

?Is this Revival of Islam or Double Standards

<"xml encoding="UTF-8?">

Please note: This is a detailed paper, comprising (i) the subject article, (ii) the website links, (iii) Press Release of Dr. Zakir Naik and (iv) the paper presented by Muallim Murtaza Bandali. You might like to take your own time in reading it in stages, and referring to the links which are very educational. May Allah (s.w.t.) compensate you abundantly for the time you spend in getting informed and seeing things in their proper perspectives. Muharram 23, 1429 marks the second anniversary of the devastation caused by the Takfiris to the sacred shrine of Askariyyain (a.s.). The Hussayniyyahs, Imambargahs and communities around the Shi'ite world remembered and commemorated this tragedy, so that it does not lapse from the memory of the generations to come. The ideology that was responsible for the destruction of Jannatul Baqee' in Madina and Jannatul Mo'alla in Makkah, was behind the destruction of the shrine of Samarra. The house of Imam Sahibuzzaman (a.t.f.) lies in ruins for the last two years in a country where the Shias are in absolute majority. To add insults to injuries, there are postings on Youtube by the Muftis of the Nasibis and the Kharijis, congratulating the culprits for blowing up the 1000-years old mausoleum of Askariyyain. They also advocate destruction of the sacred shrines of Imam Hussayn and Sayyida Zainab (peace be upon them) in gross violation of the Islamic Shari'ah, International Law and the UN Charter of Human Rights. All this is done under the cover of revival of Islam, whilst maintaining the age-old animosity of Banu Umayyah and the Kharijites against the blessed Household of the Prophet. Under the circumstances, if the true followers of the Prophet and his Ahl-ul-Bayt choose to ignore them, then their voice will become active and our voice will remain voluntarily suppressed or passive, with undesirable consequences in the long run. And the history will not remember us kindly. There are thousands of misinformed people who are espousing the ideology of violence, enshrined in the teachings of the Nasibis and the Kharijis. But far more serious is the mind that works behind them and the cunningness of the agent provocateurs. That is why the Qur'an considers the offence of Fitnah more serious than murder. How can we ignore (?) the Fatwah given by several Muftis of the Salafis/Wahhabis, who have ruled that the Shias are "kuffar" (but notice their sympathy towards the usurpers of the rights of, and murderers of Ahl-ul-Bayt). They preach that it is an Islamic duty to destroy the shrine of Imam Hussayn and Sayyida Zainab (a.s.). These types of rulings, coming from the top of the hierarchy, pave way for the fanatical clerics to pass Fatwahs that whoever kills the Shias will

enter Heaven.

The ignorant among them, implement these Fatwahs in action by targeting innocent people. The result is the daily carnage of indiscriminate killings in Iraq, the dreadful scenes of which we see on our TV screens. The bloodshed and human sufferings caused by these people have far overtaken that caused by their ancestors in Jahiliyyah. And yet they are considered "mujahideen" by the Salafi/Wahhabis.

On the day of Ashura this year, a cyanide attack in the water of Sabeels was averted in Karachi. This would have caused mass-massacre of thousands of men, women and children. But has anyone heard even a semblance of condemnation from those who have given themselves the exclusive right of speaking in the name of Islam, in particular, the Salafi/Wahhabi/Deobandis? Even the new converts who are indoctrinated at the Madina University against the Shias, consider themselves 'all-knowing all-wise' to attack the Shi'ite concept of Imamatus, without leaving any room for themselves that they may have misread and misunderstood the faith of the School of Ahl-ul-Bayt.

Yet, they take quotes out of context and find for themselves the pretext to attack the Shi'ite faith. The following link demonstrates how the so-called scholars who are brainwashed at the Madina University and Muhammad ibn Sa'ud University enter the arena, believing that it is their holy duty to spread malice against the Shias: [Why Shias are not Muslims - Dr Bilal Phillips](#). What this Wahhabi indoctrinated "scholar" should have asked himself is that, has he got any knowledge and qualification in the Shi'ite theology in order to be able to pass any comment at all on their faith? Or is the incentive for making mockery of the Shia faith too strong to resist? There are several postings of Dr. Zakir Naik on Youtube, where he is on record to have defended the criminality of Taliban and bin Laden, saying that if bin Laden is a terrorist, then all Muslims are terrorists! The crimes of the terrorists are self-confessed through dozens of audio/video tapes televised on al-Jazeera. Why should any public figure take undue advantage of his fame and tie the destiny of bin Laden with the reputation of the peaceful Muslim community as a whole?

Our children and youths growing up in the West, are already facing problems and prejudice due to stereotyping of all Muslims as "terrorists". Yet, this intellectual, because of the ideological alliance between his Deobandi School and the Salafi/Wahhabi School, to which most if not all the terrorists belong, provides ammunition to the biased media in the West to target the Muslim community even further. Where is the wisdom in this case?

During the Muharram majalis, many speakers around the world, have answered his invocation of Allah's pleasure on Yazid and his branding the battle of Karbala as a "political war". The

readers are strongly advised to access the following links and make themselves aware of the development. In this link, Sayed Ammar has answered him in the tenth night's majlis from Sydney. In the following four links, Mehdi Hasan has answered him in detail: Part 1, Part 2, Part 3, Part 4.

There have been world-wide protests, including in Dr. Naik's home-town Mumbai. Since then, he has replied to his critics. To be fair to him, his response in full has been reproduced at the end of this article for the information of those who are yet unaware or unconvinced about this debacle. Notice the way he justifies his position. In some cases, his response is far worse than

his initial outburst. Hence, it is clear that whatever he said was not accidental.

