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# Chapter One

## Introduction

The topic that we present concerns the character of Yazeed ibn Mu’awiya. Whilst many would feel that this topic serves no purpose since all Muslims are aware of Yazeed’s notorious character and heinous deeds, one should know that in recent years the increased influence and infiltration of Salafi and Nasibi minds into the Sunni consciousness has led to a sudden turnaround in the way that many ordinary Sunnis tend to view Yazeed. If in the past the common Sunni would curse and condemn Yazeed, today voices shaped by influential Nasibi Shaykhs have led to Sunnis becoming confused on this topic. Some have adopted a code of silence, refusing to pass judgement on Yazeed, which is exactly what these Nasibi want; others have joined hands with these Nasibi wherein they have:

 Openly advocated support for Yazeed’s reign, deeming it legitimate

 Rejected the notion that Imam Husain’s opposition was a battle between truth and falsehood.

 Deemed Imam Husain (a.s.) a rebel (astaghfirullah)

 Extolled Yazeed as a man of noble character

 Denied his role in killing Imam Husain (a.s.)

 Vigorously opposed cursing Yazeed

The true inspiration of the Nasibis is, unlike that of most Sunnis, a deep-seated resentment and hatred of the Ahlul bayt (family of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.)). Numerous proofs of this exist on this website already. In this article we have decided to analyse the Nasibi appraisals for Yazeed. Whilst the focus of this article are the comments of Azam Tariq, and his passionate defence of Yazeed on the Haq, Char Yaar Website, we also felt it imperative to clump these comments with similar comments of writers on Ansar.org who are also trying to falsely portray themselves as warriors of Ahle Sunnah. Although we had rebutted some comments on Yazeed in our article on Mu’awiya we did not focus on the specific issue of Yazeed, who was in popular Muslim belief the vilest leader of Muslims ever. Hence the decision was taken to dedicate a separate and detailed rebuttal to this beloved Imam of the Nasibi movement.

# Chapter Two

## Was there an ijma in Yazeed’s Khilafah?

Azam Tariq stated:

All the Muslim citizens including the then living sahaba with the exception of Hazrat Husain and Abdullah bin Zubair swore allegiance to Yazeed. When Hazrat Husain decided to go from Makkah to Kufa where the people were constantly inviting him for bayt (oath of allegiance) his close associates and well-wishers like Abdullah bin Umar, Hazrat Abu Saeed Khudri, Hazrat Abu Darda, Hazrat Abdullah bin Abbas, Hazrat Muhammad bin Abu Hanifa etc. Tried to persuade him not to undertake this journey as it was full of risks and hazards. They were however, not successful in their attempt and Hazrat Husain proceeded on his mission of reformation conceived on the basis of his own ijtehad.

### Mu’awiya planned the succession of Yazeed for seven years

We read in Iqd al-Fareed, vol. 2, p. 247 Zikr Mu’awiya:

فلم يزل يروض الناس لبيعته سبع سنين، ويشاور، ويعطى الأقارب ويداني الأباعد، حتى استوثق له من أكثر الناس.

“Mu’awiya spent seven years seeking to galvanise the people’s minds towards giving baya’h to Yazeed and he rewarded those that ascribed to his views. He [Mu’awiya] tried to get closer to those that opposed this purpose [to intimidate them]”.

### Mu’awiya appointed Mugheera bin Shuba to carry through his objective of intimidation

As evidence we shall rely on the following texts of Ahle Sunnah:

1. Al-Bidayah wa al-Nihayah (Urdu), vol. 8, p. 870. The events of 56 Hijri

2. Tareekh al-Kamil Volume, 3, p. 252, The events of 56 Hijri

3. Tareekh Ibn Khaldun, vol. 3, p. 16

4. Tareekh al-Kholafa, p. 205 Zikr Mu’awiya

5. Al Imama wa al-Siyasa, p. 152

6. Nasa al-Kafiya, p. 38

For the sake of brevity we shall cite Al-Bidayah:

“Mu’awiya made plans to remove Mugheera bin Shuba from his post of Governor of Kufa and replace him with Sa’eed bin Aas. When Mugheera caught wind of his intention, he arrived in Damascus and said to Yazeed bin Mu’awiya ‘Your father should appoint you as khalifah after him’. When Yazeed asked Mu’awiya if this was indeed the case, he replied ‘Who said this to you?’ He [Yazeed] said Mugheera bin Shuba. This recommendation pleased Mu’awiya immensely; he kept Mugheera in post, and ordered him to drum up support for giving baya’h to Yazeed. Upon his return to Kufa, Mugheera did actions to secure the baya’h for Yazeed”.[[1]](#footnote-1)

Mu’awiya set the wheels in motion and wanted people to give baya’h to Yazeed. It is critical to note that in doing so Mu’awiya was breaching the terms of the treaty that had been reached with Imam Hasan (a.s.), namely that Mu’awiya would NOT appoint a successor after him and that the succession to the khilafat would return to the Imams of the Shia i.e. Al-Hasan (a.s.) and after him his successor Al-Imam Husain (a.s.). Mu’awiya is thus in breach of a solemn oath he took not to make the khilafat a monarchy by appointing his own son as Crown Prince.

### Imam Hasan (a.s.) made peace to avoid bloodshed

This issue is fundamentally tied up with the forced abdication of Al-Hasan (a.s.) as khalifa in the face of Muawiya’s rebellion against Imam Hasan (a.s.)’s lawful and noble khilafat. Al-Hasan (a.s.)’s is deemed by Jalaaluddin Suyuti in his established Sunni account of the khilafat the fifth rightly guided khalifa, and while most Sunnis have not heard this he ruled for six months and was by their scholars rightly guided.

For this section we shall focus on the following texts of Ahle Sunnah:

1. Irshad al-Sari Sharh Bukhari, vol. 1, p. 198 Baabul Fetan

2. Umdatul Qari fi Sharh Bukhari, vol. 11, p. 361 Kitab al-Fitan

3. Mirqaat Sharh Mishqat, vol. 11, p. 379

4. Al Istiab, vol. 1, p. 370

For the sake of brevity we shall cite al-Irshad:

“Imam Hasan did not abdicate on account of any bribe / worldly gain or weakness; rather he made peace so as to avoid fitnah and bloodshed.”

### Mu’awiya had agreed that the Khilafat would return to Imam Hasan (a.s.) when he died

This is undeniable and is testified to, amongst numerous other Sunni works, in:

1. Fathul Bari fi Sharh Bukhari, vol. 3, p. 65 Kitab al-Fitan

2. Mirqat Sharh Mishqat, vol. 11, p. 38 Bab Manaqib Ahlulbait

3. Al-Bidayah wa al-Nihayah (Urdu), vol. 8, p. 871 ‘The events of 56 Hijri’

4. Hayaat al-Haywaan Volume, 1, p. 53 Zikr Khilafa

5. Tareekh-e-Khamees, vol. 2, p. 29 Zikr Hasan

6. Al Imama wa al-Siyasa, p. 18 Sulh Hasan

7. Al Istiab, vol. 1, p. 370 Zikr Hasan

Ibn Kaseer records:

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”[[2]](#footnote-2)

Imam Ibn Hajar Asqalaini records in Fathul Bari:

اني اشترطت على معاوية لنفسي الخلافة بعده

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

The fact that Mu’awiya wanted to make Yazeed his successor was hugely embarrassing for him, since this contravened the peace treaty and hence the better option would be to remove Imam Hasan (a.s.) (this has been discussed in our article on Mu’awiya). In the meantime Mu’awiya’s flagrant breach of the treaty continued. This is an embarrassment for the Nasibis as this treaty and its terms are not controversial and accepted by all. Thus the Nasibis might claim that this happened after Imam Hasan (a.s.) was martyred but the fact is…

### Mu’awiya sought to secure the baya’h for Yazeed whilst Imam Hasan was alive

We read Al Imama wa al-Siyasa, p. 155 Zikr baya’h Yazeed

“An Iraqi tribal chief said to Mu’awiya ‘As long as Hasan is alive the people of Iraq and Hijaz shall not give baya’h to Yazeed.”

### Mu’awiya had potential successor and rival Abdur Rahman bin Khalid poisoned

We read in Al-Bidayah:

عبد الرحمن بن خال بن الوليدالقرشى المخزومى وكان من الشجعان المعروفين والأبطال المشهورين كابيه 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”[[3]](#footnote-3)

We read in al-Istiab:

“Abdur rahman was against Ali and Bani Hashim … he had fought in Sifeen alongside Muawiyah…When Muawiyah 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 Abdur rahman’. Muawiya didn’t like it but kept it within him and once Abdu rahman got ill, Muawiya told the doctor to treat him and gave him syrup that could kill him, the doctor administered it and killed him by giving him poison.”[[4]](#footnote-4)

This Abdul Rahman was the son of Khalid bin Waleed, and he was Mu’awiya’s general in Siffeen. Mu’awiya was willing to shed his blood to secure the transition of power to his son. While we the Shia have nothing but contempt for Khalid bin Waleed for reasons discussed elsewhere (he murdered a Muslim general during the khilafat of Abu Bakr so as to marry the general’s beautiful wife, and prior to this had murdered thousands of innocent Shias in the Yemen), Khalid is hailed as a great champion of the khilafat and a hero by the Sunnis.

### The opposition of the family of Abu Bakr towards Mu’awiya’s plans

We read in Al-Bidayah wa al-Nihayah (Urdu), vol. 8, p. 890-891 ‘Zikr Abdur Rehman bin Abi Bakar’:

“When Marwan entered into discussions with the tribe of Salim, Abdul Rahman ibn Abu Bakr stated ‘In the same way that one king nominates another king to succeed him; one Umayyad is seeking to appoint another Umayyad to succeed him’. Marwan then told Abdul Rahman to be silent.”

“…when Abdul Rahman refused to give baya’h to Yazeed, Mu’awiya sent Abdul Rahman one thousand dirhams. Abdul Rahman replied ‘Do you expect me to sell my religion for dinars?”[[5]](#footnote-5)

Imam of Ahle Sunnah Mahmud Abu Riyyah in his excellent Shaykh al-Mudira, p. 168 states that Mu’awiya used force to secure baya’h for Yazeed and discretely splayed with poison those that he could not bribe…

“Even if that meant using methods such as poison, he used this method that led to the deaths of Hasan, Abdul Rahman bin Abu Bakr and Abdul Rahman bin Khalid”.

Whilst Nawasib such as Ansar have no love for Ahlulbait (a.s.) we would at least urge them to look at the case of the son of Abu Bakr, the natural brother of Ayesha and brother in law of Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.). Anyone who has the slightest love for Abu Bakr should have nothing to do with Mu’awiya.

### Mu’awiya even killed Ayesha so as to secure the baya’h for his son

We read in Ahle Sunnah’s authoritative work Habeeb as Sayyar vol., p. 58:

“In 56 Hijri Mu’awiya arrived in Madina to get people to give baya’h to Yazeed, in this regard (the baya’h) Ayesha became upset with Mu’awiya and openly expressed her discontent. Mu’awiya then instructed an acquaintance to dig a hole, cover it up and place a chair on the top of it and invite Ayesha to the house for a dinner. No sooner had Ayesha settled down on the chair that she fell through the hole that had been dug. Mu’awiya order the hole to be covered, he then made his way from Madina to Makka”.

Ayesha is the mother of the believers and no momin would ever contemplate killing his mother. This legitimate baya’h that these Nasibi like singing about cannot be deemed to be the correct by anyone that has love for Ayesha in his heart. To secure this baya’h, Mu’awiya murdered the son and daughter of Abu Bakr, he killed Imam Hasan (a.s.), Sa’d bin Abi Waqqas and Abdur Rahman bin Khalid. Is there really any ground to deem an ijma that involved the murder of these prominent personalities? If this is still deemed ijma then we would like to counter this by stating that Usmaan was also killed by the ijma of the people, do you accept this ijma? Contradictions abound in Sunni Islam, really harsh ones that only those of the attitude ‘I was born into a Sunni family and will die a Sunni’ can accept.

### The family of Umar’s opposition towards the baya’h of Yazeed

We read in Fathul Bari, vol. 13, p. 80:

Nafee narrated that Mu’awiya wanted Ibn Umar to give Baya’h to Yazeed, but he (Ibn Umar) refused and said: ‘I don’t give baya’h to two princes’. Then Mu’awyia sent 100,000 Dirham to him and he (ibn Umar) received it. Then he (Mu’awiya) sent a man to him (Ibn Umar) and he (the man) said to him (ibn Umar): ‘What is stopping you from giving baya’h?’ He (ibn Umar) replied: ‘If this (money) is for that (baya’h) then my faith is of low price’. When Mu’awyia died Ibn Umar gave baya’h to Yazeed.

### The family of Usmaan’s opposition towards the baya’h of Yazeed and Mu’awiya’s use of bribery to secure compliance

We read in al-Imama was al-Siyasa, vol. 2, p. 184:

“At the time that baya’h was being given to Yazeed, Usmaan’s son Sa’eed approached Mu’awiya, and said ‘Commander of Syria, on what grounds are you making Yazeed your successor, and why are you ignoring me? After highlighting some of his own faults he [Sa’eed] then said ‘If you object to making me the khalifa then at least give something to me’. Mu’awiya said ‘I’ll give you the province of Khurasan. Sa’eed accepted and recited a eulogy ‘Even if may father Usmaan were alive he would not give me as much as Mu’awiya just did’.

We read in Tareekh ibn Asakir, vol. 6, p. 159 Zikr Saeed bin Usmaan:

“The people of Medina such as Saeed bin Usmaan disliked Mu’awiya. At the time of the baya’h to Yazeed, Sa’eed came to Mu’awiya, and Mu’awiya asked him ‘My brother’s son why did the people say what they say?’ Saeed replied by citing a Madian poem ‘Verily by Allah, Yazeed is not deserving of khilafat, after Mu’awiya our leader is Sa’eed’. Saeed then said ‘Which part of this poem offended you?’ Sa’eed then began to highlight his own faults saying ‘Sa’eed is mischievous and witty’. Mu’awiya sought to resolve the matter by sending him 100,000 dirhams and appointing him as Governor over Khurusan”.

Abu Sulaiman is chanting that his Imam Yazeed obtained the ijma of the Sahaba. The fact is, in the first instance the leading families of Abu Bakr, Umar and Usmaan wore opposed to the khilafat of Yazeed, and Mu’awiya secured their consent via political assassination, intimidation and bribery. Only the family of Ali (a.s.) refused to be bought, and around them rallied the last sincere companions, who were killed by Yazeed when they rallied to the side of Imam Husain (a.s.) at Karbala.

### Marwan’s opposition towards the baya’h of Yazeed and Mu’awiya’s use of bribery to secure his compliance

We read in al-Imama wa al-Siyasa Vol 1, p. 164, Baya’h Yazeed:

“At the time that bayya was given to Yazeed, Marwan became perturbed, he reached Damascus and began to outline his own personal merits such as his age [experience over Yazeed]. Mu’awiya then gave Marwan a 1000 dinar reward.”

That did the trick and shut him up; Marwan was also on board now! We read in Muruj al-Zahab, vol. 3, p. 38

“When baya’h was administered to Yazeed, Marwan became concerned and went to Damascus, and began to cite his own merits citing his age. Mu’awiya calmed him down and said ‘After my successor, the Khilafat shall go to you’. Yazeed then appointed Marwan as his successor and sent him back to Medina”

That’s right Yazeed; keep the khilafat in the family.

### The opposition of the Arab tribes to the baya’h of Yazeed

We read in Talkhees Ibn Asakir, vol. 5, p. 92 Zikr Khalida bin al-Mu’ammar:

“When the Commander of Syria [Mu’awiya] initiated his desire [to appoint Yazeed] the tribe of Rabia opposed this and the tribe of Abid al-Qays joined them (i.e. refused to give baya’h). The tribe of Barr bin Wa’l and the tribe of Khalid bin al-Mu’ammar also joined in opposition. When the tribe of Rabia refused to give baya’h other Arab tribes followed suit. This perplexed Mu’awiya immensely.”

### Nasibi Hajjaj bin Yusuf’s admission that he used violence to secure the khilafat for Yazeed

We read in Iqd al-Fareed, vol. 2, p. 20 that Hajjaj bin Yusuf once told Mu’awiya’s grandson Khalid bin Yazeed about the assassination of witnesses to Yazeed’s playboy lifestyle in Mu’awiya’s palace:

أنا ابن الأشياخ من ثَقِيف، والعقائل من قُريش، والذي ضَرب مائة ألفٍ بسيفه هذا، كُلّهم يَشْهد على أبيك بالكُفْر وشُرْب الخمر، حتى أَقروا أنه خليفة

“I am the son of the noble man of Thaqif and the noble women of Quraish, (I am the one) who killed one hundred thousand people by this sword, all of them deemed your father Kafir and alcoholic, until they recognized him as caliph”

We read similar thing in Tareekh Kamil:

وأنا الذي ضربت بسيفي هذا مائة ألف كلهم يشهد أن أباك كان يشرب الخمر ويضمر الكفر

“I killed one hundred thousand people with this sword, as they deemed your father [Yazeed] to be a kafir and drunkard”

We read in Semt al-Nujum al-Awali by al-Esami, vol. 2, p. 134:

ولقد ضربت بسيفي هذا أكثر من مائة ألف، كلهم يشهد أنك وأباك وجدك من أهل النار

“I killed more than one hundred thousand people with this sword, as they deemed that you, your father and your grand father are in the hell”

Is this how this ijma was achieved – through the slaughtering of opponents and witnesses? Is this the ‘legitimate’ method via which the people happily gave baya’h to Yazeed? If the people had been silenced through such methods, it does not in any way mean that they deemed Yazeed’s khilafat to be rightful. When they saw that Yazeed was not even prepared to spare the life of the grandson of Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) they simply adopted taqiyyah through fear of death. Securing allegiance under the threat of death can never constitute ijma. We see a situation in which the whole Ummah was terrified of being killed by Mu’awiya’s de facto secret police unless they gave baya’h to Yazeed.

### Banu Hashim’s opposition to the baya’h of Yazeed was the reason for their genocide

We shall now quote directly from al-Imama wa al-Siyasa, p. 163:

“Mu’awiya sent a letter to Husain that stated ‘Banu Hashim, Salaamun Alaykum, accept Yazeed’s leadership and refrain from opposing me’.

Husain replied saying:

‘Mu’awiya your actions are those of a Zaalim [unjust and also sadistic, cruel person]. Shaytaan is working with you. You are shedding the blood of pious Muslims. You have declared Ziyad bin Sumayya [Abu Sufyan’s bastard son] to be your brother and he has turned your khilafat into an unjust one. It is clear from your actions that you are not from the Ummah of Muhammad, Allah (s.w.t.) shall never forgive you for appointing that youth [Yazeed] as a successor who plays with dogs [civil expression for bestiality] and drinks alcohol….’… Not a single member of Banu Hashim accepted Yazeed as Khalifah. Sa’d write to Mu’awiya and said the people of Medina had not accepted Yazeed as khalifah, and none of Banu Hashim have accepted Yazeed’s khilafat”.

### The opposition of Abdullah ibn Abbas towards the baya’h given to Yazeed

We are continuing from where we left off in al-Imama wa al-Siyasa, Mu’awaiya wrote to Abdullah ibn Abbas:

“Ibn Abbas, I hear that you are refusing to recognise Yazeed as my successor. I am within my rights to kill you to avenge Usmaan’s death since you were responsible for inciting people against him and I have no proof of your iman…when you receive this letter go the Mosque of the Prophet, curse the killers of Usmaan and give Yazeed baya’h by placing your hand into my governor’s hand. I have written this letter to warn you, and you know your heart better than I.

Ibn Abbas replied:

‘I am in receipt of your letter and I understand its contents. I don’t possess any proof of your iman, neither are you in the position to weigh the iman of others nor can we rely on your words. You are threatening to kill me, if you do, then I shall appear before the justice of Allah (s.w.t.) in such a manner that my blood shall speak out against you, and Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) shall also speak against you. Anyone that Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) speaks against shall never attain salvation. With regards to the allegation on the killing of Usmaan, his children are alive, what is refraining them from cursing the killers of Usmaan?’”

Ibn Qutaybah then records a letter from Mu’awiya to Banu Hashim that was sent to Ibn Jafar:

‘Up until now my view of you was a good one. I have now received information on some matter about you that I dislike. If you don’t accept my son’s right to rule, I shall pressure you and threaten you.”

Ibn Qutaybah records Ibn Jafar’s reply as follows:

“I received your letter; your intention is to force me to accept the khilafat of Yazeed. Well, we made you and your fathers accept Islam, and you only accepted out of desperation [i.e. Mu’awiya is a hypocrite who only ‘converted’ when he was beaten, and never embraced Islam in his heart]”.

Our Ahle Sunnah brothers have an aqeedah that there were four rightly guided khalifahs. They should know that the family of these four khalifahs all opposed the Khilafat of Yazeed.

### The opposition of the sons of Ashra Mubashura [the supposed 10 companions promised Paradise in Sunnidom] to the baya’h of Yazeed, Mu’awiya’s cursing them and advising Yazeed to kill them

We read in Iqd al-Fareed, vol. 2, p. 247 Baya’h Yazeed as follows:

“At the time that baya’h was administered to Yazeed, Mu’awiya asked Abdullah ibn Zubayr for his views on giving baya’h. Abdullah said ‘before rushing forward on this matter, you should think about the consequences carefully, to avoid embarrassment later. Mu’awiya then said ‘It seems that the deceptive fox has become somewhat brave in his old age’.

We read in Tareekh-e-Kaamil, vol. 3, p. 284 Zikr Baya’h Yazeed:

“Mu’awiya came to Medina at the time that baya’h was being given to Yazeed, he approached Abdullah Ibn Zubayr and said ‘Your welcome is not acceptable here. You are like a mole that keeps his head buried in a hole and wags his tail outside, it may be that the mole is captured and his back broken’. With that Mu’awiya told him to go away and he smacked his (ibn Zubayr’s) ride”.

In al-Bidayah, vol. 8, p. 115 under the topic of Muawiya’s death:

“Before his death Mu’awiya said to Yazeed, Ibn Zubayr won’t accept your reign. He will approach you like a lion. When he opposes you then rip him to shreds.”

Abdullah Ibn Zubayr is a great figure of Ahle Sunnah and they believe that he is a son of Ashura Mubashra (The ‘Heavenly Ten’ who seemed to be killing each other). Zubayr was also the grandson of Abu Bakr and nephew of Ayesha. For Ahle Sunnah it is indeed unfortunate that Mu’awiya had the audacity to disregard Ibn Zubayr’s close relationship to Abu Bakr, to the point that he even advocated killing this ‘esteemed’ personality.

### Threats of physical violence to secure the baya’h for Yazeed

In ‘Abu Hanifa ki Siyasi Zindagi’ [The political life of Abu Hainfa], p. 51 and al-Misra, vol. 2, p. 115 it is cited the way that Abdullah bin Umro bin Aas gave baya’h to Yazeed:

“When Ibn Sa’eed approached his door with firewood, and said ‘Give baya’h to Yazeed otherwise I shall set your home alight’, Abdullah then joined the majority by giving baya’h to Yazeed”.

Yes, burning people’s homes was a favourite threat from the khalifa to get people to see things their way. It didn’t work to get the Baya’h when Abu Bakr and Umar burned Ali (a.s.) and Fatima (a.s.)’s house, but it worked here and got the desired result!

### Mu’awiya’s use of threats to secure Yazeed’s khilafat

We read in al-Bidaya, vol. 7, p. 79 Zikr events of 54 Hijri

Five people rejected the baya’h to Yazeed.

1. Abdur Rahman bin Abu Bakr

2. Abdullah bin Umar

3. Abdullah bin Zubayr

4. Abdullah bin Abbas

4. Husain bin Ali

Mu’awiya then personally went to Medina, summoned all five and threatened them.”

We read in Tareekh-e-Kaamil, vol. 3, p. 455 Zikr baya’h Yazeed

“Five people rejected the baya’h of Yazeed. Mu’awiya approached Ayesha and said, ‘If these individuals don’t give baya’h to Yazeed then I will kill them’. Ayesha replied ‘I have also heard news that that you are threatening the Khalifah’s sons, in connection with the baya’h to Yazeed”.

We read in Tareekh Tabari, vol. 7, p. 177 Events of 56 Hijri

“Abdur Rahman bin Abu Bakr refrained from giving baya’h to Yazeed. Mu’awiya called him and said ‘You have the audacity to raise your hands and feet against me? By Allah I am thinking of having you killed’. Abdur Rahman said ‘By killing me, then your punishment shall be that Allah (s.w.t.) shall curse you in this world and throw you in Hell in the next”

We read in Nuzul al-Abrar, p. 89 Zikr baya’h Yazeed:

“When Mu’awiya made plans to make Yazeed the khalifah he consulted the people of Syria. He then made his way to Medina and Makka; to raise this matter they voiced their opposition. Mu’awiya then intimidated and threatened them”.

Just look at the way that Mu’awiya secured the Khilafat that Abu Sulaiman and Azam Tariq deem to be lawful. He threatened to kill the sons of the rightly guided khalifahs. If Yazeed were really worthy of Khilafat then the situation would not have reached a stage where Mu’awiya was issuing threats to kill people to secure baya’h!

### Mu’awiya’s withdrawal of stipends to Banu Hashim for their rejection of Yazeed

We read in al-Imama wa al-Siyasa, vol. 1, p. 173 Zikr Baya’h as follows:

“Mu’awiya sent stipends to the people of Medina he increased their amounts, with regards to Banu Hashim stipends were withdrawn as they had rejected the baya’h of Yazeed”

We read in Tareekh-e-Kaamil, vol. 3, p. 256:

“When Mu’awiya made preparations to return to Syria, Ibn Abbas complained ‘You have perpetuated injustice against us’. Mu’awiya replied ‘Your chief Husain bin Ali has not given baya’h”.

This was the legitimate baya’h; Mu’awiya was willing to apply economic sanctions as a bargaining chip for Yazeed’s baya’h! It was like the United Nations. When Sunni Muslims contemplate their khalifas they should know that their games were no different to those of America and Britain in the UN – acting holier-than-though, while slaughtering and getting away with it through legal loopholes. The problem with the Sunni khalifas is their sincerity. Neither is America sincere, nor was the khilafat sincere. This makes their protagonists pathetic.

### Mu’awiya adopted evil methods to secure the baya’h to Yazeed

We read in Tafseer Ruh al-Ma’ani, vol. 26, p. 73:

ولو نظروا في السير لعلموا كيف عقدت له البيعة وألزم بها ولقد فعل كل قبيح

“If people analyse history, they shall realise how he (Muawiyah) obtained Bayah and how he (Yazeed) complied others with it, he (Yazeed) did every evil deed”.

Mu’awiya used every means at his disposal to secure baya’h for his Nasibi son: bribery, threats, intimidation and killing. Despite this we have Nasibi such as Abu Sulaiman and Azam Tariq deeming his baya’h to be legitimate simply because he got it. This is no dissimilar to what goes on at the United Nations. The Sunni khilafat is one big legal loophole whereby the worst men are revered as saints. It is part of the Nasibi religion...one big sickening legal loophole. The integrity, the honesty, the TRUTH is with Shia Islam and the Twelve Shia Imams. Imam Husain (a.s.) refused to play ball with the American President of his time, the Sunni khalifa Yazeed, appointed like George Bush was through a legal loophole and through his father’s influence. Nawasibis condemn Imam Husain (a.s.). Real Muslims applaud him. The mentality of the Nasibis is that of southern redneckers in America – “What MY President (Khalifa) does is ALWAYS right. God bless America (Sunni Islam). How can WE be wrong? George Bush (Yazeed) is our leader. He’s as good as his father George Bush Snr. (Mu’awiya).” And just like George Bush Jr, Yazeed was the vile (but stupid) son of a cunning father. And just like Bush, he has the media (Nasibi scholars such as the Ansar site) feeding the masses his lies. Only difference is Mu’awiya and Yazeed, father and son, were several times worse even than the Bushes in the White House.

### Abu Sulaiman al-Nasibi’s claim that there was an ijma in Yazeed’s khilafat is an absolute lie

Advocate of Mu’awiya Ibn Hajr al-Makki in Thatheer al-Janaan, p. 109 Zikr Khalasa Jang Jamal states:

“The Sahaba were just, but on some occasions they would make such mistakes that were not becoming of the Sahaba. Such mistakes can be highlighted. For example Mu’awiya’s appointing his son as Khalifah was a mistake, his love for his son clouded his eyes. This love in effect made Mu’awiya blind, and his making Yazeed the khalifah was a mistake, may Allah (s.w.t.) forgive him….”

This is a polite way to say nepotism.

According to Ibn Hajr al-Makki, Mu’awiya was blinded by his love for his son Yazeed. Nasibis such as Abu Sulaiman and Azam Tariq are just as blind when they sing the praises of Yazeed and deem his khilafat to be legitimate.

The acknowledgement that this appointment was a mistake destroys the Nasibi notion that Yazeed’s khilafat had ijma and was hence lawful. Had there been ijma then there would have been no grounds to conclude that a mistake had taken place. Mu’awiya through his blind love of his fasiq / fajir son sought to secure his Khilafat via the State machinery of terrorism and bribery.

Another defender of Mu’awiya, Allamah Abdul Hai states in Mahmuwa Naqwi, vol. 2, p. 94 states:

At the time of the baya’h to Yazeed, Hazrat Husain and other Sahaba did not give baya’h. Those who did give baya’h were forced to do so; it was known that Yazeed was a fasiq and faajir.

This is further proof that people were pressured to give baya’h, thus meaning that Abu Sulaiman’s glowing curriculum vitae for Yazeed, namely that his khilafat had ijma, is a clear lie.

In Fatawa Azeezi, p. 227 al-Muhaddis Shah Abdul Aziz states as follows:

“People in Makka, Medina and Kufa were unhappy at filthy Yazeed being made heir apparent, and Imam Husain, Abdullah bin Umar, Abdullah bin Abbas, Abdullah bin Zubayr and other Sahaba did not give baya’h”.

Medina was the capital and heart of Islam where the family of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) and remaining companions lived. When the people of Madina rejected the khilafat of Yazeed then to all extent and purposes Nasibi Abu Sulaiman’s claim that Yazeed’s khilafat was legitimate on account of ijma is an absolute lie. It doesn’t get more clear cut than this.

In Shaheed Karbala, p. 11 Part 19 the Hanafi scholar Mufti Muhammad Shaafi writes:

“Yazeed’s personal lifestyle was such that many in the vast Ummah did not deem him to be the khalifah. The people (Sahaba) opposed this planning, many opposed it till their last breath, and the situation got to a point where residents of Medina, Kufa and Karbala were massacred.”

This author has also through his pen discredited the claim that Yazeed had attained ijma of the people.

We read in Takmeel al-Iman, p. 178 by Shah Abdul Haq Dehlavi:

“How could Yazeed be the Ameer when Imam Husain (a.s.) was present? How was it a duty to obtain ijma (in this circumstance) when the Sahaba and their children were present at that time and when they had already voiced their opposition to this order? They were aware that he was an enemy of Allah (s.w.t.), would drink, did not offer Salat, committed Zina (adultery), he could not even refrain from copulating with his Mahram relatives (incest – having sex with sisters, daughters etc.).”

This further destroys Nasibi Abu Sulaiman’s false claim that ijma constitutes legitimacy.

Shah Abdul Haqq also wrote in Ba Shabaath basnaath, p. 36 as follows:

“The reality is Yazeed was born in 25 or 26 Hijri, and just like his father public disdain was no bar on him attaining power”.

i.e. father and son displayed a trait peculiarly common to many notorious families, who want power at any cost, even human life.

Maulana Akbar Shah Abadi in Tareekh Islam, vol. 2, p. 56 stated:

“Mu’awiya’s securing baya’h for his son during his lifetime was a major mistake; this mistake was on account of his blind love for his son”.

We have faithfully relied on Sunni sources to prove that the claims of any Muhaddis that ijma was secured for Yazeed is an absolute lie.

### Mu’awiya’s securing support for Yazeed via his political rally in Makka

We have already given some examples with regards to Mu’awiya’s intimidation tactics to gain support for his son. At this point it would be fitting to take apart this romantic notion that Ansar.Org’s Abu Sulaiman had portrayed in his article on Mu’awiya:

Ansar.org states:

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.

Ha...ha...ha. What a bunch of lies for our readers to laugh at: What’s this...? ‘grandest companions’? We have proved that Mu’awiya killed or bribed them all! This is called whitewashing history...something very common in Sunni Islam. Sometimes the Nawasibis even rewrite history. Yes, it’s the Santa Claus fairy tales again in a different guise. That Pinocchio factor in Sunni Islam, like you have in today’s world leaders...they just lie. Abu Sulaiman must have a very rich plastic surgeon. What, how many nose jobs is it now? We would like to cite an example of this wonderful ‘consultation’ process that Mu’awiya adopted, and leave it to our readers to think whether this baya’h was really as popular as Abu Sulaiman would have us believe. We read in Tareekh-e-Kaamil, Zikr events of 56 Hijri, vol. 3, p. 257:

“In his efforts to secure baya’h for Yazeed, whilst in Makka Mu’awiya summoned the key members from the families of Abu Bakr, Umar, Banu Hashim and Ibn Zubayr to be brought to him. He then said to them all ‘I am about to make a speech and should any one of you interrupt me, this shall be the last thing that he shall say, his head shall be removed with this sword’. He then called an officer and said that he should position two soldiers next to each of these chiefs, ‘should they oppose what I say then strike off their heads’. The chieftains were then brought before the podium accompanied by the guards. Mu’awiya began to speak, he praised the chieftains and then said that these individuals ‘have expressed their pleasure at the baya’h given to Yazeed and have also given baya’h’, with that the speech was brought to an end. When these Chieftains left and the people asked them about the situation, they said ‘we have not given baya’h to Yazeed’. When they were asked why they had not spoken up, they replied, ‘we were under the threat of death’.

Nasibi ideology justifies such methods of despotic government. For them, obedience to the leader be that man lawful or not, is mandatory. We the Shia do not regard as true Khalifas men who broke the sacred rules by which leadership is bestowed. This is a cardinal difference between Shia and Sunni. The Sunnis believe that a man who fixes the elections and becomes leader must be obeyed, or even one who likes Mu’awiya murdered to do so. There is no other explanation other than this is as might is right, they believe, and all that counts is that man’s holding the leadership and the army. The Shia believes that the leader must be bestowed with leadership in an honest and halal fashion. We believe that one who is unlawfully appointed is not the lawful leader. The unlawful leader has no right to demand our obeisance. Unbiased men and women can decide on who is right, Shia or Sunni. It is as obvious as the difference between day and night. It is in this context that the case of Yazeed becomes an embarrassment for Sunnis. For their khalifa Yazeed denied that Prophet Muhammad (s.a.w.a.) was even a prophet, in al-Tabari stating that the Holy Qur’an was a fabrication. In the first year of his rule Yazeed slayed al-Imam Husain (a.s.), in the second year of his rule he put the people of Madina to the sword, and in the third year of his rule he burned the Holy Ka’aba. All three actions are in the Sunna of Shia and Sunni acts which condemn a man to hellfire. Yet by Sunni orthodoxy Yazeed must be obeyed, and those of the khalifa’s army who refused to slay Imam Husain (a.s.), slay the people of Madina, or burn the Holy Ka’aba, were transgressors!

