



Repelling False Notions of Ali Sina Part 1:

Preamble

Courtesy of al-Mustaqeem

Claim 1; You accused the the defendant of Muhammad ibn Abdillah of being an assassin and you listed four reasons as proofs.

The first two of which is

<http://www.answering-islam.org/Muhammad/Enemies/abuafak.html>

<http://www.answering-islam.org/Muhammad/Enemies/asma.html>

The examination of this proof

1. The issue of the Assassination of Abu Afaak reported by Ibn Ishaq and Ibn S'ad. I will disregard Ali Dashti as he speaks from the avenue of nifaaq (hypocrisy) and thus his testimony is unreliable with regard to speaking about Islam.

Firstly it becomes undeniably important, for muslims especially, and those who have any form of reason to aadopt a fundamental that was stated by Ibn Sireen where he stated "Al-isnaad fee deen" the isnaad is the religion. The basic explanation of this is the fact that upon making a claim of a matter, one must bear the burden of proof. With regard to matters attributed to the prophet salallahu alaihi wa sallam that proof is brought forth with the naming of men, meaning to shed light with regard to its chain of transmitters.

So this proof you use (Mr.Sina) is defective in two ways.

1. It is based on a fabrication that I will highlight and
2. it contradicts other established authentic reports that is somehow inadvertently not used by you or those of your ilk in the assessment of this matter.

As for my claim of its defectiveness then

In the books where these riwayat were narrated in, there is no mention at all as to its isnad. And due to the matn of the riwayat it become mudtarib (shaky) as well as shadh (irregular).

Secondly the muhaditheen have passed the ruling of this very riwayat as la aslaha or having no basis which is basically the lowest end of classification of reported traditions

Asma Bin Marwan

This story also connects to another misnomer that the prophet ordered the assassination of Asma. As the previous riwayat, this riwayat as well is reported by Ibn S'ad, Ibn Adiy, and Ibn Asakir.

Yet the proficiency of non muslims and missionaries pretty much ends up as it started, muflis, when trying to make a claim about Islam.

Interestingly Ibn Adiy reports in his "al-Kamaal" on the authority of Ja'far Ibn Ahmad Ibn Muhammad Ibn As-Sabah on authority of Muhammad Ibn Ibrahim Ash-Shami on authority of **Muhammad Ibn Al-Hajjaj Al-Lakhmi** on authority of Mujalid on authority of Ash-Shu'abi on authority of Ibn 'Abbas, and added that

...this isnad (chain of reporters) is not narrated on authority of Mujalid but by **Muhammad Ibn Al-Hajjaj** and they all (other reporters in the chain) **accuse Muhammad Ibn Al-Hajjaj of forging it**

It is also reported by Ibn al-Ghawzi in "*Al-'Ilal*" and is listed among the flawed reports.

So according to its isnad the report is mawdu (fabricated) and thus the ruling of this riwayat (narration) is unreliable and the use of its narration as a proof becomes nullified and the burden of proof reforms upon the claimant who remains upon his original claim with this specific proof.

Another fundamental asl that should be adhered to whether such apostates and opposers wish to adopt or not is the fact that just because reports are mentioned in classical and accepted by the orthodoxy of Islam, such a fallacious notion is not correct due to the fact that such acceptance of these people and their books are so accepted upon their general application. Such generality does not encompass the reality that a particular matter stated by some of them is outright accepted. That is because for works to be accepted in its particular, it must be accompanied by tahqeeq and or takhreej of its proofs and the facilitation of the evidences and its investigation, a matter that the entire confederation of opposers to Islam to this day have failed to endeavor, due to its monumental and strenuous task. and of course other matters.

So what has preceded refuted two of the reports listed as reasons for the proof of Muhammad's "supposed" assassin hood.

With that being said let us bring clarity into the taint of Ali Sina's thoughts about the following

Examination of the last two arguments found here

<http://www.faithfreedom.org/Articles/sina/assassinations.htm>

<http://www.answering-islam.org/Muhammad/Enemies/sallam.html>

as for the first

Ali Sina starts off with

Confucius said: You can judge a man by seeing how his words match his deeds. Lying and murdering are great sins in Islam. Yet Muhammad himself ordered his followers to lie and to assassinate his enemies.

lets examine the context of the claims brought up by Sina mainly urging the facilitation of lying and "assassinating"

So he brings the hadeeth narrated in Saheeh al-Bukharee volume 5 hadeeth 369.

