

THE STATE POLICY OF THE Umayyad CALIPHATE AND ISLAM

Dr. Sohail Akhtar ¹, Dr. Khalid Khan ²¹Lecturer, Department of History, Ghazi University, Dera Ghazi Khan, Pakistan²Lecturer, Department of Political Science, University of Loralai, Pakistan.¹sakhtar@gudgk.edu.pk, ²khalid.khan@uoli.edu.pkDOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18181397>**Keywords**

Banu Umayyads, Caliphate, Islam, Government, Policy, State.

Article History

Received: 11 October 2025

Accepted: 21 November 2025

Published: 31 December 2025

Copyright @Author

Corresponding Author: *

Dr. Khalid Khan

Abstract

Primarily the study emphasizes and focuses on the state policy of the government of the Umayyad Dynasty which claimed as caliphate to receive the emotional support of the subject through religious stance. The third phase of Islamic government was established by the Umayyads at the end of the pious caliphate. While Umayyad caliphate which was a dynasty considered as the second phase of the Caliphate in Islam. The Umayyad dynasty was established thirty years after the departure of the Holy Prophet (ﷺ) from this temporary world. Hazrat Amir Muawia founded this dynasty in 41 A.H, 661 AD and it lasted for ninety-two, 92 years in 132 A.H as 750 AD in the battle of Zaab. This paper highlights the state policy of Banu Umayyad during their reign from Amir Muawia to Marwan-II.

**INTRODUCTION****Discussion**

The Banu Umayyad tribe was one of the two major branches of the Quraish at Makkah. They were the political rival of Banu Hashim the tribe of the Prophet ﷺ. The conflict between Banu Hashim and Banu Umayyad started before Islam and it continued in different phases of the history. Abu Sufiyan opposed against the Holy Prophet (ﷺ) until Makkah was conquered by the Prophet (ﷺ). After the martyrdom of Ali, Banu Umayyad established their government under the command of Amir Muawia. The members of this tribe ruled for about a century (41-132 AH). The era of Banu Umayyad began with the beginning of the reign of Hazrat Amir Muawiyah in 41 AH and fell after the defeat of Marwan bin Muhammad in 132 AH. During this period, 14 members of this family ruled the Islamic countries.

Muawiyah was succeeded by his son Yazid, followed by his son Muawiyah bin Yazid, after whom the caliphate passed to Marwan and his descendants. The strengthening of the Banu Umayyads along with the expansion of the empire was an important process in the state policy of the Banu Umayyads. Nepotism and the establishment of a hereditary state was the policy for the protection of this government and empire. Likewise, removing all the opponents of the Banu Umayyad, especially the claimants of the Caliphate, including the Ahlul-Bayt, the Khawarij, the Alawis, and all their allies, was an important part of the state policy of the Banu Umayyad. As soon as Hazrat Muawiyah took over the caliphate, the meaning of caliphate changed to kingship and empire. Mu'awiyah and his followers and Ansar

repeatedly used the word "MulK" (or Kingdom) for their government. Even Muawiya himself used to say to himself that I am the first king of the Arabs. This period in the history of Islam is extremely important because of its proximity to the times of the Prophet (ﷺ) and the Pious Caliphs, and also because it is the formative period of Islamic law and theology and the one in which Islam became a world-wide movement and installed itself firmly in the three continents of Asia, Europe, and Africa. The actual records of the Umayyad period are, however, so much mutilated and distorted, and even the known facts about it are so deliberately misrepresented that, to the general reader, the Umayyads appear to be little less than infidels. It is said that they were Arabs by conviction and Muslims by policy. They ignored and vitiated Islam: changed the democratic Caliphate into hereditary rule. which revived the tribal jealousies of Pre-Islamic Arabia; imposed the Jizyah on the non-Arab converts to Islam; kept their own interest of maintaining themselves in power above the interest of religion; were tyrants and unscrupulous in all that they did, etc. If these statements are accepted, they pose a number of serious questions about the early development of Islam. One may ask, for instance: Was the work done by the Prophet and the Orthodox Caliphs so weak and so transient in nature that the infidel onslaught of the Umayyads undid it so easily? Why was no serious attempt made by the Orthodoxy, the true champions of Islam, for nearly one hundred years to snatch political power from these enemies of the faith? (The rising of the Hashimies and the Zubayries against the early Umayyad rule are only stray examples of personal ambition; they do not represent collective endeavor on the part of the community in general to revive the golden era of the Prophet or that of the Orthodox Caliphs.) If Islam was systematically destroyed by the Umayyads over the course of a century, how did it rise again suddenly after their fall? Did any political regime after the Umayyads ever make any attempt to restore the democracy of the Orthodox Caliphate? Is there any evidence to show that there was really a democratic or republican constitutional theory in early Islam based on the Qur'an and the Sunnah so that it may be rightly alleged that the Umayyad destroyed it? Have Islamic jurisprudence and theology, even in the later ages, ever formulated a

