



# SHĪ<sup>ʿ</sup>AH AND THE FALL OF BAGHDAD

by:

ʿAbd Allāh al-Wībārī

[WWW.MAHAJJAH.COM](http://WWW.MAHAJJAH.COM)

© Maḥajjah Research Institute

All Rights Reserved.

No part of this book may be reproduced, photocopied, or printed without written permission from the Maḥajjah Research Institute.

Title: Shī'ah And The Fall Of Baghdad

Author: 'Abd Allāh al-Wībārī

First published: August 2022

Website: [www.mahajjah.com](http://www.mahajjah.com)

Contact: [info@mahajjah.com](mailto:info@mahajjah.com)

## Contents

<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Chapter One - The catastrophe of Baghdad and the collapse of the khilāfah</b>	<b>5</b>
A few examples of such poetry	8
1. Attack on Dīn	11
2. Execution of the Khalīfah (and the disgrace that came with it)	12
3. The wife and children of the Khalīfah	19
4. What happened to the Abbasids in Baghdad?	20
5. What happened to the Elders of Baghdad?	22
6. What happened to the general masses of Baghdad?	24
7. Elimination of Books	31
<b>Chapter Two - Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī and Ibn al-‘Alqamī</b>	<b>33</b>
1. Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī	33
His status in the eyes of Halaku	34
The Creed of al-Ṭūsī	36
The status of al-Ṭūsī amongst the Shī‘ah	38
2. Muḥammad ibn al-‘Alqamī	41
The status of Ibn al-‘Alqamī in the eyes of the Khalīfah	42
The Creed of Ibn ‘Alqamī	44
Shī‘ah adoration for him	45
Relationship between al-Ṭūsī and Ibn al-‘Alqamī	46
The Shī‘ī Creed	49
<b>Chapter Three</b>	<b>51</b>
Introduction	51
Inception of the Shī‘ī Creed	51

Beliefs of the Shī'ah regarding the Ahl al-Sunnah and others	51
Who are the al-Nawāsib according to the terminology of the Shī'ah?	53
If according to them, Naṣb isn't having enmity for 'Alī <small>عليه السلام</small> , then what is it?	56
Who are the 'Āmmah according to the terminology of the Shī'ah?	57
Who are the Mukhālif according to the terminology of the Shī'ah?	58
1. The one who rejects the authority of the Twelve Imāms is a disbeliever	60
2. Permissibility of shedding the blood of Ahl al-Sunnah	70
3. Permissibility to usurp the wealth of Ahl al-Sunnah	75
4. Impurity of Ahl al-Sunnah according to the Shī'ah	76
5. Their ruling with regards to living under the rule of Ahl al-Sunnah	81
'Alī ibn Yaqṭīn	89
6. The Shī'ah belief of Taqiyyah and the aspect of concealing their beliefs	92
Taqiyyah of the Shī'ah	96
Ruling regarding Taqiyyah with the Ahl al-Sunnah	106
Taqiyyah is so ingrained withing them that they utilise it among themselves also	110
<b>Chapter 4 - The accusations against al-Ṭūsī and Ibn al-'Alqamī</b>	<b>113</b>
Accusations against al-Ṭūsī	113
1. His treachery of the Ismā'īliyyah	113
2. His role in the instigation of the war of Iraq and Baghdad	118
3. His facilitating the massacre of the Khalīfah in the presence of Halaku	126
The libraries of Baghdad	131

The accusations against al-‘Alqamī	137
The accusation against him of treachery	137
What supports the affiliation of Wazīr to the Mongols	145
Reason for this treachery	147
The accusations against al-‘Alqamī	153
1. He reduced the army of Baghdad	153
2. He tricked the Khalīfah into coming out to Halaku with the seniors of the state so he could assassinate them	164
<b>Chapter Five - The stance of the remaining Shīī scholars</b>	<b>169</b>
The First Delegation	173
The Second Delegation	176
The Third Delegation	178
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>193</b>

## Transliteration key

أ - 'ā	ض - ḍ
آ - ā	ط - ṭ
ب - b	ظ - ṣ
ت - t	ع - 'a
ث - th	غ - gh
ج - j	ف - f
ح - ḥ	ق - q
خ - kh	ك - k
د - d	ل - l
ذ - dh	م - m
ر - r	ن - n
ز - z	و - w, ū
س - s	ه - h
ش - sh	ي - y, ī
ص - ṣ	

## Introduction

In the Name of Allah, the Most Compassionate, the Most Merciful

All praises are due to Allah, the Alternator of the night and day, the One who alternates the times, and the One who crushes empires. May salutations and peace be on His choicest, selected, and chosen creation, upon his family and Companions, and upon all those who are on his path till the Day of Judgment.

After praise and salutations:

Certainly, scholars, thinkers, and leaders have devoted themselves circumstantially to the study of history and its incidents, and their devotion was not a mere pastime which yielded no benefit but rather became a means of realising the importance of history.

It is said:

*Study history as there are lessons in it.*

*Many a nation went astray due to not having knowledge.*

So, as it appears, history is definitely a study everyone can benefit from but more importantly, it sheds light on the current situation and provides a significant idea of what may occur in the future.

Therefore, from this point, with the permission of Allah, we will begin to study an important incident from the incidents of Islamic history: the fall of Baghdad at the hands of the Mongols.

Certainly, the reasons of this dreadful collapse are diverse and many of which require an intensive study to gain historical benefit. In this

discussion, however, I would like to present one reason from the many reasons and it is:

Two individuals played an undeniable role in this catastrophe and they were Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī—the minister of Halaku (ruler of Baghdad)—and Muḥammad ibn al-‘Alqamī—the minister of the Khalīfah. Not to mention the influence of their creed, the Ithnā ‘Asharī Shīī creed, and its role in this catastrophe. The astonishing thing was that the ministers of the two fighting countries were of a single religion even though the religions of both the countries differed from that of the ministers. The Mongols were idolaters whereas the ruler of the Islamic empire was a Sunnī Muslim.

As for the reason prompting me to write this treatise, the Shīī government has adopted a new methodology in Iran after the Khomeini Revolution, giving rise to great hostility towards the Ahl al-Sunnah. This led to what was termed as “exporting of the revolution.” However, after it failed in changing the demographics in the Arab world, in particular the Arab states of the Persian Gulf, they changed their policies, consciously working for political change, their “Secret Plan” as they call it. They are well aware that this plan will never become apparent in an official capacity, but the political landscape today attests to this change. We find the Shīī opposition in the Gulf states—for example—making deals with those very countries they were opposed to, attending their meetings and appearing alongside each other in the papers, demonstrating eagerness for patriotic unity, freedom, etc. We are more eager than them for unity and hope they are truthful; however, lessons from our history and the fundamentals tenets of the Shīī creed force us and our leaders to remain apprehensive.



It is for these reasons that I felt it necessary to elaborate on this incident and the role of these two individuals in it, and their link to the fundamental tenets of the Shī'ah, hoping it be a means of guidance for the general masses and those in authority.

I begin, seeking help from Allah.



## Chapter One

### The catastrophe of Baghdad and the collapse of the khilāfah

The collapse of Baghdad into the hands of the Mongols was not just the collapse of a great city or the collapse of a capital of a country, rather it was the collapse of that symbolic sign which as long as it remained acted as a means of honour for Muslims and a sanctuary for the exiled and the displaced. It was the centre of diplomatic, intellectual, and cultural exposure so its collapse was the collapse of the authority from which many religious leaders of the Islamic world would take their decisions from even in its times of weakness. And that was due to its religious and spiritual status. Even though the Abbasid khilāfah had for some time lost control over the regions under its dominion, the name of the khalīfah would still be taken before that of the governor in the Friday sermon, in those regions that did not openly distance themselves from their rule.

The collapse of Baghdad became an influencing factor in the diplomatic, intellectual, and religious aspects in the life of Muslims, especially the collapse of khilāfah despite its frail form, which gave the Muslims a sense of unity in thinking and religion.

The collapse of Baghdad lists amongst the most catastrophic events that one can read about, and history fails in presenting examples similar to it. Historians and scholars who waded painfully through these tragic events, give us the clearest explanation of the tragedy that unfolded.

Taqī al-Dīn al-Subkī mentions:

سنة ست وخمسين وستمائة وهي السنة المصيبة بأعظم المصائب المحيطة بما فعلت من المعائب المقتحمة أعظم الجرائم الواثبة على أقبح العظام الفاعلة بالمسلمين كل قبيح وعار النازلة عليهم بالكفار المسمين بالتتار ولا بأس بشرح واقعة التتار على الاختصار و حكاية كائنة بغداد لتعتبر بها البصائر وتشخص عندها الأبصار ويُجري المسلمين على ممر الزمان دموعهم دما و ليديري المؤرخين بأنهم ما سمعوا بمثلها واقعة جعلت السماء أضا و الأض سماء

... the year 656 was a year afflicted with the greatest tribulations, filled with vice and the worst of crimes being perpetrated upon the most infamous of the powerful, treating of Muslims in every evil and disgraceful manner, and the decent of disbelievers upon them called the Tartars. There is no harm in a briefly touching upon the Tartars incident, and the report of what Baghdād used to be, so that a deep understanding be achieved and a picture be portrayed. Muslims have shed tears of blood over the passing of time and historians know for a fact that they have not come across anything of a similar nature which caused such anarchy as if the world was turned upside down.<sup>1</sup>

He also mentioned:

ثم دخلت سنة ست وخمسين وستمائة ذات الداهية الدهياء و المصيبة الصماء

Then dawned the year 656, the year of the severe catastrophe and the huge trial.<sup>2</sup>

---

1 *Al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā*, 8/261.

2 *Ibid.*, 8/269.

Ibn Kathīr mentioned:

ما وقع من الأمر الفظيع الذي لم يؤرخ أبشع منه منذ بنيت بغداد

There has not been a more heinous crime documented more dreadful than it since the establishment of Baghdād.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Yunīnī mentions:

وما دهى الإسلام بداهية اعظم من هذه الداهية ولا أفضع

Islam has not been afflicted with a catastrophe greater and more repulsive than it.<sup>2</sup>

Poets have also competed in depicting the disaster, and why should they not when they were the most affected, to the extent that Muḥammad al-Tūnjī says:

فلا عجب إذا رأينا الشعراء و الأدباء يولون بغداد بعظيم عواطفهم  
وتقديرهم اكثر من غيرها بل كانت عاطفة الشعراء في رثائها أعمق من  
عاطفتهم حين انتصر المسلمين في عين جالوت بعد سنتين

It is not strange to witness extreme attachment and reverence being expressed for Baghdād by poets and intellectuals. In fact, the attachment of the poets in their poetic renditions is more profound than their attachment when the Muslims were victorious in ‘Ain Jalūt 2 years later.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 *Al-Bidayāh wa al-Nihāyah*, 13/214.

2 *Dhayl Mir'āt al-Zamān*, 1/85.

3 *Bilād al-Shām Ibān al-Ghazw al-Mughūlī*, pg. 112.

## A few examples of such poetry

Ibn Futī has mentioned in *al-Hawādith al-Jāmi‘ah*:

ولقد قال الشعراء في واقعة بغداد أشعاراً كثيرة منها ما قاله شمس الدين  
محمد بن عبيد الله الكوفي الواعظ

ولوعة في مجال الصد تعترك      بانو ولي أدمع في الخد تشتبك  
من الورى فاستوى المملوك      يا نكبة ما نجا من صرفها أحد  
والمملك  
أيدي الأعادي فما أبقوا ولا      تمكنت بعدعز من أحبتنا  
تركوا  
بمهجتي وبما أصبحت امتلك      لو أن ما نالهم يفدى فديتهم  
معطلاً ودم الإسلام منسفاً      ربع الهداية أضحى بعد بعدهم  
أين الذين اقتنوا أين الأولى      أين الذين على كل الورى  
ملكوا      حكموا  
عنهم وعمّا حووا فيها وما      وقفت من بعدهم في الدار  
ملكوا      أسألها  
خالي نعم هاهنا كانوا وقد      أجابني الطلل البالي وربعمهم  
هلكوا      ال  
وإنما هي روح الصّب تنسكب      لا تحسبوا الدمع ماء في  
الخدود جرى

Poets have certainly composed much regarding the incident of Baghdād, from among them are the words of the orator Muḥammad ibn ‘Ubayd Allāh al-Kūfī.

*It has become evident that I have tears rolling down my cheek,*

*And the anguish is growing in the wounds of the heart.*

*O the catastrophe from whose adversities none was spared,  
From the human race, which rendered the slave and master  
equal.*

*They seized control after the glory of our beloved ones,  
The hands of the enemies so they did not spare nor did they  
desist.*

*If whatever they obtained could be of any ransom to them.  
Then by my soul and that which it awakens, they have gained  
victory.*

*After their departure the guided ones set out,  
Disbelieving, whilst the blood of Islam is being shed.*

*Where are those who were just to every soul,  
Where are those who procured, where are the former ones who  
ruled.*

*I paused after them in the vicinity asking it,  
Regarding them, that which they accumulated in it and what  
they owned.*

*Abandoned remains and their empty vicinity answered me.  
Yes, they existed here and this is where they were destroyed.  
Don't regard tears to be just water that streamed down the  
cheeks.*

*For it is actually the spirit of the lover pouring out.<sup>1</sup>*

Taqī al-Dīn Ismā'īl ibn Abī al-Yusr mentioned:

---

<sup>1</sup> Al-Hawādith al-jāmi'ah, pg. 363.

لَسائلُ الدمعِ عنِ بغدادِ أخبارِ	فما وقوفك و الأحباب قد
يا زائرين إلى الزوراء لا تغدوا	ساروا
تاج الخلافة والربع الذي	فما بذاك الحمى والدار ديار
شرفت	به العالم قد عفاه اقفار
أضحى يعصف البلى في ربه	وللدموع على الآثار آثار
أثر	
يا نار قلبي نار الحرب و غى	شبت عليه و وافي الربع
	إعصار
علا الصليب على أعلى	وقام بالأمر من يحويه زنار
منابرها	
وكم حريم سبته الترك غاصبة	وكان من دون ذلك الستر نار
وكم بدور على البدرية	ولم يعدلوا لبدور منه أبدار
انخسفت	
وكم ذخائر أضحت وهي	من النهاب وقد حازته كفار
شائعت	
وكم حدود أقيمت من	على الرقاب و حطت فيه أوزار
سيوفهم	
ناديت والسبي هتوك تجزلهم	إلى السفاح من الأعداء دعار

*There is news about Baghdād for the one who asked of the tears.*

*So, why are you stopping whereas the people have moved on.*

*O visitors, do not come here.*

*For there is not any place of sanctuary or a shelter amongst the homes.*

*The crown of the Khilāfah and its inhabitants,*

*Have been completely obliterated by the Earth.*



*The region began violently deteriorating right after,  
And the tradition of tears followed thereafter.  
O the burning desire of my soul, the burning desire to fight,  
Has been rekindled whilst a tornado afflicted the people.  
The cross has been elevated to the highest platform,  
And the one who raised it wears it as a girdle.  
Many sanctums were dishonoured by the Turks upon being usurped,  
And there was excluding this pretext... a fire.  
Many full moons eclipsed while shining,  
And will never return to shine ever again.  
Many treasures appear radiant,  
From the plunderer whereas the disbelievers seized it.  
Many borders were established by their swords,  
Around their necks where the burden has been placed.  
I called out whilst the prisoners were taken to be cut down,  
By the immoral executioner of the enemy.<sup>1</sup>*

## **The Ummah suffered many calamities due to the Collapse of Baghdad**

A few are as follows:

### **1. Attack on Dīn**

The greatest attack a person, country, or nation can be afflicted with is an attack on their religion and its fundamentals. Baghdad suffered a

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibid.

defeat prior to this phenomenon; however, it was a diplomatic military defeat, so it did not affect them from a religious perspective. This time around, Baghdad was overpowered by a group of idolaters.

Al-Subkī mentions regarding it:

هذه بغداد لم تكن دار كفر قط جرى عليها هذا الذي لم يقع منذ قامت  
الدنيا مثله وقتل الخليفة وكان وقع في الدنيا أعظم منه إلا أنه أضيفت له  
هوان الدين والبلاء الذي يختص بل عم سائر المسلمين

Baghdad was never a place of disbelief, never has anything occurred of a similar nature to what occurred there since the creation of the world. As for the murder of the Khalīfah, though in the world worse things occurred, it became the means of the degradation of dīn and the calamities which affected Muslims on the whole.<sup>1</sup>

## **2. Execution of the Khalīfah (and the disgrace that came with it)**

As previously mentioned, the Khalīfah acted as a symbolic figure of religious and diplomatic unity, therefore the Berbers gaining dominance over him shook this lofty position in the Islamic civilization. However, even though the true authority of the Khalīfah had been lost for a while, it was not lost to an enemy from the outside. An outsider gaining authority over the Khalīfah was a defeat for all of the Muslims. Previously, it was a group of Muslims gaining victory over other Muslims but now, the Khalīfah was destroyed entirely, leaving the Muslims without any ruler.

Al-Hamdhāni mentions what happened to the Khalīfah at their hands:

---

1 *Al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā*, 8/262.

وبعد خراب البصرة خرج ومعه أبناؤه الثلاثة وكان ذلك يوم الأحد الرابع من صفر سنة ٦٥٦ وكان معه ثلاثة آلاف من السادات والأئمة والقضاة والأكابر وأعيان المدينة

After the destruction of Baṣrah, he set out with his 3 sons, on Sunday, 4 Ṣafar 656, and accompanying him were chieftains, leaders, judges, notables, and prominent people of the city totalling 3000.<sup>1</sup>

Ibn Kathīr mentions:

وأحضر الخليفة بين يدي هولاء فساله عن أشياء كثيرة فيقال إنه اضطرب كلام الخليفة من هول ما رأى من الإهانة والجبروت

The Khalīfah stood before Halaku, who asked him about many things. It is narrated that the Khalīfah began to stutter as he saw the disgrace and tyranny he was being subjected to.<sup>2</sup>

Al-Subkī mentioned:

فأنزل الخليفة في خيمة

And the Khalīfah was kept in a tent.<sup>3</sup>

Al-Hamdḥānī mentioned:

وفي يوم الجمعة التاسع من صفر دخل هولاء خان المدينة لمشاهدة قصر الخليفة وجلس في الميمنة واحتفل بالأمرء ثم أشار بإحضار الخليفة — ذكر السبكي أنه قيل طلبه ليلاً — وقال له إنك مضيف ونحن

---

1 *Jam' al-Tawārīkh*, pg. 290. And he was a man from the Mongols.

2 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, 13/214.

3 *Al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā*, 8/270.

ضيوف فيها أحضر ما يليق بنا فظن الخليفة أن هذا الكلام على سبيل الحقيقة وكان يرتعد من الخوف وبلغ من دهشته أنه لم يعد يعرف مكان مفاتيح الخزائن فأمر بكسر عدة أقفال وأحضر لهولاكو ألفي ثوب وعشرة آلاف دينار ونفائس مرصعات وعدداً من الجواهر فلم يلتفت هولاءكو خان إليها ومنحها كلها للأمراء والحاضرين ثم قال للخليفة إن الأموال التي تملكها على وجه الأض ظاهرة هي ملك عبيدنا لكن أذكر ما تملكه من الذخائر وما هي وأين توجد فاعترف الخليفة بوجود حوض مملؤ بالذهب في ساحة القصر فحفروا الأرض حتى وجوده كان مليئاً بالذهب الأحمر

And on Friday, 9 Şafar, Halaku Khan entered the city to view the palace of the Khalīfah, he happily sat down and welcomed the leaders. Then he commanded that the Khalīfah be brought—according to al-Subkī, he summoned him at night—and said, “You are the host and we are the guest so why do you not present us with something appropriate?”

Trembling with fear, the Khalīfah was of the impression that he meant what he said, but to his amazement he could not remember where the keys for treasury was, so he commanded that many locks be broken. He then presented to Halaku 2000 sets of clothing, 10 000 gold coins, studded gems, and a number of jewels, but Halaku Khan was not impressed and handed all of it to the leaders and those present.

He then addressed the Khalīfah saying, “The apparent wealth of the world that you possess is wealth fit for our slaves; however, I am referring to the hidden treasure you own, what is it and where is it hidden?”

The Khalīfah then pointed out the well full of gold in the courtyard of the palace, so they dug the ground, and found it filled with red gold.<sup>1</sup>

Hindūshāh al-Nakhjawānī mentions:

ثم وضع أمام المستعصم طبقاً من الذهب وقال ولاكو له كل فأجابه لا  
يؤكل فقال فلم لم تدفع للجند لم تأت لحربي إلى شاطئ جيحون أولم  
لم تسع إلى كسب ودي ... ثم قال له وأين خزائنك الدفينة فأراه حوضاً

Halaku then placed a plate filled with gold in front of Mu‘taṣim and said, “Eat!”

Mu‘taṣim replied, “It cannot be eaten!”

He then said, “So, why did you not give it to the army? Why did you not bring it before the soldiers on the banks of the Amu Darya (river in Asia)? Or why didn’t you send it as a friendly tribute?”

He then said to him, “And where is your hidden treasure?”

So, he showed him the pond...<sup>2</sup>

Al-Hamdhānī mentions:

وقصارى القول أن كل ما كان الخلفاء قد جمعوه خلال خمسة قرون  
وضعه المغول بعضه على بعض فكان كجبل على جبل

In brief, the Mongols piled up whatever the Khulafā’ had gathered in the last 5 centuries, and it resembled a gigantic mountain.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 *Jam‘ al-Tawārīkh*, pg. 291.

2 *Tajārib al-Salaf*, pg. 357, quoting from Bilād al-Shām, pg. 109.

3 *Jāmi‘ al-Tawārīkh*, pg. 292.

Al-Hamdhānī mentions:

وبعد ذلك صدر الأمر بإحصاء نساء الخليفة فعدوا سبعمائة زوجة وسرية وألف خادمة فلما أطلع الخليفة على تعداد نسائه تضرع وقال مَنْ عَلِيٌّ بأهل حرمي اللائي لم تطلع عليهن الشمس و القمر فقال هولاءكو أختر مائة من هذه النساء السبعمائة واترك الباقي فأخرج الخليفة معه مائة امرأة من أقاربه والمحبيات إليه...

Thereafter, they proceeded to count the womenfolk of the Khalīfah and they amounted to 700 wives and slaves, and 1000 servants. When the Khalīfah was informed about the number of his women, he pleaded that the honour of the women of his family be upheld. Halaku commanded, "Choose 100 from your women and leave the rest," so the Khalīfah excluded 100 of his closest family members and loved ones.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Hamdhānī also mentions:

في يوم الأربعاء الرابع عشر من صفر... ثم استدعى الخليفة فأدرك هذا أن أمارات النحس تبدوا على مصيره وخاف خوفاً شديداً وقال للوزير ابن العلقمي ما حيلتنا فأجاب الوزير لحيثنا طويلة... ويئس الخليفة من إنقاذ حياته واستأذن في أن يذهب إلى الحمام ليجدد اغتساله فأمر هولاءكو خان بأن يذهب مع خمسة من المغول ولكن الخليفة قال أنا لا أن أذهب بصحبة خمسة من المغول من الزبانية وكان ينشد بيتين أو ثلاثة من قصيدة هذا مطلعها

و أصبحنا لنا دار كجئات وفردوس

وأمسينا بلا دار كأن لم تغن بالأمس

---

<sup>1</sup> *Jāmi' al-Tawārikh*, pg. 292.

On Wednesday, 14 Safar... the Khalīfah was summoned. Realising that his end was near, he apprehensively said to his Wazīr, Ibn al-‘Alqamī, “What is the way out?”

The Wazīr replied, “Our beards are long.”

The Khalīfah lost hope in his life being spared and requested to visit the bath to renew his Ghusl. Halaku Khan acceded to his request but commanded 5 Mongols to accompany him.

“I cannot go with 5 Mongols from Hell accompanying me,” objected the Khalīfah whilst mentioning a few verses from a poem the opening verses of which are:

*We spent the morning in a dwelling of paradisiacal gardens,  
And we spent the night homeless as if it never existed.*

On Wednesday evening, 14 Safar 656, the Khalīfah was executed.<sup>1</sup>

Halaku was fearful of shedding the Khalifah’s blood, the reason for which is mentioned by Burtold Spuler:

من خوف موروث مصدره خرافي من إراقة الدماء الملكية

He feared inheriting the blame of initiating bloodshed of legendary rulers.<sup>2</sup>

It appears in *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi‘iyyah*:

فقليل لهولاكو إن هذا إن أهريق دمه تظلم الدنيا ويكون سبب خراب  
ديارك فإنه ابن عم سول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وخليفة الله في أرضه

---

1 *Jāmi‘ al-Tawārīkh*, pg. 293.

2 *Kitāb al-‘Ālam al-Islāmī*, pg. 48.

فقام الشيطان المبين الحكيم نصر الدين الطوسي وقال يقتل ولا يراق  
دمه ... فقيل أن الخليفة غم في بساط وقيل رفسوه حتى مات ولما  
جاءوا ليقتلوه صاح صيحة عظيمة

It was said to Halaku, “By spilling the blood of this man, you will be oppressing the world, and it will become the means of the destruction of your empire as he is from the descendants of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ and the vicegerent of Allah in the earth.”

Then the evil and wretched Naṣr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī stood up and said, “He should be killed without his blood being spilled...”

It is mentioned that the Khalīfah was wrapped in a sack, and was kicked to death. When they were about to kill him, he let out a loud cry...<sup>1</sup>

Ibn Kathīr mentioned:

فقتلوه رفسا وهو في جوالق لئلا يقع على الأرض شيء من دمه خافوا أن  
يؤخذ بثأره فيما قيل لهم وقيل بل خنق وقيل بل أغرق والله أعلم

They kicked him to death whilst he was in a sack so that his blood would not spill onto the ground. They feared being afflicted by the retaliation they were warned of. He was suffocated according to one narration and drowned according to another. Allah knows best.<sup>2</sup>

Al-Dhahabī mentioned:

---

1 *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi'iyyah*, 8/217.

2 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, 13/234.



توفي الخليفة في أواخر المحرم سنة ٦٥٦ هـ وما أظنه دفن وكان الأمر  
أعظم من يوجد من يؤرخ موته أو يوارى جسده

The Khalīfah was massacred towards the end of Muḥarram 656, and I believe he was not buried as it is difficult to find someone who dated his death or buried his corpse.

Ibn al-Futī mentioned:

فقتل يوم الأربعاء رابع عشر صفر ولم يهرق دمه بل جعل في غرارة  
ورفس حتى مات ودفن وعفي أثر قبره

He was murdered on Wednesday, 14 Safar, in a manner that his blood was not spilled. He was placed in sacks and kicked to his death. The location of his grave is unknown.<sup>1</sup>

### 3. The wife and children of the Khalīfah

Ibn al-Futī mentions:

ثم قتل ولده أبو العباس احمد... ثم قتل ابن الخليفة الأوسط أبو الفضل  
عبد الرحمن ... وأما ولد الخليفة الأصغر مبارك وأخواته فاطمة و  
خديجة ومريم فإنهم لم يقتلوا بل أسروا

Then, his son Abu al-‘Abbās Aḥmad was killed... Thereafter his middle son, Abu al-Faḍl ‘Abd al-Raḥmān was killed. The daughters of the Khalīfah, Fāṭimah, Khadījah, Maryam, and his youngest son, Mubārak were taken as captives.<sup>2</sup>

Al-Hamdḥānī mentions:

---

1 *Al-Ḥawādith al-Jāmi‘ah*, pg. 357.

2 *Al-Ḥawādith al-Jāmi‘ah*, pg. 357.

وفى مساء الأربعاء الرابع عشر من صفر سنة ٦٥٦ هـ قضاوا على الخليفة وعلى ابنه الأكبر وخمسة من الخدم... وقد سُلم الابن الأصغر للخليفة إلى أولجى خاتون فأرسلته إلى مراغة ليكون مع الخواجه نصير الدين ثم زوجته من امرأة مغولية فأنجب منها ولدين وفي يوم الجمعة سادس عشر من صفر ألقوا الابن الثاني للخليفة بوالده وأخيه...

On the eve of Wednesday, 14 Safar 656, they massacred the Khalīfah together with his eldest son and 5 servants. The Khalīfah's youngest son was handed over to Ūlja Khātūn, she then sent him to Maragheh (city in Iran) so he could be with al-Khawājah Naṣīr al-Dīn. They then got him married to a Mongol woman who bore him 2 children. On Friday, 16 Safar, they killed the Khalīfah's second son joining him with his father and brothers...<sup>1</sup>

It is mentioned regarding the Khalīfah's wife, when Halaku planned on having relations with her, she got one of her slave girls to kill her. Her story is mentioned in *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi'iyyah* of al-Subkī.<sup>2</sup>

#### 4. What happened to the Abbasids in Baghdad?

Al-Hamdhānī mentions:

كذلك قضاوا على كل شخص وجدوه حيا من العباسيين اللهم إلا أفرادا  
قلائل لم يأبهو بهم

They killed every single one of the Abbasids with the exception of the very few insignificant ones.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 *Jāmi' al-Tawārīkh*, pg. 294.

2 *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi'iyyah*, 8/272.

3 *Jāmi' al-Tawārīkh*, pg. 294.

Similarly, Ibn al-Futī explains what occurred:

وجاءوا إلى أعمام الخليفة وأنسابه الذين كانوا في الصخرة ودار الشجرة  
وكانوا يطلبون واحداً بعد واحد فيخرج بأولاده وجواريه فيحمل إلى  
مقبرة الخلال التي تجاه المنطرة فيقتل جميعهم عن آخرهم

They came to the relatives of the Khalīfah in Ṣakhra and Dār al-Shajarah. They called them out one by one with their children and servants. They were then taken to the al-Khilāl graveyard which was facing the watch tower, where every last one of them was killed.<sup>1</sup>

In reality, even the dead were not safe from them, as Ibn al-Futī mentioned regarding the poet, Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn ‘Ubayd Allāh al-Kūfī:

ولما شهد ترب الرصافة وقد نبشت قبور الخلفاء وأحرقت تلك الأماكن  
وأبرزت العظام والرؤوس كتب على بعض الحيطان  
إن ترد عبرة فتلك بنو العباس حلت عليهم الآفات  
استبيح الحريم إذ قتل الأحياء منهم وحرقت الأموات

When he visited the graveyard of Ruṣafa (district in Baghdad), the graves of the Khulafā’ were dug up, the area was burnt and bones and skulls were in sight, he wrote on some stones:

*If you desire a lesson then these are the Abbasids,  
Upon whom catastrophes descended.  
Their sanctum was dishonoured by their living ones being killed,  
And their dead ones being burnt.<sup>2</sup>*

---

1 Al-Ḥawādith al-Jāmi‘ah, pg. 359.

2 Al-Ḥawādith al-Jāmi‘ah, pg. 364.

And Ibn Kathīr mentions:

وكان الرجل يستدعى به من دار الخلافة من بني العباس فيخرج باولاده  
ونسائه فيذهب بهم إلى مقبرة الخلال تجاه المنطرة فيذبح كما تذبح  
الشاة ويؤسر من يختارون من بناته وجواريه

Men of the Banū al-‘Abbās would be called out from the house of the Khalīfah together with their children and womenfolk. They would take them to the al-Khilāl graveyard which was facing the watch tower where they would be slaughtered like sheep. They would also take girls and slaves captive as they wished.<sup>1</sup>

## 5. What happened to the Elders of Baghdad?

Al-Hamdhānī mentions:

وكان معه لما خرج الخليفة إلى هولاءكو ثلاثة آلاف من السادات والأمة  
والقضاة والأكابر وأعيان المدينة

A group of 3000 which were made up of leaders, Imāms, judges, elders, and important people accompanied the Khalīfah to Halaku.<sup>2</sup>

Ibn al-Fūṭī mentions:

فخرج الخليفة و الوزير... ومعه جمع كثير فلما صاروا ظاهر السور  
منعوا أصحابه من الوصول معه

The Khalīfah and Wazīr set out... accompanied by a large number of people. As they got to the gate, his companions were stopped and the Khalīfah proceeded alone.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, 13/216.

2 *Jāmi‘ al-Tawārikh*, pg. 290.

3 *Al-Ḥawādith al-Jāmi‘ah*, pg. 357.

Al-Yūnīnī mentions:

فحينئذ أشار ابن العلقمي الوزير على الخليفة بمصانعة ملك التتار ومصالحته وسأله أن يخرج إليه الوزير في تقرير ذلك فخرج وتوثق منه لنفسه ثم رجع الى الخليفة وقال له انه قد رغب أن يزوج ابنته من ابنك الأمير أبي بكر ويبقيك في منصب الخلافة ... فتجيبه إلى هذا فإن فيه حقن دماء المسلمين ... فخرج في جمع من أكابر أصحابه فأنزل في خيمه ثم دخل الوزير فاستدعى الفقهاء و الأماثل ليحضروا عقد النكاح فيما أظهره فقتلوا وكذلك صار يخرج طائفة بعد طائفة

At this point the Wazīr Ibn al-‘Alqamī advised the Khalīfah to initiate peace with the King of the Tartars and requested to play an active role in it. He set out confident in himself and soon returned to the Khalīfah saying, “The King plans on getting his daughter married to the son of the Amīr, Abū Bakr, thus keeping you as the Khalīfah. You should consent to his plan so that the lives of the Muslims may be spared.”

Hearing this, the Khalīfah set out taking a group of his senior associates and entered his tent. The Wazīr then came after inviting the Jurists and their likenesses to attend what seemed to be a marriage ceremony, but turned out to be the place where their blood was shed. Similarly, group after group were made to come out.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Subkī also mentions this in *al-Ṭabaqāt*<sup>2</sup> and similar is mentioned in *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 Dhayl Mirāt al-Zamān, 1/88.

2 Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi‘iyyah, 8/270.

3 Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah, 13/214.

Ibn al-Fūṭī makes mention of more than 15 ministers who were killed by the Mongols.<sup>1</sup>

Whereas Ibn Kathīr mentioned:

وقتل الخطباء و الأئمة و حملة القرآن

Lecturers, Imāms, and Ḥuffāz were put to death.<sup>2</sup>

Among the many incidents narrated by historians regarding the killing of the scholars, is the incident of Jamāl al-Dīn Abū Zakarīyyā al-Ṣarṣarī al-Ḥanbalī. Ibn Kathīr mentions:

ولما دخل التتار إلى بغداد دعي إلى دار بها كرمون بن هولاءكو فأبى أن  
يجيب إليه وأعد في داره حجارة فحين دخل عليه التتار رماهم بتلك  
الأحجار فهشم منهم جماعة فلما خلصوا إليه قتل بعكازه أحدهم ثم  
قتلوه شهيداً رحمه الله تعالى

When the Tartars entered Baghdad, he was summoned to the house where Karmūn ibn Halaku was, but he refused to comply. Rather, he collected stones in his home and when the Tartars tried to enter, he pelted them with it thereby killing some of them. As they got closer to him, he killed one of them with his staff. Only after this did they kill him, may Allah shower his mercy upon him.<sup>3</sup>

## 6. What happened to the general masses of Baghdad?

The general masses did not surrender but persistently continued to deplorably fight the Tartars, until Halaku commanded the Khalīfah

---

1 *Al-Ḥawādith al-Jāmi'ah*, pg. 358.

2 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, 13/216.

3 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, 13/224.

saying, “Get the inhabitants of the city to put down their weapons and go out so that we can count them.” The Khalīfah thereby sent an announcer into the city commanding the people to act accordingly. The people dropped their weapons and began setting out in groups. Nevertheless the Mongols killed every one of them.<sup>1</sup>

It has also been mentioned that the Mongols granted Sulaīmān Shāh and al-Dāwadār immunity to come out with their armies. As they set out, they divided them into groups of thousands, hundreds, and tens thereby killing them. This happened before the Khalīfah set out.<sup>2</sup>

Ibn al-Fūṭī mentions regarding the fate of the general masses:

ووضع السيف في أهل بغداد يوم الاثنين خامس صفر وما زالوا في قتل ونهب وأسر وتعذيب الناس بأنواع العذاب واستخراج الأموال منهم بأليم العقاب مدة أربعين يوماً فقتلوا الرجال والنساء والصبيان والأطفال فلم يبق من أهل البلد ومن التجأ إليهم من أهل السواد إلا القليل... وأحرق معظم البلد وجامع الخليفة وما يجاوه واستولى الخراب على البلد وكانت القتلى في الدروب و الأسواق كالتلول ووقعت الأمطار عليهم ووطئتهم الخيول فاستحالت صورهم وصاروا عبيرة لمن يرى ثم نودي بالأمان فخرج من تخلف وتغيرت ألوانهم وذهلت عقولهم لما شاهدوا من الأهوال التي لا يعبر عنها بلسان وهم كالموتى إذا خرجوا من القبور يوم النشور من الخوف والجوع والبرد... قيل أن عدة القتلى ببغداد زادت على ثمان مئة ألف نفس عدا من ألقى من الأطفال في الوحول ومن هلك في القنى والآبار وسرايب الموتى جوعاً و خوفاً ووقع الوباء فيمن تخلف بعد القتل من شم روائح القتلى و شرب الماء

---

1 *Jāmi' al-Tawārīkh*, pg. 291.

2 *Jāmi' al-Tawārīkh*, pg. 289.

الدمتزع بالءءفف وءان الناس فءءرون من شم البصل لءوة الءءفة وءءرة  
الءباب فأنه ملاء الفءاء وءان فسءط على المءعومات ففسءها

The massacre began on Monday, 5 Safar. They killed, plundered, captured, punished people multifariously and looted their wealth with agonizing punishments for a duration of 40 days. They killed men, women, and children. Only a handful of people survived from the city's inhabitants and adjoining areas. Most part of the city, the Masjid of the Khalifah and its surroundings were burnt as the city was overwhelmingly ravaged. There were heaps of corpses in the pathways and market places. Rain fell on them and horses trotted over them making their forms inconceivable. It was a lesson for those who were present. The call of peace was then made, and those who remained came out in panic and utter disbelief of the atrocities they witnessed which cannot be explained with words. They resembled the dead coming out of their graves on the Day of Resurrection due to the fear, hunger, and cold they experienced. It is narrated that the fatalities of Baghdad exceeded 800 000, with the exception of children who were thrown into mires, those who were drowned in canals and wells, and those who died in catacombs due to fear and hunger. As for those who survived, they had to bear the smell of dead corpses and drinking water contaminated by dead bodies. They used onions to repel the rancid smell of the dead corpses and the swarms of flies that filled the air. The swarms of flies were substantial enough to ruin food by merely sitting on it.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Subkī mentions:

---

1 *Al-Ḥawādith al-Jāmi'ah*, pg. 357.



