



Muawiya

Author

Answering-Ansar.org

Muawiya

Author : Answering-Ansar.org

[Introduction](#)

[Was Mu'awiya seeking Qisas for the death of Hadhrath Uthman?](#)

[Mu'awiya and his supporters](#)

[Imam Ali \(as\) questions Mu'awiya's motives](#)

[Mu'awiya's actual motive was power](#)

[Abu Sulaiman questions the justice of Imam 'Ali \(as\)](#)

[Mu'awiya made Yazeed his Khalifa during his lifetime](#)

[Mu'awiya forced people to give bayya to Yazeed](#)

[Mu'awiya forced people to give bayya to Yazeed](#)

[Yazeed the 'protector of afflictions'](#)

[Nasibi appraisal of 'pious' Yazeed](#)

[The callous killing of Hujr bin Adi \(ra\)](#)

[The peace treaty with Imam Hasan \(as\)](#)

[Mu'awiya's poisoning of Imam Hasan \(as\)](#)

[The early Sahaba fought alongside Imam 'Ali \(as\)](#)

[Abu Sulaiman's refusal to describe Mu'awiya as a baghi](#)

Presented by <http://www.alhassanain.com> & <http://www.islamicblessings.com>

[Mu'awiya asks Sa'd to curse Hadhrath 'Ali \(as\)](#)

[Mu'awiya's Governors would curse Hadhrath 'Ali \(as\)](#)

[Maula 'Ali \(as\) was cursed for ninety years](#)

[Cursing Ali \(as\) is tantamount to cursing Allah \(swt\)](#)

[Mu'awiya 'the Hadi' took interest](#)

[Mu'awiya confirmed that he knew this to be the position](#)

[Rasulullah \(s\) made three Dua's, one that was rejected](#)

[Rasulullah's advice for Mu'awiya is also a fabrication](#)

[Abu Sulaiman's plea of clemency for Mu'awiya](#)

[Was Mu'awiya a Momin or Munafiq?](#)

[Hadhrath 'Ali \(as\)'s testimony - Mu'awiya is my enemy](#)

[The 'virtues' possessed by one born illegitimately](#)

[Mu'awiya's Conquests](#)

[Praising a fasiq leads to incurring the wrath of Allah \(swt\)](#)

[Mu'awiya shall die a kaafir](#)

Introduction



This is our comprehensive rebuttal to Ansar.org's defence of Mu'awiya bin Hind. Mu'awiya is a character whose antics have been meticulously recorded in the annals of history. From his birth onwards, the historians and Ulema of Ahl'ul Sunnah have managed to provide a significant insight in to the character of Mu'awiya. His role within the history of Islam during the advent of Rasulullah(s)'s mission is non-existent.

In fact he spent the vast portion of it on the opposite side his alleged father being 'Abu Sufyan leader of the Banu Umayya Clan who sought to undermine, fight and destroy the message of Rasulullah (s). 'Abu Sufyan eventually conceded defeat following the conquest of Makka and allegedly embraced Islam.

In much the same way Rasulullah (s) was opposed by Abu Sufyan, his alleged son Mu'awiya carried on the mantle of his father opposing the rightful khalifa 'Ali during his lifetime, refusing to give him bayya (oath of allegiance) and even after his martyrdom vented his hatred of Imam 'Ali via the disgraceful practice of cursing him during the Friday Sermons.

Despite his disgraceful acts a new generations of Nasibi disguising themselves Sunni have appeared in recent years declaring the affiliation with Mu'awiya and defending his actions and praising them. 'Abu Sulaiman is at the forefront of this neo-Nasibi ideology.

His appraisal of both Mu'awiya and Yazeed demonstrates how convoluted Nasibi ideology is and how it seeks its utmost to raise doubts on the stance of Ameerul Momineen 'Ali ibne abi Talib (as) in an effort to protect the persona of Mu'awiya. Hence we decided to lift the veils on Mu'awiya and present his true image to our readers.

Was Mu'awiya seeking Qisas for the death of Hadhrath Uthman?

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

Ansar.org states:Mu'awiyah did not want to rule, nor refused the leadership of Ali bin Abi Talib, may Allah be pleased at him, but Mu'awiyah requested from Ali was to give in Uthman's

Presented by <http://www.alhassanain.com> & <http://www.islamicblessings.com>

murderers, and only after that he would obey him (Ali).

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

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

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

Later on Abu Sulaiman passes the following comment:

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

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

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

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

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

We should also ask Abu Sulaiman 'was Mu'awiya's desire for revenge, more important than the smooth running of the Islamic State under the rule of the rightful caliph? Did Mu'awiya not consider the repercussions of such an action? Was there for example not a risk of Munafiqs (hypocrites) and the Kuffar (pagans) exploiting the situation and spread fitnah to further their own machinations?

It is indeed interesting that when the same Abu Sulaiman seeks to read the mind of Mu'awiya later by pointing out that Mu'awiya killed Hujr to quell the risk of sedition and yet the same Mu'awiya saw no problem in himself opposing Imam Ali (as) actively participating in rebellion and sedition!

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

How exactly was Mu'awiyas demand going to help the situation? One also wonders how Mu'awiya had all of a sudden become the Waris of Uthman demanding Qisas. Hadhrath Uthmans was survived by sons all of who were baligh they were his Waris and they had the right to ask for Qisas not Mu'awiya.

Ansar.org states:Al-Thahabi narrated in "Sayr A'alam Al-Nubala'a" from Ya'ali bin Ubayd from his father who says: (Abu Muslim Al-Khulani and some others went to Mu'awiyah and asked him: "Do you dispute Ali or are you equal to him? Mu'awiyah answered: "By Allah no. I know he is better than I am, and he has the right to rule, but do not you know that Uthman was killed as an innocent? And I am his cousin and the seeker of his revenge?

Therefore go to Ali and tell him to send me Uthman's murderers then I will obey him." They went to Ali and talked to him, but Ali refused to hand in Uthman's murderers to Mu'awiyah.) [Sayr A'alam Al-Nubala'a, vol.3, p.140, the examiner of the book said that its narrators are trustworthy] Abu Sulaiman's use of this reference is indeed disturbing. It is implying that Imam Ali (as) was AWARE who the killers of Uthman were, despite this he let these killers roam free.

Does Abu Sulaiman not understand the serious implication of this viewpoint? The Ahl'ul Sunnah have never espoused the view that Imam Ali (as) knew and protected Uthman's killers, they absolve him of any such slander and yet Abu Sulaiman is seeking to offer a new approach casting doubts on Imam Ali (as).

This is a subtle and devious method used by Abu Sulaiman, he has consciously cited this reference,

implicating Imam Ali (as) as the wrongdoer and Mu'awiya as the distraught sincere relative. It is clear that the majority Ahl'ul Sunnah do NOT believe such slander against Imam Ali (as) but they should be warned of the risks of infiltration by Nasibis seeking protection for their comments under the Sunni garb.

Mu'awiya and his supporters

Abu Sulaiman extols the cosy relationship between Mu'awiya and the people of Sham at several points in his article.

Ansar.org states:"Mu'awiyah ruled Al-Sham for forty years, and his relationship with Al-Sham's people was a relationship of love and loyalty to a degree that the people of Al-Sham agreed strongly with him when Mu'awiyah wanted to avenge Uthman's murder".

When Mu'awiyah took the governship of Al-Sham, his policy with his people was one of the best policies. His people loved him, and he loved them too his people supported him when Mu'awiyah wanted to take Uthman's revenge. They gave him allegiance on that and promised him that they will spend their lives and money for the cause of Uthman, take Uthman's revenge, or Allah take their souls before that. [Al Bidaya Volume 8 p.131] So we learn:

Mu'awiya loved the people of Sham and vice versa

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

It should be made clear than the Sharia is NOT based on the opinions of the Sahaba. The legitimacy of any stance is only valid if it is supported by the dictates of the Qur'an and Sunnah. The premise that the love of the people constitutes legitimacy of a stance is indeed a very faulty logic. The German people had a deep seated love for Adolph Hitler, this does not in any way mean that this support and his subsequent actions were sanctioned by Allah (swt). To love a person and follow him accordingly does not in any way mean that an individual's action is correct.

On the contrary the correct approach is to follow Allah (swt)'s Deen. Had he been sincere, Abu Sulaiman would have informed his admiring public as to who should have been followed in those circumstances, the Khalifa Ali (as) or Mu'awiya?

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

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

The reality is that Mu'awiya was indeed a 'master politician' with the ability to use any method to get his way, like the Leaders of Arab nations today, he used methods of maintaining leadership - 'by any means necessary'. This included courting and bribing people and subduing opposition through intimidation and violence.

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

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

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

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

Ansar.org states:Al-Shareef Al-Ridi narrated in Nahjul Balagha a speech delivered by Ali where Ali says: "In the beginning of our matter, the people of Sham and us met. It is obvious that our God is one, our Prophet is one, and our call in Islam is one. We do not see ourselves more in faith in Allah or more in believing His messenger than them, nor they do. Our matter is one, except for our disagreement in Uthman's blood, and we are innocent from his murder."

[Nahjul Balagha, vol.3, p.648] Hence, Ali is confirming that the conflict between him and Mu'awiyah is about the murder of Uthman, not for the sake of leadership or to take control of the Muslims"

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

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

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

This sermon is taken from Ahl'ul Sunnah's authority work al-Akhbar al-Tiwal page 173:

"From the Servant of Allah, Ali Ammerul Momineen to Mu'awiya ibn Abi Sufyan. Khaulani has brought your letter to me. You have claimed that I deserted Uthman and instigated people against him. In fact I did no such thing, when people got annoyed with the late Caliph some withdrew their support of him whilst others killed him. I chose to remain in my home keeping aloof from the matter. As regards to your demand that I hand over the killers of Uthman I shall not.

I am fully aware that you wish to exploit this as a means to fulfil your own ambitions, which has no aim to avenge the blood of Uthman. By my life if you refuse to abandon your rebellion and opposition, this same chastisement will fall on you as has fallen on every tyrant, sinner and rebel".

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

The Imam can only implement Qisas

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

Zameer Sayyid Sharred in Sharra Muwaffaq page 530 comments:

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

In Sharh al Maqasid page 251 we read:

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

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

In an Islamic State Individuals are entitled to voice their concerns / opinions to those in authority. Concerns are only permitted to go as far as 'silent protest' not armed rebellion. There exists no verse in the Qur'an or hadith that entitles individuals to rebel and fight the rightful khalifa if their demands are not met.

If this was the case then all Governments would be held to ransom, a 'its my way or the highway' approach - leaders would be constantly watching over their shoulders wondering when the next opposition rebellion would take place. If Mu'awiya was indeed correct in rebelling to get his way, then this sets a clear precedent,

if you don't get your way and the rightful khalifa does not listen to your demands then you can rebel. Is this option set out in any of the sources of Sharia? Clearly it is not as we have stated already Allah deems obedience to Ulil 'Amr unconditional, and with regards to 'Ali (as) Rasulullah (s) said:

"Whoever obeys 'Ali, obeys me, whoever obeys me, obeys Allah, whoever disobeys 'Ali disobeys me, whoever disobeys me, disobeys Allah" [Kanz ul Ummal, hadith numbers 32973]

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

Mustadrak al Hakim, Vol. 3, Page 128

Riyadh ul Nadira, Vol. 3, Page 110

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

Fatwa of Shah Abdul Aziz - one that fights 'Ali (as) is a kaafir Al Muhaddith Shah Abdul Aziz comments in - Hadiyyah Majeediyah page 813 "One who fights 'Ali [r] with enmity is a kaafir according to the ijma of Ahl'ul Sunnah"

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

"Whoever deems 'Ali [r] to be a kaafir or opposes his khilafath is a kaafir, this trait was evident amongst the Khawaarij at Naharwaan". Also on the same page Shah Abdul Aziz seeks to protect

Mu'awiya by pointing out that Mu'awiya does NOT come within this definition since: "Mu'awiya and the people of Syria sought revenge for the killing of Uthman".

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

Mu'awiya's actual motive was power

Since Mu'awiya had decided to take it on himself to avenge Uthman's death, perhaps Abu Sulaiman could inform us what efforts Mu'awiya had taken to protect Uthman while he was alive? Had Mu'awiya had any love for his relative he would have sought to protect him, and protect he could, after all he had command over the army of greater Syria (Syria and Damascus).

With the largest army in the Empire at his disposal, what action did Mu'awiya adopt? In Ahl'ul Sunnah's authority work al-Nasa'ih al-Kaafiyah page 19 we learn that:

"Hadrath Uthman asked Mu'awiya for assistance, but Mu'awiya did not listen to him. When the situation got worse and there remained little chance that Uthman would survive Mu'awiya sent Yazeed bin Asand ul Kasheeree with an army and told him to reach the point of Zeekush and remain there. The officer followed this order and when Uthman was killed Mu'awiya ordered his army to return.

This was done in order to show the people that he had sent an army but in reality this was just a trick, so that he could exploit Uthman's death as a means of taking power".

The agreement between Mu'awiya and Amr bin Aas is clear proof that the motive was power not avenging Uthman's murder Perhaps the advocates of Mu'awiya will not be convinced, well let us hear the testimony from the mouth of their Imam Mu'awiya. In Iqd al Fareed page 238 Volume 2 Chapter "Dhikr Amr bin Aas" a detailed conversation is cited between Amr bin Aas and Mu'awiya.

"Mu'awiya told Amr bin Aas to give him bayya. Amr replied 'if its with regards to the next world, then Allah (swt) will not be with you, if its in connection with this world then I would like a share". Mu'awiya replied, "in my world there is an equal share". Amr said, "I would like you to put into writing that you will give me Egypt and its surrounding suburbs". Mu'awiya did so adding (in the agreement) that Amr give him bayya.

Amr replied that it should also be written (in the agreement) that it (bayya) will be subject to the conditions being met. Mu'awiya replied "people will not look at this" but Amr said "Do this". At this point Umro attended and Amr said "Mu'awiya I have sold my religion at your hands". Umro said "Verily give him the full agreed amount as he was a Sahaba of the Prophet".

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

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

Power was the name of the game not the enforcement "revenge for Uthman" was the war cry via which Mu'awiya sought to enhance his ambitions. What greater proof of the deviance of Mu'awiya can there be than the admission of his key supporter Amr bin Aas. We read in in Ta'rikh Kamil Volume 2 page 139 "Dhikr Siffeen" that Amr bin Aas said the following to Mu'awiya:

"Avenging Uthman's blood was just an excuse, we are desirous of worldly power, upon hearing this Mu'awiya agreed to hand over Egypt to Amr". Do the defenders of Mu'awiya need to be convinced any further? This is the testimony of one of the key central characters in this episode admitting to Mu'awiya that Uthman's revenge was an excuse, the real motive was just power. If Mu'awiya disagreed with this assertion then why did he not admonish him and set the record straight?

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

Advocate of Mu'awiya, Ibn Kathir records two interesting references that further exposes the real reason for Mu'awiya's opposition:

In Al Bidayah page 131 Volume 8:

Un Sayeed bin Sadeed states that in Nakheela, Mu'awiya read Juma and said this, "I haven't fought with you to fast, pray and give Zakaat go on Hajj, you already do this, I fought to become Leader and Commander you don't like this but I have achieved it". Al Bidayah Page 128 Volume 8

"Prior to the battle of Siffeen, 'Ali gave Jareer bin Abdullah a letter that said 'Mu'awiya give me bay'a and obey me, do not create fitnah in the Islamic State'. Mu'awiya replied to Jareer, 'If 'Ali makes me Governor over the provinces of Egypt and Syria I will give him bayya, on the condition that after him no one else is given bay'a save me".

Imam of Ahl'ul Sunnah Khawarzmi in his "Manaqib" page 179 Chapter "Dhikr Siffeen" states that:

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

This and the previous reference from al Bidaya proves he had NO INTEREST in the killing Uthman rather his interest was one - gaining power. Mu'awiya simply used Uthman's murder as an 'excuse' not to give baya to Imam 'Ali (as). If he was indeed sincere perhaps Abu Sulaiman can explain why Mu'awiya did not ask for the killers to be handed following arbitration between the two sides at Sifeen? After all as Abu Sulaiman states the Syrians loved him and Mu'awiya was so determined to avenge Uthman's death that he deemed it appropriate to go to war.

This being the case how is it that he totally abandoned this determination when the two sides were negotiating, if Uthman's death was so important that thousands of lives could be lost, why did he all of a sudden abandon this resolve? If he was sincere would this not have been the very first thing that he demanded? This was clearly a farce and Deobandi scholar Sayyid Ahmad Raza Bijnori in his commentary of Sahih al Bukhari "Anwar ul Bari" states on Volume 12 page 73:

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

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

Moreover Shah Abdul Aziz Dehlavi in his Fatwa Azizi page 161 Chapter 8 under the chapter "Marwan" in answer to question 5 makes the admission: "The scholars of Ahl'ul hadith having relied on narration's have concluded that Mu'awiya's actions were based on his personal grudge and desire and it was not on account of the enmity that had been borne out between the Quraysh and Banu Umayya following the murder of the possessor of two lights [Uthman], the truth is that he was guilty of a great sin, was a baghi (rebel) and a fasiq (transgressor)".

Fatwa Azizi page 161 Chapter 8

Mu'awiya Thaneeh's condemnation of his grandfather eludes the fact that he fought Imam 'Ali (as) for power When Mu'awiya ibn Yazeed became khalifa he gave the following sermon:

"Verily Khilafath is Allah (swt)'s. My grandfather fought one that was more deserving of the khilafath and that was 'Ali ibne abi Talib and he performed such acts that you are all aware of, and in consequence he is suffering for these acts" A number of leading Sunni Ulama have recorded this sermons (Tareekh Khamees Volume 2 page 301; Hayatul Hayawan Volume page 88; Tareekh Ya'qubi Volume 2 page 241; Sawaiq al Muhriqa page 134; Yanabi al Mawaddah Volume page 325).

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

Abu Sulaiman questions the justice of Imam 'Ali (as)

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

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

On the one hand the Ansar passionately use every method in the Book to stir emotions to the masses, namely Shi'a don't respect the Sahaba, and here Abu Sulaiman's Nasibi mentality shines so clear that he is even supporting the view that Ali was unjust. Does this Nasibi really believe Mu'awiya was more interested in justice than 'Ali (as)? This when we have 'Abu Bakr narrating this hadith:

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

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

Ansar.org states:"Uthman's murderers are in the army of Ali, and these murderers are unjust".

Mu'awiya did not apply Qisas against Amr bin Aas

Now perhaps Abu Sulaiman could inform us how Mu'awiya dealt with the killers of Uthman in his own side, did he implement Qisas, as he demanded? He did not and in fact the clearest evidence that Mu'awiya's approach was nothing but a faade, comes from the very fact that he failed to take any action against the killers of Uthman who were also in his army.

Is it not logical that the first thing he would do would be to get his own house in order and 'avenge' Uthman's murders by slaying the killers hiding in his army? His trusted general at Sifeen was none other than Amr bin al-Aas who openly admitted his role in the killing of Uthman proudly declaring:

"I am Abu Abdullah. When I scratch an ulcer, I cut it. I used to campaign against him vehemently. I even instigated the shepherds at the top of the mountains to revolt against him." (Al-Tabari Volume 4, pages 356-57)

This can also be found in English version.

Al-Tabari Volume 14, pages 171-172

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

The comments of modern day Sunni academic Professor Masudul Hasan in his book Hadrat Ali Murtada (R.A.A) page 248 are indeed worthy of note: "Mu'awiya in spite of his cry for vengeance for the blood of Hadrat Othman found no harm in making an alliance with a man who had in fact incited the rebellion against Hadrat Othman.

'Amr bin Al-Aas in spite of his bitter opposition to Hadrat Othman during his lifetime saw nothing wrong in joining the chorus for vengeance for the blood of the man in whose murder he was indirectly if not directly involved"

Hadrat Ali Murtada (R.A.A) by Professor Masudul Hasan. page 248 Mu'awiya's appointment of Yazeed as his successor Abu Sulaiman claims:

Ansar.org states:"Mu'awiyah did not force people to give allegiance to his son Yazeed"

There is no evidence to support Abu Sulaiman's assertion. We learn from history that Mu'awiyah used many methods at his disposal to secure his son's position as Khalifa. Methods included bribery and coercion [for those interested they can consult Khilafat wa Mulukiyyat, chapter 4, page 149, Ibn Atheer, vol 3, page249, Bidaya, vol 8, page 79, Tareekh Ibn Kahldoon, vol 3, page, 15-16]

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

In his effort to protect Mu'awiyah we see Abu Sulaiman to yet again use semantics stating:

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.

Many Companions gave him the allegiance as well. Al-Hafedh Abdulghani Al-Maqdisay says: "His (Yazeed's) caliphate is rightful, sixty of the companions of the prophet peace be upon him gave him the allegiance. IbnUmar was one of them." [Qayd Al-Shareed min Akhbar Yazeed, by Ibn Khaldoun, p.70]

Could Abu Sulaiman explain the definition of a Crown Prince? If this is indeed the case, is there any evidence in the Qur'an and Sunnah entitling individuals to give baya to a Crown Prince? In fact in Islam Kingship is rejected outright, so even if this was correct Mu'awiyah had acted contrary to Islam.

If for arguments sake we accept this argument could Abu Sulaiman kindly tell us what the difference is between him appointing Yazeed as Crown Prince or Khalifa? Did he appoint someone separate as Khalifa? Did he tell the people to give baya to another person? In any case this defence is unsubstantiated and we challenge Abu Sulaiman to cite us a single source where he had referred to Yazeed as his Crown Prince and ordered people to give baya on this position.

