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بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

الحمد لله رب العالمين والواكية للمتّقين ولا غ/Layout إلا على الظالمين. وأشهد أن لا إله إلا
الله وحده لا شريك له وأشهد أن محمداً عباده ورسوله وصفيه من خلقه وخليلة بلغ
الرسالة وأدّى الأمانة ونصّب الأمة وكشف الله به الغمّة صلى الله عليه وعلى آله وصحبه
 وسلم... وبعد: قال الله تعالى:

1) إن هذّه أمثلّكُم أمة واحدة وآنا ربيُكُم فاعبدون...

2) وإن هذّه أمثلّكُم أمة واحدة وآنا ربيُكُم فاعبدون...

3) إنما المؤمنون إخوة فاصبحوا بين أخوٍ يَحِبُون ويَعْبُدُون الله لعلمهم يرحمون (10) يأيها الذين آمنوا لا يسخُر
قوم من قومٍ عسي أكونوا خيراً منهم ولا يسبطاً من نساء عسي أن يكون خيراً منهم ولا تلزموا أنفسكم
ولا التنافروا بالأنفلون بل اسموا الفسوق أينما لزمت بمثاباً فلولاهم الناس الظالمون...

4) وقال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: مثل المؤمنين في توادهم وترحمهم وتعاطفهم كمثل الجسد
الواحد إذا اشتكى منه العضو تداعى له سائر الجسد بالحمى والسهري (أو كما قال عليه الصلاة والسلام).
ABOUT THE BOOKLET

This booklet – as almost all my other published works – was originally a series of articles written for the Zanzinet (a Zanzibaris' Internet Forum). The original work was in my mother tongue of Kiswahili, the language widely spoken in East Africa where I was born and bred. Then came to me the idea of translating it into the English language so that the non-Kiswahili speakers may also benefit thereby. The decision of rendering it into the English language has come as a result of seeing the Ibadhi library suffer from the poverty of Ibadhi literature written in English. Even so, in this translation, there are many things which have been omitted. This has been done with the object of avoiding the approach of prolonging the booklet with matters of less importance. The original Kiswahili work consists of nine chapters with two hundred and fifty pages. Some of those who have gone through it, have suggested that the better way of translating it, is to divide the book into small booklets so as to save time for the readers and to facilitate the task in general. Unhesitatingly, I accepted their advice and so decided to divide the book into nine parts; each chapter making one part.\footnote{Meaning each chapter of the original Kiswahili work, making one part of this series.}
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2 - Because the said paragraph is about Kiswahili and its origin.
PREFACE

In the pamphlet no. 1, a critical analysis was conducted on all important definitions which various Muslim scholars postulated as bases for their reasoning on the concept of the term Khawarij. That beginning was very important especially when we take into consideration the fact that to understand any thing properly depends mainly or entirely on the understanding of its real concept. It will be remembered that, in part one of this series, we made an extensive survey of the subject and finally concluded with the idea of disqualifying all the definitions put forward to expound the concept of the word Khawarij, viewing them as merely theories with no logical and philosophical tendencies. We also ended with the notion that the lack of specificities capable of identifying who and what the Khawarij were, was a clear indication to the serious misconception into which most scholars and researchers have fallen concerning the subject of the so-called Khawarij. This, as technically demonstrated, was partly due to the fact that all the suggested definitions were similarly applicable to all other Islamic sects due to the presence of the common stance shared by all towards the politics of secession when bitter feelings develop about a certain existing political or social order as being corrupt or unjust.

In this pamphlet no. 2, we shall study the history of how and why the so-called Khawarij splintered from 'Ali's leadership. We shall begin our work with a brief introduction and then hint at the background that acted as a gist and preliminary step towards the division and finally delve into the core of the subject by studying the Battle of Siffin whose understanding is essential in understanding the factors and preconditions that gave rise to the Nahrawanees' splinter group. The importance of having knowledge of the Battle of Siffin, is not merely to add new information to the already existent store of ideas we have had, but rather its importance can also be manifested in the
creation and the definition of the distinctive features that may provide those who follow up this history with right perspectives with which to be able to make out what is right and what is wrong.

The Author.
INTRODUCTION

AL-MUHAKKIMA OR THE NAHRAWAANEEES
VANGUARDS AND PIONEERS OF
THE SO-CALLED KHAWARIJ

Though, in its widest sense, the term Khawarij has been used to refer to many politico-religious groups that belong almost to the same political origin, yet the faction of the First Muhakkima or the Nahrawanees is the one that is primarily intended for the term. But one thing that many researchers have not discovered or have neglected, is the fact that this splinter group consisted of a number of companions of the Prophet (pbuh) who were the real followers of his footsteps.

It is strongly possible that the act of refraining from mentioning those Sahaba, in most works done on the Islamic history, as being among the Nahrawanees, has originated from the Umayyad idea of justifying all Sahaba. The Umayyads, in their attempt to defend Mu'awiya, claimed that all Sahaba were just. But, clearly, this position was not held in order to defend the Sahaba in general; on the contrary, the virtual and ultimate goal of the Umayyads was to

---

1 - This idea is strongly crushed by so many authentic traditions in which the Prophet clearly stated that some of his companions would go to hell. Mostly known of these, is the one referred to as Hadith Al-Haudh (the tradition of the pool), in which he said: "(On the day of judgment) they will be expelled from my pool as the lost camels are expelled... Thereupon, I will call them: 'Come here!'...." Or my Lord, these are my Companions..." It will be said (by the Angels): 'You do not know how they changed (the teachings of the religion) after you.' Refer to Al-Bukhari Sahihu Al-Bukhari traditions no. 6576-6582-6583-6584-65856586-6593-7049-7050-7051. Muslim Sahihu Muslim tradition no. 39_583 in "Kitabu Al-Tahara." Ibn Majah Al-Sunan traditions no. 4302,4306. Al-Rabi'u Al-Jami'u Al-sahih tradition no. 43.
exonerate⁴ Mu'awiya, 'Amru bin Al-Aas and those who sided with them politically, from the mass condemnation for their misdeeds. If the term Prophetic companionship had served as a cover under which to hide the misdeeds of some companions of the Prophet (pbut), it would be natural, therefore, that any Umayyads' admission of the participation of the Sahaba in Nahrawanee's political movement, would spontaneously uproot their politics of justifying all Sahaba. For, to them, the Nahrawanee were the Khawarij who went out of Islam, while the aim of the Umayyads to justify all Sahaba was to defend Mu'awiya and his fellow leaders of corruption.

In other words, the Umayyads sought for the means to justify their course and protect themselves, under the shield of Prophetic companionship, against Muslims' condemnation for the grave sins they committed, and simultaneously stigmatize the opposition groups in general and the Nahrawanee in particular. As such, any sharing of the common attribute of the Prophetic companionship with the Nahrawanee would nullify both the justification of friends' position and the condemnation of foes' opposition! The solution, therefore, would be either a total renunciation of the existence of the companions of the Prophet (pbut) among the Nahrawanee or at least the avoidance of mentioning them publicly and, instead, branding them with abominable⁵ labels so as to keep the mass away from them!⁶ So born, was the term Khawarij as part of the psyche-politics of negative terminologies which were played out to disguise the reality!

---

⁴ - To free or declare free from blame.
⁵ - Very bad or unpleasant.
⁶ - Books on history are laden with the names of Sahaba who were among the people of Nahrawaan. The last part of this series is specific for that research.
Al-Khawarij

This Umayyad approach of dealing with the Nahrawanee in such psychologically virulent7 weapon of bad terminologies was necessarily unavoidable. It was a kind of political race aimed at providing the Umayyad political existence with self-defence against the already existent danger of ideological views held by the Nahrawanee. The Nahrawanee ideological engeneering had already developed full political muscles to do away with any secular or semi-secular leadership or rather with any rule of nominal Islam. Standing as a united-front inspired by the history of justice, morality and equality of the first and the second reigns successively symbolized in the personalities of both Abu Bakr and 'Umar, the Nahrawanee adopted a political culture containing two major elements which were unharmonious with the Umayyad ideology as well as that of the followers of 'Ali.

One thing which was the integral part of the Nahrawanee political tradition was the idea that a leader of the Islamic state must neither belong to the Quraish stock8 nor must he be a descendant of the Prophet (pbuh). Another important thing which caused friction, was their illegalization of the whole Umayyad political culture based upon hereditary system where the real meaning of the divinely legislated Shura became necessarily irrelevant.

But there was another third factor which brought about the clash of ideas – the separation of politics from religion. The nature of the Nahrawanee political ideology was also reflected in their notion that the religion could by no means be separable from politics. To them the rule without Islamic law, is a kind of disbelief though they categorized this kind of disbelief as being not the one which renders a Muslim non-Muslim and takes him out of Islam altogether. This idea may at least be acclaimed and applauded by all other camps, but

7 - Strongly poisonous and bitterly hostile.
8 - A line of ancestry; family origin.
misinterpretations which were made to distort the truth were another major problem.

Indeed, the very idea of regarding Quraishism as a criterion for the eligibility of the Islamic leadership resulted from both misinterpretation of some of the authentic Prophetic traditions and the fabrication of many other traditions. Equally, the idea of 'Ali and his descendants being the selected ones to undertake the leadership of the Islamic state, was a result of indefatigable efforts to fabricate as many traditions as possible so as to support the ethnic politics and integrate the caste and class struggle. However, where fabrication was not possible as the case with the incorruptible or rather inviolable Qur-anic verses, the advocates of Alism turned to the same misinterpretations as made by the Umayyad politicians. It is very difficult for a researcher to be able to collect all fabricated hadiths or misinterpreted verses, for such a task will take him a long time and will need extra-ordinary efforts. But for one to have a clear picture in mind, one may consider the verse that: "And the most beautiful Names belong to Allah...."\(^{10}\) about whose interpretation the Shi'as, in their most authentic book on traditions entitled Al-Kafi, quote one of their Imams named Abu Abdillah (Ja'afar Al-sadiq) as saying: "We (the Imams of the Ahlu Al-Bait) are the most beautiful names themselves without which Allah accepts no deed!"\(^{11}\). It is suprising to learn that this tradition has been accepted as authentic and so authorized\(^{12}\) by the Shi'a scholars!

Back to the Nahrawaneees, you will remember that it is from them

\(^{9}\) - That can not be tired out.

\(^{10}\) - *The Qur-an*: 7, 80.

\(^{11}\) - Al-Kuleini Al-Kafi Vol. 1, p. 192, hadith no. 4, babu Al-Nawadir.

\(^{12}\) - Because of this authorization, the tradition has been incorporated, as a marginal note, into one of the Shi'a published Mushaf entitled *Al-Qur-an Wa Fadhailu Ahli Al-Bait* p. 174.
that the Ibadhi school has had its political ideology. The emphasis on
the words *political ideology* here is very important since it has been
intentionally put with the aim of showing that during those early
divisions which took place among the companions of the Prophet
(pbuh), there were no differences in matters concerning Islamic creed
and doctrine; nor were there such serious differences in matters
concerning Islamic jurisprudence\(^\text{13}\) to the extent that they led to the
emergence of different schools. Contrarily, all Muslims observed a
uniform of prayer and other rituals in the same manner as they held
one creed in common. The differences, with historical weight, which
occurred at the time of the companions of the Prophet (pbuh), were
strictly limited to the political affairs most importantly were those
which concerned the leadership of the Islamic state – who had a
better right to be a leader than another?

Finally and shortly, in order to know what the *First Muhakkima* or
the *Nahrawanees* were and why they were referred to as *Khawarij*,
we need to know the history of the Battle of Siffin, for this was the
basis and the main factor that gave rise to that name and eventually
confused and misled the general public. Our concern in this booklet,
is the Battle of Siffin and its aftermath.

\(^{13}\) - Jurisprudence is the science or the philosophy of law or skill in law. Thus
Islamic jurisprudence is the science of Islamic law otherwise known as *fiq-h*. 
BACKGROUND

Far back in the remote past of its history, Islam, as hinted before, was without denominations. Some few political differences which were experienced in the early Islamic society, were not such effective to the point of giving rise to various sectarian schools with different identities. Most of these differences, were limited to the issue of merits of the Sahaba in order to distinguish those who had a higher position in Islam from others. Unexpectedly, this attitude gradually grew up to become the root cause for the later differences in the very sensitive question of the succession of the Prophet (pbuh). Thus born was the clash of opinions on who was right or rather rightful to succeed him after his death?

Obviously, the basic problem as to why the Sahaba did not come up with one united stand towards this matter, stemmed from the fact that they had no one standard criterion by which to judge men and their merits. While the overwhelming majority had religious merits for the only criteria by which to give precedence to one over another, there was a minority of them to whom a genealogical closeness to the Prophet (pbuh) was the first and ultimate criterion! Thus grew up the seeds of the ideology of the so-called Ahlu Al-Bait school with almost similar elements to the ideology of divine kingship! Simultaneously, there were others who took different direction and so claimed the orthodoxy of the Islamic ideology exclusively on the basis of Quraishism without an additional attribute of a ruler being descended from the Prophet (pbuh) – the ethnic politics in the post-Islamic society were thus re-born with the inspiration of the ignorance of the pre-Islamic community!

14 - Sects.
15 - Though with some disparities, this part of history has been spoken of in the pamphlet no. 1, even so, it is better to remind you here once again so that you may get a context of the subject.
Yet these ethnic politics could merely form bases for the upcoming sectarian division which became more serious and effective during the second half of the third Islamic rule.

So the history of how and why sects came into existence can be placed, in its significant scale of time, on the history of a struggle for social order, political morality and economic equality, which was a natural outcome of the third Islamic reign symbolized in the personality of Caliph 'Uthman bin 'Affan. Caliph 'Uthman's inability or negligence to deal positively with the day-to-day increasing socio-politico-economic problems which emerged during the second half of his rule plus his persistent refusal to introduce reforms the Muslims had called for, provoked the wrath of the Muslim mass upon him. This prompted the advocates of the reforms in the expenditure of public funds, justice in political assignments and morality in social affairs to rising in opposition against the third rule. The revolutionaries among the Sahaba, if it is right to call them so, and their followers, demanded that the Caliph should either reform the status quo to cope with the way of his predecessors or abdicate\textsuperscript{16} and leave the matter with the Muslims to decide whom they would entrust with the charge of the Islamic state. In the long run, and more precisely after reaching no agreement at all between the opposition and the opposed, the third Caliph was murdered by the discontented\textsuperscript{17} among the Prophet's companions and their followers. His death had very far-reaching impacts in the history of Islam in general as it was the preliminary cause for all historically significant, subsequent divisions – a background that was a seed and root of religious schism\textsuperscript{18} and sectarianism among the Muslims. Thus the murder of 'Uthman can be said to be a background and indirect factor for the

\textsuperscript{16} - Step down.
\textsuperscript{17} - Dissatisfied.
\textsuperscript{18} - The division of a group into opposing sections or parties.
Battle of Siffin and the direct factor is the one mentioned in the following explanation.
SECTION ONE

THE BATTLE OF SIFFIN
FACTORS AND AFTERMATH
SECTION ONE

THE BATTLE OF SIFFIN
FACTORS AND AFTERMATH

Often the advent of a war has its factors which give birth to it. As for the Battle of Siffin, the direct factors that gave birth to it, were both the act of 'Ali to demand that Mu'awiya should recognize him as Caliph and be under the control of the Central Government led by him; and the act of Mu'awiya to refuse the demand. In response to that, Mu'awiya demanded from 'Ali to first surrender to him those who murdered 'Uthman bin 'Affan in order that they might be judged according to Islamic law, then, after that, he would recognize him as Caliph.

Another version of the same account provides that Mu'awiya demanded from 'Ali to surrender the killers then the next step would be the repetition of the appointment of the Islamic Caliph, leaving the people free to appoint whom they wanted.\(^19\) Ibn A'atham – in this regard – quotes Mu'awiya as saying: "Are we to give up the blood of 'Uthman for nothing? By Allah! I will never do so."\(^20\) Al-Tabari and Ibn Al-Athir, on their part, narrate the words of Mu'awiya as:

Verily, your companion (Ali) has killed our companion ('Uthman); then he claims that he has not killed him. How do you think: are those who have killed him not his companions? So let him submit them to us so that we kill them then we shall agree with you, join the mass and be obedient to him.\(^21\)

\(^{19}\) - Ibn A'atham Al-Futuh Vol. 3, p. 27.
On another occasion, Mu'awiyah, in the medium of his messenger, said:

Submit those who have killed him to us...so that we may kill them, then step down so that we may leave the matter wide open for a new Shura (consultation), and leave the matter with the people....so that they may appoint whom they want.²²

Al-Imam 'Ali — after Mu'awiyah claimed so — ordered Mu'awiyah again and again to join the mass, then if he knew those who killed 'Uthman he would fetch them to him so that justice might be carried out on them.²³ Mu'awiyah refused the demand and persisted in his claim that 'Ali knew those who killed 'Uthman and so he should first surrender them to him then he would recognize 'Ali as Caliph.²⁴

At this juncture, there were many letters of correspondence between 'Ali and Mu'awiyah. Sometimes, the language used in the letters was a gentle and polite one but on other occasions, the letters carried very harsh words. There were other occasions when the messengers were sent to deliver oral messages. One of the letters sent by 'Ali, states:

Bismi Allahi Al-Rahmani Al-Rahim (In the Name of Allah, Most Gracious Most Merciful). From the servant of Allah, 'Ali, the leader of the Muslims, to Mu'awiyah bin Sakhr.²⁵ Verily you are obliged (to accept) my appointment²⁶ (as Caliph), though I was

²⁵ - Sakhr, Mu'awiyah's father, is commonly known as Abu Sufyaaan. So Mu'awiyah bin Sakhr is otherwise known as Mu'awiyah bin Abi Sufyaaan. In Arabic, Abu and Abi have the same meaning but their forms change according to the words which come before them.
²⁶ - Consider the fact that Ali did not claim that he was declared by the Prophet to be Caliph after him, contrarily he said: "I was appointed in Madina and you were
appointed in Madina while you were in Sham (Syria). That was because I was appointed by the same people who had appointed Abu Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthman. The present had no right of choice and the absent had no right to refuse. As for 'Uthman, his case confused the people: the informer was like a blind person and the listener was like a deaf. People stigmatized 'Uthman, but he did not pay attention to that; and others liked him but did not help him; contrarily they gainsaid those who were present and accused those who were absent. Certainly, the mass as a whole has appointed me (Very much like modern universal adult suffrage). He who hates (that appointment), has gone astray from the Right (Path); and he who remains behind, has perished. So accept the truth and comply with what I have written to you Wa-salam!27

Another letter reads:

Bismi Allahi Al-Rahmani Al-Rahim (In the Name of Allah, Most Gracious Most Merciful). From the servant of Allah, 'Ali, the leader of the Muslims, to Mu'awiya bin Sakhr! Oh Mu'awiya! You know very well that the Shura (to hold a consultative council on who should be a leader) is the privilege of the Muhajirin and the Ansaar alone. If they agree on a person and appoint him to be an Imam (leader), Allah is content with that. If anyone goes outside their agreement by criticizing or by heretical innovations, they will

in Sham (Syria)..... That is because I was appointed by the same people who had appointed Abu Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthman'. These words provide enough evidence that the legal formality to appoint a leader of the Islamic state is through a consultative council held by the Muslim authorities. The appointment of the Islamic leadership, therefore, is purely human. As for the claim of the ideology of divine appointment, as advocated by the Shi'as, it, in fact, resulted from the political race during the period of struggling for power among the Alawiyin, the Umayyidin and the Abasiyyin. Yet all of them had many dozens, if not scores, of the Prophetic traditions which either predicted or ordered that they should be the leaders. But the Alawiyin were the richest of all in such kind of traditions!

