

ANALYSIS OF BATTLES FOUGHT BETWEEN ALI AND MUAWIAH

Muhammad Anwar Shah*
A.I.R Department ,
Gomal University, D.I.Khan,
PAKISTAN.

Dr. Salah-ud-Din
A.I.R Department ,
Gomal University, D.I.Khan,
PAKISTAN.

Muhammad Anzar Shah
A.I.R Department ,
Gomal University, D.I.Khan,
PAKISTAN.

ABSTRACT

Islam is the religion which gave the rights of equality to the whole humanity. It rooted out all types of national, languial and racial differences and did not leave any type of distinction on the base of materialistic status. Almighty Allah Says: "O mankind! Lo! We have created you male and female and have made you nations and tribes that Ye may know one another."Due to this universal slogan of equality Islam didn't miss a chance of peace and justice. If there were a king in the court of Judge of justice. Therefore it is clearly shown in the pages of history that Islam has not taken pause or stop in the achievement of rights even sword has been used for this holy purpose. For cause of Islam every type of hurdle has been rooted out. It was the solid reason due to which Islam provided equal piece of justice to the every individual of the whole universe for one thousand years.

Keywords: Prophet (PBUH) Banu Hashim, Banu Umyaya, Hazrat Ali (R.A), Hazrat Muaveya (R.A).

INTRODUCTION

After the assassination of Hazrat Usman (R.A) the Islamic state was deeply indulged in various types of conflicts. All these complications must be analysed with open heart and cool mind. These differences resulted in wars. It is not fair that, one of them should be considered responsible for these crises. All the conditions of that very age must be studied deeply. The social conditions of that very era were the greatest source of these crises. And we must keep in mind the social factors of that age rather than imposing our emotional approach upon them. We often fail to understand the exact situation of that very age in every field of life because society and its happenings have various requirements and demands which are difference from conditions the other age. Every problem of every individual should be studied deeply according to the religious and social conditions of that age and after studying both one can be able to find the way of justice otherwise it is a quite tough task.

PURPOSE

Object of this research to analyse the wars between / among the companions of Prophet (PBUH) and to Find out the cause of wars among the companions of prophets. Why these battles were fought.

RESEARCH MYTHODOLOGY

The material of this paper has been collected through historical method.

FINDING

There battles were not fought for power but for certain aim.

SIGNIFICANCE

The objective of this paper is to clear the Misunderstanding which are found among the people because of Sahaba's (companions) battles with one another.

* Corresponding Author: A.I.R Department , Gomal University, D.I.KHAN, yaseenzai1@gmail.com

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. Why were the battles fought between Hazrat Ali and Hazrat Ameer Muaviya (R.A)?
2. What were the objects of these battles?
3. What were the results of these battles?

HISTORY OF THE BATTLES BETWEEN HAZRAT ALI AND HAZRAT AMEER MUAVIYA (R.A)

The historical back ground of study and discussion will help us to understand the facts and deep issues of battles between Hazrat Ali (R. A)And Hazrat Ameer Muaviya (R.A)

(Ibne-e-Khaldoon 1961)Ibn-e-Khaldoon says about these circumstances.

Beware! Don't say or even think badly about both of them. And as far as possible be optimistic about them. Both of them are able to think positively. The difference between them was based upon positive (welfare) approach for Ummah. And their difference was in search of welfare of Ummah which according to Khaldoon provided two ways of welfare for Muslim Ummah. And both played a role of great leaders. And improve your knowledge about the hidden philosophy of. Almighty Allah about his creatures.

(Ibn-e-Khaldoon 1961) Further Allama says that:

“In these difference Ali (R.A) was the on the right way but on the other hand the intention of Amir Muaviya (R.A) was not wrong. He (Amir Muaviya) had tried to select a right path but he committed a mistake. All the people were on the right way with regard to their purposes but the kingdom and government is demanded by every individual for himself as well as a tribe for itself. This was the law of nature that compelled Muaviya R.A to do so. It was also the demand of tribal system of that age which could not be avoided by Muaviya R.A.