و قيل إن هولاءكو أمر بعد ذلك بعدّ القتلى فكانوا ألف ألف وثمانمائة ألف النصف من ذلك تسعمائة ألف غير من لم يعد و من غرق ثم نودي بعد ذلك بالأمان فخرج من كان مختبئ و قد مات الكثير منهم تحت الأرض بأنواع من البلايا والذين خرجوا ذاقوا أنواع الهوان والذل ثم حفرت الدور وأخذت الدفائن والأموال التي لا تعد ولا تحصى وكانوا يدخلون الدار فيجدون الخبيثة فيها وصاحب الدار يحلف أن له السنين العديدة فيها ما علم ان بها خبيثة ثم طلبت النصارى أن يقع الجهر بشرب الخمر و أكل لحم الخنزير و أن يفعل معهم المسلمون ذلك في شهر رمضان فألزم المسلمون بالفطر في رمضان و أكل الخنزير و شرب الخمر... و أعطى دار الخليفة لشخص من النصارى و أريقت الخمر في المساجد و الجوامع و منع المسلمون من الإعلان بالأذان فلا حول و لا قوة إلا بالله العلي العظيم هذه بغداد لم تكن دار كفر قط و جرى عليها هذا الذي لم يقع قط من منذ قامت الدنيا مثله

Halaku then commanded that the slain be counted and it amounted to 1 800 000. Whilst 900 000 were physically counted, the other 900 000 was an estimate of those who were missed out and those who drowned. The announcement of peace was then made and those who were in hiding came out. Many lost their lives underground due to various misfortunes, whereas those who survived had to face disgrace and humiliation on many levels. The ground was then dug up, and innumerable treasures and wealth was taken out. Hidden treasures were also found in common homes whilst its occupants for years had absolutely no clue of it being there. In the month of Ramaḍān, the Christians were ordered to openly drink wine and eat pork, and the Muslims were commanded to join them. So, the Muslims abandoned fasting and began eating pork and drinking wine.

The Khalīfah's house was given to a person from the Christians, wine was spilled in the Masājīd and Muslims were prohibited from calling out the Adhān loudly. And there is no Might nor Power except by Allah. The Baghdad that was never a disbelieving state is the same Baghdad in which such incidents took place, similar to which the earth has never witnessed.<sup>1</sup>

Ibn Kathīr mentions:

ومالوا على البلد فقتلوا جميع من قدروا عليه من الرجال والنساء والولدان والمشايخ والكهول والشبان ودخل كثير من الناس في الآبار وأماكن الحشوش وقتي الوسخ وكمنوا كذلك أياما لا يظهرون وكان الجماعة من الناس يجتمعون إلى الخانات ويغلقون عليهم الأبواب فتفتحتها التتار إما بالكسر وإما بالنار ثم يدخلون عليهم فيهربون منهم إلى أعالي الأمكنة فيقتلونهم في الأسطحة حتى تجري الميازيب من الدماء في الأزقة فإننا لله وإنا إليه راجعون وكذلك في المساجد والجوامع والربط ولم ينج منهم أحد سوى أهل الذمة من اليهود والنصارى ومن التجأ إليهم وإلى دار الوزير ابن العلقمي الرافضي وطائفة من التجار أخذوا لهم أمانا بذلوا عليه أموالا جزيلة حتى سلموا وسلمت أموالهم وعادت بغداد بعدما كانت آنس المدن كلها كأنها خراب ليس فيها إلا القليل من الناس وهم في خوف وجوع وذلة وقلة... وقد اختلف الناس في كمية من قتل ببغداد من المسلمين فقبل ثمانمائة ألف وقيل ألف ألف وثمانمائة ألف وقيل بلغت القتلى ألفي ألف نفس فإننا لله وإنا إليه راجعون ولا حول ولا قوة إلا بالله العلي العظيم.

وكان دخولهم إلى بغداد في أواخر المحرم وما زال السيف يقتل أهلها أربعين صباحا... وتعطلت المساجد والجماعات والجمعات مدة شهور

---

1 Al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā, 8/271.

بيغداد... ولما انقضى أمد الأمر المقدر وانقضت الاربعون يوما بقيت بغداد خاوية على عروشها ليس بها أحد إلا الشاذ من الناس والقتلى في الطرقات كأنها التلول وقد سقط عليهم المطر فتغيرت صورهم وأنتنت من جيفهم البلد وتغير الهواء فحصل بسببه الوباء الشديد حتى تعدى وسرى في الهواء إلى بلاد الشام فمات خلق كثير من تغير الجو وفساد الرياح فاجتمع على الناس الغلاء والوباء والفناء والطعن والطاعون فإنا لله وإنا إليه راجعون.

ولما نودى ببغداد بالأمان خرج من تحت الأرض من كان بالمطامير والقني والمغاير كأنهم الموتى إذا نبشوا من قبورهم وقد أنكر بعضهم بعضا فلا يعرف الوالد ولده ولا الأخ أخاه وأخذهم الوباء الشديد ففتنونا ولحقوا بمن سبقهم من القتلى واجتمعوا في البلى تحت الثرى بأمر الذي يعلم السر وأخفى الله لا إله إلا هو له الأسماء الحسنی

They stormed the city, killing every person they laid hands on; men, women, children, the elderly, middle aged, and even adolescent ones.

Many people hid for days in wells, grassy places and dirt pipes. Similarly some groups would hide in hostelries. They would secure the doors but the Tartars would manage to open them by either breaking them down or burning them. They would then flee to the roofs but the Tartars would manage to kill them there, so much so that the gutters along the streets would flow with blood. Certainly, to Allah do we belong and to Him shall we return. The situation was similar in the Masājid and the borders, and the only people saved were the Jews and Christians from the *Ahl al-Dhimma* (people living under the protection of the Islamic state), those who they granted asylum to, those who sought refuge in the house of the Wazīr, Ibn ‘Alqamī al-Rāfiḍī,

and a group of traders who promised to pay a large amount on condition that they and wealth remain unharmed. After all this, the Baghdad that used to be entertaining became desolate with very few inhabitants who were living with humiliation, fear, and poverty.

There are different opinions regarding the number of Muslims slain in Baghdad. There is an opinion of 800 000, 1 800 000, and 2 000 000. Certainly, to Allah do we belong and to Him shall we return, there is no might or power except from Allāh, the Most high, the Great.

They entered Baghdad towards the end of Muḥarram and the massacre continued for 40 days...

Masājid were closed and congregational Ṣalāh and Jumu'ah were not performed for months....

When the duration of the destined matter ended and the 40 days passed, Baghdad was in utter ruins inhabited by just a handful. There were heaps of corpses lying in pathways. Rainfall caused them to become disfigured whilst their rancid odour filled the air. A severe plague broke out on account of it which reached Syria travelling through the air. Many creatures died from the change in atmosphere and the pollution in the air. Inflation, defamation, evanescence, epidemics, and plagues became the order of the day. Certainly, to Allāh do we belong and to Him shall we return.

When the call of peace was made in Baghdad, those who were hiding in the underground pipelines, dirt pipes, and water pipes came out as if they were resurrected from their graves as they did not recognise one another. The father did not recognise

his son and the brother did not recognise his sibling. A severe plague afflicted them which consumed them and joined them with their deceased ones. Ultimately, they all began decaying together underneath the earth with the command of the One Who has knowledge of the apparent and hidden. Allah, there is no deity but He, The best names belong to Him.<sup>1</sup>

## 7. Elimination of Books

From a diplomatic and cultural perspective, one of the catastrophes brought by this destructive invasion, was the elimination of books from the greatest libraries on the planet. It resulted in the human race losing a great deal of knowledge and skills.

‘Alī al-Ṭabāṭabā’ī mentions:

وأما ما حل بخزائن العلم من المكاتب والمدارس في بغداد فحدث  
ولا حرج فقد كانت بغداد مركز من أعظم مراكز الإشعاع الفكري في  
العالم... وقد حرق التتار كل ما وجدوا في بغداد من علم ومن مراكز  
للعلم كما قتلوا كل من عثروا عليه من العلماء أو كل من كان في بغداد  
من العلماء... يقول قطب الدين الحنفي تراكت الكتب التي ألقاها  
التتار في دجلة حتى صارت معبراً يعبر عليه الناس والدواب واسودت  
مياه دجلة بما ألقى فيها من الكتب

Without a doubt, what happened to the treasures of knowledge in the libraries and schools of Baghdad has to be a matter of concern. Baghdad was amongst the greatest centres of intellectual dissemination in the world. The Tartars set fire to everything they came across knowledge related, including the

---

1 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, 13/215.

centres of knowledge just as they killed every scholar they came across present in Baghdad.

Quṭb al-Dīn al-Ḥanafī mentions, “The books were dumped into the Tigris River. Due to the large amount, it piled up and became a bridge for people and animals to cross. The water of the Tigris also turned black.”<sup>1</sup>

To end this heinous incident, I will mention the words of Abū Shāmah al-Maqdisī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ:

وجاء كتاب من بعض من سلم منهم ببغداد يقول والأمر أعظم مما  
بلغكم من الأخبار اللهم عافنا وبلادنا من كل سوء

A letter arrived from one of the survivors in Baghdad stating, “The situation is worse than the news you have received.” May Allah protect us and our countries from all harm.<sup>2</sup>

---

1 *Riyāḍ al-Masā'il*, 2/7.

2 *Al-Ẓayl 'alā al-Rawḍatayn*, pg.199.

## Chapter Two

### Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī and Ibn al-‘Alqamī

After mentioning these horrific incidents, we now come to the objective of this book which is the role of Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī and Ibn al-‘Alqamī in these happenings and their level of commitment to the creed they adhered to. It was none other than the creed of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah which we will discuss.

#### 1. Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī

His was Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī. He was commonly known as Muḥaqqiq al-Ṭūsī or Khawājah Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī. He was born in Ṭūs (a city in Iran) in 597 AH and passed away in Baghdad in 672 AH.

Due to his proficiency in the science of philosophy, his wisdom, and elocution, the Ismā‘īlī ruler of Quhistān (a province in Iran), Nāṣir al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Raḥīm ibn Abī Maṣṣūr, in his honour requested that he reside with him. He later on took up residence by the Ismā‘īlī authority, ‘Alā’ al-Dīn acting as the Wazīr. After the demise of ‘Alā’ al-Dīn, He remained the wazīr in the rule of his son Rukn al-Dīn Khūr Shāh who was the last ruler of the Ismā‘īlī empire prior to it being overturned by Halaku. Thereafter, he was granted honour and position by Halaku and acted as the Wazīr in his era and the era of his children until his demise in 672 AH.<sup>1</sup>

---

1 *A‘yān al-Shī‘ah*, 9/114.

## His status in the eyes of Halaku

The rank of al-Ṭūsī in the eyes of Halaku is an important factor in the topic of our discussion due to his participation in what happened to Baghdad. In this regard, I will not depend on Sunnī historians, but I will rather depend on unbiased historians of a similar era and Shīī historians.

Al-Hamdhānī mentions:

ولما تأكد هولاءكو من صدق وإخلاص الخواجة نصير الدين الطوسي و  
... شملهم بعطفه وإنعامه وأعطاهم ... وألزمهم حضرته هم وأبنائهم  
حتى اليوم...

When Halaku became convinced of the truthfulness and sincerity of Khawājah Naṣīr al-Ṭūsī and... he showered them with kindness and favours, and gifts... compelling them and their children to remain with him up and until this day.<sup>1</sup>

He also mentioned:

ذلك لأنه أي هولاءكو كان قد أطلع على حسن سريره فكان يريد أن يظل  
ملازماً له

Halaku became apprised of the beauty of his heart, so desired that he remain close to him.<sup>2</sup>

Al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī (a Shīī scholar) mentions in *Khātimah al-Mustadrak*:

وكان ذا حرمة وافرة عند هولاءكو وكان يطيعه فيما يشير به عليه والأموال  
في تصرفه

---

1 *Jāmi' al-Tawārikh*, pg. 245.

2 *Jāmi' al-Tawārikh*, pg. 304.



He was greatly revered in the eyes of Halaku. He would give him anything he asked for. Wealth was at his disposal.<sup>1</sup>

‘Alī al-Ṭabāṭabā’ī narrated a similar quotation affiliating it to al-Kitbī.<sup>2</sup>

Al-Mīrzā al-Nūrī al-Ṭabrasī also mentions:

أكرم هولاءكو المحقق الطوسي غاية الإكرام والإعزاز وصبحه وارتكب  
الأمر الكلية حسب رأيه وإجازته ...

Halaku went all out in honouring and revering Muḥaqqiq al-Ṭūsī. He would keep him by his side and ensure that every matter was decided with his advice and blessings.<sup>3</sup>

Ibn al-‘Abrī (a Jewish historian who died in 685 AH) mentions in his book *Tārīkh Mukhtaṣar al-Duwal*:

وأصبح نصير الدين بعد ذلك اليد اليمنى لهولاءكو ووزيراً له

Naṣīr al-Dīn became the close confidant and Wazīr of Halaku.<sup>4</sup>

Due to the position and authority he enjoyed by Halaku:

فقد أقنعه بأن يعهد إليه بالإشراف على الأوقاف الإسلامية والتصرف  
بمواردها بما يراه فوافق هولاءكو

He managed to persuade Halaku to entrust him with the supervision of the Islamic endowments and the regulation of resources without accountability.<sup>5</sup>

---

1 *Khātimah al-Mustadrak*, 2/323.

2 *Riyād al-Masāil*, 2/26.

3 *Khātimah al-Mustadrak*, 2/425.

4 *Tārīkh Mukhtaṣar al-Duwal*, pg. 250.

5 *Al-Ghazw al-Maghūlī li-Ḥasan al-Amīn; Tārīkh Mukhtaṣar al-Duwal*, pg. 250.

Ḥasan al-Amīn mentions in his father's book, *A'yān al-Shī'ah*:

وقال محمد مدرسي زنجاني ... فضلاً عن مقام الطوسي العلمي  
استطاع بتأثيره على مزاج هولاء أن يستحوذ تدريجياً على عقله وأن  
يروض شارب الدماء...

Muḥammad Mudarrisī Zinjānī mentioned, "Let alone his intellectual authority, al-Ṭūsī managed to have such an influence on the disposition of Halaku that he gradually captured his mind and turned him into the drinker of blood."<sup>1</sup>

This was the rank of al-Ṭūsī in the eyes of Halaku after being the Wazīr. As a matter of fact, the association continued after the demise of Halaku in 663 AH and al-Ṭūsī acted as Wazīr for his successor who was his son Abaqa Khan. Al-Ṭūsī remained the Wazīr until his demise in 672 AH. But even his death did not end the relationship and his son, Ṣadr al-Dīn 'Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Ṭūsī became the Wazīr of this perfidious empire. Upon his demise, his brother Aṣḡl al-Dīn Ḥasan ibn Muḥammad al-Ṭūsī was entrusted with his position.<sup>2</sup> After all of this, is it still possible to say, "Al-Ṭūsī became the Wazīr of Halaku due to fearing his tyranny"?

### **The Creed of al-Ṭūsī**

Determining a person's creed plays a vital role in understanding his principles which dictates his life, his conduct, and his jurisdiction over others. Similarly, his status and rank in the creed plays a role in judging

---

1 *A'yān al-Shī'ah*, 9/417.

2 *Jāmi' al-Khilāf wa al-Wifāq li 'Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Qummī*, pg. 10; *Al-Durar al-Kāminah*, 1/390; *A'yān al-'Asr li al-Ṣafḍī*, 1/541; *A'yān al-Shī'ah*, 5/269.

his disposition considering the fact that he will not compromise his position and rank. Likewise, the creed can gain dominance over his character even if his participation is partial.

Al-Ṭūsī was torn between the two Shī'ah groups, the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah and Ismā'īliyyah due to the following two reasons:

1. He was the Wazīr for Ismā'īliyyah.
2. He assisted the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah creed after the Mongol invasion.

Looking at the reasons below, it appears that he was Ithnā 'Asharī:

As previously mentioned, He assisted the Ithnā 'Asharī creed after gaining authority in empire of Halaku.

1. He published a work on the Ithnā 'Asharī creed affirming his affiliation with them.
2. There isn't anything contrary to this belief. Acting as Wazīr for Ismā'īliyyah does not necessitate his affiliation to their creed. He al-Ṭūsī sought assistance from Ibn al-'Alqamī to get close to the Khalīfah as will be discussed [indicating that he had a good relationship with Ibn al-'Alqamī.
3. The biography of al-Ṭūsī is mentioned in the books of Imāmīyyah, in which he has been highly praised. A few examples are as follows:

The statement of al-Ḥillī (known as al-'Allāmah amongst the Shī'ah) in his correspondence to the Banū Zuhrah, when mentioning the name of al-Ṭūsī:

وكان هذا الشيخ محققاً... وله مصنفات كثيرة... على مذهب الإمامية

He was a great scholar... he authored many works... on the creed of the Imāmīyyah.<sup>1</sup>

As well as in *Khātimat al-Mustadrak* of al-Ṭabarāsī (al-Shīṭī), volume 2, page 424; and *Ṭarā'if al-Maqāl* of 'Alī al-Burūjirdī, volume 2, page 444.

His biography is also mentioned in *A'yān al-Shī'ah* of Muḥsin al-Amīn; however, the biography was written by his son Ḥasan al-Amīn, as Muḥsin al-Amīn left some of the biographies incomplete which his son later completed.<sup>2</sup>

### **The status of al-Ṭūsī amongst the Shī'ah**

Ḥasan Beg Rumlu mentions in his historiography:

لم يسع أحد بعد الخواجة نصير الدين الطوسي مثل ما سعى الشيخ  
علي الكركي هذا في إعلاء أعلام المذهب الجعفري وترويج دين الحق  
الاثنى عشر

After Khwājah Nasīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī, none has adequately advocated the banner of the Ja'farī creed and the propagation of the true Ithnā 'Asharī creed in a manner similar to that of 'Alī al-Karakī.<sup>3</sup>

Al-Shahīd al-Thānī—as he is referred to by the Shī'ah—regarded him to be the “Reviver of the seventh century”.<sup>4</sup> He also mentions in *Rawḍ al-Janān*:

---

1 Al-Ḥurr al-Āmilī: *Amal al-Āmil*, 2/299.

2 *A'yān al-Shī'ah*, 9/414.

3 *Muqaddamah Jāmi' al-Maqāshid*, 1/33.

4 *Sharḥ al-Lum'ah*, 1/298.

العلامة السعيد سلطان العلماء المحققين خواجه نصير...

The auspicious scholar, the ruler of all scholars and experts,  
Khawājah Nasīr...

‘Allāmah al-Ḥillī of the Shī‘ah mentions in his correspondence with the  
Banū Zuhrah:

وكان هذا الشيخ أفضل أهل عصر في العلوم العقلية و النقلية وكان  
أشرف من شاهدناه في الأخلاق نور الله ضريحه

He was the most knowledgeable of his era in rational sciences  
and transmitted knowledge. He was also the most noble in  
character among those we have observed. May Allah fill his  
grave with nūr.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarāsī mentions:

ناموس دهره وفيلسوف عصره وعزيز مصره سلطان المحققين الخواجه  
نصير الملة والدين الأعظم محمد بن محمد بن الحسن الطوسي الحكيم  
المحقق الجليل الذي شهد بعلو مقامه في مراتب العلوم المخالف  
فضلاً عن المؤلف

The honour of his era, philosopher of his time, leader of his  
capital, head of the scholars, al-Khawājah, the aid of the sect  
and elevated religion; Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan  
al-Ṭūsī, the wise, esteemed researcher. Attesting to his great  
stature in the various sciences were the opposition [referring to  
the Ahl al-Sunnah] over and above that of his partisans.<sup>2</sup>

---

1 Al-Ardabīlī: *Majma‘ al-Fā‘idah*, 1/17; *Biḥār al-Anwār*.

2 *Khātimat al-Mustadrak*, 2/422.

Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī mentions:

... كان فاضلاً ماهراً عالماً متكلماً محققاً في العقلیات

... He was outstanding, proficient, knowledgeable, theologian, and researcher in the rational sciences.<sup>1</sup>

Khomeini sang his praises, saying:

وإذا كانت ظروف التقية تلزم أحداً منا بالدخول في ركب السلاطين  
فهنا يجب الامتناع عن ذلك حتى لو أدى الامتناع إلى قتله إلا أن يكون  
في دخوله نصر حقيقي للإسلام والمسلمين مثل دخول علي بن يقطين  
ونصر الدين الطوسي

When the circumstances of Taqiyyah demand one of us to enter into the cavalry of the rulers, then in this case it is compulsory to desist from this Taqiyyah, even if it may lead to being slain. Unless adopting it will truly assist Islam and the Muslims, like it was in the case of ʿAlī ibn Yaḡṡīn and Naṡīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī.<sup>2</sup>

I have no clue as to how his disposition and conformance to Halaku can be interpreted in way proving that he was compelled or in his ministry, he assisted Islam and Muslims, unless the implications of Khomeini's statement—as well as the others who praised him like al-Khuwānasārī—is that he assisted the Shīʿah creed during the Mongol rule. In no way, can the catastrophe of Baghdad and the fall of the khilāfah possibly be termed assisting Islam and the Muslims. It is now prevalent that this was the master plan. We will discuss later, Allah willing, the stance of the Shīʿah during the invasion of Baghdad and what they achieved thereafter.

---

1 *Amal al-Āmil*, 2/299.

2 *Al-Ḥukūmah al-Islāmīyyah*, pg. 142, don't be deceived by pg. 47.

Contemporary Shī'ahs glorified this individual by holding a ceremony commemorating the lapse of seven centuries after his death. This took place in Iran on 26 Iyar (second month of the Hebrew calendar) which corresponded to 2 June 1956, in the windy season, and with the Persian spirit as mentioned by Professor Muḥammad al-Mashhadānī.<sup>1</sup>

## 2. Muḥammad ibn al-'Alqamī

He was Mu'ayyid al-Dīn Abū Ṭālib Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ibn al-'Alqamī. He died in 656 AH.<sup>2</sup>

Ibn Ṭabāṭabā'ī mentions:

كان رجلا فاضلا كاملا لبيا كريما وقورا محبا للرئاسة كثير التحمل  
متمسكا بقوانين الرئاسة خبيرا بأدوات السياسة

He was an outstanding, idyllic, wise, notable, dignified, and loved individual who endured a lot for leadership, adhering to its statutes and cognizant of management requirements.<sup>3</sup>

Muḥammad Mudarrisī mentions, in his book about al-Tūsī and his life, regarding Ibn al-'Alqamī:

وأقام عند خاله عضد الدين القمي الذي كان يشغل يومئذ منصب رئاسة  
دار الإنشاء للحاكم العباسي ثم أنتقل هذا المنصب بعد مدة إلى شمس  
الدين ناقد و أنيط بعد فتره بابن العلقمي ومات ابن الناقد الذي كان  
وزيرا سنة ٦٤٢هـ وبعد وفاة المستنصر وتسلم المعتصم زمام الأمور  
فانتقلت الوزارة إلى ابن العلقمي الذي ظل فيها أربع عشرة سنة من سنة )

---

1 *Maḥkamah al-Tārīkh*, pg. 13.

2 *A'yān al-Shī'ah*, 9/82.

3 *Al-Fakhrī*, pg. 312.

٦٤٢) إلى سنة (٦٥٦) إلى أن غزا هولاء بغداد ونسف قواعد الحكم العباسي وقتل المستعصم وأسند إلى ابن العلقمي حكومة بغداد فظل فيها وبعد أشهر اعتلت صحته حتى أسلمه الداء إلى المنون.... وتولى نجله رف الدين أبو القاسم على حكومة بغداد بعد أبيه

He resided by his maternal uncle 'Aḍud al-Dīn al-Qummī who was at that time assigned to supervise the development sector for the Abbasid ruler. After some time, this position was assigned to Shams al-Dīn Nāqid, and later on the responsibility was bestowed upon Ibn 'Alqamī. Ibn al-Nāqid passed away while acting as Wazīr in 642 AH. The position of Wazīr was assigned to Ibn 'Alqamī when Mu'taṣim assumed responsibility of the empire after the demise of Mustanṣir. He remained the Wazīr for fourteen years, from 642 AH till 656 AH, up until Baghdad was invaded by Halaku. Following the invasion, Halaku obliterated the foundations of the Abbasid rule, killed Mu'taṣim, and handed the rule of Baghdad over to Ibn 'Alqamī. Ibn 'Alqamī then ruled Baghdad for a few months prior to contracting a disease which proved fatal... His son, Sharaf al-Dīn Abū al-Qāsim, being his successor thereafter took charge of the affairs of Baghdad.<sup>1</sup>

### **The status of Ibn al-'Alqamī in the eyes of the Khalīfah**

Ibn al-'Alqamī serving as the Wazīr for 14 years (624-656 AH) clearly indicates to the status and authority he enjoyed. But even then, some Shī'ah attempt to prove the absence of this status and authority by describing him as being weak and incompetent in influencing the Khalīfah. So, to ascertain the truth of this opinion, I will present reports of historians regarding his status in the eyes of the Khalīfah.

---

1 Muḥammad Taqī Mudarrisī: *Al-'Allāmah al-Khawājah Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī Ḥayātuhi wa Āthāruhi*, pg. 110.



Ibn Ṭabāṭabā, known as Ibn al-Ṭiḡṭaḡā mentions:

وكان الخليفة يعتقد فيه ويحبه

The Khalīfah had faith in him and loved him dearly.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Suyūṭī mentions:

ثم ركن المستعصم إلى وزيره مؤيد الدين العلقمي ... والعب بالخليفة  
كيف أراد

Al-Mustaʿṣim had complete reliance on his Wazīr Muʿayyid al-Dīn al-ʿAlqamī ... and al-ʿAlqamī would interact with the Khalīfah in the manner he desired.<sup>2</sup>

Al-Khuwānasārī cites a correspondence between al-Ṭūsī and Ibn al-ʿAlqamī which also attests to his status. In it, Al-Ṭūsī requests the help of Ibn al-ʿAlqamī to arrange a meeting with the khalīfah indicating his knowledge of Ibn al-ʿAlqamī's status in the eyes of the Khalīfah. Similarly, the stance of Ibn-ʿAlqamī informs us of the same as he did not award al-Ṭūsī proximity to the khalīfah fearing his lofty status, had he not had any lofty position he would not have feared being close to him.<sup>3</sup>

There is an incident which attests to the same, where Halaku got in contact with the Khalīfah of Hamedan (city in Iran) requesting that all the Wazīr's be sent to him, Ibn al-ʿAlqamī, Sulaymān Shāh, and al-Dawīdār, as he was aware of their ranks.<sup>4</sup>

---

1 *Al-Fakhrī*, pg. 313.

2 *Tārīkh al-Khulafā'*, pg. 401.

3 *A'yān al-Shīah*, 9/86.

4 *Jāmi' al-Tawārīkh*, pg. 268; Ibn al-ʿUbrī: *Mukhtaṣar al-Duwal*, pg. 235.

Ibn al-‘Alqamī, however, enjoyed the highest rank from the three. The Khalīfah himself attested to it as he sent him off to Halaku saying, “You requested any one of them, whereas I have sent you the Wazīr who is the most talented from them.”<sup>1</sup>

‘Abdullāh al-Shīrāzī, who was Shī‘ah, mentions:

وكان الذي يدير الأمور وينظم الأعمال مؤيد الدين ابن العلقمي

Mu‘ayyid al-Dīn ibn al-‘Alqamī had authority over all matters and control over all districts.<sup>2</sup>

There are other aspects that also indicate to his status like the course of events, his presence at the Khalīfah’s side right until the end, and the Khalīfah only setting out after he (Ibn ‘Alqamī) consulted with Halaku. All this clearly attests to his status. Therefore, the claim of some Shī‘ah, like that of Ibn al-Ṭiḡṭaḡā and Ja‘far Khiṣbāk, is unfounded.<sup>3</sup>

Even if he had no authority and power, and his opinion was not given much consideration by the khalīfah, he is still responsible for the events that transpired in Baghdad as he was the Wazīr and second in charge of stately matters.

### **The Creed of Ibn ‘Alqamī**

Due to no opposing views of him being a Shī‘ah, I shall suffice on just a few supporting statements below.

Al-Khuwānasārī mentions:

---

1 *Mukhtaṣar al-Duwal*, pg. 236; *A‘yān al-Shī‘ah*, 9/88.

2 *Maḥkamah al-Tārīkh*, pg. 57.

3 *Al-Fakhrī*, pg. 308 & 313; *A‘yān al-Shī‘ah*, 9/99.

ولما كان مؤيد الدين العلقمي الذي هو من أكابر الشيعة في ذلك الزمان

Mu'ayyid al-Dīn al-'Alqamī was amongst the seniors of the Shī'ah creed in his era.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Majlisī mentions:

وكان رضي الله عنه إمامي المذهب صحيح الاعتقاد ...

He was the leader of the creed, a person of correct beliefs, May Allah be pleased with him.<sup>2</sup>

His biography is mentioned in *A'yān al-Shī'ah*, volume 9, page 82.

### **Shī'ah adoration for him**

It is mentioned in *A'yān al-Shī'ah*:

وكان عالماً فاضلاً أديباً وجاء في كتاب الإجازات من بحار الأنوار ومات الوزير السعيد مؤيد الدين أبو طالب محمد بن أحمد العلقمي وكان رحمه الله إمامي المذهب صحيح الاعتقاد رفيع الهمة ولأجله صنف ابن أبي الحديد شرح النهج

He was a learned and cultured scholar. It is mentioned in *Kitāb al-Ijāzāt* in *Bihār al-Anwār* that the auspicious Wazīr Mu'ayyid al-Dīn Abū Ṭālib Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-'Alqamī passed away as the leader of the creed. He was a man of correct beliefs and high ambitions and due to him, Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd authored *Sharh al-Nahj*.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 *A'yān al-Shī'ah*, 9/68.

2 *Bihār al-Anwār*, 14/31.

3 *A'yān al-Shī'ah*, 9/82.

The statement of al-Khuwānasārī has already passed which mentions that he was amongst the seniors of the Shī'ah creed.

Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd mentions:

وبعد فإن مراسم المولى الوزير الأعظم صاحب الصدر الكبير المعظم  
العالم العادل المظفر المنصور المجاهد المرابط مؤيد الدين عضد  
الإسلام سيد وزراء الشرق والغرب أبي محمد ابن العلقمي ...

The ceremonial of the leader, the great Wazīr, the magnificently generous man, the supported and triumphant righteous scholar, the soldier who fought for Islam, the helper of Dīn, the support of Islam, the leader of the Wazīr's of the east and west, Abī Muḥammad ibn al-'Alqamī ...<sup>1</sup>

### Relationship between al-Ṭūsī and Ibn al-'Alqamī

Other aspects that provides insight into the incidents of Baghdad is the mutual relationship between these two individuals, their mutual understanding and recognising the common factor among their objectives. So, is there any mention of the relationship between these two individuals, what the nature of their relationship was, and what were its objectives?

It is mentioned in *A'yān al-Shī'ah*:

قال الخوانساري في ترجمة نصير الدين الطوسي ولما كان مؤيد الدين  
العلقمي الذي هو من أكابر الشيعة في ذلك الزمان وزير المستعصم الخليفة  
العباسي في بغداد أراد المحقق (الطوسي) دخول بغداد ومعارضته  
بما أختلج بداخله من ترويج المذهب الحق بمعاونة الوزير المذكور

---

1 *Muqaddamah Sharh Nahj al-Balāghah*, 1/3.

Al-Khuwānasārī mentions in the biography of Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī, “When Mu’ayyid al-‘Alqamī, one of the senior Shī’ah’s of his era, was the Wazīr for al-Musta’ṣim, the Abbasid Khalīfah in Baghdad, Muḥaqqiq al-Ṭūsī wanted to visit Baghdad with the objective of permeating the true creed utilizing the assistance of Wazīr al-‘Alqamī.

So, a mutual relationship definitely existed between them, furthermore their objectives were common in the interest of the creed, otherwise he would not have disclosed his motive to him. It is mentioned that Wazīr did not accede to the request as he feared his position.

Al-Khuwānasārī makes mention of this mutual relationship in *Rawḍāt al-Jannāt*, pg. 610 of the first edition as it is referred to in the footnotes of *A’yān al-Shī’ah*. Al-Nūrī al-Shī’ī makes mention of it in *Khātimat al-Mustadrak*, vol. 2 pg. 442 and al-Burūjirdī makes mention of it in *Ṭarā’iq al-Maqāl*, vol. 2 pg. 447.

The mutual relationship of Ibn al-‘Alqamī and al-Ṭūsī was unharmed, even though Ibn al-‘Alqamī refused to accede to al-Ṭūsī’s wish. We gather this about their relationship as it was al-Ṭūsī, as the Shī’ah claim, who elevated the status of Ibn al-‘Alqamī in the eyes of Halaku.

Ibn Ṭabāṭabā (known as Ibn al-Ṭiqṭaqā’) mentions in his book, *Al-Fakhrī fī al-Ādāb al-Sulṭāniyyah*:

وكان الذي تولى تربيته في الحضرة السلطانية الوزير السعيد نصير الدين  
محمد الطوسي ...

The one who supported him into the royal presence was the blessed Wazīr Naṣīr al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Ṭūsī.<sup>1</sup>

---

1 *Al-Fakhrī*, pg. 313.

It is mentioned in the biography of Ibn al-‘Alqamī:

والأرجح أن شفاعته نصير الدين الطوسي كانت أهم سبب في نجاته

The advocacy of Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī was most likely the key factor in the success of Ibn al-‘Alqamī.<sup>1</sup>

We are not highlighting here the actual reason for Ibn al-‘Alqamī’s salvation, but rather just determining the extent of the relationship between these two individuals.

Al-Majlisī mentions the correspondence between them discussing the religious verdict (according to Shī‘ah) regarding the collapse of the Abbasid empire, justifying it and the permitted ways of achieving it. He mentions:

لقول أبو جعفر عن العباسيين : لا يزال القوم في فسحة من ملكهم ما لم يصيبوا منا دماً حراماً

Abū Ja‘far has stated regarding the Abbasids, “They will live without fear in their land as long they do not shed our blood unjustly.”<sup>2</sup>

Al-Majlisī mentions:

ويحتمل أن يكون إشارة إلى قتل رجل من العلويين قتلوه مقارناً لانقضاء دولتهم كما يظهر مما كتب ابن العلقمي إلى نصير الدين الطوسي ...

As it appears in the correspondence between Ibn al-‘Alqamī and Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī, this was possibly referring to the murder of

---

1 *A‘yān al-Shī‘ah*, 9/101.

2 *Bihār al-Anwār*, 64/341.

an Alawid man which the Abbasids had killed in retaliation of the destruction of their state.

ʿArif Tāmūr also mentions the possibility of this liasion between them.<sup>1</sup>

## **The Shīʿī Creed**

As previously mentioned, al-Ṭūsī and Ibn al-ʿAlqamī belonged to the Shīʿah creed which constitutes belief in the Twelve Imāms. Manifesting the creed of these two individuals is of utmost importance, as the intellectual, cultural, and sociological background is a key factor in understanding a person’s influence, recognising the motives behind their disposition, the measures undertaken, and their outlook and perspective of those around them, be it individuals, groups, or nations. Due to this significance, I would like to mention some of the fundamental rules and beliefs of the Shīʿī creed which I believe will be of assistance in understanding the stance of these individuals. Similarly, the stance of the Shīʿah will become manifest regarding the accusations made against al-Ṭūsī and Ibn al-ʿAlqamī. Surprisingly, you will notice that despite their conflicting stances, they were harmonious in the beliefs and principles of this creed. Allah willing, this will soon become apparent upon examining the statements of their scholars. I say seeking help from Allah.

---

1 *Murābiʿ ibn Sīnā*, pg. 73.





## Chapter Three

### Introduction

Of the various names for the Shī'ī creed is the name al-Imāmīyyah, and this is due to their belief, "Appointing an Imām is from the fundamentals of Īmān". Hence, they have been named al-Ithnā 'Asharīyyah due to their belief in Twelve infallible Imāms.

The driving factor of this creed is the declaration to establish the leadership of 'Alī ibn Ṭālib رضي الله عنه and the leadership of his eleven sons subsequently.

### Inception of the Shī'ī Creed

The Shī'ī creed has been through many stages historically and ideologically, the first being the controversy between 'Alī رضي الله عنه and Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه.

It was a mere difference of opinion concerning the assassins of 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه, not an ideological dispute. The dispute continued and ideological opinions began gradually infiltrating the Shī'ah until it formed such beliefs that had no affiliation to Islam whatsoever, like declaring the Ṣaḥābah apostates, Badā', believing the Qur'ān has been adulterated, exceeding the bounds in relation to scholars, and so forth.

In this chapter, we will mention their existing and adopted beliefs together with those that have a connection to our discussion.

### Beliefs of the Shī'ah regarding the Ahl al-Sunnah and others

We repeatedly come across the statements of selected Shī'ī figures of our country and abroad regarding the need for unity and elimination

of conflicts, these are in fact things every rational person would aspire for; however, do their claims have any practical support to it? Why then the annual enactment of self-flagellation and other acts? Why are the emotions of the commonality spurred to hate the so-called enemies of the Ahl al-Bayt? Then—we ask—who are the enemies of the Ahl al-Bayt at present to whom this hatred is directed? The only response we get are generalisations; should this then not be regarded as Taqiyyah?

If you look attentively at the narrations of the creed and the statements of its scholars, you will realise that this concealed ranker and enmity is in actual fact directed towards the Ahl al-Sunnah.

Another matter worthy of mention is that if they are truthful to their claim of unity, then their stances should be clear from the narrations and the statements of their scholars regarding that which causes disunity in the Ummah and plants the seeds of hostility, as will be discussed in this chapter. Among the vague general responses that they give the closest which may be deemed to be a firm clear position or dissociation from it is their statement:

ليس كل رواياتنا صحيحة

Not every narration of ours is authentic.

Apart from this we have not come across any warning to abstain from those narrations that advocate disunity.

This opinion is an individual opinion, subject to scholarly discretion. Furthermore, we then witness those declaring the Ummah to be apostate and creating disunity being honoured and respected in Shīrī circles. So, if they were true to their word, they would have removed

all the narrations and statements that were causing the disunity, they would have established its inaccuracy and challenged those who followed it.