27 - Ibn A'atham Al-Futuh Vol. 2, p. 352-353. This letter has also been quoted by Al-Tabari in his Al-Taariikh Vol. 6, p. 293-294.
have to take him back to the (Right Path from which) he has gone out. If he refuses, they will have to kill him because of his act to follow the way different from that of the Muslims.  

When the first letter reached Mu'awiya, he said to the messenger of 'Ali: "Return to your fellow with no answer; for – by the will of Allah – my messenger is coming after you." This was obviously the answer of good hope. But things were different and so it took no time for the answer of good hope to prove itself meaningless. All other subsequent replies of Mu'awiya, were an open declaration of war against 'Ali and his followers. One of them reads:

I swear by the name of Allah if those whom you mentioned, had (really) appointed you, and you were innocent of (shedding) the blood of 'Uthman, then you would be like Abu Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthman. But you have instigated the Muhajirin to shed the blood of 'Uthman and made the Ansar not to support him; the ignorant obeyed you and the weak got strong through you. Certainly, the Syrians want nothing except to fight you until you submit to them those who have killed 'Uthman. If you do so, then the Shura (consultative council) will be held among the Muslims (in order to newly appoint an Islamic Caliph).

In response to that, 'Ali said to Mu'awiya:

...As for your statement: 'Submit to me those who have killed 'Uthman;' what does it concern you?! For the sons of 'Uthman are present here, they are more rightful to claim so than you. If you allege that you are stronger to claim the avenging than they, then

---

come to my appointment which is incumbent upon you, then bring me those who have killed him.\textsuperscript{31}

Such were some of the written messages exchanged between the two leaders, 'Ali and Mu'awiya. As for the oral messages which were delivered by the messengers of 'Ali to Mu'awiya, included the one sent by a delegation composed of Bashir bin 'Amri bin Mihsan Al-Ansari, Said bin Qais Al-Hamdani and Shabath bin Rib'i Al-Tamimi.\textsuperscript{32} Sending the three, 'Ali ordered them saying: "Go to this man (Mu'awiya), call him to the obedience of Allah and (to the respect of the decision) of the people." Mu'awiya replied: "And I, on my part, invite your fellow ('Ali) to surrender to me those who killed 'Uthman so that I may kill them, then he steps down so that the Shura may be held anew."\textsuperscript{33}

In short, in this mission, no good language – at least – was heard from Mu'awiya and, therefore, no mutual understanding with the messengers was reached and instead Mu'awiya expelled them saying:

\textsuperscript{31} Ibn Abdi Rabih \textit{Al-Iqdu Al-Farid} Vol. 4, p. 310.
\textsuperscript{32} Al-Tabari \textit{Al-Taarikh} p. 301. Ibn Al-Athir \textit{Al-Kamil} Vol. 2, p. 636. Ibn A'atha Al-Futuh Vol. 3, p. 23. According to Ibn A'atha, the messengers of 'Ali to Mu'awiya were only two persons: Bashir bin 'Amri bin Mihsan Al-Ansari and Said bin Qais Al-Hamdani. Also 'Ali sent Jarir bin Abdillahi Al-Bajali. Refer to Al-Baladhari \textit{Al-Ansab} Vol. 3, p. 65,72, and he sent Dhumra bin Yazid and 'Amru bin Zaraara. Refer to Al-Baladhari \textit{Al-Ansab} Vol. 3, p. 78, 84.
\textsuperscript{33} Al-Tabari \textit{Al-Taarikh} Vol. 5, p. 301. Al-Baladhari \textit{Al-Ansab} Vol. 3, p. 84.
\textsuperscript{34} Al-Baladhariy \textit{Al-Ansab} Vol. 3, p. 84. In fact, the words of Mu'awiya are enough to prove that Caliph is appointed through a Shura and that there is no text neither in the Qur-an nor in the Prophetic traditions that 'Ali or any other person would succeed the Prophet. Otherwise 'Ali himself and his followers would respond to Mu'awiya that Caliph is not appointed through a Shura, for Allah and His Messenger have already appointed him.
"Get out! For there will be nothing between you and me except swords."

THE REAL OBJECTIVES OF MU'AWIYA

In fact, as many historical records show, Mu'awiya was, from the beginning, determined to secede from 'Ali's leadership and form his separate, independent state of Syria. That political ambition was the real reason for his persistent refusal to recognize 'Ali as Caliph. The repeated demand for the avenging of the death of 'Uthman, was merely a pretext for which to justify his secession from the main stream of Islam.

16 - We call it pretext simply because Mu'awiya first had not had that intention at all. It was not until when he was required to recognize 'Ali as caliph that he sought advice from 'Amr bin Al-Aas, who gave him that advice. Refer to Ibn Al-Athir Al-Kamil Vol. 2, p. 629. Al-Baladhari Al-Ansab Vol. 3, p. 73-74. Another account says that it was Shurhabil bin Al-Simti who gave Mu'awiya the advice. Refer to Ibn Al-Athir Al-Kamil Vol. 2, p. 630. Al-Baladhari Al-Ansab Vol. 3, p. 65. Because the claim of Mu'awiya for avenging the death of 'Uthman was merely a pretext, Shabath bin Rib'i told him: "Verily, you have had nothing with which to mislead the people and by which to attract them to (your) desires...except your statement that your Imam ('Uthman) has been killed unjustly and we want to avenge his murder." Thus, the weak, ignorant obeyed you. All of us know that you did not help him but you liked that he would be killed so that you might get this office for which you struggled." Ibn Al-Athir Al-Kamil Vol. 2, p. 636.
17 - 'Uthman was besieged in Madina for more than one month and he sent envoys to Mu'awiya in Syria in order to get a military aid from him, but, ironically, neither Mu'awiya nor 'Amr bin Al-Aas ever went to help 'Uthman?! Can such a person really be said to be a defender of 'Uthman? Adversely, 'Amr bin Al-Aas was said to be among those who instigated people to kill him. Indeed, this is not refutable for a person like 'Amr bin Al-Aas especially when we take into consideration the fact that from the beginning, 'Amr bin Al-Aas held a negative position against 'Uthman simply because he deposed him from the office of governorship. Refer to Al-Baladhari Al-Ansab Vol. 6, p. 162.
To understand this properly, consider what Ibn Taymiyya records in his *Minhaj Al-Sunnah*. He states:

> Following the death of 'Ali, people agreed on having Mu'awiyah (for their Caliph),\(^{38}\) and, as a result, he became the leader of all. Yet, in spite of this, he killed no one of those who killed 'Uthman...Indeed, it was narrated that when he (Mu'awiyah) was passing by Madina in his journey to the pilgrimage (to the Holy City of Makka), he heard a voice (calling) from 'Uthman's house: 
> 'Oh Amir Al-Mu'uminin (Oh leader of believers)! "Who is that." 
> Asked Mu'awiyah. The people answered: "It is the daughter of 'Uthman, crying for 'Uthman"...He (Mu'awiyah) went to her and said: 'The people have agreed to obey us unwillingly; and we have taken pity on them though we have hatred (against them); therefore, from now onwards, I do not want to hear you cry.'\(^{39}\)

This quotation, from one of the staunchest supporters of Mu'awiyah, gives clear evidence that Mu'awiyah's claim for avenging the death of 'Uthman was merely a tact aimed at giving his political course justification and momentum. Had Mu'awiyah been really sincere on his demand from 'Ali to submit those who killed 'Uthman, or preferably had he really wanted to avenge the death of 'Uthman, he

---

\(^{38}\) Ibn Taymiyya's words that "Following the death of 'Ali, people agreed on having Mu'awiyah (for their Caliph) is not correct. The Muslims at that time were divided into three main groups and several smaller ones. The major three groups were the Nahrawaneees, the followers of Mu'awiyah and the followers of 'Ali. The two groups openly opposed Mu'awiyah. But, obviously, Ibn Taymiyya, by those words, meant the recognition of Mu'awiyah by Al-Hasan bin 'Ali which came as a result of a peace treaty signed by the two leaders. However, this treaty did not reflect the general concensus of the Islamic Ummah. Indeed, many - if not most - of the followers of Al-Imam Al-Hasan himself rose in opposition against the treaty to the extent that they regarded Al-Hasan as a betrayer of the Muslims. It is obvious, therefore, that there was no agreement on the legitimacy of Mu'awiyah's rule, and the idea that his rule was illegitimate is unquestionably correct.

would have done it himself at this time when the reins of the Islamic state were in his hands. But, instead, he prohibited the daughter of 'Uthman even from crying for her father, telling her: "The people have agreed to obey us unwillingly; and we have taken pity on them though we have hatred (against them)" meaning that we have already succeeded to gain what we have been struggling for, so keep quiet lest you awaken the sleeping!

The acquisition of such evidence makes those endowed with understanding minds not to agree with any claim that Mu'awiya – by seceding from 'Ali's leadership – was really fighting to avenge the death of 'Uthman. For by the time Mu'awiya ruled, most of those who killed 'Uthman were still alive, and yet he took no action against them! This and many other proofs make us unhesitatingly believe that nothing Mu'awiya struggled for except the throne of power. It was for this reason – as history books state – that Mu'awiya claimed for himself to be more worthy and rightful for the Islamic Caliphate than 'Ali. In his Al-Futuh Ibn A'athom says:

Then Mu'awiya went to his followers and said: "Oh men! For what thing has 'Ali bin Abi Talib been better than I in this matter (of Islamic Caliphate)? By God! I was a writer of the Prophet (pbuh); my sister was married to the Prophet (pbuh); I was a governor of 'Umar bin Al-Khattab and 'Uthman bin 'Affan.....If he ('Ali) has been appointed by the Iraqis, I have been appointed by the Syrians, and all these (people) are the same towards this matter, and he who wins a thing, it belongs to him."

Here again, consider how contradictory Mu'awiya's statements were! While on this occasion, he claims to be better than 'Ali or at least

---

40 - Mu'awiya distorts the truth! 'Ali was not appointed by the Iraqis, on the contrary, he was appointed by the Sahaba, Muhajirin and Ansar, in Madina.
similar to him in rank, and so they are equal in deserving the leadership of the Islamic state, possibly Mu'awiyah viewing himself as being the first among equals; ironically, in other sessions held to discuss the crisis, he said that nothing he claimed except the avenging of 'Uthman's death. "But I fight until he submits to me those who killed 'Uthman, if he does so, I will be one of the ordinary Muslims; I will be as obedient (to him) as other people." So said Mu'awiyah.\footnote{Ibn A'atham \textit{Al-Futuh} Vol. 3, p. 94. Similar to this, is the narrative by Al-Baladhari in his \textit{Al-Ansab} Vol. 3, p. 66. But there were other occasions when he asked 'Ali to let him continue with his governorship of the Syrian province. Refer to Al-Baladhari \textit{Al-Ansab} Vol. 3, p. 78.}

But was it true that Mu'awiyah fought for that end? In the quotation by Ibn Taymiyyah, as shown before, we have seen a clear statement by Mu'awiyah himself about the goal for which he went. 'Amru bin Al-Aas, the great political adviser of Mu'awiyah, also had this clarification about their real goal during the Battle of Saffin. He said to 'Ammar bin Yasir: ":Go back to where you have been from and leave what is in our hands with us."\footnote{Ibn A'atham \textit{Al-Futuh} Vol. 3, p. 126.} By the words "Leave what is in our hands with us".. 'Amru bin Al-Aas meant that Syria should be formally recognized as Mu'awiyah's sphere of influence.

Another example which can be taken to express the real aspiration of Mu'awiyah, was what 'Utba bin Abi Sufyaan, Mu'awiyah's brother, said to a follower of 'Ali named Ja'ada bin Hubaira. He told him:

\begin{quote}
By God! We would not have claimed that Mu'awiyah was more eligible for the Islamic leadership than 'Ali, had it not been for the question of 'Uthman's murder. But Mu'awiyah has been more
\end{quote}
eligible for the leadership of Syria, because the people thereof are content with him.\textsuperscript{44} Tell your uncle to leave it (Syria) for us.\textsuperscript{45}

Shurahbil, a messenger of Mu'awiyah to 'Ali, was another man to claim the province of Syria. He said to 'Ali: "...We have seen that you should rather leave the battlefield; then we leave your Iraq with you and you leave our Syria with us."\textsuperscript{46} Finally, we find that Mu'awiyah himself — in one of his letters to 'Ali — confesses that nothing he has been fighting for except the rule of Syria. He says to 'Ali: "I asked you to give me Syria on the condition that you neither force me to obey you, nor you assign to me any responsibility, but you did not agree."\textsuperscript{47}

These historical data provide irrefutable evidence that Mu'awiyah's refusal to recognize 'Ali as Caliph, was not because he really wanted to avenge the death of 'Uthman or that he wanted justice to be done, but rather, he was struggling for the evil political power to undermine the Islamic nation, by changing its ruling system from Chaliphat to Monarchy where the word of a ruler — rather that of God and His Messenger — would become a law in the land.

Back again to the letters of correspondence exchanged between the two leaders as well as their reciprocal sending of oral messages, we find that the hot disputes which took place between them proved nothing meaningful or fruitful. Thus after the failure of all diplomatic

\textsuperscript{44} - It seems that this man is ignorant of how Islamic Caliph is appointed. He does not know that the appointment of Caliph is a special entitlement for the most knowledgeable scholars. At the time of the companions of the Prophet, those who were responsible for appointing and being appointed Caliphs, were in Madina. Mu'awiyah had no single quality with which to be an Islamic Caliph as many Sahaba openly told him.

\textsuperscript{45} - Ibn A'tham Al-Futuh Vol. 3, p. 177.

\textsuperscript{46} - Ibid p. 286.

\textsuperscript{47} - Ibid p. 259.
efforts, 'Ali became disappointed and now realized that part of his state had really rebelled against him. What to do then? 'Ali with those who sided with him found no solution except the one mentioned in the Holy Qur-an: "...If one (party) transgresses beyond the bounds against another, then fight against the one that transgresses until it complies with the command of Allah".\(^{48}\) Thus began, the Battle of Siffin: one of the most sanguinary\(^ {49}\) and internecine\(^ {50}\) wars ever to be experienced in the History of Islam.

\(^{48}\) The Qur-an: 49-9.
\(^{49}\) Sanguinary: accompanied by bloodshed.
\(^{50}\) Internecine: mutually destructive.
SUMMARY AND MAIN POINTS

This section can be summarized as follows:

1) Our subject in this section has been about the factors which gave birth to the Battle of Siffin.

2) Following the death of 'Uthman, 'Ali bin Abi Talib was appointed the fourth Caliph.

3) Mu'awiya bin Abi Sufyaan refused to recognize him as Caliph, claiming that 'Ali either took part in killing 'Uthman or, at least, he knew those who killed him and gave them asylum. As such, for him to recognize 'Ali, the guilty should first be surrendered to him so that he might kill them, then he would recognize 'Ali as Caliph.

4) 'Ali ordered Mu'awiya to first follow suit by accepting him as Caliph, then, if he knew the killers, he would bring them before him for justice to be carried out on them.

5) Mu'awiya's own words and those of his accomplices\(^1\) were a clear confession that their secession emanated from their political ambitions to accede to the throne of Caliphate.

6) There was no mutual understanding between them though all diplomatic efforts were made.

7) Having seen this, 'Ali with those who sided with him among the Sahaba and their followers decided to wage war against Mu'awiya in order to suppress his insurrection\(^2\) and reunify

\(^1\) - A partner or helper especially in a crime or wrongdoing.
\(^2\) - Rebellion.
the Islamic Ummah. Thus born, was the Battle of Siffin whose details are as follows in section two.

