



Muawiya

Author: Answering-Ansar.org

www.alhassanain.org/english

Notice:

**This version is published on behalf of www.alhassanain.org/english
The composing errors are not corrected.**

Table of Contents

Chapter One: Introduction.....	13
Chapter Two: Was Mu’awiya seeking Qisas for the death of Uthman?	14
.....	
Note	14
Mawla Ali (as) did not deem Uthman to have been killed innocently ...	14
Who Killed Uthman?	14
The Opinion of Mawla Ali (as) upon Uthman and Mu’awiya	14
Mu’awiya’s refusal to help Uthman during the Seige	15
Mu’awiya and his supporters	18
Mu’awiya exploited people’s ignorance and greed to attain support	19
Mu’awiya falsely claimed that Ali (as) killed Uthman so as to garner the support of the Syrians.....	20
Abu Sulaiman’s attempts to misinterpret the words of Imam Ali (as) as a means of defending Mu’awiya	21
Imam Ali (as) questions Mu’awiya’s motives	21
The Imam can only implement Qisas	22
Fatwa of Shah Abdul Aziz – one that fights Ali (as) is a kaafir	22
Mu’awiya’s actual motive was power.....	23
The agreement between Mu’awiya and Amr bin Aas is clear proof that the motive was power not avenging Uthman’s murder	24
Mu’awiya’s testimony further proves his real motive was power not vengeance for the slain Uthman	25
Mu’awiya Thaneeh’s condemnation of his grandfather eludes the fact that he fought Imam ‘Ali (as) for power	26
Abu Sulaiman questions the justice of Imam Ali (as)	26
Mu’awiya did not apply Qisas against Amr bin Aas.....	27
Misuse of a Shia tradition by the Nawasib to support Uthman	28
Reply One: The authenticity of the tradition.....	28
“This tradition is Muzamir and Musquf”.....	28
Reply Two: The actual ‘Uthman’ mentioned in the tradition and the Nasibi distortion	28
Reply Three: The actual attributes of the followers of Uthman bin Affan recoded in Sunni texts	29
Chapter Three: Mu’awiya’s appointment of Yazeed as his successor .	31
Did Mu’awiya want to make Yazeed just a Crown Prince or Khalifa?..	31
Mu’awiya made Yazeed his Khalifa during his lifetime	32
Mu’awiya forced people to give bayya to Yazeed	33
Please see our article: Yazeed (L’aeen)	33
Mu’awiya bribed people to give bayya to Yazeed	35
Mu’awiya killed all those who posed a hurdle for him making Yazeed Khalifah.....	35
Why did Imam Hussain (as) refuse to give bay’a to Yazeed?	35
Mu’awiya’s development of lineal succession	37
Yazeed the ‘protector of afflictions’	37
Appraisal of ‘pious’ Yazeed by the Nasibi author	38
Ibn Kathir’s comments on Yazeed the drunkard	39

Al Bidayah Wal Nihayah (Urdu), Vol 8 Page 1169, Nafees Academy Karachi.....	39
Mu'awiya also knew that Yazeed drank alcohol.....	42
Ibn Hajar Asqalani's views regarding those that praise Yazeed.....	42
Imam Ahmad issued Takfeer against drunkard Yazeed.....	43
Allamah Mahmood Alusi's takfeer against Yazeed.....	43
Qadhi Thanauallah Paani Patti's takfeer against Yazeed.....	44
Various other Sunni Ulema did takfeer against Yazeed and have deemed it permissible to curse him.....	44
An appeal to our Sunni brethren.....	46
Chapter Four: The callous killing of the Sahaba including Hujr bin Adi (ra) and of other innocent Shias.....	48
Comment.....	48
Wasn't Hujr (ra) a Sahabi?.....	49
Reply.....	49
Allah (swt)'s displeasure at those who killed Hujr (ra).....	50
Was Hujr (ra) a troublemaker?.....	52
Reply One – Dishonesty committed by the author in order to absolve Muawiyah bin Hind.....	52
Reply Two – Imam Hasan Basri's testimones that Hujr was a great man and his maglining Muawiyah for the murder of Hujr (ra).....	53
Reply Three- Imam Muhammad bin Sirin testified to Hujr (as) being virtuous.....	54
Reply Four– Imam Dhahabi, Imam Ibn Habban and Ibn Asakir's testimonies that Hujr (ra) was an honorable, pious and worshiper.....	54
Reply Five – The families of Abu Bakr and Umar condemning Mu'awiya for killing Hujr proves that he was not a trouble maker in their eyes ...	55
Comment.....	56
Reply Six – The Sahaba deemed the killer of Hujr (ra) to be worthy of being cursed.....	56
“If it is asked: Why the Sahaba object on him?.....	56
Reply Seven – Even the hardline Nasibi companion of Muawiyah was on saddened at the murder of Hujr (ra).....	57
Reply Eight – The Sunni Ulema's recognition that Hujr was Shaheed (a martyr) proves that he was not a baghi (rebel).....	57
Reply Nine – Prophet's prediction proves that Hujr bin Adbar (rh) and Malik bin Ashatar (rh) are amongst the Momineen.....	58
Abu Sulaiman defends the method of killing.....	59
Mu'awiya killed Malik bin Ashthar (ra).....	60
Mu'awiya killed the sahabi Amr bin al-Hamiq.....	62
Muawiyah kept Shia women as prisoners in dungeons.....	63
Mu'awiya killed the two children of Ubaydullah ibn Abbas.....	63
Abdurehman bin Hasaan was buried alive by Muawiyah.....	64
Mu'awiya gave an order to slaughter the Shi'a.....	65
During Mu'awiya's brutal reign, Shia Muslim women were made slaves and were sold in the market place.....	65
The punishment for killing a Momin from the Qur'an.....	67
Chapter Five: The peace treaty with Imam Hasan (as).....	68

Reply One.....	68
Reply Two – The Prophet (s) saw the Banu Umayya climbing his Pulpit and this saddened him	69
Reply Three – Imam Hasan deemed Mu’awiya an unjust thief	69
Reply Four – Imam Hasan (as) deemed the Khilafath to be his own right	70
A Nasibi excuse and its reply.....	70
Reply Five – By making peace Imam Hasan (as) was able to show the Ummah that Mu’awiya was a hypocrite	71
Reply Six – The peace treaty in the eyes of the Sunni Ulema	71
Reply Seven – Mu’awiya was not well intentioned when he made peace with Imam Hasan (as)	72
Reply Eight – Imam Hasan (as) made peace on account of pressure	73
Reply Nine – If you see Mu’awiya on my pulpit kill him (hadeeth)	74
Reply Ten – Banu Zarqa cannot be Khalifas.....	75
Reply Eleven – Imam Hasan (as) made peace to protect Muslim lives, property and honour, and thus provided an example for those people faced with difficult choices	75
Reply Twelve – According to Sunnies it is permissible to make peace with unjust people	77
Reply Thirteen – The Tulqa cannot be khalifas	77
Reply Fourteen – Mu’awiya took the Caliphate by force	78
Reply Fifteen– Imam Hasan (as) said he had the right to kill Mu’awiya	79
Reply Sixteen – Textual evidence from Quran.....	79
Reply Seventeen – Infallible ones under pressure from common men ..	80
The bay’a given to Mu’awiya	81
Reply One – The meaning of bayya.....	81
Reply Two – Nawasib have stupidly assumed that peace means bayya .	81
Mu’awiya’s poisoning of Imam Hasan (as)	82
Who was Ja’da bint Asha’ath bin Qays?	86
Now, how did Asha’ath bin Qais repay this favor?	87
Reasons behind the poisoning of Imam Hasan (as)	87
Mu’awiya’s pleasure upon hearing about the death of Imam Hasan (as)	89
Nasibi conjecture about Imam Hasan (as) receiving stipends from Muawiya’s government.....	93
Reply one	93
Reply Two	94
Reply Three	94
Reply Four	94
Reply Five	94
Nasibi accusation on Aqeel bin Abi Talib	95
Reply One – We have already provided an array of replies about accepting stipends from a tyrant.....	95
Reply Two – Aqeel always held Ali (as) to be on the right path as compared to his views on Muawiya	95
Reply Three – The Bani Umayya fabricated texts to cast aspersions over Aqeel’s relationship with Ali (as)	96

Reply Four – Aqeel didn't participate in battles alongside Ali bin Abi Talib (as) due to illness	96
Refuting the Nawasib claim that there existed a reciprocal warmth, respect and affection between Imam Hussain (as) and Muawiya.....	97
Muawiya's will for his son Yazeed	98
Muawiya threatened to kill Imam Hussain (as)	100
Concluding this chapter.....	101
Chapter Six: Mu'awiya the baghi (rebel)	103
Ali (as) was the Imam and rightful caliph of the time	103
Muawiya fought Ali (as), the Imam and rightful caliph of the time	104
It was incumbent to fight alongside Imam Ali (as)	104
Abdullah bin Umar's regret he didn't fight the baghi Mu'awiya	105
The early Sahaba fought alongside Imam Ali (as)	106
Abu Sulaiman's refusal to describe Mu'awiya as a baghi	107
Defining baghi (rebell)	108
The Sunni scholars deemed Muawiyah as a baghi, Khariji and tyrant .	108
Mu'awiya's rebellion was in violation of the Qur'an	111
Mu'awiya's rebellion was in violation to the Sunnah of Rasulullah (s)	111
Mu'awiya was from amongst Qasateen (those refrained from giving bayya to Imam e Haqq).....	112
Mu'awiya was amongst the Fajireen (perpetrators of debauchery).....	113
Abu Sulaiman's plea that both parties were believers	113
To rebel against the Imam is tantamount to Zina in a Mosque	114
If a Baghi dies in war don't perform his funeral prayers	114
One who rebels is from the Party of Satan	114
One who fights Imam Ali is Zaalim and Faasiq	114
Testimony of the Sahabi Amar Yasir (ra) that Mu'awiya and his cohorts were misguided ones.....	115
By fighting Maula 'Ali, Mu'awiya fought against the truth, the Qur'an and Rasulullah (s).....	115
Muawiya's opposition was motivated by his hatred of Imam 'Ali (as)	116
Answering Abu Sulaiman's criticism that Imam 'Ali (as) should have left Mu'awiya alone.....	117
Answering Abu Sulaiman's criticism that Imam 'Ali (as) started the battle, contradicting the Qur'an (astaghfirullah)	117
Imam 'Ali (as) fought for interpretation of the Qur'an in the same way Rasulullah (s) fought for the revelation of the Qur'an	118
The martyrdom of Ammar bin Yasir was comprehensive proof that Mu'awiya was a baghi.....	119
Ammar deemed those that fought Imam 'Ali (as) to be the same munafiqs that tried to assassinate Rasulullah (s).....	121
Abu Sulaiman's defence of ijtihaad	122
Reply One.....	124
Reply Two – A Mujtahid has to be a pious / just man	125
Reply Three – Mu'awiya was not a mujtahid	125
Reply Four – Imam Ali (as)'s verdict that Mu'awiya should be killed as he has no grounds to oppose him.....	126

Reply Five – Maula Ali’s expose on Mu’awiya’s character destroys the defence of ijtihaad	126
Reply Six – Abdullah bin Umro’s regret that he fought alongside Mu’awiya at Sifeen	126
Rasulullah’s condemnation of Mu’awiya and Amr bin Aas refutes the defence of ijtihaad	127
Abu Sulaiman’s verdict that both parties were on truth and cannot be criticised	127
It is narrated on the authority of ‘Abdullah b. Mas’ud that	128
Imam Taymeeya al Nasibi’s Fatwa that killers of Amar lead people to Hell.....	129
Chapter Seven: Mu’awiya instituted the bid’ah of cursing Imam Ali (as).....	131
Mu’awiya asks Sa’d to curse Ali (as)	131
Al-Nawawi offered lame excuses to defend Mu’awiya.....	132
1st critique – Nawawi’s misguided innovation in Islamic Sharia to defend the Sahaba.....	133
Incidents of Sahaba Cursing/Abusing each other	133
2nd critique – Al-Nawawi applied this insane logic, so as to defend Mu’awiya (i.e. no textual proofs)	133
1st Hadith that Al-Nawawi & Co. Concealed.....	134
2nd Hadith that Al-Nawawi & Co. Concealed	135
Al Bidayah wa al Nahayah, Volume 7 page 341, Chapter: The virtues of Ali	135
3rd Hadith that Al-Nawawi & Co. Concealed	135
4th tradition that Al-Nawawi & Co. concealed	136
5th tradition that Al-Nawawi & Co. concealed	136
6th tradition that Al-Nawawi & Co. concealed	137
7th Tradition, that Al-Nawawi & Co. concealed.....	137
8th Tradition that Al-Nawawi & Co. concealed – Imam Hasan (as) asking Muawiya not to curse Ali (as) from the pulpits	138
Al-Abar fi Khabar min Ghabar, Volume 1, page 18 Chapter: Year 37 the battle of Sifin	138
Comments.....	142
Sunni scholars rejected Al-Nawawi’s conjecture pertaining to Sahih Muslim’s episode	142
Shaykh Wajihuddin Umar bin Abdulmuhsin	142
Imam Muhammad bin Shahab al-Zuhri	142
Shaykh Musa Shahin Lashin	142
Allamah Muhammad bin Abdulhadi al-Sindi (d. 1138 H).....	143
Sharh Sunnan ibn Majah, Kitab al-Muqadma, Chapter: Merits of Ali bin Abi Talib (ra)	143
Muhammad al-Amin al-Hurarri	143
Ibn Tamiyah	143
The Governors of Mu’awiya started cursing Mawla Ali (as) upon the instructions of Mu’awiya	144
Muawiya’s Governor Marwan bin Hakam cursed Imam Ali (as)	144
Mu’awiya’s Governor Mughira bin Shu’ba (la) cursed Imam Ali (as) .	146

Sunan Nasai al-Kabeer, Kitab al-Manaqib, Volume 7 Hadith 8148, Merits of Abdurehman bin Auf	148
Mu'awiya's Governor Busr Bin Artat cursed Maula Ali	148
Muawiya's Governors Ziyad and Kathir ibn Shahab cursed Imam Ali (as)	149
Mu'awiya would curse Ali after the Friday Sermon and this bid'a became a tradition during the Banu Umayya reign	150
Mu'awiya refused to follow the peoples' demands that he abolish the practice of cursing Ali (as)	150
Mu'awiya changed the Sunnah of the Prophet (s) to ensure that the people heard the cursing of 'Ali (as)	151
Faiz al Bari Sharah Sahih Bukhari, Volume 1 page 722 No. 954, Kitab al-Eidayn.....	152
Testimonies of prominent Sunni scholars that Ali bin Abi Talib (as) used to be cursed from pulpits	153
Learned Scholar Ahmad Zaki Safwat's comments on the Governors of Mu'awiya	153
Imam of Ahle Sunnah Awzai also reviled Ali (as) as a means of acquiring gifts from the Umayyad rulers	153
The admission by al Muhaddith Shah Abdul Aziz Dehlavi that Mu'awiya cursed Ali (as)	154
The admission by leading Deobandi Ulema that Mu'awiya introduced the bid'ah of cursing Ali (as)	154
Learned Sunni Scholar Abu Zahra	156
Taha Hussain.....	156
Shaykh Hassan Saqqaf.....	156
Imam of Ahl'ul Sunnah Muhammad Abdul Hai Lucknawi	157
Qadhi Thanauallah Paani Patti al-Uthmani.....	157
Imam Ibn Hazm Andlasi.....	157
Jawami al Seerah	157
Imam Muhammad Zahed al-Kawthari	157
Maula Ali (as) was cursed for ninety years	158
Summary of references	158
Conclusions	158
Rasulullah (s) cursed those who commit bidah	158
Allamah Abdul Qadir Gilani's Fatwa against Ahl'ul bidah	158
Allamah Sa'duddeen Taftazani's fatwa that Ahl'ul bidah should be cursed	158
Cursing Ali (as) is tantamount to cursing Allah (swt)	159
Fatwa of al Muhaddith Shah Abdul Aziz – those that curse Ali are kaafir	159
Fatwa of Muhaddith Shah Abdul Aziz – whoever disrespects Ahl'ul bayt (as) is a murtad.....	159
An appeal to justice	159
Chapter Eight: The phantom merits of Mu'awiya	160
Was Mu'awiya the writer of the revelation?	160
Reply One – Prominent Ulema of Ahl'ul Sunnah have not counted Mu'awiya as writer of the revelation	160

Reply Two- Mu'awiya wrote letters not the revelation	161
Reply Three- A writer of the revelation became a kaafir	162
Was Mu'awiya a Hadi?.....	162
A Hadi is one who guides his followers in accordance with the Qur'an and Sunnah.....	163
Mu'awiya 'the Hadi' declared Ziyad, the bastard son of Abu Sufiyan as his real brother contradicting the Sharia.....	164
Mu'awiya 'the Hadi' made decisions that contradicted the Shar'ia on inheritance	165
Mu'awiya 'the Hadi' contradicted the Shar'ia on Blood money	165
Mu'awiya 'the Hadi' contradicted the Shar'ia on the distribution of war booty	166
Mu'awiya 'the Hadi' drank a prohibited substance	167
Mu'awiya 'the Hadi' used to smuggle alcohol.....	168
Mu'awiya 'the Hadi' used to sell idols to polythiests helping them to worship the idols.....	169
Mu'awiya 'the Hadi' undresses and inspects the body of a naked woman	170
Mu'awiya 'the Hadi' tells the people to consume haraam items and kill each other	171
Mu'awiya 'the Hadi' took interest	172
Mu'awiya 'the Hadi' made changes to the Eid Salat	173
Mu'awiya 'the Hadi' reduced the number of Takbeers from daily prayers	174
Mu'awiya 'the Hadi' reduced Iqamah from daily prayers	175
Mu'awiya 'the Hadi' issued a Fatwa deeming it permissible for a man to marry two sisters at any one given time	175
Mu'awiya 'the Hadi' abandoned to apply the mandatory punishment for theft in Islam	176
If a right hand parts from its left?	177
Mu'awiya 'the Hadi' and his Nasibi adherents abandoned the Sunnah due to their hatred of Ali (as)	177
Sharah Sunan Nasai.....	178
Mu'awiya 'the Hadi' and his fellow Nasibi rulers of Bani Ummayah abandoned to recite 'Bismillah' loudly due to their hate towards Ali (as)	178
Comments.....	178
Mu'awiya 'the Hadi' wore prohibited items despite the fact that he was aware that Rasulallah (s) deemed them haraam.....	179
An appeal to justice.....	179
Rasulallah (s) criticised those that praise Ahl'ul Bidah.....	180
Rasulallah (s) made three Dua's, one that was rejected	180
Rasulallah (s) even prayed for Abu Jahil to be guided	181
Not all of Rasulallah's prayers were accepted	181
Allah (swt) never guides a wrongdoer	181
The narrator of this 'Hadi' hadith is not a reliable authority.....	182
Not a single hadith in praise of Mu'awiya is Sahih	182
Rasulallah's advice for Mu'awiya is also a fabrication	185

Reply One – This verse merely states Allah (swt) emboldened the believers on that day	185
Reply Two – The verse only benefits believers in the true sense of the word not those that stood in the ranks of the Muslims but were pagans and hypocrites.....	185
Chapter Nine: Abu Sulaiman’s plea of clemency for Mu’awiya	187
Chapter Ten: Was Mu’awiya a Momin or Munafiq?	189
The sign of a Munafiq is hatred of ‘Ali (as).....	189
Fada’il al-Sahaba, Volume 2 page 549 (Published in Makkah Mukkarmah, Saudi Arabia).....	189
It is not permissible to refer to a Munafiq as Sayyidina	190
‘Ali (as)’s testimony – Mu’awiya is my enemy	191
An enemy of Ali (as) is an enemy of Allah (swt)	191
One who fails to accept ‘Ali as his Maula is not a Momin	191
Chapter Eleven: The ‘true’ merits of Mu’awiya bin Hind	193
The meaning of Mu’awiya	193
Love and hatred of Ali is the difference between one being legitimate and illegitimate	193
Ayesha’s testimony about methods of Nikah during the time of Jahiliyya .	193
.....	193
Mu’awiya bin Hind was the product of a combined Nikah	194
Ayesha’s testimony that Hinda committed Zina	195
The ‘virtues’ possessed by one born illegitimately	195
One born illegitimately can not be a Khalifa.....	195
One who fights the rightful Imam is a Fasiq	196
One who turns his back on the right path is a Zaalim and Fasiq.....	196
Mu’awiya’s Conquests	196
Mu’awiya’s declaration that Ziyad was the son of ‘Abu Sufyan is proof that he was a fasiq	196
It is a religious duty to expose the deeds of a fasiq	198
A Zaalim Ruler	198
Praising a fasiq leads to incurring the wrath of Allah (swt)	198
Muawiya was wicked and is cursed	199
Mu’awiya was a Nasibi.....	199
Fatwa of Imam of Ahl’ul Sunnah, Shah Abdul Aziz that Nawasib are equal to dogs and pigs	200
Appraisals of Mu’awiya	200
Appraisal of Mu’awiya by Rasulullah (s)	200
First appraisal – Rasulullah (s) cursed Mu’awiya’s stomach	200
Nasibi excuses for the Prophet’s curse on Muawiya’s stomach	200
Reply One.....	201
Reply Two	202
Reply Three	202
Reply Four	202
Reply Five	203
Reply Six.....	204
Second appraisal – Rasulullah (s) cursed Mu’awiya, his brother father and Amr bin Aas	204

Third appraisal – Rasulullah (s) cursed Mu’awiya and Amr bin Aas ..	204
Fourth appraisal – Rasulullah (s) cursed Mu’awiya, his father Abu Sufyan and his son Yazeed	205
Ffifth appraisal – Mu’awiya shall die a kaafir	205
Sixth appraisal – Mu’awiya shall be raised with a different Ummah on the day of Judgment	206
Seventh appraisal – Mu’awiya shall be in the deepest part of Hell Fire	206
Eighth appraisal – Mu’awiya and Amr bin al-Aas can never gather for a good cause	206
Ninth appraisal – Mu’awiya is Kafir	207
Tenth appraisal – Mu’awiya shall be killed if tried to sit on Prophet’s pulpit	207
Umar’s appraisal of Mu’awiya	208
First appraisal	208
Second appraisal	208
Maula Ali (as) appraisal of Mu’awiya	208
First appraisal	208
Second appraisal	208
Third appraisal	209
Fourth Appraisal	209
Fifth Appraisal	209
Ayesha’s appraisal of Mu’awiya	209
First appraisal – Mu’awiya’s Government compared by Ayesha to Firawn (Pharoah) and other Kaafirs (Pagans)	209
Second Appraisal – Ayesha cursed Mu’awiya and Amr bin Aas	210
Saad ibn Waqqas’s appraisal of Mu’awiya	210
Mu’awiya the second’s appraisal of his grandfather Mu’awiya	210
Qays bin Sa’d bin Ibada’s appraisal of Mu’awiya	211
These words suffice to destroy the Nasibi appraisals of Mu’awiya. Or should we question by the truthfulness of the Sahaba?	211
Abu Hurrayra’s appraisal of Mu’awiya	211
Muhammad bin Abi Bakar’s appraisal of Mu’awiya	211
Samra bin Jandab’s appraisal of Mu’awiya	211
Miswan, appraisal of her husband Mu’awiya	211
Mamun Abbasi’s appraisal of Mu’awiya.....	212
The people of Madina’s appraisal of Mu’awiya	212
Ibn Katheer’s appraisal of Mu’awiya	212
Imam Shafiyee’s appraisal of Mu’awiya that his testimony is unacceptable	212
Imam of Ahle Sunnah al-Atiqi al-Baghdadi’s appraisal of Mu’awiya .	212
Imam of Ahle Sunnah Ali bin Ja’ad’s appraisal of Mu’awiya	213
Mu’awiya – According to the Imams of Ahlulbayt (as)	213
A German scholar’s recognition of the contribution made by Mu’awiya ..	214

Chapter One: Introduction

This is our comprehensive rebuttal to Ansar.org's defence of Mu'awiya bin Hind. Mu'awiya is a character whose antics have been meticulously recorded in the annals of history. From his birth onwards, the historians and Ulema of Ahl'ul Sunnah have managed to provide a significant insight in to the character of Mu'awiya. His role within the history of Islam during the advent of Rasulallah(s)'s mission is non-existent. In fact he spent the vast portion of it on the opposite side his alleged father being 'Abu Sufyan leader of the Banu Umayya Clan who sought to undermine, fight and destroy the message of Rasulallah (s). 'Abu Sufyan eventually conceded defeat following the conquest of Makka and allegedly embraced Islam. In much the same way Rasulallah (s) was opposed by Abu Sufyan, his alleged son Mu'awiya carried on the mantle of his father opposing the rightful khalifa 'Ali during his lifetime, refusing to give him bayya (oath of allegiance) and even after his martyrdom vented his hatred of Imam 'Ali via the disgraceful practice of cursing him during the Friday Sermons. Despite his disgraceful acts a new generations of Nasibi disguising themselves Sunni have appeared in recent years declaring the affiliation with Mu'awiya and defending his actions and praising them. 'Abu Sulaiman is at the forefront of this neo-Nasibi ideology. His appraisal of both Mu'awiya and Yazeed demonstrates how convoluted Nasibi ideology is and how it seeks its utmost to raise doubts on the stance of Ameerul Momineen 'Ali ibne abi Talib (as) in an effort to protect the persona of Mu'awiya. Hence we decided to lift the veils on Mu'awiya and present his true image to our readers.

Our readers should know that the approach taken by the post modern advocates of Mu'awiya whose defence of him is (according to them) part and parcel of their Sunni ideology, the Sunnis of past eras were unrelenting in their criticism of Mu'awiya and in no way felt that it negated their Sunni credentials, a fact vouched for by Salafi scholar Hassan bin Farhan al-Maliki who on page 171 of his book 'Qeraah fi Kutub al-Aqaed' page 171 said:

وأصبح نقد معاوية بن أبي سفيان (وهو من الطلقاء) غير مقبول عند السنة بعد أن كان متقدموهم يذمون ظلم معاوية وانتزأه على هذه بالسيف وجعله الخليفة ملكا عضوا واستثناه بيت المال وما إلى ذلك من المفاسد التي أحدثها

“Criticizing Mu'awiyah bin Abi Sufiyah (who was from the Tulaqa) is unacceptable to the Sunnis, whereas the former Sunnis would criticize Mu'awiyah for his injustices, his taking power via by sword, and turning the Caliphate into a monarchy, his seizing public money, and (their citing) the numerous corruptions that he perpetrated”

We would urge our Sunni readers to ponder over this admission. If today's Sunni advocates are insisting that reading any form of critique of Mu'awiya is abhorrent and places one's faith at harm, then their emotional rants come into conflict with the past Sunni Ulema who did just that.

Chapter Two: Was Mu'awiya seeking Qisas for the death of Uthman?

Note

Since the field of history is mostly relied upon for revealing the detestable actions of Muawiyah and Co, the present day Nawasib try their utmost to exhibit their treachous nature and cast doubts on the authenticity of certain notable narrators of historical text. Abu Mukhnaf Lut bin Yahyah and Waqidi are two such narrators who shall appear in the texts we will quote throughout this article. The Nawasib shall no doubt bring objections against both narrators accompanied with deceitfulness. We shall therefore direct our readers to these two links right at the start of the article that contains the refutation to all objections the Nawasib raise against both of these Sunni figures:

1. **Muhammad bin Umar al-Waqidi**
2. **Abu Mukhnaf Lut bin Yahyah**

Mawla Ali (as) did not deem Uthman to have been killed innocently

Before we analyse Muawiyah's claim that he was seeking to avenge the blood of Uthman, it is essential to highlight the conditions under which Uthman was killed. Firstly, Uthman was not killed innocently. The facts are clear:

Uthman contributed towards his demise due to his transgressions as well as those of his relatives.

His alleged killers (the people of Kufa, Basra and Egypt) came only for his correction and demanded that he put an end to his evil and cruel innovations. This was their initial claim, but Uthman deceived them (as well as Ali and other Madinan Sahaba) on several occasions by making false promises whilst conspiring against them.

Historical facts are very clear that when the Madinans failed to support Uthman against them, he sent letters to his governors in other provinces (including Mu'awiya) to send armies in order to kill these innocent people.

Allah (swt) saved these people from all these conspiracies of Uthman Ibn Affan, and they came to know of them at the right time, and killed Uthman in order to quell those problems. Uthman's killing was a direct consequence of his unjust corrupt reign.

Prior to discussing Mu'awiya, it is essential that we first look at all the historical events which corroborate the fact that Uthman was killed on account of his transgressions. We therefore strongly recommend that our readers first read out our article on Uthman:

Who Killed Uthman?

The Opinion of Mawla Ali (as) upon Uthman and Mu'awiya

We read in Tarikh Tabari:

People of delegation asked Ali Ibn Talib) Do you bear witness that Uthman has been killed Innocent? Upon this Ali responded:

لا اقول انه قتل مظلوماً ولا انه قتل ظالماً

Neither do I say he was killed as an innocent, nor as an oppressor.
History of Tabari, Arabic Edition, volume 4, page 4 and 5

Mu'awiya's refusal to help Uthman during the Seige

Mu'awiya was the master of deception and his sole aim was to reap the pleasures of the world. Just look at his role during Uthman's life:

Imam Tabari says, it was related to me by Ja'far- 'Amr and 'Ali-Husayn- his father- Muhammad bin Sa'ib Kalbi:

When Uthman saw what happened to him and how many of people had been sent against him, he wrote Mu'awiyah bin Abi Sufyan in Syria: "In name of God, the Merciful, the Compassionate. To proceed: The Medinese (i.e. Uthman referring to People of Madina and not of Egypt) have become unbelievers (Kafirs), they have abandoned obedience and renounced their oath of allegiance. Therefore send to me the Syrian soldiers who are at your disposal, on every camel you have, whether docile or stubborn".

When Mu'awiya got the letter, he delayed action on it, for he did not wish to differ openly with the Companions of Messenger of God, since he knew that they concurred [on this matter].

When Uthman became aware of the delay, he wrote to seek and from Yazid bin Asad bin Kurz and the Syrians, he stressed his rightful claims upon them, and mentioned Almighty God's commandment to obey the Caliphs.

History of Tabari, English Edition, vol. 15, page 185 (Translated by R. Stephan Humphreys)

Therefore it becomes very clear from the above narration (and many others) that:

Outsiders and the Madinans opposed Uthman and ultimately deemed him a Kaafir (infidel).

Uthman asked Mu'awiya for support by sending an army, but Mu'awiya didn't respond whilst he knew that the Sahaba had turned against the Ummayad Khalifa.

It is also appropriate at this point to highlight the fact that the leading antagonists in the killing of Uthman were Aisha, Talha and Zubair and other Sahaba such 'Amr bin al-Aas. Ultimately Mu'awiya's claim that he was avenging Uthman's blood was nothing more than a drama. He took on these actor skills when (at the beginning of his reign) Maula Ali (as) wanted to remove Mu'awiya from his post as Governor of Syria. Let's see the following tradition of Ibn Abbas:

According to Muhammad- Hisham b. Sa'd- Abu Hilal- Ibn Abbas:

I went into Ali, and greeted him. He asked me: Did you meet al-Zubayr and Talhah? "I met them in al-Nawasif." "Who was with them?" He asked. "Abu Saïd bin al-Harith bin Hisham with a Quraishi force," I replied. 'Ali then said: 'I am sure they will never refrain from coming out and saying, 'We seek repayment for 'Uthman's blood.' By Allah! We know that they are the ones who killed 'Uthman'".

"Commander of faithful!" said Ibn Abbas. "Tell me about the business with al-Mughirah and why he had a private audience with you." He said:

“He came to me two days after the murder of Uthman and said to me”, May I have a private word with you?” I agreed, and he said: “Good advice costs nothing. You are the most excellent in this community and I have some sincere advice for you. I advise you to return Uthman’s governors to office this year, so write to them confirming their governorships. When they have given you allegiance and things have settled down under your command, then you may remove or confirm whomever you wish”. So I replied: “By Allah! I don’t compromise my religion by cheating, nor do I give contemptible men [a say] in my command” . If you insist on rejecting this suggestion, he replied, ‘then remove whomever you will, but leave Mu’awiya. Mu’awiya is daring, and Syrians listen to him. Moreover, you have good reason to keep him in office, for Umar bin al-Khattab made him governor of whole Syria.’ “By Allah! no,” I replied. “I would never appoint Mu’awiya as Governor, even for two days! “ Al-Mughirah then left me without further suggestion. However, he came back again and said to me: ‘I gave you some advice, but you didn’t agree with me. So I thought about it and realized that you were right. You should not assume your authority deceitfully. There should be no fraud in your rule’”.

“So I said to Ali, said Ibn Abbas, “his first suggestion advised you well, his last deceived you. I advise you to confirm Mu’awiya. If he gives you allegiance, then I will undertake to topple him from his position. “Ali replied, “By Allah! No. I will give him nothing but the sword. ” And he quoted the following verse:

Death, if I die without weakness, is no disgrace when the soul meets its destruction.

“Commander of Faithful! I replied, you are a courageous man, but you are not a warmonger. Didn’t you hear the Messenger of Allah say, ‘War is deceit’? “Indeed I did,” said Ali. “By Allah! If you do as I say” replied Ibn Abbas, “I will take them back to the desert after a watering, and I will leave them staring at the backside of things whose front side they have no idea of, and you will incur neither loss nor guilt,” Ibn Abbas, said Ali, “I don’t want anything to do with these mean schemes of yours or of Mu’awiya’s. You give me advice, and I consider it. If I go against you, then you do as I say.” “I will,” I replied. “Obedience is my first and foremost obligation to you.”

History of Tabari, English Edition, volume 16, page 23-24.(Translated by R. Stephan Humphreys)

This was the evil scheme of Mu’awiya, the claim that he was avenging Uthman’s blood was just a farce. Maula Ali (as) vigorously criticised Uthman (during his siege) about the wrong doings of his governors (especially Mu’awiya). How could Khalifa Ali (as) allow Mu’awiya to continue such transgressions in the name of politics? If this background has become clear to our readers, then we can move forward and assess the quality of excuse offered by today’s Nasibi to defend their father Mu’awiya.

Abu Sulaiman of ansar.org puts forward the common excuse:

Mu’awiyah did not want to rule, nor refused the leadership of Ali bin Abi Talib, may Allah be pleased at him, but Mu’awiyah requested from Ali to give in Uthman’s murderers, and only after that he would obey him (Ali).

The contradiction is evident in just this single sentence. On the one hand he states Mu'awiya did not "refuse the leadership of Ali bin Abi Talib" and yet then states it was not until Uthman's killers were handed over that "he would obey him". Hence he WAS refusing the Leadership. In other words Mu'awiya was indeed refusing the leadership of Ali (as) by placing a 'condition' for bay`a. We should also point out Abu Sulaiman's tactical use of the English language.

Mu'awiyah 'requested' from Ali was to give in Uthman's murderers, and only after that he would obey him Ali.

A request in English is simply when a person asks another as to whether such an option was available. Clearly Mu'awiya was NOT in any way making a request, since as Abu Sulaiman says, it was not UNTIL this so-called request was granted that he would give bay`a. So it was NOT a 'request' but a 'demand'.

Later on Abu Sulaiman passes the following comment:

Mu'awiyah did not fight Ali except for the matter of Uthman. Mu'awiyah saw himself as the guardian of Uthman's blood, and Uthman was one of his relatives"

Whilst Abu Sulaiman admires Mu'awiya's stance we ask 'is there any evidence from the Qur'an and Sunnah that entitles an individual to delay giving bay`a UNTIL Qisas is implemented?' If there is, why did Mu'awiya the alleged Mujtahid not cite a source to support his position and why did Imam Ali (as) not accept it? Or does Abu Sulaiman have more knowledge on the Shari`a than these two central characters?

Abu Sulaiman also seeks to defend Mu'awiya by saying:

Ansar.org states:

"...and Mu'awiyah relied on some prophetic hadeeths that show and clear that Uthman would be killed as an innocent and describes the rebels as hypocrites... Mu'awiyah and his companions thought they were right according to this and that they were on guidance especially when we know that the hypocrite rebels against Uthman were in the army of Ali. Hence, Mu'awiyah and his companions thought them on astray and therefore they made it lawful for themselves to fight Ali and his faction.."

Could Abu Sulaiman show any reference as to when Mu'awiya cited these traditions to support his action? Or is Abu Sulaiman simply seeking to read Mu'awiya's mind? Do these ahadith (narrations) state that it will then be permissible for Uthman's relatives to rebel against the state and demand retribution forthwith?

We should also ask Abu Sulaiman 'was Mu'awiya's desire for revenge, more important than the smooth running of the Islamic State under the rule of the rightful caliph? Did Mu'awiya not consider the repercussions of such an action? Was there for example not a risk of Munafiqs (hypocrites) and the Kuffar (pagans) exploiting the situation and spread fitnah to further their own machinations? It is indeed interesting that when the same Abu Sulaiman seeks to read the mind of Mu'awiya later by pointing out that Mu'awiya killed Hujr to quell the risk of sedition and yet the same Mu'awiya saw no problem in himself opposing Imam Ali (as) actively participating in rebellion and sedition!

Clearly the risk was inherent – the third khalifa had been killed, so it was a time of upheaval. In light of such tense / delicate circumstances would it not have been better for Mu'awiya to allow the new Khalifa to settle down and then punish the killers of Uthman? What was the exact correlation between giving bay`a and Imam Ali (as) handing over Uthman's killers? How exactly was Mu'awiyas demand going to help the situation?

One also wonders how Mu'awiya had all of a sudden become the Waris of Uthman demanding Qisas. Uthmans was survived by sons all of who were baligh they were his Waris and they had the right to ask for Qisas not Mu'awiya.

Ansar.org states:

Al-Thahabi narrated in “Sayr A’alam Al-Nubala’a” from Ya’ali bin Ubayd from his father who says: (Abu Muslim Al-Khulani and some others went to Mu’awiyah and asked him: “Do you dispute Ali or are you equal to him? Mu’awiyah answered: “By Allah no. I know he is better than I am, and he has the right to rule, but do not you know that Uthman was killed as an innocent? And I am his cousin and the seeker of his revenge? Therefore go to Ali and tell him to send me Uthman’s murderers then I will obey him.” They went to Ali and talked to him, but Ali refused to hand in Uthman’s murderers to Mu’awiyah.) [Sayr A’alam Al-Nubala’a, vol.3, p.140, the examiner of the book said that its narrators are trustworthy]

Abu Sulaiman’s use of this reference is indeed disturbing. It is implying that Imam Ali (as) was AWARE who the killers of Uthman were, despite this he let these killers roam free. Does Abu Sulaiman not understand the serious implication of this viewpoint? The Ahl’ul Sunnah have never espoused the view that Imam Ali (as) knew and protected Uthman’s killers, they absolve him of any such slander and yet Abu Sulaiman is seeking to offer a new approach casting doubts on Imam Ali (as). This is a subtle and devious method used by Abu Sulaiman, he has consciously cited this reference, implicating Imam Ali (as) as the wrongdoer and Mu’awiya as the distraught sincere relative. It is clear that the majority Ahl’ul Sunnah do NOT believe such slander against Imam Ali (as) but they should be warned of the risks of infiltration by Nasibis seeking protection for their comments under the Sunni garb.

Mu’awiya and his supporters

Abu Sulaiman extols the cosy relationship between Mu’awiya and the people of Sham at several points in his article. Ansar.org states:

“Mu’awiyah ruled Al-Sham for forty years, and his relationship with Al-Sham’s people was a relationship of love and loyalty to a degree that the people of Al-Sham agreed strongly with him when Mu’awiyah wanted to avenge Uthman’s murder”.When Mu’awiyah took the governship of Al-Sham, his policy with his people was one of the best policies. His people loved him, and he loved them too... his people supported him when Mu’awiyah wanted to take Uthman’s revenge. They gave him allegiance on that and promised him that they will spend their lives and money for the cause of Uthman, take Uthman’s revenge, or Allah take their souls before that. [Al Bidaya Volume 8 p.131]

So we learn:

Mu'awiya loved the people of Sham and vice versa

Such was their love they supported him in his decision to avenge Uthman's murder

It should be made clear than the Shari`a is NOT based on the opinions of the Sahaba. The legitimacy of any stance is only valid if it is supported by the dictates of the Qur'an and Sunnah. The premise that the love of the people constitutes legitimacy of a stance is indeed a very faulty logic. The German people had a deep seated love for Adolph Hitler, this does not in any way mean that this support and his subsequent actions were sanctioned by Allah (swt). To love a person and follow him accordingly does not in any way mean that an individual's action is correct. On the contrary the correct approach is to follow Allah (swt)'s Deen. Had he been sincere, Abu Sulaiman would have informed his admiring public as to who should have been followed in those circumstances, the Khalifa Ali (as) or Mu'awiya?

Even if for arguments sake we were to accept this, i.e. love for Mu'awiya constitutes legitimacy to rebel, what is Abu Sulaiman's verdict on those that opposed Mu'awiya and fought him, were they not also the Prophet's Sahaba (companions)?

Mu'awiya exploited people's ignorance and greed to attain support

The reality is that Mu'awiya was indeed a 'master politician' with the ability to use any method to get his way, like the Leaders of Arab nations today, he used methods of maintaining leadership – 'by any means necessary'. This included courting and bribing people and subduing opposition through intimidation and violence. This was a reality that was recognized by famed Salafi Syed Qutub in 'Kutub wa Shakhsyat' page 242 who whilst commenting on the modus operandi he used to oppose Ali (as) stated:

وحين يركن معاوية وزميله إلى الكذب والغش والخديعة والنفاق والرشوة وشراء الذمم

Mu'awiya and his comrade (Amr bin Aas) used lies, deception, hypocrisy, and bribery.

Ibne Maghazli states in his Manaqib page 128 "Dhikr Sifeen"

"Imam 'Ali wrote a letter to Mu'awiya stating 'Makka and Madina have given bayya to me you should do the same so as to avoid a war between the people of Iraq and Syria'. Mu'awiya used Uthman's blood as an excuse not to give bayya and he used this excuse to mislead the ignorant Arabs, bribing people with money and land".

The issue that Abu Sulaiman intentionally avoids throughout the article is not that they loved and supported Mu'awiya the actual issue that he should answer is 'does The Shari`a permit them to act in the way that they did?' This is a question Abu Sulaiman knows he has no answer to which is why he has failed to cite even a single verse to defend Mu'awiya. Mu'awiya was an individual deviated from the truth and had likewise led others into misguidance.

Mu'awiya falsely claimed that Ali (as) killed Uthman so as to garner the support of the Syrians

Mufti Ghulam Rasool (d. October 2010) of Daar ul Uloom Qadriyah Jilaniyah, London in his famed work 'Hasab aur Nasab' Volume 5 page 252 records as follows:

“Moreover in the year 62 H, Ali, the lion of Allah, sent another letter to Muawiya through Jarir bin Abdullah al-Bajali wherein he tried to make him understand that he should obey the caliphate upon which the Ummah had agreed and not to cause a dispute by separating from the majority but for a considerable period of time, Muawiya did not respond to Jarir bin Abdullah al-Bajali and kept avoiding him. At last, upon the advice of Amr bin al-Aas, Muawiya decided that war should be fought against Ali by proving him responsible for the murder of Uthman, thus Muawiya appointed a man so that he could arrange for some witnesses that could testify before the people of Syria that Ali was responsible for Uthman's murder. The man therefore prepared five such witnesses who testified before the people of Syria that it was Ali who had murdered Uthman after which Ali from Iraq and Muawiya from Syria prepared for the war and advanced towards each other ”

Hasab aur Nasab, Volume 5 page 252

This reference proves that the causal factor that led to the battle of Sifeen was Mu'awiya's efforts to whoop up an anti sentiment against the Ali (as) amongst the Syrian, and he did this by falsely claiming that he killed Uthman. This was the spring board that via which the Syrians were convinced that an armed campaign should be launched against Ali (as), one that formed on the plains of Sifeen.

Along the same lines Ahle Hadith scholar Sideeq Hassan Khan Qanuji in 'Al-Roza tul Nadiyah Sharah Al-Durar al-Bahiya' Volume 2 page 360 also opined that Muawiya's motivation behind rebelling against Ali (as) was nothing other than greed:

وأما الكلام فيمن حارب عليا كرم الله وجهه فلا شك ولا شبهة أن الحق بيده في جميع مواطنه أما طلحة والزبير ومن معهم فلا أنهم قد كانوا بايعوه فنكثوا بيعته بغيا عليه وخرجوا في جيوش من المسلمين فوجب عليه قتالهم وأما قتاله للخوارج فلا ريب في ذلك والأحاديث المتواترة قد دلت على أنه يمرقون من الدين كما يمرق السهم من الرمية وأما أهل صفين فبغيتهم ظاهر لو لم يكن في ذلك إلا قوله ﷺ لعمار: “تقتلك الفئة الباغية” لكان ذلك مفيدا للمطلوب ثم ليس معاوية ممن يصلح لمعارضة علي ولكنه أراد طلب الرياسة والدنيا بين قوم أعتام لا يعرفون معروفًا ولا ينكرون منكرًا فخادعهم بأنه طلب بدم عثمان

With regards those that fought against Ali (k), there is no doubt or suspicion that the truth was in his hands on all occasions. In relation to Talha, Zubair and others accompanying them, they gave allegiance to Ali but then broke it and brought an army from the Muslims, it was hence necessary to fight against them. With regards to his fighting against the Khawarij, there is no doubt that, there are Mutawatir traditions that refer to them being outside the pale of religion in the same manner that an arrow

that has left its bow. With regards the people of Sifeen, they were open rebels, as the Prophet (s) had stated to Ammar ‘You will be killed by a rebel group’ and this is what was required in this regard. Muawiya was not competent to oppose Ali rather he wanted government and the world and he was with a nation that neither commanded good things nor forbade bad things. Thus Muawiya deceived them by calling for avenging the blood of Uthman’.

Abu Sulaiman’s attempts to misinterpret the words of Imam Ali (as) as a means of defending Mu’awiya

Ansar.org states:

Al-Shareef Al-Ridi narrated in Nahjul Balagha a speech delivered by Ali where Ali says: “In the beginning of our matter, the people of Sham and us met. It is obvious that our God is one, our Prophet is one, and our call in Islam is one. We do not see ourselves more in faith in Allah or more in believing His messenger than them, nor they do. Our matter is one, except for our disagreement in Uthman’s blood, and we are innocent from his murder.” [Nahjul Balagha, vol.3, p.648] Hence, Ali is confirming that the conflict between him and Mu’awiyah is about the murder of Uthman, not for the sake of leadership or to take control of the Muslims”

If anything Imam Ali (as) is expressing his concern at, is the ‘mentality’ of the people of the time, both believed in the principles of Deen and yet despite this fact they sought it fit to rebel against the Ul’il ‘Amr whilst such an act contradicts the Qur’an. Whilst the spilt was linked to over allegation that Mu’awiya sought retribution for Uthman’s killers, there is no edict in Islam for an individual to rebel against the rightful Khalifa in order to his own way, and that was what Imam Ali (as) had set out here. He was questioning the legality of Mu’awiya’s actions.

Imam Ali (as) questions Mu’awiya’s motives

Since Abu Sulaiman’s sought to defend his Imam Mu’awiya by misinterpreting the words of Imam ‘Ali (as)’s, we present proof that Imam Ali (as) was openly sceptical about Mu’awiya’s motives. Coupled with the sermon cited by Abu Sulaiman, one is able to get a true picture of how Ali (as) saw and interpreted his opponent’s actions:

This sermon is taken from Ahl’ul Sunnah’s authority work al-Akhbar al-Tiwal, page 173 by Ahmed Bin Daud Abu Hanifa Dinwari:

“From the Servant of Allah, Ali Ammerul Momineen to Mu’awiya ibn Abi Sufyan. Khaulani has brought your letter to me. You have claimed that I deserted Uthman and instigated people against him. In fact I did no such thing, when people got annoyed with the late Caliph some withdrew their support of him whilst others killed him. I chose to remain in my home keeping aloof from the matter....As regards to your demand that I hand over the killers of Uthman I shall not. I am fully aware that you wish to exploit this as a means to fulfil your own ambitions, which has no aim to avenge the blood of Uthman. By my life if you refuse to abandon your rebellion and opposition, this same chastisement will fall on you as has fallen on every tyrant, sinner and rebel”.

Here Imam ‘Ali (as) exposes the treachery of Mu’awiya making clear that he has no interest in avenging Uthman’s murder rather he had ulterior motives. The harsh reality is that the demand of Qisas was in fact a smokescreen by which Mu’awiya sought to catapult his ambitions of power.

The Imam can only implement Qisas

Even if his motives were sincere Mu’awiya’s very demand that the killers of Uthman are handed over to him contradicts the Shari`a since the Head of State can ONLY enforce the Law of Qisas.

Zameer Sayyid Sharred in Sharra Muwaffaq page 530 comments:

“The Imam’s duty is to implement the Shari’a, rules on Qisas, nikah jihad, Eid, the rules cannot be implemented without an Imam”.

In Sharh al Maqasid page 251 we read:

“The appointment of the Imam is an absolute necessity, he implements the Shari’a and places the required limits upon man”.

If one was to accept Mu’awiya’s stance, then this in effect gives a green light for blood feuds and vigilantism – the law of the land is a mockery since citizens have the right to kill to avenge the murder of a relative. Does Abu Sulaiman represent this viewpoint, that not only undermines a Khalifa’s authority but in effect creates a state of anarchy and violence? If he does not deem this as the correct way for a citizen to behave when there is a rightful Khalifa at the helm, then on what premise is he seeking to defend Mu’awiya’s demand?

In an Islamic State Individuals are entitled to voice their concerns / opinions to those in authority. Concerns are only permitted to go as far as ‘silent protest’ not armed rebellion. There exists no verse in the Qur’an or hadith that entitles individuals to rebel and fight the rightful khalifa if their demands are not met. If this was the case then all Governments would be held to ransom, a ‘its my way or the highway’ approach – leaders would be constantly watching over their shoulders wondering when the next opposition rebellion would take place. If Mu’awiya was indeed correct in rebelling to get his way, then this sets a clear precedent, if you don’t get your way and the rightful khalifa does not listen to your demands then you can rebel. Is this option set out in any of the sources of Shari’a? Clearly it is not as we have stated already Allah deems obedience to Ulil ‘Amr unconditional, and with regards to ‘Ali (as) Rasulullah (s) said:

“Whoever obeys ‘Ali, obeys me, whoever obeys me, obeys Allah, whoever disobeys ‘Ali disobeys me, whoever disobeys me, disobeys Allah” [Kanz ul Ummal, hadith numbers 32973]

Kanz ul Ummal, Page 614, Hadith numbers 32974 & 32977

Mustadrak al Hakim, Vol. 3, Page 128

Riyadh ul Nadira, Vol. 3, Page 110

This hadith is absolutely explicit, obedience to ‘Ali (as) is unconditional, it is on par with obedience to Rasulullah (s) and Allah (swt).

Fatwa of Shah Abdul Aziz – one that fights Ali (as) is a kaafir

Al Muhaddith Shah Abdul Aziz comments in – Hadiyyah Majeediyyah page 813

“One who fights Ali (r) with enmity is a kaafir according to the ijma of Ahl’ul Sunnah”

On that same page he seeks to protect Mu’awiya citing the Ansar line of defence namely:

“Whoever deems Ali (r) to be a kaafir or opposes his khilafath is a kaafir, this trait was evident amongst the Khawaarij at Naharwaan”.

Also on the same page Shah Abdul Aziz seeks to protect Mu’awiya by pointing out that Mu’awiya does NOT come within this definition since:

“Mu’awiya and the people of Syria sought revenge for the killing of Uthman”.

As we shall prove if this is the defence by which the majority seek to prevent Mu’awiya then this motive is also without any comprehensive proof....

Mu’awiya’s actual motive was power

Since Mu’awiya had decided to take it on himself to avenge `Uthman’s death, perhaps Abu Sulaiman could inform us what efforts Mu’awiya had taken to protect `Uthman while he was alive? Had Mu’awiya had any love for his relative he would have sought to protect him, and protect he could, after all he had command over the army of greater Syria (Syria and Damascus). With the largest army in the Empire at his disposal, what action did Mu’awiya adopt? In Ahl’ul Sunnah’s authority work al-Nasa’ih al-Kaafiyah page 19 we learn that:

” Uthman asked Mu’awiya for assistance, but Mu’awiya did not listen to him. When the situation got worse and there remained little chance that Uthman would survive Mu’awiya sent Yazeed bin Asand ul Kasheeree with an army and told him to reach the point of Zeekush and remain there. The officer followed this order and when Uthman was killed Mu’awiya ordered his army to return. This was done in order to show the people that he had sent an army but in reality this was just a trick, so that he could exploit Uthman’s death as a means of taking power”.

The following reference recorded by Ibn Katheer also makes it clear that the main motive of Muawiyah was not to avenge the murder of Uthman rather he was interested to become the ruler over various key geographical areas like that of Egypt. Ibn Kathir records:

“When Ali came to know that people of Egypt have deemed Muhammad bin Abu Bakar as inferior due to his tender age of 26, he thought of giving Egypt back to Qais bin Sa`d who was the head of his police during that time or give Egypt to Ashtar Nakhi who was his vicegerent over Mosul and Nasibain. Thus, after Sifteen Ali wrote to him, called him and made him the ruler of Egypt. When Muawiyah came to know that instead of Muhammad bin Abu Bakar, Ali had made Ashtar Nakhi the ruler of Egypt, this thing went harsh on him because he was interested in Egypt and he wanted to snatch it from Muhammad bin Abi Bakar and he knew that Ashtar bin Nakhi would save Egypt from his hands due to his intelligence and bravery.”

Al Badayah wal Nihayah (Urdu), Vol 7 page 612, Events of 38 H, [Nafees Academy Karachi].

The agreement between Mu'awiya and Amr bin Aas is clear proof that the motive was power not avenging Uthman's murder

Perhaps the advocates of Mu'awiya will not be convinced, well let us hear the testimony from the mouth of their Imam Mu'awiya. In Iqd al Fareed page 113 Volume 1 Chapter "Yaum Sifteen" a detailed conversation is cited between Amr bin Aas and Mu'awiya.

"Mu'awiya told Amr bin Aas to give him bayya. Amr replied 'if its with regards to the next world, then Allah (swt) will not be with you, if its in connection with this world then I would like a share'. Mu'awiya replied, "in my world there is an equal share". Amr said, "I would like you to put into writing that you will give me Egypt and its surrounding suburbs". Mu'awiya did so adding (in the agreement) that Amr give him bayya. Amr replied that it should also be written (in the agreement) that it (bayya) will be subject to the conditions being met. Mu'awiya replied "people will not look at this" but Amr said "Do this". At this point Utba bin Abi Sufiyan attended and Amr said "Mu'awiya I have sold my religion at your hands". Utba said "Verily give him the full agreed amount as he was a Sahaba of the Prophet".

Notice how the killing of Uthman is missing from the entire conversation. The discussion is about power and Mu'awiya's bribing of Amr with land to get him on board. Despite Abu Sulaiman's excuses, the words used by Amr bin Aas "Mu'awiya I have sold my religion at your hands", stand as clear testimony that even he felt that he had abandoned his religion by siding with Mu'awiya, but alas for bin Aas his lust for power was so great that it outweighed his iman. Power was the name of the game not the enforcement "revenge for Uthman" was the war cry via which Mu'awiya sought to enhance his ambitions.

We read in al-Akhbar al-Tiwal page 158 "Dhikr Sifteen" that Amr said to Mu'awiya "Give me Egypt to eat from as long as you are a ruler". Tareekh Abu Fida Volume 2 page 238 "Dhikr Sifteen" likewise states that Amr placed a condition that to join Mu'awiya he would be given the power to govern Egypt. It is indeed interesting to note how the promise of power and authority was the factor that 'moved' Amr bin Aas over to the noble cause of avenging the blood of Uthman.

Power was the name of the game not the enforcement "revenge for Uthman" was the war cry via which Mu'awiya sought to enhance his ambitions.

What greater proof of the deviance of Mu'awiya can there be than the admission of his key supporter Amr bin Aas. We read in in Ta'rikh Kamil Volume 2 page 139 "Dhikr Sifteen" that Amr bin Aas said the following to Mu'awiya:

"Avenging Uthman's blood was just an excuse, we are desirous of worldly power, upon hearing this Mu'awiya agreed to hand over Egypt to Amr".

Do the defenders of Mu'awiya need to be convinced any further? This is the testimony of one of the key central characters in this episode admitting to Mu'awiya that Uthman's revenge was an excuse, the real motive was just

power. If Mu'awiya disagreed with this assertion then why did he not admonish him and set the record straight?

Mu'awiya's testimony further proves his real motive was power not vengeance for the slain Uthman

Advocate of Mu'awiya, Ibn Kathir records two interesting references that further exposes the real reason for Mu'awiya's opposition. One of these references is about Mu'awiya's first sermon to the people of Kufa that has also been quoted by Syed Qutub Shaheed in his famous book 'Social justice in Islam':

"Men of Kufa, do you think I fought against you on account of prayers or Zakar or pilgrimage? I knew that you said the prayers, that you paid the Zakar and that you performed the pilgrimage. I fought you in order to have control and mastery over you, now Allah has granted me that mastery, though you may not like it. Now, therefore, all the money and all the blood that I have had to expend in this war is still to be repaid, and all the promises that I made in the truce are under my feet here"

1. Social justice in Islam, page 237

2. Al-Bidayah (Urdu), Vol 8 page 974, under the topic of Merits and virtuous of Muawiyah

The report has originally been recorded in al-Musannaf of Ibn Abi Shaybah, Volume 6 page 187 No. 3055 that has been graded as 'Jaiyid' by Al-Albaani in Irwa al-Ghalil, Volume 3 page 63.

Before the above cited episode, we read in Al-Bidayah wal-Nihayah, Volume 8 page 13 under the topic of Merits and virtuous of Muawiyah:

Ibn Asakir has narrated from Amir Shu'bi that prior to the battle of Siffeen...Ali sent Jareer bin Abdullah al-Bajli to Muawiyah with a letter which contained the text: 'It is compulsory on you to give allegiance (bayyah) to me since Muhajir and Ansar have already given their allegiance to me and if you don't give it, I will seek Allah's help against you...' Muawiyah read the letter before the public and Jareer got up and addressed the people and in his speech he advised Muawiyah to listen and obey (Ali) and warned him from opposing and prevented him from spreading mischief (fitna) among the people...Muawiyah told Jareer: 'If Ali makes me Governor over Syria and Egypt, on the condition that after him it will not be obligatory on me to give bayyah to someone else, I will give him bayyah.'

Allamah Khawarzami in his "Manaqib" page 255 Chapter "Dhikr Siffeen" states that:

"Mu'awiya wrote a letter to 'Ali which he sent via the hand of 'Abdullah bin Uqbah. In the letter he stated 'I asked you about my ruling Syria, and placed an additional condition that neither I give you bay'a nor do I obey you, but you rejected this. But Allah gave me what you rejected to give me, I continue to hold the same view about what I had invited you before (about Syria and not giving you bay'a)."

This and the previous reference from al Bidaya proves he had NO INTEREST in the killing Uthman rather his interest was one – gaining power. Mu'awiya simply used Uthman's murder as an 'excuse' not to give bay'a to Imam 'Ali (as). If he was indeed sincere perhaps Abu Sulaiman can

explain why Mu'awiya did not ask for the killers to be handed following arbitration between the two sides at Sifeen? After all as Abu Sulaiman states the Syrians loved him and Mu'awiya was so determined to avenge Uthman's death that he deemed it appropriate to go to war. This being the case how is it that he totally abandoned this determination when the two sides were negotiating, if Uthman's death was so important that thousands of lives could be lost, why did he all of a sudden abandon this resolve? If he was sincere would this not have been the very first thing that he demanded? This was clearly a farce and Deobandi scholar Sayyid Ahmad Raza Bijnori in his commentary of Sahih al Bukhari "Anwar ul Bari" states on Volume 12 page 73:

"Mu'awiya fought out of a personal desire for power and was motivated by his pro Umayya bias".

Anwar-ul-Bari Sharah Sahih Al-Bukhari Vol. 12 page 73

Moreover Shah Abdul Aziz Dehlavi in his Fatwa Azizi page 161 Chapter 8 under the chapter "Marwan" in answer to question 5 makes the admission:

"The scholars of Ahl'ul hadith having relied on narration's have concluded that Mu'awiya's actions were based on his personal grudge and desire and it was not on account of the enmity that had been borne out between the Quraysh and Banu Umayya following the murder of the possessor of two lights [Uthman], the truth is that he was guilty of a great sin, was a baghi (rebel) and a fasiq (transgressor)".

Fatwa Azizi page 161 Chapter 8

Mu'awiya Thaneeh's condemnation of his grandfather eludes the fact that he fought Imam 'Ali (as) for power

When Mu'awiya ibn Yazeed became khalifa he gave the following sermon:

"Verily Khilafath is Allah (swt)'s. My grandfather fought one that was more deserving of the khilafath and that was 'Ali ibne abi Talib and he performed such acts that you are all aware of, and in consequence he is suffering for these acts"

A number of leading Sunni Ulama have recorded this sermons (Tareekh Khamees Volume 2 page 301; Hayatul Hayawan Volume page 88; Tareekh Ya'qubi Volume 2 page 241; Sawaiq al Muhriqa page 134; Yanabi al Mawaddah Volume page 325).

This sermon by Mu'awiya's own grandson destroys the notion that he sought Uthman's revenge. He clearly pointed out that his opposition was without any basis rather he just fought for attaining power.

Abu Sulaiman questions the justice of Imam Ali (as)

In his defence of Mu'awiya Abu Sulaiman further uses his psychic abilities citing the opinions of Mu'awiyas supporters. Ansar.org states:

"Mu'awiyah's supporters would say: "We cannot give allegiance to anyone except the one who would act with justice and does not oppress us...Ali is unable to act justly and we do not have to give allegiance to such a person".

On the one hand the Ansar passionately use every method in the Book to stir emotions to the masses, namely Shi'a don't respect the Sahaba, and here

Abu Sulaiman's Nasibi mentality shines so clear that he is even supporting the view that Ali was unjust. Does this Nasibi really believe Mu'awiya was more interested in justice than 'Ali (as)? This when we have 'Abu Bakr narrating this hadith:

“Verily Allah (swt) and his Prophet (s) spoke the truth, I heard Rasulullah (s) say on the night of Hijrah as we left Makka ‘My hand and Ali’s hand are EQUAL in dispensing justice” (Taken from Manaqib by Ibne Maghazli al Shaafi page 98, this hadith can also be found in Kanz al Ammal Volume 11 page 604)

Interestingly whilst also defending the rebellious group, Abu Sulaiman manages to travel back in his imaginary time machine and state on their behalf that they would justify their opposition saying:

“Uthman’s murderers are in the army of Ali, and these murderers are unjust”.

Mu’awiya did not apply Qisas against Amr bin Aas

Now perhaps Abu Sulaiman could inform us how Mu'awiya dealt with the killers of Uthman in his own side, did he implement Qisas, as he demanded? He did not and in fact the clearest evidence that Mu'awiya's approach was nothing but a façade, comes from the very fact that he failed to take any action against the killers of `Uthman who were also in his army. Is it not logical that the first thing he would do would be to get his own house in order and 'avenge' `Uthman's murders by slaying the killers hiding in his army? His trusted general at Sifeen was none other than `Amr bin al-`Aas who openly admitted his role in the killing of `Uthman proudly declaring:

“I am Abu Abdullah. When I scratch an ulcer, I cut it. I used to campaign against him vehemently. I even instigated the shepherds at the top of the mountains to revolt against him.”

Al-Tabari Volume 14, pages 171-172

Despite this, not only did Mu'awiya not kill him, he promoted him to his second in command – would he really have acted in this way if he sincerely wanted to avenge Uthman's murder? Demanding the killers from Ali's side and promoting the killers to Commanders on his own?

The comments of modern day Sunni academic Professor Masudul Hasan in his book Hadrat Ali Murtada (R.A.A) page 248 are indeed worthy of note:

“Mu'awiya in spite of his cry for vengeance for the blood of Hadrat Othman found no harm in making an alliance with a man who had in fact incited the rebellion against Hadrat Othman. 'Amr bin Al-Aas in spite of his bitter opposition to Hadrat Othman during his lifetime saw nothing wrong in joining the chorus for vengeance for the blood of the man in whose murder he was indirectly if not directly involved”

Hadrat Ali Murtada (R.A.A) by Professor Masudul Hasan. page 248

Misuse of a Shia tradition by the Nawasib to support Uthman

Since Nawasib like Abu Sulaiman do not find any justification for the deviations committed by their Imam Mu'awiya, they are often left with misusing Shia texts and interpreting them in a way that suits them.

Ansar.org states:

If Al-Tijani haven't had enough of this, then I would be compelled to give him something from his guides, the Imamiyah, what proves that Ali and Mu'awiyah are both rightful in their interpretation. Al-Kulayni mentioned in his book, Al-Rawdah min Al-Kafi – which represents the basis and branches of the Imamiyah sect – from Muhammad Bin Yahya who says: (I heard Abu Abdullah peace be upon him saying: “Disagreement of Bani Al-Abbas is unavoidable, the calling is unavoidable, and the coming of the twelfth Imam is unavoidable.” I said: “And how is the calling?” He answered: ‘Someone will call from the heaven in the beginning of the day: “Ali and his party are the winners.”’ He also said: “And someone will call in the end of the day: “Uthman and his party are the winners!”’) [Al-Rawdah min Al-Kafi, p.177, vol.8] And here is Ali bin Abi Talib makes a resolution that Uthman and his party are people of Islam and faith, but the case is a matter of interpretation, every person seeing himself on the right path in the matter of Uthman.

Reply One: The authenticity of the tradition

The hadith cited by Ansar.org can be read at:

Al-Kafi, Volume 8 page 209 Chapter 25 Hadith 253

It is indeed unfortunate that our opponents stoop so low in order to absolve their ancestors sins, to the point that they feel no shame in attributing a tradition to one of our Imams, namely Imam Abu Abdullah Jafar al-Sadiq (as), in this age of internet when anyone can browse a relevant library and check the chain of any tradition along with its ‘Matan’ (text). If one reads the complete chain of narration, we see that there is no mention of Imam Jafar (as) in the text, rather it has been narrated by a narrator namely Dawood bin Farqad who heard this tradition from an unknown man belonging to the tribe of Al-Ejlia. That is why Muhaqiq Ali Akbar Ghaffari who wrote the margin/column of Furu al-Kafi has written about this tradition:

“This tradition is Muzamir and Musquf”

Hashiya Kitab Raudah, page 209

Maquf is a type of tradition whose chain does not go back to the infallible ones.

Reply Two: The actual ‘Uthman’ mentioned in the tradition and the Nasibi distortion

Unsurprisingly, Nawasib have adopted such distortion to evidence the merits of their ancestors in Shia books, such as the misuse of the tradition but such dissection has placed them in a rather awkward situation. How did they conclude that the Uthman mentioned in the above tradition is their

caliph Uthman bin Affan? Who told these lunatics that the second caller mentioned in the tradition will be the caller of glad-tidings?

Let us first reveal the identity of the second caller mentioned in the traditions as commented upon by Shaykh Ali Khorani al-Amili in 'Al-Entisar' Volume 9 page 145:

“The first call is the call of truth because it is the voice of Gabriel from the sky, the second call is of the falsehood because it is the voice of Iblis from the earth.”

Coming to the person mentioned in the tradition by the name of Uthman, we shall point out that Nawasib have committed deceit by making it Uthman bin Affan while in reality the Uthman mentioned in the tradition is one is often mentioned as Sufyani, who will be from the Nasibi progeny of Abu Sufyan and will eventually be shown the path of hell by the Imam of the time [aj]. Imam Ali (as) narrated:

“The son of the liver eater shall appear from the dry valley, he is a man of average height, an ugly face, big head, there is trace of smallpox on his face, if you see him you will think he is one-eyed, his name is Uthman, his fathers name is Anbesa and he is from the descendants of Abu Sufyan.”

Kamal al-Deen, by Sheikh Seduq, page 651

We also read the testimony of Imam Jafar Sadiq (as) in this regard:

Abu Hamza al-Thumali narrated: I said to Abu Abdullah (as) that Abu Jafar (as) used to say: 'The Sufyani is unavoidable'. He (Abu Abdullah) replied: 'Yes, Bani al-Abbas disagreement is unavoidable, the death of Nafs al-Zakia is unavoidable, the coming of the twelfth Imam is unavoidable.' I asked: 'How that be?' He (Abu Abdullah) replied: 'Someone will call from the heaven in the beginning of the day 'the truth is with Ali and his party', then Iblis may Allah curse him will call at the end of the day 'The truth is with Sufyani and his party' then the followers of falsehood will have doubts'.

Kamal al-Deen, by Sheikh Seduq, page 652

Reply Three: The actual attributes of the followers of Uthman bin Affan recoded in Sunni texts

We have cited the dishonesty of the Nasibi author who tried to use the above cited Shia tradition in order to prove Uthman and his followers to be on right path. We would like to know why they don't they reveal the actual attributes of the followers of Uthman bin Affan recorded in authentic Sunni texts? Dear readers, let us reveal the attributes of the followers of Uthman whom the author of Ansar.org suggesyed were on the right path, but were infact Nawasib according to the testimonies of Sunni scholars. The favorite scholar of the Nawasib, Ibn Tamiyah recorded:

وقد كان من شيعة عثمان من يسب عليا ويجهر بذلك على المنابر

“The followers (shias) of Uthman used to do abuse Ali openly from the pulpits of mosques”

Minhaj al Sunnah, Volume 6 page 201

We all know that one who abuses Ali bin Abi Talib (as) is hypocrite according to the prophetic traditions, yet the author of Ansar.org is keen to give glad tidings to the perpetrators of this very sin!

If this does not suffice, let us point out an Uthmani individual namely Abul Ghaya and then check the 'virtuous' act he committed. Imam Ibn Abdul Barr while writing on Abul Ghaya records in Al-Istiab, Volume 2 page 153:

“He was a lover of Uthman and was the killer of Ammar bin Yasir”

Imam Ibn Athir records in ‘Asad al-Ghaba’ Volume 5 page 267:

وكان من شيعة عثمان رضي الله عنه وهو قاتل عمار بن ياسر

“He (Abu al-Ghadya) was among the followers (Shia) of Uthman (ra) and he is the killer of Ammar bin Yasir”

According to the prediction of Holy Prophet (s) regarding Ammar Yasir (ra), “He will be killed by a rebellious aggressive group. ‘Ammar will invite them to (obey) Allah and they will invite him to the (Hell) fire.’” (Bukhari, v4 Hadith 67). Thus, there shall remain no confusion in the mind of the present day Nawasib regarding the Uthmani killers of Ammar Yasir (ra) being the people of Hell fire, yet we see author like Abu Sulaiman suggesting that Uthmanies are the people of heaven contrary to the prediction of Holy Prophet (s)!

