



REVEALING THE TRUTH

Who killed Imam Hussain (as)?

Work file: who_killed_imam_hussain.pdf

Project: Answering-Ansar.org Articles

Revisions:

No.	Date	Author	Description	Review Info
2.0.0	17.01.2006	Answering-Ansar.org	2 nd Edition	Lot of spelling/typing corrections. Few new sub-chapters also included.
1.0.0	04.08.2002	Answering-Ansar.org	Created	

Contents

<u>1. SO WHO KILLED IMAM HUSSAIN (AS)? – LETS INVESTIGATE HISTORY</u>	4
<u>2. THE BELIEFS OF THE PEOPLE OF KUFA</u>	5
2.1 THE MASS EXTERMINATION OF THE KUFAN SHI'A BY MU'AWIYA'S GOVERNOR ZIYAD	5
2.2 SAHABA AND TABIEEN LIVING IN KUFA WROTE TO IMAM HUSSAIN (AS) AND BECAME THE TAWABUN	7
2.3 THE SAHABI SULAYMAN BIN SURAD AND AL MUSSAYAB BIN NAJABAH LED THE TAWABUN	7
<u>3. ANALYSING THE COMMENTS OF S.M.A JAFRI</u>	10
<u>4. THE PARTICIPATION OF THE SAHABA AND THEIR SONS IN KILLING HADHRATH MUSLIM BIN AQEEL (AS)</u>	12
4.1 THE SHI'A OF UTHMAN / NASIBIS KILLED IMAM HUSSAIN (AS)	13
<u>5. NAMING AND SHAMING THE NASIBI KILLERS OF IMAM HUSSAIN (AS)</u>	16
5.1 YAZEED'S ADVISER MARWAN WAS A NASIBI	16
5.2 YAZEED BIN MU'AWIYA WAS A NASIBI	16
5.3 UBAYDULLAH BIN ZIYAD'S FATHER WAS A NASIBI	16
<u>6. SO WHO SUPPORTS THE NASIBI KILLERS OF IMAM HUSSAIN (AS)?</u>	17
6.1 UMAR BIN SAD BIN ABI WAQQAS	17
6.2 UBAYDULLAH BIN ZIYAD	18
6.3 SHABATH BIN RIB'I	19
6.4 SOME MORE PROOFS OF THE KILLERS OF IMAM HUSSAIN [AS] BEING NASIBIS WHILE SUPPORTERS OF IMAM HUSSAIN [AS] BEING SHIA	20
PROOF ONE	20
PROOF TWO	21
PROOF THREE	21
PROOF FOUR	22
PROOF FIVE	23
PROOF SIX	24
<u>7. DID THE TRAGEDY OF KARBALA HIGHLIGHT THE SHI'A / SUNNI SCHISM?</u>	26
7.1 AHL'UL SUNNAH DEEM YAZEED TO BE THE LEGITIMATE KHALIFA OF RASULULLAH (S)	26

7.2	THE HANAFI FIQH DEEMS YAZEED TO BE THE SIXTH KHALIFA OF RASULULLAH (S)	
	28	
7.3	IT WAS INCUMBENT UPON ALL MUSLIMS TO SUPPORT IMAM HUSSAIN (AS)	30
7.4	NASIBI SUPPORT FOR YAZEED	30
7.5	YAZEED WAS A SUNNI MUSLIM	33
7.6	SOME QUESTIONS FOR ANSAR AND THEIR NASIBI BRETHERN	34
8.	<u>THE IMAMS CRITICISM OF ‘THEIR’ SHI’A</u>	36
	REPLY ONE	39
	REPLY TWO - THE AHL’UL SUNNAH FALSELY CLAIMED THAT THEY WERE SHI’AS	39
8.1	THE SHI’A WILL ENTER HEAVEN WITH THE PROPHET (S), IMAMS ALI (AS) HASAN (AS) AND HUSYAN (AS)	43
9.	<u>CONCLUSION</u>	45
10.	<u>COPYRIGHT</u>	47

1. So who killed Imam Hussain (as)? – Lets investigate history

Ansar had perpetuated the common lie that the Shia killed Imam Hussain (as). In this refutation we shall analyse the facts of history to expose the fallacy of such a claim. Their argument can be summarised as follows

1. The Shi'a invited Imam Hussain (as) by writing letters and requesting that he come to Kufa so that they can recognise him as their Imam.
2. Imam Hussain (as) sent Muslim bin Aqeel (as) as his representative to assess the situation
3. The Shi'a gave bayya to Imam Hussain via Hadhrath Muslim bin Aqeel (as).
4. The same Shi'a subsequently abandoned him following the entry of Abdullah ibn Ziyad.
5. The Shi'a failed to support Imam Hussain (as) as a result he was killed.

The approach we have taken is to focus on the historical sources in detail and then identify and expose the beliefs of the Kufan people.

2. The beliefs of the people of Kufa

Imam of Ahl'ul Sunnah Allamah Shibli Numani in al Faruq states that Hadhrath Umar established Kufa city:

"The city was founded in 17AH and, as Omar had expressly commanded, houses sufficient to lodge forty thousand persons were built. Arab tribes were allotted separate quarters under the supervision of Hayaj ibn Malik. Omar had given clear instructions with regard to the plan of the city as well as its construction... The Jami Masjid was built on a raised square platform and was so big that forty thousand persons could pray in it at one time."

 [Omar the great \(Al Faruq\) Volume 2 page 95](#)

"Besides the Jami Masjid, separate mosques were built for each quarter of the city. Among the people settled in Kufah were twelve thousand from Yemen and eight thousand of the Nazar Clan. Bahilah, Nim-ul Lat, Taghlab, Bani Asad, Nakha, Kindah, Azd, Mazainah, Tamim, Muharab, Asad and Amirm Bajalah, Jadilah and Akhlat, Juhaina, Muhjaz, Hawazin, etc"

"In Omar's lifetime the city came to attain such greatness and splendour that the Caliph called it the head of Islam".

 [Omar the great \(Al Faruq\) Volume 2 page 96](#)

Kufa was a city that was founded by the second khalifa, Arab tribes settled there. No doubt they were loyal to him. They deemed him to be the legitimate khalifa, so much so that Umar deemed Kufa to be the head of Islam. Accordingly they accepted the Caliphate of Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman. Umar's building a Jami Masjid having accommodation of 40,000 worshippers and many other mosques further proves the fact that the majority of the population were his followers or Nawasib want to suggest that their caliph made a mosque for 40,000 Shias?

The people of Kufa believed firmly in Khailafath of Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthman and 'Ali (as). This is clearly proven by the fact that we read in al-Tabari (Egypt Ed) p189 Volume 5 Chapter 19, that when a group including Malik bin Ashthar spoke out against Uthman in Kufa they were set upon and attacked.

The Kufan Arabs accepted the concept of khilafath that had been established at Saqifa, and expanded by Hadhrath Umar. The Kufans were those that deemed Ali (as) to be the fourth khalifa, which is not the belief espoused by the Shi'a who deem him (as) to be the rightful khalifa after Rasulullah (s).

We do not learn from any authentic text of history that the vast bulk of the people of Kufa were Shi'a, on the contrary we learn that the majority were adherents of Uthman.

2.1 The mass extermination of the Kufan Shi'a by Mu'awiya's Governor Ziyad

Afriki had posed this question regarding the situation Imam Hussain (as) faced:

Ansar.org states:

There are also the numerous references to the people of Kûfah as the followers (albeit capricious followers) of his father and brother. And were we to assume that many, or even most of them were not Shî'ah in the "religious" sense, the question

which next presents itself is: Where were the real Shi'ah when their Imâm required their help? Were they only that handful who emerged from Kûfah?

One should also point out that any trace of Shi'a presence that existed in Kufa was in effect eliminated with the coming to power of Ansar.org's Imam Mu'awiya. When Ziyad bin Sumayya became Governor of Kufa he slaughtered the vast bulk of the Shi'a of Ali, to the extent that only a few were left.

see:

1. *Al Bidayah wa al Nihaya Volume 3 P50;*
2. *Al Kamil Volume 3 page 245,*
3. *Nasai al Kafiya page 70,*
4. *al Istiab Volume 1 p138 and*
5. *Tarikh al Tabari Volume 6 page 155*

Allamah Muhammad Bin Aqeel writes in Nisaih Kafia, page 70 (published in Bombay):

"Muwiyah made Ziyad Bin Sumaya governor over the people of Kufa and linked it with Basrah. As Ziyad had lived in Kufa during the time of Ali[ra], he was aware of all Shias living there. He dragged Shias from every stone and mount and murdered them, threatened them, cut off their hands and legs, made needles pierce their eyes, hanged them over trees, exiled them from Iraq and made them homeless to the extent that no renowned Shia remained there in Iraq"

This was the treatment afforded to the adherents of Ali (as) under Mu'awiya. Such was its severity that when Ibn Ziyad became Governor of Kufa, he said to Hani bin Urwa (who was Shi'a):

"Didn't you know Hani, when my father came to this land, he did not spare the life of any one of this Shi'a except for your father and Hujr? You know what happened to Hujr".

 [History of Tabari, English translation - Volume 19 page 38](#)

In such circumstances how can we accept that the vast bulk of Kufans were Shi'a? How can it be believed that the Shi'a, that had been obliterated by Ziyad all of a sudden appeared again and were strong and confident enough to summon Imam Hussain (as) to them.

No doubt Ansar will claim that Imam Ali (as) making Kufa his centre of administration was due to the Shi'a Majority there. We would ask Ansar:

"Did Imam Ali spread Imami Shia'ism in Kufa at the time? If yes then this proves Imami Shi'aism is the true sect that was propagated by Maula Ali (as) to the masses. If there answer is no, then it not somewhat unusual that another Sect was propagating their beliefs, and the yet the Shi'a Madhab spread everywhere?"

Whatever answer Ansar give, the fact is that it cannot be proven that the majority was Shia. When Ziyad and his son had successfully adopted every method to exterminate the Shia then it is logical that vast bulk of those individuals who invited Imam Hussain (as) to Kufa were not Shi'a.

The words of Abdullah Ibn Abbas which he spoke to Imam Hussain[as] serves another proof that there were just a few Shias left in Kufa. When Imam Hussain[as] decided to leave Makkah to Kufa Ibn Abaas suggested him not to go Kufa. When Ibn Abbas came to Imam Hussain[as] for the second time he said:

“ O my brother! I want to be patient but what shall I do since the problem is serious that I cannot maintain patience. I fear your death and destruction during this journey because the people of Iraq are the group of deceitful people hence you should not go near them and if the people of Iraq really want your caliphate as they claim, then you should write to them that they should first drag their enemies out of Iraq only then you should go there. And if you are adamant to leave Makkah then (instead of Iraq) you should go Yamen that there are huge forts and mountains and there are Shias of your father and you will remain safe there from people (Banuy Umayyah)”

Tareekh Tabari, Volume 6 page 217 (Arabic)

Ibn Abbas suggested Imam Hussain[as] not to go Iraq as its dwellers were deceitful rather he should go Yemen as there are Shias of Ali. This proves that there were almost no Shia in Kufa otherwise Ibn Abbas would not have mentioned this feature of Yemen. If there were really Shias in Kufa then anyone could have easily refuted Ibn Abbass view by saying that *if there are Shias in Yemen then there are Shias in Kufa as well.*

Letters were written by those people with differing aqeedas, the majority of which were not Shi'a, but adhered to an aqeedah that in later times came to be coined as the beliefs of Ahlul Sunnah. They considered all 4 to be Khalifas of Rasulullah (s). The fact is the People of Kufa were tired of the repressive policies that Yazeed had subjected them to, and hence they turned to Imam Hussain (as) for help.

2.2 Sahaba and Tabieen living in Kufa wrote to Imam Hussain (as) and became the Tawabun

Ansar.org states:

Four years later the Shi'ah of Kûfah attempted to make amends for their desertion of the family of Rasûlullâh sallallâhu `alayhi wa-âlihî wasallam. There emerged a group of Kûfans calling themselves the Tawwâbûn (Penitents) who made it their duty to wreak vengeance upon the killers of Hussain.

It is an established fact that those that wrote to Imam Hussain (as) and then failed to support him became the force of the tawabun. Where Afriki's logic falls apart is the fact that he assumes that ALL those who wrote to Imam Hussain (as) adhered to Shi'a aqeedah, a fact that cannot be supported by the fact that the Shi'a had in effect been ethnically cleansed of Kufa under Nasibi Ziyad's Leadership. Afriki has tactically avoided this, preferring to describe ALL the writers of letters as Shi'a. The reality is amongst those leading figures that led the calls for the Imam (as) to join them in Kufa WERE Sahaba such as Sulayman bin Surad and Mussayab bin Najabah (see History of Tabari – English translation Volume 19, page 24) and Tabieen. Afriki has failed to comment on this fact, preferring to simply copy and paste from his Nasibi Imams. For the benefit of Afriki and his fellow adherents we shall inshallah delve into this matter by examining the lives of two Sahaba that lead the invites to Imam Hussain (as) and then led the Tawabun.

2.3 The Sahabi Sulayman bin Surad and al Mussayab bin Najabah led the Tawabun

Sulayman bin Surad was a Sahabi of Rasulullah (s), not only that – he was an individual from

whom hadith have been narrated on his authority in the Saha Sittah of Ahl'ul Sunnah. As evidence on can consult al Jamaah Bayyan Rijal, Sahah Sittah Volume 1 page 176 (Published in Dekkan).

We read in al Aqd al Shameen fi Tareekh al Jildh al Kameen Volume 4 page 607 that:

"Sulayman bin Surad al Khuza'i benefited from the companionship of Rasulullah (s) and narrated hadith from him".

Imam Abu Muhammad Abdullah bin As`ad al Yameni also known as Al Yaf`ee states:

"Sulayman (ra) was a Sahabi of the Prophet (s) hadith have been narrated on his authority".

