

## **HOW TO APPROACH THE SHIA BROTHERS/SISTERS - A STRAIGHT FORWARD LOGIC INSTEAD OF A NEVER ENDING DEBATE**

Salamon Alaykom

Dear reader if you are interested in the subject I recommend that you read the whole article, although I admit it's a bit long but there are important points in the introduction that I wanted to share with you.

**INTRODUCTION:**

These days any one who is interested in discussion on Islamic subjects will come across a lot of discussion boards where there are a long and often-pointless debates going on between Shia Muslims and Mainstream Muslims (I prefer to use the term "Main Stream" rather than Sunnis which gives an impression of sectarianism).

The features of these kinds of debates are as follow:

- ➔ **THEY SEEM TO BE ENDLESS**
- ➔ **IN SOME POINT ONE OF THE SIDES STARTS USING OFFENSIVE LANGUAGE AND USUALLY THIS IS THE REASON FOR ENDING THE DEBATE**
- ➔ **THEY ARE REPEATED MATERIAL THAT ARE POSTED EVERY NOW AND THEN IN MANY WEBSITES**

I thought as an Ex-Shia who was born in Iran in an all Shia family and Al-hamdulillah found his way later, I could have a contribution to this.

Before explaining what is an appropriate way to discuss with Shia I need to make an important point and then refer to some facts. I do apologize for the lengthy article but I think it might be interesting for my brothers/sisters.

**The point:**

If we consult the Hadeeth we will see that in general the Muslims are warned about entering pointless debates. It is a pity to see engaging in long and often fruitless debates over Internet wastes the valuable time of a Muslim youth. Long debates like this result in making the heart and soul dry and very materialistic. I think the time of a responsible Muslim should be devoted to his/her efforts to more effective things like education, prayer and reading Quran , improving his/her purity for the God, increasing practically useful Islamic knowledge, making him/herself a good example of a Muslim, helping others and of course enjoying life and family and friends without committing any sins.

Now some facts:

1. After the revolution in Iran, the Shia scholars became very powerful and they invested a lot to spread Shia'ism in Islamic countries. What they are doing in Africa? In Saudi Arabia during Hajj, in Western countries and over the net are only parts of these activities.
2. Every belief usually has a main stream followers and then sectarian followers. It is a simple fact that the sectarian followers always need to defend

themselves against the main stream while the main stream feels less necessary to challenge the sects. This results in mainstreams having less idea about the belief of sects while sects have a rather good idea about the belief of the mainstream. This in turn results in the main stream being less prepared to discuss with the sects while sects are always prepared to discuss with the mainstream. For instance: Among Christians, Mormons have a strong discussion material when entering a debate with mainstream Christians while the Mainstream Christians have less idea about what are the Mormons all about. In the same way Shia is more prepared to discuss with mainstream Muslims. The same rule applies to Shia themselves. The Shia that are usually starting debate with mainstream Muslims are Imami (12er) Shia. However among them there are minorities like Zaidis, Ismailis, Dawoodis, Druzes, Bohras, Agakhanis, Bahayees, Nusayris etc. These minorities usually are very much prepared to enter a debate with Imami Shia while an ordinary Imami Shia usually has no idea about the belief of these minorities.

3. The above fact results that some of the mainstream Muslims have wrong idea about the belief of Shia and their practices.
4. The three points above leads us to the fourth fact: One of the reasons you find that Shia people are very much engaged in discussion with mainstream Muslims, particularly over internet is that there are lots of material available for them that they usually find a relevant answer to any question and copy and paste it in reply. These materials are loaded systematically in many shia sites and online books like: Shia Encyclopedia - Tijani's works - Peshawar Nights - Islam.org website and the rest. The latter website has even prepared a propaganda toolkit for Shia and have encouraged them to use it. They can simply print out a short article and nicely fold it like a catalogue and leave it in a mosque. Comparing to this vast activities, mainstream Muslims do not have such an access to good material.
5. Shia is far better in debate in English websites. This is because while most of the Shia propaganda books are translated to English, unfortunately less good Arabic books of the mainstream Muslims that provide answers have been translated to English.
6. Some of my brothers/sisters might not like this one but Insha'Allah they will realize that my intention is nothing but to help: Unfortunately due to some prejudice from some of the Scholars, many of the mainstream Muslims now a days have opinions that put them in a fragile position when debating with Shia. These opinions are not backed by any strong evidences and many of them are newly emerged opinions rather than old opinions. Among them are:

☞ The belief that whatever is in Siha-Sitta is Authentic

☞ The belief that any one who has seen the Prophet even for a short while can be considered a SAHĀBAH and thus can be trusted.

☞ The belief that anything that SAHĀBAH and others have done during and after the death of the Prophet are right or that all their behaviour has to be justified [please note that I am not suggesting criticizing SAHĀBAH, I am just saying that we don't need to feel responsibility to justify anything they have done. Our responsibility is to defend Islam, Quran and the holy Prophet not the SAHĀBAH who after all were fallible. If we do this, then we are automatically defending the SAHĀBAH (RADIYALLĀHU'ANHUMA) as well.]

☞ The idea that there were absolutely no conflicts between the SAHĀBAH after the passing away of the Prophet and that they all loved each other

☞ The idea of giving the title of Kafir to anyone who is not among the mainstream Muslims.

Another point I need to make before saying how is an appropriate approach in discussing with Shia in my opinion:

I think a very big mistake that some of the Mainstream Muslims have, when discussing with Shia, is that they fall in their trap by being engaged with issues that are not really directly relevant to Shia doctrine.

All the issues below and many more that I cannot remember just now are among these directly irrelevant issues:

1. The story of Fadak
2. The story of Omar (RA) and Pen and Paper
3. The battles of Siffin, Jamal
4. The attitude of Moawiah against Ali (RA)
5. Karbala and the martyrdom of Hussain (RA)
6. The story of Ghadire Khom (this is more relevant than others but still far away from the main issue)
7. The debates about Tahrif of Quran
8. The debates about Bukhaaree and Muslim and their collections
9. The stories regarding our mother Ayesah (RA)
10. The stories regarding Saqifah of Bani Saedah
11. Combining the prayers, issues about Azan, ablution and so on
12. Things like visiting graves, calling a dead and so on
13. Etc, Etc.

The above and many other issues are important but not directly relevant to Shia doctrine. At least in theory, you may find a Muslim who is not a Shia but has an opinion about the above issues that is very similar to the opinion of Shia. Interestingly enough among some moderate Shia scholars too you might find some one who has opinions about the above issues which is very similar to the opinion of the main stream Muslims. One might be interested to have a search about the above issues but to me no matter what is your opinion about them, they have nothing to do with 12er Shia doctrine.

The above are the issues for which there are lots of material provided by Shia in Internet and Shia feels very easy and comfortable to find the relevant material and copy and paste it in a discussion. Actually for them it is like repeating a same prescription. Most of the above issues at the end rely on Hadeeth and what happens is that Shia base the argument on certain Hadeeth and mainstream Muslims base their argument on another sort of Hadeeth and they will ended up with fighting to prove a Hadeeth is authentic and the other one is not. From there they usually get no where, because first of all, people generally do not have enough knowledge about verifying if a Hadeeth is authentic and even if they do so, they still cannot prove their points cause verifying if a Hadeeth is authentic is itself depending to the words of mouths of fallible scholars. While I agree that in many of the above cases, Shia

people try to disfigure the story and very ruthlessly attack great SAHĀBAH on the basis of their biased understanding of these stories, I still remain in my position that talking about the above leads the two sides to no where (as evident in the last 1000 years).

After this rather long introduction I would like to start the main issue that is:

\*\*\*\*\* **How to discuss with Shia:**

Let us review the doctrine of 12er Shia first, this is the doctrine that makes 12er Shia a SECT different from the mainstream Muslims and different from other Shia sects:

"The doctrine of **Imaat**: Apart from Prophets, there are another group of God appointed persons called Imams. These are people who are infallible and have access to a knowledge that is not accessible by ordinary people. The world cannot be empty of an Imam otherwise it will be destroyed. In the Islamic context, these individuals are 12 people among the descendants of the Holy Prophet who are appointed by no one but God to lead Muslims. Any one who chooses any leader other than these 12 is misguided and not a complete believer. The twelfth (last) of the above Imams is Mahdi and is alive and in occultation (now) for more than 1000 years and will come out of his occultation when God wants".

**The above is the core belief of 12er Shia.** They consider 5 articles of belief as fundamentals of their religion. These are: Tawheed (Oneness of God) - Nabuwwat (Prophet hood) - Ma'ad (Day of Judgement) - Adl (Justice of God) and **IMAAMAT** (The above doctrine).

In another way to put it they some times refer to 5 pillars of Islam to be: Prayer, Zakat, Fasting, Hajj and **IMAAMAT**. They further hold that the latter (**Imaat**) is the most important one.

The above shows the importance of **Imaat** in Shia doctrine. And when I say **Imaat** I don't mean Leadership. Certainly leadership is an important issue not only for Muslims but also for any group of people. **Imaat** here means the above specific doctrine.

Now let me tell you:

When you want to help a Shia to realize how deviated he/she is from Islam or to help a fellow Muslim from the mainstream not to be deceived by Shia, there are TWO QUESTIONS that completely do the job for you:

Question One: Where is the doctrine of **IMAAMAT** in Quran ?

Question Two: How does the current **IMAAM** lead Shia?

I elaborate on each of these here:

Question One: Where is the doctrine of **IMAMAT** in Quran ?

This is a very sound question. Quran is the book of guidance and we have been told by the Prophet that whenever we felt lost we can consult Quran and it will never betray us. The above doctrine is not a minor issue, it is very important. Its importance is to the extent that Shia holds that because of not believing in this doctrine, 80% of Muslims are misguided and in fact not true believers. Well, which verses of Quran have given us this doctrine?

