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Abstract

This historical research discusses the conquest of Mecca. It proves that the Hudaibiyah peace treaty was first violated by Quraysh. This paper also studies the color, the name, and the message of the flag of the Prophet Muhammad in the Mecca conquest. It has been shown that the idea of the flag with the word punishment written on it, is wrong or is a carefully designed lie. It has been proved that the Muslims’ flag had been a black flag called the Eagle flag and this type of flag with this color and this name had been previously used by Meccans (Quraysh) in battles. The name of the Eagle flag dates back to the use of the eagle as the symbol of power on the flags of the ancient empires. The message of the flag of the Prophet Muhammad could have never been the punishment because he never punished the Quraysh and did not ever decide to do that. It has also been explained that Prophet Muhammad organized a marvelous plan to peacefully come back to his homeland Mecca. Prophet Muhammad suffered from Quraysh for more than 21 years but after the Mecca conquest, while he had the opportunity to revenge and no one would blame him for that, by his inspiring act of forgiveness, he made a great moment in history. This article shows that Prophet Muhammad recorded the greatest forgiveness in history. Some other carefully designed lies about the conquest of Mecca are shown to be deliberate distortions of the history by some authors to defame Prophet Muhammad.
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1. Introduction

In today's world, the media is being abused to spread made-to-order news or lies rather than unveiling the truth. Studies have shown that Lies spread faster on media and untrue stories have more staying power than truth does (Vosoughi, Roy, & Aral, 2018). This can be generalized to the public opinion about events, countries, characters, and religions which might be very long-lasting and influential. The character of the Prophet Muhammad has always been interesting for human beings. Many people believe in him as an infallible Prophet that has always said the truth and acted right and by implementing God’s revelations, could bring enormous changes in societies (Tihrani, 2015). They believe that humans need to have leaders who exemplify a Perfect Human and Prophet Muhammad is a perfect human from any point of view. This can help them to grow the human values in themselves (Najjarian, 2016). Shia Muslims believe that the human always needs such a leader and at any time there exist a
leader (Imam) on the earth to help people grow themselves and so is today (al-Sha'ri, 1997 (1418); al-Shafii'i, 2000). Many others know the Prophet Muhammad as a genius whose wisdom and brilliance have to be appreciated. Prophet Muhammad leads the list of the world's most influential persons in Hart’s ranking (Hart, 1978). On the other hand, accusations have been made against Prophet Muhammad’s character in media, social media, books, and in turn by public opinion (Shalabi et al., 1999; Zayd, 2003). Unfortunately, a recent research shows that the arguments matter more than their sources when a public opinion is being shaped (Dür, 2019). These shaped public opinions can in turn have substantial effects on society (Burstein, 2003), not only on ordinary people but also on researchers, writers, and in turn on the historical analyses. In this paper, we discuss a set of accusations made against Prophet Muhammad in some books. We prove that almost all of them are deliberate defamations and made-to-order reports which in turn have entered the public opinion. We prove that the historical sources deny these accusations. One of the accusations against Prophet Muhammad is about the conquest of Mecca in 8 AH (Anno Hegirae). It happened more than 8 years after Prophet Muhammad was forced to migrate from his homeland Mecca to Medina (630 AD) (al-Bayhaqi, 1985 (1405); The Court Journal: Court Circular & Fashionable Gazette, 1833) because of violent actions of Quraysh. The Quraysh were a powerful tribe that controlled Mecca. After the Meccans (Quraysh) understood that torturing and suffering will not stop the Prophet Muhammad’s strong will to promote Islam teachings, they planned to kill him which caused the Prophet to leave his motherland (A. i. Athir, 1965 (1385); Tabarsi, 1997). In 6 AH, the Hudaibiyah peace treaty was signed between Muslims and the Quraysh of Mecca in which both sides affirmed a 10-year peace (I. Hisham, 1991). Many of Muslims were from Mecca who were forced to leave their homeland because of the Quraysh hostility and they had been banned from living in Mecca. In 10 AH, the Quraysh broke the truce and Muslims gathered for opening of Mecca. Prophet Muhammad has been accused that he broke the treaty by moving toward Mecca. He has been also accused that he intended to punish the Meccans and the word “punishment” had been written on his flag while entering the Mecca. In this paper, based on the historical accounts and evidences, it has been proved that these claims are mistakes or most probably, designed lies against Prophet Muhammad. The main discussions in the article have been focused on Prophet Muhammad’s great forgiveness of the Meccans and his planned peaceful opening of Mecca. The author has put the unfair biases aside to discuss and analyze the historical events impartially but keep the right for himself to judge based on historical evidences. It has been shown that the Quraysh broke the peace treaty and Prophet Muhammad had always adhered to it. Setting out for conquering Mecca had been planned by Prophet to be peaceful and bloodless from the beginning. It has also been shown that it is a historical fact that Prophet Muhammad forgave the Meccans. By explaining the history of the Quraysh brutality toward Muslims, it is proved that Prophet Muhammad’s forgiveness in the conquest of Mecca is the largest forgiveness in the history. After defeating his archenemies, Prophet Muhammad ignored the crimes of Quraysh, proclaimed general amnesty and forgave his most ardent enemies. The goal of the paper has been shedding the light on the truth. The author has brought adequate references and reasons for anything discussed in the article independent of any belief or religion and without any biases or preconceived notions. In the following sections, accusations made against Prophet Muhammad have been addressed and discussed.

2. Accusation of Breaking the Peace Treaty

Some people accuse Prophet Muhammad of breaching the Hudaibiyah treaty by deciding to open Mecca. This article proves that this accusation has been made without investigation of history. In the following lines it has been proved that based on the historical evidences, the Quraysh breached the treaty and the Prophet Muhammad organized a unique plan to come back to his homeland Mecca without battle.
2.1. Quraysh Broke the Treaty by Attacking Banu Khuza'ah