Conscience does not exist in Sunni Islam when it comes to the relationship of client/citizen to leader. The notion of individual accountability for one’s actions is dummed down when it comes to obeying the leader. This strange and morally unacceptable position comes from the fact that men like Mu’awiya and Yazeed had scholars in their pockets, on their payroll, bribed like the men named above, to spin doctor Hadees that were falsely attributed to Prophet Muhammad (s.a.w.a.). Saheeh Bukhari notes Abu Hurayra being caught lying about the Hadees he would fabricate, yet the same Saheeh Bukhari, each word of which is Gospel and the truth for Sunnis, takes most of its Hadees from the same Abu Hurayra.

### Summary of these references

We have only selected a few highlights depicting the wonderful methods that Mu’awiya had adopted to secure his son’s position as Khilfat’ul Muslimeen. He employed the following tactics:

 Bribery, financial indictments and political positions

 Economic sanctions

 Physical intimidation

 Threats of violence

 State sponsored executions and state terrorism

 Poison administered by his secret police

It is ironic that the great Nasibi debater Abu Sulaiman in his pathetic defence of Mu’awiya (that we have refuted) made the comment:

Ansar.org states:

Mu’awiyah did not force people to give allegiance to his son Yazeed

Perhaps we are being a little naïve, but can we not construe his methods of sanctions, intimidation, violence and murder to secure this baya’h as evidence of coercion on his part? Or does this Nasibi have a different definition of the word ‘force’ to the rest of the human race?

We appeal to those with brain cells, is this the way that ijma is attained? Can we really extol the legitimacy of a Khalifah who comes to power under the shadow of such methods? Is this how you sell the Islamic concept of khilafat to non-Muslims?

# Chapter Three

## Was Yazeed’s khilafah rightful?

Abu Sulaiman al-Nasibi in his article on Mu’awiya had tirelessly sought to canvass for his Imam Yazeed’s right to rule by stating:

Ansar.org states:

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 Holy prophet (s.a.w.a.) him gave him the allegiance. Ibn `Umar was one of them.”[[6]](#footnote-6)

### The concept of ijma is null and void since Allah (s.w.t.)’s opposition to the baya’h to Yazeed can be proven from the Holy Qur’an

We read in Surah Baqarah verse 124 (Yusuf Ali transliteration):

“And remember that Abraham was tried by his Lord with certain commands, which he fulfilled: He said: “I will make thee an Imam to the Nations.” He pleaded: “And also (Imams) from my offspring!” He answered: “But My Promise is not within the reach of evil-doers.”

We will rely on the following classical Sunni tafseer’s to understand how the leading Sunni Ulema interpreted this verse.

1. Tafseer Khazan, vol. 1, p. 89

2. Ma’lam al-Tazeel, vol. 1, p. 89

3. Fathul Qadeer, vol. 1, p. 140

4. Tafseer Madarak al-Tazeel, vol. 1, p. 84

5. Tafseer Durre Mansoor, vol. 1, p. 118

6. Tafseer Jama al-Mubeen, vol. 1, p. 118

7. Tafseer Gharaib al-Qur’an, vol. 1, p. 439

8. Tafseer Ibn Kaseer, vol. 1, p. 167

9. Ahkam al-Qur’an, vol. 1, p. 69

10. Tafseer al-Kabeer, vol. 1, p. 494

In Tafseer Khazan, vol. 1, p. 89 we read as follows:

“Allah (s.w.t.) said to Ibrahim (a.s.) that we have made the condition of Imamate to be the same as that of Prophethood, that he who amongst your descendants is ظالم cannot attain it”.

The verse clearly guarantees Imamate to be administered, but NOT to those that are unjust. The Ahle Sunnah Ulema in their tafseers have defined ظالمون (pronoun of the noun ظالم) as كفر and فسق (transgression). Both of these traits were inherent in Abu Sulaiman’s Imam Yazeed ibn Mu’awiya.

### The opinions of Ahle Sunnah on the kufr and fisq of Yazeed

As evidence we are relying on the following texts of Ahle Sunnah:

1. Al-Bidayah wa al-Nihaya (Urdu), vol. 8, pp. 1146, 1147 & 1165

2. Siyar A’lam Al-Nubala, vol. 4, pp. 37-38

3. Al-Sawaaeq al-Mohreqa, p. 131

4. Tatheer al-Janaan, p. 115

5. Sharh Fiqh Akbar, p. 73

6. Fatawa Azeezi, p. 80 Zikr Yazeed

7. Nuzulul Abrar, p. 97 Zikr Yazeed

8. Yanaabee’ al-Mawaddah, vol. 2, p. 325 Part 60

9. Al-Nass al-Kaafiya, p. 120

10. Tareekh Ibn Khaldun, vol. 1, p. 179

11. Sharh Aqaid Nasfee, p. 113 Zikr Yazeed

12. Tareekh-e-Kaamil, vol. 3 pages, 152, 153 and 156 and 450 events of 52 Hijri

13. Al-Imama wa al-Siayasa, p. 165

14. Iqd al-Fareed, vol. 2, p. 258 Zikr Yazeed

15. Tareekh Abu al-Fida, vol. 1, p. 186 Zikr al-Khabar Mu’awiya

16. Al-Akbar al-Tawaal, p. 268 Zikr Yazeed

17. Tareekh Tabari, vol. 7, p. 146

18. Rasaael, p. 129 by Abu Bakr Jauzi

19. Maqatil Husain, p. 172 Ch 9

20. Tazkeratul Khawaas, p. 164

21. Shazraat al-Zahab, vol. 1, p. 69 events of 61 Hijri

22. Tareekh al-Kholafa, p. 204 Zikr Mu’awiya

23. Al-Khabar al-Awwal, p. 6,1 Zikr Hukumat Ibn Ziyad

24. Tareekh-e-Khamees, p. 300, Zikr Yazeed

25. Hayaat al-Haywaan, vol. 2, p. 196

26. Tareekh Islam, vol. 2, p. 356 events of 63 Hijri

27. Ahsan aur Meezan, vol. 5, p. 284

28. Tafseer Mazhari, vol. 5, p. 61 Surah Ibrahim, part 13

29. Muruj al-Zahab, vol. 3, p. 78 Zikr Yazeed

30. Tohfa Isna Ashari, p. 6 Chapter 1

31. Mataleb al-So’ul, vol. 2, p. 26 Zikr Husain

32. Noor al-Absaar, p. 139, Zikr Husain

33. Sharh Maqaasid, vol. 2, p. 309, Part 6

34. Al-Tabaqat al-Kabeer, vol. 5, p. 96

35. Mustadrak al-Hakim, vol. 3, p. 522

36. Tareekh Ibn Asakir, p. 275

37. Meezan al-Eatedaal, vol. 4, p. 440

38. Wafa al-Wafa, vol. 1, p. 127

39. Tabthaseer wa al-Sharaf, p. 265 Zikr Yazeed

40. Mujma al-Buldan, vol. 2, p. 253 Zikr Harra

41. Fathul Bari, vol. 13, p. 70 Zikr Yazeed

42. Irshad al-Sari, vol. 10, pp. 171 and 199 Baabul Fetan

43. Sirrush Shahadatayn, p. 26 Zikr Shahadat Imam Hasan

44. Minhaj al-Sunnah, p. 239 Zikr Yazeed

45. Takmeel al-Imaan, p. 178

46. Shaheed Karbala, pp. 11-12 by Mufti Muhammad Shaafi

47. Sharh Muwatta Imam Malik, vol. 5, p. 435 by Shaykh Muhammad Zakaria

48. Tareekh Milat, p. 55 Part 3 by Qazi Zaynul Abideen

49. Tareekh Islam, vol. 2, p. 56 by Akbar Najeeb Abadhi

50. Bahar Shariat, vol. 1, p. 76

51. Hidayaat al-Shi’a, vol. 1, p. 95 by Allamah Rasheed Ahmad Gangohi

52. Isthaklah al-Yazeed, p. 312 by Maulana Lal Shah Bukhari

53. Fitna Kharijee, vol. 1, p. 267 by Qazi Mazhar Husain

54. Maktabaat Shaykhul Islam, vol. 1, p. 267 by Maulana Husain Hamdani

55. Sharh Shifa, vol. 1, p. 694 by Mulla Ali Qari al-Hanafi

56. Siraj Muneer Sharh Jama Sagheer, vol. 3, p. 382

57. Hujjatul Baalegha, p. 507

58. Qasim al-Ulum, p. 221

59. Nabraas ala Sharh Aqaid, p. 553

61. Is’aaf al-Raaghebeen, p. 210

61. Yazeed bin Mu’awiya, p. 30 by Ibn Taimiyyah

62. Maktubaat, p. 203 by Qazi Sanaullah Panee Patee

63. Al Shabeeya, p. 60 by Barelvi

64. Al Mafooz, p. 114 Barelvi

65. Ahsaan Alwa, p. 52 by Barelvi

66. Ahkam Shariat, vol. 2, p. 88 Barelvi

67. Fatawi, vol. 5, p. 51 by AA Thanvi

68. Fatawa Rasheediya, vol. 1, p. 7

69. Shaykhul Islam by Muhammad Qaim Nanotavi, vol. 1, p. 258

70. Imam Pak aur Yazeed paleed, by M Shaafi, p. 33

71. Tabat Ibn Sa’d, p. 283 Zikr Ma’aqil bin Sanan

72. Mirqaat Sharh Mishkaat, vol. 1, p. 120

73. Umdatul Qaari, vol. 11, p. 334

74. Fatawa Azeezi, vol. 1, p. 21

75. Izalat al-Ghaneen, vol. 1, p. 368 by Maulana Haider Ali

76. Mataaleb al-So’ul, p. 26

77. Noor al-Absaar, p. 139

78. Neel al-Auwtar, vol. 7, p. 181 Zikr Jihad

79. Tahzeeb by Abu Shakur Shaami, p. 15

80. Al Samra, p. 317 by ibn Shareef Shaami

81. Mujmua al-Zadhaar, p. 241

82. Khilafat Mu’awiya, aur Yazeed, p. 378 Zikr Yazeed

83. Muruj al-Nubuwat, vol. 1, p. 126

84. Ahkam al-Qur’an, vol. 3, p. 119

85. Tareekh Ibn Asakir, vol. 5, p. 107

86. Tafseer Ruh al-Ma’ani, p. 72 Surah Muhammad (s.a.w.a.)

### The Nasibi author’s insistence that Yazeed was not a drunkard

Before we unveil the evil character of Yazeed, let us first cite the daring claim of Nasibi author:

Ansar.org stated:

It is also a lie that Yazeed was an alcohol drinking person.

The author has then used the alleged comments of Muhammad bin al-Hanafiyah to prove that Yazeed was a pious person. We will discuss the alleged tradition separately in another chapter. Let us begin the actual ‘appraisal’ of Yazeed we find in Sunni books:

### Ibn Kaseer’s comments on Yazeed

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 Kaseer proving that he was indeed a drunkard. Ibn Kaseer is the Wahhabi’s biggest historian and a student of Ibn Taymiyya himself. As far as Wahhabis are concerned, his words are written in gold. Yet Ibn Kaseer himself writes in ‘Al-Bidayah’, vol. 8, p. 1169 “Zikr 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”.[[7]](#footnote-7)

Moreover we read:

قلت: يزيد بن معاوية أكثر ما نقم عليه في عمله شرب الخمر، وإتيان بعض الفواحش

I say: The worst of offences amongst the bad deeds of Yazeed ibn Mauwiya are drinking alcohol and engaging in some immoral acts’.

### Munzar bin Zubayr’s comments on Yazeed

Imam Ibn Aseer Jazri records the following testimony of Munzar bin Zubayr in ‘Tareekh al-Kamil’, vol. 3, p. 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’[[8]](#footnote-8)

### Imam Zahabi’s narration and verdict on Yazeed ‘the drunkard’

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

In “Siyar A’lam Al-Nubala”, vol. 4, p. 37, Zahabi 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 Zahabi then gave his own verdict regarding Yazeed that has also been recorded by Allamah Ibn al-Emaad al-Hanbali (d. 1089 A.H.) in “Shajarat al-Zahab”, vol. 1, p. 69:

وقال الذهبي فيه كان ناصبياً فظاً غليظاً يتناول المسكر ويفعل المنكر افتتح دولته بقتل الحسين وختمها بوقعة الحرة فمقته الناس ولم يبارك في عمره

“Al-Zahabi said about him (Yazeed) that he was Nasibi, rude, harsh, would drink alcohol and committed evil deeds. He commenced his reign by killing al-Husain and concluded it with the battle of al-Harrah, so the people hated him and Allah (s.w.t.) didn’t bless his life”

Moreover, in his other authority work ‘Tareekh Islam’, vol. 5, p. 30, Imam Zahabi states:

قلت: ولما فعل يزيد بأهل المدينة ما فعل، وقتل الحسين وإخوته وآله، وشرب يزيد الخمر، وارتكب أشياء منكرة، بغضه الناس، وخرج عليه غير واحد، ولم يبارك الله في عمره، فخرج عليه أبو بلال مرداس بن أدية الحنظلي

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

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

Allamah Samhodi in his book Wafa al-Wafa records the following from Imam Ibn Jauzi:

“After the incident of Karbala, Yazeed appointed his cousin Usmaan bin Muhammad bin Abu Sufyan as Governor of Madina and asked him to secure Bayah his (Yazeed’s) Bayah from the people of Madina. He (Usmaan) came to Madina and prepared a delegation and sent it to visit Yazeed so that it can give Bayah to Yazeed. Yazeed gave them gifts but despite this, when the delegation returned, it expressed negative things about Yazeed and said: ‘We have returned having visited a man who has no religion, he drinks alcohol, plays instruments, keeps the company of singers and dogs [civil word for bestiality], we declare that we have broken our allegiance to him...’ Abdullah bin Abi Umro bin Hafs Makhzumi commented: ‘Although Yazeed gave me gifts and other benefits but the reality is this man is an enemy of Allah (s.w.t.) and a drunkard. I shall separate myself from him in the same way that I remove my turban from my head’ and having said that he removed his turban from his head and a person said: ‘I come out from his Bayah in the way that I come out from this shoe of mine’ then all people began to do this to the extent that there became a pile of turbans and shoes”

Ibn Hajr’s comments on Yazeed

In his book written against the Shi’a namely ‘Sawaaeq al-Mohreqa’, p. 221, Ibn Hajr Makki al-Haysami sets out the Sunni position on Yazeed:

One group that includes Ibn Jauzi deem Yazeed a kafir, another group says that he was not a kafir, this is a matter of dispute in the Ummah and the majority of Ahle 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 (s.w.t.) would send down stones on us, Yazeed considered nikah (marriage) with mothers, daughters and sisters to be permissible, drank alcohol and abandoned prayers’.

Ibn Hajr al-Makki like Abu Sulaiman and Azam Tariq was a major adherent of Mu’awiya, and in fact wrote a book in honour of Mu’awiya. Yet even he deemed Yazeed to be a fasiq. The Ulema of Ahle Sunnah are united that Yazeed was a fasiq. Nasibis such as Abu Sulaiman and Azam Tariq of course beg to differ as they support anyone who hates Ahlul bayt, even if that person uses his penis to penetrate the anuses of young boys and dogs, and the vaginas of his sisters and mother.

### A Sahabi’s testimony that Yazeed was an incestuous drunkard

We read the following testimony of the Sahabi Maqal bin Sinan in al-Mustadrak al-Hakim, vol. 3, p. 522:

هو رجل يشرب الخمر ويزني بالحرم

“…he is a man who drinks alcohol and performs adultery with Mahram (blood relatives)”

### al Muhaddis Shah Abdul Aziz’s comments on Yazeed

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 [l.a.] Maulana Mahmood Abbasi. During the course of the argument, Allamah Okarvi quoted the famed anti-Shia scholar and the beloved of Ahle Sunnah Muhaddis Shah Abdul Aziz Dehlawi who wrote the following about Yazeed:

“Verily, Imam Husain (a.s.) rejected the proposal to give bayah to Yazeed because he was Fasiq, drunkard and an oppressor and Husain went Makkah.”[[9]](#footnote-9)

### Qazi Sanaullah’s comments on Yazeed’s kufr

We read in Tafseer Mazhari:

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 are 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 whilst the place for the sunset (alcohol) is my mouth, thus, if one day alcohol was made Haram in Ahmad’s religion, then O addressee, just take it according to the religion of Masih ibn Mariam (i.e. deem it Halal)’[[10]](#footnote-10)

At another place (under the commentary of 24:55), Qazi Sanaullah wrote:

“It is possible that this verse refers to Yazeed bin Muawiyah. Yazeed had martyred the grandson of Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) and his companions, those companions were actually the members of the Prophet’s family. He disgraced the honour of the Prophet (s.a.w.a.) and then became proud of it and stated: ‘Today, vengeance 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 Harrah, and he dishonoured 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 [r.a.] the grandson of the first caliph Abu Bakr [r.a.]. He did such indecent things that he finally denounced the religion of Allah and made alcohol Halal that had been made Haram by Allah”[[11]](#footnote-11)

### Mu’awiya also knew that Yazeed drank alcohol and committed other sins

Ibn Kaseer in his authority work ‘Al-Bidayah wa al-Nihaya’ (Urdu) Vol 8, p. 1156 “Zikr Yazeed bin Muawiya” testifies that Muawiyah also knew of Yazeed’s drinking and in this regard he advised him through poetry to hide such activities away from the public glare. Ibn Kaseer 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 treaty you badly’. He then stated: ‘O my son, let me recite to you some couplets, try to learn manners from these couplets and memorise them by heart’. Thus, Muawiyah recited:

“Stay all the day long in the pursuance 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, whilst the wish of a stupid person is of a visible nature.”[[12]](#footnote-12)

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 Kaseer’s narration wherein Ibn Hanafiyya said he had never seen Yazeed drinking alcohol. In the same book Ibn Kaseer 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?

### Yazeed’s rule was dogged by alcoholism and transgression

We read in Muruj al-Zahab:

“Due to his hatred of Allah (s.w.t.) Yazeed openly drank alcohol. In his deeds he followed the Seerah of Pharoah, but Pharoah was more just to his own subjects.”

In Wafyat al-Ayan, vol. 3, p. 287 popularly known as Tareekh Ibn Khalkan we read the following testimony of the great Sunni scholar Ibn Khalkan:

وهو اللاعب بالنرد والمتصيد بالفهود ومدمن الخمر، وشعره في الخمر معلوم

“Yazeed would hunt with cheetahs play chess and drink alcohol and had famous poems about alcohol”.

We read the following testimony of Hasan al-Basri in Tareekh Abul Fida, vol. 1, p. 288:

يزيد وكان سكيراً خميراً يلبس الحرير ويضرب بالطنابير

“Yazeed drank alcohol, wore silk and played the tambourine”.

We read in Hayaat al-Haywaan:

وهو المتصيد بالفهد واللاعب بالنرد ومدمن الخمر

“Yazeed would hunt with cheetahs, play chess and drink alcohol”.

### People opposed Yazeed due to his atrocious deeds

We read in Tareekh-e-Khamees:

ثم أن اكابر أهل المدينة نقضوا بيعة يزيد لسوء سيرته ويشرب الخمر

“The prominent people of Medina broke the baya’h to Yazeed on account of his bad character and drinking alcohol”

### Any narrations by Yazeed are to be rejected

In Ahsan aur Meezan:

“Yazeed was a fasiq, faajir; we cannot rely on his narrations.”

Yazeed was such a fasiq that not a single hadees of his can be accepted, when this is the case then his khilafat cannot be accepted either.

### Shah Abdul Haqq Dehlavis comments on impure Yazeed the drunkard

In Takmeel al-Iman, p. 97 Shah Abdul Haqq Dehlavi gives Yazeed a number of titles such as impure, fasiq and drunkard.

### It is not permissible to say Yazeed “(r)”

In Fatawa Abdul Hai, the author states after condemning Yazeed,

“…one should not say Yazeed radhina or rahmathullah”.

### Barelvi Ulema have deemed Yazeed a fasiq

Ahmad Reza Barelvi in Irfan al-Shariat stated:

“There is an agreement amongst the Ahle Sunnah that he was a fasiq and a fajir, the dispute is over whether he was a kaafir”.

Shariat Muhammad Majid Ali Shakir stated in Badh Shariat:

“Some say ‘Why should we discuss such a thing since he [Yazeed] was a King and he [Husain] was also a King’ – one who makes such comments {refusing to hold opinion on Yazeed and Imam Husain (a.s.)] is accursed, a Kharijee, Nasibi and hell bound. The dispute is over whether he [Yazeed] was a kaafir. The madhab of Abu Hanifa stipulates that he was a fasiq and fajir, nor was he a kaafir or a Muslim”.

### Deobandi Ulema have deemed Yazeed to be a fasiq

Whilst Azam Tariq claims to reflect the views of the Deobandi Sect, it is worthy to note that the founder of Dar al-Ulum Deoband, Muhammad Qasim Nanuthee stated in Qasim al-Ulum:

“Yazeed was a fasiq; he was irregular in Salat, committed Bidah and was Chief of the Nasibi”.

Ashraf Ali Thanvi in Fatawi stated:

“Yazeed was a fasiq; there are different levels of fisq”.

Rasheed Ahmad Gangohi in Fatawa said:

“One should refrain from calling Yazeed a kaafir, but there is no objection to referring to him as a fasiq”.

In Shaheed al-Karbala aur Yazeed, Deobandi scholar Muhammad Tayyib stated:

“Yazeed was a fasiq and a fajir and there is absolute unanimity amongst the scholars on this point”.

### The Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.)’s prophecy that Yazeed would destroy the religion

We read in Majma al-Zawaid, vol. 5, p. 435:

Abu Ubaida al-Jarah narrated that Allah’s messenger (s.a.w.a.) said:

‘My nation’s matter will remain on justice until the first person who shall spoil it, who will be a man belonging to the Bani Umaya namely Yazeed.’

Shaykh Ahmed Aziz in his authority work Siraj al-Munir Sharah Jami al-Saghir, vol., p. elaborated:

يزيد بن معاوية واضرابه من احداث ملوك بني أمية فقد كان منهم ما كان من قتل أهل أهل البيت

Yazeed bin Mu’awyia and those is similar to him from the young rulers of Bani Umaya killed the progeny of Ahlul bayt

Mulla Ali Qari in Sharh Shifa commenting on hadees that the Deen will be harmed by young men states:

“The destruction of the Deen at the hands of a young man refers to Yazeed bin Mu’awiya who sent Muslim bin Uqba to pillage Madina”

Mulla Ali Qari in Mirqat Sharah Mishkaat, commenting on hadees that the Deen will be harmed by young men states:

“It refers to those who came after the rightly guided caliphs such as Yazeed bin Muawiyah and Abdul Malik bin Marwan”

The amount of condemnation that the Sunni Ulema have vented against Yazeed is astounding. The amount of material that we have presented should convince our readers that the appraisals that these Nasibi present are lies, and the Azam Tariq’s and Abu Sulaiman’s of this world would never be able to reply to these references.

### Yazeed was a homosexual

Imam Zahabi records the following words from the sermon of Abdul Malik bin Marwan in ‘Tarkeeh Islam’, vol. 1, p. 634:

ولست بالخليفة المستضعف – يعني عثمان – ولا الخليفة المداهن – يعني معاوية – ولا الخليفة المأبون – يعني يزيد

“I am not weak like Usmaan and I am not cunning like Mu’awiya and I am not a homosexual like Yazeed”

The tradition is also recorded in old transcripts of ‘Al-Bidayah wa al-Nihayah’ whilst in the present transcripts available on the internet, the filthy Nawasib have committed Tahreef but substituting the word Ma’bun (homosexual) with Ma’un (secure).

We would ask actual Sunnis to go and ask your imams whether a man that does such a thing is a fasiq (transgressor) or not? Can he be an Imam or not? We congratulate Azam Tariq the pride of Lut, who is advocating the piety of Yazeed, and deeming him to be a legitimate Imam. Perhaps the late Azam Tariq was himself a closet homosexual.

### Yazeed used to copulate with his mother and sisters

Here we shall cite the following authentic Sunni sources:

1. Tabaqat al-Kabeera, vol. 5, p. 66 Zikr Abdullah bin Hanzala and, vol. 4, p. 283

2. Tareekhul Kholafa, (Urdu), p. 210 Zikr Yazeed

3. Sawaaeq al-Mohreqah, p. 132 Zikr Yazeed

4. Mustadrak al-Hakim, vol., p. 522

5. Al Isaba, vol. 3, p. 469

6. Yanaabee’ al-Mawaddah, p. 326

7. Tareekh Ibn Asakir, vol. 7, p. 275

8. Fatawi Abdul Hai, p. 79

9. Tareekh al-Islam, vol. 2, p. 356

10. Aujaz al-Masalaik Sharh Muwatta Imam Malik, p. 435

We read in Tabaqat:

“Abdullah bin Hanzala the Sahaba stated ‘By Allah we opposed Yazeed at the point when we feared that stones would reign down on us from the skies. He was a fasiq who copulated with his mother, sister and daughters, who drank alcohol and did not offer Salat”

Allamah Jalaluddin Suyuti writes in Tareekhul Kholafa:

“Waqidi has narrated from Abdullah bin Hinzala al-Ghaseel: ‘We prepared to attack Yazeed at the time when we were sure that stones would come from sky because people were performing Nikah with their mothers, sisters and daughters. They were drinking alcohol and have left prayers’.”[[13]](#footnote-13)

Imam Zahabi has recorded the statement of Abdullah bin Hinzala al-Ghaseel in the following manner:

فقال : يا قوم والله ما خرجنا حتى خفنا أن نرجم من السماء ، رجل ينكح أمهات الأولاد والبنات والأخوات

“O people, we better start a movement to oppose Yazeed otherwise stones may reign down on us because he is a man who performs zina with slave women, daughters and sisters.”

We read the following testimony of the Sahabi Maqal bin Sinan in al-Mustadrak al-Hakim, vol. 3, p. 522:

هو رجل يشرب الخمر ويزني بالحرم

“…he is a man who drinks alcohol and performs adultery with Mahram”

Now we have these Nasibi such as Afriki and Sipaa-e-Sahaba are praising a man who was so filthy he indulged in incest to satisfy his lusts, and these Nasibi deem him to be the lawful successor to Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.).

### Yazeed bin Mu’awiya’s rejection of the Holy Qur’an

We shall rely on the following reputable books of Ahle Sunnah:

1. Al-Bidayah wa al-Nihayah, vol. 8, p. 204 Zikr Ras al-Husain

2. Minhaj al-Sunnah, vol. 2, p. 249 Dkikr Yazeed

3. Sharh Fiqh Akbar, p. 73 Zikr Yazeed

4. Sharh Tafseer Mazhari, vol. 5, p. 21 Surah Ibrahim

5. Shadraat al-Dhahab, p. 69 Zikr

6. Maqatail Husain, vol. 2, p. 58 Zikr

7. Tazkeratul Khawaas, p. 148

8. Tareekh Tabari, vol. 11, pp. 21-23 Zikr 284 Hijri

9. Tafseer Ruh al-Ma’ani (commentary of Surah Muhammad)

We are citing Tadhkira, Maqatil and Shadraat al-Dhahab. This is also found in the Arabic (non-Leiden) version of the History of Al-Tabari:

When the head of Imam Husain (a.s.), the grandson of the Holy prophet (s.a.w.a.), was presented before Yazeed he recited the couplets of the kaafir Zubayri:

“Banu Hashim staged a play for Kingdom there was no news from the skies nether was there any revelation”

We have proven from the sources of Ahle Sunnah that Yazeed rejected the concept of revelation; rather he deemed all this a stage for power by Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.). This proves that Yazeed was a kaafir, so what right do these Nasibi have to extol Yazeed, deem him to the rightful Khalifah over the Muslims and Ameer’ul Momineen?

In Tafseer Ruh al-Ma’ani it is stated clearly:

“Yazeed the impure denied the Prophethood of Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.). The treatment that he meted out to the people of Makka, Medina and the family of the Prophet proves that he was a kaafir”.

The problem is Sunni Islam accepts as a khalifa (literally ‘successor’ to the Prophet (s.a.w.a.)) a man who clearly did not believe in the Qur’an and instead believed the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) was a fraud. This is part of Sunni doctrine. It is unacceptably and obviously FLAWED, both logically and also intuitively. So what can we make of this religion? Such ridiculous dogmas exist because the whole structure is based on a fundamental lie and injustice: the usurpation of the true Khilafat from Ali (a.s.) which was his divinely sanctioned prerogative, and instead the institution of Abu Bakr as khalifa. So the lies became bigger and bigger as time went on, to the degree that in the 21st century Yazeed is even hailed as a Santa-Saint by the modern-day Nasibi camp amongst Sunnis.

### Yazeed bin Mu’awiya’s declaration on the pulpit of the khalifa that Yazeed was not worthy of Khilafah

We read in Sawaaeq, p. 134 about what the khalifa succeeding Yazeed said in his inaugural address as khalifa:

“When Yazeed’s son came to power he gave the speech: ‘Khilafat is from Allah (s.w.t.). My grand father Mu’awiya bin Abu Sufyan fought for khilafat against that individual who was more entitled to it, that being Ali. He [Mu’awiya] performed actions that you are all aware of, and he is suffering in his grave for that. Then my father Yazeed became the khalifah even though he was not deserving of khilafat. He fought the grandson of Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) [Imam Husain (a.s.)] and is suffering in the grave on account of his sins.’ Mu’awiya bin Yazeed then proceeded to cry, ‘It is a terrible thing that we are fully aware of Yazeed’s bad deeds: he slaughtered the family of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.), he deemed alcohol halal, and set fire to the Holy Ka’aba. I don’t need this khilafat, you deal with it”

This is what a son said about his father and grandfather. Not surprisingly, this lone voice of conscience amongst the Umayyads didn’t last long in power, and was rapidly succeeded by the power-hungry branch of the Umayyads led by Marwan, whose devious and vile character are vouched for in the references at the start of this article. Here one khalifa is condemning his two predecessors. Yet Sunni Islam is content to believe that they were one happy family.

Similarly in Tareekh-e-Khamees, vol. 2, p. 301, “Zikr Mu’awiya the second” and Hayaat al-Haywan, vol. 1, p. 88 “Zikr al-Awaaz” we read that Mu’awiya the second stated in a sermon:

“My father Yazeed did not deserve to attain the position as khalifah over the Prophet’s Ummah”.

Yazeed bin Mu’awiya was such a fasiq that his own son sought to distance himself from his reign and publicly declared that Yazeed was not entitled to be khalifah on account of his fasiq actions. These are the comments of Yazeed’s son. Yet despite the testimony of the countless scholars we have cited, the countless companions, and above all, Al-Imam Husain (a.s.) himself, and here Yazeed’s own son, the 21st century Nasibis of Ansar.org and Sipah-e-Sahaba think they know better.

### Mu’awiya was fully aware of Yazeed’s transgression

As evidence we shall rely on the following texts of Ahle Sunnah:

1. Al-Bidayah wa al-Nihaya (Urdu), vol. 8, p. 1156 ‘Zikr Yazeed’

2. Tareekh Ibn Khaldun, p. 176 Zikr Baya’h

3. Thatheer al-Janaan, p. 52

4. Nasa al-Kaafiya, p. 38

5. Tazkeratul Khawaas, p. 161 Zikr Yazeed

6. Serra al-Alam’an naba, vol. 3, p. 105

7. Tareekh Tabari, vol. 2, p. 174 Events of 56 Hijri

We read in Al-Bidayah wa al-Nihaya (urdu) Vol 8, p. 1156 “Zikr Yazeed bin Muawiyah”:

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 treaty 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 pursual 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.”[[14]](#footnote-14)

The advocate of Mu’awiya then seeks to defend this action by stating:

“Mu’awiya’s advice that Yazeed hide his acts is in accordance with Hadees wherein Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) said that one should seek to cover up the faults of others”.

This proves that Mu’awiya was fully aware of his son’s disgraceful acts.

We also read in al-Bidaya, vol. 8, p. 79:

وكتب معاوية إلى زياد يستشيره في ذلك ، فكره زياد ذلك لما يعلم من لعب يزيد وإقباله على اللعب والصيد

“Mu’awiya wrote to his [bastard] brother Ziyad to seek advice on securing the baya’h for Yazeed. Ziyad was not receptive of this since he knew that he [Yazeed] was fond of hunting and had done bad deeds.”

Yazeed’s own uncle was aware of his bad acts. Hence to suggest that his dear father had no idea that his son possessed bad traits is an utter lie; after all he was the King over the nation who kept news of all developments throughout his empire. Is it believable he had no idea of the deeds of his own son? It is a testament to the truth that Mu’awiya’s own advocate Ibn Kaseer highlights the fact that Mu’awiya knew of his son’s faults.

### Mu’awiya’s motive behind appointing his Fasiq son as Khalifah

Abu Sulaiman al-Nasibi in his article on Mu’awiya sought to apply conjecture, seeking to defend Mu’awiya’s appointment of his son by stating:

Ansar.org states:

“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.

These Nawasib dig up the most bizarre excuses – the reason Mu’awiya made Yazeed his son was not for these namby-pamby ‘maybe’ reasons. It’s because all kings want to make their sons the king after them. It’s called monarchy and nepotism. It’s why all the scholars say Mu’awiya made Yazeed khalifa. Do the Ansar team live on another planet?

It is a fickle effort to cover up Yazeed’s Nasibi father’s sin. If we really want to know Mu’awiya’s motive, why use guesswork when we have his own testimony. We thus read in Al-Bidayah, vol. 8, p. 118 that prior to his death, Mu’awiya admitted his appointment of his son was based on his love for him, nothing else.

“If it was not my love for Yazeed, I would have known the path of guidance.”

This proves that Mu’awiya’s motive to appoint Yazeed was not to prevent affliction as this Nasibi claims, rather his aim was only based on the love of his son and his regret that he was blinded by love is proof that Mu’awiya was fully aware that his son was a transgressor who had no right to be deemed as the Guide over Muslims. Here Mu’awiya confesses to being misguided – so the Nasibi cult reveres and follows an imam who admits he is misguided!