Ask Shia to ONLY give you the verses with NO additions to the translation and NO Hadeeth to support a certain interpretation of the verse and NO personal commentaries. Do this and you will see how helpless the arguments will be.

Now when you ask this from a Shia you receive different sorts of answers (and it is interesting that because the discussion is over the net, usually people cannot coordinate among themselves and you will receive responses from Shia that are in contradiction to each other and this in turns shows how baseless are the discussions).

Here are the most popular answers that you get:

1. There are also no verses in Quran to tell us how to pray. We learn some of our duties from Hadeeth not Quran .
2. There are certain verses but you need to look at Hadeeth to understand their true meaning cause we are advised to learn Quran from the Prophet and Hadeeth is his teachings.
3. Long and complicated analysis of certain verses of Quran to prove that even without the help of Hadeeth, they are proving **Imaamat**.
4. There are no mention of the name of our Prophet in Bible but still Christians need to believe in the Prophet.
5. The verses of Quran are usually general and it is not the style of Quran to name people (i.e. Imaams)
6. Quran says "follow the Prophet". There are Hadeeth from the Prophet that prove the doctrine of **Imaamat** and this should be enough for a Muslim if he wants to follow the Prophet.
7. There are not explicit verses because if they were, Quran was in danger of fabrication
8. Finally among the classic scholars of Shia at the old times there were some of them who hold that Quran is changed by Sahabah and that certain verses are removed from it.
9. Where in Quran it is said that Muslims should choose a khalifah by themselves?
10. Show us the names of the prophets between ... and ... in Quran if you think that every thing should be in Quran .
11. It is a test that's why it is not mentioned in Quran
12. Arguments that use few verses of Quran out of the context
13. Sunnis believe in Mahdi while he is not mentioned in Quran
14. **Imaamat** is not the fundamental belief of 12ers, the appointment of Ali is the fundamental of belief.

Now I'm sure most of you realize the weakness of all the above replies but let me write a brief for each of them. Using the same order of numbers:

1. There are also no verses in Quran to tell us how to pray. We learn some of our duties from Hadeeth not Quran :  
Prayer has been referred to EXPLICITLY and STRONGLY more than ninety times in Quran . In each of these verses one of the aspects of prayer is covered. Many of these verses talk about the details of prayer, like how to come prepared for prayer (ablution), prayer in travel, etc. Certainly with such a vast and strong reference from Quran , Muslims will refer to the Prophet to know the details. In comparison, the total number of the verses that Shia refers to for **Imaamat** is no more than 5 or 6 and yet none of them can be interpreted by a non-biased mind in the way that 12ers interpret it. In fact none of them are explicit and strong enough to prove **Imaamat** doctrine. This is while Prayer is not at all comparable with **Imaamat**. **Imaamat is the fundamental of belief. Shia calls it one of the Osoole Din (Fundamental of religion). Prayer however according to Shia is one of the Foroo'e Din (Subsidiary)** Imaamat is important enough to convince Shia to separate themselves from the mainstream Islam. If the only difference between Shia and the Mainstream Islam was the way they perform prayer they would never become a sect out of the mainstream Islam.
2. There are certain verses but you need to look at Hadeeth to understand their true meaning cause we are advised to learn Quran from the Prophet and Hadeeth is his teachings.  
Why only when it comes to **Imaamat**, we need Hadeeth to help us? We don't need a Hadeeth to understand from Quran that reading prayer, performing Hajj, fasting, Jihad etc. are obligatory upon Muslims. We don't need Hadeeth to understand from Quran that a Muslim needs to believe in Oneness of God and his Prophets and the Hereafter. We don't need Hadeeth to understand from Quran that God has angels, there were Prophets in the history of mankind and some of them had books, and that the destiny of man is in the hands of God. All of the sudden when it comes to **Imaamat**, Hadeeth becomes a vital tool to understand Quran . Quran how ever does not need a tool to be understandable. It is written in Quran that this book has been made easy to get guidance from. It is true that the Prophet explains certain verses of Quran but explaining is different from interpreting. Explaining means giving the details. Interpreting means giving the meaning. Quran needs no tool to be meaningful otherwise it wasn't the book of guidance. Also there are many contradictory Hadeeth in explaining verses of Quran and at the end of the day it is impossible to verify exactly which ones are authentic. How could God expect people of our time to use Hadeeth to understand the MEANING of Quran? Is this the way that God says in Quran that Truth and False are separated and clear evidences have been shown? I don't think so.
3. Long and complicated analysis of certain verses of Quran to prove that even without the help of Hadeeth, they are proving **Imaamat**.  
Same argument goes here. Quran is not a book of riddles and puzzles. God does not expect an ordinary Muslim to have a search in Quran and have a professional analysis of the verses of Quran to understand what should be his belief and what are his duties as a Muslim. Of course it is very beneficial to analyse the verses of Quran to understand more from it. Quran is like an ocean. However to say that our fundamental belief can only derived from Quran after such an analysis is in contradiction with the use of Quran as a book of guidance. (For a detailed review of the verses that 12ers usually use and the discussion of the way they attempt to misinterpret these verses please refer to my other article: ["The Quran refutes the Shiite concept of Imamate."](#) and this article also [The Qur'an and The Imamah](#)

4. There are no mention of the name of our Prophet in Bible but still Christians need to believe in the Prophet

I appreciate that this justification is very out of line but because I have heard it, I am going to address it here: Firstly we believe that Bible in fact gave the information about our Prophet but these verses were removed (Quran tells us). However the most important thing is that Christians are not expected to accept the Prophet only based on their Bible. Christians along with other human being are given a brand new guidance that is Quran. It is Quran that challenges Christians not merely their own book. The last point is that the comparison is illogical. We are asking for proof of the Shia doctrine from our book of guidance, what does it have to do with the proof of our Prophet in the Bible?! There are many belief that Christians have but are not in their Bible, we however as Muslims have to disregard any belief that is not supported by Quran. On the other hand, another misunderstanding here is that we are not asking about the name of a particular Imaam. We are asking about the CONCEPT of **Imaamat**. The concept of prophethood is well established in Bible (both old and new testaments). It is only after the establishment of this concept in the Christian holy book that they are expected to believe in ANOTHER prophet that is Muhammad (PBUH). The CONCEPT of Imaam (in the way that 12er Shia put it) however has not even referred to (in a convincing way) in Bible, let alone being established. Therefore from this respect too, the comparison is illogical.

5. The verses of Quran are usually general and it is not the style of Quran to name people (i.e. Imaams)

No body asked for names. Only some general verses that give us the above doctrine. Something as simple as: "Oh Muslims, be aware that there will be certain Imaams for you after the Prophet from his generation who are appointed by God and you need to follow them". It is as if (God Forbidden) God was worried about talking about **Imaamat** explicitly. Having said that, we have the name of Zaid (Ra) in Quran who was a SAHĀBAH and his name is there to refer to a very minor issue. It is not unfair to ask for a single verse with the name of Ali in it if (according to Shia) he had such an important role (Imaam).

6. Quran says "follow the Prophet". There are Hadeeth from the Prophet that prove the doctrine of **Imaamat** and this should be enough for a Muslim if he wants to follow the Prophet.

Again why is that only for this article of faith we need to consult Hadeeth? Let's test something. Take Quran in your hand and open it by chance. I can guarantee that no matter where it is opened, few verses before or after are about one of the Oneness of God, Prophet hood, Day of Judgement, Destiny of Human Being, or Duties of Muslims. Now how far you need to go in order to find a verse that (with the help of certain Hadeeth) could be interpreted as **Imaamat** in the 12er doctrine? How come for our other fundamental believes Quran is quite direct, even for our main duties as Muslims but when it comes to **Imaamat**, we need to refer to Hadeeth? This is inconsistency and God is far greater than having inconsistency in his perfect book. Hadeeth is not the second volume of Quran. Authentic Hadeeth is explanation of Quran not a secondith to see what is our religion? This is even more difficult when bare in mind that for every Hadeeth that Shia use to prove **Imaamat**, there are other Hadeeth that are in contradiction with it. In fact even Hadeeth (as a whole) are not structured in a way that could prove **Imaamat**. Such a justification is in fact the main reason for having different sects in Islam. Zaidis too have their own Hadeeth, same for Ismailis and same for Bahayees.

All have the same problem, they are trying to understand their religion from the sources other than Quran. Please note that I am not denying the importance of Hadeeth ([I am not a Quranist](#)). However believing that certain parts of our fundamental belief has to be derived from Hadeeth rather than Quran is far different from using Hadeeth as a source to Prophet's Sunnah. There are no use of discussing the ahaadeeth of the prophet with 12ers when it comes to the fundamental issues. To all Muslims except those who have made sects the fundamentals of belief need to be derived from Quran, if they are not then either they are wrong or they are not fundamental and thus not acceptable reasons for forming a specific sect to be separated from the rest of the Muslims.

7. There are not explicit verses because if they were, Quran was in danger of fabrication.

This is actually guessing God's intentions and is very close to Kufr. From where one could come to this conclusion? Is there any verse in Quran that says God has not revealed certain things because if he does, you will change Quran? In fact the verses of Quran are supportive to the opinion that nothing has been left out for us from Quran and that God keeps Quran safe and that the Prophet should not be worried about delivering the verses. This is in fact attributing Taqqiyyah to God himself (God forbid).

8. Finally among the classic scholars of Shia at the old times there were some of them who hold that Quran is changed by Sahabah and that certain verses are removed from it.