Miraat al Janaan Volume 1 page 141 – Hyderabad edition

Dhahabi writes as follows:

"Sulayman bin Surad, the Leader of the al Khuza'i in Kufa, the Sahabi, he has a small narration from Ubayy and Jubayr bin Mut'im from Yahya bin Ya'mar and Uday bin Thabet and Abu Ishaq and others. Ibn Barr states 'He (Sulayman) was amongst those that wrote to Imam Hussain [r] and gave him bayya. They were unable to support him and greatly regretted this, and subsequently waged war. I am of the opinion that he was a pious religious individual, he joined the army on account of his sin of failing to support Hussain [r], he made tauba (asked for forgiveness) and left to avenge the shedding of his (Hussain's) blood, this army was known as the army of the Tawabun"

Siyar al-Aalam al-Nubla Volume 3 page 394 -395 (Beirut edition)

This book can also be downloaded from a Salafi/Wahabi website:

[url]http://www.almeshkat.net/books/archive/books/hh.zip[/url] - [\(Cached\)](#)

So from here it is clear that a Sahaba was a lead figure that deserted Imam Hussain (as). Whilst Afriki is seeking to attack the Shi'a for allegedly deserting the Imam, Ibn Barr a leading Sunni scholar despite Sulayman bin Surad's inability to support the Imam, praises him and deems him religious and pious.

Mussayab bin Najabah was another Sahabi that joined Sulayman in the Tawabun. Although he did not side with the Nasibi army of Yazeed, they (despite their promise) failed to support Imam Hussain (as), they regretted this sin, made tauba and led a movement to avenge the slaughter of Imam Hussain (as), his family and supporters. When they left for battle and confronted Abdullah Ibn Ziyad, Sulayman....

"Gave an order to commence Jihad against Ibn Ziyad. Backed by a one thousand strong army, Sulayman stated 'If I am killed your leader is Mussayab".

Siyar al-Aalam al-Nubla Volume 3 page 395

Ibn Barr writing on Sulayman bin Surad states:

"Sulayman bin Surad was a good, pious and religious man. During jahiliyya his name was 'Laseer' – Rasulullah (s) changed it to Sulayman. He was amongst those that wrote to Hussain ibn 'Ali [r] and invited him to Kufa. When he [Hussain] arrived he was killed, although they did not participate in his murder, Sulayman bin Surad, Mussayib bin Najbah, Najab Furdhee and others expressed regret for having failed aid Hussain [r] and die with him".

al Istiab Volume 2 pages 43-44

It is clear from this source that whilst these individuals did not join Yazeed's army, they felt

remorse having invited the Imam (as) and then not supported him in his hour of need.

Ibn Kathir states as follows:

“And the people gathered in the home of Sulayman bin Surad, this gathering comprised of the great righteous Sahaba”.

ibid Volume 8 page 2

Ibn Kathir also records a letter of Mussayab bin Najabah that states clearly that whilst not siding with Yazeed, the Tawabun failed to support Imam Hussain (as) having themselves invited him:

“Allah (swt) has tested us, in relation to supporting the son of Rasulallah’s daughter. We were exposed as liars, he relied on our support and we failed to provide it, we broke our promise, we shall kill those that killed him and his family”.

al Bidayah Volume 8 page 247

Among those who wrote letters to Imam Hussain [as] also includes Shabath bin Rabi * who later on also participated in his murder. Those Nawasib who accuse that it was Shias who wrote letters to Imam Hussain [as] shall check their prominent hadith books in which we can find hadeeth narrated by this beloved killer of Imam Hussain [as]. We will prove the Sunnism (Nasibism to be correct) of this man in another chapter.

* Al Bidayah Wal Nihayah (Urdu) Vol 8 page 1013

Here is a list of those Sunni scholars and hadith scholars that have referred to Sulayman bin Surad leader of the Lashkar Tawabun as a Sahaba:

1. Kitab al Muhajir page 691 by Muhammad bin Habeeb al Baghdadi
2. Tahdeeb al Ithidab page 187 by Ibn Hajr Asqalani
3. Tareekh Baghdad Volume 1 page 200-201 by Abu Bakr Khateeb Baghdadi
4. Tajheed al Isma al Sahaba Volume 1 page 255 by Dhahabi
5. Jamaadath Nasab al Arab page 238 by Ibn Hazm Andalus
6. Al Tabaqat al Kubra Volume 4, part 1 page 30 by Ibn Sa’d
7. Al Kashaf Volume 1 page 316, footnote 2122 by Dhahabi
8. Al Ahbar fi Khabar Volume 1 page 53 by Dhahabi
9. Al Jama bayyan al Rijaal al Saha Sittah by al Hafidh Muhammad bin Tahir Volume 1 page 174 footnote 673
10. Tahkeeb al Takreeb page 187 by Ameer `Ali Barelvi

3. Analysing the comments of S.M.A Jafri

Ansar.org states:

There is also the tendency of claiming that those who deserted Sayyidunâ Husayn were not of the Shî'ah. Jafri writes:...

of those who invited Husayn to Kûfa, and then those 18,000 who paid homage to his envoy Muslim b. 'Aqîl, not all were Shî'is in the religious sense of the term, but were rather supporters of the house of 'Alî for political reasons - a distinction which must be kept clearly in mind in order to understand the early history of Shî'î Islam.⁴

Jafri' s motive in excluding the deserters of Sayyidunâ Husayn from the ranks of the "religious" (as opposed to the "political") supporters of the house of Sayyidunâ 'Alî is quite transparent. He is clearly embarrassed by the fact that it was the Shî'ah themselves who abandoned their Imâm and his family after inviting him to lead them in revolt. What leads us to reject this distinction between "religious" and "political" supporters is the fact that Sayyidunâ Husayn himself, on more than one occasion, referred to the Kûfans as his Shî'ah. It is strange that while there is so much reluctance on the part of the Shî'ah to accept the deseof Kûfah as their own, they are quite proud and eager to identify themselves with the movement of the Tawwâbûn. The speeches made at the inception of the movement of the Tawwâbûn very clearly prove that they were the same people who invited Sayyidunâ Husayn and then deserted him.⁵ Their very name is indicative of their guilt in this regard. The attempt by the Shî'ah to absolve themselves from the crime of deserting Sayyidunâ Husayn is therefore at best nothing more than pathetic.

To counter this we should point to Ansar that your very own great Anti Shi'a scholar al Muhaddith Shah Abdul Aziz stated that at that time, all Muslims were known as Shi'a! He wrote:

"It should be known that the first Shias (who are the Sunnis and the Tafdiliyyah) in old days were known as Shias. When the Ghulat and the Rawafid Zaydiyyah and Ismailiyyah took the name for themselves, Sunnis and Tafdiliyyah did not like this name for themselves and so they took the name of Ahlu's-Sunnah wa'l Jamaah."

 [Tuhfa Athna Ashari \(Urdu\) page 16, published in Karachi](#)

So at this particular time yes the Shi'a did kill Imam Hussain (as) but that is only because all Muslims were known by the title Shi'a. But as Shah Abdul Aziz states this Shi'aism developed in to the beliefs of the Rafidi (Imami Shi'a) and Ahl'ul Sunnah. Being Shi'a of Ali (as) meant a different thing to different people. Identifying the true Shi'a, Shah Abdul Aziz states:

"The title Shi'a was first given to those Muhajireen and Ansar who gave allegiance (bay'ah) to Ali (may Allah enlighten his face). They were his steadfast faithful followers during his (Ali's) caliphate. They remained close to him; they always fought his enemies, and kept on following Ali's commands and prohibitions. The true Shi'a are these who came in 37 Hijri" (NB 37 Hijri -the year Imam Ali (as) fought Mu'awiya at Sifeen).

 [Tuhfa Athna Ashari \(Urdu\) page 27, published in Karachi](#)

Here those that stood at Sifeen with Imam Ali (as) were his Shi'a. But to say their views on Imam Ali (as) were one and the same is completely incorrect. There were those that were:

1. Loyal to Imam Ali (as) because they deemed him to be the khalifa after Rasulullah (s) e.g. Amar bin Yasir (ra).
2. Loyal to Imam Ali (as) because his khailafath was legitimate in accordance to the principles of ijma, bayya had been given hence it was compulsory to obey him e.g. Ubayy bin Kab (ra).
3. Loyal to Imam Ali (as) as long as he fought Mu'awiya once arbitration was accepted these same Shi'a turned their backs on the Imam and became Khwaarijee.

From these three groups three schools have developed the Imami Shia, Ahl ul Sunnah, Khwaarji. All groups were called Shi'a despite their differing beliefs. And then what of Ansar forefathers the camp of Mu'awiya, by what belief system were they known? The answer is they were known as the Shi'a of Uthman – the title Shi'a also identified this group.

So Ansar in light of this fact, tell us which of these groups of Shia killed Imam Hussain (as)? Were they:

1. Those that deemed Ali to be the Imam after Rasulullah (s) appointed by Allah (swt) Shi'a that developed today in to what is known as Shi'a Ithna Ashari?
2. Those Shi'a that deemed Imamate to be the right of the Ummah, and that Imam 'Ai WAS the rightful khalifa due to the people of Madina giving him bayya? The belief that developed into Ahl'ul Sunnah?
3. Those that had become his enemies (following the Sifeen arbitration) who are today's Khwaarij?
4. Those that stood opposite Imam Ali (as) as his enemies right from the start – the Shi'a of Uthman?

These are the 4 categories of Shi'a that existed at that time, so which group shed the blood of Imam Hussain (as)? Was it just one group, or did all of these Shi'a collude collectively?

History tells us that two groups of people played a role in Imam Hussain (as) killing, they were:

1. Those that vocally supported Yazeed and hence deemed his Khalifa to be legitimate.
2. Those that physically supported Yazeed by fighting in his army against Imam Hussain (as).

4. The participation of the Sahaba and their sons in killing Hadhrath Muslim bin Aqeel (as)

We have clear proof that prior to his invitation to come to Kufa Yazeed had resolved to take whatever steps were necessary to extract bayya from Imam Hussain (as). When Mu'awiya died Yazeed wrote to his Governor in Madina, Waleed bin Utbah:

"Adopt a tough attitude in obtaining bayya from Hussain, Abdullah Ibn Umar, Abdullah Ibn Zubayr, do not delay, nor display any signs of weakness, do not leave them until they give bayya".

Al Bidaya wal Nihayah (Urdu) Vol 8 page 1004, Nafees Acadmy Karachi

In this connection Waleed summoned Marwan and asked his opinion on which he said:

"They are aware that Mu'awiya has died, invite them to give bayya, should they refuse then strike off their necks".

 [Al Bidaya wal Nihayah \(Urdu\) Vol 8 page 1004, Nafees Acadmy Karachi](#)

Upon returning to Makka he [Hussain] received letters from the people of Kufa, He sent Muslim bin Aqeel to go and assess the situation. Outwardly the people portrayed their support for Muslim bin Aqeel and in turn for Hussain – 1000 people gave bayya. Spies notified Numan bin Basheer, he did not openly adopt tough measures, but in this regard gave a sermon warning people against sedition and urged the people to remain loyal in the bayya that been afforded to Yazeed. One man stood up and said to Numan 'This matter cannot be curtailed without adopting force, the approach that you have adopted is like that of weak people".

...Yazeed said to Ibn Ziyad 'When in Kufa find Muslim bin Aqeel and then kill him. Ibn Ziyad arrived in Kufa with 17 men having assessed the situation he spoke to the respectable people in his palace and queried the whereabouts of Muslim bin Aqeel. There was some opposition but Ubaydullah abducted these notables and deterred people from supporting Muslim.

So much so that by Maghrib prayers only thirty people remained with him, by night fall they also deserted him. That night Muslim stayed in the home of an elderly lady, her son notified Abdul Rahman bin Asheesh. Abdul Rahman told his father at that same time who was in Ubaydullah's house, Ibn Ziyad asked why the secrecy, they told him and Ibn Ziyad immediately sent 70-80 men headed by Ibn Harith Makhzomi who was the head of police. Muhammad bin Asheesh and Abdul Rahman were with them. They collectively captured [Muslim] and sent him to Ibn Ziyad residence. Upon reaching the doors of the residence (he was met by) some of the sons of the Sahaba standing there. Muslim did not recognise them although they recognised him. They were waiting to meet Ibn Ziyad, Muslim's face and clothes were covered in blood, whilst in that state he made a request for water, one of the group said, 'You will not be able to drink this until you taste the hot water of Hell'. Muslim replied 'Son of Hell you are more entitled to drink the fire of Hell; than me'.

Al Bidaya Volume 7 page 154

Ibn Katheer fails to name the group of Sahaba and tabieen that had taunted Muslim (as), Tabari identifies some names including one 'Umro bin Harith Makhzoomi".

Dhahabi states **"Umar bin Harith is counted amongst the Sahaba of Rasulullah (s) that had settled in Kufa... he is a Sahabi who narrated hadith from Rasulullah (s).**

Siyar Al-Aalam al-Nubla, Volume 3 page 417

Later Ibn Kathir informs us about Umar bin Harith:

“Ubaydullah ibn Ziyad arrested Muslim bin Aqeel and sent him to Umro bin Harith Makhzoomi, who was the Chief of Police”.

al Bidaya Volume 7 page 155; Tabari Volume 6 page 198

Those waiting to meet Ibn Ziyad in his Palace were Kathir bin Shahab, we learn of him in Tabaqat ibn Sa’d Volume 6 page 103:

“He narrated traditions from Umar bin Khattab and was one of Mu’awiya bin Abu Sufyan’s Governors”.

This can also be read in the Online Tabaqat Ibn Sa’d at the website of Salafies/Wahabies: [url]<http://www.al-eman.com/Islamlib/viewchp.asp?BID=185&CID=75#s48>[/url]

Upon receiving the news that Imam Hussain (as) was making his way for Kufa Marwan bin Hakam wrote to Ibn Ziyad, stating:

“Hussain ibn Ali is heading in your direction. He is Fatima’s son and she is the daughter of Rasulallah (s). By Allah! We deserve nothing greater than bringing him into our possession”.

al Bidayah Volume 8 page 165

As Imam Hussain (as) made his way to Kufa, Yazeed also wrote to Ibn Ziyad stating:

“I have heard Hussain is making his way to Kufa. From amongst my Governors it is you that is being tested, freedom shall depend on successful completion of this mission, or you could be enslaved again, in the same way that slaves are freed, or freemen are made slaves”

al Bidayah Volume 8 page 165

4.1 The Shi’a of Uthman / Nasibis killed Imam Hussain (as)

History lifts the lid and exposes the true killers of Imam Hussain (as). On route to Kufa Imam Hussain (as) met Al Farazdaq and asked him about the situation in Kufa, he assessed the matter saying:

“The people’s hearts are with you but their swords are with the Banu Ummayya”.