Further to my two articles on the subject: "For the love of Yazid ibn Mu'awiyah" [#169] and "The fight between Truth and Falsehood goes on" [#5], a well-meaning reader wrote that we should ignore him altogether and not make a martyr out of him like Salman Rushdie. Without any attempt at drawing a comparison, if Salman Rushdie had been ignored, many paradigms of dirty politics and conspiracies against Islam, that had been concealed from public-eye, would never have been known.

We have to think about the millions whose feelings were injured through his provocation. When anyone has the audacity of clashing with the position adopted and promulgated by the purified members of the Household of the Prophet (s.a.w.w), then he must not expect to get away with it. The voice of the grand-daughter of the Prophet, Sayyida Zainab (a.s.) is still echoing through

the layers of time, when she addressed the accursed Yazid and his sympathisers:

"It is quite sufficient that Allah is your Judge and Muhammad (SAWW) is your opponent and Gabriel is the supporter (of Muhammad). All those who instigated you to do what you did and all those who put you in charge due to which you are playing havoc with the lives of the Muslims will know for certain how evil the end of the oppressors is, and which of you shall have the worst place and will be the least protected."

When the interest of some sectors of the community clashed with the interest of Islam, then the uncompromising stance adopted by members of Ahl-ul-Bayt is exemplary. Otherwise, what would we make of the tone of speech of Imam Ali (a.s.) in Nahjul Balaghah, when he addresses the agent provocateur Mu'awiyah ibn Abi Sufyan? What would we make of the tone of speech of Sayyida Fatima (a.s.) in her famous sermon challenging the ruling elite, after the death of the Prophet (s.a.w.w.)? What would we make of the strong message of defiance in the face of the tyrant Yazid and his sympathisers by Sayyida Zainab (a.s.) in her sermons? What do we make of Ziyarat-e-Ashura, in which we pelt curses on the oppressors, collectively and individually?

When in the name of Islam and Qur'an, a particular School of thinking (or sect) which stands as the adversary against the rights of Ahl-ul-Bayt (in those days and in present times) is promoted (or marketed) then the truth has to be proclaimed and defended. This is the only weapon the devotees of Ahl-ul-Bayt have. Otherwise, why bother? But when innocent members of the public are misled through the sugar coated poisonous pills, the true followers of the Prophet and his Ahl-ul-Bayt cannot maintain silence. With this in mind, the reply of Dr.

Naik has to be analysed and answered.

In point (1) Dr. Naik's propaganda machinery throws the ball in the court of Khoja Shia Ithnaasheri community, "a minority of the minority" as it calls them, and accuses them of misleading others, on totally flimsy grounds. Before accusing others of being "a minority of the minority" perhaps he should have assessed the ideology of Deobandis that he is espousing. Aren't they THE minority among Ahl al-Sunnah? The following is the link of the press-conference in Mumbai in which prominent Ulama of Ahl al-Sunnah have condemned Dr. Naik personally, and they are not Khoja Shia Ithnaasheris. Therefore, his accusation is nothing but guesswork, which is strictly forbidden in the Qur'an. Conference Part 1, Part 2, Part 3, Part 4, Part 5.

Does this mean that, for political expediencies, his organisation is even prepared to tell lies in public? It goes on to claim: "Irrespective of the difference of opinion on this issue in Ahle Sunnah Wal Jamaah yet it is unanimously agreed that one can say RadhiAllahu Anhu (May Allah be pleased with him) for Yazeed." By making such a claim, at the behest of Dr. Naik, his organisation is either right or wrong. If it is wrong, despite very strong resources, finance and research material at its disposal, then what can it be called? I leave it up to the readers to decide for themselves.

There are many public recordings of Shaykh-ul-Islam, His Excellency Professor Muhammad Tahir al-Qadri, which penetrate even the hearing of the deaf. He openly curses Yazid in his speeches, and he is a prominent Sunni scholar of our time. Therefore, the so-called statement of unanimity among Ahl al-Sunnah for saying "may Allah be pleased with him" for Yazid simply does not exist, and hence, the Sunni Schools are being misrepresented by Dr. Naik's organisation on the basis of guesswork, which is against the ethics of the Qur'an and the Sunnah of the Prophet.

The reply sent to Dr. Naik by Muallim Murtaza Bandali (reproduced at the end of this article) is full of references from the sources of Ahl al-Sunnah against Yazid. But the root problem has always been that the Salafi/Wahhabi ideology, represented in the teachings of Deobandis in the sub-continent, looks at the matters from the prism of self-righteousness.

They consider nobody else as "Ahl al-Sunnah" except themselves. Otherwise, the top scholars and pioneers of the Madhab of Ahl al-Sunnah have considered Yazid as entitled to be cursed and they believe that at the very least, he was a Fasiq (debaucher or evil).

In point (2), notice the arrogance in the tone of his propaganda machinery. It writes that he regrets hurting the feelings of others unintentionally, and then it asserts: "but that does not mean what he has said is wrong."

In point (3), it declares: "Dr. Zakir Naik after mentioning the name of Yazeed, who is a Taba ' een, (sic) he followed his name with (May Allah be pleased with him). To pray for the Muslims is also instructed by Allah (swt) in the Glorious Qur 'an – 98:8, 9:100 and 58:22".