Let us conclude the topic by gifting the following reference to the Nawasib recorded by one of their esteemed Imams, Dhahabi:

إن خرج الدجال تبعه من كان يحب عثمان

“When Dajjal appears, his followers will be the lovers of Uthman”

Mizan al-Eitadal, Volume 2 page 107 Translation No. 3031

Sunni scholar Yaqub Fasawi tried to cast doubts on the authenticity of the chain of narration of this tradition which sparked the grand Sunni Imam Dhahabi to refute him, stating:

“That is what al-Fasawi rejected from the hadiths, no one did so before him, and if we follow such scruples we would be rejecting many correct Sunnah just due to wrong illusions”

Chapter Three: Mu'awiya's appointment of Yazeed as his successor

Abu Sulaiman claims:

“Mu'awiyah did not force people to give allegiance to his son Yazeed”

There is no evidence to support Abu Sulaiman's assertion. We learn from history that Mu'awiya used many methods at his disposal to secure his son's position as Khalifa. Methods included bribery and coercion [for those interested they can consult *Khilafat wa Mulukiyyat*, chapter 4, page 149, Ibn Atheer, vol 3, page 249, *Bidaya*, vol 8, page 79, *Tareekh Ibn Kahldoon*, vol 3, page, 15-16]

Did Mu'awiya want to make Yazeed just a Crown Prince or Khalifa?

In his effort to protect Mu'awiya we see that Abu Sulaiman yet again uses semantics stating:

Mu'awiyah was eager for people's agreement to give allegiance to his son Yazeed. He resolved to take allegiance to Yazeed as a crown prince. So he consulted the grandest companions, the masters of the people and the district's governors. They all accepted. Delegations from the districts came with acceptance to give allegiance to Yazeed. Many Companions gave him the allegiance as well. Al-Hafedh Abdulghani Al-Maqdisay says: “His (Yazeed's) caliphate is rightful, sixty of the companions of the prophet peace be upon him gave him the allegiance. Ibn`Umar was one of them.” [Qayd Al-Shareed min Akhbar Yazeed, by Ibn Khaldoun, p.70]

Could Abu Sulaiman explain the definition of a Crown Prince? If this is indeed the case, is there any evidence in the Qur'an and Sunnah entitling individuals to give bay`a to a Crown Prince? In fact in Islam Kingship is rejected outright, so even if this was correct Mu'awiya had acted contrary to Islam. If for arguments sake we accept this argument could Abu Sulaiman kindly tell us what the difference is between him appointing Yazeed as Crown Prince or Khalifa? Did he appoint someone separate as Khalifa? Did he tell the people to give bay`a to another person? In any case this defence is unsubstantiated and we challenge Abu Sulaiman to cite us a single source where he had referred to Yazeed as his Crown Prince and ordered people to give bay`a on this position.

It is not surprising that Abu Sulaiman has relied on the work of Ibn Khaldun who was an open Nasibi, such words from him are not an aberration. Recently killed prominent Deobandi Mufti Nizamuddin Shamzai records the following episode in his esteemed work 'Aqeedah Zahoor-e-Mahdi' pages 113-114 (published by Idarah Dawat-e-Islam, Karachi.):

Hafiz Ibn Hajar states: “Our teacher, the prominent Muhaddith Hafiz al-Haythami used to severely condemn Ibn Khaldun. When its reason was asked to him, he said that Ibn Khaldun while mentioning Hussain has recorded a statement viz ‘He was killed with the sword of his grandfather’. Sakhawi states that when our teacher Hafiz Ibn Hajar narrated this statement, he cursed Ibn Khaldun, said something bad about him and was weeping. Hafiz Ibn Hajar has said that those words of him are no longer

written in the present history book. [Al-Zawa Al-Lamea, Volume 4 page 147]

It should also be kept in mind that Ibn Khuldun was a Nasibi and had deviations for the progeny of Ali”

The book ‘Al-Zawa Al-Lamea’ by Imam Sakhawi can be downloaded from the Salafi website mentioned below and the aforesaid reference can be seen in Volume 2 No. 387 of this version.

<http://www.almeshkat.net/books/open.php?cat=12&book=2276>

Mu’awiya made Yazeed his Khalifa during his lifetime

The sources of history tell us quite the opposite. Abu Sulaiman’s claims are refuted by the last will and testament of Mu’awiya in which it is clear that he has made Yazeed his khalifa:

“O my son, I have arranged everything for you, and I have made all the Arabs agree to obey you. No one will now oppose you in your title to the caliphate, but I am very much afraid of Husayn b. Ali, Abd Allah b. ‘Umar, Abd ar-Rahman b. Abi Bakr, and Abd Allah b. az- Zubayr. Among them Husayn b. Ali commands great love and respect because of his superior rights and close relationship to the Prophet. I do not think that the people of Iraq will abandon him until they have risen in rebellion for him against you. As far as possible, try to deal with him gently. But the man who will attack you with full force, like a lion attacks his prey, and who will pounce upon you, like a fox when it finds an opportunity to pounce, is Abd Allah b. az- Zubayr. Whenever you get a chance, cut him into pieces.”

Iqd al Fareed, Volume 4 page 226

Here they also try to rid Mu’awiya of the crimes his son Yazeed committed against the Ahlul Bait at Kerbala.

From this text Mu’awiya had told his beloved son “No one will now oppose you in your title to the caliphate” – he is not telling Yazeed that he had made him Crown Prince he is informing him that he had laid the foundation for him to succeed him as khalifa.

To this effect we even have evidence from Sahih Bukhari, Volume 6, hadith 352:

Narrated Yusuf bin Mahak:

Marwan had been appointed as the governor of Hijaz by Muawiya. He delivered a sermon and mentioned Yazeed bin Muawiya so that the people might take the oath of allegiance to him as the successor of his father (Muawiya)..

From this source it is clear that the bay’a was given to Yazeed as khalifa, not Crown Prince, unless Abu Sulaiman is suggesting that Mu’awiya deemed himself to be a Crown Prince!

The evidence is clear that the people gave bay’a to Yazeed as the Khalifa. This is even evident from a source cited by Abu Sulaiman himself. Although we will examine the tradition at length afterwards suffice it to say Abdullah Ibn Umar said:

“...we have given the oath of allegiance to this person (Yazeed) in accordance with the conditions enjoined by Allah and His Apostle [Saheeh Al-Bukhari, Book of "Afflictions", vol.7, #6694]“

According to Ibn Umar bay'a was given to Yazeed "in accordance with the conditions enjoined by Allah and His Apostle" clearly these conditions are connected with giving bay'a to a khalifa not a Crown Prince.

Mu'awiya forced people to give bayya to Yazeed

We have discussed this topic with complete references in our article on Yazeed.

Please see our article: Yazeed (L'aeen)

Legendary Salafi scholar Muhammad Rasheed Raza (d. 1935) who is known as 'reformer' and who has been praised by several Salafi scholars including Al-Albaani has stated in his authority work Mujalat al-Manar, volume 33 page 441:

فإن متبع الحق مستقل الفكر فيه بلا هوى ولا تعصب لمذهب يجزم بأن معاوية نفسه كان باغيًا خارجًا على الإمام الحق كالخوارج ، وأنه طالب ملك ، ويؤيد ذلك إكراه الناس على جعل هذا الملك لولده يزيد المشتهر بالفسق

Anyone delving into the truth with a free mind unclouded by emotion or sectarian affiliation, shall confirm that Mu'awiyia was rebel (Baghi) and one that departed (Kharij) against the true Imam, he sought the throne and forced the people to transfer the throne to his son Yazeed who was known for his lechery (Fisq).

In Volume 24 page 33, he stated:

معاوية واستخلافه ليزيد الفاسق الفاجر بقوة الإرهاب من جهة ورشوة الزعماء من أخرى

Mu'awiyia inaugurated Yazeed the Fasiq sometimes by means of terror while sometimes by means of bribe.

His book has been translated into Urdu language by the name of 'Imamate al Uzma' published by Quran Mahal, Molvi Musafir Khana, Karachi:

Imamate al Uzma page 99

Deobandi scholar Rasheed Akhtar Nadwi in "Tahzeeb o Tamadun-e-Islami" comments on page 1:

"Mu'awiyia forced people to give bayya to Yazeed".

Tahzeeb-o-Tamadun-e-Islami, part 3 page 2 by Rasheed Akhtar Nadwi (Idara Saqafat-e-Islamia, Lahore)

Professor Saeed Akbar Allahbadi in his book "Musalman ka 'Uruj-o-Zawal" (Urdu) page 53 likewise states:

"Mu'awiyia attained power by force and secured it for Yazeed in the same manner. People who did not agree were forced to give it".

Musalman ka 'Uruj-o-Zawal page 53

Abu Sulaiman had proclaimed that Mu'awiyia:

consulted the grandest companions, the masters of the people and the district's governors. They all accepted. Delegations from the districts came with acceptance to give allegiance to Yazeed

What Abu Sulaiman fails to explain is the method Mu'awiyia used that resulted in delegates giving bayya to Yazeed. Let us shed light on his

methods by citing the comments of Syed Qutb Shaheed in “Social Justice in Islam” (English translation pages 209-210):

“With the coming of Mu’awiya, the caliphate in Islam became a monarchy, a tyranny confined to the Umayyad family...”

It will be sufficient at this point to quote as proof of this the account of the oath of allegiance to Yazid. From here we may discover the foundation of Umayyad power and find out whether Mu’awiya who established that power was true to the spirit of Islam or to some other ideal. Mu’awiya summoned delegates to represent all the provinces at the taking the oath of allegiance to Yazid. Then Yazid Ibn al Muqaffa stood up and said “The Commander of the Faithful is here”, and he indicated Mu’awiya, “If he dies his successor is here” and he indicated Yazid. “And if anyone refuses – here” and he pointed to his sword. The, said Mu’awiya, “Sit down O best of preachers”.

After the oath was taken to Yazid in Syria Mu’awiya gave Said ibn al-’As the task of gaining the acceptance of the people of the Hejaz. This he was unable to do, so Mu’awiya went to Mecca with an army and with full treasury. He called together the principal Muslims and addressed them thus:

“You all know that I have lived among you, and you are aware also of my ties of kindred with you. Yazid is your brother and your nephew. It is my wish that you take the oath of allegiance to Yazid as the next Caliph; then it will be you who will bestow offices and depose from them, who will collect and apportion money”. He was answered by Abdullah ibn Al Zubair, who gave him a choice of three things to do, first he might do as Allah’s Messenger had done and appoint no successor, second he might do as Abu Bakr had done and nominate a successor, third he might do as Umar had done, and hand over the whole matter to a council of six individuals, none of whom was a member of his own immediate family. Mu’awiya’s anger was kindled, and he asked “Have you any more to say?” “No”. Mu’awiya turned to the remainder of the company “And you?” “We agree with what Ibn Al Zubair has said”, they replied. Then he addressed the meeting in threatening terms: “The one who warns is blameless. I was speaking among you, and one of you was bold to get up and call me a liar to my face. That I will bear and even forgive. But I stand to my words, and I swear by Allah that if any of you speaks one word against the position that I take up, no word of answer will he receive, but first the sword will take his head. And no man can do more than save his life”.

Thereupon the commander of Mu’awiya’s guard ordered two men to stand over each of the nobles of the Hejaz who opposed him and to each he said, “If your man leaves his guards to speak one word, either for me or against me, then let the guards strike off his head with their swords”. Then he mounted the pulpit and proclaimed: “These men are the Leaders and the choicest of the Muslims; no matter can be successfully handled without them, nor can any decision be taken without their counsel. They are now satisfied to take the oath to Yazid, and have indeed already taken that oath by the name of Allah”. So the people took the oath.

Social Justice in Islam, (English translation) pages 209-210

Mu'awiya bribed people to give bayya to Yazeed

We read in Tarikh al Kamil, Volume 3 page 350:

“Mu'awiya kept Mugheera in his post. Mugheera arrived at Kufa and spoke to his close representatives, bribing them with 30,000 dirhams to maintain their support. Mugheera sent his son Musa bin Mugheera to Head a delegation that visited Damascus, there they [the group] reiterated their support for the nomination of Yazeed as Khalifa. Mu'awiya summoned Musa and asked him how much money his father had spent to buy these individuals, he replied 30,000 dirhams”.

Mu'awiya killed all those who posed a hurdle for him making Yazeed Khalifah

Muawiyah not only used his money, but he also made use of violence to secure his filthy son's seat succession to the throne. Victims of such violence included Abdur Rahman bin Khalid bin Waleed. Though Abdur Rahman was not a Shia rather a Nasibi, when it came to the love of his filthy son, Muawiyah didn't even spare one of his companions.

al Bidaya wa al Nihaya, Volume 8 page 31 Dhikr 31 Hijri

al Istiab, Volume 1 page 250, Dhikr Abdur Rahman bin Khalid

al Nasa al Kafiya, page 62

Asadul Ghaba, page 440 Dhikr Abdur Rahman bin Khalid bin al-Walid

Tarikh Kamil, Volume 2 page 213

Shazarath'ul Dhahab, Volume 1 page 55 Dhikr 46 Hijri

We read in Al Bidaya:

عبد الرحمن بن خالد بن الوليد

القرشي المخزومي وكان من الشجعان المعروفين والأبطال المشهورين كايه وكان قد عظم

ببلاد الشام لذلك حتى خاف منه معاوية ومات وهو مسموم

“Khalid bin Walid's son Abdur Rahman was from amongst the brave men and was popular in Syria hence Mu'awiya was against him and was poisoned”

We read in al-Istiab:

“Abdurehman was againt Ali and Bani Hashim ... he had fought in Sifeen alongside Muawiyah...When Muaiywah decided to take bayah from people for his Yazeed, he gave a sermon to the people of Syria in which he said: ‘the time of my death is approaching, I am elderly and I want to make a ruler for you people, what do you people want?’. They said: ‘We like Abdurehman’. Muawiyah didn't like it but kept it within him and once Abdurehman got ill, Muawiyah told the doctor to treat him and gave him a syrup that could kill him, the doctor administered it and killed him by giving him poison.”

Why did Imam Hussain (as) refuse to give bay'a to Yazeed?

Abu Sulaiman claims:

Ibn Al-Zubair and Al-Hussain (as) disagreed on this allegiance but it does not defame this allegiance because it must have some objectors. From this we know that Mu'awiyah was eager to have the acceptance of the Ummah in giving the allegiance to Yazeed.

The objection was not some simple matter like a difference of opinion over a dinner table. This was a matter intrinsically linked to the Deen (religion), that ultimately asks the question, 'was it legitimate for a fasiq to be the khalifa of Rasulullah (s)?' On the one hand we had the opinion of Ibn`Umar who deemed it correct, and on the other we had Imam Hussain (as) who said that this was a sin in the eyes of Allah (swt). The clearest proof comes from his letter to the Shi'a of Kufa:

"From Husayn b. Ali to the believers and the Muslims. Hani and Sa'id came to me with your letters, they being the last among your messengers and delegations to come to me. I have understood what you said and that you have invited me to come to you because you have no Imam to guide you, and that you hope my arrival there will unite you in the right path and in the truth. I am sending my cousin and the trusted one from my family [Muslim b. Aqil] to report to me about your affairs. If his report conforms with what you have written, I will soon come. But you must be clear about the fact that the Imam is only one who follows the Book of God, makes justice and honesty his conduct and behaviour, judges with truth, and devotes himself to the service of God. Peace."

History of Tabari, Volume 19 pages 26-27

The last sentence of the letter, explaining the duties of an Imam and the nature of the Imamate, helps us to understand Hussain's approach and attitude towards the whole problem. The Imam was one who:

Followed the Quran and Sunnah

Was just and trustworthy

Was of good character

Was a true devotee of Allah (swt)

It is evident that Imam Hussain (as) did not see these conditions inherent in Yazeed which is why he refused to give him bay'a.

Tabari also records this letter of Imam Hussain (as) to the Shi'a of Basra:

"God has chosen Muhammad from among his people, graced him with His Prophethood and selected him for His message. After he admonished the people and conveyed His message to them God took him back unto Himself. We, being his family (ahl), his close associates endowed with the quality of guardianship (awliya'), his trustees and vice regent (awsiya'), and his heir and legatee (warith), are the most deserving among all the people to take his place. But the people preferred themselves over us for this [privilege]. We became contented, disliking dissension and anxious to preserve the peace and well being [of the community], though we were fully aware that we were more entitled to this [leadership] than those who had taken it for themselves . . . I have sent my messenger to you and I call you to the Book of God, and the Sunna of his Prophet, the Sunna which has become obliterated and innovations have become active and energetic. If you listen to me and obey my orders I will guide you to the right path. May the Peace and the Mercy of God be upon you."

History of Tabari, Volume 19 page 32

So Imam Hussain (as) felt that the Deen had been corrupted and he was calling on the people to turn to him for guidance. This was far more than just a difference of opinion it was a difference at the heart of Deen, who has the right to call oneself the khalifa?

Mu'awiya's development of lineal succession

Ansar.org states:

Mu'awiyah did not invent a new system for the caliphate by inheriting the leadership to his son Yazeed. Abu Bakr was the first to do it when he gave the leadership to `Umar bin Al-Khattab and `Umar did the same when he limited the leadership in six Companions.

Mu'awiya created a completely new system. Abu Bakr deemed Umar the most worthy for the role of succession and Umar selected six people who he himself stated that were the most worthy to succeed him. For Mu'awiya he created a system where succession was NOT based upon merit but upon lineage character did not come in to the equation.

He then states that Imam Ali (as) in fact started the lineal succession that appointed Imam Hasan (as). He accuses the Shi'a of applying contradiction condemning:

“...Mu'awiyah giving the leadership as an inheritance to his son Yazeed yet the greatest doctrine of the Imamiyah Rafidites is their belief that the leadership is a hereditary in the sons of Ali bin Abi Talib by the father giving the leadership as an inheritance to his son! Is it allowed for them and forbidden on others?”

This type of hereditary succession is in accordance with the will of Allah (swt) and Rasulullah (s). The Shi'a concept of succession is that the Imam is appointed by Allah (swt) BECAUSE he has the right to succeed on account of his perfection / merits. Imam Ali's appointment of Imam Hasan (as) is not on account of the fact that he is his son, but because he is the most superior in the Ummah to lead the Ummah. Rasulullah had made it clear that if you follow the Qur'an and Ahl'ul bayt (as) you will NEVER go astray. Hence the succession of Hasan (as) was not in any way shaped by nepotism rather it was on account of his entitlement to lead as he was the legitimate Imam appointed by Ali (as) through the will of Allah (swt) who would prevent the people from going astray. Imam Hasan (as) was qualified to take power, whilst the Banu Umayya possessed no such qualities. Is Abu Sulaiman going to suggest to us that no one in the entire Ummah was superior to Yazeed?

Yazeed the 'protector of afflictions'

In his defence of Mu'awiya, Abu Sulaiman comments:

Perhaps the reason that pushed Mu'awiyah to take allegiance to Yazeed was to push away the disagreement and to be one in this crucial time at which the Ummah lived and where a lot of people claimed the caliphate. Hence, Mu'awiyah thought that by giving the leadership to Yazeed would be a good thing for the Ummah and it would prevent another affliction of happening

And what wonderful affliction was prevented. Yazeed reigned for three years. In the first year Imam Hussain his family and companions were martyred. In the second year Yazeed ordered an attack on Harra that led to the slaughter of the companions and the mass rape of their women folk.

In History of al-Fakhri, translated by C.E.J. Whitting, London, 1947, pp. 113-115 we learn that Yazeed first asked Ubaydullah bin Ziyad to lead an army against Medina, who made excuses, then he asked Muslim bin Uqbah who led the army:

“Then Muslim, son of ‘Uqbah, for three days gave Madinah to the sack. He murdered, looted and took prisoners, so that it was said that a man of Madinah thereafter, if he gave his daughter to wed, would not guarantee her virginity, “She may have been raped in the battle of Harrah.” (from page 114)

Ta’rikh Duwal al-Islam, al-Dhahabi, Hyderabad, page 31 provides list of those Sahaba who were killed in Harra.

Yazeed’s protection from affliction did not just end there. Fakhri on page 114-115 states that Yazeed issued an order to go to Mecca, though Muslim died before he reached Mecca and so that another person (who Yazeed had nominated should Muslim die, since he was old led attack:

“The son of Zubair, with the men of Meccah, made a sally against him, battle was joined and a Syrian versifier said:- “‘Artillery’ like a foaming stallion, with which he shoots at the timbers of this mosque.” A footnote says ‘timbers’ refers to the Prophet’s pulpit and other relics.

In al-Isabah fi tamyiz al-Sahaba, Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani volume 3, page 470 also mentions the pillage of Medina, and stoning of Ka’bah during Yazeed’s reign.

Appraisal of ‘pious’ Yazeed by the Nasibi author

Abu Sulaiman states:

“It is also a lie that Yazeed was an alcohol drinking person”. We will let Muhammad bin Ali bin Abi Talib to answer this claim because Muhammad knew Yazeed the best because he lived with him for a while. Ibn Katheer says in Al-Bidayah: (When the people of Al-Medina returned from Yazeed, Abdullah bin Mutee’a and his companions walked to Muhammad bin Al-Hanafiyah. They wanted Muhammad to agree to dismiss Yazeed, but Muhammad refused. Ibn Mutee’a said: “Yazeed drinks alcohol, does not pray, and ignores the rule of the Book.” Muhammad answered them: “I never saw what you are saying about him. I came to him, and stayed with him for a while and I saw him taking care of his prayers, looking for goodness, asking about jurisprudence, and clinging to the Sunnah....[Al-Bidayah wa Al-Nihayah for IbnKatheer,vol.8,p.236]

It is agreed by Sunni and Shi’a alike that Yazeed was an ill character individual, and he is reviled throughout the world in Muslim circles. Curiously Abu Sulaiman seems to depart from the common Sunni line and all of a sudden endorses the piety of Yazeed! No true Sunni would ever utter praise for Yazeed. It is extremely insulting to see that yet again Abu Sulaiman is presenting his Nasibi thinking and cloaking it as Sunni Islam.

In any case Abu Sulaiman has failed to substantiate his claim. Assuming that this statement attributed to Ibn al-Hanafiyya is not a fabrication,

Muhammad bin Hanafiyya is stating that he (personally) had NOT seen Yazeed drinking this so could not verify the allegation. Had Abu Sulaiman had an ounce of honesty in him, he would have acknowledged that the filthy character was a fact that no prestigious scholar of Ahlul Sunnah has denied.

Ibn Kathir's comments on Yazeed the drunkard

Interesting the very same text al Bidaya from where Abu Sulaiman had sought to extol the virtues of his Imam Yazeed, also contains comments of Ibn Kathir proving that he was indeed a drunkard. Ibn Kathir is the Wahabi's biggest historian and a student of Ibn Taymiyya himself. As far as Wahabis are concerned, his words are written in gold. Yet Ibn Kathir himself writes in 'al Bidayah' Volume 8 page 1169 "Dhikr Yazeed bin Muawiya":

"Traditions inform us that Yazeed loved worldly vices, would drink, listen to music, kept the company of boys with no facial hair [civil expression for paedophilia with boys, a form of homosexuality], played drums, kept dogs [civil expression for bestiality], making frogs, bears and monkeys fight. Every morning he would be intoxicated and would bind monkeys to a horse saddle and make the horse run".

Al Bidayah Wal Nihayah (Urdu), Vol 8 Page 1169, Nafees Academy Karachi

Imam Ibn Atheer's comments on Yazeed 'the drunkard'

Imam Ibn Atheer Jazri records the following testimony of Munzar bin Zubayr in 'Tareekh al Kamil' Volume 3 page 450:

إنه أجازني بمائة ألف ولا يمنعني ما صنع بي أن أخبركم خبره وأصدقكم عنه والله إنه

ليشرب الخمر والله إنه ليسكر حتى يدع الصلاة

'He rewarded me with one hundred thousand, but this deed will not prevent me from telling you honestly about his status, by Allah he drinks alcohol, by Allah he is drunkard and even abandons prayer'

Tareekh al Kamil, Volume 3 page 450

Imam Dhahabi's narration and verdict on Yazeed 'the drunkard'

Yazeed's drinking despite Abu Sulaiman's denials is such an established fact that even Dhahabi, relied on as an authority by Abu Sulaiman, testifies to this fact.

In "Siyar A'lam Al-Nubala" Volume 4 pages 37, Dhahabi narrates:

"Ziyad Haarthi narrated: 'Yazeed gave me alcohol to drink, I had never drunk alcohol like that before and I enquired where he had obtained its ingredients from'. Yazeed replied: 'it is made of sweet pomegranate, Isfahan's honey, Hawaz's sugar, Taif's grapes and Burdah's water'. Ahmed bin Masama' narrated: 'Once Yazeed drank alcohol and started to dance, suddenly he fell down and his nostril began to bleed'.

After citing the above cited traditions, Imam Dhahabi then gave his own verdict regarding Yazeed which has also been recorded by Allamah Ibn al-Emaad al-Hanbali (d. 1089 H) in "Shadharat al Dhahab" Volume 1 page 69:

وقال الذهبي فيه كان ناصبياً فظاً غليظاً يتناول المسكر ويفعل المنكر افتتح دولته بقتل

الحسين وختمها بوقعة الحرة فمقتته الناس ولم يبارك في عمره

“Al-Dhahabi said about him (Yazeed) that he was Nasibi, rude, harsh, used to drink alcohol and committed evil deeds. He started his reign by killing al-Hussain and concluded it by the battle of al-Hara, so the people hated him and Allah didn’t bless his life”

The book can also be downloaded from the following Salafi library:

<http://almeshkat.com/books/open.php?cat=13&book=733>

Moreover, in his another authority work ‘Tarikh Islam’ Volume 5 page 30, Imam Dhahabi states:

قلت: ولما فعل يزيد بأهل المدينة ما فعل، وقتل الحسين وإخوته وآله، وشرب يزيد الخمر،

وارتكب أشياء منكراً، بغضه الناس، وخرج عليه غير واحد، ولم يبارك الله في عمره، فخرج

عليه أبو بلال مرداس بن أديّة الحنظلي

I say: ‘When Yazeed did to the people of Madina what he did and killed al-Hussain and his brothers and progeny, and Yazeed drank alcohol, and performed abominable things, then the people hated him and rose against him more than once and God didn’t bless his life and Abu Bilal Mirdas bin Adya al-Hanzali rose against him.’

Imam Ibn Jauzi’s comments on Yazeed ‘the drunkard’

Ibn Jauzi in Wafa al-Wafa Volume 1 page 217:

“Yazeed appointed his cousin Uthman bin Muhammad bin Abu Sufyan as Governor of Madina. He sent a delegation to visit Yazeed who bore gifts so that they might take the oath of allegiance to him. Upon their return they said ‘We have returned having visited a man who has no religion, he drinks, plays instruments, keeps the company of singers and dogs, we declare that we have broken our allegiance to him. Abdullah bin Abi Umro bin Hafs Mukhzumee commented ‘Yazeed gave me gifts, the reality is this man is an enemy of Allah (swt) and a drunkard, I shall separate myself from him in the same way that I remove my turban [from my head]...’”

Ibn Hajar al-Haythami’s comments on Yazeed ‘the drunkard’

In his book written against the Shi’a namely ‘Sawaiqh al Muhriqa’ page 221, Ibn Hajr Makki al-Haythami sets out the Sunni position on Yazeed:

One group that includes Ibn Jauzi deem Yazeed a kaafir, another group says that he was not a kaafir, this is a disputable matter of Ummah and the majority of Ahl’ul Sunnah agree that he was a fasiq (transgressor), a fajir (one that commits debauchery) and a drunkard.

Al-Waqidi has recorded from various ways that Abdullah bin Hanzallah narrated: ‘verily we opposed Yazeed at that time when we feared that Allah (swt) would then send down stones on us, Yazeed considered nikah (marriage) with mothers, daughters and sisters to be permissible, drank alcohol and abandoned prayers’.

These comments are indeed interesting. Ibn Hajr asserts that in the eyes of the vast bulk of Ahl’ul Sunnah, Yazeed was “a fasiq, a fajir and a drunkard” while Abu Sulaiman who claims he is Ahl’ul Sunnah wants us to

believe in a tradition portraying him as a pious worshipper who never drank alcohol.

Shah Abdul Aziz Muhadith Dehalwi's comments on Yazeed 'the drunkard'

Renowned Sunni scholar of Pakistan (Late) Allamah Shafi Okarvi Qadri who was known by the title "Khateeb A'zam of Pakistan" wrote a book "Imam Paak aur Yazeed Paleed" [The pure Imam and filthy Yazeed] wherein he refuted one of the lovers of Yazeed [la] Maulana Mahmood Abbasi. During the course of argument, Allamah Okarvi quoted the famed anti-Shia scholar and the beloved of Ahle Sunnah Muhadith Shah Abdul Aziz Dehalwi who wrote the following about Yazeed:

"Verily, Hussain (as) rejected to give bayah to Yazeed because he was Fasiq, drunkard and an oppressor and Hussain went Makkah.[Sirul Shahadatayn, page 12]"

Imam Paak aur Yazeed Paleed, page 97 (Zia ul Quran publications, Lahore)

Qadhi Thanauallah Paani Patti's comments on Yazeed 'the drunkard'

Qadhi Thanauallah Paani Patti (d. 1225) was a Sunni scholar of twelfth century, who studied under the teachings of Shah Waliullah Muhadith Dehalvi (d. 1176 H) while his anti-Shia son Shah Abdul Aziz Muhadith Dehalvi (d. 1239 H) would call Qadhi Thanauallah the 'Behaqqi of his time'. He was also the Khalifa of Mirza Mazhar Jaan Janan (d. 1195 H) who would refer to Qadhi Thanauallah as 'Ilm al-Huda'. His commentary of the Holy Quran, Tafseer Mazhari is popular among the Sunni masses particularly amongst the Deobandies. We will cite the complete text later on, suffice is to quote Qadhi's testimony regarding Yazeed being a drunkard:

Moreover, he made alcohol Halal and these are his couplets for alcohol:

'The treasure of alcohol is in a utensil which is like silver and the branch of grapes are loaded by grapes which is like stars, the depth of the branch of grapes is alternate for the stars over sun, the east of this sun (alcohol) is the hand of the drinker while the place for the sunset (alcohol) is my mouth, thus, if one day alcohol was made Haram in Ahmad's religion, then O addressee, you just take it according to the religion of Masih ibn Mariam (i.e. deem it Halal)'

Tafseer Mazhari [Arabic], Volume 5 page 271, commentary of 14:29

Tafseer Mazhari [Urdu], Volume 6 pages 202-203, commentary of 14:29

At another place (under the commentary of 24:55), Qadhi Thanauallah wrote:

"It is possible that this verse refers to Yazeed bin Muawiyah. Yazeed had martyred the grandson of Holy Prophet (s) and his companions, those companions were actually the members of the Prophet's family, he disgraced the honor of the Prophet (s) and then became proud of that and stated: 'Today, the revenge for the day of Badr has been taken'. He was the one who brought the army to storm Madina and destroyed it during the incident of Hara, and he dishonored the mosque that had been founded on the basis of Taqwa and which has been referred to as one of the gardens of heaven, he installed positions in order to stone the house of Allah, he was

the one who martyred Abdullah bin Zubair (ra) the grandson of the first caliph Abu Bakr (ra). He did such indecent things that at last he denounced the religion of Allah and made the alcohol Halal that had been made Haram by Allah”

Tafseer Mazhari [Urdu], Volume 8 page 268

Mu’awiya also knew that Yazeed drank alcohol

Ibn Kathir in his authority work ‘Al Bidayah wa al Nihaya’ (Urdu) Vol 8 page 1156 “Dhikr Yazeed bin Muawiya” testifies that Muawiyah also knew about Yazeed’s habit of consuming alcohol and in this regard Muawiyah advised him through poetry not to do such things in daylight (i.e. in public) as a means of avoiding objections from his opponents. Ibn Kathir states:

Yazeed in his youth indulged in alcohol consumption and used to do other things youth would do, and this came to the attention of Mu’awiya who wanted to advise him warmly so he said to him: ‘O my son, you do have capability of achieving what you want without disgrace and debasement, which will destroy your youthfulness and value, and will make your enemy happy at your adversity and your friend will treat you badly’. He then stated: ‘O my son, let me recite to you some couplets, try to learn manners from these couplets and learn them by heart’. Thus, Muawiyah recited:

“Stay all the day long in the pursuit of heights and have patience on the departure of a close mate, until the darkness of night appears and your enemy falls asleep, thus, do whatever you wish to do throughout the night, night is like a day for the wise, there are plenty of Fasiq people whom you deem pious, but they spend their nights committing strange things, night has provided veils to their acts and he has spent the night with calm and pleasure, while the wish of a stupid person is of a visible nature.”

Al Bidayah wa al Nihaya (Urdu) Vol 8 page 1156 (published by Nafees Academy Karachi)

We appeal to our readers to ponder over this reference carefully. Who knows a man’s character better than his father? Abu Sulaiman relied on Ibn Kathir’s narration wherein Ibn Hanafiyya said he had never seen Yazeed drinking alcohol. In the same book Ibn Kathir records the testimony of Mu’awiya himself, namely his advice that Yazeed keep his alcoholism a secret. Tell us Abu Sulaiman whose word is more reliable yours or Muawiya’s?

Ibn Hajar Asqalani’s views regarding those that praise Yazeed

The statement by one of the most esteemed Sunni Imams Ibn Hajar Asqalani regarding the one who praises Yazeed is quite serious, yet we find Nawasib like those of Ansar.org, Sipah-e-Sahabah (hcy.com) and some self proclaimed scholars like that of Dr. Zakir Naik trying to absolve Yazeed [la] and making an attempt to praise him. Imam Ibn Hajar Asqalani records:

وأما المحبة فيه والرفع من شأنه فلا تقع إلا من مبتدع فاسد الاعتقاد فإنه كان فيه من الصفات ما يقتضي سلب الإيمان عمن يحبه لأن الحب في الله والبغض في الله من الإيمان والله المستعان

‘Loving and glorifying him is not performed except by a heretic who has void belief because he (Yazid) had characteristics that his lover deserves to be faithless, because to love and hate just in the sake of God is the sign of faith’

Al-Emta bil al-Arbaeen, page 96

Imam Ahmad issued Takfeer against drunkard Yazeed

In Sharh Fiqh Akbar, page 88 we read the following account about Yazeed:

“He considered alcohol halal and at the time of killing Husayn and his companions, he stated: ‘I have avenged the death of my ancestors at Badr’ and other statements like this. This is the reason that Imam Ahmad Ibn Hanbal declared Yazeed to be a kaafir as the copy of Yazeed’s statement was proved authentic to him (Imam Ahmed)”

Allamah Syed Mahmood Alusi al-Baghdadi (d. 1270 H) under the commentary of 47:22-23 as well as other Sunni scholars quoted the following opinion of Imam Ahmed bin Hanbal regarding Yazeed:

Al-Barzanji in Al-Ishaat and al-Haythami in al-Sawaiq recorded that Imam Ahmad bin Hanbal’s son (Saleh) narrated that he said to his father that he had seen people saying that they love Yazeed bin Muawiya. To this Imam Ahmed bin Hanbal said “For a person having belief in Allah there was no reason to love Yazeed bin Muawiya. Why should the person not be cursed who has been cursed by Allah in Quran. To this Saleh asked that where in the Quran had Allah cursed Yazeed bin Muawiya. Imam Ahmed replied quoting the verse: ‘Then, is it to be expected of you, if ye were put in authority, that ye will do mischief in the land, and break your ties of kith and kin? Such are the men whom Allah has cursed for He has made them deaf and blinded their sight. Do they not then earnestly seek to understand the Qur’an, or are their hearts locked up by them?’ [47:22-24].

1. Tafseer Ruh al-Ma’ani, Volume 26 page 227

Tafseer Ruh al-Ma’ani (Online), Volume 26 page 72

2. Tafsir Mazhari (Urdu), volume 10 page 326 (Published by Darul Isha’at Karachi)

3. Ghidha al-albab li-Sharh Manzumat al-Adab by Muhammad ibn Ahmad al-Saffarini al-Hanbali (d. 1188), Volume 1 page 182

4. Adab Shari’a by ibn Muflih al-Hanbali, Volume 1 page 342

In Sawaiq al-Muhriqa (Urdu), page 734, the conversation ends with the words of Imam Ahmed:

“Can there be any worse fitna than this murder (of Hussain)?”

Sawaiq al-Muhriqa (Urdu), pages 733-734

Allamah Mahmood Alusi’s takfeer against Yazeed

Allamah Syed Mahmood Alusi al-Baghdadi (d. 1270 H) in his famed commentary of Quran namely Tafseer Ruh al-Ma’ani, Volume 26 page 73

under the commentary of the verse 47:22-23, wrote his views about Yazeed in the following words:

“And I say what is prevalent over my mind that (Yazeed) Khabeeth did not testify to the messengership of the Holy Prophet (s)... According to me it is correct to curse a person like Yazeed, although one cannot imagine a Fasiq like him and apparently he never repented, the possibility of his repentance is weaker than the possibility of his faith (Iman). Along with Yazeed, Ibn Ziyad, Ibn Sa’ad and his group shall also be included. Verily, may Allah’s curse be upon all of them, their friends, their supporters, their group and upon everyone who inclines towards them until Qayamah and until an eye sheds a tear for Abu Abdullah Hussain (ra)”

Tafseer Ruh al-Ma’ani (online), Volume 26 page 73

Tafseer Ruh al-Ma’ani, Volume 26 pages 228-229

Qadhi Thanauallah Paani Patti’s takfeer against Yazeed

The following views of Qadhi Thanauallah about Yazeed will shut the mouths of those Deobandies who are coming under Salafi/Wahabi influence for absolving Yazeed from his Kufr. Qadhi wrote:

Yazeed and his associates did Kufr with the bounties of Allah. They deem it as their aim to have a grudge against the progeny of the Prophet (s) and murdered Hussain (ra) with oppression and Yazeed did Kufr with the religion of Prophet (s) to the extent that Yazeed recited the following couplets over the murder of Hussain (ra)

‘Where are my ancestors, they should come and see that I have take revenge from the progeny of the Prophet and Bani Hashim’.

And the last prose are:

‘I would not be from the progeny of Jandab had I not taken revenge from the progeny of Ahmad for whatever they had done.’

Moreover, he made alcohol Halal and these are his couplets for alcohol:

‘The treasure of alcohol is in a utensil which is like silver and the branch of grapes are loaded by grapes which is like stars, the depth of the branch of grapes is alternate for the stars over sun, the east of this sun (alcohol) is the hand of the drinker while the place for the sunset (alcohol) is my mouth, thus, if one day alcohol was made Haram in Ahmad’s religion, then O addressee, you just take it according to the religion of Masih ibn Mariam (i.e. deem it Halal)’

Tafseer Mazhari [Arabic], Volume 5 page 271, commentary of 14:29

Tafseer Mazhari [Urdu], Volume 6 pages 202-203, commentary of 14:29

Various other Sunni Ulema did takfeer against Yazeed and have deemed it permissible to curse him

Let us begin with the views of great Shafiyee scholar al-Kesa al-Harsi. The prestigious rank of this Shafiyee scholar and his views about Yazeed are recorded by Ibn Katheer:

“Ibn Ali bin Emaaduddin Abu Hassan Tabari, who was known as al-Kesa al-Herasi and was amongst the activist pioneer jurists (Fuqaha) of Shafiya (sect), he was born in 450 H. He benefited from Imam al-Harmayn, he and Imam Ghazzali are among his prominent students...at Nizamamiyah in Nishapur, he used to curse Iblis seven times at every stair of Nizamiya and

there were 70 stairs in all. He heard plenty of hadiths, he debated, issued edicts, taught and was amongst the Akabir Fuzala and Sadaat jurists...And he was asked an edict about Yazeed bin Muawiyah to which he mentioned Yazeed's dishonesty and his being a Fasiq and deemed it permissible to slander him"

Al Badayah wal Nihayah [Arabic], Volume 12 page 213

Shaykh Kamaluddin Muhammad bin Musa Damiri (742-808 H) in 'Hayaat ul Haywaan' Volume 2 page 196 recorded the views of this great Shafiyye scholar in detail. When he was asked whether it is permissible to curse Yazeed, he replied:

"As for cursing him, there are two types of statements from the Salaf Saliheen, Imam Abu Hanifa, Imam Malik and Imam Ahmed Hanbal, one statement is with Tasreeh (i.e. to curse him by taking his name) and another one is with Talweeh (i.e. to curse without taking his name and only by using hint e.g. May Allah curse the killers of Imam Hussain) but according to us, there is only one statement which is Tasreeh, not the Talweeh and why should that not be the case since Yazeed used to play the game of hunting cheetahs, chess and always used to drink alcohol thus amongst his couplets, the one regarding alcohol is:

I say to my friends who have been gathered by the alcohol and the warmness of romance are calling in rhythm to take your portion of bounties and enjoyment because every person shall die no matter how long his age is (thus do all kinds of enjoyment you want to do in this short time span)."

Allamah Ibn Khalikaan (d. 681 H) in Wafayat al-A'yan, Volume 3 page 287 also recorded the very text with difference of words.

Wafayat al-A'yan, Volume 3 page 287

We read in Sharh Aqaid Nafsiyah (with Nabras), page 553:

"Some Ulema and Imams have declared it permissible to curse Yazeed, because by ordering the killing of Husayn he had committed kufr".

This text as well as the text from Sharah Fiqh Akbar that we cited above have also been quoted by the Mufti of Daarul Uloom Qadriyah Jilaniyah London namely Mufti Ghulam Rasool in:

Hasab wa Nasab, Volume 2 pages 89-90 (published in London)

Ibn Kathir writes in 'Al Bidayah Wal Nihayah':

"Whoever frightens Medina incurs the wrath of Allah, His Angels and all the people". Those people who deem it permissible to curse Yazeed bin Muawiyah deemed this and other similar kinds of hadiths as its basis. This tradition is from Ahmad ibn Hanbal and has been taken by Alkhilal, Abu Bakr Abdul Aziz, Qadhi Abu Laila and his son Qadhi Abul Husayn. Abul Faraj Ibn Jauzi wrote a seperate book deeming it permissible to curse Yazeed".

Al Bidayah Wal Nihayah (Urdu), Vol 8 Page 1148, Nafees Academy Karachi

Imam of Ahle Sunnah Saaduddin Taftazani also cursed and did takfeer against Yazeed, as recorded by Imam Ibn Emaad Hanbali (d. 1089 H) as well as by Allamah Mahmood Alusi under the commentary of 47:22-23:

فنحن لا نتوقف في شأنه بل في كفره وإيمانه لعنة الله عليه وعلى أنصاره وأعوانه

‘We don’t delay in his (Yazeed’s) case, not even in his kufr and faith, may Allah curse him, his supporters and his helpers’

1. Shadharat al Dhahab, Volume 1 pages 68-69

2. Tafseer Ruh al-Ma’ani, Volume 26 page 72

Imam Jalaluddin Suyuti is also one of those prestigious Sunni scholars who cursed Yazeed personally, we read in Tareekh Khulafa:

“Allah’s curse be upon all three Ibn Ziyad, Yazeed and the killer of Imam Hussain”

Tareekh ul Khulafa (Urdu) page 208, published by Nafees Academy Karachi

While answering to the question whether it is permissible to curse Muawiyah, Imam of Ahle Sunnah Mullah Ali Qari replied:

“It is not permissible but it is permissible to curse Yazeed, Ibn Ziyad and their likes. [Sharah Shifa, Volume 2 page 556]“

Imam Paak aur Yazeed Paleed, page 93 (Zia ul Quran publications, Lahore)

Qadhi Thanauallah Paani Patti (d. 1225) in one of his letters wrote:

“Verily, the Kufr of Yazeed is proven from authentic traditions, thus he is worthy of being cursed, though there isnt any benefit in cursing him but ‘Al-Hub fi Allah’ and ‘Al-Bughz fi Allah’ demands it. [Maktubaat, page 203]“

Imam Paak aur Yazeed Paleed, page 104 (Zia ul Quran publications, Lahore)

Prominent Shafiyee scholar Shaykh Sulaiman bin Muhammad bin Umar al-Bejarmi (d. 1221 H) records:

أن للإمام أحمد قولاً بلعن يزيد تلويحاً وتصريحاً وكذا للإمام مالك وكذا لأبي حنيفة ولنا قول بذلك في مذهب إمامنا الشافعي وكان يقول بذلك الأستاذ البكري. ومن كلام بعض أتباعه في حق يزيد ما لفظه زاده الله خزياً ومنعه وفي أسفل سجين وضعه وفي شرح عقائد السعد يجوز لعن يزيد

“Imam Ahmad has statements about cursing Yazid both Talweeh (directly) and Tasreeh (indirectly) and so has Imam Malik and Abu Hanifa and we have similar statements in the madhab of our Imam Shafiyee and al-Bakri too said the same. Some of his (al-Bakri’s) followers said about Yazeed ‘may Allah increase his disgrace and put him in the most lowest level of hell’. According to Sharh Aqaid al-Saad, it is permissible to curse Yazeed”

Hashyat al-Bejarmi, Volume 12 page 369

An appeal to our Sunni brethren

We have faithfully cited the comments of grand Sunni Ulema who have deemed Yazeed to be a drunkard and issued fatwas declaring it permissible to curse him on account of his deeds. Sunnies likewise the world over are united in their hatred of Yazeed ibn Mu’awiya, he is despised and cursed whenever his name is mentioned. Curiously by citing this tradition Abu Sulaiman has sought to present an alternative viewpoint of Yazeed, one of an ardent pious worshipper. This is a belief that is alien to Sunni aqeedah

and one has to ask 'what is this new belief system that Abu Sulaiman is seeking to pass off as 'the truth'? Clearly his views bear no correlation with Sunni Islam; the only group that would have the audacity to praise Yazeed, killer of Imam Hussain (as) would be Nasibis. Would it not simply be better for Abu Sulaiman to stop adopting taqiyya and instead acknowledge that his appraisal of Yazeed is in line with his Nasibi ideology? Why is he seeking to make false misleading representations on behalf of Sunni Muslims? Perhaps Abu Sulaiman is seeking to amalgamate his Nasibi endorsement of Yazeed with mainstream Sunni aqeedah. Whatever his motives, we would urge our Sunni brethren to distance themselves from Nasibis like Abu Sulaiman who are seeking to indoctrinate Sunnis with the false thinking that Yazeed was a pious Muslim.

Chapter Four: The callous killing of the Sahaba including Hujr bin Adi (ra) and of other innocent Shias

References in relation to the killing of Hujr bin Adi al-Adbar can be located in the following Sunni texts:

- 1- al Bidaya wa al Nihaya, Volume 8 page 53 Dhikr 51 Hijri
- 2- Tarikh Kamil, Volume 3 page 249 Dhikr 51 Hijri
- 3- Tarikh ibn Asakir, Volume 12 page 227 Dhikr Hujr ibn Adi
- 4- Tarikh ibn Khaldun, Volume 3 page 13 Dhikr 51 Hijri
- 5- al Isaba, Volume 1 page 313 Dhikr Hujr ibn Adi
- 6- Asad'ul Ghaba, Volume 1 page 244 Dhikr Hujr ibn Adi
- 7- Shadharat ul Dhahab, Volume 1 page 57 Dhikr 51 Hijri
- 8- Tabaqat al Kubra, Volume 6 page 217 Dhikr Hujr ibn Adi
- 9- Mustadrak al Hakim, Volume 3 page 468-470 Dhikr Hujr ibn Adi
- 10- Akhbar al Tawaal, page 186 Dhikr Hujr ibn Adi
- 11- Tarikh Abu'l Fida, page 166 Dhikr 51 Hijri
- 12- Muruj al Dhahab, Volume 3 page 12 Dhikr 53 Hijri
- 13- Tarikh Yaqubi, Volume 2 page 219

We read in Al Isaba:

After the battle of Qudsiya Hujr ibn Adi participated in Jamal and Sifeen, alongside Ali and was amongst his Shi'a. He was killed upon the orders of Mu'awiya in a village called Mriaj Adra near Damascus. At the time of his execution he requested: 'Do not remove these chains after I am killed, nor clean the blood. We will meet again with Mu'awiya and I shall petition my case against him'.

We read in Al Bidaya:

أن معاوية جعل يفرغر بالملوت وهو يقول إن يومى بك يا حجر بن عدى لطويل قالها

ثلاثا

When the time of death approached Mu'awiya, he said to himself thrice: 'Hujr bin Adi! The day of answering for your murder is very lengthy'

We read in Tarikh ibn Asakir:

"Ayesha said: 'Mu'awiya you killed Hujr and his associates, By Allah! The Prophet told me 'In the ditch of Adra seven men will be killed, due to this all the skies and Allah will be upset'".

We read in Asad'ul Ghaba:

فأنزل هو وأصحابه عدراء وهي قرية عند دمشق فأمر معاوية بقتلهم

"Hujr and his associates were arrested and taken to a ditch in Adra which was near Damascus. Mu'awiya ordered that Hujr and his associates be executed in this ditch"

Comment

Hujr bin Adi al-Adbar was a pious lover of Maula Ali (as). Mu'awiya made his bastard brother the Governor of Kufa, he would disgrace the family of the Prophet (s) whilst standing on the pulpit, Hujr as a true lover of Maula 'Ali (as) was unable to tolerate such insults. He would praise

Maula ‘Ali (as) and object to such insults. Ibn Ziyad through his usual deception fabricated allegations to Mu’awiya who ordered that they be apprehended and sent to him. On route to Damascus Mu’awiya ordered their execution. This is a fact that the Nawasib cannot escape, a fact that has even been vouched for by the Salafi scholar Hasan bin Farhan al-Maliki who on page 170 of his book ‘Qeraah fi Kutub al-Aqaed’ said:

إذ لجأ بنو أمية إلى الفتك بمحبي أهل البيت وإذلالهم. فقتلوا حجر بن عدي صبراً في عهد معاوية لأنه أنكر سب علي على المنابر

“The Bani Umayya killed and humiliated the lovers of Ahlulbayt, and ruthlessly killed Hujr bin Adi during Mu’awiyah’s reign on account of his criticism of their act of cursing Ali from the pulpits”

Wasn’t Hujr (ra) a Sahabi?

Abu Sulaiman immediately begins this defence by seeking to deny that Hujr was a Sahabi (companion of the prophet), he states:

People disagreed on the companionship of Hujr bin Uday (the famous!). Al-Bukhari and others counted him as a follower (Tabe’ei), and some others as a companion”

Reply

Prominent Sunni Ulema have counted Hujr bin Adi al-Adbar amongst the Sahaba. Allamah Ibn Abdul Barr in his authority work ‘Al Istiab’ records under the biography of Hujr bin Adi al-Adbar:

كان حجر من فضلاء الصحابة

“Hujr was amongst the virtuous Sahaba”

Istiab, Volume 1 page 97 – Hujr bin Adi al-Kindi

Ibn Atheer in ‘Asad ul Ghaba’ counts Hujr amongst the great Sahaba:

كان من فضلاء الصحابة

“He was amongst the virtuous Sahaba”

Asadul Ghaba fi Ma’rafat Sahabah, Volume 1 page 244

Imam Hakim in ‘al-Mustadrak’ created a chapter called:

“Manaqib Hujr bin Adi (ra) wa wahu rahib Asahab Muhammad” i.e. “Merits of Hujr bin Adi (May Allah be pleased with him) and he is one of the companions of Prophet (s)”.

Mustadrak Hakim, Volume 3 page 468

Ibn Asakir recorded that Hujr bin Adi (ra) met Holy Prophet (s) and Ibn Kathir echoed the same in his book ‘Al-Bidayah wal Nihayah’ Volume 8 page 55 . He records:

قال ابن عساكر: وفد إلى النبي ﷺ، وسمع علياً وعماراً وشراحيل بن مرة، ويقال:

شريحيل بن مرة.

“Ibn Asakir has recorded that Hujr came to Holy Prophet (s) and he heard (hadith) from Ali, Ammar, Sharajeel bin Marat and he is known as Sharjeel bin Marat”

Similarly while talking about Hujr bin Adi (ra), Hanafi scholar Kamaluddin Umar ibn al-Adeem (586-660 H/1191-1262) records in 'Bughyat al-Talib fi Tarikh Halab' Volume 2 page 298:

وكان من أهل الكوفة، وفد على النبي ﷺ، وحدث عن علي بن أبي طالب

“He was among the people of Kufa, he came to Prophet (s) as a delegate and narrated from Ali bin abi Talib”

Likewise Imam Ibn Qutayba Dinwari (213-276 H) records in his famed work 'Al-Maarif' page 76:

وفد إلى النبي ﷺ وأسلم وشهد القادسية وشهد الجمل وصفين مع علي، فقتله معاوية

بمخرج غدراء مع عدة

“He came to the Prophet (s) as a delegate and converted to Islam, he attended the battle of al-Qadsiya, he attended the battles of Jamal and Sifeen with Ali then Mu'awiyah killed him in Adra along with his group”

While recording about the miracles possessed by the companions of Holy Prophet (s), Shafiyee scholar Allamah Hibatullah Lalkai (d. 418 H) records in his authority work 'Sharh Usool Etiqad Ahl Sunnah' Volume 7 page 18:

ما روي من كرامات حجر بن عدي أو قيس بن مكشوح في جماعة أصحاب رسول الله

ﷺ

“What have been narrated from the miracles of Hujr bin Adi or Qais bin Makshooh who are the companions of Prophet (s)”

If still there remains any doubt in Nasibi minds, then let us complete the story by citing the words of the beloved scholar of the Nawasib, Imam Dhahabi who while recording details of Hujr bin Adi stated:

“He had companionship and he was a delegate”

Siyar alam an Nubla, Volume 3 page 463

Hujr was a great Sahabi and Abu Sulaiman al-Nasibi's attempts to reject this are just shameless! It is indeed a sign of sheer hypocrisy by these people that they try their best to cast doubts on the companionship of Hujr bin Adi (ra) just because he was a lover of Ali bin abi Talib (as) for which he was martyred by the Nasibi ancestors of Abu Sulaiman & Co. on the contrary are in fact proud of the companionship of those Nawasib that would abuse Ali bin Abi Talib (as), that includes Mughira bin Shubah, Busr bin Irtat etc. Shame!

Even if for arguments sake Abu Sulaiman is correct and Mu'awiya killed a Tabi'i, the fact of the matter is that he killed a MUSLIM, unless of course Abu Sulaiman is now also going to suggest that he had converted to Judaism at the time of his death!

Allah (swt)'s displeasure at those who killed Hujr (ra)

We shall prove this from the following Sunni works:

Tarikh ibn Asakir, Volume 12 page 227 Dhikr Hujr ibn Adi

Subul al-Huda wa al-Rashad by Muhammad bin Yusuf al-Salehi al-Shami (d. 942 H), Volume 10 page 156

Kanz ul Ummal, Tradition Nos. 30887, 37510, 37511 and 36530

Dalail al-Bayhaqi, Volume 6 page 456

Khasais al Kubra, Volume 2 page 500

Allamah Mullah Muttaqi Hindi in 'Kanz ul Ummal' and Imam al-Bayhaqi in 'Dalail' have recorded:

It is narrated that Ali said: 'Oh people of Kufa! The best seven people amongst you will be killed, the likeness of them is as the likeness of the believers in the ditches'. Hujr bin al-Adber and his companions are among them and they are from the people of Kufa, Mu'awiya killed them at Adra in the outskirts of Damascus'.

Kanz ul Ummal, Volume 13 page 531 Tradition 36530

Allamah Mullah Muttaqi Hindi records the testimony from the tongue of Ayesha as well:

Abi al-Aswad reported that Mu'awiya went to Aysha, and she asked him: 'Why did you kill the people of Adra, Hujr and his companions?'. He replied: 'Oh mother of believers! I saw that their death was referring to the good for the nation and their lives referring to the corruption of nation.' She said: 'I heard the messenger of Allah (pbuh) saying: 'Some people will be killed in Adra, Allah and the people of heaven will become angry over that''

Kanz ul Ummal, Volume 13 page 556 Tradition 37510

We further read in Kanz ul Umaal:

Saeed bin Hilal narrated that Mu'awiya went to pilgrimage (hajj) and entered on lady Aysha then she said to him: 'Oh Mu'awiya! You killed Hujr bin al-Adbar and his companions! By Allah! I heard that some people will be killed at Adra and Allah and the people of heaven will get angry over that'

Kanz ul Ummal, Volume 13 page 556 Tradition 37511

We also read in Kanz ul Ummal:

"Some people will be killed in Adra, Allah and the people of heaven will get angry over that" (Yaqoub bin Sufyan in his Tarikh and ibn Asakir from Ayesha).

Kanz ul Ummal, Volume 10 Tradition 30887

al-Bayhaqi has dedicated a separate chapter in his book 'Dalail' called:

باب ما روى في إخباره بقتل نفر من المسلمين ظلما بعدد من أرض الشام فكان كما

أخبر ﷺ

"Chapter about what he have narrated of some Muslims getting unjustly killed in a land in Shaam namely Adra, and it was true as He (pbuh) had told".

When Allah (swt) is angry over the killing of Hujr (ra) then how can Mu'awiya be referred to as '(ra)'?

If some low esteemed Nawasib cast doubts on the authenticity of the prediction of Holy Prophet (s) regarding Allah's wrath on the murderers of Hujr and his companions, we would like to mention that Imam Behaqqi accepted the version of this prediction narrated by Ali (as) by stating: 'I say: 'Ali (ra) would never say such a thing unless he heard it from the Prophet (s)'. Moreover, those pathetic Nawasib who might question the authenticity of the narrator Ibn Lahiyah in order to save their filthy father Muawiyah, let us remind such lunatics that beside being the narrator of Sunan Abu Daud, Timirdhi and Ibn Majah, Ibn Lahiyah is one of the narrators of Sahih

Muslim. Imam Ibn Hajar Asqalani called him Seduq (Taqreeb al Tahdeeb, v1 p536), Imam Ahmed stated: ‘The muhadith of Egypt is only ibn Lahiyah’ (Tahdib al-kamal, v15, p496), Ahmad bin Saleh said: ‘Ibn Lahiyah is thiqah’ (Tahdib al Tahdib, v5, p331), Muhammad bin Yahya bin Hasaan narrated from his father who said: ‘After Hushaim, I never saw some one more preserved than Ibn Lahya’ (Al-jarh wa al-Tadeel, by al-Razi, v5 p148), Allamah Badruddin al-Aini stated in his esteemed sharah of Sahih Bukhari: ‘Abdullah bin Lahiyah is considered thiqah according to Ahmad and al-Tahawi’ (Umdat al-Qari, v7, p13), Umar bin Shahin counted him amongst the reliable narrators in his book Tarikh Isma al-Thuqat, page 125, moreover Ahmad Shakir wrote in the margin of Ibn Hazam’s famed work ‘al-Muhala’ (v4, p82) that ‘Ibn Lahiyah is Thiqah’. He has also been deemed Thiqah by Imam Ibn Khuzaima as he declared in his book that he only narrated from Thiqah narrators while hadiths having Ibn Lahiyah in the chains can be read in the book. Imam Nawawi at one place in his commentary of Sahih Muslim (v12 p210) cited a tradition and commented on its chain in the following words: “Narrated by Ibn Lahiyah from Muslim bin Abi Mariam from Abi Salem al-Jeshani from Abu Dar, al-Darqutni did not criticize it, so the hadith is Sahih as a chain and content” and last but certainly not the least, Imam of Salafies Naasiruddin Al-AlBaani declared many hadiths narrated by Ibn Lahiyah to be Sahih (see Sahih Ibn Majah, v1 p58 Hadith 258, v2 p8 H 1754, p20 H 1814, p39 H 1892, p7 H 2051, p116 H 2207, p120 H 2221, p132 H 2270, p133 H 2278, p232 H 2676, p240 H 2714, p363 H 3222, p399 H 3338, p404 H3359, p416 H 3418).

Was Hujr (ra) a troublemaker?

Abu Sulaiman then seeks to tactically select and water down the events behind Hujr’s killing so as to prevent Hujr as a troublemaker.

Mu’awiyah did not kill Hujr because he refrained from insulting Ali, and this is calumny. What the historians mentioned about the reason behind killing Hujr bin Uday was that Ziyad, the ruler of Al-Kufah appointed by Mu’awiyah, once gave a prolonged speech. So Hujr bin Uday called for the prayer, but Ziyad went along with his speech. So, Hujr and his group threw stones at Ziyad. Ziyad wrote Mu’awiyah telling him what Hujr did and Ziyad reckoned that as corruption on earth. Hujr used to do this with the governor of Al-Kufah who preceded Ziyad. Mu’awiyah ordered that Hujr be sent to him. When Hujr reached there, Mu’awiyah ordered to kill Hujr.

Reply One – Dishonesty committed by the author in order to absolve Muawiyah bin Hind

It is worthy to note that Abu Sulaiman fails to cite even a SINGLE reference to support this watered down event. He of course does so intentionally for he knows that his version of events does NOT tally up with his self-defined version of history.

Maulana Sayyid Abul A’la Maudoodi in his book “Khilafat wa Mulukiyyat” cites several classical sources providing the reason behind the murder of Hujr bin Adi. Under the chapter 4 “the elimination of freedom of speech”, he states:

“The implementation of this new policy was started during the reign of Muawiyah (ra) with the murder of Hujr bin Adi (in 51 H), who was a pious Sahabi and was the man of a superior level in Ummah. During Muawiyah’s reign when the custom of open cursing and abusing Ali from the pulpits of Mosques began, hearts of the common Muslims were being wounded because of that but people bit their tongues fearing death. In Kufa, Hujr bin Adi could not remain silent and he began to praise Ali (ra) and condemn Mu’awiya. Until Mughira (ra) remained the Governor of Kufa, he adopted a lenient attitude towards him, but when Ziyad’s Governorship of Basra was extended to include Kufa, serious altercations arose. He would curse Ali (ra) during the sermon (khutba) and Hujr would stand and refute him. On one occasion he (Hujr) warned Ziyad for being late for Jumma prayers. Ziyad then arrested him along with twelve of his companions and gathered witnesses to testify that “these people had formed a group, they openly slander the caliph, they invite people to fight the Ameer al-Momineen, they claim that caliphate is not the task of anyone other than the progeny of Abi Talib, they created hue and cry in the city and exiled the Aamil of Ameer al-Momineen, they support Abu Turab (Ali), invoke mercy on him while disassociated themselves from his enemies.”

From amongst those witnesses, Qadi Shudhri’s testimony was used. But he later wrote to Mu’awiya: ‘I have heard that among the testimonies that have been sent to you against Hujr bin Adi, there is my testimony as well. My actual testimony regarding Hujr is that he is among those people who offer Salat, pay zakat, and perform Hajj and Umrah, call for good and forbid the evil, his blood and property is Haram, however if you want to kill him so do it, otherwise forgive him.’

The accused were sent to Mu’awiya and he sentenced them to death. Prior to their murder, the executors put some conditions before them which were: ‘We have been instructed to pardon you on a condition if you disassociate yourselves from Ali (ra) and curse him otherwise you are to be murdered’. They refused to accept that offer and Hujr said: ‘I cannot not say that thing from my tongue that displease Allah’. Finally he and his seven companions were murdered. From amongst them, Abdur Rahman bin Hasaan was sent back to Ziyad with a written instruction that he be murdered in the worst possible manner, hence Ziyad buried him alive. (Tarikh al Tabari, Volume 4 page 190 – 208, al Istiab by Ibn `Abdul Barr Vol I page 135, Tarikh by Ibn Athir Volume 3 page 234 – 242, al Bidayah al Nihaya by Ibn Kathir, Volume 8 page 50 -55j, Ibn Khaldoon Volume 3 page 13).

Khilafat wa Mulukiyyat, pages 164-165 (published by Idara Tarjuman ul Quran)

Reply Two – Imam Hasan Basri’s testimones that Hujr was a great man and his maglining Muawiyah for the murder of Hujr (ra)

We read the following episode in Tarikh Ibn Wardi Volume 1, page 255 as well as the opinion of a great Tabyee and learned Sunni Faqih, Imam Hasan al-Basri regarding Hujr bin Adi (ra):

“Ziyad cursed Ali as it was their custom at that time. On hearing this Hujr ibn ‘Adi stood and praised Ali, and so he (Ziyad) tied him up in chains and sent him to Muwaiya’ (1)

Footnote (1): And ibn Jawzi narrated the same from Hasan Al Basri...that Muwaiya killed Hujr and his companions, and Hujr was one of the greatest people.”

Tarikh Ibn Wardi Volume 1, page 255

We also learn that Imam Hasan al-Basri used to malign Muawiya for the murder of Hadrath Hujr bin al Adi al-Adbar. Imam of Nawasib, Ibn Kathir in his esteemed work Al Bidayah Wal Nihayah (Urdu), Vol 8 page 973 under the topic ‘reign of Muawiyah and his merits’ (Nafees Academy Karachi) records the condemnation of Muawiyah by the great Sunni faqih Hasan al Basri in this manner:

“It is narrated from Hassan Basri that he used to malign Muawiya for four things, for fighting against Ali, for the murder of Hadrath Hujr Bin Adi, Mu’awiya’s declaring that Ziyad was his brother and for taking the bayah of his son Yazid”

Al Bidayah Wal Nihayah (Urdu), Vol 8 page 973

It is shameful that Abu Sulaiman is seeking to suggest an individual that lead the people in greatness was a troublemaker.

Reply Three- Imam Muhammad bin Sirin testified to Hujr (as) being virtuous

Allamah Ibn Atheer records the views of Imam of Ahle Sunnah, Muhammad bin Sirin (d. 110 H) about Hujr bin Adi (ra):

وسئل محمد بن سيرين عن الركعتين عند القتل، فقال: صلاهما خيب وجر، وهما فاضلان، وكان الحسن البصري يعظم قتل حجر وأصحابه.

Muhammad bin Syrin was asked about the two rakat prayers that is prayed before being killed, he said: ‘Khabyb and Hujr prayed likewise and they are virtuous, and Hasan Al Basri denounce the killing of Hujr and his companions’.

Usdal Ghaba, Volume 1 page 245- Hujr bin Adi

For those who know less about Muhammad bin Sirin they can check his brief biography prepared by the website of one of the biggest Deobandi school, Jamia Binoria at

<http://www.binoria.org/ArticleArchives/Personality/p002.asp>

Reply Four– Imam Dhahabi, Imam Ibn Habban and Ibn Asakir’s testimonies that Hujr (ra) was an honorable, pious and worshiper

The filthy Nawasib i.e. the followers of Muawiyah have always sought to cast doubts on the good character of great Hujr bin Adi (ra) so as to absolve their spiritual father Muawiyah from the grave sin of murdering an innocent Muslim. We shall refute this by presenting the character of Hujr bin Adi (ra) from the mouth of their esteemed Sunni scholars. Imam Abdur Rauf al-Munawi in his famed work ‘Faidh al-Qadeer Sharha Jami’e al-Sagheer’ records about Hujr (ra):

قال ابن عساكر في تاريخه عن أبي معشر وغيره: كان حجر عابداً ولم يحدث قط إلا توضأ

ولا توضأ إلا صلى

‘Ibn Asakir said in his book from Abi M’asher and others: ‘Hujr was a worshipper and if he would get any ritual impurity, he used to immediately perform wudu and whenever he performed wudu he would then perform salat’

1. Faidh al-Qadeer Sharha Jami’e al-Sagheer, Tradition 4765

2. Tarikh Dimashq, Volume 12 page 212

3. Wafi bel wafyat by Safadi, Volume 11 page 247

Imam Dhahabi records in ‘Siyar alam alnubala’ Volume 3 page 462:

وكان شريفاً أميراً مطاعاً أماراً بالمعروف مقمداً على الإنكار من شيعة علي رضي الله عنه شهد

صفين أميراً وكان ذا صلاح وتعبد

‘He was an honorable man, commander with authority, he used to enjoin what is right and forbid what is wrong, he was amongst the Shia of Ali (ra), he participated in the battle of Sifin as a commander, he was pious and worshipper’.

The fact that Hujr (ra) would enjoin what is right and forbid what is wrong, proves that his stance against the Nasibi ancestors of Abu Sulaiman was according to Islamic regulations. Imam Ibn Habban in his book ‘Mashahir ulama al-Amsar’ page 144 counted Hujr (ra) among the Tabayeen but testified to him being a worshipper:

من عباد التابعين ممن شهد صفين مع علي بن أبي طالب

“He is amongst the worshippers of Tabiyeen and amongst those who participated in the battle of Sifin with Ali bin Abi Talib”

Reply Five – The families of Abu Bakr and Umar condemning Mu’awiya for killing Hujr proves that he was not a trouble maker in their eyes

We shall evidence this from the following Sunni works:

al-Bidaya wa al-Nihaya, Volume 8 page 55

Kanz al Ummal, Volume 3 page 88

Tarikh al Islam by Dhahabi Volume 2 page 217

Tarikh ibn Khaldun, Volume 3 page 12

al Isaba, page 355 Dhikr Hujr

al-Istiab, Volume 1 page 97

In Tarikh ibn Khaldun, we read the opposition to the murder of Hujr (ra) by one of the popular figure from the family of Abu Bakar namely Ayesha:

أرسلت عبد الرحمن بن الحرث إلى معاوية يشفع فيهم – أسفت عائشة لقتل حجر و

كانت تشني

“Ayesha appointed and sent Abdur Rahman to intercede (save) Hujr... Upon his death Ayesha expressed sadness and she used to praise him”

In Al-Isaba, we learn that when Mu’awiya arrived in Madina, Ayesha summoned him and the first thing she raised was the killing of Hujr. Ibn

Kathir in 'Al Bidaya' Volume 8 page 55, under the events of 51 H, records these words of Ayesha:

“Marwan narrated: ‘I along with Muawiyah went to Ayesha, so she said: ‘O Muawiyah! You killed Hujr and his companions, you did what you had to do but did you not fear that upon coming to me I would arrange for a man to hide and kill you?’”.

So we came to know that such was the gravity of the case that Ayesha deemed it permissible to kill Mu’awiya for his killing Hujr bin al-Adbar. We further read:

“In another tradition it is narrated that Ayesha screened from Muawiyah and said: ‘Don’t ever come to me’.

We further read:

“In another tradition it is stated that she used to threaten Muawiyah and would tell him: ‘Had it not been my fear of these stupid people triumphing over us, there would have been disorder between me and Mu’awiya over the killing of Hujr”

That was the opinion of the family of Abu Bakr regarding the unjust killing of Hujr (ra), now let us look at the reaction of one of the famed figures from the family of Umer. In ‘Al-Istiab’ we read the following reaction of Abdullah Ibn Umar to the murder of Hujr (ra):

كان ابن عمر في السوق فنعى إليه حجر فأطلق حبوته وقام وقد غلب عليه النحيب

“Ibn Umar was in the market when he heard of the news of Hujr’s murder, he threw down his cloak and spontaneously cried”

al-Istiab, Volume 1 page 97

Comment

Ayesha condemning Mu’awiya for this action has been reported in a similar vain by other Sunni Ulema. Ayesha deemed it permissible to kill Mu’awiya for his killing Hujr bin al-Adi. The testimony of Ayesha deemed by the Ahl’ul Sunah ‘The truthful’ shall suffice to counter Abu Sulaiman Nasibi’s suggestion that Hujr had conducted an unlawful rebellion against Mu’awiya.