8) So the indirect factor for the Battle of Siffin was the murder of 'Uthman and the direct factors were the act of 'Ali to demand from Mu'awiya to recognize him as Caliph of the Islamic state and the act of Mu'awiya to reject the demand.
SECTION TWO

THE BEGINNING OF THE WAR
SECTION TWO
THE BEGINNING OF THE WAR

Then the war broke out on Wednesday\textsuperscript{53} of Safar\textsuperscript{54} in the year 37 A.H.,\textsuperscript{55} between Al-Imam 'Ali and his Iraqi army on one side, supported by most of the Sahaba, Muhajirin and Ansar, and Mu'awiyah bin Abi Sufyaan and his Syrian forces on the other side. The eruption of this war, however, did not come as the last straw, contrarily, it was preceded by other sporadic wars, fought for the first time between the Iraqi vanguard\textsuperscript{56} led by Malik bin Al-Harith Al-Shtar and the Syrian vanguard led by Abu Al-A'awar Al-Sulami.\textsuperscript{57} In this preliminary war, Mu'awiyah troops fled by night, and when it dawned, 'Ali's army found none of them.\textsuperscript{58} At that time, 'Ali and part of his army had not yet arrived at the battlefield. When he arrived, it was still morning, he ordered his vanguard commander, Malik bin Al-Harith Al-Ashtar, to leave the place with those troops placed under his leadership for Siffin where Mu'awiyah had been.\textsuperscript{59} Accordingly, Al-Ashtar and the troops set out therefor and when they arrived at the place they found Mu'awiyah had already occupied a militarily most strategic area where pure drinking water was available.\textsuperscript{60} Some of Mu'awiyah's advisers told him not to let 'Ali's forces drink water therefrom:

\textsuperscript{54} - The second month in the Islamic calendar.
\textsuperscript{56} - Vanguard is the foremost part of an army advancing or ready to advance.
\textsuperscript{58} - Al-Tabari Al-Taariikh Vol. 5, p. 298. Ibn Al-Athir Al-Kamil 2, p. 634.
\textsuperscript{59} - Al-Tabari Al-Taariikh Vol. 5, p. 298.
Deprive them of the water as they deprived 'Uthman thereof, they besieged him for forty days without the coldness of water and the deliciousness of food. Kill them by denying them water, may Allah make them die of thirst.\textsuperscript{61}

Others said: "May Allah deprive them of water on the day of judgement."\textsuperscript{62} Accordingly, Mu'awiya declined to allow 'Ali's forces to drink water therefrom and said:

By Allah! The idea is the one you have suggested.....may Allah not let Mu'awiya and his father drink water from the pool of the Prophet Muhammad (on the day of judgement) if 'Ali and his followers ever drink the water of the Euphrates, except if he defeats (me in this war).\textsuperscript{63}

Hence began the second war\textsuperscript{64} which came to be known historically as Al-Qitalu 'Alaa Al-Maaai meaning "The Battle for water."\textsuperscript{65} This war lasted for a few hours only before 'Ali's forces gained victory and so brought the water under their control. Unlike Mu'awiya, 'Ali, after he secured the water sources, allowed the Syrian troops to drink therefrom.\textsuperscript{66}

\textsuperscript{63} - Ibn A'atham Al-Futuh Vol. 3, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{64} - Which was the first war to break out at Siffin, and the second in the total events of the wars fought between 'Ali's forces and Mu'awiya's, meaning that the first broke out somewhere else before the arrival of 'Ali's forces at Siffin.
Then during the whole month of Thul-Hijjah\textsuperscript{67} there was a daily war though not fought collectively, but, on the contrary, it was fought in a style very much like modern contest where one man from this side comes to contest another from another side. On other occasions, a group of fighters from one side contested another group from the opposite side. When Muharram\textsuperscript{68} came in, the war was stopped in respect of the glory of the month. A narrative by Ibn A'atham shows that while 'Ali broke off the action to honour the month, Mu'awiya did not.\textsuperscript{69} But according to Al-Tabari,\textsuperscript{70} Ibn Al-Athir\textsuperscript{71}, Al-Mas'udi\textsuperscript{72} and Al-Baladhiri,\textsuperscript{73} the men of the two sides unanimously agreed on stopping the war. Soon after the month of Muharram was over, and Safar came in, 'Ali again wanted Mu'awiya and his party to join the mass, but there was no response from Mu'awiya except to begin the rearrangement of his troops and say that: "Nothing between you and us except a sword or the weak (among us) would perish."\textsuperscript{74} On Wednesday, of Safar of the year 37 A.H., therefore, the massive scale war of Siffin broke out, where one day before, 'Ali said to his forces: "For how long shall we not stand collectively against these people?"\textsuperscript{75} Thus 'Ali began to prepare his troops for a collective

\textsuperscript{67} - The twelfth month in Islamic calendar when the rituals of the Islamic pilgrimage are performed in the Holy City of Makka.

\textsuperscript{68} - The first month in the Islamic calendar.

\textsuperscript{69} - Ibn A'atham Al-Futuh Vol. 3, p. 31.

\textsuperscript{70} - Al-Tabari Al-Taarikh Vol. 5, p. 303.

\textsuperscript{71} - Ibn Al-Athir Al-Kamil Vol. 2, p. 637.

\textsuperscript{72} - Al-Mas'udi A-Muruj Vol. 2, p. 516.

\textsuperscript{73} - Al-Baladhari Al-Ansab Vol. 3, p. 84.

\textsuperscript{74} - Al-Mas'udi A-Muruj Vol. 2, p. 516.

attack against the Syrian forces and in the following day the massive scale Battle of Siffin began.

THE KILLING OF THE SAHABI 'AMMAAR BIN YASIR

In this war, a great Sahabi of the Prophet (pbuh) named 'Ammaar bin Yasar, who was in 'Ali's army, was killed. His death aroused severe emotions and sentiments of sadness among the forces of 'Ali. Thus cries were heard from everywhere: "The Sahabi of the Prophet (pbuh) has been killed; the Prophet (pbuh) said that 'Ammaar would be killed by a rebellious group."

Certainly, this tradition gave enough evidence on who was right between 'Ali and Mu'awiya. Furthermore, the tradition was well known to everyone to the extent that even Mu'awiya himself, when reminded thereof by his close friend, 'Amru bin Al-Aas, did not

---

78 - Al-Tabari Al-Taarikh Vol. 5, p. 325.
79 - Al-Ya'qubi Taarikh Al-Ya'qubi Vol. 2, p. 188. This narrative provides a clear-cut evidence that Mu'awiya and his group were Bughat (rebels). It is a matter of great surprise to learn that when Mu'awiya is mentioned by name, there are many who pray for him saying: Radhiya Allahu 'Anhu! (May Allah be pleased with him)! What is Allah to be pleased with?! Is He to be pleased with his rebellion which the Prophet had long predicted? Actually, we still need to liberate ourselves from the chains of slavery of sectarianism. For the tradition of who would kill 'Ammaar, refer to: Ibn A'atham Al-Futuh Vol. 3, p. 119. Ibn Abi Rabih Al-Iqdu Al-Farid Vol. 4, p. 317-318. Ibn Al-Athir Al-Kamil Vol. 2, p. 663-677. Ibn Abi Shaiiba Al-Musannaf Vol. 8, p. 723, narrative no. 15, p. 728, narrative no. 39-40. Muslim Sahih Muslim Vol. 9 of Sharhu Al-Nawawi by Al-Nawawi p. 172-173, traditions no: 70_2915-72_2916-73_2916. Al-Bukhari Sahih Al-Bukhari tradition no. 447. Al-Baladhihi Al-Ansab Vol. 3, p. 93.
renounce it, but he misinterpreted it, saying "His killers were those who brought him to the war." Hearing this illogic 'Ali responded that in this sense: "The Prophet (pbuh) killed (his uncle) Hamza because it was he who brought him to the war". Another version of the same narrative quotes 'Ali as saying: "So we also killed Hamza, for it was we who brought him (to the war)." But, obviously the former account is the authentic one as it is more worthy as argument against the opponent.

THE RAISING OF COPIES OF THE HOLY QUR-AN

After the war lasted for many days with victory almost every day going to 'Ali's side, Mu'awiyah and his close friend 'Amru bin Al-Aas contemplated what they would do and how they would save themselves from the close defeat and, more importantly, how they would be able to either technically disintegrate Ali's army or at least lessen its strength by creating disunity in it. The first step taken towards this was the attempt to beguile Ibn 'Abbaas with

82 - Ibn A'atham Al-Futuh Vol. 3, p. 268. Ibn Taymiyya Minhaj Al-Sunna Vol. 2, p. 208. There is a contradiction of narratives concerning who replied so. Other accounts, such the one narrated by Ibn A'atham in his Al-Futuh Vol. 3, p. 268, mention Abdullah bin 'Amru bin Al-Aas as the one that gave that answer, whereas Ibn Abdi Rabih in his Al-Iqdu Al-Farid Vol. 4, p. 319, says that it was Ali who replied so. Probably, there is another account which attributes the answer to Ibn 'Abbaas. Wa Allahu A'lam.
85 - To survey with eyes or mind (meditate).
86 - To cheat.
impressive but deceitful words. Yet Mu'awiya, from the beginning, realized that the door to Ibn 'Abbaas was not easy of access: Ibn 'Abbaas, the most knowledgeable Sahabi of the Qur-an, was not such a credulous\(^ {87} \) man to be deceived easily. Nevertheless, 'Amru bin Al-Aas was not disappointed by Ibn 'Abbaas' intellectual capability and keen insight. As such, he made a trial of persuading him so that he would convince Al-Imam 'Ali to stop the war, ensuring that common interests of the two contesting parties lay in the stopping of the war and reaching a truce. But this trial was also a failure: the answer he got from Ibn 'Abbaas disheartened him.\(^ {88} \)

The war, therefore, continued and as the days went by it became more and more fierce. The most memorable of all were two incidents. One was the incident that came to be known historically as Al-Waqia Al-Khamisyiya\(^ {89} \) meaning Thursday's incident; another was the event of the next night which was referred to as Lailatu Al-Harir.\(^ {90} \) It is said that during this night alone, about thirty six thousand men were killed,\(^ {91} \) of whom 'Ali alone is believed to have slain five hundred and twenty three persons!\(^ {92} \)

Thus Mu'awiya, seeing such unexpected defeat, sought advice from 'Amru bin Al-Aas, saying:

\(^{87}\) The one that is too much ready to believe.

\(^{88}\) For these details, refer to Ibn A'atham Al-Futuh Vol. 3, p. 249-252.

\(^{89}\) Ibn A'atham Al-Futuh Vol. 3, p. 293.


\(^{91}\) Refer to Ibn A'atham Al-Futuh Vol. 3, p. 305.

Oh Aba Abdillahi! Where are your tricks I have always experienced? 'Amru (bin Al-Aas) said: 'What do you want? (Mu'awiya) said: 'I want you to stop the war, for the Syrians have perished to the extreme, indeed, I am sure that if this war lasts for this one day, none in the land of Syria will carry a weapon.'

Again he told him: "Where is your reserve you have saved up, remember Egypt". 'Amru bin Al-Aas, told Mu'awiya what we quoted before:

Am I to show you a thing which will strengthen our unity and intensify their disunity? He replied: 'Yes'. He ('Amru bin Al-Aas) said: "Let us raise copies of the Holy Qur-an on the spearheads and then let us say that what is inside these (copies) is the judgement between you and us. If some of them refuse, you will have others who will say: 'Yes: we are obliged to agree'. Hence there will happen disunity among them. And in case all of them say: 'Yes', we shall keep this war away from us for a while."

---

94 - Al-Mas'udi Al-Muruj Vol. 2, p. 524. The meaning of the words "Remember Egypt" is that Mu'awiya asked 'Amru bin Al-Aas for an aid against 'Ali in this war. 'Amru told Mu'awiya: "I exchange my religion for the temporal life of this world. So what will you give me? Mu'awiya replied him: "Egypt will be yours," meaning I will assign to you the governorship of Egypt. Thus the words "Remember Egypt" were meant to remind 'Amru the promise he was given. Refer to Al-Mas'udi Al-Muruj Vol. 2, p. 499,532. Ibn Abdi Rabih Al-Iqdu Al-Farid Vol. 4, p. 319. Ibn Al-Athir Al-Kamil Vol. 2, p. 707. Al-Baladhi Al-Ansab Vol. 3, p. 71,74.
95 - In the pamphlet no. 1, p. 6.
Another account quotes 'Amru bin Al-Aas as saying "In fact, if you do so, none will fight another." He also said: "There has remained nothing except one trick – raise copies of the Holy Qur-an so that you may stop 'Ali's forces and break up their strength."

Thus, following the order of Mu'awiya, copies of the Holy Qur-an were raised and one of his followers came between the two armies and read the following verses:

Have you not turned your thought to those who have been given a portion of the Book? They are invited to the Book of Allah so that it may judge among them but a party of them turns back and declines (the arbitration).

When they are summoned to Allah and His Messenger, in order that he may judge among them, behold, some of them decline (to come) But if the right is theirs, they come to him with submission Is there disease in their hearts; or they doubt; or they fear that

---

98 - Al-Ya'qubi Taarikh Al-Ya'qubi Vol. 2, p. 188.
99 - Ibn A'atham Al-Futuh Vol. 3, p. 308. Similar to it, is the narrative by Ibn Abi Shaiba Al-Musannaf Vol. 8, p. 736, narrative no. 34, but he did not mention the latter group of the verses.
100 - The Qur-an, 3, 23.
Allah and His Messenger will deal with them unjustly* Nay it is they themselves who do wrong* The answer of the Believers, when summoned to Allah and His Messenger in order that he may judge among them is that they say: 'We hear and we obey.'

The aim of the follower of Mu'awiya by reciting these verses was to convince 'Ali's side that as long as Mu'awiya was now ready to stop the war and enter into an arbitration, it was the obligation of the Muslims to respond to his call positively. But, the verses – as evidently seen – have nothing to do with the legality of stopping the war fought against the Bughat (rebels). The verses primarily command people to follow the Book of Allah: no further explanation has been given and so they have nothing in common with the differences which took place between the two rival camps. In other words, the ultimate meaning the verses hold is to enjoin us to refer to the Book of Allah as the first and final solvent force to all our problems. Luckily, when we refer to the Book, as Allah requires us, we find the clearer and more explanatory verse that: "...If one (party) transgresses beyond the bounds against another, then fight against the one that transgresses until it complies with the command of Allah". Mu'awiya and his group rebelled against the legitimate Islamic government led by 'Ali, so, after all attempts to solve the crisis peacefully failed, the Book of Allah commands us to fight them a war: "...fight against the one that transgresses until it complies with the command of Allah." As such, the verses which

101 - The Qur-an, 24, 48-51.
102 - The Qur-an: 49-9. The beginning of this verse, as we said in part one of this series, requires us to make reconciliation between the two quarrelling parties and then, if that fails to solve the problem, the next and final step would be the use of force against the transgressing party. Prior to the outbreak of the war between Ali and Mu'awiya, Ali had already sent several envoys to Mu'awiya. Typically, many peacemakers were involved in order to solve the problem peacefully, but none of these efforts succeeded.
the follower of Mu'awiyah came with as proofs for the legality of stopping the war, were in reality not in his favour.

In short, as Mu'awiyah ordered, copies of the Qur-an were raised and as a result 'Ali's soldiers, as explained before, were divided in opinions: while some supported the idea of ceasing the war and making negotiation with the rebellious party; others found the act of stopping the war to be Qur-anically illegitimate and a seriously grave sin. Hence the dreams of 'Amru bin Al-Aas of divide-and-rule came true.

Al-Imam 'Ali bin Abi Talib – on his part – knew exactly that nothing was aimed behind the act of raising copies of the Qur-an except as a military trick.\(^{103}\) That was why he said to his troops:

> Go on (fighting) for your right and perpetuate your truthfulness of fighting against your enemy, verily Mu'awiyah, 'Amru bin Al-Aas, Ibn Mu'aith, Habib bin Maslama, Ibn Abi Sarih and Al-Dhahhak bin Qais, are neither religious people nor are they the people of the Qur-an; I have known them since their childhood while you have known them in their adulthood; how evil children they were and how evil adults the are (now)! Alas! Indeed they have not raised (copies of the Qur-an) but as a trick and deception.\(^{104}\)

But, unfortunately, at this time the Mu'awiyah politics of division, very much like the modern Anglo-Israel politics of divide-and-rule, had already won the game and acquired access to 'Ali's forces – the supreme hour of the real crisis had arrived.

\(^{103}\) Ibn A'atham *Al-Futuh* Vol. 3, p. 319.

SUMMARY AND MAIN POINTS

1) Our concern in this section has been about how and when the Battle of Siffin was fought.

2) This Battle was fought between 'Ali with his Iraqi army on one side; and Mu'awiya with his Syrian Army on the other.

3) The war was fought in the year 37 A.H.

4) After days had gone by, the victory was now surely going to 'Ali's side.

5) Seeing this, Mu'awiya decided to raise copies of the Holy Qur'an as a trick to stop the war and create division among the forces of 'Ali.

6) The division, as dreamt by Mu'awiya and his accomplice, occurred among them: some supported the idea; others opposed it.

7) Some writers and some historians claim that it was the Khawarij who required 'Ali to accept the proposal of stopping the war and making an arbitration with Mu'awiya, then they turned around and blamed him on that account. But was it true that the so-called Khawarij were concerned with the idea of stopping the war and making arbitration? The following section gives eight tangible, irrefutable proofs to disprove this false historical propaganda.
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ARGUMENT NO. 1: THE INAUTHENTIC SANAD OF THE ACCOUNT AS OPPOSED TO THE AUTHENTIC ONE

Most of the people have been wrongly claiming that the so-called Khawarij were the ones that supported the idea of making arbitration and reaching truce with Mu'awiyah in the Battle of Siffin, then they turned around to blame 'Ali and detach themselves from him. This misconception has brought about a massive scale condemnation against them. However, the claim that the so-called Khawarij have supported the idea of truce with Mu'awiyah, has entirely relied on a fabricated account narrated by Al-Tabri in his Al-Taarikh. It is surprising to learn that people have not only depended upon this inauthentic account, but have also turned blind eyes from another authentic account which holds a contrary idea to that – the authentic tradition has got no acclamation in the world of Islamic literature; and the fabricated one has been warmly applauded! Evidently, this act of leaving the authentic tradition and adhering to the inauthentic one has resulted from the influence of both political and historical prejudices of the Umayyad-centric writers as well as those who supported 'Ali's course.