To misinterpret the Qur'an is a very serious matter and any Muslim worth the salt will not bear this offence. Will Dr. Naik apply the same rationale to Abu Lu'lu, whom the Ahl al-Sunnah consider to be the murderer of Umar ibn al-Khattab? I challenge him and his entire establishment of Salafis/Wahhabis and Deobandis to pronounce in public "Radiallahu anhu – may Allah be pleased with him" after the name of Abu Lu'lu.

They would never do it. Why? Wasn't he a Muslim? Wasn't he from the Taba'een? On the contrary, Shaykh al-Qardawi, a prominent Salafi scholar, has cursed Abu Lu'lu in his Friday Sermons. Does this mean that a different standard applies to the murderer of the grandson of the Prophet (s.a.w.w.) from the one applied to whom they consider the murderer of Umar? Then Dr. Naik's propagandists question: "Do the views of the Khoja Shia Isna Ashari Jamaat represent the view of the Muslim Ummah? Do they have the fatawas of all the cross section of Muslims, especially the Ahl-e-sunnat-wal-Jamaat, for their stand? If it is only Khoja Shia Isna Ashari Jamaat raking up the controversy, then they are misleading the common masses by saying Muslim Ummah."

Let the readers decide after going through the press-conferences referred earlier on and the references from the wide cross-section of Ahl al-Sunnah wal Jama'ah reproduced at the end of this article.

Notice the blatant blasphemy in his statement: "Yazeed was also the commander of the Muslim army, which went to fight the battle of Constantinople, which was predicted by the Prophet (pbuh) himself along with the glad tidings, " Paradise will be granted to the first batch of my followers who will undertake a naval operation." [Sahih Bukhari, Vol. 4 Book of Jihad Hadith 2924]. This was a very prominent war as far as the spread of Islam was concerned. There were Sahabah like Hussain Ibn Ali, Abdullah bin Abbas, Ibn Umar and Abu Ayyub Ansari and Abdullah bin Zubair (May Allah be pleased with all of them) who participated and fought under the leadership of Yazeed."

He has made Yazid (la'natullah alaih) the commander of Imam Hussayn (a.s.). These ideologues would be least interested to know that the Prophet, by the command of Allah, has given the title of "Sayyid Shabab ahl-al-Jannah" (the leaders of the youths of Paradise) to Imams Hassan and Hussayn (a.s.) and a fasiq and fajir can never lead a personality like Imam Hussayn whose sanctity and purity is protected in the Qur'an in Ayat al-Tathir, which will survive long after the lovers of their enemies are forgotten.

The following links of the speeches of Shaykh-ul-Islam, His Excellency Professor Muhammad Tahir al-Qadri, falsifies the allegation which turns Yazid as "Jannati", with proofs from the sources of Ahl al-Sunnah. He also bravely and courageously condemns unequivocally those who have an iota of respect for Yazid. [Link 1](#) & [Link 2](#).

Dr. Naik then goes on to enlist the fatwahs of the Deobandi (Salafi/Wahhabi) establishment across India who have supported his views on Yazid. No wonder he names Abdullah bin Jabrin as the supporter of his views. This extremist Wahhabi cleric has issued fatwah declaring the Shias to be "kuffar" and solicits terrorist attacks on the shrines of Imam Hussayn (a.s.) and Sayyida Zainab (a.s.).

Such is the credibility of his referees. He also names Ibn Taymiyyah, the spiritual mentor of Muhammad ibn Abdul Wahhab, as permitting prayers in favour of Yazid. Needless to mention that Ibn Taymiyyah's ideology, which had offended all the Schools of Ahl al-Sunnah in his times, were adopted and embraced by Ibn Abdul Wahhab.

Both, Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn Abdul Wahhab consider the hadiths narrated through Imam Ali (a.s.) as "unreliable"! But Ibn Taymiyyah considers the Khawarej as some of the most reliable narrators of Ahadith of the Prophet! Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn Abdul Wahhab's allegiance to Banu Umayyah against Ahl-ul-Bayt, in particular, against the rights of Imam Ali (a.s.) and his sons, are well-documented in history.

Dr. Naik has the audacity of accusing others of hurling abuses on the three Caliphs and Mother of the Believers, when he himself is using the expression of reverence for the drunkard transgressor Yazid ibn Mu'awiyah, as he is using for the three Caliphs and Ayesha. He has placed all of them in the same category. The ideology that uses the expression "may Allah be pleased with them" for all and sundry, without any exception, has abused Ayesha and the three Caliphs publicly.

By misusing this expression, it means that may Allah be pleased with those who spread rumours against Ayesha in the incident of Ifk, which is condemned in the Qur'an; but which was nevertheless carried out by some Companions of the Prophet. This means that may Allah be pleased with those who ran away from the Battle of Uhud, for saving their own skins,

abandoning the Prophet in the battlefield with injuries. This means that may Allah be pleased with those who conspired to kill the Prophet.

This means that may Allah be pleased with those who fought the Prophet until they could fight no more, and who are clearly categorised as not equal in ranks with the earliest migrants by the Qur'an itself. This means that may Allah be pleased with those who raised their voices over the voice of the Prophet in defiance, despite the Qur'anic prohibitions.

This means that may Allah be pleased with those whom the Qur'an condemns in Sura al-Munafiqoon and calls them liars, despite the fact that they were the Companions of the Prophet. This means that may Allah be pleased with those who are condemned in Sura al-Bara'ah, despite the fact that they were the Companions of the Prophet. This means that those who besieged the house of the third Caliph to kill him, may Allah be pleased with them, because all of them were the Companions of the Prophet or from the taba'een.