Tabari English translation Volume 19 pages 70-71)

When the people had swords raised against Imam Hussain (as) there is then no basis to conclude that these individuals were Shi’a, rather they were Nasibi hiding in the midst of the people.

It is clear that when Ibn Ziyad began his terror campaign it was the second group of “Shi’a” that were brought to heel – not the first group since as mentioned earlier they has already been exterminated in Kufa. This second group of Shi’a whilst unhappy with Yazeed’s behaviour, still deemed his position as Khalifa to be legitimate as he had obtained the bayya of the people, if they had any doubts these were laid to rest by advocates of Yazeed such as the sahaba Abdullah Ibn Umar (as we shall expand on later). This group therefore set aside their personal views and abandoned support for Imam Hussain (as) and joined hands with Yazeed as he in their eyes had obtained the ijma of the people. These individuals were Shi’a when they gave bayya and sided with Ali (as) following the death of Uthman. They deemed Imam ‘Ali (as) to be the legitimate fourth khalifa as he had obtained the ijma of the people. Their being Shi’a of ‘Ali (as) was only as long as Imam ‘Ali (as) was khalifa. These same individuals therefore had no hesitation in supporting Yazeed as they likewise deemed his succession as Khalifa to be based on ijma. The Kufans may have had sympathies towards Imam Hussain (as) that influenced their

decision to write to him, but influential words of support for Yazeed's right to rule from notables such as Ibn Umar, ensured that their faltering loyalty to Khalifa Yazeed was restored. They were NOT the Shi'a of 'Ali rather they were the Shi'a of Uthman.

We have the example of Nafi bin Hilal who entered the battlefield of Karbala, in Imam Hussain (as)'s army declaring:

"I am al-Jamali. I believe in the religion of Ali. A man called Muzahim al Hurayth came against him crying "I follow the religion of Uthman". Nafi replied, "Rather you follow the religion of Satan". Then he attacked and killed him

Tabari Volume 19 pages 136-137

So here we see Yazeed's army was not Shi'a in the sense that Ansar would like to lead its readers to believe rather it was Uthmani.

Azrar bin Qays taunted Zuhayr bin al-Qayn (History of al-Tabari Volume 19 page 113):

"Zuhayr according to us you were not the Shi'ah from this family (bayt). You used to be a supporter of the party of Uthman. Zuhayr said, 'Aren't you presuming from my position that I am one of them?'"

Note the reply Zuhayr admitted that he was Uthmani Nasibi but we ask Afriki, 'what was his position now?' Clearly his position with the Imam (as) meant that he was a Shi'a of Ahl'ul bayt (as).

From here the truth has been separated from falsehood, the true Sect has been distinguished from the false Sect – Yazeed's army were not Shi'a, but were in fact Nasibi / Uthmani the army of Hussain were the Shi'a of Ahl'ul bayt (as).

When Yazeed's forces encircled Imam Hussain (as) and his Sahaba, Ibn Ziyad sent a letter to Ibn Sad in which he stated:

"Stop the water of Hussain in same way that Ameer'ul Momineen Uthman was treated".

Tabari Volume 19 page 107)

Ibn Kathir similarly records that Ibn Ziyad gave the order:

"Become obstacle between Hussain and water and treat them in the same way that pious, righteous and oppressed Ameer'ul Momineen Uthman was treated".

 [Al Bidayah wal Nihayah \(Urdu\), Volume 8 page 1058](#)

It is clear as day that those that killed Imam Hussain (as) were those that deemed Uthman to be Ameer'ul Momineen. In Shia aqeedah we do not deem anyone other than Imam Ali (as) to be Ameer'ul Momineen, we do not even bestow this title to any of the other Imams. But the army of Yazeed considered Yazeed to be Ameerul Momineen, contrary to Shi'a Aqeeda.

Ibn Kathir further records:

"Ibn Ziyad wrote Ameer al Harmain Umro bin Saeed and informed him about about the glad news of Hussain's death, he asked a caller who then made its announcement and when the woman of Banu Hashim heard that announcement their voices of lamentation raised and Umro bin Saeed said: " This is the revenge for the lamentation of the wives of Uthman bin Affan"

 [Al Bidayah wal Nihayah \(Urdu\), Volume 8 page 1097](#)

Those in Yazeed's army were not the Shi'a of Ali, rather they were Uthmani / Nasibis. If Ansar

are going to plead with us and claim that these are different terms then allow us to present the views of one of their own beloved Imams, Ibn Taymiyya:

“If Nasibi deem Ibn Sad to be an Uthmani it is on account his taking avenge for Uthman and praising him”

Minhajj al Sunnah Volume 1 page 164

Ibn Taymiyya had also written that:

“Uthman’s Shi’a would openly curse ‘Ali from the Mosque pulpits”.

Minhajj al Sunnah Volume 3 page 178

So we learn that those that martyred Imam Hussain (as) were NOT the Shi’a of ‘Ali (as) but were the Shi’a of Uthman – the Nasibi forces loyal to Yazeed. Ibn Kathir (who was a student of Ibn Taymiyya) and other historians have shed light on the fact that amongst the killers were the sons of the Sahaba. Even prominent Sahaba such as Umar bin Harith and his family joined the ranks of Yazeed’s army. As we have already proven Umar bin Harith was Ibn Ziyad’s, Chief of police, who arrested Muslim bin Aqeel (as) and presented him to Ibn Ziyad, who subsequently had him executed.

Yazeed had given a free hand to Ibn Ziyad, and Marwan’s letter to Ibn Ziyad demonstrated that the aim was for Imam Hussain (as) to give bayya – if he refused then he was to be killed. It is ironic that the Ansar Nasibi claim that the Shi’a of Ali (as) killed Imam Hussain (as) by inviting him to Kufa – the reality is the Nasibi Shi’a of Uthman had pre planned his murder before he even reached Kufa. If we were to accept that these individuals were the Shi’a of Ali (as), their very entry on to the battlefield in Yazeed’s camp meant that they were now Shi’a of Uthman i.e. Nasibi.

5. Naming and shaming the Nasibi killers of Imam Hussain (as)

5.1 Yazeed's adviser Marwan was a Nasibi

Imam of Ahl'ul Sunnah Shah Abdul Aziz Dehlavi states in Tuhfa Ithna Ashari page 97:

"Hadith narrated by Marwan can be found in al Bukhari, even though he was a Nasibi, rather he was leader of that wicked cult."

 [Tuhfa Ithna Ashari \(Urdu\), page 97 Published in Karachi](#)

Shah Waliyullah Dehlavio had also written similarly:

"Mu'awiya's rebellion and Marwan's being a Nasibi are proven facts"

Sharh Ahfaq Tasneef page 270

5.2 Yazeed bin Mu'awiya was a Nasibi

Shah Abdul Aziz states in Tuhfa Ithna Ashari page 8:

"When the cruel people of Syria and Iraq upon orders of impure Yazeed and due to the efforts of chief of hatred and fitnah Ibn Ziyad martyred Imam Hussain.."

 [Tuhfa Ithna Ashari \(Urdu\), page 8 Published in Karachi](#)

Founder of Dar al Ulum Deoband, Muhammad Qasim Nanotwi writing on Yazeed stated:

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

Qasim al Ulum page 221

The presence of Yazeed, Marwan and Ibn Ziyad proves that this was a Nasibi Government, that took hatred of Ahl'ul bayt (as) as part of their deen. If Yazeed's advocates are going to absolve him of the killing of Imam Hussain (as) we would like to know why he failed to adopt steps to protect Imam Hussain (as)? Is the protection of life and property of subjects not the duty of an Imam? Did Yazeed send his army to protect Imam Hussain (as) from the Kufan Shi'a who (as Ansar attest) had deserted him – or did he send the army to corner and kill him?

5.3 Ubaydullah bin Ziyad's father was a Nasibi

Writing on Ubaydullah's father Ziyad, Shah Abdul Aziz states in Tuhfa Ithna Ashari page 484:

"We need to mention Ziyad the product of fornication, upon receiving power from Mu'awiya the first thing that he demonstrated was his enmity towards the family of Ali".

 [Tuhfa Ithna Ashari \(Urdu\), page 484 Published in Karachi](#)

If Ziyad was a Nasibi on account of his hatred of Imam 'Ali (as)'s children then his son continued this Nasibi mantle playing a lead role in the oppression of Imam Hussain (as).

6. So who supports the Nasibi killers of Imam Hussain (as)?

It is quite logical that those that deemed Yazeed to be the rightful khalifa, were the same individuals that killed Imam Hussain (as). We the Shi'a distance ourselves from Yazeed and his supporters. So Ansar, kindly tell us, do you? Do the Ahl'ul Sunnah and Nasibi express hatred towards those that supported Yazeed and killed Imam Hussain (as)? Unfortunately this is not the case. Nasibi claiming to adhere to the Sunni faith have written, praised and defended Yazeed as a pious man. We have Pakistani Hanafi scholar Mahmood Abadi who wrote "Khilafath Muawiya aur Yazeed"- where he praised Yazeed, deeming the method of ruling used by Hadhrath Umar and Yazeed to be the same.

Had the matter stopped there then no doubt that would be proof in itself, but what Ansar are hiding from their followers is the fact that their Salaf Imam took ahadith from those that killed Imam Hussain (as). Proof of guilt lies with 'association' those with blood on their hands will have no shame / guilt in taking hadith from the killers of Hussain (as) since these are their descendants. Those who had no part in killing the Imam (as) would naturally revile his killers and have no association with these killers on matters pertaining to Deen. The ultimate criterion for determining WHOM the actual killers of Hussain (as) lies in hadith. No doubt a group whose Salaf ancestors supported the Khilafath of Yazeed and killed Imam Hussain (as) will have no shame in taking hadith from those same individuals.

Whilst we deem the cursing of Yazeed, Ibn Sad, Ibn Ziyad etc to be a compulsory act, compare this to the respect afforded to Imam Hussain (as)'s killers by the Ahl'ul Sunnah Ulema...

6.1 Umar bin Sad bin Abi Waqqas

Dhahabi whilst writing on the life of Ibn Sa'd states in Siyar Al-Aalam al-Nubla Volume 4 page 349:

"Umar bin Sa'd lead the army that killed Imam Hussain (as), the Mukhthar killed him...Imam Nasai has narrated traditions from him".

Ibn Hajr Asqalani writes:

"Umar Ibn Sa'd bin Abi Waqqas Zuhri Abu Hafs Madani lived in Kufa .He narrated traditions from his father and Abu Said al Khudri. His son Ibraheem and grandson Abu Bakr bin Hafs, Abu Isaac Al Subay'ee, Ayzaar bin Harees, Yazeed bin Abi Maryam , Qathadha, Zuhri and Yazeed bin Habeeb and others have narrated hadith from him. Ajli commented that he narrated hadith from his father, many took narrations from him, he is counted amongst the Tabieen, and he is Thiqah (highly reliable), he killed Al Hussain"

Tahdeeb al Tahdeeb Volume 7 page 450-451

The book can also be downloaded from a Wahabi/Salafi website:

 [Tahzeb al-Tahzeb, Vol 7 No. 747 - \(Cached\)](#)

Another Sunni scholar Jamalalddin Abi al Hajaj Yusuf al Mizzi in his detailed and esteemed Rijal book "Tahdeeb al Kamal" under under the topic "Umar ibn Sa'd" records:

"Ahmed ibn Abdullah al'Ajli said: He is the one that killed Hussain, and he is a thiqah (trustworthy) Tabiee."

 [Vol 21 No. 4240](#)

This 'reliable' Umar bin Sad was the son of the Sahabi Sa'd bin Waqqas, about him Imam Bukhari wrote in Tareekh al Sagheer:

“When Imam Hussain arrived in Kerbala, Umar bin Sa'd was the first individual that cut the tent ropes”

Tareekh al Sagheer, Volume 1, page 75

From here it should have dawned on Ansar that the killers of Imam Hussain (as) were Nasibis. Your Salaf followed their way and deemed these figures to be reliable / respected personalities, basing the cornerstone of Deen – hadith in accordance with traditions that had been passed down by them.

6.2 Ubaydullah bin Ziyad

On Ibn Ziyad, Ibn Hajr Asqalani states:

“He is 'UbaydAllah bin Ziad , the prince of Kufa for Mu'awiyah and his son Yazid , and he is the one who prepared the armies from Al Kufa to fight Al Hussain until he was killed in Karbala . He was known as Ibn Marjanah and she is his mother (Marjanah) .

Ibn Asakir has mentioned for him a "translation" in "Tarikh Dimashq" and he was mentioned in Sunan Abi Dawood... And he narrated from Sa'ed bin Abi Waqas and Mu'awiyah and Ma'qel bin Yasar and Ibn Umayyah the brother of Bani Ja'dah . And from those who narrated from him are Al HASan al Basri and Abu al MALih bin Usama.”

T`ajeel al Munfa Bazawaid Rijal al Aimah al Arbah, page 180

The book can also be downloaded from one of the favourite website of Wahabies/Salafies:

 [No. 647](#)

Ibn Kathir in Al Bidayah wal Nihayah (Urdu), Vol 8 page 1252 Under the topic 'Ibn Ziyad' also recorded the place of Ibn Ziyad in the Sunni Hadith works.

 [Al Bidayah wal Nihayah \(Urdu\), Vol 8 page 1252](#)

If the Ansar claim that they bear enmity towards the Shi'a as they killed Imam Hussain (as) could they be so kind to comment on why their madhab take hadith from those that killed him? This proves that their leading recorders were at peace with taking hadith from the killers of Imam Hussain (as). Ansar, you claim to be the true adherents of Ahl'ul bayt (as) tell us, would true lovers of Ahl'ul bayt (as) take traditions from their killers?

If some ignorant Nasibi is still going to assert their ancestor Ibn Ziyad as Shia then allow us to present the words of Ibn ziyad which clearly proves that just like other Nasibis Ibn Ziyad also deemed Yazid as his Imam. Ibn Kathir records that Ibn Ziyad wrote to Umar Ibn Sa`d:

“Become obstacle between Hussain and water, treat them in the way Ameer al Momineen Uthman was treated and ask him and his companions to give byah to Ameer al Momineen Yazid bin Muawiyah”

al Bidayah wal Nihayah (Urdu) Volume 8 page 1058

Ahmed Bin Daud Abu Hanifa Dinwari records the statement of Ibn Ziyad:

“I killed Al Hussain due to the reason that he revolted against our Imam [Yazid] and the very Imam[Yazid] sent me the message to kill Al Hussain. Now if the murder of Hussain is a sin then Yazid is responsible for it”

Akhbaar Tawaal, page 279 (Egypt) by Ahmed Bin Daud Abu Hanifa Dinwari

Hence we came to know that Ibn Ziyad likewise prominent Sunni scholars deemed Yazid as one of the caliphs of Islam or Ameer al Momineen. We will inshallah elaborate on this in our

Seventh Chapter.

