

# Prophet mohammed

Religion



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

Response In agreement with the argument, the conflicts from way back when Prophet Mohammed died, over 1600 years ago. The Sunnis, whose current number of adherents goes way above 940 million, believe that the Prophet Mohammed never designated any successor and thus Abu Bakr, the father to the Prophet's favored wife, A'ishah, elected in Medina is the true successor of the prophet<sup>1</sup>. The Shia on the other hand, believes that Prophet Mohammed designated a successor who was his son in law, Ali Ibn Abi Talib. To concur more with the argument, the Sunnis have had a commanding influence in Iraq, getting the best education and controlling the state since then until the 2003 invasion by America. This was when one of the Shiites, Al Maliki, took over from Saddam Hussein and brought the Shi'a to the front line of leadership. Al Maliki however did not lead fairly as the functionaries of his regime were mainly made of Shi'a adherents.

I agree that the US did not actually favour the Shi'a though they may be due to the long conflicts between the two sides, found it necessary to have them holding all the leadership banners.

## Response 2

The argument that the intense conflicts between the Majority Shi'a adherents and the minority Sunni adherents, has been apparent since the death of Prophet Mohammed is correct. Both groups have been trying to rule over each other with violence and turmoil between them going back to when their two leaders were chosen.

In agreement with the argument also, the war between the Saddam Regime and the Shi'a actually fitted the definition of a civil war. The Shi'a, the Kurds and Sunnis all shared the state of Iraq with the Sunnis having more privileges compared to the majority Shi'a Muslims thus bringing eruptions of  
<https://assignbuster.com/prophet-mohammed/>

revolutions. The revolutions were however unable to shake the Saddam regime and thus the involvement of the United States.

During the invasion, however, the US did not take any sides and was trying to bring peace to the state. Saddam was the enemy but not the Shi'a community and on bringing him down, they even started forming coalitions with other Shi'a leaders. A good example is the case of Abul Abed from Amariyah<sup>2</sup>.

### Response 3

Each group believing that their rivals follow false leaders thus being betrayers of Islam has brought about the sectarian conflict between the Sunnis and the Shittes. For the faith to be cleansed, each believes that they must eradicate the other group completely. Therefore, the question whether they will ever reconcile is somehow already answered. However, they are all Muslims who believe that there is no other God but Allah, believe in the Koran and in the Prophet Mohammad, and will therefore seem to come together in case of a common enemy.

As stated, forging a common enemy towards the Islamic sects will bring them together but as soon as the threat is over, they will never allow themselves to be led by the other. They see each other as apostates<sup>3</sup>. One group believes that the Prophets son in law is the true leader while the other believes that the prophet's father in law is the true leader.

It does not matter that the two groups pray to the same God, their ideologies that date back to the demise of Prophet Mohammed will always bring them to conflicts.

### Bibliography

Greeley, Andrew M. A Stupid, Unjust, and Criminal War: Iraq, 2001-2007.

<https://assignbuster.com/prophet-mohammed/>

Maryknoll, N. Y.: Orbis Books, 2007.

Mason, Paul. Iraq. New York: Marshall Cavendish Benchmark, 2008.

Rodinson, Maxime and Anne Carter. Mohammed. London: Penguin Books, 1991.