Therefore, before pointing fingers at others, the Deobandis/Salafis/Wahhabis should care to look at their own irrational thinking and contradictions. If Allah (s.w.t.) curses the oppressors, the unjust and the transgressors many times in the Qur'an, who on earth are they to invoke the pleasure of Allah on them, and place them on equal footing with the sincere Companions of the Prophet?

Those who believe that the Prophet has said that when two Muslim factions take out swords against each other, then the "qatil and maqtool" (the murderer and the murdered) are in the Fire, should re-think about the Companions whom they themselves are cursing, and then passing their guilt on others.

It is to be noted that the entire concentration of Dr. Naik is on impermissibility by Ahl al-Sunnah for cursing the first three Caliphs and Ayesha. What about their fourth Caliph? Perhaps, he should care to re-read history and find out for himself as to who started the most evil and vile practice of cursing Imam Ali (a.s.) from the pulpits (?) which continued throughout the reign of Banu Umayyah.

According to the hadith he has quoted, if the person being cursed was not entitled to be cursed in the first place, (because abusing him (in case of Imam Ali) was tantamount to abusing the Prophet himself) then does not the curse return back to the person who started this wicked practice and those who succumbed to it?

Let us hear from him about the Sunnah started by Mu'awiyah ibn Abi Sufyan for cursing Imam Ali (a.s.) from the pulpits. Or does a different standard altogether apply to their Imams from Aal Abu Sufyan and Aal Marwan, for whom, misinterpretation of the Qur'an and ahadith and distortions in history are quite permissible?

The deviant philosophy of the Salafis/Wahhabis excuses Yazid altogether from the massacre of Karbala. They claim that he was not personally present there, although overwhelming historical evidences are available that Yazid ordered the killing of Imam Hussayn, as testified by his own governors and fellow-criminals. If we apply their rationale, how can they say that the first three Caliphs conquered the empires of that time when they had not physically participated in the wars of conquests?

But as the conquests were made during the times of the first three Caliphs, irrespective of whether they themselves fought or not, they give the credit to them. In the second case, they maintain Nifaq and double standards by exempting Yazid from any blame for murdering the nearest and dearest members of the Prophet's family under the excuse that he was not present in Karbala.

Abu Bakr ibn al-'Arabi has gone as far as claiming that Imam Hussayn was killed with the sword of his own grandfather for having created "division in the ummah"! This is the stance of the Salafi/Wahhabis. This link gives the version of these Nasibis, blaming Imam Hussayn (a.s.) for revolting against the Imam of his time Yazid (la'anatullah alaih).

The Shia Ithnaasharis do not stake their Hereafter for the sake of the oppressors and unjust tyrants of Aal Abu Sufyan and Aal Marwan or whoever brought them in power. The Shia Ithnaasharis do not equate the oppressors and the oppressed, the murderers and the murdered because they consider this to be a blasphemy against Islam and against the Qur'anic message. The Shia Ithnaasharis abhor double standards which others consider as norm - one for their tyrants and the terrorists, and the other for helpless members of the public.

The Shia Ithnaasharis do not wear two masks on their faces. The oppressors will be cursed forever until the Day of Judgement, simply because the Qur'an and the Prophet have cursed the unjust people. The Shia Ithnaasharis do not auction their Hereafter for the sake of this world .and its temptations

SHOWING LOVE AND RESPECT TO YAZID?

Hadith of the Prophet(saw) : "Yuhsharu al-mar'u(al-insan) ma'a man ahab" "Man will be resurrected on the Day of Judgement with those whom he loves."

(Sunni sources : Musnad Ahmad ibn Hanbal Vol. 3 page 336 Hadith No. 14644, Al-Tabarani Hadith No. 8953 ; Ibn Asakir Hadith No. 2427)

Sunni Sources say : Yazid was a fasiq (transgressor) a fajir(a debaucher, a person who leads a life of promiscuity) a drunkard, 'mal'oon'(accursed) and a 'kafir'. He drank wine(shaaribul .khamr). He kept dogs. He abandoned salat

He did not believe in the revelation of the Qur'an. He inaugurated his 'dawla'(kingdom) with the killing of Shahid al-Husain(a.s.), the grandson of the Prophet(saw) and closed it with the catastrophe of 'Al-Harra' in which he ransacked Madina for three days during which many companions and Huffaz of Qur'an were massacred and women were raped). Finally, the Ka'ba was set on fire. In 'Asma al Khulafa biography of Yazid ibn Mu'awiyah Allama Ibn Hazm writes, "His abomination went to such an extent that when Yazid's army attacked Madina, their horses .urinated in the Mosque of the Messenger of Allah, and also in Riyad al Jannah

Dr. Zakir Naik

I begin in the Name of Allah the All-beneficent, the All-merciful.

On 1st of December 2007 at the World Peace Conference a Hindoo sought your opinion regarding Husaini Brahmins and mentioned two characters, Ravan and Yazid as symbols of evil. In reply you said among other things that 'there is a difference of opinion' and 'that is history' and that 'the war of Karbala was a political war'. Also after the name of Yazid you gave an epithet 'May Allah be pleased with him'. To the vast majority of Muslims this was blasphemous and revolting.