In fact this is the most logical reply that one can get. However no Shia scholar these days refer to this response. They have changed their minds about this opinion (although among them there are still some individuals that do not deny the possibility). However every one knows that this is opposed to the verse of Quran where God promises to keep the book. Also if this is the case then how we know that there weren't some verses in Quran in support of (say) Baha'ollah or (say) George w. Bush? By this assumption no basis will remain to hold any opinion as a Muslim. On the other hand, God could reveal as much as needed about **Imaamat** (like 98 verses about prayer). Just imagine how difficult would it be if some one wanted to remove all the verses about prayer from Quran, God could do the same for **Imaamat**.

9. Where in Quran it is said that Muslims should choose a khalifah by themselves?

Firstly it is not appropriate to answer a question with a question. Shia needs to adjust their doctrine with Quran and only after that it is appropriate to ask such a question.

Nevertheless this question only shows the misunderstanding of some brothers about the belief of the mainstream Muslims. Believing in **Khulafaaye Raashedin** is not a fundamental element of Islam. According to the main stream Muslims, there are only 6 Articles of Faith and 5 pillars of Islam and believing in khilaafath of Aboobakr is not part of either of them.

Any groups of people tend to elect some one as their leader. And the rational and most reasonable way to do so is by election. This is a routine social/political practice. Certainly no system of public election was established at that time and the election of Aboobakr was done through negotiation of present people. You might think that it was not a good choice or that not all qualified people were presented at the time, that's your opinion but it has nothing to do with looking for evidences in Quran about



it. It's just a routine social practice that was and is and will be done in any society and no logical mind would expect a divine evidence for that.

Having said that, once the SAHĀBAH of the holy prophet agree on a great SAHĀBAH like Aboobakr (RA) to become the Khalifah, then it is the duty of all Muslims to obey him for the sake of Islam and unity.

If a Shia asks me what is my proof about this, I will give him/her a source that Shia holds as a very strong proof:

Nahjolbalaqah, letter No. 6 of Imaam Ali to Mo'aviah (note that in some versions of Nahjul balagha. This letter is few numbers before or after): **"People who did Bayat to Aboobakr and Omar, did bayat with me in the same way. So the one who is present cannot select any one else for Khalifah and the one who is absent cannot disobey people in their selection. Shurah belongs to Mohajer and Ansar, so if they gather around a person and appoint him as their Imaam this is to the satisfaction of Allah. If any one disapprove them on this or innovate something about it he should be taken back to the people who he has left (by accepting the appointed Khalifah), and if he refused to do so people has to fight with him as he is going to a path other than of Muslims."** (Note that in the Shia websites like al-islam.org, certain words have been inserted in the translation -like the word "suppose" - without putting them in the brackets in an attempt to change the meaning of the text.)

Now it's up to the Shia brothers and sisters whether they want to attribute Taqyah or lie or politics or what ever to their Imam and whether they like to justify his comment in the same way that they justify verses of Quran. (also please bear in your mind that we have an explicit verse in Quran that says **"va amrohom shoora baynahom"**, **(and their affairs are done by consultancy between them)**). Surely the question of leadership is one of the affairs of Muslims. However I won't use this verse to prove anything about Khilaafath in Islam. Unlike the Shia brothers and sisters, I am quite cautious about playing Lego with the verses of Quran)

So let us not compare apple with orange. **Imaamat** doctrine is a fundamental belief of Shia, election or selection of **Khulafaaye Raashedin** is just a routine and common socio-political practice.

On the other hand, let's look at the present situation in Iran. Is there any divine command about how to establish a leadership in the occultation of Mahdi? Let's remember that there were no religious system of governing after the occultation of Mahdi for about 1000 years after the recent revolution of Iran and emerging of the theory of Welayate Faqih. Those who know about Shia and Iran appreciate that Welayate Faqih of Khomeini was only a theory that he derived from some ahaadeeth. Not all Shia scholars agree with that (like Khoiee and his followers). Among the classic Shia scholars only few had referred to this theory and most like Sheikh Ansari had the opinion that it is difficult to derive such a theory from ahaadeeth (refer to Makaseb of Sheikh Ansari). Also among those recent scholars who accept the theory there are un-agreements about the extend of the theory and that how it could be put in practice (Like Montazeri, late Shirazi, etc.). So again as I referred to in the article, Shia too ended up with the same situation as the mainstream Muslims that is to elect a leader by themselves in the absence of any direct divine command.

10. Show us the names of the prophets between ... and ... in Quran if you think that every thing should be in Quran

The Shia who sends this question cannot realise what is the main issue. The issue is not about NAMES. It is about a CONCEPT.. The concept of prophethood has been addressed in Quran in many verses and there are a few verses that tells Muslims that they need to believe in all the prophets. Allah has given use the story of the main prophets and have left the story of others. There is no need to know the NAME of the (as they say) 124,000 prophets in order to obey Allah. The question is about the concept of **Imaamat** not the names of Imaams. Quran has established the concept of prophethood and its function for us through many verses. There is however not a single verse in Quran that explicitly tells us that there is another position called **Imaamat** which refers to infallible God appointed individuals who are not prophets and that their existence are necessary and there will be such Imams after the prophet.

11. It is a test that's why it is not mentioned in Quran

This claim puts the function of Quran as a guidance under a serious doubt. By this claim there is no use to read Quran to get any guidance because who knows maybe there is a fundamental part of your belief that is not mentioned in Quran because God wants to test you! By the same token Bahayees claim that Quran talks about their prophet Baha'Ollah. When you ask them but where in Quran they will show you some verses that have nothing to do with their claim. When you say but these verses are not clear about your claim they say Oh because God is testing you, Nice!

This is again playing with divinity. Who are we to decide for God that what is a test and what is not a test? The prophethood of Muhammad (PBUH) was also a test but there are many verses in Quran that directly tells people that Muhammad (PBUH) is a prophet. A test is different from a puzzle. God says in Quran that he makes things clear for people. Even a teacher first makes it clear for his students that what is the material of exam and then designs a test based on those material. We need to read Quran to see what are the materials that God is going to ask us about in the day of judgement. Is 'believing in the doctrine of **Imaamat**' one of the materials that Quran commanded us about? God makes things clear for you and sends you enough evidences and then test you to see if you can be humble enough to obey his guidance. The claim that this sorts of answers are making is like we expect Quran to be empty of any verses about the day of judgement and then say that God wants to test people to see if they can GUESS or DEDUCT that there is a day of judgement. No way, God makes it clear in Quran that we need to believe in him and his prophet and to do good things and to pray etc. and the test is whether we obey these commands. God does not play game with us. He does not expect us to solve puzzles and riddles. I wonder why Shia cannot see this in another way around. **Imaamat** is not explicitly referred to in Quran but still Shia insists to be separate from the mainstream Muslims because of this doctrine. Aren't they under a test by Allah? Allah knows best.

12. Arguments that use few verses of Quran out of the context Here Shia tries to refer to few verses in which the words Imaam or Khalifa are used. It is interesting that most of the verses in this category are those that even Shia scholars do not use them to prove their doctrine cause Shia tafasir are clear about the commonly agreed meaning of these verses. There are however non-Scholar Shia youths, those who spend all their youth over internet debating with others that use these verses. To be more specific, these are the verses where the term Khalifa/Kholafa have been used or the verses that the

term Imaam has been used in the meaning other than Leader. The Shia friends simply think any reference to Imaam or khalifa means what they think. The best way to answer them in this category is to refer them to their own tafasir like Almizan and Majmaolbayan. Also to remind him of the warning that Allah gives us in Quran about taking the verses out of their context (Arabic: Yoharrefonal Kalema An Mawaze'ehi)

13. Sunnies believe in Mahdi while he is not mentioned in Quran:

Firstly the concept of Mahdi for the mainstream Muslims is totally different from the concept that Shia holds for Mahdi. This is another issue discussing of which will extend the length of the article. The Shia who brings this justification has confused his own understanding of the concept of Mahdi with the mainstream's understanding of the concept. However the more important thing is that we cannot compare the belief of the mainstream Muslims about Mahdi with the belief of **Imaamat** in Shia. **Imaamat** is one of the main articles of faith for Shia but belief in Mahdi is not one of the main articles of belief of the mainstream Muslims. The articles of belief of the mainstream Muslims have been listed by the scholars and Alhamdolellah all of them are based on explicit verses of Quran. These are 6 (or 7 depending on the phrasing) articles of belief: Belief in God and his Oneness - Belief in Angels - Belief in God's books (Bible, Quran, etc.) - Belief in God's messengers = Believe in the day of resurrection= Believe in Qadar (i.e. every thing and event has been written). All of these are derived from explicit verses of Quran. The very reason that we cannot see THE BELIEF IN MAHDI being listed among the articles of belief of the mainstream Muslims is that this has not been commanded and explained and established in Quran in the same way that other articles of belief are established in Quran.

14. **Imaamat** is not the fundamental belief of 12ers, the appointment of Ali is the fundamental of belief.

If one cannot appreciate (in line with the consensus of all the scholars of Shia) that Ali being appointed by the prophet is the direct consequence of the concept of **Imaamat** and that **Imaamat** is the core belief of 12er Shia that's fine. I would ask the same question about Ali. The question is a generic one that can be applied to any fundamental of belief:

Where are explicit verses of Quran without any Tafsir or Hadeeth that clearly command us about what ever is the fundamental of 12ers' belief that distinguishes them from the mainstream Muslims, being **Imaamat** or the Khilafat of Ali after the holy prophet. There is no escape from this question as long as one believes that Quran is the ultimate guidance. And if a Muslim is not able to find this in Quran then by God he/she needs to answer God in the day of judgement that why he/she separate him/herself from the mainstream Muslims.

**So as you see, none of the above responses are really answering the question. These responses are actually escaping from the truth.** Give Quran (a translation) to an English man with no idea about Islam and ask him to read it and write down 5 important articles of Islamic belief based on his understanding from Quran. I can imagine that he will write down oneness of God, Prophet-hood, the Day of Judgment, perhaps the rewards and punishments, prayer, Zakat, ... but is there any chance that he writes the doctrine of **Imaamat** as 12ers put it? I don't think so.