Reply Six – The Sahaba deemed the killer of Hujr (ra) to be worthy of being cursed

Qadhi Abi Bakar al-Arabi (468- 543 H) in his famed work ‘Awasim min al Qawasim’ page 341 records the reasoning for which the Sahaba used to criticize Ibn Ziyad. He first stated:

فإن قيل : فلم أنكر عليه الصحابة ؟

“If it is asked: Why the Sahaba object on him?”

Then we further read along with the comments of the margin writer of the book Allamah Muhibuddin al-Khateeb (1303-1389 H):

إنما لعنه من لعنة لوجهين – وكان زياد أهلاً ان يلعن – عندهم – لما حدث بعد

استلحق معاوية – وأهم ذلك – عندهم تسببه في قتل حجر بن عدى

“Those who cursed him, did so for two reasons... Ziyad deserved to be cursed according to them (Sahaba) because of the deeds which were committed after joining Mu’awiya... and the most important reason for them (Sahaba who deemed Ziyad deserved to be cursed) is his role in the killing of Hujr bin Adi”

<http://saaid.net/book/open.php?cat=1&book=19>

We appeal to justice; the Sahaba cursed Ibn Ziyad for advising that Hujr be killed, so where does that leave Mu’awiya who actually ordered his killing? By the same token Mu’awiya should also be cursed like Ibn Ziyad for theory and practice are two different things?

Reply Seven – Even the hardline Nasibi companion of Muawiyah was on saddened at the murder of Hujr (ra)

The callous killing of Hujr bin Adi (ra) by Muwiyah had left even the loyal Nasibi companions of Muawiyah dejected. The first person was Rabi’ bin Ziyad al-Harithi about whom Imam Ibn Hajar Asqalani records:

“He was an employee of Mu’awiya in Khurasan and Hasan Al Basri was his writer, when he heard about the death of Hjur and his companions, he said: “God! If you have something good for Al Rabi’ then call him immediately” so he died in the very gathering. The death of Hjur and his companions was in year 51.”

Tahdeeb al Tahdeeb, Volume 3 page 211 Translation No. 469

Allamah Ibn Atheer records in Usad al Ghaba, Volume 1 page 245 – Hujr bin Adi :

Muhammad bin Sirin was asked about the two rakat prayers that is prayed before being killed, he said: ‘Habyb and Hujr prayed likewise and they are virtuous, and Hasan Al Basri denounced the killing of Hujr and his companions’. When the news of Hujr’s killing reached Al Rabi’ bin Ziad Al Harithi who was a worker for Mu’awiya in Khurasan, he said: “God! If you have something good for Al Rabi’ then take him immediately” so he didn’t leave his sitting before he died.”

Also see Isitab, Volume 1 page 98, while Ibn Hajar Asqalani records the following words about Rabi’ bin Ziyad in his other famed work ‘Taqreeb al Tahdeeb’:

Al Rabi’ ibn Ziad Al Harithi al Basri, he resided in many areas, [and it was said that he was a Sahabi, and was mentioned by Ibn Habban in the ‘Thiqat al Tabieen’]. The second, the author of ‘Al Kamal’ mentioned that he is Abu Firas who narrated from Umar ibn Al Khattab.

Taqreeb al Taqreeb, page 206 Translation No. 1890

Reply Eight – The Sunni Ulema’s recognition that Hujr was Shaheed (a martyr) proves that he was not a baghi (rebel)

Hanafi Imam Muhammad bin Ahmad Sarkhasi (d. 483 H) who enjoys the title of ‘Shams al-Aimah’ (Sun of Imams) in his esteemed and most acclaimed work al-Mabsut, Volume 1 page 131 testifies that Hujr bin Adi was a martyr and then Imam Sarkhasi used “RA” that proves that Imam of

Ahle Sunnah deemed Hujr bin Adi (ra) among the Sahaba and obviously not amongst the ‘troublemakers’ like the filthy Nawasib of Ansar.org asserted.

ويصنع بقتلى أهل العدل ما يصنع بالشهيد فلا يغسلون ويصلى عليهم هكذا فعل علي
- ﷺ - بمن قتل من أصحابه وبه أوصى عمار بن ياسر وحجر بن عدي وزيد بن صوحان
- ﷺ - حين استشهدوا

“And the treatment that should be given to the dead from amongst the people of right path (Ahl al Adl) should be the same that is afforded to the martyrs, means they should not be given ghusl (ablution) and funeral prayers should be performed for them, this is what Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) used to do with those who were killed from amongst his sahaba and this is what was left as a ‘will’ by Ammar bin Yasir, Hujr bin Adi and Zaid bin Sohan (may Allah be pleased with them) at the time of their martyrdoms.”

Online Al-Mabsut, Volume 6 page 138

Imam Sarkhasi counted Hujr amongst the martyrs, that proves that Mu’awiya was an oppressor since he killed Hujr and a killer of a martyr is deemed as an oppressor in Islam. Hence Muawiyah was an oppressor and an unjust man that cannot be the khalifa of the Prophet (s) and such people are cursed in Holy Quran.

Reply Nine – Prophet’s prediction proves that Hujr bin Adbar (rh) and Malik bin Ashatar (rh) are amongst the Momineen

We are citing from the following famed Sunni works:

Al-Istiab, Volume 1 page 75, Dhkir Jandab

Usad al-Ghaba, Volume 1 page 258

Tabaqat al-Kubra, Volume 4 page 234, Dhkir Abu Dhar

Safwa tul Safwa, Volume 1 page 237, Dhkir Abu Dhar

Mustadrak al-Hakim, Volume 3 page 345, Dhkir Abu Dhar

Al-Bidayah wal-Nihayah, Volume 6 page 207, Chapter: Akhbar al-Ghayb

We read in Tabaqat and Istiab as follows:

Ibrahim bin Malik al-Ashtar has narrated from his father that when Abu Zar’s death approached, his wife started to cry, at which he inquired about her weeping, to which she replied that she couldn’t arrange his funeral, and she didn’t have any sufficient piece of cloth to use as shroud for him.

To this Abu Zar asked her not to cry and said that he had heard the Holy Prophet [saww] that one from amongst his companions would die in the desert and a group of believers would come to him, and I know that I am that person, because its me that lives in the desert. By Allah! Neither did I lie, nor was I lied to, therefore keep observing and wait. She asked how that could be possible when the pilgrim caravans had passed.

She, then would hike a mount and watch the path and return to look after her husband. She then saw a group who were moving very fast on their riding animals. She waved a cloth at them, which they noticed and came to inquire about it. She said that a believer was dying and she didn’t have cloth

for his shroud. When asked she told then that it was Abu Zar, to which they replied, may their parents be sacrificed on him....

An Ansari youth came forward and offered a shroud saying it was from the clothes that he wore and was in his bag. He agreed and allowed him to shroud him. He said that the Ansari shrouded him and all the others in the group also came to him. The group also included Hujr bin al-Adbar and Malik bin Ashtar. They were all Cypriots.

Tabaqat ibn Sa'ad (Urdu), Volume 2, part 4, page 601-602 (Published by Daarul Ishaat, Karachi)

Abu Sulaiman defends the method of killing

Ansar.org states:

”Muawiya’s severity in killing Hujr was because Hujr tried to transgress against the Islamic nation and to break the bond of the Muslims and Mu’awiyah considered it as an endeavor to corrupt the earth especially in Kufah where some groups of the affliction first appeared against Uthman. If Uthman were lenient in this matter, which ultimately lead to his death and lead the Islamic nation to the greatest affliction and caused blood to run like rivers, then Mu’awiyah wanted to cut this affliction from its roots by killing Hujr”

If Mu’awiyah wanted to kill Hujr in this way to quell sedition, how is it that he was in effect willing to provide immunity to Hujr and his supporters if they cursed Ali. This ‘transgression’ and attempt to corrupt the earth would have been eliminated by the act of cursing Ali (as)? This is the bond of the Muslims that Abu Sulaiman claims that Mu’awiyah was trying to protect, a bond that could only be maintained through the cursing of Ali (as)!

Now let us turn to the ‘method of punishment’ that of burying the associate of Hujr – Abdur Rahman bin Hassan alive. Since Islamic Shari`a prescribes clear methods of penal punishment, could Abu Sulaiman cite a single verse of the Qur’an or hadith that states the punishment for sedition is live burial?

If Hujr was indeed a troublemaker as Abu Sulaiman suggests then one assumes that this action would have received widespread support by the Sahaba and tabieen, and yet we find no such evidence. On the contrary, we find clear condemnation. Maudoodi in “Khilafath wa Mulukiyyat” page 160, states:

“This incident shook the heart of the Ummah. Upon hearing the news Ibn Umar and Ayesha were aggrieved. Ayesha had previously written a letter admonishing Mu’awiyah. Later on when she met Mu’awiyah she said ‘Mu’awiyah did you not fear Allah even slightly when killing Hujr?’. When Mu’awiyah’s Governor of Khurasan Rabiya bin Ziyad heard this news he shouted ‘O Allah if in your knowledge there is anything good left on my part, take me from this world’. [Khilafat wa Mulukiyyat, chapter 5, page, 165 citing Tabari vol 4, page 19 to 207, Ibn Athir, vol 3, page 234-242, Al bidaya wan Nihaya, vol 8, pages 50-55, Al-isti'aab, vol 1, page 135]

You can see the clear contradiction in the way Abu Sulaiman writes. If the Sahaba like Ayesha, Talha, Zubayr rebel against Khalifa Ali (as) it is on account of ijtehad for which they will be rewarded, the same approach is

NOT applied to Hujr. If he opposed Mu'awiya. Why is Abu Sulaiman condemning him? Can it also not be deemed that he exercised ijthihad for which he will be rewarded? If not, why not? Is there one rule for those that oppose Ali (as) and another for those who oppose Mu'awiya? Or are those who oppose Mu'awiya more abominable in his eyes than those who oppose Ali (as)? Clearly Abu Sulaiman's Nasibi beliefs have been exposed.

Fortunately 'true' Sunnis have a love for Imam 'Ali (as) and his adherents in their hearts and hence have been particularly critical of the killing of Hujr bin Adi (ra) and his supporters. Mufti Ghulam Rasul (d. October 2010) was a modern day Hanafi scholar from Daar ul Uloom Qadiyah Jilaniyah London, in his biography of Imam Jafar Sadiq "Subeh al Sadiq" discusses a number of topics including the slaughter of Hujr bin Adi. On pages 93-94 he makes these comments that one hopes will convince actual Sunnis that Hujr's only 'crime' was his love for 'Ali and that only Nasibis (who are pretending to be Sunnis) would have the audacity to conclude otherwise:

"Hujr and his associates were killed in 51 Hijri and I pray that Allah (swt) showers his mercy upon them. Verily they sacrificed their to protect the honour and dignity of the Lion of Allah, 'Ali. Their murderers told them that they would be saved if they cursed 'Ali – they refused saying 'We shall not do that which shall cause the wrath of Allah (swt). This is because Hujr and his companions knew that the truth was with 'Ali, he was the example of Harun, he was the brother of the Prophet (s) in this world and the next, 300 verses had descended in his praise, 'Ali was with the Qur'an and the Qur'an was with 'Ali, to look at 'Ali's face was an act of worship, to hate 'Ali was an act of Kufr and to have love and faith in 'Ali was a part of Iman. Rasulullah (s) said that the sign of a momin was love for 'Ali and the sign of a munafiq was hatred of 'Ali. It was in light of these facts that Hujr and his companions refused to disassociate themselves from 'Ali, they happily accepted death and willingly sacrificed their lives due to their love for 'Ali".

Subeh al-Sadiq, pages 93 & 94

We should also point out that Tareekh ibne Wardee Volume 1 page 55 also confirms that Mu'awiya killed Hujr on account of his love of Imam 'Ali (as).

Mu'awiya killed Malik bin Ashthar (ra)

We shall evidence this from the following Sunni works:

Tadhirathul Khawwas, page 64

Muruj al Dhahab, Volume 3 page 420

Tarikh ibn Khaldun, Volume 2 page 191

Tarikh Kamil, Volume 3 page 179

Tarikh Tabari, English translation Volume 18 pages 144-146

Habib al Sayyar, Volume 1 page 72

Tabaqat al Kubra, Volume 6 page 213

"When 'Ali returned from Siffin he had sent al Asthar back to his command over the Jazirah and had said to Qays bin Sa'd 'Stay with me in charge of my personal guards (shurat) until we have finished this business of the arbitration (hukumah) and then do to Adharbayjan". So Qays remained with 'Ali over his personal guard and when the business of the

arbitration was over, 'Ali wrote to Malik b, al-Harith al-Asthar, who was at the time in Nasibin. "Now you are one of those whose help I need in making the religion (din) effective, by whom I restrain the arrogance of the sinner, and by whom I fortify the dangerous frontier district (thagir). I have Muhammad b. Abu Bakr over Egypt, but the rebels (Khawarij) there came out against him and he is a raw youth with no experience of war and untested. Come to me so that we can consider what is necessary regarding that, and leave behind over your province, those of your men who are trustworthy and sincere advisors. Salutations".

Malik came 'Ali and went in to him.'Ali told him the news about the men of Egypt and gave him the reports about them, and he said, "You are the only man for it. Set out there, may God have mercy on you. If I do not tell you what to do about it, it is because I am content with your own judgement. Ask for God's help if anything worries you, and mix firmness with gentleness. Be mild so long as mildness is effective, but insist on firmness when you have to". So al-Asthar left 'Ali, went to the place where he had left his things, and got ready to set out for Egypt.

Mu'awiyah's spies came and informed him of 'Ali's appointment of Al-Asthar, and that weighed heavily on him for he coveted Egypt and knew that if Al-Asthar arrived there he would be a more difficult prospect than Muhammad b. Abu Bakr. He therefore sent to al Jayastar, one of those subject to the Kharaj tax, and told him that al Asthar had been appointed over Egypt. And he said to him, "If you take care of him, I will not take any Kharaj from you as long as I live; so do what you can to outwit him". al Jayastar then went to al Qulzum and waited there. Al Asthar left Iraq for Egypt, and when he reached al Qulzum al Jayastar met him and said, "Here is somewhere to stay and here is food and fodder. I am one of those subject to the Kharaj". Al Asthar stayed there with him and the diqhan came with fodder and food. Then, when he had fed him, he bought him a honeyed drink into which he had mixed poison. He gave it to him to drink and when he had done so he died.

Mu'awiyah proceeded to tell the Syrians, "Ali has sent Al-Asthar to Egypt – Call on God that he will suffice you against him". So everyday they implored God against Al-Asthar, and then he who had given him the drink came to Mu'awiyah and told him of Al-Asthar's death. Mu'awiyah stood among the people and delivered a khutbah. He praised God and extolled Him and then said "Ali b. Abi Talib had two right hands; one of them was cut off on the day of Siffin (meaning Ammar b. Yasir) and the other today (meaning Al-Asthar)".

History of Tabari, Volume 18 pages 144-146

Ali's enemy Muawiyah referring to Malik bin Ashtar as the right hand of Ali bin Abi Talib (as) proves the importance that Malik bin Ashtar had to Ali bin Abi Talib (as), hence those children of Muawiyah who in their love of their father malign Malik bin Ashtar (ra) should realise that he was the right hand of their fourth 'rightly guided caliph'. If still remains any doubt about Malik bin Harith al Ashtar being amongst the believers then the incident of the funeral of Abu Dhar (ra) we cited above from Tabaqat Ibn Saad shall suffice to silence Nasibi hearts.

Mu'awiya killed the sahabi Amr bin al-Hamiq

The account of Amr bin Hamiq's murder by Muawiya is recorded in the following Sunni books:

Al Bidayah wal Nihayah, Volume 8 page 52, death of Amro bin al-Hamiq al-Khazai

al Istiab, Volume 1 page 363

al Isaba, Volume 4 page 623, Translation No. 5822

Asadul Ghaba, Volume 1 page 846, Amr bin al-Hamiq al-Khazai

Tabaqat al Kubra, Volume 6 page 25

Tarikh Kamil, Volume 3 page 240 Dhikr 51 Hijri

Risala Abu Bakr Khawarzmi, page 122

Tarikh ibn Khaldun, Volume 3 page 12

al Maarif, page 127

History of Tabari, Volume 18 page 137

First of all let us cite a brief introduction of this person as recorded by Imam Ibn Hajar Asqalani:

“Amr Ibn Al Hamiq, Ibn Kahil and they also call him Ibn Kahin, Ibn Habeeb Al Khuzai, a Sahabi who lived in Kufa then in Egypt, he was killed during the caliphate of Muawiya”

Taqreeb al Tahdeeb, page 420 Translation No. 5017

So Ibn Hajar pointed out that the Sahabi Amr bin Hamiq was killed during Muawiya's rule, Ibn Atheer records in Usdal Ghaba fi Mar'arafat Sahabah:

“Amr was hence arrested and murdered and his head was sent to Muawiyah in Syria.”

Ibn Atheer has also recorded that:

“In Islam, the first head that was raised on a spear was the head of Amr bin Hamiq which was sent to Muawiyah.”

History of Tabari provides details in relation to the arrest and murder of Amr bin al Hamiq:

“When the latter saw Amr bin al-Hamiq, he recognized him, and wrote to Mu'awiyah with this information. Mu'awiyah wrote back ‘Amr claimed that he stabbed Uthman bin Affan nine times with a dagger that he had with him, so stab him nine times just as he stabbed Uthman. At that, Amr was taken out and stabbed nine times, and he died from the first or second blow”

History of Tabari, Volume 18 page 137

As for his role in the murder of Uthman we shall also quote what Imam Sa'ad has written:

The Egyptians who attacked Uthman were 600 and were lead by Abdurehman ibn Adees al Balawi, Kanana bin Bashir al Atab al Kindi and Amr ibn Hamiq al-Khuzai and those who came from Kufa were lead by Malik Ashtar.

Ibn Katheer also testified:

“He was amongst those four people who had entered in to the house of Uthman (ra)”

The murder of a companion Amr bin al-Hamiq by Muawiya has put the present day Nawasib in deep trouble, it's a thorn that they can neither swallow nor spit since these people claim that the Sahaba were innocent of

the agitation against Uthman and his murder while Muawiyah testified that a companion Amr bin Hamiq was amongst those Sahaba that took alligiance under the tree which Nawasib think is the greatest proof of the righteousness of the Sahaba, was actually involved in the murder of Uthman. The Nawasib are left with only two options, they either:

accept that the Sahaba were involved in the agitation and murder of Uthman

or:

Muawiyah attributed the murder of Uthman to a Sahabi Amr b. Hamiq and unjustly murdered him.

Muawiya kept Shia women as prisoners in dungeons

This can be evidenced from the following Sunni works:

Al Bidayah wal Nihayah, Volume 8 page 52, death of Amro bin al-Hamiq al-Khazai

Asad'ul Ghaba Volume, 1 page 846, Dhikr Umro bin Hamiq

Tarikh Yaqubi, volume 2 page 200, 50 H

Ibn Katheer while recording about the death of Amro bin al-Hamiq stated:

“The head of Amr bin Hamiq was cut off and was sent to Mu’awiya and it was displayed in in Syria etc. This was the first head that was displayed through the cities. The head was presented to the wife of Umro bin Hamiq, Amina bint Shareed who had been imprisoned in a dungeon by Mu’awiya. The head was thrown into her lap. His wife laid his hand over his forehead and kissed the face and said: ‘You deprived me from him for such a long period of time and then you sent it to me after killing him. Thus, I duly accept this gift’”

During the battle of Uhud the Prophet did not order the Sahaba to mistreat the captive Kuffar women, yet Mu’awiya was such a violator of the Sunnah of the Prophet (s), that he would imprison Shi’a women whose sin was their husbands love for Maula ‘Ali (as), as is proven from the horrific treatment of the wife of Umro, who was presented with the decapitated head of her husband whilst imprisoned. This proves that Mu’awiya has an evil cold hearted man, whose treatment of women prisoners was no different to the American treatment of prisoners in Aby Gharaib.

Mu’awiya killed the two children of Ubaydullah ibn Abbas

Ubaydullah bin Abbas was the son of the Prophet’s uncle and was the ruler over Yemen during the reign of Ali bin abi Talib (as). In order to disturb the rulers from the family of Holy Prophet (s), Muawiyah initiated a campaign of terrorism through the country, and selected the notorious thugs of the Arab world Busar bin Irtat for this purpose. Muawiyah sent him to the provinces of Yemen and Hijaz in order to do disturb the Shias and kill them. Amongst the murders by Busar during his terrorism campaign, he also killed two children of Banu Hashim. We are citing from the following Sunni works:

Tarikh Kamil, Volume 3 page 194 Dhikr 40 Hijri

Shadharath al Dhahab, page 64 Dhikr 58 Hijri

Tarikh Tabari (English translation) Volume 18 pages 207-208

Murujh al Dhahab, Volume 3 page 30
al Istiab, Volume 1 page 49, Chapter: Busar
Tarikh ibn Asakir, Volume 10 page 146
Asad'ul Ghaba Volume 1 page 213 Dhikr Busar
Tarikh Islam by Dhahabi, Volume 2 page 187

We read in Al Istiab:

وكان يقول فيه رجل سوء - ذبحه ابني عبيد الله بن العباس بن عبد المطلب وهما صغيران
بين يدي أمهما وكان معاوية قد استعمله على اليمن أيام صفين

“Busar bin Irtat was a bad person... He slit the throats of the two children of Ubadullah ibn Abbas bin Abdul Mutalib in the presence of their mother, Mua'waiya had sent him to Yemen during the days of Sifeen”

We read in Tarikh Ibn Asakir:

بعثه معاوية إلى اليمن فقتل بها ابني عبيد الله (1) بن العباس وصحب معاوية إلى أن

مات

“Muawiya sent him (Busar) to Yemen, so he killed the two sons of Ubaydullah bin Al Abbas, and he remained Muawiya's companion till he died.”

Not even innocent children could evade the sword of Mu'awiya, Islam does not permit the killing of innocent children, in Sahih Bukhari, we find:

[4:52:257] Narrated 'Abdullah: During some of the Ghazawat of the Prophet a woman was found killed. Allah's Apostle disapproved the killing of women and children.

Mu'awiya had no regard for the words of our Prophet (s) which is why when we witness al Qaida's suicide bombers killing innocent women and children in Iraq, it because they get their inspiration from their beloved Imam Mu'awiya. If Nawasib will seek to absolve their king Mu'awiya by saying that he did not personally kill the boys we will point out that in Surah Qasas, Allah deems Pharoah responsible for the slaughter of the children of Banu Israeel even though he did not kill them by his own hands, rather his henchmen did as is the case with Mu'awiya.

Abdurehman bin Hasaan was buried alive by Muawiyah

Bidayah wal Nihayah, Volume 8 page 52, Murder of Hujr
Tarikh Kamil, Volume 3 page 245
History of Tabari, Volume 18 page 151

We read in Tarikh Kamil:

When Abdurehman bin Hasaan was arrested and presented before Muawiyah, he asked Aburehman: 'What is your notion about Ali?'. Abdurehman replied: 'It is better for you not to ask me regarding my notion about him'. Muawiyah said: 'By Allah, I will not spare you'. Abdurehman stated: 'I testify that Ali is amongst those people who do Dhikr of Allah copiously and establish justice in the world and pardon the mistakes/sins of the people'. Then Muawiyah asked: 'What is your notion regarding Uthman?'. Abdurehman replied: 'Uthman was the first person to open the gates of injustice and closed the gate of righeousness'. Muawiyah stated: 'You killed yourself'. Abdurehman said: 'Rather you killed yourself'. Then

Muawiyah sent him to Ziyad and ordered that he be executed brutally, thus Ziyad buried him alive'

Dear readers, now you can realize how worst oppressor was Muawiyah that he made people buried alive just because they were blessed to have love for Ali bin Abi Talib (as) that according to Sunni sources is the sign of belief. We want to ask those lunatics who praise the tyrants of Bani Ummayah that does Islam permits the punishment of burying one alive even for the biggest sin Islam highlights? All the oppressors of the present world feel embarrass when they see the limits of oppression that Muawiyah had crossed in his Nasibism (hate of Ali (as)).

Mu'awiya gave an order to slaughter the Shi'a

We can evidence this from the following Sunni works:

Tarikh Tabri Volume 18 page 201

al Istiab, Volume 1 page 49, Chapter: Busar

al Isaba Volume, 1 page 289, Translation No. 642, Busar bin Irtat

Asadul Ghaba, Volume 1 page 113, Topic: Busar bin Irtat

Tarikh Ibn Asakir, Volume 3 page 225

Tarikh Asim Kufi, page 308

Al-Istiab:

وقال أبو عمرو الشيباني لما وجه معاوية بسر بن أرطاة الفهري لقتل شيعة علي عليه السلام

"It is narrated by Abu Amro Al Shaybani that Mu'awiya sent Busar bin Irtat to kill the Shias of Ali (ra)"

Usad al Ghaba:

وكان معاوية سيره إلى الحجاز واليمن ليقتل شيعة علي

"Muawiyah sent Busar to Yemen and Hijaz in order to kill the Shias of Ali"

Isaba:

وكان معاوية وجهه إلى اليمن والحجاز في أول سنة أربعين وأمره أن ينظر من كان في

طاعة علي فيوقع بهم

"In the beginning of 40 Hijri, Muawiyah sent Busar to Hijaz and Yemen with an instruction to kill the followers of Ali"

During Mu'awiya's brutal reign, Shia Muslim women were made slaves and were sold in the market place

We read citing from the following esteemed Sunni sources:

al Istiab, Volume 1 page 49, Chapter: Busar

Asad'ul Ghaba, Volume 1 page 113, Topic: Busar bin Irtat

Siyar alam Nubla, Volume 3 page 409

We read the following in Asad'ul Ghaba about Busar bin Irtat (laeen):

وشهد صفيين مع معاوية وكان شديدا على علي وأصحابه - وكان معاوية سيره إلى

الحجاز واليمن ليقتل شيعة علي - وأغار على همدان باليمن وسبي نساءهم فكن أول

مسلمات سبين في الإسلام

“He witnessed (battle of) Sifeen along side Muawiyah, he was aggressively against Ali and his Sahaba...Mu’awiya sent him to kill the Shi’a of Ali in Hijaz and Yemen... In Yemen he attacked the famous tribe of Hamdan and captured their women. These were the first Muslim women that were captured and made slaves”

Istiab:

وقال أبو عمرو الشيباني لما وجه معاوية بسر بن أرطاة الفهري لقتل شيعة علي ﷺ - ذكر
أبو عمر الشيباني أغار بسر بن أرطاة على همدان وسبي نساءهم فكان أول مسلمات سبين
في الإسلام

“Narrated by Abu Amro Al Shaybani that Muawiyah sent Busar bin Irtat Al-Fahri to kill the Shi’a of Ali... Abu Amro Al Shaybani says that Basr bin Arta’a attacked Hamdan, and took women as hostages, so they were the first women in Islam who were taken as hostages.”

Allamah Ibn Abdul Barr in Al-Istiab has recorded:

“Abi al-Rabab and his friend reported that they heard Abi Dharr (may Allah be pleased with him) invoke and seeking refuge during his prayers and he spent a long time bowing and prostrating in his prayers. They say that they asked him: ‘what do you seek refuge from and what are you invoking for?’ He said: ‘I seek refuge to Allah from the day of al-Bala and the day of al-Awrah’. We asked him: ‘What is it?’ He replied: ‘The day of al-Bala is the day on which the Muslim youth will clash and kill each other. The day of al-Awrah is the day on which the Muslim women will be made captives and their legs will be disclosed, and who among them have a great leg will be purchased according to the greatness of her leg. So I invoked not to make me live till that time, you two might live till that day’.

He (the narrator) said: ‘Then Uthman was killed, and then Mu’awiya sent Busr bin Art’a to Yemen and he made the Muslim women as captives and took them into the market as slaves”

Al-Istiab, Volume 1 page 49

Dhahabi in ‘Siyar alam an Nubla’ recorded the following about Busar:

Ibn Yunis said: ‘A companion testified to the conquest of Egypt, he owned a house and a resort there. He ruled Hijaz and Yemen for Mu’awiya, he did many bad things and he got scruple (sickness) towards the end of his life’...He imprisoned Muslim women in Yemen and brought them for selling’.

These were the ‘victories’ and ‘achievements’ of Bani Ummayah over which Nawasib are always excited. The tribe Hamdan under discussion was an Arab tribe rather than the Iranian Hamdan. We want to ask those of the Nawasib who extend their support for the oppressors of Bani Umayyad, if making Muslim women captives and selling them in the markets is not an example of injustice and oppression then they need to define the definition of injustice and oppression. It was the very era about which Sunni scholar Muhammad ibn Aqeel al-Hadrami stated in his book ‘Al-atab al-Jameel ala ahl al-Jarh wa al-Tadeel’ page 14:

“In some ages it was better for human beings to be accused of kufr and other things, rather than be accused of loyalty to Ali and his household.”

The punishment for killing a Momin from the Qur'an

The killing of a mu'min is a clear violation of the Shari'a, and Allah (swt) sets out the punishment for such an individual:

“And whoever kills a believer intentionally, his recompense shall be hell, he shall abide therein and God's wrath (Ghazibullaho) shall be on him and his curse (lanato), and is prepared for him a great torment” (Surah Nisa, v 93).

This is the punishment for killing one believer, whilst Mu'awiya was responsible for murdering thousands? Allah (swt) is not happy with such a person rather he has obtained the wrath of Allah (swt).

Chapter Five: The peace treaty with Imam Hasan (as)

Ansar.org states:

It is taken for granted for anyone who read something about the Imamiyah sect that they attribute kufr to Mu'awiyah because he fought Ali. However, the fact is that Al-Hasan bin Ali – and he is one of the infallible Imams according to the Shia, therefore whatever he says is truth – made peace with Mu'awiyah...So, did the “infallible” Hasan made peace with a kafir and gave him the leadership?? Or he made peace between two parties of Muslims as the Prophet peace be upon him says: “My son is a master, and Allah may use him to make peace between two parties of Muslims.” [Saheeh Al-Bukhari, Book of "Afflictions," #6629, vol.6]

Even if someone calls Muawiyah a Kaafir, then that is no insult on Imam Hasan (as) for making peace treaty with him, since our infallible Prophet (s) negotiated peace with the kaafirs at Hudaibiya, contrary to the criticisms of `Umar. Is Abu Sulaiman also now going to criticise Rasulullah (s)? Mu'awiya was professing that he was a Muslim (though his stance towards Ahlulbait (as) has been contrary to his claim of being a Muslim), hence the agreement was indeed between two Muslim groups, but his subsequent conduct in breaching the conditions of the agreement bear testimony to the fact that he was a fasiq. Since Nawasib for centuries have been asking reasons on Imam Hassan's stance of making peace with Muawiyah, we shall now explain why Imam Hasan (as) made peace with Mu'awiya, and shall counter the claim that his making peace proves that Mu'awiya was the rightful khalifa.

Reply One

Why did the Prophet (s) make peace with the Kuffar of Makka at Hudaibya? The Makkan Kuffar were known for their bad character and evil nature, and yet the Prophet (s) made peace with such individuals. He made a binding covenant with the Kuffar, one which even meant (under the terms) that they would not perform Hajj rather only Umrah, and that any Kaafir that reverted had to be returned to his tribesman. On the written treaty the Prophet (s) even agreed to have his title 'Prophet of Allah' being removed. The treaty of Hudaibya was an act that even the brave lion Umar al Farooq vigorously opposed, so much so that he stated that he had 'never doubted the Prophethood as much as he did on that day'. Why did the Prophet (s) enter into such an unjust pact which led to Umar doubting his Prophethood?

In the same way that the difficult situation meant that the Prophet (s) struck out his title from the document, it did not negate his truthful position, Imam Hasan (as) was likewise right for making peace with Mu'awiya. In the same way that the treaty of Hudaibya did not change the station of the Kuffar as impure, the peace treaty with Mu'awiya, still maintained Imam Hasan's position as on the right path, and further cemented Mu'awiya's as a lying hypocrite. Imam Hasan entered into a peace treaty with Mu'awiya in the same way that Rasulullah (s) made one with the Kuffar of Makka. Whatever excuses these Nasibi offer for the Prophet (s) making peace with

the Kuffar of Makka will also be advanced by us to explain the peace treaty Imam Hasan made with Mu'awiya.

Reply Two – The Prophet (s) saw the Banu Umayya climbing his Pulpit and this saddened him

This will be evidenced from the following Sunni works:

Sunan Tirmidhi, Volume 2 page 169 Bab Tafseer al Qur'an
al Bidayah wa al Nihaya, Volume 8 page 21, Dhikr Khilafah Hasan

Asadul Ghaba, Volume 2 page 14, Dhikr Hasan

Al Istiab, Volume 1 page 372

Tarikh Ibn Asakir, Volume 4 page 228 Dhikr Hasan

Maqatil al Husayn, Volume 1 page 135

Mustadrak al Hakim, Volume 3 page 170 (al-Hakim said that the chain is Sahih)

Tarikh Kamil, Volume 3 page 207 Dhikr Hasan

Quruth al Ainayn, page 147

We read in Tirmidhi and Bidayah:

“When Hasan made peace with Mu'awiya, one individual stood up and said 'You have blackened the face of the believers'. He replied 'Do not get upset with me, the Prophet saw in a dream that the Banu Umayya were climbing on to his pulpit. Upon seeing them on his pulpit the Prophet (s) was very saddened, so al-Kauthar descended- it means a river in the paradise – and then descended “We have descended it in the night of Qadr, a night better than thousand month” {Qadr 1-3}. It will be owned by Bani Umayyad after you O Muhammad.”

The Prophet (s) saw the Banu Umayya climbing onto his pulpit. Mu'awiya is from the Banu Ummaya. It was incumbent on the Prophet (s) to explain how this sad state of affairs could be prevented, so as to prevent the Banu Ummaya from attaining power and occupying his seat.

The Prophet (s) witnessed this dream and yet offered no remedial solution to prevent this sad state of affairs. We appeal to justice. In the same way that after seeing this dream the Prophet (s) remained silent, on account of specific problems, Imam Hasan likewise adopted silence on account of problems when making peace with Mu'awiya. In the same way that the Prophet's silence does not legitimise the reign of the Ummaya, the silence of Imam Hasan does not legitimise the reign of Mu'awiya.

Reply Three – Imam Hasan deemed Mu'awiya an unjust thief

We will prove this from the following Sunni works:

Matalib al Seul, Volume 2 page 17, Dhikr Hasan

Nazal al Abrar, page 81 Dhikr Hasan by Allamah Badkashani al-Harithi

Tadhkirathul Khawwas al Ummah, page 113

Nasa al Kifaya, page 58

Sawaiqh al Muhriqa, page 81 Chapter 10, Part 1

al Istiab, page 372 Dhikr Hasan

Fusl al Muhimma, page 146 Dhikr Hasan

Shaykh Mufti Kamaluddin Ibn Talha Shafiyee recorded in Matalib al Seul:

When the battle came to an end Imam Hasan gave a sermon wherein he said 'People of Allah! You know that Allah (swt) guided the people through my grandfather, and saved you from error and took you out of Jahiliyya. Mu'awiya has fought me over that matter which is my right not Mu'awiya's. I was worried about protecting the Ummah, and you gave me bayya on the condition that you make peace with whoever I make peace with and fight whosoever I fight. I looked at the problems and made peace with Mu'awiya and put an end to war.

The comments of Imam Hasan (as) prove that Mu'awiya was not entitled to the Khilafath, rather he deemed him an unjust thief, and he made peace due to difficulties, and made peace like the Prophet (s) did with the Kuffar of Makka. In the same way objections and wrong interpretations cannot be brought for the Prophet (s) making peace with the Kuffar of Makka, the same is the case with Imam Hasan (as) making peace with Mu'awiya.

Reply Four – Imam Hasan (as) deemed the Khilafath to be his own right

al Istiab, Volume 1 page 343 Dhikr Hasan

Asad'ul Ghaba, Volume 2 page 15 Dhikr Hasan

Tareekh Ibn Asakir, Volume 4 page 228 Dhikr Hasan

Tadhkiratul Khawas al Ummah, page 113 Dhikr Imam Hasan

Maqatil Husayn, page 134

Dhakayr al Uqba, page 140

Tahdeeb al Tahdeeb, Volume 2 page 300 Dhikr Imam Hasan

Seerat al Halbeeya, Volume 3 page 352

We read in 'Maqtal Hussain' and 'Asadul Ghaba' that Imam Hasan (as) said:

"Verily, the matter in which I and Muawiyah disputed, either this is my right, and I left this in Muawiyah's favour in order to protect the Ummah, or this is the right of a person who is more deserving for this post, hence I left this on account of that person".

The words of Imam Hasan (as) prove that he (as) deemed caliphate to be his own right and did not deem Muawiyah to be eligible for that responsibility but since Muawiyah was a terrorist and wasn't hesitant in shedding the blood of innocents thus Imam Hassan (as) accepted the treaty which doesn't mean he accepted the caliphate of Muawiyah.

A Nasibi excuse and its reply

Here Nawasib may argue that Imam Hassan (as) mentioned 'right' (haq) through the words 'Imma' and 'Aw' which shows the possibility that he deemed the 'right' (haq) belonged to Muawiyah. To those Nawasib, we would like to remind them the verse of Holy Quran (34:24) which also contained the words 'Imma' and 'Aw'.

[Yusufali 34:24] Say: "Who gives you sustenance, from the heavens and the earth?" Say: "It is Allah; and certain it is that either we or ye are on right guidance or in manifest error!"

If we look at this verse, apparently this shows that (godforbid) Prophet [s] was not sure about Him (as) being on guidance but that was certainly not the required meaning. Sometimes the aspect of eloquence and rhetorical demands that the addressee is addressed in a manner that may show dual meanings/possibilities. The manner in which the Prophet [s] adopted an either-or question in his statement, Imam Hassan (as) likewise adopted the manner in his statement. The Prophet [s] was tactically taunting the misguidance of the infdels similarly Imam Hassan (as) was actually taunting the misguidance of Muawiyah.

Reply Five – By making peace Imam Hasan (as) was able to show the Ummah that Mu’awiya was a hypocrite

This will be evidenced from the following esteemed Sunni works.

Fathul Bari Sharh Bukhari, Volume 13 page 65 Kitab al Fitan

Mirqaat Sharh Mishkaat, Volume 11 page 38 Bab Manaqib Ahl’l bayt

al Bidayah wa al Nihaya, Volume 8 page 80 Dhikr 57 Hijri

al Istiab, Volume 1 page 37 Dhikr Hasan

Imam Ibn Hajar Asqalaini records in Fathul Bari:

اني اشترطت على معاوية لنفسى الخلافة بعده

“Hasan said:’I placed a condition on Mu’awiya that I will become leader after Mu’awiya”

al Bidaya:

وقد كان معاوية لما صالح الحسن عهد للحسن بالأمر من بعده

“When Mu’awiya made peace with Hasan, he made a promise that leadership would go to Hasan after him”

Sahih Bukhari makes it clear that a hypocrite is one who makes a promise and then breaks it. The peace treaty exposed the hypocrisy of Mu’awiya, and his enmity to the family of Maula’Ali (as). The treaty was set up to show to the Ummah that he was a hypocrite and his breaking of this promise through the poisoning of Imam Hasan (as) made this absolutely clear. Allah (swt) says in Holy Quran (13:25)

But those who break the Covenant of Allah, after having plighted their word thereto, and cut asunder those things which Allah has commanded to be joined, and work mischief in the land;- on them is the curse; for them is the terrible home!

Mu’awiya’s reneging on his promise proves that he was a accursed one and a hypocrite (munafiq). The peace treaty rather than prove the faith of Mu’awiya exposes him as a hypocrite.

Reply Six – The peace treaty in the eyes of the Sunni Ulema

We shall evidence this from the following Sunni works:

Irshad al-Sari Sharh Sahih Bukhari, Vol 10 page 190 Bab ul Fitan

Umda’tul Qari Shrah Sahih Bukhari, page 361

Mirqaat Sharh Mishkat, Volume 11 page 379, Bab Manaqib Ahl’ul bayt

al Istiab, Volume 1 page 370 Dhikr Hasan

Irshad al-Sari:

“Hasan did not leave worldly power on account of personal weakness, rather he made peace to avoid Fitnah and to quell hostilities”

Irshad al-Sari Sharh Sahih Bukhari, Vol 10 page 198 Bab ul Fitana

The reference proves that the Sunni Ulema did not deem the treaty as proof that Mu’awiya was right; rather the Imam did it to prevent the further loss of life. The Nasibi’s claim that Mu’awiah obtained ijmaa is a lie. Ijmaa requires the consensus from the scholars of piety on an Islamic problem, but neither was Mu’awiya pious nor were those that supported his reign, his sidekicks Ibn Aas, Mughira bi Shubah, Ziyad, Marwan were devoid of piety.

Reply Seven – Mu’awiya was not well intentioned when he made peace with Imam Hasan (as)

If we read history, it becomes clear that Muawiyah’s heart was (as usual) impure and was not clear of bad intentions at the time of making treaty with Imam Hassan (as). We shall prove this from the following Sunni sources:

Sahih Muslim, Kitab al Imara, Book 20, Number 4553

Miskhat al Msaabih, Volume 2 page 166 Bab ul Fitana

Ash’at al Umaat, Volume 3 page 286 Kitab al Fitana

Mirqat Sharh Mishqat, Volume 1 page 114 Kitab al Fitana

Hujjatul Balagha, Volume 2 page 213

al Nihaya, Volume 2 page 109

Majm’a al Imthaal, Volume 2 page 386 Chapter 27

Minhaaj al Sunnah, Volume 1 page 560

Fatwa Meheriya, page 145 by Syed Meher Ali

We read in Sahih Muslim:

It has been narrated on the authority of Hudhaifa b. al-Yaman who said: People used to ask the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) about the good times, but I used to ask him about bad times fearing lest they overtake me. I said: Messenger of Allah, we were in the midst of ignorance and evil, and then God brought us this good (time through Islam). Is there any bad time after this good one? He said: Yes. I asked : Will there be a good time again after that bad time ? He said: Yes, but therein will be a hidden evil. I asked: What will be the evil hidden therein? He said: (That time will witness the rise of) the people who will adopt ways other than mine and seek guidance other than mine. You will know good points as well as bad points. I asked: Will there be a bad time after this good one ? He said: Yes. (A time will come) when there will be people standing and inviting at the gates of Hell. Whoso responds to their call they will throw them into the fire. I said: Messenger of Allah, describe them for us. He said: All right. They will be a people having the same complexion as ours and speaking our language. I said: Messenger of Allah, what do you suggest if I happen to live in that time ? He said: You should stick to the main body of the Muslims and their leader. I said: If they have no (such thing as the) main body and have no leader ? He said : Separate yourself from all these factions, though you may have to eat the roots of trees (in a jungle) until death comes to you and you are in this state.

Ibn Tamiyah al-Nasibi stated about this hadith:

والخبر الثاني اجتماع الناس لما اصطاح الحسن ومعاوية لكن كان صلحا على دخن

“The second news is about the people who gathered when al-Hassan and Mu’awiya made treaty, but the treaty was based on malice”

Minhaaj al Sunnah, Volume 1 page 560

Mullah Ali Qari wrote:

وبالخبر الثاني ما وقع من صلح الحسن مع معاوية والإجماع عليه وبالمدخن ما كان في زمنه

من بعض الأمراء كزياد بالعراق

“The second news refers to the treaty that took place between Mu’awiya and Hasan, and Dakhan refers to some of Mu’awiya’s Governors like Ziyad in Iraq”.

Mullah Ali Qari says the word ‘Dakhan’ refers to Ziyad but fails to include his teacher Mu’awiya under this definition/word. These Nawasib try to legitimise the reign of a leader who came to power by making a peace that he has no support for, and the Prophet (s) used the term for one that referring to a hypocritical agreement. Shah Abdul Haq Dehalvi in his Sharh Mishkat stated:

‘Dakhan’ refers to a treaty involving dishonesty and hypocrisy.

Nawawi said in ‘Sharh Muslim’ Volume 6 page 227 that:

‘Dakhan’ among animals refers to a colour that is black and in this hadith it refers to a heart which is not pure and its impurity doesn’t erase.

Ibn Atheer stated in ‘Al-Nihayah’ that ‘Hadna Ala Dakhan’ refers to:

“A treaty about which hearts are not pure”.

Shah Waliullah Dehalvi in ‘Hujjuthul Balagha’ stated:

“Dakhan refers to the peace treaty between Mu’awiya and Hasan”

Imam Hasan was the grandson of the Prophet, one of the members under the cloak of purity, the rightful leader and the master of the youth of paradise, He (as) was of pure intention when making peace, unlike Mu’awiya, later on proven by his flagrant violation of the conditions, killing of Imam Hasan (as) and showing happiness over His (as) murder. Thus, the filthy heart being referred to by the word ‘Dakhan’ was the heart of Muawiyah.

Reply Eight – Imam Hasan (as) made peace on account of pressure

Ibn Asakir in his authority work ‘Tareekh Damishq’ and Imam Dhahabi in ‘Siyar Alam Nubla’ Volume 3 page 269 records:

إلا وان معاوية دعانا إلى أمر ليس فيه عز ولا نصفة فان اردتم الموت رددناه عليه

وحاكمناه إلى الله جل وعز بظبا (5) السيوف وان اردتم الحياة قبلناه واخذنا لكم الرضا

فناداه القوم من كل جانب البقية البقية (6) فلما افردوه امضى الصلح

Hasan said: “Be informed that Mu’awiya has called us to such a treaty that is neither honourable nor is it based on justice. If you are ready for death then we will reject this offer, and answer the matter with our swords and leave the matter with Allah. If you like life then we can accept it. Upon

saying this, the calls from all around were 'Taqiyyah, Taqiyah' when the people left Hasan, he made peace".

Tarikh Ibn Asakir, Volume 13 page 268

Ibn Asakir has used to the words 'Baqiyyah Baqiyah' but he said Dahabi has recorded it them as 'Taqiyyah Taqiyah' in 'Siyar Alam Nubla' Volume 3 page 269 hence we used it likewise.

Imam Nawawi records:

فإن قيل فكيف خلع الحسن بن علي نفسه؟ قلنا لعله علم من نفسه ضعفا عن تحملها
أو علم أنه لا ناصر له ولا معين فخلع نفسه تقية

"If it is been asked as how did Hassan bin Ali oust himself? We would reply that perhaps he figured out his inability due to weakness, or perhaps he figured out that he had no supporter hence he ousedt himself under Taqiyah".

Kitab al-Majmoa, Volume 21 page 29

We appeal to justice! The Taqiyah mentioned above was the same Taqiyah that a terrified / tearful Abu Bakr adopted in the cave, that the Prophet (s) adopted at Hudaibya where he had to delete the words 'Prophet of Allah' from the treaty doucment.

Reply Nine – If you see Mu'awiya on my pulpit kill him (hadeeth)

We will cite this Prophetic Hadeeth from the following esteemed Sunni works:

Mizan al-Itidal Volume 2 page 17; Volume 2 page 129 on the authority of Abu Said al Khudri; Volume 7 page 324 and Volume 8 page 74 al Bidayah wa al Nihaya Volume 8 page 133 Dhikr Mu'awiya

Kunzul Haqaiq, Volume 1 page 18

Tatheer al Janaan, columm on Sawaiqh al Muhriqa page 62

Al Nasa al Kifaya page 35

Maqatil al Husayn, page 175

Tareekh Tabari, Volume 13 the events of 284 Hijri, the rule of Banu Ummayya

Tahdeeb al Tahdeeb, Volume 5 page 110 Dhikr Ubada bin Yaqoob

Tareekh al Baghdad, Volume 12 page 181 Dhikr bin Ubayd

Tabaqat by Ibn Sad, Volume 4 page 134-135

al Kamil fi Safa al Rijal, Volume 2 page 146 hadith number 343,

Ansab al Ashraf, Volume 5 page 136,

Waqt Sifeen, page 216 and 221

We read the following hadith in the above cited books:

إذا رأيتم معاوية على منبري فاقتلوه

"If you see Mu'awiya on my pulpit then kill him"

Sheikh Muhammad bin Aqeel al-Hadrami (d. 1350 H) said in his book 'al-Atab al-Jameel ala ahl al-Jarh wa al-Tadeel' page 63 that the hadith is Sahih. An interesting event in connection with this event can be located in 'Ansab al Ashraf' Volume 5 page 136:

“On one occasion an Ansari individual wanted to kill Mu’awiya, the people said, ‘the sword can not be raised during the reign of Umar, they said that he should write to Umar and seek his consent. He replied ‘ I heard that Rasulullah had said: ‘If you see Mu’awiya on my pulpit then kill him’. The people confirmed that they had also heard the hadith, but said we have not carried out this action, so let us write to Umar on the matter, which they did, but Umar did not write back to resolve the matter, until he died”

We read in Maqatil al Husayn:

“Hussain said to Marwan: ‘My grandfather said: ‘Khilafah in the family of Abu Sufyan is haraam, since they embraced Islam after the conquest of Makka’. My grandfather also said: ‘When you see Mu’awiya on my pulpit then rip open his stomach’. The people of Madina failed to kill Mu’awiya, which is why Allah (swt) on account of His wrath gave them the leadership of Yazeed”.

We appeal to justice. If Mu’awiya had not become Khalifa after making peace with Imam Hasan (as), the Prophet (s) would not have issued an order that he be killed. It is clear that when the Prophet (s) dreamt of the Banu Umayyaa climbing his pulpit like monkeys it referred to Mu’awiya, which is why he (s) wanted him to be killed. The leadership of anyone who has to be killed when attaining power, is unacceptable. Imam Hasan (as) made peace, that was it. The Prophet (s) deemed the Khilafath of Mu’awiya to be so unpalatable that he said he had to be killed the moment he sat on his throne. That makes all the arguments of Nasibis that the son of Hind’s reign was legitimate to sheer nonsense.

Reply Ten – Banu Zarqa cannot be Khalifas

We will evidence this from the following esteemed Sunni works:

Sunan Tirmidhi, Volume 2 page 114 Kitab al Fitn

Sunan Abu Daud, Kirtab al Sunnah Volume 4 page 211

Asad ul Ghaba page 411 Dhikr Safiba Sahabi

Sawaiqh al Muhriqa page 131 Kitab Dhikr Sahaba

Tarikh al Khulafa page 199, Dhikr Mu’awiya

Tarikh al Khualafa:

“Sa’ad said to the Safina: ‘The Banu Umayyaa state that the Prophetic Khialfah is their right’. Safina said: ‘The Zarqa lie, they are Kings, and their first king was Mu’awiya’.

Safina did not recognise Mu’awiya as Khailifa after the peace with Hasan (as) rather he deemed him the first from a line of Banu Umayyaa kings, in exactly the same way that Ayesha compared Muawiya to the rule of Pharoah.

Reply Eleven – Imam Hasan (as) made peace to protect Muslim lives, property and honour, and thus provided an example for those people faced with difficult choices

We read in Tarikh ibn Asakir, Volume 13 page 280 Dhikr Hasan:

قال يا مالك لا تقل ذلك أني لما رأيت الناس تركوا ذلك إلا أهله خشيت أن تجتثوا عن

وجه الأرض فاردت أن يكون للدين في الأرض ناعي

“After Hasan made peace with Mu’awiya, Malik ibn Dhumr said: ‘You have blackened the face of the believers’ to which he [Hasan] replied: ‘Don’t say this! I feared that the Muslims would be exterminated from the earth. My desire is that some people will remain on the earth who will mention Islam to the people”

Tarikh ibn Asakir, Volume 13 page 280

Ibn Kathir records the following clear cut words of Imam Hasan (as):

“Naeem bin Hamad has narrated that Ibn Fazeel has narrated from Sari bin Ismaeel narrated to us from Shaybi that Sufiyan bin al-Lail narrated to me that when Hasan bin Ali [ra] came Madina from Kufa, I said to him: ‘O the one who disgraced the believers’. He replied: ‘Dont say this! I heard Holy Prophet [s] saying that day and nights will not cease to end until Muawiyah becomes king, thus I knew that Allah’s ‘will’ had to take place, therefore I did not like bloodshed of Muslims taking place between me and him”

Al-Bidayah (Urdu), Vol 8 page 974, under the topic of Merits and virtuous of Muawiyah

Imam of Ahle Sunnah Ibn Habbab in al-Thuqat, Volume 2 page 305 cites how ruthless and low Mu’awiya was prepared to stoop to seize power:

فاحتال معاوية في الحسن بن علوتلطف له وخوفه هراقه دماء المسلمين وهتك حرمتهم
وذهاب أموالهم إن لم يسلم الأمر لمعاوية فاختار الحسن ما عند الله على ما في الدنيا وسلم
الأمر إلى معاوية

Mu’awiyah tricked Hassan bin Ali and issued a threat of shedding Muslim’s blood, sexually abusing them, and destroying their properties if he didn’t give up Caliphate in favour of him [Mu’awiyah]. Hassan therefore chose what was with Allah over what is in the world and handed over Caliphate to Mu’awiyah.

Salafi scholar Hasan bin Farhan al-Maliki who on page 72 of his book ‘Qeraah fi Kutub al-Aqaed’ attests to the hidden benefit that came from the peace treaty:

صلح الحسن أفضل من تعرضه ومن معه من بقية أهل البيت ومحبيهم لمذبحة ينتهي فيها
ذكر أهل البيت !! فصلح الحسن أتاح لهؤلاء المحبين الاختلاط بالناس ونقل أحاديث علي
وفقهه وعلمه

“The peace treaty made by Hasan was better than his slaughter as well as that of the remaining Ahlulbayt members and their adherents, that would have brought about an end to remembrance of the Ahlulbayt!! Hasan’s peace making enabled their adherents to contact the people and transmit Ali’s traditions, jurisprudence and knowledge”

Our Imam (as) did not stop the war because he deemed Mu’awiyah to be legally entitled to rule the Ummah, rather he did so to protect the life, honour and properties of Muslims. In the same way that our Prophet (s) made peace with the Makkan Kuffar to avoid Muslim bloodshed, Imam Hasan (as) did exactly the same when he made peace with Imam Hasan (as). The role of the Imam (as) is to set an example for the people so that future

generations can rely on his decision making when faced with a difficult choice. We appeal to justice, was there not a more difficult choice that this one? The Imam (as) was giving up that which was his legitimate right, yet he weighed up the consequences, and felt that the less harmful / better option would be to vacate his seat, in doing so he set a precedent, with regards to how one should decide on a matter when faced with difficult choices, as has been attested to by Salafi scholar Hasan bin Farhan al-Maliki who on page 72 of his book 'Qeraah fi Kutub al-Aqaed' said:

كما تعلم الناس من الحسن اختيار أخف الضررين

“Also the people learnt from Hasan, to opt for the less harmful option when faced with two matters”

Reply Twelve – According to Sunnies it is permissible to make peace with unjust people

We read in one of the esteemed Hanafi works 'al Hidayah' Volume 3 page 133, Kitab al Adab also in 'Sharah Hidayah' Volume 10 page 217:

ثم يجوز التقليد من السلطان الجائر كما يجوز من العادل لأن الصحابة تقلده من معاوية

والحق كان بيد علي رضي الله تعالى عنه والتابعين تقلدوه من الحجاج وكان جائرا

“It is permissible to be appointed as a Judge by an unjust ruler, in the same way as it is the case of a just ruler. This is because the Sahaba were appointed Judges under Mu'awiya, even though the truth was with Ali [ra]. The Tabieen were appointed as Judges by Hajjaj, even though he was unjust”.

Hidayah contains the Fatwa that both Mu'awiya and Hajjaj were unjust and the Sahaba would accept the position of a judge from the unjust rulers. We appeal to justice. When the Sahaba made peace agreements with the unjust Mu'awiya and Hajjaj did they also become unjust in the process? If they did then we congratulate you for being the adherents of bulk of unjust companions. If they did not, then in the same way the Sahaba did not become transgressor / sinners for entering into such agreements, there was nothing wrong with Imam Hasan (as) making peace with unjust Mu'awiya. This Fatwa will be an eternal slap on the face of the Nasibis.

Reply Thirteen – The Tulqa cannot be khalifas

We will evidence this from the following esteemed Sunni works:

Asad'ul Ghaba, Volume 5 page 212 Dhikr Mu'awiya

al Nasa al Kifaya, page 153 Dhikr Sulh Hasan

al Isaba, Volume 3 page 414 Dhikr Mu'awiya

Aqd al Farid, Volume Volume 2 page 240

Asad'ul Ghaba:

“Umar said that caliphate will remain with the participants of Badr and the Tulqa and their children have no share in it”

Mu'awiya out of deperation embraced Islam after the conquest of Makka, and such people are deemed the 'Tulqa' and according to Umar such people have no right to become Khalifas. Shah Waliyullah commented in Izlatul Khifa, Volume 1 page 25 that:

“One who does not satisfy the conditions to be khalifa, but takes the seat by injustice is a sinner”

Based on these comments, we can conclude that Shah Waliullah deemed even Mu’awiya’s claim to be khalifa to constitute a sin. In this connection we read in al-Bidaya wa-al Nihaya, Volume 8 page 131, Dhikr Mu’awiya:

Aswad bin Yazeed narrated: ‘I heard Ayesha say: ‘Aren’t you surprised over a person who is from Tulaqa (freed captive) and yet he fights against the companions of Prophet regarding the issue of caliphate?’ Ayesha further stated: ‘And aren’t you surprised that this is Allah’s reign which He (swt) grants to good and bad and He (swt) made Pharoah King over the people of Egypt for 400 years, and similarly other infidel kings”.

Al-Bidayah (Urdu), Vol 8 pages 974-975, under the topic of Merits and virtuous of Muawiyah

Based on the comments of Ayesha, if Mu’awiya’s children deem their father to be a Khailfa of the Prophet (s) then they have perpetuated a major injustice.

Reply Fourteen – Mu’awiya took the Caliphate by force

Ansar.org states:

“Mu’awiyah did not take the caliphate by force, but it was given to him by Al-Hasan bin Ali after peace occurred between them.

One needs to look at the historical background to understand why Imam Hasan (as) stood down. The circumstances were such that he had been forced into making a difficult choice peace or bloodshed, Mu’awiya used bribery and intimidation to “win over” Hasan (as)’s army and had posted his army outside Kufa (a clear pressure tactic). Mu’awiya summoned all the commanders of his forces in Syria, Palestine, and Transjordan to join him. Not long after, the Syrian leader marched against Hasan with an army of sixty thousand men, (Ibn A’tham, IV, p. 153). Clearly marching towards Imam Hasan (as) with a 60,000 force in no way demonstrates Mu’awiya wanted peace – he WAS preparing for battle. If his interest was just peace why not go alone with a handful of supporters? By bringing such a powerful force Mu’awiya was making his intention clear, that he intended to wrest the khilafth from Imam Hasan (as) willingly or unwillingly. Mu’awiya had used the threat of force as a bargaining chip, Imam Hasan (as) was placed under duress to hand over the caliphate, it was not willingly handed to Mu’awiya on silver platter rather Imam Hasan (as) was pressurised into yielding to Mu’awiya’s demands.

The taking of Caliphate by force has also been acknowledged by late Sunni Scholar Sayyid Abu’l Ala Maudoodi who writes:

Kingship’s foundation began with this change. The khilafat of Mu’awiya (ra) was not of a kind wherein he was appointed by the Muslims...despite this Mu’awiya wanted to be the Khalifa, he fought in order to achieve the khilafat, and his khilafat was not dependent on the satisfaction/acceptance of the Muslims. The people did not appoint him as Khalifa, he became so by force and when he became Khalifa, people had no other choice but to give him bay’a. Had the people not given him baya at that time, it would have not meant that those people had to lose their positions / ranks rather it would have meant bloodshed and disturbance which could not have been given

preference over peace and order. That is why after Imam Hasan's (ra) abdication (in Rabi al-Awwal, 41 H) all the Sahaba, Tabayeen and Muslims agreed on his bay'a and that year was called 'Aam al Jamaat' because of considering the fact that at least civil war was made to an end. Mu'awiya was himself well aware of this position. He stated the following in his speech in the initial days of his Khilafat at Madina:

"By Allah, while taking charge of your government I was not unaware of the fact that you are unhappy over my taking over of government and you people don't like it. I am well aware of whatever is there in your hearts regarding this matter but still I have took it from you on the basis of my sword... Now if you see that I am not fulfilling your rights, then you should be happy with me with whatever is there."

khilafat wa mulukiyyat, chapter 5, pages 158-159 citing Al Bidaya wa al Nihaya by Ibn Katheer, vol 8, page 132

This negates the defence advanced by Abu Sulaiman as we hear from the mouth of Mu'awiya himself that his coming to power was via the sword i.e. physical force.

Reply Fifteen– Imam Hasan (as) said he had the right to kill Mu'awiya

We read in Nasa al Kifaya page 157, Dhikr Sulh Hasan:

"The Khawarij opposed the peace made between Mu'awiya and Hasan. Mu'awiya approached Hasan and said 'Join us to fight them'. Hasan said 'It was halal for me to make war with you, and I left this matter to protect the Muslim Ummah'".

We appeal to justice, the words of Imam Hasan (as), proves that he (as) did not deem the son of Hind to be the rightful khalifa, but rather the duty was to kill him, in the same way that at the time of the conquest of Makka, the Prophet (s) deemed it incumbent to kill Mu'awiya's mother and Uthman's brother. In the same way that the Prophet (s) spared their lives on account of personal reasons, Imam Hasan (as) likewise spared Mu'awiya due to specific reasons. The fact that Imam Hasan (as) maintained this stance even after making peace proves that he did not deem him to be the true Khalifa of the Prophet (s).

Reply Sixteen – Textual evidence from Quran

We read in Surah Anfal verse 061:

But if the enemy incline towards peace, do thou (also) incline towards peace, and trust in Allah: for He is One that heareth and knoweth (all things).

We shall now rely on the following Sunni commentaries of this verse:

Tafsir Mazhari, Volume 4 page 109

Tafsir Kabir, page 283

Tafsir Fathul Qadir, Volume 2 page 307

Tafsir Khazan, Volume 3 page 39

al Hidayah, Volume 1 page 381

We read in al Hidayah:

الإمام أن يصلح أهل الحرب أو فريقاً منهم وكان في ذلك مصلحة للمسلمين فلا بأس به

لقوله تعالى : { وإن جنحوا للسلم فاجنح لها وتوكل على الله } الأنفال : 61

When the Imam considers making peace with the Kuffar, a peace that will have some (hidden) reasonings for the Muslims, there is still no problem with making such peace, since Allah (swt) states 'But if the enemy incline towards peace, do thou (also) incline towards peace, and trust in Allah: for He is One that heareth and knoweth (all things)'."

We appeal to justice. Muawiya's children allow for an Imam to make a difficult peace with the Kuffar. The Qur'an states that you can make peace with polytheists, and you cannot get worse than a polytheist! If you can make peace with the Kuffar, then Imam Hasan (as) was likewise entitled to make peace with Mu'awiya. It is dishonesty to deem such a peace to constitute bayya.

We read in Tafsir Khazan:

"If an Imam wishes to make peace with his enemies amongst infidels, and the Imam is strong enough to make war, then he can make peace for a year or less. If the strength lies with the Mushrikeen then it is permissible for the Imam to make peace for a ten year period but the timescale cannot exceed this, since the Prophet only made peace with the Kuffar for ten years"

Imam Hasan was the Khalifa of the Prophet (s), but did not command the same level of strength as the Prophet (s). When the Prophet (s) who was able to split the moon, was prepared to drop his weapons and make peace with the Kuffar then why the objection to Imam Hasan doing likewise? The treaty was so unbalanced that Umar began doubting his Prophethood. When the Prophet (s) was ready to make such peace, deeming the Muslims to be weak despite the presence of valiant lions of the caliber of Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman, then clearly there were some personal pressures on the Prophet (s). In the same way that the treaty of Hudaibiya cannot question the Prophethood of Muhammad (s), if Imam Hasan (s) made treaty with a hypocrite then no questions should be raised on his Imamate.

Reply Seventeen – Infallible ones under pressure from common men

When we say that Imam Hasan (as) was under pressure when he made treaty, the next question in fact an objection that comes from Nawasib is that how is it possible that a chosen one, the infallible one can be under pressure by an ordinary men and he is compelled to do a thing which he doesn't like to do. The answer comes right from the Holy Book, we read in Surah Tauba verse 40:

[YUSUFALI: 009.040]

when the Unbelievers drove him out: he had no more than one companion; they two were in the cave

The followers of Mu'awiya try to deceive the people claiming that the Prophet (s) and Imam cannot be pressured, so what pressures were on Imam Hasan (as) to make peace with Mu'awiya? The Kuffar of Makka put such extreme pressure on the Prophet that he left his city of birth, Abu Bakr

accompanied him and they hid in a cave. If taqqiya doesn't mean to give in under pressure then what else does it mean? In the same way the Prophet (s) sought to save his life and that of Abu Bakr by hiding in the cave, Imam Hasan likewise made peace with Mu'awiya due to external pressures. In this connection we read in Surah Kahf how Khider killed a child, an act that Musa (as) was critical of, from which we can see that certain Men of Allah (swt) act in a manner that even prophets are unable to understand the reasoning. If people are unable to see why Imam Hasan (as) made peace, then it shouldn't be an issue, after all the Ul'il Azm Prophet (s) Musa was unable to understand why Khider (as) killed a child.

The bay'a given to Mu'awiya

Abu Sulaiman writes:

“Al-Hasan bin Ali abandoned the caliphate for Mu'awiya and all the people gave the allegiance to Mu'awiya and none of the companions refrained in giving him the allegiance!”

Reply One – The meaning of bayya

On the issue of Imam Hasan (as) allegedly giving ba'ya we should point out that ba'ya has two meanings “to make a contract” and “to pledge allegiance” see Hans Wehr's Arabic – English Dictionary page 86. The fact that agreement between the two sides was written on a piece of paper clearly alludes to the fact that a contractual agreement had been drawn up. Imam Hasan (as) was offering his Leadership in return for the conditions that he had placed. With Mu'awiyah's signature the baya was concluded, i.e. the contract was finalised and agreed between the two sides. ba'ya as in exchange, now if Imam Hasan (as) was giving his ba'ya as in pledge, then why do Ahl'ul Sunnah not regard Mu'awiya as a rightly guided khalifa as well? After all as Clarke in his translation of Suyuti's 'The Khalifas who took the right way' on page 9 admits:

“I have continued beyond the first four khulafa to include Hasan ibn 'Ali because as Suyuti saw him as the fifth of the khulafa”.

It is clear that the bayya was an agreement surrounding the peace treaty, nothing more. Thus the pathetic arguments of 'Abu Sulaiman are baseless.

Reply Two – Nawasib have stupidly assumed that peace means bayya

al Bidaya wa al Nihaya, Volume 8 page 18 Dhikr Hasan

al Isti'ab, Volume 1 page 115

Tahdeeb al Tahdeeb, Volume 2 page 259

Matalib al Seul, Volume 2 page 26

Tadhkirathul Khawwas al Ummah, page 113 Dhikr Hasan

Murujuh al Dhahab, Volume 3 page 8 Dhikr Hasan

Aqd al Farid, Volume 2 page 244

Asaf al Ra'ghbain, page 167 Dhikr Hasan

Nur al Absar, page 120 Dhikr Hasan

Dakhayr al Uqba, page 140 Dhikr Hasan

al Maarif, page 92, Dhikr Imam Hasan

Maqatil Husayn, page 134

Nazal al Abrar, page 82 Dhikr Hasan by Allamah Badkashani al-Harithi

Sawaiqh al Muhriqa, Volume 2 page 399

al Fusl al Muhimma, page 163

Tarikh Baghdadi, page 178, Dhikr Qaya ibn Sa'd

Akhbar al Tawal, page 118 Dhikr Hasan

Minhaaj al Sunnah, Volume 1 page 560

Ibn Katheer states in Al Bidaya:

-فضالجه- وهو في ذلك هو البار الراشد الممدوح

“Verily Hasan made peace with Mu’awiya, and this peace is a praise worthy act”

Ibn Hajar Makki stated in his anti-Shia book Sawaiqh al Muhriqa:

ولما تصالحا كتب به الحسن كتابا لمعاوية صورته

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ هذا ما صالح عليه الحسن بن علي رضي الله عنهما معاوية بن أبي

سفيان

When they made peace treaty, Hassan wrote a message to Mu’awiyah the content of which was:

‘In the name of Allah the beneficent the merciful, this is what Hassan son of Ali made peace on with Mu’awiyah son of Abi Sufyan’

Allamah Ibn Abdul Barr records in al Istiab:

عن الشعبي قال لما جرى الصلح بين الحسن بن علي ومعاوية

“Shaybi narrates when Hasan and Mu’awiya made peace treaty..”

Ibn Hajar Asqalani in Tahdeeb al Tahdeeb stated:

“Peace treaty took place between Muawiyah and Hasan in 41 Hijri during the month of Rabi al-Awwal”

Imam of Salafies Ibn Tamiyah while explaining a hadith stated:

والخبر الثاني اجتماع الناس لما اصطاح الحسن ومعاوية لكن كان صلحا على دخن

“The second news is about the people who gathered when al-Hassan and Mu’awiya made treaty, but the treaty was based on malice”

We appeal to justice. Imam Hasan made peace with Mu’awiya but the nation of Muawiyah gave it the colour of an allegiance (bayah) and they did this propaganda to the extent that some historians while admitting it as a peace treaty gave it the touch of bayah also. The scholars have recorded the fact that peace was made between the parties. It is not necessary that you recognise the legitimacy and right to rule of one that you make peace with, otherwise we will have to believe that the Prophet (s) believed in the legitimacy of the Makkan Kuffar when making peace with them. At the time of the peace, Mu’awiya was not on the path of truth. Efforts to present this peace treaty as evidence that bayya was given and Mu’awiya was right is utmost stupidity on the part of Mu’awiya’s followers.

Mu’awiya’s poisoning of Imam Hasan (as)

Abu Sulaiman rejects such narration’s excuses include the following:

“At those days, people were in an affliction, and their desires leading their instincts, each sect attributing bad things to other sects. If a story was told about that, then we ought not to accept it unless just and trustworthy people narrated it”.