Mu'awiyah made Yazeed his Khalifa during his lifetime

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

"O my son, I have arranged everything for you, and I have made all the Arabs agree to obey you. No one will now oppose you in your title to the caliphate, but I am very much afraid of Husayn b. Ali, Abd Allah b. 'Umar, Abd ar-Rahman b. Abi Bakr, and Abd Allah b. az-Zubayr. Among them Husayn b. Ali commands great love and respect because of his superior rights and close relationship to the Prophet.

I do not think that the people of Iraq will abandon him until they have risen in rebellion for him against you. As far as possible, try to deal with him gently. But the man who will attack you with full force, like a lion attacks his prey, and who will pounce upon you, like a fox when it finds an opportunity to pounce, is Abd Allah b. az-Zubayr. Whenever you get a chance, cut him into pieces." (Iqd al Fareed Volume 4 page 226)

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

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

To this effect we even have evidence from Sahih al Bukhari:

Narrated Yusuf bin Mahak:

Marwan had been appointed as the governor of Hijaz by Muawiya. He delivered a sermon and mentioned Yazeed bin Muawiya so that the people might take the oath of allegiance to him as the successor of his father (Muawiya). (Sahih al-Bukhari, Volume 6, hadith 352).

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

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

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

According to IbnUmar baya was given to Yazeed "in accordance with the conditions enjoined by Allah and His Apostle" clearly these conditions are connected with giving baya to a khalifa not a

Crown Prince.

Mu'awiya forced people to give bayya to Yazeed

We have discussed this topic with complete references in our article on Yazeed. Please see our article: Yazeed (L'aenn)

Deobandi scholar Rasheed Akhtar Nadwi in "Tahzeeb au Tamadhun e Islami" comments on page 1: "Mu'awiya forced people to give bayya to Yazeed".

Tahzeeb au Tamadhun e Islami

Sayyid Muhammad Rashid Raza the Syrian scholar echoes similar words in his book "Imamate al Uzma" page 99: Mu'awiya introduced the bad practice of giving bayya to Yazeed by force".

Imamate al Uzma page 99

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

"Mu'awiya attained power by force and secured it for Yazeed in the same manner. People who did not agree were forced to give it". Musalman ka 'Uruj-o-Zawal page 53

Abu Sulaiman had proclaimed that Mu'awiya:

Ansar.org states:consulted the grandest companions, the masters of the people and the district's governors. They all accepted. Delegations from the districts came with acceptance to give allegiance to Yazeed What Abu Sulaiman fails to explain is the method Mu'awiya used that resulted in delegates giving bayya to Yazeed. Let us shed light on his methods by citing the comments of Syed Qutb Shaheed in "Social Justice in Islam" (English translation pages 209-210):

"With the coming of Mu'awiya, the caliphate in Islam became a monarchy, a tyranny confined to the Umayyad family It will be sufficient at this point to quote as proof of this the account of the oath of allegiance to Yazid. From here we may discover the foundation of Umayyad power and find out whether Mu'awiya who established that power was true to the spirit of Islam or to some

other ideal. Mu'awiya summoned delegates to represent all the provinces at the taking the oath of allegiance to Yazid.

Then Yazid Ibn al Muqaffa stood up and said "The Commander of the Faithful is here", and he indicated Mu'awiya, "If he dies his successor is here" and he indicated Yazid. "And if anyone refuses - here" and he pointed to his sword. The, said Mu'awiya, "Sit down O best of preachers".

After the oath was taken to Yazid in Syria Mu'awiya gave Said ibn al-'As the task of gaining the acceptance of the people of the Hejaz. This he was unable to do, so Mu'awiys went to Mecca with an army and with full treasury. He called together the principal Muslims and addressed them thus: "You all know that I have lived among you, and you are aware also of my ties of kindred with you.

Yazid is your brother and your nephew. It is my wish that you take the oath of allegiance to Yazid as the next Caliph; then it will be you who will bestow offices and depose from them, who will collect and apportion money".

He was answered by Abdullah ibn Al Zubair, who gave him a choice of three things to do, first he might do as Allah's Messenger had done and appoint no successor, second he might do as Abu Bakr had done and nominate a successor, third he might do as Umar had done, and hand over the whole matter to a council of six individuals, none of whom was a member of his own immediate family. Mu'awiya's anger was kindled, and he asked "Have you any more to say?" "No".

Mu'awiya turned to the remainder of the company "And you?" "We agree with what Ibn Al Zubair has said", they replied. Then he addressed the meeting in threatening terms: "The one who warns is blameless. I was speaking among you, and one of you was bold to get up and call me a liar to my face. That I will bear and even forgive.

But I stand to my words, and I swear by Allah that if any of you speaks one word against the position that I take up, no word of answer will he receive, but first the sword will take his head. And no man can do more than save his life".

Thereupon the commander of Mu'awiya's guard ordered two men to stand over each of the nobles of the Hejaz who opposed him and to each he said, "If your man leaves his guards to speak one word, either for me or against me, then let the guards strike off his head with their swords". Then he mounted the pulpit and proclaimed: "These men are the Leaders and the choicest of the Muslims;

no matter can be successfully handled without them, nor can any decision be taken without their counsel. They are now satisfied to take the oath to Yazid , and have indeed already taken that

oath by the name of Allah". So the people took the oath.

Mu'awiya bribed people to give bayya to Yazeed

We read in al Kamil Volume 3 page 350:

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

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

Abu Sulaiman claims:

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

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

"From Husayn b. Ali to the believers and the Muslims. Hani and Sa'id came to me with your letters, they being the last among your messengers and delegations to come to me. I have understood what you said and that you have invited me to come to you because you have no Imam to guide you, and that you hope my arrival there will unite you in the right path and in the truth.

I am sending my cousin and the trusted one from my family [Muslim b. Aqil] to report to me about your affairs. If his report conforms with what you have written, I will soon come. But you must be clear about the fact that the Imam is only one who follows the Book of God, makes justice and honesty his conduct and behaviour, judges with truth, and devotes himself to the service of God. Peace." (Tareekh Tabari Volume 2 page 235)

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

Followed the Quran and Sunnah
Was just and trustworthy
Was of good character
Was a true devotee of Allah (swt)

It is evident that Imam Hussain (as) did not see these conditions inherent in Yazeed which is why he refused to give him baya. Tabari also records this letter of Imam Hussain (as) to the Shi'a of Basra:

"God has chosen Muhammad from among his people, graced him with His Prophethood and selected him for His message. After he admonished the people and conveyed His message to them God took him back unto Himself. We, being his family (ahl), his close associates endowed with the quality of guardianship (awliya'), his trustees and vice regent (awsiya'), and his heir and legatee (warith), are the most deserving among all the people to take his place. But the people preferred themselves over us for this [privilege].

We became contented, disliking dissension and anxious to preserve the peace and well being [of the community], though we were fully aware that we were more entitled to this [leadership] than those who had taken it for themselves . . . I have sent my messenger to you and I call you to the Book of God, and the Sunna of his Prophet, the Sunna which has become obliterated and innovations have become active and energetic. If you listen to me and obey my orders I will guide you to the right path. May the Peace and the Mercy of God be upon you." (Tareekh Tabari Volume 2 page 240)

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

Mu'awiya's development of lineal succession

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

Mu'awiya created a completely new system. Abu Bakr deemedUmar the most worthy for the role of succession and Umar selected six people who he himself stated that were the most worthy to

succeed him. For Mu'awiya he created a system where succession was NOT based upon merit but upon lineage character did not come in to the equation.

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

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

This type of hereditary succession is in accordance with the will of Allah (swt) and Rasulallah (s). The Shi'a concept of succession is that the Imam is appointed by Allah (swt) BECAUSE he has the right to succeed on account of his perfection / merits. Imam Ali's appointment of Imam Hasan (as) is not on account of the fact that he is his son, but because he is the most superior in the Ummah to lead the Ummah. Rasulallah had made it clear that if you follow the Qur'an and Ahl'ul bayt (as) you will NEVER go astray.

Hence the succession of Hasan (as) was not in any way shaped by nepotism rather it was on account of his entitlement to lead as he was the legitimate Imam appointed by Ali (as) through the will of Allah (swt) who would prevent the people from going astray. Imam Hasan (as) was qualified to take power, whilst the Banu Umayya possessed no such qualities. Is Abu Sulaiman going to suggest to us that no one in the entire Ummah was superior to Yazeed?

Yazeed the 'protector of afflictions'

In his defence of Mu'awiya, Abu Sulaiman comments

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

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

"Then Muslim, son of 'Uqbah, for three days gave Madinah to the sack. He murdered, looted and took prisoners, so that it was said that a man of Madinah thereafter, if he gave his daughter to wed, would not guarantee her virginity, "She may have been raped in the battle of Harrah." (from page 114) Ta'rikh Duwal al-Islam, al-Dhahabi, Hyderabad, page 31 provides list of those Sahaba who were killed in Harra.

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

"The son of Zubair, with the men of Meccah, made a sally against him, battle was joined and a Syrian versifier said:- "'Artillery' like a foaming stallion, with which he shoots at the timbers of this mosque." A footnote says 'timbers' refers to the Prophet's pulpit and other relics. In al-Isabah fi tamyiz al-Sahaba, Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani volume 3, page 470 also mentions the pillage of Medina, and stoning of Ka'bah during Yazeed's reign.

Nasibi appraisal of 'pious' Yazeed

Abu Sulaiman states:

Ansar.org states:"It is also a lie that Yazeed was an alcohol drinking person". We will let Muhammad bin Ali bin Abi Talib to answer this claim because Muhammad knew Yazeed the best because he lived with him for a while. Ibn Katheer says in Al-Bidayah: (When the people of Al-Medina returned from Yazeed, Abdullah bin Mutee'a and his companions walked to Muhammad bin Al-Hanafiyah.

They wanted Muhammad to agree to dismiss Yazeed, but Muhammad refused. Ibn Mutee'a said: "Yazeed drinks alcohol, does not pray, and ignores the rule of the Book." Muhammad answered them: "I never saw what you are saying about him. I came to him, and stayed with him for a while and I saw him taking care of his prayers, looking for goodness, asking about jurisprudence, and clinging to the Sunnah.[Al-Bidayah wa Al-Nihayah for IbnKatheer,vol.8,p.236]

It is agreed by Sunni and Shi'a alike that Yazeed was an ill character individual, and he is reviled

throughout the world in Muslim circles. Curiously Abu Sulaiman seems to depart from the common Sunni line and all of a sudden endorses the piety of Yazeed! No true Sunni would ever utter praise for Yazeed. It is extremely insulting to see that yet again Abu Sulaiman is presenting his Nasibi thinking and cloaking it as Sunni Islam. In any case Abu Sulaiman has failed to substantiate his claim.

Assuming that this statement attributed to Ibn al-Hanafiyya is not a fabrication, Muhammad bin Hanafiyya is stating that he (personally) had NOT seen Yazeed drinking this so could not verify the allegation. Had Abu Sulaiman had an ounce of honesty in him, this was a fact that few ulama of Ahlul Sunnah deny.

Ibn Kathir's comments on Yazeed the drunkard

Interesting the very same text al Bidayah from where Abu Sulaiman had sought to extol the virtues of his Imam Yazeed, also contains these comments of Ibn Kathir proving that he was indeed a drunkard. Ibn Kathir writes in al Bidayah Volume 8 page 239:

"Traditions inform us that Yazeed loved worldly vices, would drink, listen to music, kept the company of boys with no facial hair, played drums, kept dogs, not a day would go by when he was not in a drunken state".

Ibn Atheer's comments on Yazeed 'the drunkard'

In Tareekh al Kamil Volume 3 page 450 Ibn Atheer narrates from Munzir bin Zabeer:

"Verily Yazeed rewarded me with 100,000 dirhams but this cannot stop me from highlighting his state, By Allah he is a drunkard"

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

In "Siyar A'lam Al-Nubala" Volume 4 pages 37-38, Dhahabi narrates:

"Ziyad Hurshee narrates 'Yazeed gave me alcohol to drink, I had never drunk alcohol like that before and I enquired where he had obtained its ingredients'. Yazeed replied 'it is made of sweet pomegranate, honey from Isfahan, sugar from Hawaz and grapes from Burdah'. Yazeed indulged in alcohol and would participate in actions that opposed the dictates set by Allah (swt)".

In "Shadharat al Dhahab" page 69, Volume 1, Ibn al-'Imad al-Hanbali cites these comments of

Dhahabi:

"Mu'awiya's son Yazeed was an enemy of 'Ali, a Nasibi, a man of evil nature, and a drunkard".

Ibn Jauzi's comments on Yazeed 'the drunkard' Ibn Jauzi in Wafa al-Wafa Volume 1 page 217:

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

Ibn Hajr's comments on Yazeed 'the drunkard'

In his book written against the Shi'a, Sawaiqh al Muhriqa, Ibn Hajr sets out the Sunni position on Yazeed:

"One group made up of individuals such as Ibn Jauzi deem Yazeed a kaafir, others say he was not a kaafir but rather this is a matter that has caused a difference of opinion, the majority of Ahl'ul Sunnah agree that he was a fasiq (transgressor), a fajir (one that commits debauchery) and a drunkard.

Waqidi had recorded a narration 'verily we opposed Yazeed fearing Allah (swt) would reign stones down on us, Yazeed considered nikah (marriage) with mothers and sisters to be permissible and drank alcohol".

These comments are indeed interesting. Ibn Hajr asserts that in the eyes of the vast bulk of Ahl'ul Sunnah, Yazeed was "a fasiq, a fajir and a drunkard" while Abu Sulaiman who claims he is Ahl'ul Sunnah wants us to believe in a tradition portraying him as a pious worshipper who never drank alcohol.

Imam Ahmad issued Takfeer against Yazeed

In Sharh Fiqh Akbar page 77 we read:

"He considered alcohol halal and at the time of killing Husayn and his companions, he approached the pulpit and said that he had avenged the death of his ancestors at Badr. It is for reasons such as

this that Imam Ahmad Ibn Hanbal declared Yazeed to be a kaafir"

The Sunni Ulema have deemed it permissible to curse the drunkard Yazeed

Both Allamah Damiri in Hayaat ul Hayawaan page 196 Volume 2 and Ibn Khallikaan in Wafayat al-A'yan Volume 3 page 287 both record that:

"Ali bin Muhammad al Qiya al Harasee al Shafi'i was asked about what evidence existed that deemed it permissible to curse Yazeed. He replied 'in our opinion it is unanimous, that we curse Yazeed. He sat in the company of hunting animals, played chess and drank alcohol'. We read in Sharh Fiqh Akbar page 355:

"Some Ulema and Imams have declared it permissible to curse Yazeed, because by ordering the killing of Husayn he had committed kufr". Ibn Kathir in al Bidaya Volume 7 page 223 notes that:

"Ibn Jauzi wrote a book proving that it was permissible to curse Yazeed".

An appeal to our Sunni brethren

We have faithfully cited the comments of grand Sunni Ulema who have deemed Yazeed to be a drunkard and issued fatwas declaring it permissible to curse him on account of his deeds. Sunni's likewise the world over are united in their hatred of Yazeed ibn Mu'awiya, he is despised and cursed whenever his name is mentioned.

Curiously by citing this tradition Abu Sulaiman has sought to present an alternative viewpoint of Yazeed, one of an ardent pious worshipper. This is a belief that is alien to Sunni aqeedah and one has to ask 'what is this new belief system that Abu Sulaiman is seeking to pass off as 'the truth'? Clearly his views bear no correlation with Sunni Islam; the only group that would have the audacity to praise Yazeed, killer of Imam Husayn (as) would be Nasibis.

Would it not simply be better for Abu Sulaiman to stop adopting taqiyya and instead acknowledge that his appraisal of Yazeed is in line with his Nasibi ideology? Why is he seeking to make false misleading representations on behalf of Sunni Muslims? Perhaps Abu Sulaiman is seeking to amalgamate his Nasibi endorsement of Yazeed with mainstream Sunni aqeedah.

Whatever his motives, we would urge our Sunni brethren to distance themselves from Nasibis like Abu Sulaiman who are seeking to indoctrinate Sunnis with the false thinking that Yazeed was a pious Muslim.

The callous killing of Hujr bin Adi (ra)

Abu Sulaiman immediately begins this defence by seeking to deny that Hujr was a Sahabi (companion of the prophet), he states: Ansar.org states: "People disagreed on the companionship of Hujr bin Uday (the famous!). Al-Bukhari and others counted him as a follower (Tabe'ei), and some others as a companion".

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

The punishment for killing a Momin is Hell

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

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

Was Hujr a troublemaker?

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

Ansar.org states: "Mu'awiyah did not kill Hujr because he refrained from insulting Ali, and this is calumniation. What the historians mentioned about the reason behind killing Hujr bin Uday was that Ziyad, the ruler of Al-Kufah appointed by Mu'awiyah, once gave a prolonged speech. So Hujr bin Uday called for the prayer, but Ziyad went along with his speech.

So, Hujr and his group threw stones at Ziyad. Ziyad wrote Mu'awiyah telling him what Hujr did and Ziyad reckoned that as corruption on earth. Hujr used to do this with the governor of Al-Kufah who preceded Ziyad. Mu'awiyah ordered that Hujr be sent to him. When Hujr reached there, Mu'awiyah ordered to kill Hujr.

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

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

"Hujr bin Adi was a pious companion of the Prophet (saws) and played a vital role in the correction of the Ummah. During Mu'awiya's reign when the custom of cursing Ali from the pulpit's of Mosques began, hearts of the Muslims were being bled dry but people bit their tongues fearing death. In Kufa Hujr bin Adi could not remain silent and he began to praise Ali (ra) and condemn Mu'awiya.

Until Mughira remained the Governor of Kufa, he adopted a lenient attitude towards this, but when Ziyad's Governorship of Basra was extended to include Kufa, serious altercations arose. He would curse Ali (ra) during the khutba and Hujr would refute him. On one occasion he (Hujr) warned Ziyad for being late for Jumma prayers.

Ziyad then arrested him along with twelve of his companions on false accusations of forming an opposition group to overthrow the Khalifa and was cursing the Khalifa.

He also gathered witnesses to testify against them alleging that they claimed that khilafath was the exclusive right of the lineage of Ali ibne Abi Talib and further accused them of creating an uproar, throwing out the commander and of supporting Abu Turab Ali, of sending blessings upon him and hating his enemies. From amongst these witnesses, Qadi Shudhri's testimony was used.

He later wrote to Mu'awiya that the blood and property of people who said they offered Salat, paid zakat, and performed Hajj and Umrah, preached right and declared that evil was haram, however if you want to kill them so be it, otherwise forgive them. The accused were sent to Mu'awiya and he sentenced them to death. A condition was placed that if they cursed Ali (ra) and showed their hatred to him they would be pardoned.

They refused and Hujr said I will not say that thing that will displease Allah'. Finally he and his seven companions were murdered. From amongst them Abdur Rahman bin Hassan was sent back to return with a written instruction that he be murdered in the worst possible manner, Ziyad buried him alive (Tarikh al Tabari, Volume 4 page 190 - 208, al Istiab by Ibn Abdul Barr Vol I page 135, Tariqh by Ibn Athir Volume 3 page 234 - 242, al Bidayah al Nihaya by Ibn Kathir, Volume 8 page 50 -55j, Ibn Khaldoon Volume 3 page 13).

Abu Sulaiman then seeks to defend the method of killing:

Ansar.org states:"Muawiya's severity in killing Hujr was because Hujr tried to transgress against the Islamic nation and to break the bond of the Muslims and Mu'awiyah considered it as an endeavor to corrupt the earth especially in Kufah where some groups of the affliction first appeared against Uthman.

If Uthman were lenient in this matter, which ultimately lead to his death and lead the Islamic nation to the greatest affliction and caused blood to run like rivers, then Mu'awiyah wanted to cut this affliction from its roots by killing Hujr" If Mu'awiyah wanted to kill Hujr in this way to quell sedition, how is it that he was in effect willing to provide immunity to Hujr and his supporters if they cursed Ali.

This 'transgression' and attempt to corrupt the earth would have been eliminated by the act of cursing Ali (as)? This is the bond of the Muslims that Abu Sulaiman claims that Mu'awiyah was trying to protect, a bond that could only be maintained through the cursing of Ali (as)!

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

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

"This incident shook the heart of the Ummah. Upon hearing the news Hadhrath Ibn Umar and Hadhrath Ayesha were aggrieved. Hadhrath Ayesha had previously written a letter admonishing Mu'awiyah. Later on when she met Mu'awiyah she said Mu'awiyah did you not fear Allah even slightly when killing Hujr?'. When Hadhrath Mu'awiyah's Governor of Khurasan Rabiya bin Ziyad heard this news he shouted O Allah if in your knowledge there is anything good left on my part, take me from this world'.

[Khilafat wa Mulukiyaat, chapter 5, page, 165 citing Tabari vol 4, page 19 to 207, Ibn Athir, vol 3, page 234-242, Al bidaya wan Nihaya, vol 8, pages 50-55, Al-isti'aab, vol 1, page 135]

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

rewarded, the same approach is NOT applied to Hujr. If he opposed Mu'awiya. Why is Abu Sulaiman condemning him? Can it also not be deemed that he exercised ijthihad for which he will be rewarded?

If not, why not? Is there one rule for those that oppose Ali (as) and another for those who oppose Mu'awiya? Or are those who oppose Mu'awiya more abominable in his eyes than those who oppose Ali (as)? Clearly Abu Sulaiman's Nasibi beliefs have been exposed.

Fortunately 'true' Sunnis have a love for Imam 'Ali (as) and his adherents in their hearts and hence have been particularly critical of the killing of Hujr bin Adi [r] and his supporters.