Prior to discussing their opinion regarding the Ahl al-Sunnah, it is imperative to clarify some of the terminologies used by the Shī'ah in their writings and in their opinions of the Ahl al-Sunnah.

The terminologies are as follows:

1. Al-Nawāṣib
2. Al-'Āmmah
3. Al-Mukhālif

### **Who are the al-Nawāṣib according to the terminology of the Shī'ah?**

Al-Nawāṣib is actually a name found in books of history and religious fundamentals of the ahl al-Sunnah, Shī'ah, and others. According to the Ahl al-Sunnah, it refers to people who harbour hatred for 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and belittle him. So, in light of this definition the Ahl al-Sunnah are not Nawāṣib, rather they consider Naṣb to be a disparagement and smear upon a person for he denies the known virtues and truth about the personality of 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. However, is this the definition of Nawāṣib according to the Shī'ah? I will present statements of their scholars to manifest the reality.

Al-Kulaynī narrates on the authority of Muḥammad ibn Muslim:

دخلت على أبي عبد الله وعنده أبو حنيفة فقلت له جعلت فداك رأيت  
رؤيا عجيبة قال لي يا ابن مسلم ها تھا فإن العالم بها جالس وأوماً بيده

إلى أبي حنيفة قال فقلت رأيت كأنني دخلت داري وإذا أهلي قد خرجت علي فكسرت جوزا كثيرا ونثرته علي فتعجبت من هذه الرؤيا فقال أبو حنيفة أنت رجل تخاصم وتجادل لئاما في مواريث أهلك فبعد نصب شديد تنال حاجتك منها إن شاء الله فقال أبو عبد الله أصبت والله يا أبا حنيفة قال ثم خرج أبو حنيفة من عنده فقلت جعلت فداك أني كرهت تعبير هذا الناصب فقال يا ابن مسلم لا يسوؤك الله فما يواطىء تعبيرهم تعبيرنا ولا تعبيرنا تعبيرنا وليس التعبير كما عبره قال فقلت له جعلت فداك فقولك أصبت وتحلف عليه وهو مخطيء قال نعم حلفت عليه أنه أصاب الخطأ قال فقلت له فما تأويلها قال يا ابن مسلم إنك تتمتع بإمرأة فتعلم بها اهلك فتمزق عليك ثيابا

I visited Abū ‘Abd Allāh [Imām Ja‘far al-Şādiq] and Abū Ḥanīfah was sitting with him.

I said to him, “May I be sacrificed for you, I have seen a strange dream.”

Abū ‘Abd Allāh replied, “What is it, O Ibn Muslim, certainly the one who can interpret it is sitting right here,” as he pointed to Abū Ḥanīfah.

So I said, “I saw myself about to enter my home but my wife came out to me and she began crushing walnuts and throwing them on me. I am astonished at the nature of this dream.”

Abū Ḥanīfah replied, “You are an evil person who will argue and dispute with your family regarding inheritance, if Allāh wills, you will attain what you will fight for after enduring a great deal of hardship.”

Abū ‘Abd Allāh remarked, “By Allah, your interpretation is correct.”

Abū Ḥanīfah then departed, so I said, “May I be sacrificed for you, I detest the interpretation of this **Nāṣīb**.”

He replied, “O Ibn Muslim, may Allah protect you! Their interpretation will never concur with ours nor will ours ever concur with theirs and the correct interpretation is not what he explained.”

So, I said, “May I be sacrificed for you, you concurred with him and took an oath upon it whereas he was incorrect?”

He replied, “Yes! I actually took an oath that he was incorrect.”

I said, “So what is the interpretation?”

He replied, “O Ibn Muslim, you will enjoy companionship with a woman but your wife will find out and tear your clothing ...”<sup>1</sup>

Similarly, their scholar Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Nu‘mān who is given the title of al-Mufīd, has called Abū Ḥanīfah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ a Nāṣībī in his book ‘*Iddah Rasā’il Fasl al-Masā’il al-Ṣāghānīyyah*.<sup>2</sup>

Ni‘mat Allāh al-Jazā’irī mentions his opinion:

ويؤيد هذا المعنى أن الأئمة عليهم السلام وخواصهم أطلقوا لفظ  
الناصبي على أبي حنيفة وأمثاله مع أن ابا حنيفة لم يكن ممن نصب  
العداوة لأهل البيت عليهم السلام بل كان له انقطاع إليهم وكان يظهر  
لهم التودد

---

1 *Al-Kāfī*, 8/292.

2 ‘*Iddah Rasā’il Fasl al-Masā’il al-Ṣāghānīyyah*, pg. 253, 263, 265, 268, 270.

What endorses this meaning is that the Imāms together with their selected ones would call Abū Ḥanīfah and those similar to him “Nāsibī”, even though Abū Ḥanīfah was not among those who incited hatred for the Ahl al-Bayt and rather distanced himself from them. He would in fact exhibit his love for the Ahl al-Bayt.<sup>1</sup>

### **If according to them, Naṣb isn't having enmity for 'Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, then what is it?**

One of their scholars, Ḥusayn ibn al-Shaykh Muḥammad Āl 'Uṣṣūr provides the answer to this:

على أنك قد عرفت سابقا أنه ليس الناصب إلا عبارة عن التقديم على  
علي غيره

As you may have previously noticed, al-Nāṣib is a term which means to give precedence to someone over 'Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.<sup>2</sup>

Therefore, due to the Ahl al-Sunnah giving the three Khulafā' precedence over 'Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, they have also been labelled as Nawāṣib by the Shī'ah. This hasn't been deduced just from his statement above, rather he has clarified it in his following statement:

بل أخبارهم عليهم السلام تنادي بأن الناصب هو ما يقال له عندهم سنيا

The narrations of the Imāms suggest that al-Nāṣib refers to all those who are classified as Sunnī.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 *Al-Anwār al-Nu'māniyyah*, 2/307.

2 *Al-Muhāsīn al-Nafsāniyyah fī Ajwibah al-Masā'il al-Khurasāniyyah*, pg. 157.

3 *Al-Muhāsīn al-Nafsāniyyah fī Ajwibah al-Masā'il al-Khurasāniyyah*, pg. 147.

Al-Darāzī mentions the same regarding this:

ولا كلام في أن المراد بالناصبه هم أهل التسنن

It is quite obvious that al-Nāṣibah refers to the Ahl al-Sunnah.

This is the actual meaning of Nāṣibī according to them. Soon, if Allah wills, there will be more clarity regarding their opinions about the Ahl al-Sunnah from their own statements, other than what we have mentioned.

### Who are the “Āmmah according to the terminology of the Shī‘ah?

Āyat Allāh al-‘Uẓmā Muḥsin al-Amīn mentions:

الخاصة وهذا يطلقه أصحابنا على أنفسهم مقابل العامة الذين يسمون  
بأهل السنة والجماعة

Al-Khāṣṣah refers to our companions whilst al-‘Āmmah refers to those classified as Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā‘ah.<sup>1</sup>

Their scholar Shaykh Ḥusayn ibn Shihāb al-Dīn al-Karkī al-‘Āmilī who died in 1076 AH mentions:

فذهب إلى الأول جماعة من العامة كالمزني الغزالي والصيرفي ومن  
الخاصة كالعلامة في أحد قوليہ ...

The first opinion has been preferred by a group of scholars made up of the ‘Āmmah, like al-Muzanī, al-Ghazālī and al-Sayrafī, and from the Khāṣṣah, like al-‘Allāmah according to one of his opinions....<sup>2</sup>

---

1 A‘yān al-Shī‘ah, 1/21.

2 Hidāyah al-Abrār ilā Tariq al-‘Immah al-Aṭhār, pg. 264.

The above mentioned ‘Āmmah are famous Sunnī scholars.

Āyat Allāh al-‘Uẓmā al-Shaykh Faṭḥ Allāh al-Namāzī al-Shīrāzī mentions:

وأما الحديث من طرق العامة فقد روى كثير من محدثيهم كالبخاري  
ومسلم

As for ḥadīth from the chains of transmission of the ‘Āmmah, many have narrated from their Muḥaddithīn, like al-Bukhārī and Muslim.<sup>1</sup>

Considering all of the above, ‘Āmmah refers to the Ahl al-Sunnah.

### **Who are the Mukhālif according to the terminology of the Shī‘ah?**

Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī mentions:

وأما ما يتضمن من الأربع تكبيرات محمول على التقية لأنه مذهب  
المخالفين

With regards to the narrations that include four takbīrs, they are subject to Taqīyah, as it is the opinion of the *Mukhālifīn*.<sup>2</sup>

Take cognisance of the fact that he did not mention “the belief of some Mukhālifīn”, indicating that Mukhālifīn refers to the Ahl al-Sunnah.

Ni‘mat Allāh al-Jazā’irī cites his explanation:

أقول هذا يكشف لك عن أمور كثيرة منها بطلان عبادة المخالفين وذلك  
أنهم وإن صاموا وصلوا وحجوا وزكوا وأتوا من العبادات والطاعات

---

1 *Qā‘idah Lā Ḍarara wa Lā Ḍirār*, pg. 21.

2 *Al-Tahdhīb*, 3/316.



وزادوا على غيرهم إلا أتوا إلى الله تعالى من غير الأبواب التي أمر بالدخول منها... وقد جعلوا المذاهب الأربعة وسائط وأبوابا بينهم وبين ربهم وأخذوا الأحكام عنهم وهم أخذوها عن القياسات والاستنباطات والآراء والاجتهاد الذي نهى الله سبحانه عن أخذ الأحكام عنها وطعن عليهم من دخل في الدين منها

I will mention something that will shed light on many matters. The futility of the worship of the **Mukhālifīn**: It is such that even if they fast, perform ṣalāh, perform ḥajj, discharge zakāh, or even exert themselves in worship and good deeds more than others, but due to them performing these deeds in a way other than the way Allah commanded to...

Their initiation of the four Madhāhib: They have made the Madhāhib as mediums and gateways between them and their Lord. They derive rulings from them, whilst its rulings are derived from analogies, deductions, opinions, and individual judgements; all of which Allah has forbidden that rulings be derived from and refuted those who follow the religion via it.<sup>1</sup>

So, Mukhālifīn refers to the adherents of the four Madhāhib, the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā'ah.

Since the meanings of their terminologies have been discussed, O brother seeking the truth, let us study their verdict regarding the Muslims, so that it becomes apparent whether it is possible for a man affiliated to this creed to betray the Ahl al-Sunnah, and does he believe that following the Shī'ī creed prevents him from betraying the Sunnī ruler. This allegation will then be substantiated.

---

1 *Qīṣaṣ al-Ambiyā'*, pg. 347.

## 1. The one who rejects the authority of the Twelve Imāms is a disbeliever

The Shī'ah believe that Imāmah is one of the fundamentals of Dīn. They believe Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم appointed Twelve Imāms after him. They believe them to be infallible. They consider obedience to them and acceptance of their teachings to be compulsory. They consider rejection of the Imāms to be tantamount to rejection of the Rasūl of Allāh صلى الله عليه وسلم.

So, what is their opinion regarding those who are not of the same belief and only honour these twelve individuals, as they recognise the status of their lineage without considering them to be infallible and obedience to them compulsory?

Before mentioning the statements of the Shī'ī scholars regarding the disbelief of Ahl al-Sunnah, I present to you the opinion of one of the two individuals connected to this topic, and it is the opinion of Khawājah al-Ṭūsī in the words of al-Māḥūzī:

In *al-Kāfi*, Thiqat al-Islam reports from Zurārāh who narrates that al-Bāqir عليه السلام said, “If a person has to spend his night in prayer and day in fasting, give all his wealth in charity, and perform Haj every year but did not recognise the Wilāyah of the Walī of Allah thereby not devoting himself and all his actions to him, he therefore has no right upon Allah that he rewards him nor is he from the people of īmān.” This meaning was determined by the great philosopher, greatest leader of the latter scholars, Naṣīr al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad al-Ṭūsī. May Allah honour his soul and please him with the gardens of Jannah.<sup>1</sup>

---

1 *Al-Arba'īn*, pg. 98.

He rendered the following:

If a servant has to come with righteous deeds tomorrow,  
From visiting every messenger sent and pious person,  
And fasting excessively without becoming tired,  
And abundant prayer without getting lazy,  
And performing compulsory Ḥajj for Allah,  
And circumambulating the Ka'bah without shoes,  
And flying into the air without the assistance of anyone,  
And diving into the ocean without getting wet,  
And clothing the orphans with silk,  
And feeding them delicious wheat with honey,  
And living amongst thousands people,  
Distanced from sin and saved from error,  
But none will be of assistance to him on the Day of judgement,  
Except great love for Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī.<sup>1</sup>

There is also a statement of al-Ṭūsī regarding 'Alī عليه السلام mentioned in *A'yān al-Shī'ah*:

When the trumpet is blown then approach 'Alī,  
For the sincerity of allegiance will be of aid.

---

<sup>1</sup> *A'yān al-Shī'ah*, 9/419 with the variance of some words; Book of 'Ārif Tāmūr about al-Ṭūsī, pg. 67, from an Ismā'īlī author of the 7th century by the name Nūr al-Dīn Aḥmad who mentions it in his book *Fuṣūl wa Akhbār*.

That Imām who if a person rejected his rank,

Then his neither his Ḥajj or ‘Umrah will be of help to him.<sup>1</sup>

Look at the extremism of their scholars, let alone their general masses.

Extremism in loving ‘Alī عليه السلام, as demanded by al-Ṭūsī above such that neither Ḥajj or ‘Umrah will be of assistance, is contrary to our understanding and belief. We are the Ahl al-Sunnah. There is actually another method of differentiation according to al-Ṭūsī which al-Māhūzī al-Shīī has informed us of:

It is narrated that al-Muḥaqqiq Naṣīr al-Millāh wa al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad al-Ṭūsī, may Allāh honour his soul, established proof of the hate of Ahl al-Sunnah towards the Ahl al-Bayt. His proof is as follows:

The Mukhālīfūn have hatred for all those who harbour enmity towards Abū Bakr, ‘Umar, and ‘Uthmān irrespective of who they may be, or whether they are familiar with their name and lineage. Our Imāms, however, openly express hatred towards Abū Bakr, ‘Umar, and ‘Uthmān, and attribute to them all the evil and shameful incidents that occurred in the Ummah therefore resulting in the Mukhālīfūn showing hatred to our Imāms. The first opinion isn’t incorrect while the second is the absolute truth although the opposition rejected it. Certainly truth does not lose credibility by being rejected. They have now become disbelievers. We have discussed it in length in our mentioned writing. Allāh is the true guider.<sup>2</sup>

---

1 *A’yān al-Shī’ah*, 9/419.

2 *Al-Arba’in*, pg. 99.

And just like that, the entire Ahl al-Sunnah are considered disbelievers in the eyes of al-Ṭūsī who was the reviver of their creed in the seventh century!

This is not just the opinion of al-Ṭūsī, rather it is the famous view of their creed and the statements of their scholars are in accordance to it.

Their leader of their Muḥaddithīn, Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn Bābawayh who they have titled al-Ṣadūq mentions his opinion:

واعتقادنا فيمن جحد إمامه أمير المؤمنين علي بن أبي طالب والأئمة  
من بعده عليهم السلام أنه كمن جحد نبوة جميع الأنبياء واعتقادنا فيمن  
أقر بأمر المؤمنين وأنكر واحدا من بعده من الأئمة أنه بمنزلة من أقر  
بجميع الأنبياء وأنكر نبوة نبينا محمد صلى الله عليه وآله

According to our belief, the one who rejects the Imāmah of Amīr al-Mu’minīn ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib and the Imāms after him is like he who has rejected the Nubūwwah of all the Ambiyā’, and the one who accepts Amīr al-Mu’minīn but rejects any one of the Imāms after him is similar to he who accepted the Nubūwwah of all the Ambiyā’ but rejected the Nubūwwah of our Messenger, Muḥammad <sup>1</sup>صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

They also attribute the following statement to Nabī صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ:

الأئمة من بعدي اثني عشر أولهم أمير المؤمنين علي بن أبي طالب  
وآخرهم القائم طاعتهم طاعتي ومعصيتهم معصيتي من أنكر واحدا  
منهم قد أنكرني

There will be twelve Imāms after me, the first of them is Amīr al-Mu’minīn ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib and the last is al-Mahdī, obeying

---

1 Risālah al-’Iṭiqādāt, pg. 103.

them is like obeying me and disobeying them is like disobeying me, whosoever rejects anyone of them then he has certainly rejected me.<sup>1</sup>

Their greatest scholar, Jamāl al-Dīn al-Ḥasan Yūsuf ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī mentions:

الإمامة لطف عام والنبوة لطف خاص لإمكان خلو الزمان من نبي حي بخلاف الإمام لما سيأتي وإنكار اللطف العام شر من إنكار اللطف الخاص وإلى هذا أشار الصادق بقوله عن منكر الإمامة أصلا ورأسا وهو شرهم

Imāmah is a universal grace while Nubuwwah is a special grace, because it is possible that a specific period in time can be void of a living Nabī, while the same is not true for the Imām. To reject the universal grace is worse than to reject the special grace. Al-Sādiq indicated towards this by calling a person who denies Imāmah in all totality “the worst of them”.<sup>2</sup>

Their scholar and Muḥaddith, Yūsuf al-Bahrānī mentions:

وليت شعري أي فرق بين من كفر بالله سبحانه وتعالى ورسوله وبين من كفر بالأئمة عليهم السلام مع ثبوت كون الإمامة من أصول الدين

What difference is there between the one who disbelieves in Allah سبحانه وتعالى and his Rasūl, and the one who rejects the Imāms عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَام when it is proven to be of the fundamentals of Dīn.<sup>3</sup>

Their Hakīm, Muḥaqqiq and Philosopher, Muḥammad Muḥsin al-Maʿrūf commonly known as Fayḍ al-Kāshānī mentions:

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār*, 27/61, 62.

2 *Al-Alfayn fī Imāmah Amīr al-Muʿminīn* ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, pg. 13.

3 *Al-Ḥadāʾiq al-Nāḍirah fī Ahkām al-ʿAtarah al-Ṭāhirah*, 18/153.

ومن جحد إمامه أحدهم أي الأئمة الاثنى عشر فهو بمنزلة من جحد  
نبوة جميع الأنبياء عليهم السلام

A person who rejects one of the Imāms is similar to he who has  
rejected the Nubūwwah of all the Ambiyā عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَامُ.<sup>1</sup>

Mullā Muḥammad Bāqir al-Majlisī mentions:

إعلم أن إطلاق لفظ الشرك والكفر على من لم يعتقد إمامة أمير المؤمنين  
والأئمة من ولده عليهم السلام وفضل عليهم غيرهم يدل أم مخلدون  
في النار

Be informed that usage of the words of Shirk and Kufr for those  
who don't believe in the Imāmah of Amīr al-Mu'minīn and the  
Imāms of his progeny عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَامُ and their superiority over others  
indicates that they will abide forever in Hell.<sup>2</sup>

Considering the above, they believe that Ahl al-Sunnah will be  
sentenced to Jahannam eternally!

Their scholar Muḥammad Ḥasan al-Najfī mentions:

والمخالف لأهل الحق كافر بلا خلاف بيننا .. كالمحكي عن الفاضل  
محمد صالح في شرح أصول الكافي بل والشريف القاضي نور الله في  
إحقاق الحق من الحكم بكفر منكري الولاية لأنها أصل من أصول  
الدين

A person who contradicts the people of truth is considered a  
disbeliever amongst us unanimously. Similarly, the statement  
of al-Fāḍil Muḥammad Ṣālih in *Sharḥ Uṣūl al-Kāfī* and that of

1 *Minhāj al-Najāh*, pg. 48.

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār*, 23/390.

al-Sharīf al-Qāḍī Nūr Allāh in Iḥqāq al-Ḥaqq is regarding the ruling of kufr upon the one who rejects Wilāyah, as it is from the fundamentals of Dīn.<sup>1</sup>

Take note that the one who rejects Imāmah is unanimously considered a disbeliever in their eyes indicating to all the Ahl al-Sunnah being unanimously considered disbelievers.

Āyat Allāh al-Shaykh ‘Abd Allāh al-Māmaqānī who they have titled *al-‘Allāmah al-Thānī* (the second ‘Allāmah) mentions:

وغاية ما يستفاد من الأخبار جريان حكم الكافر والمشرك في الآخرة  
على كل من لم يكن اثني عشري

The objective to be understood from these statements is that all those who are not Ithnā ‘Asharī will be labelled Kāfir and Mushrik in the hereafter.<sup>2</sup>

Khomeini narrates from Muḥammad ibn Muslim al-Thaqafī who mentioned:

سألت أبا جعفر محمد بن علي عليهما السلام عن قول الله عز وجل:  
فأولئك يبذل الله سيئاتهم حسنات وكان الله غفورا رحيما(الفرقان: ٧٠  
) فقال : يؤتى بالمؤمن المذنب يوم القيامة حتى يقام بموقف الحساب  
فيكون الله تعالى هو الذي يتولى حسابه لا يطلع على حسابه أحدا من الناس  
فيعرفه ذنوبه حتى إذا أقر بسيئاته قال الله عز وجل للكتابة: بدلوا حسنات  
وأظروها للناس فيقول الناس حينئذ ما كان لهذا العبد سيئة واحدة ! ثم  
يأمر الله به إلى الجنة فهذا تأويل الآية وهي في المذنبين من شيعتنا خاصة

1 *Jawāhir al-Kalām*, 6/62.

2 *Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl*, 1/208.



I asked Abū Ja'far Muḥammad ibn 'Alī regarding the Qur'ānic verse, “They are those people whom Allāh will change their evil deeds into good deeds, and Allāh is most forgiving most merciful.”<sup>1</sup>

He replied, “A sinner will be brought on the Day of Qiyāmah to the place of reckoning where he will be discreetly reckoned by Allah alone. He will recognise and confess to his wrongs. Allah will then say to the scribes, ‘Convert all his deeds into good deeds and reveal it to the people.’ The people in shock will say, ‘Wow, this person has not committed even a single wrong!’ Allah will then usher him into Jannah. This is the interpretation of the verse, and it only refers to the sinners of the Shī'ah.”<sup>2</sup>

Khomeini has commented as follows regarding this narration:

ومن المعلوم أن هذا الأمر يختص بشيعة أهل البيت ويحرم عنه الناس الآخرون لأن الإيمان لا يحصل إلا بواسطة ولاية علي وأوصيائه من المعصومين الطاهرين عليهم السلام بل لا يقبل الإيمان بالله ورسوله من دون الولاية كما نذكر ذلك في الفصل التالي

It is obvious that this favour is exclusive to the sect of the Ahl al-Bayt and forbidden for others as īmān can only be attained via the Wilāyah of 'Alī and his pure and infallible heirs عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام. In fact, īmān in Allāh and his Messenger is not acceptable without belief in Wilāyah as we will expound on in the coming chapter.<sup>3</sup>

Khomeini further mentions:

إن ما مر في ذيل الحديث الشريف من أن ولاية أهل البيت ومعرفتهم

---

1 Sūrah al-Furqān: 70.

2 Al-Arb'ūn Ḥadīthan, pg. 510, 511.

3 Al-Arb'ūn Ḥadīthan, pg. 511.

شرط في قبول الأعمال يعتبر من الأمور المسلمة بل تكون من ضروريات مذهب التشيع المقدس وتكون الأخبار في هذا الموضوع أكبر من طاقة مثل هذه الكتب المختصرة على استيعابها وأكثر من حجم التواتر ويتبرك هذا الكتاب بذكر بعض تلك الأخبار

As mentioned in the latter portion of the previous ḥadīth that the matter of Wilāyah of Ahl al-Bayt and recognising their status is a condition for acceptance of actions in the matters of Dīn; however, it is in reality a requisite of the sanctified Shī'ī creed. Information of this topic exceeds the capacity of this concise booklet and surpasses the definition of uninterrupted transmission, although this booklet is now blessed due to some of this information being incorporated.<sup>1</sup>

Take note, the Wilāyah which the Shī'ah are devoted to is a fundamental belief which they will never shift from, due to their belief in it having surpassed the definition of uninterrupted transmission as attested to by Khomeini. They consider it not only to be a condition of acceptance for actions but also a requisite for īmān in Allāh and his Messenger صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

Look carefully at this statement of Khomeini as he clearly attests to it:

والأخبار في هذا الموضوع وبهذا المضمون كثيرة ويستفاد من مجموعها أن ولاية أهل البيت عليهم السلام شرط في قبول الأعمال عند الله سبحانه بل هو شرط في قبول الإيمان بالله والنبي الأكرم صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم

There is plenty of information on and about this subject. The essence of it is that the Wilāyah of Ahl al-Bayt is not just a

---

1 Al-Arb'ūn Ḥadīthan, pg. 512.

condition of the validity of actions in the court of Allah but rather it is a requisite of the validity of imān in Allāh and Nabī ﷺ.<sup>1</sup>

Their scholar ‘Abd Allāh Shubbar who is titled the greatest leader, the strongest support, the greatest scholar and crown of the jurists, the leader of the creed, the compiler of transmitted knowledge and rational sciences, the educator of practical and fundamental laws, mentions:

وأما سائر المخالفين ممن لم ينصب ولم يعاند ولم يتعصب فالذي عليه جملة من الإمامية كالسيد المرتضى أنهم كفار في الدنيا والآخرة والذي عليه الأكثر الأشهر أنهم كفار مخلدون في الآخرة

As for all of the Mukhālifīn, those who are not guilty of Naṣb, nor have they opposed, or conspired against, then according to a group of Shī‘ah which includes Sayyid al-Murtaḍā, “They are disbelievers in this world and the next”; however according to the majority, “They are disbelievers who will remain in hell eternally.”<sup>2</sup>

Al-Mufīd mentions in *al-Masā’il*:

اتفقت الإمامية على أن من أنكر إمامة أحد من الأئمة وجحد ما أوجبه الله تعالى له من فرض الطاعة فهو كافر ضال مستحق للخلود في النار

All the Shī‘ah are of the opinion regarding a person who rejects the Imāmah of any of the Imāms and rejects what Allah has made binding upon him of compulsory obedience that he is a misguided disbeliever who is worthy of remaining in hell forever.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 *Al-Arb‘ūn Ḥadīthan*, pg. 513.

2 *Haq al-Yaqīn fī Ma‘rifah Usūl al-Dīn*, 2/188.

3 *Bihār al-Anwār*, 23/391.

## 2. Permissibility of shedding the blood of Ahl al-Sunnah

We begin explaining their belief regarding the blood of Muslims by mentioning the view of none other than al-Ṭūsī himself. His previous statement is regarding the disbelief of the Ahl al-Sunnah. He declares the blood of Ahl al-Sunnah to be permissible in such a distinct manner that it leaves no room for dispute.

One of their scholars, al-Jawāhirī, mentioned the following in a dispute with someone who did not deem the slaying of the opposition to be permissible:

وما أبعد ما بينه وبين الخاجا نصير الدين الطوسي والعلامة الحلبي وغيرهم ممن يرى قتلهم ونحوه من أحوال الكفار حتى وقع منهم ما وقع في بغداد ونواحيها وبالجملة طول الكلام في ذلك كما فعله في الحدائق من تضييع العمر في الواضحات .....

There is not any difference between Khājah Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī or ‘Allāmah al-Ḥillī and those who are of the opinion of killing and its likes in respect of the disbelievers, to the extent of perpetrating what occurred in Baghdad and its surroundings. In short, discussing this matter in length as he has done in *al-Ḥadā’iq* is spending time discussing the obvious.<sup>1</sup>

The followed scholar as they call him, al-Mīrẓā Muḥammad Bāqir al-Mūsawī al-Khuwānasārī al-Aṣbahānī mentions his view in the biography of Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī:

هو المحقق المتكلم الحكيم المتبحر الجليل... ومن جملة أمره المشهور المعروف المنقول حكاية استيزار للسلطان المحتشم في

---

1 *Jawāhir al-‘ilm*, 22/62.

محروسة إيران هولاًكو خان بن تولي جنكيز خان من عظماء سلاطين التاتارية وأتراك المغول ومجيئه في موكب السلطان المؤيد مع كمال الاستعداد إلى دار السلام بغداد لإرشاد العباد وإصلاح البلاد وقطع دابر سلسلة البغي والفساد وإخماد دائرة الجور والإلباس بإبداة دائرة ملك بني العباس وإيقاع القتل العام من أتباع اولئك الطغاة إلى أن أسال من دمائهم الأقدار كأمثال الانهار فأنهار بها في ماء دجلة ومنها إلى نار جهنم دار البوار و محل الأشقياء والأشرار

He was an eloquent, wise, profound and powerful scholar ... In a nutshell, the famous recognised... From the famous reported incidents that are known is his appointment to act as Vizier for the reticent ruler of the guarded domains of Iran, Halaku Khan ibn Tolui Genghis Khan, who was at the time a powerful king of the Tartars and Mongol Turks. He joined the convoy of the powerful king with absolute propensity towards Baghdad the city of peace with the purpose of guiding the people, improving the city, eradicating the ongoing tyranny and corruption together with its headquarters, by destroying the empire of Abbasids and openly killing the followers of those oppressors until their dirty blood flowed like rivers into the Tigris River, and from there into the fire of Jahannum the place of ruin, hardships, and evils.<sup>1</sup>

May Allah save the Muslims from ever being ruled by them.

### **Statements of their scholars:**

Their scholar Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī narrates the following from Dāwūd ibn Farqad:

---

1 *Rawḍāt al-Jannāt fī Aḥwāl al-‘Ulamā’ wa al-Sādāt*, 1/300-301.

قلت لأبي عبد الله ما تقول في قتل الناصب قال حلال الدم ولكنني أتقى عليك فإن قدرت أن تقلب عليه حائطاً أو تغرقه في ماء لكيلا يشهد به عليك فافعل، قلت فما ترى في ماله قال توّه ما قدرت عليه

I enquired from Abū ‘Abd Allāh, “What is your opinion regarding the slaying of a Nāṣib?”

He replied, “Killing them is permissible; however, I fear for you, it would be better if you could drop a wall on him or drown him in water so that nobody can testify against you.”

I then said, “What is your opinion regarding his wealth?”

He replied, “Deceive him as much as you can.”<sup>1</sup>

This repulsive narration has also been mentioned by their scholar al-Ḥurr al-‘Āmilī in *Wasā’il al-Shī’ah* and by Ni‘mat Allāh al-Jazā’irī in *al-Anwār al-Nu‘māniyyah* under the following statement:

جواز قتلهم (أي النواصب) واستباحة أمواله

Permissibility of killing them and usurping their wealth.<sup>2</sup>

So, the only problem with it is a manner needs to be adopted to absolve the Shī’ah from being subjected to the penalty for murder.

Yūsuf al-Baḥrānī mentions that the permissibility to take the wealth and lives of Ahl al-Sunnah is the view of the former and latter Shī’ah. He mentions the following:

إن إطلاق المسلم على الناصب وأنه لا يجوز أخذ ماله من حيث الإسلام خلاف ما عليه الطائفة المحقة سلفاً وخلفاً من الحكم بكفر الناصب ونجاسته وجواز أخذ ماله بل قتله

---

1 *Ilal al-Sharāyī*, pg. 601.

2 *Wasā’il al-Shī’ah*, 18/463; *al-Anwār al-Nu‘māniyyah*, 2/307.

Muslims are referred to as Nāṣib. According to Islam, it is impermissible to usurp their wealth. But former and latter scholars are of the opinion that a Nāṣib is a disbeliever and an impure person whose wealth cannot only be usurped, but he can also be killed.<sup>1</sup>

Ni‘mat Allāh al-Jazā‘irī mentions:

يجوز قتلهم (أي النواصب) واستباحة أموالهم

Killing them and usurping their wealth are both permissible.<sup>2</sup>

Yusuf al-Baḥrānī mentions:

وإلى هذا القول ذهب أبو الصلاح ، وابن إدریس ، وسالار ، وهو الحق الظاهر بل الصريح من الأخبار لاستفاضتها وتكاثرها بكفر المخالف ونصبه وشركه وحل ماله ودمه كما بسطنا عليه الكلام بما لا يحوم حوله شبهة النقض والإبرام في كتاب الشهاب الثاقب في بيان معنى الناصب وما يترتب عليه من المطالب

Abū al-Ṣalāḥ, Ibn Idrīs, and Salār are all of the above opinion. It is apparent and rather obvious considering the abundance of statements that consider the opposition to be a disbeliever, Nāṣib, Mushrik and consider his wealth and blood permissible. We have explained at length in *Kitāb al-Shihāb al-Thāqib* under the explanation of Nāṣib and what is he held accountable for, in a manner that prevents the possibility of contradiction or obscurity arising.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 *Al-Ḥadā‘iq al-Nāḍirah fī Aḥkām al-‘Atarah al-Ṭāhirah*, 12/323-324.

2 *Al-Anwār al-Nu‘māniyyah*, 2/307.

3 *Al-Ḥadā‘iq al-Nāḍirah fī Aḥkām al-‘Atarah al-Ṭāhirah*, 10/360.

Shaykh ‘Abd al-Mun‘im al-Nimr mentions in his book *Al-Shī‘ah al-Mahdī al-Darūz Tārīkh wa Wathā‘iq* that he faced many threats from the Shī‘ah at the time of writing about them.<sup>1</sup>

The Shī‘ah harbour hatred, enmity and aversion to the Ahl al-Sunnah, but based on their abhorrent belief of Taqiyya, they conceal it by means of civility towards Ahl al-Bayt and expressing false love. This has, however, blinded the Ahl al-Sunnah from seeing their actual stance. ‘Abd al-Mun‘im al-Nimr mentions the following:

ولكننا نحن العرب السنين لا نفطن إلى هذا بل ظننا أن السنين الطويلة قد تكفلت مع الإسلام بمحوه وإزالته فلم يخطر لنا على بال فشاركنا الإيرانيين فرحهم واعتقدنا أن الخميني سيتجاوز أو ينسى مثلنا كل هذه المسائل التاريخية ويؤدي دوره كزعيم إسلامي لأمة إسلامية يقود الصحوة الإسلامية منها وذلك لصالح الإسلام والمسلمين جميعا لا فرق بين فارسي وعربي ولا بين شيعي وسني ولكن اظهرت الأحداث بعد ذلك أننا كنا غارقين في أحلام وردية أو في بحر آمالنا مما لا يزال بعض شبابنا ورجالنا غارقين فيها حتى الآن برغم الأحداث المزعجة

We the Sunnī Arabs do not realise this, rather we are of the opinion that the many years of Islam acts as a security from its destruction or eradication. It has not occurred to us, so we became part of Iranian festivals and began believing that Khomeini will soon disregard or forget like us all these historic matters, and he will rule like an Islamic ruler of an Islamic nation who will awaken consciousness to Islam which will be to the advantage of Islam and the Muslims altogether, as there will be no difference between a Persian and an Arab or between

---

1 *Al-Shī‘ah al-Mahdī al-Darūz Tārīkh wa Wathā‘iq*, pg. 10.



a Shīī and a Sunnī. However the incidents thereafter proved to us that we were drowning in rosy dreams or in the ocean of our hopes which some of our youngsters and grownups continue drowning in until now, despite the unpleasant incidents.

The massacre of Shaykh Iḥsān Ilāhī Ḍahīr together with eighteen other Muslims that occurred on 23 July 1407 in the midst of the conference for ‘Ulamā’ of Ḥadīth was due to the blood of those who oppose them or refute their baseless claims to be permissible.

### 3. Permissibility to usurp the wealth of Ahl al-Sunnah

There has already been mentioned regarding the permissibility to usurp the wealth of the Ahl al-Sunnah in the discussion regarding their ruling regarding the blood of Muslims. However, the following statements also appear.

The statement Abū ‘Abd Allāh:

خذ مال الناصب حيث ما وجدته وادفع إلينا الخمس

Usurp the wealth of the Nāṣib no matter where you find it and give us a fifth of it.

Shaykh al-Ṭā’ifah Abū Ja’far al-Ṭūsī mentions this narration in *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām*<sup>1</sup>, al-Fayḍ al-Kāshānī mentions it in *al-Wāfi*<sup>2</sup>, whilst their Shaykh al-Darāzī al-Baḥrānī quotes it in *al-Mahāsin al-Nafsāniyyah*<sup>3</sup> and explains it elaborately.

---

1 *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām*, 4/122.

2 *Al-Wāfi*, 6/43.

3 *Al-Mahāsin al-Nafsāniyyah*, pg. 167.

Their great authority, Rūḥ Allāh Khomeini ruled the following regarding this matter:

والأقوى إلحاق الناصب بأهل الحرب في إباحة ما اغتتم منهم وتعلق  
الخمس به بل الظاهر جواز أخذ ماله أين وجد وبأي نحو كان ووجوب  
إخراج خمسه

According to the most authentic narration, a Nāṣib is similar to a disbelieving enemy in regards to the permissibility of usurping wealth from him, and the law of Khumus applies. It is evident that it is permissible to usurp his wealth wherever it is found and by any means as long as a fifth is taken out.<sup>1</sup>

Muḥsin al-Muʿallim also quotes this narration in his book *al-Naṣb wa al-Nawāṣib* gathering from it the permissibility of usurping the wealth of Ahl al-Sunnah as they are Nawāṣib considering this misguidance.<sup>2</sup>

Certainly the methods of deceit, stealing, trickery, fraud and other impermissible means are considered permissible to the Ahl al-Sunnah according to Khomeini by means of his statement:

...وبأي نحو كان...

And by any means possible.

#### 4. Impurity of Ahl al-Sunnah according to the Shīʿah

Their former authority, Muḥammad Kāẓim al-Ṭabāṭabāʾī mentions:

لا إشكال في نجاسة الغلاة والخوارج والنواصب

---

1 *Taḥrīr al-Wasīlah*, 1/352.

2 *Al-Naṣb wa al-Nawāṣib*, pg. 615.

There is not any ambiguity in the fact that the Ghulāt, Khawārij, and Nawāṣib are considered impure.<sup>1</sup>

Their definition of Nawāṣib has been explained previously.

