

Karbala

**A glance from
another angle**

**Abu Muhammed
(MI) Ridhwan ibn Dawood**

Contents

Preface	6
<i>The need to review this aspect of Islamic history</i>	6
A crux of the entire discussion	8
Venturing deep into Karbala - A Dangerous yet vital step in obtaining a clearer picture of Islamic History	13
Irâq/Iran in the light of the narrations	15
What made Irâq and its inhabitants, i.e. the <i>majûs</i> (fire-worshippers) the centre of so much of evil?	21
The <i>Majûs</i> (fire-worshippers) of Persia	22
Ma'bad ibn Abdullâh Juhani (a leading figure of the Qadariyâh).....	28
The mischief of Irâqi hypocrites during the era of Hadhrat Umarؓ.....	31
The accusation against Hadhrat Amr ibn Al-Aasؓ, and the issue of <i>Tahkeem</i> (Arbitration).....	35
The status and principles of <i>Târikh</i> (Islâmic history)	47
The rise of the Khawârij	62
A glance at the hypocritical traits and filthy minds of the <i>Khawârij</i>	64
The martyrdom of Hadhrat Aliؓ.....	69
Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ and his era of rule.....	82
Jihâd during the era of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ.....	91

Fifteen noteworthy points.....	102
Karbala and its surrounding issues, facts or fiction	111
1) The assassination of Hadhrat Hasanؓ and the culprits behind it.....	111
2) Why did Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ appoint his son, Yazîd, as Caliph after him?	119
The opposition of a few illustrious Sahâbahؓ to the appointment of Yazîd and its reason	131
The death of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ and an end to a glorious period of rule	138
Criticism levelled against Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ with regards to his dealing with Hajar ibn Adiؓ.....	139
Only two issues.....	146
Caliphate and Mulookiyah (kingship).....	148
The reason for Hadhrat Huseinؓ standing up against Yazîd ibn Muawiyah	156
Fighting for the Caliphate, an issue of <i>Ijtihâd</i>	167
Muslim ibn Aqeelؓ and the betrayal by the hypocrites of Iraq	181
Mukhtaar ibn Abu Ubeid Al-Thaqafi a <i>dajjâl</i> (open liar) of this Ummah...	186
Prominent figures present in Kufa, at the time of Karbala	197
a) Hadhrat Nu'maan ibn Basheerؓ.....	198
b) Qadhi Shureihؓ.....	200

c) Muhammad ibn Ash'ath	202
d) Umar ibn Sa'd, the son of Hadhrat Sa'd ibn Abi Waqqâs.....	204
The journey to Karbala	208
Arriving at Karbala	213
Hadhrat Huseinؑ speaks.....	217
The battle of Karbala and its after-math	241
What really happened?	242
The battle itself.....	242
In the court of Yazîd	243
What happened when the news of the outcome of Karbala reached Yazîd?	243
The after-math of Karbala and the Battle of Harrah	252
Mukhtaar ibn Abu Ubeid Thaqafi, a dajjâl of this Ummah.....	270
The shia themselves admit their guilt	279
Summary	282
Conflicting views regarding Yazid.....	287
Ten points worth pondering over	327
A most unique and moderate stance adopted by Allamah Rashid Ahmed Ghangohi	338
Conclusion	340

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم
نحمده و نصلي و نسلم على رسوله الكريم

Preface

The issue of Karbala and the role that Yazîd had played therein has always been a contentious issue amongst the Ulema and the general masses. Much of what we know regarding this event is based upon historical narrations. These however can never serve the purpose of being a proof, owing not only to the weakness of the majority of its narrations, but also due to the existence of conflicting narrations as well.

Writing on this subject has never been deemed easy, since one must ensure that one maintains the utmost respect for the *Ahle-Bait* (immediate family of Rasulullâh'), while at the same time conforming to the demands of justice that have been required before pronouncing the 'guilty verdict' upon any party.

The need to review this aspect of Islamic history

As one reads further, whilst discussing the events of Karbala in the manner that has today become 'general knowledge' amongst the masses, if one scratches slightly at its surface, he shall find many questions surfacing for which there is apparently no answer.

He will then have the choice of either ignoring these questions and sticking to the version of Karbala which he grew up with, or of reviewing the entire incident in the light of the 'Quraan; The Sunnah; and Principles laid down for the acceptance of Historical Narrations.

Examples of questions that surface from the commonly explained version of Karbala are as follows:

- 1) It is generally understood that Hadrat Huseinؑ proceeded to Iraq to fight against the evil forces of Yazid in Iraq. What has unfortunately not been considered is that at the time of hisؑ going to Iraq, the governor of Iraq was a Sahabiؑ, Hadrat Nu'maan ibn Bashirؑ. The armies were under his command. What evil could they thus have been committing?
- 2) In the reasons that Hadrat Huseinؑ gave to the Sahabaؑ of Hijâz, whilst explaining the need for him to proceed to Iraq, heؑ did not even once make mention of Yazid drinking alcohol, fornicating, committing open evil, etc. All that heؑ mentioned was that the masses of Iraq had not pledged allegiance to the new caliph, Yazid, and were desirous of pledging allegiance to Hadrat Huseinؑ instead.
- 3) If Yazid was openly sinning in the court of the caliphate, why did the senior members of the Tabi'een of Shaam and Damascus not rise against him?
- 4) Even after the event of Karbala, Hadrat Nu'maan ibn Bashirؑ, a high-ranking Sahâbiؑ, remained at the side of Yazid as his chief-minister. Could it ever be possible that a caliph commits open atrocities, whilst a Sahâbiؑ remains quiet at his side?
- 5) The Sahabi, Hadrat Abdullâh ibn Ja'farؑ (the nephew of Hadrat Aliؑ) was also amongst the elite of Yazid's cabinet. Heؑ too did not ever criticize the caliph, despite viewing his actions from close-up.

- 6) Had Yazid been committing open evil in the court of the caliph, would it ever seem possible that senior Sahabaؑ would attempt to dissuade Hadrat Huseinؑ from proceeding forward? Nay, rather they too would surely have joined his caravan!
- 7) Had Yazid been committing open evil after becoming caliph, would it ever seem possible that Hadrat Abdullah ibn Abbâsؑ and Hadrat Abdullâh ibn Umarؑ would now pledge allegiance to him whereas during the lifetime of Hadrat Muawiyahؑ they had refused to do so? It would mean that when Yazid was good they abstained from pledging allegiance, but on his turning evil they accepted him with open arms! (Na-uu zu billah!)

These are just a few of the questions that arise when one views the issue of Karbala as has been generally understood by the masses.

And the point that disturbs one the most is that this version places a major taint upon the honour of many of the Sahabaؑ and Tabi'een of that era. One would surely find some doubt created regarding their integrity, that when Yazid was committing such open evil whilst on the seat of the caliph, how could they just sit back and take no action against him?

A crux of what follows

The version of Karbala that this book shall try to prove is as follows:

- Just as Hadrat Ayeshaؑ had been deceived by hypocrite factions into setting out for Basrah, in order to ensure that the killers of Hadrat Uthmaanؑ are brought to trial; and just as these very hypocrites launched the first attack in order to ignite

war between the parties of Hadrat Aliؑ and Hadrat Ayeshaؑ (in the Battle of Jamal) when both parties seemed on the verge of reaching a truce, so too was it with Karbala.

- Hadrat Huseinؑ was deceived by Iraqi hypocrites into proceeding towards Iraq, believing the countless letters that had reached him, with false promises that the masses of Iraq had not pledged allegiance to Yazid and were instead waiting for Hadrat Huseinؑ to come over to accept their allegiance.
- On the other side, Yazid was deceived into sending Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad over to Iraq, to replace Hadrat Nu'maan ibn Bashirؑ, after being made to believe that Hadrat Nu'maanؑ was displaying a weak attitude and was not strong enough to repel a possible rebellion.
- The son of Hadrat Sa'd ibn Abi Waqqaasؑ was finally sent out to prevent Hadrat Huseinؑ from entering Iraq, and to place himؑ under arrest, due to the misunderstanding that Hadrat Huseinؑ had come to instigate a rebellion against the new caliph.
- When Hadrat Huseinؑ explained that he had been misled into believing that the masses of Iraq had not as yet pledged allegiance to Yazid; and were desirous of pledging allegiance to himؑ instead, the son of Hadrat Sa'd ibn Abi Waqqaasؑ attempted to calm the situation by entering into negotiations with Hadrat Huseinؑ.
- When the hypocrites realized that Hadrat Huseinؑ was on the verge of himself proceeding to Yazid in order to settle the matter, they decided to attack immediately, as they had done in

the Battle of Jamal. The two parties, on the verge of reaching a truce, (i.e. the Iraqi army and the caravan of Hadrat Huseinؑ) were thus thrown into battle against each other, just as had occurred at Jamal.

- The very hypocrites who launched the first attack on the plains of Karbala left no stone unturned in ensuring that Hadrat Huseinؑ does not leave the plains of battle alive. Had they wished they could easily have merely arrested Hadrat Huseinؑ and his companions, but that would then have foiled their plans for re-igniting war amongst the Ummah.
- After the tragedy, these hypocrites wasted no time in spreading their concocted version of events to the far corners of the globe, and were very soon able to turn many cities against the government, which then led to the rebellion in Hijaaz, and the Battle of Harrah.
- Using the call of 'revenge for the Ahl-e-Bait' the efforts of the hypocrites of Islam continued, until it found effect about seventy years later, when a Persian-backed group tore down the Umayyad Caliphate, massacred the Umayyad families, and established in its place a new government, under the name of 'Abbaasi'.

Until today, the concocted version of Karbala is used, especially during the month of Muharram, by the hypocrite enemies of Islam, known as 'the shia', in order to anger the masses against those who 'did not' and 'do not' avenge the 'noble blood of Hadrat Huseinؑ', despite the fact that the **true** killers of Hadrat Huseinؑ were the very leaders of this hypocrite sect, with Mukhtaar ibn Ubeid Thaqafi, being in the forefront.

The calls of 'revenge for the Ahl-e-Bait' which we hear today, after the passing of hundreds of years from that fateful day of Karbala, is a mere shaitaani tool to win support for their filthy shaitaani beliefs, especially the belief that the entire Ummah betrayed the 'Ahl-e-Bayt', and it was only the shia who stood in their support. (Na uuzu billah!)

In the version that we shall attempt to prove, Insha-Allah, one shall find answers to many of the 'unanswered questions' that have always hung over the shia-promoted version of Karbala, and one shall gain some understanding of the depths that shia hypocrites have gone in fabricating historical narrations, in order to taint the honour of great personalities in Islam, and to provide support for their concocted, filthy beliefs.

Note: At no point, whilst reading this book, should one misunderstand that Hadrat Huseinؑ was wrong in proceeding to Iraq as a candidate for the caliphate. Nay, rather Hadrat Huseinؑ' s proceeding to Iraq was based upon a decision heؑ had reached, after consulting with those around him. Hisؑ decision was based upon Ijtihaad, for which Hadrat Huseinؑ shall receive tremendous rewards. There was nothing wrong that Hadrat Huseinؑ had done in this entire matter!

Yes, the liars that had invited himؑ over, they are the one's that shall taste the punishment of their deception. They are the one's to be blamed and they are the one's deserving criticism.

As for Yazid himself, since his personal life had nothing to do with Hadrat Huseinؑ' s setting out for Iraq, and since it has never been proven that he indeed ordered the killing of Hadrat Huseinؑ, it would indeed be a much more cautious approach to remain silent on his matter and leave it to Almighty Allah to decide, especially since one

finds numerous narrations that show an entirely different picture of Yazid.

Venturing deep into Karbala - A dangerous yet vital step in obtaining a clearer picture of Islamic History

Introduction to the topic

The death of Hadhrat Huseinؓ, which is commonly known as 'Karbala', was indeed one of the most tragic events in the history of Islâm, but not for the reasons which have generally been understood. If the grief over Hadhrat Huseinؓ's martyrdom was merely on account of hisؓ being martyred, then a question should surely arise as to why has this grief only been displayed over hisؓ death? Was the death of Rasulullâhؐ not a more tragic event? And if it is said that the extra grief is due to the cruel manner in which Hadhrat Huseinؓ was killed, then one could surely ask as to why such grief is then not displayed over the death of Hadhrat Uthmaanؓ.

In the pages that follow, an attempt has been made to delve deep into the episode of 'Karbala', in search of the many unanswered questions that revolve around this issue and in search of the true villains responsible not just for the death of Hadhrat Huseinؓ, but for the widespread chaos, bloodshed and anarchy that resulted therefrom.

By merely glancing at the battle itself and perhaps a few days prior to the battle, one gets exposed to only that portion of 'Karbala', which the hypocrites of Islâm have always attempted to bring forward, due to the support they acquire through it in achieving their sinister motives.

However, when this matter is studied carefully, keeping in mind the seventy years of Islâmic history that had preceded it; the era during which it occurred; the area in which it occurred; the people with whom it occurred; the reasons behind Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ appointing Yazîd as his vicegerent and the reasons which brought Hadhrat Huseinؓ over

to Irâq, when these issues are kept in mind, a new picture emerges, totally different from what had previously been entrenched in the minds of people.

Thus, in the first half of this book, various such issues shall be discussed, which, when pieced together in one puzzle, shall enable one to reopen an investigation into a fifty-year old conspiracy, which finally culminated with the catastrophe, known as 'Karbala'. Amongst these issues are:

- 1) Looking at Irâq/Iran and its inhabitants in the light of the Ahâdith
- 2) The propaganda of the hypocrites of Irâq against every leader in Islâm
- 3) The strength and status of historical narrations
- 4) The era of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ
- 5) Who assassinated Hadhrat Hasanؓ and why
- 6) Reasons behind Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ remaining insistent regarding the appointing of Yazîd as caliph

After the death of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, Hadhrat Huseinؓ set out for Irâq, with the hope of taking back the Caliphate from the Umayyad family. Hadhrat Huseinؓ chose Irâq as the base from where heؓ could launch his military campaign due to the numerous invitations and hundreds of letters heؓ had received from various parties in Irâq. Yet, upon his arrival, these parties disappeared from the scene, leaving Hadhrat Huseinؓ to the mercy of Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad and his forces. Why did all these parties disappear? Did they merely turn coward upon receiving news of the arrival of Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad, or was the reason behind their disappearing act based upon some other ulterior motive?

Could it be that the parties that had invited Hadhrat Huseinؓ over to Irâq were in fact hypocrites and shaitâni forces, plotting to reignite the flames of infighting within the Ummah, and to turn the masses against

their leaders, thereby ensuring that the Caliphate never remain stable? When one makes an in-depth study of the people of Irâq/Iran in the light of the Ahâdith of Rasulullâh ﷺ, and in the light of their history, prior to Islâm reaching their lands, this seemingly improbable notion becomes more and more probable.

The first part of this book shall thus deal with this subject:

Irâq/Iran in the light of the narrations

Hadhrat Abu Hureirah ؓ narrated that Rasulullâh ﷺ said:

رأس الكفر قبل المشرق¹

'The centre of kufr is towards the East'

Hadhrat Abdullah ibn Umar ؓ mentioned, 'I saw Rasulullâh ﷺ pointing towards the East and saying,

*'Trials shall come from there! Trials shall come from there!'*²

In an attempt to pinpoint the exact area intended in this narration, scholars have provided a few possibilities, but the one that has attracted the attention of the majority is **Irâq/Iran**, which includes Kufa, Basrah, Baghdad, Khuraasan, etc. This area was the capital of the Persian Empire and was famous as the stronghold of the *majûs* (zoroastrians). It was from this area that the majority of the early conspiracies against Islâm were planned.

The Ahâdith and statements of the Sahâbah ؓ and Tâbi'een which indicate that 'East' refers to the area of Irâq/Irân are many. From amongst them are the following:

¹ رواه مسلم

² عن ابن عمر رأيت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يشير نحو المشرق إن الفتنة ههنا إن الفتنة ههنا

(صحيح ابن حبان)

- Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umar ؓ narrated that he witnessed Rasulullâh ﷺ **pointing towards Irâq**, saying,

*'Listen well! Fitnah (trials and tribulations for the Ummah) shall come from there! (Rasulullâh ﷺ repeated this thrice.) It is there that the horn of shaitân shall rise!'*³

- Abdullâh ibn Umar ؓ narrate that Rasulullâh ﷺ once made dua for the land of Shâm and Yemen. When the Sahâbah ؓ asked for dua for Najd (a famous raised area of Irâq⁴), Rasulullâh ﷺ replied,

*'That is the area of tremors and trials, and it is there that the horn of shaitân rises/shall rise!'*⁵

In explaining the meaning of the rising of 'qarn-u-shaitân' (the horn of shaitân), scholars have mentioned various possibilities, viz.

- shaitân really has horns, and it is in this land that he rises / shall rise to make his attacks.
- It is metaphoric; referring to power, i.e. from this land shaitân's power shall spread.
- It refers to the army/helpers of shaitân, i.e. this area shall be their capital/headquarters.
- The word 'Qarn' refers not to 'horns', but rather to 'generation'. The meaning of the narration shall then be:

³ عن ابن عمر قال : رأيت رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم يشير بيده يؤم العراق ها ان الفتنة ههنا ها ان الفتنة ههنا ثلاث مرات من حيث يطالع قرن الشيطان (مسند احمد بسند صحيح)

⁴ قال الخطابي نجد من جهة المشرق ومن كان بالمدينة كان نجده بادية العراق ونواحيها وهي مشرق أهل المدينة (فتح الباري) وكل ما ارتفع عن تهامة إلى أرض العراق فهو نجد (عمدة القاري) قال الباهلي : كُلُّ ما وَرَاءَ الْخُنْدُقِ عَلَى سَوَادِ الْعِرَاقِ فَهُوَ نَجْدٌ (تاج العروس)

⁵ عن ابن عمر قال قال رسول الله : (اللهم بارك لنا في شامنا وفي يمننا) . قال قالوا وفي نجدنا ؟ قال قال (اللهم بارك لنا في شامنا وفي يمننا) . قال قالوا وفي نجدنا ؟ . قال قال (هناك الزلازل والفتن وبها يطالع قرن الشيطان) (صحيح البخاري)

'In this land, evil shall continue springing up. Every time one generation comes to an end, another shall rise.'

- Speaking of the Harûriyah (i.e. the Khawârij), Hadhrat Sahl ibn Huneifؓ explained that he had heard Rasulullâhﷺ saying, *'From there, (pointing towards Irâq), that group shall emerge who shall recite Qurân, but it shall not pass their throats (i.e. it shall not affect their hearts at all). They shall be exiting Islâm as an arrow leaves its bow.'*⁶

It was from this very area (i.e. Irâq and its neighbouring areas) that:

- a) the killer and the parties responsible for the assassination of Hadhrat Umarؓ came⁷
- b) the killers of Hadhrat Uthmânؓ⁸ came
- c) the battle of Jamal occurred in this area, i.e. near Basrah⁹, which was perhaps one of the greatest trials for the Ummah.
- d) the rise of the Khawârij occurred in this area. Many of the soldiers of the army of Hadhrat Aliؓ who participated in the

⁶ عن سهل بن حنيف سمعت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يذكر قوما يخرجون من ههنا وأشار بيده نحو العراق يقرؤون القرآن لا يجاوز حناجرهم يمرقون من الدين كما يمرق السهم من الرمية (مسند احمد بسند صحيح)

⁷ In the assassination of Hadhrat Umar, the names of four people came up, viz. Abu Lu'lu Firoz Al-Majûsi (the killer), Hûrmuzaan, Jufeina, and the son of Firooz. (Usdûl Ghâba)

The following text appears in Târikhul Islam of Hâfiz Zahabi :

عبد الرزاق، عن معمر، عن الزهري: أخبرني سعيد بن المسيب، أن عبد الرحمن بن أبي بكر ولم تجرب عليه كذبة قط قال: انتهيت إلى الهرمزان وجفينة وأبي لؤلؤة وهم نجي فتبعتهم، وسقط بينهم خنجر له رأسان نصابه في وسطه، فقال عبد الرحمن: فانظروا بم قتل عمر، فنظروا فوجدوه خنجراً على تلك الصفة

Abu Lu'lu and his son were both fire worshippers. Hûrmuzân, a famous leader of the Persians, accepted Islâm after being caught. Some have said that he was a good Muslim. Others felt he definitely played some part in the assassination of Hadhrat Umarؓ, since Hadhrat Abu Bakrؓ's son had seen him holding the knife the night before the killing. (And Almighty Allâh knows best)

⁸ وعن أبي جعفر القاري قال: كان المصريون الذين حصروا عثمان ستمائة: رأسهم كنانة بن بشر، وإن عديس البلوي، وعمرو بن الحمق، والذين قدموا من الكوفة مائتين، رأسهم الأشتر النخعي، والذين قدموا من البصرة مائة، رأسهم حكيم بن جبلة، وكانوا يداً واحدة في الشر (تاريخ الاسلام للذهبي)

⁹ وكانت الواقعة يوم الجمعة، خارج البصرة، عند قصر عبيد الله بن زياد (تاريخ الاسلام للذهبي)

battle of Siffîn (between Hadhrat Aliؓ and Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ) were from Kûfa (Irâq). After the battle, when a truce was finally reached, these soldiers showed their true colours by abandoning Hadhrat Aliؓ, and settling in the area of Harûrah (a district of Kûfa). Their abandoning Hadhrat Aliؓ at this stage clearly showed that their purpose behind the war was never to establish justice, but rather to keep the Ummah fighting amongst each other. This group became famous as the Khawârij, regarding whom Rasulullâhﷺ had many years previously warned the Ummah about, saying¹⁰:

'From the East there shall emerge a sect, whose Jihâd, Salâh, and fasting shall amaze all, but in reality they shall be exiting from Islâm as an arrow exits from the bow, (i.e. with great speed). Amongst them shall be a man whose forearm shall bulge out as the breast of a woman. The group at that time, which is closest to the truth, shall stand up against them!'

Hadhrat Aliؓ, after witnessing the emergence and rise of this sect, which in a short span of time had reached numbers of up to twelve thousand, waged a severe war against them, and with the Divine Aid of Almighty Allâh, destroyed their backbone. At the end of the battle Hadhrat Aliؓ even sent his soldiers in search of the one who had been described by Rasulullâhﷺ. After an extensive search he was located hidden under some dead corpses. He was dragged in front of Hadhrat Aliؓ, affording all the opportunity to see the truth of the words of Rasulullâhﷺ.

¹⁰ إن طائفة تخرج من قبل المشرق عند اختلاف من الناس ، لا ترون جهادكم مع جهادهم شيئا ، ولا صلاتكم مع صلاتهم شيئا ، ولا صيامكم مع صيامهم شيئا ، يمرقون من الدين كما يمرق السهم من الرمية ، علامتهم رجل عضده كئدي المرأة ، يقتلهم أقرب الطائفتين من الحق فسار علي إليهم ، فافقتلوا قتلاً شديداً ... وفيها "فقال : ابتغوه ، فطلبوه ، فلم يجدوه فركب علي دابته وانتهى إلى وهدة من الأرض ، فإذا قتلى بعضهم على بعض ، فاستخرج من تحتهم ، فجر برجله يراه الناس" (رواه إسحاق بن راهويه بسند صحيح - اتحاف الخيرة)

- e) the martyrdom of Hadhrat Aliؑ occurred in Kûfa, and those behind the assassination were all from the Khawârij sect¹¹, whose roots were in Irâq.
- f) The martyrdom of Hadhrat Husseinؑ, known as the incident of Karbalâ, occurred in Irâq. The murderers and the ones who had plotted his death and brought him over were all from Irâq. The first claims of the shia were made by a jew who portrayed himself as a revert to Islâm, viz. Abdullûh ibn Saba (also known as Ibn Saudah). Although he came from Yemen, the area he chose for laying the foundation of his false creed was none other than Irâq (Kûfa and Basrah) and Egypt¹².
- g) The rise of the jabariyâh occurred in Irâq/Irân. The leader of this sect was Jahm ibn Safwân¹³, who studied under Ja'd ibn Dirham¹⁴ in Basrah. Jahm was from Khurâsân (Irân), and in the forefront of the call to overthrow the rule of the Banu Ummayyah.
- h) Irâq was the birthplace of the sect known as the qadariyâh. The first recorded claims regarding the denial of Taqdîr came from Ma'bad Juhani in Basrah.¹⁵

¹¹ انتدب ثلاثة نفر من الخوارج : عبد الرحمن بن ملجم المرادي وهو من حمير وعداده في بني مراد وهو حليف بني جيلة من كندة . والبرك بن عبد الله التميمي وعمرو بن بكر التميمي . فاجتمعوا بمكة . وتعاهدوا وتعاقدوا ليقتلن هؤلاء الثلاث علي بن أبي طالب ومعاوية وعمرو بن العاص (اسد الغاية - علي بن ابي طالب)

¹² فلما قدم عبد الله بن سبأ البصرة نزل على حكيم بن جيلة، واجتمع إليه نفر، فنفت فيهم سموه، فأخرج ابن عامر عبد الله بن سبأ من البصرة، فأتى الكوفة فأخرج منها، ومن هناك رحل ابن سبأ إلى القسطنطينية ولبث فيه وجعل يكتبهم ويكتبونه، ويختلف الرجال بينهم، وذكر الطبري أن السبئية لما قرروا الزحف من الأمصار على مدينة الرسول صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم كان عدد من خرج منهم من البصرة كعدد من خرج من مصر (العواصم من القواصم - قول علي أن الخارجين على عثمان حساد طلاب دنيا)

¹³ الجهمية: تنسب الجهمية إلى الجهم بن صفوان من أهل خراسان ومولى لبني راسب، تتلمذ على الجعد بن درهم وكان كاتباً للحارث بن سريح، الذي أثار الفتن ضد الدولة الأموية في خراسان، وكان جهم يقرأ سيرته ويدعو إلى توليته، ويحرص الناس على الخروج (الدولة الأموية عوامل الإزدهار وتداعيات الإنهيار المؤلف: علي محمد محمد الصلّائي)

¹⁴ J'ad 'coincidentally' happened to be the first person to voice the filthy opinion that the Qurân-e-Majîd is a created word.

¹⁵ عَنْ يَحْيَى بْنِ يَعْمَرٍ قَالَ: كَانَ أَوَّلُ مَنْ قَالَ فِي الْقَدْرِ بِالْبَصْرَةِ مَعْبُدُ الْجَهْنِيِّ (معارج القبول بشرح سلم الوصول)

- i) The rise of Mukhtâr ibn Ubeid Thaqafi (the liar,) occurred in Kufa. Claiming to take revenge from the killers of Hadhrat Huseinؑ, he had thousands of innocent men, women and children slaughtered. He even laid claim to being a recipient of revelation¹⁶. The brother of Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeir, viz. Musab ibn Zubeir finally had him killed.
- j) The killing of thousands of leading scholars of the Tâbi'een at the hands of Hajjâj ibn Yusuf Thaqafi occurred in Irâq.
- k) The home of the qarâmita was Persia¹⁷. This sect was regarded as perhaps the worst sect of the shia, famous for their massacre of the Hujjâj and their abduction of the Hajar-e-Aswad in the year 317 A.H. for a period of about twenty-two years.
- l) The issue known as *Khalqul-Quraan* (the claim that the Qurân is created) was spearheaded by a man from the qarâmita, Bishr ibn Ghayyâth Al-Marîth. In fact, as recorded in Al-Bidâyah¹⁸, the first person to raise this issue was Ja'd ibn Dirham (of Khurâsân -Irân). He learnt it from Bayân ibn Sam'ân, who learnt it from Tâlût (the nephew and son-in-law of Labîd ibn Asam, the jew who practiced black magic upon Rasulullâhؐ). Tâlût learnt it from his father-in-law, Labîd, who learnt it from a jew of Yemen.

Summarising the conspiracies, the trials, and the evils that arose from this area, Hadhrat Moulâna Sayyid Suleimân Nadwiؒ wrote in *Sîratun Nabi*, the summary of which is:

¹⁶ (المختار بن أبي عبيد) الثقفي الكذاب، الذي خرج بالكوفة، وتبع قتلة الحسين يقتلهم. قال النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم: يكون في ثقيف كذاب ومبير فكان أحدهما المختار، كذب على الله وادعى أن الوحي يأتيه، والآخر: الحجاج (تاريخ الاسلام للذهبي)

¹⁷ وفيها تحركت القرامطة وهم فرقة من الزنادقة الملاحدة أتباع الفلاسفة من الفرس الذين يعتقدون نبوة زرادشت ومزدك، وكانا يبيحان المحرمات (البداية و النهاية)

¹⁸ قال ابن عساكر وغيره: وقد أخذ الجعد بدعته عن بيان بن سميعان، وأخذها بيان عن طالوت ابن اخت لبيد بن أعصم، زوج ابنته، وأخذها لبيد بن أعصم الساحر الذي سحر رسول الله (صلى الله عليه وسلم) عن يهودي باليمن، وأخذ عن الجعد الجهم بن صفوان الخزري (البداية)

‘When one makes a deep study of history one seems to get the feeling that almost every astray sect and every major trial and evil that arose against Islâm somehow had its roots in the land of Irâq!’

It should however not be understood that Irâq produced nothing but filth. Rather, to confront the evil that continuously arose from Irâq, Almighty Allâh brought forth from that very land such giants of Islâm that in every era broke the backbone of these fitnas. On account of these luminaries, the land of Irâq was regarded as one of the major centres of Islâmic knowledge during the era of the Sahâbaؓ, Tâbi’een and for many years thereafter.

What made Irâq and its inhabitants, i.e. the *majûs* (fire-worshippers) the centre of so much evil?

The inhabitants of Irâq, before being conquered by the Muslims, were mainly ‘*majûs*’ (fire worshippers). In the Ahâdith one finds clear mention that just as the *majûs* (fire-worshippers) were responsible for much of the attacks made upon religion in the previous Ummahs. So too shall it be in this Ummah.

Rasulullâhؐ warned most emphatically,

لكل أمة مجوس¹⁹

‘For every Ummah there have been Majûs, i.e. worshippers of the fire.’

¹⁹ حدثنا علي بن عبد العزيز ثنا حجاج بن المنهال ثنا معتمر بن سليمان حدثني علي أبو الحسن رجل من أهل واسط ثنا جعفر بن الحارث عن يزيد بن ميسرة عن عطاء الخراساني عن مكحول عن أبي هريرة قال قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم (لكل أمة

Due to another hadith, which has been narrated on a similar pattern, i.e. ‘*Verily for every Ummah there is a test!*’²⁰, the explanation of (‘*verily for every Ummah there are majûs!*’) that comes to mind is, that just as how in every Ummah there have been ‘*majûs* (worshippers of the fire) that stood in the frontline of evil, ensuring that ‘the truth’ never spreads, so too shall it be in this Ummah, irrespective whether they expose themselves as open *majûs*, (i.e. fire/devil-worshippers/satanists, etc) or they hide behind the mysterious names of ‘illuminati’, ‘free-masons’, etc)

The *Majûs* (fire-worshippers) of Persia

The basic principles of the religion of the *majûs*, (Zoroastrianism, named after ‘Zoroaster’) at the outset appears quite similar to that of Islâmic belief, i.e. they believe in and worship a mighty Being that had created the entire universe, a Being that is good and rewards good. Their only difference is that together with this they also believe in a separate deity of evil, also uncreated, whose mission is to create chaos, mischief, etc. Ultimately the Diety of Good shall triumph, thus their worship is directed solely towards it, and they hold nothing but enmity and hatred for the God of evil.

Until this point, nothing about them appears so significant, that could have necessitated the mention of ‘*for every Ummah there are majûs*’, since their only error was their attribution of evil to another Being, whereas in Islâm the Creator of both good and evil is one, whilst the shayâtîn are mere instruments utilized for the creation of evil. When only so much is understood regarding their faith, one in fact finds it

مجوس ومجوس هذه الأمة القدرية لا تعودوهم إذا مرضوا ولا تصلوا عليهم إذا ماتوا (قال المحقق حمدي بن عبد المجيد والحديث رواه ابن أبي عاصم في السنة والآجري في الشريعة والدولابي والحديث صحيح لشواهده ²⁰ إن لكل أمة فتنة (رواه أحمد)

difficult to understand why so many of them refused to accept Islâm, since the difference between the two faiths hardly appears major.

But when one looks deeper and understands which Being, according to them, is good and which is bad, which shall triumph and which shall fail, at that point the reality of this faith comes to the fore.

Majûs (Zoroastrians) turn towards a flame while praying. At the heart of a Zoroastrian place of worship burns a fire and where possible the fire burns continuously, symbolizing 'an eternal fire', 'a fire that shall always remain high'.

According to them fire represents the spiritual flame within us, and through fire are the ethical values of order, beneficence, honesty, fairness and justice created. As long as the temporal, outside fire remains burning high, till then shall the inside fire stay lit. Creation is a result of the 'fire!' A famous sentence in their set of beliefs is, 'God did not create the heavens and earth with dust and water, but rather with fire!' Fire is a source of light, and, in their understanding, light represents wisdom, while darkness represents ignorance. The passing of Zoroastrian ideas and values from one person to the next is symbolized by a new flame being lit from an existing one, or by a flame being passed from one person to the next.

To simplify it further, when Iblîs refused to prostrate to Nabi Aadamﷺ, it was merely because of jealousy, since he felt himself alone worthy of being vicegerent on earth. When he saw this honour being passed on to one created from dust he could not control his enmity, and vowed to prove that not only shall fire remain supreme over man, but that man himself shall bow to the service of fire, hold it high, and himself become its slave.

When Zoroastrians speak of the god of good, they are not at all referring to Almighty Allâh, but rather to Iblîs, their god of fire, known

to them as 'the god of wisdom, justice, and order'. As for the god who is not of fire, (i.e. Almighty Allâh) that, according to them, is a god of darkness, intent on spoiling all the good of this world and the next; an evil God, who hates man; a god that shall eventually be destroyed. (Na'ûzubillah)

Many are mistaken into believing that the *majûs* (Zoroastrians) worship fire. Rather, they worship a 'being' whose symbol is 'fire', and thus direct their worship towards it.

As for the birth of Zoroastrianism, it is believed to have commenced in Southern Russia almost four thousand years ago. Its adherents then migrated south into Eastern Iran. Around the eight century BCE, the Persians and the Medes of Western Iran also adopted the religion. When the Persians conquered Babylon, they took the religion with them into Southern Mesopotamia (modern-day Irâq and a few surrounding areas).

The concept of New Year's Day comes from a Zoroastrian festival known as Naw Rauz (New Year's Day) which is celebrated every year around March 21 at the Northern Spring Equinox. In fact, many aspects of present-day Christianity hail from the rituals of the Zoroastrians, since Constantine, the king who carved out much of modern-day Christianity, was a Zoroastrian disciple, who had hypocritically accepted Christianity in order to ruin it from within.

Zoroastrians worship none other than Iblîs himself, and it is this ideology of theirs towards which the burning flame in the hand of the statue of liberty indicates, and it is this ideology which is shown world-wide in the opening ceremony of the Olympics, i.e. 'the Fire shall always remain high'.

This is the reason why they could never accept Islâm, since the Almighty of the Muslims is the one they detest the most, and the accursed Iblîs is the one they revere the most.

Another interesting feature of these people is that they would prefer lighting their fire on high open areas, mountains or hill tops, etc. and their worship ceremonies would be officiated by the 'Magi' (legendary Zoroastrian priest). Add to the word 'Magi' a few extra letters and you are left with 'Magician', with 'cian' meaning 'ancient.'

The role of the 'Magi' would be to ensure that the fire never dies. Households would come to the fire-house, which the Magi would man, to light their own fires. Since they gave their lives to the 'Fire' it was only natural that the 'Fire' (Iblîs and his shaytânî forces) would reward them for their services, but their reward would only be superfluous, just as how today's Ashkenâzi jews, freemasons, etc, are rewarded.

Through the rewards offered by their false deity, the fame of the Magi spread beyond the borders of Iran. They were found to be unsurpassed in their knowledge of philosophy, history, geography, plants, medicine and events regarding the heavens. Their high moral standing, their wisdom, their ability to heal the sick and their years of learning made them legendary throughout the Middle East .

A particular feature of the Magi was their habit of always wearing the Taylasaan (Tayâlisa – a Persian shawl, which shall be discussed further) over their shoulders. The other amazing dress feature of the Magi was that they would have their faces covered, just as how today satanists cover their faces when in their temples.

Their mighty empire was known as the Sassanid Empire, and they were known during the era of the Sahâbaﷺ as Banu-Saasaan. Islâm first penetrated Sassanid territory when Hadhrat Khalid ibn Walidﷺ invaded what is presently known as 'Irâq', and the battle of Qâdisiyah,

which followed three years later, under Hadhrat Sa'd ibn Abi Waqqâsﷺ, led to the permanent end of Sassanid control of West Iran.

Finally in the year 644 (A.C) the mighty Sassanid Empire was brought permanently to the ground, with its emperor just managing to save his life, by fleeing to China. At the time of the death of Hadhrat Umarﷺ, almost the whole of the South Caucasus (the entire region of the Persian Sassanid Empire) was captured. The Persian War ended with the conquest of Balkh. Beyond that lay what was known as the lands of the 'Turks' and still further lay China.

After the assassination of Hadhrat Umarﷺ, at the hands of a Persian slave,²¹ almost the entire Sassanid empire, at various intervals, tried rising in rebellion, being spearheaded by their emperor, who had returned from China to co-ordinate the rebellion. These rebellions finally ended with the death of the emperor himself, killed by one of his own people, a miller, trying to snatch his purse. These rebellions clearly showed that many of the Zoroastrians were never going to be happy with Islâmîc rule.

Long before the invasion of Persia had even began, Rasulullâhﷺ mentioned that Kisra, the Persian emperor, had been destroyed and there would be no real Kisra after him, i.e. their empire was on the verge of collapsing. In fact, at the time of the birth of Rasulullâhﷺ, the Persian emperor had seen a dream in which he was shown that their empire shall only see twelve more emperors. In the era of Hadhrat

²¹ According to some historians, and this was the view of the son of Hadhrat Umarﷺ himself, as well as a few of the Sahâbaﷺ, the assassination of Hadhrat Umarﷺ was not merely a result of a verdict that had been passed by Hadhrat Umarﷺ regarding the slave, Abu Lu'lu Al-Majûsi, but was rather the result of a well-planned Persian plot to assassinate their most-hated conqueror (i.e. Hadhrat Umarﷺ), with Harmozân, a Persian leader, who had only accepted Islam after being caught, being at the center of the plot.

Umar ؓ this became a reality and the mighty satan-worshipping empire (known as the Persian Empire) collapsed.

Due to many of the inhabitants of this empire having enjoyed years of close contact with the shayâtîn, it was obvious that not everyone was going to accept Islâmic rule. Some satanists fled to neighbouring Zoroastrian countries, whilst others, upon the instruction and guidance of the shayâtîn above them, disguised themselves as believers and hypocritically entered into Islâm, merely so that they could launch their attack against Islâm from within, as Paul, Constantine and others had done with the religion of Nabi Isa ؑ. Due to their satanic empire being destroyed, the attack of the majûs (satanists) against Islâm would now be through 'taqiyyah' (concealing their true identity), and 'nifaaq' (hypocrisy).

Thus, when Rasulullâh ﷺ spoke of the *majûs* (fire worshippers/satanists) that shall operate in this Ummah, he ﷺ did not speak of a non-Muslim party, that shall openly worship the fire and believe in two dieties, but rather of a group that shall appear in Muslim garb and with a pious outlook, but shall have kufr beliefs lurking deep within their bosoms.

Their mission shall be the same as the majûs (fire-worshippers) that preceded them, except that their method of operation shall be different. Their attack shall be from within, which shall make it all the more dangerous, and the targets of their attack shall be innocent believers, who shall be deceived by their apparent piety, acts of worship, and profound knowledge.

Discussing the *majûs* of this Ummah, Rasulullâh ﷺ said:

ومجوس هذه الأمة القدرية لا تعودوهم إذا مرضوا ولا تصلوا عليهم إذا ماتوا

*The majûs of this Ummah are the Qadariyâh!
If they fall sick, do not visit them, and if they pass away, do not
perform their janaazah salaah!*

This group, labelled as the 'Qadariyâh' due to their strange beliefs regarding 'taqdeer' (pre-destination) appeared towards the end of the era of the Sahâbah ؓ and thereafter spread into about twenty-two different groups. The salient feature of this sect was their denial or their creating doubts with regards to the divine creed of *taqdîr*. Speaking of their different groups Ulema have listed the following:

واصلية وعمرية والهديلية والنظامية والاموارية والعمرية والشمالية والجاحظية والحايظية والحمارية والخياطية
والسحامية واصحاب صالح قبة والمويسية والكعبية والجباية والبهشيمية المنسوبة الى أبي هاشم ابن
الجباي في ثنتان وعشرون فرقة

Regarding the evil of this sect, many narrations have been recorded from Rasulullâh ﷺ wherein the order was given to completely disassociate from these people. For this reason, the Sahâba ؓ would even refuse to reply to the salaam of these people.

A mere glance at one of the leading figures of this sect, viz. Ma'bad Juhani, shall enable one to easily dissect this group and see through their guise of deception. Through the brief description of Ma'bad, that shall now be provided, there is hope that much shall be understood regarding the hypocrites that operate within Islâm, the strength of their propaganda, and the power and support they enjoy from all other shaitân circles.

**Ma'bad ibn Abdullâh Juhani
(a leading figure of the Qadariyâh)**

Amongst the first to raise issues with regards to *taqdîr* was Ma'bad ibn Abdullâh Juhani, from Kufa (Iraq). He portrayed himself as a man of

piety, ibâdah, and a reliable narrator. He was known to always frequent the gatherings of Hadhrat Hasan Al-Basri. He narrated Ahâdith from many of the Sahaba رضي الله عنهم. After his fame had spread to quite an extent, he began denying the concept of taqdîr, and spreading confusion amongst the masses of Basrah.

When Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umar رضي الله عنه was informed of his actions, he issued the following verdict regarding Ma'bad and others who followed his thought of mind:

فإذا لقيت أولئك فأخبرهم أني بريء منهم وأنهم براء مني والذي يحلف به عبد الله بن عمر
لو أن لاحدهم مثل أحد ذهباً فأنفقه ما قبل الله منه حتى يؤمن بالقدر (مسلم)

'If you meet them again, inform them that I have nothing to do with them. By Allâh, if any of them spends gold equal to Mount Uhad in charity, Almighty Allâh shall never accept it, until he believes in taqdîr.'

Ma'bad later on proceeded towards Madinah Munawwara and attempted spreading his filthy beliefs there. He was so persistent on his view that he was ready to die for it. The Caliph, Abdul Malik ibn Marwân finally had him executed on account of his kufr beliefs.

Amongst the people who learnt from him and strove to spread his false claims was Ghailân of Damascus. After being threatened by Umar ibn Abdul Aziz رضي الله عنه with execution he drew back, but on the death of Umar ibn Abdul Aziz رضي الله عنه he again emerged. The Caliph, Hishâm ibn Abdul Malik, later had him executed.

Regarding Ma'bad, the words of Hadhrat Hasan Al-Basri most adequately describe his reality:

إياكم ومعبدا فإنه ضال مضل²²

'Be aware of Ma'bad. He is astray and leading others astray.'

The actual reason behind Ma'bad holding so firm to his false belief, and the true identity of the people from whom he learnt this filth shall perhaps never be known with certainty, but one fact that stands out in his history, as well as the history of the innovators of the three main astray groups of Islâm, viz. the Shia, the Khawârij and the Jahmiya, is that they were all from Iraq.

Ma'bad's execution brought an end to his life, but his false beliefs continued spreading through the different sects that surfaced thereafter. Some of the Qadariyâh would deny *taqdîr* completely, claiming man has full control of his affairs, whilst others would claim that man has no control and will, whatsoever.

The views of the Qadariyâh, despite facing the opposition of the Sahâbah رضي الله عنهم and the most learned of the Tâbi'een, continued spreading, and over twenty sects of theirs became notorious. The Mu'tazila, Jahmiya, etc. who later arose would adopt from their claims and thus share many similarities with the Qadariyâh.

What caused the false beliefs of one man to spread so fast and to such a great extent? Why did it not stop spreading with his death? What caused others to share the same conviction and fervour as Ma'bad? Could it be that the source from which Ma'bad had acquired his training was still alive, preparing others to do the same? Could it be that great, evil powers were behind the sect known as the Qadariyâh, as well as being behind the rise of the Khawârij, the Shia, and the Jahmiyâh? Could it be that sinister forces within Irâq were behind the initial conspiracies against Islâm, or do you feel the views of Ma'bad were just based on a thought that occurred to him, for which he and those who came after him, were ready to lay down their lives?

After reading just a little regarding the life of Ma'bad and the influence he had in spreading the creed of the Qadariyâh, does the possibility now not seem strong that Ma'bad, the Qadariyâh and all the other

sects that arose thereafter, from Irâq and surrounding lands, were nothing but satanic groups working in the guise of pious Muslims?

Due to having such sinister groups operating within Irâq/Iran and its surrounding areas, these areas would continuously cause mischief and plot to weaken the foundation of the Islâmic Caliphate. Their mischief began as soon as Islâm entered their borders, i.e. during the era of Hadhrat Umarؓ and peaked during the rule of Yazîd ibn Muâwiyah.

Amongst the mischief caused by these trouble-makers was their habit of laying complaints and branding false accusations against practically every leader appointed over them. Many unfortunately are only aware of the complaints they had laid against Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ and his son, Yazîd, whereas if one were to scrutinize the amount of times complaints came from this region and how each time it proved to be false, one would surely be more cautious regarding accepting or lending an ear to any of the accusations of the people of Irâq.

A brief summary of some of their accusations shall now follow, whereby one may understand the manner of their propaganda. An important point that should be noted from the following is that their accusations would be spread with great expertise, as though they were masters in the field of propaganda. For this reason, despite the amount of times that their claims would be proven false, Muslim leaders would still feel compelled to lend a slight ear to their new claims and thus send out teams to investigate.

The mischief of Irâqi hypocrites during the era of Hadhrat Umarؓ

Hadhrat Sa'd ibn Abi Waqqâsؓ (the conqueror of Irâq and one of the ten given the glad tidings of Jannah) was appointed over the people of

Kufa in the era of Umarؓ. Within a short space of time, complaints began reaching Hadhrat Umarؓ regarding various aspects of his public and private life. They even complained regarding the quality of his Salaah! Hadhrat Umarؓ thus had him removed from his post and appointed Hadhrat Ammaar ibn Yaasirؓ in his place.

Hadhrat Umarؓ thereafter summoned Hadhrat Sa'dؓ and questioned him regarding the allegations levelled against him. When asked about his Salaah he responded, 'By Allâh, I lead them in Salaah in the manner taught to me by Rasulullâhﷺ, without the slightest deviation. I lengthen the first two Rakaats of the Esha and shorten the last two. Hadhrat Umarؓ expressed great happiness at his answers and remarked, 'I thought as much!'

A delegation was also sent to Kufa to enquire from the locals regarding Hadhrat Sa'dؓ and to see how many disliked his rule. To the amazement of the delegation not a single Masjid could be found supporting these allegations. Rather the people had nothing but praise for Hadhrat Sa'dؓ. They finally met one man by the name of Usâmah ibn Qatâdah. He stood up and said, "Since you are asking in the name of Allâh, I feel obligated to speak. Sa'd does not take part in military expeditions; he does not distribute the spoils of war fairly, and he is not just in his rulings!"

When Hadhrat Sa'dؓ came to know of what he had said, he remarked, 'I shall make three duas. O Allâh, if this man is lying and is merely trying to gain fame, then lengthen his life, lengthen his poverty, and let him fall into great calamities!' Thereafter, whenever this man would be asked regarding his condition he would reply, 'Old and in great difficulty. I have been afflicted with the curse of Sa'd!'

Abdul Malik ibn Umair mentioned, 'I have personally seen this man, with his eyebrows drooping over his eyes due to old age. He would interfere with young girls and poke them as they passed by. (Bukhâri/Muslim)

Hadhrat Ammar ibn Yaasirؓ was appointed in the place of Hadhrat Sa'd ibn Abi Waqqâsؓ. Within a short period of time, complaints against this most noble Sahâbiؓ began reaching Hadhrat Umarؓ from various quarters of Kufa. Amongst the accusations levelled against this Sahâbiؓ was that he was incapable of fulfilling his duties and he was not trustworthy! (Na'ûzubillah)

So many complaints reached Hadhrat Umarؓ regarding him, as though the entire Kufa had turned against him. Hadhrat Umarؓ thus summoned him to Medina Munawwara. A group set out with him on the pretence that they would stand in his defence, but when he reached Medina Munawwara he found them worse than the people he had left behind. They complained that Hadhrat Ammaarؓ was incapable of fulfilling his responsibilities, knew nothing of politics, and was totally unaware of what role he had been appointed to fulfil. On seeing their hatred for their leader, Hadhrat Umarؓ felt it best to remove Hadhrat Ammaarؓ from his post.

Hadhrat Umarؓ thereafter enquired as to whom they would prefer as a leader. They nominated Hadhrat Abu Musa Ash'ariؓ. Hadhrat Umarؓ acceded to their request. Within a year from the appointment of Hadhrat Abu Musaؓ the complaints began again. As the complaints intensified Hadhrat Umarؓ sent an order that Hadhrat Abu Musaؓ step down from his post and had him re-appointed in Basrah.

Hadhrat Umarؓ, despite his unique talent in ruling and recognising the talent and qualities of others, found himself confused as to how he

could sort out the affairs of the people of Kufa. He complained to those around him:

إِنَّ أَهْلَ الْكُوفَةِ قَدْ عَضَلُونِي (الكامل)

The people of Kufa have rendered me helpless!

He also said, 'What is wrong with this group of one hundred thousand, that they are not content with any Amîr, nor can any Amîr live happily with them? After deep thought and consultation with those around, Hadhrat Umarؓ asked Hadhrat Mughîra ibn Shu'bahؓ to take up residence in Kufa as its governor. Hadhrat Mughîraؓ remained governor over Kufa until the death of Hadhrat Umarؓ. Just before the death of Hadhrat Umarؓ, due to complaints received, Hadhrat Umarؓ made a decision to appoint Hadhrat Sa'd ibn Abi Waqqâsؓ once again over the people of Kufa. This decision was regarded as part of his bequest and carried out after his demise. Hadhrat Mughîraؓ remained governor of Kufa for just over two years.

In the place of Hadhrat Mughîraؓ, Hadhrat Sa'd ibn Abi Waqqâsؓ was re-appointed. The poisonous environment of Kufa and its surrounding areas however could never allow any leader to stay in peace. Soon after heؓ too was removed and replaced with Walid ibn Utbah. Walid had been a governor from the time of Hadhrat Abu Bakrؓ and at the head of numerous conquests in the era of Hadhrat Umarؓ. Until his appointment in Irâq, he had never been found guilty of any wrong.

Amazingly, as with many leaders before and after him, it was only the people of Irâq who would find something wrong with him. Through the efforts of this unique group of Irâqis he was finally brought to court accused of drinking liquor and being a *fâsiq* (an open transgressor).

The testimony of the Irâqis would always appear strong, thus the Caliph would be hesitant in rejecting their word. On the same note however he would neither be too keen to accept it, knowing well that accusations from the people of Irâq had always proven to be false.

These Irâqis exhibited no shame in leveling accusations, and had no regard for any personality. People generally only know of the accusations they had leveled against Yazîd, the son of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, branding him an adulterer, a drunkard and even an apostate. The fact of the matter is that they spared none from their poisonous tongues. Yazîd was not the first accused of being evil and unjust. This accusation had already been levelled against Hadhrat Sa'd ibn Abi Waqqâsؓ. Yazîd was not the first branded as a drunkard. Walid ibn Utbah was accused with the same. Yazîd was not the first accused of adultery. This accusation had already been levelled against Hadhrat Mughîra ibn Shu'baؓ.

The people of Irâq, as Hadhrat Umarؓ had rightly said, left no leader exempt from their accusations and false propaganda. However, certain individuals were selected to receive the worst that their tongues could offer. Amongst them were Hadhrat Uthmaanؓ, Hadhrat Mughîra ibn Shu'bahؓ, Hadhrat Amr ibn Al-Aasؓ, Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, Yazîd, and in recent times, the last Caliph of the Islâmic world, Sultân Abdul Hamid.

The accusation against Hadhrat Amr ibn Al-Aasؓ and the issue of *Tahkeem* (Arbitration)

The incident of *Tahkeem* (Arbitration) is one that is well-known amongst scholars. Unfortunately, the details of this incident have been mixed with many filthy, poisonous lies, and propagated with such

strength, that for many it has become a fact-beyond-question. In the version that the persian/jewish-satanists ensured gets propagated, one finds a blatant attack being made upon the honour and noble character of Hadhrat Amr ibn Al-Aasؓ, an illustrious companion of Rasulullâhؐ, a Sahâbiؓ who had the honour, after accepting Islâm, of being invited by Rasulullâh' to all major consultations, and only after hearing his opinion would Rasulullâhؐ make a decision.

Unfortunately, due to the effort made behind the propaganda regarding him, many good Muslims and even certain scholars have become doubtful of his sincerity. Certain individuals have even gone to the extent of labelling him as a traitor, a liar, a deceiver and a cunning fox. (Na'ûzubillah!)

Before proceeding further, it would be appropriate to first shed some light on the issue of *Tahkeem*, an arbitration that was carried out by Hadhrat Abu Musa Ash'ariؓ and Hadhrat Amr ibn Al-Aasؓ, (the conqueror of Egypt), to solve the dispute which had occurred between Hadhrat Aliؓ and Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ and thus bring an end to years of in-fighting which had (according to what has been narrated) already claimed the lives of over seventy thousand believers, a figure which even the wars against the mighty persian and roman empires had not managed to produce.

When the battle of Siffin²³ was brought to an abrupt halt, each party was asked to send an arbitrator to discuss the situation and find a solution to end the bloody conflict that had begun with the death of

²³ A huge battle, in which Hadhrat Aliؓ and the people of Irâq fought against Hadhrat Muawiyahؓ and the people of Shaam, due to Hadhrat Muawiyahؓ not being prepared to pledge allegiance to Hadhrat Aliؓ, as long as the killers of Hadhrat Uthmaanؓ were not brought to trial and punished.

Hadhrat Uthmaanؓ. Hadhrat Aliؓ sent Hadhrat Abu Musa Ash'ariؓ and Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ sent Hadhrat Amr ibn Al-Aasؓ.

The details generally given for what occurred during the arbitration process are as follows:

- Hadhrat Abu Musaؓ and Hadhrat Amr ibn Al-Aasؓ met, discussed the matter in great detail and finally decided to remove both Hadhrat Aliؓ and Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ from their posts and leave the Ummah to then choose someone else for the Caliphate.
- When the time came to make this announcement, Hadhrat Amr ibn al Aasؓ requested Hadhrat Abu Musaؓ to address the crowd first. Hadhrat Abu Musaؓ, after praising Almighty Allâh and sending salutations upon Rasulullâhؐ announced that he had decided to remove both Hadhrat Aliؓ and Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, and leave the Ummah free to elect a new leader.
- After stepping back, Hadhrat Amr ibn al Aasؓ came forward and contrary to what had previously been decided, announced that he agrees with Hadhrat Abu Musaؓ as far as removing Hadhrat Aliؓ from his post is concerned. As for Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, it is his decision to keep him in his post.
- When Hadhrat Abu Musaؓ heard this he became furious and a heated argument broke out between the two. The two parties returned to their leaders, informing Hadhrat Aliؓ of his removal from the seat of Caliphate, and giving Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ the glad tidings of becoming Amîrul-Mumineen.

- When the party of Hadhrat Aliؓ was informed of the decision, a huge number of them broke away from his party and put up their tent at a place known as Harurâ. This group became known as the Khawârij. Dissatisfied with the decision made by the arbitrators, they branded Hadhrat Aliؓ kâfir (disbeliever) and began making terrible attacks on his followers, going to the extent of cutting open the bellies of Muslim women, while still alive. Hadhrat Aliؓ made great attempts to bring them back under his authority, but when all efforts failed, he launched a severe attack upon them, which resulted in their almost total annihilation.

These are the details which are generally in the minds of those who have a little knowledge of Islâmic history, due to man's quick perusal through the books of history, without any concern of what is authentic and what is not, what is acceptable and what is not, what could be considered as probable and what could not.

Again, with just a little pondering over the above, keeping in mind the principles laid down for the acceptance of historical narrations, with the honour and integrity of the Sahâbaؓ being at the prime, one shall quickly realise that much of the details of the above account are nothing but lies propagated by satan-worshipping persians, posing as soldiers in the armies of both parties.

A few of the events mentioned above, which obviously cannot be correct shall be listed below, intended merely as a guide, knowing full well that a thorough investigation of the incident shall surely result in more and more lies coming to the fore.

First lie regarding the Tahkeem: *The Khawârij were angered by the deceit of Amr ibn al Aasؓ*

It has generally been understood that the Khawârij broke away from Hadhrat Aliؑ due to their dissatisfaction with the ruling of Hadhrat Amr ibn al Aasؑ, whereas the reality is that they had expressed their anger and dissatisfaction with Hadhrat Aliؑ from the very beginning, i.e. from the time they were informed that both parties had agreed to arbitration. Thus their anger was never with the decision made by the arbitrators, rather it was with the fact that the Muslim Ummah had brought an end to the in-fighting, which had already resulted in the deaths of thousands.

These filthy people were never going to accept any decision made by the arbitrators, since disunity within the Ummah was their prime objective. The basis of their entire mission was to divide the Ummah and they were well aware that arbitration would burst their balloon. Criticizing the decision made by Hadhrat Amr ibn al Aasؑ, and portraying him as a deceitful, cunning politician was done merely to formulate a better excuse for their breaking away from Hadhrat Aliؑ.

The proof of this is what has been narrated in Al-Bidâyah that when the decision was made to allow Hadhrat Abu Musa Al-Ash'ariؑ and Hadhrat Amr ibn Al Aasؑ to arbitrate in the matter of the Ummah, Ash'ath ibn Qais was sent to inform all of this decision. When he came to the tribe of Banu Tamîm and read the message to them, Urwah ibn Uzainah stood up angrily and shouted out, 'How dare you allow 'man' to decide in the matters of religion! Only Almighty Allâh is the One who decides!' Urwah then swiped his sword towards Ash'ath, but missed, with the blade landing on the behind of the horse of Ash'ath.

The division in the army of Hadhrat Aliؑ began after this event, with thousands separating themselves and camping at the area known as Harûriyah. The evil perpetrated by this band finally compelled Hadhrat

Aliؑ to raise his sword against them, whereas just a few months ago, they formed a major part of his army.

In reality it was this very group that were behind the assassination of Hadhrat Uthmaanؑ and the wars of Jamal and Siffin. Until that moment they had been operating in the guise of noble men, constantly in prayer and recitation of the Qurân. At this point in history their guise was thrown off, and their identity exposed. Rasulullâhﷺ warned the Ummah of this hidden threat and heؐ himself had mentioned that the first time the identity of these hypocrites shall be exposed is when they shall rebel against Hadhrat Aliؑ.

Exactly as predicted by Rasulullâhؐ, this filthy group of hypocrites surfaced and as predicted, were halted in their tracks and brought to their heels by Hadhrat Aliؑ and his faithful companions, but only after having wreaked great damage in the Ummah. After the war, when someone remarked that the hypocrites have now been eradicated, Hadhrat Aliؑ corrected him saying that this group shall in fact continue re-surfacing till the end of time, with its sole mission being to halt the progress of Islâm and the Muslim Ummah.²⁴

Anyway, the actual purpose of mentioning the above is to show that irrespective of what decision the arbitrators would make months later, this group of hypocrites were never going to accept it, since their sole desire was to keep the Ummah divided, fighting amongst themselves.

During the incident of *Tahkeem* (arbitration), neither did Hadhrat Abu Musa Ash'ariؑ make a cowardly decision, nor did Hadhrat Amr ibn al

²⁴ عن حبة العرنى قال لما فرغنا من النهروان قال رجل والله لا يخرج بعد اليوم حروري أبدا فقال علي مه لا تقل هذا فوالذي فلق الحبة وبرأ النسمة إنهم لفي اصلاب الرجال وارحام النساء ولا يزالون يخرجون حتى تخرج طائفة منهم بين نهري (الدجلة و الفرات) حتى يخرج إليهم رجل من ولدي (لعله الامام المهدي) فيقتلهم فلا يعودون أبدا (تاريخ بغداد لاحمد البغدادي)

Aasؓ deceive. Rather their gathering brought a halt to years of infighting which had already claimed the lives of close to one hundred thousand. The only group angered by their decision was that of the hypocrites and it was these very people who would later disfigure the entire issue of *Tahkeem* (arbitration) and have historians record it with their fabricated versions.

Second lie regarding the *Tahkeem*: *Hadhrat Abu Musaؓ and Hadhrat Amr ibn al Aasؓ had discussed the matter in privacy, but Hadhrat Amrؓ, later lied regarding the decision they had reached.*

Narrations show that many Sahâbaؓ and prominent men were present at the meeting between Hadhrat Abu Musa Ash'ariؓ and Hadhrat Amr ibn al Aasؓ, and that each detail of the meeting was recorded on paper. How then could it ever be possible for Hadhrat Amr ibn al Aasؓ to lie in front of the entire crowd, gathered to hear the decision, without a single person, from those present standing up at that moment, or even after, and explaining to both parties that his announcement was not true.

The purpose of arbitration was to unite both parties, with both parties accepting the decision taken by the man they had elected to decide on their behalf. If Hadhrat Amr ibn al Aasؓ had lied, why then did Hadhrat Abu Musa Ash'ariؓ not just say so. The words of Hadhrat Amr ibn al Aasؓ could never demand the obedience of the army of Hadhrat Aliؓ. Rather, that which Hadhrat Abu Musaؓ would decide for them, only that would they regard as binding and necessary to accept.

In arbitration matters the possibility of 'deception' does not arise, since each party shall only listen to the words of its own member!

Third lie regarding the *Tahkeem*: *Both parties had initially agreed on removing both Hadhrat Aliؓ and Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ from their posts and to leave the Ummah free to choose their Caliph.*

Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ had until now never made a claim of being the Caliph. He himself had repeatedly said that when the killers of Hadhrat Uthmaanؓ would be brought to trial, he would be the first to pledge allegiance to Hadhrat Aliؓ. When Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ had never laid a claim for the Caliphate, what then would be the need for Hadhrat Amr ibn Aasؓ and Hadhrat Abu Musa Ash'ariؓ to decide to remove both and let the Ummah choose a new leader!

He who was never in a post, how does one remove him from that post?

It would not even be correct to say that perhaps what is meant is that he be removed from his position as governor over Shâm, because the words attributed to Hadhrat Abu Musaؓ and Hadhrat Amrؓ clearly state they wanted to remove both, so that the Ummah could again decide who should rule over them. In an islâmic state it is only the Caliph that rules over all. As for the governors, they shall remain governors only as long as the Caliph allows, thus they have no rule of their own. To remove a governor would have no significance, since his post depends upon the Caliph. If the new Caliph would choose to keep him, he would remain. If the new Caliph would choose to dismiss him, he would be dismissed.

A different scenario of the *Tahkeem* (arbitration) has been narrated in the Musannaf of Abdur Razzaq as well as in the *Târikh* of Tabari, with a much stronger chain of narrators (sanad). In this narration clear mention is made that after agreeing upon choosing a new Caliph, Hadhrat Abu Musaؓ presented the name of Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn

Umarؓ as a suitable candidate, but Hadhrat Amrؓ did not agree. Thereafter, Hadhrat Amrؓ presented the name of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ as a suitable candidate for the Caliphate, but Hadhrat Abu Musaؓ did not agree. Both parties then separated, since they could not agree upon a new Caliph. Had there been any truth to the normally-famous version that they had initially agreed to remove both Hadhrat Aliؓ and Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ from their posts, what then would be the reason for Hadhrat Amrؓ presenting the name of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ to Hadhrat Abu Musaؓ as a suitable candidate for the Caliphate? After agreeing on firing one, would one ever present that same person's name as a candidate for the position one had just fired him from?

The sanad of this narration is indeed much stronger than all the other narrations describing the *Tahkeem* (arbitration), thus to ignore it would truly be a great injustice to the field of proper research. The narration, as recorded by Abdur Razzaq, narrating from Abdullâh ibn Ahmad, narrating from his father, Imâm Ahmed ibn Hanbal, narrating from Suleiman ibn Yunus, narrating from Zuhri, is as follows:

فلما اجتمع الحكماء وتكلموا قال عمرو بن العاص يا أبا موسى رأيت أول ما نقضى به من الحق أن نقضى
 لأهل الولاية بوفائهم وعلى أهل الغدر بغدرهم قال أبو موسى وما ذاك قال أليس تعلم أن معاوية وأهل الشام
 قد وفوا وقدموا للموعد الذي واعدناهم إياه قال بلى قال عمرو اكتبها فكتبها أبو موسى
 قال عمرو يا أبا موسى أنت على أن نسمي رجلاً يلي أمر هذه الأمة فسم لي فإن أقدر على أن أتابعك فلك
على أن أتابعك وإلا فلي عليك أن تتابعني
 قال أبو موسى أسمى لك عبد الله بن عمر وكان ابن عمر فيمن اعتزل قال عمرو إني أسمى لك معاوية بن
 أبي سفيان (المصنف لابن عبد الرزاق)

In this narration a completely different picture has been painted, quite contrary to what is normally mentioned with regards to a great Sahâbi lying and deceiving, an act which even the pagan Arabs would not do!

The above-mentioned text forms only a small portion of a lengthy narration, the crux of which is that when the time appointed for 'The Arbitration' drew near, the parties representing Hadhrat Aliؓ and Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ arrived at the selected spot, known as Daumatul-Jundal. A special invitation was sent to Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umarؓ, who had kept himself aloof from the conflict, and Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeirؓ to attend and help the Ummah reunite. The invitation was accepted, and these two luminaries, accompanied by many of their friends and students, also presented themselves at the meeting. Nothing was decided in privacy. The discussions that took place between Hadhrat Amrؓ and Hadhrat Abu Musaؓ were witnessed by many. In fact, Hadhrat Amrؓ ensured that all important points and issues on which consensus had been reached were written down.

The first major decision upon which consensus was reached was that the present Caliph steps down from his post, affording the Ummah the opportunity to unanimously choose a leader. The problem however arose when it came to choosing a new Caliph. Hadhrat Abu Musa Ash'ariؓ proposed the name of Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umarؓ, which Hadhrat Amr ibn al Aasؓ was not prepared to accept. Hadhrat Amr ibn al Aasؓ then proposed the name of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, which Hadhrat Abu Musa Ash'ariؓ would not accept. The two parties thus separated without the arbitration proving successful.

(In this narration there is absolutely no mention of Hadhrat Amr ibn al Aasؓ deceiving or lying. Had the issue of preference been solely the strength of this narration over all the other narrations regarding the

'Tahkeem', that would have indeed been sufficient for it alone to be considered and all conflicting narrations be left aside. However that is not the case. Besides the fact that this narration is backed up with a much stronger chain of narrators, there are many other factors also which demand it be given preference and placed above all other conflicting narrations. Amongst those factors are the following:

- a) This narration refutes the accusation laid against Hadhrat Amr ibn al Aasؓ that he won the arbitration through deceit and blatant lies. Arguments and harsh words on many occasions occurred between the Sahâbaؓ, since they were all children of the same household, i.e. they were all from the illustrious fraternity of the Sahâbaؓ and were not bound to those laws of respect which we have been commanded to observe for the Sahâbaؓ. Princes, in the court of the king, may criticize, argue and even fight against each other, but dare any man from out of the royal family attempt to slap a prince or merely look at him with contempt! The Sahâbaؓ, due to the fervor each one had for establishing the truth, would many a time issue a harsh word against his fellow Sahâbi brother, but never would he dare lie or deceive.

The hearts of the Sahâbaؓ, as mentioned in Quraan, have already passed the tests of Imaan. The purity of their hearts had received certificates from the highest of quarters, i.e. from Almighty Allâh himself. Only that mind which has not as yet understood the strength of Almighty Allâh's declaration of purity could ever conceive such hearts to still be stained with filthy, hypocritical traits of deceit, lies, etc.!

Hadhrat Amr ibn al Aasؓ occupied a most prominent position amongst the Sahâbahؓ. After his accepting Islâm, Rasulullâhﷺ included him amongst his selected confidants, with whom heؓ would consult regarding all matters of importance. During the eras of Hadhrat Abu Bakrؓ, Hadhrat Umarؓ, and Hadhrat Uthmaanؓ, heؓ played a leading role as a leader in the conquests of prominent areas like Egypt, Al-Aqsa, etc.

Could any sane mind ever imagine a Sahâbiؓ of this calibre concluding his chapter in the glorious history of Islâmîc heroes with an act of deception and that too, not just deceiving a few individuals or friends but rather the entire Ummah, the illustrious Sahâbaؓ around him and all those who until that time had viewed him as a true leader and hero of Islâm?!

Could any sane mind ever imagine a Sahâbiؓ of this calibre concluding his chapter in the glorious history of Islâmîc heroes causing untold harm to the cause of Islâm, that Islâm for which he had on so many occasions thrown himself towards the tips of poisonous swords without any concern for his life?! Na'ûzubillah! The Sahâbaؓ were men of true purity and piety and Hadhrat Amr ibn al Aasؓ was from amongst the elite of this illustrious fraternity.

- b) Logically also, deception from the side of Hadhrat Amr ibn Aasؓ can never be conceived possible. The reason being that he only played the role of one member from a panel of two, chosen to arbitrate between two major forces. Even if he lied as to what had been agreed between him and Hadhrat Abu Musa Ash'ariؓ, his lie would hold no effect, since the party of Hadhrat Aliؓ would obviously only accept as true what Hadhrat Abu Musaؓ would report.

c) History itself shows that the arbitration never led to the appointment of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ as Caliph. Rather, after the assassination of Hadhrat Aliؓ, Hadhrat Hasan ibn Aliؓ was chosen as caliph and it was he who then handed the caliphate over to Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ. What then was the purpose of Hadhrat Amr ibn al Aas deceiving and lying to Hadhrat Abu Musa Ash'ariؓ and what did it achieve? The only logical answer would be that there was no deception and no lie. Both parties attempted choosing a new caliph, but they were unable to reach any consensus. The two parties thus returned to their lands, without agreeing upon a new leader.

Despite no agreement being reached, fighting between the parties did however come to a halt, due to a pact made soon thereafter between Hadhrat Aliؓ and Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, with each promising not to launch any attack on the land of the other. Irâq would be the land of Hadhrat Aliؓ and Shâm would be the land of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ.²⁵

The status and principles of *Târikh* (Islâmic history)

This discussion has become quite lengthy, whereas it was only intended as an example of how the enemies of Islâm have distorted so many historical narrations with their poisonous propaganda. In fact, many a time one shall find an extremely weak narration being given more prominence and being more well known than all other narrations

^{٢٥} (وفي هذه السنة) فيما ذكر جرت بين علي وبين معاوية المهادنة بعد مكاتبات جرت بينهما يطول بذكرها الكتاب على وضع الحرب بينهما ويكون لعلي العراق وللمعاوية الشام فلا يدخل أحدهما على صاحبه في عمله بجيش ولا غارة ولا غزو قال زياد بن عبد الله عن أبي إسحاق لما لم يعط أحد الفريقين صاحبه الطاعة كتب معاوية إلى علي أما إذا شئت فلك العراق ولي الشام وتكف السيف عن هذه الأمة ولا تهريق دماء المسلمين فعل ذلك وتراضيا على ذلك فأقام معاوية بالشام بجنوده يجيها وما حولها وعلى بالعراق يجيها ويقسمها بين جنوده

on the topic, despite their chains of narrations being stronger and their being closer to the demands of the Shariah and logic.

The reason for this is that man is prone to remember and accept that which is oft-quoted, without much consideration to its authenticity. Even if one were later to be shown a more reliable narration, he would brush it off as fabricated, merely on the basis that it conflicts with what he has already been taught.

However it should never be felt that due to the lies and poison hidden within historical narrations, the entire subject of Islâmic history has now been rendered useless and without any purpose. This is not at all the case. Islâmic history plays a vital role in understanding many aspects of Islâm and it serves as a unique tool to cultivate the awe of Islâm in one's heart, to create awareness within one of the plots of Iblîs and his armies and teaches one the modus operandi of the enemies of Islâm.

Understanding the status of Islâmic history, its level of authenticity, and the manner in which it should be utilized, is essential if one desires re-opening the pages of history and delving deep into the episode of Karbala. Thus before proceeding to the discussion regarding the era of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ and the reasons for his selecting Yazîd as his vicegerent, it would seem appropriate to shed some light on the principles of the study of Islâmic history.

For this, the gist of two articles shall be mentioned, one as a footnote in Arabic²⁶, written by the great scholar of Islâm, Allâmah Zâhid

²⁶ Allahmah Zahid Al-Kauthari, after making great research into the incident which occurred between Hadhrat Khalid ibn Walidؓ and Malik ibn Nuwaira, in which Hadhrat Khalidؓ was accused of having him unjustly killed, felt it appropriate to shed

some light on the reality of historical narrations, especially when it deals with influential men, and more especially when it deals with men from the Glorious eras of the Sahaba رضي الله عنهم and Tabieen. This advice was thus rendered in a booklet, titled the gist of which is as follows:

و امثلُ مَنْ كَتَبَ في السَّير من رجال الصدر الاول موسى بن عَقبَة , و عليه يَعمَلُ البخاريُّ , و قد اثنوا عليه خيراً , الا أنَّ رواياته عن ابن شهاب , و قد ذكر الاسماعيليُّ الحافظ (بصيغة التمريض - الكاتب) انه لم يسمع منه شيئاً , و ابن شهاب تغلب عليه المراسيلُ في باب السَّير و المغازي , و مراسيله شبه الريح عند ابن القطان و الشافعي.

و اما ابن جرير الطبريُّ صاحب "التاريخ" فجليل القدر في الحديث و التفسير و الفقه , و لكنه لم يضمن صحَّة ما اورده في "تاريخه" بل قال في (١: ٥) فما كان في كتابي هذا مما يستكره قارئه أو يستشيعه سامعه , من اجل انه لم يعرف له وجهاً في الصحَّة و لا معنى في الحقيقة فليعلم انه لم يؤت من قبلنا , و انما أتني من قبل بعض ناقله البنا , و انما أدنا ذلك على نحو ما أدَّي البنا" و قال هناك ايضاً "اذا لم نقصد بكتابنا هذا قصد الاحتجاج ... " فهذا يعلم انه تبرأ من عهدة رواياته في "التاريخ" و حملها على اكتاف رواتها له

و محمد بن اسحاق صاحب "المغازي" اختلف فيه اهل النقد , و قد كذبه كثير منهم , و كان ابو حنيفة و مالك لا يرضيان به , و من قواه في المغازي اشترط في رواياته شروطاً لا تتوفر في مواضع الريبة , و الجمهور على تقويته في المغازي بشروط معروفة , و روايات مثله يجب التروى فيها و لو بالنظر الى رجال الاسانيد اليه , فراوته : زياد البكائي مختلف فيه , ضعفه النسائي و تركه ابن المديني , و قال فيه ابو حاتم: لا يحتج به. و روايته الآخر : سلمة بن الفضل الرازي مختلف فيه ايضاً , يقول عنه ابو حاتم : لا يحتج به. و روايته سلمة هذا : هو محمد بن حُميد الرازي , مختلف فيه , و قد كذبه كثيرون أشنع تكذيب , و بطريقه يسوق ابن جرير روايات ابن اسحاق.

و اما هشام بن محمد الكلبي و ابوه و الواقديُّ فالكلامُ فيهم معروف و اما رواية الوليد بن مسلم : محمد بن عائذ الدمشقي فيقول عنه ابو داود : هو كما شاء الله (و هو ثناء عليه) و اما سيف بن عمير التميميُّ صاحب كتاب "الردة و الفتوح" فمتروك الحديث عند ابي حاتم , و قد ضعفه غير واحد , بل رماه ابن حبان بالوضع . و الراوي عنه شعيب بن ابراهيم من المجاهيل عند ابن عدي و الذهبي , و له اخبار فيها تحامل على السلف. و الراوي عن شعيب هذا السريُّ بن يحيى , غير مؤثق , و هو شيخ ابن جرير في رواياته عن سيف. و اما من فوق سيف من الرجال فمجاهيل في الغالب.

فاذا كانت اسانيد ابن جرير في السَّير كما ذكرناه تعيّن وجوب التحري في رواياته في السَّير لا سيما في مواضع الانفراد , فضلاً عن وجوب ذلك فيمن هو دونه في العلم من حملة السَّير. فاليقويي (صاحب "البلدان") شيعي متحامل , و ابو الفرج الاصبهاني

Kauthari رحمته الله عليه, which shall prove extremely beneficial to the Ulema; and the other of Hadhrat Mufti Muhammad Shafee' Uthmâni Sâhib رحمته الله عليه, which was intended as a foreword to a book Hadhrat had compiled at the end of his life, in refutation to the many who were relying upon historical narrations in passing judgement and leveling criticism against the illustrious Sahâbah رضي الله عنهم and those that came after them.