Many afflictions occurred during that time but the Ahl’ul Sunnah happily embrace narration about Abdullah bin Saba so why do they not happily accept this as a fact of history? Should we reject ALL narrations during that period? A number of the grand Sunni scholars HAVE recorded this. We will evidence this by relying on the following Sunni works:

Mu’ajam al-Kabeer, Volume 3 page 119 Tradition 2628

al Istiab, Volume 1 page 115

Tadkhirat ul Khawwas, page 192

Rabi’ ul Abrar, Volume 4 page 208

Maqatil al Talibeen, Volume 1 page 20

al Fusul al Muhimma, page 164

Tarikh Ibn Asakir, Volume 13 page 284

Tarikh Khamis, Volume 2 page 294

Shawahid un Nubuwwat, page 303

Tarikh Abul Fida, page 183, Dhikr Wafaat Hasan

al Habib al Siyar, Volume 1 page 81

Hadahrat Ali, page 214, by Taha Husayn

Sirrul Awliya, page 81

Murujuh al Dhuhab, Volume 3 page 5, Dhikr Khilafa Hasan bin Ali (ra)

Rouzatul Shouhdah, Volume 3 page 12

Ayun al-Anba Fi Tabaqat al-Atba, page 153

Kitab Al-Bada wal-Tarikh, Volume 6 page 5

Al-Bidayah wal Nihayah, Volume 8 page 47

Siyar Alam an Nubla, Volume 3 page 247

Fist of all, it should be made clear that there isn’t any doubt that Imam Hasan (as) was poisoned and that too by his wife Ja’da bint al-Ash’ath for which she was rewarded with handsome amount of money. Imam Hakim records in ‘Al-Mustadrak’ Volume 3 page 176:

“Qutada bin Du’ama al-Sedusi said that the daughter of al-Ash’ath bin Qais poisoned al-Hassan bin Ali and she was his wife, she received huge amount of money for that.”

Neither Imam Hakim nor Imam Dhahabi advanced any sort of objection to this tradition endorsing the authenticity of the tradition. As for the person who was actually behind the murder of Imam Hasan (as), Imam of Ahle Sunnah Tabarani in his book Mu’ajam al-Kabeer, Volume 3 page 119 Tradition 2628 has recorded a tradition from some of the most authentic narrators of Sunni sect:

عن أبي بكر بن حفص ، أن سعدا والحسن بن علي رضي الله تعالى عنهما ماتا في زمن

معاوية رضي الله تعالى عنه ، فيرون أنه سمه

“Muhammad bin Abdullah Al-Hadarmi narrated from Muhammad bin Abdullah bin Numair from Yahyah bin Abi Bakir from Shu’ba from Abu Bakr ibn Hafs who narrated that Sa’ad and Hasan, son of Ali (may Allah be

pleased with both of them) died during the reign of Muawiya, and it is believed that he (Muawiya) poisoned him (Hasan).”

All the narrators of the tradition are Thiqah (authentic), let us present the views of the two biggest Rijal scholars of Ahle Sunnah namely Ibn Hajar Asaqalani and Dahabi. Muhammad bin Abdullah al-Hadrami: Al-Dahabi decalred him ‘Thiqah Mutlaqan’ (Tazkirat al-Hufaz v2, p662). Ibn Hajar stated that people have authenticated him (Lisan al-Mizan, v5, p233). Muhammad bin Abdullah bin Numair: Al-Dahabi said: ‘Thabt’ (Tazkirat al-Hufaz, v2, p439). Ibn Hajar: ‘Thiqah’ (Taqrīb al-Taḥdīb, v2, p100). Yahya bin Abi Bakir: Al-Dahabi said: ‘Thiqah’ (Al-Kashef, v2, p362), Ibn Hajar said: ‘Thiqah’ (Taqrīb al-Taḥdīb, v2, p298). Shu’aba bin al-Hajaj: Al-Dahabi said: ‘Thabt Huja’ (Al-Kashef, v1, p485), Ibn Hajar said: ‘Thiqah’ (Taqrīb al-Taḥdīb, v1, p418). Abi Bakr bin Hafs: Al-Dahabi said: ‘al-Nisa’i authenticated him.’ (Al-Kashef, v1, p546). Ibn Hajar said: ‘Thiqah’ (Taqrīb al-Taḥdīb, v1, p487).

In Sirrul Awliya by S.M. Mubarak Alawi Karmani (Urdu translation by Ijaz ul Haqq Quddoosi) page 81 it is stated:

“Imam Hassan (ra)’s wife Ja’da bint Ash’ath Kindi some how managed to poisoned him on the orders of Mu’awiya”.

Sirrul Awliya, page 81

In Tadkhirat au Khawwas, page 192 we read:

“Sho’ubi states that Mu’awiya sent a message to Jada bint al-Ash’ath bin al Qays that if you poison Hasan then I shall marry you to Yazeed and in addition to this I shall give 100,000 dirhams. When Hasan was martyred Judh sent a message to Mu’awiya asking that he fulfil his side of the deal. Mu’awiya sent the money but said “I reject that matter of Yazeed since I want him to remain alive, had this matter not occurred then I would have married you to Yazeed”.

Allamah Zamakshari in Rabi’ ul Abrar, Volume 4 page 208 notes that:

Mu’awiya reached an agreement with Jada bint al-Ash’ath bin al Qays, namely 100,000 dirhams if she poisons Imam Hasan. For two months Hasan bled profusely, and he would state ‘I have been poisoned on several occasion before but on this occasion the poison has attacked my heart’

We read in Fusl ul Muhimma:

“Hassan came to Madina where he lived for about ten years. His wife Ja’da bint Ash’ath poisoned him, as Mu’awiya had promised Ja’da 100,000 Dirhams. After being poisoned, Hasan remained alive for forty days”.

Allamah Ibn Abdul Barr in his esteemed work al-Istiab records:

وقال قتادة وأبو بكر بن حفص سم الحسن بن علي سمته امرأته جعدة بنت الأشعث بن قيس الكندي. وقالت طائفة كان ذلك منها بتدسيس معاوية إليها وما بذل لها من ذلك وكان لها ضرائر والله أعلم.

Qatada and Abu Bakr bin Hafs stated that Hasan was administered poison, via his wife Ja’da bint Ashath. One group have said that Mu’awiya have sent Ja’da the poison and upon administering this poison, Ja’da was rewarded”.

Anti-Shia scholar Maulana Abdur Rahman Jaami writes in Shawahid un Nubuwwa:

“This is commonly known among the people that his wife Ja'da administered poison to him upon the orders of Ameer Mu'awiya.”

Shawahid un Nubuwwat, page 303

Tarikh Ibn Asakir:

كان معاوية قد تلف لبعض خدمه أن يسقيه سما

“Mu'awiya created a mixture via his servants, which was administered to Hasan.

Allamah Ismaeel bin Abul Fida in his famed work ‘Tarikh Abul Fida’ records:

وتوفي الحسن من سم سقته زوجته جعدة بنت الأشعث قيل فعلت ذلك بأمر معاوية

“Hasan was killed via poisoning, administered by his wife Ja'da bint Ashath upon the orders of Mu'awiya”

Muruj al Dhahab:

His wife Ja'da bint Ashath gave him poison, Mu'awiya gave her this poison stating: ‘If you administer this poison and kill Hasan by mixing it in food, I will reward you with 100,000 Dirhams and marry you to Yazid’. When the Hasan was martyred, Mu'awiya gave her 100,000 Dirhams, but on marrying Yazid, he said: ‘I value the life of Yazid’.

Maqatil al Talibeen:

“Muawiya administered poison to him (Hasan) when he wanted to appoint Yazeed, and poisoned Saad bin Abi Waqas and they both died in close days. The one who administered poison to al-Hasan was his wife J'ada bin al-Ash'ath bin Qais, for which she was rewarded with money, paid to her by Mu'awiya”

And last but certainly not least for the present day Nawasib, since two of their beloved Imams having Nasibi tendencies and influenced by the habit of question the authenticity of those traditions that affect the Sahaba namely Dhahabi and Ibn Katheer also recorded this fact without any objection:

وقد سمعت بعض من يقول: كان معاوية قد تلف لبعض خدمه أن يسقيه سماً.

“Waqidi stated: I heard some people saying that Mu'awiyah secretly made one of his servants administer poison to him”

Shaykh Muwafiquddin Ahmed bin Qasim al-Khazarji popularly known as Ibn Abi Asiba (d. 668 H) in his authority work Ayun al-Anba Fi Tabaqat al-Atba, page 153 has recorded the biography of one of the closest physicians of Muawiya, namely Thamama bin Athaal. He was a prominent Christian Damascene and acted as the means via which Muawiya would access poison that he would use to eliminate his opponents. We read:

وكان ابن أثال خبيراً بالأدوية المفردة والمركبة وقواها وما منها سموم قاتل وكان معاوية يقربه

لذلك كثيراً ومات في أيام معاوية جماعة كثيرة من أكابر الناس

Ibn Athaal was an expert in mixing unique mixtures of medicine and was well versed in their results and potencies and was hence well versed in the different types of lethal poisons, which is hence why Muawiya praised him

immensely. During an era of Muawiya, a numerous Muslim personalities were killed on account of these poisons.

The said author cites the names of those individuals that succumbed to the poisons administered by Muawiya through the above-mentioned doctor that includes Abdulrehman bin Khalid bin Waleed, the famous companion of Maula Ali bin Abi Talib namely Malik bin Ashtar (ra) etc. Then on page 156, the author then references Tabari:

الحسن بن علي رضي الله عنهما مات مسموماً في أيام معاوية وكان عند معاوية كما قيل دهاء ففسد إلى جعدة بنت الأشعث بن قيس وكانت زوجة الحسن رضي الله عنه شربة وقال لها إن قتلت الحسن زوجتك بيزيد فلما توفي الحسن بعثت إلى معاوية تطلب قوله فقال لها في الجواب أنا أضن بيزيد

Hasan bin Ali (ra) died on account of poisoning during the reign of Muawiya. Muawiya connived with Ja'da bint al-Ash'ath bin Qays the wife of Hasan who administered poison to him, on the condition that Muawiyah would marry her to his son Yazeed. When Hasan died, she sent a request to Muawiya to fulfill the said promise to which Muawiyah replied he feared for the well being of Yazeed.

Similarly Mutahar bin Tahir al-Maqdasi in his esteemed work Kitab Al-Bada wal-Tarikh, Volume 6 page 5 states:

أن معاوية دس إلى جعدة بنت الأشعث بن قيس بأن تسم الحسن ويزوجها بيزيد فسمته وقتلته فقال لها معاوية إن يزيد منا بمكان وكيف يصلح له من لا يصلح لابن رسول الله وعوضها منه مائة ألف درهم

Muawiya conspired with Ja'da bint al-Ash'ath bin Qays and issued her with an assurance that he would marry her to Yazeed provided she administered poison to Hasan. When she killed him, Muawiya gave her 100,000 Dirhams and said: 'Yazeed is dearer to me, how can I be sure that what transpired with the grandson of the Prophet will not also happen to Yazeed?'

Who was Ja'da bint Asha'ath bin Qays?

At this juncture we deem it apt to shed some light on Ja'da's family background as most of our opponents are unaware as to what sort of relationship she had with some notable ones. The learned ad-Dhahabi, writes about her father Asha'ath bin Qays al-Kindi:

له صحبة ورواية

“He is a companion and there are traditions narrated through him”

and then his tarnishing the honor of companionship:

ارتد الأشعث في ناس من كندة - لما قدم بالأشعث بن قيس أسيراً على أبي بكر أطلق

وثاقه وزوجه أخته

“He apostatized along with several clan members of Banu Kindah...When he was arrested and was brought to Abu Bakar, he was unshackled and got his sister (Farwah Bint Abi Quhafa) married to him.”

Now, how did Asha'ath bin Qais repay this favor?

فاخترط سيفه ودخل سوق الإبل فجعل لا يرى ناقاة ولا جملا إلا عرقبه وصاح الناس كفر الأشعث ثم طرح سيفه وقال والله ما كفرت ولكن هذا الرجل زوجني أخته ولو كنا في بلادنا لكانت لنا وليمة غير هذه يا أهل المدينة انحروا وكلوا ويا أهل الإبل تعالوا خذوا شرواها

He unsheathed his sword and thereafter entered the market of Camels and without discriminating between male or female camels, proceeded to slice off their humps. People, thus exclaimed Asha'ath you have (yet again) become a disbeliever (kafir). He then threw his sword and said: ‘By God, I have not apostatized, but this person (your Caliph) has given his sister in marriage to me, and were we in our country, we would have also thrown a banquet. O citizens of Medina, slaughter and feast, O camel owners, come hereby and take revenge.

1. Siyar alam-al-Nubala, Volume 2, pages 38 39

2. al Mujam-al Kabir, at-Tabarani, v1, tradition # 649, p237, Baghdad Edition)

And take note that the editor to al-Mujam-al Kabir namely Mahshi Hamdi Abdulmajeed Salafi, has stated regarding this tradition:

“All narrators of this tradition are narrators of Sahih with the exception of Abd al-Momin bin Ali but he it Thiqa”

Along the same lines al-Haythami in Majmua al-Zawaid, Volume 9 page 115 has certified the tradition as authentic.

Dhahabi in the same work records a very humorous incident worth mentioning:

دخل الأشعث على علي في شيء فتهدهه بالموت فقال علي بالموت تهددني ما أباليه

هاتوا لي جامعة وقيدا ثم أوماً إلى أصحابه قال فطلبوا إليه فيه ف تركه

Asha'ath went to Ali for some work, however (due to his lowly stature) he began to threaten to kill Ali. Ali said: ‘You want me to fear death, I am not unnerved by it, bring forth a collar chain and a sharp knife’. Then Ali pointed towards his companions (i.e. arrest this man), but upon their intercession on Asha'ath behalf, Ali let him go.

Siyar alam-al-Nubala, Volume 2 pages 40 41

Despite his apostasy (Irtad) and disbelief (kufr) what was the reason behind giving him such benefits and grants? The daughter of this brother in law of Abu Bakar poisoned Imam Hasan (as) while Ja'da's brother Muhammad was the key men to Ubaydullah Ibn Ziyad and played a vital role against Muhammad bin Aqil (as). What shall we learn from warm and healthy relations the father of Ja'da had with the rulers and that of his policy of betrayal and hypocrisy towards Ali bin Abi Talib (as)?

Reasons behind the poisoning of Imam Hasan (as)

Abu Sulaiman then seeks to use some logic as follows:

“...The truth is that Al-Hasan made peace with Mu’awiyah, and gave him the leadership and the allegiance. Therefore, for what reason would Mu’awiyah poison Al-Hasan?”

Mu’awiyah despite gaining power saw in Imam Hasan (as) a formidable opponent. As Abu Sulaiman admits Mu’awiyah wanted Yazeed to succeed him. This contradicted one of the conditions stipulated in the agreement with Imam Hasan (as) namely that in the event of Mu’awiyah’s death khilafath would RETURN to Hasan. See:

Fatah ul Bari Sharh Bukhari, Volume 13 page 65 Kitab al Fitn
Mirqaat Sharh Mishkaat, Volume 11 page 38 Bab Manaqib Ahl’l bayt
al Bidayah wa al Nihaya, Volume 8 page 80 Dhikr 57 Hijri
al Istiab, Volume 1 page 37 Dhikr Imam Hasan

Mu’awiyah had no intention to comply with this, to ensure the best approach would be to kill Imam Hasan (as) during his own lifetime. The famous commtentry of Sunan Abu Dawood has been written by Allamah Shams ul Haq Haqqani which is known as ‘Awn al Mabud Sharah Sunan Abu Dawud’ Volume 11 page 128 wherein he records:

لأن معاوية رضي الله عنه كان يخاف على نفسه من زوال الخلافة عنه

“Mu’awiyah (ra) was afraid of losing his caliphahte”

Late Salafi scholar Maulana Waheed uz Zaman Khan Hyderabad states in his commentary of Sunan Abu Dawood:

“As long as Imam Hasan (ra) lived, Muawiyah was afraid of loosing caliphate”

Sunan Abu Dawood, Volume 3 page 273 Hadith 731 (Quran Mahal, Opp. Molvi Musafir Khana, Karachi)

Renowned Egyptian academic Dr Taha Husayn in his book ‘Ali wa BanooH’ (Ali and his sons) translated in Urdu as “Ali (ra)” by Maulana Abdul Hameed Numani on page 214 writes:

“By poisoning Hasan, Mu’awiyah and Amr bin Aas had made the way clear for making Yazeed the next khalifa”.

Ali, page 214

Similarly we read in Ahl’ul Sunnah’s esteemed work ‘Maqatil al Talibeen’ Volume 1 page 13:

ودس معاوية إليه حين أراد أن يعهد إلى يزيد بعده، وإلى سعد بن أبي وقاص سماً فماتا منه في أيام متقاربة. وكان الذي تولى ذلك من الحسن زوجته ” جعدة ” بنت الأشعث بن قيس لمال بذله لها معاوية.

“Muawiyah administered poison to him (Hasan) when he wanted to appoint Yazeed, and poisoned Saad bin Abi Waqas and they both died in close days. The one who administered poison to al-Hasan was his wife J’ada bin al-Ash’ath bin Qais, for which she was rewarded with money, paid to her by Mu’awiyah”

Maqatil Talibeen, Volume 1 page 13

The sole reason that Mu’awiyah sought to kill Imam Hasan (as) was so that he could renege on the peace he had made, and place his drunkard son onto the throne of Rasulullah (s). Our assertion is further strenghtned when

we take account of the fact that in ‘Al Imama wa al Siyasia’ page 155 Dhikr bayya Yazeed we learn:

“An Iraqi tribal chief said to Mu’awiya ‘As long as Hasan is alive the people of Iraq and Hijaz shall not give bayya to Yazeed.’”

Mu’awiya poisoned the Chief of the youth of Paradise Imam Hasan (as) to strengthen the seat of his Fasiq son Yazeed. Through this poisoning we can see a clear sign of Mu’awiya’s evil nature. He had no intention of honouring the promise that he had reached and signed as part of the peace treaty with Imam Hasan (as), and in this connection we read in Sahih Bukhari, Kitab al Iman Volume 1, Book 2, Number 32:

“The Prophet said, “The signs of a hypocrite are three:

1. Whenever he speaks, he tells a lie.
2. Whenever he promises, he always breaks it (his promise).
3. If you trust him, he proves to be dishonest. (If you keep something as a trust with him, he will not return it.)”

Consider this Hadith and measure it against the way Mu’awiya acted when agreeing terms with Imam Hasan (as). He breached the terms, by planning to make Yazeed Khalifa, during the lifetime of Imam Hasan (as), thus proving that he was a dishonest, untrustworthy liar.

Mu’awiya’s pleasure upon hearing about the death of Imam Hasan (as)

Even if ‘Abu Sulaiman refuses to accept this evidence, one thing is for certain – Mu’awiya’s reaction upon hearing the death of Imam Hasan (as) proves his evil nature. We will evidence this from the following esteemed Sunni works:

Akhbar al Tawaal, page 221, Dhikr Hasan

Aqd al Fareed, Volume 1 page 225 Dhikr Hasan

al Imama wa al Siyasia, page 159 Dhikr Hasan

Tarikh Khamees, Volume 2 page 294

Hayat al Haywaan, Volume 1 page 84 Dhikr Hasan

Tadhkiratul Khawaas, page 123 Dhikr Hasan

Nuzul Abrar by Allamah Badkashani al-Harithi, page 85 Dhikr Hasan

Muruj al Dhahab, Volume 3 page 8, Wafaat Hasan

Habeeb al Syaar, Volume 1 page 19 Dhikr Hasan

Maqatil Hasnayn, Volume 1 page 140

Tayseer al Bari fee Sharh Sahih Bukhari as per ‘Maula aur Mu’awiya’ page 332

Dhurat ul Ma’arif, Volume 4 page 756 Dhikr Yazeed

Rabi’ ul Abrar, Volume 4 pages 186 & 209

Tareekh Abul Fida

Wafayat al-A’ayan, by Ibn Khalakan, Vol 2 page 67

Allamah Zamakshari in Rabi’ ul Abrar notes:

“Upon receiving news of Hasan’s death, Mu’awiya paid a prostration of thanks”.

Rabi’ ul Abrar, Volume 4 pages 186 & 209

al Imama wa al Siyasa:

“Upon receiving news of Hasan’s death, Mu’awiya displayed such signs of pleasure that he made a prostration of thanks as did those with him”

Allamah Abu Hanifa Ahmed bin Dawud Dinori records in ‘Akhbar al Tawaal’:

Muawiyah (ra) got the news of Hasan’s (ra) death, Muawiyah was informed about this by the Marwan the ruler of Madina. Thus Muawiyah called on Ibn Abbas [ra] who was there in Syria during those days. When he came, Muawiyah expressed condolence as well as pleasure over the death of Hasan. Therefore Ibn Abbas [ra] said: ‘Don’t be happy over the death of Hasan’.

Akhbar al Tawaal (Urdu), published by Urdu board Lahore.

Nuzlul Abrar:

“Upon receiving news of Hasan’s death, Mu’awiya recited Takbeer in a loud voice as did the people of Syria. Fakhra bint Qulaya asked ‘Why are you reciting Takbeer so loudly? Mu’awiya said ‘Hasan has died’. Fakhra then said “You are reciting a Takbeer of joy at the death of the son of Fatima?”. To which Mu’awiya said “Not on account of joy, rather comfort and ease has reached my heart”

Mu’awiya’s denial that he is happy is a pure lie, you only have comfort in your heart when you are happy, and a closed heart is on account of sadness. Allamah Kamaluddin Muhammad bin Musa Damiri (d. 808 H) in ‘Hayaat al Haywaan’ and Allamah Diyar Bakri al-Maliki in ‘Tareekh Khamees’ recorded this narration:

Ibn Abbas approached Mu’awiya, and Mu’awiya said: ‘Do you know what happened to your household?’ Ibn Abbas said: ‘I am unaware of any thing, all I know is that you are happy, and I heard that you recited a loud Takbeer’. Mu’awiya said: ‘Hasan has died’.

Hayat al Haywaan, Volume 1 page 84 Dhikr Hasan

Tarikh Khamees, Volume 2 page 294

Allamah Ibn Abd Rabih in his esteemed book ‘Aqd al Fareed’ records the following incident:

ولما بلغ معاوية موت الحسن بن علي خر ساجداً لله ثم أرسل إلى ابن عباس وكان معه في

الشام فعزاه وهو مُستبشر

“Upon receiving news of Hasan’s death, Mu’awiya became happy made a prostration of thanks. He then sent a message to Ibn Abbas and summoned him. When Ibn Abbas came, although Muawiyah advanced his condolence for Hasan but he was happy over the death”

Maqatil al Husayn:

“Mu’awiya said: ‘News has reached me of the death of Hasan’, and he displayed signs of happiness”

We read in Tareekh Abul Fida:

ولما بلغ معاوية موت الحسن خر ساجداً.

“When Muawiyah came to know about the death of al-Hasan, he performed a prostration of thanks”

Ibn Khalakan records:

ولما كتب مروان إلى معاوية بشكاته كتب إليه أن أقبل المطي إلى بخبر الحسن ولما بلغه موته سمع تكبيرا من الحضرة فكبر أهل الشام لذلك التكبير فقالت فاختة زوجة معاوية أقر الله عينك يا أمير المؤمنين ما الذي كبرت له؟ قال مات الحسن

When Marwan wrote a complaint to Muawiyah, he mentioned that he has been informed that Hassan had passed away. When Muawiyah heard the news, he did Takbir and the people of Khadra area performed Takbir too and so did the people Shaam. Thus Fathkita, Muawiyah's wife said: 'O commander of believers, may Allah please you, for what you did Takbir?' He replied: 'Hassan has died'.

Is this type of love Allah (swt) commands his faithful to bestow on the Ahl'ul bait expressing joy upon their deaths? Those that are happy at the tragedy that befalls the Ahl'ul bayt (as) adhere to the Sunnah of Mu'awiyah.

Mu'awiyah's not considering the death of Imam Hasan (as) as a calamity and the Sunni Ulema's acknowledgement that this demonstrated his hatred towards the family of Ali (as)

We read in Sunan Abu Daud Book 32, hadith Number 4119:

Narrated Al-Miqdam ibn Ma'dikarib:

"Khalid said: Al-Miqdam ibn Ma'dikarib and a man of Banu Asad from the people of Qinnisrin went to Mu'awiyah ibn AbuSufyan.

Mu'awiyah said to al-Miqdam: Do you know that al-Hasan ibn Ali has died? Al-Miqdam recited the Qur'anic verse "We belong to Allah and to Him we shall return."

A man asked him: Do you think it a calamity? He replied: Why should I not consider it a calamity when it is a fact that the Apostle of Allah (peace_be_upon_him) used to take him on his lap, saying: This belongs to me and Husayn belongs to Ali?

The man of Banu Asad said: (He was) a live coal which Allah has extinguished. Al-Miqdam said: Today I shall continue to make you angry and make you hear what you dislike. He then said: Mu'awiyah, if I speak the truth, declare me true, and if I tell a lie, declare me false.

Allamah Shams ul Haq Azeem Abadi in his famed commentary on Sunan Abu Dawood commonly known as 'Awn-ul-Mabood' revealed the following about "a man" mentioned in the cited tradition of Sunan Abu Dawood. Allamah Shams ul Haq records:

فقال له فلان (وفي بعض النسخ وقع رجل مكان فلان والمراد بفلان هو معاوية بن أبي سفيان رضي الله تعالى عنه والمؤلف لم يصرح باسمه وهذا دأبه في مثل ذلك وقد أخرج أحمد في مسنده من طريق حيوة بن شريح حدثنا بقر بن سعد عن خالد بن معدان قال وفد المقدم بن معد يكرب وفيه فقال له معاوية أيراهم مصيبة الحديث

(أتعدها) وفي بعض النسخ أترها أي أنعد يا أيها المقدم حادثة موت الحسن رضي الله تعالى عنه مصيبة والعجب كل العجب من معاوية فإنه ما عرف قدر أهل البيت حتى قال ما

قال فإن موت الحسن بن علي رضي الله عنهما من أعظم المصائب وجرى الله المقدم رضي عنه فإنه ما سكت عن تكلم الحق حتى أظهره وهكذا شأن المؤمن الكامل المخلص

“...Fa Qaala Lahu Fulan...”(And so-and-so said to him)

In some texts, the word “Rajul”(a man) occurs in the place of “Fulan”(so-and-so), and what is intended by “Fulan”is Muawiyah ibn Abi Sufyan. The author (i.e. Imam Abu Dawood) did not let it be known, as this was his practise. Ahmad (ibn Hanbal) has reported in his Musnad through Haiwah ibn Shareeh, Baqiyyah, Baheer ibn Sa’d, from Khalid ibn Ma’dan who said: “And Muawiyah asked him whether he thought it was a calamity...”(the rest of the above hadeeth).

“...A-Ta’adaha...”(Do you consider this...?)

In some texts it is “A-Taraaha”(Do you see this...?), that is to consider. This means: ‘Do you regard, oh Miqdam, this event of the death of Al-Hasan as a calamity?’ Astonishment upon astonishment to Muawiyah. Surely he never recognised the status of the Ahlul-Bait, (Muawiyah) saying what he said. For surely the death of Al-Hasan ibn Ali (RA) is the greatest of tragedies. May Allah reward Miqdam, and may He be pleased with him, for he did not stay silent from speaking the truth, until he proclaimed it. And this is the sign of a genuine and pious believer.

Awn al Mabood Sharah Sunan Abu Dawood, Volume 11 page 127

Late Salafi scholar Maulana Waheed uz Zaman Khan Hyderabad in his commentary of this Hadeeth said:

“Muawiyah’s saying about the death of Imam Hassan (ra) that it was not a calamity was based on biasness against Ali and his progeny. May Allah keep us along with AhleBait on the day of judgement, and may Allah we are raised with them. Amin”

Sunan Abu Dawood, Volume 3 page 273 Hadith 731 (Quran Mahal, Opp. Molvi Musafir Khana, Karachi)

Despite this, Nasibies are still blind when it comes to the behaviour of Mu’awiya.

Paksitani Hanafi scholar Allamah Khalil Ahmad Chisti in his book Maula aur Mu’awiya citing Tayseer al Bari Sharh Bukhari states that it was actually Mu’awiya who said “He (Hasan) was a live coal which Allah has extinguished”.

Another Deobandi Hanafi scholar Malik Ghulam ‘Ali in his book “Khiafaat aur Mulukiyat par Aitrazaat ka Tajziya” [Analysis of criticism of the book Khilafat aur Mulukiyat] page 338 cites Waheed uz Zaman’s text Tayseer al-Bari in his discussion of this episode that:

“Ameer Mu’awiya’s heart was not pure with regards to the Ahl’ul bayt”.

Malik Ghulam Ali also in “Khiafaat aur Mulukiyat par Aitrazaat ka Tajziya” page 340 quoting further comments from ‘Awn Maboodh Sharh Sunan Abu Daud’ said as follows:

“Maulana Sham al Haqq Haqqani stated, Mu’awiya failed to recognised the esteemed station that had been afforded to the Ahl’ul bayt, he said such a thing at a time when Imam Hasan had died, this was a major tragedy and Miqdam recited the couplets of truth at that tragic time, he did not remain silent, and this is the sign of a pious momin. The comments of the man from

the Asad tribe were said so as to please Mu'awiya. He went close to Mu'awiya and said '(He was) a live coal which Allah has extinguished'. Such strong and obnoxious language was said before Mu'awiya (as with Hasan present he felt that some aspects of reign were in danger)".

We agree with this assertion this was said by this Nasibi to please Mu'awiya. Notice how Mu'awiya at no point reprimands the individual for such a disgraceful comment. If this is not proof within itself that Mu'awiya supported this view, notice the comment of:

Al-Miqdam said: Today I shall continue to make you angry and make you hear what you dislike.

He then proceeds some faults that he noticed in Mu'awiya. The man from Asad's failure to ask permission BEFORE he slandered Imam Hasan (as) in the presence of Mu'awiya is clear proof that he was fully aware that such a comment would not offend Mu'awiya.

In this day and age these supporters of Mu'awiya seek to incite hatred against the Shi'a for they disrespect the Sahaba. We should point out to these Nasibis that their Imam Mu'awiya would disrespect the family of Rasulullah (s) and that insults about Imam Hasan (as) were said in his presence so as to please him.

Hanafi scholar Maulana Sultan Mahmood in his footnote of the Urdu translation of Sunan Abu Daud Volume 3 page 273 states:

"Mu'awiya did not consider Imam Hasan's martyrdom as a sad matter, this was on account of his animosity towards 'Ali and his family'".

Sunan Abu Daud Voul. 3 page 273

Nasibi conjecture about Imam Hasan (as) receiving stipends from Muawiyah's government

Nawasib in one way or another have always sought to prove the validity of the Muawiyah's reign but in vain. One of the feeble attempts in this regard is their notion that since Imam Hasan (as) took stipends from Muawiyah after the peace treaty, therefore it serves as a proof that according to Imam Hasan (as) the caliphate of Muawiyah was rightful.

Reply one

If an oppressor snatches a right of a oppressed person and afterwards the former returns some of the snatched quantity in installments to the latter, it doesn't mean that:

The oppressor is merciful towards oppressed person

The acceptance of some of the rights in installments by the oppressed person doesn't mean that the remaining wealth in possession of the oppressor has become legal.

Consider the example of occupied Palestine. The Palestinians have entered into an agreement with the Israeli occupiers, as a result of which they have returned certain land such as Gaza back to the Palestinians. The partial return of the Gaza strip does not mean that the Israeli occupation of other Palestinian land is lawful, the Israelis remain oppressors, and the Palestinians remained oppressed.

By the same logic we say that Imam Hasan (as) was the true successor of Holy Prophet [s] and was the rightful owner of all the wealth while

Muawiyah was the ruler at that time and was an usurper, if he returned some of that wealth to Imam Hasan [a] in installments, that doesn't make his usurped caliphate to be referred to as a rightful caliphate.

Reply Two

Prophet Musa (as) was brought up in the house of Firawn from the infancy and was dependent upon the provisions and wealth provided to him by Firawn. Despite this, the prophet remained a prophet and the infidel remained an infidel. Similarly, Imam Hasan (as) kept taking stipends from the treasury during the rule of Muawiyah but the rightful Imam remained a rightful Imam and the oppressor remained an oppressor.

Reply Three

Yusuf (as) was a prophet, but remained in the house of a Kafir King and relied on his wealth throughout his childhood and a time came when He (as) was appointed by the Kafir King as the supervisor of provisions, even then the Prophet remained a Prophet and the infidel remained infidel. Similarly, even if Imam Hasan (as) accepted stipends from the wealth of the state, what harm was in it? The Imam remained an Imam and the transgressor remained a transgressor.

Reply Four

The treasury (Bait al Maal) was not the personal property of Muawiyah rather it is established for the development and prosperity of the Muslims and from that house, whatever Muawiyah would send to Imam Hasan (as), would be used by him (as) to meet his basic needs with the remainder distributed to the poor, orphan and needy ones, thus Imam Hasan (as) used to take the right of the people from an usurper and oppressor and would ensure it reaches the hands of those legally entitled to receive it.

Reply Five

Having provided these logical arguments, let us now cite a Sunni source which serve as the the final nail in the coffin of Nasibi 'evidence' of Imam Hasan a[s] supposedly accepting the caliphate of Muawiyah. An esteemed Sunni Muhadith, Faqih and commentator Shaykh Abu Bakar Ahmed bin Ali Jasas Razi (d. 370) records in his authority work:

“Hasan Basri, Saed bin Jubayr, Shau'bi and all Tabayeen used to take stipends from oppressors, but not because they were friends with them or deemed their reign as legitimate, rather they used to take it because it was their own right which was in the hands of oppressors and Fajir people. How could this happen on the basis of friendship when they were confronted with Hajjaj via sword, four thousand Qura (scholars) who were the best and jurists amongst the Tabayeen fought against Hajjaj at Ahwaz under the leadership of Abdur Rehman bin Muhammad bin Ashas, and then fought Hajjaj in Basra and then at the places of Deer Jamajam near Furaat in Kufa. They had broken their allegiance with Abdul Malik bin Marwan, they used to curse and do Tabbara on them [Ummayad rulers]. Pirior to them, people had the same behavior with Muawiyah when he became ruler after the murder of Ali (as). And so Hasan and Hussain & the companions (sahaba) of that time (also used to take stipends from Muawiyah), they werent

friendly to him, in fact they used to do Tabbarra on him [Muawiyah] in the same manner as Ali (as) used to do (tabbarra) till Allah (swt) took Ali to paradise and Ridhwan. Thus, accepting the position of a judge and taking stipends from them [oppressors] does not mean that those people were on friendly terms with them or accepted their rulership.”

Ahkam al Quran al Jasas, Volume 1 pages 86-87 (Beirut)

Whilst the explanation advanced by an esteemed Sunni scholar shall suffice to shut the filthy mouths of Nawasib, we shall corroborate our stance by citing the words of one of the scholars of their own camp namely Imam Ghazzali:

“There were many among the companions who lived up to the time of tyrant rulers and used to accept properties from them. Such were Abu Hurairah, Abu Sayeed Khodri, Zaid bin Sabei, Abu Ayyub Ansari, Jarir bin Abdullah, Anas bin Malik and others. Some of them received from caliphs Marwan and Yazid bin Abul Malik, some from the tyrant governor Hajjaj. Imam Shafeyi received once from caliph Harun Rashid one thousand dinars. Imam Malik also received them from different caliphs. Hazrat Ali said: ‘Whatever a ruler gives you, he gives out of lawful things. He himself did not accept it out of greater sense of piety. When Imam Hasan came to caliph Muawiyah, the latter gave him four lac dirhams which he accepted. These sages used to accept properties of tyrant rulers. The supporters of above opinion say that some of the sages did not accept out of great sense of piety. This does not show that it is illegal.”

Ihya Ulum-id-din, Volume 2 page 98

Nasibi accusation on Aqeel bin Abi Talib

Having discussed the topic of Imam Hassan (as) receiving stipends from Muawiya, we deem it an appropriate place to also discuss a similar dogma held by Nawasib regarding the brother of Ali bin Abi Talib (as) namely Aqeel bin Abi Talib (as). Some Nawasib elements are of the view that Aqeel did not have good relationships with his brother Ali bin Abi Talib (as), and took stipends from Muawiya and never fought alongside Ali bin Abi Talib (as) particularly when he waged war against Muawiya.

Reply One – We have already provided an array of replies about accepting stipends from a tyrant

We have already cited Sunni opinions deem it permissible for people to take stipends from tyrants, and the same precedent applies in relation to Aqeel (ra).

Reply Two – Aqeel always held Ali (as) to be on the right path as compared to his views on Muawiya

If present day Nawasib suggest that Aqeel did not have a positive opinion of Ali bin Abi Talib (as) but did have such of Muawiya then they should know that their own spiritual father Muawiya held that very misapprehension as we read in Muruj al-Zahab, Volume 1 page 364:

وفد عليه عَقِيلُ بن أبي طالب منتجعاً وزائراً، فرحَّبَ به معاوية، وسُرَّ بوروده، لاختياره إياه علي أخيه، وأوسَّعَه حلماً واحتمالاً، فقال له: يا أبا يزيد، كيف تركت علياً؟ فقال: تركته

على ما يحبُّ الله ورسوله والفيتك على ما يكره الله ورسوله، فقال له معاوية، لولا أنك زائر
منتجع جنابنا لرددت عليك أيا يزيد جواباً تألم منه

Aqeel went to Mu'awiyah as a visitor, thus Mu'awiyah welcomed him and felt happy for his visit because he chose him over his brother. Mu'awiyah was hence extremely patient and tolerant towards him. Then he (Mu'awiyah) said: 'O Aba Yazid, how did you leave Ali?' He (Aqeel) replied: 'I left him in that same situation wherein Allah and his messenger loved him while I have met you in that same wherein Allah and his messenger abhor you'. Thus Mu'awiyah said to him: 'O Aba Yazid, if you were not a visitor, I would have given you a painful reply'.

We read in al-Istiab, Volume 3 page 1079:

ويزعمون أن معاوية قال يوماً بحضرتة: هذا لولا علمه بأبي خير له من أخيه لما أقام عندنا
وتركه. فقال عقيل: أخي خير لي في ديني وأنت خير لي في دنياي

"They claim that once Mu'awiyah said in his (Aqeel's) presence: 'If he didn't believe that now I was better than his brother he would not reside with us.' Thus Aqeel said: 'My brother is better for me for my religion whilst you are better for me for my life / world'.

Reply Three – The Bani Umayya fabricated texts to cast aspersions over Aqeel's relationship with Ali (as)

We read in al-Istiab, Volume 3 page 1079:

كان عقيل أكثرهم ذكراً لمثالب قريش فعادوه لذلك وقالوا فيه بالباطل ونسبوه إلى الحمق
واختلقوا عليه أحاديث مزورة

"Aqeel was the individual who that cited the most defects of the Quraish, they hence bore enmity towards him and attributed false things to him and claimed that he was a fool and they fabricated false traditions about him."

In light of this fact, we can deduce that it was the Bani Umayya that fabricated false stories about Aqeel so that they could attack the position of Ali bin Abi Talib (as). It is indeed ironic that the doubts that the today's Nawasib cast regarding Aqeel are on account of the very propaganda that was first perpetuated by their Bani Umayya ancestors.

Reply Four – Aqeel didn't participate in battles alongside Ali bin Abi Talib (as) due to illness

The reason Aqeel didn't participate in the battles of Jamal, Sifeen and Naharwan alongside Ali bin Abi Talib (as) was due illness as attested to by Imam Dhahabi in Tarikh al-Islam, Volume 4 page 84:

ثم هاجر اول سنة ثمان ثم عرض له مرض بعد شهوده غزوة مؤتة فلم نسمع له بذكر في
الفتح ولا ما بعدها

'Then he migrated in the beginning of the 8th year, and fell ill after attending the battle of Mota, we therefore here nothing of him after the Fatah fateh (conquest of Makka).'

Refuting the Nawasib claim that there existed a reciprocal warmth, respect and affection between Imam Hussain (as) and Muawiya

Since we have, in this chapter, discussed the evil stance of Muawiya towards Imam Hassan (as), it is relevant at this point to also shed some light on the relationship that between Muawiya and Imam Hussain (as) as the Nawasib have strove to paint a happy picture in this regard. One such example comes from Azam Tariq the slain leader of the terrorist organization who in his book Khutbaat-e-Jail alleged that the Shias of Iraq invited Imam Hussain (as) to rise against Muawiya but the Imam (as) sided with Muawiya and turned down their request.

The reality is that Imam Hassan (as), whilst writing down his views about Muawiya, had already expounded his reasons for not rising against him and Imam Hussain (as) likewise reiterated that same stance, namely that he did not deem Muawiya to be a just and rightful caliph. Dhahabi summarizes these authentic reports in his words as follows:

بلغنا أن الحسين لم يعجبه ما عمل أخوه الحسن من تسليم الخلافة إلى معاوية بل كان رأيه القتال ولكنه كظم وأطاع أخاه وبايع وكان يقبل جوائز معاوية ومعاوية يرى له ويحترمه ويجعله فلما أن فعل معاوية ما فعل بعد وفاة السيد الحسن من العهد بالخلافة إلى ولده يزيد تألم الحسين وحق له وامتنع هو وابن أبي بكر وابن الزبير من المبايعة حتى قهرهم معاوية وأخذ بيعتهم مكرهين وغلبوا وعجزوا عن سلطان الوقت

We have become aware of the fact that Hussain was unhappy with Hassan's handing over the caliphate to Muawia. Hussain's opinion was that a war should be waged upon Muawia but he remained temperate and patient and showed obedience to his brother and gave allegiance to Muawia. He would accept stipends from Muawia, whilst Muawia also gave regards and respected him. When after the death of Hassan, Muawia appointed his son Yazid as crown prince for the purpose of caliphate, that deeply hurt Hussain and rightly so, on his part. Thus Hussain, Abdul Rahman bin Abi Bakar and Ibn Zubair did not pledge allegiance to Yazid's right to caliphate until Muawia forced and coerced them to pay their allegiance to Yazid. They were overwhelmed and helpless in front of the strength and force of the ruler of the time.

Siyar aalam-al-Nubala Volume 3 pages 291-292

Following the death of Imam Hassan (as), Mussayib bin Najbah and various other people approached Imam Hussain (as) and suggested that he wage war against Muawia. Those people mentioned that they were aware of his stance and that of his brother, Imam Hassan. Imam Hussain (as) then stated to them:

أرجو أن يعطي الله أخي على نيته وأن يعطيني على نيتي في حبي جهاد الظالمين

“I hope that Allah will reward my brother for his intention and reward me for my love of Jihad against oppressors”

1. Siyar aalam-al-Nubala Volume 3 page 294

2. Tahdheeb by Ibn Asakir, Volume 4, page 330

Marwan bin Hakam wrote to Muawiya that he feared that Hussain would become the centre of tumult for him (Muawiya) and cause him major difficulties. Muawiya responded by penning an admonishing letter to Hussain (as):

... فكتب إليه الحسين أتاني كتابك وأنا بغير الذي بلغك جدير وما أردت لك محاربة

ولا خلافا وما أظن لي عذرا عند الله في ترك جهادك وما أعلم فتنة أعظم من ولايتك ...

“A person who has alleged his allegiance and attested in the name of Allah should fulfill his promise. I have been informed that a few people from Kufa have invited you to wage war against me. You have already tested these people; they did not stand with your father and brother. Hence, be afraid of Allah and honor your promise and if you plan against me, I shall wage war against you”. Hussain wrote to him: ‘I have received your letter. What you have heard is not worthy of my standards. I haven’t made any intention of waging a war or opposing you but I think that Allah will not accept any excuse for not waging a war (Jihad) against you, according to me there is no bigger sedition than your government’.

1. Siyar alam-an-Nubala, Volume 3 page 294

2. Tareekh Al-Islam, Volume 2 page 341

Like other typical Nasibi authors, Azam Tariq likewise alleged that both Imam Hassan and Imam Hussain (as) deemed Muawiya a just and rightful caliph. This lummo and his delusional forefathers have lied. As per the aforementioned words of a great Sunni scholar, Imam Hussain (as) had in fact declared that Muawiya:

was most worthy of being fought against or killed

was unjust and he, the Imam (as) would have no excuse before Allah for not waging a war (Jihad) against Muawiya, thus implying that it was correct to pursue a course of Jihad against Muawiya but circumstances prevented him from doing so.

was at the helm of the most seditious form of Government, whilst the Quran stipulates:

Tumult is worse than the act of murder. Keep waging war on these non-believers until tumult is no more.

Hence, according to Imam Hussain (as), Muawiya was symbolized the worse form of sedition; he was the incarnation of tumult, that thus rendered his Government and his being at its helm to be the epitome of sedition. Unfortunately, Imam Hussain (as) had very few trustworthy supporters and delegates and therefore desisted from waging jihad.

Muawiya’s will for his son Yazeed

Azam Tariq writes in his book Khutbat Jail, pages 334-335:

“Now with Hadhrat Ameer Muawiya’s death approaching, he announced Yazid as his heir to save the Ummah from separation and divergence and obtained the allegiance from all the Islamic Kingdom however Hadhrat Hussain, Hadhrat Abdulah bin Zubair (ra) and a few other companions of the Prophet did not pledge their allegiance to Yazid. That is why at the time of his death, Hadhrat Ameer Muawiya’s last will to Yazid,

as recorded in Jila al-Ayun page 431 by the great Shia Mujtahid Mullah Baqir Majlisi is as follows:

‘But you are aware of the relation and affinity of Hussain with the Holy Prophet (s) i.e. he is part of Prophet’s body and he has been brought up through Prophet’s flesh and blood. I am aware that the people of Iraq will call him and will not help him, they will abandon him. If you overwhelm him, then do recognize his rights and respect and do remember his status and affinity to the Prophet of Allah. Do not impeach him for his acts and do not break the terms that I have strengthened with him during this time and beware not to hurt him in any manner’

Reply

This will of Muawiya has been derived from the non-basic books of Ahle Sunnah and these words were not spoken by Muawiya to his son Yazeed to support and protect Imam Hussain (as) it was merely part and parcel of the dirty politics that Muawiya adhered to. Ironically, as usual, the ill-advised author has stuttered and copied this narration dishonestly by omitting the following text:

“Muawiya’s intention with this will was the protection of Yazeed the impure’s government and country as he was very much aware of the fact that after the martyrdom of Imam Hussain, instability will plague the government and all, believers and hypocrites alike would abandon Yazeed.”

Jila al-Ayun, page 324, printed in Iran

Furthermore, it has already been narrated before that Muawiya personally wrote to Imam Hussain and within that correspondence stated:

فإنك متى تكذبني أكذك

“if you plan against me, I shall wage war against you”

When Muawiya himself intended to violently deal with Imam Hussain how can he insist that his son behave in a respectful? Muawiya’s real intention can be gauged from the contents of his will as recorded by Dhahabi:

ولما حضر معاوية دعا يزيد فأوصاه وقال انظر حسينا فإنه أحب الناس إلى الناس فصل

رحمه وارفق به فإن يك منه شيء فسيكفيك الله بمن قتل أباه وخذل أخاه

When Muawiya’s time of death approached, he asked for Yazeed. He bequeathed Yazeed and said: ‘Keep an eye on Hussain. He is the most favorite personality amongst the people. Treat him nicely and adopt kind behavior towards him. If he does something (against you) then Allah will be sufficient for you through those people who through Allah killed betrayed his brother’.

Siyar aalam-al-Nubala, Volume 3 page 295

Muawiya’s use of the term “through those people” clearly alludes to the fact that he was referring to the Nawasib and traitors from Kufa and Syria who served as a conduit for Muawiya via which he was successfully able to remove the Imam (as) from power, oppress him and thereafter execute him.

In light of the above reference, we can ascertain that Muawiya opined that:

Allah helped him by killing Hussain's father Ali bin Abi Talib (God forbid) and dishonoring Hassan unlike him (God forbid).

Allah would enable his son to prevail over Hussain via the same people (God forbid).

Allah would facilitate the same end to Hussain via the same hypocrites and traitors that his father and brother faced.

Can the abovementioned opinion evidence that Muawiya afforded respect towards Imam Hussain and left a will that his son behave in an impeccable, decent manner towards him? If anything one can deduce from the advice a suggestion to kill Imam Hussain should he seek to rise up. The will dictating an inference to kill the Imam (as) is a later issue, the fact is, during his reign, Muawiya had himself made a firm decision to kill Imam Hussain (as). Had Allah not favored Imam Hussain (as), he would have been martyred in Makkah in 56 A.H instead of Karbalain 61 A.H. but it was the Imam's far-sightedness and situational analysis that neutralized Muawiya's evil machinations had the Imam (as) not acted in this manner Muawiya would have no doubt disposed of him during his own reign. Yazeed was taught in this will not to abstain from shedding Hussain's blood to enable the stability of his reign. Yazeed followed this lesson to the hilt and sent thirty people dressed as pilgrims to Makkah so that they could assassinate Hussain (as) even if he was circumambulating the Kaba. One can therefore conclude with certainty that Muawiya aided and abetted Hussain's, murder, had he not done so, his death threats would have been otiose. However, Muawiya's all time heartiest wish was fulfilled by his son Yazeed.

Muawiya threatened to kill Imam Hussain (as)

In the previous pages we have mentioned that according to Imam Dhahabi, Imam Hussain, Ibn Zubair and Ibn Abi Bakar had maintained silence over Yazid's allegiance on account of their being coerced into doing so. Dhahabi explains the details as to how they were forced and rendered helpless:

ثم اعتمر سنة ست وخمسين في رجب وكان بينه وبين الحسين وابن عمر وابن الزبير وابن أبي بكر كلام فيبيعة العهد ليزيد ثم قال إني متكلم بكلام فلا تردوا علي أقتلكم فخطب وأظهر أنهم قد بايعوا وسكتوا ولم ينكروا

Then Muawiya intended to perform Umrah during the month of Rajab in 56 A.H. Hence, discussions were held between Hussain, Ibn Umar, Ibn Zubair, Ibn Abi Bakar and Muawiya over the issue of for Yazeed's allegiance. Eventually, Muawiya said: 'I will make an announcement and you will not negate it otherwise I will kill you'. Then Muawiya gave a sermon and pretended as if those people had agreed to pledge their allegiance Yazeed. These people remained quiet and did not negate Muawiya.

Siyar aalam-al-Nubal,a Volume 3 pages 137-138

The incident that has been reported by Dhahabi so as to flatter Muawiya and has also been reported by other prominent Sunni scholars such as Ibn

Athir in a more elaborate manner. Muawiya called the abovementioned personalities who were against the allegiance of Yazeed and threatened them and made it clear that he would address the people and that they were not to utter a single word either to endorse or negate him, a failure to do so would result in their necks being removed before their lips moved. To evidence this intention Muawiya summoned the commander of his special armed troops and ordered that these people sit by the pulpit and that a soldier be assigned on both sides, left and right, of each of these people with sword, and that he beheads them as soon as their lips move. The four individuals therefore remained quite on account of Muawiya's threats their silence thus implying that they has paid allegiance to Yazeed. When Muawiya left Madina right after this operation, the people came to ask these people individually as to why they had now pledged to Yazeed when they had hitherto not done so? It was at that point that they revealed the real situation and told the entire incident.

Similarly, all time favorite scholar of Nawasib namely Ibn Kathir has unsurprisingly also favored Muawiya and shortened this incident but has failed to hide the truth. His peculiar words are as follows:

استدعى كل واحد من هؤلاء الخمسة فأوعده وتهدده بانفراده

“Muawiya called those five people individually and threatened them”

Then we read:

ثم خطب معاوية وهؤلاء حضور تحت منبره، وبايع الناس ليزيد وهم قعود ولم يوافقوا ولم يظهرُوا خلافاً، لما تهددهم وتوعدهم

Then Muawiya gave a sermon to the people whilst these personalities sat by the pulpit. People pledged their allegiance to Yazeed whilst they remained sitting and watching everything. They did not agree or disagree because Muawiya had already threatened and oppressed them.”

Al-Bidayah wal-Nihayah, Volume 8, pages 79-80

How can a person stop his son from murdering Hussain (as) when he himself came close to implementing that very act? Some wills of Muawiya bin abi Sufian that have been recorded in the history works have been influenced by craftiness, dishonesty and hypocrisy so that the people of later times would not know that that Muawiya was an enemy of the Ahlulbayt (as) but Muawiya 's character could not remain hidden as he was aware that Yazeed's government would not last long in the presence of Imam Hussain (as). In light of this reality, he sought to teach him fraudulent excuses and tricks that is part and parcel of being a dishonest, conniving politician. The truth however is that historical facts cannot be hidden like this.

Concluding this chapter

We are told that an individual should not express pleasure at the death of his enemy. Yet the geart of Mu'awiya bin Hinda was filled with such hatred towards the family of the Prophet (s), that he expressed joy at the death of Imam Hasan (as), and made a prostration of thanks. One who behaves in such a manner is clearly an enemy of the Ahl'ul bayt (as). One who refuses to silence insolence towards Imam Hasan (as) when hearing of his death, is

content with such comments and will only have such patience on account of his hatred of Imam Hasan (as). Hence calling such a person Radhinathalloho (may Allah be pleased with him) and Sayyidina causes pains to the Prophet (s) and constitutes opposition to the Deen.

Fatwa of Shah Abdul Aziz Dehlavi, “One that expresses happiness at the suffering of Ahl’ul bayt (as) is a murtad”

In Tauhfah Ithna Ashariyya Shah Abdul Aziz states on page 263:

“What view should we hold of those people who express happiness on Ashura when Imam Hussain was killed, who marry on that day who disrespect the family of the Prophet and the descendants of Sayyida Fatima? It is correct to refer to such individuals as Murtad”.

If expressing happiness on the day that the Ahl’ul bayt (as) experienced problem is in the eyes of Shah Abdul Aziz apostacy, then what view should we hold of Mu’awiya who poisoned Imam Hasan (as), and expressed happiness upon hearing that the Imam was dead? We have Mu’awiya’s happiness at the death of the Imam (as) from a plethora of esteemed Sunni works. We thank the Shah and appeal to those with logic to think, who comes within this Fatwa of apostacy? We leave it to Mu’awiya’s spiritual descendants to pass verdict on the son of Hind in light of the Shah’s Fatwa.

Chapter Six: Mu'awiya the baghi (rebel)

Ali (as) was the Imam and rightful caliph of the time

This fact is confirmed by the leading Ahl'ul Sunnah Ulema. We have cited a number of sources for those wishing to delve in to the matter.

Sharah Maqasid, page 24

Al Sawaiq al Muhriqa, page 139

Al Ma'arif, page 90

Riyadh al Nadhira, Vol 3 page 293

Usud ul Ghaba, Vol 4 page 113

al-Isti'ab, Volume 3 page 55

al-Isaba, Vol 2 page 503

al-Bidaya, Vol 7 page 226

Tahdheeb ul Tahdheeb page 338 Volume 7

Nisai al Kaafiya page

al Imama wal Siyasa oage 44 Vol 1

Tarikh ul Khulafa page 174

Al-Akhbar al Tawal page 140

Sharah Aqaid al-Nasfi, page 105

We read in Sharah Maqasid:

والذي اتفق عليه أهل الحق أن المصيب في جميع ذلك علي رضي الله تعالى عنه لما ثبت من إمامته ببيعة أهل الحل والعقد وظهر من تفاوت ما بينه وبين المخالفين سيما معاوية وأحزابه وتكاثر من الأخبار في كون الحق معه وما وقع عليه الاتفاق حتى من الأعداء إلى أنه أفضل زمانه وأنه لا أحق بالإمامة منه والمخالفون بغاة لخروجهم على الإمام الحق

The righteous people agreed that Ali (ra) was right in all those events as his Imamate was correct which was proved through baya and also it's obvious the difference (in ethics) between him and his opponents particularly Mu'awiyah and his party, also there are many traditions which indicate that the truth is with Ali, and also the agreement including the enemies that he was the best person of his time and no body was worthier to be the Imam other than him, his opponents were Baghi for opposing the true Imam.

We read in Al-Bidayah:

وخرج علي إلى المسجد فصعد المنبر وعليه إزار وعمامة خز ونعلاه في يده، توكأ على قوسه، فبايعه عامة الناس،

“At the time of Bayya, Ali approached the mosque, got on the Minbar and the general public gave him bayya”

This refutes Nasibi claims that he didn't get ijma hence Mu'awiya opposition to Imam e Haqq made him a baghi who could not place conditions

Abu Hainfa Dinwari records in Al-Akhbar al-Tawal:

“After Uthman's death people were without an Imam for three days. They gave Ali bayya after careful thought and he said whoever opposes me has opposed Islam as this decision was not taken in haste”.

Sharah Aqaid al-Nasfi:

“The grand Muhajireen and Ansar had an ijma in the khilafah of Ali happily. They accepted his khilafat and gave him bayya”

Muawiya fought Ali (as), the Imam and rightful caliph of the time

The books of Ahl’ul Sunnah are replete with references which prove that Mu’awiya’s opposition was an act of rebellion.

Al-Isaba, Volume 1 page 444

Usud al Ghaba, Volume 5 page 211

Al-Isti’ab, Volume 3 page 376

Al-Bidaya, Volume 8 page 23

Tareekh Khamis, Volume 2 page 386

Tarikhul Khulafa, page 173

Nayl al Awtar, Volume 7 page 179

Al-Nisai al-kaafiya, page 16

We read in Al-Istiab and Tareekh Khamis:

فحارب معاوية علياً خمس سنين.

“Mu’awiya fought Ali for five years”

Usud ul Ghaba:

ولم يبايع علياً وأظهر الطلب بدم عثمان فكان وقعة صفين بينه وبين علي

“He didn’t give bayya to Ali, then he advanced the demand of avenging Uthman [’s murder], thus the battle of Sifeen took a place between him and Ali”

Tarikhul Khulafa:

خرج معاوية على علي كما تقدم و تسمى بالخلافة ثم خرج على الحسن

“Mu’awiyia rebelled against Ali and appointed himself as Caliph, then he rebelled against al-Hassan”

We read in Al-Bidayah::

فلما امتنع معاوية من البيعة لعلي حتى يسلمه القتلة، كان من صفين ما قدمنا ذكره

“When Mu’awiyia refused to give bayya to Ali until he (Ali) submitted him the killer, Sifeen battle took a place due to it.”

It was incumbent to fight alongside Imam Ali (as)

Ansar.org states:

“authentic traditions from the prophet peace be upon him says that to leave the fight was better for both parties. The fight was neither mandatory nor preferable”.

This proves how low Abu Sulaiman will go in his efforts to cover up the truth. As he has done consistently throughout his defence he fails to cite even one hadith in which Rasulullah (s) said to leave the fight was better. He undoubtedly knows that this is baseless the reality is that it was indeed mandatory for Rasulullah (s) said:

“O Ali! Soon a rebellious group will fight against you, you will be on the truth. Whoever does not support you on that day will not be from us”

Kanz al Ummal, by Ali Muttaqi al Hind quoting Ibn Asakir, hadith number 32970

Abu Sulaiman praises those Sahaba who stayed away from either side at Sifeen:

“Sa’ad bin Abu Waqqas, Muhammad bin Muslimah, Abdullah bin Umar, Osamah bin Zayd, and many other of the first believers from the muhajireen and Al-Ansar who isolated themselves from the affliction and did not partake in the fight”.

Their decisions not to participate do NOT in any way mean that they were right. Or is Abu Sulaiman now suggesting that they were right and Imam Ali (as) was wrong? If so this demonstrates the contradictory nature of Abu Sulaiman’s statements. Sometimes he describes Ali as closer to the truth, Mu’awiya as searching for the truth and now he is stating that the correct position was to keep aloof in times of fitnah! The decision to isolate themselves from both sides and hence refuse to side with the right (as Abu Sulaiman is likewise doing) was in no way supported by Rasulullah (s). The duty in Islam is to side with truth, no matter how much Abu Sulaiman seeks to water down facts, Imam Ali (as) was on the path of truth, Rasulullah (s) said that haqq would always accompany him and this was in ALL circumstances. The duty was to attach themselves to Ali (as) NOT to separate from him, in this regard we have the explicit words of Rasulullah (s):

“After me people shall experience fitna, you will split into groups, he then pointed at ‘Ali and said Ali and his companions shall be on the right path” [Kanz ul Ummal hadith number 33016].

Abdullah bin Umar’s regret he didn’t fight the baghi Mu’awiya

Of interest is the fact whilst citing Ibn Umar’s non-participation stance he fails to cite the same Ibn Umar’s remorse on his deathbed. He made an admission that he was wrong and should have fought with Ali (as) against Mu’awiya.

Ibn Abd al-Barr in al-’Istiab and Badruddin Al-Aini in Umdatul Qari Sharh Sahih Bukhari, Volume 11 page 349 narrated that Umm Habeeb ibne Abi Sabith (ra) heard Abdullah ibn Umar say:

“I regret that I did not join Ali and fight the rebellious group”. Abi Baakar bin Abi Jaham (ra) narrates that he heard Abdullah ibne`Umar say “I never regretted anything in my life other than the fact that I did not fight the rebels”

Al Isti’ab, by Ibn Abd al-Barr, Vol. 3, Page 83

We will inshallah expand on the slaughter of Hujr bin Adi later but in his conclusion of the tragic episode the comments of Mufti Ghulam Rasul al-Hanafi in his ‘Subeh al Sadiq’ page 94 are indeed of interest since he states that the killing of Hujr of his followers left a lesson to the people, namely that....

“Hujr bin Adi and his and his companions proved that Ali’s love is Iman. If someone wishes to maintain his Iman and remain on the Deen, he must believe and love Ali and in all situations he must stand with Ali. That is why

those who did not stand with Ali regretted that they failed to do so for example Abullah Ibn Umar bin al-Khattab in the final stages of his life said: ‘I don’t regret anything as much as the fact that I did not support Ali’. (Tabaqat Ibn Saad, Volume 4 page 187)”

The early Sahaba fought alongside Imam Ali (as)

In his attempt to play down the actions of Imam Ali (as), Abu Sulaiman had made this baseless claim:

Moreover, authentic traditions from the prophet peace be upon him says that to leave the fight was better for both parties. The fight was neither mandatory nor preferable. Although Ali was more deserving and closer to right than Mu’awiyah was, if Ali left the fight, a great goodness would happen and the shedding of the blood would be spared. Hence, Omran bin Haseen, may Allah be pleased at him, banned the selling of weapons at the time of afflictions. He says: “Weapons are not supposed to be sold in the affliction.” The same saying was shared by Sa’ad bin Abu Waqqas, Muhammad bin Muslimah, Abdullah bin Omar, Osamah bin Zayd, and many other of the first believers from the muhajireen and Al-Ansar who isolated themselves from the affliction and did not partake in the fight.

With regards to Abu Sulaiman’s claim that “many other of the first believers from the muhajireen and Al-Ansar who isolated themselves from the affliction and did not partake in the fight” – he has no evidence to support this claims and fails to cite even a single source. The fact is that the early converts the Muhajireen and Ansar WERE those that fought with Imam Ali (as) at Sifeen. This has even been admitted by the Sunni scholar Al Muhaddith Shah ‘Abd al-’Aziz Dehlavi who in his book written against the Shi’a states:

“The title Shi’a was first given to those Muhajireen and Ansar who gave allegiance (bay’ah) to Ali (may Allah enlighten his face). They were his steadfast faithful followers during his (Ali’s) caliphate. They remained close to him, they always fought his enemies, and kept on following Ali’s commands and prohibitions. The true Shi’a are these who came in 37 Hijri”

Tauhfa Ithna ‘Ashariyyah, (Gift to the Twelvers) (Farsi edition p 18, publishers Sohail Academy, Lahore, Pakistan).

(NB 37 Hijri -the year Imam Ali (as) fought Mu’awiya at Sifeen).

The Muhajireen and Ansar (Sahaba) were the Shi’a of Ali (as). One wonders how Abu Sulaiman claims that MANY Muhajireen and Ansar did not participate. Amongst those killed fighting alongside Imam ‘Ali (as) were prominent companions including Khuzema bin Thabit (al Isti’ab Volume 1 page 437; Usud ul Ghaba, Volume 2 page 133 – Chapter Dhikr Khuzema), devotee of Rasulullah (s) Uways Qarni (Usud ul Ghaba Volume 1 page 180; al Isti’ab Volume 1 page 123). One prominent Sahabi killed fighting under Maula Ali’s banner was Hashim ibne Utbah. We learn in Usud ul Ghaba, Volume 5 page 277 that when Hashim ibne Utbah was killed, Abu Tufail Amar ibne Waseela said:

“you are a martyr because you fought an enemy of the Sunnah”.

Usud ul Ghaba, Volume 5 page 277

We read in al Istiab, Volume 3 page 229 that:

“Abdur Rahman Ibn Abdi narrates that eight hundred Sahaba who pledged allegiance at Ridwan fought alongside ‘Ali at Sifeen”.

Al Isti’ab, by Ibn `Abd al-Barr, Vol. 3, Page 229

This is a significant figure, particularly when one takes into account that the number of Sahaba who pledged allegiance at Ridhwan totalled 1400. With the passage of thirty years there is no doubt that many would have died whether via natural deaths or in the battlefield. Despite this fact, we learn that a significant number stood shoulder to shoulder with Imam ‘Ali (as) at Sifeen.

It is indeed sad to see that the early Muslims knew where the truth lay and fought with ‘Ali (as) whilst we have a defender of Mu’awiya writing some 1400 years later raising question marks on Imam Ali (as)’s position and defending and showering praise on his enemies.

Abu Sulaiman’s refusal to describe Mu’awiya as a baghi

We then witness Abu Sulaiman’s deviant interpretation of the Qur’an so as to protect Mu’awiya and apportion transgression to Imam Ali (as):³

“Even if we supposed that the people who fought Ali were insurgents and not depending on personal interpretation of texts, then it would not be considered as a slander in their belief and their deservance in entering heaven. Almighty Allah says: “If two parties among the Believers fall into a quarrel, make ye peace between them: but if one of them transgresses beyond bounds against the other, then fight ye (all) against the one that transgresses until it complies with the Command of Allah; but if it complies, then make peace between them with justice, and be fair: for Allah loves those who are fair (and just), The Believers are but a single Brotherhood: so make peace and reconciliation between your two (contending) brothers; and fear Allah, that ye may receive Mercy.” [Surat Al-Hujarat, verses 9 and 10] Allah described the two parties by faith and made them brothers despite the fact they fought each other and transgressed on each other. Then what about if one of them transgressed on the other thinking he is right? Does it prevent him from being an interpreter, wrong or right? “

One can see how desperate Nasibis get to protect their beloved Imam. He claims that:

“Allah described the two parties by faith and made them brothers despite the fact they fought each other and transgressed on each other”

The Qur’an says no such thing, it refers to one party transgressing:

“but if one of them transgresses beyond bounds”

This is being done intentionally he is seeking to describe Imam Ali (as) as a baghi too, i.e. the battle was between two groups of baghis! Abu Sulaiman’s refusal to acknowledge which party had transgressed is quite intentional, the moment his rebellion is proven then his actions can be condemned, which would be too much for him. The fact is Mu’awiya and his party had refused to give bay’a to Imam Ali (as) and were defiantly opposing him. Is this not evidence of transgression, opposing the Khalifa of the time? Whilst his Nasibi leanings make it impossible to speak the truth we shall delve in to the matter to determine the Ahl’ul Sunnah definitions of a baghi.

Defining baghi (rebell)

Durr al-Mukhtar, Volume 4 page 448:

البغي لغة الطلب ومنه {ذلك ما كنا نبغي} وعرفا طلب ما لا يحل من جور وظلم ،

وشرعا هم الخارجون عن الامام الحق بغير حق

Baghi commonly means “to demand”, it is commonly used to refer to one that “demands unlawfully” such as in terms of injustice and tyranny, from a legal perspective it refers to “one that rebels against the legitimate Imam without having any legal justification for doing so”.

al-Nasa’ih al-Kaafiyah page 16:

“Baghi is one who refuses to obey Imam al-Haqq and opposes him”.

The late scholar Sayyid Abu’l A`la Maudoodi in his ‘Tafhim ul Qur’an’ Volume 5 page 80 collates the opinions of the Ahl’ul Sunnah `ulama about a ‘baghi’. He writes:

“Ibn Humam in Hidayah’s commentary Fatah ul Qadir states that the scholars have declared that a baghi is he who disobeys the rightful Imam. Imam Shafi’i in Kitab ul-Umm states ‘Baghi’ is he who fights the `Adil Imam. Imam Malik declared that it is a duty to fight those who oppose the ‘Adil Imam [al Mudawanna]“.

The Sunni scholars deemed Muawiyah as a baghi, Khariji and tyrant

Legendry Muhadith of Ahle Sunnah Shah Abul Aziz Dehalvi records in his anti-Shia book ‘Tauhfa Ithna Ashariyyah’ page 181 Chapter 7:

“Should know that there is ijma of Ahlul Sunnah Qutb, that Muawiyah bin Abu Sufyan from the beginning of the Imamah of Hazrat Amir till the sulh of Imam Hasan remained a baghi and did not obey the Imam of the time....”

Tauhfa Ithna Ashariyyah, page 181

At another place we also read:

“The original pure Sect was the Ahl’ul Sunnah wa al-Jammah of the Sahaba and Tabieen, these are the Muhajireen and Ansar who were the servants of Ali, they were helpers of the khilafah. Their religion was that Murtaza was the Imam of truth, following the martyrdom of Uthman, and that all mankind was duty bound to obey him. Ali during his times was the most superior, whoever disputed with him on the issue of Khilafah, or opposed his reign is a sinner and a baghi. Whoever deemed him unworthy of khilafah was a sinner mislead on falsehood..”

Tauhfa Ithna Ashariyyah, page 11

Imam of Ahle Sunnah Sa’duddin Taftazani records in his esteemed work ‘Sharh al Maqasid’ page 306:

“The aqeedah in Ahl’ul Sunnah is that the first baghi in Islam was Mu’awiya”

Sharh al Maqasid, Volume 2 page 306

Now let us quote some of the esteemed curriculum Hanafi works wherein Muawiyah has been clearly equated with unjust and rebel ruler. We read ‘al Hidayah’ Volume 3 page 133, Kitab al Adab and the reference has obviously also been quoted in the commentaries of Hidayah such as in

‘Fathul Qadeer Sharah Hidayah’ Volume 16 page 333 and ‘Anayah Sharah Hidayah’ Volume 10 page 217:

“It is permissible to be appointed as a Judge from an unjust ruler, in the same way as it is the case of a just ruler. This is because the Sahaba were appointed Judges under Mu’awiya, even though the truth was with Ali (ra). The Tabieen were appointed as Judges by Hajjaj, even though he was unjust”.

We also read in Fathul Qadeer:

هذا تصريح بجور معاوية

‘This is a declaration of Muawiya’s oppresssion’

Fathul Qadeer Sharah Hidayah. Volume 16 page 333

Imam Alauddin Abi al-Hasan Ali bin Khalil al-Tarabelsi al-Hanafi (d. 844 H) records in ‘Maeen al-Hukam fima yatradad bain al-khasmain min al-ahkam’ as follows:

ويجوز تقلد القضاء من السلطان العادل والجائر ، وأما العادل فلأن النبي ﷺ بعث معاذاً إلى اليمن قاضياً وولى عثمان بن أسد على مكة أميراً ، وأما الجائر فلأن الصحابة رضوا تقلدوا الأعمال من معاوية بعد أن أظهر الخلاف مع علي رضي الله عنه وكان الحق مع علي.