In connection with these words of Mu’awiya, his great advocate Ibn Hajr al-Makki in Thatheer al-Janaan, p. 52 stated:

“Mu’awiya’s saying had it not been my love for Yazeed in my heart, although I know the path of guidance, serves as testimony against him [Mu’awiya]. He placed his fasiq son over the people. Mu’awiya’s love for his son destroyed his thinking and political astuteness. Mu’awiya’s allowing his personal feelings / love to decide how the Deen should be led, to the point that his son’s transgressions [which were beyond the pale of the Sharia and merited the death penalty] were an irrelevancy constitutes a major sin for which he shall be called to answer for on the Day of Judgement”.

We read in Siyar Alam al-Nubla:

“Mu’awiya said to his son, ‘The thing that I fear most of all is my act of making you my successor”.

Mu’awiya indulged in all manner of act to secure a smooth transition of power for his son: threats, intimidation, and he even had Imam Hasan (a.s.) martyred by poison. Such methods to make his fasiq son Khalifah over the Muslims are definitely a major sin.

### The Holy Qur’an deems singing Raag (Scales) to be a major sin

We know that Yazeed was fond of listening to music and hired girls for the same purpose. Advocate of Mu’awiya, Ibn Khaldun, stated in Tareekh Ibn Khaldun:

حدث في يزيد من الفسق أيام خلافته فإياك أن تظن بمعاوية رضي الله عنه أنه علم ذلك من يزيد فإنه أعدل من ذلك وأفضل

“Yazeed showed Fisq during his Caliphate, therefore don’t think that Mu’awiya [r.a.] knew that about Yazeed (and remained silent), surely he is just, nay he (Mu’awiya) used to make him (Yazeed) refrain from listening to songs during his (Mu’awiya’s) life time.”

Now the method Muawiyah adopted to make his Fasiq son refrain from singing and other sins has already been cited earlier from Al-Bidayah wa al-Nihaya (Urdu) Vol 8, p. 1156 according to which Muawiyah asked Yazeed to refrain from all the sins during daylight and conduct them under the protection of nights! As for the forbiddance of listening music, we read in Surah Luqman verse 6 (Yusuf Ali transliteration):

But there are among men those who purchase idle tales (Lahv Al-Hadees) without knowledge (or meaning) to mislead (men) from the Path of Allah and throw ridicule (on the Path): for such there will be a humiliating Penalty.

As evidence we shall advance the following texts of Ahle Sunnah that have commented on this verse:

1. Tafseer Mazhari, vol. 7, p. 260 al-Luqman verse 6

2. Tafseer Madarik, vol. 3, p. 25 Part 21

3. Tafseer Ibn Kaseer, p. 221 al-Luqman verse 6

4. Tafseer Fat’hul Qadeer, vol. 4, p. 226

5. Tafseer Janan, vol. 4, p. 177 al-Luqman verse 6

6. Tafseer Rooh al-Ma’ani, p. 67 Part 21 al-Luqman verse 26

7. Tafseer Tabari, p. 39

8. Tafseer Qurtubbi, commentary of verse 6 al-Luqman

In Tafseer Mazhari we read:

“The scholars have deemed Raag (singing scales) to be haraam on the basis of this verse.

We read in Tafseer Ibn Kaseer:

Ibn Masud commented about the Ayah: (And of mankind is he who purchases Lahv Al-Hadees to mislead (men) from the path of Allah), “This – by Allah – refers to singing.’’

Imam of the Salafies Ibn Qayim records in Eghasat al-Lahfan, vol. 1, p. 241:

“You never find some one that cares about songs and music save those who are misguided from the right path”

### Mu’awiya’s own admission that Yazeed did not deserve to be khalifa

For this section we shall rely on the following texts of Ahle Sunnah:

1. Al-Bidaya wa al-Nihaya, vol. 8, p. 118

2. Tatheer al-Janan, p. 52

3. Nasa al-Kaafiya, p. 38

4. Tazkerahtul Khawaas, p. 161 Zikr Yazeed

5. Syiar al-alam al-Naba, vol. 3, p. 105

In al-Bidayah, we read the following about Muawiyah:

وقد أصابته لوقة في آخر عمره، فكان يستر وجهه ويقول: رحم الله عبدا دعا لي بالعافية، فقد رميت في أحسني وما يبدو مني ولولا هواي في يزيد لابصرت رشدي

In the end of his life, he got a blot (on his face) and would cover his face and say: ‘May Allah’s mercy be upon the one who invocates for my health, I have been blotted on my best body part had it not been my love for Yazeed, I would have known the path of guidance.’

Blinded by his love for his son, he was willing to impose his demonic fasiq son as the Khalifah over the Muslims. How considerate! Clearly Mu’awiya’s admission proves that even he did not feel Yazeed was deserving of khilafat. Nasibi Warrior Abu Sulaiman asserts the imposition was to save fitnah, but this is a lie. Mu’awiya never made such a claim, rather he stated that he made his fasiq son the Khalifah on account of his blind love for him i.e. a father’s natural love for his son. No doubt Nasibis will claim that Mu’awiya made a mistake in ijtihaad in this respect, but they should know that one of the conditions for a mujtahid to give rulings is that he has to be adil (just), and Mu’awiya was not adil, as we have proven in our article on Mu’awiya – the Ulema of Ahle Sunnah have themselves defined Mu’awiya as a transgressor.

In ‘Siyar Alam al-Nubla’ we read:

إن معاوية قال ليزيد: إن أخوف ما أخافه شئ عملته في أمرك

Mu’awyia said to Yazeed: ‘The thing that I fear most is the fact that I have imposed you (as my successor)’.

Deobandi scholar Aadhi Zaynul Abdideen in Tareekh Milat, p. 55 states

“Mu’awiya was aware of the situation, having witnessed Yazeed’s acts he deemed him to be unacceptable”.

This is more proof that Mu’awiya knew of his son’s demonic personality and yet he still sought to appoint him as khalifah over the Muslims. Mu’awiya’s regret was a shame, the reality is he had a hatred for Ahlulbait (a.s.) in his heart and wanted to keep them out of power. We would like to ask these Nasibi: you assert that khilafat is not an exclusive right of the Ahlulbait (a.s.). Could you kindly tell us which merits were missing in the members of Ahlulbait (a.s.) but were present in the Banu Ummayya Clan? Did Allah (s.w.t.) keep traits of knowledge, sense, guidance away from the Ahlulbait (a.s.), and prefer to give worldly reign to the cursed tree of Banu Ummayya? Or should we blame the Muslims in general for turning their backs on religious righteousness?

### The stipulation by the Ahle Sunnah Ulema that the khalifah be just makes the khilafat of Mu’awiya and Yazeed batil

For this section we shall rely on the following authentic texts of Ahle Sunnah:

1. Ezalatul Khefa, p. 20 Zikr Sharth Imamate

2. Sharh Muwaffaq, p. 731 Muqassad Saneeh

3. Sharh Maqasid, vol. 2, p. 271 Fadail Imama

4. Al-Ahkam al-Sultaniya, p. 8 by Al-Mawardi

5. Al-Ahkam al-Sultaniya, p. 9 by Qazi Abu Yala

6. Tohfa Isna Ashari, p. 178 Bab 7 Imamate Aqeedah

We read in Izalat ul Khifa:

“The khalifah should be a man and should be adil. By ‘just’ we mean he should refrain from major sins and should not repeat minor sins. He should also be a mujtahid”.

We read in Sharh Muqassad:

“The Imam over the Ummah should possess these merits – have sense, be Muslim, be just, free, a man, a mujtahid, and brave”

We read in Sharh Muwafaq:

“It is incumbent on the Imam / Khalifah to be adil, he should not be zaalim, since a fasiq deems the treasury to be his personal wealth, and will waste money”.

### Ahl al-Sunna believe that no khalifa has the right to appoint his son as khalifa without shura (consultation)

Al Mawardi in Al-Ahkam al-Sultaniya, p. 8 states:

“When a khilafah intends on appointing a successor the khilafah should make efforts to locate the individual that is most deserving, and the condition of khilafat is if after this extensive search a person is located, provided he is not the Khalifah’s father or son, and then he can be appointed without seeking the counsel of anyone else.”

Abu Yala in this same book, echoing the words of other Salaf Ulema stated that the contract of Imamate can only go to one that is Adil, and the Qur’an stipulates that it cannot be bestowed on one that is Dhaalim. We have the consensus from the Ulema of Islam that a fasiq cannot attain the station of Imam; we can prove from the texts of Ahle Sunnah that both Mu’awiya and Yazeed were not adil. Mu’awiya’s deeds throughout his reign, including efforts to secure Yazeed’s nomination via duress prove that he was not adil. When Mu’awiya was himself unjust then he had no right to appoint his fasiq son as Imam over the Ummah. Moreover his methods of intimidation to ‘win’ backing for Yazeed, makes Nasibi claims that Yazeed’s khilafat was legitimate a complete farce.

### Our challenge to Sipah-e-Sahaba and Ansar.org

Our open challenge to Nasibis such as Abu Sulaiman and the followers of Azam Tariq is to produce a single reference from the Holy Qur’an / hadees that deems the Imamate of a fasiq khalifah to be legitimate. We are aware that there are ridiculous coined traditions deeming it lawful to pray salat behind a fasiq Imam, but we want proof with regards to the Imam (khalifa) of Muslims not the Imam of a salafi / Deobandi mosque.

# Chapter Four:

## The stance of Imam Husain (a.s.)

### Was this only a political dispute?

Azam Tariq al-Nasibi stated:

Kr-hcy.com states:

It was only a political difference with Yazeed and Hazrat Husain wanted to rectify the situation. It was never a confrontation between Islam and kufr as none of the contestants even once called each other as kafir (infidel).

### Reply One

What this Nasibi has failed to recognise is the fact that opposition to Ahlulbait (a.s.) is inexorably linked to the Deen; it cannot simply be watered down to a political dispute. In this connection we shall cite a narration of a Sunni scholar Allamah Shibli:

“‘Ali [r.a.] said to Mu’awiya ‘Guard yourself from hating me since Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) said that on the Day of Judgement those that hate me shall be turned away from the Pond of Kauthar and be thrown in the fire”.

This one example serves as proof that Mu’awiya’s hatred / opposition to Imam Ali (a.s.) can never be defined as a political dispute. Had it just been a political matter, Hazrat Ali (a.s.) would not have threatened Mu’awiya his enemy with Hell Fire. This example serves as proof that even the political enemies / opponents of ‘Ahlulbait (a.s.) shall burn in Hell.

### Reply Two

Hafiz Ibn Asakir records this tradition on the authority of Sahabi Anas bin al-Haris:

أنس بن الحارث يقول سمعت رسول الله ( صلى الله عليه و سلم ) يقول إن ابني ذا يعني الحسين يقتل بأرض يقال لها كربلاء فمن شهد ذلك منكم فلينصره

“I heard Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) say ‘Verily my son, means Husain, will be killed in a land called Karbala, whoever amongst you is alive at that time must go and help him”.[[15]](#footnote-15)

If this was only a political dispute, then why did Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) deem it incumbent on the Sahaba to help his grandson Imam Husain (a.s.), who he called his son? Politics is something without compulsion, for in Islam it is part of religion, for Islam is a system of life. And there is no ordinance in Islam that compels a person to follow a certain political persuasion UNTIL that person submits to Islam. But here Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) commands the companions to side with Imam Husain (a.s.), making it a duty on them to side with Imam Husain (a.s.). Hence it can only be deemed to be a religious ordinance for THOSE WHO BELIEVE and have embraced Islam. The difference between Imam Husain (a.s.) and Yazeed was thus, incontrovertibly, a religious one, for the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) made it a duty for the Muslims who follow his religion to side with Imam Husain (a.s.). This logic is undeniable and crystal-clear.

### Was this a battle of truth against falsehood?

Azam Tariq Nasibi stated:

Kr-hcy.com states:

“The battle of Karbala in 61 A.H. was not a battle between truth and falsehood or Islam and kufr as is alleged by the shias”.

This is an attempt by the champions of the 21st century Nasibi movement to deny how all Muslims, Shia and Sunni alike, view the Battle of Karbala. To most Muslims, Shia and Sunni alike, Imam Husain (a.s.) embodied faith and the true religion, while Yazeed embodied kufr and the devil. After all, did not Imam Husain (a.s.)’s grandfather tell the Muslims to side with Imam Husain (a.s.). Thus most Muslims see in Karbala the ultimate battle between the forces of good and those of evil. The Nasibis would instead have us see it another way, simply as the embodiment of good happens also to be the Third Shia Imam, and this adulation for him by the Sunni world is intolerable to the Nasibi cult. Ansar.Org’s favourite Nasibi son Afriki also sought to discredit the martyrdom of Imam Husain (a.s.) – by mocking the notion of most Muslims that this was a battle between truth and falsehood. In his article on ‘Who killed Imam Husain?’ he stated:

Ansar.org states:

However, it is regrettable that despite the huge amount of attention the subject of Karbala enjoys, the event is persistently portrayed as two-sided. It is always depicted as Husain against Yazeed, Right rising up against Wrong, the Quest for Justice against the Forces of Oppression.

### Reply One – In the battle of Karbala Imam Husain (a.s.) was with the truth and Yazeed adhered to falsehood

As we cited above, Ibn Asakir has recorded this tradition on the authority of Sahabi Anas bin al-Haris:

“I heard Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) say ‘Verily my son, means Husain, will be killed in a land called Karbala, whoever amongst you is alive at that time must go and help him”.

This same narration can be located in the following Sunni books:

1. al-Esaaba, vol. 1, p. 81, Zikr Uns bin Haris

2. Khasais al-Kubra, vol. 2, p. 125

3. Kanzul Ummaal, vol. 6, p. 223 Zikr Husain

4. Sirrush Shahadatayn, p. 80

5. Kifayat al-Talib, p. 429 Zikr Husain

6. Neel al-Autar, p. 88

7. Zakhair al-Uqba, p. 146

#### Comment

If two individuals are fighting and the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) tells you to go to the aid of one of them, then that individual will be on the path of truth, since the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) would never give an order to stand with falsehood. In Karbala, on one side was the illegal Khaleefa Yazeed bin Mu’awiyah on the other was Imam Husain grandson of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.), an individual whom the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) gave an order that his Sahaba come to his aid.

### Reply Two – One, who fights Imam Husain (a.s.), fights the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.)

We will prove this by citing the following Sunni sources:

1. Azaab al-Mufraad, p. 17

2. Sunan ibn Majah, p. 14, Manaqib Husain

3. Sunan Tirmizi, vol. 2, p. 587 Manaqib Husain

4. Zakhair al-Uqba, p. 133 Zikr Husain

5. Sawaaeq al-Mohreqah, p. 114 Zikr Husain

6. Yanaabee’ al-Mawaddah, p. 164 Chapter 54

7. Jaame’ al-Usool, vol. 10, p. 21

8. Mustadrak al-Hakim, vol. 3, p. 177

9. Kanz al-Ummal, vol. 6, p. 220 Manaqib Husain

10. al-Fusool al-Muhimmah, p. 171 Zikr Husain

11. As’aaf al-Raaghebeen, p. 175 Zikr Husain

12. Nuzoolul Abrar, p. 55 Zikr Husain

13. Mirqaat Sharh Mishqaat, p. 55

In Adaab al-Mufarad, p. 17 we read:

“The Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) said Husain is from me and I am from Husain”

In Mirqaat, Qazi Iyad states:

“Our Prophet via Prophetic knowledge and revelation knew that his grandson Husain would be martyred fighting Yazeed bin Mu’awiya, that is why the Prophet made a specific reference about him, stating he shared three qualities with Him (s.a.w.a.), 1. Loving both is compulsory 2. Disrespecting both is a sin 3. Fighting both is haraam and a sin”

This Hadees proves that in the same way one that fights the Prophet can never be on Haqq (Truth), likewise on that fights Husain can never be on Haqq either, this proves that in Karbala Yazeed was on the path of falsehood, and Imam Husain (a.s.) on the path of truth.

### Reply Three – One that fights the Ahlulbait (a.s.) fights the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.)

We have relied on the following Sunni works:

1. Sunan Ibn Majah, English translation by Muhammad Tufail Ansari, vol. 1, p. 81

2. Fazaael al-Sahaba, by Ahmad Ibn Hanbal, v2, p767, Tradition #1350;

3. al-Mustadrak al-Hakim, vol. 3, p. 149

Allah’s Messenger (s.a.w.) said regarding Ali, Fatima, Hasan and Husain (a.s.): “I am at peace with those with whom you make peace and I am at war with those with whom you make war.”[[16]](#footnote-16)

This Hadees proves that when Yazeed fought Imam Husain (a.s.) in Karbala he was actually fighting the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.), and is automatically on falsehood.

### Reply Four – The Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.)’s distraught appearance before Ibn Abbas proves Imam Husain (a.s.) was on truth and Yazeed was on falsehood

We have located this narration from the following esteemed Sunni works:

1. Sawaaeq al-Muhreqah, p. 642-643 published in Faisalabad

2. Mishkat al-Masabeeh, vol. 8, p. 140

3. al-Isaaba, p. 334, Zikr Husain

4. al-Isteaab, p. 340, Zikr Husain

5. Asad ul Ghayba, vol. 2, p. 23 Zikr Husain

6. Mirqaat Sharh Mishkaat, vol. 11, p. 397 Zikr Husain

7. Musnad Ibn Hanbal, vol. 4, p. 29 Hadees number 2165

8. Tareekh Islam by Zahabi, vol. 2, p. 349 Zikr Husain

9. Tareekh Ibn Asakir, vol. 4, p. 343 Zikr Husain

10. Tareekhul Kholafa, p. 208 Zikr Husain

11. Sirrush Shahadatayn, p. 88

12. Tazkeratul Khawaas al-Ummah, p. 152, Zikr Husain

13. Kifayat al-Muttalib, p. 428 Zikr Husain

In Mishkat we read:

“One afternoon I dreamt of Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) standing with his hair disturbed and with dust tangled in them and he was holding a phial filled with blood. I said to the Prophet: “May my parents by sacrificed at you. What are you holding?” The Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) replied: “I am holding this phial filled with the blood of my son and his companions that I have been collecting all the day long.”

I remembered that day and when the news of Al Husain (a.s.)’s martyrdom came, and I matched that day with the day I had dreamt the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.), I came to know that it was the same day”.

The distressed state of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) at the time of the death of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) serves as clear evidence that our Imam Husain (a.s.) was with the truth and Yazeed (l.a.) was on falsehood. If Nasibis argue that the words of Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) in a dream are not authentic then we suggest to them to consider these words:

Abu Huraira narrates: The Prophet (pbuh) said: “Whoever has seen me in a dream has in fact seen me, for Satan does not appear in my form”[[17]](#footnote-17)

### Reply Five

We have proven that Yazeed opposed the concept of revelation and denied the Prophethood. To raise one’s voice against such an enemy of God is certainly proof that Imam Husain (a.s.) was on the party of truth and was seeking to counter Yazeed’s falsehood. Shah Abdul Aziz Dehlavi, a staunch Wahabi, in Taufa Isna Ashari, Chapter 1, p. 6 stated clearly that:

“Imam Husain was aware of the falsehood of Yazeed the Paleeth (impure)”

If opposition to such a transgressor is not Jihad then what is? How can these same Nasibi define the Banu Umayyad campaigns of conquests, pillaging / looting etc., to satiate Muslim greed and maintain a life of luxury as Jihad? If Jihad is defined as fighting the kuffar then Yazeed and his ancestors were kaafir, his father may have sought to cloak his hypocrisy but Yazeed openly declared his kaafir beliefs, and al-Istiab also gives clear proof over the hypocrisy of Abu Sufyan.

When people opposed Yazeed in Madina, amongst them were the largest concentration of still living Sahaba, and the vast bulk were slaughtered. Amongst those who were martyred by the side of Imam Husain (a.s.) in actual battle were also Prophet Muhammad (s.a.w.a.)’s sahaba, while at the actual battle not one sahaba was found on the side of Yazeed’s army. Were their actions [as Sahaba] false? Against Yazeed ranged the majority of the surviving sahaba – were all misguided waging war against a man who did not even know the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.), was a man who used his penis to penetrate men / dogs / bears / sisters / daughters / mother? Yazeed expected the Baya’h while he openly expressed that Prophet Muhammad (s.a.w.a.) was a fraud. Yazeed and the clique of sahaba like Abdullah bin Omar (son of the second khalifa) that supported him were scum of the worst kind.

### Reply Six

Ibn Kaseer in al-Bidaya wa al-Nihaya, vol. 8, p. 231 narrates this hadees on the authority if Abu Ubaydah:

“My Ummah shall be ruled with justice, until the first individual that shall destroy it, he shall from the Banu Ummaya, and his name will be Yazeed”.

In a short time span of three years this Khalifah of Azam Tariq shed the blood of the family of the Prophet, the residents of Medina and catapulted the Holy Ka'aba. Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) pinpointed the man that would destroy the Deen BY NAME. When this is the case then opposition to him can automatically be defined as opposition to falsehood. Why do the Nasibis support a man cursed BY NAME by the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) himself.

### Reply Seven – The Sunni Ulema have accepted that in Karbala Imam Husain (a.s.) adhered to the truth and Yazeed was on falsehood

As evidence we shall cite the following esteemed Sunni works:

1. Sharh Fiqh Akbar, p. 72

2. Neel al-Autar, vol. 7, p. 181, Kitab al-Jihad

3. Shazaras al-Zahab, vol. 1, p. 69 Zikr the events of 61 Hijri

4. Tareekh Ibn Khaldun, vol. 1, p. 180

5. Tohfa Isna Ashari, p. 370 Chapter 11 part 3

6. Minhajj al-Sunnah, vol. 2, p. 241 Zikr Yazeed

7. al-Awasim min al-Qawasim, p. 232

In Sharh Fiqh Akbar we read:

“Some illiterates have said (Allah forbid) that Imam Husain (a.s.) was a rebel, this is Batil according to the aqaid of Ahle Sunnah wa al-Jamaah, this may not be palatable to those that have fallen away from the truth”.

This is a leading book of Hanafi aqaid that is clearly stating that Hanafi Sunnis do not deem our Imam to be a rebel; obviously those Sunnis that say otherwise are actually practising taqiyya, posing as Sunnis when they are actually hard-core Nasabis.

Neel al-Autar:

“There are those people who aided the Deen, they opposed the leader of the time because the leader was Unjust who had left the way of the Prophet, these people are the people of truth and Imam Husain (a.s.) is at the top of such individuals”

Imam of Ahle Sunnah Shaukani stated clearly that Yazeed was unjust and abandoned the way of the Prophet (s.a.w.a.), and Imam Husain (a.s.) aided the Deen by opposing Yazeed, and our Imam was on truth and Yazeed was on falsehood.

Shajarat al-Zahab:

“The people in Islam are in absolute agreement, that Imam Husain’s opposition to Yazeed’s bad deeds was a good step, similarly the act of Ibn Zubayr and the Madinans opposition against the Banu Umayya was also a good step”.

Even advocate of Mu’awiya Ibn Khaldun in Mudaqqimah states:

“Husain was on the right path, he attained martyrdom for which he shall be rewarded”.

Another Mu’awiya supporter, the Grand Sheikh of Wahabis Ibn Taymiyya states:

“The middle way is that of the Ahle Sunnah who don’t deem Husain a baghi or the Khaleefa, and deem his murder to be martyrdom”

In this connection Allamah Shibli also makes an important observation:

“Husain did not oppose giving baya’h to Yazeed because he wanted to become the Khalifa – his opposition was to elevate the kalima of Tauheed and Deen of Hanafiyya, in this regards he was following the footsteps of his father”.[[18]](#footnote-18)

When Imam Husain, according the Ahle Sunnah Sect, died a martyr then his difference with Yazeed cannot be condensed down to a political dispute. These Nasibi need to understand that you can only die a martyr if you are defending the Deen – and Ibn Taimiyyah said the Ahle Sunnah hold the opinion that Imam Husain (a.s.) was a martyr. Can we not therefore conclude that the aqeedah of Ahle Sunnah is that Imam Husain (a.s.) the martyr was slain upholding the Deen and his killer Yazeed was following falsehood? This is self-implicit if one accepts, as Ahl al-Sunna do, that Imam Husain (a.s.) achieved the rank of martyrdom.

These references prove that the scholars of Islam acknowledge that Imam Husain (a.s.) attained

Martyrdom, hence Imam Husain (a.s.) adhered to the truth in Karbala. The Prophet (s.a.w.a.) stated that the Ummah must come to his (a.s.) aid that he would be martyred in Karbala

### Reply Eight

Ibn Asakir records (in Mishbaath ba Sunnath, p. 219) a hadees on the authority of Hazrat Ayesha:

“O Allah never shower your blessings on the cursed killer Yazeed. He will rebel against my beloved Husain and martyr him”

Does this not act as conclusive proof that the battle of Karbala was a battle between truth and falsehood? Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) deemed Imam Husain (a.s.) a martyr and cursed Yazeed, his killer who rebelled against Imam Husain (a.s.). Verily a martyr dies on the path of truth whilst a baghi (rebel) dies on the path of falsehood. Need we say any more on this topic?

The acceptance that the Imam (a.s.) was a martyr is proof that he adhered to the path of truth and Yazeed was on falsehood.

### Does the Sahaba’s failure to support Imam Husain (a.s.) prove that this was not a battle between truth and falsehood?

This filthy Nasibi then states:

Kr-hcy.com states:

It is evident from the fact that several hundreds of sahaba were alive at that time but all of them kept aloof from this event to save ummah from entanglement and bloodshed. Had it been an encounter between good and evil, the sahabah who throughout their lives had not shirked jihad would have definitely thrown all their weight behind Hazrat Husain.

### Reply One

Azam Tariq seems to suggest that the Sahaba would not be so shameless as to ignore Jihad. These Nasibi claim to be the defenders of the Sahaba, let us leave them aside for a moment and focus on Mu’awiya and the Banu Ummaya clan. Did they not shirk their duties to defend Usmaan at the time of his murder? The entire Banu Umayya, including Mu’awiya stood back and allowed their relative Khalifah be slaughtered. Poor old Usmaan was left on his own with no support, no son, and brother in law or relative sought to protect his dear relative. Is this how the passive Gandhi ethics of Usmaan were met? If these Nasibi claim that they were merely following the words of noble Usmaan who stated no one whether that be his clan, the people of Medina or Mu’awiya’s army support him, then his desire is false since it is even incumbent on a seventy year old man to protect his life. Failure to do so constitutes suicide that contravenes the Shari’a.

### Reply Two

If the Sahaba could not shirk the responsibility of Jihad then we should point out that poor old Usmaan was cornered in his home for forty days before his end and the Sahaba did not have the decency to fight and protect their imam even though this oppression occurred in the city in which they resided. When they shirked ‘jihad’ in their own hometown then what likelihood was there to expect these same ‘lions’ to defend Imam Husain (a.s.) who had been cornered two thousand miles away by Yazeed in the remote plains of Karbala? Can these Nasibi produce any evidence that their Imam Yazeed had made a declaration via radio / television / papers that he was intending to fight Imam Husain (a.s.) on a specific date at a specific venue – and that despite this, the Sahaba shirked their responsibilities?

### Reply Three

Rather than protect poor Usmaan history testifies that many played a key role in his downfall and killing. Ayesha for example had issued takfeer against Usmaan. Why did the Sahaba not raise their objections and seek to head off these libellous claims? Why is this Nasibi trying to use the Sahaba’s inaction with regards to supporting Imam Husain (a.s.) as proof – when the same Sahaba were involved in killing Usmaan? On Azam Tariq’s assessment can we therefore deem their action against Usmaan to be correct?

When the Sahaba had participated in the killing of Usmaan, who as they claim was the Khilafah over the Muslims, and this did not bother them in the slightest, then how can Azam Tariq ask us why the Sahaba remained silent and failed to side with Imam Husain (a.s.)?

It’s those Santas again – the Nasibis keep hiding behind them while we lift their red Santa kaftans and expose their uncircumcised privates.

### Reply Four

If this Nasibi claims that the Sahaba’s inaction serves as evidence that no Jihad had taken place then we should point out that in Medina a group of the companions openly advocated their opposition to Yazeed and demonstrated this opposition by removing their shoes from their feet. Then the people of Medina rebelled and fought the army of Yazeed. Tell us, can we describe the Sahaba’s rebellion in Medina and fighting Yazeed, as Jihad on their part and a battle between truth and falsehood? Were the people of Medina not on the path of truth? Or were all those who narrated this event of Harra including great Nasibis such as Ibn Kaseer Dimishqi misguided by Ibn Saba in this regard?

### Reply Five: The Santas are cowards

If Azam Tariq claims that the Sahaba never shirked Jihad then what can we say of the fact that the Sahaba in the Battle Uhud fled for their lives leaving Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) exposed to the enemy forces – does Surah Aal-e-Imran not expose their Jihad phobia in this regards?

### Reply Six

Did the Sahaba and Taabe’een not leave Umm’ul Momineen Ayesha during the battle of Jamal? She was left on her camel, undefended. What happened to the honourable Sahaba on this occasion? Did they not shirk their Jihad duties here?

Imam Husain (a.s.) fought Yazeed’s army in hand-to-hand combat as he was brave, as were the sahaba who joined him. Most of the other sahaba only fought Yazeed when Yazeed attacked them in Madina i.e. they were set upon. This is because none had the courage of a Shia Imam, who took on the might of the world’ most powerful empire rather than abandon his principles. Meanwhile, the Santas were running scared.

### Was Imam Husain (a.s.) returning so as to give baya’h to Yazeed?

1. Tareekh-e-Kaamil, vol. 4, p. 48 Imam Husain

2. Al-Bidayah, vol. 8, p. 175

3. Tareekh Tabari, p. 314

4. Tazkeratul Khawaas, p. 141

We read in al-Bidaya that Uqbah bin Subhan narrates:

“I accompanied Husain from Makka until the time that he was killed. I heard all of his speeches and at no point did he state ‘Take me to Yazeed so that I can give him baya’h”

The comments of an actual Sunni scholar, Allamah Shibli in his book Zainab, p. 156 are also worthy of note:

“Husain said ‘I am from the Ahlulbait of the Prophet. Yazeed is not worthy of receiving my baya’h’”

Kr-hcy.com states:

When Hazart Husain was still on his way to kufa he received news that his cousin, Muslim bin aqeel, who was sent earlier by him to kufa to ascertain the conditions there, had been murdered on receiving news of the death of Muslim bin Aqeel, Hazrat Husain lost confidence in the people of kufa and decided to return but the relatives of Muslim bin Aqeel under the influence of sabai elements insisted on avenging the murder of Muslim bin aqeel and hence Hazrat Husain decided to resume his onward journey to kufa.

### Reply

If the brothers of Muslim wanted to avenge his death – then what is the big deal here? The desire to avenge the blood of an innocent is not a reprehensible act. The Holy Qur’an prescribes an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. Yazeed was responsible for the killing of an innocent here, and the state being controlled by Yazeed had committed the atrocity, so the innocent’s brothers decided to follow God’s Word and carry out the penalty against the soldiers of Yazeed who had committed this action as the state would do nothing having committed the atrocity. The family of Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) were the rightful heirs of Hazrat Muslim (a.s.) – if his brothers took action to fulfil a desire to avenge their brother’s unlawful murder at the hands of a demonic khalifa, then what is the objection? It was no reason why Imam Husain (a.s.) should have halted his journey. If the family of Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) had discussions amongst themselves and continued on the journey then how exactly does this absolve the transgression of Yazeed? If Imam Husain (a.s.) was intending to return to Medina, a view for which there is no historical or textual basis, then what basis did Yazeed then have to kill Imam Husain (a.s.)?

We the Shi’a believe that Yazeed, in order to strengthen his reign, blocked Imam Husain (a.s.)’s march to Kufa at a place called Karbala. This is testified to in all historical sources e.g. whole chapters in Tabari and the chapters in all the other historical works that chronicle 60-61 A.H. They also chronicle the fact that Yazeed’s army then killed Imam Husain (a.s.) in a pitched battle. This sin is worse than kufr. Imam Husain (a.s.) was the last voice of open dissension in the Ummah, and dictators like Yazeed deal with those that speak out against their unjust ways by using their armed forces to liquidate them. The choices that were put before Imam Husain (a.s.) were to either accept the reign of Yazeed or die. If Imam Husain (a.s.) really was returning to give baya’h to Yazeed then there would have been no need for this battle. The objective of baya’h could have been carried out through via an intermediary, and indeed Yazeed’s commanders at the Battle of Karbala said to Imam Husain (a.s.) that he would be free to go if he gave the baya’h to Yazeed.

In fact it is manifestly clear that Yazeed wanted one thing and one thing only from Imam Husain (a.s.) – his bayat. Imam Husain (a.s.)’s refusal to give this baya’h was the trigger that enabled Yazeed to justify killing Imam Husain (a.s.) to the Muslims. But other Muslims objected and said, as most do to this day, that Imam Husain (a.s.) could not have given baya’h to Yazeed as the latter was unlawfully appointed khalifa in breach of treaty, and further Yazeed’s character would have destroyed Islam had the very grandson of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) sanctioned such a demon as Khalifah. It is like voting for a homosexual into power – if he is elected it means that homosexuality is not condoned by the people. This is the state in many western countries today. Had the greatest and most learned Muslim of the age, indeed the closest male blood of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) given the bayat, it would mean that dog/sister/bear/mother daughter penetration was acceptable in Islamic society. Given how fragile 60/61 A.H. was – Islam was still a very new religion – Islam itself as a religion with laws for society would have been destroyed. This is why Imam Husain (a.s.) is called the Saviour of his grandfather’s religion. Yazeed’s ulterior motive was on top of extracting the bayat, and thereby completing his agenda to decimate Islam as a religion in society, to avenge the slaying of his family by Prophet Muhammad (s.a.w.a.) and Ali (a.s.) by exacting tribal blood revenge – this is obvious from his words when the head of Imam Husain (a.s.) was brought before him, in which Yazeed claims that the Revelation to Prophet Muhammad (s.a.w.a.) was a power game of the Hashim tribe, and one in which his own tribe of Umayyad had been the losers which was now avenged by killing Prophet Muhammad (s.a.w.a.)’s grandson who was also Imam Ali (a.s.)’s son.

### Was Imam Husain (a.s.)’s alleged return from Karbala without fighting proof that this was not a battle between truth and falsehood?

Another Nasibi, lieutenant of Azam Tariq, Hafiz Salah’udeen in his book ‘Khilafat al-Mu’awiya aur Yazeed’ echoed these comments in his book, p. 23

“If the battle of Karbala was a fight between truth and falsehood, then he [Imam Husain (a.s.)] would not have made plans to return to Medina. Haqq (truth) is linked to rules of martyrdom; falsehood is not linked to anything”

### Reply One

Can this Nasibi cite us any proof that Imam Husain (a.s.) set a date and venue to fight Yazeed? Yet again the Nasibis adopt a tactic of using words that give the impression that they are supported by historical facts. The reader might think that this premise of the Nasibis is based on some kind of textual source. There is none – it is just a fairy-tale of this Nasibi that Imam Husain (a.s.) intended to return to Madina rather than do battle. Not one book, page, sentence, word, letter or dot in any book exists that says this was his intention or that he made plans to return to Madina. This is what Nasibis do every day in their speeches. They just LIE to people. I am angry at being LIED to like this. The most disturbing thing is that this man Azam Tariq and his deputies have hundreds of thousands of followers in places like Pakistan who believe every word of his. See how the Nasibis just lie. Here the Nasibi makes up a whole story that Imam Husain (a.s.) was returning to Madina – as if he is an expert on history with academic references. This story has, literally, just been made up by him in this sentence.