The entire matn (text) that he uses is the following

Narrated Jabir Abdullah:

Allah's messenger said "Who is willing to kill Ka`b bin al-Ashraf who has hurt Allah and His apostle?" Thereupon Maslama got up saying, "O Allah's messenger! Would you like that I kill him?" The prophet said, "Yes". Maslama said, "Then allow me to say a (false) thing (i.e. to deceive Ka`b). The prophet said, "You may say it."

Maslama went to Ka`b and said, "That man (i.e. Muhammad) demands Sadaqa (i.e. Zakat) [taxes] from us, and he has troubled us, and I have come to borrow something from you." On that, Ka`b said, "By Allah, you will get tired of him!" Maslama said, "Now as we have followed him, we do not want to leave him unless and until we see how his end is going to be. Now we want you to lend us a camel load or two of food." Ka`b said, "Yes, but you should mortgage something to me." Maslama and his companion said, "What do you want?" Ka`b replied, "Mortgage your women to me." They said, "How can we mortgage our women to you and you are the most handsome of the Arabs?" Ka`b said, "Then mortgage your sons to me." They said, "How can we mortgage our sons to you? Later they would be abused by the people's saying that so and so has been mortgaged for a camel load of food. That would cause us great disgrace, but we will mortgage our arms to you."

Maslama and his companion promised Ka`b that Maslama would return to him. He came to Ka`b at night along with Ka`b's foster brother, Abu Na'ila. Ka`b invited them to come into his fort and then he went down to them. His wife asked him, "Where are you going at this time?" Ka`b replied, "None but Maslama and my (foster) brother Abu Na'ila have come." His wife said, "I hear a voice as if blood is dropping from him." Ka`b said, "They are none by my brother Maslama and my foster brother Abu Na'ila. A generous man should respond to a call at night even if invited to be killed."

Maslama went with two men. So Maslama went in together with two men, and said to them, "When Ka`b comes, I will touch his hair and smell it, and when you see that I have got hold of his head, strike him. I will let you smell his head."

Lets look at the first issue

Allah's messenger said "Who is willing to kill Ka` b bin al-Ashraf who has hurt Allah and His apostle?"

The correct or more accurate translation o the Arabic reading of it is “Who has **maligned** Allah and His messenger” not hurt as was reported in this translation. That pretty much debunks his statement after citing this hadeeth

How a man can hurt Allah? How can God be hurt by one of his creatures? If he is hurt and wants revenge by killing the person who hurt him can't he kill him himself?

Secondly,

" The prophet said, "Yes". Maslama said, "**Then allow me to say a (false) thing** (i.e. to deceive Ka` b). The prophet said, "You may say it."

There are two issues in this regard

1. The Arabic reading says “Fa adhana li an aqulu shay aa” Given the context along with its Arabic, it leads to a more proper reading of “The allow me to talk to him (shay aa) in the way that I deem fit. So the context does not give way that the matter was of speaking a straight lie. However casting this to the rest o the narration it gives way that it was so by way of deceit. So lets look at what was said with regards to deceit which leads me to my second reply and this reply will pretty much put the entire narration, no infact all of the arguments of Sin with regards to assassination into perspective

2. The prophet salallahu alaihi wa sallam was reported to have said in Bukharee volume 4 hadeeth 268 and 269 each narrated by Abu Hurairah and Jabir ibn Abdullah who said that “**war is deceit**” Which is why this hadeeth of “war is deceit” is under the book of jihad and the chapter where it narrates the assassination of kab Ibn al-Ashraf is under “military expeditions”.

Of course the opponenets of islam would try to make this war issue a matter of non war which is evident throughout their site. However what matters is the matter of historical affirmation of the event, not what people pathologically try to deny.

Here is the context surrounding Kab Ibn Ashraf.