In 8 AH, while most of the Arabia was converted to Islam, Prophet Muhammad sent a missionary to the ruler of the Bosra (Ghassan tribe) in Levant (al-Sham or Syria) for the purpose of propagation of Islam. However, the governor of that boundary region executed the Prophet’s emissary on his way in the village of Mutah (near Karak in Jordan). He was ordered to be beheaded (Al-Waqidi, 1989 (1409); Faizer, 2013; Sal’d, 1972, 1990 (1410)). At the same time 15 envoys of the Prophet Muhammad sent to the northern Arabian tribes were killed except one who was injured and came back to Medina (A. i. Athir, 1965 (1385); Brinner, 2015; Tabari, 1987). Killing the messengers and envoys was regarded as a very awful crime in that time and amounted to a declaration of war. Muslims decided to fight against them. These tribes were close allies of Byzantines, thus Muslims in fact had to fight the Byzantines. Prophet Muhammad ordered Muslims not to betray or break the treaties, not to be the first side to begin the battle and not to harm or disrespect dead bodies (Talib, 2013). He also strongly prohibited killing or injuring innocent people, women, children, ageing men, infirm, hermits, other religious leaders, and other noncombatants (al-Amili, 1993; Al-Waqidi, 1989 (1409)). Muslims should avoid killing of livestock and animals, poisoning the water or food of the enemies and depriving them from water. Moreover, neither trees should be cut down nor homes or wells demolished (al-Ghuchani, 1983; al-Zahayli, 1963; Oussef H. Aboul-Enein, 2004). Observers were appointed in Muslim armies to control the soldiers’ behavior (Haj, 1992). Prophet Muhammad always had an instruction for his companions: you do not return evil for evil, but excuse and forgive (Muhammad Ibn Ismail Bukhari, 1996). Later these have been known as Islamic military jurisprudence. He also told the commanders to call the enemy to accept some suggestions to avoid bloodshed so that the battle would be prevented unless the fighting would be the only alternative left. However, the armies fought. Muslims encountered a huge army whose number of soldiers was several times the Muslims. The battle did not proceed as they thought. Muslims failed to gain a victory and all their three commanders were killed (Prophets Muhammad’s Nephew Jafar and his adopted son Zayd were among them) and the rest of the Muslims withdrew (Al-Waqidi, 1989 (1409)). When Quraysh heard of the Muta battle, they imagined that the Muslims’s spirit of bravery had diminished and they had lost their military strength. This encouraged the Quraysh to act against the peace treaty. According to the Hudaibiyyah treaty, the tribes were free to ally Muslims or Quraysh and the peace treaty included the allies of Muslims and Quraysh. Based on this, Banu Khuza’ah continued their old treaty with Banu Hashim (Hashemites) with Prophet Muhammad and Banu Bakr became ally of Quraysh (Al-Waqidi, 1989 (1409)). These two tribes had old animosity toward each other. Two years after Hudaibiyyah peace treaty, a two-person argument soon awakened the old violent feud between two tribes. At this dangerous situation, Quraysh stepped toward the violation of the Hudaibiyyah peace treaty by instigating the Banu Bakr to conduct a night attack on Banu Khuza’ah. Arm distribution of Quraysh among Banu Bakr was another act of violence. A number of the Quraysh men were willfully participated in the night attack (Ishaq, 2002). Some of the Quraysh’s leaders with masked faces were among the attackers (Al-Waqidi, 1989 (1409)). Inciting to attack Muslims, arming the men and directly involving in the night attack are enough reasons which introduce Quraysh as the treaty breaker. It should be noticed that when the Hudaibiyyah treaty had already been breached by Quraysh, there remained no longer a valid treaty between the two sides so that the Muslim would adhere to it. Banu Bakr with the help of the Quraysh launched a surprise attack by night on Banu Khuza’ah who were unaware. They killed Banu Khuza’ah people and chased them to the sacred precinct of Mecca (Haram) where blood-shed was forbidden and violated the sanctity of the Haram. They killed more than twenty of Banu Khuza'ah innocent people (al-Shiddy, 2011; Al-Waqidi, 1989 (1409)).

2.2. Islam Cares Every Single Human Life

Investigation of the Islamic sources shows that the Islam cares much about every single human life. Quran has a statement that says whoever killed a soul, it should be considered as though he had killed all mankind (Chapter 5, Verse 32). This shows that even if the Quraysh participated in killing one man of the Muslim allies they would be the violator of the peace.
2.3. Many Muslims were Exiled from Mecca

The decision of opening the Mecca had not been a mere wish of conquest but in fact a coming back to home. Mecca was the birthplace of Prophet Muhammad and many other Muslims. Due to tortures of the Quraysh, Prophet Muhammad and Muslims had been forced to migrate to Medina 8 years before and their properties were confiscated by Quraysh. Muslims had not the permission to come back to Mecca, contact their relatives or stay there. Now, after 8 years of exile, with the violation of the peace treaty by Quraysh, Prophet Muhammad decided to come back home.

2.4. Prophet Muhammad Patiently Tired to Preserve the Peace

A delegation from the aggrieved Banu Khuza'ah was sent to Medina seeking the justice from their Muslim allies. They informed Prophet Muhammad of this breach of truce and asked for the help of Muslims of Medina as their allies (Ishaq, 2002). Prophet Muhammad promised to help them but never was thinking about battle. Prophet Muhammad patiently offered the Quraysh the chance to redress for not only violating the treaty but also slaying men allied to him. He could abuse the situation and immediately set out for defeating Quraysh in a battle. But he gave them the chance to accept one of the two offers made for preventing the battle (Al-Waqidi, 1989 (1409); Hasan, 1988; Hussin, Othman, & Al-Suwaidan, 2015):

1. To pay the blood money for the victims
2. To terminate their alliance with Banu Bakr

Otherwise the Quraysh has considered the Hudaibiya truce abrogated (Al-Waqidi, 1989 (1409); Hamid, 2009). Mecca had been fighting Islam for 20 years from the beginning of Prophet’s public invitation. After breaking the Hudaibiya treaty by Quraysh, Prophet Muhammad and his companions who had been exiled by Quraysh from their homeland for 10 years decided to peacefully return to the Mecca. In order to prevent battle and bloodshed, Prophet Muhammad ingeniously designed an attractive artful plan.

2.5. Prophet Muhammad planned His Strategy based on a Peaceful Conquest

After the peace treaty was broken by Quraysh, Prophet Muhammad did not decided to revenge but he planned a peaceful return to Mecca. Prophet Muhammad planned a secret set out for Mecca and kept the objective of the operation secret, so that no one knew the plan even the Muslims and their commanders (Al-Waqidi, 1989 (1409); Ishaq, 2002). On the other hand, he closed the ways Quraysh could be informed of the Muslims setting out for Mecca (Ishaq, 2002). Prophet Muhammad knew that if he do not let the Quraysh be informed of the expedition of Muslims and if Quraysh instead of getting prepared for battle outside of Mecca, encounter a huge army near the Mecca, then they would definitely surrender and no battle would take place. In addition, by sending some men to elsewhere, Prophet gave the impression that he intended to move the Muslims and their allies there (Al-Waqidi, 1989 (1409); Sa'd, 1990 (1410)). This is how Prophet Muhammad prevented bloodshed and converted a possible battle to a peaceful entrance. The operation was performed in a complete silence so as the Quraysh not to be alerted to any activity. The ten thousand well-organized powerful army of Islam was led most skillfully by Prophet Muhammad up to the borders of Mecca so that the spies and agents of Quraysh did not become aware of Muslims movement. Unless Quraysh started the attack, Prophet Muhammad put large emphasis on refraining from fighting. In addition to the Prophets Muhammad moral disapprobation of battle and killing, by peaceful opening of Mecca, no blood would be shed in sacred precinct of Mecca (Haram) and the respect for the Haram or Masjid al-Haram would not be violated. In order to satisfy the Meccans to surrender without resistance, with the order of the Prophet, ten thousand fires were lit up at elevate places (Al-Waqidi, 1989 (1409)). Up to then (Muslims were in 10 miles northwest of Mecca), the leaders of Quraysh still did not know anything about Muslim movement. When Abu Sufyan saw the great fires, admitted that no army can resist against this strong army and came to the Prophet and the Mecca
surrendered (A. i. Athir, 1965 (1385); Ishaq, 2002). It can simply be imagined if every other ruler were in the Prophet’s place tried to revenge and would happily conquer the city with his huge army in a bloody war. However, the historical facts reported above show that the surprise plan, movement of ten thousands in military silence and lighting up ten thousands fires all had been extraordinary art of Prophet Muhammad for peaceful opening of Mecca without war and without killing. This way, years of warfare and violence of Quraysh toward Muslims were ended with Mercy and leniency of Prophet Muhammad toward Quraysh.

3. Accusation of Punishment of Meccans

It has been claimed that in the conquest of Mecca, the word “punishment”, had been written on the flag of Prophet Muhammad (Gabriel, 2004; Richardson, 2006, 2009; Smith & Furnish, 2011). But the history brings evidences that while all the preliminaries for a full-scale punishment and revenge were available, the largest forgiveness in the history of mankind took place. Prophet Muhammad forgave the Meccans that had injured, tortured and killed Muslims for years.