I do hope that you will take seriously the following revelations from Sunni sources. You will see that there is a consensus among the vast majority of Muslims that Imam Husein(a.sw.) did not fight a political war. Imam Husain(a.s.) refused to give 'bay'aa'(allegiance) to Yazid, a tyrant and one who openly indulged in sinful acts ; he gave his life and those of his family to save the faith of Islam from the hands of depraved Yazid. You will come to know that Yazid has not been been condemned by the Shias only but he has been condemned and cursed by Sunni scholars. You will also be able to judge the position of Imam Husain(a.s.) in the eyes of the .Muslims and non-Muslims compared with that of Yazid

CONTENTS: (From Sunni Sources)

1. What does the Qur'an say about the Prophet(saw) and Ahlul Bayt(a.s.)
2. The Prophet's sayings and his declaration of war against the enemies of Ahlul Bayt(a.s.)
3. Shayk-ul-Islam, Dr. Muhammad Tahir-ul-Qadri's recent remarks on Yazid
4. Establishing the fact that Yazid was responsible for the killing of Imam Husain(a.s.)
5. Yazid's pride in killing Imam Husain(a.s.)
6. Why did Imam Husain(a.s.) rise up and fight against Yazid ?
7. Who was Imam Husain ?

WHAT DOES THE QUR'AN SAY ABOUT THE PROPHET AND AHLUL-BAYT(A.S.) (1

Since you are so knowledgeable and conversant with Verses from Qur'an and Ahadith I am going to quote only a few verses from the Holy Qur'an(the translation is one published by Abul-Qasim Publishing House, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia which you are promoting) and the Ahadith from Sunni sources for your reminder and reflection. For Allah(swt) says in Surah Al A'laa Surah 87

Verse 9 "So remind, if the reminder should benefit."

You so rightly advocate that "what is important is the Qur'an and the Prophetic sayings." and I agree totally with you. Let us therefore look at what the Qur'an and the Ahadith of the Prophet(saw) have to say.

First, You will agree with me that whatever the Prophet(saw) said was not out of his whim or inclination but it was by an inspiration from Allah(swt).

In Surah Al Najm Surah No. 53 Verse No.3. Allah says, "Nor does he(the Prophet)(saw)) speak from his own inclination. It is not but a revelation revealed."

In Surah al-Ahzab Surah 33 Verse 6 Allah(swt) says, "The Prophet(saw) is more worthy of the believers than themselves." In Ma'ariful Qur'an by Maulana Mufti Muhammad Shafi he says that the meaning of the expression, "The Prophet is closer to the believers than their own selves" mentioned by Maulana Thanvi is based on the saying of Ibn 'Atiyyah and others which has been opted for by al-Qurtubi and most commentators. According to it, every Muslim is duty-bound to obey and implement the command of the Holy Prophet(saw) more than the command of his own parents.

Allah(swt) also says in Surah Al-Shura Surah 42 Verse 23 say, (O Muhammad), " I do not ask you for it (i.e.this message)any payment (but) only good will through (i.e. due to) kinship." In the translation by Abdullah Yusuf Ali which the late Ahmad Deedat used to promote, it says, ". "No reward do I ask of you for this except the love of those near of kin

THE PROPHET'S SAYINGS AND HIS DECLARATION OF WAR AGAINST THE ENEMIES OF (2 AHLUL BAYT(A.S.)

The Messenger of Allah(saw) said: If one while praying between Rukn and Maqam (near Ka'bah) and fasting, dies but with the hate of the family of Muhammad(saw) he will enter the Fire. And he who abuses my Ahlul Bayt is verily an apostate and is driven out of Islam. And he who inflicts pain on my progeny upon him is the curse of Allah. And he who hurts me by hurting

my progeny has verily hurt/angered Allah. Certainly Allah has made Paradise forbidden to he who does injustice to my Ahlul Bayt, or kills them, or assists against them or abuses them. (Sunni reference : al-Sawi'iq al-Muhriqah by Ibn Hajar al-Hathami, Ch. 11, p. 357 who said this tradition is authentic)

"Allah's Messenger(saw) looked at 'Ali, Fatima, Hasan and Husayn(Allah be pleased with them all) and said, " I am at peace with those with whom you make peace and I am at war with those with whom you make war."

Sunni sources : Sahih Tirmidhi v.5 p.699 ; Sunan Ibn Majah, English translation by Muhammad Tufail Ansari, Vol. 1 p. 81 ; Fada'il al-Sahaba, by Ahmad Ibn Hanbal, v. 2 p. 767, Tradition No. 1350 and al Mustadrak al Hakim Vol.3 p. 149.

"Husain is from me and I am from Husain" is the famous saying of the Prophet(saw) (see Masnad Ahmad Ibn Hanbal V.4 p. 172 ; Al-Mustadrak by al-Hakim V.3 p.177; al-Tabarani V.3 p.21; Mishkat al-Masabih by Khatib al-Tabrizi English Version tradition No. 6160 and al-Sawaiq al-Muhriqah by Ibn Hajar Haythami Ch.11 Section 3 p.291.

In another Hadith the Prophet said, "One who fights Husain fights the Prophet" (Sunni sources : Sunan Ibn Majah p.14 Manaqib Husayn; Tirmidhi Vol. 2 p.587; Sawaiq al Muhriqa p.114 Dhikr Husain ; Yanabi al Mawaddah p.164 Ch.54 ; Mustadrak al Hakim Vol. 3 p.177 and so on.