theory of democracy which was practically demonstrated in early Islam? Answers to these questions become necessary if the statements in the previous paragraph were admitted. We shall, therefore, in this brief article try to inquire into the relation of Islam to the Umayyad State policy, and test the above statements and many others, and then see whether the Umayyads were infidels or Muslims. The Messenger of Allah (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) declared prophet-hood in Mecca and preached Islam in Mecca for a long time. Arriving in Madinah from Makkah, the Messenger of Allah (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) founded a state. And collected the different tribes at the level of a center. And for this centralization, the Mawakhat Madinah between the Muhajirin and the Ansar and the Maslans and the Jews established the best examples of Madinah. The Messenger of Allah (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) established a state in Madinah with the tribes of Aws and Khazraj. The constitution of the state was prepared by which the rights and duties of the ruler and the subjects were determined in the state. This constitution was decided in consultation with everyone and written down. This historical document is called the first written constitution of the state of Madinah. Along with the establishment of the state, the second most important topic was the system of government and administration of the empire. And its beginning was not only coffee, but the Messenger of Allah, peace and blessings be upon him, formally started the state system of the common people. Masudi and other historians have clearly written that the government structure was set up with a secretariat that regulated various matters in a formalized manner, including *katbin wahi* as well as soldiers who kept accounts of the collection and distribution of booty. In addition to this, the amount that was brought in as Zakat was registered. The special scribes were given different matters within 10-12 periods for which they would register their details separately. If we look at the beginning of the Diwan, there was a financial system which was followed by a regular one during the time of Hazrat Umar. The system was introduced but before that we see. It began in the Prophetic era and it was the responsibility of a scribe to compile a list of adult men who were fit to fight, not only to be called up

for battle, but a regular stipend was also fixed for them. The Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) also worked especially in the matter of defense and in which we see that he used to arrange different things according to the conditions of peace and war.

There were various orders for those performing such services and they had instructions on how to reach which places and what weapons and necessary equipment they had to carry along with their regular physical training. Exercises were also conducted for archery, horse races and camel races were also conducted. And along with that, the mosque which was on the north side of Madinah, because of the winners of the competition inside this mosque, it was named Masjid al-Subak. He himself used to decide who is on the first place, who is on the second place, and who is on the third place, and he used to reward them. Under state affairs, letters were written to various rulers and the letters written to these rulers were regularly compiled, a long list of which seems to exist in book form as well as the grant of various Safra lawyers and He used to go to the courts of various kings and rulers and convey the message of Islam, which determined the foreign policy between the Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) and the non-Muslim rulers. The Islamic State had a series of relations with other countries. The Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) also introduced a system of finance in which, in addition to booty, the proceeds of Zakat and some other taxes were also determined which were collected and paid to them. were regularly collected and through this revenue the expenses of the state were met. Rite ex-bookie was also a condition and usually a part of what is Usually, some part of it was received by the state and the remaining money was spent by the common poor for the purposes of sometimes philanthropists like Hazrat Abu Bakr Siddiq, Hazrat Umar Farooq, Hazrat Usman. Ghani Abu Ubaydah bin Jara was one of the people from whom financial support was obtained. He also appointed the department of education and he also paid special attention to it.

