



A VICTIM  
LOST  
IN  
SAQIFAH

VOL 3 OF 4

xkps

Ali Labbaf

**Part 1**  
**Motive of this Research**

Analysis of the method and type of His Eminence, Amirul Momineen Ali's (a.s.) government was one of the subjects for a thorough research in recent years, that is two years (Solar) were named after Imam Ali (a.s.). This resulted in an abundant output in this field, either in books or in shape of articles written on this matter.

Our main aim of writing this is to gauge the originality of these endeavors by means of criticism and analysis into claims such as:

“His Eminence, Ali (a.s.) was not a governor or an administrator in an ordinary sense. He was not a Caliph as those of Umayyad and Abbasid dynasties. But he was a Caliph at parity with Abu Bakr and Umar!

The pivot around which policies of our Lord and Master Ali rotated was the spirit that protected Caliphate of the prophets and the way of the Righteous Caliphs.”!**[1]**

“And this statement is not correct that Caliphate of the preceding Caliphs and the four members, altogether, differed from one another in thought, policy and aims. Each of these four Caliphs was a mirror reflecting one image. They together reflected and represented Caliphate of the Prophet. One spirit ran between the four. These four collectively completed one image, one system and one aim.”!**[2]**

“Salient here is conduct and true faith of Caliphs in Islam and divine teachings. Humility of Caliphs, their unanimity in word and deed, their moderation and honesty is worth appreciating. Scrutiny into their life shows that they collectively had one and same moral and manner.”!**[3]**

“When Islam was subject of conversation and Islamic teachings and law, Ali did not discriminate between the learned and ignorant. In the same way was Umar.”!**[4]**

---

**[1]** Abdul Qadir Dahqaan Siraawaani: Article quoted in *Nida-e-Islam Magazine*, Issue No. 17, (9000 copies), Spring 83, Pg. 14

**[2]** Ibid. Article quoted in *Nida-e-Islam Magazine*, Issue No. 2, (copies not mentioned), Summer 79, Pg. 30; *Bani Khatam wa Deen-e-Kamil* (1<sup>st</sup> Edition 1379), Pgs. 102-103

**[3]** Fawad Farooqi: *Beest-o-panj Saal Sukoot-e-Ali* (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition 1379), Pgs. 49-50

[4] *Ibid. Beest-o-panj Saal Sukoot-e-Ali (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition 1379), Pg. 101*

“Ali was like Umar in piety of a poor life.”! [1]

“Ali was strict and hard like Umar. He acted as per laws of religion.” [2]

In order to answer these claims and conjectures we have tried to scrutinize the praises rendered to Caliphs and their rule. We have tried to display contrasts and contradictions in narrations based on documents of Sunni sources. This will assist the reader to conclude for himself in the light of proofs and reach a judgment about the claims made in this regard.

### **Reminder**

Perhaps after reading the above statements our reader might ask why in this analysis of thirteen years of the rule of two Caliphs nothing is mentioned about usurpation of Ali’s Caliphate which is followed by denial of his Imamate and *Wilayat*, attack on Zahra’s house which resulted in the martyrdom of Zahra (s.a.) and Mohsin Ibne Ali (a.s.), usurpation of Fadak, denial of Khums and inheritance etc. and all the other crimes committed with regard to Ahle Bayt (a.s.)?

Because these events themselves are self-explanatory about the behaviors and moral of Caliphs and their tyrant rule.

In the same way some of you might think that if the analysis done so far had been compared with the method of administration of Imam Ali (a.s.) the result would have been more beneficial and satisfactory.

In reply, we should say that the thing which impeded us to write these points is that extensive influence of the outlook of open-minded people who urge us to avoid criticizing this period of thirteen years. They insist to not compare this period with Ali’s government. Else, the reader would see the simplicity and matchlessness of Ali’s government in those days. The reader would see the status of freedom and liberty. Thus they say:

“Had there not been shed the pure blood of these men of liberty, equality and justice; and had there not been the self gleaming path of God and its devotees, today we would have thought Islam and the spirit of Quran and Prophet’s traditions to be in the royal court of Uthman, sycophant courtiers,

deceptive people, the Green palace of Muawiyah and his murder agents, the ignorant days' arrogance and Arab bigotry. Not in the astonishing life of Ali and not in the simplicity, equality and freedom of the government of Abu Bakr and Umar."!**[3]**

---

**[1]** *Ibid. Beest-o-panj Saal Sukoot-e-Ali (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition 1379), Pg. 139*

**[2]** *Ibid. Beest-o-panj Saal Sukoot-e-Ali (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition 1379), Pg. 244*

**[3]** *Dr. Ali Shariati: Husain Warith-e-Adam (Collected Writings 19), 1<sup>st</sup> Edition Pg. 356*

In continuation of this same text written as preface to the book of *Hujr bin Adi*, we read in the footnote:

"Here the criticism of Shia narrated from Ali's tongue that personifies the spirit of Islam, is accurate and detailed. But no historian having a least information about world politics will ever judge the government of these two renowned companions of Prophet at the scale of Choesroe's and Caesar's governments. He cannot resist admiring these governments. The only misfortune of these two, Abu Bakr and Umar, was that their rival was Ali an extraordinary man. Historians judge them at the level of Ali and hence condemn them.

If there were no Ali the rule of Abu Bakr and Umar would have been recognized as the best government in the world and a model."!**[1]**

Regarding the analysis of the question why Iran displayed its weakness when the soldiers entered, we read:

"It is quite obvious as to why: Umar was then the Caliph and advisors and commanders were close companions of Prophet. (continuation of the footnote). Indeed, in comparison to Ali they did have shortcomings and weakness. However comparing to Sassanides and Rome they were paragons of freedom and justice in the eyes of non-Muslims."!**[2]**

Therefore it seems necessary to scrutinize the system current in those days in order to provide information to our Shia youths. It is a dire necessity of the day that they, our youths, should become strong and powerful with knowledge to be able to answer such conjectures or not fall a prey to these conjectures. They should be acquainted with relative historical documents to make their answers weighty with reason and

evidence. We will try to prove here to our youths that Caliphs within themselves were not bound to any teaching of Islam. They wanted Islam only to the extent of their interests to have a ground to put their foot. They needed Islam as much as they needed power because Islam gave them a ground to establish their power. Therefore when necessary to their own interests they did not hesitate to crush under their feet principles and fundamentals of freedom and justice. On most occasions, they too acted as Romans and Sassanides. The only difference was that their rule was in a guise and name of Islam. From one side the name of Islam covered their real horrible

---

**[1]** *Ibid. Husain Warith-e-Adam (Collected Writings 19), Pg. 356*

**[2]** *Dr. Ali Shariati: Tarikh O Shanakht-e-Adyan (Collected Writings 15), Vol. 2, (8<sup>th</sup> Edition 1381), Pg. 18*

designs and from the other side dishonest historians did not record the truth. Therefore it vanished from the history also. The record of thirteen years' tyrant rule was wiped out from the annals. Therefore we face a great many difficulties on way of research; we face many shortages and lack of documents. For instance:

"Ahmad bin Hanbal in his book Al Ilal (The Causes) says: Abu Awana**[1]** in his book had recorded the defects of the companions of Prophet of God. Salam bin Abi Mutee came to him and said: Give this book to me. Abu Awana gave to him the book. Salam took and burnt it.**[2]**

Ahmad bin Hanbal in the same book has narrated from Abdur Rahman bin Mahdi that: I seek forgiveness of Allah for having seen the book of Abu Awana.**[3]**

He seeks God's forgiveness for having seen the book. And another one takes the book and burns it without the owner's permission.

In the biography of Abdul Rahman bin Kharash is written that he had recorded the defects of Abu Bakr and Umar in two volumes.

In the biography of Husain bin Hasan Ashqar it is mentioned: Ahmad bin Hanbal has narrated traditions from him and said that no one has called him a liar.

Someone told Ahmad bin Hanbal that Husain bin Hasan Ashqar narrated traditions against Abu Bakr and Umar and that he had a separate chapter in his book in this regard.

Ahmad bin Hanbal said that he (Ashqar) was no more competent and trustworthy to be quoted traditions from. **[4]**

Where are those two parts or chapters about defects of Abu Bakr and Umar?

Why nothing from its contents is narrated and reached us?

As soon as Ahmad bin Hanbal understood that Husain bin Hasan Ashqar has narrated traditions against Abu Bakr and Umar he changes his opinion. Ashqar, all of a sudden becomes a liar, unreliable and untrustworthy. He is not worth relating from. Why? But why!

---

**[1]** *Abu Awana was a prominent Hafiz and scholar of Ahle Sunnat*

**[2]** *Quoted from: Al-Ilal war-Rijaal, Vol. 1, Pg. 60*

**[3]** *Quoted from: Al-Ilal war-Rijaal, Vol. 3, Pg. 92 (New Edition)*

**[4]** *Quoted from: Tahdhib at-Tahdhib, Vol. 2, Pg. 291*

In the biography of many great tradition scholars except the authors of Sihah Sitta it is mentioned:

They used to abuse Abu Bakr and Umar. For instance, see the biographies of Ismail bin Abdur Rahman, **[1]** Taleed bin Sulaiman, **[2]** and Ja'far Ibn Sulaiman al-Zabyee **[3]** and others. **[4]**

In the middle of third century curse and abuse of Abu Bakr and Umar was a common practice. Zaid bin Qadama who lived in that period (3<sup>rd</sup> Century) writes:

What a time has come! People abuse Abu Bakr and Umar. **[5]** This matter spread till in the Sixth Century prominent hadith scholar of Ahle Sunnat Abdul Mughees bin Zuhair bin Harb Hanbali Baghdadi wrote a book in praise of Yazid bin Muawiyah. He defended Yazid and prohibited cursing him (Yazid). The author of the book was asked why he had written it. He replied: To prevent the people from cursing the Caliphs. **[6]**

At the end of the eighth century we come across Taftazani. In Sharh al-Maqasid (Explanation of Purposes) he says:

If it is asked why some religious scholars consider Yazid eligible for curse but still consider it impermissible to curse him? In reply we say: It is so because that they may prevent cursing

of persons beyond Yazid (Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthman and Muawiyah etc.)[7]...”[8]

“In view of what we said, after necessary search in sources we first conclude that there are many scholars and writers of Sunni school who have written about the impolite and indecent behavior and conduct of companions of Prophet either during his lifetime or after his death. But these narrations are missing mostly due to various reasons. Or these narrations are distorted.

---

[1] Quoted from: *Tahdhib at-Tahdhib*, Vol. 1, Pg. 274

[2] Quoted from: *Tahdhib al-Kamal*, Vol. 4, Pg. 322

[3] Quoted from: *Tahdhib at-Tahdhib*, Vol. 2, Pgs. 82-83

[4] *Ustad Sayyid Ali Husaini Milani: Guftaarhai-e-Peeramoon Mazloomiyat-e-Bartareen Banu (Translation: Masood Shikohi), Pgs. 38-40*

[5] Quoted from: *Tahdhib at-Tahdhib*, Vol. 3, Pg. 264

*[From his statement it seems that talking about the defects of Caliphs was a common practice in those days]*

[6] Quoted from: *Seer Alaamun Nubla*, Vol. 21, Pg. 161

[7] Quoted from: *Sharh Maqasid*, Vol. 5, Pg. 311

[8] *Ibid. Pgs. 41-42*

Ibn Adi, died 365 Hijra, writes about Ibn Kharash:

He wrote two volumes containing defects and shameful actions of Abu Bakr and Umar.

Then Ibn Adi regards it most reliable.[1]

In the biography of Abdul Razzaq bin Hamaam he writes after praising him very much:

He has many things by way of defects of some companions and Caliphs which I shall not mention in my book. He has mentioned excellences of the Prophet’s Household and shameful behavior of companions and Caliphs, which is hard to accept.

Ibn Adi considers this also reliable.[2]

Zahabi (d. 798 A.H.) in the biographies of Abu Sult Haravi[3] and Rawajini[4] and similarly Ibn Hajar (d. 852 A.H.) in the biography of Ja’far bin Sulaiman[5] have mentioned the defects of Caliphs. According to them it is a weakness to mention the defects of companions and Caliphs.

In his Sahih, Muslim has mentioned:

Abdullah bin Mubarak used to say in public: Do not narrate anything from the tongue of Umar bin Thabit because he speaks ill of companions.**[6]**

In this regard we can refer to biographies of Ahmad bin Muhammad Ibn Saeed bin Uqda,**[7]** Ismail bin Abdur Rahman,**[8]** Taleed bin Sulaiman,**[9]** Qadasi,**[10]** Amr bin Shimr,**[11]** Muhammad bin Abdullah Shaibani,**[12]** Ziyad

---

**[1]** Quoted from: *Al-Kamil fee Zo'fa ar-Rijaal*, Vol. 5, Pg. 519

**[2]** Quoted from same source, Vol. 6, Pg. 545

**[3]** Quoted from: *Seer Alaamun Nubla*, Vol. 11, Pgs. 447-448

**[4]** Quoted from same source, Vol. 11, Pgs. 537-538

**[5]** Quoted from: *Tahdhib at-Tahdhib*, Vol. 2, Pg. 83

**[6]** Quoted from: *Sahih Muslim*, Vol. 1, Pg. 12

**[7]** Quoted from: *Al-Kashful Hadith*, Pg. 70

**[8]** Quoted from: *Tahdhib at-Tahdhib*, Vol. 1, Pgs. 273-274

**[9]** Quoted from same source, Vol. 1, Pg. 447

**[10]** Quoted from: *Seer Alaamun Nubla*, Vol. 18, Pg. 12

**[11]** Quoted from: *Lisanul Mizan*, Vol. 4, Pg. 366

**[12]** Quoted from same source, Vol. 5, Pg. 231

bin Mundhir**[1]** and others.**[2]**

Why did they curse Abu Bakr and Umar?

Did a narration or narrations reach them that encouraged them to curse them and themselves gave permission to curse the First and Second Caliph? Now where have those narrations and matters gone?"**[3]**

"The information certainly was within books. So what happened to those books?

Did they meet some other fate? Ahmad bin Hanbal says that the books were burnt. Whether all that information is locked in boxes of bigotry and obduracy? Or it is concealed in obstinacy and stubbornness? It is another tyranny that made such rare information inaccessible.

Zahabi writes:

Though writings and books are full of texts that convey disputes, brawls and skirmishes among companions, however at the same time some stories are short of documents and proofs. We must hide them. We must destroy them. This will pave way to make the people to love companions. People must be made pleased with them.

Concealing such matters is compulsory on all generally and on the scholars especially...[4]”[5]

This reflects to our readers how difficult has become the job of scrutiny or research into history of the thirteen years since passing away of Prophet. Therefore it must be said:

Discussions in this book have limited scope and from the whole it is very little. This clearly shows that Islam served their own interest and was a tool to them to do what they wanted. They had no belief in its teachings. The enthusiastic reader will shift from plain thinking towards Caliphs’ government under the title of Islam to the depths of thought. If one performs a postmortem of those

---

**[1]** Quoted from: *Al-Majrooheen (By Ibne Hibban), Vol. 1, Pg. 302; Refer: Tahdhib al-Kamal, Vol. 10, Pg. 136 & Vol. 21, Pg. 594*

**[2]** Shaykh Abdur Zahra Mahdi: *Bibliography of Al-Hujoom Alaa Bait-e-Fatima, Pgs. 186-188*

**[3]** Ustad Sayyid Ali Husaini Milani: *Guftaarhai-e-Peeramoon Mazloomiyat-e-Bartareen Banu (Translation: Masood Shikohi), Pg. 40*

**[4]** Quoted from: *Seer Alaamun Nubla, Vol. 10, Pgs. 92-93*

**[5]** Shaykh Abdur Zahra Mahdi: *Bibliography of Al-Hujoom Alaa Bait-e-Fatima, Pg. 190*

days one will see the cause of illness of Islam and the reason for its decline. Then he will be able to reach a correct and accurate judgment.

## **Analysis of Honorable Ustad Sayyid Muhammad Dhiyabaadi about the reign of Caliphs[1]**

“It might not be out of place here to remind them by way of admonishment. We mean the simple-minded people.

Sometimes we hear and read appreciations of deeds of the first category hypocrites of early days of Islam. They made wars and expanded territories of Islam. They extended far and wide the rule of Quran and laws of Islam. They lived a simple life. They were humble and were not worldly men. They hated the world and its enchantments. Such a show demonstrated by those hypocrites, indeed, has gone a long way to deceive many simple-minded people. They believe that it was a service to Islam and Muslims. It was propaganda in name of Islam disseminated by them. Therefore they consider those hypocrites worthy of praise. These simple-minded believe that a good deed should be praised and a bad one censured.

We have this to comment to tell them in reply to such thinking and such conclusions:

First you must know the wrong or sin in usurping something which does not belong to one. The office of Caliphate was already made known by the Prophet as to whom it belongs. But this was snatched away in a plot designed since long and in secrecy. The infallible Imam was set aside. In other words, he was discarded. Caliphate, which belonged to Ali by Divine command, was against God’s orders taken from Ali. This action ended in undesired consequences which contrast to God’s obvious orders and His Prophet’s instructions and teachings. By so doing, they changed the straight path of Islam shown by God and the Prophet. They indulged the society into misfortune and perversion. Everything went wrong. The direction, which was towards heaven, was changed to hell.

If you could understand this crime and reach into its depths then only you can guess or at least imagine the dimensions resulted therefrom. You can hear its agonies from the tongue of history of Islam. You will then be able to see the real ugly faces of these betrayers hidden in the guise of Islam. They concealed their face of paganhooD behind a veil of false Islam. There is no

havoc that they did not bring to the Muslims. There no calamity they did not bring for Islam.

---

**[1]** *This text is included with permission from the author.*

They led the Ummah to a horrible valley of darkness. You will understand that their good deeds too were not good. In those good actions were hidden several crimes. Their good actions were their additional crimes, harmful and hurtful to mankind.

Suppose: A cheater comes to you. By a trick, he occupies your house and expels you from there. Then he behaves as if he is the real master of everything. He expands the house and builds it in the way he wants. He decorates and paints it after his own taste. This rogue got hold of your house by force and fraud, by trick and tyranny. So his later actions such as building and rebuilding and decorating the house would be regarded by you as service to you? Would you be indebted to him? Would you owe any gratitude to him? Of course not! It is usurpation. It is immoral. It is a transgression. It is regarded a sin, a crime, a tyranny.

In the same way we know that they forcibly occupied the seat and place of the Prophet and laid hands on the Prophet's pulpit and niche. Their outward show was their good actions that they fought against pagans and the tribes of Arabs and Ajam (non-Arab).

They also waged wars and occupied countries where they hoisted the Islamic flag. They posed themselves as protectors of justice and guards of Islamic territories. They showed themselves as executors of Divine laws. In this respect, they even scourged their own son for his wrong or sin. But any of their deeds, however admirable, was not to the pleasure of God. From the root it was wrong. It originated from illegitimacy. They first robbed and from usurpation, they spent on good things. Therefore they did not deserve reward. They stand answerable for their very first step - that is their occupation of the Prophet's seat which should have been occupied by his rightful successor, Ali. Their every good deed shall be counted as a sin for them.

One who, without having the capability and divine permission claimed to be Prophet's successor, which is a divine office (caller towards Allah), in the view of Quran he is the greatest liar and most unjust being and will be liable to the most

terrible punishments and most serious chastisements; even though from the position of the usurped pulpit and prayer niche in a show of piety delivers lectures of guidance calling people to god-worship, truth, honesty, trustworthiness and fear of God. And he makes war on the infidels and defeats them widening the territories of Islam and bringing countries under the banner of Quran!

Possibly the simple-minded people on the basis of this outward show could have accepted them as contributors to Islam and Quran. But their real features with real identities are seen by those who have insight and look deeply into issues. The lack of leadership of an infallible Imam was the cause of these fatal results that the tyrant Caliphs prepared ground for peoples' negative thinking. They made people to doubt about the divine religion. They posed Islam as a tool to expand territories and to gain worldly purposes. Islam was looked upon not as a religion but a reason to rule and govern." **[1]**

---

**[1]** *Extract from Dar Justujoo-e-Ilm-e-Deen (In search of religious knowledge), Pgs. 165-182*

**Part 2**  
**Introduction Claim of Righteous**  
**Caliphate is Untrue**

Before we scrutinize praises about government and personalities of Caliphs, let us see what Righteous Caliphate is, which is claimed by today's defenders of Caliphs and their government.

What we grasp from the writing of this group is this:

“Righteous Caliphate represents fully and completely the Prophet's way of thinking, his thought, his attitude and his behavior.”!**[1]**

“In the period of Righteous Caliphate, Caliphs totally represented the Prophet's thought and attitude. And even displayed his way of life.”!**[2]**

We ignore the evidence and historical documents as to what extent and what length they go to establish this claim. We even ignore whether the documents belie the claim totally. What we want in this preface is to awaken the readers from their somnolence towards such expressions and distorted belief of Sunni sect about the position of prophethood and personality of the Seal of prophets.**[3]** We only want to have a short reference to the verbal outlook of Sunni scholars regarding the position of Caliph. We would like to scrutinize their display of Caliphs' personality and criticize what is demonstrated in relation to the reader's mentality about the Prophet's pristine personality. It is this image that naturally strikes the reader's mind and it is our object to mend or erase it totally therefrom.

In anticipation of a correct outlook from our reader on these conjectures, we discuss prophethood. In the meantime, we shall dwell on the outlook of prominent scholars of Sunni sect in the field of Caliphate. Our discussion will prove that this Sunni school acknowledges that scandalous and most detested qualities did exist in the person of Caliph. But the said school does not consider such undesired qualities an impediment for one to become a Caliph. Such mentality incites them to lower the station of the Prophet. It is easy for them to bring down the position of the Prophet from its actual standard. Therefore this

---

**[1]** Abdul Qadir Dahqaan Siraawaani: Article quoted in *Nida-e-Islam Magazine, Issue No. 2, Summer 79, Pg. 30*

**[2]** *Ibid.* Article quoted in *Nida-e-Islam Magazine, Issue No. 2, Summer 79, Pgs. 30-31*

**[3]** For Example: Refer: Allamah Sayyid Murtuza

*Askari: Naqsh-e-Aaimma Dar Ahya-e-Deen (Role of Imams in the Revival of Religion, Vol. 4 of collection of Naqsh translated and published separately), Role of the Imams in Revival of Religion, Vol. 1-7*

group of writers cannot claim that Caliphate of Abu Bakr and Umar mirror every detail of the Prophet[1] – that too prophethood based on a sound reason and pristine human nature. However in the mind of the reader such essays do impart its effect and influence. This can only be eschewed if the writer makes known his perverted beliefs in prophethood beforehand. They draw similarity between prophethood (of their own creation) and Caliphate: Caliphate, which is:

**A)** Qadi Abu Bakr Muhammad bin Tayyab Baqilani (d. 403 Lunar) writes in his book *Al-Tamheed* that this school allows its followers to believe him in place of the Prophet as his Caliph in spite of his sins, low moral and corrupted personality. He adds:

“A Caliph cannot be deposed because of his atrocities, confiscation of people’s properties, lashing innocent people and not respecting and protecting rights of people.”[2]

**B)** Saad al-Din, Masood bin Umar Taftazani (d. 792 Lunar) writes in his book *Sharh al-Aqaid al-Nasafiya*:

“A Caliph cannot be deposed or dismissed from his position because of his sins, corruption and tyranny.”[3]

He writes in this book *Sharh al-Maqasid*:

“When a Caliph dies and a person having qualifications of Imamate – without getting allegiance or having been appointed by the previous Caliphs – forcibly takes the seat of Caliphate, the position of vicegerency of the Prophet will be established for him and in the same way – according to the view nearest to correctness – even if he is corrupt and ignorant... and the Caliph cannot be deposed on the ground of corruption and sins.”[4]

**C)** In addition to these two quotations, we add one more here from the book *Al-Vikhaye Fi Fiqh al-Hanafia*. [5] This shows the identity of the Caliph in the Sunni school:

---

**[1]** Title of article in Issue No. 2 from Nida-e-Islam Magazine

**[2]** *Ustad Ja'far Subhani: Peshwayi az Nazar-e-Islam (Leadership in the view of Islam), Pg. 21*

**[3]** *Ibid. Pg. 24*

**[4]** *Ibid. Pg. 21*

**[5]** [Apparently the title of the original book is *Waqayatur Rawaya fee Masail al-Hidayah*, by Mahmood bin Ubaidullah Mahboobi (died around 673 Lunar Year) about the Hanafite Fiqh. (Refer: *Kashfuz Zunoon*, Vol. 6, Pg. 406; *Hadiyatul Aarifeen*, Vol. 2, Pg. 406; *Mojam al-Moallifeen*, Vol. 12, 178)]

“If the Caliph drinks wine the punishment prescribed by Shari-ah cannot be carried out on him because he is a representative of God.” **[1]**

Such statements in books of the School of Caliphate clearly show that from the viewpoint of this school there is no objection if the Caliph happens to be profane, perfidious, a sinner or an alcoholic also. This shows that their Caliphs were men of such qualities. They gave allowance from these bad qualities and exempted them from conditions that qualify one for the office of Caliphate. Our reader can conceive what type of men they were who for thirteen years occupied the divine office of Caliphate.

According to the belief of this sect, a Caliph can be a tyrant. He can oppress the people and commit any sin he desires. He can snatch from the people's belongings what attracts him; and can still remain Caliph of the Prophet of God. At the same time they claim that Righteous Caliphate is a true representation of the Prophet in all respects.

On the basis of this identification of the personality of the Caliph we conclude that neither the Caliph nor Caliphate carries remotest resemblance to the person of Prophet and prophethood. The real face of the Prophet is attractive, endearing, worthy of respect and regard while the office of prophethood is divine and awe-inspiring. However Caliphate is not in line with prophethood because it is short of divine attributes and deprived of those high and glorious qualities of the Prophet. This is the reason that we witness no moral at all with the Caliph. Further, we see his enthusiasm to destroy that beautiful image of Prophet to have occupied his place. It is a false claim that his Caliphate is Rashida; that it is a true reflection of the

Prophet's character. It is a trap and a guise they are dressed in. It is a device to fool people. The claim provides them an excuse to prolong their rule and strengthen yoke on the necks of masses. They claim that their Righteous Caliphate reflects the face of the Prophet while they usurped his face as soon as he died. **[2]**

Now with this knowledge of intellectual bases of Ahle Sunnat regarding the issue of Caliphate how can we trust the point of view of "Second revival of the system of Caliphate" which is expressed by the unity-

---

**[1]** *Ibid. Pg. 23*

**[2]** *For more details refer to Al-Imamah fee Ahaammal Kutub al-Kalaamiya wa Aqeedatush Shiatul Imamiyah by Sayyid Ali Husaini Milani.*

This book is a criticism of discussions on Imamate and Caliphate in three books of Ahle Sunnah: *Sharh Mawaqif, Sharh Maqasid* and *Sharh Aqaid Nasafiya*.

mongers who think that this is the only possible solution for the present situation to bring Islamic unity? This is itself a question!!!

Can it be accepted that:

"...The system of Caliphate of Sunni sect can bring unity among Muslims and in all Islamic countries..." **[1]**

To acquaint you further with the outlook of the enthusiasts of this movement in the Islamic world we quote here the epitome of their thought:

"Modern historians, both western and Muslims, cannot refrain themselves from praising the Second Caliph of Prophet Muhammad. They consider his Caliphate as a consummate and complete Caliphate. The Sunni sect particularly is of such a belief. They (the Sunnis) think that Quranic principles were carried out by Umar. He laid the foundation of the leadership of society on the basis of religious politeness. He catered to the aspirations of Islam. They consider it a renovation of Caliphate on democratic basis." **[2]**

- Mirza Rizayee Kermani narrates from Sayyid Jamaluddin Asadabadi (1254-1314 Lunar) that he (Sayyid Jamaluddin) used to say:

“The difference of word Ali and Umar must be kept aside and then one must look at Caliphate.”**[3]**

- Shaikh Muhammad Abduh (1266-1323 Lunar), considered the greatest student of Sayyid Jamal, in totality repeats the views of his teacher, in a more refined way.

Even though political views of Abduh are not so liberal as his thoughts about reform of religion but he seems to be a believer in principle of Caliphate and its central position.**[4]**

“He bases his sociology and psychology on things that Muhammad bin Abdul Wahab had invited the people to.

---

**[1]** Sayyid Ahmad Mawassaqi: *Istiratazi-e-Wahdat (Strategy of Unity)*, Vol. 2, Pg. 106

**[2]** Wilfred Madelung: *Succession to Muhammad*, Pg. 109

**[3]** Nazim-ul-Islam Kermani: *Tarikh-e-Bedaari-e-Iraniaan (History of Iranian Awakening)*, Vol. 1, Pgs. 114-115; Dr. Sayyid Ja’far Shaheedi in his article titled, ‘Wahdat-e-Gumshudai Ke Bayad Yaft, Amma Che Gune Wa Az Kuja?’ printed in the book of *Kitab-e-Wahdat*; have accepted the authenticity of this historical quotation.

**[4]** Refer: Dr. Hamid Inayat: *Seeri Dar Andisha Siyasi Arab*

Shaykh Muhammad Abduh was supported in his view by Sayyid Muhammad Rasheed Riza, a close friend and a devoted pupil who published ‘Al Munar’ magazine and disseminated his thoughts in the world.”**[1]**

- Muhammad Rasheed Riza (1354-1382 Lunar) a close student of Abduh considered Caliphate as the best means to achieve Islamic unity. He was a defender of early Caliphate. That is the Caliphate of Abu Bakr and Umar and some Bani Umayyah persons like Umar bin Abdul Aziz.**[2]** To him these Caliphs were paragons.**[3]**

- Abdur Rahman Kaukabi (1271-1320 Lunar) another pupil of Sayyid Jamal was also a supporter of early Caliphate. It was a model to him. Islamic unity was possible through that Caliphate.**[4]**

- Hasan Banna (1368 Lunar), founder of Muslim Brotherhood too, like Rasheed Riza was an advocate of Islamic Caliphate. What Muslim Brotherhood wanted from the theory of Islamic government is the same idea of Rasheed Riza but in a stronger sense.**[5]**

---

**[1]** *Ali Asghar Faqih: Wahhabiyaan, Research and Study of the Beliefs of the Wahabis, Pgs. 407-408*

**[2]** *[When Umar bin Abdul Aziz used to study under his maternal uncle, Ubaidullah bin Umar bin Khattab in Medina, he himself used to talk ill of Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.)]*

Ibne Asakir in his *Tarikh Damishq* has written about the enmity of Umar bin Abdul Aziz to Ahle Bayt (a.s.) in the report of his entry into Medina:

Abdul Aziz was appointed by the Syrian regime as the governor of Egypt. He sent his son Umar, who was named after his maternal grandfather to Medina for studies. The narrator says that when he arrived in Medina and entered the Prophet's mosque, people remarked: The sinner has sent his son to obtain knowledge so that later he may act as the successor of Umar bin Khattab and act on his practice.

