

Yazeed:

(Reponse to Some Salfis' Endeavors to Purify Him)

Author: Rafed Network

Table of Contents

Introduction	5
Vigorously opposed cursing Yazeed	5
Was there an ijma in Yazeed's Khilafath?.....	5
For the sake of brevity we shall cite al Bidaya.....	6
Imam Hassan (as) made peace to avoid bloodshed	6
The opposition of the Arab tribes to the bayya of Yazeed.....	10
Threats of physical violence to secure the bayya for Yazeed	13
Summary of these references	17
Was Yazeed's khilafat rightful?	19
Ibn Kathir's comments on Yazeed.....	21
Ibn Atheer's comments on Yazeed	22
Allamah Dhahabi's narration and verdict on Yazeed	22
Ibn Hajr's comments on Yazeed.....	22
It is not permissible to say Yazeed "(r)"	26
Deobandi Ulema have deemed Yazeed to be a fasiq.....	26
Yazeed's attack on Harra	27
Yazeed was a homosexual.....	27
Yazeed bin Mu'awiya's rejection of the Qur'an	28
The stance of Imam Hussain [as]	35
Reply One.....	35
Reply Two	35
Was this a battle of truth against falsehood?	35
Reply One	36
Reply Two.....	36
Reply Three	37
Reply Four	37
Reply One.....	38
Reply Two	38
Reply Three	38
Reply Four	38
Reply Five: The Santas are cowards	39
Reply Six.....	39
Reply	40
Reply One.....	41
Reply Two	42
Reply Three	42
Reply Four	42
Reply Five	42
Yazeed's killing of Imam Hussain [as]	44
Yazeed wrote to Ibn Ziyad telling him to kill Imam Hussain [as].....	45
Testimony of Ibn Abbas that Yazeed killed Imam Hussain [as].....	46
Yazeed's pride at killing Imam Hussain [as]	46
Did Yazeed express sadness at the death of Imam Hussain [as]?	46
Reply One	47
Yazeed's treatment of the Ahl'ul bayt [as].....	48
Reply One.....	49
Reply Two	49

Was Yazeed related to Imam Hussain[as] via marriage?The Nasibi liar says:	49
Hadith referring to Yazeed	50
Rasulullah (s) said Yazeed will destroy my religion.....	50
Analysing hadith blessing Yazeed	51
Has Yazeed been guaranteed Paradise?	51
Reply One.....	51
Reply Two: Bukhari did not trust the narrations of Imam Jafer Sadiq ..	52
Reply Three	52
Reply Four: All the narrators of this tradition are Syrian	52
Reply Five: the narrators of this hadith are enemies of Ahl'ul bayt (as). ..	53
Reply Six.....	53
Tareekh al Damishq.....	53
Reply Seven.....	54
Reply Eight	54
Reply Nine	54
Reply Ten	55
Reply Eleven.....	55
Khalid bin Madan - 'Umair bin Al-Aswad Al-Anasi -Um Haram. ...	55
Reply Eleven.....	55
Reply Twelve	56
Reply Thirteen	56
Reply Fourteen.....	57
Reply Fifteen.....	58
The alleged comments of Muhammad al Hanafiyya	61
Reply One.....	61
Reply Two	61
Reply Three	62
Reply Four	62
Cursing Yazeed	62
First Reply	63
Second Reply	64
Third Reply	64
Fourth Reply	64
Fifth Reply	65
Reply Six: The Ulema of Ahl'ul Sunnah deemed it permissible to curse Yazeed	66
Nasibi grounds for NOT cursing Yazeed.....	67
Al Suyuti personally cursed Yazeed.....	67
The Shaafi Ulema deem it permissible to curse Yazeed	68
Azam Tariq's false attempts to represent Sunni aqeedah	70
Reply One.....	70
Reply Two	70
Azam Tariq's objection to the terminology 'alahis salaam'	71
Reply	71
Azam Tariq's attack on the concept of Imamate	72
Man has the duty to appoint the Imam	73
Why do these Nasibi vigorously defend the reign of Yazeed?	74

Our appeal to justice	76
-----------------------------	----

Introduction

The topic that we present concerns the character of Yazeed ibn Mu'awiya. Whilst many would feel that this topic serves no purpose since all Muslims are aware of Yazeed's notorious character and heinous deeds, one should know that in recent years the increased influence and infiltration of Salafi and Nasibi minds into the Sunni consciousness has led to a sudden turnaround in the way that many ordinary Sunnis tend to view Yazeed.

If in the past the common Sunni would curse and condemn Yazeed, today voices shaped by influential Nasibi Shaykhs have led to Sunnis becoming confused on this topic. Some have adopted a code of silence, refusing to pass judgement on Yazeed, which is exactly what these Nasibi want; others have joined hands with these Nasibi wherein they have:

Openly advocated support for Yazeed's reign, deeming it legitimate

Rejected the notion that Imam Husayn's opposition was a battle between truth and falsehood.

Deemed Imam Husayn (as) a rebel (astaghfirullah)

Extolled Yazeed as a man of noble character

Denied his role in killing Imam Husayn (as)

Vigorously opposed cursing Yazeed

The true inspiration of the Nasibis is, unlike that of most Sunnis, a deep-seated resentment and hatred of the Ahlulbayt (family of the Holy Prophet (saws)). Numerous proofs of this exist on this website already. In this article we have decided to analyse the Nasibi appraisals for Yazeed. Whilst the focus of this article are the comments of Azam Tariq, and his passionate defence of Yazeed on the Haq,

Char Yaar Website, we also felt it imperative to clump these comments with similar comments of writers on Ansar.Org who are also trying to falsely portray themselves as warriors of Ahl'ul Sunnah.

Although we had rebutted some comments on Yazeed in our article on Mu'awiya we did not focus on the specific issue of Yazeed, who was in popular Muslim belief the most vile leader of Muslims ever. Hence the decision was taken to dedicate a separate and detailed rebuttal to this beloved Imam of the Nasibi movement.

Was there an ijma in Yazeed's Khilafath?

Kr-hcy.com states: ALL THE MUSLIM CITIZENS INCLUDING THE THEN LIVING SAHABA WITH THE EXCEPTION OF HAZRAT HUSAYN AND ABDULLAH BIN ZUBAIR SWORE ALLEGIANCE TO YAZID. WHEN HAZRAT HUSAYN DECIDED TO GO FROM MAKKAH TO KUFA WHERE THE PEOPLE WERE CONSTANTLY INVITING HIM FOR BAYT (OATH OF ALLEGIANCE) HIS CLOSE ASSOCIATES AND WELL-WISHERS LIKE ABDULLAH BIN UMAR, HAZRAT ABU SAEED KHUDRI, HAZRAT ABU DARDA, HAZART ABDULLAH BIN ABBASS, HAZART MUHAMMAD BIN ABU HANIFA ETC.

TRIED TO PERSUADE HIM NOT TO UNDERTAKE THIS JOURNEY AS IT WAS FULL OF RJSKS AND HAZARADS. THEY WERE HOWEVER, NOT SUCCESSFUL IN THEIR ATTEMPT AND HAZART HUSAYN PROCEEDED ON HIS MISSION OF REFORMATION CONCEIVED ON THE BASIS OF HIS OWN IJTEHAD.

Mu'awiya planned the succession of Yazeed for seven years We read in Iqd al Fareed Volume 2 page 247 Dhikr Mu'awiya:

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

Mu'awiya appointed Mugheera bin Shuba to carry through his objective of intimidation As evidence we shall rely on the following texts of Ahl'ul Sunnah:

Al Bidayah wa al Nihaya Volume 8 page 79 The events of 56 Hijri

Tarrekh al Kamil Voilume 3 page 252 The events of 56 Hijri

Tareekh Ibn Khaldun Volume 3 page 16

Tareekh al Khulafa page 205 Dhikr Mu'awiya

Al Imama wa al Siyasa page 152

Nasa al Kafiya page 38

For the sake of brevity we shall cite al Bidaya

"Mu'awiya made plans to remove Mugheera bin Shuba from his post of Governor of Kufa and replace him with Sa'eed bin Aas. When Mugheera caught wind of his intention, he arrived in Damascus and said to Yazeed bin Mu'awiya 'Your father should appoint you as khalifah after him'. When Yazeed asked Mu'awiya if this was indeed the case, he replied 'Who said this to you?' He [Yazeed] said Mugheera bin Shuba.

This recommendation pleased Mu'awiya immensely; he kept Mugheera in post, and ordered him to drum up support for giving bayya to Yazeed. Upon his return to Kufa, Mugheera employed his trickery to secure the bayya for Yazeed". Mu'awiya set the wheels in motion and wanted people to give bayya to Yazeed.

It is critical to note that in doing so Mu'awiya was breaching the terms of the treaty that had been reached with Imam Hassan (as), namely that Mu'awiya would NOT appoint a successor after him and that the succession to the khilafat would return to the Imams of the Shia i.e. Al-Hassan (as) and after him his successor Al-Hussain (as). Mu'awiya is thus in breach of a solemn oath he took not to make the khilafat a monarchy by appointing his own son as Crown Prince.

Imam Hassan (as) made peace to avoid bloodshed

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

For this section we shall focus on the following texts of Ahl'ul Sunnah:

Irshad al Sari Sharh Bukhari Volume 1 page 198 Bab ul Fitan

Umdah thul Qari fi Sharh Bukhari Volume 11 page 361 Kitab al Fitan

Murqaath Sharh Mishqat Volume 11 page 379

Al Istiab Volume 1 page 370

For the sake of brevity we shall cite al Irshad:

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

Mu'awiya had agreed that the Khilafat would
return to Imam Hasan (as) when he died

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

Fathul Bari fin Sharh Bukhari Volume 3 page 65 Kitab al Fitan

Mirqat Sharh Mishqat Volume 11 page 38 Bab Manaqib Ahl'ul Bayt

Al Bidayah wa al Nihaya Volume 8 page 80 events of 57 Hijri

Hayaath al Haywaan Volume 1 page 53 Dhikr Khilafa

Tareekh Khamees Volume 2 page 29 Dhikr Hasan

Al Imama wa al Siyasa page 18 Sulh Hasan

Al Istiab Volume 1 page 370 Dhikr Hasan

For the sake of brevity we shall cite al Bidayah:

"At the time of the peace treaty, Mu'awiya agreed that the khilafat would
return to Hasan when he died"

In Fathul Bari we read:

"At the time that the peace treaty was agreed Hasan stated that 'I have
made this treaty on the condition that after Mu'awiya I succeed as Khalifa'.

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

Mu'awiya sought to secure the bayya for
Yazeed whilst Imam Hasan was alive

We read *Al Imama wa al Siyasa page 155 Dhikr bayya Yazeed*

"An Iraqi tribal chief said to Mu'awiya 'As long as Hasan is alive the
people of Iraq and Hijaz shall not give bayya to Yazeed."

Mu'awiya had potential successor and rival

Abdur Rahman bin Khalid poisoned

We read in *al Istiab Volume 2 page 400*:

"Mu'awiya said to the people of Syria, 'I want to appoint a successor over
you and need your advice'. The people liked Abdul Rahman bin Khalid, but
Mu'awiya could not tolerate this, since his intention was to appoint Yazeed
[his own son] as his successor. After this Abdul Rahman became ill and he
[Mu'awiya] asked his Jewish physician Ibn Athaal to give him poison to
drink. The physician then administered this poison to Abdul Rahman".

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

innocent Shias in the Yemen), Khalid is hailed as a great champion of the khilafat and a hero by the Sunnis.

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

We read in *al Baidayah wa al Nihaya Volume 8 page 89*:

"Mu'awiyah wrote to Marwan [who was of the same Umayyad tribe as Uthman, Abu Sofyan, Mu'awiya and Yazeed] and told him to get the people of Madina to give bayya to Yazeed. When Marwan entered into discussions with the tribe of Salim, Abdul Rahman ibn Abu Bakr stated 'In the same way that one king nominates another king to succeed him; one Umayyad is seeking to appoint another Umayyad to succeed him'. Marwan then told Abdul Rahman to be silent when Abdul Rahman refused to give bayya to Yazeed, Mu'awiya sent Abdul Rahman one thousand dirhams.

Abdul Rahman replied 'Do you expect me to sell my religion for dinars?'" Imam of Ahl'ul Sunnah Mahmud Abu Riyyah in his excellent Shaykh al Mudira page 168 states that Mu'awiya used force to secure bayya for Yazeed and discretely splayed with poison those that he could not bribe "Even if that meant using methods such as poison, he used this method that led to the deaths of Hasan, Abdul Rahman bin Abu Bakr and Abdul Rahman bin Khalid".

Whilst Nasibis such as Ansar have no love for Ahl'ul Bayt (as) we would at least urge them to look at the case of the son of Abu Bakr, the natural brother of Ayesha and brother in law of Rasulullah (s). Anyone who has the slightest love for Abu Bakr should have nothing to do with Mu'awiya.

Mu'awiya even killed Hadhrath Ayesha so as to secure the bayya for his son We read in Ahl'ul Sunnah's authoritative work Habeeb as Sayyar Volume page 58:

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

Ayesha is the mother of the believers and no momin would ever contemplate killing his mother. This legitimate bayyah that these Nasibi like singing about cannot be deemed to be the correct by anyone that has love for Ayesha in his heart. To secure this bayya, Mu'awiya murdered the son and daughter of Abu Bakr, he killed Imam Hassan (as), Sa'd bin Abi Waqqas and Abdur Rahman bin Khalid.

Is there really any ground to deem an ijma that involved the murder of these prominent personalities? If this is still deemed ijma then we would like to counter this by stating that Uthman was also killed by the ijma of the people, do you accept this ijma? Contradictions abound in Sunni Islam, really harsh ones that only those of the attitude 'I was born into a Sunni family and will die a Sunni' can accept.

The family of Umar's opposition towards the bayya of Yazeed

We read in *Fathul Bari Volume 13 page 80*:

"Mu'awiya asked Abdullah ibn Umar to give bayya to Yazeed. Mu'awiya then sent 100,000 dirhams to Abdullah ibn Umar, he refused to accept this. He then sent a treasure chest to Hifa with the message that he gives bayya. Ibn Umar said 'These dirhams are because he is chasing bayya'

The family of Uthman's opposition towards the bayya of Yazeed and Mu'awiya's use of bribery to secure compliance

We read in *al Imama was al Siyasa Volume 2 page 184*:

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

We read in *Tareekh ibn Asakir Volume 6 page 159 Dhikr Saeed bin Uthman*:

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

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

Marwan's opposition towards the bayya of Yazeed and Mu'awiya's use of bribery to secure his compliance We read in *al Imama wa al Siyasa Voume 1 page 164, Bayya Yazeed*:

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

That did the trick and shut him up, Marwan was also on board now! We read in *Muruj al Dhahab Volume 3 page 38*:

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

That's right Yazeed, keep the khilafat in the family.

The opposition of the Arab tribes to the bayya of Yazeed

We read in *Thalkhees ibn Asakir Volume 5 page 92 Dhikr Khalida bin al Mu'ammara*

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

Nasibi Hujjaj bin Yusuf's admission that he used violence to secure the khilafat for Yazeed We read in *Iqd al Fareed Volume 2 page 20* about the assassination of witnesses to Yazeed's playboy lifestyle in Mu'awiya's palace:

"Hujjaj bin Yusuf once told Mu'awiya's grandson Khalid bin Yazeed

'Listen, I killed one hundred people with this sword, as they deemed your father [Yazeed] to be a kaafir, and they would testify to his drinking, to the point that that their blood on this sword would testify that Yazeed was the khalifa.'"

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

Banu Hashim's opposition to the bayya of Yazeed was the reason for their genocide We shall now quote directly from *al Imama wa al Siyasa page 163*:

"Mu'awiya sent a letter to Husayn that stated 'Banu Hashim, Salaamun Alaykum, accept Yazeed's leadership and refrain from opposing me'.

Husayn replied saying:

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

The opposition of Abdullah ibn Abbas towards the bayya given to Yazeed We are continuing from where we left off in *al Imama wa al Siyasa*:

Mu'awaiya wrote to Abdullah ibn Abbas (both men are accepted as reliable, honest transmitters of Hadith and Santa Clauses by the Sunnis):

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

Ibn Abbas replied:

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

Ibn Qutaybah then records a letter from Mu'awiya to Banu Hashim that was sent to Ibn Jafer: 'Up until now my view of you was a good one. I have now received information on some matter about you that I dislike. If you don't accept my son's right to rule I shall pressure you and threaten you.'

Ibn Qutaybah records Ibn Jafer's reply as follows:

"I received your letter, your intention is to force me to accept the khilafat of Yazeed. Well, we made you and your father accept Islam, and you only accepted out of desperation [i.e. Mu'awiya is an hypocrite who only 'converted' when he was beaten, and never embraced Islam in his heart]". Our Ahl'ul Sunnah brothers have an aqeedah that there were four rightly guided khalifahs. They should know that the family of these four khalifahs all opposed the Khilafat of Yazeed.

The opposition of the sons of Ashra Mubashura [the supposed 10 companions promised Paradise in Sunnidom] to the bayya of Yazeed, Mu'awiya's cursing them and advising Yazeed to kill them We read in *Iqd al Fareed Volume 2 page 247 Bayya Yazeed* as follows:

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

We read in *Tareekh Kamil Volume 3 page 284 Dhikr Bayya Yazeed*:

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

al Bidayah Volume 8 page 115 Dhikr Wafaath Mu'awiya

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

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

Threats of physical violence to secure the bayya for Yazeed

In '*Abu Hanifa ki Siyasi Zindagee page 51' al Misra page 115 Volume 2* it is cited the way that Abdullah bin Umro bin Aas gave bayya to Yazeed:

"When Ibn Sa'eed approached his door with firewood, and said 'Give bayya to Yazeed otherwise I shall set your home alight', Abdullah then joined the majority by giving bayya to Yazeed".

Yes, burning people's homes was a favourite threat from the khalifa to get people to see things their way. It didn't work to get the Bayya when Abu Bakr and Umar burned Ali (as) and Fatima (as)'s house, but it worked here and got the desired result. I wonder how the Nasibis live with their religion?

Please see our article "Burning the house of Fatima [sa]"

Mu'awiya's use of threats to secure Yazeed's khilafat We read in *al Bidaya Volume 7 page 79 Dhikr events of 54 Hijri* "5 people rejected the bayya to Yazeed.

Abdur Rahman bin Abu Bakr

Abullah bin Umar

Abdullah bin Zubayr

Abdullah bin Abbas

Husayn bin 'Ali

Mu'awiya then personally went to Medina, summoned all five and threatened them."

We read in *Tareekh Kamil Volume 3 page 455 Dhikr bayya Yazeed*:

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

We read in *Tareekh Tabari Volume 7 page 177 Events of 56 Hijri*:

"Abdur Rahman bin Abu Bakr refrained from giving bayya to Yazeed. Mu'awiya called him and said 'You have the audacity to raise your hands and feet against me? By Allah I am thinking of having you killed'. Abdur Rahman said 'By killing me, then your punishment shall be that Allah (swt) shall curse you in this world and throw you in Hell in the next"

We read in *Nuzul al Abrar page 89 Dhikr bayya Yazeed*:

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

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

Mu'awiya's withdrawal of stipends to Banu Hashim for their rejection of Yazeed We read in *al Imama wa al Siyasa Volume 1 page 173 Dhikr Bayya* as follows:

"Mu'awiya sent stipends to the people of Medina he increased their amounts, with regards to Banu Hashim stipends were withdrawn as they had rejected the bayya of Yazeed"

We read in *Tareekh Kamil Volume 3 page 256*:

"When Mu'awiya made preparations to return to Syria, Ibn Abbas complained 'You have perpetuated injustice against us'. Mu'awiya replied 'Your chief Husayn bin 'Ali has not given bayya'".

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

Mu'awiya adopted evil methods to secure the bayya to Yazeed We read in *Tafseer Ruh al Ma'ani page 73 Surah Muhammad Part 29*:

"If people analyse history, they shall realise how people were forced to give bayya to Yazeed, and that Mu'awiya adopted every wicked method to secure bayya".

Mu'awiya used every means at his disposal to secure bayya for his Nasibi son: bribery, threats, intimidation and killing. Despite this we have Nasibi such as Abu Sulaiman and Azam Tariq deeming his bayya to be legitimate simply because he got it. This is no dissimilar to what goes on at the United Nations. The Sunni khilafat is one big legal loophole whereby the worst men are revered as saints. It is part of the Nasibi religion...one big sickening legal loophole. The integrity, the honesty, the TRUTH is with Shia Islam and the 12 Shia Imams.