Now that we have established from the Qur'an that the Prophet(saw) is dearer to us than our own selves, that he does not speak except by inspiration from Allah(swt) and that we have been commanded by Allah(swt) to love the family of the Prophet(saw) and now that we have also seen from the Ahadith in which the Prophet says that he who fights Husain fights him and he who angers Husain angers Allah, how should we rate those who shower praise on Yazid in the eyes of Allah(swt) and the Prophet(saw).

The Prophet(saw) would definitely not take it lightly and kindly the appellation "May Allah be pleased with Yazid"? pleased for what ?

for killing Imam Husain and for not believing in the revelation of the Qura'n ? This is nothing but 'kufr' and disrespect for Allah(swt) and the Prophet(saw) It is incurring anger of Allah(swt) and the Prophet(saw). It follows from the above Hadith of the Prophet(saw) that one who hurts and angers the Prophet by saying May Allah be pleased with Yazid has waged a war against the Prophet(saw) and blasphemed Allah(swt) and the Prophet(saw).

What does the Qur'an say about those who cause annoyance to Allah and His Messenger ?

See Surah Al-Ahzab Surah No. 33 Verse 57

"Indeed, those who abuse Allah and His Messenger – Allah has cursed them in this world and the Hereafter and prepared for them a humiliating punishment. " Both Abdullah Yusuf Ali and

Maududi have translated "those who cause annoyance to Allah(swt) and the Prophet(saw).....". Sunni scholar Sayyid Mahmood Alusi in 'Ruh al Ma'ani Part 26 comments on Imam Husain's murder. He says, " Those who state that Yazeed was not responsible and should not be cursed, ".or that he committed no sin are in fact Yazid's helpers

SHAYKH-UL-ISLAM, DR. MUHAMMAD TAHIR-UL-QADRI'S RECENT REMARKS ABOUT (3 YAZID

Let us hear what the world renowned scholar has to say about Yazid. Shaykhu-ul-Islam, Dr. Muhammad Tahir-ul-Qadri in his speech on the 3rd of October 2007(21 st Ramadhan) in Baghdad Town, Lahore on "Manaqib Ali al Murtaza(a.s.) said in Urdu and I quote, "Khasais Amiril Muminin Ali Ibn Abi Talib Imam Abu Abdulrahman An Nasai(r.a.) Sahibu-s-Sunan ne ye kitab khasais 'Ali Ibn Abi Talib parke Damishk me sunai to Kharji khare ho gae. Kharjioko na us waqt Ahlebayt ki ta'rif gawara thi na aaj gawara hai. Ye baat sunle.

Unhone ye kiya ke Ahlebayt ke fazail aur manakib ko taake logo tak na pahonche wo chupana shuru' kiya. Jo Khawarij hay, Yazid jayse badbakht aur lae'en jahannami aur dushman-e Islam ke liye lafze Hazrat kehna unko zeb deta hai, unko tabiyyat manti hai, usko hazrat bhi kehte hai, ".Amiril Mu'mineen bhi kehte hay, likhte bhi hai

ESTABLISHING THE FACT THAT YAZID WAS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE KILLING OF (4 IMAM HUSAIN(A.S.):

Let us quote just a few Ahadith (I can fill pages and pages of Ahadith from acknowledged Sunni sources but I will mention only a few that Yazid beyond any doubt was responsible for the killing of Imam Husain(a.s.)

In al-Bidayah ibn Ziyad admitted that he killed Imam Husayn(a.s.) on the orders of Yazeed. According to the testimony of Ibn Abbas Yazid killed Imam Husain(a.s.) We read in Tareekh Kamil: Ibn Abbas replied to a letter of Yazeed stating 'You killed Husayn ibn 'Ali as well as the youth from Banu Abdul Muttalib, who were beacons of guidance." In Maqatil Husayn of al Khawarzmee Vol. 2 p. 80 Ch. 9 we read "Yazeed wrote a letter to Waleed the Governor of Medina, in which he stated 'Force Husayn to give bay'a. Should he refuse then strike off his head and return it to me." I have at least 25 Sunni references confirming that Yazid was .responsible for the killing of Imam Husain

YAZEED'S PRIDE IN KILLING IMAM HUSAIN(A.S.)(5

Ibn Asakir, writing on Yazid, states that when Husain's head was brought before Yazid, he recited the couplets of Ibn Zubayr "I wish my ancestors of Badr were here to see the severed head of the rebellious tribe(The Prophet's tribe of Banu Hashim)." (Al Bidayah by Ibn Asakir Volume 8 p.204.

Following the murder of Husain, Yazid said, " I avenged the killing of my kaafir relatives in Badr through the killing of the family of the Prophet."
(Sharh Fiqh Akbar Vol. 1 p. 73)

Sunni scholar Sayyid Mahmood Alusi in 'Ruh al Ma'ani Part 26 says, "Those who state that Yazid was not responsible and should not be cursed, or that he committed no sin are in fact Yazid's helpers."

Be he a Muslim or a non-Muslim the whole world with the exception of the Nasibis and the Khawarij have only one impression about Yazid ibn Mu'awiyah and that is that he was corrupt and a pervert whereas Imam Husain(a.s.) the beloved grandson of the Holy Prophet(saw) was an epitome of love, truth and justice and above all the Saviour of Islam.