3.1. The Lie of the Punishment Flag

The accusation of the punishment flag is as follows: “When Muhammad returned to his home city of Mecca after eight years of exile, he returned as a conqueror. With him marched ten thousand Muslim soldiers. They carried with them black flags. On the flags was one word written in Arabic: punishment” (Gabriel, 2004; Richardson, 2006, 2009; Smith & Furnish, 2011). In the above sentence the truth has been inverted. The history reports the love of the Prophet Muhammad for humanity and his concern for the safety of lives. Nowhere in the history it has been reported that something had been written on the flag, but the history tells that the flag has had a name. The meaning of that name surely had not been punishment. There are some books that have mistaken in the translation from Arabic or replaced the true translation with their desired one. We found nowhere in the history that some words would have been written on the flag but it is reported that the name of that type of the black flag had been “Eagle”. In the next section it has been shown that the name Eagle has been replaced by the word punishment to defame the Prophet Muhammad Character.

3.2. The Truth about the Flag

Part of the problem arises because in many historian Arabic texts the vowel symbols are omitted. In Arabic, short vowels are not a part of the Arabic alphabet, instead they are written as marks over or below the consonant and sometimes over or below a long vowel. In Arabic, short vowels are generally not written. Almost in all sentences, the right pronunciation is realized based on the meaning of the sentence. However, there also exist words that are spelled the same but pronounced differently and have different meanings. This types of words with the same spellings but different pronunciations and meanings from another are called heteronyms (also known as a heterophones) in English. As an example the word “bass” with the same spelling if pronounced /ˈbæs/ means a kind of fish but if pronounced /ˈbeɪs/ means a low-pitched sound. The appropriate meaning comes to mind based on the sentence and the knowledge of the reader.

The Arabic word which has been translated to English in this case is (العقاب) for which there are two different pronunciations with two different meanings: “Eagle” or “punishment”. The differences between writing, pronunciations and meanings have been shown in Table 1.
Table 1. The original Arabic word, its pronunciation and its meaning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic Word</th>
<th>Without Short Vowel Symbol</th>
<th>With -ُ-</th>
<th>With -ِ-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>عقاب</td>
<td>عقاب</td>
<td>عقاب</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>[ʻuqāb]/[ʻiqāb]</td>
<td>[ʻuqāb]</td>
<td>[ʻiqāb]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>Eagle/Punishment</td>
<td>Eagle</td>
<td>Punishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Reports</td>
<td>In many historical books the vowel symbols are omitted.</td>
<td>The “Eagle flag” had existed in the conquest of Mecca.</td>
<td>Prophet Muhammad acted generously to the Meccans in the Conquest of Mecca.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the other meaning of the translated Arabic word here is “Eagle”, the biased writers or translators have deliberately chosen the meaning “punishment” to make use of it against Prophet Muhammad.

3.3. Eagle Flag/Symbol in History

The history sheds the light on the truth: The eagle has long been a symbol of power and dominion. Some of ancient militaries had used the symbol of eagle on their flags as a representation of high-flying, power, having sharp sight and victory. The symbol of Eagle is believed to have been taken from Flags of the ancient empires like Persia (late Iran) and Rome. Persian Empire used the Eagle on their flags as the allegory of victory and prosperity (Pirnia, 2010; Yahaqqi, 1996). The standard of the Persian king Cyrus was a golden eagle with outspread wings (Miller, 1961). The oldest flag of the world was found in archaeological excavations in Shahdad city in Iran (Lawler, 2011; Sepehr & Almodaresi, 2013). It is a metal flag which dates back to the early 3rd millennium BC. It is mounted on a copper pole topped with a perching eagle (Lawler, 2011). The eagle symbol re-emerged later in many empires and countries even on their flags or as a symbol of power. Coat of arms of many old empires like Hittite and Byzantine had been a double-headed eagle which was reused by countries, nations, and royal houses in Europe since the early medieval period (Mackey, 1924). In (Wittkower, 1939) many civilizations have been named that used the eagle symbol. Even today, some Arab countries use eagle as their national symbol, for example a golden black eagle is the coat of arms of state emblem of Iraq. Egypt has the eagle on its flag. The coat of arms of Mexico depicts a perched golden eagle as well. Some countries like Serbia, Montenegro and Russia have a double-headed eagle in their coats of arms. This shows that the use of the Eagle on the flags as a symbol of power and victory had been prevalent from ancient times to the present day.

3.4. Eagle Flag in Islam

Flags (standard) in ancient armies had important roles in arrangement of the forces. The flag could be used as a signal which would send predetermined commands to the soldiers. A raised standard implied the life and the stand of the army and it was a sign of victory. If the flag was not flying, then it would be a sign of being defeated. Because of that, the standard bearers were chosen among the bravest and the strongest men. Naming a flag has always been prevalent. In history and at the present time, most of the country or army flags usually have names just like the South Africa flag which is called “The Rainbow Flag” or the Luxembourg flag “Red Lion” or Wales flag “The Red Dragon” or Albania flag “The two-headed eagle” or Spain flag "Red-weld" and so on.

Some of the historians believe that “Eagle” had been the name of a black flag which was kept by Quraysh. They brought it out in their battles and handed it to their standard bearer (Zaidan, 2013). It has also been reported that Abu Sufyan had a flag which had been dedicated to the aristocrats. It had been the...
flags of the chiefs and was called Eagle (Halabi, 2006). But if there had been an Eagle flag in Mecca which Quraysh used it in wars, how could Prophet Muhammad get the flag while Quraysh had plotted to assassinate the Prophet and he migrated to Medina to continue his prophetic mission. How could he take their flag with him?

Jurji Zaidan in History of Islamic Civilization writes that Quraysh and Prophet Muhammad both had black Eagle flags (Zaidan, 2013). Thus, it can be concluded that the Eagle flag had not been the name of a particular flag but a distinct type of flag which had been usually black.

Prophet Muhammad abandoned the incorrect traditions, customs and behavior that belonged to the age of Ignorance like spilling of blood, slander, backstabbing, stealing, unjust earnings, bribery, black-marketeering, cheating, bad behavior with women and adultery, but kept some traditions like sacred months. Thus, it seems that the same black flags called “Eagle” which had been used before the advent of Islam had also been used by Muslims.

It has also been reported that the flag of the prophet Muhammad had been a flag in black called “al-Uqab”, literally ‘the Eagle’ (Hinds, Bacharach, Conrad, & Crone, 1996; Matthew S. Gordon, 2018; PODH, 2011; Zaidan, 2013). During the battle of Badr, Prophet Muhammad handed Ali ibn abi Talib a black flag called Eagle (Halabi, 2006; Kathir, 1978 (1398)). Historical books have reported that in the battle of Badr, the white banner of the apostle was carried by Musab and the black banner (the Eagle) by Ali ibn abi Talib and another by Ansar (the Helpers) (A. a.-M. I. Hisham, 1936 (1355); Ishaq, 2003; Kathir, 2006). During the battle of Khaybar in 628 AD, after a few unsuccessful charges, Prophet Muhammad said: "Tomorrow I will give the flag to a man who loves Allah and His Apostle, and God and His Prophet love him. God will grant victory at his hands. He is not someone who retreats." Next day he gave the flag to Ali ibn Abi Talib and said: “get hold of this flag and carry it through, until God grants you conquest”. Ali, carrying the flag, attacked the Khaybar fort and conquered it (M. i. J. al-Tabari, 2015; Al-Waqidi, 1989 (1409); Ishaq, 2002). Sir William Muir in his book Life of Muhammad writes that the prophet said: “I will give the eagle,” he said – the great black eagle – "into the hands of one that loveth the Lord, and his Apostle, even as he is beloved of them; he shall gain the victory”. Next morning the flag was placed in Ali's hands, and troops advanced. He adds that the great standard was called 'Okab, the “Black Eagle” (Muir, 1923). Ibn Ishaq states that the banner of the Messenger of God the day Mecca was conquered was white and his black flag was known as al-uqab, ‘the eagle’. It was made of a piece of variegated wool (Kathir, 2006). Ibn Abi Shaybah in his book Musannah reports that the flag of the prophet was black and called al-Uqab (Shaybah, 1988 (1409)).

