Chapter-I

Nomination of Yazid
Few histories of the period from Hazrat Uthman’s (RA) Khilafah (24-36AH/644-656AD) to the death of Yazid successor of Hazrat Muawiyah (RA) and the second Umayyad Khalifah (60-63 AH/680-683AD), have been written by Muslim writers with complete objectivity. Due to the political differences between Hazrat Muawiyah (RA) and Hazrat Ali (RA) over the issue of the qisas (punishment of the assassins) of the third Khalifah of Islam and eventually the political conflict between Hazrat Husain and the second Khalifah of the Umayyads, a saga of Hashimite — Umayyads tribal rivalry was fabricated and personal and political differences of two individuals were converted into deep-rooted prejudices of the later Pro-Hashimite writers especially the Sunni traditionalists and Shiah reporters. Consequently, the historical writings were coloured by fancy, legend, exaggeration and imagination.

There are, however, certain writers and a large number of reports that stand out as indisputable. First, the Khalifah’s appointment i.e., succession to the political office of the Prophet Muhammad (SAW) had different modes and methods adopted by the notables of the capital city of Islam in conformity to the dictates of time and occasion. On the other hand the Quran had not laid down any rule of the appointment of a successor to the Prophet Muhammad (SAW); neither the Prophet Muhammad
(SAW) had appointed any one to discharge the functions of Government which, due to the establishment of the new state, had become necessary by the complete subjugation of a vast country like Arabia.

**Urdu scholars in support of the nomination**

The first Khalifah of Islam, Hazrat Abu Bakr (11-13 AH/632-634AD) was proclaimed Khalifah by the majority opinion of a number of notables of Madinah assembled at the Sajifah of Banu Saidah – a public gathering place of a family of Ansar, namely, Banu Saidah and Khazraj tribe.\(^1\) Hazrat Abu Bakr (RA) appointed Hazrat Umar (13-25AH/634-644AD) as his successor in the presence of the companions of the Prophet Muhammad (SAW). They considered this appointment permissible and also felt by it to render obedience to Hazrat Umar (RA). Likewise, Hazrat Umar (RA) appointed six persons, the remnant of the *Asharah Mubashsharah* (The ten companions declared by the Prophet as the people of paradise during their lifetime), to be members of an electoral council (*Shura*); in fact it was a council of candidates as well as electors. By a device that emerged later as a way of consensus of the notables Hazrat Uthman (RA) was declared as the third Khalifah of the Prophet and unanimously accepted by the *Ummah*.\(^2\) Hazrat Ali (36-41AH/656-661AD) had been proclaimed as Khalifah by a section of the notables gathered in the Mosque at
Madinah. The election of Hazrat Ali (RA), though carried out under compulsion of the people, resembled somewhat the popular election of the first Khalifah. It should be noted that all these appointments took place in Madinah, which was the seat of the Khilafah. From the time of Hazrat Ali election of the succeeding Khalifah was associated with and followed by controversy and conflict, while the seat of government had been transferred by Hazrat Ali from Madinah to Kufah and then to Damascus by Hazrat Muawiyah (41-60/661-679), who, interestingly enough, was elected by his supporters at Jerusalem, while Hazrat Hasan was declared Khalifah by the supporters of his father at Kufah; this lead to appointment and existence of two Khulafa at one time at two different places. However, the political dichotomy was solved by the abdication of Hazrat Hasan (RA) in favour of Muawiyah after six months and the Syrian governor was eventually recognised as the universal Khalifah of Islam, setting up a new mode of election.

Ibn Khaldun (732-808 AH/1332-1406AD), the great historian in his *Muqaddimah* writes,

"(The Caliph) is the guardian and trustee of (the Muslims). He looks after their (affairs) as long as he lives. It follows that he should also look after their (affairs) after his death, and, therefore, should appoint someone to take charge of their affairs as he
had done (while alive), whom they can trust to look after them as they had trusted him then.

(Such appointment of successor) is recognised as part of the religious law through the consensus of the (Muslim) nation, (which says) that it is permissible and binding when it occurs. A great number of the men around Muhammad were present on the first and on the second (occasion). That is, when the appointments of Umar and of Uthman were decided. None of them expressed the slightest disapproval. This shows that they were agreed upon the correctness of the procedure and recognised its legality. It is recognised that consensus constitutes proof.