Their learned scholar, Āyat Allāh al-Ḥasan ibn Yūsuf ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī mentions:

والخوارج والغلاة والناصب وهو الذي يتظاهر بعداوة أهل البيت عليهم السلام أنجاس

The Khawārij, Ghulāt, Nāṣib and those who display hatred for the Ahl al-Bayt are all considered impure.<sup>2</sup>

Khomeini mentions:

وأما النواصب والخوارج لعنهم الله تعالى فهما نجسان من غير توقف

As for the Nawāṣib and Khawārij, may the curse of Allah be on them, they are without a doubt considered impure.<sup>3</sup>

Khomeini also mentions:

غير الاثنى عشرية من فرق الشيعة أذ لم يظهر منهم نصب ومعاداة وسب لسائر الأمة الذين لا يعتقدون بإمامتهم طاهرون وأما مع ظهور ذلك منهم فهم مثل سائر النواصب

The Shī'ah of sects other than the sect of the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah are considered pure as long as they are not harbouring any Naṣb, animosity or vituperation towards the Imāms they have

---

1 Al-'Urwah al-Wuthqā, 1/68.

2 Nihāyah al-Aḥkām fī Ma'rifah al-Aḥkām, 1/274.

3 Taḥrīr al-Wasīlah, 1/118.

no belief in. However, if they begin displaying the above, then they are no different to the Nawāṣib.<sup>1</sup>

O beloved reader, take note of the above that sects other than Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah are still considered to be pure, whereas mention of the Ahl al-Sunnah has not even been made as they are considered impure without a doubt.

Al-Ṣadūq narrates on the authority of Abū Baṣīr who narrates from Abū ‘Abd Allāh saying:

إن نوح احمّل في السفينة الكلب والخنزير ولم يحمل فيها ولد الزنا  
والناصب ر من ولد الزنا

Nūḥ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام took a dog and a pig along into the ark; however, he did not take along an illegitimate child, and a Nāṣib is considered to be worse than an illegitimate child.<sup>2</sup>

Their great symbol, al-Ḥājj al-Sayyid Muḥammad Riḍā Golpaygani mentions:

ناصب العداوة لأحد من المعصومين الأربعة عشر سلام الله عليهم  
أو الساب له نجس وإن أظهر الإسلام ولا إشكال في كفر الغلاة  
ونجاستهم وهم المعتقدون بألوهيته أمير المؤمنين وكذا الخوارج  
والنواصب

A person who has hatred for any of the fourteen infallible personalities—may Allah shower them with peace—or reviles them, is considered impure even though he may proclaim Islam. There is no ambiguity regarding the disbelief of the Ghulāt

---

1 *Taḥrīr al-Wasīlah*, 1/119.

2 *Taḥrīr al-Wasīlah*, 1/119.

and their impurity as they believe in the divinity of Amīr al-Mu'minīn. Similar are the Khawārij and the Nawāṣib.<sup>1</sup>

Take note that the mention of Nāṣb which means hatred for the Ahl al-Bayt and reviling them refer to the Nawāṣib of previous times who do not exist today. There is another classification of Nawāṣib which according to their terminology, the Ahl al-Sunnah belong to. It has been mentioned previously that according to them, a Sunnī is referred to as Nāṣib.

Their scholar Yūsuf al-Baḥrānī mentions:

ولا يخفى ما في هذا الاستدلال من الضعف والوهن لدلالة الأخبار المستفيضة بل المتواترة معنى كما أوضحناه في الرسالة المشار إليها على كفر المخالف الغير مستضعف ونصبه ونجاسته ولا ريب أن هذين الخبرين يقصران عن معارضة تلك الأخبار سندا وعددا ودلالة فالواجب حملها إما على التقية وهو الأظهر بقريئة الرواة فيهما أو تخصيصها بما عدا المخالف كما أنه يجب تخصيصها بما عدا الغالي والخوارج والنواصب بالمعنى المشهور بين الأصحاب فإنهم لا يختلفون في كفر الجميع

The deficiency and inadequacy of this deduction is apparent due to the indication of extensive or rather uninterrupted explanations as we have shed light on it in the aforementioned booklet regarding the disbelief of the other opposition being deemed weak, their Naṣb, and their impurity. There is no doubt in these two matters being inadequate in contradicting these claims from the aspect of ascription, number, and semantics. Therefore, understanding it as Taqiyyah is clearly the only

---

1 Mukhtaṣar al-Aḥkām, pg. 9.

option considering the connection of narrators in them both or specifying it by excluding the opposition just as it is necessary to exclude the extremist, Khawārij, and Nawāṣib according to the famous interpretation of the scholars, as they do not differ regarding the disbelief of the masses.<sup>1</sup>

In that case, the narrations and statements that do not attest to the disbelief and impurity of the opposition will be understood as Taqiyyah and this is probably not heard from them nowadays due to the same reason. I do not intend generalising, as there are some who are truthful; however, a truthful Shīṭī will become apparent in his firm stances against those statements which create disunity in the Ummah.

Ni‘mah Allāh al-Jazā’irī mentions:

وأما الناصب وأحواله، فهو بما يتم ببيان أمرين. الاول: في بيان معنى الناصبي الذي ورد في الأخبار أنه نجس، وأنه أشر من اليهودي والنصراني والمجوسي وأنه كافر نجس بإجماع علماء الإمامية رضوان الله عليهم

The matter of the Nāṣib and his position can be understood by explaining two matters:

1. Explaining the meaning of Nāṣib that appears in the narrations that he is impure, worse than a Jew, Christian or Fire worshipper and he is considered an impure disbeliever according to the consensus of the Shīṭī scholars, may Allah be pleased with them...<sup>2</sup>

---

1 *Sharḥ al-Risālah al-Ṣalātiyyah*, pg. 334.

2 *Al-Anwār al-Nu‘māniyyah*, 2/306.

## 5. Their ruling with regards to living under the rule of Ahl al-Sunnah

We have noticed from the previous statements of the Shī'ah that the Ahl al-Sunnah are disbelievers due to their famous rejection of the necessary beliefs, according to the Shī'ah. This also includes their governors and rulers; however, the matter concerning the rulers is greater, as they have usurped the position from the very Imām who was the reason why they were ruled disbelievers in the first place; so, what would the ruling regarding the one who usurped his position unrightfully be and what would be the ruling regarding living under such a ruler?

Muḥaqqiq al-Baḥrānī explains this ruling and the statements related to it:

المسألة الثالثة في معونة الظالمين والمشهور في كلام الأصحاب تقييدها بما يحرم وأما ما لا يحرم كالخياطة لهم والبناء ونحو ذلك فإنه لا بأس به قال في الكفاية ومن ذلك معونة الظالمين بما يحرم أما ما لا يحرم كالخياطة وغيرها فالظاهر جوازه لكن الأحوط الاحتراز عنه لبعض الأخبار الدالة على المنع وقوله تعالى ولا تركزوا إلى الذين ظلموا فتمسكم النار قال في مجمع البيان فليل معناه ولا تميلوا إلى المشركين في شيء من دينكم عن ابن عباس وقيل لا تدهنوا الظلمة عن السدي وابن زيد قيل إن الركون إلى الظالمين المنهي عنه هو الدخول معهم في ظلمهم وإظهار موالاتهم وأما الدخول عليهم ومعاشرتهم فدفعاً لشرهم فجائز عن القاضي وقريب منه ما روى عنهم عليهم السلام إن الركون هو المودة والنصيحة والطاعة لهم انتهى

The third ruling with regards to assisting the oppressors which is famous amongst the statements of the scholars is restricted to

that which is impermissible. As for that which is permissible like sewing for them, building, and similar, then there is no objection to it. He mentions in al-Kifāyah, “It only includes assisting the oppressors in that which is impermissible, whereas permissible things like tailoring or similar are clearly permissible. However, the more precautionary measure would be to refrain altogether considering the few statements which condemn it. Allah mentions in the Qur’ān, “*And incline not to those who are sinners, lest the fire afflicts you.*”

It is mentioned in *Majma‘ al-Bayān*, “The interpretation of the verse is, “And do not side with the polytheists in any aspect of your religion”, attributed to Ibn ‘Abbās. And it is said, “Do not treat a transgressor with kindness,” from al-Suddī and Ibn Zayd. It has been said that the inclination towards the transgressors which is prohibited is being part of their transgression and expressing love for them. It is, however, permissible to have dealings with them to prevent their evil, from al-Qāḍī. Close to that is what has been narrated from them عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ, “Inclining refers to having love, wishing well, and obeying them.”<sup>1</sup>

The abovementioned statements regarding this discussion clearly indicates to the impermissibility of their assistance in general, whether in impermissible or permissible instances.

Muḥaqqiq al-Baḥrānī then provides proofs for the statements:

أقول لا يخفى ما في هذه الأخبار باعتبار ضم بعضها إلى بعض من التدافع والتمانع ومجمل القول فيها أنه لا شك أنه قد علم من الأخبار المتقدمة حرمة الدخول في أعمالهم على اوكد وجه بل مجرد محبتهم

---

1 *Kitāb al-Ḥadā'iq al-Nāḍirah*, 18/118.



والركون إليهم وحب بقائهم فضلا عن مساعدتهم وأعانتهم بالاعمال إلا أن الأخبار الدالة على الجواز ظاهرة فيه بالقيود المذكورة فيها والتحقيق في ذلك أن هنا مقامات ثلاثة (الأول) أن يدخل في أعما لهم لحب الدنيا وتحصيل لذة الرياسة والأمر والنهي وهو الذي يحمل عليه أخبار المنع (الثاني) أن يكون كذلك ولكن يمزجه بفعل الطاعات وقضاء حوائج المؤمنين وفعل الخيرات وهذا هو الذي أشير إليه في الأخبار المتقدمة كما عرفت من قوله عليه السلام ذا بذا وقوله واحدة بواحدة وقوله وهو أقلهم حظا ونحو ذلك (الثالث) أن يكون قصده من الدخول فيها إنما هو محض فعل الخير و دفع الأذى عن المؤمنين واصطناع المعروف إليهم وهو الفرد النادر وأقل قليل حتى قيل إنه من قبيل إخراج اللبن الخالص من بين فرث ودم ويشير إلى هذا الفرد عجز حديث السرائر المتقدم وعلى هذا يحمل دخول مثل الثقة الجليل على بن يقطين ومحمد بن إسماعيل بن بزيع و أمثالهما من إجلاء الرواة عنهم النجاشي المتقدم ذكره وكذلك جملة من علما ثنا الأعلام كالمرتضى والمحقق الخواجه نصير الدين والملة وآية الله العلامة الحلبي ومن المتأخرين المحقق الثاني في سلطنة الشاه إسماعيل و شيخنا البهائي و شيخنا المجلسي و نحوهم عطر الله مراقدهم مع تسليم دعوى العموم وبذلك يزول الإشكال والله العالم.

The attempt to advocate it is clear from these statements considering its link to one another. The synopsis is as follows; There is no doubt that the previous statements strongly emphasise the impermissibility in entering into dealings with them, rather mere love, inclination towards them and loving their existence [is impermissible], more than assisting them and helping them in dealings except that the statement indicating towards permissibility clearly has conditions which are mentioned in it. In reality, there are three levels:

1. Entering into dealings with them due to love of the world, to attain the enjoyment of leadership and to command with good and forbid evil. The statements of prohibition are referring to this level.
2. Same as the above but coupled with acts of obedience, fulfilling the needs of the believers and good deeds. The previous statements are referring to this level. Similar is the words of ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, “This for this”, “One for one” and “Even though his share is the least” and so forth.
3. Entering into dealings with the primary objective of initiating good, preventing the believers from harm and making good reach them. This is, however, such a rare phenomenon that it is likened to the act of removing pure milk from amidst dung and blood. The latter part of the aforementioned narration on secrets indicates to this level.

This is the opinion of the great expert ‘Alī ibn Yaqtīn, Muḥammad ibn Ismā‘īl ibn Bazīgh, other great narrators of their likenesses, al-Najāshī mentioned previously, and similarly a group of our great scholars like al-Murtaḍā, Muḥaqqiq Khawājah Naṣīr al-Dīn wa al-Millah, ‘Allāmah al-Ḥillī and some latter scholars like Muḥaqqiq al-Thānī in the rule of Shāh Ismā‘īl, Shaykh al-Bahā‘ī, Shaykh al-Majlisī and their likenesses, may Allah make their abodes a place of comfort, while excepting the claim of generality.

Khomeini mentions:

ونتيجة هذه الطوائف أن التولي وتقلد الأمر من أعظم المحرمات الإلهية التي لا تترخص إلا في مواقف التقية والضرورة مع لزوم جبر

المفسدة الواقعة فيها بالأعمال الصالحة وقضاء حوائج الشيعة ف (إن الحسنات يذهبن السيئات) كما في واية مفضل بن مريم وكفارة عمل السلطان قضاء حوائج الإخوان كما في الفقيه وما ورد في ترخيص الدخول في ولاياتهم ومناصبهم كثيرا على مبنى التقية حتى عن مثل زرارة كما في صحيحة الوليد بن صبيح ولاسيما إن المسألة في نهاية الدقة في الحفظ على دمائهم ودماء أصحابهم ودخول مثل علي بن يقطين للإذن الخاص ولمصالح عالية مؤقتة وبالجملة تصدى أمور الممالك محرم والإعانة على هذا الظلم العظيم محرم بأن يتصدى الولايات والمناصب حتى على الشيعة والاستثناء ينحصر بصورة التقية والضرورة راعيا مصالح الأمة حال الاشتغال ولا معنى لان يكون المستثنى في المقام مستحبا لما تقرر أن الاستثناء عن العناوين المقبحة لا يعقل إلا فيما زاحم الملاك الأقوى البالغ حد الإيجاب والسر كل السر أن الشقاوة والسعادة الدنيوية والأخروية تنشأ عن الخلافة الصحيحة والسلطنة العادلة والفاصلة الظلمة وجميع الخيرات والشروط مربوطة بهما وعندئذ يجب بحكم العقل إيجاد هذه واقتناء ذلك ولو بالسياسة المنفية التي هي المنساق من مآثر المسألة بعد التدبر والتأمل هذا كله حول السلطان الجائر المدعي للخلافة الإسلامية الذي هو القدر المتيقن من الأدلة حسب زمان صدورهما وأما من يتصدى الممالك الإسلامية من غير الادعاء المذكور فهو عندي أيضا من الفساق في تقلده لما تقرر منا أنه حق الفقهاء

The result of these divisions is that leadership and taking control of matters is the most heinous of that which has been prohibited, which does not have any scope for practice except in situations of Taqiyyah and necessity where there is a dire need to replace evil with good and fulfilling the needs of the Shī'ah. This is because "good deeds take away evil deeds," as appears in

the narration of Mufaḍḍal ibn Maryam. The atonement for the actions of the ruler is fulfilling the needs of the Shī'ah, as it is mentioned in al-Faqīh.

And what has been reported about the concession of taking up their authoritative positions is primarily upon the basis of Taqiyyah, even from the likes of Zurarah, as appears in the *Ṣahīḥah* of al-Walīd ibn Ṣabīḥ, especially considering the matter to be extremely complex due to it pertaining to the protection of their blood and the blood of their companions. The participation of the likes of 'Alī ibn Yaqtīn was on account of special permission [from the Imām] and for higher circumstantial interests.

So, in essence, occupying oneself with the matters of the state is forbidden, and assisting in this grave oppression is also disallowed, even if it be assuming leadership over the Shī'ah. The exception is restricted to instances of Taqiyyah and dire need, and that also with due consideration to the interests of the Ummah.

And there is no meaning in the excluded being desirable, due to what has been established that making exclusions from reprehensible matters is illogical, but in the instance where the sovereign authority is contested and that reaches the extent of compulsion. And the actual secret is that worldly and otherworldly wretchedness and good fortune is a result of a correct Khilāfah and a just rulership or an illegitimate khilāfah and an oppressive rulership respectively. Hence, all good and bad are linked to them. That being the case it will be necessary to bring such a rulership about and achieve it even if it be by way of the less-than-ideal political framework.

This is all regarding an oppressive ruler who claims an Islamic Khilāfah. And this is absolute from the evidences as per the time of their emergence.

As for the one who assumes authority without the aforementioned claim, he also is a from the sinful according to me in his rule, due to the established fact that rulership is the right of the jurists.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī has devoted many chapters to this theory in his book *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah*, some of which are as follows:

Chapter 45: Impermissibility of being in a position of authority under the rule of a transgressor unless in a case of exception. He presents herein 12 narrations.

Chapter 46: Permissibility of being in a position of authority under the rule of a transgressor to bring benefit to the believers and save them from harm. He mentions herein 17 narrations.

Chapter 47: Compulsion of returning that which was oppressively taken to those from whom it was taken if they are known or else it be given in charity. He presents herein 1 narration.

Chapter 48: Permissibility of accepting a position of authority under the rule of a transgressor due to need and fear. He mentions herein 10 narrations.<sup>2</sup>

Take note from the aforementioned that the primary rule is that of non-involvement, as the Ahl al-Sunnah and their rulers are disbelievers. This is due to the fact that the Khilāfah is an undisputable

---

1 *Musnad Tahṛīr al-Wasīlah*, 1/488, 496.

2 *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah*, 12/135.

right of the Imām. Therefore, whoever assumes its responsibility or is pleased with someone other than the Imām who has assumed its responsibility is considered a disbeliever, as previously mentioned in the discussion regarding their belief of Ahl al-Sunnah being disbelievers. For this reason, assuming positions in their country is impermissible unless in the cases of exception which have been mentioned. They are as follows:

- Fear of their creed being exposed regarding excommunication of the state, like he who conceals his Shī'ism due to fear of the Khalīfah.
- Obtaining benefit for the believers—referring to only the adherents of their creed—just as Ibn Yaqṭīn had by returning the wealth of the Shī'ah after it was usurped.
- Inflicting harm to the Ahl al-Sunnah and more especially their leaders similar to the previous statement regarding the person who sought permission to satisfy his thirst for revenge by usurping the wealth of the Ahl al-Sunnah.

Observe how al-Baḥrānī mentioned that al-Ṭūsī was among those who assumed a position in the service of Halaku due to the interests of his creed. Someone could possibly claim that he was compelled, but this would be an answer to that claim. However, what answer can be given regarding Ibn al-'Alqamī and why did he assume the position of vizier? Was he compelled by the Khalīfah, although this hasn't been mentioned by anyone, and why did the Khalīfah detest his position as vizier? Or was his position a mere service to his creed?

Before ending this chapter, I would like to cite an example of one of these viziers who gained such approval among the scholars of the

Shī'ah thereby being cited as an example of a righteous vizier, he is none other than 'Alī ibn Yaḡṡīn.

### 'Alī ibn Yaḡṡīn

He was the vizier of the Abbāsīd Khalīfah Hārūn al-Rashīd رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. Al-Baḡrānī mentions regarding his status amongst the Shī'ah:

ومنها الأخبار ما يدل على إنه ينال بذلك الحظ الأوفر والمنزلة العليا  
كما يدل عليه كلام الرضا عليه السلام في رواية الكشي وأخبار على بن  
يقتين وعلو مرتبته عند الكاظم عليه السلام ويؤيده خبر منع الكاظم  
عليه السلام لعلی بن يقتين عن الخروج من أعمالهم

There are statements which indicate that a great fortune and lofty position is attained by means of it, as indicated to by the statement of al-Riḡā in the narration mentioned by al-Kashshī. The statements regarding 'Alī ibn Yaḡṡīn and his lofty status in the eyes of al-Kāzīm. The command of al-Kāzīm to 'Alī ibn Yaḡṡīn preventing him from giving up his post attests to it.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Baḡrānī also mentions:

وعلى هذا الذين قصدهم في العمل لسلاطين أهل السنة الخیر لمذهبهم  
فقط يحمل دخول مثل الثقة الجليل على بن يقتين ومحمد بن إسماعيل  
بن بزيع و أمثا لهما من إجلاء الرواة...

Regarding their objective of working under the rulers of Ahl al-Sunnah merely for the benefit of their creed, the participation of the likenesses of 'Alī ibn Yaḡṡīn, Muḡammad ibn Ismā'īl ibn Bazī and other famous scholars of their stature is narrated.<sup>2</sup>

1 Al-Ḥadā'iq al-Nāḡirah, 18/132.

2 Al-Ḥadā'iq al-Nāḡirah, 18/133.

It appears in the foreword of *al-Rasā'il al-'Ashr* of Shaykh al-Ṭūsī:

إن المكانة التي أحرزها الشيعة في بغداد كان الفضل يعود فيها بشكل أساسي إلى رجال كانت لهم منزلة وشأن من أمثال علي بن يقطين

As for the position attained by the Shī'ah in Baghdad, al-Faḍl would be referred to as a chief by those of position and honour from the likenesses of 'Alī ibn Yaqtīn.<sup>1</sup>

Khomeini mentions his opinion:

وإذا كانت ظروف التقية تلزم أحدا منا بالدخول في ركب السلاطين فهنا يجب الامتناع عن ذلك حتى لو أدى الامتناع إلى قتله إلا أن يكون في دخوله الشكلي نصر حقيقي للإسلام والمسلمين مثل دخول علي بن يقطين ونصير الدين الطوسي رحمهما الله

When the circumstances of Taqiyyah demand one of us to enter into the cavalry of the rulers, then in this case it is compulsory to desist from this Taqiyyah even if it may lead to being slain, except in the situation where outward participation will bring true assistance to Islam and the Muslims like it was in the case of 'Alī ibn Yaqtīn and Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī.<sup>2</sup>

Al-Ḥurr al-'Āmilī narrates from 'Alī ibn Yaqtīn who mentioned:

قال قلت لأبي الحسن عليه السلام ما تقول في أعمال هؤلاء قال إن كنت لا بد فاعلا فائق أموال الشيعة قال فأخبرني على أنه كان يجيبها من الشيعة علانية ويردها عليهم في السر

I said to Abū al-Ḥasan عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام, “What is your opinion regarding taking up a position under these people?”

---

1 *Al-Rasā'il al-'Ashr*, pg. 19.

2 *Al-Ḥukūmah al-Islāmiyyah*, pg. 142.



He replied, “Do it if you have to, but do not take the wealth of the Shī’ah.”

Ibn Yaqtīn then said, “I would accept the wealth from the Shī’ah in public and return it to them secretly.”<sup>1</sup>

As we can see, he would return the wealth of the Rāfiḍah back to them whilst he would deal with the Ahl al-Sunnah differently. This is one of the reasons for permissibility in participating according to them as previously mentioned. Here is another duty from the duties of this great vizier featuring a great and righteous example to the one who wishes to be in the service of the rulers of the Ahl al-Sunnah.

Ni‘mat Allāh al-Jazā’irī mentions:

وفي الروايات أن علي بن يقطين وهو وزير الرشيد فد اجتمع في حبسه جماعة من المخالفين وكان من خواص الشيعة فأمر غلمانه وهدموا سقف الحبس على المحبوسين فماتوا كلهم وكانوا خمسمائة رجل تقريبا فأراد الخلاص من تبعات دما ئهم فأرسل إلى الإمام مولانا الكاظم فكتب عليه السلام إليه جواب كتابه بأنك لو كنت تقدمت إلي قبل قتلهم لما كان عليك شيء من دمائهم وحيث أنك لم تتقدم إلي فكفر عن كل رجل قتلته منهم بتيس والتيس خير منه فانظر إلى هذه الدية الجزيلة التي لا تعادل دية أخيهم الأصغر وهو كلب الصيد فإن ديته عشرون درهما ولا دية أخيهم الأكبر وهو اليهودي أو المجوسي فإنها ثمانمائة درهم وحالهم في الآخرة أحسن وأبخس

It is narrated regarding ‘Alī ibn Yaqtīn, whilst the vizier of Harūn al-Rashīd, that he once imprisoned a group of the opposition. Being a leader of the Shī’ah, he commanded some youngsters

---

1 Wasā’il al-Shī’ah, 12/140.

to cause the roof of the prison to fall onto the inmates killing them all. The prisoners amounted to approximately 500 men. To be absolved from any responsibility, he wrote to Imām Mawlānā al-Kāẓim who in turn replied to his letter saying, “Had you had come to me prior to killing them, you would have been totally absolved. Since you hadn’t come to prior, you should give one goat as compensation for each person you slain, although a goat is more valuable than any of them.” Just look at the amount of this blood money, it is not even equivalent to that of their [referring to the Ahl al-Sunnah] smallest brother which is a hunting dog, as the blood money for it is 20 silver coins, neither is it equal to the blood money of their eldest brother who is either a Jew or Fire-worshipper, as their compensation is 800 silver coins and an evil punishment in the hereafter.<sup>1</sup>

Muḥsin al-Mu‘allim also quoted this narration.<sup>2</sup> With actions such as these is he still regarded as a trustworthy righteous vizier? Is the trustworthiness and piety Ibn al-‘Alqamī the same as this?

## **6. The Shī‘ah belief of Taqiyyah and the aspect of concealing their beliefs**

Why should we discuss Taqiyyah? Studying the beliefs and principles of the Shī‘ī creed has revealed many inconsistencies present therein, which not only weakens the foundation upon which the creed stands, but rather affects majority of the creed. This is a statement made by the most reputed scholars of the Shī‘ah. Some of the confessions are as follows:

---

1 *Al-Anwār al-Nu‘māniyyah*, 2/308.

2 *Al-Naṣb wa al-Nawāṣib*, pg. 622.

The statement of Dildār ‘Alī:

إن الأحاديث المأثورة عن الأئمة مختلفة جدا لا يكاد يوجد حديث إلا وفي مقابله ما ينافيه ولا يتفق خبر إلا وبإزائه ما يضاده حتى صار ذلك سببا لرجوع بعض الناقصين عن اعتقاد الحق

The narrations attributed to the Imāms are divergent to such an extent that it is almost impossible to find a narration that doesn't have another contradicting it. There isn't any statement that isn't contradicted by another, such that it became a reason for a number of the weak abandoning the true faith.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Tūsī has also mentioned:

ذاكرني بعض الأصدقاء بأحاديث أصحابنا وما وقع فيها من الاختلاف والتباين والتضاد حتى لا يكاد يسلم خبر إلا وبإزائه ما يضاده ولا يسلم حديث إلا وفي مقابله ما ينافيه حتى جعل مخالفونا ذلك من أعظم الطعون على مذهبنا

Some friends have mentioned to me regarding the narrations of our scholars and the contradictions, disparities, and opposition in them to such an extent that there will not be a narration, except that another narration will contradict it. There is no narration that is not opposed by another narration. Such that this has become the greatest accusation of our opposition against our creed.<sup>2</sup>

Upon looking into the things that kept these discrepancies hidden, Taqiyyah is the most apparent of them from an ideological perspective.

---

1 *Ḥaqīqah al-Shī'ah*, pg. 36.

2 *Muqaddamah Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām*.

There are other reasons but these explanations are not the purpose of discussion here, although they should be discussed.

So, what is this Taqiyyah all about?

Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى says in the noble Qur'an:

لَا يَتَّخِذُ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ الْكَافِرِينَ أَوْلِيَاءَ مِنْ دُونِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ ۗ وَمَنْ يَفْعَلْ ذَلِكَ فَلَيْسَ مِنَ اللَّهِ فِي شَيْءٍ إِلَّا أَنْ تَتَّقُوا مِنْهُمْ تُقَاةً ۗ وَيُحَذِّرُكُمُ اللَّهُ نَفْسَهُ ۗ وَإِلَى اللَّهِ الْمَصِيرُ ۗ قُلْ إِنْ تُخْفُوا مَا فِي صُدُورِكُمْ أَوْ تُبْدُوهُ يُعْلَمَهُ اللَّهُ ۗ وَيَعْلَمُ مَا فِي السَّمَاوَاتِ وَمَا فِي الْأَرْضِ ۗ وَاللَّهُ عَلَىٰ كُلِّ شَيْءٍ قَدِيرٌ ۝

*Believers shall not take disbelievers as allies instead of believers. And whoever does that has nothing to do with Allah unless he does so in order to protect himself from them, and Allah warns you of himself and to Allah is the final abode. Say, whether you hide what is in your hearts or reveal it, Allah is aware of it, and he knows that which is in the heavens and on the earth, and Allah has power over everything.<sup>1</sup>*

Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى also says in the noble Qur'an:

مَنْ كَفَرَ بِاللَّهِ مِنْ بَعْدِ إِيمَانِهِ إِلَّا مَنْ أُكْرِهَ وَقَلْبُهُ مُطْمَئِنٌّ بِالْإِيمَانِ وَلَكِنْ مَنْ شَرَحَ بِالْكُفْرِ صَدْرًا فَعَلَيْهِمْ غَضَبٌ مِنَ اللَّهِ ۗ وَ لَهُمْ عَذَابٌ عَظِيمٌ ۝

---

1 Sūrah Āl 'Imrān: 28-29.

*Whosoever disbelieves in Allah after his belief except for the one who is forced while his heart is secure in faith, but those who open their hearts to disbelief then upon them is the wrath of Allah and they will face a great punishment.*<sup>1</sup>

It is clear from the above verses that the Taqiyyah referred to as permissible by Allah has a specific limit to the extent that it came in the form of dispraise for the one who forms allies with the disbelievers. It did not appear independently indicating to its restricted scope, therefore it is impossible for Taqiyyah to be a general constant for a Muslim in his life, such that its requisite is continuous without clarity of truth. In that case, the purpose for sending Messengers cannot be ascertained and it is not possible for anyone to call towards Islam, as it is known that every call of this sort will definitely be responded to with war and rejection. So, when will the truth become apparent and earn standing when the callers are making Taqiyyah for every fear he faces from transgressors and general masses. In connection with this, I call unto the heedful, educated youth of the Shī'ah, those who are seeking the truth in following the creed of the Ahl al-Bayt and those who are not prompted by desire position, wealth, fame or even due to prejudice to blindly accept what is falsely and deceptively attributed to the Ahl al-Bayt. I invite them to a critical and thorough study of the relied upon books of the creed and of its statements and beliefs, but in particular, a complete introspection into the answers of the scholars of the creed regarding its discrepancies and the extent of its clarity and symmetry to the Qur'ān, intellect and historical events regarding which there is no contradiction. In this way my brothers, true unity can be achieved.

---

1 Sūrah al-Naḥl: 106.

We are aware of the Taqiyyah mentioned in the Qur'ān; however, what does Taqiyyah of the Shī'ah constitute?

### **Taqiyyah of the Shī'ah**

It refers to demonstrating the opposite of reality, and it allows a Shī'ī to deceive others. So based on this Taqiyyah, a Shī'ī can reject outwardly what he believes inwardly, and it allows him to demonstrate beliefs other than his inward beliefs. For this reason, you will find the Shī'ah rejecting many of their beliefs in front of the Ahl al-Sunnah. Like their stance regarding the lives of the Ahl al-Sunnah, them being apostates, and the ruling of cooperating with their rulers.

Shaykh Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb mentions:

وأول موانع التجاوب الصادق بإخلاص بيننا وبينهم ما يسمونه التقيّة  
فإنها عقيدة دينية تبيح لهم التظاهر لنا بغير ما يظنون فينخدع سليم  
القلب منا بما يتظاهرون له به من رغبتهم في التفاهم والتقارب وهم لا  
يريدون ذلك ولا يرضون به ولا يعلمون له إلا على أن يبقى من الطرف  
الواحد مع بقاء الطرف الآخر في عزلة لا يتزحزح عنها قيد شعرة

The first prevention of true and sincere unity between us and them is what is known as Taqiyyah, for it is a religious belief which allows them to demonstrate to us other than what they conceal, therefore causing a clean hearted one of us to be misled by their portrayal of zeal for concurrence and mutual approximation whereas they have no desire for it, they are not pleased by it nor are they aware of its reality, except that it should be from one side whereas the other side remain in their position without even moving a hair breath.<sup>1</sup>

---

1 *Al-Khuṭūṭ al-'Arīḍah*, pg. 10.

I present the following to explain its reality and importance in their belief:

Their Shaykh and chief of their Muḥaddithīn, Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn—who is titled al-Ṣadūq—mentions:

واعتقادنا في التقية أنها واجبة من تركها كان بمنزلة من ترك الصلاة والتقية واجبة لا يجوز رفعها إلى أن يخرج القائم فمن تركها قبل خروجه فقد خرج من دين الله وعن دين الإمامية وخالف الله ورسوله والأئمة

Taqiyyah is compulsory in our belief. The one who abandons it is similar to he who has abandoned ṣalāh. Taqiyyah is compulsory and it will not be waived until the Qā’im emerges. Whosoever abandons it before his emergence, then he has left the religion of Allah and the Imāmiyyah, and went against Allah, His Messenger and the Imāms.<sup>1</sup>

The narration of al-Kulaynī where he narrates from Ma‘mar ibn Khallād who says:

سألت أبا الحسن عن القيام للولادة فقال قال أبو جعفر التقية من ديني ودين آباي ولا إيمان لمن لا تقية له

I asked Abū al-Ḥasan regarding rising for the leaders, he replied, “Abū Ja‘far has said, ‘Taqiyyah is part of my religion and the religion of my forefathers, and Īmān is incomplete without Taqiyyah.’”<sup>2</sup>

It is narrated in *al-Uṣūl of al-Kāfī* from Abū ‘Abd Allāh, who mentioned:

---

1 *Risālah al-I‘tiqādāt*, pg. 104.

2 *Al-Kāfī*, 2/219.

يا أبا عمر إن تسعة أعشار الدين في التقية ولا دين لمن لا تقية له والتقية  
في كل شيء إلا في النيذ والمسح على الخفين

O Abū Umar, certainly nine tenths of religion is in Taqiyyah, and religion is incomplete without Taqiyyah. Taqiyyah is permissible in everything except Nabīdh and Masaḥ on Khuffayn.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Kulaynī also narrates from al-Ṣādiq saying:

سمعت أبي يقول لا والله ما على وجه الأرض شيء أحب إليّ من التقية  
يا حبيب إنه من كانت له تقية رفعه الله يا حبيب من لم تكن له تقية وضعه  
الله يا حبيب إن الناس إنما هم في هدنة فلو قد كان ذلك كان هذا

I heard my father saying, “By Allah, there is nothing on the surface of this earth more beloved to me than Taqiyyah.” O Ḥabīb, Allah honours a person who adopts Taqiyyah and disgraces the one who abandons it. O Ḥabīb, indeed people are in a truce, had there been anything, it would have been this.<sup>2</sup>

The following is narrated from Abū ‘Abd Allāh:

التقية ترس الله بينه وبين خلقه

Taqiyyah is a shield between Allah and his creation.<sup>3</sup>

The following is narrated from Abū ‘Abd Allāh:

أبى الله عز وجل لنا ولكم في دينه إلا التقية

Allah only accepted Taqiyyah as part of his religion for us all.<sup>4</sup>

---

1 Al-Kāfi, 2/217.

2 Al-Kāfi, 2/217.

3 Al-Kāfi, 2/220.

4 Al-Kāfi, 2/218.



The following is narrated from Abū ‘Abd Allāh:

كان أبي يقول أي شيء أقر لعيني من التقية إن التقية جنة المؤمن

My father would say: There is nothing more beloved to me than Taqiyyah. Taqiyyah is definitely the shield of a believer.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Kulaynī and al-Fayḍ al-Kāshānī narrate from Abū ‘Abd Allāh saying:

من استفتح نهاره بإذاعة سرنا سلط عليه حر الحديد و ضيق المجالس

He who begins his morning by proclaiming our secret, will be inflicted with the heat of iron and confinement of company.<sup>2</sup>

It is mentioned in *al-Kāfī* and *al-Rasā’il* of Khomeini from Sulaymān ibn Khālīd who mentions:

يا سليمان إنكم على دين من كتّمه أعزه الله ومن أذاعه أذله الله

O Sulaymān, you are an adherent of a religion of which a person is honoured by concealing it and disgraced by exposing it.<sup>3</sup>

Al-Ḥurr al-‘Āmilī narrates from Amīr al-Mu’minīn saying:

التقية من أفضل أعمال المؤمنين

Taqiyyah is from the greatest actions of a believer.<sup>4</sup>

The following is mentioned in *Wasā’il al-Shī’ah* from ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn:

يغفر الله للمؤمن كل ذنب ويطهره منه في الدنيا والآخرة ما خلا ذنبي  
ترك التقية وتضييع حقوق الإخوان

---

1 *Al-Kāfī*, 2/220.

2 *Al-Kāfī*, 2/372; *Al-Wāfī*, 3/159.

3 *Al-Kāfī*, 2/222; *Al-Rasā’il*, 2/185.

4 *Wasā’il al-Shī’ah*, 11/473.

Allah forgives all sins of a believer and purifies him from it as long as he isn't a perpetrator of two things: Abandoning Taqiyyah and not fulfilling the rights of people.<sup>1</sup>

It appears in *Jāmi' al-Akhbār* of Shaykh Tāj al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad al-Sha'īrī attributed to Nabī:

تارك التقية التقية كتارك الصلاة

A person who abandons Taqiyyah is similar to he who has abandoned ṣalāh.<sup>2</sup>

It is narrated in *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* from al-Ṣādiq who said:

ليس منا من لم يلزم التقية

The one who abandons Taqiyyah is not from us.<sup>3</sup>

Khomeini mentions:

فتارة تكون التقية خوفاً وأخرى تكون مداراة والمراد بالمدارة أن يكون المطلوب فيها نفس شمل الكلمة ووحدها بتحبيب المخالفين وجر مودتهم من غير خوف ضرر كما في التقية خوفاً وسيأتي التعرض لها وأيضا قد تكون التقية مطلوبة لغيرها وقد تكون مطلوبة لذاتها وهي التي بمعنى الكتمان في مقابل الإذاعة على تأمل فيه

Sometimes Taqiyyah is due to fear whilst other times it is to be polite. The object of this type of Taqiyyah is to unite the different sects of the faith by showing love to the opposition and to achieve their love without the fear of harm, as in Taqiyyah done due to

---

1 *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah*, 11/474.

2 *Jāmi' al-Akhbār*, pg. 95.

3 *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah*, 11/466.

fear, regarding which an explanation will be presented shortly. Taqiyyah is sometimes desired for another reason besides this and sometimes it is in itself desired, and that is that Taqiyyah which refers to concealment as opposed to publicising upon contemplating on it.<sup>1</sup>

Look at the hypocrisy of this man in his following statement, “by showing love to the opposition and to achieve their love without the fear of harm.” Look at how he made it permissible in this instance without the fear of harm, and if the opposition are his brothers in Dīn, then why is he practicing Taqiyyah with them?

