophet was from others than you and they do not object to giving it to those, whom the Prophet was from. Who dare to dispute us for the authority of Muhammad while we are his tribe and guardians?" Al-Hubab bin al-Munthir said: "O people of Ansar, keep to your agreement and do not listen to the speech of this or his companions lest they seize your right. If they deny, you are to expel them from this country because you are worthier of this matter than them. By your swords people submitted to this religion. It is our thought that we defend and we suffice to. I swear by Allah that we, if you want, will fight for it". Then Omar said: "Allah may kill you". He said: "It is you, whom Allah may kill". Abu Obayda said:

“O people of Ansar, you were the first, who supported the Prophet, so do not be the first, who change the Sunna”.

Basheer bin Sa’d, the father of an-Nu’mān bin Basheer, stood up and said: “O people of Ansar, Muhammad was from Quraysh and his people are worthier of him. I swear by Allah that I never dispute with them in this matter”. Abu Bakr said: “These are Omar and Abu Obayda. You may pay homage to any of them”. They both said: “By Allah, we will not do that when you are the best of the Muhajireen and the successor of the Prophet in prayer, which is the best pillar of religion. Extend your hand!” When he extended his hand so that Omar and Abu Obayda would pay homage to him, Basheer bin Sa’d preceded and paid homage before them. Al-Hubab bin al-Munthir said to him: “Misfortunes may hit you! Do you begrudge your cousin the emirate?” Osayd bin Khudhayr, the chief of the tribe of al-Ouss[1] said to his fellows: “By Allah, if you do not pay homage, the tribe of al-Khazraj will gain the virtue for ever”. They paid homage to Abu Bakr. People, from every side, began to pay homage.[2]

We notice in this tradition that it was Omar, who heard about the meeting of the Ansar at the Saqeefa and told Abu Bakr of it. As long as we know that Omar was not inspired with this news by the Heaven, so he must have left the Prophet’s house after Abu Bakr had convinced him of the Prophet’s death. Why did he leave the prophet’s house? And

[1] *The other great tribe of Medina.*

[2] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha vol.1 p.127-128 and at-Tabari’s Tareekh vol.2 p.243.*

why did he tell Abu Bakr alone about the event of the Saqeefa? And many other questions like that, which we do not find reasonable answers for. It leads us to think that there was a previous agreement between Abu Bakr, Omar and Abu Obayda on a certain plan concerning the caliphate. We can find many evidences for this concept that may permit us to suppose so.

First: Omar told Abu Bakr alone about the news of the Saqeefa and he insisted on calling him even after his excusing himself as being busy until he hinted at the purpose. He went out and they both hurried to the Saqeefa.[1] It was possible for Omar to call for any other one of the great companions of the Muhajireen after Abu Bakr apologized that he could not come out. This insistence of Omar could not be interpreted as the friendship that was between them because the matter was not a matter of

friendship and the dispute of the Ansar did not depend on that Omar was to find a friend but to be assisted by anyone, who was to agree with him on the precedence of the Muhajireen.

Let us notice too that Omar sent a messenger to Abu Bakr telling him of that and he himself did not go fearing that the news might spread in the Prophet's house and that the Hashimites and the others might hear of it. The second time he asked the messenger to tell Abu Bakr that something had happened, which required his attendance. We do not think that the attendance of Abu Bakr was so important unless the matter was so private and the purpose was to carry out a plan that was agreed on previously.[2]

[1] *At-Tabari's Tareekh vol.2 p.242.*

[2] *Refer to at-Tabari's Tareekh vol.2 p.234. He mentioned that al-Himyarisaid: "Some of the Prophet's companions, whom we*

Second: Omar's situation about the Prophet's death when he claimed he did not die. We cannot interpret it as that Omar was confused because of the disaster of the Prophet's death and lost his reason to claim what he claimed because the conduct of Omar along his life did not show that he was from this kind, especially his situation in the Saqeefa after this matter immediately.

He, who was affected by the disaster to a degree that he lost his reason, would not do what he did after one hour of that. He argued, resisted and struggled.[1]

We know too that Omar had not that opinion, which he declared in that critical moment some days or some hours before, when the Prophet became seriously ill. The Prophet (s) wanted to write a will to safeguard people from deviation but Omar opposed him and said: "The Book of Allah (the Quran) is enough for us. The Prophet is raving.[2]Or (he is overcome by pain)" as it was mentioned in the Sunni books (*Sihah*). He believed that the Prophet would die (like the others) and that his illness might make him die, otherwise he would not oppose him.

It was mentioned in Ibn Katheer's *Tareekh* (history) that Omar bin Za'ida had recited the

reached, swore: we did not know that these two verses had been revealed until Abu Bakr recited them that day, when someone came saying: the Ansar have gathered in the shed (saqeefa) of Beni Sa'ida to pay homage to one of them (to be the caliph). He said: one emir from us and one emir from Quraysh. Abu Bakr

and Omar hurried to the saqeefa one leading the other. Omar wanted to talk but Abu Bakr prevented him. Omar said: I do not disobey the caliph two times a day...". He meant that in the first time when he declared that the Prophet died and this was the second time. Notice his word (the caliph) and yet the homage (slip) as he described later on, did not occur. Refer to p.235.

[1] *At-Tabari's Tareekh vol.2 p.235.*

[2] *Refer to al-Bukhari's Sahih vol.1 p.37 and vol.8 p.161.*

verse, which Abu Bakr recited to Omar, before Abu Bakr recited it to Omar, but Omar was not satisfied with it yet he accepted Abu Bakr's speech and was satisfied with it.[1]

So can we interpret that but to say that Omar wanted to make disturbance among people by his word (that the Prophet did not die) and to make people busy confirming or refuting it as long as Abu Bakr was absent lest something would happen concerning the caliphate and something that Abu Bakr must attend-according to Omar's saying? Thus when Abu Bakr appeared, Omar became tranquil and felt safe that the caliphate had turned away from the Hashimites as long as the oppositionists had a voice in the field. He went to pick up the news expecting what would happen until he got the news that he did not expect.

Third: the form of the government that was produced in the Saqeefa; Abu Bakr became the caliph, Abu Obayda became in charge of the treasury and Omar became in charge of judgment.[2] In modern terms that the first was in charge of the high political authority, the second was in charge of the economic authority and the third was in charge of the judicial authority, which were the main authorities in the system of the Islamic government. The division of the vital positions of the Islamic government on that day among these three men, who played the prominent role at the Saqeefa, did not happen by chance or that it was improvised.

Fourth: the saying of Omar when he was about

[1] *Al-Bidayeh wen-Nihayeh by ibn Katheer, vol.5 p.213.*

[2] *Al-Kamil fit-Tareekh by ibnul Atheer, vol.2p.176. When Abu Bakr became the caliph, Abu Obayda said to him: I will suffice for the treasury and Omar said: I will suffice for the judgement....the wali of Mecca was Etab bin Osayd.*

to die: "If Abu Obayda was alive, I would appoint him as the caliph".[1]

It was not the sufficiency of Abu Obayda that led Omar to wish so, because he thought that Ali was the most sufficient one for the caliphate; nevertheless he did not want to undertake the responsibility of the umma alive or dead.[2]

It was not the fidelity of Abu Obayda, of which the Prophet (s) had witnessed-as Omar claimed-that was the reason of that because the Prophet (s) did not distinguish Abu Obayda with praise whereas many of the great Muslims at that time were honored by the prophetic praise much more than that of Abu Obayda[3] as it was mentioned in the Sunni and Shia books.

Fifth: Fatima (s) accused the rulers of political partisanship as you will see in the next chapter.

Sixth: the saying of Imam Ali to Omar: "O Omar, milk a milking that you will have a half of it. Support him (Abu Bakr) today so he may recompense you tomorrow".[4]

It was clear that Imam Ali hinted at a mutual understanding between the two persons and at an agreement on a certain plan between them, otherwise the day of the Saqeefa itself would not hold all those political accounts that made Omar

[1] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol.1 p.64 and at-Tabari's Tareekh, vol.2 p.580. It was mentioned that al-Awdi had said: "When Omar was stabbed, he was asked: If you had appointed the caliph! He said: Whom would I appoint? If Abu Obayda was alive, I would appoint him..."*

[2] *At-Tabari's Tareekh, vol.2p.580 and al-Ansab by al-Balathiri, vol.5p.16.*

[3] *Refer-for example-to Mukhtasar Tareekh of ibn Assakir, vol.17p.356 to see the virtues of Imam Ali, an-Nassa'iy's Khassa'iss p.72 and Murooj ath-Thahab by al-Mas'oudi, vol.2p.437.*

[4] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol.6p.11.*

have a half of the milk!

Seventh: what was mentioned in the letter of Mu'awiya bin Abu Sufyan to Muhammad bin Abu Bakr (may Allah be pleased with him) about accusing his father (Abu Bakr) and Omar of having agreement together to spoil Imam Ali's right (the caliphate) and of their secret planning for the attack against Imam Ali. He said in his letter:

"We and your father knew the virtue of ibn Abu Talib and his right that we had to regard and accept. When Allah chose for His Prophet what He had, carried out His promise, spread His mission and cleared His evidence then He raised his (the Prophet's) soul to the better world,

your father and Omar were the first, who extorted his (Ali's) right and opposed his claim. On that they agreed and became consistent. Then they asked him to pay homage to them but he did not respond to them so they intended to force him to by any means even the worst of it".[1]

We notice that Mu'awiya added after Abu Bakr and Omar's asking Imam Ali to pay homage "then they agreed... and became consistent" to show that their movement was planned previously and the agreement on the caliphate preceded their political actions on that day.

I do not want to go far in studying this historical side but I may think in the light of that historical account that the caliph was not indifferent to the rule as many researchers described him. In fact we can find in the very argument, done by the caliph in the Saqeefa on that day, evidence showing that he looked forward to the rule. He, after declaring the main conditions of the caliph, wanted

[1] *Murooj ath-Thahab by al-Mas'oudi, vol.3p.199.*

to limit the matter to himself so he suggested one of his two companions (Omar and Abu Obayda),[1] who would not precede him. So the natural result of that was that he himself got it.

The haste of Abu Bakr to apply that form, which he presented, as the form of the legal caliph and that he suggested one of his two friends specially that would not lead except to him, did mean that he wanted to extort the caliphate from the Ansar and to fix it for himself at the same time. For that reason he did not hesitate when his two friends offered him to be the caliph. Omar himself witnessed to Abu Bakr that he was a skilled evasive politician on the day of the Saqeefa in one of his long traditions, in which he described Abu Bakr as the most envious of Quraysh.[2]

We find in what was mentioned about the two caliphs (Abu Bakr and Omar) during the time of the Prophet (s) that they had a political fancy in their minds and that they thought of something at least. It was mentioned in the Sunni books that the Prophet (s) had said: "Some of you will fight for the sake of the interpretation of the Quran as I fought for the sake of its revelation." Abu Bakr said: "Is it me, O messenger of Allah." He said: "No." Omar said: "Is it me, O messenger of Allah." He said: "No, but he is the one mending the shoes-he meant Ali."[3]

Fighting for the interpretation would be after the death of the Prophet and the fighter must be the emir of people, so each of Abu Bakr and Omar

[1] *At-Tabari's Tareekh*, vol.2p.233.

[2] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha*, vol.1 p.125.

[3] *As-Sawa'iqul Muhriqa* by ibn Hajar p.123, *Imam Ahmad's Musnad*, vol.3p.33, *Kanzul Ommal*, vol.15p.94, *Khassa'iss Amirul Mu'mineen* by an-Nassa'ei, p.131, *at-Taj aj-Jami' lil-Usool*, vol.3p.336.

looked forward to be the fighter for the interpretation although the fighting for the revelation was available to them in the time of the Prophet but they did not have a share in it that might show the side, which we try to uncover in their psychologies.

In fact I want to go further to clarify that there were many persons working in the interest of Abu Bakr and Omar.[1]First of them were Aa'isha and Hafsa,[2] who hurried to call their fathers when the Prophet (s) sent for his beloved (Ali) in his last moments[3] that the evidences showed it was the natural circumstance for making the will. They both (Aa'isha and Hafsa) must be meant by the tradition saying that some of the Prophet's wives sent a messenger to Ossama[4]telling him to delay the travel. If we know this and we know it was not done by the Prophet's permission, otherwise he (the Prophet) would not order Ossama to hurry in his travel when he came to him after that[5] and if we know that the travel of Ossama with those, who

[1] *Imam as-Sadr commented: The Prophet was asked when he threatened a group of Quraysh to be fought by a man from Quraysh, whose heart Allah had tested with faith. He would kill them for the sake of the religion. Was that man Abu Bakr? He said: No. was that man Omar? He said: No....Refer to Ahmad's Musnad, vol.3 p.33. The tradition ignored the name of the asker, who thought that the man, whom the Prophet described, was either Abu Bakr or Omar. If Abu Bakr and Omar were known neither for courage nor bravery in the wars at the time of the Prophet, so there must be another reason led the asker to ask those two questions. I let you think of the rest!*

[2] *Aa'isha was the daughter of Abu Bakr and Hafsa was the daughter of Omar. Both were the Prophet's wives.*

[3] *Refer to as-Sunan al-Kubra by an-Nassa'ei vol.5 p.145 and Mukhtassar Tareekh ibn Assakir, vol.18 p.21.*

[4] *Ossama was the leader of the army that the Prophet-some days before his death- ordered to set out for Sham.*

[5] *Al-Kamil fit-Tareekh, vol.2 p.218 and at-Tabaqat al-Kubra by ibn Sa'd, vol.2 p.248-250.*

were with him, would prevent the results of the day of the saqeefa from being achieved, we will find a case with a premeditated plot confirming what we thought.

The opinion of the Shia about why the Prophet sent Ossama with that army was clear. It was because the Prophet felt that there was an agreement between some of his companions on a certain thing, which would make them a front of opposition to Ali.

Even if we doubt this, we never doubt that the Prophet put Abu Bakr and Ali in the scales many times in front of the Muslims to see with their eyes that they (Abu Bakr and Ali) would never even in the fair scales. Would you think that exempting Abu Bakr[1] from informing the unbelievers of the sura of Bara'a, after he was charged with it, was a natural thing? Why did the Archangel Gabriel wait until Abu Bakr reached the halfway and then he descended to the Prophet ordering him to send after Abu Bakr ordering him to come back and then to send Ali to carry out the task? Was it in vain or inadvertence or something else? Yes, it was something else. The Prophet (s) felt that the stand-by competitor against his cousin and guardian (Ali) was Abu Bakr. So Allah wished him to send Abu Bakr and then to return him after the people knew that Abu Bakr was sent then to send Ali, whom the Prophet considered as himself,[2] to show the Muslims the difference between the two and the insignificance of this competitor, whom Allah did not entrust with a sura to be informed to a group of

[1] *Ahmad's Musnad, vol.1 p.3, al-Kashshaf by az-Zamakhshari, vol.2 p.243 and as-Sawa'iqul Muhriqa by ibn Hajar p.32.*

[2] *Refer to al-Kashshaf by az-Zamakhshari, vol.1 p.368 and as-Sawa'iqul Muhriqa by ibn Hajar p.156.*

people, so how about the caliphate and the absolute authority?

We get out of this analysis with two conclusions;

The first: Abu Bakr was keen for the caliphate and dreamt of it and that he came to it eagerly and longingly.

The second: Abu Bakr, Omar and Abu Obayda formed an important political party. We cannot put a clear image for it but we can confirm its existence by many evidences. I do not think that it disparaged them and it was not bad for them to think about the affairs of the caliphate and to agree on a same policy if the Prophet had not a verdict concerning the matter but if there was a certain verdict, their being far away from the

political fancy and their improvising the concept of the caliphate at the moment of the saqeefa[1] would not acquit them from the responsibility before Allah and the remorse of conscience.

Analysis of the Situation in the Case of Saqeefa

I am not about to analyze the situation, in which the Ansar disputed with Abu Bakr, Omar and Abu Obayda or to express the psychology of the Islamic society or its political temperament and to apply the case of the saqeefa to the deep-rooted principles of the Arabic nature because all of that is away from the essence of the subject. I want to clarify that the triple party, which held the reins of government at that time, faced opposition of three kinds;

The first: the Ansar, who disputed with Abu Bakr and his two friends in the saqeefa, among

[1] With reference to the saying of Omar: "The homage of Abu Bakr was a slip that Allah kept away its evil...". At-Tabari's Tareekh, vol.2 p.235.

whom the argument occurred that came to an end for the benefit of Quraysh because of the concept of the religious inheritance settled in the Arab mentality and the secession among the Ansar themselves because of the tribal tendency.

The second: the Umayyads, who wanted to get a share of the government and to recover something of their political glory^[1] of the pre-Islamic age. At the helm was Abu Sufyan.

The third: the Hashimites and their close companions like Ammar, Salman, Abu Tharr, al-Miqdad and groups of people,^[2] who thought that the Hashimites were the real heirs of the Prophet (s) according to the nature and the methods of politics they were familiar with.

Abu Bakr and his two friends struggled with the first kind in the saqeefa. They concentrated their defense on what they claimed as a notable point for the most of people. It was that as long as Quraysh was the tribe of the Prophet and his close assistants, so they (Quraysh) would be worthier among all the Muslims of his rule and authority.

Abu Bakr and his party profited from the meeting of the Ansar in the saqeefa in two ways;

First: the Ansar put themselves in a situation that would not permit them to stand with Ali after that and to serve his aim in the correct way as we will explain later on.

Second: Abu Bakr, who was served by the circumstances, which made him the only defender of the rights of the Muhajireen in the society of the Ansar, would not gain a situation realizing his interests better than that of the saqeefa where it

[1] *At-Tabari's Tareekh, vol.2 p.243.*

[2] *ibid.vol.2 p.233.*

was free from the notables of the Muhajireen, whose attendance would never lead to the same results that was recorded on that day.

And so Abu Bakr got out from the saqeefa as the caliph, to whom homage was paid by groups of Muslims, who believed in Abu Bakr's point of view relating to the caliphate or to whom it was unacceptable that Sa'd bin Obada would be the caliph.

The rulers were indifferent to the opposition of the Umayyads and to the threat of Abu Sufyan and his words of revolt after he came back from his travel, to which the Prophet had sent him to collect the taxes, because they (the rulers) knew well about the nature of the Umayyads' psychology and their tendency to authority and wealth. It was easy for the rulers to get the Umayyads to their side as Abu Bakr did. He permitted himself or-most correctly-Omar permitted him, as it was mentioned,[1] to grant Abu Sufyan all that was there in his hands of the Muslims' wealth and zakat.[2] He gave the Umayyads[3] a share of the government when he gave them some positions in the public utilities.

Hence the ruling party succeeded in two ways, but this success led to a clear political contradiction because the circumstances of the saqeefa invited the rulers to make an account for the Prophet's relatives in the matter of the caliphate and to confess the concept of hereditary in the religious leadership. But the case changed after the situation

[1] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol.1 p.130.*

[2] *In the light of this story we can answer the question we put at the beginning of this chapter about the situation of the two caliphs if they were in Ali's situation, which would force him to incite many like Abu Sufyan with money and ranks!*

[3] *At-Tabari's Tareekh, vol.2 p.237.*

of the saqeefa and the opposition took a new and clear method that if Quraysh was worthier of the Prophet than the rest of the Arabs because he (the Prophet) was from Quraysh, therefore the Hashimites were worthier than the rest of Quraysh.

This was what Ali declared when he said: "If the Muhajireen pleaded that they were closer to the Prophet, so it would be our plea against them

(that we were closer to the Prophet). If their plea would be accepted, it would be our right rather than them otherwise the Ansar would have the right with their protest".[1] Al-Abbas[2] showed that clearly to Abu Bakr when he said to him: "As for your saying: "We are the tree of the Prophet", indeed, you are (only) its neighbors and we (in fact) are its branches".[3]

Ali, who led the opposition of the Hashimites, was a source of great insecurity for the rulers because his special environments supplied him with strength in two ways of positive action against the government;

One of them joined the material parties to him like the Umayyads, al-Mugheera bin Shu'ba and the likes, who began to sell their votes and to negotiate the different sides for high prices as it was clear from Abu Sufyan's words about the caliphate come out from the saqeefa when he arrived at Medina, his talk with Ali and his urging him to revolt, his inclination to the caliph's side, his giving up the opposition when the caliph granted him the wealth of the Muslims, which he had collected in his travel, and Etab bin Ossayd's situation, whose secret we will uncover in this chapter.

So the material fancy had overcome some of the

[1] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha*, vol.6 p.5.

[2] *The Prophet's uncle*.

[3] *Ibid.* vol.6 p.5.

people at that time.

It was clear that Ali was able to satiate their tendency with what the Prophet had left of khums[1] and yields of his lands in Medina and Fadak, which were of great production as we saw in the previous chapter.

The other way of the resistance that Ali was supplied with its abilities was as he meant by his saying: "They pleaded with the tree and lost the fruit". I mean that general concept, which agreed unanimously on sanctifying the Prophet's family and acknowledged their great honor of their relation to the Prophet (s), was a strong support for the opposition.

The ruling party found that its material situation was very critical because the sides of the state, from which taxes were collected, were not under the authority of the new government unless the rule became strong and stable in the capital, whereas Medina had not yet submitted unanimously.

It would be easy for Abu Sufyan, and others who had sold their votes, to revoke the bargain when there was someone offering a better price. Ali was able to do this at any time; therefore they had to extort from Ali, who was not ready for confronting at those moments, all the moneys that became as source of danger against the interests of the ruling party. They had to do that to retain their assistants and to prevent the oppositionists from forming a party looking forward to achieve their hopes.

It was not possible for us to set this account aside as long as it was applied to the nature of the policy that must be followed. We knew that Abu Bakr had bought the vote of the Umayyad party with

[1] One fifth; Islamic levy imposed on certain things.

money when he gave up all the moneys of the Muslims that were with Abu Sufyan and appointed Abu Sufyan's son as wali. It was mentioned that when Abu Bakr became the caliph, Abu Sufyan said: "We have nothing to do with "the father of a young weaned camel (Abu Faseel).[1]The matter concerns Abd Manaf's family". It was said to him: "But he appointed your son as wali". He said: "Allah may have mercy on him".[2]So it was no wonder of him to extort from the Hashimites their important wealth to support his government or he feared that Ali might spend the yields of Fadak or other than Fadak to recover his extorted rights.