The narrator says: By Allah! We saw that he became a Caliph and acted on the practice of his grandfather.

(Husain Ghaib Gholami: *Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.) wa Zumar Hadith Fadak*, Pgs. 63-64; quoting from *Tarikh Madina Damishq*, Vol. 45, Pgs. 136-137; *Tahdhib al-Kamal*, Vol. 14, Pg. 118; *Seer Alaamun Nubla*, Vol. 5, Pg. 116)

From this aspect it can be said that ban on the practice of abusing His Eminence Ali (a.s.) from the pulpits in force since the time of Muawiyah by Umar Ibne Abdul Aziz was a diplomatic move to strengthen the weakening Umayyad empire.]

**[3]** Refer: Dr. Hamid Inayat: *Seeri Dar Andisha Siyasi Arab*

**[4]** Refer: Muhammad Jawad Sahibi: *Tabiyat Istibdaad*

**[5]** Refer: Dr. Hamid Inayat: *Tafakkur Nuyin Siyasi Islam*

At the end of this short introduction, we would like to remark that historical documents indicate that differences even existed between Abu Bakr and Umar. Contradictory to general belief there existed a wide gulf between the two in their aims, motives, political programs, way of thinking and the method.

“The apparent behavior of those two can be only considered as a political program framed in accordance to the demands of time.”[1]

Historical evidences that show a deep gulf between the thoughts of the First Caliph who differed in his practice with the second in dimensions of gaining power and exercising his influence in society. This difference stretched and attained two different identities, which can be said to be opposed to each other.

**A)**

“Saeed bin Jubair narrates: Someone mentioned the name of Abu Bakr and Umar in the presence of Abdullah bin Umar bin Khattab.

Another in the group said: By God they were the sun and light for the Ummah.

Abdullah bin Umar asked: How did you derive this conclusion?

The man said that they were allies in Caliphate.

Ibne Umar said that it was not so. On the contrary they had differences among themselves. One day I was with my father when he restricted from seeing any. In the meantime Abdur Rahman Ibne Abu Bakr came and sought permission to see my father. My father said: This is also a bad four-legged crawler. But in spite of it he is better than his father.

My father’s words horrified me. I asked: Is Abdur Rahman better than his father?

My father said: O motherless! Who is there not better than his father! Ask him to enter...

After Abdur Rahman went away my father turned to me and said: Until today you were in ignorance about the things in which this great fool of Bani Teem (Abu Bakr) went ahead of me and the tyranny he did to me.

I said: I had no knowledge of this.

My father said: I had not expected you to know it.

---

**[1]**

Hashmatullah Qambari Hamadani: Israar wa Asaar Saqifah Bani Saada

(Secrets and relics of Saqifah Bani Saada), Pg. 71

I said: He (Abu Bakr) is dearer to the people than the light of their eyes.

My father said: Yes, it is so in spite of your father's anger.

I said: O father, don't you want to disclose the secret to the public?

My father said: How it could be possible when the people love him more than the light of their own eyes? If I do so people would not believe me. And as a consequence they would break my head with a rock. Later my father showed courage and on Friday told the people: Know that! Allegiance of Abu Bakr was a job done in haste and without thought. God saved the people from it evil. You must kill whoever invites you to do Bay'at like Abu Bakr." [1]

**B)**

Shareek bin Abdullah Nakhayee narrates from Abu Moosa Ashari that he (Abu Moosa) went to Hajj in the company of Umar. When we arrived Mecca, says Abu Moosa, I wanted to see Umar. Therefore he went to the place he had chosen for his residence. On the way, he met Mughaira bin Shoba. He too wanted to meet Umar. So we both followed the same way. On the way, we talked about Umar and his reaching to Caliphate. The talk brought within its folds Abu Bakr. I told Mughaira that Abu Bakr was insistent upon Umar becoming Caliph. Mughaira attested my view. He added that the people were not inclined to Umar to become Caliph. They had hatred towards Umar. They viewed no benefit to them in his Caliphate.

I asked him who opposed Umar? Mughaira said: O, Abu Moosa! As if you don't know to what extent the tribe of Quraish is jealous. Here Quraish means the tribe of Teem. Abu Bakr belongs to this tribe. If jealousy could be split into ten parts, nine would go to Quraish and remaining to all the people.

I told Mughaira to be silent. He seemed to ignore the favor of Quraish to the people and the people were indebted to them. We were busy talking and in the meantime, we reached the residence of Umar. He was not there. We were told that he had just left. From there we went to the sacred Mosque and saw Umar going around the Kaaba, so we also started doing the same.

When he finished he came and stood among us leaning on Mughaira. He asked where we were coming from. We said that we wanted to see him,

---

**[1]** *Ahmad Asadnejad: Wasi-e-Payambar Keest? Pgs. 139-140; quoted from: Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Ibne Abil Hadeed, Vol. 2, Pgs. 28-29*

since he was not there we came here. Mughaira looked at me and laughed. Umar did not seem pleased with his laughing; and asked why he laughed. Mughaira said that he was talking on his way with Abu Moosa, at which I laughed then Umar asked what the matter was. We narrated to him the subject on which we had talked and told him the views exchanged between us over jealousy of Quraish. Then we told him about one who had approached Abu Bakr to persuade him to abstain from nominating Umar to Caliphate. Umar then sighed a long sigh and said: May your mother wail for you, Mughaira. Nine out of ten; what? It is nothing. It is ninety-nine out of hundred. Ninety-nine would go to this group of Quraish and the remaining one to others. And in that one too Quraish shares with others. Umar was calmed down to a certain extent after saying that sentence. Then he (Umar) asked: So you want me to inform you about the most jealous of Quraish? We asked to him to do. He asked: How that could be possible when you are wearing clothes. We asked him what connection it had with our clothes. He said: I am afraid the secret might creep out of the cloak. We said that he must have meant us. He said it was true. So we all together went to his (Umar's) residence.

He pulled out his hands from us and entered but asked us to remain outside. In the meantime, I told Mughaira that our conversation seemed to have influenced him. Since he asked us to wait here because perhaps he would say the rest to us. He said that we too were after the same. We were asked to come in and we entered. We saw that Umar was relaxing stretched on his back. He again asked us to respect the secret. We again assured him not to worry in this respect. Then he got up to close the door. A guard was standing at the door. Umar ordered him to go; and he went. He closed the door came and sat in our company. He asked us to repeat the question in order to hear the answer from him. We reminded him that he had told us that he would inform us who the most jealous one among

Quraish was. He answered that we had asked the most difficult thing. He proceeded and said that we should not disclose it as long as he was alive.

Abu Moosa says that he thought to himself that the reason for his grievance could be Talha and Zubair because they did not like Umar to be Caliph. They had even told Abu Bakr not to nominate him. From subsequent words I understood that he meant someone else. Umar sighed again. We told him that whatever we know was only supposition. Umar asked against whom our supposition was. We said that they were those who had asked Abu Bakr to not make Umar a Caliph.

Umar said: No. by God, it is not so. It is Abu Bakr himself – the most jealous of Quraish.

Then Umar cast his head down for a long time. I looked at Mughaira and Mughaira stared at me. We too cast our heads down. Silence prevailed for a long time. We guessed that Umar was sorry for telling us the secret. Then Umar continued: How sad! This man of no weight at all from Bani Teem! He advanced his own gain and pushed me behind. He committed tyranny and a sin against me, made me lag behind.

Mughaira said: O Chief! We know what you say, but we don't know how he kept you behind by sin?

Umar said: Abu Bakr did not do that till I lost hope in Caliphate because I knew that people were not with me. I pushed him ahead. Otherwise he would have never enjoyed the sweet taste of Caliphate. Had I obeyed my own brother, Yazid bin Khattab it would have been far better to me. I lifted him high. I supported him. I got Caliphate confirmed in his favor. I made simple for him the issue of Caliphate. I closed every trouble-creating issue for him. When he got the job, he adhered to it blindly without a thought of me. Alas! Hell to me! I was hoping the government will turn its face toward me. By God, Abu Bakr did not gain anything besides the measure a sparrow needs to be fed. He lost that too ultimately.

Mughaira said: What was the obstacle in your reaching to Caliphate. On the day of Saqifah, Abu Bakr offered Caliphate to you. You yourself returned it to him and now you feel sorry for it.

Umar said: May your mother lament for you. I thought you are one of the shrewdest and cleverest Arabs, but now it seems

that you have no knowledge of what happened there. This man played a trick on me. So I too cheated him. He found me cleverer than a hen that eats stones.

Umar further added: When Abu Bakr saw the welcome of the people to him he became sure that they will not prefer anyone. He was very much anxious to know my mind then. He wanted to know whether I would campaign against him. Whether I would surrender to my inner inclination to Caliphate? He wanted to test me by inciting me towards the position. For this reason, he offered the Caliphate to me. On the other hand he very well knew and I too know that if he had surrendered Caliphate to me people would have never complied and responded favorably. In spite of my deep attachment to that position, he (Abu Bakr) found me clever and also circumspect. Though I might have given a positive answer to attain that office but people would have prevented it to reach me. Abu Bakr would have reserved in his heart implacable hatred and rancor against me. I would never have been safe from him. I came to know that people hate me.

Umar continued his talk and finally said: Didn't you hear people were shouting: O Abu Bakr! We don't want anyone other than you. You are befitting one to Caliphate.

Finally he said: When he heard people calling his name he became so glad that he became invigorated. I do not forget the envy Abu Bakr had against me. Someone had backbitten me to Abu Bakr. Abu Bakr had scolded me. The story is not new. Ashath was captured and brought before Abu Bakr. Abu Bakr did a favor to him and set him free. He even gave his sister in marriage to him. I visited Abu Bakr when Ashath was sitting with him. I told Ashath: O Enemy of God! You became apostate after having become a Muslim. You have turned back and taken the way of denial.

Ashath looked at me seriously. I thought he wanted to talk to me. But in his view, the time was not suitable. After sometime he met me in a by lane of Medina and asked whether it was I who had told those words. Umar said: Yes, it was me. Further Umar told him that the punishment awaiting him was more detrimental and pernicious than the sentence he had uttered.

Ashath said: I am very much distressed because of you because you are compelled to be a follower of Abu Bakr. I swear

by God, that which made me disobey Abu Bakr was his getting ahead of you in Caliphate. Had you been the Caliph you would never have seen any insurgency from me.

Umar: Yes, it is so. Now what do you advise me?

Ashath: Now is not the time to advise. It is time to be patient.

Umar said that they separated after that much conversation. Ashath on his way met Zibirqaan bin Badr and narrated the whole conversation to him. He too had filed a request with Abu Bakr.

Abu Bakr wrote a letter to Umar expressing his anger, sorrow and censure. Umar too replied to Abu Bakr in the following words:

I swear by God! I will prevent you from continuing this job or I will reveal the secret that is between me and you. If the horse riders heard it they will disseminate it along the route they traverse and at the destination they arrive. In this current condition, if you want, let us be at

forgiveness towards each other. The secret too will remain unrevealed.

After this letter, Abu Bakr told Umar: We should remain on terms as before. This Caliphate too will be yours shortly.

Umar added: After these words of Abu Bakr I thought that he will return me Caliphate before Friday passes between us. But he did not care. He did not even refer to this matter. He never mentioned it any more until he died. As long as he was Caliph, he never paid attention to his words. He always pressed his teeth due to the excess of malice and envy towards me until he died and was disappointed that he will no more be a Caliph.

Please keep secret from people particularly from Bani Hashim whatever I told you. Do not disclose it at all. Now if you like you may go.

We got up and left amazed at what we had heard. By God, we did not disclose his secret until he was killed.”**[1]**

---

**[1]** Ahmad Asadnejad: *Wasi-e-Payambar Keest? Pgs. 140-147; quoted from: Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Ibne Abil Hadeed, Vol. 2, Pgs. 30-34*

**Part 3**  
**Piety and Simplicity Scrutinized**

## Motive of Caliphs' Piety

“People contemporary to the Prophet had become familiar and habituated to plain living. Besides, people were very much happy and gratified that their leader was living a simple life. This had become a particularity, a distinction and a standard of a leader.

If one in his worldly life used to adopt piety and keep himself from extravagance, ate simple food and wore coarse clothes, even though he did not have other qualifications of leadership, he was considered most qualified for leadership.”**[1]**

Accordingly it was natural that Caliphs should have adopted this way of life, which gives them a hand to deceive people and attain legitimacy to their usurped Caliphate. This weak point in public opinion had been of much benefit to Caliphs to draw from it as much advantage as they could in political and social aspects. Whatever capacity they had, they exerted efforts to abstain from worldly luxuries and comforts. This was a tool to deceive people. By doing so they got the pleasure of governing people - Arabs and non- Arabs.

The type of life they lived gave them required strength and needed ability to cheat and deceive people to an extent, which provided them a stand among them and brought the public opinion to their absolute favor. Such a gain on their part went a long way to silence people when the First Caliph confiscated Fadak and when the Second Caliph brought new things into religion that had not existed in the Prophet's lifetime. Because:

“Abu Bakr and Umar did not very much take benefits from the Public Treasury. On the basis of this, people thought that if the Caliph confiscated one's property or wealth it was not that he wanted to increase his own wealth.

People like that their rulers not be strict towards them in collecting taxes. And if the public pays taxes, the money should not be used for personal expenditure.”**[2]**

---

**[1]** Yusuf Gholami: *Pas az Ghuroob (After Sunset)*, Pg. 173

**[2]** Yusuf Gholami: *Pas az Ghuroob (After Sunset)*, Pg. 239; quoting from: *Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Ibne Abil Hadeed, Vol. 16, Pgs. 266-267; Ash-Shafi, Pgs. 233-234*

Ibn Abil Hadeed Motazalli narrates in his commentary of *Nahjul Balagha* what his teacher, Abu Ja'far Naqeeb had told about the deep influence of pious-looking politicians:

“The style that Abu Bakr and Umar had adopted in their political life attracted peoples’ general admiration because they distanced themselves from worldly riches and adopted piety, though a feign one.**[1]**They eschewed worldly decorations and greatness. They showed as if they are at a distance from worldly gains. They sufficed with a little of it. For food, they sufficed on very simple food. In clothes, they chose very coarse cloth. Whenever they got any worldly profit they divided it among the people. They did not corrupt themselves with worldly riches. This issue played a great part in attracting peoples’ hearts towards them. Caliphs remained always in good books of people and in their good will. Those who had a little doubt in their hearts said to themselves:

Had they been opponents of Prophet’s orders it would have been for their personal benefit. Some or other attachment to world could have been seen in them.

How they opposed the Prophet’s command and [at the same time] eschewed worldly pleasures; so they spoiled for themselves both the worlds. Would a man with a little sense do it?

It was this issue that left no doubt in anyone with regard to their actions;**[2]** they trusted their rulership and approved their character.

But people neglected one point in their calculations that is the pleasure of being in power. Being at the helm of affairs and ruling people and steering the government is itself a great luxury and a great gain.**[3]** For this, everything is sacrificed. Food and other things are of no importance for those who are after greater aims. Thus the poet says:

Some ignored the pleasure of riches.

But they did not ignore the pleasure of commanding and prohibition.

Abu Ja'far Naqeeb says: The difference of the two Caliphs with the third was the cause that the third was killed that way. People had deposed him. Uthman thought that he and his family has a share in the public

---

**[1]** *[To leave]*

**[2]** *[It means the opposition of those two and their associates]*

*to the customs of Prophet and laws of Shariah]*

**[3]** *[This quality in the Caliphs was like cunning that is associated with Amr Aas.]*

belongings. Whatever does not belong to him and his family, he thought that it should belong to him. When it belongs to him, it belongs to his family too. If Uthman also had followed the system of his predecessors and kept his family away from public treasury, people would have been at his side. Even if he had changed the direction of prayers from Kaaba to Jerusalem or if he had reduced the five-time prayers to four, people would not have objected and none would have criticized him..."**[1]**

According to this analysis, we can understand the reason of peoples' silence against innovations of the Second Caliph. Whatever wrong the Caliph did, it was regarded within a religious framework even by the Prophet's Companions, even though it be against the Prophet's practice.

## Political Piety

Although it is claimed:

“He was so pious and God-fearing that he did not appoint Saeed bin Zaid in the consulting (Shura) committee because he was his cousin.”!**[2]**

But it must be said: The fake piety that he had created around himself brought him popularity among the people. Through this means, he gained legitimacy for his Caliphate. He adopted the same policy in appointment of government staff.

Both Abu Bakr and Umar avoided giving jobs in government at low or high levels to their relatives and close ones - no matter how befitting or qualified they be for that job. This trick reflected among the people their piety and fear of God.**[3]**

Of course some exceptions were there:

**A)** Abu Moosa Ashari was an official of Umar in Basrah. Abdullah Ibn Umar was his son-in-law.**[4]**

**B)** Qadama bin Maz’oon was Abdullah bin Umar’s maternal uncle. He was Umar’s agent in Bahrain.**[5]**

---

**[1]** Ali Muhaddith (Bandar Regi): *Siyaah Tareen Hafta-e-Tarikh*, Pgs. 142-144; quoting from: *Sharh Nahjul Balagha*, Ibne Abil Hadeed, Vol. 12, Pgs. 82-90

**[2]** Abdul Qadir Dahqaan Siraawaani: Article quoted in *Nida-e-Islam Magazine*, Issue No. 14, (9000 copies), Summer 82, Pg. 15

**[3]** Refer: *Najah Ata at-Tai: Nazaryaat al-Khaleefatain*, Vol. 2, Pgs. 210-211

**[4]** Refer: *Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Askari: Naqsh-e-Aysha Dar Tarikh-e-Islam*, Vol. 3, Pg. 103; he wanted his son-in-law to become the Caliph through the arbitration.

**[5]** Refer: *Najah Ata at-Tai: Nazaryaat al-Khaleefatain*, Vol. 2, Pgs. 257-259; quoting from: *Al-Isabah*, Vol. 3, Pg. 228

Historical documents also show that Umar was well aware of the danger of appointing family members in government affairs. Therefore he avoided appointing his relatives and his dear ones.**[1]** Instead, he appointed outsiders who had their tribal backings.

“It is said that Umar had predicted Uthman’s fate in the following words: If Uthman becomes Caliph, sons of Abi

Muit[2] and Umayyah[3] will dominate people. He will place public revenue at their disposal. I swear by God, if he reaches to Caliphate he will certainly do what I have said. Arabs will riot against him such that they will kill him in his own house.”[4]

How come Umar frame a committee of six persons and gave such powers to Ibne Auf[5] so that it was sure that Uthman would become the Caliph? This is a question that can only be answered by Umar himself.

## Piety or Public Deception

The following document shows that it was Umar's trick to deceive people by the cloak of piety he had donned. It was to protect himself from peoples' objection. Because historical sources say:

"Hurmuzan**[6]** asked Umar: Do you allow me to cook food for Muslims?

Umar said: I am afraid you won't be able to.

Hurmuzan: No. I can.

Umar: Then, the choice is yours.

Hurmuzan cooked food in various tastes of different varieties – sweet, pinching, sore, mild and hot. He came to Umar and informed him that the food was prepared. He invited Umar to come and eat the food.

---

**[1]** *[Perhaps he learnt this diplomacy from the First Caliph]*

**[2]** *[It denotes the sons of Abu Mui't bin Abu Amr bin Umayyah! Abu Mui't was the grandfather of Waleed bin Uqbah.]*

**[3]** *[Sons of Umayyah means: Abul Ais, Abu Amr, Aas, Abul Aas (grandfather of Uthman bin Affan and Marwan bin Hakam) and Harb (father of Abu Sufyan).]*

**[4]** *Ahmad al-Kubra: Min Hayatul Khaleefah, Pg. 435; quoting from Tarikh Yaqoobi, Vol. 2, Pgs. 158-159*

**[5]** *[Abdur Rahman bin Auf, brother-in-law of Uthman (husband of Umme Kulthum binte Uqbah bin Abi Mui't) (Balazari: Ansaab al-Ashraaf, Vol. 5, Pg. 19)]*

**[6]** *[Hurmuzan, the former king of Shoos and Shustar had become a Muslim who sketched conquest of Iranian towns for Umar.]*

Umar stood in the middle of the mosque and said loudly:

O, Muslims! I am a messenger of Hurmuzan to you. Then Muslims followed Umar. When Umar reached the house of Hurmuzan, he stopped at the door and said:

Wait here. Then he entered the house alone. He asked: Bring the food that is cooked. I like to see it. Then Umar asked to bring a huge plate for him. The plate was given to him. He

ordered to put the food from each variety in it. Then Umar mixed it.

Hurmuzan shouted: What are you doing. You spoiled the food because some is sweet and some is salty.

Umar answered: Do you want Muslims to change their opinion about me. After doing this, he asked Muslims to enter the house and eat the food.”**[1]**

## Hypocritical Piety

One of the claims to prove the piety of Caliphs is this:

“To prove Abu Bakr’s piety in not utilizing the public funds and showing his dislike to worldly luxuries these two examples are enough:

One day household members of Abu Bakr asked him get sweets for them.

His wife suggested that she would save some money from daily expenses for a few days until it makes a sum. Abu Bakr accepted his wife’s suggestion. After a few days, a small amount was saved. This amount was given to Abu Bakr to buy sweets. Abu Bakr took the amount and surrendered it to the Public Treasury. He said to the official of funds that experience proved that the sum was more than domestic expenses. So he ordered the treasury to reduce his monthly allowance by the same amount. For the past months, he ordered to collect the sum from his personal property he had before becoming Caliph.”**[2]**

“Another case: Abu Bakr in his last days sold the land he had bought during his Caliphate from the amount he had taken as his salary by consent of Muslims**[3]** to be used by Caliph, and returned it to the Public

---

**[1]** *Najah Ata at-Tai: Nazaryaat al-Khaleefatain, Vol. 2, Pg. 36*

**[2]** *Abdul Qadir Dahqaan Siraawaani: Article quoted in Nida-e-Islam Magazine, Issue No. 10, (9000 copies), Summer 81, Pg. 20*

**[3]** *Consent: what is this consent? We very much come across this word in the Sunni books. If they mean it is the consent of all the Muslims, it is impossible to obtain from all. If they mean only those around the caliph and if they are regarded as the representatives of Muslims, they have no such authority because of the ruling of Umar*

Treasury. He also made a will that all amenities utilized by him as Caliph should be returned to treasury.”**[1]**

Before analysis, we would like to draw the attention of our readers to a historical document in which you will see for yourself that Abu Bakr himself has admitted that he cannot refrain from the world and its attractions. Yet they claim:

“Abu Bakr was a man most indifferent to the world.” [2]

“It is mentioned in Mustadrak Sahihain Vol. 4, Pg. 309 that Zaid bin Arqam narrated: We were with Abu Bakr when he asked for something to drink.

Water mixed with honey was brought for him.

He took the glass close to his lips and wept for a long time then he wiped his tears.

He was asked: O Caliph of Prophet of God, why are you weeping?

Abu Bakr: I was with the Prophet of God. I saw him driving away something, but there was no one to be seen.

I asked: O the Messenger of Allah! What is it that you are warding off from you?

He said: It was the world that came to me personified. I told it to go away from me. She (the world) cried and returned and said: Even though

---

*in the following case:*

*Here is this historical document:*

*Two men came to Abu Bakr and demanded a piece of land for cultivation. Abu Bakr asked the opinion of those who were around him that time. They agreed. So, Abu Bakr gave them the relative documents of the land. The two men took the document to Umar to attest it. Umar took the document and tore it up. Umar was angry and came to Abu Bakr and asked: Is this land yours? Or, is it of all Muslims? Abu Bakr said that it belonged to all Muslims. He said that he had consulted his courtiers. Umar asked whether the few persons were all Muslims. Whether all have agreed on this? Abu Bakr said: I told at the beginning that you are more competent to be the Caliph. But you did not agree and forced me to accept this post. (Ali Muhammad Mir Jalili: Imam Ali and the Rulers, Pg. 61, narrated from Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Ibn Abil Hadid, Vol. 12, Pg. 58)*

**[1]** Abdul Qadir Dahqaan Siraawaani: Article quoted in Nida-e-Islam Magazine, Issue No. 2, Summer 79, Pg. 31

**[2]** Sayyid Abdur Raheem Khateeb: Shaykhain (6<sup>th</sup> Edition 1382), Pg. 29

you may flee from me but he that would come in your place after you would not be able to leave me.

This same story Khateeb Baghdadi has written in the Tarikh Baghdad Vol. 10, Pg. 286 and Abu Naeem has written in Hilyat al-Awliya Vol. 1, Pg. 30. Both of them have mentioned this too that Abu Bakr told that he feared that the world might occupy him in its pleasures. Muttaqi has also written in Kanzul Ummal Vol. 4, Pg. 37 that Abu Bakr wept fearing the world would entrap him..."[1]

Analysis of this quotation brings three points to the fore:

**A)** This story is narrated by Sunni sources in their reliable books. If relation or mutual attachment between Abu Bakr and the world is accepted, it would contradict the claim of his being pious.

**B)** If the claim of Abu Bakr of the talk of the world with the Prophet were true then there comes the attachment of the world and Abu Bakr, which contradicts the claim of his piety.

**C)** If this talk between Abu Bakr and Muslims is true, it seems that the confession of Abu Bakr before Muslims and his companions in that particular way was a salient quality with him and was a covering over his extraordinary inclination towards the world. The Caliph (Abu Bakr) here has invented the tradition to confirm his Caliphate and at the same time his piety. He wants to establish his probity before the events of Saqifah. He wants to prove by this invention of his, close familiarity between him and the Prophet. This will give popularity to his Caliphate and justification to him for that post. In the tradition invented by him these worlds are very much meaningful "...he that will come in your place after you." How can it be believed when in order to justify the usurpation of Caliphate of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) they claim that the Prophet did not appoint anyone as his Caliph or successors?

The document leads us to a crossroad where one way leads to his confession of being worldly and enchanted by the world and the other is contrast in claim of his piety and fear of God, which compelled him to return public funds he had used during his Caliphate.

Abdullah, grandson of Abu Bakr (from his daughter), requested Asma, wife of Zubair, to recommend Abu Bakr. He was very much dear to Ayesha - his aunt.

---

**[1]** *Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Husaini Firozabadi: Shanasai-e-Haft Tan Dar Sadr-e-Islam (Translation of As-Saba' tu Min as-Salf; written by Abbas Rasikhi Najafi), Pgs. 81-82*

His request from his grandfather Abu Bakr is interesting.

“When Abu Bakr became Caliph Abdullah was a youth. One day he came to Abu Bakr (his grandfather) and asked him to give him a huge piece of land. A hill too was in that land. Abu Bakr granted that big piece of land to his grandson to please him.

In Tarikh Ibn Asakir this story of wholehearted generosity of Abu Bakr to his own grandson, Abu Bakr bin Zubair is narrated as follows:

Abdullah requested his grandfather to give him a hill somewhere in Medina. Abu Bakr asked him what he wanted the hill for?

Abdullah answered: We had such a hill in Mecca. So we want to have a similar thing in Medina also. Abu Bakr spotted out a suitable location and granted it to Abdullah. He built two bridges in that place but now there is no sign of them.” **[1]**

Such irresponsible utilization of public funds is recorded in the annals of history. On the other hand conjectures are invented to dress the Caliph in a guise of piety.

“It is also said that when Abu Bakr was dying he said to his daughter Ayesha: We had Muslim affairs in our hands. But you know that I did not take even one Dinar or Dirham from public funds by way of salary...” **[2]**

In the same way we see the following claim repeated regarding the deprivation of family members and children of Caliph from minimum material needs through Abu Bakr:

“Abu Bakr adopted a life of piety since he became a Caliph. He took from public treasury the minimum amount in salary. His salary was not enough to purchase sweets for his wife and children. He lived such a stringent life at a time when conditions were improved, Islamic territories were stretched and expanded and the revenues too had increased.” **[3]**

On the other hand we hear this story from a girl grown and brought up in the house of Abu Bakr:

---

**[1]** Husain Ghaib Gholami: *Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.) wa Rumuz-e-Hadith-e-Fadak*, Pgs. 43-45; quoting from: *Tarikh Madeenatud Damishq*, Vol. 28, Pg. 200

**[2]** Fawad Farooqi: *Beest-o-panj Saal Sukoot-e-Ali* (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition 1379), Pg. 35

**[3]** Abdul Qadir Dahqaan Siraawaani: Article quoted in *Nida-e-Islam Magazine*, Issue No. 2, Summer 79, Pg. 31

“Ayesha, in the days**[1]** of the Prophet, had several dresses and cloaks of different designs and fashions while other wives of Prophet had simple dresses of cheap quality.

Ayesha also wore gold and other jewellery.

Even in the days of Hajj when costly dresses and ornaments are ignored and not used Mother of believers did not abstain.”**[2]**

Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Askari has shown documents in this respect, which he has utilized in his analysis. We quote a few here:

A) The author of *Tabaqaat* writes on the basis of the narration from Qasim bin Muhammad bin Abu Bakr (son of Ayesha’s brother): Ayesha wore costly cloaks – mostly of yellow color. She had costly rings, which she used to wear.

B) A Muslim woman named Shamsia narrates: One day I visited Ayesha and found her wearing a yellow dress and a yellow headscarf.

C) Son of Ayesha’s sister, Urwah bin Zubair narrates: Ayesha had an upper dress of silk. She used to wear it on occasions. Later she gave it to Abdullah bin Zubair.

D) After passing away of Prophet, Muhammad bin Ashath brought a present of a skin coat, which she used to wear in winter.

E) A Muslim lady named Amina says that she saw Ayesha wearing upper dress of red color and headscarf of black color.**[3]**

F) Qasim bin Muhammad bin Abu Bakr says: Ayesha used to wear a yellow Hajj dress (Ihraam). At the time of Hajj, she performed Hajj wearing her gold ornaments and other costly things.**[4]**

The interesting thing is Ayesha wore such dresses and appreciated the dress of the ladies of Ansaar as a model for a Muslim lady. She says:

“I have not seen women better than the women of Ansaar. When this verse [verse of Hijab in Surah Noor] descended each one hurried to her

---

**[1]** *[After the passing away of the Seal of the prophets and during continuous wars there was excess of war booty and wealth.]*

**[2]** *Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Askari: Naqsh-e-Ayesha Dar Tarikh-e-Islam, Vol. 3, Pg. 232*

**[3]** *Ibid. Vol. 3, Pgs. 232-233; quoting from: Tabaqat al-Kubra, Vol. 8, Pgs. 69-73*

**[4]** *Ibid. Vol. 3, Pg. 233; quoting from: Seer Alaamun Nubla, Vol. 2, Pg. 132*

woolen cloth, cut it and covered their heads with it as though a black crow was sitting on their heads.” **[1]**

## Personal use of Public Funds

In the same way it is said that Abu Bakr lived a simple life and was very careful with public funds:

“Abu Bakr told his daughter, Ayesha, at the close of his death to surrender the camel, which he was riding and the bowl of his food and the gown he was wearing to the new Caliph who would succeed him. These things are prohibited to others than the Caliph.”!**[2]**

In reply to this we have to rely on historical documents that show how he lavished bribes from Muslims treasury on his opponents to obtain their support. It is the worst type of advantage that puts the piety of Caliph to question.