Mufti Ghulam Rasul a modern day Hanafi scholar in his biography of Imam Jafar Sadiq "Subeh al Sadiq" discusses a number of topics including the slaughter of Hujr bin Adi. On pages 93-94 he makes these comments that one hopes will convince actual Sunnis that Hujr's only 'crime' was his love for 'Ali and that only Nasibis (who are pretending to be Sunnis) would have the audacity to conclude otherwise:

"Hujr and his associates were killed in 51 Hijri and I pray that Allah (swt) showers his mercy upon them. Verily they sacrificed their to protect the honour and dignity of the Lion of Allah, 'Ali. Their murderers told them that they would be saved if they cursed 'Ali - they refused saying 'We shall not do that which shall cause the wrath of Allah (swt).

This is because Hujr and his companions knew that the truth was with 'Ali, he was the example of Harun, he was the brother of the Prophet (s) in this world and the next, 300 verses had descended in his praise, 'Ali was with the Qur'an and the Qur'an was with 'Ali, to look at 'Ali's face was an act of worship, to hate 'Ali was an act of Kufr and to have love and faith in 'Ali was a part of Iman.

Rasulullah (s) said that the sign of a momin was love for 'Ali and the sign of a munafiq was hatred of 'Ali. It was in light of these facts that Hujr and his companions refused to disassociate themselves from 'Ali, they happily accepted death and willingly sacrificed their lives doe to their love for 'Ali".

Subeh al-Sadiq pages 93 & 94 We should also point out that Tareekh ibne Wardee Volume 1 page 55 also confirms that Mu'awiya killed Hujr on account of his love of Imam 'Ali (as).

The killer of Hujr shall receive the wrath of Allah (swt)

Abu Sulaiman's admission "Muawiya's severity in killing Hijr" is at least an admission that Mu'awiya had the blood of Hujr bin Adi on his hands. We have already cited the fact that Allah

(swt) punishes a believer for the murder of a momin by cursing him and sending him in to the Fire. That is with the regards to the murder of any ordinary momin, Hujr was not an ordinary momin. In Kanz al Ummal Volume 7 page 87 we read that Hadhrath Ayesha narrated that Rasulullah (s) said "Whoever kills Hujr will incur the wrath of Allah".

The peace treaty with Imam Hasan (as)

Ansar.org states:It is taken for granted for anyone who read something about the Imamiyah sect that they attribute kufr to Mu'awiyah because he fought Ali. However, the fact is that Al-Hasan bin Ali - and he is one of the infallible Imams according to the Shia, therefore whatever he says is truth - made peace with Mu'awiyahSo, did the "infallible" Hasan made peace with a kafir and gave him the leadership??

Or he made peace between two parties of Muslims as the Prophet peace be upon him says: "My son is a master, and Allah may use him to make peace between two parties of Muslims." [Saheeh Al-Bukhari, Book of "Afflictions," #6629, vol.6]

We are not calling Mu'awiya kaafir, if for arguments sake he was, then that is no insult on Imam Hasan (as) for our infallible Prophet (s) negotiated peace with the kaafirs at Hudaibiya, contrary to the criticisms of Umar. Is Abu Sulaiman also now going to criticise Rasulullah (s)? Mu'awiya was professing that he was a Muslim, hence the agreement was indeed between two Muslim groups, but his subsequent conduct in breaching the conditions of the agreement bear testimony to the fact that he was a fasiq.

Mu'awiya took the Caliphate by force

Ansar.org states:"Mu'awiyah did not take the caliphate by force, but it was given to him by Al-Hasan bin Ali after peace occurred between them. One needs to look at the historical background to understand why Imam Hasan (as) stood down. The circumstances were such that he had been forced into making a difficult choice peace or bloodshed, Mu'awiya used bribery and intimidation to "win over" Hasan (as)'s army and had posted his army outside Kufa (a clear pressure tactic).

Mu'awiya summoned all the commanders of his forces in Syria, Palestine, and Transjordan to join him. Not long after, the Syrian leader marched against Hasan with an army of sixty thousand men, (Ibn A'tham, IV, p. 153). Clearly marching towards Imam Hasan (as) with a 60,000 force in no way demonstrates Mu'awiya wanted peace - he WAS preparing for battle.

If his interest was just peace why not go alone with a handful of supporters? By bringing such a

powerful force Mu'awiya was making his intention clear, that he intended to wrest the khilafth from Imam Hasan (as) willingly or unwillingly. Mu'awiya had used the threat of force as a bargaining chip, Imam Hasan (as) was placed under duress to hand over the caliphate, it was not willingly handed to Mu'awiya on silver platter rather Imam Hasan (as) was pressurised into yielding to Mu'awiya's demands.

In this regard the comments of defender of Mu'awiya Ibn Kathir Volume 8 page 17 are indeed of interest:

"The Sunnah is that there khalifa (Banu Umayya) be referred to as Kings, because Rasulullah (s) said that khilafth would last for thirty years, this would be followed by kingdom. This (khilafth) remained until the Rabi'ul Awwal 31 Hijri when Hasan was left with no other choice but to make peace with Mu'awiya" Ibn Kathir's admission that Imam Hassan (as) was left with no choice but to make peace is clear proof that the khilafth was not happily handed over to Mu'awiya on a silver platter as Abu Sualiman would lead us to believe.

The caliphate was indeed taken by the threat of 'force' - hence Imam Hasan (as)'s decision was to step aside to save further bloodshed, but that was NOT until he obtained Mu'awiya's signature to agree to certain key conditions.

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

"Kingship's foundation began with this change. Mu'awiya (ra) was not appointed with the consensus of the Muslims at large as was the case with his predecessors, if the Muslims were not happy with them they would have not taken the positions, despite this Mu'awiya wanted to be the Khalifa, he fought for this position, the Muslims were not pleased with his appointment.

The people did not appoint him, he became by force and when he became Khalifa people had no other choice but to give him baya. If the people did not give him baya, they would not only lose their positions / ranks but also would have also lost their lives and would have been catastrophic for the system, people would rather give baya than confront this consequence.

That is why after Imam Hasan (ra) stepped down the other Sahaba joined him so as to avoid the risk of civil War amongst Muslims. Mu'awiya was well aware of this strategy". [khilafat wa mulukiyyat, chapter 5, pages 158-159 citing Al Bidaya wa al Nihaya by Ibn Katheer, vol 8, page 132]

Mu'awiya's own admission that he took the Caliphate by force

Abu Sulaiman may insist that he did not take the caliphate by force, but this defence falls flat on its face when we in fact have the testimony of his master Mu'awiya who set out the means via which he attained power. Al Bidaya Volume 8 page 132 and Iqd al Fareed Volume 2 page 139 both record that:

"In the year of Jamaa, Mu'awiya entered Madina and gave a sermon from the Mosque pulpit stating 'I have become ruler over you. Although I know that you are unhappy with my rule and that your hearts bear enmity towards me, I have attained power via the sword'. This negates the defence advanced by Abu Sulaiman as we hear from the mouth of Mu'awiya himself that his coming to power was via the sword i.e. physical force.

The bay'a given to Mu'awiya

Abu Sulaiman writes:

Ansar.org states:"Al-Hasan bin Ali abandoned the caliphate for Mu'awiya and all the people gave the allegiance to Mu'awiya and none of the companions refrained in giving him the allegiance!"

On the issue of Imam Hasan (as) allegedly giving baya we should point out that baya has two meanings "to make a contract" and "to pledge allegiance" see Hans Wehr's Arabic - English Dictionary page 86. The fact that agreement between the two sides was written on a piece of paper clearly alludes to the fact that a contractual agreement had been drawn up.

Imam Hasan (as) was offering his Leadership in return for the conditions that he had placed. With Mu'awiyah's signature the baya was concluded, i.e. the contract was finalised and agreed between the two sides. Baya as in exchange, now if Imam Hasan (as) was giving his baya as in pledge, then why do Ahl'ul Sunnah not regard Mu'awiya as a rightly guided khalifa as well? After all as Clarke in his translation of Suyuti's 'The Khalifas who took the right way' on page 9 admits:

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

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

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

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

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

Many afflictions occurred during that time but the Ahl'ul Sunnah happily embrace narration about Abdullah bin Saba so why do they happily accept this as a fact of history? Should we reject ALL narrations during that period? A number of the grand Sunni scholars HAVE recorded this. You can find this in the following books that we shall cite as proof, but before expanding on this let us set the scene to prove Mu'awiya's motive:

Reasons behind the poisoning of Imam Hasan (as)

Abu Sulaiman then seeks to use some logic as follows:

Ansar.org states:"The truth is that Al-Hasan made peace with Mu'awiyah, and gave him the leadership and the allegiance. Therefore, for what reason would Mu'awiyah poison Al-Hasan?"

Mu'awiya despite gaining power saw in Imam Hasan (as) a formidable opponent. As Abu Sulaiman admits Mu'awiya wanted Yazeed to succeed him. This contradicted one of the conditions stipulated in the agreement with Imam Hasan (as) namely that in the event of Mu'awiya's death khilafath would RETURN to Hasan (as) (see Isti'ab, I, pp. 355 f. Usd al-ghaba, II, p. 14).

Mu'awiya had no intention to comply with this, to ensure the best approach would be to kill Imam Hasan (as) during his own lifetime. Renowned Egyptian academic Dr Taha Husayn in his book "'Ali wa banooh (Ali and his sons)" (translated in Urdu as Hadhrath 'Ali (ra) by Maulana 'Abdul Hameed Numani) on page 214 writes:

"by poisoning Hasan, Mu'awiya and Amr bin Aas had made the way clear for making Yazeed the next khalifa". Hadhrath 'Ali page 214

The motive was there, so was the method as was the means, and Masudi in Muruj-ud Dhahab Volume 2 page 486 and in Sirrul Awliya by S.M. Mubarak Alawi Karmani (Urdu translation by Ijaz ul Haqq Quddoosi) page 81 it is stated:

"Imam Hassan (as)'s wife Ja'da bint e Ashas Kindi poisoned him on the orders of Mu'awiya".

Sirrul Awliya page 81 In Tadkhirath al Khawwas page 192 we read:

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

Zamakshari in Rabi' ul Abrar notes that on page 208 Volume 4:

Mu'awiya reached an agreement with Jada binte al-Ash'ath bin al Qays, namely 100,000 dirhams if she poisons Imam Hasan. For two months Hasan bled profusely, and he would state 'I have been poisoned on several occasion before but on this occasion the poison has attacked my heart' Mu'awiya's pleasure upon hearing about the death of Imam Hasan (as)

Even if 'Abu Sulaiman refuses to accept this evidence, one thing is for certain - Mu'awiya's reaction upon hearing the death of Imam Hasan (as) proves his evil nature. Zamakshari in Rabi' ul Abrar notes that on page 186 & 209 Volume 4: "upon receiving news of Hasan's death, Mu'awiya paid a prostration of thanks (Sajdah e Shukr)".

Rabi' ul Abrar Vol. 4 page 186 & 209

Is this type of love Allah (swt) commands his faithful to bestow on the Ahl'ul bait expressing joy upon their deaths? We will inshallah cite this reference later in another context for the moment analyse the 'respect' that is afforded to Imam Hasan (as) in the presence of Mu'awiya:

We read in Sunan Abu Daud Book 32, hadith Number 4119:

Narrated Al-Miqdam ibn Ma'dikarib:

"Khalid said: Al-Miqdam ibn Ma'dikarib and a man of Banu Asad from the people of Qinnisrin went to Mu'awiyah ibn AbuSufyan. Mu'awiyah said to al-Miqdam: Do you know that al-Hasan ibn Ali has died? Al-Miqdam recited the Qur'anic verse "We belong to Allah and to Him we shall return."

A man asked him: Do you think it a calamity? He replied: Why should I not consider it a calamity when it is a fact that the Apostle of Allah (peace_be_upon_him) used to take him on his lap, saying: This belongs to me and Husayn belongs to Ali?

The man of Banu Asad said: (He was) a live coal which Allah has extinguished. Al-Miqdam said: Today I shall continue to make you angry and make you hear what you dislike. He then said:

Mu'awiyah, if I speak the truth, declare me true, and if I tell a lie, declare me false.

Paksitani Hanafi scholar Allamah Khalil Ahmad Chisti in his book *Maula aur Mu'awiya* citing Tayseer al Bari Sharh Bukhari states that it was actually Mu'awiya who said "He (Hasan) was a live coal which Allah has extinguished".

Another Deobandi Hanafi scholar Malik Ghulam 'Ali in his book "*Khifaath aur mulukiyath phur itrizath ki tajzeeya*" page 338 cites Wahidudeen az Zaman's text *Tayseer al Bari* in his discussion of this episode that:

"Ameer Mu'awiya's heart was not pure with regards to the Ahl'ul bayt".

Malik Ghulam 'Ali also in "*Khifaath aur mulukiyath phur itrizath ki tajzeeya*" page 340 quoting 'Awn Maboodh Sharh Sunan Abu Daud' said as follows:

"Maulana Sham al Haqq Haqqani stated, Mu'awiya failed to recognised the esteemed station that had been afforded to the Ahl'ul bayt, he said such a thing at a time when Imam Hasan had died, this was a major tragedy and Hadhrat Miqdam recited the couplets of truth at that tragic time, he did not remain silent, and this is the sign of a pious momin.

The comments of the man from the Asad tribe were said so as to please Mu'awiya. He went close to Mu'awiya and said '(He was) a live coal which Allah has extinguished'. Such strong and obnoxious language was said before Mu'awiya (as with Hasan present he felt that some aspects of reign were in danger)".

We agree with this assertion this was said by this Nasibi to please Mu'awiya. Notice how Mu'awiya at no point reprimands the individual for such a disgraceful comment. If this is not proof within itself that Mu'awiya supported this view, notice the comment of:

Al-Miqdam said: Today I shall continue to make you angry and make you hear what you dislike.

He then proceeds some faults that he noticed in Mu'awiya. The man from Asad's failure to ask permission BEFORE he slandered Imam Hasan (as) in the presence of Mu'awiya is clear proof that he was fully aware that such a comment would not offend Mu'awiya.

In this day and age these supporters of Mu'awiya seek to incite hatred against the Shi'a for they disrespect the Sahaba. We should point out to these Nasibis that their Imam Mu'awiya would disrespect the family of Rasulullah (s) and that insults about Imam Hasan (as) were said in his presence so as to please him.

Hanafi scholar Maulana Sultan Mahmood in his footnote of the Urdu translation of Sunan Abu Daud Volume 3 page 273 states: "Mu'awiya did not consider Imam Hasan's martyrdom as a sad matter, this was on account of his animosity towards 'Ali and his family". Sunan Abu Daud Vol. 3 page 273

Mu'awiya the baghi (rebel)

The books of Ahl'ul Sunnah are replete with references which prove that Mu'awiya's opposition was an act of rebellion.

Al Isaba page 412

Usd al Ghaba page 211

Al Isti'ab page 376 Volume 3

Al Bidaya page 21 Volume 8

Tareekh Khamis Volume 2 page 386

Tarikhul Khulafa page 195 Volume 2

Nayl al Autar page 179 Volume 7

Al Nisaayaul kaafiya page 16

Al Istiab page 376 Volume 3 & Tareekh Khamis Volume 2 page 386

"Mu'awiya fought Ali for five years"

Usdul Ghaba page 211

"Mu'awiya didn't give Ali bayya but fought him. Sifeen is the war connected with this"

Tarikhul Khulafa page 195 Volume 2

Mu'awiya fought Ali and rebelled against him and also rebelled against Imam Hasan

Al Bidaya page 21 Volume 8

Mu'awiya opposed Ali's bay'a and Sifeen is the result of this action

Hadhrath Ali (as) was the Rightful Imam and the Imam of the time

This fact is confirmed by the leading Ahl'ul Sunnah Ulema. We have cited a number of sources for those wishing to delve in to the matter.

Sharra Muqassad page 24

People of haqq are in agreement that in Sifeen Ali was on Haqq (the truth). By obtaining bayya from Basra his Imamate was established, his opponent Mu'awiya was a baghi. He opposed the rightful Imam.

Al Sawaiq al Muhriqa page 139

Al Ma'arif page 90

Riyadh al Nadira page 293 Vol 3

Usdul Ghaba page 113 Vol 4

Al Isti'ab page 55 Volume 3

al-Isaba page 503 Vol 2

Al Bidaya page 226 Vol 7

"At the time of Bayya, Ali approached the mosque, got on the Minbar and the general public gave him bayya"

This refutes Nasibi claims that he didn't get ijma hence Mu'awiya opposition to Imam e Haqq made him a baghi who could not place conditions Al Akhbar al Tiwal page 140

"Abu Hanifa Duni Dhuree comments that after Hadhrath Uthman's death people were without an Imam for three days. They gave Ali bayya after careful thought and he said whoever opposes me has opposed Islam as this decision was not taken in haste".

Shara Aqaid al Nasfee page 105

"The grand Muhajireen and Ansar had an ijma in the khilafath of Ali happily. They accepted his khilafat and gave him bayya" Tahzeeb ul Tahzeeb page 338 Volume 7

Nisai ul Kaafiya page

al Imama wal Siyasa oage 44 Vol 1

Tarikh ul Khulafa page 174

It was incumbent to fight alongside Imam Ali (as)

Ansar.org states:"authentic traditions from the prophet peace be upon him says that to leave the fight was better for both parties. The fight was neither mandatory nor preferable".

This proves how low Abu Sulaiman will go in his efforts to cover up the truth. As he has done consistently throughout his defence he fails to cite even one hadith in which Rasulullah (s) said to leave the fight was better. He undoubtedly knows that this is baseless the reality is that it was indeed mandatory for Rasulullah (s) said:

"O Ali! Soon a rebellious group will fight against you, you will be on the truth. Whoever does not support you on that day will not be from us" Kanz al Ummal, by Ali Muttaqi al Hind quoting Ibn Asakir, hadith number 32970

Abu Sulaiman praises those Sahaba who stayed away from either side at Sifeen:

Ansar.org states:"Sa'ad bin Abu Waqqas, Muhammad bin Muslimah, Abdullah binUmar, Osamah bin Zayd, and many other of the first believers from the muhajireen and Al-Ansar who isolated themselves from the affliction and did not partake in the fight".

Their decisions not to participate do NOT in any way mean that they were right. Or is Abu Sulaiman now suggesting that they were right and Imam Ali (as) was wrong? If so this demonstrates the contradictory nature of Abu Sulaiman's statements. Sometimes he describes Ali as closer to the truth, Mu'awiya as searching for the truth and now he is stating that the correct position was to keep aloof in times of fitnah! The decision to isolate themselves from both sides and hence refuse to side with the right (as Abu Sulaiman is likewise doing) was in no way supported by Rasulullah (s).

The duty in Islam is to side with truth, no matter how much Abu Sulaiman seeks to water down facts, Imam Ali (as) was on the path of truth, Rasulullah (s) said that haqq would always accompany him and this was in ALL circumstances. The duty was to attach themselves to Ali (as) NOT to separate from him, in this regard we have the explicit words of Rasulullah (s):

"After me people shall experience fitna, you will split into groups, he then pointed at 'Ali and said Ali and his companions shall be on the right path" [Kanz ul Ummal hadith number 33016].

Abdullah bin Umar's regret he didn't fight the baghi Mu'awiya

Of interest is the fact whilst citing Ibn Umar's non-participation stance he fails to cite the same Ibn Umar's remorse on his deathbed. He made an admission that he was wrong and should have fought with Ali (as) against Mu'awiya.

Ibn Abd al-Barr in al-'Istiab narrates that Umm Habeeb ibne Abi Sabith (ra) heard Abdullah ibnUmar say:

"I regret that I did not join Ali and fight the rebellious group". Abi Barr bin Abi Jaham (ra) narrates that he heard Abdullah ibneUmar say "I never regretted anything in my life other than the fact that I did not fight the rebels"

Al Isti'ab, by Ibn Abd al-Barr, Vol. 3, Page 83 Other Sunni Ulema have also recorded the regret of Abdullah ibn Umar in the same way. Al Nisa al kaffiya page 19

Ummdatul Qari Sharh Sahih al Bukhari page 349 Volume 11 We will inshallah expand on the slaughter of Hujr bin Adi later but in his conclusion of the tragic episode the comments of Mufti Ghulam Rasul al Hanafi in his " Subeh al Sadiq " page 94 are indeed of interest since he states that the killing of Hujr of his followers left a lesson to the people, namely that.

"Ali's love is Iman. If someone wishes to maintain his Iman and remain on the Deen he must believe and love 'Ali and in all situations he must stand with Ali. That is why those who did not stand with 'Ali regretted that they failed to do so for example Abullah ibne Umar in the final stages of his life said 'I don't regret anything as much as the fact that I did not support 'Ali (Tabaqat Ibn sad page 187 Volume 4)"

The early Sahaba fought alongside Imam 'Ali (as)

In his attempt to play down the actions of Imam 'Ali (as), 'Abu Sulaiman had made this baseless claim:

With regards to Abu Sulaiman's claim that "many other of the first believers from the muhajireen and Al-Ansar who isolated themselves from the affliction and did not partake in the fight" - he has no evidence to support this claims and fails to cite even a single source. The fact is that the early converts the Muhajireen and Ansar WERE those that fought with Imam Ali (as) at Sifeen. This has even been admitted by the Sunni scholar Al Muhaddith Shah 'Abd al-'Aziz Dehlavi who in his book written against the Shi'a states:

"The title Shi'a was first given to those Muhajireen and Ansar who gave allegiance (bay'ah) to Ali (may Allah enlighten his face). They were his steadfast faithful followers during his (Ali's) caliphate.