Imam Husayn (as) refused to play ball with the American President of his time, the Sunni khalifa Yazeed, appointed like George Bush was through a legal loophole and through his father's influence. Nawasibis condemn Hussain (as). Real Muslims applaud him. The mentality of the Nasibis is that of southern rednecks in America - "What MY President (Khalifa) does is ALWAYS right. God bless America (Sunni Islam).

How can WE be wrong? George Bush (Yazeed) is our leader. He's as good as his father George Bush Snr. (Mu'awiya)." And just like George Bush Jr, Yazeed was the vile (but stupid) son of a cunning father. And just like Bush, he has the media (Nasibi scholars such as the Ansar site) feeding the masses his lies. Only difference is Mu'awiya and Yazeed, father and son, were several times worse even than the Bushes in the White House.

Abu Sulaiman al Nasibi's claim that there was an ijma in Yazeed's khilafat is an absolute lie Advocate of Mu'awiya Ibn Hajr al Makki in *Thatheer al Janaan page 109 Dhikr Khalasa Jang Jamal* states:

"The Sahaba were just, but on some occasions they would make such mistakes that were not becoming of the Sahaba. Such mistakes can be highlighted. For example Mu'awiya's appointing his son as Khalifah was a mistake, his love for his son clouded his eyes. This love in effect made

Mu'awiya blind, and his making Yazeed the khalifah was a mistake, may Allah (swt) forgive him."

This is a polite way to say nepotism.

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

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

Another defender of Mu'awiya, Allamah Abdul Hai states in *Mahmuwa Naqwi Volume 2 page 94* states:

At the time of the bayya to Yazeed, Hadhrath Husayn and other Sahaba did not give bayya. Those who did give bayya were forced to do so; it was known that Yazeed was a fasiq and faajir.

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

In *Fatawa Azeezi page 227 al Muhaddith Shah Abdul Aziz* states as follows:

"People in Makka, Medina and Kufa were unhappy at filthy Yazeed being made heir apparent, and Imam Husayn, Abdullah bin Umar, Abdullah bin Abbas, Abdullah bin Zubayr and other Sahaba did not give bayya".

Medina was the capital and heart of Islam where the family of the Holy Prophet (saws) and remaining companions lived. When the people of Madina rejected the khilafat of Yazeed then to all extent and purposes Nasibi Abu Sulaiman's claim that Yazeed's khilafat was legitimate on account of ijma is an absolute lie. It doesn't get more clear-cut than this. In *Shaheed Karbala page 11 Part 19* the Hanafi scholar Mufti Muhammad Shaafi writes:

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

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

We read in *Takmeel al Iman page 178 by Shah Abdul Haq Dehlavi*:

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

This further destroys Nasibi Abu Sulaiman's false claim that ijma constitutes legitimacy. Shah Abdul Haqq also wrote in Ba Shabaath basnaath page 36 as follows:

"The reality is Yazeed was born in 25 or 26 Hijri, and just like his father public disdain was no barr on him attaining power". i.e. father and son displayed a trait peculiarly common to many notorious families, who want power at any cost, even human life.

Maulana Akbar Shah Abadi in *Tareekh Islam Volume 2 page 56* stated:

"Mu'awiya's securing bayya for his son during his lifetime was a major mistake, this mistake was on account of his blind love for his son".

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

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

Mu'awiyah was eager for people's agreement to give allegiance to his son Yazeed. He resolved to take allegiance to Yazeed as a crown prince. So he consulted the grandest companions, the masters of the people and the district's governors. They all accepted. Delegations from the districts came with acceptance to give allegiance to Yazeed. Ha...ha...ha. What a bunch of lies for our readers to laugh at: What's this ... 'grandest companions'? We have proved that Mu'awiya killed or bribed them all! This is called whitewashing history...something very common in Sunni Islam. Sometimes the Nawasibis even rewrite history. Yes, it's the Santa Claus fairytales again in a different guise.

That Pinocchio factor in Sunni Islam, like you have in today's world leaders...they just lie. Abu Sulaiman must have a very rich plastic surgeon. What, how many nose jobs is it now? We would like to cite an example of this wonderful 'consultation' process that Mu'awiya adopted, and leave it to our readers to think whether this bayya was really as popular as Abu Sulaiman would have us believe. We read in *Tareekh Kamil*, Dhikr events of 56 Hijri *Volume 3 pages 257*:

"In his efforts to secure bayya for Yazeed, whilst in Makka Mu'awiya summoned the key members from the families of Abu Bakr, Umar, Banu Hashim and Ibn Zubayr to be brought to him. He then said to them all 'I am about to make a speech and should any one of you interrupt me, this shall be the last thing that he shall say, his head shall be removed with this sword'. He then called an officer and said that he should position two soldiers next to each of these chiefs, 'should they oppose what I say then strike off their heads'.

The chieftains were then brought before the podium accompanied by the guards. Mu'awiya began to speak, he praised the chieftains and then said that these individuals 'have expressed their pleasure at the bayya given to Yazeed and have also given bayya', with that the speech was brought to an end. When these Chieftains left and the people asked them about the situation, they said 'we have not given bayya to Yazeed'. When they were

asked why they had not spoken up, they replied, 'we were under the threat of death'.

Nasibi ideology justifies such methods of despotic government. For them, obedience to the leader, be that man lawful or not, is mandatory. We the Shia do not regard as true Khalifas men who broke the sacred rules by which leadership is bestowed. This is a cardinal difference between Shia and Sunni. The Sunnis believe that a man who fixes the elections and becomes leader must be obeyed, or even one who like Mu'awiya murdered to do so. There is no other explanation other than this is as might is right, they believe, and all that counts is that man's holding the leadership and the army. The Shia believe that the leader must be bestowed with leadership in an honest and halal fashion.

We believe that one who is unlawfully appointed is not the lawful leader. The unlawful leader has no right to demand our obeisance. Unbiased men and women can decide on who is right, Shia or Sunni. It is as obvious as the difference between day and night. It is in this context that the case of Yazeed becomes an embarrassment for Sunnis. For their khalifa Yazeed denied that Muhammad (saws) was even a prophet, in al Tabari stating that the Qur'an was a fabrication. In the first year of his rule Yazeed slayed al-Husayn (as), in the second year of his rule he put the people of Madina to the sword, and in the third year of his rule he burned the Ka'aba.

All three actions are in the Sunna of Shia and Sunni acts which condemn a man to hellfire. Yet by Sunni orthodoxy Yazeed must be obeyed, and those of the khalifa's army who refused to slay Husayn (as), slay the people of Madina, or burn the Ka'aba, were transgressors! Conscience does not exist in Sunni Islam when it comes to the relationship of client/citizen to leader. The notion of individual accountability for one's actions is dummed down when it comes to obeying the leader.

This strange and morally unacceptable position comes from the fact that men like Mu'awiya and Yazeed had scholars in their pockets, on their payroll, bribed like the men named above, to spin doctor Hadith that were falsely attributed to Muhammad (saws). Sahih Bukhari notes Abu Hurayra being caught lying about the Hadith he would fabricate, yet the same Sahih Bukhari, each word of which is Gospel and the truth for Sunnis, takes most of its Hadith from the same Abu Hurayra.

Summary of these references

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

Bribery, financial indictments and political positions

Economic sanctions

Physical intimidation

Threats of violence

State sponsored executions and state terrorism

Poison administered by his secret police

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

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

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

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

Was Yazeed's khilafat rightful?

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

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

The concept of ijma is null and void since Allah (swt)'s opposition to the bayya to Yazeed can be proven from the Qur'an Here we shall rely upon the following sources of Ahl'ul Sunnah and their commentaries of Surah Baqarah verse 124 (Yusuf 'Ali transliteration):

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

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

Tafseer Khazana volume 1 page 89

Ma'am al Tazeel Volume 1 page 89

Fathul Qadeer Volume 1 page 140

Faseer Mudharik al Tazeel Volume 1 page 84

Tafseer Durre Manthur Volume 1 page 118

Tafseer Jama al Mubeen Volume 1 page 118

Tafseer Gharab al Qu'an Volume 1 page 439

Tafseer Ibn Katheer Volume 1 page 167

Ahkam al Quir'an Volume 1 page 69

Tafseer al Kabeer Volume 1 page 494

Let us first of all see what Allah (swt) says in Surah Baqarah verses 124:

In Tafseer Khazana volume 1 page 89 we read as follows:

"Allah (swt) said to Ibrahim (as) that we have made the condition of Imamate to be the same as that of Prophethood, that he who amongst your descendants is Dhaalim cannot attain it".

The verse clearly guarantees Imamate to be administered, but NOT to those that are unjust. The Ahl'ul Sunnah Ulema in their tafseers have defined Dhalimoon (pronoun of the noun Dhaalim) as kufr and fisq (transgression). Both of these traits were inherent in Abu Sulaiman's Imam Yazeed ibn Mu'awiya.

The opinions of Ahl'ul Sunnah on the kufr and fisq of Yazeed As evidence we are relying on the following texts of Ahl'ul Sunnah:

Al Bidayah wa al Nihaya Volume 8 pages 232,224 and 248

Siyar A'lam Al-Nubala" Volume 4 pages 37-38

Al Sawaiqh al Muhroqa page 131

Thatheer al Janaan page 115

Sharh Fiqh Akbar page 73

Fatawa Azezi pafe 80 Dhikr Yazeed

Nuzool al Abrar page 97 Dhikr Yazeed

Ya Nabi al Mawaddath Volume 2 page 325 Part 60

Al Nasaa al Kaafiya page 120
Tareekh Ibn Khaldun Volume 1 page 179
Sharh Aqaaid Nasfee page 113 *Dhikr Yazeed*
Tareekh Kamil Volume 3 pages, 152, 153 and 156 and 450 events of 52
Hijri
Al Imama wa al Siayasa page 165
Iqd al Fareed Voume 2 page 258 *Dhikr Yazeed*
Tareekh Abu al Fala Volume 1 page 186 *Dkihr al Khabar Mu'awiya*
Al Akbar al Taweel page 268 *Dhikr Yazeed*
Tareekh Tabari Volume 7 page 146
Rasail page 129 by Abu Bakr Jauzi
Maqathil Husayn page 172 Ch 9
Tadkhira Khawwas page 164
Shazath al Dhabab Volume 1 page 69 events of 61 *Hijri*
Tareekh al Khulafa page 204 *Dhikr Mu'awiya*
Al Khabar al Awal page 61 *Dhikr Hukumith Ibn Ziyad*
Tareekh Khamees oage 300 *Dhikr Yazeed*
Hayaath al Haywaan Volume 2 page 196
Tareekh Islam Volume 2 page 356 events of 63 *Hijri*
Ahsan aur Meezan Volume 5 page 284
Tafseer Mazhari Volume 5 page 61 *Surah Ibraheem part 13*
Murudjh al Dhahab Volume 3 page 78 *Dhikr Yazeed*
Taufa Ithna Ashari page 6 *Chapter 1*
Muttalib al Saul Volume 2 page 26 *Dhikr Husayn*
Nur al Absar page 139 *Dhikr Husayn*
Sharh Muqassid Volume 2 page 309 *Part 6*
Al Tabaqat al Akbar Volume 5 page 96
Mustadrak al Hakim Volume 3 page 522
Tareekh Ibn Asakir page 275
Al Isaba page 181
Meezan al Itidal Volume 4 page 440
Wafa al Wafa Volume 1 page 127
Tahdheeb al Itidal Volume 11 page 361
Tabthaseer wa al Sharaf page 265 *Dhikr Yazeed*
Mujum al buldan Volume 2 page 253 *Dkikr Harra*
Fathul Bari Volume 13 page 70 *Dhikr Yazeed*
Irshad al Sari Volume 10 pages 171 and 199 *Bab ul Fitan*
Sirush Shahadathayn page 26 *Dhikr Shahadath Imam Hasan*
Minhajj al Sunnah page 239 *Dhikr Yazeed*
Takmeel al Iman page 178
Shaheed Karbala pages 11-12 by Mufti Muhammad Shaafi
Sharh Muwatta Imam Malik Volume 5 page 435 by Shaykh Muhammad
Zakaria
Tareekh Milat page 55 *Part 3* by Qadhi Zaynul Abideen
Tarrekhl Islam Volume 2 page 56 by Akbar Najeeb Abadhi
Bahar Shariat Volume 1 page 76
Hidayaath al Shi'a Volume 1 page 95 by Allamah Rasheed Ahmad
Gangohi

Isthaklah ai Yazeed page 312 by Maulanan Lal Shah Bukhari
Fitna Kharijee Volume 1 page 267 by Qadhi Madhar Husayn
Mukthubaath Shaykhul Islam Volume 1 page 267 by Maulana Husayn Hamdani
Sharh Shifa Volume 1 page 694 by Mulla 'Ali Qari al Hanafi
Siraaj Muneer Sharh Jama Sagheer Volume 3 page 382
Hujutul Balagha page 507
Qasim al Ulum page 221
Nabraas ala Sharh Aqaaid page 553
Ahsaaf al Ghaneen page 210
Yazeed bin Mu'awiya page 30 by Ibn Taymeeya
Muktobaath page 203 by Qadhi Thanauallah Panee Pathee
Al Shabeeya page 60 by Barelvi
Al Mafooz page 114 Barelvi
Ahsaan alwa page 52 by Barelvi
Ahkam Shariat Volume 2 page 88 Barelvi
Fatawi Volume 5 page 51 by AA Thanvi
Fatawa Rasheediya Volume 1 page 7
Skahyk al Islam bu Muhammad Qaim Nanothi Voluime 1 page 258
Imam Pak aur Yazeed paleeth by M Shaafi page 33
Tabat Ibn Sa'd page 283 Dhikr Ma'aqil bin Sanan
Mirqaat Sharh mishkaat Volume 1 page 120
Umdah Qari fo Sharh Bukhari Volume 11 page 334
Fatawa Azeezi Volume 1 page 21
Izalath al Ghaneen Volume 1 page 368 by Maulana Haydher 'Ali
Muttalib al Saul page 26
Nur al Absar page 139
Neel al Authar Volume 7 page 181 Dhikr Jihad
Tahdheeb Abu Shakur Shaami page 15
Al Samra page 317 by ibn Shareef Shaami
Mujmua al Zadhaar page 241
Khilafat Mu'awiya aur Yazeed page 378 Dhikr Yazeed
Muruj al Nubuwwat Volume 1 page 126
Ahkam al Qur'an Volume 3 page 119
Tareekh Ibn Asakir Volume 5 page 107
Tafseer Ruh al Ma'ani page 72 Surah Muhammad
Siraj Muneera Sharh Jama al Sagheera Volume 2 page 80 Letter Alif
Shadharat al Dhahab page 69, Volume 1
Wafa al-Wafa Volume 1 page 217

Ibn Kathir's comments on Yazeed

Ibn Kathir is the Wahabi's biggest historian and a student of Ibn Taymiyya himself. As far as Wahabis are concerned, his words are written in gold. Yet Ibn Kathir himself writes in al Bidayah:

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

Listen up you Nasibi scholars! This is what the second highest ranking Wahabi scholar in history says, so why do you come out with this nonsense about Yazeed? Can the religion of truth confusion?

Ibn Atheer's comments on Yazeed

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 naration and verdict on Yazeed

Yazeed's drinking despite Azam Tariq'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*:

"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 [civil word for bestiality], we declare that we have broken our allegiance to him. Abdullah bin Abi Umro bin Hafs Mukhzumee commented 'Yazeed gave me gifts. But 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

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

"There is difference between Ahl'ul Sunnah over whether Mu'awiya's heir apparent Yazeed was a kaafir. One group have deemed Yazeed to be a kaafir, another has stated he was a Muslim but a fasiq (transgressor), a fajir (one that commits debauchery) and a drunkard. There is consensus over his fisq (transgression). One party of Ulema have stated that you can curse him by name, this includes individuals such as Ibn Jauzi and Ahmad. 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** all 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".

In Thatheer al Janaan, Ibn Hajr al Makki had stated:

"Rasulullah (s) witnessed a dream in which thirty individuals were jumping on his pulpit like monkeys. This pained Rasulallah (s) so much that until his death no one ever witnessed him smiling. The thirty include the family of Marwan and Yazeed, Yazeed was the worst of them and the greatest Fasiq, and there is a group amongst the [Sunni] imams that have issued fatwas deeming Yazeed to be a Fasiq and a kaafir. Rasulallah (s) said that the Deen would be destroyed at the hands of the youth from Quraysh. This refers to Banu Marwan, Yazeed bin Mu'awiya and others. Yazeed ranks amongst the most debased dhaalims and fasiqs of all time".

Ibn Hajr al Makki like Abu Sulaiman and Azam Tariq was a major adherent of Mu'awiya, and in fact wrote a book in honour of Mu'awiya. Yet even he deemed Yazeed to be a fasiq. The Ulema of Ahl'ul Sunnah are united that Yazeed was a fasiq. Nasibis such as Abu Sulaiman and Azam Tariq of course beg to differ as they support anyone who hates Ahlulbayt, even if that person uses his penis to penetrate the anuses of young boys and dogs, and the vaginas of his sisters and mother. Nasibis portray the most debased sinners as saints. The Santa Claus fairytale is taken to new heights of lying with Yazeed. Yes, I said he had sex with his mother also, for we read in Tareekh al Islam:

"Dhahabi narrates that when Abdullah bin Kuzai returned from Damascus he stated that Yazeed performs zina with his mother, sister and daughters. We had better start a movement to oppose Yazeed otherwise stones may reign down on us".

This is one reason why Ibn Hajar al Makki (above) calls Yazeed one of the most debased men in history.

A Sahaba's testimony that Yazeed was an incestuous drunkard In Isaba we read:

"The Sahaba Maqil stated that 'Yazeed drank alcohol, committed zina with his mahram relatives, infact he performed every type of bad action"

al Muhaddith Shah Abdul Aziz's comments on Yazeed In Sirush Shahadathayn, Shah Abdul Aziz states:

"Imam Husayn did not give bayya to Yazeed because he was a drunkard, a fasiq and Dhaalim".

Ibn Taymeeya's condemnation of unjust Yazeed Ibn Taymeeya in *Minhajj*:

"Yazeed had the sword and hence he had the power to deal with anyone that opposed him. He had the power to reward his subjects with the contents of the treasury, and could also withhold their rights. He had the power to punish criminals; it is in this context that we can understand that he was the khalifah and king. Issues such as Yazeed's piety or lack of it, or his honesty

or lack of it, is another matter. In all of his actions Yazeed was not just, there is no dispute amongst the people of Islam on this matter".

Ibn Taymeeya here acknowledges that none of Yazeed's actions were just, and then this automatically means some of his actions also fall within the category of fisq. For a Nasibi such as Ibn Taymeeya to acknowledge such a fact is a major coup, it seems that Azam Tariq and Abu Sualiman's al Nasibi aqeedah is worse than Ibn Taymeeya for these Mullah's are seeking to portray Yazeed in a pious just manner that even Ibn Taymiyya does not! Tell me this you 21st century Nasibis. This is damming for you. The grand sheikh of the Nasibis, Ibn Taymiyya himself, says that Yazeed's evil character and actions are indisputable and unanimously accepted by all scholars. So why have YOU taken it upon yourselves to glorify Yazeed as a Santa Claus and saint? After all, you say Ibn Taymiyya's opinion overrides that of any scholar. This proves that Nasibi'ism /Wahabi'ism is no religion for it has no order or logic in it. It is a confused cult. It feeds on the deep resentment and hatred within the hearts of men. It is a vicious, irrational cult that is pathetically humiliated when asked to debate in the open arena. Ibn Taymiyya's own fatwa on Yazeed damns Nasibi'ism/Wahabism, which he is the leading scholar of. Just recite this fatwa to **ANY Nasibi** and you will stop him dead in his tracks.

Yazeed's rule was dogged by alcoholism and transgression We read in *Muruj al Dhahab*:

"Due to his hatred of Allah (swt) Yazeed openly drank alcohol. In his deeds he followed the Seerah of Pharoah, but Pharoah was more just to his own subjects."

Ibn Khaldun states:

"Yazeed's time of governance can be seen as fisq and debauchery, and the blame is on Mu'awiya who should have controlled him".

We read in Tareekh Kamil:

"The narrator states 'By Allah, Yazeed drinks alcohol and abandons Salat"

We read in Tareekh Abul Fida:

"Yazeed played the tambourine, drank alcohol and raised bears [civil expression for bestiality]".

Hayaath al Haywaan states:

"Yazeed would hunt with cheetas, play chess and drink alcohol".

