FINDTRUTH

YAZID WAS NEVER AMIRUL-MU'MININ

YAZID WAS NEVER AMIRUL MUMININ

www.findtruth.co.uk

Yazid

was never Amiirul-mu'minin

Abdilahi Nassir

YAZID WAS NEVER AMIRUL-MU'MININ

By:
ABDILAHI NASSIR

Translated by:
MOHAMED RAZA DUNGERSI, Ph.D.

Published by:
Bilal Muslim Mission of Kenya
P. O. Box 82508 - 80100
Mombasa - Kenya

Published and Printed by:
BILAL MUSLIM MISSION OF KENYA
P. O. Box 82508 - 80100
MOMBASA - KENYA

CONTENTS

When Walid bin Utbah bin Abi Sufyan, the Governor of Madinah, informed Imam Husayn that Yazid demands a pledge of allegiance from him, the Imam politely refused by saying that an allegiance in secret will be of no value, we shall see into this matter tomorrow in public.

But then Marwan bin Hakam, who was also present in the meeting, told Walid to force the Imam for pledging allegiance to Yazid or to kill him and send his head to Damascus.

At that time, the Imam said:

…We are the household of the prophethood, the source of messengership, the descending-place of the angels, through us Allah has begun (showering His favours) and with us He has perfected (His blessings). Whereas Yazid is a sinful man, a drunkard, killer of innocent people, and one who openly indulges in sinful acts. A person like me can never pay allegiance to a person like him…

Foreword

All praise be to Allah (S.W.T); and may His salutations and peace be upon His prophet and his household who have been purified from all uncleanliness; Amin.

At the onset of the month of Muharram this year (1424 A.H.), a pamphlet with the heading "Open letter to the Sunni preachers and Imams" was circulated in Mombasa. (See p. 26-29)

The objective of this pamphlet was to show the Sunni preachers and Imams the mistake that they were committing "by holding lectures, particularly in the first ten days of Muharram." In the opinion of the authors of this pamphlet, "there is no Tradition (evidence) that tells us to do so." To them, this is "an innovation" following which causes them to mislead the Sunni congregation by imitating the Shias.

The writers of this pamphlet called themselves "Ahlul-Tawheed", but the entire public/reader (*wasomi*) knows that they are Wahabis. They use this pseudo-name for two reasons. Firstly to conceal their Wahabi identity, knowing that all muslims abhor it. Disclosing their true identity would therefore cost them their support. The second reason is related to their faith which is that only they are the true believers of Unity (*Tawheed*) of Allah, the rest of the muslims, who *do not concur* with their views, are *polytheists*. Since all muslims believe that they are *Ahlul tawheed*, as it entails acceptance of LA ILAAHA ILLALLAH, by the use of such a terminology, the Wahabis intend to hoodwink the muslims to believe that the writers of the pamphlet, too, are bona fide muslims.

In order to respond to their allegations against the Shias regarding the martyrdom of Imam Husayn (a.s), and in order to correct the claims, in the pamphlet referred, that Yazid was *Amirul–mu'minin*, I issued a series of ten pamphlets in Kiswahili, from 8th Muharram 1424 A.H. / 12th March 2003 to 14th Rabi ul Awwal 1424 A.H. / 16th May 2003

under the heading: "Open letter to the Wahabis" (*Barua ya wazi kwa Mawahabi*).

These pamphlets have been compiled into this booklet the English translation of which, thanks to Dr. Mohamed Raza Dungersi, Ph.D. of Dar ul tableegh, New York, U.S.A., is now in your hands.

I have gone through this translation and found it to be a correct version of what I wrote originally in Kiswahili. For this I would like to express and record my sincere thanks to Dr. Mohamed Raza Dungersi and pray to Allah to reward him for the good job done.

And success is due to Almighty Allah (S.W.T).

Abdilahi Nassir

Mombasa, Kenya
26th Rabiuth Thani, 1425 A.H.
15th June, 2004

1
IT IS NOT AN INNOVATION OF THE SHI'AS

In their pamphlet, the wahabis state: "The Sabai writers of Iraq concocted false, brutal and frightful traditions such that Husssein and his kith and kin were deprived of water, forced into a battle, and then beheaded. Such traditions are neither believable nor reliable, and are far from being true."

Our reply: Where we can find our reply from books written in Kiswahili and available in local shops, there is no need to refer to books which may not be available, or which may have been written in languages unfamiliar to most of us. For that reason, let us review a book named *Maisha ya Sayyidna Huseyn* 1999 ed. (*The Biography of Sayyidna Huseyn*) authored by Sheikh Abdalla Saleh Farsy and published by Adam Traders of Mombasa.

On page 37 of this book, Sheikh Abdalla states that: "when he (Imam Huseyn) told them that he was not prepared to surrender to Ubeydillah and then be humiliated and killed together with his followers, family members, both male and female, young and old, they *surrounded them completely* so that they should not be able to escape. *They were deprived of water and food from the eighth to the tenth of the month (of Muharram) 61 (A.H.). Thus having been made weak through hunger and thirst*, they were then killed." At this point, the author then names "the first eleven martyrs", *all* of them belonging to the Prophet's family.

Again, on page 39 of the same book, he says that after this massacre, (their heads) were "dispatched *with festivity and drum beats* to the governor of Kufa. Each carrier was boasting in the presence of the governor, saying, 'I killed so and so' *as they each received their prizes*." The Sheikh then adds: "The heads were then put on display."

Our question is: Did these heads fall off their respective bodies on their own if they had not been severed?

Over and above this, they (the Wahabis), allege in their pamphlet that: "And the Shia's claim that Hussein was beheaded is an utter lie."

Our reply: Re-visit Sheikh Abdalla's book. On page 38 of his book, our Sheikh says that having been "surrounded from all sides and attacked with arrows, spears and swords, he (Imam Huseyn) fell down and *his head was severed* by them (the oppressors). And by common account, *this act was carried out* by Shimr bin Ziljawshan …" Further more, he adds: "What is it that fortune and the love of fame cannot do!"