The narrative on which those people base their arguments, has been told by Al-Tabari as follows:
Mis'ar bin Fadaki Al-Tamimi, Zaid bin Husain Al-Tai along with a
group with which were Al-Qurraa\textsuperscript{105} (the learned ones) who later
became Khawarij, said (to 'Ali): 'Oh 'Ali! Respond to the call of
the Book of Allah, the Exalted, to which you have been called,\textsuperscript{106}
otherwise we shall hurl you to those people (Mu'awiya and his
forces) or we shall do to you what we have done to ('Uthman) bin
'Affan.\textsuperscript{107}

This account, as seen, gives a clear evidence that it was the so-called
Khawarij who wanted the war to be stopped. But this evidence will,
ironically enough, not stay long to dissolve, vaporize and vanish
under the vehement influence of true proofs from the authentic
account narrated by Al-Imam Ahmad bin Hanbal, Ibn Abi Shaiba,
Al-Minqari and Abu Ya'ala. The account says:

\textit{...Al-Khawarij came and we, at that time, referred to them as Al-
Qurraau (the learned ones).\textsuperscript{108} (When They came) they were
placing their swords on their shoulders. They said (to 'Ali): 'Oh
Amir Al-mu-uminin (the leader of the Muslims), what are we
waiting for about these people who are on the hill; why not go to

\textsuperscript{105} - Remember that the Qurraa are the Nahrawanies themselves, are the people of
Nahrawaan, are the so-called Khawarij and are the First Muhakkima. Thus any of
these names if mentioned, refers to the same people.
\textsuperscript{106} - Meaning when Mu'awiya raised copies of the Qur-an as a sign of wishing to
stop the war and reach a truce.
\textsuperscript{107} - Al-Tabari \textit{Al-Taarikh} Vol. 5, p. 330, Vol. 6, p. 3. Ibn Abi Al-Hadid \textit{Sharhu
\textit{Al-Muruj} Vol. 2, p. 525.
\textsuperscript{108} - Contrast it with Mu'awiya's army in which there were no scholars. 'Ali said to
his followers about Mu'awiya and his forces: "Fight the guilty, apostates, wicked
who are neither the readers of the Qur-an, nor are they jurists or scholars in \textit{ta-awil}
(interpretation)." Refer to Al-Tabari \textit{Al-Taarikh} Vol. 5, p. 330, Vol. 6, p. 21. Ibn
Al-Athir \textit{Al-Kamil} Vol. 2, p. 689.
them with our swords until Allah passes His judgment between us and them.\(^{109}\)

This narrative uproots the fabrication that the so-called Khawarij wanted the war to be ceased and insisted on making an arbitration. But, as hinted before, there is another important thing here to note concerning the two quoted accounts. The former account upon which depend those who claim the participation of the so-called Khawarij in the peace justification process, has been narrated through a weak sanad.\(^{110}\) The sanad through which the account has been narrated, is as follows: "Abu Mikhnaf (said): 'I was told by Abdul-Rahman bin Jundab from his father..."\(^{111}\) Unfortunately, this chain of transmitters is unacceptable according to the science of hadith. Abu Mikhnaf,\(^{112}\) the first man in the sanad, has been strongly disqualified by all proficient experts in traditions. Ibn Hajar in his Lisanu Al-Mizan, Al-Dhahabi in his Mizan Al-I`itidaal, Ibn Abi Hatim in his Al-Jarhu Wa Al-Ta`adil and others, have vigorously renounced his narratives. Read, for example, what both Ibn Hajar and Al-Dhahabi write about Abu Mikhnaf. They say:

He is an evil and unreliable reporter. He has been abandoned by Abu Hatim and his counterparts. Al-Daraqutni says: 'He is


\(^{110}\) Sanad means a chain of transmitters. For example, if we say: "From 'Ali from Saleh from Abu Huraira said: "The Prophet (pnh) said......" In the science of the Prophetic traditions, we refer to the words 'Ali from Saleh from Abu Huraira" as sanad meaning a chain of transmitters. And the text itself is called matn. Try to memorise these two words especially the former because it will be repeatedly used in this work.

\(^{111}\) Al-Tabari Al-Taarikh Vol. 6, p. 3.

\(^{112}\) His name is Lut bin Yahya.
weak. 113 Yahya bin Ma'in says: 'He is not reliable.' Al-'Aqili has mentioned him in his Al-Dhu'aafa (a book on weak narrators of traditions). Al-Dhahabi added: 'He is an extremist Shi'a who narrates their accounts (on their creeds). 114

As for Abdul-Rahman bin Jundab, the second man in the sanad, he is unknown what he was. 115 A tradition narrated by such a person is equally classified as inauthentic. As such, the dependence on this account which attributes to the so-called Khawarij the proposal or the acceptance of arbitration, has not emanated from a scientifically acceptable research.

While, on the other hand, the second tradition which maintains the opposite idea that the so-called Khawarij asked 'Ali to continue the war, has been narrated through an acceptable chain of transmitters. The following is the sanad of the second account: Ya'ala bin 'Ubaid from Abdul-'Aziz bin Siyaah from Habib bin Abi Thabit said: 'I came to Abu Wail, and asked him... (then follow the texts of the account). This sanad is undoubtedly acceptable as explained below. 116

---

113 - Meaning the traditions narrated by him are inauthentic and so not authoritative.
114 - Refer to Ibn Hajar Lisanu Al-Mizan Vol. 4, p. 492, biography no. 1568. More details about him can be found in Mizan al-itidaal by Al-Dhahabi, Vol. 4, p. 340, biography no. 6992. Also refer to Al-Jarh Wa Al-Ta 'adil by Ibn Abi Hatim Vol. 7, p. 182, biography no. 1030.
115 - Refer to Lisanu Al-Mizan Vol. 3, p. 408, biography no. 1610. Sometimes a narrator may not be known who he is and sometimes he may be known who he is but unknown what he is. In both conditions, such a narrator is disqualified.
116 - Ya'ala bin 'Ubaid - the first narrator - is a reliable reporter. Al-Imam Ahmad says: "His hadiths are authentic, and he himself is a good person." Ibn Ma'in says: "He is reliable." Abu Hatim says: "He is truthful." Refer to Ibn Hajar Tahdhibu Al-Tahdhib Vol. 11, p. 353-354, biography no. 680. In short, none has criticized Ya'ala bin 'Ubaid except Ibn Ma'in says that only his traditions which he has received from Sufyaan are inauthentic. Luckily, as seen, he has not received this tradition from Sufyaan, contrarily, he has received it from Abdul-Aziz bin...
Al-Khawarij

As such, the correct idea is the one holding that the Nahrawanees refused altogether the proposal of stopping the war and making arbitration with Mu'awiya. Indeed, this was the basic difference, between 'Ali and them, which led them to detaching themselves from 'Ali and forming their splinter group with politico-religious

Sivaah – the second narrator – a Shi'a by sect, yet he has been accepted by all. Ibn Ma'in and Abu Daud say: "He is reliable." Abu Hatim says: "He is truthful." Refer to Ibn Hajar Tahdhibu Al-Tahdhib Vol. 6, p. 304, biography no. 657. **Habib bin Abi Thabit** – the third narrator – though is reliable but he has one flaw – *tadlis* (deception). The concept of *tadlis* (deception) in the science of *hadith*, is to conceal defects by which a *hadith* is disqualified so that it may be seen as authentic. But again for a *hadith* narrated by a *mudallis* (deceitful) to be disqualified, it is further conditioned that the deceitful narrator must use a word which signifies that he has not received the narrative directly from a person to whom he attributes it. Such forms of narration as: From so and so or that so and so said, mean that the narrator has not heard the narrative directly from the one to whom he has attributed it. But if the form used by a *mudallis* means that he has heard the tradition directly from a person who is before him, then his account is acceptable so long as he has no other defects that disqualify him. **Habib bin Abi Thabit** has directly heard the account from his Sheikh, and as such, his account here is acceptable as authentic. Al-'Ajli says about **Habib bin Abi Thabit** that he is a: "Reliable follower of the Sahaba." Al-Nasai and Ibn Ma'in say: "He is reliable." Refer to Tahdhibu Al-Tahdhib Ibn Hajar Vol. 2, p. 156, biography no. 323. But there are still two *sanads* of Habib bin Abi Thabit which have always been unacceptable: 1) the *hadiths* he narrates from Ataa bin Yasaar, 2) the *hadiths* he narrates from 'Asim bin Dhumra. Refer to Tahdhibu Al-Tahdhib Vol. 5, p. 40-41, biography no. 77, and Vol. 2, p. 156, biography no. 323. Finally, Habib bin Abi Thabit has received this account from **Abu Wail** – the fourth and last narrator who has witnessed the event. Abu Wail's name is Shaqiq bin Salama Al-As'adi. Ibn Ma'in says: "He is reliable, no question is to be asked about a person like him." Waki'i says: "He was reliable." Ibn Sa'ad says: "He was reliable; he had many traditions." Ibn Abdil-Barr says: "(Scholars engaged in the biographies of narrators and collectors of traditions) have agreed that he is reliable." Ibn Hajar Tahdhibu Al-Tahdhib Vol. 4, p. 317-318, biography no. 619. As such, the authentic account is the one that says the so-called Khawarij were the ones that asked 'Ali to continue the war and not accede to the demand by Mu'awiya and his Syrian forces. As for another account upon which others have depended for their counter-claim is totally inauthentic due to the defects which are in its chain of transmitters.
inspiration of re-establishing a just Imamate whose major objectives were to enjoin what is just and forbid what is evil.
ARGUMENT NO. 2: A TEXTUAL CRITICISM OF THE ACCOUNT

Besides the weakness of the sanad of the former account, there are yet other weak points concerning its texts:

One of these weak points which can be taken to prove the inauthenticity of the account is the presence of contradiction between it and the views held in common by all of its advocates. The account, as seen before, states clearly that Al-Khawarij required or rather forced 'Ali to accept the arbitration, otherwise they would do to him what they did to 'Uthman. Ibn A'atham, in this regard, quotes the so-called Khawarij as saying to 'Ali: "Oh 'Ali! You know very well that we killed 'Uthman when he did not want to follow us and resisted to grant our demand about which the Book of Allah said."\(^{117}\)

As such, this account, if accepted as authentic, will necessarily support the claim that 'Ali took part in the murder of 'Uthman or at least he knew the killers.\(^{118}\) Generally, whether 'Ali directly took part therein or not, in both two probabilities, he was responsible as long as the so-called Khawarij had articulated this in his presence without him taking any legal measures against them. However, this textual criticism of the account, if contrasted to the Sunni-Shi'a common stance towards it, the results will come into a strong clash between the content and make-up of the account and the ideas held in common by the two schools; for the two schools, surprisingly, do not agree with that necessary implication held by the account. But, unconsciously, the refutation of this implication will naturally imply that the account is not authentic. Indeed, if we refute that 'Ali took part or at least was content with the murder of 'Uthman, as clearly

\(^{117}\) - Ibn A'atham Al-Futuh Vol. 3, p. 312.
\(^{118}\) - Ibn Al-Athir Al-Kamil Vol. 2, p. 629.
stated by the account, then this will necessarily imply that the account is unacceptable. Suprisingly, people have accepted the text of the account but have rejected the implication it holds – a kind of poor methodology of analysis in the world of science of religion!

Another thing to note concerning this account is the fact that while Al-Tabari – in the medium of Abu Mikhnaïf – narrates the story that it was the Nahrawaneees who urged 'Ali to accept the idea of stopping the war and reaching a truce with Mu'awiya, we find another account narrated by Al-Tabari himself, through the same chain of transmitters, saying that when 'Ali reminded the so-called Khawarij that it was they who forced him to the arbitration, they answered him that: "That was our Kufir (blasphemy); but we have repented of our sin...so you also have to repent (as we have done) so that we may appoint you anew". 119 Al-Mubarrad, another historian, quotes the answer of the Nahrawaneees to 'Ali as follows: "Have you made men judge in the religion because of our opinion? So we admit that we have blasphemed, thus admit as we have admitted and repent as we have done so that we may leave together for Syria (to fight Mu'awiya once again)". 120 Al-Baladhiiri, on his part, spells out this event in the words thus: "Verily you have said what you have, and, verily, those who have leaned towards the arbitration among us, have already repented thereof ..if you repent then we shall support you, otherwise we detach ourselves from you." 121

Indeed, even 'Ali himself, according to these accounts, admitted that to agree with the arbitration was a kufir. Ibn A'atham in his Al-Futuh 122 quotes one of the followers of Mu'awiya as saying to 'Ali during the Battle of Siffin: "...We have seen that you leave here

119 - Al-Tabari Al-Taarikh Vol. 6, p. 13, p. 25.
(you leave the battlefield at Siffin) with those who are with you, so that we leave your Iraq and your Hijaz with you and you leave our Syria with us." 'Ali replied: "This matter has saddened me much and kept me awake, but I have found nothing except (to fight) a war against Mu'awiya or (otherwise) I blaspheme what Allah has revealed." In another version, Ibn A'atham in his Al-Futuh quotes 'Ali as saying: ".....Or I disbelieve what Muhammad (pbuh) has brought."\textsuperscript{124}

As such, the arguments that the Nahrawanees supported the arbitration as based on the account narrated by Al-Tabari "from Abu Mikhna from Abdul-Rahman bin Jundab Al-Azdi,\textsuperscript{125}" are questionable, because even in case of the accuracy of the claim that the so-called Khawarij were really the ones that demanded from 'Ali to stop the war and make an arbitration, this will still, according to these accounts, not brand them as the people of injustice. The reason behind such a conclusion is the observation that, according to these accounts, the Nahrawanees admitted that – by so-doing – they committed sins or at least made mistakes of which they repented.\textsuperscript{126} Thus the obligation of 'Ali was also to repent as they did so that they might reunify their stand against the rebellious party. Indeed, if

\textsuperscript{123} - Modern Saud Arabia.
\textsuperscript{124} - Ibn A'atham Ibid Vol. 3, p. 287. Thus according to these accounts, 'Ali admitted that to stop the war was Islamically not lawful.
\textsuperscript{125} - Al-Baladhar has narrated this account through two sanads: one is the sanad of Abu Mikhna, another is the sanad of 'Awana. Refer to Al-Baladhar Al-Ansab Vol. 3, p. 121. 'Awana is reliable as detailed in Siyaru Al-A'alam by Al-Dhahabi Vol. 7, p. 153-154, biography no. 1079. Even though the problem still remains in the fact that both accounts were finally related by Al-Kalbi, who was one of the greatest liars and fabricators of false accounts and traditions. Refer to Ibn Hajar Tahdhibu Al-Tahdhib Vol. 9, p. 157, biography no.268.
\textsuperscript{126} - But care should be taken not to think that Nahrawanees admission of making mistakes or committing sins, can be taken to stigmatize their position and soil their name, contrarily, this shows how truthful those people were. Indeed, the repentence of misdeeds, is one of the most important attributes of the pious.
examined critically and methodologically, it will be found that nothing in these accounts can be taken to soil the position of the Nahrawanee or exonerate 'Ali from general condemnation, for the former have repented, while the latter has not.

ARGUMENT NO. 3: THE RECONCILIATION OF THE TWO CONTRARY NARRATIVES

We have seen previously that the authentic tradition is the one that refutes any participation of the Nahrawanee in the peace process or in the demand of arbitration. Similarly, we have seen that another account which maintains the counter-idea is to be necessarily classified as an inauthentic one due to the weak sanad through which it has been received. But, for the sake of arguments or rather for the sake of reconciliation between these two contrary accounts, let us suppose that both accounts are authentic. In this case, we shall have two contradictory accounts on the same subject. What will be our explanation then?

The science of the Prophetic traditions known as 'Ullumu Al-Hadith and the science of the fundamentals of Islamic jurisprudence known as Usulu Al-Fiqhi, require us not to directly disregard the texts that are apparently in mutual contradiction. Contrarily, they should first be reconciled by being interpreted in as many ways as possible or every one of them being given a proper meaning corresponding to other texts of the Qur-an and Prophetic traditions. In case, no interpretation is possible, then the solution is to regard the more authentic tradition and disregard the less authentic one. If both have similar qualities by which they can be classified as authentic, then both are to be disregarded.\textsuperscript{127} But care should be taken not to think that the authenticity of traditions are weighed only in terms of their

\textsuperscript{127} - The words of the Prophet – as those of Allah – never contradict themselves because contradiction is a sign of fabrication.
Sanads. There are occasions when a tradition is refuted not on the basis of the sanad through which it has been received, but rather, on the basis of the defects that are found in its texts. Such is the general law of how Islamic texts are studied.

As such, if we regard both narratives as authentic – the narrative that attributing to the Nahrawanees the idea of stopping the war and making the arbitration, and the account that suggests the counter-idea, then the only logical and possible explanation on them is to say that when the Nahrawanees demanded from 'Ali to stop the war, they did so in order to know why Mu'awiya raised copies of the Qur-an: did he do so in repentence of his rebellion and was now ready to join the mass or otherwise? This is the only possible interpretation that can be applied to the account that the so-called Khawarij demanded from 'Ali to stop the war after the Syrian forces had raised copies of the Qur-an.

On the other hand, the latter tradition which says that the so-called Khawarij insisted that 'Ali should continue the war, as narrated by Al-Imam Ahmad and others, can be harmonized with the former by being interpreted that first the so-called Khawarij responded to the Syrian call for stopping the war in order to hear what Mu'awiya really wanted. This is what the former account narrated by Al-Tabari indicates. Then, as the latter says, after the war stopped and they knew that what Mu'awiya demanded was contrary to the Qur-an, the Nahrawanees asked 'Ali to resume the war, for they found that what Mu'awiya wanted had nothing in common with the Qur-an. Mu'awiya's demand was to make an arbitration, whereas the Qur-an says: "...If one (party) transgresses beyond the bounds against another, then fight against the one that transgresses until it complies with the command of Allah".
This is to say that when the Nahrawanees first supported the idea of ceasing the war, they did not exactly know what Mu'awiya wanted, meaning that there was a strong possibility for him to repent and resume the main stream of Islam. When it was clear to them that his demand was by no means in conformity with the Qur'an, they insisted that 'Ali should continue the war until, as the Qur'an says, they comply with the command of Allah or the elements of their rebellion are completely eliminated. These are the only interpretations which are possible to be applied to the two contrary accounts for the sake of reconciling them and setting them free from contradictions. Otherwise, we shall have to regard the authentic account and disregard the inauthentic one.