### A)

As you know the Prophet delegated Abu Sufyan to a certain district to collect Zakat. When Abu Sufyan returned to Medina the Caliphate of Ali was hijacked in the Saqifah conspiracy.

Abu Sufyan at first because of communal feelings proposed to Imam Ali (a.s.) of his acknowledgement to him as the Caliph but after

“He got disappointed from Ali towards his own personal gains. On the other hand the government at that time was anxious for his campaign, which was in anticipation of government. Umar went to Abu Bakr and told him that Abu Sufyan had returned from his assignment. He warned Abu Bakr that they would not be safe from his mischief. The Prophet of God too, always treated him with care and affection for this very reason. Now he has some amount collected by him in Zakat. Although the amount with him belongs to the Public Treasury we should ignore the amount and give it to him to please him. Abu Bakr agreed and did the same.

Abu Sufyan was pleased and he paid allegiance to Abu Bakr.**[3]**

According to the narration of Tabari, Abu Sufyan did not pay allegiance to Abu Bakr until he got the post of commander for his son, Yazid bin Abu Sufyan, to the army in Syria.**[4]”[5]**

---

**[1]** *Zamakhshari: Al-Kashaf, Vol. 3, Pg. 231, Under Verses 30-31 of Surah Noor*

**[2]** *Abdul Qadir Dahqaan Siraawaani: Article quoted in Nida-e-Islam Magazine, Issue No. 10, Summer 81, Pg. 20*

**[3]** *Quoted from: Al-Iqdul Fareed, Vol. 3, Pg. 62*

**[4]** *Quoted from: Tarikh Tabari, Vol. 2, Pg. 449*

**[5]** *Allamah Askari: Abdullah Ibne Saba Wa Deegar Afsaane (Abdullah Bin Saba and other legends), Vol. 1, Pg. 157*

*Allamah Askari: Abdullah Ibne Saba Wa Deegar Afsaane (Abdullah Bin Saba and other legends), Vol. 1, Pg. 157*

“Our readers are aware of the fact that among them and Bani Umayyah chief (Abu Sufyan) there was no difference of views. I (the author)**[1]** believe that contradictions in their behavior were a strategy to create divisions in society. There was no motive at all of any good among them.”**[2]**

## **B)**

Although it must be noted that diversion of public funds in such a way and bribing political adversaries was a common practice of Caliphs. Such misappropriation was in excess. They did it freely without fearing God. To prove this there are many historical documents but we quote here a few:

“When Abu Bakr was established in office he fixed salaries from public funds to Muhajireen and Ansaar women.

Share of a woman from Bani Adi bin al-Najjar was given to Zaid bin Thabit to deliver to her. Zaid went to her and presented the stipend. The woman asked him what it was for. Zaid told her that it was her share fixed by Abu Bakr. The woman replied: Do you want to take away my faith by this bribe? I swear by God, I will not accept anything from him.

The amount was returned to Abu Bakr.”**[3]**

This of course was not the first case and that woman, not the only woman to be bribed though she rejected. Such cases of expenditures that told on public funds are aplenty. Besides there are many cases of bribes given to persons of their own choice secretly and which were not recorded in books of treasury. For instance the Bani Aslam tribe got free provision in return to their support to Abu Bakr’s rule.**[4]**

---

**[1]** *[Author of Asraar wa Asaar Saqifah Bani Saada]*

**[2]** *Hashmatullah Qambari Hamadani: Asraar wa Asaar*

*Saqifah Bani Saada (Secrets and relics of Saqifah Bani Saada), Pg. 81*

**[3]** *Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Askari: Saqifah (Study about the formation of government after the passing away of the Holy Prophet), Edited by Mahdi Dashti, Pg. 58; quoting from: Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Ibne Abil Hadeed, Vol. 2, Pg. 133*

**[4]** *Refer: Shaykh Mufeed: Al-Jamal, Pg. 43*

Anyway the policy of terror, fear, greed and bribe -was at the top of the list that ran the administration of Abu Bakr's rule. Such that he said:

I hope your hearts by terror and your bellies by food have been filled.**[1]**

At the end we would like to quote another case of misappropriation of public funds by Caliphs for their personal benefit and benefit of their families, particularly by Umar.

### C)

"Zakwan a freed slave of Ayesha narrates: When Iraq was conquered, spoils of the war were distributed among Muslims. A basket was sent to Umar with a jewel. Umar showed the jewel to Muslims around him and asked its worth. Nobody knew its worth. He then asked them to allow him to send the jewel to Ayesha for the love the Prophet had towards her.**[2]**

All agreed.

He sent the jewel to her.

Ayesha said: O, God! What a great victory You have bestowed on Umar today... "**[3]**

Apparently Umar had forgotten what he himself had told Abu Bakr that public property cannot be granted to anyone that the Caliph likes. Acceptance of a few cohorts around the Caliph cannot be a sanction for this generosity. It belongs to all Muslims. The courtiers of Caliph are not peoples' representatives. So their sanction does not carry any credit.

More interesting is that Ayesha accepted the jewel as a present. She immediately was pleased and praised Umar. She forgot her father's will in which he had advised her not to use anything from public property or any sum from public funds because it belonged to Muslims. This shows that in fact there was no such will.

Anyway, public funds were used for personal interests very openly and freely. On the other hand they go on making claim after claim. For instance:

---

**[1]** *Suyuti: Jame al-Ahadith, Vol. 13, Pg. 106*

**[2]** *[On reading the first volume of Naqsh-e-Ayesha Dar Tarikh-e-Islam, it is known how Ayesha coined traditions to strengthen the foundation of Caliphate.]*

**[3]** *Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Askari: Naqsh-e-Ayesha Dar Tarikh-e-Islam, Vol. 1, Pg. 118; quoting from: Seer Alaamun Nubla, Vol. 2, Pg. 133 & Mustadrak Hakim & Talkhis Dhahabi, Vol. 4, Pg. 8*

“Umar did not use his Caliphate for any personal benefit. He did not allow himself any sum from public funds for his private ends. He did not allow himself to lavish money on others from public funds.” **[1]**

#### **D)**

“Ibn Saad narrates from Saeed bin Aas Amawi **[2]** that he (Saeed) asked Umar to give him a piece of land surrounding his house. He wanted the land to expand his house.

He was encouraged to make such a request because Umar had given lands to some of his close associates.

The Caliph told him: Come after the Morning Prayer so that I may do what you want.

Saeed did accordingly. Then they both, Umar and Saeed, went to the spot to see the land.

Umar drew a line by his foot over the land and said this too is yours.

Saeed bin Aas said to Umar to enlarge the land to some extent because he had a large family.

In reply to this request, Umar said: This much is enough for you. However I’ll tell you a secret, which you please don’t disclose to anyone. After me, one will become Caliph that will give you what you request. He will attend to family ties and relations.

Saeed waited the whole duration of Umar’s Caliphate. When Uthman became a Caliph he did what Umar had predicted.” **[3]**

The interesting point is that Umar did not consult anyone in his charity of lands, which belonged to all Muslims. He did not

obtain permission of any Muslim around him. He perhaps forgot the many times he had censured and blamed Abu Bakr in his similar procedure and had even refused the excuse that he (Abu Bakr) had consulted the people around him.

---

**[1]** *Ali Tantawi (Translated by Abu Bakr Hasanzadeh): Dastan-e-Zindagani-e-Umar, (1<sup>st</sup> & 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition 1380), Pg. 46*

**[2]** *[Saeed bin Aas bin Saeed bin Aas bin Umayyah]*

**[3]** *Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Askari: Naqsh-e-Aaimma Dar Ahya-e-Deen (Role of Imams in the Revival of Religion, Vol. 14, Pgs. 25-26; quoting from: Tabaqat, Vol. 5, Pgs. 20-22*

## Clandestine Luxury

Claims are made that:

“Umar was an emperor who used to sit over naked ground instead of a throne embossed with jewels. He wore a coarse cloak - very ordinary and cheap, which was quite in line with the dress of a poor ordinary citizen. In his dress, there was no distinction as to differentiate him from others. In those days there were very costly cloths and pieces in the treasury that came from East and West as gifts and presents.”!**[1]**

“Umar used to work from early morning to late at night and take wages for his labor. This he made a source for his livelihood and did not burden public funds.”!**[2]**

“He did not have leisure to eat in ease and comfort or to wash his clothes. He did not go after luxury and pleasure.”!**[3]**

“When Umar left the world he was in debts. His conscience did not let him to take a single Dirham from public funds.”!**[4]**

On the other hand historical document indicates something else:

A - “Umar borrowed a great sum from public funds. It amounted to 86000 Dirhams.”**[5]**

Now if we suppose his fixed annual expenses were five thousand Dirhams then such a loan as this would equal expenses of more than sixteen years.”**[6]**

Other matters recorded in history say:

B) “Umar gave one thousand Dirhams to one of his relatives.”**[7]**

C) “He fixed a dowry to one of his wives as forty thousand Dirhams.”**[8]**

---

**[1]** Abdul Qadir Dahqaan Siraawaani: Article quoted in *Nida-e-Islam Magazine*, Issue No. 11, (9000 copies), Autumn 81, Pg. 7

**[2]** Fawad Farooqi: *Beest-o-panj Saal Sukoot-e-Ali* (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition 1379), Pg. 73

**[3]** Ali Tantawi (Translated by Abu Bakr Hasanzadeh): *Dastan-e-Zindagani-e-Umar*, (1<sup>st</sup> & 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition 1380), Pg. 90

**[4]** Muhammad Kamil Hasan al-Hami (translated by Ghulam Haider Farooqi): *Zindagi Naame Umar bin Khattab* (1<sup>st</sup> Edition 1382), Pg. 22

**[5]** Quoted from: *Tarikh al-Khulafa*, Pg. 135

**[6]** *Najah Ata at-Tai: Nazaryaat al-Khaleefatain*, Vol. 2, Pg. 7

**[7]** *Ibne Abil Hadeed: Sharh Nahjul Balagha*, Vol. 12, Pg. 62

**[8]** *Ustad Ja'far Murtuza Amili: Tahlili Az Zindagi-e-Siyasi Imam Hasan Mujtaba (a.s.) (Translated by Muhammad Shahri, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition)*, Pg. 182; quoting from: *Al-Futuhaat al-Islamiya*, Vol. 2, Pg. 55; *At-Tarateeb al-Idariya*, Vol. 2, Pg. 405; *Al-Bahrur Zakhaar*, Vol. 4. Pg. 100

It is said that they were 10000 in number (*Ansaab al-Ashraaf*, Vol. 2, Pg. 109)

D) "He presented 10000 Dirhams to one of his sons-in-law who had come from Mecca."**[1]**

E) "One of the sons of Umar sold his share of inheritance to his brother, Abdullah bin Umar to the amount of a hundred thousand dirhams.**[2]**"**[3]**

Abu Yusuf confirms all these cases and adds:

F) "Umar had four thousand distinguished horses in the way of God.

Umar used to give one of these horses to one whose share from public treasury was little and his needs more. Umar put this condition when he gave the horse: If you tire the horse or do not feed it properly or make it thin and lean, you will be held responsible. If you went to holy war with it and it got wounded you will not be accountable."**[4]**

Although the last part of the narration is praise to Umar in some way or other, if the Sunni sect believes this praise they should also believe that Umar owned four thousand horses in the first place. If it is so, it will be in immediate contradiction with claims of his having had lived a poor life because of his piety. On the whole, it can be said:

"His pious life does not mean that he had no wealth during his Caliphate. According to sources Umar was among the rich ones of Quraish."**[5]**

---

**[1]** *Ibid.* Pg. 182; quoting from: *Tabaqat*, Vol. 3, Pg. 219; *Al-Futuhaat al-Islamiya*, Vol. 2, Pg. 390; *Hayatus Sahaba*, Vol. 2, quoting from: *Ibne Saad and Kanzul Ummal*, Vol. 2, Pg. 317 & *Ibne Jurair and Ibne Asakir*; *Tarikh al-Khulafa*, Pg. 120

**[2]** *Ibid.* Pg. 182; quoting from: *Jame Bayan al-Ilm*, Vol. 2, Pg. 17

**[3]** Extract from: *Rasool Ja'faryan: Tarikh Khulafa, Pg. 705;*  
quoting from: *Tarikh Mukhtasar Damishq, Vol. 10, Pg. 406]*

**[4]** *Ibid. Pg. 182; quoting from: Al-Kharaij, Pg. 51*

**[5]** *Rasool Ja'faryan: Tarikh Khulafa, Pg. 70; quoting*  
*from: Hayatus Sahaba, Vol. 1, Pg. 347*

While it is said about him:

“Umar owned nothing and he did not desire to own anything.”**[1]**

## Support to Royal life and Hoarding Wealth

Even though in this regard their claim is:

“Hazrat Umar succeeded in his days to stand like an iron wall against this tempest and hurricane and with all his power held it in abeyance.”!**[2]**

But historical documents indicate opposite of this. Please note the following:

### 1 - Support to Muawiyah

“The Second Caliph used to issue special orders with regard to Muawiyah regardless of the fact that Muawiyah was one of the freed ones, yet Umar was enthusiastic to prepare him for Caliphate. So he tried to prepare ground for his (Muawiyah) coming to power.

It is enough to mention that:

A) Umar kept Muawiyah for years in the post of governor of Syria but did not check his accounts as was routine. While every year he sent auditors to check account books of his district collectors and provincial governors which sometimes ended in insult to the governors.

B) Umar did not keep his collectors and governors in their posts for more than two years. He either changed their locations or transferred them to other places.**[3]**

C) Muawiyah asked Umar to furnish him with instructions so that he acts thereupon accordingly. Umar said that he would neither issue any orders to him nor would restrict him from doing anything.**[4]**

D) These were the things in addition to other wrongdoings of Muawiyah, which Umar did know but overlooked. For instance he lent money on interest but Umar did not take any action against him.**[5]**

---

**[1]** Fawad Farooqi: *Beest-o-panj Saal Sukoot-e-Ali* (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition 1379), Pg. 221

**[2]** Abdul Qadir Dahqaan Siraawaani: Article quoted in *Nida-e-Islam Magazine*, Issue No. 14, Summer 82, Pg. 20

**[3]** Quoted from: *At-Tarateeb al-Idariya*, Vol. 1, Pg. 269

**[4]** Quoted from: *Tabari*, Vol. 6, Pg. 184; *Al-Iqdul Fareed*, Vol. 1, Pg. 14

**[5]** Quoted from: *Musnad Ahmad, Vol. 5, Pg. 347; Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Ibne Abil Hadeed, Vol. 4, Pg. 60*

E) One day Muawiyah was censured and blamed in the presence of Umar. Umar said to them: Don't blame the brave man of Quraish before me. He is so brave that he laughs even while he is angry.**[1]**

F) Umar paid as a salary of one thousand Dinars every month to Muawiyah from public funds. This amount is mentioned as 10000 dinars yearly in other narrations.**[2]**

G) Umar used to say about Muawiyah:

Beware of a man of Quraish - a man whose color is closer to black. Also beware of his son. He is one who goes to slumber when he is pleased and laughs when he is in rage.**[3]**

H) Once Umar saw Muawiyah and remarked: He is Choesroe of Arabs.**[4]**

I) One day Umar asked his companions: Will you speak about Choesroe and Caesar and their policies in the presence of Muawiyah?!"**[5]**"**[6]**

Such praises for Muawiyah and his royalty while it is that:

"Sometimes Umar too had called himself a king."**[7]**"**[8]**

It is interesting that in spite of these clear confessions of the Caliph it is still claimed that:

"Having had so much greatness and power he did not like to be counted among kings and rulers."**[9]**

---

**[1]** Quoted from: *Al-Istiab, (on the margins of Al-Isabah), Vol. 3, Pg. 397*

**[2]** Quoted from: *Uyun al- Akhbaar, Vol. 1, Pg. 9*

**[3]** Quoted from: *Uyun al- Akhbaar, Vol. 1, Pg. 9*

**[4]** Quoted from: *Al-Istiab, (on the margins of Al-Isabah), Vol. 3, Pgs. 396-397*

[In this book it is mentioned:

Whenever Umar came to Syria or looked at Muawiyah he used to remark: This is the Choesroe of Arabs.

(*Al-Isabah, Vol. 3, Pg. 434; Usud al-Ghaba, Vol. 5, Pg. 386*)

**[5]** Allamah Ja'far Murtuza Amili: *Tahlili Az Zindagi-e-Siyasi Imam Hasan Mujtaba (a.s.), Pgs. 98-100*

**[6]** [The Caliph said before the people: By Allah! I don't know

*whether I am a Caliph or a king (Ibne Abil Hadeed: Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Vol. 12, Pg. 66)]*

**[7]** *Ibid. Pg. 181; quoting from: Al-Futuhaat al-Islamiya, Vol. 2, Pg. 290; Hayatus Sahaba, Vol. 2, Pg. 256*

**[8]** *Fareedoon Islamniya: Ashra-e-Mubashira (1<sup>st</sup> Edition 1380), Pg. 102*

**[9]** *Fareedoon Islamniya: Ashra-e-Mubashira (1<sup>st</sup> Edition 1380), Pg. 102*

“This great sacred man instead of becoming proud and arrogant because of his battles – one of which was Jerusalem – became humble.” **[1]**

## **2 - Support to Tameem[2]**

Historical documents show that:

“In this period the Caliph made Tameem equal to the people of Badr and elevated him to the rows of great men of Islam. He was allotted a monthly salary of five thousand Dirhams.” **[3]**

Yes, this Caliph is reputed for piety and God-fearing nature.

“Umar had great reverence and respect with regard to Tameem. He used to attribute him as the best among the people of Medina.” **[4]**

While:

“About Tameem, it is said that he bought a dress for himself for one thousand Dirhams to wear it on the night of Power. **[5]** This amount was sufficient to buy two hundred sheep. By this amount, he could have fed hundreds of hungry men.” **[6]**

## **3 - Support to Zaid bin Thabit[7]**

Historical documents show that:

“Umar had a special affection towards Zaid bin Thabit. Abu Bakr during his reign asked Umar to appoint Zaid (who was a youth then) in Finance Department. When Umar became Caliph, Zaid came to him with money he had from the Treasury but Umar told him to keep it for himself.” **[8]**

---

**[1]** *Sayyid Abdur Raheem Khateeb: Shaykhain (6<sup>th</sup> Edition 1382), Pg. 417*

**[2]** *[Tameem bin Aws bin Kharija was a Christian monk who had converted to Islam in 9<sup>th</sup> year of Hijra, that is a year before the passing away of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.)]*

**[3]** Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Askari: *Naqsh-e-Aaimma Dar Ahya-e-Deen (Role of Imams in the Revival of Religion, Vol. 6, Pg. 88; quoting from: Futuh al-Buldan, Pg. 556*

**[4]** *Ibid. Vol. 6, Pg. 87; quoting from: Al-Isabah, Vol. 3, Pg. 473; Seer Alaamun Nubla, Vol. 2, Pg. 446*

**[5]** *Quoted from: Seer Alaamun Nubla, Vol. 2, Pg. 445*

**[6]** *Ustad Ali Koorani: Tadween-e-Quran, Pg. 186*

**[7]** *[A young Jew who had recently converted to Islam]*

**[8]** *Rasool Ja'faryan: Tarikh Khulafa, Pg. 76; quoting from: Tarikh Madinatul Munawwara, Vol. 3, Pgs. 854-855; Al-Isabah, Vol. 1, Pg. 85*

#### **4 - Support to Qunfudh**

This happened in one of the years when Umar was checking the financial status of his personnel. Qunfudh was having twenty thousand dirhams of the treasury. Umar did not check the account and gave the money for his personal use even though that year he had confiscated half the property of all his officers.**[1]**

## Properties of Staff Members

“Abdur Rahman bin Auf went to see Abu Bakr who was seriously sick. Abu Bakr spoke to him. One of his statements was:

Whoever among you I appointed as officer collected the revenue for himself.”[2]

“Umar bin Khattab [also] time to time used to call his officers to Medina. His officers had openly hoarded wealth from public funds. Umar checked their financial position and interrogated them. He used to take half of their money for public funds and the other half he left for themselves.[3] He neither changed their position nor transferred them.[4]

Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.) did not like this policy. He told Umar: If you think they are wrongdoers, why you take half of their wealth obtained by them illegitimately and return the other half? Why you keep them in their posts?

One day one of the interrogated officers asked the Caliph: If this money is God’s why don’t you take all of it? If it is mine why you take half of it?[5]”[6]

More interesting is that:

### A)

Persons like Abu Huraira, governor of Bahrain was accused of misappropriation of public funds and the Caliph was notified of this accordingly.[7]

---

[1] Balazari: *Futuh al-Buldan*, Pgs. 90, 226 & 392

[2] *Mustafa Iskandari: Baazkhwani Andisha-e-Taqreeb*, Pg. 247; quoting from *Tarikh Yaqoobi*, Vol. 2, Pg. 137

[3] [This shows misappropriation, and the action of Caliph proves that he did not consider his officers trustworthy]

[4] Quoted from: *Al-Iqdul Fareed*, Vol. 1, Pg. 46

[5] Quoted from: *Al-Iqdul Fareed*, Vol. 1, Pg. 46

[6] *Yusuf Gholami: Pas az Ghuroob (After Sunset)*, Pg. 285

[7] *Najah Ata at-Tai: Nazaryaat al-Khaleefatain*, Vol. 2, Pg. 205; quoting from: *Sharh*

### B)

“The Caliph confiscated the property of Abu Moosa Ashari,[1] governor of Basrah, but he was not dismissed from his job.”[2]

In other words, one whose property is confiscated because he misappropriated public funds is allowed to continue in his job!

There are further documents that show:

“A man named Zabbat bin Mohsin Anzai quarreled with Abu Moosa Ashari for spoils of war. Abu Moosa sent him to Umar. Umar, without asking him for the reason of his quarrel with Abu Musa, punished him. Zabbat was enraged and wanted to leave the place. At that time, Umar asked him the reason of the quarrel.

He replied: Abu Moosa has seventy Iranian slaves and a maid by name Aqeela. He said that Abu Moosa lives in such and such way. Then the man counted to Umar the spoils Abu Moosa had taken for himself.**[3]**In spite of this information about Abu Moosa, the Caliph did not dismiss him. The only thing Umar did was that he purchased Aqeela from Abu Moosa for himself!”**[4]**

Keeping in mind his partiality with freed slave like Muawiyah, Zaid bin Thabit and Tameen you can yourself judge the following claim about him:

“Umar was so astute and shrewd that he sensed the slightest change in the life of his personnel while they were in the hurricane of victories and spoils of war. He had a watch over all of them. He interrogated them without exemption to check their honesty and trustworthiness towards government and Muslims.”**[5]**

“Umar throughout the years of his Caliphate paid due care and attention to the work of his personnel and proceedings of his governors.”**[6]**

---

*Nahjul Balagha, Ibne Abil Hadeed, Vol. 3, Pg. 113*

**[1]** *[Abdullah bin Qais, also called as Abu Musa; Abdullah bin Umar was his son-in-law]*

**[2]** *Najah Ata at-Tai: Nazaryaat al-Khaleefatayn, Vol. 2, Pg. 222; quoting from: Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Vol. 12, Pg. 43*

**[3]** *Quoted from: Al-Futuh, Vol. 2, Pgs. 288-289*

**[4]** *Mustafa Iskandari: Baazkhwani Andisha-e-Taqreeb, Pg. 248*

**[5]** *Abdul Qadir Dahqaan Siraawaani: Article quoted in Nida-e-Islam Magazine, Issue No. 11, Autumn 81, Pg. 6*

**[6]** *Fareedoon Islamniya: Ashra-e-Mubashira (1<sup>st</sup> Edition 1380), Pg. 102*



## **Selection of officers**

The Second Caliph strongly believed that competency and astuteness in carrying out responsibility of government and military affairs was more important than faith and justice of his men.

## Selection of Mughaira bin Shoba

Ibn Abde Rabb writes in the beginning of his book *Iqdul Fareed* under the topic of 'Discretion of the ruler for those competent for the job':**[1]**

"When the Caliph decided to appoint a new governor for Kufa in place of Ammar Yasir**[2]** he was confused because if he sent a man of probity he would be regarded as weak**[3]** and if he sent a man of ability, he would be considered a tyrant. At this juncture, Mughaira interfered and put the suggestion:

A man of probity if considered weak the weakness will be his own - not yours. But his inability is counted on you because it will have an immediate bearing on you. On the other hand a strong man will be to your advantage while the sins will be his alone!

The Caliph said: You are right! That man is yourself, because at the same time you are a tyrant also. This was the ground for his appointment and he was sent to Kufa.**[4]"[1]**

---

**[1]** *Najah Ata at-Tai: Nazaryaat al-Khaleefatain, Vol. 2, Pg. 199*

**[2]** *[In the original text it is mentioned that this happened at the time of dismissal of Saad bin Abi Waqqas and appointment of Mughaira in his place, while the fact is that Mughaira was not immediately appointed after Saad, in between Ammar Yasir occupied the post of governorship of Kufa for a brief period. "After Saad bin Abi Waqqas for a short period Abdullah bin Utban and then Ammar bin Yasir became the governor of Kufa. Since the people of Kufa found him lenient they asked Umar to appoint someone else and he sent Mughaira bin Shoba to Kufa." (Yusuf Gholami:Pas az Ghuroob, Pg. 283)]*

**[3]** *[Umar is said to have expressed his view in this sentence: "They weakened him - their pious governor! The pronoun used by him refers to Ammar Yasir and not Saad bin Abi Waqqas. As such, the man who was considered able one and at the same time a tyrant and profligate was Saad bin Abi Waqqas. It should be remarked here because the name of Salman Farsi too is referred to. The historical document shows that Umar appointed Salman Farsi governor of Madayn. The motive of Umar was that Salman would commit some or other wrong. This would provide Umar with an excuse to destroy Salman*

*and discard him from society.*

*According to this, one can conclude that such a plot could have been there for Ammar to enmesh him. So, quite possibly Ammar must have been the victim of such intrigues.]*

**[4]** *Quoted from: Al-Istiab, Vol. 3, Pg. 472 & Ibid. Vol. 2, Pg. 204; quoting from Al-Iqdul*

In this way the Caliph preferred a profane man who had committed great many sins and crimes in Basrah when he was the governor there, but he (Mughaira) was never punished or dismissed. Now he was appointed governor of Kufa.

Historical annals say that Abu Bakr too had the same policy.

## **Selection of Khalid bin Waleed**

Abu Bakr acted in the same way with Khalid bin Waleed and in spite of the wicked crimes Khalid perpetrated he made him commander of Syrian army.**[2]** In the meantime, Abu Bakr left a will**[3]** in which he had enjoined to send Khalid with governorship to Iraq as soon as he returns from Syria.**[4]**

## Selection of Amr bin Aas

Similarly Abu Bakr surrendered Palestine and its affairs to Amr bin Aas. When Umar became Caliph, he transferred him to Egypt as a governor while he (Umar) himself had written a letter to Amr bin Aas addressing him as disobedient, son of disobedient (Al-Aasi ibnal Aasi).**[5]**

More interesting is the fact that Sunni scholars have themselves written that Umar bin Khattab said:

“One who appoints a transgressor to a job knowing that he is such, is like him only.”**[6]**

Anyway, in spite of all these historical records still they claim:

“Umar bin Khattab himself was epitome of justice. Therefore he wanted his district collectors and provincial governors to be like him - men of justice in all respects.”**[7]**

---

*Fareed, Vol. 1, Pg. 35*

**[1]** *Najah Ata at-Tai: Nazaryaat al-Khaleefatain, Vol. 2, Pg. 200*

**[2]** *Refer: Ibid. Vol. 2, Pg. 189; quoting from: Tarikh Yaqoobi, Vol. 2, Pg. 138; Tarikh Tabari, Vol. 2, Pg. 617*

**[3]** *Refer: Ibid. Vol. 2, Pg. 189; quoting from: Tarikh Tabari, Vol. 2, Pg. 603*

**[4]** *[Regarding the attitude of Mughaira and Khalid we will be giving more sources and documents in the following pages.]*

**[5]** *Ibid. Vol. 2, Pg. 200; quoting from: Abqariya Umar, Pg. 28*

**[6]** *Ibid. Vol. 2, Pg. 200; quoting from: Tarikh Umar bin Khattab, Pg. 56*

**[7]** *Sayyid Abdur Raheem Khateeb: Shaykhain (6<sup>th</sup> Edition 1382), Pg. 204*

## Piety without a Holy War

It is commonly known that the Prophet used to take the responsibility of the command of the army in important and key battles. In battles like Badr, Uhad, Khandaq, Khaiber, Conquest of Mecca, Hunain and Tabuk the Prophet himself was present. On the other hand historical annals show that neither Abu Bakr nor Umar were present in any of the battles or invasions for expanding Islamic territories though these battles took place during their Caliphate. Besides, these battles were called 'Holy War' that is war in the way of God. Neither Abu Bakr nor Umar took the command of the army nor directed military movements.

“Historians have unanimously narrated that Abu Bakr only once left Medina to wage a war. After Usamah returned from Mutah, he moved towards Zilqissa. There he prepared a well-equipped army. He gave the command of this army to Khalid bin Waleed while command of Ansaar group was responsibility of Thabit bin Qais. Earlier it was under command of Khalid. He issued orders to them to destroy Tolaiha and those who were from tribes of Asad and Fuzara and had gathered around Tolaiha under his command. So they had to move towards Buzakha. There are some historians who have mentioned the surprise attack launched by Bani Fuzara and that one man from them was killed. This happened in Zilqissa.”[1]

“Balazari and Muqaddasi have also mentioned the story of Zilqissa and the event of the attack of Bani Fuzara.

Muqaddasi after narrating Abu Bakr’s journey to Zilqissa adds:

Then Khalid advanced towards the enemy with his army. Kharija bin Hisn saw Muslims were in a limited number so he gathered courage and attacked them with a few mounted warriors. As a result, Muslims fled and Abu Bakr too fled with them. His age put him out of breath which failed his legs so he took refuge by climbing up the nearest tree concealing himself in the foliage to escape the enemy...”[2]

“It is interesting how they fabricate narrations[3] and create stories to justify the Caliph’s absence in the field and the necessity for his presence in the capital (Medina).

---

**[1]** Allamah Askari: *Abdullah Ibne Saba Wa Deegar Af-saane (Abdullah Bin Saba and other legends)*, Vol. 2, Pg. 43

**[2]** *Ibid.* Vol. 2, Pg. 42

**[3]** For example: Refer: *Tarikh Khaleefatain bin Khayyat*, Pg. 51 (Darul Kutub al-Ilmiya, Beirut)

They in the same way have forged narrations attributed to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) in which Ali (a.s.) restrained Abu Bakr and Umar not to personally take part in battles for the safety of their lives.” **[1]**

While Amirul Momineen (a.s.) although having devoted and loyal warriors around him like Malik Ashtar etc. himself commanded the Islamic forces in three battles of Jamal, Siffeen and Nahrawan and took an active part in them.

