'Devotion' Of Maulavi Nazir Ahmad to the Holy Prophet and His Family

From the topic of his writing, it seems to be devotion, but he says: "We consider the Holy Prophet (S) to be having all the human weaknesses and regard him as human."[1] If this statement is correct, the Prophet cannot be in any way considered superior to Isa (a.s.) and from this statement, the infallibility of the Holy Prophet (S) is nullified. Indeed, being a prophet, Isa (a.s.) was infallible just as his followers agree to his infallibility and on the basis of his infallibility, he was away from all human weaknesses. In this way, the non-infallible cannot be superior to an infallible.

Now the Christians would know that a well-known Ahlul Sunnat scholar has made a statement, which testifies to the claim of the Christians and falsifies the claim of the followers of Muhammad. It is correct that: The people are on the religion of their rulers. Thus, the writer has only supported the religion of his masters, the British, who were ruling the country during this time, so it was not unexpected from him. The writer has, by his writing, repaid the favors of his British masters, especially, Sir William Mayer, who was the Lieutenant Governor and a well-known anti-Muslim personality. The Maulavi has written similar things about the Chief of the Lady of Paradise, Lady Fatima Zahra (s.a.), which shows that he had no regard for the infallibility of the great lady.

On page 99 of his book, he writes: "In spite of the fact that Fatima was not denied her rightful share of Fadak, she, on the basis of her enmity with Abu Bakr took a negative stance. She stopped speaking to Abu Bakr and made a request that she must be buried at night and these people should not be allowed to participate in her funeral. What a severe anger she had!"

We seek Allah's refuge! O Maulavi fear Allah! You have written such a statement about the Chief of the Lady of Paradise! And accused her of anger? Can such words be justified for a daughter of the Holy Prophet (S) like Fatima (s.a.)? Except for an everlasting unfortunate person, such a misdemeanor cannot be performed by anyone. Whether Fatima (s.a.) rightfully expressed her dislike for Abu Bakr and Umar or not is beyond the scope of this discussion. Here, we just point out the disrespectful attitude of

the Maulavi. Indeed, such a statement about the chief of the Lady of Paradise can only be issued by one who is an opponent of the family of the Holy Prophet (S). It seems that the writer had no manners at all, though he considered his style to be liberal.

There is no strength and power except by Allah.

Another example of the same type of misdemeanor is presented below. The Maulana says: "It was all the better for Islam that the male issues of the Holy Prophet (S) did not survive. Only a daughter survived him and due to her progeny, the Muslims were divided into Sunnis and Shias, who are forever fighting each other. If a male child had survived, he would have proved to be like the son of Nuh (a.s.)."

O Muslims! Is such writing according to Islamic etiquette that he is expressing satisfaction that the Holy Prophet (S) did not leave a male issue? First he said that his son would have proved to be like the son of Nuh (a.s.), then he expressed regret that his surviving daughter had issues and progeny. He wished that she were issueless. How can a Muslim pen such words? Or can be pleased with such writings? If such writings are not considered vile, what is?

Apparently, it seems that just as the Maulana is pleased at the absence of male issues of the Prophet, he was also unhappy that Lady Fatima had issues. If the Maulana had been present during the time of the Prophet, he would have congratulated the Prophet for his not having any son and he would have also expressed condolence on the birth of his grandsons. The statement of Maulana clearly shows that he is indeed hateful to the Sadaat, and he wished that all Sadaat became extinct. But when cruel people like Muawiyah and Yazeed could not destroy the Sadaat how can this Maulana succeed in his aim?

When the wretched infidels began to address the Prophet as childless, the divine command affected the spread of the Prophet's progeny to such an extent that Muawiyah, Yazeed and all the Caliphs of Bani Umayyah and Bani Abbas got tired of killing the Sadaat, but they did not succeed in their mission. How can the Maulana be considered in any way effective in this matter?

The Maulana writes that if a son of the Prophet had survived, he would have been like the son of Nuh (a.s.). This is indeed a strange statement. It is not necessary that the son of every Prophet should be like Nuh's son. However, one thing is certain that if the Prophet had left a son, he would also have been treated like the other members of the Prophet's family at the hands of people like the Maulana.

The next example of this disrespect is on the page 99 of his book where he writes: "On one side was Fatima (s.a.) that she died but did not reconcile and on the other was 'A'ysha, much more than this. In our country there is a belief that women are extremely stubborn and the same qualities were found in these two."

Whatever the Maulana has written about Fatima (s.a.) will be recompensed by the Prophet but whatever he has written disrespectfully about 'A'ysha caused consternation among Sunnis and after this he was greatly criticized by Ahlul Sunnat intellectuals. Apparently, Shias do not say anything because this sect

was used to such disrespectful acts.