Indeed, such reconciliation has been logically necessary simply because all accounts — in the widest sense of the word "All" — agree that the Nahrawanees began their opposition against the idea of making arbitration soon after the idea was proposed at Siffin or, in a more accurate scale of time, after Al-Ash'ath bin Qais Al-Kindi read the terms of agreement to 'Ali's forces. This means that before that event no one knew what really Mu'awiya wanted. It was then after the event that they came to know what he wanted and that his demand was Islamically unacceptable. This explanation is further maintained by the narration by Ibn A'atham that when the discussion was being held among 'Ali's forces to decide whether to agree with Mu'awiya or not, a man named Rifa'a bin Shaddaad Al-Bajali stood up and said:

We had already called these people to the Book of Allah but they refused. Even so, let us listen to them: if they say anything that is

128 - As explained later on.
compatible with the Qur-an,\textsuperscript{129} we shall agree with them, otherwise these are our swords on our shoulders.\textsuperscript{130}

ARGUMENT NO. 4: THE CONTRADICTION OF ACCOUNTS

Another tradition, on the subject, says that Zur'a bin Al-Burh and Hurqus bin Zuhair Al-Sa'adi came to 'Ali and said to him: "There is no judgement except that of Allah."\textsuperscript{131} 'Ali, equally, replied to them: "There is no judgement except that of Allah."\textsuperscript{132} Hurqus asked 'Ali to repent of his sin of accepting the arbitration with Mu'awiya so that they\textsuperscript{133} might return to the war against Mu'awiya. 'Ali responded: "I asked you (not to stop the war) but you did not obey me."\textsuperscript{134} They told 'Ali: "That was a sin of which you are supposed to repent."\textsuperscript{135} 'Ali answered: "That was not a sin!"\textsuperscript{136}

The presence of such contradiction among parts of the same narration on one hand and its contradiction with other narratives on the other, is a clear sign that these accounts were fabricated in order to soil the genuineness of the Nahrawanites and exonerate 'Ali and his followers from the wrong or at least the mistakes they did. Consider, for example, that when asked to repent of his sin of accepting the arbitration, 'Ali responded to the Nahrawanites: "I asked you (not to stop the war) but you did not obey me."\textsuperscript{137} These words clearly mean

\textsuperscript{129} - A thing which is compatible with the Qur-an here is only one – to accept the Caliphate of Al-Imam 'Ali: not the other way round.
\textsuperscript{130} - Ibn A'atham Al-Futuh Vol. 3, p. 310-311.
\textsuperscript{132} - Op.cit.
\textsuperscript{133} - The pronoun they refers to Hurqus bin Zuhair and all the Nahrawanites alike as Hurqus was, obviously, representing them here.
\textsuperscript{134} - Op.cit.
\textsuperscript{136} - Op.cit.
\textsuperscript{137} - Op.cit.
that the Nahrawanees wanted or supported the idea of stopping the war and that, by so doing, they were wrong. In other words, 'Ali, according to this account, views the act of stopping the war as being totally a wrong idea whereas the Nahrawanees justify it. While in other accounts we find that 'Ali has been strongly defended with the Qur-anic verses\textsuperscript{138} that by yielding to the peace proposal, he was right! So 'Ali was right for agreeing with the peace treaty; the Nahrawanees were wrong for agreeing with the same peace treaty—Alas! The same item is weighed by two different scales!

Again consider the following discussion between 'Ali and the Nahrawanees. 'Ali said to them: "I required you (not to stop the war) but you did not obey me." The Nahrawanees replied "That was a sin of which you are supposed to repent,"\textsuperscript{139} and 'Ali told them: "That was not a sin!"\textsuperscript{140} So, if we put all these accounts together and analyse them methodologically, we shall come up with the following results:

1) 'Ali first resisted to stop the war, then, finally as other accounts hold\textsuperscript{141}, he agreed. This is to say that his subsequent decision of agreeing to stop the war was contrary to the Qur-an. That was why he blamed the Nahrawanees on that account.

2) It was his acceptance of the truce that the Nahrawanees referred to as a sin.

3) He regarded it not to be a sin. The questions that arise here are:

\textsuperscript{138} - As detailed in part three of this series \textit{in shaa Allah}.
\textsuperscript{140} - Op.cit.
\textsuperscript{141} - As explained in the preface of part one of the series.
a) If that was not a sin – as he said – why then he first declined the idea of stopping the war?!

b) When was it a sin? Was it a sin at the time when he agreed to stop the war or at the time when he refused to stop the war?

c) Why blame the Nahrawanees that it was they who committed a sin or at least made a mistake for their act to insist on stopping the war\textsuperscript{142} if that was not a sin – does he blame them for a thing which is not a sin?!

The presence of such contradictions in these accounts, provides enough evidence that all these accounts which state or show that the Nahrawanees were concerned with the idea of proposing or accepting the truce and making the arbitration, were fabricated. Additionally, as shown before, besides these textual defects found in the accounts, the accounts have had another defect for which they are to be necessarily disqualified – the problem of a weak sanad. Yet another problem is the fact that they are opposed by another authentic account.

\textsuperscript{142} - My aim here is only to discuss the traditions, otherwise there is no accurate evidence that the Nahrawanees demanded that the war should be stopped.
ARGUMENT NO. 5: THE BALADHIRIAN, NEGATIVE ACCOUNT PLUS THE POSITION OF MODERN RESEARCHERS

Further evidence that can be taken to disprove the idea of associating the Nahrawanees with the proposal of arbitration is given by Al-Baladhiri.\(^{143}\) He narrates an account whose text clearly states that the so-called Khawarij were not the ones that wanted the war to be ceased. He says:

When 'Ali and Mu'awiya met to appoint two arbitrators, people disagreed with 'Ali; the majority acceded to and were content with arbitration. Yet a group among them – the members of which numbered about four thousand people among those who had vision and efforts in worship – opposed any arbitration .....thus the opposing group came to 'Ali and said: 'Resume the war.' So they abandoned him and others (among them) left for Al-Kufa before even the arbitration agreement was written; others, though maintained opposition against the arbitration, remained with him saying: 'Possibly he will repent.'\(^{144}\)

It is clear hitherto that it was not the so-called Khawarij who supported the idea of stopping the war and calling for an arbitration. Indeed, in our modern time, there have been vast intellectual works which support the idea of renouncing any participation of the Nahrawanees in the justification of the peace agreement with Mu'awiya. Dr. Hisham Ju'aht, for example, – as quoted by Al-Sabili – says: "...It is impossible to admit that Al-Qurraa (the learned ones), who were the seeds of all Khawarij sects,\(^{145}\) were the ones that

\(^{143}\) - That is why I have referred to it as "The Baladhirian, negative account."

\(^{144}\) - Al-Baladhiri Al-Ansab Vol. 3, p. 112.

\(^{145}\) - This researcher has been unable to completely free himself from the chains of bigotry resulted from long-standing false propaganda against the Nahrawanees. He has at least reached the stage of knowing the truth to a certain degree, but he has
forced 'Ali to accept (the proposal of) stopping the war. Actually, this is the result reached by most researchers.\textsuperscript{146}

Dr. Isma'il, another researcher, further verifies this... as he says: "The result we finally come up with is that the Al-Qurraa who subsequently became Khawarij, were innocent of the responsibility for suggesting arbitration. (This came from) their political and religious stance simultaneously..." \textsuperscript{147}

Al-Sab'i'i goes on to quote Ma'aruf Ahmad:

Just as Ahmad bin Sulaiman Ma'aruf has based his renouncement of the claim that the people of Nahrawaan took out their swords before Al-Imam 'Ali and forced him to stop the war and accept the basis of making people pass judgement and force 'Ali to make Abu Musa arbitrator (in 'Ali's side)...... (Ahmad bin Sulaiman Ma'aruf has founded his renouncement of these claims on the basis that) by that time the Qurraa had not yet built a united force with common ideas.\textsuperscript{148}

failed to know that the Nahrawanees were the great Sahaba of the Prophet. So, he puts them in a very abominable term of "Seeds of the Khawarij!"
\textsuperscript{147} - Isma'il Qadhayaa Fii Al-Taarikh p. 61 as quoted by Al-Sab'i in his Al-Khawarij Wa Al-Haqiqatu Al-Ghaiba, p. 107-108.
\textsuperscript{148} - Ma'aruf, Ahmad: Qiraadtu Jadida Fii Mawaqif Al-Khawarij p. 37 as quoted by Al-Sab'i in his Al-Khawarij Wa Al-Haqiqatu Al-Ghaiba, p. 107-108. 1. In my part, believe that this analysis by Sheikh Ma'aruf Ahmad is incorrect, though the conclusion is correct.
ARGUMENT NO. 6: THE SUPPORTERS OF THE ARBITRATION WERE A MAJORITY

Another thing which can be taken to show that the Nahrawanees were not the ones that called for a truce and arbitration, is the historically agreed upon account that those who called for a truce and an arbitration were a majority, while the Nahrawanees were composed of a minority in contrast with them. Al-Mas'udi in his Al-Muruj says: "When the majority of the Iraqis ('Ali's forces) saw that (copies of the Qur-an had been raised), said: 'Let us respond to the (call of) the Book of Allah.'"¹⁴⁹ In his another account, Al-Mas'udi says: "The majority of the people said: 'We are content; we agree; we hear and we are obedient.'"¹⁵⁰ Al-Baladhiri spells out the stance held by the majority as: "Most of them agreed to make an arbitration and were content; and a minority among them – numbered four thousand people among the wise and those who had efforts in worship – was dissident with it."¹⁵¹ Al-Baladhiri's narrative goes on saying that: "The dissident group (of the minority) went to 'Ali and said: 'Resume the war – and 'Ali liked to do so – but the supporters of arbitration said: 'By God! These people (Mu'awiyah and his accomplices) have called us to the right, impartiality and justice.' Al-Ash'ath bin Qais and the people of Yemen were the greatest opponents of those who wanted the war (to continue)."¹⁵² Al-Baladhiri also records another account that: "The majority of 'Ali's followers leaned towards what they were summoned to and so they illegalized (the continuation of) the war."¹⁵³

¹⁵⁰ - Ibid p. 525.
¹⁵¹ - Al-Baladhiri Al-Ansab Vol. 3, p. 112.
These historical data clearly prove the fact that it was not the Nahrawaneees who wanted the war to be stopped, for, as these accounts provide, it was the majority that supported the idea of stopping the war, while – as the account by Al-Baladhi says – the dissident group consisted of a minority of merely four thousand people.\[154\] Indeed, Al-Baladhi's account puts it clear that it was Al-Ash'ath bin Qais and the people of Yemen who wanted the war to stop as it says that they "were the greatest opponents of those who wanted the war (to continue)."

**ARGUMENT NO. 7: 'ALI'S SPEECH TO THE PEOPLE OF AL-KUFA**

Another thing which provides evidence on the fact that it was not the Nahrawaneees who wanted the war to be ceased can be taken from 'Ali's own words after the arbitration had been made. In his *Al-Muruj*, Al-Mas'udi records:

> When the news about what happened between Abu Musa and 'Amru (bin Al-Aas) reached 'Ali, he said: 'I had come to you and prohibited you from (accepting) the arbitration, (but) you refused and disobeyed me. How do you see now the result of your matter about which you refused (to obey) me? By God! I know who has made you oppose me and not comply with my order, if I wanted to afflict him I would do, but Allah is behind him.'\[155\]

---

\[154\] - These were the Qurraa who were at first not more than four thousand people. Then after other men, who also opposed the arbitration, joined them, they numbered twelve thousand people, whereas the whole 'Ali's army consisted of more than ninety thousand soldiers. Refer to Ibn Abdi Rabib *Al-'Iqdu Al-Farid* Vol. 4, p. 314. But take care not to think that the criterion for right and wrong is the majority and minority; right and wrong are weighed on the scale of the law.

Then Al-Mas'udi goes on saying: "He ('Ali) means, by those words, Al-Ash'ath bin Qais."

The evidence drawn from these words, is that the speech was delivered by 'Ali at the time when the Qurraa (the learned ones or the Nahrawanees) were no longer present with him: they had already set out for Al-Harauraa\textsuperscript{157} and later for Al-Nahrawaan. The question that arises, therefore, is: to whom did 'Ali's direct his speech that: "I had come to you and prohibited you from (accepting) the arbitration, (but) you refused and disobeyed me?"

It is clear that 'Ali burdened the sins of agreeing with the arbitration on those who remained with him after the so-called Khawarij had already left him. To understand it better, read clearer words found in another speech of 'Ali with which he addressed the people of Al-Kufa long after the Nahrawanees had already isolated themselves. In his Taarikh, Al-Tabari writes:

When the Khawarij departed... ('Ali) stood at Al-Kufa; he addressed them (the people of Al-Kufa) saying: 'Verily, disobedience causes sorrow and results in regret. I gave you my order about these two men (Abu Musa and 'Amru bin Al-Aas) and about this arbitration and I gave you my idea ...but you refused all except what you wanted.\textsuperscript{158}

\textsuperscript{156} - Op.cit.
\textsuperscript{157} - Some books refer to the place where the Al-Nahrawanees had for their whereabouts to turn as Al-Haruraa as found in Al-Taarikh by Al-Tabari, Sharhu Al-Nayl by Al-Shaukani and Sharhu Nahji A-Blagha by Ibn Abi Al-Hadid. Other books, such as Al-Tabaqat by Ibn Sa'ad and Mu'ujamu Al-Buldan by Yaqt Al-rumi, refer to the place as Al-Harauraa. I have depended on the latter simply because Yaqt Al-Rumi has been more reliable in this field. Refer to Yaqt Al-Rumi Mu'ujamu Al-Buldan Vol. 3, p. 138.
This narrative testifies that the people whom 'Ali blamed for the act of agreeing with the arbitration, were his followers who remained with him at Al-Kufa after the so-called Khawarij had already left him first for Al-Harraraa then for Al-Nahrawaan. This testimony can be further strengthened by the last part of the same narrative which says:

Then after that (Ali) alighted (from the platform, and) wrote (a letter to) the Khawarij who were at Nahrawaan (saying to them): 'Actually these two men (Abu Musa and 'Amru bin Al-Aas) with whom we have been content to be our arbitrators, have gone contrary to the Qur'anic decision and have followed their own desires...so when my letter reaches you, come (to us), for, verily, we are now going to our enemy (Mu'awiya) who is also your enemy.'

ARGUMENT NO. 8: THE AHNAFIAN OPPOSITION AND THE OUTBREAK OF DISPUTES IN 'ALI'S FORCES

Here are other two things which offer themselves for evidence against the claim that the Nahrawaneees supported the proposal to cease the war and make arbitration. One can be found in the position of Al-Ahnaf bin Qais, one of 'Ali's staunch supporters who later joined the Nahrawaneees. He repeatedly went to 'Ali to eagerly request him not to yield to the idea of arbitration: he strongly opposed both the proposal of entrusting Abu Musa Al-Ash'ari with the charge of representing 'Ali's side in the arbitration process just as he opposed the whole idea of an arbitration at large.

159 - Consider the words of 'Ali: "Actually these two men with whom we have been content", he did not say: "...With whom you have been content." Had the Nahrawaneees been the ones responsible for that, he would have blamed them by saying to them: "...With whom you have been content."
Another thing which provides the evidence can be manifested in the severe differences that occurred and the altercation\textsuperscript{162} that broke out among 'Ali's forces when they were on their way back to Al-Kufa from the battlefield at Siffin. The Qurraa – in these disputes – told those who remained under the allegiance of 'Ali: "Oh! The enemies of Allah! You have been pliable\textsuperscript{163} in the matter of Allah."\textsuperscript{164} Another version quotes them as saying: "You have been pliable in the matter of Allah and you have assigned to men the charge of making decision in the matter already decided by Allah in His Book."\textsuperscript{165} In response, the supporters of the arbitration said to the Nahrawanee: "You have detached yourself from our Imam ('Ali) and disunited us."\textsuperscript{166}

Consider here the words of the Nahrawanee to the followers of 'Ali: "You have assigned to men the charge of making decision in the matter already decided by Allah in His Book" you will get the answer of who supported the arbitration and who did not.

These verified historical data are enough as evidence which nullifies all attempts to associate the Nahrawanee with the idea of ceasing the war. They also abrogate all claims of their participation in the peace treaty with Mu'awiya and his Syrian forces. Finally, the data prove that the advocates of the arbitration and the proponents or supporters of the truce in the Battle of Siffin, were those who remained under the leadership of 'Ali. Indeed, the authentic account, as quoted

\textsuperscript{162} - Hot dispute.
\textsuperscript{163} - Pliable or pliant: bending easily, supple or flexible.
\textsuperscript{164} - Ibn Al-Athir Al-Kamil Vol. 2, p. 673.
\textsuperscript{165} - Al-Baladhiri Al-Ansab Vol. 3, p. 114.
\textsuperscript{166} - Ibn Al-Athir Al-Kamil Vol. 2, p. 673.
before, clearly states that the Nahrawanees were very much against both the truce and the arbitration.\cite{note167}

**SUMMARY AND MAIN POINTS**

1) Our concern in this section has been the question of who supported the proposal of stopping the war and making arbitration with the Syrian forces led by Mu'awiya in the Battle of Siffin?

2) The opponents of the Nahrawanees, depending on the account narrated by Al-Tabari, claim that it was the Khawarij who supported the proposal and then turned around to blame 'Ali.

3) We have advanced eight arguments to disprove this claim, as follows:

   a) In argument no. 1, we have shown that the Tabarian account upon which they have based their arguments has been narrated through a weak sanad and so it is inauthentic. Furthermore, there is another authentic account related by Ahmad and others, which is contrary to the account upon which the opponents of the Nahrawanees have depended as their evidence. Ahmad's account clearly states that the so-called Khawarij wanted the war to continue.