(Ibn-e-Khaldoon 1961) On another occasion Ibn-e-Khaldoon said that this conflict between Ali (R.A) and Muaviya flared up due to their family relationships but both of them did not give preference to the worldly desires. They never let go the right way of Islam. Their first preference was that to serve Islam in true spirit. If we proclaim that Ali (R.A) was on the right way but on the other hand Muaviya was not trying o hurt Islam but to serve Islam so all the Muslims of both groups were trying to show the true spirit of service for Islam.

(Ibn-e-Khaldoon 1961) Wars which were fought among Sahaba and Tabe-een were not on the basis of materialistic approach but religious differences. All these differences came into being due to Ijtihad. Every Mujtahid has tried his level best to serve Islam in true sense but a mistake is created due knowledge rather than belief. All the Mujtahideen tried their level best to server Islam and their efforts were positive and if we keep a soft of corner for them then there is no single chance of blame.

Now from this evidence we can easily say that the difference among them was consisting upon Ijtihad. And no chance of blame can be seen. The great source of their difference was the difference upone one point through various channels and the point was “taking Revenge of Hazrat Usman Majority of the Sahaba was spread throughout the country and the Sahaba in Madina were distributed in to two groups. One group wanted to wait for all the Shahba arrival in Madina so that they may unite on one Imam. And they insisted for taking revenge of Hazrat Usman's assasins first than the oath of new Caliph. They were proclaiming that Hazrat Ali (R.A) is not taking serious action against Hazrat Usman assisination. They were not claiming that Ali (R.A) is the responsible for Hazrat Usman (R.A) assassination.

On the other hand Hazrat Ali (R.A) was standing firmly on the stance that Oath (Baiat) has become necessary because the inhabitants of Madina had accepted him their leader. As Madina was the centre of Islam in those days and majority of Sahaba were the citizen of Madina city and the Holy Prophet was buried there. Due to these conditions Hazrat Ali was of the point of view that all Muslims should accept him as a leader and on becoming the conditions favourable the Usman's assassination revenge will be taken. While the other group of Sahaba proclaimed that the Oath ceremony could not be performed well because majority of Sahaba were out side the Madina city. And as far as all the great

Sahab are not present a Caliph cannot be elected by few Sahabas. (Mehmood Alquad, 2000) Mehmood Abbas Al aqaad says: "The main difference between their thoughts was difference between the people of Syria and the people of Iraq. He says that the great difficulty which Hazrat Ali faced was conspiracies of the people of Syria and their remedy was nothing else but war. On the other hand there were Ansaar who lacked the war spirit as compared to the people of Syria and Iraq. Both countries (Iraq and Syria) have strong psychological and historical backgrounds which were shown by both in the battle field

Due to these clashes with Hashim the granddad of Amir Muaviya Ummayah had left Makka for Syria and he stayed there for a long time and his grandson Abu Sufyan got the post of Allawa (The Chief security officer of Force and convey) in which responsibilities were to make secure the conveys going towards Syria and this duty great source of strong relations with Syria people.

The other strong relation of Amir Muaviya with Syria was that due to his father's post of Allawa he visited time and again Syria due to which his personal relations motivated the Roman king Hiraqqal for getting information about a personality (Hazrat Muhammad) who had sent him letter about new religion. It was he (Abu Sufyan) who presented himself for this information. Yazeed bin Abu Sufyan and his brother Muaviya bin Abu Sufyan who had been ruler over here. Regarding disciplinary principals and administrative power Amir Muaviya had great reputation amongst his tribe. He knew the decency of the society and public dealings. He was also expert in political setup.