How do we find it odd of a man like Abu Bakr, who depended on money as means of incitement and buying the votes until he was accused by a believer woman during his reign? It was mentioned that when people gathered against Abu Bakr, he divided gifts among the women of the Muhajireen and the Ansar. He sent a share with Zayd bin Thabit to a woman of Adiy bin an-Najjar. She said: "What is this?" They said: "It is a share that Abu Bakr has distributed to the women". She said: "Do you bribe me to change my faith? I swear by Allah that I will not accept a bit of it." Then she sent it back to him.[3]

I do not know where from that money came to the caliph since the zakat collected by the messenger went to his stomach[4] alone, if it was not from the moneys that the Prophet (s) had left and that the Prophet's family asked for.

[1] He referred to Abu Bakr ridiculously. In Arabic bakr, which has the same meaning of faseel, means a young camel.

[2] At-Tabari's Tareekh, vol.2 p.237.

[3] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol.1p.133 and at-Tabaqatul Kubra by ibn Sa'd, vol.3p.182.*

[4] *He meant Abu Sufyan as it was mentioned by ibn Abul Hadeed in Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol.1p.130.*

Whether this account was true or not, the meaning that we tried to get from this tradition was that some of the coevals of Abu Bakr felt the same as we felt according to the historical facts of those days.

Let us not forget to note that the general economic state in those days urged on improving the financial status of the government to be ready for the expected events. Perhaps this prompted the rulers to extort Fadak as it was clear from Omar's talk with Abu Bakr preventing him[1] from giving Fadak back to Fatima (s) justifying that the state was in need of money in order to establish the rule, to discipline the rebels and to do away with the secessionist movements led by the apostates.

This showed the opinion of the two caliphs about the individual ownership that the caliph had the right to confiscate people's properties to spend them on the affairs of the government and the state without recompense or permission. So the individual had no stable ownership with his moneys and properties if the authorities needed something of them. Many of the caliphs, who ruled after Abu Bakr and Omar, adopted this policy so their history was full of confiscations they did.[2] But Abu Bakr did

[1] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha , vol.16 p.274. It was mentioned that when Ali witnessed that Fadak (was for Fatima), Abu Bakr wrote a decree to give Fadak to Fatima but Omar objected and tore what Abu Bakr had written.... Refer to as-Seera al-Halabiya, vol.3 p.391.*

[2] *Most of the caliphs, especially the Umayyads and the Abbasids, used (the law of) confiscation (or as it is known nowadays as nationalization) or seizing the movable and immovable properties by a decree from the ruler, some for economic purpose and some because their possessors had opposed the government. Refer to the detailed research on the confiscations in history by Dr. Muhammad Sa'eed Reza, the College of Arts magazine, University of Basra, vol.15 in the year 1978.*

not apply this opinion except to the properties of the daughter of the Prophet (s) exclusively.

The ruling party (represented by Abu Bakr) hesitated in dealing with the second way of opposition between two things;

One of them was to acknowledge that the relation to the Prophet had nothing to do with the caliphate and this did mean to put the legal dress off the caliphate of Abu Bakr, which he had put on according to that.

The other was to contradict himself and remain with the principles he announced on the day of the saqeefa and not to think that the Hashimites had a right or a privilege or to think that they had the right but in a circumstance other than that, in which the opposition would mean standing against an established rule and a state that people had agreed on.

The dominant party chose to maintain their principles, which they announced in the congress of the Ansar in the saqeefa and to protest against the oppositionists that their opposition after the homage paid by people would not be but making sedition,[1] which was prohibited according to the Islamic laws!

This was the temporary method the rulers used to do away with this side of the Hashimite opposition. Certain circumstances at that time helped the rulers to carry out their plan successfully as we will later explain.

But we feel when we study the policy of the rulers that they followed, since the first moment, a certain policy towards the Prophet's family in order to crush the concept that supplied the Hashimites

[1] Refer to at-Tabari's Tareekh, vol.2 p.234-235, the events of the saqeefa, and refer to them in al-Kamil by ibnul Atheer.

with power for the opposition as they crushed the opposition itself. We can describe this policy as that it aimed at abolishing the honor of the Hashimite house and removing its sincere assistants from the public utilities of the Islamic government system at that time and divesting it of its respect and high position in the Islamic mentality.

Many historical conducts confirmed this concept;

The first: the caliph and his companions' behavior towards Ali, which reached an extent of severity that Omar threatened to burn his house although Fatima was inside it.[1] It meant that Fatima and other than Fatima of her family had no any sanctity preventing them from the same way, which he used with Sa'd bin Obada, when he ordered the people to kill him.[2] One of the forms of violence towards Ali that Abu Bakr

described him by saying that he lived with every sedition and that he was like (Umm Tihal),[3] whose family was delighted with her prostitution.[4] Once Omar said to Ali: "The Prophet is from us and from you".

The second: the first caliph did not share any of the Hashimites with any important affair of the government and did not make any one of them as wali over even a span of the wide Islamic state whereas the share of the Umayyads in that was very

[1] *At-Tabari's Tareekh, vol.2 p.233, al-Iqd al-Fareed by ibn Abd Rabbih, vol.4 p.242 and Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol.16 p.47-48.*

[2] *At-Tabari's Tareekh, vol.2 p.244. It was mentioned through the event of the saqeefa that: (...some of Sa'd's companions said: Avoid Sa'd! Do not tread on him! Omar said: Kill him! May Allah kill him! Then he stood up near Sa'd's head and said: I was about to tread on you until your arm would crumble!...).*

[3] *She was a famous prostitute in the pre-Islamic age.*

[4] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol.16 p.215.*

great.[1]

One can perceive clearly that this was a product of an intended policy from a dialogue occurred between Omar and ibn Abbas. Omar showed his fear from appointing ibn Abbas as wali of Hams because he feared that if the Hashimites became walis of the Islamic countries that something might happen to the caliphate, when he would die, which he did not want.[2]

If we knew according to Omar's opinion that if one of the ambitious families gained a position of wali in one of the Islamic countries, would led them to gain the caliphate and the highest ranks, and we noticed that among the Umayyads, with their political greed, there were some walis, who occupied the front of the administrative positions during the reigns of Abu Bakr and Omar and if we added to that the fact that he knew at least that the Shura, which Omar had invented, would make the chief of the Umayyads Othman the caliph, we would get out with an important result and a historical account, which would be confirmed by many evidences that the two caliphs were preparing the causes and the tools for the Umayyad rule. They knew very well that establishing a political entity for the Umayyads-the old enemies of the Hashemites-anew, would present an opponent for the Hashimites and so the individual opposition against the Hashimites would advance into opposition of a family completely ready to dispute and compete.

This opposition would last and widen because it was not of an individual person but of a big family.

[1] *At-Tabari's Tareekh, vol.2 p.337.*

[2] *Refer to Murooj ath-Thahab printed on the margins of ibnul Atheer's Tareekh, vol.5 p.135. At-Tabari's Tareekh, vol.2 p.578.*

We can understand from this that it was the policy of Abu Bakr and Omar, which had put the cornerstone of the Umayyad state in order to insure the opposition for Ali and the family of Ali along the way.[1]

The third: Abu Bakr deposed Khalid bin Sa'eed bin al-Aass from the leadership of the army, which he had sent to conquer Sham[2] for nothing but because Omar had warned him that Khalid had a Hashimite tendency and he inclined to the Prophet's family and he reminded him of Khalid's situation towards the Prophet's family after the Prophet's death.[3]

If we wanted to go further in studying this side, we would add to these evidences the story of Omar's Shura, by which Omar lowered Ali to the level of the other five men, who did never match Ali with anything of his Muhammadan aspects. Az-Zubayr, who was one of the five, thought, when the Prophet died, that the caliphate was Ali's legal right. You can notice how Omar extorted this thought from az-Zubayr's mind and made him after a short time an opponent of Ali when he put him among the six, whom Ali was one of.

Hence the ruling party tried to match between the Hashimites and the rest of people and tried to detach the Prophet from concerning the Hashimites to extort the concept that supplied them with the

[1] *This was the political secret of the Shura that the researchers ignored. It was mentioned that Omar threatened the six men, whom he chose for the Shura, by Mu'awiya. He predicted that Mu'awiya would gain the rule...Refer to Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol.1 p.62. If this would show his physiognomy, so it had showed his policy more clearly.*

[2] *Nowadays Damascus. But then Sham encompassed Syria, Jordan, Lebanon and Palestine.*

[3] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol.1 p.135.*

power of the opposition. If the rulers were safe from Ali to revolt in that critical hour, they would not feel safe from a revolt after that in any time. So it was natural of them that they hurried to finish off his both powers; the material and the moral as long as the truce was on before he would surprise them with a fierce war.

It was no wonder after that for the caliph to declare his historical situation against Fatima (s) related to the case of Fadak. It was the situation, in which the two purposes met and concentrated on the two main directions of his policy because the incentives that led him to extort Fadak from Fatima prompted him to keep on his plan to extort from his opponent the wealth that was the great weapon according to the rulers' terminology at that time in order to consolidate his authority, otherwise what prevented him from giving Fadak to Fatima after she had promised him definitely to spend its yields on the ways of charity and commonweal?[1] It was nothing but that he feared she would interpret her promise according to her spending the yields of Fadak on the political sides. And what prevented him from giving up his share and the shares of the companions if it was true that Fadak was the Muslims' ownership save that he wanted to strengthen his authority?

Also, if we knew that Fatima was a strong support for her husband in his claim and she was an evidence that Ali's companions used as plea on his right concerning the caliphate, we would find that Abu Bakr was successful in his situation against Fatima's claim that Fadak was her donation and that he acted according to the political method imposed

[1] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol.4 p.80.*

on him by that critical circumstances. He seized the opportunity to make people understand indirectly and in a tactful way that Fatima was a woman just like the other women and her thoughts and claims would not be considered as evidence in a simple case like Fadak rather than an important subject like the caliphate and that if she asked for a piece of land, which was not hers, it would be possible for her to ask for[1] the Islamic state for her husband, who had no right to ask for it.

We can conclude, out of this research, that the nationalization of Fadak by Abu Bakr can be interpreted as follows:

First: the economic circumstances led to that.

Second: Abu Bakr feared that Ali might spend his wife's wealth in his attempt to get the rule.

The situation of Abu Bakr towards the claim of Fatima after that and his insistence on refusing it was because of these two reasons:

The first: sentimental feelings, which we referred to some of their causes, provoked the caliph.

The second: a general political strategy, on which the caliph based his conduct towards the Hashimites that we noticed according to the aspects of the rule at that time.

Imam Ali; His Aspects and Situation Towards the Rule

Perhaps the most typical sacrifice for the sake of Islam Imam Ali exemplified and the high sincerity for the ideology that freed him from all the personal accounts and made him a fact as high as the ideology and as long as the ideology would be alive was his situation[2] towards the caliphate of Shura, by which

[1] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol.16 p.284.*

[2] *Notice his situation with Abu Sufyan when he prompted Imam*

he presented himself as the highest example of devotion to the belief, which became a part of his nature.

Just as the Prophet (s) could remove the deviation of the idolatry, he could make Ali, by educating him with his own high standards, to be the wakeful eye guarding the divine mission. The human life, with its desires and feelings, slept in him and he began to live with faith and belief.[1]

If the virtuous human sacrifices had a book, the deeds of Ali would be the title of that book shining with lights of immortality.[2]

If the principles of the Heaven that Muhammad spread had a practical expression on the face of the earth, Ali would be their live expression along the

Ali to start a bloody fight against the caliphate come out of the Shura. At-Tabari mentioned in his Tareekh, vol.2 p.237 that (Hisham said that Ouana had said: "When people gathered to pay homage to Abu Bakr, Abu Sufyan came saying: "By Allah, I see a tumult that will not be put out except by blood. O family of Abd Manaf (the great grandfather of the Prophet), what does Abu Bakr have to do with your affairs?... O Abu Hassan (Ali), give your hand that I pay homage to you". Imam Ali refused. He began to recite some poetry...Imam Ali

scolded him and said: "I swear by Allah that you did not intend by this but making sedition. How long you did seek evil for Islam!"

[1] The Prophet (s) said: "Ali is with the truth and the truth is with Ali. They never separate until they come to me (at the pond of Paradise) on the Day of Resurrection". Refer to *History of Baghdad* by al-Khateeb al-Baghdadi, vol.14 p.321, *Tafseer of al-Fakhr ar-Razi*, vol.1 p.111, *al-Khawarizmi's Manaqib* p.77 and *al-Mu'jam as-Sagheer* by at-Tabarani, vol.1p.255. In another tradition the Prophet said: "Allah may have mercy on Ali. O Allah, turn truth with Ali wherever he turns". Refer to *at-Taj aj-Jami' lil-Ussool* by sheikh Mansoor Ali Nasif, vol.3p.337, *al-Hakim in his Mustadrak*, vol.3 p.125, *Kanzul Ommal*, vol.6p.175 and *at-Tarmithi's Jami'*, vol.2p.213.

[2] The Prophet (s) said: "The strike of Ali's sword on the day of Khandaq was better than the worship done by the human beings and the angels, or he said: The fighting of Ali with Amr was better than the deeds of my umma until the Day of Resurrection". Refer to *al-Hakim's Mustadrak*, vol.3p.32.

times and generations.

Since the Prophet (s) had left to his umma Ali and the Quran[1] and he joined them together, he wanted to show that the Quran was to interpret the great meanings of Ali and that the meanings of Ali were to be the typical example for the examples of the holy Quran.

And since Allah, the Almighty had made Ali equal to the Prophet in the verse of Mubahala,[2] so that He would make people understand that Ali was the natural extent of the Prophet and a shining light from his great soul.

And since the Prophet (s) went out of Mecca emigrating, fearing about himself and leaving Ali in his bed[3] to die instead of him, it would mean that the holy belief did draw for these two great men the lines of their lives. And if the divine mission, in order to spread, had to have a man to do that and another to die for the sake of it, so its first man must remain for the mission to live by him and the second must sacrifice himself for the mission to live by him too.

And if it was Ali the only one, whom the Heaven allowed to sleep in the mosque and to pass through it when he was impure,[4] so this

[1] The Prophet (s) said: "I have left to you two weighty things, if to which you keep, you will never go astray after me; the Book of Allah and my family. They will never separate until they come to me at the pond (of Paradise)". Refer to *Muslim's Sahih*, vol.4p.1874, *at-Tarmithi's Sahih*, vol.1 p.130, *ad-Darmi's Sunan*, vol.2 p.432, *Imam Ahmad's Musnad*, vol.4 p.217 and *al-Mustadrak*,

vol.3 p.119.

[2] Quran 3:61. For the interpretation of this verse refer to Tafseer of al-Fakhr ar-Razi sura of Aal Imran: 61, as-Sawa'iqul Muhriqa, p.143 and Asbabun Nuzool by al-Wahidi p.67.

[3] Tafseer of ar-Razi, vol.5 p.204, ibn Hisham's Seera, vol.2 p.95, Tathkira by Sibt ibn aj-Jawzi, p.34.

[4] Ahmad's Musnad, vol.4 p.369, Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol.2 p.451,

exclusiveness would mean that Ali had the meaning of the mosque because the mosque was the silent divine symbol in the material life and Ali was the live divine symbol in the spiritual life.

If the Heaven praised the magnanimity of Ali and announced its contentment with him when the caller said: "There is no sword but Thulfaqar and no youth but Ali", [1] it would mean that Ali's magnanimity only was the complete valor that no man could reach and no heroism of any hero or any sincerity of any devotee could imitate.

It was the irony of the fate that this magnanimity, which the divine caller had sanctified, was considered as shame and defect in Ali according to the opinion [2] of the sheikhs of saqeefa that he was to be blamed for and to be lowered before Abu Bakr, who was preferred to Ali just for some years he had spent in unbelief and polytheism! I do not know how the dualism between the pre-Islamic rites and the Islamic rites in one person's life became as glory preferring him to that, whose entire life was in the way of Allah! [3]

If it appeared to people according to the new

Tathkiratul Khawass by Sibt bin aj-Jawzi, p.41, as-Sawa'iqul Muhriqa by ibn Hajar p.133 and Tareekhul Khulafa' by as-Sayooti, 172.

[1] Thulfaqar was the name of Imam Ali's famous sword. Refer to at-Tabari's Tareekh, vol.2 p.65, ibn Hisham's Seera and Sharh Nahjul Balagha.

[2] Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol.6 p.45. There was a dialogue between Omar and ibn Abbas. The caliph Omar said: "O ibn Abbas, I think they (!) prevented your friend (Ali) from his right (of the caliphate) for nothing but because they found him too young...". Ibn Abbas said: "I swear by Allah, that Allah did not find him too young when He ordered him to take the sura of Bara'a from your friend (Abu Bakr)...". In page 12 there was the saying of Abu Obayda: "O Abul Hasan (Ali), you are too young and these are the chiefs of Quraysh".

[3] As-Sawa'iqul Muhriqa p.120.

researches that the natural power, which make the objects, rotating around the axis, move in a certain line, it had appeared in Ali hundreds of years ago a power like that but it was not a fact of physics, but of the powers of Heaven that made Ali as the natural immunity for Islam, which kept his high position as long as he was alive and made him the axis, around which the Islamic life rotated and took its spirituality, culture and essence from him whether he was in the government or not.

This power put its magical effect on Omar himself and attracted him to its straight lines many times until he said: "If Ali was not there, Omar would perish".[1] Its great effect appeared by the gathering of the Muslims around him on the day when the caliphate came to the public to decide. It was a nonesuch gathering[2] that seldom happened in the history of peoples.

We know by this that Ali, with what he was supplied of that power by the Heaven, was a necessity among the other necessities of Islam[3] and a sun, around which the Islamic orbit rotated after the Prophet (s) according to his nature that could not be resisted until even Omar resorted to him.

It becomes clear to us that the sudden reversal in the ruling policy was not possible at that time-although it was as slip-because it contradicted that natural power concentrated in the personality of

[1] *At-Tabaqatul Kubra by ibn Sa'd, vol.2 p.339 and as-Sawa'iqul Muhriqa by ibn Hajar, p.127.*

[2] *At-Tabari's Tareekh, vol.2 p.696.*

[3] *In the light of what we cleared, we understand the saying of the Prophet (s) to Ali: "I was not to go unless you would be my successor" and his saying to him when he was ready to go to the battle of Tabook: "Either I stay or you stay". Refer to Ahmad's Musnad, vol.1 p.331, Thakha'irul Oqba p.87, al-Khassa'iss by an-Nassa'ei p.80-81 and Sahih of at-Tarmithi, vol.5 p.596.*

Imam Ali. So it was normal for the ruling policy to move in a crooked way until it reached the point that the Umayyad rule reached avoiding the effect of that wakeful power watching the regularity and straightness like a driver when bending with his car to an opposite point avoiding the natural power that imposed on him the straightness in movement. This wonderful chapter of the greatness of Imam Ali deserves to be studied thoroughly, which we will do in one of the opportunities to uncover the personality of Imam Ali, the oppositionist of the rule, the wakeful guard

of Islam and the adapter between guarding the ruling authority not to deviate and opposing it at the same time.

Although all Imam Ali's situations were wonderful, his situation towards the caliphate after the Prophet (s) was the most wonderful.[1]

If the divine belief at every time needed a hero to sacrifice himself for its sake, it also would need a hero to accept this sacrifice and to consolidate the belief with it. It was this that sent Ali to the bed of death[2] and sent the Prophet to the city of safeness on the honorable day of hijra. It was not possible for Imam Ali in his distress after the death of his brother (the Prophet) to offer both of the heroes, because if he sacrificed himself in order to direct the caliphate to its legal way, according to his thought, no one would remain to catch the thread from its both ends whereas his two sons, Imam Hassan and Imam Hussayn were yet children.

[1] We will explain this point in the last chapter.

[2] Refer to at-Tafseer al-Kabeer by ar-Razi, vol.5 p.205. Imam Ali sacrificed himself for the Prophet (s) to rescue him from death on the day of hijra therefore Allah revealed to the Prophet this verse: (And among men is he who sells himself to seek the pleasure of Allah)2:207.

Imam Ali stopped at a crossroad, each was critical and each was difficult for him;

One of them was to declare the armed revolt against the caliphate of Abu Bakr.

The other was to remain silent unwillingly with pain and suffering. But what results would he expect from the revolt? This is what we want to clarify in the light of the historical circumstances of that critical hour.

The rulers would never give up their positions by any kind of opposition since they, enthusiastically and strongly, held the caliphate. It meant that they would fight and defend their new rule and so it was possible that Sa'd bin Obada would seize the opportunity to declare another war for his political fancy because we knew that he had threatened the victorious party (Abu Bakr, Omar and Abu Obayda) by revolt when he was asked to pay homage. He said: "No, I swear by Allah, until I throw you with what I have in my quiver, dye my spear (with your blood), strike with my sword and fight with my family and whoever obeys me. If all human beings and jinn join you, I will never pay homage to you".[1] Perhaps he feared to venture on revolting or he did not dare to be the first fighter against the caliphate but satisfied himself with the

severe threatening, which was like declaring the war. He began to wait for the decline to draw his sword with the other swords. So he was ready to recover his enthusiasm and to give up his fear and to consider the ruling party as weak when he heard a strong voice declaring the revolt trying to bring it back as it was before (sedition and commotion) and

[1] *At-Tabari's Tareekh, vol.2 p.244.*

to expel the Muhajireen from Medina by sword.[1] It was al-Hubab bin al-Munthir, who declared that in the saqeefa for the interest of Sa'd bin Obada.

Let us not forget the Umayyads and their political bloc for ranks and authority, which they already had in the pre-Islamic years. Abu Sufyan was the leader of Mecca in standing against Islam and the Prophet's government. Etab bin Ossayd bin Abul Aass bin Omayya was its (Mecca) obeyed emir at that time.