The Umayyad Concept of State

One of the main objections against the Umayyads is that they changed the democratic principle of the

Early Caliphate into hereditary rule and hence acted against one of the main injunctions of Islam. But there is no constitutional theory of any kind in the Qur'an or the Sunnah. No theologian of repute has ever based a political theory on these sources. As regards the regime of the Prophet it was in no sense democratic or republican, because he was neither elected by the people nor was he responsible to them in any way. He was a Prophet-imam, deriving his authority from God alone. Hence the constitutional form and structure of the State in his day could not be imitated in later ages. Only the functions of that State could be repeated and realized again and again in history. It is well known that the Prophet did not suggest any political constitution for the Muslim community. He also did not nominate anyone to succeed him after his death. The institution of the Caliphate was, therefore, based only on the ijma '(consensus) of the Companions of the Prophet. Moreover' the Caliphs did not establish uniform democratic institutions to serve as models for later generations. The four Caliphs were chosen in four such different ways. It may be admitted that the spirit of their regimes was could also be maintained under a monarchy. There are numerous democratic manners, particularly under Hazrat Abu Bakar and Hazrat 'Umar, but that spirit examples of it in Islamic history. But the point to be considered here is that the Caliphs did not set up a constitutional machinery that could be called model democratic state. Hence the question of destroying this democratic political system by the Umayyads does not arise. Any serious student of political science may easily notice that the endeavors of the Orthodox Caliphs can be termed only as historical precedents, and cannot be accepted as permanent principles of Islamic Political System. It was for this reason that 'Ali refused to follow the Sunnah of Abu Bakar and 'Umar when asked to do so by 'Abdul Rahman ibne 'Awuf, on the eve of 'Uthman's election by the electoral college of the six Companions. It may further be noted that 'Ali and the Hashimies never reconciled themselves to the regime of the first three Caliphs, and claimed hereditary succession immediately after the death of the Prophet. Sometimes it is vainly argued that 'Ali claimed the succession not on the basis of heredity but of personal excellence. There is, however,

overwhelming, historically authentic evidence to prove the contrary. A few references would suffice. After the election of Abu Bakar, 'Ali took his wife, Fatima, on a pony and visited the homes of all the Ansar in Medina, asking them to accept him as the successor of the Prophet, because he was the Prophet's son-in-law. The Ansar told him that had they not declared their allegiance to Abu Bakar, they would have considered his case. It is reported that on the occasion of his election Abu Bakar quoted the hadith of the Prophet: The Imams will be only from the Quraish.' Afterwards 'Ali often remarked that the Hashimies were the fruit of the tree of which the Quraish were only the branches, referring of course to the fact that he was the son-in-law of the Prophet and, therefore, rightly entitled to be his successor. After the death of Fatima, 'Ali, intending to declare his allegiance to Hazrat Abu Bakar, came to the Masjid Nabvi and addressed him thus! , O Abu Bakar: We refrained from declaring our allegiance to you not because we rejected your excellence or that we were jealous of you, but because we believed that we had the claim to political power and that you usurped it from us." Authoritative statements from the mouth of 'Ali claiming hereditary succession indeed are too many to be quoted here. Until the time of Al-Mahdi (d. 169/785) thirty-six Alid princes courted martyrdom. There were many illustrious men in the company of the Prophet and above all there were the first three Caliphs all of whom had numerous children, many of them famous in the early annals of Islam for their piety and scholarship, but none of them ever nourished the faintest idea of securing or seizing political power in his day. As against this the Hashimies have claimed the Caliphate from the days of 'Ali down to our own age in every generation. The only thing that one can infer from their age long claim and early practice is that the Hashimies were the first people in Islam to inaugurate the monarchical principle. This is the relation of the Umayyad State theory to the past. Its relation to the future makes its position more invulnerable. The Hashimies effort to overthrow the Umayyads started with Hussain R.A. It was intensified after his death. It became an active and powerful movement in the beginning of the second century of the Hijrah. This effort was entirely based on the principle of hereditary right. In fact, when