Hadhrat Mufti Sâhib رحمته الله عليه writes²⁷:

'It has been explained above that it is not correct to judge the noble Sahâba رضي الله عنهم, their personalities and to stipulate their rank, based only on historical narrations. This is because they hold a special position in the light of the Qur'ân and Sunnah because of their being the medium between Rasûlullâh صلى الله عليه وسلم and the Ummah. History does not have such a rank, based on which this status could be lowered or increased. The meaning of this can never be understood to be that the science of history is totally unreliable and useless (the need and importance of it in Islâm will be clarified later), but the reality is that belief and reliance has various stages.

صاحب "الاغاني" من رجال الاسمار , لا من مصادر صحيح الاخبار , كان يأتي بأعاجيب ب "حدثنا و أخبرنا" , و قد اتهم , قال التوحيدي: كان اكذب الناس . (تمت)

(و قال في مقام آخر) و قد قلت في مقال لي : انه لا يخفى على الباعث مبلغ سعي اعداء الاسلام في كل دور , و وجوه تجدد مكرهم في كل طبقة , فمن ألوان مكرهم في عهد تدوين الروايات اندساس أناس منهم بين نقلة الاخبار , متلفعين بغير ازيائهم لترويج اكاذيب بينهم ممّا يشوّه سمعة الاسلام و سمعة القانمين بالدعوة الى الاسلام , فراجت تلك الاكاذيب المدبرة على نقلة لم يؤتوا بصيرة نافذة , فخلدوها في الكتب , حتى ظل الكائدون يتذرعون بها في كل قرن للكيد بالاسلام , لكن الله سبحانه اقام ببالغ فضله جهابذة تصغ الموازين القسط لتعرف الأنباء الصافية العياري , من نبهرج الاخبار , فأصبحت تعاليم الاسلام و أنباء الاسلام في جزر أمين من دس الدسائس عند من يعرف أن يزن بها بتلك الموازين. (من عبر التاريخ)

²⁷ The translation of Hadhrat Mufti Muhammad Shafi' Sâhib's booklet has been done by Mufti Abdullah Mulla Sâhib of Dârul Ulûm, Azaadville, titled: 'The Rank of The Sahâbah رضي الله عنهم'. The paragraphs quoted above have been copied directly from the English translation.

In Islām, the level of belief and reliance that is placed on the Qur'ān and Mutawātir Ahādīth, that level of belief has not been placed upon the general Ahādīth. The rank of the statements of the Ṣaḥābah ؓ is not that of the Ahādīth of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Similarly, the rank of the belief and reliance on historical narrations is not the same as that of the Qur'ān, Sunnah or statements of the Ṣaḥābah ؓ proven through an authentic chain of narration.

If a hadith is found to be in (apparent) contradiction to the text of the Qur'ān, then it will be compulsory to interpret it (make ta'wīl) and if the interpretation is not understood, then it will be compulsory to leave that Hadith out. Similarly, if a historical narration contradicts anything proven in the Qur'ān and Sunnah, then it will be left out or it will be compulsory to interpret it, no matter how reliable and dependable that narration is in historical terms.

This grading of reliability and dependability does not lower the honour and importance of a science, but it enhances the Sharīah and the honour of its laws, such that the highest level of reliability and dependability will be necessary in order to prove them.

THE IMPORTANCE OF HISTORY IN ISLĀM

It is sufficient to gauge the importance of history in Islām from the fact that history and stories is one of the five important sciences of the Noble Qur'ān. The Noble Qur'ān gives special importance to explaining the good and bad conditions of the days of before and of past nations. However, the Noble Qur'ān has a unique style of explaining history and stories. Instead of mentioning the story in sequence, it divides the story and narrates it together with other subjects. Also, the story is not mentioned just in one place, but the Qur'ān repeats the story in various places.

Through this unique method, the importance of history as well as its objective is clarified, i.e. the lessons behind each incident. Islām has taught special etiquettes in the writing of history and has also stated that history, merely as a subject, has no real value. History becomes valuable only when one takes lesson from it.

After pondering over the treasure of Ahādīth and the Sīrah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, one shall find the entire treasure to be a history of the speech and actions of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. When people began narrating incorrectly and fabricating Ahādīth, the need arose for the history of the narrators to be known, in order to protect the Ahādīth. The imāms of ḥadīth placed great importance upon this. Sufyān Thaurī رحمه الله said that when narrators began to lie, we used history to oppose them.

That part of history, which deals with narrators of Ahādīth, (regarding whether they are reliable or not) has been given great importance in the science of hadith. It even received a separate name, i.e. Asmā' ur Rijāl (The Names of Narrators).

The scholars of the Ummah who have objected and classified the criticism of narrators to be backbiting were only referring to those cases where the criticism went beyond the limits of the Sharīah; where finding fault and disgracing the person without need and necessity became the objective; or where there was no justice and balance exercised in the grading of a narrator.

Just as the muḥaddithīn felt the need to scrutinize the narrators, at the same time they placed a number of necessary conditions in order to keep this work within the limits of the Sharīah. These have been explained in detail by Ḥāfiẓ Abdur Raḥmān Sakhāwī رحمه الله in his book: الاعلام بالتوبيخ لمن ذم التاريخ.

In this book, he has mentioned that the first condition for levelling criticism is that the intention of the criticizer be correct. The intention should never be to expose a fault of a narrator or to disgrace him, but rather the objective should be well-wishing and the protection of the Aḥādīth.

Secondly, this work should only be done regarding that person who has a link to the narration of a ḥadīth; or in the case where one would be saved from harm due to the criticism levelled. If this is not the motive, then remember, it is no work of Dīn to make spreading the faults of someone a past time.

Thirdly, a scholar should only suffice on the minimum required in this field, which is that a particular narrator is weak, unreliable or he fabricates narrations. Extra words that point out a fault should be avoided. Whatever is said must only be said after thorough investigation and research.

In summary; that part of history that deals with the protection of ḥadīth, i.e. criticizing the narrators, jarḥ and ta'dīl, explaining their biographies, etc, forms part of those necessary sciences upon which the preservation of the Aḥādīth of Rasūlullāh ﷺ depends.

As for that part of history, which has generally been referred to as 'history', which discusses all major events which occurred from the time the universe was created until present times, the incidents of the Ambiyā ﷺ, the lives of rulers and kings, revolutions in the world, wars, victories, etc, these incidents, have been narrated from generation to generation and some have come down in book form. Before Islām, this was nothing but a collection of stories, incidents and tales, which had no verification and none ever bothered regarding checking its authenticity.

Islām was the first to make clarification and research into the authenticity of the narration necessary. The Noble Qur'ān says,

إِنْ جَاءَكُمْ فَاسِقٌ بِنَبَأٍ فَتَبَيَّنُوا (الحجرات)

If a sinful person brings you a report, verify its correctness.

Those who recorded the teachings of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, his speech and actions adopted this special method and made more than one science through which the ḥadīth of Rasūlullāh ﷺ was protected. Principles were also formulated for other matters that were narrated. In the general history of the world that Muslims compiled, these principles were considered as far as possible.

Muslims were the ones who afforded history the standing of being a proper and reliable science. Muslims taught the world to write history and to verify it. The scholars of the Ummah had scrutinized the narrations of the incidents of the Ambiyā ﷺ and then the Aḥādīth. Not only did they separate truth from falsehood, but also they established stages from highest to lowest in the true and reliable narrations.

They separated the part of history that dealt with Aḥādīth, i.e. Asmā' ur Rijāl, and made it a part of the science of ḥadīth. They also paid special attention to writing general history, the history of countries and kings, the history of various parts of the world and its geography.

There are great Imāms of Aḥādīth and tafsīr, scholars and jurists, etc, who have written regarding the history of the Ummah. Thousands of small and big books were written, from which it is proven that this history also has a status in Islām.

In the first 40 pages of his book, Ḥāfiẓ Abdur Raḥmān Sakhāwī رحمه الله mentioned the virtues and benefits of history in detail, in the light of the statements of the scholars and wise men. The greatest and most

comprehensive benefit is to derive lesson; to realize the temporary nature of this world by pondering over the rise and fall of nations; to create consciousness of the great power of Allāh ﷻ and to become aware of His bounties and blessings through the biographies of the Ambiyā ﷺ and the pious; and to inculcate within one the importance of staying away from disbelief and sin, by taking lesson from the evil end of the disbelievers and sinners.

Despite this science having so many benefits and virtues, none have ever afforded this science the status that the beliefs of Islām and laws could be drawn from it. No one ever afforded it such a status that historical reports could be used as proof in the laws of halāl and harām. Historical reports are not regarded as effective in those laws for which there is a need for Sharī proof. In addition, there is no path for historical reports to create doubt in any of the laws that have been proven from the Qur'ān, Sunnah, Ijmā or Qiyās.

The reason for this is that, although Islāmic history is not baseless tales, without a chain of narration. However two matters cannot be overlooked when studying history and when using it for one's objective. Those who overlook these two matters will use history incorrectly and will fall into the trap of many deviated groups.

The first matter is that the Ahādīth of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, i.e. his speech and actions which the Sahāba ﷺ have heard or seen, was a trust which they understood had to be conveyed to the Ummah. They thus paid special attention to every utterance and action of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, and ensured that it remain preserved in their minds and hearts, as far as possible.

Besides this, the intense love that the Sahāba ﷺ had for Rasūlullāh ﷺ was such that they were not even prepared to let the water he ﷺ used for wuḍū' fall to the ground; they would rub it on their faces and chests. When they would protect the hair that separated from the body of

Rasūlullāh ﷺ and his old clothing more than their own lives. How could it ever be fathomed that they would not give due importance to protecting the Ahādīth of Rasūlullāh ﷺ?

The immense love of the Sahāba ﷺ spurred them to protect his ﷺ every word and to care for his every ḥadīth, more than even their own lives. Almighty Allāh, for the protection of the words of His beloved messenger ﷺ, created a most noble group, possessing angelic qualities, numbering more than a hundred thousand, all with one mission, i.e. to ensure the protection and propagation of the speech and actions of a single personality, Rasūlullāh ﷺ.

This privilege was not accorded to anyone before Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Even if one were amongst the greatest of kings, then too no one would ever have the concern to listen to every word of his, attentively, remember it and propagate it to others. The incidents of kings, conditions of countries and places, and the changes of times are definitely studied and heard with interest, but who has the concern to remember them properly and propagate them as well? Therefore, historical incidents and narrations can never have the same status as that of Ahādīth!

Rasūlullāh ﷺ was commanded to propagate the Qur'ān and the teachings of Risālat (known as the Ahādīth) throughout the world and to the coming generations, until the Final Hour. For this purpose, Almighty Allāh blesses him' with such companions, who were filled with his' love and honour. Together with this, Rasūlullāh ﷺ made it the obligation of every Sahābī ﷺ to convey whatever aspect of dīn they heard or saw from Rasūlullāh ﷺ to the Ummah.

Then too, the danger remained, that when propagating a law, or when narrating from one person to the next, it could easily happen that a mis-quote would occur, or that a man could misunderstand a statement and narrate it according to his misunderstanding. To ward off this

danger, he ﷺ issued a stern warning to the narrators of his Ahādith, that they were to exercise the utmost caution possible when narrating his' words and actions. Rasūlullāh ﷺ would constantly repeat the following:

من كذب على متعمداً فليتبوأ مقعده من النار

He who wilfully attributes something false to me should prepare his abode in the fire!

This severe warning made the Ṣaḥāba and the scholars of ḥadīth that came later so cautious in the narration of ḥadīth, that as long as a ḥadīth was not proven with very strong research, they stayed away from attributing it to him ﷺ. The scholars that followed and arranged the Aḥādīth in chapters and sections, selected only a few thousand Aḥādīth, after great research, from the hundreds of thousands that they learnt.

In Tadrīb ur Rāwī p.12, Allāmah Suyūṭī رحمه الله عليه has written,

‘Imām Bukhārī رحمه الله عليه said that he chose (the aḥādīth of) Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī from a hundred thousand authentic (ṣaḥīḥ) and two hundred thousand unauthentic (ghayr ṣaḥīḥ) Aḥādīth that he knew from memory. Subsequently, in Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī, there are four thousand unrepeated aḥādīth.

Imām Muslim رحمه الله عليه said that he chose from three hundred thousand Aḥādīth when writing his Ṣaḥīḥ, in which there are only four thousand unrepeated Aḥādīth.

Imām Abū Dāwūd رحمه الله عليه says from five hundred thousand Aḥādīth of Rasūlullāh ﷺ he selected for his Sunan only four thousand Aḥādīth.

Imām Ahmad رحمه الله عليه says that he chose the Aḥādīth of Musnad Ahmad from seven hundred and fifty thousand Aḥādīth.

In this way, through natural means and in the shade of the wise administration of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, the Aḥādīth of Rasūlullāh ﷺ were gathered in a unique, divinely-aided method and it became the second proof of the sharīah after the Qur’ān.

GENERAL HISTORY COULD NEVER ACQUIRE THIS STATUS!

This is because, firstly, there was no reason for people to give importance to remembering general incidents and events and then to convey them to people, exactly as they had heard.

Secondly, if the historians had to judge and scrutinize historical reports and record them with the strict research that ḥadīth narrations require and if only three or four thousand narrations were chosen from four hundred thousand in Aḥādīth, then in historical narrations, not even four hundred would have remained! Ninety-nine percent of historical narrations would be forgotten and obliterated and many worldly and religious benefits attached to them would have been lost.

This is the reason why the books of the Imāms of Aḥādīth alone have the status of being principle, reliable works. Those narrators that have been classified as weak in the field of Ahādith, when it comes to history, these narrators are also accommodated and their narrations are given consideration.

Wāqidī and Sayf Ibn Umar have been classified weak in narrating ḥadīth. In fact, they have been criticized quite severely. However, when it comes to history, the Imāms of Aḥādīth do not find any problem in narrating from them.

In the science of history, all types of narrations are gathered under each chapter, without any real research and inquiry regarding its strength. Scholars who are taken to be leaders in research, inquiry and investigation in the sciences of the Qur’ān and Sunnah, when they write

a book in the field of history, then although they do not give place to baseless stories and tales, however, they do not over-exert themselves in researching the lives of the narrators and checking the criticism levelled against them, as they would have done, had it been Ahâdith that were being narrated.

Had these scholars exercised such caution in history as they did when it comes to the science of Ahâdith, then ninety nine percent of history would have been lost from the world. The world would then have been left deprived of the benefits, lessons, wisdoms, etc, that are linked to this science.

Also, since no Shar'ee law was ever going to be extracted from the books of history, no real need for such caution and research was ever felt. That is why the Imāms of Jarḥ and Tadīl (scholars who were famous in describing narrators) have also adopted a wide, accepting stance in the science of history. The famous Imām of Ḥadīth and Uṣūl ul Ḥadīth, Imām Ibn Ṣalāḥ رحمته الله عليه states in his book Ulūm ul Ḥadīth,

وغالب على الأخباريين الاكتفاء والتخليط فيما يروونه . (علوم الحديث ص ٢٦٣)

This aspect is dominant among the historians that they gather many narrations in which authentic, unauthentic, and all types of narrations are mixed

Allamah Ibn Kathīr رحمته الله عليه was a famous Imām and well known researcher. He had an outstanding quality of researching and investigating narrations. However, when this very same luminary wrote his history work, Al Bidāyah wan Nihāyah, then this level of investigation and inquiry does not remain. In fact, he himself attested to this fact, with the following statement, regarding some of the historical narrations in his book:

“I have doubt about their authenticity. However, since Ibn Jarīr Ṭabarī رحمته الله عليه and others have transmitted these narrations before me, I have thus merely followed suit. Had they not mentioned these narrations, I would have not recorded it in my book.”

It is quite apparent that in the research of a ḥadīth, he would have never said that despite doubting its authenticity, just because some previous author had mentioned it that is why he wrote it.

This is despite the fact that Ibn Kathīr رحمته الله عليه has refuted many narrations of Ṭabarī رحمته الله عليه and criticized them in Al Bidāyah wan Nihāyah. All these points testify to the fact that in the field of history, those who criticize some narrations, they too have regarded it appropriate to gather as many narrations as possible regarding an incident, under one chapter, despite it being weak or even possibly fabricated.

This is not the co-incidental error of any individual, but this is the line of thinking of all the Imāms of the science of history, that it is no fault to mention weak, unreliable narrations in the science of history without criticizing them. The reason for this is that they understood well that beliefs and laws of the sharīah are not proven through history. Rather, its purpose is that man takes lesson from it, and learns from the errors of those who had already slipped.

If a person desires using these narrations as proof for a ruling that deals with Islāmic belief or practical deeds, then it is his responsibility to adopt the same laws of scrutinizing the details of each and every narrator, as is necessary in the narration of ḥadīth.

Without doing this, how could it ever be permissible to draw rulings from historical narrations, just on the basis of a narration being found in the history book of some reliable Imām of ḥadīth!

(End of quotation from Maqām-e-Sahābah رحمهم الله)

.....

Crux of the entire discussion

Every science and every book occupies an important position, but as long as the principles of that science are not understood, the usage of the books written in that science could easily prove detrimental.

History occupies a lofty position in the sciences of Islâmic knowledge, due to the immense benefit it provides. It too, however, is governed by principles. If these principles are not understood and adhered to, the science of history could easily lead one to straying far from the path of the truth, which eventually ends with one criticizing the Ambiyahﷺ and Sahâbaﷺ, who have already received their pass-certificates from The Knower of All Secrets, Almighty Allâh, Himself.

A book of history can never be regarded as a book of Ahâdith and its narrations can never be regarded as immune from being fabricated or altered, irrespective of who the author may be. No book of history has the right to be regarded as '*Sahîh*' (authentic)!

The narrations of history shall be governed by the principles of the Quraan and authentic Ahâdith, sayings of the Sahâbaﷺ, statements of the Tâbi'een, Tabe'-Tâbi'een, and great scholars of Islâm and finally common sense. If it is found contradicting any of the above, it shall be subjected to '*ta'weel*' (interpretation). If interpretation proves difficult, it shall be discarded, since its chain of narrators offer no guarantee of the authenticity of the narration. The most that could be said is that it has a fifty percent chance of being true, and a fifty percent chance of being fabricated. Due to the chance of being fabricated being so high, there is no reason to demand the narration being accepted, especially

when it contradicts solid evidence and is itself surrounded by so much contradiction.

Keeping the above principles in mind, one shall find the objections levelled against the illustrious Sahâbaﷺ, merely on the basis of historical narrations, having no authenticity whatsoever!

The demand however is that these principles should not only be applied when it comes to the accusations levelled against the Sahâbaﷺ, but rather these principles are to be considered before lending credence to any accusation made, against any individual, irrespective of creed, colour, and position.

Together with this, it is vital that one keeps in mind that the evil Persian/jewish satanists who were operating in full-force during the era of Hadhrat Uthmaanﷺ and Hadhrat Aliﷺ were not going to suddenly disappear from the scene and stop their mischief. Rather, their evil would grow stronger with the passing of each day.

Creating fights amongst the Muslims was their ambition, and they were prepared to do anything to achieve that goal. When studying any incident of conflict between Muslims, which occurred after the era of the Khulafâ-e-Râshidînﷺ, it is imperative that one bears in mind this group of hypocrites and first check if perhaps their filthy hand was not operating from behind the scene.

The rise of the Khawârij

After the "*Tahkeem*" (Arbitration) failed to reach a unanimous decision, Hadhrat Aliﷺ and Hadhrat Muâwiyahﷺ, after a few more skirmishes, agreed to halt the in-fighting and not to contest for land which was already under the opposing party's rule. The people of Irâq

and other areas would still refer to Hadhrat Aliؓ as “Amir-ul-Mu’mineen”, whilst the people of Shaam would address Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ with the title of “Amir”. The Ummah finally found some relief from the years of internal conflict that had already claimed the lives of thousands. The only ones that were not happy were the hypocrite Persian/Jewish Satanists, who had made it their ambition to break the strength of the Ummah through internal conflict.

The only way to now re-initiate the internal conflict amongst the Muslims was to have all those personalities assassinated, who had taken the Ummah out of the vicious waves of turmoil. The three personalities who were viewed as the greatest threats to the plot of the Persian Satanists, and whose being assassinated was vital for their plans, were:

- 1) Hadhrat Aliؓ
- 2) Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ
- 3) Hadhrat Amr ibn al Aasؓ

As long as portraying the love of Hadhrat Aliؓ had helped the cause of the Persian Satanists, they were in the front line of those singing his praises, attributing to him divine qualities and levelling the worst sort of criticism against all who had prevented him taking his so-called ‘destined’ place as the ‘true first Caliph of Islâm. (Na’ûzubillah!). But, as soon as they perceived Hadhrat Aliؓ being a barrier to their filthy motives, they forgot all their claims of love and switched to the other extreme of branding him and all his loyal followers as “kâfir”. (Na’ûzubillah!). In fact, some of these hypocrites went as far as slaying Hadhrat Aliؓ’s close companions, just on account of their remaining loyal to his command.

A glance at the hypocritical traits and filthy minds of the *Khawârij*

These hypocrites had portrayed themselves as the most pious, most learned, and most loving and loyal from the warriors of Hadhrat Aliؓ. The marks of lengthy sajda (prostration) would be clearly visible on their foreheads. Their continuous recitation of Qurân earned them the title of ‘Qurrâ (The Reciters)’, and their fervor for fighting was unique. But, as soon as the Ummah accepted the decision of “*Tahkeem* (Arbitration)”, which brought a temporary halt to years of in-fighting, their true colours came to the fore.

Without any thought to the love and honour they had for so many years portrayed for Hadhrat Aliؓ, eight thousand of these so-called “Qurrâ (Learned men of the Qurân)’, together with their families and friends, broke away from his army, and refused to listen to the answers Hadhrat Aliؓ presented to their objections. Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Abbâsؓ, who the entire Ummah has accepted as the “Ocean to the knowledge of the Qurân”, his answers too could not break their stubbornness, which was based not on ignorance, but rather on hypocrisy.

The Khawârij refused to shift from their position unless and until Hadhrat Aliؓ would accept his error in agreeing to the “*Tahkeem*”, and would openly repent from his act of “*kufir*” (Na’ûzubillah!), which heؓ had committed by allowing “man” to arbitrate, whereas according to their concocted understanding, “the only arbitrator is Allâhﷻ”.

Hadhrat Aliؓ obviously would never accept these absurd demands, and the Khawârij were never going to alter their stance.

After the “*Tahkeem* (Arbitration)” ended without any unanimous result, Hadhrat Aliؓ initially intended setting off in the direction of Shâm, attempting once more to force the people of Shâm into pledging their allegiance. As his army moved away from Irâq, the Khawârij found an opportunity to vent their anger and went wild in their massacre of Muslim women and children left behind.

Amongst those brutally slaughtered by the Khawârij was the prominent Sahâbi, Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Khabbâbؓ, together with his pregnant wife. On their way to execute this noble Sahâbiؓ, they happened to pass by a swine, belonging to some *Zimmi* (non-Muslim citizen). One of the men struck it with his weapon, tearing its skin apart. A so-called “pious” man of the group rebuked him on his action and sent him to the *Zimmi*, to pay the price of the animal, and ask for pardon. A while thereafter, one of the men picked up a date that fell from a nearby tree, and began chewing it. His friends rebuked him and forced the date out, saying, “What, without paying its price?” (This was the condition of their outward piety. As for the condition of their hearts and soul, the action that followed is more than sufficient to explain its filth and hypocrisy!)

They then brought Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Khabbâbؓ forward, and mercilessly severed his head from his body. As they approached his wife, she scream out, ‘Do you not fear Allâhﷻ! I am a pregnant woman!’ Her plea was of no avail, since these were not men in front of her, but rather animals. They cut her belly open, exposing the foetus! (May Almighty Allâh deal with them as they deserve!)

The filthy actions of these animals caused Hadhrat Aliؓ to stall his plans of battle against the people of Shâm, and instead turn his attention to the Khawârij, who had once upon a time, formed part of

his elite force and close confidants. Due to having for so long enjoyed such a close relationship with these people, Hadhrat Aliؓ felt it extremely difficult to suddenly lift his sword against them. He thus sent Harb ibn Murrah Abdi to discuss the matter with them, but he too was mercilessly slaughtered. Hadhrat Aliؓ was now forced to engage them in battle.

Before the battle could begin, Hadhrat Aliؓ announced that if the killers of his companions were handed over, he would leave the rest unharmed. The Khawârij boldly answered that all of them had killed his companions and were now desirous of spilling his blood as well.

Qais ibn Sa’d ibn Ubâdahؓ, with great feeling, warned them of the consequences of their actions, followed by the advices of Hadhrat Abu Ayub Ansaariؓ, and finally by the eloquent and heart-rendering speech of Hadhrat Aliؓ himself, but all ended in vain.

Hadhrat Aliؓ then ordered Hadhrat Abu Ayub Ansâriؓ to lift up a flag of protection for the Khawârij, and announced that whosoever walks towards the flag shall be spared. Similarly, whosoever walks towards Irâq and Madâ’in, he too shall be spared. This announcement proved detrimental to the Khawârij, as majority of their men deserted their ranks and sped towards safety. The Khawârij were now left with just less than a thousand warriors and against the force of Hadhrat Aliؓ, this number proved too insignificant. Seven from the army of Aliؓ attained martyrdom, whilst on the side of the Khawârij, not a single soul was spared, from either death or severe injury.

The shayâtîn had deceived these Khawârij to such an extent, that even as they were being pierced, at that moment too they remained adamant that they alone were on the truth. Hadhrat Abu Ayub Ansaariؓ, after stabbing his spear through the chest of a Khawârij,

exclaimed, “Go straight to the fire, o enemy of Allâh!” To his amazement, the Khawârij, with his last worldly words, replied, “Soon you shall see who is more deserving of the fire!”

After the battle, Hadhrat Aliؓ took a walk amongst the dead, saying, “Woe be to you! The one who has deceived you has truly caused you the greatest of harm!” Someone asked, “Who had deceived them?” Hadhrat Aliؓ replied, ‘Shaytân and evil souls that had given them false hopes, made their evil deeds seem noble and deceived them into believing eternal success and victory was destined for them.’ Hadhrat Aliؓ thereafter ordered that the wounded of the Khawârij, numbering over four hundred, be attended to.

The Khawârij once formed a great part of the army of Hadhrat Aliؓ, thus the relationship that existed between them and the true followers of Hadhrat Aliؓ was very strong. To raise the sword against one’s own friends was obviously very hard on the heart and after the battle many of Hadhrat Aliؓ’s own men were remorseful, knowing that they had just killed their own friends.

To remove their grief, Hadhrat Aliؓ informed them that Rasulullâhﷺ had predicted that such a group would one day rise, who shall apparently have all the traits of piety, whereas in reality they shall have no relationship whatsoever with Islâm. They shall be the worst of people and the ones that shall kill them shall attain immense reward. Hadhrat Aliؓ explained that Rasulullâhﷺ had even described the features of the leader of this group and made special mention of a bulge on his arm. He then sent out scouts to search for such a man amongst the dead, explaining that if such a man is not found, it shall be proof that they were wrong in their attack, but if they do find this man,

then they should understand that they had been selected to kill the worst of men.

After an exhaustive search, the man described by Rasulullâhﷺ was pulled out from under some corpses. As soon as Hadhrat Aliؓ’s eyes fell upon the man’s body, he fell straight into *sajda*, and rose only after spending a long time thanking and glorifying Almighty Allâh. The feelings of remorse that had gripped his men now disappeared.

The number of Khawârij killed during this encounter was close to six hundred, and about four hundred were injured. What do you think happened to the rest of them? Do you think they just disappeared? Nay, they just stepped into the dark for a brief while, waiting for the next opportunity to strike and reignite the flames of disunity that had been burning within the Ummah for so many years.

The assassin of Hadhrat Umarؓ had come from Irâq/Iran. The killers of Hadhrat Uthmaanؓ hailed from Egypt and Irâq/Iran. The hypocrites who ignited the wars of Jamal and Siffin were men from Irâq/Iran, who later took the name of Khawârij. Now, when it came to the assassination of Hadhrat Aliؓ, who else could one expect to step forward for this most heinous deed, except one from Irâq/Iran.

After a few more encounters between Hadhrat Aliؓ and Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, a truce was finally concluded, which demanded that the in-fighting be brought to an immediate halt. The hypocrite enemies of Islâm realized that their only hopes for re-igniting the flames of war amongst the Muslims now lay in the assassination of Hadhrat Aliؓ, Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, and Hadhrat Amr ibn al Aasؓ. Three men from the Khawârij met to lay out the plans for a co-ordinated strike upon these three luminaries at one and the same time.

It was decided that ‘Abdur Raḥmān Ibn Muljim will martyr Hadhrat ‘Ali ؑ, Bark Ibn ‘Abdullāh will slay Hadhrat Muawiyah ؑ and ‘Amr ibn Bark will kill Hadhrat ‘Amr ibn ‘al Aas ؑ. The 17th of Ramaḍān 40 A.H was the day set to carry out this task.

The martyrdom of Hadhrat Ali ؑ

Many years previously, Rasullullāh ﷺ had asked Hadhrat Ali ؑ if he was aware of who the most wretched man was. Hadhrat Ali ؑ replied that it was the man who stood up to slaughter the camel of Nabi Salih ؑ, in lieu of a few nights of enjoyment with a woman renowned for her beauty. Hadhrat Ali ؑ’s answer was derived from the verse of Surah Al-Dhuha, wherein Almighty Allāh states:

إِذْ أَنْبَأْتُ أَخْقَاهَا

“Then the most wretched man stood up (intending to slaughter the camel of Nabi Sālih ؑ)”

Rasullullāh ﷺ then asked Hadhrat Ali ؑ if he was aware who the second most wretched man is. Hadhrat Ali ؑ expressed ignorance, upon which Rasullullāh ﷺ himself answered as follows:

“The man who shall murder you!”²⁸

To assist with the assassination, Ibn Muljim brought two other khārijis; Shabīb Ibn Najdah Harūrī and Wardān into the plot. On Friday night, 17th Ramaḍān 40 A.H, the three of them hid in the Jāmi‘ Masjid of Kufa. Hadhrat ‘Alī ؑ entered the Masjid at the time of Fajr and began awakening the people for salāh as normal. Shabīb Ibn Najdah Harūrī came out and struck Hadhrat ‘Alī ؑ with his sword causing him ؑ to fall in the mihrāb. ‘Abdur Raḥmān ibn Muljim came forward and dealt a

²⁸ المقصد العلي في زوائد أبي يعلى الموصلي للهشمي

second blow with his sword. The beard of Hadhrat ‘Alī ؑ was soaked in blood. He shouted, “Catch my killer!” Wardān and Shabīb Ibn Najdah Harūrī fled but ‘Abdur Raḥmān ibn Muljim was caught. Hadhrat ‘Alī ؑ was brought to his home and ‘Abdur Raḥmān ibn Muljim was presented before him. He said, “If I die, kill him and if I remain alive, I shall mete out an appropriate punishment myself!”

Rasullullāh ﷺ had in fact described the details of the assassination of Ali ؑ to such an extent, that Hadhrat Ali ؑ himself, just a few days before his assassination, was found saying,

*“What is keeping the ‘most wretched’ back? Why is he delaying?
By Allāh! Soon this beard of mine shall be drenched with the blood of
my neck!”*

When hope of his life came to an end, he called his sons and made a bequest to them regarding taqwā (piety), good deeds and service to religion. Someone asked, “O noble one, shall we pledge allegiance at the hands of Hadhrat Hasan after you?” He replied, “I do not command you to do so, nor do I prohibit you. Do what is appropriate!”

He ؑ was reciting the following verse when he passed away,

وَمَنْ يَعْمَلْ مِثْقَالَ ذَرَّةٍ شَرًّا يَرَهُ ۖ وَمَنْ يَعْمَلْ مِثْقَالَ ذَرَّةٍ خَيْرًا يَرَهُ

Whoever does any good act (even) to the weight of a particle, he shall surely see it!

And whoever does evil (even) to the weight of a particle, he too will see it!

He was 63 years of age and he held the post of caliphate for approximately 4 years and 9 months. The janāzah salāh (funeral-prayer) was performed by Hadhrat Hasan ؑ and according to the

preferred narration of Ibn Kathīr رحمہ اللہ he was buried in the inner part of the Dār al Khilāfah, Kufa.²⁹ May Allāh ﷻ be pleased with him ﷻ.

After the demise of Hadhrat ‘Alī ﷺ, Hadhrat Hasan ﷺ called for ‘Abdur Rahmān Ibn Muljim. ‘Abdur Rahmān Ibn Muljim said, “I took a promise to also kill Muāwiyah. If you permit, I want to carry this duty out as well. I promise that if I remain alive, I shall definitely come to you.” Hadhrat Hasan ﷺ rejected this request and told ‘Abdullāh Ibn Ja’far ﷺ to kill him.

Abdur Rahmān ibn Muljim had so much conviction on his baseless belief that at the time of his execution he was reciting Sūrah ‘Alaq and he was saying, “I do not want to keep my tongue negligent of the remembrance of Allāh at this time!”

The friend of ‘Abdur Rahmān ibn Muljim, Bark ibn ‘Abdullāh reached Damascus. The very same day, at the same time, he attacked Hadhrat Muāwiyah ﷺ when he ﷺ emerged from the Masjid after Fajr. Hadhrat Muāwiyah ﷺ was slightly injured but recovered quickly. Bark ibn ‘Abdullāh was caught and killed. After this incident, Hadhrat Mu‘āwiyah ﷺ got a room made for himself in the Masjid and appointed a guard that would be on duty at the time of salāh.

The other friend of ‘Abdur Rahmān Ibn Muljim, ‘Amr ibn Bark, reached Egypt and he too attempted to fulfil his promise at the appointed time. Coincidentally, that day, on account of illness, Hadhrat ‘Amr ibn ‘al Ās ﷺ could not come to the Masjid. Khārijah ibn Abū Habībah came instead and led the salāh. ‘Amr ibn Bark thought that Khārijah ibn Abū

²⁹ Some shī‘ās think that the grave of Hadhrat ‘Alī ﷺ is in Najaf. Ibn Kathīr رحمہ اللہ has classified this view to be baseless. He then narrates from Khaṭīb Baghdādī رحمہ اللہ that the grave in Najaf attributed to Hadhrat ‘Alī ﷺ is actually that of Hadhrat Mughīrah Ibn Shu‘bah ﷺ. Besides this, there are various narrations regarding the place of burial of Hadhrat ‘Alī ﷺ. See Al Bidāyah wan Nihāyah vol. 7 pp.329,330. – [Qādī Zayn ul ‘Abidīn Mirthī رحمہ اللہ]

Habībah was Hadhrat ‘Amr ibn ‘al Ās ﷺ and attacked him lethally. ‘Amr ibn Bark was caught and killed.

After the assassination of Hadhrat Ali ﷺ, the people of Irāq pledged allegiance at the hands of Hadhrat Hasan ﷺ, whilst the people of Shām pledged their allegiance to Hadhrat Muāwiyah ﷺ. Hadhrat Hasan ﷺ held the post of Caliphate for about six months, and thereafter made a decision to hand the Caliphate totally over to Hadhrat Muāwiyah ﷺ. This decision of Hadhrat Hasan ﷺ shocked all, but through it the Ummah was re-united, the doors for Islāmīc conquests reopened, the many evils that had crept into the Ummah, due to in-fighting, were now pushed back, the Muslims power strengthened and the hopes of the hypocrites were shattered.

During his youth, Hadhrat Hasan ﷺ had received many indications from Rasulullāh ﷺ regarding the mantle that he would one day occupy. In the light of those indications, Hadhrat Hasan ﷺ took this most bold step, despite the opposition he encountered from those around him. The results of his bold decision soon proved that no better decision could have been made at that crucial time in Islām. Rasulullāh ﷺ had himself indicated towards the wisdom and goodness behind this decision, when he said, many years previously, from the pulpit, whilst pointing towards Hadhrat Hasan ﷺ:

ان ابني هذا سيد ولعل الله أن يصلح به بين فئتين من المسلمين عظيمتين (السنن الكبرى للنسائي)

This son of mine is a leader.

Perhaps Almighty Allāh shall use him to reconcile between two great parties of the Ummah!

The decision that Hadhrat Hasan ﷺ took to hand over the Caliphate was thus one hundred percent in accordance with the wish of Rasulullāh ﷺ. It was a decision that finally brought back for the Muslims their days of peace and unity. The only group that burnt upon seeing the results of

this decision were the Khawârij/Persian satan-worshipping hypocrites, since this decision was going to halt their progress and spoil their plans for another twenty years plus.

As long as the term 'Love for the Ahle-Bait' suited their nefarious plans, these hypocrites would scream it out at the top of their voices. But, when the need for these illustrious personalities of the 'Ahle-Bait' would no longer remain, it would be these very hypocrites who would ensure their assassination. Who else was responsible for the assassination of Hadhrat Aliؑ? Were it not the very men, who as long as they needed him, fought bravely in his defence and scream out slogans in his honour, raising him from the level of being a slave of Almighty Allâhﷻ to the mantle of divinity? Did the Khawârij, once upon a time, not form a major part of the army of Hadhrat Aliؑ? Did they break away from him, merely on account of a misunderstanding, or was it due to many of their leaders being nothing but satan-worshipping hypocrites?

After the assassination of Hadhrat Aliؑ, many of these hypocrites came running to pledge allegiance upon the blessed hands of Hadhrat Hasanؑ. Their intention however was nothing but to re-ignite the extinguished flames of war and start the fight for power all over again. Their slogans of "love for the Ahle-Bait" once more began, and with it their hopes of collapsing the Islâmic Caliphate were raised again.

Six months later however, when the news of Hadhrat Hasanؑ's decision reached their ears, they, in one second, forgot all their sympathy and love for the 'Ahle-Bait', and began openly mocking Hadhrat Hasanؑ. For the second time this group was found supporting hypocritically, merely in order to have their nefarious plans passed, and pulling back support, as soon as their need for the individual no longer remained.

Tabari has narrated that when Hadhrat Hasanؑ was accepting the allegiance, he made the people say that they would obey his every command, would unite with whosoever he unites and fight against whosoever he fights. These conditions made the people of Irâq doubt his ability to rule. They began saying amongst themselves, 'This man is not fit for the job! It seems he is not interested in fighting! It was not long after that Hadhrat Hasanؑ was stabbed (by some Irâqi warriors). This attack made Hadhrat Hasanؑ more wary and distant from the people of Irâq.³⁰

Khateeb Al Baghdadi narrates in his Târikh that when the news of the decision of Hadhrat Hasanؑ reached the ears of his die-hard supporters, it seemed as though their backs were going to break in anger. When Hadhrat Hasanؑ returned, they even had the audacity to openly mock at him. A man, known as Abu Aamir, Saeed ibn Natl, mockingly addressed Hadhrat Hasanؑ with the words:

السلام عليك يا مدل المؤمنين

*Salaam be upon you, O the one who has disgraced the believers
(Na'ûzubillah)*

In Al-Bidayah it has been narrated that after handing over the Caliphate, Hadhrat Hasanؑ, together with his entire family, left the lands of Irâq and returned to Madina Munawwara. As he would pass the different clans and tribes of Irâq, instead of crying and bidding him

³⁰ حدثني عبد الله بن أحمد المروزي، قال: أخبرني أبي، قال: حدثنا سليمان، قال: حدثني عبد الله، عن يونس، عن الزهري، قال: بايع أهل العراق الحسن بن علي بالخلافة، ففلق يشترط عليهم الحسن: إنكم سامعون مطيعون، تسالمون من سالمته، وتحاربون من حاربت، فارتاب أهل العراق في أمرهم حين اشترط عليهم هذا الشرط، وقالوا: ما هذا لكم بصاحب، وما يريد هذا القتال؛ فلم يلبث الحسن رضي الله عنه بعد ما بايعوه إلا قليلاً حتى طعن طعنة أشوته، فازداد لهم بغضاً، وازداد منهم ذعراً (تاريخ الطبري)

farewell, many would come out merely to rebuke him over his decision and cowardice.

Had these people really had any respect for him on the basis of his being from the Ahle-Bait, they would have respected his every decision and would never have dared showing the least form of disrespect, especially when in front of him. The reality however was that there never was in the hearts of the Satanist hypocrites of Irâq/Iran any love for the household of Rasulullâh'. The term 'love and revenge for the Ahle-Bait' was merely a slogan they had devised to win support and sympathy. As long as any member of the Ahle-Bait was needed, they would reach the sky in praising and extolling him, but as soon as their motive was attained, they would disassociate from him completely and in fact if needed, they would even be prepared to have him assassinated.

When one studies the reasons behind Hadhrat Hasanؑ leaving Irâq for Madina-Munawwara, one shall find the prime reason being the abuse of the Irâqis towards himؑ and his family, after he refused to submit to their demands of continuing the war against Hadhrat Muâwiyahؑ. These people had no real interest in the spirituality and high rank of Hadhrat Aliؑ, Hadhrat Hasanؑ and Hadhrat Husainؑ, and for all the other great personalities of the Ahle-Bait. Rather, the names of these luminaries were used merely to bait innocent believers into thinking that Imaan is based upon hating and fighting against all those, who, in their corrupted opinion, were opposed to the Ahle-Bait and had prevented them from their 'divine' right of rule, even if it may be the closest and most beloved companion of Rasulullâhؐ, viz. Hadhrat Abu Bakrؑ and his daughter, Hadhrat Ayeshaؑ.

Hadhrat Hasanؑ himself explained the prime reason behind his abandoning Irâq. His words, as quoted by Tabari, were as follows:

يا أهل العراق إنه سخي بنفسي عنكم ثلاث قتلكم أبي وطعنكم إياي وانتهابكم متاعي (الطبري)

O people of Irâq! Three of your actions have spurred me to migrate from this land:

1) *You assassinated my father!*

2) *You openly criticize and hurl remarks at me!*

3) *You looted my belongings!*

The crux of the above is that Hadhrat Hasanؑ never left Irâq due to being 'defeated' by Hadhrat Muâwiyahؑ. His life did not end while he was burning with fury against Hadhrat Muâwiyahؑ and the people of Shâm. In fact, heؑ and his brother, Hadhrat Husainؑ, enjoyed many privileges during the reign of Muâwiyahؑ, and would at least once a year visit him in Shâm. Hadhrat Hasanؑ posed no threat to Hadhrat Muâwiyahؑ, thus it is impossible to believe that Hadhrat Muâwiyahؑ, after receiving a complete hand-over of power from Hadhrat Hasanؑ, would now find the need to have himؑ poisoned. The only ones that had a motive for assassinating Hadhrat Hasanؑ were the hypocrites of Irâq, who had been behind the assassination of Hadhrat Aliؑ, who had looted the belongings of Hadhrat Hasanؑ and stabbed him in the process, and who had turned completely against himؑ after his hand-over of power.

Those who were thirsty for the blood of the believers and who had from the very beginning, been behind all the turmoil reigning amongst the Muslims, who had been instigating one Muslim group against another and who had forsaken Hadhrat Aliؑ and planned his assassination after finding him a barrier to their plans, these very people, after finding Hadhrat Hasanؑ not interested in continuing the war, were now searching for a new avenue to re-ignite the flames of disunity and turmoil within the Ummah.

As long as Hadhrat Hasanؑ would remain alive, there was no hope of any other opposition to Hadhrat Muâwiyahؑ standing up. Thus the

removal and assassination of Hadhrat Hasanؓ was imperative for the hypocrite/Satanist league operating from Irâq/Iran. Hadhrat Hasanؓ was poisoned, while in Madinah Munawwara and an attempt was made to point the finger towards Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, an accusation that no sane mind would ever believe, and which no Sahâbiؓ ever gave any consideration to. The evil bodies behind hisؓ assassination however remained hidden, as they had been in the assassination of Hadhrat Umarؓ, Hadhrat Uthmaanؓ, in the battles of Siffin and Jamal, in the assassination of Hadhrat Aliؓ and in numerous other incidents.

As soon as Hadhrat Hasanؓ was assassinated, this hidden satanic league turned its attention towards Hadhrat Huseinؓ, hoping that through him the fight for the caliphate would be re-ignited. Letters began pouring in, addressed to Hadhrat Huseinؓ, falsely attributed to the general population of Irâq, begging him to accept their allegiance and stand up against the so called 'oppressive' rule of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ.

In Al-Bidâyah, Allâmah ibn Kathir narrates that after the death of Hadhrat Hasanؓ, Musayyib ibn Utbah Al-Fazâri, together with a group of Irâqis, came to Hadhrat Huseinؓ and begged him to break his allegiance to Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ and accept their allegiance to him, saying, 'We are well aware of your opinion in the matter regarding Muâwiyah, (referring to the fact that Hadhrat Huseinؓ was, from the very beginning not happy with the decision to hand over the caliphate).

Hadhrat Huseinؓ replied, 'I have hope that Almighty Allâh reward my brother for his good intentions (i.e. to refrain from fighting, and thus

save the blood of the Ummah) and I hope that he rewards me for my good intentions (i.e. the love of fighting against the oppressors).³¹

When the governor of Madinah Munawwara, Marwan ibn Hakam received news of these delegations, he had a message sent to Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, saying, "I fear that Huseinؓ shall become a target of *fitnah* (turmoil)!" Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ thus wrote to Hadhrat Huseinؓ, cautioning him from falling into the trap of the Irâqis. His advice was as follows:

'Remember, the one who makes a pledge on the name of Allâh (i.e. has pledged allegiance to a Caliph), it is only appropriate that he now fulfils his pledge!' I have been informed that some people of Kufa have requested you to join them in breaking the unity. I am sure that through past experience you now realise that the people of Kufa can never be trusted. They have already betrayed your father and your brother. Thus, fear Almighty Allâh and remember your pledge. If you attempt to plot against me, I shall punish you severely!'

Hadhrat Huseinؓ replied to this letter, saying,

*'Your letter has reached me. I have no intention to do that which you suspect. And Almighty Allâh alone guides towards good. I have no intention to fight against you, but at the same time I fear that if Almighty Allâh has to ask as to why I abandoned Jihad against you, I shall have no answer!'*³²

³¹ قدم المسيب بن عتبة الفزاري في عدة معه إلى الحسين بعد وفاة الحسن، فدعوه إلى خلع معاوية وقالوا: قد علمنا رأيك ورأي أخيك، فقال: إني لأرجو أن يعطى الله أخي على نيته في حبه الكف، وأن يعطيني على نيته في حبي جهاد الظالمين (البداية)

³² وكتب مروان إلى معاوية: إني لست آمن أن يكون حسين مرصدا للفتنة، وأظن يومكم من حسين طويلا. فكتب معاوية إلى الحسين: إن من أعطى الله صفقة يمينه وعهده لجدير بالوفاء، وقد أنبت أن قوما من أهل

In Al-Akhbar Al-Tiwâl, Hâfiz Dînawari has quoted the following³³, which explicitly shows that some people of Irâq were continuously on the lookout for some excuse to reignite the flames of disunity amongst the believers:

'When the news of the death of Hadhrat Hasan ؑ reached the people of Kufa, the leaders of Kufa sent their condolences to Hadhrat Husein ؑ, via letters. Ja'dah ibn Hubeira, who would display the most love for the Ahle-Bait, wrote,

'Such friends of yours are present here (i.e. in Kufa and Irâq), who are eagerly awaiting your coming, who regard none as your equal! They are well aware that the opinion of your brother, Hasan, was to avoid war, whereas you are a man who shows kindness to friends and severity against the enemy, a man who fights bravely for the Deen of Allâh. Thus, if you are desirous of achieving these goals, come over to

الكوفة قد دعوك إلى الشقاق، وأهل العراق من قد جربت قد أفسدوا على أهلك وأخيك، فاتق الله واذكر الميثاق، فإنك متى تكذني أكذلك. فكتب إليه الحسين: أتاني كتابك وأنا بغير الذي بلغك عني جدير، والحسنات لا يهدي لها إلا الله، وما أردت لك محاربة ولا عليك خلافا، وما أظن لي عند الله عذرا في ترك جهادك (البداية)

^{٣٣} وبلغ أهل الكوفة وفاة الحسن، فاجتمع عظماءهم فكتبوا إلى الحسين رضي الله عنه يعزونه. وكتب إليه جعدة بن هبيرة بن أبي وهب، وكان أمحضهم حبا ومودة: (أما بعد، فإن من قبلنا من شيعتك متطلعة أنفسهم إليك، لا يعدلون بك أحدا، وقد كانوا عرفوا رأي الحسن أخيك في دفع الحرب، وعرفوك باللين لأوليائك، والغلظة على أعدائك، والشدة في أمر الله، فإن كنت تحب أن تطلب هذا الأمر فاقدم علينا، فقد وطننا أنفسنا على الموت معك) فكتب إليهم: (أما أخي فأرجو أن يكون الله قد وفقه، وسدده فيما يأتي، وأما أنا فليس رأيي اليوم ذلك، فالصقوا رحمكم الله بالأرض، وأكمنوا في البيوت، واحترسوا من الظنة ما دام معاوية حيا، فإن يحدث الله به حدثا وأنا حي، كتبت إليكم برأيي والسلام) (الاخبار الطوال للدينوري)

Kufa immediately, for we have, in your service, handed ourselves over to death!

Hadhrat Husain ؑ answered as follows:

'I hope that Almighty Allâh blesses my brother with the best. As for me, at the present moment, I do not feel rebellion to be appropriate. Thus, as long as Muâwiyah remains alive, remain in Kufa, seek shelter in your homes and avoid becoming targets of suspicion. If something happens to him (i.e. he passes away) whilst I am still alive, I shall write to you again, informing you of my plans.

If one were to ponder over the above quotes, the reality shall surely dawn that certain elements in Irâq and its neighbouring surroundings were desperate to keep the Muslims disunited and were clutching at every straw to achieve this. It is commonly understood that Hadhrat Husein ؑ went to Kufa due to the evil that Yazîd was perpetrating. The above and other evidence, that shall later be brought, shows that this was never the reason for Hadhrat Husein ؑ going over to Irâq. Rather, the call for rebellion against every ruling government was a common cry of evil elements of Irâq, Egypt, etc. They had made this cry during the rule of Hadhrat Uthmaan ؑ, during the initial reign of Hadhrat Muâwiyah ؑ, during the end of the rule of Muâwiyah ؑ, when he appointed Yazîd as his successor, and during the era of Yazîd, when Hadhrat Husein ؑ finally accepted their invitation, but upon reaching Kufa, found none ready to stand in his support.

This call of rebellion against the Umayyad government, would thereafter continuously be made, in different areas and at different times, with the basis now being 'revenge for the Ahle-Bait, revenge for Hadhrat Husein ؑ'. The efforts of these Satanist groups finally found some sort of success, about seventy years later, with the fall of the Umayyad empire and the rise of the Abbâsi government, which was

in actual fact, a Persian backed government, a government that opened up the doors for the Fâtîmi/Satanist rule in Egypt and brought into the Islâmic countries all corrupt ideologies and cults.

During the twenty-year reign of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, Hadhrat Huseinؓ showed no interest in joining any rebellion, due to which the success of the Irâqi hypocrites in reigniting the flames of disunity during this period was minimal. The Muslims were now able to enjoy an era of peace, stability and have their eyes cooled by witnessing the doors of Jihâd against the disbelievers reopening. For some unknown reason, many still hold the notion that the rule of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ was an oppressive, evil rule. To remove this misconception, a summary of the era of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, together with a brief introduction to the man himself, shall be given:

Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ and his era of rule

- 1) Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ was amongst those Sahâbahؓ who took part in the battle of Hunain, regarding whom Almighty Allâh declared:

ثُمَّ أَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ سَكِينَتَهُ عَلَى رَسُولِهِ وَعَلَى الْمُؤْمِنِينَ (التوبة - ٢٦)

'Then Allâh sent down His special mercies upon His messenger and upon the believers!'

- 2) Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ was amongst those Sahâbahؓ who took part in the battle of Tabuk, regarding whom Almighty Allâh declared:

لَقَدْ تَابَ اللَّهُ عَلَى النَّبِيِّ وَالْمُهَاجِرِينَ وَالْأَنْصَارِ الَّذِينَ اتَّبَعُوهُ فِي سَاعَةِ الْعُسْرَةِ

'Verily Almighty Allâh turned His attention of mercy upon His messenger, the Muhaajireen and the Ansaar, those who followed His messenger during the hour of difficulty (i.e. The Battle of Tabuk)'

- 3) Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, besides being a close relative of Rasulullâhؐ, was also blessed with the honour of being amongst the scribes of revelation.³⁴
- 4) Qâdhi Iyâdh رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ has quoted that Muaaz ibn Imraan رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ was once asked whether Muâwiyah ibn Sufyaan رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ was greater or

³⁴ وعن عبد الله بن عمرو بن العاص رضي الله عنهما قال: إن معاوية كان يكتب بين يدي رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم. رواه أبو عوانة والبزار والآنسري من طريق الأعمش، عن عمرو بن مرة، عن عبد الله بن الحارث، عن أبي كثير الزبيدي، عن عبد الله بن. قال الهيثمي في المجمع: "رواه الطبراني، وإسناده حسن

وقال شيخ الإسلام ابن تيمية في منهاج السنة "استكتبه النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم لخبرته وأمانته

Umar ibn Abdul Aziz رحمته الله عليه. Hadhrat Muaaz became angry and retorted,

“A non-Sahâbi (i.e. Umar ibn Abdul Aziz رحمته الله عليه or anyone else like him) can never be compared to a Sahâbi رحمته الله عليه!

(i.e. A non-Sahâbi can never reach the mantle and status of a Sahâbi رحمته الله عليه).

Hadhrt Muâwiyah رحمته الله عليه was a Sahâbi of Rasulullâh رحمته الله عليه, his sister was the wife of Rasulullâh رحمته الله عليه, he was the scribe of Rasulullâh رحمته الله عليه, and one who Rasulullâh رحمته الله عليه trusted with revelation.”

- 5) When Abdullâh ibn Mubarak رحمته الله عليه (the world-renowned scholar of hadith and fiqh, famous for his bravery, generosity, and deep knowledge in literature, nahw, language, poetry and all other Islâmic branches) was asked as to who was greater, Umar ibn Abdul Aziz رحمته الله عليه or Hadhrt Muâwiyah رحمته الله عليه, he issued such a reply which brought an end to the entire discussion. He said:

“The dust that settled on the nose of the horse of Muâwiyah رحمته الله عليه, whilst he rode alongside Rasulullâh رحمته الله عليه

that dust alone is a thousand times superior to Umar ibn Abdul Aziz رحمته الله عليه!”

- 6) Hadhrt Muâwiyah رحمته الله عليه was blessed with the trait that his every judgement found success. One who will ponder slightly over his twenty-year rule, in which he pulled the entire Ummah out of years of in-fighting and united them under one flag, in which he sorted out the differences between all the disputing parties and brought stability back for the Ummah, in which he reopened the doors of Jihâd against the enemies of Islâm, and in which he extinguished much of the *fitnah* (evil) that the Khawârij had ignited. If one were to ponder over these feats, achieved in such a short span, one shall surely admit that Hadhrt

Muâwiyah رحمته الله عليه was indeed one of the greatest rulers the world had ever seen. If one were to ask as to where did Hadhrt Muâwiyah رحمته الله عليه learn such remarkable governing principles, the answer would be nothing else but that he had been blessed with the duas of Rasulullâh رحمته الله عليه.

Abdur Rahman ibn Abi Umairah رحمته الله عليه narrated that Rasulullâh رحمته الله عليه made the following dua for Hadhrt Muâwiyah رحمته الله عليه:

اللهم اجعله هاديا مهديا واهدا به (الترمذي)³⁵

“O Allâh, make him a guide, guide him, and guide others through him!”

The results of this most blessed dua were visible throughout the life of Hadhrt Muâwiyah رحمته الله عليه and through the blessings of this dua he was able to establish such an empire, that made a senior member of the Tâbi'een, Al-A'mash, exclaim,

‘If you had seen Muâwiyah, you would have thought him to be Al-Mahdi!’³⁶

The dua of Rasulullâh رحمته الله عليه aided Hadhrt Muâwiyah رحمته الله عليه throughout his life and drew him out safely from the most dangerous of situations. It established him as ‘one guided in his decisions’ and as ‘one, through whom others found guidance’. It enabled him to rule wisely as Amir over Shâm for twenty years, during the era of Hadhrt Umar رحمته الله عليه and Hadhrt Uthmaan رحمته الله عليه and then for another twenty years as Caliph over the entire Muslim world. Could one ever then imagine that at the most crucial juncture of his life, i.e. at the time of his death, this most blessed dua would fail him and instead of ending his life on the high

³⁵ عن عبد الرحمن بن أبي عميرة وكان من أصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم أنه قال لمعاوية

اللهم اجعله هاديا مهديا واهدا به قال أبو عيسى هذا حديث حسن غريب

³⁶ وعن الأعمش قال: لو رأيتم معاوية لقلتم: هذا المهدي. رواه الطبراني مرسلاً وفيه يحيى الحماني وهو ضعيف. (مجمع الزوائد)

note it had reached, he would end his life with the ‘worst’ decision a ruler could have ever made, i.e. appointing as a successor one who had absolutely no right and was not at all worthy of being appointed?

Those that view the decision of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ in appointing his son as his successor, a decision upon which heؓ remained upon during the last four years of his life, those that regard this decision to be the greatest administration error ever committed, should ponder over the dua of Rasulullâhؐ for Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ and ask themselves as to why did the dua fail when the time came for him to make the most crucial decision of his life!

Whosoever shall ponder over this point shall see in Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ and in his decision to appoint his son as his successor a completely different picture as to what Persian Satanists have portrayed to the world! (Insha-Allâh, at a later stage, this picture i.e. the true picture behind hisؓ decision, shall be made more clear)

- 7) Tabraniؒ has quoted an amazing experience of the Sahâbi, Hadhrat Auf ibn Malikؓ. He narrates that while Hadhrat Aufؓ was having a siesta, he awoke suddenly to find a lion approaching. He reached out for his sword, but the talking of the lion (by way of a miracle) caused him to stop in his tracks. The lion said, ‘Do not panic! I have been sent with a message! Allâh has sent me to order you to inform Muâwiyah that he is from the men of Jannah!’ Hadhrat Aufؓ asked, ‘Which Muâwiyah?’ The lion replied, ‘Muâwiyah ibn Abi Sufyaan!’³⁷

³⁷ وعن عوف بن مالك قال : كنت قائلاً في كنيسة بأريحا وهو يومئذ مسجد يصلى فيه قال : فانتبه عوف بن مالك من نومه فإذا معه في البيت أسد يمشي إليه فقام فزعا إلى سلاحه فقال له الأسد : صه إنما أرسلت إليك برسالة لتبلغها قلت : من أرسلك ؟ قال : الله أرسلني إليك لتعلم معاوية الرحال أنه من أهل الجنة قلت : من معاوية ؟ قال : ابن أبي سفيان رواه الطبراني وفيه أبو بكر بن أبي مريم وقد اختلط (مجمع الزوائد)

- 8) Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ had the good-fortune of enjoying family relations with Rasulullâhؐ. His relationship was first established due to both he and Rasulullâhؐ being born in the family of Abd-e-Manaaf. This relationship was later strengthened when his sister, Hadhrat Umme-Habeebahؓ, was married to Rasulullâhؐ.

Imam Ahmad ibn Hanbalؒ was once asked if the hadith, ‘No family relation shall be of any aid on The Day of Judgement except that relationship which is linked to me’ also applies to Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ. Imam Ahmad replied, ‘Most certainly! In fact he is linked to Rasulullâhؐ both due to *nasab* (being from the same family) and due to him being the brother-in-law of Rasulullâhؐ.’³⁸

Hadhrat Imam Ahmad ibn Hanbalؒ also said that due to Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ being the brother of Umme-Habeebahؓ, who is one of the mothers of the believers, heؓ shall thus take the title of being from amongst ‘the uncles (mother’s brother) of the believers.’³⁹

- 9) Rasulullâhؐ praised the first Muslim army that shall wage jihâd by sea with the following words,

أول جيش من أمّتي يغزون البحر قد أوجبوا (البخاري)

‘The first army of my Ummah that shall ride the seas has made Jannah compulsory⁴⁰ for themselves’

Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ was blessed with the good-fortune of being the Amîr of this army.⁴¹ This occurred during the rule of Hadhrat Uthmaanؓ.

³⁸ روى الخلال في السنة واللالكائي عن عبد الملك بن عبد الحميد الميموني، قال: قلت لأحمد بن حنبل: أليس قال النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم: كلُّ صَهر ونسب ينقطع إلا صَهر ونسبي؟ قال: بلى. قلت: وهذه لمعاوية؟ قال: نعم! له صَهر ونسب ³⁹ قال الإمام أحمد: أقول: معاوية خال المؤمنين، وابن عمر خال المؤمنين. رواه الخلال في السنة بسند صحيح

⁴⁰ قال ابن حجر وغيره: معنى أوجبوا: أي فعلوا فعلاً وجَّبتْ لهم به الجنة

10) Rasulullâh ﷺ asked Almighty Allâh to overlook any such sentence that could emit from his blessed tongue, in which there might be some form of curse for an individual who was not deserving of it. If ever such a sentence would emit, Rasulullâh ﷺ had asked Almighty Allâh to transform it into a means of purifying and elevating the individual.

Imam Muslim رحمه الله، in the chapter of those regarding whom Rasulullâh ﷺ uttered some word, which they were not deserving of, and which was then transformed into a dua for their spiritual and worldly elevation, made mention of an incident concerning Hadhrat Muâwiyah ﷺ, which has been narrated from Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Abbaas ﷺ. The incident is as follows:

'Rasulullâh ﷺ sent Abdullâh ibn Abbaas ﷺ to call Muâwiyah ﷺ. He returned, informing Rasulullâh ﷺ that Muâwiyah ﷺ was eating. After a while Rasulullâh ﷺ again sent him and he returned with the same reply, i.e. that he is still eating. Rasulullâh ﷺ, at that moment said, May Almighty Allâh never satiate his belly!' (Muslim)

Commenting on this, Allâmah ibn Kathir رحمه الله has written that Hadhrat Muâwiyah ﷺ benefitted from this statement both in this world and the hereafter. His condition in this world was that his table would never be empty. Food would continuously be brought in front of him, for him and his guests and he would never find his belly unable to take in more. In fact, he would say, 'My belly always has space for more. It is only that I get tired of eating!'⁴²

^{٤١} وقال الفريابي: وكان أول من غزا يعني البحر معاوية في زمن عثمان بن عفان. (الشريعة للآجري) وعلى ذلك المؤرخون
^{٤٢} وقال ابن كثير: "وقد انتفع معاوية بهذه الدعوة في دُنياه وأُخراه، أما في دُنياه فإنه لما صار إلى الشام أميراً كان يأكل في اليوم سبع مرات، يُجاء بقصعة فيها لحم كثير ويصل فيأكل منها، ويأكل في اليوم سبع أكالات بلحم، ومن الحلوى والفاكهة شينا كثيرا، ويقول: (والله ما أشبع، وإنما أعيا)، وهذه نعمة ومعدة يرغب فيها كل الملوك"

11) Ibn Sa'd has narrated that once Hadhrat Muâwiyah ﷺ requested Hadhrat Ayesha ﷺ that she send to him the hair and shawl of Rasulullâh ﷺ. When it reached him he wore the shawl and after soaking the hair in water, drank the water, and passed it over his face.⁴³

12) Despite Hadhrat Muâwiyah ﷺ being amongst those Sahâbah ﷺ who would only narrate from Rasulullâh ﷺ, after great thought and ensuring that he had heard and understood correctly, then too he was blessed with the honour of having, according to what has been counted, twenty three Sahâbah ﷺ narrating from him ﷺ, amongst whom were: Abu Zar Ghifari ﷺ, Abdullâh ibn Zubeir ﷺ, Abdullâh ibn Abbaas ﷺ, Abdullâh ibn Umar ﷺ, Abdullâh ibn Amr ibn al-Aas ﷺ, Nu'maan ibn Bashir ﷺ, Wa'il ibn Hujar ﷺ, Abu Darda ﷺ, and Hadhrat Abu Saeed Al-Khudri ﷺ..

Hafiz Ibn Hajar Al-Haithami wrote, after making mention of the great luminaries from the Sahâbah ﷺ and Tâbi'een that had narrated from Hadhrat Muâwiyah ﷺ:

فتأمل هؤلاء الأئمة أئمة الإسلام الذين رواوا عنه؛

تَعْلَمُ أَنَّهُ كَانَ مُجْتَهِداً أَيَّ مُجْتَهِدٍ، وَفَقِيهاً أَيَّ فَقِيهٍ. (تطهير الجنان)

'If you were to ponder over which giants of Islâm narrated from Hadhrat Muâwiyah ﷺ, you shall realise what a great jurist and Mujtahid he was!'

13) The fact that Hadhrat Muâwiyah ﷺ occupied the position of governor over Shâm during the reign of Hadhrat Umar ﷺ is itself sufficient testimony of his high rank. Hadhrat Umar ﷺ said:

^{٤٣} روى ابن سعد ومن طريقه ابن عساکر عن مرجانة أم علقمة قالت: "قَدِمَ معاوية بن أبي سفيان المدينة، فأرسل إلى عائشة: أن أُرْسِلِي إِلَيَّ بِأَنْجَانِيَةِ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ وَشَعْرِهِ، فَأُرْسَلَتْ بِهِ مَعِي، حَتَّى دَخَلْتُ بِهِ عَلَيْهِ، فَأَخَذَ الْأَنْجَانِيَةَ فَلَبَسَهَا، وَأَخَذَ شَعْرَهُ فَدَعَا بِمَاءٍ فَغَسَلَهُ، فَشَرِبَهُ وَأَفَاضَ عَلَى جِلْدِهِ". وسنده جيد

ليس أحد منا أعلم من معاوية (رواه الشافعي في الأم بسند جيد)

'None of us have more knowledge than Muâwiyah!'

19) Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umar ؓ praised the generosity of Hadhrat Muâwiyah ؓ, saying that he had never seen a man more generous than him. When questioned as to whether he was even more generous than Hadhrat Umar ؓ himself, Ibn Umar ؓ replied that Hadhrat Umar ؓ was greater, but Hadhrat Muâwiyah ؓ was more generous.⁴⁵

20) The great Sahâbi, who was placed in a fire but did not burn, Hadhrat Abu Muslim Khawlânî ؓ once said to Hadhrat Muâwiyah ؓ, 'By Allâh, from the time we began loving you, we have never harboured any anger towards you! From the time we began obeying you, we have never disobeyed you! From the time we united under you, we have never separated from you! From the time we pledged allegiance to you, we have never broken that allegiance! Our swords are on our necks. If you order, we shall obey! If you call, we shall immediately present ourselves! If you proceed ahead, we shall follow! If we proceed ahead, we shall always await your arrival!⁴⁶

21) Abu Ishaq As-Subei'ie ؓ said, 'After Muâwiyah ؓ, we found none that could match him!'⁴⁷ He would also say, 'If you had

"والله ما آلو أن أختار خياركم" (أبو عبيد في الأموال)

'By Allâh, I make every effort possible to choose only the best (as governor over the Muslims)

14) In praise of Hadhrat Muâwiyah ؓ, Hadhrat Umar ؓ said:

تذكرون كسرى وقيصر ودهاءهما؛ وعندكم معاوية! (البلاذري بسند صحيح)

"You speak regarding the wit and intelligence of Kisrah and Caesar, whereas you have Muâwiyah amongst you!

15) In praise of Hadhrat Muâwiyah ؓ, Hadhrat Abu Dardah ؓ said:

ما رأيت أشبه صلاة برسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم من أميركم هذا،

يعني معاوية (سير اعلام النبلاء)

'I have not seen one whose Salaah resembles the Salaah of Rasulullâh ؓ more than your Amîr, i.e. Hadhrat Muâwiyah ؓ!

16) Urwah ibn Zubeir ؓ narrates that he never heard Miswar ibn Makhramah ؓ mention Hadhrat Muâwiyah ؓ, except that he would make dua for him.⁴⁴

17) Hadhrat Ayesha ؓ was so happy with the rule of Hadhrat Muâwiyah ؓ and the peace and stability he had established, that she would at times say:

إني لأتمنى أن يزيد الله عز وجل معاوية من عمري في عمره.

(روى أبو عروبة الحراني في الطبقات بسند صحيح)

'At times I even wish that Almighty Allâh take from my lifespan and increase through it the lifespan of Muâwiyah.'

18) In praise of Hadhrat Muâwiyah ؓ, Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Abbaas ؓ, who was known as the ocean of knowledge, said:

⁴⁴ قال عروة: فلم أسمع المسثور ذكر معاوية إلا صلى عليه

⁴⁵ وثبت من طرق عن عبد الله بن عمر رضي الله عنهما أنه قال: ما رأيت أحدا أسود من معاوية، قال الراوي: ولا عمر؟ قال: كان عمر خيرا منه، وكان معاوية أسود منه. قال الإمام أحمد: "معنى أسود: أي أسخى، وقال: السيد: الحليم، والسيد: المعطي، أعطى معاوية أهل المدينة عطايا ما أعطاه خليفة قد كان قبله"

⁴⁶ وقال أبو مسلم الخولاني لمعاوية: فلا والله ما أبغضناك منذ أحبناك، ولا عصيناك بعدما أطعناك، ولا فارقناك بعدما جامعناك، ولا نكفنا بيعتنا منذ بايعناك، سيوفنا على غواتقنا، إن أمرتنا أطعناك، وإن دعوتنا أجبتناك، وإن سبقتنا أذركناك، وإن سبقتنا نظرتناك. رواه أحمد في مسائل ابنه صالح وفي الزهد، ومن طريقه ابن عساكر وابن العديم بسند شامي جيد.

⁴⁷ قال أبو إسحاق السبيعي الكوفي: كان معاوية، وما رأينا بعده مثله. (منهاج السنة بسند صحيح)

seen the era of Muâwiyahؓ, you would have thought him to be the 'Promised Mahdi'!⁴⁸

22) Mujahid would say, 'Had you seen Muâwiyahؓ, you would have said due to his great virtue that he is indeed "Al- Mahdi"!⁴⁹
A similar statement has been attributed to Qatadah.⁵⁰

Jihâd during the era of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ

One of the salient features of the truthful Caliphs of Islâm was that they strove to keep Jihâd alive. In the era of turmoil, i.e. from the death of Hadhrat Uthmaanؓ until the appointment of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ as Caliph, this fundamental pillar of Islâm came to a temporary halt, which was just what the enemy desired. Then too, the desire to send the Muslim armies to all the corners of the world, for the spreading of the truth, remained the burning desire of Hadhrat Aliؓ, but due to circumstances he was unable to do so.

When Muâwiyahؓ was appointed and the Muslims once again gathered under one flag, he immediately re-ignited the process of having armies continuously on the move.

Describing this virtue, Saeed ibn Abdul Aziz stated:

لما قُتل عثمان واختلف الناس لم تكن للناس غازية ولا صائفة حتى اجتمعت الأمة على معاوية سنة أربعين، وسموها سنة الجماعة. قال سعيد: فأغزا معاوية الصوائف وشتاهم بأرض الروم؛ ست عشرة صائفة تصيفُ بها وتشتو، ثم تقفل وتدخل مُعَبَّئَةً، ثم أغزاهم معاوية ابنه يزيد في سنة ثنتين وخمسين في جماعة من أصحاب

⁴⁸ وقال حماد بن أسامة: حدثني الثقة عن أبي إسحاق أنه ذكر معاوية فقال: لو أدركتموه -أو: أدركتم زمانه- كان المهدي. رواه

الخلال في السنة، وسنده صحيح إلى حماد، وهو مسلسل بالكوفيين

⁴⁹ عن مجاهد قال: لو رأيتم معاوية لقلتم هذا المهدي من فضله. رواه الخلال في السنة وسنده صحيح

⁵⁰ عن قتادة، قال: لو أصبحتم في مثل عمل معاوية لقال أكثركم: هذا المهدي. رواه أبو بكر الأثرم -ومن طريقه الخلال في السنة

و سنده جيد

رسول الله في البر والبحر؛ حتى أجاز بهم الخليج، وقتلوا أهل القسطنطينية على بابها، ثم قفل. رواه أبو زرعة في تاريخه ومن طريقه ابن عساكر بسند رجاله ثقات أثبات.

ورواه ابن عساكر أيضا عن سعيد بزيادة: "فلم يزل معاوية على ذلك حتى مضى لسبيله، وكان آخر ما وصاهم به أن شُدوا خناق الروم، فإنكم تضبطون بذلك غيرهم من الأمم"

After the assassination of Hadhrat Uthmaanؓ, the sending out of armies came to a halt, and was only re-initiated when the Ummah united on the appointment of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ as Caliph, in the fortieth year after Hijri, which was called 'The Year of Unity'. Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ began sending armies into the Roman lands. A group of sixteen armies would spend the entire year there, and upon their return another group would take their place. Then, in the fifty-second year after Hijri, he appointed his son (Yazîd) as Amir over an army, which included many Sahâbahؓ, (amongst whom were Hadhrat Abu Ayoob Ansaariؓ and Hadhrat Huseinؓ) to attack the Romans by land and by sea. This army finally managed to cross the gulf and lay an attack on Constantinople, from its very door step.

The army thereafter returned.

Had there been no other virtue to mention for Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ except this one, it would have been sufficient for his status to be realised, since the upholding of the fundamental of Jihâd has always been the hallmark of the truthful leaders of Islâm. Evil elements have always tried to lay criticism on the rule of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ and the Umayyad Empire that he established, by citing incidents from the personal lives of some of its members, incidents which have no real sanad and can thus never be verified. The one aspect which they could not however manage to cover was the fact that Jihâd and Islâmic conquests thrived during this era, with its armies spreading out from Shâm in all directions.

It was during this era that:

- the first attack on Constantinople occurred under the leadership of Yazîd

- Muslim Armies reached islands of the Mediterranean Sea
- Muslim armies crossed the Atlantic and conquered Spain
- Conquests reached the southern tip of France
- Practically the entire North Africa was brought under Muslim rule
- The lands known as 'ما وراء النهر', including Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, etc, were brought under Islâmic rule
- Muslim armies reached the borders of China and collected Jizyah from its ruler
- Muslim armies brought India under Muslim rule

Due to the great conquests that occurred during this dynasty, some historians have stated:

لا غرو اذ قيل انّ عصر بني امية من اهم عصور الفتوح في التاريخ الاسلامي
(تاريخ العالم الاسلامي)

It would not be anything amazing if one were to say that the Umayyad Empire played one of the most important roles in Islâmic History, with regards to conquests made!

As for the dynasty that followed, known as the 'Banu Abbâs' which hailed from the lands of Irâq/Iran, this dynasty, despite opening wide its doors for all deviant groups; allowing the establishment of the first shia empire in Muslim lands, i.e. the Fatimid Empire; and bringing to a practical halt all Islâmic Jihâd movements, despite delivering these and numerous other terrible blows to the Muslim world, one finds the books of history silent when it comes to criticizing it. Why? The reason is what has been mentioned right at the beginning, i.e. jewish/satanic/hypocrite forces have always attacked the books of history and endeavoured that the truth remain stained.

As for the oft-repeated narrations and historical incidents in which some form of criticism against Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ and his family, the

Banu Umayyah, can be discerned, Allâmah Ibn Taimiyah, after proving in length that the Rawâfidh (Shia) have always emerged as the greatest liars and deceivers of every era, summarised the answers to all the objections raised against Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ and the Umayyad Dynasty in the following words:

'The Shia rejects that which is clear-cut, and whose truth is evident. As for that which has no basis and whose falsehood is manifest, those are the narrations which they strive to revive, an example of which is what they narrate regarding Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ. (Majmu-al-Fatawa)

When fabricated Ahâdith, condemning Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, can be found with made-up-chains of narrators, what could one then expect to be the case with historical incidents, which have no chain of narrators whatsoever?!

(If one peruses through the narrations fabricated against Hadrat Muawiyahؓ, which by hook and by crook found their way into the pages of Islamic History, narrations whose absurdity is evident both logically as well as by looking at its sanad, one shall realise that the narrations criticizing Yazid are of this exact nature. Thus, just as all have agreed that the allegations made against Hadrat Muawiyahؓ have no basis and should not even be considered, it would be only fair to treat the allegations made against Yazid in the exact manner, since its sanads are also full of liars and logically too, these allegations seem quite improbable. For the benefit of the Ulema some of the absurd alleagations made against Hadrat Muawiyahؓ shall be quoted in the footnote⁵¹, which shall Insha Allah make this point even clearer.

رُوي عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم أنه قال: "إذا رأيتم معاوية على منبري فاقتلوه".
وهذا حديثٌ كَذَبَهُ وأنكره سائر العلماء،

Sheikh Mahmood Shakir, while discussing the issue of Hadhrat Muâwiyah رضي الله عنه, his family, the Banu Ummayyah and all its caliphs, wrote most decisively:

"إن هذه الافتراءات على بني أمية ليس لها سند صحيح، ومعظمها مجهول المصدر، الأمر الذي يدل على كذبها، وبهذا لا يمكن الاعتماد عليها أبداً، وإذا أخذنا بمنهج الحديث في الجرح والتعديل، وهو أفضل منهج للوصول إلى صحة الخبر، فإننا سنطرح هذه الروايات كلها التي تقولت على بني أمية"

فزيادة "فيرون أنه سمّه" نبّه محقق المعجم أنها لم ترد إلا في (هامش!) نسخة واحدة، وخلت منها النسختان الأخريان، ثم قد رواه أبونعيم في معرفة الصحابة وابن عساكر وغيرهما من طرق عن ابن بكير بدون هذه الزيادة، فثبت أنها مقحمة لا أصل لها، وكان من الواجب عدم إثباتها في صلب الكتاب، فينتبه لذلك.