If we pondered on the history of those days[2] that when the Prophet (s) died and the news reached Mecca, whose emir was Etab bin Ossayd bin Abul Aass bin Omayya, Etab disappeared, the city shook and its people were about to apostatize, we might not be satisfied with what justification they gave about people's giving up apostasy. I do not believe that their giving up apostasy was because they found that the victory of Abu Bakr was as their own victory against the people of Medina as some researchers concluded, for the caliphate of Abu Bakr was on the same day, in which the Prophet died and the news of the caliphate and the death of the Prophet reached Mecca at the same time. I think that the Umayyad emir, Etab bin Ossayd knew the policy that his family adopted at that moment, so he disappeared and caused the disturbance until he knew that Abu Sufyan became contented after his discontent and that he agreed with the rulers on results serving the Umayyads' interests,[3] he (Etab) appeared again and restored the situation as it was. Hence it was clear that the political connections

[1] *At-Tabari's Tareekh, vol.2 p.243*

[2] *Al-Kamil fit-Tareekh by ibnul Atheer, vol.3 p.123.*

[3] *At-Tabari's Tareekh, vol.2 p.237. Abu Sufyan became calm when the first caliph appointed his son Mu'awiya as wali.*

between the Umayyads were present at that time. This account explains for us the power behind Abu Sufyan's sayings when he was

discontented with Abu Bakr and his companions that he said: "I see a disturbance that would not be put out except by blood" and his saying about Ali and al-Abbas: "I swear by Him, in whose hand my soul is, that I will assist them".[1] The Umayyads were ready for the revolt. Ali knew that clearly when they asked him to lead the opposition but he knew too that they were not of those people, whom he could depend on. In fact they wanted to reach their aims by the means of Ali so he refused their offer. It was expected then that the Umayyads would declare their rebellion if they saw the armed parties fighting each other or they found that the rulers were not able to insure their (the Umayyads') interests. Their rebellion would mean their apostasy and the separation of Mecca from Medina.

So an Alawite[2] revolt in those circumstances was as declaration for a bloody opposition that would be followed by other bloody oppositions with different tendencies, which might pave the way for the rioters and the hypocrites to seize the opportunity.

The distress would not permit Ali to raise his voice alone against the rule at that time. In fact if he did, many different revolts would arise and many groups of different aims and tendencies would fight each other and hence the Islamic state would be lost in the critical moment that required people to gather around a united leadership and to concentrate their powers to repel what was expected in that difficult circumstances of riots and

[1] *At-Tabari's Tareekh, vol.2 p.237.*

[2] *Related to Ali.*

rebellions.

Ali, who was so ready to sacrifice himself for the faith along his life[1] since he was born in the divine house (the Kaaba) until he was killed in it (the divine house-the mosque of Kufa), sacrificed his natural position and divine rank for the sake of the high interests of the umma, for which the Prophet (s) had made him the guardian and the guard.

If Ali revolted, the mission of Muhammad (s) would lose some of its meaning. When the Prophet (s) was ordered by his God to declare the mission, he gathered his family and announced his prophethood by saying: "By Allah, I do not know a youth among the Arabs that have brought his people something better than what I have brought you" and announced the imamate of his brother (Ali) by saying: "This is my brother, guardian and successor. Therefore listen to him and obey him".[2] It

meant that the imamate of Ali was a natural complement of the prophethood of Muhammad (s) and that the Heaven had declared the prophethood of greater Muhammad and the imamate of lesser Muhammad at the same time.

Ali, whom the Prophet had brought up and had brought up Islam with him like his two dear sons, felt this brotherhood between himself and Islam. This feeling prompted him to sacrifice himself for his brother. He took part in the wars against the apostates[3] and the leadership of the others did not

[1] *Mukhtasar Tareekh ibn Assakir by ibn Mandhoor, vol.17 p.356, al-Khassa'iss by an-Nassa'ei, Tathkiratul Khawass by Sibti ibnuj Jawzi and others. They mentioned Ali's situations since the first moments of the mission until he was martyred in the mihrab.*

[2] *At-Tabari's Tareekh, vol.3 p.218-219, Tafseerul Khazin, vol.3 p.371, Sharh Nahjul Balagha, the old edition.*

[3] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol.4 p.165.*

prevent him from doing his sacred duty. If Abu Bakr extorted his right and seized his inheritance, Islam had raised him to the top and appreciated that true brotherhood and recorded it with letters of light on the pages of the Holy Book.

Imam Ali withstood not to think of revolting against the rule but what would he do? Which way would he adopt for his situation? Would he protest against the ruling party using the Prophet's traditions and words, which announced that Ali was the axis prepared for the Islamic orbit to turn around and that he was the leader, whom the Heaven had presented for the people of the earth?[1]

This question hesitated in his mind too much then he put the answer, which the circumstances of his distress specified and the nature of the state at that time imposed on him. The answer was to put the Prophet's traditions aside for a while.

Why Did He not Protest With the Prophet's Traditions?

The confused image of the conditions would make the protest using the Prophet's holy traditions at that time, in which the frantic thoughts and the fiery fancies had controlled the ruling party to the furthest point, face bad results, because no one had heard the Prophet's sayings about the caliphate except his fellow citizens of Medina; the Muhajireen and the Ansar. Those sayings were the expensive deposit near that group, who had to spread them to all the people of the Islamic world and to the successive generations and the following ages. If Imam Ali protested against the people of Medina by

[1] As it was declared in the tradition of al-Ghadeer. Refer to at-Taj aj-Jami' lil-Ussool, vol.3 p.335, Sunan of ibn Maja, vol.1 p.11, Imam Ahmad's Musnad, vol.4 p.281 and as-Sawa'iqul Muhriqa p.122.

the words, which they had heard from the Prophet, concerning him (Ali) and he presented them as evidences proving his right of the imamate and the caliphate, it would be natural for the ruling party to consider the veracious of the umma,[1] Imam Ali, as liar and to deny those prophetic traditions, which would remove from the caliphate of Shura its legal aspect and its religious dress.

And the truth would not find a strong voice defending it in front of that denial because many of Quraysh, at the head were the Umayyads, who were ambitious to gain the glory of the authority and the ease of the rule whereas they thought that presenting the caliph according to the Prophet's saying would confirm the belief of the divine imamate. If this theory was applied to the Islamic law, it would mean limiting the caliphate to the Hashimites, the honored family of Muhammad (s), whereas the others would lose the battle. We could find this kind of thinking in Omar's saying to ibn Abbas when justifying excluding Ali from the caliphate: "The people hated to see both of prophethood and the caliphate in your family".[2] This showed that giving the caliphate to Ali from the beginning would mean, according to the public thinking, limiting the caliphate to the Hashimites. It could not be said that the opinion of people at that time towards the Alawite caliphate as it was the application of the orders of the Heaven and not according to the votes of the electors. If Ali found a supporter from the upper class of Quraysh encouraging him to stand against the rulers, he

[1] Refer to *as-Sawa'iqul Muhriqa*. Imam Ali said: "I am the great veracious. No one other than me will say it unless he is a liar".

[2] *Ibnul Atheer's Tareekh, vol.3 p.24, at-Tabari's Tareekh, vol.2 p.577.*

would never find any one assisting him if he said that the Prophet had recorded the caliphate for his family when he said: "I have left for you two weighty things; the Book of Allah and my family..."[1]

As for the Ansar, they preceded all the Muslims in slighting these Prophetic traditions. The greed to the rule led them to hold a conference in the shed (saqeefa) of Beni[2] Sa'ida to pay homage to one of them.[3] So if Ali depended on the prophetic traditions, he would not find the Ansar as soldiers and witnesses for his case because if they witnessed of that, they would record a shameful contradiction against themselves on the same day and they, definitely, would not do that.

Paying homage by the tribe of Ouss to Abu Bakr and the saying of some, who said: "We will not pay homage except to Ali"[4] had no contradiction like that of the Ansar because the meaning of holding the conference in the saqeefa was to imply that the matter of the caliphate was a matter of election and not according to the Prophet's traditions. Hence they had no way to retract on the same day.

As for the confession of the Muhajireen, it had no embarrassment because the Ansar did not agree on an opinion in the saqeefa but they were conferring and deliberating, therefore we found al-Hubab bin al-Munthir[5] trying to stir them to adopt his opinion. It showed that they gathered to support a certain thought that only some of them believed in.

Imam Ali thought that the ruling party would

[1] *Muslim's Sahih, vol.4 p.1874, Ahmad's Musnad, vol.4 p.281.*

[2] It means tribe or family of.

[3] *At-Tabari's Tareekh, vol.2 p.242.*

[4] *ibid.vol.2 p.233.*

[5] *At-Tabari's Tareekh, vol.2 p.243.*

deny and strive to deny the traditions if he declared them and would not find any one supporting him with his claim, because the people were between those, whose political fancy led them to deny the traditions in order to close the way of retracting after hours of their conference, and those, who thought that the traditions would limit the caliphate to the Hashimites with no litigant. If the ruling party and its assistants denied the traditions and the rest were satisfied with silence at least, it would

mean that the traditions would lose their real value and all the evidences of the Alawite caliphate would be lost and the Islamic world, which was far from the Prophet's city (Medina), would accept the denial because it was the utterance of the dominant power at that time.

Let us notice another side; if Ali got some people agreeing with him on his claim, witnessing to the holy traditions and opposing the denying of the ruling party, it would mean that they denied the caliphate of Abu Bakr and this would make them liable to a cruel attack by the rulers that would lead them to a war against the ruling party, which was so enthusiastic about the political entity and would never be silent. So the declaration of the traditions by Ali would lead him to a real encounter and we have seen previously that he was not ready to declare the revolt against the actual rule and to face the dominant authority in fighting.

Protesting by using the prophetic traditions would have no clear effect against the ruling policy. In fact it would make the rulers be cautious and try their strict means to remove those prophetic traditions from the Islamic mentality because they knew that it would be too dangerous for them and that it would give a great incentive to the oppositionists to revolt at any time.

I think if Omar had noticed the dangers of the traditions, after Imam Ali pleaded with them in the time of his own reign[1] and they spread among his Shia, as the Umayyads noticed, he would have done away with them and he could have done what the Umayyads could not do to put out their light. Imam Ali perceived that if he used the traditions as his plea at that time, he would subject them to many dangers from the ruling party, so he pitied those holy traditions in order not to be crushed under the feet of the dominant policy. He kept to silence unwillingly but he took advantage of their inadvertence. Omar himself declared that Ali was the guardian of every believer man and every believer woman according to the Prophet's saying.[2]

Then was not it reasonable that Imam Ali feared for the honor of his beloved brother, the Prophet, to be disparaged where it was more precious for Ali than everything at all if he declared the prophetic traditions and he did not yet forget Omar's situation when the Prophet (s) asked for an inkpot to write a decree for people, with which they would never deviate at all, then Omar said: "The Prophet is raving...or he is overcome by pain"?[3] Later on Omar confessed to ibn Abbas that the Prophet

[1] Imam Ali asked some of the companions to witness if they had heard the Prophet's tradition of al-Ghadeer. Refer to *al-Bidayeh wen-Nihayeh* by ibn

Katheer, vol.7 p.360. Ali asked some people about the tradition of al-Ghadeer, in which the Prophet declared that Ali would be the caliph after the Prophet's death, and thirty of them witnessed that they had heard it from the prophet (s). Refer to as-Sawa'iqul Muhriqa, p.122.

[2] *Thakha'irul Oqba p.67. The tradition showed that Omar intended sometimes to change the way that the party followed in the beginning towards the Hashimites but he was overcome by the political nature of the first reign at last.*

[3] *Sahih of al-Bukhari, vol.1 p.37.*

wanted to appoint Ali for the caliphate and he (Omar) prevented him from that for fear of sedition to occur.[1]

Whether the Prophet (s) wanted to write down Ali's right of the caliphate or not, it is important for us to ponder on Omar's situation against the Prophet's order. Since Omar was ready to accuse the Prophet face to face of what the holy Quran had purified him from,[2]then what would prevent him from accusing another one after the Prophet's death? However we softened Omar's situation it would not refer but to claiming that the Prophet's decree about the caliphate was not from Allah but he wanted to appoint Ali just for sympathy. In fact his opposition to the traditions confirming Ali's right of the caliphate would be worse than his opposition to the Prophet claiming that it would cause disturbance if the Prophet (s) had left a written text confirming the imamate of Ali.

If the Prophet (s) had given up declaring the caliphate of Ali at the last hours of his life because of a saying said by Omar, it was also possible that Imam Ali would give up using the traditions in his protest for fear of a saying that might be said by Omar.

The result of this research was that the silence of Imam Ali in not declaring the traditions as evidence of his right was imposed on him because:

He did not find among the men of that time any, in whose witnessing he could trust.

Using the prophetic traditions as evidence would draw the rulers' attention to their effect and they would use any means to do away with

[1] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol.3 p.97.*

[2] *The holy Quran says: (Nor does he speak out of desire. It is naught but revelation that is revealed). 53:3-4.*

them.

Protesting by means of the traditions would mean the full readiness for the revolt, which Imam Ali did not want. When Omar accused the Prophet (s) at his last hours, it became clear for Imam Ali to what extent the rulers strove to keep their positions and their readiness to support and defend them. So Imam Ali feared that something might happen if he declared the traditions of his imamate.

Peaceful Confrontation

Imam Ali decided to give up the revolt and not to be armed with the traditions openly to confront the rulers until he became confident of his ability to persuade the public opinion against Abu Bakr and his two friends. This was what Ali tried to do in his distress then. He began, secretly, to meet the chiefs of the Muslims and some of the important persons of Medina[1] preaching them and reminding them of the divine evidences that confirmed his right. Beside him was his wife Fatima consolidating his situation and assisting him in his secret jihad. Ali did not intend to form a party fighting for him for we know that he did have a party of assistants, who gathered around him and announced his name to be the caliph, but he intended by those meetings to make people agree on him unanimously.

Here the case of Fadak came to occupy the front of the new Alawite policy. The Fatimite role, which Imam Ali drew its lines accurately, was in agreement with the night meetings of the important persons. It was worthy of changing the situation

[1] Sharh Najul Balagha, vol.6 p.13. It was mentioned that Abu Ja'far Muhammad bin Ali (s) had said: "Ali put Fatima on a donkey and went together in the night to the houses of the Ansar. Imam Ali asked them to support him and Fatima asked them to support Imam Ali'.

against the caliph and to end the caliphate of Abu Bakr as the end of a drama and not as the demolition of a powerful rule.

The Fatimite role was that Fatima was to ask Abu Bakr for her extorted rights and to make this claim as the means of the argument about the main case that was the case of the caliphate, and to make people understand that the moment, in which they left Ali and went towards Abu Bakr, was a moment of infatuation and irregularity[1] and that they committed a great mistake and opposed the Book Of Allah and turned to other than their drinking (other than their natural source)! [2]

When the thought ripened in Fatima's mind, she rushed to correct the situations and to wipe out the mud that stained the Islamic government, whose first base was made in the saqeefa. Her first step was to accuse the caliph (Abu Bakr) of barefaced treason, playing with the law and to accuse the results of the electoral battle, out of which Abu Bakr had come victoriously, of being contradictory to the Quran and reason.[3]

Two sides were available for Fatima in her confrontation that were not options for Imam Ali

[1] Refer to *Balaghat an-Nissa'*, p.25. Fatima said referring to this meaning: "The Satan put his head out of its socket crying out to you. He found you responders to his cry and noticers of his inadvertence. He awakened you and found you nimble.....so you branded other than your camels...".

[2] *Shrah Nahjul Balagha*, vol.6 p.12. Imam Ali said in one of his arguments with the people: "O people of Muhajireen, keep to Allah. Do not take the authority of Muhammad out of his house and family to your houses and families. Do not keep his family away from his position and right among people. I swear by Allah, that we, the Prophet's family, are worthier of this matter (the rule) than you..."

[3] *As-Sawa'iqul Muhriqa*, p.36. Omar said: "The homage of Abu Bakr was a slip that Allah saved us from its evil. If any one does it again, you have to kill him..."

had he been in her situation.

The first was that Fatima was more able, according to the circumstances of her private distress and her position to her father, to move the sentiments and to connect the Muslims to a wire of spiritual electricity with her great father and his glorious days and to attract their feelings towards the cases of the Prophet's family.

The second was that whatever kind of dispute she adopted it would not take a shape of the armed war, which needed a leader to control, because she was a woman and her husband was in his house keeping to the truce that he adopted until the people would gather around him. He was watching the situation to intervene whenever he wished as a leader for the revolt if it reached the top or to calm the sedition if the circumstances would not help him with what he wanted. So Fatima in her confrontation either she would cause a public opposition to the caliph or she would not go further than the circle of the argument and the dispute and she would not cause sedition or separation between the Muslims.

Imam Ali wanted to make people hear his voice via the mouth of Fatima and to be away from the field of the struggle waiting for the suitable moment to make use of it and for the opportunity that would make him the man of the situation. Also he wanted to present to all of the umma via the Fatimite confrontation an evidence showing the nullity of

the present caliphate. And it was as Imam Ali wanted when Fatima expressed the Alawite right clearly in a way of fairness.

The Fatimite opposition could be summarized in some facts:

First: her sending a messenger[1] to Abu Bakr asking for her rights. This was the first step she did in order to undertake the task by herself.

Second: she faced Abu Bakr in a special meeting[2] and she wanted by that to insist on her rights of the khums, Fadak and other things to know the extent of the caliph's readiness for resistance.

It was not necessary to arrange the steps of her asking for her rights in a way that the claim of donation was to precede the case of inheritance as some people thought. In fact I think that asking for the inheritance preceded because the tradition showed that the messenger of Fatima asked for the inheritance and it was more possible to be the first step as required by the natural progress of the dispute. The claim of inheritance was more likely to regain the right because of the certainty of succession[3] in the Islamic Sharia; therefore Fatima would not be blamed if she first asked for her inheritance that included Fadak according to the Caliph's thought, who had not known about the donation.[4] This asking for the inheritance did not contradict that Fadak was a donation from the Prophet (s) for his daughter because asking for the inheritance did not refer to Fadak specially but it concerned the Prophet's inheritance in general.

Third: her speech in the mosque after ten days

[1] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha*, vol.16 p.218-219.

[2] *Ibid.* vol.16 p.230.

[3] *The succession is one of the necessities of Islam according to the Holy Quran: (Men shall have a portion of what the parents and the near relatives leave, and women shall have a portion of what the parents and the near relatives leave) 4:7 (Allah enjoins you concerning your children: The male shall have the equal of the portion of two females) 4:11.*

[4] *Abu Bakr claimed that he had not known about the donation (of Fadak). Refer to Sharh Nuhjul Balagha*, vol.16 p.225.

of her father's death.[1]

Fourth: her talk with Abu Bakr and Omar when they visited her to apologize and her declaring her discontent with them and that they had displeased Allah and His messenger (s) by displeasing her.[2]

Fifth: her speech to the women of the Muhajireen and the Ansar when they visited her.[3]

Sixth: her will that no one of her opponents was to attend her funeral and burial procession.[4] This will was the final declaration of Fatima showing her indignation against the present caliphate.

The Fatimite movement failed on one side but succeeded on the other. It failed because the government of the caliph was not overthrown when Fatima did her last important march in the tenth day of her father's death.

We cannot ascertain the reasons that made Fatima lose the battle, but, undoubtedly, the most important reason was the personality of the caliph himself because he was of political talents. He dealt with the situation with a noticeable tact. We find that in his answer to Fatima when he directed his speech to the Ansar after Fatima had finished her speech in the mosque. He was so tender-hearted in

[1] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha*, vol.16 p.211. It was mentioned that: "when Fatima knew that Abu Bakr decided to prevent her from getting Fadak, she put on her veil and came surrounded by a group of her maids and fellow-women...until she came in to Abu Bakr, who was among a big crowd of the Muhajireen and the Ansar...".

[2] *Al-Imama wes-Siyassa by ibn Qutaba* p.14, *Sharh Nahjul Balagha*, vol.16 p.281 and 264, *al-Bukhari's Sahih*, vol.5 p.83 and *A'lamun Nissa'*, vol.4 p.123. The Prophet (s) said: "Fatima is a part of me. Whoever discontents her, will discontent me".

[3] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha*, vol.16 p.233.

[4] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha*, vol.6 p.281, *Hilyatul Awliya'* vol.2 p.42, *al-Hakim's Mustadrak*, vol.3 p.178.

his answer to Fatima and suddenly he ejected his burning fire after Fatima left the mosque. He said: "What is this attention to every saying! He is but a fox. His witness is his tail".[1] We have mentioned all of this speech in a previous chapter. This reversal from leniency and calmness to fury anger showed us what ability of controlling his feelings he had

and what ability to humor the circumstance and to play the suitable role at any time.

On the other side, the Fatimite opposition succeeded because it supplied the truth with a mighty power and added to its eternality in the field of the ideological struggle a further power. She recorded this success throughout her movement and in her argument with Abu Bakr and Omar especially when they visited her. She said to them: "If I narrate to you a tradition from the Prophet, will you acknowledge it and act on it?" They said: "Yes". She said: "I adjure you by Allah. Did not you hear the Prophet saying: "Fatima's contentment is my contentment and her discontentment is my discontentment. Whoever loved Fatima, loved me, whoever pleased her, pleased me and whoever displeased her, displeased me?"[2] They said: "Yes we did". She said: "I call Allah and His angels to witness that you have displeased me and have never pleased me. If I meet the Prophet, I will complain

[1] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol.16 p.214-215.*

[2] *Many statements having this meaning were said by the Prophet. He said to Fatima: "Allah becomes angry if you become angry and He becomes delighted if you become delighted...". And he said: "Fatima is a part of me. Whatever displeases her displeases me and whatever hurts her, hurts me". Refer to al-Bukhari's Sahih, vol.5 p.83, Muslim's Sahih, vol.4 p.1902, al-Hakim's Mustadrak, vol.3 p.167, Thakha'irul Oqba, p.39, Ahmad's Musnad, vol.4 p.328, at-Tarmithi's Jami', vol.5 p.699, as-Sawa'iqul Muhriqa by ibn Hajar p.190 and kifayat at-Talib p.365.*

of both of you to him".[1]

This tradition showed how much she concerned about concentrating her opposition against the two opponents and declaring her anger and rage at them in order to derive from the dispute a certain result that we do not want to study in depth and to draw conclusions because that will take us away from the subject of this research and because we respect the caliph and do not want to come with him in such arguments but we just want to record it in order to clarify Fatima's opinion and point of view. She believed that the result she got was the certain victory in the account of faith and religion. I mean by this, that Abu Bakr had deserved wrath from Allah and the Prophet by displeasing Fatima and he hurt Them by hurting her because They became angry if she became angry and They became displeased if she became displeased according to the prophetic

tradition. Then he would not deserve to be the caliph of Allah and His messenger. Allah said: (*...and it does not behove you that you should give trouble to the Apostle of Allah, nor that you should marry his wives after him ever; surely this is grievous in the sight of Allah*) 33:53.