Hassan handed over the Caliphate to Muawiyah he clearly told him that the right of the Hashimies had been trampled for long by the Quraish, and that he was taking this step only to save the religion and the ummah from ruin and disintegration and harm. Moreover, he regarded the affair as a temporary bargain, for it was stipulated in the treaty that the Caliphate would return to Hassan after the death of Muawiyah. As regards Hussain, when he was stopped by the advanced party of Ibn-e-Ziyad's army led by Hurr, near Kufah, he addressed the Kufians, thus: 'Fear God and recognize the right of those whom it is due; this would please Allah. We, who belong to the House of the Prophet, are more entitled to possess the Caliphal power to rule over you than these people [the Umayyads] who claim things to which they have no right. Further, it is clear from the correspondence which Hussain had with the Kufians that he wanted to seize political power in Iraq and there was no question of the revival of the Orthodox Caliphate. There were abler men than he at that time in Hijaz, like Sad ibn Abu Waqqas, Ibn 'Abbas, Abdullah ibn Zubair, Muhammad ibn Hanfiah, but he did not forge a joint scheme with them to break the power of the Umayyads. He was over-confident of regaining the Caliphate for the Hashimies with the help of the Iraqians. Some Meccans even asked him not to leave the Jama'ah and destroy the unity of the ummah. But he replied, 'My deeds are with me and your deeds are with you. You are not responsible for what I do and I am not responsible for what you do' similar evidence can be easily cited from the utterances of the numerous Hashimies leaders who frequently rebelled in the later Umayyad and early Abbasid periods. The Umayyad rule lasted only ninety-two years. After them there came the Abbasids, the Fatimids, the Mamluks, the Mongols, the Safawids, the Ottomans, and many other great empire-builders, but they all established monarchies, and never thought of reviving the ancient Caliphate. It is impossible to believe that the Umayyads sapped the moral stamina of the ummah for ever, and rendered it permanently incapable of enforcing the true principles of Islamic polity. It is a fact that no democratic movement ever arose in Islamic history. All the revivalist movements, like those of the Murabitun, the Muwahhidun, the Sanusiyyah and of Muhammad bin Abdul Wahab,

ended by establishing monarchical systems. How would the sin of all this fall on the shoulders of the Umayyads? And why should they be accused of not introducing a political order (the democratic Khilafah which did not exist before or after them)?

The truth is that after the death of 'Ali, the power and prestige of the Caliphate came to an end. At this moment the Umayyads were the only people in Islam who possessed the military prowess, administrative experience and the integrative force to manage the affairs of the Muslim community efficiently. When Hasan asked Muawiyah to end the disunity of the Muslims and submit to his rule, Muawiyah wrote to him, 'I understand the the Caliphs are glorified as the heroes of religion. The attachment to religion of Walid I, 'Umar II, Hisham and Yazid III is too well known to need a comment here. But the Umayyads were not only good and zealous Muslims in their personal character, they were also strong champions of Islam in their State policy and day to day administration. The Quran and the Sunnah served as the main basis of legislation in their day. It is true that Islamic law was not codified during their regime, but most of its details were certainly evolved in this period. Awza'i's opinions collected by al-Shafi'i, Abu Yusuf's *al-Raddala Siyar al-Awza'i* and Malik's *Muwatta'*, mostly refer to the efficient functioning of the Shari'ah under the Umayyads. Indeed the judicial controversies referred to by al-Shafi'i in his great compendium, the *Kitab-ul-Umm*, cannot be imagined to have evolved in the closet of a madrasah or the fifty years of Abbasid administration, the period that preceded the writing of this book. They undoubtedly arose in the Umayyad courts. Even the works of Abu Yousuf and Muhammad al-Shaybani must be treated as a systematisation of the vast legal material received from the Umayyad period. If no effort was made during this period to work out the details of law the great project of codification would not have been successfully undertaken during the early Abbasid rule. The Umayyads set up an ideal administration. Muawiyah, Abdul Malik, and Hisham rank among the greatest administrators in Islamic history. Hisham possessed the smallest stature among the three, yet al-Mansur, the greatest Abbasid Caliph, emulated him as his model. As a matter of fact the Umayyad administration has served as the standard pattern for all Muslim States