People opposed Yazeed due to his atrocious deeds We read in Tareekh Khamees:

"The people of Medina broke the bayya to Yazeed on account of his bad acts, he used to drink alcohol"

Qadi Thanauallah's comments on Yazeed's kufr poetry We read in Tafseer Mazhari:

"Yazeed deemed drinking alcohol to be Halaal, and he recited these couplets 'if the Deen of Ahmad deems alcohol to be haraam Any narrations by Yazeed are to be rejected In Ahsan aur Meezan:

"Yazeed was a fasiq, faajir, we cannot rely on his narrations"

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

Haqq Dehlavis comments on impure Yazeed the drunkard In *Takmeel al Iman* page 97 Shah Abdul Haqq Dehlavi gives Yazeed a number of titles such as impure, fasiq and drunkard.

It is not permissible to say Yazeed "(r)"

In Fatawa Abdul Hai, the author states after condemning Yazeed, "one should not say Yazeed radhina or rahmathullah".

Barelvi Ulema have deemed Yazeed a fasiq Ahmad Reza Barelvi in Irfan al Shariat stated:

"There is an agreement amongst the Ahl'ul Sunnah that he was a fasiq and a fajir, the dispute is over whether he was a kaafir".

Shariat Mukhammad Majid 'Ali Shakir stated in Badh Shariat:

"Some say 'Why should we discuss such a thing since he [Yazeed] was a King and he [Husayn] was also a King' - one who makes such comments {refusing to hold opinion on Yazeed and Husayn (as)} is accursed, a Kharijee, Nasibi and hell bound. The dispute is over whether he [Yazeed] was a kaafir. The madhab of Abu Hanifa stipulates that he was a fasiq and fajir, nor was he a kaafir nor a Muslim".

Deobandi Ulema have deemed Yazeed to be a fasiq

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

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

Ashraf 'Ali Thanvi in Fatawi stated:

"Yazeed was a fasiq, there are different levels of fisq".

Rasheed Ahmad Gangohi in Fatawa said:

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

In Shaheed ai Kerbala aur Yazeed, Deobandi scholar Muhammad Tayyib stated:

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

Maulana Muhammad Shaafi in 'Imam Pak aur Yazeed Paleeth' stated:

"Yazeed was not pious rather but was a fasiq, fajir, dhaalim and a drunkard".

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

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

In 'Siraaj Muneera', Allamah 'Ali bin Ahmad also stated that the hadith refers to Yazeed. The same comment can also be located in Ashiaath al Lamaat by al Muhaddith Shah Abdul Haq Dehlavi.

In al Bidaya wa al Nihaya we read:

"The Deen will be damaged at the hands of a man from Banu Ummaya whose name shall be Yazeed"

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

Yazeed's attack on Harra

We read in 'au khanar al masalik' that Shaykh al hadith Muhammad Zakaria stated:

"The army that Yazeed had sent to Medina comprised of 60,000 horsemen and 15,000 foot soldiers. For three days they shed blood freely, 1000 women were raped and 700 named Quraysh and Ansar were killed. Ten thousand women and children were made slaves. Muslim bin Uqba forced people to give bayya to Yazeed in such a manner that people were enslaved and Yazeed could sell them as he pleased, no Sahaba who were [with the Prophet (saws)] at Hudaibiya were spared".

Ibn Katheer in al Bidayah Volume 8 page 222 stated:

"Muslim was ordered to ransack Medina for three days. Yazeed committed a major sin. Sahaba and their children were slaughtered openly; other heinous acts were also perpetuated. We have already mentioned that he had Ibn Ziyad kill the grandson of Rasulullah (s) Husayn and his companions. In those three days in Madina, it is difficult to mention the type of acts that were carried out. By doing this act Yazeed wanted to secure his governance, in the same way Allah (swt) broke the neck of every Pharaoh, the true King (swt) also broke the neck of Yazeed".

One who attacks Medina is cursed We read in *al Bidaya Volume 8 page 223*

"Rasulullah (s) said whoever perpetuated injustice and frightened the residents of Medina, the curse (la'nat) of Allah (swt), His Angels and all people is on such a person"

Yazeed was a homosexual

We read in *al Bidayah wa al Nihayah page 64 Volume 9* "Dhikr Abdul Mulk"

"Abdul Malik bin Marwan said in a khutbah that unlike Uthman I am not weak and unlike Mu'awiya I am not cunning / dishonest and unlike Yazeed I am not a homosexual".

We would ask actual Sunnis to go and ask your imams whether a man that does such a thing is a fasiq (transgressor) or not? Can he be an Imam or not? We congratulate Azam Tariq the pride of Lut, who is advocating the piety of Yazeed, and deeming him to be a legitimate Imam. Perhaps Azam Tariq is himself a closet homosexual who follows the Sunna attributed to 'Umar by some Sunni groups (see article '*Akhth Umm-Kulthoom* (as)' on this site).

Yazeed used to copulate with his mother and sisters Here we shall cite the following authentic Sunni sources:

Tabaqath al Kabeera Volume 5 page 66 Dhikr Abdullah bin Hanzala and Volume 4 page 283

Tareekh ul Khulafa page 209 Dhikr Yazeed

Sawqih al Muhriqa page 132 Dhikr Yazeed

Mustadrak al Hakim Volume page 522

Al Isaba Volume 3 page 469

Ya Nabi al Mawaddath page 326

Tareekh Ibn Asakir Volume 7 page 275

Fatawi Abdul Hai page 79

Tareekh al Islam Volume 2 page 356

Al Masalaik Sharh Muwatta Imam Malik page 435

We read in *Tabaqath*:

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

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

Yazeed bin Mu'awiya's rejection of the Qur'an

We shall rely on the following reputable books of Ahl'ul Sunnah:

Al Bidayah wa al Nihayah Volume 8 page 204 Dhikr Ras al Husayn

Minhajj al Sunnah Volume 2 page 249 Dikr Yazeed

Sharh Fiqh Akbar page 73 Dhikr Yazeed

Sharh Tafseer Mazhari Volume 5 page 21 Surah Ibrahim

Shazrah al Dhahab page 69 Dhikr Shahadth Husayn

Maqatahil Husayn Volume 2 page 58 Dhikr Shahdath Husayn

Tadhkira Khawwas page 148

Tareekh Tabari Volume 11 pages 21-23 Dhikr 284 Hijri

Tafseer Ruh al Ma'ani (commentary of Surah Muhammad)

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

When the head of Husayn (as), the grandson of the Holy prophet (saws), was presented before Yazeed he recited the couplets of the kaafir Zubayri:

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

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

In *Tafseer Ruh al Maani* it is stated clearly:

"Allamah Alusi stated, Yazeed the impure denied the Prophethood of Rasulullah (s). The treatment that he meted out to the people of Makka, Medina and the family of the Prophet proves that he was a kaafir".

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

Yazeed bin Mu'awiya's declaration on the pulpit of the khalifa that Yazeed was not worthy of Khilafat: Yazeed's own son condemned his father and grandfather, stating they will be punished in the grave, and supported Shia claims that the khilafat was the right of the Shia Imams

We read in *Sawaiqh page 134* about what the khalifa succeeding Yazeed said in his inaugural address as khalifa:

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

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

Similarly in *Tareekh Khamees Volume 2 page 301*, "Dhikr Mu'awiya the second" and *Hayaath al Haywan Volume 1 page 88* "Dhikr al Awaaz" we read that Mu'awiya Saneeh stated in a sermon: "My father Yazeed did not deserve to attain the position as khalifah over the Prophet's Ummah".

Yazeed bin Mu'awiya was such a fasiq that his own son sought to distance himself from his reign and he declared publicly that Yazeed was not entitled to be khalifah on account of his fasiq actions. These are the comments of Yazeed's son. Yet despite the testimony of the countless scholars we have cited, and the countless companions, and above all, Al-Hussain (as) himself, and here Yazeed's own son, the 21st century Nasibis of Ansar.org and Sipah-e-Sahaba think they know better, even better than their Grand Sheikh Ibn Taymiyya, whose words supersede all scholars according even to the Nasibis themselves. They seek to bring Yazeed to your hearts, a man whose own son said before the Ummah that his father is enduring the punishment of the grave.

Mu'awiya witnessed Yazeed's actions with his own eyes Tareekh Tabari, page 2173 Dhikr 284 Hijri

Tareekh Abu Fida Volume 2 page 57 Dhikr 284 Hijri

Tareekh Kamil Volume 7 page 192 Dhikr 284 Hijri

Tareekh ul Khulafa page 371 Dhikr 284 Hijri

Sharath al Dhahab Volume 2 page 185

Al Bidaya wa al Nihaya Volume 11 page 76 Dhikr 284 Hijri

Nasa al Kaafiya page 220

Maula aur Mu'awiya page 353

"And counted amongst the bad deeds of the Leaders of Syria, he [Mu'awiya] encouraged people to give bayya to his son Yazeed who was a drunkard, who brought up bears and Cheetahs. He [Mu'awiya] issued threats against good people to secure bayya even though he was aware of Yazeed's stupidity and transgressions that included his kufr, fisq and drunkardness...after slaughtering the family of the Prophet he said 'Banu Hashim staged a play for Kingdom [power], there was no revelation [the Qur'an is not revelation]'

Only a bafoon (also known as Nasibi) would claim that Mu'awiya had no idea of his son's transgressions. Is it believable that a father has no idea of his son's wrongdoings while literally thousands of witnesses to the palace intrigues do? How can an emperor who has spies and a secret service that knows what is going on from Africa to Persia have no idea of what is going on in his own palace? These spies told Mu'awiya every detail of what the people said about Yazeed.

They would also have told him what went on in the imperial palace. If Mu'awiya did not know what his son was like, why have the scholars condemned him for appointing Yazeed. Did not Mu'awiya's wives tell him that his son had had sex with his father's wives? Did not Mu'awiya's daughters tell their father that their brother had had sex with them? Or is it that the imperial family was almost to a person steeped in the worst forms of vice imaginable.

Mu'awiya was fully aware of Yazeed's transgression As evidence we shall rely on the following texts of Ahl'ul Sunnah:

Al Bidayah wa al Nihaya Volume 8 page 228 "Dhikr Yazeed"

Tareekh Ibn Khaldoon page 176 Dhikr Bayya

Thatheer al Janaan page 52

Nasa al Kaafiya page 38

Tadkhira al Khawwas page 161 Dhikr Yazeed

Serra al Alam'an naba Volume 3 page 105

Tareekh Tabari Volume 2 page 174 Events of 56 Hijri

We read in *al Bidayah*:

"Yazeed in his adolescence indulged in alcohol consumption and youthful exuberance, and this came to the attention of Mu'awiya, and he wanted to give him some kind advice so he said 'Refrain from such activities in public since this shall serve as ammunition for our enemies and they shall reject you on this basis.'"

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

"Mu'awiya's advice that Yazeed hide his acts is in accordance with Hadith wherein Rasulullah (s) said that one should seek to cover up the faults of others".

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

We also read in *al Bidayah Volume 8 page 79*:

"Mu'awiya wrote to his [bastard] brother Ziyad to seek advice on attaining the bayya for Yazeed. Ziyad was not receptive of this since he knew that he [Yazeed] was fond of hunting and had done bad deeds."

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

Mu'awiya's motive behind appointing his Fasiq son as Khalifah Abu Sulaiman al Nasibi in his article on Mu'awiya sought to apply conjecture, seeking to defend Mu'awiya's appointment of his son by stating:

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

Boy o boy, these Nasibis dig up the most bizarre excuses - the reason Mu'awiya made Yazeed his son was not for these namby-pamby 'maybe' reasons. It's because all kings want to make their sons the king after them. It's called monarchy and nepotism. It's why all the scholars say Mu'awiya made Yazeed khalifa. Do the Ansar team live on another planet? It is a fickle effort to cover up Yazeed's Nasibi father's sin. If we really want to know Mu'awiya's motive, why use guesswork when we have his own testimony. We thus read in al Bidayah Volume 8 page 118 that Mu'awiya admitted his appointment of his son was based on his love for him, nothing else.

"Prior to his death Mu'awiya stated if it was not my love for Yazeed, I would have known the path of guidance."

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

In connection with these words of Mu'awiya, his great advocate Ahmad Ibn Hajar al Makki in *Thatheer al Janaan* page 52 stated:

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

We read in Sira alam al Naba:

"Mu'awiya said to his son, 'The thing that I fear most of all is my act of making you my successor'".

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

Advocate of Mu'awiya, Ibn Khaldoon, stated in Tareekh Ibn Khaldoon:

"Mu'awiya was unaware that Yazeed was a fasiq and faajir, on the contrary during his lifetime he would tell his son to refrain from singing".

In addition to Ibn Hajr we also have another Nasibi advocate making admissions that destroy Mu'awiya. One admits that that during his lifetime Yazeed would sing music, the other admits that he would drink alcohol.

The Qur'an deems singing Raag (Scales) to be a major sin Surah Luqman verse 6 (Yusuf 'Ali transliteration):

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

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

Tafseer Mazhari Volume 7 page 260 al Luqman verse 6

Tafseer Madharik Volume 3 page 25 Part 21

Tafseer Ibn Katheer page 221 al Luqman verse 6

Tafseer Fath'ul Qadeer Volume 4 page 226

Tafseer Janan Volume 4 page 177 al Luqman verse 6

Rafseer Ruh al Ma'ani page 67 Part 21 al Luqan verse 26

Tafsseer Tabari page 39

Tafseer Qurtubi, commentary of verse 6 al Luqman

In Tafseer Mazhari we read: "The scholars have deem Raag (singing scales) to be haraam on the basis of this verse.

We read in Tafseer Ibn Katheer:

The Sahaba Ibn Masud said 'How al Hadeeth' refers to Raag and he stressed this three times. Tafseer Ruh al Maani records the fact that Imams Abu Hanifa, Ahmad, Malik and Shaafi issued fatwas that raag is haraam.

Mu'awiya's own admission that Yazeed did not deserve to be khalifa For this section we shall rely on the following texts of Ahl'ul Sunnah:

Al Bidaya wa al Nihaya Volume 8 page 118

Thatheer al Janan page 52

Nasa al Kaafiya page 38

Tadhkira Khawwas page 161 Dhikr Yazeed

Seerath al alam al Naba Volume 3 page 105

We read in al Bidaya:

"Towards the end of his life Mu'awiya expressed regret at fighting the family of Rasul (s) and appointing Yazeed as his successor, and he admitted 'if it was not for my love of Yazeed the guidance would have shone on me"

Blinded by his love for his son, he was willing to impose his demonic fasiq son as the Khalifah over the Muslims. How considerate! Clearly Mu'awiya's admission proves that even he did not feel Yazeed was deserving of khilafat. Nasibi Warrior Abu Sulaiman asserts the imposition was to save fitnah, but this is a lie.

Mu'awiya never made such a claim, rather he stated that he made his fasiq son the Khalifah on account of his blind love for him i.e. a father's natural love for his son. No doubt Nasibis will claim that Mu'awiya made a mistake in ijtihaad in this respect, but they should know that one of the conditions for a mujtahid to give rulings is that he has to be adil (just), and Mu'awiya was not adil, as we have proven in our article on Mu'awiya - the Ulema of Ahl'ul Sunnah have themselves defined Mu'awiya as a transgressor.

In Sira alam we read:

"The thing that I fear most is the fact that I have imposed Yazeed as my successor over you, of all matters I am fearful of this most."

Deobandi scholar Aadhi Zaynul Abdideen in *Tareekh Milat* page 55 states

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

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

The stipulation by the Ahl'ul Sunnah Ulema that the khalifah be just makes the khilafat of Mu'awiya and Yazeed batil For this section we shall rely on the following authentic texts of Ahl'ul Sunnah:

Izalathul Khifa page 20 *Dhikr Sharh Imamate*

Sharh Muwaffaq page 731 *Muqassad Saneeh*

Sharh Muqassad Volume 2 page 271 *Fadail Imama*

Al Ahkam al Sultaneeya page 8 by *Al Mawardi*

Ahkam al Sultaneeya page 9 by *Qadi Abu Yala*

Taufa Ithna Ashari page 178 *Bab 7 Imamate aqeedah*

We read in *Izalath ul Khifa*:

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

We read in *Sharh Muqassad*:

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

We read in *Sharh Muwaffaq*

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

Ahl al Sunna believe that no khalifa has the right to appoint his son as khalifa without shura (consultation) Al Mawardi in Al Ahkam al Sultaneeya page 8 states:

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

Abu Yala in this same book, echoing the words of other Salaf Ulema stated that the contract of Imamate can only go to one that is Adil, and the Qur'an stipulates that it cannot be bestowed on one that is Dhaalim. We have the consensus from the Ulema of Islam that a fasiq cannot attain the station of Imam; we can prove from the texts of Ahl'ul Sunnah that both Mu'awiya and Yazeed were not adil.

Mu'awiya's deeds throughout his reign, including efforts to secure Yazeed's nomination via duress and coercion proves that he was not adil. When Mu'awiya was himself unjust then he had no right to appoint his fasiq son as Imam over the Ummah. Moreover his methods of intimidation to 'win' backing for Yazeed, makes Nasibi claims that Yazeed's khilafat was legitimate a complete farce.

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

The stance of Imam Hussain [as]

Was this only a political dispute? Azam Tariq al Nasibi stated:

Kr-hcy.com states: **IT WAS ONLY A POLITICAL DIFFERENCE WITH YAZID AND HAZRAT HUSAYN WANTED TO RECTIFY THE SITUATION. IT WAS NEVER A CONFRONTATION BETWEEN ISLAM AND KUFR AS NONE OF THE CONTESTANTS EVEN ONCE CALLED EACH OTHER AS KAFIR (INFIDEL).**

Reply One

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

"Ali [r] said to Mu'awiya 'Guard yourself from hating me since Rasulullah (s) said that on the Day of Judgement those that hate me shall be turned away from the Pond of Kauthar and be thrown in the fire".

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

Reply Two

Imam of Ahl'ul Sunnah al Hafidh Jalaladun Suyuti records this tradition in Khasais al Kubra, on the authority of Sahaba Uns bin Harith: "I heard Rasulullah (s) say 'Verily my son [Husayn] will be killed in a land called Kerbala, whoever amongst you is alive at that time must go and help him".

Khasais al Kubra Volume 2 page 125 (Maktaba Nurree Rizvi Publishers, Pakistan) If this was only a political dispute, then why did Rasulullah (s) deem it incumbent on the Sahaba to help his grandson Husayn (as), who he called his son? Politics is something without compulsion, for in Islam it is part of religion, for Islam is a system of life. And there is no ordinance in Islam that compels a person to follow a certain political persuasion UNLTIL that person submits to Islam. But here Rasulullah (s) commands the companions to side with Imam Husayn (as), making it a duty on them to side with Husayn (as). Hence it can only be deemed to be a religious ordinance for THOSE WHO BELIEVE and have embraced Islam. The difference between Husayn (as) and Yazeed was thus, incontrovertibly, a religious one, for the Holy Prophet (saws) made it a duty for the Muslims who follow his religion to side with Husayn (as). This logic is undeniable and crystal-clear.

Was this a battle of truth against falsehood?

Azam Tariq Nasibi stated:

Kr-hcy.com states: **"THE BATTLE OF KARBALA IN 61 A.H. WAS NOT A BATTLE BETWEEN TRUTH AND FALSEHOOD OR ISLAM AND KUFR AS IS ALLEGED BY THE SHIAS".**

This is an attempt by the champions of the 21st century Nasibi movement to deny how all Muslims, Shia and Sunni alike, view the Battle of Karbala. To most Muslims, Shia and Sunni alike, Husayn (as) embodied faith and the

true religion, while Yazeed embodied kufr and the devil. After all, did not Husayn (as)'s grandfather tell the Muslims to side with Husayn (as). Thus most Muslims see in Karbala the ultimate battle between the forces of good and those of evil.

The Nasibis would instead have us see it another way, simply as the embodiment of good happens also to be the Third Shia Imam, and this adulation for him by the Sunni world is intolerable to the Nasibi cult. Ansar.Org's favourite Nasibi son Afriki also sought to discredit the martyrdom of Imam Husayn (as) - by mocking the notion of most Muslims that this was a battle between truth and falsehood. In his article on 'Who killed Imam Husayn?' he stated:

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

Reply One

We have proven that Yazeed opposed the concept of revelation and denied the Prophethood. To raise one's voice against such an enemy of God is certainly proof that Imam Husayn (as) was on the party of truth and was seeking to counter Yazeed's falsehood. Shah Abdul Aziz Dehlavi, a staunch Wahabi, in *Taufa Ithna Ashari, Chapter 1 page 6* stated clearly that: "Imam Husayn was aware of the falsehood of Yazeed the Paleeth (impure)"

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

When people opposed Yazeed in Madina, amongst them were the largest concentration of still living Sahaba, and the vast bulk were slaughtered. Amongst those who were martyred by the side of Husayn (as) in actual battle were also Muhammad (saws)'s sahaba, while at the actual battle not one sahaba was found on the side of Yazeed's army.