(*Surely (as for) those who speak evil things of Allah and His Apostle, Allah has cursed them in this world and the here after, and He has prepared for them a chastisement bringing disgrace*) 33:57.

(*And (as for) those who molest the Apostle of Allah, they shall have a painful punishment*) 9:61.

(*O you who believe! do not make friends with a people with whom Allah is wroth*) 60:13.

(*And to whomsoever My wrath is due he shall perish indeed*) 20:81.

[1] *Al-Bukari's Sahih*, vol.5 p.5, *Muslim's Sahih*, vol.2 p.72, *Ahmad's Musnad*, vol.1 p.6, *at-Tabari's Tareekh*, vol.2 p.236, *Kifayat-Talib* p.266 and *al-Bayhaqi's Sunan*, vol.6 p.300.

Chapter 6

Lights from the Fatimite Speech

On the day when she came to Adiy and Taym,[1]

*Moved with
passion, how
prolonged was
her weeping
Preaching
people with
perfect speech,
Imitating
al-
Mustafa,[2] as
if he was the
preacher.*

We quote here some statements from the speech of Fatima az-Zahra' (s) to analyze and explain them in order to understand them as they are in the world of immortality and as they are in their wonderful reality.

The Greatness of the Leading Prophet

“Then He caused him to pass away mercifully, willingly, desiringly and preferably. Muhammad became safe from the sufferings of this world. He was surrounded by the reverent angels and the contentment of the forgiving God, enjoying the neighborhood of the Almighty King”.

Look at this eloquent lady, how she did leave all the material ease and the sensible comfort when she wanted to praise her father’s eternal Paradise. She found in her father what sanctified him above all that. What would the value of the material pleasure

[1] Adiy was the tribe of Abu Bakr and Taym was the tribe of Omar.

[2] Muhammad (s).

whether worldly or paradisiacal be in Muhammad’s spiritual account, when no one raised the human soul to the highest level of values like he did and no one took it to its pinnacle except him? (No reformer, except him, had fed the soul with the complete divine belief, which was the aim of the minds in their mental flight and in their final round of roving for the sacred human truth, with which the conscience would rest and the soul would be comforted).[1]

He was, then, the greater educator of the soul and the unique leader, under whose banner the morals had achieved the immortal victory against the material effects in their struggle since mind had started its living with materials.

And as long as he was the hero of the battle between the morals and the materials, that hero, by whose mission the missions of the Heaven were ended, it was no wonder that he would be the center of that great world of morals. This was what Fatima wanted to say in her speech when describing the Muhammadan Paradise: “Muhammad became safe from the sufferings of this world...” Certainly he was the pivot in the worldly life and in the hereafter but he was, in the first, tired for he kept on struggling to build the fair human life in an immortal way, and in the second he became at ease for he was the pivot surrounded by the angels to offer in front of him the signs of praise and honor.

And as the Prophet was from the highest kind, so his Paradise must be like him. It was full of material ease or in fact it was full of the moral ease. Was there spiritual ease higher than to be beside the

[1] It was quoted from The Divine Belief in Islam by the author himself.

Almighty King and to gain the contentment of the Forgiving God?

Such Fatima described her father's paradise in two sentences to clarify his fact that he was the axis connected to the origin of the light and the sun surrounded by the angels in a world of radiance.

Greatness of Imam Ali and His Excellences

She said (addressing the public):

“You were on the brink of a pit of fire. You were as a drink for the drinkers, as an easy prey for the greedy, as a firebrand, from which someone took a piece hurriedly and so it would be put out in a short time. You were as foothold.[1] You used to drink from the rain water, in which animals urinated, and eat from the leaves of the trees. You were low and subservient. You were afraid of the nations around you. Then Allah saved you by Muhammad after the misfortunes and calamities he faced and after he was afflicted with the courageous men,[2] highwaymen and the insolent hypocrites of the Jews and the Christians. Whenever they kindled a fire for war, Allah put it out. Whenever the Satan’s followers revolted or a trouble came out of the polytheists the Prophet (s) sent his brother (Ali) into its flames. He would not be back until he treaded the war with his sole and put out its flames with his sword. He (Ali) tired himself out for the sake of Allah. He overworked to achieve the orders of Allah. He was the nearest to the Prophet.[3] He

[1] She wanted to say that they were so low and subservient and that they were as a ready bite for the Romans, the Persians and some of the Arab tribes.

[2] The strong courageous men stood against him in the beginning of the mission.

[3] Ali was the Prophet’s cousin, son-in-law and guardian. He was to be the caliph after him. He was the most aware of the Prophet’s

was the master of the guardians. He always was ready, sincere, diligent and striving while you were living in luxury, ease and safety”.[1]

How wonderful the comparison that Fatima made between the highest kind of the military quality in the world of Islam at that time and the manliness attached to the qualities of the hero and the qualified soldier was! A comparison between bravery, whose signs the Heaven and the earth announced, and it was written with the pen of eternity in the index of the human idealities and between a personality (Abu Bakr and others..) satisfied with jihad by standing in the last line of the battle and would it was satisfied with that rather than to commit the prohibited fleeing according to the law of Islam and the law of sacrifice to unite the divine government on the earth!

We have never known throughout the history of mankind a skilled military talent having so excellent effects on the life of this planet like Ali's among all heroes' history. Imam Ali's situations[2] in the fields of jihad and struggle were indeed the stilt, on which the world of Islam was erected and gained its great history.

Ali was the first Muslim in the first moment of the history of prophethood when the divine voice was echoed by Muhammad's lips.[3] Then he was the first in being zealous and the first defender, to whom the Heaven entrusted the dealing[4] with the unbelieving community.

knowledge. They both knew each other so closely.

[1] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol.16 p.250-251.*

[2] *At-Tabari's Tareekh, vol.2 p.25, 65-66.*

[3] *Referring to Ali's being a Muslim, his assisting the Prophet and his infinite readiness to sacrifice for the sake of Islam. As-Sawa'iqul Muhriqa, p.185, at-Tabari's Tareekh, vol.3 p.218-219.*

[4] *At-Tarmithi's Sahih, vol.8 p.596.*

The victory of Imam Ali in this comparison meant that he had the right to be the caliph for two reasons:

The first: he was the only soldier among all the Muslims of that time, who never separated the highest political position from the military positions.

The second: his wonderful jihad showed a great sincerity that had no way of doubt at all and a burning firebrand of faith that extinction could not find a way to it. This eternal burning firebrand and that immortal profuse sincerity were the two basic conditions for the leader, on whom the umma would depend to guard its morals and to keep its honor along the history.

A comparison between Imam Ali's situations and the others'

If you study the life of the Prophet (s) and the history of his jihad, you will find that Ali astonished the earth and the heaven with his support to the Prophet[1] and you will find that Abu Bakr resorted to

[1] *At-Tabari mentioned in his Tareekh, vol.2 p.65-66 that when Imam Ali had killed (the keepers of the banners), the Prophet noticed some of the polytheists of Quraysh and said to Ali: "Attack them". Ali attacked them. He scattered them and killed Amr bin Abdullah aj-Jumahi. Then the Prophet noticed another group of the polytheists of Quraysh. He said to Ali: "Attack them". Ali attacked them. He scattered them and killed Shayba bin Malik. Gabriel said: "O*

messenger of Allah, this is the real support". The Prophet said: "He is from me and I am from him". Gabriel said: "And I am from you both". Then a voice was heard saying: "No sword but Thulfaghar, and no youth but Ali".

Let us think of the Prophet's answer to notice how he raised Ali above the concept of support that required multiplicity; Muhammad and Ali, to the unity and mixture when he said: "He is from me and I am from him". He did not want to separate Imam Ali from himself because they were a unity that did never separate. Allah had made this unity as example for the human beings to imitate and for the heroes and reformers to be guided

the high leadership position surrounded by many heroes of the Ansar to guard him[1] in order to be safe from the calamities of the war.

It was he (Abu Bakr) himself, who fled from the battle of Uhud[2] as did Omar[3] and left the Prophet to die at that terrible hour where the helpers became rare and the banner of the Muslims declined. Only eight persons promised the Prophet to die for him; three from the Muhajireen and five from the Ansar, whom Abu Bakr was not one of as it was mentioned by the historians.[4] In fact no one of the historians mentioned that he ever fought in that situation any kind of fighting.[5]

Why was he with the returning people if he had not fled? Was not fighting the duty at that moment where the number of the defenders was not enough to stand against the enemy, who struck the Prophet with many strikes that made him offer the prayers while sitting?

We all might know that if someone was in the middle of the battle-field, he would not be safe from death by his enemy, unless he fled or he actually defended himself in the battle. Since Abu Bakr did not do any of these two things and yet he was safe, so it would mean that an opponent stopping in front of his enemy without defending and his enemy did not kill him. Did the polytheists pitied Abu Bakr

according to its light to get to the top of highness. I do not know how the companions or some of them tried to disassemble this unity and to put between these two heroes three persons (the three caliphs, Abu Bakr, Omar and Othman) that they had better not to separate between Muhammad and Ali.

[1] *Oyoonul Athar by ibn Sayyid an-Nass, vol.1 p.336.*

[2] *As it was mentioned in the books of the Shia.*

[3] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol.3 p.389-390.*

[4] *Shar Nahjul Balagha, vol.3 p.388 and al-Imta' by al-Maqreezi p.132.*

[5] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol.3 p.389*

and did not pity Muhammad, Ali, az-Zubayr, Abu Dijana and Sahl bin Hunayf?

I have no reasonable interpretation for this situation except to say that he might stand beside the Prophet and got a safe place because it was the farthest point from the danger as the Prophet was then surrounded by his sincere companions. This was not unlikely because we knew Abu Bakr's tact. He always liked to be beside the Prophet (s) in the war because the place of the Prophet (s) was the safest where the sincerest Muslims safeguarded and defended him devotedly.

If you studied the life of Imam Ali and the life of Abu Bakr, would you find in the life of the first any kind of extinction in his sincerity or a weakness in his rush for the sacrifice or leaning on ease and comfort at the hour of the sacred war? Let you ponder again, would you find any languor? (*Then turn back the eye again and again; your look shall come back to you confused while it is fatigued. 67:4*), because he would find splendor and death defiance in the way of Allah that you would never find the like and you would find a man that falsehood would never come to, neither from before him nor from behind him. He had the readiness for eternity like his great teacher Muhammad because they were but one![1]

Then if you study the life of Abu Bakr during the Prophet's lifetime, will you find but weakness and ineffectuality in the ideological life and in the military life? It was clear when he fled from the

[1] According to the verse: (Then say: Come let us call our sons and your sons and our women and your women and ourselves and yourselves, then let us be earnest in prayer, and pray for the curse of Allah on the liars). 3:61.

battle of Uhud and the battle of Hunayn[1] and it was clear from his lagging to do his duty when the Prophet ordered him to go with the army under the leadership of Ussama[2] and from his defeat at Khaybar when the Prophet (s) sent him as the leader of an army to occupy the fort of the Jews and he fled back. Then the Prophet (s) sent Omar, who did the same as his friend.[3] In that terrible situation the enthusiasm of Omar and his wonderful heroism during the peacetime, with which Islam became so strong as they claimed, evaporated. Omar went back with his fellows, one cowardly the other.[4] Then the Prophet (s) said: "Tomorrow I will give the banner to a man, whom Allah and His Messenger love and he loves Allah and His Messenger. He will not come back until he wins".[5] The Prophet, in his speech, gave a hint to crush

the feelings of the two unsuccessful leaders and a frank pride on great Ali, who loved Allah and His Messenger and Allah and His Messenger loved him.[6]

[1] Refer to *as-Seera al-Halabiya*, vol.2p.126 and refer to *al-Bukhari's Sahih*, vol.3 p.67. Al- Bukhari mentioned that someone of those, who fought in the battle of Hunayn, had said: "The Muslims fled and I fled with them. I saw Omar among them. I said to him: What is wrong with the people? He said: it is the will of Allah. This showed that Omar was among the fleers.

[2] *As-Seera al-Halabiya*, vol.3 and *ibn Sa'd's Tabaqat*, vol.2 p.248-250.

[3] *Ahmad's Musnad*, vol.5 p.253, *al-hakim's Mustadrak*, vol.3 p.27, *Kanzul Ommal*, vol.6 p.394 and *at-Tabari's Tareekh*, vol.2 p.136.

[4] This was Ali's description of the failed leader and the languid soldiers, who knew the weakness of each other; therefore they began to terrify the situation in order to find an excuse for their flight. Refer to *at-Tabari's Tareekh*, vol.2 p.136.

[5] *Al-Bukhari's Sahih*, vol.5 p.18, *Ahmad's Musnad*, vol.5 p.353, *at-Tar-mithi's Sahih*, vol.5 p.596 and *Muslim's Sahih*, vol.4 p.1873.

[6] It was very probable that the army, which Ali led to conquer the Jewish colony, was the same army, which fled a day ago. We understand from this the great effect of the leader on his army and the connection between their feelings and his. Ali could make

O you the two caliphs of the Muslims-or of some of the Muslims-, did your Prophet, whom you replaced, behave so? Did not you learn from him some of his lessons in jihad and suffering for the sake of Allah? Was not in your companionship with him for two decades any deterrent preventing you from doing what you did? Did not you hear the Quran, which you were entrusted with to guard and to spread its high idealities, saying: *(And whoever shall turn his back to them on that day, unless he turn aside for the sake of fighting or withdraws to a company, then he, indeed, becomes deserving of Allah's wrath, and his abode is hell; and an evil destination shall it be)* 8:16.

You might agree with me that the important position of Abu Bakr and Omar in Islam made them above committing the prohibited fleeing, so they might have interpreted and found an excuse for their fleeing. We know that the space of interpretation was wide for the caliph Abu Bakr like when he justified the sin of Khalid bin al-Waleed when he killed a Muslim intendedly by saying: "He (Khalid) issued a fatwa but he mis-judged".[1]

We may apologize if what we have said above requires an apology, but we were obliged to mention that because the Fatimite comparison needed detailed explanations.

those soldiers, who cowarded Omar in the previous attack, victorious heroes by pouring in their souls some of his great soul effusing with enthusiasm and sincerity.

[1] *At-Tabari's Tareekh, vol.2 p.273. Omar said to Abu Bakr: "In Khalid's sword there is injustice. If it is not right, he deserves to be punished". He insisted on that...Abu Bakr said: "O Omar, excuse him! He interpreted and misjudged". Refer to Tareekh of ibn Shuhna printed on the margins of al-Kamil, vol.11 p.114.*

The Ruling Party

Fatima said: “You lurk to bring us adversities and look forward to hearing bad news (which bring misfortunes to us)”.

This speech was addressed to the ruling party, which claimed that what Fatima ascribed to her addressees, made them hasten the homage for fear of sedition to occur. Her speech was a clear accusation for this party to prepare the terrible plot and to compact the plans waiting for the suitable opportunity in order to seize the rule and to divest the Hashimite house of it.

It was shown in the previous chapters that the secret agreement between Abu Bakr, Omar and Abu Obayda[1] was proved by the historical facts.

We did not have to expect material evidence more perfect than Fatima’s speech for she lived with those difficult circumstances. Certainly she perceived the events of that time really, correctly and accurately more than the researchers, who came hundreds of years later to analyze those events.

And for the right of the research, we have to record that Fatima (s) was the first-if her husband was not the first -to declare the partisan assortment of the ruling party. She accused them of political plotting then she was followed, in this thought, by some of her contemporaries like Imam Ali[2] (s) and

[1] We apologize to our master Abu Obayda for mentioning his mere name without a title. It was not my mistake but the death, which took his soul before he got the caliphate that people might give him any of the titles. As for the title (the faithful), I think that he got it neither from the Prophet (s) nor from people but he got it in special occasions that had nothing to do with the official decorations!

[2] With reference to Imam Ali’s saying: “O Omar, you milk a milking that you will have a half of it! Support him today to recompense you tomorrow...”. Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol.6 p.11 and p.12 Abu Obayda’s saying to Imam Ali.

Mu’awiya bin Abu Sufyan.[1]

As long as this party, which Fatima (s) confirmed its existence, Imam Ali (s) referred to and Mu’awiya glimpsed at, was controlling the rule and the fate of the umma and as long as the following ruling families, which directed all the public utilities to their interests, followed the same basis of that policy and the elements of that partisan method, which

dazed the Islamic world, it is very natural that we do not see in history or at least the general history a clear image of that party, whose first partisans tried their best to color their deeds with the pure legal color, which was too far from their political colors and secret agreements.

Fatima (s) said: "Then you branded other than your camels and went to other than your drinking places. You did so and the age (of the Prophet) was still recent, the wound was still wide and not yet healed, and the Prophet was not yet buried. Did you so quickly claim the fear of sedition? Surely into sedition have they already tumbled down, and most surely hell encompasses the unbelievers. By Allah, it was impregnated so wait until it bears then milk its blood...then they will perish who say false things and the successors will know what bad the earlier ones have established. Be at ease and wait relaxedly for the sedition. Rejoice at a sharp sword, general commotion and despotism, which will make your victuals so insignificant and your gathering separate. Alas for you!"[2]

If Abu Bakr and his two friends formed a party having special intents, it would be vain for us to expect that they would declare of it or announce the

[1] Refer to *Murooj ath-Thahab*, vol.3 p.199 and *Waq'at Siffeen* by Nasr bin Muzahim p.119-120.

[2] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha*, vol.16 p.234.

basic lines of their program, by which they would justify their situation on the day of the saqeefa; nevertheless there must be a justification and an interpretation!

It was clear that they hastened and longed eagerly to complete the homage to one of them and to seize the high positions in a way that it was not expected from such companions! It was supposed that they were prudent and having minds that did not think except of the benefit of Islam and did not care for keeping high positions. The possession of authority and seizing of ranks would not be the aim of Muhammad's disciples.

The rulers felt that and perceived that their situation was somewhat odd so they wanted to patch it by claiming their keeping to the high aims and fearing for Islam from a sedition that might do away with it. What they forgot was that the patch always would expose itself and the new threads inserted in the dress would lead to show the patch. Therefore Fatima (s) declared her eternal word: "You claimed that you feared of

sedition (*Surely into sedition have they already tumbled down, and most surely hell encompasses the unbelievers. Quran, 9:49*) Yes, it was the sedition or the source of seditions definitely.

How wonderful you were O daughter of the Prophet, when you took the mask off the bitter truth and predicted for your father's umma a terrible future, in whose sky red clouds would lighten to make rivers of blood full of skulls! How wonderful you were when reproached those persons with their bad deeds by saying: (*Surely into sedition have they already tumbled down, and most surely hell encompasses the unbelievers*).

The Great Sedition

The political performances at that time were sedition and were the source of all seditions occurred thereafter.[1]

It was a sedition according to Fatima's opinion-at least-because it was against the legal Islamic government, which was Ali's right, who was the Prophet's Aaron and was worthier to the Muslims than themselves.[2]

Among the ironies of the fate was that Omar justified his situation that he feared for sedition and he forgot that extorting the right from its legal keeper that the Prophet (s) had decided with the confession of Omar himself, was the very sedition with all meanings of sedition!

I do not know what prevented those, who feared from sedition to occur and had no greed for the rule except as much as related to the interests of Islam, from asking the Prophet about the caliph after him and asking him to appoint for them the higher authority of the Islamic government after him, where he was sick for many days and he said many

[1] As it was cleared by the saying of Omar: "The homage of Abu Bakr was a slip that Allah kept the Muslims safe from its evils". Refer to at-Tabari's Tareekh, vol.2 p.235 and it was mentioned in as-Sawa'iqul Muhriqa p.36: "...and whoever does it (the homage) again must be killed".

[2] According to the tradition of al-Ghadeer, which was narrated by one hundred and eleven companions, eighty-four of the successors and was mentioned by three hundred and fifty-three of our brothers of the Sunni authors as mentioned in the book al-Ghadeer by al-Ameen. I would like to notice here that much of the holy Quran was not narrated by such number of narrators as those, who narrated the tradition of al-Ghsdeer. So whoever suspected this tradition, would suspect the holy Quran. The evidence proving the imamate and caliphate of Ali was so clear that had no way for doubt and suspicion. Refer to al-Muraja'at by Sayyid Abdul Hussayn Sharafuddeen and refer to as-Sawa'iqul Muhriqa p.122.

times that he would leave for the better world nearly and some of his companions gathered around him asking him about how to wash him (ghusl)[1]and how to prepare the procedures of the burial?[2] Did not those, who insisted on Omar (when he was about to die) to appoint for them the caliph after him in order not to leave the umma without a ruler for fear of sedition,[3] think of asking for that from the Prophet (s)? Did they ignore the dangers of the situation in spite of that the Prophet had warned them of seditions like the dark night? But as the Prophet (s)

joined his Exalted Companion, their zeal for the religion shined and their hearts were filled with fear from sedition and evil results! Do you agree with me that the Prophet had chosen for the ship the best captain and therefore no one of them asked him any question?

Let us leave this aside and try to find for them whatever excuses that may justify their actions. Those people, zealous for Islam, not only were satisfied with not asking the Prophet, but also they prevented him from saving them from the expected dangers when he wanted to write a decree, by which (the Muslims would never deviate at all).[4] Deviation did mean sedition and then there would be no sedition after that decree so did they suspect the Prophet not to be truthful?! Or did they think that they were more zealous for Islam and more able to do away with the seditions and commotions than the Prophet and the first man of Islam?

[1] *Washing a dead man in a special manner according to the Islamic rules.*

[2] *Al-Kamil fit-Tareekh by ibnul Atheer, vol.2 p.122 and as-Seera an-Nabawiya by ibn Katheer, vol.4 p.527.*

[3] *At-Tabari's Tareekh, vol.2 p.580, al-Iqd al-Fareed, vol.4 p.260.*

[4] *Al-Bukhari's Sahih, vol.1 p.371 and vol.8 p.161.*

It would be better for us to ask about what the Prophet (s) had meant by seditions when he addressed those buried in the cemetery of al-Baqee'[1] in the last days of his honored life: "How lucky you are by being here! Seditions will come like pieces of dark nights".[2]

Perhaps you might say that it referred to the sedition of the apostates. This justification would be accepted if the Prophet was afraid that the deads of al-Baqee' would apostatize but if he was not afraid of that-as it was real-because they were good Muslims and many of them were martyrs, so why did he congratulate them for not attending those days? And definitely the Prophet (s) did not mean the Umayyad riots done by Othman and Mu'awiya[3] for they were nearly three decades after that date.