They remained close to him, they always fought his enemies, and kept on following Ali's commands and prohibitions. The true Shi'a are these who came in 37 Hijri" (NB 37 Hijri -the year Imam Ali (as) fought Mu'awiya at Sifeen). Tuhfa Ithna 'Ashariyyah, (Gift to the Twelvers) (Farsi edition p 18, publishers Sohail Academy, Lahore, Pakistan).

The Muhajireen and Ansar (Sahaba) were the Shi'a of Ali (as). One wonders how Abu Sulaiman claims that MANY Muhajireen and Ansar did not participate. Amongst those killed fighting alongside Imam 'Ali (as) were prominent companions including Khuzema bin Thabit (al Isti'ab Volume 1 page 437; Usdul Ghaba Volume 2 page 133 - Chapter Dhikr Khuzema), devotee of Rasulallah (s) Uways Qurni (Usdul Ghaba Volume 1 page 180; al Isti'ab Volume 1 page 123). One prominent Sahaba killed fighting under Maula 'Ali's banner was Hashim ibne Utbah. We learn in Usdul Ghaba Volume 5 page 277 that when Hashim ibne Utbah was killed, Abu Tufail Amar ibne Waseela said:

"you are a martyr because you fought an enemy of the Sunnah".

Usdul Ghaba vol. 5 page 277

We read in al Istiab Volume 3 page 229 that:

"Abdur Rahman Ibn Abdi narrates that eight hundred Sahaba who pledged allegiance at Ridwan fought alongside 'Ali at Sifeen".

Al Isti'ab, by Ibn Abd al-Barr, Vol. 3, Page 229

This is a significant figure, particularly when one takes into account that the number of Sahaba who pledged allegiance at Ridhwan totalled 1400. With the passage of thirty years there is no doubt that many would have died whether via natural deaths or in the battlefield. Despite this fact, we learn that a significant number stood shoulder to shoulder with Imam 'Ali (as) at Sifeen.

It is indeed sad to see that the early Muslims knew where the truth lay and fought with 'Ali (as) whilst we have a defender of Mu'awiya writing some 1400 years later raising question marks on Imam Ali (as)'s position and defending and showering praise on his enemies.

Abu Sulaiman's refusal to describe Mu'awiya as a baghi

We then witness Abu Sulaiman's deviant interpretation of the Qur'an so as to protect Mu'awiya and apportion transgression to Imam Ali (as):

Ansar.org states:"Even if we supposed that the people who fought Ali were insurgents and not depending on personal interpretation of texts, then it would not be considered as a slander in their belief and their deservance in entering heaven. Almighty Allah says: "If two parties among the Believers fall into a quarrel, make ye peace between them:

but if one of them transgresses beyond bounds against the other, then fight ye (all) against the one that transgresses until it complies with the Command of Allah; but if it complies, then make peace between them with justice, and be fair: for Allah loves those who are fair (and just), The Believers are but a single Brotherhood: so make peace and reconciliation between your two (contending) brothers;

and fear Allah, that ye may receive Mercy." [Surat Al-Hujarat, verses 9 and 10] Allah described the two parties by faith and made them brothers despite the fact they fought each other and transgressed on each other. Then what about if one of them transgressed on the other thinking he is right? Does it prevent him from being an interpreter, wrong or right? "

One can see how desperate Nasibis get to protect their beloved Imam. He claims that:

Ansar.org states:"Allah described the two parties by faith and made them brothers despite the fact they fought each other and transgressed on each other"

The Qur'an says no such thing, it refers to one party transgressing:

"but if one of them transgresses beyond bounds" This is being done intentionally he is seeking to describe Imam Ali (as) as a baghi too, i.e. the battle was between two groups of baghis! Abu Sulaiman's refusal to acknowledge which party had transgressed is quite intentional, the moment his rebellion is proven then his actions can be condemned, which would be too much for him.

The fact is Mu'awiya and his party had refused to give baya to Imam Ali (as) and were defiantly opposing him. Is this not evidence of transgression, opposing the Khalifa of the time? Whilst his Nasibi leanings make it impossible to speak the truth we shall delve in to the matter to determine the Ahl'ul Sunnah definitions of a baghi.

Defining baghi (rebell)

Durre Mukhtar page 113:

"Baghi is one who indulges in an act that is not halaal. A baghi is one who opposes Imam-e-Haqq". al-Nasa'ih al-Kaafiyah page 16

"Baghi is one who refuses to obey Imam-e-Haqq and opposes him". The late scholar Sayyid Abu'Ala Maudoodi in his 'Tafhim ul Qur'an' Volume 5 page 80 collates the opinions of the Ahl'ul Sunnah ulama about a 'baghi'. He writes:

"Ibne Khumman in Hidayah's commentary Fathul Qadir states that the scholars have declared that a baghi is he who disobeys the rightful Imam. Imam Shafii in Kitab ul-Umm states 'Baghi' is he who fights the Adil Imam. Imam Malik declared that it is a duty to fight those who oppose the 'Adil Imam [al Mudawanna]".

Mu'awiya became baghi because he fought Imam 'Ali (as)

Tuhfa Ithna Ashariyyah page 181 Chapter 7

"Anyone who knows Farsi and school child who read Jami Aqaid Ahl'ul Sunnah should know there's a jamaah that from Ali's khilfath up to Sulh Hasan Mu'awiya was a baghi because he didn't give bayya or obey the Rightful Imam" Sharh al Maqasid page 306:

"The aqeedah in Ahl'ul Sunnah is that the first baghi in Islam was Mu'awiya" Hidayah Page 134, Volume 3:

"Being a Judge under a Zaalim King is [permissible in the same way that one is appointed as a

Judge under an Adil Imam, for example the Sahaba were Judges under Mu'awiya Zaalim even though the truth was with 'Ali" Naylul Autar page 187 Volume 7:

"In hadith it is proven that Hadhrath 'Ali was on the path of truth and Mu'awiya and his companions were on falsehood. Only a stubborn person will deny this".

al-Nasa'ih al-Kaafiyah page 22:

"Mu'awiya and his companions are baghis without a doubt and they are Qasitooon, Allah says Qasithoon are in deepest part of Hell". In Al Milal wa al Nihal by Allamah Shahrastani in Volume 1 page 103 cites the comments of the Sahabi Abul Hasan Ashari who expressed a clear opinion namely that:

"Mu'awiya and Amr bin Aas fought against the rightful Imam. Ali fought the rebels, he was with the truth and the truth was with him Mu'awiya's rebellion was in violation of the Qur'an Allah (swt) says in his Glorious Book:

"O you who believe! Obey Allah and his Apostle and those in authority among you". (Al-Quran, Surah Nisa, Verse 59) It is interesting that 'Abu Sulaiman has failed to comment on this verse in his lengthy article. This is a clear verse that proves beyond a doubt that Mu'awiya's opposition was one that contravened the Book of Allah (swt). This verse provides no room for manoeuvre. Obedience to those in authority is on par with obedience to Allah (swt) and the Prophet (s). This means that disobeying the Leader amounts to disobeying Allah (swt) and his Prophet (s). The verse is absolutely clear. How can anyone interpret this verse as entitling someone to rebel against a leader. Anyone who does so is a rebel.

Now we ask:

Does Imam Ali (as) not come within this verse?

Was he not 'those in authority'?

Is he not the fourth rightly guided khalifa?

Did Mu'awiya obey him?

In accordance with this verse and the definitions of Ahl'ul Sunnah, Mu'awiya's disobedience of Imam Ali (as) had made him a rebel. His entire rebellion was baseless since the Qur'an would not support it. He had no text to justify his actions he was on the path of falsehood and had led his supporters down that same slippery road of deviance.

Mu'awiya's rebellion was in violation to the Sunnah of Rasulallah (s)

If this verse of the Qur'an is not a sufficient indictment against Mu'awiya, then we also have this hadith in Sahih Muslim "Kitab al Imara" Book 020, Number 4557:

It has been narrated (through a different chain of transmitters) on the authority of Abu Huraira that the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) said: Who defected from obedience (to the Amir) and separated from the main body of the Muslims - then he died in that state-would die the death of one belonging to the days of Jahilliyya.

And he who is killed under the banner of a man who is blind (to the cause for which he is fighting), who gets flared up with family pride and fights for his tribe-is not from my Umma, and whoso from my followers attacks my followers (indiscriminately) killing the righteous and the wicked of them, sparing not (even) those staunch in faith and fulfilling not his obligation towards them who have been given a pledge (of security), is not from me (i.e. is not my follower).

Mu'awiya openly violated this tradition. He refused to obey Imam 'Ali (as), he separated from the main body misleading others in the process. The seriousness of this tradition is clear one who separates and died "would die the death of one belonging to the days of Jahilliyya" i.e. he would die a kaafir. Rasulallah (s) did not provide any defense for such individuals. He did not say that they would be rewarded having exercised ijtihad, he said that the perpetrators were not his followers.

This is in relation to those that rebel against any Leader, with regards to those that rebel against Imam 'Ali (as) we read in al-Nasa'ih al-Kaafiyah page 36 that Rasulallah (s) said:

"If anyone fights Ali's Khilafath, kill him". Rasulallah offered no excuses for the opponents of Imam 'Ali (as), all who come against Imam 'Ali (as) should be killed; clearly Mu'awiya comes within this hadith. Mu'awiya was from amongst Qasateen (those refrained from giving bayya to Imam e Haqq) Usdul Ghaba page 114 V 4 Abu Sa'id narrates:

"Rasul ordered us to fight Nakisheen, Qasatheen and Marakeen. We asked under who? He said Ali ibn abi Talib! .. Amar will be killed in this war". Matalib al Sa'ul p 68 "Sahaba and Ayesha fought Ali and they were amongst oath breakers. Ali fought Mu'awiya and he was amongst the Qasatheen" Sharh al Maqasid Volume 2 page 304:

"Rasulallah (s) said to Ali 'Nakisheen, Qasatheen and Marakeen will fight you'. Mu'awiya and his companions were Qasatheen they left the truth, which was to follow Ali and give him bayya".

Of relevance here is the admission of the darling of the Nasibis, Ibn Taymeeya, who writes in Minhaj al Sunnah page 210 Volume 3 "Dhikr Mu'awiya": "During Ali's reign the most entitled person to be the Khalifa of Rasulallah (s) was 'Ali. He was a rightly guided khalifa and to obey him was mandatory"

So from this Nasibis own pen we have an admission that 'Ali was the rightful Imam and that it was mandatory to obey him. From the hadith mentioned before it is clear that those who refuse to submit to the Rightful Imam and oppose him, are deemed as Qasatheen. The duty was to obey Imam Ali (as) and yet Mu'awiyah and his supporters refused to recognise his authority and give him bayya, hence they were the Qasatheen.

Mu'awiya was amongst the Fajireen (perpetrators of debauchery)

Fara'id us Simtayn page 157

Kifaya al Talib p 221 Ch 58

Mawaddatul al Qurba p 45

Manaqib al Khawarazmi p 11

Nuzul ul Abrar "Dhikr Fadail Ali" p24

Kunuz al Haqaiq v 2 page 16

Jami' al Sagheer v 2 p 65

Qurrat al 'Aynayn p 141

Maula wa Mu'awiya p 141

al Mustadrak al Hakim Volume 3 page 129

All the above books record traditions in which Rasulallah (s) referred to Imam 'Ali (as) as the killer of the Fajireen:

For example in Nuzul ul Abrar Chapter "Dhikr Fadail Ali" p24 we read that The Prophet (s) said:

"O 'Ali you are the Imam of the pious and the slayer of those that are fasiq and fajireen" In al Mustadrak al Hakim Volume 3 page 129, we read a more lengthy tradition: "'Ali is Imam of the pious and killer of the fajireen. Aided will be those that aid him, abandoned shall be those that abandon him".

al Mustadrak al Hakim, Vol. 3, Page 129

In addition to this we have the comments of Imam 'Ali (as) taken from Tareekh Tabari Volume 4 page 77: "The Fajir son of a fajir is Mu'awiya and the fajir son of a kafir is Amr bin Aas"

Abu Sulaiman's plea that both parties were believers

Ansar.org states:[Surat Al-Hujarat, verses 9 and 10] "Allah described the two parties by faith and made them brothers despite the fact they fought each other and transgressed on each other".

We are not suggesting that Imam Ali (as) was fighting the Kuffar, he was fighting believers. Since the duty is to fight until the transgressors accept the truth, the verse makes it clear that believers can be wrong and when they transgress one is permitted to fight them. Perhaps Abu Sulaiman could elaborate 'What if this group of believer's don't accept the truth and are killed while they were still transgressors? Will they still be equal to those who were on the path of truth? This clearly cannot be the case and Allah (swt) says "Are a Momin and Fasiq equal? certainly not". The Ulema of Ahl'ul Sunnah have been uncompromising in the criticisms of a baghi.

To rebel against the Imam is tantamount to Zina in a Mosque Naylul Atar page 1893 Volume 7 Mu'awiya instituted the bid'ah of cursing Imam Ali (as) In his attempt to protect his Nasibi Imam, Abu Sulaiman vigorously seeks to deny the historically established fact that Imam Ali (as) was cursed by Mu'awiya. He claims:

Ansar.org states:It is a lie that Mu'awiyah ordered to insult Ali from the pulpits. There is no rightful or clear evidence about that. Mu'awiya's biography and manners refuses this accusation. What some of the historians mention about that has no value because when these historians presents these words about Mu'awiyah, they do not differentiate between true or false stories.

In addition, most of these historians are Shia. But some of the Historians narrated in their books sound stories and false stories, but they are excused when they attributed these stories to their narrators so that we could judge these stories, whether to accept them or reject them.

This being the case then what facts of history should we accept, only those that support Nasibi's and defame Shi'a? Abu Sulaiman is stating that anything that agrees with the Shi'a must be false on account of Shi'a influence. By the same logic anything that supports Nasibi must also be false as it is based on Nasibi influence.

Evidence of the tradition of cursing Ali and Mu'awiya being at its heart can be found in a vast array of books of leading scholars of Ahl'ul Sunnah. The books of Tarikh, Sirah and hadith are replete with the fact that Mu'awiya introduced the bidah of cursing Imam of Guidance, Ammerul Momineen Ali (as), in his Kingdom. If we are to accept Abu Sulaiman's absurd claim then he is in effect suggesting that all the classical Sunni historians were duped and into narrating this fable.

It would be one thing if this alleged fabrication could only be located in scarcely known extant

works, but the fact is that leading scholars of Ahl'ul Sunnah have narrated that Imam 'Ali (as) was indeed reviled during the reign of Banu Umayya upon the specific orders of Mu'awiya bin Hind. Abu Sulaiman's attempts to hide this fact is in vain to suggest that most of the historians (who narrated this) are Shia rather than Sunni who would never find fault with Mu'awiya, laughable notion.

Especially for him and those wishing to examine the matter further we shall insha'allah present a list of references where you can locate this episode. We then leave it to readers to decide whether there is indeed any basis for Abu Sulaiman's claims that this event never happened, did all these historians get it wrong?

Mu'awiya asks Sa'd to curse Hadhrath 'Ali (as)

We read in Sahih Muslim, Chapter of Virtues of Companions, Section of Virtues of Ali - see Chapter p1284, Tradition #5916

Muawiyah, the son of Abu Sufyan, gave order to Sa'd, and told him: "What prevents you that you are refraining from cursing Abu Turab (nickname of Ali)?" Sa'd replied: "Don't you remember that the Prophet said three things about (the virtue of) Ali? So I will never curse Ali." The Nasibi adherents of Mu'awiya have sought to redefine it to protect their Imam. Abu Sulaiman is the perfect example who cites the pathetic defence of Nawawi, namely that:

Ansar.org states: "This hadeeth does not mean that Mu'awiyah ordered Sa'ad to insult Ali. But, as it is obvious, Mu'awiyah wanted to know the reason that prevented Sa'ad from insulting Ali... Al-Nawawi says: "Mu'awiyah's saying does not declare that he ordered Sa'ad to insult Ali, but asked him for the reason that prevented him from insulting.

As if Mu'awiyah was saying to him: "Have you refrained from insulting Ali as a result of piety, fear or anything like that? If it was as a result of piety and veneration to refrain from insulting, then you are rightful and if it were other than that, then there would be another answer." Or it might be that Sa'ad was in a group of people who insults Ali and he did not insult Ali with them, and could not prevent them and controverted them so Mu'awiyah asked him this question.

They said: "And it may have another explanation, that what prevented you from making Ali wrong in his thought and opinion, and to show to people our good opinion and thought and that Ali was

wrong?" [Ibid. p250-252]

Clearly this is a case of defending the un-defendable. Why would Mu'awiya want to know why Sad did not insult Ali? Was this a normal practice for the Muslims of the time? If so who CURSED Ali (as)?

The above tradition clearly indicates that Mu'awiya was surprised why he was refraining from cursing. Mu'awiya asks this question with surprise "What prevents you" - you only ask a matter in this way if you are surprised if for example an individual is acting in a manner that is contrary to a norm / precedent.

I will give you an example; in the West it is enshrined in law and customary to wear a seat belt when you go out driving. If I act contrary to the act it in front of my acquaintances a common reaction would be or them to ask "What prevents you from wearing a seat belt?". Why? Because I am violating an accepted practice and they are enquiring WHY.

Likewise, it is clear common sense that Mu'awiya wanted to know why Sad was NOT cursing Ali (as). This shows that cursing Ali was a common practice and Mu'awiya wanted to know why he was acting contrary to it? If this is not logical then the clearest proof comes from the next narration from other sources of Ahl'ul Sunnah that shed light on Mu'awiya's intention.

Mohibuddin al Tabari in his classical book of hadith Riyad ul Nadira states that "Mu'awiya ordered Sa'd bin Abi Waqqas to curse 'Abu Turab" (Volume 3 page 194).

Ibn Hajar Asqalani in his commentary of Sahih al Bukhari "Fathul Bari" states:

"Mu'awiya issued an order to curse Hadhrath 'Ali. Upon hearing this Sa'd bin Abi Waqqas said "Even if you place a sword over my head and demand that I curse 'Ali, I will refuse to do so".

Fathul Bari, Vol. 7, Page 74, "Bab Manaqib 'Ali"

Today's modern day Nasibi whos concept of authenticity is limited to the writings of Ibn Taymeeya, Ibn Katheer, Bin Baaz should know that this is one of your greatest hadith scholars, so his narration cannot simply be rejected. We read in the Biographical Notes in 'Reliance of the Traveller', Noah (Nuh) Ha Mim Keller, USA:

Sunna Books, 1991 CE, x159 (pg. 1054):

"Ibn Hajar Asqalani (w29.2(1)) is Ahmad ibn Ali ibn Muhammad al-Kinani, Abu al-Fadl Shihab al-Din Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani, born in Cairo in 773/ 1372. A Shafii Imam and hadith master (hafiz), he

reached the level of Commander of the Faithful in Hadith, the only rank above that of hadith master (hafiz).

Known as Sheikh al-Islam, scholars travelled to take knowledge from him, and he was appointed to the judiciary in Egypt several times. He authored a number of works on hadith, history, biography, Koranic exegesis, poetry, and Shafii jurisprudence, among the most famous of them his fourteen-volume Fath al-Bari bi sharh Sahih al-Bukhari [The victory of the Creator:

a commentary on the "Sahih" of Bukhari] which few serious students of Islamic knowledge can do without. He died in Cairo in 852/1449 (al-Alam (y136), 1.178; Sheikh Shuayb Arna'ut; Sheikh Hasan Saqqaf; and A).

In Sunan Ibn Majah page 12 Dhikr 'Ali we read:

"On his way to Hajj, Sad met Mu'awiya and his companions mentioned 'Ali upon which Mu'awiya showed disrespect towards Ali, Sad got angry and asked 'why do you say such things?'"

In the Arabic text the words used by Mu'awiya are "fanala minho" and the editor Muhammad Faula Abdul Bakee states in the footnotes that these words mean that Mu'awiya cursed and disparaged 'Ali. If the word fanala does not mean curse / disparage then what was the reason for Sa'd getting angry? Ibn Kathir records that:

"Sa'd bin Abi Waqqas said to Mu'awiya you have sat me next to you on your throne and begun to curse Hadhrath 'Ali"

Al Bidayah al Nihayah" page 341 Volume 7 the Chapter "The virtues of 'Ali" This reference is enough to shut the mouths of the Salafi who love and admire the writings of Ibn Kathir, who they deem the definitive word when it comes to ascertaining historical facts - the Ibn Kathir that you worship cited the fact that Mu'awiya not just cursed but used vile language about Imam 'Ali (as). Check out the link and weep!

Ibn Kathir also records:

"Mu'awiyah ibn Sufiyan ordered Sa'd [ibn Abi Waqas], saying to him: 'What prevents you from insulting (tasabb) Abu Turab?'"

Al Bidayah wal Nihayah, Vol. 7, Page 352, Chapter "The virtues of 'Ali" If the Nawawi party are to say that it doesn't mean anything bad, we should point out that the word sabb according to the Hans Wehr's dictionary that is the standard English-Arabic dictionary says: "Sabb. To insult, abuse, call names, revile, rail at; to curse; to blaspheme, curse, swear." The only other meaning that the

word has is to cause something, as in the word 'sabab' which means cause.

Obviously the hadeeth has no meaning with this second meaning, so anybody who has even a basic knowledge of Arabic would know that the tradition means to curse or swear at somebody. The important thing to note is that Mu'awiyah gave a command to Sa'd. "He commanded him saying: What prevents you from insulting Abu Turab?" So it is not possible to say that he was merely asking a general question, but in fact the question was merely a way of giving an order, such as if you said to somebody "Why don't you give me that book?" intending to tell that person to give you a book.