Now in the end, I am giving another statement of the Maulana by which we realize the devotion of the Maulana to the family of the Messenger (S), especially with regard to Imam Husayn (a.s.) and the tragedy of Karbala'. In the same book, on page 94, he writes: The Prophet willingly spent his life in poverty and hunger and he preferred it. He always prayed for such a life for himself: "O Allah! Make me live among the poor and count me among the group of the destitute." And for his progeny he used to pray: "O Allah! Appoint the bare minimum sustenance for the progeny of Muhammad."

The Progeny members could not remain content on their sustenance and they began to dream of kingdom and even lost their demeanor. How many conquests did His Eminence, Ali (a.s.) obtain when he was on the seat of Caliphate. Poor man! He could remain a Caliph only for four years and nine months. And in the beginning itself an internal war erupted. When he was free from it, Muawiyah usurped the Caliphate and he was just a Caliph for namesake.

After his death, his son, Hasan, tried his best to obtain Caliphate but within a period of six months, he had to forgo Caliphate and the power of governance completely came into the hands of Muawiyah and after his death this continued in his progeny. At that time, the Prophet's progeny should have remained patient and content like their respected grandfather. But Husayn, the second son of Ali, did not accept the Caliphate of Yazeed, the son of Muawiyah. And reaching Kufa, he took allegiance of the people for his own Caliphate. Everyone knows the consequence of this. The future progeny of Fatima (s.a.) should have derived a lesson from this incident. But the greed of kingdom never allowed them to sit in peace.

In the view of this Maulana, Muhammad's Progeny had no contentment and they were greedy for rulership. If Husayn Ibn Ali (a.s.) did not accept the Caliphate of Yazeed, it was a very unsuitable act. And when he did not do so, he had to suffer the consequence of his deed. This shows that the Maulana does not consider Muhammad's Progeny worth honoring. Apparently, in his view, Muhammad's Progeny was selfish and greedy. If the Maulana had only half the love for Muhammad's Progeny that he has for their enemies, he would not have written such a book.

Patience, contentment and thankfulness were imbibed in the very souls of Muhammad's Progeny and they had no desire for rulership. Imam Husayn (a.s.) had opposed Yazeed for religious factors. He considered it illegal to give allegiance to Yazeed and he also believed that the allegiance of Muslims for Yazeed was incorrect. Imam Husayn (a.s.) knew that he was the rightful Imam and the Caliph appointed by Allah. That is why he gave his life on the path of truth with absolute patience and satisfaction. The view of Maulana that Imam Husayn (a.s.) lost his life for greed of material world, could only be the belief of the followers of Yazeed and it cannot be a belief of any Muslim. The views of a person are in consonance with his character.

Here, I am reminded of an incident, which is very suitable at this juncture. A person who had become rich by chance, told a friend of mine that Husayn (a.s.) gave his life in pursuit of material wealth. If he

had no greed of wealth and kingdom, he would not have rebelled against Yazeed. My friend replied: “Because you are prepared to lay your life for worldly wealth, always busy in selfish pursuit of wealth and spend a life of selfishness, you consider Imam Husayn (a.s.) like yourself. Indeed, one considers others like oneself.

I know what type of a person you are. Providence has not given you the ability to discern the merits of Imam Husayn (a.s.). Your internal make up is like Bani Umayyah and you are created only for the worldly life. How can you understand the benevolence, courage, magnanimity and other praised qualities of Imam Husayn (a.s.)?” One who considers Caliphate and Imamate as divinely ordained affairs could not have a view like that of the Maulana. It is a pity that on the basis of false beliefs, Muslims used to consider Muhammad’s Progeny as ordinary people. They should look at them with an impartial view. How can the Maulana call himself a Muslim and refer to Imam Husayn (a.s.) in such words?

While a German scholar has contrary views. He writes: “Imam Husayn (a.s.) certainly did not undergo the hardships of Karbala’ for greed of wealth. It was for the defense of his grandfather’s religion that he suffered such tribulations.” The same scholar has penned a seven-volume book on Islamic Politics. The followers of truth must appreciate his impartiality and truthful view and gain divine rewards for this. He writes: “On one hand, Imam Husayn (a.s.) saw that Yazeed has become the heir apparent and Bani Umayyah has got the rulership of Muslim lands. They were slowly gaining influence over the religious affairs of the Muslims. It was certain that in the due course, they would destroy the faith of Muslims and deviate them from the religion of his grandfather.

On the other hand, Imam Husayn (a.s.) was certain that due to ancestral enmity, Yazeed will destroy Bani Hashim whether he was given allegiance or not. This was the reason why he decided to start a revolution against Bani Umayyah. From the time Yazeed became the successor of Muawiyah, Imam Husayn (a.s.) considered it obligatory for himself to deny his obedience. He did not even conceal his opposition from anyone. And on the same basis, Yazeed was in pursuit to extract allegiance from him and to make him subservient. Imam Husayn (a.s.) moved towards martyrdom and established a superb example of revolution.”