“It is permissible to accept the position of a judge from a just or unjust ruler, the just ruler (is permissible) because the prophet (pbuh) sent Mu’ath to Yemen as a judge and appointed Uthman bin Asad as a governor of Makka, from the unjust ruler (it is permissible) because the companions may Allah be pleased with them assumed the duties from Mu’awiya after he (Mu’awiya) showed disagreement with Ali”

Maeen al-Hukam, page 3

We read in ‘Tubyeen ul Haqaiq Sharah Kanz ul Daqaiq’ Volume 4 page 177:

(ويجوز تقلد القضاء من السلطان العادل والجائر ومن أهل البغي) لأن الصحابة رضي الله تعالى عنهم تقلدوه من معاوية في نوبة علي ، وكان الحق بيد علي يومئذ ، وقد قال علي رضي الله تعالى عنه أخواننا بغوا علينا

(It is permissible to be appointed as a judge by a just or unjust ruler or by rebels) because the companions)may Allah be pleased with them(accepted it from Mu’awiya, during Ali’s reign, and the truth was with Ali at that time, Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) said: ‘Our brothers are committing rebellion against us.’

Tubyeen ul Haqaiq Sharah Kanz ul Daqaiq, Volume 4 page 177

We read in ‘Bahar al Raiq’ Volume 6 page 274:

(قوله ويجوز تقلد القضاء من السلطان العادل والجائر وأهل البغي) لأن الصحابة رضي الله تعالى عنهم تقلدوه من معاوية والحق كان بيد علي رضي الله تعالى عنه

“(It is permissible to be appointed as a judge by a just or unjust ruler or by rebels) because the companions may Allah be pleased with them accepted it from Mu’awiya while the truth was with Ali (ra)”

Bahar al Raiq, Volume 6 page 274

Let us now present the views of Imam Muhammad bin Hasan al-Shaybani (d. 189 H) about Muawiyah. Allamah Abdul Qadir Qurshee al-Hanafi Misree while recoding the biography of a Hanafi scholar recorded the statement of Imam Muhammad bin Hasan al-Shaybani as follows:

Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Musa bin Dawoud al-Razi al-Berzali, al-Faqih al-Qazi al-Khazen. He heard (hadith) from his uncle Ali bin Musa and Muhammad bin Ayoub al-Razi. He was appointed as a judge of Samarqand. He heard (hadith) from (Samarqand's) people. He died in year 361. al-Sam'ani said: 'He was thiqah and pious'. al-Hakim said: 'He was jurist of Abu Hanifa's companions'. He said I heard my uncle Abu Sulaiman al-Jawzjani, who heard Muhammad bin al-Hasan saying: 'Had Muawiya not fought against Ali and he (Mu'awiya) was an oppressor, aggressor and a rebel, we would not have been able to fight the oppressors.'

Jawahir al Muziyah Tabaqat al Hanafiyah by Allamah Abdul Qadir Qurshee al-Hanafi Misree, Volume 2 page 26

The notion of Imam Muhammad bin Hasan al-Shaybani that they would not have the honor of fighting the rebels if Mu'awiya the commander of rebels had not started the war, shall suffice to shout the mouths of present day Nawasib like Abu Sulaiman. Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Musa bin Dawoud al-Razi not reacting at the statement proves that he also echoed the sentiments of Imam Shaybani.

As for Salafies, their legendary scholar Rasheed Raza in his book Mujalat al-Manar, volume 29 page 671 attested to the fact that:

ولكن السواد الأعظم من أهل السنة سلفهم وخلفهم يعتقدون أن معاوية كان باغيًا على الإمام الحق أمير المؤمنين علي كرم الله وجهه

The vast majority of the Ahlul sunnah whether the former or the modern (scholars) believe that Mu'awiyah rebelled against the true Imam, the Commander of the Faithful Ali (Karam Allah Wajhu).

The same scholar wrote elsewhere in Mujalat al-Manar, volume 33 page 441:

فإن متبع الحق مستقل الفكر فيه بلا هوى ولا تعصب لمذهب يجزم بأن معاوية نفسه كان باغيًا خارجًا على الإمام الحق كالخوارج ، وأنه طالب ملك ، ويؤيد ذلك إكراه الناس على جعل هذا الملك لولده يزيد المشتهر بالفسق

Anyone delving into the truth with a free mind unclouded by emotion or sectarian affiliation, shall confirm that Mu'awiyah was rebel (Baghi) and one that departed (Kharij) against the true Imam, he sought the throne and forced the people to transfer the throne to his son Yazeed who was known for his lechery (Fisq).

Also Imam Showkani records in his authority work Nayl al Autar, Volume 7 page 348:

قوله: أولاهما بالحق فيه دليل على أن عليا ومن معه هم المحقون ، ومعاوية ومن معه هم المبتطلون ، وهذا أمر لا يمتري فيه منصف ، ولا ياباه إلا مكابر متعسف

“The hadith about ‘more deserving of rightness’ contain an evidence that Ali and those who were with him are on the truth, and Mu’awiya and those who were with him are on falsehood, and any fair person would not doubt about that and only the stubborn person would deny it.”

Allamah Abdul Kareem Shahrastani in his famed book ‘Al Milal wa al Nihal’ Volume 1 page 103 expressed a clear opinion:

ولا نقول في حق معاوية وعمرو بن العاص الا أنهما بغيا على الامام الحق فقاتلهم مقاتلة أهل البغي وأما أهل النهروان فهم الشراة المارقون عن الدين بخبر النبي ﷺ ولقد كان ﷺ على الحق في جميع أحواله يدور الحق معه حيث دار

“We don’t say about Mu’awiya and Amro bin al-Aas except that they fought against the rightful Imam, so he (Ali) fought them deeming them as rebels. And the people of Nahrawan, they were evil and apostate as the Prophet (s) had informed, and he (Ali) (ra) was on right path in all of his situations, the truth was turning with him wherever he turned.”

Allamah Muhammad bin Aqeel states in al-Nasa’ih al-Kaafiyah, page 22:

“Mu’awiya and his companions are baghis without a doubt and they are Qasitoon, Allah says Qasithoon are in deepest part of Hell”.

Mu’awiya’s rebellion was in violation of the Qur’an

Allah (swt) says in his Glorious Book:

“O you who believe! Obey Allah and his Apostle and those in authority among you”. (Al-Quran, Surah Nisa, Verse 59)

It is interesting that ‘Abu Sulaiman has failed to comment on this verse in his lengthy article. This is a clear verse that proves beyond a doubt that Mu’awiya’s opposition was one that contravened the Book of Allah (swt). This verse provides no room for manoeuvre. Obedience to those in authority is on par with obedience to Allah (swt) and the Prophet (s). This means that disobeying the Leader amounts to disobeying Allah (swt) and his Prophet (s). The verse is absolutely clear. How can anyone interpret this verse as entitling someone to rebel against a leader. Anyone who does so is a rebel.

Now we ask:

Does Imam Ali (as) not come within this verse?

Was he not ‘those in authority’?

Is he not the fourth rightly guided khalifa?

Did Mu’awiya obey him?

In accordance with this verse and the definitions of Ahl’ul Sunnah, Mu’awiya’s disobedience of Imam Ali (as) had made him a rebel. His entire rebellion was baseless since the Qur’an would not support it. He had no text to justify his actions he was on the path of falsehood and had led his supporters down that same slippery road of deviance.

Mu’awiya’s rebellion was in violation to the Sunnah of Rasulullah (s)

If this verse of the Qur’an is not a sufficient indictment against Mu’awiya, then we also have this hadith in Sahih Muslim “Kitab al Imara” Book 020, Number 4557:

It has been narrated (through a different chain of transmitters) on the authority of Abu Huraira that the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) said: Who defected from obedience (to the Amir) and separated from the main body of the Muslims – then he died in that state-would die the death of one belonging to the days of Jahilliyya. And he who is killed under the banner of a man who is blind (to the cause for which he is fighting), who gets flared up with family pride and fights for his tribe-is not from my Umma, and whoso from my followers attacks my followers (indiscriminately) killing the righteous and the wicked of them, sparing not (even) those staunch in faith and fulfilling not his obligation towards them who have been given a pledge (of security), is not from me (i.e. is not my follower).

Mu'awiya openly violated this tradition. He refused to obey Imam 'Ali (as), he separated from the main body misleading others in the process. The seriousness of this tradition is clear one who separates and died "would die the death of one belonging to the days of Jahilliyya" i.e. he would die a kaafir. Rasulullah (s) did not provide any defense for such individuals. He did not say that they would be rewarded having exercised ijtehad, he said that the perpetrators were not his followers.

This is in relation to those that rebel against any Leader, with regards to those that rebel against Imam 'Ali (as) we read in al-Nasa'ih al-Kaafiyah page 36 that Rasulullah (s) said:

"If anyone fights Ali's Khilafah, kill him". Rasulullah offered no excuses for the opponents of Imam 'Ali (as), all who come against Imam 'Ali (as) should be killed; clearly Mu'awiya comes within this hadith.

Mu'awiya was from amongst Qasateen (those refrained from giving bayya to Imam e Haqq)

We read in Usud ul Ghaba, Volume 1 page 801:

Abu Saeed narrated: 'Allah's messenger (s) ordered us to fight Nakiheen, Qasateen and Maraqaen, we asked: 'Oh Allah's messenger ! You ordered us to fight them but along with who?' He said with Ali Ibn abi Talib and Ammar bin Yasir will be killed'.

At another place we read:

Mukhnaf bin Salim said: 'We went to Abu Ayub and asked: 'You by your sword fought with Allah's messenger (s) against the polytheists, then you kill Muslims'? He replied: 'Rasulullah (s) ordered that I kill Nakiheen, Qasateen and Maraqaen'.

Matalib al Sa'ul, page 68:

"Ali started by fighting the oath breakers (Nakiheen) who were the people of battle of Jamal and then he fought the Qasateen who were the companions of Mu'awiya".

Sharh al Maqasid, Volume 2 page 304:

"Rasulullah (s) said to Ali 'Nakiheen, Qasateen and Maraqaen will fight you'. Mu'awiya and his companions were Qasateen they left the truth, which was to follow Ali and give him bayya".

Of relevance here is the admission of the darling of the Nasibis, Ibn Taymeeya, who writes in Minhaj al Sunnah page 210 Volume 3 “Dhikr Mu’awiya”:

“During Ali’s reign the most entitled person to be the Khalifa of Rasulullah (s) was ‘Ali. He was a rightly guided khalifa and to obey him was mandatory”

So from this Nasibis own pen we have an admission that ‘Ali was the rightful Imam and that it was mandatory to obey him. From the hadith mentioned before it is clear that those who refuse to submit to the Rightful Imam and oppose him, are deemed as Qasatheen. The duty was to obey Imam Ali (as) and yet Mu’awiyah and his supporters refused to recognise his authority and give him bayya, hence they were the Qasatheen.

Mu’awiya was amongst the Fajireen (perpetrators of debauchery)

Fara’id us Simtayn, page 157
Kifaya al Talib, page 221 Ch 58
Mawaddatul al Qurba, page 45
Manaqib al Khawarazmi, page 11
Nuzul ul Abrar, Dhikr Fadail Ali, page 24
Kunuz al Haqaiq, Volume 2 page 16
Jami’ al Sagheer, Volume 2 page 65
Qurrat al ‘Aynayn, page 141
Maula wa Mu’awiya, page 141
al Mustadrak al Hakim, Volume 3 page 129

All the above books record traditions in which Rasulullah (s) referred to Imam ‘Ali (as) as the killer of the Fajireen:

For example in Nuzul ul Abrar Chapter “Dhikr Fadail Ali” p24 we read that The Prophet (s) said:

“O ‘Ali you are the Imam of the pious and the slayer of those that are fasiq and fajireen”

In al Mustadrak al Hakim Volume 3 page 129, we read a more lengthy tradition:

“‘Ali is Imam of the pious and killer of the fajireen. Aided will be those that aid him, abandoned shall be those that abandon him”.

al Mustadrak al Hakim, Vol. 3, Page 129

In addition to this we have the comments of Imam ‘Ali (as) taken from Tareekh Tabari Volume 4 page 77:

“The Fajir son of a fajir is Mu’awiya and the fajir son of a kafir is Amr bin Aas”

Abu Sulaiman’s plea that both parties were believers

Ansar.org states:

[Surat Al-Hujarat, verses 9 and 10] “Allah described the two parties by faith and made them brothers despite the fact they fought each other and transgressed on each other”.

We are not suggesting that Imam Ali (as) was fighting the Kuffar, he was fighting believers. Since the duty is to fight until the transgressors accept the truth, the verse makes it clear that believers can be wrong and when they

transgress one is permitted to fight them. Perhaps Abu Sulaiman could elaborate ‘What if this group of believer’s don’t accept the truth and are killed while they were still transgressors? Will they still be equal to those who were on the path of truth? This clearly cannot be the case and Allah (swt) says “Are a Momin and Fasiq equal? certainly not”. The Ulema of Ahl’ul Sunnah have been uncompromising in the criticisms of a baghi....

To rebel against the Imam is tantamount to Zina in a Mosque

Nayl al-Awtar, Volume 7 page 198:

واعلم أن قتال البغاة جائز إجماعا كما حكى ذلك في البحر ولا يبعد أن يكون واجبا لقوله تعالى { فقاتلوا التي تبغي } وقد حكى في البحر أيضا عن العترة جميعا أن جهادهم أفضل من جهاد الكفار إلى ديارهم إذ فعلهم في دار الإسلام كفعل الفاحشة في المسجد

“You have to know that the there is Ijma regarding the lawfulness of fighting the rebel as it is written in al-Bahr (book), and likely it is obligatory for His almighty statement ‘{ then fight ye (all) against the one that transgresses}’, and it is also written in al-Bahr (book) that all of the progeny said fighting them is superior to fighting the disbelievers in their homeland because their act of rebellion on Muslims’ homeland is like performing adultery inside a mosque.”

If a Baghi dies in war don’t perform his funeral prayers

Imam Nawawi records in Al-Minhaj, Volume 7 page 47:

وقال أبو حنيفة لا يصلى على محارب ولا على قتيل الفئة الباغية وقال قتادة لا يصلى

على ولد الزنى

“Imam Abu Hanifa said that if one dies from baghi group or a robber, one should not read their Funeral Prayer, Qatada says a bastard’s Janaza should not be read either”

Al-Dur al-Mukhtar, Volume 2 page 282:

(وهي فرض على كل مسلم مات، خلا أربعة: بغاة، وقطاع طريق) فلا يغسلوا، ولا

يصلى عليهم

“It is obligatory over every dead Muslim except four, the Baghi and the pirates, they should neither be washed nor their funeral prayers be performed”

One who rebels is from the Party of Satan

We read in al-Nasa’ih al-Kaafiyah page 23 and in Kanz al ‘Ummal page 89 Volume 6:

Ali (as) said: “Our Jamaat is Allah’s and one who opposes us is Satans Party. One who regards them as equal is not from us”.

One who fights Imam Ali is Zaalim and Faasiq

Sharh Mawafiq page 745 Mir Seyyed Shareef states:

“in eyes of Ahl ul Sunnah there is agreement that those who fought him were sinners and Qadi Ibn al Arabi states that this sin is not fisq, view of the Shia and majority Sunni is that those who fought ‘Ali became fasiq and fajir”

Sharh Mawafiq page 745

Sharh al Maqasid Vol 2 page 307 Allamah Sa’duddeen comments:

“Amongst Sahaba the differences makes it clear that some Sahaba left the path of truth and got to a point of Dhulm and Fasiq based on enmity, jealousy and a desire for power”

Testimony of the Sahabi Amar Yasir (ra) that Mu’awiya and his cohorts were misguided ones

“Imam Ahmed states that Muhammad Bin Jaffar narrated that Sh’eba narrated from Umer bin Marat that he had heard Abdullah bin Salmah saying: On the day of Sifeen I saw Ammar like a man of tall height and he was having a standard in his hand and his hand was shivering . He said: In the name of One who possesses my life, I have fought thrice carrying the same standard under the supervision of Holy Prophet (s), this is the fourth time and by the One who posses my life, even if they attack us and make us reach at the “Dates of Hijr”, I still know that our group is on right path while they are on the path of misguidance”

Al Badayah wal Nihayah (Urdu), Vol 7 page 523 – Events of 37 H, [Nafees Academy Karachi].

By fighting Maula ‘Ali, Mu’awiya fought against the truth, the Qur’an and Rasulallah (s)

In his flawed attempt to protect Mu’awiya’s killing of Hujr, Abu Sulaiman sought to compare Mu’awiya’s actions to Imam ‘Ali (as)’s stance at Sifeen:

“Ali fought the rebels against his caliphate at the battle of The Camel and Saffeen, which caused the death of the best Companions and in addition, the death of thousands of Muslims, although the reason was one i.e. rebelling against the ruling of the caliph!”.

Now we get a clear understanding of the Nasibi beliefs of Abu Sulaiman. Mu’awiya had no basis to kill Hujr bin Adi, as we have already discussed earlier. His only ‘sin’ was his opposition to the cursing of Ali (as) – pure and simple. The Qur’an and Sunnah cannot support slaying Hujr in this manner.

As for Imam Ali (as)’s stance, not a shred of condemnation can be placed on him, as Abu Sulaiman is clearly seeking to do. Imam Ali (as)’s actions were supported by the Qur’an and Sunnah. He WAS the Ul’il ‘Amr and Rasulallah (s) said the following about Ali (as)

Rasulallah (s) said:

“Ali is with the Qur’an and the Qur’an is with Ali, the two shall not separate until the meet me at the Fountain of Kauthar”

Kanz ul Ummal hadith number 32912

“Ali is with the Truth and the Truth is with Ali”

Kanz ul Ummal hadith number 33018

“Oh Allah, turn the truth in whichever direction Ali turns”

al Mustadrak, Vol. 3, Page 124

These three ahadith make it clear that every decision that Imam Ali (as) takes is Haqq and is supported by the Holy Qur'an. In other words, if he declares war on rebels to his leadership, it is the truth supported by the Qur'an.

If these hadith are not prove within themselves then perhaps Abu Sulaiman could offer his views on this hadith:

“Allah’s Messenger (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) said regarding ‘Ali, Fatima, Hasan and Husayn (Allah be pleased with them all): I am at peace with those with whom you make peace and I am at war with those with whom you make war”

1. Sunan Ibn Majah, English translation by Muhammad Tufail Ansari, Volume 1 page 81

2. Fada'il al-Sahaba, by Ahmad Ibn Hanbal, v2, p767, Tradition #1350; al-Mustadrak, by al-Hakim, Vol.3, P149

Rasulullah (s) is clearly endorsing every position that Ali (as) takes, to the point that one he is also at war with those that Ali (as) is at war with, i.e. Rasulallah (s) considers such individuals not just Imam Ali’s opponents but his own opponents. Despite this Abu Sulaiman’s Nasibi leanings lead make it impossible for him to attribute the truth to Imam Ali (as) ‘s position:

“Although Ali was more deserving and closer to right than Mu’awiyah was”

If anything, this demonstrates how much Nasibis seeks to play down Ali (as)’s position in the eyes of Rasulallah (s). Just contemplate the Nasibis clever play on words Ali was “closer to right” this when Rasulallah (s) stated that Ali is always with the haqq and Abu Sulaiman is suggesting that this was not entirely the case at Sifeen! Who should we follow the comments of Abu Sulaiman or those of Rasulallah (s)?

With such clear evidence one wonders how Nasibis like Abu Sulaiman have the audacity to equate Mu’awiyah’s baseless killing of Hujr to Imam Ali (as) war against his opponents.

Muawiyah’s opposition was motivated by his hatred of Imam ‘Ali (as)

Riyad ul Nadira V 3 page 234:

“Rasulallah (s) told ‘Ali that people have enmity to you, and it will open up after me”

In Yanabi al Muwaddah p 135 we learn that Prophet (s) said:

“Protect yourself from your enemies who have a hatred in their hearts. Those who hate you Allah’s has cursed such individuals”

This certainly rings clear with regards to Mu’awiyah. His enmity opened to Imam ‘Ali(as) and came to the front. The moment Imam ‘Ali (as) came to power he refused to submit to the authority of Imam ‘Ali (as) and if this was not bad enough he then proved his hatred by introducing the bidah of cursing Imam ‘Ali during the Friday Sermons throughout his dominion (as shall be discussed later).

Answering Abu Sulaiman's criticism that Imam 'Ali (as) should have left Mu'awiya alone

Ansar.org states:

“if Ali left the fight, a great goodness would happen and the shedding of the blood would be spared”.

This indicates further evidence of Abu Sulaiman's pro Nasibi leanings. It is indeed curious that he does not seek to ask the same questions to his client Mu'awiya. Why did he not surrender before the battle? Would this not have saved lives? He prefers to attack 'Ali (as) blaming him for the war and failing to place even a shred of criticism against Mu'awiya. Had Imam Ali abandoned the fight, then the situation would have remained unresolved. Mu'awiya would have continued his propaganda campaign, refused to pledge bay`a and would continue to keep Syria and its people under his helm. How could Ali (as) allow Mu'awiya to continue to act in this way? 'Ali (as) had provided Mu'awiya with ample opportunity to step in line and Mu'awiya refused. Hence he acted properly in declaring war on Mu'awiya.

Answering Abu Sulaiman's criticism that Imam 'Ali (as) started the battle, contradicting the Qur'an (astaghfirullah)

In his discussion of Surah Hujurat verse 8 Abu Sulaiman vents his anger against Imam 'Ali (as) commenting:

“Allah did not put it a condition to fight the transgressor party except when the transgressor party starts to fight. But Ali was the one who started the fight”

This further exposes Abu Sulaiman's direct attempt to place blame at the door of Imam Ali (as) in his efforts even reads a verse incorrectly so as to attack him. He claims that you can only fight when the transgressors fight first, but this is NOT what the verse states:

“if one of them transgresses beyond bounds against the other, then fight ye (all) against the one that transgresses”

The right to fight is not based on defensive Jihad, this can be exercised when the transgressor party has exceeded its limit and acted beyond its bounds, the word fight is not used. What right does Abu Sulaiman have to interpret the verses in this way? Mu'awiya had refused to accept Imam Ali (as) demands, during that time he had incited the Syrians into such a frenzy that they were also opposing Imam Ali (as). An entire region of the Arab peninsula had transgressed and was opposing the rightful khalifa, hence Imam Ali (as) was perfectly within his right to quash their opposition.

If one is to apply Nasibi logic and blame Imam Ali (as) for fighting the transgressors, why do these same Nasibis shower praise on Abu Bakr's jihad against those who refused to pay zakaat to him?

No matter how much Abu Sulaiman would like us to believe otherwise, rebellion is an act of transgression and Abu Sulaiman's defence is baseless when we know that Rasulullah (s) had referred to the transgressors as the “baghi group” that would fight Ali (as). Rather than speak the truth, he then suggests that perhaps Mu'awiya deemed 'Ali to be the transgressor. It is interesting to note that Mu'awiya NEVER used this verse to justify his opposition and declare Imam Ali (as) as the transgressor. If we are indeed to

accept Abu Sulaiman's logic then this makes a mockery of Islam, entitling Muslims to interpret the Qur'an in any way they like to get whatever result they like. If Mu'awiya had indeed sought to misinterpret this verse to fight 'Ali (as) then this does not afford him any protection in the eyes of Allah (swt).

Imam 'Ali (as) fought for interpretation of the Qur'an in the same way Rasulallah (s) fought for the revelation of the Qur'an

This tradition can be located in the following books:

Riyad al Nadira, V 3 p 200

Khasais al Nasai, p 87

Manaqib al Khawarzmi, p 44

Usud al Ghaba, V 4 p 114

Matalib al Sa'ul, p 64

Nuzul al Abrar, p 24

Fara'id al Simtayn, p 160 Ch 33

Yanabi al Mawaddah, page 59 Ch 11

Hilayat al Awliya, V 1 page 67

Sharh Fiqh al Akbar, page 67

al Bidaya, V 7 p 362

Tauhfa Ithna Ashariyya, page 219

Kanz ul Ummal, hadith number 32967

History of the Khalifas who took the right way (Part English translation of Suyuti's Tarikh'ul Khulafa" page 180)

al Mustadrak al Hakim, Vol. 3, Page 123

Rasulallah said:

"Verily among you will be one who will fight for the meaning of the Qur'an in the same way that I fought for its revelation. People asked will that be Abu Bakr or Umar? Rasulallah (s) replied 'No, but he who is mending my shoes, that person was 'Ali"

Kanz ul Ummal, Hadith number 32967

This hadith is absolutely explicit every Jihad of 'Ali (as) will be in defence of the Qur'an, to protect it from misinterpretation. This means that even if Abu Sulaiman is seeking to defend his client Mu'awiya on the basis of alleged Qur'an interpretation, his position is one against Imam Ali (as) and is hence groundless.

Abdullah ibne Umar declared Mu'awiya a baghi in his commentary of Surah Hujuraat verse 8

Despite Abu Sulaiman's attempts to defend Mu'awiya this verse IS an indictment against him and proves that he was a transgressor. Whilst he might reject our comments, let us see how Abdullah Ibn`Umar interprets this very verse. Al Hakim in his al Mustadrak narrates from Hamza as follows:

"While he (Hamza) was sitting with Abdullah ibn`Umar a man from Iraq came to Ibn`Umar. He said Abu Abdul Rahman, By Allah I have seriously been trying to follow you and adopt an attitude like yours towards the division of the nation and be neutral as far as I could. Yet I have read a verse

from the Qur'an that has occupied my mind and I would like you to comment on it. "If two parties among the Believers fall into a quarrel, make ye peace between them: but if one of them transgresses beyond bounds against the other, then fight ye (all) against the one that transgresses until it complies with the Command of Allah; but if it complies, then make peace between them with justice, and be fair: for Allah loves those who are fair (and just), Please inform me how to comply with this verse. Abdullah said, "You have nothing to do with this, now go away. The man left, when he disappeared Abdullah said "I never found in my heart something that I felt about this verse, that I did not fight the aggressor part as Allah commanded me to do"

Al Mustadrak by al Hakim, Vol. 3, Page 115

Underneath the tradition al-Hakim states:

"This is an important narration recorded by many outstanding tabieen. I have used the channel of Shuaib Ibn Abu Hamza to Al-Zuhri because the two Sheikhs (al Bukhari and Muslim) used the channel indicating its authenticity"

Ibn `Umar had already (as mentioned earlier) expressed his regret that he had failed to fight the baghi group i.e. Mu'awiya. Here he went further basing his regret on this very verse (that Abu Sulaiman used to defend Mu'awiya). Since Abu Sulaiman has consistently used Ibn`Umar as an authority throughout the article, one suggests that he ponders over the comments of Ibn`Umar here...or is Abu Sulaiman now going to suggest that he is more learned than Ibn`Umar on the commentary of this verse?

The martyrdom of Ammar bin Yasir was comprehensive proof that Mu'awiya was a baghi

We read in Sahih Muslim hadith number 6970 that Umm e Salmah narrated that:

"Allah's Apostle (peace be upon him) said: A band of rebels would kill Ammar".

This is a famous tradition in which Rasulullah (s) had made it clear that the murderers of Ammar WERE baghi's – Ammar's martyrdom at the hands of Mu'awiya's forces at Sifeen is clear unequivocal proof that Mu'awiya was a baghi. This would of course be the conclusion reached by one with a rational mind that is searching for the truth, not one that is seeking to defend Mu'awiya turning his deviancy in to a matter of appreciation, Abu Sulaiman is the perfect specimen of this school, he states:

About the Hadeeth: "Ammar would be killed by the transgressor party." This hadeeth is one of the greatest evidences that the truth lies with Ali but Mu'awiyah interpreted the meaning of the hadeeth differently when Ammar's death shocked Omro Bin Al-A'as and his son. Omro and his son got astound. Ahmed narrated in his Musnad from Abu Bakr bin Muhammad bin Omro bin Hazm from his father who says: (When Ammar bin Yaser was killed, Omro bin Hazm entered upon Omro bin Al-A'as and said: "Ammar was killed and the Prophet peace be upon him said that Ammar would be killed by the transgressor party." Omro bin Al-A'as stood fearing and vomiting until he entered upon Mu'awiyah. Mu'awiyah asked him: "What is

the matter?” Omro answered: “Ammar was killed.” Mu’awiyah asked again: “So what if Ammar was killed?” Omro answered: “I heard the messenger of Allah saying that Ammar would be killed by the transgressor party.” Mu’awiyah told him: “... were we the ones who killed him? Ali and his comrades killed him. They brought him (to the war) and threw him into our lances (or swords).” [Musnad the people of Syria from Musnad Al-Imam Ahmed, vol.2, Musnad Omro bin Al-A’as, #957, p.163. The Examiner of the book said the narrators of the story are trustworthy].

According to the Qur’an, Sunnah (this very hadith) and definitions of the Ahl’ul Sunnah `ulama Mu’awiya was a baghi. His attempts to reject this and accuse Imam Ali (as) of killing `Ammar “The one who killed Ammar is the one who brought him” is irrelevant and further exposes his deviancy. In fact his treachery is clear from the fact that not only did he twist the hadith he also became abusive.

We read in History of al-Tabari, Translation volume xvii, The First Civil war, page 69

“Abdallah [son of `Amr bin al-`Aas] said to his father, “Father, have you killed this man in your fighting today, even though the Messenger of God has said what he said about him?” `Amr asked what that was, and his son said: “Were you not with us while we were building the mosque and everyone was moving stone by stone and brick by brick while `Ammar brought two stones and two bricks at a time? The effort caused him to faint, and the Messenger of God came to him and began wiping dust from his face, saying, ‘Alas for you, Ibn Sumayyah! The people transport stone by stone and brick by brick while you move two stones and two bricks at a time, desiring (divine) reward. In spite of that the usurping party will kill you. Alas for you” `Amr pushed `Abdallah’s horse away and pulled Mu’awiya toward him. He said, “Mu’awiya, do you not hear what `Abdallah is saying?” Mu’awiya asked what it was, and `Amr reported the story. Mu’awiya said: “You are a stupid old man. You keep on telling stories while you slither about in your piss. Was it we who killed `Ammar? It was only those who brought him here.” And the men came out from their tents and bivouacs, saying, “It was only those who brought `Ammar who killed him.”

History of al-Tabari, Volume 17, The First Civil war, page 69

Mu’awiya’s redefinition is in fact further evidence of how low he was willing to stoop to slander Imam Ali (as) to the point of intentionally misinterpreting a hadith to fit his rebellion. Mu’awiya may well have sought to convince his supporters but Ammar’s death stands testament to where the truth lay.

In his discussion of Sifeen, Maudoodi writes as follows:

“There were some companions who were reluctant to participate in Jihad as they were unsure which party was that of truth and which party was that of falsehood. After Ammar ibn Yasir’s death the matter became clear. It is on this basis that Abu Bakr al Jassas writes in Ahkam ul Qur’an, Volume 3 page 492: ‘Ali ibne Abi Talib (ra) fought a rebellious group. Accompanying him were recognised Sahaba who had participated in Badr, they were in the right. The Prophet told Amar that a ‘baghi group will kill you’ this hadith is

Mutawatir and Sahih, so much so that when Abdullah bin Umar bin Aas said this to Mu'awiya he did not refute it". Allamah Ibn 'Abdul Barr in al Isti'ab Volume 2 page 424 records the hadith 'a baghi group will kill Ammar, this is a Mutawatir / Sahih tradition. Allamah Hafid Ibn Hajar in al Isaba writes on Volume 2 page 502 'After Ammar's murder it became clear that the truth was with 'Ali and on this the Ahl'ul Sunnah became united when previously there were differing opinions"

Al Khilfat wa Mulukiyyat – by Sayyid Abu'l Ala Maudoodi, pages 137

Interestingly despite his fondness for Muawiyah, Ibn Kathir still states in Al-Bidayah wal Nihayah, incidents of 13-40 H:

وهذا مقتل عمار بن ياسر رضي الله عنه مع أمير المؤمنين علي بن أبي طالب قتله أهل الشام وبان
وظهر بذلك سر ما أخبره به الرسول ﷺ من أنه تقتله الفئة الباغية وبان بذلك أن عليا محق
وأن معاوية باغ وما في ذلك من دلائل النبوة

"Amar bin Yasir was also killed along with Ameer al Momineen Ali (ra). He (Ammar) was killed by Syrians. By his killing, the prediction of Prophet (s) came true because He (s) had predicted that Ammar would be killed by a rebellious group, moreover it further proved that Ali was on right path whereas Muawiyah was a rebel and there were several prophetic predictions in this regard"

Mullah Ali Qari in his commentary of Mishkaat al-Masabih records:

"Ammar was killed by Mu'awiya whose party were oppressors and baghis"

Mirqaat Sharah Mishkaat, Volume10 page 171

Allamah Abu Bakar al-Jasas in his authority wok 'Ahkam al Quran' states:

"Ali bin Abi Talib (ra) fought the baghi party"

We also read:

"The prophet (pbuh) said to Ammar: 'a baghi group will kill you'. This tradition is acceptable and Mutawatir, even Mu'awiya couldn't deny it."

Ahkam al Quran al Jasas, Volume 3 page 400

This hadith is so explicit only one of the calibre of Mu'awiya could redefine it so suit his own needs. Perhaps we should ask ourselves, what about the proponent of this hadith `Ammar bin Yasir? Did he not know where right and wrong lay? If he did then why was he fighting Mu'awiya? Clearly Ammar knew where the truth was in that there is no doubt, and in that connection we have his testimony...

Ammar deemed those that fought Imam 'Ali (as) to be the same munafiqs that tried to assassinate Rasulullah (s)

We read in Sahih Muslim Book 038, Number 6688:

"Qais reported: I said to 'Ammar: What is your opinion about that which you have done in case (of your siding with Hadrat 'Ali)? Is it your personal opinion or something you got from Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him)? 'Ammar said: We have got nothing from Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) which people at large did not get, but Hudhaifa told me that Allah's Apostle (may peace be upon him) had especially told him

amongst his Companion, that there would be twelve hypocrites out of whom eight would not get into Paradise, until a camel would be able to pass through the needle hole. The ulcer would be itself sufficient (to kill) eight. So far as four are concerned, I do not remember what Shu'ba said about them”.

It is clear from this tradition that Ammar is referred to his opponents (and those of Imam 'Ali) in battle as munafiqs. Even more interesting is that he associated this group with the list of 12 or 14 hypocrites from the Aqaba incident who had tried to assassinate the Prophet (s) and about whom only Hudhayfa was told their names, for which he was called 'saahib al-sirr' (man with the secret).

Abu Sulaiman's defence of ijtihaad

Of interest is Abu Sulaiman's own admission that Mu'awiya was wrong, he says:

But the truth that should be said is that these thinkings are definitely false and that the truth is with Ali. But Mu'awiyah's party are excused in their interpretation because they wanted the truth but did not get it.

So he is admitting:

The truth was with Ali

Mu'awiya's assertion was false, but is 'excused' because he was looking for the truth

Subhanallah! What sort of search for the truth is this? One that entitles an individual to rebel against the rightful khalifa, incite people to join in his opposition and then fight the khalifa! And who has excused Mu'awiya for his transgression? Does Abu Sulaiman have any evidence from the Qur'an and Sunnah to prove this point? Rasulullah (s) said`Ammar would be killed by baghi's. Did he state that this baghi group will be excused because they will be searching for the truth? Is there any verse of the Qur'an stating that one who is a transgressor is excused? According to Abu Sulaiman all this is permissible in Islam and it was based on interpretation i.e. ijtihaad. If the truth was with Ali (as), a fact that Rasulullah had vouched for, as we have mentioned, how did Mu'awiya feel that he was on the path of truth by fighting Ali (as)? Abu Sulaiman can defend Mu'awiya all he likes, the fact is he was a baghi and one who is a baghi can NOT use ijtihaad to justify his opposition. A Mujtahid can ONLY exercise Ijtihaad when no solution is available in the Qur'an and Sunnah. When the Qur'an states clearly the obedience to the Ul'il Umr is unconditional and we have Ahl'ul Sunnah traditions in which Rasulullah (s) condemned splitting from the Jamaah then it is evident that the excuses provided by Abu Sulaiman are as weak as the claim that Imam Ali and his party were baghi's having brought `Ammar to the battlefield.

Abu Sulaiman, that for every Shi'a accusation:

“...against Mu'awiyah, there would be a similar argument from other parties. Ahl Al-Sunnah are pleased by the two parties, and do not consider them impious”.

Only a Nasibi could claim such a lie. Abu Sulaiman by citing this example is in effect suggesting that any sin has been cancelled out since both parties were as culpable as each other. This type of answer can only

come from those bearing a hidden grudge towards Imam ‘Ali (as). If we take this type of excuse to its logical conclusion then Mu’awiya’s alleged father ‘Abu Sufyan fought Rasulullah (s) and Rasulullah (s) fought him, so no blame should be apportioned to either since both were responsible for deaths. In Badr, Uhud, Khayber, Khunduq and Hunain Muslims fought kuffar, they were both equal in the blame. By the same token we should distinguish between a goat and a cow since both eat grass, or one’s sister from one’s wife since both are women. This is the typical Nasibi thinking, a concerted effort not to distinguish truth from falsehood in their attempts to lower the exalted rank of Maula ‘Ali (as).

In response to this Nasibi defence what better reply to Abu Sulaiman can there be than Imam ‘Ali (as)’s own assessment of the situation. This sermon of Imam ‘Ali was said at Sifeen and can be located in the following texts of Ahl’ul Sunnah – Waq’at Sifeen page 314, Jamharat Ansab al-Arab, Volume 1 page 353, Sharh of Nahajul Balagha by Ibn Abi al Hadeed Volume 5 page 245:

“I made a promise with Rasulullah (s) that I shall never forego. Your enemies are approaching, you should know that their leader is a hypocrite son of a hypocrite. He is inviting his supporters to Hell Fire while you have the cousin of Rasulullah (s) in your midst, as you know, no one else performed Salat with Rasulullah (s) before me. I am from amongst the participants of Badr while Mu’awiya is the freed captive, son of a freed captive. By Allah! We are on the path of truth whilst Mu’awiya is on the path of falsehood”.

We deem it appropriate to mention that some Nawasib have tried to prove us liars for using ‘Waq’at Sifeen’ as a Sunni text and it has been stated that the author Ibn Mazahim has been called a Shia and as such, they have tried to portray Ibn Mazahim as a weak source. We would like to respond that other Sunni scholars such as Hakim, the author of Al-Mutadrak has likewise been called Shia but that did not mean an outright rejection of the author. We should also point out that Ibn Mazahim has been included in the books of Thiqah narrators by Imam Ibn Habban (al-Thuqat, v9, p215). Moreover several leading Sunni scholars have relied upon Ibn Mazahim in their respective authority works such as Ibn Abi al-Dunya in his book al-Ikhwan, Ibn Abi Shyba in his book al-Arsh, Tabarani in his books al-Mujam al-Kabir and al-Mujam al-Saghir, Darqutni in his al-Sunnan, Umar bin Shaheen in his book Fadhael Saydat al-Nisa, Abu Nu’aim al-Asbahani in his book Musnad Abu Hanifa, Ibn Abdulbar in al-Istiab, Samani in Adab al-Emla, Ibn Abi Hatim who in his Tafsir of Holy Quran declared he had relied upon authentic chains only has also narrated from Ibn Mazahim, Ibn Jarir Tabari in his Tafsir as well as in his Tarikh while Ibn Tamiyah has stated that Tabari in his Tafsir didn’t record from narrators who were liars, Ibn Asakir in Tarikh Dimashq, Ibn al-Athir in Usud al-Ghaba and Khawarezmi in his book al-Manaqib.

One needs to remind our readers that first and foremost Imam Ali (as) was the rightful khalifa and Mu’awiya was a baghi – so right from the start this premise that both parties are just as guilty falls flat. Imam Ali (as)’s actions were supported by the Qur’an and hadith, Rasulullah (s) said he is at

war with anyone that ‘Ali (as) fights, proving his actions will always be correct. If we were to take ‘Abu Sulaiman’s allegation as true then this would suggest that Rasulallah (s) was also culpable! Mu’awiya had no texts to support his rebellion. Abu Sulaiman may feel happy living the dream blindly quoting the defence:

Ansar.org states: “Ahl Al-Sunnah are pleased by the two parties, and do not consider them impious” – but we give greater credence to the words of Imam Ali and in Sharh Ibn Al Hadeed Volume 6 page 71, we read the letter of Imam ‘Ali (as) to Muhammad bin Abi Bakr, that destroys this baseless notion:

“Protect yourself from Hind’s lying son and his invitation, stop and think, the Imam of guidance and the Imam of destruction, Rasulallah’s wasi (executor) and Rasulallah’s enemies can never be seen as equals”.

Through his opposition and propaganda campaign against the Imam he was responsible for inciting fitnah and causing the death of thousands of people. What is interesting is the fact that ‘defences’ and ‘explanation’ are ONLY provided by the Ahl’ul Sunnah for those who rebelled against Imam Ali (as). Why are counter arguments and explanation never provided by Abu Sulaiman and his company for those that rebelled against Abu Bakr, refusing to hand over zakat to him? These individuals are not deemed impious, worse they are deemed murtad! Sayyid Abul A’la Maudoodi, in his book “Murtad ki Saza” (Punishment of the apostate) states that those who did not pay Zakat became apostates because they rebelled against the Khalifa of the time (Murtad ki Saza, page 24 – 25 Karachi edition 1954) Curiously when the companions rebel against Ali (as) and wage war against him the same thinking is not applied, rather as Abu Sulaiman claims they searched for the truth, could not find it but will be forgiven and will be rewarded for it, as Abu Sulaiman comments:

“...the party of Ali was right, and Mu’awiyah was not a despotic, nor a caller to falsehood, but he searched for the truth and did not find it. Therefore, Mu’awiyah is rewarded for his religious interpretation. None of the two was an oppressor or impious”.

Reply One

Rasulallah (s) clearly referred to the party that killed Ammar as baghi, he did not say that they would be rewarded having exercised ijtihaad. He condemned the killers of Amar so hence we can condemn them and call them pious. How was Mu’awiya searching for the truth by opposing Imam ‘Ali (as) who Rasulallah said is with the truth and the truth was with him? To suggest that all acts will be forgiven and rewarded on account of religious interpretation (ijtihaad) is such perverse concept it in fact attacks the core of Shari’a – justice. We have dedicated a separate article exposing the fallacy of the ijtihaad of the companions, but for the moment the cynical comments from Ahl’ul Sunnah’s authority work “Nasbaan Muluk Adoud” page 224 will suffice:

“Ijtihaad is a very unusual concept, which in effect suggests that you can do whatever you like and can simply present ijtihaad as an excuse, by the same token kaafirs could likewise rely in ijtihaad Shaykh ul Hadith Abu Jahil, Shaykh ul Islam Abu Sufyan and the Great Imam Ibne Ziyad all

performed deeds in the name of ijtihaad! Mu'awiya contradicted the Qur'an and Sunnah in his exercise of ijtihaad, and there is no basis to make ijtihaad when there is clear text available”.

Reply Two – A Mujtahid has to be a pious / just man

Both Sects are in agreement that a Mujtahid must be a pious, praiseworthy and just man. Mu'awiya was devoid of all these requirements, through political trickery Mu'awiya allowed Uthman to be killed and then used his death to propel his political ambitions, by rebelling against Maula Ali that led to the Battle of Siffeen, and his army slaughtered many prominent Sahaba. After the martyrdom of Maula Ali (as), Mu'awiya killed his Shi'a to strengthen his reign, and then assassinated Maula Ali (as), Ayesha and prominent Sahaba who he deemed his critics.

Nawasib say that anyone that curses the Sahaba is a transgressor and a kaafir, Maula 'Ali was a rank higher in that he was from the Ahl'ul bayt (as) and one of the Ahl'ul Sunnah's rightly guided khalifas. Muawiya opposed him, rebelled against him and cursed him (as we shall evidence in the next chapter). Muawiya was neither pious nor just which thus makes his ijtihaad of no value. Mu'awiya did not just kill ordinary Sahaba, he killed the participants of Bayt al Ridhwan, and Sahaba such as Amar bin Yasir (ra), Khudhayma bin Thabit an Malib bin Ashthar. The Qur'an says killing one momin leads one to Hell and Muawiya was responsible for killing thousands, which negates any suggestion that he was Adil (just).

Reply Three – Mu'awiya was not a mujtahid

We will rely on the following Sunni works:

Al Ahkam fi Usul al Ahkam, Volume 4 page 218

al Bahar al Raiq Volume 1 page 3 by Muhammad bin Naeem

Tauzhee al Talweeh, page 30

We read in Bahar al Raiq:

“Ijtihad involves having knowledge and evidence for the principles of Shari'ah, Fiqh and Ijtihad...”

One who has form grasp of the Shariah is a mujtahid and according to Sunni jurisprudence a Mujtahid is one with a command of the following principles:

1. The Qur'an
2. Sunnah of the Prophet (s)
3. Ijma of the Ulema
4. Qiyas

Mu'awiya was ignorant of these principles. He was brought up in that household which would place their fingers in their ears when they heard the Qur'an being recited. He lived in that house that was used as a brothel, wherein the inhabitants were idolaters and lead opponents of the Prophet (s). He only embraced Islam through surrender approximately ten years prior to the death of the Prophet (s). Mu'awiya had very little opportunity to sit in the midst of the Prophet. It should also be made clear that the Qur'an and Sunnah is not simple to understand, it took Umar twelve years to recite Surah Baqarah, and at the time of the death he claimed that the Prophet (s) could not die, and did not shift from this stance until Abu Bakr recited the

Qur'anic verse 'And there had been (other) prophets before him'. ' If this was the state of such an esteemed figure, then what can we say of Mu'awiya with his limited exposure to the Prophet (s)? Mu'awiya was neither a mujtahid in practice (in his daily life) nor in theory.

Reply Four – Imam Ali (as)'s verdict that Mu'awiya should be killed as he has no grounds to oppose him

In al-Nasa'ih al-Kaafiyah page 24 this tradition is taken from Ibn Asheer who quotes this sermon of Imam 'Ali (as):

“Mu'awiya and his army should be killed as they are Qasateen neither are they from amongst those that understand the Qur'an, nor are they experts on the principles of deen, nor are they counted as scholars who can issue verdicts”.

These words discredit the false notion that Mu'awiya had exercised ijtiḥad Imam Ali (as) made it clear that he had no basis to oppose and had no defense in Shari'a to support his rebellion.

Reply Five – Maula Ali's expose on Mu'awiya's character destroys the defence of ijtiḥad

In Tarikh Kamil Volume 3 page 140, the words of Imam 'Ali (as) are recorded:

“Mu'awiya and his supporters such as Amr bin Aas were dishonest, they had no knowledge of the Qur'an, I know them from their childhood through to their adolescence, they were the worst of all people”.

This testimony of Imam 'Ali (as) in effect destroys the defence of ijtiḥad. Ijtiḥad is exercised by an scholar who is honest and posses a command of the Qur'an and Sunnah. In the eyes of Imam Ali (as) Mu'awiya was dishonest and ignorant of the Qur'an hence he was in no position to rely on the Qur'an to justify his opposition.

Reply Six – Abdullah bin Umro's regret that he fought alongside Mu'awiya at Sifeen

Al Isti'ab, Volume 1 page 292 under the biography of Abdullah bin Umro bin al-Aas:

“Ibn Abi Malika narrated that Abdullah bin Umro bin al-Aas said: 'Why I participated in Sifeen! Why I fought the Muslims! By Allah I wish I was died ten years before this incident'. Than he said: 'By Allah I didn't strike by sword, nor did I strike by spear, nor shot an arrow, and I wish I never attended this incident, I repent to Allah almighty to seek repentance'. It has been narrated that he held the flag during that incident, therefore he extended regret for fighting beside Mu'awiya, thus he continuously sought forgiveness from Allah”.

Now if both parties were indeed right as is 'Abu Sulaiman's claim then why was bin Umro asking for forgiveness having fought with Mu'awiya at Sifeen? According to Abu Sulaiman's logic there would be nothing to be shameful about since both will be rewarded – but the regret, embarrassment and tauba of this participant destroys the fallacy of ijtiḥad since Abdullah bin `Amr al Aas clearly viewed his support of Mu'awiya to be a great sin for which he sought the forgiveness of Allah (swt).

Rasulullah's condemnation of Mu'awiya and Amr bin Aas refutes the defence of ijtihaad

We read in Waq'at Sifeen page 218 that Zaid bin Arkam narrated that he heard Rasulullah (s) say:

“If you ever see Mu'awiya and Amr bin Aas sitting together then split them up because they will never unite on anything good”

We read in al-Nasa'ih al-Kaafiyah page 94 and Tatheer al Jinan page 120 that Rasulullah (s) said the following:

“If you ever see Mu'awiya and Amr bin Aas sitting together then split them up because verily they will only unite on deception”.

This tradition and the former destroys Abu Sulaiman's defense of ijtihaad in the case of Mu'awiya, because Rasulullah (s) said anything they do will be deception i.e. would contradict the dictates of the Deen. Ijtihad is based on sincere interpretation in the absence of nass (text). Rasulullah (s) said the union of these two individuals would ALWAYS be based on deception and never for a good cause NOT on matters pertaining to Deen. Mu'awiya and Amr bin Aas united at Sifeen against the Imam of the time. Their claims to avenge the death of Uthman was deception as testified by the words of Rasulullah (s).

Abu Sulaiman's verdict that both parties were on truth and cannot be criticised

Ansar.org states:

Authentic traditions prove that both parties have the same claim and seek the truth they believe. These authentic traditions also declare that the two parties are innocent from looking for caprice and following falsehood. Al-Bukhari narrated in his Saheeh from Abu Hurayrah who says: (The Messenger of Allah peace be upon him said: “Judgement Day will not come until two parties fight with similar claims.”) [Saheeh Al-Bukhari, Book of "Virtues," Chapter of "Signs of Prophecy in Islam," #3413] This hadeeth, as you see, proves that the two parties have the same demand and the same religion.

We reiterate that we are not saying Imam Ali (as) was fighting Kuffar, the battle was with baghi's / transgressors. Both parties might indeed have the same demand but the question Abu Sulaiman intentionally avoids is to cast light on which party is on the right path which party was correct in its demand, Ali demanding obedience or Mu'awiya refusing obedience and opposing him. We know from the hadith cited earlier that Rasulullah (s) said that Imam Ali was on Haqq, supported by the Qur'an and would fight the Baghi Party. So these hadith make it clear that the demands of Imam Ali (as) that Mu'awiya submit to his authority was the correct demand, supported by the Qur'an and hadith. Mu'awiya's opposition was and cannot in retrospect (despite Abu Sulaiman's loyal efforts) be supported by the Shari'a. He WAS following falsehood. Now let us analyse the second hadith:

Muslim narrated in his Saheeh from Abu Saeed Al-khudaro who says: (The messenger of Allah peace be upon him said: “Renegades will pass through a group of Muslims. They would be killed by the more deserving

party of truth.”) [Muslim with Explanation, Book of "Zakkat," Chapter of "The Kharijites and their characteristics," #150] This hadeeth clears that both parties ask for the truth and fight for it. Meaning that the two parties were intending the truth and requesting it. This hadeeth also shows that the truth lies with Ali because he was the one who fought these renegades i.e. the Kharijites at Al-Nahrawan.

Interesting is the fact that in this hadith Rasulallah (s) did not say that the other party was also on the truth! It clearly indicates that Imam Ali (as)'s Party IS the party of truth, has Rasulallah (s) showered praise on the other group?

Abu Sulaiman had stated, “These authentic traditions also declare that the two parties are innocent from looking for caprice and following falsehood”. We wonder how it is that Abu Sulaiman has arrived at this conclusion. Did Rasulallah (s) state in either of these traditions “the two parties are innocent from looking for caprice and following falsehood”? He (s) clearly did not identify which party was correct and this can be further proven from the other hadith cited so we should remind our readers of the repercussions for one who attributes a lie to Rasulallah (s).

Abu Sulaiman then cites the words of Al-Nawawi:

“It is a declaration that both parties are believers and fighting each other does not cancel their faith and they should be not called impious.” [Sahih Muslim vol.7, p.235]

Nawawi asserts that it does not cancel their faith, but the Qur'an and Sunnah tell us perpetrators of such crimes have committed kufr:

“And whoever kills a believer intentionally, his recompense shall be hell, he shall abide therein and God's wrath (Ghazibullaho) shall be on him and his curse (lanato), and is prepared for him a great torment” (Surah Nisa, v 93)

Further, Abdullah Ibn`Umar narrates he heard Rasulallah (s) say:

“Do not revert to disbelief after me by striking (cutting) the necks of one another”. Sahih al Bukhari Arabic-English Volume 9 hadith number 198

The Holy Prophet said, “Your blood, property, honour and skin (ie body) are sacred to one another” Sahih al Bukhari Arabic-English Volume 9 hadith number 199

It is narrated on the authority of ‘Abdullah b. Mas’ud that

The Prophet, said, “Abusing a Muslim is Fusuq (evil doing) and killing him is Kufr (disbelief).” [Sahih al-Bukhari Volume 9, Book 88, Number 197]

So these ahadith and verse make it clear:

To kill a Muslim is an act of kufr (so one is at risk of losing one's faith)

The intentional killing of a mu'min places the perpetrator in hell

Now with these facts in mind we should ask ‘how many believers were intentionally killed at Sifeen?’

The ONLY way that these actions can be defended is if there is a clear provision in Islam that entitles an individual to fight and kill his Muslim brother. If no such provision exists then in light of the Qur'an and hadith

ALL those who fought against Imam Ali (as), committed kufr, they are murderers and are therefore in hell.

There had to be clear text to support the stance of the parties. The fighting was between two groups of believers. One group was led by the rightful Khalifa of the time who was supported in his actions by the Qur'an and words of Rasulallah, and on the opposing side we had Abu Sulaiman's client Mu'awiya who had no basis under the Shari'a to transgress in the manner that he did. It is indeed sad that Abu Sulaiman does not even possess the courage to admit which party was correct in light of the Qur'an and Sunnah. Rather than do so, he continues to defend Mu'awiya's transgression.

Try as he may these defences are of no avail. We have the guarantee of Rasulallah (s) in this hadith from Sahih Bukhari Chapter, Fighting for the Cause of Allah (Jihaad) Volume 4 hadith number 67 that Ikrima narrated:

"Ibn 'Abbas told him and 'Ali bin 'Abdullah to go to Abu Said and listen to some of his narrations; so they both went (and saw) Abu Said and his brother irrigating a garden belonging to them. When he saw them, he came up to them and sat down with his legs drawn up and wrapped in his garment and said, "(During the construction of the mosque of the Prophet) we carried the adobe of the mosque, one brick at a time while 'Ammar used to carry two at a time. The Prophet passed by 'Ammar and removed the dust off his head and said, "May Allah be merciful to 'Ammar. He will be killed by a rebellious aggressive group. 'Ammar will invite them to (obey) Allah and they will invite him to the (Hell) fire."

So from this hadith we learn

A rebellious group will kill Ammar

Ammar will invite this rebellious group to submit to the will of Allah

This rebellious group shall be inviting him to Hell Fire

Imam Taymeeya al Nasibi's Fatwa that killers of Amar lead people to Hell

In this connection we have this fatwa of Ibn Taymeeya:

"And it has been narrated in Muslim, 'O Ammar you will be killed by a group of transgressors', and this is proof on the correctness of the Imamah of Ali and that it is obligatory to follow him, and those that were calling to his obedience were calling to Jannah and that those who fought him were calling towards hellfire, even though they did ta'wil.."

Majmu' Fatawa Vol 4 Page 437

Rasulallah (s) deemed the opponents and killers of Ammar a rebellious group that was inviting him to Hell Fire i.e. Destruction. This is clear proof that this group was deviant and was so far from the truth that it was in effect recruiting people to destruction in the next world. This being the case how can individuals who in Rasulallah's own words were inviting Ammar to the Hell Fire be deemed (as Abu Sulaiman would like us to believe) to be pious, innocent individuals searching for the truth?

For Nawawi to comment that neither side should be called impious is symptomatic of those who refuse to separate truth from falsehood. How can we not declare impious those that are deemed impious according to the

Qur'an and Sunnah? Allah (swt) deems such individual transgressors and Rasulallah (s) had described those that would fight Imam 'Ali (as) as Baghi (rebels). If Allah and his Rasul (s) have condemned this seditious element then why should we be condemned for doing likewise?

Chapter Seven: Mu'awiya instituted the bid'ah of cursing Imam Ali (as)

In his attempt to protect his Nasibi Imam, Abu Sulaiman vigorously seeks to deny the historically established fact that Imam Ali (as) was cursed by Mu'awiya.

It is a lie that Mu'awiyah ordered to insult Ali from the pulpits. There is no rightful or clear evidence about that. Mu'awiya's biography and manners refuses this accusation. What some of the historians mention about that has no value because when these historians presents these words about Mu'awiyah, they do not differentiate between true or false stories. In addition, most of these historians are Shia. But some of the Historians narrated in their books sound stories and false stories, but they are excused when they attributed these stories to their narrators so that we could judge these stories, whether to accept them or reject them.

This being the case then what facts of history should we accept, only those that support Nasibi's and defame Shi'a? Abu Sulaiman is stating that anything that agrees with the Shi'a must be false on account of Shi'a influence. By the same logic anything that supports Nawasib must also be false as it is based on Nasibi influence.

Evidence of the tradition of cursing Ali and Mu'awiya being at its heart can be found in a vast array of books penned by the leading scholars of Ahl'ul Sunnah. The books of Tarikh, Sirah and hadith are replete with the fact that Mu'awiya introduced the bidah of cursing the Imam of Guidance, Ameerul Momineen Ali (as), throughout his Kingdom. If we are to accept Abu Sulaiman's absurd claim then he is in effect suggesting that all the classical Sunni historians were duped into narrating this fable. It would be one thing to say that this alleged fabrication could only be located in scarcely known extant works, but the fact is that leading scholars of Ahl'ul Sunnah have narrated that Imam Ali (as) was indeed reviled during the reign of the Banu Umayya upon the specific orders of Mu'awiya bin Hind. Abu Sulaiman's attempts to hide this fact is in vain. To suggest that most of the historians (who narrated this) are Shi'a rather than Sunni who would never find fault with Mu'awiya, is indeed a laughable notion. Especially for Abu Sulaiman and those wishing to examine the matter further we shall insha'allah present a list of references where you can locate this episode. We will then leave it to our open minded readers to decide whether there is indeed any basis for Abu Sulaiman's claims that this event never happened, and that it was all a mistake by dim witted historians, duped by the Rafidah!

Mu'awiya asks Sa'd to curse Ali (as)

We read in Sahih Muslim:

عن عامر بن سعد بن أبي وقاص، عن أبيه، قال أمر معاوية بن أبي سفيان سعدا فقال ما منعك أن تسب أبا التراب فقال أما ما ذكرت ثلاثا قالهن له رسول الله ﷺ فلن أسبه لأن تكون لي واحدة منهن

This hadith has been narrated on the authority of Shu'ba with the same chain of transmitters. Amir b. Sa'd b. Abi Waqqas reported on the authority

of his father that Muawiya b. Abi Sufyin appointed Sa'd as the Governor and said: What prevents you from abusing Abu Turab (Hadrat 'Ali), whereupon he said : It is because of three things which I remember Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) having said about him that I would not abuse him and even if I find one of those three things for me, it would be more dear to me than the red camel. I heard Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) say about 'Ali as he left behind him in one of his campaigns (that was Tabuk). 'Ali said to him: Allah's Messenger, you leave me behind along with women and children. Thereupon Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) said to him: Aren't you satisfied with being unto me what Aaron was unto Moses but with this exception that there is no prophethood after me. And I (also) heard him say on the Day of Khaibar: I would certainly give this standard to a person who loves Allah and his Messenger and Allah and his Messenger love him too. He (the narrator) said: We have been anxiously waiting for it, when he (the Holy Prophet) said: Call 'Ali. He was called and his eyes were inflamed. He applied saliva to his eyes and handed over the standard to him, and Allah gave him victory. (The third occasion is this) when the (following) verse was revealed: "Let us summon our children and your children." Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) called 'Ali, Fatima, Hasan and Husain and said: O Allah, they are my family.

Sahih Muslim, Chapter of Virtues of Companions, Section of Virtues of Ali, Book 31, Number 5915

Al-Nawawi offered lame excuses to defend Mu'awiya

The above narration of Sa'd in Sahih Muslim is so clear that the Sunni Ulema in past centuries arrived at the conclusion that Mu'awiya ordered Sa'd to curse Ali (as). A departure from this accepted fact occurred after the passage of 650 years, when Al-Nawawi, tried to defend Mu'awiya by advancing some lame excuses that today's Nasibis blindly cling to cite on their internet forums. Abu Sulaiman is the perfect example who cites the pathetic defence of Nawawi, namely that:

"This hadeeth does not mean that Mu'awiyah ordered Sa'ad to insult Ali. But, as it is obvious, Mu'awiyah wanted to know the reason that prevented Sa'ad from insulting Ali... Al-Nawawi says: "Mu'awiyah's saying does not declare that he ordered Sa'ad to insult Ali, but asked him for the reason that prevented him from insulting. As if Mu'awiyah was saying to him: "Have you refrained from insulting Ali as a result of piety, fear or anything like that? If it was as a result of piety and veneration to refrain from insulting, then you are rightful and if it were other than that, then there would be another answer." Or it might be that Sa'ad was in a group of people who insults Ali and he did not insult Ali with them, and could not prevent them and controverted them so Mu'awiyah asked him this question. They said: "And it may have another explanation, that what prevented you from making Ali wrong in his thought and opinion, and to show to people our good opinion and thought and that Ali was wrong?" [Ibid. p250-252]

1st critique – Nawawi’s misguided innovation in Islamic Sharia to defend the Sahaba

Imam al-Nawawi said:

“The Ulema said that any hadith that appears to refer to intra-Sahaba enmity should be interpreted figuratively”.

We will respond by saying that it this is blind worship of the Sahaba and constitutes a major innovation. We ask:

‘Has Allah (swt) revealed this legal principle via the Quran or the tongue of his blessed Prophet (saw)? If the Sahaba were aware of this legal position, why did they abuse, curse and fight one another?’

We shall in this very chapter provide textual evidences that just like Muawiya, companions like Mughira bin Shu’ba and Busr bin Irtat shamelessly cursed/abused Ali bin Abi Talib (as). For more detail, please see our article “Shari Penalty of Cursing Sahaba”, and chapter of:

Incidents of Sahaba Cursing/Abusing each other

Wherein numerous incidents of the Sahaba abusing and fighting each other are quoted from Bukhari and Muslim.

2nd critique – Al-Nawawi applied this insane logic, so as to defend Mu’awiya (i.e. no textual proofs)

Al-Nawawi has used ONLY his insane logic in this case and has tried to provide as many lame excuses as he could, so as to change the meaning of this tradition of Sa’d to defend and honour of Mu’awiya. We will ask, is the conjecture of Nawawi valid when we measure it against:

The logical arguments about this tradition of Sa’d ?

Textual proofs from other Sunni Ahadith and history books, which have recorded the Sa’d / Mu’awiya interaction in more explicit detail?

The opinion of other Sunni Ulema on the tradition of Sa’d, who criticised Al-Nawawi for hiding the truth.

Logical answer versus the conjectures of Al-Nawawi & Co.

Whilst the job of a good lawyer is to defend the position of his client and seek to defend him from all charges, what we have seen here is a scenario of a lawyer defending the indefensible

Why would Mu’awiya want to know why Sa’d did not insult Ali?

Was this a normal practice for the Muslims of the time? If so who used to curse Ali (as)?

The above tradition from Sahih Muslim clearly indicates that Mu’awiya was surprised why he was refraining from cursing. Mu’awiya asks this question with surprise “What prevents you!” . You only ask a matter in this way if you are surprised if for example an individual is acting in a manner that is contrary to a norm / precedent. Let us provide two simple examples:

One: In the West, it is enshrined in law and custom for drivers to wear seat belts. If I act contrary to it in front of my acquaintances, a common reaction would be for them to ask “What prevents you from wearing a seat belt?”. Why? Because I am violating an accepted practice and they are enquiring WHY!

Two: If you walk into a room and see people doing something that you disapprove of, would you ask the person abstaining from the action, or the

people doing the action, would you not directly ask them WHY they were doing (or not doing) such an act? For instance, if I walked into a room where one of my kids was doing something that I never approve while the other child was not doing it, I would NOT ask the one doing nothing wrong as to why he was not misbehaving. I'd ask the one doing the thing I didn't approve and that's human nature.

Likewise, it is clear common sense that Mu'awiya wanted to know why Sa'd was NOT cursing Ali (as). This demonstrates that cursing Ali was a common practice and Mu'awiya wanted to know why he was acting contrary to it?

Also let us analyze these arguments in light of the following version of the tradition recorded by Imam Ibn Hajar Asqalani:

وعند أبي يعلى عن سعد من وجه آخر لا بأس به قال لو وضع المنشار على مفرقي على أن أسب عليا ما سبته أبدا

And Abi Ya'la from Sa'd from another source which is not incorrect, Sa'd said: "Even if a saw was placed over my neck to abuse Ali, I wouldn't abuse him."

Fathul Bari Sharah Sahih Bukhari, Vol. 7, Page 74, "Bab Manaqib Ali"

The arguments put forward by Sa'd in this tradition makes it further clear that cursing Ali (as) was a common practice at that time and force was being used by the rulers for this purpose, it is for this precise reason that Sa'd stated that he would not submit under and form of duress.

If this still is not logical for the children of Muawiya then the clearest proof comes from the next narration from other sources of Ahl'ul Sunnah that shed light on Mu'awiya's intention.

Textual proofs from other Sunni Hadith and history books, versus the conjectures of Al-Nawawi & Co.

The Traditions cited hereinafter are those that Al-Nawawi deliberately CONCEALED, as they come into direct conflict with his Conjectures.

1st Hadith that Al-Nawawi & Co. Concealed

Since the Arabic grammar of the version found in Sahih Muslim is in an 'interrogative style' that might provide a glimmer of hope to people like Nawawi to offer an alternative interpretation, the fact is variants of the same episode have recorded that leave us with no doubt about what Mu'awiyah's intentions. For example, we read the following version record by Muhibuddin al-Tabari in his famed work 'Al-Riyadh al-Nudhira Fi Manaqib Ashra Mubashira' Volume 1 page 262:

عن سعيد قال أمر معاوية سعدا أن يسب أبا تراب فقال أما ما ذكرت ثلاثا قالهن رسول الله ﷺ

Saeed said: Mu'awiyah ordered Sa'd to curse Abu Turab, so he replied: 'Regarding what you have said, the Prophet said three things...'

Imam of Ahle Sunah Mulla Ali Qari also relied upon the version recorded by Muhibuddin Tabari in his esteemed work Mirqat Sharah Mishkat, Volume 17 page 493.

Mirqat Sharah Mishkat, Volume 17 page 493

2nd Hadith that Al-Nawawi & Co. Concealed

Ibn Kathir records that:

وقال أبو زرعة الدمشقي : ثنا أحمد بن خالد الذهبي أبو سعيد ، ثنا محمد بن إسحاق ، عن عبد الله بن أبي نجيح ، عن أبيه قال : لما حج معاوية أخذ بيد سعد بن أبي وقاص فقال : يا أبا إسحاق ، إنا قوم قد أجفانا هذا الغزو عن الحج حتى كدنا أن ننسى بعض سننه ، فطف نطف بطوافك . قال : فلما فرغ أدخله دار الندوة ، فأجلسه معه على سريره ، ثم ذكر علي بن أبي طالب فوقع فيه ، فقال : أدخلتني دارك ، وأجلستني على سريرك ، ثم وقعت في علي تشتمه ؟

When Mu'awiya went for Hajj, he held the hand of Sa'd bin Abi Waqas and said to him: 'Oh Abi Ishaq! We are the people who abandoned Hajj because of wars until we almost forgot some of its laws, so we performed Tawaf (circumambulation) to imitate your Tawaf'. When they completed (the hajj), he (Muawiya) entered upon him (Sa'd) in a conference room and sat with him on his sofa, then he (Muawiya) mentioned Ali bin Abi Talib and cursed him. He (Sa'd) said: 'You brought me to your house and made me sit on your sofa and then you have begun to curse Ali?'

Al Bidayah wa al Nahayah, Volume 7 page 341, Chapter: The virtues of Ali

It is evident that Al-Nawawi has sought to conceal these traditions, so as to deceive people by making lame excuses and submitting his conjectures that Mu'awiya was not asking Sa'd to curse Ali (as).

We should point out that a Nasibi in a very known Shia debate forum on the internet tried to cast doubts on the authenticity of one of the narrators in the tradition namely Ahmed bin Khalid, since Nawasib are fond of rotating anti-Shia texts all over the internet, we will clarify this misconception, the narrator Ahmed bin Khalid is an extremely authentic narrator. Al-Dahabi said about him: "Imam, Muhadith, Thiqah" (Siar alam al Nubala, v9 p539). Imam Yahya ibn Mueen said: 'Thiqah' (Tahdib al-kamal, v1 p301). Imam Ibn Haban included him in his book of authentic narrators 'al-Thuqat' (v8 p6). He has also been deemed Thiqah by Imam Ibn Khuzaima as he declared in his book that he only narrated from Thiqah narrators while hadiths having Ahmed bin Khalid in the chains can be read in the book. Imam Hakim narrated hadith from him and stated the hadith to be Sahih according to the condition of Imam Muslim while Imam Dhahabi echoed the same (Mustadrak, v4 p117 Hadith 7072). Imam Ibn Majah narrated hadith from him and beloved Imam of Salafies Al-Baani decalred the hadith as 'Sahih' (Sahih Ibn Majah, v2 p351 Hadith 3188).

3rd Hadith that Al-Nawawi & Co. Concealed

In Musanaf Ibn Abi Shayba, volume 7 page 496 as well as in Sunan Ibn Majah, Volume 1 page 45 we read the following tradition:

عن سعد بن أبي وقاص قال قدم معاوية في بعض حجاته فدخل عليه سعد فذكروا عليا
فنال منه فغضب سعد وقال تقول هذا

“On his way to Hajj, Sa’d met Mu’awiya and his companions mentioned Ali upon which Mu’awiya cursed him, Sa’d got angry and asked ‘why do you say such things?’”

An esteemed pillar of the Salafi Sect Shaykh Al-albaani graded the above cited Hadith as ‘Sahih’, see

Sahih Sunan Ibn Majah by Albani, Volume 1 page 26

Not only this but Al-Albaani stated:

فنال منه)) أي نال معاوية من علي وتكلم فيه))

“((cursed him)) means Mu’awiyah cursed Ali and spoke ill about him”

So Sa’d got ANGRY! But why? According to the risible logic of Al-Nawawi and his adherents, his ANGER was only on account of the fact that Mu’awiya ‘requested’ that he offer his reasons for not cursing Ali (as)! Will you get ANGRY if someone simply requests you to tell him why you don’t curse another person?