Some of the translators when translating from Arabic to English, have read the Arabic pronunciation of the word “Eagle” as “Iqab” which is definitely wrong because as mentioned above, the historical proofs and many translators and writers expressed that the Arabic word means Eagle and the correct pronunciation for Eagle is “Uqab” not “Iqab”. In the book “Sirat ibn Hisham: Biography of the Prophet” (I. Hisham, 2000), it has been written that in the battle of khaybar, two black flags were in front of the Prophet Muhammad. One with Ali ibn Abi Talib called Al-Iqab and the other with one of the Ansar (helpers). The Prophet Muhammad said to Ali: Take this standard and proceed with it until Allah grants you victory (Al-Waqqi, 1989 (1409); I. Hisham, 2000).

I checked the original Arabic text of (A. a.-M. b. Hisham, 1955) and it is obvious that the translator of (I. Hisham, 2000) has used the wrong pronunciation Al-Iqab as explained in Table 1. He has not written the English translation of the word in the book, only its pronunciation has been mentioned. The vowel symbols in the original Arabic book of Sirat ibn Hisham (A. a.-M. b. Hisham, 1955) shows that the true pronunciation is Al-Uqab and the true translation is “Eagle”. The same statement but with the correct pronunciation Al-Uqab has been written in (Kathir, 2001; ut-Tahrir, 2012).
3.5. Analogy Between the Flag and the Eagle in Old Poems

Ibn al-Kathir in the book "The Life of the Prophet Muhammad" (Kathir, 2006), refers to some old poems that include the statements like: fighting in the shade of the eagle (banner), at Mecca when we came it was as if our banner was an eagle (also in (Kathir, 1978 (1398))), heading for the shade of the banner as though they were an eagle's shadow and etc. These analogies in the old Arabic poems reveal clearly why the flag name had been Eagle.

3.6. White Banner of the Prophet Muhammad

In addition to the detailed historical evidences expressed above, there are a number of references which have reported that Prophet Muhammad have had a white banner as well (Shaybah, 1988 (1409)). Also, it has been reported that Prophet Muhammad entered Makkah with his white banner (an-Nasa'i, 1990 (1411); at-Tirmidhi, 2000 (1421)). We can conclude that there existed two types of standards, the banner (Liwa in Arabic) had been white, and the flag (Rayah in Arabic) had been black (Al-Waqidi, 1989 (1409); at-Tirmidhi, 2000 (1421); Majah, 1952). In next sections, historical proofs verify that despite the Prophet Muhammad was severely harassed and offended by Meccans he never punished them but graciously forgave them.

4. What Quraysh Did to Prophet Muhammad

Prophet Muhammad received first revelations at the age of 40. In the early three years, Prophet Muhammad could only preach monotheism secretly. Some of his peers respected his words and became his followers. When the Prophet began preaching Islam publicly, the Quraysh did not believe him. Many members of the Quraysh stiffly opposed Prophet Muhammad. Meccans were not satisfied with only ignoring or mocking him and his followers but started to answer his invitation by violence. Tribal leaders, opposed, ridiculed and eventually boycotted his clan Banu Hashim and Prophet Muhammad and his followers were harassed, assaulted and tortured (Sardar, 2014). The Quraysh was the first and the worst enemy of Prophet Muhammad and Islam.

When the Quraysh chiefs encountered the emergence of a new Prophet who invited all the people to monotheism, equality, justice and instructed them not to worship idols, they resorted to any means to silence him from the early days of Islam at Mecca. Prophet Muhammad believed that women should be honored and their dignity and rights have to be respected. The Prophet taught people to worship the one God who is the Lord of the universe, to have faith instead of tribal and kinship pride, to provide for the poor, and to realize that all humans are equal regardless of race, geographical contiguity or a specific privilege. Quraysh had problems with all of these and reacted to the Prophet Muhammad’s new enlightenments. If any person accepted the new religion, they oppressed and harassed him. The minority of Muslims including the Prophet of Islam were suffered in most brutally and ruthlessly ways discarding all moral and humane principles. What Quraysh did was ten years of persecution and torture in Mecca. The Muslims who resisted in their belief, faced imprisonment, torture, and even martyrdom. These dark years were followed by six years of skirmishes and full-blown battles.

4.1. Ridiculing and Accusing

At the beginning of the Prophet Muhammad invitation to Islam, Quraysh did everything for the defamation of the character of Prophet Muhammad (Bahman Zeinali, 2017). They planned to make his invitation and speeches seem not important among ordinary people and undermine his mission. So, they started mocking and ridiculing Prophet Muhammad and accused him of being a magician, insane, liar,
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poet and the like (I. Hisham, 2000). Quraysh also accused Prophet Muhammad of not getting the revelations from God but making by himself (God).

A group of Quraysh including several men and women mocked the Prophet and also derided him in their poems. The mockery was to an extent that Prophet Muhammad was inspired by god: “indeed we will suffice you against the deriders” (Chapter 15; verse 95). Quraysh provoked a large number of people against him and laid the blame on him as a divisive among the Quraysh (I. Hisham, 2000). They imposed a complete ban on the invitation to Islam. They pursued the destructive policies involving the slander, insult, invective and curses but soon grew more aggressive and Muslims gradually became victims of physical violence in addition to insults.

4.2. Threatening

The people in power in Mecca, threatened Muslims with destruction of property and wealth and threatened the new Muslims and who recited the Quran to punishment and death (Siddiqi, 2016).

4.3. Torturing and Suffering

Quraysh tried any way to stop Prophet Muhammad. Since Prophet Muhammad was preaching monotheism, they assaulted him verbally and physically (al-Bukhari, 2016). The public opinion was violently set against Muslims and they were exposed to open attack or blows in the dark (Muir, 1923). Quraysh repeatedly harassed and persecuted the Muslims cruelly. They threw uterus of sheep at the face and head of the Prophet, threw dust, trash and garbage on him and on his doorstep and walkway (I. Hisham, 2000). The prophet’s enemies threw stone at him when he was inviting people to monotheism (a.-M. al-Hindi, 2013).

Uqbah insulted the Prophet and put a long piece of cloth around the Prophet's neck and twisted it hard in an attempt to throttle the Prophet to death (al-Majlisi, 1983 (1403); Shaybah, 1988 (1409)). Abu Jahl decided to trample the Prophet’s neck while he was engaged in prayer but he couldn’t (Tabresi, 1986 (1406)). Since Prophet Muhammad condemned racism and tribalism, Mecca slaves loved and believed him. Because of that, male and female slaves and servants who converted to Islam were tortured by their masters. The Quraysh whipped the slaves, threw the naked slaves on the scorching sands of the desert at the hottest times of the summer day. Quraysh chiefs further stamped the pained body of the slaves by hot iron rod or put a heavy rock on their chest (Nadwi, 2001). Every day, there would be a scene in which Muslims were beaten or tortured and when they complained to Prophet Muhammad he asked them to be patient.