So that sedition, the Prophet (s) referred to, must be after his departure immediately and that it would concern the deads of al-Baqee' more than the sedition of the apostates and of those, who claimed to be prophets.

Hence it was the very sedition that Fatima (s) referred to when saying: (Surely into sedition have they already tumbled down, and most surely hell encompasses the unbelievers).

Is it then wrong to call it the first sedition in the Islamic history after the Prophet (s) had called it sedition?

The political performances of that days were sedition from another side that they imposed on the umma a caliphate, with which no one was satisfied except a few,[4] who had no right to decide the fate of

[1] *The graveyard of the Muslims in Medina.*

[2] *At-Tareekh al-Kamil by ibnul Atheer, vol.2 p.318.*

[3] *At-Taj aj-Jami' lil-Ussool, vol.5 p.310.*

[4] *At-Tabari's Tareekh, vol.2 p.233.*

the government neither according to the Islamic laws nor according to all the civil laws.

It was the caliphate of Abu Bakr, when he came out of the saqeefa (and Omar trotting in front of him shouting until his mouth foamed) surrounded by his group (wearing San'ani[1] aprons and passing by no one unless they hit him and brought him (in front of Abu Bakr). They extended his hand to touch Abu Bakr's hand to pay homage to him willingly or unwillingly).[2]

This showed that the rulers had carried to the Muslims a caliphate that was neither blessed by the Heaven nor accepted by the Muslims. Abu Bakr did not gain his authority by a decree from the Prophet nor by the consensus of the umma as long as Sa'd did not pay homage until Abu Bakr died and as long as the Hashimites did not pay homage until six months of Abu Bakr's caliphate.[3]

It was said that those in power had paid homage to him and that was enough.

Did this concept not need an explanation or a reference to be concerned? Who did consider those, who had paid homage to Abu Bakr such and had given them that unlimited authority?

It was neither the umma nor the Prophet (s) because we knew that the men of the saqeefa had not followed the normal method of elections and had not permitted the Muslims to choose secondary candidates, who were considered men in power according to the traditions of that time.

It was not mentioned that the Prophet (s) had granted this wide authority to any special group.

[1] *Related to Sana'a.*

[2] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol.1 p.74.*

[3] *Al-Bukhari's Sahih (the virtues of the companions) chap.35 p.66 and chap.43 p.8.*

Then how would it be granted to a few Muslims, who would control the affairs of the Muslims without their consent, in a constitutional regime like the Islamic government as they claimed?

How wonderful of the political tradition it was that the government itself would appoint those in power[1] and then it would gain its final opinion from them.

And more wonderful it was that they excluded Ali, al-Abbas and all the Hashimites, Sa'd bin Obada, az-Zubayr, Ammar, Salman, Abu Tharr, al-Miqdad and all those gifted with intellect and prudence[2] from those in power if actually there was such class in Islam that had the right of deciding exclusively.

Putting this word in the dictionary of the Islamic life paved the way for the aristocracy to appear, which was too far from the essence of Islam and its reality that was purified from caste and discrimination.

Would that great wealth, with which the sacks of Abdur Rahman bin Ouff, Talha and the likes were filled, be heaped unless those rulers adopted this ugly aristocracy, which was ill-omened for Islam, and saw that they were the high class deserving to have the millions and to control people's rights as

[1] *At-Tabari's Tareekh, vol.2 p.233. Abu Bakr said: "I accepted to you one of these two men; Omar and Abu Obayda (to be the caliph)... and I myself choose Abu Obayda". Omar stood up and said (to the people in the saqeefa): "Who of you would refuse the two feet (Abu Bakr) that the Prophet had preferred?" Then Omar paid homage to Abu Bakr and then people paid homage too...the Ansar said: "We do never pay homage except to Ali".*

[2] *According to the saying of ibn Abbas to Omar: "As for those gifted with intellect and intelligence they still consider him (Ali) as perfect man since Allah have raised the banner of Islam, but they consider him as being wronged and deprived of his rights". Refer to Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol.3 p.115.*

they liked?

They said: "The majority is the criterion of the legal government and the principle, on which the caliphate is based".

But the holy Quran did not pay attention to the majority and did not consider it as evidence or true proof. Allah said:

(And if you obey most of those in the earth, they will lead you astray from Allah's way) 6:116.

(And most of them are averse from the truth) 23:70.

(And most of them do not follow (anything) but conjecture) 10:36.

(But most of them are ignorant) 6:111.

It was mentioned in the Sunni books of Hadith that the Prophet (s) had said: "While I am (at the pond on the Day of Resurrection) a group of people will come. When I recognize them, a man will come between me and them. He will say to them: "Let us go." I will ask: "Whereto (are you taking them)?" He will say: "To Hell." I will say: "What for?" He will say: "They apostatized after you..." until he (the Prophet) said: "I do not think that many of them will be saved except as much as the lost livestock".[1]

So that majority of Hell that the Prophet talked about could not be the source of the Islamic government because they would form a caliphate impressed with their own morals.

If we considered that this majority did not concern the people of Medina only, about whose eternal seats in Hell we knew from the Prophet's tradition, and we considered the majority of the Muslims in general to be the true criterion, so we

[1] *Al-Bukhari's Sahih, vol.8 p.68. The lost livestock means very little.*

had to notice that whether Medina was the only inhabitation of the Muslims, by whom the quorum would be enough to certify the caliphate of Abu Bakr or he was not satisfied with them and he sent for all the Muslims all over the Islamic state counseling and taking their votes into account? Certainly not! Nothing of that happened. He imposed his government over the entire state forcibly and there was no way of reviewing or arguing until the hesitation in submitting to the government became an unforgivable crime.[1]

They said: "The homage could be valid if some of the Muslims paid it and undoubtedly this happened with Abu Bakr's homage".

This would not be acceptable by any standard of proper political thinking because those some could not control the affairs of all the umma and the fate of the umma could not be hanged by so thin thread like this. The sanctities and the high position of the umma could not be left to a government established by a group of companions, who were not recommended by the public consensus nor by a sacred decree but they just were ordinary people of the companions. We know well that: *(And there are some of them who molest the Prophet and say: He is one who believes every thing that he hears) 9:61 (And there are those of them who made a covenant with Allah: If He give us out of His grace, we will certainly give alms and we will certainly be of the good. But when He gave them out of His grace, they*

became niggardly of it and they turned back and they withdrew. So He made hypocrisy to follow as a consequence into their hearts till the day when they shall meet Him because they failed to perform towards Allah what they had promised with Him and because they told lies

[1] *Al-Bukhari's Sahih, vol.8 p.68.*

9:75-77) and among them were some, whom Allah kept knowing their bad intents and hypocrisy to Himself when saying to the Prophet (s): *(and from among the people of Medina (also); they are stubborn in hypocrisy; you do not know them; We know them)* 9:101.

A group that included hypocrites, liars and some, who hurt the Prophet (s) could not have the right to decide the highest position of the Islamic world or the fate of the entire umma.

Commenting on this information we say: the caliphate of Abu Bakr was not done according to a prophetic tradition or the approval of the majority or a result of direct or indirect elections. Yes, some of the Muslims tried their best to secure this caliphate, around which some people gathered and many groups of the people of Medina supported, but all those were not but some of the Muslims and the some could not represent the entire umma. The legal rule that would represent all the umma had to be approved by all the umma or by the great majority of the umma. Secondly there were among the Muslims many hypocrites, whom no one knew but Allah according to the holy Quran, and to determine that this minority, who would form the political entity of the umma, were not hypocrites would have to be according to the Quran, the prophetic traditions or the opinion of the umma.

So let Abu Bakr permit us to incline towards Fatima's opinion partially or totally because we did not find a meaning for the sedition clearer than the dominating of one man over the umma without any legal justification and controlling all its public utilities as Abu Bakr had done in the days of his caliphate or the first months or the first weeks of his rule when Fatima did her speech.

I do not know whether the hasty despots thought about the results of their despotism and not paying any attention to those, who definitely had an opinion about the matter if they began to oppose and if the Hashimites got ready to resist the government. This thing was possible and might happen at any moment so why did not they take care of this

side when they decided and got their final result in not more than an hour?

Why would we sanctify the situation more than its heroes had sanctified it? Omar exceeded in sanctifying it to a point that he ordered to kill whoever would do like the homage of Abu Bakr[1] and he himself did it.

If we regarded this speech and understood it as speech of an imam caring for the constitution of Islam, we would perceive that he found the situation of Abu Bakr and his friends in the saqeefa as sedition and corruption because killing was prohibited except for these reasons.

It was after all the source of every sedition because it made the caliphate of Allah as a fancy that the pious and the dissolute began to look forward to it as Aa'isha, who undoubtedly represented the ruling party, declared.[2] It was this sedition that paved the way for the political fancies. The parties were formed, the policies fought each other, the Muslims separated and divided so badly[3] that their great entity and glory was lost.

What would you think about this umma, which formed in a quarter of century the first state all over the world because the leader of the opposition at that time-Ali- did not activate the opposition, which

[1] *As-Sawa'iqul Muhriqa* p.56.

[2] *Ad-Durr al-Manthoor*, vol.6 p.19.

[3] *Al-Milel wen-Nihal* by ash-Shahristani, vol.1 p.30-31.

would have shaken the entity and the unity of the umma?

What glory, what authority and what domination over the world the umma would have if it was not afflicted with the conflicting lovers of the rule and the drunken emirs affected with the ecstasy of authority and if it was not a field for the bloody fights, which were unequalled throughout history, and if the rulers did not exploit all the wealth of the umma for their pleasures and eases and after that they despised the values and the traditions of the umma![1]

Abu Bakr and Omar did not think beyond their own time. They imagined that their power would guard the Islamic entity, but if they thought better of their view and studied the situation prudently as Fatima (s) did, they would know the truthfulness of the warn she warned them with.

[1] *Murooj ath-Thahab* by al-Mas'oodi, vol.3 p.214, *al-Iqd al-Fareed* by ibn Abd Rabbih, vol.5 p.200-202 and *The Social Justice in Islam* by Sayyid Qutub.

Chapter 7

The Court of the Book

Surely Allah commands you to make over trusts to their owners and that when you judge between people you judge with justice; surely Allah admonishes you with what is excellent; surely Allah is Seeing, Hearing.

Quran, 4:57

If we wanted to raise our study to an adequate level, we would have to follow the methods of the scientific research in studying two sides:

Abu Bakr's Situation on the Prophet's Inheritance

The first side: Abu Bakr's situation regarding the inheritance of Fatima (s) that he justified according to a tradition, which he alone narrated from the Prophet (s) about the matter of inheritance. He narrated the tradition in different ways and different statements for the confrontations between him and Fatima (s) were many, so each saying of his had a different form and different statements according to the phrases that came to his mind at the time of each confrontation between them.[1]

[1] Refer to *Sunan of al-Bayhaqi*, vol.6 p.297-302 and *Sharh Nahjul Balagha*, vol.16 p.214, 218, 219, 221, 227.

1. Before all we want to note how certain the caliph was of the truthfulness of the tradition, which he found that it showed that the Prophet (s) did not bequeath. How certain was he that he had heard it from the Prophet (s) and whether he changed his mind or not?

We can understand that from the traditions[1] saying that the caliph gave Fadak back to Fatima and the case was about to be ended unless Omar came and said to the caliph: "What is this?" Abu Bakr said: "It is a document I wrote for Fatima confessing her right of her father's inheritance". Omar said: "What will you spend on the Muslims and as you see that the Arabs stand against you?" He (Omar) took the document and tore it.[2] We quote this tradition cautiously although we may believe in its truthfulness because every thing would encourage not narrating this story unless it had something of reality. If it was true, it would mean that (the attempt of) giving Fadak to Fatima (s) occurred after Fatima's eternal speech and when Abu Bakr denied the Prophet's inheritance by narrating his odd tradition, because of the wars of apostasy, Omar referred to in his saying, took place ten days after the day of the saqeefa[3] and Fatima's speech was in the tenth day too.[4]

2. Abu Bakr showed his regret for not giving Fadak to Fatima when he was about to die.[5] He was

[1] *Sibt bin aj-Jawzi* in his book *as-Seera al-Halabiya*, vol.3 p.363, *Sharh Nahjul Balagha*, vol.16 p.234.

[2] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha*, vol.16 p.234-235.

[3] *Murooj ath-Thahab, vl.2 p.193.*

[4] *This may weaken the tradition mentioned above because if Abu Bakr was ready to recall, he would have responded to Fatima in the mosque when she scolded him so bitterly.*

[5] *At-Tabari's Tareekh, vo.2 p.353, Sumooow al-Ma'na fe Sumooow ath-That by al-Alayili, p.18.*

so moved that once he said to the people gathering around him: "Revoke your pledge of homage to me!" We perceive by this that the caliph was so worried, feeling that he had committed a great mistake in his judgment against Fatima without a certain evidence. His conscience became so excited and he could not find a justification that might quiet his worried soul. He was unable to bear this bitter condition so his soul was brimmed to express the regret for his situation towards Fatima at the last hour of his life; the critical hour, in which one would review all the scenes one had acted on the stage of life when feeling that the curtain was about to be lowered, and the different threads of one's life gathered in one's memory that were about to be cut and nothing would remain but the burden of the sins committed.

3. Let us not forget that Abu Bakr had recommended in his will[1] to be buried beside the Prophet's tomb. This would not be except if he had recalled his tradition, in which he had narrated that the Prophet (s) did not bequeath, and then he asked his daughter (Aa'isha) permission to be buried in her share of the Prophet's inheritance (in the house)-if the wife would have a share of land and if that share of land would be enough for Abu Bakr-or if he thought that what the Prophet (s) had left was to be as common charity for all the Muslims, then he had to ask permission of all of them. Suppose that the adults permitted him, what about the minors and the children at that time?

4. We knew well that Abu Bakr had not seized the Prophet's wives' houses, in which they lived during the Prophet's lifetime, so what was the reason that made him seize Fadak from Fatima (s)

[1] *At-Tabari's Tareekh, vol.3 p.349.*

and make its yields for the public interests while he let the Prophet's wives make use of their houses as real keepers so that he asked Aa'isha permission to let him be buried in her house? Did the verdict of not

bequeathing concern the Prophet's daughter only? Were the wives' houses their donations? We are to know what made the caliph do that without any evidence despite that no one of the wives had claimed that the house was hers. Inhabiting a house by a wife during the Prophet's lifetime did not mean that she became the owner because it was not private ownership but it was as part of the Prophet's ownership as for any wife and a husband. This verse (*And stay in your houses. 33:33*) did not mean that the houses were theirs because a little after that the houses were ascribed to the Prophet where Allah said: (*O you who believe! do not enter the houses of the Prophet unless permission is given to you. 33:35*) If the order of the Quran was sufficient evidence, this verse must be taken into account. It was mentioned in the Sunni books of Hadith that the house was ascribed to the Prophet when he had said: "Between my house and my minbar there is a garden of Paradise".[1]

5. Let us ask the caliph about the verdict that the prophets did not bequeath. Did it concern Muhammad (s) only and he kept it secret until it would be required to be applied to Fatima only from among all the heirs of the other prophets? Did the other prophets ignore it? Did they not inform their successors and heirs of it because of their greed of the transient wealth in order to remain with their sons and families? Or did they follow the verdict of not bequeathing but it was not mentioned

[1] *Ahmad's Musnad, vol.2 p.236.*

in all the histories of the nations? Or did the actual policy at that time establish this verdict?

6. On the other hand could we accept that the Prophet (s) would bring distresses and disasters for his most beloved one, at whose displeasure he would be displeased, for whose delight he would be delighted and for whose distress he would be distressed?[1] Nothing would cost him to keep all those distresses away from his daughter more than to tell her the truth if there was such a thing. Would the Prophet (s) be pleased if his daughter suffered and faced ordeals and that ordeals would widen to be a cause for disagreement among all the Muslims whereas he was sent by Allah to be a source of mercy? Did he conceal it from his daughter while he had revealed it to Abu Bakr?

The Variations of Abu Bakr's Tradition

1. In order to have a look at the tradition from the moral side, we divided the way of narrating the tradition into two parts:

The first: It was mentioned that Abu Bakr cried when Fatima (s) talked with him and said: "O daughter of the messenger of Allah, I swear by Allah that your father did not bequeath a dinar or a dirham and he said that the prophets did not bequeath".[2] It was mentioned too that when Fatima did her speech he said: "I have heard the Prophet saying: We, the prophets, do not bequeath gold and silver nor lands, properties or houses but we bequeath faith, wisdom, knowledge and the Sunna".[3]

[1] *Al-Bukhari's Sahih, vol.5 p.83, Muslims Sahih, vol.4 p.1902, History of Baghdad by al-khateeb al-Baghdadi, vol.17 p.203 and Ahmad's Musnad, vol.1 p.6.*

[2] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol.16 p.316, al-Bayhaqi's Sunan, vol.6 p.301.*

[3] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol.16 p.252, 214, al-Bayhaqi's Sunan,*

The second: Abu Bakr narrated that the Prophet had said: "We do not bequeath. What we leave is to be as charity".[1]

2. The important point in this research is to know whether these ways of the tradition lead clearly, without any doubt or other interpretation-the proviso (nass)[2] according to the scholars of Hadith-to that what the Prophet (s) had left would be as inheritance or it could lead to another meaning even if it apparently gave an impression showing the verdict of not bequeathing. The matter had a third account that was not to outweigh the meaning that served the caliph more than the other meanings the wording might have, which was called (mujmal) summary.[3]

3. If we noticed the first variations of the tradition, we would find that the tradition might not refer to the legislation of bequeathing by the prophets but to another thing that the Prophet (s) wanted to clear; that was to glorify the prophethood and to exalt the prophets. There was no clearer aspect of the spiritual loftiness and the divine greatness than to be ascetic with regard to the evanescent luxuries and pleasures of the worldly life. Could not we suppose that the Prophet (s)

vol.6 p.300.

[1] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol.16 p.224, 218, al-Bayhaqi's Sunan, vol.6 p.301.*

[2] *Proviso: ar-Razi said: if the wording refers to one meaning and has no*

possibility to refer to another it is proviso (nass).

[3] *Mujmal means that the wording refers to two meanings equally. Refer to at-Tafseer al-Kabeer by al-Fakhr ar-Razi, vol.7 p.18. It was mentioned in Ma'arij al-Ussool by al-Hilli p.105 that: "Proviso (nass) is the wording that refers to its very meaning and not to any other than what it is said for but the (mujmal) summary refers to some meanings and it is not limited to its wording...". Refer to Bayan an-Nussoss at-Tashree'iyya by Badran Abul Aynayn, p.5 and al-Misbah al-Muneer, vol.2 p.654.*

wanted to show that the prophets were angelic people or people of the highest rank that they would not be affected by the earthly egoism or the human tendencies, because their nature was derived from the elements of the Heaven flowing with goodness and not from the elements of the earthly world? They always and for ever were the sources of good and light. They were devisors of faith and wisdom. They fixed the divine authority on the earth. They were not the sources of material wealth and they did not look forward to its values. So why did not we consider his saying: "We the prophets do not bequeath gold or silver nor lands or properties or houses" as metonymy referring to this meaning? Their bequeathing of these things did mean owning them and leaving them after their death whereas in fact they turned away from all these things. Hence the wording showed not bequeathing because the prophets did not have anything to bequeath as if we said: "the poor men do not bequeath" not because the verdict of inheritance does not include them but because they do not have anything to bequeath. The real aim of the Prophet's saying was to show the loftiness of the prophets. This style of eloquence agreed with the wonderful styles of the Prophet's speech, which were full of such great meanings in short statements.

4. In order that you agree with me on a certain interpretation for this tradition, we have to know the meaning of bequeathing so that we can understand the sentence that negated bequeathing in the tradition. Bequeathing means leaving something as inheritance; that is to say that the legator is he, who becomes a cause of transmitting a property

from the dead to his relative.[1] This transmitting depends on tow conditions:

First: the existence of the patrimony.

Second: the law that lets the heir have a share of the dead's property. The first condition happens by means of the dead himself and the second condition happens by means of the legislator, who establishes the law of inheritance, whether he is an individual, who is entrusted with the

legislative competence by people, or a society responsible for that or a prophet legislating according to the orders of the Heaven. Each of the dead and the legislator has a share in deciding the inheritance but the real legator is the dead, who founds the matter of the inheritance, because it is he, who prepares for the inheritance its second condition whereas the legislator is not a real legator because by establishing the law he cannot generate any inheritance. In fact he just legislates a law saying that if the dead leaves a property, it will be for his relatives. This is not enough to find inherited wealth unless the dead actually has left some of his own properties after his death.

So the legislator is like that, who adds a special nature to an element that enables it to burn whatever it meets. Then if you throw a piece of paper into it and the paper burns, you will be the one that burns it and not that one, who adds the burning element to that nature. The principle justifying that is to say that everything is ascribed to the final influence on it. In the light of this principle we know that ascribing bequeathing to somebody means that he is the final influence on the inheritance and it is he, who founds the patrimony.

[1] *Al-Misbah al-Muneer, vol.2 p.654.*

It is understood from the statement (the prophets do not bequeath) that they do not prepare for the inheritance its final condition for they do not try to gather wealth and then to leave them for their heirs after their death. So the meaning of (the prophets do not bequeath) does not deny the legislative bequeathing because the verdict of the inheritance is not the real bequeathing but the real bequeathing is to prepare the patrimony, which is the matter of the inheritance. It is this, which was denied by the tradition.

On the other way, if the bequeathing that the Prophet denied was the legislative bequeathing it would mean canceling the law of bequeathing from the Sharia of the Heaven. This could not be because the legislative bequeathing did not concern the prophets' heirs only. If the denial referred to the real bequeathing it would mean that the prophets had no wealth in order to bequeath and so Abu Bakr's justification would be in vain.

5. In the first narration of the tradition Abu Bakr said: "By Allah, your father did not bequeath a dinar or a dirham".[1] It showed clearly that the Prophet (s) did not leave any money. If Abu Bakr used that statement

to refer to this meaning, then the tradition would lead to denying the patrimony and not the legislative bequeathing.