The very reason that Shia needs to include lots of explanation and commentaries and Hadeeth to prove his doctrine from verses of Quran proves that Quran is not explicit

and direct about **Imaamat** and when a book of guidance is not explicit and direct about some thing, that "thing" CANNOT be a fundamental of guidance and people who have chosen to be separated from the mainstream Muslims because of that "thing" are responsible for their sectarianism attitude.

The above is the weakest link of 12er Shia and repeating it over and over is the only ways that we could make some of them realize this weakness. Interestingly enough further discussion with Shia about this issue only results in completing this argument by adding more justifications from Shia side to the above. The more the number of justifications the more apparent the gap and the false in the logic of Shia theory of **Imaamat**. Verily as Quran says (25: 30), THE complain of the Prophet about his people in the Day of Judgment is that they put Quran aside and ignored it. While I think that we are all subject to this complain and we all need to re-establish the role of Quran in our belief, I should say that to me 12er Shia are one of the best examples of such complain.

Question Two: How does the current Imaam leads Shia?

The first question should be enough for any one to consider 12er Shia as a group that is biased from the original Islam. However it is helpful to have a word about the concept of occultation of Mahdi.

When you ask a Shia that why we need an infallible Imaam, he says we need it because it is not justice from God to leave us without any divine leadership. When you say okay then where is this divine leader now, the Shia will say: Oh he has been hidden for more than 1000 years and will come out near the end of the world. Nice!

This means that the theory of Justice of God in terms of guidance worked only for about 300 years (before the occultation)!

Imaam means a leader, how can you be led when the leader is not contactable and accessible? It is a conscious of Shia that no one has direct contact with Mahdi during his greater occultation (they believe he had about 70 years smaller occultation during which direct contact was possible). So what is the point of all this debate?

Shia believes in **Imaamat** and accused others for not having a leadership system, well at the end of the day we all ended up at the same point didn't we? Shia had no leadership system up to the Iranian revolution and the system of Welayate Faqih that is the leadership system in the current Iran is nothing but a man made system in which people elect certain scholars to elect a leader for them. Well this is exactly what happened in Saqufeye Bani Saedeh when people elected Hazrat Abu Bakr, so, what is all the fuss about? Some of the Muslims have elected Osamah Ben Laden to be their leader, does Khameneyee the leader of Shia has any divine advantages to Osamah?

The point is that if Shia had a live Imaam who was supposedly infallible and had access to extra ordinary knowledge than we did not need this much waste of time. Instead of all these debates I would have asked a Shia to take me to his infallible Imaam and there surely the Imaam could prove me his right by his extra ordinary knowledge and attitude. This is not the case now. If some one becomes a Shia these days, nothing will be changed for him in terms of guidance. He/she will combine the prayers and attend ceremonies for Hussain and pay Khums to scholars and rub his

feet in ablution and start a debate over Internet by a user name like Ex-Sunni but nothing in terms of being directed by a divine Imam. So what? Shia says it is obligatory to know the Imaam of your time, but from the so-called Imaam of their time what do they know? Anything more than his name and the fact that he will not come out till near the end of the world? So is it all about knowing a name rather than actual guidance?

We are fighting over a closed file (I hold respect and do not say over a ... body).

The occultation of Imaam is in 100% in variance with the very basis of the reason Shia claims we need an Imaam. The Shia belief is in fact not self consistent.

Honestly I have not received any considerable reply for this question to elaborate on, let me only address two semi-replies:

1. The guidance of Imaam is not restricted to direct guidance. There are other functions of **Imaamat** that we cannot fully understand except that his existence is a must for universe.
2. Imaam's benefit in occultation is like the benefit if sun when it's behind the cloud.

I answer them in the same order:

1. The guidance of Imaam is not restricted to direct guidance. There are other functions of **Imaamat** that we cannot fully understand except that his existence is a must for universe.

This is just a philosophical argument (being affected by pre-Islamic belief) that has absolutely no support from Quran and Hadeeth. We have been told that certain angels are arranging certain things for the universe but we have heard nothing about such an extra ordinary claim. If this is the case then who was the Imaam immediately before the Prophet? Did the Prophet ever meet him?! And why we need some one being alive in the earth to do the job? Imaam Reza the 8th Imaam of Shia said to people (who thought his father is not dead but is alive and in occultation) a very interesting point: "if Allah wanted to extend the life of any of his servants for the need of people to him, he would have extended the life of his Prophet" **(Kashshi -a Shia author- Marefatorrejal P. 379)**.

Furthermore by the above reply in fact the 12ers are stepping down and surrender their main argument that says in every time there is a need for an Imaam to direct and lead people (i.e. tangible direction and leading not philosophical direction). In fact the earlier 12er scholars nearer to the beginning of the time that the 12ers refer to as the greater occultation of Mahdi has used the same argument to prove the existence of Mahdi. They even go as far to say that this 'obvious' argument suffices them from referring to any ahaadeeth to prove the existence of Mahdi.

Let's see what is the argument of one of the classic gurus of 12ers:

"... Rationality tells us that surely there should be an infallible leader at every time who is not relying on people in matters and science -of religion- because it is impossible that people live in a time when there are no leaders to bring them closer

to good and farther from bad and every non-complete human needs some one to advise him and every oppressor needs some one to control him ... and there should be some one who teaches those who don't know and waken up ignorant, advise misguided and perform the Hodood (Punishments of Shariat) ... and solve the differences of opinion and appoint governors and defend the borders and protect properties ... and gather people for Eids and collective prayers. (Ershad by Mofid - Section 36).

As it can be seen, this scholar who was one of the ones who established 12er doctrine clearly says that there always need to an infallible Imaam at all times who could practically (and in a tangible way) direct and guide people (look at the bold words). It seems that to people like Mofid who was quite close to the beginning of what 12ers refer to as the greater occultation of Mahdi. The expectation was that the occultation will not last for a long period and Mahdi will appear shortly otherwise all the above argument (knowing that Mahdi is not accessible) had no points.

The above is the understanding of other classic 12er scholars as well but I preferred to quote from one of the main ones that is considered as one of the pillars of the 12er scholars.

As you see, the Mahdi that is the subject of our debate with 12ers is the one that the classic 12er Shia believed in as some one who practically and in a tangible way leads people. If an Imaam could be hidden and not available to people then what is the point of arguing for the necessity of having a God appointed leader at the first place?

To change the function of Mahdi to be able to justify his long occultation is nothing but changing the whole story to be able to escape from the truth. It is exactly like changing the function of Quran (from the book of guidance to a book that is only completed by Hadeeth and needs the explanation of 12er Imams) to be able to justify why the 12er theory of **Imaamat** is not mentioned in Quran.

2. Imaam's benefit in occultation is like the benefit if sun when it's behind the cloud.

This is nothing but a poetic justification of the problem. What is exactly meant by sun behind clouds? Even sun behind the clouds has many benefits. You can still find your way when the sun is behind the cloud. However is there any clue from Mahdi now days to direct the Shia in Iran in any way? There are lots of controversy issues in Iran these days among the scholars in terms of Islam and modernism, the extend of the power of Walye Faqih (the leader), etc. There are certain Shia scholars (Mojtaheds) that are in home arrest because they are not agree with the current policies and leader. Was there any letters, voices, what ever from Mahdi to clear up a bit of these difficulties? Which one of these Mojtaheds who are in sever disagreement with each other are directed and led by Mahdi and how are the 12er people suppose to realise that?

**There is a difference between a fairy tale and reality and I hope some Shia could realize it.**

To conclude, I think by refraining from entering never ending debates about minor issues and sticking to the major issue both Shia and mainstream Muslims will be able to come to conclusions faster. I tried to explain in my

article that the main issue in debate with 12er Shia is their doctrine of **Imaamat**.

I further described that the best never answered question for Shia is to ask them for prove for their doctrine from Quran (simply by pasting the verse with no commentary) and to ask them about the practicability of their doctrine in the absent of an accessible Imaam. These remain as two severe problems with Shia belief and no answer could be given for them unless new verses of Quran come down and their so called Imaam of Time come out of his occultation. As I don't think that any of these would happen I had no problems in posting this here knowing that Shia brothers and sisters will also read it. There are no hidden plans. **These are facts**.

And Allah knows best.

May Allah Guide Us All and forgive our sins.

[Student](#)

## QURAN VS. SHIA !

### INTRODUCTION:

1. Whether we can assume that all the fundamentals of Islam has to be in Quran in an explicit and strong way:

Actually I am sorry that when it comes to referring to Quran, few Shia friends prefer to even sacrifice Quran for their own belief. They prefer to put the authority of Quran under question rather than their own opinions. Truly the most serious complain of the holy Prophet on his Ummah in the day of judgement (that has been mentioned in Quran) is about people who have put this book away.

"... and the messenger saith: O my lord lo mine own folk make this Quran of no account" (Furqan, 30, trans. Pikhthall)

(by the way, according to Shia, the biggest misguidance of Muslims after the death of prophet was that they left AhlAlbayt. I wonder why then the complain of the holy prophet is about leaving Quran, not AhlAlbayt, let me guess, because leaving Quran resulted in leaving AhlAlbayt, how complicated. But this is another issue!!!)

Now here I am trying to some how prove to my Shia brothers/sisters that we need to look for explicit evidences of our belief in Quran.

Dear brothers, unlike what some of you are saying, I haven't put any assumption from my own. I think the fact that our fundamental belief needs to be directly and strongly backed by Quran is part of Badihiat (crystal clear facts), I still try to prove it to you via 4 ways:

a. By verses of Quran:

Quran itself says that it is the book of guidance.