Were their actions [as Sahaba] false? Against Yazeed ranged the majority of the surviving sahaba - were all misguided waging war against a man who did not even know the Holy Prophet (saws), was a man who used his penis to penetrate men/ dogs/bears/sisters/daughters/mother? Yazeed expected the Bayya while he openly expressed that Muhammad (saws) was a fraud. Yazeed and the clique of sahaba like Abdullah bin Omar (son of the second khalifa) that supported him were scum of the worst kind.

Reply Two

Ibn Kathir in al Bidaya wa al Nihaya Volume 8 page 231 narrates this hadith on the authority of Abu Ubaydah: "My Ummah shall be ruled with justice, until the first individual that shall destroy it, he shall from the Banu Ummaya, his name will be Yazeed". In a short time span of three years this Khalifah of Azam Tariq shed the blood of the family of the Prophet, the

residents of Medina and catapulted the Kaaba. Rasulullah (s) pinpointed the man that would destroy the Deen BY NAME. When this is the case then opposition to him can automatically be defined as opposition to falsehood. Why do the Nasibis support a man cursed BY NAME by the Holy Prophet (saws) himself.

Reply Three

Even advocate of Mu'awiya Ibn Khaldun in Madaqqimah Volume 2 page 304 states:

"Husayn was on the right path, he attained martyrdom for which he shall be rewarded". Another Mu'awiya supporter, the Grand Sheikh of Wahabis Ibn Taymiyya states:

"The Ahl'ul Sunnah believes that Husayn was a martyr and he attained an exalted rank on account of this martyrdom. Those that killed him are worthy of God's condemnation and curse".

In this connection Allamah Shibli also makes an important observation: "Husayn did not oppose giving bayya to Yazeed because he wanted to become the Khalifa - his opposition was to elevate the kalima of Tauheed and Deen of Hanafeeya, in this regards he was following the footsteps of his father".

Zaynab page 157

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

Reply Four

Ibn Asakir records (in *Mishbaath ba Sunnath* page 219) a hadith on the authority of Hadhrath Ayesha: "Oh Allah never shower your blessings on the cursed killer Yazeed. He will rebel against my beloved Husayn and martyr him"

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

Does the Sahaba's failure to support Imam Husayn (as) prove that this was not a battle between truth and falsehood? This filthy Nasibi then states:

Kr-hcy.com states: **IT IS EVIDENT FROM THE FACT THAT SEVERAL HUNDREDS OF SAHABA WERE ALIVE AT THAT TIME BUT ALL OF THEM KEPT ALOOF FROM THIS EVENT TO SAVE UMMAH FROM ENTANGLEMENT AND BLOODSHED. HAD IT BEEN AN ENCOUNTER BETWEEN GOOD AND EVIL, THE SAHABAH WHO THROUGHOUT THEIR LIVES HAD NOT SHIRKED JIHAD WOULD**

HAVE DEFINITELY THROWN ALL THEIR WEIGHT BEHIND HADHRAT HUSAYN.

Reply One

Azam Tariq seems to suggest that the Sahaba would not be so shameless as to ignore Jihad. These Nasibi claim to be the defenders of the Sahaba, let us leave them aside for a moment and focus on Mu'awiya and the Banu Ummaya clan. Did they not shirk their duties to defend Uthman at the time of his murder? The entire Banu Umayya, including Mu'awiya stood back and allowed their relative Khalifah be slaughtered. Poor old Uthman was left on his own with no support, no son, brother in law or relative sought to protect his dear relative.

Is this how the passive Gandhi ethics of Uthman were met? If these Nasibi claim that they were merely following the words of noble Uthman who stated no one whether that be his clan, the people of Medina or Mu'awiya's army support him, then his desire is false since it is even incumbent on a seventy year old man to protect his life. Failure to do so constitutes suicide that contravenes the Shari'a.

Reply Two

If the Sahaba could not shirk the responsibility of Jihad then we should point out that poor old Uthman was cornered in his home for forty days before his end and the Sahaba did not have the decency to fight and protect their imam even though this oppression occurred in the city in which they resided. When they shirked 'jihad' in their own hometown then what likelihood was there to expect these same 'lions' to defend Imam Husayn (as) who had been cornered two thousand miles away by Yazeed in the remote plains of Kerbala?

Can these Nasibi produce any evidence that their Imam Yazeed had made a declaration via radio / television / papers that he was intending to fight Imam Husayn (as) on a specific date at a specific venue - and that despite this, the Sahaba shirked their responsibilities?

Reply Three

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

When the Sahaba had participated in the killing of Uthman, who as they claim was the Khilafah over the Muslims, and this did not bother them in the slightest, then how can Azam Tariq ask us why the Sahaba remained silent and failed to side with Imam Husayn (as)? It's those Santas again - the Nasibis keep hiding behind them while we lift their red Santa kaftans and expose their uncircumcised privates.

Reply Four

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

Reply Five: The Santas are cowards

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

Reply Six

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

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

Was Imam Husayn (as) returning so as to give bayya to Yazeed? Tareekh Kamil Volume 4 page 48 Imam Husayn

Al Bidayah Volume 8 page 175

Tareekh Tabari page 314

Tadkhira Khawwas page 141

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

"I accompanied Husayn from Makka until the time that he was killed. I heard all of his speeches and at no point did he state 'Take me to Yazeed so that I can give him bayya' The comments of an actual Sunni scholar, Allamah Shibli in his book *Zeyneb* page 156 are also worthy of note:

"Husayn said 'I am from the Ahl'ul bayt of the Prophet. Yazeed is not worthy of receiving my bayya'"

Kr-hcy.com states: **WHEN HAZART HUSAYN WAS STILL ON HIS WAY TO KUFA HE RECEIVED NEWS THAT HIS COUSIN, MUSLIM BIN AQEEL, WHO WAS SENT EARLIER BY HIM TO KUFA TO ASCERTAIN THE CONDITIONS THERE, HAD BEEN MURDERED ON RECEIVING NEWS OF THE DEATH OF MUSLIM BIN AQEEL, HAZRAT HUSAYN LOST CONFIDENCE IN THE PEOPLE OF KUFA AND DECIDED TO RETURN BUT THE RELATIVES OF MUSLIM BIN AQEEL UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF SABAI ELEMENTS INSISTED ON AVENGING THE MURDER OF MUSLIM BIN AQEEL AND HENCE**

HAZRAT HUSAYN DECIDED TO RESUME HIS ONWARD JOURNEY TO KUFA.

Reply

If the brothers of Muslim wanted to avenge his death - then what is the big deal here? The desire to avenge the blood of an innocent is not a reprehensible act. The Qur'an prescribes an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. Yazeed was responsible for the killing of an innocent here, and the state being controlled by Yazeed had committed the atrocity, so the innocent's brothers decided to follow God's Word and carry out the penalty against the soldiers of Yazeed who had committed this action as the state would do nothing having committed the atrocity.

The family of Rasulullah (s) were the rightful heirs of Hadhrath Muslim (as) - if his brothers took action to fulfil a desire to avenge their brothers unlawful murder at the hands of a demonic khalifa, then what is the objection? It was no reason why Imam Husayn (as) should have halted his journey. If the family of Rasulullah (s) had discussions amongst themselves and continued on the journey then how exactly does this absolve the transgression of Yazeed? If Imam Husayn (as) was intending to return to Medina, a view for which there is no historical or textual basis, then what basis did Yazeed then have to kill Imam Husayn (as)?

We the Shi'a believe that Yazeed, in order to strengthen his reign, blocked Imam Husayn (as)'s march to Kufa at a place called Karbala. This is testified to in all historical sources e.g. whole chapters in Tabari and the chapters in all the other historical works that chronicle 60-61 AH. They also chronicle the fact that Yazeed's army then killed Husayn (as) in a pitched battle.

This sin is worse than kufr. Husayn (as) was the last voice of open dissension in the Ummah, and dictators like Yazeed deal with those that speak out against their unjust ways by using their armed forces to liquidate them. The choices that were put before Imam Husayn (as) were to either accept the reign of Yazeed or die. If Imam Husayn (as) really was returning to give bayya to Yazeed then there would have been no need for this battle. The objective of bayya could have been carried out through via an intermediary, and indeed Yazeed's commanders at the Battle of Karbala said to Husayn (as) that he would be free to go if he gave the bayya to Yazeed.

In fact it is manifestly clear that Yazeed wanted one thing and one thing only from Imam Husayn (as) - his bayat. Husayn (as)'s refusal to give this bayya was the trigger that enabled Yazeed to justify killing Imam Husayn (as) to the Muslims. But other Muslims objected and said, as most do to this day, that Husayn (as) could not have given bayya to Yazeed as the latter was unlawfully appointed khalifa in breach of treaty, and further Yazeed's character would have destroyed Islam had the very grandson of the Prophet (saws) sanctioned such a demon as Khalifah.

It is like voting for a homosexual into power - if he is elected it means that homosexuality is not condoned by the people. This is the state in many western countries today. Had the greatest and most learned Muslim of the age, indeed the closest male blood of the Prophet (saws) given the bayat, it would mean that dog/sister/bear/mother daughter penetration was acceptable

in Islamic society. Given how fragile 60/61 AH was - Islam was still a very new religion - Islam itself as a religion with laws for society would have been destroyed.

This is why Husayn (as) is called the Saviour of his grandfather's religion. Yazeed's ulterior motive was on top of extracting the bayat, and thereby completing his agenda to decimate Islam as a religion in society, to avenge the slaying of his family by Muhammad (saws) and Ali (as) by exacting tribal blood revenge - this is obvious from his words when the head of Husayn (as) was brought before him, in which Yazeed claims that the Revelation to Muhammad (saws) was a power game of the Hashim tribe, and one in which his own tribe of Umayyad had been the losers which was now avenged by killing Muhammad (saws)'s grandson who was also Ali (as)'s son.

Was Imam Husayn (as)'s alleged return from Karbala without fighting proof that this was not a battle between truth and falsehood? Another Nasibi, lieutenant of Azam Tariq, Hafidh Salah'udeen in his book 'Khilafat ai Mu'awiya aur Yazeed' echoed these comments in his book page 23 "If the battle of Kerbala was a fight between truth and falsehood, then he [Husayn (as)] would not have made plans to return to Medina. Haqq (truth) is linked to rules of martyrdom, falsehood is not linked to anything"

Reply One

Can this Nasibi cite us any proof that Imam Husayn set a date and venue to fight Yazeed? Yet again the Nasibis adopt a tactic of using words that give the impression that they are supported by historical facts. The reader might think that this premise of the Nasibis is based on some kind of textual source. There is none - it is just a fairytale of this Nasibi that Husayn (as) intended to return to Madina rather than do battle. Not one book, page, sentence, word, letter or dot in any book exists that says this was his intention or that he made plans to return to Madina. This is what Nasibis do every day in their speeches. They just **LIE** to people.

I am angry at being **LIED** to like this. The most disturbing thing is that this man Azam Tariq and his deputies have hundreds of thousands of followers in places like Pakistan who believe every word of his. See how the Nasibis just lie. Here the Nasibi makes up a whole story that Husayn (as) was returning to Madina - as if he is an expert on history with academic references. This story has, literally, just been made up by him in this sentence.

However we shall refute this fairytale that has come out of this Nasibi's deranged mind (Is this Nasibi on hallucinogenic drugs?) - we are now having to refute the verbal diarrhoea that comes out of a deluded mind: this is the level of argument the Nasibis have. If the Imam (as) had set a date, and then not fought, then we would have to accept that Imam Husayn (as) abandoned Jihad.

We the Shi'a believe that Imam Husayn (as) declared that he was the true representative of Rasulullah (s) and hence he rejected the authority / obedience to Yazeed. Yazeed's army, by cornering and killing Imam Husayn (as), proves Yazeed's actions were false and Imam Husayn (as) was on the path of truth. Had Imam Husayn (as) returned from Karbala that

would not in any way prove that Yazeed was on the right path, his returning without fighting in no way means that Yazeed was right! What on Earth was that reply from the Nasibis about in the first place? It still does nothing to exonerate Yazeed. What this nasibi said is called verbal diarrhoea.

It's malformed crap without any shape or substance that just comes out and you can't control it. This is what Nasibis talk - crap with a kaftan, a turban and an Arabic accent to pass off as something more substantial. It is tragic that this turbaned crap is out there preaching to Muslims and taking them astray.

Reply Two

The Sahaba in Usamah's army returned without fighting We read in Sharh Muwaqqaf Volume 1 page 746 Dhiky Ikhthilaaf Al-e-Islam Rasulallah (s) said that whoever does not participate in the army of Usamah, Allah's lanath be on such a person. N.B. This is not the Usamah bin Ladin of today but the Usamah bin Zaid who was a companion of the Holy Prophet (saws).

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

Reply Three

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

Reply Four

Rasulullah (s) returned from Tabuk without fighting

We read in *al Bidayah Volume 5 pages 14*, that Rasulallah (s) prepared a huge army to counter the kaafir threat at Tabuk, but he returned without fighting. This expedition was definitely a battle between truth and falsehood, and in the same way that Rasulallah (s) returned without fighting does not mean that the kaafir Byzantines were in the right, Imam Husayn (as)'s **ALLEGED** returning to Medina (in the Nasibi's dream) in no way means that Yazeed was in the right.

Reply Five

Rasulullah (s) returned from Makka without performing Hajj

The books of Ahl'ul Sunnah are replete with the fact that Rasulallah (s) left from Medina to go to Makka and perform Hajj with the Sahaba. The Kuffar and Makka prevented him from doing so and he returned without

carrying through this objective. Hajj is a duty, so how were all the Muslims forgiven for failing to carry out Hajj that year?

Yazeed's killing of Imam Hussain [as]

Azam Tariq Nasibi stated:

Kr-hcy.com states: "IT WOULD BE SEEN THERE FROM THAT YAZID HAD NO HANDS IN THE MURDER OF HAZRAT HUSAYN. MOST OF THE HISTORICAL ACCOUNTS ARE WRITTEN BY SHIAS AND AS SUCH HEAP ALL SORTS OF RUBBISH ON YAZID OUT OF SHEER CONTEMPT AND HATRED AND DEPICT HIM IN ALARMING COLOUR WHICH IS FAR FROM TRUTH AND REALITY. STILL SOME OF THE IGNORANT MUSLIMS ACCUSE HIM UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF SHIAS. THE FACT IS THAT WHEN THE NEWS OF HAZRAT HUSAYN'S MARTYRDOM REACHED YAZID, HE AND HIS FAMILY WEPT. YAZID EVEN SAID: "CURSE OF ALLAH BE ON UBAIDULLAH BIN ZIAD. BY ALLAH! IF HE HAD BEEN A RELATIVE OF HAZRAT HUSAYN HE WOULD HAVE NEVER KILLED HIM. I WOULD HAVE ACCEPTED THE SUBMISSION OF IRAQIS WITHOUT THE KILLING OF HAZRAT HUSAYN."

Here we shall cite the following reputable texts of Ahl'ul Sunnah, that confirm that Yazeed killed Imam Husayn (as):

Maqathil Husayn al Khuwarzmei Volume 2 page 80 Chapter 9

Ya Nabi al Mawadath page 223 Chapter 91

Tareekh al Yaqoobi Volume 2 page 299 Dhikr Yazeed

Mtallib al Saul Volume 2 page 26

Nur al Absar page 139

Al Bidayah wa al Nihaya page 219 Dhikr 63 Hijri

Tareekh Kamil Volume 4 page 69

Tareekh Tabari page 408 Dhikr Ibn Ziyad

Akhbar al Tiwal page 384

Tadkira Khawwas page 159

Hayaath al Haywaan Volume 1 page 88

Tareekh Khamees Volume 2 page 301

Sawaiqh al Muhriqa page 134

Sharh Fiqh Akbar page 73

Taufa Ithna Ashari page 6 Volume 1

Izalath Ayn page 368

Ash Shiaath al Lamaath Volume 4 page 623 Bab Manaqib Quraysh

Shazarath al Dhahab Volume 1 page 69 Dhikr 61 Hijri

Muruj al Dhahab Volume 3 page 71 Dhikr Yazeed

Tafseer Mazhari Volume 5 page 21 Part 13 Surah Ibrahim

Aqaid al Islam page 232 by Maulana Abdul Haqq Haqani

Imam Pak aur Yazeed Palaeeth page 88

Aqaid Nafsee page 113

Sharh Muqassad Volume 2 page 309

Nuzul al Ibrar page 97

Irfan Shariath Volume 2 page 21

Fatawi Maulana Abdul Hai page 79

Shaheed ai Kerbala pages 11-12 by Mufti Muhammad Shaafi

Irshad al Sari (Sharh Bukhari) Volume 10 page 1717 Bab ul Fitan

Durre Maarif Volume 4 page 295 Dikr Zeyneb binte 'Ali

Sharh al Muneer Sharh al Sagheer Volume 1 page 80

We read in *Irfan ai Shariath*:

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

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

It's like saying the Pope is Jewish.

I mean what can you say to a man who lies like Azam Tariq (and he is the HEAD of the Wahabis in Pakistan, and they all speak these exported Saudi lies].

Interviewer: Mr. Tariq ... [interruption]

Azam Tariq: No, my name is Mr. Abdul

Interviewer: Mr. Abdul....[interruption]

Azam Tariq: No, my name is Mr. Saleem

Interviewer: Mr. Saleem...[interruption]

Azam Tariq: No, my name is Mr. Mustafa

.....and on it goes.

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

Yazeed ordered his Governor Waleed kill Imam Hussain [as] We read in Maqathil Husayn:

"Yazeed wrote a letter to Waleed the Governor of Medina, in which he stated 'Force Husayn to give bayya. Should he refuse then strike off his head and return it to me.'

Yazeed wrote to Ibn Ziyad telling him to kill Imam Hussain [as]

We read in Mutaalib al Saul that:

"Ibn Ziyad wrote to Husayn 'I have received information that you have arrived in Kerbala, and Yazeed has told me not to kill you, provided you accept his authority and mine.'"

Ibn Ziyad's own admission that he killed Imam Husayn on the orders of Yazeed We read in al Bidayah:

"When Yazeed wrote to Ibn Ziyad ordering him to fight Ibn Zubayr in Makka, he said 'I can't obey this fasiq. I killed the grandson of Rasulullah (s) upon his orders, I'm not now going to assault the Kaaba'.

Interesting also to note the fact that Azam Tariq says that Yazeed blamed Ibn Ziyad (his governor in Kufa at the time of the Battle of Karbala) for the killing of Husayn (as). Yet we see here the fact that Ibn Ziyad twp years AFTER Karbala is still in a position of authority in Yazeed's government and army.

Had Yazeed sincerely wept for Husayn (as) (he did not and Azam Tariq is quoting the story out of context - see imminently later) then he would have dismissed and executed Ibn Ziyad for genocide. Indeed Yazeed kept Ibn Ziyad in a position of authority in Yazeed's government, and indeed Ibn Ziyad outlived Yazeed, till Shia rebels killed him during the insurrection of Al Mukhtar to avenge the blood of Imam Husayn (as).

Testimony of Ibn Abbas that Yazeed killed Imam Hussain [as]

We read in *Tareekh Kamil*:

Ibn Abbas replied to a letter of Yazeed stating 'You killed Husayn ibn 'Ali as well as the youth from Banu Abdul Muttalib, who were beacons of guidance.'

The testimony of Abdullah Ibn Umar that Yazeed killed Imam Hussain [as] We read in *Maqathil al Husayn*:

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

The Nasibis want to drag the Muslims to hell to face the charge of taking to their heart the man who hurt Muhammad (saws)'s soul more than any other.

Mu'awiya The Second's testimony that his father Yazeed killed Imam Hussain [as] We read in *Hayaath al Haywaan*:

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

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

Yazeed's own admission that he killed the family of the Prophet (s) We read in *Sharh Fiqh Akbar*:

"Following the murder of Husayn, Yazeed said 'I avenged the killing of my kaafir relatives in Badr through killing the family of the Prophet'. The testimony of Shah Abdul Aziz that Yazeed killed Imam Hussain [as] We read in *Taufa* "Upon the orders of Yazeed the disgraceful people from Syria and Iraq killed Imam Husayn".

The testimony of Shah Abdul Haqq that Yazeed killed Imam Hussain [as] We read in *Ashiath al Lamaath*:

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

Yazeed's pride at killing Imam Hussain [as]

We read in *al Bidayah* Volume 8 page 204:

"Ibn Asakir, writing on Yazeed, states then when Husayn's head was brought before Yazeed, he recited the couplets of Ibn Zubayri the kaafir 'I wish my ancestors of Badr were hear to see the severed head of the rebellious tribe [The Prophet (saws)'s tribe of Hashim]."

Did Yazeed express sadness at the death of Imam Hussain [as]?