No suspicion of the Imam is justified in this connection, even if he appoints his father or his son his successor. He is trusted to look after the affairs of the Muslims as long as he lives. He is all the more responsible for not tolerating while he is (alive the possibility that there might arise evil) developments after his death. This is against those who say that the Imam is suspect with regard to (the appointment of) his son or father, and also against those who consider him suspect with regard to (appointment of) his son only, not his father. In fact, he could hardly be suspected in this respect in any way. Especially if there exists some reason for (the appointment of a successor), such as desire to promote the (public) interest or fear that some harm might arise (if no successor were appointed), suspicion of the Imam is out of the question.
This, for instance, was the case with Muawiyah’s appointment of his son Yazid. This action met with agreement of the people, and, therefore, is in itself an argument for the problem under discussion (namely, that the Imam is not suspect with regard to whomever he might appoint). But Muawiyah himself preferred his son Yazid to any successor, because he was concerned with the (public) interest of preserving unity and harmony among the people, (and realized that he could achieve this purpose only by appointing Yazid), since the men who possessed executive authority, that is, the Umayyads, agreed at that time upon Yazid. The Umayyads were then agreeable to no one except (Yazid). The Umayyads constituted the core (group) of the Quraysh and of all the Muslims, and possessed superiority (Muawiyah), therefore, preferred (Yazid) to any one else who might have been considered more suited for the Caliphate. He passed over the superior person in favor of the inferior one, because he desired to preserve agreement and harmony, which is the more important thing in the opinion of the Lawgiver (Muhammad). No other motive could be expected of Muawiyah. His probity and the fact that he was one of the men around Muhammad preclude any other explanation. The presence of the men around Muhammad on the occasion and their silence are the best argument against doubt in this matter”.

However, all the reports of the original sources and the analytical studies made on their basis by the Muslim political
scientists, thinkers and historians, agree that different modes for the election of the first five or six Khulafa of Islam were followed and all have been declared quite legitimate and in consonance with the Islamic teachings.

According to Ibn Kathîr (701-774/1301-1373), Hazrat Muawiyah, like Hazrat Umar (RA) the great, planned to nominate an electoral council to decide the issue of succession to the office of the Khilafah. The proposed panel consisted of Hazrat Said bin al-Äs, Hazrat Abdullah bin Amir, Hazrat Marwan, Hazrat Abdullah bin Umar and Hazrat Abdullah bin Zubair. But it could eventually not materialize; and Hazrat Muawiyah thought it more proper to appoint or nominate Yazid, because the people of Syria and other powerful sections insisted that only Yazid should be chosen.

Hazrat Muawiyah consulted all the people of the Islamic world including Sahabah and other notables of the provinces. As several historians suggest that Yazid’s nomination as a heir – apparent was done on such a wide and universal scale that no similar nomination is recorded in history.

Several Urdu writers also hold that Hazrat Muawiyah consulted all the people of Islamic world and nominated Yazid as his successor only after their concurrence. Mir Mahmud Ali Qaisar writes that Yazid was nominated with the consent of the whole Ummah. He argues that the decision in this regard was taken in the
most peaceful time of the Khilafah with the consent of the respected Companions of the Prophet Muhammad (SAW).⁸ According to Atiqur Rahman Sambhali Hazrat Muawiyah was not favouring Yazid’s nomination because he was his son but he considered him the most suitable person to be assigned as his successor.⁹ Other scholars like Mahmud Ahmad Abbasi, Muhammad Yasin Mazhar Siddiqui, Ali Ahmad Banarsi, Hafiz Salahuddin Yousuf and Murtaza Ahmad Khan hold that all the notables of Islamic world accepted the nomination of Yazid as Muawiyah’s successor. In addition to this, Abbasi writes that it were Iraqis who suggested Muawiyah to appoint his son Yazid as his successor.¹⁰ This is supported by another scholar Muhammad Ishaq Siddiqui Nadvi who also holds that the Kufans favoured Yazid as Muawiyah’s successor. He argues that Yazid’s nomination was suggested with the collective opinion of *ahl-i-Sunnah wa al-Jamat* that is the core of notables of the *Ummah*.¹¹ An eminent Muslim theologian and scholar Maulana Mufti Muhammad Taqi Usmani has dealt with the issue of the nomination of Yazid by Muawiyah. He has discussed the views and opinions of great Islamic scholars like Shah Waliullah Dehlavi, Mawardi, Abi Yala al-Farra Hambali, Ibn Khaldun, Tabari, Ibn-i-Qutaibah Dinavari, Ibn Kathîr, al-Dhahabi, Suyuti, al-Baladhuri, Qazi Ibn al-Arabi, Ibn al-Hamam and Ibn Taimiyah
and came to the conclusion that the nomination of Yazid by the ruling Khalifah Muawiyah was done in quite conformity of the Islamic law as well as political sagacity; it was done in fact in the best interests of the Islamic *Ummah* and no ulterior motive can be ascribed to Hazrat Muawiyah. The best proof of the legitimacy of the nomination of Yazid is found in the consensus of the Sahabah and other notables of the *Ummah*.