Khomeini also mentions:

و منها ما شرعت لأجل مداراة الناس وجلب محبتهم ومودتهم ...  
ومنها التقسيم بحسب المتقي منه فتارة تكون التقية من الكفار وغير  
المعتقدين بالإسلام سواء كانوا من قبل السلاطين أو الرعية وأخرى  
تكون من سلاطين العامة وأمرائهم وثالثة من فقهاءهم وقضاتهم ورابعة  
من عوامهم ... ثم إن التقية من الكفار وغيرهم قد تكون في إتيان عمل  
موافقا للعامة كما لو فرض أن السلطان ألزم المسلمين بفتوى أبي حنيفة  
وقد تكون في غيره

One of the purposes for its initiation is for the purpose of uniting people and earning their love and proximity. There are levels in accordance to the person upon which Taqiyyah is being adopted. Taqiyyah is either done to disbelievers and those who do not believe in Islam whether they are leaders or laymen, or to rulers in general and their governors, or to their jurists and their judges and lastly to general people. Taqiyyah to disbelievers and

---

1 Al-Rasā'il, 2/174.

others constitutes doing actions in accordance to the general masses. For example, the ruler obligates the Muslims to adhere to the ruling of Abū Ḥanīfah, whereas you follow another.<sup>1</sup>

Khomeini also mentions:

وليعلم أن المستفاد من تلك الروايات صحة العمل الذي يؤتى به تقية سواء كانت التقية لاختلاف بيننا وبينهم في الحكم كما في المسح على الخفين والإفطار لدى السقوط أو في ثبوت الموضوع الخارجي كالوقوف بعرفات اليوم الثامن لأجل ثبوت الهلال عندهم

The validity of actions that are carried out as Taqiyyah is deduced from these narrations, whether the Taqiyyah is due to difference in ruling between us and them like that of Masaḥ on Khuffayn and by abandoning fasting, or establishment of an outward act, like performing the Wuqūf in ‘Arafah on the eight day of Ḥajj due to the crescent proven to be sighted according to them.<sup>2</sup>

Khomeini also mentions:

ثم إنه لا يتوقف جواز هذه التقية بل وجوبها على الخوف على نفسه أو غيره بل الظاهر أو المصالح النوعية صارت سببا لإيجاب التقية من المخالفين فتجب التقية وكتمان السر لو كان مأمونا وغير خائف على نفسه

The permissibility of this Taqiyyah is not dependant on fearing for oneself or for another; however, the evident or specific benefit is a reason for the compulsion of Taqiyyah with the

---

1 *Al-Rasā'il*, 2/175.

2 *Al-Rasā'il*, 2/196.

opposition. Thus, Taqiyyah and *Kitmān* (concealing one's beliefs) is compulsory although the person may be safe and not in any personal danger.<sup>1</sup>

The following can also be found when looking at the statements of Khomeini regarding Taqiyyah:

ومنها ما تكون واجبة لنفسها وهي ما تكون مقابلة للإذاعة فتكون بمعنى التحفظ عن إفشاء المذهب وعن إفشاء سر أهل البيت فيظهر من كثير من الروايات أن التقية التي بالغ الأئمة عليهم السلام في شأنها هي هذه التقية فنفس إخفاء الحق في دولة الباطل واجبة وتكون المصلحة فيها جهات سياسية دينية ولولا التقية لصار المذهب في معرض الزوال والانقراض

The type of taqiyyah which is compulsory in itself is what is referred to as concealment. It constitutes not divulging information of the creed and not divulging the secrets of the Ahl al-Bayt. It is apparent from many narrations that it is this type of Taqiyyah that was emphasised by the Imāms. Concealing the truth in a disbelieving state is compulsory, which has benefits from a religious and political perspective. If it was not for Taqiyyah, the creed would have become extinct.<sup>2</sup>

Their scholars would frequently travel to Sunnī states where they would manifest Taqiyyah and mislead the Ahl al-Sunnah by pretending to be from the Ahl al-Sunnah. This was a plot to gather information about them and to closely follow their errors and oversights. Among them was their scholar by the name of Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥusayn

---

1 *Al-Rasā'il*, 2/201.

2 *Al-Rasā'il*, 2/185.

ibn ‘Abd al-Ṣamad commonly known as Shaykh al-Bahā’ī who died in 1031 AH. He mentions, “I was in Shām pretending to be an adherent of the Shāfi’ī madhhab.” His Taqiyyah and story is narrated by their scholar Muḥammad Muḥammadī al-Ashtahārdī in his book *Ajwad al-Munāzarāt*.<sup>1</sup>

Their scholar, al-Shahrastānī mentions his view regarding what they have narrated:

لذلك أوضحت شيعة الأئمة من آل البيت تضطر في أكثر الأحيان إلى  
كتمان ما تختص به من عادة أو عقيدة أو فتوى أو كتاب أو غير ذلك..  
لهذا الغايات النزيهة كانت الشيعة تستعمل التقية وتحافظ على وفاقها  
في الظواهر مع الطوائف الأخرى متبعة في ذلك سيرة الأئمة من آل  
محمد وأحكامهم الصارمة حول وجوب التقية من قبل التقية ديني  
ودين آبائي ومن لا تقية له لا دين له إذ أن دين الله يمشي على سنة  
التقية

For this reason, the followers of the Imāms from the Ahl al-Bayt are most of the time forced to conceal the peculiar customs, beliefs, rulings, books, and other things. Due to these pure goals, the Shī’ah began utilising Taqiyyah to maintain an apparent united front with other groups, in so doing adhering to the practice of the Imāms of the Ahl al-Bayt and their strict instructions concerning the compulsion of Taqiyyah, such as, “Taqiyyah is my Dīn and the Dīn of my forefathers,” and, “The one who has not adopted Taqiyyah is deprived of Dīn as the Dīn of Allah is dependent upon Taqiyyah.”<sup>2</sup>

---

1 *Ajwad al-Munāzarāt*, pg. 188.

2 Footnote of *Awā’il al-Maqālāt*, pg. 138.

Ponder over his statement “to maintain an apparent united front,” while what is concealed opposes it. This is why we remain sceptical of those who claim to desire unity. Our analysis is summed up below:

1. Taqiyyah in the opinion of the Shīrah is not to save lives, but in reality is to conceal the infamies of the creed and its hostile stance towards the Ahl al-Sunnah.
2. Taqiyyah is an intrinsic methodology to Shīrī life which is contrary to the definition of the Qur’ān which restricts it to specific situations, thereby making it similar to Ṣalāh in their opinion. Al-Ḥurr al-‘Āmilī narrates the following from ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad:

يا داود لو قلت إن تارك التقية كتارك الصلاة لكنت صادقا

O Dāwūd, If you were to say that the one who abandons Taqiyyah is like one who has abandoned ṣalāh then you would be truthful.<sup>1</sup>

The following appears in *Wasā’il al-Shīrah* attributed to al-Ṣādiq:

عليكم بالتقية فإنه ليس منا من لم يجعلها شعاره ودثاره مع من يأمنه  
لتكون سجية مع من يحذره

Hold onto Taqiyyah, for verily there isn’t anyone of us who has not made it his motto and mantle with those who he trusts as a practice for those whom he fears.<sup>2</sup>

Their scholar Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn Ṣādiq al-Ṣadr al-Mūsawī mentions his opinion:

---

1 *Wasā’il al-Shīrah*, 11/466.

2 *Wasā’il al-Shīrah*, 11/466.

الأمر بالتقية في عصر الغيبة الكبرى وهذا المضمون مما اقتضت عليه أخبار الإمامية دون غيرهم فقد أخرج الصدوق في إكمال الدين والشيخ الحر في وسائل الشيعة والطبرسي في إعلام الوري عن الإمام الرضا أنه قال لا دين لمن لا ورع له ولا إيمان لمن لا تقية له وإن أكرمكم عند الله أعلمكم بالتقية فمن ترك التقية قبل خروج قائمنا فليس منا

The matter of Taqiyyah during the era of the major occultation is a subject regarding which the statements of Imāmah are more substantial than others. Al-Ṣadūq in *Ikmāl al-Dīn*, Shaykh al-Ḥurr in *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah*, and al-Ṭabarsī in *T'lām al-Warā* narrate the following from Imām al-Riḍā, “One who does not have piety has no Dīn and the one who hasn't adopted Taqiyyah has no īmān; and certainly, the most honourable in the court of Allah is one who has the most knowledge regarding Taqiyyah. The one who abandons Taqiyyah before the appearance of our Imām is not from us.”<sup>1</sup>

So, Taqiyyah will remain with them until the appearance of their Imām who currently is in the cave.

### **Ruling regarding Taqiyyah with the Ahl al-Sunnah**

The following is just to emphasise what has passed and to explain that those who are the primary focus of this evil practice are the Ahl al-Sunnah. To the extent that it cannot be claimed that the previously mentioned statements is refers to other than the Ahl al-Sunnah such as the extremists, Khawārij, and Nawāṣib.

Al-Aṣfahānī mentions a narration attributed to Imām 'Alī which he himself authenticates:

---

1 *Tārīkh al-Ghaybah al-Kubrā*, pg. 352.



فلا تغرنكم كثرة المساجد وأجساد قوم مختلفة قيل يا أمير المؤمنين كيف العيش في ذلك الزمان فقالخالطوهم بالبرانية يعني في الظاهر وخالفوهم في الباطن للمرء ما اكتسب وهو مع من أحب وانتظروا مع ذلك الفرج من الله عز وجل وقال بعدها والأخبار في هذا الباب كثيرة ذكرت في مكيال المكارم جملة منها ولا يعرف مذهب هو أكثر مساجدا من الشيعة غير السنة

“The multitude of their Masājid and diversity of their followers should not deceive you.”

It was asked, O Amīr al-Mu'minīn, how should a person live in such an era?”

He replied, “Pretend to concur with them in the open while opposing them secretly. Every person is rewarded according to his actions and will be with whom he loves, so act upon what has been said and wait for a way out from Allah.”

There are many statements regarding this topic some of which I have mentioned in *Mikyāl al-Makārim*. There isn't any sect who has more Masājid than the Shī'ah other than the Ahl al-Sunnah.<sup>1</sup>

Their great scholar Abū al-Qāsim al-Khū'ī mentions regarding Taqiyyah:

وذلك لأن المستفاد من الأخبار الواردة في التقية إنما شرعت لأجل أن تختفي الشيعة عن المخالفين وألا يشتهروا بالتشيع أو الرفض ولاجل المدارة والمجاملة معهم ومن البين أن المكلف إذا أظهر مذهب الحنابلة عند الحنفي مثلا أو بالعكس حصل بذلك التخفي وعدم الاشتهار بالرفض والتشيع و تحققت المدارة والمجاملة معهم فإذا صلى في مسجد الحنيفة مطابقا لمذهب الحنابلة صدق أنه صلى في

---

1 *Wazifah al-'Anām fī Zaman Ghaybah al-Imām*, pg. 44.

مساجدهم أو معهم والسر في ذلك أن الواجب إنما هو التقية من العامة والمجاملة والمداراة معهم ولم يرد في شيء من الأدلة المتقدمة وجوب إتباع أصنافهم المختلفة ولا دليل على وجوب إتباع من يتقي منه في مذهبه وإنما اللازم هو المداراة والمجاملة مع العامة وإخفاء التشيع عندهم

It has been deduced from the present narrations that Taqiyyah was initiated to veil the Shī'ah from the opposition, so that they would not be known for their Tashayyu' or Rafḍ and to initiate love and unity with them. Evidently, if a person pretends to adhere to the Hanbalī Madhhab in front of Hanafi's for example or vice versa, he would achieve disguise and nonconformity to Rafḍ and Tashayyu' together with love and unity being established with them. Therefore, when he performs Ṣalāh in a Ḥanafī Musjid according to the Ḥanbalī Madhhab, he is believed to have performed Ṣalāh in their Masājid or with them. The secret, however, is that the compulsory aspect is Taqiyyah from the general masses whilst establishing love and unity with them. There isn't any compulsion in following their different sects mentioned in the previous proofs nor is there any proof regarding the compulsion of following the one who he fears in his religion. However, the compulsion is of establishing love and unity with the masses and concealing Tashayyu' from them.<sup>1</sup>

Their scholar Murtaḍā al-Anṣārī, who is titled Shaykh al-Fuqahā' wa al-Mujtahidīn, mentions:

ويشترط في الأول أن تكون التقية من مذهب المخالفين لأنه المتقين من الأدلة الواردة في الأذن في العبادات على وجه التقية لأن المتبادر

---

1 Al-Tanqīh Sharḥ al-'Urwah al-Wuthqā, 4/332,333.

التقية من مذهب المخالفين فلا يجري في التقية عن الكفار أو ظلمة  
الشيعية

Firstly, it is a condition that the Taqiyyah be from the creed of the opposition; as it is confirmed from the reported evidences that worshipping while employing Taqiyyah is permitted. Due to the first thing coming to mind is Taqiyyah from the creed of the opposition. Therefore, it will not apply to Taqiyyah from the Kuffār or the oppressors of the Shī'ah.<sup>1</sup>

Who is left after the Kuffār and oppressors of the Shī'ah? Take note of the fact that there are proofs which determine that according to them Taqiyyah needs to be adopted from the Ahl al-Sunnah only, not from the Kuffār and neither from the oppressors of the Shī'ah.

Al-Khū'ī mentions:

وأما التقية بالمعنى الأخص أعني التقية من العامة فهي في الأصل  
واجبة وذلك للاخبار الكثيرة الدالة على وجوبها بل دعوى تواترها  
الإجمالي

As for the specific form of Taqiyyah which is Taqiyyah from the 'Āmmah [Ahl al-Sunnah], it is compulsory in itself. This is on account of the multiple reports that deem it obligatory. Rather their has been a subtle claim of it being Mutawātir, “comprehensive claim of its authenticity. As for the general form of Taqiyyah, it is in reality considered permissible and lawful.<sup>2</sup>

And:

---

1 *Risālah al-Taqiyyah*, pg. 53.

2 *Al-Tanqīh Sharḥ al-'Urwah al-Wuthqā*, 4/254.

وأما التقية بالمعنى الأعم فهي في الأصل محكومة بالجواز والحلية

As for the general form of Taqiyyah, it is in reality considered permissible and lawful.<sup>1</sup>

The Taqiyyah which is considered compulsory in the opinion of al-Khūṭī is the specific form of Taqiyyah which is adopted from the Ahl al-Sunnah, and the general form of Taqiyyah which is adopted from the disbelievers, other than the Ahl al-Sunnah, is considered permissible. Can there be unity in the Ummah with these statements and from those of the greatest contemporary authority of the Shī'ah. This is proof that the Ahl al-Sunnah are considered worse than Jews, Christians, and Polytheists in the eyes of the Shī'ah, therefore Taqiyyah from the Ahl al-Sunnah is compulsory, but from disbelievers merely permissible and lawful!

### **Taqiyyah is so ingrained withing them that they utilise it among themselves also**

As previously mentioned from al-Şādiq:

عليكم بالتقية فإنه ليس منا من لم يجعلها شعاره ودثاره مع من يأمنه  
لتكون سجية مع من يحذره

Hold onto Taqiyyah, for verily there isn't anyone of us who hasn't made it his motto and mantle with those who he trusts as a practice for those whom he fears.

In addition to this is the answer which some Shī'ī scholars who rejected the marriage of 'Umar ibn al-Khattāb to the daughter of 'Alī ibn Abī

---

1 Ibid.

Ṭālib, Umm Kulthūm. They say in response to what has been falsely attributed to the Imām of the Ahl al-Bayt regarding this marriage—“This woman was forcefully taken from us,”—amongst them Ni‘mat Allāh al-Jazā’irī:

محمول على التقية و الالتقاء من عوام الشيعة كما لا يخفي

It is obvious that it is based on Taqiyyah and concealment from the Shī‘ah masses.<sup>1</sup>

Look at the words, “concealment from the Shī‘ah masses,” meaning it is obvious that it was to practice Taqiyyah from his own Shī‘ah; and if this is the case with their own, that what about the so called opposition?

---

1 *Al-Anwār al-Nu‘māniyyah*, 1/84.



## Chapter 4

### The accusations against al-Ṭūsī and Ibn al-ʿAlqamī

These two individuals face multiple accusations in relation to their participation in the collapse of the Abbasid Khilāfah. Some people have argued the accusations and attempted to justify the actions of these two individuals or deny whatever possible, while believing the reason of these accusations to be mere enmity and religious controversies.

So, what is the reality?

To answer this question, we will present these accusations and determine whether they are mere speculation of enemies and opposition or are they really consistent with the beliefs and principles of the Shīʿī creed and has any Shīʿah ever admitted to these infidelities. Before beginning, if Allah wills, I would like to mention that I endeavour to present most statements in the argument of these accusations from Shīʿī books and references, unbiased sources or sources based on Mongol history while seldomly making mention of references of the Ahl al-Sunnah scholars. This is mostly to explain the understanding of other than them from the previous references.

I beseech Allah for ability, assistance and fair judgement.

#### Accusations against al-Ṭūsī

##### 1. His treachery of the Ismāʿīlyyah

Al-Ṭūsī had achieved such a lofty status among the Ismāʿīlyyah that they regarded him as a master of all sciences. He was also their general Wazīr.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> *Aʿyān al-Shīʿah*, 9/415.

‘Ārif Tāmūr mentions:

وأما الإسماعيليون فكانوا يطلقون عليه أسم الداعي الأجل وحجة  
الإمام وداعي الدعوة

The Ismā‘īlī’s would refer to him as “Caller of the era”,  
“Authoritative leader” and “Best of callers.”<sup>1</sup>

With all of this, he considered his life with them to be the most miserable and difficult, calling it a painful punishment, helplessness, a great regret, and so on. He describes it in his last writing, *Sharḥ al-Ishārāt*, which he authored while residing in the fortress of the Ismā‘īlī’s.<sup>2</sup>

As for the cause of these sentiments, some historians attribute it to the reason of his coming to the Ismā‘īlī’s, as they had threatened and forced him to take up the position among them.

Another group is of the opinion that he eagerly presented himself before Nāṣir al-Dīn when he invited him; however, something occurred which made Nāṣir al-Dīn apprehend him. Muḥammad al-Zinjānī, who was a Shī‘ī, mentions that it was due to a difference between his beliefs and theirs.<sup>3</sup>

The above is regarding his relationship with them, but what about his role in the collapse of their empire?

We obviously do not defend the Ismā‘īlīyyah as they were responsible for the destruction of the Muslim Ummah from all ideological and political perspectives.

---

1 *Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī*, pg. 43.

2 *A’yān al-Shī‘ah*, 9/416; *Al-‘Allāmah al-Khwajah Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī li Muḥammad Taqī Mudarrisī*.

3 *A’yān al-Shī‘ah*, 9/416.



‘Ārif Tāmūr describes the situation, and he was with them at that time:

يوم كانت شوكة في عين الدولة العباسية وغيرها من الدول والإمارات

A day which was like a thorn in the eye of the Abbasid Empire together with the other dynasties and emirates.<sup>1</sup>

As it is said regarding them, “A creed whose apparent is Tashayyū‘ whilst its reality is disbelief and atheism”; however, we intend to expose the demeanour of this individual and his manner of dealing with those whom he served.

Al-Mashhadānī narrates from ‘Abd al-Amīr al-A’sam that al-Ṭūsī secretly corresponded with the Mongols around about 650 AH.<sup>2</sup>

This correspondence has been praised by ‘Ārif Tāmūr in the following statement:

الذي لا يسعني إلا الإشادة بمقدرته وسعة إطلاعه

I can only commend his ability and his great insight.<sup>3</sup>

Bear in mind that in the year 651 AH, Monku Khan issued an order commanding his brother Halaku to invade the western regions.<sup>4</sup>

Al-Hamdhānī mentions:

فلما أن كان منكوخان يودع أخاه كلفه بأن يرسل إليه الخواجه نصيرالدين  
بعد الاستيلاء على قلاع الملاحة

---

1 *Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī*, pg. 57.

2 *Muḥakkamah al-Tārīkh*, pg. 70, 71; *Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī*, pg. 22-46.

3 *Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī*, pg. 40, 132.

4 *Muḥakkamah al-Tārīkh*, pg. 70, 71.

When bidding his brother farewell, Monku Khan assigned to him Khawājah Naṣīr al-Dīn after the capture of the apostate stronghold.<sup>1</sup>

The above testifies to the correspondence, while strengthening the possibility of its authenticity.

Al-Hamdhānī also mentions:

وفي ذلك الوقت هجوم المغول على الإسماعيليين كان مولانا السعيد الخواجة نصير الدين الطوسي الذي كان أكمل وأعقل العالم وجماعة آخرون من الأطباء... يقيمون لدى ملك الإسماعيلية مكرهين... وكانوا قد ملوا ملازمة الملاحدة ونفروا منهم ومالوا إلى هولاء إلى أقصى حد ومن قبل كانوا يرغبون في ذلك فصاروا يتشاورون سرّاً لكي يجعلوا هذا الملك يخضع لهولاء على الوجه الأحسن والطريق الأسهل وانضم إليهم كثر من الغرباء والمسلمين... ولهذا السبب لم يدخروا وسعاً في حث خورشاه على الخضوع والطاعة وصاروا يخوفونه مغبة المقاومة وعدم التسليم فاستجاب لنصحهم

During the attack of the Mongols upon the Ismāʿīlīs, Khawājah Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī who was the greatest and most knowledgeable scholar together with a group of others, were forced to remain in the Ismāʿīlī territory although they were fed up by residing with them apostates and despised them. They had established deep ties with Halaku as was always their intent, and they began secretly seeking his counsel in preparation for the reigns to fall into his hands in the easiest and best manner possible by joining forces with Muslim and foreign masses. For this reason, they spared no effort in convincing Khūrshāh to surrender and

---

1 *Jāmiʿ al-Tawārīkh*, pg. 203.

obey by scaring him with the consequences of resistance and opposition, which resulted in him accepting their advice.<sup>1</sup>

This was the era in which Ibn al-‘Alqamī tricked the Khalīfah.

Al-Mīrzā al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī mentions:

ثم لما قرب إيلخان المشهور بهولاكو خان من قلاع الإسماعيلية لفتح تلك البلاد خرج ولد الملك علاء الدين عن القلعة بإشارة المحقق الطوسي سرّاً واتصل بخدمة هولاكو خان فلما استشعر هولاكو أنه جاء عنده بإجازة المحقق ومشاورته وافتتح القلعة ودخل بها أكرم المحقق غاية الاكرام والاعزاز

When Īl Khan, famously known as Halaku Khan, approached the Ismā‘īlī territory to conquer those cities, the son of king ‘Alā’ al-Dīn emerged from one of the forts by the secret instruction of Muḥaqqiq al-Ṭūsī and began serving Halaku Khan. When Halaku conceived that this was by the permission and consultation of Muḥaqqiq and that he had opened the fort and granted them entry, he granted Muḥaqqiq great honour and respect.<sup>2</sup>

So, the reality is not as explained by Ḥasan al-Amīn in his defence of al-Ṭūsī that Halaku kept him just for his knowledge and that al-Ṭūsī was forced to remain with him.<sup>3</sup> Rather the actual reason is mentioned by the Mongol historian al-Hamdḥānī:

ولما تأكد هولاكو من صدق وإخلاص الخواجه نصير الدين الطوسي و شملهم بعطفه وإنعامه وأعطاهم الخيول اللازمة لحمل أهلهم ومواليهم

---

1 *Jāmi‘ al-Tawārīkh*, pg. 249.

2 *Khātimah al-Mustadrak*, 2/425.

3 *Al-Ghazwa al-Maghūlī li Ḥasan al-Amīn*, pg. 118-154; *A‘yān al-Shī‘ah*, 9/416.

وأقاربهم مع أتباعهم وخدمهم وأشباعهم وإخراجهم من القلعة  
وألزمهم حضرته وأبناؤهم حتى اليوم ملازمون للحضرة ، ومقربون من  
هولاكو خان وأفراد أسرته المشهورين

When Halaku became certain of the truthfulness and sincerity of Khwājah Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī, he showered him with his kindness and favours. He gave him a number of horses to carry his family and close ones, together with his followers, servants, and belongings from the fort. He kept him and his family in his company up until this day making sure they are present and close to Halaku Khan and the famous ones of his family.<sup>1</sup>

Some of the above has been previously mentioned, as well as more, regarding the status of al-Ṭūsī in the eyes of Halaku. So, after all of this, can it be said that he was forced? Allah willing, more incidents will be mentioned which will further clarify that he did not act with fear but rather with sincerity to strengthen this empire, when it became clear to him that he could achieve the goals of the creed to which he belonged.

## **2. His role in the instigation of the war of Iraq and Baghdad**

We previously discussed the Shī'ah ruling with regards to the disbelief of the Ahl al-Sunnah and permissibility of their killing. We also presented the opinion of al-Ṭūsī which echoed the same beliefs; therefore, it is not strange to find that he urged Halaku to invade Baghdad.

Other than the statements mentioned by the Ahl al-Sunnah scholars and historians testifying to the occurrence of this instigation, there are statements from some Shī'ī scholars mentioning that al-Ṭūsī played a

---

1 *Jāmi' al-Tawārikh*, pg. 257.

role in the decision of Halaku regarding the invasion of Baghdad. Yes, he and Ibn al-‘Alqamī were not the primary motivators, but that does not mean that they played no role in it.

Their scholar of ḥadīth, al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī mentions:

و دخل القلعة ودخل بها هولاءكو وأكرم المحقق الطوسي غاية الإكرام  
والإعزاز وصحبه وارتكب الأمر الكلية حسب رأيه وإجازته فأرغبه  
المحقق لتسخير عراق العرب فعزم هولاءكوخان على فتح بغداد وسخر  
تلك البلاد والنواحي واستأصل الخليفة العباسي

He entered the fort together with Halaku. Halaku held Muḥaqqiq in high esteem by keeping him by his side and orchestrating all matters in accordance to his opinion and permission. Muḥaqqiq thereby made Halaku desirous to conquer Southern Iraq, which resulted in Halaku Khan thereafter conquering Baghdad, subjugating those cities, its surroundings, and annihilating the Abbasid Khilāfah.<sup>1</sup>

Naẓmī Zādah mentions the following in his book *Kalsh Khalfā*, which is the biography of Kāẓim Nūrus:

وبتشويق من نصير الطوسي أتجه نحو بغداد

Through the persuasion of Naṣīr al-Dīn, I am proceeding towards Baghdad.<sup>2</sup>

Muḥammad Taqī Mudarrisī Riḍwī mentions:

وبعد أن فرغ هولاءكو من أمر الإسماعيلية فكر بغزو بغداد وتأديب  
السلطان العباسي فاستشار الخواجه الطوسي وطلب منه أن يتقصى

---

1 *Khātimah al-Mustadrak*, 2/425.

2 *Kalsh Khalfā*, pg. 127.

هذه المهمة عبر التنجيم ويخبره بالنتيجة فتأمل الخواجه في طلب  
هولاكو كثيراً ثم وافاه بما توصل إليه فقال إن الذي يلوح من التنجيم  
هو أن المستعصم سينتهي أمره أن العراق سيقع تحت تصرف الملك بلا  
جهد ومشقة وبالغ الخواجه مبالغة جعلت هولاكو يثق بكلامه حتى شد  
رحاله تلقاء بغداد وهو مطمئن البال

After invading the Ismā'īlyyah, Halaku contemplated invading Baghdad and disciplining the Abbasid ruler. He consulted Khawājah al-Ṭūsī and asked him to examine this plan by means of astrology and to advise him with the outcome. After pondering deeply over the request of Halaku, Khawājah came up with an answer that spued Halaku on further. He said, "The stars indicate that Musta'ṣim will soon die and Iraq will fall into the hands of a king without any difficulty whatsoever." Khawājah exaggerated to such an extent in convincing Halaku that he immediately began preparations towards Baghdad without even giving it second thought.<sup>1</sup>

Upon looking at this, can it still be said that he was afraid and forced? Ponder over the above statement, "Khawājah exaggerated to such an extent..."

Muḥammad al-Mudarrisī also mentions the following in the same book:

ويرى القاضي نورالشوشتري شيعي في كتاب مجالس المؤمنين أن  
الخواجه لما كان الخواجه على علم بتعصب المستعصم مذهبياً وطرق  
سمعه ما يلاقيه الشيعة من المحن حث هولاكو على غزو بغداد

---

1 Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī Ḥayātuhu wa 'Āthāruhu, pg. 21.

Qāḍī Nūr al-Shūshṭarī al-Shīrī mentions the following in his book *Majālis al-Mu'minīn* regarding Khawājah, "When Khawājah found out regarding the ideological fanaticism of Musta'ṣim and his manner of dealing with the suffering of the Shī'ah, he persuaded Halaku to invade Baghdad."<sup>1</sup>

Some astrologers have attempted to praise Halaku upon the invasion on Baghdad from an astrological perspective, as he was a staunch believer of it; however, Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī caused this attempt to fail. Hereunder is a statement in connection with this incident, as it appears in *Jāmi' al-Tawārīkh* of al-Hamdhānī:

وكان الخان يتشاور مع أركان الدولة وأعيان الحضرة في أمر تصميمه على الزحف إلى بغداد فكان كل منهم يبدي رأيه حسب ما يعتقد ثم طلب حسام الدين المنجم الذي كان مصاحباً له بأمر القائد... وقال له بين كل ما يبدو لك في النجوم دون مداهنة ولما كانت له جرأة بسب تقربه فقد قال للملك بصوره مطلقة أنه ليس ميمونا قصد أسرة الخلافة والزحف بالجيش إلى بغداد إذ أن كل ملك حتى زماننا هذا قصد بغداد والعباسيين لم يستمتع بالملك والعمر وإذا لم يصغ الملك إلى كلامي وذهب إلى هناك فستظهر ستة أنواع من الفساد أولها أن تنفق الخيول كلها ويمرض الجنود ثانيها أن الشمس لا تطلع ثالثها أن المطر لا ينزل رابعها تهب ريح صرصر وينهار العالم بالزلازل خامسها لا ينبت النبات في الأرض سادسها أن الملك الأعظم يموت تلك السنة فطلب منه هولاءكو خان هادة بصحة هذا الكلام فكتبها المسكين وقال اللامات (بخشيان) والأمر إن الذهاب إلى بغداد هو عين الصواب بعد ذلك استدعى هولاءكو خان الخواجة نصر الدين الطوسي واستشاره فخاف الخواجة وظن الأمر على سبيل الاختبار فقال لن تقع أية واقعة من هذه

1 Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī *Ḥayātuḥu wa 'Āthāruḥu*, pg. 22.

الأحداث فقال هولاًكو إذاً ماذا يكون ... قال إن هولاًكو خان سيحل محل الخليفة ثم أحضر هولاًكو حسام الدين ليتباحث مع الخواجة الذي قال لقد استشهد جمع كثير من الصحابة باتفاق آراء الجمهور وأهل الإسلام ولم يحدث فساد قط ولو قيل إن للعباسيين مكرمة خاصة بهم فإن طاهراً جاء من خراسان بأمر المأمون وقتل أخاه محمد الأمين وقتل المتوكل ابنه بالاتفاق مع الأمراء كذلك قتل الأمراء والغلمان المنتصر والمعزز وقتل عدد من الخلفاء على يد جملة من أشخاص فلم تختل الأمور

Halaku consulted with the members of the state and the present notables regarding his decision to invade Baghdad and each one of them gave their opinion according to what they believed. He then summoned the astrologer Ḥassām al-Dīn who was his companion in the matters of decision making and said to him, “Shed light on what is clear to you from the stars without any flattery.” When he mustered up the courage due to his close proximity, he told the king secretly that he is not happy that he intends to attack the Khilāfah and proceed with an army to Baghdad, as every king up to this day who had planned to attack Baghdad and the Abbasids did not enjoy kingship nor life. If you do not believe me and go there, you will face six types of issues:

1. Horses will die and the army will get sick.
2. The sun will not rise.
3. There won't be any rain.
4. Violent winds will blow and the land will be destroyed by earthquakes.
5. Plants will not grow in the soil.
6. The main ruler will die this year.



Halaku then asked him to testify to the veracity of his words which the poor man then wrote down. However, the general public and the leaders were of the opinion that proceeding to Baghdad was the correct course of action. Thereafter Halaku Khan called for Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī to consult with. Khawājah was afraid, thinking it was a test so he said, “None of these things will ever happen.”

Halaku replied, “In that case, what will happen?”

Khawājah replied, “Halaku Khan will soon replace the Khalīfah.”

Halaku then called in Ḥassām al-Dīn to discuss this with Khawājah, who said, “A large number of companions were martyred according to the opinion of the majority and people of Islam and no corruption arose.

ولو قيل إن للعباسين مكرمة خاصة بهم فإن طاهراً جاء من خراسان بأمر  
المأمون وقتل أخاه محمد الأمين وقتل المتوكل ابنه بالاتفاق مع الأمراء  
كذلك قتل الأمراء والغلمان المنتصر والمعتز وقتل عدد من الخلفاء  
على يد جملة من أشخاص فلم تختل الأمور

If it were to be said that the Abbasids have been particularly honoured, then verily Ṭāhir [ibn Ḥusayn ibn Zurayq] came from Khurāsān on the order of al-Ma'mūn and killed his brother Muḥammad al-Amīn. and al-Mutawakkil was killed by his own son according to the consensus of the leaders. Similarly, the leaders and the youngsters assassinated al-Muntaṣir and al-Mu'taz whilst many other Khulafā' were slain at the hands of a number of people, yet it did not result in anarchy.<sup>1</sup>

---

1 *Jāmi' al-Tawārīkh*, pg. 278-280.

The following is a poem mentioned regarding the above incident:

فأضاء قلب الملك من قول العالم      كأنه زهرة اللعل في الربيع الباكر

*The heart of the king was put at ease by the words of the scholar,*

*As if it were a crimson flower in the beginning of spring.<sup>1</sup>*

If we had to believe that he mentioned these words out of fear for his life, then does he also justify the killing of hundreds and thousands of Muslims and letting the Khilāfah fall into the hands of idol worshippers as part of saving himself, considering his actions to be justified, although how can this be acceptable from a scholar who is revered, respected, and considered the *Reviver of the Seventh Century* according to the adherents of his creed? It is prevalent from the previously mentioned narrations that not only did al-Ṭūsī not object, but rather commended and encouraged the invasion of Baghdad due to his rancour for the Ahl al-Sunnah and their leaders, and as vengeance for the adherents of his creed.

As for the justification that this was the result of the Abbasid's maltreatment to the Shī'ah, accepting it would be a foolish ignorant act which will render the acceptor worthy of every description of treachery and depravity. However, the actual motivating factor in this is their belief which considers the Ahl al-Sunnah the most disbelieving people on the face of the earth, as it has been previously mentioned in the discussion regarding their rulings concerning the Ahl al-Sunnah and as previously mentioned regarding his personal opinion concerning the disbelief of the Ahl al-Sunnah and the permissibility of shedding their blood.

---

1 A'yān al-Shī'ah, 9/92; Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī li al-Mudarrisī, pg. 21.

After the capture of Baghdad, was he remorseful or moved by what occurred to the Muslims? Hereunder are some of the letters he had written to Muslim rulers threatening them on behalf of Halaku. Muḥammad Taqīy Mudarrisī mentions:

وبعد غزو بغداد أمر هولاء الخوارج الطوسي أن يكتب رسالة باللغة العربية حول غزو مدينة السلام وقمع الحاكم العباسي ... ثم يرسلها إلى بلاد الشام... وفيما يأتي نص الرسالة... يعلم الملك الناصر أننا نزلنا بغداد سنة ست وخمسين وستمائة فاستأسرنا مالكها وسألنا وسائل فيها وندم واستوجب من العدم وضمن بالمال فال به الأمر إلى ما آل واستبدل نفائس نفيسة نفوساً بذيّة خسيصة وكان ذلك ظاهراً فوجدوا ما عملوا حاضرًا وقد قال القائل إذا تم أمر دنا نقصه ونحن في الاستزادة أما بعد يعلم الملك الناصر و... أنا جند الله خلقنا من سخطه وسلطنا على من حل عليه غضبه

Following the invasion of Baghdad, Halaku commanded Khawājah al-Ṭūsī to write letters in Arabic concerning the capture of the peaceful city and subdual of the Abbasid Ruler... which was then sent to Syria. The following is a portion of the letter:... King Nāṣir should be aware that we have invaded Baghdad during the year 656 AH and the ruler surrendered to us. He asked us for agents in it, he regretted and became worthy of non-existence. He withheld the money so the matter became of how it was and precious valuables were exchanged for evil despicable individuals. What occurred was inevitable and they got what they deserved. Someone once said, "When a matter reaches completion, its retrogression draws closer whilst we are in the state of seeking more." With regards to the future, King al-Nāṣir should know ... I am from the army of

Allah, we have been created from His wrath to dominate those who earn His wrath.<sup>1</sup>

Their entire letter is written in this manner and with this spirit. In this, he addressed the Arabs and Muslims in Syria on behalf of the pagan Halaku. It should be clear after this whether his actions were due to fear or in accordance to his beliefs and established principles.

Take a look at another example from these correspondences of his which are mentioned in *Jāmi' al-Tawārīkh*, *Muḥakkamah al-Tārīkh* of Muḥammad al-Mashhadānī and other books that make mention of the correspondences of al-Tūsī regarding the description of their entry into Baghdad. It is an imperative read.<sup>2</sup>

### **3. His facilitating the massacre of the Khalīfah in the presence of Halaku**

Ibn al-'Alqamī and al-Ṭūsī are both accused of being from those who encouraged Halaku with the killing of the Khalīfah, as mentioned in *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi'iyyah* and *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* of Ibn Kathīr.<sup>3</sup>

Al-Mīrza Muḥammad Nankābanī is among the Shī'ah who makes mention of this matter:

ونقل المؤرخون أن حسام الدين المنجم عرض على هولاء أن لا  
يقتل المستعصم لأن له رحم برسول الله ﷺ وليس في قتله مصلحة  
وإذا ما قتله فإن الأرض ستتهتز وتنشق وتخر السماء عليها فرد الخواجة  
الطوسي كلامه وقال هذه كلها أباطيل ولما تردد هولاء بعد سماع

---

1 *Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Tūsī*, pg. 30.

2 *Jāmi' al-Tawārīkh*, pg. 296; *Muḥakkamah al-Tārīkh*, pg. 87.

3 *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi'iyyah*, 8/271; *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, 13/214,283.