As for as Iraq is concerned, it remained under the rule of Iranian Sasani rulers. There was no political stability for long time. Kingship changed everyday Kisra Pervaz on the place of Kisra now shqivwan who was defeated by Herkal. In this way the son of Pervaz Qabaz became king but did not rule for more than six months and in the period of six years there came ten emperors on the kingdom of Sasan. The people chose Yazd Gard Third as their king who proved the lost ruler of Bani Sasan. Due to miss management the daughter of Herms got a chance of kingship and she ruled one year and four months. The difference between the citizens of Iraq and Syria was due to the habits of those Arabic tribes who on the one side conquered Syria and on other side those tribes who have conquered Iraq and followed their habits. The conquerors of Syria were those tribes who lived in the North West of Vast Arabia. The conquerors of Iraq were the eastern tribes of vast Arabia, not properly disciplined.

Doctor Ahmer Amin says:

"Iraq has remained the central place of different kinds of religions and beliefs. Since ancient time for the first period there were the beliefs of Mani, Mazdak and Ibne Deesan. Chirstians were also there, who had learned the teachings of every religion who also believed that God is present in some people". (Ahmer Amin, 1987)

Ahmad Hassan Ziath says:

"The Arabs, who came in Iraq, were Yamnies and brought Nazari enmity with them. Either there was Nasranizm or Khwarji in Jaziratul Gharatia because it was the central place of tribes". (Ahmad Hassan, 1980)

Mehmoodual Abaad (2000) Says:

The first kind, who was fond of discipline, was in the part of Hazrat Maviya, they were stread in Syria and its Parts. In the second part there was hatered of congregational discipline, it came in the part of Hazrat Ali. This group belonged to the different parts of vasat Arabia by area and caste.

Muhammad Sarwar Moulana Ubaidullah Sindhi says:

To the martyrdom of Hazrat Umar (R.A) Islam was international. But Hazrat Umar became martyr at the hands of an Iranian. After the martyrdom of Hazrat Umar a reaction starts. Now the Arabs did not trust Iranians. The safety of Islam becam the national questions of Arabs now. It also affected the Government. Till now Islam was an international religion, but Arabs took it as a national religion because at this time its safety was possible only in this way. If the Arabs had not taken it as a national Problem, then the safety of Islam would not have been attacked by different elements. (Sarwar 2002)

Moulana Ubaidullah Sindhi thought that the enmity of Banu Umia and Banu Hashim was the fight of

two tribes. Every tribe wanted that they became the rulers of Arabs. Banu Umia was financially strong, they succeeded and Banu Hashim failed.

Moulana Sindhi says:

That the responsibility, of civil war between Muslims in the last days of Hazrat Usman's reign and in the period of Hazrat Ali, is not right to put on Christians.

On one side it is said that the system of Islam is the best one and the people who laid the base of this system and made it strong, were the best people of the world. If this claim of us is true, then how was it possible, that hypocrites or Christians attacked this system easily? If we agree with this, then a question arises that the system of Islam and its first followers were so weak and not well prepared that their grown tree fell down with such a little power. The superiority of a system and the greatness of its inventors can be proved the system remained stable after the inventors and not only stable, but also make improvement. Otherwise it is seen again and again in the history that there arise a great personality in a nation and carry the nation to a very high position in a short time. But with his decline, its glory also came to an end.

If our idea about Sahaba Kiram's group and Islam becomes such a low one then the system, about which we claim that it is the highly preferred system of all the worldly systems. This system worked only for thirty years properly and its last ten years passed in civil war, then what is more injurious to Islam than this?

According to Moulana, civil war is the inevitable result of revolution. Because in revolution people of different mentality meet with each other. It is a famous saying that the enmity of other unite the oppositions, so there is no chance of mental differences in the revolutionary movement.

But as the external oppositions and enemies disappear, the sleeping hostile emotions arise and at last the people divide in groups and fight with each other. This fight is not the result of decline but there are different decisions about each activity.

Now if every decision is welcomed then the group or party declines.

This problem is solved by elections in the parliamentary system. The victorious party consults of the defeated party and some times accept their opinions. But remember, that this system can only work in peace and normal conditions of the country but in case of revolution people have to resort to work with power and use of sword instead of opinions or understanding. Because the people of that time thought power absolute instead of argument.

The fights of Hazrat Usman (R.A) Hazrat Ali (R.A) and Hazrat Maavia (R.A) and their reign were the fights of the clashing opinions.