Nasibi Azam Tariq's lies continue as follows:

Kr-hcy.com states: **THE FACT IS THAT WHEN THE NEWS OF HAZRAT HUSAYN'S MARTYRDOM REACHED YAZID, HE AND HIS FAMILY WEPT. YAZID EVEN SAID: "CURSE OF ALLAH BE ON UBAIDULLAH BIN ZIAD. BY ALLAH! IF HE HAD BEEN A RELATIVE OF HAZRAT HUSAYN HE WOULD HAVE NEVER KILLED HIM. I WOULD HAVE ACCEPTED THE SUBMISSION OF IRAQIS WITHOUT THE KILLING OF HAZRAT HUSAYN." THEN HE ACCORDED A VERY GRACIOUS HOSPITALITY TO THE REMAINING FAMILY MEMBERS OF HAZRAT HUSAYN AND ARRANGED THEIR RETURN JOURNEY TO MADINAH WITH GREAT HONOUR AND RESPECT.**

Reply One

We can establish from the texts of Ahl'ul Sunnah that not only was Yazeed content with the death of Imam Husayn (as) he recited a couplet that he had avenged the deaths of his kaafir ancestors, by the killing of Imam Husayn (as) - can this poetry be deemed to be a couplet of regret? Reply TwoTariq's reference that we presume is a crude translation of the text in al Bidaya wa al Nihaya, we suggest that he cite all that Ibn Katheer had written in that section so that the truth can be made known to all.

We are quoting from *al Bidaya wa al Nihaya Volume 8 page 235*:

"When Ibn Ziyad killed Husayn and his companions and sent their heads to Yazeed, he [Yazeed] became happy at the death of Husayn which is why the position of Ibn Ziyad was elevated, but this happiness was only short lived".

This text confirms that Yazeed was pleased that Imam Husayn (as) had been killed and the rank of his killer Ibn Ziyad had automatically increased in Yazeed's estimation. The happiness being short-lived means that rebellions arose to avenge Husayn (as)'s martyrdom that threatened to destroy Yazeed's khilafat - Madina, Makka and Iraq all rose up against him, which is why he sent his army in to burn the Ka'aba and sack Madina. Nasibis are not horrified, you see, by these actions by their khalifa. This is as they have no sense of anything being sacred save the remembrance of the Santas. They even reproach other Sunnis for saying peace to the Prophet (saws).

The next portion is the part that Nasibis such as Azam Tariq and Bilal Philips are most fond of citing (they tactically forget the above paragraph). We are quoting from *al Bidayah wa al Nihaya Volume 8 page 235*:

"the situation reached a point of embarrassment for Yazeed and he said 'Curse be upon Ibn Murjan [Ibn Ziyad] he pained Husayn, made him desperate. Husayn had asked to be allowed to roam freely wherever to see me, or go to the frontier - but Ibn Ziyad rejected this. He [Ibn Ziyad] killed him and has now due to this Muslim shall bear enmity towards me, now every person, good and bad shall bear hatred in their hearts towards me, people shall be shocked at my killing Husayn. I have nothing to do with Murjan's son? May Allah (swt) destroy him and reap destruction upon him'."

Carefully analyse the final comments of Yazeed in this regard:

"now every person, good and bad shall bear hatred in their hearts towards me, people shall be shocked at my killing Husayn."

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

Ibn Katheer further commented as follows:

"Verily Yazeed cursed Ibn Ziyad for his actions and spoke ill of him, since the truth had dawned on him, that when the matter came out what would happen to him? But, neither did Yazeed punish Ibn Ziyad for his filthy act, nor did he say anything to him after, neither did he tell people to learn from this lesson, via retelling and condemning the episode".

al Bidaya wa al Nihaya Volume 8 page 204

If the argument is Yazeed didn't physically kill Imam Husayn (as) then these Nasibi should know that Pharaoh is deemed the killer of the Israelites even though he only issued the order for boys to be executed though he didn't use the sword himself. Irshad al Sari Volume 10 page 171 Bab ul Fitān states clearly that Yazeed was happy at killing Imam Husayn (as) and his disrespect of the family of Rasulullah (s) is a proven fact.

Let us see the comments of the President of Shari'a Majid 'Ali in Bhar Shariath:

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

Yazeed's treatment of the Ahl'ul bayt [as]

Yazeed's army looted the camps of the women of Rasulullah (s)'s household and made them captives We read in al Bidayah Volume 8 page 188:

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

Habeeb as Sayyar Volume 2 page 33 also confirms that the tents belonging to the Ahl'ul bayt (as) were set alight.

Iqd al Fareed Volume 2 page 254 states that the women of the household were then imprisoned.

Did Yazeed treat the women from Ahl'ul bayt (as) with respect and treat them as guests? Azam Tariq could have us believe that:

Kr-hcy.com states: THEN HE ACCORDED A VERY GRACIOUS HOSPITALITY TO THE REMAINING FAMILY MEMBERS OF HAZRAT HUSAYN AND ARRANGED THEIR RETURN JOURNEY TO MADINAH WITH GREAT HONOUR AND RESPECT.

HAD YAZID GOT ANY INVOLVEMENT IN THE MURDER OF HADHRAT HUSAYN THE REMANANTS OF HIS FAMILY WOULD HAVE NEVER STAYED WITH YAZID AS HIS GUESTS FOR SEVERAL DAYS IMMEDIATELY AFTER THE INCIDENT OF KARBALA. HOW CAN ONE STAY AND DINE WITH THE MURDERERS OF ONE'S BLOOD RELATIONS? ALL THE VILE PROPAGANDA AGAINST YAZID IS A LATTER INNOVATION OF THE SHIAS.

Reply One

What hospitality! Perhaps we are not up to date with Nasibi etiquettes, but would the reasonable man deem the act of parading of women in ropes before Yazeed, without scarves to be an act of honour and respect. These women did not happily visit Yazeed whilst on holiday, Yazeed's army had slaughtered their men folk and they had entered the court as prisoners not guests. Even inside the court Yazeed showed his hospitality by rowing with Sayyida Zeyneb and argued with her. Is this how guests are respected when they visit friends?

See how this nasibi, the biggest one in Pakistan, Azam Tariq, twists basic facts to make it seem like a tea party. He calls prisoners of war 'guests of the khalifa' on the basis of thei having been in his palace. Yes, roped, chained and in the dungeon! The rest about meals with the khalifa is all lies...there is no basis for it in any textual source. In fact these sources all testify to the fact that Yazeed had their hijab torn off them.

Reply Two

The women appeared before Yazeed without purdah and yet 'dear hospitable Yazeed' the prima Donna Santa Claus failed to address this issue. Is this how honour and respected was afforded to the grand daughters of Rasulullah (s)? Ibn Katheer states in al Bidaya Volume 8 page 204 as follows:

"If he [Yazeed] was embarrassed [by the killing of Imam Husayn] then why did he not arrange for the women's purdah when they appeared without any covering? Some supporters of Yazeed state that he respected the women [treated them well] when the reality is, in regards to his treatment of the women of Husayn's household, efforts were made to make Yazeed aware that the grand daughters of Rasulullah (s) were without Purdah, whilst his own Servant women were in Purdah [i.e. he humiliated them further]".

Was Yazeed related to Imam Hussain[as] via marriage?The Nasibi liar says:

Kr-hcy.com states: **THIS IS HIGHLY MISLEADING AS IT MAY BE MENTIONED HERE THE CLOSE AFFINITY OF YAZID WITH THE FAMILY OF HADHRAT ALI. IN 53 H WHEN YAZID AS AMIR-UL-HUJJAJ WENT TO MAKKAH AND AFTER HAJ REACHED MADINAH, AT THAT OCCASION HE WAS MARRIED TO SAYYEDA UMM HUHAMMAD, THE DAUGHTER OF ABDULLAH BIN JAFFAR YAHYAR WHO WAS THE SON-IN-LAW OF HADHRAT ALI AND BROTHER-IN-LAW OF HASAN AND HUSAYN.**

Our challenge is to this Nasibi to substantiate this claim. Produce us an authentic text, with a complete chain proving this alleged marriage. Also, did Yazeed or any members of the Ahl'ul bayt (as) mention that they were related to Yazeed via marriage? Can Azam Tariq produce even a single source wherein Yazeed had stated that he was the brother in law of Imam Husayn (as)? What is astonishing is the way in which Azam Tariq just makes up historical facts with no textual basis. And he spurts them out with such confidence. This man, who is clearly a pathological liar, is the leader of the Wahabis in Pakistan...it is shocking.

Hadith referring to Yazeed

Abu Hurraira sought protection from the events of 56 Hijri Al Bidayah wa al Nihaya Volume 8 page 114

Fathul Bari Volume 13 page 10 Kitab al Fitān

Tareekh al Islam (Dhahabi) Volume 2 page 339 Dhikr Abu Hurraira

Al Isaba Volume 4 page 200 Dhikr Abu Hurraira

Al Bidayah wa al Nihaya Volume 6 page 228

Abu Hurraira would walk through the markets and 'O Allah don't accept the events of 56

Hijri and I don't see this boy's reign'

In Fathul Bari Ibn Hajr states that:

"Abu Hurraira was referring to the youth of Quraysh"

Abu Said al Khudri's condemnation of 60 Hijri Tafseer Ibn Katheer Volume 3 page 128, Surah Maryam verse 59

Mujmu al Zadaad Volume 6 page 231

Musnad Ibn Hanbal Volume 3 page 38

Fathul Qadeer Volume 3 page 329

Al Bidayah wa al Nihaya Volume 8 page 230

Ibn Kathir states:

"The Sahaba Abu Said al Khudri narrates that he heard Rasulullah (s) say after 60 Hijri undeserving people shall ignore prayers and enter the deepest part of Hell".

This hadith is also a condemnation of Yazeed since he became the Leader immediately after 60 Hijri. (Page 219)

Rasulullah (s) said Yazeed will destroy my religion

We read in al Bidayah Volume 8 page 231 Dhikr Yazeed:

Justice shall rule my Ummah until the first individual who shall destroy my Deen, from the Banu Ummayyaa his name shall be Yazeed. Yes, imam of the Nasibis Yazeed is accused of destroying the Deen by the Holy Prophet (saws) himself. I say we destroy the Deen of the Nasibis. Their Deen is different to that of other Muslims, Shia or Sunni.

Analysing hadith blessing Yazeed

Has Yazeed been guaranteed Paradise?

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

Kr-hcy.com states: YAZID WAS THE COMMANDER OF MUSLIM FORCES WHO MARCHED TO CAESAR'S CITY. THIS EXPEDITION WAS SENT DURING THE REIGN OF HAZRAT MUAWIYAH AND IN THIS TASK FORCE WERE INCLUDED ELDERLY AND ILLUSTRIOUS SAHABA LIKE HAZRAT ABU AYYUB ANSARI WHOSE FUNERAL PRAYER WAS LED BY YAZID ACCORDING TO THE WILL OF HAZRAT AYYUB ANSARI HIMSELF. THIS EXPEDITION TOOK PLACE IN 51 H IN WHICH HAZRAT HUSAYN FOUGHT UNDER THE LEADERSHIP OF YAZID. THIS WAS THE PIONEERING MUSLIM FORCE WHICH LANDED IN CAESAR'S CITY AND ACCORDING TO A HADITH NARRATED BY ABDULLAH BIN UMAR WHICH HAS BEEN RECORDED BY BUKHARI, RASUL-ALLAH SAID:

"THE ARMY WHICH WILL FIRST EMBARK ON THE EXPEDITION OF CONTANTINOPLE WILL BLESSED." (BUKHARI).

YAZID WAS THE COMMANDER OF MUSLIM FORCES ON THIS EXPEDITION WHO WAGED JIHAD IN CAESAR'S CITY AND AS SUCH HE FALLS WITHIN THE PARAMETER OF ABOVE HADITH OF THE PROPHET (SAW). IN VIEW OF THIS IT IS NOT BECOMING ON ANY MUSLIM TO CAST ASPERIONS ON YAZID AS THE ENTIRE ARMY WHICH TOOK PART IN THIS CAMPAIGN HAS BEEN BLESSED BY ALLAH IN THE CONTEXT OF ABOVE HADITH.

Reply One

Let us analyse the complete tradition from *Sahih al Bukhari*, Book of *Jihad Volume 4, Book 52, and Number 175*:

Narrated Khalid bin Madan:

That 'Umair bin Al-Aswad Al-Anasi told him that he went to 'Ubada bin As-Samit while he was staying in his house at the seashore of Hims with (his wife) Um Haram. 'Umair said. Um Haram informed us that she heard the Prophet saying, "Paradise is granted to the first batch of my followers who will undertake a naval expedition."

Um Haram added, I said, 'O Allah's Apostle! Will I be amongst them?' He replied, 'You are amongst them.' The Prophet then said, 'the first army amongst' my followers who will invade Caesar's City will be forgiven their sins.' I asked, 'Will I be one of them, O Allah's Apostle?' He replied in the negative."

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

Reply One: Imam of Ahl'ul Sunnah Muhammad bin Yahya deemed Bukhari an innovator and amongst Murijee Fathul Baree Volume 13 page 490

Tabaqat Shaafeeya Volume 2 pages 12-13

Tareekh Baghdad Volume 2 page 32

"Imam Yahya deemed Muhammad bin Ismail Bukhari an innovator and a Murijee"

Reply Two: Bukhari did not trust the narrations of Imam Jafer Sadiq

Bukhari's Nasibi leanings are evident from this reference, and he steered clear of narrating tradition from the Imams from Ahl'ul bayt (as). This is clear from the fact that he didn't narrate from Imam Ja'far As-Sadiq (as), nor from his son Imam Musa Al-Kathem (as), nor from his son Imam Ali Ar-Reda (as), nor from his son Imam Muhammad Aj-Jawad (as), nor from his grandson Imam Hasan Al Askari (as) who was a contemporary of Bukhari. Why didn't Bukhari narrate from his own contemporary Imam of Ahl'ul Bayt (as)?

He narrated only two ahadith from the master of the youth of paradise, Imam Husayn Bin Ali (as). He only narrated six hadith from his son Imam Ali Bin Al Husayn Zaynul Abideen (as). He only narrated seventy-nine hadith from the City of Knowledge Imam Ali Bin Abi Talib (as)!

He also didn't narrate from Al-Hasan Al Muthana son of Imam Hasan (as). He didn't narrate from Zayd Bin Ali, nor from his son Yahya Bin Zayd, nor from Muhammad Bin Abdullah Bin Hasan Bin Hasan, nor from his brother Ibrahim, nor from Husayn bin Ali bin Hasan bin Hasan, nor from Yahya Bin Abdullah Bin Hasan, nor from Idris bin Abdullah, nor from Muhammad Bin Ja'far, nor from Ibrahim Bin Isma'eel bin Ibrahim bin Hasan bin Hasan, nor from his brother Qasem, nor from Muhammad bin Muhammad bin zayd bin Ali, nor from Ali bin Ja'far Al Aridi, etc.

Reply Three

The Sunni Ulema have deemed this narration as worthless Fathul Bari Volume 6 page 120, Kitab Jihad

Umdahthul Qari Volume 6 page 648

Irshad Sari Volume 5 page 140 Kitab Jihad

Siraaj al Muneer Sharh Jami al Sagheer Volume 2 page 80

The above leading Sunni scholars have rejected this hadith that Nasibi Azam Tariq cited to defend his Imam.

Reply Four: All the narrators of this tradition are Syrian

Ibn Hajar Asqalani and al Aini in their analysis of this hadith commented that its narrators are all Syrians that constitutes sufficient grounds to reject it, since any hadith devoid of narrators from Makka, Medina makes that hadith worthless. Bukhari narrated this from Ishaq bin Yazeed who narrated the tradition from Bukhari's own teacher Abu Abdu'Rahman bin Yahya bin Hamza, who was the Qadhi of Damascus, this was the heart of the Yazeedi / Nasibi homeland.

Reply Five: the narrators of this hadith are enemies of Ahl'ul bayt (as)

If we consult *Sahih al Bukhari Volume 1 page 409 Kitab Jihad Rasheedeya Publishers Delhi 1377 Hijri* and the commentary by Shaykh ul Hadith Ahmad 'Ali Shahrani we read:

"The tradition relating to Caesar's City was narrated by Sawaar binte Yazeed he was an enemy of Commander of the Faithful 'Ali". If this doesn't convince these Nasibi then we shall cite Tadheeb al Tadheeb Volume 2 page 33, Dhikr Sawaar binte Yazeed:

Sawaar binte Yazeed bin Ziyad was an irreligious man, his grandfather sided with Mu'awiya in Sifeen, and he was killed in this battle. When he referred to 'Ali, he would say 'I do not deem a person that killed my grandfather to be my friend'.

These so called defenders of Ahl'ul Sunnah are trying to get us to accept a hadith narrated by this Nasibi!

Reply Six

The people of Syria in the eyes of the Qur'an, Hadith, the Sahaba and Ahl'ul Sunnah Ulema We read in *Sunan al Kabir Volume 8 page 174*

Do not say that the people of Syria committed kufr; rather say they committed Fisq (transgression).

Tareekh al Damishq

"Umar bin Ubayd was asked when we read this verse 'Those that rule against the orders of Allah are Fasiq, does this refer to the people of Syria' he replied 'yes'.

This proves that the people of Syria were fasiq and we shall now cite from Tareekh Damishq proof that the Syrians did not deserve to be deemed Imams of Shari'a that could narrate traditions When Umar would be angered with someone he would expel that person to Syria Abu Hurayra narrated, in Syria there is a Devil that calls out loudly in a manner that leads people astray [This voice was raised in 60 Hijri with the bayya to Yazeed].

Amr bin Aas stated the people of Syria are different from all others; they disobey Allah (swt).

Sheeba urged that people refrain from taking hadith from a Syrian.

Abdur Rahman bin Hadi was asked 'which people's hadith are most reliable? He replied the people of Hejaz, the people of Basra then the people of Kufa. He was then asked 'What of the people of Syria?' He replied by opening his hand, 'when it comes to the people of Syria they narrate traditions with open hands'.

The people of Syria find it hard to listen to hadith praising 'Ali.

Here it's proven that the Syrians of the time were a population comprised of criminals and men who would naturally be on the payroll of the khalifa Yazeed as Damascus was his capital and powerbase where he lived and he centred his army. The people of Syria were the worst of people they were die-hard lovers of Mu'awiya that rebelled against the lawful Imam 'Ali ibn Abi Talib (as).

This was the hub of the Banu Ummaya Kingdom where the cursing of Imam 'Ali (as) went on for some ninety years - people had a hatred of Imam

'Ali in their hearts and the Salaf Ulema deemed these people to be careless / untrustworthy narrators of hadith. Despite this, we have this contemporary Nasibi trying to get people to accept a sole hadith whose narrators are all Syrians, one who happens to be an open Nasibi.

Reply Seven

Bukhari is the ONLY person to have recorded the word 'maghfoor' - Paradise We read in *al Bidaya wa al Nihaya Volume 8 page 222*:

In the hadith that makes reference to Caesar's City, Imam Bukhari is the sole individual to have recorded the words maghfoor; all the other books do not record this word.

We appeal to these Nasibi advocates, why did all the other hadith narrators remove this word. Either every one of these is dishonest or Bukhari added it in to fit in with his support for Yazeed.

We all know that the Sunni scholars say the Sahih of Bukhari is their most authentic work of Hadith. Yet, despite this, ALL the countless Sunni scholars, just some of whom we have quoted and all who would have been well-versed in Sahih Bukhari, have nevertheless condemned Yazeed and many said he will burn in hellfire. Thus they have placed the sheer number of other authentic chains above the testimony of Bukhari. Thus though this Hadith exists in Bukhari it is not accepted by Sunni scholars.

In itself this is a contradiction in the Sunni religion as many of the same scholars say Bukhari is 100% authentic! Perhaps now the reader can understand how many Hadith in Bukhari that portray the sahaba as Santas are coined. They were cooked up by men of the payroll of the likes of Yazeed and Muawiya, and were passed down to enter Bukhari a couple of generations later - old wives tales.

Reply Eight

The teachers of Khalid bin Madani were all Nasibi We read in *Tadheeb al Tadheeb Volume 3 page 119 Dhikr Khalid*:

Khalid was from third generation of Ulema from Syria, he had three teachers, Mu'awiya bin Abu Sufyan, Suhar bin Yazeed and Hareez bin Uthman. All three of his teachers were Nasibi enemies of Ahl'ul bayt (as). What reliance can we have on a hadith nararted by a scholar whose source of knowledge came from three KingPins of Salafi Aqeedah?

Reply Nine

Is this the only tradition that 'Umair bin Al-Aswad Al-Anasi narrated during his life? We read in *Fathul Bari Volume 6 page 102 Bab Maqeel Fi Qaathil al Rum*

"Other than the hadith relating to Caesar's City this narartor 'Umair bin Al-Aswad Al-Anasi has narrated no other hadith. There is a distinction between [him and] 'Umair and Amr bin al Aswa since 'Umair was a Syrian".