“I killed Al Hussain on the orders of Yazid to kill him otherwise he would kill me therefore I chose to kill Hussain”

Tareekh Kamil, Volume 4 page 55 (Egypt)

Allamah Jalaluddin Suyuti writes in Tareekh Khulfa, page 140:

“Yazid wrote his ruler in Iraq Ibn Ziyad for the murder of Hussain”

We read that it was Yazid who gave orders to Ibn Ziyad for the murder of Imam Hussain[as] and those people who deemed Yazid as their caliph and Ibn Ziyad as their ruler made the instructions of Yazid practical. The case is clear like mirror. The army which Abu Bakar sent during his caliphate deemed him as their caliph not somebody else, same was the case with Umar when he send troops to Iraq, Iran and Syria. Those armies followed the instructions of their respective caliphs because they deemed them their caliphs or Imams and suppose if there was someone who didn't deem Umar or Abu Bakar as his caliph, he could have easily refused to follow the instructions what ever the result might have been. Thus we see that Ibn Ziyad & Co. thoroughly obeyed Yazid without any hesitation.

6.3 Shabath bin Rib'i

The Ansar had claimed that the Shi'a of Kufa had written letters to Imam Hussain (as) inviting him to join them in Kufa. One of the leading figures who no doubt Ansar will claim was Shi'a was Shabath bin Rib'i. His writing to Imam Hussain (as) is stated clearly in History of Tabari English translation, Volume 10 pages 25-26 and [Al Bidayah Wal Nihayah \(Urdu\) Vol 8 page 1013](#).

We should point out that neither do we take hadith from this individual, nor do we praise him. He had no link to the Shi'a madhab. This 'betrayed' whom the Ansar would no doubt label as Shi'a is actually an authority narrator in the eyes of Ahl'ul Sunnah.

Dhahabi writes on him in Siyar Al-Aalam al-Nubla, Volume 4 page 150:

“This is the individual that rebelled against Imam Ali, he rejected the arbitration, and then subsequently repented...he narrated hadith on the authority of 'Ali, Hudhaifa. Muhammad bin Ka'b Kurdhee and Sulayman Timee took hadith from him in Sunan Daud”

Ibn Hajr writes in Tahdeeb al Tahdeeb, Volume 4 page 303:

“Shabath bin Rb'i al Tamimi AL Yurbo'i Abu 'Abd al Quddous Al Kufi, narrated from Hudayfa and Ali, and from those who narrated on him Mhammad bin Ka'eb Al Qarzi and Sulayman A Tamimi DarQutni states that he (Shabath) was a caller (Mu'azzen) for Sajah. Ibn Habban mentioned him among the truthworthy (Thiqa) and states that he committed wrongs, Bukhari and Muslim have narrated hadith on his authority where Fatima [r] had asked to be given a Servant. Al 'Ajali said that this is the first individual that assisted in the killing of 'Uthman and also participated in the killing of Hussain [r].”

[Tahzeb al-Tahzeb - \(Cached\)](#)

We appeal to justice. Examine the life of this Nasibi / Khwaarijee. No rational person would ever conclude that he was a Shi'a of Ahl'ul bayt (as). This so called 'Shi'a' Kufan that wrote letters to Imam Hussain (as) is a narrator of your Saha Sittah – Sunan Nasai and Abu Daud – you deem him to be an authority figure. Despite his writing to the Imam (as) he can never be defined as Shi'a – he never was a true Shi'a – simply a troublemaker who dedicated his entire life to

playing an integral role in dissension. Despite this Imams of Ahl'ul Sunnah Nasai and Abu Daud deemed him to be a reliable source – tell us Afriki should we deem the killers of Imam Hussain (as) to be reliable honest individuals – or should we distance ourselves from such personalities? We should point out to Nasibi al Afriki that the harsh reality is it was your Salaf that invited Imam Hussain (as) and then subsequently killed him – that is why you still love the individuals and prove your appreciation for them by narrating hadith on their authority. Would you respect and rely on the words of an individual that murdered your grandson? If not, then why do you respect and accept the word of those that killed the grandson of Rasulullah (s)? Is such behaviour not an insult to the memory of Imam Hussain (as) and Rasulullah (s)? Would true followers of Ahl'ul bayt (as) behave in such a manner?

6.4 Some more proofs of the killers of Imam Hussain [as] being Nasibis while supporters of Imam Hussain [as] being Shia

Proof one

When Imam Hussain [as] left Makka and arrived at a place near Kufa, upon the orders of Hasees bin Tamim he was met by Hur bin Yazid who was accompanied by 1000 of his army men. Hur bin Yazid remained with Imam Hussain [as] so that he could not let Hussain [as] go to Madina and then both of those groups reached at Nainawa. Suddenly there appeared a rider on a fast mount coming from Kufa. He was bearing weapons and carrying a bow on his shoulder. They all stopped and watched him. When he reached there he greeted Hur and his followers but did not greet al Hussain and his followers. He handed Hur a letter from Ibn Ziyad. It said the following:

“... When this letter reaches you and my messenger comes to you, make al Hussain come to a halt. Let him stop at an open place without protection and water...”

History of Tabari, Volume 19 page 102

Yazid bin Ziyad bin al Muhasir Abu al-Sha`tha al Kindi who was with al Hussain [as] looked at the messenger of Ibn Ziyad and recognized him. He asked him:

“Are you Malik bin Nusayr al Baddi? The other replied: “Yes”. He was the member of the tribe of Kindah. Yazid bin Ziyad exclaimed: “May your mother be deprived of you! What is the business you have brought!”. The other man retorted: “What is this that I have brought, I have obeyed my Imam and have remained faithful to my oath of allegiance”. Abu al-Sha`tha responded: You have been disobedient to your Lord and have obeyed your imam in bringing about the destruction of your soul. You have aquired shame and punishment of Hell-fire.Indeed God has said: “ We have made them imams, who summon people to the Hell-fire and on the Day of Resurrection they will not be helped”. You imam is one of those”

 [History of Tabari, Volume 19 page 102](#)

Dear readers, who was this messenger of Ibn Ziyad Malik bin Nusayr? This was the same individual who approached Imam Husain (as) on the day of Ashur when he [as] fell from his horse suffering from severely injuries and struck him [as] on the head with his sword. The sword cut the hood of his (as) cloak and injured his head.

See:  [History of al Tabari, Volume 19 page 153](#)

The words of that brutal person i.e **“I have obeyed my Imam and have remained faithful to my oath of allegiance”** clearly shows that he deemed Yazeed [la] to be his imam which is a conclusive proof of him being aloof from the madhab of Ali/Hussain [as], and his association with the Sunni madhab that deems Yazeed [la] to be their 6th imam a belief that Sahih Bukhari proves that Abdullah bin Umar the son of second caliph adhered to.

Proof Two

When Muslim bin Aqeel [as] was taking bayah from the Kufans who had gathered there on account of their disaffection with the tyranny that the Bani Umayyah were subjecting them to, Yazeed [la] received a letter from Kufa written by Abdullah bin Muslim al Hadrami which contained the following text:

“Muslim bin Aqeel has come to Kufa and the Shia have given the oath of allegiance to him on behalf of al Hussain bin Ali. If you have any need of Kufah then send a strong man there who will carry out your orders and act in the same way as you would against your enemy. Al Numan bin Bashir is a weak man or he is acting like a weak man”

 [History of al Tabari, Volume 19 page 30](#)

He was the first man who wrote to Yazeed [la] and then Umarrah bin Uqbah and Umar bin Sa`ad also wrote along the same lines to Yazeed. Yazeed on receiving this letter wrote to Ibn Ziyad:

“My followers [Shia] among the people of Kufa have written to me to inform me that Ibn al Aqeel is in Kufa gathering units in order to spread rebellion among the Muslims. Therefore when you read this letter of mine go to Kufa and search for Ibn Aqeel as if you were looking for a bead until you find him. Then bind him in chains, kill him or expel him”

 [History of al Tabari, Volume 19 page 31](#)

Yazeed [la] used the word “Shia” for his adherents in Kufa which has been translated as “followers” in English version but can be read in its original Arabic and Urdu version.

 [Tarikh Tabari \(Urdu\), Volume 4 part 1 page 154, Nafees Academy Karachi](#)

Dear readers, you must have recognized the writer of this letter Umar bin Sa`d. This was same cursed individual who was sent as an army chief for the murder of Imam Hussain [as] and he was the one who fired the first arrow at Imam al Hussain [as].

See: *History of al Tabari, Volume 19 page 129*

His words i.e **“Shia have given the oath of allegiance to him on behalf of al Hussain bin Ali”** clearly shows that he did not have any connection with the the Shia of Ali/Hussain [as] in fact we have already highlighted the prestigious place this individual enjoys among the hadith works of the Ahl`ul Sunnah. Crucially, the words of Yazeed [la] i.e **“My Shia among the people of Kufa have written to me”** strengthen our stance that Umar bin Sa`d was the Shia of Yazeed [la] and from the group/sect that deemed him [la] to be their Imam. Moreover the belief that Hussain rebelled against Yazeed accurately tallies with that of the present age Nasibis like Ibn Arabi etc. Are the Nasibis still going to show their stubbornness and remain shouting that the **“killers of al Hussain were his own Shias”** while we have already made the sect of His [as] killers known to everyone?

Proof Three

We read in history that on the day of Ashur when the war began and the majority if helpers of Imam Hussain [as]’s helpers were martyred a man namely Yazeed b. Maqil of the Banu Salimah of Abd Qays, came forward from the army of Umar bin Sa`d and called out to Burayr b. Hudayr who was the companion of Imam al Hussain [as]:

“How do you think God has treated you? Burayr replied, “By God! God has treated me well and treated you badly”. He answered “You are a liar. Even before today you were always a liar. Do you remember when I used to go with you among the Banu

Lawdhan? Then you used to say that Uthman was a man who indulged himself excessively, that Mu'awiyah b. Abi Sufyan was one who was in error and who caused people to go astray, and that the Imam of guidance and truth was 'Ali b. Abi Talib. Burayr retorted: "I testify that this is my opinion and belief". Yazeed b. Maqil replied: "And I testify that you are one of those who are in error. Burayr called out: Then I challenge you to contest of curses. Let us call on God that the lair be cursed and the spreader of falsehoods be killed. Then come out for combat." They both advanced and raised their hands to God, calling upon Him to curse the lair and the one who was truthful should kill the one who was false. Each of them came advanced against the other. They exchanged blows. Yazeed b. Maqil struck Burayr b. Hudayr a light blow that did not do him any harm. Burayr b. Hudayr struck Yazeed b. Maqil a blow that cut through his helmet and penetrated his brain".

 [History of al-Tabari Volume 19 pages 132-133](#)

Dear readers, do we still need to prove the madhab of the killers of Imam al Hussain [as] and the madhab of his helpers? Burayr b. Hudayr deemed:

1. Uthman a man who indulged himself excessively,
2. Mu'awiyah a follower and a guide of wrong path
3. 'Ali b. Abi Talib as Imam of guidance and truth

The above three beliefs tally up with the belief of the Shia Athna Asharis. Compare this to Yazeed b. Maqil who was among the opponents of Imam Hussain [as] and deemed Burayr b. Hudayr misguided for having those three beliefs in the same way that modern day Sunnis deem the Shi'as misguided for adhering to these three believes.

If the filthy Nasibis like that of Sipah e Sahaba still insist that Shi'a killed Imam Hussain [as] whilst that are the true lovers of Ahlulbait [as] then we have a simple and straight question to them:

"Do you Nasibis like the helper of Imam Hussain [as] Burayr b. Hudayr deem Uthman a man who indulged himself excessively, Mu'awiyah a follower and a guide of wrong path and 'Ali b. Abi Talib as Imam of guidance and truth ?"

If your answer is in positive only then you have every right to to call yourselves the lovers of Ahlulbait [as] oif you do not then you adhere to the school of thought followed by Yazeed b. Maqil who was among the killers of Imam Hussain [as].

Moreover the thing on which Mubahila took place between Burayr b. Hudayr and Yazeed b. Maqil along with its result is clear to all readers and that makes it clear as to which side adhered to the truth and which side adhered to misguidance.

Proof Four

After immense fighting that resulted in Burayr b. Hudayr being martyred his killer Ka` b bin Jabir Al Azdi left the scene, his wife or his sister said to him:

"You have given help against son of Fatimah and you have killed the leader of reciters of Quran. You have brought great disgrace. By God! I will never speak a word to you"

History of al-Tabari Volume 19 pages 134

Ka` b bin Jabir Al Azdi then proudly recited a poetry:

“Ask that you be told about me - and you are blameworthy at the battle against Hussain, while the spears were pointed.... I had with me a spear from Yazan- whose joints had not betrayed it, And white sword which was sharpened, and both edges of it were cutting. I singled him out amid a group whose religion was not my religion, for I am satisfied with Ibn Harb (i.e Yazid)..... Tell Ubaydallah if you meet him, That I am obedient and attentive to the Caliph...”

 [History of al-Tabari Volume 19 pages 134](#)

His words **“whose religion was not my religion”** clearly shows that his religion was different than the religion of the helpers and followers of Imam al Hussain [as] while the religion of Imam Hussain [as] and his followers was affirmed through the words of Burayr b. Hudayr. Yet again his belief of deeming Yazeed as his caliph corroborates Sunni ideology espoused by Abdullah ibn Umar in Sahih al Bukhari. If Nawasib like that of Sipah e Sahaba and ansar.org accept the religion and beliefs told by Burayr b. Hudayr only then they should rightly deem themselves the follower of Ahl'lubait [as] otherwise they should be ashamed of sharing the same religions as the killers of Imam al Hussain [as].