in later times. Had their government been really un-Islamic, tyrannical or immoral it, would not have been so much liked and imitated. Among the basic and everlasting achievements of the Umayyad regime are the preservation of the Quran, introduction of Arabic as the State language and the minting of the Islamic coinage. The official text of the Quran issued by Hazrat Usman was written in the ancient character which had no dots and no diacritical marks. This caused great difficulty in reading the sacred book and the people committed many mistakes. When 'Abdul-Malik saw that the situation was aggravating he ordered Hajjaj bin Yousuf to look after this important affair. Hajjaj employed a number of expert calligraphers and readers (*Qurra'*) who fixed the dots and the diacritical marks on the letters of the Quran. Another report says that this work was done by Abu al-Aswad al-Duali under the direction of Ziyad. Yet another report declares that it was performed by Khalid bin al-Hayyaj under the orders of Walid-I. In any case the Umayyads did a great service to Islam by saving the text of the Quran from corruption. Arabic was introduced as the State language for the first time by 'Abdul Malik. Until then in the government offices (*Dawawin*) Greek was used in Syria, Coptic in Egypt, and Persian in Iraq. Historians have given many reasons for the sudden change effected by the Caliph. But reasons don't matter. The fact remains that the adoption of Arabic for official business gave a great impetus to the spread of Arabic learning and of Islam. Minting of the pure Islamic coinage was also for the first time undertaken by Abdul-Malik. Before this time the Iranian and the Byzantine coins were the legal tender in the Islamic dominions. One side of these coins bore the effigy of the Roman or the Iranian Emperor. The other side was over-stamped by the Muslims with the *Shahadah*. After the reform by the Umayyads, coins carried on one side the *Surah Ikhlas* and on the other side the *Shahadah*, the name of the ruler or the governor, and the date. The independent coinage raised the prestige of Islam all over the world. Similarly, the credit for introducing standard weights and measures and fixing the period of their use goes to Marwan bin Hakam. He also took positive steps to ensure compliance with these measures so that the people were not deceived in their daily transactions. Marwan did so in response

to a well-known Quranic command. The Umayyads had great love for architecture. But they did not display their genius only in building great palaces. They were particularly interested in building mosques. Some of their famous mosques have remained intact to this day. The great mosque of Kufah was built by Muawiyah. It no longer exists but it served as the archetype of the great mosques that were built in later times. The famous Dome of the Rock (al-Qubbah al-Sakhrah) was built by 'Abdul Malik the Great Mosque of Damascus, the wonder of the world, and the Prophet's Mosque in Medina by Walid-I, and the Mosque of 'Amr ibn al-'As in Fustat (Cairo) by 'Abd al-'Aziz ibn Marwan.⁴² Hisham built the great mosque at Qayrawan. The beautiful mosque of Harran, now partly in ruins, was built by Marwan-II. Are these living monuments not sufficient testimony to the religious devotion of the Umayyads? Perhaps the greatest achievement of the Umayyads was their most sincere efforts to carry Islam to the four corners of the world. They conquered most of the civilized lands in Asia, Africa and Europe, and converted most of the subject races to Islam. They remained but for a short period on the stage of history, but during their short stay they built a permanent home and a powerful empire for the progress and defence of the religion of Islam. No such conquests were ever again made by any Muslim power or dynasty. One of the remarkable things of Umayyad expansion is that wherever they went they carried with themselves the genuine Islam. The result is that most of their dominions are to-day the permanent centres of Islamic faith and culture, where Islam is truly fixed for ever.