However we shall refute this fairy-tale that has come out of this Nasibi’s deranged mind (Is this Nasibi on hallucinogenic drugs?) – we are now having to refute the verbal diarrhoea that comes out of a deluded mind: this is the level of argument the Nasibis have. If the Imam (a.s.) had set a date, and then not fought, then we would have to accept that Imam Husain (a.s.) abandoned Jihad. We, the Shi’a, believe that Imam Husain (a.s.) declared that he was the true representative of Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) and hence he rejected the authority / obedience to Yazeed. Yazeed’s army, by cornering and killing Imam Husain (a.s.), proves Yazeed’s actions were false and Imam Husain (a.s.) was on the path of truth. Had Imam Husain (a.s.) returned from Karbala that would not in any way prove that Yazeed was on the right path, his returning without fighting in no way means that Yazeed was right! What on Earth was that reply from the Nasibis about in the first place? It still does nothing to exonerate Yazeed. What this nasibi said is called verbal diarrhoea. It’s malformed crap without any shape or substance that just comes out and you can’t control it. This is what Nasibis talk – crap with a kaftan, a turban and an Arabic accent to pass off as something more substantial. It is tragic that this turbaned crap is out there preaching to Muslims and taking them astray.

### Reply Two – The Sahaba in Usamah’s army returned without fighting

We read in Sharh Muwaqqaf, vol. 1, p. 746:

Rasoolullah (s.a.w.a.) said that whoever does not participate in the army of Usamah, Allah’s lanat be on such a person.

N.B. This is not the Usamah bin Laden of today but the Usamah bin Zaid who was a companion of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.).

The Shaykhain were also present in this army. A battle that Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) prepares and sends out is definitely a battle of truth, so why did Abu Bakr and Umar leave the battle and return without fighting? This Nasibi clearly believes that martyrdom is dependant on Jihad, then how will these two individuals be forgiven for failing to participate in Jihad whilst Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) was on his deathbed? If these Nasibi are going to claim that the Shaykhain’s return without fighting does not prove that their Kaafir opponents were on the right path, Imam Husain (a.s.)’s ALLEGED (in this Nasibi’s dream) returning to Medina does not prove the correctness of Yazeed’s Fasiq Government.

### Reply Three

Riyadh al-Nadira states that Abu Bakr returned without delivering the verses of Baraath to the kuffar. The deliverance of these verses was definitely delivering truth against falsehood, and Abu Bakr’s return without delivering these verses in no way means that the kuffar were right.

### Reply Four – Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) returned from Tabuk without fighting

We read in Al-Bidayah, vol. 5, p. 14, that Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) prepared a huge army to counter the kaafir threat at Tabuk, but he returned without fighting. This expedition was definitely a battle between truth and falsehood, and in the same way that Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) returned without fighting does not mean that the kaafir Byzantines were in the right, Imam Husain (a.s.)’s ALLEGED returning to Medina (in the Nasibi’s dream) in no way means that Yazeed was in the right.

### Reply Five – Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) returned from Makka without performing Hajj

The books of Ahle Sunnah are replete with the fact that Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) left from Medina to go to Makka and perform Hajj with the Sahaba. The Kuffar and Makka prevented him from doing so and he returned without carrying through this objective. Hajj is a duty, so how were all the Muslims forgiven for failing to carry out Hajj that year?

# Chapter Five

## Yazeed’s killing of Imam Husain (a.s.)

Azam Tariq Nasibi stated:

Kr-hcy.com states:

“It would be seen there from that yazeed had no hands in the murder of Hazrat Husain. Most of the historical accounts are written by shias and as such heap all sorts of rubbish on Yazeed out of sheer contempt and hatred and depict him in alarming colour which is far from truth and reality. Still some of the ignorant Muslims accuse him under the influence of shias. The fact is that when the news of Hazrat Husain’s martyrdom reached yazeed, he and his family wept. Yazeed even said: “curse of Allah be on ubaidullah bin ziad. By Allah! If he had been a relative of Hazrat Husain he would have never killed him. I would have accepted the submission of Iraqis without the killing of Hazrat Husain.”

Here we shall cite the following reputable texts of Ahle Sunnah that confirm that Yazeed killed Imam Husain (a.s.):

1. Maqatil Husain al-Khwaarazmi, vol. 2, p. 80 Chapter 9

2. Yanaabi al-Mawaddah, p. 223 Chapter 91

3. Tareekh al-Yaqoobi, vol. 2, p. 299 Zikr Yazeed

4. Mataaleb al-So’ul, vol. 2, p. 26

5. Noor al-Absaar, p. 139

6. Al-Bidayah wa al-Nihaya, p. 219 Zikr 63 Hijri

7. Tareekh-e-Kaamil, vol. 4, p. 69

8. Tareekh Tabari, p. 408 Zikr Ibn Ziyad

9. Akhbar al-Tawal, p. 384

10. Tazkeratul Khawaas, p. 159

11. Hayaat al-Haywaan, vol. 1, p. 88

12. Tareekh-e-Khamees, vol. 2, p. 301

13. Sawaaeq al-Mohreqa, p. 134

14. Sharh Fiqh Akbar, p. 73

15. Tohfa Isna Ashari, p. 6

16. Ash Shiaas al-Lamaat, vol. 4, p. 623 Bab Manaqib Quraysh

17. Shazarat al-Zahab, vol. 1, p. 69 Zikr 61 Hijri

18. Murujh al-Zahab, vol. 3, p. 71 Zikr Yazeed

19. Tafseer Mazhari, vol. 5, p. 21 Part 13 Surah Ibrahim

20. Aqaid al-Islam, p. 232 by Maulana Abdul Haqq Haqani

21. Imam Pak aur Yazeed Paleed, p. 88

22. Aqaid Nafsee, p. 113

23. Sharh Maqasad, vol. 2, p. 309

24. Nuzul al-Ibrar, p. 97

25. Irfan Shariat, vol. 2, p. 21

26. Fatawi Maulana Abdul Hai, p. 79

27. Shaheed al-Karbala, pp. 11-12 by Mufti Muhammad Shaafi

28. Irshad al-Sari (Sharh Bukhari), vol. 10, p. 1717 Baabul Fetan

29. Durre Maarif, vol. 4, p. 295 Zikr Zainab binte Ali

30. Sharh al-Muneer Sharh al-Sagheer, vol. 1, page 80

We read in Irfan al-Shariat:

“Yazeed tore away a piece of Messenger of Allah’s heart, starving him for three days and then killing him, together with his companions and then he ordered horses to trample his body after his martyrdom, his body was ripped to shreds. His head was then placed on a spear; this was a head that Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) would kiss. The head was exhibited at various places, people of the household were arrested and brought before the wicked Yazeed, cursed is he who does not deem such acts as atrocious”.

Are all these men, together with the authorities cited at the start including the Grand Sheikh of the Wahabis Ibn Taymiyya, and his successor Ibn Kaseer, all SHIAS or influenced by SHIAS??

There must be a medical syndrome for this behaviour....oh yes, it’s called pathological liar [also known as Nasibi Syndrome]. Maybe your local Sheikh has symptoms of it.

### Yazeed ordered his Governor Waleed kill Imam Husain (a.s.)

We read in Maqtal Husain:

وكتب إليه في صحيفة كانها أذن فأرة : أما بعد فخذ حسينا وعبد الله بن عمر وعبد الله بن الزبير بالبيعة أخذاً شديداً ليست فيه رخصة حتى يبايعوا والسلام

Yazeed wrote: ‘Force Husain, Abdullah ibn Umar, Abdullah ibn al-Zubair to give Baya and don’t spare them’

We also read:

فلما قرأ عليه كتاب يزيد استرجع وترحم عليه ، واستشاره الوليد في الامر وقال كيف ترى ان نصنع؟ قال : فاني ارى ان تبعث الساعة إلى هؤلاء النفر فتدعوهم إلى البيعة والدخول في الطاعة فان فعلوا قبلت منهم وكففت عنهم ، وان ابوا قدمتهم فضربت اعناقهم

When he (Waleed) read Yazeed’s letter for him (Marwan) and did consultation with him in that matter and said: ‘What do you think we shall do?’ He (Marwan) replied: ‘I see to send to them now and ask them to give baya and obey us, if they accept then we will let them go but if they reject you shall arrest them and strike off their heads’

### Yazeed wrote to Ibn Ziyad telling him to kill Imam Husain (a.s.)

We read in Mataalib al-So’ul that:

“Ibn Ziyad wrote to Husain ‘I have received information that you have arrived in Karbala, and Yazeed has told me not to kill you, provided you accept his authority and mine.’”

Imam Jalaluddin Suyuti records in Tareekh Khulfa:

فكتب يزيد إلى واليه بالعراق عبيد الله بن زياد بقتاله فوجه إليه جيشا أربعة آلاف عليهم عمر بن سعد بن أبي وقاص

“Yazeed wrote to his governor in Iraq Ubaidllah bin Ziyad ordering him to fight him (Husain) therefore he (Ibn Ziad) sent an army consisting of four thousand people lead by Umar bin Saad bin Abi Waqqaas”

Imam Zahabi records in Siar Alam al-Nubala, vol. 3, p. 305:

Muhammad bin al-Zahak narrated from his father that he said: ‘When Husain marched, Yazeed wrote to his governor Ibn Ziyad saying: ‘Husain is marching to Kufa and he is a problem of your time not of other times, your state not of other states and you not for the other governors. At that time you might be free or be slaved.’ Therefore Ibn Ziad killed him and sent his head to him (Yazeed).

### Ibn Ziyad’s own admission that he killed Imam Husain (a.s.) on the orders of Yazeed

We read in Tareekh Kamil, vol. 4, p. 112:

وبعث إلى عبيد الله بن زياد يأمره بالمسير إلى المدينة ومحاصرة ابن الزبير بمكة، فقال: والله لا جمعتهما للفاسق، قتل ابن رسول الله وغزو الكعبة. ثم أرسل إليه يعتذر

“He (Yazeed) wrote to Ubaydullah Ibn Ziyad ordering him to march towards Madina and surround Ibn Zubayr in Makka. He (Ibn Ziyad) replied: ‘I can’t give both these things to this Fasiq, after killing the grandson of Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.); I’m not now going to assault the Kaaba’.

Notice how Azam Tariq says that Yazeed blamed Ibn Ziyad (his governor in Kufa at the time of the Battle of Karbala) for the killing of Imam Husain (a.s.). Yet we see here that Ibn Ziyad two years AFTER Karbala is still in a position of authority in Yazeed’s government and army. Had Yazeed sincerely wept for Imam Husain (a.s.) then he would have dismissed and executed Ibn Ziyad for genocide. Indeed Yazeed kept Ibn Ziyad in a position of authority in Yazeed’s government, and indeed Ibn Ziyad outlived Yazeed, until Shia rebels killed him during the insurrection of Al-Mukhtar to avenge the blood of Imam Husain (a.s.).

### Testimony of Ibn Abbas that Yazeed killed Imam Husain (a.s.)

We read in Tareekh-e-Kaamil:

فكتب إليه ابن عباس:...وقد قتلت حسيناً وفتيان عبد المطلب مصابيح الهدى ونجوم الأعلام غادرتهم خيولك بأمرك

Ibn Abbas replied to Yazeed’s letter stating: “… You killed Husain as well as the youth from Banu Abdul Muttalib who were beacons of guidance and famed stars, your troops marched on them at your orders.”

### The testimony of Abdullah Ibn Umar that Yazeed killed Imam Husain (a.s.)

We read in Maqatil al-Husain:

Ibn Umar wrote to Yazeed, ‘Hasn’t your heart gone black yet? You murdered the family of the Prophet?’

The Nawasib want to drag the Muslims to hell to face the charge of taking to their heart the man who hurt Muhammad (s.a.w.a.)’s soul more than any other.

### Mu’awiya the Second’s testimony that his father Yazeed killed Imam Husain (a.s.):

We read in Hayaat al-Haywaan:

“When Yazeed was succeeded to the throne by his son Mu’awiya he said in his first sermon ‘We are definite about Yazeed’s wrongdoing, he killed the family of the Prophet, deemed alcohol halal, and brought pain to the Holy Ka’aba.”

This was the testimony of the succeeding khalifa, and Yazeed’s own son, Mu’awiya the Second.

### Yazeed’s own admission that he killed the family of the Prophet (s.a.w.a.):

We read in Sharh Fiqh Akbar:

“Following the murder of Husain, Yazeed said ‘I avenged the killing of my kaafir relatives in Badr through killing the family of the Prophet”.

### The testimony of Shah Abdul Aziz that Yazeed killed Imam Husain (a.s.):

We read in Tohfa:

“When the cruel people of Syria and Iraq upon orders of impure Yazeed and due to the efforts of chief of hatred and fitnah Ibn Ziyad martyred Imam Husain...”[[19]](#footnote-19)

### The testimony of Shah Abdul Haqq that Yazeed killed Imam Husain (a.s.)

We read in Ashias al-Lamaas:

“It is unusual that some say Yazeed did not kill Husain when he instructed Ibn Ziyad to carry out the killing”.

### The testimony of Imam Zahabi that Yazeed killed Imam Husain (a.s.)

Now let us cite words of a Sunni Imam whose words cannot be denied by any Nasibi. Imam Zahabi in his authority work ‘Tareekh Islam’, vol. 5, p. 30 states:

قلت: ولما فعل يزيد بأهل المدينة ما فعل، وقتل الحسين وإخوته وآله، وشرب يزيد الخمر، وارتكب أشياء منكرة، بغضه الناس، وخرج عليه غير واحد، ولم يبارك الله في عمره، فخرج عليه أبو بلال مرداس بن أدية الحنظلي

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

### The testimony of Ibn Khaldun that Yazeed killed Imam Husain (a.s.)

Now let us cite the testimony of a scholar who despite his known Nasibi tendencies confirmed the fact that it was Yazeed who killed Imam Husain (a.s.). We read in Al-Muqaddema by Ibn Khaldun, p. 254:

فلا يجوز نصرة يزيد بقتال الحسين ، بل قتله من فعلات يزيد المؤكدة لفسقه ، والحسين فيها شهيد

“It is impermissible to support Yazeed in the matter of killing Husain; nay (Husain’s) murder is Yazeed’s deed that proves him to be a Fasiq and Husain a martyr.”

### The testimony of Ibn Hazm that Yazeed killed Imam Husain (a.s.)

Although the ‘Nasb’ of Imam Ibn Hazm made him to call Yazeed ‘Amir ul-Momineen’ but despite that he did acknowledge all the evil deeds committed by his Amir al-Momineen:

ويزيد أمير المؤمنين؛ وكان قبيح الآثار في الإسلام؛ قتل أهل المدينة، وأفاضل الناس، وبقية الصحابة -رضي الله عنهم- يوم الحرة، في آخر دولته؛ وقتل الحسين -رضي الله عنه- وأهل بيته في أول دولته؛ وحاصر ابن الزبير -رضي الله عنه- في المسجد الحرام، واستخف بحرمة الكعبة والإسلام؛ فأماته الله في تلك الأيام

“Yazeed Ameerul Momineen was an evil doer in Islam. During the last days of his rule he massacred the people of Madina on the day of Harrah. He killed the best of people and the remaining companions (r.a.). During the initial part of his rule, he killed Husain (r.a.) and his Ahle Bait. He surrounded Ibn Zubair in Masjid al-Haram. He violated the sanctity of Holy Ka'aba and Islam. And during these days Allah killed him”[[20]](#footnote-20)

### The testimony of Ibn Kaseer that Yazeed killed Imam Husain (a.s.)

Let us read the views of Ibn Kaseer regarding the role of Yazeed in the murder of Imam Husain. While discussing the events of 63 H, He stated:

وقد تقدم أنه قتل الحسين وأصحابه على يدي عبيد الله بن زياد‏

“It is already mentioned that he (Yazeed) killed al-Husain and his companions through Ubaidullah bin Zyad”[[21]](#footnote-21)

### The testimony of Qazi Sanaullah that Yazeed killed Imam Husain (a.s.)

Qazi Sanaullah Pani Pati Uthmani under the commentary of 24:55 records:

“It is possible that this verse refers to Yazeed bin Muawiyah. Yazeed had martyred the grandson of Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) and his companions, those companions were actually the members of the Prophet’s family.[[22]](#footnote-22)

At another place he stated:

Yazeed and his associates did Kufr with the bounties of Allah (s.w.t.). They deemed it their aim to have a grudge against the progeny of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) and murdered Husain (r.a.) with oppression and Yazeed did Kufr with the religion of Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) to the extent that Yazeed recited the following couplets over the murder of Husain (r.a.)

‘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 is:

‘I would not be from the progeny of Jandab had I not taken revenge from the progeny of Ahmad for whatever they had done.’[[23]](#footnote-23)

### Testimony of Qazi Saleh bin Mahdi al-Maqbali that Yazeed killed Imam Husain (a.s.)

Prominent Mujtahid of era namely Allamah Qazi Saleh bin Mahdi al-Maqbali (d. 1108) who is much liked by Ahle Hadees/Salafies confirms in his authority work Al-Ilm Al-Shamikh Fi Eesaar Al-Haq Ala Alaba wal Mashaikh, p. 367 that it was Yazeed who killed al-Husain:

“And even more strange is a person who praises Yazeed who reverted from Islam, the one who insulted the honourable people of this Ummah, dishonouring the sanctity of Madina of Messenger (s.a.w.a.), killed Husain the son of the Prophet and his Ahlulbayt and humiliated them and he treated them in such a manner that even if the enemies of Islam, the Christians were to do the same acts, they might have been more reasonable.”[[24]](#footnote-24)

### Yazeed’s pride at killing Imam Husain (a.s.)

We read in Al-Bidayah, vol. 8, p. 204:

Ibn Asakir in his history book states… When Husain’s head was brought before Yazeed, he recited the couplets of Ibn Zubayri: ‘I wish my ancestors of Badr were here to see the fright of al-Khazraj (tribe) as the spears hit’.

Moreover we read:

Al-Qasim bin Bakhit said: ‘When the head of Husain was placed in front of Yazeed bin Mu’awyia, he started to hit his (Husain’s) teeth with his stick, then he (Yazeed) said: ‘His (Husain’s) and my example is same as the saying of Husain Ibn al-Hamaam al-Mari: ‘These swords split the heads of those men who pose harm to us and they were very disobedient and oppressors’’.’[[25]](#footnote-25)

### Did Yazeed express sadness at the death of Imam Husain (a.s.)?

Nasibi Azam Tariq’s lies continue as follows:

Azam Tariq stated:

The fact is that when the news of Hazrat Husain’s martyrdom reached Yazeed, he and his family wept. Yazeed even said: “Curse of Allah be on Ubaidullah bin Ziad. By Allah! If he had been a relative of Hazrat Husain he would have never killed him. I would have accepted the submission of Iraqis without the killing of Hazrat Husain.” Then he accorded a very gracious hospitality to the remaining family members of Hazrat Husain and arranged their return journey to madinah with great honour and respect.

### Reply One

The cited report about Yazeed getting upset over the martyrdom of Imam Husain (a.s.) is primarily in Tareekh Tabari contains an unknown narrator in its chain. We challenge Nawasib to either prove the authenticity of the narration or shut up and accept that Yazeed was the lead culprit in the murder of Imam Husain (a.s.).

### Reply Two

Tariq’s reference that we presume is a crude translation of the text in al-Bidayah wa al-Nihayah, Was only partially translated the actual text that we are quoting from al-Bidaya wa al-Nihaya, vol. 8, p. 235 is as follows:

إن يونس بن حبيب الجرمي حدثه قال: لما قتل ابن زياد الحسين ومن معه بعث برؤوسهم إلى يزيد، فسر بقتله أولا وحسنت بذلك منزلة ابن زياد عنده، ثم لم يلبث إلا قليلا حتى ندم

Yunus bin Habib al-Jarmi said: ‘When Ibn Ziyad killed Husain and his companions and sent their heads to Yazeed, he [Yazeed] became happy at the death of him (Husain) which is why the position of Ibn Ziyad was elevated, but this happiness was only short lived and then he regretted’.

This text confirms that Yazeed was pleased that Imam Husain (a.s.) had been killed and the rank of his killer Ibn Ziyad had automatically increased in Yazeed’s estimation. The happiness being short-lived means that rebellions arose to avenge Imam Husain (a.s.)’s martyrdom that threatened to destroy Yazeed’s khilafat – Madina, Makka and Iraq all rose up against him, which is why he sent his army in to burn the Holy Ka’aba and sack Madina. Nawasib are not horrified by such actions by their khalifa, since they share the doctrine of Al Qaeda that deem it lawful to kill, maim and rape to attains ones objectives. This is as they have no sense of anything being sacred save the remembrance of the Santas. They even reproach other Sunnis for reciting blessings upon the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.).

Moreover, in al-Bidayah wa al-Nihayah, vol. 8, p. 235 we read that the situation reached a point of embarrassment for Yazeed that he said:

ثم يقول: لعن الله ابن مرجانة فإنه أحرجه واضطره، وقد كان سأله أن يخلي سبيله أو يأتيني أو يكون بثغر من ثغور المسلمين حتى يتوفاه الله، فلم يفعل، بل أبى عليه وقتله، فبغضني بقتله إلى المسلمين، وزرع لي في قلوبهم العداوة، فأبغضني البر والفاجر بما استعظم الناس من قتلي حسينا، مالي ولابن مرجانة قبحه الله وغضب عليه.

‘Curse be upon Ibn Marjana [Ibn Ziyad] for he pained Husain and made him desperate although Husain had asked him to be allowed to go wherever he wanted to or to come to me or he be allowed to go to the border but Ibn Ziyad rejected this and killed him and it is now due to this, that Muslims shall bear enmity towards me, now every person, good and bad shall bear hatred in their hearts towards me, people shall be shocked at my killing Husain. I have nothing to do with Marjana’s son. May Allah destroy him and reap destruction upon him’.

Carefully analyse the final comments of Yazeed in this regard:

“Now every person, good and bad shall bear hatred in their hearts towards me, people shall be shocked at my killing Husain.”

These words clearly prove that the killing of Imam Husain (a.s.) was upon the orders of Yazeed, and t his act of cursing Ibn Ziyad was in effect a tactical method to cover up his own culpability. These were crocodile tears shed to display false grief as the Ummah now wanted revenge and were blaming Yazeed. Indeed, the Islamic heartlands of Makka, Madina and Kufa were now in open armed rebellion and Yazeed had lost control there.

Ibn Kaseer further commented as follows:

وقد لعن ابن زياد على فعله ذلك وشتمه فيما يظهر ويبدو، ولكن لم يعزله على ذلك ولا عاقبه ولا أرسل يعيب عليه ذلك

“And it appears that Ibn Ziad was cursed and insulted for what he did but he did not sack him nor did he punish him nor did he rebuke him for his actions”[[26]](#footnote-26)

If the argument is Yazeed didn’t physically kill Imam Husain (a.s.) then these Nasibi should know that Pharaoh is deemed the killer of the Israelites even though he only issued the order for boys to be executed and didn’t use the sword himself. Irshad al-Sari, vol. 10, p. 171 Baabul Fetan states clearly that Yazeed was happy at killing Imam Husain (a.s.) and his disrespect of the family of Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) is a proven fact.

Let us see the comments of the Majid Ali in Bahar Shariat:

‘Those who in this day and age state ‘who are we to comment on Yazeed and Husain and that they were both Princes’ are cursed, Hell bound individuals.’

Thus, reports which show that Yazeed was very happy at the martyrdom of Imam Husain (a.s.) but later altered his opinion and became sad shall not assist the present day Nawasib since the sadness letter expressed by Yazeed was not on account of remorse for his unforgivable sin but was to a response to the public opinion that had swelled against him. We read in Tareekh Khulfa:

ولما قتل الحسين وبنو أبيه بعث ابن زياد برؤوسهم إلى يزيد فسر بقتلهم أولا ثم ندم لما مقته المسلمون على ذلك وأبغضه الناس وحق لهم أن يبغضوه

“When Husain and his family were killed, Ibn Ziyad sent their heads to Yazeed. He (Yazeed) was happy with it in the beginning but after that, when the people hated him for that, he then expressed regret but people should indeed have hated him”

The change in emotions was to quell public anger not due some remorse on his part.

### Reply Three

Yazeed’s maltreatment of the blessed head of Imam Husain which had the honour of being kissed by the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) shall suffice to evidence Yazeed’s actual reaction at the death of Imam Husain (a.s.). Imam Ibn Jauzi records in his book Al-Rad ala al-Mutaseb al-Aneed Al-Manee men Zam Yazeed, p. 58:

قال ابن ابي الدنيا وثنا سلمة بن شبيب قال ثنا الحميدي عن سفيان قال سمعت سالم بن أبي حفصة يقول قال الحسن جعل يزيد بن معاوية يطعن بالقضيب موضع في رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم واذلاه

Ibn Abi Dunya recorded from Salamah bin Shabib from al-Humaydi from Sufyan from Salim bin Abi Hafsa from Hasan (al-Basri) saying: “Yazeed bin Mu’awyia was prodding with a stick that place kissed by Allah’s messenger kissed, how shameful!”.

Al-Hasan al-Basri: Ibn Hajar said: ‘Seqah’.[[27]](#footnote-27) Salim bin Abi Hafsa al-Khayat: Ibn Hajar said: ‘Seduq’.[[28]](#footnote-28) Sufyan al-Sawri: Ibn Hajar said: ‘Seqah’.[[29]](#footnote-29) Abdullah bin al-Zubair al-Humaydi: Ibn Hajar said: ‘Seqah’.[[30]](#footnote-30) Salamah bin Shabeeb: Ibn Hajar said: ‘Seqah’.[[31]](#footnote-31) Abdullah ibn Abi Dunya: Ibn Hajar said: ‘Seduq’.[[32]](#footnote-32) Hasan al-Basri died in year 109 A.H. and he was 89 years old as it is mentioned in Tahzeeb al-Kamal, which means he was 41 years old when Imam Husain was martyred. We should also point out that narrator Salim bin Abi Hafsa al-Khayat is not the only narrator to transmit the tradition rather there are three more reliable narrators from the same generation (tabaqa) as of Salim who have narrated the same incident in the same book and in the science of Hadees such a method of determining authentication of a tradition is called Mutab’a which has also been used by the Imam of Salafies Albaani. The three narrators are Imam Muhammad al-Baqar (a.s.): Ibn Hajar said: ‘Seqah’.[[33]](#footnote-33) Khalid bin Yazeed al-Saksaki: Ibn Hajar said: ‘Seqah’.[[34]](#footnote-34) Lays bin Saad: Ibn Hajar said: ‘Seqah Sabt’.[[35]](#footnote-35)

### Those who were involved in the murder of Imam Husain (a.s.) are Kafirs

Since we have proved the involvement of Yazeed (l.a.) in the murder of Imam Husain (a.s.), let us now present the edict of one of the legendary Sunni Imams, Imam Abu Muhammad Abdullah bin Asad al-Yemeni popularly known as Al-Yaf’ee as recorded by Ibn Emaad al-Hanbali in his authority work Shazarat al-Zahab, vol. 1, p. 68:

قال اليافعي : وأما حكم من قتل الحسين ، أو أمر بقتله ، ممن استحل ذلك فهو كافر

Yaf’ee said: ‘Whoever killed Husain or gave orders to kill him whilst he deemed it a lawful action, is a Kafir’

# Chapter Six:

## Yazeed’s treatment of the Ahlul bait (a.s.)

### Yazeed’s army looted the camps of the women of Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.)’s household and made them captives

We read in Al-Bidayah, vol. 8, p. 188:

“Following the killing of Husain the tents were set on fire and women and their possession were distributed and scarves were removed from the heads of the women”.

Habeeb as Sayyar, vol. 2, p. 33 also confirms that the tents belonging to the Ahlulbait (a.s.) were set alight.

Iqd al-Fareed, vol. 2, p. 254 states that the women of the household were then imprisoned.

Ibn Emaad Hanbali records in his famed work Shazarat al-Zahab, vol. 1, p. 61:

ولما تم قتله حمل رأسه وحرم بيته وزين العابدين معهم إلى دمشق كالسبايا قاتل الله فاعل ذلك وأخزاه ومن أمر به أو رضيه

“When he was killed, his head, women and Zain al-Abedin were taken to Damascus as slaves, may Allah destroy and disgrace whoever did this, whoever issued the orders and whoever was pleased with it”.

### Did Yazeed treat the women from Ahlul bait (a.s.) with respect and treat them as guests?

Azam Tariq could have us believe that:

Kr-hcy.com states:

Then he accorded a very gracious hospitality to the remaining family members of Hazrat Husain and arranged their return journey to madinah with great honour and respect.

Had Yazeed got any involvement in the murder of Hazrat Husain the remnants of his family would have never stayed with Yazeed as his guests for several days immediately after the incident of Karbala. How can one stay and dine with the murderers of one’s blood relations? All the vile propaganda against Yazeed is a latter innovation of the shias.

### Reply

What hospitality! Perhaps we are not up to date with Nasibi etiquettes, but would the reasonable man deem the act of parading of women in ropes before Yazeed, without scarves be an act of honour and respect. These women did not happily visit Yazeed whilst on holiday, Yazeed’s army had slaughtered their men folk and they had entered the court as prisoners not guests. Even inside the court Yazeed showed his hospitality by rowing with Sayyida Zainab (a.s.). Is this how guests are respected when they visit friends? See how this nasibi twists basic facts to make it seem like a tea party. He calls prisoners of war ‘guests of the khalifa’ on the basis of their having been in his palace. Yes, roped, chained and in the dungeon! The rest about meals with the khalifa is all lies...there is no basis for it in any textual source.

### Was Yazeed related to Imam Husain (a.s.) via marriage?

The Nasibi liar says:

Kr-hcy.com states:

This is highly misleading as it may be mentioned here the close affinity of Yazeed with the family of Hazrat Ali (a.s.). In 53 A.H. when Yazeed as Amir-ul-Hujjaj went to Makkah and after Haj reached madinah, at that occasion he was married to Sayyeda Umm Muhammad, the daughter of Abdullah bin Ja’far Yahyar who was the son-in-law of Hazrat Ali and brother-in-law of Hasan and Husain.

Our challenge is to this Nasibi is to substantiate this claim. Produce us an authentic text, with a complete chain proving this alleged marriage. Also, did Yazeed or any members of the Ahlulbait (a.s.) mention that they were related to Yazeed via marriage? Can Azam Tariq produce a single source wherein Yazeed had stated that he was the brother in law of Imam Husain (a.s.)? What is astonishing is the way in which Azam Tariq just makes up historical facts with no textual basis. The answer is that this marriage never took place and the Nasibi has played a very cunning game by calling a proposal (which was subsequently rejected) as ‘marriage’. Imam Ibn Hajar Asqalani records in the Muqadmah of his authority work Fathul Bari, p. 339:

بنت عبد الله بن جعفر بن أبي طالب ووليها أبوها وكان الخاطب لها يزيد بن معاوية فتزوجها ابن عمها القاسم بن محمد

“The guardian of the daughter of Abdullah bin Ja’far bin Abi Talib, was her father. Yazeed bin Muawyiah proposed to marry her but she was married to her cousin al-Qasim bin Muhammad”

# Chapter Seven

## The incident of Harrah

The atrocities committed against the Ahlul bayt (a.s.) and the brutal murder of the grandson of holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.), his family and his companions were not the only crimes perpetuated by Yazeed rather that was just the beginning of his malicious reign. After the slaughter of the Ahlulbait (a.s.) in Karbala, he continued from where he left off and exhibited further heinous and vicious aspects of his persona against the people of Harra. To shed light on the incident, allow us to cite the words that we read in the footnote of a tradition of Saheeh Muslim:

We read in Saheeh Muslim, Hadees 1851:

“The incident of Harra is indeed one of the most despicable events of early Islamic history. It occurred in 63 A.H. at the fag [sic] of the reign of Yazeed. The sum and substance of this event is that the people of Madina on seeing the atrocities of his un-Islamic conduct in the affairs f the state had raised the standard of revolt against him and turned his governor out of the city and elected Abdullah b. Hanzala as the new Governor of Madina. When Yazeed heard of it, he sent Muslim b. Uqba al-Murri at the head of 12,000 soldiers to attack Madina. The city of Messenger (s.a.w.) was brutally attacked and such horrifying atrocities were perpetuated upon the citizens as the very thought of them makes one’s hair stand on end. There was plunder and massacre on a large scale and even a large number of woman was…[[36]](#footnote-36).[[37]](#footnote-37)

Whilst it is evident that the writer was ashamed of mentioning the historical fact that a large number of women folk from the families of the Sahaba were raped by Yazeed’s forces, let us cite it from the History of al-Fakhri, translated by C.E.J. Whitting, London, 1947, pp. 113-115 wherein we learn that Yazeed initially instructed Ubaydullah bin Ziyad to lead an army assault on Medina, who offered excuses, as a result of which he then appointed Muslim bin Uqbah to lead the charge:

“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.”

Imam Daarami records in his Sunan, vol. 1, p. 57 No. 94:

أخبرنا مروان بن محمد عن سعيد بن عبد العزيز قال لما كان أيام الحرة لم يؤذن في مسجد النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم ثلاثا ولم يقم ولم يبرح سعيد بن المسيب من المسجد وكان لا يعرف وقت الصلاة إلا بهمهمة يسمعها من قبر النبي فذكر معناه

Saeed bin Abdul Aziz states that during the days of Harrah, neither Azan nor Iqamah was given for three days in the Mosque of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) despite this Saeed bin al-Musayib did not depart from the mosque, he would acquire receipt of the prayer times through faint voice of the Azan coming from the grave of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.).

Imam Suyuti in his famed work Tareekhul Kholafa writes as follows:

و في سنة ثلاث و ستين بلغه أن أهل المدينة خرجوا عليه و خلعوه فأرسل إليهم جيشا كثيفا و أمرهم بقتالهم ثم المسير إلى مكة لقتال ابن الزبير فجاؤوا و كانت وقعة الحرة على باب طيبة و ما أدراك ما وقعة الحرة؟ ذكرها الحسن مرة فقال : و الله ما كاد ينجوا منهم أحد قتل فيها خلق من الصحابة رضي الله عنهم و من غيرهم و نهبت المدينة و افتض فيه ألف عذراء فإنا لله و إنا إليه راجعون! قال صلى الله عليه و سلم : [من أخاف أهل المدينة أخافه الله و عليه لعنة الله و الملائكة و الناس أجمعين] رواه مسلم

“And in year 63 hijri, he came to know that the people of Madina had separated from him, so he sent a huge army to them and ordered that they be murdered and that they then head to Makka and kill Ibn Zubair, so there was Harrah on the gate tayyaba and how can one realize what Harrah was? Hasan said: ‘By Allah! There was none that was saved, that included companions of Prophet, and others, they looted the city, and took the virginity of a thousand women’.

The Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) had said;

“Whosoever frightens the people of Madina, Allah (s.w.t.) shall frighten him. The curse of Allah (s.w.t.), his angels, and all the people shall be upon such an individual”[[38]](#footnote-38)

We also read:

و سار جيش الحرة إلى مكة لقتال ابن الزبير فمات أمير الجيش بالطريق فاستخلف عليهم أميرا و أتوا مكة فحاصروا ابن الزبير و قاتلوه و رموه بالمنجنيق و ذلك في صفر سنة أربع و ستين و احترقت من شرارة نيرانهم أستار الكعبة و سقفها و قرنا الكبش الذي فدى الله به إسماعيل

“When the army of Harrah left for Makka so as to fight Ibn Zubayr, the commander died, so a new commander was appointed. They then surrounded Makka and proceeded to fight Ibn Zubayr and fired stones from a catapult, the flames of which burnt down the curtains of the Kaaba as well as its ceiling and the horn of the ram which was replaced as a sacrifice for Ismail (a.s.) by Allah (s.w.t.).”

Ibn Kaseer states:

وقد أخطأ يزيد خطأ فاحشا في قوله لمسلم بن عقبة أن يبيح المدينة ثلاثة أيام، وهذا خطأ كبير فاحش، مع ما انضم إلى ذلك من قتل خلق من الصحابة وأبنائهم، وقد تقدم أنه قتل الحسين وأصحابه على يدي عبيد الله بن زياد.وقد وقع في هذه الثلاثة أيام من المفاسد العظيمة في المدينة النبوية ما لا يحد ولا يوصف، مما لا يعلمه إلا الله عز وجل، وقد أراد بارسال مسلم بن عقبة توطيد سلطانه وملكه، ودوام أيامه من غير منازع، فعاقبه الله بنقيض قصده، وحال بينه وبين ما يشتهيه، فقصمه الله قاصم الجبابرة، وأخذه أخذ عزيز مقتدر وكذلك أخذ ربك إذا أخذ القرى وهي ظالمة إن أخذه أليم شديد.

“Yazeed committed a big mistake by telling Muslim bin Utbah to continue with the bloodshed in Madina for three days. This was a huge and Fahash mistake and the bloodshed of Sahaba and their sons was further added to it while it has just been previously mentioned that Husain and his Sahaba had been killed at the hands of Ibn Ziyad. During those three days, such huge crimes were committed that cannot be counted and cannot be mentioned; only Allah knows about them. Yazeed by sending Muslim bin Utbah had sought to strengthen the roots of his government and extend it without any obstacle. But contrary to his wishes, Allah punished him and became an obstacle to his desires and Allah, who (s.w.t.) breaks the backbone of the oppressors, likewise broke the backbone of Yazeed and He (s.w.t.) apprehended him in the same manner that a powerful all conquering individual apprehends someone ‘Even thus is the grasp of thy Lord when He grasped the townships while they are doing wrong. Lo! His grasp is painful, very strong’.[[39]](#footnote-39)

We read in ‘Aujaz al-Masalik’ that Shaykh al-Hadees Muhammad Zakaria stated:

“The army that Yazeed had sent to Medina comprised of 60,000 horsemen and 15,000 foot soldiers. For three days they shed blood freely, 1000 women were raped and 700 named Quraysh and Ansar were killed. Ten thousand women and children were made slaves. Muslim bin Uqba forced people to give baya’h to Yazeed in such a manner that people were enslaved and Yazeed could sell them as he pleased, none of the Sahaba that were present [with the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.)] at Hudaibiya were spared”.

Ibn Hazm has summarised the entire incident in the following manner:

The oath of allegiance administered to Yazeed occurred following the death of his father; his title was Abu Khalid, Husain bin Ali and Abdullah bin Zubair refused to pay the allegiance; then Husain (a.s.) left for Kufa, and he was martyred before entering Kufa, this was the third sad incident following the death of Usmaan and the fourth one following the martyrdom of Umar and was an interruption in Islam because oppression was openly declared against the Muslims with his martyrdom. Abdullah bin Zubair then went to Makka wherein he sought refuge in the House of Allah and resided there.

Yazeed sent his army towards Madina and Makka that amongst the holy sites of Allah (s.w.t.), so in the battle of Harrah, those of Muhajir and Ansar that remained therein were killed and this horrendous incident is also amongst the worst tragic incidents of Islam, creating a break in it because esteemed Muslims, the remnants of the Sahaba and the honourable Tabayeen were openly killed in it or apprehended and then martyred. The horses of Yazeed’s army were present in the mosque of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) and in Riadh ul Jannah, between the grave of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) and his pulpit, they defecated therein; no prayer was offered during those days. And there remained none, save Saeed ul Masayib, he did not leave the mosque at all and had Amro bin Usmaan bin Afan and Marwan bin Hakam not testified to him being insane to Muslim bin Uqba [the leader of the army], he would have likewise been killed. He (Muslim bin Uqba) also compelled people to administer their oaths of allegiance on the condition that they were the slaves of Yazeed bin Mu’awiya, whether he sells them or frees them and when an individual said that we would pledge allegiance on the condition the allegiance was pursuant to the terms of the Qur’an and Sunnah, an order was made to kill him, the said individual was subsequently captured and killed; this sinner Muslim bin Uqba insulted Islam immensely; there was looting in Madina for three days; the companions of Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) were insulted and maltreated; their houses were robbed. The army then surrounded Makka and stoned the House of Allah (s.w.t.) via catapults and this was done under the supervision of Husain bin Numair by the Syrian battalions and this was because the sinner ibn Uqba died three days after the battle of Harra and the leader was now Husain bin Numair. Allah likewise apprehended Yazeed in the same manner, the Owner of power and glory, apprehends others; he died in less than three months but over two months (that is between 2 and 3 months) and Yazeed’s forces returned from Makka. Yazeed died on 15th Rabiul Awwal, 64 hijri, his age was just above 30, his mother was Maisoon bint Bajdal Kalbia, and the era of his rule was three years, eight months and a few days.[[40]](#footnote-40)

### The Fatwa of Ibn Umar and the implications derived thereof

Talking of the incident of Harrah, we deem it an apt opportunity to discuss the role of Abdullah Ibn Umar with respect to Yazeed and the defences for him that are commonly advanced by certain segments of Ahle Sunnah.

Harrah was a horrific event; it involved the ethnic cleansing of the last remnants of those with a nexus with Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.), the surviving Sahaba and Taabe’een that followed them, individuals that as per Sunni beliefs were the best of generations. Slaughter and rape are not uncommon in war, we often hear such despicable crimes being perpetuated during the Rwandan civil war and when the Serbs sought to ethnically cleanse Yugoslavia of its Muslim inhabitants. Anyone that hears of such crimes is shocked, what is moiré shocking is the fact that the ransacking of Madina, the murder and rape of its female inhabitants was not by any non Muslim army during the crusades, this was a crime perpetuated by the Muslim head of state we have already quoted the comments of the translator of Saheeh Muslim:

“The city of Messenger (s.a.w.) was brutally attacked and such horrifying atrocities were perpetuated upon the citizens as the very thought of them makes one’s hair stand on end”.

Just reading about it make’s one’s hair stand on end, can one imagine how the Madian population would have felt, the men folk were slaughtered, the women sexually violated and turned into captives, are these crimes not sufficient enough to cause an individual with a hear to distance himself from Yazeed and all that he stood for? Was the ransacking of Madina not sufficient evidence that Yazeed had nothing to do with the Deen? We are sure that any rational, just individual would agree with us that this would be enough proof for anyone to distance themselves from Yazeed, but not for one prominent individual by the name of Abdullah Ibn Umar. Following Harrah and all the horrors associated with it, Abdullah Ibn Umar convened a private gathering of his near and dear ones and made clear his views on Yazeed and his views on those that had opposed him at Harra, and this is how this fact has been recorded in Saheeh Bukhari, vol. 9, Book 88, and Number 227:

Narrated Naafe’:

When the people of Medina dethroned Yazeed bin Muawiya, Ibn Umar gathered his special friends and children and said, “I heard the Prophet saying, ‘A flag will be fixed for every betrayer on the Day of Resurrection,’ and we have given the oath of allegiance to this person (Yazeed) in accordance with the conditions enjoined by Allah and His Apostle and I do not know of anything more faithless than fighting a person who has been given the oath of allegiance in accordance with the conditions enjoined by Allah and His Apostle , and if ever I learn that any person among you has agreed to dethrone Yazeed, by giving the oath of allegiance (to somebody else) then there will be separation between him and me.”

So the facts are clear that Ibn Umar:

 was advising those within his close circle

 it was at a time when the people of Madina had broken their baya’h to Yazeed

 relied upon a Hadees that any individual that breaks baya’h will be raised as a betrayer on the Day of Judgment

 underlined in no uncertain words that the baya’h to Yazeed was pursuant to the conditions enjoined by Allah and His Apostle

 would distance himself from anyone that broke the baya’h to Yazeed

There is no way that these comments can be put down to taqiyya. Ibn Umar was not making some public declaration in the market it was a private audience with those closest to him and took the form of firm religious advice. In that advice not only did he condemn those that rebelled against Yazeed and made it clear that they would be raised as betrayers on the next world in other words suffer eternal damnation, pursuant to a Hadees of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) he reaffirmed his loyalty to Yazeed making it that he was a legitimate head of state, and his right to rule was in accordance with conditions set by Allah (s.w.t.) and his Rasul, in other words he had the legal backing of Shariah, negating the right of any individual to oppose him by breaking baya’h. The thought of an individual turning his back on Ibn Umar made him so irate that he made it clear that he wanted nothing to do with such an individual.

Lest not forget this Islamic advice is being made after the Harrah and all the heinous crimes that flowed from it. Crimes such as murder, mass rape and the pillaging of Madina may well have taken place but to Ibn Umar there was no Islamic basis to oppose Yazeed he remained the legal head of State in accordance with the conditions set by Allah (s.w.t.) and his Rasul (s.a.w.a.), such conditions were not in any way negated by what Yazeed ordered either at Karbala or Harra!

This was not the single episode of Ibn Umar’s advocacy; he also went to the home of people to vouch for Yazeed’s Khilafat as can be gauged from this tradition in Saheeh Muslim, Kitab al-Imara Book 020, and Number 4562:

It has been reported on the authority of Nafi, that ‘Abdullah b. Umar paid a visit to Abdullah b. Muti’ in the days (when atrocities were perpetrated on the People of Medina) at Harra in the time of Yazeed b. Mu’awiya. Ibn Muti’ said: Place a pillow for Abu ‘Abd al-Rahman (family name of Abdullah bin Umar). But the latter said: I have not come to sit with you. I have come to you to tell you a tradition I heard from the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.). I heard him say: One who withdraws his band from obedience (to the Amir) will find no argument (in his defence) when he stands before Allah on the Day of Judgment, and one who dies without having bound himself by an oath of allegiance (to an Amir) will die the death of one belonging to the days of Jahillyya.

### Note

In the Bukhari tradition he gathered his close ones together and pledged his support for Yazeed, relying on a Hadees to support his stance. In this tradition he personally goes to the home of an acquaintance with one specific objective, to reiterate the legitimacy of Yazeed’s khilfath and the Islamic rulings for one that opposes him. He cites two traditions to evidence his support for Yazeed:

 One who withdraws his hand from obedience (to the Amir) will find no argument (in his defence) when he stands before Allah on the Day of Judgment,

 One who dies without having bound himself by an oath of allegiance (to an Amir) will die the death of one belonging to the days of Jahillyya

If we bring together all the traditions relied upon by Ibn Umar from the Sahihayn as part of his representing his client Yazeed we learn three things:

 Those that break the baya’h to Yazeed will be raised as betrayers in the next world

 Those that break the baya’h to Yazeed will have no defence in the next world

 Those who died without having given baya’h to Yazeed as their leader will die the death of Jaheliyyah

This Fatwa of Ibn Umar, based on his reliance on three traditions means that in his eyes:

 All of the Sahaba in Madina that broke their baya’h will be punished in the next world accordingly

 All those Sahaba that died without having given baya’h to Yazeed whether that be by not having even given (Imam Husain (a.s.), his family and Sahaba) or broke it (all the Sahaba and Taabe’een in Harrah) died the death of apostates.

Now our questions are as follows:

1. How does the Sunni aqaid that all the Sahaba are just, truthful and guaranteed Paradise concur with the viewpoint of Ibn Umar that all those that opposed Yazeed by either not giving him baya’h or breaking died the death of jahilyya? Dying the death of jahilyya cannot be deemed to be the stance of people that are just and truthful.

2. If Ibn Umar was so worried that failing to give Yazeed baya’h, results in people dying the death of jahiliyya, why did he not inform Imam Husain (a.s.) as such before he left Madina?

3. If the Hadees relied on by Ibn Umar for Yazeed were correctly applied why is it that no other Sahaba of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) alive at that time recollected it as proof of Yazeed’s Khilafat?

4. If Ibn Umar was warning people not to died in a state wherein they have not accepted Yazeed, since doing so leads to an individual dying the death of Jaheliyyah, why did he not rely on this Hadees himself, after all according to Fatah ul Bari Sharh Saheeh Bukhari, v6 p145 Ibn Umar never gave baya’h to Imam Ali (a.s.) but gave it to Yazeed. Was he not fearful that he might die the death of Jaheliyyah by not giving baya to his Amir of time? If so why was he prepared to take a risk and wait until Muawiyah became Khalifa to give baya’h to an Amir? Was Yazeed more worthy of recognition to avoid the death of Jaheliyyah than Yazeed?[[41]](#footnote-41)

5. If those that break their baya’h to Yazeed will die the death of Jaheliyyah and be raised as Baghis in the next world, why is the same Hadees not applied to those that broke the baya’h to Hazrat Ali (a.s.), fought him and died in a state wherein they had not recognized him?

This Fatwa of Ibn Umar carries major implications for the Sunni belief system:

 Most Sunnis regard Imam Husain (a.s.), his family and supporters who lost their lives in Karbala as martyrs, Ibn Umar views them as dying the death of jahiliyya

 Must Sunnis regard those Sahaba that broke the baya’h to Yazeed and died in that stat, laying their lives against the principle that he was not the legitimate head of state died as martyrs, Ibn Umar views them as dying the death of jahilyya, and persons who will be raised as betrayers in the next world

 Sunnis believe that all the Sahaba that fought in wars after the Prophet (s.a.w.a.) during the Caliphate of Ali (a.s.) will be forgiven, as they exercised ijtihaad, for which they will get one reward if wrong and two if right. The Fatwa of Ibn Umar negates that completely he stated that those Sahaba that lost their lives Harrah, will have no defence whatsoever on the Day of Judgment rather they will die the death of kaafirs and will be raised as rebels in the next world. Why did he not say they will be forgiven as they exercised ijtihad, for which they will get one reward if wrong and two if right? Who knows the Shariah better today’s Sunni Mullah or Abdullah Ibn Umar?

The above points leave Sunni Muslims in a serious quandary. As a Sahabi he is regarded as just and truthful meaning that his Fatwa on those that opposed Yazeed by either not recognizing him or breaking baya’h and dying in that state will die the death of jahiliyya was also accurate as it was given by a just and truthful man. Once they accept his reliance upon these Hadees then that automatically means all the other Sahaba died kaafirs then means that they cannot be regarded as just and truthful.

If Ibn Umar’s interpretation of Hadees to evidence his pro Yazeed stance was wrong then that destroys his credibility, it openly leads to one questioning his probity, he can no longer be viewed as just and truthful after all he was relying on Hadees to prove the legitimacy of a major transgressor, a view that was not shared by all of the other Sahaba of the time. If that approach is taken then questions need to be asked of all that he says, that means that Sunnis will have to reject the thousands of his narrations in Saheeh Bukhari. So what can they do?

The tragedy of Harrah and the open advocacy of Ibn Umar create serious questions for those Sunnis that love Imam Husain (a.s.) and support the stance that he took, deeming it one that revived the faith. The ordinary person on the street might be moved by what happened to the Ahlulbait (a.s.) at Karbala and the Sahaba at Harrah and hate Yazeed, but not Ibn Umar, Abdullah Ibn Umar does not concur with modern day popular Sunni opinion, he was an out and out advocate of Yazeed and supported him through thick and thin at every stage of his life of debauchery, even when Madina rose up against him having recognized his atrocious conduct, Ibn Umar loyally stood behind him insisting to the people that his Khilafat was pursuant to the conditions set by Allah (s.w.t.) and his Rasul (s.a.w.a.) and that anyone opposing him would die the death of Jaheliyyah and that he wanted nothing to do with anyone that abandoned him. Perhaps it was for this very reason that the Urdu translator of Saheeh Bukhari, Maulana Syed Naib Husain (revision done by Maulana Syed Muhammad Ali) adopted blatant tahreef when translating this tradition when he replaced the name Yazeed with Muawiyah, so that it seemed as if Ibn Umar was rebuking those that had broken their baya’h to Muawiyah, when the original/Arabic text has the words Yazeed ibn Muawiyah![[42]](#footnote-42)

The tragedy of Harrah and the Fatwa of Ibn Umar after it has major implications for those that adhere to the thought that all the Sahaba are just and truthful on its head, and highlights how baseless this doctrine is.

# Chapter Eight

## Hadees referring to Yazeed and his era

### Abu Hurairah sought protection from the events of 56 Hijri

1. Al-Bidayah wa al-Nihaya, vol. 8, p. 114

2. Fatah ul Bari, vol. 13, p. 10 Kitab al-Fitan

3. Tareekh al-Islam (Zahabi), vol. 2, p. 339 Zikr Abu Hurairah

4. Al Isaba, vol. 4, p. 200 Zikr Abu Hurairah

5. Al Bidaya wa al-Nihaya, vol. 6, p. 228

Abu Hurairah would walk through the markets and ‘O Allah don’t accept the events of 56 Hijri and I don’t see this boy’s reign’

In Fatah ul Bari Ibn Hajr states that:

“Abu Hurairah was referring to the youth of Quraysh”

### Abu Said al-Khudri’s condemnation of 60 Hijri

1. Tafseer Ibn Kaseer, vol. 3, p. 128, Surah Maryam verse 59

2. Majm’a al-Zawaid, vol. 6, p. 231

3. Musnad Ibn Hanbal, vol. 3, p. 38

4. Fatah ul Qadeer, vol. 3, p. 329

5. Al-Bidayah wa al-Nihaya, vol. 8, p. 230

Ibn Kaseer states:

“Abu Said al-Khudri narrates that he heard Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) say after 60 Hijri undeserving people shall ignore prayers and enter the deepest part of Hell”.

This hadees is also a condemnation of Yazeed since he became the Leader immediately after 60 Hijri.

### Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) said Yazeed will destroy my religion

We read in Al-Bidayah, vol. 8, p. 231 Zikr Yazeed:

Justice shall rule my Ummah until the first individual who shall destroy my Deen, from the Banu Ummayaa his name shall be Yazeed.

Yes, imam of the Nawasib Yazeed is accused of destroying the Deen by the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) himself. I say we destroy the Deen of the Nasibis. Their Deen is different to that of other Muslims, Shia or Sunni.

# Chapter Nine

## Analysing hadees allegedly blessing Yazeed

### Has Yazeed been guaranteed Paradise?

Here it comes; more from Azam Tariq (may Allah’s curse be upon him):

Azam Tariq stated:

Yazeed was the commander of Muslim forces who marched to Caesar’s city. This expedition was sent during the reign of Hazrat Muawiyah and in this task force were included elderly and illustrious sahaba like Hazrat Abu Ayyub ansari whose funeral prayer was led by Yazeed according to the will of Hazrat Ayyub Ansari himself. This expedition took place in 51 A.H. in which Hazrat Husain fought under the leadership of Yazeed. This was the pioneering Muslim force which landed in Caesar’s city and according to a hadees narrated by Abdullah Bin Umar which has been recorded by Bukhari, Messenger of Allah said:

“The army which will first embark on the expedition of Constantinople will bless.”[[43]](#footnote-43)

Yazeed was the commander of Muslim forces on this expedition who waged jihad in Caesar’s city and as such he falls within the parameter of above hadees of the Prophet (s.a.w.a.). In view of this it is not becoming on any Muslim to cast aspersions on yazeed as the entire army which took part in this campaign has been blessed by Allah (s.w.t.) in the context of above hadees.

Let us analyse the complete tradition from Saheeh al-Bukhari, Book of Jihad, vol. 4, Book 52, and Number 175:

Narrated Khalid bin Madan:

That Umair bin Al-Aswad Al-Anasi told him that he went to Ubada bin As-Samit while he was staying in his house at the seashore of Hims with (his wife) Um Haram. Umair said. Um Haram informed us that she heard the Prophet saying, “Paradise is granted to the first batch of my followers who will undertake a naval expedition.” Um Haram added, I said, ‘O Allah’s Apostle! Will I be amongst them?’ He replied, ‘You are amongst them.’ The Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) then said, ‘the first army amongst’ my followers who will invade Caesar’s City will be forgiven their sins.’ I asked, ‘Will I be one of them, O Allah’s Apostle?’ He replied in the negative.”

These filthy Nasibi have only one hadees that they claim absolves their Imam of any wrongdoing, namely his participation in the army that conquered Caesar’s City. They allege that this allege attendance has assured him of Paradise. We all have to die one day and answer our Creator we have cited scores of Sunni sources that highlight Yazeed’s deeds, his love of incest, homosexuality, drinking, singing, kufr aqeedah and his killing of Imam Husain (a.s.). Are we really going to just accept this single hadees in Bukhari to neutralise all of Yazeed’s deeds? We appeal to justice and shall cite the following replies:

### Reply One – The narrators of this hadees are enemies of Ahlulbait (a.s.)

If we consult Saheeh Bukhari, vol. 1, p. 409 Kitab Jihad Rasheedeya Publishers Delhi 1377 Hijri and the commentary by Shaykhul Hadees Ahmad Ali Shahranpuri, we read:

“The tradition relating to Caesar’s City was narrated by Sawr bint Yazeed he was an enemy of Commander of the Faithful Ali”.

If this doesn’t convince these Nawasib then we shall cite the following glittering obituary of the man recorded by Imam Ibn Saad:

“He is Seqah in Hadees. It is said that he was a rejecter of Taqdeer. He died in 152 A.H. in Bait al-Muqaddas during the era of Abu Ja’far over the age of 60. The grandfather of Sawr was present in Siffeen and participated along side Muawiyah and was killed in the same war. Therefore whenever the name of Ali was taken before Sawr he used to say: “I do not love the man who killed my grandfather.”[[44]](#footnote-44)

Moreover, when we read the biography of another narrator of the tradition namely Khalid bin Madan, we learn that he used to narrate from Imam of Nawasib while second category Nawasib used to narrate from him, this shall suffice to prove his firm association with Nasibism. We read in Tahdeeb al-Tahdeeb, vol. 3, p. 102:

“Khalid bin M’adan bin Abi Kuraib al-Kalaaei Abu Abdullah al-Shaami al-Hemsi, he narrated from Thawban, Ibn Amro, Ibn Umar, Utbah bin Abdulsalami & Mu’awyia bin Abi Sufyan…Narrated from him by Buhair bin Saeed, Muhammad bin Ibrahim bin al-Haris al-Taimi, Sawr bin Yazeed and Hariz bin Usmaan…”

As we can see that one of his teachers was Imam of the Nasibi cult namely Muawiyah and notorious Nawasib such as Sawr bin Yazeed and Hariz bin Usmaan used to narrate from him, this shall suffice to evidence the ideology that Khalid adhered to. What reliance can we have on a hadees narrated by a scholar whose source of knowledge came from three King Pins of the Nasibi cult? These so called defenders of Ahle Sunnah are trying to get us to accept a hadees narrated by Nawasib to absolve their Imam of all wrongdoings!

### Reply Two – The only narrator of this hadees is a woman

This is a crucial point. Why would Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) choose to locate non-mahram woman (viz. Um Haram) to convey this hadees to? Is this the type of hadees that he (s.a.w.a.) would not wish to convey to a wider audience, particularly to men participating in Jihad? Is this not a hadees that would boost morale / encourage soldiers to fight? Why keep it top secret, to the point that only person who knows of the rewards for participating in this expedition is a woman, who would clearly be unable to communicate this to an audience in a manner that ‘esteemed’ figures such as Abu Hurairah could do.

Additionally why convey this to a woman, who was his (s.a.w.a.) non-mahram that meant that she would have had to observe strict purdah (veil) in his presence? After all Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) had nine wives, could he not have conveyed this hadees to any of them? Why convey this to a woman that was not his (s.a.w.a.) wife, relative or sister in law? And why did her husband not take this hadees and declare it to the masses in the battlefield? Surely this would have instilled true fighting spirit amongst masses, if they knew that they were to attain Paradise. Rather than do this, why did Um Haram choose to only convey this to her student Umair bin Al-Aswad Al-Anasi?

Worthy of note, when we read this hadees in sources other than Saheeh Bukhari wherein Um Haram has narrated the tradition to her nephew Uns bin Malik there is no mention of maghfoor [Paradise], yet when she narrates it to a non mahram Umair she remembers that the participants are blessed with Heaven! Why did she forget to convey the words ‘Paradise’ to her nephew but then chose to entertain a non-mahram in her home and convey the hadees with this word to him?

### Reply – The Sahaba’s Ignorance of guaranteed Paradise issued by the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) proves the tradition is fabricated

The fabricated tradition of Bukhari attributed two predictions to the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.), firstly the glad tidings of paradise for the participants of the first naval war and then the glad tidings fabricated for the benefit of Yazeed according to which the sins of the army invading Caesar’s City would be forgiven. Let us now point out some visible defects in the first alleged glad tiding so that the second part will automatically be proven to be a fabrication.

We would like to ask our unbiased and a prudent reader that if this tradition was true then doesn’t it mean that importance of first naval war and attacking Caesar’s city was equal to Bait Ridhwan (allegiance under tree) in terms of nature and its merits? Surely the answer would be in the affirmative since in both cases there are either glad tidings of Allah being pleased or guaranteed paradise for the respective participants. Now the importance of Bait Ridhwan is that Allah (s.w.t.) Himself mentioned it in the Holy Qur’an, it was then that the Sahaba bore their allegiance upon the blessed hands of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.); Bait Ridhwan appeared on the tongues of each and every Muslim child. The companions who participated in that were respected and possessed a rank above those who didn’t participate.

Now the main question arises:

If this first naval war was also equally Important as Bait Ridhwan then why does it have only one narrator and that too a woman?

If the first naval war was associated with glad tidings of earning paradise then:

 The Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) should have repeatedly cascaded these glad tidings of earning paradise and forgiveness of sins for participating in the first naval war and invading Caesar’s city to his Sahaba so as to encourage them to strive towards getting into that rank.

 The Sahaba should have likewise propagated these crucial glad tidings associated with the first naval war and gathered together the Muslims to attack the city of Caesar and attain Paradise in the process.

Rather than this happening, NONE of Sahaba knew of such glad tidings of Jannah, in fact, even the Sahaba that participated in the first naval war were unaware that their participation had erased their sins and guaranteed them Paradise! The reality is long after the invasion of Caesar’s city the main objective behind fabricating such a tradition was to provide a safe path to Yazeed but since the genetic makeup of the Nasibi species has always comprised of imbeciles those with rational minds can easily distinguish truth from falsehood and identify basic weaknesses in the text of the tradition.

Let us now cite some historical accounts which shall prove that the Sahaba were unaware of any traditions indicating that glad tidings were associated with the first naval war.

### First & second traditions: Caliph Umar Ibn Khattab didn’t know of any glad tidings for the first naval war nor did he authorize such a campaign

We read in History of al-Tabari:

According to Ubaidah and Khalid:

In times of Umar bin al-Khattab, Muawiyyah pleaded with him about naval campaigns (غضو البحر) and closeness of the Byzantines to Hims. He said, “In one of the villages of Hims, the inhabitants hear the barking of (the Byzantines) dogs and the squawking of their chickens.” [He pressed Umar] until he was on the verge of being won over. So Umar wrote to Amr b. al-As [saying] “Describe the sea and the seafarer to me, for I am uneasy about it.”

According to Ubadah and Khalid: When [Umar] informed him of the benefits for the Muslims and the damage to the Polytheists to be derived from (naval warfare), Amr wrote back to him [as follows]: “Verily I have seen a great creature [that is, the sea] ridden by a small one [that is, man]. If (the sea) is calm it rends the heart with anxiety, and if it is agitated it leads the mind into confusion. On it certainty shrinks and doubt increases. Those who are on it are like a worm on a twig, if it bends he is drowned, and if he is saved he is astounded. “When Umar read (this letter), he wrote to Mu’awiyah [as follows]: “No, by Him who sent Muhammad with the Truth, I shall never send any Muslim there.”[[45]](#footnote-45)

We also read:

Junadah bin Abi Umayyah al-Azdi:

Mu’awiyah had written a letter to Umar and provoke his interest in naval campaigns, saying, “O Commander of the Faithful, in Syria there is a village whose inhabitants hear the barking of the Byzantines dogs and the crowing of their roosters, for (the Byzantines) are directly opposite a certain stretch of the coast of (the district of) hims. Now Umar was doubtful about this because (Mu’awiyah) was the one who advised it. He therefore wrote to Amr (as follows): “Describe the sea for me and send me information about it.” Amr then wrote to him (as follows): “O Commander of the Faithful, I have seen a mighty creature ridden by a small one. It is naught but sky and water, and (those who travel upon it) are only like a worm on a twig: if it bends he drowns, and if he is saved, he is smashed.”

After reading these traditions, we see that in the years that followed the death of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) no efforts were made to establish and float the Paradise guaranteed first naval expedition. This omission can better be explained if break down the relevant periods:

1. The Caliphate of Abu Bakr followed the death of the Prophet (s.a.w.a.) and lasted for two and a half years, yet during that entire period there was no mention of glad tidings being associated with the first naval war. This non compliance to the alleged words of the Prophet (s.a.w.a.) was very different to the enthusiasm shown by Abu Bakr in sending the remaining army of Usama.

2. Then came, the lengthy ten year tenure of Umar Ibn Khattab’s caliphate. In his time, Muslim Armies were sent were sent out to capture land that expanded the Islamic territory to regions such as Africa, Iran and North Asia. Despite this no first naval war was every mentioned or conducted in his reign.

3. Whilst Muawiyah as Governor became the first person that expressed a desire to attack the Byzantine Empire through the sea he remained ignorant of any glad tidings associated with the first naval war. Muawiyah didn’t get permission from the Caliph and made no mention of glad tiding associated with such an expedition to convince him. He simply mentioned the barking of dogs of Byzantine Empire and the squawking of their chickens as his argument.

4. Muawiyah spent years failing to convince Umar Ibn Khattab of the merits of his proposal. Subsequently, Umar began to have some interest in it but again after reading the letter of Amr bin Al-Aas he made an oath not send a single Muslim on the naval war.

Do the najis Nawasib believe that Umar became afraid after hearing about the sea? Didn’t Umar believe in the Prophecy of Muhammad (s.a.w.a.) that participating in first naval war would guarantee entry into paradise? Why was he preventing his soldiers from getting the chance to attain Paradise? Was it not selfish if him to restrict such a beneficial opportunity? And why didn’t a single Sahabi during this lengthy period mention the alleged glad tidings attributed to the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) in the tradition of Bukhari?

### Third tradition: Umar admonishing Muawiyah for his constant attempts to persuade him to order the naval war

We read:

Junadah bin Abi Umayah and Rabi and Abu al-Mujalid:

Umar wrote to Muawiyyah (as follows): “We have heard that the Mediterranean Sea (bhar al-Sham) surpasses the longest thing upon the earth, seeking God’s permission every day and every night to overflow the earth and submerge it. How then can I bring the troops to this troublesome and infidel being? By God, one Muslim is dearer to me than all that the Byzantines possess. Take care not to oppose me. I have given you a command, you know what al-’Ala’ (bin al-Hazrami) encountered at my hands, and I did not give him such categorical orders.”

In this tradition we learned that no where the alleged glad tidings associated with the first naval war were discussed between the two popular Sahaba, Umar ibn Khattab admonished Muawiyah. Had there been really any such glad tidings associated with the first naval war, would the followers of the Sahaba accept such a response from Umar Ibn Khattab?

### Fourth tradition: Forced recruitment of Muslims to participate in the naval war

Khalid bin Madan:

The first to conduct naval warfare was Mu’awiyah bin Abi Sufyan in the time of ‘Usmaan bin Affan. He had sought Umar’s permission for this but did not obtain it. When ‘Usmaan took Office, Mu’awiyah persisted until at last ‘Usmaan decided to grant permission. He said, “Do not conscript the people or cast lots among them. Let them decide for themselves and whoever chooses [to go on] campaign in obedience [to your call], support and aid him.”

Uptil now, we learned:

1. Muawiyah failed to convince Umar Ibn Khattab during his ten years reign to conduct a naval war.

2. When Usmaan became caliph he did not prepare a naval war until four years into his reign. Readers should remember that Usmaan became caliph in year 24 A.H. while first naval was conducted in year 28 A.H. People who have studied history know the influence Muawiyah yielded over Usmaan due to their relationship and thus, Usmaan would without hesitation accept his demands yet when it came to the first naval war, it took four years for Muawiyah to persuade Usmaan.

3. After four years, permission was given to Muawiyah on the condition that the people should not be forced to join the army put forward by Usmaan. This fact destroys all the efforts of Nawasib to associate alleged glad tidings to the first naval war. Why the issue of forced recruitment in the naval army would not have even come into the equation, rather the Sahabah would be forcing their way onto the naval boats if they new that all participants attained a passport to Paradise!

By now, any rational and unbiased reader would understand that the tradition of Bukhari was fabricated by the Nawasib in their feeble attempt to provide some merits to the son of their master Muawiyah. Since the first part of the Bukhari tradition which alleges glad tidings of paradise for the participants of first naval war proved to be a fabricated the second part of the tradition which alleges glad tidings and the erasure of sins of the army invading Caesar’s City automatically become fabricated.

### Reply – At the time that Constantinople was attacked Yazeed was at home drunk

Azam Tariq Nasibi sought to bless his Khalifah Yazeed by stating:

Azam Tariq stated:

Yazeed was the commander of Muslim forces on this expedition who waged jihad in Caesar’s city and as such he falls within the parameter of above hadees of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.).