وهذا شاهد على محاولات التحريف والدس من الرافضة في الكتب! علما بأن لبعض المتشيعه هوامش سخيفة على بعض نسخ المعجم الكبير، انظر مثلاً (٢٢١/٦) رقم ٦٠٦٣ منه.

مثال آخر: قال الطبراني في المعجم الكبير ومسند الشاميين: حدثنا يحيى بن عثمان بن صالح، ثنا سعيد بن عفير، ثنا سعيد بن عبد الرحمن من ولد شداد بن أوس، عن أبيه، عن يعلى بن شداد بن أوس، عن أبيه، أنه دخل على معاوية وهو جالس، وعمرو بن العاص على فراشه، فجلس شداد بينهما، وقال: هل تدریان ما يجلسني بينكما؟ إني سمعت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يقول: "إذا رأيتُموهما جميعاً ففرّقا بينهما، فوالله ما اجتماعاً إلا على غدره". فأخْبِثْ أن أَفَرِّقَ بَيْنَكُما!

قلت: هذا حديث موضوع، ورواه ابن عساكر من طريق الطبراني، وقال: "سعيد بن عبد الرحمن وأبوه مجهولان، وسعيد بن كثير بن عفير وإن كان روى عنه البخاري فقد ضَعَفَهُ غيره". وأقره ابن حجر في اللسان، وذكر الهيثمي في المجمع أن فيه عبد الرحمن بن يعلى، ولم يعرفه.

و مثال أخير: حديث "اللهم أركسهما في الفتنة ركسا"، قال الحافظ محمد بن طاهر المقدسي: هو حديث رواه يزيد بن أبي زياد عن سليمان بن عمرو بن الأحوص، عن أبي برزة الأسلمي، ويزيد هذا من أهل الكوفة كان الكدبة بلقنونه على وَفْق اعتقادهم فيتلقنها، ويحدث بها ضعة أئمة أهل النقل، وقد زُوي هذا الحديث عن طريق آخر نُسب فيه معاوية هذا، وأنه ابن التابوت.. ثم ختم بقوله: ولم يصح عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم أنه ذكر أحداً من الصحابة إلا بخير.

قال الإمام البخاري بعد أن أعل أشهر طرقه: إن هذه الأحاديث "... ليس لها أصول، ولا يثبت عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم خبرٌ على هذا النحو في أحدٍ من أصحاب النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم، إنما يقوله أهل الضّعف". (التاريخ الأوسط) وقال العقيلي: "ولا يصح من هذه المتون عن النبي عليه السلام شيء من وجه يثبت". وقال الجورقاني في الأبطال: "هذا حديث موضوع باطل لا أصل له في الأحاديث، وليس هذا إلا من فعل المبتدعة الوضاعين؛ خذلهم الله في الدارين، ومن اعتقد هذا وأمثاله؛ أو خطر بباله أن هذا جرى على لسان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم؛ فهو زنديقٌ خارجٌ من الدين".

مثال آخر: وضع ابن المُطَهَّر الرافضي (منهاج الكرامة ص ٦٤) حديثاً وهو: "يطلع عليكم رجل يموت على غير سنّتي"، فطلع معاوية، وقام النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم خطيباً، فأخذ معاوية بيد ابنه يزيد وخرج، ولم يسمع الخطبة، فقال النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم: "لئن الله القائد والمقود، أي يوم يكون للأمة مع معاوية ذي الإساءة!" قال شيخ الإسلام ابن تيمية في رده عليه (منهاج السنة): "هذا الحديث من الكذب الموضوع باتفاق أهل المعرفة بالحديث، ولا يوجد في شيء من دواوين الحديث التي يُرجع إليها في معرفة الحديث، ولا له إسناد معروف". ومما يدل على أن واضح الحديث رافضي على غير السنّة والعقل: أن يزيد وُلد سنة سبع وعشرين في خلافة عثمان! ومعاوية لم يتزوج إلا في خلافة عمر، رضي الله عن الجميع!

مثال آخر: زعم بعضهم أن معاوية أوعز للأشعث بن قيس إلى ابنته (وكانت تحت الحسن بن علي رضي الله عنهما) أن تضع السم لزوجها، وأنه مات بسبب ذلك!

وهذا باطل، فالأشعث توفي قبل الحسن بنحو عشر سنين، ثم إن بقاء الحسن كان فيه مصلحة لمعاوية، بخلاف أهل الفتنة من شيعة الكوفة، وقال ابن العربي عن الخبر إنه محال (العواصم)، وقال ابن تيمية: إن تسميم معاوية للحسن لم يثبت ببينة شرعية، أو إقرار معتبر، ولا نُقل يُجزم به. (منهاج السنة)، وقال الذهبي: هذا شيء لم يصح، فمن الذي اطلع عليه؟ (تاريخ الإسلام)، وقال ابن كثير: ليس بصحيح. (البداية والنهاية)، وجعله ابن خلدون مما وضعه الشيعة. (التاريخ) وانظر: مواقف المعارضة في خلافة يزيد بن معاوية للأستاذ محمد بن عبد الهادي الشيباني ص ١٢٠-١٢٥ وعنه الأخ الشيخ سليمان الخراشي في كتابه: اتهامات لا تثبت ص ١٦٥-١٧٤)

واعلم أنه لا يصح خبرٌ في موت الحسن بالسم، وكل ما روي في ذلك ضعيف جداً أو شديد الإعضال والانقطاع، أما ما وقع في مطبوعة معجم الطبراني الكبير من طريق يحيى بن بكير، عن شعبة، عن أبي بكر بن حفص: "أن سعدا والحسن بن علي رضي الله عنهما ماتا في زمن معاوية، فيرون أنه سمّه".

The accusations levelled against the Banu Umayyah have no sound chains. In fact, in the majority of these narrations there is no mention of who first narrated it, which clearly indicates its being baseless. Thus, no consideration could ever be given to it. If one were to adopt here the method used for scrutinizing Ahâdith, which is of course the best method for ascertaining the truth of any manner, then the majority, if not all, of the accusations levelled against the Banu Umayyah shall be found unreliable and unacceptable.

A common accusation levelled against Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ from hypocrite quarters is that he had made many promises to Hadhrat Hasanؓ and Hadhrat Huseinؓ to entice them to hand over the caliphate, but failed to fulfil those conditions afterwards. Anyone with a little knowledge of Islâmic history shall know that deception and lying were never the traits of the noble Arabs, neither before Islâm and of course, not after.

Together with that, not a single incident can be found wherein Hadhrat Hasanؓ or Hadhrat Huseinؓ ever stood up to complain to the people of Makkah Mukarramah or Madina Munawwara that Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ had deceived them and broken his promise. When the generosity of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ would not miss the commoner, could one ever think that the noble grandsons of Rasulullâhﷺ would ever find him unwilling to give? Yes, if what they had asked for was out of his reach, due to promises and pacts which he could not break, Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ would then ensure that they be given a much better substitute.

Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ had a lot of respect for Hadhrat Hasanؓ and Hadhrat Huseinؓ and would try his utmost to fulfil their every request. This remained his trait throughout his life and he departed with this very bequest that their rank and status always be considered.

Hafiz Al-Deenawari has quoted the following in Akhbaar Al-Tiwaal:

"قالوا: ولم ير الحسن ولا الحسين طول حياة معاوية منه سوءاً في أنفسهما ولا مكروها، ولا قطع عنهما شيئاً مما كان شرط لهما، ولا تغير لهما عن بر"

Historians have mentioned that throughout the life of Muâwiyahؓ, Hadhrat Hasanؓ and Hadhrat Huseinؓ never experienced any such act from him, which caused them inconvenience and difficulty, nor did they ever harbour any sort of anger and malice against him. Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ ensured that they received whatever had been promised to them and he never withheld his favours and kindness from them.

Summary of the above

Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, together with being a close Sahâbi of Rasulullâhﷺ, which in itself is sufficient for one's praise, was blessed with many noble qualities and traits which made him an outstanding leader and a winner of hearts. His twenty year rule of peace and stability, which had been preceded by years of war and internal conflict, bear ample testimony to this.

If the purpose of mentioning all the above was merely to highlight the status of this great Sahâbiؓ, then despite this too being necessary in today's time and an act of great merit, but in the context of what we are trying to discuss, i.e. the reality behind Karbala, such a discussion would naturally seem out of line, since it has generally never been denied that he was a great man. The only problem seems to be with his son, Yazîd.

The actual purpose of the entire above discussion in actual fact has nothing to do with regards to the personality and status of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, but rather has been brought to lay the foundation of a most important issue, which constitutes the basis of the investigation into the reality of Karbala.

In simpler words, whoever shall read about the conditions of peace and stability in the era of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ and shall study his noble traits and qualities, he shall be forced to admit that Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ left nothing during his reign of rule as a cause for any group to rise in rebellion. Yet if when one were to look a bit deeper, he would find the people of Kufa continuously **calling for the overthrow of the government of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ** and the reinstating of the Ahle-Bait. What was Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ doing wrong that made them beg the Ahle-Bait to come over and have him overthrown? Was it that he too was committing adultery, or was he drinking liquor openly, or was he an oppressive, stone-hearted ruler?

The fact that the people of Irâq were continuously making attempts to incite Hadhrat Hasanؓ and Hadhrat Huseinؓ to rebel against Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ is no hidden matter. A few examples of their nefarious activities during the era of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ have already been mentioned. But for the purpose of re-highlighting this fact, a narration of Mu'jam-e-Tabrani, which has a sound and strong chain of narrators, shall now be mentioned:

روى الطبراني في المعجم الكبير عن ابن عُيينة، عن عُبيد الله بن عبد الله بن الأَصم، عن عمه يزيد بن الأَصم، قال: خرجتُ مع الحسن (يعني ابن علي رضي الله عنهما) وجارية تُحْتُ شينا من الجناء عن أظفاره، فجاءته إضبارة من كُتُب، فقال: يا جارية هاتي المِخْضَب، فصبَّ عليه ماء، وألقى الكُتُب في الماء، فلم يفتح منها شيئا، ولم ينظر إليه، فقلتُ: يا أبا محمد! ممن هذه الكُتُب؟ قال: من أهل العراق، من قوم لا يرجعون إلى حقٍّ، ولا يقصرون عن باطل، أما إني لستُ أخشاهم على نفسي، ولكي أخشاهم على ذلك. وأشار إلى الحسين. (وسنده جيد على شرط مسلم، وقال الهيثمي في المجمع: ورجاله رجال الصحيح، غير عبد الله بن الحكم بن أبي زياد، وهو ثقة)

Yazîd ibn Al-Asam narrates that once whilst on a journey with Hadhrat Hasan ibn Aliؓ, a bundle of letters reached him., Hadhrat Hasanؓ called for a container, and had water poured into it. He then threw the letters into the water, without even bothering to glance at its contents.

*I asked, 'O Abu Muhammad (Hadhrat Hasanؓ), who has sent all of these letters?' He replied, 'It has come from the people of Irâq, a group that shall never accept the truth and shall never desist from their evil! As for myself, I do not fear being deceived by these people. **However I***

do fear that they may have an impact on him!' Saying this Hadhrat Hasanؓ pointed towards Hadhrat Huseinؓ'

When one questions the reason behind Hadhrat Huseinؓ going over to Irâq to assist with the overthrow of Yazîd, the answer shall generally be that Yazîd was a tyrant, an adulterer, a habitual drunkard, etc, (allegations that have never been proven).

But, if the same question is now put forward that these reasons are all well and valid, but what then was the reason behind the people of Irâq calling Hadhrat Hasanؓ over, for the same sort of overthrowing during the reign of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ. Was he too doing the same?

If this question can be answered, it shall open up an entirely new understanding of the incident of Karbala. Had the people of Irâq never complained of any governor before Yazîd, one could have possibly believed all their sorrowful tales of the cruelty of Yazîd, his oppression, his open transgression, etc. However, after realising that a group of people from Irâq were from the very beginning always at the throat of their leader, desiring his removal from his post, irrespective of his status; when one realises that overthrowing the government was always their goal and that they would do anything to accomplish it, one shall then look at the entire incident of Karbala and the accusations against Yazîd, preceded by the assassination of Hadhrat Hasanؓ, from a different angle, and Insha-Allâh many unanswered questions shall then be answered.

The issues that shall, Insha-Allâh, be discussed are of an extremely delicate nature. It is like a bush of thorns, from which very few have come out unscathed. The majority who attempted falling into these issues were finally forced to take sides, some would side with Hadhrat Huseinؓ (which would obviously be the safer option), but would then have to answer as to why none of the Sahâbaؓ of Makkah

Mukarramah and Madina Munawwara were prepared to join him in his journey to Irâq, and he would also have to explain why Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, after ruling wisely for approximately twenty years, chose to make an unwise and rash decision to appoint his son who was (according to this group) not at all fit for the job, and thus put his hereafter in jeopardy.

As for the second group, who would side with Yazîd (which is clearly not a good decision at all), he would, besides having to face the wrath of the Ummah, have to answer why Yazîd made such a hasty decision in sending Ubeidullah ibn Ziyad to Kufa to deal with Hadhrat Huseinؓ. When the matter was of such great importance, why did he himself not go over to Kufa and deal directly with the problem? And if it is said that Yazîd had never asked for the assassination of Hadhrat Huseinؓ, then why did he later not have Ubeidullah ibn Ziyad punished for not obeying his command? Also, why did he order an attack on the blessed cities of Makkah Mukarramah and Madinah Munawwara just before his passing away?

To attempt a thorough investigation into the matter of Karbala, with the purpose of making a decision in favour of one of the two groups, and finding the other blameworthy, such an attempt is not only futile and dangerous, but it is in fact fully in line with what the shaytâni forces had wanted from the very beginning. Taking sides has and shall achieve nothing except further weakening of the Ummah.

Fifteen noteworthy points

The safest route in this matter would thus be to look with an eye of justice at the matter and to realise that love for one party does not demand that the other not be given the right of being innocent until found guilty. If one were to look at the matter of Karbala, after adopting this approach, fifteen startling points shall come to light, viz.

- 1) The call for the overthrowing of the Umayyad Caliphate had nothing to do with the private life of Yazîd. Rather, this call had already been made in the era of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ and even in the era of Hadhrat Uthmaanؓ. The practice of falsely accusing leaders and governors, merely to ensure no stability in the government, was thus nothing new.
- 2) The love of the Ahle-Bait, which the people of Irâq claimed to be the basis of their entire mission, was nothing but a shaytâni farce. This very slogan had already been used against Hadhrat Abu Bakrؓ and Hadhrat Umarؓ, with the claim that they snatched the right of Caliphate from Hadhrat Aliؓ and deprived Hadhrat Fatimahؓ from her inheriting a share in the land of Fidak. (*Na'ûzubillah*)

These very same hypocrites, who intended nothing but dividing the Ummah, then sided with Hadhrat Aliؓ and at the same time continued instigating the opposing party, resulting in major wars breaking out amongst the Muslims and many valuable lives being lost through infighting. In their hypocritical expression of love for the Ahle-Bait, they were even prepared to claim the divinity and infallibility of Hadhrat Aliؓ, but as soon as he chose to halt the war, they forgot all their love and branded him apostate. Hadhrat Aliؓ was thereafter assassinated by these very slogan-waving hypocrites, now known as the Khawârij, and Hadhrat Hasanؓ was elected as the new leader.

The books of history record that the love the people of Irâq expressed for Hadhrat Hasanؑ was much more than the love they had once held for Hadhrat Aliؑ, but this too was short-lived. As soon as Hadhrat Hasanؑ handed the reins of Caliphate over to Hadhrat Muâwiyahؑ his 'loyal' supporters suddenly disappeared. In fact, their attitude towards the illustrious grandson of Rasulullâhؐ now became so antagonistic that he finally abandoned the lands of Irâq and returned to the pure lands of Hijaz. The hypocrites of Irâq were so bold in their criticism of their once 'pure, infallible Imam', that they even had the audacity to walk right up to himؑ and brand him as 'a disgrace to the Ummah'. (Na'ûzubillah)

After reaching Madina Munawwara, the attempts of the hypocrites in luring Hadhrat Hasanؑ to break his pledge and call for the overthrow of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؑ continued, but Hadhrat Hasanؑ was no longer prepared to lend them an ear. The only fear he had was that their sad letters could have an effect on his brother, Hadhrat Huseinؑ. Thus he always ensured that the letters were destroyed. There are even recorded incidents of Hadhrat Hasanؑ warning his brother against ever inclining towards the liars of Irâq.

- 3) As soon as Hadhrat Hasanؑ was assassinated, the slogans of love for the Ahle-Bait once again began pouring in from the people of Irâq and regular invitations and appeals would be sent, begging that he take back the right of the caliphate, which (in their opinion) had been reserved for the Ahle-Bait and promising their full support if he does so. Hadhrat Huseinؑ, understanding well that breaking one's allegiance without any real grounds was not allowed, would respond that at the present moment they should remain patient, and let fate take its course.

The news that the people of Irâq were instigating Hadhrat Huseinؑ to oppose the government reached the ears of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؑ, upon which he sent a letter advising Hadhrat Huseinؑ against any such act. Hadhrat Huseinؑ's reply, as recorded in Al-Bidayah and which had already been mentioned, was as follows:

*'Your letter has indeed reached me, and I am in no way intending to do that which you suspect. And Almighty Allâh alone guides towards good. I have no intention to fight against you, but at the same time I fear that if Almighty Allâh has to ask as to why I abandoned Jihad against you, I shall have no answer!'*⁵²

- 4) When Hadhrat Muâwiyahؑ decided upon selecting his son as the next Caliph, from the entire galaxy of the Sahâbahؑ and Tâbi'een, he found four or five senior Sahâbahؑ not in favour of his decision. From these, Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umarؑ and Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Abbaasؑ, both promised that if they found the rest of the Ummah pledging allegiance to Yazîd, they would follow suit.

Hadhrat Muâwiyahؑ was now faced with the choice to either change his decision, due to the opposition of Hadhrat Huseinؑ, Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeirؑ and Hadhrat Abdur Rahmaan ibn Abu Bakrؑ, or ignore their opposition and move ahead with his intention. He chose the latter, since the selection of any other person would also not be free of the opposition of one party or the other. The people of Egypt would prefer Hadhrat Amr ibn al Aasؑ, the people of Hijâz would

⁵² وكتب مروان إلى معاوية: إني لست آمن أن يكون حسين مرصدا للفتنة، وأظن يومكم من حسين طويلا. فكتب معاوية إلى الحسين: إن من أعطى الله صفقة يمينه وعهده لجدير بالوفاء، وقد أنبت أن قوما من أهل الكوفة قد دعوك إلى الشقاق، وأهل العراق من قد جربت قد أفسدوا على أبيك وأخيك، فاتق الله واذكر الميثاق، فإنك متى تكذني أكذلك. فكتب إليه الحسين: أتاني كتابك وأنا بغير الذي بلغك عني جدير، والحسنات لا يهدي لها إلا الله، وما أردت لك محاربة ولا عليك خلافا، وما أظن لي عند الله عذرا في ترك جهادك (البداية)

prefer Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umarؓ or Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeirؓ, the people of Irâq would not be happy with anyone besides Hadhrat Huseinؓ and the people of Shâm would never accept as their leader, except one from the tribe of the Ummayyad. Expecting all the clans and tribes to unanimously select one leader was thus a futile exercise and Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ was well aware of this.

It should also be remembered that when selecting the next Caliph, the present Caliph is encouraged to consult with his subjects, but not compelled to accept the decision. Hadhrat Abu Bakrؓ himself ignored the opposition of certain people when it came to electing Hadhrat Umarؓ as Caliph, and this has been the practice of every leader who came thereafter. Even in electing Hadhrat Uthmaanؓ there existed a difference of opinion amongst the few who had been appointed to choose, so how could it now ever be considered possible to find a man, upon whom the entire nation would agree?

- 5) When Hadhrat Huseinؓ and his companions were questioned as to the reason of their not agreeing with the decision of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, none of them made any mention that they found him unfit for the position, or that he was a habitual drunkard, or an adulterer, etc. Their answer was merely that they felt that this was opening up the door of 'Hirqaliyah' (a system of succession), where after every leader his son ascends the throne, irrespective of whether he is capable or not.
- 6) Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ was well aware of the reason behind their opposition, but still he felt that the betterment of the Ummah lay in Yazîd being elected. This decision of his was based purely on his sincere concern for the unity of the Ummah and had nothing to do with desiring to keep power within his family.

7) The hypocrites of Irâq understood well that Hadhrat Huseinؓ was opposed to the appointment of Yazîd as Caliph, and found this to be the ideal opportunity to re-ignite the flames of war amongst the Ummah. Yazîd was in Shâm, far away from Irâq, but as soon as the news of the death of his father began spreading, their letters of complaints against Yazîd began pouring in, whereas their leader was Hadhrat Nu'maan ibn Bashir, a Sahâbiؓ, and Yazîd was far, far away from them.

8) The inhabitants of Makkah Mukarramah and Madinah Munawwara warned Hadhrat Huseinؓ from believing the letters of the people of Irâq, since their betrayal was well known. But heؓ was determined to give them a final chance to prove their loyalty. Finally, due to the insistence of the people of Hijâz, he agreed to first send his cousin, Muslim ibn Aqeelؓ to Irâq, to confirm the authenticity of the letters from the people of Irâq. When Muslim ibn Aqeelؓ arrived, he was introduced to scores of loyal supporters, each claiming to have with him the allegiance of many more, who could not be present due to government spies all over.

Heؓ thus wrote to Hadhrat Huseinؓ that their support was genuine. As soon as the letter was sent, his host Mukhtaar ibn Ubeid Thaqafi had him exit his house, and Muslim ibn Aqeelؓ found himself deserted, left at the mercy of Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad. Before his death, he made a final attempt to warn Hadhrat Huseinؓ of the betrayal of the Irâqis, but his warning reached too late.

9) Had there been no instigators and hypocrites acting as intermediaries, Hadhrat Huseinؓ and Yazîd would have surely come to a truce, but fate had been written otherwise. Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad was never going to allow Hadhrat

Huseinﷺ the opportunity to speak personally to Yazîd, knowing full well that Yazîd would surely pardon him, as was the bequest of his father.

10) Hadhrat Huseinﷺ had been invited by the hypocrites so that his blessed blood could be used as an excuse to start a revolution that was intended to bring down the entire Umayyad Empire. The hypocrites who had written to him, inviting him and promising their help, were never going to be interested in saving his life. Rather, it was nothing but his blood that they desired, which they could thereafter use as a support-gainer against the Umayyads, who would be framed for the killing. Why else do you think that from the hundreds that showed their faces to Muslim ibn Aqeel, as loyal supporters of Hadhrat Huseinﷺ, not a single one of them offered up when he required their help the most. In fact, as mentioned in many narrations, **it was these very hypocrites who stood on the side of the army who had come out in his opposition.**

11) There was no reason to have Hadhrat Huseinﷺ martyred. He himself offered to allow himself to be arrested and taken to Yazîd. In fact, he even promised, as mentioned in narrations, that he was now prepared to pledge allegiance at the hands of Yazîd. Such a move would have surely been a strengthening factor to the rule of Yazîd, thus it is inconceivable that Yazîd would have ever disagreed to such a proposal. The only benefactors from the martyrdom of Hadhrat Huseinﷺ were the very hypocrites who had lured him into coming to Irâq. His blood was essential to their plans. To ensure that he does not leave alive they even joined the army coming out to have him arrested. The purpose of these hypocrites in the army of

Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad was merely to ensure that Hadhrat Huseinﷺ does not leave Karbala alive.

12) There is no proof that Yazîd ever ordered the killing of Hadhrat Huseinﷺ and common sense itself shall show that even the most weak-minded of rulers would avoid issuing such an order. Historical narrations clearly show Yazîd openly expressing his innocence from having issued such a command and desiring that such a disaster could have been averted.

13) A few years after the martyrdom of Hadhrat Huseinﷺ, the first host of Muslim ibn Aqeelﷺ, Mukhtaar ibn Ubeid Thaqafi, openly made the call of rebellion against the Umayyad, using the slogan of 'revenge for the Ahle-Bait' as a source of winning support. With such a slogan, who would ever think of not lending a helping hand to his movement? The sorrowful tales of Karbala had already made the public lose faith in the Umayyads and all were thus desirous of justice being served.

The revolution led by Mukhtaar gained tremendous support and soon the majority of Irâq was rallying under his flag. As his power increased, he made apparent a few of his satanic beliefs, first claiming that Mohammad Hanafiya, the son of Hadhrat Aliﷺ, was the promised 'Mahdi', and thereafter moving to the claim that he himself was 'God-incarnate'! (*Na'ûzubillah*). His soldiers behaved like barbarians as they savaged innocent women and children and massacred all who resisted joining their movement.

His move was finally brought to an abrupt end when Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeirﷺ ordered his brother, Mus'ab, to stop him in his tracks. A fierce war broke out and Mukhtaar was finally defeated. When this was the reality of the first host of Muslim ibn Aqeelﷺ, what else could then be said of the entire affair of calling Hadhrat Huseinﷺ to Irâq

except that it was nothing but a bloody conspiracy, plotted by shaytâni forces spread along the length and breadth of the Islâmîc world, with its centre being Kufa?

14) Just as how Yazîd had been instigated into sending Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad against Hadhrat Huseinؑ, so too was he later instigated into having his forces attack the holy lands of Makkah Mukarramah and Madinah Munawwara. Yazîd could possibly never be found completely innocent of having made rash decisions, but accusations of kufr, fisq, etc, without any real proof, is surely not the demand of looking at the matter with the eyes of justice.

15) The martyrdom of Hadhrat Huseinؑ was surely one of the major catastrophes that the Ummah had to witness, but it was definitely not the worst. Why then has it remained the only episode that gets remembered year after year, and why has an open investigation into its reality never been allowed?

Why has every party that has attempted to question the affair of Karbala been branded as 'men against the Ahle-Bait'? Is it that the label 'against the Ahle-Bait' has been formed to ensure that none ever dare investigate the 'bloody' secrets behind Karbala, and to serve a purpose similar to that which 'the holocaust' and '911' serve, i.e. to keep the flames of war blazing, to rally support for a mission engulfed in false accusations and oppression and to ensure that the truth never gets revealed.

The above fifteen points have been mentioned as a summary of what one could discover if the incident of Karbala were to be studied without any preconceived idea in mind. It is not necessary that one's conclusion be exactly the same, but the minimum that an unbiased study of the incident would do is leave one with many unanswered

questions and with many doubts regarding the story that has become common amongst the masses and even amongst many scholars.

With regards to proving the above fifteen points, let it first be understood that most of what is known regarding Karbala and the factors leading to it have been derived from historical narrations, which can never be accepted as concrete proof. These historical narrations either have no chain of transmission (*sanad*) and even if they do, very few have undergone any sort of test to verify their authenticity. Added to this is the fact that even if a narration can be traced up to a Sahâbiؓ, through a strong chain of narrators, then too, the question shall always remain as to who did the Sahâbiؓ get his information from. A Sahâbiؓ would never lie, but in the era of the Sahâbahؓ and Tâbi'een, hypocrisy was indeed rife, and liars, instigating Sahâbahؓ and Tâbi'een against each other, were spread around the Muslim world.

If a statement of a Sahâbiؓ or a senior Tabi'ee had to reach us with an accepted chain, it would still be necessary to search for the informant before accepting the information. If the Sahâbiؓ or Tabi'ee were to claim that he had witnessed an incident personally, his word would be taken immediately, but if he was merely quoting what had reached him, such news would require verification.

Incidents of men like Abdullâh ibn Saba' and others instigating Sahâbahؓ and Tâbi'een against each other are numerous. In fact it was this very sort of instigation that laid the foundation for the assassination of Hadhrat Uthmaanؓ, and the wars that followed thereafter. Thus, if a Sahâbiؓ or Tabi'ee were to comment on any issue regarding the conflicts that occurred during their era, it would be essential that before accepting his statement, it first be seen if his informant can be relied on, and whether the informant himself witnessed the incident personally, or is he also merely narrating from

someone else. At times, one shall realise that despite an incident being narrated by numerous historians, when it comes to tracing it to at least one authentic source, not a single narration can be found to be reliable.

Historical narrations lending support to the version that has been mentioned above can thus easily be provided, but narrations supporting conflicting versions can just as easily be found. What shall the criterion therefore be, which shall prompt one to accept one narration over another, when in strength each narration is practically the same, i.e. its authenticity can hardly be verified?

In proving the fifteen points mentioned above, I have thus chosen a method of questioning the motive, wisdom, probability and practicality of different aspects regarding Karbala and surrounding issues. That version which fits most with the demands of Islâmic principles and does not leave unanswered questions shall be adopted, and all conflicting narrations ignored. Historical narrations supporting the preferred version shall be provided, not to prove the version, but rather merely to show that such narrations also exist, which have generally been ignored, either purposely, or just because it was felt that it goes against the grain of the commonly accepted version.

Karbala and its surrounding issues, facts or fiction

1) The assassination of Hadhrat Hasanؑ and the culprits behind it

Various parties have been accused of poisoning Hadhrat Hasanؑ, with the most famous being that it was his wife, Ja'dah bint Ash'ath, instigated either by Hadhrat Muâwiyahؑ, with the promise of marrying her to his son, Yazîd, or instigated by her own father, Ash'ath ibn Qais, who in turn was instigated by Hadhrat Muâwiyahؑ. Despite

this view being mentioned in many unverified historical narrations, the accusation against Ja'dah and Hadhrat Muâwiyahؑ fails to answer the following questions:

- a) What benefit could Hadhrat Muâwiyahؑ ever derive from the assassination of Hadhrat Hasanؑ? In fact, as long as Hadhrat Hasanؑ remained alive, there remained no fear of the Irâqis instigating Hadhrat Huseinؑ, since it was common knowledge that Hadhrat Hasanؑ was totally against in-fighting, and for that very reason had agreed to hand over the Caliphate. Had Hadhrat Hasanؑ been alive at the time when Hadhrat Muâwiyahؑ decided to elect his son, Yazîd, as the next Caliph, there is a great possibility that he would have ensured that none oppose Hadhrat Muâwiyahؑ, since his life ambition was to keep the unity of the Ummah and to seal all doors that could lead to in-fighting.

In attempting to answer this, certain narrations have been concocted to show that in the truce made between Hadhrat Muâwiyahؑ and Hadhrat Hasanؑ it was agreed that after the death of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؑ the caliphate would be returned to Hadhrat Hasanؑ. Hadhrat Muâwiyahؑ's motive in having himؑ assassinated was thus to protect himself from having to fulfil this condition. (Na'ûzubillah) The absurdness of this 'made up motive' is more than evident, since if such a condition had ever been laid, it would have been common knowledge amongst all the Sahâbahؑ and Tâbi'een present during that era and it would surely have found some mention in authentic narrations.

- b) Why can no narration be found wherein Hadhrat Huseinؑ accuses Hadhrat Muâwiyahؑ of having killed his brother? Rather, what can be found is that even after the death of Hadhrat Hasanؑ, Hadhrat Huseinؑ would continue visiting

Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ at least once a year and accepting from him gifts, just as he would do during the lifetime of his brother.

- c) The wife of Hadhrat Hasanؓ, Ja'dah, was herself a princess, being the daughter of Ash'ath ibn Qais, chief of the famous and mighty tribe of Kindah, and loyal friend of Hadhrat Aliؓ. She had the honour of being in the marriage of the prince of both the worlds, the most handsome man of the time, the grandson and beloved of Rasulullâhؐ, a man who every woman of that time desired entering into his wedlock, even if only for a short while. Due to being the wife of Hadhrat Hasanؓ, she was also blessed to be the daughter-in-law of Hadhrat Fatima Zahraؓ, and of the close household of Rasulullâhؐ. Having acquired all this prestige and honour, what benefit could there now possibly be for her to forfeit all this glory and honour, merely so that she could be married to Yazîd, who was absolutely no match whatsoever in front of the leader of the youth of Jannah, Hadhrat Hasanؓ!
- d) Had Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ or Yazîd ever thought of poisoning Hadhrat Hasanؓ, they would never have done it through his wife. Would they ever take the chance of having themselves humiliated in front of the entire Ummah and branded as traitors, knowing full well that a wife's love for her husband, especially a husband like Hadhrat Hasanؓ, would surely have her expose their evil intentions? When no weak-minded man would ever take such a chance, where then could such an unwise plot ever emit from the mind of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, who has been declared as one of the most wise of the Arabs.
- e) If the motive behind the assassination of Hadhrat Hasanؓ was to clear the path for his son, Yazîd, to become Caliph, why then did Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ also not make some sort of effort to

have the few standing in opposition to Yazîd's election also murdered. Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ was well aware that the only true opposition that Yazîd would have to face was that of Hadhrat Huseinؓ and Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeirؓ. If assassinating Hadhrat Hasan was so easy, why did he then not have the same done with these illustrious two as well?

- f) Hadhrat Hasanؓ would yearly present himself, together with his brother, in front of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ. Had Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ ever intended having him assassinated, he could have easily ordered that they be ambushed during one of their journeys and killed. In this way, there would be no fear of a woman ever exposing the men behind the killing, nor any concern of Hadhrat Huseinؓ later standing up in retaliation.
- g) According to one narration, the father of Ja'dah, i.e. Ash'ath ibn Qais, having been bought off by Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, instigated his daughter to poison Hadhrat Hasanؓ. From all the narrations, this one is the most preposterous, since Ash'ath ibn Qais passed away approximately nine years before the demise of Hadhrat Hasanؓ, and according to some narrations, Hadhrat Hasanؓ himself performed his janaazah.

Due to the above eight factors (a-g) it seems only right that Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, Yazîd, and Ja'dah bint Ash'ath be absolved from having played any role in the assassination of Hadhrat Hasanؓ, and other suspects now be brought under investigation. The suspects with the greatest motive, who would attain the most benefit through the death of Hadhrat Hasanؓ would obviously be none other than the very ones who had been behind all the wars and assassinations thus far, i.e. the Satanist/persian /Khawârij/jewish forces operating primarily from Irâq, but whose forces of hypocrites had now spread all over the Muslim world.

Their motive would be obvious, i.e. only with the removal of Hadhrat Hasanؑ could their hopes of re-igniting the flames of war ever be realised. Hadhrat Hasanؑ had already made it clear that he was never going to lend support to any Irâqi movement and as long as he was alive, he would ensure that Hadhrat Huseinؑ also never inclines towards them.

A narration, with a sound and strong chain, which supports this, has already passed⁵³, in which Hadhrat Hasanؑ expressed concern that in his absence he feared that the people of Irâq would easily instigate his brother against the present government and thus re-ignite the flames of war amongst the Ummah.

Another factor indicating towards the involvement of this group is the fact that as soon as the news of the death of Hadhrat Hasanؑ spread, letters from parties in Irâq began pouring in, expressing regret over his death, but at the same time instigating Hadhrat Huseinؑ to join them in opposing the government. An example of this has been previously mentioned, the gist of which is as follows:

(When the news of the death of Hadhrat Hasanؑ reached the people of Kufa, the leaders of Kufa sent their condolences to Hadhrat Huseinؑ, via letters. Ja'dah ibn Hubeira, who would display the most love for the Ahle-Bait, wrote,

⁵³ Yazid ibn Al-Asam narrates that once whilst on a journey with Hadhrat Hasan ibn Aliؑ, a bundle of letters reached him., Hadhrat Hasanؑ called for a container and had water poured into it. He then threw the letters into the water, without even bothering to glance at its contents. I asked, 'O Abu Muhammad (Hadhrat Hasanؑ), who has sent all of these letters?' He replied, 'It has come from the people of Irâq, a group that shall never accept the truth, and shall never desist from their evil! As for myself, I do not fear being deceived by these people. However I do fear that they may have an impact on him!' Saying this Hadhrat Hasanؑ pointed towards Hadhrat Huseinؑ.' (Majmauz Zawaid)

'Such friends of yours are present here (i.e. in Kufa and Irâq), who are eagerly awaiting your coming, who regard none as your equal! They are well aware that the opinion of your brother, Hasan, was to avoid war, whereas you are a man who shows kindness to friends and severity against the enemy, a man who fights bravely for the Deen of Allâh. Thus, if you are desirous of achieving these goals, come over to Kufa immediately, for we have, in your service, handed ourselves over to death!)

As for Hadhrat Muâwiyahؑ, no real change in his manner of governing occurred after the death of Hadhrat Hasanؑ, which could in some way have indicated that he was just waiting for the death of Hadhrat Hasanؑ to carry out a new idea. It was only seven years later, when he felt that his death was fast approaching, that he began considering having Yazîd appointed as Caliph after him. Hadhrat Hasanؑ passed away in the 49th year after Hijrah, whilst the issue of having Yazîd elected only began in the 56th year after Hijrah, four years before the death of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؑ.

The crux of this discussion is that the accusation made against Hadhrat Muâwiyahؑ and Yazîd regarding their involvement in the murder of Hadhrat Hasanؑ has no basis and common logic too defies it. In fact, during the entire era of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؑ, not a word was ever mentioned regarding his, or his son's possible involvement in the death of Hadhrat Hasanؑ. Hadhrat Huseinؑ, for the next nine years, continued making his annual visits to Hadhrat Muâwiyahؑ, but not once did he even raise the issue of the death of his brother.

It was only years later that evil segments had this absurd claim propagated and without any verification, simple-minded believers began repeating it, as though it was a decided truth. As for those against whom there definitely was some form of case, i.e. the liars of

Irâq, their mention was hardly ever made in the lists of possible suspects.

With regards to the woman accused of poisoning Hadhrat Hasanؓ, Ja'dah bint Ash'ath, despite famous historians having painted her as the killer, without making any indication whatsoever that this accusation too has never been verified, if one were to merely ponder over her life-history alone, it would be more than sufficient to expose the fact that the accusation laid against her, forget not being proven, was never even mentioned during her lifetime.

A summary of her life, as taken from Tabaqât Ibn Sa'd, and other sources, show:

- 1) She was the maternal niece of Hadhrat Abu Bakrؓ.
- 2) She was married to Hadhrat Hasanؓ, while Hadhrat Aliؓ, was alive. She thus had the privilege of remaining in the wedlock of Hadhrat Hasanؓ for over nine years, getting separated only due to his death. Hadhrat Hasanؓ was well known for his habit of retaining women in his marriage for only short periods of time, and thereafter divorcing them and accepting others into his wedlock, merely with the intention of allowing more and more woman the opportunity of having some sort of share to be from the family of Rasulullâhؐ. Despite this habit, Hadhrat Hasanؓ kept Ja'dah till the end. Why?

Can it be conceived that a man of such wisdom and foresight remain blinded from the evil hidden within this woman, thereby keeping her back and sending away so many other righteous and pious women? Does the love and inclination which Hadhrat Hasanؓ expressed for this woman not offer any indication towards her nobility, piety,

righteousness and sincerity? Has Quraan not hinted that the inclination, love and admiration expressed by a pure believing male for his female partner should be considered as a significant sign of the purity of the female herself?⁵⁴

- 3) After the death of Hadhrat Hasanؓ, Ya'qub ibn Talhaؓ, the son of Hadhrat Talhah ibn Zubeirؓ (one of the ten who received glad-tidings of Jannah during their lifetime) extended his hand of marriage towards her. She remained with him in Madinah Munawwara, till his death and bore him three children. Ya'qub ibn Talha was a high-ranking Tabi'ee, famous for his generosity. Would such a man ever think of marrying a woman who had been accused of poisoning Hadhrat Hasanؓ, and thereafter residing with her in the very city in which Hadhrat Hasanؓ had passed away?
- 4) During her stay in Madinah Munawwara, with her new husband, a time came when the people of Madinah,

⁵⁴ Reference is being made to the verse 26 of Surah An Nur, wherein Almighty Allah states:

- وَالطَّيِّبَاتُ لِلطَّيِّبِينَ وَالطَّيِّبُونَ لِلطَّيِّبَاتِ

'And pure souls shall surely only be inclined to that which is pure'.

This verse was revealed in relation to the incident of Ifk, wherein Hadhrat Ayeshaؓ was accused of adultery (Na'ûzubillah). In explaining the various reasons why the believers should never have paid heed to the accusation, Almighty Allah here explained that the fact that Rasulullâh', who was the purest of pure, reserved the most love and inclination for Hadhrat Ayeshaؓ, that in itself should have been sufficient to expose the lie in this false claim.

{ والخبيثون } أيضاً { للخبيثات } لأن المجانسة من دواعي الانضمام { والطيبات } منهن { للطيبين } منهم { والطيبون } أيضاً { للطيبات } منهن بحيث لا يتجاوزنهن إلى من عداهن وحيث كان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أطيب الأتبيين وخيرة الأولين والآخرين تبين كون الصديقة رضي الله تعالى عنها من أطيب الطيبات بالضرورة واتضح بطلان ما قيل فيها من الخرافات حسبما نطق به قوله سبحانه : { أُولَئِكَ مِرَّةُونَ مِمَّا يَقُولُونَ } (روح المعاني)

including her husband, pledged their allegiance to Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeirؓ. During this time, why did Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeirؓ not have her brought to trial? The only plausible reason is that during that time, in Madinah Munawwara, not a single accusation had been levelled against her by anyone, thus the need of an investigation never arose.

- 5) After the death of Ya'qub, the eldest son of Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Abbaasؓ married her, from whom she bore two children. Knowing the close relationship between Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Abbaasؓ and the family of Hadhrat Aliؓ, could one ever imagine his eldest son marrying a woman accused of poisoning Hadhrat Hasanؓ. The fact that he married her and kept her with him in Shâm clearly shows that during that era no accusation had been levelled against her, neither in Hijâz, nor in Shâm.

From the above, one can clearly ascertain that during the era of the Sahâbahؓ, no accusation had ever been made against Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, and neither against Yazîd, nor against Ja'dah, at least not in the lands of Hijâz and Shâm. No trial was ever held, no evidence was ever heard, and in fact no finger was ever pointed at any one of these three, regarding having played any role in the death of Hadhrat Hasanؓ. When this is the case, could one ever now ever dare lift a finger of accusation against any of these individuals, especially after being aware of the strict verdict of the Shariah regarding accusing without any valid proof!

- 2) **Why did Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ appoint his son, Yazîd, as Caliph after him?**

Was it due to extreme love he held for his son, which spurred him to betray the trust the Ummah had placed upon him and appoint an unworthy one as their leader. (Na'ûzubillah) Or was it that his love for fame and power would not allow him to let the reigns of Caliphate ever leave his family? (Na'ûzubillah)

After a period of over forty years, during which Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ proved himself as a great well-wisher of the Ummah, and displayed, through his actions, the acceptance of the dua of Rasulullâhﷺ for him, that he always be righty-guided, now when his death was most imminent, and when his hereafter was about to begin, would such an intelligent man ever make a decision that would wash away all his good, just so that his son gets the title of 'Caliph'? (Na'ûzubillah)

If all the above are to be regarded as impossible, what then could have been the reason for Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ being so insistent that the Ummah accept Yazîd as their Caliph, despite knowing full well that certain illustrious Sahâbahؓ were not at all happy with his intention?

Perhaps one could say that Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ was unaware at that time regarding the future actions of his son and understanding him worthy appointed him. The problems with this answer however are manifold, a few of which are:

- a) It is clear from the books of history that Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ was well informed of the dissatisfaction of certain Sahâbahؓ, with regards to his making Yazîd Caliph. In fact, Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ even travelled to Hijâz, solely to discuss this issue with them and question the reasons for their disapproval.
- b) After the death of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, not a single Sahâbiؓ, from those who had shown their dissatisfaction with his decision, ever mentioned to the people that the

reason for their not pledging to Yazîd was due to his actions changing drastically after the death of his father.

- c) From the five Sahâbahؓ who openly criticized the decision of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ while he was alive, only two remained in opposition after the appointment of Yazîd, viz. Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeirؓ and Hadhrat Huseinؓ. Hadhrat Abdur Rahmaan ibn Abi Bakrؓ passed away before this, whilst Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umarؓ and Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Abbaasؓ, as they had previously promised, pledged allegiance.

If one were to say that Yazîd was good while his father was alive and his true colours were only revealed upon the death of his father, then one would surely have to question the wisdom for Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umarؓ and Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Abbaasؓ opposing Yazîd's appointment, while he was outwardly pious and upright (i.e. during his father's life) and accepting his rule happily, after he began displaying all his evil colours and traits (i.e. after the death of his father). It would be as though one is saying that they openly rejected his appointment while he was good, and happily accepted it when he became bad! (Na'ûzubillah)

- d) If Yazîd did really become bad and evil after the death of his fatherؓ, why then did the vast majority of Sahâbahؓ and Tâbi'een not oppose him? Rather, the books of history show clearly many illustrious Sahâbahؓ and Tâbi'een serving happily as commanders, chiefs, advisers, etc, under Yazîd.

Could it ever be possible that after having seen only upright, Allâh-fearing caliphs, viz. Hadhrat Abu Bakrؓ, Hadhrat Umarؓ, Hadhrat Uthmaanؓ, Hadhrat Aliؓ, Hadhrat Hasanؓ, and Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, the Ummah would then suddenly find their new Caliph, Yazîd, perpetrating open acts of indecency and immorality, yet none from his chief ministers, advisers, soldiers, and the Ulema and Fuqeha around

him would criticize his actions, or at least announce his resignation from Yazîd's cabinet?

The above few points shall *Insha-Allâh* be sufficient to show the weakness of the view that Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ appointed Yazîd as Caliph while he was good, and that the opposition of Hadhrat Huseinؓ occurred only due to his later turning evil.

The question now remains as to why would Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, right at the end of his life, choose to spoil his hereafter by entrusting the responsibility of caliphate over to his son, knowing full well that there were many other more deserving candidates, and that his son, Yazîd, was not at all fit for the job? What could possibly have spurred him on to make such a rash decision and why did the general Ummah, which comprised of many Sahâbahؓ, during the four years that he remained alive after openly announcing his decision, not demand that he retract? If one were to reply that five senior Sahâbahؓ did in fact object, the question shall then be phrased more explicitly as, 'why did only five from the entire galaxy of Sahâbahؓ and Tâbi'een object? Why did the rest remain silent? Could it be conceived that all the Sahâbahؓ and Tâbi'een of that era, besides five, had now become so gripped with the fear of the Muâwiyah regime that none dared speak out?

If one were to then answer that during that era there were not really so many senior Sahâbahؓ alive, our answer would be that in the matters of Din, the junior Sahâbahؓ, and Tâbi'een were blessed with the very fervour which the seniors had been blessed with. Where the seniors were lamps of guidance, so too were the juniors!

In fact, a mere glance at the names of the illustrious Sahâbahؓ alive during that era would be more than sufficient to show the weakness behind this argument. For the benefit of the masses, some of these names shall be listed below. Amongst these names, some shall be of those, who although they never lived to see the reign of Yazîd, but

were however alive when Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ announced his decision to have his son appointed as Caliph after his death, yet they voiced no opposition to his decision.

In Al-Bidayah it has been recorded that the announcement of Yazîd becoming Caliph after Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ was made in the 56th year after Hijrah, four years before the demise of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ. Sahâbahؓ and senior Tâbi'een, who lived after the announcement, but did not voice any objection, include, amongst others:

- 1) Hadhrat Ayeshaؓ, (passed away 58 A.H) whose opinion in all Deeni matters was respected greatly by all, and whose objection against Yazîd being appointed would most definitely have been recorded, had she ever made any. In fact, when Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ complained to herؓ, regarding the few Sahâbahؓ who were in objection to his decision of appointing Yazîd, sheؓ advised him to treat them with forbearance, and assured him that what he desired would surely happen.⁵⁵
- 2) Hadhrat Umme Salamahؓ (59 A.H)
- 3) Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Amr ibn Aasؓ (63 A.H)
- 4) Hadhrat Dhahaak ibn Qaisؓ (64 A.H) He served under Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, then under Yazîd, then under Muâwiyah ibn Yazîd, and finally when Muâwiyah ibn Yazîd stepped down from the caliphate, he pledged allegiance to Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeirؓ.
- 5) Hadhrat Jaabir ibn Samuraؓ (66 A.H)
- 6) Hadhrat Adi' ibn Haatimؓ (67 A.H)
- 7) Hadhrat Bashir ibn Aqrabah Al-Juhaniؓ
- 8) Hadhrat Mahmud ibn Rabi' (99 A.H)

°° ثم دخل على عائشة، وقد بلغها أنه ذكر الحسين وأصحابه، فقال: لأقتلنهم إن لم يبايعوا، فشكاهم إليها، فوعظته وقالت له: بلغني أنك تهتددهم بالقتل، فقال: يا أم المؤمنين هم أعز من ذلك ولكي يابعت ليزيد وبايعه غيرهم، أفترين أن أنقض بيعه قد تمت؟ قالت: فارق بهم فإنهم يصيرون إلى ما تحب إن شاء الله. قال: أفعل (الكامل)

- 9) Hadhrat Bureida Aslamiؓ (73 A.H)
- 10) Hadhrat Bilal ibn Harith Muzaniؓ (60 A.H) He carried the flags of Muzeinah on the Day of the Conquest of Makkah Mukarramah.
- 11) Hadhrat Aa'iz ibn Amr (Abu Hubeira)ؓ (passed away in the caliphate of Yazîd) – He was from the Sahâbah who made the pledge of Al-Ridwan.
- 12) Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Abi Aufaؓ (86 A.H)
- 13) Hadhrat Abu Juheifahؓ (83 A.H)
- 14) Hadhrat Amr ibn Hirriethؓ (85 A.H)
- 15) Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Busr Maaziniؓ (88 A.H)
- 16) Hadhrat Abu Umamah Baahiliؓ (86 A.H)
- 17) Hadhrat Anas ibn Mâlikؓ (93 A.H)
- 18) Hadhrat Wathila ibn Asqa'ؓ (85 A.H)
- 19) Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Hadith Zubeidiؓ (86 A.H)
- 20) Hadhrat Hirmaas ibn Ziyaad Baahiliؓ (102 A.H)
- 21) Hadhrat Ruweiqi' ibn Thabit Ansaariؓ (63 A.H)
- 22) Hadhrat Salamah ibn Akwaؓ (74 A.H)
- 23) Hadhrat Bureida ibn Huseibؓ (73 A.H)
- 24) Hadhrat Abu Baraza Aslami (74 A.H)
- 25) Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Mugaffalؓ (59 A.H)
- 26) Hadhrat Abu Waqid Laithiؓ (68 A.H)
- 27) Hadhrat Jaabir ibn Abdullâhؓ (74 A.H)
- 28) Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Tha'labahؓ (93 A.H)
- 29) Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Ja'farؓ (84 A.H)
- 30) Hadhrat Miswar ibn Makhramahؓ (64 A.H)
- 31) Hadhrat Maslamah ibn Makhladؓ (62 A.H)
- 32) Hadhrat Abu Tufeil, Aamir ibn Wathilahؓ (100 A.H)
- 33) Hadhrat As'ad ibn Sahl ibn Haneefؓ (100 A.H)

In short there were many Sahâbahؓ who were alive at the time when Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ announced his decision to appoint his son after him, yet none of them voiced any objection. Neither have any objections, in the lifetime of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, against Yazîd from

the senior Tâbi'een been recorded. Could it be that all were afraid of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, or was there some other reason for their silence?

An explanation that, in my understanding, answers the issue of why Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ chose to appoint his son, Yazîd, despite being aware that five senior Sahâbahؓ were opposing the idea, and answers why practically all the Sahâbahؓ and Tâbi'een accepted Yazîd as Caliph, shall now be mentioned. If one chooses not to accept this explanation, he should then search for another, but one that does not put any stain on the integrity of the Sahâbahؓ as a whole, and on Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ in particular.

**An explanation that clears the illustrious personalities of that era
from accusations and doubts**

When Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ passed the age of seventy, after enjoying twenty years of stable rule as Caliph, his attention and worry shifted to ensuring that the Ummah do not, after his death, again fall into years of in-fighting, due to their differences with regards to who should be the next Caliph.

Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ's base had always been the land of Shâm, with his capital in Damascus. The army of Shâm had always proven loyal to his command, even during the most trying of times. Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ understood well that the warriors of Shâm had a strong affiliation with the Umayyad clan, due to Hadhrat Muâwiyah's lengthy rule over them, first as governor, from the time of Umarؓ and thereafter as Caliph. The fear always existed that by now selecting a Caliph from another clan, it could re-ignite the fighting and bloodshed that the Ummah had just come out of.

This feeling of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ was indeed accurate, and found its proof years later when Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeirؓ was selected as

Caliph by the inhabitants of Hijâz, but due to his not being from the Umayyad clan, he did not receive the full support of the people of Shâm. In fact, they were even prepared to make an assault upon the noble cities of Hijâz, just so that an Umayyad could receive the seat of caliphate. Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeirؓ was finally martyred and an Umayyad, Marwan ibn Hakam, followed by his son, Abdul Malik ibn Marwan was placed on the seat of caliphate.

Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ's ardent desire was that the flames of fire amongst the Muslims never be re-ignited by the hypocrites of Irâq. He thus searched for a solution that would keep all happy and the flags of Jihâd in full motion. For this, he consulted his senior advisors and spent many months in deep thought. Finally, his eye fell upon his son, Yazîd, who had already proven himself as an able leader, after leading the first attack on Constantinople, over an army, which consisted of many senior Sahâbahؓ, with Hadhrat Abu Ayoob Ansaari Radhiyallahu Anhu being the most note-worthy, due to his passing away on this journey.

Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ found his armies of Shâm as loyal and obedient to Yazîd as they were to him. Had he immediately chosen Yazîd as Caliph after him, he would hardly have found any opposition from those around him and his decision would then have become binding upon the rest of the Ummah. Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ however felt it best to make his intention known and to see what the Ummah felt regarding it.

From the very beginning, Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ made it clear that the appointment of his son had nothing to do with holding on to power. It was based solely on the well-being of the entire Ummah, and to keep the unity. Statements recorded from Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, regarding this, are as follows:

إني خفت أن أذر الرعية من بعدي كالغنم المطيرة ليس لها راع (البداية)

I fear leaving the Ummah after me as a scattered flock with no shepherd!

Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ presented this reason to Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umarؓ, upon which Ibn Umarؓ promised that if the Ummah would pledge allegiance to Yazîd, he too would do the same, and this was exactly what heؓ did after the death of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ.

وروينا عن معاوية أنه قال يوماً في خطبته: اللهم إن كنت تعلم أنني وليته لأنه فيما أراه أهل لذلك فأتهم له ما وليته، وإن كنت وليته لاني أحبه فلا تتمم له ما وليته (البداية)

(It has been narrated that Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ mentioned once, while on the pulpit)

O Allâh, if I appointed him (Yazîd) on account of finding him able and suitable for the post, then let it happen!

And if I appointed him, solely out of my love for him, then let it not happen!

إني أرحب أن أدع أمة محمد كالضأن لا راعي لها (الطبري)

I fear leaving the Ummah of Rasulullâhؐ as sheep with no shepherd!

إني قد كبرت سني، ودق عظمي، وخشيت الاختلاف على الأمة بعدي،

وقد رأيت أن أتخير لهم من يقوم بعدي،

وكرهت أن أقطع أمراً دون مشورة من عندك، فاعرض ذلك عليهم وأعلمني بالذي يردون عليك (الكامل)

(When the thought of appointing Yazîd as Caliph first occurred to Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ,

heؓ sent the following command to his governors)

I have reached old age and my bones are now weak and lean. I fear that the Ummah may divide and differ after my death, thus I have chosen to appoint a Caliph who shall rule after me. However, I dislike doing any such thing, except after mutual consultation. Thus, inform the people of my intention and inform me regarding their opinions in this matter!

History can never deny that after the intention of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ was made known, the vast majority accepted his decision happily, and

many even expressed joy over the fact that a suitable leader had been chosen, and that future internal fighting would now not occur. To throw water over this reality, hypocrite elements worked tirelessly to pollute these narrations with their poison, and today unfortunately there are fabrications suggesting that all the noble and influential men and women of that era, besides three⁵⁶, were bought off and bribed by Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ into accepting Yazîd as their leader. (Na'ûzubillah)

Some speeches made in front of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, by delegations of various Muslim countries, with regards to his intention of appointing Yazîd, shall now be mentioned. However, as previously mentioned, if one were to open the books of history, he shall find just before the narration a few sentences, fabricated by hypocrite forces, indicating that the speaker had been bought off and was thus acting hypocritically. (Na'ûzubillah!)

a) According to some narrations, the first individual to suggest appointing Yazîd as Caliph was Hadhrat Mughîra ibn Shu'bahؓ.

In presenting the reason behind his suggestion, he explained:

يا أمير المؤمنين قد رأيت ما كان من سفك الدماء والاختلاف بعد عثمان، وفي يزيد منك خلف، فاعقد له

فإن حدث بك حادثٌ كان كهفأ للناس وخلفاً منك ولا تسفك دماء ولا تكون فتنة (الكامل)

O Amirul-Mu'mineen, verily you have seen the spilling of blood and disunity that occurred after the assassination of Uthmaanؓ. In Yazîd there is a worthy successor, thus appoint him as the next leader, so that if something has to happen to you, the people may find protection in him, and a leader to take over from you and the need to spill blood and cause chaos shall not arise!

⁵⁶ Initially five had voiced their opposition, but two, viz. Hadhrat Abdullah ibn Umarؓ and Hadhrat Abdullah ibn Abbasؓ made it known from the beginning that they would accept Yazid, if the rest of the Ummah did.

b) A delegation of approximately forty people from Irâq, including Urwah ibn Mughîra (رحمة الله عليه) (the son of Hadhrat Mughîra ibn Shu'bah (رحمة الله عليه)), delivered the following address:

يا أمير المؤمنين كبرت سنك وخفنا انتشار الحيل فانصب لنا علماً وحد لنا حداً تنتهي إليه. فقال: أشيروا علي. فقالوا: نشير بيزيد ابن أمير المؤمنين. فقال: أوقد رضىتموه؟ قالوا: نعم. قال: وذلك رأيكم؟ قالوا: نعم، ورأي من وراءنا

O Amirul-Mu'mineen, now that you have become old we fear disunity once again raising its ugly head, thus choose for us a leader, to who we may all turn! When asked who they felt suitable, they replied, 'Your son, Yazîd! That is our opinion and the opinion of those behind us!'

c) Dhahaak ibn Qais Al-Fihri (رحمة الله عليه) (a prominent Sahâbi (رحمة الله عليه)) delivered the following address:

يا أمير المؤمنين إنه لابد للناس من والٍ بعدك، وقد بلونا الجماعة والألفة فوجدناهما أحقن للدماء، وأصلح للدهماء، وآمن للسبل، وخيراً في العاقبة، والأيام عوج رواجع، والله كل يوم في شأن، ويزيد ابن أمير المؤمنين في حسن هديه وقصد سيرته على ما علمت، وهو من أفضلنا علماً وحلماً، وأبعدنا رأياً، فوله عهدك واجعله لنا علماً بعدك ومقرعاً نلجأ إليه ونسكن في ظله

O Amirul-Mu'mineen! It is essential that the people have a leader after you. We have found that in unity alone is the protection of our blood, and it alone shall keep peace and harmony amongst us. Times are always changing and Almighty Allâh alone is unique. As you are well aware, Yazîd, your son, is a man of good character and firm determination. He is most forbearing, knowledgeable and far-sighted. Thus appoint him as leader after you, so that we may live in harmony under his shadow!

It should be well understood that I am not trying to show that none opposed the decision to have Yazîd appointed, as that would be an open lie. What I am trying to show is that those that happily accepted the decision were indeed many; and to say that their acceptance was based solely on worldly motives, greed, etc, is preposterous and an unsupported accusation.

The books of history itself accept the fact that the vast majority of the Ummah promised to pledge their allegiance to Yazîd, in the case of the demise of Hadhrat Muâwiyah (رحمة الله عليه), a majority which consisted of many illustrious Sahâbah (رحمة الله عليهم) and Tâbi'een. And from those that opposed, history itself shows that Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Abbaas (رحمة الله عليه) and Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umar (رحمة الله عليه) later pledged their allegiance, just as they had initially promised. Were they all bribed into silence?

Unable to veil this reality, the most that the hypocrites could do was to contrive some excuse why the vast majority of the Ummah happily accepted the decision of Yazîd's appointment as the next Caliph. One such excuse that found a stable place in the books of history is what has been quoted by Ibn Athir in Al-Kamil:

وكان معاوية يعطي المقارب ويداري المبعاد ويلطف به حتى استوثق له أكثر الناس وبياعه

Muâwiyah (رحمة الله عليه) would shower favours upon those close to him and show his compassion and kindness to those who wished to remain aloof, until finally majority of the Ummah accepted his decision and pledged their allegiance to Yazîd.

The excuse mentioned above, despite it being the most suppressed in attacking the honour of the illustrious personalities of that era, yet when one scrutinizes it slightly, its boils down to one statement, i.e. Hadhrat Muâwiyah (رحمة الله عليه) bought their allegiance! (*Na'ûzubillah!* – Neither was Hadhrat Muâwiyah (رحمة الله عليه) a briber, nor was the Ummah as a whole ever a sell-out!)

The fact of the matter is that there is no other reason for the vast majority of the Ummah accepting Yazîd, except that they had no real problem with him being their leader, just as how they had no problem when he led the first expedition to Constantinople, despite there being senior Sahâbah (رحمة الله عليهم) alive at that time, who in fact participated in that very expedition.

The only question that now arises is that if there was nothing really wrong with Yazîd, then why did Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeirؓ, Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umarؓ, Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Abbaasؓ, Hadhrat Huseinؓ and Hadhrat Abdur Rahmaan ibn Abu Bakrؓ openly oppose the decision?

The opposition of a few illustrious Sahâbahؓ to the appointment of Yazîd and its reason

It has been falsely propogated that these Sahâbahؓ opposed the decision due to Yazîd being a drunkard, an adulterer, an open transgressor, etc. Had any of these evils been present in Yazîd, during his illustrious father's life, do you think Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ would ever have appointed him as the next Caliph? Forget caliphate, Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ would never have even made him a governor or collector over any area. Rather, Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ would have immediately established the Islâmic punishment upon him and had he not done so, the rest of the Ummah would surely have stood up and demanded that his son be tried for his crimes and filthy acts.

Had any of these evils been present in Yazîd, do you think Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ would have made a special trip to Hijâz, just to enquire the reason for the opposition of these illustrious men? And when he did finally get the opportunity to question them with regards to their opposing his decision, would not at least one of them have made mention of any one of these evils? In the answers that these illustrious Sahâbahؓ presented to Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, there is no mention of Yazîd being a transgressor, an adulterer, a drunkard, etc. In fact, had any of them or anyone else ever accused Yazîd of adultery, the accuser would immediately have been asked to present four witnesses, failing which, he himself would have been whipped eighty times for false accusation. Did any such thing happen?

When Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ questioned the reason for their opposition, their answer was solely that they feared that by him appointing his son as Caliph, an act which none had done thus far, it would open up the doors for *hirqaliyah* in the matters of caliphate, i.e. upon the death of a Caliph, the eldest son would automatically take the throne, even if he had no credentials, no ability and no interest whatsoever.

According to a narration of Ibn Athir in Al-Kamil, when the first news of Yazîd's appointment reached the people of Hijâz, Hadhrat Abdur Rahmaan ibn Abu Bakrؓ openly announced his displeasure in the following words:

ولكنكم تريدون أن تجعلوها هرقلية كلما مات هرقل قام هرقل

Rather, it is your intention to establish the caliphate on the principles of hirqaliyah,

i.e. upon the death of one leader; his son immediately takes his place!

When Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeirؓ spoke on behalf of all, the point that he put forward to Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ was that he should adopt the method of either Hadhrat Rasulullâhؐ, who left the matter of appointing a new Caliph in the hands of the Ummah, or of Hadhrat Abu Bakrؓ, who appointed a man out of his family circle, viz. Hadhrat Umarؓ, or of Hadhrat Umarؓ, who ordered that the next Caliph be chosen from a group, after mutual consultation of the members of that particular group. Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeirؓ's purpose was to highlight the point that before Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, none had ever chosen a Caliph from within his own family and thus they felt that he should follow suit.

The discussion between Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ and Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeirؓ, as recorded in Al-Kamil, was as follows:

'Choose one of three options. Either adopt the method of Rasulullâhؐ, or that of Abu Bakrؓ, or that of Umarؓ. The method of Rasulullâhؐ

was that heﷺ did not appoint any vicegerent, and the Ummah thereafter unanimously chose Abu Bakrﷺ as their leader.’ Hadhrat Muâwiyah replied, ‘At present, there is no man like Abu Bakrﷺ, upon whom all shall unite, thus I fear disunity arising.’

Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeirﷺ thereupon said, ‘Fair enough, so why do you not adopt the method of Abu Bakrﷺ, who did appoint a man from the Qureish, but who was not of his immediate family, or the method of Umarﷺ, who left the matter for six to decide, but ensured that his sons and immediate family did not feature amongst those six!’⁵⁷

The options presented by Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeirﷺ to Hadhrat Muâwiyahﷺ makes it very clear that the opposition of these illustrious individuals had nothing to do with the personality of Yazîd himself, but rather with the fact that he was the son of the Caliph. They had no problem with Hadhrat Muâwiyahﷺ selecting a future Caliph, nor did they have any problem with Yazîd. They were only in opposition to the act of a Caliph selecting some close family member as the next Caliph.

In clearer words, had Hadhrat Muâwiyahﷺ selected someone out of his immediate family circle, they would have no objection. Also, if some other Caliph had to later choose Yazîd, that too would be acceptable, as long as there existed no close family link between the two. The issue was with selecting close family members, and had nothing whatsoever to do with the personality of Yazîd!

⁵⁷ نَحِيرُكَ بَيْنَ ثَلَاثِ خِصَالٍ. قَالَ: اَعْرِضْهُنَّ. قَالَ: تَصْنَعُ كَمَا صَنَعَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ، صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ، أَوْ كَمَا صَنَعَ أَبُو بَكْرٍ أَوْ كَمَا صَنَعَ عُمَرُ. قَالَ مُعَاوِيَةُ: مَا صَنَعُوا؟ قَالَ: قَبِضَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ، صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ، وَلَمْ يَسْتَخْلَفْ أَحَدًا فَارْتَضَى النَّاسُ أَبَا بَكْرٍ. قَالَ: لَيْسَ فِيكُمْ مِثْلُ أَبِي بَكْرٍ وَأَخَافُ الْاِخْتِلَافَ. قَالُوا: صَدَقْتَ فَاصْنَعْ كَمَا صَنَعَ أَبُو بَكْرٍ فَإِنَّهُ عَهْدٌ إِلَى رَجُلٍ مِنْ قَاصِيَةِ قُرَيْشٍ لَيْسَ مِنْ بَنِي أَبِيهِ فَاسْتَخْلَفَهُ، وَإِنْ شِئْتَ فَاصْنَعْ كَمَا صَنَعَ عُمَرُ، جَعَلَ الْأَمْرَ شُورَى فِي سِتَّةِ نَفَرٍ لَيْسَ فِيهِمْ أَحَدٌ مِنْ وَلَدِهِ وَلَا مِنْ بَنِي أَبِيهِ (الكامل)

This, and this alone is the reason why none of them criticized the character of Yazîd when voicing their opposition, and why none of them felt the need to attack the integrity, ability, etc. of Yazîd. Understand this well, for upon this lies the basis for understanding the truth behind the incident of Karbala, and it is this point that shall explain why both parties, i.e. Hadhrat Huseinﷺ and Yazîd, later did what they did.

Hadhrat Muâwiyahﷺ heard and understood the reason behind their opposing his decision, but as every Amîr has the option to either consider or reject the opinion of even influential members of his cabinet; Hadhrat Muâwiyahﷺ too had that right. Hadhrat Muâwiyahﷺ weighed his options and finally decided to go ahead with his proposed intention, knowing full well that some or the other party would always stand in opposition, no matter who would be elected.

The people of Shâm had their own likes and dislikes, the people of Irâq were never found happy with anyone thus far, the people of Hijâz would obviously desire one from the Banu Hashim, whereas the people of Damascus would not accept except one from the Umayyad family. Choosing one whom all unanimously accepted was now close to impossible. Thus Hadhrat Muâwiyahﷺ felt that the safest for the Ummah would now be to choose one that he had seen and tested from up close; one who the Muslim armies of Shâm would full support; one who the people of Irâq would be too scared to oppose; and one who the majority of Hijâz had already shown that they would accept.

As for the few from whom Hadhrat Muâwiyahﷺ feared opposition, he could have decided upon one of two options:

- 1) Have them arrested and kept under government eye, letting none come close to them, nor allowing them in any way to start any sort of revolt against the Caliph. This plan of action has,

from the very beginning, been allowed in Islâm, irrespective of who the arrested party is.

In Islâm, maintaining the peace and stability of the Ummah is of paramount importance, so much so, that Islâm has even allowed the beheading of great personalities if there is a fear of their destroying the peace. Acting upon this very principle, Hadhrat Aliؓ raised the sword against Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, when he refused to pledge allegiance. Hadhrat Umarؓ, in his parting advices, explained this principle of Islâm most vividly, when he ordered Hadhrat Suheibؓ to keep watch over the six Sahâbahؓ, who had been appointed to choose the next Caliph from amongst them. Hadhrat Umarؓ's order at that time clearly showed that the Ummah accepting only one leader is most vital, and that in achieving this purpose, even if an illustrious individual has to be executed, it shall be allowed. Hadhrat Umarؓ's words were:

صل بالناس ثلاثاً وليخل هؤلاء النفر في بيت، فإذا اجتمعوا على رجل منهم فمن خالفهم فاضربوا رأسه
(انساب الاشراف)

Lead the people in Salaah for three days, during which time they should discuss this matter privately.

If they unite upon any one man, then if any person dare oppose their decision, cut off his neck!

- 2) The other option that Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ had was to now leave matters as they were, and overlook the opposition of a few, irrespective of their popularity and prominence, as long as they do not initiate any sort of revolt against the government. The second option was one which demanded a great amount of tolerance and forbearance and a heart of sympathy, compassion and love, which is exactly what Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ was blessed with.

Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ neither forced his decision upon them, nor had any of them arrested and persecuted. Rather he himself overlooked

and ignored their opposition, and advised his son, Yazîd, to later do the same. Had Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ wished, he could have easily ordered their arrest and expulsion from the lands of Hijâz, or that they be executed, but nothing of that sort occurred. Rather, what the books of history show, is that Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ accepted the allegiance of the majority of the Ummah for his son, overlooked the opposition of the few who did not agree, and bequeathed that their opinion be respected, as long as it does not lead to chaos and strife.

The advices and *wasiyah* (bequest) of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ to his son, Yazîd, as appears in Tabari, which has been mentioned below, shows clearly the love and respect Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ had for Hadhrat Huseinؓ, and his desire to save the Ummah from in-fighting:

⁵⁸In the sixtieth year after the Hijrah, when Hadhrat Muawiyahؓ began feeling the pangs of death, he called Dhahaak ibn Qaisؓ, who was in charge of the police force, and Muslim ibn Uqbahؓ, and ordered that they convey his *wasiyah* (parting advices) to his son, Yazîd, who was at that time absent. His *wasiyah* was as follows:

“Always be considerate to the people of Hijâz, for they are your origin. Honour the one who comes to you from them, and always be concerned of those who do not come.

^{59A} ان معاوية لما حضره الموت وذلك في سنة ٦٠ وكان يزيد غائباً فدعا بالضحاك بن قيس الفهري وكان صاحب شرطته ومسلم بن عقبة المري فأوصى إليهما فقال بلغا يزيد وصيتي أنظر أهل الحجاز فإنهم أصلك فأكرم من قدم عليك منهم وتعاهد من غاب وانظر أهل العراق فإن سألوك أن تعزل عنهم كل يوم عاملاً فافعل فإن عزل عامل أحب إلي من أن تشهر عليك مائة ألف سيف وانظر أهل الشام فليكونوا بطانتك وعيبتك فإن نأبك شيء من عدوك فانتصر بهم فإذا أصبتهم فاردد أهل الشام إلى بلادهم فإنهم إن أقاموا بغير بلادهم أخذوا بغير أخلاقهم وإنني لست أخاف من قریش إلا ثلاثة حسين بن علي وعبد الله بن عمر وعبد الله بن الزبير فأما ابن عمر فرجل قد وقده الدين فليس ملتصقاً بشئ قبلك وأما الحسين بن علي فإنه رجل خفيف وأرجو أن يكفيك الله بمن قتل أباه وخذل أخاه وإن له رحماً ماسة وحققاً عظيماً وقرابة من محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم ولا أظن أهل العراق تاركيه حتى يخرجوه فإن قدرت عليه فاصفح عنه فإني لو أني صاحبه عفوت عنه وأما ابن الزبير فإنه خب ضب فإذا شخص لك فأنذ له إلا أن يلتبس منك صلحاً فإن فعل فاقبل واحقن دماء قومك ما استطعت (الطبري)

As for the people of Irâq, even if they have to ask for a new leader every single day, hear their request and endeavour to fulfil it, for the changing of rulers is much less in weight than having a hundred thousand swords raised against you.

Never forget the people of Shâm! In fact regard them as the carriers of your secrets and the base of your trust. When in difficulty, seek their help and when the difficulty gets removed, return them to their lands! Spending too much time in foreign lands could ruin their culture and beautiful traits.

From the Qureish I fear only three! Husein ibn Aliؑ, Abdullâh ibn Umarؑ and Abdullâh ibn Zubeirؑ. As for Ibn Umarؑ, his abstinence has made him such that he shall never really show any interest in taking what you have, i.e. the caliphate.

As for Husein ibn Aliؑ, I feel that the people of Irâq themselves, who have already assassinated his fatherؑ, and deserted his brother, they shall also do him down, i.e. betray him. But remember that he is your family, his rights over us are indeed enormous, and he has been blessed with an extremely close relationship with Rasulullâhؐ.

I feel that the people of Irâq shall somehow or the other entice him into going back to Irâq (to start some sort of revolt). If he does do so and in the process gets arrested, then overlook his error, forgive him and set him free. Verily, if the same would happen in my life, I would surely forgive him!

Finally, regarding Ibn Zubeirؑ, beware of his cunning ways! If he stands in opposition, then do not leave him until he seeks a truce. If he does,

*then immediately accept, and as far as possible save the blood of your nation from being spilled!*⁵⁹

The death of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؑ and an end to a glorious period of rule

After spending over forty years governing the affairs of the Ummah, twenty as governor and twenty as Caliph, during which he returned to the Ummah its stability and reinitiated the blessed act of Jihâd against the disbelievers, Hadhrat Muâwiyahؑ at the ripe age of seventy-eight, parted from this temporary world for the eternal life of the Hereafter. To Almighty Allâh do we all belong and solely to Him shall be our return!

Before passing away, Hadhrat Muâwiyahؑ bequeathed that he be buried in the *qamees* (kurta) that Rasulullâhؐ had given him. Hadhrat Muâwiyahؑ had some of the blessed nails of Rasulullâhؐ with him. He asked that they be crushed in powder and placed in his eyes and mouth, after which he should be left to the mercy of Almighty Allâh, who is The Most Merciful.

As death approached, Hadhrat Muâwiyahؑ began saying, "If only I was an ordinary man from the Qureish, in Zu-Tawaa', and had not ever had any share in governing!" (Statements of this kind were found on the

⁵⁹ Allâmah Tabari has also recorded another narration, wherein Hadhrat Muawiyahؑ renders similar advice, just before his death, to Yazid directly, and in which he warns him of the danger posed by Hadhrat Abdullah ibn Umarؑ, Hadhrat Huseinؑ, Hadhrat Abdur Rahmaan ibn Abu Bakrؑ and Hadhrat Abdullah ibn Zubeirؑ. The harsh words of this narration, attributed to Hadhrat Muawiyahؑ, against these illustrious Sahâbahؑ, itself is sufficient as an indication of fabrication. Another indication of fabrication is the fact that Hadhrat Abdur Rahmaan ibn Abu Bakrؑ had already passed away, thus there was no need whatsoever for Hadhrat Muawiyahؑ to take his name in the list of those he feared opposing Yazid. Thus, that narration has been ignored and the one mentioned above has been preferred.

tongues of many of the great rulers in Islâm, which portrayed the great fear they had in their hearts for Allah.)

After his death, Hadhrat Dhahaak ibn Qaisؓ, holding the shroud of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, mounted the pulpit, saying,

“Amirul Mu’mineen, Muâwiyahؓ was the blade and strength of the Arabs, with which Almighty Allâh brought to an end turmoil, and who Almighty Allâh gave rule over His servants and whose armies were spread in the lands and at sea. He was a servant from the servants of Allâhؐ, who Almighty Allâh has now called back. He has now completed his time and has returned to his Creator.”⁶⁰

Criticism levelled against Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ with regards to hisؓ dealing with Hajar ibn Adiؓ

By the grace of Almighty Allâh, in this chapter, a great deal has been mentioned, through which it is hoped that the reader shall gain some understanding of the character of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, his honourable position as a high-ranking Sahâbiؓ, the wisdom and reasons behind his every decision, his fervent desire to keep the Ummah united, his foresight and forbearance, and finally the basis of his intention to appoint his son, Yazîd, as Caliph after him.