The Syrian scholar Abu Zahra in his Tarikh ul Islam Volume 1 page 38 records:

When Mu'awiyah was proceeding to Hajj he saw Sad, grabbed him by the hand and sat him next to his pulpit. Thereafter he proceeded to curse Ali, Sad got angry stating you have sat me next to you and began to indulge in the awful act!

It is proven from Sahih Muslim that Mu'awiyah would curse Hadhrath 'Ali. Nawawi in his Sharh Muslim displays dishonesty in his defence of Mu'awiyah. An Ahl'ul Sunnah scholar took notice of this, basing his comments on Sahih Muslim, we plead justice accordingly.

In Tashdheed al Mathan Volume 2 page 405, we read that scholar of Ahl'ul Sunnah Wajideen Umar bin Abdul Muhsin in his famous work "Hilyatul Azhar Sharra Mushraak ul Anwar wrote "When the people of knowledge saw that Mu'awiyah's language contravened the dictates of norms, they sought to justify his actions and this is wrong, for it is clear that Mu'awiyah wanted Sad to curse Ali, and Sad objected. Mu'awiyah asked what prevented him from cursing Abu Turab, to which Sad replied citing three traditions as his reasons"

Sibt Ibn Jauzi al Hanafi in His Tadhkiratul Khawass page 113 narrates:

"Mu'awiyah ordered the people and Sa'd bin Abi Waqqas to curse 'Ali, this angered Sa'd and fearing Allah (swt) he refused to do so, not caring what anyone else thought".

Mu'awiyah would curse Ali after the Friday Sermon and this bida became a tradition during the Banu Umayya reign Ibn Abi al Hadeed in his commentary of Nahjul Balagha Volume 1 page 464 states:

"At the end of the Friday sermon Mu'awiyah would say 'O Allah, curse Abu Turab, he opposed your Deen and path, curse him and punish him in the fire.' He introduced this bidah during his reign, his Governors acted upon it, this bidah continued until the reign of Umar bin Abdul Aziz" In Mu'jam al Buldan, Volume 1 page 191 Allamah Yaqoot Hamawi states:

"Upon the orders of Mu'awiya, 'Ali was cursed during the reign of Banu Umayya from Mashrik (east) to Mughrib (west) from the Mosque Pulpits". In Iqd al Fareed Volume 1 page 246 we read:

"Following the deaths of 'Ali and Hasan, Mu'awiya issued an order to all Mosques including Masjidun Nabi that the people curse 'Ali".

In al-Nasa'ih al-Kaafiyah page 77 we read that "This practice (of cursing) reached such state that the people considered that without cursing Ali their Friday worship was incorrect" The comments on this shameful practice of Pakistani Hanafi scholar Maulana Raghbir Rahmani in "Hadhrath Umar bin Abdul Aziz" page 246, are indeed very poignant:

"It is indeed unfortunate that this bidah was introduced that cut the nose of the cities, this bidah even reached the pulpits and even shamelessly reached the ears of those present in the Mosque of Rasulullah (s). This bidah was introduced by Amir Mu'awiya".

Khalifatul Zahid, Page 246

Mu'awiya refused to follow the peoples' demands that he abolishes the practice of cursing Hadhrath 'Ali (as)

In al-Nasa'ih al-Kaafiyah page 70 we read that:

Some people from Banu Umayya approached Mu'awiya and said 'You've attained power so why don't you stop the practice of cursing 'Ali, he replied "By Allah I wont, not until every child grows up, not until every grown up becomes elderly, not until no one is left to praise him".

In Tarikh Madhahib al Islam Muhammad Abu Zahra records in Volume 1 page 35:

"And during the reign of Banu Umayya the dignity of 'Ali was attacked, he was cursed because Mu'awiya during his reign introduced the ugly bidah of cursing 'Ali. His successors continued this tradition until the reign of Umar bin Abdul Aziz.

The tradition entailed cursing the Imam of Guidance 'Ali at the end of the Friday Sermons, the Sahaba's remonstrations that this was wrong was ignored, Mu'awiya and his Governors refused to desist from their actions. Ummul'Momineen Salma (ra) wrote a letter to Mu'awiya and his respective Governors reminding them that by cursing 'Ali they were in fact cursing Allah (swt) and his Prophet (s)".

Tarikh Madhahib al Islam Muhammad Abu Zahra page 35

This book has also been rendered in to Urdu by Professor Ghulam Hamid Hurrayree and we attach the Urdu translation of the above text:

Islami Madhahib page 66

If today's Nasibi try and distance themselves from this reference by deeming Abu Zahra's book as unreliable, they should know that their beloved Website Ansar.org deemed the same book as reliable enough to 'prove' that the Shi'a betrayed Zayd Ibn'Ali due to his refusal to criticise the Shaykhayn, (please see footnote 6 in their article - 'Who killed Imam Hussain'). If this source can be advanced as 'proof' by Ansar.org against the Shi'a then by the same token this book can also be used by the Shi'a as 'proof' against Mu'awiya.

Mu'awiya's Governors would curse Hadhrath 'Ali (as)

Egyptian Sunni scholar Ahmad Zakhee Safwaath in his book Umar bin Abdul Aziz (Urdu translation by Abdul Samhad al Azharee) pages 54-55 states: "Hadhrath Umar abolished the practice of cursing 'Ali on the pulpits, that started during the reign of Amir Mu'awiya.

Historians have recorded that in 41 Hijri, Mu'awiya wrote to his Governors stating 'I have no responsibility for anyone who praises 'Ali and his family. As a result [reciters] from every pulpit in every village would curse 'Ali, they would distance themselves from 'Ali, and would disrespect him and his family.

Mu'awiya issued an edict throughout the provinces that no one should accept the testimony of any Shi'a or members of that person's family. In a separate order he stated that if it is established that an individual loves 'Ali and the Ahl'ul bayt, his name should be removed from the register and his stipends should be withheld. In another order Mu'awiya said that any person who has friends that are Shi'a should be punished and his house should be demolished.

Mu'awiya went on Hajj, upon his arrival in Madina he intended on disrespecting 'Ali. People told him not to since Sa'd bin Abi Waqqas would oppose such an action. Mu'awiya sent a man to Sa'd so as to ascertain his viewpoint, Sa'd replied, 'If you perform such an act I shall never set foot in the Mosque again'.

Mu'awiya chose to desist from this action until the death of Sa'd in 55 Hijri - it was then that he proceeded to climb on to the pulpit of 'Ali and from there spoke out against him, he then wrote to his Governors to discredit 'Ali. Umm Salmah wrote to Mu'awiya stating 'You are in fact cursing Allah (swt) and his Prophet (s), verily I testify that Rasulullah (s) loved him ['Ali]. Mu'awiya ignored

her words".

Umar bin Abdul Aziz, Page 54 & 55 In Tarikh Kamil Volume 3 page 25 we read that:

"Mu'awiya appointed Mughira as a Governor stating to him 'I have based your appointment on common sense, give me bayya on the condition that you continue with the practice, (namely) that you cease to disgrace and curse 'Ali and praise Uthman. Mughira was the Governor of Kufa for some time, during it he cursed and disgraced 'Ali".

In Tarikh Abul Fida Volume 1 page 120 we are told that:

"Mu'awiya and his Governors during the Friday Sermons would say things in praise of Uthman and would curse 'Ali".

Dr Umar Farokh in his Seerat-i-Khilafat, under the Chapter "Dhikr Umar bin Abdul Aziz" narrates as follows:

"One ugly shameful bidah practised during the Banu Umayya reign, one that reached all the Mosque pulpits including the Mosque of Rasulullah (s) and every ear was introduced by Mu'awiya and spread by his order to his (provincial governors). The order was that they curse Hadhrath 'Ali during the Friday Sermons as an act of obedience to him".

Mu'awiya agreed with Imam Hasan (as) that he would not curse Ali (as), but then reneged on the promise In Tarikh Kamil Volume 1 page 203 Chapter "Dhikr Sulh Hasan" we read that during the negotiations with Mu'awiya:

"Hasan placed a condition that Mu'awiya stop the practice of cursing 'Ali, a condition that he rejected. Hasan then asked that he refrain from cursing 'Ali in his presence. Mu'awiya agreed but did not fulfil this condition either".

Tarikh Ibn Wardi Volume 1 page 251 likewise states that despite the agreement Mu'awiya continued to curse Imam 'Ali. Tarikh Ibn Wardi Vol. 1 page 251

Mu'awiya signing the Peace Treaty and the conditions is the clearest proof that he cursed Imam 'Ali (as). If he did not then why did he agree to abide by this condition? His reneging on the condition is yet further proof that he was a munafiq, for we read in Sahih Bukhari hadith 4:403 that Allah's Apostle said, that one sign of a pure hypocrite is "if he gives a promise, he breaks it". Mu'awiya's promise and his subsequent breach are clear indictments with regards to his character.

The admission by al Muhaddith Shah Abdul Aziz Dehlavi that Mu'awiya cursed Hadhrath 'Ali (as)

Al Muhaddith Shah Abdul Aziz was a leading Sunni scholars and a lead name in his fight against the spread of Shi'aism in the Indian Subcontinent. Despite his opposition to the Shi'a he also made the acknowledgement in his Fatawa Azizi on page 214:

"The act of cursing 'Ali was introduced by Mu'awiya, this is not worse than fighting, for we learn from hadith that cursing a Muslim is Fisq, fighting him is kufr. It is established that Mu'awiya fought 'Ali and in doing so he committed a great sin, to explain this away in terms of ijtihad is wrong".

The admission by leading Deobandi Ulema that Mu'awiya introduced the bidah of cursing Ali (as)

Deobandi's are rigid Hanafis from the Indian Subcontinent and are strong opponents of the Shi'a hence there is NO opportunity for Abu Sulaiman to claim that they were influenced by Shi'a leanings.

Maulana Sayyid Abu'l Ala Maudoodi records this fact in his "Khilafath wa Mulukiyaat". On page 174 he writes:

"Ibn Kathir in al Bidayah records that one unlawful and outrageous practice started by Mu'awiya was that he and his governors would curse Hadhrath 'Ali during the Friday sermon from the Imam's position. This took such an extreme that this practised even took place in the Mosque of the Prophet, in front of the grave of the Prophet (saws), the cursing of the most beloved relative would take place, in the presence of Hadhrath 'Ali's family who would hear this abuse with their own ears." (also: Tabari Volume 4 page 188, Ibn Athir Volume 3 page 234, al Bidayah Volume 8 page 259 and Volume 9 page 80)

Khilafath wa Mulukiyaat page 174

Before supporters of Mu'awiya seek to attack Maudoodi it should be pointed out that he was NOT expressing an opinion, he was citing the facts recorded in the annals of Sunni history books, including al Bidayah by Ibn Kathir. The sources are cited; Maudoodi has not just fabricated them out of the blue.

The supporters of Mu'awiya were naturally perturbed by Maudoodi's critical stance of Mu'awiya. This led to rebuttal and counter rebuttals by Deobandi Ulema. Pakistani scholar Abu Khalid Muhammad Aslam in "Khilafat wa Mulukiyyat wa Ulema-i-Ahle Sunnat" wrote in defence of Maulana Maudoodi. He wrote:

"Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi in Hakayat Awliyaa page 124 wrote that Shah Ismail Shaheed had a debate in Lucknow with a Shi'a by the name of Subhan Khan. Shah Ismail asked him "Did they curse Mu'awiya in the court of Ali? Khan replied, "Ali's Court was pure of such things. Shah Ismail then asked did Mu'awiya curse Ali in his Court? To which Khan replied "Yes he did". Maulana Ismail then said "The Ahl'ul Sunnah are alhamdulillah followers of Ali and have left Mu'awiya'

From this it is proven that Shah Ismail and Thanvi both agreed that in Mu'awiya's Court people would curse Ali. Now if someone continues to deny this then we are left with no other choice but to adopt silence in the presence of illiterates, one should take note of the individual who was being cursed.

Zaynul Abideen Sajjad Meerathee in Tareekh ay Milath al Islam writes: "The greatest achievement of Umar bin Abdul Aziz was, one that shall be written in Gold is the fact he put an end to the Banu Umayya tradition of cursing Ali [r] from the pulpits. When he became khalifa he ordered this to be banned".

Maulana Shah Moinuddin Nadvi in Tareekh-i-Islam, Volume 1 pages 13-14, writes "During his reign Mu'awiya introduced the tradition of cursing Ali [r], his subjects followed suit. Mugheera bin Shu'ba was a great man but in his obedience to Mu'awiya also followed this bidah" In previous pages we have cited the comments of great Ulema, all who have confirmed the fact that Ali was cursed.

Were they not Ulema of Ahl'ul Sunnah? If they were then what right do their opponents have to call themselves Ahl'ul Sunnah? It would better that they leave Ahl'ul Sunnah and embrace Yazeed and Nasibi aqeedah, entertaining others with their new thought". [Khilafath wa Mulukiyyat wa Ulema-i-Ahle Sunnath, by Abu Khalid Muhammad Aslam - pages 120-122]

Khilafath wa Mulukiyyat wa Ulema-i-Ahle Sunnath page 120-122

Mu'awiya's bidah of cursing Imam Ali during the Friday Sermon was a practice that continued during the Banu Umayya reign until the reign of Umar bin Abdul Aziz In Nifa Thafthee wa Islaal by Maulana Abdul Hai we are informed on page 42 that:

"During the Banu Umayya reign Hadhrath 'Ali was cursed in the Friday Sermons".

In Tafseer Mazhari Volume 5 page 21, Hanafi Scholar Qadhi Thanauallah Uthmanee makes the admission that:

"There was a time when the Banu Umayya would curse the family of the Prophet".

In Tarikh Madhaib al Islameeeya Volume 1 page 38 we learn that:

Abu Muhammad Abu Zahra writes:

During Banu Umayya reign Ali was openly cursed, this tradition was started by Mu'awiya and continued until the reign of Umar bin Abdul Aziz" In Tarikh Khamis Volume 2 page 316 we learn:

"When Umar bin Abdul Aziz came to power he put an end to the bidah introduced by Mu'awiya, namely of swearing at 'Ali and cursing the family of the Prophet at the end of the Juma Khutba".

Similarly we read in Tarikh Abul Fida Volume 1 page 301 "Dhikr Mu'awiya":

"During the reign of Banu Umayya Banu Umayya would curse 'Ali in the Friday Sermon, when Umar bin Abdul Aziz became khalifa he brought an end to this horrible bidah that had been introduced by Mu'awiya".

Maula 'Ali (as) was cursed for ninety years

Allamah Shibli Numani writes:

"Traditions were first formed in book form in the days of Ummayyads, who, for about 90 years, throughout their vast dominions stretching from the Indus in India to Asia Minor and Spain, insulted the descendants of Fatima and got Ali openly censured in Friday sermons at the mosques. They had hundreds of sayings coined to eulogise Amir Muawiya." (taken from Siratun Nabi, Volume 1 page 60).

Siratun Nabi Vol.1 page 60 Summary of references

So to summarise from the references presented (many more could have been cited we felt this will suffice for the sake of brevity), we learn:

Mu'awiya used to curse Hadhrath 'Ali (as)

He introduced the bidah of cursing 'Ali (as) in the mosques following the Friday Sermons during

Presented by <http://www.alhassanain.com> & <http://www.islamicblessings.com>

his reign.

In line with the order his Governors would carry out the bidah of cursing 'Ali in the Mosques This outrageous bidah went on for 90 years During that same time (of cursing) hadith were first collected Umar bin Abdul Aziz abolished this ugly bidah.

Conclusions

In light of these established let us now see the true position of Mu'awiya in light of hadith and Fatwas of Ahl'ul Sunnah:

Rasulullah (s) cursed those who commit bidah

Abdul Qadir Jilani in "al Ghuniya" Volume 1 page 60 narrates that Rasulullah (s) said:

"Whoever introduces a bidah or protects it is cursed by Allah (swt) his Angels and the vast bulk of mankind".

Allamah Abdul Qadir Gilani's Fatwa against Ahl'ul bidah Abdul Qadir Jilani in "al Ghuniya" Volume 1 page 18, Chapter "Dhikr Mu'awiya" states: No one should go near Ahl'ul Bidah, don't go near them, don't share in their happiness on Eid, don't participate in their Salat or Funerals, don't read mercies upon them".

Allamah Saduddeen Taftazanees fatwa that Ahl'ul bidah should be cursed Allamah Saduddeen Taftazanees in Sharh al Maqasid page 270 comments:

"One should hate Ahl'ul bidah, talk ill of them, curse them, do not pray Salat behind them to do so is Makruh". These fatwas make it clear those that indulge in bidah are cursed and it is a duty to separate ourselves from such people. This being the case one needs no reminding that Mu'awiya was responsible for the introduction of the bidah of cursing Ameerul Momineen 'Ali throughout his empire a bidah that went on for 90 years.

Cursing Ali (as) is tantamount to cursing Allah (swt)

"Whoever curses (or verbally abuses) Ali, he has, in fact, cursed me, and whoever has cursed me, he has cursed Allah, and whoever has cursed Allah, then Allah will throw him into Hell-fire."

Musnad Ahmad Ibn Hanbal, v6, p33

Hanafi Fatwa declaring it kufr to curse Hadhrath 'Ali (as)

In Sharh Mishkat Volume 11 page 345, esteemed Hanafi scholar Mulla Ali Qari states:

'Imam Ahmad narrates from the Prophet(s) "Whoever curses Ali, he has, in fact, cursed me, and whoever curses me, has cursed Allah.", this hadith means that cursing Hadhrath 'Ali is kufr'. Fatwa of al Muhaddith Shah Abdul Aziz - those that curse 'Ali are kaafir In Tuhfa Ithna Ashariyya Shah Abdul Aziz states on page 394:

"If the people of Syria i.e. Mu'awiya and his supporters bore enmity towards 'Ali(r), considered him a kaafir and cursed him, then I consider such people to be kaafir".

As is habit of the Ulema of his like, Shah Sahib has sought to cast doubts as to whether Mu'awiya did indeed curse Maula 'Ali (as). Fortunately as is common amongst such scholars his contradiction is exposed by the fact that he himself admitted in Fatwa Azeezi that Mu'awiya would curse Maula Ali (as).

Similarly the Grand Imam of the Nasibis Ibn Taymeeya whilst tactically avoiding to implicate Mu'awiya make this admission in his Fatawa Volume 2 page 408:

"The followers of Mu'awiya would curse Hadhrath 'Ali".

If those that curse Maula Ali are kaafir then from the Shah's own pen Mu'awiya IS a kaafir as are those that entertained this action. Fatwa of al Muhaddith Shah Abdul Aziz - whoever disrespects Ahl'ul bayt (as) is a murtad In Tuhfa Ithna Ashariyya Shah Abdul Aziz states on page 263:

"What view should we hold of those people who express happiness on Ashura when Imam Hussain was killed, who marry on that day who disrespect the family of the Prophet and the descendents of Sayyida Fatima? It is correct to refer to such individuals as Murtad".

If one who shows disrespect towards Ahl'ul bayt (as) is a Murtad then clearly one of the rank and file of Mu'awiya who demonstrated his disrespect of 'Ali (as) by introducing the cursing of him in the Mosques comes at the fore-front of such murtads. Moreover one should also highlight Mu'awiya's pleasure upon receiving the news that Imam Hasan (as) was dead.

An appeal to justice

Is it not curious that those that curse the Sahaba are kaafir (as a general rule) whilst those that curse Imam 'Ali (as) are not kaafir but the Imam of Nasibis, whom Allah (swt) is pleased with? Now

think about the personality being cursed, a Khalifa Rashid, the cousin and son in law of the Prophet (s) - Ali ibne abi Talib (as).

The phantom merits of Mu'awiya

The aim of the writer (Abu Sulaiman) behind this passionate defense was to:

Ansar.org states:"defend the writer of the revelation whom the Prophet peace be upon him said about: "O' Allah, make him guided, a guider, and guide people through him." [Sunan Al-Turmidhi, Book of "Virtues," Chapter of "Virtues of Mu'awiyah," #3842, see also Saheeh Al-Turmidhi #3018] Was Mu'awiya the writer of the revelation?

Ansar.org states:"It is a firm thing that Mu'awiyah was among the writers of the revelation. Muslim narrated in his Saheeh from Ibn Abbas that Abu Sufyan asked the prophet peace be upon him for three things: (He (Abu Sufyan) said to the prophet: "O' Prophet of Allah, give me three things." The prophet said: "yes." ... Abu Sufyan said: "Mu'awiyah, make him a writer (of the revelation) under your hands."

The prophet answered: "Alright.") [Muslim with explanation. Book of "Virtues of the Companions," Chapter of "Virtues of Abu Sufyan," vol.17, p.2501] Ahmad narrated in his Musnad, and Muslim from Ibn Abbas who says: (Once I was a kid playing with other boys when I looked behind and I saw the prophet peace be upon him coming towards us.