## Pleasant Food

Let us see what food the Caliph used to eat and in this respect, what claims have been launched.

“He (the Caliph) was so frugal in food that no one liked to eat even one morsel of his food.”!**[2]**

“Sometimes he (the Caliph) remained hungry for long that his belly used to impart sounds as an empty vessel does.”**[3]**

But what historical documents say is that:

A) “A man told Umar: You have put on weight.

Umar replied: Why should I not when I have women around me who have no pursuit except to fill my stomach?...”**[4]**

More interesting is that the Caliph himself chastised those who grew fat.

“The Caliph saw a man, who because of obesity walked huffing and puffing.”**[5]**

He asked: What’s wrong with you?

The man replied: This is a blessing from God.

Umar said: No, this is a punishment from God. He is punishing you in this way.”**[6]**

B) The narrator says: “I was in Umar’s house at dinner time. He (Umar) was eating bread with meat...”**[7]**

---

**[1]** Extract from: *Najah Ata at-Tai: Nazaryaat al-Khaleefatain, Vol. 1, Pgs. 313-314*

**[2]** *Fareedoon Islamniya: Ashra-e-Mubashira (1<sup>st</sup> Edition 1380), Pg. 101*

**[3]** *Ibid. Ashra-e-Mubashira (1<sup>st</sup> Edition 1380), Pg. 102*

**[4]** *Najah Ata at-Tai: Nazaryaat al-Khaleefatain, Vol. 2, Pg. 8; quoting from: Shaykhaan Balazari, Pg. 237*

**[5]** [Around 3 Kgs.]

**[6]** *Ibne Abil Hadeed: Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Vol. 12, Pg. 165*

**[7]** *Najah Ata at-Tai: Nazaryaat al-Khaleefatain, Vol. 1, Pg. 44; quoting from: Tabaqat, Vol. 3, Pg. 318*

C) “Ibn Abbas says that he visited Umar during his Caliphate. A vessel full of dates was brought that he may taste them. It contained a Saa-a**[1]** of dates.

He invited me to join and I only took one piece but he ate up all the dates emptying the vessel, then drank water from a

flask kept near him. After that he put his head on a pillow, stretched his legs and relaxed..."[2]

D) Abdullah bin Umar narrates: "I saw my father that his mouth was watering. I asked him how he was feeling?

He said: I very much want to eat red shrimp[3]."[4]

In the end, we leave to you to judge the truth of claims such as:

"Our lord Umar was a model and example to Muslims for his simple living, not getting entrapped in worldly pleasures and his humble and submissive nature."![5]

## Rivalry to piety of Amirul Momineen (a.s.)

Truly inspite of the fact that Amirul Momineen (a.s.) was at the pinnacle of piety and at the highest degree of probity, how can others gain a reputation among people as being models of piety just by pretending to be simple and pious? Thus even in criticism of the aristocratic attitude of the Second Caliph it is said:

“Umar inspite of his piety was the first to lay the foundation of Arab aristocracy[6].”[7]

Reply to this claim should be searched in the spirituality of people who witnessed the piety of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) during the period of his rule.

“People want a leader who should not prefer his own family to the

---

[1] [Around 3 Kgs.]

[2] *Ibne Abil Hadeed: Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Vol. 12, Pg. 20*

[3] [A delicious Arabian dish]

[4] *Ahmad al-Bakri: Min Hayatul Khaleefa, Pg. 76; quoting from: Tabaqat, Vol. 3, Pgs. 229-230*

[5] *Abdul Qadir Dahqaan Siraawaani: Article quoted in Nida-e-Islam Magazine, Issue No. 11, Autumn 81, Pg. 5*

[6] [Rule of nobles]

[7] *Muhammad Hasan Mashayakh: Article quoted in Nahjul Balagha Magazine, Issue Nos. 2-3, Summer 80 - Spring 81, Pgs. 70-71*

people. He should live like them with them. He should try for their well-being - not the well-being of his own circle. And Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.) was such.

People were well aware of virtues and other tributes of Ali and also knew that he was not like Umar. To Ali there was no difference between an Arab and non-Arab, he did not overlook least disobedience to God, never cancelled the smallest penalty, never feared scolding anyone and except for divine standards and distinctions did not care for anything. It was all this that the people could not bear...”[1]

Caliphs had to maintain the show of simple living and poverty because days of Prophet were still fresh in memories of people. The Prophet had lived such and people had seen it.

Therefore it became binding for Abu Bakr and Umar, but both pursued the practice of ignorant days behind this show of piety and poverty. They were partial to Arabs in relation to others. They gave preference to Quraish over the people. They satisfied their inner inclination[2] such as pride and self-lust. Of course their victories in expanding Islamic territories also served a shield to them. It silenced the people to a great extent. In the meantime, they preceded little by little in bringing a gradual change in the style of government. They distanced from the type of government the Prophet had. At the same time they pleased the people so that even to this day of ours they are pleased with them. Ali did not like any trickery and hypocrisy.

For this the piety of Caliphs was propagated to shadow the piety of Imam Ali (a.s.). Today they claim:

“The pious life of Ali was a shadow of the Prophet’s life and a ray of light of Caliphate Abu Bakr and Umar.” [3]

“Ali was like Umar in his piety.” [4]

---

[1] Yusuf Gholami: *Pas az Ghuroob (After Sunset)*, Pg. 174; quoting from *Sharh Nahjul Balagha*, Vol. 4, Pg. 78

[2] Like in establishment of Taraviah Prayer or with attention to the recitation of Quran.

Abu Moosa Ashari says: “The Caliph appointed me as the governor of Basra and instructed me only to make the recitation of Quran popular among the people.” (Ibne Kathir: *Al-Bidaya wan Nihaya*, Vol. 8, Pg. 107)

[3] Abdul Qadir Dahqaan Siraawaani: Article quoted in *Nida-e-Islam Magazine*, Issue No. 2, Summer 79, Pg. 33

[4] Fawad Farooqi: *Beest-o-panj Saal Sukoot-e-Ali* (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition 1379), Pg. 139

**Part 4**  
**Scrutiny of Social Justice**

## Help to the Deprived

History shows that the Caliph had no information about the poor and needy ones of the seat of his government. Here are a few proofs:

“When Umar returned from Syria to Medina, he mingled with the public to become aware of their condition.

He passed by a woollen tent in which lived an old woman. Umar went to her.

The woman asked: O man, what does Umar do when he returned from Syria?

Umar said: He has returned from Syria and has now reached Medina.

The woman: May Allah not give him a good reward from my side.

Umar asked: Woe on you. Why?

The woman said: Because I swear by God, since he has become a Caliph he has not given me a Dirham or Dinar as stipend.

Umar: Woe on you. How can Umar know about your condition while you are here?

The woman replied: Glory be to God! I didn't know that one who governs the people doesn't know what's going on in the East and the West of his government?!... ”**[1]**

The point worth noting is that they have added a good quality for him in continuation of this story, which in fact contradicts it.

“In the nights Umar used to go out from his house and roam the skirts of the city to know the people and their circumstances, alone without a bodyguard.”**[2]**

“He was an Emperor but with people's pain at heart. At night he was in the streets to help the weak and support widows.”**[3]**

---

**[1]** Ahmad al-Bakri: *Min Hayatul Khaleefa*, Pgs. 379-380; quoting from: *Al-Futuhaat al-Islamiya*, Vol. 2, Pg. 407

**[2]** Abdul Qadir Dahqaan Siraawaani: Article quoted in *Nida-e-Islam Magazine*, Issue No. 11, Autumn 81, Pg. 7

**[3]** Abdur Raheem Mahmoodi: *Maqaam-e-Sahaaba wa Zindagi-e-Khulafa-e-Raashideen*

On the whole, it can be said:

Scrutiny into praises lavished on Umar shows that there are obvious contradictions in them.

For instance with regard to public welfare they remark:

“During Umar’s Caliphate, Muslims had become rich. They had too much money that they did not know how to spend it. There was not a single hungry man in the whole Arab peninsula.”**[1]**

“In the period of Umar there was not one poor man to be found in the Arab state.”**[2]**

On the other hand some praise Umar for his affection to oppressed and needy people. In this respect, they have shown the power of their pens to gain the feelings of their readers. They have accepted existence of poverty in days of Umar as a fact and on the basis of that say:

“Caliph of Islamic government, Umar bin Khattab, on a very cold night saw a fire at a distance and along with his companions went towards it to see a mother sitting with her three small children by the fireside. One of the children was crying and saying: Mother, see my tears and have mercy on me. The other was saying: Mother! I’ll die of hunger. The third said: Mother! Can I possibly have some food before I die? Umar sat near the fire and said to the mother: To whom do you complain? The mother said: By God! By God! To Umar!

Umar asked: Who has informed Umar about you and your condition? She said: He is our guardian (wali) and responsible**[3]** and he is ignorant about us!

When Umar heard this, he immediately hurried to the Treasury and brought back a bag of flour, a vessel of ghee (oil) and a vessel of honey. He prepared the food and then he himself fed the children...”!

**[4]**

---

*Dar yek Nigaah (Status of Companions and life of Rightly Guided Caliphs in a Glance), Pg. 21*

**[1]** *Fawad Farooqi: Beest-o-panj Saal Sukoot-e-Ali (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition 1379), Pg. 149*

**[2]** *Ibid. Beest-o-panj Saal Sukoot-e-Ali (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition 1379), Pg. 154*

**[3]** *[It is interesting that here they have translated Wali as leader and chief but in the instance of Ghadeer with regard to*

*Ali (a.s.) they say that Wali means friend.]*

**[4]** *Abdur Raheem Mahmoodi: Maqaam-e-Sahaaba wa Zindagi-e-Khulafa-e-Raashideen Dar yek Nigaah (Status of Companions and life of Rightly Guided Caliphs in a Glance), Pgs. 23-24*

Here we should ask:

If such a story is indeed true what is the meaning of the claim that there did not exist a single poor needy one? If this claim is true and there was not a single person hungry in all the Arabian Peninsula what is the aim of this story?

We leave the judgment on the part of the reader. Such contradictions are aplenty in all stories invented by them.

For instance, we give here one more example:

“Umar had no leisure to wash his clothes.”!**[1]**

On the other hand they say:

“He was careless about the fashion or elegance of dress but he was very much particular about neatness and cleanliness of clothes.”!**[2]**

These contrasts resulted due to concept of piety with the different writers. Some saw goodness in dirty clothes while some in neat. So each batch of writers writes according to its mind not wanting to deprive Umar of this quality. They want to elevate him in the sight of the readers causing this discrepancy.

In this way they painted the face of their beloved Caliph so that as much as possible it appears attractive to all.

## Love for the People

This claim is surprising:

“Umar is always mentioned as a friend of humanity. He was much concerned about mankind.”!**[3]**

This claim is made at a time when his affections to the people are sketched in a different color.

“Umar bin Khattab said: I hate so and so.

It was communicated to that man concerned and he asked what the reason was for his hatred?

---

**[1]** Ali Tantawi (Translated by Abu Bakr Hasanzadeh): *Dastan-e-Zindagani-e-Umar*, (1<sup>st</sup> & 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition 1380), Pg. 90

**[2]** Muhammad Kamil Hasan al-Hami (translated by Ghulam Haider Farooqi): *Zindagi Naame Umar bin Khattab* (1<sup>st</sup> Edition 1382), Pg. 6

**[3]** Ali Tantawi (Translated by Abu Bakr Hasanzadeh): *Dastan-e-Zindagani-e-Umar*, (1<sup>st</sup> & 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition 1380), Pg. 80

Many people had come to the house of Umar. Little by little, the number of visitors formed a gathering. That man too arrived. He asked Umar: Have I created division in Islam?

Umar said: No.

The man: Have I perpetrated a crime?

Umar: No.

The man: Have I introduced something new in Islam?

Umar: No.

The man: Then why do you hate me? God has said:

Those who torture believers, men or women, without a reason, they carry sin and a blame openly. (Quran: Chapter Parties, V. 58).

So you have tortured and vexed me. May God not forgive you.

The Caliph heard this and admitted that the later was right...”**[1]**

This document shows that Umar hated people without any reason; while they claim:

“Umar... loved his people. Umar was by nature a man of justice and love...”!**[2]**

## Social Classes

As far as social justice is concerned during his Caliphate they claim as follows:

“It is a fact that Umar was an expression of Islamic behavior. He destroyed all individual and national distinctions.”! **[3]**

On the other hand Caliphs after Saqifah

“Established a Quraishi kingdom, especially in the days of Umar accommodating the tribes in newly created cities of Kufa and Basrah but keeping the Quraish in Medina itself. He distributed lands in Medina among them and created social classes and distinctions so that wealth remained with Quraish. The Quraish tribe now owned slaves, gardens,

---

**[1]** Ahmad al-Bakri: *Min Hayatul Khaleefa*, Pg. 347; quoting from: *Hayatus Sahaba*, Vol. 2, Pg. 419; *Kanzul Ummal*, Vol. 2, Pgs. 480, Tr. 4552

**[2]** Sayyid Abdur Raheem Khateeb: *Shaykhain* (6<sup>th</sup> Edition 1382), Pgs. 205 & 206

**[3]** Abdul Qadir Dahqaan Siraawaani: Article quoted in *Nida-e-Islam Magazine*, Issue No. 11, Autumn 81, Pg. 10

fertile fields and villas. The Quraish had the army under them because the commanders and officers were from Quraish. Likewise, the governors were also from Quraish. The city of Medina became a place of kings, princes and wealth. All facilities, amenities and wealth were now for Quraish.

The Quraish purchased slaves and used them as labor - a free labor. They expanded the town and settled around it. **[1]**

Umar's regime was a pure Arab regime. He restricted non-Arabs to live in Medina. **[2]** Medina was the capital of Islam.

Besides Arabs, no one was allowed to live in the capital. Umar had prohibited an Arab girl to be married with a non-Arab. Likewise, a non-Quraish Arab was not allowed to marry a girl from Quraish.

Accordingly Umar made the Islamic society into a society of classes and ranks. Whatever Umar ordered, the people considered a divine order and as religion itself. If an Arab married a non-Arab girl and if she gave birth in Arab territories the male child was entitled and liable to inherit. On the other hand if the birth took place in non-Arab territory; that is in a land

which does not belong to Arabs – the male child was deprived of heritage.

Umar's regime was an Arab and Quraishi regime. In military the top posts of captain, brigadier, colonel, general, commander and so forth were for Quraish. He never appointed an outsider from Quraish to any position in military.

However there was an exception. Among all the tribes of Quraish, he (Umar) did not give governorship of any province to Bani Hashim.**[3]**

In Islam, Public Treasury was called Baitul Maal. In days of Prophet, public funds were distributed among all Muslims equally without any distinction. Abu Bakr did the same during his two years' rule.

Umar did not like this method and said that particularly from the residents of Medina each individual should get in accordance to his social status. The salaries were set for annual distribution. He made classes and grades among the people themselves."**[4]**

---

**[1]** Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Askari: *Naqsh-e-Aaimma Dar Ahya-e-Deen (Role of Imams in the Revival of Religion)*, Vol. 14, Pgs. 95-96

**[2]** [Except Hurmuzan, Abu Lulu, Salman and Bilal.]

**[3]** Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Askari: *Saqifah (Study about the formation of government after the passing away of the Holy Prophet)*, Edited by Mahdi Dashti, Pgs. 124-125

**[4]** Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Askari: *Naqsh-e-Aaimma Dar Ahya-e-Deen (Role of Imams in the Revival of Religion)*, Vol. 16, Pg. 54

"During Umar's rule a court was formed. Courtiers came into existence. He based his rule on tribal foundations. He gave preference to his courtiers who were his companions. Among them too he framed distinctions and differences."**[1]**

"In financial distribution, he adopted this formula: A thousand Dirhams to participants of the battle of Badr, four thousand to those present in Uhad, three thousand to fighters of Khandaq. To the Prophet's widows he gave ten thousand Dirhams each. But Ayesha was an exception and was paid twelve thousand."**[2]**

"Umar introduced these classified grades. He gave to Muawiyah and his father Abu Sufyan a share equal to those who took

part in the battle of Badr. He gave a distinction to three women among ladies of Islam. He preferred these three to all other women of the society of those days. They were (1) Hafasa, his own daughter (2) Ayesha, Abu Bakr's daughter and (3) Umme Habeeba, Abu Sufiyan's daughter and Muawiyah's sister.[3]"[4]

"These preferences and distinctions were carried out at a time when for the whole year he did not pay any amount to Umme Salma - another widow of Prophet[5] because she had sided with Fatima, the Prophet's daughter, when he confiscated Fadak."[6]

"Well, what is the outcome of this division? It is quite obvious, the class of dignitaries, aristocrats or lords -were up and above the common people. This is the same division that existed in Mecca prior to Islam. Now it returned but this time under the banner of Islam. In other words he took the society backwards and destroyed all that Islam had labored hard for its goals and ends."[7]

"Thus Islamic society also became a society of classes like in Iran and Rome. There were various divisions - princes, clerks, military personnel, laborers, shopkeepers etc.

---

[1] *Rasool Ja'faryan: Seerah Rasool-e-Khuda, Pg. 164*

[2] *Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Askari: Naqsh-e-Aaimma Dar Ahya-e-Deen (Role of Imams in the Revival of Religion), Vol. 14, Pg. 160*

[3] *Quoted from: Tarikh Yaqoobi, Vol. 2, Pg. 153*

[4] *Najah Ata at-Tai: Nazaryaat al-Khaleefatain, Vol. 2, Pg. 47*

[5] *Quoted from: Dalail al-Imamah, Pg. 39*

[6] *Ibid. Vol. 2, Pg. 66*

[7] *Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Askari: Naqsh-e-Aaimma Dar Ahya-e-Deen (Role of Imams in the Revival of Religion), Vol. 16, Pg. 55*

When Iranians and Romans were embracing Islam they used to see Islam in the deeds of Muslims and in Caliphs' government. They concluded that Islamic society resembled theirs - that is a society of classes and divisions.

Immediately after the battles in early Islamic era, Umar issued orders to build towns like Basrah, Kufa and a city near Iskandaria. When these towns were built, he relocated Arab

tribes there but kept Quraish in Medina itself. He gave the lands in Medina to them.”[1]

“Umar fixed a tax under name of Zakat upon farmers, artisans and merchants. The revenue accrued from this was spent on scholars,[2] governors,[3] commanders[4] and other military personnel. In this regard he created offices and to run the offices he employed staff. Their salaries were paid from this revenue. The job of these officers was to keep a record of money collected in taxes and its expenditure.”[5]

In praise of this taxation and expenditure, they have said:

“By so doing he uprooted poverty from Islamic Ummah.”![6]

While on the whole it be concluded that:

“This policy of Umar was based on tribal discrimination that he divided the shares from public treasury. This is appreciated as his justice. He took pride to announce that he learnt[7] justice from Choesroe.[8] Here a question arises that why he learnt from Choesroe and not from the Prophet of Islam? Which would have been better for him. What did he see in Choesroe that enchanted him to compare himself with Choesroe!?”[9]

---

[1] *Ibid. Vol. 14, Pg. 76*

[2] *[It denotes the intellectuals, persons like Kaab al-Ahbaar! (Refer: Najah Ata at-Tai: Yahood Be-Suboot al-Islam)]*

[3] *[Persons like Mughaira and Amr Aas]*

[4] *[Persons like Muhammad bin Musailama who killed Saad bin Ubadah]*

[5] *Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Askari: Doo Maktab Dar Islam (Two Schools of Islam) Vol. 2 (Outlooks of two schools about sources of Islamic legislation) Pg. 559, Footnote no. 3*

[6] *Fareedoon Islamniya: Ashra-e-Mubashira (1<sup>st</sup> Edition 1380), Pg. 92*

[7] *Quoted from: Ahsan at-Taqaaseem, Pg. 18*

[8] *[The Arabs called all the Sasanid rulers as Choesroe]*

[9] *Allamah Ja'far Murtuza Amili: Tahlili Az Zindagi-e-Siyasi Imam Hasan Mujtaba (a.s.) (Translated by Muhammad Shahri), Pg. 103*

There are further historical evidences that show:

**A)**

“People were harassed and tortured for taxes. Troubling people started from the days of Umar.”[1]

**B)**

“Malik bin Anas says about Muslims who lived outside Medina that they were treated such at the orders issued by the rulers.[2]”[3]

**C)**

“Umar doubled the tax for Christians of Taghlib[4] which is a widely known fact and there is no need to write anything in this regard.”[5]

**D)**

“Umar tried very much to tax the man who had become a Muslim. While originally it was only applied to Jews and Christians, and Muslims were exempted.”[6]

Inspite of this they claim:

“In the days of Umar in Jerusalem, taxes were collected from non-Muslims for protection of their properties and them. Once it so happened that it became necessary to transfer the army from Jerusalem to some other front. Umar gathered all non-Muslims and announced to them that their protection had been the responsibility of government therefore taxes were collected from them. Now that the army is transferred from there the money taken from them in taxes will be returned to them.”[7]

**[1]** *Ibid. Pg. 184; quoting from: Al-Musannaf, Vol. 11, Pg. 245 onwards*

**[2]** *“Umar applied the custom of Iran and Rome to landed properties in Iraq.”*

*Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Askari: Nigahi be Sarguzahsht-e-Hadith, Pg. 26)]*

**[3]** *Allamah Ja’far Murtuza Amili: Tahlili Az Zindagi-e-Siyasi Imam Hasan Mujtaba (a.s.), Pg. 124; quoting from: Jame Bayan al-Ilm, Vol. 2, Pg. 194*

**[4]** *[In order to maintain the supremacy of the Arabs the Caliph used to collect from them a tax, that he didn’t refer to by the name of Jizyah as they would have considered it abhorring, but he collected from them a tax which was twice that of Zakat.]*

**[5]** *Ibid. Pg. 184; quoting from: Sunan Baihaqi, Vol. 4, Pg. 216; Al-Musannaf, Vol. 6, Pg. 50*

**[6]** *Ibid. Pg. 184; quoting from: Al-Musannaf, Vol. 6, Pg. 94*

**[7]** *Abdus Samad Hasan Zahi: Article quoted in Nida-e-Islam Magazine, Issue No. 7, (7000 copies), Autumn 80, Pg. 13*

## Policy of Racial Discrimination

“Umar was always insistent to prefer Arabs on other communities. In this respect, he exerted his efforts:

He was very much anxious and enthusiastic about this matter to establish the priority of the Arabs in the society. He wanted this to become a basic policy after his death. The next generation should follow this same track he was leaving behind.” **[1]**

Following territorial expansion **[2]** a large number of freed prisoners from neighboring countries **[3]** joined groups of Muslim Arabs, but their national status was never equal to that of Arabs. The Caliph (Umar) campaigned and never recognized their rights at the same level of that of Arab. He insisted on superiority of Quraish and Arab aristocrats.” **[4]**

The following document shows this policy:

“Umar saw a woman in a dress, which surprised him. He inquired about her. He was told that she was a slave of so and so.

---

**[1]** *Allamah Ja’far Murtuza Amili: Salman Farsi (Translated by Muhammad Shahri), Pg. 127*

**[2]** *[The system of taking war hostages as slaves was responsible for so many Arabs being made slaves in the period of Abu Bakr.*

Waging battles was the most important method of getting slaves.

It is mentioned in history that one-fifth prisoners of the town of Qaisariya during the time of Umar bin Khattab used to be 4000 slaves. (Ref: *Futuh al-Buldan*, Pg. 142)

In the same way it is said that the prisoners of Ahwaz, especially Shustar, were in such a large number that Umar bin Khattab ordered them to be returned. (Ref: *Futuh al-Buldan*, Pg. 382)

The distribution of slaves among the soldiers and the government was in such a way that one-fifth were given to the government and four-fifth were retained with the soldiers.

Therefore these war prisoners were lodged in houses built for this purpose during the time of the Second Caliph.

*(Ref: Tabaqat Ibne Saad, Vol. 3, Pg. 203 & 261.)]*

**[3]** *[Released hostages were called Mawali]*

**[4]** *Yusuf Gholami: Peshwai Farzand Abu Talib, Pg. 61*

Umar scourged her a few lashes and said: O vile and low woman!**[1]** You make up yourself like free ladies.”**[2]**

While it is claimed:

“...Selection which brought Umar to power was a successful and timely one. He was, in fact, a media God selected to round up through him powers that had taken human destiny in their hands and suppressed human liberty.”!**[3]**

Now let us see to what extent Umar spread justice for the people and how far he extended liberty for nations.

Is their claim really true when they say:

“Umar was a perfect example of truth, a model of justice and a symbol of good standard for one and all and gained historical repute.”!**[4]**

“He was severe and tough but one who spread justice and equity.”!**[5]**

Or the fact is that he was a racial bigot who advocated the supremacy of Arabs?

Among his famous statements, he usually used to issue are:

A) “Arab cannot be enslaved by anyone.”**[6]**

---

**[1]** *[Surprising is the claim that:*

*“He had a clean tongue and he did not like bad language.”!  
(Muhammad Kamil Ilhami (Translation by Ghulam Haider Farooqi): Zindagi Name Umar bin Khattab (1<sup>st</sup> Edition 1382), Pg. 24)*

*While historical documents show that: Abu Sufyan in dialogue with Umar bin Khattab in the presence of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) and Abbas told Umar: “Woe be on you Umar! You are a profane man.” (Najah Ata at-Tai: As Seeratun Nabaw-  
iyyah, Vol. 2, Pg. 130; quoting from Sirah Ibne Dahlan, Vol. 2, Pg. 58)]*

**[2]** *Najah Ata at-Tai: Nazaryaat al-Khaleefatain, Vol. 1, Pg.*

392; quoting from: *Abqariya Umar, Pg. 130*

**[3]** *Abdul Qadir Dahqaan Siraawaani: Article quoted in Nida-e-Islam Magazine, Issue No. 11, Autumn 81, Pg. 4*

**[4]** *Sayyid Abdur Raheem Khateeb: Shaykhain (6<sup>th</sup> Edition 1382), Pg. 197*

**[5]** *Abdul Qadir Dahqaan Siraawaani: Article quoted in Nida-e-Islam Magazine, Issue No. 11, Autumn 81, Pg. 6*

**[6]** *Allamah Ja'far Murtuza Amili: Salman Fars, Pg. 128; quoting from: Al-Amwaal, Pgs. 197-199; Al-Izaah, Pg. 249; Tarikh al-Umam wal Mulook, Vol. 2, Pg. 549; Sunan Baihaqi, Vol. 9, Pg. 74*

B) It is very awkward for Arabs to enslave among themselves; that is some to become slaves of some..."**[1]**

C) "He mentioned in his will that all Arabs are free from God's property..."**[2]**"**[3]**

D) "Whenever Umar sent his agents on some assignment he used to enjoin them: Not to beat Arabs as it will belittle them in the eyes of others. Do not detain them too long in the battlefields as it will make them to go astray and corrupt them. Don't act as their superiors as it will make them to feel deprived or disgruntled."**[4]**

"On the other hand he always tried in his policies to reduce the rights of non-Arabs. He persisted on this policy regardless of conditions and circumstances. He even went beyond this and suppressed their honor and prestige. To him the entity that was not an Arab carried neither meaning nor weight."**[5]**"**[6]**

"His policy brought them atrocities in various forms and shapes beside injustice in its thousand vogues, in addition to scorn, acrimony, vilification and hardship every morning and evening.

Umar founded such policies of racial discrimination. After Umar, the Bani Umayyah Caliphs followed it exactly."**[7]**

---

**[1]** *Ibid. Pg. 129; quoting from: Al-Kamil Fit Tarikh, Vol. 2, Pg. 382; Tarikh al-Umam wal Mulook, Vol. 2, Pg. 549*

**[2]** [*"Sending Arab tribes to war was responsible for promoting the practice of slavery among Arabs...*

*It is seen that prosperity of these tribes after conquests motivated them to pay religious penalties by freeing slaves...*

*But these changes and steps were not effective with all slaves...it can be said that these victories created among the Arabs a feeling of racial superiority...” (Jamal Jooda: Auzaa Ijtimai – Iqtisaadi Mawali Dar Sadr-e-Islam, Pgs. 88-90)]*

**[3]** Allamah Ja’far Murtuza Amili: *Salman Farsi*, Pg. 128; quoting from: *Al-Musannaf*, Vol. 8, Pgs. 380-381; Vol. 9, Pg. 168

**[4]** *Ibid.* Pg. 130; quoting from: *Al-Musannaf*, Vol. 11, Pg. 325; *Tarikh al-Umam wal Mulook*, Vol. 3, Pg. 273; *Mustadrak Hakim*, Vol. 4, Pg. 439; *Hayatus Sahaba*, Vol. 2, Pg. 82

**[5]** [Its most prominent example will be given in the matter of Jabla bin Aiham]

**[6]** *Ibid.* Pg. 127

**[7]** *Ibid.* Pg. 131

Here with support of relative historical documents we sketch the method Umar adopted to carry out his policy of racial superiority:

### **1 - Prohibition for non-Arabs to enter Medina**

*“Umar never allowed any non-Arab to enter Medina...” [1]*

### **2 - Retaliation of Arab through non-Arab prohibited**

*“Ubadah bin Samit asked a Nabatean [2] to take care of his horse or camel. He refused. Ubadah kicked him wounding his head. He complained to the Caliph (Umar). Umar wanted to punish Ubadah for his beating the Nabatean by lashes but Zaid bin Thabit told Umar: Do you want to scourge an Arab taking the side of your slave?*

*As a result, Umar did not scourge him but imposed a monetary penalty.” [3]*

*In spite of this established fact of racial preference and partiality in annals of history they still claim:*

*“Umar’s justice is the highest example of justice that history has shown so far. The guarantee and security for putting this justice into practice was strictness of Umar.” [4]*

*“To Umar all Muslims were equal when justice was in question.” [5]*

*When an Arab and a non-Arab citizen to him (Umar) were two different categories at two different levels as you just read in the foregone text how one can believe that:*

*“Whenever a difference or a dispute occurred between a government officer, regardless of his rank or position and an ordinary citizen, Umar used to take the side of the citizen. He used to take immediate steps in launching investigations. If he was convinced that the complainer was the victim in the case he dismissed or punished the officer whoever he might*

**[1]** *Ibid.* Pg. 131; quoting from: *Muruj az-Zahab*, Vol. 2, Pg. 320

**[2]** [Nubati or Nabatean were non-Arab people who had settled down in Iraq and southern Palestine and mixed with the local population of unspecified lineage.]