٦٠ ولما مرض كان ابنه يزيد غائبا ولما حضره الموت أوصى ان يكفن في قميص كان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قد كساه اياه وان يجعل مما يلي جسده وكان عنده قلامة أظفار رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فأوصى ان تسحق وتجعل في عينيه وقمه وقال افعلوا ذلك وخلوا بيني وبين أرحم الراحمين ولما نزل به الموت قال ليتني كنت رجلا من قريش بذي طوى واني لم أَل من هذا الامر شيئا ولما مات أخذ الضحاك بن قيس أكفانه وصعد المنبر وخطب الناس وقال ان أمير المؤمنين معاوية كان حد العرب وعود العرب قطع الله به الفتنة وملكه على العباد وسير جنوده في البر والبحر وكان عبدا من عبيد الله دعاه فأجابه وقد قضى نحبه (اسد الغابة)

Great effort has been made to highlight the point that many issues in this regard have generally been regarded as unquestionable, whereas the reality is something entirely different. Basic principles have at times been ignored, just on the basis of certain unauthenticated historical narrations, an act which should never have been done, especially when it becomes a cause of tainting the image of illustrious Sahâbahؓ and great men of the Ummah.

There would obviously be numerous accusations and criticism levelled against this great personality of Islâm, since the shaitani forces of his area were scratching frantically for any thread, through which they could turn the Ummah against their leader and have them call for the overthrow of the government and a return to civil strife, but the strength and tact of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, earned through the duas of Rasulullâhؐ, prevented their plots from fully hatching.

The answer of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, when questioned as to why it seemed as though he was ageing fast, throws plenty of light on the extent that these forces would go to somehow try to pull him down from his seat of rule or at least taint his image in the public eye. His answer was:

كيف لا ولا أزال أرى رجلا من العرب قائما على رأسي يلقي لي كلاما يلزمني جوابه، فإن أصبت لم أحمد، وإن أخطأت سارت بها البرود (البداية)

Why should I not be ageing, when I am always being confronted by various individuals from the Arabs, levelling such criticism and remarks against me, which I am forced to answer!

Whatever good I do is ignored, but if any error occurs, its news spreads like wild-fire!

The crux of the matter is that the accusations and criticism levelled against the rulers of Islâm, especially during its initial era, never had any substance and weight behind it, but the manner in which it was propagated made it seem as though it was major.

Hadhrat Mufti Muhammad Taqi' Uthmani Sâhib has mentioned some of the weightier accusations levelled against Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, in his book, 'Hadhrat Muâwiyah aur Târikhi Haqâ'iq' and has provided detailed answers explaining the truth behind each of those accusations. Since work has already been done in this sphere, I have chosen to not delve into these issues.

However, since a great lesson regarding history can be learnt from one of the issues that Hadhrat Mufti Taqi Sâhib has discussed, I shall spare a few moments to briefly outline that issue and then draw attention to the point to be learnt from the incident.

Hadrat Hajar ibn Adi' رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ

The incident concerns Hadhrat Hajar ibn Adi' رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ, a senior Tabi'ee and a man of extreme piety, who, due to unknowingly being spurred by shaitaani forces in Muslim guise, would continuously spearhead efforts to have Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ overthrown. At times his attacks on the government would be merely verbal and at times physical. In fact, he was one of the sincere ones who wrote to Hadhrat Huseinؓ that he had under his belt many, many fighters who were ready to immediately lend their support to Hadhrat Huseinؓ, if he decided standing up against the rule of Muâwiyahؓ.

Hadhrat Hajar ibn Adi' was finally arrested, after spearheading an unsuccessful rebellion against the ruling party, and sent to Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ to make a ruling regarding him. After hearing and receiving testimony from many Sahâbahؓ and Tâbi'een, that Hadhrat Hajar had, without any doubt, spearheaded attacks and revolts against the Islâmic state, Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ ordered his execution.

Hadhrat Hajar was a man of great piety, thus news of his execution would obviously shock many. The very shaitaani forces who had until now been using Hajar ibn Adi' for their ulterior, filthy motives,

immediately moved into step two of their plan, which was to now propagate and portray his execution as an act of barbarism, injustice, cruelty, etc. Their propaganda, as is the case with all their propaganda until today, caused tears to be shed for Hajar, in places far and wide. So strong was their manner of portraying Hajar as a hero, who died fighting for the truth, that Hadhrat Ayeshaؓ, despite the unique respect she held for Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, was also angered at the decision, and when heؓ later visited her, during a trip for Umrah, sheؓ, immediately brought up the issue.

Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ's decision regarding Hajar ibn Adi' was definitely correct, but due to the picture of the incident having been portrayed all over the Islâmic world totally different from its reality, whoever would hear it would regard Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ blame-worthy.

As for Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, he was so convinced that his decision regarding Hajar had been correct, that after explaining his reasons to Hadhrat Ayeshaؓ regarding why he had issued the order for Hajar's execution, heؓ ended the discussion regarding Hajar ibn Adi' saying:

دعني و حَجْرًا حَتَّى نَلْتَقِيَ عِنْدَ رَبِّنا (اسد الغابة)

*Allow me and Hajar to sort this matter out amongst ourselves,
in front of our Creator!*

Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ would never have said the above had he not been confident that in front of Almighty Allâh he would be able to adequately answer why he had decided in the case of Hajar رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ as he had decided.

In the mind of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ the principle of *ijtihad* (deductions of legal rulings) was well-ingrained. He understood well that Almighty Allâh alone is the True Judge, in front of Who lies every event, seen from every angle.

When looked at from the angle of Hajar ibn Adi' رَحِمَهُ اللهُ، Almighty Allâh knows well that Hajar was sincere in his attempts to remove what he felt was incorrect. Hajar had no idea whatsoever that the ones spurring him to do what he was doing were in fact using him for sinister motives, i.e. to start some form of uprising and push the Ummah back into civil strife. Almighty Allâh would never deal with Hajar as He ﷻ will deal with the hypocrites operating behind the shield of Hajar, despite them all being of the same camp. By Allâh ﷻ man shall be judged upon his intention and not just the outside picture. Where the satanic hypocrites would be flung headlong into Jahannum, at the very same time Hajar ibn Adi' ﷺ will find himself being crowned as a martyr, who died for the establishment of the truth.

As for Hadhrat Muâwiyah ﷺ, Almighty Allâh shall judge his action, looking at it from his angle, and not the angle of Hajar ibn Adi. Hadhrat Muâwiyah ﷺ's reasons behind ordering the execution of a pious soul shall be kept in front and on account of these reasons Hadhrat Muâwiyah ﷺ shall also be declared 'correct in his judgement' and rewarded for his efforts.

Whosoever studies the entire incident of Hajar ibn Adi' رَحِمَهُ اللهُ، keeping in mind the principles of studying history which has thus far been mentioned, he shall surely admit that neither was Hadhrat Muâwiyah ﷺ wrong in his decision to execute Hajar ibn Adi' رَحِمَهُ اللهُ، nor shall Hajar ibn Adi' be held blameworthy in the Hereafter. Each one shall easily prove that had any other upright person been in his position, looking at the matter from his angle, he would have probably made the very same decision.

The entire incident, as we have it today, presented in front of us to read and study from different angles, were neither in front of Hadhrat Muâwiyah ﷺ, nor in front of Hajar ibn Adi' رَحِمَهُ اللهُ. Thus it would be totally unfair to today read the incident, and whilst reclining in our soft couches question why Hadhrat Muâwiyah ﷺ had done this, or why

Hadhrat Hajar رَحِمَهُ اللهُ had done that. Almighty Allâh shall judge them on account of how they saw the picture, not on account of how we today see the picture. When in the eyes of Almighty Allâh both shall be worthy of reward and praise, would it then ever make sense to us, who are not at all aware of what our own condition shall be tomorrow, to take the seat of 'self-appointed judge' and issue verdicts of guilt against any one of the two?

Through the incident of Hadhrat Muâwiyah ﷺ and Hajar ibn Adi' رَحِمَهُ اللهُ the principle of *Ijtihad* has been made very clear. If you have properly understood this point, you shall now find it quite easy to apply this principle to all the other '*mushâjaraat*' (internal conflicts) that occurred from the very beginning and continue until today.

Where Hadhrat Uthmaan ﷺ was martyred oppressively, at the same time you shall be able to understand that not every single individual involved in the rebellion against Hadhrat Uthmaan ﷺ is to be regarded as evil. Where many had evil intentions from the very beginning, there were definitely just as many who were pulled into the rebellion innocently. Where some of the killers of Hadhrat Uthmaan ﷺ were nothing but satanists, operating hypocritically, there were many others who were sincere devotees of Islâm, desirous of only good and totally unaware of what was to unfold thereafter.

Similarly, where Hadhrat Ali ﷺ had just reasons for delaying in bringing the killers to court, Hadhrat Muâwiyah ﷺ, when looking at the picture from his angle, shall be found just as correct in refusing to pledge allegiance, as long as the killers were not taken to task. This is how Almighty Allâh shall rule between both these parties, thus we should never feel bold enough to try and offer any other ruling.

Hadhrat Ali ﷺ, Hadhrat Uthmaan ﷺ and Hadhrat Muâwiyah ﷺ shall surely be found holding hands in Jannah, while the satan-worshipping individuals who operated hypocritically, some from the quarters of

Hadhrat Aliؓ and others from the quarters of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, their abode shall be hell.

This is a golden principle in understanding the internal conflicts of the past, the summary of which is that each party did what he did, due to seeing the picture from his angle. The whole picture, as we can perhaps see it today, was never in front, and thus his ruling can never be expected to have been in accordance to the demands of the entire picture. His responsibility was *Ijtihâd*, using whatever knowledge was at that moment before him, and that is exactly what he did and upon that shall Almighty Allâh judge him.

At the same time, there would always be powerful satanic elements, operating from both sides, and painting pictures in front of both parties, whose falsehood would years later emerge, but at that moment would be understood as true. Each party would thus at times make decisions based on false pictures and fabricated information put forward and this would obviously just lend wood to an already burning fire.

When Almighty Allâh shall judge, Heﷻ shall never reprimand the one who was sincere in his intentions but erred in his *Ijtihâd*, rather he shall be rewarded for his efforts and sent straight into Paradise. Destruction and misery shall never be his lot, but rather the lot of the hypocrites operating from within. As Almighty Allâh states:

وَمِنَ النَّاسِ مَنْ يَقُولُ آمَنَّا بِاللَّهِ وَيَأْتِيهِمْ الْآخِرُ وَمَا هُمْ بِمُؤْمِنِينَ (٨) يُخَادِعُونَ اللَّهَ وَالَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَمَا يُخْدَعُونَ إِلَّا أَنْفُسُهُمْ وَمَا يَشْعُرُونَ (٩)

فِي قُلُوبِهِمْ مَرَضٌ فَزَادَهُمُ اللَّهُ مَرَضًا وَلَهُمْ عَذَابٌ أَلِيمٌ بِمَا كَانُوا يَكْذِبُونَ

Amongst man are those who make claims of Imaan in Allâh and the Last Day, whereas in reality they have no belief whatsoever. Their intention is merely to deceive Allâh and the believers, but in actual fact they are deceiving none but themselves. In their hearts there is filth (i.e. the filth of kufr), and Allâh allows them to make it even filthier (i.e. with

their plots against Imaan, which initially always appears successful).
For them is a severe punishment, on account of what they have earned!!!

In the internal conflicts of the past, on both sides one shall find innocent, sincere men, being spurred against each other by hypocrite forces. For the sincere, Almighty Allâh has written forgiveness and reward and for the hypocrites operating from both sides Almighty Allâh has destined total destruction.

This golden principle must now be applied to the internal conflict that occurred between Hadhrat Huseinؓ and his cousin, Yazîd, and to the conflict that occurred between Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeirؓ and Abdul Malik ibn Marwaan and to all other internal conflicts that continue until today and then see what conclusion and judgement you reach.

The incident of Karbala shall Insha-Allâh shortly be dissected in detail. If this principle can however be kept in the fore, it shall adequately provide answers to most of the unanswered questions regarding Karbala and it shall help tremendously in explaining the conflicting reports regarding everything surrounding Karbala. (And Almighty Allâh alone guides towards the entire truth)

Returning to the original discussion, mention was made that Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ would obviously have been criticized on numerous accounts and occasions, due to the satanic forces working full force to somehow or the other de-throne him or at least spoil his reputation in the public eye.

Hadhrat Mufti Taqi Uthmani Sâhib has, in a most beautiful manner, explained the reality behind those accusations, thus there is no need to repeat it all here.

Only two issues

Only two accusations that stand out quite vividly, due to the intense manner in which it has been propagated, shall, as a conclusion to this part, be discussed.

- 1) Why did Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ appoint his son, Yazîd, as Caliph, despite being aware of the opposition of great Sahâbahؓ?
- 2) Rasulullahﷺ mentioned⁶¹ that the caliphate shall last for thirty years, (which would end in the 40th year after Hijrah) after which the era of kingship shall begin. Does this then not make clear indication that the rule of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ was a disliked rule due to it beginning after the fortieth year of the Hijrah?

In the pages that have passed, much of issue No.1 has been discussed, from which it has become apparent that:

- a) Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ's decision had nothing to do with holding onto power
- b) Yazîd was not, during the life of his father, regarded as unfit for the post
- c) The majority of the people of that era were happy with the decision
- d) There was no other solution which Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ could see, which would ensure the unity of the Ummah remains intact and infighting does not recur
- e) The appointment of Yazîd was an issue of Ijtihâd, for which Almighty Allâh has promised reward, even though one errs in his final judgement
- f) It was never necessary that Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ submit to the view of the Sahâbahؓ opposing his decision, nor was it necessary that he seek their opinion

⁶¹ الخلافة في أمي ثلاثون سنة ثم ملكا بعد ذلك (السنن الكبرى للنسائي)

- g) Selecting one's son as Caliph is totally permissible in Islâm, on condition that the son be fit for the post.
- h) The basis of the opposition to Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ's decision was never the personality of Yazîd, his character, actions, etc, as has been generally understood, but rather the fear that appointing one's close family members would open up the door of *Hirqaliyah* (the throne of rule being held by one family, irrespective of ability, piety, etc.)
- i) Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, until his death, upheld the honour of the Ahle-Bait and instructed his son, Yazîd, to do the same

What has to now be discussed is issue No.2, with an explanation of the hadith of caliphate and *mulookiyah* (kingship), which shall provide the reason behind Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ being prepared to take the throne, knowing full well that the era of caliphate had now terminated.

To understand this issue, it would first be necessary to discuss the difference between caliphate and *mulookiyah* (kingship), to understand the Shar'ie ruling of both and then to study the Ahâdith regarding this issue.

Caliphate and Mulookiyah (kingship)

From the very onset it must be understood that *Mulookiyah* (kingship) and *Hirqaliyah* (system of succession) are not one and the same. When Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeirؓ, Hadhrat Abdur Rahmaan ibn Abu Bakrؓ, etc, voiced dissatisfaction against the appointment of Yazîd as the next Caliph, they explained the reason of their dissatisfaction being that his appointment was opening the door for '*Hirqaliyah*' (a system of succession, that every time one would pass away, another family member would immediately take his place, even though he was not at all capable for the post). Had *Hirqaliyah* (system of succession) and *Mulookiyah* (kingship) been the same, they would never have accepted

the rule of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ as well, since they were all well aware that after the 40th year of Hijrah, the era of kingship was to begin.

Hadhrat Hasanؓ, when handing over the caliphate to Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ, made it very clear that the underlining reason for doing so was that the era of caliphate had now terminated and he did not desire ruling as a king. When Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ accepted the caliphate, he too accepted it knowing full well that the era of caliphate had terminated. He even openly expressed that despite the era of caliphate having come to an end, he was prepared to accept the responsibility of rule, even though it would be through the system of *Mulookiyah* (kingship).

Had *Mulookiyah* (kingship) and *Hirqaliyah* (system of succession) been the same, the Sahâbahؓ who voiced opposition against Yazîd's appointment would have also voiced their opposition against Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ's appointment, which they never did.

If *Mulookiyah* held the same meaning as *Hirqaliyah*, there would have been no need for Hadhrat Hasanؓ to hand the Caliphate over so quickly, since there was still to be another twenty years plus before the 'so called' system of *Hirqaliyah* would start.

If *Mulookiyah* held the same meaning as *Hirqaliyah*, the Ahâdith would not have mentioned the 41st year after Hijrah as the beginning of *Mulookiyah*, but rather the 60th year of Hijrah, since it was only around that time that Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ began thinking of appointing Yazîd.

What then is the meaning of *Mulookiyah*? If one were to ponder over the make-up and the root (*masdar*) of the two words, i.e. caliphate and mulookiyah, much of this shall be answered, the details of which are as follows:

The word 'ملك' – with a kasra under the 'Laam', which translates as 'king', comes from the root word 'ملك' – with a dhammah on the 'Meem', which means to rule. As for the word 'Caliph' it comes from the root خلف which literally translates as 'to come after, to come from behind, a successor'.

Looking at the root word, one shall find that much of the meaning of 'Caliph' can be found in a king and vice-versa. A Caliph succeeds another ruler, and so does a king. He comes from behind and so too does a king. A king rules and so too does a Caliph.

The only difference is that a Caliph becomes a ruler and succeeds primarily through initial appointment (الاستخلاف), whereas this is not necessary for a king. Nabi Adamؑ was a Caliph of Almighty Allâh on earth, due to his being appointed and selected for the responsibility. As for a king, being selected by the masses, or by a large group of upright men and scholars, this is not conditional. A king may become king through force, by waging wars and attacking village after village and town after town, until its inhabitants finally surrender to his command.

A Caliph is one who does not work and fight for his selection. Yes, after the majority or the main core of the scholars and men of piety select him as Caliph, there shall naturally be those who still oppose the decision. At that time, to save the system of caliphate, the Caliph is permitted to wage war against those refusing to pledge allegiance.

In short, in caliphate the underlining issue is the selection of an individual, after which he, the Caliph, shall then work towards strengthening the empire, whereas in *Mulookiyah*, the underlining issue is to acquire rule and to get oneself accepted, which is achieved through permissible avenues and many a time through impermissible avenues, e.g. oppression, propaganda, false promises made during campaigning, etc.

If one, as a king, rules justly, he shall be rewarded and if one after being selected (made Caliph) abuses his post, he shall be severely taken to task.

A Caliph and King, both are rulers, both come after someone else and both shall either be rewarded or punished, in accordance, not to the name of their position, but rather to the work they do in that position. Merely being a Caliph never meant that one now becomes exempt from Divine Punishment and neither does being a king make one worthy of punishment. It all has to do with what work one carries out and has nothing to do with what title one carries.

Had Mulookiyah (kingship) been a sin, no sane believer, forget one who holds the rank of a Sahâbi[ؓ], would have openly expressed happiness to take over through the system of *Mulookiyah*. Would a Sahâbi[ؓ] ever say that he was more than happy to allow the burden of a major sin upon his shoulders?!

Once, when Hadhrat Muâwiyah was taunted that he is not a Caliph but merely a king, he replied that although the responsibility of the Ummah was not destined to reach him through the system of caliphate, he was still quite happy to accept it through the system of kingship. Had kingship been a sin and an act of oppression, do you think Hadhrat Muâwiyah[ؓ] would ever have said this? On that occasion his words were:

٦٢ تخبرنا أنا ملوك فقد رضينا أن نكون ملوكا

You are telling us (in a taunting manner) that we are mere kings, whereas we are more than happy to be mere kings!

After having understood this, one can easily understand why the era after the 40th year of Hijrah was declared as an era of Mulookiyah, why

Hadhrat Hasan[ؓ] was not prepared to hold onto rule and why Hadhrat Muâwiyah[ؓ] was ready to accept it.

The illustrious personalities, Hadhrat Abu Bakr[ؓ], Hadhrat Umar[ؓ], Hadhrat Uthmaan[ؓ] and Hadhrat Ali[ؓ], were selected, without any fight, to lead the Ummah, thus each one was 'a Caliph'. There was no rival competition, and thus no need to fight for rule. Their taking the seat of rule was purely due to being selected by others, without them having to lift a sword.

Even during the era of Hadhrat Ali[ؓ], when Hadhrat Muâwiyah[ؓ] refused to pledge allegiance, it was never due to him rivalling for the post of Caliph. In fact, Hadhrat Muâwiyah[ؓ] mentioned on numerous occasions that as soon as the killers of Hadhrat Uthmaan[ؓ] are put on trial, he will immediately pledge allegiance. The era of the first four Caliphs of Islâm was termed as an era of Caliphate due to the fact that each leader during this era would be selected by others, without him having any rival for the post against whom he would first have to fight.

Then, when the issue of arbitration arose, during the end of Hadhrat Ali[ؓ]'s life, despite it not reaching any final decision, so much was definitely made clear that in the event of Hadhrat Ali[ؓ] stepping down from the post of Caliphate, the decision for the next leader was not going to be a unanimous one. Some were now going to be in favour of Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umar[ؓ], some in favour of Hadhrat Hasan[ؓ] and some in favour of Hadhrat Muâwiyah[ؓ]. Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umar[ؓ] would most probably never have accepted the caliphate, thus the fight for the post would now be concentrated between Hadhrat Muâwiyah[ؓ] and Hadhrat Hasan[ؓ].

When Hadhrat Hasan[ؓ] was appointed as Caliph by the people of Irâq and accepted by majority in Hijaaz, he[ؓ] knew very well that Hadhrat Muâwiyah[ؓ] and the majority of Shâm, which was the central army of Islâm, were not going to readily accept his caliphate. He[ؓ] understood, through the indication of the Ahâdith, that the era of being

unanimously selected and having no opposition had now end, and the seat of rule would now go to whosoever would fight for it and win. Hadhrat Hasan (عليه السلام), in accordance to his the very beginning, was never going to be prepared to spilled merely so that he could keep his post and for handed the reins of rule over to Hadhrat Muâwiyah (عليه السلام).

When Hadhrat Muâwiyah (عليه السلام) was given the post, he (عليه السلام) also that it had not reached him through any unanimous decision just so that further bloodshed could be avoided. He (عليه السلام) was that the manner 'rulership' had reached him was different the previous Caliphs, but at the same time understood the rule, whether through the method of unanimous selection *Istikhlaaf* (being made a Caliph), or whether through the *Mulookiyah* (fighting for the position), both were permissible as the underlining intention was good. This was what Muâwiyah (عليه السلام) meant when he said that if rule had to come through the system of *Mulookiyah* (i.e. due to force and power) too he (عليه السلام) was prepared to accept it, especially when this was the only way that stability was going to be restored for the

Hadhrat Muâwiyah (عليه السلام) had already realized that as long as it was going to be kept close to Irâq, satanist forces, operating from there, would continuously be igniting some or the other trouble and dissension. Moving the Islâmic government their central base would at least minimize their influence bears testimony that this was exactly what thereafter happened. In the next twenty years the Ummah were able to experience within their lands, the wheels of Jihâd began spinning, territories were conquered, the Khawârij were hunted down, treacherous attacks of satanic hypocrites, working from within, brought to an abrupt end.

Satan's forces now found that their only hope of success in crushing Islâm from within lay in bringing down the Umayyad Dynasty (the government of Hadhrat Muâwiyah (عليه السلام) which ruled from Shâm) and somehow or the other shifting the caliphate back to Irâq. The entire escapade of Karbala was solely so that this could be achieved. By winning the sympathy of the Ummah against the Caliphate, through the blood of Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام) and through the slogan of 'revenge for the Ahle-Bait', the Ummah would now unknowingly be pitted against the ruling government, thereby weakening its pillars and laying the foundation for it to one day be overthrown.

Having understood this much, an attempt shall Insha-Allâh now be made to dissect the incident of Karbala itself, together with answering pertinent issues which have generally been ignored, so that a clearer picture of the incident may come to the fore and the true conspirators behind the assassination of Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام) may get exposed.

The first call to stand up against the Umayyad rule

As already mentioned, the calls for overthrowing the government had been made numerous times during the rule of Hadhrat Muawiyah (عليه السلام), with letters being sent, first to Hadhrat Hasan (عليه السلام) and after his death, to Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام), but for various reasons, consideration was hardly given to their letters.

Hadhrat Hasan (عليه السلام), after having seen the conduct of the people of Iraq first-hand, knew quite well that the voices of many of its population were nothing but hypocritical. He had heard them proclaiming untold love for him, much more than even that which they had once claimed for Hadhrat Ali (عليه السلام), but as soon as he expressed his desire to bring back unity for the Ummah, by handing over the caliphate to Hadhrat Muâwiyah (عليه السلام), in a second all their claims of love disappeared and thereafter during his short stay in Iraq, he received nothing from these

once-loyal supporters, except filthy remarks, criticism of the worst level and even a physical attack upon his most noble body.

Hadhrat Hasan عليه السلام was thus most wary when letters began reaching him in Madinah Munawwara, begging that he return to lead a revolt against the present Umayyad government. Behind these numerous letters, Hadhrat Hasan عليه السلام could see another sinister plot hatching, with nothing but bloodshed, treachery, and further shaitaani schemes resulting from it.

Hadhrat Hasan عليه السلام, on numerous occasions, expressed his dissatisfaction with those fragments in Iraq, who were forever moaning and complaining regarding their rulers and who were always eager to reignite some sort of fire amongst the Ummah.

The following statement of Hadhrat Hasan عليه السلام, as recorded in Mu'jam Tabrani, with a strong chain of narrators, which has previously been mentioned, clearly indicates to most of what has been mentioned above:

Yazîd ibn Al-Asam narrates that once whilst on a journey with Hadhrat Hasan ibn Ali عليه السلام, a bundle of letters reached him., Hadhrat Hasan عليه السلام called for a container and had water poured into it. He then threw the letters into the water, without even bothering to glance at its contents. I asked, 'O Abu Muhammad (Hadhrat Hasan عليه السلام), who has sent all of these letters?' He replied, 'They have come from the people of Iraq, a group that shall never accept the truth, and shall never desist from their evil! As for myself, I do not fear being deceived by these people. However I do fear that they may have an impact on him!' Saying this Hadhrat Hasan عليه السلام pointed towards Hadhrat Husein عليه السلام.⁶³

⁶³ روى الطبراني في المعجم الكبير عن ابن عُبَيْنَةَ، عن عُبيدِ اللَّهِ بن عبدِ اللَّهِ بن الأَصَمِّ، عن عمه يزيد بن الأَصَمِّ، قال: خرجتُ مع الحسن (يعني ابن علي رضي الله عنهما) وجاريةً تحُثُّ شينا من الجَنَاءِ عن أطفاره، فجاءتهُ إِبْرَارَةٌ من كُتُب، فقال: يا جارية

The reason for Hadhrat Husein عليه السلام standing up against Yazîd ibn Muawiyah

Understanding this issue is vital for anyone desirous of understanding the reality of Karbala and the role that Yazîd had played in this entire episode.

Due to immense shia propaganda and influence, many have been unfortunately misled into believing that the underlining reason behind Hadhrat Husein عليه السلام proceeding to Iraq was that Yazîd had turned renegade, or that he was oppressing the masses, or that he had begun committing open adultery, or that he had now become an open transgressor, or that he had fallen totally into drinking liquor, etc.

Yet, if one were to be asked to provide some sound evidence for the above, one shall find that despite these allegations being recorded in many books, none have ever provided any solid chain of narrators, reaching up to any reliable person, who had witnessed any of these acts from Yazîd.

It should be understood well, that the punishment for acts of the above nature, in Islâmic circles, has been termed as 'hadd', i.e. punishment decreed by Divine Law, which no judge, leader, etc, can overrule. If one were to thus say that Yazîd had indeed perpetrated these acts in the open, as mentioned in historical narrations, then one would automatically be admitting that during this period of Yazîdi rule,

هاتي الميخَضَب، فصَبَّ عليه ماء، وألقى الكُتُب في الماء، فلم يفتح منها شيئا، ولم ينظر إليه، فقلتُ: يا أبا محمد! ممن هذه الكُتُب؟ قال: من أهل العراق، من قوم لا يرجعون إلى حق، ولا يقصرون عن باطل، أما إني لستُ أخشاهم على نفسي، ولكني أخشاهم على ذلك. وأشار إلى الحسين. (وسنده جيد على شرط مسلم، وقال الهيثمي في المجمع: ورجاله رجال الصحيح، غير عبد الله بن الحكم بن أبي زياد، وهو ثقة)

all the scholars, Tâbi'een and even the Sahâbahؓ of Shâm and its surrounding areas, had either become cowards, or had themselves fallen into gross sin, by ignoring his vile acts of open transgression and not even voicing dissatisfaction that the Islâmic Laws of 'Hadd' were being totally disregarded!

Had Yazîd really been involved in such acts, do you really think that Hadhrat Nu'maan ibn Bashirؓ, a prominent Sahâbiؓ, would remain quiet, and continue serving as Yazîd's close confidant?! Do you think that Yazîd's awe was such that it could subdue and silence every Tabi'ee and Tabe'-Tabi'ee in Shâm, which as the Ahâdith had described, was the fort of Islâm?! Why can the books of history not provide a single eye-witness report, from any reliable person, who had witnessed Yazîd doing these actions?

Taking it slightly further, in Islâmic Law, if one openly accuses another of adultery, he would be asked to present four reliable witnesses and if he fails to comply, he himself would be subjected to eighty lashes, on account of 'Qazaf' (a false accusation of adultery). Had Yazîd, in his era and in his land, really been openly accused of adultery, there would have been at least one case, where a witness would have been asked, by some or the other judge, spread across the length and breadth of Shâm, to bring forth witnesses.

Anyone, with a slight amount of knowledge regarding the strict conditions laid down for one's witness to be accepted in the issue of adultery, would know well that had any accuser ever been asked to bring forth witnesses, he would most likely have failed to do so and would then have been subjected to the punishment of eighty lashes, whereas this too cannot be found in any historical narration! Why?

Could it be that all the judges of the era, described as *Khairul-Quroon* (the best of eras), had unanimously agreed to discard the laws of

'Qazaf (false accusation)' and ignore all the accusations of adultery being openly made against the Caliph?!

If one finds accepting the above difficult, then the only other possibility that exists, in my limited understanding, is that during the era of Yazîd, in the lands of Shâm, no open accusation of adultery, drinking, transgression, etc, had been levelled against Yazîd, thus the need to investigate these accusations never arose.

In fact, if one were to ponder deeply over what has been narrated in the books of history, one shall find ample evidence that the reasons for Hadhrat Huseinؓ standing up against Yazîd had nothing whatsoever to do with Yazîd being an open transgressor, an adulterer, etc.

Some narrations and points of interest shall Insha-Allâh now be mentioned, through which, if studied with an open mind, one shall clearly see the truth of what has just been mentioned.

1) Hadhrat Huseinؓ, had already, in the era of Hadhrat Muawiyahؓ expressed his dissatisfaction with the decision to have Yazîd appointed as caliph. Obviously, during that time, Yazîd could not have been committing vile acts in the palace of his illustrious father. What then was the reason, at that time, for Hadhrat Huseinؓ to openly reject Hadhrat Muâwiyahؓ's decision to have his son, Yazîd, appointed as the next caliph?

Will it not make sense that the reason for Hadhrat Huseinؓ later opposing Yazîd be the very same reason for Hadhrat Huseinؓ initially not accepting the rule of Yazîd? Yet, when one studies the reasons listed for Hadhrat Huseinؓ opposing Yazîd, the initial, true reason, forget being at the top of the list, hardly finds any mention, even at the bottom of the list. Why?

The reason for this, in my understanding, is that had the true reason for Hadhrat Huseinؑ's dissatisfaction with Yazîd's rule been mentioned, the sympathy and tears for the Ahle-Bait and the anger and resentment against the entire Umayyad dynasty, which the satanic/hypocrite forces were desirous of obtaining through the martyrdom of Hadhrat Huseinؑ, would never have been attained.

The only way to create sympathy and support for their sinister plot to overthrow the present Umayyad government was to create in the minds of all a picture of a blessed soul, devoted to the truth, i.e. Hadhrat Huseinؑ, without any support from the Sahâbahؓ and Tâbi'een of Hijâz, Shâm, Iraq and the rest of the Muslim world, standing up all alone to eradicate the evils of drinking, oppression, adultery, etc, which were now being committed openly by the leaders of Shâm and in fact by the caliph, Yazîd, himself.

After ingraining this picture in the minds of the masses, through mass propaganda, it would only be natural that all would lend support to any and every movement that would later rise in a so-called rally to have revenge taken for the Ahle-Bait, irrespective of who would be spearheading the movement and irrespective of the filth and atrocities that would accompany every such rally.

With regards to the initial reasons for Hadhrat Huseinؑ being dissatisfied with the rule of Yazîd, had those reasons been allowed to come forth, all would have understood that the struggle between Hadhrat Huseinؑ and Yazîd was solely and only an *Ijtihâdi Ikhtilaafi* issue (i.e. an issue in which parties differ, after having made a sincere exerted effort to find a solution).

In the battles between Hadhrat Aliؑ and Hadhrat Muawiyahؑ, thousands of illustrious souls had attained martyrdom, yet all understood that this conflict was based solely on *Ijtihâd*, in which each party, due to its sincerity and good intentions, was absolved,

from the very beginning, by Almighty Allâh, of retribution in the Hereafter. Due to this understanding, when Hadhrat Muawiyahؑ later took complete control, not a single sincere believer, despite his own family having being killed by the forces of Hadhrat Muawiyahؑ just a few years before, would even entertain the thought of taking revenge, forget practically standing up to do so.

To make a successful call of 'revenge' it was vital for such a picture to be painted in the minds of all that would cause tears to pour from the eyes and blood to boil on the mere mention of Karbala, a picture that would include, amongst other things, the sad and sorrowful scenes of:

- a) A struggle of truth against falsehood
- b) A struggle of one brave soldier against the united armies of evil
- c) A bloody encounter, in which the leader of the youth of Jannah was left to die a dreadful death, suffering in thirst till the very last moment of his blessed life
- d) An evil ruler mocking the fate of the beloved grandson of Rasulullâhؐ
- e) A picture of the wives and daughters of Hadhrat Huseinؑ being jeered, taunted, and disgraced

The actual purpose of the hypocrites of Iraq and surrounding areas behind Karbala was to initiate a call of 'revenge' and for their call to have effect, sorrowful scenes and open lies had to be propagated to such an extent, that it would reach a level of so-called 'absolute truth', which should never be questioned, similar to the so-called 'gospel truth' regarding the attacks of September 11, known as 911.

Amongst those lies, one batch of lies, in my understanding, is with regards to the character and private life of Yazîd, in which Yazîd has been portrayed as a villain, an evil monster, an adulterer, a drunkard, a renegade, etc!

- 2) If Yazîd was really drinking liquor and committing adultery openly, why was this irritating the people of Iraq, who were thousands of miles away and not the people of Shâm, who lived near Yazîd?

Also, assuming that there really was some truth in the complaints that came from certain factions of Iraq, regarding Yazîd and if Yazîd's evil conduct was really the reason behind their calls for rebellion, the question would then arise as to why then had they sent to Hadhrat Huseinؑ similar letters calling for rebellion, during the era of Hadhrat Muawiyahؑ himself. Was heؑ also committing such evil and vile acts?!

In Al-Bidâyah, Allâmah ibn Kathir has narrated that after the death of Hadhrat Hasanؑ, Musayyib ibn Utbah Al-Fazari, together with a group of Iraqis, came to Hadhrat Huseinؑ and begged him to break his allegiance from Hadhrat Muâwiyahؑ. What was the reason for these Iraqis being upset with the rule of Hadhrat Muâwiyahؑ? Was it that Hadhrat Muawiyahؑ was flagrantly breaking the commands of Almighty Allâh (*Na'ûzubillah*), or was it rather that certain satanic factions in Iraq, Egypt and surrounding areas were continuously on the lookout for some sort of excuse to reignite war amongst the Ummah. And if such excuses could not be found, they would then be prepared to themselves create such excuses?

- 3) When the first letters from Iraq reached Madinah Munawwara, calling for Hadhrat Huseinؑ to come to Kufa to spearhead their rally for a new leader, if one were to ponder over the contents of those letters, and the quick manner that it reached Hadhrat Huseinؑ, one would realise that:

- a) In those letters no mention was made that Yazîd was committing open adultery, drinking, etc

- b) In those letters, instead of complaining against Yazîd, complaints were actually being made against the Umayyad governor in Iraq, Hadhrat Nu'maan ibn Bashirؑ, who was in fact a prominent Sahâbiؑ

- c) The speed with which these letters reached Madinah Munawwara greatly indicate that these letters had already been prepared, and were just being held back until the death of Hadhrat Muawiyahؑ before it could be sent out.

Otherwise, in such a short space of time, could one ever imagine it possible that immediately after the death of Hadhrat Muawiyahؑ, Yazîd throws open the doors of all evil in the court of caliphate, the news of his evil rapidly spreads all the way to Iraq, the people of Iraq unite against him, letters are written and signed by different clans and prominent men and all these letters get delivered to Madinah Munawwara, reaching even before the news of the death of Hadhrat Muawiyahؑ gets conveyed to the people, since Hadhrat Huseinؑ's refusal to pledge allegiance to the new caliph occurred as soon as the news of the death of Hadhrat Muawiyahؑ reached Madinah Munawwara?

If the reason for Hadhrat Huseinؑ's refusal to pledge allegiance was due to Yazîd being involved in all sorts of evil, how could it be possible that the news of Yazîd's evil conduct could travel so fast, first to Iraq and from there to Madinah Munawwara, arriving even before Yazîd could send out his own letter to Madinah Munawwara, directly from Shâm, informing the people of the death of his father?!

Below are some extracts of the first letters that reached Hadhrat Huseinؑ, addressed from the people of Iraq, as narrated in Tarikh-e-Tabari, narrating from Abu Mikhnaf (a staunch shia, whose narrations

would normally be overlooked, but has been narrated here to show that even according to their own sources, the initial letters sent to Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام), had no mention of the evil of Yazîd as the reason for their calling Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام) to Iraq):

*In the name of Allâh, Most Beneficent, Most Merciful
To Husein ibn Ali, from Suleiman ibn Sard, Musaayib ibn Najbah,
Rifaa'ah ibn Shaddad, Habib ibn Muzaahir, and all his (Husein (عليه السلام)'s)
supporters of Kufa. May Peace be upon you. We praise Allâh, besides
whom there is no deity. All praise is due to Allâh, who has brought an
end to your most oppressive enemy, the one who had pounced upon
the Ummah and unjustly taken the seat of rule, who had killed the
good of this Ummah, and left the evil, who had made the wealth of
Allâh as his own treasure. May he be kept far from Divine Mercy, as
was the case of Thamud.⁶⁴*

(Na'ûzubillah!!!) As already mentioned, the narrator of this incident, Abu Mikhnaf, was a staunch shi'ee, who never felt shy to blurt out any and every type of filth. It is obvious that such a letter would never have been entertained by Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام). The purpose of mentioning this alleged letter is merely to show that even their own sources, with all its lies, initially when discussing the letters they had sent to Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام) made no mention of Yazîd being an evil man, an adulterer, a drunkard, etc. The next portion of his letter makes this even clearer.) He continues:

^{٦٤} (بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم) لحسين بن علي من سليمان بن سرد والمسيب بن نجبة ورفاعة ابن شداد وحبيب بن مظاهر وشيعته من المؤمنين والمسلمين من أهل الكوفة سلام عليك فإننا نحمد إليك الله الذي لا إله إلا هو أما بعد فالحمد لله الذي قسم عدوك الجبار العنيد الذي انتزى على هذه الأمة فابتزها أمرها وغصبها فيأها وتآمر عليها بغير رضى منها ثم قتل خيارها واستبقى شرارها وجعل مال الله دولة بين جابرتها وأغنيانها فبعدا له كما بعدت ثمود إنه ليس علينا إمام فأقبل لعل الله أن يجمعنا بك على الحق والنعمان بن بشير في قصر الامارة لسنا نجتمع معه في جمعة ولا نخرج معه إلى عيد ولو قد بلغنا أنك قد أقبلت إلينا أخرجه حتى نلحقه بالشام إن شاء الله والسلام ورحمة الله عليك

*At the present moment we find ourselves with no leader. If you come over it is hoped that through you Almighty Allâh shall gather all of us under your banner, to fight for the truth. **As for Nu'maan ibn Bashir (عليه السلام) who at present occupies the seat of governing, we have nothing to do with him. We do not perform Jumu'ah behind him, nor do we go out with him for Eid. If the news reaches us that you are coming over, we shall immediately force him out and have him sent back to Shâm,***

Insha-Allâh!

May Almighty Allâh's peace, mercy and blessings always be upon you!

Continuing with his preposterous narration⁶⁵, Abu Mikhnaf explains that this letter was then sent with Abdullâh ibn Saba' Al-Hamdaani and Abdullâh ibn Waal. The letter was handed to Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام) on the 10th of Ramadan, while he was in Makkah Mukarramah. Two days later, Qais ibn Mishar and a few others were sent with approximately thirty-five such letters, allegedly sent from individuals, as well as groups. Then Hani' ibn Hani' As-Subai'ee and Saeed ibn Abdullâh Al-Hanafi were sent with the following letter:

(بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم) لحسين بن علي من شيعته من المؤمنين والمسلمين أما بعد فحيهلا فإن الناس ينتظرونك ولا رأى لهم في غيرك فالعجل العجل والسلام عليك

In the Name of Allâh, Most Kind and Merciful. To Husein ibn Ali from his believing supporters. Hasten to us, for verily people are waiting anxiously for you and they want none but you! Please Hasten! Please Hasten! And May Almighty Allâh's peace be with you!

^{٦٥} ثم سرحنا بالكتاب مع عبد الله بن سيع الهمداني وعبد الله بن وال وأمرناهما بالنجاء فخرج الرجلان مسرعين حتى قدما على حسين لعشر مضي من شهر رمضان بمكة ثم لبثنا يومين ثم سرحنا إليه قيس بن مسهر الصيداوي وعبد الرحمن بن عبد الله بن الكدن الارجحي وعمارة بن عبيد السلولى فحملوا معهم نحو من ثلاثة وخمسين صحيفة من الرجل والاثنين والاربعة قال ثم لبثنا يومين آخرين ثم سرحنا إليه هاني بن هاني السبيعي وسعيد بن عبد الله الحنفي وكتبنا معهما (بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم) لحسين بن علي من شيعته من المؤمنين والمسلمين أما بعد فحيهلا فإن الناس ينتظرونك ولا رأى لهم في غيرك فالعجل العجل والسلام عليك وكتب شيث بن ربعي وحجار بن أبجر ويزيد بن الحارث ويزيد بن رويم وعزرة ابن قيس وعمرو بن الحجاج الزبيدي ومحمد بن عمير التميمي أما بعد فقد اخضر الجناب وأينعت الثمار وطمت الجمام فإذا شئت فاقدم على جند لك مجند والسلام عليك

Like this, numerous other letters (written by the same party and ascribed to various influential people) were sent to Hadhrat Huseinؑ, but in hardly any of these letters can mention be found that Yazîd had taken to drinking, adultery, etc. Rather, as mentioned in the first letter, these letters were in actual fact complaining of Hadhrat Nu'maan ibn Bashirؑ, who was a high-ranking Sahâbiؑ. As for Yazîd, who was far away in Shâm, had he been doing any such act, which history today attributes to him, at least one letter from Shâm should have come, or at least one complainant could have stood up in the Masjid of Rasulullâhﷺ, and spoken out against the so-called evil practices of Yazîd. The fact that this did not happen and the fact that even the forged letters of Iraq made no mention of these acts lays ample indication to the fact that these accusations levelled against Yazîd were not even heard of during his reign and that Hadhrat Huseinؑ's going over to Iraq had nothing to do with the so-called evil character, ruthless behavior, immoral practices, etc, of Yazîd, which are today described as 'gospel-truth'.

In the same narration of Abu Mikhnaḥ, mention is made of a letter written by Hadhrat Huseinؑ to the people of Iraq, the contents of which were:

In the Name of Allâh, Most Kind and Most Merciful.

From Husein ibn Ali to the believing masses. Hani' ibn Hani' As-Subei'ee and Saeed ibn Abdullâh Al-Hanafi have presented your letters before me and they are the last of the messengers that have come to me, with messages from your side. I have understood what you have said, the crux of which is that you have no leader and desire that I come, so that all may be united, under the banner of the truth, through me.

I have thus sent my brother, my cousin, a man from the Ahle-Bait and one who I trust fully, i.e. Muslim ibn Aqeel, to investigate the truth behind your claims. If he informs me that the leaders, scholars, and masses have truly united in the decision to take me as their leader, as

*your letters have described, I shall waste no time in setting out to Iraq, since a true leader can only be he who himself practices on that which is right and who rules with justice! And may Almighty Allâh's blessings be upon you!*⁶⁶

4) When Hadhrat Huseinؑ finally decided to go to Iraq, many influential men of Hijâz tried to dissuade him. Amongst these men, many were even illustrious Sahâbahؑ. Had the purpose behind Hadhrat Huseinؑ's setting out been that Yazîd was committing vile acts in the court of the caliphate, Hadhrat Huseinؑ would surely have mentioned this to them, and would have in fact rebuked them for not joining his cause.

Had Yazîd been doing such actions, would it not then mean that at that moment the fervor to defend Islâm from all types of innovations and innovators had disappeared from practically the hearts of all the soldiers of Islâm, situated in Hijâz and Shâm, and it was only some unknown people in Iraq who were left to defend Islâm from the rot which Yazîd was apparently causing. Could any sane mind ever accept such nonsense, that in the fear of Yazîd, the illustrious Sahâbahؑ and Tabi'ee of the blessed lands of Hijâz and Shâm all turned coward?! *Na'ûzubillah* (May Almighty Allâh protect us from such filth)!

The fact of the matter is that, as mentioned above, Hadhrat Huseinؑ's setting out for Iraq was never based upon any evil that Yazîd had began perpetrating, but rather on account of something completely different. The shaitaani world could not however allow this reason to become known to the masses, for if known, their

⁶⁶ أما بعد فإن هاننا وسعيدا قدما على بكتيكم وكان آخر من قدم على من رسلكم وقد فهمت كل الذي اقتصصتم وذكرتم ومقالة جلکم إنه ليس علينا إمام فأقبل لعل الله أن يجمعنا بك على الهدى والحق وقد بعثت إليكم أخى وابن عمى وثقتى من أهل بيتى وأمرته أن يكتب إلي بحالكم وأمركم ورايكم فإن كتب إلي أنه قد أجمع رأى ملنكم وذوى الفضل والحجى منكم على مثل ما قدمت على به رسلكم وقرأت في كتبكم أقدم عليكم وشيكا إن شاء الله فلعمرى ما الإمام إلا العامل بالكتاب والآخذ بالقسط والدائن بالحق والحابس نفسه على ذات الله والسلام (الطبري)

entire emotional escapade would get watered down to a practical zero, and the chance of spurring the masses against the Umayyad Empire would never be achieved.

In the next few pages, a detailed explanation shall, Insha-Allâh highlight the true reason for Hadhrat Huseinؑ refusing to pledge allegiance to Yazîd, the reason for his setting out for Iraq and the reason why all the soldiers of Islâm, scattered throughout the Muslim world, did not accompany him on his journey.

Fighting for the Caliphate, an issue of *Ijtihâd*

A deeper study of historical narrations shall clearly show that Hadhrat Huseinؑ's displeasure with the Umayyad government was not born in the era of Yazîd, but rather from the very beginning, when his brother, Hadhrat Hasanؑ, decided to hand over the Caliphate to Hadhrat Muawiyahؑ.

As mentioned earlier, the issue of handing over the caliphate was one of *Ijtihâd*. Hadhrat Hasanؑ understood well that, as the Ahâdith had predicted, the issue of caliphate would no longer be judged solely on the basis of mutual consultation (mashwera), but rather wars would now decide who the next caliph would be.

Fighting for the caliphate was no sin, but Hadhrat Hasanؑ did not want to see any more blood spilled over this issue. Heؑ thus decided to hand over the caliphate to Hadhrat Muawiyahؑ and through this action of his, the in-fighting amongst the Muslims came to an abrupt halt. Had Hadhrat Hasanؑ wished, he could also have fought for the caliphate and this was exactly what many hypocrite factions of Iraq were desirous of seeing.

Fighting for the caliphate would have also been a meritorious deed, since when one makes *Ijtihâd*, Almighty Allâh has promised that reward shall be given upon his effort and not in accordance to whether the decision was the best for that moment or not.

The *Ijtihâd* of Hadhrat Muawiyahؑ on the other hand was that as long as the caliphate remained in Iraq, the hypocrites of that area would continue utilizing their influence in stirring trouble, chaos and anarchy throughout the Muslim World. Hadhrat Muawiyahؑ's view was that if the caliphate moves over to Shâm, such an act would greatly weaken the plots of the shaitaani elements who had already spread throughout the Muslim Lands, but whose base had always been Iraq.

In the twenty years of peace and stability that thereafter followed, ample evidence was provided to show that Hadhrat Hasanؑ's decision to hand over the caliphate was indeed one of great wisdom and practicality and at the same time, the decision of Hadhrat Muawiyahؑ to be prepared to fight for the caliphate, that too was correct.

Hadhrat Huseinؑ, on the other hand, from the very beginning, held onto the view upon which he had found his illustrious father, Hadhrat Aliؑ, i.e. to keep the seat of the caliphate in Kufa. When Hadhrat Huseinؑ came to know of his brother's intention to hand over the caliphate, he clearly made known to his brother his feelings. The books of history provide numerous statements of hisؑ, in which heؑ expressed his unhappiness with regards to the decision taken. The following passage of Al-Bidâyah highlights this point most clearly⁶⁷:

⁶⁷ فلما آلت الخلافة إلى أخيه وأراد أن يصالح شق ذلك عليه ولم يسدد رأي أخيه في ذلك، بل حثه على قتل أهل الشام، فقال له أخوه: والله لقد هممت أن أسجنك في بيت وأطبق عليك بابه حتى أفرغ من هذا الشأن ثم أخرجك. فلما رأى الحسين ذلك سكت وسلم، فلما استقرت الخلافة لمعاوية كان الحسين يتردد إليه مع أخيه الحسن فيكرههما معاوية إكراما زائدا، ويقول لهما:

When Hadhrat Hasan ؑ intended handing over the caliphate to Hadhrat Muawiyah ؑ, through a peace treaty, **Hadhrat Husein ؑ disapproved the decision and insisted instead that the war against the people of Shâm continue.** Hadhrat Hasan ؑ finally threatened to have him placed under house arrest until the peace-treaty was finalized. Realizing his brother's determination to proceed with the treaty, Hadhrat Husein ؑ kept silent and accepted.

Afterwards, Hadhrat Husein ؑ would accompany his brother, Hadhrat Hasan ؑ, on his regular visits to Hadhrat Muawiyah ؑ, during which Hadhrat Muawiyah ؑ would honour them greatly and shower them with gifts.

Even after the death of Hadhrat Hasan ؑ, Hadhrat Husein ؑ would continue paying regular visits to Hadhrat Muawiyah ؑ and would receive the same honour as before. In fact, Hadhrat Husein ؑ even participated in the battle of Constantinople, **fighting under the leadership of Yazîd ibn Muawiyah**, which occurred in the 51st year of Hijrah!

SubhanAllâh! This was the superb nature of the Sahâbah ؑ, that despite not agreeing with the decisions of their leaders, once the decision would be passed, they would forget all their personal views and remain united under one banner. From the very beginning Hadhrat Husein ؑ was not at all in favour of seeing the caliphate being placed in the hands of Hadhrat Muawiyah ؑ, but once he pledged his allegiance to Hadhrat Muawiyah ؑ he would never be prepared to pull his hand out.

The following passage of Al-Bidâyah is clear proof of this:

مرحبا وأهلا، ويعطيها عطاء جزيلًا، وقد أطلق لهما في يوم واحد مائتي ألف، وقال: خذاها وأنا ابن هند، والله لا يعطيكماها أحد قبلي ولا بعدي، فقال الحسين: والله لن تعطي أنت ولا أحد قبلك ولا بعدي رجلا منا. ولما توفي الحسن كان الحسين يقد إلى معاوية في كل عام فيعطيه ويكرمه، وقد كان في الجيش الذين غزوا القسطنطينية مع ابن معاوية يزيد، في سنة إحدى وخمسين

After the death of Hadhrat Hasan ؑ, Musayyib ibn Utbah Al-Fazari, together with a group of Iraqis, came to Hadhrat Husein ؑ and begged him to break his allegiance to Hadhrat Muâwiyah ؑ, and accept their allegiance to him, saying,

‘We are well aware of your opinion in the matter regarding Muâwiyah, (referring to the fact that Hadhrat Husein ؑ was, from the very beginning not happy with the decision to hand over the caliphate).

Hadhrat Husein ؑ replied, **‘I have hope that Almighty Allâh reward my brother for his good intentions (i.e. to refrain from fighting, and thus save the blood of the Ummah), and I hope that He rewards me for my good intentions (i.e. the love of fighting against the oppressors).’⁶⁸**

When the governor of Madinah Al Munawwara, Marwan ibn Al-Hakam, received news of these delegations, he sent a message to Hadhrat Muâwiyah ؑ, saying, “I fear that Husein ؑ shall become a target of fitnah (turmoil)!” Hadhrat Muâwiyah ؑ thus wrote to Hadhrat Husein ؑ, cautioning him from falling into the trap of the Iraqis. His advice was as follows:

‘Remember, it is only appropriate that the one who makes a pledge to a caliph now fulfils his pledge!’ I have been informed that some people of Kufa have requested that you join them in breaking the unity. I am sure that through past experience you now realise that the people of Kufa can never be trusted. They have already betrayed your father and your brother. Thus, fear Almighty Allâh and remember your pledge. If you attempt to plot against me, I shall punish you severely!’

Hadhrat Husein ؑ replied to this letter, saying,

^{٦٨} قدم المسيب بن عتبة الفزاري في عدة معه إلى الحسين بعد وفاة الحسن، فدعوه إلى خلع معاوية وقالوا: قد علمنا رأيك ورأي أخيك، فقال: إني لأرجو أن يعطى الله أخي على نيته في حبه الكف، وأن يعطيني على نيته في حبي جهاد الظالمين (البداية)

'I have no intention of doing that which you suspect. And Almighty Allâh alone guides towards good. I have no intention to fight against you, but at the same time I fear that if Almighty Allâh has to ask as to why I abandoned Jihad against you, I shall have no answer!'⁶⁹

In Al-Akhbar Al-Tiwaal, Hafiz Deenawari quoted the following⁷⁰, which explicitly shows that some people of Iraq were continuously on the lookout for some excuse to reignite the flames of disunity amongst the believers, but due to the respect Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام) held for the institution of allegiance, he was not at all prepared to lead any rebellion at that moment:

When the news of the death of Hadhrat Hasan (عليه السلام) reached the people of Kufa, the leaders of Kufa sent their condolences to Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام), via letters. Ja'dah ibn Hubeira, who displayed the most love for the Ahle-Bait, wrote,

'Such friends of yours are present here (i.e. in Kufa and Iraq), who are eagerly awaiting your coming, who regard none as your equal! They are well aware that the opinion of your brother, Hasan, was to avoid

⁶⁹ وكتب مروان إلى معاوية: إني لست آمن أن يكون حسين مرصدا للفتنة، وأظن يومكم من حسين طويلا. فكتب معاوية إلى الحسين: إن من أعطى الله صفقة يمينه وعهده لجدير بالوفاء، وقد أنبت أن قوما من أهل الكوفة قد دعوك إلى الشقاق، وأهل العراق من قد جريت قد أفسدوا على أبيك وأخيك، فاتق الله واذكر الميثاق، فإنك متى تكذني أكذك. فكتب إليه الحسين: أتاني كتابك وأنا بغير الذي بلغك عني جدير، والحسنات لا يهدي لها إلا الله، وما أردت لك محاربة ولا عليك خلافا، وما أظن لي عند الله عذرا في ترك جهادك (البداية)

⁷⁰ وبلغ أهل الكوفة وفاة الحسن، فاجتمع عظماءهم فكتبوا إلى الحسين رضي الله عنه يعزونه. وكتب إليه جعدة بن هبيرة بن أبي وهب، وكان أمحضهم حبا ومودة: (أما بعد، فإن من قبلنا من شيعتك متطلعة أنفسهم إليك، لا يعدلون بك أحدا، وقد كانوا عرفوا رأي الحسن أخيك في دفع الحرب، وعرفوك باللين لأوليائكم، والغلظة على أعدائكم، والشدة في أمر الله، فإن كنت تحب أن تطلب هذا الأمر فاقدم علينا، فقد وطننا أنفسنا على الموت معك) فكتب إليهم: (أما أخي فأرجو أن يكون الله قد وفقه، وسدده فيما يأتي، وأما أنا فليس رأيي اليوم ذلك، فالصقوا رحمكم الله بالأرض، وأكمنوا في البيوت، واحترسوا من الظنة ما دام معاوية حيا، فإن يحدث الله به حدثا وأنا حي، كتبت إليكم برأيي والسلام) (الاخبار الطوال للدينوري)

war, whereas you are a man who shows kindness to friends and severity against the enemy, a man who fights bravely for the Deen of Allâh. Thus, if you are desirous of achieving these goals, come to Kufa immediately, for we have, in your service, handed ourselves over to death!

Hadhrat Husain (عليه السلام) answered as follows:

'I have hope that Almighty Allâh treats my brother favourably. As for me, at the present moment, I do not feel rebellion to be appropriate. Thus, as long as Muawiyah remains alive, remain in Kufa, seek shelter in your homes and avoid becoming targets of suspicion. If something happens to him (i.e. he passes away) whilst I am still alive, I shall write to you again, informing you of my intentions.

Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام), in the company of his elder brother, Hadhrat Hasan (عليه السلام), had pledged allegiance to Hadhrat Muawiyah (عليه السلام) and no matter what his personal feelings were, he understood very well that breaking allegiance was abhorred by the Shariah. As long as Hadhrat Muawiyah (عليه السلام) remained alive, Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام) remained loyal to the demands of his allegiance. When Hadhrat Muawiyah (عليه السلام) made known his plan to have his son, Yazîd, elected as the next caliph, Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام) was amongst those in Hijaz who refused to accept this proposal. Such a proposal, despite it being made by a caliph, does not hold the status of a binding law of the *Shariah* and thus those who oppose the proposal were at full liberty to do so. By not pledging allegiance to Yazîd, Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام) kept open for himself a door, through which, if he ever decided, he could once again stand up to fight for the caliphate and bring it back into the hands of the Banu Hashim. This decision of Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام) was one of *Ijtihâd*, and as with every *mujtahid*, he was at full liberty to practice upon the dictates of his *Ijtihâd*.

Based upon the contents of the letters of Iraq, Hadhrat Huseinؓ understood that there were many factions in Iraq and its surrounding areas, who had either not yet pledged allegiance to Yazîd or had been forced into doing so, and that these people were eagerly awaiting his return to Kufa, so that they could happily pledge their allegiance to him. As Hadhrat Muawiyahؓ had once upon a time been prepared to fight for the caliphate, Hadhrat Huseinؓ now also had every right to do the same.

Many of the inhabitants of Hijaaz however were not fully in favour of this decision of Hadhrat Huseinؓ. Many based their opinion upon the fact that the letters and letter-bearers from Iraq had shown time and again, from the era of Hadhrat Uthmaanؓ till the present day, that they should never be trusted. These inhabitants had no problem with Hadhrat Huseinؓ standing up to fight for the caliphate, since they understood well that this was an issue of *Ijtihâd*, wherein each *mujtahid* is free to practice upon his opinion. Their only worry was that it should not be that Hadhrat Huseinؓ becomes bait for the liars of Iraq, who would merely be using him to re-ignite the flames of war within the Muslim world.

It was for this very reason that some requested that he first send someone to investigate the reality on the ground in Iraq. Others pleaded that he choose any other direction but that of Kufa. And there were even those who advised him against heading for any major city, but rather to move through villages and slowly gather around him an army of loyal followers.

Below shall follow some passages from the books of history, which if read with an unbiased and open heart, one shall, Insha-Allâh, surely see the truth of much of what has just been mentioned:

a) Mohammad ibn Al-Hanafiyahؓ was the son of Hadhrat Aliؓ, and the consanguine brother of Hadhrat Hasanؓ and Hadhrat Huseinؓ. The love and honour that he held for his brothers was immense, which would make him say that even his own children do not occupy that spot in his heart which Hadhrat Hasanؓ and Hadhrat Huseinؓ would occupy. Despite being younger, due to his bodily and mental strength, Hadhrat Aliؓ would constantly remind him to keep a watchful eye over Hadhrat Hasanؓ and Hadhrat Huseinؓ, due to which, during battles, he would mostly be found in close proximity to them.

When the news of Hadhrat Huseinؓ intending to set out reached him, he, after failing to dissuade Hadhrat Huseinؓ from leaving Madinah Munawwara, offered the advice mentioned below, and ended with the plea that if Hadhrat Huseinؓ had to leave, he should rather go over to Makkah Mukarramah, and from there give the matter second thought:

*O my brother, you are indeed the most beloved to me, as well as the most honoured, thus I shall spare no effort in rendering the most sincere of advices. Avoid open confrontation with Yazîd ibn Muawiyah and stay away from major cities as far as possible. Staying away from major areas, send your messengers to the people and **invite them to pledge allegiance to you. If they pledge allegiance, praise Almighty Allâh and accept. However, if they prefer someone over you, that shall not harm your religion nor your intelligence and neither shall it cause any deficiency in your honour and status.***

I fear that if you enter any major city and due to your arriving, war breaks out between two parties, i.e. the party supporting you against the party supporting the opposition, I fear that you may perhaps be the

*first to be shot down, and thereby the blood of the best of this world, at the present moment, shall be spilled in a ruthless manner.*⁷¹

In the above advice can one find any sort of indication that the setting out of Hadhrat Husein عليه السلام was due to some sort of oppression and evil that Yazîd was perpetrating, or rather does the above words indicate towards something completely different, i.e. to return the caliphate to the Banu Hashim, which was purely an Ijtihâdi issue.

Had the campaign been to rid the world of Yazîd's so-called oppression and evil, Hadhrat Mohammad ibn Al-Hanafiyyah عليه السلام would never have dissuaded Hadhrat Husein عليه السلام from proceeding forth, rather he would have been the first to join the campaign.

Due to the issue having nothing to do with any oppression and evil of Yazîd, but rather with the issue of fighting for the caliphate and due to Hadhrat Mohammad ibn Al-Hanafiyyah عليه السلام, in this matter, agreeing more with the reasoning of Hadhrat Hasan عليه السلام, i.e. to leave the caliphate to others and not to ever fight for it; he not only refrained from joining the caravan of Hadhrat Husein عليه السلام, but in fact even prohibited his own children from participating in the expedition.⁷²

b) Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umar عليه السلام, whose name had been taken many a time as a possible candidate for the caliphate, whose

^{٧١} يا أخى أنت أحب الناس إلى وأعزهم على ولست أدخر النصيحة لأحد من الخلق أحق بها منك تنح بتبعك عن يزيد ابن معاوية وعن الامصار ما استطعت ثم ابعت رسلك إلى الناس فادعهم إلى نفسك فان بايعوا لك حمدت الله على ذلك وإن أجمع الناس على غيرك لم ينقص الله بذلك دينك ولا عقلك ولا يذهب به مروءتك ولا فضلك إني أخاف أن تدخل مصرا من هذه الامصار وتأتى جماعة من الناس فيختلفون بينهم فمنهم طائفة معك وأخرى عليك فيقتلون فتكون لأول الاسنة فإذا خير هذه الامة كلها نفسا وأبا وأما أضياعها دما وأذلها أهلا (انساب الاشراف)

^{٧٢} فأدرك حسينا بمكة فاعلمه أن الخروج ليس له برأي يومه هذا، فأبى الحسين أن يقبل، فحبس محمد بن الحنفية ولده فلم يبعث أحدا منهم حتى وجد الحسين في نفسه على محمد، وقال: ترغب بولدك عن موضع أصاب فيه ؟ فقال: وما حاجتي إلى أن تصاب ويصابون معك ؟ وإن كانت مصيبتك أعظم عندنا منهم (البداية)

position during the years of internal conflict had always been neutral and who had initially also refused to pledge allegiance to Yazîd, after finding that the Ummah has practically united upon Yazîd, not only pledges allegiance, but in fact even invites Hadhrat Husein عليه السلام and Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeir عليه السلام to refrain from standing up against the government. An extract of the advice offered by Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umar عليه السلام, as quoted in Al-Bidâyah is as follows:

أذكركما الله إلا رجعتما فدخلتما في صالح ما يدخل فيه الناس، و تنظرا فإن اجتمع الناس عليه فلم تشذا، وإن افترقا عليه كان الذي تريدان

I beg you in the name of Allâh to return to Madinah and to again ponder over this matter. If you find the people have accepted Yazîd, then do not be the ones who remain aloof.

And if the people themselves pull away from him, then that is exactly what you desire.

Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umar عليه السلام said:

غلبنا حسين بن علي بالخروج، ولعمري لقد رأى في أبيه وأخيه عبرة، فرأى من الفتنة وخذلان الناس لهما ما كان ينبغي له أن لا يتحرك ما عاش، وأن يدخل في صالح ما دخل فيه الناس، فإن الجماعة خير (البداية)

"We were unable to dissuade Husein ibn Ali عليه السلام from his intention to stand against the government, whereas he عليه السلام himself had seen in the life of his father and brother and in the strife that existed during that period, and in how the people (of Iraq) had deserted them, in all of this he had surely seen such lessons which should have been sufficient to hold him back from standing against the government and making him accept what the majority had accepted. And in unity there is plenty of good!

c) Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Abbaasؓ, upon being informed that Hadhrat Huseinؓ was planning to go over to Iraq, made the following plea to Hadhrat Husein:

إنى لكاره لوجهك هذا تخرج إلى قوم قتلوا أباك وطعنوا أخاك حتى تركهم سخطه وملاة لهم أذكرك الله أن تغزر بنفسك (البداية)

*I am not happy with the direction you have chosen to take. You are heading to the very people who had killed your father and slandered your brother, until finally he left angry and tired of their disloyalty.
I ask you in the name of Allâh that you do not go!*

d) Hadhrat Abu Saeed Al-Khudriؓ, describing his efforts in trying to change the mind of Hadhrat Huseinؓ, is quoted as having said:

غلبنى الحسين على الخروج وقلت له اتق الله فى نفسك والزم بيتك ولا تخرج على إمامك
I failed in dissuading Huseinؓ from standing up against the government. I pleaded with him, saying, 'Fear Allâh, with regards to your life, do not leave your house and do not stand up against your Imaam (leader)!'

e) Hadhrat Abu Waqid Al-Laihiؓ narrates⁷³ that when the news of Hadhrat Husein ibn Aliؓ leaving for Iraq reached him, he implored himؓ not to go, saying that the direction he had chosen was leading to nowhere but his death.'

f) Hadhrat Jaabir ibn Abdullâhؓ is quoted as having said to Hadhrat Huseinؓ on this occasion:

⁷³ بلغنى خروج الحسين بن على فأدركته بملا فاشدته الله أن لا يخرج فانه يخرج فى غير وجه الخروج إنما خرج يقتل نفسه (البداية)

اتق الله ولا تضرب الناس بعضهم ببعض (البداية)

Fear Allâh and do not become the cause of infighting amongst the believers!

g) Hadhrat Saeed ibn Al-Musayyib (the most senior of the Tâbi'een) is quoted as having said:

لو أن حسينا لم يخرج لكان خيرا له (البداية)

Had Huseinؓ never left for Iraq, it would have been much better for him!

h) Hadhrat Miswar ibn Makhramahؓ wrote to Hadhrat Huseinؓ and warned him not to be fooled with the letters of the people of Iraq⁷⁴

i) Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Abbaasؓ offered the following advice to Hadhrat Huseinؓ:

لا تبرح الحرم فانهم إن كانت بهم إليك حاجة فسيضربون إليك أباط الابل حتى يوافوك
فتخرج فى قوة وعدة (البداية)

Do not leave the Haram! If the people of Iraq are truthful in their claims, they will themselves come on the backs of their camels to find you, after which you may set out with a huge powerful army!

j) Hadhrat Amrah bint Abdur Rahmaan (the grand-daughter of Hadhrat Sa'd ibn Zuraarahؓ) wrote to Hadhrat Huseinؓ, emphasizing upon him to accept the new government and keep the unity. She also mentioned that if heؓ had to leave for Iraq, he would only be dragging himself towards his place of slaughter, since she had clearly heard from Hadhrat

⁷⁴ وكتب إليه المسور بن مخزوم إياك أن تغتر بكتب أهل العراق ويقول ابن الزبير الحق بهم فانهم ناصروك (البداية)

Ayeshaؓ that Rasulullâhؐ mentioned that *Bâbil* (Babylon – city of Iraq) shall be the place at which Hadhrat Huseinؓ would be killed.⁷⁵

- k) Abu Bakr ibn Abdur Rahmaan ibn Haarith ibn Hishâmؓ, (one of the famous seven jurists of Madinah Munawwara), while pleading with Hadhrat Huseinؓ to abandon his idea of proceeding towards Iraq, made the following remark, which if one ponders deeply over the secret realities behind Karbala, shall find to be totally on target. He said:

يا ابن عم قد رأيت ما صنع أهل العراق بأبيك وأخيك وأنت تريد أن تسير إليهم وهم عبيد الدنيا
فيقاتلك من قد وعدك أن ينصرك ويخذلك من أنت أحب إليه ممن ينصره (البداية)

O my cousin, after having seen what the people of Iraq had done to your father and brother, how can you ever think of going back to them, whereas they are nothing but slaves of this world.

If you do proceed, it may well result in those very people fighting against you who are at present inviting you. Then those who truly love you shall be unable to assist you!

- l) Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Ja'farؓ (the son of Hadhrat Ja'far Tayyaarؓ) wrote to Hadhrat Huseinؓ warning him of the people of Iraq and begging him, in the name of Allâhﷻ, not to proceed towards them.⁷⁶

Despite the above mentioned pleas, as well as many others, from influential and prominent individuals of Makkah Mukarramah and

⁷⁵ وكتب إليه عمرة بنت عبد الرحمن تعظم عليه ما يريد أن يصنع وتأمرة بالطاعة ولزوم الجماعة وتخبره أنه إن لم يفعل إنما يساق

إلى مصرعه وتقول أشهد لسمعت عائشة تقول إنها سمعت رسول الله ص يقول يقتل الحسين بأرض بابل (البداية)

⁷⁶ وكتب إليه عبد الله بن جعفر كتابا يحذره أهل العراق ويناشده الله أن شخص إليهم (البداية)

Madinah Munawwara, Hadhrat Huseinؓ remained determined to proceed towards Iraq, perhaps on account of a dream in which he had seen his beloved grandfather, Rasulullâhؐ, making some indication towards him, the details of which heؓ felt best not to disclose to anyone.⁷⁷

Whatever the case may be, Hadhrat Huseinؓ had his reasons for proceeding towards Iraq, despite receiving much advice not to do so, and none could ever dare question his reasons. However, the above mentioned twelve advices, rendered by the prominent Sahâbahؓ and Tâbi'een of his time and their disapproving with his decision, that should surely cause a bell of doubt to ring against the story of Karbala that is popularly known.

Had Hadhrat Huseinؓ's setting out been to fight against some oppression, evil and corruption of Yazîd, could one ever fathom such luminaries discouraging him from doing so?! Could it ever be possible, that after having placed their lives on the line in the defence of Islâm on numerous occasions, these luminaries now, in the face of Yazîd, turn coward?!

Had Yazîd been drinking and committing open adultery, would Hadhrat Huseinؓ not have rebuked at least one of these personalities, that despite knowing of vice being committed openly in the court of the caliphate, they are not only lagging behind, but in fact attempting to prevent him from standing against falsehood?! Forget rebuking, in not one of these narrations can any mention whatsoever be found of

⁷⁷ فكتب إليه الحسين إني رأيت رؤيا ورأيت رسول الله ﷺ أمرني بأمر وأنا ماض له ولست بمخير بها أحدا حتى ألقى عملي

(البداية)

Hadhrat Huseinؑ mentioning the evil, drinking, adultery, etc. of Yazîd as the reason behind his setting out. Why?!

If, in the story of Karbala that is normally known, one finds himself unable to answer the above, then it shall only be fair that one now extends a just and unbiased ear, eye and heart in search of some sort of explanation that could answer the above.

One such explanation, which could provide answers to many unexplainable issues, is the one that has been rendered from the very beginning of this book, i.e. Hadhrat Huseinؑ had no personal issue with Yazîd, nor was there any issue of Yazîd drinking, committing adultery, etc, but rather Hadhrat Huseinؑ's leaving for Iraq was so that he could find an army prepared to stand with him in his fight to take back the caliphate, an act which was totally permissible and being based on *Ijtihâd*, would in fact be rewardable.

This alone, in my opinion, was the reason that Hadhrat Huseinؑ set forward for Iraq, and in my understanding, it is an explanation which can provide answers as to why Hadhrat Huseinؑ was left alone in his fight against Yazîd and why the vast majority of the inhabitants of Makkah Mukarramah and Madinah Munawwara, as well as all the pious of Iraq, Shâm, etc, abstained from joining the expedition of Hadhrat Huseinؑ.

Muslim ibn Aqeelؑ and the betrayal by the hypocrites of Iraq

After being warned numerous times of the common treacherous practices that the people of Iraq were famous for, Hadhrat Huseinؑ decided to tread with slightly greater caution. For this, he requested his cousin, Muslim ibn Aqeelؑ, to proceed ahead and report back on

whether the facts on the ground were really as the letters had described.

Had Muslim ibn Aqeel been sent in secrecy, without the hypocrites of Iraq being made aware of his coming, he most probably would have seen a completely different picture, just as how the investigators, sent in the era of Hadhrat Umarؑ and Hadhrat Uthmaanؑ to investigate complaints being made against governors, found that the accusations had practically no weight whatsoever.

Destiny however rules, thus the news of Muslim ibn Aqeel's coming was conveyed to the parties whose letters were continuously pouring in.

The hypocrites of Iraq wasted no time and as reports suggest, hundreds were prepared to welcome Muslim ibn Aqeelؑ into Iraq. The figure of ten to twenty thousand does seem exaggerated, but whatever the matter is, the numbers that met him on his arrival were definitely huge, which spurred him to immediately write to Hadhrat Huseinؑ, and convey the glad tidings that the matter in Iraq is fully stable and that the people are in eager anticipation of Hadhrat Huseinؑ's coming.

If one were to ponder slightly over the recorded events regarding Muslim ibn Aqeelؑ, from the time he arrived in Iraq until his death, one would surely notice many such points that indicate towards some sort of conspiracy, in which Hadhrat Huseinؑ was being called towards Iraq solely so that his innocent blood could be later used for nefarious purposes. Amongst these many points, one that I feel deserves the most attention is with regards to the identity of the ones who were begging Hadhrat Huseinؑ to come to Iraq.

If these men can be identified, and a glimpse into their life-history be made, I am certain that that itself would be sufficient in exposing the lies and conspiracies behind Karbala. A glimpse at their lives would clearly show that, from the very beginning, they had no good intentions. Rather, if one were to say that many were nothing but satanists, that too would not be far-fetched. Quoting from the books of history, some aspects of these individuals shall now be put forward, whereby one may understand the nature of those who were behind Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام)'s coming to Iraq. If the intention and character of these inviters turn out evil, it would then only be fair that one accept that perhaps the complaints and calls made to Husein (عليه السلام), which finally resulted in him (عليه السلام) going to Iraq, were nothing but lies!

From the names that have been recorded, who were in the forefront of bringing Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام) over to Iraq, one individual stands out most vividly, an individual whose every act shows that he was totally under the influence of shaitân, an individual who would be the first to lay a claim of being appointed by Al-Mahdi, thereafter to advance to the claim of being a Nabi, and finally to take the step of declaring himself as The Almighty incarnated! (*Na'uuzubillah*) The individual I am referring to here is the one whom the Ummah would later, in the light of the Sunnah and the disgusting deeds of this man, declare him as 'الدجال الكذاب' (i.e. one of the biggest liars in this Ummah). This liar was none other than Mukhtaar ibn Abu Ubeid Thaqafi. (May Almighty Allâh deal with him as he deserves).

When Hadhrat Muslim ibn Aqeel (عليه السلام) reached Iraq, to ascertain whether the invitation to Iraq could be trusted, it was this very Mukhtaar ibn Ubeid Thaqafi who hosted him and arranged meetings between him

and the 'loyal' supporters of Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام)⁷⁸. Finding the numbers of supporters to be adequate, Hadhrat Muslim ibn Aqeel (عليه السلام) sends out a letter to Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام), informing him (عليه السلام) that Iraq does indeed have many supporters, eagerly awaiting his (عليه السلام) arrival.