However, these oppressors were not satisfied by cutting off Imam Huseyn's head. Sheikh Abdalla Farsy explains (on page 39) that when the severed head was presented to the governor, Ubeydillah, "the governor *struck the head with a cane as if it were a drum*." When the head was presented to the Ruler himself (Yazid bin Muawiya), Sheikh says on page 40 that "he (the Ruler) repeated what his governor of Kufa had done before, *holding a cane and poking at the teeth of Huseyn*…"

These are the writings of Sheikh Abdalla Saleh Farsy, who was the Chief Kadhi of Kenya and, prior to that, of Zanzibar. What! Do we count him "as a Sabai author from Iraq?" Was he a Shia? A "liar"? Was not he the same Sheikh of whom the "Ahlul Tawheed" were proud, then and now? What have they to say?

2
INSTALLATION OF YAZID AS RULER

Before Yazid's reign in 60 A.H., his father, Muawiya bin Abi Sufyan, ruled over the Muslims. Both, the father and the grandfather, accepted Islam *only as a measure of last resort*, after the recapture of Mecca and their defeat as leaders of intense opposition against Prophet Muhammad (s.a.w.w.).

This is the same Muawiya who, not only rebelled and waged a war against "The Fourth Caliph" (Imam Ali bin Abi Talib a.s.), who had been elected by the Muslims to be their Caliph, but also opposed and fought Imam Hasan (the brother of Imam Hussein a.s.), who, according to Sheikh Abdallah S. Farsy, "was murdered by being poisoned" by Yazid, the so called *Amirul–mu'minin*! (Refer Sheikh Abdalla S. Farsy's book *Maisha ya Sayyidna Hassan* (The Biography of Sayyidna Hassan) p. 24, 1999 ed., published by Adam Traders, Mombasa.

Ten years before he was poisoned, Imam Hassan had signed a ceasefire agreement with Yazid's father, Muawiya, after an intense battle. In his book, on page 16, Sheikh Abdalla S. Farsy states that one of the conditions of this ceasefire agreement was that Imam Hassan would cede Caliphate to Muawiya. However, on the death of Muawiya, the Caliphate would revert to Imam Hassan (a.s.), if he were still alive, or else, it would revert to Imam Hussein (a.s.).

Sheikh Abdalla S. Farsy continues to explain on page 24 of the same book that "Yazid realized the fact that on the death of his father, he would lose the opportunity to inherit his rulership, which would pass on to Hassan, as per the treaty. He decided to murder him (Hassan) by poisoning him. He sent some trusted individuals secretly to Sayyidnal Hassan's last wife, Jaada binti Asha-ath, who had no children with him.

She was promised that if she murdered her husband, Yazid would marry her and that she would be given one hundred thousand Dirhams in advance, and much more, if she so wished. She was overcome by this temptation and poisoned her husband, who suffered for forty days, and passed away, a martyr…"

On page18 of his book titled *The Biography of Sayyidina Huseyn*, Sheikh Abdalla S. Farsy says: "Before the death of Sayyidina Hasan, Muawiya *had made up his mind to unbind himself from his treaty to let Al Hasan*, or any one else, to succeed him. He decided *to make his favorite son*, Yazid, *heir-apparent to his throne*. He would let the public know that *on his death, there would be no nomination, except that his son, Yazid would become the Caliph. This would be done regardless of Hasan's consent or not, and in face of acceptance or rejection by all and sundry*." He concludes thus: "*So that they should continue to stay in their positions*, most of his governors strongly supported this idea *despite the fact that it was un-Islamic*…"

After the martyrdom of Imam Hasan that resulted from him being poisoned, Muawiya planned his strategy to establish his son Yazid's succession. But to do this was not easy. According to what Sheikh Abdalla S. Farsy states in his book *The Biography of Sayyidina Huseyn* on page 18, "(Muawiya) perceived the difficulties in breaching the covenant and planned to execute his stratagem *stealthily by prompting his governors to air this view and thus create an impression that this idea was not his but that of his governors*. He instructed his governors to promote this idea in their domains of authority casually, in the initial stage."

Having done so, he then assembled them all at one venue and as preplanned, made each of them, one after the other, propose Yazid's succession. However, all of them did not comply; among those who opposed this idea was Al Ahnaf bin Qays, who, according to Sheikh Abdalla S. Farsy (refer his book Page 20), said: '*No! We, the people of Iraq, and the people of Hijaz, too, are not in agreement with this. We are*

not satisfied with the prospect of having Yazid as the Caliph of Muslims. And you, more than any one else, know that your son is unfit (for this position). Do not purposely condemn yourself to Hell. *As for us, we shall not be satisfied unless we see this position goes to one from the progeny of Ali*."

There ensued a commotion. Sheikh reports (page 20): "Abu Khunayf *unsheathed his sword*…Addressing Muawiya, he said, '*Let him who opposes me taste this: he will then come to his senses*.' Preparing to go away, Muawiya said: '*Indeed, this is a true patriot*, one who is man of action, not mere words, one who is the best of all who are present here.' The assembly then dispersed."

Sheikh Farsy continues (page 21) saying that when Bibi Aisha, the Prophet's wife, came to know about this, "*she was very angry* because *Muawiya was going back on his promises given to Sayyidnal Hasan*…"

This matter ended at that, and no further action was taken. However, after a while, (in 50 A.H.), Muawiya went to Medina, in the words of Sheikh A. S. Farsy, "to send out his feelers." There, "he had a meeting with the sons of prominent companions (of the Prophet s.a.w.w.), namely, Abdullah bin Abbas bin Abdil Muttalib, Abdullah bin Ja'far bin Abi Talib bin Abdil Muttalib, and Abdullah bin Zubair bin Awam; he did not call for Sayyidinal Huseyn." He talked with them very graciously so as to win their approval, *but all of them turned him down*, and he went home empty handed!

"On the death of Sayyidnal Hasan," says Sheikh A. S. Farsy (page 22), "Muawiya *ordered* people of Syria to *accept Yazid* as their Caliph after him. *They complied unanimously*." He then ordered the governor of Medina to force all people of Medina to accept Yazid (as their next Caliph). According to Sheikh A. S. Farsy (page 23), "he (the governor of Medina) was *deeply agitated*, seeing no reason why a *depraved young man* should rule over the elders and the companions of the Prophet (s.a.w.w.)." Therefore, he let Muawiya know his stand; Muawiya

responded immediately, "writing him a letter to terminate his services as governor."