Quran itself says that it is including every thing (which in the context of Quran it means every thing for our guidance)

Quran itself says that it is a clear and easy book (except the Moteshabeh verses).

Quran itself says that it is directing to guidance, cure, Rahmat, straight way, and Haqq.

Quran asks isn't revealing Quran enough for you (Ankaboot, 51)

Quran introduces itself as Allah's guidance (Anam 88)

Then it also tells us that the real guidance is from Allah (Baqarah 120), and that even the holy prophet cannot guide any one he wish (Baqarah 272, Qesas 56), and that even the prophet himself is being guided by Quran (Saba 50).

Quran challenges people if they can bring ANYTHING that could be better source of guidance than Quran (Qesas 49)

I cannot see how Quran can satisfy all the above characteristics and yet it does not include enough explicit and strong verses on the fundamental beliefs of Islam. How can we say that Allah is implicit about some of the fundamentals and explicit about some others after reading the above verses.

b. By looking at contents of Quran:

If Quran was only giving us stories of prophets or Fiqh or only advise to follow the prophet maybe the case was different, but Quran clearly gives us explicit criteria for our salvation (what at the end of the day every one of us is looking for):

Quran itself talks about the criteria for salvation in the day of judgement:

According to Quran the criteria is Iman and Amale Saleh (good deeds). In Quran itself we can see the definition for Momen (e.g. first verses of Sura Momenoon).

When I read in numerous places in Quran that believe in Allah and his prophet and doing good deeds are the criteria for being saved in the day of judgement, that's the only criteria for me to look for (note that every fundamental issue, commanded by the prophet is also supported by Allah, in other words even the prophet learns from Quran).

If believing in anything else was necessary, Allah would have added it in those numerous verses, and if you say why, you are questioning the guidance function of Quran.

Look at the cases where Allah tells us the criteria for salvation. Can you find even one verse where believing and following Imam (in Shia definition) has been mentioned as one of the criteria?

Now Shia says that all these criteria are nonsense if you don't believe in Imamah. And when you ask for explicit evidences they say why you think there should be explicit evidences in Quran.

Excuse me but do you believe the Quran to be the book of guidance or the book of misguidance?! (God forbidden).

c. Shia sources of Hadith:

If you refer to your own Ahadith you can see that Quran had been introduced as the main source of guidance.



Hadithe Seqelayn (which Shia is very found of) introduces Quran as the Seqle Akbar (the bigger Seql). Shia seems to just stick to their own specific interpretation of the second part of hadith (and even there only the versions that suits them) on the smaller Seql (Ahlebait) with no notice to the first part.

Also from Shia sources:

Imam Ali says in Nahjul Balagha.:

Quran is Hujjat of Allah for his servants (No. 183, or one before or after depending on the edition)

... it is the basis of Islam ... and the guidance for anyone who follow it and justification for any one who take it as his approach and the evidence for any one who take it as his supporter in his discussions and winner for any one who use it for making his arguments (No. 198)

(how can Quran be hojjat, while it is not consisting strong explicit references to the main beliefs of Islam?)

Ahadith fi Quran, Bab Fazle Quran (a Shia book):

Holy prophet says (my translation): when fetnah comes to you like the darkness, stick to Quran ... it directs you to heaven if you follow it and it's your guide to the best way ...

Mizanol-Hekmah, Babe Quran:

The holy prophet was informed about the Fetnah of his people in future, People asked him how can we be safe from it and he replied: By Quran ... any one who look for knowledge in any were other than Quran Allah will misguide him.

Same source form the holy prophet:

Allah has not advise people in any way like when he advises them by Quran.

Imam Sadiq (same source):

Any one who comes to recognise the truth from any sources other than Quran will not be prevented from Fetnah.

Also:

Same source from Imam Ali:

It's the book of Allah by which you hear, see and talk ...

Same source from holy prophet:

Put Quran as your main leader and director

Same source, Imam Ali:

Best statements, clearest advises and best stories are in Quran.

Same source Imam Ali:

The superiority of Quran to others is like superiority of Allah to others.

All the above are Shia sources.

Again I cannot see how Quran can fulfil all the above and still it can be without explicit evidences of some of the most important parts of Islamic belief which is necessary for your guidance.

d. by rational thinking:

Quran is the textbook and guidebook of Muslims.

When a teacher gives a text book to his students, he choose a book that reflects the main subjects that the teacher wants students to learn. If in the exam students find that the questions with most significant marks are those that the text book has not refer to them or has very briefly and indirectly talked about them, they can put the justice of the teacher under question.

Allah is the best teacher and the absolute Just and he says in Quran that he never punish people unless he has given them the reasons and proof. Allah is giving certain credits to some issues in Quran by his emphasis on it, thus Muslims try to be good at those issues. He is far greater than asking people about something that he has not given it the same credit in Quran.

Why is that only when talking about Imamah, we start arguing about the degree of guidance in Quran?!

Why only when talking about Imamah, we need to prove that we need Tafsir and hadith as well?!

My question was a simple and rational one.

It's up to Shia to justify why Quran is not referring to Imamah in the same way (emphasis, strength, being explicit, command) that it refers to other things (things that to Shia are less important than Imamah?)

Note that I am not a Quranist and I do not reject the importance of Ahadith, however the main point is that if Quran (as the main source of guidance) had talked about Imamah in the same way that it talks about Oneness of God, Nabovvat, Salat, etc, then Muslims were encouraged to seek hadith and tafsir to know more about imamah.

I advise myself and all fellow Muslims to accept Quran as their Imam and not to put themselves Imams of Quran. Please do not put the complete authority of Quran under question to prove your points.

Let us not be among those who the holy prophet will complain of in the day of judgement. Those who have ignored Quran.

2. Is it accurate to say Quran has commanded obedience of the holy prophet and therefore we can refer to Hadith in order to prove Imamah?

It's true that we are commanded to follow the holy prophet.

However it's very very strange that as for less important issues (according to Shia) like Nabovvat and Ma'ad and Salat and Zakat, Allah has not left us only with the holy prophet. He has given us lots of verses in Quran to command us about these issues. However when it comes to Imamah, we are being referred to the holy prophet. Are you suggesting inconsistency in Quran?

The holy prophet IS NOT the volume II of the book of guidance. He is a messenger who delivers and teaches us the guidance that Allah has given us in Quran. . The prophet himself was learning Islam through Quran.

Besides, I would argue that even in the (authentic) words of the holy prophet there are no evidence for the doctrine of Imamah (and not in the words of Imam Ali, and Hassan and Hussain and Ali-ebnel-Hussain, up to Imam Baqir -RA,HM)

3. Some Shia brothers say: Prove that Aboobakr (RA) should be the khalif after the holy prophet from Quran:

This only shows the misunderstanding of some brothers about the belief of Sunnies. Believing in Kholafaye Rashedin is not a fundamental element of Islam. According to Sunnies, there are only 6 Articles of Faith and 5 pillars of Islam and believing in khelafat of Aboobakr is not part of either of them.

Any groups of people tend to elect some one as their leader. And the rational and most reasonable way to do so is by election. Certainly no system of public election was established at that time and the election of Aboobkar was done through negotiation of present people. You might think that it was not a good choice or that not all qualified people were presented at the time, that's your opinion and you might be able to prove it to be true. But it has nothing to do with looking for evidences on Quran about it. It's just a routine social practice that was and is and will be done in any society and no logical mind would expect a divine evidence for that.

Having said that, once the Sahabeh of the holy prophet agree on a great Sahabi like Aboobakr (RA) to become the Khalifah, then it is the duty of all Muslims to obey him for the sake of Islam and unity.

If you ask me what is your proof about this, I will give you a source that Shia holds as a very strong proof:

Nahjolbalaqah, letter No. 6 of Imam Ali to Mo'aviah (note that in some versions of Nahjul balagha. This letter is few numbers before or after):

"People who did Beyat to Aboobakr and Omar, did beyat with me in the same way. So the one who is present cannot select any one else for Kahlifah and the one who is absent cannot disobey people in their selection. Shora belongs to Mohajer and Ansar, so if they gather around a person and appoint him as their Imam this is to the satisfaction of Allah. If any one disapprove them on this or innovate something about it he should be taken back to the people who he has left (by accepting the appointed Khalifah), and if he refused to do so people has to fight with him as he is going to a path other than of Muslims."

Now it's up to you brothers whether you want to attribute Taqyah or lie or politics or what ever to your Imam and whether you like to justify his comment in the same way that you justify verses of Quran.

(also please beer in your mind that we have an explicit verse in Quran that says "va amrohoh shoorah baynahom", (and their affairs are done by consultancy between

them). Surely the question of leadership is one of the affairs of Muslims. However I won't use this verse to prove anything about Khelafat in Islam. Unlike you Shia brothers and sisters, I am quite cautious about playing Lego with the verses of Quran)

Please note:

All the idea of this message is that the credit that we give to things needs to be the same level of credit that Quran gives to them, if we are to follow Quran.

4. whether the way Quran talks about fundamentals are enough for us to understand all their details:

I have said this before and repeat it again here:

As Quran said, it's the book of guidance. Quran teaches us all the main things that we need to know for salvation and by putting emphasis on the issues it also encourages us to know more about them by referring to the holy prophet and by thinking. Only after finding the emphasis of Allah on Salat in Quran (98 explicit and strong verses) a Muslim will get an idea to refer to Sunnah for more details. It's not like Quran only talks very implicitly about an issue and when you refer to the holy prophet you find that the issue is the most important issue in Islam after Tohid!. If it was like that Allah would never asked us to read Quran and to think about it. Then it wasn't really a book of guidance and the prophet would not advise us to refer to it in the state of confusion.