But very soon after the letter gets despatched Muslim ibn Aqeel (عليه السلام) is forced to leave the house of Mukhtaar. Finding himself deserted makes his way to the house of Hani ibn Urwah, a senior, loyal to the Ummayyad government. The discussion⁷⁹ that occurred when Hadhrat Muslim ibn Aqeel reached the house of Hani and begged for his assistance shows clearly that as soon as news of the arrival of Ubeidullah ibn Ziyad reached the ears of the 'hypocrite Iraqis', 'the loyal supporters of the Ahl-e-Bait' had already begun deserting Muslim ibn Aqeel. Otherwise, why could none of them give shelter to Muslim ibn Aqeel, nor offer him any support in finding alternative shelter. Why was he left alone to seek aid, whereas just a few days previously he was promised the support of thousands, who were prepared to sacrifice their blood at his call. Where were all those 'loyal supporters' when Muslim ibn Aqeel was left in the streets without shelter?

A few days later, upon hearing of the arrest of Hani ibn Urwah, Muslim ibn Aqeel made a last, desperate attempt to rally to his aid those who had pledged their support for the Ahl-e-Bait. The great shia liar, Abu

⁷⁸ فصار مسلم حتى قدم الكوفة ، فنزل في دار المختار بن أبي عبيد ، وهي تُعرف اليوم بدار مسلم بن المسيّب ، وأقبلت إليه الشيعة ، فقرأ عليهم كتاب الحسين رضي الله عنه ، فبكوا ، وأجابوا بالسمع والطاعة . وشاع خبره ، فقام النعمان بن بشير على المنبر ، وقال : اتقوا الله عباد الله ، ولا تُسارعوا إلى الفتنِ وسفكِ الدماء (مرآة الزمان في تواريخ الأعيان - سبط ابن الجوزي)

⁷⁹ قام مسلم ، فسلم عليه ، وقال : اني اتيتك لتجيرني وتضيفني . فقال له هاني : لقد كلفني شططا بهذا الأمر ، ولولا دخولك منزلي لأحببت ان تنصرف عني ، غير انه قد لزمني ذمام لذلك . فادخله دار نساءه ، وافرد له ناحية منها (الاخبار الطوال)

Mikhnaf, has been quoted that upon this call thousands rallied to his support and laid siege to the place in Ibn Ziyad was residing.

Amongst those recorded as being in the forefront with Muslim ibn Aqeel as these thousands gathered, one finds again the name of the great liar and deceiver, Mukhtar ibn Ubeid⁸⁰. If such huge numbers did really gather and were close to toppling the palace of Ibn Ziyad, the books of history fail to offer any solid reason as to why the next day Muslim ibn Aqeel was found running and desperately searching for anyone to offer him a place of hiding and something to drink. All that the books of history show is that upon hearing the threats of Ibn Ziyad, these thousands, who were just a few days ago prepared to lay down their lives, felt it best to return home and leave the vicegerant of Hadrat Husein stranded, whereas it was upon their call that he had come. When these thousands (if there really were so many) cowardly returned home, despite there being no real reason to do so, amongst those cowards that returned, or amongst the hypocrites that returned was indeed Mukhtar ibn Ubeid.

When Ubeidullah ibn Ziyad ordered Hani ibn Urwah to hand Muslim ibn Aqeel over, he refused, despite knowing that his refusal would result in his execution. Despite Hani not having called Muslim ibn Aqeel over to Iraq, it was against the demand of love for the Ahl-e-Bait, which was and shall always be engrained in the heart of all Muslims, to betray his trust.

It was only a hypocrite that would stoop to the level of inviting the Ahl-e-Bait over and at the time of their greatest need, to turn one's back

⁸⁰ ذكر هارون بن مسلم، عَنْ عَلِيِّ بْنِ صَالِحٍ، عَنْ عِيسَى بْنِ يَزِيدَ، أَنَّ الْمُخْتَارَ بْنَ أَبِي عُبَيْدٍ وَعَبْدَ اللَّهِ بْنَ الْخَارِثِ بْنِ نَوْفَلٍ كَانَا خَرَجَا مَعَ مُسْلِمٍ، خَرَجَ الْمُخْتَارُ بِرَايَةِ خُضْرَاءَ، وَخَرَجَ عَبْدُ اللَّهِ بِرَايَةِ حُمْرَاءَ (الطبري)

and become deaf to their plea for help. It was this very vile act that Mukhtar ibn Ubeid committed and by this act we can today pinpoint at least one of the hypocrites and ring-leaders behind the tragedy of Karbala.

Mukhtar ibn Ubeid is arrested a few days later, and thus, being in a cell, disappears completely from the scene, resurfacing only after the death of Hadrat Husein (عليه السلام).

To further understand the role of Mukhtar in this tragic episode, it is vital that a glimpse into the life of this 'open liar' be made, which shall, Insha-Allâh, follow...

Mukhtaar ibn Abu Ubeid Al-Thaqafi⁸¹ a *dajjal* (open liar) of this Ummah

⁸¹ المختار بن أبي عبيد بن مسعود الثقفي، ولد في الطائف في السنة الأولى للهجرة، ووالده صحابي استشهد في معركة الجسر حينما كان قائداً لجيش المسلمين في فتح العراق، وقام بكفالة المختار عمه سعيد بن مسعود الثقفي الذي كان والياً على الكوفة لعلي رضي الله عنه. وقد نشأ المختار على جانب من الذكاء والفطنة مراوفاً مكرراً غير صادق في تشيعه، وإنما كان يريد من ورائه تحقيق طموحه السياسي بأي وجه، وله مواقف تشهد بصحة هذا القول عنه ذكرها أهل التاريخ والفرق.

وقد كان للمختار أدوار مع ابن الزبير، وخاض معارك في العراق خرج منها ظافراً فأعجبته نفسه، وأخذ يسجع كسجع الكهان، ويلمح لأناس ويصرح لآخرين أنه يوحى إليه، فانفض عنه كثير من أصحابه، وقُتل في حربه مع مصعب بن الزبير سنة ٦٧هـ، وتفرق أتباعه، وصدق عليه الحديث الذي روته أسماء بنت أبي بكر وغيرها أنه كذاب ثقيف (موسوعة الفرق المنتسبة للإسلام)

كان خارجياً، ثم صار زبيرياً، ثم صار شيعياً كيسانياً، قال بإمامة محمد بن الحنفية بعد أمير المؤمنين علي رضي الله عنهما. وقيل لا، بل عبد الحسن والحسين رضي الله عنهما، وكان يدعو الناس إليه، وكان يظهر أنه من رجاله ودعائه، ويذكر علوموا مزخرفة بترهاته ينوطها به. ولما وقف محمد بن الحنفية على ذلك تبرأ منه، وأظهر لأصحابه أنه إنما نمس على الخلق ذلك ليتمشى أمره، ويجتمع الناس عليه. وإنما انتظم له ما انتظم بأمرين: أحدهما انتسابه إلى محمد بن

Note: In the footnotes, a glimpse of the life of this great liar has been given. From the little that has been written regarding him in Tabaqat-al-Kubra, under the discussion of Muhammad ibn Hanafiyah, one shall find that his life was a life of open deception, forgery of letters attributed to great men that they had appointed him as their vicegerent, acting as a bosom friend of Hadrat Abdullah ibn Zubeir and winning over his confidence, but as soon as he leaves and returns to Iraq, he speaks nothing but evil regarding Hadrat Abdullah ibn Zubeir, and has his deputy over Iraq removed by force. When his fame spreads as a true defender of the Ahle-Bait, his true colours of kufr begin emerging, which result in the ones who had previously been deceived by his generosity and expressions of love for the Ahl-e-Bait to openly announce their disassociation from him, and to declare him a disbeliever.

الحنفية فيبايعونه له سراً. فَشَكَ قَوْمٌ مِمَّنْ بَايَعَهُ فِي أَمْرِهِ وَقَالُوا: أَعْطَيْنَا هَذَا الرَّجُلَ هَذَا عُهُودَنَا أَنْ زَعَمَ أَنَّ رَسُولَ ابْنِ الْخَنَفِيَّةِ. وَابْنُ الْخَنَفِيَّةِ بِمَكَّةَ لَيْسَ مَتَا بَعِيدٍ وَلَا مُسْتَبَرٍّ. فَلَوْ شَخَصَ مَتَا قَوْمٌ إِلَيْهِ فَسَأَلُوهُ عَمَّا جَاءَ بِهِ هَذَا الرَّجُلُ عَنْهُ. فَإِنْ كَانَ صَادِقًا نَصَرْنَاهُ وَأَعَانَاهُ عَلَى أَمْرِهِ. فَشَخَصَ مِنْهُمْ قَوْمٌ فَلَقُوا ابْنَ الْخَنَفِيَّةِ بِمَكَّةَ فَأَعْلَمُوهُ أَمْرَ الْمُخْتَارِ وَمَا دَعَاهُمْ إِلَيْهِ فَقَالَ: نَحْنُ حَيْثُ تَرَوْنَ مُحْتَسِبُونَ وَمَا أَحَبُّ أَنْ لِي سُلْطَانُ الدُّنْيَا يَقْتُلَ مُؤْمِنٍ بِغَيْرِ حَقٍّ. وَلَوْ دِدْتُ أَنَّ اللَّهَ انْتَصَرَ لَنَا بِمَنْ شَاءَ مِنْ خَلْقِهِ. فَاحْذَرُوا الْكُذَّابِينَ وَانظُرُوا لِأَنْفُسِكُمْ وَدِينِكُمْ. فَانصَرَفُوا عَلَى هَذَا. وَكَتَبَ الْمُخْتَارُ كِتَابًا عَلَى لِسَانِ مُحَمَّدِ ابْنِ الْخَنَفِيَّةِ إِلَى إِبْرَاهِيمَ بْنِ الْأَشْثَرِ. وَجَاءَ فَاسْتَأْذَنَ عَلَيْهِ. وَقِيلَ لِلْمُخْتَارِ أَمِينَ آلِ مُحَمَّدٍ وَرَسُولُهُ. فَأَذِنَ لَهُ وَحَيَّاهُ وَرَحَّبَ بِهِ وَأَجْلَسَهُ مَعَهُ عَلَى فَرَّاشِهِ. فَتَكَلَّمَ الْمُخْتَارُ. وَكَانَ مَقْوَّهَاً. فَحَمِدَ اللَّهَ وَأَثْنَى عَلَيْهِ وَصَلَّى عَلَى النَّبِيِّ - صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ - ثُمَّ قَالَ: إِنَّكُمْ أَهْلُ بَيْتٍ قَدْ أَكْرَمَكُمُ اللَّهُ بِنُصْرَةِ آلِ مُحَمَّدٍ. وَقَدْ رَكِبَ مِنْهُمْ مَا قَدْ عَلِمْتُمْ. وَخَرُمُوا وَمُنِعُوا حَقَّهُمْ وَصَارُوا إِلَى مَا رَأَيْتُمْ. وَقَدْ كَتَبَ إِلَيْكَ الْمُهَدِي كِتَابًا. وَهُوَ لِأَيِّ الشُّهُودِ عَلَيْهِ. فَقَالَ يَرِيدُ بَنِي أَنْسِ الْأَسَدِيِّ وَأَحْمَرُ بَنِي شَمِيطِ الْبَحْلِيِّ وَعَبْدُ اللَّهِ بْنُ كَامِلِ الشَّكْرِيِّ وَأَبُو عَمْرَةَ كَيْسَانَ مَوْلَى بَجِيلَةَ: نَشْهَدُ أَنَّ هَذَا كِتَابُهُ قَدْ شَهِدَنَاهُ حِينَ دَفَعَهُ إِلَيْهِ. فَقَبَضَهُ إِبْرَاهِيمُ وَقَرَأَهُ ثُمَّ قَالَ: أَنَا أَوَّلُ مَنْ يُجِيبُ وَقَدْ أَمَرْنَا بِطَاعَتِكَ وَمُؤَارَاةِكَ فَقُلْ مَا بَدَا لَكَ وَادْعُ إِلَى مَا شِئْتَ. ثُمَّ كَانَ إِبْرَاهِيمُ يَرْكَبُ إِلَيْهِ فِي كُلِّ يَوْمٍ فَرَزَعَ ذَلِكَ فِي صُدُورِ النَّاسِ. وَوَرَدَ الْخَبَرُ عَلَى ابْنِ الزُّبَيْرِ فَتَنَكَّرَ لِمُحَمَّدِ ابْنِ الْخَنَفِيَّةِ. وَجَعَلَ أَمْرَ الْمُخْتَارِ يَغْلُظُ فِي كُلِّ يَوْمٍ وَيَكْثُرُ تَبَعُهُ. وَجَعَلَ يَتَّبِعُ قِتْلَةَ الْحُسَيْنِ وَمَنْ أَعَانَ عَلَيْهِ فَيَقْتُلُهُمْ

الحنفية علما ودعوة والثاني: قيامه بتأثر الحسين بن علي رضي الله عنهما، واشتغاله ليلا ونهارا بقتال الظلمة الذين اجتمعوا على قتل الحسين.

فمن مذهب المختار: أنه يجوز البداء على الله تعالى وإنما صار المختار إلى اختيار القول بالبداء، لأنه كان يدعي علم ما يحدث من الأحوال إما بوحى يوحى إليه، وإما برسالة من قبل الإمام. فكان إذا وعد أصحابه بكون شيء وحدث حادثة؛ فإن وافق كونه قوله، جعله دليلا على صدق دعواه، وإن لم يوافق قال: قد بدا لربكم. وكان لا يفرق بين النسخ والبداء؛ قال: إذا جاز النسخ في الأحكام، جاز البداء في الأخبار. وقد قيل: إن السيد محمد بن الحنفية تبرأ من المختار حين وصل إليه أنه قد لبس على الناس أنه من دعائه ورجاله. وتبرأ من الضلالات التي ابتداعها المختار من التأويلات الفاسدة؛ والمخاريق المموهة. فمن مخاريقه: أنه كان عنده كرسي قديم قد غشاه بالديباج، وزينه بأنواع الزينة وقال: هذا من ذخائر أمير المؤمنين على كرم الله وجهه، وهو عندنا بمنزلة التابوت لبني إسرائيل. وكان إذا حارب خصومه يضعه في براح الصف ويقول: قاتلوا ولكم الظفر والنصرة، وهذا الكرسي محله فيكم محل التابوت في بني إسرائيل، وفيه السكينة والبقية، والملائكة من فوقكم ينزلون مددا لكم. وحديث الحمامات البيض التي ظهرت في الهواء، وقد أخبرهم قبل ذلك بأن الملائكة تنزل على صورة الحمامات البيض، معروف. والأسجاع التي ألقها أبرد تأليف مشهورة. (الملل و النحل)

(و في الطبقات الكبرى لابن سعد) كَانَ الْمُخْتَارُ بْنُ أَبِي عُيَيْدٍ مَعَ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ بْنِ الزُّبَيْرِ فِي خَضِرِهِ الْأَوَّلِ أَشَدَّ النَّاسِ مَعَهُ وَبُرْهَهُ أَنَّهُ شَيْعَةٌ لَهُ. وَابْنُ الزُّبَيْرِ مُعْجَبٌ بِهِ وَيَحْمِلُ عَلَيْهِ فَلَا يَسْمَعُ عَلَيْهِ كَلَامًا. كَانَ الْمُخْتَارُ يَخْتَلِفُ إِلَى مُحَمَّدِ ابْنِ الْخَنَفِيَّةِ. وَكَانَ مُحَمَّدٌ لَيْسَ فِيهِ بَخْسٌ الرَّأْيِ وَلَا يَقْبَلُ كَثِيرًا مِمَّا يَأْتِي بِهِ. فَقَالَ الْمُخْتَارُ: أَنَا خَارِجٌ إِلَى الْعِرَاقِ. فَقَالَ لَهُ مُحَمَّدٌ: فَارْجِعْ وَهَذَا عَبْدُ اللَّهِ بْنُ كَامِلٍ الْهَمْدَانِيُّ يَخْرُجُ مَعَكَ. وَقَالَ لِعَبْدِ اللَّهِ: تَحَرَّزْ مِنْهُ وَاعْلَمْ أَنَّهُ لَيْسَ لَهُ كَبِيرُ أَمَانَةٍ. وَجَاءَ الْمُخْتَارُ إِلَى ابْنِ الزُّبَيْرِ فَقَالَ: أَعْلَمْ أَنَّ مَكَانِي مِنَ الْعِرَاقِ أَنْفَعُ لَكَ مِنْ مَقَامِي هَاهُنَا. فَأَذِنَ لَهُ عَبْدُ اللَّهِ بْنُ الزُّبَيْرِ فَخَرَجَ هُوَ وَابْنُ كَامِلٍ. وَابْنُ الزُّبَيْرِ لَا يَشْكُ فِي مَنَاصِحِهِ. وَهُوَ مُصِرٌّ عَلَى الْعُشِّ لِابْنِ الزُّبَيْرِ. فَخَرَجَا حَتَّى لَقِيَا لَاقِيًا بِالْعَذِيبِ فَقَالَ الْمُخْتَارُ: أَخْبِرْنَا عَنْ النَّاسِ. فَقَالَ: تَرَكْتُ النَّاسَ كَالسَّفِينَةِ تَجُولُ لَا مَلَا حَ لَهَا. فَقَالَ الْمُخْتَارُ: فَأَنَا مَلَا حُهَا الَّذِي يَقِيمُهَا. أَخْبَرَنَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ عُمَرَ قَالَ: حَدَّثَنِي عَبْدُ الرَّحْمَنِ بْنُ أَبِي الزِّنَادِ عَنْ هِشَامِ بْنِ غَزْوَةَ عَنْ أَبِيهِ قَالَ: لَمَّا قَدِمَ الْمُخْتَارُ الْعِرَاقَ اخْتَلَفَ إِلَى عَبْدِ اللَّهِ بْنِ مُطِيعٍ. وَهُوَ وَالِي الْكُوفَةِ يَوْمَئِذٍ لِعَبْدِ اللَّهِ بْنِ الزُّبَيْرِ. وَأُظْهِرَ مَنَاصِحَةَ ابْنِ الزُّبَيْرِ وَعَابَهُ فِي السَّرِّ. وَدَعَا إِلَى ابْنِ الْخَنَفِيَّةِ وَخَرَضَ النَّاسَ عَلَى ابْنِ مُطِيعٍ. وَاتَّخَذَ شَيْعَةً. يَرْكَبُ فِي خَيْلٍ عَظِيمَةٍ. فَلَمَّا رَأَى ذَلِكَ ابْنُ مُطِيعٍ خَافَهُ فَهَرَبَ مِنْهُ إِلَى عَبْدِ اللَّهِ بْنِ الزُّبَيْرِ. أَخْبَرَنَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ عُمَرَ قَالَ: حَدَّثَنِي جَعْفَرُ بْنُ مُحَمَّدٍ بْنِ خَالِدِ بْنِ الزُّبَيْرِ عَنْ عُثْمَانَ بْنِ غَزْوَةَ عَنْ أَبِيهِ قَالَ: وَحَدَّثَنَا إِسْحَاقُ بْنُ يَحْيَى بْنِ طَلْحَةَ وَغَيْرُهُمَا قَالُوا: كَانَ الْمُخْتَارُ لَمَّا قَدِمَ الْكُوفَةَ كَانَ أَشَدَّ النَّاسِ عَلَى ابْنِ الزُّبَيْرِ وَأَعْيَبَهُ لَهُ. وَجَعَلَ يُلْقِي إِلَى النَّاسِ أَنَّ ابْنَ الزُّبَيْرِ كَانَ يَطْلُبُ هَذَا الْأَمْرَ لِأَبِي الْقَاسِمِ. يَعْنِي ابْنَ الْخَنَفِيَّةِ. ثُمَّ ظَلَمَهُ إِيَّاهُ. وَجَعَلَ يَذْكُرُ ابْنَ الْخَنَفِيَّةِ وَخَالَه وَوَرَعَهُ وَأَنَّهُ بَعَثَهُ إِلَى الْكُوفَةِ يَدْعُو لَهُ. وَأَنَّهُ كَتَبَ لَهُ كِتَابًا فَهُوَ لَا يَغْدُوهُ إِلَى غَيْرِهِ. وَيَقْرَأُ ذَلِكَ الْكِتَابَ عَلَى مَنْ يَتَّقِي بِهِ. وَجَعَلَ يَدْعُو النَّاسَ إِلَى الْمِيعَةِ لِمُحَمَّدِ ابْنِ

Mukhtâr's father, Abu Ubeid Thaqafiؓ was a sincere Sahâbiؓ of Rasulullâhؐ, who enjoyed the privilege of being the first leader to be sent by Hadhrat Umarؓ in the Muslim campaign against Kufa. From the children of Hadhrat Abu Ubeid Thaqafiؓ, two stood out in history, a daughter who reached the heights of piety and a son who dropped to the depths of disgrace.

His daughter, Safiyahؓ, was amongst the most prominent and righteous women of the Tâbi'een, especially noted for her position as the honourable wife of Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umarؓ.

Mukhtaar, despite being born in the first year after the Hijrah, was not blessed with the companionship of Rasulullâhؐ⁸². During his initial years, he displayed great qualities of virtue, knowledge and piety, but time would show that this was purely an outward show, as was the case with all the senior hypocrites of Iraq, who would display great humility and piety in front of the leaders of the Tâbi'een, solely so that their prominence could one day aid them in spreading their evil amongst the ignorant masses.

After the death of his honourable father, Mukhtaar was placed under the care of his uncle, Sa'd ibn Masood, who was amongst the trusted aides of Hadhrat Aliؓ.

From the very beginning, Mukhtaar could be found playing a game of switching camps, solely to benefit his own whims and fancies. Initially he served under the authority of Hadhrat Aliؓ, rarely showing signs of enmity, until one day, when words of extreme hatred for Hadhrat Hasanؓ slipped from his tongue, due to which he became known as a khaariji.

After the death of Hadhrat Muawiyahؓ however, he again stands in the frontline of the lovers of the Ahle-Bait, being amongst those inviting Hadhrat Huseinؓ to Iraq. His enmity for the Ahle-Bait again displays itself when he abandons Hadhrat Muslim ibn Aqeelؓ, at the most crucial of moments, but shortly thereafter he is found raising the call of 'revenge for the Ahle-Bait', displaying his 'most sincere' love for the Ahle-Bait and open hatred for the entire Banu Umayyad, irrespective of whether they physically participated in Karbalâ or not.

Mukhtâr's chameleon colours also got displayed when he pledged allegiance to Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeirؓ in Makkah Mukarramah, after the death of Hadhrat Huseinؓ, but upon his immediate return to Kufa, broke his allegiance and instead initiated his own campaign, inviting towards Muhammad ibn Hanafiyah, (the son of Hadhrat Aliؓ), claiming him to not only be the caliph, but also the awaited 'Mahdi', a claim which Muhammad ibn Hanafiyah rejected openly. (Tabaqatul-Kubra)

Ibn Hanafiyahؓ's rejection unfortunately fell upon the deaf ears of the people of Kufa, who would simply claim that Muhammad ibn Hanafiyahؓ is practicing *taqiyyah*, i.e. concealing the truth, in the fear of the present Umayyad government.

During the era of Hadhrat Aliؓ, on one occasion, Mukhtaar presented fifteen dirhams to Hadhrat Aliؓ, on behalf of his uncle. After putting the money down, he commented, 'These coins are from the fares of prostitutes!' Hadhrat Aliؓ, shocked at his audacity, exclaimed, "May you be destroyed! What do I have to do with prostitutes?" Thereafter, when Mukhtaar stood up to leave, Hadhrat Aliؓ noticed that he was wearing a red *jubbah* (cloak). Hadhrat Aliؓ, upset with his dressing, remarked, "**What is wrong with this man? May Almighty Allâh destroy**

him! If his heart had to be opened, I am certain you would find it full of the love of Laat and Uzzah (two famous idols)⁸³

During the short rule of Hadhrat Hasanؑ, an incident occurred, which is more than sufficient to display the hatred this hypocrite, Mukhtaar, bore for the Ahle-Bait. Tabari has recorded this incident in the following words⁸⁴:

When Hadhrat Hasanؑ reached Madaain, Mukhtaar indicated to his uncle, Sa'd ibn Masood, who was the governor of Madaain, that if he desired wealth and honour, he should arrest Hadhrat Hasanؑ, and through it acquire a guarantee of protection from Hadhrat Mu'awiyahؑ. His uncle, Sa'd, disgusted at his intention, replied in astonishment, 'May the curse of Almighty Allâh be upon you! Do you expect me to lay ambush to the grandson of Rasulullâhﷺ? You are indeed a most wretched man!

When this was the condition of Mukhtaar, during the era of Hadhrat Aliؑ and Hadhrat Hasanؑ, what then made him change his opinion and attitude with regards to the Ahle-Bait, just a few months later, he now becomes ready to sacrifice his own life just so that Hadhrat Huseinؑ could become caliph?

⁸³ المختار ابن أبي عبيد مسعود بن عمرو الثقفي الكذاب الأمير، فقال أبو عوانة عن مغيرة، عن ثابت بن هرمز، قال: حمل المختار مالا من المدائن من عند عمه إلى علي، فأخرج خمسة عشر درهماً، وقال: هذا من المومسات، فقال: (مالي -ويلك- والمومسات؟ قال: ثم قام وعليه مَقْطَعَةٌ له حمراء، فقال علي: ماله قاتله الله، لو شق عن قلبه لوجد مالا من حب اللات والعزى. (المقتنى في سرد الكنى للذهبي - المصدر)

⁸⁴ وخرج الحسن حتى نزل المقصورة البيضاء بالمدائن وكان عم المختار بن أبي عبيد عاملا على المدائن وكان اسمه سعد بن مسعود فقال له المختار وهو غلام شاب هل لك في الغنى والشرف قال وما ذاك قال توثق الحسن وتسامن به إلى معاوية فقال له سعد عليك لعنة الله أثب علي ابن بنت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فأوثقه بنس الرجل أنت (تاريخ الطبري)

Had Mukhtaar thereafter remained loyal till the end, one could perhaps have given him the benefit of the doubt that his repentance was sincere, whereas this was not the case. When Muslim ibn Aqeelؑ found himself on the streets, searching for protection and refuge from the soldiers of Ibn Ziyad, Mukhtaar disappeared totally from the scene, leaving Muslim ibn Aqeelؑ to be killed mercilessly.

Thereafter, when Hadhrat Huseinؑ reaches Karbala and finds himself led into a trap, there too, one finds no mention of Mukhtaar and the thousands of followers, who had just recently welcomed Muslim ibn Aqeelؑ into Kufa. Where did they all disappear to? Then, amazingly, just after the martyrdom of Hadhrat Huseinؑ, suddenly Mukhtaar reappears, as a devout supporter of Hadhrat Huseinؑ, desiring nothing but revenge for the Ahle-Bait.

Again, had Mukhtaar now kept a pious outlook till the end, one, with a very heavy heart, would perhaps be ready to again forgive Mukhtaar, and accept his tears of repentance, but this was not the case. Mukhtaar now sheds all his outer coverings, and allows his true chameleon colours to shine. First he rebels against Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeirؑ, to whom he had made all sorts of promises of loyalty. Then, after having the governor of Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeirؑ removed from his post, he voices the claim that Muhammad ibn Hanafiyah, the son of Hadhrat Aliؑ, is the promised Mahdi, and that he, Mukhtaar, has been appointed to accept allegiance on his behalf. This ridiculous claim is followed with even more ridiculous calls. He eventually ends up announcing himself to be The Almighty Himself. Nauuzubillah!

(All these details regarding Mukhtar's devilish life can be found in Tabaqatul Kubra, under the discussion of Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyah)

The majority of the evil forces operating behind the scenes of Karbala have till today escaped investigation, but none shall ever manage to escape the interrogation which shall occur tomorrow, on the Day of Qiyamah. Despite these great efforts by satanist hypocrites to keep their members disguised and out of the limelight, Almighty Allâh has always assured that some mention of these hidden elements spring to light, even if only for a brief while.

During the era of the Hadhrat Uthmaan and Hadhrat Aliؓ, the name of Abdullâh ibn Saba' would time and again come to the fore, and by the grace of Almighty Allâh, there are many today who have at least understood this much, that this hypocrite was one of the evil elements behind many of the early conflicts that arose amongst the Muslims. Obviously, Abdullâh ibn Saba' was not the only one operating during his era, but at least one from the many evil forces of that era had been recognised.

However, when it came to Mukhtaar ibn Ubeid Thaqafi, for some unknown reason, this villain, despite his numerous appearances at strategic points, somehow managed to avoid the attention that he deserved, especially when it came to his role in the assassination of Hadhrat Huseinؓ.

In the following lines, a summary of some of Mukhtâr's activities shall be outlined, whereby one may, to a greater extent, realise the role played by this hypocrite in instigating Yazîd against the caravan of Hadhrat Huseinؓ, and thereafter in instigating the masses in Iraq against the ruling Umayyad government.

- As mentioned above, during the era of Hadhrat Aliؓ and Hadhrat Hasanؓ, Mukhtaar openly displayed the hatred he bore against the men of Islâm, and in particular, the Ahle-Bait.

- Upon the death of Hadhrat Hasanؓ, Mukhtaar, in chameleon style, switches sides, and is now found in the forefront of those inviting Hadhrat Huseinؓ to Iraq, to lead the fight of the people of Iraq against the ruling government.
- When Muslim ibn Aqeelؓ arrived in Kufa, to ascertain whether the people of Iraq were truthful in their claim of being ready to lend full support to Hadhrat Huseinؓ, it was this very Mukhtaar, according to one narration, who acted as his host⁸⁵. Thereafter, due to certain unclear reasons, Muslim ibn Aqeelؓ left the residence of Mukhtaar and took shelter elsewhere.
- When Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad arrived in Kufa, replacing Hadhrat Nu'maan ibn Bashirؓ as the newly appointed governor, Muslim ibn Aqeelؓ suddenly found himself in a predicament. The books of history describe the scenes that occurred thereafter, something to this effect, that in an effort to rally quick support, Muslimؓ called out the slogan which had been agreed upon between him and the thousands of followers who had already pledged their allegiance for Hadhrat Huseinؓ. Hearing his scream, about four thousand supporters gathered and staged some sort of attack upon the royal palace, which forced Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad to scramble for cover.

The books of history clearly mention that Mukhtaar ibn Ubeid was amongst those who gathered at that moment. Thereafter, through some incomprehensible technique, Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad managed to turn the tables completely. The books of history mention that Ubeidullah sent out well-respected men to

⁸⁵ حتى إذا كان زمن الحسين وبعث الحسين مسلم بن عقيل إلى الكوفة نزل دار المختار وهي اليوم دار سلم بن المسيب فبايعه المختار بن أبي عبيد فيمن بايعه من أهل الكوفة وناصحه ودعا إليه من أطاعه (الطبري)

encourage their tribe men to return home and abandon Muslim ibn Aqeelؓ. Had the four thousand men around Muslimؓ been genuine supporters, or even one tenth of them, this ploy would never have succeeded, yet as the books of history show, all of the followers around Muslimؓ disappeared, including Mukhtaar, leaving Muslimؓ all alone, at the mercy of Ubeidullah. (The numbers in these narrations and the manner in how these Iraqis abandoned Muslimؓ seem exaggerated, but whatever the case may be, the question shall always remain as to why was Mukhtaar not at the side of Muslim ibn Aqeelؓ, at a time when he was most in need of support!

Finding himself completely abandoned, Muslim ibn Aqeelؓ went searching for some household which could offer him some sort of protection or at least act as a hideout. After much begging and pleading he was finally allowed refuge in the house of a woman, whose son had not as yet arrived home.

During these tense moments, where were the 18 000 people who had just a few days ago pledged allegiance to sacrifice their lives for the Ahle-Bait? Was it that they were too scared to show face, or rather was the entire episode an act of hypocrisy, just so that Hadhrat Huseinؓ could be lured to Kufa, so that his blessed blood could serve as a tool to reignite the flames of internal war, which the Ummah had just recently ended?

Shortly thereafter, Muslim ibn Aqeelؓ was arrested and later executed. Just before his execution, he made a plea to Muhammad ibn Ash'ath, the officer who had been sent to arrest him. Before proceeding with the details of the plea that Muslim ibn Aqeelؓ made, it would indeed seem appropriate to

mention some history regarding this officer, Muhammad ibn Ash'ath, so that the issue of Karbala can become even clearer.

Muhammad ibn Ash'ath

Muhammad ibn Ash'ath was the son of Ash'ath ibn Qaisؓ. His father, Ash'athؓ accepted Islâm at the blessed hand of Rasulullâhﷺ, in the tenth year of Hijrah. During the period of *Irtidaad*, which occurred in the initial era of Hadhrat Abu Bakrؓ, Ash'athؓ was amongst those misinformed and unfortunate souls who turned renegade. Almighty Allâh however favoured him, and after being caught and brought in front of Hadhrat Abu Bakrؓ, he repented sincerely and promised to recompense by continuously fighting in the path of Allâh. Hadhrat Abu Bakrؓ understood that his repentance was indeed sincere and even got him married to his own sister. From this union was born Muhammad ibn Ash'ath, who we are presently discussing.

Ash'ath ibn Qaisؓ, in accordance to his promise, thereafter devoted his life to Jihaad, and took part in many of the great and historic battles, viz. Yarmook, Qaadisiyah, Nahaawind, etc. During the battle of Siffin, he fought on the side of Hadhrat Aliؓ. His loyalty towards Islâm and Hadhrat Aliؓ was well known. In honour of this loyalty, Hadhrat Hasanؓ ibn Aliؓ married his daughter and kept her as his wife till the end. Ash'ath ibn Qaisؓ passed away shortly after the death of Hadhrat Aliؓ and Hadhrat Hasanؓ himself performed his janaazah. (Usdul Gaabah)

His son, Muhammad ibn Ash'ath was thus the nephew of Hadhrat Abu Bakrؓ and the brother-in-law of Hadhrat Hasanؓ. After being blessed with such close ties to Hadhrat Hasanؓ and Huseinؓ what could then be the reason that this very Muhammad ibn Ash'ath now allies himself

with the 'enemy' of the Ahle-Bait and himself proceeds to arrest Hadhrat Muslim ibn Aqeelؓ?

Shia hypocrites would love one to believe that this individual, as well as all the other prominent Sahâbahؓ and Tâbi'een of Kufa, had no real love for Islâm, but were only after fame and wealth. *Na'ûzubillah!*

Not only does a stain of hypocrisy fall upon this individual if one were to believe the normally-mentioned chain of events regarding Karbala, but rather, this stain would fall on practically every individual of Kufa, since none of the people of Kufa stood with Hadhrat Muslim ibn Aqeelؓ, whereas at that time Kufa was the centre of Islâmic learning, thus many prominent figures were surely present at that time.

To understand this better, some names shall be provided of individuals who were present at that time, yet they never affiliated themselves with the call of Muslim ibn Aqeelؓ. After reading these names, one shall be forced to ask oneself the question, that why did no individual of Kufa stand up in defence of Muslim ibn Aqeelؓ, and neither in the defence of Hadhrat Huseinؓ, who as all were well aware, was on his way to Kufa.

The answer that one would finally be forced to accept, would be the very reason why the majority of the Sahâbahؓ and Tâbi'een did not accompany Hadhrat Huseinؓ, when he set out towards Iraq, i.e. these individuals found no reason to stand up against the ruling government, especially after learning from Rasulullâhﷺ that allegiance to a caliph should never be broken, unless and except where the caliph is found guilty of open kufr, which was not the case with Yazîd, even though Shia hypocrites would desire that we believe so.

Prominent figures present in Kufa at the time of Karbala

Prominent figures present in Kufa at the time when Hadhrat Huseinؓ was called over and martyred include, amongst many others, individuals such as:

a) Hadhrat Nu'maan ibn Basheerؓ

When Muslim ibn Aqeelؓ arrived, this illustrious Sahâbiؓ, was the governor of Kufa, on behalf of Yazîd. His love for the Ahle-Bait would not allow him to arrest Hadhrat Muslim ibn Aqeelؓ, but at the same time he made it clear that he would not delay in raising his sword, if heؓ found anyone rising against the caliph. The action and words of this illustrious Sahâbiؓ, when informed of the work of Muslim ibn Aqeelؓ and the coming of Hadhrat Huseinؓ, has been narrated in Al-Bidâyah. Ponder deeply over his conduct and words, and one shall soon realise that how Karbala has been explained today is far from the realities which those present in Kufa were witnessing. The text of Al Bidâyah is as follows:

'When the news of Hadhrat Muslim ibn Aqeelؓ and Hadhrat Huseinؓ reached Hadhrat Nu'maan ibn Bashirؓ, he behaved as though it had nothing to do with him. However he delivered a sermon, in which he forbade the people from causing strife and dissension, and ordered them to remain united and upon the teachings of the Sunnah. During his sermon he announced,

'I shall not fight against one that does not fight against me, neither shall I attack the one who does not attack first! Also, merely on the basis of suspicion, I shall not arrest anyone.

However, by the oath of that Being in whose Hand lies my life, if you stand up against your Imaam and break your allegiance, I shall immediately raise the sword against you!

Thereafter, when Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad reached Kufa, Hadhrat Nu'maan ibn Bashirؓ mistook Ubeidullah to be Hadhrat Huseinؓ. In the love of the Ahle-Bait he found it difficult to issue any order against Hadhrat Huseinؓ and thus locked himself up in the palace. When the sound of footsteps reached close, Hadhrat Nu'maan ibn Bashirؓ, thinking it to be the footsteps of Hadhrat Huseinؓ, announced, in an apologetic manner:

أنشدك الله ألا تنحيت عني! فوالله ما أنا بمسلم إليك أمانتي وما لي في قتالك من حاجة (الكامل)

I plead with you that you leave this area, since I am unable to hand over to you this trust and I at the same time do not wish to fight against you.⁸⁶

Why was he not prepared to hand over his post to Hadhrat Huseinؓ? Was it his love for fame and power, or was it that he did not like the Ahle-Bait? Nay, rather due to not having found any reason in Kufa for an uprising, he could not understand why Hadhrat Huseinؓ would even think of inciting the population against the ruling government. In accordance to what he had seen and was seeing on the ground in Kufa, the Umayyad government had been happily accepted as the ruling party, and thus breaking the allegiance, without a valid reason, was not acceptable.

Hisؓ holding onto power had absolutely nothing to do with love for fame, thus we find that as soon as he realised it was Ubeidullah ibn

⁸⁶ ولما انتهى ابن زياد إلى باب القصر وهو متلثم ظنه النعمان بن بشير الحسين قد قدم فأغلق باب القصر وقال ما أنا بمسلم إليك أمانتي (البداية)

Ziyaad at the door, who had been sent to replace him, he handed over his power immediately. Knowing well the personality of Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad and that he would hardly show mercy to the Ahle-Bait, Hadhrat Nu'maan ibn Bashirؓ did express regret over Yazîd's choice, but, in accordance to the demands of Islâmic teachings, obedience to the caliph was incumbent.

b) Qadhi Shureih رحمته الله

Regarded as one of the most famous and prominent judges in Islâmic history, so much so, that Hadhrat Aliؓ himself declared him to be the best judge of the Arabs⁸⁷ during his era. Hadhrat Umarؓ had appointed this personality as judge over Kufa and he held this post for years thereafter. The great scholars of Kufa, like Sha'bi, Ibrahim An-Nakha'ie, Muhammad ibn Sireen, etc, narrated Ahâdith from him.

When Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad reached Kufa, Muslim ibn Aqeelؓ sought refuge in the house of a nobleman of the area, Haani ibn Urwah, since owing to his close relationship with the Umayyads, the fear of his house being searched was minimal. However, through spies, the whereabouts of Muslimؓ soon became known and Haani was summoned.

The news spread that Haani had been executed which, at that moment, was not true. Upon hearing this, the tribe of Haani rushed towards the palace and were on the brink of storming it. Fearing their attack, Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad ordered Qadhi Shureih to inform them that Haani was still alive and that he was merely being kept for questioning. The words of Qadhi Shureih to the mob that had gathered outside the palace, as narrated in Al-Bidâyah, is hereunder mentioned,

⁸⁷ فقال له علي: اذهب، فأنت أفضى العرب (تاريخ الاسلام للذهبي)

which is worth pondering over. Addressing the crowds, Qadhi Shureih announced:

إن صاحبكم حي وقد ضربه سلطاننا ضربا لم يبلغ نفسه ، فانصرفوا ولا تحلوا بأنفسكم
ولا بصاحبكم. (البداية)

*'Your companion is alive! The Sultân has indeed punished him, but
nothing fatal.*

Thus disperse and do not interfere in this matter!

Understanding the authority of Qadhi Shureih, the crowds dispersed. The question that arises is why did Qadhi Shureih at that tense moment, say what he said. Had he wished, he could easily have indicated to the crowds to attack, and that would have been the end of Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad. Was this honourable judge of Islâm a sell-out, or a coward, or one who hated the Ahle-Bait?! If the story of Karbala was truly in accordance to what is normally known, the basic demand of the love of the Ahle-Bait would have never allowed Qadhi Shureih to do what he had done. So what then spurred him on to make peace between the angry crowds and Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad?

The reason behind him doing so was that he too found no reason for factions in Kufa standing up against the state. Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad, in Qadhi Shureih's understanding, had been sent to repress a possible uprising and thus had every right to take into custody anyone accused of lending aid to the opposition.

Yes, the conduct of Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad thereafter with Muslim ibn Aqeelؓ and Hani ibn Urwah, wherein he had them executed without mercy was indeed an act of oppression, but Qadhi Shureih cannot be held accountable for that, since he had no knowledge of what was to happen.

c) **Muhammad ibn Ash'ath**

The third individual, who played a major role in the incident of Karbala, was Muhammad ibn Ash'ath, the son of Ash'ath ibn Qaisؓ, whose biography, as well as the close relationship between his father and Hadhrat Aliؓ, has been discussed in the preceding pages.

When Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad took over, Muhammad ibn Ash'ath, being a chief member of the police force, was ordered to arrest Hadhrat Muslim ibn Aqeelؓ. As with the two personalities mentioned above, here too, Muhammad ibn Ash'ath participating in the arrest of Hadhrat Muslim ibn Aqeelؓ and standing on the side of Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad, had nothing to do with hatred for the Ahle Bait and love for the Umayyads. In fact, when one studies the words and actions of all these individuals, one would quickly come to realize that their hearts were brimming with the love of the Ahle Bait. Their obedience to the Umayyad government was only and solely due to the demand of Islâmic teachings that once one pledges allegiance to a ruler, he should never break his allegiance, nor disobey his ruler's command, as long as it is not clearly against the Shariah.

After Muslim ibn Aqeelؓ was arrested heؓ realised that the inviters to Iraq were all hypocrites and that Hadhrat Huseinؓ was being led into a trap. At that juncture Muslim ibn Aqeelؓ did not trust any of the people who had just recently pledged their allegiance at his hands, to deliver his second message to Hadhrat Huseinؓ, a message vital to save the life of Hadhrat Huseinؓ. At this critical juncture, Hadhrat Muslim ibn Aqeelؓ **asks Muhammad ibn Ash'ath** to ensure that his letter reaches Hadhrat Huseinؓ. Had he the slightest doubt regarding Muhammad ibn Ash'ath's love for the Ahle-Bait, he would never have

entrusted him with delivering the letter, especially at such a crucial moment.

The crux of this message, as recorded from Tabari in Al-Bidâyah, is as follows⁸⁸:

'When Muslim ibn Aqeel was arrested, he was found crying. Ubeidullah ibn Abbaas Sulemi, finding this astonishing, remarked, 'It is not befitting a man of your caliber, who has set out on a mission such as yours to cry in the face of difficulty!' Hadhrat Muslim ibn Aqeel ؓ replied, 'I am not crying in the fear that I am about to be killed, but rather over the misfortune that is soon to befall Hadhrat Husein ؓ and his family!'

Muslim ibn Aqeel ؓ thereafter turned to Muhammad ibn Ash'ath, saying,

'O Abdullâh, by Allâh, I do not believe that Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad shall give any regard to the guarantee of safety that you have given me. I however would deeply appreciate if you could send someone to Hadhrat Husein ؓ, with this message:

⁸⁸ وفي رواية ذكرها ابن جرير أن مسلم بن عقيل لما بكى قال له عبيد الله بن عباس السلمي إن من يطلب مثل ما تطلب لا يبكي إذ أنزل به مثل الذي نزل بك قال إني والله ما لنفسى أبكى ومالها من القتل أرثي وإن كنت لم أحب لها طرفة عين تلفا ولكنني أبكى لأهلئ المقبلين إلى الكوفة أبكى الحسين وآل حسين ثم أقبل على محمد بن الأشعث فقال يا عبد الله إني والله أراك ستعجز عن أمانئ فهل عندك خير تستطيع أن تبعث رجلا على لسانئ يبلغ حسينا عنئ رسالة فاني لا أراه إلا قد خرج إليكم اليوم أو غدا هو وأهل بيته وإن ما تراه من جزعئ لذلك فتقول له إن ابن عقيل بعثنئ إليك وهو في أيدي القوم أسير لا يدرئ أيصبح أم يمسي حتى يقتل وهو يقول لك ارجع بأهلك ولا يغرنك أهل الكوفة فانهم أصحاب أبيك الذي كان يتمني فراقهم بالموت أو القتل أن أهل الكوفة قد كذبوك وكذبوني وليس لكاذب رأى فقال ابن الأشعث والله لأفعلن ولأعلمن ابن زياد أنئ قد أمنتك قال أبو مخنف فدعا محمد بن الأشعث إياس بن العباس الطائي من بني مالك بن ثمامة وكان شاعرا فقال له اذهب فائق حسينا فأبلغه هذا الكتاب وكتب فيه الذي أمره به ابن عقيل ثم أعطاه راحلة وتكفل له بالقيام بأهله وداره فخرج حتى لقي الحسين بزئالة لأربع ليال من الكوفة فأخبره الخبر وأبلغه الرسالة (البداية)

*O Husein, I am now a prisoner and shall most probably soon be killed. Please return at once with your family, and **do not fall for the trap of the people of Kufa, the very men from whom your father desired separation, even if it had to come through death. The people of Kufa have lied to you and to me, and the requests and opinions of liars hold no weight.***

Muhammad ibn Ash'ath promised to have the message conveyed, and fulfilled his promise by sending a messenger and taking full responsibility of the needs of the family of the messenger until his return. Muhammad ibn Ash'ath also informed Ibn Ziyaad that he had promised Muslim ibn Aqeel ؓ that he would not be harmed, but as Muslim ibn Aqeel ؓ had already predicted, Ibn Ziyaad showed no respect to his promise and had Muslim ibn Aqeel ؓ executed. The messenger, sent by Muhammad ibn Ash'ath reached Hadhrat Husein ؓ about four days prior to his reaching Kufa, but after having come so far, Hadhrat Husein ؓ felt it appropriate to now continue ahead.

From this incident, two important matters come to light, viz.

- Despite working for the Umayyad government, the Ahle-Sunnah of Iraq respected and loved the Ahle-Bait and till the very end did what was within their capacity to save Hadhrat Husein ؓ from falling into a trap.
- In the warning that Muslim ibn Aqeel issued, he was not warning Hadhrat Husein ؓ from the dangers of the Umayyads, but rather from falling into a trap that had been set up in Kufa, by the very people that had called him over.

d) Umar ibn Sa'd, the son of Hadhrat Sa'd ibn Abi Waqqâs ؓ

The forth individual, acting on behalf of the Umayyads, but brimming with the love of the Ahle-Bait, was Umar ibn Sa'd. Books dealing with the issue of Karbala generally depict this personality as an evil, blood-thirsty oppressor, solely due to him being the commander of the army sent out to halt Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام) and prevent him from entering Kufa. Here too, a mere introduction and a few statements made by this individual, during the sad episode of Karbala shall be more than sufficient to show that his obedience to the commands of the state had nothing to do with hatred for the Ahle-Bait, but was based solely and only upon the law of '*obedience to the caliph is essential, as long as open, clear-cut kufr (disbelief) is not manifest*'.

Thus when Muslim ibn Aqeel (عليه السلام) realized he was going to be killed, he sought permission to have a word in privacy with Umar ibn Sa'd. Here too, instead of seeking help from one of those who had initially hosted him, or from one of those that had initially pledged allegiance at his hands, he (عليه السلام) sought the help of Umar ibn Sa'd and at his hands made his final *wasiyah* (bequest), the first sentence of which, as narrated in Akhbaar-al-Tiwâl of Hafiz Ad-Dînawari⁸⁹, was:

'I need to make a bequest in private, and at the present moment I find none that holds a closer relationship to me than you.'

⁸⁹ اخل معي في طرف هذا البيت حتى أوصي إليك، فليس في القوم أقرب إلي ولا أولى بي منك. ففتحني معه ناحية، فقال له: (أتقبل وصيتي؟) قال: نعم. قال مسلم: إن علي هاهنا ديناً، مقدار ألف درهم، فاقض عني، وإذا أنا قتلت فاستوهب من ابن زياد جنتي لئلا يمثل بها، وابعث إلى الحسين بن علي رسولاً قاصداً من قبلك، يعلمه حالي، وما صرت إليه من غدر هؤلاء الذين يزعمون أنهم شيعة، وأخبره بما كان من نكثهم بعد أن بايعني منهم ثمانية عشر ألف رجل، لينصرف إلى حرم الله، فيقيم به، ولا يغتر بأهل الكوفة. وقد كان مسلم كتب إلى الحسين أن يقدم ولا يلبث. فقال له عمر بن سعد: لك على ذلك كله، وأنا به زعيم. فانصرف إلى ابن زياد، فأخبره بكل ما أوصى به إليه مسلم. فقال له ابن زياد: قد أسأت في أفشائك ما أسره إليك، وقد قيل (إنه لا يخونك إلا الأمين، وربما اتتمنك الخائن) (الاخبار الطوال للدينوري)

(Hadhrat Sa'd ibn Abi Waqqâs (عليه السلام) was family of Rasulullâh (ﷺ), thus Umar ibn Sa'd and Muslim ibn Aqeel (عليه السلام), enjoyed close family ties.)

Muslim ibn Aqeel (عليه السلام) first asked Umar ibn Sa'd to pay back on his behalf the loans he had taken in Kufa, which equalled to about one thousand dirhams. (Will one ever ask his enemy to pay on his behalf his debts?) The second request was that Umar ibn Sa'd request from Ibn Ziyaad that he does not mutilate his body. The third request, which was the most important, was that Umar ibn Sa'd send a message to Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام) warning him of the impending danger. The wording of the message that Muslim ibn Aqeel (عليه السلام) asked to be conveyed to Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام), indeed demands a few moments of contemplation. Read it slowly and carefully, especially the part under-lined.

وابعث إلى الحسين بن علي رسولاً قاصداً من قبلك، يعلمه حالي، وما صرت إليه من غدر هؤلاء الذين

يزعمون أنهم شيعة،

وأخبره بما كان من نكثهم بعد أن بايعني منهم ثمانية عشر ألف رجل، لينصرف إلى حرم الله، فيقيم به، ولا

يغتر بأهل الكوفة

'Send a message to Husein ibn Ali (عليه السلام), informing him of my condition and the plight I have ended up in, due to the deception of those who claim to be your helpers. Inform him of how 18 000, who had pledged allegiance at my hands, have suddenly broken their allegiance! Beg him to please return to the Haram (Makkah Mukarramah or Madinah Munawwara) and to remain there, and to never allow himself to again be deceived by the people of Kufa!

Umar ibn Sa'd immediately set out to fulfil his bequest. The issue of paying of the debts was an easy matter. As for the other two requests, it needed the permission of Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad, thus Umar ibn Sa'd mentioned it before him. Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad however, instead of respecting the bequest and the promise of Umar ibn Sa'd, mocked him

for revealing the contents of the discussion and against his wish, had the head of Muslim ibn Aqeelؓ severed, and sent to Yazîd.

Together with the head of Muslim ibn Aqeel, Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad sent two men to explain what had happened and obviously, being the confidants of Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad, the picture that they would portray to Yazîd would only be their side of the story, regarding the effort of Muslim ibn Aqeelؓ to overthrow the government and how Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad managed, just in time, to nip it in the bud.

After hearing their story, Yazîd, due to being so far away and trusting fully the words of his confidants, expressed pleasure at the achievements of Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad and sent back with them a second command, regarding the coming of Hadhrat Huseinؓ, the details of which shall follow soon.

Summary of the chapter above

The crux of what has been mentioned above is that before his death, Muslim ibn Aqeelؓ clearly realized that the true lovers of Hadhrat Huseinؓ were not those who had invited him over, or those who had come in large numbers to pledge their allegiance, but rather it was the very ones who were not desirous of seeing any new war starting amongst the Muslims, which would include people like Hadhrat Nu'maan ibn Bashirؓ, Haani ibn Urwah, Muhammad ibn Ash'ath, Umar ibn Sa'd, Qadhi Shureih, etc.

Thus, when Muslim ibn Aqeelؓ cursed and lamented, his complaint was not against the people of Kufa, who were not prepared to break their allegiance to Yazîd, but rather his curse and complain was against the liars and hypocrites of Kufa, who had absolutely no love for any of the Ahle-Bait, and were desirous of nothing but re-igniting the flames of war amongst the Muslims, using the blood of the Ahle-Bait as bait for their satanic ambitions.

It is solely for this reason, that when one ponders over the names of those who had invited Hadhrat Huseinؓ over, or over the names of the thousands who had pledged allegiance to Muslim ibn Aqeelؓ and then suddenly abandoned him when he needed them most, one shall find no mention of any of the great Sahâbahؓ and Tâbi'een of that time.

The fact that hardly any mention can be found of any of the illustrious students of Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Masoodؓ and Hadhrat Aliؓ joining the movement of Muslim ibn Aqeelؓ speaks volumes of the nature of this incident and the liars who were behind it!

Hadhrat Huseinؓ, trusting upon the dozens of letters that he had received from hypocrite quarters, had due reason to march to Iraq. But the population of Iraq, having not seen any of the matters which these letters had described, were obviously not going to join any rebellion, without due reason. As for the love of the Ahle-Bait that was embedded deep in the hearts of practically every individual of Kufa, this in no way necessitated that they join the rebellion against the government.

When one studies deeply the incident of Karbala, he shall find that those that had made the greatest attempts to save the Ahle Bait were not the ones that had invited and begged Hadhrat Huseinؓ to come over, but rather those that had nothing to do with the rebellion.

The journey to Karbala

After receiving the news of the execution of Muslim ibn Aqeelؓ and hearing the story of his rebellion, as depicted by the two men sent by Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad, Yazîd ibn Muawiyah sent a command back that Ubeidullah should now halt Hadhrat Huseinؓ and prevent himؓ from causing any uprising. The command issued by Yazîd ibn Muawiyah

however clearly showed, as his illustrious father had bequeathed, that he had absolutely no desire to see Hadhrat Huseinؑ killed.

Yazîd was never thirsty for the blood of Hadhrat Huseinؑ, neither before and not now. All he wanted was to ensure that an uprising does not occur, which would then result in years of in-fighting again. Had Yazîd desired to have Hadhrat Huseinؑ martyred, he could easily have issued such a command to his governors of Makkah Mukarramah and Madinah Munawwara, that they murder Hadhrat Huseinؑ, either in the Holy Lands itself, or anywhere in the desert, after his departure from the city.

Rather, history itself shows that Yazîd had great concern that Hadhrat Huseinؑ not be led into a trap by the people of Iraq, which could easily result in his death. For this reason, we find that Yazîd himself wrote to Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Abbaasؑ, that he should somehow or the other discourage Hadhrat Huseinؑ from leaving Hijaz for Iraq. Hafiz Ibn Kathir, in Al-Bidâyah, quotes:

'Yazîd ibn Muawiyah wrote to Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Abbaasؑ and after informing him that Hadhrat Huseinؑ had already left for Makkah Mukarramah, expressed his concern in the following manner:

'It is my understanding that some men from the East (Iraq) have tricked him into believing that they shall make him caliph, whereas you are well aware of their lies and tricks. If heؑ has fallen for their offer, then indeed, he has cut a firm family tie. You are amongst the heads of this family and one whose opinion is heard, thus stop himؑ from doing such an act that shall result in division.

Yazîd, together with the above appeal, also included some verses of poetry⁹⁰, addressing Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Abbaasؑ and the Qureish of Makkah Mukarramah and Madinah Munawwara, a rough translation of which is:

'O rider, travelling upon a unique animal, as it flies across the deserts, on my behalf inform the Qureish, who are very far away from me, that I have placed Allâhﷻ and the demand of family ties between me and Huseinؑ. And I will surely come to Makkah itself to discuss this matter with himؑ.

I beg himؑ in the name of Allâh, through whose Name responsibilities get fulfilled, (that heؑ does not proceed to Iraq) (If heؑ does leave for Iraq) your tribe shall then have to bear great grief, such a tribe that has been blessed with the most noble and pure of mothers, i.e. Hadhrat Fatimahؑ, who is the daughter of Rasulullâhﷺ and the best that man has ever known. Herؑ virtue is virtue for you and through her all others also enjoy some virtue.

It is my strong feeling that the one in whom you take pride, (i.e. Hadhrat Huseinؑ) very soon he shall be leaving you, and shall perhaps end up killed, with vultures eating from his blessed body.

O my nation, do not reignite the flames of war after it has died down, rather hold firm onto the rope of unity. Our forefathers and those of previous nations had indeed seen plenty of war amongst themselves,

⁹⁰ يا أيها الراكب العادي مطيته * على عذافرة في سيرها فحم , أبلغ قريشا على نأي المزار بها * بيني وبين حسين الله والرحم وموقف بقاء البيت أنشده * عهد الاله وما توفي به الذم عنيتم قومكم فخرا بأمكم * أم لعمرى حصان برة كرم هي التي لا يداني

فضلها أحد * بنت الرسول وخير الناس قد علموا

وفضلها لكم فضل وغيركم من قومكم لهم في فضلها قسم

إني لأعلم أو ظنا كعالمه * والظن يصدق أحيانا فينتظم أن سوف يترككم ما تدعون بها * قتلى تهاداكم العقبان والرخم يا قومنا لا تشبوا الحرب إذ مسكت * ومسكوا بحبال السلم , واعتصموا قد جرب الحرب من قد كان قبلكم * من القرون وقد

بادت بها الامم

فانصفوا قومكم لا تهلكوا برحا, * قرب ذي برح زلت به القدم (البداية) * و في ابن الاعثم بدل "برحا" بذخا في الموضعين

thus I beg that your noble nation view this matter without any prejudice and that you choose not to throw your bold warrior (Husein ؑ) to his destruction, for verily at times bold warriors do have terrible slips!

Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Abbaas ؑ replied to this letter of Yazîd and again a brief pondering over his answer shall be more than sufficient to show that Hadhrat Husein ؑ going to Iraq had nothing to do with Yazîd being an adulterer, drunkard, etc. Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Abbaas ؑ answered:

إني لأرجو أن لا يكون خروج الحسين لامرئ تكرهه،

ولست أدع النصيحة له في كل ما تجتمع به الالفه وتطفي به النائرة، (البداية)

'I have hope that Hadhrat Husein ؑ's leaving Madinah Munawwara is not due to any matter that would displease you (i.e. I do not feel he shall stand up against you.) Then too, I shall continue advising him ؑ regarding all matters which deals with keeping the Ummah united and extinguishing the flames of in-fighting.

Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Abbaas ؑ thereafter proceeded to Hadhrat Husein ؑ and contrary to what he had assumed, found Hadhrat Husein ؑ determined to leave immediately for Iraq. The details of what thereafter transpired and how various other Sahâbah ؑ and Tâbi'een attempted to dissuade Hadhrat Husein ؑ from leaving, that has already been mentioned in the chapter titled 'The issue between Hadhrat Husein ؑ and Yazîd'. We shall thus suffice with the mere mentioning of their names, so that again it can be made clear that no one, not even Hadhrat Husein ؑ had any issue with the character of Yazîd.

Illustrious personalities, who tried to dissuade Hadhrat Husein ؑ from proceeding ahead to Iraq, include amongst others:

Mohammad ibn Al-Hanafiyah ؑ

Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umar ؑ

Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Abbaas ؑ

Hadhrat Abu Saeed Al-Khudri ؑ

Hadhrat Jaabir ibn Abdullâh ؑ

Hadhrat Miswar ibn Makhramah ؑ

Hadhrat Amrah bint Abdur Rahmaan (the grand- daughter of Hadhrat Sa'd ibn Zuraarah ؑ)

Abu Bakr ibn Abdur Rahmaan (one of the famous seven Fuqahah of Madinah Munawwara)

Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Ja'far ؑ (the son of Hadhrat Ja'far At-Tayyaar ؑ)

Hadhrat Husein ؑ however, after receiving assurance from Muslim ibn Aqeel ؑ that he had knowledge of eighteen thousand die-hards in Kufa, behind whom were obviously thousands more, accompanied by close family members, left for Iraq. The intention of Hadhrat Husein ؑ was to settle in Iraq and join those who desired to become his warriors. For this reason, Hadhrat Husein ؑ left with women and children.

The second letter of Muslim ibn Aqeel ؑ, in which the treachery of the Iraqis was exposed, reached Hadhrat Husein ؑ after much of the journey had already been completed. Its contents greatly saddened Hadhrat Husein ؑ, firstly because it got delivered together with the news of the death of Muslim ibn Aqeel ؑ, and secondly because his trust and hopes in the people of Iraq had been crushed. At that juncture, Hadhrat Husein ؑ actually did consider acting upon the advice of the second letter and returning to Medina Munawwara, but two reasons finally made him move forward, viz.

- Some of the group suggested that perhaps when the people of Iraq would see Hadhrat Husein ؑ personally, they would abandon their cowardice and live up to their promises of supporting him ؑ to the very end.
- Those very close to Muslim ibn Aqeel ؑ were intent on going forward and investigating the reasons behind the execution of Muslim ibn Aqeel ؑ, since there was no real reason to have

Muslim ibn Aqeel ؓ executed. Hadhrat Husein ؓ felt that since they had come all the way with him, he ؓ might as well continue ahead and at least question the reasons behind the execution of Muslim ibn Aqeel ؓ.

Arriving at Karbala

Yazîd had already written to Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad that he should keep an eye on the movements of Hadhrat Husein ؓ and ensure that an uprising does not occur in Iraq. At the same time Yazîd had also issued the instruction that the caravan of Hadhrat Husein ؓ not be attacked, unless they attack first, which was most unlikely. Strict orders were issued that no major decision be taken except after receiving guidance from the government in Shâm⁹¹.

In fact, if one were to scrutinize the pages of history, one shall find that just before the arrival of Muslim ibn Aqeel ؓ, Yazîd was on the verge of having Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad removed from his post as governor over Basrah, due to misgivings he had about him. When Muslim ibn Aqeel ؓ reached Kufa, the governor, on behalf of the Umayyads, was Hadhrat Nu'maan ibn Bashir ؓ. Had Hadhrat Nu'maan ؓ remained as governor, the incident of Karbala, as it occurred, would perhaps never have transpired and the flames of war amongst the Ummah would not have been re-ignited. Hadhrat Nu'maan ibn Bashir ؓ would have merely arrested `Muslim ibn Aqeel ؓ, if he found the matter getting out of hand, and have him and Hadhrat Husein ؓ sent to Shâm, so that the matter could be sorted out there properly.

Shaitaani forces were well aware of this, thus plans were made to have Hadhrat Nu'maan ibn Bashir ؓ replaced by Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad brought in his place. This required just two moves, made at the right

⁹¹ وإنه قد بلغني أن الحسين بن علي قد توجه نحو العراق فضع المناظر والمسالخ واحترس على الظن وخذ على التهمة غير ألا تقتل إلا من قاتلك واكتب إلى في كل ما يحدث من الخير والسلام عليك ورحمة الله (تاريخ الطبري)

time, and backed with the propaganda and drama that shaitaani forces are masters at.

The first of these two moves was to have Yazîd's faith in Hadhrat Nu'maan ibn Bashir ؓ broken. For this, letters from Kufa were sent to Yazîd, warning of a rebellion that was on the verge of breaking out and that Nu'maan ibn Bashir ؓ was doing practically nothing to sort out the problem. The contents of the letters and the names and signatures that accompanied them (which were most probably forged) would have confused the greatest of leaders and thus Yazîd can never be blamed for falling for the trap. Describing the scene prevailing in the court of Yazîd, Tabari writes⁹²:

(Abdullâh ibn Muslim, after engaging in a heated debate with Nu'maan ibn Bashir ؓ regarding why he was acting so cowardly, wrote to Yazîd: 'Muslim ibn Aqeel has come to Kufa and many have already pledged their allegiance to Husein. If you have any desire that Kufa remains yours, you must send immediately someone strong, who shall deal with your enemy as you would have dealt with them. As for Nu'maan ibn Bashir, he is a weak leader, or perhaps he is just acting weak!'

This was the first letter that reached Yazîd regarding the dangerous situation in Kufa. Thereafter the letter of ibn Uqbah arrived, followed almost immediately by the letter of Umar ibn Sa'd , both mentioning the very same thing.

⁹² وخرج عبد الله بن مسلم وكتب إلى يزيد بن معاوية أما بعد فإن مسلم بن عقيل قد قدم الكوفة فبايعته الشيعة للحسين بن علي فإن كان لك بالكوفة حاجة فابعث إليها رجلاً قوياً ينفذ أمرك ويعمل مثل عملك في عدوك فإن النعمان بن بشير رجل ضعيف أو هو يتضعف فكان أول من كتب إليه ثم كتب إليه عمارة بن عقبة بنحو من كتابه ثم كتب إليه عمر بن سعد بن أبي وقاص بمثل ذلك قال هشام قال عوانة فلما اجتمعت الكتب عند يزيد ليس بين كتبهم إلا يومان دعا يزيد بن معاوية سرجون مولى معاوية فقال ما رأيك فإن حسينا قد توجه نحو الكوفة ومسلم بن عقيل بالكوفة يبايع للحسين وقد بلغني عن النعمان ضعف وقول سيء وأقرأه كتبهم فما ترى من أستعمل على الكوفة وكان يزيد عاتبا على عبيدالله بن زياد فقال سرجون أرايت معاوية لو نشر لك أكنت آخذاً برأيه قال نعم فأخرج عهد عبيد الله على الكوفة فقال هذا رأى معاوية ومات وقد أمر بهذا الكتاب فأخذ برأيه وضم المصيرين إلى عبيدالله (تاريخ الطبري) فأشار إلى يزيد سرجون الرومي كاتب أبيه بعبيد الله بن زياد، وكان منحرفاً عنه (سبط النجوم)

Hishâm said, quoting from Awaanah, 'After reading these letters which arrived one after the other, in the space of just two days, Yazîd ibn Muawiyah acceded to the advice of Sarjoon, the freed slave of Hadhrat Muawiyah, that none but Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad could sort out the situation, whereas at that moment Yazîd was not seeing eye-to-eye with Ibn Ziyaad) End of quote

Whether Umar ibn Sa'd really wrote such a letter is definitely questionable, especially considering the fact that from the arrival of Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad till the very end, he continuously expressed displeasure with the commands being issued by Ibn Ziyaad. This letter was thus most probably forged in the name of Umar ibn Sa'd. Whatever the case may be, such letters were most definitely going to get Yazîd searching for a solution.

The second move of the shaitaani forces was to have Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad brought in, in the place of Hadhrat Nu'maan ibn Bashir. Yazîd himself did not choose Ibn Ziyaad, since at that time Yazîd was having misgivings with regards to him⁹³. Yazîd was in fact instigated into allowing Ibn Ziyaad to take charge, a move that would soon ruin the image of Yazîd throughout the Muslim world.

Regarding this, Tabari narrates:

'In search of a solution to the problem facing him, Yazîd ibn Muawiyah sought the counsel of Sarjoon, the freed slave of Hadhrat Muawiyah. At that moment, Yazîd was not seeing eye-to-eye with Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad (and Sarjoon was well aware of that). Sarjoon thus asked, 'If Muawiyah himself had to be brought alive and he were to give advice in this matter, would you be prepared to accept his advice?' Yazîd responded in the affirmative. Sarjoon thereafter drew out a document

⁹³ فأشار إلى يزيد سرجون الرومي كاتب أبيه بعبيد الله بن زياد، وكان منحرفاً عنه (سمط النجوم العوالي في أنباء الأوائل والتوالي للعصامي)

in which it was stated that Hadhrat Muawiyah had, just before his death, written that Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad be placed in charge of Kufa. Seeing this letter, Yazîd forgot his misgivings regarding Ibn Ziyaad and ordered that together with Basrah, (over which he was governor) the rule of Kufa now also be handed over to him.'

Whether Hadhrat Muawiyah had ever written such a thing shall perhaps never be known with certainty. Whatever the case may be, the narrations above show clearly that the appointment of Ibn Ziyaad was not a brain-storm of Yazîd, but rather upon the inciting of the 'forged' letters from Kufa, followed with the persistence of Sarjoon ibn Mansoor.

Sarjoon, as the books of history explain, was one of the senior leaders of the christian army that came out to face the Muslims during the era of Hadhrat Abu Bakr. After being taken as captive, he began serving in Shâm, as a slave, in many top government posts due to his expertise in the field of finance, especially since the financial matters at that time were still being recorded in Persian, in registers known as 'Diwaan'. In the era of Hadhrat Muawiyah, he rose to the position of being one of Hadhrat Muawiyah's right-hand men⁹⁴ and perhaps due to his outward loyalty, or due to his accepting Islâm at the hands of Hadhrat Muawiyah, he was finally set free.

Whether Sarjoon was sincere in his intentions or not when he proposed the name of Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad is for Almighty Allâh alone to decide. However it is a point worth noting that Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad's selection was not done by any Sahâbi or illustrious Tabi'ee, but rather by a former christian/recently-reverted-Muslim freed-slave, Sarjoon ibn Mansoor.

⁹⁴ سرجون بن منصور الرومي كاتب معاوية وابنه يزيد بن معاوية وعبد الملك بن مروان ذكره أبو الحسين الرازي في تسمية كتاب أمراء دمشق وذكر أنه كان نصرانيا فأسلم (تاريخ دمشق)

Hadhrat Huseinؑ speaks

From the time that Hadhrat Huseinؑ found himself facing the army of Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad, in practically every statement that heؑ uttered, some or the other indication can be found of whatever has been discussed above, i.e.

- a) Hisؑ coming to Iraq was merely on the basis that, as he had been led to believe, there were many in Iraq who had not as yet pledged allegiance to Yazîd, and were rather desirous of pledging allegiance to him
- b) Besides the issue of fighting for the caliphate, heؑ had no other issue with Yazîd, i.e. heؑ never held any misconception regarding Yazîd's deen, private life, etc.
- c) The traitors and evil men in the entire episode were not Yazîd and his government, situated in Shâm, but rather the hypocrites who had sent many forged letters, inviting himؑ over, and who had deceived Muslim ibn Aqeelؑ into believing that Hadhrat Huseinؑ had a huge following in Iraq.
- d) If heؑ had known from the beginning that the people of Iraq were happy with the Umayyad rule, heؑ would never have come over, but would rather have remained in Hijaaz and allowed the Umayyads the right to rule.

The above points can easily be gleaned from the numerous statements made by Hadhrat Huseinؑ before his martyrdom. From these statements, two statements however deserve extra attention, viz.

- 1) A man, who had met Hadhrat Huseinؑ shortly before his death, narrated to Yazîd Ar-Rashk:

'I noticed some tents pitched in an open area. Upon enquiry, I was informed that these were the tents of Hadhrat Huseinؑ. I approached and found within one tent an elderly man reciting Quraan, whilst tears flowed down his cheeks and beard. I asked, "O grandson of Rasulullâhؐ, what has brought you to this barren area? Heؑ replied,

*'The letters of the people of Kufa,
and I have a strong feeling that these very people are now
going to kill me!⁹⁵*

- 2) When Umar ibn Sa'd, the leader of the army sent by Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad, came in front of Hadhrat Huseinؑ, heؑ said,
'O Umar! Allow me one of three options:

- *Either let me return to where I have come from, i.e. Madinah Munawwara*
- *If that is too difficult, then allow me to proceed to Yazîd, at whose hands I shall pledge allegiance and he can thereafter judge regarding me as he wills*
- *And if that is not acceptable, then place me in an army heading towards the Turks, against whom I shall continue fighting till my death*

Umar ibn Sa'd was happy with these options, but as a mere formality, sent a message to Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad enquiring regarding which option to choose. Shimr ibn Haushab, (a senior member of the cabinet of Ubeidullah) objected severely and demanded that Hadhrat Huseinؑ

⁹⁵ وقال محمد بن سعد: حدثنا موسى بن إسماعيل، ثنا جعفر بن سليمان، عن يزيد الرشك قال: حدثني من شافه الحسين قال: رأيت أخية مضروبة بفلاة من الأرض فقلت: لمن هذه؟ قالوا: هذه لحسين قال: فأتيته فإذا شيخ يقرأ القرآن والدموع تسيل على خديه ولحيته، قال قلت: بأبي وأمي يا بن بنت رسول الله ما أنزلك هذه البلاد والفلاة التي ليس بها أحد؟ فقال: هذه كتب أهل الكوفة إلي ولا أراهم إلا قاتلي، (البنية)

be brought in front of Ibn Ziyaad. Hadhrat Huseinؑ was not happy with the decision of Shimr and refused to present himself in front of Ibn Ziyaad. Umar ibn Sa'd was ordered to attack, but he showed unwillingness. Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad thus had him removed from his post as leader and appointed Shimr in his place and in fact even ordered him to execute Umar ibn Sa'd, (if he found him to be a barrier)⁹⁶

While both of the above statements serve as eye-openers, it is the second one that really puts a nail in the entire episode of lies, which shaitaani forces desire all to believe regarding Karbala. Had Yazîd really been a drunkard, an adulterer, etc. and had that been the basis of Hadhrat Huseinؑ standing up against him, why would he now, right at the end of his life, be prepared to proceed to Shâm and pledge allegiance at the hands of Yazîd? Could it ever be possible that this lion of Islâm, merely in the fear of death, would forget his mission of fighting against sinful rulers and would actually agree to even join under their ranks? *Na'ûzubillah!*

^{٩٦} وبعث عبيد الله بن زياد عمر بن سعد لقتالهم، فقال له الحسين: يا عمر اختر مني إحدى ثلاث خصال، إما أن تركني أرجع كما جئت، فإن أبيت هذه فسيرني إلى يزيد فأضع يدي في يده فيحكم في ما رأى، فإن أبيت هذه فسيرني إلى الترك فأقاتلهم حتى أموت. فأرسل إلى ابن زياد بذلك، فهم أن يسيره إلى يزيد، فقال شمر بن ذي الجوشن: لا ! إلا أن ينزل على حكمك، فأرسل إلى الحسين بذلك فقال الحسين: والله لا أفعل، وأبطأ عمر عن قتاله فأرسل ابن زياد شمر بن ذي الجوشن وقال له: إن تقدم عمر فقاتل وإلا فاقتله وكن مكانه، فقد وليتك الامرة. (البداية)

(و في رواية) ثم إن عبيد الله بعث شمر بن ذي الجوشن فقال: اذهب فإن جاء الحسين وأصحابه على حكمي وإلا فمر عمر بن سعد أن يقاتلهم، فإن تباطأ عن ذلك فاضرب عنقه ثم أنت الأمير على الناس.

(و في الاستيعاب) فلما التقيا قال له الحسين اختر مني إحدى ثلاث إما أن ألحق بغير من الثغور وإما أن أرجع إلى المدينة وإما أن أضع يدي في يد يزيد بن معاوية فقبل ذلك عمر منه وكتب به إلى عبيد الله فكتب إليه لا أقبل منه حتى يضع يده في يدي فامتنع الحسين فقاتلوه فقتل معه أصحابه وفيهم سبعة عشر شاباً من أهل بيته ثم كان آخر ذلك أن قتل (الاستيعاب)

فقال الحسين: يا عمر، اختر مني إحدى ثلاث: إما تركني أرجع، أو تسيرني إلى يزيد، فأضع يدي في يده فيحكم في ما يرى، فإن أبيت فسيرني إلى الترك فأقاتلهم حتى أموت . فأرسل عمر بذلك إلى ابن زياد، فهم أن يسيره إلى يزيد، فقال شمر بن ذي الجوشن: لا، أيها الأمير، إلا أن ينزل على حكمك . فأرسل إليه؛ فقال الحسين: والله لا أفعل ، وأبطأ عمر عن قتاله، فأرسل إليه ابن زياد شمرًا، وقال: إن تقدم عمر وقاتل وإلا فاقتله، وكن مكانه (الوفاي بالوفيات)

Had Yazîd been committing open acts of kufr and evil in the court of the caliphate, Hadhrat Huseinؑ would never have been prepared to even present himself in front of Yazîd, forget pledging allegiance at his hands!

It is for this reason that shaitaani hypocrites have made great efforts to keep this statement of Hadhrat Huseinؑ hidden from the public, either by branding the narrator of the incident as unreliable, or by fabricating statements attributed to Hadhrat Huseinؑ, which show a different meaning, or by just branding the incident as unacceptable, without giving any reason for its denial, except that only a coward could have uttered such a statement, and Hadhrat Huseinؑ was no coward.