Not only is this hadees a lie but so is the claim that Yazeed led this campaign and as evidence for this we have relied on the following authentic texts of Ahle Sunnah:

1. Tareekh-e-Kaamil, vol. 3, p. 231 Events of 49 Hijri

2. Tareekh Ibn Khaldoon, vol. 3, p. 15

3. Muruj al-Zahab, vol. 3, p. 33

4. Umdat al-Qari, vol. 14, p. 199

We read in Tareekh-e-Kaamil:

في هذه السنة، وقيل: سنة خمسين، سير معاوية جيشاً كثيفاً إلى بلاد الروم للغزاة وجعل عليهم سفيان بن عوف وأمر ابنه يزيد بالغزاة معهم، فتثاقل واعتل، فأمسك عنه أبوه فأصاب الناس في غزاتهم جوعٌ ومرض شديد، فأنشأ يزيد يقول

“In this year (49 Hijri) and some says 50 A.H., Mu’awiyah made preparations to take the towns and cities of Rome under Sufyan bin Auf. He sent out the army and ordered his son Yazeed to join him but Yazeed was lax in this regard; Mu’awiya therefore became silent on the matter. The army during the conquered suffered from sickness and hunger and upon receipt of this news, Yazeed recited a couplet:

Why shall I care about what the army facing in Farqadona from fever and smallpox, while I lay comfort in deluxe clothes at the house of Marwan with Umm-e-Kulsum”?

Um Kulthoom bint Abdullah Ibn Aamir was Yazeed’s wife. When Muawiyah heard the couplets of Yazeed, he vowed to send him to Rome to Sufiyan bin Auf so that he also confronts hardship”

We read in Muruj al-Zahab:

“Mu’awiya received information on the progress of the army and conveyed this news to Yazeed who said, “In this case I shall convene a function in home, joined by my fellow drunkards”.

Imam of Ahle Sunnah Badruddin al-Aini stated:

قلت الأظهر أن هؤلاء السادات من الصحابة كانوا مع سفيان هذا ولم يكونوا مع يزيد بن معاوية لأنه لم يكن أهلا أن يكون هؤلاء السادات في خدمته

“I say that it appears that those Sahaba were with Sufyan (bin Auf) not with Yazeed bin Mu’awiyah because he (Yazeed) didn’t deserve to have those Sahaba at his service”[[46]](#footnote-46)

By citing these references, it has become clear that:

1. Unlike the propaganda of Azam Tariq al-Nasibi al-Mala’oon, it was Sufyan bin Auf who was the commander of the army that went to Caesar’s City and not Yazeed.

2. Yazeed had no interest in participating in the Jihad and thus didn’t go with the army which clearly excludes him from the first army promised forgiveness in the alleged hadees.

3. On hearing the hardships the army confronted there, Yazeed became pleased at his decision of not going which is not a sign of a person worthy enough to have a glance at Paradise let alone enter it.

4. On hearing Yazeed’s satisfaction, Muawiyah decided to send him as a punishment.

### Reply – Sunni scholars have discounted Yazeed from the glad tidings of forgiveness mentioned in the tradition

Even if for the sake of argument it is believed that the tradition of Bukhari is not fabricated, the present day Nawasib would still attain no advantage for their father Yazeed through this tradition since the Sunni Imams, have asserted that the tradition guarantees glad tidings for those worthy of it, not Yazeed. To evidence this we have relied on the following esteem Sunni sources:

1. Umdat al-Qari, vol. 14, p. 199

2. Faydh al-Qadir, vol. 3, p. 109 Tradition 2811

3. Fathul Bari, vol. 6, p. 102

4. Irshad al-Sari, vol. 5, p. 101

5. Siraj al-Munir Sharah Jami al-Saghir by Shaykh Ali bin Ahmed Azeezi, vol. 1, p. 79

6. Sharah Tarajum

Imam of Ahle Sunnah Badruddin al-Aini in commentary of this tradition records:

وقال المهلب في هذا الحديث منقبة لمعاوية لأنه أول من غزا البحر ومنقبة لولده يزيد لأنه أول من غزا مدينة قيصر انتهى قلت أي منقبة كانت ليزيد وحاله مشهور فإن قلت قال في حق هذا الجيش مغفور لهم قلت لا يلزم من دخوله في ذلك العموم أن لا يخرج بدليل خاص إذ لا يختلف أهل العلم أن قوله مغفور لهم مشروط بأن يكونوا من أهل المغفرة حتى لو ارتد واحد ممن غزاها بعد ذلك لم يدخل في ذلك العموم فدل على أن المراد مغفور لمن وجد شرط المغفرة

Ibn al-Muhalab said that this hadees contain a merit for Muawiyah because he is the first one who invaded through sea and a merit for Yazeed because he invaded Cesar’s city.

I say that what kind of merits could there be for Yazeed while his status is known! If you say that He (s.a.w.a.) said about this army that their sins are forgiven then I say its not necessary to include each and every one without any exception because the scholars agree that the forgiveness is conditional by being for the one who deserve forgiveness, because had some one among the invaders become apostate after the invasion, he would have not been included among those who had been forgiven, which proves that the forgiveness (in the hadees) is conditional.[[47]](#footnote-47)

Likewise Imam Abdul Rauf Munawi while commenting on this tradition records:

لا يلزم منه كون يزيد بن معاوية مغفورا له لكونه منهم إذ الغفران مشروط بكون الإنسان من أهل المغفرة ويزيد ليس كذلك لخروجه بدليل خاص ويلزم من الجمود على العموم أن من ارتد ممن غزاها مغفور له وقد أطلق جمع محققون حل لعن يزيد

“It is not necessary that Yazeed is forgiven just because he was with them, since the forgiveness is conditional by being for the one who deserve forgiveness while Yazeed is not so and there is an exception in his case according to a reliable proof, but if we want to be stubborn in dealing with this tradition that it include every one then we have to include who ever become apostate among the invaders, in addition a group of scholars declared the lawfulness of cursing Yazeed”[[48]](#footnote-48)

Imam of Ahle Sunnah Ibn Hajar Asqalani in his esteemed commentary of Saheeh Bukhari presents his arguments relying on the arguments of two more Sunni scholars namely Ibn al-Tiin and Ibn al-Munir:

قال المهلب في هذا الحديث منقبة لمعاوية لأنه أول من غزا البحر ومنقبة لولده يزيد لأنه أول من غزا مدينة قيصر وتعقبه بن التين وبن المنير بما حاصله أنه لا يلزم من دخوله في ذلك العموم أن لا يخرج بدليل خاص إذ لا يختلف أهل العلم أن قوله صلى الله عليه و سلم مغفور لهم مشروط بأن يكونوا من أهل المغفرة حتى لو ارتد واحد ممن غزاها بعد ذلك لم يدخل في ذلك العموم اتفاقا فدل على أن المراد مغفور لمن وجد شرط المغفرة فيه منهم

Ibn al-Muhalab said that this hadees contain a merit for Muawiyah because he is the first one who invaded through sea and a merit for Yazeed because he invaded Cesar’s city.

Ibn al-Tiin and Ibn al-Munir answered back and said that it is not necessary to include every one without any exception because the scholars agree that forgiveness is conditional by being for the one who deserve forgiveness, because if some one among the invaders became apostate after the invasion, he will not be included among those who had been forgiven, which proves that the forgiveness (in the hadees) is conditional.[[49]](#footnote-49)

Similarly, Imam Qastalani in his famed commentary of Saheeh Bukhari namely Irshad al-Sari, vol. 5, p. 101 stated:

“In this hadees, Muhalab has inferred about Yazeed’s caliphate and he being worthier to enter paradise by saying that he was included in the generality of the word ‘Maghfoor lahum’ in this hadees. This has been refuted in the manner that this has been said just in support of Bani Umayah and Yazeed being included in its generality doesn’t mean that he is unable to be excluded from it on the basis of some special reason because there isn’t any dispute in the fact that the aforesaid words of ‘Maghfoor lahum’ by Prophet (s.a.w.a.) are conditional for those people deserving of forgiveness (Maghfarah), if somebody among them becomes apostate after the war then there is a consensus that such a person will no longer be included in this glad tiding. This has been said by Ibn Munir and verily some scholars have deemed it permissible to curse Yazeed for example Saaduddin Taftazani”

By giving examples of one apostatizing after falling into the category of those who are forgiven, the Imams of Ahle Sunnah sought to prove that even if an individual falls under the category of a group that has been given the glad tiding of forgiveness, he must be a deserving candidate, once he falls into that category he shall be held accountable for the subsequent sins committed by him. This can further be explained by the following Hadees recorded in Musnad Abi Yala, vol. 7, p. 32 which has been declared Saheeh by the margin writer of the book Husain Salim Asad:

أن النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم قال : يا معاذ قال : لبيك يا رسول الله قال : بشر الناس أنه من قال : لا إله إلا الله دخل الجنة

Anas narrated that the Holy prophet (s.a.w.a.) said: “O Ma’az”. Ma’az said: “Yes Allah’s messenger”. He (s.a.w.a.) said: “Tell the people, who ever said ‘there is no God except Allah’ will enter paradise”.

If we interpret the aforesaid words of Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) literally, that would mean that all those who after reciting ‘there is no God except Allah’ commit adultery, take bribes, consume alcohol, commit theft, murder the innocent and commit all other sorts of sin will not be held accountable for them, which is illogical and un-Islamic. Reciting the Kalima certainly makes one eligible to enter paradise as long as one also obeys the other Islamic injunctions.

# Chapter Ten

## The alleged comments of Muhammad al-Hanafiyya

The Nasibi have left no stone unturned in their efforts to protect Yazeed, and what a surprise! They find a tradition that they deem to be so solid that they in effect destroy everything that the Sunni Ulema had stated before!

Kr-hcy.com states:

The Shias have done a lot of mud-slinging on the conduct and character of yazeed trying out of malice and prejudice to falsely project him as addicted to wine and passion on account of sheer ill-will and enmity. This has been refuted by Muhammad bin al-Hanifa, the elder brother of Hazrat Husain who remarked:

“Whatever ill you say about him (Yazeed), i have witnessed none of the same. I have stayed with him and found him a regular worshipper (i.e. Fast observer of salat), well wisher of others, fonder of the knowledge of shari’ah and abiding by the Sunnah of the prophet (s.a.w.).”[[50]](#footnote-50)

Therefore, unenlightened Muslims under the influence of shias should not transgress the limits of cursing Yazeed in their love for Hazrat Husain and Ahle-bait.

### Reply One

The reference comes from Ibn Kaseer’s famed work ‘al-Bidayah wa al-Nihaya’ and both Azam Tariq and Abu Sulaiman produced this same reference as evidence of Yazeed’s immense piety but the episode is not going to help the Nawasib since Ibn Kaseer quoted it without mentioning the original source or its chain of narration which was quite unusual on Ibn Kaseer’s part. Thus, this episode will be considered baseless and weak until our opponent proves that it is considered as authentic in their school. Still for the sake of arguments we would also like to add some additional replies for the followers of Mu’awiya to mull over.

### Reply Two

We find no evidence in any Shi’a book, wherein Muhammad al-Hanafiyya had made such a claim. This reference can only be located in a book belonging to the people of Mu’awiya, and such a reference has no bearing on the Shi’a.

### Reply Three

This is a fabricated tradition for no Shia or Sunni scholar with the exception of some Nasibis, and only those of this age and none of the past, believe to be authentic. For they all state that Yazeed was a fasiq and a fajir. If, however, he had made these comments, which he did not, then he would have been in clear error. It should be pointed out that neither was Muhammad al-Hanafiyya a Prophet or an Imam. These are not the words of an Imam (a.s.) or Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) so they mean absolutely nothing in our eyes.

### Reply Four

Abdullah bin Abbas, Abdullah ibn Zubaur and Abdullah ibn Umar and Abdullah bin Hanzala, are all counted by the Ahle Sunnah as Sahaba and they openly condemned Yazeed’s character. In addition when our own Imam Husain (a.s.) condemned Yazeed, then any attempts to present him in a favourable light are worthless to us.

### Reply Five

We read in al-Bidaya wa al-Nihaya, vol. 8, p. 217 under the events of 63 Hijri when a movement began against Yazeed, and the Sahaba began to testify with regards to Yazeed’s fasiq status, every person began to say they would revoke the baya’h in the same way that they remove a shoe. Soon there was an entire stack of shoes. We can judge the extent to which the Sahaba hated Yazeed, by the fact that compared baya’h to Yazeed to a shoe. It is highly improbable that Muhammad al-Hanafiyya would have heaped criticism on the people of Medina for opposing Yazeed.

# Chapter Eleven

## Cursing Yazeed

### Answering the Fatwa of Abu Hamid Ibn Ghazzali

The lovers of Yazeed have made efforts to exalt him as a pious and just khalifa who has been the victim of a smear campaign spanning 1,400 years waged by both Sunni and Shia Ulema. They have thus sought to rewrite history. In the midst of all the scholars who condemned Yazeed, including Imam Ahmed ibn Hanbal who issued Takfir on him (see above), the Nawasib found one, and only one ‘father figure’ of traditional Sunni Islam: Ibn Ghazzali. It is interesting to note that the same Nasibis that HATE Ghazzali on account of his Sufi leanings are happy to embrace his position on Yazeed. He miraculously transforms from deviant to the greatest scholar after the four Fiqh Imams. Azam Tariq rants off the prized fatwa as follows:

Azam Tariq stated:

A question was put to Imam Ghazzali whether there is a valid ground for cursing Yazeed for his alleged complicity in the murder of Hazrat Husain. The Imam Ghazzali replied as under:-

“It is not lawful to curse any Muslim. Anyone who curses a Muslim is himself accursed. Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.) said: “A Muslim is not given to cursing.” Besides the Islamic Shariah has prohibited us from even cursing the animals. How then it would be permissible to curse any Muslim when the honour of a Muslim is more sacred than the Holy Ka'aba as mentioned in a hadees.[[51]](#footnote-51)

“The Islamic faith of Yazeed is proved without any shadow of doubt. As regards the murder of Husain, there is no definite evidence that Yazeed either killed him or issued orders for his killing or approved any such plans. When nothing has been proved in this regard, how would it be lawful to cast doubts and aspersions on Yazeed when entertaining suspicion about a Muslim is unlawful in Islam.”

Almighty Allah says in the Holy Qur’an “O ye who believe! Shun much suspicion; for lo! Some suspicion is crime. And spy not, neither backbite one another. Would one of you love to eat the flesh of his dead brother? Ye abhor that (so abhor the other). And keep your duty (to Allah).”**[[52]](#footnote-52)**

Hazrat Abu Hurairah reported Allah’s Messenger as saying “despising his brother Muslim is enough evil for any one to do. Every Muslim’s blood, property and honour are sacred to a Muslim.”[[53]](#footnote-53)

Imam Ghazzali reiterates:

“Anyone who thinks that Yazeed ordered the killing of Husain or liked the killing of Husain such a person is absolutely fool. . . . . . . . .”

“As regards saying (Radiallahu Anha) after the name of Yazeed, this is not only permissible but commendable. It is rather included in our dua when we pray for the forgiveness of all Muslims and Yazeed was certainly a momin (believer).”[[54]](#footnote-54)

Here Ghazzali takes on every other classical Sunni scholar from the year dot to the present day, by presenting a supporting statement for Yazeed. All four Sunni madhabs, including the four sheikhs deemed it permissible to curse Yazeed (see below).

### First Reply

Ghazzali has linked his defence for Yazeed with the murder of Imam Husain but the fact is that that was not the only crime Yazeed had committed but the list is way too lengthy. Thus this very fact suffices to bring down the building that Ghazzali had created in defence of Yazeed.

### Second Reply

Allah (s.w.t.) in his pure book sends curses on various types of people, for example in Surah Baqarah verse 161 we read:

“Those who reject Faith, and die rejecting, – on them is Allah’s curse, and the curse of angels, and of all mankind”

In Surah Aal-e-Imran verse 61 we read:

“If any one disputes in this matter with thee, now after (full) knowledge hath come to thee, say: “Come! Let us gather together, – our sons and your sons, our women and your women, ourselves and yourselves: Then let us earnestly pray, and invoke the curse of Allah on those who lie!”

It is stated in Surah Hud verse 18:

Who doth more wrong than those who invent a life against Allah? They will be turned back to the presence of their Lord, and the witnesses will say, “These are the ones who lied against their Lord! Behold! The Curse of Allah is on those who do wrong!

And Surah Hud verses 59-60:

Such were the ‘Ad People: they rejected the Signs of their Lord and Cherisher; disobeyed His messengers; and followed the command of every powerful, obstinate transgressor.

And they were pursued by a Curse in this life, – and on the Day of Judgment. Ah! Behold! For the ‘Ad rejected their Lord and Cherisher! Ah! Behold! Removed (from sight) were ‘Ad the people of Hud!

Surah Maidah verse 78:

Curses were pronounced on those among the Children of Israel who rejected Faith, by the tongue of David and of Jesus the son of Mary: because they disobeyed and persisted in excesses.

These verses prove that it is the Sunnah of Allah (s.w.t.) and his prophets (peace be upon all of them) to curse rejecters. Can there be a greater rejecter that Yazeed who rejected the Ahlulbait (a.s.), the Holy Qur’an stipulates love for them to be a part of Deen; he killed them and openly rejected the Prophet hood of Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.)?

### Third Reply

Ghazzali supporters should refrain from cursing the Devil – since according to Ghazzali the act of cursing someone that you do not know is pointless, and it is better to use one’s tongue to recite Surah Fateha. This type of logic contradicts the practice Allah (s.w.t.) and his Rasul (s.a.w.a.) – for no man can be as forgiving and pious as Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.), and yet we learn that at various points during his life that he would curse his enemies and those of Allah (s.w.t.). If Ghazzali would deem this practice to be a sin then is he accusing Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) of indulging in sinful actions?

### Fourth Reply

It is very amusing that these Nawasib afford Ghazzali this rank because he gave this pro Yazeed fatwa – but fail to apply the Fatwa to their, own lives. They have issued takfeer and cursed other Muslim Sects such as the Shi’a and Barelvi, indeed no one has escaped their takfeer tirade. They accept one part of the fatwa and then leave the part that serves no benefit to them – if they deem Ghazzali to be a reliable Hujjut-ul-Islam then should they not be adhering to everything that their dear imam had said? Instead they curse the Sufis, and Ghazali is famous for being his Sufi leanings.

### Fifth Reply

We read in Al-Bidayah wa al-Nihayah (Urdu), vol. 8, p. 1147:

“Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) said whoever perpetuated injustice and frightened the residents of Madina; the curse (la’nat) of Allah (s.w.t.), His Angels and all people is on such a person”[[55]](#footnote-55)

We have already presented the event of Harra before our readers and shown how Yazeed ordered his Nasibi troops to attack the city of Madina. Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) cursed those that caused fear to Madina. When Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) cursed an individual that perpetrated such an act then what right does this third rate Nasibi group have to demand that we refrain from cursing Yazeed? Whoever adheres to the Sunnah of Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) shall definitely curse Yazeed.

### Sixth Reply

Surah Rad verse 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!

Surah Shoora verse 151-2:

“And follow not the bidding of those who are extravagant, – Who make mischief in the land, and mend not (their ways).”

The sum total of these two verses is as follows:

 We should steer away from mischief makers

 Allah (s.w.t.) has cursed those that indulge in mischief through the land

With these two verses in mind, now contemplate this verse:

Surah Baqarah verse 220:

“Their bearings on this life and the Hereafter. They ask thee concerning orphans. Say: “The best thing to do is what is for their good; if ye mix their affairs with yours, they are your brethren; but Allah knows the man who means mischief from the man who means good. And if Allah had wished, He could have put you into difficulties: He is indeed Exalted in Power, Wise.”

We would appeal to those with open minds to decide for themselves whose intention was mischief and whose intention was good in this circumstance? There are two paths: one of the Banu Ummayya with Yazeed at the helm (the Nasibi path) and one of Ahlulbait (a.s.) with a Shia Imam in Imam Husain (a.s.) at the helm – which of these two individuals was working for the benefit of the Deen and for the salvation of our souls? Who was the mischief monger whose actions have been cursed by Allah (s.w.t.)?

Was the killing of Imam Husain (a.s.) not an act of Fitnah? Was the attack on Madina, slaughtering and raping its inhabitants not an act of Fitnah? Was the assault on Makka that included catapulting the Kaaba with fire causing it to catch fire not acts of Fitnah. Was killing men in the most sacred of all sanctuaries where it is forbidden to kill even an ant an act of Fitnah? It is forbidden to kill a man in the sanctuary of the Holy Ka’aba even if that man is about to kill you, yet Yazeed slaughtered innocents there! There is no need to exercise caution when one is cursing an enemy of Allah (s.w.t.). It is a praiseworthy act so long as it does not create Fitnah.

### Reply Seven – The Ulema of Ahle Sunnah deemed it permissible to curse Yazeed

#### One: Imam Ahmad issued Takfeer against drunkard Yazeed and deemed it permissible to curse him

The Salafi cult shares a close nexus with the Hanbali doctrine. Imam Ahmed bin Hanbal’s unequivocal Takfeer against Yazeed has such difficulties to the Salafies and other Nawasib that they have sought to cast doubts on the existence of such a Fatwa and have instead suggested hat Imam Ahmed urged his adherents to remain neutral and maintain silence on the matter of Yazeed. Curiously in this period of post modernity, we are witnessing a phenomenon wherein those professing adherence to Sunni Sufi influenced belief system are advocating a neutral viewpoint of Yazeed, at the forefront of this is Cyber Shaykh dejour Gibrael Hadad who has sought to (just like the Salafies) corroborate his point by falsely suggesting that Imam Ibn Hanbal adopted silence towards Yazeed.

Hadad opines as follows:

Wondered what the position of the scholars of Ahl us sunna towards Yazeed is. I ask this because I have read claims from Shia sources that quote:

“Most of your ulema regard Yazeed as an infidel. Even Imam Ahmad Ibn Hanbal and many other great ulema of your sect suggest that curses on him should be recited.

Wa ‘alaykum as-Salam:

What would be the source for this new concoction?

Abu Muhammad al-Tamimi said in ‘Aqidat al-Imam Ahmad as narrated from him by Ibn Abi Ya`la in Tabaqat al-Hanabila (2:273): “He [Imam Ahmad] withheld saying anything about Yazeed ibn Mu`awiya but rather committed his matter to Allah. He would refrain from speaking against anyone from the first century. But our [Hanbali] colleagues differ concerning him [Yazeed]. Some declared it permissible to blame him because he terrified Madina, and the Prophet cursed whoever terrifies Madina.

Others withheld from taking any position.

Imam Ahmad was asked about it and he said: ‘People prayed behind him and took his alms.’ Others considered him among the Muslims that sinned and it is better to refrain from taking any position in what is not obligatory. It was impermissible to curse any Muslim unless the Law provided a proof-text to that effect. For it is narrated and transmitted that ‘To curse a Muslim is like killing him’ and ‘The believer is not one given over to cursing.’”

We shall rebut this assertion by pointing out that this approach is otiose when we have the testimonies of esteemed Sunni scholars who confirmed the fact that Imam Ahmed did issue Takfeer against Yazeed and deemed it permissible to curse him. For example, we read in the prominent Sunni work Sharh Fiqh Akbar, p. 88 that has also been quoted by the Mufti of Daarul Uloom Qadriyah Jilaniyah London namely Mufti Ghulam Rasool in:[[56]](#footnote-56)

“He considered alcohol halal and at the time of killing Husain 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)”

Similarly, Ibn Hajar Makki al-Haysami in his book al-Menah al-Makkia fi Sharh al-Hamzia, p. 220 recorded:

إنّ يزيد قد بلغ من قبائح الفسق والانحلال عن التقوى مبلغاً لا يستكثر عليه صدور تلك القبائح منه، بل قال الاِمام أحمد بن حنبل بكفره، وناهيك به علماً وورعاً يقضيان بأنّه لم يقل ذلك إلاّ لقضايا وقعت منه صريحة في ذلك

“Yazeed attained the worst level of corruption and moral degeneracy to the point that committing such evil actions had become the norm. This was to such an extent that Imam Ahmad Ibn Hanbal declared him a Kafir. Given that he (Ahmad Ibn Hanbal) is highly knowledgeable and a scholar of high integrity, he would only issue such statements on account of the actions perpetuated by Yazeed that would thus prove such a statement.”

Haddad has relied upon a report recorded by Qazi Abu Ya’la regarding his and Imam Ahmed’s stance on Yazeed, later in this chapter we will be citing none other than but Imam Ibn Kaseer who himself confirmed that both of these esteemed personalities, amongst others, deemed it permissible to curse Yazeed and the affirmation by Ibn Kaseer shall serve as the final nail in the coffin such Yazeed apologetics.

Allamah Syed Mahmood Alusi al-Baghdadi (d. 1270 A.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-Isha’at and al-Haysami in al-Sawaaeq have 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 the Holy Qur’an? To this Saleh asked that where in the Holy Qur’an had Allah (s.w.t.) 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?’[[57]](#footnote-57)

1. Tafseer Ruh al-Ma’ani, vol. 26, p. 227; Tafseer Ruh al-Ma’ani, vol. 26, p. 72

2. Tafseer Mazhari (Urdu), vol. 10, p. 326 (Published by Darul Isha’at Karachi)

3. Ghiza al-albab li-Sharh Manzumat al-Adab by Muhammad ibn Ahmad al-Saffarini al-Hanbali (d. 1188), vol. 1, p. 182

4. Adab Shari’a by ibn Muflih al-Hanbali, vol. 1, p. 342

5. al-Rad ala al-Mutaseb al-Aneed al-Mane le zam Yazeed, p. 41

In Sawaaeq al-Mohreqa (Urdu), p. 734, the conversation ends with the words of Imam Ahmed:

“Can there be any worse fitna than this murder (of Husain)?”[[58]](#footnote-58)

We should point out that the above cited stance of Imam Ahmed has been narrated by out and out authentic personalities of Ahle Sunnah therefore, any other statement, if any, of Imam Ahmed contradicting the above stance automatically loses its credibility. Now in order to know the authenticity of the said tradition, let us see the chain of narration recorded by Imam Ibn Jauzi in his book al-Rad ala al-Mutaseb al-Aneed al-Mane le zam Yazeed, p. 41:

“Abu Ja’far al-Akbari from Abu Ali al-Husain bin al-Junaid from Abu Talib bin Shahab al-Akbari from Abu Bakr Muhammad bin al-Abbas from Saleh bin Ahmad bin Hanbal who said:…”

Abu Ja’far al-Akbari: Zahabi said: ‘Seqah’.[[59]](#footnote-59) Al-Husain bin Junaid: Zahabi said: ‘Authenticated’.[[60]](#footnote-60) Abu Talib bin Shehab al-Akbari: Zahabi said: ‘Seqah’.[[61]](#footnote-61) Abu Bakr Muhammad bin Abbas: Zahabi said: ‘Muhaddis Imam’.[[62]](#footnote-62) Saleh bin Ahmad bin Hanbal: Zahabi said: ‘Imam Muhaddis Hafiz’.[[63]](#footnote-63)

Two: Imam Abu Hanifa, Imam Shafiyee and Imam Malik deemed it permissible to curse Yazeed

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

أن للإمام أحمد قولا بلعن يزيد تلويحا وتصريحا 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 خزيا ومنعه وفي أسفل سجين وضعه

“Imam Ahmad has statements about cursing Yazeed 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 also said the same. Some of his (al-Bakri’s) followers said about Yazeed ‘may Allah increase his disgrace and put him in the lowest level of hell’”[[64]](#footnote-64)

Shaykh Kamaluddin Muhammad bin Musa Damiri in his famed work Hayaatul Haywaan, vol. 2, p. 175 records:

إن لكل واحد من أبي حنيفة ومالك وأحمد في لعن يزيد قولين ، تصريح وتلويح

“Abu Hanifa, Malik and Ahmad have two statements about cursing Yazeed, 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 Husain)”

#### Three: Allamah Mahmood Alusi’s takfeer against Yazeed and deeming it permissible to curse him

Allamah Syed Mahmood Alusi al-Baghdadi (d. 1270 H) in his famed commentary of Holy Qur’an namely Tafseer Ruh al-Ma’ani, vol. 26, p. 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 messenger ship of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.)... 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 Husain (r.a.)”[[65]](#footnote-65)

Alusi also states:

فياليت شعري ماذا تقول في يزيد الطريد أكان يحب عليا كرم الله تعالى وجهه أم كان يبغضه ولا أظنك في مرية من أنه عليه اللعنة كان يبغضه رضي الله تعالى عنه أشد البغض وكذا يبغض ولديه الحسن والحسين على جدهما وأبويهما وعليهما الصلاة والسلام كما تدل على ذلك الآثار المتواترة معنى وحينئذ لا مجال لك من القول بأن اللعين كان منافقا

“So what will you say about damn Yazeed, did he have love or hate for Ali (a.s.)? I assume you will not have any doubt that Yazeed, curse be upon him, had a strong hatred against Ali (r.a.) and also against both of his sons Al-Hasan and Al-Husain may blessings and peace be upon their grandfather, parents and upon them. Therefore as proved from Mutawatur (reliable) Hadees it becomes apparent to say that he, the accursed one, was a hypocrite.”[[66]](#footnote-66)

We should point out that Ghazzali was an adherent of the Shafiye madhab and so was Allamah Alusi who set out the viewpoint of the Shafiye Ulema on this topic as follows:

“Amongst the Shafiyees we are in agreement that it is permissible to curse Yazeed”[[67]](#footnote-67)

When a renowned Shafiye scholar has taken the responsibility to reflect the opinion of the Shafiye Ulema, confirming that they deemed it permissible to curse Yazeed, then the opposite voice of Imam Ghazzali’s fatwa becomes batil (false).

We have cited actual Sunni texts wherein the grand Sunni Ulema deemed it permissible to curse Yazeed. Azam Tariq seeks solace in the fatwa of al-Ghazzali. Now whose fatwa bears greater value, the sole fatwa of Ibn Ghazzali or the fatwas of all the Sunni Ulama that we cited? Why should this single Ghazzali fatwa be deemed to be strong and conclusive enough to nullify the fatwas of all these Sunni Ulema? Would the more correct approach not to be to reject Ghazzali’s fatwa and give greater credence to these Salaf Ulema who had an ijma (consensus) that it was permissible to curse Yazeed? Why are the Salafi and Deobandi seeking to create doubts over a matter that has attained a broad consensus amongst the Sunni Ulema? In reality by quoting Ghazzali they are trying to divide the Sufis, who they are well-known to despise. Our du’a is that Allah (s.w.t.) guides these advocates of Yazeed to disown and hate him and to develop faith and love for the family of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.).

#### Four: Qazi Sanaullah Paani Patti’s takfeer against Yazeed and deeming it permissible to curse him

Qazi Sanaullah Paani Patti (d. 1225) was a Sunni scholar of the twelfth century, who studied under the teachings of Shah Waliullah Muhaddis Dehalvi (d. 1176 H) while his anti-Shia son Shah Abdul Aziz Muhaddis Dehalvi (d. 1239 H) would call Qazi Sanaullah the ‘Behaqqi of his time’. He was also the Khalifa of Mirza Mazhar Jaan Janan (d. 1195 H) who would refer to Qazi Sanaullah as ‘Ilm al-Huda’. His commentary of the Holy Qur’an, Tafseer Mazhari is popular among the Sunni masses particularly amongst the Deobandies. The following views of Qazi Sanaullah about Yazeed will silence those Deobandies who adhere to the Salafi/Wahabi stance of absolving Yazeed from his Kufr. Qazi wrote:

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

‘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 is:

‘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 are 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)’[[68]](#footnote-68)

Qazi Sanaullah 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 isn’t any benefit in cursing him but ‘Al-Hub fi Allah’ (love for the sake of Allah) and ‘Al-Bughz fi Allah’ (hatred for the sake of Allah) demands it.”[[69]](#footnote-69)

#### Five: Shafiyee jurist Ibn Ali bin Emaaduddin deemed it permissible to curse Yazeed

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

“Ibn Ali bin Emaaduddin Abu Hasan 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 A.H. He benefited from Imam al-Harmayn, he and Imam Ghazzali are amongst 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 master of jurists... And he was asked an edict about Yazeed bin Muawiyah to which he mentioned that Yazeed was a cheater and immoral and deemed it permissible to slander him”[[70]](#footnote-70)

Shaykh Kamaluddin Muhammad bin Musa Damiri (742-808 A.H.) in ‘Hayaatul Haywaan’, vol. 2, p. 196 recorded the views of this great Shafiyee scholar in detail. When he was asked whether it is permissible to curse Yazeed, he replied:

وأما قول السلف ففيه لكل واحد من أبي حنيفة ومالك وأحمد قولان: تصريح وتلويح. ولنا قول واحد: التصريح دون التلويح، وكيف لا يكون كذلك وهو المتصيد بالفهد واللاعب بالنرد ومدمن الخمر؟ ومن شعره في الخمر قوله:

أقول لصحب ضمت الكأس شملهم ... وداعي صبابات الهوى يترنم. خذوا بنصيب من نعيم ولذة ... فكل وإن طال المدى يتصرم

“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 Husain) 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 A.H.) in Wafayat al-A’yan, vol. 3, p. 287 also recorded the very text with difference of words.[[71]](#footnote-71)

#### Six: Imam Saaduddin Taftazani deemed it permissible to curse Yazeed and he personally did so

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

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. Shazarat al-Zahab, vol. 1, pp. 68-69

2. Tafseer Ruh al-Ma’ani, vol. 26, p. 72

Shafiyee scholar Shaykh Sulaiman bin Muhammad bin Umar al-Bejarmi (d. 1221 A.H.) while referring to Imam Saduddin Taftazani’s authority work Sharah Aqaid records:

وفي شرح عقائد السعد يجوز لعن يزيد

“According to Sharh Aqaid al-Saad, it is permissible to curse Yazeed”[[72]](#footnote-72)

In his book Sharah Maqasid, Imam Saaduddin Taftazani stated:

“The injustices perpetuated against Ahlulbayt are so clear that no one can deny them…may Allah curse those who committed injustices against them…if they say that there are some scholars who don’t allow the cursing of Yazeed whilst the acknowledge he is worthy of it, we say that he deserves it…how can such legitimacy remain unclear to them, how can there be no agreement on this?”