This Nasibi Shaykh al Hadith is a very unusual creature whose only reason for existence was to award the killer of the Ahl'ul bayt (as) with Paradise in a fabricated Hadith made up on the payroll of the Umayyads to protect Yazeed's reputation amongst the Ummah they ruled over i.e. shut up

and stop condemning him because the Holy Prophet (saws) said such and such about him, which he just didn't.

Reply Ten

Umair bin Al-Aswad Al-Anasi only taught one person We read in Ahl'ul Sunnah authority work *Muqaddimah Ibn Saleh* page 23:

"The illiteracy of a narrator is established when we learn that in principles of Shari'a he had only two students"

Umair had only one student Khalid bin Madain and he was himself a Nasibi.

Reply Eleven

: 'Umair bin Al-Aswad Al-Anasi's teacher was a non-Mahram woman If we analyse the chain in Sahih al Bukhari it is as follows:

Khalid bin Madan - 'Umair bin Al-Aswad Al-Anasi -Um Haram.

We ask people to think over this matter logically. How is it that this 'Umair bin Al-Aswad Al-Anasi was unable to find a teacher for his entire life, then ventures into the home of a friend whose wife (a non mahram woman to Umair), as luck might have it happens to be an expert of hadith. After this fortunate and unlikely occurrence his entire research scholarship leads him to learn just one hadith from her, a hadith that guarantees Paradise for a man who (with the exception of Nasibi) the entire Muslim world sends curses on - the killer of Imam Husayn (as), Yazeed ibn Mu'awiya (LA).

Reply Eleven

The only narrator of this hadith is a woman:

This is a crucial point. Why would Rasulullah (s) choose to locate non-mahram women to convey this hadith to? Is this the type of hadith that he (s) would not wish to convey to a wider audience, particularly to men participating in Jihad? Is this not a hadith that would boost morale / encourage soldiers to fight? Why keep it top secret, to the point that only one person knows of the rewards for participating in this expedition is a woman, who clearly will be unable to communicate this to an audience in a manner that 'esteemed' figures such as Abu Hurraira could do.

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

Worthy of note, when we read this hadith in sources other than Sahih al-Bukhari wherein Um Haram has narrated the tradition to her nephew Uns bin Malik there is no mention of maghfoor [Paradise], yet when she narrates it to a non mahram Umair she remembers that the participants are blessed with Heaven! Why did she forget to convey the words 'Paradise' to her

nephew but then chose to entertain a non-mahram in her home and convey the hadith with this word to him? Smells very fishy.

Reply Twelve

Yazeed was not amongst the people that led the expedition Umdah thul Qari page 649 Kitab Jihad

Al Isaba Volume 2 page 54 Dikr Sufyan bin Auf

Al Fathowaath page 161

We read in Umdah:

"Mu'awiyah sent the army under the Leadership of Sufyan bin Auf they reached upto Constantinople. Those present in this army were Ibn Abbas, Ibn Zubayr and Abu Ayub Ansari. Abu Ayub died when they reached Egypt, the elderly Sahaba were with Sufyan they were not with Yazeed, since Yazeed was not of the rank to be in their midst".

When Yazeed was not even in this first naval expedition then the claims of this Nasibi are Batil. Azam Tariq's whole premise is thus flawed - Yazeed was part of this massive campaign but was not even in this key first expedition that took Constantinople. So where was he at the time?

Reply Thirteen

At the time that Constantinople was attacked Yazeed was at home drunk Azam Tariq Nasibi sought to bless his Khalifah Yazeed by stating:

Kr-hcy.com states: **YAZID WAS THE COMMANDER OF MUSLIM FORCES ON THIS EXPEDITION WHO WAGED JIHAD IN CAESAR'S CITY AND AS SUCH HE FALLS WITHIN THE PARAMETER OF ABOVE HADITH OF THE PROPHET (SAW).**

Not only is this hadith a lie but also so is the claim that Yazeed led this campaign and as evidence for this we have relied on the following authentic texts of Ahl'ul Sunnah:

Tareekh Kamil Volume 3 page 231 Events of 49 Hijri

Tareekh Ibn Khaldoon Volume 3 page 15

Tareekh Yaqaobi page 217

Muruj al Dhahab Volume 3 page 33

Shaheed ai Kerbala page 184

Mu'awiya aur isthikhlaaf ai Yazeed page 343

Imam Pak aur Yazeed Paleeth page 138

We read in *Tareekh Kamil*

"In 49 Hijri, Mu'awiya made preparations to take the towns and cities of Rome under Sufyan bin Auf. He sent out the army and ordered his son Yazeed to join him but Yazeed was lax in this regard - Mu'awiya therefore became silent on the matter. The army successfully conquered Rome and upon receipt of this news Yazeed recited a couplet".

We read in *Muruj al Dhahab*:

"Mu'awiya received information on the progress of the army and conveyed this news to Yazeed who said, "In this case I shall convene a function in home, joined by my fellow drunkards". Azam Tariq's Nasibi Khalifah was not even present when the army took Rome, an army that according to him had been blessed with paradise.

By citing the non attendance of Yazeed from Sunni sources we are seeking to demonstrate to actual run of the mill Sunnis that these fake Sunnis are extolling a fasiq / alcoholic / fornicator / mother/sister/daughter/dog/bear/man/young boy orifice penetrator- and as part of their efforts have even deemed it fit to cite a fabricated tradition to the Sunni majority.

Like Yazeed, Mu'awiya also conquered lands and what a surprise we even find a tradition stating that the participant of the first naval expedition shall be blessed with Paradise (Mu'awiya led this expedition). We reject these absurd claims since salvation is dependant on being momin and those that sought it fit to rebel against the Ahl'ul bayt (as), harm their reign, curse them and kill them are devoid of Iman and cannot benefit from salvation. If a Dhaalim and Fasiq shall not enter Hell then why will Shaythaan - since Shaythaan never committed an act of Shirk?

It is implausible that the Holy Prophet (saws) who did not even promise Paradise to those who fought in the first battles of Badr and Uhud would promise it to a massive army fighting a war years after his departure from this world, led by the first khalifas the Sunni world itself say were 'not rightly guided'. What about the campaigns led by the so-called 'rightly guided' khalifas? As we have proven part of the reason these khalifas were 'not rightly guided' (a polite expression for them) is their cooking up of Hadith.

Reply Fourteen

Texts purporting Yazeed to have been present in this 'Paradise-bound army' are lies.

We appeal to our Sunni brothers: are these advocates of Yazeed not the same people that have relied on the texts of irreligious alleged scholars? These Nasibi claim that Shi'a writers are in effect seditious Iranian Ibn Saba elements of Jewish origin. We challenge these followers of Yazeed to prove to us from the Qur'an and Sahih hadith that Yazeed was present in the army that according to Umm Haram had been blessed with Paradise - and these people's claims shall be proven false.

The fact is we curse all these commentators who claim that Yazeed was praiseworthy / deserving of Paradise - and for that aim they rely on a hadith that had been recorded by an Iranian - called Ismail Bukhari - so let's ignore him as he may be an Ibn Saba Magian. In fact it is the Nasibis who practice a form of Islam pioneered by men like Mu'awiya and that perpetrates fabricated Umayyad Hadith to this day, and upon which they base their 'Deen' (Cult).

Since Mu'awiya and Yazeed both never accepted Islam in their hearts (proved in this article and the one on Mu'awiya) it is quite reasonable to say the Nasibis represent the Jahiliyya element in Islam - their cult is that which is influenced by the pagan Meccans like Abu Sofyan and Mu'awiya and the hardness of their hearts to this day to Muhammad (saws) and his family is indicative of that hatred - for their cult was founded by our dear Prophet (saws)'s worst enemies. That's why when the Fatwa from the Shia came on Salman Rushdie's head, the scholars of Saudi Arabia were quiet they didn't feel for the Holy Prophet (saws) like Shias and Sunnis do.

In the words of mainstream Sunnis the silence from the Sunni world was deafening. So next time, be you Shia or Sunni, and you hear the Nasibis stop you saying Salam to the Prophet (saws) and calling it bid'a - just pause - that Nasibi voice is the voice 1,400 years later of the Prophet (saws)'s enemies. It's the voice of Abu Jahl, Abu Lahab, Abu Sofyan, Mu'awiya and Yazeed. It's the voice of Shaitan. That's why something in you makes you react against it, or something in you will make you turn away from it if they've already snared you...Insha Allah. We challenge Azam Tariq Nasibi to: Present us this hadith from an Arab scholar who recorded in his book that the first army to enter Rome shall be in Paradise, and then:

Produce an authentic Arab source with a Sahih Isnad confirming the presence of Yazeed in that army.

How can one even entertain the notion that Yazeed will attain Paradise? A man that killed the descendents of the Prophet (saws) kills Ahl'ul bayt (as) and also allows the occurrence of gang rapes of the Sahaba's daughters in Medina. If Yazeed can enter Paradise then by the same token then so can the killers of Hadhrath Uthman. They did a lot less harm than Yazeed did.

Reply Fifteen

Sunni Ulema have stated that Yazeed was not deserving of Paradise

As proof we shall rely on the following authentic Sunni texts:

Fathul Bari Volume 6 page 102, Kitab Jihad

Umdah'thul Qari fi Sharh Bukhari Volume 6 page 649 Bab ba Qeel fi Qaathil al Rum

Mu'awiya aur Isthakhlaf ai Yazeed page 391

Imam Pak aur Yazeed Paleeth page 138

Shaeed ai Kerbala aur Yazeed page 184

Siraj al Muneer Volume 1 page 80, the letter 'Alif'

We read in *Umdah*:

"Yazeed's character is well known. If people cite the fact that this hadith points to the conquerors of Rome attaining Paradise - it is not incumbent to incorporate Yazeed here (in this group). It does not guarantee Paradise for all combatants, since there is no dispute amongst the people of knowledge, that Rasulullah's order was placed on a condition - the only participants that can rely on the promise of Paradise are those worthy of attaining it. Those that participated and then subsequently apostatised will not be counted as those deserving of Salvation".

We read in *Fathul Bari*:

"Some state that the hadith relating to the city of Caesar constitutes a merit of Yazeed, but Ibn Atheer and al Muneer have stated that even if Yazeed was one of those in that army being referred to in the Caesar tradition, it does not prevent Yazeed from being excluded from this group, since there is no dispute amongst the people of knowledge, that the only participants that can rely on the promise of Paradise are those worthy of attaining it. Those that participated and then subsequently apostatised will not be counted amongst these people".

We could say the same thing about the Day of Hudaibiya using this same logic of Sunni scholarship - many of the companions there apostatised AFTER the Treaty. Thus Allah's words giving peace to those who swore

allegiance to the Prophet (saws) under the tree at Hudaibiya only apply to those who did not later apostasies and were thus worthy of this merit and did not betray its beatific sense, which many did when they denied Ali (as) the khilafat. The same applies according to these scholars when dealing with the combatants in the battle for Constantinople.

We read in *Irshad Sari* by *Shahabadeen Taftazani*:

"People have cited the Caesar hadith so as to prove that Yazeed is in Heaven and our reply to such a claim is Even if Yazeed was amongst the combatants there is no reason why he cannot be removed from this group since there is no dispute amongst the people of knowledge, that the only participants that can rely on the promise of Paradise are those worthy of attaining it. Those that participated and then subsequently apostatised will not be counted amongst these people. May Allah's curse (la'nat) be upon Yazeed and such disgraceful people" After citing the comments of Ibn al Muneer [see above], Shahabadeen Taftazani states that: ".according to Sa'dadeen Taftazani some Ulema have deemed it permissible to curse Yazeed by name - since by ordering the execution of Husayn he committed Kufr. His ordering the killing of Husayn, being happy at his death and his painning the Ahl'ul bayt are proven facts".

In *Siraj al Muneer*, *Allamah Shaykh 'Ali bin Ahmad Azeezi* after citing the tradition from al Bukhari states:

"Having been satisfied at the killing of Husayn, the Ulema of Ahl'ul Sunnah have deemed it permissible to curse Yazeed, since he ordered his killing and was happy at his death. Imam Taftazani and Ibn Hajr Asqalani in Sharh Mubeeya commented that a scholar of the rank of Imam Ibn Hanbal issued takfeer against Yazeed".

We appeal to those with just minds:

Ibn Hajr Asqalani

Allamah Taftazani

Aini

Ali bin Ahmad Azeezi

Ibn Atheer

Ibn Muneer

The above six personalities are all reputed classical Sunni Ulema that rejected the notion that Yazeed was blessed with Paradise. Taftazani openly cursed Yazeed and these comments serve as a slap in the face of Maulana Azam Tariq. We would like to say to these Nasibi attempts, 'you have failed to prove that Yazeed attained Paradise. Your attempts are futile, and the hadith that you worship fails to mention your dear Khalifah by name. You stand in opposition to 99% of Sunni scholars. NO scholar till this age, and it is a corrupt age, said what you say about Yazeed. ' In this context it is worth noting that in regard to the rising of Sofyan and Raja and the final age, the Holy Prophet (saws) said, as we all know, that the scholars would be liars. Dear brothers, Sunni and Shia.

The lying by the Ansar group, the Saudi scholars, the Pakistani Wahabis, and the Nasibis in general, and that we have exposed....the sheer blatant pathological compulsive lying that we have shown you ...is the biggest proof to date that the scholars of the Muslims lie. This is a sign of the last

age. Till this age NO scholar of any persuasion extolled Yazeed. Today, the Nasibis are doing this. This lying is so blatant that it appals. It is exactly as our Prophet (saws) said of this age. The scholars would be the liars and the worst of people in the Ummah.

This doesn't mean all scholars. It means Nasibi scholars. Protect yourself from them, for the Prophet (saws) wept for they would take Muslims to Hellfire with them. Despite his citing the hadith that allegedly purports to Yazeed being in Paradise, Nasibi Azam Tariq has failed in his efforts to get Muslims to sign up to the 'We love Yazeed Fan Club'. For these Nasibi, Paradise is so cheap that Yazeed, killer of Imam Husayn (as), raper of the companions' wives in Madina, burner of the Ka'aba, can enter it. If Yazeed's massacre of the Ahl'ul bayt (as) is no barr on his entering Paradise then by the same token:

The killers of Uthman should also enter Paradise.

The Rafidi, whose affiliation is with Ahl'ul bayt (as), who distance themselves from their enemies should also be deemed as momin, and there should be no barr on the amount of tabarra they do, since like Yazeed they will also be in Heaven.

It is indeed unusual that in the eyes of these Nasibi the Shi'a who condemn those Sahaba that harmed, fought and cursed the Ahl'ul bayt are kaafirs as they curse the Sahaba, whilst a fasiiq, fajir, incestuous, paedophile, homosexual drunkard who attacks Medina, slaughters the Sahaba, upholds the rape of their daughters, in Kerbala corners, starves and massacres the family of the Prophet (s) including the Leader of the People of Paradise is a momin.

These pathetic Nasibi should know that murder is a big sin, whilst cursing is a lesser sin - your Imams Mu'awiya and Yazeed cursed and killed the family of the Prophet and cursed them and yet you exalt them as pious Muslims. You say the murderer of the Chief of the Youths of Paradise will be in Paradise also. Yes, Husayn (as) is by the accounts of all Muslims, Shia and Sunni, leader of the Heavenly Youth (and since we are all youths in Paradise according to the Qur'an this means he is the leader with his brother (who also held this title from the Prophet (saws) of the believers who make it to Heaven). Why don't you wake up and smell what you shovel.

The Devil has taken hold of your scholars' minds. How can the murdered and the murdered both be in Paradise. They can both be in Hell. They cannot both be in Heaven. Still less a Heaven where the murdered is the Leader of its Youth.

The alleged comments of Muhammad al Hanafiyya

The Nasibi have left no stone unturned in their efforts to protect Yazeed, and what a surprise! They find a tradition that they deem to be so solid that they in effect destroy everything that the Sunni Ulema had stated before!

Kr-hcy.com states: THE SHIAS HAVE DONE A LOT OF MUD-SLINGING ON THE CONDUCT AND CHARACTER OF YAZID TRYING OUT OF MALICE AND PREJUDICE TO FALSELY PROJECT HIM AS ADDICTED TO WINE AND PASSION ON ACCOUNT OF SHEER ILL-WILL AND ENMITY. THIS HAS BEEN REFUTED BY MUHAMMAD BIN-AL-HANIFA, THE ELDER BROTHER OF HAZRAT HUSAYN WHO REMARKED:

"WHATEVER ILL YOU SAY ABOUT HIM (YAZID), I HAVE WITNESSED NONE OF THE SAME. I HAVE STAYED WITH HIM AND FOUND HIM A REGULAR WORSHIPPER (I.E. FAST OBSERVER OF SALAT), WELL WISHER OF OTHERS, FONDER OF THE KNOWLEDGE OF SHARI'AH AND ABIDING BY THE SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET (SAW)." (VOL. VIII P. 233).

THEREFORE, UNENLIGHTENED MUSLIMS UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF SHIAS SHOULD NOT TRANSGRESS THE LIMITS OF CURSING YAZID IN THEIR LOVE FOR HAZRAT HUSAYN AND AHLE-BAIT.

The reference comes from Ibn Katheer al Nasibi's 'al Bidayah wa al Nihaya' and both Azam Tariq and Abu Sulaiman produced this same reference as evidence of Yazeed's immense piety. We had already addressed this claim in this article on Yazeed and showed how it was taken out of context and sections deleted by the lying Nasibis. Incidentally, not one Sunni scholar prior to the current age ever took this Hadith they quote above as sahih (reliable). In fact, as we have proved beyond doubt, the consensus amongst Sunni scholars has been that Yazeed ordered the killing of Imam Husayn (as). That is, till the current age of the lying scholars like Azam Tariq.

So we don't need to go any further for our Sunni brothers as it is obvious that they will follow the opinions that Sunni scholarship, even that of Ibn Taymiyya, has held....that Yazeed did indeed slay Imam Husayn (as) and was thus evil. But we would also like to add some additional replies for the followers of Mu'awiya to mull over.

Reply One

We find no evidence in any Shi'a book, wherein Muhammad al Hanafiyya had made such a claim. This reference can only be located in a book belonging to the people of Mu'awiya, and such a reference has no bearing on the Shi'a.

Reply Two

This is a fabricated tradition for no Shia or Sunni scholar with the exception of some Nasibis, and only those of this age and none of the past, believe to be authentic. For they all state that Yazeed was a fasiq and a fajir. If, however, he had made these comments, which he did not, then he would have been in clear error. It should be pointed out that neither was

Muhammad al Hanafiyya a Prophet or an Imam. These are not the words of an Imam (as) or Prophet (s) so they mean absolutely nothing in our eyes.

Reply Three

Abdullah bin Abbas, Abdullah ibn Zubair and Abdullah ibn Umar and Abdullah bin Hanzala, are all counted by the Ahl'ul Sunnah as Sahaba and they openly condemned Yazid's character. In addition when our own Imam Husayn (as) condemned Yazid, then any attempts to present him in a favourable light are worthless to us.

Reply Four

We read in *al Bidaya wa al Nihaya Volume 8 page 217* under the events of 63 Hijri when a movement began against Yazid, and the Sahaba began to testify with regards to Yazid's fasiq status, every person began to say they would revoke the bay'ah in the same way that they remove a shoe. Soon there was an entire stack of shoes. We can judge the extent to which the Sahaba hated Yazid, by the fact that compared bay'ah to Yazid to a shoe. It is highly improbable that Muhammad al Hanafiyya would have heaped criticism on the people of Medina for opposing Yazid.

Cursing Yazid

Answering the Fatwa of Abu Hamid Ibn Ghazali The lovers of Yazid have made efforts to exalt Yazid as a pious and just khalifa who has been the victim of a 1,400 year hate campaign waged by (almost) ALL the scholars and Shia AND Sunni (including Wahabi) Islam. They have thus sought to rewrite history. In the midst of all these scholars who condemned Yazid, including imam Ahmed ibn Hanbal who issued Takfir on him (see above), the Nasibis found one, and only one 'father figure' of traditional Sunni Islam: Ibn Ghazali. Now Ghazali was a Sufi, and all other Sufi sheikhs condemn Yazid.