**[3]** *Ibid.* Pg. 132; quoting from: *Tahdhib Tarikh-e-Damishq*, Vol. 5, Pg. 446; *Tadkirah al-Huffaz*, Vol. 1, Pg. 31; *Sunan Baihaqi*, Vol. 8, Pg. 32; *Seer Alaamun Nubla*, Vol. 2, Pg. 440; *Kanzul Ummal*, Vol. 7, Pg. 303

**[4]** Fawad Farooqi: *Beest-o-panj Saal Sukoot-e-Ali* (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition 1379), Pg. 115

**[5]** Muhammad Kamil Hasan al-Hami (translated by Ghulam Haider Farooqi): *Zindagi Naame Umar bin Khattab* (1<sup>st</sup> Edition 1382), Pg. 3

have been.” **[1]**

### **3 - Prohibition to Speak in Language other than Arabic**

“Umar bin Khattab said: Do not give popularity to the language of Persians. **[2]**

It is narrated that Umar said that if anyone spoke in Persian he has committed a very impolite act. So whoever commits an impolite act has lost self-respect.” **[3]**

### **4 - Objection against Rulership of Nobles over Quraish**

“Abdur Rahman Ibn Abi Laili narrates: I was in the company of Umar on way to Mecca when Nafe bin Alqama came to welcome us.

Umar asked him as to whom he appointed in his place.

He replied: Abdur Rahman Ibn Abzi.

Umar became angry and told him: You chose one from Mawali and kept him in your place over Quraish and friends of Prophet of God?!” **[4]**

## **5 - Restriction for Non-Arabs to marry Arab ladies**

“Umar restricted marriage of Arab ladies with non-Arabs. He announced that he would surely not allow marriage of Arab ladies with those not equal to their status and class.[5]

He insisted that they should marry those who are equal to them.[6] This resulted in dissolution of several marriages performed earlier.”[7]

## **6 - Minimum possible allowance for non-Arabs from public treasury**

“It is a widely known fact that Umar gave preference to Arabs even in fixing financial monthly allowance. They received a lion’s share while

---

[1] Ali Tantawi (Translated by Abu Bakr Hasanzadeh): *Dastan-e-Zindagani-e-Umar*, (1<sup>st</sup> & 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition 1380), Pg. 82

[2] Allamah Ja’far Murtuza Amili: *Salman Farsi*, Pg. 133; quoting from: *Iqtiza as-Siraat al-Mustaqeem*, Pg. 162

[3] *Ibid.* Pg. 133; quoting from: *Rabi al-Abraar*, Vol. 1, Pg. 796; *Tarikh Jurjaan*, Pg. 486

[4] *Ibid.* Pg. 134; quoting from: *Hayatus Sahaba*, Vol. 3, Pg. 150; *Al-Musannaf*, Vol. 11, Pg. 439

[5] *Ibid.* Pg. 136; quoting from: *Al-Izaah*, Pgs. 280 & 286; *Muhaziraat al-Udba*, Vol. 3, Pg. 208

[6] *Ibid.* Pg. 136; quoting from: *Al-Uthmaniya*, Pg. 211

[7] *Ibid.* Pg. 136; quoting from: *Al-Izaah*, Pg. 286

non-Arabs got the minimum possible sum from public funds.[1]

He made records of people on the basis of origin. Only when Arabs had been recorded[2] did he record the names of Ajam (non-Arabs) thus giving them a second grade while Arabs remained at the top.

His policy of giving preference to Quraish over all freed ones, even Arabs, was carried out for the widows of the Prophet.

Here we suffice to mention one case:

Umar gave six thousand Dirhams to Juwairia[3] while to Ayesha he sanctioned twelve thousand.

Umar said that he would never treat one who was a slave equal to the daughter of Abu Bakr.”[4]

## **7 - Distinction between an Arab living in a town and an Arab living in deserts**

“Umar always tried to choose his staff from Arabs living in towns. He avoided the nomads.

When Umar was told that Utbah[5] had appointed Majasheh bin Masood in his place in Basrah, he said it was better that Mughaira be the governor of Basrah. Majasheh was from Wabar[6] and Mughaira[7] was from Madr. Wabar means outside the town - a nomad. Madr means a town-dweller.[8]”[9]

**[1]** *Ibid. Pg. 135; quoting from: Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Ibne Abil Hadeed, Vol. 8, Pg. 111*

**[2]** *Ibid. Pg. 135; quoting from: Iqtiza as-Siraat al-Mustaqeem, Pg. 159*

**[3]** *[She was the wife of the Prophet and the daughter of Harith, the chief of Bani Mustaliq tribe. She was taken as a prisoner by Muslims along with the people of her clan. The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) purchased and emancipated her and then he married her; when this news reached Harith, he came to Medina and accepted Islam and after that most people of his tribe also accepted Islam (Refer: Sayyid Murtuza As-kari: Naqsh-e-Ayesha Dar Tarikh-e-Islam, Vol. 1, Pgs. 58-59)]*

**[4]** *Allamah Ja’far Murtuza Amili: Salman Farsi, Pg. 135; quoting from: Ansaab al-Ashraaf, Sirah Payambar, Pg. 442; Tarikh al-Umam wal Mulook, Vol. 2, Pg. 614*

**[5]** *[Utbah bin Ghazawaan was the founder of Basrah]*

**[6]** *[That is desert dweller; Bedouins etc.]*

**[7]** *[Mughaira was a Thaqafi and a native of Taif]*

**[8]** *[That is city dwellers]*

**[9]** *Rasool Ja’faryan: Tarikh Khulafa, Pg. 79; quoting from: Mojam al-Buldan, Vol. 1,*

These seven evidences and cases we mentioned have historical background. These events well establish how he treated Arabs and non-Arabs reflecting his injustice due to his partiality. It is odd that in spite of his record they still claim that he said in his last days:

“Beware that in Islam all individuals are equal. Islam does not agree to any superiority among individuals. Wealth, birth, race, position or any other distinction does not stand in Islam any reason for special treatment or preference.” **[1]**

“Umar is regarded among great national leaders. He is looked upon as a supporter of liberty, democracy, justice and equality. He is indeed the greatest of the great.”**[2]**

“He succeeded because his great mind enabled him to administer the wide Islamic world of those days alone and by his own style. He did it so justly that there is no parallel to it in history.”**[3]**

“Hazrat Umar brought a political revolution in the Islamic world which brought with it prosperity to mankind. He brought into light the old doctrines on the basis of which tyrant rulers were oppressing people.”**[4]**

“Whoever looks into the life of Umar and ponders a little will understand that it was God, the Almighty’s will that he should take the seat of Caliph of the last Prophet of God to disseminate social justice in accordance with divine rules and Islamic teachings. It was His will that people of Arabian Peninsula and abroad should enjoy equally the bounty of justice.”!**[5]**

“Islam was spread far and wide in the period of Umar. He invented laws during his administration which were unknown before.”!**[6]**

---

Pg. 433

**[1]** *Fawad Farooqi: Beest-o-panj Saal Sukoot-e-Ali (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition 1379), Pg. 164*

**[2]** *Ali Tantawi (Translated by Abu Bakr Hasanzadeh): Dastan-e-Zindagani-e-Umar, (1<sup>st</sup> & 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition 1380), Pg. 79*

**[3]** *Ibid. Dastan-e-Zindagani-e-Umar, (1<sup>st</sup> & 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition 1380), Pg. 46*

**[4]** *Sayyid Abdur Raheem Khateeb: Shaykhain (6<sup>th</sup> Edition 1382), Pg. 422*

**[5]** *Ibid. Shaykhain (6<sup>th</sup> Edition 1382), Pg. 421*

**[6]** *Ahmad Naseeb (translated by Saaduddin Shaykh Ahmadi): Mohabbat-e-Payambar Dar Qalb-e-Yaaranash (1<sup>st</sup> Edition 1380), Pg. 84*

Here it should be asked: With policy of racial discrimination even among the Arabs themselves how could it be possible that he dispensed justice and equality to non-Arabs and new converts to Islam? That it should be claimed that:

“During the rule of Umar... without any break, communities enjoyed ease and well-being which was the beginning of Muslim kingdoms.”!**[1]**



## **Racial discrimination Resulted in Advantage to Arabs**

“As a result of this policy Arabs [particularly Quraish] laid hands on every benefit and climbed the social ladder to the top. They got preference and priority in everything and in today’s terms they became first citizens. They grasped every source wherefrom flowed some or other good; anything that yielded profit was theirs. Such was the situation in all fields – business, merchandise, political, economical, etc.

These Arabs in their recent past had never even dreamed to be rulers and had lived a life, which was a source of their own vilification. It was a constant pain to them that they were alive because life was a package of misfortunes to them. The days passed in agony to them.

People who looked on their neighboring nations from a lower station and in a needy position felt their own littleness and non-entity too deeply. They compared with the dazzling glare of the greatness of Choesroe – the Emperor of Iran and the imperious glory of Caesar and saw their own backwardness magnified to them. The difference that appeared to them further impressed them.

It never occurred to their imagination that a day would come to their relief from this ugly impecuniosity. They even in their dreams never had imagined that they would be victors over Choesroe. A day they will rule the lands outlandish to them. One day they will be the masters of widespread territories.

It is normal that they will behave with pride and vainglory. It was their background that had maddened them in self-centeredness, stubbornness and arrogance. They believed that all were indebted to them. Now they should pay back what was withheld from them. Therefore they committed tyrannies on nations subordinate to them. To belittle the men of yesterday’s greatness was a pleasure to them.

---

**[1]** *Abdul Qadir Dahqaan Siraawaani: Article quoted in Nida-e-Islam Magazine, Issue No. 11, Autumn 81, Pg. 6*

What they did when they captured their properties, farms, cultivated lands and so forth; it is natural and expected from

anyone long deprived. They plunged headlong into sins and crimes. They stooped to low pleasures of life. Tyranny became their sport.

This made them like a disobedient ghost. Whoever stood to challenge it, was crushed. It had gone so wild that it would show no mercy or least leniency in dispatching its opponents to perdition.

It is exactly the same thing that is explained by us as the cause of calamities on His Eminence, Ali (a.s.), his family and his Shias throughout history.”**[1]**

## Cause of Rulers' Greatness in view of Arabs

### A)

"Among the factors that brought fame to some and a few were forgotten and retired into oblivion was the battles that had fallen to their lot in the period of three Caliphs. These battles brought them revenue. The revenue resulted in a common and a general welfare of the people. They satisfied their desires. They catered to their needs. They satisfied their greed's. So they at a national level as well as in groups benefited well from the changed conditions." [2]

"The world smiled to them as a result of the battles. Their dreams of wealth were translated into reality and now they had what once was their ambition. They carried propaganda on a wide scale and a particular group benefited from this propaganda. Racial discrimination was an advantage to Arabs. It was natural to remember with affection and reverence the man who had initiated this source of benefit to them. Therefore what he said became a tradition and what he desired became a law obliged to be obeyed." [3]

### B)

"Besides people desired continuity of government which had brought benefits to them. In the life of government, they saw the life of racial discrimination since it was the necessary element for continuation of their advantage." [4] **Because:**

---

[1] Allamah Ja'far Murtuza Amili: *Salman Farsi* (Translated by Muhammad Shahri), Pgs. 170-171

[2] Allamah Ja'far Murtuza Amili: *Tahlili Az Zindagi-e-Siyasi Imam Hasan Mujtaba (a.s.)* (Translated by Muhammad Shahri), Pg. 106

[3] Allamah Ja'far Murtuza Amili: *Salman Farsi* (Translated by Muhammad Shahri), Pg. 172

[4] Allamah Ja'far Murtuza Amili: *Tahlili Az Zindagi-e-Siyasi Imam Hasan Mujtaba (a.s.)*,

"Racial discrimination increased their shares from Public Treasury and gave them superiority over non-Arabs...as a result they became proud, haughty and imperious and did not

know any bounds to confine them. They became an aristocrat class. The plenitude of pelf, the pleasures of no prohibitions made them even challenge every power that could restrict them. So they crossed the borders of religion and trespassed limits of conscience.”**[1]**

## **Influence of Greatness of Rulers over Ali's Government**

In this way the greatness of Umar was to such an extent in the view of Arabs that it became troublesome for Imam Ali (a.s.).

The usurpation of Caliphate was not only restricted to rulership. It went far beyond, robbing the essence of faith; that is Guardianship or Imamate of Ali, an essential part of belief and a tent-pole of religion. The divinely given virtues and heavenly attributes of Ali were overshadowed. So Ali to them was not an Imam - compulsorily to be obeyed and necessarily to be believed.

Historical documents show:

A)

"This much is sufficient to give a picture. He**[2]** was so great to them that Ali could not restrict his own soldiers from performing Taraveeh prayers (innovated by Umar).

His Eminence (a.s.) regarding this says:

Some of my soldiers who had fought under my command cried and shouted that the tradition of Umar is being changed. Ali is prohibiting us from Taraveeh!

So I feared that they might revolt in the camp.**[3]**

In some other version it runs thus: The soldiers came to Ali and asked him to appoint a man to lead Taraveeh prayers. Ali explained that those prayers are not authentic. They are against Prophet's tradition.**[4]**

---

Pg. 106

**[1]** *Ibid. Pg. 179*

**[2]** *[Second Caliph]*

**[3]** *Quoted from: Kafi, Vol. 8, Pgs. 59-63*

**[4]** *[It includes his words, actions and silent approval.]*

So they went away and selected one among themselves to lead them in prayers. Ali sent his son, Hasan, to disperse them. When they saw Hasan coming, they ran towards the mosque doors and shouted: O Umara!**[1]**

Perhaps the first to shout thus was Qadi Shurai.**[2]**

B)

When His Eminence wanted to dismiss Qadi Shurai from his post of judge, people of Kufa approached and pleaded him not to dismiss him because Umar had appointed him.

They said: We paid allegiance to you in the condition that you will not change anything that Abu Bakr and Umar had done.**[3]****[4]**

C)

“When Khawarij were driven out of Kufa, friends and Shias of Ali came to him and pledged allegiance to him saying: We are friends of your friends and enemies of your enemies.

His Eminence put a condition to them that he (Ali) would act according to Sunnah of Prophet. Rabiya bin Abi Shaddad Khathami, standard-bearer Khathami tribe who had fought under Ali’s command in Jamal and Siffeen came to Ali.

His Eminence (a.s.) said: Pay allegiance to me according to Book of God and Sunnah of Prophet.

Rabiya said: I will pay allegiance to you according to the Sunnah of Abu Bakr and Umar.

Ali told him: Woe be on you! Even though Abu Bakr and Umar acted against Book of God and Prophet’s tradition and were far from truth...?”**[5]**

---

**[1]** Quoted from: *Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Ibne Abil Hadeed, Vol. 1, Pg. 269; Vol. 2, Pg. 283*

**[2]** Quoted from: *Rijaal Mamaqaani, Vol. 2, Pg. 83*

**[3]** Quoted from: *Rijaal Mamaqaani, Vol. 2, Pg. 83*

**[4]** Allamah Ja’far Murtuza Amili: *Salman Farsi (Translated by Muhammad Shahri), Pg. 173*

**[5]** *Ibid. Pgs. 175-176; quoting from: Al-Imamah was-Siyasah, Vol. 1, Pg. 146*

D)

“Soldiers who had fought in Jamal under Ali’s command shouted: O Ali! With regard to us act according to tradition of Abu Bakr and Umar.**[1]**

E)

Khawarij told Qais bin Saad that they would not obey him unless he brought to them one like Umar.**[2]****[3]**

F)

“Ashath bin Qais[4] said with regard to Abu Moosa-Ashari who was chosen as arbitrator:

This is Abu Moosa. He was delegated by people of Yemen to the Prophet. He was the treasurer of spoils for Abu Bakr and a staff member of Umar...”[5]

G)

“They say: Ibn Abbas said to Ali to keep Muawiyah in his post as governor of Syria. His reasoning was that Umar had appointed him in that post.[6]”[7]

As is clear most troubles that Ali had to face during his rule was the presence of soldiers in his army who had received religious training by Umar. Later they were known as Khawarij and they fought against Ali.

“Even though Khawarij openly declared their entity in the battle of Siffeen, in the issue of raising Quran on spear points and in the matter of arbitration the fact is that doubt had already crept in their hearts in the battle of Jamal when they saw Ali’s stand towards captives and spoils of battle.[8]

---

[1] Quoted from: *Al-Kamil fil Adab, Vol. 1, Pg. 144*

[2] Quoted from: *Akbaar at-Tiwaal, Pg. 207; Tarikh al-Umam wal Mulook, Vol. 4, Pg. 62; Al-Kamil fit Tarikh, Vol. 3, Pg. 343; Ansaab al-Ashraaf, Vol. 2, Pgs. 370-371*

[3] *Ibid. Pg. 174*

[4] *[He was from Kinda tribe]*

[5] *Ibid. Pg. 176; quoting from: Al-Imamah was-Siyasah, Vol. 1, Pg. 130*

[6] *[Careful attention on these statements would clearly prove what circumstances restrained Amirul Momineen (a.s.) from criticizing the Caliphs openly during his Caliphate and the exigencies of accepting the names of Caliphs for his sons.]*

[7] *Ibid. Pg. 175; quoting from: Al-Fusool al-Muhimma by Ibne Sabbagh Maliki, Pg. 49*

[8] *[His Eminence, Ali (a.s.) asked them: What has made you angry with me? They replied: The first thing that infuriated us against you was that in the battle of Jamal, though you allowed us to take war booty you restrained us from taking their women*

It can even be said that doubt and suspicion took hold of them when Ali became Caliph and gave up the practice of Umar following the tradition of Prophet in treating all equally. He did not give any preference to anyone. It was at that time that they objected to him. They told him to pay their shares in the same scale as Umar used to give. Ali (a.s.) rejected their demand and acted on the Sunnah of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.)...

Khawarij censured Ali because in the battle of Jamal, Ali did not allow them to plunder the defeated opponents and take their sons and women captives. **[1]**”**[2]**

---

*and children as hostages. (Quoted from: Baghdadi: Al-Farq Bainal Firq, Pg. 78)*

**[1]** Quoted from: Shahrastani: *Al-Milal wan Nihal*, Vol. 1, Pg. 116

**[2]** Allamah Ja’far Murtuza Amili: Article: ‘Mariqeen’ (Translation Muhammad Shahri) quoted in *Danish Nama Imam Ali (a.s.)*, Vol. 9, Pgs. 239-241

# **Part 5**

## **Scrutiny of Judicial justice**

## Double standards in judgment

### 1 - Two ways of dealing - with Zahra and Jabir bin Abdullah Ansaari

“Bukhari narrates in Sahih:

Ayesha says that Zahra demanded from Abu Bakr her inheritance - the Fadak and the rest of the amount of Khums. But Abu Bakr refused to pay. Zahra got angry and retired to her house. She never spoke to Abu Bakr until she died.**[1]**

It is interesting that Bukhari writes:

After passing away of Prophet, Jabir bin Abdullah claimed that the Prophet had promised him to give him certain amount.

Abu Bakr put his hand inside and gave to Jabir again and again. Each time he gave five hundred dirhams and he did this thrice.**[2]”[3]**

This double policy of the Caliph is surprising: He did not accept the claim of Zahra to inheritance, who is infallible according to the testimony of verse of Quran and he asked her to present witnesses whom also he rejected later, but he accepted the claim of Jabir bin Abdullah Ansaari without asking for any witness regarding Prophet’s promise.

“Bukhari and Muslim have narrated from Jabir bin Abdullah Ansaari: When revenue from Bahrain was brought to Abu Bakr I was present there. I said to Abu Bakr: The Prophet had told me that when the revenue from Bahrain came he would give me something from it.

Abu Bakr told Jabir to go and pick up what the Prophet had promised.

You see that the Prophet has passed away, Jabir claims that the Prophet had promised him a certain amount from Bahrain revenue. After his death the revenue comes. Abu Bakr has succeeded the Prophet. Jabir goes to Abu Bakr and narrates a story to him. Abu Bakr believes him and pays him the amount he wants.

---

**[1]** Quoted from: *Sahih Bukhari, Vol. 5, Tr. 704; Tarikh Tabari, Vol. 3, Pg. 104*

**[2]** Quoted from: *Sahih Bukhari, Vol. 4, Tr. 889*

**[3]** *Sayyid Muhammad Hasan Jawahiri: Abu Bakr, Pg. 53*

Commentators of Bukhari and Muslim in their books justify the act of Abu Bakr in his making the payment from public funds without a witness or swearing.

The book *Al-Kawakib al-Durari Fi Sharh Sahih al-Bukhari* of Kermani, the most reliable commentary on Bukhari, writes:

Abu Bakr believed the word of Jabir because of the Prophet. He had warned that if anyone said a lie on his behalf he would have a seat of fire in the next world. Therefore it was not possible for a companion of Prophet to lie and accept fire for himself.**[1]** There was great likelihood that Jabir told the truth. Well, why is such a possibility not considered with regard to Zahra? She was the daughter of Prophet and she was infallible. Her position was far greater than that of Jabir, who was only a companion of the Prophet.

Now let us see what Ibn Hajar Asqalani says in *Fath al-Bari*:

This tradition proves that the word of a just companion of the Prophet, individually, should be accepted though it may be profitable to him.**[2]**

For this reason, Abu Bakr did not demand a witness.

Zahra said that the Prophet had bestowed to her the Fadak. So why such difference between the two claims - one his only daughter and another only his companion among so many?

Ayini says in his book *Umdat al-Qari Fi Sharh Sahih al-Bukhari*: Jabir is a just man according to the proof of Quran and traditions. Therefore Abu Bakr did not demand a witness. It is not likely that a Muslim would lie on the Prophet, what to say of a companion!**[3]**

How is it that Abu Bakr accepted the claim of Jabir but did not accept the claim of Zahra?

Was she lesser than Jabir?

Would she lie about the Prophet? You do not presume that a Muslim would attribute lie to the Prophet.

What is the difference between the two claims?

Why the claim of Zahra is rejected inspite of the rules and witnesses? But

---

**[1]** Quoted from: *Al-Kawakib*, Vol. 1, Pg. 125

**[2]** Quoted from: *Fath al-Bari*, Vol. 4, Pg. 375

**[3]** Quoted from: *Al-Umdatul Qari*, Vol. 12, Pg. 121

the claim of Jabir is accepted without any witness!!"**[1]**

## **2 - Double Standard Treatment between Son of Amr Aas and Ubadah bin Samit**

With regard to justice of Umar it is said:

“Umar was so dignified that he could stop any insurgency. Muhammad son of Amr Aas was a victor and governor of Egypt. During the governorship of Amr Aas a horse race was held. In this race someone else was riding the horse of Muhammad. In the race a horse resembling Muhammad’s won. Muhammad was present there. He presumed his horse won the race. He said: By the Lord of Kaaba my horse was ahead of all.

The real owner of the horse, an Egyptian, shouted: By God of Kaaba it was my horse that won. Muhammad bin Amr Aas became angry and scourged him with the lash he was holding and said: Take this. I am a noble. The Egyptian went to Umar and complained. Umar called Amr Aas and his son to Medina. Umar asked the Egyptian to take the lash and beat the noble’s son. Then he asked Amr Aas why he treated people like slaves when they were born free?”**[2]**

It seems that Umar had forgotten the case of Ubadah bin Samit who had beaten up a man and broken his head. The complaint went to Umar who took the side of Ubadah and without obtaining the consent of plaintiff ordered a penalty to be paid.

At that time Zaid bin Thabit was present who reminded him that he was favoring of his slave to lash his own brother. Therefore he imposed penalty instead of lashing.**[3]**

Still they claim:

“Umar always held justice in his view above everything. He executed justice without any consideration.”**[4]**

The incidents narrated here show double standards and that justice depended upon his policies.

---

**[1]** *Ustad Sayyid Ali Husaini Milani: Guftaarhai-e-Peeramoon Mazloomiyat-e-Bartareen Banu (Translation: Masood Shikohi), Pgs. 61-65*

**[2]** *Abdul Qadir Dahqaan Siraawaani: Article quoted in Nida-e-Islam Magazine, Issue No. 11, Autumn 81, Pg. 5*

**[3]** *Its sources were explained in Discourse Two*

**[4]** *Sayyid Abdur Raheem Khateeb: Shaykhain (6<sup>th</sup> Edition 1382), Pg. 203*

“When he gave his lash to the Egyptian to scourge Muhammad bin Amr Aas, he said: O, Amir! Are you satisfied now? Is your heart pleased now?

In this way he accused Umar of taking revenge from him and his father for personal reasons.[1]”[2]

### **3 - Different Treatment between the Son of Amr Aas and Mughaira bin Shoba**

Historical documents indicate that Mughaira was the first to address Umar as Lord of Believers and he greeted[3] Umar with this title. He was appointed by Umar as the governor of Basrah and he remained in this post for a long time.

Abu Bakra[4] was from Thaqif tribe who had embraced Islam when soldiers of Prophet surrounded Taif. Abu Bakra together with his two brothers, Nafe and Ziyad from his mother deposed to Umar to stone Mughaira for adultery. The fourth witness was a person named Shaml bin Ma’bed.

All three gave evidence according to religious standard for Mughaira’s sin, but Umar by some trick or other treated the case in such a way that the evidence given by three Muslim was not established as authentic. Thus he rescued him from death.

“When Ziyad arrived and entered the mosque, elders of Muhajireen and Ansaar came and gathered around him. Umar saw Ziyad and said: God will not belittle any man from Muhajireen by the tongue of Ziyad.[5]

[Ziyad got the message and gave evidence in a way, which exonerated Mughaira.]

Mughaira was saved from death and Umar was glad[6] and shouted: God

---

**[1]** *[It was perhaps on the basis of this argument that Amr Aas said: “Curse be on the time when I served as a governor of Umar.”]*

*(Najah Ata at-Tai: Saqifah, Pgs. 100; quoting from: Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Vol. 1, Pg. 58)]*

**[2]** *Najah Ata at-Tai: Nazaryaat al-Khaleefatain, Vol. 2, Pgs. 208*

**[3]** *Some are of the view that Amr Aas has used this appellation for the Caliph (Najah Ata at-Tai: Nazaryaat al-*

*Khaleefatain, Vol. 2, Pg. 240)*

**[4]** *[Nofiya bin Harith]*

**[5]** *Quoted from: Wafayaat al-Ayaan, Vol. 2, Pg. 406*

**[6]** *[Umar's dealing in this case shows that he had a hidden aim in carrying out or not carrying out the death penalty. His insistence on punishing Khalid bin Waleed in the case of Malik bin Nuwairah was not obedience to religious rules but to obtain political power, which Umar was after. He wanted to remove Khalid from the way as he*

*is greater. All shouted along with him. Then Umar scourged the three witnesses but not Ziyad...[1]"[2]*

Allamah Askari narrates from Ibn Abdul Barr that Umar admitted to Mughaira during Hajj rituals:

"I swear by God I don't think Abu Bakra had lied about you."**[3]**

Yet Umar rescued him, which was against justice while Mughaira deserved punishment according to religious law and God's decree. Still they say:

"In Umar's view the governor was an individual like others. He too is subject to punishment as others according to God's Rule."**[4]**

"Although he was a ruler of a wide and extended country he was a shrewd, astute and a clever man in executing justice in all cases."**[5]**

"Umar bin Khattab used to mention this in public. He said: Now I am the Caliph. I will be serious, severe, harsh and hard towards tyrants and wrongdoers. With regard to good people and pious, I will be kind and affectionate."**[6]**

## Ignoring Calls of Oppressed

While it is claimed:

“He (Umar) made himself available to every victim, no matter however low a station he was from.”!**[7]**

“In investigating disputes he was to the extreme extent particular. Wherever one approached to him for justice he used to stand then and

---

*considered him a strong rival.]*

**[1]** Quoted from: *Talkhees Dhahabi, Vol. 3, Pg. 448*

**[2]** Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Askari: *Abdullah Ibne Saba Wa Deegar Afsaane (Abdullah Bin Saba and other legends), Vol. 1, Pgs. 249-254*

**[3]** *Ibid. Vol. 1, Pg. 253*

**[4]** Fawad Farooqi: *Beest-o-panj Saal Sukoot-e-Ali (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition 1379), Pg. 85; Fareedoon Islamniya: Ashra-e-Mubashira (1<sup>st</sup> Edition 1380), Pg. 90*

**[5]** Abdul Qadir Dahqaan Siraawaani: *Article quoted in Nida-e-Islam Magazine, Issue No. 11, Autumn 81, Pg. 7*

**[6]** Sayyid Abdur Raheem Khateeb: *Shaykhain (6<sup>th</sup> Edition 1382), Pg. 195*

**[7]** Abdul Qadir Dahqaan Siraawaani: *Article quoted in Nida-e-Islam Magazine, Issue No. 11, Autumn 81, Pg. 7*

thereon the spot and dispense justice.”!**[1]**

Historical documents show how inattentive Umar was in complying with petitions calling on him for justice:

“Ahnaf bin Qais narrates: On the occasion of a great victory we went to Umar to congratulate him.

Umar asked: Where have you lodged?

We told him such and such place. He got up and came with us to see the place of our lodging. We rode our horses. The horses were too tired, because they had run long.

Umar said: Why didn't you fear God when you rode the horses? Don't you know that they have a right upon you? Why didn't you show mercy to them? Had you come alone they would have grazed.

We replied: We are returning from victory and we hurried to congratulate you and Muslims.

Then he returned and we too accompanied him.

In the meantime, a man approached him and demanded justice from him as he had become a victim of someone's tyranny.

Umar immediately raised the cane and hit him on his head saying: When Umar is at your disposal you have no business with him, but when he is busy in attending Muslim affairs you come to him asking for justice.

The man went away angry..."[2]

Does this incident not show that Umar, who was so anxious about horses that are animals, was not at all anxious about human beings - especially the oppressed? Animal meant to him more than a man.

The judgment is upon you.

---

**[1]** *Fareedoon Islamniya: Ashra-e-Mubashira (1<sup>st</sup> Edition 1380), Pg. 101*

**[2]** *Ibne Abil Hadeed: Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Vol. 12, Pg. 19; Ibne Jauzi: Tarikh Umar bin Khattab, Pg. 83*

This historical document also contains additional incidents that speak of the regret of the Caliphs but the attitude of the Caliphs portrayed in history is against these claims.

**Part 6**  
**Analysis of the Rights of Legal**  
**Opponents**

## **Type of dealing with legal opponents**

### **Iron-handed policy**

When Muhajireen came out successful in Saqifah, they at once adopted the policy of suppressing rival parties or adversaries. This they did to establish Abu Bakr's authority at any rate:

“Abu Bakr Jauhari has narrated from Baraa bin Azib: After the news of allegiance to Abu Bakr in Saqifah spread, immediately Abu Bakr, Umar, Abu Ubaidah and a group of associates of Saqifah set out in the town roaming the streets. Whomever they met on way they held his hand and put it on the hand of Abu Bakr without regard whether that man was in favor or not.[1]

They dragged the people to give Bay'at to Abu Bakr in any way possible. In this matter Umar was more rough than others and after him was Qunfudh bin Umair.

The group that set out to take Bay'at from people was anxious to finish the job as early as possible.”[2]

Umar started the job from Saqifah itself.