4.4. Three Year Imposed Harsh Boycott

When Quraysh understood that their plans for limiting Islam had been ineffective, they decided to kill Prophet Muhammad. Implementing this plan was not possible unless the Banu Hashim and their leader Abu Talib (Prophet Muhammad’s uncle) would be agreed, otherwise the Banu Hashim clan would avenge the Prophet Muhammad blood and the Quraysh entered an endless internal war. They suggested Abu Talib to accept and get two times the blood money and let someone not from Quraysh assassinate Prophet Muhammad (Barr, 1995 (1415)). Abu Talib opposed vehemently and urged the families of the sons of the Abd al-Muttalib (grandfather of Prophet Muhammad) to go to their valley (valley of Abu Talib, a narrow valley between two mountains in the east of Ka'ba) to defend the Prophet Muhammad’s life. Quraysh declared a harsh economic and social boycott against Prophet Muhammad, Banu Hashim and Banu ’Abd al-Muttalib and they were ostracized and forced to withdraw from Makkah and live in the valley with massive difficulties for three years. Quraysh imposed heavy social and economic sanctions so that they were prevented from buying even essentials. Prophet Muhammad and his clan lived in misery under the devastating boycott for three years (Pickthall, 1975). The stifling siege was so rigorously applied and food was so scarce that Banu Hashim, especially the children were suffering from massive
difficulties (Ghaedan, 1996). They ate leaves and one date was divided between two people (Kurdi, 2000 (1420); Sulaiman, 2007 (1428)). The women and more specially the famished children and suckling babies would cry with hunger which could be heard all over the valley and the citizens could hear their wailing outside the valley (al-Majlisi, 1983 (1403); Muir, 1923). Quraysh noticed the children's suffering but they didn't sympathize with them. Abu Talib knew that every night there might be a threat against the Prophet’s life, so during the nights he asked the Prophet Muhammad to sleep in his bed or other men of the Banu Hashim (al-Bayhaqi, 1985 (1405)). They even gloated over their “triumph” in making the children of Banu Hashim cry for water and food. Quraysh planned to continue the ban until the Prophet was given up to them to be killed. Ali ibn Abi Talib in one of his letters writes: Quraysh put us at risk because we refrain from handing Prophet Muhammad over to them, as they wanted to kill him and mutilate his body (Shushtari, 1997).

4.5. Killing, Assassination and Terror

When Sumayyah the mother of the Ammar ibn Yasir announced that she would not renounce her Islam. Abu Jahl killed her with a spear in front of her husband and son and then killed her husband Yasir. Ammar watched both his parents being murdered. Abu Jahl also tried to assassinate Prophet Muhammad while praying by throwing a heavy stone at the head of the Prophet which did not succeed (Ishaq, 2002; Kathir, 2006). Two other Prophet’s followers, Abdulla ibn Masud and Abuzar, were suffered severely. The threat of the polytheists became so serious and they continued their persecution and oppression to an extent that Prophet Muhammad decided to have 83 of the Muslims migrate to Abyssinia (present day Eritrea and Ethiopia) to save their lives and faith (I. Hisham, 2000).

The tribes of Quraysh were always seeking opportunities to kill the Prophet Muhammad. While Prophet Muhammad was still in Mecca (last days before his migration to medina) his life was severely in danger. Quraysh planned a very serious murder plot to avert the new born Islam. It was agreed by consensus to choose a young man from each tribe and they attack the Prophet Muhammad’s home overnight and kill the Prophet while sleeping (Barr, 1995 (1415)). This way, since a group of men would kill the Prophet, the Hashimites would not be able to fight against all the clans at the same time in retaliation for the murder of Prophet Muhammad and the Quraysh could achieve their goals without internal wars. But, God revealed to Prophet about their plot. On the night of the plot, Ali ibn Abi Talib, the Prophet’s devoted cousin, sacrificed himself and slept in the Prophet’s bed (Barr, 1995 (1415); Pickhtall, 1975).

In the middle of the night, the Prophet Muhammad could slip out of the house and leave Mecca to start his migration to Medina (Jordac, 2014). Just before daybreak, the slayers stormed into the house to kill the Prophet, but they surprised when they discovered that it was Ali instead of Prophet Muhammad who was sleeping in the bed (al-Nishaburi, 1990 (1411); A. i. M. i. Athir, 1989 (1409); Hanbal, 2009 (1430); Kurdi, 2000 (1420); Tabari, 1987). To praise Ali ibn Abi Talib sacrifice, loyalty and his daring, a Quranic verse was revealed about that fateful incident at the night of the Migration: “And among men is he who sells himself to seek the pleasure of Allah. Allah is very kind to His devotees” (Chapter 2; verse 207) (Tirmazi, 2007; Zeineddine, 2017).

4.6. Muslims Property Were Stolen

Prophet Muhammed and his companions fled to Madinah from persecution. They could not take their property to medina and almost all of their property was left in mecca. Meccans started stealing and confiscation of the property of Muslims who fled persecution from Makkah to Madinah (Gharavi, 2010). The Muslims not only were expelled from their homes but also their property were stolen.
4.7. Battles against Muslims

Quraysh also killed many of Prophet Muhammad’s companions in a set of battles that imposed on the Muslims. They killed 14 of prophet Muhammad’s followers in the battle of Badr (Lings, 1991) and about 70 Muslims in the battle of Uhud (al-Bukhari, 2016). Quraysh killed Hamze (Prophet’s uncle) in the battle of Uhud (Irving, 1989). The Meccans hostility was to an extent that they mutilated Hamza body (Al-Baladhuri, 1974 (1394); Al-Waqiqi, 1989 (1409)). The Quraysh army killed many Muslims in the Uhud battle and injured the Prophet Muhammad in the face and his front teeth were broken (A. a.-M. b. Hisham, 1955).

They imposed a set of battles against Muslims, broke their treaties and did everything to annihilate Muslims.

4.8. After Prophet Muhammad

Some of the Quraysh never lost their hatred of Islam and the Prophet. After Prophet Muhammad’s demise, they spewed out their hatred and hostility toward him, his successor and his family. Banu Umayyah (Abu Sufyan was from Banu Umayyah clan) were one of the clans in the Quraysh tribe who always opposed Banu Hashim (Prophet Muhammad was from Banu Hashim clan). Abu Sufyan was one of the leaders of Mecca oppositions who provoked several battles against Muslims in which many Muslims were killed. He never believed in Prophet Muhammad and Islam with his heart. After the Prophet’s demise he always had plans for his clan to get the power (Askari, 2017). Against Prophet Muhammad’s warning about Banu Ummayyah, his son Muawiyah was appointed as the governor of Levant region of Arabia (modern day Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, Palestine) seven years after Prophet’s demise (Asakir, 1994 (1415)). Prophet Muhammad had warned the Muslims about the threats of Banu Ummayyah, the family of Abu sufyan, Muawiyah and even Yazid (son of Muawiyah) for the future of the Islam (al-Nishaburi, 1990 (1411); Hatim, 1999 (1419); Qurtubi, 1985). However, the appointment of Muawiyah as the governor of Syria gave them the opportunity to become stronger and get the power. Muawiyah fought Ali ibn Abi Talib, who was always respected and beloved by Prophet and was the nearest companion to him and the Prophet Muhammad had announced him as his successor (al-Suyuti, 1994 (1414); al_Sadr, Sachedina, Rizvi, & Khimjee, 2014; Amini, 1987). Muawiyah ordered public cursing of Ali ibn Abi Talib (al-Hajjaj, 1998 (1419); Sighaf, 2007 (1428)) and also killed many of Ali ibn Abi Talib’s companions (Asakir, 1994 (1415); A. i. M. i. Athir, 1989 (1409)). After Ali ibn Abi Talib was assassinated, Muawiyah was in conflict with his son Hassan ibn Ali (grandson of the Prophet) and was involved in the poisoning and killing Hassan ibn Ali (Al-Baladhuri, 1974 (1394); al-Masudi, 1989 (1409); Asakir, 1994 (1415)). Fifty years after the prophet, Yazid (grandson of Abu Sofyan) killed Hussein (grandson of the Prophet) In Karbala battle (Ashura day). Yazid murdered Hussein, his bothers, sons, relatives and his companions and enslaved his wives, sisters and daughters along with the other women and children (al-Alusi, 1994 (1415); Al-Baladhuri, 1974 (1394); Al-Hakeem & Albodairi, 2017).