Due to the importance of this narration, especially in exposing the lies behind the shaitaani version of Karbala, a discussion regarding the strength of this narration is essential.

The statement of Hadhrat Huseinؑ, in which he agreed to pledge allegiance to Yazîd can be found in practically all the major works on Islâmic history. For example, Tabari has narrated it in his Târikh, Ibn Kathir has narrated it in Al-Bidâyah, Ibn-e-Abdul Barr has mentioned it in Al-Istee'aab, Safdi in Al-Waafi, as well as many others. However, as mentioned previously, a narration merely appearing in numerous history books does not really increase its strength, since it is quite possible that all are narrating from the same one source. If that one source is unreliable, hundreds narrating it thereafter shall do nothing in making it reliable. To find the strength of a narration, its chain of narrators has to be studied, and only after that can a verdict be passed.

Below shall follow a few of the chains, through which Hadhrat Huseinؑ's statement has been narrated:

- 1) Hafiz Mizzi, in Tahzeebul-Kamaal, and Hafiz Zhahabi in Siyar-an-Nubala, narrated this statement, from Hadhrat Huseinؑ's

grandson, Abu Ja'far, Muhammad ibn Ali ibn Husein, through the following narrators⁹⁷:

'Abu Walid, Ahmed ibn Janaab Maseesi, who narrates from Khalid ibn Yazîd Qisri, who narrates from Ammaar ibn Abi Muawiyah, Dhuni, who narrates from Hadhrat Husein's grandson, Abu Ja'far, Muhammad ibn Ali'

All the narrators of the above tradition have been termed as reliable, except for Khalid ibn Yazîd Qisri⁹⁸.

2) Allâmah ibn Kathir, in Al-Bidâyah⁹⁹, narrated the above statement of Hadhrat Husein, through the following chain:
Abu Ubeid Qasim ibn Salaam, who narrates from Hajjâj ibn Muhammad (A'war), who narrates from Abu Ma'shar (Najeeh ibn Abdur Rahmaan), who narrates from some of his elders

Abu Ubeid and Hajjâj ibn Muhammad are not only regarded as reliable narrators, but in fact Imams in the field of narrating¹⁰⁰. As for Abu

^{٩٧} وقال أبو الوليد أحمد بن جناب المصيصي حدثنا خالد بن يزيد بن أسد بن عبد الله القسري قال حدثنا عمار بن أبي معاوية الذهني قال قلت لأبي جعفر محمد بن علي بن الحسين عليه السلام حدثني بقتل الحسين عليه السلام حتى كأتي حضرته (تقريب التهذيب)

^{٩٨} أحمد بن جناب بفتح الجيم وتخفيف النون بن المغيرة المصيصي أبو الوليد صدوق من العاشرة مات سنة ثلاثين م د س (تقريب التهذيب - ابن حجر)

خالد بن يزيد بن أسد القسري عن إسماعيل بن أبي خالد قال ابن عدي لا يتابع على رواياته (المعنى للذهبي)
عمار بن أبي معاوية الذهني بضم المهملة وسكون الهاء ثم نون صدوق من الثامنة ع م ل س (تقريب التهذيب - ابن حجر)
محمد بن علي بن الحسين بن علي بن أبي طالب أبو جعفر الباقر ثقة فاضل من الرابعة مات سنة بضع عشرة ع (تقريب التهذيب - ابن حجر)

^{٩٩} وقال أبو عبيد القاسم بن سلام: حدثني حجاج بن محمد عن أبي معشر عن بعض مشيخته... فقال له الحسين: يا عمر اختبرني إحدى ثلاث خصال، إما أن تتركني أرحج كما جئت، فإن أبيت هذه فسيرني إلى يزيد فأضع يدي في يده فيحكم في ما رأى، فإن أبيت هذه فسيرني إلى الترك فأقاتلهم حتى أموت. فأرسل إلى ابن زياد بذلك، فهم أن يسيره إلى يزيد، فقال شمر بن ذي الجوشن: لا ! إلا أن ينزل على حكمك

^{١٠٠} أبو عبيد القاسم بن سلام: قال أحمد بن حنبل: أبو عبيد أستاذ، وهو يزداد كل يوم خيرا، وسئل يحيى بن معين عنه فقال:

أبو عبيد يسأل عن الناس. وقال أبو داود: ثقة مأمون (تذكرة الحفاظ للذهبي)

Ma'shar, he has been described as 'one of the vessels of knowledge', due to his vast knowledge regarding Islâmic history. His memory has been criticized slightly, due to certain errors he made in narrating chains of transmission. Regarding his honesty in narrating, Imam Ahmed ibn Hanbal and Abu Zur'aa have termed him as 'Sadooq' (truthful).¹⁰¹

Thus, the only issue that can be raised with this chain is that the names of those Abu Ma'shar has narrated from has not been mentioned, even though the word 'from some of his elders' does lend indication that he heard this narration from those who he constantly narrated from, and trusted.

The summary of the above is that the incident of Hadhrat Husein agreeing to pledge allegiance to Yazîd has been narrated with chains, which for historical purposes, is indeed quite strong.

Together with the above, indication towards these three options, i.e. returning to Madinah Munawwara; moving into the wilderness and engaging in Jihaad against the Turks; or pledging allegiance to Yazîd in Shâm, can easily be noticed in other narrations as well.

One example of such an indication is what has been narrated by Hafiz Ibn Asakir in Târikh-e-Dimishq, that the last request made by Hadhrat Husein before being martyred was that he be allowed to proceed to Yazîd. His exact words were:

فدعوني آتي أمير المؤمنين

حجاج بن محمد الحافظ أبو محمد المصيصي الأعور أحد الأئمة: قال ابن معين: كان أثبت أصحاب ابن جريج (تذكرة الحفاظ للذهبي)

^{١٠١} نجیح بن عبد الرحمن أبو معشر السندي مولى بني هاشم عن المقبري والقرظي ونافع وعنه بن مهدي وسعيد بن منصور قال أحمد صدوق لا يقيم الإسناد وقال بن معين ليس بالقوي وقال بن عدي يكتب حديثه مع ضعفه (الكاشف في معرفة من له رواية في الكتب الستة - الذهبي)

‘Then allow me to proceed to Ameerul-Mumineen.¹⁰²’

This statement of his has been narrated through a very strong chain of narrators, as follows:

أخبرنا أبو غالب أحمد بن الحسن أنا عبد الصمد بن علي أنا عبيد الله بن محمد بن إسحاق أنا عبد الله بن محمد بن عبد العزيز حدثني أحمد بن محمد بن عيسى نا عمرو بن عون أنا خالد عن الجريري عن عبد ربه - أو غيره

Ibn Asakir narrates from Abu Ghalib, Ahmed ibn Hasan (Banna)¹⁰³, who has been termed as ‘the leading scholar of hadith in his time, in Baghdad. He narrates from Abdus Samad ibn Ali (ibn Ma’mun), who has also been described as the leading scholar of hadith in Baghdad, during his era¹⁰⁴. He narrates from Ubeidullah ibn Muhammad ibn Ishaq, who has been described as ‘a leading authority in hadith¹⁰⁵. He narrates from Abdullâh ibn Muhammad ibn Abdul Aziz, who has been described as the leading scholar of hadith of his era¹⁰⁶. He narrates from Ahmed ibn Muhammad ibn Isa (Barti), who has been described as

^{١٠٢} أن الحسين بن علي لما أرقه السلاح وأخذله السلاح قال ألا تقبلون مني ما كان رسول الله (صلى الله عليه وسلم) يقبل من المشركين قالوا وكان رسول الله (صلى الله عليه وسلم) يقبل من المشركين قال إذا جنح أحدهم قبل منه قالوا لا قال فدعوني أرجع قالوا لا قال فدعوني آتي أمير المؤمنين فأخذ له رجل السلاح فقال له أبشر بالنار فقال بل إن شاء الله برحمة ربي عز وجل وشفاعة نبيي (صلى الله عليه وسلم) فقتل وجئ برأسه حتى وضعه في طست بين يدي ابن زياد فنكته بقضييه وقال لقد كان غلاما صبيحا ثم قال أيكم قتله فقال أنا قتله فقال ما قال لك فأعاد الحديث فاسود وجهه لعنه الله (تاريخ ابن عساكر)

^{١٠٣} الشَّيْخُ الصَّالِحُ، الثَّقَّةُ، مُسْنِدُ بَغْدَادَ، أَبُو غَالِبٍ أَحْمَدُ ابْنُ الْإِمَامِ أَبِي عَلِيٍّ الْحَسَنُ بْنُ أَحْمَدَ بْنِ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ بْنِ الْبَيْتَاءِ الْبَغْدَادِيِّ ... وَكَانَ مِنْ بَقَايَا الثَّقَاتِ (سير اعلام النبلاء)

^{١٠٤} ابْنُ الْمَأْمُونِ عَبْدُ الصَّمَدِ بْنُ عَلِيٍّ بْنِ مُحَمَّدٍ الْهَاشِمِيُّ الشَّيْخُ، الْإِمَامُ، الثَّقَّةُ، الْجَلِيلُ، الْمُعْتَمَرُ، أَبُو الْقَتَانِمِ عَبْدُ الصَّمَدِ بْنُ عَلِيٍّ بْنِ مُحَمَّدٍ بْنِ الْحَسَنِ بْنِ الْفَضْلِ بْنِ الْمَأْمُونِ بْنِ الرَّشِيدِ الْهَاشِمِيِّ، الْعَبَّاسِيُّ، الْبَغْدَادِيُّ، شَيْخُ الْمُحَدَّثِينَ بَغْدَادَ (سير اعلام النبلاء)

^{١٠٥} ابْنُ حَبَابَةَ عَبْدُ اللَّهِ بْنُ مُحَمَّدٍ الْبَغْدَادِيُّ الشَّيْخُ، الْمُسْنِدُ، الْعَالِمُ، الثَّقَّةُ، أَبُو الْقَاسِمِ عَبْدُ اللَّهِ بْنُ مُحَمَّدٍ بْنِ إِسْحَاقَ بْنِ سَلَمَانَ بْنِ حَبَابَةَ - بِالتَّخْفِيفِ - الْبَغْدَادِيُّ، الْمُتَوَفَّى، الْبَزَّازُ (سير اعلام النبلاء)

^{١٠٦} الْبَغْوِيُّ عَبْدُ اللَّهِ بْنُ مُحَمَّدٍ بْنِ عَبْدِ الْعَزِيزِ ابْنِ الْمَرْزُبَانِ بْنِ سَابُورَ بْنِ شَاهِنْشَاهِ، الْحَافِظُ، الْإِمَامُ، الْحُجَّةُ، الْمُعْتَمَرُ، مُسْنِدُ الْعَصْرِ (سير اعلام النبلاء)

a hafiz of Ahâdith¹⁰⁷. He narrates from Amr ibn Aun, who has been described as an ‘Imaam’ in the field of Ahâdith¹⁰⁸. He narrates from Khalid (Hazza’), who has been described as an ‘Imaam’ in this field and a ‘hafiz’ of Ahâdith¹⁰⁹. He narrates from Jureiri, who also has been described as an ‘Imaam’ in the field of hadith¹¹⁰. At this point there is a slight doubt whether Jureiri narrates from Abd-e-Rabbi, who has been described as reliable by Imam Ahmed ibn Hanbal¹¹¹, or from someone else.

When one ponders over the men mentioned in this sanad, one finds practically all to be narrators of the highest standard. In Siyar A’laam An-Nubalaa, Hafiz Zahabi has described each one of them the highest of praises. The only issue with this sanad is at the end, where slight doubt is shown with regards to whether the final narrator is Abd-e-Rabbi or someone else.

The fact that Hadhrat Husein عليه السلام himself agreed to go to Shâm and pledge allegiance to Yazîd was definitely going to create a thorn in the shia description of what happened on that fateful day. Thus we find from the very beginning shaitaani hypocrites making every effort to ensure that this incident never becomes famous, despite its strength being much more than most of the narrations commonly mentioned when discussing Karbala.

^{١٠٧} الْبَرْثِيُّ أَبُو الْعَبَّاسِ أَحْمَدُ بْنُ مُحَمَّدٍ بْنِ عِيْسَى الْقَاضِي، الْعَالِمُ، الْحَافِظُ، الثَّقَّةُ، أَبُو الْعَبَّاسِ أَحْمَدُ بْنُ مُحَمَّدٍ بْنِ عِيْسَى بْنِ الْأَزْهَرِ الْبَرْثِيُّ، الْبَغْدَادِيُّ، الْحَنْفِيُّ الْعَابِدِ (سير اعلام النبلاء)

^{١٠٨} عَمْرُو بْنُ عَوْنٍ بْنِ أَوْسٍ بْنِ الْجَعْدِ السُّلَمِيُّ (خ، د) الْحَافِظُ، الْمُحَدِّثُ، الْإِمَامُ، أَبُو عَثْمَانَ السُّلَمِيُّ، الْوَاسِطِيُّ، الْبَزَّازُ (سير اعلام النبلاء)

^{١٠٩} خَالِدُ بْنُ مَهْرَانَ أَبُو الْمُنَازِلِ الْبَصْرِيُّ الْخَدَّاءُ (ع) الْإِمَامُ، الْحَافِظُ، الثَّقَّةُ، أَبُو الْمُنَازِلِ الْبَصْرِيُّ، الْمَشْهُورُ: بِالْخَدَّاءِ، أَخَذَ الْأَعْلَامَ. رَأَى: أَنَسُ بْنُ مَالِكٍ (سير اعلام النبلاء)

^{١١٠} الْجُرَيْرِيُّ أَبُو مَسْعُودٍ سَعِيدُ بْنُ إِبْرَاهِيمَ (ع) الْإِمَامُ، الْمُحَدِّثُ، الثَّقَّةُ، أَبُو مَسْعُودٍ سَعِيدُ بْنُ إِبْرَاهِيمَ الْجُرَيْرِيُّ، الْبَصْرِيُّ، مِنْ كِبَارِ الْعُلَمَاءِ (سير اعلام النبلاء)

^{١١١} عَبْدُ رَبِّهِ بْنِ سَعِيدٍ الْأَنْصَارِيُّ (ع) وَثَّقَهُ: أَحْمَدُ بْنُ حَنْبَلٍ. وَقَالَ يَحْيَى الْقَطَّانُ: كَانَ حَيَّ الْفَوَادِ، وَقَادًا (سير اعلام النبلاء)

The crux of the shia effort to discredit this narration can be condensed in two points, viz.

- 1) Shaitaani hypocrites invented their own narrations in which the willingness of Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام) to proceed to Shâm was totally denied.
- 2) The credibility of Umar ibn Sa'd (the son of Hadhrat Sa'd ibn Abi Waqqâs (عليه السلام)) was attacked, since he was the main narrator of the proposal of Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام). To discredit him, shaitaani propagandists left no stone unturned in having him declared as the killer of Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام), and then propagating this to such an extent that it soon became 'gospel truth', despite so much evidence proving his innocence from this act.

With regards to the first effort, i.e. inventing contradictory narrations, one example of that is what Abu Mikhnaf (a famous shia narrator and a great liar) would falsely narrate from Abdur Rahmaan ibn Jundub, from Uqbah ibn Sam'aan, the wording of which is as follows¹¹²:

*'I accompanied Husein (عليه السلام) from Makkah until his death. By Allâh, during that journey, he did not utter a word, except that I heard it. **He never asked permission to proceed to Yazîd, so that he could place his hands in his hands**, nor did he ask to be sent to the Islâmic frontier, rather all that he asked was that he be allowed to return from where he had come, or that he be allowed to wander in the open lands, so that he could see the outcome of Yazîd's rule and thereafter make a decision.'*

¹¹² وقد روى أبو مخنف: حدثني عبد الرحمن بن جندب، عن عقبة بن سميان. قال: لقد صحبت الحسين من مكة إلى حين قتل، والله ما من كلمة قالها في موطن إلا وقد سمعتها، وإنه لم يسأل أن يذهب إلى يزيد فيضع يده إلى يده، ولا أن يذهب إلى ثغر من الثغور، ولكن طلب منهم أحد أمرين، إما أن يرجع من حيث جاء، وإما أن يدعوهم يذهب في الأرض العريضة حتى ينظر ما يصير أمر الناس إليه. (البداية)

Wherever one finds Abu Mikhnaf narrating, one can be sure to find a lot of exaggeration, at times vivid lies and some sort of attack on some personality or the other. For this reason the masters of the science of scrutinizing narrators were practically unanimous that the narrations of Abu Mikhnaf not be trusted.

Yahya ibn Maeen described him as 'unreliable'.¹¹³ Ibn Adi in Al-Kamil has described him as a staunch shia, whose narrations are not worth mentioning, especially due to his habit of criticizing the pious predecessors.¹¹⁴ Abu Haatim Raazie would not narrate from him and Dar-e-qutni termed him as 'weak'. Hafiz Zahabi summed up his reality in one word, i.e. 'هالك' (one that has destroyed himself), which means that he was from the worst of narrators.¹¹⁵ Hafiz ibn Hajar has described him as a narrator of history who can never be trusted. In fact, when Abu Haatim Raazi was asked regarding Abu Mikhnaf, he replied in astonishment, 'Is there even a need to ask regarding him!' What he meant was that his unreliability is so apparent, that the need to enquire regarding him should not even arise.¹¹⁶

Another issue with Abu Mikhnaf was that he was a staunch supporter of the shia movement against the Umayyads and actually even died for

¹¹³ أبو مخنف ليس بشئ وفي موضع آخر ليس بثقة حدثنا محمد بن عباس قال سمعت يحيى قال أبو مخنف وأبو مريم وعمر بن شمر ليسوا هم بشئ قلت ليحيى هما مثل عمر بن شمر قال هما شر من عمرو بن شمر (الضعفاء للعقيلي)

¹¹⁴ وهذا الذي قاله بن معين يوافقه عليه الأئمة فإن لوط بن يحيى معروف بكنيته وباسمه حدث بأخبار من تقدم من السلف الصالحين ولا يبعد منه ان يتناولهم وهو شيعي محترق صاحب أخبارهم وإنما له من الأخبار المكروه الذي لا أستحب ذكره (الكامل في ضعفاء الرجال)

¹¹⁵ لوط بن يحيى أبو مخنف ساقط تركه أبو حاتم وقال الدارقطني ضعيف وقال الذهبي: أبو مخنف هو لوط بن يحيى هالك (المغني للضعفاء للذهبي)

¹¹⁶ لوط بن يحيى أبو مخنف اخباري تالف لا يوثق به تركه أبو حاتم وغيره وقال الدارقطني ضعيف وقال يحيى بن معين ليس بثقة وقال مرة ليس بشيء وقال بن عدى شيعي محترق صاحب أخبارهم وقال أبو عبيد الآجري سألت أبا حاتم عنه ففض يده وقال أحد يسأل عن هذا وذكره العقيلي في الضعفاء (لسان الميزان)

this corrupt movement¹¹⁷. On this basis too, one would find it necessary that all his narrations regarding Karbala and its aftermath be viewed with suspicion.

Had Abu Mikhnaf been the only problem with this narration, that itself would have been sufficient to have it rendered baseless. Together with the above however is the issue with the wording of the narration itself, especially this portion, *'I accompanied Huseinؑ from Makkah until his death. By Allâh, during that journey, he did not utter a word, except that I heard it'*. If these words were true, it would demand that Uqbah ibn Sam'aan be present, at the side of Hadhrat Huseinؑ, right until his death, whereas, according to what history has narrated, there were many instances during this journey when Hadhrat Huseinؑ was alone with the women of his family. Also, in the majority of events recorded regarding Karbala, no mention has been made of this man, whereas if he was a permanent companion in every occasion, in every decision, and in every discussion, which is quite improbable, his name would surely have been mentioned much more than just in a few places.

After having proven the first sentence being narrated from Uqbah ibn Sam'aan to be an open exaggeration, or a lie, how could one thereafter entertain the possibility that the rest of his narration is true!

From the above one can easily judge the status of the narrations of Abu Mikhnaf, and that it holds hardly any weight in refuting what Umar ibn Sa'd would narrate, regarding Hadhrat Huseinؑ's willingness to pledge allegiance at the hands of Yazîd. A point which can however be learnt from his narration is that during his time (which was just after the death of Hadhrat Huseinؑ) the word was already going around that

¹¹⁷ Abu Mikhnaf was killed in the seventy forth year after Hijrah, fighting along Suleiman ibn Sard, one of the leaders in the war of 'Revenge for the Ahle-Bait' a movement initiated by the infamous group known as the 'Tawwabeen', who were in fact the very liars who had the Ahle-Bait (the family of Hadhrat Huseinؑ) martyred.

Hadhrat Huseinؑ had, at the very end of his life, expressed his willingness to proceed to Yazîd and pledge allegiance. This was obviously going to create huge thorns in the shaitaani propaganda, and thus the need arose for Abu Mikhnaf to forge narrations refuting it totally.

As for the second attempt of shaitaani forces to have the narration of Hadhrat Huseinؑ's willingness to pledge allegiance to Yazîd declared unreliable, this was accomplished by tainting the image of the narrator, Umar ibn Sa'd (the son of Hadhrat Sa'd ibn Abi Waqqâsؑ).

For this, shaitaani hypocrites left no stone unturned in painting him as 'the evil butcher/killer, responsible for the death of Hadhrat Huseinؑ'. By having the Ummah regard him as evil, there would obviously be no question of anyone ever regarding his narrations as reliable.

Their efforts in this regard reaped some fruit and certain great authorities in the field of scrutinizing narrators ended up branding Umar ibn Sa'd as unreliable, solely due to his 'assumed inhumane acts' on the field of Karbala. For example, when Yahya ibn Maeen رحمه الله was asked regarding Umar ibn Sa'd, he replied, 'How can a man ever be considered as reliable after having killed the grandson of Rasulullâhﷺ?!

Despite the fact that Umar ibn Sa'd was from the very beginning right till the end in the fore-front of trying to salvage the situation and bring about a peaceful result in the affair between Hadhrat Husainؑ and Yazîd, shaitaani hypocrites succeeded to a great extent in portraying him as the villain of the plains of Karbala, whereas the reality is totally different.

As previously mentioned, the first villain to be pinpointed in this entire episode is none other than Mukhtaar ibn Ubeid Thaqafi, whereas his name is hardly to be found in any of the basic booklets written regarding Karbala! Why? The answer is clear. **In the episode of**

Karbala, due to it being narrated and depicted almost entirely by shaitaani hypocrites, the truthful and innocent have been framed, and the guilty have been made to disappear from the scene completely.

Just as how proving the innocence of Yazîd was never the actual purpose of this book, but rather to expose how much of the common story of Karbala really conforms with what actually happened on that fateful day, so too is the case with Umar ibn Sa'd. It is not our responsibility to prove that he is to be completely absolved from all responsibility, however if we were to accuse him and brand him guilty, it would be necessary that we have valid proof to substantiate our claim. If we are unable to do so, the obvious demand of the Shariah would then be that a believer gives his fellow believer the benefit of the doubt, as per Quranic guidance, viz.

لَوْلَا إِذْ سَمِعْتُمُوهُ ظَنَّ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ وَالْمُؤْمِنَاتُ بِأَنفُسِهِمْ خَيْرًا

'Why do the believers, when they hear an accusation, not think good of their own people, i.e. other believing men and women'

In the next few lines, a little time shall be spared to describe Umar ibn Sa'd, thereby enabling the reader to view Umar ibn Sa'd, the supposed killer of Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام), from a different angle.

When one flips through the pages of history, conflicting accounts come to the fore regarding this man, some showing him to be a wretched, blood-thirsty, fame and money loving villain, prepared to even spill the blood of the grandson of Rasulullâh (ﷺ), merely to fulfil his worldly base desires, whereas in the very next few lines, being narrated from another source, one finds this very individual pushing every rock possible to avert calamity falling upon the family of Rasulullâh (ﷺ). A few examples of this shall now be presented:

- In the pages that have passed, mention had been made that when Muslim ibn Aqeel (عليه السلام) found himself abandoned by the so-called supporters of Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام) the only person that he

felt could be trusted with the responsibility of conveying his message to Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام), a message upon which rested the life of Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام) and the Ahle-Bait, was Umar ibn Sa'd. And as expected, Umar ibn Sa'd ensured that he had the entire message conveyed. (By way of reminder, a portion of what has already been mentioned shall be repeated:

'Muslim ibn Aqeel (عليه السلام) first asked Umar ibn Sa'd to pay back on his behalf the loans he had taken in Kufa, which equaled to about one thousand dirhams. The second request was that Umar ibn Sa'd request from Ibn Ziyaad that he does not mutilate his body. The third request, which was the most important, was that Umar ibn Sa'd send a message to Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام), warning him of the impending danger. The wording of the message, that Muslim ibn Aqeel (عليه السلام) asked to be conveyed to Hadhrat Husein, was as follows:

'Send a message to Husein ibn Ali (عليه السلام) informing him of my condition and the plight I have ended up in, due to the deception of those who claim to be your helpers. Inform him of how 18 000, who had pledged allegiance at my hands, have suddenly broken their allegiance! Beg him to please return to the Haram (Makkah Mukarramah or Madinah Munawwara) and to remain there, and to never allow himself to again be deceived by the people of Kufa!'

- In Iraq, the story of Umar ibn Sa'd playing the biggest role in the death of Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام), that, at one time, due to intense shaitaani propagation, was regarded as 'absolute truth'. As time passed however another version came to the fore, but very few were prepared to discard what they had always known and look at the event again in the light of new information received.

The statement of Yahya ibn Ma'een, while describing Umar ibn Sa'd, is sufficient to understand the extent of propaganda, regarding this

individual, that had, in his time already filtered throughout Iraq. His words were:

‘The people of Iraq say that the one who had killed Husein ؑ was none other than Umar ibn Sa’d. Ibrahim ibn Sa’d however would deny this and narrate a statement showing that Umar was not the killer’ (Isti’aab)

- Hafiz A’jali, in his book dealing with ‘reliable narrators’ (الثقات) described Umar ibn Sa’d thus:

“A reliable narrator, hailing from Madinah Munawwara, who narrated Ahâdith of Rasulullâh ﷺ, which he had heard from his father (Hadhrat Sa’d ibn Abi Waqqâs ؑ), and those who came after would then narrate from him.

It has been said that) he is the one who had killed Hadhrat Husein ؑ. I say, ‘He was the Amîr of the army, but played no physical part in the killing.’¹¹⁸

- Historical narrations clearly show that Umar ibn Sa’d had no desire to engage in battle with Hadhrat Husein ؑ. Rather, when Hadhrat Husein ؑ made his proposal, agreeing to one of three things (as mentioned previously), Umar ibn Sa’d happily agreed, and wrote to Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad, seeking his approval. Certain narrations even show Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad inclining to accept Hadhrat Husein ؑ’s proposal of allowing him to proceed to Yazîd, but then retracting upon being reprimanded by Shimr ibn Zil-Jaushan. Thereafter, narrations make clear mention that Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad had Shimr ibn Zil-Jaushan sent over to the battlefield to ensure that Umar ibn Sa’d engages in battle, with the order that if Umar ibn Sa’d is found reluctant, he should be

¹¹⁸ عمر بن سعد بن أبي وقاص مدني ثقة كان يروي عن أبيه أحاديث وروى الناس عنه وهو الذي قتل الحسين قلت كان أمير الجيش ولم يباشر قتله (الثقات للعجلي)

beheaded, and Shimr should take over. (A few examples of such narrations are as follows:

- In Al Bidâyah the following appears:

‘Umar ibn Sa’d delayed in launching an attack upon the caravan of Hadhrat Husein ؑ. Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad thus sent Shimr ibn Zil-Jaushan with the command that if Umar ibn Sa’d proceeds to attack, then he should allow him to do so. If he is found unwilling, he should be killed and Shimr should take his place.’¹¹⁹

- Ibn Athir has recorded the following in Usdul-Gabah:

‘Some have said that Umar ibn Sa’d had killed Hadhrat Husein ؑ, whereas this is totally incorrect. Rather, it was Sinaan ibn Anas Nakha’i who had killed him ؑ. As for the statement that Shimr and Umar ibn Sa’d had killed Hadhrat Husein ؑ, what was really meant was that Shimr was the one spurring the people on to have Hadhrat Husein ؑ killed, and Umar ibn Sa’d was the Amîr of that army, thus the act of killing had been attributed to him.’¹²⁰

- In fact, stronger narrations even show Umar ibn Sa’d being absent from the scene when the fatal attack upon Hadhrat Husein ؑ was made. Imam Bukhârî has narrated the following in his Târikh:

¹¹⁹ وبعث عبيد الله بن زياد عمر بن سعد لقتالهم فقال له الحسين يا عمر اختبرني إحدى ثلاث خصال إما أن تتركني أرجع كما جئت فان أبيت هذه فسيرني إلى يزيد فأضع يدي في يده فيحكم في ما رأى فان أبيت هذه فسيرني إلى الترك فأقاتلهم حتى أموت فأرسل إليه ابن زياد بذلك فهم أن يسيره إلى يزيد فقال شمر بن ذى الجوشن لا إلا أن ينزل على حكمك فأرسل إلى الحسين بذلك فقال الحسين والله لا أفعل وأبطأ عمر عن قتاله فأرسل ابن زياد شمر بن ذى الجوشن وقال له إن تقدم عمر فقاتل وإلا فاقتله وكن مكانه فقد وليتك الإمرة (البداية)

¹²⁰ وقيل: قتله عمر بن سعد، وليس بشيء، والصحيح أنه قتله سنان بن أنس النخعي. وأما قول من قال: قتله شمر وعمر بن سعد، لأن شمر هو الذي حرض الناس على قتله وحمل بهم إليه، وكان عمر أمير الجيش، فنسب القتل إليه (اسد الغاية)

'Muhammad ibn Miswar¹²¹ narrated from Qareen ibn Ibrahim that he heard Umar ibn Sa'd proposing to Hadhrat Husein one of three options, either that he return.....

He (i.e. Qareen) then said, 'I was with Umar ibn Sa'd when the announcement was made that Husein had been martyred.

***At that time we were taking a bath at the Euphrates river.**¹²²*

Imam Bukhâri thereafter comments that Nuh Al-Muadib¹²³ (a reliable narrator) narrated this to him, saying that Ibrahim ibn Sa'd (a most reliable narrator¹²⁴) narrated this to him.

The sanad through which the above has been narrated is indeed quite strong, yet amazingly contradicting incidents, with practically no sanad or very weak sanads, have become more well-known.

One point that indeed deserves note in the entire episode of Karbala is that if one were to look at this episode in the light of **strong narrations**, an entirely different picture of the affair shall emerge, compared to what has become common amongst the masses .

This can be seen when one investigates the role of Umar ibn Sa'd in the death of Hadhrat Husein, as well as in the incidents that followed immediately thereafter, especially with regards to Yazîd's conduct with the head of Hadhrat Husein, when it was presented to him, and his conduct with the Ahle-Bait, when they were brought in front of him. (Details of this shall Insha-Allâh soon be mentioned).

¹²¹ a reliable narrator, the grandson of Hadhrat Abdur Rahmaan ibn Auf
¹²² محمد بن مسور عن قرين بن إبراهيم سمع عمر بن سعد قال لحسين بن علي اختر إحدى ثلاث أما أن ترجع قال فأنا مع عمر نغتسل بالغرات إذ قيل قتل الحسين عليه السلام قاله نوح المؤدب (التاريخ الكبير للبخاري)
¹²³ نوح بن يزيد بن سيار المعلم ويقال المؤدب من أهل بغداد يروى عن إبراهيم بن سعيد روى عنه أبو قدامة ومحمد بن يحيى وأهل العراق (الثقات لابن حبان)
¹²⁴ إبراهيم بن سعد بن إبراهيم بن عبد الرحمن بن عوف الحافظ الإمام أبو إسحاق الزهري المدني (تذكرة الحفاظ)

- To end the discussion regarding Umar ibn Sa'd, it would be wise to ponder over a few statements and actions of Umar ibn Sa'd, during and after the calamity of Karbala, which also lends clear indication that this was not a man desirous of the blood of the grandson of Rasulullâh, but was rather an army lieutenant who found himself in a quagmire, between obedience to the rule of those appointed by the caliph and love of the Ahle-Bait.

On the one hand he could not rebel against the command coming from above, while on the other hand he understood well that if Hadhrat Husein refused to submit, he would be forced to raise the sword against him. Umar ibn Sa'd also realised that Shimr ibn Zil-Jaushan was intent on having blood spilled, thus as long as he could, he regarded it wiser to keep the reigns of leadership in his hands and comply with the command of Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad. The statements that shall follow clearly show that it was Umar ibn Sa'd's desire to somehow avert battle, and when that hope was lost, he found himself with no other option but to have Hadhrat Husein arrested, and taken to Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad.

This final point, for some reason, has always gone unnoticed, which is that just as how Umar ibn Sa'd had only arrested Muslim ibn Aqeel, without harming him, here too, had Umar ibn Sa'd been present during the fatal attack upon Hadhrat Husein, he would never have allowed that he be hurt.

As for Umar ibn Sa'd, neither was he initially eager to meet Hadhrat Husein on the battle-field, nor did he ever take pleasure thereafter in the outcome of what had occurred. Rather, from the very second that he saw the mutilated body of Hadhrat Husein, he expressed his displeasure with the outcome of the incident.

The next few sentences that shall, Insha-Allâh, elucidate the above:

- a) Initially Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام) had refused to hand himself over to Yazîd, but later, after realizing that hypocrites of Iraq had pulled him (عليه السلام) into a trap and had deserted him (عليه السلام) in his most needed hour, Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام) called Umar ibn Sa'd over, and expressed his willingness to allow himself to be taken to Yazîd. As mentioned previously, this offer was finally turned down by Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad, due to the pressure of Shimr ibn Zil-Jaushan. The point worthy of note however, is the eagerness with which Umar ibn Sa'd sent the proposal, hoping that the matter could somehow be solved and fighting avoided. The news of Ibn Ziyaad not accepting caused him great pain, which he made apparent during the battle, when asked by Hur ibn Yazîd as to how could such a proposal be refused. His reply at that moment was¹²⁵:

أما والله لو كان الامر إلى لفعلت ولكن أميرك قد أبى ذلك

"By Allâh, had I been in charge, I would have surely accepted. Rather it is your Amîr that does not want to accept!"

- b) As mentioned previously, Umar ibn Sa'd, despite being present when the initial attack was launched, was absent when the fatal attack upon Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام) took place. Had he been present, he would have insisted that Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام) be arrested and would never have allowed him (عليه السلام) being murdered. During his absence the hypocrites who were there to ensure that Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام) be killed, took advantage of the situation. First they martyred Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام) and looted most of his and his family's possessions. They then proceeded to the bed upon

¹²⁵ ثم إن الحر بن يزيد لما زحف عمر بن سعد قال له أصلحك الله مقاتل أنت هذا الرجل قال إى والله قتالا أيسره أن تسقط الرأس وتطيح الأيدي قال أفما لكم في واحدة من الخصال التي عرض عليكم رضي قال عمر بن سعد أما والله لو كان الامر إلى لفعلت ولكن أميرك قد أبى ذلك (تاريخ الطبري)

which lay Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام)'s twenty-three year old¹²⁶, ill son, Ali ibn Husein (عليه السلام), known famously as Zainul-Aabideen.

Humeid ibn Muslim tried his best to keep them away from Zainul-Aabideen, but it was only upon the arrival of Umar ibn Sa'd that they dispersed. Describing this, Tabari narrates from Humeid ibn Muslim the following¹²⁷:

"I (Humeid ibn Muslim) reached the tent in which Ali ibn Husein (عليه السلام) was lying ill. I heard Shimr ibn Zil-Jaushan saying to his men, 'Why have we not as yet killed this one?' I exclaimed, SubhanAllâh! Do you wish to kill a child? I continued pushing them back until Umar ibn Sa'd arrived. Seeing the situation, he immediately ordered that none should enter the tent in which the women were present and that the ill youngster be left alone. He also ordered that all the looted possessions be returned, but nothing was brought back.

Ali ibn Husein (عليه السلام) at that time thanked Umar ibn Sa'd, saying, May you be rewarded, for verily your words have saved us from great danger!'

What becomes clear from the above narration is that Shimr ibn Zil-Jaushan and his band of thugs were not merely fighting to suppress a possible uprising, but were rather carrying out a satanic attack upon the innocent family members of Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام). Their motive and mission was to ensure that none of the male members of the Ahle-Bait remain alive, even if they posed no possible threat to the government.

¹²⁶ وَأَخِيرًا مُصْعَبٌ ؛ قَالَ : كَانَ عَلِيٌّ بْنِ الْحُسَيْنِ مَعَ أَبِيهِ يَوْمَ قُتِلَ وَهُوَ ابْنُ ثَلَاثٍ وَعِشْرِينَ سَنَةً ، فَلَمَّا قُتِلَ الْحُسَيْنُ ؛ قَالَ عُمرُ بْنُ سَعْدٍ : لَا تَعْرِضُوا لِهَذَا الْمَرِيضِ ، وَكَانَ عَلِيٌّ بْنُ الْحُسَيْنِ مَرِيضًا ، وَمَاتَ عَلِيٌّ بْنُ حُسَيْنٍ وَهُوَ ابْنُ ثَمَانٍ وَخَمْسِينَ سَنَةً ، (تاريخ ابن أبي خيثمة)

¹²⁷ عن حميد بن مسلم، قال، انتهيت إلى علي بن الحسين بن علي الأصغر وهو منبسط على فراش له، وهو مريض، وإذا شمر بن ذي الجوشن في رجالة معه يقولون: ألا نقتل هذا؟ قال: فقلت: سبحان الله! أنقتل الصبيان! إنما هو صبي؛ قال: فما زال ذلك دأبي أدفع عنه كل من جاء حتى جاء عمر بن سعد، فقال: ألا لا يدخلن بيت هؤلاء النسوة أحد، ولا يعرضن لهذا الغلام المريض، ومن أخذ من متاعهم شيئاً فليرده عليهم. قال: فوالله ما رد أحد شيئاً؛ قال: فقال علي بن الحسين: جزيت من رجل خيراً! فوالله لقد دفع الله عني بمقاتلتك شراً (تاريخ الطبري)

As for Umar ibn Sa'd, from the very beginning he was desirous of averting the need for battle and when it unfortunately did occur, at that time too his desire was merely to have the noble members of the Ahle-Bait brought under arrest. Having them slain was far from what he ever imagined was going to occur. Thus, as soon as he reached the tent of Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام) he expressed lament over what he saw and he ordered that all attacks stop immediately. Certain narrations make mention that he even had a force loyal to him appointed to guard the living inhabitants of the tent, and protect them from any further attack.¹²⁸

- c) From this very same Humeid ibn Muslim, who kept the forces of Shimr back until the arrival of Umar ibn Sa'd, it has been narrated that after the battle he approached Umar ibn Sa'd, who was a close friend of his and asked regarding his well-being. Umar ibn Sa'd replied,

¹²⁸ The unfortunate aspect of this narration is that Tabari had only recorded this narration from Abu Mikhnaaf, the shia famous for polluting narrations with his poisonous short additions. Here too Abu Mikhnaaf ensured that before ending the narration some sort of poison be added, due to which one shall find in the next few lines of this narration a completely different Umar ibn Sa'd, as compared to the one described in the lines just before. To end the narration and ensure that no sympathy is shown to Umar ibn Sa'd, Abu Mikhnaaf concludes the narration by saying that after leaving the tent, he had it surrounded by his loyal men, to ensure no further attack. Umar ibn Sa'd then summoned his horsemen and ordered that they first trample the blessed body of Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام) before severing his head. (May Allah protect all from such inhumane acts) After what has been described of Umar ibn Sa'd, it seems quite far-fetched that he could ever stoop to such a level, and merely trusting upon the words of a renowned shia liar, i.e. Abu Mikhnaaf, to blindly accept this as true and have Umar ibn Sa'd labelled as a demon in human disguise is indeed far from the demands of justice! And Almighty Allah alone knows best and He alone guides towards that which is correct.

“Do not ask regarding me, for verily none could ever return home with such a calamity, as that with which I am returning with. I have cut extremely close ties and have taken part in a major calamity!”¹²⁹

- d) In the Târikh of Ibn Asaakir¹³⁰, the following has been narrated from Abu Mikhnaaf, whose narrations as a general rule shall always include some sort of allegation and poisonous attack against the Ahle-Sunnah. Those narrations of his without any such slander and accusations could perhaps be considered, but to be fair, it would be appropriate that none of his narrations be used to prove any point. The narrations mentioned above and below are thus being mentioned merely as a conclusion to what has already been proven and not as a proof itself.

Abu Mikhnaaf narrates from Mujaalid ibn Saeed and Saq'ab ibn Zuheir that Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام) and Umar ibn Sa'd met three or four times to discuss their matter. Umar ibn Sa'd thereafter wrote to Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad, 'Verily Almighty Allâh has extinguished the flames of in-fighting and has brought about unity. Husein (عليه السلام) has agreed to return from where he has come, or to proceed to the borders of the Islâmic state and join the Muslim forces protecting the Islâmic borders, or to proceed to Yazîd and pledge allegiance at his hands and let Yazîd decide

¹²⁹ وروي عن حميد بن مسلم قال: كان عمر بن سعد لي صديقاً، فأتيته عند منصرفه من قتال الحسين، فسألته عن حاله، فقال:

(لا تسأل عن حالي، فإنه ما رجع غائب إلى منزله بشر مما رجعت به، قطعت القرابة القريبة، وارتكبت الأمر العظيم

¹³⁰ قال أبو مخنف حدثني المجالد بن سعيد الهمداني والصقعب بن زهير أنهما التقيا مرارا ثلاثا أو أربعاً حسين وعمر بن سعد قال فكتب عمر بن سعد إلى عبيدالله بن زياد أما بعد فإن الله قد أطفا النائرة وجمع الكلمة وأصلح أمر الأمة فهذا حسين قد أعطاني أن يرجع إلى المكان الذي منه أتى أو أن نسيره إلى ثغر من الثغور فيكون رجلاً من المسلمين له ما لهم وعليه ما عليهم أو أن يأتي أمير المؤمنين يزيد فيضع يده في يده فيرى فيما بينه وبينه رأيته وفي هذا لكم رضى ولأمة صلاح قال فلما قرأ عبيدالله الكتاب قال هذا كتاب ناصح لأمره مشفق على قومه نعم قد قبلت قال فقام إليه شمر بن ذي الجوشن فقال أتقبل هذا منه وقد نزل بأرضك وإلى جيبك والله لمن رجل من بلادك ولم يضع يده في يدك ليكون أولى بالقوة والعز ولتكون أولى بالضعف والعجز فلا تعطه هذه المنزلة فإنها من الوهن ولكن لينزل على حمكك هو وأصحابه فإن عاقبت فانة ولي العقوبة وإن غفرت كان ذلك لك والله لقد بلغني أن حسيناً وعمر بن سعد يجلسان بين العسكرين فيتحدثان عامة الليل فقال له ابن زياد نعم ما رأيت الرأي رأيك (تاريخ دمشق)

regarding him. In this there is great goodness for the Ummah and it is exactly what you want.

When Ibn Ziyaad read the letter, he said, 'This is a letter, containing good advices for the Amîr. Indeed I have accepted his request! Hearing this, Shimr ibn Zil-Jaushan stood up and said, 'Are you going to accept this? By Allâh, if he does manage to escape from this land, without first pledging allegiance at your hands, his strength shall surely increase and yours shall decrease. Accepting his request is a sign of weakness from you. Rather, order that he submit to your decision. Thereafter, if you choose to punish him, so indeed he is deserving of punishment. And if you choose to forgive, then that is in your hands. By Allâh, I have received news that Husein and Umar ibn Sa'd have spent a great amount of time together, discussing their plans! Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad acceded to Shimr's advice and said, 'Your opinion is indeed worthy of acceptance!'

Summary of the discussion regarding Umar ibn Sa'd

In the above discourse regarding the credibility of Umar ibn Sa'd, many lessons can be learnt, especially with regards to how quick man is to pass judgement upon individuals, based merely upon oft-repeated narrations and tales, yet when the narrations are dissected, many a time a completely different version of events emerge, which reveals the flaws of the judgement and leave the 'self appointed judge' hiding his head in shame. This lesson however, only he shall learn who has been blessed with the bounty of 'justice' and has been saved from the sickness of 'prejudice' and 'emotional judgements'.

From the narrations of Umar ibn Sa'd, in which mention was made of Hadhrat Husein's willingness to pledge allegiance to Yazîd, a great deal can be learnt regarding how Hadhrat Husein viewed his cousin, Yazîd. Had Yazîd really been the drunkard, transgressor, renegade, etc,

as depicted in shia-influenced narrations, Hadhrat Husein would have never agreed to pledge allegiance!

Thereafter, when one accepts that Hadhrat Husein had no personal grudge against Yazîd, the question shall resurface as to why then did Hadhrat Husein proceed to Iraq. If one now finds himself unable to provide a satisfactory answer to this question, it would then only be fair that the answer provided in this booklet be considered, which is that this fight was based solely upon an *Ijtihâd Ikhtilaafi* issue (difference in reasoning, with both views based upon Islâmic principles).

Hadhrat Husein felt the need to bring the caliphate back to the family of the Banu Hashim and having not as yet pledged allegiance to Yazîd, he was fully entitled to fight for this. He was not on a mission to remove any tyrant, drunkard, etc, but rather his journey was to find an army ready to support him in his mission, an army who had not as yet pledged allegiance to the new government. Based upon the false letters of the hypocrites of Iraq, in which promises were made that such an army was eagerly awaiting his arrival in Iraq, Hadhrat Husein set out in that direction. When he finally realised that the letters were false and that the promises were lies, he now felt it best to abandon his quest to take back the caliphate and to enter into allegiance with the new government, as his other friends of Hijaaz had done. Unfortunately, the hypocrites of Iraq had at this stage reached too far in their plans, and were easily able to ensure that Hadhrat Husein never reaches Yazîd.

As for Yazîd, due to the great distance between Shâm and Iraq, his *Ijtihâd* would obviously be based upon the reports he would be receiving from men who held senior posts in his cabinet. When even a man like Hadhrat Ali failed to recognise the scores of hypocrites amongst his army, except until they exposed themselves under the banner of the 'Khawârij', how then could one blame Yazîd for not being

able to differentiate between true and false reports, especially when it concerned matters occurring thousands of miles away?

Many statements, expressions and actions of Yazîd, before and after the incident of Karbala, lend clear indication that his war with Hadhrat Huseinؑ had nothing to do with enmity, but rather was an Ijtihâdi error, due to it being based upon news received from hypocrite quarters.

The battle of Karbala and its aftermath

As with most of the issues regarding the lead-up to Karbala, where nothing definite can be deduced, due to the vast collection of lies and exaggeration that has always surrounded it, so too is the issue with the battle itself. Prior to the battle and on the day of the fatal battle itself, many sermons were delivered, many discussions were held, and many statements were made, which had they been recorded in an authentic manner, would have shed much more light on who really was responsible for the massacre of Karbala, and what was the true motive behind it. Unfortunately, Divine Wisdom did not allow that to happen, and shaitani forces were allowed to write their own version of history regarding this great calamity. Despite this, historians did still manage to gather statements and narrations showing an entire different chain of events, but as mentioned previously, these narrations have always been kept hidden, as though they never existed.

It is not my intention to prove that only these narrations be accepted which portray the event of Karbala different to what is normally known. Rather, the purpose of drawing light to these narrations is merely to show that when contradictory statements in every issue of Karbala can be found, what then shall the basis of accepting and rejecting be? Why is it that whatever shows Yazîd guilty and evil, only those narrations are considered and narrations showing the opposite are immediately rejected, without any bother of even viewing its chain of narrators?

What really happened? The battle itself.....

Sad and emotional scenes have always been painted of the fateful battle of Karbala, which ended in the martyrdom of Hadhrat Huseinؑ and hisؑ entire caravan of men. Besides the women in the tents, Hadhrat Zainul-Aabideenؑ and one slave, no other member of the caravan of Hadhrat Huseinؑ survived. From these, perhaps only the slave was present on the battle-field the day Hadhrat Huseinؑ was martyred.

Yet, when one reads about the battle, expecting that very little be known regarding it, due to the absence of survivors, one amazingly finds the reporting of the incident explicit to the finer detail. Was it the lone slave that was able to freely move around the battle-field and record the different scenes that occurred on that fateful day, or was there perhaps some other force working in drawing up a tearful, sorrowful picture of blood, oppression and torment?

It is obvious that when none, except one slave, from the caravan of Hadhrat Huseinؑ lived to recount the events of the 10th of Muharram, the only source that could have been narrating it would either be the very men who had come out to fight against Hadhrat Huseinؑ, or people who had never witnessed the battle. Whatever the case may be, such narrators can never be gauged as reliable, due to them either not being first-hand witnesses, and if they were, then due to the doubt that falls upon their integrity, in that after having themselves taken part in the slaying of Hadhrat Huseinؑ and his caravan, what suddenly made them repent?

When they could not be trusted before the battle, what then transformed them now into reliable, trustworthy narrators? Also, when one takes part in a battle, one endeavours to conceal the errors of his

party. Here however we find the fighters describing their own acts of aggression and violence. Why? **Unless their desire was naught, but to bring the anger of the entire Ummah against the Caliphate of the Umayyads.**

In the court of Yazîd

Scenes of the wives and daughters of Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام) being dragged, without any consideration for their modesty, across the vast plains of Iraq, until arriving finally at Yazîd's palace in Shâm; then being presented in a shameless manner in front of the caliph and then having to witness Yazîd, boldly and mockingly scratch the noble, blessed face of Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام), etc; have become entrenched in the minds of many.

Had one to hear that the possibility of these incidents not having occurred at all not only exists, but rather seems most probable, many shall turn on the defensive and oppose it immediately. It is only the share of a few who shall afford themselves time to investigate the matter and allow themselves the opportunity to view all angles justly.

If you are one such person, then the following narrations shall surely be sufficient to make you understand that many issues regarding Karbala have never been thoroughly investigated, whilst numerous statements of unknown or unreliable narrators have been treated as though they are 'authentic', without any question and need for further verification.

What happened when the news of the outcome of Karbala reached Yazîd?

The following narrations may help in answering that question...

- a) Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad wrote to Yazîd ibn Muawiyah, informing him of what had occurred and seeking his counsel with regards

to the children of Husein (عليه السلام) and the women of his (عليه السلام) caravan. When the news reached Yazîd, he cried and said,

'O people of Iraq! I would have been more than pleased with your submitting to my rule, without the need to have Husein killed! This then is the result of rebelling and disobedience!

May Allâh curse Ibn Marjaana (i.e. Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad)! Just because Husein was not his close family (he found no need to show mercy!) By Allâh! Had I been there, I would have surely pardoned Husein. May Allâh show mercy to Husein!¹³¹

- b) Yazîd thereafter sent a reply to Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad¹³², ordering that the captives be sent to him. Zakwaan Abu Khalid had ten thousand dirhams given to them, (i.e. the family of Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام)), **with which they could prepare for the journey.**

- c) The following has been narrated from a man of the tribe of Himyar, Ghaaz ibn Rabeiah Jurashi¹³³:

^{١٣١} كتب عبيد الله بن زياد إلى يزيد بن معاوية يخبره بما حدث ويستشير في شأن أبناء الحسين ونسائه فلما بلغ الخبر يزيد بن معاوية بكى وقال: " كنت أرضى من طاعتكم . أي أهل العراق . بدون قتل الحسين، كذلك عاقبة البغي والعقوق لعن الله ابن مرجانة لقد وجده بعيد الرحم منه، أما والله لو أني صاحبه لعفوت عنه فرحم الله الحسين وفي رواية أنه قال: ... أما والله لو كنت صاحبه، ثم لم أقدر على دفع القتل عنه إلا ببعض عمري لأحببت أن أدفعه عنه (الدولة الاموية)

^{١٣٢} فجاء رد يزيد على ابن زياد يأمره بإرسال الأسارى إليه، ويادر ذكوان أبو خالد فأعطاهم عشرة آلاف درهم فجهزوا بها، ومن هنا يعلم أن ابن زياد لم يحمل آل الحسين بشكل مؤلم أو أنه حملهم مغللين، كما ورد في بعض الروايات، وقد مر معنا كيف أن ابن زياد قد أمر للأسارى بمنزل منعزل وأجرى عليهم الرزق والنفقة وكساهم. (الدولة الاموية)

^{١٣٣} قال هشام فحدثني عبد الله بن يزيد بن روح بن زيناك الجذامي عن أبيه عن الغاز بن ربيعة الجرشى من حمير قال والله إنني لعند يزيد بن معاوية بدمشق إذ أقبل زحر بن قيس فدخل على يزيد فقال له يزيد ويحك ما وراءك فقال أبشر يا أمير المؤمنين بفتح الله عليك ونصره ورد علينا الحسين بن علي بن أبي طالب وثمانية عشر من أهل بيته وستون رجلا من شيعته فسرنا إليهم فسألناهم أن يستسلموا وينزلوا على حكم الأمير عبيد الله بن زياد أو القتال فاختراروا القتال فغدونا إليهم مع شروق الشمس فأحطنا بهم من كل ناحية حتى أخذت السيوف مأخذها من هام القوم فجعلوا يهربون إلى غير مهرب ولا وزر ويلوذون منا بالأكام والحفر لئلا كما لاذ الحمام من صقر فوالله ما كانوا إلا حزر جزر أو نومة قاتل حتى أتينا على آخرهم فهاتيك أجسادهم مجردة وثيابهم مزملة وخدودهم معفرة تصهرهم الشمس وتسفى عليهم الريح زوارهم العقبان والرخم قال فدمعت عينا يزيد بن معاوية وقال كنت أرضى

By Allâh, I was in Damascus with Yazîd ibn Muâwiyah when Zuhri ibn Qais¹³⁴ arrived. Yazîd questioned him with regards to what had happened at Karbala. He replied, 'Glad tidings, O Leader of the faithful! Allâh has aided you and blessed you with victory. Husein ibn Ali came upon us with seventeen of his family members and seventy of his devout followers. We asked them to surrender to the decision of the Amîr, Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad, or else to be prepared to fight. They chose to fight.

Just as the sun was rising, we attacked them from all sides and our swords had its full share in severing the necks of many of them. They then tried to flee, but in vain. In a very short space of time, the battle came to an end, with their bodies burning under the scorching sun, with winds blowing across and vultures pecking at their bodies.'

As the eyes of Yazîd swelled with tears, he said, 'I would have been pleased with your submitting (o people of Iraq) without the need to have Husein ibn Ali killed. May Allâh curse Ibn Sumayya (Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad)! By Allâh, had I been there, I would surely have forgiven Husein! May Almighty Allâh shower His mercies upon Husein.'

من طاعتكم بدون قتل الحسين لعن الله ابن سمية أما والله لو أني صاحبه لعفوت عنه ورحم الله الحسين ولم يصل الذي جاء برأسه بشيء ولما وضع رأس الحسين بين يدي يزيد قال أما والله لو أني صاحبه ما قتلته ثم أنشد قول الحسين بن الحمام المرمى الشاعر ... يفلقن هاما من رجال أعزة ... علينا وهم كانوا أعق وأظلم (البداية)

¹³⁴ Historians have generally given the name of the man who came with the head of Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام) as Zuhri ibn Qais Al-Ju'fi. Ibnul-Adeem has expressed his reservations about whether this too is authentic, since Zuhri ibn Qais Al-Ju'fi was a man very close to Hadhrat Ali (عليه السلام) and Hadhrat Hasan (عليه السلام), and was regarded as a noble man of his tribe. For such a man to bring the blessed head of Husein (عليه السلام) in the manner described above, and to say what has been quoted above, indeed seems quite far-fetched. Either another man having the same name had brought it, which made historians mistakenly assume that it was this very Zuhri Al-Ju'fi, or perhaps, as with many aspects of Karbala, the inclusion of this 'name' is also a false allegation against a noble man. And Almighty Allah knows best.

Yazîd gave no reward to the man who brought the head of Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام) to him. When the head was placed in front of Yazîd, Yazîd remarked, **'By Allâh! Had I been there, I would never have killed you!'**

Yazîd thereafter recited the following from the poetry of Husein ibn Hammaan:

يفلقن هاما من رجال أعزة ... علينا وهم كانوا أعق وأظلم

'He severs the heads of men, **who are indeed most beloved to us** merely due to their disobedience and unjust attitude with us'

d) Allâmah Haithami narrated, with a sound chain of narrators, from the great jurist of Islâm, Hadhrat Laith ibn Sa'd, regarding what transpired when the blessed head of Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام) was brought in front of Yazîd. This narration depicts a totally different picture to what is normally narrated and deserves to be placed at the top of the list of the narrations dealing with this aspect of history.

The unique feature of this narration is that it has been narrated with a sound and strong chain of narrators, right up to Hadhrat Laith ibn Sa'd, which is something quite rare, when it comes to historical narrations. Tabrani has narrated this incident from Abu Zanbaa', who narrates from Yahya ibn Bukeir, who narrates from Laith ibn Sa'd, Both Abu Zanbaa' and Yahya have been declared reliable.

As for Laith ibn Sa'd, his status amongst the illustrious scholars of Islâm is well known. Regarding him, Imâm Shafee' said, 'Laith was a greater jurist than even Imâm Mâlik, except that his students did not preserve his teachings.' Imâm Ahmed ibn Hanbal said regarding Laith, 'I had

seen many, but never had I seen a man like Laith ibn Sa'd!¹³⁵ Hafiz Zhahabi has described Laith ibn Sa'd with the following words:

¹³⁶*Laith ibn Sa'd, the Imâm, Hafiz of Ahâdith, Sheikh of Egypt and its leader'*

Laith ibn Sa'd was born about thirty years after the martyrdom of Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام), thus the narration which shall now be mentioned was obviously not what he had himself witnessed, but rather what he would be narrating from one of his seniors. Narrators like Laith ibn Sa'd would only leave out mentioning the name of the one they had heard from when they were sure of his narration being reliable. If not, they would clearly make mention of his name, so that the responsibility to prove the authenticity of their narration does not rest upon their shoulders.

The narration of Laith ibn Sa'd follows¹³⁷:

'Husein ibn Ali (عليه السلام) refused to be taken captive and fell as a martyr, fighting against the forces of Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad. He and his companions were martyred at a place called 'Tuff'.

¹³⁵ نقل أبو حاتم بن حبان، عن الشافعي، رضي الله عنه، أنه قال: كان الليث بن سعد أفقه من مالك، إلا أنه ضيعه أصحابه . و قال أحمد: رأيت من رأيت، فلم أر مثل الليث (تهذيب الأسماء واللغات للعلامة أبي زكريا محيي الدين بن شرف النووي)

¹³⁶ الليث بن سعد الإمام الحافظ شيخ الديار المصرية وعالمها ورئيسها (تذكرة الحفاظ)

¹³⁷ حدثنا أبو الزباع روح بن الفرج المصري ثنا يحيى بن بكير حدثني الليث قال - يعني ابن سعد - قال : أبى الحسين بن علي أن يستأسر فقاتلوه وقتلوه وقلوبنا بنيه وأصحابه الذين قاتلوا معه بمكان يقال له : الطف وانطلق يعلى بن حسين وفاطمة بنت حسين وسكينة بنت حسين إلى عبيد الله بن زياد وعلي يومئذ غلام قد بلغ فبعث بهم إلى يزيد بن معاوية فأمر بسكينة فجعلها خلف سريره لئلا ترى رأس أبيها وذوي قرابتها وعلي بن حسين في غل فوضع رأسه فضرب على ثنيتي الحسين فقال : نفلق هاما من رجال أحية . . إلينا وهم كانوا أعق وأظلما فقال علي بن حسين : { ما أصاب من مصيبة في الأرض ولا في أنفسكم إلا في كتاب من قبل أن نبرأها إن ذلك على الله يسير } . ففعل علي يزيد أن يتمثل ببيت شعر وتلا علي ابن الحسين آية من كتاب الله عز و جل . فقال يزيد : بل بما كسبت أيديكم ويعفو عن كثير . فقال علي : أما والله لو رآنا رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم مغلولين لأحب أن يخلينا من الغل . فقال : صدقت فخلوهم من الغل . فقال : ولو وقفنا بين يدي رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم على بعد لأحب أن يقرنا . قال : صدقت فقربوهم . فجعلت فاطمة وسكينة يبطولان لتريا رأس أبيهما وجعل يزيد يتناول في مجلسه ليستر رأس الحسين ثم أمر بهم فجهزوا وأصلح إليهم وأخرجوا إلى المدينة (رواه الطبراني رجاله ثقات) مجمع الزوائد

Ali ibn Husein, Fatimah bint Husein and Sukeinah bint Husein were taken as captives and presented in front of Ibn Ziyaad.

Ali ibn Husein had just turned mature. From there they were sent to Yazîd ibn Muâwiyah, who ordered that Sukeinah be placed at the back, attempting thereby to prevent her eyes falling upon the sight of the blessed head of her father, Husein (عليه السلام), as well as upon her male family members, especially Ali ibn Husein (عليه السلام), who were in chains.

(Note: This last sentence, if correct, makes clear indication that chains were placed upon the surviving men of the caravan of Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام), and not upon the women. End Note)

When the head was placed in front of Yazîd, he tapped at the teeth of Husein (عليه السلام) and recited the following couplets:

'We sever the heads of men, who are indeed most beloved to us merely due to their disobedience and unjust attitude with us'

Hearing this, Ali ibn Husein (عليه السلام) spoke out, reciting the verse:

ما أصاب من مصيبة في الأرض ولا في أنفسكم إلا في كتاب من قبل أن نبرأها
إن ذلك على الله يسير

*'Whatever afflicts one, either in the lands or within one himself, it has all been recorded and pre-destined.
Verily that for Almighty Allâh is most easy!*

Yazîd felt a pinch that after using poetry to describe the situation, a young lad had answered him with a verse of the Noble Quraan. Yazîd thus also read a verse:

(بل) بما كسبت أيديكم ويعفو عن كثير

'(Rather, this is) due to what your hands have earned, and indeed Almighty Allâh forgives plenty!

Ali ibn Husein (عليه السلام) then said, "Listen, had Rasulullâh (صلى الله عليه وسلم) seen us in this condition, he would surely have desired that our chains be removed!

Yazîd replied, "You are correct", and ordered that their chains be immediately taken off. Ali ibn Huseinؑ continued, "By Allâh, had we been standing in front of Rasulullâhﷺ at such a distance, he would surely have desired that we be brought closer. Yazîd again accepted and ordered that they be brought forward.

Fatima and Sukeinah then began raising their necks, to have a closer look at the blessed head of their illustrious father. Noticing this, Yazîd attempted stretching out his body, in order to somehow obscure their view. Yazîd then gave orders that preparations be made for their journey home. **Yazîd himself saw to all their needs and affairs until finally they left for Madinah Munawwara.** (Majmauz-Zawaa'id)

- e) Yaafi'ee has quoted from Hafiz Abul-Alaa Hamdani that when the blessed head of Hadhrat Huseinؑ was brought to Yazîd, he sent a message to Madinah Munawwara, summoning the freed slaves of the Banu Hashim. When they arrived, he joined with them many of the freed slaves of Abu Sufyaan. Under their guard the blessed head of Husein Radhiyallahu Anhu and his surviving family members were sent. **Yazîd made every possible arrangement to make the journey comfortable and ordered that their every need in Madinah Munawwara be fulfilled.** (Miraatul Jinaan)¹³⁸

¹³⁸ واختلف الناس أين حمل الرأس المكرم من البلاد وأين دفن، فذكر الحافظ أبو العلاء الهمداني أن يزيد حين قدم عليه رأس الحسين بعث إلى المدينة فأقدم عليه عدة من موالي بني هاشم، وضم إليهم عدة من موالي أبي سفيان، ثم بعث ينتقل رأس الحسين ومن بقي من أهله، وجهزهم بكل شيء ولم يدع لهم حاجة إلا أمر لهم بها، وبعث برأس الحسين إلى عمرو بن سعيد بن العاص وهو إذ ذاك عامله على المدينة، فقال عمرو: وددت أنه لم يبعث به إلي ثم أمر عمرو بن سعيد برأس الحسين وضوان الله عليه فكفن ودفن في البقيع عند قبر أمه فاطمة رضي الله عنها. قال: هذا أصح ما قيل فيه (مرآة الجنان وعبرة اليقظان)

- f) Allâmah Zarkali, in his monumental work, 'Al A'laam, while discussing the life of Hadhrat Huseinؑ's daughter, Fatimah, has quoted the following incident¹³⁹:

'When her father (Hadhrat Huseinؑ) was martyred, she was taken to Shâm, together with her sister, Sukeinah, and her two aunts, Umme Kulthum bint Ali and Zainab bint Aqeel. When they stood in front of Yazîd, she (Fatimah) said,

'O Yazîd, are the daughters of Rasulullâhﷺ going to be treated as captives?' Yazîd immediately replied, 'Rather, they are free and noble! Enter upon your cousins (i.e. the women of the household of Yazîd).

Fatima said,

'I entered upon the woman of the house of Yazîd, and did not find a single one of them, except that she was mourning the death of Hadhrat Huseinؑ.

Discussing the issue of Yazîd, Allâmah ibn Taimiyyah wrote¹⁴⁰:

'As for what some have mentioned, that the women of the caravan of Hadhrat Huseinؑ were made captive, and taken around the towns disgracefully, upon camels with no saddles, these narrations are nothing but clear-cut lies and fabrications. By the grace of Almighty Allâh, the Muslim Ummah has never taken a Hashimi woman as a captive, nor have they ever taken one as a slave. It is the ignorant and those drowned in their base desires that have spoken many lies in this regard!'

At another juncture, Ibn Taimiyyah wrote¹⁴¹:

¹³⁹ ولما قتل أبوها حملت إلى الشام مع أختها سكينه، وعمتها أم كلثوم بنت علي، وزينب العقبيلة، فأدخلن على يزيد، فقالت: يا يزيد أبنات رسول الله سبائا؟ قال: بل حرائر كرام، أدخلني على بنات عمك، فدخلت على أهل بيته، فما وجدت فيهن "سفيانية" إلا نادية تبكي (الاعلام للزركلي)

¹⁴⁰ وأما ما ذكره من سبي نسائه والدوران بهن على البلدان وحملهن على الجمال بغير أقتاب، فهذا كذب، وباطل وماسى المسلمون. والله الحمد. هاشمية قط، ولا استحلحت أمة محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم هاشمية قط، ولكن أهل الهوى والجهل يكذبون كثيراً. (منهاج السنة النبوية)

‘Yazîd ibn Muawiyah, in accordance to what all have narrated, never gave the order that Husein (عليه السلام) be killed. All that he did was that he wrote to Ibn Ziyaad ordering that he prevent Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام) from taking over Iraq.

Husein (عليه السلام) felt that the people of Iraq would support him (عليه السلام) and would fulfil the promises they had made in the letters they had sent to him (عليه السلام). He (عليه السلام) thus sent his cousin, Muslim ibn Aqeel to them, but when they had Muslim ibn Aqeel killed and pledged their allegiance to Ibn Ziyaad, Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام) decided to return to Madinah Munawwara.

Unfortunately, an oppressive army of Ibn Ziyaad caught up with him. Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام) requested that he (عليه السلام) be allowed to proceed to Yazîd, or to any of the borders of the Islâmic state, or to return to Medina Munawwara, but the army refused and demanded that he hand himself over to be arrested. Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام) refused and in the fighting that followed attained martyrdom.

When the news of the killing of Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام) reached Yazîd, he expressed great remorse over it and his entire household went into mourning. Yazîd never took any of the women of the caravan of Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام) as captive, rather he honoured them and rewarded them with gifts until they returned home.

The narrations, which appear in the books of the Shia, which show that the women of the Ahle-Bait were disgraced and taken to Shâm as

^{١٤١} إن يزيد لم يأمر بقتل الحسين باتفاق أهل النقل ، ولكن كتب إلى ابن زياد أن يمنعه عن ولاية العراق . والحسين - رضي الله عنه - كان يظن أن أهل العراق ينصرونه ويقفون له بما كتبوا إليه ، فأرسل إليهم ابن عمه مسلم بن عقيل ، فلما قتلوا مسلماً وغدروا به وبايعوا ابن زياد ، أراد الرجوع فأدركته السرية الظالمة ، فطلب أن يذهب إلى يزيد، أو يذهب إلى الثغر، أو يرجع إلى بلده ، فلم يمتكنه من شيء من ذلك حتى يستأسر لهم ، فامتنع ، فقاتلوه حتى قُتل مظلوماً - رضي الله عنه - ، ولما بلغ ذلك يزيد أظهر التوجع على ذلك ، وظهر البكاء في داره ، ولم يسب له حريماً أصلاً ، بل أكرم أهل بيته ، وأجازهم حتى ردهم إلى بلدهم (منهاج السنة النبوية)

captive and disgraced, are nothing but lies and fabrications. In fact, the Banu Ummayyah would show great respect to the Banu Hashim.

Imam Ghazali, in explaining why cursing Yazîd should not be deemed permissible, made mention of this very point, i.e. since it has never been established that Yazîd gave the command for Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام) to be killed, it is not correct to accuse him of the deed. Imam Ghazali writes¹⁴²:

‘If one were to ask, ‘Is it permissible to curse Yazîd, since he was the killer of Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام) or at least he was the one who gave the order that he (عليه السلام) be killed?’ Our reply shall be, ‘This has never been proven! Forget cursing him, just to say that Yazîd killed Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام) or issued the order for him (عليه السلام) to be killed, that too shall not be permissible, since, without proof, to attribute a major sin to a Muslim is not permissible!’

The aftermath of Karbala and the Battle of Harrah

Justice to the incident of Karbala can only be done if one looks at it from ten years before the incident and ten years after. This rule in fact applies to all political events. If one studies an event only by looking at the few days during which it occurred, in all probability, one shall accuse a party that has been framed. To find the truth, one needs to search in the past, to see which parties were deeply active in preparing the scene for what has just occurred and then one has to patiently wait until the future shows which party benefitted the most from what occurred. In the incident of Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام) and Yazîd, the past and the future clearly indicate towards the existence of evil forces operating from Iraq, manipulating scenes and instigating one group of sincere men against another.

^{١٤٢} فإن قيل هل يجوز لعن يزيد لأنه قاتل الحسين أو أمر به ؟ قلنا : هذا لم يثبت أصلاً فلا يجوز أن يقال إنه قتله أو أمر به ما لم يثبت ، فضلاً عن اللعنة ، لأنه لا تجوز نسبة مسلم إلى كبيرة من غير تحقيق (احياء العلوم - بيان عظيم خطر اللسان)

When the battle of Karbala ended, many felt that this sad episode in history had now terminated, whereas in reality it was only beginning. The blood of Hadhrat Huseinؑ was spilt, so that it could be used as bait to be dangled in front of the Muslim world, forcing them to once again draw the swords of infighting, which Hadhrat Muawiyahؑ had just managed to sheath.

Before the incident of Karbala, the majority of the inhabitants of Makkah Mukarramah and Madinah Munawwara had accepted Yazîd as their ruler, thus very few joined Hadhrat Huseinؑ when heؑ left for Iraq. The attitude of the people of Hijaaz however changed after hearing exaggerated stories of what had transpired on the plains of Karbala, from shaitaani hypocrites who were streaming in from all sides, each with a story more dreadful than the one that preceded it.

Just as the shaitaani forces had desired, the fire of infighting had now been rekindled and talks of rebelling against the caliph could be heard from all corners. When Yazîd received the news, in accordance with what any leader would do, he too ordered that an army be sent out immediately to suppress the rebellion.

In the battles that occurred thereafter, many illustrious figures lost their lives, and shaitaani forces, after having painted the scenes of these battles in the ugliest of ways, could now spread out into the Muslim lands fully armed with the propaganda required to make the Muslim world rebel against the Umayyad Caliphate. After the painted images of Yazîd's cruelty at Karbala, followed by the massacres he had caused in Makkah Mukarramah and Madinah Munawwara, there was now no way anyone could stand in support of Yazîd. The time was now ripe for shaitaani forces to cry for revenge and go out in full force to tear the caliphate to the ground.

To spearhead this shaitaani movement, the devil that Rasulullâhؐ had labelled as the **dajjâl of Thaqeef**, i.e. Mukhtaar ibn Abu Ubeid Thaqafi, was now ready to rise. However, before proceeding with Mukhtaar's rise against the caliphate, it would indeed seem appropriate to shed

light on the battles that occurred in Makkah Mukarramah and Madinah Munawwara, between the army of Yazîd and the inhabitants of these two Holy Lands.

When the details of these battles are read superficially, one can easily be forgiven if one hates Yazîd and his entire army, since the love of Madinah Munawwara and its inhabitants is a trait which has been ingrained within the heart of every believer, as is the case with the love of Hadhrat Huseinؑ. However, when deeper investigation is done, a picture emerges, quite different from what has over the years been understood.

In describing the battle that occurred against the inhabitants of Medina Munawwara, famously known as 'the battle of Harrah', shaitaani elements went one step further in adding spice to what was already a hot curry, with some taking the bold step to spoil the pages of history with such filthy lies, the likes of which perhaps no other leader or army has ever been accused of.

Examples of such lies, which spilled from the filthy tongues of shaitaani hypocrites, which would later innocently be narrated in the compilations of historians, are the following:

- a) During the battle over one thousand virgins were raped at the hands of the oppressive soldiers that had come from Shâm.¹⁴³
Na'ûzubillah!
- b) As a result of being raped, one thousand women of Madinah Munawwara gave birth.¹⁴⁴ *Na'ûzubillah!*

¹⁴³ ورد في دلائل النبوة للبيهقي من طريق يعقوب بن سفيان قال: حدثنا يوسف بن موسى حدثنا جرير بن المغيرة قال: أنهب مسرف بن عقبة المدينة ثلاثة أيام، فزعم المغيرة أنه اقتض فيها ألف عذراء

¹⁴⁴ أول من أشار إلى انتهاك الأعراض، المدائني المتوفي سنة ٢٢٥ هـ حيث قال المدائني عن أبي قرعة عن هشام بن حسان قال: ولدت بعد الحرة ألف امرأة من غير زوج

c) A soldier from Shâm entered the home of an Ansaari woman, who was breastfeeding her child. He threatened her that if she did not hand over her gold, he would kill her and her child. The woman scream out, 'How dare you kill this boy, whose father is Abu Kabasha, the companion of Rasulullâhﷺ, and I am from the women who had pledged allegiance to Rasulullâhﷺ!' The soldier, taking no notice of her words, grabbed the child whose mouth was still on the woman's breast, and bashed him upon a nearby wall, smashing his brains. In frustration, the woman cried and said, 'O my child, had I anything which I could give to save you, I would surely have given it!' As the soldier left the room, half his face turned black and he had to walk amongst the people disfigured. *Na'ûzubillah!*¹⁴⁵

d) A virgin was raped right in front of Rasulullâhﷺ's sacred chamber and after raping the girl, when the soldier could not find anything with which to wipe away the blood that was on him, he took a page of the Noble Quraan and used it to wipe himself clean! *Na'ûzubillah!*¹⁴⁶

This, i.e. (d) is perhaps **the most filthy and despicable lie** that has found its way into the books of history, but the narrations mentioned before it, i.e. (a), (b) and (c) are no better. Besides these, there are many more such narrations, not only with regards to Yazîd, but rather, even with regards to the illustrious Khulefa-e-Raashideenﷺ, the wives of Rasulullâhﷺ, the Sahâbahﷺ in general and many of the great personalities that came after. When shaitani agents target any individual, they spare no effort in painting him with the worst

¹⁴⁵ سمط النجوم

¹⁴⁶ وافترض فيها ألف عذراء، وإن مفتضها فعل ذلك أمام الوجه الشريف، والتمس ما يمسح به الدم، فلم يجد، ففتح مصحفاً قريباً منه، ثم أخذ من أوراقه ورقة، فتمسح بها (سمط النجوم)

propaganda one could ever dream of and they do it in such a manner that the one who refutes it is regarded as the biggest liar.

If every narration of history gets afforded the status of 'accepted without question', merely due to it appearing in a book, comprising of a couple of volumes, or having a fancy title and some beautiful binding, then perhaps not a single saint's sainthood shall remain in Islâmic history, since surrounding every great man would always be great enemies, whose tongues and limbs would tire themselves out in their attempt to defame and disgrace them and what their hearts would conceal would be even worse.

In the blatant lies mentioned above, i.e. (a), (b), (c) and (d), the lineage of over a thousand *Tab-e'-Tâbi'een* has been tainted, yet amazingly no mention can be found in the books regarding the great men that were born in Madinah Munawwara, that so and so individual was born as a result of his mother being raped by a Shaami soldier!