“Umar says: When they obtained Bay'at from people they attacked Saad bin Ubadah. One person asked him whether he killed Saad. Umar replied that God killed him![3]

According to another narration after Umar said: Kill Saad! He shouted: May God kill him. Then he went at the head of Saad and said:

I want to kick in such a way that you become invalid.[4]”[5]

“At the indication of Umar people kicked Habbab bin Mundhir,[6] filled his mouth with mud[7] and broke his nose.[8]

---

[1] Quoted from: *Saqifah wa Fadak*, Pg. 4; *Sharh Nahjul Balagha*, Vol. 1, Pg. 219

[2] *Mustafa Dilshad Tehrani: Meeras Rabooda (Usurped inheritance)*, Pg. 83

[3] Quoted from: *Al-Kamil Fit Tarikh*, Vol. 2, Pg. 12

[4] Quoted from: *Tarikh al-Umam wal Mulook*, Vol. 3, Pg. 222

[5] *Sayyid Hasan Fatimi: Article quoted in Danish Nama Imam Ali (a.s.)*, Vol. 8, Pg. 433

**[6]** *[He was a respectable personality of Khazraj tribe]*

**[7]** *Quoted from: Tarikh al-Umam wal Mulook, Vol. 3, Pg. 210*

**[8]** *Quoted from: Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Vol. 1, Pg. 174*

After a short while another group came and kicked Miqdad.**[1]**

On the same spot Saad bin Ubadah was about to die because of the kicks he had got.**[2]**

On that day whoever shouted against them his mouth was filled with mud.**[3]** There was only one cry, one clamor and one shouting that was constantly heard:

Kill so and so!**[4]** Kill them! We cut your throat...**[5]**

Umar set free whoever paid allegiance to Abu Bakr, pointing him the direction to go. He did this to impress on the public that job was done and finished.

Afterwards this group consisting of close associates and supporters headed to the lanes and by lanes of the town. Whoever they came across they held a grip on him and dragged him, whether he liked it or not to Abu Bakr and taking his hand touched it to the hand of Abu Bakr. Then they set him free.**[6]**”**[7]**

There are historical annals that show:

“A group of Arab nomads (Bani Aslam)**[8]** came to Medina to buy rations. Umar sent word to them to see him. When they came Umar told them that:

If they paid allegiance to Abu Bakr they would be paid the cost of rations. He further suggested them to go in the lanes and streets and invite people to pay allegiance to Abu Bakr. He encouraged them to break the head and nose of those who refused.

---

**[1]** *Quoted from: Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Vol. 1, Pg. 174*

**[2]** *Quoted from: Tarikh al-Umam wal Mulook, Vol. 3, Pg. 210; Tarikh Khamees, Vol. 2, Pgs. 187 & 188; Musnad Ahmad, Vol. 1, Pg. 56; Sirah Halabiyya, Vol. 3, Pg. 396*

**[3]** *Quoted from: Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Vol. 6, Pg. 40*

**[4]** *Quoted from: Musnad Ahmad, Vol. 1, Pg. 56; Tarikh al-Umam wal Mulook, Vol. 3, Pg. 210; Al-Imamah was-Siyasah, Vol. 1, Pg. 10*

**[5]** *Quoted from: Al-Iqdul Fareed, Vol. 2, Pg. 253; Tarikh Abul Fida, Vol. 1, Pg. 156*

**[6]** *Quoted from: Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Vol. 1, Pg. 219*

**[7]** *Yusuf Gholami: Pas az Ghuroob (After Sunset), Pgs. 75-16*

**[8]** *[With regards Bani Aslam, many traditions were fabricated to say they were not nomads but Medinites. So that since they were first to pay allegiance to Abu Bakr ahead of Ansaar and Muhajireen it would give them credit and distinction and also block the way of those who object to Abu Bakr's Caliphate.]*

The narrator says: By God! I saw those rough Arabs tied their waists closely, cloth-pieces of Sanaa on their heads and faces as covering. They took batons in their hands and set out like dogs and forced people to pay allegiance to Abu Bakr's Caliphate."**[1]**

In the same way some orientalist have analyzed the act and behavior of Bani Aslam Arabs thus:

"Bani Aslam was a branch of Khuzaaya. They were known to be loyal to Prophet Muhammad. The Prophet valued their loyalty. He gave them the status of Muhajireen. He ignored as to whether they had really migrated to Medina or not. A considerable number of them resided close to Medina. As such, they were always ready to help the Prophet. They were known as enemies of Ansaar. Therefore it can be said that they with their huge number proved a force that gave strength to Abu Bakr's Bay'at. They at once replied positively to the proposal of Umar. They also hit Saad bin Ubadah as an insurgent."**[2]**

## Stamp of Apostasy

“Apostasy was a great disgrace that supporters of Saqifah stamped on their opponents to justify their tyrannies such as killings and forcibly taking Bay’at from the people. These battles and suppressing those who had falsely claimed prophethood went a long way in deceiving people. It was a great help to them to establish their authority and gain people’s confidence. It completed the designs and tricks of the Quraishi party that had now attained the status of being a rightful one to be at power.”**[3]**

In a short scrutiny on the basis of *Abdullah bin Saba*, battles that occurred during Abu Bakr’s Caliphate and got a distinction for him according to claim of Sunni sect can be divided into three parts.

**1** - Battle with Musailaima and Tolaiha, who claimed prophethood. Some groups too had gathered around them who were in fact, infidels - not *Murtad*. But Saif bin Umar calls these battles the battles of *Murtads* and shows its mischief to be widespread one.

In this respect, we should know that Abu Bakr had no other way but to fight them to keep his Caliphate.

---

**[1]** *Mustafa Dilshad Tehrani: Meeras Rabooda (Usurped inheritance), Pg. 74; quoting from: Al-Jamal, Pg. 199*

**[2]** *Wilfred Madelung: Succession to Muhammad, Pg. 55*

**[3]** *Mustafa Iskandari: Baazkhwani Andisha-e-Taqreeb, Pg. 221*

“Only two tribes among the tribes around Medina rose against Islam in support of Tolaiha. One was the tribe of Tolaiha himself named Asad, the other was a group of Fuzara, a branch of Ghatfan tribe. This tribe was again a branch of the tribes of Qais Aelaan. Except these two, there appears no other name that could have gathered around Tolaiha and fought against Muslims.”**[1]**

“In the army of Tolaiha were a few men from Asad tribe, which was his own; besides there were few more from the tribe of Fuzara under the command of their own chief Ainat bin Hisn. There was no one from other tribes.”**[2]**

Therefore their mischief was not as serious as claimed; that their suppression should be a matter of pride for Abu Bakr and that also in the way of service to Islam!

**2** - The numerous battles, all of which are fabricated by Saif bin Umar, have no reality at all.

“In this respect, we see battles of imagination in the history of Islam, which are called battles with apostates during the Caliphate of Abu Bakr like: the Battle of Abraq, attack of Zilqissa, apostasy and battle of Tai tribe, apostasy and battle of Umme Zamal, apostasy of the people of Mohra, apostasy of the people of Oman, the first battle with the apostates of Yemen, apostasy and battle of Akhabas, the second battle of apostates of Yemen.”**[3]**

“Yes, the only thing true and which other historians have also mentioned is that Abu Bakr raised an army and gave the command of Ansaar to Thabit bin Qais, making Khalid bin Waleed the commander of the forces and sent them to confront those who had camped at Buzakha intending to attack the Muslims. After this there was no other battle.

Yes, except for these two Abu Bakr did not appoint anyone else to the command and except for this flag did not raise any flag. He also did not send Khalid bin Saeed [bin Aas] as commander of army to fight apostates of Hamaqtain at the outskirts of Syria. Actually Khalid bin Saeed [bin Aas] was sent with soldiers to Syria.”**[4]**

---

**[1]** Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Askari: *Abdullah Ibne Saba Wa Deegar Afsaane (Abdullah Bin Saba and other legends)*, Vol. 2, Pg. 56

**[2]** *Ibid.* Vol. 2, Pg. 61

**[3]** *Ibid.* Vol. 1, Pg. 338

**[4]** *Ibid.* Vol. 2, Pg. 47

Accordingly on this basis battles with the *Murtads* in the time of Abu Bakr and all other battles are short of credit, having no basis. They are all inventions of Saif bin Umar.**[1]**

“According to a deep research and investigation in this matter it can be said with certainty that: all the matters given in detail about the battle of Abraq and story of Zilqissa, they are all mentioned only by Saif bin Umar. No other historian has said anything about them. It is nothing but fabrication of Saif. There was no apostasy of most of these tribes Saif has blamed.

No one camped at Abraq and Zilqissa and neither is there any truth in the story that the apostates were about to attack Medina. Similarly the report that Abu Bakr appointed some persons for defense of Medina is also false. All the four battles of Abu Bakr mentioned by Saif are imaginative ones. He has fabricated all incidents about the victories, his praises, his domination and control over enemy territories. In fact all the persons and places recorded by Saif have no base in reality.”[2]

These stories are invented to give superiority and greatness to Abu Bakr. To show that it was service to Islam and to uplift the Caliph in people’s view.

According to the research of Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Askari in the 2<sup>nd</sup> volume of his book, *Abdullah bin Saba*, all the narrations related to the battle of Abraq are forged and all the events that show the serious problems the apostates posed that the Caliph had to struggle hard to suppress them, are in fact all figments of the imagination of Saif bin Umar.

In the same way except for some events related to Zilqissa all are forgeries and unreliable.[3]

The whole story of apostasy of Umme Zamal, People of Oman and Mohra,[4] people of Yemen and Akhabat are fabrications of Saif bin Umar.[5] These stories were invented to give superiority to Abu Bakr and show that it was service to Islam; thus exalting him in people’s view.

---

[1] Refer: *Ibid. Vol. 2, Pgs. 39-46*

[2] Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Askari: *Abdullah Ibne Saba Wa Deegar Afsaane (Abdullah Bin Saba and other legends)*, Vol. 2, Pgs. 46-47 [Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Askari has launched a vast research. He has written the outcome of his toil in the second volume of his book *Abdullah bin Saba*]

[3] Refer: *Ibid. Vol. 2, Pgs. 43-47*

[4] *Ibid. Vol. 2, Pg. 56*; we have mentioned actual parts of this incident in this book.

[5] Refer: *Ibid. Vol. 2, Pgs. 63-77*

Similarly, the apostasy of Tai tribe and their insurgency being crushed during Abu Bakr’s Caliphate is not true. According to historical documents, the Tai tribe had not apostised; in fact they were staunch supporters of Abu Bakr.[1]

On the basis of this all the battles of apostates supposed in the time of Abu Bakr and other battles which are called as

victories, are all fabricated and have no historical basis. [2] They are all products of the imagination of Saif Ibne Umar. (13)(14)

**3** - The real reason for battle with Muslims was for their not accepting Abu Bakr. They declared them *Murtad* (Apostates) only to justify their suppression and bloodshed at the hands of officers of Abu Bakr such as Khalid bin Waleed, Akrama bin Abi Jahl and Ziyad bin Labeed.

“Some tribes revolted on the issue of Zakat. They did this because they were against Abu Bakr and his rule. Their reasoning was: Just as Quraish revolted against the will of Prophet, so too do not obey the

---

[1] Refer: *Ibid. Vol. 2, Pgs. 56 & 61*

[2] *There are many other battles in Islam like the wars of Ridda which are also fabricated, like battle of Salasil, Ableh, Mazar, Walja, Alees, Amghishia, Furat Badkhuli, battle of Ha-seed, battle of Masbagh, battle of Thani, battle of Zameel and battle of Farez. etc.*

*Refer: Allamah Askari: Abdullah Ibne Saba Wa Deegar Afsaane (Abdullah Bin Saba and other legends), Vol. 1, Pg. 339*

[3] *Refer: Abdullah Ibne Saba Wa Deegar Afsaane, Vol. 2, Pg. 46; Pg. 79 & Vol. 1, Pg. 338*

[4] *When Abu Bakr finished the Ridda issue he deemed it befitting to send his soldiers to Syria. He wrote letters to the people of Mecca, Taif and Yemen and all Arabs of Najd and Hijaz inviting them to Holy war and the spoils that they would attain in Rome. People complied with his invitation in greed of spoils. They started from all corners to meet in Medina.*

Perusal of these pages clearly shows that the incidents or the battles in the historical books of Sunni sect are only intended to create some greatness for Khalid bin Waleed in a frame of his inhuman behavior. We recommend the work of Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Askari *Abdullah bin Saba and other historical stories* Vol. 1, Pg. 329. We further recommend the same source Vol. 2, Pgs. 83-113 for the scrutiny of these battles which the Sunni sect attach great importance to, because in their opinion it is a collection of pride and glory for Khalid bin Waleed - the Commander in the army of Abu Bakr, for the sake of better

acquaintance with a real part of the above said battles which is the invention of Saif bin Umar we recommend Vol. 2 of 'Historical Stories' Pgs. 88, 91, 100, 101, 112 and 113.

Quraishite regime of Abu Bakr and his party. The sign of their disobedience was their not paying the tax to central government. By this act they in fact challenged the legitimacy and legality of Abu Bakr's rule. It stamped a great question mark over it. From here started the battles under name of Battles of Apostates which were actually the battles to confirm their own seat of Caliphate, which had come into being by means of revolt of Quraish immediately after passing away of Prophet. They thought such a way of harsh dealing with the people would blanket their rule by legitimacy."**[1]**

Saif bin Umar continued to add imaginative wars and battles either under name of *Murtads* or victories. In fact it was suppression of opponents who refused to give *Bay'at* to Abu Bakr like the Kinda tribes that lived outside Medina. They called *Murtad* whoever refused to give *Bay'at* to Abu Bakr as Caliph. While the fact was that they were not so.**[2]** But they found no other excuse. In the days of Abu Bakr it is said:

"Associates of Saqifah wanted to show that refusal to accept Abu Bakr as Caliph and not to pay Zakat to him was refusal of the very faith of Islam. So it is infidelity. By so doing, they were making Abu Bakr sacred."**[3]**

"The logic of Saqifah people was that whoever opposes Abu Bakr and his government was an infidel and the battles of Ridda against the nearby tribes were based on this policy."**[4]**

Some of these tribes were dealt with very harshly. The soldiers of Abu Bakr killed them and destroyed their properties. Most of this bad treatment was not necessary either. Therefore they refused to pay taxes to the collectors of Abu Bakr. For this also they had to pay heavily.**[5]**

We read the following claim in describing Abu Bakr's stand in such cases:

"In crushing insurgency and campaigning against the plot of Murtads and the disunity in Islam our lord Abu Bakr followed the same policy which the prophets of God had adopted in their age. Abu Bakr performed

---

**[1]** *Mustafa Iskandari: Baazkhwani Andisha-e-Taqreeb, Pg. 217*

**[2]** *Refer: Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Askari: Abdullah Ibne Saba*

*Wa Deegar Afsaane (Abdullah Bin Saba and other legends),  
Vol. 1, Pg. 339*

**[3]** *Mustafa Iskandari: Baazkhwani Andisha-e-Taqreeb, Pg. 218*

**[4]** *Ibid. Pg. 221*

**[5]** *Refer: Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Askari: Abdullah Ibne Saba Wa Deegar Afsaane (Abdullah Bin Saba and other legends),  
Vol. 2, Pgs. 215-216*

the true part of Caliphate. The gratitude and praises together with thanks of Muslims go to him till the Day of Judgment.”!**[1]**

Let us scrutinize the behavior of Abu Bakr with those who opposed him; how they were falsely declared as *Murtads* no matter however staunch Muslims they were.

“The regime of that time started a bloody campaign against opponents of Abu Bakr and killed them all so there remained no opponent.”**[2]**

“In historical books, it is endeavored to avoid mention of their apostasy but several evidences prove they were not *Murtads* nor did they refuse Zakat. They refused to pay Zakat only because they did not recognize Abu Bakr a legitimate successor of Prophet.**[3]**

Some historians and researchers have also explained this matter:

Ibn Katheer says:

Various tribes of Arabs entered Medina in groups. They prayed. But they did not pay Zakat.

Some only refused to pay Zakat to Abu Bakr.**[4]**

Yaqoobi narrates:

Some groups of Arabs declared their Prophethood. Some became *Murtad*, some placed crown on their heads.

Some were although not *Murtads* yet they refused to pay Zakat to Abu Bakr.**[5]**

Regarding the rules of *Murtad* (Apostates) Ibn Hazm says:

These men were Muslims. They never departed from faith of Islam. So they were not *Murtads*. The only thing they did was they refused to pay tax to the person of Abu Bakr. They were killed for this.

---

**[1]** *Abdul Qadir Dahqaan Siraawaani: Article quoted in Nida-e-Islam Magazine, Issue No. 10, Summer 81, Pg. 19*

**[2]** *Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Askari: Abdullah Ibne Saba Wa Deegar Afsaane (Abdullah Bin Saba and other legends), Vol. 1,*

Pg. 188

**[3]** For details about the types of apostasy in the view of contemporary historians refer to: Ali Gholami Dahqi: *Janghai Irtdidat wa Bohran Janasheeni-e-Payambar*, Pgs. 97-102.

**[4]** Quoted from: *Al-Bidaya wan Nihaya*, Vol. 6, Pg. 311

**[5]** Quoted from: *Tarikh Yaqoobi*, Vol. 2, Pg. 128

Ibn Hazm further adds: The Hanafi and Shafei sect too are in agreement with belief that the decree of Murtad cannot be applied to them. They all were Muslims – within the embrace of Islam. Therefore both these two sects are against the ruling of Abu Bakr. **[1]**

Naubakhti and Saad bin Abdullah Ashari have the following comments:

They were a group unwilling to pay Zakat to Abu Bakr. They said they would distribute that sum among poor and needy ones of their own tribe. They said: We shall do this until a real and rightful successor of the Prophet is known to them. This shows that they did not consider Abu Bakr as a rightful successor to Prophet. So were they Murtad? **[2]**

Tabari also narrates from Abu Mikhnaf: The two tribes Asad and Fuzara said: By God! We will never give Bay'at to Abu Bakr – the successor to Prophet. **[3]**

In this regard, the well-known Egyptian writer Abbas Mahmood Uqqad writes:

Another group was believer in the very principle of Zakat. But they did not believe nor had any faith in one whom they were supposed to pay Zakat. **[4]**

Shaykh Muhammad Aale Yasin has performed a scholarly analysis of all narrations regarding Murtads mentioned in Tarikh Tabari surrounding the whole period of Abu Bakr. He rejects all of them because of false reports and lack of authenticity. He comments: There is no text in hand that shows their rejection of the principle of Zakat. When it is thus, there is no ground to prove their turning Murtad (apostates). **[5]**

He says: Behind the killings on pretext of being *Murtad* is concealed some other reality. The fact is that the code of *Murtad* was the only option to Abu Bakr. It gave him a pretext to destroy and kill them as their presence was

destructively detrimental to Abu Bakr. Their not paying Zakat could have taken to itself a movement and a movement could have

---

**[1]** Quoted from: *Al-Mahalli, Vol. 11, Pg. 193*

**[2]** Quoted from: *Farq-e-Shia (Translation and notes by Dr. Muhammad Jawad Mashkoor), Pg. 7; Al-Maqaalaat wal Farq (Edited with notes by Dr. Muhammad Jawad Mashkoor), Pg. 4.*

**[3]** Quoted from: *Tarikh Tabari, Vol. 3, Pg. 255.*

**[4]** Quoted from: *Al-Majmua al-Kamila, Vol. 1 (Abqarya Abu Bakr), Pg. 306*

**[5]** Quoted from: *Nusoos ar-Ridda fit Tarikh at-Tabari, Pg. 91*

spread far and wide. The consequence was still more dangerous because it could have challenged his Caliphate - that is his occupation of the seat of a Caliph of the Prophet of God. Therefore he had to kill them to rescue himself. Of course the code of Murtad came to his aid.

Ali Abdul Razzaq (a contemporary Egyptian writer) says in frankness: There no doubt at all that battles with Murtad was only a political aspect. Abu Bakr had to crush it under the excuse of apostasy, which he did.

They were only opponents of Abu Bakr like other Muslims who did not desire to come under the yoke of Abu Bakr's rule.

The writer says that the issue of apostasy is the darkest spot of the ground of crimes in the history.**[1]**

Allamah Askari also in his documentary research has dealt with the sense and the meaning of Murtad, that is denial of faith after having embraced it and the difference how the Prophet looked at it and how he (Abu Bakr) used it as a tool. Thus the Allamah comments:

From what we said so far it comes to light that those accused of being Murtad were actually not apostates. They were only opposed to Abu Bakr's Caliphate therefore they refused to pay Zakat to him.**[2]**

The writer of History of Ridda**[3]** says that Malik bin Nuwairah, Qais bin Asim and Aqra bin Habis collected Zakat and distributed it among their own people.**[4]** This act of Qais was regarded as a great crime and they said that he was the greatest criminal.**[5]**

More than this is Ibn Athim's[6] saying and also Waqadi's words: They talk of apostasy of the people of Hadhramaut and tribes of Kinda:

Some among these tribes considered Caliphate the right of the Prophet's house members.

---

[1] Quoted from: *Al-Islam wa Usool al-Hukm*, Pgs. 193-197

[2] Quoted from: *Abdullah Ibne Saba Wa Deegar Afsaane*, Vol. 1, Pg. 141

[3] [Clive Balansi, a Spanish scholar of 6<sup>th</sup> century]

[4] Quoted from: *Tarikh ar-Ridda*, Pg. 10

[5] Quoted from: *Majma al-Imthaal*, Vol. 2, Pg. 65

[6] It is worthy of mention that at the beginning of his book he says: We have not included these narrations as Shias will use them to prove their stand.

Haritha bin Suraqa one of the chiefs of Kinda, said to Ziyad bin Labeed[1] who had come to collect Zakat:

We obeyed the Prophet of God as long as he was alive. Now if one of his House Members comes to power we will obey him. But as for Abu Bakr there is no obligation on us to obey him and he has no commitment towards us.[2]

...Harith bin Muawiyah, one of the chiefs of Bani Tameem, said to Ziyad bin Labeed who had come to collect Zakat: You are asking us to obey one regarding whom we have not pledge or covenant.

Ziyad said: But we have chosen him for us.

Then Harith asked: Just tell me why Caliphate was taken away from the Prophet's House? On the other hand Quran says that they are more befitting than others to this job.

Zaid answered: Muhajireen and Ansaar know their own affairs better than you.

Harith: No. By God, it is not so. Because of your envy you departed from Household Members of Prophet. I can never accept that the Prophet passed away without nominating anyone in his place.

Ziyad! Get up and go away from here because you are inviting us to a thing, which enrages God.

In the meantime Arfaja bin Abdullah al-Zahali said: By God, Harith is telling the truth. Avoid this man (Ziyad) as his friend, Abu Bakr has no worth to sit in the seat of Caliph. Emigrants

and Helpers also are not wiser than the Prophet for the Ummah.

Then they dragged Ziyad from there. They wanted to kill him. Ziyad forced the tribe whichever he visited to pay allegiance to Abu Bakr. But they responded in a way that was unpleasant to Ziyad. They did not agree with Ziyad's logic. Therefore Ziyad's mission failed in the tribes. Finally, Ziyad returned to Medina and reported the results of his visits to Abu Bakr.

Abu Bakr became extremely angry. He sent Ziyad again to the same tribes, this time with a force of four thousand soldiers.

Ziyad went to the tribes with the soldiers and also with a concealed motive of revenge. He massacred the tribes of Bani Hind, Bani Aqal, Bani Hujar and Bani Himyar.**[3]**

---

**[1]** *[He was from Khazraj tribe from the clan of Bayaz]*

**[2]** *Quoted from: Al-Futuh, Vol. 1, Pg. 58; Kitab ar-Ridda, Pgs. 171-172*

**[3]** *Quoted from: Al-Futuh, Vol. 1, Pgs. 65-66; Kitab ar-Ridda, Pgs. 186 & 188 (Waqidi*

Then he confronted other tribes of Kinda. After many battles and attacks which resulted in bloodshed on a wide scale, help reached Ziyad when soldiers of Akrama bin Abi Jahl came to his rescue. Ziyad defeated all of them at Hadhramaut.**[1]**

Besides these tribes, there are other tribes whose men too were massacred and their properties and belongings looted or destroyed. Their children and womenfolk were made captives. When Yamama people heard that Abu Bakr had become Caliph they refused to recognize him. Abu Bakr sent troops there. Yamama people also refused to pay Zakat to Abu Bakr because he was in their view not the legitimate Caliph. Abu Bakr found no ground to kill them in order to take revenge of their rejecting his authority. The only way open to him was to declare them apostates. The soldiers massacred them all.**[2]**

The tribe of Bani Salim too was not safe from this killing, plunder, pillage and other atrocities. Khalid bin Waleed under instructions of Abu Bakr burned their menfolk alive. This was such a brutal tyranny that even Umar objected and censured Abu Bakr. Abu Bakr in reply to criticisms said: Khalid is the sword of God.**[3]**

The inhabitants of Daba, a district between Oman and Bahrain were also massacred by the army of Akrama bin Abi Jahl. Abu Bakr had issued him direct orders to not leave anyone alive. Their properties were plundered. Their sons, daughters and widows were made captives. **[4]**

There are several other tribes and also groups who came under the category of apostates.

Tabari gives us a list of the tribes in the third volume of his history that apostatised after passing away of Prophet.

For instance, he mentions Tai, Asad, Ghatfan, Hawazin, Bani Salim, Bani Amir, people of Yamama, Najd, Bahrain, Amman, Tihama, Yemen, Hadhramaut and Bani Tameem. It is interesting that Tabari has narrated

---

*instead of Bani Aqal has written Bani Atik and instead of Bani Himyar he has mentioned Bani Jamr)*

**[1]** Quoted from: *Al-Futuh, Vol. 1, Pgs. 66-87*

**[2]** Quoted from: *Tarikh Tabari, Vol. 3, Pg. 246; Sawaiqul Mohreqa, Pg. 86; Al-Jamal, Pg. 118; Al-Izaah, Pg. 132*

**[3]** Quoted from: *Tabaqat, Vol. 7, Pg. 396 (In the account of Khalid bin Waleed); Riyadh an-Nazarah, Vol. 1, Pg. 100*

**[4]** Quoted from: *Tabaqat, Vol. 7, Pgs. 101-102; Al-Futuh, Pgs. 73-74*

most events from the greatest liar of history, Saif bin Umar. **[1]** His source was the lies of Saif. **[2]** Because the sense and meaning of Murtad is obscure and even its extent not known, most cases of apostasy are doubtful and cannot be accepted. **[3]**

In a way these cases of *Murtad* were fabricated, the battles against them too were false. Some were only to provide a ground to crush opponents of Abu Bakr.

It could be said that fabrication of cases of apostates and including them in books like *Tarikh Tabari* was only to hide the crimes of Abu Bakr's rule towards Muslims who regard Abu Bakr's regime illegitimate.

In other words, so many cases of apostates in the history of Abu Bakr's Caliphate were fabricated to suggest to the people what terrible harm they would have caused to Muslim society, thus leading to the conclusion that whatever done was necessary. So the readers will not go after research and on the contrary even praise Abu Bakr and feel a sense of indebtedness to

him for his services to Islam. The reader would regard him as a rescuer of Islam from apostasy.

“They were those who did not see Abu Bakr a deserving one to succeed the Prophet as Caliph. Therefore they were not willing to pay tax to him though they had no doubt in Zakat as an obligation.

...people who were massacred in those days had faith in God and His Prophet. They prayed. They did not deny the obligation of Zakat. The only thing was they hesitated to pay tax to Abu Bakr because Abu Bakr’s becoming the Caliph to them was a matter of suspicion.

The Sunni sect too believes that Abu Bakr tried to justify the crimes of Khalid. They refused to pay tax to Abu Bakr, but they did not refuse the very Zakat itself.

In fact, they did a right thing. So they have a reward with their God. Zakat of property should be calculated and paid. But to whom? Only to him who has Guardianship (*Wilayat*) over them. Such a one can be only

---

**[1]** *For explanation about Saif bin Umar refer to: Khamsoon wa Miya Sahabi Mukhtaliq of Allamah Askari and also Nusoos ar-Ridda fee Tarikh Tabari of Shaykh Muhammad Hasan Aale Yasin, Pgs. 24-29*

**[2]** *Whatever Tabari has quoted from people other than Saif (like Abi Mikhnaf, Hisham Kalbi, Ibne Ishaq and Madaini) is very little because in those there is no mention of apostasy.*

**[3]** *Masoodpur Sayyid Aaqai: Chashma dar Bistar, Pgs. 89-97*

Infallible - introduced by God and His Prophet. He must be the legitimate successor of the Prophet. Was Abu Bakr so? He came to power through a plot - Saqifah. But tyranny knows no reasoning. Its language is of force, torture and atrocity.

On the other hand in reliable books of Sunni sect such as Sahih of Muslim and Sahih of Bukhari it is mentioned that the blood of those who refused to pay tax to Abu Bakr was not legal to be shed. Their bloodshed was wrong because they were Muslims.

These numerous traditions are partly general and partly conditional.

Neither a battle with them nor killing them could be justified. Abu Bakr has said that Zakat is from the property and it should be paid. But the dispute here is the person or authority who

can demand it. Only he can demand who is a guardian of people. It is the Prophet only who can appoint a guardian. Anyone who reaches the seat of Caliph by hook or by crook cannot be a guardian. What is the legitimacy that gives authority to him?

Even if they refused to pay, was it reasonable to wage a war against them? Or kill them? Reason dictates to attend to the grievances and see their reasoning instead of killing them.

Battle with them is against their right of protection of their blood. Mere presumption of Abu Bakr cannot be a ground for their killing.

In the Sahihs of Bukhari and Muslim, it is narrated on the authority of Usamah bin Zaid that: The Prophet sent us to Hirqa.**[1]** In the morning we attacked the pagans there and defeated them. I and one of Ansaar reached them. When we were among them, one shouted: There is no god except Allah. The Ansaari who was with me left him unhurt, but I killed him. When we returned and reported the event to the Prophet he told me: Usamah! Did you kill him after he had uttered there is no god except Allah?

I told the Prophet: I thought he meant refuge by uttering the name of God.

The Prophet repeated his words so much, I wished I were not a Muslim before that day.

Allamah Sharafuddin writes: Usamah wished thus because he thought that all his deeds such as prayers, fasting, being in the company of the

---

**[1]** *In Oman*

Prophet, holy wars, paying Zakat and going to Hajj all have gone in vain. They cannot wipe out the sin of killing a man who had just become a Muslim. He knew that the sin of killing a Muslim had destroyed all his virtuous deeds.

The feelings of Usamah represent his fear that he would not be forgiven or redeemed. For this very reason, he wished that he were a Muslim after that incident of killing as the Prophet has said that Islam washes all sins preceding it.

We think it is enough for the reader to understand the worth of: 'There is no god but Allah' and its sayer.