However, difference of opinion on the issue of the nomination of Yazid is found among some early scholars also. The scholars like Tabari, Ibn Kathîr, Al-Dhahabi, and Jalaluddin Suyuti are unanimous over the fact that Muawiyah prayed regarding the appointment of his son Yazid. In this regard Jalaluddin Suyuti on the authority of Atiah b. Kays says that Hazrat Muawiyah prayed and said:

"O Lord, if I have surely made a covenant for Yazid on account of the merit I saw in him, then cause him to arrive at that which I have hoped, and assist him, but if it was indeed the love of the father for his son that hath influenced me, and if he be not deserving of that which I have done for him, then take him away before he arriveth at it."

**Urdu scholars who criticize the nomination**

**Hereditary Succession**

Many Urdu scholars like their medieval predecessors have criticized the nomination of Yazid and ascribed immoral and
ulterior motives to Hazrat Muawiyah; they very clearly suggest that Muawiyah was led and carried away by his desire to perpetuate the rule in his family and whatever he did in this regard was to bring about a dynastic rule which is quite alien to Islamic Shariah. This thesis has been mainly discussed and advocated by Maulana Abul Ala Maududi in his book *Khilafat-o-Mulukiat*. Many other scholars like Ghulam Rasul Mohr, Sarwat Saulat, Abdul Wahīd Khan, Shah Moinuddin Nadvi, Qazi Zainul Abidīn and Taha Hasain have also taken up the idea and elaborated on the same lines.¹⁴

There is another set of scholars who opine that the nomination of Yazid by Muawiyah heralded a hereditary monarchy in Islam. They hold the view that Muawiyah was the first to establish the hereditary principle of succession. Sayyid Abu Bakar Ghaznavi writes that Muawiyah was the first to establish the hereditary principle.¹⁵ Several other scholars like Taha Husain, Muhammad Abdur Rahman Sayyid Siddiqui, Sayyid Mahmudun Nasir and Ghulam Rasul Mohr hold that the nomination of Yazid was certainly a deviation from the principle followed by the pious Khalifahs. They argue that the system of leadership among the Arabs even before Islam was never hereditary. This was opposed to the old Arab conception and new Islamic ideals.¹⁶ The scholars Shah Moinuddin Nadvi and Muhammad Abdur Rahman Sayyid
Siddiqui hold that the nomination of Yazid by Muawiyah left untouched the rule that homage must be paid at the moment of succession. In this way Muawiyah achieved a compromise. Theoretically, the will of electors was respected, since it was admitted that they could reject the heir appointment by the reigning sovereign, but in reality it implied the abolition of the elective system, which had been the cause of so much trouble in the past, and in this way introduced hereditary succession.  

These scholars hold that the dynastic principle was introduced into Islam and the Arabs were henceforth governed after the fashion of the Greeks and Romans, where one Heraclius was followed by another. This is the general view presented by the traditional scholars.

But the fact is otherwise. Historical facts establish beyond doubt that hereditary succession always followed in the political succession of all the posts of the Mala of Quraish, the senate of the Quraysh of Makkah in the Pre-Islamic period and in other political and tribal institutions, as has been critically examined by Sayyid Sulaiman Nadvi in his seventh volume of the *Sirat-un-Nabi*.

Nomination of Yazid as described by various scholars was a deviation or departure from previous practice. They named it an innovation as well as the institution of Byzantine practice. In this
regard the scholars Abdul Wahid Khan, Amir Ali, Sarwat Saulat and Abu Bakar Ghaznavi argue that Muawiyah's innovation implied the abolition of the elective system and was followed by all the Khulafa who succeeded him. This innovation enabled the Umayyads to retain power for ninety years, and the Abbasids for five centuries. According to William Muir, "swayed by the desire of maintaining the Caliphate in his own line Muawiyah entertained the project of declaring his son Yazid, to be his heir apparent." The scholars like Sayyid Abul Ala Maududi and Sarwat Saulat maintain that Muawiyah had already decided to found a dynasty, with his son Yazid as his successor. They hold that Muawiyah was willing to nominate Yazid as successor because of the love of father. According to Shauk Amritsari, Hamiduddin, and Muhammad Abdul Hakim, Muawiyah insisted that the Muslims recognize his son as his successor. They hold that Muawiyah was desirous of maintaining the Khilafah in his own line.