4th tradition that Al-Nawawi & Co. concealed

The following account in particular, when read alongside the actual tradition of Sahih Muslim under discussion, will clarify the whole episode and negate all the absurd attempts to misinterpret the tradition of Sahih Muslim on the basis of pathetic conjectures. We read:

“When Hassan bin Ali died, Mu’awiyah performed the Hajj, and then entered into Madina where he wanted to curse Ali from Prophet’s pulpit, thus they said to him: ‘Sa’d bin Abi Waqqas is right here and he will not accept your behaviour, you should ask him first.’ Thus he sent for him and asked him about this to which he (Sa’d) said: ‘If you did it, I shall leave the mosque and never come here again.’ Thus Mu’awiyah restrained himself from cursing (Ali) until Sa’d passed away, when Sa’d died, he cursed him (Ali) from the pulpit and also ordered his governors to curse him from the pulpits and they (his governors) did likewise. Then Umm Salama, the wife of the Prophet (pbuh), wrote to Mu’awiyah saying: ‘You are cursing Allah and his Messenger from your pulpits and that is as a result of cursing Ali bin Abi Talib and his lovers and I testify that Allah and his Messenger love him.’ However he (Mu’awiyah) didn’t pay any attention to her statement”.

al Aqd al-Fareed, Volume 3 page 300

5th tradition that Al-Nawawi & Co. concealed

As pointed out above, the Kufr act initiated by Muawiyah of cursing Ali bin Abi Talib (as) from the pulpits incensed Ummul Momineen Um Salama (sa). As Imam Ahmed records with a chain that has been declared ‘Sahih’ by Shaykh Shoib al-Arna’ut:

قال دخلت على أم سلمة فقالت لي : أيسب رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم فيكم
قلت معاذ الله أو سبحانه الله أو كلمة نحوها قالت سمعت رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم
يقول من سب عليا فقد سبني

Abdullah al-Jadali said: ‘I came to Um Salama and she said to me: ‘How come Allah’s Messenger is being cursed among you?’. I replied: ‘We seek refuge from Allah or praise Allah or some similar words’. She said: ‘I heard Allah’s Messenger (pbuh) saying ‘whoever curses Ali has cursed me’

Musnad Ahmed, Volume 6 page 323 Hadith 26791

Similarly we read in Musnad Aba Y’ala, Volume 12 page 444 a tradition about which the margin writer Hussain Salim Asad has stated: ‘The narrators are Thiqah’. We read:

قالت أم سلمة : أيسب رسول الله - صلى الله عليه و سلم - على المنابر ؟ قلت : وأنى ذلك ؟ قالت : أليس يسب علي ومن يجبه ؟ فأشهد أن رسول الله - صلى الله عليه و سلم - كان يجبه

Abi Abdullah al-Jadali said: Um Salama said: ‘How come Allah’s Messenger is being cursed from the pulpits?’ I replied: ‘How?’. She replied: ‘Aren’t Ali and his lovers being cursed?’ I testify that Allah’s Messenger (pbuh) used to love him’.

6th tradition that Al-Nawawi & Co. concealed

al-Tabari reported:

When Muawiya Ibn Abi Sufyan put al-Mughairah Ibn Shu’ba in charge of Kufah in Jumada 41 (September 2- October 30, 661), he summoned him. After praising and glorifying God, he said:

“Now then, indeed a forbearing person has been admonished in the past... The wise might do what you want without instruction. Although I have wanted to advise you about many things, I left them alone, trusting in your discernment of what pleases me, what helps my regime and what sets my subjects [raiyyah] on the right path. I would continue to advise you about a quality of yours- do not refrain from abusing Ali and criticizing him, not from asking God’s mercy upon Uthman and His forgiveness for him. Continue to shame the companions of Ali, keep at a distance, and don’t listen to them. Praise the faction of Uthman, bring them near, and listen to them.

History of Tabari, English version, events of year 51 AH, Execution of Hujr Ibn Adi, v18, pp 122-123

The very instructions of Muawiya to his governors are found in next tradition as well.

7th Tradition, that Al-Nawawi & Co. concealed

Imam Ibn Jareer Tabari records:

The Messenger of Muawiya then came to them with orders to release six and to kill eight, telling them:

We have been ordered to let you disavow Ali and curse him. If you do so, we shall release you, and if you refuse, we shall kill you.

History of Tabari, English version, events of year 51 AH, v18, p149

8th Tradition that Al-Nawawi & Co. concealed – Imam Hasan (as) asking Muawiya not to curse Ali (as) from the pulpits

Those who deny that Muawiya promulgated the act of cursing Ali bin Abi Talib (as) throughout his reign, should be reminded about the peace treaty between Imam Hasan (as) and Muawiya that contained several conditions, one of those was that Muawiya would no longer curse Ali (as) which Muawiya refused to accept, it was then said that he would not allow the cursing of Ali (as) whilst Imam Hasan (as) was present and could hear it, which Muawiya accepted this but since Nasibism was flowing through his veins, he did not keep this promise. In Tarikh Kamil, Volume 2 page 108 we read the testimony of Ibn Athir that during the negotiations with Mu'awiya:

“Al-Hasan asked Mu'awiya to give him what is in Kufa's treasury worth five million, Ebjird city tax, and not to curse Ali, Mu'awiya refused to desist from cursing Ali, so (al-Hasan) asked him not to curse Ali when he could hear it, (Mu'awiya) accepted this but failed to fulfil it, and about Darabjird city tax, the people of Basrah refused to deliver it to him and said that the income belonged to them and they would not give it to any one, their rejection was upon the orders of Mu'awiya”

Tarikh Kamil (Urdu), Volume 3 pages 2-3 (Usmania Academy, Hyderabad, India)

Tarikh Kamil (Arabic), Volume 3 page 272 (Beruit)

Tarikh Kamil, Volume 2 page 108 (from www.islamport.com)

Imam Dhahabi also recorded:

ثم كتب إلى معاوية على أن يسلم إليه بيت المال وأن لا يسب عليًا بحضرته وأن يحمل

إليه خراج فسا ودارابجرد كل سنة

“Then he (al-Hasan) wrote to Mu'awiya to give him the treasury (of Kufa), not to curse Ali and give him the tax of Darabjird every year”

Al-Abar fi Khabar min Ghabar, Volume 1, page 18 Chapter: Year 37 the battle of Sifin

Imam Ibn Jarir Tabari also records:

“Al Hasan had already made peace with Muawiya on condition that he concede to him what was in his treasury plus the revenue (kharaij) of Darabjird and that Ali is not reviled in his hearing.”

History of Tabari, Volume 18 page 5

One of the narrators in the chain of the cited tradition from Tareekh Tabari is Awnah bin al-Hakam al-Kalbi about whom Imam Dhahabi stated: ‘He was truthful (seduq) in his narrations’ (Siyar alam al-Nubla, v7 p201) while Imam Ejli included him in his book of authentic narrators “Marifat al-Thuqat” v2 p196. Shaykh Yaqut al-Hamawi (575-626) records: “Awanah bin al-Hakam bin Ayadh bin Wazer ibn Abdulharith bin Abi Husn bin Thalba bin Jubair bin Amer bin al-Numan. He was a scholar in history and traditions, was Thiqah...Abdullah bin Jaffar said: ‘Awanah bin al-Hakam amongst the scholars of history and conquests from Kufa and highly knowledgeable in poems and eloquence, he had brothers and witty

narrations, he was authentic and the whole al-Madaeni narrations are from him” (Mu’ajam al-Udaba, v2 p232). Safadi (d. 764 H) records about Awnah: “It appears that he is Seduq”. (Nakth al-Hayman, v1, p90). Also we read in the margin of Ibn Aarabi’s book ‘al-Awasim min al-Qawasim’ by Allamah Muhibuddin al-Khatib, p189: “Awanah bin al-Hakam was one of the greatest Sheikhs of al-Madaeni”.

Ibn Asakir records the same from a chain with three different variants:

Abu Bakar Muhammad bin Abdulbaqi from al-Hassan bin Ali from Muhammad bin al-Abbas from Ahmad bin Marouf from al-Hussain bin Muhammad from Muhammad bin Saad from Abu Ubaid from Mujalid from al-Shu’abi and Yunus bin Abi Ishaq from his father and Abi al-Sefr and others.

So the three variants are:

[1]. Abu Bakar Muhammad bin Abdulbaqi from al-Hassan bin Ali from Muhammad bin al-Abbas from Ahmad bin Marouf from al-Hussain bin Muhammad from Muhammad bin Saad from Abu Ubaid from Mujalid from al-Shu’abi.

[2]. Abu Bakar Muhammad bin Abdulbaqi from al-Hassan bin Ali from Muhammad bin al-Abbas from Ahmad bin Marouf from al-Hussain bin Muhammad from Muhammad bin Saad from Abu Ubaid Yunus bin Abi Ishaq from his father.

[3]. Abu Bakar Muhammad bin Abdulbaqi from al-Hassan bin Ali from Muhammad bin al-Abbas from Ahmad bin Marouf from al-Hussain bin Muhammad from Muhammad bin Saad from Abu Ubaid from Abi al-Sefr and others.

All the chains mention that Imam Hasan (as) placed the following conditions before Muawiya La’een:

ولا يسب علي وهو يسمع وان يحمل إليه خراج فسا (3) ودار البجرد (4) من ارض

فارس كل عام

“Not to curse Ali whilst he could hear it, send him the tax of Fesa and Darabjird in Persian every year.”

Tareekh Damishq by Ibn Asakir, Volume 13 page 246

All the narrators in the 2nd chain are authentic. Abu Bakar Muhammad bin Abdulbaqi: Ibn al-Jawzi said: ‘Thiqah’ (Trikh al-Islam, by Dahabi, v36, p392), Dahabi said: ‘Adil’ (Siar alam alnubala, v20 p23). Hassan bin Ali al-Jawheri: Al-Baghdadi said: ‘Thiqah’ (Tarikh Baghdad, v7 p404), Dahabi said: ‘Seduq’ (Siar alam, v18 p68). Muhammad bin al-Abbas al-Khazaz: Al-Baghdadi said: ‘Thiqah’ (Tarikh Baghdad, v3 p337), Dahabi said: ‘Thiqa’ (Siar alam, v16 p409). Ahmad bin Marouf bin Beshr: Al-Baghdadi said: ‘Thiqah’ (Tarikh Baghdad, v5 p368), Dahabi said: ‘Thiqa (Tarikh Islam, v24, p103). Hussain bin Muhammad bin Abdulrahman bin Fehm: Al-Baghdadi said: ‘Thiqah’ (Tarikh Baghdad, v8 p91), Dahabi said: ‘Huge Hafiz’ (Tazkirat al-Hufaz, v2 p680) & also said: ‘He was strict in narrating’ (Tarikh al-Islam, v21 p164). Muhammad bin Saad (the author of Tabaqat al-Kubra): Al-Baghdadi said: ‘According to us he is among just people and truthful in narrating’ (Tarikh Baghdad, v2, p366), Dahabi said: ‘Hafiz, Allamah, Hujja’ (Siar alam, v10 p664). Muhammad bin Ubaid al-Tenafsi:

Both Ibn Hajar & Dahabi declared him Thiqa (Taqrib al-Taḥḍīb, v2 p110 & Tazkirat al-Hufaz, v1 p333). Yunus bin Abi Ishaq: Both Ibn Hajar & Dahabi declared him Seduq (Taqrib al-Taḥḍīb, v2 p348 & al-Kashif, v2 p402). [His father] Abi Ishaq al-Suba'i: Ibn Hajar said: 'Thiqah' (Taqrib al-Taḥḍīb, v1, p739), Dahabi said: Thiqah, Hujja (Siar alam, v5 p394).

We don't know whether it is intentional or by mistake, but in the copy of Tarikh Ibn Asakir the names of two narrators have been merged i.e. 'al-Hussain bin Muhammad bin Saad' which gives an impression that its a single narrator when they are in fact two different people, the first one having the surname Muhammad while the other one as his first name as Muhammad and thus, actually it should be 'al-Hussain bin Muhammad from Muhammad bin Saad' as correctly recorded by Imam Dhahabi and Imam Jamaluddin al-Mezi with two and three variants of chain respectively. We read in Siyar alam al-Nubla:

Ibn Saad: Narrated Muhammad bin Ubaid from Mujalid from al-Shu'bi and Yunus bin Abi Ishaq from his father...not to curse Ali while he can hear that..."

Siar alam al-nubala by Imam Dhahabi, Volume 3 page 263

So the two variants of chain that Dhahabi used are:.

[1]. Muhammad bin Saad from Muhammad bin Ubaid from Mujalid from al-Shu'bi.

[2]. Muhammad bin Saad from Muhammad bin Ubaid from Yunus bin Abi Ishaq from his father.

Imam Jamaluddin al-Mezi records:

Muhammad bin Saad said: Narrated Muhammad bin Ubaid from Mujalid from al-Shu'abi – and Yunus bin Abi Ishaq from his father – and Abi al-Sefer and others...not to curse Ali while he can hear that..."

Taḥḍīb al-Kamal by Imam Jamaluddin al-Mezi, Volume 6 page 246 Translation No. 1248

The three variants Imam Al-Mezi relied on are:

[1]. Muhammad bin Saad from Muhammad bin Ubaid from Mujalid from al-Shu'bi.

[2]. Muhammad bin Saad from Muhammad bin Ubaid from Yunus bin Abi Ishaq from his father.

[3]. Muhammad bin Saad from Muhammad bin Ubaid from Abi al-Sefer & others.

The reason for emphasizing on different variants chain is, that all three scholars namely Imam Dhahabi, Imam Jamaluddin al-Mezi and Ibn Asakir have quoted and relied on this narration from Imam Ibn Sa'ad, the author of the famed Sunni work 'Tabaqat al-Kubra', but today we do not find this tradition in Tabaqat due to a surgery performed by Nasibi doctors who extracted the 'truth tumour' that posed a threat to the image of their master Muawiya.

Regarding the conditions on which the treaty took place With regards to the treaty condition agreed between Imam Hasan (as) and Muawiya bin al-Hinda, we also read in Tarikh al-Wardi:

"The conditions were: To give him what is in Kufa's public treasury, the tax of Darabjird city in Persia, and not to curse Ali.

He (Mu'awiya) didn't accept the condition that the cursing of (Ali) be stopped. So, He (al-Hasan) asked them to stop cursing when he (al-Hasan) could hear it. (Mu'awiya) accepted that condition but he didn't fulfil it.”

Tarikh of Al-Wardi, Volume 1 page 251

Ibn Kathir records in Al Bidayah wal Nihayah, Volume 8 page 17:

فاشترط أن يأخذ من بيت مال الكوفة خمسة آلاف ألف درهم، وأن يكون خراج دار

أبجرد له، وأن لا يسب علي وهو يسمع

“He (Hasan) placed conditions of having five million from Kufa's treasury, the income from the taxes of the city of Darabjird and not to curse Ali when he (al Hasan) could hear that”

Al Bidayah wal Nihayah, Volume 8 page 17

The authenticity of this incident has caused such a big blow to the Nasibi movement that they have removed this narration from various versions of the book available on the internet, such as from www.al-eman.com.

One of the champions of the Nasibi cult, Ibn Khaldun similarly recorded in Tarikh Ibn Khaldun, Volume 2 page 648:

فكتب إلى معاوية يذكر له النزول عن الأمر على أن يعطيه ما في بيت المال بالكوفة و

مبلغه خمسة آلاف ألف و يعطيه خراج دار ابجرد من فارس و ألا يشتم عليا و هو يسمع

He (al Hasan) wrote to Mu'awiya informing him about his abdication from khilafat in exchange for receiving Kufa's treasure worth five million, the income from the taxes of the city of Dar Abjard and not to curse Ali when he (al Hasan) could hear it.

Allamah Ismaeel bin Abul Fida records in his Tarikh, Volume 1 page 126:

وكان الذي طلبه الحسن أن يعطيه ما في بيت مال الكوفة وخراج دارا بجرد من فارس وأن

لا يسب علياً فلم يجبه إلى الكف عن سب علي فطلب الحسن أن لا يشتم علياً وهو يسمع

فأجابه إلى ذلك ثم لم يف له به

The conditions of al-Hasan were: To give him what is in Kufa's treasury, give him ibjerd's city tax income and not to curse Ali. He (Mu'awiya) didn't accept the condition about cursing Ali, so al-Hasan asked him not to curse Ali when he could hear it, so (Mu'awiya) accepted that but but failed to fulfil it”

The peace treaty conditions have also been recorded by Salah-uddin Khalil bin Aybak al-Safadi (d. 764 H) in his authority work 'Al-Wafi bil Wafiyat' Volume 12 page 68 and by Imam Ibn Al-Shahnah al-Hanafi (d. 815 H) in 'Roza tul Manazir' page 117 and also commented that Muawiya did not fulfill even single of condition treaty. Moreover, Mufti Ghulam Rasool al-Hanafi of Daarul Uloom Qadiriya Jilaniya, London also recorded the treaty conditions from various Sunni works and then stated:

“Hadhrat Muawiya did not fulfil this condition as well, in fact, the rulers and governors of Bani Umayyah abused Hadhrat Ali (kr), the lion of Allah”

Imam Hasan aur Khilafat e Rashida, page 167

Comments

If Muawiya was not involved in the Kufr act of cursing Ali bin Abi Talib (as) then why did Imam Hasan (as) place the condition before him that neither he nor his rulers curse Imam Ali (as) and then why did Muawiya reject the condition. The proposed condition and Muawiya's rejection of it nullifies the the argument of the Nawasib that Ali (as) was never cursed by Muawiya and leaves us with no doubt that Nawawi concealed the reality when formulating his conjectures.

Sunni scholars rejected Al-Nawawi's conjecture pertaining to Sahih Muslim's episode

Shaykh Wajihuddin Umar bin Abdulmuhsin

Tashyid al-Mata'in is a refutation of chapter 10 of the famous anti-Shia book Tauhfath Athna Ashariya. In Volume 2 page 405 of the said book, we read that scholar of Ahl'ul Sunnah Wajihuddin Umar bin Abdulmuhsin Al-Arzanjani in his famous work 'Hadaaiq al-Izhaar fi Sharah Mashaariq al-Anwaar' wrote:

“When the people of knowledge saw that Mu'awiya's language contravened the dictates of norms, they sought to justify his actions and this is wrong, for it is clear that Mu'awiya wanted Sa'd to curse Ali, and Sa'd objected. Mu'awiya asked what prevented him from cursing Abu Turab, to which Sa'd replied citing three traditions as his reasons.”

Imam Muhammad bin Shahab al-Zuhri

Sibt Ibn al-Jawzi al-Hanafi in His Tazkira tul Khawas, page 28 records the comments of Imam Zuhri:

“Mu'awiya cursed Ali and ordered people to do the same Sa'd's fear of Allah stopped him from cursing Ali, ignoring the consequences.”

Tazkira tul Khawas, page 28

Shaykh Musa Shahin Lashin

It is proven from Sahih Muslim that Mu'awiya would curse 'Ali. Nawawi in his Sharh Muslim displays dishonesty in his defence of Mu'awiya. An Ahl'ul Sunnah scholar took notice of this, basing his comments on Sahih Muslim, we plead justice accordingly. Modern day Sunni scholar Shaykh Musa Shahin Lashin in his commentary of Sahih Muslim known as Fateh al-Munem, Volume 9 page 332 states:

ويحاول النووي تبرئة معاوية من هذا السوء..... هذا تأويل واضح التعسف والبعده، والثابت أن معاوية كان يأمر بسب علي ، وهو غير معصوم، فهو يخطئ، ولكننا يجب أن نمسك عن انتقاص أي من أصحاب رسول الله ﷺ، وسب علي في عهد معاوية صريح

“Nawawi tried to prove Mu'awiya's innocence from this bad deed...such an interpretation is clearly void, as it is confirmed that Mu'awiya would order the cursing of Ali, he (Mu'awiya) is not infallible, he might commit mistakes but we should not criticize anyone from amongst the companions of the Prophet of Allah (s), cursing Ali during Mu'awiya's reign is something definite”.

Allamah Muhammad bin Abdulhadi al-Sindi (d. 1138 H)

One of the favorite scholars of the Salafies/Wahabies namely Muhammad bin Abdulhadi al-Sindi (d. 1138 H) in his esteemed commentary of Sunan Ibn Majah testified that one could deduce from the tradition of Sahih Muslim, that Muawiya ordered Sa'd to curse Ali bin Abi Talib (as).

نال معاوية من علي ووقع فيه وسبه بل أمر سعدا بالسب كما قيل في مسلم والترمذي

“Muawiya insulted and abused Ali, verily he also ordered Sa'ad to abuse Ali as is mentioned in Muslim and Tirmidhi”

Sharh Sunnan ibn Majah, Kitab al-Muqadma, Chapter: Merits of Ali bin Abi Talib (ra)

Muhammad al-Amin al-Hurarri

Muhammad al-Amin al-Hurarri is a modern day Wahabi/Salafi scholar born in year 1348 A.H. an Ethiopian by origin he currently resides in Saudi Arabiawhere he is employed as a hadith teacher in Mecca. In his authority work Al-Kawkab al-Wahaj Volume 23 page 444 he attests:

أمر معاوية بن أبي سفيان) الأموي الشامي، الخليفة المشهور (سعداً) بن أبي وقاص رضي الله عنهما أي أمره بسب علي بن أبي طالب ﷺ فأبي سعد أن يسب علياً (فقال) معاوية بن أبي سفيان لسعد: (ما منعك) يا سعد (أن تسب أبا التراب

Mu'awiyah bin Abi Sufyan the Umayyad Caliph ordered Sa'd bin Abi Waqas to curse Ali bin Abi Talib, but Saad refused to curse Ali, Mu'awiyah bin Abi Sufyan therefore said to Sa'd: 'O Sa'd what prevents you from cursing Abu Turab?'

Al-Qurtubi

Qurtubi in his famed work Al-Mufhem, Volume 20 page 25 whilst commenting on the tradition under discussion also stated that during the Ummayyad dynasty the practice was to curse Ali bin Abi Talib (as):

وقول معاوية لسعد بن أبي وقاص: ما منعك أن تسب أبا تراب؛ يدل: على أن مقدم

بني أمية كانوا يسبون عليا وينتقصونه

The statement of Mu'awiyah to Sa'd bin Abi Waqas “What prevents you from cursing Abu Turab” indicates that the first generation of Bani Umayya would abuse and belittle Ali.

Ibn Tamiyah

If there still remains any doubt then let us submit the testimony from the tongue our arch nemesis the beloved Imam of the Salafis Ibn Tamiyah who in Minhaj al-Sunnah, Volume 5 page 42 also confirmed that Muawiya 'ordered' Sa'd to curse Ali bin Abi Talib:

وأما حديث سعد لما أمره معاوية بالسب فأبي

“While the narration about Sa'd (relates to) when Mu'awiyah ordered him to curse but he refused”

The Governors of Mu'awiya started cursing Mawla Ali (as) upon the instructions of Mu'awiya

Mu'awiya sent out an unequivocal order to his Governors that they implement the cursing of Ali (as) in their provinces as we read in Tarikh Abul Fida Volume 1 page 120 that:

وكان معاوية وعماله يدعون لعثمان في الخطبة يوم الجمعة ويسبون علياً ويقعون فيه

“Mu'awiya and his Governors during the Friday Sermons would say things in praise of Uthman and would curse Ali”.

Ibn Tamiyah records:

وقد كان من شيعة عثمان من يسب علياً ويجهر بذلك على المنابر

“The followers (shias) of Uthman used to abuse Ali openly from the Mosque pulpits”

Minhaj al Sunnah, Volume 6 page 201

We ask our opponents:

[1]. Where were those thousands of Sahaba and Tabieen whom they consider stars of guidance, when Ahle Bait (as) were cursed from the pulpits of Mosques? Were they doing Taqyyah?

[2]. Why Mu'awiya kept these Governors in their office even still after their cursing of Ahle Bait (as)?

We will keep repeating these two questions as we analyse this shameless practice further.

Muawiya's Governor Marwan bin Hakam cursed Imam Ali (as)

In this regard we will present three traditions affirming that Marwan bin Hakam (Laeen ibn Laeen), the beloved and reliable partner of Muawiyah used to curse Ali bin Abi Talib (as). First, let us cite the comments of Ibn Kathir from Al Badaya wa Al Nahaya, Volume 8 page 285 :

ولما كان متولياً على المدينة لمعاوية كان يسب علياً كل جمعة على المنبر، وقال له الحسن

بن علي: لقد لعن الله أباك الحكيم وأنت في صلبه على لسان نبيه فقال: لعن الله الحكيم وما ولد

“When Marwan was a governor of Mu'awiya in Madina, he would curse Ali every Friday from the pulpit (Minbar). Hasan bin Ali then said to him: “Allah then cursed your father by the tongue of His messenger when you were in his ‘Sulub’ (loins) and has said that the curse of Allah be upon Hakam and his progeny.”

We read in Tarikh ul Khulafa, page 199:

“Umayr ibn Ishaq said: Marwan was the amir over us, and he would abuse ‘Ali every Jumah from the mimbar, whilst al Hasan would listen and offer no reply”

Imam Dhahabi also confirmed the Kufr act by Marwan (Laeen ibn Laeen) of cursing Ali bin Abi Talib (as) by citing it as follows:

“Marwan bin Hakam used to curse Hadrat Ali (as) in the Sermon (Khutba) of Friday.”

Tarikh al Islam, by Al-Dhahabi, vol. 2, page 288

Now we present one of the principle books of Ahle Sunnah to prove that Marwan's enmity towards the fourth caliph of Ahle Sunnah was not deemed sufficient grounds for the Ahle Sunnah to remain aloof from him, on the contrary he was granted a certain rank in their hadeeth works and the term "RA" was used for him.

The Governor of Medina who was one of the members of the house of Marwan called Sahl Ibn Sa'd, and ordered him to curse Ali. But Sahl refused to do so. The governor said: "If you don't want to curse Ali, just say God curse Abu Turab (the nickname of Ali)." Sahl said: "Ali did not like any name for himself better than Abu Turab, and Ali used to become very happy when somebody would call him Abu Turab."

Sahih Muslim, Chapter of Virtues of Companions, Section of Virtues of Ali, Arabic version, v4, p1874, Tradition #38

Ibn Hajar Makki al-Haythami records the following incident that shows the abhorrence this impure person had towards Ahlulbayt (as):

"There is another tradition with Thiqa narrators wherein when Marwan became ruler over Madina and proceeded to abuse Ali every Friday from the pulpit. Saeed bin Aas then became Wali (Governor) of Madina, he didn't say anything but when Marwan returned as Wali he started uttering the same absurdities again. Hadhrat Hasan knew about this and would remain silent and he would enter the mosque at the time of Takbeer only, when Marwan became unsatisfied with the patience of Hasan (ra) and sent some appalling messages about him and His respected father. His absurdities included this sentence that "Your example is like that of a mule for when it is asked who its father is, it will reply: "a horse". Hadhrat Hasan told the messenger: 'Go back and tell Marwan: 'By calling names to you, we do not want to remove whatever you have said against us. Verily we shall both appear before Allah. If you are ruled upon as a liar, Allah is the Greatest for taking revenge.'" Verily Marwan has indeed 'respected' my grandfather Prophet (s) by giving me the similitude of a mule!". When returning the messenger met Hadhrat Hussain and after forcing him, he told him the statement of Marwan. Hadhrat Hussain said: "Tell Marwan: Take information about your father and your people yourself, and the sign between you and me is that the curse of the Holy Prophet (s) has stuck between your two shoulders"

"Tanveer al-Iman" the Urdu translation of "Tat-heer al-Jinan" page 111

Sawaiq al-Muhriqa (Arabic), page 63

Salafi scholar Hassan bin Farhan Maliki, in his book Naho Enqad al-Tarikh, Volume 3 page 22 stated:

والي المدينة وهو مروان بن الحكم في زمن معاوية كان يسب ويأمر بسب علي علي

المنابر، هذه حقيقة تاريخية ثابتة

"The governor of Madina, Marwan bin al-Hakam during the reign of Mu'awiyah used to curse Ali and ordered the cursing of Ali from the pulpits; this is an affirmed historical fact.

We read in Masael Imam Ahmad- Kitab al-Eilal wa Maarifat al-Rijal, Volume 3 page 176 No. 4781:

عن عمير بن إسحاق قال كان مروان أميراً علينا ست سنين فكان يسب علياً كل جمعة
ثم عزل ثم استعمل سعيد بن العاص سنتين فكان لا يسبه ثم أعيد مروان فكان يسبه

From Umair ibn Ishaq who said: Marwan was our Ameer for six years and he used to curse Ali every Friday! Then he was fired and then Said ibn al-Aas was hired for two years and he did not curse him. After him Marwan was rehired and he (again) cursed him.

In the footnote we read:

“He said the chain of narration is Sahih and may Allah (swt) help us.”

We again ask Nawasib to inform us of the whereabouts of the scores of beloved Sahaba and Tabaeen at a time when Ali and his family were being abused by Mu’awiya’s governor in Madina? Were they all hiding under the veil of Taqqiyah?

As for those children of Mu’awiya who try to conjure up excuses by insisting that the traditions wherein Marwan cursed Ali (as), suggest that he was acting upon the orders of Muawiya, then we would like to ask them a simple question:

“As the governors of Muawiya publicly cursed Ali (as) from the mosque pulpits before thousands of worshippers throughout Muawiya’s vast reign, what efforts did he (Muawiya) personally take to curtail this act, if he was indeed not involved in that Kufr act? Is there any documentary evidence of Muawiya ordering that this practice be stopped forthwith? Were those governors guilty of this shameless deed, apprehended, relieved of their duties or punished in any other way?”

Mu’awiya’s Governor Mughira bin Shu’ba (la) cursed Imam Ali (as)

The first tradition we present in this regard is from ‘Tarikh Kamil’ Volume 3 page 234 wherein we read that:

“Mu’awiya appointed Mughira as a Governor telling him ‘I have based your appointment on common sense, give me bayya on the condition that you continue with the practice, (namely) that you don’t cease to disgrace and curse ‘Ali and praise Uthman. Mughira was the Governor of Kufa for some time, during it he cursed and disgraced ‘Ali’”.

Also see the following tradition recorded by Imam Ibn Jareer Tabari:

When Muawiya Ibn Abi Sufyan put al-Mughairah Ibn Shubah in charge of Kufah in Jumada 41 (September 2- October 30, 661), he summoned him. After praising and glorifying God, he said:

“Now then, indeed a forbearing person has been admonished in the past... The wise might do what you want without instruction. Although I have wanted to advise you about many things, I left them alone, trusting in your discernment of what pleases me, what helps my regime and what sets my subjects [raiyyah] on the right path. I would continue to advise you about a quality of yours- do not refrain from abusing Ali and criticizing him, not from asking God’s mercy upon Uthman and His forgiveness for him. Continue to shame the companions of Ali, keep at a distance, and don’t listen to them. Praise the faction of Uthman, bring them near, and listen to them.”

History of Tabari, English version, events of year 51 AH, Execution of Hujr Ibn Adi, v18, pp 122-123

On the same page of Tabari, it is written:

“Al Mughira remained governor of Kufah for Mu’awiyah for seven years and (some) months. He was the best behaved and most (strongly) in favor of well being, in spite of the fact he would not stop blaming ‘Ali for what had happened and for killing Uthman”

So, according to this tradition, Mughira counted Maula Ali (as) amongst the killers of Uthman. Although here at the end of the Hadith, the narrator has not identified those killers of Uthman referred to by Mughira at the beginning of this tradition, he has made clear that it was “Ali” to whom Mughira was referring to.

And also see later narrations wherein hadith ahead of Hujr bin Addi, where Hujr bin Addi made it very clear that he understood who Mughira was referring to as the killer of Uthman. Al-Tabari reported on the next page:

“Once governor of Kufa Mughira bin Shuba, as usual sought mercy for Uthman and asked that his killers be punished (Ali)”.

Upon this Hujr bin Addi stood up and gave a lecture against Mughira:

“O man. Order our rations and stipends for us, for you have certainly withheld them from us, and this is not your right, and no one who preceded you has desired that. You have become passionate about blaming the Commander of the Faithful and praising the criminals”.

History of Tabari, English version, events of year 51 AH, Execution of Hujr Ibn Adi, v18, pp 124

We read in Musnad Ahmad, Volume 3 page 185 that has been declared ‘Hasan’ by Shaikh Shoib Al-Arn’aut:

From Abdillah al-Mazini who said: ‘When Muawiya left Kufa he employed al-Mughirah ibn Shubah. He said: al-Mughirah hired orators to insult Ali’.

Musnad Ahmad, Volume 3 page 185

Similarly we read in Fadhael al-Sahaba by Ahmad ibn Hanbal, Volume 1 pages 142-143:

عن عبدالرحمن بن الأحنس أن المغيرة بن شعبة خطب فقال من فلان

From Abdur Rahman ibn al-Akhnas who said: “al-Mughirah ibn Shu’bah gave a sermon and cursed so and so”.

We read in the footnote:

“So and so is Ali ibn Abi Talib as it is found in the narrations by Ibn Abi Asim and Ahmed”

As for its authenticity, the margin writer namely Wasiullah bin Muhammad Abbas has declared the tradition as Sahih:

Fadhael al-Sahaba by Ahmad ibn Hanbal, Volume 1 pages 142-143 Hadith 87

Here we present another tradition proving that the beloved governor of Muawiyah namely Mughira al-Nasibi (La’een) used to curse the fourth caliph of Ahle Sunnah and the first Imam of the Shias of Ahlulbait (as). One of the esteemed figures from amongst the Deobandies, Maulana Taqi

Uthmani records the following episode in his book rendered in the service of Muawiyah al-Nasibi citing from Sunnan Abu Dawud and Musnad Ahmad bin Hanbal:

“Some one started abusing Ali in the presence of Mughira bin Shu’ba (ra). Upon this Hadhrat Said bin Zaid warned Mughira that this cursing is made in front of you and you don’t stop it”.

Hadhrat Ameer Muawiya, by Taqi Uthmani, page 196

While the very episode has also been recorded by Imam Nasai:

عن عبدالله بن ظالم قال خطب المغيرة بن شعبة فسب عليا فقال سعيد بن زيد أشهد

على رسول الله ﷺ لسمعتة يقول أثبت حراء فإنه ليس عليك إلا نبي أو صديق أو شهيد

Abdullah bin Dhalem said: al-Mughira bin Shu’aba was addressing and cursing Ali, then Saeed bin Zaid said: ‘I testify that the messenger of Allah said: ‘Be still, Hira, for only a Prophet, or an ever-truthful, or a martyr is on you...’”

Sunan Nasai al-Kabeer, Kitab al-Manaqib, Volume 7 Hadith 8148, Merits of Abdurehman bin Auf

We also read similar incident with reference to Zaid bin Arqam in Musnad Ahmad bin Hanbal, Volume 4 Hadith 18485:

“The uncle of Ziad bin Alaqa narrated that al-Mughira bin Shu’aba abused Ali, so Zaid bin Arqam stood up and said: ‘You know that the Prophet forbade abusing the dead, then why are you abusing Ali when he is dead?’”

The hadith has been recorded and declared ‘Sahih’ not only by Shaykh Shoib al-Arnaut in his margin of Musnad Ahmed bin Hanbal, Imam Hakim in ‘Mustadrak’ Volume 1 page 541 Hadith 1419 ‘Kitab al-Janaiz’ but also by the beloved Imam of Salafies/Wahabies Nasiruddin Al-albaani who graded it Sahih in ‘Selselat al-ahadith al-Sahiha’ Volume 5 page 520 Hadith 2397.

Al-Mustadrak al-Hakim, Volume 1 page 541 Hadith 1419

Selselat al-ahadith al-Sahiha, Volume 5 page 520 Hadith 2397

Moreover Imam Dhahabi who had a habit of scrutinizing the Hadeeth assessments made by Imam Hakim also found no objection to this tradition. The tradition can also be located in other esteemed Sunni works such as:

1. Musanaf ibn Abi Shayba, Volume 3, page 244
2. Al-Mu’ajam al-Kabir, Volume 5, page 168
3. Musnad ibn al-Mubarak, page 111

Yet, this notorious enemy of Ali bin Abi Talib (as) is respected by our opponents and is remembered by using “RA” with his name!

Mu’awiya’s Governor Busr Bin Artat cursed Maula Ali

We read the following account in the History of Tabari:

“When Busr spoke on the pulpit (minbar) of al Basrah, he reviled ‘Ali. Then he said ‘I imlore God, that anyone knows that I am truthful should say so, or likewise if I am a liar’ When Abu Bakrah said, “By God we know you only as a liar” (Busr) order him to be strangled”

History of Tabari Volume 18 (English version) page 15

Similarly, Ibn Athir records:

When Hassan made peace with Mu'awiya in year 41 H, Hamraan bin Af'aan attacked Basra and occupied it, Mu'awiya then sent him to Busr bin Artat and ordered him to kill the progeny of Ziyad bin Abih, and Ziyad was in Persia because Ali bin Abi Talib had sent him there, when Busr spoke on the pulpit (minbar) of al Basrah, he reviled 'Ali. Then he said 'I implore God, that anyone who knows that I am truthful should say so, or likewise if I am a liar" When Abu Bakrah said, "By God we know you only as a liar"

Tarikh Kamil, Volume 2 page 110

Busr bin Irtat is also one of the companions, thus the ad nauseum Nawasib slogan "All Sahabah are just" falls flat here since an individual cursing Ali bin Abi Talib (as) is a Munafiq and a Kafir according to authentic Sunni traditions!

Muawiya's Governors Ziyad and Kathir ibn Shahab cursed Imam Ali (as)

Ziyad, the mistake of Muawiyah's infamous father Abu Sufian continued the practice of Mughira bin Shuba and would curse Imam Ali (as) from the mosque pulpits in his sermons.

Tabari has noted the following words of Ziyad (History of Tabari, vol 4 page 190):

"Ziyad praised Uthman and his companions and then cursed the killers of Uthman. Upon that Hujr stood up....."

Ibn Atheer records in Al-Kamil fi al-Tarikh, volume 3 page 473:

ثم ترحم على عثمان وأئني على أصحابه ولعن قاتليه

Then he (Ziyad) sent mercy upon Uthman and praised his companions and cursed his killers".

Ibn Kathir records in Al-Bidaya wa Al-Nihaya, Volume 8 page 55:

ذكر في آخرها فضل عثمان وذم من قتله أو أعان على قتله

"He (Ziyad) mentioned in the end of it (sermon) the virtue of Uthman and then disparaged his killers and those who had aided them".

Ibn Khaldun in Tarikh Ibn Khaldun, Volume 3 page 11:

وترحم على عثمان ولعن قاتليه وقال حجر ما كان يقول

"And he (Ziyad) sent mercy upon Uthman and cursed his killers and said about Hujr..."

But who did Mughira bin Shu'ba and Ziyad deem to be the killers of Uthman? Just see the following tradition and you will know whom they cursed in name as the "killers of Uthman".

Al-Tabari reported:

The Messenger of Muawiya then came to them (Ziyad) with orders to release six and to kill eight, telling them:

We have been ordered to let you disavow Ali and curse him. If you do so, we shall release you, and if you refuse, we shall kill you.

History of Tabari, English version, events of year 51 AH, v18, p149

Hujr bin Adi (ra) knew this fact too (i.e. they are cursing Ali) and that is why he always replied to the sermons of Mughira bin Shuba and Ziyad in the following words:

O Mughira! you have lost your senses and you don't know to whom you are showing your love..... You DISGRACE AMEERUL MOMINEEN (Ali) and you praise the criminals.

History of Tabari, vol.4, page 188, 189

We read in Tarikh Kamil, Vol 3 page 207:

“And when Mughira was placed in charge of Kufa, Kathir ibn Shahab was placed in charge of al-Ray, and he used to copiously curse Ali from the pulpit of Al-Ray...And Ziyad...when he reached Basra got up onto the pulpit and gave a khutba (sermon) wherein he cursed Ali”

Tarikh Kamil, Vol 3 page 207

This Kathir bin Shahab narrated Hadith in Sunni works on the authority of Umar ibn al Khattab. We read in Tabaqat Ibn Sa'd:

“He narrated traditions from Umar bin Khattab and was one of Mu'awiya bin Abu Sufyan's Governors”.

Mu'awiya would curse Ali after the Friday Sermon and this bid'a became a tradition during the Banu Umayya reign

Ibn Abi al Hadeed in his commentary of Nahjul Balagha Volume 1 page 464 states:

“At the end of the Friday sermon Mu'awiya would say ‘O Allah, curse Abu Turab, he opposed your Deen and path, curse him and punish him in the fire.’ He introduced this bidah during his reign, his Governors acted upon it, this bidah continued until the reign of Umar bin Abdul Aziz”

In al-Nasa'ih al-Kaafiyah, page 77 we read that

“This practice (of cursing) reached such a state that the people considered that without cursing Ali their Friday worship was incorrect”

Mu'awiya refused to follow the peoples' demands that he abolish the practice of cursing Ali (as)

Allamah Muhammad bin Aqeel al-Shafiee records in al-Nasa'ih al-Kaafiyah page 70 we read that:

Some people from Banu Umayya approached Mu'awiya and said ‘You've attained power so why don't you stop the practice of cursing Ali, he replied “By Allah I wont, not until every child grows up, not until every grown up becomes elderly, not until no one is left to praise him”.

In ‘Tarikh Madahib al Islam’ Muhammad Abu Zahra records in Volume 1 page 35:

“And during the reign of Banu Umayya the dignity of Ali was attacked, he was cursed because Mu'awiya during his reign introduced the ugly bid'ah of cursing Ali. His successors continued this tradition until the reign of Umar bin Abdul Aziz. The tradition entailed cursing the Imam of Guidance Ali at the end of the Friday Sermons, the Sahaba's remonstrations that this was wrong was ignored, Mu'awiya and his Governors refused to desist from their actions. Ummul'Momineen Salma (ra) wrote a letter to Mu'awiya and his respective Governors reminding them that by cursing ‘Ali they were in fact cursing Allah (swt) and his Prophet (s)”.

Tarikh Madahib al Islam by Muhammad Abu Zahra, page 35

This book has also been rendered in to Urdu by Professor Ghulam Hamid Hurrayree and we attach the Urdu translation of the above text:

Islami Madhahib, page 66 by Muhammad Abu Zuhra, translated in Urdu by Prof. Ghulam Ahmed Jariri (Faisalabad)

If today's Nawasib try and distance themselves from this reference by deeming Abu Zahra's book as unreliable, they should know that their beloved Website Ansar.org deemed the same book as reliable enough to 'prove' that the Shi'a betrayed Zayd Ibn Ali due to his refusal to criticize the Shaykhayn, (please see footnote 6 in their article). If this source can be advanced as 'proof' by Ansar.org against the Shi'a then by the same token this book can also be used by the Shi'a as 'proof' against Mu'awiya.

Mu'awiya changed the Sunnah of the Prophet (s) to ensure that the people heard the cursing of 'Ali (as)

We read in Sahih Bukhari Volume 2, Book 15, Number 76:

Narrated Abu Sa'id Al-Khudri:

The Prophet used to proceed to the Musalla on the days of Id-ul-Fitr and Id-ul-Adha; the first thing to begin with was the prayer and after that he would stand in front of the people and the people would keep sitting in their rows. Then he would preach to them, advise them and give them orders, (i.e. Khutba). And after that if he wished to send an army for an expedition, he would do so; or if he wanted to give an order, he would do so, and then depart. The people followed this tradition till I went out with Marwan, the Governor of Medina, for the prayer of Id-ul-Adha or Id-ul-Fitr.

When we reached the Musalla, there was a pulpit made by Kathir bin As-Salt. Marwan wanted to get up on that pulpit before the prayer. I got hold of his clothes but he pulled them and ascended the pulpit and delivered the Khutba before the prayer. I said to him, "By Allah, you have changed (the Prophet's tradition)." He replied, "O Abu Sa'id! Gone is that which you know." I said, "By Allah! What I know is better than what I do not know." Marwan said, "People do not sit to listen to our Khutba after the prayer, so I delivered the Khutba before the prayer."

Why would the people (the sahaba and tabieen) choose to refrain from listening to the sermon after Eid prayers? Were these people flagrantly ignoring the Sunnah of Rasulallah (s) or was there an underlying reason that caused them to abandon this sermon?

One needs to understand the background that led to the Sunnah of Rasulallah (s) being changed. We have already proven that Mu'awiya sought to keep a grip on his reign by subjecting his enemies, the Shi'a of Ali (as) to oppression. One method of doing so was through instilling into the minds of the people a hatred of 'Ali (as). The best mechanism for doing so was during prayer times, after all a viewpoint could be propagated to thousands of people at one time, and it was coming from the mouth of the Imam, thus giving it more clout. We had already mentioned the fact that Mu'awiya had utilised this method by ordering the cursing of 'Ali (as) in Friday sermons, he extended this practice to the Eid prayers also. The Sunnah of the Prophet (s) was that the Khutbah was after Eid prayers, but as

Marwan said “People do not sit to listen to our Khutba after the prayer’ – clearly pious people disliked to hear the beloved of Rasulullah (s) being abused in such a manner which is why they preferred to walk away than hear it.

This change in Sunnah was not Marwan’s choice rather he was merely implementing the order of Mu’awiya, as we read in Sahih Muslim Book 001, Number 0079:

It is narrated on the authority of Tariq b. Shihab: It was Marwan who initiated (the practice) of delivering khutbah (address) before the prayer on the ‘Id day. A man stood up and said: Prayer should precede khutbah. He (Marwan) remarked, This (practice) has been done away with. Upon this Abu Sa’id remarked: This man has performed (his duty) laid on him. I heard the Messenger of Allah as saying: He who amongst you sees something abominable should modify it with the help of his hand; and if he has not strength enough to do it, then he should do it with his tongue, and if he has not strength enough to do it, (even) then he should (abhor it) from his heart, and that is the least of faith.

al ‘Al-Uam’ volume 1 page 392 by Imam al-Shafi’ee we read:

Shafi’ee stated that Abdullah bin Yazid al-Khutmi said: ‘The prophet (pbuh), Abu Bakar, Umar and Uthman used to start by praying before the sermon until Muawiya came and made the sermon before (the prayer)’

Of course Muawiya changed the timing of prayers via his governors, hence we read that Imam of Deobandies, Muhammad Anwar Shah Kashmiri recorded the following reference in his esteemed commentary of Sahih Bukhari about Marwan; the beloved governor of Muawiya:

“The sunnah is to perform prayer before the sermon, but Marwan made it (the sermon) before the prayer because he used to abuse Ali (may Allah be pleased with him)”

Faiz al Bari Sharah Sahih Bukhari, Volume 1 page 722 No. 954, Kitab al-Eidayn

Qadhi Showkani records in his authority work ‘Neel al-Awtar’ Volume 3 page 363:

Al-Iraqi said: ‘The truth is that the first one to did that was Marwan in Madina during the caliphate of Muawiya’

The importance of getting the people’s mind frame to hate Ali (as) was such that Mu’awiya was prepared to change the Sunnah of the Prophet (s) if it ensured that the anti Ali message reached the ears of the people. This was all quite intentional getting a people accustomed on a staple diet of cursing Ali (as) in prayers would gradually become incorporated as natural custom, so that eventually people (particularly successive generations) exposure to Ali (as) would be restricted to hearing him being cursed during prayers. The objective of Muawiya was thus to get people accustomed to associating Maula Ali (as) with all that was inherently evil, as time went on people’s knowledge of Ali (as) would be with regards to treating him as a figure of hate.

Testimonies of prominent Sunni scholars that Ali bin Abi Talib (as) used to be cursed from pulpits

Uptil now we relied upon traditions to prove that Muawiya had instituted the Bidah of cursing Ali bin Abi Talib (as) from the pulpits and his governors, with the exception of Sa'd bin Abi Waqas, obeyed his orders. Now let us bring the testimonies of some prominent scholars of Ahle Sunnah who have vouched the same.

Learned Scholar Ahmad Zaki Safwat's comments on the Governors of Mu'awiya

Egyptian Sunni scholar Ahmad Zaki Safwat in his book 'Umar bin Abdul Aziz' (Urdu translation by Abdul Samhad al-Azhari) pages 54-55 states:

“Hadhrat Umar (bin Abdul Aziz) abolished the practice of cursing Ali on the pulpits, that started during the reign of Amir Mu'awiya.

Historians have recorded that in 41 Hijri, Mu'awiya wrote to his Governors stating 'I have no responsibility for anyone who praises Ali and his family. As a result [reciters] from every pulpit in every village would curse 'Ali, they would distance themselves from 'Ali, and would disrespect him and his family.

Mu'awiya issued an edict throughout the provinces that no one should accept the testimony of any Shi'a or members of that person's family. In a separate order he stated that if it is established that an individual loves 'Ali and the Ahl'ul bayt, his name should be removed from the register and his stipends should be withheld. In another order Mu'awiya said that any person who has friends that are Shi'a should be punished and his house should be demolished.

Mu'awiya went on Hajj, upon his arrival in Madina he intended on disrespecting 'Ali. People told him not to since Sa'd bin Abi Waqqas would oppose such an action. Mu'awiya sent a man to Sa'd so as to ascertain his viewpoint, Sa'd replied, 'If you perform such an act I shall never set foot in the Mosque again'. Mu'awiya chose to desist from this action until the death of Sa'd in 55 Hijri – it was then that he proceeded to climb on to the pulpit of 'Ali and from there spoke out against him, he then wrote to his Governors to discredit 'Ali. Umm Salmah wrote to Mu'awiya stating 'You are in fact cursing Allah (swt) and his Prophet (s), verily I testify that Rasulallah (s) loved him ['Ali]. Mu'awiya ignored her words”.

Umar bin Abdul Aziz (ra), by Ahmed Zaki Safwat Misri, Urdu translation by Abdusamad Saarim al-Azhari, pages 54-55 (Maktaba Marry Library, Lahore)

Imam of Ahle Sunnah Awzai also reviled Ali (as) as a means of acquiring gifts from the Umayyad rulers

Imam Dhahabi in his book Siyar Alam an-Nubla, Volume 7 page 130 has recorded the following statement of one of the revered Sunni Imams namely Abdulrahman bin Amro Awzai (d. 157 H):

سمعت الأوزاعي يقول: ما أخذنا العطاء حتى شهدنا على علي بالنفاق وتبرأنا منه

Sadaqa bin Abdullah said: ‘I heard al-Awzai saying: ‘We didn’t obtain gifts until we testified that Ali was a hypocrite and declared our disavowal towards him’.

The statement of this Sunni Imam also serves as strong evidence that the rulers of Bani Ummayah were pursuing the practice of abusing Ali bin Abi Talib (as) that had been introduced by Muawiyah. The policy was to either threaten the masses to abuse Ali bin Abi Talib (as) or offer them gifts and other benefits and it is unfortunate and yet not surprising to see that Sunni Imams opted for the second option in this regard. Let us now quote the names of the rulers belonging to Bani Umayyah that ruled during the life of Imam Awzai:

Walid bin Abdulmalik bin Marwan (86 – 96 H)

Sulayman bin Abdulmalik bin Marwan (96 – 99 H)

Umar bin Abdulaziz (99 – 101 H)

Yazid bin Abdulmalik (101 – 105 H)

Hisham bin Abdulmalik (105 – 125 H)

Walid bin Yazid bin Abdulmalik (125 – 126 H)

Yazid bin Walid bin Abdulmalik (126 – 126 H)

Ibrahim bin Walid bin Abdulmalik (126 – 127 H)

Marwan bin Muhammad bin Marwan bin al-Hakam (127 – 132 H)

The comments on this shameful practice of Pakistani Hanafi scholar Maulana Raghیب Rahmani in his book “Umar bin Abdul Aziz” page 246, are indeed very poignant:

“It is indeed unfortunate that this bidah was introduced that cut the nose of the cities, this bidah even reached the pulpits and even shamelessly reached the ears of those present in the Mosque of Rasulullah (s). This bidah was introduced by Amir Mu’awiya”.

Khalifat ul Zahid – Hadhrat umar bin Abdul Aziz, page 246 by Abdul Aziz Syed, translated in Urdu by Maulana Raghیب Rehmani (Nafees Academy. Karachi)

The admission by al Muhaddith Shah Abdul Aziz Dehlavi that Mu’awiya cursed Ali (as)

Al Muhaddith Shah Abdul Aziz was a leading Sunni scholar and was a lead name in his fight against the spread of Shi’aism in the Indian Subcontinent. Despite his opposition to the Shi’a he also made the acknowledgement in his Fatawa Azizi on page 214:

“...The act of cursing Ali was introduced by Mu’awiya, this is not worse than fighting, for we learn from hadith that cursing a Muslim is Fisq, fighting him is kufr. It is established that Mu’awiya fought ‘Ali and in doing so he committed a great sin, to explain this away in terms of ijthihad is wrong”.

The admission by leading Deobandi Ulema that Mu’awiya introduced the bid`ah of cursing Ali (as)

Deobandi’s are rigid Hanafis from the Indian Subcontinent and are strong opponents of the Shi’a hence there is NO opportunity for Abu Sulaiman to claim that they were influenced by Shi’a leanings and at the same time

Nasibis like that of Sipah Sahaba have no excuses to deny the testimonies of the ulema of their school.

Maulana Sayyid Abu'l Ala Maudoodi records this fact in his "Khilafat wa Mulukiyaat". On page 174 he writes:

"Another extremely Makrooh (dislikeable) Bida that was introduced during the reign of Hadhrat Muawiya was that he and upon his orders, all of his governors would curse Ali during the sermon from the Imam's position. This took such an extreme that this practice even took place in the Mosque of the Prophet, in front of the grave of the Prophet (saws), the cursing of the most beloved relative would take place, in the presence of Ali's progeny and his close relatives who would hear this abuse with their own ears." (Tabari, Volume 4 page 188, Ibn Athir Volume 3 page 234, al Bidayah Volume 8 page 259 and Volume 9 page 80).

Khilafat wa Mulukiyaat, page 174

Before supporters of Mu'awiya seek to attack Maudoodi it should be pointed out that he was NOT expressing an opinion, he was citing the facts recorded in the annals of Sunni history books, including al Bidayah by Ibn Kathir. The sources are cited; Maudoodi has not just fabricated them out of the blue.

The supporters of Mu'awiya were naturally perturbed by Maudoodi's critical stance of Mu'awiya. This led to rebuttal and counter rebuttals by Deobandi Ulema. Pakistani scholar Abu Khalid Muhammad Aslam in "Khilafat wa Mulukiyyat wa Ulema-i-Ahle Sunnat" wrote in defence of Maulana Maudoodi. He wrote:

"Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi in Hakayat Awliyaa wrote that Shah Ismail Shaheed (rh) had a debate in Lucknow with a Shi'a by the name of Subhan Khan. Shah Ismail asked him: 'Did they curse Mu'awiya in the court of Ali?' Khan replied: 'Ali's Court was pure of such things'. Shah Ismail then asked: 'Did Mu'awiya curse Ali in his Court?' To which Khan replied: 'Yes he did'. Maulana Ismail then said: 'The Ahl'ul Sunnah are alhamdolillah followers of Ali and have left Mu'awiya' (Hakayat Awliya, page 124).

From this it is proven that Shah Ismail and Thanvi both agreed that in Mu'awiya's Court people would curse Ali. Now if someone continues to deny this then we are left with no other choice but to adopt silence in the presence of illiterates, one should take note of the individual who was being cursed.

Qadhi Zayn ul Abideen Sajjad Meerutee in Tareekh-e-Milat writes: 'The greatest reform amongst all achieved by Umar bin Abdul Aziz was one that has been written in Gold namely the fact that he put an end to the tradition of cursing Ali (r). It had been an old practice that the caliphs and their Banu Umaya supporters would curse Ali in their sermons. When he became caliph, he ordered the practice of cursing Ali in the sermons to be banned and instead the following verse was recited... (Tareekh-e-Milat, Vol 3 page 624)'.

Maulana Shah Moinuddin Ahmed Nadvi in Tareekh-e-Islam, writes: 'During his reign, Mu'awiya introduced the condemnable tradition of cursing Ali (r) from the pulpits, his subjects followed suit. Mughira bin Shu'ba was a man of great qualities but in his obedience to Mu'awiya he also followed this bidah' (Tareekh-e-Islam, Part 1 & 2 pages 13-14).

Tell us, were these prominent scholars whose statements we have cited above scholars of Ahle Sunnah or not? If all of them are Ahle Sunnah, then what right does the one have to count himself amongst Ahle Sunnah, who forms an opinion that goes against the aforementioned scholars? It would be better that they leave Ahle Sunnah and embrace Yazeed and Nasibi ideology, entertaining others with their new thoughts”. [Khilafat wa Mulukiyyat wa Ulema-i-Ahle Sunnath, by Abu Khalid Muhammad Aslam - pages 120-122]

Khilafat wa Mulukiyyat wa Ulema-i-Ahle Sunnath page 120-122

Here we have attached the scanned page from Maulana Asharaf Ali Thanvi's famed work 'Hakayat al Awliya' also known as 'Arwah Thalasaah' that contains the incident of Shah Ismaeel Shaheed mentioned above:

Arwah Salasaah, page 77 (Published in Lahore)

Learned Sunni Scholar Abu Zahra

In Tarikh Madahib al Islam, Volume 1 page 35 Muhammad Abu Zahra records:

“And during the reign of Banu Umayya the dignity of Ali was attacked, he was cursed because Mu'awiya during his reign introduced the ugly bid'ah of cursing Ali. His successors continued this tradition until the reign of Umar bin Abdul Aziz. The tradition entailed cursing the Imam of Guidance Ali at the end of the Friday Sermons, the Sahaba's remonstrations that this was wrong was ignored, Mu'awiya and his Governors refused to desist from their actions. Ummul'Momineen Salma (ra) wrote a letter to Mu'awiya and his respective Governors reminding them that by cursing 'Ali they were in fact cursing Allah (swt) and his Prophet (s)”.

Taha Hussain

Taha Hussain, the renowned Egyptian research scholar writes that Muawiyah forced Syrian prisoners to curse Ali ibn Abi Talib(as) and show their love for Uthman.

“Now the path was clear for Amir Muawiyah (ra), he through his men, brought two conditions before the prisoners, first to curse Ali (ra) and to love Uthman. Those who accepted this were pardoned whilst the necks of those who rejected this were removed.

A group of some important Syrian personalities mediated for some of those prisoners before Muawiyah hence he accepted their intercession. Now only eight men were left from amongst that rejected (the condition) to curse Ali (ra). The story about their murder is lengthy... The second from amongst those who refused to curse Ali (ra) instead began to malign Muawiyah and Uthman. Muawiyah handed him over to Ziyad and instructed in that he be killed in the most brutal manner. Ziyad buried him alive”

Hadhrat Ali(ra), page 244 Urdu translation by Allamah Abdul Hameed Numani (Nafees Academy Karachi)

Shaykh Hassan Saqqaf

Modern day Sunni scholar Shaykh Hassan Saqqaf stated in his book Maselat al-Rouya, page 11:

دولة تبني وتعتنق لعن سيدنا علي وشتمه وذمه

“The (Ummayad) regime adopted and embraced the cursing, swearing and disparaging of Ali”.

In the footnote of this sentence, he wrote:

ويكابر بعض الجهلة المتعصبين وينكر ذلك مع كونه ثابتا عن معاوية

“Some ignorant and intolerant people stubbornly insist on denying this even though it’s a proven fact about Mu’awiyah”.

Imam of Ahl’ul Sunnah Muhammad Abdul Hai Lucknawi

Imam of Ahl’ul Sunnah Muhammad Abdul Hai Lucknawi testified that the Nasibi rulers of Banu Umayyah made the criticism of Ali bin Abi Talib (as) to be a part of their religion.

“Question 268: It is in practice to recite the verse “IN ALLAHA BEAMREKUM BILADL E WAL AHSAN in the second sermon. What is the reason behind it?”

Answer: The Bani Umayyah rulers used to taunt and malign the fourth caliph in their sermons. When Umer bin Abdul Aziz became caliph, he was a religious worshiper and a pious ruler, he ended the prevailing practice of taunting and replaced it by introducing the recitation of this verse in the second sermon”

Mutafariqaat al Massail (Urdu), page 280 by Muhammad Abdul Hai Lucknawi published H.M Saeed Co. Karachi

Qadhi Thanauallah Paani Patti al-Uthmani

In Tafseer Mazhari Volume 5 page 21, Hanafi Scholar Qadhi Thanauallah Uthmani makes the admission that:

“There was a time when the Banu Umayya would curse the family of the Prophet”.

Imam Ibn Hazm Andlasi

Ibn Hazm writes in his book “Jawami’ al Seerah” published in Gujranwala, Pakistan:

“...And then the caliphate was transferred to Bani Abbas...but it returned to a kingship as before...however this time they did not curse any of the Sahaba (ra) unlike Bani Umayyah who supported people who used to curse Ali (ra), and those who cursed his pure sons, the sons of Zahra”

Jawami al Seerah

Imam Ibn Hajar Asqalani

We read in Fatah ul-Bari, Volume 7 page 57:

ثم كان من أمر علي ما كان فنجمت طائفة أخرى حاربه ثم أشد الخطب فتنقصوه

واتخذوا لعنه على المنابر سنة

“Then it was the matter of Ali and a group of people fought against him, then the situation got more complicated and they began to belittle him and they made cursing Ali from the pulpits, a regular habit”

Imam Muhammad Zahed al-Kawthari

Imam Muhammad Zahed al-Kawthari, the Imam of Hanafis during the Ottoman empire wrote in his book Taneeb al-Khateeb, page 285:

ولا شك أن خلفاء بني أمية كانوا يلعنون الإمام علي بن أبي طالب كرم الله وجهه على ذلك المنبر أخزاهم الله، إلى أن رفع ذلك عمر بن عبد العزيز رضي الله عنه

“No doubt that the caliphs of Bani Umayya used to curse Imam Ali bin Abi Talib (kr) from the pulpit, may Allah disgrace them, until Umar bin Abdulaziz banned it”

Maula Ali (as) was cursed for ninety years

Allamah Shibli Numani writes:

“Traditions were first formed in book form in the days of Ummayyads, who, for about 90 years, throughout their vast dominions stretching from the Indus in India to Asia Minor and Spain, insulted the descendants of Fatima and got Ali openly censured in Friday sermons at the mosques. They had hundreds of saying coined to eulogise Amir Muawiyah.”

Siratun Nabi, Volume 1 page 60

Summary of references

So to summarise from the references presented (many more could have been cited we felt this will suffice for the sake of brevity), we learn:

Mu’awiya used to curse ‘Ali (as)

He introduced the bidah of cursing ‘Ali (as) in the mosques following the Friday Sermons during his reign.

In line with the order his Governors would carry out the bidah of cursing ‘Ali in the Mosques

This outrageous bidah went on for 90 years

During that same time (of cursing) hadith were first collected

Umar bin Abdul Aziz abolished this ugly bidah.

Conclusions

In light of these established let us now see the true position of Mu’awiya in light of hadith and Fatwas of Ahl’ul Sunnah:

Rasulullah (s) cursed those who commit bidah

Abdul Qadir Jilani in ‘al-Ghuniya’ Volume 1 page 60 narrates that Rasulullah (s) said:

“Whoever introduces a bidah or protects it is cursed by Allah (swt) his Angels and the vast bulk of mankind”.

Allamah Abdul Qadir Gilani’s Fatwa against Ahl’ul bidah

Abdul Qadir Jilani in ‘al-Ghuniya’ Volume 1 page 18, Chapter “Dhikr Mu’awiya” states:

No one should go near Ahl’ul Bidah, don’t go near them, don’t share in their happiness on Eid, don’t participate in their Salat or Funerals, don’t read mercies upon them”.

Allamah Sa’duddeen Taftazani’s fatwa that Ahl’ul bidah should be cursed

Imam Sa’duddeen Taftazani in Sharh al Maqasid page 270 comments:

“One should hate Ahl’ul bidah, talk ill of them, curse them, do not pray Salat behind them to do so is Makruh”.

These fatwas make it clear those that indulge in bidah are cursed and it is a duty to separate ourselves from such people. This being the case one needs no reminding that Mu'awiya was responsible for the introduction of the bidah of cursing Ameerul Momineen 'Ali throughout his empire a bid'ah that went on for 90 years.

Cursing Ali (as) is tantamount to cursing Allah (swt)

We read in Al-Jam'e al-Saghir, Volume 2 page 608 Hadith 8736 that has been declared 'Sahih' by the author Hafiz Jalaluddin Syuti:

من سب عليا فقد سبني، ومن سبني فقد سب الله

Prophet said: 'Whoever curses Ali has cursed me and whoever has cursed me, he has cursed Allah'

Fatwa of al Muhaddith Shah Abdul Aziz – those that curse Ali are kaafir

In Tauhfa Ithna Ashariyya Shah Abdul Aziz states on page 394:

“If the people of Syria i.e. Mu'awiya and his supporters bore enmity towards 'Ali(r), considered him a kaafir and cursed him, then I consider such people to be kaafir”.

As is the habit of the Ulema of his like, Shah Abdul Aziz has sought to cast doubts as to whether Mu'awiya did indeed curse Maula 'Ali (as). Fortunately as is common amongst such scholars his contradiction is exposed by the fact that he himself admitted in Fatwa Azeezi that Mu'awiya would curse Maula Ali (as). If those that curse Maula Ali are kaafir then from the Shah's own pen Mu'awiya IS a kaafir as are those that entertained this action.

Fatwa of Muhaddith Shah Abdul Aziz – whoever disrespects Ahl'ul bayt (as) is a murtad

In Tauhfa Ithna Ashariyya Shah Abdul Aziz states on page 263:

“What view should we hold of those people who express happiness on Ashura when Imam Hussain was killed, who marry on that day, who disrespect the family of the Prophet and the descendants of Sayyida Fatima? It is correct to refer to such individuals as Murtad”.

If one who shows disrespect towards Ahl'ul bayt (as) is a Murtad then clearly one of the rank and file of Mu'awiya who demonstrated his disrespect of 'Ali (as) by introducing the cursing of him in the Mosques comes at the fore-front of such murtads. Moreover one should also highlight Mu'awiya's pleasure upon receiving the news that Imam Hasan (as) was dead.

An appeal to justice

Is it not curious that those that curse the Sahaba are kaafir (as a general rule) whilst those that curse Imam 'Ali (as) are not kaafir but the Imam of Nasibis, whom Allah (swt) is pleased with? Now think about the personality being cursed, a Khalifa Rashid, the cousin and son in law of the Prophet (s) – Ali ibne abi Talib (as).

Chapter Eight: The phantom merits of Mu'awiya

The aim of the writer (Abu Sulaiman) behind this passionate defense was to:

“I will represent Al-Tijani’s libels against this companion and I will refute these allegations against Mu’awiyah defend the writer of the revelation whom the Prophet peace be upon him said about: “O’ Allah, make him guided, a guider, and guide people through him.” [Sunan Al-Turmidhi, Book of "Virtues," Chapter of "Virtues of Mu'awiyah," #3842, see also Saheeh Al-Turmidhi #3018]

The Nasibi author has tried to prove Muawiyah as guide (Hadi) but he is so shameless to cite this tradition while he knew that Imam Tirmidhi himself rejected to deem the tradition to be ‘Sahih’. We will later on in this very chapter show the credibility of this hadith right from the Sunni sources while we will also shed light on the acts committed by the ‘guided guide’ of Ansar.org and other Nawasib so that the naïve Sunnies can better analyze the religious standing of Muawiyah.

Was Mu’awiya the writer of the revelation?

Ansar.org states:

“It is a firm thing that Mu’awiyah was among the writers of the revelation. Muslim narrated in his Saheeh from Ibn Abbas that Abu Sufyan asked the prophet peace be upon him for three things: (He (Abu Sufyan) said to the prophet: “O’ Prophet of Allah, give me three things.” The prophet said: “yes.” ... Abu Sufyan said: “Mu’awiyah, make him a writer (of the revelation) under your hands.” The prophet answered: “Alright.”) [Muslim with explanation. Book of "Virtues of the Companions," Chapter of "Virtues of Abu Sufyan," vol.17, p.2501] Ahmad narrated in his Musnad, and Muslim from Ibn Abbas who says: (Once I was a kid playing with other boys when I looked behind and I saw the prophet peace be upon him coming towards us. So I said: “The prophet did not come to anyone but to me.” So I went behind the door to hide. I did not feel until the prophet found me, grasped my neck, and pressed my shoulders gently. The prophet said: “Go and call Mu’awiyah for me.” And Mu’awiyah was his writer (of the revelation). So I went looking for Mu’awiyah and told him: “Go and answer the prophet of Allah peace be upon him because he needs you.”) [Musnad Ahmed, vol.1, Musnad Ibn Abbas #2651, and Muslim with explanation, Book of "Al-Birr wa Al-Silah," #2604] These two hadeeths prove that Mu’awiyah was one of the writers of the revelation”

Reply One – Prominent Ulema of Ahl’ul Sunnah have not counted Mu’awiya as writer of the revelation

One wonders to what extent Mu’awiya was the writer of the revelation, after all he embraced Islam following the conquest of Mecca, so the vast bulk of the revelation had already been revealed. In fact many classical Sunni scholars whilst listing those individuals honored as writer of the revelation did not count Mu’awiya. For evidence see the following texts:

Fathul Bari, page 450 Volume 2

Irshad al Sari, Volume 9 page 22

Umdhathul Qari, Volume 9 page 307
Nasah al Kafiya, page 170

Reply Two- Mu'awiya wrote letters not the revelation

In 'Iqd al Fareed' Volume 2 page 197 we read that:

“Ali bin Abi Talib with all of his honor and nobility in addition to his being a relative of Rasulullah (s), was also a writer of the revelation, thereafter he also became Khalifa. Uthman bin Afan used to write the revelation. In the absence of them (Ali & Uthman) Ubai bin Ka'ab and Zaid bin Thabit used to write, in the absence of these men, some other used to write. Khalid bin Saeed and Mu'awiya bin 'Abu Sufyan were entrusted with the duty of writing documents, al-Mugira bin Shu'aba and al-Husain bin Numair used to write the documents for the people, they used to replace Khalid and Mu'awiya in their absence.”

Similarly Imam Ibn Hajar Asqalani records in 'al Isaba' Volume 6 page 121:

وقال المدائني كان زيد بن ثابت يكتب الوحي وكان معاوية يكتب للنبي ﷺ فيما بينه

وبين العرب

“According to Madaini the writer of the revelation was Zaid bin Thabit and Muawiyah used to write for Prophet (s) the letters between Him (s) and the Arabs”.

Similarly Imam Dhahabi records in 'Tarikh al-Islam' Volume 4 page 309:

وذكر المفضل الغلابي : أن زيد بن ثابت كان كاتب وحي رسول الله ﷺ ، وكان معاوية

كاتبه فيما بينه وبين العرب

Al-Mufadhhal Al-Ghulabi stated: “Zaid bin thabit was the writer of the revelation for Holy Prophet (s), Mu'awiya was His (s) writer of correspondence between Him (s) and the Arabs.”