On receiving this letter, the governor (Marwan bin Hakam) "was furious, and accompanied by elders of his maternal relatives and members of his clan (Bani Kinana), he went to Syria to meet Muawiya with a threat of a coup. Thus threatened, *Muawiya treated the governor and his relatives with soothing words, plenty of cash and a life-long pension comprising three hundred pounds per month for him, and fifty pounds per month for each of his relatives...*"

Back in Medina, the new governor implemented Muawiya's orders fully, and reported to him those who were in the front line opposing this order. In turn, Muawiya dispatched to him individual letters for each one of them, and ordered him to extract from each of them a response. The addressees of these letters were: Abdullah bin Abbas bin Abdil Muttalib, Huseyn bin Ali bin Abi Talib bin Abdil Muttalib, Abdullah bin Ja'far bin Abi Talib bin Abdil Muttalib, and Abdullah bin Zubair bin Saffiya bint Abdil Muttalib." Sheikh A. S. Farsy reports in his book on page 24, that "the content of this letter was very harsh, *warning the addressees that he would kill them if they refused to accept Yazid's succession to Caliphate after his death*."

As per Sheikh A. S. Farsy (page 24), these dignitaries "responded in sharp and stern words. The longest reply was from Sayyidinal Huseyn."

On receiving these replies, Muawiya instructed his governor, once more, to put "*severe pressure on them to make them comply*. The governor did so, but with no success," says Sheikh A. S. Farsy (page 24). He, therefore, advised Muawiya to go to Medina to meet them personally.

Muawiya went to Medina and "after resting, he met secretly with each one of them separately, so that they should not give him one reply unanimously," says Sheikh A. S. Farsy (page 25). The first one he talked to was Imam Huseyn a.s. "He told him, 'My son! Do not create division

in the community of your grandfather. Every one is satisfied that Yazid should succeed me as the Caliph. There are no opponents to this except you and those whom you lead. They have told me that as soon as you have agreed, they, too, will be satisfied.' He (Imam Huseyn) replied, 'Bring them here and let them say so in my presence. For I do not believe that they have really told you so. However, if they truly reiterate what they have told you I, too, will, comply, but I'm certain that they will not concur.' Muawiya retorted: 'Fine, you can go, but do not disclose to any one any thing that transpired in the course of our conversation." This is what Sheikh A. S. Farsy has recorded in his book on page 25.

After Imam Huseyn a.s., Muawiya called Abdullah bin Zubair, and then Abdullah bin Umar bin al Khattab. They, too, gave the same reply as that of Imam Husayn a.s. - "verbatim." Here, Sheikh A. S. Farsy, adds (page 25-26), "Muawiya sent for Abdul Rahman bin Aby Bakrinis Sidiqq. They had an *intensively bitter exchange of words*. As they both were of the same age, their exchange of words was at par with each other, with anger."

After that, Muawiya had to change his strategy. "On the next day," says Sheikh A. S. Farsy (page 26), "he called for Sayyidinal Huseyn and Abdullah bin Abbas." After inquiring about "them and their families, he began to praise his son, Yazid, *attributing to him qualities that he had, and ones that he did not have*. Having done so, he told them, 'For this reason he deserves to become the Caliph of Muslims…'" Sheikh A. S. Farsy says on page 26 that, Imam Huseyn retorted by *describing Yazid's viciousness* and then added, "Do not add more sins to what you have already accumulated for yourself. Enough is enough. *You are violating Islamic values and Muslims' rights. by imposing on them your whims*."

When this strategy also failed, Muawiya ordered that all the three dignitaries be presented to him: they being Abdur Rahman bin Aby Bakr, Abdullah bin Umar and Abdullah bin Zubair. (See Sheikh A. S. Farsy, page 27). "He welcomed them collectively, and then told them,

'This issue of Yazid's succession *is the choice of Allah* and acceptable to all except you three. Be careful not to cause a calamity. Or else, you will incur both Allah's and *my* wrath…' *All of them contradicted him*… He decided to talk in confidence with Adur Rahman bin Aby Bakr. On hearing this talk about Yazid's succession, Abdur Rahman said: '*We don't want that to happen*. And if you implement your decision by force, *we shall re-enact the first battle fought by the Muslims, you and those who share your views being on the side of polytheists, the way your father was then*.'" So saying, Abdur Rahman walked out.

After three days, all the people of Medina were ordered to assemble. Muawiya kept close to himself all those who were opposing him; announced to those present that every nook and corner of his empire had accepted Yazid as their next Caliph except the people of Madina, and that if he knew of any other person better qualified than Yazid, he would have paved way for that person's succession, but there was no such person. Then he warned them all that he did not want to hear any opposition. He adjourned the assembly, to resume it again in the evening.

Sheikh Abdallah narrates (page 28-29) that prior to going to this meeting, Muawiya "assembled all his opponents and went with them to the meeting. When he arrived there, he said, '*I have arranged for hired killers* to be present at the assembly. I shall announce to the public that *you have now agreed with the succession of Yazid. He who does not value his life should raise his objection. For no sooner does he do so, than people will see his head rolling on the ground*.' And he had instructed his soldiers to *instantly kill anyone who dared oppose him*. Besides that, he made this threat known to all those who were present there, so that *all of them remain in a state of fear*."

Now! This is Muawiya and this is how he planned his son's succession -- that son, Yazid, whom the Wahabis regard as *Amirul–mu'minin* (the Prince of Believers), May Allah forgive us!

At this public assembly, assuming the same threatening posture that he had used in warning Imam Huseyn and others, Muawiya mounted the pulpit and said, "Be my witness that those who had been opposing me (regarding Yazid's succession) are now in agreement (with my proposal); and they are all present here. They are the patriots of Madina and the companions (of the Prophet (s.a.w.w.)). All is now well." This is what Sheikh Abdallah S. Farsy narrates in his book, page 29. He then adds, "*After that, he distributed large sums of money to the elders of each clan belonging to Muhajirs and Ansars, and others…*" This is how Yazid secured his Caliphate in the month of Rajab, A.H. 60, on the death of his father.

O my Muslim brothers! If this is how things were, as portrayed by Sheikh Abdalla Saleh Farsy, then would any genuine Muslim, who truly understands his religion, and who wishes to protect the honor of Islam, ever perceive a man like Yazid to be among the leaders of Islam, let alone accept him as *Amirul–mu'minin* or the Prince of the Believers? Bear in mind that these are not the direct acts of Yazid as such; they were perpetrated by his father, Muawiya. However, the heinous acts that he himself committed after his succession surpasses those of his father.