Proof Five

Ibn Kathir records following incident:

“Qais bin Mashar Sedadi brought the letter of Hadrath Hussain to Kufa where Hussain bin Numair Thaqfi caught him and sent him to Abaidullah ibn Ziyad. Ibn Ziyad asked him to climb over the peak of the palace and abuse the liar and the son of a liar Ali bin Abi talib and his son Hussain. He climbed up and praised Allah (swt) and then said: ‘O people! Without any doubt this man Hussain bin Ali is the best of among all creations of Allah and he is son of Hadrath Fatima the daughter of Holy Prophet and I am his messenger towards you and I have been separated from you from the valley of Zulamt, respond to him, be obedient and pay heed to him. Then he cursed Ubaidullah Ibn Ziyad and his father and supplicated for the salvation of Hadrath Ali and Hadrath Hussain. He was then hurled from the top of the palace on the orders of Ibn Ziyad”

 [Al Bidayah wal Nihayah \(Urdu\), Vol 8 page 1045-1046 topic "Incident of Hussain bin Ali, reason of his exit from Makkah and situation of his murder"](#)

Just compare the views of Ibn Ziyad and Qais bin Mashar with that of Shias and Ahl'ul Sunnah of today but asking yourselves:

Which sect adheres to the position of Imam Hussain's messenger Qais bin Mashar by cursing Ibn Ziyad and his father

Which Sect has accommodated Ibn Ziyad into their madhab by taking hadeeth from him?

Moreover the role of Ibn Ziyad's close associate Hussain bin Numair who apprehended Imam's messenger and sent him to Ibn Ziyad is also evident against Imam Hussain [as] and His [as] lovers. After the incident of Karbala he was burnt to death alongwith Ibn Ziyad (Tarikh al-Saghir, Vol 1 by Imam Bukhari). But worthy to note is the fact that Hussain bin Numair has narrated hadeeth in Sunni text. Hafiz Ibn Hajar Asqalani records:

نمير الكندي ثم السكوني الحمصي روى حصين بن

عن بلال مولى أبي بكر... كان على الجيش الذين قاتلوا بن الزبير بمكة ويقال أنه أحرق الكعبة... قلت في وقعة الحرة كان أحد أمراء يزيد بن معاوية

"Hussain bin Numair al Kndi Sakuni Himsi narrated from Billal the slave of a person namely Abu Bakar... He was in the army which fought Ibn Al-Zubair in Mecca, and said that he burnt Ka'aba...He was one of Yazeed's army leaders in Hara battle"

Tahdeeb al Tahdeeb, Volume 2 No. 683

Proof Six

Ibn Kathir records that when Ubaidullah Ibn Ziyad caught Hani bin Urwah, he started to torture him. When the relatives of Hani gathered at his palace Ibn Ziyad through Qadi Shureh sought to turn them away by calming them:

"Ubaidullah Ibn Ziyad said to Hani: 'Allah has made your blood Halal for me because you are Haroori'. Thus according to his orders he was locked up in next to a house and his tribe Banu Mazhaj came and stood at the door of the palace along with Umro bin al-Hajaj. They thought that Hani had been killed. When Ibn Ziyad heard their noise he asked Qadi Shureh who was near to him to go to the people and told them that the Ameer has detained him so that he could question him about Muslim bin Aqeel. Therefore Qadi told them: 'Your master is alive and our king has beaten him up to a extent where there was no danger to his life'"

 [Al Bidayah wal Niihayah, \(Urdu\) Vol 8 page 1018-1019 topic "Incident of Hussain bin Ali, reason of his exit from Makkah and situation of his murder"](#)

If Nawasib have not recognized this Qadi Shureh; yet another follower of Ibn Ziyad then allow us to reveal his revered place in the madhab of Ahl'ul Sunnah. This main is not only praised by the Sunni Ulema but he has also narrated hadiths in principle hadith books like Bukhari. Imam Ibn Hajar Asqalani records:

الأدب المفرد والنسائي شريح بن البخاري في الحارث بن قيس بن الجهم بن معاوية بن عامر أبو أمية الكوفي القاضي ويقال شريح بن الكندي شرحبيل ويقال بن شراحيل... وقال حنبل بن إسحاق عن بن معين شريح بن هانئ وشريح بن وقال أرطاة وشريح القاضي أقدم منهما وهو ثقة العجلي كوفي تابعي ثقة... المفرد وقال بن سعد ثقة توفي سنة 79 وكان

Shureh bin Al-Harith bin Qais bin Al-Juham bin Muawya bin Amer Al-Kindi Abu Amuaya Al-Kufi the Qadi, he is called Shureh bin Sharhabil or Sherahil narrated in Bukhari, Sunan Al-Nesa'i ... Hanbal bin Ishaq narrate that Ibn Meen said about him:

'Thiqah'. Al-Ejli said: 'Kofi Tabee Thiqah'... Ibn Sa`ad said: 'He died in year 79 and he is Thiqah'.

Tahdeeb al Tahdeeb, Volume 4 No. 574

If any Nasibi still accuse Shias of being involved in the murder of Imam Hussain [as] then it is just pure stubbornness, for the truth is that Sunni Ulema not only praised the associate of Ibn Ziyad but also deemed him worthy enough to derive their religion from him.

7. Did the tragedy of Karbala highlight the Shi'a / Sunni schism?

Ansar.org states:

However, it is regrettable that despite the huge amount of attention the subject of Karbalâ enjoys, the event is persistently portrayed as two-sided. It is always depicted as Husayn against Yazîd, Right rising up against Wrong, the Quest for Justice against the Forces of Oppression. Many an opportunist has even gone to the extent of superimposing upon the event the theme of Shî'ah against Ahl as-Sunnah.

It certainly was since here stood the difference between the two concepts of Imamate. Those that deemed the station of Imamate to be man appointed and than it was based on ijma. This school of thought developed into what is today Ahl'ul Sunnah. Those that deemed the station to be based on the appointment of Allah (swt) and his Prophet (s) a school today deemed Shi'a Ithna Ashari. On the one side we had the Imam of the people [ie. The Imam of Ahl'ul Sunnah] and on the other side was the Imam appointed by Allah (swt) - the Imam of the Shi'a. As Shi'a we reject the claim that Yazeed was a legitimate khalifa, rather we make it clear that a fasiq can not occupy the position of Khalifa of Rasulullah (s). Hence we believe that the duty was to support Imam Hussain (as) as we deem him to be the legitimate Khalifa of Rasulullah (s). This automatically places us at logger heads with Ahl'ul Sunnah who believe that:

1. Appointment of the Khalifa is based on the ijm'a of the public.
2. Once bayya is given the Khalifa rule is legitimate.
3. Once bayya is given it is incumbent upon the people to support the Khalifa

In accordance with these principles the Ahl'ul Sunnah deem Yazeed to be the legitimate Khalifa of the time, and that it was incumbent upon the people to support him by any means necessary. The struggle was indeed a battle of two concepts and can be deemed to be a struggle between Sunni / Shi'a viewpoints on Imamate.

7.1 Ahl'ul Sunnah deem Yazeed to be the legitimate Khalifa of Rasulullah (s)

Ansar.org's Nasibi writer Abu Sulaiman gave a glowing endorsement of Yazeed's legitimate right to rule in his article on Mu'awiya, stating:

Ansar.org states:

Mu'awiyah was eager for people's agreement to give allegiance to his son Yazeed. He resolved to take allegiance to Yazeed as a crown prince. So he consulted the grandest companions, the masters of the people and the district's governors. They all accepted. Delegations from the districts came with acceptance to give allegiance to Yazeed. Many Companions gave him the allegiance as well. Al-Hafedh Abdulghani Al-Maqdisay says: "His (Yazeed's) caliphate is

rightful, sixty of the companions of the prophet peace be upon him gave him the allegiance. Ibn Omar was one of them." [Qayd Al-Shareed min Akhbar Yazeed, by Ibn Khaldoun, p.70]

This is an interesting fact since according to Ahl'ul Sunnah aqeedah opposition to the rightful Imam constitutes rebellion - by relying on this fatwa taken from Nasibi Ibn Khaldun's work, Ansar are covertly indicating that Imam Hussain (as) was a baghi (Allah forbid) as he opposed the rightful khalifa. Are actual Sunnis content with this type of thinking, one that endorses Yazeed's right to rule and in effect makes Imam Hussain (as) a baghi?

This endorsement is further attested in Sahih al Bukhari. After the event of Harra, Ibn Umar reaffirmed his undying loyalty to Yazeed:

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

So in the eyes of Abdullah ibne Umar the bayya of Yazeed that Imam Hussain (as) opposed was "in accordance with the conditions enjoined by Allah and His Apostle" i.e. Completely legitimate, and breaking the Jamaah would lead to individuals being raised as betrayers on the Day of Judgement.

He gave bayya to Yazeed and yet the Ahl'ul Sunnah deem Ibn Umar to be a high authority figure! The son of Khalifa of Ahlul Sunnah Umar bin Khattab deemed the Khilafath of Yazeed to be rightful and deemed his obedience to be on par with obedience with Allah and His Rasul!

Abdullah bin Umar was no ordinary person the leading texts of Ahl'ul Sunnah inform us that he was one of the advisers to the Shura committee that had been established to choose the successor to Umar.

This tradition in al Bukhari clearly eludes to the fact that in Madina the people were seeking to turn their backs on Yazeed. Seeing such opposition Ibn Umar was advocating the religious duty to remain loyal to the Imam of the Jamaah - to Yazeed so much so that Ibn Umar was reconfirming Yazeed to be the rightful khalifa and that the duty was to obey him failure do so was such a sin that the perpetrator would be raised as a betrayer on the Day of Judgement. Ibn Umar warned against abandoning Yazeed and revoking Bayya - whoever separates from Yazeed **"there will be separation between him and me"**.

Tell us Ansar, was Ibne Umar a follower of Shi'a Madhab or an adherent what in this day and age is deemed Ahl'ul Sunnah? There is no doubting that Ibn Umar adhered to the faith which developed in to Ahl'ul Sunnah. This fact leaves actual 'Sunnis' with a somewhat difficult choice, you either you distance yourself from Ibn Umar or accept Yazeed as the rightful Khalifa. Clearly for Nasibis such as Ansar.org they have no qualms in affiliating themselves with Ibn Umar's fatwa and they proudly declare:

Ansar.org states:

"It is proven in Saheeh Bukhari that Ibn Omar gave allegiance to Yazeed"

It clear that the killers of Imam Hussain (as) were those that deemed Yazeed to be the rightful Khalifa, so which religion did they adhere to? Yazeed's supporters were those that deemed Yazeed to be the rightful khalifa over the Ummah as is proven from Al Bukhari. Clearly Ibn Umar can never be deemed to have adhered to the Shi'a Madhab. He is the leading authority of Ahl'ul Sunnah, in fact is one of their key narrators of Hadith.

7.2 The Hanafi Fiqh deems Yazeed to be the Sixth Khalifa of Rasulallah (s)

As Shi'a we believe that our 12 Imams were Rasulallah (s)'s legitimate successors, appointed by Allah (swt). We deem Imam Hussain (as) to be the third in the chain. As part of the proof from Sunni traditions we cite hadith such as this:

"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"

Sahih Muslim, hadith number 4483, English translation by Abdul Hamid Siddiqui

Sharh Fiqh Akbar by Mulla 'Ali Qari is the Hanafi Book of aqaid. On the very first page it is stated that the book sets out the aqeedah of Ahl'ul Sunnah wa al Jamaah. So there is no room for the Ansar.Org to make the excuse that this is JUST a viewpoint. Everything set out in this book is the aqeedah of Hanafi Sunni Muslims. Mulla Ali Qari sets out who the 12 khalifas are:

1. **Abu Bakr**
2. **Umar**
3. **Uthman**
4. **Ali**
5. **Mu'awiya**
6. **Yazeed**
7. **Abdul Malik bin Marwan**
8. **Walid bin Abdul Malik bin Marwan**
9. **Sulayman bin Abdul Malik bin Marwan**
10. **Umar bin Abdul Aziz**
11. **Yazeed bin Abdul Malik bin Marwan**
12. **Hasham bin Abdul Malik bin Marwan**

Taken from Sharah Fiqh Akbar, by Mulla Ali Qari, p 176 (publishers Muhammad Saeed and son, Qur'an Muhalla)]"

 [Sharah Fiqh Akbar, by Mulla Ali Qari, page 70 \(published by Qadeemy Kutub Khana, Aram Bagh, Karachi\)](#)

It would be quite appropriate to ask why Imam Hasan (as) is missing from this list? Do the Ahl'ul Sunnah not deem him to be a Khalifa? If so then why does this book of Hanafi fiqh remove his name from the list?

Of course remaining faithful to Hanafi aqeedah, later Sunni Ulema have defined this hadith in the same way. We now present Siratun Nabi by Allamah Shibli Numani and Syed Sulaiman Nadvi.

Sufficient as to its rank are the words of the Sunni scholar Muhammad Atiqul Haque in his "Heroes of Islam":

"Sirat an Nabi is a unique book on the life of the Prophet and is acclaimed as one of the best books in the world. He wrote only four volumes of this book and the remaining four volumes were written by his disciple, Syed Sulayman Nadvi". (p130)

These are Nadvi and Numani's comments taken from Volume 3 page 380:

"In Sahih Muslim Kitab ul Imara Rasulallah (s) said, This Islamic Government would last until it has been ruled over by 12 people. This Rulership will not end until these 12 Rulers are at the helm of the State. Islam will be "protected and respectable" (the Urdu says Mahfooz aur muazziz) during their reigns. Abu Daud in Kitab al Mahdi records these words "The Deen will remain intact as long as 12 people have ruled it and the Ummah will recognize them". Among the scholars of Ahle Sunah Qadi Iyad explains these words (of Abu Daud) 'Among all khalifas these 12 khalifas who aided Islam were pious', Hafidh Ibn Hajar counts the following as Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthman, Ali, Mu'awiya, Yazeed, Abdul Malik bin Marwan, Walid bin Abdul Malik bin Marwan, Sulayman bin Abdul Malik bin Marwan, Umar bin Abdul Aziz, Yazeed bin Abdul Malik bin Marwan, Hasham bin Abdul Malik bin Marwan"

 [Sirat un Nabi, \(Urdu\) Volume 3 page 380 published in Lahore](#)

Writing on the 12 Khalifa hadith modern day Hanafi scholar, Hakeem Mahmood Ahmad Zafar Sialkoti, on page 261 of his book (Urdu) "Sayyadina Mu'awiya (ra), Shukhsiat aur kirdhaar", states:

"These 12 khalifas are good natured, pious men and in their reigns Islam shall be protected and respectable, their reigns shall be in accordance with the Qur'an and Sunnah and in their reign the rule of justice shall be apparent. Mulla Ali Qari put forward these 12 as "Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthman, Ali, Mu'awiya, Yazeed, Abdul Malik bin Marwan, Walid bin Abdul Malik bin Marwan, Sulayman bin Abdul Malik bin Marwan, Umar bin Abdul Aziz, Yazeed bin Abdul Malik bin Marwan, Hasham bin Abdul Malik bin Marwan - taken from Sharra Fiqa Akbar page 184; Fathul Bari Volume 3 page 182) According to Mulla Ali Qari's above statements its quite evident that Mu'awiya is a Rightly Guided Khalifa".

