



Relationship Between Hazrat Ali and Mawiyah Ibn Abu Sufyan

Rahkmatov Abbas

Assistant of the Department of "Social Sciences and Sports"
Fergana Polytechnic Institute
e-mail: abbosraxmatov75@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This article talks about the relationship between Ali ibn Abu Talib and Muawiya ibn Abu Sufyan in the early days of the Arab caliphate, and tried to provide objective opinions and conclusions by focusing on the complex political situation between these two companions. This period is one of the most turbulent periods in the history of Islam. Some historians call it even the smallest civil war in the history of Islam. Actually, if we look at this period, we can see that there were some disagreements between Ali ibn Abu Talib and Muawiya I, and they found their solution over time.

Keywords:

Ali ibn Abu Talib, Muawiyah ibn Abu Sufyan, Jamal, Siffin, ibn Hazim

Mu'awiyah was governor of Syria during the caliphate of Umar and Uthman. When Ali, may God be pleased with him, became caliph, he decided to remove him from his position. It seems that Ali, may God be pleased with him, was pressured by the rebels to fire Muawiya, because they knew Muawiya well. The reason for saying this is that before Ali became caliph, he had good relations with Muawiya. In addition, the rebels later put pressure on Ali and succeeded in removing Qays ibn Sa'd from the governorship of Egypt, and after that the situation in Egypt changed for the worse.

Instead of Amirul Momineen Ali ibn Abu Talib, may Allah be pleased with him, Muawiya may be pleased with him, he chose Abdullah ibn Umar, may God be pleased with him, to be the governor of Sham. However, Abdullah ibn Umar excused himself and did not accept this task and asked the caliph not to send him to Syria out of respect for the relationship between them. Amirul Momineen Ali accepted his request not

to send him to Sham. It is said in some narrations that Ali Abdullah bin Umar did not accept the governorship, gave him allegiance, and gave him severe insults and gave him a fight because he did not accept the governorship¹. In fact, the conversation that took place between them was as described in the following narration. Imam Zahabi, on the authority of Sufyan ibn Uyaina, who is the son of Nofa, and he is the father of Ibn Umar, says: Ali called me and said: "O Abu Abdurrahman, you are the one who has earned the respect of the people of Syria. Go, I have made you their commander." I said to him: "I am asking you in the name of Allah, my closeness to the Prophet, may God bless him and grant him peace, and my companionship, release me from this work." He did not get tired. I put Hafsa in the middle, but she still didn't get tired. After that I left for Makkah at night². This is a strong proof that Ibn Umar pledged allegiance to Ali and obeyed him. Otherwise, how can a caliph appoint someone

¹ "Istishodu Uthman wa waq'atul Jamal" - Cairo, 1999, p. Page 160.

² "Siyaru a'lomin nubalo" – Cairo, 1999, page. 3/224-bet.

who has not pledged allegiance to him as a governor?! Ibn Abdulbar mentions in "Istiy'ab" that before the death of Ibn Umar, he said: "I do not regret anything except that I did not fight with Ali, may God be pleased with him, against the related group."³. This is also a proof that he recognized Ali as caliph and pledged allegiance to him. Because he regretted that he did not go to war with Ali, because he, like several other companions, was excluded from the conspiracy and did not go to battle with any side. If Ibn Umar had refused to pledge allegiance to Ali, he would have regretted it more and said so openly. Because pledging allegiance to the caliph and joining the ranks of the Muslim community was considered obligatory, and the one who refrained from it was threatened with punishment. In the following hadith narrated by Ibn Umar himself, the Messenger of Allah, may God bless him and grant him peace, said: "Whoever dies without the pledge of allegiance, dies the death of ignorance." The sentence of not going to war with Ali was much lighter than this, and there was a disagreement among the Companions about it, and some of the Companions abstained from it. Therefore, if Ibn Umar did not pledge allegiance to Ali, how can he regret not going to war with him and not regret abandoning the pledge?! With this, the statement of some historians that Ibn Umar did not pledge allegiance to Ali is unfounded. On the contrary, it is certain that he not only pledged allegiance to Ali, but also was one of the people close to him, who gained his trust due to their impartiality and true friendship, whom he considered worthy of the position of governor and relied on his help. So, when Ibn Umar refused to accept the governorship of Sham, Ali, may God bless him and grant him peace, sent Suhayl ibn Hanif as the governor instead. However, when he approached Sham, Muawiya's horsemen blocked his way and sent him back, saying: "If Uthman sent you, welcome, but if someone else sent you, go back." After all, the land of Sham was boiling with anger because of the cruel and aggressive execution of Uthman.

The disagreements of the Companions about the way to take revenge on the killers of Uthman

The cause and center of the caliphate, which arose between Amir al-Mu'minin Ali, may God be pleased with him, on the one hand, and Talha, Zubayr, and Aisha, may God be pleased with him, may be on the other hand, and then moved between Ali and Mu'awiya, is the fact that they do not recognize the caliphate and imamate of Amir al-Mu'minin Ali, may God be pleased with him, and deny that he is worthy of the caliphate and leadership of Muslims. It was not, everyone already unanimously recognized Ali's caliphate.