كلام حسام الدين أشار عليه الخواجة أن يضعوا المستعصم في بساط  
ويضغطوا عليه قليلا فإذا بان أثر كلام المنجم يترك ، وإلا يضغط عليه  
حتى تزهد روحه من غير أن يراق دمه فاستحسن هولاء كلام الخواجة  
وأمر أن يفعل به كما أشار

Historians have recorded that the Astrologer Ḥassām al-Dīn suggested to Halaku that he should not take the life of Mustaʿsim as he was from the descendants of Rasūl Allāh ﷺ and that there was no benefit in his killing, as the earth will shake and the sky will split open upon it. Khawājah al-Ṭūsī refuted his suggestion saying that it was all fallacies. When Halaku became reluctant after hearing the words of Ḥassām al-Dīn, Khawājah advised him to roll Mustaʿsim in a rug and squeeze him slowly so that the repercussions mentioned by the Astrologer could be avoided, or else squeeze him until he dies without shedding his blood. Halaku fancied the suggestion of Khawājah and ordered that the Khalīfah be killed in that manner.<sup>1</sup>

Mention has been made previously regarding the method used in killing the Khalīfah in the chapter regarding the mention of the catastrophe of Baghdad.

Muḥammad Taqī al-Mudarrisī, a contemporary Shīʿī, comments the following under this subject:

وعلى فرض أن الخواجة ضالعا في ذلك العمل وأنه هو الذي دفع  
هولاءكو إلى قتل الحاكم العباسي فإن هذا العمل إذا كان ذنباً لا  
يغتفر عند السني المتعصب فهو ليس ذنباً عند الشيعة الذي لا يؤمن  
بالحكومة العباسي ويرى أن العباسيين غضبوا حق آل محمد صلوات

---

1 Qīṣa al-ʿUlamāʾ, pg. 287; Al-ʿAllāmah al-Khwājah Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī, pg. 28.

الله عليه وعليهم بل هو عنده باعث على التقرب إلى الله زلفى وكسب أجره وثوابه و الخواجة الطوسي كان شيعياً وكان يرى أن الإقدام على هذا العمل تكليف شرعي وواجب ديني فمن هذا المنطلق ليس لهذا الأمر عند الشيعة وقع يذكر حتى يكون داعياً إلى الكفر

Assuming that Khawājah was the cause of this matter, and he was the one who persuaded Halaku to take the life of the Abbasid ruler, it is worthy of note that although this action may be an unforgivable sin in the eyes of extremist Sunnīs, it is not regarded as a sin in the eyes of the Shī'ah, who reject the Abbasid rule and believe that they usurped the right of the progeny of Muḥammad صلى الله عليه وسلم. Therefore, he regards it to be a means of gaining proximity to Allah and earning his rewards. Khawājah al-Ṭūsī was a Shī'ī who was of the opinion that achieving this was a religious obligation and duty. So, from this perspective, this matter is not of any significance among the Shī'ah for it to be an indication of disbelief.<sup>1</sup>

Considering the above, how can it be said that they endeavour for national unity whereas they consider the massacre of our leaders through the disbelievers to be a means of gaining proximity to Allah? To the extent, that they consider this reason enough to empower the disbelievers over the Ummah, because they consider us to be similar to disbelievers if not worse than them in disbelief.

Let us take a look at the statement of another Ismā'īlī Shī'ah, who is of a similar nature, echoing the same hatred for the Ahl al-Sunnah and considers them to be disbelievers, viz. 'Ārif Tāmur. He says:

---

1 Al-'Allāmah al-Khwājah Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī, pg. 69.

من جهة أخرى ... فيجب أن ندخل في حسابنا بأن نصير الدين لم يكن  
يعتبر المستعصم العباسي خليفة شرعي للمسلمين بل كان يحصر هذه  
الرتبة بالفاطميين الذين ينحدرون من أسرة الرسول الكريم وبما كان هو  
السبب بوقوفه موقف اللامبالاة من كارثة بغداد

Looking at it from another angle... it should definitely be taken into account that Naṣīr al-Dīn did not consider Mustaʿsim al-Abbasid to be the rightful Khalīfah of the Muslims, rather he considered that position to be the right of the Fāṭimiyyīn, those who hail from the progeny of Rasūl Allah ﷺ, so perhaps this was the reason for his stance which was a stance of indifference amidst the catastrophe of Baghdad.<sup>1</sup>

He also mentions:

أليس في هذا قبوله وزارة هولاء ما يؤكد إسماعيليته ويلبي رغبته  
بمشاهدة مصير الذين كانوا وراء النكبة الكبرى

Does his role as the Wazīr of Halaku not confirm his affiliation to the Ismāʿīliyyah? He was satisfying his desire to witness the end of those who were behind the great catastrophe.<sup>2</sup>

So, this was the harmonious logic, together with the established beliefs of the Shīʿah. As for the tears shed by some of them over the incident of Baghdad and Islam, then it is either crocodile tears, or in keeping with the belief of Taqīyyah regarding which mention has been made previously, or from their general masses who are ignorant of the inception and requisites of this creed and the makeup of a sound disposition.

---

1 Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī, pg. 89.

2 Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī, pg. 62.

For this reason, we are not surprised at the words of Muḥammad Bāqir al-Khuwānasārī in the biography of Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī:

ومن جملة أمره المشهور المعروف المنقول حكاية استيزار للسلطان المحتشم في محروسة إيران هولاکو خان ... ومجيئه في موكب السلطان ... إلى دار السلام بغداد لإرشاد العباد وإصلاح البلاد وقطع دابر سلسلة البغي والفساد وإخماد نائرة الجور والإلباس بإبادة دائرة ملك بني العباس وإيقاع القتل العام في أتباع أولئك الطغاة إلى أن أسال من دمائهم الأقدار كأمثال الانهار فأنهار بها في ماء دجلة ومنها إلى نار جهنم دار البوار و محل الأثقياء والأشرار

In a nutshell, the famous recognised individual commanded him to act as Wazīr for the reticent ruler of the guarded domains of Iran, Halaku Khan ibn Tolui Genghis Khan who was at the time a powerful king of the Tartars and Mongol Turks. He joined the convoy of the powerful king with absolute propensity towards Baghdad the city of peace with the purpose of guiding the people, improving the city, eradicating the ongoing tyranny, and corruption together with its headquarters, by destroying the empire of Banū al-‘Abbās and openly killing the followers of those oppressors until their dirty blood flowed like rivers into the Tigris River and from there into the fire of Jahannum the place of ruin, hardships, and evils.<sup>1</sup>

Some have attempted to explain this stance of al-Khuwānasārī to be an uncommon stance of the Shī‘ī creed motivated by the unjust actions that were carried out and that the Shī‘ī creed does not sanction

---

1 *A’yān al-Shī‘ah*, 9/157; *Rawḍāt al-Jinān fi Aḥwāl al-‘Ulamā’ wa al-Sādāt*, pg. 578; *Muḥakkamah al-Tārīkh li Muḥammad al-Mashhadānī*, pg. 101; Footnote 1 of *Bihār al-Anwār li al-Majlisī*, 31/104.



the killing of even a single Muslim, whereas the reality is that the statement of al-Khuwānasārī is in keeping with the beliefs of the creed and the statement of this claimant also is in keeping with the belief of Taqiyyah!

### **The libraries of Baghdad**

Some Shīrī books take pride in praising al-Ṭūsī regarding his attempt to protect the knowledge, scholars, and the books of Baghdad during the invasion. Among them is al-Ṭabāṭabā'ī who mentions the following:

كما استطاع أن ينقذ الكثير من علماء بغداد و مدارسها ومكتباتها وقد  
سلم بفضل هذا العلم الجليل الكثير من التراث والكتب والمكتبات من  
سقوط بغداد

He tried to save as much scholars, schools, and libraries as he could. A lot of significant knowledge from the legacy, books, and libraries were saved from the Fall of Baghdad, thanks to his efforts.<sup>1</sup>

He also mentions:

وكان للمحقق نصير الدين الطوسي ... الدور الكبير في إنقاذ ما أمكن  
إنقاذه من العلماء والمكتبات في بغداد

Muḥaqqiq Naṣīr al-Dīn... played a big role in protecting the scholars and libraries of Baghdad as much as he could.<sup>2</sup>

The statements of Ḥasan al-Amīn also echo similar sentiments.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 *Riyāḍ al-Masā'il*, 2/26.

2 *Riyāḍ al-Masā'il*, 2/27.

3 *Al-Ghazwa al-Maghūlī*, pg. 156; *A'yān al-Shī'ah*, 9/416.

However, there are two undeniable things that spoil this fabricated praise:

1. The books that are claimed to have been saved by him in reality had been stolen by him from the libraries and he did not actually save them. ‘Alī al-Ṭabāṭabā’ī himself relates this matter from Shākir al-Kitbī:

...واتخذ في ذلك خزانة عظيمة فسيحة الأرجاء وملاءها من الكتب التي نهبت من بغداد والشام والجزيرة حتى تجمع فيها زيادة على أربعمئة ألف مجلد

...And he took a ginormous box filled with books that he had stolen from Baghdad, Syria and Arabia, which exceeded 400 000 volumes.<sup>1</sup>

Ḥasan al-Amīn mentions similar but mentions the following excuse:

...لإنقاذ أكبر عدد من الكتب وتجميعها

... He accumulated them in an attempt to save a great number of books.<sup>2</sup>

2. It was the Mongols who destroyed the books and libraries of Baghdad as ‘Alī al-Ṭabāṭabā’ī quotes from Quṭb al-Dīn al-Ḥanafī:

و تراكمت الكتب التي ألقاها التتار في دجلة حتى صارت معبراً يعبر عليه الناس والدواب واسودت مياه دجلة بما ألقى فيها من الكتب

---

1 *Riyād al-Masā’il*, 2/26; *Khātimah al-Mustadrak*, 2/423; Foreword of *al-Risālah al-Sa’īdah*.

2 *Al-Ghazw al-Maghūlī*, pg. 156.

The books were dumped into the Tigris River. Due to the large amount, it piled up and became a bridge for people and animals to cross. The water of the Tigris also turned black due to the great number of books.<sup>1</sup>

It has also been mentioned that he saved whatever could be saved; however, it is more accurate to say that he chose that which suited his beliefs and knowledge. Ibn al-Fūṭī who was the student of al-Ṭūsī mentions the following in this regard:

سنة اثنتين وستين وست مئة فيه وصل نصير الدين الطوسي إلى بغداد  
... ثم أنحدر إلى واسط والبصرة وجمع من العراق كتباً كثيرة لأجل  
الرصد

During the year 662 AH, Naṣīr al-Dīn came to Baghdad ... He then proceeded to Wāsiṭ and Baṣrah and collected many books from Iraq for the purpose of study.<sup>2</sup>

Similar to the fate of the libraries of Baghdad was the fate of the Ismā'īlī state libraries as mentioned in the following by 'Atā' Malik al-Juwaynī and attested to by the officials of Halaku who invaded Baghdad after invading the Ismā'īliyyah:

وعندما كنت بأسفل لمسر استولت علي الرغبة في تفقد مكتبة الموت  
التي استطار صيتها في الأقطار فعرضت على السلطان فتقبل السلطان  
طلبي بقبول حسن وأعطى الأوامر اللازمة ، فتوجهت لتفقد المكتبة  
وأخرجت كل ما وجدت من المصاحف ونفائس الكتب وأحرق ما  
بقي وكان متعلقاً بضاللتهم وغوايتهم

---

1 Riyād al-Masā'il, 2/7.

2 Al-Ḥawādith al-jāmi'ah, pg. 382.

Upon reaching the depths of the Lambesar castle, the desire to destroy the library of Alamut overcame me, so I proposed it to the King who keenly accepted thereby giving the necessary instructions. I then proceeded to destroy the library by removing all of the Qur'āns and precious books that I could find and setting the rest alight as it was filled with their false propaganda and errors.<sup>1</sup>

As for his efforts in protecting the scholars, it was only confined to Shīrī scholars and not the general scholars of Baghdad. We have not come across anything with regards to his special effort except that of saving al-'Alqamī which isn't something strange as we have previously cited narrations attesting to the bond between al-Ṭūsī and Ibn al-'Alqamī.

Muḥammad Mudarrisī al-Shīrī also cites a narration mentioning the intercession of al-Ṭūsī and Ibn al-'Alqamī for Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd and his brother from being slain in the presence of Halaku.<sup>2</sup>

The rest of the scholars were slain as mentioned previously in the statement of 'Alī al-Ṭabāṭabā'ī and other historians, under the discussion of the destruction of books.

'Ārif Tāmūr also attests to this in his following statement:

وعند اجتياح المغول لبغداد لم يتوقف عن أعمال الخير فاستحصل من  
هو لاكو على أمر باستثناء المسيحيين والشيعة والعائلات الغير إسلامية  
من الاستباحة وهكذا بالنسبة للعلماء ورجال الفكر والدين

Their good continued even during the invasion of Baghdad. Halaku was asked to order the exception of Christians, Shī'ah,

---

1 *Jahā Nakshāy*, pg. 271.

2 *Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī*, pg. 29-113.

and other non-believing families from being slain. Similar was the exception in relation to the scholars and intellectuals.<sup>1</sup>

He also mentions:

فأعلن أنه من أتباع مذهبهم الإثنى عشري وبأنه ما جاء إلى بغداد مع هولاء إلا لحمايتهم من خطر المغول وعزلهم عن العباسيين السنة

He announced that he was an adherent of their creed, al-Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah and that his coming to Baghdad with Halaku was to protect them from the danger of the Mongols and to release them from the Sunnī Abbasids.

Ibn al-Qayyim mentions the following in this regard:

ولما انتهت النوبة إلى وزير الملاحدة النصير الطوسي وزير هولاءكو شفا نفسه من أتباع الرسول و أهل دينه فعرضهم على السيف حتى شفا إخوانه من الملاحدة و اشتفى هو فقتل الخليفة والقضاة والفقهاء والمحدثين واستبقى الفلاسفة والمنجمين والطبائعيين والسحرة ونقل إليهم أوقاف المدارس والمساجد والربط إليهم

When the matter reached the apostate Wazīr al-Naṣīr al-Ṭūsī, the Wazīr of Halaku, he removed himself from the followers of Rasūl Allāh ﷺ and his religion, and presented them to the sword to the extent that he sought only intercession for his own apostate brothers. So, the Khalīfah together with the Judges and Jurists were slain, whereas the Philosophers, Astrologers, Physicists and sorcerers were spared and the endowments and affairs of the educational institutes and Masājid were assigned to them.<sup>2</sup>

---

1 Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī, pg. 77, 88-89.

2 Ighātha al-Lahfān, 2/380.

In the foreword of *Qawā'id al-Aḥkām* of their scholar al-Ḥillī, the writer mentions:

وبفضل هذا الشيخ المعظم وتدبير نجا أهل الكوفة والحلة والمشهدين  
الشريفيين من القتل والنهب والسبي وذلك حين غزا التتار العراق  
وعملوا ما عملوا

By virtue of this great Shaykh and planning, the people of Kūfah, Ḥillah, and the two noble shrines were saved from being slain, robbed, or even taken as captives. This all occurred during the Tartar invasion of Baghdad when many wrongs were perpetrated.<sup>1</sup>

The above are all the locations of the Shī'ah.

We end this discussion of al-Ṭūsī with the words of Edward Granville Browne who mentions the following:

We should not lose sight of the fact... that despite his writings in the topics of ethics and religion, he showed ingratitude to his Ismā'īlī hosts just as he assisted in the massacre of the Khalīfah in a manner that pleased an apostate blood shedding pagan such as Halaku...<sup>2</sup>

---

1 Foreword of *Qawā'id al-Aḥkām*, 1/14.

2 *Tārīkh al-Adab fī Irān*, pg. 588; *Muḥakkamah al-Tārīkh*, pg. 108.

## The accusations against al-‘Alqamī

### The accusation against him of treachery

Ibn al-‘Alqamī has been accused of treachery and numerous correspondences with the Mongols by the Historians of Islam. Some of them are as follows:

1. Abū Shāmah who was a witness to the incident mentions it in his work, *Al-Dhayl ‘alā al-Rawḍatayn*.<sup>1</sup>
2. Al-Jūzajānī in his work, *Ṭabaqāt Nāṣiri*.
3. Aḥmad ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhāb al-Nuwayrī in his work, *Nihāyah al-Irb*.
4. Al-Dhahabī in his work, *Duwal al-Islām*.
5. ‘Umar ibn al-Wardī in *Tatimmah al-Mukhtaṣar*.
6. Ibn Shākir al-Kutubī in *Fawāt al-Wafayāt*.
7. ‘Abd Allāh al-Shīrāzī—who was an adherent of Ibn al-‘Alqamī’s Shī‘ī creed—in his work, *Waṣṣāf al-Ḥaḍarah*.
8. Tāj al-Dīn al-Subkī in *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi‘iyyah*.<sup>2</sup>
9. Ibn Kathīr in *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*.<sup>3</sup>
10. Al-Malik al-Ashraf al-Ghassānī in *al-‘Asjad al-Masbūk*.
11. Ibn Khaldūn in *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn*.
12. Al-Maqrīzī in *al-Sulūk li Ma‘rifah Duwal al-Mulūk*.

---

1 *Al-Dhayl ‘alā al-Rawḍatayn*, pg. 199.

2 *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi‘iyyah*, 8/263.

3 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, 13/225.

13. Ibn Taghrībirdī in *al-Nujūm al-Zāhirah*.
14. Al-Suyūṭī in *Tārīkh al-Khulafā'*.
15. Ḥasan al-Diyār Bakrī in *Tārīkh al-Khamīs*.
16. Ibn al-‘Imād al-Ḥanbalī in *Shadharāt al-Dhahab*.
17. Ibn Taymiyyah.
18. Naẓmī Zādah ‘Afandi in *Kalsh al-Khulafā'*.<sup>1</sup>
19. Quṭb al-Dīn al-Yūnīnī in *Dhayl Mir’āt al-Zamān*.

‘Abd Allāh ibn Faḍl al-Shīrāzī, who was a Shī‘ī, mentions:

فكتب أهل بغداد على جدرانهم وأبواب المدارس و الأربطة بأقلام  
مختلفة لعن الله من لا يلعن ابن العلقمي

The people of Baghdad wrote the following on their walls, doors of schools, and signs, in various writings, “May the curse of Allah be on the one who refrains from cursing Ibn al-‘Alqamī.”<sup>2</sup>

The above gives the impression that the treachery of Ibn al-‘Alqamī was widely known, including among the general public.

Below are some of his own people who have confessed to his treachery:

1. Nūr Allāh ibn Sharaf al-Dīn al-Ḥusaynī al-Mar‘ashī who is commonly known as al-Shushtarī mentions:

إنه كاتب هولاءكو و الخواجة نصير الدين الطوسي و حرضهما على  
تسخير بغداد للانتقام من العباسيين

---

1 *Muḥakkamah al-Tārīkh*, pg. 29.

2 *Waṣṣāf al-Ḥaḍarah*, pg. 151.



He wrote to Halaku and al-Khawājah Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī and spurred them on to exploiting Baghdad as a form of retaliation to the Abbasids.<sup>1</sup>

This reminds us of the indication of al-Majlisī to the correspondence between Ibn al-‘Alqamī with al-Ṭūsī, which in it is an indication to what occurred to the two Alawid individuals or one of them by the Abbasids. He mentions the following:

ويحتمل أن يكون إشارة يقصدق قول أبو جعفر عن العباسيين لا يزال  
القوم في فسحة من ملكهم ما لم يصيبوا منا دماً حراماً إلى قتل رجل من  
العلويين قتلوه مقارناً لانقضاء دولتهم كما يظهر مما كتب ابن العلقمي  
إلى نصير الدين الطوسي

The statement of Abū Ja‘far regarding the Abbasids where he mentions, “The nation will remain fearless in their territory as long as they do not take the life of one of us unjustly,” is a possible indication to the massacre of an Alawid individual whom they had killed towards the end of their rule as it appears in the correspondence between Ibn al-‘Alqamī and Naṣīr al-Dīn al Ṭūsī.

2. ‘Alī ibn Anjab al-Baghdādī famously known as Ibn al-Sā‘ī (d. 665 AH), who in addition to being a contemporary Shī‘ī was also a resident of Baghdad, thereby making his testimony admissible.<sup>2</sup> He mentions:

وفي أيامه أي المستعصم استولت التتار على بغداد وقتلوا الخليفة وبه  
انقضت الدولة العباسية من أرض العراق وسببه أن وزير الخليفة مؤيد  
الدين بن العلقمي كان رافضياً...

---

1 *Majālis al-Mu‘minīn*, pg. 400; *Muḥakkamah al-Tārīkh*, pg. 29.

2 His biography is mentioned in *A‘yān al-Shī‘ah*, 1/305.

During the rule of al-Mu'taṣim, the Tartars invaded Baghdad and massacred the Khalīfah which brought the Abbasid rule to an end in the lands of Iraq. This catastrophe was caused by the minister of the Khalīfah, Mu'ayyid al-Dīn ibn al-'Alqamī who was a Rāfiḍī.<sup>1</sup>

3. 'Abd Allāh Faḍl al-Shīrāzī (d. 730 AH) mentions:

أرسل ابن العلقمي في الخفاء رسولا إلى هولاءكو أظهر الإخلاص  
والطاعة وزين مملكة بغداد في خاطره

Ibn al-'Alqamī secretly sent a messenger to Halaku demonstrating sincerity and obedience to suggest his plan concerning Baghdad.<sup>2</sup>

Āghā Burzuk al-Ṭahrānī mentions similar in *Ṭabaqāt A'lām al-Shī'ah* and in the discussion concerning Shī'ah works.<sup>3</sup> Al-Shīrāzī had given this book of his to one of the Mongol rulers.

4. We find the following in the recognized book of *Bihār al-Anwār* authored by Muḥammad Bāqir al-Majlisī, discussing the association with Wazīr Mu'ayyid al-Dīn ibn al-'Alqamī:

كان هو وزير أبو احمد المستعصم بالله عبد الله بن المستنصر بالله آخر  
خلفاء بني العباسيين لعنهم الله وكان من خيار الشيعة وأعان هولاءكو  
خان المغول على هلاك الخليفة و أغفل سلطانه المذكور إلى أن قتله  
سلطان المغول وأزال دولة العباسية فاستوزر نفسه

He was the Wazīr of Abū Aḥmad al-Musta'ṣim bi Allāh 'Abd Allāh ibn al-Mustanṣir bi Allāh who was the last khalifah of the

---

1 *Mukhtaṣar Akhbār al-Khulafā'*, pg. 136-137; *Mas'alah al-Taqrīb bayn al-Sunnah wa al-Shī'ah*, 2/263.

2 *Tārīkh Waṣṣāf al-Ḥaḍarah*, 1/37-38; *Muḥakkamah al-Tārīkh*, pg. 25.

3 *Ṭabaqāt A'lām al-Shī'ah*, 3/123,358.

Abbasid dynasty, may the curse of Allah be on them. He was an admirable Shīṭī who assisted Halaku Khan in massacring the Khalīfah. He took advantage of the above-mentioned ruler allowing the Mongol Ruler to kill him and destroy the Abbāsīd rule, who in return appointed him as minister.<sup>1</sup>

The Kūfan preacher, Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn ‘Ubayd Allāh al-Hāshimī composed a poem lamenting the catastrophe of Baghdad. Some of it is as follows:

يا عصابة الإسلام نوحوا واندبوا      أسفاً على ما حل بالمستعصم  
دست الوزاة كان قبل زمانه      لابن الفرات فصار لابن العلقمي

*O Muslims, mourn and wail,*

*Over what has happened to al-Musta‘ṣim.*

*Prior to his rule, the position of ministership was filled by*

*Ibn al-Furāt, but he handed it over to Ibn al-‘Alqamī.*

The above indicates to the influence of the ministership of Ibn al-‘Alqamī concerning what transpired to the Khalīfah. Had Ibn al-‘Alqamī been the way some have attempted to portray him, having nothing to do with the matter and that it had all happened due to the instigation of al-Duwaydār who didn’t actually have any power, al-Hāshimī would not have blamed him above.

He also composed the following poem regarding this tragedy after witnessing the graves of the Abbasid Khalīfah being dug up and burnt:

---

<sup>1</sup> *Bihār al-Anwār*, footnote 1, 104/31, second revised edition, Mu’assat al-Wafā’, Beirut, 1403-1983.

إن ترد عبرة فتلك العباس حلت عليهم الآفات  
استبيح الحريم إذ قتل الأحياء منهم وأحرق الأموات

*If you desire a lesson then these are the Abbasids,*

*Upon whom catastrophes descended.*

*Their sanctum was dishonoured by their living ones being killed,*

*And their dead ones being burnt.<sup>1</sup>*

The incident of burning the graves of the Abbasid Khulafā' indicates to the motivating factor being rancour for them. However, this is not found amongst the Mongols but rather only among those who believe that the Abbasids usurped the Khilāfah from the Alawids and thereby became disbelievers due to this action.

Some have attempted to raise doubts regarding the treachery of Ibn al-'Alqamī by doubting the Muslim historians whose accusations concerning Ibn al-'Alqamī have been mentioned previously, claiming the absence of contemporary existence or difference in religion.<sup>2</sup>

Concerning the above-mentioned statement of treachery, it is the testimony of a contemporary Shī'ī known as Ibn al-Sā'ī. Furthermore, he was a resident of Baghdad during the Mongol invasion occupying the librarian position in the al-Mustanşiriyyah university. He died in 674 AH.

There are also the testimonies of the Shī'ah themselves like that of Nūr Allāh al-Mar'ashī who is commonly known as al-Shushtarī, 'Abd Allāh

---

1 *Al-Ḥawādith al-Jāmi'ah*, pg. 364.

2 *A'yān al-Shī'ah*, 9/100.

al-Shīrāzī, and others whose statements have previously appeared.

Ibn Abī Shāmah who was a Sunnī contemporary to the incident also makes mention of this treachery.<sup>1</sup>

Looking back at the chapter in which we discussed the Shī'ī rulings regarding the blood of the Ahl al-Sunnah and working under their rulers, it is not farfetched, as it stems from this belief. The statement of Muḥammad Mudarrisī has also been previously mentioned stating that massacre of the Abbasid Khalīfah and destroying the Abbasid Khilāfah was not a misdeed, but rather a righteous deed by means of which a Shī'ī gains proximity to his lord.<sup>2</sup>

Ibn al-'Alqamī's appointment as the Wazīr of Baghdad by the Mongols also testifies to his treachery, as it is mentioned below by the Mongol historian, al-Hamdhānī:

وفي نفس اليوم الذي قتلوا فيه الخليفة أرسلوا إلى المدينة مؤيد الدين  
ابن العلقمي ليقوم بالوزارة

Mu'ayyid al-Dīn ibn al-'Alqamī was appointed as the Wazīr of the city by the Mongols the exact day in which the Khalīfah was massacred.<sup>3</sup>

Do you know the reason that distinguished al-'Alqamī from al-Duwaydār or Sulaymān Bāshā for instance, as not only were they slain while he was spared, the affairs of the state were handed over to him although he was portrayed as incapable of such matters by his

---

1 *Dhayl al-Rawḍatayn*, pg. 656.

2 *Allāmah al-Khawājah Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī*, pg. 69.

3 *Jāmi' al-Tawārīkh*, pg. 295.

defenders, with him only being second-in-charge to be proof of his weakness according to what the defenders believed.

Furthermore, their appointment of his son ‘Izz al-Dīn Abū al-Faḍl as governor upon his demise, which occurred a few months after their settling in Baghdad, also indicates to the matter not being due to individual abilities. Do you regard his rank or previous experience to have made him worthy of becoming the governor of Baghdad?<sup>1</sup>

There are a few who have objected, claiming that these are not sufficient evidence to prove his treachery and rather see it to be proof of his sincerity. Among them is al-Ṭiḡṭaqā who mentions the following:

فأن السلطان لما فتح بغداد وقتل الخليفة سلم البلد إلى الوزير وأحسن  
إليه وحكّمه فلو كان قد خامر على الخليفة لما وقع الوثوق به

After conquering Baghdad and massacring the Khalīfah, the King treated the Wazīr with kindness by handing over the city to him and appointing him as its ruler. Had he defended the Khalīfah, the King would not have trusted him.<sup>2</sup>

Ja‘far Khīṣbāk and Ḥasan al-Amīn have mentioned similar and added that Halaku chose him as he was in need of a governor for the city.<sup>3</sup>

A concise reply to the above claim would be that it is not the only evidence present and that the former and latter evidence contradict it.

---

1 *Al-Ḥawādith al-Jāmi‘ah*, pg. 362; *A‘yān al-Shī‘ah*, 9/87; *Jāmi‘ al-Tawārīkh*, pg. 297; *Ṭarā‘if al-Maqāl*, 1/105.

2 *Al-Fakhrī*, pg. 313.

3 *Al-Ghazw al-Maghūlī*, pg. 105; *A‘yān al-Shī‘ah*, 9/101.

A detailed response is as follows:

Ibn al-Ṭiqṭaqā mentioned that had the Wazīr been treacherous to the Khalīfah, the King would not have deemed him reliable whereas it has been observed that Halaku would appoint as leaders those very individuals who had been treacherous to their leaders. This is exactly what transpired with the Fort of Mārdīn, the King al-Saʿīd prepared to fight against the Mongols; however, his son killed him and appointed himself as the leader. He then sought a truce from the Mongols which they awarded and Halaku granted them security. Halaku then handed over the fort to him in which he remained Sultan until the year 695 AH.<sup>1</sup> This individual deceived his own father and killed him which is the greatest form of treachery, yet Halaku overlooked it and handed over authority to him.

Regarding the statement of Jaʿfar Khiṣbāk that is endorsed by Ḥasan al-Amīn which claims that Halaku chose the Wazīr due to his need for him, if it was as they claim then why did the King appoint his son ʿIzz al-Dīn as his replacement bearing in mind it was only a few months after his demise which means that the city was still in need of strengthening and reinforcement.

### **What supports the affiliation of Wazīr to the Mongols**

Their attempt to raise his status among people by making his home a place of sanctuary at the time of the Baghdad's slaughter, which was prior to the massacre of the Khalīfah, indicates that the endeavour in giving him position was predetermined and prior to the massacre of the Khalīfah, as mentioned by Ibn al-Fūṭī:

---

<sup>1</sup> *Jāmiʿ al-Tawārīkh*, pg.325.

و وضع السيف في أهل بغداد يوم الاثنين خامس صفر مازالوا في قتل ونهب و ... فلم يبق ... إلا القليل ما عدا النصارى ... والتجاء إليهم خلق كثير من المسلمين ... وكان ببغداد جماعة من التجار ... قد تعلقوا من قبل على أمراء المغول وكتب إليهم فرامين ... والتجاء إليهم أيضاً جماعة ... وكذلك دار الوزير مؤيد الدين ابن العلقمي فإنه سلم بها خلق كثير ودار صاحب الديوان ... ودار حاجب الباب ... وما عدا هذه الأماكن فإنه لم يسلم فيه أحد إلا من قن في الآبار والقنوات

The massacre of the general residents of Baghdad began on Monday, 5th Şafar together with the plunder... Other than Christians, very few made it out alive.... Therefore, many Muslims sought refuge from the Christians... There were also many traders present in Baghdad who had relations with Mongol leaders... and had received *laissez-passers* from them... so a group of Muslims also sought refuge from them... Similar was the residence of Wazīr Mu'ayyid al-Dīn ibn al-'Alqamī as many had taken refuge in it together with the residence of the treasurer... and the residence of the doorkeeper... With the exception of those seeking refuge at these locations, none were spared except those who hid in wells and mountaintops.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Fūṭī mentions in his work *Majma' al-Alqāb* that Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd was from those who sought refuge in the residence of Wazīr Mu'ayyid al-Dīn al-'Alqamī together with his brother Muwaffiq al-Dīn.<sup>2</sup>

Having accomplices in this matter does not exonerate him but rather implicates him together with others.

---

1 *Al-Ḥawādith al-Jāmi'ah*, pg. 359.

2 *Muqaddamah Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāghah*, 1/18.



## Reason for this treachery

All those who have accused Ibn al-‘Alqamī of treachery have linked it back to his anger at what occurred to the people of his creed, “The Shī‘ah”, amidst the incidents of conflict between the Ahl al-Sunnah and Shī‘ah which occurred many times in Baghdad during the era of his ministership.

The first conflict occurred in 650 AH.

The second incident occurred in 653 AH between the people of Karkh and Bāb al-Baṣarah.<sup>1</sup>

The third incident was in Dhū al-Ḥijjah 654 AH, when the Shī‘ah of Karkh killed a man from the Ahl al-Sunnah. The Ahl al-Sunnah then complained to the Khalīfah who ordered that the perpetrators be detained. However, the army then began acting harshly to the Shī‘ah which caused them to complain of it to the Khalīfah who then ordered that they be left alone and to return to them whatever was usurped or seized from them in an attempt to curb the discord and killing.<sup>2</sup>

As al-Tūjī mentions in the following:

إن حادثة الكرخ لا شك فيها ويذكرها المؤرخين كافة

There is no doubt in the occurrence of the Karkh incident as it has been documented by adequate historians.<sup>3</sup>

However, in most cases victory was the lot of the Ahl al-Sunnah due to them being the majority and the fact that the army and Khalīfah was from among them.

---

1 *Al-Ḥawādith al-Jāmi‘ah*, pg. 320.

2 *Jāmi‘ al-Ḥawādith*, pg. 331.

3 *Bilād al-Shām*, pg. 120.

All of this made the Wazīr furious and hateful of the Khalīfah and the state. We have previously discussed the correspondence between him and al-Ṭūsī together with the portion which al-Majlisī makes mention of and the opinion of Ibn al-‘Alqamī stating that the Abbasid dynasty deserves to be destroyed in terms of their actions as they killed some Alawids in these conflicts.<sup>1</sup> This explains the effect the incidents of Karkh had on Ibn al-‘Alqamī. Soon we shall present the stance of some Shī‘ah who remained in the ranks of Halaku, substantiating the position they had taken from another narration which gives us an indication of the attitude of these people towards Halaku in light of their general beliefs and that which was mentioned previously.

Muḥammad al-Ḥasūn is among those of the Abbasid dynasty who have mentioned the stance of Ibn al-‘Alqamī after the incident of Karkh:

والظاهر أنه كان الكتاب الرائج بين الشيعة في بغداد في القرن السابع  
وذلك واضح من الكتاب الذي كتبه الوزير العلقمي إلى تاج الدين ابن  
صلايا - وهو شيعي - وفيه فكان جوابي بعد خطابي لأبد من الشيعة  
بعد قتل جميع الشيعة ومن إحراق كتاب الوسيلة والذريعة

It is no secret that it was an infamous book among the Shī‘ah of Baghdad in the seventh century. It can also be proven from the letter written by Wazīr al-‘Alqamī to Tāj al-Dīn Ibn Ṣalāyā who was a Shī‘ī. A portion of the letter is as follows: My answer after my speech had to be horrible as it was after the killing of all the Shī‘ah and burning the books *al-Wasīlah* and *al-Dharī‘ah*.<sup>2</sup>

---

1 *Bihār al-Anwār*, 64/341.

2 *Muqaddamah Kitāb al-Wasīlah*, pg. 8.

Ibn al-Wardī includes the entire correspondence between Ibn al-‘Alqamī and Ibn al-Ṣalāyā towards the latter part of al-Mukhtaṣar.<sup>1</sup>

Similarly does al-Subkī, the following being part of it:

وكتب الوزير إلى نائب الخليفة بإربل وهو تاج الدين محمد بن صلاحيا  
وهو أيضاً شيعي رسالة يقول فيها نهب الكرخ المكرم و العترة العلوية  
وحسن التمثيل بقول الشاعر

أمور تضحك السفهاء منها      ويكي من عواقبها اللبيب

فلهم أسوة بالحسين حيث نهب حريمه وأريق دمه

أمرتهم أمري بمنعرج اللوى      فلم يستبينوا الرشد إلا ضحى الغد

وقد عزموا لا أتم الله عزمهم ولا أنفذ أمرهم على نهب الحلة والنيل بل  
سولت لهم أنفسهم أمر فصبر جميل و الخادم قد أسلف الإنذار وعجل  
لهم الإعدار

أرى تحت الرماد وميض نار      ويوشك أن يكون له ضرام

وإن لم يطفئها عقلا قوم      يكون وقودها جثث وهام

فقلت من التعجب ليت شعري      أيقظان أمية أم نيام

فإن يك قومنا أضحوا نياماً      فقل هبوا لقد حان الحمام

... فكان جوابي بعد خطابي لا بد من الشيعة بعد قتل الشيعة ومن  
إحراق كتاب الوسيلة والذريعة فكن لما نقول سميعاً ... إلى أن يقول  
فلأفعلن بلي كما قال المتنبي:

1 Al-Mukhtaṣar, pg. 88.

قوم إذا أخذوا الأقلام من غضب      ثم استمروا بها ماء المنيات  
 نالوا بها من أعاديهم وإن بعدوا      ما لا ينال بحد المشرفيات  
 ولأئينهم بجنود لا قبل لهم بها      ولأخر جنهم منها أذلة وهم صاغرون  
 ووديعه من سر آل محمد      أودعتها إذا كنت من أمنائها  
 فإذا رأيت الكوكبين تقاربا      في الجدي عند صباحها ومسائها  
 فهناك يؤخذ ثار آل محمد      لطلابها بالترك من أعدائها  
 فكن لهذا الأمر بالمرصاد وترقب أول النحل وآخر صاد

Al-Wazīr wrote the following in a letter to the Khalīfah's deputy in Irbil, namely Tāj al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Ṣalāyā, who was also a Shī'ī:

The blessed Karkh together with the Ahl al-Bayt and the Alawids have been ravaged. The following verse of the poet represents the situation:

*Matters which cause the foolish to laugh,  
 While the intelligent cry over its consequences.*

Their plight is similar to that of Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه when his sanctum was violated and his blood was shed.

*I had commanded them not to stop at Mun'arij al-Lawā,  
 But they only listened when it was too late.*

They are determined to raid and assume control of Ḥillah and Nīl<sup>1</sup>, may Allah cause their plans to seize, for their souls have

---

1 A village on the outskirts of Kūfah.

enticed them to do so, therefore patience is most befitting as Khādim's previous threats were combatted with excuses in their favour.

*I see beneath the ash sparks of fire,  
Soon it will come to ablaze.  
If the intelligent ones do not distinguish it,  
Then the fuel of this fire will be bodies and heads.  
I said out of astonishment if only,  
Are the Umayyads awake or asleep?  
If the time of midday approaches while the people are asleep,  
Then say to them: Awaken to your deaths.*

... Therefore, my answer after my speech had to be one of disgust due to the killing of the Shī'ah and burning of *al-Wasīlah* and *al-Dharī'ah*, so pay attention to what we have to say...