So I said: "The prophet did not come to anyone but to me." So I went behind the door to hide. I did not feel until the prophet found me, grasped my neck, and pressed my shoulders gently. The prophet said: "Go and call Mu'awiyah for me." And Mu'awiyah was his writer (of the revelation). So I went looking for Mu'awiyah and told him: "Go and answer the prophet of Allah peace be upon him because he needs you.") [Musnad Ahmed, vol.1, Musnad Ibn Abbas #2651, and Muslim with explanation, Book of "Al-Birr wa Al-Silah," #2604] These two hadeeths prove that Mu'awiyah was one of the writers of the revelation"

Prominent Ulema of Ahl'ul Sunnah have not counted Mu'awiya as writer of the revelation One wonders to what extent Mu'awiya was the writer of the revelation, after all he embraced Islam following the conquest of Mecca, so the vast bulk of the revelation had already been revealed. In fact many classical Sunni scholars whilst listing those individuals honored as writer of the revelation did not count Mu'awiya. For evidence see the following texts:

Fathul Bari page 450 Volume 2

Irshad Saneed Volume 9 page 22

Umdhathul Qari Volume 9 page 307

Nasa al Kafiya page 170

Mu'awiya wrote letters not the revelation In Iqd al Fareed Volume 2 page 197 we read that:

"Hadrath 'Ali was a good writer, in addition to his being a relative of Rasulullah (s) he was also a writer of the revelation, thereafter he also became Khalifa. Khalid bin Saeed, Mu'awiya bin 'Abu Sufyan were entrusted with the duty of writing documents other than Wahy". Similarly in al Isaba Volume 3 page 413 we learn that:

"According to Madani the Writer of the Revelation was Zaid bin Thabit and letters to provinces were written by Mu'awiya".

On this topic the comments of the renowned Egyptian Sunni scholar Sayyid Qutb are worthy of note:

"The erroneous fable still persists that Mu'awiya was a scribe who wrote down the revelations of Allah's Messenger. The truth is that when Abu Sufyan embraced Islam, he besought the Prophet to give Mu'awiya some measure of position in the eyes of the Arabs; thus he would be compensated of being slow to embrace Islam and of being one of those who had no precedence in the new religion. So the Prophet used Mu'awiya for writing letters and contracts and agreements.

But none of the companions ever said that he wrote down any of the Prophet's revelations, as was asserted by Mu'awiyas partisans after he had assumed the throne. But this is what happens in all such cases". (Social Justice in Islam by Sayyid Qutb, English translation by John B. Hardie, page 215).

A writer of the revelation became a kaafir In Fathul Bari Volume 9 page 22 we read:

"The first man from the Quraysh who was the writer of the revelation was Abdullah bin Sad. After this he apostatised and became a kaafir and then became a Muslim again".

As we see from this reference attaining the station of Writer of the Revelation means absolutely nothing, it does not in any way protect you from deviance since Sad who was incidentally Mu'awiya own Umayya relative became a kaafir after attaining this post. Even if we accept that Mu'awiya attained this honour then his later transgressions are even more damning.

The writing down of the revelation does not in any way 'protect' Mu'awiya from the wrath of Allah (swt). It is the end result that counts; Allah (swt) was so impressed by the subservience of Iblis the Jinn that he elevated him to the Heavens. Despite this he was expelled and cursed by Allah (swt) following his refusal to submit himself to the will of Allah (swt). Hence Mu'awiya's behaviour despite having benefited from sitting with Rasulullah (s) will no doubt be viewed as a greater transgression in the eyes of Allah (swt).

Was Mu'awiya a Hadi? A number of interesting facts need to be considered before analyzing the authenticity of this hadith. It is quite logical that Rasulullah (s) would not just say something like this out of the blue. Mu'awiya must have demonstrated some quality in his presence that led to Rasulullah (s) making this dua. It is common an individual is only praised when he has committed a praiseworthy action and proven his worth e.g. on the battlefield, in exams etc. The clearest proof comes from a tradition that Abu Sulaiman cites:

Ansar.org states: A'amir bin Sa'ad bin Abi Waqqas who narrated from his father who says: (Mu'awiyah bin Abi Sufyan ordered Sa'd and asked him: "What prevented you from insulting Abu Turab (Ali bin Abi Talib)?" Sa'ad answered: "The prophet peace be upon him said three things to him (Ali bin Abi Talib), so I would not insult him because to have one of these three things is more beloved to me than Humr Al-Nni'am (a kind of best camels). I heard the prophet peace be upon him saying to appoint Ali as a leader when the prophet used to go to Jihad (Holy War). Ali then would say to him:

"O' Messenger of Allah, you left me with the women and children?"

The prophet peace be upon him answered him: "Would not you be pleased if you were for me as Haroon was for Mousa? Except there is no prophecy after me." And I heard the prophet saying at the day of Khaybar: "I would give this banner to a man who loves Allah and His Messenger and who Allah and His Messenger love him too." He said: "Then we were looking for this honor." Then the Prophet said: "Call Ali."

Ali was brought and he had sore eyes. So the prophet peace be upon him spitted in his eyes and gave him the banner. Then Allah granted victory to the Muslims by the hands of Ali. And when this verse revealed: "Come, let us gather together, our sons and your sons," the messenger of Allah called Ali, Fatima, Hasan, and Hussain and said: "O' Allah, they are my family." [Saheeh Muslim with Explanation, Book of "The Companions," Chapter of "Virtues of Ali," #2404]

All three traditions praising Ali (as) have a context as to 'why' Rasulullah said these words praising 'Ali, thus explaining the reason BEHIND these words. Now could Abu Sulaiman cite us the reason why Rasulullah (s) prayed for Mu'awiya as Hadi? Moreover with such a desire that Mu'awiya become a Hadi, surely Rasulullah (s) would have sought to train Mu'awiya in this role. Could Abu

Sulaiman cite us any events when he sent Mu'awiya on dawah campaigns to guide the people or to converts to Judge over them (as he did when he sent Ali (as) to Yemen).

One should also ask Abu Sulaiman, is it not curious that Mu'awiya never once recollected this hadith? Would this not have been clear evidence to convince his doubters?

It is also quite fascinating that Rasulullah referred to Mu'awiya as a Hadi who would guide the people whilst he never referred to the three caliphs as Hadi who would provide Hidayah (guidance). No such tradition appears about these three in the Sihah Sittah. Is Abu Sulaiman therefore suggesting that Mu'awiya was more learned on matters pertaining to the Deen than them?

With such a strong hadith do we have any evidence that the three khulafa ever appointed Mu'awiya as a Judge over the Muslim Ummah after all the role of a Judge far outweighs the role of a governor - since only a Hadi can attain the station of Qadi. So did the three khulafa recognize Mu'awiya's greatness and appoint him as a Judge?

A Hadi is one who guides his followers in accordance with the Qur'an and Sunnah Hadi is one that guides the Ummah in accordance with the Qur'an and Sunnah, so exactly what Hidayah did Mu'awiya provide for his followers? Can we interpret this hadith to mean that he was the Hadi that would lead the Ummah to fight Imam Ali (as) and curse him in the mosques?

If Mu'awiya was indeed a Hadi for the Ummah and people would be guided by him then that in effect means that anyone that opposes him is opposing guidance and has deviated from the right path. In other words the alleged hadith would suggest that Mu'awiya and his supporters were right at Sifeen and Ali (as) and his Shi'a were deviants as they were fighting the Hadi - does Abu Sulaiman uphold this view?

If we look in to the works of Ahl'ul Sunnah we learn that this alleged Hadi made decisions in violation to the Sharia.

Mu'awiya 'the Hadi' made decisions that contradicted the Shar'ia on inheritance

Ibn Kathir narrates in Al Bidayah Volume 8 page 141 that:

"Imam Zuhri recorded that during the time of Rasulullah (s) and the four khulafa the Sunnah was that neither could a kaafir inherit from a Muslim, nor a Muslim inherit from a kaafir. During his reign Mu'awiya allowed Muslims to inherit from Kaffir's, whilst Kaffir's could not inherit from Muslims. This practice was terminated by Umar bin Abdul Aziz, but was then revived by Abdul Malik".

Al Bidayah Volume 8 page 141

Mu'awiya's introduction of this practice was an open violation to the teachings of Islam and we read in Sahih al Bukhari Volume 8 hadith number 756 that Rasulullah (s) said, "A Muslim cannot be the heir of a disbeliever, nor can a disbeliever be the heir of a Muslim".

Mu'awiya 'the Hadi' contradicted the Shar'ia on Blood money

Ibn Kathir also narrates that in relation to blood money, Mu'awiya changed the Sunnah, namely that a non-Muslim's blood money would be equal to that of a Muslim, but Mu'awiya halved it and kept the other half for himself (Al Bidayah Volume 8 page 139).

Mu'awiya 'the Hadi' contradicted the Shar'ia on the distribution of war booty We also read in Tabaqat ibn Sad Volume 7 pages 28-29 that:

"In the distribution of war booty Mu'awiya acted in violation to Book of God and his Sunnah. The Qur'an and Sunnah dictated that the fifth portion of war booty be placed into the treasury and the remaining four / fifths be distributed amongst the troops that participated in the battle, but Mu'awiya issued an order that from the war booty gold and silver would be removed, and the remainder would be distributed".

Mu'awiya 'the Hadi' drank a prohibited substance Imam of Ahl'ul Sunnah Ibn Hanbal records in his Musnad Volume 5 page 347:

"Mu'awiya consumed a liquid that had been declared haraam by the Prophet (s)".

Mu'awiya 'the Hadi' took interest

We read in Muwatta Book 31, Number 31.16.33 under the chapter "Selling Gold for Silver, Minted and Unminted":

Yahya related to me from Malik from Zayd ibn Aslam from Ata ibn Yasar that Mu'awiya ibn Abi Sufyan sold a gold or silver drinking-vessel for more than its weight. Abu'dDarda said, "I heard the Messenger of Allah, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, forbidding such sales except like for like." Mu'awiya said to him, "I don't see any harm in it." Abu'd-Darda said to him, "Who will excuse

me from Muawiya?

I tell him something from the Messenger of Allah, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, and he gives me his own opinion! I will not live in the same land as you!" Then Abu'd-Darda went to Umar ibn al-Khattab and mentioned that to him. Umar ibn al-Khattab therefore wrote to Muawiya, "Do not sell it except like for like, weight for weight."

Muwatta Book 31, Number 31.16.33

Just contemplate the significance of this narration. Mu'awiya had entered in to a profit making transaction that was haraam. Abu'd-Darda corrected him and told him of the verdict of Rasulallah (s) on the matter only permitting such transactions on a 'like for like' basis. Rather than concede that he was wrong, Abu Sulaiman's Hadi replies "I don't see any harm in it" - thus justifying his opinion over that of Rasulallah (s). We congratulate Abu Sulaiman for grasping a Hadi who has no shame in holding an opinion different to that of Rasulallah (s)!

One would think that the natural response would be for Mu'awiya to desist from such actions in the future, Mu'awiya had been told clearly by Abu'd Darda and Umar that an individual can only sell a like for like item i.e. Gold for Gold. The position under the Sharia had been made clear and yet as Khalifa, Abu Sulaiman's Hadi Imam continued to ignore the order of Rasulallah (s) on the matter.

We read in Sahih Muslim Book 010, Number 3852: "Abil Qiliba reported: I was in Syria (having) a circle (of friends). in which was Muslim b. Yasir. There came Abu'l-Ash'ath. He (the narrator) said that they (the friends) called him: Abu'l-Ash'ath, Abu'l-Ash'ath, and he sat down. I said to him: Narrate to our brother the hadith of Ubada b. Samit. He said: Yes.

We went out on an expedition, Mu'awiya being the leader of the people, and we gained a lot of spoils of war. And there was one silver utensil in what we took as spoils. Mu'awiya ordered a person to sell it for payment to the people (soldiers).

The people made haste in getting that. The news of (this state of affairs) reached 'Ubada b. Samit, and he stood up and said: I heard Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) forbidding the sale of gold by gold, and silver by silver, and wheat by wheat, and barley by barley, and dates by dates, and salt by salt, except like for like and equal for equal. So he who made an addition or who accepted an addition (committed the sin of taking) interest. So the people returned what they had got. This reached Mu'awiya. and he stood up to deliver an address.

He said: What is the matter with people that they narrate from the Messenger (may peace be upon him) such tradition which we did not hear though we saw him (the Holy Prophet) and lived

in his company?

Thereupon, Ubida b. Samit stood up and repeated that narration, and then said: We will definitely narrate what we heard from Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) though it may be unpleasant to Mu'awiya (or he said: Even if it is against his will). I do not mind if I do not remain in his troop in the dark night. Hammad said this or something like this".

Sahih Muslim Book 010, Number 3852

Yet again Mu'awiya allowed a transaction that was not based on the 'like for like principle' as stipulated by Rasulallah (s). It is interesting to see Mu'awiya's denial of this matter declaring "they narrate from the Messenger (may peace be upon him) such tradition which we did not hear though we saw him". How can Mu'awiya deny knowledge of this matter when it is proven from the previous narration in Muwatta that as Governor of Syria under Umar this issue was brought to his attention by Abu'd Darda and then confirmed in writing to him by the Khalifa himself?

We also read in Sharra Ma'ani Lill Sharra Lill Thahavee page 263 that Mu'awiya used to take interest. In this regard Imam Thahavee narrates a very interesting incident in his work Mana al Ahsaar page 262:

"Mu'awiya purchased a Pearl and Yaqoot necklace for 4,600 dirhams. When Mu'awiya got on to the Pupil Ibada Ibne Samaad stood up and said "No! Mu'awiya entered in to an agreement based on interest and also ate interest and as a result of this is in the Fire".

Mana al Ahsaar page 262

Interest is a despicable act in the eyes of Allah (swt) and In Sahih Muslim hadith number 3881 Jabir bin Abdullah narrates: "Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him) cursed the acceptor of interest and its payer, and one who records it, and the two witnesses; and he said: They are all equal".

Sahih Muslim hadith number 3881

Mu'awiya's introduction of interest in clear violation to the Sharia is worthy of note, particularly in light of the modern day book of Hanafi Fatwas "Aqaaidul Islam" - rendered into English by Moulana Zahier Ahmed Ragie. On page 158 we read the following fatwa:

"A person becomes an unbeliever if he makes lawful the unlawful acts of Islam or vice versa e.g. legalizes interest etc" Mu'awiya 'the Hadi' made changes to the Eid Salat Suyuti in Tarikh ul Khulafa page 200 notes that:

"Zuhri narrates in relation to the Salat of Eid, the first to deliver the Khutba before the Salat was Mu'awiya bin Abu Sufyan". We read in Kitab al Ilm Volume 1 page 229 that:

"Imam Zuhri narrates that Rasulallah (s), Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman lead the Eid Salat without Adhan, but Mu'awiya introduced the Adhan in the Eid prayer".

Ibn Hajar Asqalani in Fathul Bari Volume 2 page 529 expands on this matter yet further:

"There is a difference of opinion over who introduced the Adhan in Eid Salat. Ibn Sheba has a tradition with a Sahih Isnad attributing this to Mu'awiya, whilst Shaafi states Ibn Ziyad introduced this in Basra, Daud claims that Marwan introduced this - but the vast bulk of traditions do not support this. Mu'awiya introduced this in the same way that he introduced the khutba of Eid before Salat".

Once again Abu Sulaiman's Hadi Imam is shown to have changed the Sharia, this time in connection with Eid prayers, in that there is no doubt, for we read in Sahih Muslim Book 004, Hadith Number 1926 Chapter 164: The prayer of the two Ids:

Jabir b. 'Abdullah reported: I observed prayer with the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) on the 'Id day. He commenced with prayer before the sermon without Adhan and Iqama.

In addition to this clear proof we also present the fatwa of Imam Malik taken from the English translation of his Muwatta under the chapter "The Ghushl of the Two Ids, the Call to Prayer for The prayer, and the Iqama" Book 10, Number 10.1.1:

"Yahya related to me from Malik that he had heard more than one of their men of knowledge say, "There has been no call to prayer or iqama for the id al-Fitr or the id al-Adha since the time of the Messenger of Allah, may Allah bless him and grant him peace." Malik said, "That is the sunna about which there is no disagreement among us."

Mu'awiya 'the Hadi' issued a Fatwa deeming it permissible for a man to marry two sisters at any one given time Imam of Ahl'ul Sunnah, al Hafidh Jalaladeen Suyuti in Durre Manthur Volume 2 page 477 records the following fatwa of Abu Sulaiman's Hadi Imam:

"Qasim bin Muhammad records that Mu'awiya was asked whether it was permissible for a man to marry two sisters at any one given time. Mu'awiya replied 'There is nothing wrong with that'. Upon hearing this reply, Numan bin Basheer asked 'You have issued this fatwa?' to which Mu'awiya replied 'yes'.

Mu'awiya 'the Hadi' wore prohibited items despite the fact that he was aware that Rasulullah (s) deemed them haraam We read in Sunan Abu Daud Book 32, hadith Number 4119:

Narrated Al-Miqdam ibn Ma'dikarib:

"Khalid said: Al-Miqdam ibn Ma'dikarib and a man of Banu Asad from the people of Qinnisrin went to Mu'awiyah ibn AbuSufyan. Mu'awiyah said to al-Miqdam: Do you know that al-Hasan ibn Ali has died? Al-Miqdam recited the Qur'anic verse "We belong to Allah and to Him we shall return."

A man asked him: Do you think it a calamity? He replied: Why should I not consider it a calamity when it is a fact that the Apostle of Allah (peace_be_upon_him) used to take him on his lap, saying: This belongs to me and Husayn belongs to Ali?

The man of Banu Asad said: (He was) a live coal which Allah has extinguished. Al-Miqdam said: Today I shall continue to make you angry and make you hear what you dislike. He then said: Mu'awiyah, if I speak the truth, declare me true, and if I tell a lie, declare me false.

He said: Do so. He said: I adjure you by Allah, did you hear the Apostle of Allah (peace_be_upon_him) forbidding use to wear gold?

He replied: Yes. He said: I adjure you by Allah, do you know that the Apostle of Allah (peace_be_upon_him) prohibited the wearing of silk?

He replied: Yes. He said: I adjure you by Allah, do you know that the Apostle of Allah (peace_be_upon_him) prohibited the wearing of the skins of beasts of prey and riding on them?

He said: Yes. He said: I swear by Allah, I saw all this in your house, O Mu'awiyah. Mu'awiyah said: I know that I cannot be saved from you, O Miqdam.

Khalid said: Mu'awiyah then ordered to give him what he did not order to give to his two companions, and gave a stipend of two hundred (dirhams) to his son. Al-Miqdam then divided it among his companions, and the man of Banu Asad did not give anything to anyone from the property he received. When Mu'awiyah was informed about it, he said: Al-Miqdam is a generous man; he has an open hand (for generosity). The man of Banu Asad withholds his things in a good manner".

So here we learn that Mu'awiya the Hadi:

Was asked whether he was aware that Rasulullah (s) had prohibited the wearing of gold, silk and animal skin.

Mu'awiya confirmed that he knew this to be the position

The man testified that he had witnessed all three prohibited items being worn in his house What a wonderful Hadi! One that is fully aware that a matter has been prohibited by Rasulallah (s) but openly violates this order. Can we define a Hadi as an individual that knowingly violates an order of Rasulallah (s)?

An appeal to justice

We have cited just a few examples where Mu'awiya violated the rules of Shari'a. What sort of Hadi could Mu'awiya be for others when he himself was so misguided that he turned his back on the Qur'an and Sunnah and followed practices that contradicted these two sources? Can one who introduces not just one, but countless bidahs into the Deen be deemed a Hadi who has guided others?

This is completely illogical, guidance is based on following the Qur'an and Sunnah not innovating and devising your own rulings to suit your personal desires! Would Rasulallah (s) deem an innovator to be a hadi? Clearly not! We had, in the previous section, highlighted the rulings of Ahl'ul Sunnah Ulema on Ahl'ul bidah, let us now cite Rasulallah(s)'s view on the matter Rasulallah (s) criticised those that praise Ahl'ul Bidah Imam of the Salafis, Albanee verifies as authentic this hadith taken from Baihaqi, in his commentary of Mishkaah al Masabih Volume 1 page 66 hadith number 189:

"He who honours an innovator has assisted him in the destruction of Islam".

Abu Sulaiman and his fellow supporters should take note. They have set out pathetic defence for their master Mu'awiya, honouring him as a Hadi, despite the fact that he was the Chief of innovators having devised and instituted the bidah of vilifying Imam 'Ali (as) during the Friday sermons, he also introduced interest, made changes in Salat, distribution of war booty, the law of inheritance etc.

Despite this Abu Sulaiman and his party continue to shower and extol this innovator calling him a Hadi. In doing so, they are only harming themselves for an innovator is an individual who is attacking Islam, and in the eyes of Rasulallah (s) those that praise him have aided and abetted him in the process.

Even if the advocates of Mu'awiya refuse to accept these facts, then let us look at this alleged

hadith from several other angles.

Rasulullah (s) made three Dua's, one that was rejected

We read in Sahih Muslim Book 041, Number 6904:

"Thauban reported that Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) said: Allah drew the ends of the world near one another for my sake. And I have seen its eastern and western ends.

And the dominion of my Ummah would reach those ends which have been drawn near me and I have been granted the red and the white treasure and I begged my Lord for my Ummah that it should not be destroyed because of famine, nor be dominated by an enemy who is not amongst them to take their lives and destroy them root and branch, and my Lord said: Muhammad, whenever I make a decision, there is none to change it.

Well, I grant you for your Ummah that it would not be destroyed by famine and it would not be dominated by an enemy who would not be amongst it and would take their lives and destroy them root and branch even if all the people from the different parts of the world join hands together (for this purpose), but it would be from amongst them, viz. your Ummah, that some people would kill the others or imprison the others".

Rasulullah (s) was fully aware in his Prophetic capacity of the fitnah that would befall the Ummah after him, and he foretold in clear traditions that Imam 'Ali (as) would face stiff opposition, that he would fight those who opposed his Leadership, the Qasatheen. Mu'awiya was the Leader of the opposition / Fitnah group, hence even if for arguments sake we were to accept Rasulallah (s) making such a dua, it would have been rejected on account of Mu'awiya's enmity and condemnation by Rasulallah (s) of those that shall fight Imam 'Ali (as).