The Sunni Sheikh from Al-Azhar University, Mahmood Abu Raya (d. 1385 H) also rejected the claim regarding Mu'awiya being the writer of Wahi. He states in 'Sheikh al-Mudhira' page 205:

“We don't rule out the probability that he wrote for the Prophet (s) anything which was not related to revelation because that is something possible, but to write anything from Quran, this is something impossible”

On this topic the comments of the renowned Egyptian Sunni scholar Sayyid Qutb are worthy of note:

“The erroneous fable still persists that Mu'awiya was a scribe who wrote down the revelations of Allah's Messenger. The truth is that when Abu Sufyan embraced Islam, he besought the Prophet to give Mu'awiya some measure of position in the eyes of the Arabs; thus he would be compensated of being slow to embrace Islam and of being one of those who had no precedence in the new religion. So the Prophet used Mu'awiya for writing letters and contracts and agreements. But none of the companions ever said that he wrote down any of the Prophet's revelations, as was asserted by Mu'awiyas partisans after he had assumed the throne. But this is what happens in all such cases”.

Social Justice in Islam by Sayyid Qutb, English translation by John B. Hardie, page 215

Reply Three- A writer of the revelation became a kaafir

Allamah Salah-uddin Khalil bin Aybak al-Safadi (d. 764 H) records in his book ‘Al-Wafei bil Wafiyat’ Volume 17 page 100:

أبي سرح الكاتب الوحي عبدالله بن سعد بن أبي سرح بن الحارث بن حبيب بن جذيمة أبو يحيى القرشي العامري. أسلم قبل الفتح وهاجر وكان يكتب الوحي لرسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ثلم ارتد منصرفا وصار إلى قريش بمكة

“Ibn Abi Sarh, the writer of wahi, Abdullah bin Saad bin Abi Sarh bin al-Harith, bin Habib, bin Judayma Abu Yahya al-Qurashi al-Amiri. Converted to Islam before fatah and migrated, he used to write revelation (Wahi) for the Messenger of Allah (s) and then he became apostate and moved to Quraish in Makka”

In Fathul Bari, Volume 9 page 22 we read:

“The first man from the Quraysh who was the writer of the revelation was Abdullah bin Saad. After this he apostatised and became a kaafir and then became a Muslim again”.

Also see ‘Al-Muntakhab min Dail al-Mudail’ page 41, Al-Ma’arif by ibn Qutayba, page 300 and Siyar alam al-Nubala, Volume 3 page 33.

As we see from this reference attaining the station of writer of the revelation means absolutely nothing, it does not in any way protect you from deviance since Saad who was incidentally Mu’awiya own Umayya relative became a kaafir after attaining this post. Even if we accept that Mu’awiya attained this honour then his later transgressions are even more damning. The writing down of the revelation does not in any way ‘protect’ Mu’awiya from the wrath of Allah (swt). It is the end result that counts; Allah (swt) was so impressed by the subservience of Iblis the Jinn that he elevated him to the Heavens. Despite this he was expelled and cursed by Allah (swt) following his refusal to submit himself to the will of Allah (swt). Hence Mu’awiya’s behaviour despite having benefited from sitting with Rasulallah (s) will no doubt be viewed as a greater transgression in the eyes of Allah (swt).

Was Mu’awiya a Hadi?

A number of interesting facts need to be considered before analyzing the authenticity of this hadith. It is quite logical that Rasulallah (s) would not just say something like this out of the blue. Mu’awiya must have demonstrated some quality in his presence that led to Rasulallah (s) making this dua. It is common an individual is only praised when he has committed a praiseworthy action and proven his worth e.g. on the battlefield, in exams etc. The clearest proof comes from a tradition that Abu Sulaiman cites:

A’mir bin Sa’ad bin Abi Waqqas who narrated from his father who says: (Mu’awiyah bin Abi Sufyan ordered Sa’d and asked him: “What prevented you from insulting Abu Turab (Ali bin Abi Talib)?” Sa’ad answered: “The prophet peace be upon him said three things to him (Ali bin Abi Talib), so I would not insult him because to have one of these three

things is more beloved to me than Humr Al-Nni'am (a kind of best camels). I heard the prophet peace be upon him saying to appoint Ali as a leader when the prophet used to go to Jihad (Holy War). Ali then would say to him: "O' Messenger of Allah, you left me with the women and children?" The prophet peace be upon him answered him: "Would not you be pleased if you were for me as Haroon was for Mousa? Except there is no prophecy after me." And I heard the prophet saying at the day of Khaybar: "I would give this banner to a man who loves Allah and His Messenger and who Allah and His Messenger love him too." He said: "Then we were looking for this honor." Then the Prophet said: "Call Ali." Ali was brought and he had sore eyes. So the prophet peace be upon him spat in his eyes and gave him the banner. Then Allah granted victory to the Muslims by the hands of Ali. And when this verse revealed: "Come, let us gather together, our sons and your sons," the messenger of Allah called Ali, Fatima, Hasan, and Hussain and said: "O' Allah, they are my family.") [Saheeh Muslim with Explanation, Book of "The Companions," Chapter of "Virtues of Ali," #2404]

All three traditions praising Ali (as) have a context as to 'why' Rasulullah said these words praising 'Ali, thus explaining the reason BEHIND these words. Now could Abu Sulaiman cite us the reason why Rasulullah (s) prayed for Mu'awiya as Hadi? Moreover with such a desire that Mu'awiya become a Hadi, surely Rasulullah (s) would have sought to train Mu'awiya in this role. Could Abu Sulaiman cite us any events when he sent Mu'awiya on dawah campaigns to guide the people or to converts to Judge over them (as he did when he sent Ali (as) to Yemen).

One should also ask Abu Sulaiman, is it not curious that Mu'awiya never once recollected this hadith? Would this not have been clear evidence to convince his doubters?

It is also quite fascinating that Rasulullah referred to Mu'awiya as a Hadi who would guide the people whilst he never referred to the three caliphs as Hadi who would provide Hidayah (guidance). No such tradition appears about these three in the Sihah Sittah. Is Abu Sulaiman therefore suggesting that Mu'awiya was more learned on matters pertaining to the Deen than them? With such a strong hadith do we have any evidence that the three khulafa ever appointed Mu'awiya as a Judge over the Muslim Ummah after all the role of a Judge far outweighs the role of a governor – since only a Hadi can attain the station of Qadi. So did the three khulafa recognize Mu'awiya's greatness and appoint him as a Judge?

A Hadi is one who guides his followers in accordance with the Qur'an and Sunnah

Hadi is one that guides the Ummah in accordance with the Qur'an and Sunnah, so exactly what Hidayah did Mu'awiya provide for his followers? Can we interpret this hadith to mean that he was the Hadi that would lead the Ummah to fight Imam Ali (as) and curse him in the mosques?

If Mu'awiya was indeed a Hadi for the Ummah and people would be guided by him then that in effect means that anyone that opposes him is opposing guidance and has deviated from the right path. In other words the

alleged hadith would suggest that Mu'awiya and his supporters were right at Sifeen and Ali (as) and his Shi'a were deviants as they were fighting the Hadi – does Abu Sulaiman uphold this view?

If we look in to the works of Ahl'ul Sunnah we learn that this alleged Hadi made decisions in violation to the Sharia.

Mu'awiya 'the Hadi' declared Ziyad, the bastard son of Abu Sufiyan as his real brother contradicting the Sharia

Regarding the acts committed by Muawiyah contradicting to the Islamic Shariya, let us begin with his first open violation of Quranic injunctions by declaring Ziyad, the bastard son of Abu Sufiyan as his real brother. He did so at the time of appointing Ziyad. Imam Jalaluddeen Suyuti also acknowledges this in his book 'Al-Debaj ala Muslim' volume 1 page 84:

“When Ziyad was attributed, as Mu'awiya attributed him to his father Abu Sufyan while he (Ziyad) was known as Ziyad bin Abih because his mother had given birth to him on Ubaid's bed, and this was the first Sharia law that was changed in Islam.”

Al-Debaj ala Muslim, Volume 1 page 84

Imam Suyuti also records in Tareekh ul Khulafa, page 185:

“Mu'awiya's appointed Ziyad bin Abih and it was the first act that contradicted an order of Rasulallah as al-Thalabi and others narrated it”.

We read in Tarikh Kamil Volume 3 page 68:

“They rejected the law of Rasulallah because Rasulallah (s) said that the legitimate child is one born from wedlock”

Allamah Ibn Abdul Barr records in his esteemed work 'al-Estidkar' volume 7 page 169:

Saeed bin al-Musayab said: 'The first law of messenger of Allah that was rejected is the case of Ziyad'

Let us also read the views of Imam of Ahle Sunnah Ahmed bin Hanbal:

Ahmad (bin Hanbal) said: 'The first law of the Holy Prophet (s) that was rejected is the case of Ziyad'

Masael Ahmad bin Hanbal, page 89

Let us now cite the words of one of the beloved scholars by Salafies Sheikh Hasan Farhan al-Maliki who was born in 1390 H and graduated from Imam Muhammad bin Saud University in year 1412 H. He records in 'Naho Inqad al-Tarikh' page 31:

“During the reign of Mu'awiya, a group testified that Abu Sufyan confessed that Ziad to be his son, so according to that Mu'awiya attributed him (to Abu Sufyan) and contradicted the correct hadith which is boy belongs to the bed (where he was born), and for the adulterer is the stone! And that was for worldly benefit. Those who condemn Mu'awiya's deed had declared it. And the scholars agreed on the illegality of his attribution to Abu Sufyan, and what happened (of silence) from the scholars during the reign of Bani Umayya was Taqyia.”

This action of Mu'awiya contravened the Qur'an, as we read in Surah Ahzab verses 4-5:

YUSUFALI: Allah has not made for any man two hearts in his (one) body: nor has He made your wives whom ye divorce by Zihar your mothers:

nor has He made your adopted sons your sons. Such is (only) your (manner of) speech by your mouths. But Allah tells (you) the Truth, and He shows the (right) Way.

Call them by (the names of) their fathers: that is juster in the sight of Allah. But if ye know not their father's (names, call them) your Brothers in faith, or your maulas. But there is no blame on you if ye make a mistake therein: (what counts is) the intention of your hearts: and Allah is Oft-Returning, Most Merciful.

Mu'awiya 'the Hadi' made decisions that contradicted the Shar'ia on inheritance

Ibn Kathir in his esteemed work Al-Bidayah (Urdu), vol 8 page 989-990 (Nafees Academy Karachi) while recording the 'merits' of Muawiya bin Hinda, records:

The Sunnah is that that neither could a kaafir inherit from a Muslim, nor a Muslim inherit from a kaafir. The first person to allow a Muslim to inherit from Kafir, whilst Kafir could not inherit from a Muslim was Muawiya, and Bani Umaya did the same after him till Umar bin Abdulaziz came and revived the Sunnah, but then Hisham returned back to what Mu'awiya and Bani Umatya used to do.

Al Bidayah (Arabic), Volume 8 page 141

Imam of Ahle Sunnah Ibn Qudamah records in his esteemed work Al-Mughni, Volume 7 page 166- Kitab al-Faraiz:

“The scholars are unanimous that the non Muslim does not inherit the Muslim, the majority of companions and jurists said: ‘The muslim do not inherit the non Muslim’. That is what narrated from Abu bakr, Umar, Uthman, Ali, Usama bin Zaid, Jaber bin Abdullah (may Allah be pleased with them), and so was said by Amro bin Uthman, Arwa, al-Zuheri, Atta, Tawous, al-Hasan, Amro bin Abdulaziz, Amro bin Dinar, al-Thawri, Abu Hanifa and his companions, Malik, Shafeei and the rest of the jurists, and that is what we follow. It is narrated about Amr, Mu'ath and Mu'awiya (may Allah be pleased with them) that they allowed Muslim to inherit the non Muslim, but they didn't allow Non-Muslim to inherit a Muslim”

Mu'awiya's introduction of this practice was an open violation to the teachings of Islam and we read in Sahih al Bukhari Volume 8 hadith number 756 that Rasulullah (s) said, “A Muslim cannot be the heir of a disbeliever, nor can a disbeliever be the heir of a Muslim”.

Mu'awiya 'the Hadi' contradicted the Shar'ia on Blood money

Ibn Kathir records in Al-Bidayah (Urdu), vol 8 page 989-990 (Nafees Academy Karachi):

ومضت السنة: أن دية المعاهد كدية المسلم، وكان معاوية أول من قصرها إلى النصف، وأخذ النصف لنفسه.

“Another Sunnah that was abolished was the blood money of non-Muslim being equal to the blood money of a Muslim, but Muawiya was the first person who reduced it to half, and kept the remaining half for himself”

Mu'awiya 'the Hadi' contradicted the Shar'ia on the distribution of war booty

In the distribution of war booty Mu'awiya acted in violation to the Book of God and his Sunnah. The Qur'an and Sunnah dictated that the fifth portion of war booty be placed into the treasury and the remaining four / fifths be distributed amongst the troops that participated in the battle, but Mu'awiya the 'Ameer al-Momineen' of Nawasib issued an order that from the war booty gold and silver would be removed, and the remainder be distributed.

A number of esteemed sunni scholars have recorded:

Al-Hassan said: 'Ziyad wrote to al-Hakam ibn Amro al-Ghafari while he was a governor of Khurasan: 'The Ameer al-Momineen wants to store the yellow (gold) and white (silver) (from the booty) and don't distribute these among the people'.

1. Al-Istiab, Volume 1 page 358, Translation of Al-Hakam al-Amro al-Ghafari
2. Al-Dur al-Manthur, Volume 6 page 234, Commentary of 65:2
3. Siar alam alnubala, Volume 2 page 475
4. Al-Mustadrak al-Hakim, Volume 3 page 442
5. Musanaf ibn Abi Shayba, Volume 7 page 270

Some Sunni scholars have recorded the episode in this manner:

Ibn Habib mentioned that Ziyad wrote to al-Rabee bin Ziyad saying: 'The Ameer al-Momineen wrote to me to order you to store the yellow (gold) and white (silver) while distribute the rest.'

1. Istiab, Volume 2 page 381 Translation No. 2579, Rabi bin Ziyad bin Anas
2. Siar alam alnubala, Volume 2 page 475
3. Asad al-Ghaba, Volume 2 page 36
4. Al-kamil fi al-Tarikh, Volume 3 page 470

If pathetic Nawasib fail to understand the correct meaning of the words 'yellow' and 'white' mentioned in the above cited traditions then let us help them by citing the meaning from great Sunni figures, for example Ibn Manzur states:

الصفراء : الذهب ، والبيضاء : الفضة

"Yellow: Gold, and white: silver"

Lisan al-Arab, Volume 4 page 460

Shaykh Abdulhamid al-Sherwani (d.1118 H) records in 'Hawashi al-Sharwani' Volume 5 page 140:

الصفراء والبيضاء أي الذهب والفضة

"Yellow and white which is gold and silver"

We read in the margin of Sunnan Abi Dawoud by Allamah Saeed al-Laham (Volume 2 page 35):

الصفراء والبيضاء : المال من الذهب والفضة

"Yellow and white is the money of gold and silver"

Also we read in the introduction of Fath al-Bari Sharah Sahih Bukhari by Hasan Zaki:

قوله الصفراء والبيضاء أي الذهب والفضة

“His saying yellow and white means gold and silver”

Sheikh Muhammad bin Aqeel al-Hadrami (d. 1350 H) records in ‘Nisai al-Kaafiyah’ page 131:

Ibn Hajar mentioned that it has been narrated with a chain of narration having thiqah narrators that Mu’awiya issued a sermon on Friday and said: ‘Verily the money is our money and the booty is our booty, we will give it to whoever we want and will seize it from whoever we want’.

More References:

1. Majm’a al-Zawaid, Volume 5 page 236 Tradition No. 9199
2. Musnad Abi Yala, Volume 13 page 374
3. Al-Mu’ajam al-Kabir, Volume 19 page 294
4. Tarikh al-islam by al-Dahabi, Volume 4 page 314
5. Tarikh Dimashq, Volume 59 page 168

Imam Abi Bakar al-Haythami said in Majma al-Zawaid: ‘The narrators are thiqah’ while famous Salafi scholar Husain Salim Asad in his margin of the book Musnad Abi Ya’la said: ‘The chain is sahih’.

In Tabaqat Ibn Saad, Volume 5 page 291- Biography of Umar bin Abdul Aziz, the author Imam Ibn Sa’ad records that Muawiyah had deprived the people from their due share of Khums:

Yahya bin Shibl said: ‘I sat with Ali bin Abdullah bin Abbas and Abi Jaffar Muhammad bin Ali, then a man came to them and cursed Umar bin Abdul Aziz, so they prohibit him (of cursing) and said: ‘We never received Khums since Muawiya’s reign till today and Umar bin Abdulaziz gave it to Bani Abdulmutalib’

Mu’awiya ‘the Hadi’ drank a prohibited substance

Imam of Ahl’ul Sunnah Ibn Hanbal records in his Musnad Volume 5 page 347:

“Abdullah bin Buraida said: ‘I entered on Muawiya with my father, then he (Mu’awiya) made us sit on a mattress then he brought food to us and we ate, then he brought drink to us, Muawiya drank and then he offered that to my father, thus (my father) said: ‘I never drank it since the messenger of Allah made it Haram’....”

Musnad Ahmad bin Hanbal, Volume 5 page 347 Hadith: 22991

Screen shot of the Musnad Ahmed bin Hanbal with the margin by Shaykh Shoib al-Arnaut

Several children of Muaiywah i.e. the hardline Nawasib have sought their utmost to find flaws in the chain of this narration but the fact is that the tradition at maximum is ‘Sahih’ and minimum is ‘Hasan’ as late Salafi scholar from Yemen Sheikh Muqbil al-Wadi’e declared it ‘Hasan’ (al-Musnad al-Sahih, page 185). Allamah Hasan bin Ali al-Saqqaf (born in 1961) is a contemporary Sunni scholar of modern day, he is the chief of Imam Nawawi center in Jordan, he has been a student of some esteemed Sunni scholars such as al-Azeemi (the margin writer of the book Sahih Ibn Khuzaima), Hafiz Ghemari and Sheikh Bouti. Allamah Saqqaf has written a margin for the book “Dafu Shubah al-Tashbih” by Imam Abu al-Faraj bin al-Jawzi al-Hanbali in which Allamah Saqqaf wrote about this tradition:

“The narrators are the narrators of Sahih Muslim”. And the version of Musnad Ahmad available at the above cited link is compiled by Shaykh Shoaib Al-Arnaut who stated about that tradition: “The chain is strong”. But if still the fact that the father of Nawasib drank a Haram substance is frustrating them and they are dying to prove it a weak narration, then let us hit the final nail in the coffin of Nasibism by presenting the comments of great Sunni Imam, Hafid Abi Bakar al-Hathami who has also recorded this tradition in his esteemed work ‘Majma al Zawaid’ Volume 5 page 554 Hadith 8022 and then stated:

رواه أحمد ورجاله رجال الصحيح

“Ahmad narrated it and the narrators are the narrators of Sahih”

Mu’awiya’s love for alcohol was such that he even recited couplets praising it after getting unconscious due to intoxication We read an episode recorded in Tarikh ibn Asakir about the meeting of two old friends, one being Abdullah bin Harith al-Umayya and the other one was Muawiya.

Anbasa bin Amro reported that Abdullah bin al-Harith bin Umayya bin Abdshams went to Mu’awiya who came so close to him (Abdullah) till Muawiya’s knees touched the head of Abdullah, then Mu’awiya asked him: ‘So, what is left in you?’ (Abdullah) said: ‘By Allah (nothing left) my good and evil are gone.’ Mu’awiya said: ‘By Allah, the good left your heart, but still a lot of evil remains, so what do we got for you?’ (Abdullah) said: ‘If you did a good deed I will not thank you and if you did a bad deed I will blame you’. (Mu’awiya) said: ‘By Allah you are not doing justice with me’. (Abdullah) said: ‘When I did justice with you? By Allah, I wounded the head of your brother Handhla and I even didn’t pay the penalty tax for it, I used to say (poem):

Sakhar bin Harab! We don’t consider you as a master, rule other than us, you are not a master.

You (Mu’awiya) used to say:

‘I drank alcohol till I become a burden over my mate, and I had one friend‘

Then he (Abdullah) jumped on Mu’awiya hitting him by his hand, Mu’awiya inclined and began laughing.

Tarikh ibn Asakir, Volume 27 page 312 Translation No. 3230

Mu’awiya ‘the Hadi’ used to smuggle alcohol

Muawiya bin Hind was not only the initiator of mass terrorism in Islam, the first tyrant to make muslim women captives, he was also the idol of present day smugglers aka Don, particularly the smugglers of alcohol. Muhadith Shah Abdul Aziz Dehalwi in his anti-Shia book records the following incident:

“Abada bin Samit was in Syria when he saw Muawiya’s convoy comprised of a queue of camels having alcohol on thier back. Abada asked: “What are these?”. People answered: “These are alcohol that Muawiya has sent for the purpose of selling”. Abada came with a knife and he cut the ropes on the camels till all the alcohol spilled out”

Tuhfa Athna Ashariya (Farsi), page 638

The tradition can be read in Tarikh Ibn Asakir, Volume 26 page 197 and in Siyar Alam al Nubla, Volume 2 page 10 but it seems that the name of Muawiya as been deleted from the recent versions of these books and instead the word “Fulan” (such and such person) appears, but in any case, the fact that Abada bin Samit spilled the alcohol belonging to the ruler of Syria is still recorded in these books and shall suffice to point out the ruler of Syria namely Muawiya. Shaykh Shoib al-Arnaut, wrote in the margin of Siyar Alam Nubla that the tradition is ‘Hasan’.

Allamah Muttaqi Ali Hindi has recorded a similar kind of incident in this manner:

Muhammad bin Ka’ab al-Qurdhi said: ‘Abdulrahman bin Sahl al-Ansari participated in a war during Uthman’s reign and Mu’awiya was a ruler of Syria, then a barrel of alcohol passed before him (Abdulrahman), so he went there while holding his spear and penetrated into every barrel, the slaves resisted him, till Mu’awiya was informed about that. (Mu’awiya) said: “Leave him, he is an old man and has lost his mind’. (Abdulrahman) said: ‘By Allah, he has lied, I didn’t lose my mind, but the messenger of Allah (pbuh) forbade us to drink it, I swear by Allah that if I live till I see what I heard from the Messenger of Allah about Mu’awiya, either I will split and open Muawiya’s stomach or I will die’.

Kanzul Ummal, Volume 5 page 713 Hadith 13716

The tradition is also present in the following esteemed Sunni books:

Faydh al-Qadir, by al-Manawi, Volume 5 page 462, Tradition 7969

Tarikh Damishq, Volume 34 page 420

Asad al-Ghaba, Volume 1 page 699, topic- Abdurehman bin Sahl bin Zayd

Al-Isaba, Volume 4 page 313, Translation 5140

So here we come to know about the alcohol smuggler of that era while those who are in this profession today, they are merely following the Sunnah of Muawiyah.

Mu’awiya ‘the Hadi’ used to sell idols to polytheists helping them to worship the idols

As we all know that the reason that some people apparently entered the pale of Islam during the time of our Prophet (s) was not due to their conviction towards Islam, rather they had some hidden agendas, possibly to hurt Islam by secretly aiding their ‘actual’ relatives and friends, the idol worshippers. By reading the following habit of Muawiya, one can easily put him into the same category of people. One of the esteemed Hanafi Imam Sarkhasi (d. 483 H) who enjoys the title of ‘Shams al-Aimah’ (Sun of Imams) in his acclaimed work al-Mabsut, Volume 14 page 46 records:

Masrooq (rh) reported that Mu’awiya (ra) sent idols made up of copper to India for the purpose of selling, further Masrooq (rh) passed on those and said: ‘By Allah if I knew that he (Mu’awiya) would kill me I would sink (the idols), but I’m afraid that he (Mu’awiya) would rather toucher and then persecute me. By Allah I don’t know what kind of man Mu’awiya is, is he the one to whom evil deeds seem to be fair, or who despairs of the hereafter (to survive) so he enjoys this life.’ It has been said that those idols were

obtained as war booty, so Mu'awiya (ra) ordered their sale in India to buy (from it's income) weapons and camels for the invaders and that is the evidence on which Abu Hanifa (rh) relied for permitting the sale of idols and the sale of the cross for the purposes of worship.'

Al-Mabsut, Volume 14 page 46

Al-Mabsut, Volume 7 page 269

This is the Hadi of the Nawasib. The role of a Hadi is to show all people the true path, to shw the disbelievers that they are on the wrong path, and that Islam is the true path. Rather than adhere to this role of a Hadi, Muawiya preferred aiding the Kuffar to worship false deities by selling idols to them. Rather than guides these deviants he was helping them to continue with their kufr ways!

We shall take the opportunity to clarify that selling idos is prohibited under Shia fiqh (see 'Mesbah al-Faqaha' by Sayyed Khoei, Volume 1 page 242). Also we read in 'Feqh al-Sadiq' by Sayyed Rohani, Volume 14 page 140 that:

'The heresy worshipping equipments such as cross and idol, the popular view among the scholars is about the prohibitions of selling these, verily there is Ijma on it.'

Mu'awiya 'the Hadi' undresses and inspects the body of a naked woman

Ibn Katheer proudly records:

Ibn Asakir has narrated under the events of Mu'awiya's slave Khadij al Hazi that Mu'awiya bought a fair complexioned and beautiful slave girl and he (Khadij) undressed her and brought her before Mu'awiya while he was having a stick in his hand and he started bowing towards her vagina and said: "I wish this vagina were for me; take her to Yazeed bin Muawyah." And then said "No! Call Rabi` bin Umro al Qarshi". He (Rabi) was a Faqih. When he came, Muawyah asked him: "This slave girl has been brought before me in naked condition and I have seen her here and there and I wished to send her to Yazeed". He said: "O commander of faithful! Don't do this. This is not appropriate". Mu'awiya said: "Your suggestion is correct". Narrator says that Mu'awiya then gifted her to the servant of Fatima daughter of Holy Prophet (s) namely Abdullah bin Mas`adat Fazari who was black and Muaywah told him: "Make your children white through her".

And this shows the cleverness and intelligence of Muawyah because he had seen her with lustful intention and felt weak in front of her, and then he was also scared of gifting her to Yazeed due to the verse of Holy Quran, and Faqih Rabi` bin Umro al Jarshi al Damashqi also agreed with him"

Al Badayah wal Niahayh (Urdu), Vol 8 page 992, Topic- Wives and sons of Muawyah (published by Nafees Academy Karachi).

We don't understand how the children of Mu'awiya such as Ibn Kathir can praise their father for mocking with the honor of a woman. According to the supposed hadith Nasibis deem Mu'awiya to be their "guide". We can deduce the horrible guidance they obtained from their beloved guide. How can a religious guide allow a man to undress a woman and not only that but

then pass disparaging comments about her in the presence of another person and in effect treat her like a toy ball that can be thrown from one hand into another in the very naked condition.

Mu'awiya 'the Hadi' tells the people to consume haraam items and kill each other

We read in Sahih Muslim, Kitab al Imara Book 020, Number 4546:

It has been narrated on the authority of 'Abd al-Rahman b. Abd Rabb al-Ka'ba who said: I entered the mosque when 'Abdullah b. 'Amr b. al-'As was sitting in the shade of the Ka'ba and the people had gathered around him. I betook myself to them and sat near him. (Now) Abdullah said: I accompanied the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) on a journey. We halted at a place. Some of us began to set right their tents, others began to compete with one another in shooting, and others began to graze their beasts, when an announcer of the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) announced that the people should gather together for prayer, so we gathered around the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him). He said: It was the duty of every Prophet that has gone before me to guide his followers to what he knew was good for them and warn them against what he knew was bad for them; but this Umma of yours has its days of peace and (security) in the beginning of its career, and in the last phase of its existence it will be afflicted with trials and with things disagreeable to you. (In this phase of the Umma), there will be tremendous trials one after the other, each making the previous one dwindle into insignificance. When they would be afflicted with a trial, the believer would say: This is going to bring about my destruction. When at (the trial) is over, they would be afflicted with another trial, and the believer would say: This surely is going to be my end. Whoever wishes to be delivered from the fire and enter the garden should die with faith in Allah and the Last Day and should treat the people as he wishes to be treated by them. He who swears allegiance to a Caliph should give him the pledge of his hand and the sincerity of his heart (i. e. submit to him both outwardly as well as inwardly). He should obey him to the best of his capacity. If another man comes forward (as a claimant to Caliphate), disputing his authority, they (the Muslims) should behead the latter. The narrator says: I came close to him ('Abdullah b. 'Amr b. al-'As) and said to him: Can you say on oath that you heard it from the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him)? He pointed with his hands to his ears and his heart and said: My ears heard it and my mind retained it. I said to him: This cousin of yours, Mu'awiya, orders us to unjustly consume our wealth among ourselves and to kill one another, while Allah says: "O ye who believe, do not consume your wealth among yourselves unjustly, unless it be trade based on mutual agreement, and do not kill yourselves. Verily, God is Merciful to you" (iv. 29). The narrator says that (hearing this) Abdullah b. 'Amr b. al-'As kept quiet for a while and then said: Obey him in so far as he is obedient to God; and disobey him in matters involving disobedience to God.

The role of a caliph is to tell people to refrain from consuming unjust wealth and killing each other, yet Mu'awiya was telling his subjects to do just that. Who forced people to break the Shariah.

Mu'awiya 'the Hadi' took interest

We read in Muwatta Book 31, Number 31.16.33 under the chapter "Selling Gold for Silver, Minted and Unminted":

Yahya related to me from Malik from Zayd ibn Aslam from Ata ibn Yasar that Muawiya ibn Abi Sufyan sold a gold or silver drinking-vessel for more than its weight. Abu'dDarda said, "I heard the Messenger of Allah, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, forbidding such sales except like for like." Muawiya said to him, "I don't see any harm in it." Abu'd-Darda said to him, "Who will excuse me from Muawiya? I tell him something from the Messenger of Allah, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, and he gives me his own opinion! I will not live in the same land as you!" Then Abu'd-Darda went to Umar ibn al-Khattab and mentioned that to him. Umar ibn al-Khattab therefore wrote to Muawiya, "Do not sell it except like for like, weight for weight."

Muwatta Book 31, Number 31.16.33

Just contemplate the significance of this narration. Mu'awiya had entered in to a profit making transaction that was haraam. Abu'd-Darda corrected him and told him of the verdict of Rasulallah (s) on the matter only permitting such transactions on a 'like for like' basis. Rather than concede that he was wrong, Abu Sulaiman's Hadi replies "I don't see any harm in it" – thus justifying his opinion over that of Rasulallah (s). We congratulate Abu Sulaiman for grasping a Hadi who has no shame in holding an opinion different to that of Rasulallah (s)!

One would think that the natural response would be for Mu'awiya to desist from such actions in the future, Mu'awiya had been told clearly by Abu'd Darda and Umar that an individual can only sell a like for like item i.e. Gold for Gold. The position under the Sharia had been made clear and yet as Khalifa, Abu Sulaiman's Hadi Imam continued to ignore the order of Rasulallah (s) on the matter. We read in Sahih Muslim Book 010, Number 3852:

"Abil Qiliba reported: I was in Syria (having) a circle (of friends). in which was Muslim b. Yasir. There came Abu'l-Ash'ath. He (the narrator) said that they (the friends) called him: Abu'l-Ash'ath, Abu'l-Ash'ath, and he sat down. I said to him: Narrate to our brother the hadith of Ubada b. Samit. He said: Yes. We went out on an expedition, Mu'awiya being the leader of the people, and we gained a lot of spoils of war. And there was one silver utensil in what we took as spoils. Mu'awiya ordered a person to sell it for payment to the people (soldiers). The people made haste in getting that. The news of (this state of affairs) reached 'Ubada b. Samit, and he stood up and said: I heard Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) forbidding the sale of gold by gold, and silver by silver, and wheat by wheat, and barley by barley, and dates by dates, and salt by salt, except like for like and equal for equal. So he who made an addition or who accepted an addition (committed the sin of taking) interest. So the people returned what they had got. This reached Mu'awiya. and he stood up to deliver an address. He said:

What is the matter with people that they narrate from the Messenger (may peace be upon him) such tradition which we did not hear though we saw him (the Holy Prophet) and lived in his company? Thereupon, Ubida b. Samit stood up and repeated that narration, and then said: We will definitely narrate what we heard from Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) though it may be unpleasant to Mu'awiya (or he said: Even if it is against his will). I do not mind if I do not remain in his troop in the dark night. Hammad said this or something like this".

Sahih Muslim Book 010, Number 3852

Yet again Mu'awiya allowed a transaction that was not based on the 'like for like principle' as stipulated by Rasulullah (s). It is interesting to see Mu'awiya's denial of this matter declaring "they narrate from the Messenger (may peace be upon him) such tradition which we did not hear though we saw him". How can Mu'awiya deny knowledge of this matter when it is proven from the previous narration in Muwatta that as Governor of Syria under Umar this issue was brought to his attention by Abu'd Darda and then confirmed in writing to him by the Khalifa himself?

We also read in Sharah Ma'ni al-Athaar by Imam Tahawi that Mu'awiya used to take interest.

"Mu'awiya purchased a Pearl and Yaqoot necklace for 4,600 dirhams. When Mu'awiya got on to the pulpit Abada bin Samit stood up and said "No! Mu'awiya entered in to an agreement based on interest and also ate interest and as a result of this is in the Fire".

Mani al Athaar, page 262

Interest is a despicable act in the eyes of Allah (swt) and In Sahih Muslim hadith number 3881 Jabir bin Abdullah narrates:

"Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him) cursed the accepter of interest and its payer, and one who records it, and the two witnesses; and he said: They are all equal".

Sahih Muslim hadith number 3881

Mu'awiya's introduction of interest is clear violation to the Sharia is worthy of note, particularly in light of the modern day book of Hanafi Fatwas "Aqaaidul Islam" – rendered into English by Moulana Zahier Ahmed Ragie. On page 158 we read the following fatwa:

"A person becomes an unbeliever if he makes lawful the unlawful acts of Islam or vice versa e.g. legalizes interest etc"

Mu'awiya 'the Hadi' made changes to the Eid Salat

Suyuti in Tarikh ul Khulafa page 200 notes that:

"Zuhri narrates in relation to the Salat of Eid, the first to deliver the Khutba before the Salat was Mu'awiya bin Abu Sufyan".

We read the following in al 'Al-Uam' volume 1 page 392 by Imam al-Shafi'ee:

Shafi'ee stated that Abdullah bin Yazid al-Khutmi said: 'The prophet (pbuh), Abu bakr, Umar and Uthman used to start by praying before the sermon till Muwiyah came and made the sermon before (the prayer)'

Al-Uam, volume 1 page 392

Ibn Kathir records in Al Bidayah Volume 8 page 139:

وقال قتادة: عن سعيد بن المسيب: أول من أذن وأقام يوم الفطر والنحر معاوية.

Qatadah narrated from Saeed bin al-Musiyib: ‘Muawiya was the first person to recite Adhan and Iqamah during Eid al-Fitr and Eid al-Adha’

We read in Kitab al Ilm Volume 1 page 229 that:

‘Imam Zuhri narrates that Rasulullah (s), Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman lead the Eid Salat without Adhan, but Mu’awiya introduced the Adhan in the Eid prayer’.

Ibn Hajar Asqalani in Fathul Bari Volume 2 page 529 expands on this matter yet further:

‘There is a difference of opinion over who introduced the Adhan in Eid Salat. Ibn Sheba has a tradition with a Sahih Isnad attributing this to Mu’awiya, whilst Shaafi states Ibn Ziyad introduced this in Basra, Daud claims that Marwan introduced this – but the vast bulk of traditions do not support this. Mu’awiya introduced this in the same way that he introduced the khutba of Eid before Salat’.

Once again Abu Sulaiman’s Hadi Imam is shown to have changed the Sharia, this time in connection with Eid prayers, in that there is no doubt, for we read in Sahih Muslim Book 004, Hadith Number 1926 Chapter 164: The prayer of the two Ids:

Jabir b. ‘Abdullah reported: I observed prayer with the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) on the ‘Id day. He commenced with prayer before the sermon without Adhan and Iqama.

In addition to this clear proof we also present the fatwa of Imam Malik taken from the English translation of his Muwatta under the chapter ‘The Ghusl of the Two Ids, the Call to Prayer for The prayer, and the Iqama’ Book 10, Number 10.1.1:

‘Yahya related to me from Malik that he had heard more than one of their men of knowledge say, ‘There has been no call to prayer or iqama for the id al-Fitr or the id al-Adha since the time of the Messenger of Allah, may Allah bless him and grant him peace.’ Malik said, ‘That is the sunna about which there is no disagreement among us.’

Mu’awiya ‘the Hadi’ reduced the number of Takbeers from daily prayers

Muawiya not only made changes to the Eid prayers but he also had the audacity to make changes in the daily prayers by reducing the Takbeer. Imam of Ahle Sunnah Badruddin al Ayyuni records in ‘Umadatul Qari Sharah Sahih Bukhari’ Volume 6 page 58:

وقال الطبري إن أبا هريرة سئل من أول من ترك التكبير إذا رفع رأسه وإذا وضعه قال

معاوية

Al-Tabari said: ‘Abu Huraira was asked about the first one who abandoned Takbir during raising the head and prostration, he replied: ‘Muawiya’.

Imam Jalaluddin Syuti likewise recorded:

أول من نقص التكبير معاوية

“The first person who reduced Takbir was Mu’awiya”.

al-Wasael ela al-Musamerah, page 164

We read in the Sharah of ‘Muawtta Imam Malik’ written by Allamah Ashfaq al-Rahman al-Sindi:

“Al-Tabarani recorded in authority of Abu Huraira that the first one who abandon it (Takbir) is Mu’awiya”

Muawtta of Imam Malik, page 61

One of the favorite scholar of Salafies Qadhi Showkani also discloses some more prominent Sunni names while recording about those who abandoned Takbeer, as he records in his authority work ‘Nail al-Awtar’ Volume 2 page 265:

Tabari narrated from Abu Huraira that the first one who abandoned takbir is Mu’awiya. It has been narrated from Abu Ubaid that the first one who abandon it is Ziyad. Such traditions are not contradictory because Ziyad abandoned it because Mu’awiya had abandoned it, and Mu’awiya abandoned it because Uthman had abandoned it”

Shawkani in the same page has also quoted the comments of the Imam of Ahle Sunnah Tahawi who without mentioning the name of Muawiya, stated:

“Al-Tahawi said that Bani Umayya abandoned Takbir during prostration but not during raising, and that is not the first Sunnah they abandoned.”

Mu’awiya ‘the Hadi’ reduced Iqamah from daily prayers

Muawiya’s distortion in the method prayers prescribed by Almighty continues. Imam Dhahabi records:

وقال النخعي : أول من نقص الإقامة معاوية

Al-Nakhaei said: ‘The first one who reduced the Iqamah was Mu’awiya.’
Tanqih al-Tahqiq by al-Dahabi, Volume 1 page 113

Dhahabi also records:

Mujahid said: “Adhan and Iqamah, both were double, but when Bani Umayya ruled they made the Iqamah single”

So Muawiya introduced Iqamah in Eid prayers which actually was not prescribed by Allah (swt) and he reduced Iqamah from daily prayers while it should have been there according to Sunni text, we don’t know why Muawiya had the habit of interfering into the decisions put forward by Allah (swt)!

Mu’awiya ‘the Hadi’ issued a Fatwa deeming it permissible for a man to marry two sisters at any one given time

Imam of Ahl’ul Sunnah, Hafiz Jalaluddin Suyuti in ‘Durr al Manthur’ Volume 2 page 477 records the following fatwa of Abu Sulaiman’s Hadi Imam:

“Qasim bin Muhammad records that Mu’awiya was asked whether it was permissible for a man to marry two sisters at any one given time. Mu’awiya replied ‘There is nothing wrong with that’. Upon hearing this reply, Numan bin Basheer asked ‘You have issued this fatwa?’ to which Mu’awiya replied ‘yes’.

Tafseer Dur al Manthur, Volume 2 page 477, Commentary of the verse 4:23

Mu'awiya 'the Hadi' introduced the Bidah of a single oath and witness in Islam.

We read in the Sharah of 'Muawtta Imam Muhammad' written by one of the revered Hanafi & Deobandi scholars Allamah Muhammad Abdul Hai al-Lucnowi (d. 1304 H):

ذكر ذلك ابن ابي ذئب عن ابن شهاب الزهري قال سألته عن اليمين مع الشاهد فقال :

بدعة وأول من قضى بها معاوية

Ibn Abi al-Deab reported that he asked ibn Shehab al-Zuhari about the oath with the a witness, he (al-Zuhari) replied: "This is bid'ah and the first one who practiced it was Mu'awiya."

Taleequl Majeed – Sharah Muawtta Imam Muhammad, page 363

We read in one of the esteemed Hanafi works, Sharah Waqaya:

إذا أنكر الخصم يرد اليمين على المدعي وعندنا هذا بدعة وأول من قضى بها معاوية

"If the opponent denied, the oath will be required from the claimant, and this is bid'ah, the first one who introduced it was Mu'awiya"

Sharah Waqayah, Volume 3 page 205

Imam of Ahle Sunnah Allamah Saaduddin Taftazani records:

وذكر في المبسوط أن القضاء بشاهد ويمين بدعة وأول من قضى بها معاوية

"It is mentioned in al-Mabsut that judgment by single witness and oath is bid'ah, the first one who introduced it was Mu'awiya"

Tauzeeh Sharah Talweeh, page 430

Mu'awiya 'the Hadi' abandoned to apply the mandatory punishment for theft in Islam

Allah (swt) has prescribed certain punishments for different sins, the penalty for theft, sarqa, is the amputation of a hand which is prescribed by the creator of the universe in his blessed book. We read in Quran.

As for the thief, whether male or female, cut off their hands as an exemplary punishment from Allah for their transgression; for Allah is the Mighty, the Wise. (Quran 5:33)

But we see in history that Muawiyah caught a group of thieves, applied the prescribed punishment to all of them except to the one who knew how to make Muawiyah (even more) fool! The thief recited stupid couplets and the Imams of Nasibies suddenly forgot the above verse of Holy Quran. One of the esteemed Sunni scholars, Ali ibn Muhammad ibn Habib al-Basri al-Baghdadi al-Mawardi (d. 450 H) records:

"It is related that Muawiyah had the arms of the band of thieves cut off. When the last one's turn came for the cutting, he recited the following lines:

Commander of the faithful, listen to my appeal,
My right arm not to torture by severing,
If unexposed, my hand will be like a pretty woman,
And a pretty woman is not exposed to anything shameful.
What good will there remain in the world,

If a right hand parts from its left?

Muawiya said, “What am I to do with you after I had your companions amputated?”. Where upon the thief’s mother retorted, “Why, you make this one of the sins you ask God to forgive!”, So, he released him, and that was the first mandatory punishment [Hadd] pardoned in Islam”

The ordinances of government, English translation of Ahkam al Sultaniyah, page 247

Mu’awiya ‘the Hadi’ and his Nasibi adherents abandoned the Sunnah due to their hatred of Ali (as)

Reciting Talbiya during pilgrimage is a Sunnah, but when we analyze authentic Sunni texts, we come to know that Muawiya and his adherents (that obviously included number of Nasibi Sahaba) abandoned this Sunnah due to their hatred of Ali bin Abi Talib (as), since Ali (as) used to perform Talbiya. This proves two points, firstly that Muawiya and his adherents were out and out Nasibi, and secondly they deliberately rejeeted the Sunnah. We read the following tradition in some esteemed Sunni books:

Saeed bin Jubair said: ‘We were with ibn Abbas in Arafa and he said to me: ‘Oh Saeed, why don’t I hear the people performing talbya?’ I replied: ‘They are afraid of Muawiya’. Then ibn Abbas went out from his cottage and said: ‘I respond to your call, Oh Allah I respond to your call, they abandon the Sunnah for their hate towards Ali (ra).

1. Sunan Nasai, Volume 5 page 253 Tradition 3019
2. Sahih Ibn Khuzaima, Volume 4 page 260 Tradition 2830
3. Mustadrak al-Hakim, Volume 1 pages 364-365

Imam of Salafies Nasiruddin Al-Baani in his margin of Sunan Nisai has decalred the tradition as ‘Sahih’, Imam Hakim in Mustadrak has decalred the tradition Sahih according to the two Imams (Bukhari & Muslim), Imam Khuzaima also decalred it ‘Sahih’ while Allamah Al-Azeemi in his margin for the book ‘Sahih Ibn Khuzaima’ further called it ‘Sahih’.

In the version of this episode recorded by Al-Bayhaqi in his authority work al-Sunnan al-Kubra , Volume 5 page 113, Ibn Abbas (ra) actually cursed Muawiyah and his Nasibi adherents:

“Thus ibn Abbas went out from his tent saying: “Labyak Allah huma Labayk” in defiance of Mu’awiyah, may Allah curse them, they abandon the Sunnah due to their hatred of Ali (ra)”.

Sheikh Hasan al-Maliki said in the margin of his book ‘al-Suhba wa al-Sahaba’ page 64:

“No one abandoned it except the people of Syria because of their hatred towards Ali, because he (Ali) used to perform talbya on the day of Arafa as the prophet (pbuh) would do, therefore ibn Abbas said: ‘They abandoned the sunnah because of their hate towards Ali (ra)”

One of the favorite scholars of the Salafies/Wahabies namely Muhammad bin Abdulhadi al-Sindi (d. 1138 H) in his commentary of Sunan Nasai stated:

أي لأجل بغضه أي وهو كان يتقيد بالسنن فهؤلاء تركوها بغضا له

“Because of their hate, since he (Ali) was committed with Sunnah, so they abandoned it because of their hate towards him (Ali)”

Sharah Sunan Nasai

Mu'awiya 'the Hadi' and his fellow Nasibi rulers of Bani Ummayah abandoned to recite 'Bismillah' loudly due to their hate towards Ali (as)

Imam Fakhruddin al-Razi in the commentary of 'Bismillah al Rehman al Rahim' (In the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful) records in his authority work Tafseer Kabeer, Volume 1 pages 180-181:

Imam Shafi'ee narrated from his isnad that Muawiyah came to Madina and led the prayers, during prayers neither did he recite "Bismillah al Rehman al Rahim" nor did he recite Takbeer during bowing and prostration. After he recited Salam, the Muhajir and Ansaar called out: 'O Muawiyah! You have committed theft in prayers, where were 'Bismillah al Rehman al Rahim' and Takbeer during bowing and prostration? Al-Shafi'ee said : 'Mu'awiya was a powerful ruler and very strong (in terms of military support), so had reciting 'Bismillah' loudly not been a settled issue in the eyes of all companions from the Muhajir and the Ansar, they would have not been able to show objection to him for abandoning the 'Bismillah'.

...Baihaqi narrates in 'Sunan al Kabeera' from Abu Hurraira (ra) that the Prophet (s) recited 'in the name of Allah most gracious most merciful' loudly. Ibn Abbas, Ibn Umar, Ibn Zubayr recited loudly. Ali bin Abi Talib used to recite 'Bismillah al Rehman al Rahim' loudly in prayers and this is a proven fact that whoever followed Ali bin Abi Talib in religion, he has been guided and its proof is that Prophet (s) supplicated: 'O Allah, turn the truth in the direction where Ali turns'.

... Ali was careful in reciting the 'Bismillah' loudly, but when the country was governed by Bani Umayya, they were careful in abandoning the recitation of 'Bismillah' loudly for the purpose of repealing the tradition of Ali, so may be Anas was scared of them and that is the reason for his contradictory reports."

Tafseer Kabeer, Volume 1 pages 180-181

Comments

1). When adhering to Ali is guidance and truth then why do the Ahl'ul Sunnah not follow Imam Ali (as) when performing Salat?

2). If adhering to Ali (as) is guidance in the religion then what of turning away from him, and doing the opposite of what he did?

3). Ibn al-Hashimi, the author of www.ahlelbayt.com made it clear 'In this hadeeth the Prophet guided to the way in which a person secures himself. He doesn't affiliate him to any sect, only the way of the salaf as-salih, to the Sunnah of our Prophet and the rightly guided caliphs'. Tafseer al Kabeer cites clear narrations that reciting 'Bismillah' loudly was the Sunnah of the Prophet (s) and two of the rightly guided khaleefas. Then why is this Sunnah being ignored and preference being given to the Bidah of Muawiyah? Does this not prove that you are not followers of the Rasul (s) but are in fact the adherents of Muawiyah the Nasibi?

Mu'awiyah 'the Hadi' wore prohibited items despite the fact that he was aware that Rasulallah (s) deemed them haraam

We read in Sunan Abu Daud Book 32, hadith Number 4119:

Narrated Al-Miqdam ibn Ma'dikarib: "Khalid said: Al-Miqdam ibn Ma'dikarib and a man of Banu Asad from the people of Qinnisrin went to Mu'awiyah ibn AbuSufyan.

Mu'awiyah said to al-Miqdam: Do you know that al-Hasan ibn Ali has died? Al-Miqdam recited the Qur'anic verse "We belong to Allah and to Him we shall return."

A man asked him: Do you think it a calamity? He replied: Why should I not consider it a calamity when it is a fact that the Apostle of Allah (peace_be_upon_him) used to take him on his lap, saying: This belongs to me and Husayn belongs to Ali?

The man of Banu Asad said: (He was) a live coal which Allah has extinguished. Al-Miqdam said: Today I shall continue to make you angry and make you hear what you dislike. He then said: Mu'awiyah, if I speak the truth, declare me true, and if I tell a lie, declare me false.

He said: Do so. He said: I adjure you by Allah, did you hear the Apostle of Allah (peace_be_upon_him) forbidding use to wear gold?

He replied: Yes. He said: I adjure you by Allah, do you know that the Apostle of Allah (peace_be_upon_him) prohibited the wearing of silk?

He replied: Yes. He said: I adjure you by Allah, do you know that the Apostle of Allah (peace_be_upon_him) prohibited the wearing of the skins of beasts of prey and riding on them?

He said: Yes. He said: I swear by Allah, I saw all this in your house, O Mu'awiyah.

Mu'awiyah said: I know that I cannot be saved from you, O Miqdam.

Khalid said: Mu'awiyah then ordered to give him what he did not order to give to his two companions, and gave a stipend of two hundred (dirhams) to his son. Al-Miqdam then divided it among his companions, and the man of Banu Asad did not give anything to anyone from the property he received. When Mu'awiyah was informed about it, he said: Al-Miqdam is a generous man; he has an open hand (for generosity). The man of Banu Asad withholds his things in a good manner".

So here we learn that Mu'awiyah the Hadi:

Was asked whether he was aware that Rasulallah (s) had prohibited the wearing of gold, silk and animal skin.

Mu'awiyah confirmed that he knew this to be the position

The man testified that he had witnessed all three prohibited items being worn in his house

What a wonderful Hadi! One that is fully aware that a matter has been prohibited by Rasulallah (s) but openly violates this order. Can we define a Hadi as an individual that knowingly violates an order of Rasulallah (s)?

An appeal to justice

We have cited just a few examples where Mu'awiyah violated the rules of Shari'a. What sort of Hadi could Mu'awiyah be for others when he himself was so misguided that he turned his back on the Qur'an and Sunnah and

followed practices that contradicted these two sources? Can one who introduces not just one, but countless bidahs into the Deen be deemed a Hadi who has guided others? This is completely illogical, guidance is based on following the Qur'an and Sunnah not innovating and devising your own rulings to suit your personal desires! Would Rasulullah (s) deem an innovator to be a hadi? Clearly not! We had, in the previous section, highlighted the rulings of Ahl'ul Sunnah Ulema on Ahl'ul bidah, let us now cite Rasulullah(s)'s view on the matter...

Rasulullah (s) criticised those that praise Ahl'ul Bidah

Imam of the Salafis, Al-Albaani verifies as authentic this hadith taken from Baihaqi, in his commentary of Mishkaah al Masabih Volume 1 page 66 hadith number 189:

“He who honours an innovator has assisted him in the destruction of Islam”.

Abu Sulaiman and his fellow supporters should take note. They have set out pathetic defence for their master Mu'awiya, honouring him as a Hadi, despite the fact that he was the Chief of innovators having devised and instituted the bidah of vilifying Imam Ali (as) during the Friday sermons, he also introduced interest, made changes in Salat, distribution of war booty, the law of inheritance etc. Despite this Abu Sulaiman and his party continue to shower and extol this innovator calling him a Hadi. In doing so, they are only harming themselves for an innovator is an individual who is attacking Islam, and in the eyes of Rasulullah (s) those that praise him have aided and abetted him in the process.

Even if the advocates of Mu'awiya refuse to accept these facts, then let us look at this alleged hadith from several other angles.

Rasulullah (s) made three Dua's, one that was rejected

We read in Sahih Muslim Book 041, Number 6904:

“Thauban reported that Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) said: Allah drew the ends of the world near one another for my sake. And I have seen its eastern and western ends. And the dominion of my Ummah would reach those ends which have been drawn near me and I have been granted the red and the white treasure and I begged my Lord for my Ummah that it should not be destroyed because of famine, nor be dominated by an enemy who is not amongst them to take their lives and destroy them root and branch, and my Lord said: Muhammad, whenever I make a decision, there is none to change it. Well, I grant you for your Ummah that it would not be destroyed by famine and it would not be dominated by an enemy who would not be amongst it and would take their lives and destroy them root and branch even if all the people from the different parts of the world join hands together (for this purpose), but it would be from amongst them, viz. your Ummah, that some people would kill the others or imprison the others”.

Rasulullah (s) was fully aware in his Prophetic capacity of the fitnah that would befall the Ummah after him, and he foretold in clear traditions that Imam 'Ali (as) would face stiff opposition, that he would fight those who opposed his Leadership, the Qasateen. Mu'awiya was the Leader of the

opposition / Fitnah group, hence even if for arguments sake we were to accept Rasulullah (s) making such a dua, it would have been rejected on account of Mu'awiya's enmity and condemnation by Rasulullah (s) of those that shall fight Imam 'Ali (as).

Rasulullah (s) even prayed for Abu Jahil to be guided

Amongst Ahl'ul Sunnah's traditions in praise of Umar, they commonly cite this one that we have taken from Riyadh ul Nadira Volume 2 page 13:

“Rasulullah made a dua, O Allah! Strengthen Islam by either Umar bin Khattab or Abu Jahil, whoever you prefer more”.

Here Rasulullah made a du'a for Abu Jahil to be guided to the truth but this never transpired, and his example is very much like Mu'awiya's. We even learn in Sahih al Bukhari Volume 8, Book 75, Number 406 that Rasulullah (s) made dua for the pagans:

At-Tufail bin 'Amr came to Allah's Apostle and said, “O Allah's Apostle! The tribe of Daus has disobeyed (Allah and His Apostle) and refused (to embrace Islam), therefore, invoke Allah's wrath for them.” The people thought that the Prophet would invoke Allah's wrath for them, but he said, “O Allah! Guide the tribe Of Daus and let them come to us,”

Rasulullah was a mercy for mankind and it was part of his great compassion that he made du'as of guidance to the truth for all people, including the mushrikeen. Praying for their guidance should not in any way be deemed as a virtue of the mushrikeen. It was an example of Rasulullah's desire that ALL are guided. So even if Rasulullah (s) did for arguments sake pray for Mu'awiya's guidance, it was in the same way as he prayed for all to be guided to the right path whether Muslim or non Muslim.

Not all of Rasulullah's prayers were accepted

Even if for arguments sake we were to accept this dua, according to Ahl'ul Sunnah not all of Rasulullah's supplications were accepted by Allah (swt). Ibn Hajar Asqalani in Fathul Bari Volume 11 page 97 states:

“If the Prophet (s) makes a dua for his Ummah it is accepted by Allah (swt) whereas if he makes it for a particular individual it may or may not be accepted”.

So even if we are to accept this dua for arguments sake, to be Sahih, whether or not it will be accepted is subject to Allah (swt)'s discretion. With regards to Mu'awiya, his 'noble' deeds make it clear that Allah (swt) would never deem him as a Guide, and to prove this, let us see the words of Allah (swt)...

Allah (swt) never guides a wrongdoer

We read in Surah Tauba verse 80:

Whether thou ask for their forgiveness or not (their sin is unforgivable): if thou ask seventy times for their forgiveness Allah will not forgive them: because they have rejected Allah and His apostle; and Allah guideth not those who are perversely rebellious (Zalimoon).

Taken from Abdullah Yusuf Ali's translation of the Qur'an].

Abdullah Yusuf Ali's comments in the footnotes of this verse are indeed interesting:

“An awful warning for those who actively oppose the Cause of Allah. The Holy Prophet was by nature full of mercy and forgiveness. He prayed for his enemies. But in such a case even his prayers are nullified by their attitude of rejecting Allah”.

We suggest our readers contemplate this verse in light of Islamic history. There is no possibility that Mu’awiya was even remotely a Hadi who guided others on account of his guidance. Such was his guidance that he introduced the disgraceful practice of cursing Imam Ali (as) throughout his Kingdom and ordered his Governors to enforce this practice – was this a form of guidance that was leading people to the right path? He led an army against the rightful Imam becoming a baghi in the process. During his reign he killed Imam Hasan (as) and adherents of Imam ‘Ali such as Hujr bin Adi. Are these actions of a Hadi?

The narrator of this ‘Hadi’ hadith is not a reliable authority

The tradition cited by Ansar.org regarding Muawiyah being a Hadi has not been even approved by Imam Tirmidhi himself as he decalred it ‘Hasan Ghareeb’. Allamah Muhammad Abdurehman bin Abdurahim al-Mubarakfuri in his commentary of this tradition cited the comments of Allamah Ibn Abdul Barr:

“The hafiz ibn Abdulbar said: “His companionship is not true and his chain (isnad) is not Sahih.”

<http://hadith.al-islam.com/Display/Display.asp?Doc=2&Rec=5878>

We also read in ‘Tanaqudat al-Albani’ volume 2 page 228 by Allamah Hassan Saqaaf:

“The Marfu Hadith from Abdulrahman bin Abi Umaira (Oh Allah guide him and make let him guide) referring to Mu’awiya, this hadith cannot be Sahih in any way”

Razi records in ‘Elal al-Hadith’ Volume 2 page 362:

“Verily Abdulrahman bin Abi Umaria didn’t hear this hadith from the prophet (s)”

Imam Dhahabi records in ‘Siar alam al-Nubala’ Volume 3 page 126:

“The (chain) is disconnected”

Sadly for the advocates of Mu’awiya the embarrassment does not just end there...

Not a single hadith in praise of Mu’awiya is Sahih

The leading ‘Ulama of Ahl al-Sunnah have declared all hadith praising Mu’awiya as fabricated.

Imam Jalaluddeen Suyuti in his book Al-Leale al-Masnooa, Volume 1 page 424 while Allamah Ibn al-Jawzi in al- Mawdu’at, Volume 2 page 24 have recorded:

قال الحاكم سمعت أبا العباس محمد بن يعقوب بن يوسف يقول سمعت أبي يقول سمعت

إسحق بن إبراهيم الحنظلي يقول لا يصح في فضل معاوية حديث

Al-Hakim said: ‘I heard Aba al-Abbas Muhammad bin Yaqoob bin Yusuf saying: ‘I heard my father saying: ‘I heard Ishaq bin Ibrahim al-Handhali saying: ‘There is no Sahih tradition about Mu’awiyah’s virtues’”.

1. Al-Leale al-Masnooa, Volume 1 page 424
2. al-Mawdu’at Volume 2 page 24

Muhammad bin Ali bin Shawkani in his boko Fawa’id al Mujmu’a fi Bay’an al-Hadith al-Maudu’a, page 147 states that:

“Ibn Hibban commented that all ahadith in praise of Mu’awiyah are fabricated”.

Fawa’id al Mujmu’a, page 147

Muhammad bin Aqeel al-Hadrami in his books Taqwiyat al-Iman, page 137 and al-Nasa’ih al-Kaafiyah, page 163 also confirmed:

“Al-Shawkani (may Allah’s mercy be upon him) said in al-Fawa’id al-Majmu’a: ‘The hufaz agreed that there is not a single Sahih hadith about Muawiyah’s merits’.”

Sheikh Abu Rayah records in ‘Adhwa ala al Sunnah’ page 128:

في فضائل معاوية من أحاديث لا أصل لها

“The traditions about Muawiyah’s merits are not true”

Al Muhaddith Shaykh Abdul Haqq Dehlavi in ‘Sharh Mishkat Shareef’ Volume 4 page 716 (published in 1873) after citing the hadith in praise of Mu’awiyah including the ‘guidance hadith’ Abu Sulaiman cited from Tirmidhi, comments:

“It is recorded in Jami’ al-Usul that many Muhaddith scholars have concluded that there exists not even a single hadith in praise of Mu’awiyah that is Sahih”.

Sharh Mishkat Shareef Vol. 4 page 716

Abu’l Hasan al-Kanani (907-963 H) in Tunziyaa as Shari’a al Murfoo’a, Volume 2, Chapter 8 page 7 comments:

“Imam Hakim cites from a chain used by Ibn al-Jauzi who cites Ishaq bin Rehwiya: ‘There exists nothing in praise of Mu’awiyah that is Sahih’.”

Tunziyaa as Shari’a al-Murfoo’an Vol. 2 Chapter 8 page 7

Similarly, Imam Dhahabi records in his esteemed work ‘Siyar alam al Nubla’ Volume 3 page 132:

الأصم حدثنا أبي سمعت ابن راهويه يقول لا يصح عن النبي ﷺ في فضل معاوية شيء

Ishaq Ibn Rehwiya said: ‘There is not any Sahih hadith from the prophet (pbuh) about the merits of Muawiyah’.

Shaykh Ismail bin Muhammad al-Ajluni (d. 1162 H) in Kashful Khafa, Volume 2 page 420 states:

“There exist no hadith in praise of Mu’awiyah that is Sahih.”

Kashful Khafa Vol. 2 page 420

Allamah Badruddin al-Aini in ‘Ummadat ul Qari fi Sharh Sahih Bukhari’ Volume 7 page 994 comments:

فإن قلت قدر ورد في فضيلته احاديث كثيرة. قلت نعم ولكن ليس فيها حديث يصح من طريق الإسناد نص عليه إسحاق بن راهويه والنسائي وغيرهما ، فلذلك قال باب ذكر

معاوية ولم يقل فضيلة ولا منقبة

If you say that many traditions have been narrated regarding Muawiya's virtues, I will say yes but none of them has been reported with an authentic chain of narration and that is what has been declared by Ishaq ibn Rehwiya and Nisai and others. That's why he (Bukhari) named the chapter as 'Dhikr Muawiyah' [Mentioning Muawiyah] and not 'merits' or 'praises of Muawiyah'.

Ibn Hajr al-Asqalani in his commentary of Bukhari namely Fathul Bari states in Volume 7 page 104:

"Bukhari on the topic (biography) of Mu'awiya wrote a Chapter namely 'Dhikr Muawiyah' [Mentioning Muawiyah] and he didn't write 'praise' or 'merits (of Muawiyah)' because the merits cannot be derived from this hadith... Ibn Abi Asim wrote a book about his (Mu'awiyah's) merits and so did Umar Ghulam Thalab and Abu Bakr al-Naqash but Ibn Jawzi recorded in (his book) "Mawdu'at" some of the traditions which the previous scholars had recorded in their books and then he quoted from Ishaq ibn Rehwiya that he said: 'Nothing is authentic in praise of Mu'awiya'. And this is the reason which made Bukhari avoid using the word 'virtue' (in chapter name)."

Fathul Bari Vol. 7 page 104

Similarly, Imam Qatalani in his commentary of Bukhari namely Irshad al-Sari states in Volume 6 page 141:

"He didn't name the chapter as 'virtues' and 'merits of Mu'awiyah' as a condemnation".

Irshad al-Sari, Volume 6 page 141

We read in Tareekh ibn Khalikaan, Volume 1 page 35:

"The compiler of Sunan Nasa'i Ahmad bin Ali was a hafiz of Hadith and in his time an Imam of Ahl'ul hadith. Towards the end of his life he went to Damascus and he was asked about the virtues of Mu'awiya, Imam Nasa'i replied "Mu'awiya should protect himself, what praise should I shower on him, I know only virtue namely that Rasulallah (s) cursed him "May Allah never satiate his stomach"

Ibn Tamiyah in Minhaj al-Sunnah, Volume 4 page 400:

"One party of people fabricated traditions about the merits of Muawiyah and they narrated hadith from the prophet (pbuh) in that matter (Muawiyah's merits) all of which are lies."

Minhaj al Sunnah, Volume 4 page 400

Let us now quote one of the great students of Ibn Hajjar Makki al-Haythami and Mullah Muttaqi Hindi namely Allamah Muhammad Tahir al-Sadiqi al-Fatni (d. 986) from his work 'Tadkirat al-Mouduat' page 100:

لا يصح مرفوعا في فضل معاوية شيء

"There isn't any Sahih Marfu (hadith) about Muawiyah's merits"

It will be relevant to cite the following account from Al-Bidaya wa al-Niyhaya, Volume 11 page 409 wherein we read that Imam of Ahle Sunnah Hakim did not include any Hadith in praise of Muawiyah:

وقال أبو عبد الرحمن السلمي : دخلت على الحاكم وهو محتف من الكرامية لا يستطيع

يخرج منهم ، فقلت له : لو خرجت حديثا في فضائل معاوية لأسترحت مما أنت فيه ، فقال:

لا يجيء من قبلي لا يجيء من قبلي

Abu Abdulrahman al-Salami said: ‘I visited al-Hakim when he was hiding from the Karamya and he could not get out because of them, thus I said to him: ‘If you narrate a tradition regarding Mu’awiyah’s virtues, you will get rid of this situation’. He replied: ‘I wont do it, I wont do it’

Rasulullah’s advice for Mu’awiyah is also a fabrication

One tradition commonly cited by the advocates of Mu’awiyah is this one, in which Mu’awiyah states:

“I longed to become Khalifa ever since I was told by the Prophet: O Mu’awiyah rule justly if you come to power”.

Like all traditions praising Mu’awiyah this is also a fabrication and Ibn Kathir in al Bidaya Volume 8 page 122 notes:

“...on the tradition in which Rasulallah (s) said O Mu’awiyah rule justly if you come to power” – Imam Bayhaqi stated that the narrator of this hadith Ismail bin Buram is weak”

Rasulallah (s) in fact did indeed give advice to his followers about how to react if Mu’awiyah attained power.

Is Mu’awiyah paradise bound on account of his participation in the battle of Hunain?

As part of their efforts to grant their Imam a “get out jail card” we have now noticed Nawasib advancing an absurd claim that his participation in the battle of Hunain gave him the green light to enter Paradise, and have sought to corroborate their claim by relying upon the following Qur’anic verse (Surah 9, Ayah 26):

Then Allah sent His peace of reassurance down upon His messenger and upon the BELIEVERS, and sent down hosts ye could not see, and punished those who disbelieved. Such is the reward of disbelievers.

Reply One – This verse merely states Allah (swt) emboldened the believers on that day

This verse informs us of the divine support to the believers during the battle of Hunain there is no guarantee of Paradise therein.

Reply Two – The verse only benefits believers in the true sense of the word not those that stood in the ranks of the Muslims but were pagans and hypocrites

Merely attending the battle alongside Muslims in no way means such persons benefited from the blessings of Allah (swt). We read in Fatah al-Bari, Volume 6 page 125:

شهود صفوان بن أمية حيناً مع النبي ﷺ وهو مشرك

“Sawfan bin Umayyah attended the battle of Hunayn with the Prophet (s) whilst he remained a pagan (Mushrik)”

In the same way a Mushrik did not acquire the blessings of Allah (swt) from this verse, the same applies from those posing as Muslims when they were in reality hypocrites, Mu’awiyah was of that category for Ammar bin Yasir (ra), decades later during the battle of opined that Mu’awiyah was never was Muslim. We read in Tarikh ibn Abi Khaythama, Volume 2 page 991:

حَدَّثَنَا أَبِي ، قال : حَدَّثَنَا جَرِيرٌ ، عَنِ الْأَعْمَشِ ، عَنْ مُنْدِرِ الثَّوْرِيِّ ، عَنْ سَعْدِ بْنِ حُذَيْفَةَ ، قال : قال عَمَّارٌ : والله ما أسلموا ولكنهم استسلموا وأسروا الكُفْرَ حَتَّى وجدوا عليه أَعْوَانًا فَأَظْهَرُوهُ

Ammar said: ‘By Allah they didn’t convert to Islam but they surrendered and veiled disbelief until they found supports so they unveiled it’.

Ibn Aqeel al-Hadrami in his book Tqawiyat al-Iman, page 169 has also recorded this tradition while Hassan Maliki in his book ‘Bahth fi Islam Mu’awya’ page 67 has stated ‘The chain is Sahih’ . A similar narration can also be found in Majma al-Zawaid by Haythami, Volume 1 page 308:

وعن سعد بن حذيفة قال : قال عمار بن ياسر يوم صفين وذكر أمرهم وأمر الصلح فقال : والله ما أسلموا ولكن استسلموا وأسروا الكفر فلما رأوا عليه أعوانا أظهروه

Saad bin Hudayfa said: ‘On the day of Sifeen Ammar bin Yasir mentioned them and mentioned the peace treaty and said: ‘By Allah they didn’t convert to Islam but they surrendered and veiled disbelief until they found supports so they unveiled it’

Chapter Nine: Abu Sulaiman's plea of clemency for Mu'awiya

Ansar.org states:

About Mu'awiya's transgression, it is either Mu'awiyah thought that the truth lies with him or that he was deliberate in his transgression. In both cases, Mu'awiyah is not infallible from mistakes. Ahl Al-Sunnah do not refrain him from falling in sins, but they say that sins have reasons, and these sins could be removed by asking for forgiveness and repenting, or other than that.

Now rather than float around the periphery of the subject matter, does Abu Sulaiman have the courage to tell us "Was Mu'awiya's act of transgression, uprising and rebelling against the Khalifa of the time a sin? Does the Shari'a apply to all Muslims or are the Sahaba exempt from sins? Clearly this cannot be the case and we have examples in the lifetime of Rasulullah (s) when he would implement Shari'a and punish companions that had committed sins.

Is he then who is a believer like he who is a transgressor (fasiq)? They are not equal.

(Qur'an: Surah al-Sajdah, verse 18)

Abu Sulaiman then cites this supplication of Mu'awiya showing his alleged 'piety':

By Allah, I have done good deeds for my people, established Islamic Law, went to Jihad for the sake of Allah, and a lot of great things I did that only Allah can count, but we do not count them more than our mistakes. And I am a believer in a religion where deeds are accepted; either rewarded by good, or rewarded by a guilt that Allah may forgive us. By Allah, if I were to choose between two matters, between Allah and anything else, I would chose Allah" [Al-Bidayah wa Al-Nihayah, vol.8, p.136-137]

Abu Sulaiman is seeking to plead clemency for his client on account that he would ask forgiveness for his sins. If sins can be removed by repentance then why do the Ahl'ul Sunnah condemn those that rebelled against Abu Bakr and incited insurgency against `Uthman? They might have likewise repented and asked for Allah (swt)'s forgiveness, so why do the `ulama insist on continuing to condemn such individuals? Rather than demand Qisas why did Mu'awiya not demand that the killers of `Uthman repent for their sins?