\cite{note167} - This part of the subject has been somewhat prolonged because it has been aimed at clarifying and crushing the popular slogan of many writers and preachers to claim that the Khawarij wanted the arbitration to be held then they turned around to splinter from 'Ali on the same ground that he accepted the proposal of stopping the war and making the peace treaty with Mu'awiya. The object behind this claim is to justify 'Ali's course and uglify the picture of the Nahrawanees. Thus to disprove this idea, long explanation of arguments has had to be given in order to produce enough evidence.
b) In argument no. 2, we have made a textual criticism to the account and demonstrated that its make-up contradicts the Shi'a-Sunni common stance towards the idea of whether 'Ali took part in killing 'Uthman or not. In this part, we have equally expressed that in case these accounts are regarded to be authentic, then the Nahrawaneees should not be blamed, for, according to them, the Nahrawaneees repented and required 'Ali to repent as they did in order that they might appoint him afresh and return along with him to the war against Mu'awiya.

c) In the argument no. 3, we have said that in case all these accounts are authentic, they must be reconciled to avoid the contradiction between them. Then we have shown that the only possible way to reconcile between them is to say that the account suggesting the participation of the Nahrawaneees in the peace treaty must be interpreted to mean that the Nahrawaneees first did not know what Mu'awiya wanted by raising copies of the Qur-an; and the account that says that the Nahrawaneees insisted on the continuation of the war, means that the Nahrawaneees demanded so after they knew that what the Syrians suggested was contrary to the Qur-an. In this way, both accounts can be regarded and the contradiction between them will no longer exist.

d) In argument no. 4, we have expressed the existence of contradiction among parts of the account which attributes to the Nahrawaneees the idea of supporting the arbitration as well as its contradiction with other accounts.

e) In argument no. 5, we have quoted Al-Baladhiri's account which clearly rejects any connection of the Nahrawaneees to the question of yielding to the proposal of arbitration.
Similarly, we have quoted some of the modern researchers who totally negate the idea.

f) In argument no. 6, we have proved that the supporters of the arbitration were a majority while the Nahrawaneees formed a minority group, which can be taken to mean that they were not the ones concerned with the question of arbitration.

g) In argument no. 7, we have quoted 'Ali's speech which he directed to his followers to blame them for their act to agree with the proposal advanced by Mu'awiya for making truce. The speech was delivered long after the so-called Khawarij had left 'Ali for Al-Harauraa and then for Nahrawaan.

h) In argument no. 8, we have expressed the position of one of the Nahrawaneees named Al-Ahnaf bin Qais who vigorously opposed the arbitration. We have also shown how the Nahrawaneees and the followers of 'Ali quarrelled when they were on their way back to Al-Kufa. In that the Nahrawaneees condemned the followers of 'Ali for their act to yield to the proposal of arbitration.

On the basis of what has been explained, therefore, we may say that the position of the so-called Khawarij was to continue the war until Mu'awiya and his forces surrender and come to join the main stream of Islam or the elements of their insurgence \(^{168}\) are completely exterminated.\(^{169}\) Indeed it was the differences in this matter between 'Ali and the so-called Khawarij, that prompted them to separate themselves and elect their new Imam, which was – *if the matter is*

\(^{168}\) - Rebellion.
\(^{169}\) - Get rid of; eliminate.
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judged from the spirit of truthfulness and without any bigotry\textsuperscript{170} - the right thing supported by the Qur-\'anic verse thus: "...\textit{If one (party) transgresses beyond the bounds against another, then fight against the one that transgresses until it complies with the command of Allah}.\textsuperscript{171}

In conclusion, therefore, let us ask ourselves one question. If the so-called Khawarij had the above-quoted verse with which to prove their case and justify their position; what did their opponents have as evidence for their position? Again, if the former have been able to produce the evidence and the latter have not, who is more liable to be referred to as Khawarij or preferably who is more worthy to be put in the term of those who have gone out of the Islamic religion? It is for this reason that I have asked those who want to know the truth to first leave aside all positive and negative terminologies, then search for the truth and reality in terms of their own logics.

Having discussed the question of who supported the issue of arbitration after the Syrians had raised copies of the Qur-\'an on the spearheads, let us now come back again to Siffin to see what happened after that.

\textsuperscript{170} - Bigotry means an obstinate and intolerant belief in a political theory or a religious creed.

\textsuperscript{171} - \textit{The Qur-\'an}: 49-9.
WHAT DID HAPPEN AT SIFFIN AFTER THAT?

In the section before the previous one, our subject was on the history of how the Battle of Siffin took place and what was the nature thereof. Then we came to speak on the differences which took place among 'Ali's soldiers concerning the question of making arbitration. Finally we came to dwell on the issue of who supported the idea of arbitration among 'Ali's forces. Now in order to make the last part of the subject coherent with the first, let us go back again to see what happened after 'Ali's army had been swept by the strong waves of differences.

Seeing that his forces were divided in views, 'Ali decided to side with those who supported the proposal. Al-'Ash'ath bin Qais Al-Kindi who was among those who insisted on the idea of arbitration asked 'Ali to let him go to Mu'awiya to ask him what he wanted for his act of raising copies of the Qur'an on the spearheads. 'Ali allowed him. Al-'Ash'ath went to ask Mu'awiya. In response, he said to him what we have quoted before:

So that we may refer to what 'Allah has commanded in His Book. You send a man from among you and we send a man from among us, then we require them to follow what is in the Book of Allah: not to go beyond it, then we are to accept what they have agreed upon.

Such was the answer of Mu'awiya to the messenger of 'Ali bin Abi Talib. Al-Ash'ath bin Qais Al-Kindi came back to 'Ali with the answer, and after a long discussion full of polemics\textsuperscript{176} and altercation,\textsuperscript{177} 'Ali and his forces appointed Abu Musa Al-Ash'ari to be their representative in the arbitration-making sessions which were due to be held later on.\textsuperscript{178} As for the side of Mu'awiya and his Syrian forces, the choice for the representation in the arbitration went to 'Amru bin Al-Aas.\textsuperscript{179}

\textbf{THE SIGNING OF THE ARBITRATION AGREEMENT AND THE DELETION OF THE TITLE OF THE AMIR AL-MU'UMININ}

Then, it is said that, on Wednesday of Safar in the year 37 A.H.,\textsuperscript{180} the treaty was signed between the two rival parties.\textsuperscript{181} This treaty was not the arbitration itself; it was merely an agreement which provided terms and conditions for the upcoming arbitration.

Two things in this agreement caused strong opposition between the Qurraa (the learned ones) and the followers of Mu'awiya who were backed by Al-Ash'ath bin Qais.\textsuperscript{182} One of them was about the deletion of the title of 'Ali as an Amiru L-Mu-uminin. 'Ali's follower wrote— in the terms of the agreement— thus: "Such is how 'Ali, Amiru L-Mu-uminin (the leader of the Muslims) has agreed with Mu'awiya".\textsuperscript{183} The words that mentioned 'Ali as Amiru L-Mu-uminin

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{176} A controversial discussion. A verbal or written attack especially on political opponent.
\item \textsuperscript{177} Hot dispute.
\item \textsuperscript{178} Al-Tabari \textit{Al-Taarikh} Vol. 6, p. 4-5. Al-Baladhuri \textit{Al-Ansab} Vol. 3, p. 103.
\item \textsuperscript{179} Op. cit.
\item \textsuperscript{180} Al-Tabari \textit{Al-Taarikh} Vol. 6, p. 7.
\item \textsuperscript{181} Al-Tabari \textit{Ibid} p. 5-6. Ibn A'atham \textit{Al-Futuh} Vol. 4, p. 8.
\item \textsuperscript{182} Al-Ya'aqubi \textit{Taarikh Al-Ya'aqubi} Vol. 2, p. 189.
\item \textsuperscript{183} Al-Tabari \textit{Ibid} Vol. 6, p. 5. Ibn Al-Athir \textit{Al-Kamil} Vol. 2, p. 670.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
in this term of the agreement got no acceptance from Mu'awiya's side. In reply to that, Mu'awiya said: "If you are the Amiru L-Muuminin, then why should I fight you?" 184 Amru bin Al-Aas added: "Write his name and his father's name; he is your Amir (leader): not ours". 185 Hence one of the Qurraa named Al-Ahnaf bin Qais 186 strongly objected to the idea of deleting the title from the terms of the agreement and said: "Do not delete the title of Amiru L-Muuminin, verily, I am afraid that if you erase it (from the terms of the agreement), it will never return to you again; do not rub it out even if the people kill one another". 187 Al-Ash'ath bin Qais said: "Delete this title", 188 and 'Ali - on his part - supported that the name should be deleted, saying: "Allahu Akbar! The same Sunna; the same example!" 189

186 - Al-Ahnaf bin Qais was among the people of Nahrwaan. Yet Al-Baladhiri has mentioned him to be among those who returned to the leadership of 'Ali after he debated with them. Refer to Al-Baladhiri Al-Ansab Vol. 3, p. 113. But the question of whether there were some of the Nahrwanites who gave up their position and rejoined 'Ali's political movement or not, is the question that needs more explanation and clarification, especially when taking into consideration the fact that Al-Baladhiri has included Abu Bilal Mirdas (may 'Allah be pleased with him) among those who rejoined 'Ali, while all historians of all Islamic denominations, including Al-Baladhiri himself (Al-Ansab Vol. 5, p. 188-195), agree that Abu Bilal was among the survivors of the Battle of Nahrwaan fought between 'Ali and the Nahrwanites and then he continued with his stance until his death at the evil hands of the Umayyids. We once held a discussion in the Zanzinet (a Zanzibar Internet Forum) on the idea of whether there were among the Nahrwanites who rejoined 'Ali or not. I have collected all points discussed there which hopefully will make the last volume of my Kiswahili work on the subject of the Khawarij in shaa Allah.
187 - Al-Tabari Al-Taarikh Vol. 6, p. 5.
Then Al-Imam 'Ali made an analogy of this event to the event of the arbitration that was held between the Prophet (pbuh) and the infidels\textsuperscript{190} of Makka in what came to be known historically as \textit{Sulhu Hudaibiya} (Hudaibiya Conciliation), where the infidels hindered the Prophet (pbuh) and his companions to reach the Holy Ka'aba for pilgrimage. Very severe disputes broke out which ended in making the conciliation between the Prophet (pbuh) and the infidels. In this conciliation, the agreement, following the order of the Prophet (pbuh), was written by 'Ali. One term of the agreement contained the words that: "Muhammad, the Messenger of Allah." The infidels refused any mention of Muhammad (pbuh) as a Messenger of Allah, saying: "Had we recognized him to be a Messenger of Allah, we would not have fought him". The Prophet (pbuh) ordered 'Ali to erase his title as the Messenger of Allah but 'Ali refused to do so. Thus the Prophet (pbuh), being illiterate, asked 'Ali to show him the point where his title was, and he rubbed it out with his own hand\textsuperscript{191} and said: "My name and my father's name do not invalidate my prophethood."\textsuperscript{192}

Thus when 'Ali said: "\textit{Allahu Akbar!} The same Sunna; the same example" his aim was to liken his case with Mu'awiya to that of the Prophet (pbuh) with the infidels of Makka during the Hudaibiya Conciliation.\textsuperscript{193} But Al-Ahnaf bin Qais answered 'Ali that:

You are quite different from the Prophet (pbuh). By God! When we appointed you, we were not biased towards you; verily, if we knew any man, among the people, was more eligible for this matter (of the Islamic leadership) than you, we would appoint him then (we would) fight you. I swear by the name of Allah if you (agree to)

\textsuperscript{190} - Kufîr or unbelievers.\textsuperscript{191} - Al-Mubarakfuri \textit{Al-Rahiqu Al-Makhtum} p. 284.\textsuperscript{192} - Al-Ya'aqubi \textit{Taarakh Al-Ya'aqubi} Vol. 2, p. 189.\textsuperscript{193} - Al-Tabari \textit{Al-Taarikh} Vol. 6, p. 5. Ibn Al-Athir \textit{Al-Kamil} Vol. 2, p. 670-671.
delete this title on which you have been appointed (by the Muslims) and with which you have fought (Mu'awiya and his forces), it will never come back to you again.  

Again, he said to him: "Verily, you have not entitlements or rights the Prophet (p.b.u.h) had". Such was the position of Al-Ahnaf towards the issue of deleting the title of Amiru Al-Mu-uminin, but, in fact, it was 'Ali alone who had a say and final decision on this matter, and so, following his order, his title as leader of the Muslims Amiru Al-Mu-uminin was rubbed out in the agreement, and instead the agreement was written bearing a heading thus: "This is what 'Ali bin Abi Talib and Mu'awiya bin 'Abi Sufyaan have agreed.." Thus 'Ali, by so-doing, placed himself, as some writers put it, in the equal position to that of Mu'awiya: he was now no longer a leader except of the Iraqis just as Mu'awiya was a leader of the Syrians.

The agreement had the following terms:

1) The two arbitrators, Abu Musa of Iraq and 'Amru bin Al-Aas of Syria, shall act in accordance with the judgement of the Qur'an: (anywhere it has been mentioned) from the beginning to the end.

2) They shall follow whatever they find in the Book of Allah; for whatever they will not find therein, they shall refer to the Prophetic traditions.

---

197 - How would they judge in accordance with the Qur'an while they gave up the Qur-anic verdict when they agreed with the idea of arbitration.
3) The two representatives, Abu Musa and 'Amru bin Al-Aas, are promised by both 'Ali and Mu'awiyah that they, their relatives and properties will be safe and the *Ummah* as a whole shall defend them.\(^{200}\)

4) The decision made by the two arbitrators, Abu Musa and 'Amru bin Al-Aas, will be binding on all the Muslims.\(^{201}\)

5) The two representatives, Abu Musa and 'Amru bin Al-Aas, shall judge in this *Ummah* and shall never take it back to the war and to the disunity.\(^{202}\)

6) The two represented leaders, 'Ali and Mu'awiyah, shall agree with the result reached by the two arbitrators.\(^{203}\)

7) A promise is strongly taken that the Muslims will be content with the terms that the upcoming arbitration will contain.\(^{204}\)

8) The people of Iraq (who were under the leadership of 'Ali) shall return to Iraq; and the people of Syria (who were under the leadership of Mu'awiyah) shall return to Syria.\(^{205}\)

9) The arbitration will be held in the Holy Month of Ramadhan at either Dumat Al-Jandal or Adhruh.\(^{206}\)


\(^{203}\) Al-Baladhihi *Al-Ansar* Vol. 3, p. 108.

\(^{204}\) Ibn A'atham *Al-Futuh* Vol. 4, p. 15.

\(^{205}\) Ibn A'atham *Al-Futuh* Vol. 4, p. 15.
10) The two Arbitrators will take from each one – Ali and Mu'awiyah – witnesses with whom they are content.\(^{207}\)

After this agreement was signed, Al-Ash'ath bin Qais Al-Kindi took it and read it to the various tribes of which 'Ali's forces were composed.\(^{208}\) Many\(^{209}\) of them, however, rose in opposition against it. Even Al-Ashtar, a very important person to 'Ali, rose in a severe opposition against it to the extent that he and Al-Ash'ath bin Qais exchanged very harsh words which were about to erupt into a fight.\(^{210}\)

When Al-Ash'ath bin Qais, who was reading the terms of agreement to 'Ali's forces, reached the tribe of Bani Tamimi, a man named Uray bin Udeyyat Al-Tamimi vigorously opposed it, saying:

Do you make men pass judgement of a thing which Allah has already judged? Are your terms and conditions stronger than the Book of Allah and its terms? Were you unsure when you first fought them? *No judgement except that of Allah.*\(^{211}\)


\(^{207}\) Al-Baladhihi *Al-Ansab* Vol. 3, p. 108.


\(^{209}\) Many but not most.


\(^{211}\) Al-Baladhihi *Al-Ansab* Vol. 3, p. 110. Al-Tabari *Al-Taarikh* Vol. 6, p. 6-7. Ibn Al-Athir *Al-Kamil* Vol. 2, p. 672. Al-Mas'udi *Al-Muruj* Vol. 2, p. 526. This account uproots the fabrication that the Nahrawanees demanded that the arbitration should be made between the two rival parties. How could one claim so while this man – one of them – opposes it in the first stage of the crisis.
The aim of Ur-wa bin Udeyyat – who was the first man to articulate his grievances against the terms – when he said "Do you make men pass judgement of a thing which Allah has already judged" is that this matter has already been decided by Allah Himself when He said in His Book: "...If one (party) transgresses beyond the bounds against another, then fight against the one that transgresses until it complies with the command of Allah."\(^{212}\) Thus, the obligation of 'Ali – and other Muslims – was to comply with the decision of Allah as mentioned in the verse: not to invent another decision of their own. In short, as Sheikh Al-Sab'\(^{i}\)'i explains:

The call by Ur-wa acquired a wide response from 'Ali's army particularly from those who, from the beginning, were dissident with the idea of stopping the war. Cries were raised from every corner: 'No judgement except that of Allah.' A group from 'Ali's soldiers went to him to ask him to resume the war, but he apologized to them that: 'We have already left the Qur-an to decide between us, it is not legal any more to fight them until we see what the Qur-an will decide.'\(^{213}\)

\(^{212}\) - The Qur-an: 49-9.
\(^{213}\) - Al-Sab'\(^{i}\)'i Al-Khawarij Wa Al-Haqiqatu Al-Ghaiba p. 69-70.
THE RETURN OF 'ALI TO AL-KUFA AND THE SPLINTERING OF THE QURRAA

Then 'Ali's army returned to Al-Kufa in a very bad state of being disunited. Some accounts portray the nature of their disunity as: "They went as friends loving one another; they returned as enemies hating one another." 214 Al-Mas'udi also illustrates the situation of the enmity which erupted among them when they were coming back to Al-Kufa in the words thus: "The people hated one another and began to disconnect from one another; brother separated himself from his brother; son detached himself from his father...." 215

When they reached Al-Kufa, a great number of 'Ali's soldiers disassociated themselves from him 216 and departed for the village of Al-Harauraa, 217 which was situated near Al-Kufa 218 still adhering to their stance characterized by their Qur-anic-inspired motto: "No judgement except that of Allah". 219 Four thousand men assembled themselves there. 220 Then, as Al-Tabari and Al-Baladhi narrate, after that:

219 - Ibn A'atham Al-Futuh Vol. 4, p. 89.
One of them called out: 'The war leader will be Shabath bin Rib'i Al-Tamimi; the leader in prayer will be Abdullahi bin Al-Kawaai Al-Yashkuri; and the question (of appointing new Caliph) will be a matter of counsultation after the victory, and the appointment (of Caliph will be done) only for the sake of the religion of Allah and for the sake of enjoining what is just and prohibiting what is evil.\textsuperscript{221}

\textit{Al-Ansab} Vol. 3, p. 126. Yet in another place, he has mentioned a narrative which says that "They were twelve thousand people, and it is said that they were six thousand people." Refer to Al-Baladhi\textit{ Al-Ansab} Vol. 3, p. 126. In his \textit{Al-Tanbihu Wa Al-Ishraf} p. 279, Al-Mas'udi says that the men numbered four thousand in all, and that later they were divided and remained one thousand and eight hundred only; it is also said that those who remained – after the said division – numbered one thousand and five hundred." Finally, I have seen in \textit{Al-Futuh} by Ibn A'atham Vol. 4, p. 89, the following words: "When the closest group to him ('Ali) departed; they numbered four thousand of the cavalry......and they were joined by about eight thousand (others among those) who agreed with them." Therefore the four thousand people mentioned by Al-Mas'udi obviously were the \textit{Qurraa} (the learned ones); and eight thousand who were mentioned by Ibn A'atham were other people who supported the Nahrawanees' course. The four thousand plus the eight thousand are equal to twelve thousand whom Al-Shahrastani and Ibn A'atham have mentioned. Thus the Nahrawanees numbered twelve thousand of whom four thousand were the \textit{Qurraa} (the learned ones).