5. Why not obeying the Shia Imams, they were very pious and knowledgeable, why first looking for evidences from Quran:

I don't think any reasonable sunni has any problem with obeying Shia Imams. If you have found your Imams to be the most knowledgeable and pious people of their time then of course you like to follow them and this has nothing to do with Shia Sunni debate. There are some groups of Sunnies in an Arab country (can't remember where) who follow Imam Sadiq in Feqhe. However the problem starts when Shia begins accusing others of being misguided and looking at their Imams as people with a rank higher than most of the prophets and start cursing and hating any one that they think some how disagreed Imams. The problem begins when they define the obedience of their Imams as a fundamental of Islam thus believing that all others are misguided.

6. The Verses that Shia refers to:

Finally and after all these arguments we reach to the verses that Shia brothers refer to in their arguments. Let us see the verses and realise how strong they are in proving Imamah.

Before this, let me discuss about few introductory concepts:

a. Let us first review the concept of Imamah in Shia:

According to 12er Shia (and not all Shia):

- Imam is the only Khalifah of Allah in the earth.
- Imam is the tool for obeying Allah, any acts of obedience without accepting the real Imam is useless.
- The world will be destroyed without Imam (Imam is the balance of the world).
- There were always Imams in the history.
- Imams have a rank that is higher than of prophets (unless prophet himself is an Imam, e.g. our holy prophet or Sayyedana Ebrahim).
- Imams are certain people that are appointed by God.
- Imams are infallible.
- Imams have access to a knowledge that normal people do not have an access to.
- After the holy prophet there are only 12 Imams with the above conditions.
- Only these 12 know all the things about true Islam and true interpretation of Quran.
- The existence of Imam is that important that it can happen that an Imam exists but is hidden for more than 1200 years (like Imam Mahdi).
- Concluding remark: The pre-requirement of any act of worship and any belief in Islam is believing in these 12 Imams. Muslims are not considered Momen (true believer) unless they are 12er Shia. Also any understanding of Islam that is not in agreement with the understanding of these 12 Imams is wrong.

I am sure anyone with a minor study of Imamah agrees with the above as the main belief of Shia on Imamah, any doubts or complains, I suggest people read the works of Mofid, Sadooq and Kolayni and Khomaini.

Now I don't mean that we need all the above to be proved by Quran. However the above shows the credit and weight that 12er Shia gives to the concept of Imamah. Now we can see whether such a weight and credit is also given to this concept by Quran.

b. Another important point:

There is a concept in Osoole Feqhe (common between both Shia and Sunni) that is called Haqiqate Shar'ie (Religious Identity) and Haqiqate Lafzi (Literal Identity) .

I need to explain this before looking at the verses:

I explain it by an example to make it easy to understand:

Salat by word means prayer, i.e any sort of. So they say that Haqiqate Lafzi (Literal Identity) of Salat is general prayer.

Now in Quran whenever we read Salat we don't get it as a general prayer, we get it as the five specific forms of prayer that a Muslim needs to perform daily. This other meaning of Salat is its Shar'iee (Religious) meaning and as they say, it is basically the Majazi (not-direct) meaning of the word.

However the word has been repeated in Quran and has been elaborated by Quran and holy prophet and has been practiced and put into action by Muslims so strongly that the Majazi meaning soon took over the Haqiqi meaning and this happened in the time of the prophet. From that time on, if a Sahabi hears Salat in Quran or from the mouth of the holy prophet he would never take it as a general prayer but he would take it as the specific meaning that we understand from it today.

In other words the importance of the concept has swapped the position of Haqiqate Lafzi (literal Meaning) with Majazi (indirect) meaning. They call the new meaning of the word (that once was Majazi) "Haqiqate Shar'ie" (Religious identity). That means Shar'ea (religion) has given a specific meaning to the word.

Zakat and hajj and Saom also have Haqiqate Shar'yee.

Even Resalat has a Haqiqate Sharyee. When you read Rasool in Quran you never think that it is talking about a postman. You know that it is talking about some one coming to us by the command of Allah. You realise the haqiqate Shar'ie of the word.

Now Imamh has a Haqiqate Lafzi.

According to all the books of Loqat it means leader.

(In common between Shia and Sunni mofassrin in some occasions it also means book)

So when we see the words Imam in Quran, we cannot simply attribute it to the 12er Shia understanding of Imam. There are lots of differences between a simple leader and what we saw as the belief of Shia on Imamah. Same goes with the word Kahlifa.

c. By an explicit and clear and strong and direct verses, I mean just the same way that Allah talks about other fundamental issues in Quran. To understand a verse of Quran by means of another verse of Quran is one of the strongest ways of interpretation of Quran. However this approach is far different from mixing verses of Quran and playing with them. If we get a verse and compare it to other one, and get the results to compare it to the third one and with the help of hadith and tafsir mix a concept with the results and apply it to the forth one for our final conclusion, we are dangerously playing with Quran and this is not what I mean by explicit, direct, clear and strong evidence. This is not the way that you would look for proof for other fundamentals of Islam in Quran. Quran is not a book of chemistry brothers, it's a clear book of guidance.

Okay now let us see the verses one by one:

\*\*\*\*\*

"And thy Lord creates what He wills and chooses; they have no right to choose; glory be to Allah, and exalted be He above what they associate! (28:68). "

The Shiite Brother who raised this verse then said:

"This clearly shows that man has no right to make any selection; it lies entirely in the hands of Allah."

Then he proceeded to say:

"Before creating Adam (as), Allah informed the angels:

... "Verily I am going to make a caliph in the earth ". . . ( 2: 30).

And when the angels demurred politely at the scheme, their protest was brushed aside by a curt reply: "Surely I know what you know not" (ibid.). If the ma'sum (infallible) angels were given no say in the appointment of a caliph, how can fallible humans expect to take the whole authority of such an appointment in their own hands?"\*\*\*\*\*

Brother, I beg you, for your own sake, go and read some of the Shia Tafasir like

Tafsire Almizan or Majma'Olbayan to see if at least your own scholars have understood these verses in the same way that you are understanding them.

Please use a search engine and search for the word Khalifa to see its meaning in Quran. If you do so you will find that Khalifa does not mean an Imam. Human being is God's Khalifa in world because he has the most complete qualifications among the whole creators, including angels.

This is exactly what Allameh Tabatabayee says in tafsir of this verse. He explains in detail that here Khalifa does not mean only Adam. It means the human being from his generation as well. Allamah then refers to other verses in which the word Khalifa or Kholafa has been mentioned to support his comment (a comment that is not exclusive to him but is a common understanding by almost all the Shia and Sunni scholars). He then says that God never said in reply to the angels that this Khalifa will not do what they suggested. He only said that he (God) knows something that they do not know.

In fact the question of the angels itself shows that Khalifa here does not have that specific meaning that the brother says.

As for the second verse please read your Majmaolbayan to see what does the "Choice" refers to in this verse and what was the story behind it.

You said "Man has no right to make ANY selection".

Firstly it is interesting that you suddenly changed the word Choice to the word Selection to make it closer to the context of 12ers Imamah!

Secondly this is a very weird comment I have ever heard and I am not sure if your scholars agree you on this.

So on what basis in Iran, the Majles of Khobregan selected Khameneyee to be the leader? In what way could a Shia select a Marja for himself? In what way do you select an Imam to lead the prayer? Haven't you ever vote for any election which is a way to selection and is a choice? Have you never chosen any thing in your life, how do you want to get married then Ensha'Allah?! Why then in another verse God says "Wa Amrohom Shoora Baynahom"? When you use the word "ANY" you are making generalisation from this verse. If you are going to say these do not included in the word Choice then I will ask on what basis you include Imamah in this word.

This is while if you read the verse and your own tafasir you will find that it has a specific meaning by Choice. In Majmaolbayan the most popular reference of the Shia Tafsir it is stated that Koffar were saying why the prophet could not be one of our bosses and in response God says in this verse that Allah choose who is going to be the prophet. The prophet that Allah talks about came with many evidences with HIMSELF to show he was chosen by Allah. And you are comparing this with choosing an Imam after the prophet. Nice!

On what authority brother you give yourself a right to ignore all the reasonable tafasir to this verse, apply your own pre-assumptions to it, interpret it in a way that it suits you and then generalise it to the issues that you like?

For further references about the meaning of Khalifa in Quran please see the next part.

(By the way, Shia says world is not empty from Imam, who was the Imam after Jesus? Who was the immediate Imam before Ibrahim and the immediate Imam before the prophet of Islam? Have the prophet ever met him?!)

\*\*\*\*\*"O Dawud ! Verily; We have made thee (Our) caliph on the earth ..." (38:26)

Sayyedana Dawood was a prophet and he was appointed by Allah to lead his people as the representative of Allah in this vesre.

Not sure how do we want to conclude Shia Imamah from a verse that is about a prophet.

First Dawood was a prophet, he had the advantage of receiving revelation, he is in no way comparable to people who are not receiving any revelations. Secondly according to Quran any one and any group of people can become Khalifah of Allah. They only need to believe in Allah and do good things.

Refer to: Noor-55

Also see: Fater: 39; Naml: 62; Yones: 14

\*\*\*\*\*And We made them Imams who were to guide by Our command ... (21:73)

Sorry that brothers often delete the first part of the verse when they refer to it, Allah warns us about those who change the words from their position (Yoharrefonal-Kalema An Mavaze'ehi).

If you read the verses before this, you will see that it's all about prophets. Has nothing to do with non-prophets and you cannot derive anything from it for non prophets.

\*\*\*\*\* "Surely I am going to make you an Imam for men." (Ibrahim) said: "And of my offspring?" He said: "My covenant will not include the unjust. " (2 : 124)

Again the verse is about a prophet and it's simply talks about the concept of leadership in general. In other verses of Quran like 21:73 you see that all of those who were from the generation of Ibrahim and are referred to as Imams are prophets.