Ibn Hazm says: "Mu'awiya never denied Ali's virtue and his right to the caliphate, but his ijtihad led him to the opinion that revenge against the murderers of Uthman should come before the pledge of allegiance and to see himself as entitled to demand Uthman's revenge." The source of disagreement was not the non-recognition of the caliphate of Amir al-Mu'minin Ali, may God be pleased with him. Perhaps the conflict in the middle was about taking revenge on Osman's killers. The difference was not in the essence of the problem, but in its solution. Because Amir al-Mu'minin Ali, may God be pleased with him, agreed with others in the opinion that revenge should be taken against the killers of Uthman, may God be pleased with him. The only difference in his opinion was to postpone taking revenge on them until the situation was stable and things calmed down and an alliance was formed, and this was the right idea.

Imam Nawawi says: "Know that the reason for these wars was the entanglement of the problem." Due to the complexity of the situation, their ijtihads differed and they were divided into three groups: according to the ijtihads of the people belonging to the first group, the truth was on the side of Ali, may Allah be pleased with him, and those who disagreed with him were dependent. According to their beliefs, it was obligatory to help the caliph and fight against those who depended on him, and they did so. It was not permissible for people of

³ "Tahzib tarixi dimashq" – Cairo, 1999, page. 4/39-bet.

this quality not to help the just imam in the war against the bogeys. The second part is the complete opposite of this, and according to their ijihad, it became clear to them that the right was on the other side, and it was obligatory for them to help them. For the third part, the issue remained unclear, they could not come to a clear opinion and decision about it. Since it was not clear which of the two sides was right, they were excluded from both sides. It was obligatory for them to do so, because it was not halal to go to war against a Muslim until it was clear that he was worthy of it. If it was clear to them that one of the two parties was right, it would not be permissible for them to refrain from helping the owner of the right against the gardener.

References:

1. Ibn Abi Shayba, "Musannaf"
2. "Istishhodu Usman and Waq'atul Jamal"
3. "Sharhi Nawawi ala Sahihi Muslim"
4. Islamov Z. Codicological Analysis of Manuscripts of "Mukaddamatu-l-Adab" of Mahmud Zamakhshari in the Funds of the World //The Light of Islam. – 2020. – T. 2020. – №. 2. – C. 30-36.
5. Islomov Z. International Islamic Academy of Uzbekistan—a result of the reforms worth to the centuries //The Light of Islam. – 2018. – T. 1. – №. 1.
6. Islomov Z. The role of the international Islamic academy of Uzbekistan in the development of Islamic studies //The Light of Islam. – 2019. – T. 2019. – №. 1. – C. 1.
7. Islomov Z. Source studies analysis of manuscripts of "muqaddimatu-ladab" in foreign archival funds //The Light of Islam. – 2019. – T. 2019. – №. 4. – C. 41.
8. Islamov Z. et al. WRITING DOWN OF HADITHS IN THE VII-VIII CENTURIES: APPROACHES AND METHODS //PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION. – 2021. – T. 58. – №. 1. – C. 5536-5545.
9. Maxsudov D. Развитие исламоведения (корановедения) в Узбекистане: история и современность //Вестник КазНУ, Серия Религиоведение. – 2020. – T. 21. – №. 1. – C. 60-67.
10. Maxsudov D. Razvitie islamovedenija (koranovedenija) v Uzbekistane: istorija i sovremennost' //Chabarşy. Dintanu serijasy. – 2020. – T. 21. – №. 1. – C. 60-67.
11. Maxsudov D. The development of transmitted and rational tafsirs //The Light of Islam. – 2019. – T. 2019. – №. 1. – C. 9.
12. Makhsudov D. Muslim world scientists of the temurids period //The Light of Islam. – 2019. – T. 2019. – №. 3. – C. 4.
13. Makhsudov D. Manuscripts of abul barakat al-nasafi's works on furu'Al-Fiqh //Asian Journal of Multidimensional Research. – 2023. – T. 12. – №. 1. – C. 31-34.
14. Mahsudov D. IX-XV асрларда Мовароуннаҳрда ёзилган тафсирларнинг хусусиятлари //Молодой ученый. – 2020. – №. 14. – C. 311-314.
15. Makhsudov D. R. Mufassirs of Mawarannahr //ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science, 12 (80). – 2019. – C. 539-543.
16. Makhsudov D. R. МУФАССИРЫ МАВЕРАННАХРА В СРЕДНИХ ВЕКАХ //Theoretical & Applied Science. – 2019. – №. 12. – C. 539-543.
17. Makhsudov D. A GENIUS OF THE WORLD //Theoretical & Applied Science. – 2019. – №. 5. – C. 544-548.
18. Ugli A. Z. Z. THE PLACE OF ALIKHANTORA SOGUNIY IN THE HISTORY OF EAST TURKESTAN //Colloquium-journal. – Голопристанський міськрайонний центр зайнятості, 2020. – №. 24 (76). – C. 32-33.
19. Arslonov Z., Ergashev H. ALIKHANTORA SOGUNIY'S VIEWS ON POLITICAL GOVERNANCE IN EAST TURKESTAN //Студенческий вестник. – 2020. – №. 32-2. – C. 84-85.
20. Zokirjonugli Z. A. Approaches to studying the scientific heritage of Alikhantora Soguni //Asian Journal of

Multidimensional Research. – 2022. – Т.

1

21. Zokirjonugli Z. A. APPROACHES TO STUDYING THE SCIENTIFIC HERITAGE OF ALIKHANTORA SOGUNI.
22. Arslonov Z. Z. THE PLACE OF ALIKHANTORA SOGUNIY IN THE HISTORY OF EAST TURKESTAN //Colloquium-journal. – Голопристанський міськрайонний центр зайнятості= Голопристанский районный центр занятости, 2020. – №. 24-2. – С. 9-11.