To understand the reality of these narrations, one needs only to ponder over the fact that despite rape being the most hideous of crimes in Islâm, especially if it has to occur in the most sacred of cities, with the most purest of women, affecting over a thousand families, yet no mention of it can be found in any of the books of Sunnah, through even one solid chain, Saheeh, Hasan nor even what is known as Dhæef. Besides the books of Sunnah, even in the first books written on Islâmic history, viz. the Târikh of Tabari and Balaazari, whose authors narrated greatly from Abu Mikhnaf, the infamous shia liar, no mention can be found of any woman of Madinah Munawwara being raped during these battles.¹⁴⁷

¹⁴⁷ ذكرت إنتهاب المدينة وأثبتناها في موضعها، لم يرد فيها ذكر لانتهاك الأعراض . إن انتهاك أعراض نساء المدينة لا أساس لها من الصحة، وأنها روايات جاءت متأخرة، وبدافع التي تمثل الجيش الأموي جيشاً برياً لا يستند لأسس دينية أو عقائدية أو أخلاقية، وهذا الاتهام لا يقصد به اتهام الجيش الأموي فقط، بل إن الخطورة التي يحملها هذا الاتهام تتعدى إلى ما هو أعظم من مجرد اتهام الجيش الأموي، إلى اتهام الجيش الإسلامي الذي فتح أصقاعاً شاسعة في تلك الفترة ... و لم نجد في كتب السنة أو

Any reader of Islâmic history who finds such narrations acceptable, should understand well that the accusations levelled are not only being directed towards the Umayyad army that served under Yazîd, but rather towards the Islâmic armies of Shâm, which Rasulullâh ﷺ had praised, the very armies that carried the flags of Islâm through many lands, holding firmly upon the principles of piety, justice and mercy that Islâm has always taught. In these narrations those very armies have been depicted as barbarians, void of all morals and basic human character. (If the filth of shaitaani propaganda cannot be smelt in even these narrations, then to Allâh alone do we complain of our plight!)

Another major lie that becomes apparent when one studies the incident of 'the battle of Harrah' is with regards to the number of Sahâbah ﷺ martyred during this battle. Many books of history show that between three to seven hundred Sahâbah ﷺ were martyred during this battle, whereas when one searches for narrations with strong chains, one fails to find mention of even ten Sahâbah ﷺ losing their lives during this battle.

Hafiz Zahabi has recorded in *Al-I'bar* that during the battle of Harrah three hundred and six of the children of the Muhaajireen and Ansaar were martyred and from the Sahâbah ﷺ, Hadhrat Ma'qil ibn Sinaan ﷺ,

في تلك الكتب التي ألفت في الفتن وكذلك لم نجد في المصدرين التاريخيين المهمين عن هذه الفترة وهما (الطبري والبلاذري) أي إشارة لوقوع شيء من ذلك، وهما قد اعتمد على روايات الإخبار بين المشهورين مثل عوانة بن الحكم وأبي مخنف الشيعي وغيرهما، ويعتبر ابن الجوزي هو أول من أورد هذا الخبر في تاريخه، وفي رسالته الخاصة التي ألفها في الطعن على يزيد بن معاوية وإظهار مثالبه، وقد نقلها عن ابن الجوزي السهمودي مؤرخ المدينة المتوفي في القرن العاشر الهجري، ويبدو أن الطبري، والبلاذري وخليفة بن خياط وغيرهم، لم يقتنعوا بصحة هذا الخبر، فإنهم قد أعرضوا عنه ولم يدخلوه في كتبهم ولا يوجد خبر صحيح الإسناد في حادثة الاغتصاب المزعومة، ومن الجدير بالذكر أن كل من أورد خبر انتهاك أعراض أهل المدينة في معركة الحرّة قد اعتمد على رواية يعقوب أو رواية المدائني فقط، وكلاهما لا تصح ولا ثبت، وقد أطلق العنان بعض الكتاب لرغباتهم وأهوائهم ولم يستندوا إلى أي دليل والروايات المتعلقة بالاغتصاب لا يمكن الاعتماد عليها، ثم إن القرائن المصاحبة لمعركة الحرّة تنفي وجود أي نوع من الاغتصاب (الدولة الاموية - مع بعض التغيير - محمد الصلابي)

Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Hanzalah ﷺ and Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zaid ibn Aa'sim ﷺ were martyred.¹⁴⁸

According to a narration, quoted in Al-Bidâyah, which can be traced through a strong chain to Imam Malik, the amount of men of the Quraan that were martyred during the battle of Harrah were about seven hundred. After narrating this portion, Ibn Wahab, the famous student of Imam Malik says, 'If I am correct, Imam Malik also said, 'Amongst the martyrs, three of four were from the Sahâbah ﷺ.'

Even though Ibn Wahab narrated this portion with the words, 'If I am correct', then too the very fact that he thought that Imam Malik had said this shows that during his era, which was not very long after these wars, the people of Medina Munawwara knew nothing of the narrations which made mention that during the battle of Harrah between three hundred to seven hundred Sahâbah ﷺ were martyred. If such a large number of Sahâbah ﷺ had really been martyred on that fateful day, it would have been common knowledge amongst the people of Medina Munawwara, and Ibn Wahab would never have made such an error.

The writings of Imam Abu Ja'far Tahaawi, the great jurist of the Hanafi Mazhab, also indicates that the number of Sahâbah ﷺ who were martyred during this battle were few. While discussing a chain of narrators, Imam Tahawi wrote the following:

'The Ashja'i, from whom Sha'bi has narrated is none other than Hadhrat Ma'qil ibn Sinaan ﷺ, that Sahâbi ﷺ whose death occurred much later than the other companions of Rasulullâh ﷺ. He ﷺ, in fact, only passed away during the day of Harrah. He was one of those Sahâbah ﷺ martyred during that battle.'

¹⁴⁸ قتل من أولاد المهاجرين والأنصار ثلاث مئة وست أنفس. وقتل من الصحابة: معقل بن سنان الأشجعي، وعبد الله بن حنظلة

الغسيل الأنصاري، وعبد الله بن زيد بن عاصم المازني (العبر-الذهبي)

By Imam Tahawi stating ‘he was **one of those** Sahâbahؓ martyred during that battle’, instead of ‘he was one from the **many** Sahâbahؓ that passed away during that battle’, there is clear indication that only a few Sahâbahؓ had passed away on this occasion.

From what has been mentioned above, one can clearly understand that, as with Karbala, the incident of Harrah has also been filled with countless lies, merely so that the image of the ruling party could be tarnished in the eyes of the public, enabling shaitani forces to gather support for their well-planned future attack on the Muslim caliphate.

As was the case of Karbala, the picture that history generally painted of the battle of Harrah fails to answer many questions, which has conveniently thereafter been swept under the carpet. Amongst those questions are the following:

- a) Had the soldiers of Yazîd really been raping the women of Madinah Munawwara, as the books describe, why then did Abdullâh ibn Umarؓ and the other senior Sahâbahؓ not speak out against these oppressive and filthy, demonic acts? Rather, what has been clearly proven is that not only did these senior Sahâbahؓ refrain from speaking out, they in fact ordered their families to remain obedient to the caliph and not break their allegiance. This point has been proven from many authentic sources, a few of which are:

- Imam Ahmed narrates in his Musnad, with a strong (saheeh) sanad¹⁴⁹:

¹⁴⁹ حدثنا عبد الله حدثني أبي ثنا إسماعيل حدثني صخر بن جويرية عن نافع قال : لما خلع الناس يزيد بن معاوية جمع بن عمر بنه وأهله ثم تشهد ثم قال أما بعد فإننا قد بايعنا هذا الرجل على بيع الله ورسوله وإني سمعت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يقول إن الغادر ينصب له لواء يوم القيامة يقال هذه غدرة فلان وإن من أعظم الغدر أن لا يكون الإشرار بالله تعالى أن يبايع رجل رجلا على بيع الله ورسوله صلى الله عليه وسلم ثم ينكث بيعته فلا يخلعن أحد منكم يزيد ولا يشرفن أحد منكم في هذا الأمر فيكون صيلم بيني وبينه - مسند احمد - (تعليق شعيب الأرناؤوط : إسناده صحيح على شرط الشيخين)

*‘When the people were breaking their allegiance, Abdullâh ibn Umarؓ gathered his sons and family members and said to them, ‘We have pledged allegiance to this man, and I have heard Rasulullâhؐ saying, ‘One who deceives shall have a flag raised for him on the Day of Judgement, which shall expose him as a deceiver.’ Verily, after ascribing partners to Allâh, the greatest act of deception one could do is that he breaks his allegiance (which he has made to the Muslim leader). **O my family, let not any one of you pull his hand away from Yazîd, nor even entertain this thought. If you do such an act, Abdullâh Ibn Umar shall cut himself off from you totally!’***

- Ibn Kathir, in Al-Bidâyah, narrates that Abu Ja’far (Baqir) said¹⁵⁰, ‘On the Day of Harrah (when the army of Yazîd attacked Madinah Munawwara) **from the family of Abu Talib and from the family of Abdul Muttalib, not a single person rose to fight the army.** And when the leader of the army, Muslim ibn Uqbah arrived, he (Muslim) honoured Abu Ja’far, made him sit close to him and handed him a document promising them safety.’
- b) Had Yazîd really ordered that his soldiers plunder and raid Madinah Munawwara and rape its noble women, would the people of Shâm have remained sitting back quietly, without raising a single objection. At least his close advisors would have been aware of the filthy orders he had issued and at least one of them would have raised an objection. Rather, history itself records that when the news of what had occurred during the battle at Madinah Munawwara, reached the ears of Yazîd, he expressed shock and grief, and immediately set out to try and

¹⁵⁰ وقال أبو جعفر الباقر لم يخرج أحد من آل أبي طالب ولا من بني عبد المطلب أيام الحرة ولما قدم مسلم بن عقبة المدينة أكرمه وأدنى مجلسه واعطاه كتاب أمان (البداية)

make amends for the losses the people of Madinah Munawwara had suffered, due to the war.

Madaaini narrates:

'Muslim ibn Uqbah sent Raoh ibn Zanbaa' to Yazîd, to give him the glad-tidings of the victory at Harrah. When Yazîd heard the details of the battle, the words that emitted from his lips were, 'Alas, how sad is the plight of my people!' He thereafter called Dhahhaak ibn Qais and asked him what could be done to ease the plight of the people of Madinah Munawwara. Dhahhaak replied, 'Food and generous handouts.' Yazîd immediately complied and had food, money and all other kind of necessary aid delivered to Madinah Munawwara.

After narrating this, Allâmah ibn Kathir comments:

*'This is quite contrary to what the lying Rawaafidh (sect of the shia) narrate!'*¹⁵¹

- c) When Yazîd dispatched his army to Madinah Munawwara and Makkah Mukarramah, the general appointed over the Palestinian garrison was Rauh ibn Zan'baa', and it was this very person who was sent to inform Yazîd of the victory of his army. According to what authentic sources have quoted, Raoh ibn Zan'baa' was an ardent worshipper of Almighty Allâh, a true Islâmic warrior, from the Sayyids of Shâm. He narrated from Hadhrat Tamim Daari and the people of Shâm would narrate Ahâdith from him.¹⁵² Abdul Malik ibn Marwân described Roah as follows, "Roah has encompassed the worship of the people

¹⁵¹ وروى المدائني أن مسلماً بن عقبة بعث روح بن زنباع إلى يزيد بشارة الحرة فلما أخبره بما وقع قال واقوماه ثم دعا الضحاك بن قيس الفهري فقال له ترى ما لقي أهل المدينة فما الذي يجيرهم قال الطعام والأعطية فأمر بحمل الطعام إليهم وأفاض عليهم أعطيته وهذا خلاف ما ذكره كذبة الروافض (البداية)
¹⁵² روح بن زنباع الجذامي من أهل فلسطين وكان عابداً غازياً من سادات أهل الشام يروى عن تميم الداري روى عنه أهل الشام (الثقات لابن حبان)

of Shâm, the cunningness of the people of Iraq and the *fiqh* of the people of Hijaz.¹⁵³

As for the Damascan garrison, the general appointed over them was in fact a Sahâbi of Rasulullâh, Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Mas'ada, one who had enjoyed the privilege of being reared in the lap of Hadhrat Fatimah.¹⁵⁴

If such men were appointed as the leaders of different garrisons when the army of Yazîd advanced towards Madinah Munawwara, could it ever be conceived that they would just stand by watching as the so-called 'bloodthirsty' soldiers of Yazîd's army raped noble women and killed innocent children around them!?

- d) In Akhbaarul-Qudaat, it has been mentioned that despite being defeated by the army of Yazîd, a few weeks later, upon receiving the news of the death of Yazîd, the people of Madinah Munawwara again stood up against the ruling party, and this time achieved success. The governor and leaders from Shâm were exiled and Ubeidah ibn Zubeir, the brother of Abdullâh ibn Zubeir was brought in as their new governor.¹⁵⁵

Had Yazîd's army really caused the massacre, which certain paragraphs of history describe, would the people of Madinah Munawwara ever have been able to recoup so quickly and stage a successful attack within just a few days of their initial defeat?!

The above are just some of the points that clearly indicate that, as with the issue of Karbala, here too a lot of exaggeration and lies have

¹⁵³ قال عبد الملك جمع روح طاعة أهل الشام ودهاء أهل العراق وفقه أهل الحجاز (اسد الغابة)
¹⁵⁴ عبد الله بن مسعدة بن مسعود الفزاري وهو من صغار الصحابة ذكره البغوي وغيره في الصحابة كان عبد الله في سبي بني فزارة فوهبه النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم لابنته فاطمة فاعتقته وكان صغيراً فترى عندها (الاصابة)
¹⁵⁵ فكانت الحرة يوم الأربعاء لليلتين بقيتا في ذي الحجة، واستخلف مسلم على المدينة عمرو بن محمد الأشجعي، ويقال: حصين بن نمير السكوني، ويقال: روح بن زنباع الجذامي، ومات يزيد بن معاوية، فوثب أهل المدينة على من بها من أهل الشام، فأخرجوهم، وبويع ابن الزبير في رجب سنة أربع وستين، فولى أخاه عبيدة بن الزبير (اخبار القضاة)

surrounded this episode, thus rendering one incapable of properly understanding what had really occurred during the unfortunate episode of Harrah. As with Karbala, which had turned the hearts of the people of Hijaz against the Umayyads, the battle of Harrah would now be used to turn the hearts of the rest of the Muslim empire against the Umayyad dynasty. As Karbala had been blown out of proportion, so too was the case of Harrah.

If one were to merely read the basic historical texts of what occurred just prior to Harrah, one could easily ascertain that this was a war which could have easily been averted, had there been no shaitaani prodding from behind the scenes, continuously angering each party against the other.

Allâmah Ibn Kathir, whilst discussing the incident of Harrah, recorded the narration mentioned below, from which much can be learnt regarding the backdrop of events that finally led to the disastrous incident of Harrah. The crux of what he wrote is¹⁵⁶:

١٥٦ وكان سببها أن أهل المدينة لما خلعوا يزيد بن معاوية وولوا على قريش عبد الله بن مطيع وعلى الأنصار عبد الله بن حنظلة بن أبي عامر فلما كان في أول هذه السنة أظهروا ذلك واجتمعوا عند المنبر فجعل الرجل منهم يقول قد خلعت يزيد كما خلعت عمامتي هذه ويلقيها عن رأسه ويقول الآخر قد خلعت كما خلعت نعلي هذه حتى اجتمع شيء كثير من العمامات والنعال هناك ثم اجتمعوا على إخراج عامل يزيد من بين أظهرهم وهو عثمان بن محمد بن أبي سفيان بن عم يزيد وعلى إجلاء بني أمية من المدينة فاجتمعت بنو أمية في دار مروان بن الحكم وأحاط بهم أهل المدينة يحاصرونهم واعتزل الناس على بن الحسين زين العابدين وكذلك عبد الله بن عمر ابن الخطاب لم يخلعوا يزيد ولا أحد من بيت ابن عمر وكتب بنو أمية إلى يزيد بما هم فيه من الحصر والاهانة والجوع والعطش وإنه إن لم يبعث إليهم من يتقدمهم مما هم فيه وإلا استؤصلوا عن آخرهم وبعثوا ذلك مع البريد فلما قدم بذلك على يزيد وجده جالسا على سريره ورجلاه في ماء يتبرد به مما به من النقرس في رجله فلما قرأ الكتاب انزعج لذلك وقال وقال ويلك ما فيهم ألف رجل قال بلى قال فهل لا قاتلوا ساعة من نهار . ثم بعث إلى عمرو بن سعيد ابن العاص فقرأ عليه الكتاب واستشاره فيمن يبعثه إليهم وعرض عليه أن يبعثه إليهم فأبى عليه ذلك وقال إن أمير المؤمنين عزلني عنها وهي مضبوطة وأمورها محكمة فاما الآن فإنما دماء قريش تراق بالصعيد فلا أحب أن أتولى ذلك منهم ليتول ذلك من هو أبعد منهم مني قال فبعث البريد إلى مسلم بن عقبة المزني وهو شيخ كبير ضعيف فانتدب لذلك وأرسل معه يزيد عشرة آلاف فارس وقيل اثنا عشر ألفا وخمسة عشر ألف رجل وأعطى كل واحد منهم مائة دينار وقيل أربعة دنانير ثم استعرضهم وهو على فرس له فقال النعمان بن بشير يا أمير المؤمنين ولي عليهم أكفك وكان العمان أبا عبد الله بن حنظلة لأمه عمر بنت رواحة فقال يزيد لا ليس لهم إلا هذا الغشمة والله لأقتلنهم بعد إحساني إليهم وعفوي عنهم مرة بعد مرة فقال النعمان يا أمير المؤمنين أنشدك الله في

'The reason for this battle was that when the people of Madinah Munawwarah broke their allegiance from Yazîd ibn Muawiyah, they appointed Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Mutee' over the Qureish, and Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Hanzalah over the Ansaar. They gathered at the pulpit and openly announced their breaking away from the Umayyad leadership.

They then gathered to have the Umayyad governor, Uthman ibn Muhammad as well as the rest of the Banu Umayyah exiled from Madinah Munawwarah. Upon receiving news of this, to ensure their protection, the Banu Umayyah gathered in the dwelling of Marwan ibn Hakam, which the people of Madinah Munawwarah then surrounded. Hadhrat Zainul-Aabideen (the son of Hadhrat Husein) and the household of Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umar however refused to break their allegiance to Yazîd.

The Banu Umayyah wrote to Yazîd, describing their miserable plight, i.e. their being kept under siege, being disgraced, being deprived of food and drink, and that if he does not immediately send an army to rescue them from their plight, they could face total annihilation. When this letter reached Yazîd, it threw him in shock. Yazîd also expressed anger over the fact that despite the Banu Umayyah in Madinah Munawwara comprising over a thousand, they had not stood up to fight, but instead allowed themselves to be placed under a siege.

Yazîd consulted with Amr ibn Saeed and requested that he lead the army, but Amr refused, saying that after having already been removed from his post as governor over Madinah Munawwara, he did not now desire that he be at the centre of Qureishi bloodshed. Amr ibn Saeed

عشيرتك وأنصار رسول الله ص وقال عبد الله بن جعفر أرايت ن رجعوا إلى طاعتك أيقبل منهم قال إن فعلوا فلا سبيل عليهم وقال يزيد لمسلم بن عقبة ادع القوم ثلاثا فان رجعوا إلى الطاعة فاقبل منهم وكف عنهم وإلا فاستعن بالله وقاتلهم وإذا ظهرت عليهم فأبح المدينة ثلاثا ثم أكف عن الناس وانظر إلى علي بن الحسين فأكف عنه واستوص به خيرا وأذن مجلسه فانه لم يدخل في شيء مما دخلوا فيه (البداية بتصرف يسير)

advised Yazîd to rather select such a person for the job who did not enjoy close family relations with the Qureish. The job was then presented to Muslim ibn Uqbah Muzani, who, despite being weak and old, accepted almost immediately.

(Not trusting Muslim ibn Uqbah,) Hadhrat Nu'maan ibn Bashirؓ pleaded with Yazîd to allow him to lead the army, in the hope that his close family relationship with the new leader of the Ansaar, Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Hanzala, would facilitate an easy reconciliation process. (Hadhrat Nu'maanؓ was the uterine brother of Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Hanzalahؓ). Yazîd refused to accept his plea, and said, **'By Allâh! I have shown compassion and tolerance to them on so many occasions, yet their behaviour remains such. By Allâh! I shall now not accept for them except this 'destroyer'!**

Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Ja'farؓ then interceded, with the following question, **'If the people of Madinah Munawwara return to their pledge of obedience, will you accept it from them? Yazîd replied, 'If they do so, none shall harm them!'**

Yazîd thus ordered Muslim ibn Uqbah to first invite the people of Madinah Munawwara, over a period of three days, to return to their pledge. He was only to attack if they refused to obey. Yazîd also ordered that if the army were able to enter Madinah Munawwara, **they would be allowed only three days within the city to find and punish the ones behind the rebellion.** As for Ali ibn Husein (Zainul-Aabideenؓ) he was to be honoured and left alone, since he had not joined the rebellion.

An accusation generally levelled against Yazîd is that he had ordered Muslim ibn Uqbah to plunder, raid and destroy Madinah Munawwara. This accusation is based upon a sentence attributed to him, said at the time of sending out the army, which was:

وإذا ظهرت عليهم فأبح المدينة ثلاثا ثم أكفف عن الناس

'If you gain the upper hand (and are able to break through the opposition's defense), you will have three days, during which Madinah shall be an 'open ground' for you. After the passing of three days, order your men to withdraw from the people!

What did Yazîd really mean when he said, 'you will have three days, during which Madinah shall be an 'open ground' for you!'? Did he mean that during these three days his soldiers could do in Madinah Munawwara whatever impermissible act they desired? Had this been his intention, it would have been a statement of kufr. This would surely have caused an outcry by the Sahâbahؓ and senior Tâbi'een that were around him.

The statement, as the narration above shows clearly, was made in front of Hadhrat Nu'maan ibn Bashirؓ and Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Ja'farؓ, yet the most that these two Sahâbahؓ did was to intercede on behalf of the people of Madinah Munawwara, and beg Yazîd to forgive them, due to their being from the family of the Ansaar. Had these Sahâbahؓ understood Yazîd's statement to mean 'open permission to do as the soldiers pleased', they would have themselves broken their allegiance and rallied the masses of Shaam against Yazîd.

Many a time the meaning of a sentence is easily understood at the time that it is said and by the audience to whom it is said, yet when that sentence leaves that environment and is now interpreted by merely looking towards its words, a different meaning emerges, totally contrary to what the speaker had intended, a meaning so filthy in nature, that had the speaker later come to know what was now being attributed to him, he would have great difficulty in even establishing which sentence of his had unintentionally indicated towards that meaning.

Many factors indicate that Yazîd's above-mentioned statement falls into this very category, especially since he said this statement, not in privacy, but in front of noble, pious men and none of them objected. Also, Yazîd's very next sentence, i.e. **'after the passing of three days,**

order your men to withdraw from the people!”, this sentence itself indicates that the order of Yazîd to his commander was not one asking for brutal force, mass killings, and total destruction, but rather that since the city of Madinah Munawwarah was one of great sanctity, in which before this no Muslim ruler had ever dared take in his army, the army were thus required to be quick in moving through the city of Madinah Munawwarah whilst searching for the ones responsible for the rebellion. They had three days after entering the city to find and apprehend all responsible, in such a manner that after their exit from the city the rebellion does not rise again. Yazîd did not feel it appropriate that the sanctity of the noble city of Madinah Munawwarah be violated for more than three days, even if those responsible for the rebellion were still at large.

Perhaps this meaning may be hard for many to digest, but it is the only meaning that explains why the Sahâbahؓ and Tâbi’een of Sham, who heard this statement directly, did not object. It also explains how the parties responsible for the first rebellion were able to so quickly re-organize their troops after the exit of the Umayyad army, and retake the city of Madinah Munawwarah. It also explains why Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umarؓ, his entire family, the family of Abdul Muttalib, Hadhrat Zainul-Aabideenؓ and many others of Madinah Munawwarah, did not support those rebelling against the Umayyads, neither before their entry into the city nor after. Had these great individuals seen those scenes which history would later paint regarding Harrah, they would surely have broken their allegiance and themselves lifted the flag against the Umayyads.

Yes, there is no denying that certain atrocities did occur at the hands of certain soldiers, but there is a great possibility that these acts were in fact committed by hypocrites serving in the army, carried out in their private capacity, with the aim to defame the entire Muslim army and set the wheels in motion for a plan constructed years previously, i.e. to

crumble the Muslim Caliphate and replace it with another, which would operate under shaitaani influence and direction.

In Karbala, as discussed earlier on, it was such evil men who had ensured that Hadhrat Huseinؓ never left the field alive, and it was such men who attacked the tents housing the noble women from the family of Hadhrat Huseinؓ. Yet, when it came to levelling accusations, sincere Muslim leaders were implicated, despite them having nothing to do with the atrocities committed. So too, in my humble opinion, is the case of Harrah, but only he shall believe who is ready to read between the lines and review this entire episode again. And it is Almighty Allâh alone who knows the complete truth, and He alone shall expose it, when and how He feels appropriate.

After the battle of Harrah, the army of Yazîd proceeded forward towards Makkah Mukarramah, where Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeirؓ had risen the flag against them, but before the fighting could reach its peak, the news of the death of Yazîd spread, which brought a halt to the fight.

As a closing statement I repeat that the intention of this book is not at all to prove the piety of Yazîd, since that is in the knowledge of Almighty Allâh alone. What I have merely shown is that the evidence that has been used to prove his guilt is not as solid as many have been made to believe. Islâmic law has never demanded that every individual’s innocence be proven beyond doubt, since that is not within one’s capacity. Yes, it is a demand of Islâmic teaching that each individual be given the benefit of the doubt, and that an accusation only be accepted when supported with solid evidence.

The purpose of this book is merely to highlight the possibility that Yazîd had been framed, in a shaitaani operation that had begun years previously, utilizing hundreds of hypocrites, spread all over the Muslim empire, with the aim of crushing the Muslim Caliphate, stopping the

forward march of the Muslim armies into non-Muslim territories and tearing into pieces the unity that Hadhrat Muawiyahؓ had just managed to restore. This plan would only prove successful if the hearts of the Ummah could turn against their leader and Yazîd was the unfortunate target against whom this hatred was going to be sowed.

As with regards to who exactly were the true culprits behind the 'massacre at Karbala' that shall indeed be difficult to pinpoint, since hypocrite forces have always endeavoured to keep their tracks covered. Yes, due to scattered pieces of evidence, one's attention is attracted towards two suspects, viz. a) Mukhtar ibn Ubeid al-Thaqafi and b) the shia.

Amongst the scattered pieces of evidence that point towards this direction are:

1) The appearance and disappearance of Mukhtar ibn Ubeid at the opportune moments and the sudden rise of his movement shortly after the martyrdom of Hadrat Husein Radiyallahu Anhu as though he was one step ahead of the rest in knowing what was to occur next. Such information is generally held only by the party pulling the strings from behind the scenes.

2) In the books of the shia, much can be found wherein their scholars admit that it was none other than their very own party that was responsible for the martyrdom of Hadrat Husein Radiyallahu Anhu. When a culprit himself admits to a crime, it does seem inappropriate for his confession to be ignored and regarded as unacceptable.

In the pages below is a brief discussion regarding the movements of Mukhtar ibn Ubeid prior to the coming of Muslim ibn Aqil, upon his arrival, and after the martyrdom of Hadrat Husein Radiyallahu Anhu. This shall then be followed by extracts from the books of the shia, in which their leaders have admitted to their guilt in this matter.

Mukhtar ibn Abu Ubeid Thaqafi, a dajjâl of this Ummah

As discussed previously, Mukhtar ibn Ubeid is recorded to have been the first host of Hadhrat Muslim ibn Aqeelؓ, when he came to Iraq to verify the contents of the letters that had been sent to Hadhrat Huseinؓ. The fact that Mukhtar was the first host, speaks volumes of the reality of the ones who had begged Hadhrat Huseinؓ to come over.

When Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad arrived at Kufa, Mukhtar was also arrested, but where the sincere friends of Hadhrat Huseinؓ were put to the sword, the lives of the hypocrites responsible in bringing Hadhrat Huseinؓ to Iraq were "amazingly spared", as though Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad was intentionally or unintentionally being controlled by orders coming from a higher shaitaani order. Mukhtar ibn Ubeid would spend a mere few days in prison, due to which his fame would spread as being a true lover of Hadhrat Huseinؓ, whereas just a few years earlier he had attempted to have Hadhrat Huseinؓ arrested and handed over to Hadhrat Muawiyahؓ. By spending just a few days in prison, all the previous enmity that Mukhtar had shown to the household of Rasulullâhﷺ would now be forgotten and Mukhtar would take the title of 'the true defender of the honour of the Ahle-Bait'.

Mukhtar was the perfect candidate that shaitân could have chosen to cause chaos amongst the Muslim Ummah, since he enjoyed the privilege of being the brother-in-law of the great Sahâbiؓ of that era, Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umarؓ, a privilege which would surely earn him much recognition in Iraq. Upon the martyrdom of Hadhrat Huseinؓ, Mukhtar would thereafter enhance his reputation by working upon the sentiments of people, and making the loudest call of 'revenge for the Ahle-Bait'. From Iraq, Mukhtar would have expensive gifts sent to

the leading Sahâbahؓ of Hijaaz and in fact even presented himself in front of Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeirؓ and pledged allegiance.

By the time the reality of Mukhtaar's kufr became public knowledge, his army had already grown into the thousands. The gullible souls of Iraq who viewed Mukhtaar as the 'savior of the Ummah' were in no way now going to listen to the verdicts of the scholars around them, even after Mukhtaar proclaimed himself to be a 'Nabi'.

Below shall follow a brief time-line of Mukhtaar ibn Ubeid, extracted from the reports written regarding him in the books of history, whereby the reader shall gain a great understanding of how shaitani forces operate when it comes to promoting its agents in the eyes of the public and raising them to high seats, from which they are able to carry out major shaitani operations, all in the guise of 'Islâm'.

- 1) Mukhtaar ibn Ubeid is the first recorded host of Muslim Ibn Aqeelؓ, despite being declared, just a few years ago, as a Khaariji (one who hates the Ahle-Bait). Muslim ibn Aqeelؓ stays at the dwelling of Mukhtaar for only a few days, after which heؓ himself decides to shift to another location.
- 2) Mukhtaar, together with many others, are arrested for their role in inviting Hadhrat Huseinؓ to Iraq, but Mukhtaar's life is spared, whilst others, who had played a much less significant role, are executed.
- 3) After the battle of Karbala, upon being released, Mukhtaar travels to Hijaaz, pledges allegiance to Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeirؓ and soon takes the position of one of the senior generals under Abdullâh ibn Zubeirؓ. Mukhtaar also fights under the flag of Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeirؓ, during Yazîd's siege upon Makkah Mukarramah. When the news of Yazîd's death spreads, and the war comes to a temporary halt,

Mukhtaar finds an excuse to break away from Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeirؓ and return to Iraq. Upon reaching Iraq, Mukhtaar starts inviting the masses towards Muhammad ibn Hanafiyah, the son of Hadhrat Aliؓ, with the claim that he, Muhammad, is the 'promised Mahdi' and that Mukhtaar is his representative in Iraq. When Muhammad ibn Hanafiyah receives news of this, he openly declares its falsehood, but Mukhtaar's beguiled followers remain deaf to his words, in the belief that Muhammad ibn Hanafiyah is merely practicing '*Taqiyyah*' (concealing the truth from the Umayyad leaders that surround him in Hijaaz).

- 4) Mukhtaar raises the call for 'revenge for the Ahle-Bait', a call that finds tremendous support from all circles, until finally Mukhtaar removes Abdullâh ibn Mutee, the governor of Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeirؓ, and takes control over Iraq.
- 5) Mukhtaar's movement in Iraq gains momentum as he goes in search of all that had taken part in the battle of Karbala. Umar ibn Sa'd and other Umayyad generals are hunted down and Mukhtaar's fame as 'defender of the Ahle-Bait' spreads. His armies continue taking area upon area and now pose a major threat to the Umayyad Caliphate, which forces the new Umayyad leader, Abdul Malik ibn Marwan, to gather his forces and bring them face to face with that of Mukhtaar's. Mukhtaar's forces deliver a severe blow to the Umayyad army and their fame grows even more.
- 6) Being aided by shaitani forces, Mukhtaar beguiles thousands and amasses an army that ravages Iraq, killing not only those involved at Karbala, but rather every group linked to the Umayyad government. So sure is Mukhtaar of victory that before each battle he announces that Almighty Allâh had informed him of victory for his army. This lie of his attracts

many more followers, but lands him in trouble when his army suffers their first defeat.

Certain followers demanded to know how could they be defeated after having received Divine assurance of victory. In response, Mukhtaar produces perhaps one of the filthiest lies ever said with regards to the Being of Almighty Allâh, i.e. that Almighty Allâh had forgotten! *Na'ûzubillah!* Despite his answer being so filthy and absurd, his shaitaani agents ensure that the masses accept even this, and this belief, known as 'Ba daa' is made a fundamental belief of the shia creed.

- 7) Mukhtaar's words of kufr breaks all barriers, with him now declaring himself first as the representative of the Awaited Mahdi, then as the Mahdi himself, then as a Nabi' and finally as 'The Almighty incarnated'. *Na'ûzubillah!*

Amongst the filth that Mukhtaar propagates is the claim that he has in his possession a chair, which is from the hidden treasures of Hadhrat Aliؑ, a chair which holds the position in this Ummah like that which the Taaboth (the Ark of the Covenant) enjoyed during the era of the Banu Israel. Mukhtaar would order that this chair be placed at the front of his army and would proclaim that victory was assured on account of the blessings of that chair. *Na'ûzubillah!*

- 8) The Sahâbahؓ of Madinah Munawwarah, with Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umarؓ, Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Abbaasؓ and Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeirؓ in the forefront, openly declare the kufr of Mukhtaar, but that too cannot distance the masses away from him. Mukhtaar takes control over all the major Muslim lands except Shaam, Egypt and Hijaaz.

- 9) When on the verge of taking over the entire Muslim world, Almighty Allâh sets up a barrier in Mukhtaar's path and slowly but surely his shaitaani dream starts collapsing. The crux of Mukhtaar's' collapse is as follows:

- First, the Arabs in Iraq, who had accepted him as their savior, start noticing that Mukhtaar is favouring the 'Ajam' Iraqis (non-Arabs from Iraq/Iran) over them and instigating them to kill and usurp the wealth of the Arabs, wherever and whenever they find the opportunity.
- Ibrahim ibn Ashtar, the senior general of Mukhtaar's' army, who had been beguiled into entering into his service, now starts receiving numerous complaints regarding Mukhtaar and authentic reports that Mukhtaar is making claims of being a Nabi. After much thought and with great difficulty, Ibrahim ibn Ashtar finally withdraws his support for Mukhtaar and encourages his loyal followers to do the same.
- Mus'ab ibn Zubeirؓ, the brother of Abdullâh ibn Zubeirؓ, after finding the Arabs of Iraq begging for protection from Mukhtaar's now-exposed evil and filthy intentions, calls for reinforcements from all loyal followers of his brother, Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Zubeirؓ.
- Almighty Allâh finally destroys Mukhtaar and his mighty army at the hands of Mus'ab ibn Zubeir, after a reign of terror which had taken the lives of thousands and had robbed many of their Imaan. So strong was Mukhtaar's web of deception that even his wife, was duped into believing him to be a Nabi. Mus'ab ibn Zubeir, makes great effort to correct her belief, but finally finds no alternative but to have her executed, on account of her apostasy.

- With the death of Mukhtaar, many of his secrets, cunning plots, satanic statements, etc, gets exposed, which convince all around that the warning issued by Rasulullâh ﷺ regarding the emergence of a 'dajjâl' from the tribe of Thaqeef, were indicating to this very Mukhtaar.

In shaitaani circles, hundreds of thousands of agents are employed, each with a different role, and totallu unaware of many of the other agents that work around him, with each enjoying a different level of superiority and closeness to their master, who is none other than Iblîs himself. In every era, certain shaitaani agents stand out amongst the rest, whose influence, teachings, acts of oppression, deception, etc. are felt the most. During the era that followed the death of Hadhrat Umar ؓ, it was this Mukhtaar ibn Ubeid that was one of shaitân's most selected agents, chosen for the task of collapsing the Muslim Caliphate and spreading chaos amongst the masses.

As with all high-ranking satanists, in order to ease his satanic task, the shaitaani world, with all its human and jinn resources, placed itself at the service of Mukhtaar, thus providing him with:

- never-ending treasures of wealth, through which he purchased the loyalty of the non-Arabs of Iraq, Iran and surrounding areas
- the ability to beguile the ignorant by displaying to them signs which indicated that Almighty Allâh's help was with him. According to what has been reported, Mukhtaar gathered around him the fighters of numerous villages by pointing to the sky and displaying to them his heavenly soldiers, i.e. huge men on horses, flying above his head, which were nothing but jinn, in the guise of angels.

- the ability to predict forthcoming events, by utilizing the information the jinn would relate to him, after stealing news from the talks of the angels of the lowest heaven
- the ability to deceive through the art of forgery, an art which was taught to him by his shaitaani masters

Mukhtaar, in the love of the power the shayâtîn had offered him, sacrificed his soul to the devil, and carved out his place in the pits of Hell. In attempting to reach his goal of reproducing in this Ummah what Paul, the hypocrite, had done to the teachings of Nabi Isa ﷺ, Mukhtaar ibn Ubeid, with direction from his satan masters, conjured many plots and conspiracies, which took the lives of thousands, and robbed just as many of their faith, but the plot that stood out the most and had the furthest reaching consequences was the plot that the world would later call 'Karbala'!

It was through this satanic plot that Mukhtaar would draw Hadhrat Hussein ؓ to Iraq; have him mercilessly slaughtered; have the leaders of the Umayyad caliphate in Shâm framed for this demonic act; and thereafter draw the entire Muslim world back into the chaos, turmoil and in-fighting which they had just recently come out of.

Where the world continues cursing Yazîd for his evil act of murdering the grandson of Rasulullâh ﷺ, an act which Yazîd till the end declared himself innocent of, it is indeed unfortunate that this shaitaani agent, Mukhtaar ibn Ubeid Thaqafi, has managed to evade the public eye, due to the blanket thrown over his satanic deeds by the shaitaani agents that followed after him.

Had the eye of the Ummah been on Mukhtaar ibn Ubeid, the Ummah would perhaps have been saved from much of the confusion and bloodshed that occurred, as he pulled strings from behind the curtains, during his lifetime, and as other shaitaani agents pulled strings after his death, which finally resulted in the first collapse of an Islâmic Caliphate,

about seventy years later, surrounded by scenes of mass execution, torture, and the opening of all doors of fitnah (religious confusion, evil and turmoil) by the new Abbaasi Caliphate, which was in fact a shaitaani-backed government that had originated in Iran (Khurâsân), with nineteen of its twenty 'founding fathers' being non-Arabs from Iraq/Iran itself.

An in-depth study of the rise of this new caliphate (The Abbasid Caliphate) shall reveal a massive shaitaani conspiracy which laid its foundation the day Hadhrat Huseinؑ was martyred, a movement that continued its work underground during the era that followed the defeat of Mukhtaar ibn Ubeid, (i.e. the era of Abdul Malik ibn Marwân, Hadhrat Umar ibn Abdul Aziz, etc), and finally succeeded about seventy years later in crushing the Umayyad Caliphate. By utilizing the name of Hadhrat Abbaasؑ and the slogan of 'love for the Ahle-Bait' it attracted the support of the masses and managed to conceal its filthy identity. By naming the new caliph as "Abbâsid" (from the family Hadhrat Abbâsؑ) shaitaani elements were able to ensure that none from the family of Hadhrat Fâtimahؑ could ever demand to be its leader.

Under the new Abbasid Caliphate, satanic and irreligious groups found the opportunity to spread freely their evil ideologies, without any fear of being reprimanded, arrested or executed. Enjoying this freedom, the Qadariyâh, Mu'tazila, Khawârij and shia were now able to create hundreds of *zindeeq* groups and ideologies which very quickly attained prominence throughout the Muslim world, amongst which were:

- The issue of Khalqul-Quraan (a satanic effort to deceive the masses into understanding that the Noble Quraan was created), which threw the Muslim world into confusion, until Almighty Allâh brought scholars like Imam Ahmed ibn Hanbal and others in its opposition
- the translating of ancient philosophical writings into Arabic which corrupted the belief of thousands and could have resulted in wide-spread *Irtidaad* (apostasy) had Almighty Allâh not created scholars like Imaam Ghazâli and others

- the fabricating of thousands of Ahâdith and spreading it amongst the masses, which could have destroyed the treasure-house of Sunnah, had Almighty Allâh not created scholars like Sufyaan ibn Uyainah and others

Due to the concealed support evil forces operating from Iran/Iraq received from this caliphate, they were able to establish the first shia empire in Egypt, (The Faatimid Empire), which would for years thereafter act as the hidden dagger of the kuffaar, stabbing the Muslim Ummah from behind and rendering them helpless from advancing further in their Islâmic conquests. These very Faatimids would later open the road for the massive invasion of the Tartars upon the entire Muslim world, an invasion that would have indeed uprooted Islâm, had it not been for Divine Intervention.

Thus, when Sultân Salahuddin Ayoubi rose to power, his first concern was to break the threat posed by the Faatimid Empire, knowing well that as long as this evil empire remains, Muslim efforts to ward off and attack kuffaar powers would always prove futile. Instead of advancing with his forces towards Masjid-al-Aqsa, he directed his effort towards Egypt, where he succeeded in crushing the Faatimid Empire and ridding the Ummah of the hidden dagger that had caused havoc amongst the Muslims for so long. With this shaitaani group dismantled, Muslims were able to make great advancements and succeeded in taking back Masjid-al-Aqsa, as well as finally conquering Constantinople (Istanbul), the fort of the Christian Empire, which had succeeded in holding out against Muslim invasion for over four hundred years.

This in brief is the biography of the works of Mukhtaar ibn Ubeid, the rise of his movement and the repercussions his movement had upon the Islamic Caliphate for centuries thereafter. When one studies deeply the biography of this individual, one shall realise why he has been declared in the light of the Ahadith as 'The dajjal of Tha'qif'.

As with regards to the second party that can be viewed as a prime suspect in this matter, i.e. the shia, who 'amazingly' regard Mukhtaar ibn Ubeid as an 'Imam', their admission to the heinous crime of murdering Hadrat Husein Radiyallahu Anhu can be found as quotation in their very books, amongst which are the following:

The shia themselves admit their guilt

1. Sayyidunā Ḥusein (ra) said, “O people of Kufa, may you be cursed, you and your intentions. O dishonest, oppressors and traitors, when you were helpless, you called us for help. When we believed you and came for guidance and help, you drew out the swords of malice and you helped your enemies (the family of Ziyād) against us.”¹⁵⁷
2. He also said, “May you be destroyed. Without any enmity, malice and argument, you drew out the swords of enmity from the scabbard of revenge and without any reason you readied yourselves to kill the Ahl al-Bayt.”¹⁵⁸

(From this we learn that the shī'ah dhākirs and mujtahidīn who lie and say that the disbelievers of the Banū Umayyah who were killed at the hands of Sayyidunā 'Alīؑ at Badr, Uhud, Şiffin and other places took revenge by martyring the Ahl al-Bayt in Karbala. This is proven totally baseless. Those who martyred Sayyidunā Ḥuseinؑ were not from Shām, they were not from the Banū Umayyah, and they did not fight in revenge for anything, as is clear from the speech of Sayyidunā Ḥuseinؑ)

¹⁵⁷ Jilā' al-'Uyūn p. 391

¹⁵⁸ Ibid

3. Finally, he made a du'ā' of misfortune, “O Allāh, stop the blessings of the land from them and split them. May the rulers never be pleased with them because they called us for help, but they used the swords of malice against us.”¹⁵⁹

Today the shī'ah proudly say that they remained oppressed under every government in Islāmic history. The reason for this is the du'ā' of misfortune made for them by Sayyidunā Ḥuseinؑ

4. He also said, “May you be destroyed. Allāh will avenge me in both the worlds....in this way that may He cause you to turn your swords against yourselves and that you shed your own blood. May you not benefit from the world and may your hopes never be realised. When you die and go the hereafter, may you be given the punishment that is meted out to the worst disbelievers.”¹⁶⁰

Today, the du'ā' of misfortune made by Sayyidunā Ḥusein holds true when they take chains, knives and swords and their mātam, they cause themselves to bleed, and it is definitely true. The du'ā' for the hereafter will also definitely be true. (O Allāh, Āmīn)

5. Looking at this julūs (gathering) Sayyidunā Zayn al-'Ābidīnؑ said, “You wail and cry over us. Tell us, who killed us?”
6. Then, Sayyidah Zaynabؑ made du'ā' of misfortune, “O Kufan traitors, plotters, you cry upon us, whereas through your oppression our eyes have not dried, our cry upon your oppression has not yet ended. Your example is like that of a woman who cuts the thread, you have also severed your imānī

¹⁵⁹ Ibid

¹⁶⁰ Jilā' al-'Uyūn p. 409

link and have turned to disbelief. You hold mātām for us, when you were the ones who killed us. You cry in grief over us, by Allāh, you will cry in abundance and laugh little. You have purchased a defect and disgrace for yourself. This brand of disgrace will never be washed away with any water (tears).”¹⁶¹

The beloved of Sayyidah Fāṭimahؓ, Sayyidah Zaynabؓ who was oppressed, made the above curse and her curse is seen to be true, to the letter.

7. Sayyidah Fāṭimah bint Ḥuseinؓ said, “You have martyred us in such a way and looted our wealth, imprisoned us, just as you martyred our grandfather Sayyidunā ‘Alīؓ. Our blood will always be dripping from your swords. You will soon face your recompense. May you be destroyed. Wait, the continuous punishment and curses of Allāh will descend upon you. Punishment from the heavens will reach you. In the world, you will turn your own swords against yourself in lieu of your deeds and in the hereafter, you will be in a terrible punishment.”¹⁶²

8. Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm bint Sayyidah Fāṭimahؓ cried and made a call from the tent, “O people of Kufa, may your condition be evil. May your faces be evil. Why did you call my brother Sayyidunā Ḥuseinؓ, you did not help him, you killed him, looted his wealth and captured his women. May you be cursed, may shame be upon you.”¹⁶³

Upon this, the people of Kufa said, “Hai, Hai” and began to cry even more and beat themselves even more. They covered their

¹⁶¹ Jilā’ al-‘Uyūn p. 424

¹⁶² Jilā’ al-‘Uyūn p. 425

¹⁶³ Ibid p. 426

heads in the soil of regret and stretched their faces, slapped themselves and wailed for destruction. They cried so much that no eye saw a greater mātām. Looking at this scene, Sayyidunā Zayn al-‘Ābidīnؓ made the people silent and after praising Allāh and sending salutations upon Rasūlullāh’, he said,

“O people, I take an oath and say that you wrote a letter to my father, deceived him. You promised that you pledged allegiance and you finally waged war against him.”¹⁶⁴

9. Umm Kulthūm bint ‘Alīؓ said, “O people of Kufa, your men kill us and women cry upon us. On the day of Qiyāmah, Allāh will decide between us and you.”¹⁶⁵

In the above quotes, the true killers of Hadrat Huseinؓ have been pointed out, upon the tongues of those who were in the caravan of Hadrat Huseinؓ on that fateful day, but were saved due to being quite at a distance, within their tents and these quotations have been recorded by the shia themselves, in books which they regard as the most authentic of scripts.

As mentioned previously, in the precense of such evidence and statements of admission, it does seem inappropriate that due consideration not be given to the two prime suspects discussed above, viz. Mukhtaar ibn Ubeid and the shia.

Summary

¹⁶⁴ Ibid

¹⁶⁵ Jilā’ al-‘Uyūn p. 428

1. The purpose of this book is merely to highlight the fact that since there is a lot of conflicting evidence with regards to Yazid ibn Muawiyah's involvement in the martyrdom of Hadrat Husein Radiyallahu Anhu, it would indeed be appropriate to consider the possibility of another 'suspect' being involved and the 'accused' having been framed.

2. In the writings above, one point that has been proven quite strongly is that Hadrat Husein's journey to Iraq had nothing to do with the character of Yazîd, whether he was evil or not, but rather with the issue of who should be caliph. After understanding this, one should ask the question as to why are we now adamant to delve into the personal, private life of Yazîd and prove that he indeed was a drunkard, adulterer, etc. Have we not been taught to hold good opinion of fellow believers and to avoid prying into their private affairs?

3. Whosoever attempts to question any issue regarding 'Karbala' immediately gets labelled as harbouring hatred for the 'Ahle-e-Bait', whereas all understand that if a lawyer stands to question the strength of the proof against the 'accused', it in no way implies that he is harbouring hatred against the 'murdered party'. Labelling anyone questioning the facts regarding 'Karbala' as 'enemies of the Ahle-Bait' is similar to the practice of labelling those who question the truth behind the 'holocaust' and '911' as 'Anti-Semitic' and as a 'terrorist'.

Just as how the love for Rasulullâh is an integral part and an obvious demand of Imaan, so too is the love of those that were beloved to Rasulullâh, with the pure daughters of Rasulullâh, his pure grandchildren, his pure wives, his believing pure uncles and aunts, (collectively known as the Ahle-Bait) and those Sahâbah who accepted Islâm right at the beginning, being in the forefront of those who Rasulullâh loved the most. Any doubt harboured against any of these illustrious personalities places one's Imaan on the brink of ruin. May Almighty Allâh save us all from saying, writing or making any type

of indication which displeases Almighty Allâh and causes hurt to Rasulullâh.

4. It is imperative to understand that in the entire episode of Karbala Hadrat Husein committed no wrong whatsoever. His journeying to Iraq to accept the allegiance of the masses was completely justified, since it was on the basis that the population of Iraq had not as yet pledged their allegiance to the new caliph, a notion that he was unfortunately deceived into believing.

Some find it hard to accept that Hadrat Husein could have been deceived, whereas he himself had stated in unambiguous words that he had been deceived into coming to Iraq by the numerous letters that were sent to him. Hadrat Muslim ibn Aqeel too had clearly stated in his letter to Hadrat Husein that he had been deceived.

Hadrat Husein and Muslim ibn Aqeel did not regard 'being deceived' to be below the status of the illustrious grandson of Rasulullâh, nor did any of the other Sahabâh who later made mention that the liars of Iraq had betrayed Hadrat Husein.

'Being deceived' is no sin, nor is it against the status of any individual. It is only one who has been affected with the 'poison' of deeming Hadrat Husein to be an 'infallible Imâm' that shall find this hard to swallow.

5. As for why Yazid did not punish Ibn Ziyâd for his oppressive attitude that led to the martyrdom of Hadrat Husein, mention has already been made that when the messenger of Ibn Ziyaad came to Yazid he presented a fabricated version of events explaining that they had merely wished to arrest Hadrat Husein, but he and his men refused to surrender.

Even the family of Hadrat Huseinؑ were not quite sure as to what had transpired just before the outbreak of the battle, thus not a single one of them can be found even once ordering or at least merely requesting Yazid to punish Ibn Ziyaad as well as the soldiers of the army that had martyred Hadrat Huseinؑ.

Due to the propaganda of the numerous hypocrites in the Iraqi army, Yazid was deceived into believing that the battle of Karbala occurred as a result of Hadrat Huseinؑ's refusal to be arrested. And, as mentioned above, 'being deceived' is no sin and one in the court of the Almighty shall not be held accountable for decisions passed as a result of being 'deceived'.

Yes, if one could prove that Yazid was well aware of all the finer details of the battle of Karbala, yet he did nothing to bring the criminals to justice, then surely he would be worthy of blame and severe criticism.

As long as such proof however does not surface, it would indeed be only fair to view him as 'innocent' until proven guilty.

6. After it has been shown that Yazid's being a transgressor or not has practically nothing to do with why Sayyiduna Husein set out for Iraq, the issue of Yazid's personal life now becomes a secondary issue and one in which 'silence' would most probably be the best approach, especially since clear mention is found in the Ahadith that man should not involve himself with criticizing the dead, since their matter has already reached Almighty Allah and He shall deal with them accordingly.

Rasulullah Sallallahu Alaihi wa Sallam has said:

لا تسبوا الأموات، فإنهم قد أفضوا إلى ما قَدَّموا (البخاري)

'Do not criticize the dead for they have reached what they have sent ahead.'

In fact the deeper one looks at this matter, the more the inclination to rather adopt silence grows.

In the pages that follow various conflicting narrations regarding the personal life of Yazid shall be placed side by side, which shall aid one in understanding why 'silence' in this matter seems to be the best approach.

Conflicting views regarding Yazid

1. Some scholars have stated that Yazid ordered the killing of Sayyiduna Hussein Radiyallahu Anhu.

Conflicting view: Contrary to this, Imam Ghazali wrote:

*'Verily the Islam of Yazid ibn Muawiyah has been proven. As for his having killed Hadrat Husein (عليه السلام), or ordering his killing, or merely being pleased with his death, nothing of that sort has ever been proven. He was not even present when Hadrat Husein (عليه السلام) was martyred! It is thus not permissible to entertain such evil thoughts regarding Yazid, since holding evil thoughts against a believer (without substantial proof) is impermissible.'*¹⁶⁶

Allamah Ibn Taimiyah wrote:¹⁶⁷

'Yazîd ibn Muawiyah, in accordance to what all have narrated, never gave the order that Husein (عليه السلام) be killed. All that he did was

^{١٦٦} وما صح قتله الحسين، رضي الله عنه، ولا أمره لا رضاه بذلك، ومهما لم يصح ذلك منه لا يجوز أن يظن ذلك به فإن إساءة الظن بالمسلم أيضاً حرام، وقد قال تعالى: (اجتنبوا كثيراً من الظن إن بعد الظن عذاباً عظيمًا) وقال النبي، صلى الله عليه وسلم: (إن الله حرم من المسلم دمه وماله وعرضه وأن يظن به ظن السوء) - (قيد الشريد من أخبار يزيد)
^{١٦٧} إن يزيد لم يأمر بقتل الحسين باتفاق أهل النقل، ولكن كتب إلى ابن زياد أن يمنعه عن ولاية العراق. والحسين - رضي الله عنه - كان يظن أن أهل العراق ينصرونه ويقفون له بما كتبوا إليه، فأرسل إليهم ابن عمه مسلم بن عقيل، فلما قتلوا مسلماً وغدروا به وبايعوا ابن زياد، أراد الرجوع فأدركته السرية الظالمة، فطلب أن يذهب إلى يزيد، أو يذهب إلى الثغر، أو يرجع إلى بلده، فلم يمكنه من شيء من ذلك حتى يستأجر لهم، فامتنع، فقاتلوه حتى قُتل مظلوماً - رضي الله عنه -، ولما بلغ ذلك يزيد أظهر التوجع على ذلك، وظهر البكاء في داره، ولم يسب له حرباً أصلاً، بل أكرم أهل بيته، وأجازهم حتى ردهم إلى بلدهم (منهاج السنة النبوية)

that he wrote to Ibn Ziyaad ordering that he prevent Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام) from taking over Iraq.

Allamah Ibn Salah (author of the famous book regarding the principles of Ahadith, Muqaddimah Ibn Salah) wrote:

*According to us, it is not correct to say that Yazid had ordered the killing of Sayyiduna Husein Radiyallahu Anhu. What is proven is that the one who ordered that fighting against the caravan of Husein Radiyallah Anhu commence, which ultimately led to the killing of Sayyiduna Husein Radiyallahu Anhu was Ubeidullah ibn Ziyad, the governor of Iraq at that time.'*¹⁶⁸

2. Some scholars have stated that after the martyrdom of Sayyiduna Husein Radiyallahu Anhu, the women-folk of his caravan were chained and in a disgraceful manner taken to Shaam, and to the court of Yazid.

Conflicting view -Allamah Ibn Taimiyah wrote:¹⁶⁹

'As for what some have mentioned, that the women of the caravan of Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام) were taken captive and paraded around the towns disgracefully, upon camels with no saddles, these narrations are nothing but clear-cut lies and fabrications. By the grace of Almighty Allâh, the Muslim Ummah has never taken a Hashimi woman as a captive, nor have they ever taken one as a slave. It is

^{١٦٨} أجاب رضي الله عنه لم يصح عندنا أنه أمر بقتله رضي الله عنه والمخفوف أن الأمر بقتاله المفضي إلى قتله كرمه الله إنما هو عبيد الله بن زياد وإلى العراق إذ ذاك (فتاوى ابن الصلاح)

^{١٦٩} وأما ما ذكره من سبي نسائه والدوران بهن على البلدان وحملهن على الجمال بغير أقتاب، فهذا كذب، وباطل وماسى المسلمين. والله الحمد. هاشمية قط، ولا استحلّت أمة محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم هاشمية قط، ولكن أهل الهوى والجهل يكذبون كثيراً. (منهاج السنة النبوية)

the ignorant and those drowned in their base desires that have spoken many lies in this regard!’

3. Some scholars have stated that Yazid was an open transgressor, with acts like drinking wine, adultery, etc being common in his court. (There are numerous historical narrations that speak regarding this, but if one were to scratch slightly at the surface of these narrations, he shall find most, if not all of it, being narrated from extremely weak narrators, liars, and shias, most famous amongst whom is Abu Mikhnaf, a well-known shia liar.)

Conflicting view -Qadhi Abu Bakr ibn Al-Arabi mentioned the following in Al-Awaasim¹⁷⁰:

‘If one were to say that Yazîd was addicted to the bottle, we shall say, ‘This accusation shall not be heard and considered as long as two witnesses are not presented, so who are your witnesses?’

Rather, righteous men have borne testimony that Yazid was just and reliable. Yahya ibn Bukeir has narrated from Laith ibn Sa’d, that he said, ‘Amirul Mu’mineen Yazid passed away on this date’. Laith ibn Sa’d called Yazid ‘Amirul Mu’mineen’ despite the era of his rule having already ended. Had Yazid not been as such, Laith would have merely said ‘Yazid passed away on...’ (End of quote)

^{١٧٠} قال القاضي أبو بكر بن العربي: "فإن قيل: كان يزيد خماراً. قلنا: لا يحل إلا بشاهدين، فمن شهد بذلك عليه؟ بل شهد العدول بعدالته، فروى يحيى بن بكير عن الليث بن سعد، قال الليث: توفي أمير المؤمنين يزيد في تاريخ كذا، فسماه الليث أمير المؤمنين بعد ذهاب ملكهم وانقراض دولتهم، ولولا كونه عنده كذلك ما قال إلا توفي يزيد (العواصم) - و كلام الليث مذكور في تاريخ خليفة بن خياط بلفظ: قرئ على ابن بكير وأنا أسمع عن الليث قال توفي أمير المؤمنين يزيد في سنة أربع وستين ليلة البدر في شهر ربيع الأول (تاريخ خليفة بن خياط)

In the book (بل ضللت)، written in refutation of Tijaani’s filthy book, titled, (ثم اهتديت)، the author, while refuting the accusations made against Yazîd, writes the following:

أما اتهام يزيد بالفسق وشرب الخمر ، فهذا من الكذب الظاهر ، وندع محمد بن علي بن أبي طالب رضي الله عنه يجيب على هذا الادعاء لأنه أقام عند يزيد وهو أدرى به

‘As for the slander made against Yazîd, regarding being an open transgressor, drinking liquor, etc, these are nothing but blatant lies. And it would seem best that we let Hadhrat Muhammad ibn Ali ibn Abi Talib (Muhammad ibn Hanafiyah - the son of Sayyiduna Ali) himself answers these accusations, since he had spent time with Yazîd, thus he should know better!’

(What did Muhammad ibn Hanafiyah, the son of Sayyiduna Ali say?)

When Abdullâh ibn Mutee’ mentioned that Yazîd is an alcoholic, one who abandons Salaah, and breaks the commands of Almighty Allâh, Muhammad ibn Hanafiyah replied,

‘I had never seen such things, whereas I had spent a good amount of time by Yazîd. Rather, I found him to be punctual with his Salaah, always desirous of good, always enquiring regarding the Shar’ee law in matters which arose before him, a man firm on the Sunnah!’

The group answered that perhaps Yazîd had behaved that way during his stay just to put on a show and deceive him. Muhammad ibn Hanafiyah replied,

‘What reason was there for him to pretend in front of me? He had no reason to fear me, nor did I have anything which he needed from me! What, did Yazîd allow you the opportunity to watch him drinking liquor? If Yazîd had drunk this liquor in your presence, then you are just as guilty, since you took part in the gathering (without making

any objection at that time)! And if you were not present, and never personally saw Yazîd drinking liquor, then it is not permissible for you to give evidence of that which you do not know for certain!’

The group replied, ‘These are known facts, even though we had personally not witnessed it.’

Ibn Hanafiyah answered, ‘Almighty Allâh has not allowed this. Almighty Allâh states, ‘Unless one gives evidence of matters one knows for certain!’

In fact, during Ibn Hanafiyah’s stay by Yazîd, an interesting dialogue took place between him and Yazîd:

Balaazari, in Ansaabul-Ashraaf, narrates¹⁷¹:

When Muhammad ibn Hanafiyah went to bid farewell to Yazîd, after having spent a considerable amount of time by Yazîd in Damascus, (which occurred after the incident of Karbala, as mentioned in other narrations), Yazîd, who had showed him great respect all along, asked him the following question:

‘O Abul-Qasim, if you have seen any evil trait or unbecoming quality in me, please inform me. I promise that I shall immediately refrain from that and I shall do as you advise.’ Ibn Hanafiyah replied, ‘By Allâh, had I seen you doing wrong, I would have immediately rebuked you and prohibited you therefrom, for Almighty Allâh has made it obligatory upon the people of knowledge to never conceal the truth! I have not seen from you, but that which is good!’

^{۱۷۱} روي البلاذري أن محمد بن علي بن أبي طالب - المعروف بابن الحنفية - دخل يوماً على يزيد بن معاوية بدمشق ليودعه بعد أن قضى عنده فترة من الوقت ، فقال له يزيد ، و كان له مكرماً : يا أبا القاسم ، إن كنت رأيت مني خُلُقاً تنكره نَزَعْتُ عنه ، و أتيت الذي تُشير به علي ؟ فقال : والله لو رأيت منكراً ما وسعني إلا أن أنْهَكَ عنه ، وأخبرك بالحق لله فيه ، لما أخذ الله علي أهل العلم عن أن يبينوه للناس ولا يكتُموه ، وما رأيت منك إلا خيراً . (أنساب الأشراف للبلاذري)

4. Some scholars have stated that the narrations indicating towards the fisq (acts of transgression) of Yazid have reached the level of ‘tawatur’ and can thus not be rejected.

Conflicting view: The great scholar of Ahadith, Allamah Habibur Rahman Azmi, wrote¹⁷²:

تواتر کی حقیقت:

اور یہ جو بعض علماء جذبات کی رو میں بہہ کر کہہ دیتے ہیں کہ یزید کی بد اعمالیوں کی شہرت حد تواتر کو پہنچی ہوئی ہے، تو میرے نزدیک یہ بات محبتِ اہل بیت کے جوش میں قلم سے نکل گئی ہے، مگر شریعت ایسے جوش کی کوئی حوصلہ افزائی نہیں کرتی، اور میں اس کو ان علماء کی اضطرابی حرکت سمجھتا ہوں، ورنہ حقیقت کی میزان میں ان کی یہ بات پوری نہیں اترتی، ہر افواہ جو پھیل جائے اس کو خبر متواتر کہنا تواتر کی سخت توہین ہے، تواتر کے لیے جہاں اور شرطیں ہیں اس کی ایک ضروری شرط یہ ہے کہ اگر خبر کا تعلق دیکھنے کی چیز سے ہو تو ضروری ہے کہ اس کا مستند انتہا مشاہدہ ہو، ورنہ وہ متواتر نہیں ہو سکتی۔

پس یزید کی بد اعمالیوں کو متواتر کہنے سے پہلے یہ دیکھنا ضروری ہے کہ ان خبروں کا سلسلہ اوپر جا کر جہاں ختم ہوتا ہے، وہاں بکثرت ایسے لوگوں کے بیانات پائے جاتے ہیں یا نہیں جو یہ کہتے ہوں کہ ہم نے ان بد اعمالیوں کا ارتکاب کرتے ہوئے یزید کو دیکھا ہے، اگر خبروں کا سلسلہ ایسے بیانات پر منتهی ہوتا ہے تو ان کو متواتر کہنا بے شک صحیح ہے، لیکن اگر ایسا نہیں ہے بلکہ ان کی آخری کڑی محض افواہ اور سُنی سنائی باتیں ثابت ہوتی ہیں، تو ان کو متواتر کہنا بالکل غلط اور صریح مغالطہ ہے۔

واقعہ تو یہ ہے کہ آنکھ سے دیکھ کر کہنے والا ایک شخص بھی نہیں ہے، چہ جائیکہ جم غفیر، اور دعویٰ کر دیا جاتا ہے تو اتر کا۔ حالانکہ اس صورت سے تو اتر تو درکنار، شرعی اصول سے بد اعمالیوں کا مطلقاً ثبوت نہیں ہوتا۔ ایسی صورت میں یزید پر شرعی اصول سے فاسق ہونے کا حکم کیسے لگے گا۔

The reality of Tawatur

As with regards to what some scholars have claimed, acting upon the impulse of their emotions, that the evil of Yazid has been narrated through matawir chains, according to what I understand, such statements should be viewed as an error from their side that resulted on account of their extreme love for the Ahlul Bait. The shariah however gives no credence to such errors.

Declaring every news item that has found place upon the tongues of the masses as mutawatir is in fact a disgrace to the high mantle of 'tawatur'. For tawatur there are many conditions, amongst which one is that if the news is with regards to something that has been seen, then it will be necessary that the amount of people that had seen it were numerous.

Thus, with regards to the evil of Yazid, it is necessary that one checks whether the amount of people that had seen Yazid doing evil were so many in number that their testimony could be called mutawatir. If this is found then without doubt it could be said that the evil of Yazid is established with tawatur. If however, we find that the chain ends with mere mention of Yazid having done evil, but with no mention of who had seen him doing it, then this can, in no way, be called mutawatir.

The fact of the matter is that forget a huge number of people having seen Yazid perpetrating evil, there is no evidence of even one person having seen him doing any evil. Thus. the claim of tawatur is indeed farfetched. On the basis of such baseless reports one cannot be declared a transgressor.

5. Some scholars have stated that it was the view of all the great scholars of the past that Yazid was a transgressor, his ascension to the caliphate was not correct and if anyone believes contrary to this, he shall be regarded to be astray.

Conflicting view: In the Tarikh of Tabari the view of Sayyiduna Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyah, the son of Sayyiduna Ali ibn Abi Talib Radiyallahu Anhu, is quoted. He said:

*'I spent much time in the company of Yazîd ibn Muawiyah. I found him punctual upon his Salaah and always desirous of doing good. He would like discussing issues of jurisprudence and was staunch upon the Sunnah!'*¹⁷³

The great historian, Ibn Khaldoon, has written in his Muqaddimah:

'The reason behind Hadrat Muawiyah رضي الله عنه preferring his son as caliph over all others was due to the great hope that lied in such a decision maintaining unity in the Ummah, due to the consensus of the leading decision makers (Ahlul-Hal Wal Aqd) from the Banu Ummayah cabinet upon Yazid.

The justice of Sayyiduna Muawiya Radiyallahu Anhu and the fact that he was a companion of Rasulullah Sallallahu Alaihi wa Sallam does not allow one to accept any other reason for his

^{۱۷۳} وقد حضرتہ وأقامت عنده فرأيتہ مواظبا على الصلاة، متخريا الخير، يسأل عن الفقه، ملازما للسنه. (تاريخ الطبري)

decision. Also, the presence of senior Sahaba Radiyallahu Anhum during that time and their silence is a clear proof that there was nothing suspicious regarding this decision, since the Sahaba Radiyallahu Anhum are not those who would ever be found lax in proclaiming the truth, and neither was Sayyiduna Muawaiya such a person whose pride would prevent him from accepting the truth. Nay, all of them were far from such acts and their quality of being just would never allow them to behave such.¹⁷⁴

The great Hanbali scholar, Abdul Ghani Maqdisi, when questioned regarding Yazid, answered as follows:

His caliphate was correct. Certain scholars of written that seventy Sahabah Radiyallah Anhum pledged allegiance to him, amongst whom was Ibn Umar Radiyallahu Anhu.

As for loving him, the one who likes him shall not be criticized. And if one does not like him, he shall not be forced to do so, since he was not a Sahabi, who we love simply on account of their being the companions of Rasulallah Sallallahu Alaihi wa Sallam. As for Yazid, there is nothing that differentiates him from the other Khulefa who were from the Ta'bieen, like Abdul Malik ibn Marwan and his sons.

^{١٧٤}: والذي دعا معاوية لإيثار ابنه يزيد بالعهد دون سواه، إنما هو مراعاة المصلحة في اجتماع الناس، واتفاق أهوائهم باتفاق أهل الحل والعقد عليه -وحيث من بني أمية- وإن كان لا يظن بمعاوية غير هذا، فعدائته وصحته مانعة من سوى ذلك، وحضور أكابر الصحابة لذلك، وسكوتهم عنه، دليل على انتفاء الريب منه، فليسوا ممن تأخذهم بها الحق هواده، وليس معاوية ممن تأخذه العزة في قبول الحق، فإنهم -كلهم- أجل من ذلك، وعدائهم مانعة منه. (ابن خلدون: المقدمة (ص ٢١٠ - ٢١١))

Yes, one should be prevented from attacking his integrity, lest this leads to opening up an avenue for the integrity of his illustrious father to be attacked, as well as in order to keep the door of fitna (turmoil) closed.¹⁷⁵

6. Some scholars have stated that Imam Ahmed ibn Hanbal would curse Yazid.

Conflicting view: -Allamah ibn Taimiyah wrote¹⁷⁶:

What is proven from Imam Ahmed ibn Hanbal is that when asked by his son whether he curses Yazid, he replied, 'And when have you ever seen your father curse anyone?'

As for the narration that makes mention of Imam Ahmed cursing Yazid, Ibn Taimiyah stated that this narration has a cut in its chain of narrators (munqati'), and is thus not a proven statement of Imam Ahmed.

^{١٧٥} وسئل عن يزيد بن معاوية؟ فأجاب: خلافته صحيحة. قال: وقال بعض العلماء: بايعه ستون من أصحاب رسول الله - صلى الله عليه وسلم -، منهم ابن عمر. وأما محبته: فمن أحبه فلا ينكر عليه، ومن لا يحبه فلا يلزمه ذلك؛ لأنه ليس من الصحابة الذين صحبوا رسول الله - صلى الله عليه وسلم -، فيلتزم محبتهم إكراماً لصحبته، وليس ثم أمر يمتاز به عن غيره من خلفاء التابعين، كعبد الملك وبنيه. وإنما يمنع من التعرض للوقوع فيه؛ خوفاً من التسلق إلى أبيه، وسداً لباب الفتنة. (عمدة الأحكام الكبرى المؤلف: عبد الغني بن عبد الواحد المقدسي الحنبلي، (المتوفى: ٦٠٠ هـ))

^{١٧٦} وأما نقلك عن أحمد فالثابت عنه من رواية ابنه صالح أنه قالَ وَمَتَى رَأَيْتَ أَبَاكَ يلعن أحداً وَنَقَلَ عَنْهُ لعنته من رواية مُنْقَطَعَةٍ لَيْسَتْ ثَابِتَةً عَنْهُ (المنتقى في منهاج الاعتدال)

Abu Talib Aqbari, who was from amongst the famous students of Imam Ahmed ibn Hanbal, and who stayed in his company till his demise, himself asked Imam Ahmed regarding the one who curses Yazid ibn Muawiya. Imam Ahmed ibn Hanbal replied:

*'We do not discuss this matter! Rasulullah Sallallahu Alaihi wa Sallam has stated that cursing a believer is as grave a sin as killing him. He Sallallahu Alaihi wa Sallam has also stated that the best of eras is his, after which is the one following it. Yazid was from that era, thus I feel it best to refrain from such discussions!'*¹⁷⁷

7. Scholars have stated that there is full permission to curse Yazid, on account of his evil personality and due to him being responsible for the killing of Sayyiduna Husein Radiyallah Anhum.

Conflicting view – Sheikh Muhammad Abu Saeed Khadimi Hanafi (d.1156 A.H) wrote regarding this¹⁷⁸:

'According to other scholars the cursing of Yazid is not permissible. This is the view of Imam Ghazali and it is this view that is in line with the principles set down, since it is always

^{١٧٧} عصمة بن أبي عصمة أبو طالب العكبري روى عن إمامنا أشياء منها قال سألت أبا عبد الله عمن لعن يزيد بن معاوية فقال لا نتكلم في هذا قال النبي (لعن المؤمن كقتله) وقال (خير القرون قرني ثم الذين يلونهم) وقد كان يزيد فيهم فأرى الإمساك أحب إلي وذكره أبو بكر الخلال وقال كان صالحا صاحب أبا عبد الله إلى أن مات روى عنه مسائل كثيرة جيادا (المقصد الأرشد في ذكر أصحاب الإمام أحمد)

^{١٧٨} وعند آخرين لا يجوز لعنه وعليه الغزالي وهو الموافق للقواعد والأصول لجواز توثيقه وإيمانه في الخاتمة وأما نفس قاتل الحسين رضي الله تعالى عنه ومن أجازه أو رضي به فيجوز على العموم كما نقل عن الصواعق المحرقة وبالجملية الأكثر والمختار على عدم لعنه كما سبق تفصيله ((ريقة محمودية))

possible that Yazid had repented and brought faith before his demise. Yes, if one wishes to, in a general manner (i.e. without specifying a particular name) curse the killers of Sayyiduna Husein Radiyallahu Anhu, or the ones who gave permission for the act and were pleased with it, such cursing shall be allowed, as mentioned in As-Sawariq al-Muharriqah. In short, the view adopted by the majority is that he should not be cursed.'

Allamah ibn Salah wrote:

'Criticizing and cursing Yazid is not from the traits of the believers, even if it were to be proven that Yazid had ordered the killing, or that he was pleased with it.'

He also wrote:¹⁷⁹

'With regards to Yazid there are three groups. The first are those who love Yazid. The second are those who criticize and curse him. Then there is a balanced approach group, who do not declare their love for him, nor do they curse him. Rather, they regard him as they regard all the other kings of Islam. It is this group that has adopted the most correct path. It is their view that seems most appropriate

١. ^{١٧٩} وأما سب يزيد ولعنه فليس من شأن المؤمنين فإن صح أنه قتله أو أمر بقتله وقد ورد في الحديث المحفوظ أن لعن المسلم كقتله وقاتل الحسين رضي الله عنه لا يكفر بذلك وإنما ارتكب عظيما وإنما يكفر بالقتل قاتل نبي من الأنبياء صلى الله عليه وسلم والناس في يزيد ثلاث فرق فرقة تحيه وتتوالاه وفرقة أخرى تسبه وتلعنه وفرقة متوسطة في ذلك لا تتوالاه ولا تلعنه وتسلك به سبيل سائر ملوك الإسلام وخلفائهم غير الراشدين في ذلك وشبهه وهذه الفرقة هي الصيبة ومذهبها اللاتق بمن يعرف سير الماضين ويعلم قواعد الشريعة الطاهرة جعلنا الله من خيار أهلها آمين (فتاوى ابن الصلاح)

to the one who understands the history of the 'past' and who understands the pure principles of the Shariah. May Almighty Allah make us from the best of the people of Islam.'

8. A Shafi' scholar, Ali ibn Muhammad (known as Ilkiya Hirasi), has written:

As for the predecessors, we find two views regarding Yazid, quoted from Imam Ahmed, one which is explicit and one which is ambiguous. So too is it with Malik and Abu Hanifah. As for us, we have one view, which is explicit, with no ambiguity in it, and why should that not be the case when he would play backgammon, would hunt with cheetahs, would be addicted to liquor, and his poetry regarding liquor is well known.¹⁸⁰

Conflicting view: Sheikh Ilkiya has not given any reference for the two views of the three Imams that he made reference to, nor has he made it clear what their two views were. All that he says is that one view is explicit and the other ambiguous.

Had this scholar been known as a reliable authority, especially in the subject regarding the history of the Umayyad empire, perhaps his statement would have been considered, and a meaning could perhaps have been derived from it that the Imam's, in both their explicit and ambiguous views had severely criticized Yazid. But,

¹⁸⁰ وأما قول السلف ففيه لأحمد قولان تلويح وتصريح، ولمالك قولان تلويح وتصريح، ولأبي حنيفة قولان تلويح وتصريح، ولنا قول واحد التصريح دون التلويح وكيف لا يكون كذلك وهو اللاعب بالنرد والمتصيد بالفهود ومدمن الخمر، وشعره في الخمر معلوم (وفيات الاعيان)

when it is known that Ilkiya had been accused of belonging to the Batiniyah sect of the shia, which was the filthiest and the most dangerous sect of the shia during that era,¹⁸¹ he no longer remains an authority, a man of credibility, and one whose words can be relied upon, especially when he provides no reference for it.

Furthermore, the very books that have quoted the above statement of Sheikh Ilkiya, have also quoted a contradictory verdict attributed to Imam Ghazali Rahimahullah, who was an authority on the verdicts of Imam Shafi' Rahimahullah, which further weakens the claim of Sheikh Ilkiya.