\*\*\*\*\*... "Verily I am going to make a caliph in the earth ". . . ( 2:30).

And when the angels demurred politely at the scheme, their protest was brushed aside by a curt reply: "Surely I know what you know not" (ibid.).

If you even refer to your own tafasir you will see that even your own scholars (mostly) say that by Khalifah here it means human being in general and specifically those who believe and do good things, as the verse 55 of Sura Noor says and like the other verses I gave earlier about Sayyedana Dawood .



\*\*\*\*\*32:24 Sura Sajdah Ayat 24

"And we assigned from among them some Imams who guide by Our authority since they were patient and believed firmly in Our Signs."

The vesre again has nothing to do with the Shia definition of Imamah. You can consider Aboobkar and Omar and Osman and Ali as Imams who Allah put them for people.

This is because "Jaalna" in Quran does not necessarily means that God has put something by command. If you read the uses of the word "Ja'alna" (which here has been translated un-accurately as we Assigned) in Quran you will see that in almost all the cases the word Ja'alna in Quran does not have an exclusive Tashre'yee meaning (i.e some thing that has been put in action by a REVEALED command of Allah), in Quran it has generally used for the Takvini meaning (i.e something that has put in action by a will of Allah without necessarily revealing a command about it), by Ja'alna it does not mean that a revelation or a command has come from Allah to appoint someone as the leader. The above verse only means that from Bani Isra'yeel, those who were qualified for leadership became leaders for their people by the will of Allah. Interestingly enough there are no mentions of infallibility as a qualification for Imams in this verse. Refer to your main source of Tafsir (Majma'olbayan) and see if there you can find any tafseer for this verse to the benefit of Shia. The author in Majmaolbayan even says that some of the scholars believe that A'emma in this verse means prophets.

To understand this verse better, I invite you to look at the other verse that includes the word Imam and interestingly enough is often EXCLUDED from the Shia argument when they talk about the use of the word Imam in Quran.

The verse is related to the debate as it has the same expression that the above verse has.

Forqan 74:

"... Those who say in their prayer: `O lord grant unto us wives and offspring who will be the comfort of our eyes, and assigned us as Imams for the righteous ".

The last part of the verse uses the same impression, i.e. Vaj'alna Ielmottaqina Imama.

Obviously the Imam in this verse is not the same Imam that Shia believes in (read the Shia tafasir to see they agree this). An Imam according to Shia never prays to become Imam (they are appointed divinely from the beginning). This verse shows that every normal human being, even those who have sins in the condition that they truly repent (refer to the few verses before the above verse), can become an Imam for Muslims. He does not need to be infallible and he does not need to be directly appointed by Allah. By the same token, the word "Ja'alna" in verse 32:24 has nothing to do with being directly appointed by Allah. Hence the verse is simply talking about the general meaning of Imamah which is leadership.

It is really sad that we read in Shia sources that a Shia is narrated from Imam Sadiq that the verse 74 of Forqan was not: "and assign us as Imams for the righteous", but it really was "and assign FOR us Imams FROM the righteous. It is sad to see a Shia narrator attributes the idea of Tahrif to Imam Sadiq just to justify a verse of Quran that is opposed to his belief.

Having said all the above, even if for the sake of discussion we accept that the verse is saying that Allah really appointed Imams for Bani Israil by revelation or so, still there is no indication from the vesre that Allah will also appoint Imams for Muslims

by revelation or so and that this is the Sunnah of Allah. We can see that any nations with their own prophets had certain conditions that were excluded to themselves.

\*\*\*\*\* 17: 71] (Remember) the day when We will call every people with their Imam; then whoever is given his book in his right hand, these shall read their book; and they shall not be dealt with a whit unjustly.

The verse above only says that at the day of judgement every one will be called with their Imam. The verse is very sensible and logical as naturally every one has a leader in his life and he/she follows that leader. Even an atheist has a leader. Quran simply says that in the day of judgement every one will be called with his leader. The question is that what does this verse have to do with Shia definition of Imamah? Allah knows best!

If you refer to the Shia popular Tafsir (Majma'olbayan), you will see that the author discusses 5 possibilities for the meaning of Imam in this verse. Interestingly enough none of them are specifically infallible Imams. I asked brothers for explicit verses and they give me a verse that even their own scholars are not taking as a proof!

\*\*\*\*\*"And We made them (but) Imams inviting to the Fire; and on the Day of Judgment no help shall they find. In this world We continued to curse them; and on the Day of Judgment they will be among the hateful. (Quran 28:41-42).

Absolutely not an explicit verse on Imamah. The brother thinks any verse that has the word Imam in it is an explicit verse for Imamah by the Shia definition!

\*\*\*\*\*"O Messenger! Make known that which has been revealed to you from your Lord, for if you do it not, you will not have conveyed His message and Allah will save you from the (mischief) of people." (Surah al-Ma'idah, 5:67)

The verse is irrelevant to the discussion. I asked verses that explicitly and with no need to Hadith proves Shia definition of Imamah and a brother is suggesting a verse that Shia use, with reference to some Ahadith to prove Ali (RA) was appointed by Allah.

First even if for the sake of discussion we agree that the verse is referring to Qadire Khom and appointment of Imam Ali, it has nothing to do with 12er's concept of Imamah. Technically one can believe that Imam Ali was appointed by the holy prophet but he can still be Sunni. Zaidies are another group of Shia, they believe in this verse in the way that 12ers interpret it but they don't accept the 12 Imams. According to 12ers they are misguided, cause 12ers have Hadith that says if some one even denies one of the 12 Imams it's like denying all of them. The distance between what Shia concludes from this verse and the doctrine of Imamah in 12er Shia is too far to call this an explicit verse for 12er Shia Imamah theory.

As I said the verse is out of the context of this discussion, however for the respect of the brother who suggested the verse let me only point out that it doesn't make sense that the verse refers to the appointment of Imam Ali.

The word "Onzela" (revealed) by default means a verse of Quran that has been revealed to the holy prophet. There are no verses of Quran on appointment of Imam Ali !

Also according to Sunnies Qadire Khom was not exclusively about appointment of Imam Ali, so again the verse does not make any sense. Also if you read Sunni tafasir you will see strong arguments to show this verse did not revealed in the

HajjatoIWedda. Moreover you cannot see a single reference to Qadire Khom in Nahjolbalaqah, even in the ceremony of Sheqshaqyah where Imam is talking openly. In fact it seems that even Imam Ali never interpreted Qadr in the way that Shia interpret it as there are no authentic hadith from Imam Ali in which he uses the event of Qadir as a proof for his right to be the only Khalifah. Where ever he has referred to this event it is to show his merits and to encourage people to support him.

As a whole, to be brief I can only say here that the verse is not at all explicit about Imamah.

\*\*\*\*\* "And everything We have detailed for you in a clear Imam." (36:12)  
The brother who suggests this verse, has not any idea of the tafsir of this verse according to Shia Scholars. Almost all the scholars (Shia and Sunni) agree that the word Imam here refers to Lohe Mahfooz (the secured book of deeds). There are other verses in Quran where the word Imam is explicitly used as "book", like: Hood 17.

The way our brother is trying to interpret the verse with Imam being meant a Shia Imam is very senseless and unreasonable and his comments are even not in agreement with the comments of the most celebrity Shia Mofassers like Tabrasi and Allammah Tabatabayee.

\*\*\*\*\* "O ye who believe! Obey God, and obey the Apostle, and those charged with authority among you. If ye differ in anything among yourselves, refer it to God and His Apostle, if ye do believe in God and the Last Day: That is best, and most suitable for final determination." (4:59)

Shia often says that this verse shows that AFTER the prophet there are CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS who it is obligatory to obey and who possess an INTRINSIC authority worthy of obedience.

I ask Allah to forgive us for interpreting his verses in the way that we desire.  
All the elements of this verse are against what Shia is saying:

The verse is talking generally about those who are given a responsibility of the affairs of Muslims, these could be heads of army, head of a group, etc. The verse does not specify these people to certain individuals.  
Last part of the verse explicitly shows that at the end of the day it's only Allah and his prophet who are the main references. So there are no INTRINSIC authority.

The question is that if the verse means the 12 infallible Shia Imams, why people are advised to go back to the Allah and his apostle as the final referee, why not going back to the infallible Imams?

Interestingly enough before the revolution in Iran almost all the Shia scholars were agreed that Olelamr here ONLY means infallible Imams. After the revolution however many of them started arguing that Olel'amr means Imam or his deputy (to prove their theory of Welayate Faqih). A clear example of putting one self as the Imam of Quran!

The other question. According to Shia, the holy prophet himself was an Imam and we cannot have two imams in one time. However the verse is suggesting obeying the holy prophet and those in authority at the same time.

I wonder how should a Muslim understand from this verse or combination of this verse and other verses that there are certain infallibles in the generation of the holy prophet that should be followed and despite the explicit point of the verse, Muslims do not need to refer their problems to Quran and the holy prophet if they follow these Imams cause they are already the talking Quran and their words are the words of the holy prophet!

The verse simply advises Muslims to obey those who are in authority. This is a very civilised advice that prevents the Islamic society of becoming a mess. The last part of the verse directs people that to whom should they refer if they had problems in obeying those authorities. They should refer to Allah (Quran) and the prophet (Sunnah).

If you refer to Tafasir (even Shia Tafasir) you will see the occasion for which this verse was revealed. It was about an incident in following a commander of an army that the prophet (PBUH) had sent.

Another interesting point is that if this was a general rule we needed to see it in other verses of Quran with the same context. There are 16 verses in Quran that command Muslims directly with the word "Ati'oo" to obey Allah and/or the prophet. Only two verses add another reference to Allah and prophet (Olelamr). Again see the weight that Quran gives to a concept and the weight that Shia gives to it. Are they equal?!