I shall therefore comply in the manner described by al-Mutanabbī:

*A people who when they draw their pens in anger,  
and persist with it into the waters of destiny,  
They achieve by it against their enemies even if they be afar,  
what they were would have been incapable to achieve even they had  
been close.*

*I shall come to them with an army that they will be unable to encounter,  
and I shall expel them from there in a disgraceful and humiliated  
manner.*

*As for the trust which is a secret of the Ahl al-Bayt,  
I had entrusted it during my custodianship,  
When I saw the two stars drawing near,  
In the Tropic of Capricorn during the morning and evening,  
Vengeance for the Ahl al-Bayt is being taken here,  
For its seekers with the Mongols from their enemies.*

So, remain in observation for this matter, while anticipating the beginning of al-Naḥl and ending of Ṣād.<sup>1</sup>

Indicating to the verses, “*The command of Allah is coming, so do not be hasty.*”<sup>2</sup> and “*And you shall certainly see its reality after a while.*”<sup>3</sup>

With this being said, the strength and authenticity of the statements which mention the treacherous involvement of Ibn al-‘Alqamī has become evident considering that the proofs mentioned above in authenticating the treacherous accusations are all statements of the opposing party. As for the level of its authenticity in our opinion, we find the statements of the large number of Islamic historians, the Shī‘ī scholars, those who have been mentioned previously and those who confirm the treacherous involvement of Ibn al-‘Alqamī to be sufficient in establishing his treachery, especially taking into consideration that they were involved in this catastrophe and the ones affected. We have read their statements which are filled with grief and sorrow over this great catastrophe, so what can be said to the few that deny all of this either due to ignorance in the matter, conformity in belief, inattention

---

1 *Al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā al-Shāfi‘iyyah*, 8/263.

2 Sūrah al-Naḥl: 1.

3 Sūra Ṣad: 88.

in it being from the people of the book or to what the Mongols have done to their state.

## The accusations against al-'Alqamī

We have already discussed the authenticity concerning the occurrence of this treachery together with the correspondences with the Mongols. In this chapter, we will expound on the actual accusations against him.

### 1. He reduced the army of Baghdad

He has been accused of this by al-Subkī, Ibn Kathīr, al-Kutubī in *'Uyūn al-Akhhbār*, al-Dhahabī in *Duwal al-Islām* together with many others.<sup>1</sup>

Ibn Kathīr mentions:

وجيوش بغداد في غاية القلة ونهاية الذلة لا يبلغون عشرة آلاف فارس  
هم وبقية الجيوش كلهم قد حرّموا إقطاعاتهم حتى استعطى كثير منهم  
في الأسواق وأبواب المساجد، وأنشد فيهم الشعراء قصائد يرثون لهم  
ويحزنون على الإسلام وأهله

The army of Baghdad was meagre and enervated as its soldiers were less than even ten thousand. They were not given stipends which forced many of them to beg in marketplaces and at the doors of the Masājid. The poets even compiled lines of poetry lamenting their plight and mourning Islam and its followers.

Al-Subkī mentions in *al-Ṭabaqāt*:

وحبب الوزير إلى الخليفة جمع المال والتقليل من العساكر فصار  
الجنود يطلبون من يستخدمهم في حمل القاذورات ومنهم من يكارى  
على فرسه، ليصلوا إلى ما يتقوتون به

---

<sup>1</sup> *Al-Ṭabaqāt*, 8/262, *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, 13/214.

The Wazīr exhorted the Khalīfah to hoard wealth and to reduce the army grants which then forced the soldiers to seek work. Some began picking up trash while others hired out their horses just so they could make ends meet.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Bakrī mentions the following in *Tārīkh al-Khamīs*:

محا اسم من ذكر من الديوان ثم نفاهم من بغداد ومنعهم من الإقامة بها  
ثم بعد شهر فعل مثل فعلته الأولى ومحا اسم عشرين ألفاً من الديوان  
ثم كتب إلى هولاء بما فعل

He removed the names of those mentioned from the treasury list and banished them from Baghdad. He repeated this action a few months later this time removing twenty thousand names. He then wrote to Halaku informing him of his actions.<sup>2</sup>

In this way, he was able to demobilize the army in a quick and effective manner. The statement of Ibn al-Fūṭī who was the student of Khawājah al-Ṭūsī and a contemporary to the incident assists us in determining the time in which the demobilization of the army took place. He mentions the following statement under the incidents of 655 AH:

وكان الخليفة قد أهمل حال الجند ومنعهم أرزقهم وأسقط أكثرهم من  
دساتير ديوان العرض. فآلت أحوالهم إلى سؤال الناس وبذل وجوههم  
في الطلب في الأسواق و الجوامع ونظم الشعراء في ذلك الأشعار

The Khalīfah neglected the army by putting an end to their stipends and removing most of them from the registries of the treasury. This forced them to stretch their hands to people and

---

1 *Al-Ṭabaqāt*, 8/262.

2 *Muḥakkamah al-Tārīkh*, pg. 35.



they began begging in the marketplaces and Masājid. Poets have even composed poetry in this regard.<sup>1</sup>

The following description of the army mentioned by Ibn Ṭabāṭabā al-Shīrī when al-Duwaydār came out to meet the Mongol army also indicates to its feeble amount:

وكان عسكرياً في غاية القلة

The army was absolutely tiny.<sup>2</sup>

The statement of Ibn al-Fūṭī clearly indicates that the immobilization of the army took place in 655 AH. What also backs this up is that Halaku prior to this reprimanded Bāijū Nūyān, a Mongol commander by saying:

إنك لم تفعل شيئاً سوى أنك رحت تخوف القوات المغولية بالمبالغة  
في غلبة الخليفة من قوة وعظمة

You have done nothing but frighten the army by exaggerating the dominance and power of the Khalīfah.

Bāijū replied saying:

إنني لم أقصر... وقد أخضعت... ماعدا بغداد فإنه بسبب كثرة سكانها  
ووفرة جيوشها وبسبب كثرة ما فيها من الأسلحة ومزيد الأهبة وبسبب  
الطرق الضيقة الصعبة...

I haven't become slack... and I have obeyed... It is just that Baghdad has a lot of inhabitants, a huge army, abundance of weaponry, plentiful preparations, and difficult narrow paths...

---

1 *Al-Ḥawādith al-Jāmi'ah*, pg. 350.

2 *Al-Fakhrī*, pg. 311.

The Mongol historian al-Hamdhānī mentions that this was done in Rabī al-Awwal 655 AH i.e., towards the beginning of the year.<sup>1</sup> The victory of the Baghdad army against one of the Mongol armies in 643 AH also confirms their prior strength.<sup>2</sup>

Al-Hamdhānī also mentions the following regarding Halaku:

كان يفكر في كثرة جند بغداد

He was concerned regarding the size of the Baghdad army.<sup>3</sup>

In that case, the Baghdad army must have been really powerful for Halaku to be concerned about it, Bāijū to fear it, and the Mongol army to flee from it. So, why did the Khalīfah neglect it? And why did he attempt to hoard the wealth stipulated for the army?

Ibn Taghrībirdī mentions:

أن ابن العلقمي أشار على المستعصم بقطع أرزاق الجند ومصانعة التتار  
وإكرامهم يحصل بذلك المقصود ولا حاجة لكثرة الجند ففعل ذلك  
الخليفة

Ibn al-‘Alqamī advised al-Mu‘taṣim to put an end to the army stipends, to cooperate with the Tartars and respect them in an attempt to achieve the objective, and that there was no need for a huge army; and the Khalīfah took his advice.<sup>4</sup>

With regards to the Wazīr being the one who initiated peace with the Tartars, putting an end to their bloodshed and giving them a lot of

---

1 *Jāmi‘ al-Tawārīkh*, pg. 260.

2 *Al-Ghazw al-Maghūlī*, pg. 86; *Al-Ḥawādith al-Jāmi‘ah*, pg. 240.

3 *Jāmi‘ al-Tawārīkh*, pg. 277.

4 *Al-Nujūm al-Zāhirah*, 7/48.

wealth, it is a widely accepted fact—not only among those who accuse him but also among those who defend him—therefore the only logical explanation would be that it was none other than Ibn al-‘Alqamī who convinced the Khalīfah to carry out these acts.

It is only Allah who is fully aware of the full reality but Ibn al-Fūṭī who was close to this incident mentioned before describing the feeble state of the army that had been sent that the Wazīr advised the Khalīfah with the following:

ببذل الأموال وحملها إليه هو لاكو مع التحف الكثيرة و الأشياء الغربية  
و الأعلاق النفيسة

To hand over all the wealth to Halaku including many gems, rare, and precious items.<sup>1</sup>

This also indicates to the fact that it was Ibn al-‘Alqamī who caused the feeble condition of the army. And Allah knows best.

The following incident also raises doubts regarding Ibn al-‘Alqamī:

ولما تحققت أمنية حسان الدين حاكم درتلك التي طالما تمنّاها  
وتجمعت عنده جنود سليمان شاه تعاضم وتكبر وأرسل ابن صلايا  
العلوي الشيعي الذي راسله ابن العلقمي بعد حادثة الكرخ إلى هكذا  
حاكم إربل ليصلحه مع ديون الخليفة و قال لقد قدرتُ هو لاكو خان  
وما هو عليه من كفاءة وكياسة ومهما يكن له من العنف والتهديد فليس  
له عندي وزن فلو طيب الخليفة خاطري وطمأن قلبي وبعث إلى بجند  
من الفرسان لجمعت أنا أيضاً ما يقرب من مائة ألف من فرق المشاة من  
كرد و تركمان ولسددت الطرق في وجه هو لاكو خان لا أدع أي مخلوق

---

1 *Al-Hawādith al-jāmi‘ah*, pg. 349.

من جنده يدخل بغداد فعرف ابن صلايا الوزير بذلك فعرضه هذا بدوره على الخليفة فلم يبدي اهتماماً كثيراً ولما بلغ هولاءكو خان هذا الكلام ثارت ثورة غضبه ... ثم قتله المغول مع كافة أتباعه

When the long hoped for goal of the Turk ruler Ḥassām al-Dīn was achieved, and the armies of Sulaymān Shāh gathered around him, he became proud and haughty and sent Ibn Ṣalāyā al-‘Alawī—the same Shī‘ī who was used by Ibn al-‘Alqamī to send messages after the incident of Karkh—to the ruler of Irbil to make peace and to settle the debts of the Khalīfah. His message was as follows, “I have assessed Halaku Khan and I have found him to be inefficient and uncivilized. No matter how brutal or intimidating he may be, it holds no weight in my eyes. Had the Khalīfah soothed me, put my heart at rest and sent an army of cavalry to me, I would have also gathered an army of one hundred thousand infantry troops of Kurds and Turks, and I would have blocked off every path in the way of Halaku Khan not allowing any creature of his army entrance into Baghdad.” Ibn Ṣalāyā informed Wazīr who in return informed the Khalīfah; however, the Khalīfah didn’t pay much attention to it. When this statement reached the ears of Halaku Khan, he became extremely furious... The Mongols later killed him together with a considerable number of his followers.<sup>1</sup>

The Khalīfah showing no concern to the report is strange unless we believe that he had already taken the advice of Ibn al-‘Alqamī which was not preparing for an altercation and that handing over the wealth was going to be sufficient. Possibly, this is what the Khalīfah indicated to when looking at the letter of Ḥassām al-Dīn as Ibn al-‘Alqamī did

---

1 *Jāmi‘ al-Tawārikh*, pg. 267.

not notice any change in his stance. Indeed, he handed over the wealth and surrendered to the Mongols which reminds us of the stance taken by Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī with the Ismāʿīlyyah when he persuaded Rukn al-Dīn Khūrshāh to surrender, which he did and that got him killed by Halaku, while Naṣīr al-Dīn remained safe. One can wonder at the extent Halaku's spies had infiltrated the palace of the Khalīfah as he was promptly apprised concerning the treachery of Ḥassām al-Dīn ʿUkkah.

Some of those who defend al-ʿAlqamī claim that he had given the best advice to the Khalīfah and guided him to the correct path which was to hand over the wealth and surrender to Halaku as it was the only way to protect himself and the Khilāfah.

However, the inauthenticity of this opinion can be seen by glancing at Mongol history, added to the fact that they cannot be trusted. Their habit was to shed the blood of every person who poses a threat or just being eligible as one, although they may have not made a single advance against them.

I present to you the following historical evidences:

1. The massacre of the Ismāʿīlī ruler even after he had given them security and surrendered. Halaku kept him alive until he took over all the forts and then killed him.<sup>1</sup>
2. Ibn Ṣalāyā al-ʿAlawī, the deputy of the Khalīfah in Irbil.

Ibn al-Fūṭī mentions:

---

1 *Al-Ghazw al-Maghūlī*, pg. 18; *Jāmiʿ al-Tawārīkh*, pg. 257.

وكان قد قصد حضرة السلطان بعد وقعة بغداد ليقرر رجاله فأمر بقتله

He planned on visiting the ruler after the incident of Baghdad to safeguard his men, but Halaku commanded that he be killed.<sup>1</sup>

Muḥaqqiq Bashshār ‘Awwād and ‘Imād ‘Abd al-Salām include the following statement of al-Dhahabī under the footnotes of this incident:

فيقال إن لؤلؤ - صاحب الموصل - قال لهولاكو : هذا شريف علوي ونفسه تحدثه بالخلافة ولو قام تبعه الناس واستفحل أمره ؛ فقتله هولاكو

It is mentioned that Lu’lu’ the ruler of Mosul said to Halaku, “This is a noble ‘Alawī person who is desirous of Khilāfah. If he stands up, people will join him and matters will become worse. So Halaku got him killed.”

Look over the conciliation of Ibn Ṣalāyā and his attempt to hand over the stronghold to them without altercation or resistance.<sup>2</sup>

### 3. The inhabitants of the Ḥārīm stronghold.

Al-Hamdhānī mentions:

ثم شغلوا مدة بمحاصرة قلعة حارم وأخيراً طلب أهلها الأمان لكنهم اشترطوا أن يقسم لهم فخر الدين المعروف بالساقي على الأمان لكي ينزلوا ، ثم سلموا بناءً على عهده وإيمانه . فكان أن غضب عليهم هولاكو غضباً شديداً ، وأمر بأن يقتلوا دفعة واحدة مع نساءهم وأطفالهم ولم ينج منهم إلا صائغ أرمني

---

1 *Al-Ḥawādith al-jāmi‘ah*, pg. 366.

2 *Jāmi‘ al-Tawārīkh*, pg. 298.

They laid siege to the Ḥārīm fort for a while but in the end its inhabitants asked for peace and decided to exit with the condition that Fakhr al-Dīn who was known as al-Sāqī takes an oath of protection. They then surrendered based on his trust and belief. However, Halaku became furious at them and commanded that they be killed at once together with their women and children. The only person who survived was an Armenian jeweller.<sup>1</sup>

That is why the logical demanded that they not be trusted and for this reason, many rulers of Islamic regions refused to initiate peace with them due to their knowledge of their treachery. Some of them were:

#### 1. Malik Sa'īd, ruler of Mardin

The Mongol general who was sent to Malik Sa'īd said to him:

أهبط من القلعة وقدم الطاعة والولاء لملك العالم ليقبلك رأسك  
ومالك ونسائك وأبناؤك

Descend from the fort and surrender to the king of the world so that your life, wealth, women, and children may be spared.

Malik Sa'īd replied with the following:

كنت قد عذمت على السمع والطاعة والحضور إلى الملك ، ولكن حيث  
إنكم قد عاهدتم الآخرين ثم قتلتموهم بعد أن اطمأنوا إلى عهدكم و  
أمانكم فإني لا أثق بكم

I would have surrendered by obeying and coming in front of the king, but I no longer trust you since you went back on your promises to others by taking their lives the minute they accepted your promises.<sup>2</sup>

---

1 *Jāmi' al-Tawārīkh*, pg. 307.

2 *Jāmi' al-Tawārīkh*, pg. 324.

## 2. Malik Kāmil

Al-Hamdhānī mentions:

ولما بلغوا حدود ميفارقين أرسلوا رسولاً إلى الملك الكامل ودعوه  
إلى الطاعة و الخضوع فأجاب الملك الكامل : ينبغي ألا يضرب الأمير  
في حديد بارد ..... إذ كيف أثق ببن رجل نكث العهود الميثاق مع  
خورشاه و الخليفة وحسام الدين عكه وتاج الدين أربل وقد جاء الملك  
الناصر الدين خصيصا بأمانكم فرأى في نهاية الأمر ما رأى وسوف أرى  
أنا أيضا ما سبق أن رأوه

Upon reaching the borders of Silvan, they sent a messenger to Malik Kāmil asking him to surrender to their rule. Malik Kāmil replied saying, “A ruler should not be slain without fighting... How do I trust the son of a man who has broken pacts with Khūrshāh, the Khalīfah, Ḥassām al-Dīn ‘Ukkah, and Tāj al-Dīn Irbil, not forgetting Malik Nāṣir al-Dīn who particularly initiated peace but still ended up being deceived in the end. I shall soon witness what has already been witnessed by them.”<sup>1</sup>

## 3. Sulṭān Quṭuz

Prior to Halaku’s return from Syria to his homeland which was due to the death of the biggest leader, he sent a letter to the ruler of Egypt threatening him and commanding him to surrender. Sulṭān Quṭuz upon receiving the letter consulted with his men. In that gathering, Nāṣir al-Dīn Qīmrī said the following regarding Halaku:

---

<sup>1</sup> *Jāmi’ al-Tawārīkh*, pg. 319.



إنه ليس بالإنسان الذي يطمأن إليه ، فهو لا يتورع عن احتراز الرؤوس وهو لا يفي بعهده وميثاقه ، فإنه قتل فجأة خورشاه والخليفة وحسام الدين عكه وصاحب إربل بعد أن أعطاهم العهد و الميثاق فإذا ما سرنا إليه فسيكون مصيرنا هذا السبيل

He is not someone who can be trusted as he does not hesitate in killing nor does he keep his word. He suddenly took the lives of Khūrshāh, the Khalīfah, Ḥassām al-Dīn ‘Ukkah, and the governor of Irbil even after giving them his word. If we surrender to him, our fate will be similar to theirs.

Towards the latter part of the meeting, they unanimously agreed to go to war. Allah’s assistance was on their side in this battle, which is referred to as ‘Ayn Jālūt and the Mongol invasion came to a halt. So, this was the correct stance to be adopted against the Mongols and not that which was advised by Ibn al-‘Alqamī which made the Khalīfah hold back the army’s grants and collect it to hand it over to the Mongols.<sup>1</sup>

The Shīī contemporary, Ḥassan al-Amīn, in his following statement agrees that the Mongols are a treacherous nation:

ولكن الذي يطالب بمثل هذا ينسى أن المغول امتهنوا الشرائع وغدروا بالرسل وخانوا المستأمنين ونقضوا العهود

However, those who are calling for the return of this are forgetting that the Mongols reviled the Sharīah, acted treacherously towards messengers, betrayed those who were granted protection, and went against their word.<sup>2</sup>

---

1 *Jāmi‘ al-Tawārīkh*, pg. 310.

2 *Al-Ghazw al-Maghūlī*, pg. 150.

How can it be said that Ibn al-‘Alqamī advised and guided the Khalīfah to the extent that Ḥasan al-Amīn himself mentions the following:

وبعد فوات الأوان يدرك المستعصم أن ما قد أشار به ابن العلقمي كان هو الصواب، وأنه لو عمل بآرائه لما وصل الحال إلى ما وصل إليه

In hindsight, al-Musta‘ṣim knew that the advice of Ibn al-‘Alqamī was the correct advice to take, and the situation would not have reached this point had he followed accordingly.<sup>1</sup>

This is nothing but contradiction and arbitrary.

## **2. He tricked the Khalīfah into coming out to Halaku with the seniors of the state so he could assassinate them**

Al-Yūnīnī is among those who makes mentions of this in the following words:

فحينئذ أشار ابن العلقمي الوزير على الخليفة بمصانعة ملك التتر و مصالحته وسأله أن يخرج إليه في تقرير ذلك فخرج وتوثق منه لنفسه ثم رجع إلى الخليفة وقال له : إنه رغب أن يزوج ابنته من ابنك الأمير أبي بكر ويبقيك في منصب الخلافة كما أبقى سلطان الروم .... ويمكن بعد ذلك أن تفعل ما تريد وحسن له الخروج إليه في جمع من أكابر أصحابه فأنزل في خيمة ثم دخل الوزير فاستدعى الفقهاء والأمثال ليحضروا عقد النكاح فيما أظهره فقتلوا وكذلك صار يخرج طائفة بعد طائفة

At this point the Wazīr, Ibn al-‘Alqamī, advised the Khalīfah to initiate peace with the King of the Tartars and requested to play an active role in it. He set out confident in himself and soon returned to the Khalīfah saying, “The King plans on getting his

---

1 Muḥakkamah al-Tārīkh.

daughter married to the son of the Amīr, Abu Bakr, thus keeping you as the Khalīfah just as he kept the ruler of Rome. It is possible that you would then be able to do what you please.” The Khalīfah happily set out taking a group of his senior associates and entered his tent. The Wazīr then came after inviting the Jurists and their likenesses to attend what seemed to be a marriage ceremony, but turned out to be the place where their blood was shed. Similarly, group after group were made to come out.<sup>1</sup>

The very accusation is mentioned in *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi‘īyyah* of al-Subkī and in *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* but excludes mention of the marriage.<sup>2</sup>

We find the following by taking a look at the books which are considered unbiased and contemporary like *Jāmi‘ al-Tawārīkh* of al-Hamdhānī as he had written the Mongol documents from the beginning which was given to him and due to him occupying an important position in their state. Similarly, *Jāmi‘ al-Ḥawādith* of Ibn al-Fūṭī as he was a contemporary to these incidents, he was present in Baghdad and he was the student of al-Ṭūsī himself, as well as other books.

Al-Hamdhānī mentions that the Khalīfah sought the advice of Wazīr prior to going before Halaku and that he was accompanied by three thousand of the state’s leaders, judges and seniors.<sup>3</sup>

Ibn al-Fūṭī mentions:

خرج الوزير .... إلى خدمه السلطان في جماعه من مماليكه وأتباعه  
وكانوا ينهون الناس عن الرمي بالشباب ويقولون سوف يقع الصلح إن

---

1 *Dhayl Mir’āt al-Zamān*, 1/88.

2 *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi‘īyyah*, 8/270; *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, 13/214.

3 *Jāmi‘ al-Tawārīkh*, pg. 290.

شاء الله فلا تحاربوا هذا وعساكر المغول يبالبغون في الرمي ... وعاد الوزير ... يوم الأحد وكان قد خرج الخميس سابع عشرين من المحرم وقال للخليفة قد تقدم السلطان أن نخرج إليه فأخرج ولده الأوسط ... فلم يقع الاقتناع به فخرج الخليفة والوزير ... ومعه جمع كثير

Wazīr entered into the service of the king together with a group of his slaves and followers. They were preventing people from shooting arrows and were saying, “Allah willing, peace will be made soon, so do not fight,” whereas the Mongol army continued to rain arrows. The Wazīr returned on Sunday 27th Muḥarram, while he left on Thursday, and said to the Khalīfah, “The king has ordered that we go before him.” However, the Khalīfah’s middle son excluded himself as he did not trust him. The Khalīfah and the Wazīr then set out together with a great number of people.<sup>1</sup>

Ibn al-Fūṭī has also mentioned the portion discussing how they removed the jurists and killed them in his book *Talkhīṣ Majma‘ al-Ādāb*<sup>2</sup> and he narrates the following from ‘Abd Allāh al-Ṭahrānī al-Rāzī al-Ḥanafī:

وهو ممن كان يخرج الفقهاء الى باب السور إلى مخيم السلطان هو لاكو  
مع شهاب الدين الزنجاني ليقتلوا

He was among those called the Jurists out to Bāb Sūr to the camp of King Halaku together with Shihāb al-Dīn al-Zinjānī so they could be killed.

---

1 *Al-Ḥawādith al-Jāmi‘ah*, pg. 356.

2 *Talkhīṣ Majma‘ al-Ādāb*, 2/195; Footnote 4 of *Al-Ḥawādith al-Jāmi‘ah*, pg. 396; *A‘yān al-Shī‘ah*, 9/85.

The above informs us that the calling of the Jurists and scholars out and their massacre is an established fact and that it was Ibn al-‘Alqamī who called the Khalīfah out with three thousand others. Ibn al-Fūṭī did not mention here that al-Ṭahrānī and al-Zinjānī were the only ones who did this, rather he mentioned “he was among those” indicating that there were others.

If someone were to object that these individuals were regarded as Ahl al-Sunnah, we accept it; however, was the fate of those Ahl al-Sunnah who assisted the Mongols one of dignity—as the Shī‘ah award al-Ṭūsī and al-‘Alqamī—or was it that of disgrace.<sup>1</sup>

In Aleppo, some youngsters together with others were put to death by the leader due to their affiliation to the Mongols.<sup>2</sup>

It is commonly known even among the defenders of Ibn al-‘Aqamī that the going out of the Khalīfah was with his reassurance of the agreement with Halaku. However, I do not see a reason why three thousand other individuals had to also go out to initiate the peace treaty except it being a way of achieving their objective, which has been mentioned by the remaining historians.

As you can see, there isn’t any objection and it is actually best that they did not mention the promise and agreement which occurred between Halaku and Wazīr wherein the Khalīfah comes out with three thousand of the state’s notables. The Ahl al-Sunnah historians,

---

1 Consequently, the author of *al-Ḥawādith al-Jāmi‘ah* (pg. 396) includes in the footnote of the above statement that He was afflicted with a disease that caused him great difficulty right until his death. It seems that some of his punishment was metered out to him in this worldly life. Allah knows best.

2 *Bilād al-Shām Abām al-Ghazw al-Maghūlī*, pg. 154.

however, mention it and it is a reasonable reason for the coming out of such a group. Allah knows best.

After shedding light on the stance of these two individuals, we will discuss the stance of the remaining Shī'ī scholars, so that a clearer picture may be obtained.

## Chapter Five

### The stance of the remaining Shī'ah scholars

What happened to the Muslims in Baghdad is a catastrophe in every sense of the word as we have previously discussed. Some Shī'ah state the same, such as al-Ṭabāṭabā'ī, while others regard it to be a triumph that brings joy to their hearts, al-Khuwānasārī being one of them.

Al-Ṭabāṭabā'ī mentions the following in *Riyād al-Masā'il*:

اولا سقوط بغداد في سنة ٦٥٦ سقطت بغداد حاضرة العالم الإسلامي بيد التتار بقيادة هولالكو وكان سقوط بغداد واحدة من أعظم النكبات التي حلت بالعالم الإسلامي منذ ظهور الإسلام إلى اليوم الحاضر وكان التخريب الحضاري والثقافي والاقتصادي والسكاني الذي حل بعاصمة العباسيين في هذا الهجوم بمقاييس ذلك التاريخ من أوسع ما حل بالحواضر البشرية ، وقد قدر عدد القتلى في هذه المجزرة الرهيبة كما يقول الياضي بألف ألف وثمانمائة وكسر وإذا كان في هذا التقدير ثمة شيء من المبالغة فمما لا ريب فيه أن الخسائر البشرية كبيرة جدا وفادحة بمقاييس الخسائر الحربية في ذلك التاريخ . وقد استمر القتل والنهب سبعة أيام ثم رفعوا السيف وبتلوا السبي وقيل إن القتل والنهب والسبي استمر نيفا وثلاثين يوما وقيل أربعين يوما يقول الدكتور حسن إبراهيم حسن وقد أعمل جند المغول السيف في رقاب أهل بغداد أربعين يوما سلبوا فيها أموالهم وأهلكوا كثيرين من رجال العلم وقتلوا أئمة المساجد وحملوا القرآن وتعطلت المساجد والمدارس والربط وأصبحت المدينة قاعا صافصفا ليس فيها إلا فئة قليلة مشردة الأذهان ... فقد كانت بغداد مركزا من أعظم مراكز الإشعاع الفكري في العالم كله في ذلك التاريخ من دون مبالغة وقد أحرقت التتار كلما وجدوا في

بغداد من علم ومن مراكز للعلم كما قتلوا كل من عثروا عليه من العلماء أو كل من كان في بغداد من العلماء وليس بإمكان أحد أن يقدر ضخامة الخسارة التي لحقت بالفكر والثقافة الإسلامية والبشرية في هذه النكبة يقول قطب الدين الحنفي تراكمت الكتب التي ألقاها التتار حتى صارت معبرا يعبر عليه الناس والدواب واسودت مياه دجلة بما القى فيها من الكتب

In the year 656 AH, Baghdad which was the capital of the Islamic world fell into the hands of the Tartars which was headed by Halaku. The fall of Baghdad was one of the greatest calamities that befell the Islamic world since the presence of Islam right until this day. The cultural, intellectual, economical, and demographical damage that was done to the Abbasid capital in this invasion was in that time the worst that had ever been done to an inhabited city. The number of slain in this bloodbath were estimated to be in excess of eight hundred thousand. There might be some exaggeration in the number, but without a doubt the loss of lives were many and serious in light of war casualties of that era. The massacre and plunder continued for seven long days coming to a halt thereafter, together with freeing of the captives. It is mentioned that the massacre and plunder continued for more than thirty or forty days.

The scholar Ḥasan Ibrāhīm Ḥasan mentions, “The Mongol army massacred the inhabitants of Baghdad for a period of forty days.”

They usurped their wealth, killed many scholars, Imāms of Masājid and Ḥuffāz of the Qur’ān, and destroyed Masājid, schools, and caravansaries rendering the city an empty plain with just a few homeless individuals. Baghdad in that era was without exaggeration one of greatest centres of knowledge in the world.



The Tartars set alight every item or place of knowledge that they came across just as they massacred every scholar they stumbled upon or was present in Baghdad at that time. It is impossible for one to even estimate the extent of damage that was done on an intellectual, cultural, Islamic, and humanitarian level in this disaster.

Quṭb al-Dīn al-Ḥanafī mentions, “The books were dumped into the Tigris River. Due to the large amount, it piled up and became a bridge for people and animals to cross. The water of the Tigris also turned black due to the great number of books.”<sup>1</sup>

After hearing the above, if you have to hear someone conversely claiming this to be the beginning of great advancement, the flourishing of his creed, and the great preparation for his hard work, I wonder where were they during the war and how were they not among those who were killed.

All of this forces us to look into the condition of the Shī'ah after the Mongol invasion and especially immediately after the capture of Baghdad, and were they inflicted similar to the infliction of others. Below are some statements which shed light on their condition during the Mongol invasion.

Ibn al-‘Abrī mentions:

وأمر هولاء البتكتجية ليكتبوا على السهام بالعربية : إن الأركاونية -  
نسبة إلى دهقان - والعلويين والداذشمديّة وبالجملة كل من ليس يقاتل  
فهو آمن على نفسه وحريمه وأمواله

---

<sup>1</sup> Riyāḍ al-Masā'il, 2/7.

Halaku ordered the writers to write the following in Arabic upon the arrows, “The leaders (from the lineage of the Dihqān), Alawids, senior leaders, and in short all those who will not be slain have been granted safety and their wealth cannot be usurped.”<sup>1</sup>

It is mentioned that this was done to divide the rank. So, the reply has been given that although it may be true, the mere fact of including the Shī'ah among them is proof of his recognising their susceptibility in assisting him and behaving treacherously towards the Khalīfah.

‘Alī al-Ṭabāṭabā'ī discusses the Shī'ah movements and stance during the Mongol invasion in their most important city close to Baghdad, namely Ḥillah. He mentions:

وكانت مدينة الحلة يومذاك ... مركزا معروفا للشيعة يسكنها في أوان هذه المحنة علماء بارزون من الشيعة من أمثال المحقق الحلي والإمام سديد الدين يوسف بن علي بن مطهر والد العلامة والإمام رضي الدين ابن طاووس والسيد مجد الدين محمد بن الحسن بن طاووس والفقيه ابن أبي العز وغيرهم من رجال ... فأدرك هؤلاء ضروة التحرك السريع لدرء الخطر المقبل ، وامتصاص ضراوة التتار ونقمتهم والعمل على دفع هجوم التتار من سائر بقاع العراق ولا سيما المراكز الدينية منها ... فاستقر رأي علماء الشيعة وعلمائها في الحلة على أن يكتبوا إلى هولاء كتابا يطلبون منه الأمان للحلة وما والاها من المناطق

The city of Ḥillah was at that time a well-known hub of the Shī'ah which was inhabited by prominent Shī'ī scholars during this ordeal, from the likenesses of Muḥaqqiq al-Ḥillī, Imām Sadīd al-Dīn Yūsuf ibn ‘Alī ibn Muṭahhar (father of ‘Allāmah al-Ḥillī),

---

1 *Tārīkh Mukhtaṣar al-Duwal*, pg. 237; *A'yān al-Shī'ah*, 9/88.

Imām Raḍī al-Dīn ibn Ṭāwūs, Sayyid Majd al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Ṭāwūs, Faqīh ibn Abī al-‘Izz, and others. They realised the need for quick action to prevent the approaching danger, absorb the virulence and vengeance of the Tartars, and work on preventing the Tartars from invading the entire Baghdad including its religious centres. So, the Shīṭī scholars and those of Ḥillah unanimously agreed on writing a letter to Halaku seeking protection for Ḥillah and its surrounding areas.<sup>1</sup>

### The First Delegation

‘Allāmah al-Ḥillī mentions the following in his book, *Kashf al-Yaqīn fi Faḍā’il Amīr al-Mu’minīn*:

لما وصل السلطان هولاكو إلى بغداد قبل أن يفتحها هرب أكثر الحلة إلى الطبايح إلا القليل فكان من جملة القليل والدي والسيد مجد الدين ابن طاووس والفقير ابن أبي العرفاء اجتمع رأيهم على مكاتبة السلطان بأنهم مطيعون داخلون تحت الايلية وأنفذوا به شخصا أعجميا فأنفذ السلطان إليهم فرمانا مع شخصين أحدهما يقال له نكلة والآخر يقال له علاء الدين وقال لهما قولاً لهم إن كانت قلوبكم كما وردت به كتبكم تحضرون إلينا فجاء الأمير أن فخافوا لعدم معرفتهم بما ينتهي الحال إليه فقال والدي إن جئت وحدي كفي فقالا نعم فاصعد معهما فلما حضر بين يديه وكان ذلك قبل فتح بغداد وقبل قتل الخليفة قال له كيف قدمتم على مكاتبتي والحضور عندي قبل أن تعلموا بما ينتهي إليه أمري وأمر صاحبكم وكيف تأمنون أن يصلحني ورحلت عنه فقال والدي إنما أقدمنا على ذلك لأننا روينا عن أمير المؤمنين علي بن أبي

1 *Riyāḍ al-Masā’il*, 2/21-25; *Suqūṭ al-Dawlah al-‘Abbāsiyyah*, pg. 331-332. The above is a response to those who have doubts regarding the efforts of Shīṭī scholars in making peace with Halaku arguing that the sources I have mentioned are all Sunnī sources.

طالب عليه السلام أنه قال في خطبته الزوراء وما أدراك ما الزوراء أرض ذات أثل يشيد فيها البنيان وتكثر فيه السكان ويكون فيها مهادم وخزان يتخذها ولد العباس موطنًا ولزخرفهم مسكنًا تكون لهم دار لهو ولعب يكون بها الجور الجائر والخوف المخيف والأئمة الفجرة والأمرء الفسقة والوزء الخونة تخدمهم أبناء فارس والروم لا يأمرؤن بمعروف إذا عرفوه ولا يتناهون عن منكر إذا نكروه تكتفي الرجال منهم بالرجال والنساء بالنساء فعند ذلك الغم العميم والبكاء الطويل والويل العويل لأهل الزوراء من سطوات الترك وهم قوم صغار الحدق ووجوهن كالمجال المطوقة لباسهم الحديد جرد مرد يقدمهم ملك يأتي من حيث بدا ملكهم جهوري الصوت قوي الصولة عالي الهمة لا يمر بمدينة إلا فتحها ولا ترفع عليه راية إلا يكشفها الويل الويل لمن ناوأه فلا يزال كذلك حتى يظفر فلما وصف لنا ذلك ووجدنا الصفات فيكم رجوناك فقصدناك

When King Halaku got to Baghdad prior to invading it, the inhabitants of Ḥillah fled to the wide valleys apart from a few. Among the very few was my father, Sayyid Majd al-Dīn ibn Ṭāwūs and Faqīh ibn Abī al-‘Urafā’. They unanimously agreed on writing a letter to Halaku informing him of their obedience and their joining with the eleatics and sent it with a foreign person. The King responded by sending them a *laissez-passer* with two men, one of them was called Naklah and the other ‘Alā’ al-Dīn who said to them, “If your intentions are as your letter portrays, then you should come to us.” The two leaders went as they feared what would be the outcome.

My father then said, “Will it be sufficient if I come alone?”

They replied in the affirmative so he proceeded with them. When he came before Halaku, and this was prior to the invasion

of Baghdad and the massacre of the Khalīfah, he said to him, “What made you believe my message and come to me without knowing what I will decide regarding you and your companions? What makes you sure that I will make peace and leave?”

My father replied, “We have only taken this path as we are aware that ‘Alī ibn Ṭālib once mentioned in his sermon, ‘The al-Zawrā’. Who knows what is the al-Zawrā? It is a land of tamarisks with many erected buildings and many inhabitants. There will be servants and treasures in it. The progeny of ‘Abbās will make it their home and place of decoration. They will have a place for fun and play. The tyranny of the tyrant, dread of the dreadful, shameless scholars, dissolute leaders, and treacherous ministers will be in it. The offspring of Persia and Rome will serve them. They will not command with righteousness although having knowledge of it, nor will they prevent evil as they will be ignorant of it. Their men will be content with men and their women with women. During this prevalent distress, long cry and wailing misfortune, the power of the Turks will come to the aid of the inhabitants of al-Zawrā’. They will be a nation with small eyes, their faces will be like that of leather shields, their clothing will be of iron, they will be shabby, and beardless. They are presented by a king who comes from among them. He has a loud voice, fierce attack, and strong motivation. He does not pass a city without conquering it, nor is a flag raised against him except that he lowers it. Destroyed is he who makes him an enemy. He will remain like this until he is victorious.’ When this was mentioned to us and we found the qualities to be in you, we became hopeful and therefore came to you.”<sup>1</sup>

---

1 *Kashf al-Yaqīn fī Faḍā’il Amīr al-Mu’minīn.*

Is this not an encouragement in his tyranny to continue his bloodshed?