Muawiyah, Yazid and their successors changed the form of Islamic caliphate to a hereditary and tyrannical monarchy (Mawdudi, 1978 (1398); Middleton, 2015) to an extent that their legacies have been summarized as dissipated Monarchs in some sources (Muir, 2004). Even this transformation had been predicted by Prophet Muhammad (al-Bayhaqi, 1985 (1405); Asakir, 1994 (1415)). During this period, acting based on the Quran and the Prophet Muhammad’s Sunna (prophet Muhammad's way of life, words and legal precedent) including his justice and lenience were forgotten and that is the very issue that Ali, Hasan and Hussein were opposing with. Nowadays a problem like this exist in the world. Extremists do any kind of violent actions and terror to get to their own or their employers’ benefits and put the objective “Islamic” on their name but not only there is no even a minimum resemblance between them and the Prophet’s Muhammad Sunna but also they are completely against it.

Prophet Muhammad had warned previously about all these happenings and had the power to prevent them (al-Nishaburi, 1990 (1411); Hatim, 1999 (1419); Qurtubi, 1985). He could disregard his
Islamic graciousness and compassion and avenge Banu Umayyah and Abu Sufyan in conquest of Mecca so that none of the future events would take place. But he never made punishments of the crimes not yet committed.

5. What Prophet Muhammad Did to Quraysh After the Conquest of Mecca

5.1. No Revenge

As mentioned in section 3, the Quraysh in Mecca had been guilty of disputation, persecution, exile, murder and battle against the Muslims. In essence, they did not omit any kind of hostile commission and omission but they practiced it against the Prophet and his followers (Nadwi, 2001). Eight years after the Prophet exile, the situation reversed and it was a good opportunity for revenge. The Prophet had more than enough reasons to avenge, so that if he did it, no one would blame him for revenging because it was his right to justice. But he had always been in a higher moral position with a great big heart and a deep soul (Sultan, 2007). He forgave the Quraysh and Meccans. Prophet Muhammad always recommended everyone not only to skip revenge but also to forgive each other and even remove hatred from their hearts (al-Qudai, 2019; Sultan, 2007). This has been recommended in Quran as well (Chapter 42, Verse 40). These advices are always alive and help improving the social, political and international relations as well as individual or family life. Prophet Muhammad who had been verbally and physically abused by Meccan, responded to them with patience and forgiveness.

5.2. Art of Peaceful Entrance

Prophet Muhammad knew that Muslims will undoubtedly conquer Mecca. He not only had no plan to revenge but also had a very accurate plan to prevent the Meccans from being killed. Prophet Muhammad was very careful that the Muslims’ army move so that the Quraysh do not become aware of the expedition. This way, Quraysh spies and the people of Mecca were fully unaware of Muslims movement until the army arrived at Marr al-Zahran, few kilometers away from Mecca. Even Muslims themselves did not know where Prophet is intended to take them until they got to Marr al-Zahran (Al-Waqidi, 1989 (1409)). Only this Prophet’s wise and artful plan could save the Meccan’s lives and ensured the masterpiece of peaceful entrance. When Muslims asked Prophet Muhammad about their destination, he simply answered “where God wills” (Al-Waqidi, 1989 (1409)). Since the inhabitants of Mecca recognized the Muslims supremacy, decided to surrender and Prophet Muhammad could enter Mecca without battle. It was 8 years since they drove Prophet Muhammad into exile (Aleem, 2011).

This plan, led to surrendering of Meccans because they had no time to prepare their army. If they had been given the chance of fighting, they would be defeated by Muslims and most of them would be killed. Prophet Muhammad even did not want that and planned a bloodless conquest of Mecca. He granted an amnesty for Meccans after entering Mecca which proved to the people that he is a Prophet not a king or a conqueror.

5.3. The Greatest Forgiveness in the History

Prophet Muhammad prevented battle and bloodshed in a situation that no one could blame him for revenging because then the justice had been carried out. In return to Quraysh terrible harassment and killing, Prophet forgave them easily and quickly. The Prophet never planned to take personal revenge. He forgave his worst enemies who had caused many horrors, tortures, Muslims exiles, battles, murders and killing of his nearest companions like Hamza (see section 4.7).

The Meccans were surprised because when Prophet Muhammad arrived, he made his announcement that anyone who does not intend to fight will be given mercy. He even prevented some of
his companions who were determined to take revenge and prohibited any aggression or offence against the family of Abu Sufyan. His forgiveness was to an extent that forbade even any kind of verbal aggressiveness against Banu Ummayyah. The conquest of Mecca was the biggest victory of the Muslims (Aleem, 2011). No one had the power to confront them. In such a situation, Prophet Muhammad forgave his and Islam’s archenemies leniently all at once. Thereupon Prophet Muhammad declared (Al-Waqidi, 1989 (1409)):

“I speak to you in the same words as my brother Joseph told his brothers. This day there is no reproof against you. May God forgive you for he is the most merciful of all the merciful (Quran: chapter 12, verse 92). Go, you are set free.”

Meccans who themselves expected a terrible punishment, surprised by the Prophet’s statement, and felt a great deal of affection for Islam and Prophet Muhammad. Studying the history in more details (some of which explained in section 4), will show that this forgiveness can be named the greatest forgiveness of the history. No other similar great forgiveness like this has ever been taken place in the history. Prophet even forgave those who brutally killed and then mutilated the body of his uncle Hamzah although missing Hamzah was very awful for him (Aleem, 2011). He acted generously to his staunchest enemies in Mecca, announced clemency for everyone and demanded only that the pagan idols around the Kaaba be destroyed. Prophet Muhammad put Ali on his shoulders and they smashed the idols inside and around the Kaaba (al-Nishaburi, 1990 (1411)). Prophet Muhammad was always courteous to his enemies and those who pretended to be allies but were not in real. He was fully aware of hypocrisy of some pseudo allies, but never confronted them. One can claim easily that if an ordinary governor was instead of the Prophet Muhammad and could conquer his enemies, a great bloodshed could be expected that would be recorded in the history. There is no other great forgiveness in the history like what Prophet Muhammad did in the conquest of Mecca. Studying sections 4 and 5 will supports why it is the greatest forgiveness in the history.

Some of those who were freed by Prophet Muhammad had never believed in Islam with their hearts. This has been regarded as kind of an ill-fame for them in the history. They pretended to accept Islam. Some of them accepted Islam with deep loathing and some remained silence waiting for the perfect moment to strike Islam as they did about the Prophet’s beloved cousin Ali and the Prophet’s grandsons Hassan and Hussein. God had informed Prophet Muhammad in Quran (Chapter 17, Verse 93) about such people (Al-Waqidi, 1989 (1409)). Prophet Muhammad could prevent future events against Islam and his family by eliminating some of Quraysh but he never made punishments before the crimes are committed. During the battle of Siffin (657 AD) Ali ibn abi Talib told his followers about Muawiyah and Banu Umayyah that they are from the freed persons who never accepted Islam, were always fighting against Islam and do not deserve the caliphate of Muslims (Qutaybah, 1990 (1410)), they had not accepted Islam but they verbally professed it to secure safety, and they had hidden their misbelief until they found helpers and then disclosed it (letter 16 of the book “Nahjul Balagha”) (Abu-Talib, 2009). When Hussein ibn Ali (grandson of Prophet Muhammad) was killed by Yazid (son of Muawiyah and grandson of Abu Sufyan) in Karbala, Zeinab (granddaughter of Prophet Muhammad and daughter of Ali) who had been taken captive, called Yazid the son of the freed people (Tahir, 1999; Tawus, 2003).