Now that we have established that it was Yazid who was responsible for the killing of Imam Husayn from the established Sunni sources, you cannot dismiss the event as a "difference of opinion" and that it was just history. This was no ordinary personality, Dr. Zakir. He was the .(beloved grandson of the Prophet(saw

WHY DID IMAM HUSAIN(A.S.) RISE UP AND FIGHT AGAINST YAZID ? (6

There are some people who say that breaking the bay'aa of Yazid was not correct. That as a Khalifa he should not have been opposed or challenged.

" Khilfah(leadership) is not established merely with the appointment of the Khalifa, rather(after his demise) it requires the approval of the Muslim Ummah" (al-Ahkam al-Sultaniyya, page 9). Therefore the leadership of Yazid was also subject to the same criterion as others. In Tarikh al-Tabari, 4/262 and al-Bidaya wa al-Nihaya, 87/151 it is stated that so many letters were sent from the people of Iraq not accepting Yazid as their leader.

The letters clearly stated that they had not given their allegiance to him. Even Abdulrehman Abi Bakr, the son of Abu Bakr and Abdullah ibn Zubayr refused to give allegiance to Yazid. Imam Husain(a.s.) set out to uphold and apply 'amra bil ma'aruf and nahyi 'anil munkar'. Allah(swt) says in Surah Ali Imran Surah 3 Verse 104, "And let there be (arising) from you a nation inviting to (all that is) good, enjoining what is right and forbidding what is wrong, and those will be the successful." According to the translation by Abdullah Yusuf Ali, it says, "Let

there arise out of you a band(group) of people inviting all that is good, Enjoining what is right and forbidding what is wrong”.

The rising of Imam Husain against Yazid was therefore justifiable. Imam Tirmizi notes that the Prophet(saw) said, “You should never let the fear of others prevent you from speaking the truth,” and the Prophet also said, “ Speaking the truth in front of a wicked king or a tyrant is the greatest Jihad.” Hence, Imam Husain faithfully acted upon the words of the Prophet(saw). Imam Nawawi writes in the commentary of Sahih Muslim that a group of scholars have said it is permissible to fight against a wicked, evil king because Imam Husain, Abdullah bin Zubair, and the pious people of Madina and Makkah fought against Yazid, and the Taba’een fought against Hajjaj bin Yusuf.

(Sharh Sahih Muslim chapter al-Amarah by Imam Nawawi. Hafiz Asqalani has also noted Imam Nawawi’s words in his book, Fath al Bari, Chapter on Fitan).

Imam Hafidh Jalaluddin Suyuti on the authority of Sahaba Uns bin Harith records, “ I heard Rasulullah(saw) say “ Verily my son(Husain) will be killed in a land called Kerbala, whoever amongst you is alive at that time must go and help him.” (Sunni Sources : Khasais al Kubra Vol.2 p.125 ; Tarikh Ibn Asakir Vol. 4 p. 341 Dhikr Husain; Kanzul Ummal Vol. 6 p. 223)

It was not a political war as you have claimed. On his departure from Mecca, Imam Husain wrote a will and handed it over to his brother Muhammad Hanafiyyah. The will read, “I have not risen against Yazid in order to create corruption or discord, nor to elevate myself in the eyes of the people, nor to oppress.” Innama kharajtu litalabil islahi fi ummati jaddi wa abi” I have only risen to rectify, to reform the affairs of the Ummah of my grandfather and of my father. “Uridu ‘an aamura bil ma’ruf wa anha ‘anil munkar.” I want to invite people towards good and forbid them from evil.”

Imam Husain rose against Yazid because he refused to pay allegiance to him. When asked to give bay’aa to Yazid, Imam Husain said, “ We are the household of the prophethood, the source of messengership, the descending place of the angels, through us Allah had begun showering His favours, whereas Yazid is a sinful person, a drunkard, the killer of innocent people and one who openly indulges in sinful acts. ‘Mithli la yubayi’u mithlah’. A person like me can never do bay’aa(pay allegiance) to a person like him(Yazid). I look upon death as but felicity of martyrdom and I regard life among oppressors and transgressors as nothing but agony and torture. By God I will never give you my hand like a man who has been defeated; nor will I flee .like a slave.” This cannot therefore be political war

Your own national hero, Mahatma Gandhi in 1924 writing in 'Young India' about the battle of Karbala said among other things " I wanted to know the best of the life of one who holds today an undisputed sway over the hearts of millions of mankind....the utter self-effacement of

Husain, his fearlessness, his absolute trust in God and in his own mission to save Islam."

So many people have paid glowing tribute to Imam Husain (a.s.) like Khwaja Muinuddin Chishti, Allama Iqbal, late Maulana Zafar Ali Khan, Banarasi Lal Varma, Mathur, 'Adib', Sardar Kunwar Singh Bedi and so many others.

Imam Husain is that purest soul that the Prophet(saw) used to interrupt his speeches to pick him up. He delayed his prostration to honour him. It was the honourable face of Imam Husain that the honourable Prophet's lips, face and body touched and loved. It is that very same honourable face that Yazid bin Muawiyah humiliated, slaughtered, put on the spears and kicked. No words can describe the pain profoundly felt in every human's mind, soul and heart.

The whole battle of Karbala was for Haqq against Batil, Freedom against Injustices. Every noble soul today grieves and is touched by the martyrdom of Imam Husain, the Master of the Youth of Paradise. Imam Husain is alive today more alive than ever, and living deep in our hearts, in our souls, and in our minds.