6. If we noticed the examples mentioned in the second variation of the tradition, we would find what confirmed the importance of this interpretation because mentioning gold, silver, properties and houses did not agree with the tradition that the patrimony was not to be bequeathed whereas every thing, even the

[1] Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol.16 p.216.

insignificant things, must be mentioned to show that the verdict included every thing. If we wanted to show that the unbeliever was not to inherit from his (Muslim) father's inheritance, we would not say that he was not to inherit gold, silver or a house but we would say that he was not to inherit anything of his dead father's patrimony. It was clear that showing the generality of the verdict required showing some kinds of properties in order that no one would think that these kinds of properties were not among the patrimony, which would not be bequeathed. Saying that the prophets do not bequeath or the unbelievers were not to inherit their fathers' inheritance shows that properties, houses, gold, silver and other valuable things of inheritance do not move to the heirs. Mentioning these things in the tradition might show that the meaning of (the prophets do not bequeath) was to confirm that the prophets did not pay any attention for such transient things of this limited worldly life, for which the rabble competed, for it was suitable for this purpose to mention these significant properties, whose owning and bequeathing contradicted the concept of asceticism and the high spiritual ranks. As for informing of not bequeathing in the Sharia, it would be more appropriate to mention the insignificant kinds of patrimony rather than the clear significant kinds.

7. Another thing that confirmed what we said about the interpretation of the tradition was the second part in the tradition: (but we bequeath faith, wisdom, knowledge and the Sunna).[1] It did not show the legislation of inheriting these things but it showed that the prophets had these things that they

[1] Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol.16 p.214.

could spread among people. Then we could understand from the first sentence, which denied bequeathing, that the prophets did not try to

gain gold, properties and the likes, therefore they did not have any to leave for their heirs as inheritance.

8. We are not to compare the Prophet's tradition: (People are not to bequeath anything to the unbeliever of their relatives)[1] with that tradition but we have to differentiate between the two because if the legislator talks about those, for whom he legislates laws, it is clear from his speech that he imposes on them a verdict. When the Prophet informs of that people do not bequeath to the unbeliever of their relatives, it is not to be considered as just informing but it shows that the unbeliever is not to inherit according to the Prophet's Sharia. It is different from that one narrated by Abu Bakr because that tradition talks about the prophets and not a group of people included in the Prophet's legislations and verdicts. So there is nothing referring to a verdict behind the informing of not bequeathing by the prophets.

9. You are not to object by saying that the prophets often owned something of what were mentioned in the tradition for it would mean that the tradition was untrue. You may remember that what was denied related to the prophets was bequeathing, which had a special meaning that was to say: ascribing the patrimony to the legator. This ascribing depended on that the legator sought to gain properties, which would be left as inheritance

[1] This tradition was mentioned in other wording having the same meaning. The Prophet (s) said: "The believer is not to inherit from the unbeliever and the unbeliever is not to inherit from the believer". Refer to Sunan of ibn Maja, vol.2 p.164 and Sahih of Abu Dawood, vol.2 p.19.

after his death, exactly as the meaning of the educator, which depended on using the means of the education. If someone could read the thoughts of one of the ethicists and educated himself according to those thoughts then we would not call that ethicist as educator because founding anything whether it was educating, bequeathing, teaching or the like would not be ascribed to a person unless that person had a positive action and a noticeable influence on the achievement of that thing. Even if the prophets had some properties or houses, it was not because of their seeking to gain wealth like other people. The tradition did not show that the prophets did not bequeath or did not leave properties but it showed their high ranks and excellences. As long as the tradition referred to this meaning and its main aim was not behind the literary meaning of the words so it was not impermissible that the prophets might have some

properties for the good intents. In the past he, who described a generous man as “he had a lot of ashes”, [1] was not to be considered as liar whether there was ash in the generous man’s house or not because he did not want actually to describe him so but he wanted to refer to his generosity because the clearest sign of generosity in those days was the amount of food cooked, which would leave a lot of ashes. And so not bequeathing was the clearest sign of asceticism and piety. Hence the Prophet (s) might have referred to the piety of the prophets by saying: “The prophets do not bequeath”.

10. In order to perceive the meaning of the second variation of the tradition we have to distinguish between three possible meanings:

[1] Refer to *Jawahir al-Balagha* by Ahmed al-Hashimi p.363.

First: the patrimony of the dead is not inherited. This means that what the dead owned until his death will not move to his heirs but it becomes as charity after his death.

Second: what the deceased had paid during his lifetime as charity or what he had given to certain parties would not be inherited but would remain as charity and entail (waqf). The heirs would inherit other than the charities of the properties that the dead owned during his lifetime.

Third: the dead had no properties to be inherited and what he would leave would be charities and entails.

If we recognized the differences between these three meanings, the tradition would appear unclear and in need of researching and testing. In fact in its interpretation there were many possibilities and it could include all the items mentioned above. The second half of the tradition (what we leave is to be as charity) might be an independent sentence with full meaning or a complement for the sentence (we, the prophets, do not bequeath). In the first case the tradition agreed with the first and the third meanings because the sentence (what we leave is to be as charity) might mean that the patrimony would not transfer to the heirs after the owner’s death but it would be considered as charity or it might refer to the third meaning that all the patrimonies would be considered as charity and the dead had not owned anything to bequeath as if the dead before his death referred to the properties and said: “All these properties are not mine. They are for charity and I am just responsible for them”. If we considered the entire tradition as having one independent meaning, it would refer to the second meaning that the charities, which the dead had given during his life, would be excluded from the other parts of the

inheritance. The same would be understood from the tradition if the wording was reversed as the following: (we do not bequeath what we leave as charity). It showed that only the charities would not be inherited but not the rest of the patrimonies were charities. Hence the tradition would be as evidence to prove that the charity was not to transfer to the heirs and not to cancel the legislation of bequeathing at all.

11. So we have put many meanings for the tradition in order to show its real content. Saying that the Prophet's properties were to be as charity after his death, would not be preferred to the other two meanings. In fact we would prefer the second meaning: (what was left as charity would be excluded from the other parts of inheritance) if we pondered on the plural pronoun the Prophet (s) used in the tradition. The use of this pronoun by the Prophet to refer to himself would not be acceptable unless it was used metaphorically. Moreover it was far away from the Prophet's humbleness in all his sayings and doings. The evidences confirmed that the pronoun referred to a group and the verdict decided by the tradition concerned the group and not the Prophet (s) alone. According to the principles of expression it was most suitable for this statement to refer to the group of the Muslims and not the group of the prophets because the tradition had no any context referring to the prophets. You cannot object by saying that the tradition might have a context when it was said by the Prophet (s) or it was preceded by an indication showing that the pronoun related to the group of the prophets because Abu Bakr had not mentioned anything of that, although the narrator of any tradition had to mention every thing concerning it in order to make interpreting it easy therefore your objection will be vain. Furthermore, ignoring these details was not for Abu Bakr's benefit. So let the actual wording of the tradition be identical to the actual situation of Abu Bakr no more no less.

It was understood that the pronoun referred to the group of the Muslims, who were attendant when the Prophet (s) said the tradition. It was ordinary that if a speaker wanted to say something among a group of people and used the plural pronoun of the first person, he would refer by the pronoun to the attendant group. If a jurist was among his friends and he began to talk to them using the plural pronoun, it would be understood that he meant by the pronoun himself and the attendant friends and not the group of the jurists, whom he was one of. If he wanted to refer to another group, his speech in this matter might be considered mysterious and unclear. In the light of this account, what would you think about this verdict that the tradition had determined for the Muslims, whom we established that the pronoun concerned? Could

it show that a Muslim was not to bequeath his patrimony? Were the properties every Muslim had not his own but they were to be considered as charities? Certainly not! This did not agree with the necessities of the Islamic Sharia. According to the holy Quran the Muslim had the right to own in different ways and had the right to bequeath what he would leave after his death (*after (the payment of) a bequest he may have bequeathed or a debt*).[1] Perhaps

[1] With reference to the Quranic verse: (Allah enjoins you concerning your children: The male shall have the equal of the portion of two females; then if they are more than two females, they shall have two-thirds of what the deceased has left, and if there is one, she shall have the half; and as for

it is clear now that the verdict is not but that the charity is not to be inherited. This is an important thing and it does not concern a certain charity but it concerns all the charities of the Muslims. It was no wonder in showing the verdict of not bequeathing the charities in the first age of legislation, because the laws and the verdicts of the Sharia were not yet fixed and widespread among the Muslims and there was a possibility of revoking the charities and entails and they would transfer to the heirs when the owner died. This interpretation could not be undermined even though Fatima (s) did not mention it and did not protest by it against the caliph.

Firstly because the critical situation of Fatima (s) in those difficult times did not let her debate these minute arguments because the ruling authority, which wanted to carry out its decisions strictly, controlled the situation with firmness and determination that did not accept any argument. Hence we found that Abu Bakr did not answer Fatima (s) when she protested by the Quranic verses talking about the matter of inheritance with more than to say: "It is so".[1] So the fate of these arguments, if they had a share in the revolt, would face but denial and failure.

And secondly because these arguments had nothing to do with Fatima's aim, which was to do away with the entire regime of the new caliphate. It was natural that she depended on the means that were nearer to achieve her aim. You found her in

his parents, each of them shall have the sixth of what he has left if he has a child, but if he has no child and (only) his two parents inherit him, then his mother shall have the third; but if he has brothers, then his mother shall have the

sixth after (the payment of) a bequest he may have bequeathed or a debt). 4:11.

[1] *Ibn Sa'd's Tabaqat, vol.2 p.315.*

her eternal speech talking to the minds and the hearts of people together but she did not exceed in her protest the intuitive methods, which was ignored by the caliph. This indifference of the caliph was about to be denied by everyone which would lead to a fierce opposition.

She denied the availability of any evidence in the holy Quran confirming the rule of the caliph Abu Bakr. Then she mentioned the verses legislating the succession among all the Muslims.[1] Then she mentioned the verses talking about the succession of some prophets like Prophet Yahya (John) and Prophet Dawood (David). Then she argued the case in another way that if what Abu Bakr followed was true, he would be more aware than the Prophet (s) and his guardian Imam Ali because they both had not told her of that verdict and if they had known it, they would definitely have told her of it. It was definitely that Abu Bakr could never be more aware of the Prophet's inheritance than the Prophet (s) or than Ali, whose guardianship[2] to the Prophet (s) was confirmed by her saying: "O ibn Abu Quhafa,[3] is it mentioned in the Book of Allah that you inherit your father but I do not inherit my father? Surely you have done a strange thing! Did you intendedly desert the Book of Allah and turned your back on it? Allah said: (*And Sulaiman was Dawood's heir Qur'an*

[1] *It was clear that if only one respected truthful man narrated a tradition, the tradition would be regarded as true but as Fatima protested by the Quranic verses it was clear that she did not recognize the truthfulness and fairness of Abu Bakr.*

[2] *The guardianship of Imam Ali was proved by many evidences. As for the Shia, they agreed on that unanimously and they agreed that it included the caliphate also. As for the others, it was also proved but in the special meaning. Refer to at-Tabari's Tareekh, vol.2 and al-Muraja'at by Abdul Hussayn Sharafuddeen p.236.*

[3] *Ibn Abu Quhafa was the surname of Abu Bakr.*

27:16) and said about Yahya bin Zachariah: (*Grant me from Thyself an heir, who should inherit me and inherit from the children of Yaqoub. Qur'an 19:5-6*) and said: (*And the possessors of relationships are nearer to each other in the ordinance of Allah. Qur'an 8:75*) So did Allah distinguish you with a verse, from which He excluded my father? Or do you say: people of two

religions do not inherit each other? Am I and my father not of one religion? Or are you more aware of the Quran than my father and my cousin?"[1]

The more prominent side of Fatima's revolt was the sentimental side. It was no wonder that Fatima (s) tried her best to gain the battle of the heart for it was the first ruler of the soul and it was the cradle, in which the spirit of revolt grew up. Fatima (s) had succeeded in forming a wonderful image, by which she shook the feelings, electrified the sentiments and dominated the hearts. It was the best weapon for a woman having the same circumstances of Fatima (s).

In order to enjoy that wonderful image painted with the finest colors, let us listen to Fatima when she addressed the Ansar by saying: "O high-born people, you are the strong guards of the religion and the nourishers of Islam. What is this languor in helping me, this slowness in assisting me, this indifference to my right and this dozing towards my being wronged? Did not the Prophet say: "Being loyal to a man is by being loyal to his offspring"? How quickly you changed the Sunna and how hurriedly you achieved your own intents. Was it because the Prophet died that you made his religion

[1] We quoted this passage in short. Imam Ali's wide knowledge about every thing of the Quran was so famous for every one. Refer to al-Ittiqan by as-Sayooti, vol.4 p.233, ibn Sa'd's Tabaqat, vol.2 p.338 and as-Sawa'iqul Muhriqa by ibn Hajar, p.173.

die? By Allah, his death was a great calamity, whose effect became greater. Its rip became obscure and there was no one to mend it. The earth became so dark. The mountains submitted. The hopes died. The sanctities were lost after him. The inviolabilities were profaned. It was a great misfortune that the Book of Allah informed of it even before the Prophet's death. Allah said: *(And Muhammad is no more than an apostle; the apostles have already passed away before him; if then he dies or is killed will you turn back on your heels? And whoever turns back on his heels, he will by no means do harm to Allah in the least and Allah will reward the grateful. Quran 3:144)* Ah, people of Ouss and Khazraj,[1] my father's inheritance was extorted in front of your sight and hearing. My call reaches you and you are with great number of men and arms.[2] You are the elite that Allah preferred and the choice that He chose...etc."[3]

Hence the arguments about the interpretation of the tradition would not be accepted by the ruling authority nor did it have anything to do

with the main aim of the revolt of Fatima (s). This explained for us why Fatima did not mention the donation (of Fadak) in her speech.

The situation of the caliph towards the matter of the inheritance

1. Now we have to clarify the caliph's situation towards Fatima about the matter of the inheritance and to show his opinion about it after we have clarified the meaning of the tradition through the different ways of narrating whether the meaning was clear or ambiguous. His situation seems to be somehow complicated if we study the historical

[1] *The greatest two tribes of the Ansar.*

[2] *She means: why do not you help me and defend my right?*

[3] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol.16 p.212-213.*

documents of the case thoroughly. Although the documents are many, it is ambiguous to know the point, on which the two opponents disagreed and it is difficult to unify this point.

People thought that the object of the disagreement between Abu Bakr and Fatima was the matter of the prophets' inheritance. Fatima claimed that they bequeathed and Abu Bakr denied that. Accounting the situation in this way would not solve the matter and would not interpret many issues:

First: the saying of Abu Bakr to Fatima when she asked for Fadak: "This property was not the Prophet's but it concerned the Muslims. The Prophet (s) spent from it on the soldiers and for the sake of Allah. When the Prophet died I managed it as he did".[1] This saying showed clearly that he was arguing about something else than the prophets' inheritance.

Second: his saying to Fatima in another dialogue: "By Allah, your father is better than me and you are better than my daughters but the messenger of Allah had said: "We do not bequeath. What we leave is to be charity".[2] This explanatory sentence that the caliph added to the tradition needs some attention. It makes us understand that the caliph thought that the verdict determined in the tradition concerned Prophet Muhammad and it was not certified to concern the inheritance of the other prophets or the rest of the Muslims. He defined the patrimony that would not be bequeathed and mentioned that the Prophet meant it by the tradition. According to this, we understand that Abu Bakr did not mean not bequeathing the

[1] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol.16 p.214.*

[2] *ibid.*

charities, because this was a general verdict and did not concern the Prophet only. It was clear also that Abu Bakr did not interpret the tradition as: (the Prophet's properties were not to be inherited but they were to be considered as charities after his death) because if he thought so in understanding the tradition, his interpretation would refer to another matter. The subject of the tradition then would refer to all of the Prophet's patrimonies and not to the actual property, which Fatima asked for. By this I mean that if these properties were excluded from the Prophet's ownership before his death, the verdict of not bequeathing would not affect them. In the same way, if the Prophet had other properties, he would not bequeath them to his relatives too. So not bequeathing of the Prophet's properties, if it was proved, would concern all the Prophet's properties whether those, which he left or others. It would not be right to say that he meant by the inheritance the specific properties that Fatima asked for.

As if you said to your friend: "honor every one visits you tonight!" Then two persons visited him. You did not mean by your saying these two persons in particular yet the order complied with these two persons by chance. So limiting the patrimonies that would not be inherited to certain properties required that the verdict mentioned in the tradition to concern these certain properties only.

No doubt if the Prophet's patrimonies were not to be inherited, the verdict would not be assigned to those certain properties but it would be applied to every property that the Prophet (s) would leave after his death. With regard to the scientific relevance of the research, I want to ask about the use of the explanatory sentence and the aim behind it whether the opinion of the caliph about the tradition was that the Prophet's properties were not to be inherited. Was it suspected that the meaning of patrimony referred to the actual properties, which Fatima asked for, or not and then he wanted to remove the suspicion in order that the tradition would agree with the meaning so that the verdict of not bequeathing would be proved? If this account was true, the suspicion would be in the interest of the caliph because if it was not certain that an asset was a part of the dead's patrimony, it would not transfer to the heirs. Hence it was not possible that the caliph wanted to remove this suspicion and it was not possible that he wanted to prevent Fatima from arguing about the application of the tradition to the properties she asked for because as long as she asked for the properties as inheritance so she obviously acknowledged that they were among the Prophet's

patrimonies. Let us suppose that those properties were a part of the Prophet's patrimony and not all what the Prophet (s) had left-it might refer to the real estate like Fadak-so can we guess that the aim of the caliph was to limit the properties that Fatima had no right to inherit? I do not think so because the Prophet's patrimonies did not differ in bequeathing or not bequeathing. We derive from these reflections a result that the caliph's intent from this tradition of the Prophet that these properties were not his property and he described them by saying: "What we leave is to be charity", so he was, in this respect, as that, who gathered his heirs and said to them: "All my patrimonies are to be for charity" trying to tell them that they were not his properties so they could not inherit them. This is the meaning that can be understood from the caliph's tradition.

Third: the caliph's answer to a messenger sent by Fatima to ask for the Prophet's properties in Medina and Fadak and the remainder of the khums of Khaybar when he said to the messenger: "The Prophet (s) said: "We do not bequeath. What we leave is to be charity. Muhammad's family spends from this money". By Allah, I will not change anything of the Prophet's charities. They will remain as they were during the Prophet's lifetime".[1]

If we supposed that the meaning of the tradition according to Abu Bakr's opinion was that the Prophet (s) did not bequeath his properties, then Abu Bakr's speech would be contradicted because his conclusion in the beginning of the tradition showed that he confessed that what Fatima asked for was among the Prophet's patrimonies and properties he left after his death, but his last sentence of the tradition: "By Allah, I do not change anything of the Prophet's charities. They will remain as they were during the Prophet's lifetime" opposed this meaning because what Fatima wanted to change-as Abu Bakr claimed-was Fadak, the Prophet's properties in Medina and the remainder of the khums of Khaybar. When Abu Bakr said: "By Allah, I do not change anything of the Prophet's charities" he meant the properties that Fatima asked for and he saw that she asked to change them from their previous condition. When he called them as the Prophet's charities it meant that he thought they were not the Prophet's properties but they were charities that the Prophet (s) managed during his lifetime. Abu Bakr's conclusion in the beginning of the tradition showed that he did not want to prove that the Prophet's properties were not to be inherited but he wanted

[1] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol.16 p.218.*

to prove that those properties, which Fatima asked for, were not among the Prophet's properties because he mentioned that they were charities.

2. We can conclude out of some variations of Abu Bakr's tradition that he argued about the prophets' properties and he did not limit the dispute to the previous point because the tradition, which mentioned Fatima's speech and the conclusion of Abu Bakr when he mentioned the Prophet's saying; "We, the prophets, do not bequeath.....etc." and when Fatima protested against him by mentioning the general Quranic verses talking about the matter of inheritance and the special verses talking about the succession of some of the prophets, uncovered a new side of the dispute where Abu Bakr denied the bequeathing of the Prophet's properties to his heirs and insisted on his denial whereas Fatima insisted on arguing him[1] and defended her opinion on the matter.

3. So the caliph had two traditions:

The first: "We do not bequeath. What we leave is to be charity".[2]

The second: "We, the prophets, do not bequeath gold or silver".[3] He therefore claimed two things:

One of them that Fadak was charity and so it was not to be inherited.

The other was that the Prophet's properties were not to be inherited. He used the first tradition to prove that Fadak was charity and the second tradition to prove that the Prophet did not bequeath.

[1] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha*, vol.16 p.211.

[2] *ibid.* vol.16 p.218 and refer to *al-Bayhaqi's Sunan*, vol.6 p.300-301. (In Arabic this tradition may have another form : "We do not bequeath what we leave as charity") The translator.

[3] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha*, vol.16 p.252.

The Results of the Argument

1. It might be not difficult to sue the caliph after his situation became clear and the notes we noticed in the two traditions narrated by Abu Bakr, claiming that the Prophet (s) had said them, were fixed. The censure we got against Abu Bakr until now related to many points. We refer to them here to conclude the results:

First: the caliph was not certain about his tradition as we explained at the beginning of this chapter.

Second: it would be implausible to imagine that the Prophet (s) confided the verdict of his inheritance to Abu Bakr and hid it from his daughter and the rest of his heirs. How did the Prophet confide this verdict to Abu Bakr?[1] The Prophet was not used to meet Abu Bakr alone unless he told him this news in a deliberate privacy so that it would be ignorant by his heirs and especially his daughter, who would receive a new ordeal-because of that-in addition to her other pains!

Third: Ali was the Prophet's guardian undoubtedly according to the true tradition narrated recurrently by the great companions and recited in their poetry. Among those, who narrated the tradition were Abdullah bin Abbas, Khuzayma bin Thabit al-Ansari, Hujr bin Adiy, Abul Haytham bin al-Tayhan, Abdullah bin Abu Sufyan bin al-Harth bin Abdul Muttalib, Hassaan bin Thabit and Imam

[1] Aa'isha said: "They disagreed about his inheritance (the Prophet's inheritance). We did not find any one knowing about it. Then Abu Bakr said: "I heard the Prophet saying: We, the prophets, do not bequeath...etc." Refer to as-Sawa'qul Muhriqa by ibn Hajar p.34 and Tareekh al-Khulafa' by as-Sayooti, p.73.

Ali.[1] The guardianship was one of the highest Islamic decorations that no doubt only Ali possessed.[2]

Ali's followers and Abu Bakr's followers disagreed on the meaning of guardianship. The first great companions believed that it was a decree for Ali's caliphate but the others interpreted it and said: "Ali is the guardian of the Prophet's knowledge, Sharia and affairs." Now we do not want to oppose these or to support those but we want to discuss the tradition as much as concerning the subject of this research and then to decide what result comes out of each interpretation.