#### Seven: Imam Jalaluddin Suyuti personally cursed Yazeed

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

“Allah’s curse be upon all three Ibn Ziyad, Yazeed and the killer of Imam Husain”[[73]](#footnote-73)

#### Eight: Qazi Shawkani personally cursed Yazeed

Qazi Shawkani who enjoys authority amongst the Salafi cult also cursed Yazeed. We read in Nail al-Awtar, vol. 7, p. 201:

الخمير السكير الهاتك لحرم الشريعة المطهرة يزيد بن معاوية لعنهم الله

“The alcoholic drunk, who disgraced the pure divine law, Yazeed bin Mu’awiya may Allah curse him”[[74]](#footnote-74)

#### Nine: Hanafi Imam Mullah Ali Qari deemed it permissible to curse Yazeed

While answering a question over 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.”[[75]](#footnote-75)

#### Ten: Imam Ibn Jauzi deemed it permissible to curse Yazeed

Now comes the discussion of one of the revered jurists of Ahle Sunnah namely Abul Faraj Ibn al-Jauzi (d. 597 A.H.) who deemed the act of cursing Yazeed so important that he wrote a separate book on this topic and this has caused such a serious damage to the lovers of Muawiyah’s vile family that they have sought to deny the aforesaid stance of their Imam Ibn Jauzi. A modern day Sunni scholar G. F. Haddad also joined the camp:

G. F. Haddad stated:

Abdur-Rahman Abul Faraj Bin Jauzi has written a book on this subject, كتاب الرد على المتعصب العنيد المانع لعن يزيد لعنة الله.

Ibn al-Jawzi was a prolific author of over seven hundred books, but I doubt very much that the above is one of them. This can be checked by looking up the Kuwaiti publishing house of Idarat al-Buhus wa al-Toras who brought out a complete bibliography and manuscriptography of his works a few years ago

It is strange to see that a modern day Sunni is trying to cast doubts on the existence of such a book on the basis of personal opinion without any corroborative evidence to support his stance and relied on the bibliography of a recent publishing house that had no details of this Ibn Jauzi’s work in their list. How can a famed scholar advance such feeble arguments! We should state that it doesn’t require rocket science to check his book and confirm the same moreover the testimonies of some of the esteemed (early) Sunni scholars about the stance of Ibn Jauzi should suffice to water down Nasibi denials and Hadad’s personal baseless guess work. To enable this let us cite the testimony of the orthodox early Sunni Imam Ibn Kaseer (774 A.H.):

وانتصر لذلك أبو الفرج بن الجوزي في مصنف مفرد، وجوز لعنته‏

“Abul Faraj Ibn Jauzi wrote a separate book deeming it permissible to curse Yazeed”.[[76]](#footnote-76)

Similarly Imam Abdulrauf al-Munawi in his authority work Faiz al-Qadir Sharah Jami al-Saghir, vol. 1, p. 204 stated:

قال أبو الفرج بن الجوزي في كتابه الرد على المتعصب العنيد المانع من ذم يزيد أجاز العلماء الورعون لعنه

“Abu al-Faraj bin al-Jauzi stated in his book ‘al-Rad ala al-Mutasib al-Aneed al-M’ane men zam Yazeed’ that the pious scholars allowed cursing him”[[77]](#footnote-77)

Moreover Shaykh Sulaiman bin Muhammad bin Umar al-Bejarmi (d. 1221 A.H.) also testified:

قال ابن الجوزي : أجاز العلماء الورعون لعن يزيد وصنف في إباحة لعنه مصنفا

“Ibn al-Jauzi said: ‘The pious scholars permitted the cursing of Yazeed’ and he wrote a book about its permissibility”[[78]](#footnote-78)

Now for the pathetic argument that a modern day publishing house has not recorded the name of this book along with the names of the books written by Imam Ibn Jauzi, we should point out that the following esteem biographical Sunni works confirm that the book under discussion was authored by Imam Ibn Jauzi:

1. Kashf al-Zunun, by Haji Khalifa, v1, p839

2. Hidyat al-Arafeen, by Allamah Ismail Pasha Baghdadi, v1, p521

3. Mu’ajam al-Moalafeen, by Umar Raza Kahala, v6, p178

As a final slap in the ugly face of Nasibism, we herewith attach a scan of the cover of Ibn Jauzi’s book under discussion i.e. Al-Rad ala al-Mutaseb al-Aneed Al-Manee men Zam Yazeed (The answer to the stubborn fanatic who prevents the cursing Yazeed) revised by a Sunni scholar Dr. Haytham Abdul salam Muhammad:[[79]](#footnote-79)

#### Eleven: Al-Khilal, Abu Bakr Abdul Aziz, Qazi Abu Yala and Qazi Abul Husain deemed it permissible to curse Yazeed

Ibn Kaseer in Al-Bidayah Wal-Nihayah has recorded the stance of some of the prominent Imams of Ahle Sunnah such as Imam Ahmed bin Hanbal (d. 241 A.H.), Imam Abi Bakar Ahmed bin Muhammad bin Harun al-Khalal (d. 311 A.H.), Imam al-Qazi Abu Ya’la ibn al-Farra’ – Muhammad ibn al-Husain ibn Muhammad ibn Khalaf (d. 458) and his son Imam Muhammad ibn al-Qazi Muhammad Abi Ya’la ibn al-Husain, Al-Qazi Abu al-Husain al-Farra’ popularly known as Ibn Abi Ya’la (d. 526 A.H.):

“Whoever frightens Madina incurs the wrath of Allah, His Angels and all the people”. Those people who deem it permissible to curse Yazeed bin Muawiyah deem this and other similar kinds of hadiths as a base and this tradition is from Ahmad ibn Hanbal and has been taken by Al-Khilal, Abu Bakr Abdul Aziz, Qazi Abu Yala and his son Qazi Abul Husain. Abul Faraj Ibn Jauzi wrote a separate book deeming it permissible to curse Yazeed”.[[80]](#footnote-80)

Regarding the view of Qazi Abu al-Husain mentioned by Ibn Kaseer, Shaykh Kamaluddin Damiri in his book Hayaatul Haywaan, vol. 2, p. 174 has elaborated the same:

وقال القاضي أبو الحسين محمد بن القاضي أبي يعلى بن الفراء الحنبلي – وقد صنف كتابا فيه بيان من يستحق اللعن وذكر فيهم يزيد : الممتنع من لعن يزيد إما أن يكون غير عالم بجواز ذلك ، أو منافقا يريد أن يوهم بذلك ، وربما استفز الجهال بقوله (ص) : المؤمن لا يكون لعانا ، وهذا محمول على من لا يستحق اللعن

The Qazi Abul Husain Muhammad bin al-Qazi Abu Y’ala al-Faraa al-Hanbali wrote a book about those who deserve to be cursed and he included Yazeed and said: ‘Whoever forbids cursing Yazeed must be unaware of the lawfulness of cursing him or he is a hypocrite who wants to give the false impression or may be he gives false impression to the ignorant ones by (the prophet’s (s.a.w.a.)) statement: ‘The believer never curses’ while this (Hadees) is about those who don’t deserve to be cursed’.

#### Twelve: Amr bin Bahr al-Laysi (d. 255 A.H.) deemed Yazeed to be an accursed

One of the early Sunni scholars Amr bin Bahr al-Laysi (d. 255 A.H.) popularly known as Al-Jahiz stated in his book Al-Risalah al-Hadyia Ashar, p. 398:

المنكرات التي اقترفها يزيد من قتل الحسين وحمله بنات رسول الله (ص) سبايا ، وقرعه ثنايا الحسين بالعود ، وإخافته أهل المدينة ، وهدم الكعبة ، تدل على القسوة والغلظة ، والنصب ، وسوء الرأي ، والحقد والبغضاء والنفاق والخروج عن الايمان ، فالفاسق ملعون ، ومن نهى عن شتم الملعون فملعون.

“The evil deed which Yazeed committed by killing Husain and took the daughters of Allah’s messenger as slaves and hit the lips of Husain’s (head) with the stick and scared the people of Madina and destroyed the Holy Ka’aba, shows that he (Yazeed) was rough, stone hearted, Nasibi, possessed bad thoughts, venom, hatred, hypocrite, was out of the pale of faith, Fasiq and an accursed, and who ever forbid cursing the accursed is himself an accursed person.”

#### Thirteen: Ahmad bin Sulayman bin Kamal al-Hanafi (d. 944 A.H.) deemed it permissible to curse Yazeed

Another Hanafi scholar namely Ahmad bin Sulayman bin Kamal al-Hanafi (d. 944 A.H.) deemed it permissible to curse Yazeed. Imam Abdulrauf al-Munawi in his authority work Faiz al-Qadir Sharah Jami al-Saghir, vol. 1, p. 204 stated:

ثم قال المولى ابن الكمال والحق أن لعن يزيد على اشتهار كفره وتواتر فظاعته وشره على ما عرف بتفاصيله جائز

“Mawula ibn al-Kamal said: ‘The truth that cursing is lawful though its popularly known that he is a kafir and his horribleness and evil deeds are successively narrated in detail’”[[81]](#footnote-81)

#### Fourteen: Imams of Bukhara such as Imam Quwamuddin al-Safari, Ibrahim bin Zahid and Imam Tahir bin Ahmed deemed it permissible to curse Yazeed

The book ‘Khulasa tul Fatawa’ authored by Shaykh Imam Tahir bin Ahmed bin Abdul Rasheed al-Bukhari is deemed as one of the most prestigious edict works in the Hanafi school of thought (d. 542 A.H.). He states in, vol. 4, p. 390:

“One should curse Yazeed bin Muawiyah and likewise Hajjaj. I heard Shaykh Al-Imam Al-Zahid Quamuddin al-Safari narrating from his father that it is permissible to curse him. He used to say: ‘There is no harm in cursing Yazeed’.

Imam Quamuddin al-Safari (d. 576) has been introduced in the following words by Imam Abdul Hai Lucknawi:

“Shaykhul Islam, Imam of the Imams, unique in subjects pertaining to religion be it related to Usool or Furu and a Mujtahid of his time”[[82]](#footnote-82)

Whilst he relied upon his father’s edict regarding the permissibility to curse Yazeed, the said individual was himself acknowledged as a notable scholar of his era. He was Imam Ibrahmi bin Ismaeel popularly known as al-Zahid al-Safari (d. 534). He was a contemporary of Imam Ghazzali and was a teacher of Imam Hasan bin Mansur Qazi Khan the author of the famous ‘Fatawa Qazi Khan’. Imam Sam’ani in his authority work Al-Ansab has recounted him in the following manner:

إماماً زاهداً ورعاً

His entire family was known for their knowledge and piety, a fact acknowledged by Allamah Abdul Qadir Qarshi in ‘Al-Jawahir al-Muziyah fi Taabqat al-Hanafiya’, p. 32 who stated:

أهل بيت علما وفضلا

“Family of scholars and qualified ones”

As Imam Tahir, the author of ‘Khulasa tul Fatawa’ has relied upon the above cited edict in the latter part and did not submit any evidence to contradict it, one can safely deduce that all three Imams of Bukhara namely Imam Tahir bin Ahmed bin Abdul Rasheed al-Bukhari (d. 542 H), Imam Quamuddin Hammad bin Ibrahim al-Safari al-Bukhari (d. 576) and Imam Ibrahim bin Ismaeel popularly known as al-Zahid al-Safari (d. 534) all deemed it permissible to curse Yazeed.

Imam Abdulrauf al-Munawi in his authority work Faiz al-Qadir, vol. 1, p. 204 has also recorded the edict of Imam Quwam al-Deen al-Safari:

قال ابن الكمال وحكى عن الإمام قوام الدين الصفاري ولا بأس بلعن يزيد

Ibn al-Kamal narrated that Imam Quwam al-Deen al-Safari who said: ‘There is no harm in cursing Yazeed’[[83]](#footnote-83)

#### Fifteen: Imam Ibn Bazzaz al-Kurdari al-Hanafi deemed it permissible to curse Yazeed

Shaykh Imam Hafizuddin Muhammad bin Muhammad ibn Shahab popularly known as Ibn Bazzaz al-Kurdari al-Hanafi (d. 827 H) states in Fatawa Bazzazia, vol. 6, p. 344:

“It is permissible to curse Yazeed and likewise Hajjaj but it is better to refrain from doing so, it is narrated from Imam Quamuddin al-Safari that there is no problem in cursing Yazeed…Kurdari states that the truth is the popular position with regards to the Kufr of Yazeed coupled with the Mutawatur reports of his evil acts, the details of which are known, supports him being cursed”

#### Sixteen: Shaykh Abdulrahman bin Yusuf al-Ajhwari’s Takfeer against Yazeed

Shaykh Abdullah bin Muhammad al-Shebrawi (d. 1172 A.H.) who the in year 1137 A.H. was the Sheikh at Al-Azhar University recorded the following about Shaykh Abdulrahman bin Yusuf al-Athwart al-Maliki (d. 960 H) in his book al-Itehaf Behub al-Ashraf, p. 69:

وقال العلاّمة الاَجهوريّ: اختار الاِمام محمـّد بن عرفة والمحقّقون من أتباعه كفر الحجّاج، ولا شكّ أنّ جريمته كجريمة يزيد، بل دونها

Allamah Athwart said: ‘Imam Muhammad bin Arafa and the scholars who followed him chose to consider Hajaj as kafir and there is no doubt that his (Hajaj’s) crime is similar to Yazeed’s crime, nay it’s less’.

#### Seventeen: Abu al-Barakat al-Demashqi al-Shafiyee (d. 871 A.H.) himself cursed Yazeed

Abu al-Barakat Muhammad bin Ahmad al-Demashqi al-Shafiyee (d. 871 A.H.) was also among those Sunni scholars who personally cursed Yazeed. He stated in his book Jawahir al-Matalib, vol. 2, p. 272:

يزيد لعنه الله

“May Allah curse Yazeed”

#### Eighteen: Imam Abu Bakar al-Jassas deemed Yazeed as La’een

One of the most prominent Hanafi Imams namely Abu Bakar Ahmed Ali al-Razi al-Jassas (d. 370 A.H.) recalled Yazeed in the following manner in his authority work Ahkam al-Qur’an, vol. 3, p. 154:

“After the four caliphs, the companions’ of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) participated in Jihad alongside Fasiq leaders, thus Abu Ayub Ansari participated in Jihad with Yazeed La’een.[[84]](#footnote-84)

It is strange to note that Nawasib belonging to Sipah-e-Sahaba claim to be the adherents of the Hanafi sect, yet they tend to defend Yazeed when we see the abovementioned stance of a great Hanafi jurist and Imam!

#### Nineteen: Daata Ganj Bakhsh al-Hajveri cursed Yazeed

Abul Hasan Ali Ibn Usman al-Jullabi al-Hajveri al-Ghaznawi is a name that requires no introduction for Sunnis that frequent from the Indian Subcontinent. Better known as Daata Ganj Bakhsh, this 11th Century Persian Sufi Saint is a renowned learned Sunni figure and his burial place in Lahore is attended by thousands of followers on a daily basis. He penned a number of works the most famous being Kashf al-Mahjhub regarded as the first treatise on Sufism. It is this very book on, p. 76 whilst discussing Imam Zainul Abideen (a.s.) he states as follows:

“When Husain and his children were killed at Karbala there was none left except Ali to take care of them; and he was ill. The women were brought unveiled on camels to Yazeed b. Muawiya – may God curse him, but not his father!”[[85]](#footnote-85)

#### Twenty: Qazi Saleh bin Mahdi al-Maqbali deemed it permissible to curse Yazeed

Prominent Mujtahid of era namely Allamah Qazi Saleh bin Mahdi al-Maqbali (d. 1108) who is much liked by Ahle Hadees/Salafies writes in his authority work Al-Ilm Al-Shamikh Fi Eesaar Al-Haq Ala Alaba wal Mashaikh, pp. 367-368:

“And even more strange is a person who praises Yazeed who reverted from Islam, the one who insulted the honourable people of this Ummah, dishonouring the sanctity of Madina of Messenger (s.a.w.a.), killed Husain the son of the Prophet and his Ahlulbayt and humiliated them and he treated them in such a manner that even if the enemies of Islam, the Christians were to do the same acts, they might have been more reasonable.

And amongst those praising Yazeed is Hujut Al-Islam A-Ghazzali, but in all of his acts, he is like a person who collects wood in the dark, who alongside the wood, also unknowingly collects snakes and scorpions.

And only that person would deem Yazeed’s act as normal who is secluded from the generosity of Allah and who has been wretched by taking part in such evil deeds. Therefore neither exaggerates nor understates this. To observe patience in this matter is like holding a red hot coal whilst ignorance is on the increase in our era. We seek blessings and protection from Allah. Ameen.

Amongst the strange matters of Jurisprudence (فقه) is one that has been mentioned by Ibn Hajar Haysami in Sawaaeq al-Mohreqa (namely that) it is not permissible to curse Yazeed even though there is strong agreement (اجماع) that it is permissible to curse one who was a drunkard, did not exhibit mercy, dishonoured the sanctity of Madina of the Messenger, murdered Al-Husain, gave the order for his murder and who was pleased with his murder, as for Yazeed as a person it’s not permissible even though he had committed all these acts and he was an absolute evil-doer (فاسق).

We find in their Jurisprudence similar reasoning, meaning that it is not permissible to curse a specific person therefore it is inconclusive and is based on the comparison of evidence (قياص الدلالة). Therefore based on this idea neither specific drunkard nor a specific adulterer should have been subject to the Islamic punishment (حدّ) and a similar approach should have been adopted in the rest of the matters of Islamic Law (شريعه), after all, the method is the same. Therefore your logic is also invalid as you have rejected a fundamental idea hence what proof is to be acceptable.

So the logic of comparing evidence should be as follows: that Yazeed is he who consumed alcohol, the one who drinks alcohol is an accursed one, therefore this Yazeed is accursed.

However if they claim that cursing should be avoided based on the saying of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.): ‘A believer does not curse copiously’ then this would be better for God fearing individuals and God knows best.[[86]](#footnote-86)

#### Twenty One: Allamah Abdul Ali Muhammad Sahalwi cursed Yazeed

Allamah Abdul Ali Muhammad Sahalwi al-Ansari al-Lucknawi in his authority work Fawateh al-Rehmut Ba-Sharah Musalam Al-Sabut, vol. 2, p. 273:

(يزيد) ابنه مع أنه كان من أخبث الفساق وكان بعيدا بمراحل من الامامة بل الشك في ايمانه خذله الله تعالى والصنيعات التي صنعها معروفة من أنواع الخبائث

“And his son Yazeed was the most deceptive of all evil doers (فاسق) and was so far away from the status of Imamate, in fact his faith (ايمان) is questionable, may Allah not bless him. All those various types of evil acts he committed are well known”[[87]](#footnote-87)

#### Nasibi grounds for NOT cursing Yazeed

Continuing on from the above text we read Ibn Kaseer tried to explain why some concerned parties opposed cursing Yazeed. This is the bit that Azam Tariq failed to quote and thus took Ibn Kaseer’s words out of context (yet again):

“Some have opposed cursing Yazeed and written books urging people to refrain from such a practice since by making Yazeed a waseela for cursing, the curse may fall back onto his father and other Sahaba”.

By this reasoning, Ibn Kaseer has in effect placed the ropes into the hands of his Nasibi brethren; the only reason that Yazeed should not be cursed is because by doing so his dear old father might also be at risk of being cursed. If Mu’awiya or the other Sahaba did nothing wrong, then what on earth is there to worry about?

One should applaud Imam Abu Ya’ala and his son who sided with the truth. It is also interesting that Ibn Kaseer, whose work is quoted by Azam Tariq, actually does nothing to exonerate Yazeed.

### 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 [l.a.] 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 done except by a heretic who has void belief because he (Yazeed) had such characteristics that his lover deserves to be faithless, because to love and hate just in the sake of God is the sign of faith’[[88]](#footnote-88)

# Chapter Twelve

## Azam Tariq’s false attempts to represent Sunni aqeedah

### Azam Tariq’s objection to the terminology ‘Imam’

Azam Tariq then sets his sites on our Imam as follows:

Kr-hcy.com states:

Another thing to guard against is the use of title of “Imam” and Alayhi Salaam for Hazrat Husain. The majority of Muslims unconsciously remember Hazrat Husain as “Imam Husain Alayhi Salaam”, although this smacks of shiaism. For all the sahaba, we use word (Hazrat) out of respect and reverence for them such as Hazrat Abu Bakr, Hazrat Umar, Hazrat Usman, Hazrat Ali etc. We never say Umam Abu Bakr or Imam Umar.

### Reply One

Yet again this lying Nasibi is making a claim without any foundation. We could produce countless writings of the Ahle Sunnah wherein Imam Husain (a.s.) has been referred to as Imam. This Nasibi’s objective has nothing to with bringing Sunni Islam back to the grand old days and way of the Salaf. It is to do with replacing Sunni Islam with Nasibi ideology that showers grand accolades on the enemies of Ahlulbait (a.s.) such as Mu’awiya and Yazeed, something that none of the old ulema did save Ghazali, while Ghazali’s boss imam Shafi’i said cursing Yazeed was acceptable.

### Reply Two

Azam Tariq Nasibi sought to set the alleged record straight by stating:

Kr-hcy.com states:

For all the sahaba, we use word (hazrat) out of respect and reverence for them such as Hazrat Abu Bakar, Hazrat Umar, Hazrat Usman, Hazrat Ali etc. We never say Imam Abu Bakar or Imam Umar.

If the terms Imam are not used for Abu Bakr and Umar it is because they never viewed themselves as Imams nor did Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) view them as such. An Imam under Arabic terminology is one who leads and a Khalifah is one who follows. Abu Bakr never viewed himself as an Imam and underlined his own failings in his inaugural speech to mark his momentous coming to power in Saqifa Bani Sa’da, we are quoting from Tareekh Tabari, vol. 9, p. 201:

“Now then: O people, I have been put in charge of you, although I am not the best of you. Help me if I do well; rectify me if I do wrong”.

If their own failings as Imams are proven it does in any way mean that no one else can be referred to as Imam. Tariq’s patriarchal efforts to bestow his corrupt views on the unsuspecting Ahle Sunnah means nothing when we have specific hadees wherein the Prophet of Allah (s.a.w.a.) referred to Imam Ali (a.s.) as an Imam, when he declared:

“Three things have been revealed to me about Ali: That he is the Sayyid al-Muslimeen (Chief of Muslims), Imam-ul-Muttaqeen (Imam of the Pious), and wa Qaaed al-Ghurrul Mohajjeleen (Leader of the bright-faced people on Yaum al Qiyamah)”[[89]](#footnote-89)

If Azam Tariq finds the term abhorrent then he is free to do so, for the only people that are entitled to refer to Ali (a.s.) as an Imam are those that are pious. Nasibi have no correlation with piety. They extol Dhaalim Khalifahs, incite fitnah, lies and shed the blood of innocent Muslims. Imam Ali (a.s.) is not the Imam of zaalims and dog / bear / sister / mother / man / daughter / boy penetrator, only the pious.

### Azam Tariq’s objection to the terminology ‘Alaihi Salaam’

Kr-hcy.com states:

Similarly after the name of every sahabi we use and write the word (radiallahu anhu i.e. May Allah be pleased with him) and never use the words like (alayhi salaam i.e. Peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) which are reserved for only the prophets. As such, we never write or utter Hazrat Abu Bakar (alayhi salaam) or Hazrat Umar alayhi salaam but in case of Hazrat Husain we use Alayhi Salaam. Have we ever given a thought why it is so? It is because of the influence of shiaism which has imperceptibly crept into our minds.

### Reply One – Sunni Imams allowed using ‘Alaihi Salaam’ for Ahlulbayt (a.s.)

Although this Nasibi’s comments have no bearing on the Shi’a, we would like to point out that he is yet again falsely claiming to represent Ahle Sunnah aqeedah. What greater evidence can we cite to counter this Nasibi than the fatwa of Sunni Islam’s most beloved opponent of the Shi’a, al-Muhaddis Shah Abdul Aziz Dehlavi? When this question was posed to him he replied as follows:

“The term ‘Alaihi Salaam’ can also be referred to for non-prophets, and evidence of this can be ascertained from the fact that in the books of hadees the term ‘Alaihi Salaam’ can be found next to the names of Hazrat Ali, Hasan, Husain, Fatima, Khadija, Abbas. Some Ulema have opposed this, in opposition to the Shi’a, but this terminology is not prohibited under the Shari’a[[90]](#footnote-90)

Similarly Allamah Alusi wrote:

“Sending blessings on other than the prophets & angels on this matter the views of the Ulema are different. In the view of Qazi Ayadh and most of the Ulema, it is permissible. They have sought to prove this in reliance of this verse:

‘Allah and his Angels send blessings on Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.), Salute him with the best salutation”’

and also the saheeh hadees:

1. The Prophet said, “O Allah! Send your blessings upon the offspring of Abu Aufa.”

2. Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) opened his hands and stated: ‘O Allah! Send your blessing & mercies upon the family Sa’d ibn Ubadah.’

3. Ibn Haban corrected a tradition that a woman approached Messenger of Allah and requested ‘O Allah send blessings on me and my husband’ and Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) sent blessings in this manner.

4. According to Muslim’s report the Angels recite for every momin ‘Sala Allah alayka wa ala jasdhaak’”[[91]](#footnote-91)

We read in Saheeh Sharh al-Aqida al-Tahawyia by Shaykh Hasan al-Saqqaf, p. 223:

لفظة (عليها السلام) بعد ذكر السيدة فاطمة ولفظة (عليه السلام) بعد ذكر سيدنا علي أو سيدنا الحسن أو سيدنا الحسين رضي الله عنهم وأرضاهم من خصوصياتهم وخصوصيات آل البيت أي من المستحبات

The term (Alaiha Salaam) after mentioning the name of lady Fatima, and the term (Alaihi Salaam) after mentioning the name of Ali, or Hasan or Husain may Allah be pleased with them, is one of the exclusives for Ahlul bayt, which means that its mustahab.

### Reply Two – Sunni Imams themselves used ‘Alaihi Salaam’ for Ahlulbayt (a.s.)

It is quite interesting that a modern day Nasibi has tried to persuade his adherents not to use ‘Alaihi Salaam’ for the members of Ahlul bayt (a.s.) in an attempt to bring the merits of Ahlul bayt (a.s.) closer to common companions but the fact is that the early Sunni Imams had themselves used ‘Alaihi Salaam’ for the members of Ahlulbayt (a.s.) distinguishing them from other companions and its biggest proof comes from none other than Imam Bukhari who has used ‘Alaihi Salaam’ for Ali bin Abi Talib (a.s.):[[92]](#footnote-92)

حدثنا ‏ ‏يحيى ‏ ‏حدثنا ‏ ‏وكيع ‏ ‏عن ‏ ‏الأعمش ‏ ‏عن ‏ ‏سعد بن عبيدة ‏ ‏عن ‏ ‏أبي عبد الرحمن ‏ ‏عن ‏ ‏علي ‏ ‏عليه السلام ‏ ‏قال...

Imam Bukhari also used ‘Alaiha Salaam’ for Fatima Zahra (a.s.)[[93]](#footnote-93):

لما ثقل النبي ‏ ‏صلى الله عليه وسلم ‏ ‏جعل يتغشاه فقالت ‏ ‏فاطمة ‏ ‏عليها السلام

Imam Bukhari also used ‘Alaihi Salaam’ for Imam Husain (a.s.)[[94]](#footnote-94):

‏أتي ‏ ‏عبيد الله بن زياد ‏ ‏برأس ‏ ‏الحسين ‏ ‏عليه السلام ‏ ‏فجعل في طست

Imam Ahmed bin Hanbal used ‘Alaiha Salaam’ for Fatima Zahra (a.s.)[[95]](#footnote-95):

... حتى دخلنا على ‏ ‏فاطمة ‏ ‏عليها السلام ‏ ‏فقال لها كيف ...

Imam Ahmed bin Hanbal used ‘Alaihi Salaam’ for Ali bin Abi Talib (a.s.)[[96]](#footnote-96):

... قرأت بسورتين قرأ بهما ‏ ‏علي ‏ ‏عليه السلام ‏ ‏قال ‏ ‏قرأ بهما ...

One of the beloved scholars of Salafies namely Imam Shawkani also used ‘Alaihi Salaam’ and ‘Alaiha Salaam’ for Ali bin Abi Talib (a.s.) and Fatima Zahra (a.s.) respectively at various places Nail al-Awtar, such as, vol. 2, p. 90:

إن في لبس الثوب الأحمر سبعة مذاهب : الأول الجواز مطلقا جاء عن علي عليه السلام وطلحة وعبد الله بن جعفر والبراء وغير واحد من الصحابة

There are seven opinions about wearing red cloth: The first (opinion) is that it is absolute lawful and this is the opinion of Ali ‘Alaihi Salaam’, Talha, Abdullah bin Ja’far, al-Bara and other companions.

We also read in Nail al-Awtar, vol. 2, p. 162:

وسيأتي حديث فاطمة عليها السلام

“The statement of Fatima ‘Alaiha Salaam’ is on the next (page)”

Imam Muhammad Zahid al-Kawthari al-Hanafi (d. 1371 A.H.) in his famed work al-Hawi fi Sirat al-Tahawi, p. 27 used ‘Alaihi Salaam’ for Ali bin Abi Talib (a.s.):

وتبدو على كلامه آثار بغضه لعلي عليه السلام في كل خطوة من خطوات تحدثه

“The signs of hatred against Ali ‘Alaiha Salaam’ appears in his (Ibn Tamiyah’s) words in every line of his statement”.

Late Salafi/Ahle Hadees scholar Maulana Waheed uz Zaman also used ‘Imam’ and ‘Ahle Salam’ for both Hasan and Imam Husain (a.s.) in his Urdu translation of Saheeh Bukhari:[[97]](#footnote-97)

And last but certainly not the least, the Imam of Salafies Nasiruddin Albaani also used ‘Alaiha Salaam’ [peace be upon her] for Fatima Zahra in his book Adaab al-Zafaf, p. 217:

شكوى ابنته فاطمة عليها السلام

“The complain of his daughter Fatima peace be upon her....”

### Reply Three – A Salafi scholar used ‘Alaihi Salaam’ for his Imam

While recording the biography of one of the most famous Salafi Imams namely Ibn Qayim al-Jawzi, a Salafi scholar Muhammad Ali Qutub stated in his book Aemat al-Fiqh al-Islami, vol. 11, p. 15:

سلام على الإمام ... الإمام شمس الدين محمد أبي عبدالله بن أبي بكر قيم الجوزية بن أيوب بن سعد الزرعي الدمشقي سلام عليه في الأولين والآخرين

“Peace be upon the Imam …the Imam Shamsuddin Muhammad Abi Abdullah bin Abi Bakr Qayim al-Jawzia bin Ayub bin Saad al-Zar’ai al-Demashqi, peace be upon him in the first and the last”.

### Azam Tariq’s attack on the concept of Imamate

Kr-hcy.com states:

Remember that imamate is an article of faith with the shias and according to their belief Imam is sinless like the prophet and appointed and commissioned by Allah. Hazrat Husain is one of their (Shia) twelve imams. As such the shias use the title of “Imam” for Hazrat Husain although in the sight of Sunni Muslims, he is a sahabi and not a “sinless imam” appointed and commissioned by Allah. We do not subscribe to the Shia belief of imamate.

Whilst Ahle Sunnah my not ascribe to the concept of Imamate within their pillars it still forms a part of their aqeedah, and their Ulema have confirmed this fact in their books of aqaid. Both Sunni and Shi’a schools hold Imamate as a part of aqeedah. Rather the difference lies over the method of appointment.

Quoting Mulla Ali Qari’s book “Sharh Fiqh Akbar”, which sets out the madhab of Imam Abu Hanifa, this is what we read in the Chapter “Masala Nusbul Imamah” (Issue of appointment of the Imam):

“It is the majority opinion that there is a duty to appoint an Imam. But there is a difference, as to whether this is Allah’s duty or whether this is incumbent on the public. The belief in the eyes of Ahle Sunnah and Muttazalites is that the duty to appoint an Imam is a duty of the public. In terms of hadees and logic this is a duty of the public. In accordance with this belief, there is a hadees in Saheeh Muslim, narrated by Abdullah ibne Umar ‘He who dies without giving bayah to an Imam dies the death of one belonging to the days of jahiliyyah’. This is why the Sahaba viewed the appointment of the Imam as so important that they preferred it to attending the Prophet’s funeral, because the Muslims need an Imam so that orders can be made on Jihad, and so that Islamic Laws can be implemented”[[98]](#footnote-98)

Maulana Abdul Aziz Fehrawi expands on this matter yet further:

“The appointment of the Imam is compulsory, its foundation is based on the fact that Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) said whoever dies in a state where he has failed to recognise the Imam of his time…. who dies at a time when the Imam is present and fails to recognise him, or dies when no Imam exists (nevertheless), his death shall be the death of jahiliyyah (one belonging to the time of ignorance). We have a hadees in Saheeh Muslim by Ibn Umar – whoever dies without an Imam dies the death of jahiliyya. In the tradition of Muslim we find these precise words “Whoever dies in state, having not had baya’h over his neck shall die the death of one belonging to the time of jahiliyyah”.[[99]](#footnote-99)

Incidentally the last sentence of this discourse on the Sunni concept of Imamate also shows the real reason why the modern-day Nasibi ulema oppose Imam Husain (a.s.) being called as such by the majority of Sunnis. Since imamate is linked here to the baya’h, by calling him Imam Husain (a.s.) the Nasibis are aware of the fact that most Sunnis accept Imam Husain (a.s.) as their imam and rightful khalifa and not Yazeed. This is a perplexing phenomenon of which the Nasibis are aware, for Imam Husain (a.s.) was not appointed by man, and could thus only have been appointed by Allah, as the Shias claim their Imams are. Yet such was the vindication of truth that he achieved over a demonic khalifa that Imam Husain (a.s.) is accepted as the rightful Imam in the spiritual sense by the Sunni majority, and the khalifa of the time Yazeed is cursed. The Shia Imam embodying pure goodness fought against the Sunni imam embodying pure evil. Yet the Sunni majority to this day side with the Shia Imam. This is intolerable to the Nasibis.

These two references from classical Hanafi scholars confirm that the Imamate is a part of aqeedah and that:

 Man has the duty to appoint the Imam

 Failure to recognise the Imam leads to the individual dying a kaafir.

If an issue as the difference between dying a Momin or a kaafir has nothing to do with aqeedah then what on earth does?

The Shi’a, as Azam Tariq has (for a change) correctly said, believes that the Imam is appointed by Allah (s.w.t.) and is infallible. We have proven this belief from the Holy Qur’an and Sunni sources in the article ‘The creed of the Shi’a’ available on this site. It is the difference in the two approaches that came to loggerheads at Karbala: the khalifa appointed by man – imam Yazeed, versus Allah’s appointed Imam Husain (a.s.). And the Sunni majority supports the Shia imam against their own imam. Sometimes whole populations oppose their leader over an issue of conscience and an intuitive understanding, deep down, as to who is right and who is wrong. We see this in the phenomenon of peace demonstrations by western civilians against the various wars that western governments have fought in their name. It is the same thing here with the Sunni majority’s attitude to Imam Husain (a.s.) and Yazeed. Azam Tariq cannot stand this as it destructors the whole edifice of Sunni Islam. We would like to end this section with a simple question to our brothers from Ahle Sunnah:

‘Supporting which Imam at that time meant the difference between dying the death of jahiliyyah and attaining salvation, Yazeed or Husain?’