'Ali Sends Ibn 'Abbaas to Debate with the Splinter Group

Al-Imam 'Ali wanted to know the reasons as to why those people splintered from him. Thus he sent Ibn 'Abbaas so that he might debate with them.\textsuperscript{222} When Ibn 'Abbaas arrived there, according to the narrative by Ibn A'atham, he debated with a man named 'Attaab bin Al-A'awar Al-Tha'alabi who was profoundly knowledgeable of the Qur'an, as the narrative commends him that: "As if the Qur'an was before his eyes."\textsuperscript{223}

The summary of this debate is that after 'Attaab postulated his arguments, Ibn 'Abbaas, in reply, said to him: 'I have some analogies I want to make for you.' 'Attaab told him: "Say (what you want to say)." Ibn 'Abbaas said that the Muslim cities belong to Allah and that He has commanded His prophets - including Prophet Muhammad (pbuh) - to construct, and establish them. Then Ibn 'Abbaas asked 'Attaab: "Did the Prophet Muhammad leave behind him anyone responsible for the cities?" 'Attaab replied: "Yes: he had the Sahaba, the people of his house (Ahlu Al-Bait), his wasii (trustee) and his descendants." Ibn 'Abbaas asked: "Are these cities as sound as left by the Prophet (pbuh) or have they been demolished?" 'Attaab replied: "They have been demolished." Ibn 'Abbaas asked: "Are those who have demolished them his descendants or rather the followers of his Umma." He said: "They are the followers of his Umma." Ibn 'Abbaas told him: "Oh 'Attaab! Do you expect to have a

\textsuperscript{223} - Ibn A'atham Al-Futuh Vol. 4, p. 89. A narrative by Ibn Abi Shaiba says about the man that held a debate with Ibn 'Abbaas that: "As if he produces his proof from one chapter of the Qur-an. Ibn 'Abbaas said (to him): 'Indeed I see that you are learned of the Qur-an; knowledgeable of what has been explained in it and what has been unexplained." Refer to Ibn Abi Shaiba Al-Musannaf Vol. 8, p. 727, narrative no. 37.
salvation while you are among the followers of his Umma; you have demolished the cities of Allah and His Messenger?!!" Eventually, according to this made-in-Al-Kufa account, 'Attaab admitted that 'Ali was the only man eligible – for that time – for establishing or re-establishing the Muslim cities but the only problem found in him was that he committed a sin by entrusting Abu Musa with the charge of making judgement of a thing to which he ('Ali) had already been entitled by Allah.\textsuperscript{224} Then, after that, Ibn 'Abbaas produced his proofs from the Holy Qur-an and the Nahrawanees produced theirs, as we shall explain them in their specific part.\textsuperscript{225}

Certainly, one does not need to be as knowledgeable as Ibn Hajar or Al-Dhahabi in order to detect this fabrication. This narration by Ibn A'atham affirms what has been claimed against him that he is a Sunni "Who leans towards Shiism"\textsuperscript{226} and that "He intends to write erroneous narratives"\textsuperscript{227} yet others say: "He speaks lie, and he is a man of little knowledge."\textsuperscript{228} Indeed, that the account has been fabricated by either Ibn A'atham himself or by the tradition-making factories scattered here and there in the birth place of Shi'a theology of Al-Kufa, is clearly manifested by the content and make-up of the account itself. Consider, for instance, that the account consists of two contradictory ideas simultaneously. One is the creed supported by both the Sunni and the Ibadhi schools, which naturally explains that the converse idea is, in their view, incorrect. While, the Shi'as

\textsuperscript{224} - Ibn A'atham Al-Futuh Vol. 4, p. 90-93.
\textsuperscript{225} - The arguments of both sides will be discussed in the pamphlet no. 3, in shaa Allah in which we shall see what Ibn 'Abbaas really said and what the Nahrawanees really responded. Equally, we shall see therein the debate that was held between Al-Imam 'Ali and those people of Nahrawaan.
\textsuperscript{226} - As Sheikh Al-Sab'i quotes Shakir Mustafaa from his Al-Taarikh Wa Al-Muarrikhun and Faruq Umar from his Tabi'atu Al-Da'awa Al-'Abbaasiyya. Refer to Al-Sab'i Al-Khawarij Wa Al-Haqiqatu Al-Ghiba p. 48.
\textsuperscript{227} - Refer to the footnotes in Al-Futuh Vol. 4, p. 8-9.
\textsuperscript{228} - Refer to the footnotes in Al-Futuh Vol. 3, p. 70.
legitimize another idea, equally implying that the opposite idea is disregarded by them. The account – as seen – speaks of the person that will take care of the Muslim cities after the Prophet (pbuh), meaning the person that would be entitled to succeed him. Then it goes on to mention that the assignees for the leadership will be: "The Sahaba, the people of his house (Ahl Al-Bait), his wasii (trustee) and his descendants". This is, of course, the mixing of two rival ideologies at the same time! The Sunni and the Ibadhi political traditions maintain the former idea which holds that the Sahaba – not one in particular; or better still no one of them was nominated by the Prophet (pbuh) – were the ones entitled to hold the reins of the Islamic rule after the Prophet (pbuh) – anyone of them they agreed to have him for a leader, that was Islamically permissible. This means, according to this Sunni-Ibadhi political ideology, that part of Ibn A’atham’s account which says: "Yes: he had the Sahaba (to succeed him)" is acceptable. However this will inevitably imply that the Sunni-Ibadhi position necessarily rejects the last part of the account which says: 

"(Yes he had)....the people of his house (Ahl Al-Bait), his wasii (trustee) and his descendants" which – to them – was invented to limit the Islamic leadership to one specific progeny.229

On the other hand, the Shi’as place their faith in the last part of the same A’athamian account which mentions the Ahlu Al-Bait as the assignees for the Islamic leadership and gurdians of the Umma. This is to say that the account as a whole is not acceptable neither to the Ibadhis nor to the Sunnis or the Shi’as.

Another much debated issue concerning the account that narrates the debate held between Ibn 'Abbaas and the Nahrawanees, is whether Ibn 'Abbaas defeated them and so caused most of them to rejoin the mass placed under 'Ali's leadership, or, reversely, they crushed his

---

229 - Progeny is the offspring or descendants of a person.
arguments and caused him to change his position.\textsuperscript{230} One account suggests that Ibn 'Abbaas defeated them argumentatively; while another account advances an idea contrary to that. Nevertheless, the fact that the Nahrawanees crushed Ibn 'Abbaas' arguments is strongly supported by a number of things, two of which are the most important:

1) Both two accounts agree that Al-Imam 'Ali in person later went to debate with the Nahrawanees after Ibn 'Abbaas had returned. Obviously, if Ibn 'Abbaas could defeat them by arguments and caused them to return to 'Ali's leadership, there would be no need for 'Ali to go there in order to hold a debate again with them.\textsuperscript{231}

2) Ibn 'Abbaas himself later affirmed that it was the Nahrawanees who were right, as Ibn Abi Shaiba, in his Al-Musannaf, narrates.\textsuperscript{232}

\textsuperscript{230} More details which affirm that Ibn 'Abbaas was defeated in arguments by the Nahrawanees and that he, as a result, changed his position, are given in pamphlet no. 3.


\textsuperscript{232} As explained in other parts of the series in shaa Allah.
THE DISCUSSION OF THE HADIDIAN FRAGILE VIEWS

But Ibn Abi Al-Hadid Al-Mu'utazili argues that the defeat of Ibn 'Abbaas by the Nahrawanees emanated from his fault of not acting on the advice of 'Ali\textsuperscript{233} in which he told him: "Do not debate with them by the Qur-anic verses, for the Qur-an bears different shades of meaning; you will speak and they will do; on the contrary, debate with them by the Sunna,\textsuperscript{234} for (if you do so) they will have nowhere to turn."\textsuperscript{235}

Then, elaborating his words, Ibn Abi Al-Hadid Al-Mu'utazili goes on to say: "In case you say: 'Did Ibn 'Abbaas debate with them in accordance with the advice of 'Ali?' I will answer: No: he did not; contrarily, he debated with them by the Qur-anic verses such as: "Appoint (two) arbiters: one from his family and another from hers...."\textsuperscript{236} and the verse that: "As judged by two just men among you."\textsuperscript{237} So very few of them returned (to 'Ali's leadership) and instead the war became fierce. Indeed, for his arguments\textsuperscript{238} a few men among them returned (to 'Ali).\textsuperscript{239}

Such is the claim of Ibn Abi Al-Hadid. But, pathetically, his words have no scientific weight, for an authentic tradition of the Prophet (pbuh) never goes contrary to the Qur-an. In fact, the Prophetic traditions, being the second fundamental principle\textsuperscript{240} upon which arguments and proofs are based, are explanatory to the Qur-an and

\textsuperscript{233} - Ibn Abi Al-Hadid Sharhu Nahji Al-Balagha Vol. 17, p. 244-45.
\textsuperscript{234} - The Prophetic traditions.
\textsuperscript{236} - The Qur-an: 4, 35.
\textsuperscript{237} - The Qur-an: 5, 95.
\textsuperscript{238} - For Ibn 'Abbaas' arguments.
\textsuperscript{239} - Ibn Abi Al-Hadid Sharhu Nahji Al-Balagha Vol. 17, p. 245.
\textsuperscript{240} - The first being the Qur-an.
clarificatory of its meanings. Apparently, Ibn Abi Al-Hadid's philosophy may delude some people that he regards the Qur-an and the Prophetic traditions to be two contradictory things: if you base your proofs on one of them you cannot base them on another in avoidance of contradiction! In case he really thinks so, then we can categorically respond to his logic through a simple methodology of what we may refer to as a law of relativity between things outlawed in the Qur-an and in the Prophetic traditions. On the scale of that probable Hadidian logic, the unlawfulness of adultery, for example, can not be proved with the verse that: "Nor come nigh to adultery" but rather with the tradition that: "The inhabitants of Hell will be bothered by the stink of the adulterous!"

Nevertheless, that is not what Ibn Abi Al-Hadid really wants to say: what he wants to say is that the Prophetic traditions are, in this subject, clearer than the Qur-anic verses, for the former bear no different shades of meaning since they have mentioned 'Ali by name as being generally righteous and so right in this particular issue. While, on the other hand, Qur-anic verses have given merely a general explanation. In other words, the traditions are specific for a particular person whereas the Qur-anic verses hold a general sense for all.

Yet even this idea has been shown to be erroneous. Sheikh Nassir Al-Sabí'i in his Al-Khawarij Wa Al-Haqiqatu Al-Ghaiba offers the most interesting response to this Hadidian philosophy. He says:

These are the most surprising words especially (when we take into consideration the fact that) they have emanated from the Mu'utazili

241 - The Qur-an: 17, 32.

242 - It will be explained later on that the traditions he claims to be stronger as evidence against the Nahrawanes are not authentic. Indeed, even in case of being authentic, they can not be taken as arguments against them.
(a man of the Mu'utazili school) who bases his (sect) on logic. For the means by which the arbitration was required to be made and the legality of the arbitration itself were taken from these two (Qur'anic) verses and those holding the same meaning. Indeed, as the words of Mu'awiya have preceded that after the act of raising copies of the Qur-an (he said): 'So that we and you may refer to what Allah has commanded. Send a man from among you and we send a man from among us...'.

What Al-Sabi'i says, in response to the Hadidian philosophy, is that the Qur-an was the only thing supposed by all the Muslims to solve their crisis. Indeed 'Ali himself, when the terms of agreement were being written, insisted on the obligation of following the Qur-an: "To cut off what the Qur-an has cut off and enliven what the Qur-an has enlivened." Also after the results of the meeting which was held to make the arbitration, and when things pathetically fell apart, everyone, including 'Ali himself, said: "The two arbiters did not judge in accordance with the Qur-an." Moreover, both 'Ali and Mu'awiya, justified their cases on the basis of the Qur-an and when the proposal of making peace was suggested and finally agreed upon by the majority, and the terms of agreement were written, the people of both sides conditioned that the arbitration should be made in accord with the Qur-an. Thus the Qur-an was the only solvent force expected by all and sundry to end the crisis. How does it come then that Ibn Abi Al-Hadid claims that the defeat of Ibn 'Abbaas by the so-called Khawarij came as a result of his using Qur'anic verses instead of Prophetic traditions?

---

243 - Al-Sabi'i Al-Khawarij Wa Al-Haqiqtu Al-Ghaiba p. 94.
244 - 'Ali told the two arbiters: "You must judge in accordance with the Book of Allah, otherwise your judgment will be disregarded." Al-Baladhi Al-Ansab Vol. 3, p. 111.
245 - Sundry: various, several. All and sundry: everyone.
But Ibn Abi Al-Hadid still defends his position with other more ridiculous arguments which are as fragile as, in the rhetorical expression of the Holy Qur-an, spider's web. He catechetically argues: "In case you ask: 'What were the Prophetic traditions which 'Ali ordered Ibn 'Abbaas to use in his debate with them? I will answer that...'Ali wanted Ibn 'Abbaas to tell the Nahrawanees that the Prophet (pbuh) said: "Ali is with the truth and the truth is with 'Ali: it goes with him wherever he goes" and the tradition that: "Oh Allah! Love those who love him ('Ali) and antagonize those who antagonize him; and help those who help him and forsake those who forsake him" and other traditions which hold the same idea."247

Such is how Ibn Abi Al-Hadid defends his position. Yet these arguments can be easily crushed as follows:

1) The traditions that he claims to be worthy as evidence against the Nahrawanees, are not authentic: they have been fabricated by the advocates of Alism during the political manoeuvre in which the 'Alawiyun,248 the 'Abbaasiyyun249 and the Umawiyyun250 were struggling for power of the Islamic state. Each of the three groups fabricated traditions and then attributed them to the Prophet (pbuh) in order to justify its political supremacy!

One thing which can be taken to prove the fact that those traditions were fabricated is that when 'Ali himself went to Nahrawan to debate with the Nahrawanees, after Ibn 'Abbaas was defeated, 'Ali

246 - Catechism: a summary of the principles of a religion in the form of questions and answers. Catechize: instruct by means of question and answer. Catechetically is the adverb.
248 - The descendants of Caliph 'Ali bin Abi Talib.
249 - The descendants of 'Abbaas bin Abi Talib.
250 - The descendants of Umayya bin 'Abdil Shams.
did not use those traditions as his arguments against them. Indeed, no man took those traditions as his proofs and arguments during the whole period of 'Ali-Mu'awiyah crisis: all of them had the Qur'an for their only source of evidence for the ideas they held. 'Ali, for example, to show that he was right, argued that he had already promised Mu'awiyah and proved with the Qur'anic verse that to break a promise is Islamically not permissible. Equally, the Nahrawanies replied, with the Qur'anic evidence, that 'Ali's agreement with Mu'awiyah was contrary to the Qur'an. It is clear, therefore, that if the traditions Ibn Abi Al-Hadid claims to be better as evidence really existed at that time and, more importantly, if 'Ali really required Ibn 'Abbaas to use them against the Nahrawanies, then Al-Imam 'Ali himself would use them when he went to Nahrawaan to debate with them. Does it make sense that 'Ali should order Ibn 'Abbaas to prove a case with particular traditions as his only suitable proofs then 'Ali himself does not produce them for the same purpose? Again, how did it come that in the whole extended period of crisis, from the time the verbal disputes between 'Ali and Mu'awiyah began till the time of military confrontation, no one ever mentioned those traditions or articulated the idea of 'Ali being infallible? In other words, no one argued that: "Ali is with the truth and the truth is with 'Ali: it goes with him wherever he goes."

Another thing to observe is that even if those traditions are really authentic, still they do not mean that 'Ali does not make mistakes especially in matters like these which depend almost entirely on the human intellectual efforts. For if "Ali is with the truth and the truth is with 'Ali: it goes with him wherever he goes" then the inevitable, logical implication is: "The Prophet is with the truth and the truth is with the Prophet (pbuh): it goes with him wherever he goes" yet, Allah has blamed him for leaving better way in some of his military

251 - Infallible: incapable of error. Unable to make error.
and civil actions. For example, the verse that: "God gives you grace! Why did you grant them exemption" 252 was revealed in order to blame the Prophet (pbuh) for his act to allow some people who brought him false excuses so that they might be exempted from taking part in the war of Jihad. Typically, the verse: "O Prophet! Why do you forbid what Allah has made lawful to you" 253 was sent down to blame the Prophet (pbuh) for outlawing a certain thing which was Islamically lawful to him. How can a person of understanding mind, therefore, claim that 'Ali was infallible simply because the Prophet (pbuh) is alleged to say: "Ali is with the truth and the truth is with 'Ali: it goes with him wherever he goes?!"254 The logical question we ought to ask ourselves is: was the Prophet (pbuh) not with the truth and the truth not with him...? Of course, every Muslim's answer will be "The Prophet (pbuh) was with the truth every time." Thus if the Prophet (pbuh) was the most truthful and so was with the truth and the truth was with him, let us ask ourselves again: was he not blamed by Allah for leaving better way in some of his actions?! It is clear, therefore, that the idea of 'Ali being infallible on the grounds that Ali is with the truth...is the result of the politics of lies aimed at indoctrinating people with the creed of Alism during the time when the waves of the politics of division swept the Islamic nation.