It is also interesting to note that the Nasibis HATE Ghazali usually because he was a Sufi. Suddenly, they forget that hate campaign against the Sufi on this issue, and these filthy Nasibi seek to pass him off as the greatest scholar after the four Fiqh Imams. Azam Tariq rants off the prized fatwa as follows:

Kr-hcy.com states: A QUESTION WAS PUT TO IMAM GHAZZALI WHETHER THERE IS A VALID GROUND FOR CURSING YAZID FOR HIS ALLEGED COMPLICITY IN THE MURDER OF HAZRAT HUSAYN. THE IMAM GHAZZALI REPLIED AS UNDER:

"IT IS NOT LAWFUL TO CURSE ANY MUSLIM. ANYONE WHO CURSES A MUSLIM IS HIMSELF ACCURSED. RASUL-ALLAH (SAW) SAID: "A MUSLIM IS NOT GIVEN TO CURSING." BESIDES THE ISLAMIC SHARIAH HAS PROHIBITED US FROM EVEN CURSING THE ANIMALS. HOW THEN IT WOULD BE PERMISSIBLE TO CURSE ANY MUSLIM WHEN THE HONOUR OF A MUSLIM IS MORE SACRED THAN THE HOLY KABA AS MENTIONED IN A HADITH (IBN MAJAH).

"THE ISLAMIC FAITH OF YAZID IS PROVED WITHOUT ANY SHADOW OF DOUBT. AS REGARDS THE MURDER OF HUSAYN, THERE IS NO DEFINITE EVIDENCE THAT YAZID EITHER KILLED HIM OR ISSUED ORDERS FOR HIS KILLING OR APPROVED ANY SUCH PLANS. WHEN NOTHING HAS BEEN PROVED IN THIS

REGARD, HOW WOULD IT BE LAWFUL TO CAST DOUBTS AND ASPERSIONS ON YAZID WHEN ENTERTAINING SUSPICION ABOUT A MUSLIM IS UNLAWFUL IN ISLAM."

ALMIGHTLY ALLAH SAYS IN THE QUR'AN "O YE WHO BELIEVE! SHUN MUCH SUSPICION; FOR LO! SOME SUSPICION IS CRIME. AND SPY NOT, NEITHER BACKBITE ONE ANOTHER. WOULD ONE OF YOU LOVE TO EAT THE FLESH OF HIS DEAD BROTHER? YE ABHOR THAT (SO ABHOR THE OTHER). AND KEEP YOUR DUTY (TO ALLAH)." (49: 12).

HAZRAT ABU HURAIRAH REPORTED ALLAH'S MESSENGER AS SAYING "DESPISING HIS BROTHER MUSLIM IS ENOUGH EVIL FOR ANY ONE TO DO. EVERY MUSLIM'S BLOOD, PROPERTY AND HONOUR ARE SACRED TO A MUSLIM." (MUSLIM).

IMAM GHAZZALI REITERATES:

"ANYONE WHO THINKS THAT YAZID ORDERED THE KILLING OF HUSAYN OR LIKED THE KILLING OF HUSAYN SUCH A PERSON IS ABSOLUTELY FOOL"

"AS REGARDS SAYING (RADIALLAHU ANHA) AFTER THE NAME OF YAZID, THIS IS NOT ONLY PERMISSIBLE BUT COMMENDABLE. IT IS RATHER INCLUDED IN OUR DUA WHEN WE PRAY FOR THE FORGIVENESS OF ALL MUSLIMS AND YAZID WAS CERTAINLY A MOMIN (BELIEVER)." (BERIRUT, P. 288).

Here Ghazzali takes on every single other Sunni scholar from the year dot to the present-day, excepting the contemporary Nasibis. Ghazzali had knowledge, but he was not in the same category of knowledge in the field of either history or traditions as the numerous Sunni scholars we have quoted. It seems he took the principle of piety in not cursing another seriously... and it reflected his PERSONAL LACK of knowledge of history and the traditions that deal with this issue.

As we saw earlier, imam Ahmad ibn Hanbal, who outranks Ghazzali in this realm of knowledge, issued Takfir on Yazeed. INDEED all 4 Sunni madhabs, including the 4 sheikhs Abu Hanifa, Ahmed ibn Hanbal, imam Malik and imam Shafi'i have said it is permissible to curse Yazeed (see below). Furthermore, unlike the Nasibi scholars of today, Ghazali was not lying but he did misinform...the misinformation that came from his tongue was due to lack of in-depth knowledge. Ghazali is in fact easily dealt with.

We don't have to, as every other substantial Sunni scholar (except modern-day Nasibis) has disagreed with him on this point and have said Yazeed killed Husayn (as) and should be cursed. This includes eminent Sufi Sheikhs who some may say outrank Ghazali. So the Nasibis producing Ghazali's viewpoint is not very substantial at all. But we might as well rebut him to be comprehensive.

First Reply

Allah (swt) in his pure book sends curses on various types of people, for example in Surah Baqarah verse 161 we read:

"Those who reject Faith, and die rejecting, - on them is Allah's curse, and the curse of angels, and of all mankind"

In Surah Aal-e-Imran verse 61 we read:

"If any one disputes in this matter with thee, now after (full) knowledge hath come to thee, say: "Come! Let us gather together, - our sons and your sons, our women and your women, ourselves and yourselves: Then let us earnestly pray, and invoke the curse of Allah on those who lie!"

It is stated in Surah Hud verse 18:

Who doth more wrong than those who invent a life against Allah? They will be turned back to the presence of their Lord, and the witnesses will say, "These are the ones who lied against their Lord! Behold! The Curse of Allah is on those who do wrong!"

And Surah Hud verses 59-60:

Such were the 'Ad People: they rejected the Signs of their Lord and Cherisher; disobeyed His messengers; And followed the command of every powerful, obstinate transgressor.

And they were pursued by a Curse in this life, - and on the Day of Judgment. Ah! Behold! For the 'Ad rejected their Lord and Cherisher! Ah! Behold! Removed (from sight) were 'Ad the people of Hud!

Surah Maida verse 78:

Curses were pronounced on those among the Children of Israel who rejected Faith, by the tongue of David and of Jesus the son of Mary: because they disobeyed and persisted in excesses.

These verses prove that it is the Sunnah of Allah (swt) and his prophets (peace be upon all of them) to curse rejecters. Can there be a greater rejecter than Yazeed who rejected the Ahl'ul bayt (as), the Qur'an stipulates love for them to be a part of Deen; he killed them and openly rejected the Prophethood of Rasulullah (s)?

Second Reply

Ghazzali supporters should refrain from cursing the Devil - since according to Ghazzali the act of cursing someone that you do not know is pointless, and it is better to use one's tongue to recite Surah Fateha. This type of logic contradicts the practice Allah (swt) and his Rasul (s) - for no man can be as forgiving and pious as Rasulullah (s), and yet we learn that at various points during his life that he would curse his enemies and those of Allah (swt). If Ghazzali would deem this practice to be a sin then is he accusing Rasulullah (s) of indulging in sinful actions?

Third Reply

It is very amusing that these Nasibi afford Ghazzali this rank because he gave this pro Yazeed fatwa - but fail to apply the Fatwa to their own lives. They have issued takfeer and cursed other Muslim Sects such as the Shi'a and Barelvi, indeed no one has escaped their takfeer tirade. They accept one part of the fatwa and then leave the part that serves no benefit to them - if they deem Ghazzali to be a reliable Hujjut-ul-Islam then should they not be adhering to everything that their dear imam had said? Instead they curse the Sufis, and Ghazali is famous for being a Sufi.

Fourth Reply

We read in *al Bidaya Volume 8 page 223*:

"Rasulullah (s) said whoever perpetuated injustice and frightened the residents of Medina, the curse (la'nat) of Allah (swt), His Angels and all people is on such a person"

We have already presented the event of Harra before our readers and shown how Yazeed ordered his Nasibi troops to attack the city of Medina. Rasulullah (s) cursed those that caused fear to Medina. When Rasulullah (s) cursed an individual that perpetrated such an act then what right does this third rate Nasibi Jamaat have to demand that we refrain from cursing Yazeed? Whoever adheres to the Sunnah of Rasulullah (s) shall definitely curse Yazeed.

Fifth Reply

Sura Rad verse 25:

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

Surah Ash Shura verse 151-2:

"And follow not the bidding of those who are extravagant, - Who make mischief in the land, and mend not (their ways)."

The sum total of these two verses is as follows:

We should steer away from mischief makers

Allah (swt) has cursed those that indulge in mischief through the land

With these two verses in mind, now contemplate this verse:

Surah Baqarah verse 220:

"Their bearings on this life and the Hereafter. They ask thee concerning orphans. Say: "The best thing to do is what is for their good; if ye mix their affairs with yours, they are your brethren; but Allah knows the man who means mischief from the man who means good. And if Allah had wished, He could have put you into difficulties: He is indeed Exalted in Power, Wise."

We would appeal to those with open minds to decide for themselves whose intention was mischief and whose intention was good in this circumstance? There are two paths: one of the Banu Ummayya with Yazeed at the helm (the Nasibi path) and one of Ahl'ul bayt (as) with a Shia Imam in Husayn (as) at the helm - which of these two individuals was working for the benefit of the Deen and for the salvation of our souls? Who was the mischief monger whose actions have been cursed by Allah (swt)? Was the killing of Imam Husayn (as) not an act of Fitnah? Was the attack on Medina, slaughtering and raping its inhabitants not an act of Fitnah?

Was the assault on Makka that included catapulting the Kaaba with fire which set the House of Allah alight not an act of Fitnah. Was killing men in the most sacred of all sanctuaries where it is forbidden to kill even an ant an act of Fitnah? It is forbidden to kill a man in the sanctuary of the Ka'aba even if that man is about to kill you, yet Yazeed slaughtered innocents there! There is no need to exercise caution when one is cursing an enemy of Allah (swt). It is a praiseworthy act so long as it does not create Fitnah.

Reply Six: The Ulema of Ahl'ul Sunnah deemed it permissible to curse Yazeed

The Fiqh Imams deemed cursing Yazeed to be an act of worship Ibn Khalikan in Wafayaath page 412 whilst discussing the biography of the Shafi'i scholar Abu Hassan bin 'Ali bin Muhammad bin 'Ali al Tabari al Amadadeen al Maroof al Bakeeya al Iraas al Shafeeya, states that:

"He (the above) was once asked 'Can Yazeed who was born during the Khilafat of Hadhrath Umar be counted as a Companion, and what have the Salaf elders said in relation to cursing him?

He replied, 'There are two statements of Imam Ahmad ibn Hanbal on this; one is an indication (that you can), the other direct (both that you can). These two views were also given by Imam Malik and by Imam 'Abu Hanifa. We (those who follow imam Shafi'i's fatwas) have only one fatwa in this regard, that it is permissible to curse Yazeed, he should be cursed since he used to play chess, would hunt with Cheetahs and drank alcohol".

Allamah Taftazani said Yazeed was worthy of more than just cursing We read in Sharh Muqassad:

"The harms that were inflicted on the Ahl'ul bayt after the Sahaba are acts that cannot be covered up. These acts were so heinous that they cannot be hidden - all including animals testify to their suffering. Their pain was such that the earth and skies shed tears and beat themselves when their suffering is retold - and retelling this shall continue until the Day of Judgement. May Allah's curse be upon those that perpetuated injustices, and those that helped them (to carry out these acts). The curse on these individuals shall be even greater in the next world. If some Ulema are opposed to cursing, then it should be known that Yazeed deserves more than just cursing".

Allamah Baghdadi's Fatwa - Yazeed denied the Prophethood, to curse him is an act of Ibadath We read in Tafseer Ruh al Ma'ani page 72 commentary of Surah Muhammad:

"The wicked Yazeed failed to testify to the Prophethood of Hadhrath Muhammad (s). He also perpetrated acts against the residents of Makka, Medina and the family of the Prophet (s). He indulged in these acts against them during their lives and after their deaths. These acts are so conclusively proven that had he placed the Qur'an in his hands it would have testified to his kuffar. His being a fasiq and fajir did not go unnoticed by the Ulema of Islam, but the Salaf had no choice but to remain silent as they were living under threat.

If we for arguments sake accept that Yazeed was a Muslim who lapsed and committed wrongs, one should know that a man of the rank of Alusi deemed it permissible to curse him by name as he [Yazeed] was a living example of atrocious acts and it is a well-known fact that he never sought forgiveness for killing the family of the Prophet (s) and other acts. The claim that he asked for forgiveness is even weaker than the claim that he possessed iman. When cursing him the names of Ibn Ziyad and Umar bin Sa'd should also be added, may Allah's curse be on them all. curse till the Day of Judgement, until then our eyes shall shed tears for Husayn's suffering.

If someone does not wish to curse by name through fear [that they might be wrong, such as Ghazali], then he should say 'May God's curse be upon those that were pleased at Husayn's killing, those that subjected sufferings on the family of the Prophet, who usurped their rights - when making such a curse Yazeed's name comes to the top of the list.

No one can oppose this method of cursing save Ibn Arabi and his like minded supporters and this is major misguidance on their part - it is worse than the misguidance of Yazeed".

Taftazani, a mainstream Sunni scholar, is reprimanding certain Sufi elements for taking one of their principles too far - that harbouring feelings of hatred to someone impairs progress on the spiritual path, which is not the case when cursing Yazeed as it falls into the realm of forbidding evil. Some Sufis reconcile this as they all accept Husayn (as) as possessed of great spiritual munificence by 'distancing' themselves from Yazeed. Others curse Yazeed.

It is important to note that Sufi Sheikhs are not usually experts on the religious traditions (Hadith), law or history, whatever their spiritual standing might be. This is not denied by any Sufis except fanatical devotees. In this realm the four Sunni imams supersede, all of whom said it was permissible to curse Yazeed.

The Fatwas of Qadhi Abu Ya'ala and Abu Husayn deeming it permissible to curse Yazeed Ibn Katheer in al Bidaya stated:

"Whoever frightens Medina incurs the wrath of Allah, His Angels and all the people - and some Ulema have deemed it permissible to curse Yazeed. This includes individuals such as Ahmad ibn Hanbal, Allamah Hilalee, Abu Bakr Abdul Aziz, Qadhi Abu Ya'ala and his son Qadhi Abu Husayn. Ibn Jauzi wrote a book deeming it permissible to curse Yazeed".

Nasibi grounds for NOT cursing Yazeed

Continuing on from the above text we read Ibn Katheer tried to explain why some concerned parties opposed cursing Yazeed. This is the bit that Azam Tariq failed to quote and thus took Ibn Katheer's words out of context (yet again):

"Some have opposed cursing Yazeed and written books urging people to refrain from such a practice since by making Yazeed a waseela for cursing, the curse may fall back onto his father and other Sahaba".

By this reasoning, Ibn Katheer has in effect placed the ropes into the hands of his Nasibi brethren; the only reason that Yazeed should not be cursed is because by doing so his dear old father might also be at risk of being cursed. If Mu'awiya or the other Sahaba did nothing wrong, then what on earth is there to worry about? You're hiding the Sahaba's atrocities beneath that kaftan Ibn Kathir.

We praise Abu Ya'ala and his son who sided with the truth. It is also interesting that Ibn Kathir, whose work is quoted by Azam Tariq, actually does nothing to exonerate Yazeed.

Al Suyuti personally cursed Yazeed

In Tareekh ul Khulafa page 207, Dhikr Shahadath Husayn we read as follows:

"May Allah's curse be upon the killers of Husayn and Ibn Ziyad".

Qadhi Thanauallah Panee Pathee deemed it permissible to curse the kaafir Yazeed We read in Tafseer Mazhari Volume 5 page 21, under the commentary of Surah Ibrahim verse 28 as follows:

"The Banu Umayya were initially kaafir, then some of them presented themselves as Muslim. Yazeed then became a kaafir. The Banu Umayya maintained their enmity towards the family of the Prophet, and killed Husayn in a cruel manner. The kaafir Yazeed committed kufr in relation to the Deen of Muhammad proven by the fact that at the time of the killing of Husayn he made a pointed reference to avenging the deaths of his kaafir ancestors slain in Badr. He acted against the family of Muhammad (s), Banu Hashim and in his drunken state he praised the Banu Umayya and cursed the Banu Hashim from the pulpit".

Yazeed's actions that mean that he turned to apostasy is within itself grounds for deeming him to be cursed.

The Fatwa of Imam Ahmad that Yazeed has been cursed in the Qur'an We also read in Tafeer Mazhari as follows:

"Qadhi Abu Ya'ala in his own book al Muthamud al Usul that Saleh Ibn Hanbal asked his father Ahmad: 'Some people state, 'We are the friends of Yazeed'. Abu Hanifa replied 'If people have faith in Allah, then it is unlikely that they also have faith in Yazeed, and why should they for this is a man that has been cursed in the Qur'an. I asked 'Where is Yazeed cursed in the Qur'an?' He replied 'Have fear when spread Fitnah through the land - these are people that Allah has cursed' - can there be a greater fitnah that killing Husayn?'"

The Fatwa of Ibn Jauzi: Hadith can testify to the fact that Yazeed can be cursed In *Tadhkira Khawaas* Ibn Jauzi al Hanafi states

"If someone states that the Prophet of Allah had blessed those that partook in the conquest of Caesar's city, then we will reply by pointing out that the Prophet of Allah (s) said whoever frightens Medina is cursed. This incorporates Yazeed and abrogates the first hadith".

Very logical too.

The Shaafi Ulema deem it permissible to curse Yazeed

We should point out that Ghazzali was an adherent of the Shaafi madhab. Another Shaafi scholar Allamah Alusi set out the viewpoint of the Shaafi Ulema on this topic as follows: "Amongst the Shaafi's we are in agreement that it is permissible to curse Yazeed" *Haseeya Nabraas* page 551

When a renowned Shaafi scholar has taken the responsibility to reflect the opinion of the Shaafi Ulema, confirming that they deemed it permissible to curse Yazeed, then the opposite voice of Imam Ghazzali's fatwa becomes batil (false).

We have cited actual Sunni texts wherein the supreme Sunni scholars of all time deemed it permissible to curse Yazeed. Azam Tariq seeks solace in the fatwa of al Ghazzali. Now whose fatwa bears greater value, the sole fatwa of Ibn Ghazzali or the fatwas of all the Sunni Ulama that we cited? Why should this single Ghazzali fatwa be deemed to be strong and conclusive enough to nullify the fatwas of all these Sunni Ulema?

Would the more correct approach not to be to reject Ghazzali's fatwa and give greater credence to these Salaf Ulema who had an ijma (consensus) that it was permissible to curse Yazeed? Why are the Salafi and Deobandi seeking to create doubts over matter that has attained broad consensus by the Sunni Ulema? In reality by quoting Ghazzali they are trying to divide the Sufis, who they are well-known to despise. Our du'a is that Allah (swt) guide these advocates of Yazeed to disown and hate Yazeed and to develop faith and love for the family of the Prophet (s).

Azam Tariq's false attempts to represent Sunni aqeedah

Azam Tariq's objection to the terminology 'Imam' Azam Tariq then sets his sites on our Imam as follows:

Kr-hcy.com states: **ANOTHER THING TO GUARD AGAINST IS THE USE OF TITLE OF "IMAM" AND ALAYHI SALLAAM FOR HAZRAT HUSAYN. THE MAJORITY OF MUSLIMS UNCONSCIOUSLY REMEMBER HAZRAT HUSAYN AS "IMAM HUSAYN ALAYHI SALLAAM", ALTHOUGH THIS SMACKS OF SHIAISM. FOR ALL THE SAHABA, WE USE WORD (HAZRAT) OUT OF RESPECT AND REVERENCE FOR THEM SUCH AS HAZRAT ABU BAKAR, HAZRAT UMAR, HAZRAT USMAN, HAZRAT ALI ETC. WE NEVER SAY IMAM ABU BAKAR OR IMAM UMAR.**

Reply One

Yet again this lying Nasibi is making a claim without any foundation ... i.e. lying again, yes the kaftan is being held high till the very end of this article. We could produce countless writings of the Ahl'ul Sunnah wherein Husayn (as) has been referred to as Imam. This Nasibi's objective has nothing to with bringing Sunni Islam back to the grand old days and way of the Salaf.

It is do with replacing Sunni Islam with Nasibi ideology that showers grand accolades on the enemies of Ahl'ul bayt (as) such as Mu'awiya and Yazeed, something that none of the old ulema did save Ghazali (because of lack of knowledge), while Ghazali's boss imam Shafi'i said cursing Yazeed was acceptable.

Reply Two

Azam Tariq Nasibi sought to set the alleged record straight by stating: Kr-hcy.com states: **FOR ALL THE SAHABA, WE USE WORD (HAZRAT) OUT OF RESPECT AND REVERENCE FOR THEM SUCH AS HAZRAT ABU BAKAR, HAZRAT UMAR, HAZRAT USMAN, HAZRAT ALI ETC. WE NEVER SAY IMAM ABU BAKAR OR IMAM UMAR.**

If the terms Imam are not used for Abu Bakr and Umar it is because they never viewed themselves as Imams nor did Rasulullah (s) view them as such. An Imam under Arabic terminology is one who leads and a Khalifah is one who follows. Abu Bakr never viewed himself as an Imam and underlined his own failings in his inaugural speech to mark his momentous coming to power in Saqifa Bani Sa'da, we are quoting from *Tarikh Tabari Volume 9 page 201*:

"Now then: O people, I have been put in charge of you, although I am not the best of you. Help me if I do well; rectify me if I do wrong".