His martyrdom still has the power to ignite the light of truth in the heart of all free people and to send a message to the downtrodden not to bow down to evil and not to surrender to tyranny. Persistent attempts to distance Imam Husain and his Sirah are afoot and more intense and serious than ever. The supporters of Yazid can no longer fool the Muslim Ummah. While we must pray for their guidance, we must not for a moment fall victim to their misguidance

WHO WAS YAZID ? (from Sunni sources)

Ibn Jauzi, Abu Ya'la and Salih Bin Ahmad, arguing from the verses of the Holy Qur'an write that " it is proven that cursing Yazid is permissible. It is the duty of all Muslims that they should know the rights that Imam Husain has over them, and how, with the strength of his suffering, oppression and tyranny, he watered the tree of Islam with his own blood and the blood of his family. Otherwise, that blessed tree might have died because of the tyranny of the Bani Umayya. It was Husain who gave Islam a new life."

In a collection of Yazid's own poetic couplets, Abul Faraj bin Jauzi has recorded the following in his Radd Ala'l Muta'sibul Anid. Yazid said, " If drinking wine is prohibited in the religion of Muhammad, let it be so; I will accept Christianity. It is this world alone for us. There is no other world. We should not be deprived of the pleasures of this world. One who frightens us with doomsday, let him do so. These are false things which deprive us of all the pleasures of sound

and music.”

In Siyar A'lam al-Nubala(4:37-38) Al-Dhahabi said of Yazid ibn Mu'awiya “Yazid drank and was a reprobate(depraved). He inaugurated his Dawla(kingdom) with the killing of the Shahid al-Husain and closed it with the catastrophe of al-Harra(the incident of al-Harra was when Madina was ransacked by Yazid for 3 days). He burnt the Ka'bah and killed the Shuhada of Badr.

Hafiz Ibn Kathir notes from Al-Bukhari that Ibn al-Harith had heard a hadith from the Prophet(saw) and while acting upon this hadith, he went to Karbala with Imam Husain: The Hadith reads, “My son will be martyred in Karbala, and whoever is present there at that time should help my son.” For this reason, Anas bin Harith helped Imam Husain and was martyred with him.

(Tareekh Ibn Kathir chapter on Karbala by Hafiz ibn Kathir (Tareekh al Kabeer biography of Anas Ibn al-Harith by Imam Bukhari).

Imam Taftazani has written in his Sharh al Aqa'id al Nasafi that Yazid was a kafir, all his supporters, helpers, those who agree with him are all kafirs !

Shaykh Amjad Ali al Azami has written in 'Bahar e Shari'at that Yazid was “paleed”, and mal'un(accursed) and those who would exonerate him and support him(naudhubillah) as “jahannam kay kuttay”(dogs of hell).

The sunni scholar Ibn Hajr's comments on Yazeed in Sawaiqh al Muhriqa writes “ One group have deemed Yazid to be a kafir, another has stated that he was a Muslim but a fasiq(transgressor), a fajir(one that commits debauchery) and a drunkard. There is consensus over his fisq (transgression). One part of Ulama have stated that you can curse him by name.

This includes individuals like Ibn Jauzi.

In Tareekh Kamil Ibn Khaldun, a 14th century Sunni scholar writes, “ By Allah, Yazeed drinks alcohol and abandons Salat.

Ibn Kathir, a 14th century Sunni Shafi'i Islamic scholar writes among other things, “Traditions inform us that Yazeed loved worldly vices, would drink, played drums, kept dogs and not a day would go by when he was not in a drunken state. He ransacked Madina for three days. Yazid committed a major sin.

Sahaba and their children were slaughtered openly. Other heinous acts were also perpetrated. Whoever frightens Madina incurs the wrath of Allah, His Angels and all the people – and some Ulama have deemed it permissible to curse Yazeed. This includes individuals such as Ahmad ibn Hanbal, Allamah Hilalee, Abu Bakir Abdul Aziz, Qadhi Abu Ya'la and his son Qadhi Abu Husayn. Ibn Jauzi wrote a book deeming it permissible to curse Yazeed.(al Bidayah wa al-

Muhammad Zakariya al-Kandahlawi, a 20th century Hanbali Deobandi Islamic scholar wrote, "The army that Yazeed had sent to Madina comprised of 60,000 horsemen and 15,000 foot soldiers. For three days he shed blood freely, 1000 women were raped and 700 from the Quraysh and Ansar were killed. Ten thousand women and children were made slaves. Muslim bin Uqba forced people to give bay'aa to Yazeed in such a manner that people were enslaved and Yazeed could sell them as he pleased. No Sahaba who were with the Prophet(saw) at Hudaibiya were spared." All the Sahaba at Badr were killed in this battle.

The Messenger of Allah(saw) said: If one while praying between Rukn and Maqam (near Ka'bah) and fasting, dies but with the hate of the family of Muhammad(saw) he will enter the Fire. And he who abuses my Ahlul Bayt is verily an apostate and is driven out of Islam. And he who inflicts pain on my progeny upon him is the curse of Allah. And he who hurts me by hurting my progeny has verily hurt/angered Allah. Certainly Allah has made Paradise forbidden to he who does injustice to my Ahlul Bayt, or kills them, or assists against them or abuses them. (Sunni reference : al-Sawi'iq al-Muhriqah by Ibn Hajar al-Hathami, Ch. 11, p. 357 who said this tradition is authentic)

A murderer of the grandson of Rasululllah(saw) deserves outright condemnation and only an enemy of Ahlul Bayt would think of defending a Shaitan like him.

.Wa aakhiru da'wana anil hamdu lillahi rabbil aalameen