Reliable books by Sunni authors are full of such traditions that show the dignity of Muslim blood.**[1]**

Accordingly the incident of Usamah clearly indicates that killing a Muslim only because of his not paying Zakat is not allowed and the case becomes more serious if the reason for non-payment is not rebellion but a suspicion on his part about the truth or legitimacy of Caliph. They doubted the right on the part of Abu Bakr to be Caliph. So they were in hesitation to make the payment. Therefore they did not deserve to be killed.”[2]

Allamah Sharafuddin has protested in a way that even the Sunni sect concurs with it. He protested for the killing of Malik bin Nuwairah. He writes:

“The crime of Malik bin Nuwairah was his refusal to pay Zakat to Abu Bakr. It was at a time when he was occupied in investigation about legality of Abu Bakr’s Caliphate to honor his own commitment to God and His Prophet. It is obvious that the intention of Malik was not to create difference among Muslims nor did he reject Zakat itself nor did he doubt about Islam and its laws. Malik did not want to fight with the Caliph. So it is better to determine the cause first for his non-payment and then decide what to do. It is not so easy to kill a Muslim merely at a

---

**[1]** *[Allamah Sharafuddin in his another book, Al-Fusool al-Muhimma fee Taleef al-Ummah has mentioned another tradition about this:*

*A person asked the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) that if he were fighting with an infidel who has cut off his hand and then hides behind a tree and says that he has become a Muslim, is it allowed to kill him? The Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) said that it is not allowed.]*

**[2]** *Allamah Sayyid Abdul Husain Sharafuddin: Ijtihad Dar Maqabil-e-Nass (Translated by Ali Dawani), Pgs. 127-132*

pretext. Malik bin Nuwairah in view of the position he had among his people obviously saw it fit to investigate the situation whether the new government that had come into being in Medina and was busy in crushing its opponents and occupied in spotting and eliminating hidden adversaries of Abu Bakr from the scene was really a legitimate government.

That is the only reason why Malik bin Nuwairah abstained from paying Zakat and began to investigate so that he pay to the proper person and thus fulfill his duty properly.

So it was necessary that Abu Bakr and his officials should have given time to Malik to make his decision in the light of his investigations and act accordingly. They should not have dealt with him in such haste.

Because he was not a denier of Zakat, he did not differentiate between Zakat and prayer and was not one that considered it necessary to fight Abu Bakr or other Muslims.

This was the reality of Malik and his people's refusal to pay Zakat.

Malik was not one to wage war among Muslims. Malik even advised his tribe members to preserve their Islam.

He further advised them to disperse and not camp all together at one place lest Khalid may think that they are planning an armed confrontation.”**[1]**

Conclusively it can be said that:

“The fact is that there was no Murtad at all in the period of Abu Bakr. Those whom Abu Bakr fought were within Islam and none had renounced faith. A few could have been there who had not become Muslims since the beginning itself. A few refused to pay Zakat to Abu Bakr. So how they became Murtad?”**[2]**

“After Zahra's martyrdom, the government sent troops to deal with those who were outside Medina as they had not given Bay'at to Abu Bakr.”**[3]**

---

**[1]** Allamah Sharafuddin: *Ijtihaad Dar Maqabil-e-Nass* (Translated by Ali Dawani), Pgs. 134-135

**[2]** Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Askari: *Abdullah Ibne Saba Wa Deegar Afsaane* (Abdullah Bin Saba and other legends), Vol. 1, Pg. 191

**[3]** Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Askari: *Saqifah* (Study about the formation of government after the passing away of the Holy Prophet), Edited by Mahdi Dashti, Pgs. 113-114

Even though Abu Bakr's regime tried to label all their opponents as Murtads and under this excuse fight and kill them, they could not identify all of them as apostates.

The accusation of being a Murtad was the best means to destroy the enemy. So he used this means, which was to his own ends.

But analysis shows that a multitude of the people was not Murtad and did not deserve such loss of life and property even though Caliph's circular reads:

Whoever does not submit to the government should be killed or burnt alive and his women and children should be taken as captives.**[1]**"**[2]**

Historical documents show that the plan of Abu Bakr was so harsh and brutal against his opponents that it is said:

A) "Fight them even if they refuse to give a camel's tether."**([3])([4])**

B) The circular of the Caliph was thus:

I have given the assignment to this army to kill by sword those who have departed from religion of Islam. Furthermore, they have a mandate to burn them alive and make their widows and children captives..."**[5]**

Now the question is - after all these scrutinies and analyses can it still be claimed:

"The stand of Abu Bakr was strong and he showed no weakness in his motive of saving the religion of Islam. Where religion of Islam was concerned, he was without any consideration. God had inspired him with such strength. The religion is indebted to him."**[6]**

Whenever we recall those strict stands of Abu Bakr towards those who

---

**[1]** Quoted from: *Tarikh al-Umam wal Mulook*, Vol. 3, Pgs. 226-227

**[2]** Yusuf Gholami: *Pas az Ghuroob (After Sunset)*, Pg. 222

**[3]** Ibid. Pg. 224; quoting from: *Al-Bidaya wan Nihaya*, Vol. 6, Pg. 311 [Ibne Abil Hadeed: *Sharh Nahjul Balagha*, Vol. 17, Pg. 209]

**[4]** Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Askari: *Abdullah Ibne Saba Wa Deegar Afsaane (Abdullah Bin Saba and other legends)*, Vol. 1, Pg. 196; quoting from: *Al-Bidaya wan Nihaya*, Vol. 6, Pg. 311

**[5]** Ibid. quoting from: *Tarikh al-Umam wal Mulook*, Vol. 3, Pgs. 226-227

**[6]** Abdul Qadir Dahqaan Siraawaani: Article quoted in *Nida-e-Islam Magazine*, Issue No. 10, Summer 81, Pg. 19

refused to pay Zakat we come to realize his honesty, truth, trustworthiness and straight forwardness in carrying out the mandate vested to him by God.”!**[1]**

“The right was with Abu Bakr in relation to those who did not pay Zakat.”**[2]**

Please do pay attention to the following statement:

“Abu Bakr’s government did not observe any distinction between a Muslim and an apostate. He dealt with all equally like Arabs of the age of ignorance. When they waged a battle, the victor had a right to take the widows as concubines and make their children captives and confiscate their property.

On this ground, when the government suppressed so-called apostates they propagated that they killed non-Muslims. Likewise, they attacked the towns, killed and murdered whomever they liked, captured and arrested some. Their children were enslaved, womenfolk made concubines and belongings they took for themselves.

As a result, a considerable wealth found its way to Medina and was hoarded there.

This process had no compatibility with teachings of Islam. That is why it reflected an unhealthy and undesirable effect in the eyes of many. People considered that the acts the Caliph committed, such as murder, plunder, killing and pillage was part of Islamic teachings. This process influenced to a great extent on the minds of the people to think - rather to believe - that Islam is a religion of sword; and it spread by force.”**[3]**

Although these crimes and inhumane acts, which are against Islamic teachings and mankind, are recorded in history yet they claim:

“Whatever the Caliph did throughout the period of his Caliphate was in

---

**[1]** *Salah Abdul Fattah al-Khalidi (Translated by Abdul Aziz Sulaimi): Khulafa-e-Raashideen Az Khilafat Taa Shahadat (1<sup>st</sup> Edition 1382), Pg. 83*

**[2]** *Ibid. Khulafa-e-Raashideen Az Khilafat Taa Shahadat (1<sup>st</sup> Edition 1382), Pg. 82*

**[3]** *Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Askari: Naqsh-e-Aaimma Dar Ahya-e-Deen (Role of Imams in the Revival of Religion, Vol. 14, Pgs. 40-41*

accordance with traditions of Prophet and God's commandments." **[1]**

While the fact is that:

"From what we said it seems that Abu Bakr's army fought with Muslims who neither drew out swords nor announced a war. Rather they repeatedly declared their Islam and prayed with Muslims in the same row.

Yes, Abu Bakr's army fought against such men, made them captives, killed them after accusing them of non-payment of Zakat. They did not even ask them to pay the Zakat to see whether they would pay or not.

There are still several other motives in these battles. There are ends and aims, hidden, which have no bearing on Zakat nor related to its payment..." **[2]**

## Examples of Caliphate facing its legal opponents

### A - Malik bin Nuwairah

“All historians, Tabari, Ibn Athir, Ibn Kathir and Yaqoobi say: Abu Bakr sent an army under Khalid bin Waleed to tribes that had not given Bay’at to Abu Bakr after passing away of Prophet or did not pay Zakat to collectors of Abu Bakr, so that they may be forced to make the payment.”**[3]**

“Malik bin Nuwairah was a brave man, a poet and chief of a part of Bani Tameem tribe. He was a companion of the Prophet and his agent. Malik did not send to Medina, alms**[4]** he had collected after passing away of Prophet. He returned the amounts to persons he had collected from.**[5]**”**[6]**

---

**[1]** *Fareedoon Islamniya: Ashra-e-Mubashira (1<sup>st</sup> Edition 1380), Pg. 47*

**[2]** *Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Askari: Abdullah Ibne Saba Wa Deegar Afsaane (Abdullah Bin Saba and other legends), Vol. 2, Pg. 240*

**[3]** *Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Askari: Saqifah (Study about the formation of government after the passing away of the Holy Prophet), Edited by Mahdi Dashti, Pgs. 65-66*

**[4]** *[Today the term used is ‘Zakat’]*

**[5]** *[According to records he distributed it among the poor people of his clan, Allamah Sharafuddin in his book: Ijtihad dar Maqabil-e-Nass, Pg. 154 has explained that Malik was famous for his kindness to the orphans and poor women and he used to distribute Zakat among the poor under approval of the Prophet.]*

**[6]** *Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Askari: Saqifah, Pg. 65; quoting from: Al-Isabah, Vol. 3, Pg. 336*

When Khalid bin Waleed arrived at Bitah**[1]** he gave an assignment to Zirar bin Azwer and sent him with a few soldiers to attack the tribe of Malik. Abu Qatadah**[2]** too was among them. They made a surprise attack on Malik’s tribe. Abu Qatadah used to narrate after a long time since this incident: We told them if you are telling the truth that you are Muslims, keep your weapons on the ground. They agreed and placed their weapons on the ground and stood to pray**[3].****[4]**

Ibn Abil Hadeed writes in his Sharh Nahjul Balagha: As soon as Malik and his associates placed their weapons on the ground, Zirar and his friends rushed up on them and tying them with ropes dragged them to Khalid bin Waleed.**[5]**”**[6]**

“Khalid claims that Malik bin Nuwairah had renounced Islam. In other words, he had become a Murtad. Khalid’s reasoning was that Malik uttered some words which made him a Murtad.

On the other hand Malik denied having uttered any words at all. Malik had this to say:

I am a Muslim. I have neither amended nor changed any of its regulations. Abu Qatadah and Abdullah bin Umar also attested the statements of Malik, but Khalid refused. He first killed Malik, then ordered Zirar to behead him. After that, Khalid the same night, slept with his widow**[7]**.”**[8]**

“In Isabah it is narrated from Zubair bin Bikkar on the authority of Ibn Shuhab (Zuhri) that Malik bin Nuwairah had lavish hair. After having killed Malik Khalid ordered that his severed head be placed under the cooking pot. The fire consumed the hair and had not yet reached to the skin that the food was cooked.”**[9]**

---

**[1]** *[Center of Bani Yarbu]*

**[2]** *[He was a companion of the Prophet who took part in the Battle of Uhad and battles after that.]*

**[3]** *[On the basis of this they were really Muslims.]*

**[4]** *Quoted from: Tarikh Tabari (European Edition), Vol. 1, Pgs. 1927-1928*

**[5]** *[It is seen that they were told to arrange prayers so that they would keep their weapons away.]*

**[6]** *Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Askari: Doo Maktab Dar Islam (Two Schools of Islam) Vol. 2 (Outlooks of two schools about sources of Islamic legislation) Pgs. 123-124*

**[7]** *[Umme Tameem binte Minhal]*

**[8]** *Ibid. Vol. 2, Pg. 125; quoting from: Kanzul Ummal, Vol. 3, Pg. 132*

**[9]** *Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Askari: Abdullah Ibne Saba Wa Deegar Afsaane (Abdullah*

From this historical document we can conclude that Malik was a hairy man. The soldiers placed the severed heads under

cooking pots. Malik's head did not burn completely because the flames that rose up from the hair cooked the food. **[1]**

## Two Reminders

**One** - We draw your attention to two points raised by Allamah Sharafuddin in his book, *Ijtihad Dar Maqaabile Nass* with regard to murder of Malik bin Nuwairah and his tribe:

“Bukhari with regard to delegating Ali and Khalid to Yemen writes in his Sahih: A man stood and said: O Prophet! Fear God. The Prophet said: Woe on you! Am I not the most deserving person in the world to be in refuge of God and most befitting to be in piety?

Khalid said: O Prophet of God! Shall I cut his throat?

The Prophet said: No. Perhaps this man performs prayers. **[2]**

How nice it would have been if Khalid had remembered Prophet’s words. If only Khalid had shown some respect to prayers. Did not Malik pray? Why Khalid did not honor prayers of Malik? Khalid disobeyed the Prophet in killing Malik. Abdullah bin Umar and Abu Qatadah Ansaari gave evidence to Khalid that Malik had performed the Morning Prayer that day. Then on what ground he killed him?” **[3]**

“According to Yaqubi’s statement in his history, Abu Qatadah went to Abu Bakr and reported the case to him and said: By God, I shall not go anywhere under the command of Khalid. He killed Malik in spite of his being a Muslim.

Tabari too has mentioned that Abu Qatadah was among those who gave evidence that Malik was a Muslim.

---

*Bin Saba and other legends), Vol. 1, Pgs. 202-203; quoting from: Tabari, Vol. 2, Pg. 503; Al-Isabah, Vol. 3, Pg. 337; Tarikh Ibne Kathir, Vol. 6, Pg. 321; Tarikh Abul Fida, Pg. 158*

**[1]** For more details refer to Refer: Ali Gholami Dahqi: *Janghai Irtdidat wa Bohran Janasheeni-e-Payambar, Section Six, Pgs. 81-91*

**[2]** The author says: This tradition is also quoted by Ahmad bin Hanbal from Abu Saeed Khudri on page 4 of the third part of Musnad.

**[3]** Allamah Sharafuddin: *Ijtihad Dar Maqabil-e-Nass (Translated by Ali Dawani), Pgs. 130-131*

In Tarikh Abil Fida it is mentioned that Abu Bakr and Umar got the news and learnt of the events. Abu Bakr said: I will never execute him (Khalid), because he has erred in his Ijtihaad. I will not sheath the sword that Allah had pulled on them.”**[1]**

“It is mentioned in several sources such as Wafayaat al-Ay-aan, Tarikh Abul Fida and Kanzul Ayaan: When the news of Khalid’s killing Malik and raping his widow reached Abu Bakr and Umar, Abu Bakr said that he would not stone Khalid to death. He is a jurisprudent and has erred in his jurisprudence.

Umar asked him to dismiss Khalid.**[2]**

Abu Bakr said: I will not sheath the sword God has pulled out.”**[3]**

“Ibn Abil Hadeed writes: Abu Bakr said: Shut up Umar! This is not our first mistake. You better hold your tongue about Khalid.”**[4]**

We must remark here:

“Abu Bakr during his rule appointed Khalid as the commander of his army in Syria.**[5]** Then he ordered him in advance to be the commander of forces in Baghdad upon his return from Syria.”**[6]**

Khalid was stone-hearted. In the history of Abu Bakr’s Caliphate his record was such:

“When Khalid bin Waleed moved to Buzakha he sent Akhasheh bin Mehsin and Thabit bin Aqram as scouts ahead of the forces. They reached near a place where Tolaiha with his brother had come to

---

**[1]** Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Askari: *Abdullah Ibne Saba Wa Deegar Afsaane (Abdullah Bin Saba and other legends)*, Vol. 1, Pgs. 204-205

**[2]** [The different policy of Umar with regard to Khalid bin Waleed was to remove Khalid from political power in order to settle personal difference, since he was from Bani Adi and Waleed was from Bani Makhzoom]

**[3]** Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Askari: *Doo Maktab Dar Islam (Two Schools of Islam) Vol. 2 (Outlooks of two schools about sources of Islamic legislation) Pgs. 127-128; quoting from: Kanzul Ummal, Vol. 3, Pg. 132, Tr. 227; Wafayaat Ay-aan, Vol. 5, Pg. 67; Tarikh Abul Fida, Pg. 158*

**[4]** Ahmad Asadnejad: *Wasi-e-Payambar Keest? Pgs. 139-140; quoted from: Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Ibne Abil Hadeed, Vol. 1*

Pg. 179

**[5]** Refer: *Najah Ata at-Tai: Nazaryaat al-Khaleefatain*, Vol. 2, Pgs. 189; quoting from *Tarikh Yaqoobi*, Vol. 2, Pg. 13; *Tarikh Tabari*, Vol. 2, Pg. 617

**[6]** Refer: *Ibid.* Vol. 2, Pg. 189; quoting from *Tarikh Tabari*, Vol. 2, Pg. 603

evaluate the army of Islam. They accidentally met Khalid's scouts and killed them.

Tabari narrates from Ibn Kalbi: Khalid with his army passed by the corpse of Thabit and rode on it by mistake. They dead body got trampled under the hooves of horses..."**[1]**

**Two** - it is interesting that inspite of these crimes committed by Khalid and murder of Malik in that bestial way they still praise Abu Bakr:

"Elasticity and leniency of Abu Bakr towards Khalid bin Waleed is appreciable. In the view of Abu Bakr the mistake and error of Khalid was ignorable."**[2]**

In the end, they add:

"Anas bin Malik says that companions of Prophet were not willing to wage a war against those who refused to pay Zakat. They said that they were performers of prayers. But Abu Bakr pulled out the sword and set out alone. People too followed him..."**[3]**

According to the above narration, Abu Bakr was alone. He pulled the sword himself only thus he went. People saw him going alone and were compelled to trot behind him.

According to this report it seems that Abu Bakr himself fought Malik bin Nuwairah. On the other hand all historians write (rather to exculpate Abu Bakr), that Khalid ordered Zirar bin Azwar and he killed Malik cutting off his head."**[4]**

"The fact is that Malik was a man of reputation. He was chief of a tribe. At that time Abu Bakr's rule was still weak and they feared that a little movement could easily topple their Caliphate.

The interior too was shaky. Groups like Bani Hashim and Ali at their head, Khazrij under the leadership of Saad bin Ubadah and Quraish with Abu Sufyan were still their opponents.

---

**[1]** Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Askari: *Abdullah Ibne Saba Wa Deegar Afsaane (Abdullah Bin Saba and other legends)*, Vol. 2, Pgs. 56-57

**[2]** Yusuf Karzai (Translated by Jalil Bahraminiya): *Weeshgihai Kulli Islam (1<sup>st</sup> Edition)*, Pgs. 373-374

**[3]** Quoted from: Haqqi: *Tafseer Ruhul Bayan*, under the exegesis of Verse 54, Surah Maidah

**[4]** Ahmad Asadnejad: *Wasi-e-Payambar Keest?* Pgs. 34-35

So this courageous and honorable man of Bani Tameem regarded as real danger a person who was a few miles from Medina and thought of some way to be safe from him. So he should be by any means and at any pretext be eliminated and the elimination should be such as to serve a lesson to others.

As a result of all this scrutiny, we can say that the real cause of the murder of Malik and one actually responsible of it was Abu Bakr himself - not Khalid.”**[1]**

“Abu Bakr was very much enraged at Malik bin Nuwairah for not considering him a lawful successor of the Prophet and had given orders to Khalid bin Waleed to kill Malik wherever he was found.”**[2]**

## Saad bin Ubadah

Saad bin Ubadah Khazraji was the first to reach the meeting of Ansaar at Saqifah Bani Saadah, and he was the most popular candidate. Muhajireen joined a little later. They changed the course of discourse, which resulted in Abu Bakr's becoming Caliph. As a matter of fact, Muhajireen made Abu Bakr the Caliph.

"They left Saad alone for a few days since the plot of Saqifah. Later he was invited to pay allegiance to Abu Bakr as all his people and relatives had paid allegiance to Abu Bakr.

Saad answered: By God! I will shoot all my arrows on you till they are exhausted. I will color my lance with your blood. But I will not give Bay'at to you. As long as I could, I will fight you, but I will not keep my hand in yours.

When they heard these words of Saad, Umar told Abu Bakr not to let Saad go unless he pays allegiance.

However Basheer bin Saad[3] said that he would not pay allegiance to you because he has become stubborn to you. He added: It is not so easy to kill him. If he is killed all his relatives, sons, associates and family members too should be killed. If you let him go[4] he would not harm you because he is only one.

They accepted the guidance of Basheer and left Saad.

[1] *Ibid. Pg. 32*

[2] *Wilfred Madelung: Succession to Muhammad, Pgs. 75-76*

[3] *[He was cousin of Saad bin Ubadah and the first one to give Bayyat to Abu Bakr]*

[4] *Quoted from: Tarikh Tabari, Vol. 3, Pg. 459; Tarikh Ibne Athir, Vol. 2, Pg. 126*

Saad did not attend any of their meetings nor joined them in daily and Friday prayers. During the Hajj season, he was not seen with them.[1]

It continued like this until Abu Bakr died and Umar came to power.[2]"[3]

One day Umar saw Saad in a lane of Medina. Umar called him: O, Saad! Saad too replied at once: O, Umar!

The Caliph asked: Are you not the one who used to say such and such? Saad said: Yes, I am that man. Now you have reached to power. By God, I hate your company.

Umar said: One who hates his neighbor changes the place. Not much time passed[4] but that Saad left Medina for Syria in the early days of Umar's Caliphate...[5]

Balazari writes in his book *Ansaab al-Ashraaf*:

Saad bin Ubadah did not pay allegiance to Abu Bakr and left for Syria.

Umar engaged a man, instructed him to go to Syria and persuade Saad to pay allegiance by hook or crook. He asked him to play any trick he knew to get Saad's acknowledgement to Umar's Caliphate. In case of failure he asked him to kill Saad by the help of God. The hired man headed to Syria, met Saad in Howaryeen and opened the subject of allegiance. He tried to persuade him to acknowledge Umar's Caliphate but when he got disappointed he pulled out the arrow from the case that hung at his back and shot him. It immediately cut the main vein and Saad died at once.[6] In the book, *Tabssiratul Awaam* it is mentioned that Umar had hired Muhammad bin Musailaima Ansaari[7] for this secret job. Muhammad

---

**[1]** *[Except for this there was no other display of opposition by Saad, yet he was murdered.]*

**[2]** *Quoted from: Riyadh an-Nazarah, Vol. 1, Pg. 168*

**[3]** *Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Askari: Saqifah (Study about the formation of government after the passing away of the Holy Prophet), Edited by Mahdi Dashti, Pgs. 63-64*

**[4]** *[It is seen that on one hand since the early day of Caliphate of Umar Khalid bin Waleed himself preferred to remain in Syria and after a short period was found dead under suspicious circumstances on the other hand there is mention in history that he also had a hand in the murder of Saad, so the exile of Saad bin Ubadah must have taken place during the period of Abu Bakr or the early part of the Caliphate of Umar.]*

**[5]** *Quoted from: Tabaqat, Vol. 2, Pg. 145; Tarikh Ibne Asakir, Vol. 6, Pg. 90*

**[6]** *Quoted from: Ansaab al-Ashraaf, Vol. 1, Pg. 589; Al-Iqdul Fareed, Vol. 3, Pgs. 64-65*

**[7]** *[It is proved that he was among those who besieged the house of His Eminence, Ali*

accordingly went to Syria and shot Saad bin Ubadah with an arrow.**[1]**

It is also said that Khalid bin Waleed was also present in Syria at that time and he assisted Muhammad bin Musailaima in eliminating Saad...**[2]**

Ibn Abde Rabb says: Saad bin Ubadah's body was found with an arrow in his heart. They spread a rumor that Jinns had killed Saad by two arrows in his heart.**[3]"[4]**

## **Umme Farwa[5]**

“This lady named Umme Farwa announced her opposition to Abu Bakr when she said: I recognize only Ali as a real and true successor of Prophet. She was executed by the orders of Abu Bakr.”**[6]**

## Fujayat al-Salma was burnt

“There was a man of Bani Salim tribe named Fujayat[7] whose main occupations were theft, murder, plunder and rowdism. At last he was captured[8] and brought to Abu Bakr. Abu Bakr ordered them to make a fire in the praying square of Medina. Then he ordered that he should be thrown into it alive with hands and legs tied.

So it was done and he died in this way. While he was dying he was calling out the testimonies of being a Muslim at the pitch of his voice.”[9]

“Tabari and Ibn Athir have narrated the story thus:

“A man named Fujayat came to Abu Bakr from the tribe of Bani Salim

---

*and Fatima (a.s.) (Tarikh Tabari, Vol. 2, Pgs. 443-444)]*

**[1]** *[It is proved that he was among those who besieged the house of His Eminence, Ali and Fatima (a.s.) (Tarikh Tabari, Vol. 2, Pgs. 443-444)]*

**[2]** *Quoted from: Tabsiratul Awaam, Pg. 32*

**[3]** *Quoted from: Al-Iqdul Fareed, Vol. 3, Pgs. 64-65*

**[4]** *Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Askari: Saqifah (Study about the formation of government after the passing away of the Holy Prophet), Edited by Mahdi Dashti, Pgs. 70-72*

**[5]** *[An Ansari lady]*

**[6]** *Muhammad Baqir Ansari: Jarfai Ghadeer, Pg. 177; quoting from: Ath-Thaqib fil Manaqib, Pg. 226*

**[7]** *[Ayaas bin Abdullah]*

**[8]** *[“He set out to fight the apostates from the side of Abu Bakr and in the end became a highway robber in Najd.” Yusuf Gholami: Pas az Ghuroob (After Sunset), Pg. 227]*

**[9]** *Sayyid Muhammad Hasan Jawahiri: Abu Bakr, Pg. 64; quoting from: Tarikh Tabari, Vol. 2, Pg. 266 (Events of year 11); Kamil Ibne Athir, Vol. 2, Pg. 211; Al-Isabah, Vol. 2, Pg. 322*

and said: I am Muslim. I want to fight against the apostates, but I have neither a horse nor a weapon. Give me a horse and a weapon. Abu Bakr provided him what he was short of, but Fujayat instead of going on his mission went to the highways and began to loot people or shoot them if they resisted. He rode the

horse looting and plundering. A man named Najba bin Abi al-Mitha from Bani Shareed tribe helped him.

When news reached Abu Bakr he wrote to Tarifa bin Hajir: The enemy of God, Fujayat, came to me and announced he was a Muslim. He asked me to provide him with a horse and weapon so he can fight the apostates. I provided him the same, but now I hear that this enemy of God is looting Muslims and pagans alike.**[1]** So you with the help of Muslims under your command arrest or kill him. If you arrest him, bring him to me.

Tarifa bin Hajir headed towards Fujayat. Both met and shooting without aim or target took place. In the meantime, Najba bin Abi al-Mitha got hurt and died. Fujayat understood that Muslims were determined to arrest and execute him. He spoke to Tarifa: You have neither preference nor any superiority over me. You have an assignment from Abu Bakr and I too have orders from him.

Tarifa bin Abi Hajar said: If you are telling the truth put down the weapon and come with me to Abu Bakr.

Fujayat agreed. They both (Fujayat and Tarifa) went to Abu Bakr.

As soon as he saw Fujayat he ordered Tarifa to take him to Baqi and burn him alive.

In another narration Tabari says that Tarifa gathered fuel wood as much as he could and ignited the fire. Then he tied up Fujayat and threw him into the huge flames.

In this regard, Ibn Athir has this to say: Tarifa tied the hands of Fujayat to his neck. Then he was tied by ropes round his body then he threw him into the fire until he died.”**[2]**

---

**[1]** *[This was the same attitude that Ziyad bin Labeed, Akrama bin Abu Jahl and Khalid bin Waleed practiced with the opponents of Abu Bakr. On the basis of this it could be said that they must have been appointed by Abu Bakr. But they have made the matter doubtful to exculpate the Caliph.]*

**[2]** *Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Askari: Doo Maktab Dar Islam (Two Schools of Islam) Vol. 2 (Outlooks of two schools about sources of Islamic legislation) Pgs. 118-119; quoting from: Tarikh Ibne Kathir, Vol. 9, Pg. 319; Tarikh Tabari, (1<sup>st</sup> Edition) Vol. 3, Pgs. 234-235; Tarikh Ibne Athir, Vol. 2, Pg. 146*

**Part 7**  
**Analysis of Individual and Social**  
**Liberties**

## Dealing with Youth

### A. Dealing with Zaid bin Muawiyah Qashari

Historical records show that the Caliph did not pay least regard to request of a Muslim youth. For instance, the youth was fond of a particular camel and thus another camel was presented by his people as Zakat. But the Caliph's men insisted that the former be given in Zakat.

We present here a historical document that indicates how the feelings of a youth were crushed in Abu Bakr's rule:

"In Yemen, Abu Bakr's agent[1] was collecting Zakat[2] when his choice fell on an infant camel, which belonged to a youth. The youth requested him to take another instead because it was his favorite.

The agent rejected the request.

The youth approached the chief of tribe[3] who mediated and recommended but the agent refused.

The chief of tribe went to the herd of camels collected from people against Zakat. He took that infant camel from the herd and gave it to the youth, its owner.

The agent reported the matter to Abu Bakr and Abu Bakr immediately sent troops there.

The people rioted and the tribes of Yemen rose to fight against them.

When the people of Daba became aware of the fighting of Kinda tribe they too rioted and expelled Abu Bakr's agent from their town.

Abu Bakr wrote to the commander of the army to go there and fight them.

He went there, surrounded them and caused for them great many difficulties.

People approached Abu Bakr's agent and offered peace to him saying

---

[1] [His name was Ziyad bin Labeed; he was among those who besieged the house of His Eminence, Ali and Fatima (a.s.)  
(*Tarikh Tabari*, Vol. 2, Pgs. 443-444)]

[2] [Zakat]

[3] [His name was Haritha bin Suraqa]

they would pay whatever tax was incumbent upon them.[1]

The agent said: I don't accept unless you admit that we are on the right and you are wrong. Our killed ones are in heaven and yours in hell. You must accept our decision.

They had no way but to accept. Then the agent ordered them to leave their weapons and go out of their native town which also they did.

In the meantime, the soldiers entered the town. One by one cut the throats of the elders. Womenfolk and children were made captives and their property was seized. Then they went to Abu Bakr with the captives and spoils.

After this, they went ahead with their tyranny, attacked Kinda and cut the throats of dignitaries and others were dispatched to Medina.

Such and similar cases abound during the period of Abu Bakr.”**[2]**

The details of the incident are:

“Abu Bakr wrote to Ziyad bin Labeed and Muhajireen of Bani Umayyah Makhzumi to come together and obtain people's acknowledgement to his Caliphate. If any refused to give allegiance or pay Zakat, they must fight him - whoever it may be.