Azam Tariq has implied above that he cannot stand the fact that the Sunni majority say it is Imam Husain (a.s.) that they choose.

We pray that this question, in light of our analysis of Yazeed’s character, leads our Ahle Sunnah brothers to understand the serious flaw that exists in believing that man NOT Allah (s.w.t.) decides on Imamate over a people. We saw what happens when a man rules. Yazeed was one of several similarly degenerate khalifas. But he embodied these degenerate traits to an unrivalled degree; this is what man’s appointment of khalifa means. This is why the Nasibis come up with the most ridiculous lies to hide his reality, for it is so scathing for the Sunni notion of khilafat. Not only scathing because Yazeed was so low, it is ten times more scathing because good was represented by an Imam of the Shia.

### Why do these Nasibi vigorously defend the reign of Yazeed?

This is one of those questions that automatically come to mind when one analyses the character of Yazeed. The reason lies in aqeedah, and goes to the heart of where the Sunni / Shi’a viewpoints diverge. The core difference between the two schools is on the topic of Imamate: who has the right to lead the Ummah. Shi’a Muslims believe that this leadership is religious guidance and hence the appointment is the sole right of Allah (s.w.t.), for Allah (s.w.t.) knows what is best for his Servants and He (s.w.t.) shall appoint the man best suited / most superior to lead the Ummah through all times. Allah (s.w.t.) will select an Imam who is best in character, most excelled on the components of Deen, who shall only rule via justice (if you want details see a ‘moderate’ article by a separate author but which we have copied and pasted onto this site called “The Khalifatullah in Shia Belief” for proof of this). There is no need for ijma, or votes since Allah (s.w.t.) appoints and no one has a voice in the matter.

The Ahle Sunnah believes that the appointment of the Imam is a duty of the Public – they decide on who comes to power. The importance in relation to appointment is the act of giving baya’h – once the Khalifah has received ijma then his imamate is legitimate. The act of baya’h is the crucial factor here – the people decide who is in power (a democratically elected dictatorship for life), and the khalifa’s character has no further bearing since once in power the Khalifah has to be obeyed. Any opposition is squashed, with violence. From the time of Mu’awiya onwards, all the khalifates become monarchies.

When this is the basis for Ahle Sunnah aqeedah, then over time their jurists have sought to revise the concept of imamate with stipulations over certain characteristics that Imam should possess, such as bravery, piety, and justice, especially after the embarrassing debacle (for Sunni Islam) with Yazeed and certain other members of the Banu Umayyad dynasty – for example the khalifa Waleed who expressed his desire to drink alcohol on the roof of the Holy Ka’aba. Unfortunately these writings have been nothing more than a ‘Dear Santa Wish List’ since an analysis of early Islamic history will quickly lead to us learning that characteristics such as justice were completely devoid in these Khalifahs, and there is no better example than Yazeed. Indeed with the exception of perhaps Umar bin Abdul Aziz in 1,100 years of khilafat after Yazeed, barely a pious man acceded to this position. Most were as bad as kings anywhere were. This left many classical Salaf scholars with a very difficult problem:

 If they reject Yazeed, they are then rejecting the concept of ijma that had been allegedly created at Saqifa Bani Sa’ada, and underpins Sunni Islam

 Rejecting this ijma’a in effect discredits Sunni aqeedah that the duty to appoint the imam is the right of the public.

 If this concept is discredited, by highlighting Yazeed’s demonic character and satanic actions, then the Ummah is forced to consider the alternative option of appointment as ascribed to by the Shi’a school of thought.

The Salaf Ulema, faced with this difficult problem, have decided to uphold the legitimacy of Yazeed’s reign since this is the only way that their belief in man made appointment can be maintained. This accounts for their pathological and indeed blatant lying, which embarrasses even the Nasibis. We shall now seek to set out the consequence of this belief…

### Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) said that he would be succeeded by twelve khalifahs

We are quoting from Saheeh Muslim hadees number 4483, English translation by Abdul Hamid Siddiqui:

“The Islamic religion will continue, until the hour has been established, or you have been ruled over by Twelve Caliphs, all of them being from Quraish”.

This is what we read in Mishkat al-Masabih:

“I heard the Apostle of Allah say ‘Islam shall not cease to be glorious up to twelve Caliphs, every one of them being from the Quraish”. (And in a narration) “The affairs of men will not cease to decline so long as twelve men will rule over them, every one of them coming from Quraysh.” And in a narration: “The religion will continue to be established till the hour comes as there are twelve Caliphs over them, everyone of them coming from the Quraish”[[100]](#footnote-100)

### The Salafi and Hanafi Schools of thought have graded Yazeed as the Sixth Khalifa of Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.)

1. Sharh Fiqh Akbar, p. 50, Zikr Fazael Uns Baad an-Nabi

2. Sawaaeq al-Mohreqah, p. 12, Chapter 3

3. Tareekh al-Kholafa, p. 11 Fazael Zikr Khilafat Islam

4. Tareekh-e-Khamees, vol. 2, p. 291 Zikr Khilafat Hasan

5. Umdahtul Qari fee Sharh Bukhari, vol. 11, p. 435, Kitab al-Ahkaam

We read in Sharh Fiqh Akbar:

Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) said that the Deen shall remain strong as long as these twelve Khalifahs are at the helm, and the twelve are Abu Bakr, Umar, Usmaan, Ali Mu’awiya, Yazeed, Abdul Malik bin Marwan, Walid bin Abdul Malik bin Marwan, Sulayman bin Abdul Malik bin Marwan, Umar bin Abdul Aziz, Yazeed bin Abdul Malik bin Marwan, Hasham bin Abdul Malik bin Marwan

The sixth Imam of truth according to Abu Sulaiman and Azam Tariq is Yazeed, but this is a fact that these Ulema often don’t mention to the public.

### Abdullah Ibn Umar deemed the baya’h to Yazeed to be in accordance with the conditions set by Allah (s.w.t.) and Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.)

We read in Saheeh al-Bukhari, Narrated Naafe’:

When the people of Medina dethroned Yazeed bin Muawiya, Ibn Umar gathered his special friends and children and said, “I heard the Prophet saying, ‘A flag will be fixed for every betrayer on the Day of Resurrection,’ and we have given the oath of allegiance to this person (Yazeed) in accordance with the conditions enjoined by Allah and His Apostle and I do not know of anything more faithless than fighting a person who has been given the oath of allegiance in accordance with the conditions enjoined by Allah and His Apostle , and if ever I learn that any person among you has agreed to dethrone Yazeed, by giving the oath of allegiance (to somebody else) then there will be separation between him and me.”[[101]](#footnote-101)

This fatwa epitomises the entire Sunni aqeedah on Imamate. We leave it to those with open minds to now decide which concept of Imamate holds true. One that deems this to be based purely on Allah (s.w.t.)’s selection, or one that deems it man’s choice no matter who, so much so that reign of Yazeed, a drunk, fornicating, zaalim, homosexual is also in accordance with the conditions prescribed by Allah (s.w.t.) and Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.). Would Allah (s.w.t.) really bless the reign of such a man?

Our Ahle Sunnah brothers should know that ‘you can’t keep your cake and eat it’ – if you want to reject the khilafat of Yazeed, then you are in effect rejecting Sunni aqeedah on Imamate. If you accept the khilafat of Yazeed, you are in effect joining the camp of the Salafi and Deobandi Nasibi shaped around the fatwa of Abdullah ibn Umar. On the plains of Karbala the two concepts of Imamate came to a head – man-made appointment (Yazeed) versus Allah’s appointment (Imam Husain (a.s.)). We pray that this article shall shed light over the consequence of believing that man, not Allah (s.w.t.) decides on the appointment of the Imam. It took the Imam appointed by Allah (s.w.t.) to lay down his life and that of his dearest blood family to save the religion for you.

# Chapter Thirteen

## Answering common Nasibi Objections to the stance of Imam Husain (a.s.)

The martyrdom of Imam Husain (a.s.) is actually the death of Yazeed and Yazeedism hence over the last few centuries Nawasib have been advancing some objections over the stance of Imam Husain (a.s.) and his merits and on some other aspects of the tragedy of Karbala. We would like to offer our replies to their criticisms of our Imam (a.s.) which are actually geared towards defending Yazeed (l.a.).

### Objection One: Did Imam Hasan give bayah to Mu’awiya? If yes, then why did Imam Husain (a.s.) not likewise give baya’h to Yazeed?

Imam Hasan (a.s.) didn’t give bayah to Mu’awyia rather he (a.s.) entered into a treaty with him. Authentic Sunni sources like Tareekh Abul Fida, vol. 1, p. 182, Tareekh Khulfa, p. 130, Tareekh-e-Kaamil, vol. 3, p. 190 and Tareekh Tabari, vol. 6, p. 92 etc. mention about the treaty and there is no mention of Bayah as one of the terms of the agreement. Moreover the most authentic Sunni work Saheeh Bukharee contains details of the treaty of Imam Hasan (a.s.) wherein there is no mention of bayah.

Saheeh Bukhari, vol. 3, Book 49, Number 867:

Narrated Al-Hasan Al-Basri:

By Allah, Al-Hasan bin Ali led large battalions like mountains against Muawiya. Amr bin Al-As said (to Muawiya), “I surely see battalions which will not turn back before killing their opponents.” Muawiya who was really the best of the two men said to him, “O Amr! If these killed those and those killed these, who would be left with me for the jobs of the public, who would be left with me for their women, who would be left with me for their children?” Then Muawiya sent two Quraishi men from the tribe of ‘Abd-i-Shams called ‘Abdur Rahman bin Sumura and Abdullah bin ‘Amir bin Kuraiz to Al-Hasan saying to them, “Go to this man (i.e. Al-Hasan) and negotiate peace with him and talk and appeal to him.” So, they went to Al-Hasan and talked and appealed to him to accept peace. Al-Hasan said, “We, the offspring of ‘Abdul Muttalib, have got wealth and people have indulged in killing and corruption (and money only will appease them).” They said to Al-Hasan, “Muawiya offers you so and so, and appeals to you and entreats you to accept peace.” Al-Hasan said to them, “But who will be responsible for what you have said?” They said, “We will be responsible for it.” So, what-ever Al-Hasan asked they said, “We will be responsible for it for you.” So, Al-Hasan concluded a peace treaty with Muawiya. Al-Hasan (Al-Basri) said: I heard Abu Bakr saying, “I saw Allah’s Apostle on the pulpit and Al-Hasan bin Ali was by his side. The Prophet was looking once at the people and once at Al-Hasan bin Ali saying, ‘This son of mine is a Saiyid (i.e. a noble) and may Allah make peace between two big groups of Muslims through him.”

We don’t see any thing about bayah in the above cited tradition rather we learn that it was Mu’awiyah who had sent two people to Imam Hasan (a.s.) for the purpose of the treaty and Imam Hasan (a.s.) adopted the method which avoided bloodshed among Muslims.

Another comment supported by a question is often advanced from Nasibis, namely ‘why didn’t Imam Hasan (a.s.) choose to fight Mu’awiya rather than enter into a peace treaty?’ We would like to reply that the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) had foretold that Imam Hasan (a.s.) will make treaty between two groups. We read in Saheeh Bukhari, vol. 5, Book 57, and Number 89:

Narrated Abu Bakra: I heard the Prophet talking at the pulpit while Al-Hasan was sitting beside him, and he (i.e. the Prophet ) was once looking at the people and at another time Al-Hasan, and saying, “This son of mine is a Saiyid (i.e. chief) and perhaps Allah will bring about an agreement between two sects of the Muslims through him.”

Thus it was not possible for Imam Hasan (a.s.) to oppose the words of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) while rejecting the offer of treaty.

### Objection Two: Why did Imam Husain (a.s.) not give bayah to Yazeed?

We should begin by pointing out that Imam Husain (a.s.) was not given the offer of a treaty. Our Imam (a.s.) was sitting at home in Madina wherein he was ordered to give bayah to Yazeed. Secondly there wasn’t any prediction by Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) that would have allowed Imam Husain (a.s.) to enter into a treaty. Imam Hasan (a.s.) made a treaty with Mu’awiya and his supporters in the same manner that the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) made peace with the Kuffar of Makkah. After agreeing the treaty our Prophet (s.a.w.a.) opted to fight the Kuffar of Makkah after migrating to Madina, and his (s.a.w.a.) younger grandson Imam Husain (a.s.) did likewise and fought the supporters of Mu’awiya during the reign of Yazeed. In brief, both Imam Hasan (a.s.) and Imam Husain (a.s.) were the mirror image of the Makki and Madani life of Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.). The reason for Imam Hasan (a.s.) making a treaty with Mu’awiya rather than fight was the same reason that the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) chose not to fight the Kuffar of Makkah, rather entered into a treaty with them. Similarly when the decision was taken by Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) to fight the same Kufar of Makkah Imam Husain (a.s.) adopted the same position by fighting against Yazeed.

If we go into detail about the two different stances adopted by Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) and his grandsons we will come to know that Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) by making treaty with the pagans of Makkah offered a final resort to them so that they might accept guidance during the said time but when they didn’t leave the path of ignorance and intolerance and kept committing oppression. This left our Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) with no other choice but to migrate to Madeena and to respond against all attacks by the pagans of Makkah. Similarly Imam Hasan (a.s.) by making treaty offered a final chance to Mu’awiya and his supporters so that they could come to the path of guidance and abandon the methods of oppression on earth but when those people didn’t abandon irreligiousness and kept destroying Islam Imam Husain (a.s.) responded by fighting the Yazeedi forces. In short, the stance of Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) of making treaty first and then making Jihad was done jointly by His (s.a.w.a.) grandsons, as had been the case with the previous Prophets. They would initially offer guidance to the ignorant of their time and when faced with stubborn refusal to the point of ruthlessness, Allah (s.w.t.) would send his wrath onto them.

### Objection Three: Why did Imam Husain (a.s.) not pay heed to the words of the eminent Sahaba not to go Iraq, a land wherein he was ultimately slain?

### Reply One

It was the words of Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) which prevented him, the way Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) had foretold that Allah will bring about an agreement between two sects of the Muslims through Imam Hasan (a.s.). Similarly (as we mentioned earlier) the Prophet (s.a.w.a.) had told him that he would have to travel to Iraq and be martyred on the path of truth. Imam Husain (a.s.) was aware of these words of the Prophet (s.a.w.a.) so how could he have accepted the advice of others proving the words of Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) false? When the Prophet (s.a.w.a.) had instructed him to proceed in this manner, then after the order of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) the advice of the Sahaba becomes irrelevant, no Sahaba is entitled to express a different opinion. At the time of the peace treaty of Hudaibiya, Umar opposed the decision of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.), yet the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) gave no consideration to Umar’s objections, likewise in this instance the order of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) was one that placed a specific duty on Imam Husain (a.s.). That is why Imam Husain (a.s.) deemed the advice of the Sahaba to be irrelevant, the words of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) made their advice null and void.

### Reply Two

The Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) deemed the martyrdom of Imam Husain (a.s.) so important for Islam that He (s.a.w.a.) instructed his companions to go and aid Imam Husain (a.s.) if they are alive by that time. We had already cited this Hadees in the previous chapter from several esteemed works:

“I heard Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) say ‘Verily my son [Husain] will be killed in a land called Karbala, whoever amongst you is alive at that time must go and help him”.

Bearing this Hadees in mind, how could Imam Husain (a.s.) ignore theses words, when the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) had stressed such great importance on them? That’s why right from the beginning till the end of the tragedy of Karbala we see that Imam Husain (a.s.) kept showing his satisfaction whenever he found the predictions made by Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) becoming true even when He (a.s.) was being slaughtered, He (a.s.) showed his satisfaction that the prediction of Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) was being confirmed. We shall evidence this from the following esteemed Sunni works:

1. Kanzul Ummaal, vol. 7, p. 11

2. Al-Bidayah wa al-Nihayah (Urdu), vol. 8, p. 1083. Nafees Academy Karachi

Kanzul Ummaal:

“Muhammad bin Umer bin Husain narrates that we were with Imam Husain (a.s.) at Karbala and when He (a.s.) saw Shimer zil Joshan he said: “Allah and His Prophet had told truth. Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) had said: ‘I see a dog with white spots on its body putting his mouth into the blood of my Ahlul bait and licking it’. Verily this statement of Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) turned out so true”.

### Reply Three:

If the above reply is not sufficient to destroy the Nasibi objection on Imam Husain’s stance then we would like to present the fact that a renowned Sunni historian Ibn Aseer Jazri has written that even after the death of Muawiyah, Imam Husain (a.s.) didn’t give bayah to Yazeed and moved to Makkah from Madina. It was in Makkah where he received letters from the people of Kufa therefore he started preparations for the journey but some people like Muhammad bin Hanafia, Ibn Umer and Ibn Abbas suggested him not to go Iraq but Imam Husain (a.s.) replied: “I have seen Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) in a dream and I will definitely do what has been instructed by Prophet (s.a.w.a.)”. Hence Imam Husain (a.s.) left for Iraq.[[102]](#footnote-102) Scholar Dyar Bakri has written same thing in Tareekh Kamees, vol. 2, p. 332.

We can read same text in many other books. For example in histories of Tabari and Kaamil we read:

“Imam Husain (a.s.) expressed the following reason for not accepting their suggestions: “I have seen Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) in a dream and He (s.a.w.a.) has instructed me such a thing which I cannot refuse whether it is goes in my favour or not”. People asked him about that instruction of Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) to which Imam Husain (a.s.) replied: “I haven’t told this dream to anyone yet and I will not tell it to anyone until I meet my lord”.[[103]](#footnote-103)

### Reply Four:

The extreme honour of Baitullah was one of the reasons which made Imam Husain (a.s.) to leave Makkah. Imam Husain (a.s.) was also aware of another prediction by Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) about a person who will commit severe bloodshed Makkah and will abandon the honour offered to Baitullah / Kabah. Therefore by deeming the prediction of Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) true, Imam Husain (a.s.) left Makkah so that He (a.s.) would not become the reason of attacking the house of Allah (s.w.t.). When some people suggested him not to leave Makkah, He replied:

“Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) had said that there will be a frog in Makkah which will abandon and destroy its honour. Hence I don’t want to become that frog”[[104]](#footnote-104)

Similarly Imam Husain (a.s.) used to say:

“By Allah! I will prefer to be murdered a step outside Makkah than to be murdered inside Makkah even its one step inside Makkah”.[[105]](#footnote-105)

### Objection Four: Had Imam Husain (a.s.) not left Makkah his blood might have been saved as opponents would have taken the honour of Holy Kabah into account

#### Reply One:

First of all this assumption is incorrect as it was certain at that time that people were not going to spare Imam Husain (a.s.) at any cost even Imam Husain (a.s.) himself was aware of this fact therefore He said:

“By Allah! Even if I go inside the holes of insects, these people will bring me out of that and will slay me”[[106]](#footnote-106)

As for the assumption that the opponents would have spared Imam Husain (a.s.) by taking the honour of Kabah in concerned, we would like to present the historical fact that Yazeed’s army didn’t spare the blood of Abdullah Ibn Zubair and murdered him inside the Holy Kabah without keeping in mind any importance of that esteemed place.

#### Reply Two: Yazeed sent assassins to kill Imam Husain within Makka

We read in Tareekh-e-Kaamil, vol. 4, p. 63:

“Ibn Abbas replied a letter of Yazeed saying ‘I can never forget the fact that you forced the grandson of the Prophet (s.a.w.a.) to leave Madeena and seek refuge in Makka, you sent soldiers on horses in his direction to disturb him, so you forced him to make his way towards Iraq, he left Makka through fear”.

#### Objection Five: Why did He (a.s.) not perform Taqiyyah?

We read in Tazkeratul Khawaas, p. 156:

“Ibn Abbas replied a letter of Yazeed saying ‘I can never forget the fact that you forced the grandson of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) to leave Madeena and seek refuge in Makka. I also can’t forget that that preparations of Ibn Ziyad the Governor of Kufa to implement your order to kill Husain, Yazeed you has sent your troops to kill Husain in Makka”

As we can see Yazeed had not care for the pure soil of Makka and sent troops to kill the Imam (a.s.) there.

#### Reply One:

The order to practice taqiyya is a common one, whereas the order to fight Yazeed was a specific edict.

1. Al-Bidayah wa al-Nihayah (Urdu), vol. 8, p. 163 Zikr Husain

2. Tareekh Ibn Asakir, vol. 4, p. 332, Zikr Husain

3. Tareekh-e-Kaamil by Ibn Aseer, vol. 4, p. 21, Zikr Husain

4. Usad al-Ghabah, vol. 2, p. 21, Zikr Husain

5. Maqatil Husain, p. 217, Part 1

6. Tareekh-e-Khamees, vol. 2, p. 197, Zikr Husain

7. Yanaabee’ al-Mawaddah, p. 336, Chapter 61

Al-Bidayah:

“Whilst making preparations for Iraq, Husain said ‘I witnessed my grandfather the Prophet in a dream, he gave me an order, and said that I must act upon it, and I cannot disclose this order to any Kufan, until I pass through this matter”

Yanaabee’ al-Mawaddah:

When efforts were made to dissuade Imam Husain from leaving for Iraq, his brother Muhammad bin Hanafeeya tried hard, the Imam said ‘I witnessed my grandfather in a dream, he ordered me to travel to Iraq, and said ‘Allah desires that you are martyred on his path covered in blood. Muhammad Hanafeeya said, ‘If this is the case, then why are you taking women with you?’ The Imam said ‘My grandfather had also told me that Allah (s.w.t.) desires that his Deen is protected via the imprisonment of these women”

If Nasabi still refuse to accept this line of reasoning then we will point out that when mass opposition turned into rebellion against Khaleefa Usmaan, and he was pressured into abandoning his post, so mush so that the Sahaba on Madeena constantly told him to resign, he replied ‘The Prophet told me not to remove the Shirt of Khilafath, even if it means me being killed’. If these Nasabi won’t accept the words of Usmaan then they will likewise not accept the word of Imam Husain (a.s.).

#### Reply Two:

The scholars of Islam are fully aware that the knowledge of Usul (principles) that if general ruling is overtaken by a specific ruling, that specific ruling takes precedence. We will provide an example:

“If a teacher says to his teacher ‘You can all go home now, the lesson has finished’ they will all leave, BUT if he says to one of those students ‘You can’t go’ the first order is a general one, the second is specific, that referred only to that student that had been asked to stay.

The order to practice taqiyya is a general one, whilst the order to be slain to protect the Deen of Allah (s.w.t.) at Karbala, was an order specific to Imam Husain (a.s.). It is clear that when the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) told Imam Husain (a.s.) to make his way to Karbala and be slain there, then any Nasabi objection as to why taqiyya was not utilized becomes redundant.

#### Reply Three:

Imam Husain (a.s.) was a divinely appointed Imam whose task is to protect the religion of Allah (s.w.t.) and guide the people and making their faith alive or more strong. Had Imam Husain (a.s.) practiced Taqiyyah at that time, the said purpose would have not been achieved, Islam would have been perished and Kufr would have been spread. The task which was given to him by Allah (s.w.t.) and the expectation Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) had from him (a.s.) about the protection of the religion of Allah (s.w.t.) would have been foiled. Imam Husain (a.s.) practicing taqiyyah at that time means that he could have given bayah to Yazeed making all of his immoral and anti Islam acts lawful while everyone know that Yazeed [l.a.] used to commit acts which were totally against the teachings of Allah and his Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.). Had Imam Husain (a.s.) practiced taqiyyah at that time, kufr would have re-emerged making all the efforts of Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) null and void.

There is a difference between the things permissible for followers and the duties of an Imam or guide. We read in history that:

The non-believers once caught Ammar-bin-Yaser (r.a.) and they forced him to say praise their false gods and to condemn Prophet Muhammad (s.a.w.a.). They forced him to an extent that Ammar bin Yasir (r.a.) gave in an exceeded to their demands. After that, when he returned to the Prophet Mohammed (s.a.w.a.), Ammar (a.s.) narrated the whole story to him (s.a.w.a.). Prophet Muhammad (s.a.w.a.) asked him, how do you feel in your heart? To which Ammar (a.s.) replied, I am fully content with Allah’s religion in my heart. To this Prophet Mohammed (s.a.w.a.) said, if non-believers ask you to say the same again, say it.[[107]](#footnote-107)

Hence we came to know that Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) gave clear permission to Ammar Yasir (r.a.) for practicing taqiyyah but Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) himself didn’t perform taqiyyah during that particular time as he(s.a.w.a.) was divinely appointed Imam of the time and practicing taqiyyah would have foiled all of his previous efforts for Islam.

### Objection Six: It was Hazrat Hamzah (r.a.) who was ‘Syed ush Shuhdah’ but later on Shias attributed this title to Imam Husain (a.s.)

We would like to reply that till his period Hazrat Hamzah (a.s.) was exalted martyr among other martyrs that is because he was ‘Syed ush Shuhdah’ till that time but Imam Husain (a.s.) touched the highest stage of martyrdom which entitled him to be called ‘Syed ush Shuhdah’. And its not only Shias but a vast majority of Ahle Sunnah ulema also call him ‘Syed ush Shuhdah’. For example Maulana Ahktar Shah of Merath (India) has called Him (a.s.) as ‘Syed ush Shuhdah’ (see Tasdeeq e Shahadat, p. 94), Maulana Shah Muhammad Suleman Phulwari in his ‘Risala Shahadat Husain o Risala Gham e Husain’ has written Imam Husain (a.s.) as ‘Syed ush Shuhdah’, Maulana Muhammad Mubeen in his esteemed book ‘Wasilat ul Nijaat ‘ (published in Lucknow) has written Imam Husain (a.s.) as ‘Syed ush Shuhdah’ at many places. Moreover Imam of Ahle Sunnah and renowned anti Shia scholar Maulana Shah Abdul Aziz Dehalwi writes in his book:

“Syed ush shuhdah Imam Husain (r.a.) attained martyrdom by the hands of enemies”[[108]](#footnote-108)

### Objection Seven: Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) himself called Hamzah (r.a.) as ‘Saheed ush Shuhdah’ while that is not the case with Imam Husain (a.s.). And Hamzah (r.a.) fought in Uhud along with Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) having higher status than Imam Husain (a.s.)

First of all we would mention that fact that Imam Husain (a.s.) was not martyred during the life of Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) then how he could have given this title to Imam Husain (a.s.)? And there is no where written that Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) restricted this title only for Hazrat Hamzah (r.a.). If the argument is that Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) called Hamzah (r.a.) as ‘Shaheed ush Shuhdah’ therefore no one can attribute this title to anyone else then we should point out that Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) called Geor Jis ‘Shaheed ush Shuhdah’ as well. Allamah Jalaluddin Syuti records:

نادى مناد من السماء إن يحيى بن زكريا سيد من ولدت النساء وإن جورجيس سيد الشهداء

“Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) said that a caller from sky called that Yahya (a.s.) is the leader of all people while Geor Jis is Shaheed ush Shuhdah”[[109]](#footnote-109)

So we came to know that Geor Jis was Shaheed ush Shuhdah during his time, Hamzah (r.a.) was Shaheed ush Shuhdah during his time but Imam Husain (a.s.) is the leaders of all martyrs hence he will remain Shaheed ush Shuhdah.

As for the comment that the martyrdom of Hazrat Hamzah (r.a.) was more superior to the martyrdom of Imam Husain (a.s.) due to the fact that Hamzah (r.a.) fought along with Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) in battle of Uhud while that is not the case with Imam Husain (a.s.), we would like to mention that the martyrdom of Hamzah (r.a.) was no doubt in the service of Islam but Shah Abdul Aziz Dehalvi writes that the martyrdom of Imam Husain (a.s.) added certain merits to Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.).

The martyrdom of Imam Husain (a.s.) is in reality the martyrdom of his Prophet Muhammad (s.a.w.a.) and it completed all the aspects of prophet hood of Prophet (s.a.w.a.)”[[110]](#footnote-110)

### Objection Eight: Imam Husain (a.s.) didn’t show bravery and kept sending his associates into battle

Some Nasibis find the tragedy of Karbala as a good opportunity to criticize the stance of Imam Husain (a.s.) and his strategy so that they can give a cover to the cowardness their caliphs exhibited in battle fields at the time of Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.). But what these Nasibis don’t know is the fact that unlike their caliphs Imam Husain (a.s.) fought hard in the battle field against his massive enemies.

Molvi Atta Muhammad wrote:

“Now the Zulfiquar of Husain Ibn Ali was unleashed…He jumped into his enemies like Ali went for Khayber… 410 enemies were killed by the hands of Imam Husain (a.s.)”[[111]](#footnote-111)

Even being thirsty Imam Husain (a.s.) managed to reach river Tigris and the enormous army of Ibn Sa`d wasn’t able to do anything. [Tareekh-e-Kaamil, vol. 4, p. 32]. Ibn Hajar Makki writes:

“If the army of Yazeed had not ditched Imam Husain (a.s.) by coming between Him and river, they would never have been able to over come Him because He was such a brave person who would never move from his place. When all of His companions got killed and Imam Husain (a.s.) became alone, He made such a strong attack on the army of Yazeed that He killed many of their strong men and then many groups collectively attacked Him”[[112]](#footnote-112)

Ibn al-Hadeed Muttazali writes:

“The army of Yazeed used to say: “We haven’t seen any courageous person than Husain because even after being injured and weak and loosing his companions and brother he used to attack the opponent army like an experienced lion”[[113]](#footnote-113)

Ibn Aseer Jazri while mentioning the last moments of His (a.s.) life writes:

“Even after resorting on his feet Imam Husain (a.s.) used to fight like a brave person and used to rigorously attack enemies while saving himself from the mass arrows and jumping into the empty spaces and used to say: “ Are you people gathering for my murder? By God! After my murder there will not be any human being on whose murder Allah would be enraged”[[114]](#footnote-114)

Ibn Aseer Jazri and Tabari write:

“When enemies started attacking Imam Husain (a.s.) from both sides He (a.s.) too jumped on them and then the situation was that when Imam Husain (a.s.) would attack the enemies on left hand side He would perished them and when He would attack the enemies of his right hand side He would make all of them unconscious. Narrator says: “By Allah! I haven’t found anyone firm, brave and strong hearted than Husain infact I haven’t seen anyone similar than him although he was collapsed at that time due to the fact that his brother, nephew, friends and companions had been killed. By Allah! The army of Yazeed used to run from his attack as if a goats run after the attack of beast”[[115]](#footnote-115)

The status of courage, strong heartedness and martyrdom of Imam Husain (a.s.) can be known from the above cited quotations. We see intense fighting by a person who was hungry and thirsty that the army of Ibn Ziyad used to run as if they were attacked by a lion.

Another point is that in the situation of Karbala, to stay alive required more courage and bravery. Everyone there knew that they were to be killed, and then there was no point in being scared or lengthening the life that had turned worse than death. At that time in the extreme hunger and thirst, Imam Husain (a.s.) showed that he indeed is the grandson of Rehmatul-Lil-Aalameen, and sent his companions to the battlefield first, as they were already there to die, but of course they were under an unbelievable spell of thirst and hunger, death was no problem for them, but yes, the starvation was a problem, therefore Imam Husain (a.s.) stayed in the battlefield till the end, bore the thirst and hunger, lifted all the corpses of his family and companions, and he was hungry and thirsty throughout that time, and finally he himself fought and achieved martyrdom himself.

Any rational sensible person would agree that in Karbala, life had become more difficult than death, hence Imam Husain (a.s.) eased up the things for his companions.

# Chapter Fourteen

## Conclusion

We read in Fatwa Azizi, p. 251, Hadees Saqalain (The Hadees of the Two Significant Things).

It should be known that the Sunni and Shi’a madhab are in agreement that Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) stated:

‘I am leaving amongst you two things; if you follow them you shall never go astray after me. These two compliment one another. One is the Book of Allah the other is my Ahlulbait (a.s.)”.

This is one of the most Mutawatur (Successively transmitted) Hadiths in Sunni Hadees methodology. It is shocking that the most incontrovertibly correct statement that Sunni scholars accept that ever came from the tongue of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) is rarely recounted to the Sunni public. It really is shocking and it smells of a cover-up of the truth by paternalistic minded Sunni scholars.

From here it can be ascertained in relation to the Shari’a of Allah that man must adhere to following both these two significant things. It is clear that the aqeedah and deeds are false of one who does not follow these two weighty things – any authority and anyone that denies these two has rebelled against the Deen. At Karbala, Imam Husain (a.s.) was the symbol of Allah (s.w.t.), and it was Yazeed who was the rebel against the sign of Allah (s.w.t.). The Sunni khilafat had turned against Allah (s.w.t.) and had done so before all mankind. This is why Yazeed is such an embarrassment to the Sunni establishment. Yet Imam Husain (a.s.) was so good, that even they cannot help but revere him.

### Our appeal to justice

We have cited the fatwa of Shah Abdul Aziz Dehlavi with regards to the position of one that rejects the Ahlulbait (a.s.). This was from the mouth of one of the lead opponents of the Shi’a of his time. The Shah stated that a madhab that opposes the Ahlulbait is false and bears no value. When we see today’s Nasibi presentation of the Ahlulbait (a.s.):

 Their raising doubts over the teachings upheld by the Ahlulbait in Karbala,

 Their rejection of the great sacrifice of Imam Husain (a.s.) in Karbala,

 Their refusal to accept that the stance of Ahlulbait (a.s.) was a stance between truth and falsehood

 Their belief that Imam Husain (a.s.)’s opposition was ‘dangerous agitation’ and that he was a baghi

These facts have been presented before you, and we appeal to those who claim themselves to be Ahle Sunnah, why do you remain silent and allow the Nasibi to bark in the manner that Azam Tariq and Co. do?

If your silence is on account of the fact that to speak out to defend Imam Husain (a.s.), may be misconstrued as support for the Shi’a as he is their Imam, then what judgement can we give on the state of your claiming to have iman, shahada and love for Ahlulbait (a.s.)? When it comes to the issue of disrespecting the Sahaba your honour is immediately challenged and you stand up vocally and attack the Shi’a on your websites, and yet when these Nasibi openly bark against the Ahlulbait (a.s.) in this type of manner then you all remain silent on the matter. You might not know it but the Nasibi plague is subconsciously affecting your hearts. The true scholars of ahl-al-Sunna vehemently condemned Yazeed. Yet the Nasibi ulema, for reasons we have exposed, blatantly lie and say that in the battle between good and evil, good was evil and evil was good. Yet are you becoming those masses of whom the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) said that the Ummah would, in the last days, listen to ulema who lie? You should know that even if the entire Sunni world sides alongside the Nasibi on this issue, it shall not effect the Ahlulbait in the slightest. It is your soul in the balance, not that of Imam Husain (a.s.). All Muslims accept he is the Chief of the Youths of Paradise. And we are all youths in Paradise. Will you be one of those youths?

For more details on the supreme sacrifice of Karbala access any Shia bookshop. We plan to produce details on the ultimate battle of good versus evil on this site.
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