Let us suppose first that the guardianship meant the caliphate to try Abu Bakr's situation in the light of the tradition. We will find that he had

usurped the most precious Islamic values and had disposed of the fates of the umma without any legal authority. So this man had no right to rule or judge between people and any tradition of his could not be believed. Let us abandon this interpretation for it would be so severe to the caliph. Let us say: "Ali was the guardian of the Prophet's knowledge and Sharia." Then could we, while confessing such kind of holy guardianship, believe in a tradition denied by the guardian himself? And as long as he (Ali) was the wakeful guard of the divine Sharia[3] so his

[1] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha*, vol.1 p.47-48 and vol.3 p.15.

[2] *Ibn Abul Hadeed* said in his book *Sharh Nahjul Balagha*, vol.1 p.46: "we believe undoubtedly that Ali was the Prophet's guardian, although some ones, whom we consider as resisters, opposed that".

[3] Refer to the Prophet's saying: "Ali is with the Quran and the Quran is with Ali. They will not separate until they came to me at the pond (in Paradise)". Refer to *al-Mu'jam as-Sagheer* by at-Tabarani. The Prophet (s) chose Ali among all his companions and relatives in entrusting him with seventeen decrees that he did not entrust any one with other than Ali. The Prophet (s) said: "Ali is

opinion had to be obeyed in every matter as an indisputable decree because he was the most aware of what the Prophet (s) had recommended and entrusted him with. And if Ali was the guardian of the Prophet's patrimonies and affairs, so what would be the meaning of plundering the Prophet's patrimonies by the caliph whereas the Prophet's guardian was available and he was more aware of their verdict and legal fate?

Fourth: the nationalization of the Prophet's inheritance was one of the caliph's initiatives in history. It was unprecedented in any of the (prophets') nations' histories. If it was a basis followed by all, who ruled after the prophets, it would be so famous and all the nations of the prophets would know that.

Denying the Prophet's ownership of Fadak by Abu Bakr-as it was shown by some of his arguments with Fatima-had much hastiness because Fadak was not gained as booty in war but its people gave in because of fear as it was mentioned by all the historians;[1] Sunni and Shia. Each land, whose people gave up like that (without fighting), was to be pure property of the Prophet (s).[2] Allah declared in the holy Quran that Fadak was of the Prophet (s) by saying: (*And whatever Allah restored to His Apostle from them you did not press forward against it any horse or a riding*

camel. Quran 59:6) It was not proved that the Prophet (s) had granted Fadak as charity or

with the truth and the truth is with Ali". He (s) also said: "Ali is from me and I am from him. No one is to carry out my tasks except him...". Refer to *as-Sawa'iqul Muhriqa* by ibn Hajar p.122 and *ibn Assakir's Tareekh*, vol.17 p.256-.

[1] *Futooh al-Buldan* by al-Balathari, p.46, *ibnul Atheer's Tareekh*, vol.2 p.321, *Sharh Nahjul Balagha*, vol.4 p.78 and *ibn Hisham's Seera*, vol.2 p.368.

[2] *Tafseer al-Kashshaf* by az-Zamakhshari, vol.4 p.502.

he entailed it.

Fifth: both of the traditions that Abu Bakr protested with in this concern had no any evidence certifying what he wanted to prove. We have already studied both variations of the tradition and shown that their meanings had nothing to do with the caliph's intent. If this is not acceptable, let us suppose the two meanings to be equal and then no one could be preferred to the other in order to depend on it.

2. These were the objections we already got. We add to them now a sixth objection after supposing that the phrase (We, the prophets, do not bequeath) is closer to denying the verdict of bequeathing than to deny the existence of the patrimony to be inherited and to suppose the phrase as following: (We do not bequeath what we leave as charity), which will be in the interest of the caliph and to cancel the interpretation saying that the charity left is not to be inherited and then to study the case in the light of these accounts. The clearest meaning of the caliph's tradition, after interpreting it according to all the possibilities, determines that the prophets were not to bequeath their patrimonies as it was clear in his saying: (We, the prophets, do not bequeath). Let us have a look at his saying: (We do not bequeath. What we leave is to be charity). The pronoun refers to the plural that the verdict concerns a group. Since the verdict in the tradition concerns not bequeathing of the patrimony then it is clear that it relates to the group of the prophets because there is no another group that we can think that their patrimonies are not to transfer to their heirs. The holy Quran declared the matter of bequeathing by the prophets. Allah, the Almighty, said about Zachariah: (*And surely I fear my cousins after me, and my wife is barren, therefore grant me from Thyself an heir, who should inherit me and inherit from the children of Yaqoub, and make him, my Lord, one in whom Thou art well pleased.* 19:5-6) The inheritance in the verse means the inheritance of wealth because it is

wealth, which actually transfers from the bequeather to the heir but knowledge and prophethood do not transfer in the real sense.[1] It is definitely clear that knowledge does not transfer according to the theory of the union of the apprehender and the apprehended data.[2] But if we acknowledge the existential difference between them, then there is no doubt of the abstractness of the scientific images[3] and that they (the scientific images) are existing in the soul in an emanational

[1] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha*, vol.16 p.241.

[2] *The concept of this theory is that the apprehended images, which are abstract, have no material aspects except that they are apprehended. Apprehension is the essence of these apprehended images. Divesting these data of the apprehender means divesting the data of their very essence. This is the sign of the existential unity. So the graduation of the soul in the ranks of knowledge is its graduation in the stages of the existence. Whatever the psychic existence becomes a confirmation for a new concept; it will be increased in its essential integration and will become of a higher rank. There is nothing at all preventing from the union of many concepts in the existence. This is not like the existential union of two existences or the conceptual union of two concepts. These two unions are impossible and not like that of the apprehender and the apprehended data.*

[3] *The truth is that all the ranks of knowledge and all the apprehended images are abstract but they are different in the ranks of abstractness. The thing apprehended by the ego will not be the very actual thing with its material identity, even that, which is apprehended by the sense of sight, has a way of abstractness and may be not defined exactly by the emanation of the ray or by the impression. What was proved about the seeing related to the science of mirrors and the researches of physics, which interpreted the optical perception philosophically, confirmed the thought of abstractness. We have to acknowledge it besides imagination and mind. We have explained this ism in our book *The Divine Belief in Islam*.*

existence,[1] which means that it is an effect of the soul and the one effect according to the soul-not by connection only-is rectified by its cause and connected with it identically so it is impossible for it to transfer to another cause. And if we supposed that the apprehended images were symptoms and qualities existing in the apprehender immanently, it would be impossible to transfer because of the impossibility of the movement of the symptom from a subject to another as it was proved by philosophy whether we thought of its abstractness or materiality in

accordance with our acknowledgement that the apprehended images included the general aspects of the material object like the ability of division and the likes.

[1] *and not immanent existence, which means to be as symptoms for the soul. Some philosophers adopted this ism in order to solve the problem, which occurred to the researchers when they wanted to adapt the evidences of the mental existence to what was known about science as it was quality, which meant that if the apprehended image was quality so what we would perceive of a human being was not essence because it was a quality and not a human being while every human being was to be essence. When all of the answers, which was put to solve the problem of denying the mental existence, determining the idealism, choosing multiplicity, considering science as symptom and the apprehended data as essence and interpreting the essence as it was the outside independent existent and not the mental existent failed, the later researchers became obliged to determine that the apprehended image was of the essence and not of the quality but the great Islamic philosopher, Sadruddeen ash-Shirazi mentioned in his Asfar that it was essence in its quiddity and quality in its presentation. We could object to him by saying that all what was in the presentation would end to what was in the soul. Then we had to suppose a real quality united with the image to be quality in the presentation. Then the theory would get to one of two things; either keeping to the multiplicity of what was there in the soul or colliding with the first problem itself. It would be better to determine that the image apprehended by man was to be essence and not in presentation at all and its connection with the soul was as the connection between the cause and effect and not the presentation with its subject.*

So it is impossible for knowledge to transfer according to the philosophical isms concerning the scientific images.

And if we consider prophethood, we will also find that it cannot be transferred whether we interpret it according to the ism of some philosophers to say that it is a rank of the spiritual perfection and a degree of the virtuous human existence, to which the human essence ascends towards the infinite perfection or we interpret it according to the general concept understood by people that prophethood is a divine position unlike the position of a king or a vizier and that spiritual perfection is a condition for that divine position. Hence in the first sense transfer cannot occur because it is the very existence of the prophet with his personal perfections and prophethood in the other sense is impossible to be

transferred too because it is a moral matter with its specified aspects and it is not possible for any aspect to transfer except by the change of the individual himself into another individual. For example the prophethood of Zachariah (S) concerned Zachariah himself. It was not possible that it would refer to other than him for it would not then be Zachariah's prophethood but a new position or a new prophethood.

In fact the initiative look at the matter determines that it is impossible for prophethood and knowledge to transfer with no need for prospect or lengthy discussion on the matter. Reason decides easily that wealth is the only thing that transfers by bequeathing and not prophethood and knowledge.

3. Someone might object that the interpretation of inheritance in Zachariah's speech might not refer to wealth because Yahya (Prophet John) was martyred during his father's life and did not inherit his father's wealth. So it must be interpreted to refer to prophethood because Yahya inherited the prophethood and that Allah responded to the prayer of his father then. But this objection should not have to concern one interpretation rather than the other because as Yahya did not inherit his father's wealth, neither did he succeed him in prophethood. The prophethood of Yahya was not hereditary and it was not the wish of Zachariah. Zachariah asked his God to grant him an heir inheriting him after his death when saying according to the holy Quran: *(And surely I fear my cousins after me)*.^[1] He meant: (after my death). It was clear from his saying that he wanted an heir succeeding him and not a prophet coeval with him otherwise his fear from his cousins after his death would remain. We have to explain the verse in a way free from objection that the phrase *(Who should inherit me and inherit from the children of Yaqoub. 19:6)* was to be an answer for his prayer. His prayer meant: "O my God, grant me a son to inherit me!" So what he asked his God for was realized when he got a son. Bequeathing him wealth or prophethood was not included in what Zachariah asked his God for but it was as a result of what he asked for in his prayer.

If we noticed the story of Zachariah in its other place of the holy Quran, we would find that he did not ask his God but for good offspring. Allah said: *(There did Zachariah pray to his Lord; he said: My Lord! grant me from Thee good offspring. Quran 3:38)*

The best way of understanding the holy Quran is what is explained by the Quran itself.^[2] Hence we

[1] Quran 19:5. Refer to *Tafseer al-Kashshaf*, vol.3 p.4.

[2] *Al-Ittiqan by as-Sayooti*, vol.4 p.200.

understand from the verse that Zachariah did not ask his God but for good offspring. The Quran gathered Zachariah's prayer in one phrase one time and made individual phrases at another time for each of the offspring and his description when saying: (...grant me from Thyself an heir) to show his asking for the offspring and: (... and make him, my Lord, one in whom Thou art well pleased) to show that he prayed Allah that his offspring would be good. If we gathered these two phrases, they would refer to the same meaning of the phrase (*My Lord! grant me from Thee good offspring*). Then the phrase of (*inherit me*) would get out of the prayer after comparing between the two phrases of the Quran. It must be then as the answer of the payer.

4. According to that it was clear that the word of inheritance mentioned in the Quranic verse was burdened with usage to mean inheriting the prophethood because it would be the answer to the prayer if it was inherent in what was asked for (in the prayer) and it would be realized always or more often whenever the required thing was available. But inheriting the prophethood was not inherent in the availability of the offspring at all. In fact it might not happen for hundreds of millions of people because prophethood required no such qualification and great perfection therefore prophethood with its unique loftiness could not be put as an answer for asking Allah for a good offspring because the proportion between the human beings and those, who were well-qualified to undertake the divine mission, was as the proportion between the units and the millions. But as for inheriting wealth, it could be as the answer to Zachariah's prayer because the offspring might live after the father's death at most and so inheriting wealth could be as a result of the availability of the offspring in the most cases. In addition to that, Zachariah himself did not think that prophethood was inherent in his offspring nor any of the spiritual ranks lower than prophethood, therefore he asked his God after that to make his son be content.

5. Let us leave that away to study the subject of the inheritance in the verse. The word (*inherit*) referred to inheriting wealth undoubtedly. What determined this meaning for the word were two things:

The first: If Zachariah had asked his God to grant him a son to inherit his prophethood, he would not have asked Him after that to make his son be content because he had asked in his first prayer for something higher than contentment.

The second: if ignoring the matter of inheritance in the story of Zachariah mentioned in the sura of Aal Imran did not show that inheritance was out of the prayer, it would, at least, show that the meaning of inheritance mentioned in the story in the other place of the Quran referred to the inheritance of wealth and not prophethood because if Zachariah had asked his God for two things; one was to grant him a good content son and the other thing was to make his son inherit his prophethood, the holy Quran would not be limited to the first thing Zachariah had asked for because it had no value in comparison with prophethood. In order to agree with me on this, suppose that someone asked you for a garden and a dirham and you granted him both. When you wanted to relate the story, would you mention the dirham? I do not think you would do that unless you were too humble. The preference of the garden to the dirham in the account of the material values is less than the preference of prophethood to the goodness of the offspring in the account of the spiritual morals. Hence the story of Zachariah mentioned in the sura of Aal Imran, which had nothing much or little about inheritance, was as evidence of that inheritance referring to the inheritance of wealth and not prophethood, otherwise it would be the most important part of the story that would not be ignored.

Sixth: some of the researchers noticed in the holy verse two points interpreting inheritance as the inheritance of prophethood:

The first: Zachariah's saying after (*inherit me*): (*and inherit from the children of Yaqoub*) that Yahya was not to inherit wealth from the offspring of Yaqoub (Jacob) but he might inherit prophethood and wisdom.

The second: what Prophet Zachariah said as a preface for his prayer: (*And surely I fear my cousins after me*) that he feared for religion and wished it to last by the lasting of the prophethood because this was the most suitable for the prophets to fear for and not the properties whether they reached their heirs or not.

Our fellows (the Shia) objected to the first point by saying that Zachariah did not ask God that his son was to inherit all the properties of Yaqoub's offspring but some of them. So this would not be as evidence to their claimed interpretation.

As for the second point, it is an inference confirming the interpretation we chose because fearing for religion and knowledge from the cousins had no meaning because the divine mercy would not leave people in vain without any guide. The religion and the word of Heaven would be protected by Allah and prophethood was always granted to the few highly distinguished people with no any fear for being extorted or

stolen. So what would Zachariah think of his God to do if He did not grant him Yahya? Was it possible that Allah would entrust Zachariah's cousins with the divine mission in spite of that they were not well qualified to undertake this divine task and they did not deserve this honor? Or did he think that Allah would ignore the affairs of His people so that they would have the evidence to protest against Him (on the Day of Punishment)? Neither this nor that would be possible for any prophet to think of. Zachariah was afraid of his cousins to seize his wealth, therefore he asked his God to grant him a contented son in order to inherit his wealth. He would not be blamed for that because he might wish to turn his properties away from his cousins, who would spend them wrongly in the way of sin and corruption as long as they were wicked and immoral until it was said that they were the worst among the Israelites.

Ibn Abul Hadeed (the author of Sharh Nahjul Balagha) tried to show a side of Zachariah's fear for religion in two ways:

The first: according to the beliefs of the Shia when he mentioned that the prophet's fear for religion would not be acceptable in the Shia point of view because people were deprived, by the absence of the Imam,[1] of many mercies related to the legal matters like punishments, Friday prayer and Eids. They (the Shia) said that people were to be blamed for that because they themselves deprived themselves of those mercies. So Zachariah had not to worry about changing the religion and spoiling the legal laws because Allah had to inform of His

[1] The twelfth and final infallible imam, whom the Shia have been expecting to come in order to spread justice all over the world.

mission to the people by the prophet and if the people changed the religion and spoiled the divine verdicts, Allah would not have to keep the religion because people themselves deprived themselves of the mercies.[1]

I would like to record my note about this speech before I move to the second point. I say: the worry about the desistance of prophethood, according to the beliefs of the Shia, would be true if it arose from the possibility of that people might spoil their religion in a way that they would not deserve mercies as it was during the absence of the expected Imam (s) and not because there were no ones well qualified for prophethood when the people were in need of it. In this case sending a prophet or appointing someone replacing him would be necessary for Allah to do because He Himself promised to spread mercy among His people. So the

insufficiency of the cousins to gain the divine position would not lead Zachariah to expect the desistance of prophethood and the effacement of the religious properties if people deserved the divine mercies. And if people did not deserve the divine mercies, it would be possible for the connection between the Heaven and the earth to be cut whether the cousins (of Zachariah) were good or bad and whether Allah granted Zachariah a son or let him remain sterile. The Quranic verse showed that the cause, which made Zachariah worry, was the corruption of his cousins and not the corruption of people.

The second: by interpreting the word (*mawali*)[2] mentioned in the verse to mean emirs. It would

[1] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol.16 p.257.*

[2] *Mawali is the word, which was interpreted as cousins.*

mean that Zachariah feared that the emirs and the rulers after his death might spoil the religion, therefore he asked Allah for a son, who was to be granted prophethood and knowledge in order to preserve the religion.[1]

We are to ask about those rulers, whom Zachariah feared that they might spoil the religion. Were they the prophets, who would succeed him, or the rulers, who had nothing to do with the Heaven? If they were the prophets, so there would be no need for fear because they would have been infallible prophets but if they were the kings, they might have been a threat to religion. But we should notice if the existence of the prophet would prevent them from playing with the Sharia and disrespecting the divine laws or not. If the existence of the prophet would suffice to safeguard the Sharia and keep its dignity, then why did Zachariah fear those emirs whereas the divine mercy promised to keep the continuity of prophethood throughout the human history and to keep the eternality of the connection between the Heaven and the earth as long as the earth would be ready to receive the divine instruction? And if the existence of the prophet was not sufficient to safeguard the religion, so the existence of Zachariah's son, who was to inherit the prophethood, would not remove fearing the rulers as long as the prophet would be unable to stand against the ruling power and as long as the emirs would be of the trickers whereas the verse showed that Zachariah's fear would be removed if he was granted a contented son to inherit him.

The result of this research showed that the inheritance mentioned in the verse referred to the

[1] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol.16 p.257-258.*

inheritance of wealth undoubtedly. It showed that some prophets bequeathed while the tradition of Abu Bakr determined that all the prophets did not bequeath.

The Quranic verse and Abu Bakr's tradition were contradicted and whatever contradicted[1] the holy Quran must be null.

We were not to exclude Zachariah from the rest of the prophets because the tradition of Abu Bakr did not accept such exclusion or differentiate between Zachariah and the others. If prophethood required not bequeathing so all the prophets would not bequeath. We do not think that the prophethood of Zachariah had a special aspect that made him bequeath rather than the rest of the prophets. What was the guilt of Zachariah, or what was his virtue that gave him this excellence? Then why do we have to burden the word (prophets) mentioned in the tradition with more than its actual meaning? In any case it is just an interpretation so why do we interpret the tradition as the Prophet's patrimony was not to be inherited and then to be obliged to say that Prophet Muhammad (s) meant by (the prophets) other than Zachariah? Let us take the other interpretation to understand the tradition as that the prophets had nothing of value to bequeath and so we will keep the truth that the wording of the tradition refers to.

If the tradition actually had the meaning that Abu Bakr intended to show, it would contradict the holy Quran and then it must be brushed aside. The matter had no any way to consider the tradition as

[1] *Prophet Muhammad (s) said: "Whatever contradicts the Book of Allah, you are to brush aside,... or to leave aside..." Refer to Ussool al-Kafi by al-Kulayni, vol.1 p.55 and ar-Radd ala Siyer al-Awza'ei by Yousuf al-Ansari p.25.*

legal evidence about the subject of bequeathing and so the caliph did not have any answer to defend himself against his opponent, who protested with the previous Quranic verse, and no one of his companions succeeded in defending him. It was so because they realized that the tradition, which justified the rulers' situation, contradicted the Quranic verse.

It could not be possible to justify the caliph's situation by saying that he chose one of the contradicted forms of the tradition and carried it out as some Muslim jurists thought, because whatever contradicted the holy Quran would definitely be null.

The Matter of Donation

It was the dispute between the caliph and Fatima (s) when she argued that the Prophet (s) had donated Fadak to her. Imam Ali and Umm Aymen witnessed of that but the caliph refused Fatima's claim[1] and was not satisfied with these two witnesses and asked her to bring two men or a man and two women as witnesses.

1. The first thing that we would blame Abu Bakr for was his situation in this case as a ruler in spite of that his caliphate did not gain the legal quality until that day at least.[2] But now we do not want to study this blame because such argument will take us to wider horizons.

2. The second note about the subject is that if Fadak was with Fatima, then she would not have to have any evidence. There were two things about this

[1] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha*, vol.16 p.216.

[2] *After ten days of the caliphate that yet the Hashimites and some of the great companions did not pay homage to Abu Bakr to be the legal caliph. Refer to at-Tabari's Tareekh*, vol.2 p.233.

note:

First: in whose possession Fadak was? Was it really in Fatima's possession? We could understand that from the letter of Imam Ali to Othman bin Hunayf: "Yes, Fadak (only) was in our possession away from all what were under the heaven but some *people* became stingy with it and others turned away from it".[1] This means that Fadak was in the Prophet's family's possession. This was confirmed by the traditions of the Shia.

The meaning of Imam Ali's speech showed that Fadak was in Imam Ali and Fatima's possession and it could not be interpreted as it was in the Prophet's possession; first because the Prophet's possession meant the Prophet's family's possession and second because the Prophet had his own properties other than Fadak.

Second: was possession as evidence of ownership? Yes, the Muslims agreed on this unanimously.[2] If it was not so, the social system of the human life would be disordered.

Someone might object by saying that if Fadak was in Fatima's possession, so why she did not protest with this evidence. It would suffice for her than to claim it was donated to her and to protest with the Quranic verses of the inheritance. In the documents of the Shia about this case there was an answer to this objection for they mentioned the protest of

the Prophet's family against the caliph by means of the very evidence but we did not want to

[1] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha*, vol.16 p.208.