3
WHAT YAZID DID AS A RULER

In brief, these acts are narrated by Sheikh Abdalla S. Farsy, on pages 29 to 41, and they are as follows:

1. He ordered his Governor of Madina, Khalid bin Hakam, to extract oath of allegiance from Huseyn bin Ali bin Abi Talib, Abdulla bin Umar bin Al Khattab, Abdulla bin Al Abbas and Abdulla bin Zubair. (By then Abdur Rahman bin Abu Bakr was dead). The order was "*He should make it absolutely sure that they accepted Yazid as the Caliph of all Muslims. If they refused to do so, then their properties should be confiscated, their marriages nullified, and their slaves be declared free*."

2. When the governor wanted to impose Yazid's terms on Imam Huseyn and Abdulla bin Zubair, they asked him to wait till the following day. Sheikh Abdalla Saleh Farsy reports (page 30) that "On reaching their homes, they bade farewell to their kith and kin and went secretly to Mecca, which was the haven of safety for them…" When Yazid came to know about this, he was outraged and "revoked his governorship."

3. No sooner had Yazid ascended the throne by force, than the people of Kufa (Iraq) "invited Imam Huseyn to hasten to Iraq, to lead an uprising to dethrone the one who was *most unworthy of being the Caliph of Muslims*." The Imam did not make an immediate move; rather, he dispatched to Kufa, his cousin, (Muslim bin Aqyl) to investigate the truth of the matter. Sheikh Abdalla Saleh Farsy says (page 34-35), "Yazid appointed, as his governor of Kufa, *one who was murderous, oppressive, high-handed and aggressive, and who was hostile to Sayyidna Ali and his progeny*; his name was Ubaidillah bin Ziyad, the son of that person whom Muawiya

declared to be his brother, *only out of political necessity*. As a matter of fact, though he (Ziyad bin Abihi) was regarded to belong to Muawiya's clan of Umayyad, *he was in no way related to Muawiya, neither was he from the tribe of Qureish or even an Arab! He was of illegitimate birth* and so crafty that he dared compete with Muawiya. The latter, out of contrivance, thought it prudent to declare the former his brother and let him manage Iraq completely." Thus Ziyad was the first bastard, in Islamic History, to be given the status of legitimacy!

4. Sheikh Abdalla writes on page 35, that having appointed this new governor, Yazid ordered him to "kill Muslim bin Aqyl, those who accompanied him, those who received him, and those who supported him; and imprison their neighbors and their kith and kin, showing them *no mercy at all*." Indeed, these instructions were fully executed. "He did exactly what Yazid had instructed him to do. *He killed all those he was instructed to kill*, and he imprisoned all those he was ordered to imprison…"

In his book Sheikh Abdalla S. Farsy does not write how Muslim bin Aqyl was martyred. However, other historians have recorded in their books, stating that he was taken to the top of the royal castle, he was then beheaded and both his severed head and body were thrown from the castle. Later his severed head was dispatched to Yazid!

5. As was described in Chapter One, Sheikh Abdalla S. Farsy narrates on page 40 that after Imam Huseyn a.s. and his followers had been beheaded brutally and their heads presented to Yazid, "he (Yazid) began to strike the teeth of Huseyn, and singing aloud, he said: '*Today, I squared up with Muhammad. The way he killed my ancestors on the Day of Badr, I killed his grandchildren. And now onwards this is going to be our policy: Whoever opposes us, we shall kill them, even if they happen to be our relatives…*'"

O my Muslim brothers! Ask yourselves: Can a person, who has the

audacity of saying that he took his *revenge on Prophet Muhammad* s.a.w.w. for killing his (Yazid's) polytheist ancestors, deserve to be addressed as *Amirrul-mu'minin*? Let alone calling him The Prince of Believers, can you consider him to be even a Muslim? Didn't the Wahabis know of this fact? Or will they tell us that Sheikh Abdalla Saleh Farsy, too, was a Shia?

There is much more to know.

After the martyrdom of Imam Huseyn in 61 A.H., Yazid invaded Madina. Sheikh Abdalla Saleh Farsy tells us about this thus (page 41): "*A large number of the companions of the Prophet s.a.w.w.*, and others were killed in Madina. There was a *complete anarchy* in Madina for three consecutive days. Destruction was rampant, not only in terms of lives and wealth, but also human dignity. *All this was carried out by Yazid's orders*... As for those companions of the Prophet s.a.w.w. whose lives were spared, *Yazid ordered that they be branded on their backs as his slaves*." Lord of Mercy! This person (Yazid) is indeed *Amirul–mu'minin* (The Prince of The Believers) of the Wahabis!

Sheikh Abdallah presented this account covertly. Other narrators, however, have given a more overt description of these events. Among them is Ibn Kathir, who is highly esteemed by the international Wahabis in the same way that Sheikh Abdalla Saleh Farsy is esteemed by the Wahabis of East Africa. In his book, *Al Bidaya Wan Nihaya*, Volume Seven, page 220, he gives a numerical count of "the many companions of the Prophet *killed as 700, comprising the notable Muhajir and Ansars*, and for others as 10,000." Elaborating what Sheikh Abdalla Saleh Farsy calls "anarchy", Ibn Kathir, on page 222, states that the atrocities committed by the orders of Yazid are indescribable, and their impact "is known only to Allah." This is despite the fact that earlier, on page 220, he had already stated that "*women were raped to the extent that 1000 of them became pregnant and gave birth to children though they were unmarried*..."

Having narrated these evil deeds, and wishing us to be cautious about whom Yazid really was, Ibn Kathir, on page 223, quotes three Traditions of the Prophet . . . . First, he takes a Tradition from Bukhari, quoting the Prophet s.a.w.w. to have said "There will be none who will oppress the people of Madina *without disintegrating the way salt dissolves in water*." Second, he borrows a Tradition from Muslim that says; "Whoever has bad intentions for Madina, *Allah will melt him the way solder melts in fire, or He will dissolve him the way salt dissolves in water*." Third, he narrates on the authority of Ahmad bin Hanbal, who says, "He who wishes to cause fear through oppression to people of Madina, *Allah will cause him to be gripped by fear, and to be cursed by Him, His angels and by everyone else. Moreover, on the Day of Judgment, Allah will not accept his repentance and will not grant him forgiveness*."