Rasulullah (s) even prayed for Abu Jahil to be guided

Amongst Ahl'ul Sunnah's traditions in praise of Hadhrath Umar, they commonly cite this one that we have taken from Riyadh ul Nadira Volume 2 page 13:

"Rasulullah made a dua, O Allah Strengthen Islam by either Umar bin Khattab or Abu Jahil, whoever you prefer more".

Here Rasulullah made a du'a for Abu Jahil to be guided to the truth but this never transpired, and his example is very much like Mu'awiya's. We even learn in Sahih al Bukhari Volume 8, Book 75, Number 406 that Rasulullah (s) made dua for the pagans:

At-Tufail bin 'Amr came to Allah's Apostle and said, "O Allah's Apostle! The tribe of Daus has disobeyed (Allah and His Apostle) and refused (to embrace Islam), therefore, invoke Allah's wrath for them." The people thought that the Prophet would invoke Allah's wrath for them, but he said, "O Allah! Guide the tribe Of Daus and let them come to us,"

Rasulullah was a mercy for mankind and it was part of his great compassion that he made du'as of guidance to the truth for all people, including the mushrikeen. Praying for their guidance should not in any way be deemed as a virtue of the mushrikeen. It was an example of Rasulullah's desire that ALL are guided. So even if Rasulullah (s) did for arguments sake pray for Mu'awiya's guidance, it was in the same way as he prayed for all to be guided to the right path whether Muslim or non Muslim.

Not all of Rasulullah's prayers were accepted

Even if for arguments sake we were to accept this dua, according to Ahl'ul Sunnah not all of Rasulullah's supplications were accepted by Allah (swt). Ibn Hajar Asqalani in Fathul Bari Volume 11 page 97 states:

"If the Prophet (s) makes a dua for his Ummah it is accepted by Allah (swt) whereas if he makes it for a particular individual it may or may not be accepted".

So even if we are to accept this dua for arguments sake, to be Sahih, whether or not it will be accepted is subject to Allah (swt)'s discretion. With regards to Mu'awiya, his 'noble' deeds make it clear that Allah (swt) would never deem him as a Guide, and to prove this, let us see the words of Allah (swt)

Allah (swt) never guides a wrongdoer

We read in Surah Tauba verse 80:

Whether thou ask for their forgiveness or not (their sin is unforgivable): if thou ask seventy times for their forgiveness Allah will not forgive them: because they have rejected Allah and His apostle; and Allah guideth not those who are perversely rebellious (Zalimoon) [Taken from Abdullah Yusuf Ali's translation of the Qur'an].

Abdullah Yusuf Ali's comments in the footnotes of this verse are indeed interesting:

"An awful warning for those who actively oppose the Cause of Allah. The Holy Prophet was by nature full of mercy and forgiveness. He prayed for his enemies. But in such a case even his prayers are nullified by their attitude of rejecting Allah".

We suggest our readers contemplate this verse in light of Islamic history. There is no possibility that Mu'awiya was even remotely a Hadi who guided others on account of his guidance. Such was his guidance that he introduced the disgraceful practice of cursing Imam Ali (as) throughout his Kingdom and ordered his Governors to enforce this practice - was this a form of guidance that was leading people to the right path? He led an army against the rightful Imam becoming a baghi in the process. During his reign he killed Imam Hasan (as) and adherents of Imam 'Ali such as Hujr bin Adi. Are these actions of a Hadi?

Not only is this hadith contrary to logic and historical facts The narrator of this 'Hadi' hadith is not a reliable authority The narrator of the tradition in which Rasulullah (s) allegedly called Mu'awiya a Hadi is Abdul Rahman Abi Ameer Qurshee. About him we read in al Istiab Volume 3 page 399:

"Abdul Rahman Abi Ameer Qurshee is not proven to be a Sahabi. He was a Qurshee and a Syrian, his hadith are not deemed as authority and some have rejected this hadith"

Sadly for the advocates of Mu'awiya the embarrassment does not just end there Not a single hadith in praise of Mu'awiya is Sahih The leading 'Ulama of Ahl al-Sunnah have declared all hadith praising Mu'awiya as fabricated.

Al Hafidh Jalaluddeen Suyuti in "La'ali al-Masnuaa fi ahadith al-Mauduaa" Volume 1 page 424 states:

"Imam Hakim claims that he never came across a single hadith in praise of Mu'awiya that was Sahih".

La'ali al-Masnuaa fi ahadith al-Mauduaa Volume 1 page 424 Muhammad bin Ali bin Shawkani in "Fawa'id al Mujmua fi bayan al-hadith al-maudua", page 147 states that:

"Ibn Hibban commented that all ahadith in praise of Mu'awiya are fabricated". Fawa'id al Mujmua fi bayan al-hadith al-maudua page 147

Al Muhaddith Shaykh Abdul Haqq Dehlavi in "Sharh Mishkat Shareef" - Volume 4 page 716 (published in 1873) after citing the hadith in praise of Mu'awiya including the "guidance hadith" Abu Sulaiman cited from Tirmidhi comments: "It is recorded in Jami al-'Usul that many muhaddith

scholars have concluded that there exists not even a single hadith in praise of Mu'awiya that is Sahih".

Sharh Mishkat Shareef Vol. 4 page 716 Abu'l Hasan Quinani in "Thunziyaa as Shari'a al Murfoo'a", Volume 2, Chapter 8 page 7 comments "Imam Hakim cites from a chain used by Sibte Ibn Jauzi who cites Isaan bin Ruhiyaa that 'there exists nothing in praise of Mu'awiya that is Sahih'. Thunziyaa as Shari'a al Murfoo'a Vol. 2 Chapter 8 page 7

Allamah Ibn al-Jawzi al-Qurashi in "al- Mawduat" Volume 2 page 24 states: "Imam Hakim narrated from Abu'l Abbas who heard from his father, who heard from Ishaq bin Ibraheem al-Hanzali that 'no hadith in praise of Mu'awiya are Sahih'.

al- Mawduat Volume 2 page 24 Shaykh Ismail bin Muhammad in "Kashful Khafa" Volume 2 page 420 states:

'There exist no hadith in praise of Mu'awiya that is Sahih'" Kashful Khafa Vol. 2 page 420 al 'Aini in "Ummadat al Qari fi Sharh Sahih al Bukhari page 994 Volume 7 comments:

"that no reports in praise of Mu'awiya are proven. If many are present, the reply is that no hadith exist with a Sahih isnad as stated by Isaac bin Rahvia and Imam Nasai, and that's why Imam Bukhari wrote Chapter bab ai Dhikr Mu'awiya rather than bab ai Fadail Mu'awiya. Ibn Hajr al-Asqalani states in Fathul Bari Volume 7 page 104:

"Imam Bukhari on the topic of Mu'awiya wrote a Chapter Bab ai Dhikr Mu'awiya because no hadith in praise of Mu'awiya are proven and Ibn Abi Asim and Abu Umar Ghulam Thalib and 'Abu Bakr Nakash wrote on the virtues of Mu'awiya and Ibn Jauzi in Maudu'at wrote about him, then Ibn Jauzi stated in the opinion of Isaac bin Raaviya, in praise of Mu'awiya no hadith is Sahih and that's why Imam Bukhari wrote a Chapter titled bab ai Dhikr Mu'awiya rather than bab ai Fadail Mu'awiya"

Fathul Bari Vol. 7 page 104 We read in Tareekh ibn Khalikaan page 35 Volume 1:

"The compiler of Sunan Nasa'i Ahmad bin 'Ali was a hafidh of Hadith and in his time an Imam of Ahl'ul hadith. Towards the end of his life he went to Damascus and he was asked about the virtues of Mu'awiya, Imam Nasa'i replied "Mu'awiya should protect himself, what praise should I shower on him, I know only virtue namely that Rasulallah (s) cursed him "May Allah never satiate his stomach" al-Nasa'ih al-Kaafiyah page 163

"Imam Ahl'ul Sunnah Muhammad bin 'Ali Shawkani wrote in his book Fawaid Majmua Dhar ahadith Maudu'ah states that in praise of Mu'awiya no hadith exists"

Ibn Taymiyya in Minhaj al Sunnah page 207

"One party has created virtues of Mu'awiya and these virtues have been presented as these hadith and all of these are lies".

Rasulullah's advice for Mu'awiya is also a fabrication

One tradition commonly cited by the advocates of Mu'awiya is this one, in which Mu'awiya states:

"I longed to become Khalifa ever since I was told by the Prophet: O Mu'awiya rule justly if you come to power".

Like all traditions praising Mu'awiya this is also a fabrication and Ibn Kathir in al Bidaya Volume 8 page 122 notes:

"on the tradition in which Rasulallah (s) said O Mu'awiya rule justly if you come to power" - Imam Bayhaqi stated that the narrator of this hadith Ismail bin Buram is daif"

Rasulullah (s) in fact did indeed give advice to his followers about how to react if Mu'awiya attained power.

Rasulullah (s) ordered the killing of Mu'awiya in the event of him becoming Khalifa

Imam of Ahl'ul Sunnah Dhahabi records this tradition in numerous places of his Mizan al-Itidal and deems the hadith to be Sahih:

"If you see Mu'awiya on my pulpit then kill him" (see Volume 2 page 17; Volume 2 page 129 on the authority of Abu Said al Khudri; Volume 7 page 324 and Volume 8 page 74).

Other Sunni Ulema have also recorded this hadith "Tadhib al Tadhib by Ibn Hajar Asqalani Volume 5 page 110 [Hyderabad edition]; Kunz al Haqaiq by al Mu'awi page 9, Tabaqat by Ibn Sad Volume 4 page 134-135 [Leiden edition], al Kamil fi Safa al Rijal Volume 2 page 146 hadith number 343, Ansab al Ashraf Volume 5 page 136, Waq'at Sifeen page 216 and 221, Tareekh Tabari Volume 8 page 186.

An interesting event in connection with this event can be located in Ansab al Ashraf Volume 5

page 136:

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

Abu Sulaiman's plea of clemency for Mu'awiya

Ansar.org states:About Mu'awiya's transgression, it is either Mu'awiyah thought that the truth lies with him or that he was deliberate in his transgression. In both cases, Mu'awiyah is not infallible from mistakes. Ahl Al-Sunnah do not refrain him from falling in sins, but they say that sins have reasons, and these sins could be removed by asking for forgiveness and repenting, or other than that.

Now rather than float around the periphery of the subject matter, does Abu Sulaiman have the courage to tell us "Was Mu'awiya's act of transgression, uprising and rebelling against the Khalifa of the time a sin? Does the Sharia apply to all Muslims or are the Sahaba exempt from sins? Clearly this cannot be the case and we have examples in the lifetime of Rasulallah (s) when he would implement Shari'a and punish companions that had committed sins.

Is he then who is a believer like he who is a transgressor (fasiq)? They are not equal.

(Qur'an: Surah al-Sajdah, verse 18)

Abu Sulaiman then cites this supplication of Mu'awiya showing his alleged 'piety':

Ansar.org states:By Allah, I have done good deeds for my people, established Islamic Law, went to Jihad for the sake of Allah, and a lot of great things I did that only Allah can count, but we do not count them more than our mistakes. And I am a believer in a religion where deeds are accepted; either rewarded by good, or rewarded by a guilt that Allah may forgive us. By Allah, if I were to choose between two matters, between Allah and anything else, I would choose Allah" [Al-Bidayah wa Al-Nihayah, vol.8, p.136-137]

Abu Sulaiman is seeking to plead clemency for his client on account that he would ask forgiveness for his sins. If sins can be removed by repentance then why do the Ahl'ul Sunnah condemn those that rebelled against Abu Bakr and incited insurgency against Uthman? They might have likewise repented and asked for Allah (swt)'s forgiveness, so why do the ulama insist on continuing to condemn such individuals? Rather than demand Qisas why did Mu'awiya not demand that the killers of Uthman repent for their sins?

Undoubtedly, Allah (swt) can pardon all sins but if we accept Abu Sulaiman's argument then what is the point in having a judiciary in Islam? Why have a penal code when all that transgressors need to do is ask for the forgiveness of Allah (swt)? Clearly this is not logical and the Sharia prescribes clear punishment for offences, particularly crimes against fellow human beings.

Interesting is the fact that Mu'awiya never sought forgiveness for his practice of cursing Ali (as), rather he introduced it throughout his Kingdom a tradition that did not end until it was repealed by Umar bin Abdul Aziz. On the issue of cursing, Rasulullah (s) said, "Abusing a Muslim is Fusuq (evil doing) and killing him is Kufr (disbelief)." [Sahih al-Bukhari Volume 9, Book 88, Number 197]. Abusing a momin is fisq; perhaps Abu Sulaiman should think about the momin that he was cursing. Now let us see the verdict on one who hates and curses Ali (as) and decide on where the truth lies.

Was Mu'awiya a Momin or Munafiq?

We have already presented to our objective readers the wonderful deeds of Mu'awiya, what should we say of his Iman?

The sign of a Munafiq is hatred of Hadhrath 'Ali (as)

As a starting pointing let us consider the words of Hadhrath 'Ali (as):

"By him who split up the seed and created something living, the Apostle (may peace and blessing be upon him) gave me a promise that no one but a believer would love me, and none but a hypocrite would nurse grudge against me. - Sahih Muslim, English version, Chapter XXXIV, p46, Tradition #141" Its is little wonder that we have the testimony of Abu Said al Khudri:

"We recognized the hypocrites by their hatred of Ali." (Fada'il al-Sahaba, by Ahmad Ibn Hanbal, v2, p639, Tradition 1086 - al-Isti'ab, by Ibn Abd al-Barr, v3, p47 - al-Riyad al-Nadira, by al-Muhibb al-Tabari, v3, p242)

One wonders how Abu Sulaiman and his Nasibi brethren can prove that Mu'awiya loved Hadhrath 'Ali (as).

Let us look at some other traditions before concluding on Mu'awiya:

The Messenger of Allah said: "Whoever hurts Ali, has hurt me"

Musnad Ahmad Ibn Hanbal, v3, p483; al-Sawa'iq al-Muhriqah, by Ibn Hajar al-Haythami, Ch. 11, section 1, p263 The Messenger of Allah said:

"Whoever curses Ali, cursed me"

1. al-Mustadrak, by al-Hakim, v3, p121, who mentioned this tradition is Authentic
2. Musnad Ahmad Ibn Hanbal, v6, p323
3. Mishkat al-Masabih, English version, Tradition 6092
4. Tarikh al-Khulafa, by Jalaluddin al-Suyuti, p173

Rasulullah (s) said:

"Whoever leaves Ali, leaves me, whoever leaves me, leaves Allah" [Kanz ul Ummal, hadith numbers 32974 - 32976, narrated by Abdullah ibneUmar {through two chains} and Abu Dharr Ghaffari (ra).

al Mustadrak al Hakim, Vol. 3, Page 146

As we have already cited earlier Rasulullah (s) also said:

"Whoever obeys 'Ali, obeys me, whoever obeys me, obeys Allah, whoever disobeys 'Ali disobeys me, whoever disobeys me, disobeys Allah" [Kanz ul Ummal, hadith numbers 32973] So these hadith tell us:

The sign of a Munafiq is hatred of Ali (as)Whoever leaves, disobeys and curses 'Ali - in fact leaves, disobeys and curses Allah (swt) Having proven that Mu'awiya cursed Imam Ali (as), perhaps it is time that Abu Sulaiman breaks free from his Nasibi ideology and answers this: Did Mu'awiya leave, disobey and curse 'Ali?Is an individual who leaves, disobeys and curses Allah (swt) a Muslim?

This being the case could Abu Sulaiman kindly explain why it is that he has throughout the article insisted on giving Mu'awiya the title (ra)? Is Allah (swt) pleased with someone that disobeys and

curses him?

Committing this sin of cursing Imam 'Ali (as) as an individual is bad enough, one wonders how Allah (swt) will deal with the fact that Mu'awiya introduced this practice through his empire thus leading thousands of Muslims (three generations) to commit this ijtimali (combined sin). Will Allah (swt) appreciate this innovation?

It is not permissible to refer to a Munafiq as Sayyidina

In al Adhab al Mufrad Muhammad, Muhammad bin Ismaeel Bukhari records on page 300 Chapter 325 we are told:

"Rasulullah (s) said 'Don't say Sayyidina to a munafiq, because that would make that munafiq your Chief (superior), and in the process you will be upsetting your Creator".

In al-Nasa'ih al-Kaafiyah page 111 this tradition of Rasulullah (s) is quoted:

Burayda narrates that the Prophet (s) said, "When you refer to a munafiq as ya sayyidina you incur the wrath of your Creator" One hopes that our readers are able to appreciate the consequences of using this title when describing Mu'awiya. We would urge our Sunni brethren to refrain from such actions.

Hadhrath 'Ali (as)'s testimony - Mu'awiya is my enemy

Despite the efforts of the Nasibis to limit the differences between Mu'awiya and 'Ali as nothing more than differences in thinking, Hadhrath 'Ali (as)'s views on Mu'awiya's iman gives us an insight into his thoughts. If enmity of 'Ali is a sign of a munafiq then consider these words of Hadhrath 'Ali (as), taken from Suyuti's "Tareekh ul Khulafa" rendered into English by Abdassamad Clarke as "The khalifas who took the right way". He records this sermon of Imam 'Ali (as) on page 184:

"Praise belongs to Allah Who made our enemy ask about something that had occurred to him in the matter of his deen. Mu'awiya wrote to me asking about the ambiguous hermaphrodite"

History of the Khalifas who took the right way (Part English translation of Suyuti's Tarikh'ul Khulafa" page 184) An enemy of 'Ali (as) is an enemy of Allah (swt)

We read in Riyadh al Nadira Volume 3 page 111 that Rasulullah (s) declared:

"O Allah, 'Ali is my beloved friend, and my beloved friend is a beloved friend of Allah. ['Ali] Your enemy is my enemy, and my enemy is Allah's enemy. O 'Ali destroyed are those that incur your wrath". Al Riyadh al Nadira, Page 111

One who fails to accept 'Ali as his Maula is not a Momin

In Sawaiq al Muhriqa page 177, Imam of Ahl ul Sunnah Ahmad Ibn Hajr al Makki records this event that took place during Hadhrath Umar's khilafath: "Once two land owners approached Umar with a dispute. Umar called 'Ali and asked that he resolve the matter. Imam 'Ali resolved the dispute, and one of the individuals said, 'This man ['Ali] is going to decide between us?' Upon hearing this Hadhrath Umar grabbed the individual by the collar and said 'Don't you know who this individual is? He is the Maula of me, you and all Momin's, and whoever does NOT take him to be his Maula is not a momin (believer)"

This incident has also been recorded in exactly the same way in Riyadh al Nadira, Volume 3, Page 115. Al Riyadh al Nadira, Vol. 3, Page 115

The key difference between Sunni and Shi'a on the topic of Imamate is in relation to the meaning of Maula used by Rasulullah (s) about Imam 'Ali (as). We do not intend to delve in to the matter here, suffice it to say Ahl'ul Sunnah deem Maula to mean friend Shia define it as Master. The question that we pose for Abu Sulaiman and his fellow advocates is, did Mu'awiya EVER deem Imam 'Ali (as) as his Maula?

If it means Master did he ever recognise Imam 'Ali (as) as his Master, rather he rejected his Leadership and openly rebelled against him, refusing to give bayya to him and as has already been mentioned, al Muhaddith Shah Abdul Aziz had stated that in the eyes of Ahl'ul Sunnah from the khilafath of Imam 'Ali to peace with Imam Hasan, Mu'awiya was a baghi - i.e. he rebelled against the rightful Imam (did not accept Ali (as) as his Maula).

If we are to accept the definition as one of friend, then perhaps Abu Sulaiman could inform his flock as to what type of friendship he showed to Imam 'Ali (as). Was opposing Imam Ali (as), inciting sedition against him and then going to war against him proof that he deemed 'Ali (as) his friend?

Did he further endorse this friendship after Imam 'Ali (as)'s death by instituting his cursing throughout his empire? Do these actions prove that Mu'awiya deemed Ali (as) as his Maula as in friend? Clearly not! Rather than defend Mu'awiya, we would urge Abu Sulaiman to at least embrace the fatwa of their authority figure Hadhrath Umar, who stated, "One who does NOT deem 'Ali his Maula, is not a believer.

The 'true' merits of Mu'awiya bin Hind

The meaning of Mu'awiya

The leading Ulema of Ahl'ul Sunnah are in agreement that Mu'awiya means "barking bitch". For those interested they can consult the following texts: Tareekh ul Khulafa by al Hafidh Jalaluddin Suyuti (Urdu translation by Maulana Hakeem Nasree) page 253. Sharh ul Aqaid page 510

Rabi' ul Abrar by Allamah Zamakhshari page 700 Tahzeeb ul Kamaal fi Asma' al-Rijal by Jamaluddin Mizzi page 371 Love and hatred of 'Ali is the difference between one being legitimate and illegitimate Mohibuddeen al Tabari in Riyad ul Nadira Volume 3 page 117 Chapter 116 narrates this tradition from 'Abu Bakr:

Rasulullah (s) said, "Love of 'Ali, Fatima, Hasan and Hussain is a sign of one being legitimate, hatred of them is the sign of one being illegitimate".

Similarly Imam of Ahl'ul Sunnah Ibn Atheer in his "Nihaya" Volume 5 page 155 records that: "Imam Ja'far al-Sadiq said that certain types of individuals will never have love towards us, those of illegitimate stock and those that possess an addiction to the anus (homosexual)"

In the case of Mu'awiya this tradition is certainly mist apt. Hadhrath Ayesha's testimony about methods of Nikah during the time of Jahiliyya We read in Sahih al Bukhari "Book of Nikah" - Chapter "Whoever said, a marriage is not valid except with the woman's relatives" - Hadhrath Ayesha narrates:

"there were four types of marriage during the Pre-Islamic period of ignorance. One type was similar to that of the present day, i.e. a man used to ask somebody else for the hand of a girl under his guardianship or for his daughter's hand. another type of marriage was that a group of less than ten men would assemble and enter upon a women, and all of them would have sexual relations with her.