[2] Refer to *al-Qawa'id al-Fiqhiyya* by Hassan al-Bajnawardi, vol.1 p.113, *al-Muhalla* by ibn Hazm, vol.9 p.436, *al-Muhaththab* by ash-Shirazi ash-Safi'ee, vol.2 p.312, *al-Furooq* by al-Qirafi al-Maliki, vol.4 p.78 and *Tahreer al-Majalla* by sheikh Muammad Hussayn Kashif al-Ghita', vol.4 p.150.

study the case in the light of something of that.

But we should notice that Fadak was a very wide land and was not like small properties, whose possession would be known easily. If we supposed that Fadak was in Fatima's possession and it was undertaken by her agent, who managed it, so who would know this other than the agent?

We knew well that Fadak was not near Medina so that the people of Medina would know about its affairs or the person, who managed it. It was at a distance of some days from Medina and it was a Jewish village. [1] It was not in the Islamic environment to be known among the Muslims that it was in Fatima's possession.

Fatima thought if she claimed her possession of Fadak that the caliph would ask her for evidence as he asked her about the donation as long as he-in her opinion-was controlled by a prevailing power of his tendency that did not make him confess anything.

It was easy for the (whale) on that day to swallow Fatima's agent of Fadak and anyone else, who knew the truth, as it swallowed Abu Sa'eed al-Khidri and prevented him from telling the truth of the donation of Fadak whereas he told of it after that as it was mentioned in the Sunni and Shia books, or it was easy for the jinn to kill as they killed Sa'd bin Obada and relieved the caliph Omar[2] from him, or to accuse anyone of being apostate if he refused to give the zakat to the caliph as those, who refused to give the zakat of the Muslims to the

[1] Refer to *Futooh al-Buldan* by al-Balathari, p.42-43.

[2] The tradition showed clearly that Omar sent a messenger to kill Sa'd if he did not pay homage (to Omar) and when Sa'd refused to pay homage, the messenger killed him. (They claimed that the jinn had killed him). Refer to *al-Iqd al-Fareed* by ibn Abd Rabbih, vol.4 p.247.

caliph Abu Bakr, were accused.[1]

3. Let us leave this argument aside to get to the basic matter, which is: did Abu Bakr believe in the infallibility of Fatima and the verse of purification, which purified the Prophet's family, among which was Fatima, from any sin or not?

We do not want to discuss in details the concept of infallibility or to prove it for Fatima by the verse of purification because the books of the Shia about the virtues of the Prophet's family suffice the task. We do not doubt that the caliph was aware of that because his daughter Aa'isha herself often narrated that the verse of purification concerned Fatima, her husband and her two sons[2] as it was declared by the Sunni and Shia books of Hadith. Whenever the Prophet (s) went to the mosque to offer the Fajr[3] prayer, after the revelation of this verse, he passed by Fatima's house and called out: "O people of the house, it is the (time for) prayer. (*Allah only desires to keep away the uncleanness from you, O people of the House! and to purify you a (thorough) purifying.* Quran 33:33)" He kept on that for six months.[4]

So why did Abu Bakr ask Fatima for evidence? Did the claim, whose truthfulness was certified, need evidence?

Those, who objected to Abu Bakr, said: "Evidence is needed to confirm the truthfulness of the claimant, but being certain (of the claimant's truthfulness) is firmer (than the evidence). If it is necessary to judge for the one, who has true

[1] As in the story of Malik bin Nuwayra. Refer to at-Tabari's *Tareekh*, vol.2 p.273 and the edited one, vol.2 p.28.

[2] *Muslim's Sahih*, vol.3 p.331, *al-Mustadrak*, vol.3 p.159 and *at-Taj aj-Jami' lil Ussool* by Mansoor Ali Nassif, vol.3 p.333.

[3] *The dawn*.

[4] *Ahmad's Musnad*, vol.3 p.295, *al-Mustadrak*, vol.3 p.172.

evidence, it must be judged for the one, whose truthfulness is known by the judge."

There is a weakness in this justification because the comparison did not occur between the evidence and the certainty of the judge in addition to the actual reality, but it considered the effect of each of them on the judge and the result was that knowledge was to be firmer than the evidence because certainty was firmer than supposition. The comparison had to regard the nearest of the two to the truth that was to be regarded in every dispute. The knowledge of the judge, in this kind of comparison, was not to be preferred to the evidence because a judge might mistake as

evidence might mistake. Both of them were equal in the regard of falling into error.

But there was something in the matter that the researchers ignored. It was impossible for the caliph's knowledge about Fatima's truthfulness[1] to be but the truth because the reason behind his knowledge of her truthfulness was not of those reasons that might lead to errors or mistakes but it was the holy Quran, which declared her infallibility.[2] In the light of this quality of knowing Fatima's truthfulness, we could determine that the evidence, even if it was the legal proof, on which the judgment would depend, might fall into error. But the knowledge that could never fall into error, because of the witness of Allah, was worthier to be relied on when judging.

[1] Refer to Abu Bakr's saying about the truthfulness of Fatima in *Sharh Nahjul Balagha*, vol.16 p.216.

[2] As in the verse: (Allah only desires to keep away the uncleanness from you, O people of the House! and to purify you a (thorough) purifying) 33:33. Refer to *al-Mustadrak*, vol.3 p.160-161 and *Muslim's Sahih*, vol.5 p.37.

In another way we say: if the holy Quran had declared Fatima's ownership of Fadak, then the matter would not have had any way of doubting or hesitating for any Muslim to judge. It was much clear that declaring the infallibility of Fatima by the holy Quran would strongly confirm her claim about her donation because the infallible would never lie and whenever claiming, the claim was definitely true. There would be no difference between determining the infallibility and determining the donation as related to the case, except that the ownership of Fadak by Fatima (s) was the literary meaning of the second text (the tradition) and the perceived concept of the first text (the verse) via its literary conception.

4. None Of the Muslims ever doubted about Fatima's truthfulness and no one ever accused her of fabricating but the dispute arose between the disputers that whether knowing the truthfulness of the claim would be sufficient evidence for judgment or not. Let us put the verse of purification aside for a moment and suppose that Abu Bakr was like anyone of the other Muslims and then his knowledge of Fatima's truthfulness did not have the quality we referred to in the previous point but it was as the rest of thoughts, which would be liable to errors and mistakes.

But nevertheless the ruler might judge according to his knowledge[1] or he might depend on the evidence as it was mentioned in the holy Quran. Allah said:(..and that when you judge between people you judge

with justice. 4:58) and:(And of those whom We have created are a people who guide with the truth and

[1] *l-Bayhaqi's Sunan, vol.10 p.142, Tanqeeh al-Adilleh by Muhammad Reza al-Ha'iri and Bidayet al-Mujtahid by ibn Rushd, vol.2 p.465.*

thereby they do justice. 7:181), which means that they judge with justice.

There are two notes about truth and justice:

First: truth and justice as an actual and real matter.

Second: truth and justice according to the judicial criteria. So judgment according to the evidence is right and just in the light of this note even if it fails in error. In opposition to that, judgment according to the witness of a sinner (*fasiq*) is neither right nor just even if the sinner is truthful in his saying.

If the two previous verses referred to the first meaning of truth and justice then they would show that judgment according to the actual reality was to be true with no need to the evidence. If the ruler found someone's ownership of a certain property, he could judge of that because he thought it was the fixed truth according to the actual reality. His judgment for that person of being the owner of that property would be the confirmation-in his opinion-of judgment with truth and justice that Allah had ordered to be followed. But if we interpreted the two verses according to the second meaning that was according to the judicial criteria hence the two verses could not be of any use in this concern because they did not prove-then-that any judgment would be right and according to the criteria! And which judgment would be but so?

It was clear that the concept understood from the verses referred to the first meaning and specially the word *truth* because whatever was described by this word would be understood that that thing was a fixed true matter. So to judge with truth was as determining a fixed fact. The form of the first verse showed that. It included judgment with justice. It was clear that the application of the Islamic rules in the case of a dispute would not need a legal order because their very legislation as law for judgment meant that they must be applied. And so the order of keeping to the law would not be but to remind and to warn and had nothing to do with the essence of the matter. The order of judging according to the actual facts, whether they had evidence and witness or not, was a part of the essence of the matter because it was a new determination showing that the reality was the basis of the Islamic judgment and the axis,

around which it should turn without being limited to formalities and special evidences.[1]

Then the two verses were considered as evidence of respecting the judge's knowledge in the Islamic judicial laws.[2]

[1] If we want to translate this meaning into the scientific language we say: according to the second account the order is a guiding order (optional) and there is no possibility for the obligatory order because the thing ordered to be followed is itself enough to be an incentive to acting. Regarding the order as obligatory determines to turn the word (justice) to the second meaning because there is a possibility for the order to be obligatory by following the reality if the evidence confirms it and a possibility of following the order at all.

I apologize for not using the scientific idioms concerning logic, philosophy, jurisprudence and fundamentals of Islam unless I am obliged to do that because I try to make the research be understood by the ordinary readers.

[2] If it was said that the tradition narrated by the Prophet's family about that, who judged with truth and he did not know the real judgement that he would deserve punishment and then it showed that judgement did not rely on the actual reality. Hence the matter would turn between casting the tradition away from showing not executing the judgement and considering the punishment to be unjustified and between considering the two verses to refer to the second meaning. I would say: no one of these two interpretations was true but the tradition kept to the verses in regard to the judge's knowledge. And so the subject of the judgement would be combined of the actual reality and the knowledge of it or in other

In addition to that Abu Bakr himself often was satisfied with claims without any evidence. It was mentioned in al-Bukhari's Sahih[1] that when the Prophet (s) died, Abu Bakr received a sum of money from al-Ala' bin al-Hadhrami. Abu Bakr announced: "Whoever the Prophet (s) was in debt for or that the Prophet had promised a gift, let him come to us". Jabir said: "The Prophet had promised to give me so and so and so..." He extended his hand three times. Jabir said: "He (Abu Bakr) put in my hand five hundred (either dirham or dinar) then five hundred then five hundred".

It was mentioned in at-Tabaqat al-Kubra by ibn Sa'd[2] that Abu Sa'eed al-Khidry had said: "I heard the caller of Abu Bakr, when he received a sum of money from Bahrain calling in Medina: "Let whoever the Prophet (s) had promised to gift, come to us". Many men came to him and he gave them money. Abu Basheer al-Maziny came to Abu Bakr

and said: “The Prophet (s) said to me: O Abu Basheer, come to us if we get something (of money)”. Abu Bakr gave him two or three handfuls. After counting them they found that they were one thousand and four hundred dirhams”.

If Abu Bakr did not ask anyone of the companions about any evidence so why did he ask Fatima for evidence regarding her gift?

Did the judicial system apply to Fatima alone or were there special political circumstances behind all that?

It was really odd to accept a companion’s claim of being promised by the Prophet (s) to be given a sum of money and to deny the claim of Fatima, the

words it would be the result of the actual reality.

[1] Vol.2 p.953.

[2] vol.2 p.318.

Prophet’s daughter, just because she did not find evidence to prove what she claimed.

And if knowing the truthfulness of the claimant permitted to give him what he claimed, was not Fatima more deserving of not being suspected by he, who did not suspect Jabir or Abu Basheer of lying?

If the caliph did not give those, who claimed that the Prophet had promised them of what they asked for according to their claim but according to the possibility of their truthfulness-and the imam had the right to give anyone any sum-then why would not he do the same with the case of Fadak?

Thus the caliph fulfilled the Prophet’s promises, which had no evidence, and ignored his (the Prophet’s) donation to his daughter, the head of the women of the world. The question about the difference between the debts and promises on one hand and the donation on the other remained without an acceptable answer!

5. Let us resume our argument in a new way: that the ruler could not judge the claim that he already knew its truthfulness if the claimant could not find any evidence proving his claim and let us for now ignore the result we got in the previous point to ask according to this account:

First: What prevented Abu Bakr from witnessing to the donation of Fadak if he had known the truthfulness of Fatima (s)? He could join his witness to Imam Ali’s witness[1] and so the evidence would be sufficient and the right would be fixed. And since he himself was the judge, it would not annul his witness because the witness of the judge[2]

[1] *So that the witness would be of two men, which was the legal condition for the witness to be accepted.*

[2] *The witness of the judge is permissible. Refer to al-Bayhaqi's Sunan, vol.10 p.131.*

was to be taken into account and it was not irrelevant to the legal evidence, which would be the reference in the disputes.

Second: about the acceptable interpretation showing that the caliph ignored the reality that was well known for him. In order to explain this point, we had to differentiate between two things that confused the researchers, who studied the case.

One: it was to judge for the claimant what she claimed.

The other: it was to carry out the effects of the actual reality.

If we supposed that the first was limited to the evidence, the other would be obligatory because it was not a judgment to be bound to its limits. If someone knew that his house belonged to another and he handed it over to him, this would not be a confession of his ownership but it would be carrying out the judgments determined by the law. Also if someone claimed before the judge that the house, which was in his possession, was his own then the judge and anyone of the Muslims had to consider that house as any of the other properties of that claimant. This did not mean that the judge judged that the house was the claimant's property according to the principle of the possession of the hand[1] or being under one's control. The Muslims got themselves to follow this judgment. In fact even if there was no judge among them, they must keep to that. Neither the controlling of a property nor the possession of the hand were among the criteria of judgment in the Sharia but they made it necessary to apply the judgments of the actual reality.

[1] *The principle of the hand means proving the ownership by the hand, which means the full control over that certain property.*

The difference between the judgment of the judge about someone's ownership, or his sinfulness or any of the other affairs, which the judge's authority held, and between the application of the effects of these matters was that judgment decided the dispute that was to be considered as an excellence of the judgment. It meant that if the judge pronounced a judgment, it would be prohibited for all the Muslims to annul it and it

would be obeyed without looking for any other excuse but to the very judgment.

But as for the judge's application of the effects of the ownership without judgment, would not have that regard and not every Muslim had to follow it and to carry out those effects except if he (any Muslim) got the knowledge of that as what the judge got.

The result: if the caliph knew of Fatima's ownership of Fadak, it would be compulsory for him not to make use of it in any way she disliked and he was not to extort it from her whether it was permissible for him to judge according to his knowledge or not. There was no any other disputer in the case, who would dispute Fatima about Fadak, in order to be asked to swear and then he would deserve it if he swore because the property that Fatima asked for was either hers or the Muslims'.

We assume that Abu Bakr was the legal caliph of the Muslims at that time; therefore he would be their guardian, who was to be responsible to guard their rights and properties. If Fatima was truthful according to his opinion and there was no one to litigate her, then the caliph had no right to extort Fadak from her. Deciding the case according to the evidence only prohibited the judgment and would not permit seizing the property from its owner.

Then the impermissibility of a judgment decided by a judge according to his own knowledge[1] would not commute the punishment and would not take the caliph out of the test successfully.

[1] Refer to *al-Bayhaqi's Sunan*, vol.10 p.143-144.

Reference Books

A'lam an-Nissa' by Omar Reza Kahala, ar-Rissala Establishment-Beirut, tenth edition 1412 AH.

Ad-Durr al-Manthoor fit-Tafseer bil-Ma'thoor by Jalaluddeen as-Sayooti, al-Maymaniyya Press-Egypt 1314 AH.

Al-Bidayeh wen Nihayeh by Isma'eel bin Katheer ad-Damashqi, Dar Sadir-Beirut.

Al-Imama wes-Siyassa by Ibn Qutayba Abdullah bin Muslim Abu Muhammad ad-Daynouri, last edition-Cairo-Mustafa al-Babi al-Halabi Press 1969 A.D.

Al-Iqd al-Fareed by ibn Abd Rabbih al-Andalussi, Dar al-Hilal Library, first edition 1986.

Al-Itqan fee Oloom al-Quran by Jalaluddeen as-Sayooti, edited by Dr. Muhammad Abul Fadhl Ibrahim, the general Egyptian institution of books 1975 A.D.

Al-Kamil fit-Tareekh by ibnul Atheer, Dar Sadir-Beirut 1399 AH.

Al-Kashshaf by Jarullah Mahmood az-Zamakhshari, checked by Mustafa Hussayn, Dar al-Kitab al-Arabi, second edition-Beirut.

Al-Manaqib by Ahmad bin Muhammad al-Makki al-Khawarizmi, edited by al-Mahmoodi, Qum.

Al-Milel wen Nihel by Abul Fat~h Muhammad bin Abdul Kareem ash-Shahristani, Anglo-Egyptian Library-Cairo.

Al-Missbah al-Muneer by al-Fayyoomi, Darul Hijra-Qum.

Al-Muraja'at by Abdul Hussayn Sharafuddeen, edited by Hussayn ar-Radhy, Islamic Book House.

Al-Mustadrak alas-Sahihayn by al-Hakim an-Nayssaboori, edited by Mustafa Abdul Qadir Ata, the Scientific Books House, first edition-Beirut.

As-Saqeefa wel Khilafa by Abdul Fattah Abdul Maqsood, Dar Ghareeb-Cairo.

As-Sawa'qul Muhriqa by Ahmad bin Hajar al-Haytami, al-Qahira Library, second edition 1385 AH and a new edition-Beirut.

As-Seera al-Halabiyya by Ali bin Burhanuddeen al-Halabi ash-Shafi'e, Islamic Library-Beirut.

As-Seera an-Nabawiya by ibn Hisham, edited by Mustafa as-Saqqa and others, Dar al-Kunooz al-Adabiyya and Dar Ihya'uat-Turath al-Arabi-Beirut.

As-Sunan al-Kubra by Abu Bakr Ahmad bin al-Hussayn bin Ali al-Bayhaqi, Dar al-Fikr.

At-Tabaqat al-Kubra by Muhammad bin Sa'd, Dar Beirut 1985 A.D. and Dar Sadir.

At-Tafseer al-Kabeer by Imam Fakhruddeen ar-Razi, the Scientific Books House-Tehran, third edition.

At-Taj aj-Jami' lil Osool fee Ahadeeth ar-Rassool by sheikh Mansoor Ali Nassif, one of al-Azhar's ulama, Dar Ihya' at-Turath al-Arabi, third edition-Istanbul 1962.

Balaghat an-Nissa' by Abul Fadhl Ahmad bin Abu Tahir Tayfoor, ash-Shareef ar-Radhiy Publications-Qum-Iran.

Futooh al-Buldan by Ahmad bin Yahya bin Jabir al-Balathari, with comment and review of Razwan Muhammad Razwan, the Scientific Books House-Beirut 1978.

Hilyatul Awliya' by Abu Na'eem al-Isfahani, the Arabic Book House, fifth edition-Beirut 1407 AH.

Kifayatut Talib by Muhammad bin Yousuf al-Kanji ash-Shafi'e, Dar Ihya' Turath Ahlul Bayt-Tehran 1404 AH.

Ma'arijul Osool by al-Muhaqqiq al-Hilli, Aalul Bayt Establishment-Qum.

Mu'jamul Buldan by Yaqoot al-Hamawi, Dar Ihya'ut Turath-Beirut 1399 AH.

Mukhtassar Tareekh ibn Assakir by ibn Mandhooz al-Afreeqi (the author of *Lissanul Arab*), edited by Ibrahim Salih, Dar al-Fikr-Damascus 1989.

Murooj ath-Thahab by al-Mass'oodi, edited by Abdul Ameer Muhanna, al-A'lami Establishment-Beirut and also the one edited by Charles Bla-Beirut 1970.

Musnad of Imam Ahmad bin Hanbal Dar Sadir-Beirut and Dar al-Fikr's edition.

Osool al-Kafi by Abu Ja'far Muhammad bin Ya'qoob al-Kulayni ar-Razi, edited by sheikh al-Aamuli, the Islamic Library-the Islamic Press 1388 AH.

Sahih al-Bukhari by Muhammad bin Isma'eel al-Bukhari, Dar at-Tiba'a al-Aamira-Istanbul 1315 AH and Dar al-Qalam, first edition-Beirut 1987 A.D.

Sahih at-Tarmithi by Abu Eessa Ali bin Eessa at-Tarmithi, edited by Kamal al-Hoot, Dar al-Fikr-Beirut and Dar Ihya'ut Turath al-Arabi-Beirut.

Sahih Muslim by Muslim bin al-Hussayn al-Qushayri, edited by Muhammad Fu'ad Abdul Baqi, Dar Ihya'ut Turath al-Arabi-second edition 1978.

Sahih Sunan al-Mustafa (Sunan Abu Dawood) by Abu Dawood, Dar al-Kitab al-Arabi-Beirut.

Sharh Nahjul Balagha by ibn Abul Hadeed al-Mu'tazili, an edition edited by Muhammad Abul Fadhl Ibrahim, Dar Ihya' al-Kutub al-Arabiyya-Egypt and an old edition, not edited.

Sunan ad-Darimi by Abu Muhammad Abdullah bin Abdur Rahman bin Bihram ad-Darimi, Dar al-Fikr-Cairo 1398 AH.

Sunan ibn Maja by al-Qazweeni, edited by Muhammad Fu'ad Abdul Baqi, Dar al-Fikr-Beirut.

Tareekh al-Khulafa' by Jalaluddeen as-Sayooti, edited by Muhammad Muhyiddeen Abdul Hameed, as-Shareef ar-Radhiy Publications-Qum.

Tareekh at-Tabari by Abu Ja'far Muhammad bin Jareer at-Tabari:

a. the edition edited by Muhammad Abul Fadhl, Dar at-Turath-Beirut.

b. the first edition, al-Hussayniyya Press-Egypt.

c. the edition of al-Istiqa Press-Cairo 1357 AH.

d. the second edition of the Scientific Books House-Beirut 1408 AH.

Tareekh Baghdad by al-Khateeb al-Baghdadi, the Scientific Books House.

Tareekh ibn Shuhna (in the margins of *Tareekh al-Kamil*) an old edition.

Tathkiratul Khawass by Sibt ibn aj-Jawzi, Ninawa New Libray-Tehran.

Thakha'rul Oqba by Muhibbuddeen at-Tabari, Dar al-Ma'rifa-Beirut.

From the same author on Feedbooks

THE REVEALER THE MESSENGER THE MESSAGE (2012)

Belief in God, His existence, and His attributes. Belief in the Messenger Prophet Muhammad (s) and in prophethood. Belief in the message Islam.

ISLAMICMOBILITY.COM

Al-islam.org

Translated by Dr. Mahmoud M. Ayoub

Published by: World Organization for Islamic Services P.O Box No
22445 Tehran - Iran

First Edition 1980/1400

ISLAMICMOBILITY.COM
IN THE AGE OF INFORMATION
IGNORANCE IS A CHOICE

*"Wisdom is the lost property of the Believer,
let him claim it wherever he finds it"*

Imam Ali (as)