Role of Mughirah bin Shubah

Opposition

There are different reports regarding the role of Mughirah bin Shubah in the nomination of Yazid as Muawiyah's successor. Some scholars opposed his role in the nomination of Yazid. According to Maududi, Muawiyah had planned to depose Mughirah
bin Shubah from Governorship. In order to retain his post safe Mughirah, immediately left Kufah for Damascus to meet Yazid. He said to Yazid “eminent Companions of the Prophet (SAW) and the notables of Quraish have passed away then why Amīrul Mūminīn is causing delay in taking oath of allegiance in your favour”. Yazid brought it to the notice of Muawiyah. Maududi further writes that in the beginning Amīr Muawiyah wanted only that the problem of his succession should be solved in his lifetime. At the time he had no idea that Yazid should be his successor. But it was Mughirah bin Shubah who suggested to the Amīr Yazid’s name, and the Amīr liked it. Mughirah also suggested this to Yazid. Thus Mughirah and Yazid both encouraged the Amīr to go forward. He argues that Muawiyah thought that absence of any definite rule of succession to the Khilafah was likely to plunge the country into a confused civil war at the death of every Khalifah. But this was not the sole reason but it was his desire to maintain the Khilafah in his own line.23 Sayyid Abu Bakar Ghaznavi says that it was Mughirah who suggested Muawiyah to nominate his son Yazid as his successor. Muawiyah should have rejected the plan of Mughirah and followed the path of Hazrat Umar.24 Sayyid Amīr Ali claims that under the instigation of Mughirah, Muawiyah conceived the design of nominating his son Yazid as his successor to the throne. He argues that this was direct breach of his covenant with Hazrat
Hasan i.e., Hasan agreed to abdicate his Khilafah in favour of Muawiyah on the condition that after his death his younger brother Husain would be the Khalifah. Accordingly, on Muawiyah's death, Yazid ascended the throne according to his father's testament. The accession of Yazid gave the death stroke to the republican principle that "The commander of the faithful should be elected by the plebiscite of the people, a principle to which the Arabs were so devoted, and which had led them to ignore the right of the Prophet's family to the spiritual and temporal headship of the Ummah. Henceforth the ruling sovereign nominated his successor, whose reversion he endeavored to assure during his life time by the oath of fealty of his soldiers and grandees.\textsuperscript{25} Abdul Wahid Khan on the authority of Jalaluddin Suyuti quotes Hasan Basri who says, "Two men threw into confusion the affairs of the Muslims; Amr, the son of al-Ás, when he suggested to Muawiyah the lifting of the copies of the Holy Quran on the lances, and it was so uplifted, and Mughirah, who advised Muawiyah to take the covenant of allegiance for Yazid. Were it not for that, there would have been a council of election till the day of resurrection, for those who succeeded Muawiyah followed his example in taking the covenant for their sons".\textsuperscript{26} Sayyid Amír Ali in his \textit{Mukamal Tarikh Islam} also quotes the above statement of Hasan Basri.\textsuperscript{27}
Lifting of the copies of the Holy Quran on the lances was, interestingly enough, done or introduced by Hazrat Ali during the battle of camel as a tradition of Tabari suggests.\(^2\)

However, the historians Tabari and Ibn Athir hold that it was Mughirah bin Shubah who for his personal interests instigated Muawiyah to nominate Yazid as his successor. They also argue that in order to retain his post safe, Mughirah suggested this plan to Muawiyah.\(^3\)

**Acknowledgement**

On the other hand scholars like Asrar Ahmad, Maulana Aslam Jairajpuri, Qazi Zainul Abidin, Zafar Ahmad Sialkoti, and Shah Moinuddin Nadvi hold that Mughirah bin Shubah was a pious and one of the notable companions of the Prophet Muhammad (SAW). They are unanimous upon the fact that Mughirah came to Damascus and said to Amīr Muawiyah,