He continues the story by saying:

فطيب قلوبهم وكتب لهم فرمانا لهم باسم والدي يطيب فيه قلوب أهل  
الحلة وأعمالها

Their hearts were at ease and he gave them a *laisser-passer* with my father's name so that hearts of the inhabitants of Ḥillah and their lives may be at ease.<sup>1</sup>

### The Second Delegation

There is another narration concerning the second delegation that met Halaku from the city of Ḥillah. Based on this narration, the delegation consisted of a group of Alawid notables in the company of Sayyid Majd al-Dīn ibn Ṭāwūs, the scholar who later authored the book *Al-Bashārah* and gifted it to the Mongol king in an attempt to prevent his evil and harm from the Muslims. This narration has been narrated by the famous historian, Ibn al-Fūṭī in *Al-Ḥawādith al-Jāmi'ah*. Just as the first narration has been narrated by 'Allāmah al-Ḥillī who was present and a witness to this incident, the matter relates to his father and there is no reason to have doubts regarding the attribution of the book *Kashf al-Yaqīn* to 'Allāmah al-Ḥillī, similarly there is no reason to doubt the narration of Ibn al-Fūṭī as Shaykh Kamāl al-Dīn 'Abd al-Razzāq ibn al-Fūṭī was a contemporary to this disaster (646-700 AH) together with him being a trustworthy narrator, therefore there is no possibility to doubt the authenticity of his narration.

Based on the above, we conceive that Ḥillah sent two delegations to Halaku, and not just one. The first delegation in the leadership of

---

1 Ibid.

Imām Sadīd al-Dīn ibn al-Muṭahhar, father of ‘Allāmah (or just Imām Sadīd al-Dīn alone as it appears in the narration of ‘Allāmah). The second delegation was headed by Sayyid Majd al-Dīn ibn Ṭāwūs and it is clear that this delegation met Halaku after getting confidence in him. Nonetheless, we will shortly review the incident of the second delegation from the narration of Ibn al-Fūṭī.

Ibn al-Fūṭī narrates that in the year 656 AH, King Halaku travelled from his city in the direction of Baghdad. The inhabitants of Ḥillah and Kūfah emigrated to the valleys with their children leaving behind all their wealth. The Alawid seniors and jurists accompanied Majd al-Dīn ibn Ṭāwūs al-‘Alawī into the company of the King requesting him to spare their lives. The King acceded to their request and appointed security for them. They then returned to their city and sent a message to all those in the valleys informing them of the security. They gathered their families and a fortune of wealth which they then handed over to the King.

The renowned genealogist, Sayyid Jamāl al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn who is known as Ibn ‘Inabah (d. 828 AH) mentions in the biography of Majd al-Dīn ibn Ṭāwūs:

خرج إلى السلطان وصنف له كتاب البشارة وسلم الحلة والنيل  
والمشاهدين الشريفين من القتل والنهب اماكن شيعية فقط ورد اليه حكم  
النقابة بالبلاد الفراتية فحكم في ذلك قليلا ثم مات

He presented him in front of the King and authored a book for him called Al-Bashārah. He saved Ḥillah, al-Nīl, and the two noble sights from bloodshed and looting (Shīī sites only). The position of judgeship was handed over to him in the land of the Euphrates, he accepted the post but passed on after a short while.

## The Third Delegation

The third delegation was the greatest which was led by the ascetic Imām, Raḍī al-Dīn ibn Ṭāwūs. Almost a thousand individuals joined him in this delegation. It is apparent in the narration that Sayyid Raḍī al-Dīn visited Halaku on this occasion with the intention of meeting him, whereas Halaku entrusted him with the Alawids in this encounter. Below is the narration of Raḍī al-Dīn ibn Ṭāwūs himself which is mentioned in his big book *Al-Iqbāl* in which he elaborates on the happenings of 28th Muḥarram:

وكان يوم الاثنين سنة ست وخمسين وستمائة فتح ملك الأرض بغداد  
وكنت مقيما بها في داري بالمقيدية وبتنا في ليلة هائلة من المخاوف  
الديوية فسلمنا الله جل جلاله من تلك الأهوال ولم نزل في حمى  
السلامة إلا لهية وتصديق ما عرفناه من الوعود النبوية... إلى أن  
استدعاني ملك الأرض إلى دركاته في صفر وولاني على العلويين  
والعلماء والزهاد وصحبت معي نحو ألف نفس ومعنا من جانبه من  
حمانا إلى أن وصلت الحلة ظافرين بالآمال وقد قررت مع نفسي أنني  
اصلي في كل يوم من مثل اليوم المذكور ركعتي الشكر للسلامة من  
ذلك المحذور

It was a Monday in the year 656 AH on which the King of the land conquered Baghdad. I was at that time residing there as my home was in Maqīdiyyah. We spent the night filled with worldly fears but then handed matters over to Allah. We remained in divine safety and believing what we were aware of prophetic promises until the King of the land summoned me to his private quarters in Ṣafar and entrusted me with the affairs of the Alawids, scholars, and ascetics. Almost a thousand individuals accompanied me and the King sent soldiers to protect us until



we reached Ḥillah triumphant in our hopes. I made a promise to myself that I would perform two rak'āts of shukr every day for being saved from that harm.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Hamdhānī mentions:

وأثناء حصار بغداد كان قد قدم إليه بعض العلويين والفقهاء من الحلة  
كلها شيعة و التمسوا إليه أن يعين لهم شحنة فأرسل إليهم هولاء كوخان  
بوكله والأمير بجلي النخجواني وأوفد على أثرهما بوقا تيمور أخا  
اولجاي خاتون لجس نبض أهالي الحلة والكوفة وواسط والوقوف على  
مدى إخلصهم فاستقبل أهل الحلة الجند و أقامو جسرا على الفرات  
وأقاموا الأفرح ابتهاجا بقدمهم ولما شاهد بوقا تيمور اخلاصهم و  
ثباتهم رحل في العاشر من صفر وتوجه إلى واسط فبلغها في السابع  
عشر ولكن أهلها لم يدخلوا في الطاعة فقتل ما يقرب من أربعين ألف  
شخص ... وألتمس الأمير سيف الدين البيتكجي إلى الحضرة أن يرسل  
مائة مغولي إلى النجف ليحافظوا على مشهد أمير المؤمنين رضي الله  
عنه وعلى أهل تلك البلدة

During the Baghdad siege, some Shī'ī Alawids and Jurists of Ḥillah came to him requesting security. Halaku dispatched his lieutenant Amīr Bajlī al-Nakhjawānī to them and sent after them Būqā Tīmūr, the brother of Ūljay Khātūn, to try and find out more about the people of Ḥillah, Kūfah, and Wāsiṭ; and to determine their sincerity. The people of Ḥillah anticipated the army by constructing a bridge over the Euphrates and organised festivals in celebration of their coming. Upon seeing their sincerity and determination, on the 10th of Ṣafar, Būqā Tīmūr proceeded to Wāsiṭ arriving there on the 17th. The people there,

---

1 *Al-Ḥawādith al-jāmi'ah*, pg. 360; *Muntahā al-Ṭalab*, 3/14.

however, did not surrender and he massacred as many as forty thousand individuals. Amīr Sayf al-Dīn al-Baytakjī begged his eminence to send a hundred Mongols to Najaf to protect the tomb of the Amīr al-Mu'minīn and the inhabitants of the city.<sup>1</sup>

As you can see, the protection was confined to Shī'ī areas after the Mongol army assumed control.

Then comes those who attempt to prove the integrity of the Wazīr by means of the Alawids and Shī'ah who were slain. However, the futility of this is clear as many errors occur during battle especially considering the nature of the barbaric Mongols and their violation of cities. Furthermore, the nature of relationship that existed between Wazīr and Halaku was secretive causing some Alawids and Shī'ah to naturally defend themselves, which also resulted in them being slain. We have previously discussed how Ibn al-'Alqamī saved his colleague Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd when the Mongols decided to assassinate him and his brother. There were also some who were not happy with this heinous treachery and had no knowledge of it.<sup>2</sup>

Al-Muzaffar mentions:

ذهاب الوفد الشيعي برئاسة ابن طاووس

The Shī'ī delegation was headed by Ibn Ṭāwūs.<sup>3</sup>

He also mentions:

---

1 *Jāmi' al-Tawārīkh*, pg. 259-296; *Muḥaqqiq al-Durūs li al-Shahīd al-Awwal*, 1/13; *Tārīkh al-'Irāq bayn Ihtilālayn*, 1/205-206.

2 *Al-Ghazw al-Maghūlī*, pg. 102.

3 *Tārīkh al-Shī'ah*, pg. 94.

فسلمت الحلة والمشهدان المقدسان

Hillah and the two sacred sites were saved.<sup>1</sup>

And:

وكلها شيعة

They were all Shī'ah.<sup>2</sup>

As for Ibn Ṭāwūs, he has the following ruling which is mentioned in the footnote of the book *Al-Imām Ja'far al-Ṣādiq*, authored by al-Ḥalīm al-Jundī:

لما فتح هولاءكو بغداد استفتى العلماء أيهما أفضل السلطان الكافر  
العادل أو السلطان المسلم الجائر فجمعوا لذلك بالمدرسة المستنصرية  
وكان على بن طاووس حاضرا وهو المقدم المحترم فتناول الفتيا ووضع  
خطه عليها بتفضيل العادل الكافر على المسلم الجائر ووضع العلماء  
خطوطهم على ذلك

When Halaku invaded Baghdad, he posed the following question to the scholars: What is better, a just disbelieving king or a tyrant Muslim king? The scholars therefore gathered at the Mustanşiriyyah college to discuss it. 'Alī ibn Ṭāwūs was also present as he was the esteemed administrator. The matter was ruled upon and was sanctioned by him that a just disbelieving king is preferred over a tyrant Muslim king. The rest of the scholars were also in agreement.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 *Tārīkh al-Shī'ah*, pg. 94.

2 *Tārīkh al-Shī'ah*, pg. 313.

3 *Al-Imām Ja'far al-Ṣādiq*, pg. 324.

It is also mentioned that general masses of Baghdad sent Sharaf al-Dīn al-Marāghī and Shihāb al-Dīn al-Zanjānī to request security for them. However, not only were they not entertained in a manner similar to that of the people of Ḥillah and other Shīʿī areas, they were looted from, jailed, and slain.<sup>1</sup>

What is also concerning is their justification for not assisting the Khalīfah as the narration mentioned by al-Ḥillī is part of this incident. If a person does not believe this interpretation of the narration to be authentic, then it will be distortion of the creed he follows and manipulation. And if he strongly believes in it, then in that case the motive of their assistance to the Mongols is legitimate in their perspective, which is that the Khalīfah is deserving of divine punishment and the challenge was not of saving lives. It should be noted that this was them prior to entering Baghdad and massacring the Khalīfah, to the extent that Halaku tested them to ascertain the honesty of their eagerness, and when they demonstrated their opinions with their narration, he believed them.

This is not the only narration used by them as proof for the Khalīfah being worthy of collapse, rather al-Majlisī mentions the following quoting Abū Baṣīr:

كنت مع أبي جعفر عليه السلام جالسا في المسجد إذ أقبل داود ابن علي  
وسليمان بن خالد وأبو جعفر عبد الله بن محمد أبو الدوانيق فقعدا  
ناحية من المسجد فقبل لهم هذا محمد بن علي جالس فقام إليه داود  
بن علي وسليمان بن خالد وقعد أبو الدوانيق مكانه حتى سلموا على  
أبي جعفر عليه السلام فقال لهم أبو جعفر ما منع جباركم من أن يأتيني

---

1 Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh al-Duwal, pg. 237.

فعدروه عنده فقال عند ذلك أبو جعفر محمد بن علي عليهما السلام أما والله لا تذهب الليالي و الأيام حتى يملك ما بين قطريها ثم ليطن الرجال عقبه ثم ليذلن له رقاب الرجال ثم ليملكن ملكا شديدا فقال له داود بن علي وإن ملكننا قبل ملككم قال نعم يا داود إن ملككم قبل ملكنا وسلطانكم قبل سلطاننا فقال له أصلحك الله هل له من مدة فقال نعم يا داود والله لا يملك بنو أمية يوما إلا ملكتم مثليه ولا سنة إلا ملكتم مثلها ولتلقفها الصبيان منكم كما تتلقف الصبيان الكرة فقام داود ابن علي من عند أبي جعفر عليه السلام فرحا يريد أن يخبر أبا الدوانيق بذلك ، فلما نهضا جميعا هو وسليمان بن خالد ناداه أبو جعفر عليه السلام من خلفه يا سليمان بن خالد لا يزال القوم في فسحة من ملكهم ما لم يصيبوا منا دما حراما وأوماً بيده إلى صدره فإذا أصابوا ذلك الدم فبطن الأرض خير لهم من ظهرها فيومئذ لا يكون لهم في الأرض ناصر ولا في السماء عاذر ثم انطلق سليمان بن خالد فأخبر أبا الدوانيق فجاء أبو الدوانيق إلى أبي جعفر عليه السلام فسلم عليه ثم أخبره بما قال له داود بن علي وسليمان بن خالد فقال له نعم يا أبا جعفر دولتكم قبل دولتنا وسلطانكم قبل سلطاننا سلطانكم شديد عسر لا يسر فيه وله مدة طويلة والله لا يملك بنو أمية يوما إلا ملكتم مثليه ولا سنة إلا ملكتم مثلها ولتلقفها صبيان منكم فضلا عن رجالكم كما تتلقف الصبيان الكرة أفهمت ثم قال لا تزالون في عنفوان الملك ترغدون فيه ما لم تصيبوا منا دما حراما فإذا أصبتم ذلك الدم غضب الله عز وجل عليكم فذهب بملككم وسلطانكم وذهب بريحكم وسلط الله عليكم عبدا من عبده أعور وليس بأعور من آل أبي سفيان يكون استئصالكم على يديه وأيدي أصحابه ثم قطع الكلام.

I was sitting with Abū Ja'far in the Masjid when Dāwūd ibn 'Alī, Sulaymān ibn Khālid, and Abū Ja'far 'Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad Abū al-Dawānīq walked in and sat in a corner of the Masjid. They

were informed that Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī was present, so Dāwūd ibn ‘Alī and Sulaymān ibn Khālīd proceeded into his company but Abū al-Dawānīq remained seated until they greeted Abū Ja‘far.

Abū Ja‘far then said, “What prevented your tyrants from coming to me?”

They replied with an excuse.

Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī then said, “Very soon he will take over the state, he will certainly execute many, people will become subservient to him and he will rule with force.”

Dāwūd ibn ‘Alī then said to him, “And our rule prior to your rule?”

He replied, “Yes O Dāwūd, Your rule prior to our rule and your king prior to our king.”

Dāwūd said, “May Allah save you. Will he have time?”

He replied, “Yes O Dāwūd, by Allah, the Banū Umayyah will not achieve anything without you achieving similar, nor a year without you having the same. The youngsters will snatch it from you just as a youngster snatches a ball.”

Dāwūd ibn ‘Alī got up from the company of Abū Ja‘far cheerful and desirous of informing Abū al-Dawānīq. As he and Sulaymān were about to leave, Abū Ja‘far called them back saying, “O Sulaymān ibn Khālīd, the people will continue living at ease in the empire as long as they do not spill blood unjustly, and he pointed to his chest. Once they spill that blood, the bottom of the earth will be better for them than the top and on that day,

they will not have a helper in the earth nor a forgiver in the skies.”

Sulaymān ibn Khālid then set out and informed Abū al-Dawānīq who then came to Abū Ja‘far, greeted him, informed him of what Dāwūd ibn ‘Alī and Sulaymān ibn Khālid conveyed and said, “Yes, O Abū Ja‘far, your turn before our turn and your rule before ours. Your rule is going to be severe and difficult with no ease and it’s going to be for a long time. By Allah, the Banū Umayyah will not rule for a day without you having similar and not for a year without you having similar. Youngsters will snatch it from you as well as your men just as a youngster snatches a ball. Do you understand?”

He then said, “You will remain carefree in the prime of power as long as you do not shed our blood unjustly. The moment you shed that blood, the wrath of Allah will befall you, he will snatch away your power and rule, take away your strength and he will establish as ruler over you an evil servant of his who will not be from the progeny of Abū Sufyān. Your extinction will occur at his hands and the hands of his companions.”

He then terminated the discussion.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Majlisī further mentions:

قوله عليه السلام ما لم تصيبوا منا دما حراما المراد إما قتل أهل البيت عليهم السلام وإن كان بالسم مجازا بأن يكون قتلهم عليهم السلام سببا لسرعة زوال ملكهم وإن لم يقارنه أو لزوال ملك كل واحد منهم فعل ذلك أو قتل السادات الذين قتلوا في زمان الدوانيقي والرشيدي

---

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār*, 46/341.

وغيرهما ويحتمل أن يكون إشارة إلى قتل رجل من العلويين قتلوه مقارنا لانقضاء دولتهم كما يظهر مما كتب ابن العلقمي إلى نصير الدين الطوسي رحمهما الله قوله عليه السلام وذهب بريحكم قال الجوهري قد تكون الريح بمعنى الغلبة و القوة ومنه قوله تعالى وتذهب ريحكم قوله عليه السلام أعور أي الدني الأصل السيئ الخلق وهو إشارة إلى هلاكو قال الجزري فيه لما اعترض أبو لهب على النبي صلى الله عليه وآله عند إظهار الدعوة قال له أبو طالب يا أعور ما أنت وهذا لم يكن أبو لهب أعور ولكن العرب تقول للذي ليس له أخ من أبيه وأمه أعور وقيل إنهم يقولون للردى من كل شيء من الأمور والأخلاق أعور وللمؤنث عوراء قوله عليه السلام وليس بأعور من آل أبي سفيان أي ليس هذا الأعور منهم بل من الترك

The part of the narration which says, “as long as you do not shed our blood unjustly,” refers to taking the life of the Ahl al-Bayt in any manner, even if it may be by use of poison for instance, as their massacre will become a means of the rapid destruction of their empire although they may not have been united, or the destruction of every one of their empires who were involved or those who massacred the leaders during the era of al-Dawānīqī, al-Rashīd, and others. It is also possible that it refers to the massacre of an Alawid individual whom they had killed towards the latter end of their rule as it appears in the correspondences between Ibn al-ʿAlqamī and Naṣīr al-Ṭūsī. As for the words, *Dhahaba Rihukum*, al-Jawharī states that Rīḥ is in the meaning of victory and strength like in the verse of the Qurʾān, “and [then] your strength would depart.”<sup>1</sup> The word Aʿwar refers to despicable behaviour and character which is an indication to Halaku. Al-

---

1 Sūrah al-Anfāl: 46.



Jazarī comments that when Abū Lahab stood up against Nabī ﷺ while giving Da‘wah, Abū Ṭālib said to him, “O A‘war, what are you doing?” Abū Lahab was not one eyed; however, the Arabs would refer to the one with no traditional brother as A‘war. It is said that it is used for the one who lacks basic character. And the words *Laysa bi A‘war min Āl Abī Sufyān* means that this ill-mannered individual will not be from the progeny of Abū Sufyān but rather from the Turks.<sup>1</sup>

The inception of their efforts was purely Shī‘ī legality, whereas the incident of Karkh just increased its hatred for the Khilāfah.

Wherever al-Ṭabāṭabā‘ī speaks about the massacre of the scholars, Imāms of Masājīd, and others; why is it that there is never a mention of a Shī‘ah? It is because they began discussing the era of prosperity and growth for the creed immediately after the war.

‘Alī al-Ṭabāṭabā‘ī says the following regarding the college of Ḥillah:

كان واحدا من أبرز نتائج الخطة التي رسمها علماء الشيعة لمواجهة الغزو المغولي أن المغول لم يتمكنوا من القضاء على العلم في بغداد فقد كانت بغداد أعظم مراكز العلم في العالم الإسلامي على الإطلاق ولو كان التخريب الذي أصاب سائر مرافق الحياة في بغداد كان يصيب مراكز العلم في بغداد لعظمت محنة المسلمين في هذه الكارثة أضعافا مضاعفة ولكن الذي حدث أن الحلة استطاعت أن تكسب أمان السلطان المغولي واستطاع علماء الشيعة أن ينقلوا ما تبقى من مراكز العلم والكتب والعلماء في بغداد إلى الحلة وكان للمحقق نصير الدين الطوسي رحمه الله الذي احتبسه السلطان لنفسه والذي كان يحضى

---

1 Ibid.

باحترام كبير من قبل هولاءكو الدور الكبير في إنقاذ ما أمكن إنقاذه من العلماء والمكتبات في بغداد وقد أصبحت الحلة منذ هذا التاريخ مركزا علميا من كبريات مراكز العلم في العالم الإسلامي وازدهرت هذه المدينة بالفقهاء والمحدثين والمفسرين والحكماء والأدباء والشعراء وبالمدارس العلمية وحفلت هذه المدارس بأعداد كبيرة من شباب الطلبة الوافدين إلى الحلة من الشام وإيران والمدن العراقية والجزيرة وقد بنى السيد فخار بن معد الموسوي مجمعا سكنيا لطلبة العلوم الإسلامية وكان يحضر درس المحقق الحلي كما يقول السيد الصدر على ما في أعلام العرب المجتهدين الجهابذة وهكذا نعلم من العلماء والفقهاء الذين قتلوا ... وكانت الحركة العلمية في عصره بلغت شأوا عظيما حتى صارت الحلة من المراكز العلمية في البلاد الإسلامية وهذه الفترة التي نتحدث عنها الفترة هي التي تعقبت كارثة سقوط بغداد مباشرة... ويقول السيد الصدو أيضا عن الحلة في نفس العصر عن تلامذة العلامة الحلي وخرج عن عالي مجلس تدريسه خمسمائة مجتهد... ولا نريد أن نطيل الحديث في مدرسة الحلة فإن هذه المدرسة جاءت بديلا عن مدرسة بغداد وخليفة لها وحلت محلها واستطاعت ان تجتذب ما تناثر من بغداد من العلم والعلماء بعد كارثة سقوط بغداد

One of the significant outcomes of the strategy that was outlined by the Shīrī scholars prior to the Mongol invasion was that the Mongols will not be able to eliminate the knowledge of Baghdad. Baghdad was by far the greatest centre of knowledge in the Muslim world and if the sabotage done to every facet of life in Baghdad has to be done to the centres of knowledge, the ordeal of the Muslims in this catastrophe will be magnified exponentially. However, what did happen was that Ḥillah was able to earn the security of the Mongol King and the Shīrī scholars managed to transfer what was left of the centres of knowledge, books, and

scholars of Baghdad to Ḥillah. Muḥaqqiq Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī who the King had been keeping in close proximity and who was given great honour by Halaku, also played a major role in saving what could be saved of the scholars and libraries of Baghdad. Ḥillah since that day became recognised as one of the greatest centres of knowledge in the Muslim world. This city flourished with jurists, muḥaddithīn, mufasssīrīn, judges, authors, poets, and science colleges. These colleges were filled with large numbers of young students who came to Ḥillah from Syria, Iran, cities of Iraq and the gulf. Sayyid Fakhkhār ibn Maʿd al-Mūsawī built a residential compound for the students of Islamic knowledge. He would also attend the lesson of Muḥaqqiq al-Ḥillī as is mentioned by Sayyid al-Ṣadr. Aʿlām al-ʿArab mentions that there were four hundred well-skilled mujtahidīn which indicates to us the number of scholars and jurists who were slain. The scientific initiative in his era was so astounding that made Ḥillah a centre of knowledge among the Islamic states. This period in mention was the period immediately after the catastrophe of Baghdad. Sayyid al-Ṣadr also mentions regarding the students of ʿAllāmah al-Ḥillī who were in Ḥillah during that period, “Five hundred Mujtahids were produced from his assembly of higher learning. We do not wish to lengthen the discussion regarding the colleges of Ḥillah as it was a replacement for the colleges of Baghdad, a successor to it, and it superseded it. It was able to draw the scattered knowledge and scholars of Baghdad after the catastrophe of Baghdad’s collapse.”<sup>1</sup>

Muḥammad al-Muḥaffar mentions:

---

<sup>1</sup> *Riyāḍ al-Masāʾil*, 2/27.

وصار التشيع بعد أيام العباسية يقوى في العدة والعدد والمذهب في  
بغداد

After the Abbasid era, the Shī'ah creed began growing in numbers.<sup>1</sup>

Due to Halaku's concern for the Shī'ī creed, some are of the opinion that he was also a Shī'ī.

‘Abd al-Rasūl al-Ghaffārī is one of them who mentions the following:

توالت الأحداث على بغداد فالتجأ الشيعة فيها إلى أن يتقوا خصومهم  
ويدفعوا شرهم بمختلف الأساليب ومع ذلك لم يسلموا من بطشهم  
والفتك بهم إلى أن جاء المغول ودخول هولاء الذي لم يكن ليقيم  
وزنا للعقائد والأديان من قبل ثم اهتدى حتى أصبح زمنه باعثا لانتشار  
التشيع مرة أخرى وقد اعتنق بعض ملوك المغول مذهب التشيع  
كنيقولاوس بن أرغون بن بغا بن هولاء

Many events took place in Baghdad which made the Shī'ah fear their adversaries and stop their evil in different manners. With all of that, they were still not safe from their brutality and lethality, right until the Mongols arrived and the invasion of Halaku who never showed importance to beliefs and religion previously. He was guided and his era became a means of spreading Tashayyū' once again. A few other Mongol Kings also embraced the Shī'ī creed including Nikolas ibn Ārgūn ibn Abaqa ibn Halaku.<sup>2</sup>

Muḥaqqiq al-Ḥillī mentions the following in the foreword of *Khulāṣah al-Aqwāl*:

---

1 *Tārīkh al-Shī'ah*, pg. 77.

2 *Al-Kulayni wa al-Kāfi*, pg. 77.

ألف السيد مجد الدين محمد بن طاووس كتاب البشارة وأهداه إلى هولاء فأنتجت هذه الخطوة أن رد هولاءكو شؤون النقابة إلى هذا السيد وبعدها قام الخواجه نصير الطوسي بإقناع هولاءكو باعتناق الدين الإسلامي فاسلم هولاءكو ومن معه من المغول

Sayyid Majd al-Dīn authored the book *Al-Bashārah* and gifted it to Halaku. This act resulted in Halaku handing over the matters of cooperative society to Sayyid. Khawājah Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī thereafter began persuading Halaku to accept the Islam. Halaku together with those with him then embraced Islam.<sup>1</sup>

The foreword of *Mukhtalaf al-Shī'ah* has the following which is similar:

وأثمرت هذه الخطوة ببركة نصير الدين الطوسي أن أسلم الملك هولاءكو وكثير من المغول

The fruits of this action through the blessing of Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī was that King Halaku and many Mongols embraced Islam.<sup>2</sup>

Their senior Muḥammad al-Muẓaffar refutes this saying:

ولما أطلق هولاءكو للأديان والمذاهب الحرية ومنها مذهب أهل البيت ولم يتعرض بسوء لأهل الحلة والمشهدين الشريفين ... وكلهم شيعة حسب البعض انه اسلم واعتنق مذهب التشيع إلا أن ذلك وهم

When Halaku became familiarised with the religions and the liberal sects, the creed of the Ahl al-Bayt being one of them and he did not subject the people of Ḥillah and the two honoured sites to any harm ... and they were all Shī'ah. According to some

---

1 *Muqaddamah Khulāṣah al-Aqwāl*, pg. 7.

2 *Mukhtalaf al-Shī'ah*, 1/15.

he embraced Islām and embraced the Shīʿī creed; however, it seems to be an assumption.<sup>1</sup>

Our intent is to portray the extent of influence achieved by these individuals after conquering Baghdad together with the level of privilege they obtained in the Mongol palace, as it makes us wonder why? Wasn't it contrary to sincerity and loyalty!

Nevertheless, the languid or rather useful stance of the Shīʿah has been exposed clearly from the Mongol conquer of Baghdad as they preceded their ideological interests over the interest of the Muslims. The picture is evident to anyone sensible that the stance of Ibn al-ʿAlqamī and al-Ṭūsī was exploited or rather provocative towards the Mongol invasion. It isn't unprecedented nor any different from the general Shīʿī stance of Iraq.

---

1 *Tārīkh al-Shīʿah*, pg. 213.

## Conclusion

In conclusion, I would like to point out that whenever we mention the treachery of Ibn al-‘Alqamī and al-Ṭūsī, it does not mean that the fall of the Khilāfah is confined to this, rather the reasons here are numerous and worthy of discussion. However, just as one has to be wary of these reasons, it is necessary to be wary of this type of viziers and advisors, who are driven by the ideological beliefs and fundamentals of their creed even if it may be harmful to those in power. We then draw the attention of Sunnī rulers, that their policy of keeping them close to prevent their evil is a policy with unfavourable results. The Banū Umayyah had adopted it and it proved to be a cause of their empire’s annihilation. One of them has commented regarding this in the following words:

قربنا عدونا لنا من شره وأبعدنا القريب ثقة بمودة فعادانا القريب وتقوى  
علينا العدو

We brought our enemies close to be saved from their evil and distanced the close ones while relying on friendship. The close ones became hostile to us while the enemy overpowered us.

Islamic sharīah has given special importance to the position of ministership in a regime. The following verses of the Qur’ān mentioned by Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ indicate the same:

قَالَ رَبِّ اشْرَحْ لِي صَدْرِي وَيَسِّرْ لِي أَمْرِي وَاحْلُلْ عُقْدَةً مِّنْ  
لِّسَانِي يَفْقَهُوا قَوْلِي وَاجْعَلْ لِّي وَزِيرًا مِّنْ أَهْلِي هَارُونَ أَخِي  
اشْدُدْ بِهِ أَزْرِي وَأَشْرِكْهُ فِي أَمْرِي كَيْ نُسَبِّحَكَ كَثِيرًا وَنَذْكُرَكَ

كَثِيرًا إِنَّكَ كُنْتَ بِنَا بَصِيرًا قَالَ قَدْ أُوتِيتَ سُؤْلَكَ يَا مُوسَى وَلَقَدْ  
 مَنَّا عَلَيْكَ مَرَّةً أُخْرَى

*Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ said, "O my Lord, expand my chest. And ease my task for me. And untie the knot from my tongue. So that people may understand my speech. And appoint for me a minister from my family. My brother Hārūn. Increase my strength with him. And let him share my task. So that we may glorify you abundantly. And remember you copiously. You are most certainly watchful over us." Allah said, "O Mūsā, your request has been granted. And we have once again conferred upon you a favour."<sup>1</sup>*

From the many wisdoms of having a minister is that it empowers the ruler to increase in obedience and good deeds due to the presence of an appointed reminder and supporter. The presence of an appointed righteous minister is regarded as a great gift in the sight of Allah which he grants to pious servants.

Below are authentic Aḥādīth on this subject:

The following appears in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* on the authority of Abū Saʿīd al-Khudrī that Nabī صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ said:

ما استخلف خليفة إلا له بطانتان بطانة تأمره بالخير وتحضه عليه وبطانة  
 تأمره بالشر وتحضه عليه والمعصوم من عصم الله

Every Khalīfah has two groups of advisers; the first commands him with good and encourages him to follow through, while the other commands him with evil and encourages him to follow through. Protected is he whom Allah protects.<sup>2</sup>

1 Surah Ṭāhā.

2 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, 6611.



The following appears in the *Musnad* of Imām Aḥmad on the authority of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Mulayl who says:

سمعت عليا رضي الله عنه يقول سمعت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يقول ليس من نبي كان قبلي إلا قد أعطي سبعة نقباء وزراء نجباء وإني أعطيت أربعة عشر وزيرا نقيبا نجيبا سبعة من قريش وسبعة من المهاجرين

I heard ‘Alī رضي الله عنه saying that he heard Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم saying, “Every Nabī prior to my coming was given seven assisting excellent advisers. I have, however, been given fourteen of them. Seven are from the Quraysh and seven from the Muhājirīn.”<sup>1</sup>

The following appears in *Sunan Abī Dāwūd* and *Sunan al-Nasā’ī* on the authority of ‘Ā’ishah رضي الله عنها:

قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم إذا أراد الله بالأمير خيرا جعل له وزيرا صدق وإن نسي ذكره وإن ذكر أعانه وإذا أراد الله به غير ذلك جعل له وزير سوء إن نسي لم يذكره وإن ذكر لم يعن

Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم said, “When Allah intends good for a leader, he appoints a truthful vizier for him who reminds him when he forgets and assists him when he remembers. But when Allah intends for him other than that, he appoints for him an evil vizier who does not remind him when he forgets and does not assist him when he remembers.”<sup>2</sup>

As for the importance of ministership in establishing the foundations of governance, the greatest importance is given to scholars who advise the leaders. Ibn Qutaybah mentions the following on this topic:

---

1 *Musnad Aḥmad*, 1/88.

2 *Sunan Abī Dāwūd*, 2932; *Sunan al-Nasā’ī*, 4209.

وفي التاج أن أبرويز كتب إلى ابنه شيرويه من الحبس ليكن من تختاره لولايتك ... ولا تجعله امرأً أصبته بعقوبة فاتضع عنها ولا امرأً أطاعك بعد ما أذلته ولا أحداً ممن يقع في خلدك أن إزالة سلطانك أحب له من ثبوته

It is mentioned in *al-Tāj* that Parviz wrote the following to his son Shērōē from prison, “Choose your team carefully... Do not appoint one who you have punished and he became humble by it, nor anyone who has obeyed you after you disgraced him, and nor anyone who merely comes to your mind [but not your heart], as the destruction of your empire is more pleasing to them than its establishment.”<sup>1</sup>

The leader and author, Ibn Munqidh mentions:

وقالوا إن السلطان إذا كان حازماً ووزراؤه وزراء سوء منعوا خيره من الناس فلم يجتر عليه أحد ولم يدن منه وإنما مثله في ذلك كالماء الصافي الطيب الذي فيه التماسيح فلا يستطيع أحد وإن كان سابحاً وكان إلى الماء محتاجاً أن يدخله وإنما حلية الملوك وزيتهم أصحابهم ان يكثرُوا ويصلحُوا

If a king is determined but his ministers are evil, they will stop his good from reaching the people which will result in people not being drawn to him and neither coming close to him. His example is like that of pure and clean water that has crocodiles. Even if one can swim and is in need of the water, he is not able to enter it. Plentiful righteous companions are the ornaments and decorations of kings.<sup>2</sup>

---

1 *Uyūn al-Akhbār*, 1/15.

2 *Lubāb al-Ādāb*, pg. 41; *al-ʿIqd al-Farīd*, 1/33.

He also mentions:

إياك والثقة بعدوك إذا صالحك وأظهر لك غاية النصح فإن صلح العدو  
لا يسكن إليه ولا يغتر به فإن الماء لو سخن فأطيل اسخانه لم يمنع من  
إطفاء النار إذا صب عليها وإنما صاحب العدو المصالح كصاحب حية  
يحملها في كفه

Be wary of trusting your enemy when he reconciles with you and portrays utmost well-wishing, as he cannot be trusted nor believed. For even if water is heated for long time, it will still be able to extinguish a fire by being poured over it. Having a well-wishing enemy is similar to carrying a snake in your sleeve.<sup>1</sup>

روي أن بعض ملوك الفرس سأل حكيما من حكما ثمهم... فما صلاح  
الملك قال: وزراؤه أصوله فإن هم فسدوا فسد وإن هم صلحوا صلح

It is mentioned that a Persian king once asked one of their wise advisers, “How can a king be righteous?”

He replied, “His ministers are his foundation. If they are corrupt then so will he, and if they are righteous then so will he be.”<sup>2</sup>

وقال أديب حقيق على كل ملك أن يتفقد وزيره ونديمه وحاجبه وكاتبه  
فإن وزيره قوام ملكه

Ardashīr once mentioned, “It is a must for a king to survey his minister, confidant, doorman and scribe. His minister is certainly the foundation of his empire.”<sup>3</sup>

---

1 *Lubāb al-Ādāb*, pg. 47.

2 *Ibid.*

3 *Ibid.*

وقال بزرجمهر من حق الملك أن يستوزر من يحفظ دينه ويستبطن من  
يحفظ سره

Buzurjmahr once said, "It is the duty of a king to employ as a minister one who will protect his religion and to confide in one who will safeguard his secrets."<sup>1</sup>

وأربعة لا يثبت معها ملك : غش الوزير وسوء التدبير وخبث النية وظلم  
الرعية

A king should not tolerate four things: Treachery of the minister, mismanagement, malicious intent, and oppression of masses.<sup>2</sup>

لا تقطع قريبا وإن كفر ولا تأمن عدوا وإن شكر

Never sever ties with a close one although they may be ungrateful.  
And never trust an enemy although he may be grateful.

قال أبو الحسن الصاغاني في الاستعانة على حسن السياسة آفة الملوك  
سوء السيرة وآفة الوزراء سوء السريرة

Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ṣaghānī mentions in *al-Isti'ānah 'alā Ḥusn al-Siyāsah*, "Misconduct is the downfall of kings and ingenuity is the downfall of ministers."<sup>3</sup>

من خانته الوزير فاته التدبير

The one who is deceived by the minister has lost his ability for management.<sup>4</sup>

---

1 Ibid.

2 Ibid.

3 Ibid.

4 Ibid.

Ibn ‘Abd Rabbihi has mentioned:

وقال الأحنف بن قيس : من فسدت بطانته كان كمن غص بالماء ومن  
غص بالماء فلا مساغ له ، ومن خانه ثقاته فقد أتى من مأمنه

Al-Aḥnaf ibn Qays once said, “The one whose secret has been divulged is the one who has been immersed in water and there is no way out for such a person. The one whose confidant deceives him has been attacked from within.”<sup>1</sup>

Al-‘Abbās ibn al-Aḥnaf mentions:

قلبي إلى ما ضرني داعي      يكثر أحزاني وأوجاعي  
كيف احتراسي من عدوي إذا      كان عدوي بين أضلاعي

*My heart calls me to what has harmed me,*

*Increasing my grief and pain.*

*How am I supposed to guard myself from my enemy,*

*When my enemy is between my ribs.<sup>2</sup>*

May Allah grant our leaders strength to do good and inspire them with guidance and the truth and may He bestow abundant peace and salutations upon our Nabī Muḥammad ﷺ, his family, and Companions. And all praise is due to Allah, Lord of the worlds.

---

1 Al-‘Iqd al-Farīd, 1/23; Rawḍah al-‘Uqalā’ wa Nazḥah al-Fuḍalā’, pg. 275.

2 Ibid.