No doubt the major Sahaba of Holy Prophet (P.B.U.H) fought and there was blood shed on both sides. The opponents of Islam laughed at it. If we look at Islam as a revolutionary movement then the affairs become clear.

Moulana says that after conquering Iran, Syria and Egypt, defeating Qisra and taking Asian kingdom from Qaisar, the areas of Islamic kingdom became wide. So the revolutionary enthusiasm of Arabs had cooled down. But the boundaries of kingdom had widened. Therefore, their boundary trends of minds were at their peak. When any nation reach at this level of revolution, then it is necessary that they should plan according to their new circumstances. In the beginning a nation is united, but when war stops due to any reason, then civil war starts among themselves.

Same was the case in the period of Hazrat Usman (R.A) Hazrat Maaviya understood this and gave it national colour and the Arabs became its guards. So Amir Maaviya took Damascus and ruled it, prepared his fleet and prepared Arabs for new conquests. The result was that those Arabs, who were being eliminated by fighting with each other, became united for twenty years again and their army made progress in every field.

(Ibne-Taimiya 1322) Hazrat Ishaq bin Rahvia is famous scholar of Hadees and Fika. He says that

Hazrat Ali (R.A) heard a person in war of Jamal and Safain that he was speaking ill about the opposition. At this Hazrat Ali (R.A) said, "That you should never speak ill about them but good because these people think that we have rebelled against them and we think they have rebelled against us. Due to this we fight with each other.

Majadid Alfe-Sani says:

"The people, who fought on the side of Hazrat Ali and Hazrat Maaviya neither pagans nor sinners". (Alif-a-Saani 1311)

Allama Zubaidi says that it is a fact that the civil war in the time of Sahaba (R.A) was not the war for kingdom and their differences were not like political parties of today. Both groups wanted the welfare of religion their hatred was for religion. And they believed their point of view is based on honesty. Each group thought the other mistaken but did not consider any one sinner. Perhaps this is the only war in the history that people fought at day time with each other and at night time they took part in funeral and burrial of the other party's dead people. (Ibn-e-Koseer 1946)

Hazrat Abu Saeed Khudri (R.A) quotes from Holy Prophet (P.B.U.B) in Sahih Muslim that during mutual difference in Muslims there will arise a group and this group will be killed by that Muslim group which is nearer to truth. (Sahih Musli 1997)

In this Hadith coming out of Umat means khwarij. They were killed by group of Hazrat Ali (R.A) which was declared nearer to truth by the Holy Prophet (P.B.U.H). it is clear from the saying of Holy Prophet that the difference between Hazrat Ali and Hazrat Maaviya is not wholly the difference of right and wrong, but it can be the difference of opinion. But the group of Hazrat Ali is nearer to truth. If Holy Prophet didn't mean it then the group of Hazrat Ali (R.A) would not have declared nearer to truth.

Similarly the Hadith of Sahih Bukhari, the Holy Prophet (P.B.U.H) said, "that the doomsday will not come, until a great blood shed do not take place between the two groups of Muslims, although both will preach the same. (Novavi 1980) The scholars says that here the two groups mean the group of Hazrat Ali (R.A) and Hazrat Maaviya (R.A) and the Holy Prophet considered the preaching of both the same. It is clear that no one fight for kingship but both were preaching Islam and boths wanted the glory of religion. That is why, at the time of Safain war majority of Sahaba did not understand which group was on right? Therefore they did't take part on any side. But majority of Sahaba did not take part in this war. (Salih Bukhari 1992)

Imam Ahmad bin Hambel Quotes,

"When the war broke out thousands of, Sahaba (R.A) were present, but even one hundred did not take part in war. The number of Sahaba was not thirty who took part in war". (Ibn-e-Tayemia 1980)

Allama Ibne Qaseer says:

It proves from this hadith that the Sahaba (R.A) of Hazrat Ali's group was nearer to truth and this is the faith of Ahle sunat, that Hazrat Ali (R.A) was right. Hazrat Maaviya also deducted from the teachigs of Islam, so Allah will award him for this deduction. (Ibn-e-Kaseer 1946)