If she became pregnant and delivered a child and some days had passed after her delivery, she would send for all of them and none of them could refuse to come, and when they all gathered before her she would say to them "You (all) know what you have done and now I have given birth to a child. So it is your child O so and so! Naming whoever she liked and her child would follow him and he could not refuse to take him.."

Although not translated in the English by Dr Muhsin Khan, the original Arabic text states Ayesha calling this "Nikah Ijtimah" (Combined Nikah). Mu'awiya bin Hind was the product of Nikah Ijtimah

(Combined Nikah)

Ibn Abi al Hadeed in Sharh Nahjul Balagha notes the following in Volume 10 page 130:

"When Mu'awiya was born, four people were thought to have been his father Abi bin Umar bin MUSAAFIR, Abi Umar bin Waleed, Abbas bin Abdul Muttalib and Sabah the Ethiopian. 'Abu Sufyan was short and ugly whilst Sabah was young and handsome, Hinda offered him sex and amongst the Arabs there was also a view that 'Abu Sufyan's other son Utbah was also a product of this union".

Similarly in Rabi'ul Abrar by Allamah Zamakhshari Volume 3 page 551:

"There were four people who were thought to be Mu'awiya's father, Abi bin Umar bin MUSAAFIR, Abi Umar bin Waleed, Abbas bin Abdul Muttalib and Sabah" Rabi'ul Abrar by Allamah Zamakhshari Volume 3 page 551 In Takhirath al Khawwas page 114 Chapter 7 we read:

"Sham bin Muhammad Kalbi in his book Kitab Mushab notes that Imam Hasan said to Mu'awiya 'Are you aware of the bed from which you were conceived?' This means he was born from four fathers".

In Thanzeeya al Nasab fi Kubul al Arab we learn that:

"In relation to the birth of Mu'awiya, four men were viewed to have been his father Umr bin Waleed bin Mugheera, MUSAAFIR Abi Umar, 'Abu Sufyan and a fourth individual was also involved. Hinda was a prostitute and had sex with black men, if any children were born from such a union she would kill them."

We read Sharh Ibn al Hadeed Volume 4 page 94 under the Chapter "Mun Kitab Ziyad Ubayya" that:

"Mu'awiya wrote a letter to Ziyad, the contents of which included the words 'O son of Sumayya' (amongst the Arabs there was a tradition that if one's ancestry was questionable, then that individual would be called by their mother's name. In the same way that Imam Hasan referred to Marwan as 'Ibn Zurqa'- Mu'awiya sought to mock Ziyad by calling him the son of Sumayya. Ziyad replied to Mu'awiya with these words 'Mu'awiya you called me by the name of my mother Sumayya, so as to mock me, well if I am the son of Sumayya then you are 'Ibne Jamaat' as you were a product of Nikah ijtimah".

More on Mu'awiya's 'noble' birth

We read in Muasalib ibne Sa'man munkool uz thun'zeey al Nasab page 97 that:

"Research has established that Musafir was a handsome and generous man, he fell in love with Hinda and fornicated with her, she was unmarried and became pregnant, this came to the knowledge of the Quraysh and Musafir ran away. Hinda's father Utbah summoned Mu'awiya's father Abu Sufyan - bribing with a huge dowry, he married him to Hinda. Mu'awiya was born three months after the marriage." We read in al-Nasa'ih al-Kaafiyah page 85 we read:

Musafir was a handsome, generous man - he fell in love with the daughter of Utbah, and she fell in love with him. She became pregnant. Maarif Ibne Khurbooz states that when her signs of pregnancy became visible Hinda told Musafir to flee and he made his way out of the city. Naufal states that Musafir was one of those individuals that was killed on account of his love of Hinda.

Hadhrath Ayesha's testimony that Hinda committed Zina

We read in Tadkhira Khawass page 62 Chapter "Dhikr Khwaarij" we read that "when Mu'awiya's sister Umme Habeeba received news about Muhammad bin Abu Bakr's murder, she sent Ayesha a cooked goat suggesting that the reason for his killing was his murder of Uthman. When this happened Ayesha said "May Allah (swt) kill this daughter of fornicating woman. By Allah! I shall never eat this meat again".

The 'virtues' possessed by one born illegitimately

Imam of Ahl'ul Sunnah Qutubadeen Shirazi in his book "Nizhaath Quloob Munkool az Isthakhsa al Fahm" page 981 states:

"A child born out of fornication is better due to the fact that a man does so with complete effort and enjoyment, whilst a child conceived legitimately only pleases his wife. A child born from fornication is more clever, that is why Amr bin Aas and Mu'awiya bin Abu Sufyan were great politicians and are counted as amongst the people of deception, the greatest politician from this group was Ziyad bin Ubayya".

One born illegitimately can not be a Khalifa

Imam of Ahl'ul Sunnah al Muhaddith Shah Waliyullah Dehlavi in his Hujjutul Balaghtha Volume 2 page 149 "Dhikr Khilafath" states: "To be a Khalifa one must satisfy the following six requirements, he must be wise mature Free a Man Brave Possess good ancestry" On this issue of ancestry Shah states:

"The Khalifa should be such an individual that people recognise him on account of his good family, and not the opposite where the people would show him disrespect".

The combined nikah, its merits and Hinda's fornication has now been presented faithfully from the texts of Ahl'ul Sunnah. Mu'awiya may indeed have been a master of deception and a great politician, but as Shah Waliyullah states, one born illegitimately can not attain the position of Khalifa, you need to possess a good ancestry - something that Mu'awiya did not possess, his mother entered the pre jahiliyya system of Nikah sleeping with four different men.

Mu'awiya the politician and khalifa dedicated 5 years of his life fighting the Imam of Guidance 'Ali ibne Abi Talib (as), he poisoned Imam Hasan (as), he introduced the ugly bidah of cursing Imam 'Ali (as) during the Friday Sermon. He murdered the supporters of 'Ali (as), introduced practices that contradicted the Qur'an and Sunnah, made his alcoholic son Yazeed Khalifa over the nation.

Hinda's suckling and the combined Nikah may well have indeed created a great politician but, one of the signs of being illegitimate is hatred of Imam 'Ali (as) - and Mu'awiya through his actions confirmed the authenticity of this hadith.

One who fights the rightful Imam is a Fasiq

In al-Nasa'ih al-Kaafiyah page 130, Muhammad din Aqeeal Shaafi whilst discussing the justice of the companions states:

"prior to the murder of Hadhrath Uthman all the Sahaba were Adil (Just). After his murder, fitnah arose and a viewpoint developed that those who fought against Hadhrath 'Ali were fasiq because they rebelled against the rightful Imam".

One who turns his back on the right path is a Zaalim and Fasiq

In Sharh al Maqasid Volume 2 page 306 Allamah Taftazani states that:

"The battles between the Sahaba are proof that some companions left the right path and became Zaalim and Fasiq because they became affected by jealousy, hatred, hypocrisy, a desire for power and indulgence because not all the companions were just, not was every individual who saw Rasulallah (s), good".

Clearly the right path was to attach themselves to 'Ali (as). By turning their backs on him and fighting him, proves that Mu'awiya and his party had gone astray. He fought 'Ali and caused the death of prominent companions. Thereafter as a Khalifa he adopted a policy of oppression against the lovers of Hadhrath 'Ali and cursed him during the Friday Sermons.

Do we need any further proof to demonstrate that Mu'awiya had gone astray and hated Imam 'Ali (as)? Mu'awiya continued to act in the way of descendants. His brother, maternal grandfather and uncle were killed at the hands of Maula 'Ali (as) at Badr. Mu'awiya was hence motivated by hatred and dedicated his life to fighting Imam 'Ali (as).

Mu'awiya's Conquests

Some advocates of Mu'awiya commonly highlight the fact that the Muslim Empire was expanded under his rule with Sahaba under his helm, as was not the case under Imam Ali (as)'s khilafath. It should be pointed out that empire expansion means little in the eyes of Allah (swt). One will be questioned on the day of judgement on his 'personal deeds' and Mu'awiya despite his advocate's poor defences, will indeed have a great deal to answer for. In any case, his conquests mean nothing, as Imam of Ahl'ul Sunnah 'Abu Bakr al Jassas states in Ahkaam ul Qur'an Volume 3 page 119:

"Following the four khalifas the Sahaba participated in Jihad under the helm of Fasiq's and Faajirs, 'Abu Ayub Ansari participated in Jihad under the Leadership of Yazeed".

Mu'awiya's Government compared by Hadhrath Ayesha to Firawn (Pharaoh) and other Kaafirs (Pagans) Shaykh ul Mudira page 165
al Bidaya 131 Volume 8 Mukhtasar Ta'reekh al-Dimishk Volume 25 page 42

Aswat bin Yazeed said to Hadhrath Ayesha: 'Aren't you surprised that this Mu'awiya is from Tulaqa (freed captive) and in Khilafath he fought the companions? Ayesha replied 'this Government and Kingdom, Allah (swt) gives Leadership to both just and tyrannical, for 400 years in Egypt the enemies of God, Phiraun ruled as did other Kaafir Kings".

Hadhrath Ayesha's comparing of Mu'awiya to Firawn and other kaafirs is in fact a reference to the Qur'an, where Allah (swt) states in Surah Hud verses 96-99:

"And we sent Moses, with Our Clear (Signs) and an authority manifest, Unto Pharaoh and his

chiefs: but they followed the command of Pharaoh and the command of Pharaoh was no right (guide). He will go before his people on the Day of Judgment, and lead them into the Fire (as cattle are led to water): But woeful indeed will be the place to which they are led! And they are followed by a curse in this (life) and on the Day of Judgment: and woeful is the gift which shall be given (unto them)!" (Taken from Abdullah Yusuf Ali's translation).

Mu'awiya's declaration that Ziyad was the son of 'Abu Sufyan is proof that he was a fasiq In Tarikh Kamil Volume 3 page 225 we are informed:

"Mu'awiya's declaring that Ziyad was his brother, was the first act that was in open contradiction to the laws of Sharia because Rasulullah (s) said that the legitimate child is one born from wedlock"

Moreover Al Hafidh Jalaluddeen Suyuti also acknowledges this in Tareekh ul Khulafa page 185:

"Mu'awiya's declaring Ziyad to be the son of Abu Sufyan was the first act that contradicted an order of Rasulullah".

For further Sunni references on this clear bidah please see the following links:

al Qawqib al Dhuree by Allamah Mahmood Ayubi page 327 Musalman kai aruj aur zawaal, by Professor Ahmad Akbar Abadai page 54

A Fasiq is one who acts in violation to the Word of Allah (swt) and his Messenger. Mu'awiya through this act proves that he was a fasiq. For his die hard Nasibi advocates we would like to know how they explain this declaration of Mu'awiya? No doubt the ijtihaad defence may be shouted out but as we have consistently proven throughout this article, you cannot exercise ijtihaad where you have nass (text), which was present here via the words of Rasulullah (s). Despite this, Mu'awiya sought fit to make a declaration that contravened the words of Rasulullah (s).

It is a religious duty to expose the deeds of a fasiq

No doubt the advocates of Mu'awiya, like Abu Sulaiman, will seek to protect their Imam from harm, but to highlight the faults of a fasiq of the likes of Mu'awiya, is a religious obligation. Hasan Basri stated that:

"The testimonies of three people should be rejected:

The individual who openly indulges in bad acts.

A Zaalim Ruler One who practices bidath"

(References: Sharh Muslim, by Nawawi Volume 2 page 322; Tafsir Ibn Katheer Volume 4 page 214; Ahkam al Qur'an by 'Abu Bakr Jassas; Tafseer Fathul Qadeer)

Abu Sulaiman can feel free to choose whatever category he likes because Mu'awiya fits at the helm of each one. His bad acts were evident from his declaring a bastard as his brother. As ruler, his harsh treatment of the likes of Hujr bin Adi as we have demonstrated, speaks for itself. With regards to his bidah of cursing Imam Ali (as), it has been discussed at length previously.

Famous deobandi scholar and former chief of Jamaat-e-Islami, Sayyid Abu'l Ala Maudoodi, after citing the words of Hasan Basri in Tahfim ul Qur'an Volume 5 page 87, makes these relevant comments:

"It is imperative that we highlight such individuals to prevent the risk of running in to danger (from such individuals) if narrators, witnesses and writers display such faults then such weaknesses should not be hidden, rather they should be conveyed"

Praising a fasiq leads to incurring the wrath of Allah (swt)

Whilst Abu Sulaiman and his Nasibi advocates have dedicated their life to defending Mu'awiya and heaping praise on him, no matter what the cost, we would urge our Ahl'ul Sunnah brothers not to get roped in to their actions, for the consequences are simply too great. The Sunni scholar al Muhaddith Shah Abdul Aziz Dehlavi in Tuhfa Ithna Ashariyya page 191 Chapter 7 states:

"It is recorded in Sahih hadith that when someone praises a bad character person, Allah (swt) gets upset with him".

Clearly one who is a momin is one that has love for Hadhrath 'Ali (as). Why would such an individual risk incurring the wrath of Allah (swt) by showering praise on an individual who was an enemy of 'Ali (as), fought and cursed him? The modern day Nasibis are trying their utmost to recruit people into their obnoxious cult by declaring their affiliation with Imam 'Ali (as).

The reality is very different as one can see from their passionate defence of Mu'awiya which as is the case with Abu Sulaiman, in fact turns in to an attack on Imam 'Ali (as). No rational lover of Ahl'ul Sunnah would ever wish to praise those that cursed Maula 'Ali (as). Let us leave the Nasibi's to wallow in their hypocrisy. They made their own bed let them lie in, to join them on their road to Hell.

"It is little wonder that Hanafi scholar Maulana 'Abdul Hakeem Chishti in his biography of Maulana Waheed uz Zaman cited his comments from "Waheed ai Lughath":

"To say radhinathallanho after Mu'awiya's names takes a considerable amount of courage".
Hayaath Waheed uz-Zaman page 109

Mu'awiya was a Nasibi

In "Lisan al Arab" page 762 by Ibn Manzur states:

"Nawasib are those who hate Hadhrath Ali, and embrace that hatred as part of their faith" If this is the definition of a Nasibi then Mu'awiya was the practical definition of one. If his fighting against Imam Ali (as) is not clear evidence in itself, then his introducing the practice of cursing 'Ali (as) in all mosques throughout the territories, serves as unequivocal proof that he had a deep seated hatred of Imam 'Ali (as) in his heart.

Mu'awiya sought to institutionalize this hatred, by making the ritual cursing a part of the Friday Sermon, by doing so he in effect sought to convince the masses that this was a part of the Deen. It is little wonder that modern day Pakistani Hanafi scholar Maulana Sayyid Lal Shah Bukhari in "Isthakhlaf ai Yazid" page 216 admitted:

"The founder of Nasibi ideology was Mu'awiya".

Fatwa of Imam of Ahl'ul Sunnah, Shah Abdul Aziz that Nasibis are equal to dogs and pigs Al Muhaddith Shah Abdul Aziz Dehlavi declared in "Tuhfa Ithna Ashariyya" page 6: "The Ulema of Ahl'ul Sunnah regard the enemies of Ali, the Nasibis as the worst party that recites the Shahada. We regard them as equivalent to dogs and pigs"

Imam Shafi'i stated that the testimony of Mu'awiya is to be rejected We learn in Rawdah-al-Manazir fi al-Awai'l wa al 'Awakhir Volume 11 page 133 that: Imam Shafi'i said that the testimony of four companions will not be accepted and those four are Mu'awiya, Amr bin Aas, Mugheera (bin Shuba) and Ziyad (bin Abi)"

This view of Imam Shafi'i has also been attributed to him by his student Hadhrath Rabi in Tareekh Abul Fidah Volume 1 under the chapter addressing the events of 45 Hijri:

It can also be located in:

Kitab Mukhthasar fi Ahbar al Bashar Vol. 1 page 100 Imam Ali (as) did not deem Mu'awiya to be a momin Hafidh Sulayman bin Ibraheem al Hanafi in "Yanabi' al Mawaddah" page 190 Chapter 53

quotes "Nasr bin Muzahim who heard from Abu Ishaq Ihsani who states that after the "Tahkeem Incident" he read a manuscript in the possession of Said bin Abi Burdah. In it, it was written that when the people asked Hadhrath 'Ali whether or not his opponents were Momin he replied, with regards to Mu'awiya and his companions 'I do not regard them as Mu'min or Muslim, and I care little about what Mu'awiya thinks".

Other Sunni authorities have also recorded these words of Imam 'Ali (as): al-Nasa'ih al-Kaafiyah page 199 Iqd al Fareed Volume 2 page 233 Al Bidaya Volume 7 page 259 Rasulullah (s) cursed Mu'awiya's stomach We read in Sahih Muslim hadith number 6298, a tradition narrated by Ibn Abbas:

"I was playing with children and Allah's Apostle (peace be upon him) happened to pass by (us). I hid myself behind the door. He (the Prophet) came and he patted upon my shoulders and said: Go and call Mu'awiyah. I returned and said: He is busy in taking food. He again asked me to go and call Mu'awiyah to him. I went (and came back) and said that he was busy in taking food, whereupon he said: May Allah not fill his belly! Ibn Muthanna said: I asked Umm Umayyah what he meant by the word Hatani. He said: It means "he patted my shoulders".

Rasulullah (s) cursed Mu'awiya, his brother and father We read in Ahl'ul Sunnah's Mukthul Husayn page 117 part 4:

"Imam Hasan reminded Mu'awiya of the occasion "when your father was riding a red camel you was in front of him and your brother Utbah was dragging the camel by its nose? On that occasion Rasulullah (s) cursed your father, brother and you"

Rasulullah's cursing of these three individuals on this specific occasion can also be located in Waq'at Sifeen Volume 8 page 185. Hadhrath Ayesha cursed Mu'awiya and Amr bin Aas We read in Tadhkira ul Khawass page 62, Tar'ikh Ibn al Wardi Voume 1 page 245 and Tarikh Kamil Volume 3 page 180 in connection with Mu'awiya's killing of Hadhrath Ayesha's brother as follows:

"Following the death of Muhammad bin 'Abu Bakr the people of Egypt gave bayya to Mu'awiya. It was following this (event) that Ummul Mu'mineen Ayesha would curse Mu'awiya and Amr bin Aas after every Salaat".

Tar'ikh Ibn al Wardi Voume 1 page 245 Tar'ikh Kamil Vol. 3 page 180 Rasulullah (s) cursed Mu'awiya and Amr bin Aas al-Dhahabi in Mizan al-Itidal, 3:311 and Haythami in Majma al-Zawa'id, 8:121 both record that:

"The Prophet (s) overheard the sound of 'ghina' (singing) and found Amr b. al-Aas and Muawiya indulging themselves by singing. He (s) supplicated that they be thrown in to the Fire"

Mu'awiya shall die a kaafir

We read in Waq'at Sifeen page 217 and Tareekh Tabari Volume 8 page 186 that Abdullah ibne Umar narrates that he heard Rasulullah say: "Mu'awiya shall not die on the path of Islam". Both the above books on the same pages also record a similar hadith, this time narrated by Jabir bin Abdullah who testified that he heard Rasulullah (s) say:

"At the time of his death, Mu'awiya shall not be counted as member of my Muslim Ummah" Mu'awiya shall be raised with a different Ummah on the day of Judgement We read in Ansab al Ashraf Volume 5 page 132 that Rasulullah (s) said:

"From this door shall enter a man from my Ummah who shall be raised with another Ummah on the Day of Judgement, at that point Mu'awiya came through the door"

Mu'awiya shall be in the deepest part of Hell Fire

It is recorded in Lisan al Mizan Volume 1 page 284 that Rasulullah (s) said:

"Verily Mu'awiya shall be in the deepest part of Hell from where he shall shout 'Ya Hanan, Ya Manan' verily I have sinned and spread fitnah throughout the earth".

Similarly find in Ansab al Ashraf Volume 5 page 132 that Rasulullah (s) said:

"Mu'awiya has a coffin in the deepest part of Hell, one that has a lock on it".

In addition, in Waq'at Sifeen page 217, we learn that Abdullah ibne Umar had also condemned Mu'awiya as follows: "Verily Mu'awiya's coffin is in the deepest part of Hell, Had Firawn not declared that he was the most superior God, nobody would have been in a deeper part of Hell than Mu'awiya".

Mu'awiya and his people are the sign of Hell Fire

We are citing this tradition from two authority works of Ahl'ul Sunnah al-Haythami, Majma al-Zawa'id, 9:406 Kanz al-ummal, 7:63 (Haydarabad) "Rasulullah (s) said that Ali and his people (qawm) are the sign of paradise while Muawiya and his people are the sign of the Fire" Now we know which direction 'Abu Sulaiman and his Nasibi brethren are heading.

We suggest they abandon their support of their baghi Imam before it is too late. Abu Sulaiman can plead clemency for his baghi Imam all he likes but it will be of no avail. His hatred of Imam 'Ali (as) will stand against him on the Day of Judgment and whilst Allah (swt) is All Forgiving the All Merciful, hatred of 'Ali (as) is one of those great sins where there is no opportunity to advance any mitigating reasons. In that there is no doubt, as we have the guarantee of Rasulullah (s) who said:

"Hatred of 'Ali is such a thing that no good deeds will benefit, whilst love of 'Ali is such a thing that no bad deeds will harm you". (taken from Ahlul Sunnah book, al-Nasa'ih al-Kaafiyah page 67).