By the same token, Yazeed is also a rightly guided khalifa since he describes the twelve as rightly guided, ruling by the Qur'an and Sunnah.

It is interesting that this Afriki asks the question:

Ansar.org states:

And were we to assume that many, or even most of them were not Shi'ah in the "religious" sense, the question which next presents itself is: Where were the real Shi'ah when their Imâm required their help?

We have already proven in Chapter one that the vast bulk of the Shi'a had been exterminated. If (as you assert) the Shi'as were responsible for killing Imam Hussain (as) then why did the majority Ahl' ul Sunnah not come to his aid? After all they were in the majority, there were millions of such individuals, what was their position at that time? Did the Ahl'ul Sunnah side with Imam Hussain (as) and support him OR were they with Yazeed? This is something that Ansar have no answer to, whilst they will assert that it was not mandatory to support Imam Hussain (as), the words of Rasulullah (s) prove otherwise...

7.3 It was incumbent upon ALL Muslims to support Imam Hussain (as)

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 [Hussain] 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)

So Ansar, tell us:

1. Did those that you deem as Salaf (Sahaba and Tabieen) take heed of this hadith and support Imam Hussain (as)?
2. Did your lead figure Abdullah Ibn Umar come to the aid of Imam Hussain (as)?
3. If the duty was to pledge support to Imam Hussain (as) then why did the Salaf pledge loyalty to Yazeed, and continue to support him - even after Kerbala?
4. Ibn Umar's unwavering support for Yazeed was such, that he declared that one who leaves Yazeed "there will be separation between him and me" -. Rasulullah (s) stated that it was incumbent to support Imam Hussain (as). Whose words do Ahl'ul Sunnah attribute greater credence to, Ibn Umar or Rasulullah (s)?

The harsh reality those who would today be deemed Ahl'ul Sunnah (the majority) at that time had given bayya to Yazeed and gave him vocal and physical support. That is why even today they deem the killers of Hussain (as) to be men of truth and Yazeed's Khilafath to be rightful. If they can prove otherwise we challenge Ansar to refute our claim.

7.4 Nasibi support for Yazeed

Let us see how the Salaf Imam's treated Yazeed in their writing's. Let us begin with Imam of Ahl'ul Sunnah Abdul Hamid Ibn Ghazzali. Ibn Khallikan records one of his fatwas in reply to the following question:

"Q. What opinion should one hold of an individual that curses Yazeed, deems him a fasiq and encourages others to curse him? Did Yazeed intend to kill Hussain [r] or were his actions aimed at defending himself? Can we say (rahmathullah) after saying his name or is silence the best approach to adopt?

'A. 'It is not allowed to curse a Muslim at all and whosoever does so is himself cursed; and how can the curse of a Muslim be ever allowed when prohibitions in this matter are clear cut. Yazeed's being a Muslim and his non-participation in killing

Hadhrat Hussain (Radhiallaahu Ánhu) nor his being pleased with this are all established from authentic narration's. When his involvement in the murder of Hadhrat Hussain (Radhiallaahu Ánhu) is not proven, it would not be correct to entertain any negative opinions about him for this is tantamount to harbouring evil thoughts about a Muslim without evidence which itself is Haraam. Allah Taála says, 'O believers! Abstain from suspicions as some suspicions are sinful.' As to bless him with Duáas of mercy; not only is it permissible but in fact, Mustahabb (preferable) we do so in every Salaat for it is encompassed in this all-inclusive Duá: 'O Allah forgive the believing men and women' for he was a believer - quoted from: Tareekh Ibn Khalikkan Volume 1 page 413, "Dhikr Aqelbin Hairth"; Tafseer Ruh al Ma'ani Volume 26 page 73 "Surah Muhammad verse 23"; Hayatul Hayawaan p. 196.

So in the eyes of Imam of Ahl'ul Sunnah Abdul Hamid Ghazzali:

1. One that curses Yazeed is himself cursed
2. Yazeed was a momin
3. There is no clear evidence that he killed Imam Hussain
4. To say Yazeed rahmathullah is a permissible action
5. We should supplicate in favour of Yazeed after every Salat

Ghazzali is one of the esteemed kingpin's of Ahl'ul Sunnah, an Imam of the Salafies - who makes known his glowing admiration for Yazeed! Can you explain why you take Nasibis with such abhorrent to be your Imams? Or is the truth that he is only saying openly what you state privately?

Compare Ghazzali's support for Yazeed to his opinion on discussing Imam Hussain (as)'s martyrdom:

"It is a sin for the people to narrate the martyrdom of Hasan and Hussain, as retelling the troubles of the family of the Prophet (s), creates enmity towards the Sahaba".

This so called Hujutul Islam Abdul Hamid Ghazzali (d. 505 Hijri) on the one hand is issuing a Fatwa seeking mercy for Yazeed, and at the same time gave a fatwa deeming it haraam to even discuss the tragedy that befell Imam Hussain (as).

Another darling of the Salfi Nasibi's is Qadhi 'Abu Bakr Ibn Arabi. He is a clear authority figure for the Salafies since we have often come across Nasibi sites where his fatwa of takfeer against the Shi'a has been cited. So let us see the esteemed rank that Ibn Arabi gave to Yazeed and his adviser Marwan.

On Marwan, Ibn Arabi stated

"With regards to Marwan and Yazeed, critics who assert that they were both fasiq, are themselves fasiq. Marwan is in the eyes of the Sahaba, tabieen and fuqaha a just individual, he was a high ranking member of the Ummah".

al Awasim min al Kawasim page 88-89

In relation to Yazeed, Ibn Arabi states as follows:

"If we state that knowledge and justice are the key features to be a Khalifa, some will claim that Yazeed was neither Adil nor was he an Aalim. We will ask 'Where is your source for claiming that these conditions were missing in Yazeed? If this was indeed the case then Ibn Zubayr and Hussain bin 'Ali would have informed us".

al Awasim min al Kawasim page 222

Ibn Arabi's support for Yazeed continues:

"If it is claimed that Yazeed drank alcohol we should point out that such a claim cannot be verified until we have the word of two witnesses, who testified against Yazeed? On the contrary a just man Yahya bin Bakeer narrates from Lays bin Sa'd, 'Ameer'ul Momineen Yazeed died on the following date...' Lays referred to him as Ameer'ul Momineen when his rule had come to an end, if Lays did not feel that this was the case he would not have referred to Yazeed as Ameer'ul Momineen after his death".

al Awasim min al Kawasim page 227

Interestingly Ansar also follow the way of their Salaf Imam Ibn Arabi - writer Abu Sulaiman had sought to deny that Yazeed drank alcohol. Alhamdulillah we have already refuted this in our article on Mu'awiya we are quoting it here to show the affection that these Nasibi have towards Yazeed.

Ansar.org states:

It is also a lie that Yazeed was an alcohol drinking person. We will let Muhammad bin Ali bin Abi Talib to answer this claim because Muhammad knew Yazeed the best because he lived with him for a while. Ibn Katheer says in Al-Bidayah: (When the people of Al-Medina returned from Yazeed, Abdullah bin Mutee'a and his companions walked to Muhammad bin Al-Hanafiyah. They wanted Muhammad to agree to dismiss Yazeed, but Muhammad refused. Ibn Mutee'a said: "Yazeed drinks alcohol, does not pray, and ignores the rule of the Book." Muhammad answered them: "I never saw what you are saying about him. I came to him, and stayed with him for a while and I saw him taking care of his prayers, looking for goodness, asking about jurisprudence, and clinging to the Sunnah." They said: "He was acting like that!" Muhammad answered: "And what did he scare from me or please so that he shows piety to me? Did he show you what you saying about drinking alcohol? If he did, then you are his partners, but if he did not, then it is not lawful for you to testify what you do not know." They said: "It is the truth for us even if we did not see it." Muhammad said: "Allah refused that on the people of witness, Allah says: "Except for those who testified with truth and they know," and I have nothing to do with you anymore." They said: "Perhaps you did not like someone to take control rather than yourself, therefore, we give you our leadership." He said: "I do not make this fight lawful for me, either as a leader or as a follower." They said: "But you fought with your father!" He answered: "Give me someone like my father to fight the like of what my father fought." They asked: "Then, order your sons Abu Al-Qassim and Al-Qassim to fight with us." He

answered: "I would have fight if I ordered them." They said: "At least join us to urge people to fight." He said: "Praise be the Lord! Do you want me to order the people to do what I do not do and do not accept? I would not then advised Allah's slaves for the sake of Allah." They replied: "Hence, we will force you." He said: "Then I will order the people to fear Allah and do not make a creature happy at the expense of the Creator's anger." Then Muhammad left to Makkah." [Al-Bidayah wa Al-Nihayah for IbnKatheer,vol.8,p.236]

Ibn Arabi's writing do not just include an appraisal of Yazeed, they also contain attacks on Imam Hussain (as) that clearly point to his Nasibi aqeedah. Writing on the position taken by Imam Hussain (as) he states:

"Hussain failed to take heed of the words of Ibn Abbas who was the greatest scholar of that time, nor did he listen to the Sahaba Ibn Umar. He rebelled, he wanted to be young when he was in fact old, people were not present around him, he did not have helpers to support his stance, nor did he have people that were willing to sacrifice their lives for him...No one supported him (Hussain) when he rebelled. His grandfather the most merciful of all Prophets, foretold disputes and warned of fitnah, it was on this basis that Yazeed fought Hussain"

al Awasim min al Kawasim page 231-232

So Ibn Arabi is seeking to inform the people that:

1. Yazeed was with the truth
2. Yazeed's stance was supported by hadith that he relied when taking the action he did.
3. Imam Hussain decided to rebel, having failed to listen to Ibn Abbas and Ibn Umar.
4. By rebelling Imam Hussain (as) was causing fitnah
5. Imam Hussain (as) was acting in violation to the words of Rasulullah (s)

This Nasibis entire portrayal is that Imam Hussain (as) died as a baghi fighting the rightful Imam. This is a serious matter since a baghi can NOT be declared a martyr under Shari'a, you can not even read the funeral prayers of a baghi.

7.5 Yazeed was a Sunni Muslim

We read in Sharh Qaseeda page 16:

"Other than a kaafir, is is not permissible to curse a Muslim and Yazeed was not a kaafir but was a Sunni Muslim"

 [Sharah Qaseeda Amali, Page 16](#)

When the Ulema of Ahl'ul Sunnah have themselves declared Yazeed to be a Sunni Muslim, is there any further need to discuss the beliefs of those that killed Imam Hussain (as)? Mullah Ali Qari al Hanafi, Hujutul Islam Ghazzali, Ibn Hajr al Makki and Ibn Katheer have forbade the cursing of Yazeed, and these are the Ulema that supported the killers of Imam Hussain (as), from their comments one can conclude that their Imam was Yazeed, Yazeed's madhab can be

determined on the basis of the madhab that these Ulema adhered to.

We have presented these examples to show that these are individuals that have been extolled as Sunni's when they are actually Nasibis who had deep felt sympathies for Yazeed. We would urge our Sunni brothers not to be taken in by these Nasibis who claim to love Ahl'ul bayt (as) - their actual beliefs are derogatory towards the memory of Imam Hussain (as). Their tactic is to:

- protect Yazeed,
- praise Yazeed's character
- absolve Yazeed of wrongdoing
- oppose cursing Yazeed

For the benefit of those who may be taken in by these Nasibis we shall conclude this chapter with the words of an 'actual' Sunni scholar Sayyid Mahmood Alusi who stated (on Imam Hussain's murder):

"Those who state that Yazeed was not responsible and should not be cursed, or that he committed no sin are in fact Yazeed's helpers".

Ruh al Ma'ani Part 26

7.6 Some questions for Ansar and their Nasibi brethren

Whilst we have highlighted Nasibi support for Yazeed perhaps Afriki would be kind enough to answer us these questions:

1. In Mishkat al Masabih Volume 3 page 244 we read this hadith:

"Oh Allah I love these two (Hasan and Hussain) love those that love them" - Do you accept his hadith of Rasulullah (s)?

2. If you accept this du'a then does Allah (swt) not love the Shi'a?

3. When Allah (swt) loves the Shi'a tell us does he love their enemies or hate them?

4. When you and your Nasibi Imams deem Imam Hussain (as) to be a baghi, can we conclude that you love Imam Hussain (as)?

5. Ibn Asakir records (in Mishbaath ba Sunnath page 219) a hadith on the authority Hadhrath Ayesha:

"Oh Allah never shower your blessings on the cursed, killer Yazeed, he will rebel against my beloved Hussain and martyr him"

When we have this hadith on the authority of Ayesha how do your Salaf Imams have the audacity to claim that absolving Yazeed of any wrongdoing is the correct approach?

6. When Rasulullah (s) has coined Yazeed a cursed murderer then when why do your Imams such as Ghazzali deem cursing Yazeed as haraam, are such fatwas not in violation to the words of Rasulullah?

7. In this hadith Rasulullah (s) explicitly named Yazeed, as a cursed murderer then is this not clear proof of him being cursed and hell bound?

8. When Rasulallah (s) deemed Yazeed to be a baghi could you explain why your brother Abu Sulaiman relied on a fatwa that "His (Yazeed's) caliphate is rightful"?