Another thing to note is the fact that as there is a tradition which quotes the Prophet (pbuh) as saying: "Ali is with the truth and the truth is with 'Ali: it goes with him wherever he goes", equally, there is a tradition attributed to the Prophet (pbuh) as saying: "Ammaar (bin Yasir) is with the truth and the truth is with 'Ammaar (bin

---

252 - The Qur-an: 9, 43.
253 - The Qur-an: 66, 1.
254 - The tradition is inauthentic as we have said before, but even if it is authentic still it does not imply that 'Ali did not make mistakes.
Yasir): it goes with him wherever he goes". Indeed, 'Ali himself has been quoted as saying: "Ammaar (bin Yasir) is with the truth and the truth is with 'Ammaar: it goes with him wherever he goes." Yet no one has ever claimed that 'Ammaar bin Yasir has been infallible, for in case the account is authentic, the meaning intended thereby is that 'Ammaar is truthful: he does not intend to do wrong – no sense of infallibility at all is produced by the account.

**OH ALLAH! LOVE THOSE WHO LOVE HIM!**

As for the tradition that "Oh Allah! Love those who love him ('Ali) and antagonize those who antagonize him; and help those who help him and forsake those who forsake him" is, in fact, part of the tradition that: "He who regards me to be his Mawla, he should also regard 'Ali to be his Mawla." Unfortunately, there are differences of opinions among scholars as to whether this tradition is authentic or not. Significantly enough, even those who believe that the tradition is authentic, most of them believe that the words "Oh Allah! Love those who love him ('Ali) and antagonize those who antagonize him; and help those who help him and forsake those who forsake him" have been added to the original text of the tradition as a fabrication.

---

257 - Basically, the word Mawla means: lord, master or chief. But it is also used to connote friend or beloved one. On this basis, the Shi'as differ with the rest of the Muslims in the meaning intended thereby. The Shi'as believe that the word Mawla has hereby been used to mean a ruler or Caliph and guardian of the Islamic state after the Prophet, whereas the overwhelming majority of the Muslims hold that the word Mawla is hereby synonymous with the word Walay which means: friend, saint or holy man. More explanation on the subject has been given in my Kiswahili work entitled Ukhalifa.
258 - Among those who have so said, is Al-Imam Ahmad bin Hanbal as quoted by Ibn Kathir in his Al-Bidaya Wa Al-Nihaya 7, p. 348. Ibn Taymiyya in his Minhaju Al-Sunnah Vol. 4, p. 86, is also among those who have rejected this tradition.
Finally, it will be found that even if we accept this part of the tradition as authentic, the meaning held thereby must either be:

a) The one that hates 'Ali without any lawful reason for which it is incumbent upon a Muslim to hate another, has, by so-doing, committed a sin. This point of view has been basically founded on the fact that Islam has one general and equal outlook on all Muslims\textsuperscript{259} which explains that Allah antagonizes anyone that hates a Muslim without having an Islamically sound reason. It is for this reason that Allah, in one of the \textit{Ahadith Qudsiyya} (Divine \textit{hadiths}), says: "He who antagonizes my beloved one, has declared a war against me."\textsuperscript{260} This is to say that if there is a lawful reason for which to dislike a person, whoever he is, then it is the obligation of the Muslims to do so irrespective of the class or caste to which the person disliked belongs. Read – if you like – the Prophetic tradition thus: "The strongest tie of Islam is to love and hate for the sake of Allah."\textsuperscript{261} Indeed, this is the just judgement for all people: I and you, Abu Bakr and 'Umar, 'Ali and 'Uthman are all indiscriminately equal before this law: whoever goes contrary to the Book of 'Allah and the Prophetic traditions, has exposed himself to the wrath of Allah and the hatred of the Muslims, be he a son of the Prophet (pbuh) or an ordinary man of the lowest class in the sight of our wrong worldly classification. Such is the Islamic justice. So, even if the tradition that: "Oh Allah! Love those who love him ('Ali) and antagonize those who antagonize him; and help those who help him and forsake

\textsuperscript{259} With the exception of the prophets who never do what incites the Muslims into having hatred against them.

\textsuperscript{260} Related by Al-Bukhari as quoted by Al-Imam Al-Nawawi in his \textit{Riyadhu Al-Salihin} p. 135, \textit{hadith} no. 387.

those who forsake him” is authentic, it must be reconciled with other
texts so as to reach the correct meaning. Thus by examining different
texts which have direct or particular connection with the subject as
well as other texts which have general connection therewith, it will
be clearly found that the people intended in the tradition Oh Allah!
Love those who love him and antagonize those who antagonize him
are those who dislike 'Ali without any Islamically acceptable reason.

b) This tradition "Oh Allah! Love those who love him ('Ali) and
antagonize those who antagonize him; and help those who help him
and forsake those who forsake him" even if it is authentic, it will be
not worthy as evidence against the Nahrawanees, for they did not
splinter from him on the basis of any hatred against him, contrarily,
they – before the war stopped and after that – insisted that he should
resume the war and they wanted him to repent in order that they
might reappoint him their Caliph. Their idea of wishing to reappoint
him was based on the observation that his stance towards this crisis
nullified his Caliphate, for he went contrary to the Qur-anic verse.
Thus for him to be Caliph once again, a new appointment should be
held, which, in turn, entailed unavoidably that he would first declare
his repentence of the sin he committed.

c) The tradition that "Oh Allah! Love those who love him ('Ali) and
antagonize those who antagonize him; and help those who help him
and forsake those who forsake him" even if authentic, still it can not
stand as argument against the Nahrawanees because books on history
and traditions show that the tradition had a particular cause for which
it was uttered. The reason, was that the Prophet (pbuh) sent 'Ali and
other Sahaba to Yemen. When they came back to him, some of them
complained against 'Ali of a thing he did which did not please them.
Hence the Prophet (pbuh), in a vast congregation, said: "He who
regards me as his Mawla, he should also regard 'Ali as his Mawla." Then
some versions of the tradition quote the Prophet (pbuh) as
saying after that: "Oh Allah! Love those who love him and antagonize those who antagonize him; and help those who help him and forsake those who forsake him." As such, the cause for which the tradition has been uttered does not support the opponents of the Nahrawanees, for the tradition has been uttered in a specific event and under specific circumstances: it does not generalize all people at all times.

d) While it has been narrated that: "Oh Allah! Love those who love him (‘Ali) and antagonize those who antagonize him; and help those who help him and forsake those who forsake him" it has also been narrated that: "He who antagonizes 'Ammar (bin Yasir), will be the enemy of Allah; and he who hates 'Ammar, Allah will hate him."\textsuperscript{262} Did this mean that 'Ammar was infallible and that to disagree with him was not Islamically outlawed?!

In conclusion, therefore, we may say that the Nahrawanees extremely loved 'Ali. Their act to detach themselves from him was not because of any hatred against him, but rather was because of his own act of not complying with the Qur-anic verse that legitimized his war against Mu'awiya. It will be remembered that the Prophet (pbuh) taught not to obey anyone when going wrong, as the tradition says: "There is no obedience to the created in the disobedience of the Creator".\textsuperscript{263} It was for this reason that they could not cooperate with him any more, for they appointed him on the condition that he would act according to the Qur-an and the Sunna;\textsuperscript{264} in case of contradicting either of the two, the Islamic Caliph is required to repent; if he refuses then he is deposed by any means – forcefully or diplomatically. 'Ali did not comply with the verse that gave him the

\textsuperscript{262} - Al-Hakim Al-Mustadrak Vol. 3, p. 441, hadith no. 5674.
\textsuperscript{264} - Prophetic traditions.
right to fight a war against the rebellious party (Mu'awiya and his forces), as we have explained more than once, and moreover he rubbed off his title as Amiru Al-Mu-umin (the leader of the Muslims) in the peace treaty, and so the Nahrawaneees decided to detach themselves from him for those reasons. Thus, considering those reasons, the Nahrawaneees appointed their new Imam named Abdillah bin Wahb Al-Raasbi\textsuperscript{265} through a Shura (a consultative council). Then they assembled themselves at Al-Nahrawaan where they remained until the outbreak of the Battle of Nahrawaan which was fought between them and 'Ali in the year 38 A.H. Almost all of them were killed in this war and very few of them survived (may Allah be pleased with them). It was from these few survivors that began the Ibadhi political movement. This movement was first led by Abu Bilal Mirdas bin Hudaar (r.a), then secretly by Al-Imam Jabir bin Zaid in joint-efforts with a man named 'Abdullah bin Ibadh who, defended by his big tribe of Bani Tamimi and under the direction of Al-Imam Jabir bin Zaid, publicly articulated the Nahrawaneees' political views which were inspired by the first and the second Islamic reigns. Because of his open opposition against the Umayyad rule and obvious support of Nahrawaneees' political views, many people thought that Abdullah bin Ibadh was the founder of Ibadhi school and so the sect was wrongly named after him. But, in fact, it was Jabir bin Zaid who was the actual and real founder as it was he who secretly directed Abdullah bin Ibadh.\textsuperscript{266} Indeed, Jabir

\textsuperscript{265} - Al-Tabari Al-Taarikh Vol. 6, p. 18-19. Al-Imam Abdillah bin Wahb Al-Raasbi was one of the Sahaba as books on history show. The names of the Sahaba who took part in the Nahrawaneees' secession movement will be mentioned in part nine which will be the last part of this work in shaa Allah.

\textsuperscript{266} - This is one of the reasons as to why many people do not know properly the history of the Ibadhi school. The Ibadhi school began under very difficult circumstances of being fought against by the Umayyad rulers, so the movement was run secretly to avoid persecution. As a result, many Muslims have been ignorant of great deal concerning its real history. But the obligation of anyone that is ignorant of any thing is to say nothing about it as the Qur-anic verse states.
was also the one that lay all foundations of Ibadhi creed and jurisprudence. As for Abdullah bin Ibadh, there is not a single opinion of his in the whole of the Ibadhi literature: he was merely a leader of political movement or rather a spokesman of the Ibadhi ideo-politico-theological thoughts.

SUMMARY AND MAIN POINTS

In conclusion, we may summarize this section as follows:

1) When 'Ali with his Iraqi forces returned to Al-Kufa after the truce was made at Siffin, a large number of his soldiers detached themselves from him, and left first for Harauraa and later for Nahrawaan.

2) 'Ali sent Ibn 'Abbaas to debate with them in order to know why they detached themselves from him.

3) Ibn 'Abbaas accordingly did so.

4) Accounts differ in whether he defeated them in arguments and so caused all or most of them to return to 'Ali's leadership or, reversely, he was defeated by them.

Unfortunately, this command of Allah in His Book has encountered very little attention from most of the Muslims and so many people have been speaking randomly of the Ibadhis, attributing to them matters which are not acceptable to them. One of them is a man named Abu Ismail, as quoted by Ibn Hazm. This man has slandered against the Ibadhis that they do not eat fish unless it has been slaughtered, they pray two raka’at only: one in the morning and another in the evening and they make pilgrimage in any month of the year. Ibn Hazm Al-Faslu Fii Al-Milal Wa Al-Ahwai Wa Al-Nnial Vol: 5 p. 51-52.
However the accounts that he was defeated are authentic ones as they are supported by a number of things, two are most important of them:

a) Al-Imam 'Ali himself later went to Nahrawaan to debate with them. Had Ibn 'Abbaas really defeated them and caused them to return to 'Ali's government, 'Ali would not have needed go there for the same purpose.

b) Ibn 'Abbaas later assured that the Nahrawanees were right and so he refused to take part in the Battle of Nahrawaan fought by 'Ali against the people of Nahrawaan, while in all other wars 'Ali fought against his opponents, Ibn 'Abbaas participated therein.

5) Ibn Abi Al-Hadid claimed that the defeat of Ibn 'Abbaas by the Nahrawanees came as a result of him not following the advice of 'Ali in which he asked him not to use the Qur-an as his argument, but rather he should use the Prophetic traditions. But this idea has been crushed by:

   a) The fact that Allah Himself has commanded us to refer to the Qur-an and Prophetic traditions whenever differences occur among us.\textsuperscript{267}

   b) The fact that all the people at that time suggested that the arbitration should be made in accordance with the Qur-an.

7) Ibn Abi Al-Hadid also suggested idea about some traditions as being more worthy as evidence against the Nahrawanees. However,

\textsuperscript{267} - Refer to the Qur-an: 4, 59, 65. The Qur-an: 42, 10.
we have shown that those traditions are not authentic, yet even if we regard them to be authentic, they prove nothing against the so-called Khawarij.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the explanation given in the passages of this work, we have been able to know how the Battle of Siffin went. Similarly, we have been able to know the reasons as to why the so-called Khawarij splintered from 'Ali, and the basis upon which they founded their proofs. However, a complete picture of things can be portrayed more clearly when the arguments of another side have been equally studied. It is only by studying arguments advanced by all involved parties that a just decision of who is right and who is wrong can be made. To justify their act of disconnecting themselves from 'Ali, the Nahrawanes argued that by yielding to the truce and agreeing with the peace treaty proposal, 'Ali went contrary to the verse that: ".....If one (party) transgresses beyond the bounds against another, then fight against the one that transgresses until it complies with the command of Allah". The opponents of the Nahrawaneees respond that the stance held by 'Ali towards the issue of arbitration did not contradict the Qur-an. But, how and why: what is the basis of their arguments and, on the other hand, what is the response of the Nahrawaneees to those arguments? The following part of this work discusses all proofs and shows which of them is strong as evidence and so who was right.

To be continued in Pamphlet No. 3.
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6) Hukumu Za Sala ya Safari (It has not yet been published).
7) Ukhalifa. (It has not yet been published).
8) Makhawarij Baina ya Ukweli Na Visa Vya Kutunga.
9) Sherehe Na Maelezo Ya Tafsiri Ya Al-Farisi. (It has just begun).
When the unpolitical are rendered political, concepts are necessarily turned upside down, realities are made ideals and truth is obscured! In the world of Wawhal, for instance, the fact that Kiswahili is the product of a dual-origin, Afro-Arab child, has been increasingly politicized by Afro-centric writers, especially those with Christo-political agendas, as an attempt to negate its real origin! The ends of these Afro-ecumenical politicians are not just the negation of the origin of the language, but, rather, the negation of the longevity of the existence of the Arabs in East Africa. Yet even the renunciation of this historical existence of the Arabs there is not the main target; Islam itself is the real target for this negation - the once-unpolitical matter of the origin of a language has been made political and in the process truth is distorted and the agendas are hidden.

Much of the political history or the history of politics can, therefore, be likened to a public dump where everyone throws one's waste. Thus the misconception of a history is often a product and natural outcome of the purposeful endeavours of the most secular politicians to make history serve politics! Most of the politicians have not been only the main destructive force to man and his achievements; they have also been the greatest catastrophe itself that has undermined the world in general both morally and physically. If the liberal ideologists hold a belief that there is no sacrosanct, precincts or limitations, nor even one established truth: all notions, teachings and doctrines are subject to the analysis and the criticism of men and women, which explains why what is valued today undergoes modification tomorrow. Then obviously the politicians believe that no limits are to be demarcated towards lying and deceiving the mass for their personal interests! Thus, unreasonably, history, serving politics to hide the truth, turns out to be a victim of lies and fabrication!

A clear picture can be illustrated by the examples of modern elections campaigns where our ears are familiar with hearing many unfulfilled promises made by the politicians - promises for social morality, political solidarity, legal equality, economic stability, individual tranquility etc. - while adversely, our eyes have been accustomed with the visualization of political corruption, economic extravagancies, legal inequality, individual anxiety etc. A politician "promises peace in order to make war" and a well-planned equal material distribution in order to make monopolization. As a result, cultures of violence in most political societies have been common phenomena! Ridiculously, in the end, the destruction these corrupt political leaders make today, turns to be part of their most celebrated historical achievements tomorrow! But for this to be achieved successfully, things must be turned upside down, hence magnifying the minute, diminishing the great and devaluing the important: the real picture of the righteous and the true face of the oppressed are usually portrayed into the most hideous pictures, and, ironically enough, the maltreatment of the wrong-doers is deceitfully represented as the most constructive force inspired by the spirit of political positiveness of the leaders - history is interpolated to serve politics!

Islam, being the teachings of Allah, is very much against such a habit of making history serve politics, yet the Muslims themselves are not ruled out from such corruption. From the second half of the first century A.H. onwards, the history of Islam has been experiencing much interpolation by some politicians and sectarian fanatics. The aim behind that, is nothing else than the justification of their political existence. Another end was to uplift the face of the opposition and to defame the names of the opponents. Hence began the task of fabricating as many traditions as possible for the sake of both the justification and the defamation. But there was another reason behind the act of corrupting history which increasingly involved the anti-Islamic movements - the interpolation of history by the hypocrites who pretended to be Muslims camouflaging themselves with long turbans and white robes to mislead the Muslim mass. All these destructive forces have contributed a great deal in distorting the truth and disguising the reality and so leaving people in the darkness of ignorance.

Among the histories that have been misconceived, thanks totally to the fabrication, interpolation and false propaganda, is the history of the so-called Khawariz in general and the history of the Battle of Siffin in particular. Many, as a result, have been as typical, in a blind following, as the Eastern left-wing radicals or the Western right-wing conservatives trained and programmed to believe in one particular idea rather than being real researchers and seekers for the truth. This pathetic situation in Islam does verify call for the urgent necessity for the Muslim intellectuals who are determined to bring about reforms or changes in the Islamic thought to strive as strongly as possible in order to disillusion the misinformed Muslim mass by exposing the truth and revealing the reality. This pamphlet - part two of the nine - studies the history of the Battle of Siffin and its resultant effects, showing what is true and what is false. It spells out how and why the so-called Khawariz detached themselves from 'Ali's political movement and launched their own. Hopefully, by acquiring such knowledge, our insight into this history will be enriched and so be able to make out what is right and what is wrong.