Anyone who is aware of the historical realities of that time and the kind of carnage unleashed by Bani Umayyah and the way they had started distorting the religion of Muhammad (S) would indeed confess that if Imam Husayn (a.s.) had not laid down his life at Karbala’, the Muslim Ummah would have had quite a different Islam than what they are having now. It was the initial period of Islam and hence it was possible that its rituals and rules would have been destroyed completely. Imam Husayn (a.s.) had seen the character of Bani Umayyah during the Caliphate of his father, Ali (a.s.) and his brother Imam Hasan (a.s.), that is why immediately after Yazeed came to the throne, Imam Husayn (a.s.) traveled from Medina so that he may propagate true Islam in major Muslim areas. Wherever he went, people developed hatred towards Bani Umayyah.

Yazeed was also not unaware of these subtle factors. He knew that even if Imam Husayn (a.s.) got the

support of people at any minor town and raised the standard or revolt due to the hatred of people towards Bani Umayyah and their love for Imam Husayn (a.s.), he would gain influence over all the kingdom of Islam and Bani Umayyah will be annihilated; that is why immediately after assuming the throne, Yazeed made a firm intention to kill Imam Husayn (a.s.). This was the only cause due to which Bani Umayyah contributed to their own eradication from the face of the earth.

The greatest proof that Imam Husayn (a.s.) willingly moved to martyrdom is that he was well aware of the military prowess of Bani Umayyah since the time of his father and brother. He was certain that he would be martyred and this was often stated after the martyrdom of his father. This proves that he had no ambition for rulership. He had time and again reiterated since he left Medina that he would certainly be killed. If it had not been a willing step, he would not have rushed to it, knowing fully well the military prowess of Bani Umayyah.

He also stated this to the people who had accompanied him, so that if any among them were after material benefits, they may leave his side. If Husayn (a.s.) had desired to save his life, he would have tried his best to collect an army. But instead of mobilizing forces, he was constantly beseeching his companions to leave him if they wanted to live. Knowing that it was the first step towards a revolution, Imam Husayn (a.s.) let himself be martyred in the most pitiful manner, so that people may be more affected by his sorrowful plight.

Obviously, if Imam Husayn (a.s.) had exploited the devotion that the people had towards him, he would have succeeded in raising a huge army. But if he were killed in those circumstances, it would have been said that he died for greed of wealth and rulership and the oppressed position that heralded the magnificent revolution would not have been achieved. Thus, except for whom it was impossible to leave; that is the sons, brothers, and nephews; he told them to leave him, but they did not agree. They were also such people whose piety and honor was much valued by the Muslims. Their martyrdom with Imam Husayn (a.s.) lent more effectiveness to the tragedy.

On the basis of his knowledge and diplomacy, and on the basis of the animosity of Bani Umayyah towards Bani Hashim, be left no stone unturned to highlight all this. Imam (a.s.) knew that after his martyrdom, the women and children of Bani Hashim, who were Muhammad's Progeny would be made prisoners and would be taken from one place to another. This incident would spread in the Arab world and have such an effect as cannot be imagined. Thus, the way the prisoners were taken around, was in no way less cruel than being killed. Similarly, it created the same effect on Muslims as the martyrdom of Imam Husayn (a.s.) had.

In these incidents, the enmity of Bani Umayyah to the Prophet's family and their beliefs regarding Islam and their treatment of Muslims has been clearly brought out. This was the reason that Imam Husayn (a.s.) used to clearly tell those of his friends who restrained him from this journey that he was going for being killed. It was because their thoughts were limited and they had no idea of Imam Husayn's aim, which is why they used to restrain him. The last reply of which was that he was going because it was the

Will of Allah and his grandfather had ordered him to take the step. The people used to say that since he was going to be killed, he should not take women and children with him. On this Husayn (a.s.) used to reply that it was the Will of Allah that his family should be made prisoners.

The words of Imam Husayn (a.s.) were unique from the aspect of spirituality and apparently he did not take these steps to obtain rulership or power. And he also did not step into this great danger without being aware of consequences. The proof is that a year before this tragedy, he used to tell his close confidants who had an enlightened heart and perfect reason to comfort them that after his martyrdom, the Almighty Allah would prepare a group who would separate truth from falsehood. And who would visit their graves and weep on their tribulations and destroy the enemies of Muhammad's Progeny. These people would follow the religion of his grandfather. He and his father would love them and on Judgment Day, they shall be raised with Muhammad's Progeny.

O readers! What should be done! It is surprising that a scholar of non-Muslims is relating the incident of Karbala' in such a way that informs of the great status of the martyrdom of Imam Husayn (a.s.) while a Maulana of Delhi in spite of his claim for being a Muslim, lays false allegations on Imam Husayn (a.s.) that are not possible in any respectable people. No one can say that the Maulana was insane, but it is certain that his blind greed for worldly status had deprived him from the wealth of the love for Muhammad's Progeny.

1. Ummahatul Aimma, Pg. 33, line 7.