Had there been a clear-cut ruling of Imam Shafi' Rahimahullah regarding the permissibility of cursing Yazid, Imam Ghazali Rahimahullah would surely have been aware of it and would not have been so vocal in declaring such an act to be impermissible. In fact, he had even gone to the limit of declaring the one who curses to be cursed.

In Wafayatul A'yaan, after quoting the statement of Sheikh Ilkiya, the following has been recorded:

¹⁸¹ علي بن محمد بن علي، أبو الحسن الطبري، الملقب بعماد الدين، المعروف بالكيا الهراسي: فقيه شافعي، أصولي، متكلم، مفسر، ولد في طبرستان، وتفقه على إمام الحرمين، وقدم بغداد فسكنها، ودرس بالنظامية إلى أن مات. قال عبد الغافر الفارسي: "كان من رؤوس معيدي إمام الحرمين في الدرس، وكان ثاني أبي حامد الغزالي، بل أصل وأصلح وأطيب في الصوت والنظر، ثم اتصل بخدمة الملك بركيارق، وحظي عنده بالمال والجاه وارتفع شأنه، وتولى القضاء بتلك الدولة". واتهم بمذهب الباطنية فرجم، وأراد السلطان قتله فحماه المستظهر وشهد له (معجم المفسرين «من صدر الإسلام وحتى العصر الحاضر» المؤلف: عادل نويهض)

Imam Ghazali Rahimahullah was asked (1) if it is permissible to directly curse Yazid, (2) if Yazid had intended to have Sayyiduna Husein Radiyallahu Anhu killed or was his intention merely to ward off his opposition, (3) is it permissible to ask Almighty Allah to show mercy to him or is silence preferred.

Imam Ghazali Rahimahullah answered as follows:

It is not permissible at all to curse a believer. He who curses a believer is in fact himself cursed. Rasulullah Sallallahu Alaihi wa Sallam declared, 'A muslim is not one who curses.' How can cursing a believer ever be permissible, whereas even the cursing of animals in the Ahadith has been declared unlawful. The sanctity of a believer is greater than that of the Ka'bah, as per the teachings of the Ahadith, and the Islam of Yazid has been proven.

As for his killing Sayyiduna Husein Radiyallahu Anhu, or ordering the killing, or being happy with it, nothing of that sort has been proven. As long as it has not been proven it will not be permissible to entertain such thoughts regarding him, since entertaining evil thoughts regarding a believer is not permissible. Almighty Allah declares: 'Avoid entertaining too many thoughts, since many a thought is a sin in itself!' Rasulullah Sallallahu Alaihi wa Sallam mentioned, 'Almighty Allah has sanctified the blood, the wealth and the honour of a believer and has declared it impermissible that one entertains evil thoughts regarding him.

Whoever has claimed that Yazid had ordered the killing of Sayyiduna Husein Radiyallahu Anu, his statement should be regarded as highly foolish, since it is well known that after the killing of even great men, if one attempts to investigate with regards to which authority had ordered the killing, etc, he would

be unable to do so, even if the killing had occurred in his own era, and close-by to him. How then could it be expected that one could learn the details of a murder that occurred in a land far away from him, approximately four hundred years after the murder had been committed, especially when bigotry (ta'assub) is found playing a big role in this incident and when conflicting narrations are found from both sides. This is thus such a matter, the reality of which is not at all known, and thus it is imperative that until the matter becomes known, one thinks good of every believer, as far as is possible.

Together with this, even if it is proven that a muslim had killed another muslim, then too he shall not be declared an unbeliever, since killing is not an act of kuft, but rather a major sin. It is always possible that before the death of the killer he repents from his sin. If a disbeliever were to repent, before death, from his kufr, it would be accepted, so why then would the repentance of one who killed not be accepted? How will it be known that the killer of Sayyiduna Husein Radiyallahu Anhu did not repent before death? Thus the cursing of any believer is not permissible and who does such an act, he shall be deemed as a transgressor.

Even if cursing was permissible, but an individual chose to remain silent, he would never be regarded as a sinner. In fact, if one did not curse Iblis even once in his life, on the Day of Resurrection, he shall never be questioned as to why he had not cursed Iblis. Yes, if could be asked from the one who cursed others, 'Why did you curse?' and 'how did you know that this individual is far from the mercy of Almighty Allah?'. It is only with regards to those whose death as disbelievers is confirmed that we can say that they are far from the mercy of Almighty Allah, since this is known from the Shariah.

As for seeking Almighty Allah's forgiveness for Yazid, that is not only permissible, but even commendable, since it forms part of the dua we make daily in every salaah, when we say, 'O Allah, forgive the believing men and the believing women', and Yazid was indeed from the believers. And Almighty Allah knows best.¹⁸² (End of verdict attributed to Imam Ghazali Rahimahullah)

^{١٨٢} وقد أفتى الإمام أبو حامد الغزالي، رحمه الله تعالى، في مثل هذه المسألة بخلاف ذلك، فإنه سئل عن صرح بلعن يزيد (٢) : هل يحكم بنفسه أم هل يكون ذلك مرخصاً فيه وهل كان مريداً قتل الحسين، رضي الله عنه، أم كان قصده الدفع وهل يسوغ الترحم عليه أم السكوت عنه أفضل ينعم بإزالة الاشتباه مثاباً، فأجاب: لا يجوز لعن المسلم أصلاً، ومن لعن مسلماً فهو الملعون، وقد قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: (المسلم ليس بلعانٍ)، وكيف يجوز لعن المسلم ولا يجوز لعن البهائم وقد ورد النهي عن ذلك، وحرمة المسلم أعظم من حرمة الكعبة بنص النبي، صلى الله عليه وسلم. ويزيد صح إسلامه، وما صح قتله الحسين، رضي الله عنه، ولا أمره لا رضاه بذلك، ومهما لم يصح ذلك منه لا يجوز أن يظن ذلك به فإن إساءة الظن بالمسلم أيضاً حرام، وقد قال تعالى: (اجتنبوا كثيراً من الظن إن بعد الظن، وقال النبي، صلى الله عليه وسلم: (إن الله حرم من المسلم دمه وماله وعرضه وأن يظن به ظن السوء)، ومن زعم أن يزيد أمر بقتل الحسين، رضي الله عنه، أو رضي به فينبغي أن يعلم به غاية حماقة، فإن من قتل من الأكابر والوزراء والسلطين في عصره لو أراد أن يعلم حقيقة من أمر بقتله ومن الذي رضي به ومن الذي كرهه لم يقدر على ذلك، وإن كان قد قتل في جواره وزمانه وهو يشاهده، فكيف لو كان في بلد بعيد وزمن قديم قد انقضى، فكيف يعلم ذلك فيما انقضى عليه قريب من أربعمائة سنة في كان بعيد وقد تطرق التعصب في الواقعة فكثرت فيها الأحاديث من الجوانب فهذا أمر لا تعرف حقيقته أصلاً، وإذا لم يعرف وجب إحسان الظن بكل مسلم يمكن إحسان الظن به، ومع هذا فلو ثبت على مسلم أنه قتل مسلماً فمذهب الحق أنه ليس بكافر، والقتل ليس بكفر بل هو معصية، وإذا مات القاتل فربما مات بعد التوبة، والكافر

لو تاب من كفره لم تجز لعنته، فكيف من تاب عن قتل وبم يعرف أن قاتل الحسين رضي الله عنه، مات قبل التوبة وهو الذي يقبل التوبة عن عباده، فإذا لا يجوز لعن أحد ممن مات من المسلمين، ومن لعنه كان فاسقاً عاصياً لله تعالى، ولو جاز لعنه فسكت لم يكن عاصياً بالإجماع، بل لو لم يلعن إبليس طول عمره لا يقال له يوم القيامة: لم لم تلعن إبليس، ويقال للآعن: لم لعنت ومن أين عرفت أنه مطرود ملعون والملعون وهو المبعد من الله عز وجل، وذلك غيب لا يعرف إلا فيمن مات كافراً فإن ذلك علم بالشرع، وأما الترحم عليه جائز، بل هو مستحب، بل هو داخل في قولنا في كل صلاة (اللهم اغفر للمؤمنين والمؤمنات)، فإنه كان مؤمناً والله أعلم؛ كتبه الغزالي (وفيات الاعيان)

9. Some have written that when the blessed head of Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام) was placed in front of Yazîd, he poked at it mockingly, and when a Sahâbi (عليه السلام) rebuked him saying that he (عليه السلام) had seen Rasulullâh (عليه السلام) kissing those very lips of Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام), Yazîd became angry and reprimanded the Sahâbi (عليه السلام).

Conflicting view: The actual reason for many believing that Yazîd mocked at the blessed head of Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام) is due to a narration mentioned in the Tarikh of Tabari¹⁸³, quoting from the infamous Abu Mikhna (the shia liar). The narration is as follows:

'A Sahâbi, by the name of Abu Barazah Al-Aslami (عليه السلام) stood up and said, 'Are you poking your stick into the mouth of Husein (عليه السلام), whereas this very mouth has been blessed that the lips of Rasulullâh (عليه السلام) itself touched it! O Yazîd, you shall appear on the Day of Qiyamah, with Ibn Ziyaad as your intercessor, whilst Husein (عليه السلام) shall appear with Rasulullâh (عليه السلام) as his (عليه السلام) intercessor!'

When one ponders over the narrations in which mention is made that a Sahâbi (عليه السلام) became irritated when witnessing the blessed head of Hadhrat Husein (عليه السلام) being mockingly poked at by Yazîd, one shall find mention being made of one of two names, viz. Hadhrat Anas ibn Malik (عليه السلام) and Hadhrat Abu Barazah Al-Aslami (عليه السلام).

With regards to these men, Allâmah ibn Taimiyyah writes:

^{١٨٣} فقال رجل من أصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يقال له أبو برزة الأسلمي أتتكم بقضيبيك في ثغر الحسين أما لقد أخذ قضيبيك من ثغره مأخذاً لربما رأيت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يرشفه أما إنك يا يزيد تجيء يوم القيامة وابن زياد شفيحك ويجيء هذا يوم القيامة ومحمد صلى الله عليه وسلم شفيعه (البداية ناقلًا عن هشام عن أبي مخنف قال حدثني أبو حمزة الثمالي عن عبد الله الثمالي عن القاسم بن بخيت)

فإنّ أبا برزة، وأنس بن مالك، كانا با لعراق لم يكونا بالشام، ويزيد بن معاوية كان بالشام، لم يكن بالعراق حين مقتل الحسين، فمن نقل أنه نكت بالقضيب بحضرة هذين قدامه فهو كاذب قطعاً، كذبا معلوما بالنقل المتواتر (راس الحسين – ابن تيمسة)

“It is known without any doubt that Abu Barazah (As-Aslami) and Hadhrat Anas ibn Malik were in Iraq and not in Shâm, whilst Yazîd ibn Muawiyah was in Shâm, not in Iraq, when Hadhrat Husein was martyred. Thus, whosoever narrates that Yazîd ibn Muawiyah poked at the blessed head of Hadhrat Husein in the presence of these two men, he should be regarded as an open liar, one whose lies have been refuted with tawatur!”

Rather, what is known and what has been narrated with much better and stronger sanads is that this incident actually occurred when the blessed head of Hadhrat Husein was placed in front of Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad. Later, either by mistake, or with evil intent, as shaitaani liars are well known for, this filthy act had been attributed to Yazîd, since he too had used a stick to touch the face of Hadhrat Husein, except that his act was done in love, not in mock.

The narrations that show this are as follows:

- Imam Bukhârî¹⁸⁴ narrates from Hadhrat Anas ibn Malik, that when the blessed head of Hadhrat Husein was brought in front of Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad, he began poking at it and he said something regarding the handsomeness of the face.
- In the Musnad of Bazzar, with a sound sanad, it has been mentioned that Hadhrat Anas rebuked Ibn Ziyaad, saying: ‘By Allâh, I shall say something that shall put you to shame.

¹⁸⁴ عن أنس بن مالك رضي الله عنه : أتى عبيد الله بن زياد برأس الحسين بن علي عليه السلام فجعل في طست فجعل ينكت وقال في حسنه شيئا (البخاري)

Verily I had seen the blessed lips of Rasulullâh on the very spot that you are poking at!’ Hearing this, Ibn Ziyaad pulled his hand back.¹⁸⁵

- a) Certain narrations, with a weaker sanad¹⁸⁶, mention that at that very moment Hadhrat Zaid ibn Arqam spoke out saying, ‘Lift up your stick, for verily I had seen the lips of Rasulullâh on that very spot!’

From the above it has become clear that Hadhrat Anas ibn Malik had rebuked Ibn Ziyaad when he poked at the blessed face of Hadhrat Husein, and not at Yazîd, since he (Hadhrat Anas) was not in Sham at that time.

With regards to Hadhrat Abu Barazah Al-Aslami, what is known for certain, as pointed out by Hafiz Ibn Taimiyyah is that he too was not in Shaam when the blessed head of Hadhrat Husein was brought there. In fact, so much can be said for certain that Hadhrat Abu Barazah Aslami was present in **Iraq**, not Shaam, during the era of Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad. If he had rebuked anyone with regards to poking at the blessed face of Hadhrat Husein, it would have been Ibn Ziyaad, and not Yazîd.

Imam Bukhârî, in his Târikh-e-Awsat, describing Hadhrat Abu Barazah, has stated:

نضلة بن عبيد أبو برزة الأسلمي نزل البصرة دخل على عبيد الله بعد حسين بن علي رضي الله تعالى عنهما (التاريخ الاوسط)

¹⁸⁵ وعن أنس قال : لما أتى عبيد الله بن زياد برأس الحسين جعل ينكت بالقضيب ثناياه يقول : لقد كان – أحسبه قال – جميلاً فقلت : والله لأسوءنك إني رأيت رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم يلثم حيث يقع قضيبك . قال : فانقبض (رواه البزار والطبراني بأسانيد ورجاله وثقوا)

¹⁸⁶ عن زيد بن أرقم لما أتى بن زياد برأس الحسين بن علي رضي الله عنهما فجعل ينقر بقضيب في يده في عينه وأنفه قال له زيد أرفع القضيب فلقد رأيت فم رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم في موضعه (المعجم الكبير و فيه حرام بن عثمان و هو متروك)

Nadlah ibn Ubeid, Abu Barazah Al-Aslami ؓ, a resident of Basrah.
After the death of Hadhrat Husein ؓ he came in the presence of
Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad

10. Many scholars have accused Yazîd of many vile acts, amongst which are: adultery, drinking of liquor, abolishing the Islâmic punishments, keeping wild animals and monkeys as pets, etc

Conflicting view: Those who differ state:

The first question that needs to be asked is who had witnessed Yazîd committing these acts. Merely stating that many books of history have narrations regarding this can in no way be sufficient. The possibility that shaitaani forces were working tirelessly to portray the rulers of the caliphate as evil, merely to instigate the masses against them, is highly probable. In the light of the above, the need arises to allow every accusation made against Yazîd to be scrutinized.

In fact, this is the approach demanded by the shariah, as is evident from the following verses:

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا إِن جَاءَكُمْ فَاسِقٌ بِنَبَأٍ فَتَبَيَّنُوا أَن تُصِيبُوا قَوْمًا بِجَهَالَةٍ
فَتُصِيبُوا عَلَى مَا فَعَلْتُمْ نَادِمِينَ (الحجرات)

O People of Imaan, if a man whose honesty and uprightness has not been established, brings you news, first authenticate it (before accepting and practicing upon its demands), lest you wrongly attack a nation in your ignorance, an act which you shall then have to lament!

With regards to lending an ear to an accusation of adultery, Almighty Allâh says:

لَوْلَا إِذ سَمِعْتُمُوهُ ظَنَّ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ وَالْمُؤْمِنَاتُ بِأَنفُسِهِمْ خَيْرًا (النور)

Why is it not that when believing men and women hear such an accusation, they do not think good of their own people?

In fact, if such an accusation had been made against a chaste woman, and she asked for her right, the ones levelling the accusation would have been ordered to bring forward four just witnesses to back their accusation, failing which they themselves would then be subjected to eighty lashes each.

Almighty Allâh says:

لَوْلَا جَاءُوا عَلَيْهِ بِأَرْبَعَةِ شُهَدَاءَ فَإِذْ لَمْ يَأْتُوا بِالشُّهَدَاءِ فَأُولَئِكَ عِنْدَ اللَّهِ هُمُ الْكَاذِبُونَ (النور)

Why do they not bring forth four witnesses?

If they cannot do so, then they themselves are, in the court of Almighty Allâh, the biggest liars!

When so much emphasis has been laid to not lending an ear to mere accusations, it seems only fair that Yazîd also be allowed this right.

When one studies the narrations spread throughout the books of history, describing Yazîd as a transgressor, adulterer, etc, one shall find that the prime source of all these narrations is a narration which Tabari narrated in his Târikh. The narration, with its sanad is as follows¹⁸⁷:

¹⁸⁷ فبعث يزيد بن معاوية إلى الوليد فعزله فيما ذكر أبو مخنف عن عبد الملك بن نوفل بن مساحق عن حميد بن حمزة مولى لبني أمية وبعث عثمان بن محمد بن أبي سفيان فيما ذكر أبو مخنف عن عبد الملك بن نوفل بن مساحق عن حميد بن حمزة مولى لبني أمية قال فقدم فتى غر حدث غمر لم يجرب الأمور ولم يحكنه السن ولم تضرسه التجارب وكان لا يكاد ينظر في شيء من سلطانه ولا عمله وبعث إلى يزيد وفدا من أهل المدينة فيهم عبد الله بن حنظلة الغسيل الانصاري وعبد الله بن أبي عمرو ابن حفص بن المغيرة المخزومي والمنذر بن الزبير ورجالا كثيرا من أشرف أهل المدينة فقدموا على يزيد بن معاوية فأكرمهم وأحسن إليهم وأعظم جوائزهم ثم انصرفوا من عنده وقدموا المدينة كلهم إلا المنذر بن الزبير فإنه قدم على عبيد الله ابن زياد بالبصرة وكان يزيد قد أجازته بمائة ألف درهم فلما قدم أولئك نفر الوفد المدينة قاموا فيهم فأظهروا شتم يزيد وعبه وقالوا إنا قدمنا من عند رجل ليس له دين يشرب الخمر ويعزف بالطناير ويضرب عنده القيان ويلعب بالكلاب ويسامر الخراب والفتيان وإنا نشهدكم إنا قد خلعناه فتابعهم الناس (تاريخ الطبري)

Yazîd ibn Muawiyah ordered that Walid hand the governorship of Madinah Munawwara over to Uthmaan ibn Muhammad ibn Abi Sufyaan. A young inexperienced man thus came over to Madinah Munawwara as governor, one who hardly paid any attention to the needs of the state and to what he had been made responsible over. He (Uthmaan ibn Muhammad) sent a delegation from the people of Madinah Munawwara to Yazîd, amongst whom were Abdullâh ibn Hanzalah ؓ; Abdullâh ibn Abu Amr ibn Hafs ibn Mugheera Al-Makhzoomi; Munzir ibn Zubeir; and other influential individuals of Madinah Munawwara.

When they came to Yazîd, he showered them with gifts and honoured them greatly. Thereafter all departed, for Medina Munawwara, except Munzir ibn Zubeir, who proceeded to Basrah, to spend time with Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad. When these men returned to Madinah Munawwara, they stood up amongst the people and began criticizing and pointing out the faults of Yazîd.

They said, 'We have come from a man, who has no Deen (religion), who drinks liquor, plays with drums, keeps dogs as pets, spends his private time with the rot of society. We thus make you witness that we have broken our allegiance from this man.' After hearing this, the people of Medina Munawwara followed suit.

The problems with this narration are:

- a) Tabari narrates this incident from Abu Mikhnaf, who narrates from Abdul Malik ibn Naufal, who narrates from Humeid ibn Hamzah. The sad state of Abu Mikhnaf, especially when it comes to lending fuel to shia propaganda, is common knowledge. His name appearing in the sanad of this narration is itself more than sufficient reason for this entire accusation to be discarded.

- b) Ibn Asakir has also narrated regarding this incident, with a much stronger chain, but in his narration a completely different picture comes to the fore.

Ibn Asakir narrates from¹⁸⁸ Abu-Ghalib, Muhammad ibn Hasan Al-Basari, (a high-ranking, reliable narrator¹⁸⁹) who narrates from Mubarak ibn Abdul-Jabbar, (also a high ranking, reliable narrator¹⁹⁰)

^{١٨٨} أخبرنا أبو غالب محمد بن الحسن البصري أنا المبارك بن عبد الجبار بن أحمد أنا أبو الحسن محمد بن عبد الواحد بن محمد بن جعفر أنا أحمد بن إبراهيم بن الحسن بن شاذان البزاز نا أبو بكر أحمد بن محمد بن شبيب بن أبي شبة البزاز أنا أبو جعفر أحمد بن الحارث الخزاز أنا أبو الحسن علي بن محمد بن عبد الله بن أبي سيف المدائني عن مسلمة بن محارب عن داود بن أبي هند وعلي بن زيد وعن سلمة بن عثمان وعامر بن حفص عن أشياخ من أهل المدينة وعوانة ويزيد بن عياض قالوا استعمل يزيد عثمان بن محمد بن أبي سفيان على المدينة فلما حضر الموسم كتب إليه يأمره أن يقيم للناس الحج سنة اثنتين وستين ثم قدم المدينة فأقام بها فقال أهل المدينة لعثمان أوفد منا وفدا إلى أمير المؤمنين يعتذر إليه مما بلغه فأوفد عثمان وفدا إلى يزيد من قریش وغيرهم فيهم عبد الله بن جعفر بن أبي طالب وعبد الله بن أبي عمرو بن حفص بن المغيرة المخزومي ورجل من بني عدي من آل سراقه وعثمان بن عطاء بن تويت ومحمد بن عمرو بن حزم الأنصاري وعبد الله بن حنظلة غسيل الملائكة والعباس بن سهل بن سعد الساعدي ومعقل بن سنان الأشجعي فقدموا على يزيد وهو بحوارين فنزلوا على الوليد بن عتبة فأقاموا عشرة أيام لم يصلوا إلى يزيد وانتقل يزيد من حوارين منتزها وشخص الوفد معه فأذن لهم يوم الجمعة فدخلوا عليه وعنده الوليد بن عتبة وعمر بن سعيد ويزيد على سرير ماد رجليه قد غطاهما بسبينة فرحب بهم وتلقاهم بشعر حسن واعتذر إليهم من تركه الإذن لهم عليهم وقال لم أزل وجعا من رجلي إن الذباب ليسقط عليها فيخيل إلي أن صخرة سقطت عليها فقام إليه السراقي وهو شيخ كبير به رعش فدنا منه فسقط عليه فقال اعمدوا الشيخ حاجتك فلم يسأله شيئا إلا أنعم له به وقام إليه العباس بن سهل بن سعد الساعدي فاتكأ على رجله التي شكا يزيد الوجع منها فقطب يزيد من شدة الوجع والعباس يكلمه ويسأله وهو يقول نعم حتى سأله عشرين حاجة ثم قام إليه عثمان بن عطاء بن تويت فقال يا أمير المؤمنين انظر إلى أثر هذا السفه في ظهري وألقى ثوبه عن ظهره فقال عمرو للوليد بن عتبة هذا عملك أنت أمرته قال لا ما أمرته قال بلى فردد ذلك مرارا فقال الوليد ما أمرته ولا أمرت أهل العراق بإخراج سعيد من الكوفة وكثر القول بينهما فكفهما يزيد وأمر الوفد برفع حوائجهم فلم يسألوا حاجة إلا قضاهما ثم وصلهم بعد قضاء حوائجهم وأذن لهم في الانصراف فرجعوا دامين له مجمعين على خلعه ورجع الوليد بن عتبة إلى المدينة وأقام عبد الله بن جعفر لم ينصرف مع الوفد وقال بعضهم لم يكن عبد الله بن جعفر في الوفد ولكنه قدم إلى يزيد وحده بعد انصراف الوفد إلى المدينة فلم يزل عند يزيد حتى انقضى أمر الحرة (تاريخ ابن عساکر)

^{١٨٩} أبو غالب الماوردي * الشيخ الامام، المحدث الصدوق، أبو غالب محمد بن الحسن ابن علي بن الحسن التميمي البصري الماوردي (سير اعلام النبلاء)

^{١٩٠} ابن الطيوري * الشيخ الامام، المحدث العالم المفيد، بقية النقلة المكثرين أبو الحسين المبارك بن عبد الجبار بن أحمد بن القاسم بن أحمد بن عبد الله البغدادي الصيرفي (سير اعلام النبلاء)

who narrates from Muhammad ibn Abdul Wahid, (a reliable narrator¹⁹¹) who narrates from Ahmad ibn Ibrahim Bazzaz (a very high ranking, reliable narrator¹⁹²) who narrates from Abu Bakr Ahmed ibn Muhammad ibn Abi Shaibah (a high ranking, reliable narrator¹⁹³) who narrates from Abu Bakr Ahmed ibn Haarith, Kharraz (a high ranking, reliable narrator¹⁹⁴), who narrates from Abu Ali Al-Madaa'ini (a very high ranking, reliable narrator, whose historical narrations hold great weight¹⁹⁵), who narrates from Maslamah ibn Muhaarib (who has been classified as reliable by Ibn Hibbaan).

Maslamah ibn Muhaarib narrates this incident from four men, viz.

- 1) Dawood ibn Abi Hind (who has been classified as reliable by Ibn Hibbaan)
- 2) Ali ibn Zaid (the writer has been unable to ascertain the status of this narrator, due to his full name not being known)
- 3) Salamah ibn Uthmaan (who has been classified as reliable by Ibn Hibbaan)
- 4) Aamir ibn Hafs (also known as Suheim ibn Hafs, who has been classified as reliable by Ibn Nadeen in his Al-Fahrist¹⁹⁶)

These four narrate from:

- 1) 'اشياخ من اهل مدينة' 'senior members of Madinah Munawwara'. The names of these seniors have not been given, but in the mere

¹⁹¹ محمد بن عبد الواحد بن محمد بن جعفر أبو عبد الله البغدادي البزاز ابن زوج الحرة مكثر روى عنه الخطيب، ووثقه (تاريخ الاسلام للذهبي)

¹⁹² ابن شاذان * الشيخ الامام، المحدث الثقة المتقن، أبو بكر، أحمد بن إبراهيم بن الحسن بن محمد بن شاذان بن حرب بن مهران البغدادي البزاز (سير اعلام النبلاء)

¹⁹³ أحمد بن محمد بن شبيب البغدادي البزاز. أبو بكر بن أبي شيبة - وثقه الدارقطني (تاريخ الاسلام للذهبي)

¹⁹⁴ أحمد بن الحارث البغدادي. أبو جعفر الخزاز (شيخ صدوق (تاريخ الاسلام للذهبي)

¹⁹⁵ المدائني * العلامة الحافظ الصادق أبو الحسن علي بن محمد بن عبد الله بن أبي سيف المدائني الاخباري. نزل بغداد، وصنف التصانيف، وكان عجا في معرفة السير والمغازي والأنساب وأيام العرب، مصدقا فيما ينقله، عالي الاستاد (سير اعلام النبلاء)

¹⁹⁶ وكان عالما بالأخبار والأنساب والمآثر والمثالب ثقة فيما يرويه (الفهرست)

mention that they were 'seniors', this itself lends great indication that their words can be trusted.

- 2) Awanah (ibn Al-Hakam, who has been classified as reliable by Hâfiz Al-A'jeli)
- 3) Yazîd ibn l'yaadh (the scholars have termed him as unreliable and some have labelled him as a fabricator of Ahâdith)

This then is the state of the sanad of the narration that shall now be mentioned. As a historical narration, it indeed seems quite strong, much stronger than what Tabari has narrated from Abu Mikhnaḥ, since the only major issue is with Yazîd ibn l'yaadh, but as the sanad shows, he is not the sole narrator of this incident. (And Almighty Allâh knows best)

The narration is as follows:

'Yazîd ibn Muawiyah appointed Uthmaan ibn Muhammad as governor over Madinah Munawwara. When the time of Hajj approached, he ordered that he lead the Hajj. This was in the 62nd year of Hijrah. After Hajj, when Uthmaan ibn Muhammad returned to Madinah Munawwara, the people of Madinah Munawwara requested that a delegation be sent to the Amîr (i.e. Yazîd) to clarify and explain some issues, the news of which had reached the ears of Yazîd.'

Uthmaan ibn Muhammad complied and sent a delegation comprising members from the Qureish, as well as other tribes. Amongst these members were Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Ja'far; Abdullâh ibn Abi Amr ibn Hafs; a man from Banu Adi', from the Suraaqah tribe; Uthmaan ibn A'ta; Muhammad ibn Amr ibn Hazm; Abdullâh ibn Hanzalah, Abbaas ibn Sahl ibn Sa'd, and Hadhrat Ma'qil ibn Sinaan.

When they reached Shâm, they were hosted by Walid ibn Utbah for ten days, due to Yazîd being at another place, called Huwwareen (a famous area in Damascus). Finally, on the day of Jumu'ah, the delegation got the chance to meet Yazîd, in the presence of Walid ibn Utbah and Amr ibn Saeed. Yazîd welcomed them and sought forgiveness for the delay,

explaining that he was suffering with severe pain in the leg, so much so that even if a fly were to sit on it, it would feel as though a rock had fallen upon it.

First the old man from the Suraaqah tribe went forward, but due to having a sickness which caused his body to shake, he tumbled and landed upon the aching leg of Yazîd. (Without showing any anger) Yazîd ordered his minister to fulfil whatever requests the Suraaqi man had. Abbaas ibn Sahl ibn Sa'd stood up next and came forward. (Without realizing) he leaned upon the very leg which was aching, causing Yazîd to shiver in pain. Abbaas ibn Sahl had twenty requests, all of which Yazîd promised to fulfil.

Uthmaan ibn A'ta stood up next. He lifted his upper garment, exposing his back and scars made most probably by a whip. He pointed to Walid ibn Utbah, indicating that he had unjustly ordered that he be whipped. Walid ibn Utbah responded, 'I had never issued such an order, neither had I ever ordered the people of Iraq to remove Saeed (ibn Aas) from Kufa!' The argument continued until Yazîd intervened and ordered both to remain quiet. Yazîd thereafter issued an order that the requests and needs of the delegation be fulfilled.

After granting them all their needs, Yazîd presented them with gifts and permitted them to leave.

The delegation returned, upset with Yazîd and intent on breaking their allegiance. Walid ibn Utbah returned to Madinah Munawwara and Abdullâh ibn Ja'far chose to remain by Yazîd. (According to one narration, Abdullâh ibn Ja'far was not part of the delegation, but rather he only reached after the delegation had departed, and he thereafter remained with Yazîd, until the war of Harrah.

In the light of this narration there are three points indeed worthy of consideration

- 1) The reason for sending the delegation was mentioned, i.e. 'to clarify and explain some issues, the news of which had reached the ears of Yazîd'. What were these issues? It seems that already in Madinah Munawwara there were some issues regarding Yazîd and his ministers that had upset certain prominent men of Madinah Munawwara and had made them utter statements, which were thereafter conveyed to Yazîd. This group now wished to be able to speak directly with Yazîd and explain the reasons behind their criticizing his government.
- 2) When the group left, despite receiving what they had requested, they were still upset with Yazîd and intent on breaking their allegiance. Why?

The reason could either be what was mentioned in the narration of Tabari, i.e. they had witnessed, **during the one meeting which they had with him, on the day of Jumu'ah**, acts of immorality, drinking of liquor, playing with dogs and monkeys, etc. If this was really the reason, then why would Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Ja'far, the nephew of Hadhrat Ali, the son of Hadhrat Ja'far At-Tayyar, after seeing such filth being committed from the seat of Caliphate, still choose to remain with Yazîd after the delegation left, as the narration mentions.

Even if it is said that he only came after the delegation, then too the question would arise that how was it possible for the delegation, in only one meeting, on the day of Jumu'ah, to see such actions, whilst Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Ja'far, Hadhrat Nu'maan ibn Basheer, and so many other prominent figures, who spent lots of time with Yazîd, had never witnessed such affairs?

The other possibility is that the reason for them being upset with Yazîd had nothing to do with Yazîd's personal life at all, but was rather the very reason for which the delegation had come, i.e. they were not happy with **certain ministers** and felt Yazîd was not doing enough to

address the situation. In the narration we read that Yazîd granted whatever they asked for, but when the issue of Walid ibn Utbah having unjustly lashed the old man from the Suraaqah tribe was brought up, Yazîd ordered that the matter be left aside.

If one were to now ask why did Yazîd not punish Walid for his wrong acts, the answer would be that such accusations against ministers were not uncommon, rather from the era of Hadhrat Umarؓ, ministers were being accused of wrong behaviour, but whenever a thorough investigation was conducted, a different picture would emerge, proving the innocence of the minister. Yazîd was well aware of this and felt that there was no real need to now ask for an investigation, especially since Walid ibn Utbah had already been removed from his post as governor over Madinah Munawwara. (And Almighty Allâh knows best)

11. Some scholars have claimed that none of the illustrious Sahaba and Tabi'een remained firm on their allegiance to Yazid. Rather, upon witnessing his evil they all broke their allegiance.

Conflicting view: When one ponders studies the books of history he shall find the names of many illustrious personalities, who not only remained firm upon his pledge to Yazid, but in fact exhorted others to do so as well. Below follows the names of some of those personalities and a crux regarding their relationship with Yazid.

1) Hadhrat Muhammad ibn Hanafiyah, the illustrious son of Hadhrat Aliؓ

Allâmah ibn Kathir narrated the following¹⁹⁷ in Al-Bidâyah, as well as Hafiz Zahabi, in Tareekhul-Islâm

¹⁹⁷ ولما رجع أهل المدينة من عند يزيد مشى عبد الله بن مطيع وأصحابه إلى محمد بن الحنفية فأرادوه على خلع يزيد فأبى عليهم فقال ابن مطيع إن يزيد يشرب الخمر ويترك الصلاة ويتعدى حكم الكتاب فقال لهم ما رأيته منه ما تذكرون وقد حضرته وأقيمت عنده فرأيتني مواضيا على الصلاة متحريرا للخير يسأل عن الفقه ملازما للسنة قالوا فان ذلك كان منه تصنعا لك فقال وما الذي خاف مني أو رجا حتى يظهر إلى الخشوع أفاطعنكم على ما تذكرون من شرب الخمر فلنن كان أطلعكم على ذلك إنكم لشركاؤه

When the delegation of Madinah Munawwara returned from Yazîd, Abdullâh ibn Mutee'ؓ and his companions came to Muhammad ibn Hanafiyah (the son of Hadhrat Aliؓ) and requested that he too break his allegiance to Yazîd.

Ibn Hanafiyah flatly refused to do so. Abdullâh ibn Mutee'ؓ then mentioned that Yazîd is an alcoholic, one who abandons Salaah, and breaks the commands of Almighty Allâh.

Muhammad ibn Hanafiyah replied, 'I had never seen such things, whereas I had spent a good amount of time by Yazîd. Rather, I found him to be punctual with his Salaah, always desirous of good, always enquiring regarding the Shar'ee law in matters which arose before him, a man firm on the Sunnah!'

The group answered that perhaps Yazîd had behaved that way during his stay just to put on a show and deceive him. Muhammad ibn Hanafiyah replied, 'What reason was there for him to pretend in front of me? He had no reason to fear me, nor did I have anything which he needed from me! What, did Yazîd allow you the opportunity to watch him drinking liquor? If Yazîd had drunk this liquor in your presence, then you are just as guilty, since you took part in the gathering (without making any objection at that time)! And if you were not present, and never personally saw Yazîd drinking liquor, then it is not permissible for you to give evidence of that which you do not know for certain!'

The group replied, 'These are known facts, even though we had personally not witnessed it.' Ibn Hanafiyah answered, 'Almighty Allâh

وإن لم يطلعكم فما يحل لكم أن تشهدوا بما لم تعلموا قالوا إنه عندنا لحق وإن لم يكن رأيناه فقال لهم أباي الله ذلك على أهل الشهادة فقال إلا من شهد بالحق وهم يعلمون ولست من أمركم في شيء قالوا فلعلك تكره أن يتولى الأمر غيرك فنحن نؤتيك أمرنا قال ما أستحل القتال على ما تريدوني عليه تابعا ولا متبوعا قالوا فقد قاتلت مع أبيك قال جيئوني بمثل أبي أقاتل على مثل ما قاتل عليه فقالوا فمر ابنك أبا القاسم والقاسم بالقتال معنا قال لو أمرتهما قاتلت قالوا فقم معنا مقاما تحض الناس فيه على القتال قال سبحان الله أمر الناس بما لا أفعله ولا أرضاه إذا ما نصحت لله في عباده قالوا إذا نكرهك قال إذا أمر الناس بتقوى الله ولا يرضون المخلوق بسخط الخالق وخرج إلى مكة (البداية)

has not allowed this. Almighty Allâh states, 'Unless one gives evidence of matters one knows for certain!'

The group responded, 'Perhaps you fear that when we choose a new leader, we shall overlook you and choose someone else? We promise that you alone shall be appointed as our leader.' Ibn Hanafiyah replied, 'I do not regard this fight of yours with the caliph as permissible, irrespective whether I am made your leader or I am made a follower.'

The group then asked, 'Then why did you fight with your father (Hadhrat Ali ؑ) against Hadhrat Muâwiyah?' Ibn Hanafiyah replied, 'Bring someone like my father, and I shall join him, fighting for what my father fought for!' The group then requested that he at least allow his two sons to join them in their fight, to which Ibn Hanafiyah replied that if he felt it right for them to join the fight, he would have himself joined.

Finally the group asked that the minimum he do is to stand and encourage the people to join them in their fight against the caliph. Ibn Hanafiyah replied, 'SubhanAllâh! Do you want that I encourage towards that which I do not regard as right. If I had to do such a thing, I would not be sincere to Almighty Allâh.'

The group then threatened that they would then force him to say what they wanted. He replied, 'If you do so, I shall stand up and warn the people that they should fear Allâh, and should not please the creation by doing that which displeases the Creator!' Saying this, Ibn Hanafiyah left for Makkah Mukarramah.

Muhammad ibn Hanafiyah is the son of Hadhrat Ali ؑ, whose love and respect for his two brothers, Hadhrat Hasan ؑ and Hadhrat Husein ؑ was unimaginable and whose piety and bravery was metaphorical. On the plains of Karbala, it was his beloved brother, Hadhrat Husein ؑ, and his family members that were martyred. Had he seen or known anything evil of Yazîd, would he ever have concealed it?

From his testimony in favour of Yazîd, together with the accusations of *fisq* (open transgression, etc) being refuted, another accusation that is clearly refuted is the accusation that Yazîd had treated the family of Hadhrat Husein ؑ with great disrespect and dishonour, when they were brought to him, after the battle at Karbala. Muhammad ibn Hanafiyah gave this testimony after having heard from his sister, Zainab bint Ali ؑ, and his nephew, Zainul-Aabideen (Hadhrat Husein ؑ' son) what had transpired on the plains of Karbala, and what treatment they had received at the hands of Yazîd. Had they seen anything evil or had they received any form of ill-treatment from Yazîd, they would surely have mentioned it to him, and he would have at the very least, made some indication towards it in his testimony of!

For this reason, in the book (بل ضللت), written in refutation of Tijaani's filthy book, titled, (ثم اهتديت), the author, while refuting the accusations made against Yazîd, wrote the following:

أما اتهام يزيد بالفسق وشرب الخمر ، فهذا من الكذب الظاهر ، وندع محمد بن علي بن أبي طالب رضي الله عنه يجيب على هذا الادعاء لأنه أقام عند يزيد وهو أدرى به

'As for the slander made against Yazîd, regarding being an open transgressor, drinking liquor, etc, these are nothing but blatant lies. And it would seem best that we let Hadhrat Muhammad ibn Ali ibn Abi Talib ؑ (Muhammad ibn Hanafiyah ؑ) himself answers these accusations, since he ؑ had spent time with Yazîd, thus he should know better!'

In fact, during Ibn Hanafiyah ؑ's stay by Yazîd, an interesting dialogue took place between him and Yazîd, which is indeed worth mentioning:

Balaazari, in Ansaabul-Ashraaf, narrates¹⁹⁸:

When Muhammad ibn Hanafiyah went to bid farewell to Yazîd, after having spent a considerable amount of time by Yazîd in Damascus, (which occurred after the incident of Karbala, as mentioned in other narrations), Yazîd, who had showed him great respect all along, asked him the following question,

‘O Abul-Qasim, if you have seen any evil trait or unbecoming quality in me, please inform me. I promise that I shall immediately refrain from that and I shall do as you advise.’

Ibn Hanafiyah replied, ‘By Allâh, had I seen you doing wrong, I would have immediately rebuked you and prohibited you therefrom, for Almighty Allâh has made it obligatory upon the people of knowledge to never conceal the truth! I have not seen from you, but that which is good!’

2) Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umarؓ, the illustrious son of Hadhrat Umarؓ

After the incident of Karbala, when many people of Madinah Munawwara were breaking the pledge of allegiance they had made to Yazîd, on account of what they were hearing regarding him, Abdullâh ibn Umarؓ not only remained firm on his pledge, but in fact severely reprimanded those who had broken theirs.

Imâm Ahmed narrates in his Musnad, with a strong (sahîh) sanad¹⁹⁹:

¹⁹⁸ روي البلاذري أن محمد بن علي بن أبي طالب - المعروف بابن الحنفية - دخل يوماً على يزيد بن معاوية بدمشق ليودعه بعد أن قضى عنده فترة من الوقت ، فقال له يزيد ، و كان له مكرماً : يا أبا القاسم ، إن كنت رأيت مني خُلُقاً تنكره نَزَعْتُ عنه ، و أتيت الذي تُشير به علي ؟ فقال : والله لو رأيت منكراً ما وسعني إلا أن أنهك عنه ، وأخبرك بالحق لله فيه ، لما أخذ الله على أهل العلم عن أن يبينوه للناس ولا يكتموا ، وما رأيت منك إلا خيراً . (أنساب الأشراف للبلاذري)

¹⁹⁹ حدثنا عبد الله حدثني أبي ثنا إسماعيل حدثني صخر بن جويرية عن نافع قال : لما خلع الناس يزيد بن معاوية جمع بن عمر بنيه وأهله ثم تشهد ثم قال أما بعد فإننا قد بايعنا هذا الرجل على بيع الله ورسوله وإني سمعت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يقول

‘When the people were breaking their allegiance, Abdullâh ibn Umarؓ gathered his sons and family members and said to them, ‘We have pledged allegiance to this man, and I have heard Rasulullâhؐ saying, ‘One who deceives shall have a flag raised for him on the Day of Judgement, which shall expose him as a deceiver.’ Verily, after ascribing partners to Allâh, the greatest act of deception is to breaks one’s allegiance (which he has made to the Muslim leader). O my family, let not any one of you pull his hand away from Yazîd, nor even entertain this thought. If you do such an act, Abdullâh Ibn Umar shall cut himself off from you totally!’

3) Ibn Kathir, in Al-Bidâyah, narrated that **Abu Ja’far (Baqir)** said²⁰⁰:

‘On the Day of Harrah (when the army of Yazîd attacked Madinah Munawwara) from the family of Abu Talib and from the family of Abdul Muttalib, not a single person rose to fight the army. And when the leader of the army, Muslim ibn Uqbah arrived, he (Muslim) honoured my father (Zainul Aabideen), made him sit close to him, and handed him a document promising them safety.’

The reason that these illustrious personalities refused to take part in the uprising against Yazîd could either be that they never believed the accusations made against Yazîd, as Muhammad ibn Hanafiyahؓ clearly stated, or it could have been for the reason that the Ahâdith of Rasulullâhؐ strongly condemned breaking one’s allegiance, merely on account of news that reaches one, portraying the Muslim leader to be evil. Ubadah ibn Saamitؓ, discussing the pledge that they had made

إن الغادر ينصب له لواء يوم القيامة يقال هذه غدرة فلان وإن من أعظم الغدر أن لا يكون الإشراف بالله تعالى أن يبايع رجل رجلاً على بيع الله ورسوله صلى الله عليه وسلم ثم ينكث بيعته فلا يخلعن أحد منكم يزيد ولا يشرفن أحد منكم في هذا الأمر فيكون صيلم بيني وبينه - مسند احمد - (تعليق شعيب الأرناؤوط : إسناده صحيح على شرط الشيخين)

²⁰⁰ وقال أبو جعفر الباقر لم يخرج أحد من آل أبي طالب ولا من بني عبد المطلب أيام الحرة ولما قدم مسلم بن عقبة المدينة أكرمه وأدنى مجلسه واعطاه كتاب أمان (البداية) و ذكر في موضع آخر وَلَمَّا قَدِمَ مُسْلِمُ بْنُ عَقْبَةَ الْمَدِينَةَ أَكْرَمَ أَبِي وَأَدْنَى مَجْلِسُهُ

with Rasulullâh ﷺ, explained one of the points to be, as narrated by Imam Bukhâri in his Saheeh:

وَأَنْ لَا نَنَازِعَ الْأَمْرَ أَهْلَهُ إِلَّا أَنْ تَرَوْا كُفْرًا بَوَاحًا عِنْدَكُمْ مِنَ اللَّهِ فِيهِ بَرَهَانٌ

*'And that we do not fight against our leaders, **unless we find them involved in open disbelief**, for which we have substantial proof.'*

12. None of the great luminaries of Hind, especially those linked to Darul Ulum Deoband have ever questioned the accusations levelled against Yazid, or doubted its authenticity.

Conflicting view: Amongst the scholars of recent times as well there have been many who have questioned the narratives regarding Karbala, in the light of the weak sanads through which it has been narrated, despite the existence of many stronger narrations portraying a totally different picture.

Amongst those scholars are:

- Moulana Manzoor Nu'mani Rahimahullah (senior disciple of Hadrat Moulana Abdul Qadir Sahib Raipuri Rahimahullah). The view of Hadrat Moulâna has been penned down as a preface to a book written on the subject of Karbala by his honorable son, Moulâna Ateequr Rahmaan Sanbali, titled 'واقعة كربلا اور اس کا پس منظر' (The Incident of Karbala and its background).
- Hadrat Allamah Khalid Mahmud Sahib of the UK
- Hadrat Mufti Rada ul Haq Sahib of South Africa (head mufti at the reknowned institute of Islamic studies in SA, Durul Ulum, Zakariya). Hadrat Mufti Rada ul Haq Sahib's research on this matter is indeed unique and has been penned down

in vol.1 of his commentary on Bad ul Amani, titled ' Badrul Layali '.

- Allamah Habibur Rahman Azmi (whose depth in knowledge was praised by his very own mentor, Hadrat Moulana Ashraf Ali Sahib Thanwi Rahimahullah). Hadrat Moulâna Habibur-Rahmaan Azmi Sâhib view on this matter has been penned down in a treatise he had prepared on this subject, titled 'Tabsirah bar Shahid Karbala wa Yazid'.

A summary of the view of Hadrat Moulâna Habibur-Rahmaan Azmi Sâhib رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ had been penned down by MI Rashied Ahmed al-Azmi and published in Majallatul-Ma-aathir Mau, the translation of which is²⁰¹:

With regards to Yazîd, a wonderful book has been written, titled 'اغلبت المؤرخين' -The Errors of the historians', which I feel should be translated into Urdu and published again and again.

Under the chapter of 'Yazîd ibn Muawiyah' the author of this book²⁰² has written:

In تاريخ الخلفاء of Allamah Suyuti (R.A) criticism has been levelled against Yazîd and he has even been cursed. It is my opinion that the writings against Yazîd are not Suyuti's but rather it has been falsely attributed to him and entered into his writings. If this is not the case, then it will have to be said that Suyuti, without

²⁰¹ Hadrat Moulâna had written this article in reply to a question received from the Mufti of Dârul-Ulûm Deoband, Hadrat Mufti Habîbur-Rahmân Sahib رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ regarding the issue of Karbalâ.

²⁰² The author was the Mufti of Damascus, Sheikh Muhammad Abul-Yusr ibn Aabideen, the grand-nephew of Allamah Ibn Aabideen Shaami (R.A)

making any deep research, merely quoted these statements from other historians.

The lengthy stories that historians quoted, depicting the oppression Yazîd meted out to the Ahle-Bait, are mere stories, narrations with no sound sanad (chain of narrators). The truth of the matter is that the Muslim Ummah had accepted Yazîd as caliph. Allegiance to him was pledged based upon Shar'ee (Islâmic juristic) principles. After becoming caliph, Yazîd had to naturally turn his attention towards those issues which could cause disunity in the Ummah, one of which was the standing up of another person or party against the caliph.

Those who were unhappy with the appointment of Yazîd, their unhappiness was based on the fact that they felt themselves or some else more deserving of the position, which without doubt was correct since they were indeed more pious than Yazîd. The uprising of this group however occurred after the pledge of allegiance had been taken by the majority, thus just as Hadhrat Aliؓ had fought against those who had stood up against him, so too was the case with Yazîd. In fighting against the opposition however, Yazîd never issued any command that the Ahle-Bait be dishonored or oppressed.

Damiri (Shafee') has quoted in Hayaatul-Hayawaan that when the blessed head of Hadhrat Huseinؓ was brought in front of Yazîd and when he heard the details of what had occurred at Karbala, he burst out crying and stated that there was no need to have Hadhrat Huseinؓ killed and that had he, Yazîd, been present at the battle, he would have surely pardoned Hadhrat

Huseinؓ. At that juncture Yazîd even cursed Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad for what he had allowed to happen.

The author thereafter, after quoting various narrations from the Tarikh of Ibn Jareer which show the good conduct that Yazîd displayed with the Ahle-Bait, explained that the virtues mentioned by Rasulullâhﷺ for the first army that shall set off by ship for Jihaad and the first army that shall lay an attack on the city of Constantinople should surely also apply for Yazîd since he was part of these two armies. Rasulullâhﷺ had promised Jannah and forgiveness for the participants of these two armies.

I (Ml Habeebur-Rahmaan Sâhib) say, 'Whoever states that Yazîd was nothing but the son of an Ameer sitting on his father's throne, why does he rather not say that Yazîd was the son of a great Sahabiؓ, the son of a great juristؓ and the son of the trusted scribe of Rasulullâhﷺ. His statement drips with disrespect for Hadhrat Muawiyaؓ! Had this person perused through the writings of Hafiz Ibn Hajar in Al-Isabah he would have perhaps never uttered such nonsense.

Hafiz Ibn Hajar narrated that when Hadhrat Abu Ayoob Ansaariؓ fell sick during the battle of Constantinople, Yazîd came to enquire regarding his health. Hadhrat Abu Ayoobؓ requested that if he were to pass away he should be placed on the back of a horse and taken towards the city as far as possible. When advancing further is no longer possible, he should be buried at that very spot. This bequest of Hadhrat Abu Ayoobؓ was fulfilled by Yazîd. Would one occupied with the enjoyments and comforts of the throne of the king bother fulfilling such requests?

Do those taunting Yazîd not know that in the path of Jihaad even the one occupying the throne is not deprived of reward? Continuing further, the author of the book wrote that Sheikh Sinânudeen Amaasi had quoted in Tabyînul-Mahârim (an accepted and well-recognized book of the Hanafi Mazhab) a letter sent by Yazîd to the people of Basrah, in which Yazîd had quoted a hadith of Rasulullâh ﷺ with regards to the warnings given for being treacherous in the affairs of booty. Would one drowned in evil and haraam bother sending out such edicts and would a jurist utilize a narration and an order issued by a perpetrator of haraam to establish a fiqhi law?

The author in his writings has also shown the errors of Munaawi and Taftaazani in their criticism of Yazîd. Quoting from Rûhul-Bayaan, the author has presented the fatwa of Hafiz Ibn Salaah that the demand of the principles of the Shariah and sound historical narrations is that one does not curse Yazîd, nor should he go to the other extreme of taking Yazîd as his bosom friend, but rather should treat and view Yazîd in exactly the same manner as he views the other Islâmic rulers that came thereafter. In the Fatâwa of Shihâb Ramli it is mentioned that cursing Yazîd is not permissible. This has been clearly mentioned by a group of recognized scholars, with the author of Khulasah being amongst them.

The author has written that the Mazhab of the Ahl-e-Sunnah regarding Yazîd is that which has been mentioned in 'Bad'ul'Amaali', which is:

و لم يلعن يزيدا بعد موت سوى المكثار في الاغراء غال

(After the death of Yazîd only he shall curse him who is an extremist, and who is desirous of nothing but stirring trouble)

The author has also made reference to the refutation of Mullâ Ali Qari راجع عليه against the criticism of Taftâzâni leveled against Yazîd. The student of Ibnul-Hummâm, Kamâl ibn Abi Sharîf, has also refuted Taftâzâni's writings, ending on this note that Taftâzâni's criticism of Yazîd does not befit with the demands of justice.

On a concluding note the author has mentioned that there are four Ahâdith recorded in the Sihâh which lend great indication that Yazîd was indeed far from what general history has depicted of him.

Amongst them is the Hadith of Sahih Bukhâri, in which mention is made that Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Umar ؓ gathered his sons and servants and warned them that Rasulullâh ﷺ had warned the Ummah against treachery. Ibn Umar ؓ then stated that since they had pledged allegiance to Yazîd, on the name of Almighty Allâh and His Messenger', it was not at all permissible for them to now break that allegiance. Ibn Umar ؓ threatened that if any of them breaks their allegiance he, Ibn Umar ؓ, shall cut off ties completely with that individual.

This is the crux of what has been written in 'اغاليط المؤرخين' - The Errors of the historians' from page 117 to 132, and this is more than sufficient for anyone with a slight amount of Deen and piety.

(Article published in مجله المآثر مؤ)

The conflicting views that have been mentioned above is the reason why many scholars have adopted silence as the most cautious route with regards to Yazid ibn Muawiya's role in the martyrdom of Hadrat Husein Radiyallahu Anhu, and with regards to his character. For every statement and narration one finds a conflicting version as well. Coupled with the above, when one ponders over the few points detailed below, one shall surely find within himself an inclination to prefer silence in this matter and leave judgement to Almighty Allah.

Ten points worth pondering over

1. Ali ibn Husein (Zainul-Aabideen)ؑ, the son of Hadhrat Huseinؑ, spent over a month with Yazîd, just after the incident of Karbala, during which time, as narrations mention, Yazîd would not eat a meal except that he was present. Yet not a single narration has come from the lips of Zainul-Aabideen in which mention is made that Yazîd would drink liquor, or commit filthy acts in his court. Had Yazîd been perpetrating these acts so openly, at least once he would have seen something, and the demand of his Imaan would surely have made him speak out, if not in front of Yazîd, then at least in front of others.
2. Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Ja'farؑ and Hadhrat Nu'maan ibn Basheerؑ were amongst those who enjoyed a very close and strong relationship with Yazîd.

Hadhrat Nu'maan ibn Basheerؑ served as Yazîd's governor over Kufa and thereafter was appointed as Yazîd's senior advisor in Shâm itself, in the matters of the state.

As for Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Ja'farؑ, regarding whom Rasulullâhؐ said, 'Abdullâh resembles me in appearance and in character', mention had already been made that Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Ja'far, after coming to Yazîd, remained with him until the incident of Harrah (the attack made by Yazîd's army against the people of Medina Munawwara).

Despite the closeness that these two illustrious men enjoyed with Yazîd, we find no record of any of them criticizing Yazîd with regards to drinking liquor, abandoning Salaah, etc. How could it be that those who were far had witnessed these affairs, whereas those close by remained totally unaware of it?

3. Qadhi Abu Bakr ibn Al-Arabi wrote in Al-Awaasim²⁰³:

'If one were to say that Yazîd was addicted to the bottle, we shall say, 'This accusation shall not be heard and considered as long as two witnesses are not presented, so who are your witnesses?'

4. In the footnotes of Al-Awaasim, under the above quotation, written by Muhibbudeen Al-Katheeb and Mahmood Mahdi Al-Istanbuli, the following has been mentioned²⁰⁴:

^{٢٠٣} قال القاضي أبو بكر بن العربي: "فإن قيل: كان يزيد خماراً. قلنا: لا يحل إلا بشاهدين، فمن شهد بذلك عليه؟ (العواصم من القواصم)

^{٢٠٤} إن الذين نسبوا ليزيد ما لا يحل لهم - الراضية للتوصل إلى التشكيك بالقرآن من وراء الطعن بمعاوية ومن عم الخلفاء الذين ولوه وأقروا على الحكم، وهم نقلة القرآن وحفظته.

* لقد كان يزيد غائباً عن الشام حينما مات أبوه فلما وصل دمشق جددت له البيعة، ثم جمع الناس في الجامع وخطب فيهم مما يدل على تقواه قائلاً بعد حمد الله والثناء عليه:

‘The fact of the matter is that the Rawaafid (sect of the shia) had attributed many lies to Yazîd, attempting thereby to create doubt in the authenticity of the Quraan, by thereafter implicating Hadhrat Muawiyah ؓ as the guilty one, since he had instated Yazîd as caliph, and after Hadhrat Muawiyah, to implicate the Khulefa-e-Raashideen ؓ, since they had instated Hadhrat Muawiyah ؓ as governor during their rule. After implicating all these illustrious men in the so called ‘crimes’ of Yazîd, the question would then be posed that when these men were in the forefront of preserving the Noble Quraan, how can the Quraan ever be accepted as authentic? Nauzubillah!

When Hadhrat Muawiyah ؓ passed away, Yazîd was absent. When he returned to Damascus, a fresh allegiance was pledged at his hands. He thereafter gathered the people and delivered a sermon, which greatly indicates towards his fear of Almighty Allâh. He said, after praising Allâh and sending salutations upon Rasulullâh ؐ

أيها الناس! إن معاوية كان عبدا من عبيد الله، أنعم الله عليه، ثم قبضه إليه، وهو خير من بعده ودون من قبله! ولا أزيكه على الله عز وجل، فإنه أعلم به. إن عفا عنه فبرحمته، وإن عاقبه فبذنبه. وقد وليت الأمر من بعده، وليست آسى على طلب، ولا أعتذر من تفریط، وإذا أراد الله شيئا كان. إن معاوية كان يغزيكم البحر، وإنني لست حاملا أحدا من المسلمين لعل مراده إلا يأذنه واختياره بدليل العبارة التي بعدها في البحر وأن معاوية كان يشتيكم بأرض الروم، ولست مشتيا أحدا بأرض الروم. وإن معاوية كان يخرج لكم العطاء أثلاثا. وأنا أجمعه لكم كله. قال الراوي فافترق الناس عنه وهم لا يفضلون عليه أحدا. (البداية)

ومن خطب يزيد الدالة على حصافة عقله وحسن بصيرته وتقواه: الحمد لله أحمدوه وأستعينه وأومن به واتوكل عليه ونعوذ بالله من شرور أنفسنا ومن سيئات أعمالنا من يهده الله فلا مضل له ومن يضلل فلا هادي له وأشهد أن لا إله إلا الله وحده لا شريك له وأن محمدا عبده ورسوله اصطفاه لوحيه. واختاره لرسالته بكتاب فضله وأعزه وأكرمه ونصره وحفظه ضرب فيه الأمثال وحل في الحلل وحرم فيه الحرام وشرع فيه الدين إعدارا وإنذارا لنلا يكون للناس على الله حجة بعد الرسل ويكون بلاغا لقوم عابدين. أوصيكم عبادة الله بتقوى الله العظيم الذي ابتدأ الأمور بعلمه وإليه يصير معادها وانقطاع مدتها وتصير دارها.

ثم إني أخذتكم الدنيا فإنها خلوة خفية بالشهوات وراقت بالقليل وأنبعت بالفاني وتحببت بالعاجل لا يدوم نعيمها ولا يؤمن فجيئها أكالة غزالة غزارة لا تثقي على حال ولا يبقى لها حال ولن تغدو الدنيا إذا تهاوت إلى أئنية أهل الرغبة فيها والرضا بها أن تكون كما قال الله عز وجل: " واضرب لهم مثل الحياة الدنيا كماء أنزلناه من السماء " إلى قوله ومقتدرا نسأل الله ربنا وإلهنا وخالقنا ومولانا أن يجعلنا وإياكم من فزع يومئذ آمين. إن أحسن الحديث وأبلغ الموعظة كتاب الله يقول الله: ما له " وإذا قرئ القرآن فاستمعوا له وأنصتوا لعلكم ترحمون ". أعوذ بالله من الشيطان الرجيم بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم لقد جاءكم رسول من أنفسكم إلى آخر السورة. (العقد الفريد - ابن عبد ربه الأندلسي)

‘O People, Muawiyah was a servant of Almighty Allâh, whom Almighty Allâh had greatly favoured and Almighty Allâh has now called him back. He (Muawiyah ؓ) was greater than those after him, but lower in rank to those that have passed before him. I shall not extol his virtues in front of Almighty Allâh, for verily Almighty Allâh knows best regarding him. If Almighty Allâh pardons him, it is solely through His mercy, and if Almighty Allâh chooses to punish him, then it shall be due to what he had committed.

Now that I have been made in charge of your matters you shall neither find me too hard in attaining what I desire, nor offering excuses when I err. And only that occurs what Almighty Allâh wishes! Verily Muawiyah had ordered that you go out for Jihaad on the sea. As for me, I shall not force anyone to go out onto the sea. Muawiyah would ensure that you go out to the Roman lands during the cold, winter season. As for me, I shall not force anyone to go into Roman lands during the winter season. Muawiyah would grant you stipends, which would be spread out in three portions over a year. As for me, I shall grant you your entire yearly stipend all at once.

The narrator says that after the sermon the people departed, regarding none better suited for the job than him. (Al-Bidâyah)

From amongst the sermons of Yazîd that indicate towards his intelligence, farsightedness and piety, is the following, as quoted from Iqdul-Fareed:

‘All praise belongs solely to Almighty Allâh. I praise Him and seek His help. I trust upon Him and seek His protection against the evil within me, and from the evil of my deeds. Whosoever Allâh guides, none can lead astray, and whosoever Allâh misguides, none can bring him unto the straight path. I bear witness that there is none worthy of worship but Allâh alone, and I bear witness that Muhammad ؐ is the servant

and messenger of Allâh, who Allâh had selected and chosen to receive the revelation of a Book, which Allâh had sent down bit by bit, which Allâh had honoured over all else, which Allâh had himself protected.

In it, Almighty Allâh has explained all important matters through beautiful parables, has defined what is permissible and what is not, and has issued severe warnings for disobedience and not heeding to His ﷻ call. All this has been done so that man can now never say he was not properly informed.

O Allâh's servants, I advise you with the fear of Allâh, who is The Most Great, who initiated all affairs and to whom, when its time is up, shall all affairs once again return.

I warn you of the harms of this world, for verily it seems sweet and lush, but in fact gives only little and its fruits are indeed temporary. Its pleasures are not eternal and it can never be trusted. It is nothing but a destroyer of one's deeds and a deceiver!

When it finally does come to those who are greedy for it, it only remains by him for a short while, as Almighty Allâh has described in Surah Kahf with the verse:

واضْرَبْ لَهُمْ مَثَلِ الْحَيَاةِ الدُّنْيَا كَمَا أَنْزَلْنَاهُ مِنَ السَّمَاءِ

We implore Almighty Allâh, who is our Sustainer, Lord, Creator, and Master, that He grants us protection from the horrors of the Day of Judgement.

Verily, the greatest and most unique advice is that of the Quraan. Almighty Allâh commands:

'When the Quraan is recited, listen attentively. Perhaps you shall become the recipient of divine mercy.'

Yazîd thereafter ended his sermon by reciting, the last verse of Surah Taubah:

(End of quotation from the footnotes of Al-Awaasim)

5. Hadhrat Ali ibn Abi Talib ﷺ displayed his love for the three Khulefa ﷺ that preceded him ﷺ by naming his sons after them. The sons that were born after Hadhrat Hasan ﷺ, Hadhrat Husein ﷺ, and Hadhrat Muhammad ibn Hanafiyah ﷺ, were named Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthmaan. Also he gave his daughter Umme-Kulthoom in marriage to Hadhrat Umar ﷺ.

In a similar manner Hadhrat Abdullâh ibn Ja'far ﷺ (the nephew of Hadhrat Ali ﷺ, and the son of Hadhrat Ja'far At-Tayyaar ﷺ) also displayed his love for the Khulefah ﷺ by naming one of his sons 'Abu Bakr' and another 'Muawiyah'.

This Muawiyah, i.e. the grand nephew of Hadhrat Ali ﷺ, thereafter named one of his sons 'Yazîd'. Had he regarded the caliph, Yazîd ibn Muawiyah, to be evil, he would never have tolerated that his son now become known amongst all as 'Yazîd ibn Muawiyah! (Quoting from الشيعة هم العدو فاحذروهم)

6. Ibn Aasim has narrated the following through a sound sanad²⁰⁵: Hadhrat Muâwiyah ﷺ once asked his son, Yazîd, after noticing within him an ardent love to be just and to emulate the Khulefah-e-Raashideen ﷺ, as to how would he rule and conduct himself with the Ummah when he would be made caliph. Yazîd replied,
'O my beloved father, by Allâh, I will deal with them how Umar ibn Khattaab ﷺ dealt with them!'
7. Ibn Kathir has recorded the statement of Abdur Rahmaan ibn Abi Mad'uur²⁰⁶ regarding Yazîd. He said:

^{٢٠٥} وقد سأل معاوية رضي الله عنه ولد يزيد يوماً حينما أنس منه الحرص على العدل وتأسيساً بالخلفاء الراشدين ، فقد كان يسأله عن الكيفية التي سيسير بها في الأمة بعد توليه الخلافة ، فإرد عليه يزيد بقوله : (كنت والله يا أبة عاملاً فيهم عمل عمر بن الخطاب) . ابن عاصم في الأحاد والمثاني بسند حسن

^{٢٠٦} وقال عبد الرحمن بن أبي مدعور حدثني بعض أهل العلم قال آخر ما تكلم به يزيد بن معاوية اللهم لا تؤاخذني بما لم أحبه ولم أُرده واحكم بيني وبين عبيد الله بن زياد وكان نقش خاتمه آمنت بالله العظيم (البنية)

Some of the men of knowledge had informed me that the last words of Yazîd ibn Muawiyah before his death were:

'O Allâh! Do not take me to task for that which I never intended, nor was I ever happy with.

O Allâh, decide between me and Ubeidullah ibn Ziyaad!'

Abdur Rahmaan also narrated that the writing on the ring of Yazîd was:

(آمنت بالله العظيم)

'I believe in Allâh, The Supreme Authority.

8. Muhibbudeen Khateeb, after having made thorough research into the life of Yazîd and the allegations levelled against him, summarised his understanding of Yazîd in the footnotes of Awaasim. His words are indeed worthy of at least a few minutes of sincere pondering. He writes²⁰⁷:

If the barometer for Yazîd being worthy of the Caliphate was that he reach the levels of Hadhrat Abu Bakrؓ and Hadhrat Umarؓ in all their traits and manners of governing, then this is something that, in the history of Islâm, none has ever reached, not even Hadhrat Umar ibn Abdul Azizؓ. And if the barometer is that one's character be stable; that one be firm on the Shariah; just; concerned with the affairs of the masses; desirous that Jihaad continues and that Islâmic borders continue expanding, and that one be gentle and kind with all, irrespective whether the one in front is a lone

^{٢٠٧} إن كان مقياس الأهلية لذلك أن يبلغ مبلغ أبي بكر و عمر في مجموع سجايهما ، فهذا ما لم يبلغه في تاريخ الإسلام ، ولا عمر بن عبد العزيز ، و إن طمعنا بالمستحيل و قدرنا إمكان ظهور أبي بكر آخر و عمر آخر ، فلن نتاح له بيئة كالبيئة التي أتاحها الله لأبي بكر و عمر ، وإن كان مقياس الأهلية ، الاستقامة في السيرة ، والقيام بحزمة الشريعة ، والعمل بأحكامها ، و العدل في الناس ، و النظر في مصالحهم ، والجهد في عدوهم ، و توسيع الآفاق لدعوتهم ، والرفق بأفرادهم و جماعاتهم ، فإن يزيد يوم تُمحص أخباره ، و يقف الناس على حقيقة حاله كما كان في حياته ، يتبين من ذلك أنه لم يكن دون كثيرين ممن تغنى التاريخ بمحامدهم ، و أجزل الثناء عليهم .

individual or a party, if this is the barometer for being worthy of Caliphate, then after having made a through research into the life of Yazîd and viewing him from an extremely close angle, one shall surely agree that Yazîd was not less superior than many that appeared later, whom history continues lauding and praising till today.

9. When one sifts through the pages of history one realises that those around Yazîd, i.e. the illustrious Sahâbahؓ and Tâbi'een of Shâm, had never spoken out against Yazîd. After having just emerged from the period where the chair of the Caliphate had been occupied by the Sahâbahؓ, after having seen such pious personalities rule from their courts with justice and piety, can one ever imagine that in Yazîd's short period of rule, he (Yazîd) could immediately stand up with the courage and audacity to commit such sinful acts, as has been ascribed to him, in full view of those around, yet not a single Sahâbiؓ, nor Tabi'ee of Shâm finds the courage to speak out against his wrongs!

Could one ever entertain the possibility that all the great jurists, judges, mufasssireen, mujaahideen of that era, of the blessed lands of Shâm, and particularly, the area of Damascus, were guilty of the crime of abandoning their duty of 'inviting to good and prohibiting from evil' and none had that Imaani fervour to speak the truth in front of an 'oppressive' ruler? Understand well, that when one accepts the accusations levelled against Yazîd ibn Muawiyah, one is in fact also accepting an accusation which has been made against the rest of the Ummah of that era, since they showed their happiness with the Umayyad Dynasty.

10. When one studies the ahadith of Rasulullâhؐ, one shall realise that the Ummah has indeed been warned of shaitaani forces that shall time and again try to incite the masses to rebel against their leaders, ensuring thereby that in-fighting continues, and government stability is never attained.

The words of Rasulullâhﷺ, i.e. ***'do not break your allegiance until and unless they (the leaders) are found involved in open disbelief'*** indicates clearly that such propaganda shall one day be made against Muslim leaders which many shall open-heartedly believe, despite not having seen or heard the actual witness and not having verified the report. In such conditions, Rasulullâhﷺ showed that the safest route for the Ummah, as long as open disbelief of their leaders is not proven, is not to fall prey to the propaganda, but rather to remain true to their pledge.

To better understand this point, in recent history, for the purpose of totally destroying the Muslim Caliphate (known as The Ottoman Empire), an all-out effort was made to paint an evil picture of the Sultân in the minds of the masses. So strong was the propaganda against the Sultân, that in the lands of Hijaaz, high-ranking scholars signed verdicts which showed the permissibility and in fact ordered the Arab masses to rise against the Turkish ruler. At that time, Sheikhul-Hind, Hadhrat Moulâna Mahmudul-Hasan Deobandi, was also in Makkah Mukarramah. Due to the high position he held, especially in the eyes of the Muslim public of Hindustan and surrounding areas, he too was ordered to sign. Sheikhul-Hind, even after being threatened with life imprisonment, flatly refused.

The Grand Mufti of Makkah Mukarramah summoned Sheikhul-Hind in an attempt to get his signature and questioned the reason for his refusal to sign, despite the fact that the present caliph, Sultân Abdul Hamid, had openly committed acts of kufr and fisq. The crux of Sheikhul-Hind's answer was the very point that this booklet is attempting to drive forward, i.e. as long as there is no concrete evidence of open kufr, breaking one's allegiance merely on the basis of 'widespread allegations' could never be deemed permissible. Sheikhul-Hind understood well that lending an ear to the allegations being made against the present caliph and calling for a better caliph, despite this

call seeming so 'rosy', would ultimately end in disaster for the entire Muslim world.

Sheikhul-Hind would years later meet Ashraf Beig, a general from the cabinet of Sultân Abdul-Hamid, who would reveal that most of the allegations against the caliph had in fact been fabricated solely to incite the Muslim world and especially the Arabs, against the Turkish rule. Discussing this meeting, Hadhrat Moulâna Husein Ahmed Madani quotes in Aseer-e-Malta:

Ashraf Beig was amongst the favourites of Sultan Abdul Hamid Marhoom. He had a unique talent to recognize the talents of others and from childhood he developed a concern regarding all internal and external political matters.

Many a time, when the mention of Sultan Abdul Hamid Marhoom would spring up in our discussions, he would speak out saying,

"People criticize the Sultan with regards to his piety. The truth however is that the Sultan was an extremely pious and ascetic man. His abstinence from that which has been forbidden was of a very high level. I should know better, since I had the opportunity to observe him from close.

I still remember him spanking me when he found me involving myself in acts of childhood mischief. The misconception regarding the Sultan arose due to evil elements that surrounded him, whose intention was nothing but to make the masses lose faith in his manner of rule. We made continuous efforts to remove these misconceptions and answer the objections and accusations that were being levelled against the Sultan, but it could never match the propaganda of the evil forces all around."

The efforts of these evil elements finally led to Ashraf Beig himself being exiled from Turkey (End of quotation from Aseer-e-Malta)

The outcome of lending an ear to the allegations being made against Sultân Abdul-Hamid, the Turkish caliph, as Hadhrat Sheikhul-Hind had feared, resulted in the Caliphate shortly thereafter being totally abolished, the Muslim world being torn into separate states, kuffaar forces now freely pouncing upon Muslim lands, knowing full well that no Muslim country shall stand up for the next and many other disastrous consequences.

Today, when one ponders over the heart-breaking scenes that the Ummah has already seen and continues seeing, due to the Arab rebellion against the Ottoman Empire, one gets some glimpse of the foresight that Almighty Allâh had blessed Sheikhul-Hind with, regarding world politics and shaitaani traps and of the deep understanding he had of the Quraan and Sunnah. But alas, at that time none were willing to accept his words!

From the brief history of how Sheikhul-Hind viewed the Arabs decision to revolt against the Ottoman Empire, due to the many allegations against its leader that had reached their ears and the outcome of the rebellion, much can be understood regarding how shaitaani forces operate, how they incite the masses against their own leaders and how they ensure that Muslim government stability is never attained.

While this has always been their modus operandi, the possibility shall always exist that it was these very shaitaani lobbies that were also in operation during the era of the Sahaba and Tabi'een, on account of whom the sad events of Jamal, Siffin, Karbala, Harrah, etc occurred.

And Almighty Allah alone knows best.

A most unique and moderate stance adopted by Allamah Rashid Ahmed Ghangohi

The following is a reproduction of a part of Hazrat Moulana Rasheed Ahmad Gangohi's رحمه الله reply to a lengthy question regarding Yazeed, as quoted in Ma'aarifus Sheikh of Sheikhul-Hadith Moulana Muhammad Zakariya Sahib Kandhelewi Rahimahullah.

"To pose a lengthy question of this nature (whether it is permissible to curse Yazeed or not) is futile. It appears in a Saheeh Hadeeth that when one person curses another, then if the accursed person is deserving of the curse, it will befall him. If not, it will return to the one who cursed him. Thus if it cannot be proven that a particular person passed away in a state of kufr, one should not curse such an individual as there is fear of the curse returning to the one who uttered it. The evil actions of Yazeed are undoubtedly worthy of curse. Those scholars who have come to know through reliable and established sources that Yazeed was pleased with his evil deeds, believed them to be halaal and passed away without making taubah are of the opinion that cursing Yazeed is permissible. This conforms to the ruling recorded in the books of Fiqh.

On the other hand, those Ulama, who have reservations in regard to cursing Yazeed, state that he was after all, a Mu'min and since there is no proof to establish whether or not he regarded his evil deeds and actions to be halaal, it will not be permissible to curse him. Therefore, these Ulama do not permit cursing Yazeed due to the Hadeeth that prohibits the cursing of a Muslim. The stance of these Ulama, when viewed from this angle, also conforms to the ruling stated in the books of Fiqh.

The summary of the matter is that the permissibility of cursing Yazeed and its prohibition is based on historical reports and facts. As for us muqallideen, it is safer for us to exercise caution and remain silent, since if cursing Yazeed is supposedly permissible and one refrains from cursing him, then one will not be sinful for not cursing him. Cursing him is neither Fardh, nor Waajib, nor Sunnah, nor Mustahab. Cursing him is merely permissible. On the other hand, if supposing he does not deserve to be cursed, then for one to be engaged in a sin (of cursing him) is not permissible. Hence the best thing is that one remains silent.

And Almighty Allah knows best.

Rashid Ahmed (Mārifush Sheikh Pg.66)

Conclusion

In the light of the various conflicting narrations and verdicts with regards to Yazid ibn Muawiyah and in the light of the ten points discussed above, I find myself inclined to the unique stance adopted by the great great scholar of Ahadith and Fiqh Allamah Rashid Ahmed Ghangohi Rahimahullah, as quoted above.

I ask that Almighty Allah accept this compilation, through it dispel incorrect notions that exist regarding the sad events of Karbala and open the eyes of the Muslim masses and leaders to the many conspiracies that are being rolled out daily in order to widen the rift amongst the Muslim Ummah, thereby ensuring that Muslim unity is never achieved.

و آخر دعوانا ان الحمد لله رب العالمين
و صلى الله على النبي الامي ة على آله و صحبه اجمعين