"I am the eye witness to Hazrat Uthman’s Martyrdom in Madinah and the whole scenario gets repeated in me, that what sort of conflicts took place among Muslims regarding Khilafat. So I consider it necessary that you should nominate Yazid as successor. It will be in the interest of Muslims. Amīr Muawiyah had no idea that Yazid should be his successor. After hearing Mughirah’s suggestion he first time got his attention diverted towards the issue".\(^4\)
Ali Ahmad Banarsi and Hamiduddin hold that Mughirah, special advisor of Muawiyah, suggested him to nominate his son Yazid as his successor. He also suggested him to take oath of allegiance from the *Ummah* so that after his death the issue of succession may not become a matter of conflict and the *Ummah* may be saved from any bloodshed thereof.\(^{31}\)

Atiqur Rahman Sambhali on the authority of Ibn Kathîr asserts that the allegations charged by some historians like Tabari and Ibn Athîr against Mughirah bin Shubah is baseless. He argues that Mughirah was the distinguished Companion of the Prophet Muhammad (SAW) and was known by his piety and probity.\(^{32}\)

The scholars like Atiqur Rahman Sambhali, Muhammad Ishaq Siddiqui Nadvi, Muhammad Yasin Mazhar Siddiqui, and Hamiduddin, hold that Yazid was forthwith acknowledged as Khalifah in Syria, Mesopotamia, Egypt, Hijaz and Persia and all other Muslim countries. According to these scholars except five persons in Makkah and Madinah all took oath of allegiance to Yazid. These five persons were, Abdullah bin Umar Advi, Abdur Rahman bin Abi Bakr Tamimi, Abdullah bin Abbas Hashmi, Abdullah bin Zubair Asadi, and Husain bin Ali Hashmi (RA).\(^{33}\) Several other scholars like Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Sarwat Saulat, Ghulam Rasul Mohr and Shah Moinuddin Nadvi also hold that except above mentioned five persons all took oath of
allegiance to Yazid as Muawiya’s successor. The scholars like Muhammad Abdul Hakim, Shauk Amritsari, Abdul Qayoom Nadvi, Sayyid Amīr Ali, Chirag Hasan Hasrat, Maulana Aslam Jairajpuri and Taha Husain hold that four persons opposed among whom, the two Abdullah bin Abbas and Abdullah bin Umar paid homage while the other two Abdullah bin Zubair and Husain bin Ali escaped from the place to avoid taking pledge to Yazid. According to Sa‘eedur Rahman Alavi only two persons, Abdullah bin Zubair and Husain bin Ali opposed the succession of Yazid and they disputed the Khilafah with him to their death. The earlier scholars like Tabari, Ibn Kathir, and Ibn Khaldun maintain that all except five persons paid oath of allegiance to Yazid.

However, all the scholars hold that the nomination of Yazid was initially opposed by five or four persons and eventually only two persons Husain and Abdullah bin Zubair never acknowledged Yazid as Muawiyah’s successor.

**Character of Yazid**

There are, however, different reports regarding the character of Yazid. A group of scholars leveled several allegations against him, declaring him not fit for Khilafah, while another set of scholars hold that he was a decent man and quite fit for Khilafah by arguing that he was a learned and pious man.
Yazid fit for the Khilafah

An analytical study of the conflicting reports will give us an insight into the matter. Zafar Ahmad Sialkoti claims that Yazid possessed various noble qualities which a Khalifah should have as a guardian and trustee of the people, to look after the affairs of the people, and so on. The scholars like Aslam Jairajpuri, Shah Moinuddin Nadvi, Mahmud Ahmad Abbasi, Asrar Ahmad, Arshad Amanullah and Atiqur Rahman Sambhali hold that Yazid gave up his pursuit of the chase, and took interest in public affairs and qualified himself to hold such an office of responsibility. They argue that Yazid was a learned and pious and had proved his mettle as a general in the wars fought against the Byzantines.

Mir Mahmud Ali Qaisar quotes P.K. Hitti who called Yazid as fata al-Arab (the hero of the Arabs). Ali Ahmad Banarsi quotes Abdullah bin Abbas who says that Yazid was such a great orator who was given the title al-Khatib al-Ashdaq. He took part in Jihad against Kuffars many times and destroyed them. By dint of his utmost bravery and fighting potential he received the title fata al-Arab. According to S.M. Imaduddin, Yazid was a poet and patron of learning and his sons distinguished themselves in science and arts. Khalid bin Yazid collected books on Syrian and Greek sciences, and started a bureau among the Muslims. The scholars like Mahmud Ahmad Abbasi, Hafiz Salahuddin Yousuf,
Muhammad Ishaq Siddiqui Nadvi, Muhammad Yasin Mazhar Siddiqui and Ali Ahmad Banarsi hold that Yazid was pious and generous who lived a simple life. According to these scholars outside conquests are also recorded during the reign of Yazid. Among them several conquests took place in Turkistan and in North Africa.