These events again show the importance of the Prophet forgiveness in the conquest of Mecca. He always behaved based on Quran which invites people to forgiveness and generosity.

6. Punishment or Mercy

Muslims believe that Prophet Muhammad have had a great moral character and a high and noble disposition based on the history and Quran: “Verily you are of an exalted standard of moral excellence”
(Chapter 68, Verse 4). In the following lines another historical evidence has been presented which verifies the Prophet’s will for Mercy toward Meccans.

When the Muslims triumphant army were entering Mecca in 630 AD (8 years after Prophet’s migration to Medina), Sa’d ibn Ubadah passed by Abu Sufyan and while marching ahead with a detachment of the Ansar, shouted:

“Today is the day of conflict, sanctuary is no more, Allah has humbled the Quraysh” (Al-Waqidi, 1989 (1409); Kathir, 1978 (1398)).

In a short while, when the Prophet’s regiment came, Abu Sufyan complained to the Prophet about what S’ad had said. The Prophet was displeased with S'ad’s bragging and replied:

“Nay, today is the day of mercy and forgiveness. Today will Allah honor the Quraysh, and raise glory of the Sanctuary” (Al-Waqidi, 1989 (1409); I-Hadid, 1965 (1385)).

The Prophet sent somebody for S'ad and took the emblem from him and gave it to his son Qays. It meant as if the standard had not been taken away from him at all (Al-Waqidi, 1989 (1409)). What Prophet did in this seen was very wise. By transferring the standard from S’ad to his son Prophet sent some messages. The Prophet announced his disagreement with the conflict and the humiliation of his enemies. He also on the one hand, pacified Abu Sufyan whose feelings had been hurt and on the other hand, hinted S'ad that he should have not do that and at the same time the prophet’s leniency included S'ad who had served Islam truly and well because the standard was in the hands of his son. It was a simultaneous condemn and remission.

The sentence that Prophet substituted the Sa'd ibn Ubada’s slogan was selected very wisely as well. Prophet Muhammad converted the meaning of the statement “Today is the day of conflict” said by S'ad to the statement “Today is the day of mercy” by only changing a letter in a word (Al-Asqalani, 2005 (1426); I-Hadid, 1965 (1385)). He converted the meaning from revenge to forgiveness without changing the sentence but only by changing a single letter. Table 2 has illustrated the letters, the words and the statements in Arabic and compares their meanings.

Table 2. The letter of the word that Prophet Muhammad changed to convert the meaning from revenge to forgiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>With “ل”</th>
<th>With “ر”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic Word</td>
<td>المَلْحَمَة</td>
<td>المَرْحَمَة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>[al-malhamah]</td>
<td>[al-marhamah]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>Bloody fight, Butchery, Carnage, Fierce battle, Massacre, Slaughter</td>
<td>Clemency, Mercy, Mildness, Mercifulness, Gentleness, Kindness, Sympathy, The state of being gracious and merciful, Not disposed to severity of punishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slogan</td>
<td>أَلْیوْم  یوْم  الْمَلْحَمَة</td>
<td>أَلْیوْم  یوْم  الْمَرْحَمَة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>Today is the day of conflict</td>
<td>Today is the day of mercy and forgiveness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference between personalities become clear by just looking at the way they use to express their believes. Some authors (Gabriel, 2004; Richardson, 2006, 2009; Smith & Furnish, 2011) change an Arabic vowel to change the meaning (from eagle to punishment) and to add the lie of punishment to the history and Prophet Muhammad in 630 AD changed an Arabic letter to change the revenge into the mercy
and forgiveness. While the most important part of the story of the conquest of Mecca is the clemency of
the Prophet Muhammad, some authors (Gabriel, 2004; Richardson, 2006, 2009; Smith & Furnish, 2011)
try to focus on the flag or the color of the flag of the Muslims which is not so important. Among
revelations of God to the Prophet Muhammad in Quran, in 4 different places God describes some who
change the letters or words to bury or converse the truth. For example: “There are some who displace
words from (their) right places” (Chapter 4, Verse 46) and condemns them.

7. Lie-Based Character Defamation of Prophet Muhammad

The truth is respectful not stories, books, names and mind defaults. In this paper we showed that
even best-selling writers have tried to convert the truth to their desired story. Of course converting the
truth to anything but truth is a lie and the converter (whoever he/she is), is a liar.

There are several books, websites, interviews and video clips declaring that the word punishment
had been written on the flag of Prophet Muhammad (Richardson, 2006, 2009; Smith & Furnish, 2011). In
this historical research, we proved that this is completely wrong. Not only there is no evidence to support
this claim but also historical evidences are against it and show that the word has been abused. The authors
of the references (Richardson, 2006, 2009; Smith & Furnish, 2011) have emphasized on the word
punishment without paying attention to historical evidences. It is obvious that they have little knowledge
about historical sources. Terrible tinting of the history and doctrines by their interests are found in these
books which will be proved to be wrong as our future works. The books (Richardson, 2006, 2009; Smith
& Furnish, 2011) are deliberately emphasizing on the word punishment which is a lie rather than the truth
for defamation of the character of Prophet Muhammad. While a simple historical research can shed the
light on the truth, they have deliberately ignored the authentic historical sources. This kind of purposely
emphasizing on false information rather than the truth is a clear deception of the readers and the reader
cannot trust the other topics discussed in these books anymore. The sentence mentioned in section 3.1
includes more than one lie. Nowhere in the history is it mentioned that a word would have been written on
the Muslim flags during the conquest of Mecca. The word “punishment” neither had been written on the
flag nor would Quraysh be punished in the conquest of Mecca. The name of the flag had been Eagle.
There is nothing related to punishment neither on the flag nor in the real events.

7.1. Lie Number 1

The history shows that the behavior of the prophet Muhammad with the Quraysh in Mecca is
completely in contradiction to the sentence “On the flags was one word written in Arabic: punishment”
(Gabriel, 2004; Richardson, 2006, 2009; Smith & Furnish, 2011). See sections 5 and 6. It is claimed in
(Gabriel, 2004; Richardson, 2006, 2009; Smith & Furnish, 2011) that this sentence has been reported in the
book of ibn kathir “The Beginning and the End”. We have referred to the original Arabic book. There
is nothing about the punishment word on flags. Ibn kathir has reported that: “the day of the conquest of
Mecca, the banner (Liwa) of the Prophet was white and his flag (Rayah) was black and called al-Ughab
(the eagle) (Kathir, 1978 (1398)). Nowhere in the history, it has been mentioned that something has been
written on the black flag in the conquest of Mecca.

7.2. Lie Number 2

In (Gabriel, 2004; Richardson, 2006, 2009) it has been written that: (As he (Prophet
Muhammad) reentered the city of Mecca with his army of ten thousand, he called to the warriors in his
army from Medina and asked them, “Do you see the soldiers from Quraysh [Mecca]? Go and slaughter
them” or in other words “Do you see the soldiers from Quraysh (from Mecca)? He asked. Go and pluck
their heads”) (Gabriel, 2004; Richardson, 2006, 2009). In the original Arabic source, the Prophet has
never said do you see “the soldiers from Quraysh”. The exact translation is: do you see “the rabbles (ruffians) from Quraysh and their adherents”? The original Arabic text has an exact translation as below:

“The Prophet asked do you see the rabbles (ruffians) from Quraysh and their adherents? Then while one of his hands was on the other one said: harvest them until you reach me on Safa (a hill near the great mosque of Mecca)” (Kathir, 1978 (1398)).