\*\*\*\*\* "And God only intends to remove all abomination from you, ye members of the Family, and to purify you with a complete purification." (33:33)

First the verse itself proves nothing for Shia. They need hadith to prove something from it.

Second, let us avoid being among those who have been complained by Allah for taking his words out of its context (Yoharrefonal Kalema An Mavaze'ehi).

After and before this verse is about the wives of the prophet. It is not nice to include something completely irrelevant in between a group of verses that are talking about a solid subject.

Brothers might say that the verb is for male not for female. Well of course, because the holy prophet himself is included here and according to Arabic grammar, when even one male is among females, we should have the verb for male. Refer to verse: 11: 73 (Ebrahim was included in AhlAlbayt, thus we have a verb for male. Also refer to 28:29.

Another important point is that whenever in Quran God says :Yoridollah (God Intendeth), it doesn't mean that God really (literally) do that, it means that God likes to see you in that position thus he gives you such commands, it is rather an encouragement to obey. See this verse:

"Allah does not intend to place you in a difficulty, but intends (Yorido) to make you purify, and to complete his favour upon you , that ye may be grateful. Quran 5 : 6  
So can we use the same analogy and say that all sahabah are infallible?!

There are lots of other difficulties in the interpretation of this verse in Shia way, like

the meaning of Rejs and whether being purified from Rejs means to become infallible.

The verse is a simple advise to the wives of the prophet to make them more pure and with the help of Hadith we can also conclude that other members of the family of the prophet, specifically Imam Ali, Lady Fatimah and Hasanain (RAHM) were included in the verse.

The verse proves nothing about the concept of Imamah and has nothing to do with the Imams of Shia from the forth Imam to the last.

\*\*\*\*\* "Didn't you turn your vision to the chiefs of the children of Israel after Moses? They said to a Prophet (that was) among them: `Appoint for us a king that we may fight in the cause of Allah.'" (Quran 2:246)

The above verse actually is against the Shia doctrine of Imamah.

First the verse shows that Allah has appointed Taloot upon the request of people themselves, . Second there is no evidence that Taloot was infallible.

Also Taloot was only appointed as a king and for the purpose of fighting, while they already had a prophet who would advise them on religion.

The discussion is not that whether we need to follow the one that God appoints for us (of course we need to), but the discussion is that weather in Islam God has appointed certain people for us to follow after the holy prophet.

\*\*\*\*\*

And make for me a vizier from my family, Harun (Aaron) my brother" (20:29-30). And Allah said: "You are indeed granted your petition, O Musa!" (ibid., 36).

This is again comparing Apple with Orange.

Haroon was himself a prophet, capable of receiving revelation.

He died before Musa and thus never was his successor after him.

This is the only occasion that we are aware of when a prophet asks God to be granted a deputy to share the prophecy. Generalising this to make conclusions for Imam Ali and eleven other Imams is really strange.

Imam Ali never shared the prophecy with the prophet.

The only occasion where the prophet compares Ali with Haroon is when he is leaving the city for a fight without Ali (RA) and finds Ali to be sad about it. The comparison refers to the incidents where Musa left his people and appointed Haroon as his rep. In his absence. It is worthy of notice that it wasn't only Ali who was occasionally appointed as the prophet's rep. Some other Sahabah too had the same privilege in other occasions, including Aboobakr.

\*\*\*\*\*

Say I do not ask you for any reward other than kindness to my kinship. (Shoora 23)

Firstly even in Shia Tafasir like Majmaolbayan you can read how many possibilities have been discussed about the meaning of Qurba. If we had Zelqurba instead of Felqurba then the Kinship was surely the best meaning but as it is just now, kinship is only a possibility.

Secondly, the verse is in a Sura that is Macchi which means has been revealed in Macceh. In Macceh Imam Ali had not yet married with lady Fatimah and there were no Hassan and Hussain!

Thirdly it is very strange that the prophet says to Koffar that I want this reward from

you while they even do not accept his message.

Thirdly, if the verse means to be kind to Ahlulbayt (and we believe that Qurba means the 12er's definition of Ahlulbayt) this again has nothing to do with the 12ers doctrine. All the sects and groups of Islam apart from Nasebis love Ahlulbayt.

Conclusion and discussion:

1. There are no explicit verses or groups of verses in Quran to prove the Shia concept of Imamah.

2. Shia brothers say that just as we have verses in Quran on important issues like Salat and the details are in ahadith, we also have verses on Imamah and the details are in ahadith.

The above is a mixed of wrong assumptions and statements. First, comparing to issues like Salat, Imamah is much more important issue. Yet while we have 98 strong and explicit verses on Salat that has changed this general term for prayer to a specific meaning in Islam (and about the same for other important issues), as for Imamah we see that Quran is (in comparison to other issues) very general.

On the other hand, even when comparing Salat for example with Imamah in ahadith, we see the same difference. Brothers say that we have the details of Imamah in Ahadith. This is not true at all. The details of Imamah can only be found in the ahadith that are attributed to Imam Baqer or Sadeq (unless we want to go for unreliable ahadith). How many ahadith do we have from the holy prophet with detailed explanation about the Imamah? Even in Shia sources there are not that much. And comparing to an issue like Salat, what is the percentage of these ahadith? Except one vague hadith in Muslem, how many other AUTHENTIC ahadith can Shia show from Sunni sources about the number of Imams? How many about their names? How many about their infallibility? How many about the obligatory of following them? And what is the percentage of these ahadith comparing with the ahadith about Salat? So what I am saying is that even in Hadith side of the story, 12ers have no better condition in terms of proof.

3. There is another very important point that Shia often ignores. We have been told in Quran that truth and false are clearly revealed for us (the verse in Ayatalkorsi) and that God do not expect any actions from his servants unless it is clearly stated for them. We only need to follow certain Imams after the prophet if there are verses to COMMAND us to do so. From all the verses of Imamah that brothers suggest only one or two are giving direct commands to Muslims. (Yet as I discussed at the above even these verses are not clear about the 12ers doctrine of Imamah). This puts the obligatory of belief in this concept in a serious question. At the same time we see serious commands of Allah about issues like oneness of God, Nabovvat, Salat, Fasting, etc.

4. While the weight of Shia concept of Imamah is very strong in their belief, to the contrary the mood of Quran is not the same. In Quran Taqva has been defined as the only criteria to be the best to Allah. Belief and good deeds are defined to be the criteria for being safe in the hereafter. Momen has been defined explicitly in certain verses of Quran, including the first verses in Sura Momenoon.

5. Not only Quran does not support the belief of Imamah in Shia, it also disagrees with this belief. Quran is full of the verses that says only Allah can help you and only he can guide you and you only need to call him and that those who you call beside

him have nothing to do with your destiny. Quran emphasis that no ones deeds are to be ignored and that no relation or friendship can help people in the day of judgement. Quran shows that even the prophets were not sinless and that some times even they were doing mistakes, let alone non-prophets. Quran indicates that the holy prophet is nothing but a Rasool and a good example for obedience. He does not have any extra knowledge and before revelation of Quran he too was lost. Let alone the non-prophets. Quran encourages us in the verse that I referred to, to ask to be an Imam for pious Muslims.

6. The fact is that the question that why Quran is not in-line with Shia belief is a very annoying and difficult question for 12er Shia. Among the old times scholars of Shia many like Jazayeri, Tabrasi, Majlesi, Ayyasi, Qomi, Feize Kashani, etc believed in Tahrif of Quran (changes appeared in Quran). They used to base their arguments on numerous ahadith that they had about Tahrif. This was the defense of Shia against the question: You cannot find any explicit verses about Shia in Quran cause Quran has been changed!

After many centuries now the Shia scholars have realised the effect and danger of this claim for themselves. Thus they are now using another approach. They say that Quran has not been changed but "we cannot interpret Quran by ourselves" or that "Quran itself is not enough for guidance", etc. These are again to defend themselves against the question above.

7. The holy prophet has said that his Ommah will go to all the wrong paths that other people have gone to. Maybe one of the examples of this is exaggerating about certain people and putting them in between people and God. The same wrong path that Christians went about Sayyedana Eisa and his pure mother.

8. Brothers have got used to some verses in Quran and they think these verses are quite clear about Imamah. Why don't they experience a very easy experimental learning? Give a simple translation of Quran to a Non-Muslim and ask him to read it and write down for you 5 of the most important principles of Islam. Is there really any chance that he writes anything close to the concept of Imamah?

With all due respect, the brother's belief in having explicit verses in Quran about Imamah is just like the belief of Bahayees in having explicit verses in Quran about their holy book, and like the belief of Ahmadiyah in having explicit verses in Quran about the continue of prophecy after the holy prophet, and like the belief of followers of Rashid Khalifah in having explicit verses in Quran about his coming. They and 12ers all have one thing in common. Only they (themselves) are able to understand your belief from Quran.

I really remind all of us to put Quran as our leader and not ourselves as leaders of Quran. I have quoted few verses of Sura of Kahf at the end of this thread. Let us all read it and think about it, maybe it also has something for us to learn.

May Allah put all of us in the right path.

\*\*\*\*\*

"We have explained in detail in this Quran, for the benefit of mankind, every kind of similitude, but man is in most things contentious.

And what is there to keep back men from believing now that guidance has come to them, nor from praying for forgiveness from their lord, but that (they ask that) the

ways of the ancients be repeated with them, or the wrath be brought to them face to face?

...

the unbelievers dispute with vain arguments, in order therewith to weaken the truth, and they treat my signs (verses of Quran) as a jest, as also the fact that they are warned.

And who doth more wrong than one who is reminded of the signs (verses) of his lord but turns away from them. ... "

(Kahf, 54-57)