Ali Ahmad Banarsi on the authority of Ibn Kathīr who quoting Muhammad bin al-Hanafiya, Husain's brother, says, "I went to Yazid, stayed with him and observed that he was bound to prayers and was active in good deeds. He discussed issues and followed the Sunnah of Prophet (SAW) with great obedience".

According to Mir Mahmud Ali Qaisar and Muhammad Ishaq Siddiqui Nadvi, Yazid was God-fearing, pious, virtuous and cultured. They argue that those who called him Fasiq and Fajir (Sinful and debauch), they actually blame the three hundred Sahabah, thousands of Tabiun and other pious Muslims who supported his nomination. These scholars on the basis of reports they cited declared Yazid fit for Khilafah. Ibn Kathīr observes that Yazid was generous and eloquent, a skilled poet, brave and courageous and an expert in administrative affairs. It is clearly mentioned in the Encyclopedia of Islam that Amīr Yazid was excessively generous and spent thousands of Dinars in granting pensions. He was wise, devoid of pride and hated the pompous life
of a ruler, a friend of the subjects and lived in the company of pious men like Abu Darda. It is stated that he was cultured and generous. Imam ibn Hambal has included his name in the list of pious men and an eminent religious teacher and philosopher. Imam Ghazali certified him as a true Muslim. Baladhuri quotes Hazrat Ibn Abbas saying that Yazid was known for his piety.

**Yazid not fit for the Khilafah**

There is another set of scholars who declare that Yazid was not fit for Khilafah. Maulana Maududi says that Yazid was unworthy to be Khalifah of Islam. He holds that he was a dissipated monarch. Sayyid Amīr Ali claims that Yazid was both cruel and treacherous; his depraved nature knew no pity or justice. His pleasures were as degrading, as his companions were low and vicious. Several other scholars like Akbar Shah Khan Najibabadi, A.A. Hashmi, Abdullah Quraishi, Murtaza Ahmad Khan, Taha Husain, Rashīd Akhtar Nadvi, Shauk Amritsari, Sarwat Saulat and Muhammad Abdul Hakim are unanimous that Yazid was a man of cruel nature. He was a drunkard and debauch and it is said that he used to go out of his way to violate the principles of Islam. The Scholars like Sayyid Aulad Hyder, Sayyid Ali Naqi Naqvi, Sayyid Qaisar Raza Taqvi, Sayyid Nawab Ali and Ali Shariati claim that Yazid was not fit for Khilafah. They argue that he had won notoriety for his addiction to liquor, and his thoughts were also equally steeped in evil. He was swayed by the beliefs of
the Pre-Islamic period of darkness and was not following Islam as the Prophet (SAW) had done. Sayyid Abul Hasan Ali Nadvi on the authority of Ibn Kathîr says that what people found most objectionable and which brought him into disrepute was a stigma of being a drunkard, immoral behaviour and certain actions deemed as infringing the Shariah. He was not accused of being an apostate or heretic but his manner and morals were regarded as profane and impious. It is alleged that he had earned a bad name for his being fond of singing and dancing, drinking, enchantment and hunting. He is also reported to be fond of keeping company with boys and dancing girls, had hounds and took pleasure in the fights of rams, monkeys and bears.

From the above discussion it can be concluded that there are apparently two schools of thought and scholars stand divided in their opinion regarding character of Yazid. One group of scholars levelled several allegations against Yazid, declaring him not fit for the Khilafah, while another set of scholars hold and declare Yazid as a lawful Khalifah by arguing that he was a learned and pious man. They further argue that Muawiyah appointed Yazid as his successor because he was afraid of the dissolution of the whole thing, in as much as the Umayyads did not like to see the power handed over to any outsider. Had Muawiyah appointed any one else his successor, the Umayyads would have been against him.

It therefore seems that taking in consideration ground realities, the majority section favouring the nomination of Yazid
and because of the administrative and organizing capabilities Yazid had, Muawiyah concluded and materialized the fact that by assigning the governance of Khilafah to his son will be in the large interest of the community and in accordance to the norms of election. Had there been any concrete evidence of Yazid being fickle-minded and wicked placed before Muawiyah, he definitely would not have considered his case as his successor for it would have been fatal which Muawiyah as Khalifah would never tolerate. So any such assumption leveled against Muawiyah stands absolutely null and void.
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