Now then, is there any salvation for Yazid after what was done in Madina by his orders as stated by Ibn Kathir (page 220), and Sheikh Abdalla Saleh Farsy (page 41), and in light of the Traditions mentioned above? What type of *Amirul–mu'minin* is this who is subject to the curse of Allah, His angels and all human beings?

6. Sheikh Abdalla S. Farsi says, on page 41, that one year after the invasion of Madina, Macca, too, was invaded. "*Yazid's army massacred many people and demolished Al Kaaba*..." Here, too, Sheikh Abdalla's narration is understated, though others have been more forthright. For instance, the same Ibn Kathir, on page 225, says that Yazid's army "pelted Al Kaaba with stones through the use of catapults and attacked it even with *fire balls till its walls were set ablaze*." In *Shadharaatudh Dhahab*, Volume Three, page 72, Ibnul Imaad Al Hanbali says that so much fire was used that "the entire building (Al Kaaba) collapsed."

This is what was meted out to "The House of Allah" which, according to the Holy Quran (Ch. 3: v 97), is a place where security is guaranteed to any one entering there, seeking refuge. This security was eliminated by Yazid. And this Yazid is the *Amirul–mu'minin* of the Wahabis who

advocate that all Muslims, too, must view him as such! *Subhaanallah*!

In a nutshell, these are the evil deeds of Yazid. Let alone *Amirul–mu'minin*, would even a common Muslim dare commit such actions? Certainly not; then how come Yazid did so?

To address this question, it is essential to know what kind of a person Yazid was. Allah willing, we shall do that in our next chapter by quoting from the books of various Muslim scholars of high repute (none of whom is a Shia).

4
WHAT THE SUNNI SCHOLARS HAVE SAID

We begin with what Sheikh Abdalla Saleh Farsy says in his book, *Maisha ya Sayyidnal Huseyn* (Biography of Sayyidna Huseyn), on page 40: "As we saw earlier, Yazid's succession was established *by force and contrary to the wishes of the people*." What needs to be asked is: Is it possible that although his succession was "by force", he himself is exculpable? Is it permissible in Islam for one to rule over Muslims as *Amirul–mu'minin* on the basis of force and "contrary to the wishes of the people"?

Similar statements have been made by Sheikh Muhammad Abduh. In his exegesis of the Holy Quran, known as *Tafsirul Manaar*, commenting on Chapter 5:36-37 (p. 367, Volume Six), this Sheikh brands Yazid as "*an oppressive and tyrannical leader*, who conducted the affairs of Muslims with force and deceit." Does he deserve to be addressed as *Amirul–mu'minin*?

Our third source is Allaamah Shawkaani who, in his book on the Traditions of the Prophet, called *Naylul Awtwaar* (in Volume Seven, page 362) characterizes Yazid as "*pathological drunkard*, and violator of the sanctified ordinances." Yet he is *Amirul–mu'minin* of the Wahabis!

Our fourth source is Abul Hasan Ali bin Muhammad Bin Ali Al Twabarii, a famous Shaafi'i scholar, who, when asked about Yazid, among other things, called him "a *notorious drunkard* whose poetry in *praise of liquor* was of public knowledge." This has been extracted from page 287 of Volume Three of Ibn Khalikaan's *Wafayaatul A'yaan*.

Fifthly, Ibn Hazm, on page 98 of Volume Eleven of his book, *Al Muhallaa*, has categorized Yazid bin Muawiya with those "*who were secularist*", the thrust of whose policy was "*oppressive and devoid of any legitimacy*." Can such a person claim the title of *Amirul–mu'minin*?

The sixth source is Abul Falaah Abdul Hayy Ibnul Imaad, who is an eminent Hanbali scholar and who, on page 69 of Volume Three of his famous book, *Shadharaatudh Dhahab*, quotes another famous scholar, Imam Dhahabi, to have said: "Yazid was *hateful of Imam Ali a.s., arrogant, insolent, wine-bibber and sinful. He initiated his kingship by murdering Husayn, and he sealed it with the incident of Harra. People hated him and he was not graced with a long life*." The incident of Harra here refers to the sacking of Madina, explained by us on page 12-13.

Do you still think it appropriate to call *Amirul–mu'minin* that person who initiated his kingdom by murdering the grandson of the Prophet s.a.w.w., and crowned it with the sacking of the Prophet's city, and violating the sanctity of not less than one thousand women (of the city) by impregnating them through raping? We ask the Wahabis: What Islamic justifications do you have to back your claim?

Our seventh source is Ibn Kathir who is regarded as an authority by the Wahabis. On pages 235-236 of Volume Eight of his *Al Bidaaya Wan Nihaaya*, he enlists what have been confirmed about Yazid. Amongst these are that "Yazid was *notorious for his love of music and liquors… his illicit friendship with singing boys and girls… There was not a single day that he woke up not intoxicated…*"

Before that, on page 216 of the above mentioned volume and book, Ibn Kathir writes about the delegation, "comprising three citizens of Madina", going to Yazid. He says: "When they returned to Madina, they made public their grave findings pertaining to Yazid's perversities. They said: 'We are returning from that *person who is irreligious, who is a wine-bibber and who is surrounded by singing girls, entertaining him with music…*'". He also writes about the comments made by the Head of this delegation, Mundhir bin Zubair, upon his return from Basra, where he had gone to meet his friend, the governor (Ubaidillaah bin Ziyaad), namely that Yazid "*consumes so much intoxicants that he misses prayers!*"

There we are! When such is the case with Yazid, then what kind of a Muslim will take pride in having him as his *Amirul–mu'minin*? Let the Wahabis, who distributed the pamphlet calling Yazid *Amirul–mu'minin*, thank their stars for not having lived during the reign of Umar bin Abdul Aziz. Or else, they would have got the best of what they deserve! This Caliph was from the same clan as Yazid; nonetheless, he flogged 20 lashes that individual who addressed Yazid as *Amirul–mu'minin*! Those who want to verify this may turn to page 69 of Volume Three of *Shadharaatudh Dhahab*.