Basic Policy

The basic policy of the Umayyads was the expansion and glorification of the Muslim ummah and the establishment of the Shari'ah. Most of these Caliphs possessed a deep religious sense and lived the simple and honest life of the early Muslims. Their courts did not present scenes of imperial splendour and awe as did those of the Abbasids. The people had easy access to them. Their critics spoke harsh and undignified words in their face, but they were tolerated. The executioner and the torture chambers which decorated the majesty of the Abbasid Caliphs were not known to the Umayyad court. The

fundamental human rights which were one of the major contributions of Islam to the world were more respected during the Umayyad age than ever afterwards. Two or three of the last Umayyad monarchs were indeed lax and incapable, but most of them, including the last one, were men of great integrity and genius. They were inspired with a sense of mission, the mission of taking Islam to the whole of mankind. This explains their spectacular conquests in the east and the west. In less than hundred years they conquered the whole of North Africa, crossed the Straits of Gibraltar, occupied the Iberian Peninsula, captured southern France, and converted the Mediterranean basin into an Umayyad Lake. Towards the east they subjugated eastern Iran, annexed the territory of Afghanistan, occupied Central Asia and penetrated into the borders of China. In the south-east they overran the great plateau of Baluchistan and conquered Sindh and southern Punjab. In the north they kept the Byzantine Empire at bay and permanently humiliated. This lightning development was due to the remarkable religious zeal of the Umayyads and not to their love of power and world domination.

The Umayyad concept of sovereignty was that the ultimate power in the State belonged to the Muslim Arabs. The non-Arab Muslims, known as clients (*Mawali*), enjoyed all the privileges of free citizens, yet they were not given high offices of State. They adopted this policy because the non-Arab converts could not be relied upon so soon for purposes of political administration. The conquered peoples, even after becoming Muslims, had not yet forgotten the humiliation they had suffered at the hands of the Arab. Moreover, the clients did not want mere participation conquerors, in the State business; they really wanted to destroy Islam along with the Arab power. This actually happened when the Persians seized power in the name of the Abbasids. They systematically undermined Islam, and hastened the advent of the age of religious darkness and skepticism in the fourth and fifth centuries of the Hijrah. They actively helped the rise of the great heretical sects of the Carmathians, the Batiniyah and the Ismailians, and extended their open support to the Buwayhids and the Fatimids. They were in the forefront of the Shubiyah movement which was nothing but an intellectual conspiracy against Islam.

The Umayyads, therefore, feared political as well as religious subversion from the clients, hence they did not associate them in the high business of State. This was nothing new. The policy of Arabisation was originally laid down by 'Umar the Great for similar reasons. Writing on his State policy Phillip Hitti observes: 'The second cardinal point in 'Umar's policy was to organize the Arabians, now all Muslims, into a complete religio-military commonwealth with its members keeping themselves pure and unmixed-a sort of material aristocracy-and denying the privilege of citizenship to all non-Arabians. 'Umar indeed did not allow the Arabs to settle in villages and cultivate the land. He was afraid lest they should forget the martial profession and be humiliated in the end. He had also strict orders that the Arabs should not speak outside Arabia any language other than Arabic. The non-Arabs were never entrusted with any high office of responsibility. Pointing this out Abual Faraj writes; The clients were always regarded as inferior to the Arabs. In early Islam they were given in the Government posts often such as required the qualities of honesty and truthfulness. They were also entrusted with teaching and religious functions. But they were deprived of high offices which required nobility and group feeling. It was a fact that no client was ever appointed to a high office under the Orthodox Caliphate. The Umayyad Empire was at least four times bigger than the Orthodox Caliphate both in area and population. Hundreds of new races and people came within its fold. Hence the fear of political subversion and rebellion was more real then. The policy of the Orthodox Caliphs, therefore, had to be continued. The taxation policy of the Umayyads has often been criticized, it is said that they extracted the Jizyah even from the converts to Islam. This is especially asserted about Hajjaj. The truth is that the non-Muslims left their villages in large numbers, came to the cities and accepted Islam to escape taxes and secure, as Muslims, lucrative jobs in the Government and the army. This caused a great dislocation in the rural economy and affected food production badly. The Government, however, did not want an effective element of the non-Arabs in the army as it would have endangered the security of the State. Hajjaj, therefore, turned them back to their villages and forced them to pay the kharaj as