8. The Imams criticism of 'their' Shi'a

Ansar.org states:

Sixty years later the grandson of Sayyidunâ Husayn, namely Zayd ibn `Alî ibn Husayn, led an uprising against the Umayyad ruler Hishâm ibn `Abd al-Malik. He received the oaths of allegiance of over 40 000 men, 15 000 of whom were from the very same Kûfah that deserted his grandfather. Just before the battle could start they decided upon a whim to ask his opinion about Abû Bakr and `Umar. Zayd answered: "I have never heard any of my family dissociate himself from them, and I have nothing but good to say about them." Upset with this answer, they deserted him en masse, deciding that the true imâm could only be his nephew Ja`far as-Sâdiq. Out of 40 000, Zayd was left with only a few hundred men. On the departure of the defectors he remarked: "I am afraid they have done unto me as they did to Husayn." Zayd and his little army fought bravely and attained martyrdom. Thus, on Wednesday the 1st of Safar 122 AH another member of the Ahl al-Bayt fell victim to the treachery of the Shî'ah of Kûfah.⁶ This time there could be no question as to whether those who deserted him were of the Shî'ah or not. The fact that the thousands of Shî'ah who deserted Zayd ibn `Alî looked upon Ja`far as-Sâdiq as their true Imâm shows that by and large they were the same as the Ithnâ `Asharî, or alternatively Imâmî or Ja`farî Shî'ah of today.

This is a completely incorrect notion. If these individuals deemed Imam al Sadiq (as) to be the Imam of the time why would they have then turned their back on the rightful Imam and turned to Zayd for guidance? In Shi'a fiqh the call for Jihad is a duty of the Imam of the time. Afriki himself admitted that the Shi'a deemed Imam al Sadiq (as) to be the Imam. When the Imam (as) had not given the call for Jihad, why would his followers entered into jihad under the leadership of another Imam? The ithna ashariyya shi'a were those that recognised the Imam al Sadiq (as) from the point of the death of his father Imam Baqir (as). They never wavered away from him (as) nor did they recognise the Imamate of Zayd bin `Ali. Those that sided with Zayd may well have had sympathies with Ahl'ul bayt (as) and a hatred of Banu Umayyaa but the fact that they had recognised the Imamate of Zayd and entered his fold means that they were NOT those that today would be deemed as Shi'a Ithna Ashariyya.

One should point out that from Abu Zahra's text we read as follows:

Ansar.org states:

"Just before the battle could start they decided upon a whim to ask his opinion about Abû Bakr and `Umar. Zayd answered: "I have never heard any of my family dissociate himself from them, and I have nothing but good to say about them."

This cannot be the case since it is well established that Hadhrath 'Ali (as) was critical of the Shaykhayn and this has even been vouched for by Imam Muslim. We read in Sahih Muslim Book 019, Number 4349 that Umar acknowledged the following to Imam 'Ali (as):

When the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) passed away, Abu Bakr said: "I am the successor of the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him)." Both of you came to demand your shares from the property (left behind by the Messenger of Allah). (Referring to Hadrat 'Abbas), he said: You demanded your share from the property of your nephew, and he (referring to 'Ali) demanded a share on behalf of his wife from the property of her father. Abu Bakr (Allah be pleased with him) said: The Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) had said: "We do not have any heirs; what we leave behind is (to be given in) charity." So both of you thought him to be a liar, sinful, treacherous and dishonest. And Allah knows that he was true, virtuous, well-guided and a follower of truth. When Abu Bakr passed away and (I have become) the successor of the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) and Abu Bakr (Allah be pleased with him), you thought me to be a liar, sinful, treacherous and dishonest.

When Umar is himself testifying that Imam 'Ali deemed him and his predecessor to be *'liars, sinful, treacherous and dishonest'* is it not logical that this opinion had filtered down to the Ahl'ul bayt (as) also? Would the Imams speak highly of individuals that their grandfather deemed to be a liars, treacherous, sinful and dishonest?

Ansar.org states:

Why then, if he had so many devoted followers, did Imâm Ja'far not rise up in revolt against the Umayyads or the 'Abbâsids? The answer to this question is provided in a narration documented by Abû Ja'far al-Kulaynî in his monumental work al-Kâfî, which enjoys unparalleled status amongst the hadîth collections of the Shî'ah: Sudayr as-Sayrafî says: I entered the presence of Abû 'Abdillâh 'alayhis salâm and said to him: "By Allâh, you may not refrain from taking up arms." He asked: "Why not?" I answered: "Because you have so many partisans, supporters (Shî'ah) and helpers. By Allâh, if Amîr al-Mu'minîn (Sayyidunâ 'Alî) had as many Shî'ah, helpers, and partisans as you have, Taym (the tribe of Abû Bakr) and 'Adî (the tribe of 'Umar) would never have had designs upon him." He asked: "And how many would they be, Sudayr?" I said: "A hundred thousand." He asked: "A hundred thousand?" I replied: "Yes, and two hundred thousand." He asked again: "Two hundred thousand?" I replied: "Yes, and half the world." He remained silent. Then he said: "Would you accompany us to Yanbu'?" I replied in the affirmative. He ordered a mule and a donkey to be saddled. I quickly mounted the donkey, but he said: "Sudayr, will you rather let me ride the donkey?" I said: "The mule is more decorous and more noble as well." But he said: "The donkey is more comfortable for me." I dismounted. He mounted the donkey, I got on the mule, and we started riding. The time of salâh arrived and he said: "Dismount, Sudayr. Let us perform salâh."

Then he remarked: "The ground here is overgrown with moss. It is not permissible to make salâh here." So we carried on riding until we came to a place where the earth was red. He looked at a young boy herding sheep, and remarked: "Sudayr, by Allâh, if I had as many Shî'ah as there are sheep here, it would not have been acceptable for me to refrain from taking up arms." We then dismounted and performed salâh. When we were finished I turned back to count the sheep. There were seventeen of them.⁷It seems from this narration that the tragedy of Karbalâ taught Imâm Ja'far as-Sâdiq something about those who claimed to be his followers which the Shî'ah of today are still refusing to come to terms with: that in the trials and misfortunes of the Family of Rasûlullâh sallallâhu `alayhi wa-âlihî wasallam the role of the Shî'ah was as great, if not greater, than that of their physical enemies.

This tradition shows how stringent the definition of Shi'a is in the eyes of our Imams. The Imam (as) had thousands sitting in his midst, but despite this he (as) felt that only a handful was his true Shi'a in name and deed. The Imam deemed the Shi'a, to be those who followed him in EVERY action and deed, the slightest transgression meant that he (as) did not deem such individuals as true Shi'a. If anything this tradition demonstrates the high standards the Imam expected of his followers. The Imam had thousands of followers who were by definition his Shi'a and yet despite this he (as) only considered 17 of them worthy of attaining martyrdom with him.

If Nasibi are still going to make this an issue stating that it demonstrates the cowardice of the Shi'a, perhaps they could elaborate on how many true Sahaba were willing to lay down their lives for Rasulallah (s). The texts of history testify that in Uhud the vast bulk of the Sahaba fled the battlefield leaving Rasulallah (s) wounded, Umar included who sat dejected declaring that there was no need to fight as Rasulallah (s) was dead (see Siratun Nabi, by Allamah Shibli Numani, English translation by M.Tayyib Bakhsh Budayuni, Volume 2 page 66-67 (Kazi Publications, Lahore - First edition), The History of al Tabari, Volume 6 page 122 - English translation by M.V.MacDonald (State University of New York Press). Similarly 'Uthman fled so far that Rasulallah (s) mocked him stating the distance you fled was far he returned to Rasul (s) after three days (The History of al Tabari, Volume 6 page 127). If this was the state of the alleged closest Sahaba then what did Rasulallah (s) expect of others?

There was no change in the situation by the time of Hunayn; the same supposed loyal / brave Sahaba yet again deserted Rasulallah's side when the going got tough. Indeed the Qur'an itself exposes their behaviour:

"Certainly Allah helped you in many places, and on the day of Hunayn, when your great numbers made you vain, but they (i.e. number) availed you nothing and the earth became too small for you not withstanding its spaciousness, then you turned back retreating."

Qur'an 9:25

The books, of Ahl'ul Sunnah clearly state that in the battle of Hunayn, in which ten thousand companions (including all those who had done bay'ah under the tree) had participated, all of them fled away except four who remained steadfast, three of them were from the Prophet's clan, Banu Hashim ('Ali ibn Abi Talib, 'Abbas ibn 'Abdul Muttalib and Abu Sufyan ibn al-Harith

ibn 'Abdul Muttalib) and one from another clan ('Abdullah ibn Mas'ud)."
see Tarikh al Khamis, vol 2. p. 113 As Sirah al Halabiyah. vol. 3. p 255

Alhamdoillah Imam Hussain (as) had far more Shi'a ready to sacrifice their lives for him in battle, than Rasulullah (s) had Sahaba. If there were any lessons to learn, it was that the Shi'a of Imam al Sadiq (as) needed to elevate themselves to rank of the Shi'a of Imam Hussain (as) before they entered the battlefield, rather than follow the example of the Sahaba of Rasulullah (s).

If we surmise from this tradition that only a hand full of true Shi'a existed we would like to Ask Afriki, which side were Ahl'ul Sunnah affiliated with at that time? Do they not claim that Imam Sadiq (as) is their Imam? If this is indeed the case why were they not supporting him? Imam Jafer (as) was referring to fighting the Khalifa of the time, so who supported the Khalifa? Were these Salaf the adherents of Ahl'ul Sunnah or Shi'a? The Khalifa was the Imam of the Jamaah the majority (Ahl'ul Sunnah) the people had pledged their allegiance to him. Is it not curious that you deem Imam Jafer Sadiq (as) to be your Imam - whilst your Salaf descendants were supporters of the Khalifa that Imam Sadiq (as) wanted to physically oppose!

Ansar.org states:

It therefore does not come as a surprise that none of the supposed Imâms after Hussain ever attempted an armed insurrection against the rulers of their times. Karbalâ had taught them the fickleness and treacherousness of those who claimed to be their Shî'ah. It is about them that Imâm Ja'far is reported to have said: No one bears us greater hatred than those who claim to love us.

Reply One

The key word here is "those who claim to love us" claiming and actually loving is where one can identify one's love for a Leader. Shi'ism is more than just a declaration that one is Shi'a. It is based on acceptance of the authority of the Imam by word and deed. The same applies to the way that we define Sahaba. We deem Sahaba as those that love and obeyed Rasulullah (s) in word and deed – actions that contravene this criteria take individuals away from the Shi'a definition of Sahaba. The Imam (as) here is making it clear that those that merely 'proclaim' love for them but do not adhere to their teachings are their greatest enemies. The same was the case of the Sahaba, those that claimed they loved Rasulullah (s) but disrespected him, opposed him and deserted him and opposed him were his greatest enemies.

Reply Two - The Ahl'ul Sunnah falsely claimed that they were Shi'as

As evidence we will cite the following esteemed Sunni works:

1. Sawaiqh al Muhriqa page 91 verse 8
2. Nur al Absar page 80
3. Ahsaaf al Rahibeen page 187
4. Taufa Ithna Ashari page 6, Part1

Tohfa:

“The first Sect was the Shi’a, and these were the Salaf of the Ahl’ul Sunnah”

We read in Tohfa page 6:

“The first Shi’a were the Sahaba and Tabi’een”

The Shah claims the Salaf of the Ahl’ul Sunnah were Shi’as, those traditions wherein our Imams condemned the Shi’a actually refer to these individuals who were Sunni’s but falsely proclaimed that they were Shi’a. That is why they had a hidden support for Mu’awiyah happy to be bribed by him, they also had their swords ready to slay Imam Hussain (as) when the time arose.

Initially there was no Sect called Sunni, hence such individuals sat amidst the Shi’a and caused difficulties. The Sahaba and Tabieen were included amongst these difficult elements. These individuals were those that initially supported Hadhrath Muslim when Imam Hussain (as) sent him, then sided with Ibn Ziyad and subsequently also deserted the Imam (as) when he arrived. Imam Jafar (as) condemned these individuals since that was the umbrella name that they were all known as, it was much later that they formally switched to calling themselves Ahl’ul Sunnah wa al Jamaah. It is about these individuals that Imam Jafar (as) was commenting, those posing as Shi’a, that led to him rightly pointing out, *‘No one bears us greater hatred than those who claim to love us’.*

Ansar.org states:

Imâm Ja’far is also reported as having said: No verse did Allâh reveal in connection with the Munâfiqîn, except that it is to be found in those who profess Shî’ism.⁹

There is nothing embarrassing here the Imam (as) is making it clear that munafiqs were present amongst the Shi’a, in the same way that munafiq sat in the midst of Rasulallah (s) and proclaimed to be his Sahaba. They were exposed in numerous verses such as Surah Munafiqun BUT their presence alongside Rasulallah (s) placed them within the ambit of Sahaba. In fact Rasulallah (s) acknowledged that munafiq were in his midst and still defined them as Sahaba:

We read in Sahih al Bukhari Volume 6, Book 60, Number 428:

Narrated Jabir bin 'Abdullah:

We were in a Ghazwa (Sufyan once said, in an army) and a man from the emigrants kicked an Ansari man (on the buttocks with his foot). The Ansari man said, "O the Ansar! (Help!)" and the emigrant said. "O the emigrants! (Help!) Allah's Apostle heard that and said, "What is this call for, which is characteristic of the period of ignorance?" They said, "O Allah's Apostle! A man from the emigrants kicked one of the Ansar (on the buttocks with his foot)." Allah's Apostle said, "Leave it (that call) as is a detestable thing." 'Abdullah bin Ubai heard that and said, 'Have the (the emigrants) done so? By Allah, if we return Medina, surely, the more honorable will expel therefrom the meaner." When this statement reached the Prophet. 'Umar got up an, said, "O Allah's Apostle! Let me chop off the head of this hypocrite ('Abdullah bin Ubai)!" The Prophet said "Leave him, lest the people say that Muhammad kills his companions." The Ansar were then more in number than the emigrants when the latter came to Medina, but later on the emigrant increased.

One should take note that Rasulallah (s) did not refute Umar’s claim that Ubai was a hypocrite. Despite this Rasulallah (s) included him within the broad definition of companions due to his sitting with this group. If munafiq sitting in the presence of Rasulallah (s) can be defined as

Sahaba then why is Afriki trying to score points by highlighting the fact that Imam al Sadiq (as) acknowledged the presence of munafiq amongst his Shi'a?