Kab Ibn Ashraf was a Jew, but the characteristic he was most known for was his resentfulness towards Islam and the Muslims. He was the keenest of inflicting harm on the Messenger and **the most zealous advocate of waging war against him.**

When he heard the news of Badr he got terribly exasperated and swore that he would prefer death to life if the news was true. When this was confirmed he wrote poems satirizing Muhammad salallahu alaihi wa sallam, eulogizing Quraish and enticing them against the prophet salallahu alaihi wa sallam. He then rode to Makkah where he started to trigger the fire of war and kindle rancor against the Muslims in Madeenah.

When Abu Sufyan asked him which religion he was more inclined, the Deen of the Makkans or the Deen of Muhammad salallahu alaihi wa sallam and his companions he replied that the pagans were better guided. With respect to this situation Allah revealed the following Ayah

“Have you not seen those who were given a portion of the scripture? They believe in Jibt and Taghoot and say to the disbelievers that they are better guided as regards the way than the believers (Muslims).

(ءاسنلأا قروس , An-Nisa, Chapter [#4](#), Verse [#51](#))

He then returned to Madeenah to start a fresh campaign of slanderous propaganda that took the form of obscene songs and amatory sonnets with a view of defaming the Muslim women.

At this stage the situation became unbearable and could no longer be tolerated which inevitably led to the narration under discussion.

If one just involved himself just slightly into the historical knowledge of the past, in particular Islamic history, especially if one begins to speak on its topic, one would have already understood the entire context of the event. It is easily understood to any student of history that the Arabs, their life was centered on Balagha or more known to us as poetry. We mean by this that poetry was the even of the day, it was the 10 o'clock news, the 6 o'clock news, all the time. It was the way many settled their disputes, and it was the way that it proved the mastery of one person over another, was due to the Arabic poetic literary campaigns that they use to have, of which only one who understands this historical fact, ultimately realizes why the Quraan came in its fashion (of being a work of literary masterpiece).

So with respect to the assassination attempts brought forth by the prophet salallahu alaihi wa sallam, the final conclusion in this regard is the fact that once the Muslims went to Madeenah, governorship was brought upon the hands of Muhammad salallahu alaihi wa sallam. He was the political ruler of it and was entrusted upon the safety of its people, Muslim and non-Muslim. The stark reality of this matter is that wars did happen between him and his foes and there was no time frame in the entire prophetic period except that there were those who were given to the uprooting and undermining of the Islamic Caliphate in Madeenah. Thus as a political leader, as with any political leader, they have the right, and this right is unanimously accepted by human reason and logic, to perform

such matters in the best interest of the state. The problem that lies here with these apostates is their unwillingness to accept the reality of the fact of the prophet's legal political authority and the fact that there were real life people who were nothing more than those who threatened the peace and security of the state, Kab being one of them.

A Comment on Idiocy

It was said

The stories naturally alter in their attacks on tribes or cities or settlements and the embracing of Islam by important people and the next attacks, interspersed with assassinations of Muhammad's personal enemies... All of this is naturally part of the progress of Islam. Without any problem in the opinion of Ibn Hisham.

Let us apply this same logic to the one who said it and the one's who appreciate this statement.

The stories of American progress naturally alter on attacks on different Indian tribes ending in the most barbaric of catastrophes as is apparent in the annals of their history coupled with progress done on account of these atrocities and the progress done on account of the great "black" atrocity, interspersed with assassinations of America's personal enemies, among them Benedict Arnold, all of this naturally part of the progress of the American dream. Without any problem in the opinion of AnsweringIslam.org or the apostates of Islam and the generality of disbelievers of western nations.

Lastly, What has preceded in the literature above brought context, linguistic analysis, and the clarification of matters left out by the claimers, which ultimately lead to the claims that were originally made to be in a state of being nullified. It is the wishes of this author that Ali Sina would hold up to his word

If you can prove any of the charges wrong I will remove that charge. I will remove the whole site when all the charges are proven wrong.

The preamble down, the rest of rhetoric to go

Subhanakallahuma wa bi hamdik, wa ashhadu anal ilaha ila ant, wastaghfirooka wa 'atoobu elaik.