usual. The Islamic law demanded that if the land of a Dhimmi was purchased by a Muslim, he too had to pay the old kharaj. The report that Jizyah was imposed on the non-Muslims is not to be found in any of the early histories. The first reference to it is made by Mubarrad but he too talks of the imposition of kharaj and not of Jizyah. The second reference is in Ibn Khallikan he also mentions only the kharaj. The third reference is in Ibn al-Athir (d 630/1232) who is the first to mention a number of cases in Iraq and Ifriqiyah where Jizyah was imposed along with kharaj on the non-Muslims. But he is too late a historian to be accepted as an authority on the period in question. The fact is that these meagre reports are intended only to malign the Umayyads. The pre-Islamic group feeling (al'-asabiyah al-jahiliyah) was not particularly revived by the Umayyads. In fact, Muslims by and large were never able to eradicate it altogether. This feeling erupted even during the life time of the Prophet now and then. For instance, on the occasion of the Battle of al-Must aliq the Muhajirs and the Ansar suddenly started quarrelling with one another about taking water from a stream. A major conflict between the two groups was likely to have broken out but for the timely intervention of the Prophet and some of his senior Companions. Similarly, after the Battle of Hunayn when the Prophet returned to Makkah and distributed the booty of war among the Makkans converted, the Ansar took exception to it, alleging that he had been partial to his own people. The Prophet told them that he had given those goods to soften for Islam the hearts of the Meccans who were weak in faith. The Ansar were pacified and the group feeling was subdued, but it was not completely rooted out. After the death of the Prophet, when the problem of succession to him was debated in the parlour of Bani Saiduah in Medina, the Ansar once again demonstrated their group feeling and wanted to have two heads for the State, one from among them and another from the Muhajirs. Abu Bakar and the Muhajirs, on the other hand, argued that the tribes of Arabia could bow down only to the leadership of the Quraish who actually managed to obtain the political power in Medina. Further, Abu Bakar at the time of his death laid down in his will that the Ansar were not to be given any share in the affairs of the State. A similar testament was made by

'Umar at his death-bed. Whatever might have been the exigencies of statesmanship, these facts, in the context of Arab history, were the manifestations of the resurgence of the feelings of Quraishi group. This is why by the time of Hazrat Usman the Ansar became impatient and aligned themselves with the Hashmies to overthrow the Quraish. The real attempt at restoration of the Pre-Islamic group feeling (al-'asabiyah al-jahiliyah) was, however, made by Banu Hashim when after the death of the Prophet they persistently claimed hereditary succession to him. The Umayyads, who were the most experienced among the Arabs in the business of State and diplomacy, at once took the clue from them. With the help of their own strong asabiyah they were able to carve an empire after the Then the grouping of the clans collapse of the Early Caliphate. and tribes of Arabia round the principal 'asabiya of the Umayyads and the Hashmies became inevitable. The Hijazians (particularly the Ansar), the Yamani tribes and the Iraqians were not at all prepared to reconcile themselves to the Umayyad State. Each one of these groups was extremely anxious and active to seize political power for itself. In these circumstances there was no way out for the rulers except to favour and encourage the tribes whose loyalty they enjoyed. Most of the Arab tribes outside Hijaz lacked the real vision in the true meaning and life of Islam. Hence they frequently changed their political affiliations in view of higher material gain. The Umayyads cannot be accused for all this. The truth is that they were all the time on the defensive, stopping the disintegrating forces in the ummah, but they had no control over all the forces of history-hence they perished. The group feeling of the Arab tribes was not something created by the Umayyads; it was inherent in their past culture. The great moral pressure of Islam suppressed it for a time, but when the pressure was relaxed, after the lessening of the religious zeal, the evil forces of the 'asabiyah were released and acted with a redoubled momentum. It was this destructive nature of an Arab which did not allow him to work in harmony and co-operation with other members of his race or with other Muslims. Commenting on it very pointedly Ibn Khaldun remarks; 'The reason for this is that because of their savagery, the Arabs are the least willing of nations to subordinate themselves to each other, as they are

rude, proud, ambitious, and eager to be the leader. Their individual aspirations rarely coincide. But when there is religion (among them) through prophecy or saint-hood, then they have some restraining influence in themselves, It was not in the power of the Umayyads to maintain the moral grip of religion on people permanently. In fact, the Muslim dynasty or State has, after them, maintained this grip better than they. Group jealousy was, therefore, not revived by the Umayyads as a State policy; it re-emerged as a natural phenomenon in history.