Ansar.org states:

Before Sayyidunâ Husayn, his elder brother Sayyidunâ Hasan was the victim of the treacherousness of the Kûfans. In his book al-Ihtijâj the prominent Shî'i author Abû Mansûr at-Tabarsî has preserved the following remark of Sayyidunâ Hasan: By Allâh, I think Mu'âwiyah would be better for me than these people who claim that they are my Shî'ah.¹⁰

Again the key word here is "claiming to be Shi'a". The Imam (as) was clearly demonstrating that proclaiming to be a Shi'a means nothing if by actions your deeds contravene the edicts of the Imam. He was seeking to expose these individuals as hypocrites / Nasibi hiding within his ranks who were seeking to harm him. We will inshallah seek to explain this, by making use of an example:

I am the Chairman of a successful football club 'The Malangs', that has won numerous lucrative titles and contracts both in my own country and in Europe. The club commands a huge fan base through the country. Unfortunately the success and popularity of the club, whilst increasing the clubs financial value has also attracted an unsavoury element, racist hooligans. Unfortunately historically there has been a correlation between racism and football. A small but vocal fringe of teams 'supporters' are members of a right wing Nazi group, whose sole objective is to create a white society. They have two methodologies for carrying this through:

1. *Recruiting racists*
2. *Seeking notoriety via random acts of violence and criminal damage*

Their loyalty is not towards the club they are not supporters in the real sense, rather they have infiltrated the fan base and are using are using the club to further their own ambitions by turning it into a recruiting ground for white youth. The club is travelling to an away match in Europe. Fans travel out including this small racist element. Whilst there, they take the opportunity to partake in anarchy after the match, they set fire to cars, smash shop frontages, shout racist slogans and daub racist slurs on the walls. Untold damage is caused to residents, businesses and personal livelihoods. My response as Club Chairman will be to call a Press Conference where I will express regret at what happened and condemn the activities of 'Our fans'. The reality is that these 'fans' are not true 'fans', but are merely opportunists who have used the teams popularity as a springboard to conduct illegal acts. The fact that these racist individuals have travelled with my team, and have attended with the official Fan Club, wearing the teams clothing etc – has led to them being associated with that team. The fact that I have condemned our fans for the unfortunate events does NOT mean that I am attacking all of the team's supporters. I am directing my criticism at those unruly element that have no loyalty towards the club, rather whilst posing as fans they have caused trouble for the local community that has in turn damaged the reputation of the Club.

The same principle applies with the source that this Nasabi has cited. When Imam Hasan (as) criticises those professing to be his Shi'a, he is referring to individuals who whilst professing their support for the Imam (as) by posing as his Shi'a were actually seeking to destroy his support base from within. They were not Shi'a in the real sense rather they were opportunist trouble makers, as were the racist fans in the above example.

If we are going to pinpoint this group of fraudulent Shi'a, then then we need to look no further than cite the comments of Al Muhaddith Shah Abdul Aziz Delhavi in Taufa Ithna Ashari page 11:

“The Sunni Sect were initially known by the title Shi’a”

The Shah admits that there was initially no name of the Ahl’ul Sunnah, and through trickery and deception these individuals made their way into the ranks of the Shi’a. By sitting with the true Shi’a they began to scheme towards killing our Imams (as). When Imam Hasan (as) laid out initial plans to fight Mu’awiya bin Hind they created a plot to have the Imam (as) killed. It was this group of Shi’a that the Imam (as) was condemning, the group that at a later time formulated into the new distinct title of Ahl’ul Sunnah was al Jamaah.

By stating **“I think Mu’awiyah would be better for me”** Imam Hussain (as) was pointing out that hypocrites are worse than one’s enemies are. Whilst Mu’awiya was Imam Hasan (as)’s open enemy, and tactics for dealing with the enemy are clearly drawn, the same cannot be said of hypocrites, those who our Imam (as) defined as **“claim that they are my Shī’ah”**. Hypocrites were conducting their nefarious activities whilst sitting amongst the Shi’a, their undercover enmity to Imam Hasan (as) was much more damaging to the visible open enmity of Mu’awiya.

Ansar.org states:

When Sayyidunâ Hasan eventually became exasperated at the fickleness of his so-called Shī’ah, he decided to make peace with Mu’awiyah. When someone protested to him that he was bringing humiliation upon the Shī’ah by concluding peace with Mu’awiyah, he responded by saying: By Allâh, I handed over power to him for no reason other than the fact that I could not find any supporters. Had I found supporters I would have fought him day and night until Allâh decides between us. But I know the people of Kûfah. I have experience of them. The bad ones of them are no good to me. They have no loyalty, nor any integrity in word or deed. They are in disagreement. They claim that their hearts are with us, but their swords are drawn against us.¹⁰

The key to this narration is what appears at the end. The Imam (as) is stating that his ‘supporters’ had deserted him stating “They claim that their hearts are with us, but their swords are drawn against us”. Can those whose swords are drawn against the Imam be deemed as his Shi’a? If for example you have a friend who you trust, behind your back he is plotting to have you killed – can that individual be deemed to be your loyal friend (even though up until yesterday you sat at the same table with him?) We ask this Nasibi this question had Rasulullah (s) stated that amongst his Sahaba existed some whose “hearts are with us, but their swords are drawn against us” – could such individuals be defined as his Sahaba? Clearly not Imam Hasan (as) was identifying the presence of Nasibi munafiqs in his camp, they claimed to be his followers but their real intention was to have him killed.

Ansar.org states:

Imâm Mûsâ al-Kâzim, the son of Imâm Ja’far, and the seventh of the supposed Imâms of the Shī’ah, describes them in the following words:

If I had to truly distinguish my Shī’ah I would find them nothing other than pretenders. If I had to put them to the test I would only find them to be

apostates. If I were to scrutinise them I would be left with only one in a thousand. Were I to sift them thoroughly I would be left with only the handful that is truly mine. They have been sitting on cushions all along, saying: " We are the Shi'ah of 'Alī." 11

Again the Imam (as) is stating that a true Shi'a is one who has a 100% conviction in the Imam and follows him in word and deed. A proclamation means nothing practical application is what counts which is what is proven in this hadith. The same is the case with the Sahaba, they might have vouched for the fact they were companions but their actions after Rasulullah (s) proves that only a handful remained as true Sahaba. As proof one need go no further than traditions in Sahih al Bukhari:

Sahih Bukhari Hadith: 8.587
Narrated Abu Huraira:

The Prophet said, "While I was sleeping, a group (of my followers were brought close to me), and when I recognised them, a man (an angel) came out from amongst (us) me and them, he said (to them), 'Come along.' I asked, 'Where?' He said, 'To the (Hell) Fire, by Allah' I asked, 'what is wrong with them?' He said, 'They turned APOSTATE as renegades after you left.' Then behold! (Another) group (of my followers) were brought close to me, and when I recognised them, a man (an angel) came out from (me and them) he said (to them); 'Come along.' I asked, 'Where?' He said, 'To the (Hell) Fire, by Allah.' I asked, 'What is wrong with them?' He said, 'They turned APOSTATE as renegades after you left. So I did not see anyone of them escaping except a few who were like camels without a shepherd.'"

If only a handful of Sahaba remained on the straight path (and were hence were true Sahaba by word and deed), then why is this Nasibi criticising the fact that Imam Kazim (as) stated that only a handful of true 'Shi'a existed' amongst those that sat in his midst?

The 'true' Shia are those that follow the Imams in all aspects of their lives. Imam Kazim (as) defined the 'true Shi'a as follows:

"These people claim that we are the Shi'a of 'Alī, the true Shi'a are those whose actions are in accordance with his words".

Rowza Kulayni page 107; Ahsaan al Fatawi Volume 1 page 84

Afriki had quoted the Imam (as) stating **"Were I to sift them thoroughly I would be left with only the handful that is truly mine"** – it is these individuals that are true Shi'a loyal followers of the Imams who adhered to them in all aspects of their lives following them in word and deed. These are those individuals that Imams deem to be 'their' Shi'a. If all the Shi'a are treacherous to the Imams could this Nasibi kindly explain why Rasulullah (as) had praised the Imams and their Shi'a?

8.1 The Shi'a will enter Heaven with the Prophet (s), Imams Ali (as) Hasan (as) and Husyan (as)

Ibn Hajr records this tradition from Imam Tabarani in Sawaiqh al Muhriqa page 159 (published in Cairo, Egypt):

"O Ali four people will enter heaven first of all. You Hasan Hussain your descendents and me will follow us and our wives will follow our descendents and our Shi'a will be

to the left and right of us”.

If the Shi'a are a treacherous people why was Rasulullah (s) guaranteeing salvation for his Shi'a as well as the Shi'a of Imams Ali (as), Imam Hasan (as) and Imam Hussain (as)?

9. Conclusion

Alhamdulillah the lies of Nasibi Ansar have been exposed yet again. The central argument of Afriki was that it was the Shi'a who called Imam Hussain (as) and it was the same Shi'a that abandoned him and allowed him to be martyred. A fact that this Afriki fails to point out is that amongst those that wrote letters were individuals such as Shabath bin Rib'i, who despite inviting the Imam in fact had a sinister motive to cause harm to him. Shabath had kept his Nasibi aqeedah hidden (in the same way that Ansar.org do) but his Nasibi aqeedah was exposed on account of his seditious activities and his entry in the ranks of Yazeed's forces as a Shi'a of Uthman.

Even if we accept that despite the policy persecution by Mu'awiya's Nasibi regime, Shi'a still resided in a large city such as Kufa, historically only a handful of individuals can definitely be located as Shi'a. We have exemplary characters whose examples cannot even be found today, individuals such as Hani bin Urwah, Qays bin Mussahar, 'Abd al-A'la bin Yazid al Kalbi, Umarah bin Salkhab al-Azdi who were captured and executed before Imam Hussain (as) reached Kufa. Mukhthar and Abdullah bin al-Harith were apprehended and imprisoned before the Imam's arrival, despite the tough measures of abduction, intimidation and violence it is truly amazing that some individuals still managed to reach the Rasulullah's grandson and sacrifice their lives for him. These individuals were indeed the Shi'a of Kufa who attained martyrdom on the 10th of Muhurrum such as Habib bin Muzahir, Sa'id bin Abdullah and Abd Rahman the two sons of Azrah, these were the faithful Kufan Shi'a that Imam Hussain (as) had praised. Despite the oppressive policy of extermination Ziyad and his son these Shi'a managed to save their lives and aid their Imam. The fact that these individuals were Shi'a had even been admitted by Ibn Ziyad. Following the martyrdom of Imam Hussain (as) Ibn Ziyad said as follows:

"Praise be to God, who revealed the truth and the followers of truth. He has given victory to the Commander of the Faithful Yazeed ibn Mu'awiyah, and his party. He has killed the liar who is the son of a liar, al Hussain bin Ali and his Shiah".

 [The History of al-Tabari, English translation by I.K.A. Howard, Volume 19 page 167](#)

Again in the Court of Yazeed, Zahr bin Qays proudly declared this to Yazeed:

"O Commander of the Faithful I bring good news of God's victory and support. Al Hussain bin Ali came against us with 18 men of his House and 60 of his Shiah"

 [The History of al-Tabari, English translation by I.K.A. Howard, Volume 19 page 169](#)

Whilst individuals such as the Sahaba of Rasulullah (s) Sulayman bin Surad, Mussayab bin Najabah and Rafah bin Shahdad may well have failed to support the Imam, it is impossible to contemplate exactly how these individuals had managed to protect themselves from Nasibi Ibn Ziyad's tyranny. When we analyse history we see that the survival of these Sahaba, devotees of Ahl'ul bayt (as) proved very beneficial, even today Mukhthar's achievements on the battlefield of Ayn ul Wardh prove their firm intention and commitment to avenge the killing of the Imam (as). These were the Shi'a of Kufa who aided the Deen as is testified to in the annals of history, these were not the Kufans that betrayed and killed the Imam – whose example was one of betrayal.

Those that killed Imam Hussain (as) were Nasibis, today's Nasibis love these killers to the extent that they take the core component of Deen (hadith) from them. These are the same Nasibi that oppose the mourning of Imam Hussain (as) deeming such practices to be bidath, their hearts are cursed just like their faces. Whilst Ansar.org claim to defend the Sahaba, they shamelessly mock and attack the Sahaba that supported Imam Hussain (as). The greatest irony lies in the fact that this group calls itself Ansar al Hussain (Helpers of al Hussain) – What sort of Ansar al Hussain are these? Ansar that take hadith from the killers of Imam Hussain (as) and praise Ibn Ziyad's supporters such as Harith Mukhdoomee. With Ansar like these who needs enemies!

It is ironic that Afrki seeks to conclude his article by stating:

Ansar.org states:

When the names of Yazîd ibn Mu`âwiyah, `Ubaydullâh ibn Ziyâd, `Umar ibn Sa`d and Shamir ibn Dhil Jawshan are mentioned and curses invoked upon their memories, then let us not forget the treachery of the Shî`ah of Kûfah.

Perhaps it would also be of relevance for this Nasibi to tell his faithful that he adheres to a school of thought that deems Yazeed to be a legitimate Khalifa of Rasulullah, and takes hadith on the authority of `Ubaydullâh ibn Ziyâd, `Umar ibn Sa`d and Shamir.

Ansar.org's Salaf are those that killed Imam Hussain (as) and these Nasibi are STILL enemies of those that support the cause of Imam Hussain (as).

10. Copyright

All rights, including copyright, in the content of these Answering-Ansar.org web pages are owned or controlled for these purposes by the Answering-Ansar.org team.

You can distribute the download version of "Adobe® PDF" documents of the Answering-Ansar.org articles, as long as the documents remain in their original state and none of the contents are modified in any format.

The Answering-Ansar.org reserves the right over the contents of the articles if they are used in the original format. You can freely distribute the Islamic references and quotes that we use in our articles in any format.

When using our articles in your websites or if in distribution in print format, please include the source as Answering-Ansar.org.

Our web site contains links to third party sites. These links are used for the convenience of our users; however, they are not under the control of Answering-Ansar.org. We are not responsible for their contents, nor should they be considered endorsements of the individual linked sites.

However, it is possible that the site could contain typographical errors. If such a condition is brought to our attention, a reasonable effort will be made to fix or remove it.

If you wish to reproduce, print and distribute our articles in book format, then you will need a written permission of Answering-Ansar.org. If you wish to do so, then please contact us for further details.