5
WHAT THE PROPHET SAID REGARDING YAZID

Having seen Yazid's perversities cited by prominent Sunni authorities, let us now look at the contents of the Traditions of the Prophet s.a.w.w., as reported by the Sunni authorities

For our purposes today, we shall dwell upon only those Traditions reported in *Sahih Bukhari*. As known by the majority of the people, to the Sunnis as well as the Wahabis, this book is regarded as the most authentic, surpassed only by the Holy Quran. To them, Traditions from this book are *most reliable, beyond any doubt!*

In Tradition Number 180 on page 147 of Volume Nine, it is stated that: "Amr bin Yahya bin Said bin Amr bin Said said: 'My grandfather narrated to me thus: I was in the company of Abu Hurayra and Marwan in the mosque of the Prophet s.a.w.w. in Madina. Abu Hurayra then said: I heard the truthful and trusted by Allah (i.e. the Prophet s.a.w.w.) saying, "The destruction of my followers will be through the hands of young men from Quraish." Marwan retorted: '*May the curse of Allah be on these youths.' Abu Hurayra said: If I could, I would have named these youths, and their parentage.' Accompanied by my grandfather, I went to Syria to meet the progeny of Marwan at the time when they were the rulers there. Whenever my grandfather saw that these rulers were young men, he would tell us: Probably, these are among them (those young men mentioned by the Prophet s.a.w.w.), and we used to reply, saying, You know better than us*'"

Before quoting the explanations of the above mentioned Tradition, those working with the English version should note that it does not fully correspond with the original Arabic text. The translator has omitted the significant part of the Tradition, printed in italics above, in the English version -- advertently or inadvertently.

Nonetheless, in his book, *Fat'hul Baari*, on page 10 of Volume Thirteen, Imam Ibn Hajar Al Asqalaani mentions a narration of Ibn Abi Shayba which says that: "Abu Hurayra used to go to the market saying: 'O Lord! Do not let me live to the year 60 A.H. nor witness the reign of the youths.'" Having said this, Imam Ibn Hajar adds, "In these words there is an indication that the first youth to come to power was in the year 60 A.H., and *indeed, this is what actually happened. Yazid bin Muawiya's succession took place in that year*, and he remained in power till his death in 64 A.H. He was succeeded by his son, Muawiya, who died after a few months."

Therefore, according to Imam Ibn Hajar, among "the Quraish youths" prophesized by the Prophet s.a.w.w. to be the ones through whose hands the destruction of his followers would be, and whom Abu Hurayra wished the Almighty to keep him away from in the year 60 A.H., was Yazid. Did the Prophet's prediction prove wrong? Wasn't the Prophet's community led astray through the massacres of Karbala, Madina and Macca as expounded hitherto? Or were those who were killed there polytheists and not Muslims? Despite all these, do we still insist that Yazid was *Amirul–mu'minin*?

Remember: Abu Hurayra did not disclose the names and the parentage of the Quraishi youths, not because he did not know them, but because he feared that if he did so he would endanger his life. This becomes clear when we revert to *Sahih Bukhari* (Tradition Number 121 on page 89 of Volume One). Which says: Narrated by Abu Hurayra: I have memorised two kinds of knowledge from Allah's Apostle s.a.w.w. I have propagated one of them to you *and if I propagated the second, then my pharynx (throat) would be cut (i.e. killed)*."

Commenting on this Tradition, on page 216 of Volume One of *Fat'hul Baari*, Imam Ibn Hajar says: "Scholars believe that the knowledge that Abu Hurayra did not disclose, relates to the Tradition in which *names, life-style and the times of the evil monarchs* have been mentioned. Abu Hurayra used to make a tacit reference about some of them, but would

never mention their real names, fearing for his own life. For instance, by seeking refuge in the Almighty from year 60 and from the reign of the youths, he was making a *tacit reference to the kingship of Yazid bin Muawiya whose reign was in the year 60 A.H*."

However, Imam Ibn Hajar was not the only person to draw this conclusion. Shihaabuddin Ahmad Al Qastwalaani too comes out with a similar interpretation of these Traditions. Those who know Arabic may refer to page 374 of Volume One, and pages 11-12 of Volume Fifteen of *Irshaadus Saari*.

Abu Hurayra, therefore, did not name Yazid, not because he did not know it, but because he was afraid that if he did so, his life would be in danger. In other words, he *observed taqiyya (dissimulation)*!

Was Abu Hurayra alone in practising *taqiyya* or others, too, observe it? We shall see that in the next chapter.

6
WHAT THE IMAMS AND SHEIKHS SAY

The first such personality is Imam Ahmad bin Hanbal. He is quoted by Imam Dhahabi in the latter's book, *Mizaanul I'tidaal*, Volume Four, page 440, to have said: "Yazid should not be accepted as a narrator of any Tradition." Besides that, Imam Dhahabi himself on the same page (where he quotes Imam Hanbal) says, "Yazid's trustworthiness is questionable. Therefore, no Traditions should be accepted from him..." There you are! Can such an unreliable person ever be regarded as *Amirul–mu'minin*?

Not only did Imam Hanbal forbid people from accepting any Tradition from Yazid, but he also cursed Yazid, in his book *Al-It'haaf Bihubbil Ashraaf*, pages 63-64 for killing Imam Husayn (a.s).

The second scholar is Sheikh Muhammad Abduh. In his exegesis of the Holy Quran called *Tafsirul Manaar* (Volume Six, pages 367-368), after explaining how Yazid opposed Imam Huseyn a.s., he says, "*May Allah forsake him* (Yazid) and all those who supported him, and those who have *hatred for Imam Ali a.s*; who continue to worship the oppressive rulers in their opposition to the establishment of justice and the religion of Allah..."

The third source is Imam Shawkaani. In his book *Naylul Awtwaar* (Volume Seven, page 362) after criticizing those who blame Imam Husayn a.s. for opposing Yazid, he *curses* both Yazid and his father (Muawiya) in these words: "*May Allah curse them*." Then, commenting on these blames, he says, "O my Lord. Just hearing such things is blood-curdling, and could shatter mountains."

Imam Taftaazaani is the fourth person to talk on this issue. He is quoted in *Irshaadus Saari* (Volume Fifteen, page12), a commentary of *Sahih Bukhari*, to have stated that the consensus among scholars is that it is

permissible "to curse those who killed Imam Husayn a.s., and those who ordered, or allowed or approved his murder." Then having said that it is a common knowledge that Yazid approved the killing of Imam Husayn r.a. and the dishonouring of the House of the Prophet s.a.w.w., he adds, "*May Allah's curse be on him (Yazid), his helpers and his associates!*."