Conclusion

In the end it may be observed that the Umayyads were not saints, but also not devils. They were, however, very able and just administrators. They set up an administration which served as a model for the later ages in Islamic history. They demonstrated on a world-wide scale that a great social order could be established on the basis of the Islamic Shari'ah. They were helped in this gigantic task by the leading 'Ulama' and jurists of the age. But the history of the Umayyads was left to be written by their enemies, the Perisans, who were inspired not only by anti-Arab jealousies but also deep Shi'ite susceptibilities. For the most part they did not record history but invented it, especially when the subject-matter affected their religious faith and sense of nationalism. The real sinners were, therefore, not the Umayyads but these historians. Truth, however, could not be obliterated by vengeful historiography. After the brief caliphate of Rashida, the power of the caliphate came to the hands of the Umayyads, and their dominance was established on the Arabian Peninsula. Amir Muawiya made a sketch of the initial political system. The main thing in it was that the caliph had a permanent personality. It was based on the principles of Shura

REFERENCES

- Rashid Rida, Califat, trans. Laoust, pp. 78-9.
Dr. Muhammad Hameedullah Islamic State of Faisal Publishers and Traders Books Lahore 1993, P. 21
Ibn Khaldun, Muqaddimah, Beyrout, 1900, p. 191.
Cairo, Vol. VIII, p. 346. Al-Mawardi, Al-Ahkam al-Sultaniyah, Cairo, p. 3; al-Iji, al-Muwaqif

- Ibn Qutaybah, al-Imamah wa'l-Siyasah, Vol. I, p. 27.
Ibid., p. 12
Al-Sharif al-Radi, Nahj al-Balaghah, ed. Muhammad Abduh, Cairo, Vol. III, p. 37.
al-Mas'udi, Muruj al-Dhahab, Cairo, 1948, Vol. II, p. 307
Abu al-Faraj al-Isbahani, Maqatil al-Talibin, Cairo, 1949, pp. 55-58
Ibn Jarir al-Tabari, Tarikh al-Rusul wa'l-Muluk, Cairo, Vol. VI, pp.,197
Ibid, P.218
Jarir, Diwan, Cairo, 1913, Vol. I, P. 168
Ibid, P.177
Al-Masudi, Vol. III, P.. 223.
Abu Ahmad Al-Askari, P.125.
Blachere, Introduction au Coran, Paris, 1947, pp. 71-83.
Al-Nadeem, AL-Fahrist, Bairut, 1978, P.6
Al-Baladhuri, Futuh al-Buldan, Cairo, 1932, pp. 196-97, 298
Al-Tabari, Leyden, Vol. II, 940.
Jurji Zaydan, Tarikh al-Tamaddun al-Islami, Cairo, 1935, Vol. I, pp. 110-114
Ahmad Shalbi, al-Tarikh al-Islami wa'al-Hadarah al-Islamiyah, Cairo, 1959, Vol. II, p. 52.
al-Ya'qubi, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 311;
al-Ya'qubi, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 399.
Ahmad Shalbi, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 52.
Creswell, op. cit., pp. 109-11.
Ibid., p. 154.
W. Muir, The Caliphate, London, 1883, p. 447
Al-Masudi, op. cit., Vol. III., pp. 39-59
P.K. Hitti, History of Arabs, London, 1937, P. 318
P.K. Hitti, History of Arabs, London, 1937, P.169
Abu al-Faraj al-Isbahani, Kitab al-Aghani, Vol. X, p. 163.
Mubarrad, al-Kamil, p. 288.
Ibn Khallikan, Wafayat al-A'yan. Vol. II, p. 277
Ibn al-Athir, Tarikh al-Kamil, Vol. V, pp. 24, 48, 11.
bn Hisham, Sirah, Cairo 1937, Vol. II, pp. 334
Ibid., Vol. IV, pp. 143-8
Ibid., p. 339
Al-Tabari, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 53