If their own failings as Imams are proven it does in any way mean that no one can else can be referred to as Imam. Tariq's patriarchal efforts to bestow his corrupt views on the unsuspecting Ahl'ul Sunnah means nothing when we have specific hadith wherein the Prophet of Allah (s) referred to Imam 'Ali (as) as an Imam, when he declared:

"Three things have been revealed to me about Ali: That he is the Sayyid al Muslimeen (Chief of Muslims), Imam-ul-Muttaqeen (Imam of the Pious),

and wa Qa'id ul Ghurrul Muhajj'ileen (Leader of the bright-faced people on Yaum al Qiyamah)"

Taken from *Al Mustadrak*, by *Imam Hakim*, p 137 & 138 *Riyadh al Nadira*, by *Mohibbuddin al Tabari*, Vol 2, p 122

If Azam Tariq finds the term abhorrent then he is free to do so, for the only people that are entitled to refer to 'Ali (as) as an Imam are those that are pious. Nasibi have no correlation with piety. They extol Dhaalim Khalifahs, incite fitnah, lies and shed the blood of innocent Muslims. Imam 'Ali (as) is not the Imam of Dhaalims and dog/bear/sister/mother/man/daughter/boy penetrator, only the pious.

Azam Tariq's objection to the terminology 'alahis salaam'

Kr-hcy.com states: **SIMILARLY AFTER THE NAME OF EVERY SAHABI WE USE AND WRITE THE WORD (RADIALLAHU ANHU I.E. MAY ALLAH BE PLEASED WITH HIM) AND NEVER USE THE WORDS LIKE (ALAYHI SALLAAM I.E. PEACE AND BLESSINGS OF ALLAH BE UPON HIM) WHICH ARE RESERVED FOR ONLY THE PROPHETS. AS SUCH, WE NEVER WRITE OR UTTER HAZRAT ABU BAKAR (ALAYHI SALLAAM) OR HAZRAT UMAR ALAYHI SALLAAM BUT IN CASE OF HAZRAT HUSAYN WE USE ALAYHI SALLAAM. HAVE WE EVER GIVEN A THOUGHT WHY IT IS SO? IT IS BECAUSE OF THE INFLUENCE OF SHIAISM WHICH HAS IMPERCEPTIBLY CREPT INTO OUR MINDS.**

Reply

Although this Nasibi's comments have no bearing on the Shi'a, we would like to point out that he is yet again falsely claiming to represent Ahl'ul Sunnah aqeedah. What greater evidence can we cite to counter this Nasibi than the fatwa of Sunni Islam's most beloved opponent of the Shi'a, al Muhaddith Shah Abdul Aziz Dehlavi? When this question was posed to him he replied as follows:

"The term alahis salaam can also be referred to for non-prophets, and evidence of this can be ascertained from the fact that in the books of hadith the words alahis salaam can be found next to the names of Hadhrath 'Ali, Hasan, Husayn, Fatima, Khadija, Abbas. Some Ulema have opposed this, in opposition to the Shi'a, but this terminology is not prohibited under the Shari'a

Fatal Azeezi page 235

Similarly Allamah Alusi wrote:

"On this matter the views of the Ulema are different. In the view of most Ulema it is permissible. In other words whoever first refers to Rasulullah (s) and then to Husayn, or where he refers to Rasulullah (s) in the same context that he refers to Husayn (as), then usage in both contexts is permissible. They have sought to prove this in reliance of this verse:

'Allah and his Angels send blessings on Rasulullah (s), Salute him with the best salutation'''

and also the sahih hadith:

1. My father went to the Prophet with his alms and the Prophet said, "O Allah! Send your blessings upon the offspring of Abu Aufa."
2. Rasulullah (s) opened his hands and stated:

'O Allah send your mercies upon the family Sa'd ibn Ubadah

3. Hadhrath Jabir narrates that he approached Rasulullah and requested 'O Allah send blessings on me and my family' and Rasulullah (s) sent blessings in this manner. Ibn Habban commented on this narration in detail.

4. Rasulullah (s) stated 'Angels recite for every momin 'Salam alayka wa alai jasdhaak'" Ruh al Ma'ani Part 22 page 85

Azam Tariq's attack on the concept of Imamate

Kr-hcy.com states: REMEMBER THAT IMAMATE IS AN ARTICLE OF FAITH WITH THE SHIAS AND ACCORDING TO THEIR BELIEF IMAM IS SINLESS LIKE THE PROPHET AND APPOINTED AND COMMISSIONED BY ALLAH. HAZRAT HUSAYN IS ONE OF THEIR (SHIA) TWELVE IMAMS. AS SUCH THE SHIAS USE THE TITLE OF "IMAM" FOR HAZRAT HUSAYN ALTHOUGH IN THE SIGHT OF SUNNI MUSLIMS, HE IS A SAHABI AND NOT A "SINLESS IMAM" APPOINTED AND COMMISSIONED BY ALLAH. WE DO NOT SUSCRIBE TO THE SHIA BELIEF OF IMAMATE.

Whilst Ahl'ul Sunnah my not ascribe to the concept of Imamate within their pillars it still forms a part of their aqeedah, and their Ulema have confirmed this fact in their books of aqaid. Both Sunni and Shi'a schools hold Imamate as a part of aqeedah. Rather the difference lies over the method of appointment.

Quoting Mulla Ali Qari's book "Sharh Fiqh Akbar", which sets out the madhab of Imam Abu Hanifa, this is what we read in the Chapter "Masala Nusbul Imamah" (Issue of appointment of the Imam):

"It is the majority opinion that there is a duty to appoint an Imam. But there is a difference, as to whether this is Allah's duty or whether this is incumbent on the public. The belief in the eyes of Ahl'ul Sunnah and Muttazalites is that the duty to appoint an Imam is a duty of the public. In terms of hadith and logic this is a duty of the public. In accordance with this belief, there is a hadith in Sahih Muslim, narrated by Abdullah ibne Umar 'He who dies without giving bayah to an Imam dies the death of one belonging to the days of jahiliyyah'. This is why the Sahaba viewed the appointment of the Imam as so important that they preferred it to attending the Prophet's funeral, because the Muslims need an Imam so that orders can be made on Jihad, and so that Islamic Laws can be implemented"

Sharh Fiqh Akbar, by *Mulla Ali Qari*, p 175 (publishers Muhammad Saeed and son, Qur'an Muhall, Karachi)

Maulana Abdul Aziz Fehrawi expands on this matter yet further:

"The appointment of the Imam is compulsory, its foundation is based on the fact that Rasulullah (s) said whoever dies in a state where he has failed to recognise the Imam of his time. who dies at a time when the Imam is present and fails to recognise him, or dies when no Imam exists (nevertheless), his death shall be the death of jahiliyyah (one belonging to the time of ignorance). We have a hadith in Sahih Muslim by Ibn Umar - whoever dies without an Imam dies the death of jahiliyya. In the tradition of Muslim we find these precise words "Whoever dies in state, having not had bayya over his neck shall die the death of one belonging to the time of jahiliyyah".

al Nabraas Sharh al aqa'id page 512:

Incidentally the last sentence of this discourse on the Sunni concept of imamate also shows the real reason why the modern-day Nasibi ulema oppose Imam Husayn (as) being called as such by the majority of Sunnis. Since imamate is linked here to the bayya, by calling him Imam Husayn (as) the Nasibis are aware of the fact that most Sunnis accept Imam Husayn (as) as their imam and rightful khalifa and not Yazeed. This is a perplexing phenomenon of which the Nasibis are aware, for Husayn (as) was not appointed by man, and could thus only have been appointed by Allah, as the Shias claim their Imams are. Yet such was the vindication of truth that he achieved over a demonic khalifa that Husayn (as) is accepted as the rightful Imam in the spiritual sense by the Sunni majority, and the khalifa of the time Yazeed is cursed. The Shia Imam embodying pure goodness fought against the Sunni imam embodying pure evil. Yet the Sunni majority to this day side with the Shia Imam. This is intolerable to the Nasibis.

These two references from classical Hanafi scholars confirm that the Imamate is a part of aqeedah and that:

Man has the duty to appoint the Imam

Failure to recognise the Imam leads to the individual dying a kaafir.

If an issue as the difference between dying a Momin or a kaafir has nothing to do with aqeedah then what on earth does?

The Shi'a, as Azam Tariq has (for a change) correctly said, believe that the Imam is appointed by Allah (swt) and is infallible. We have proven this belief from the Qur'an and Sunni sources in the article 'The creed of the Shi'a' available on this site. It is the difference in the two approaches that came to loggerheads at Karbala: the khalifa appointed by man - imam Yazeed, versus Allah's appointed Imam Husayn (as). And the Sunni majority supports the Shia imam against their own imam. Sometimes whole populations oppose their leader over an issue of conscience and an intuitive understanding, deep down, as to who is right and who is wrong.

We see this in the phenomenon of peace demonstrations by western civilians against the various wars that western governments have fought in their name. It is the same thing here with the Sunni majority's attitude to Imam Husayn (as) and Yazeed. Azam Tariq cannot stand this as it deconstructs the whole edifice of Sunni Islam. We would like to end this section with a simple question to our brothers from Ahl'ul Sunnah: 'Supporting which Imam at that time meant the difference between dying the death of jahiliyyah and attaining salvation, Yazeed or Husayn?'.

Azam Tariq has implied above that he cannot stand the fact that the Sunni majority say it is Imam Husayn (as) that they choose.

We pray that this question, in light of our analysis of Yazeed's character, leads our Ahl'ul Sunnah brothers to understand the serious flaw that exists in believing that man NOT Allah (swt) decides on Imamate over a people. We saw what happens when a man rules. Yazeed was one of several similarly degenerate khalifas. But he embodied these degenerate traits to an unrivalled degree, This is what man's appointment of khalifa means. This is why the Nasibis come up with the most ridiculous lies to hide his reality, for it is so scathing for the Sunni notion of khilafat. Not only scathing because

Yazeed was so low, it is ten times more scathing because good was represented by an Imam of the Shia.

Why do these Nasibi vigorously defend the reign of Yazeed?

This is one of those questions that automatically comes to mind when one analyses the character of Yazeed. The reason lies in aqeedah, and goes to the heart of where the Sunni / Shi'a viewpoints diverge. The core difference between the two schools is on the topic of Imamate: who has the right to lead the Ummah. Shi'a Muslims believe that this leadership is religious guidance and hence the appointment is the sole right of Allah (swt), for He (swt) knows what is best for his Servants and He (swt) shall appoint the man best suited / most superior to lead the Ummah through all times.

Allah (swt) will select an Imam who is best in character, most excelled on the components of Deen, who shall only rule via justice (if you want details see a 'moderate' article by a separate author but which we have copied and pasted onto this site called "The Khalifatullah in Shia Belief" for proof of this). There is no need for ijma, or votes since Allah (swt) appoints and no one has a voice in the matter.

The Ahl'ul Sunnah believe that the appointment of the Imam is a duty of the Public - they decide on who comes to power. The importance in relation to appointment is the act of giving bayya - once the Khalifah has received ijma then his imamate is legitimate. The act of bayya is the crucial factor here - the people decide who is in power (a democratically elected dictatorship for life), and the khalifa's character has no further bearing since once in power the Khalifah has to be obeyed. Any opposition is squashed, with violence. From the time of Mu'awiya onwards, all the khalifates become monarchies.

When this is the basis for Ahl'ul Sunnah aqeedah, then over time their jurists have sought to revise the concept of imamate with stipulations over certain characteristics that Imam should possess, such as bravery, piety, and justice, especially after the embarrassing debacle (for Sunni Islam) with Yazeed and certain other members of the Banu Umayyad dynasty - for example the khalifa Waleed who expressed his desire to drink alcohol on the roof of the Ka'aba.

Unfortunately these writings have been nothing more than a 'Dear Santa Wish List' since an analysis of early Islamic history will quickly lead to us learning that characteristics such as justice were completely devoid in these Khalifahs, and there is no better example than Yazeed. Indeed with the exception of perhaps Umar bin Abdul Aziz in 1,100 years of khilafat after Yazeed, barely a pious man acceded to this position. Most were as bad as kings anywhere were. This left many classical Salaf scholars with a very difficult problem:

If they reject Yazeed, they are then rejecting the concept of ijma that had been allegedly created at Saqifa Bani Sa'ada, and underpins Sunni Islam

Rejecting this ijma'a in effect discredits Sunni aqeedah that the duty to appoint the imam is the right of the public.

If this concept is discredited, by highlighting Yazeed's demonic character and satanic actions, then the Ummah is forced to consider the alternative option of appointment as ascribed to by the Shi'a school of thought.

The Salaf Ulema, faced with this difficult problem, have decided to uphold the legitimacy of Yazeed's reign since this is the only way that their belief in man made appointment can be maintained. This accounts for their pathological and indeed blatant lying, which embarrasses even the Nasibis. We shall now seek to set out the consequence of this belief

Rasulullah (s) said that he would be succeeded by twelve khalifahs We are quoting from *Sahih Muslim hadith number 4483*, English translation by Abdul Hamid Siddiqui:

"The Islamic religion will continue, until the hour has been established, or you have been ruled over by 12 Caliphs, all of them being from Quraish".

This is what we read in Mishkat al Masabih:

"I heard the Apostle of Allah say 'Islam shall not cease to be glorious up to twelve Caliphs, every one of them being from the Quraish'. (And in a narration) 'The affairs of men will not cease to decline so long as twelve men will rule over them, every one of them coming from Quraysh.'" And in a narration: "The religion will continue to be established till the hour comes as there are twelve Caliphs over them, everyone of them coming from the Quraish"

Mishkat al Masabih: (Vol 4 p 576), Hadith 5

The Salafi and Hanafi Schools of thought have graded Yazeed as the Sixth Khalifa of Rasulullah (s) Sharh Fiqh Akbar page 50 Dhikr Fadail Uns Bad un Nabi

Sawaiqh al Muhriqa page 12 Chapter 3

Tareekh al Khulafa page 11 Fadail Dhikr Khilafath Islam

Tareekh Khamees Volume 2 page 291 Dhikr Khilafat Hasan

Umdah' thul Qari fi Sharh Bukhari Volume 11 page 435, Kitab al Ahkaam

We read in *Sharh Fiqh Akbar*:

Rasulullah (s) said that the Deen shall remain strong as long as these twelve Khalifahs are at the helm, and the twelve are Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthman, 'Ali Mu'awiya, Yazid, Abdul Malik bin Marwan, Walid bin Abdul Malik bin Marwan, Sulayman bin Abdul Malik bin Marwan, Umar bin Abdul Aziz, Yazid bin Abdul Malik bin Marwan, Hasham bin Abdul Malik bin Marwan The sixth Imam of truth according to Abu Sulaiman and Azam Tariq is Yazeed, but this is a fact that these Ulema often don't mention to the public.

Abdullah Ibn Umar deemed the bayya to Yazeed to be in accordance with the conditions set by Allah (swt) and Rasulullah (s) We read in *Sahih al Bukhari*, Narrated Nafi':

When the people of Medina dethroned Yazeed bin Muawiya, Ibn 'Umar gathered his special friends and children and said, "I heard the Prophet saying, 'A flag will be fixed for every betrayer on the Day of Resurrection,' and we have given the oath of allegiance to this person (Yazeed) in accordance with the conditions enjoined by Allah and His Apostle and I do not know of anything more faithless than fighting a person who has been

given the oath of allegiance in accordance with the conditions enjoined by Allah and His Apostle, and if ever I learn that any person among you has agreed to dethrone Yazeed, by giving the oath of allegiance (to somebody else) then there will be separation between him and me."

Sahih al-Bukhari Volume 9, Book 88, Number 227:

This fatwa epitomises the entire Sunni aqeedah on Imamate. We leave it to those with open minds to now decide which concept of Imamate holds true. One that deems this to be based purely on Allah (swt)'s selection, or one that deems it man's choice no matter who, so much so that reign of Yazeed, a drunk, fornicating, Dhaalim homosexual is also in accordance with the conditions prescribed by Allah (swt) and Rasulullah (s). Would Allah (swt) really bless the reign of such a man?

Our Ahl'ul Sunnah brothers should know that 'you can't keep your cake and eat it' - if you want to reject the khilafat of Yazeed, then you are in effect rejecting Sunni aqeedah on Imamate. If you accept the khilafat of Yazeed, you are in effect joining the camp of the Salafi and Deobandi Nasibi shaped around the fatwa of Abdullah ibn Umar. On the plains of Kerbala the two concepts of Imamate came to a head - man-made appointment (Yazeed) versus Allah's appointment (Imam Husayn (as)). We pray that this article shall shed light over the consequence of believing that man, not Allah (swt) decides on the appointment of the Imam. It took the Imam appointed by Allah (swt) to lay down his life and that of his dearest blood family to save the religion for you.

Fatwa of Imam of Ahl'ul Sunnah, al Muhaddith Shah Abdul Aziz Dehlavi - whoever opposes the teachings of the Ahl'ul bayt (as) is a liar We read in *Fatwa Azizi page 251*, Hadith Saqlain (The Hadith of the Two Significant Things). It should be known that the Sunni and Shi'a madhab are in agreement that Rasulullah (s) stated:

'I am leaving amongst you two things; if you follow them you shall never go astray after me. These two compliment one another. One is the Book of Allah, the other is my Ahl'ul bayt (as)''.

This is the most tawatur (reliable) Hadith in Sunni Hadith methodology. It is shocking that the most incontrovertibly correct statement that Sunni scholars accept that ever came from the tongue of the Prophet (saws) is rarely recounted to the Sunni public. It really is shocking and it smells of a cover-up of the truth by paternalistic-minded Sunni scholars. From here it can be ascertained in relation to the Shari'a of Allah that man must adhere to following both these two significant things. It is clear that the aqeedah and deeds are false of one who does not follow these two weighty things - any authority and anyone that denies these two has rebelled against the Deen. At Karbala, Imam Husayn (as) was the symbol of Allah (swt), and it was Yazeed who was the rebel against the sign of Allah (swt). The Sunni khilafat had turned against Allah (swt) and had done so before all mankind. This is why Yazeed is such an embarrassment to the Sunni establishment. Yet Husayn (as) was so good, that even they cannot help but revere him.

Our appeal to justice

We have cited the fatwa of Shah Abdul Aziz Dehlavi with regards to the position of one that rejects the Ahl'ul bayt (as). This was from the mouth of

one of the lead opponents of the Shi'a of his time. The Shah stated that a madhab that opposes the Ahl'ul bayt is false and bears no value. When we see today's Nasibi presentation of the Ahl'ul bayt (as):

Their raising doubts over the teachings upheld by the Ahl'ul bayt in Karbala,

Their rejection of the great sacrifice of Imam Husayn (as) in Karbala,

Their refusal to accept that the stance of Ahl'ul bayt (as) was a stance between truth and falsehood

Their belief that Imam Husayn (as)'s opposition was 'dangerous agitation' and that he was a baghi These facts have been presented before you, and we appeal to those who claim themselves to be Ahl'ul Sunnah, why do you remain silent and allow the Nasibi to bark in the manner that Azam Tariq and Co. do?

If your silence is on account of the fact that to speak out to defend Imam Husayn (as), may be misconstrued as support for the Shi'a as he is their Imam, then what judgement can we give on the state of your claiming to have iman, shahada and love for Ahl'ul bayt (as)? When it comes to the issue of disrespecting the Sahaba your honour is immediately challenged and you stand up vocally and attack the Shi'a on your websites, and yet when these Nasibi openly bark against the Ahl'ul bayt (as) in this type of manner then you all remain silent on the matter.

You might not know it but the Nasibi plague is subconsciously affecting your hearts. The true scholars of ahl-al-Sunna vehemently condemned Yazeed. Yet the Nasibi ulema, for reasons we have exposed, blatantly lie and say that in the battle between good and evil, good was evil and evil was good. Yet are you becoming those masses of whom the Prophet (saws) said that the Ummah would, in the last days, listen to ulema who lie?

You should know that even if the entire Sunni world sides alongside the Nasibi on this issue, it shall not effect the Ahl'ul bayt in the slightest. It is your soul in the balance, not that of Imam Husayn (as). All Muslims accept he is the Chief of the Youths of Paradise. And we are all youths in Paradise. Will you be one of those youths? For more details on the supreme sacrifice of Karbala access any Shia bookshop. We plan to produce details on the ultimate battle of good versus evil on this site.