Undoubtedly, Allah (swt) can pardon all sins but if we accept Abu Sulaiman's argument then what is the point in having a judiciary in Islam? Why have a penal code when all that transgressors need to do is ask for the forgiveness of Allah (swt)? Clearly this is not logical and the Shari'a prescribes clear punishment for offences, particularly crimes against fellow human beings.

Interesting is the fact that Mu'awiya never sought forgiveness for his practice of cursing `Ali (as), rather he introduced it throughout his Kingdom a tradition that did not end until it was repealed by `Umar bin Abdul Aziz. On the issue of cursing, Rasulullah (s) said, "Abusing a Muslim is Fusuq (evil doing) and killing him is Kufr (disbelief)." [Sahih al-Bukhari Volume 9, Book 88, Number 197]. Abusing a momin is fisq; perhaps Abu Sulaiman

should think about the momin that he was cursing. Now let us see the verdict on one who hates and curses Ali (as) and decide on where the truth lies.

Chapter Ten: Was Mu'awiya a Momin or Munafiq?

We have already presented to our objective readers the wonderful deeds of Mu'awiya, what should we say of his Iman?

The sign of a Munafiq is hatred of 'Ali (as)

As a starting pointing let us consider the words of 'Ali (as):

“By him who split up the seed and created something living, the Apostle (may peace and blessing be upon him) gave me a promise that no one but a believer would love me, and none but a hypocrite would nurse grudge against me’.

Sahih Muslim, English version, Chapter XXXIV, p46, Tradition #141

It is little wonder that we have the testimony of Abu Saeed al Khudri:

“We recognized the hypocrites by their hatred of Ali.”

1. Fada'il al-Sahaba, by Ahmad Ibn Hanbal, v2, p639, Tradition 1086

2. al-Isti'ab, by Ibn Abd al-Barr, v3, p47

3. al-Riyad al-Nadirah, by al-Muhibb al-Tabari, v3, p242

Salafi scholar Dr. Wasiullah bin Muhammad Abbas in his margin of the book 'Fadail al-Sahaba' published by the the second largest Salafi/Wahabi university namely Umm Al-Qura University in Makkah, decalred the tradition as 'Sahih':

Fada'il al-Sahaba, Volume 2 page 549 (Published in Makkah Mukkarmah, Saudi Arabia)

One of the pioneer Sunni scholars Imam Ali bin Muhammad al-Hemayri (d. 323 H) who has been referred to as “Imam, Faqih and Allamah” by Imam Dahabi (Siar alam al-nubala, v15 p13) has also recorded this tradition with different chain of narration in his book 'Juzu al-Hemayri' page 34 Hadith 38:

ثنا هارون بن إسحاق ثنا سفیان بن عيينة عن الزهري عن يزيد بن خصيفة عن بسر بن سعيد عن أبي سعيد الخدري قال ما كنا نعرف المنافقين على عهد رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم إلا ببغض علي

Harun bin Ishaq – Sufyan bin Aayna – al-Zuhari – Yazid bin Khusayfa – Busr bin Saeed – Abi Saeed al-Khudri said: ‘During the time of Messenger of Allah (pbuh), we used to recognize the hypocrites through their hate towards Ali’.

Juzu al-Hemayri, page 34 Hadith 38

All the narrators in the chain are authentic. Harun bin Ishaq: Ibn Hajar said: ‘Seduq’ (Taqrib al-Tahdib, v2 p257), Dahabi said: ‘Thiqah’ (Al-Kaashef, v2 p329). Sufyan bin Aayna: Ibn Hajar said: ‘Thiqah’ (Taqrib al-Tahdib, v1 p371), Dahabi said: ‘Thiqah Thabt’ (Al-Kaashef, v1 p449). Al-Zuhari: Ibn Hajar said: ‘There is an agreement about his magnificence & mastery’ (Taqrib al-Tahdib, v2 p133), Al-Dahabi said: ‘The Imam, the Hafiz of his time’ (Siar alam alnubala, v5 p326). Yazid bin Khusayfa: Ibn Hajar said: ‘Thiqah’ (Taqrib al-Tahdib, v2 p327), Dahabi said: ‘Thiqah’ (Al-Kaashef, v2 p386). Busr bin Saeed: Ibn Hajar said: ‘Thiqah’ (Taqrib al-

Tahdib, v1 p125) while Dahabi have recorded various accolades given to him by Sunni scholars (Tarikh al-Islam, v6 p302).

One wonders how Abu Sulaiman and his Nasibi brethren can prove that Mu'awiya loved 'Ali (as). Let us look at some other traditions before concluding on Mu'awiya. The Messenger of Allah said:

“Whoever hurts Ali, has hurt me”

1. Musnad Ahmad Ibn Hanbal, v3, p483

2. al-Sawa'iq al-Muhriqah, by Ibn Hajar al-Haythami, Ch. 11, section 1, p263

The Messenger of Allah said:

“Whoever curses Ali, cursed me”

1. al-Mustadrak, by al-Hakim, v3, p121, who mentioned this tradition is Authentic

2. Musnad Ahmad Ibn Hanbal, v6, p323

3. Mishkat al-Masabih, English version, Tradition 6092

4. Tarikh al-Khulafa, by Jalaluddin al-Suyuti, p173

Rasulullah (s) said:

“Whoever leaves Ali, leaves me, whoever leaves me, leaves Allah”

[Kanz ul Ummal, hadith numbers 32974 - 32976, narrated by Abdullah ibne' Umar {through two chains} and Abu Dharr Ghaffari (ra).

al Mustadrak al Hakim, Vol. 3, Page 146

As we have already cited earlier Rasulallah (s) also said:

"Whoever obeys 'Ali, obeys me, whoever obeys me, obeys Allah, whoever disobeys 'Ali disobeys me, whoever disobeys me, disobeys Allah" [Kanz ul Ummal, hadith numbers 32973]

So these hadith tell us:

The sign of a Munafiq is hatred of Ali (as)

Whoever leaves, disobeys and curses 'Ali – in fact leaves, disobeys and curses Allah (swt)

Having proven that Mu'awiya cursed Imam Ali (as), perhaps it is time that Abu Sulaiman breaks free from his Nasibi ideology and answers this:

Did Mu'awiya leave, disobey and curse 'Ali?

Is an individual who leaves, disobeys and curses Allah (swt) a Muslim?

This being the case could Abu Sulaiman kindly explain why it is that he has throughout the article insisted on giving Mu'awiya the title (ra)? Is Allah (swt) pleased with someone that disobeys and curses him?

Committing this sin of cursing Imam 'Ali (as) as an individual is bad enough, one wonders how Allah (swt) will deal with the fact that Mu'awiya introduced this practice through his empire thus leading thousands of Muslims (three generations) to commit this ijtimali (combined sin). Will Allah (swt) appreciate this innovation?

It is not permissible to refer to a Munafiq as Sayyidina

In 'al Adhab al Mufrad' Imam Muhammad bin Ismaeel Bukhari records on page 300 Chapter 325:

“Rasulullah (s) said ‘Don't say Sayyidina to a munafiq, because that would make that munafiq your Chief (superior), and in the process you will be upsetting your Creator”.

In al-Nasa'ih al-Kaafiyah page 111 this tradition of Rasulullah (s) is quoted:

Burayda narrates that the Prophet (s) said, "When you refer to a munafiq as ya sayyidina you incur the wrath of your Creator"

One hopes that our readers are able to appreciate the consequences of using this title when describing Mu'awiya. We would urge our Sunni brethren to refrain from such actions.

'Ali (as)'s testimony – Mu'awiya is my enemy

Despite the efforts of the Nasibis to limit the differences between Mu'awiya and 'Ali as nothing more than differences in thinking, 'Ali (as)'s views on Mu'awiya's iman gives us an insight into his thoughts. If enmity of 'Ali is a sign of a munafiq then consider these words of 'Ali (as), taken from Suyuti's "Tareekh ul Khulafa" rendered into English by Abdassamad Clarke as "The khalifas who took the right way". He records this sermon of Imam 'Ali (as) on page 184:

"Praise belongs to Allah Who made our enemy ask about something that had occurred to him in the matter of his deen. Mu'awiya wrote to me asking about the ambiguous hermaphrodite..."

History of the Khalifas who took the right way (Part English translation of Suyuti's Tarikh'ul Khulafa" page 184)

An enemy of Ali (as) is an enemy of Allah (swt)

We read in Riyadh al Nadira, Volume 3 page 111 that Rasulullah (s) declared:

"O Allah, 'Ali is my beloved friend, and my beloved friend is a beloved friend of Allah. ['Ali] Your enemy is my enemy, and my enemy is Allah's enemy. O 'Ali destroyed are those that incur your wrath".

Al Riyadh al Nadira, Page 111

One who fails to accept 'Ali as his Maula is not a Momin

In Sawaiq al Muhriqa page 177, Imam of Ahl ul Sunnah Ibn Hajr al-Makki al-Haythami records this event that took place during Umar's khilafath:

"Once two land owners approached Umar with a dispute. Umar called 'Ali and asked that he resolve the matter. Imam 'Ali resolved the dispute, and one of the individuals said, 'This man ['Ali] is going to decide between us?' Upon hearing this Umar grabbed the individual by the collar and said 'Don't you know who this individual is? He is the Maula of me, you and all Momin's, and whoever does NOT take him to be his Maula is not a momin (believer)"

This incident has also been recorded in exactly the same way in Riyadh al Nadira, Volume 3, Page 115.

Al Riyadh al Nadira, Vol. 3, Page 115

The key difference between Sunni and Shi'a on the topic of Imamate is in relation to the meaning of Maula used by Rasulullah (s) about Imam 'Ali (as). We do not intend to delve in to the matter here, suffice it to say Ahl'ul Sunnah deem Maula to mean friend Shia define it as Master. The question that we pose for Abu Sulaiman and his fellow advocates is, did Mu'awiya

EVER deem Imam ‘Ali (as) as his Maula? If it means Master did he ever recognise Imam ‘Ali (as) as his Master, rather he rejected his Leadership and openly rebelled against him, refusing to give bayya to him and as has already been mentioned, al Muhaddith Shah Abdul Aziz had stated that in the eyes of Ahl’ul Sunnah from the khilafath of Imam ‘Ali to peace with Imam Hasan, Mu’awiya was a baghi – i.e. he rebelled against the rightful Imam (did not accept Ali (as) as his Maula). If we are to accept the definition as one of friend, then perhaps Abu Sulaiman could inform his flock as to what type of friendship he showed to Imam ‘Ali (as). Was opposing Imam Ali (as), inciting sedition against him and then going to war against him proof that he deemed ‘Ali (as) his friend? Did he further endorse this friendship after Imam ‘Ali (as)’s death by instituting his cursing throughout his empire? Do these actions prove that Mu’awiya deemed Ali (as) as his Maula as in friend? Clearly not! Rather than defend Mu’awiya, we would urge Abu Sulaiman to at least embrace the fatwa of their authority figure Umar, who stated, “One who does NOT deem ‘Ali his Maula, is not a believer.

Chapter Eleven: The ‘true’ merits of Mu’awiya bin Hind

The meaning of Mu’awiya

The leading Ulema of Ahl’ul Sunnah are in agreement that Mu’awiya means “barking bitch”.

For those interested they can consult the following texts:

Tareekh ul Khulafa by al Hafidh Jalaluddin Suyuti (Urdu translation by Maulana Hakeem Nasree) page 253.

Sharh ul Aqaid page 510

Rabi’ ul Abrar by Allamah Zamakhshari page 700

Tahzeeb ul Kamaal fi Asma’ al-Rijal by Jamaluddin Mizzi page 371

Love and hatred of Ali is the difference between one being legitimate and illegitimate

Mohibuddeen al-Tabari in Riyadh ul Nadhira, Volume 3 page 117 Chapter 116 narrates this tradition from ‘Abu Bakr:

Rasulullah (s) said, “Love of Ali, Fatima, Hasan and Hussain is a sign of one being legitimate, hatred of them is the sign of one being illegitimate”.

Similarly Imam of Ahl’ul Sunnah Ibn Atheer in his ‘Nihayah’ Volume 5 page 155 records that:

“Imam Ja’far al-Sadiq said that certain types of individuals will never have love towards us, those of illegitimate stock and those that possess an addiction to the anus (homosexual)”

In the case of Mu’awiya this tradition is certainly mist apt....

Ayesha’s testimony about methods of Nikah during the time of Jahiliyya

We read in Sahih Bukhari, Volume 2 Chapter 37, pages 44-45:

“Narrated Urwa bin Zubair: Aisha the wife of the Prophet told him that there were four types of marriage during the Pre-Islamic period of ignorance. One type was similar to that of the present day, i.e. a man used to ask somebody else for the hand of a girl under his guardianship or for his daughter’s hand, and give her dowry and then marry her. The second type was that a man would say to his wife after she had become clean from her period, “Send for so-and-so and have sexual relations with him.” Her husband would then keep away from her and would never sleep with her till she gets pregnant from the other man with whom she was sleeping. When her pregnancy became evident, her husband would sleep with her if he wished. Her husband did so (i.e. let her wife sleep with some other man) so that he might have a child of noble breed. Such marriage was called Al-Istibda. Another type of marriage was that a group of less than ten men would assemble and enter upon a woman, and all of them would have sexual relation with her. If she became pregnant and delivered a child and some days had passed after her delivery, she would send for all of them and none of them would refuse to come, and when they all gathered before her, she would say to them, “You (all) know what you have done, and now I have given birth to a child. So, it is your child, O so-and-so!” naming

whoever she liked, and her child would follow him and he could not refuse to take him. The fourth type of marriage was that many people would enter upon a lady and she would never refuse anyone who came to her. Those were the prostitutes who used to fix red flags at their doors as signs, and he who wished, could have sexual intercourse with them. If anyone of them got pregnant and delivered a child, then all those men would be gathered for her and they would call the Qaifs (persons skilled in recognizing the likeness of a child to his father) to them and would let her child follow the man (whom they recognized as his father) and she would let him adhere to him and will be called his son.

Mu'awiya bin Hind was the product of a combined Nikah

Ibn Abi al Hadeed in Sharh Nahjul Balagha notes the following in Volume 10 page 130:

“Mu'awiya's parentage was attributed to four persons namely Abi Amar bin MUSAAFIR, Abi AMMARA bin Waleed, Abbas bin Abdul Muttalib and Sabah the Ethiopian. Abu Sufyan was short and ugly whilst Sabah was young and handsome thus Hind offered him sex and from amongst the Arabs, it has also been stated that Abu Sufyan's other son Utbah was also a product of this union”.

Similarly in Rabi'ul Abrar by Allamah Zamakhshari, Volume 3 page 551:

“There were four people who were thought to be Mu'awiya's father, Abi bin Umar bin MUSAAFIR, Abi Umar bin Waleed, Abbas bin Abdul Muttalib and Sabah”

Rabi'ul Abrar by Allamah Zamakhshari Volume 3 page 551

In Tadkhirat al Khawwas, page 114 Chapter 7 we read:

“Sham bin Muhammad Kalbi in his book Kitab Mushab notes that Imam Hasan said to Mu'awiya 'Are you aware of the bed from which you was conceived?' This means he was born from four fathers”.

We read Sharh Ibn al Hadeed Volume 4 page 94 under the Chapter “Mun Kitab Ziyad Ubayya” that:

“Mu'awiya wrote a letter to Ziyad, the contents of which included the words 'O son of Sumayya' (amongst the Arabs there was a tradition that if one's ancestry was questionable, then that individual would be called by their mother's name. In the same way that Imam Hasan referred to Marwan as 'Ibn Zurqa'- Mu'awiya sought to mock Ziyad by calling him the son of Sumayya...Ziyad replied to Mu'awiya with these words 'Mu'awiya you called me by the name of my mother Sumayya, so as to mock me, well if I am the son of Sumayya then you are 'Ibne Jamaat' as you was a product of Nikah ijtimah”.

We read in al-Nasa'ih al-Kaafiyah page 85 we read:

Musafir was a handsome, generous man – he fell in love with the daughter of Utbah, and she fell in love with him. She became pregnant. Maarif Ibne Khurbooz states that when her signs of pregnancy became visible Hinda told Musafir to flee and he made his way out of the city. Naufal states that Musafir was one of those individuals that was killed on account of his love of Hinda.

Ayesha's testimony that Hinda committed Zina

We read in Tadhira tul Khawass, page 62 Chapter “Dhikr Khwaarij” we read that

“When Mu’awiya’s sister Umme Habeeba received news about Muhammad bin Abu Bakr’s murder, she sent Ayesha a cooked goat suggesting that the reason for his killing was his murder of Uthman. When this happened Ayesha said “May Allah (swt) kill this daughter of fornicating woman. By Allah! I shall never eat this meat again”.

The ‘virtues’ possessed by one born illegitimately

Imam of Ahl’ul Sunnah Qutubadeen Shirazi in his book “Nizhaat Al-Quloob Munkool az Istakhsa al Fahm” page 981 states:

“A child born out of fornication is better due to the fact that a man does so with complete effort and enjoyment, whilst a child conceived legitimately only pleases his wife. A child born from fornication is more clever, that is why Amr bin Aas and Mu’awiya bin Abu Sufyan were great politicians and are counted as amongst the people of deception, the greatest politician from this group was Ziyad bin Ubayya”.

One born illegitimately can not be a Khalifa

Imam of Ahl’ul Sunnah al Muhaddith Shah Waliyullah Dehlavi in his Hujjutul Balaghtha Volume 2 page 149 “Dhikr Khilafat” states:

“To be a Khalifa one must satisfy the following six requirements, he must be

1. wise
2. mature
3. Free
4. a Man
5. Brave
6. Possess good ancestry”

On this issue of ancestry Shah states:

“The Khalifa should be such an individual that people recognise him on account of his good family, and not the opposite where the people would show him disrespect”.

The combined nikah, its merits and Hinda’s fornication has now been presented faithfully from the texts of Ahl’ul Sunnah. Mu’awiya may indeed have been a master of deception and a great politician, but as Shah Waliyullah states, one born illegitimately can not attain the position of Khalifa, you need to possess a good ancestry – something that Mu’awiya did not possess, his mother entered the pre jahiliyya system of Nikah sleeping with four different men.

Mu’awiya the politician and khalifa dedicated 5 years of his life fighting the Imam of Guidance ‘Ali ibne Abi Talib (as), he poisoned Imam Hasan (as), he introduced the ugly bidah of cursing Imam ‘Ali (as) during the Friday Sermon. He murdered the supporters of ‘Ali (as), introduced practices that contradicted the Qur’an and Sunnah, made his alcoholic son Yazeed Khalifa over the nation. Hinda’s suckling and the combined Nikah may well have indeed created a great politician but, one of the signs of

being illegitimate is hatred of Imam ‘Ali (as) – and Mu’awiya through his actions confirmed the authenticity of this hadith.

One who fights the rightful Imam is a Fasiq

In al-Nasa’ih al-Kaafiyah page 130, Muhammad din Aqeeal Shaafi whilst discussing the justice of the companions states:

“...prior to the murder of Uthman all the Sahaba were Adil (Just). After his murder, fitnah arose and a viewpoint developed that those who fought against ‘Ali were fasiq because they rebelled against the rightful Imam”.

One who turns his back on the right path is a Zaalim and Fasiq

In Sharh al Maqasid Volume 2 page 306 Allamah Taftazani states that:

“The battles between the Sahaba are proof that some companions left the right path and became Zaalim and Fasiq because they became affected by jealousy, hatred, hypocrisy, a desire for power and indulgence because not all the companions were just, not was every individual who saw Rasulallah (s), good”.

Sharh al Maqasid Volume 2 page 306

Clearly the right path was to attach themselves to ‘Ali (as). By turning their backs on him and fighting him, proves that Mu’awiya and his party had gone astray. He fought ‘Ali and caused the death of prominent companions. Thereafter as a Khalifa he adopted a policy of oppression against the lovers of ‘Ali and cursed him during the Friday Sermons. Do we need any further proof to demonstrate that Mu’awiya had gone astray and hated Imam ‘Ali (as)? Mu’awiya continued to act in the way of descendants. His brother, maternal grandfather and uncle were killed at the hands of Maula ‘Ali (as) at Badr. Mu’awiya was hence motivated by hatred and dedicated his life to fighting Imam ‘Ali (as).

Mu’awiya’s Conquests

Some advocates of Mu’awiya commonly highlight the fact that the Muslim Empire was expanded under his rule with Sahaba under his helm, as was not the case under Imam Ali (as)’s khilafat. It should be pointed out that empire expansion means little in the eyes of Allah (swt). One will be questioned on the day of judgement on his ‘personal deeds’ and Mu’awiya despite his advocate’s poor defences, will indeed have a great deal to answer for. In any case, his conquests mean nothing, as Imam of Ahl’ul Sunnah ‘Abu Bakr al Jassas states in Ahkaam ul Qur’an Volume 3 page 119:

“Following the four khalifas the Sahaba participated in Jihad under the helm of Fasiq’s and Faajirs, ‘Abu Ayub Ansari participated in Jihad under the Leadership of Yazeed”.

Mu’awiya’s declaration that Ziyad was the son of ‘Abu Sufyan is proof that he was a fasiq

Imam Jalaluddeen Suyuti acknowledges this following in his book ‘Al-Debaj ala Muslim’ volume 1 page 84:

ادعي زياد بضم الدال مبني للمفعول أي ادعاه معاوية وألحقه بأبيه أبي سفيان بعد أن كان يعرف بزياد بن أبيه لأن أمه ولدتها على فراش عبيد وهذه أول قضية غير فيها الحكم الشرعي في الاسلام

“When Ziyad was attributed, as Mu’awiya attributed him to his father Abu Sufyan while he (Ziyad) was known as Ziyad bin Abih because his mother had given birth to him on Ubaid’s bed, and this was the first Sharia law that was changed in Islam.”

Al-Debaj ala Muslim, Volume 1 page 84

Imam Suyuti also records in Tareekh ul Khulafa, page 185:

“Mu’awiya’s attributed Ziyad bin Abih and it was the first act that contradicted an order of Rasulullah as al-Thalabi and others narrated it”.

We read in Tarikh Kamil Volume 3 page 68:

“They rejected the law of Rasulullah because Rasulullah (s) said that the legitimate child is one born from wedlock”

Allamah Ibn Abdul Barr records in his esteem work ‘al-Estidkar’ volume 7 page 169:

Saeed bin al-Musayab said: ‘The first law of messenger of Allah that was rejected was in the case of Ziyad’

Let us also read the views of Imam of Ahle Sunnah Ahmed bin Hanbal:

Ahmad (bin Hanbal) said: ‘The first law of the Holy Prophet (s) that was rejected is the case of Ziyad’

Masael Ahmad bin Hanbal, page 89

For further Sunni references on this clear bidah please see the following links:

al-Kawqib al-Durri by Allamah Mahmood Ayubi page 327

Musalman kai aruj aur Zawaal, by Professor Ahmad Akbar Abadai, page 54

al Bidaya wa al Nihaya Volume 8 page 28

Tarikh ibn Asakir, page 412

Mizan al Itidal page 86, Dhikr Ziyad

Tarikh Abu’l Fida, page 185, Dhikr Mu’awiya

Tarikh ibn Khaldun, Volume 3 page 8 Dhikr Mu’awiya

This action of Mu’awiya contravened the Qur’an, we read in Surah Ahzab verses 4-5:

YUSUFALI: Allah has not made for any man two hearts in his (one) body: nor has He made your wives whom ye divorce by Zihar your mothers: nor has He made your adopted sons your sons. Such is (only) your (manner of) speech by your mouths. But Allah tells (you) the Truth, and He shows the (right) Way.

Call them by (the names of) their fathers: that is juster in the sight of Allah. But if ye know not their father’s (names, call them) your Brothers in faith, or your maulas. But there is no blame on you if ye make a mistake therein: (what counts is) the intention of your hearts: and Allah is Oft-Returning, Most Merciful.

A Fasiq is one who acts in violation to the Word of Allah (swt) and his Messenger. Mu’awiya through this act proves that he was a fasiq. For his

die hard Nasibi advocates we would like to know how they explain this declaration of Mu'awiya? No doubt the ijtiḥad defence may be shouted out but as we have consistently proven throughout this article, you cannot exercise ijtiḥad where you have nass (text), which was present here via the words of Rasulullah (s). Despite this, Mu'awiya sought fit to make a declaration that contravened the words of Rasulullah (s).

It is a religious duty to expose the deeds of a fasiq

No doubt the advocates of Mu'awiya, like Abu Sulaiman, will seek to protect their Imam from harm, but to highlight the faults of a fasiq of the likes of Mu'awiya, is a religious obligation. Hasan Basri stated that:

“The testimonies of three people should be rejected:
The individual who openly indulges in bad acts.

A Zaalim Ruler

One who practices bidath”

(References: Sharḥ Muslim, by Nawawi Volume 2 page 322; Tafsir Ibn Katheer Volume 4 page 214; Ahkam al Qur'an by 'Abu Bakr Jassas; Tafseer Fathul Qadeer)

Abu Sulaiman can feel free to choose whatever category he likes because Mu'awiya fits at the helm of each one. His bad acts were evident from his declaring a bastard as his brother. As ruler, his harsh treatment of the likes of Hujr bin Adi as we have demonstrated, speaks for itself. With regards to his bidah of cursing Imam Ali (as), it has been discussed at length previously.

Famous deobandi scholar and former chief of Jamaat-e-Islami, Sayyid Abu'l Ala Maudoodi, after citing the words of Hasan Basri in Tahfim ul Qur'an Volume 5 page 87, makes these relevant comments:

“It is imperative that we highlight such individuals to prevent the risk of running in to danger (from such individuals) if narrators, witnesses and writers display such faults then such weaknesses should not be hidden, rather they should be conveyed”

Praising a fasiq leads to incurring the wrath of Allah (swt)

Whilst Abu Sulaiman and his Nasibi advocates have dedicated their life to defending Mu'awiya and heaping praise on him, no matter what the cost, we would urge our Ahl'ul Sunnah brothers not to get roped in to their actions, for the consequences are simply too great. The Sunni scholar al Muhaddith Shah Abdul Aziz Dehlavi in Tauhfah Ithna Ashariyya page 191 Chapter 7 states:

“It is recorded in Sahih ḥadith that when someone praises a bad character person, Allah (swt) gets upset with him”.

Clearly one who is a momin is one that has love for 'Ali (as). Why would such an individual risk incurring the wrath of Allah (swt) by showering praise on an individual who was an enemy of 'Ali (as), fought and cursed him? The modern day Nasibis are trying their utmost to recruit people into their obnoxious cult by declaring their affiliation with Imam 'Ali (as). The reality is very different as one can see from their passionate defence of Mu'awiya which as is the case with Abu Sulaiman, in fact turns in to an

attack on Imam ‘Ali (as). No rational lover of Ahl’ul Sunnah would ever wish to praise those that cursed Maula ‘Ali (as). Let us leave the Nasibi’s to wallow in their hypocrisy. They made their own bed let them lie in, to join them on their road to Hell.

“It is little wonder that Hanafi scholar Maulana ‘Abdul Hakeem Chishti in his biography of Maulana Waheed uz Zaman cited his comments from “Waheed ai Lughath”:

“To say ‘may Allah be pleased with him’ after Mu’awiya’s names takes a considerable amount of courage”.

Hayaat Waheed uz Zaman, page 109 by Maulana Muhamad Abdul Haleem Chishti

Muawiya was wicked and is cursed

In Nuzlul Abrar Volume 3 page 94 by famed Salafi scholar Maulana Waheed uz Zaman Khan Hyderabadadi made these very frank comments about Mu’awiya and his cohorts whilst attacking the character of his governor Walid:

“if an evil-doer comes to you with a report, look carefully into it”[49:6]. It was descended in Al Walid Ibn Aqaba .

Also His (swt) saying: “Is he who is a believer like unto him who is an evil-liver? They are not alike.” [32:18]

And from that we know that there was wicked persons among the Sahaba like Al Walid and his likes who are Mu’awiya, Amr bin Al-Ass, Mughira, and Sumra.

And the meaning of the Sahaba are fair, means they are truthful in the narration and not that they are protected from being wicked.”

Nuzlul Abrar, Volume 3 page 94

Allamah Waheed uz Zaman also refers to Mu’awiya having attained the wrath of Allah (swt):

And God Almighty said: “Those who malign Allah and His messenger, Allah hath cursed them in the world and the Hereafter, and hath prepared for them the doom of the disdained.”

Mu’awiya, Yazid, Umro bin Al ‘Ass, Shimr, Umer bin Sa’ad, Sannan, Khuli annoyed Allah and His prophet, so every one who was like them is cursed . For that some of our companions like Ahmad bin Hanbal have allowed to curse Yazid and his likes .

Al Marshrab al Wardi Minal Fiha e Muhammadi, page 251 by Maulana Waheed uz Zaman Khan Hyderabadadi

Note: Both of these referecnes have been deleted from the later versions of both of these books.

Mu’awiya was a Nasibi

In “Lisan al Arab” page 762 by Ibn Manzur states:

“Nawasib are those who hate Ali, and embrace that hatred as part of their faith”

If this is the definition of a Nasibi then Mu’awiya was the practical definition of one. If his fighting against Imam Ali (as) is not clear evidence in itself, then his introducing the practice of cursing ‘Ali (as) in all mosques throughout the territories, serves as unequivocal proof that he had a deep

seated hated of Imam ‘Ali (as) in his heart. Mu’awiya sought to institutionalize this hatred, by making the ritual cursing a part of the Friday Sermon, by doing so he in effect sought to convince the masses that this was a part of the Deen. It is little wonder that modern day Pakistani Hanafi scholar Maulana Sayyid Lal Shah Bukhari in “Isthakhlaaf ai Yazid” page 216 admitted:

“The founder of Nasibi ideology was Mu’awiya”.

Fatwa of Imam of Ahl’ul Sunnah, Shah Abdul Aziz that Nawasib are equal to dogs and pigs

Al Muhaddith Shah Abdul Aziz Dehlavi declared in “Tauhfah Ithna Ashariyya” page 6:

“The Ulema of Ahl’ul Sunnah regard the enemies of Ali, the Nasibis as the worst party that recites the Shahada. We regard them as equivalent to dogs and pigs”

Appraisals of Mu’awiya

Character references play a pivotal role in society. Having good character means that you have such admirable traits as honesty, responsibility and piety. It is important to have good character. The ability of someone to couch for the character of another is essential to attaining a place in university, work etc. From a religious context a good character of a person will help judge his suitability to take up religious posts such as an Imam, teacher etc. Let us now present the character reference of the Imam of the Nasabis namely Mu’awiya, from those that had the honour of meeting him.

Appraisal of Mu’awiya by Rasulallah (s)

First appraisal – Rasulallah (s) cursed Mu’awiya’s stomach

We read in Sahih Muslim hadith number 6298, a tradition narrated by Ibn Abbas:

“I was playing with children and Allah’s Apostle (peace be upon him) happened to pass by (us). I hid myself behind the door. He (the Prophet) came and he patted upon my shoulders and said: Go and call Mu’awiya. I returned and said: He is busy in taking food. He again asked me to go and call Mu’awiya to him. I went (and came back) and said that he was busy in taking food, whereupon he said: May Allah not fill his belly! Ibn Muthanna said: I asked Umm Umayyah what he meant by the word Hatani. He said: It means “he patted my shoulders”.

Nasibi excuses for the Prophet’s curse on Muawiya’s stomach

Anyone with the slightest honesty can recognize how severely Muawiya is being condemned in this Hadeeth. Unsurprisingly the Nawasib due to their absence of integrity offer an alternative interpretation, and seek to suggest that the Hadeeth should be recognized as an appraisal of Muawiya. Consider this the article ‘Hadith About Muawiyah: “May Allah Not Fill His Belly” [A Sunni Perspective]’ wherein Ibn al-Hashimi stated:

The Shia will look within the Hadith collection of the Ahlus Sunnah in order to prove their viewpoint. However, the Shia will oftentimes need to make use of academic deceit when they quote such Hadith. One such example can be found when they procure Hadith about Muawiyyah.

It is recorded in the Hadith of the Ahlus Sunnah that the Prophet said of Muawiyyah, “May Allah not fill his belly.” The Shia will then claim that the Hadith thereby condemns Muawiyyah. What these Shia fail to say is that there is an Arabic saying “may Allah not fill your belly” which means “may your sustenance be without end” (i.e. its end never come). In the Semitic cultures, this is a commonly used colloquialism: when someone is about to die, people say that so-and-so has reached his fill of food.

Oftentimes, Shia youth will go to various discussion forums and use simple “copy and pastes” in order to “prove” their point; they will duplicate this Hadith. These Shia propagandists do not have a grasp of the Arabic language and are thus liable to make such mistakes whereby they take things drastically out of context. The analogy of this is a man telling his son to “break a leg” before a soccer match. If we were to literally translate “break a leg” into Chinese, it would lose its intended meaning; a Chinese reader would think that this father actually wants his son to physically get hurt! If this same Chinese reader asked the Chinese police to arrest this man for child abuse, they would probably do so. But if this Chinese reader went to English-speaking police, they would probably laugh at him for misinterpreting English colloquialism. In the same manner do we laugh at the Shia who use the afore-mentioned Hadith to prove anything.

The truth is that the Shia scholars who first posted this Hadith about Muawiyyah were engaging in deceit in order to fool the masses and “prove” their point. In reality, the Hadith is in praise of Muawiyyah and not a condemnation of him. Unfortunately, this Hadith is now circulating the internet without proper context. We see that this is a recurring theme in the debate with the Shia.

Reply One

Lets just for arguments sake accept this claim of Nawasib that we know nothing of Arabic – tell us one thing whose knowledge of the true meaning of this Hadeeth should we accept, yours or that of Imam Muslim? The hadeeth that you suggest is an appraisal of Muawiya has been inserted by Muslim under this heading:

“He upon whom Allah’s Apostle (May Peace Be Upon Him) invoked curse whereas he in fact did not deserve it, it would be a source of reward and mercy for him”

Look carefully at the wording here, those that fall within this Hadeeth chapter are those that the Prophet (s) cursed, so how can this Nasibi suggest that it is an appraisal of Muawiya suggesting that he attains eternal sustenance. If Imam Muslim really wanted to evidence this as an appraisal of Muawiya then he could have placed this within the chapter dealing with the merits of the Sahaba but he did not, he placed it in the chapter dealing with those that the Prophet cursed! We are sure that Ibn al Hashimi is fully aware of the heading wherein this Hadeeth is found, but his love of Muawiya was such that he made a last ditch effort to defend his Imam

before his Sunni audience, tragically the only thing that he achieved was to expose his intellectual dishonestly.

Reply Two

Face facts Ibn al-Hashimi, this Hadeeth is a clear condemnation of Mu'awiya which is why when Imam Nasai recited it in Damascus he was murdered. If (as Ibn al Hashimi and other Nasibi lawyers suggest) it was an appraisal of him then why did the Damascans not recognize it as such, and instead murder Imam Nasai for reciting it? Ibn al Hashimi suggests that the Shia debaters lack knowledge of Arabic as used by the Arab people, tell us are the Syrians not Arabs? Would they have been ignorant of this alleged praiseworthy term in Semitic culture? If they were aware of this praiseworthy saying, then rather than fill Imam Nasai's pockets with sweets and Dirhams, why did they react by beating him so severely that he died of his injuries? Imam Nasai's recital of this tradition and the violent reaction of the Syrians and the chapter wherein Imam Muslim records this Hadeeth proves that the Hadeeth is a severe condemnation of Muawiyah. Mu'awiya's eating habits were a mirror reflection of the type of behaviour that Allah (swt) has condemned in the Qur'an, stating that the kaafirs eat like animals.

Reply Three

Here we deem it appropriate to also mention the excuse that was advanced by Ibn Katheer al-Nasibi in al Bidayah. He provided an interesting commentary of this Hadeeth suggesting that Rasulallah (s) had praised Mu'awiya via this supplication, by pointing out he would benefit from the blessing of Allah (swt). It's the type of logic wherein someone says 'Your house will burn down' meaning no mouse will remain in the house.

Reply Four

Now we should also comment on the Sunni notion we read above in shape of the chapter name in Sahih Muslim. It tells us that the curse of Rasool (saw) becomes a blessing ONLY if he curses someone who didn't deserve it, but it will certainly be a valid and applicable curse if the one being cursed is worthy of it . Now the key question is, whether the Prophet's curse really hurt Muawiyah or it was just a 'friendly curse' as Nawasib would like to suggest? The answer is that the Prophet's curse acted as a major blow to Muawiyah's life as he would eat SEVEN times a day, and yet remained hungry, Ibn Kathir records in Al-Bidayah wa al-Nihayah, Volume 8 page 119:

وقال مغيرة عن الشعبي: أول من خطب جالسا معاوية حين كثر شحمه وعظم بطنه
وكذا روى عن مغيرة عن إبراهيم أنه قال: أول من خطب جالسا يوم الجمعة معاوية. وقال
أبو المليح عن ميمون: أول من جلس على المنبر معاوية واستأذن الناس في الجلوس.

And Mughira reported from Sh'ubi: "And Muawiyah was the first person who started giving sermon (of Friday prayer) while sitting. And this happened at that time when Muawiyah acquired thick layers of fat and his stomach grew large.

Mughirah also reported Ibrahim: “The first individual that delivered the Friday sermon whilst seated was Muawiya”.

And Abu Malih also reported the same from Memoon that Muawiya was the first who sat on the Minbar.

We also read in Al-Bidayah wa al-Nihayah, Volume 8 page 138:

فإنه لما صار إلى الشام أميرا، كان يأكل في اليوم سبع مرات يجاء بقصعة فيها لحم كثير ويصل فيأكل منها، ويأكل في اليوم سبع أكالات بلحم، ومن الحلوى والفاكهة شيئا كثيرا ويقول والله ما أشبع وإنما أعياء، وهذه نعمة ومعدة يرغب فيها كل الملوك.

“When he became the ruler of Syria, he used to eat SEVEN times a day. The bowl which was brought to him for eating was full of meat and onions. He would eat from the bowl seven times a day along with a lot of sweets and fruits. Despite this he would still say: “By God! my belly is not full, but I am tired and food is a form of blessing with which all Kings are interested.”

Reply Five

The interesting thing is that Rasulullah (s) said that a believer does not eat excessively whilst a kaafir does. In this regards we read in Sahih Muslim, The Book of Drinks (Kitab Al-Ashriba) Volume 7, Book 65, Number 306:

Narrated Ibn ‘Umar: Allah’s Apostle said, “A believer eats in one intestine (is satisfied with a little food), and a kafir (unbeliever) or a hypocrite eats in SEVEN intestines (eats too much).”

One can now easily relate the habit of Muawiya eating seven times a day with this prediction of the Prophet (s) according to which only the Kuffar adhere to such eating habits. Moreover we read in Sahih Bukhari, Volume 7, Book 65, Number 308:

Narrated Abu Huraira:

Allah’s Apostle said, “A Muslim eats in one intestine (i.e. he is satisfied with a little food) while a Kafir (unbeliever) eats in seven intestines (eats much).”

Here we see a difference between Muslim and Kufar in eating habits. In his commentary of this Nawawi in Sharh said eating less is good etiquette whilst excessive eating is bad etiquette. We hence leave it to Mu’awiya’s supporters to think about this. Rasulullah (s) said that excessive eating is the sign of a kafir and Allah (swt) compared this to an animal. With this in mind how can this Hadeeth be an appraisal of Mu’awiya?

It is down to Mu’awiya’s lovers to issue the appropriate Fatwa on their Imam in light of this Hadeeth. When Rasulullah (s) raised his hands and supplicated “May Allah not fill his belly!” Will this benefit him in the next world? The example of Mu’awiya is like that of kaafirs and animals, it is not the practice of the believer as is clear from the Seerah of Rasulullah (s).

If Nawasib argue that it was against the manner of the Prophet to believe that he would supplicate against a believer, we will respond that Mu’awiya was worthy of such condemnation, since Rasulullah (s) said a believer is he whose blood is protected from another Muslim, and killing a Muslim is Fisq

and killing him is kufr and He (s) also said that loving Ali (as) is belief and hating Ali (as) is disbelief.

Reply Six

Concluding the Prophet (s)'s curse on Mu'awiya's stomach, we shall also mention the following prediction of our Holy Prophet (s) which is quite relevant to His (s) curse on the filthy stomach of Mu'awiya. Allamah Naeem bin Hamad al-Marozzi (d. 229 H) records the following tradition in his esteemed work 'Al-Fetan' Volume 1 page 116:

يجمع أمر هذه الأمة على رجل واسع السرم ضخم البلعم يأكل ولا يشبع

Prophet (s) said: 'This ummah will have Ijma on a man whose rectum's hole will be as wide as the hole of his throat, he eats but doesn't get filled'

We can now deduce why Muawiya's stomach remained constantly empty. That is why Allamah Muhammad bin Aqeel Shaf'ee in his book 'Nasai al-Kafia' page 162 clearly stated that the person being talked about in the above prediction is Muawiya. As for words "Was'a Saram" the Allamah Ibn Atheer in his book 'Al-Nihayah' Volume 2 page 916 and Ibn Manzur in 'Lisan al-Arab' Volume 12 page 286 have clearly mentioned their meanings.

So next time when the children of Mu'awiya want to use the tradition of Sahih Muslim as one of the merits of Mu'awiya rather than Prophet's curse on his stomach, these people shall also mention the reason behind the always empty stomach of Mu'awiya i.e. "Was'a Saram".

Second appraisal – Rasulallah (s) cursed Mu'awiya, his brother father and Amr bin Aas

We read in Ahl'ul Sunnah's book 'Maqatil Husayn' page 117 part 4:

"Imam Hasan reminded Mu'awiya of the occasion "when your father was riding a red camel you was in front of him and your brother Utbah was dragging the camel by its nose? On that occasion Rasulallah (s) cursed your father, brother and you"

Rasulallah's cursing of these three individuals on this specific occasion can also be located in Waq'at Sifeen, Volume 8 page 185.

Ibn Katheer in al Bidaya wa al Nihaya, Volume 8 page 133 records this Hadeeth:

"If you see Mu'awiya on my pulpit then kill him"

Rasulallah (s) asked to kill Mu'awiya which negates the alleged ijma associated with his khilafah. To hold a position contrary to this is clear opposition to Rasulallah (s)

Third appraisal – Rasulallah (s) cursed Mu'awiya and Amr bin Aas

Imam al-Dhahabi recorded that:

ابن فضيل حدثنا يزيد بن أبي زياد عن سليمان بن عمرو بن الأحوص عن أبي برزة كنا مع النبي ﷺ فسمع صوت غناء فقال انظروا ما هذا فصعدت فنظرت فإذا معاوية وعمرو بن العاص يتغنيان فجئت فأخبرته فقال اللهم أركسهما في الفتنة ركسا ودعهما في النار دعا

Abi Burza said: ‘We were with the prophet (pbuh) then he heard someone singing, so He (s) said: ‘Go and see what is going on there’. Thus, I climbed and looked, I saw Mu’awiya and Amr bin al-Aas singing, then I returned and told (the prophet). He (the prophet) said: ‘May Allah throw them in fitna (sedition) and push them towards hell’.

1. Mizan al-I’tidal, Volume 3 page 311
2. Siyar alam al Nubla, Volume 3 page 132

Fourth appraisal – Rasulallah (s) cursed Mu’awiya, his father Abu Sufyan and his son Yazeed

Imam Ibn Jarir Tabari records in Tareekh Tabari, Volume 5 page 622:

قول الرسول عليه السلام وقد رآه مقبلاً على حمار ومعاوية يقود به ويزيد ابنه يسوق به

لعن الله القائد والراكب والسائق

The prophet (pbuh) said: ‘May Allah curse the leader, the rider and the driver’ when He (s) saw him (Abu Sufiyan) on a donkey Mu’awiya leading it and his son Yazid riding on it’

Allamah Ismaeel bin Abul Fida in his famed history work also recorded:

ورأى النبي (ص) أبا سفيان مقبلاً ومعاوية يقوده ويزيد أخو معاوية يسوق به فقال :

لعن الله القائد والراكب والسائق

Prophet (s) saw Abu Sufyan coming and Mu’awiya leading him and Yazid (Mu’awiya’s brother) driving him, so the Prophet (s) said: ‘May God curse the leader and the rider and the driver’.

Tarikh Abul-Fida, Volume 2 page 75

Ibn Mazahim records in ‘Waqat Sifeen’ page 218:

“Nasar narrated from Abdul Ghafar bin al Qasim who narrated from Adi bin Thabit who narrated from Bara bin Aazab who said that Abu Sufiyan came along with Muawiyah, thus Holy Prophet (s) said: ‘May Allah curse the leader and the one being lead. Allah, send your wrath on Al-Aqi’as’. Ibn al-Bara’ asked his father: ‘Who is Al-Aqi’as?’. He replied: ‘Muawiyah’.

Allamah Ali bin Abi Bakar al-Haythami in his esteemed work ‘Majmu al-Zawaid’ also recorded a version of this hadith without naming the characters.

Narrated Safena:

The prophet (s) was sitting, so a man on a mule passed and between his hands a leader, and behind him a driver, so Prophet (s): “May God curse the leader, the driver and the rider”. Narrated by Al Bazzar and his men are thiqat (authentic).

Majma ul Zawaid, Volume 1, page 113 Tradition: 437

Fifth appraisal – Mu’awiya shall die a kaafir

We read in Waq’at Sifeen page 217 and Tarikh Tabari Volume 8 page 186 that Abdullah ibne Umar narrates that he heard Rasulallah say:

“Mu’awiya shall not die on the path of Islam”.

Both the above books on the same pages also record a similar hadith, this time narrated by Jabir bin Abdullah who testified that he heard Rasulallah (s) say:

“At the time of his death, Mu’awiya shall not be counted as member of my Muslim Ummah”

Sixth appraisal – Mu’awiya shall be raised with a different Ummah on the day of Judgment

We read in Ansab al Ashraf Volume 5 page 132 that Rasulullah (s) said:

“From this door shall enter a man from my Ummah who shall be raised with another Ummah on the Day of Judgment, at that point Mu’awiya came through the door”

Seventh appraisal – Mu’awiya shall be in the deepest part of Hell Fire

It is recorded in Tarikh Tabari, Volume 5 page 622 that Rasulullah (s) said:

“Verily Mu’awiya shall be in the deepest part of Hell from where he shall shout ‘Ya Hanan, Ya Manan’ verily I have sinned and spread fitnah throughout the earth”.

Similarly find in Ansab al Ashraf Volume 5 page 132 that Rasulullah (s) said:

“Mu’awiya has a coffin in the deepest part of Hell, one that has a lock on it”.

In addition, in Waq’at Sifeen page 217, we learn that Abdullah ibne Umar had also condemned Mu’awiya as follows:

“Verily Mu’awiya’s coffin is in the deepest part of Hell, Had Firawn not declared that he was the most superior God, nobody would have been in a deeper part of Hell than Mu’awiya”.

Eighth appraisal – Mu’awiya and Amr bin al-Aas can never gather for a good cause

According to the prediction of Holy Prophet (s), the gathering of Mu’awiya and Amr bin al-Ass is the sign of evil as they can never gather for a good cause. We read the following episode in famed Sunni work al-Eqd al-Fareed, Volume 1:

It is narrated that when Amro bin al-A’as went to Mu’awya and stood beside him in Ali’s case after (Mu’awya) gave him Egypt as a booty. He (Amro bin Al-A’s) said to him (Mu’awiya): ‘There is a honorable and well reputed man in your country, if he stands beside you, you will own the hearts of the people, he is Ubada bin al-Samit.’

Mu’awiya sent to him, so when he (Ubada) arrived, (Mu’awiya) made space for Ubada between him and Amro bin al-A’as, then he (Ubada) sat between them.

Then Mu’awiya praised Allah and then he mentioned the merits of Ubada and his vanguard of Islam, then he mentioned the merits of Uthman and whatever had happened to him, then he motivated (Ubada) to stand beside him. Ubada said: ‘I heard what you said, do you know why I sat between you in your place?’ They said: ‘Yes, because of your honor, virtue and your vanguard of Islam. He (Ubada) said: ‘By Allah, that is not why I sat between you, and I would never sit between you in your place, but when we were marching along with the Prophet (s) for Tabuk battle, he looked at

both of you walking talking. So He (s) looked at us and said: ‘If you see them gathered, separate them because they never gather for the good.’”

Ninth appraisal – Mu’awiya is Kafir

Baladhuri records:

وحدثني إسحاق وبكر بن الهيثم قالاً حدثنا عبد الرزاق بن همام أنبأنا معمر عن ابن طاوس عن أبيه عن عبد الله بن عمرو بن العاص قال: كنت عند النبي ﷺ فقال: يطلع عليكم من هذا الفج رجل يموت على غير ملتي، قال: وكنت تركت أبي قد وضع له وضوء، فكنت كحابس البول مخافة أن يجيء، قال: فطلع معاوية فقال النبي ﷺ: هو هذا

Ishaq and Bakr bin Haytham from Abdurazaq bin Hamam from Mu’amar from Ibn Taous from Taous bin Kisan from Abdullah Ibn Amr ibn Al-’as who stated: ‘I was sitting with the Prophet of Allah (s) when He (s) said: ‘A man will come out of this mountain pass, who will die and he will be outside my nation (Islam)’. I had left behind my father there for wudhu, and I feared, as if holding back my urine, that he would be the one to come, but Mu’awiya came out. The Prophet (s) said: ‘He is the one’.

Ansab al-Ashraf, Volume 2 page 120

Ishaq bin Abi Israel: Ibn Hajar said: ‘Seduq’ (Taqrib al-Taḥdib, v1 p79), Dahabi said: ‘Thiqah’ (Al-Kashif, v1 p234). Abdulrazaq bin Hamam: Ibn Hajar said: ‘Thiqah’ (Taqrib al-Taḥdib, v1 p599), Dahabi said: ‘Thiqah’ (Siar alam alnubala, v9 p563). Mu’amar bin Rashid: Ibn Hajar said: ‘Thiqah Thabt’ (Taqrib al-Taḥdib, v2 p202), Dahabi said: ‘Hujja’ (Tazkirat al-Hufaz, v1 p190). Abdullah bin Taous: Ibn Hajar said: ‘Thiqah’ (Taqrib al-Taḥdib, v1 p503), Dahabi said: ‘Thiqah’ (Siar alam alnubala, v6, p103). Taous bin Kisan: Ibn Hajar said: ‘Thiqah’ (Taqrib al-Taḥdib, v1 p448), Dahabi said: ‘He had a great magnificence’ (Tazkirat al-Hufaz, v1 p90). Abdullah bin Amro bin al-Sas: A Sahabi. Moreover, Hafiz Ahmad bin al-Sidiq said about this tradition: ‘Sahih according to Muslim’s condition’ (Jawnat al-Attar, v2 p154)

Tenth appraisal – Mu’awiya shall be killed if tried to sit on Prophet’s pulpit

Baladhuri records in Ansab Al-Ashraf, volume 5 page 130:

حدثني إبراهيم بن العلاف البصري قال، سمعت سلاماً أبا المنذر يقول: قال عاصم بن بهدلة حدثني زر بن حبيش عن عبد الله بن مسعود قال: قال رسول الله ﷺ: “إذا رأيتم معاوية بن أبي سفيان يخطب على المنبر فاضربوا عنقه

Ibrahim Ibn Al-Alaaf from Salaam Ibn Sulayman from Isam Ibn Bahdalah from Zirr from Abdullah Ibn Masood from Rasoolullah (s) who said: ‘If you see Muwiyah bin Abi Sufiyan on my pulpit then kill him’.

Abdullah bin Masud: Sahabi. Zirr bin Hubaysh: Ibn Hajar said: ‘Thiqah’ (Taqrib al-Taḥdib, v1 p311). Asim bin Bahdalah: Ibn Hajar said: ‘Seduq’ (Taqrib al-Taḥdib, v1 p546). Salaam bin Sulayman Abu al-Munder: Ibn Hajar said: ‘Seduq’ (Taqrib al-Taḥdib, v1 p406). Ibrahim bin al-Alaf al-

Basri: Imam Ibn Haban included him among the Thiqa narrators (al-Thuqat, v8 p78).

Umar's appraisal of Mu'awiya

First appraisal

Al Bidaya Volume 8 page 125 'Dhikr Mu'awiya' contains the words of Umar :

“Mu'awiya is the Kisra of the Arabs”.

Umar compared Mu'awiya to kaafir king, the same Umar said that the Tulqa cannot be khalifas, and the words of Umar are enough to refute the Nasibi assertions that Muawiyas' reign is correct according to the ijma of the Sahaba,

Second appraisal

Baladhuri records in Ansab al-Ashraf, Volume 3 page 403:

حدثني الحسين بن علي بن الأسود، ثنا يحيى بن آدم عن وكيع عن إسماعيل بن أبي خالد عن شبيل اليحصبي قال: كانت لي حاجة إلى عمر بن الخطاب، فغدوت لأكلمه فيها، فسبقني إليه رجل فكلمه فسمعت عمر يقول له: لئن أطعتك لتدخلني النار، فنظرت فإذا هو معاوية. أبو الحسن المدائني عن وكيع عن إسماعيل عن شبيل بمثله.

Al-Hussain bin Ali al-Aswad from Yahya bin Adam from Wakee from Ismail bin Abi Khalid from Shubail al-Yahsabi who said: 'I had requisition from Umar bin al-Khatab, hence I went to him to ask him but a man reached to him before me and talked to him, then I heard that Umar was saying to him: 'If I obey you, you will make me enter into hell.' Then I looked and it was Mu'awiya'.

Al-Hussain bin Ali al-Aswad: Ibn Hajar said: 'Seduq' (Taqrīb al-Taḥdīb, v1 p216). Yahya bin Adam: Ibn Hajar said: 'Thiqah' (Taqrīb al-Taḥdīb, v2 p296). Wakee: Ibn Hajar said: 'Thiqah' (Taqrīb al-Taḥdīb, v2 p284). Ismail bin Abi Khalid: Ibn Hajar said: 'Thiqah' (Taqrīb al-Taḥdīb, v1 p93). Shubail al-Yahsabi: Ibn Hajar said: 'Thiqah' (Taqrīb al-Taḥdīb, v1 p412).

Maula Ali (as) appraisal of Mu'awiya

First appraisal

In 'Tauhfah Ithna Ashari' page 308, Chapter Mathaein Uthman, Shah Abdul Aziz records these words of advice of Maula Ali (as) to Ibn Ziyad:

“Muawiya has writtern you a letter, be careful of him or you will get fooled as he is a devil”.

Tauhfah Ithna Ashari, page 308

The Imam of truth Maula 'Ali (as) compared Mu'awiya to Shaytan, and there is no way that a Shaytan can be deemed the Khaleefa of Rasulullah (s), Nasibi such as Abu Sulaiman who espouses such a view are the enemies of Islam.

Second appraisal

Shaykh Sulayman Qanduzi al-Hanafi in “Yanabi al Mawaddah” page 190 Chapter 53 quotes:

“Nasr bin Muzahim who heard from Abu Ishaq Ihsani who states that after the “Tahkeem Incident” he read a manuscript in the possession of Said bin Abi Burdah. In it, it was written that when the people asked ‘Ali whether or not his opponents were Momin he replied, with regards to Mu’awiya and his companions ‘I do not regard them as Mu’min or Muslim, and I care little about what Mu’awiya thinks”.

Other Sunni authorities have also recorded these words of Imam ‘Ali (as):

1. al-Nasa’ih al-Kaafiyah page 199
2. Al Bidaya Volume 7 page 259
3. Iqd al Fareed Volume 2 page 233

Third appraisal

Imam of Ahle Sunnah Ibn Abi Shebah records:

Abdulrahman bin Mughfal said: ‘I prayed with Ali dawn prayer, then he (Ali) performed Qunoot and said: ‘Oh Allah, punish Mu’awiya and his followers, Amro bin al-Aas and his followers, Aba al-Salami and his followers, Abdullah bin Qais and his followers.”

1. Musnaf Ibn Abi Shebah, Volume 2 page 108 Tradition 7050
2. Kanzul Ummal, Volume 8 page 134 Tradition 21989

Fourth Appraisal

Shaykh Muhammad Khudri Beik records in his book ‘Tarikh al-Umam al-Islamiyah’ Volume 2 page 67 records that Imam Ali (as) used to deem Muawiya to be of a much lower man because of his hate against Prophet Muhammad (s):

He (Ali) saw Mu’awiya much lower than him, why? Because he was from al-Tulaqa and the son of al-Tulaqa who used to show enmity and fight against the prophet (pbuh)”

Tarikh al-Umam al-Islamiyah, Volume 2 page 67

Fifth Appraisal

This is for those ignorant ones who claim that Maula Ali bin Abi Talib (as) had love and affection towards his all time enemy Mu’awiya bin Hind. Imam Mawardi in his book Adab al-Dunya wa al-Deen, page 197 and Shamsuddin Abu al-Barakat al-Demashqi al-Shafiyye (d. 871 H) in Jawahir al-Matalib, Volume 2 page 158 recorded:

“A man came to Ali and said to him : ‘I love you and I love Muwayia’. He (Ali) may Allah be pleased with him replied: ‘Now you are one eyed, either to heal or get blind’.

The above mentioned reply from the door of knowledge is totally comprised on logic i.e. one cannot love an oppressed and the oppressor at the same time.

Ayesha’s appraisal of Mu’awiya

First appraisal – Mu’awiya’s Government compared by Ayesha to Firawn (Pharaoh) and other Kaafirs (Pagans)

We are quoting from the following books:

1. Shaykh ul Mudira, page 165

2. al Bidaya, 131 Volume 8

3. Mukhtasar Ta'reekh al-Dimishq, Volume 25 page 42

Aswat bin Yazeed said to Ayesha: 'Aren't you surprised that this Mu'awiya is from Tulaqa (freed captive) and in Khilafat he fought the companions? Ayesha replied 'this Government and Kingdom, Allah (swt) gives leadership to both just and tyrannical, for 400 years in Egypt the enemies of God, Firawn ruled as did other Kaafir Kings'.

Ayesha's comparing of Mu'awiya to Firawn and other kaafirs is in fact a reference to the Qur'an, where Allah (swt) states in Surah Hud verses 96-99:

"And we sent Moses, with Our Clear (Signs) and an authority manifest, Unto Pharaoh and his chiefs: but they followed the command of Pharaoh and the command of Pharaoh was no right (guide). He will go before his people on the Day of Judgment, and lead them into the Fire (as cattle are led to water): But woeful indeed will be the place to which they are led! And they are followed by a curse in this (life) and on the Day of Judgment: and woeful is the gift which shall be given (unto them)!"

Taken from Abdullah Yusuf Ali's translation.

It is sheer stupidity for the like of Abu Sulaiman to suggest a reign that Ayesha compared to that of a Muslim to infact be the Khilafat of the Prophet (s). If these stupid Nasabi uphold the khilafat of Mu'awiya, they are in effect deeming Ayesha to be a liar which destroys their whole aqeedah.

Second Appraisal – Ayesha cursed Mu'awiya and Amr bin Aas

In connection with Mu'awiya's killing of Ayesha's brother, we read as follows:

"Following the death of Muhammad bin 'Abu Bakr the people of Egypt gave bayya to Mu'awiya. It was following this (event) that Ummul Mu'mineen Ayesha would curse Mu'awiya and Amr bin Aas after every Salaat".

1. Tar'ikh Ibn al Wardi Voume 1 page 245

2. Tar'ikh Kamil Vol. 3 page 180

3. Uthman Shaheed by Muhammadi bin Yahya bin Abi Bakar Maliki (d. 741 H), Urdu translation by Kaukab Shadani, page 216 (Nafees Academy Karachi)

4. Tadhkira tul Khawas, page 62

Saad ibn Waqqas's appraisal of Mu'awiya

We read these words of Sa'd to Mu'awiya in Fasul al Muhimma, page 164, Dhikr Hasan bin 'Ali and in Tarikh Kamil, page 407:

"Peace be upon you, o King!"

Sa'd is counted by the Ahl'ul Sunnah as one of the ten blessed with Paradise and he addressed Mu'awiya as a King not a Khaleefa.

Mu'awiya the second's appraisal of his grandfather Mu'awiya

We read in Hayaath al Haywaan Volume 1 page 88 the khutbah of the Mu'awiya the second i.e. Mu'awiya bin Yazeed bin Mu'awiya, wherein he said:

“My grandfather fought over the khilafat with than man more entitled to it, i.e. ‘Ali ibn Abi Talib”

See how grandson views the grandfather as unjust. Mu’awiya never sought forgives from ‘Ali for the injustice that he perpetuated.

Qays bin Sa’d bin Ibada’s appraisal of Mu’awiya

We read in al Bidaya, Volume 8 page 108 “Dhikr Qays bin Sa’d bin Ibada” that he mocked Mu’awiya as follows:

فقال له قيس: وأنت يا معاوية كنت صنماً من أصنام الجاهلية

“O Muawiya! You are an idol from amongst the idols of jahilyya”

We read in Muruj al Dhahab Volume 8 page 125:

“Your son is an idol worshipper as are you”.

These words suffice to destroy the Nasibi appraisals of Mu’awiya. Or should we question by the truthfulness of the Sahaba?

Abu Hurrayra’s appraisal of Mu’awiya

We read in Seerah Halabeeya Volume 3 page 367:

“On the plains of Sifeen Abu Hurrayra who pray Salat behind ‘Ali and would eat with Mu’awiya. Someone asked why he did this, to which he replied “Salat behind ‘Ali is better and food provided by Mu’awiya is better”.

In the eyes of Abu Hurrayra, Mu’awiya was not even worthy of leading the Salat, so what right did he have to rule the Muslim state?

Muhammad bin Abi Bakar’s appraisal of Mu’awiya

We read in Murujh al Dhahab Volume 3 page 20 that Muhammad bin Abi Bakr said to Mu’awiya:

‘You are the cursed son of a cursed person”.

Samra bin Jandab’s appraisal of Mu’awiya

We read the following words by one of a notorious Nasibi Sahabi namely Samra bin Jandab in Tarikh Tabari Volume 3 page 240, Dhkir Mu’awiya:

فقال سمرة لعن الله معاوية والله لو أطعت الله كما أطعت معاوية ما عذبني أبدا

“May Allah curse Muaw’iya, had I obeyed Allah in the same manner that I had obeyed Mu’awiya, God would not have made be perish”

1. Tarikh Kamil, Volume 3 page 640, Dikr Wafat Rabi

2. Tarikh Tabari, Volume 3 page 240

Look at the supplication of Mu’awiya’s former governor; he gave the sort of du’a that he truly deserves.

Miswan, appraisal of her husband Mu’awiya

We read in Tarikh Abdul Fida Volume 1 page 193, Dhikr the death of Yazeed:

“On one occasion I entered the house of Mu’awiya and Yazeed’s mother was singing couplets about Mu’awiya:

“I fear that I preferred my cousin Ziyad since this house is like that of Jews”

No one knows of the character of a man better than his wife.

Mamun Abbasi's appraisal of Mu'awiya

We read in Murujh al Dhahab volume 4 page 41:

“During his reign Mamun ordered the cursing of Mu'awiya from the pulpits, stating it was revenge from Allah (swt) for his cursing the family of the Prophet (s).

The people of Madina's appraisal of Mu'awiya

We have already cited this reference earlier from Al Bidaya Volume 8 page 132 and Iqd al Fareed Volume 2 page 139 both record that:

“In the year of Jamaa, Mu'awiya entered Madina and gave a sermon from the Mosque pulpit stating ‘I have become ruler over you. Although I know that you are unhappy with my rule and that your hearts bear enmity towards me, I have attained power via the sword’.

Any rule attained via oppression cannot be deemed valid ijma. It is telling that the city wherein the great Sahaba and Tabieen resided were unhappy with the rule of Mu'awiya.

Ibn Katheer's appraisal of Mu'awiya

We read in al Bidaya Volume 8 page 135:

“The Sunnah is Mu'awiya should be referred to as king not khaleefa”

These words are a real slap for these Nasibi who refer to Mu'awiya as the rightful khaleefa.

Imam Shafiyee's appraisal of Mu'awiya that his testimony is unacceptable

Allamah Ismaeel Abul Fida records:

“Imam Shafiyee said that the testimony of four companions will not be accepted and those four are Mu'awiya, Amr bin Aas, Mugheera (bin Shuba) and Ziyad (bin Abi)”

Kitab Mukhtasar fi Ahbar al Bashar Vol. 1 page 100

Imam of Ahle Sunnah al-Atiqi al-Baghdadi's appraisal of Mu'awiya

Let us now reveal the testimony of great Sunni Imam al-Atiqi about whom Imam Dhahabi wrote:

“The Imam the Muhadith, the Thiqah, Abu al-Hassan Ahmad bin Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Mansor al-Baghdady al-Atiqi”

Siar alam alnubala, Volume 17 page 602

Allamah Khateeb Baghdadi records about him:

“I wrote from him & he is Seduq (truthful)”

Tarikh Baghdad, Volume 5 page 143

Now we read the following testimony of Imam al-Atiqi about Mu'awiya in Tarikh Baghdad, volume 6, page 248 ‘Dhkir Yahyah bin Abdul Hameed al-Hamani’:

“Atiqi said: ‘Mu'awaiya did not die on the Islamic faith’.

Tarikh Baghdad, volume 6, page 248

For those who may cast doubt on the authenticity of Yahyah bin Abdul Hameed Hamani we shall point out that he is one of the narrators of Sahih

Muslim, moreover Imam Yahyah bin Mueen declared him ‘Thiqa’ (Tahdib al-Kamal v31, p423), Ibn Numair and Muhammad al-Bushanji also declared him ‘Thiqa’ (Tahdib al-Tahdib v11 p 248) and Allamah Ibn Shaheen included him in his book of Thiqa narrators ‘Tarikh Asma al-Thuqat’ page 270.

Is it not shameful for these Nasibis to tout the Khilafat of one that failed to die on the Islamic faith? These Nasabis are so thick, they deem one whose death on Iman is unproven to be the legitimate khalifa of the Prophet (s).

Imam of Ahle Sunnah Ali bin Ja’ad’s appraisal of Mu’awiya

Imam Dhahabi in Siyar Alam al-Nubala, Volume 10 page 464 has recorded the statement of the Sheikh of Baghdad, Ali bin Ja’ad (d. 230 H) regarding Mu’awiya:

قال أحمد بن إبراهيم الدورقي قلت لعلي بن الجعد بلغني أنك قلت ابن عمر ذاك الصبي قال لم أقل ولكن معاوية ما أكره أن يعذبه الله

Ahmad bin Ibrahim al-Duraqi said: ‘I said to Ali bin al-Ja’ad: ‘I have been informed that you said called Ibn Umar a kid.’ He replied: ‘I didn’t say such a thing but I don’t mind if Allah would punish Muawiyah’.

Similarly we read in Masael Imam Ahmad Ibn Hanbal, page 408:

وسمعت أبا عبد الله وقال له دلويه : سمعت علي بن الجعد يقول: مات والله معاوية على غير الإسلام

“I heard Aba Abdullah that Delweh said to him: ‘I heard Ali bin al-Ja’ad saying: ‘By Allah Muawiyah had died as a non-Muslim’”.

Mu’awiya – According to the Imams of Ahlulbayt (as)

In order to misguide naive Shias, some Nawasib try to make feeble attempts to prove that the Imams of Ahlulbayt (as) thought well of Mu’awiya. Therefore, before ending the article, we deemed it appropriate to present the actual status of Mu’awiya in the eyes of Imams (as). We read the following statement of Imam Jafar Sadiq (as) in Usool al-Kafi, Volume 8 page 234:

“Abu Abdullah (as) said: ‘Three things are the proud of a believer and decorate him in the world and hereafter, prayer in the end of night, to abstain from what is in the hand of the people and advocate the Imam from Muhammad’s (s) progeny.

And three are the most evil of creatures by whom the best of the creatures were afflicted with, Abu Sufyan is one of them who fought the messenger of Allah (s) and showed enmity towards Him (s), Mu’awiya who fought Ali (as) and showed enmity towards Him, and Yazid bin Mu’awiya may God curse him, who fought Hussain bin Ali (as) and showed enmity towards him till he killed Him (as).”

Allamah Majlesi in Mirat al-Uqool, Volume 26 page 178 declared it to be a ‘Hasan’ narration while Sheikh Hadi Najafi declared it ‘Sahih’ in Mawsuat ahl Albayt, Volume 4 page 445.

Shaykh Saduq records in Al-Khesal, page 360:

Muhammad bin Fudhail al-Zerqi narrated that Abu Abdullah (as) said that his father [Imam Baqir (as)] who said that his father [Imam Sajjad (as)] said: ‘The hell got seven gates, gate will make enter into it Pharaoh, Haman and Korah. And gate will make enter into it the polytheists and the disbelievers who never believed in Allah. And gate will make enter into it Bani Umaya because it is particularly for them, no one will compete them, and it’s a blazed gate, it’s the gate of Saqar and it is bottomless, they will remain there for seventy years and they will remain there eternally. And gate will make enter into it whoever hate us, fought us and disappointed us, verily it’s the most horrible and warm gate.’

Muhammad bin Fudhail al-Zerqi said: ‘I asked Abu Abdullah (as): ‘The gate which you mentioned from your father from your grand father (as) that Bani Umaya will enter into, will they be those of them who died as polytheist or those who attained Islam?’ Abu Abdullah (as) replied: ‘Didn’t you hear that he (Imam Sajjad) said: ‘And gate will make enter into it the polytheists and the disbelievers. So this gate will make enter into it every polytheist and disbeliever, who don’t believe in the day of judgment, while the other gate will make enter into it the Bani Umaya, because it is made specially for Abi Sufian, Mu’awiya and al-Marwan, they will enter from that gate and hell fire will destroy them, no one will listen to them (to their begging).’

A German scholar’s recognition of the contribution made by Mu’awiya

We have thus far cited the criticisms heaped upon Mu’awiya by Islamic figures, who recognized him for the shames trouble maker that he was. Whilst such a viewpoint is understandable due to the untold suffering his seditious conduct caused to Muslims when Imam Ali (as) took power, it is worthy to note that a critic of Islam was in awe of Mu’awiya for his activities that split the Muslims into two camps when Imam Ali (as) took power, a split that created a weaker Ummah less able to spread its teachings to other domains, in other word Mu’awiya was able to stop the spread of Islam in its tracks. Salafi scholar Rasheed Reza in Mujalat al-Manar, volume 30 page 450 wrote:

قال أحد علماء الألمان المتعصبين لجنسيتهم أنه ينبغي لنا أن نقيم لمعاوية تمثالاً من الذهب في أعظم ساحة من عاصمتنا (برلين) وينبغي مثل ذلك لجميع شعوب أوربة ، إذ لولاه لكانت هذه الشعوب كلها عربية تدين بالإسلام

“One German scholar with bias in favor of his race stated that they should build a golden statue for Mu’awiyia in best square in Berlin, and every nation should do so, because without him, all nations would have become Arab and Muslim nation”.

www.alhassanain.org/english