Shah Wali Ullah says that Hazrat Ali (R.A) and Hazrat Maaviya both were on right path and them both committed mistakes. Hazrat Maaviya committed a mistake that he took revenge. And Hazrat Ali (R.A) committed a mistake that having power, he did not take revenge from the killers of Hazrat Usman (R.A). Therefore the problem became longer instead of coming to end, political problems arose and good people opposed him. (Shah Wali Ullah 1987)

Imam Novavi: Imam Novavi says that the belief of Ahle sunat is that we should believe right about Sahaba should be silent about their mutual differences. And we should consider that they comitted mistakes in the iterpretation of Islam. They did't have the mentality of sins and not wealth, but every group claimed that they were on right. And their opponents were not right, so war against them is right. So they should fight to bring the oppositions back to Islam. Some of their decisions were actually true and some were false. So whose decision was false, it was their disability. And the idea of Hazrat Ali (R.A) was true in wars and this is the religion of Ahle Sunat. And at that time it was so

difficult to differentiate between false and true that a major group of Sahaba Kiram could not make difference between rights and wrong so did not take part in fight. If Sahaba Kiram (R.A) had got surety about right and wrong at that time, they would not refused to take part in war. (Novavi 1980)

CONCLUSION

From the above statement it is clear that it is difficult to understand the circumstances in the light of individual point of view in history. So from the collective point of view the study of history will be helpful.

While discussing the period of Sahaba Kiram (R.A) a person having democratic mind will have to go to that age mentally, and not sit in the democratic age of today and speaking about the period of fourteen hundred years ago. Therefore study of circumstances of that period is necessary. And there are all political and religious problems, so their study with political and religious mind is very necessary.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The study of these battles should be analyzed collectively not individually. This study should not be done in the light of present circumstances, but this should be done according to those circumstances which prevailed at that time. So the real result may be seen.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad Hassan Zayat (1980). *Tareekhul-Adabul Arabi*. SalafiahAlqahira, Page 210, Vol 1.
- Ahmar Ameen, (1987). *Fajar-ul-Islam*. Aljanat-ul-Taleef Wal Nashar Alqahira, Page 935, Vol 1.
- Al-dihlavi, Shah Waliullah (1987). *Izalatul Khifa An Khilafatil Khulafa*. Qadeemi Kutab Khan Karachi, Page 279, Vol 2.
- Al-Nawawi, Abuzakaria, Yahya bin Sharf (1980). *Sharh Muslim*. Assahul Matabi Karachi, Page 390, Vol 2.
- Al-qasheeri, Muslim bin Hajaj (1997). *Aljami Alsaheeh Almuslim*. Darusalam Riadh, Page 201, Vol 2.
- Bukhari, Muhammad bin Ismail (1992). *Aljamusaheeh Al-bukhari*. Qadeemi Kutab Khana Lahore, Page 80, Vol 1.
- Ibne Kasir, Muhammad Bin Ismail (1946). *Albidaya Walnihaya*. Darul Ahya Alturas-u-Alarabi, Bairoot, Page129, Vol 8
- Ibne Khuldoon, Abur-Rehman (1961). *Tareekh-e-Ibne Khuldoon*. Darul Kitab Lubnani, Bairoot, Page 210, Vol 5.
- Ibne Taimia, Ahmad Bin Abdul Haleem (1322). *Minhajus Sunah*, Balaq Egypt, Page 61, Vol 3.
- Mahmood Alaqqad, Alustad (2000). *Alabqariat-al-Islamiah* .Darul Muarif Egypt, Page 200, Vol 2.
- Muhammad Sarwar (2002). *Halat-u-Taaleemat Siasi Afkar*. Sindh Sagar Academi Lahore, Page 141, Vol 1.
- Mujadid Alf Sani, Sheikh Ahmad Sarhindi (1311). *Minhajusunah*. Boolaq Egypt, Page 61, Vol 3.