Athim says in Futuh:

Ziyad bin Labeed was involved in collecting Zakat from people, some of whom paid willingly and some under force, unwillingly. He was too strict and harsh with people in collecting tax. One day it so happened that a youth, Zaid Ibn Muawiyah Qashari, accidentally saw his camel with the stamp of Zakat over it among the camels which Ziyad bin Labeed had collected from people. The herd was still there and not yet moved to be sent to Abu Bakr. The youth approached Haritha bin Surakha one of the heads of Kinda tribe and said:

---

**[1]** *[It is surprising that inspite of this historical proof it is claimed that: “Before military campaign Hazrat Abu Bakr started a peaceful campaign.” (Fareedoon Islamniya: Ashra-e-Mubashira, Pg. 35)]*

**[2]** *Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Askari: Naqsh-e-Aaimma Dar Ahya-e-Deen (Role of Imams in the Revival of Religion, Vol. 14, Pgs. 40-41 & Saqifah (Study about the formation of government after the passing away of the Holy Prophet), Edited by Mahdi Dashti, Pgs. 68-69; quoting from: Al-Futuh, Vol. 1, Pgs. 49-61. The details of this incident can be seen in his*

*book Abdullah bin Saba, Vol. 1, Pgs. 175-237 & Vol. 2, Pgs. 51-77.*

O cousin! Ziyad bin Labeed has taken one of my camels and stamped it and kept it among camels of Zakat. I don't mind paying Zakat but I am very much fond of this particular camel. Please talk with Ziyad and ask him to take another instead.

Athim adds: Haritha bin Surakha approached Ziyad bin Labeed and said: If possible, do a favor to this youth to return his camel and take another instead.

Ziyad answered:

This camel is now a part of God's property and also stamped as such. I don't want to substitute it by any other.

Haritha said:

We are asking you to do a favor. Do this by way of charity and generosity. It will be better than to do it by force. Ziyad was also enraged by Haritha's statement and he said:

I will not let this camel go. I'll see who can take it from me.

Athim goes on:

Then Haritha went to the herd and spotted the camel, took it out and gave it to the youth and told him: If anyone asks you anything about it, break his nose by the sword. Then, he added:

We obeyed the Prophet of God when he was alive. After his death had any from members of his Household succeeded him we would have obeyed him also. But the son of Abu Qahafa has no obligation on us neither is it incumbent on us to obey him or pay allegiance to him.

Athim continues:

When these couplets reached Ziyad bin Labeed dread overtook him: He feared to lose the whole herd of camels he had collected as Zakat. In the darkness of the night, which was a good covering to him, he together with his colleagues fled from Hadhramaut to Medina. Ziyad bin Labeed was driving the herd to surrender them to Abu Bakr. All of a sudden he changed his mind. He sent the camels to Medina with a reliable person and advised the man not to say a word to Abu Bakr about the developments that had taken place. He himself returned to Bani Zahal bin Mawia - a branch of Kinda tribes and reported to them all the events. He also invited them to accept Abu Bakr as

Caliph and pay allegiance to him and remain obedient to Abu Bakr. Ziyad went from tribe to tribe among Kinda with this same mission. Wherever he went and extended invitation

to obey Abu Bakr, he received a negative answer. They did not entertain him as guests are usually received among Arabs because of his mission.**[1]**

Disappointed, Ziyad had no alternative but to return to Medina. He met Abu Bakr and reported the matter to him adding a little mischief. He told Abu Bakr that Kinda tribes about to renounce Islam and return to their previous infidelity. So soon they will be Murtads.

Abu Bakr sent an army of four thousand soldiers to Hadhramaut under the command of Ziyad himself.**[2]**

Ziyad first attacked Bani Hind - a division of Kinda, and defeated them. Then he set out towards another branch named Banu Aqal. Then he attacked the sub-division named Bani Hujar. In this sub-division, he made a surprise attack. After this, he headed to Bani Jumair. It is not that he went to pay friendly visits. Wherever he went he waged a battle and fought the inhabitants, killed their elders, made their widows and orphans captives. So wherever he went, death and destruction accompanied him. The bloodshed at the hands of Ziyad bin Labeed and cruelties he committed began to be talked of and reached Ashath bin Qais. Ashath bin Qais was very much perturbed and he called for a domestic meeting consisting of his cousins only to decide what should be done. They headed towards Ziyad, met him near the town of Tareem. Fighting started and with it started bloodshed. Ashath bin Qais killed three hundred soldiers of Ziyad and he was defeated. Ziyad found himself nowhere. He fled to the town of Tareem and took refuge there. From there he reported the matter in a letter to his master - Abu Bakr. Abu Bakr saw he held no more cards. So he wrote a letter to Ashath and tried to make peace with him. The messenger while talking to Ashath accused him of apostasy. One of the cousins of Ashath rose, pulled to the sword and brought it down on the head of the messenger who died instantly.

This incident deprived Ashath of his friends. Most of his friends deserted him and fled. Now only two thousand persons remained with Ashath.

Ziyad wrote to Abu Bakr that the messenger has been killed. Abu Bakr said: If they refused to pay Zakat to me or paid less even by a camel's

---

**[1]** *From this it can be surmised that Ziyad did not invite these tribes to accept Islam because they were already Muslims and they accepted the commands of Prayer and Zakat. It was only that they rejected Abu Bakr's Caliphate and refused to pay Zakat to him.*

**[2]** *Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Askari: Abdullah Ibne Saba Wa Deegar Afsaane (Abdullah Bin Saba and other legends), Vol. 2, Pgs. 218-223*

tether from the quantity the Prophet had fixed for them I will wage war against them. Abu Bakr wrote to Akrama bin Abi Jahl asking him to mobilize a group of Meccans and also those who obeyed him and to go to Ziyad bin Labeed. Accordingly Akrama moved towards Ziyad with two thousand mounted men from Quraish and also those who had a treaty with him. The inhabitants of Daba got the intelligence of Akrama's arrival in the town of Ma'arab. They became angry by this and made a plan to engage Akrama in some occupation or other and not to let him go and attack their cousins from Kinda tribe and other than Kinda. They had expelled Hudhaifah bin Mehsin - the agent of Abu Bakr for reporting the revolt of Daba people to Abu Bakr. This development enraged Abu Bakr who wrote to Akrama: I had instructed you in my previous letter to move towards Hadhramaut. But now upon receipt of this letter please change your route and go to Daba. Deal with the inhabitants as they deserve. Do not be in the least careless in carrying out the mission, which is the theme of this letter. Upon completion of the task arrest the people and send them to me. Afterwards you go to Ziyad bin Labeed. I hope that God will conquer the land of Hadhramaut at your hands."**[1]**

"Akrama, son of Abu Jahl, acted according to the contents of the letter, moved towards Daba**[2]** with a battalion and faced the inhabitants there. A battle ensued. The attacks were lethal and fatally destructive to such an extent that the armed generation of Daba could not stand before the army of Akrama.

The military pursued and killed them wherever they were found and even dragged them out of their hiding places to kill. But the swords of Abu Bakr's army under Akrama's command

remained yet thirsty. Altogether one hundred men of Daba were killed in this battle a few could manage to escape to neighboring towns or remote lands for their life.[3] Some seeing no hope to be safe from those dreadful swords, which were tempered in revenge, surrendered to Akrama.

Akrama's soldiers killed the elders, commanders and heads of Daba people. The folks that became captive were three hundred in number;

---

**[1]** *Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Askari: Abdullah Ibne Saba Wa Deegar Afsaane (Abdullah Bin Saba and other legends), Vol. 2, Pgs. 224-229*

**[2]** *[This incident alone is sufficient to prove that the people of Oman and Mohra were wrongly accused of apostasy]*

**[3]** *[In the text of the document, the word of Muslims is used so that the opposite group could be posed to be of apostates.]*

among them were warriors, children and women. They were sent to Abu Bakr.

Abu Bakr wanted to kill the men and distribute among Muslims the children and women. But Umar did not allow.**[1]...****[2]**

What all these tyrannies and atrocities, in addition to bloodshed on a wide scale, were for? It started from a baby camel!!!

Why should Abu Bakr's agent behave in such a harsh, impolite and inhumane way with them? Had he shown least leniency to that youth no one would have been killed. Had he given that camel back to the youth who had promised to substitute it by another, what wrong would have been there in it?

Was it such a serious matter that it had to be responded with military attacks and bloodshed of hundreds of Muslims?!!

"While the Prophet had ordered his agents and officials to be mild and polite with the people and strictly enjoined them to not show any inconsideration to values of brotherhood, humanity and morals. The way Abu Bakr handled this and several such cases had, indeed, enraged the magnanimous soul of Prophet. For instance, when the Prophet sent Maaz bin Jabal to Yemen he instructed him as follows:

"Maaz! You are going to the people of the book - Jews and Christians. They do not deny God and His religion. You only invite them to oneness of God and prophethood of Muhammad. If they comply you inform them that God had made five times

prayers incumbent on Muslims. If they accept this you make them aware of Zakat which God has made incumbent on the rich and wealthy people to benefit of needy and poor ones. If they accept this you do not take what is dear to them under pretext of Zakat.

Do fear the curse of a victim and an oppressed one. God swiftly complies with the curse of victims.

This tradition is mentioned in reliable sources such as Sahih of Bukhari, Abu Dawood, Tirmidhi, Nasai, Ibn Majah, Darimi, Malik and Ibn Hanbal.

---

**[1]** *[Because on one hand tribal prejudice did not permit him this and on the other hand Ashath bin Qais Kindi was his staunch supporter.]*

**[2]** *Ibid. Vol. 2, Pg. 69*

Ibn Hajar in Fath al-Bari writes about things which were dear to the people and must not be taken in Zakat from them. The Prophet means anything which is good or worthy and which is dear to its owner must not be snatched from him. The real philosophy of Zakat is (a) help to needy ones, (b) providing satisfaction to wealthy people that their property is blessed by God because of the share they have given in Zakat to poor. Therefore in no way a Zakat payer should be wounded in his thoughts, feelings and conjectures. If so it will disturb the system.

In commenting on the Prophet's warning: Do fear the curse of a victim he says: The Prophet means to prohibit torture and harassment of people. He warns us to not do things, which could become a cause for a victim to curse us.

Thus was the instruction of Prophet was with regard to Zakat and the way it should be collected from people. Now the reader himself can see and judge how Abu Bakr acted in this suspect. He acted exactly opposite to Prophet's teachings and instructions and did so under the claim of being the Caliph of God's Prophet. The Prophet took Zakat and distributed it among the poor and needy people. But Abu Bakr collected Zakat through his agents and sent it to wealthy personalities of Quraish. The needy ones had no share in it. So there is obvious contrast between what they did and what the Prophet had taught to do or himself used to do. They went against Prophet's teachings, took from people things they held dear. They took by force

while the Prophet was against it. They did not heed their requests and petitions. For the sake of a baby camel, they waged bloody battles that enveloped several tribes..."[1]

When they realized that what they had done was wrong they gave it a covering by accusing them falsely of apostasy.

Following are sources of traditions of Prophet on Zakat with regard to the command that things dear to owners must not be taken.

1 - Sahih Bukhari, Chapter: Charities, Vol. 1, Pg. 181

2 - Ibid. Chapter: Costly things, Vol. 1, Pg. 176

3 - Fath al-Bari, Vol. 4, Pg. 65-97

4 - Musnad Ahmad, Vol. 1, Pg. 233

5 - Sunan Punch Guneh: Tirmidhi, Nasai, Ibn Majah, Darimi and Muwatta Malik, Chapter of the Regulations of Zakat."[2]

**[1]** *Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Askari: Abdullah Ibne Saba Wa Deegar Afsaane (Abdullah Bin Saba and other legends), Vol. 2, Pgs. 236-237*

**[2]** *Ibid. Vol. 2, Pg. 250*

*Inspite of these historical documents can it be accepted that:*

*"This staunch stand and strong determination of Abu Bakr was the right and faith he obtained directly from fountains of bounty of prophethood. This enabled him to attain the position of Siddiq Akbar (The great true one).!"[1]*

*"The stand of Abu Bakr Siddiq arose from that foundation. His insistence on truth and his endeavor to avoid giving least allowance or distinction to any is also based on his ardent faith."[2]*

*"If we ponder a little how deep his statesmanship was and how wise his policies that he repelled every riot and suppressed every revolt and brought under control the whole peninsula of Arabia overcoming the political corruption; we are compelled to feel so lowly before this great man in respect and awe."[3]*

## **B) Behavior with Nasr bin Hajjaj**

There is a historical document, which says that the Second Caliph expelled a youth to Basrah because he was much attractive and handsome. He had no other sin. He did not allow him to return as long as he was alive.

“Abdullah bin Buraid says: Umar used to go out into the town at night. One night he saw a house that its door was closed but from inside came a female voice that was singing:...**[4]**

...the next day he [the Caliph] called for Nasr bin Hajjaj.

When he came the Caliph saw that he was young, handsome and exceptionally charming.

Umar ordered to shave his head from the front and when it was done, the forehead became more prominent and it enhanced his elegance.

The Caliph said: Go and shave the rest of your head.

When he did so he became still more beautiful.

---

**[1]** Sayyid Abul Hasan Nadwi (*Translation Muhammad Qasim Qasimi*): *Yaqeen Mardaan-e-Khuda* (3<sup>rd</sup> Edition 1381), Pg. 36

**[2]** Salah Abdul Fattah al-Khalidi (*Translated by Abdul Aziz Sulaimi*): *Khulafa-e-Raashideen Az Khilafat Taa Shahadat* (1<sup>st</sup> Edition 1382), Pg. 80

**[3]** Sayyid Abdur Raheem Khateeb: *Shaykhain* (6<sup>th</sup> Edition 1382), Pg. 52

**[4]** [In couplets composed by him he had expressed love for a young man called Nasr bin Hajjaj.

Umar said: O, son of Hajjaj! You should not live in the town I live.

Then he expelled him to Basrah**[1]**

Nasr remained in Basrah for a long time. He wrote a letter to Umar with a few verses.

He criticized Umar as to what his sin was that he were expelled. You presumed about me wrongly. You deprived me of my right to live in my native town. Finally, he ended the letter with a request to let him return. Umar received the letter and after reading said:

He should not come back as long as I am alive.”**[2]**

## Sacrifices of Limitations

Although much is claimed about individual and social liberties during this period, such as:

“In the days of Umar’s Caliphate, one day a woman met him in the streets of Medina. She started to advise him about running the government. Umar continued listening to her in a most respectable and humble manner. Then he promised her with gratitude to act upon her advice.”**[3]**

“See the liberty: A woman advises and criticizes the Caliph, the powerful one of his time, Umar too stops on the street, listens to her without showing any uneasiness and even says: you are right while I wrong.”**[4]**

But records show something else:

### A) Ibn Abbas

“The roughness of Umar reached to the extent that Ibn Abbas could not dare to mention a religious rule about his inheritance:

Umar died. Now Ibn Abbas could make the demand. He was criticized why he did not say during the time of Umar. Ibn Abbas answered: By

---

**[1]** *[Umar issued same order for the cousin of Nasr bin Hajjaj. (Refer: Tabaqat Ibne Saad, Vol. 3, Pg. 385)]*

**[2]** *Sayyid Abdul Husain Sharafuddin: Ijtihad Dar Maqabil-e-Nass (Translated by Ali Dawani), Pgs. 355-356; quoting from: Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Ibne Abil Hadeed, Vol. 3, Pg. 122*

**[3]** *Kamaal Ruhani: Article quoted in Nida-e-Islam Magazine, Issue No. 8, (7000 copies), Winter 80, Pg. 58*

**[4]** *Ibid. Article quoted in Nida-e-Islam Magazine, Issue No. 8, Winter 80, Pg. 59*

God, I was afraid of him.”**[1]**

“Ibn Abbas says: There was a thing. I waited for two years to ask about it. The thing that withheld me was the fear of Umar.**[2]**”**[3]**

### B) Abu Ayyub

“Abu Ayyub Ansaari did not dare to act on the traditions of Prophet. Umar used to abuse, scold and beat anyone who acted according to traditions of the Prophet.”**[4]**

C) Slave of Zubair bin Awwam

“Once after Asr prayer a slave of Zubair stood to pray. At the same moment, he became aware that Umar was coming towards him with his cane**[5]** so he fled from there at once.”**[6]**

D) Sabeegh bin Isal

“Sabeegh bin Isal Tameemi**[7]** was a dignitary and chief of tribe. He was very fond to learn and understand the meanings of Quran. Therefore he traveled to various towns where companions of Prophet lived such as Kufa, Basrah, Damascus, Humis, Iskandaria and he ask them meanings of Quranic verses.

Amr Aas wrote to Umar that there was a man who asked about the commentary of Quran.

Umar told him to send him to Medina.

So he was dispatched to Medina. He came to the Caliph and had not yet seated when Umar asked him: What is the meaning of: Wazzariyat zarwan?

Umar said: You are that same one! Come here! Then with the branch of dates**[8]** hit him on his head a hundred times.

---

**[1]** Quoted from: *Al-Mahalli, Vol. 8, Pgs. 279-280; Kanzul Um-mal, Vol. 11, Pg. 28*

**[2]** Quoted from: *Tarikh Umar bin Khattab, Pg. 126*

**[3]** Ali Muhammad Meer Jalili: *Imam Ali (a.s.) wa Zamaam-daaraan (Imam Ali and the Rulers), Pg. 110*

**[4]** Allamah Ja'far Murtuza Amili: *Tahlili Az Zindagi-e-Siyasi Imam Hasan Mujtaba (a.s.), Pg. 124; quoting from: Al-Musan-naf, Vol. 2, Pg. 433*

**[5]** Rasool Ja'faryan: *Tarikh Khulafa, Pg. 66; quoting from: Al-Marifah wat Tarikh, Vol. 1, Pgs. 364-365*

**[6]** Refer: Ahmad al-Bakri: *Min Hayatul Khaleefa, Pgs. 375-377*

**[7]** Refer: Ahmad al-Kubra: *Min Hayat al-Khaleefa, Pg. 375-377*

**[8]** [A broom]

The man said: What was in my head has now gone. Then Umar ordered him to be imprisoned.

When he arose his clothes were smeared with blood.

When he recovered, Umar ordered him to be brought again.

This time he beat him a hundred times at the waist so that it was badly bruised. Then he told them to throw him into the prison.

After that the man was brought before Umar for the third time. The man said: If you want to kill me, kill without any hindrance. Relieve me.

Umar expelled him to Basrah. He wrote a letter to the governor of Basrah, Abu Moosa Ashari, to see no one contacted him. He must be boycotted.

This man used to go to congregation prayers. But nobody talked to him. After a long time he approached Abu Moosa and asked him to recommend to Umar using his good offices. Abu Moosa wrote to Umar that the man had repented, could he please forgive him? Umar accepted. Then people began to interact with him.

It is mentioned that the man was one of the dignitaries. But after this incident he lost his station.”**[1]**

“The punishment of Sabeegh was so serious and harsh that it rang the bell of danger to all.

A man asked Ibn Abbas the meaning of a Quranic verse and Ibn Abbas explained it to him.

The man repeated his question again and again. Ibn Abbas got tired and said:

Your case is like that of Sabeegh whom Umar had beaten up. Why do you want the same treatment?

Umar got intelligence and he beat up the man such that his back bled.”**[2]**

“And it is also mentioned that: A man approached Umar and asked the meaning of a Quranic verse.

---

**[1]** Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Askari: *Naqsh-e-Aaimma Dar Ahya-e-Deen (Role of Imams in the Revival of Religion, Vol. 14, Pgs. 50-51; quoting from: Sunan Darimi, Vol. 1, Pgs. 54-55; Tafseer Ibne Kathir, Vol. 4, Pg. 232; Itqan Suyuti, Vol. 2, Pg. 4; Tafseer Qurtubi, Vol. 18, Pg. 29*

**[2]** Ustad Ali Koorani: *Tadween-e-Quran, Pg. 119; quoting from: Ad-Durre Manthur, Vol. 3, Pg. 161*

Umar hit him with a cane he was carrying so that his turban fell down...”**[1]**

“Abdur Rahman bin Yazeed narrates: A man asked Umar the meaning of a particular word of Quran. Umar ran after him with a lash in hand.”**[2]**

“It is also narrated that: A man came to Umar and told him that he knew the most difficult part of Quran.

Umar lashed his head and said: What business do you have with Quran?" **[3]**

E) Narrators of Traditions

"Abu Huraira says: In the days of Umar, there was no one who could narrate any saying of Prophet but that it was certain that his back would bleed." **[4]**

From the above preceding instances one can understand to what extent liberties existed in the time of Umar. Neither religious laws nor Quran or traditions were allowed to be mentioned.

## Roughness and Extremism

Here are a few cases of roughness of the Caliph taken from historical annals:

A) "He was the first to always carry a cane." **[5]**

B) "Ibn Shubbeh narrates that a man told Umar: People are angry with you. People are angry with you. People hate you!

Umar asked: Why?

The man replied: Because of your tongue and your cane." **[6]**

**[1]** *Ibid. quoting from: Sunan Darimi, Vol. 1, Pg. 54*

**[2]** *Ibid. quoting from: Ad-Durre Manthur, Vol. 6, Pg. 317*

**[3]** *Ibid. quoting from: Ad-Durre Manthur, Vol. 2, Pg. 227*

**[4]** *Najah Ata at-Tai: Nazaryaat al-Khaleefatain, Vol. 2, Pg. 477; quoting from: Mukhtasar Tarikh Ibne Asakir, Vol. 3, Pg. 11*

**[5]** *Rasool Ja'faryan: Tarikh Khulafa, Pg. 65; quoting from: Tarikh Tabari, Vol. 4, Pg. 209; Tarikh al-Khulafa, Pg. 137; Tabaqat al-Kubra, Vol. 3, Pg. 282*

**[6]** *Rasool Ja'faryan: Tarikh Khulafa, Pg. 65; quoting from: Tarikh Madinatul Munawwara, Vol. 2, Pg. 858*

On the other hand it is claimed that:

"No one was unhappy in his rule. All were pleased, happy and satisfied. They had trust in his justice." **[1]**

"When Uthman announced that he would act according to the Book of God, Sunnah of Prophet and method of Abu Bakr and Umar, people rejoiced because they were fond of the God-pleasing programs **[2]** of the two preceding Caliphs." **[3]**

On the whole it can be said

"The spiritual personality of the Caliph had a great influence in his executive activities and political job. He was of short temper **[4]** and from viewpoint of his thoughts, he was an extremist." **[5]**

C) "He viewed Islam only from a harsh and merciless angle. This was the reason that Jabla bin Aiham, one of the kings of Syria who had committed a mistake, fled from Mecca to Syria and renounced Islam." **[6]**

"The story was: Five hundred riders from tribes of Akka and Jafna entered Medina. Their complexion was Arabic. Their

dress was woven with threads of gold and silver. Jibla (an Arab speaking the Ghasani language of Jordan) was leading them. His mother, Maria wore a costly crown inlaid with jewels. They all became Muslims. Muslims rejoiced their conversion because of the long following they had. Jibla went with his followers in the company of the Caliph to Hajj. While King Jibla was going round Kaaba according to the rules of Hajj a man of Fuzara tribe stepped on the cloth the king had wrapped around himself; so it became loose and rolled down. Jibla slapped the man who complained to Umar and Umar called for Jibla. He ordered the victim to slap Jibla or that Jibla should obtain the man's forgiveness and satisfy him.

---

**[1]** *Ali Tantawi (Translated by Abu Bakr Hasanzadeh): Dastan-e-Zindagani-e-Umar, (1<sup>st</sup> & 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition 1380), Pg. 78*

**[2]** *Author of the article has considered the audience in Masjid as Emigrants and Helpers!*

**[3]** *Abdul Qadir Dahqaan Siraawaani: Article quoted in Nida-e-Islam Magazine, Issue No. 14, Summer 82, Pg. 16*

**[4]** *Quoted from: Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Ibne Abil Hadeed, Vol. 1, Pg. 183*

**[5]** *Rasool Ja'faryan: Tarikh Khulafa, Pg. 65*

**[6]** *Ibid. Pg. 67; quoting from: Tabaqat al-Kubra, Vol. 1, Pg. 265; Al-Futuh, Vol. 2, Pgs. 302-304*

Umar made the case so hard that Jibla dispaired from satisfying Umar and the complainant.

Jibla fled in the night with his followers and associates and landed in Constantine. The harsh and rough behavior of Umar made him scornful to Islam, so all of them became Christians again.

Hercules, the emperor of Rome, received them with great honor and distinction, accorded them a grand welcome and provided every facility and pleasure to them.

Inspite of this, Jibla used to cry and lament for having had lost and given up the faith of Islam.”**[1]**

It seems Umar had forgotten the recommendation of Zaid bin Thabit with regard to Ubadah bin Samit. So Umar's obstinacy towards Jibla was like one he showed to Amr Aas and his son. He did so to crush their personality.

Ibn Abi al-Hadeed compares Imam Ali (a.s.) with all Caliphs thus:

“The three Caliphs who preceded, acted according to the dictates of their personal interests and in accordance with their hidden proclivities. They did not pay regard whether it was in accordance with laws of Islam or not.

There is no doubt that one who acts as he desires becomes distant from faith. He cannot perform what goes against his desire though it could be in line with religion. As a result, there cannot be discipline in him and no coherence in his actions.”**[2]**

Allamah Ja’far Murtuza based on the above analysis, writes about the stand of Umar against Egyptians and his reply to his critics in the same atmosphere.

D) Some came from Egypt to investigate with Umar for his not acting in some cases according to Quran. Umar maintained that he had acted according to his personal interpretation of Quran. Then he asked them:

“Do people of Medina know for what you have come here? They said: No.

---

**[1]** Sayyid Abdul Husain Sharafuddin: *Ijtihad Dar Maqabil-e-Nass (Translated by Ali Dawani), Pgs. 346-347; quoting from: Al-Iqdul Fareed, Vol. 1, Pg. 187*

**[2]** Allamah Ja’far Murtuza Amili: *Tahlili Az Zindagi-e-Siyasi Imam Hasan Mujtaba (a.s.), Pgs. 123-124; quoting from: Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Ibne Abil Hadeed, Vol. 12, Pg. 83*

Umar said: Had they known the reason of your coming I would have punished you so much that it could be a lesson for others.”**[1]**

E) So can it be believed that a woman advised him and he listened to her patiently? The records say:

Roughness of Umar was a block to criticize him

“Ayesha, daughter of Uthman, says that Umar was a harsh and rough man. Therefore no one dared to criticize him.”**[2]**

Umar was harsher to ladies

“Women were terrified with Umar because he was harsher towards them.”**[3]**

For example:

1 - “Abdul Razzaq Sanani says: Ibrahim Nakhai narrates that Umar used to roam in the rows of women. Once he smelt perfume from the lines of women. He declared: If I knew which of

you has applied this perfume I would have done such and such.

The woman who had used the perfume urinated out of fear.”[4]

2 - “Umar’s face was so dreadful that a pregnant woman saw him and miscarried.”[5]

The incident occurred at a time when Umar summoned the woman to court. The woman was terrified and she miscarried.

While it is said in his praise:

“He was the first leader of the people and a democratic one in Islam.”[6]

---

[1] Ibid. Pg. 117; quoting from: *Hayatus Sahaba*, Vol. 3, Pg. 260

[2] Rasool Ja’faryan: *Tarikh Khulafa*, Pg. 69; quoting from: *Nasrud Durar*, Vol. 4, Pg. 34

[3] Shaheed Murtuza Mutahhari: *Seeri Dar Nahjul Balagha*, Pg. 160

[4] Rasool Ja’faryan: *Tarikh Khulafa*, Pg. 66; quoting from: *Al-Musannaf*, Vol. 4, Pgs. 343-344

[5] Ali Muhammad Meer Jalili: *Imam Ali (a.s.) wa Zamaam-daaraan* (Imam Ali and the Rulers), Pg. 111; quoting from: *Sharh Nahjul Balagha*, Ibne Abil Hadeed, Vol. 1, Pg. 183; *Tarikh Umar bin Khattab*, Pg. 125

[6] Ahmad Naseeb (translated by Saaduddin Shaykh Ahmadi): *Mohabbat-e-Payambar Dar Qalb-e-Yaaranash* (1<sup>st</sup> Edition 1380), Pgs. 85-86

Historical records show:

3 - “The harsh behavior raised the objection of people. They approached Abdur Rahman bin Auf to talk to Umar in this respect and to tell him that daughters in home fear him. Umar said in reply:

People must be dealt with in only this way. Else, they cannot be reformed. If I don’t do thus they will take off my dress from my body.[1]

He himself had acknowledged that people were terrified of him.[2]

In fact, this behavior prevented people to oppose him in any matter.[3]”[4]

---

[1] Quoted from: *Nasrud Durar*, Vol. 2, Pg. 35; *Uyun al-Akhaabar*, Vol. 1, Pg. 12

**[2]** *Quoted from: Hayatul Haiwan, Vol. 1, Pg. 49*

**[3]** *Quoted from: Nasrud Durar, Vol. 4, Pgs. 34-35*

**[4]** *Rasool Ja'faryan: Tarikh Khulafa, Pg. 67*

**Part 8**  
**Conclusion Zahra's speech de-**  
**scribes the social conditions**  
**after usurpation of Caliphate and**  
**identifies the ills in politics and**  
**government**

In the end we refer to five points indicated by Zahra to Ansaar ladies in her speech. And we end this volume thereat.

The ladies visited Zahra to see her and inquire into her health because Zahra was sick at home as her sides were broken due to the door falling on her by the kick of her enemy.

Zahra sketched to them a picture of society of tomorrow - a society deprived of Imamate and Guardianship of Ali bin Abi Talib (a.s.) and molded into the present illegitimately running government:

“Beware of pulled out swords, sharp and destructive - and a tyrant attack advancing atrocities and a haughty stubbornness of oppressors.

All your affairs will be upset except the haughtiness of tyrant and you will be given your lot but little.

Your gatherings will be separated by swords. You will harvest nothing but fruit of disappointed hope. Where will you go; and where will your destiny end.”**[1]**

A history of thirteen years of national rivalry from Saqifah and finally its surrender to Bani Umayyah who held it so tightly under their claws showed deviation of Muslims from the path prescribed by Quran through His Prophet and the Prophet announced it in Ghadeer. The consequences that followed - how horrible, how dreadful and how destructively fatal!

It was not only the matter of tyranny to Ahle Bayt (a.s.). The tyrannies committed against the dearest ones to God, against the purified personalities of time immemorial cannot be confined to writing by any pen. Although endeavors were made to make history forget or take it as little as possible the rightfulness of Ali to Caliphate, which was usurped so openly by the conspiracy

---

**[1]** *Mahdi Ja'fari: Mastoor Aaftaab-e-Sarmad, Pgs. 190-194; quoting from: Ibne Taifur: Balaghatun Nisa, Pg. 32; Jauhari: Saqifah wa Fadak, Pg. 117; Ibne Abil Hadeed: Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Vol. 16, Pg. 233; Umar Reza Kahhala: Alaamun Nisa, Vol. 3, Pg. 1219*

of Saqifah. While they claim:

“People liked the method of Caliphate of Abu Bakr and Umar! And were really fond of it! They were sure their Caliphate was truly based on the method of Prophet. They could

live in safety under this Caliphate from tyranny and danger.”!**[1]**

---

**[1]** *Abdul Qadir Dahqaan Siraawaani: Article quoted in Nida-e-Islam Magazine, Issue No. 14, Summer 82, Pg. 16.*

ISLAMICMOBILITY.COM

IN THE AGE OF INFORMATION

IGNORANCE IS A CHOICE

*"Wisdom is the lost property of the Believer,  
let him claim it wherever he finds it"*

*Imam Ali (as)*