The fifth person to expose Yazid was his own son whom he named after his father, Muawiya. He took over Caliphate on the death of his father, Yazid. But his reign was short-lived since he abdicated forty days after his succession or, by other accounts, five months after his succession. At the time of his abdication, he went on the pulpit and gave an address in which, among other things, he talked about the feud between his grand-father (Muawiya bin Abi Sufyan) and "*one who was better than him and every body else (meaning Imam Ali a.s.)*." He then mentioned his father (Yazid) and "*all his evil deeds*", and "*that he did not have the qualities befitting a Caliph of Muhammad's community*"; he then described his father's "*atrocities committed against the progeny of the Messenger of Allah*." On finishing his address, he wept bitterly and told his kinsmen, the Umayyads, that he was not prepared to carry the burden of their sins on his back. Therefore, he said: "*Do as you wish. Load this Caliphate on whomever you please. As for me, I am out of here*." This all has been narrated fully in *Taariikhul Khamiis*, Volume Two, page 301.

There you are! Having read all this (despite leaving out much more) would you still think of Yazid as *Amirul–mu'minin*? Would you still do so when his own son did not consider him to be qualified to have this title? Who would know him better, his son or an outsider? I leave this to the readers to decide.

7
WAHABIS CONTRADICT THE SUNNAH!

In their pamphlet, to which we have responded hereby, the Wahabis have criticized Sunni Imams of Mombasa for conducting lectures in the Konzi Mosque on the first ten days of the month of Muharram. This is because, in accordance with Wahabi philosophy, by so doing the Sunni Imams will have "misled the Sunnis by *imitating Shias*"!

Before responding to this aversion, we need to let our readers note two important things. First, at their gatherings, the Sunni Imams, customarily, do not discuss the same subjects that Shias do at their Muharram gatherings. As a matter of fact, the Sunni Imams say exactly the opposite of what the Shias do! How then do they mislead their congregation, and in what way do they imitate the Shias?

Second, let the Sunnis not be fooled by such statements into believing that the Wahabis are one with them. For those Sunnis who do not, according to what Wahabis say and believe, concur with them, are no different from the Shias. All are *not believers*, but *polytheists*, and "therefore spilling their blood and confiscating their wealth is legitimate, *despite the fact that they declare LA ILAHA ILLALLAH, say their prayers, fast and proclaim themselves to be Muslims*." In other words, to Wahabis, all of us -- Shias and Sunnis alike -- are unbelievers! This is not a mere accusation, but has been categorically stated on page 179 of the book on the life of their Imam, called *Muhammad Bin Abdilwahhab: Muswlihun Madhluum wa Muftaraa Alayh*, written by Ustadh Mas'ud An-Nadawii.

Has this Wahabi outcry regarding "imitating Shias" a recent practice, or has it been there before? The truth of the matter is that such propaganda was there before, though our Wahabis in Mombasa have come out with yet another inventive strategy that criticizes the Sunni Imams for

not only imitating Shias, but also indulging in an activity that was not performed by the Prophet s.a.w.w., and as such it is an innovation (*bid'a*).

At first sight, one would think that the Wahabis are genuinely out to do what the Prophet s.a.w.w. practiced, and condemn what the Prophet abstained from. However, those who have a deep insight of Wahabism know that this is far from being the truth. Under the guise of love for the Prophet s.a.w.w. the Wahabis promote their hatred toward the believers *even if the latter truly abide by what the Prophet s.a.w.w. used to do*.

As a way of illustration, let us see what Ibn Taymiyya has said on this matter. Ibn Taymiyya is from their school of thought.; he lived for 67 years and died in the year 728 A.H. His thoughts had a deep influence on Muhammad bin Abdilwahhab who, with the help of King Saud's wealth, succeeded in spreading this sect, more than Ibn Taymiyya himself. Ironically, during his life time, Ibn Taymiyya had failed to promote his sect because of the heavy opposition that he faced from his fellow sheikhs, who went to the extent of declaring him apostate!

In his book, *Minhaajus Sunnah* (Volume Two, page 143), he says, "It is appropriate to discard those recommended acts (*mustahabaat*) when they are their (Shias') trademark!" One such act that non-Shias have been urged to discard is the wearing of a ring in the right hand finger, *despite the fact that the Prophet s.a.w.w. himself used to do so*. Why so? Simply because *this tradition is customarily observed by Shias*!

O my brothers! If Wahabis brand those who do things that the Prophet s.a.w.w. did not do as the *innovators (ahlul bid'a)*, what title do we give to them for *preventing people from doing* what the Prophet s.a.w.w. used to do *merely because* such deeds are observed faithfully by those whom the Wahabis do not like (i.e. the Shias)? You be the judges to decide between the Shias and the Wahabis as to who are the strict followers of the ways of the Prophet s.a.w.w. (*ahlul sunna*), and who are the innovators (*ahlul bid'a*).

All said and done, the motive behind Wahhabis' demand to the Sunni Imams not to emulate Shias should be evaluated in light of what has been said so far. Perhaps, in conclusion, we may pause this question: Since Shias use their left hand to clean themselves after relieving their bowels, should Sunnis therefore stop using their left hands and, instead, use their right hands to clean themselves in the bathroom, just not to emulate Shias? One wonders how the Wahabis make their judgments!

APPENDIX
Open Letter to All Sunni Imams and Preachers

(The following letter was circulated by the Wahhabis to All Sunni Imams & Preachers in Mombasa (Kenya) in the year 1424 AH / 2004 CE. Also see the Foreword.)

My question is why do we specifically keep "WAIZ" sessions (Majlis) on the first ten nights of the month of Muharram; and why not in any of the other months of the year?

There is no Ahadith (dalil) that can be found that states that we should take the first ten days of Muharram as special days to observe "THAWAB" except that the Prophet (s.a.w.) has ordered:-

The Prophet s.a.w. observed the fast on the 10th of Muharram (Ashura), and ordered (Muslims) to fast on that day (Sahih Al-Bukhari)

Besides this there is no special act of "Ibadah" during these ten days.

Now the question is why do we observe these ten days of Muharram and not the ten days of, for example Dhul-Hajj or any other month? Hafsah (r.a) said:-
There were four things the Prophet (s.a.w.) *never omitted: fasting on Ashura; the first ten days of Dhul-Hijjah and three days every month, and praying two rak'ahs before dawn. Nasa'i transmitted it (Mishkat Al-Masabih).*

There is no indication of "WAIZ" sessions in these days, mentioned by Allah's Rasool (s.a.w.). Question again is why the ten days of Muharram? It is well known fact that the Shias started this custom of mourning Al-Husayn (maatam Husayn). The Shia historian Mr. Justice Amirali says, "the founder and starter of Maatam Husayn was Mazzal Dal Velmi a Shia in 352 A.H. (300 years after the incident).

This person appointed 10 days of Muharram as permanent days for the remembrance of the lamentable tragedy of Karbala. The Shias even today commemorate these 10 days of Muharram. The Iraqi Sabai narrators and authors fabricated imaginary stories of cruel acts of horrific nature, like refusal of water and of the forced combats, which are not reliable and worthy of trust and far from the truth.

These are merely wishful thoughts. Some of them are just sculptured falsehood. Some pure lies akin to the truth, in particular the details about the date and days of which they can be rejected unquestionably on the fact that the caravan of Husayn had made a very long journey over a difficult route and in difficult circumstances, could never have made it in a matter of 20 days or 22 days time and reach its destination (from Mecca to Karbala).

The fabricators of the story of his arrival on the 2nd of Muharram of 61 A.H. did this on purpose to fabricate the imaginary stories for the 10 days, which flourish the facts of cruelty, refusal of water, the battles and forced combats.

The average speed of a laden camel, which is moving in the line of a caravan under normal circumstances, is two and a half miles per hour. Now to cover a distance of about nine hundred and fifty miles of a journey (Mecca to Karbala) at the speed of two and a half miles per hour and daily traveling for twelve hours on the average would take at least 30 to 31 days and the covering of that distance in any lesser than that time is amongst the impossibilities.

The departure of Al-Husayn from Mecca was on the 10th of Dhul-Hajj 60 A.H. Many historians including Ibn-Kathir has written that: "So Husseinn with his family members and sixty kufi companions departed from Mecca for Kufa and the date of his departure was 10th of Dhul-Hajj." Therefore, as per above it was impossible for him to arrive at Karbala on the 2nd of Muharram.

But according to the truthful narrators Husayn reached Karbala on the

10th of Muharram 61 A.H., which is acceptable. Thus it is obvious that the purpose of the false and fabricated narrations of making the caravan reach its destination eight days ahead was to enable in the place of the actual and true events that had come to pass, the narrators to present happenings in the colours and in accordance with their mental ideals.

While nothing has aspired in these ten days, and all these incidents are just imaginary stories and lies, then why do we keep "Majlis" in these 10 days of Muharram?

In brief the true story is that, Husayn revolted against Amirul-Mu'minin Yazid bin Muawiya and the Kufis instigated him by supporting his idea. But when he realized on his way near Kufa, that the Kufis had betrayed his cousin Muslim bin Aqil, he diverted the caravan towards Syria.

On the way at Karbala the Amir's army halted him, and he agreed to pledge to Yazid bin Muawiya. The 60 Kufis who had accompanied Husayn saw that their fate was at stake now that Husayn has changed. When the army approached them for their weapons, these Kufis attacked and during this attack, Al-Husayn was killed (martyred).

This incident took place at Karbala when the caravan arrived on the 10th of Muharram and the fight was over in less than an hour. The claim of the Shias that Hussein was beheaded is all lies. Husseinn was buried with great respect and the Janaza namaz was led by his son Ali bin Al-Husayn (Zeinul Abideen). So when every thing was over in less that an hour, then why 10 days of "WAIZ" sessions in Muharram?

Is it an "IBADAH" commanded by Allah (s.w.t) or His Prophet (s.a.w.) to keep waiz sessions especially on the 10 days of Muharram? If you claim that you are trying to divert Sunni Muslims from following the Shias by keeping these "Majlis" sessions then I would say that you are wrong by introducing this bidah (innovation) act, and misleading the Sunni Ummah.

By holding these "Majlis" sessions for 10 days you are supporting the mourning of Al-Hussein, which is baseless and a fabricated custom introduced and practiced by the Shias. On the contrary you should enlighten the Sunni Ummah on the real events and educate them against the fabricated and false stories created by the Shias, which have been ingrained in the minds of Sunnis, for the past 12 centuries.

Ahlul-Tawheed

IMAM HUSAYN'S MESSAGE TO THE ARMY OF YAZID

On the day of Ashura facing the army of Yazid, Imam Husayn a.s. said:-

O Men! Verily the Messenger of Allah said: "If someone sees a cruel king who permits those things which have been forbidden by Allah, who disregards his duty, who opposes the way of the Messenger of Allah and acts amongst the servants of Allah sinfully and aggressively, and that person does not do anything, in action or speech, to change the situation, then it would be right for Allah to place that person (on the Day of Judgement) alongside the tyrant ruler."

"We are the slaves of Yazid and it is entirely upon him to either give back our freedom or sell us in the slave-market"

The people of Madina were forced to repeat the above words as a sign of accepting the rule of Yazid who reigned from 680 CE to 683 CE. Those who resisted had their heads chopped off.

The army of Yazid invaded Madina and Makka, the two holy cities of Islam.

Openly and publicly, Yazid rejected the belief in the Prophet of Islam. He mocked the Day of Judgement, made fun of the daily prayers (salat), wine being his drink and chess gambling was his favorite pastime at all times. He committed indecent acts even with his stepmothers and aunts. Does a person of this character and behaviour deserve to be called *Amirul–mu'minin* (Commander of the Faithful)?

This book is a translation of the original title *Yazid Hakuwa Amirul–mu'minin* authored in Kiswahili by Sheikh Abdilahi Nassir

In this book Sheikh Abdilahi Nassir corrects the claim made by the Wahhabis that Yazid was *Amirul–mu'minin*, with proofs and evidence from the traditions (ahadith) of the Prophet (s.a.w.w.) and the books of prominent Muslim scholars.

Printed and Published by:
Bilal Muslim Mission of Kenya
P. O. Box 82508 - 80100
Mombasa - Kenya