The original Arabic word exactly means “harvest” which means eliminating. But the authors in (Gabriel, 2004; Richardson, 2006, 2009) have deliberately chosen the word “slaughter”. They try to show their desired picture from the situation which is not true. In the following lines it has been shown that what has been claimed in (Gabriel, 2004; Richardson, 2006, 2009) is wrong.

The history verifies that the Prophet Muhammad had forbidden the battle (Al-Waqidi, 1989 (1409)). The Muslims had a strict order from Prophet Muhammad not to fight except when the other group fight them (A. a.-M. b. Hisham, 1955; Kathir, 1978 (1398)). The Prophet said to the Muslims’ commanders: don’t fight except who fights you (Al-Waqidi, 1989 (1409)).

It has been mentioned in the history through several narrations that some of the Quraysh and their allies tried to wage a battle. Although Prophet Muhammad planned a peaceful conquest and he had announced safety for all those who do not intend to fight, some of the men of the Quraysh and their allies including some of Quraysh leaders gathered in Khandamah in Mecca to fight Muslims (A. a.-M. b. Hisham, 1955). They did not pay attention to the safety condition announced. They gathered the Quraysh’s rabbles and their adherents and got ready to attack Muslims (Al-Asqalani, 2005 (1426)). They confronted a group of Muslims whose commander was Khalid ibn al-Walid in Khandamah and killed one of them. A battle set up and the Meccans were defeated (A. a.-M. b. Hisham, 1955; Kathir, 1997 (1418)).

Waqidi (Al-Waqidi, 1989 (1409)) writes: When Khalid ibn al-Walid was entering Mecca, he saw that a group of the Quraysh and their allies have been gathered to fight him. They prevented him from entering the city, drew their swords and shot arrows at Muslims. Khalid fought and defeated them. Ibn Kathir (Kathir, 1978 (1398)) writes: When entering Mecca, Prophet Muhammad emphasized that he does not allow his army to fight, however, he was informed that Khalid ibn al-Walid was fighting. Prophet Muhammad told someone: go and get yourself to Khalid and tell him to stop fighting. But he changed the order of the Prophet and told Khalid: the Prophet says kill anyone you got the power over. Khalid continued fighting and killed a number of them. When Prophet Muhammad was informed of that. He blamed khalid and told him: didn’t I forbid you from fighting and killing? Khalid said that he was told to do so. Prophet Muhammad sent for the messenger and blamed him (Kathir, 1978 (1398)). In another narration of the same event Khalid said to the Prophet: they started to fight first, threw us arrows and attacked us with their weapons. I refrained from fighting as long as I could. I invited them to Islam and asked them behave like other people and remain safe but they refused. Until I didn’t find any other choice and I fought them, we defeated them and they ran away in all directions (Al-Waqidi, 1989 (1409)). Another Waqidi’s narration is almost the same but with different details. He narrates that Prophet Muhammad saw the glitter of swords. He asked: What is that glitter. Didn’t I forbid the fighting? He was answered that Khalid ibn al-Walid was fought and if he wasn’t being fought he would not fight (Al-Waqidi, 1989 (1409)).

Based on the narrated incidence in (Kathir, 1978 (1398)), the Prophet called them rabbles because they insisted in fighting and bloodshed. Then he ordered to fight them.

Based on the above historical events, it can be concluded that the Prophet had certainly planned for preventing the battle and a peaceful opening. He had forbidden fighting. He had also announced safety for everyone who does not fight against Muslims. This announcement was made by the Prophet Muhammad before they get near to Mecca when the Prophet and Muslims were in Marr-uz-Zahran (Al-Asqalani, 2005 (1426)). However, when entering Mecca, he was informed that some of the Quraysh and their allies have waged a battle and attacked the Muslims. At first, he blamed his own commanders for
fighting but when he was said that the Quraysh has started and there had been no other choice for Muslims he ordered fighting them. It should be noticed that he ordered fighting only that group of Quraysh who waged the battle and attacked the Muslims. This is in complete contradiction with the claim of Mark A Gabriel and Joel Richardson in (Gabriel, 2004; Richardson, 2006, 2009). In an awfully failed attempt, they have tried to defame Prophet Muhammad as if he had commanded to “slaughter” the “people”. The real behavior of Prophet Muhammad toward Meccans can be also deduced from another historical event during the conquest of Mecca as follows. In (Kathir, 1978 (1398)) it has been mentioned that one of the Meccans named Fazalah intended to assassinate Prophet Muhammad while he was rounding the Kaaba at the day of conquest. When he got closer, Prophet recognized him. Prophet Muhammad behaved him kindly and put his hand on Fazalah’s heart so that Fazalah changed his mind, believed in Islam and he himself admitted that he loved the Prophet more than anybody and anything else (Kathir, 1978 (1398)).

There had been no other clash but that’s of Khalid in the conquest of Mecca, which was not started and intended by Muslims (Al-Waqidi, 1989 (1409)).

7.3. Lie Number 3

Mark A. Gabriel in his book “Jesus and Muhammad” in the section about the return of the Prophet to Mecca writes: “Years earlier, when the people were harassing him in the marketplace of Mecca, Muhammad had warned them, “O people of Mecca, I swear in the name of Allah I come as a slaughterer” (Gabriel, 2004).

In this section, it is proved that the Prophet did not mean all the people of Mecca but only a group of men who were present at the scene and tried to kill him. In addition, the statement “I come as a slaughterer” is not an exact translation and none of the sources has mentioned that this happened in the marketplace of Mecca. The original story is (Naeem, 1991 (1412); Shaybah, 1988 (1409));

The leaders of the Quraysh was sitting in the shadow of the Kaaba and had planned to kill Prophet Muhammad (Naeem, 1991 (1412)). Prophet Muhammad was saying his prayer near Kaaba. Suddenly, Uqba ibn Abi Mu'ayt approached him and violently twisted his garment round his neck and strangled it severely so that Prophet fell to his knees. He used all his force to cruelly throttle Prophet Muhammad (al-Bayhaqi, 1985 (1405); Kathir, 1978 (1398)), till the eyes of the Prophet bulged out (Zubaidi, 1996 (1417)). Prophet Muhammad could not breathe and Uqba was close to kill him. The scene was so horrible that people shouted and thought Uqba killed Prophet Muhammad (A. i. A.-a.-M. al-Hindi, 1981 (1401); Naeem, 1991 (1412)) and came to the scene to stop Uqba. Prophet Muhammad stood up and the group of men of Quraysh left him. Prophet said his prayer and when finished, passed them who were sitting in the shadow of Kaba and said: you, men of Quraysh, by him in whose hand my soul rests, I bring you slaughter. Prophet Muhammad succeeded in temporarily preventing them from further violent actions against him. They were gripped by what the Prophet said so severely that it was as though every man of them had a bird perched on his head (not one of them but stood silent and still because they were shocked). Even those of them who had been urging the severest measures against him previously, now turned to speak in a conciliatory way to him. Using the politest expressions they could think of, Abu Jahl said: depart in true guidance Abu al-Qasim, by God you were never ignorant (M. B. J. al-Tabari, 1987; Hanbal, 2009 (1430); Naeem, 1991 (1412)).

Based on (Kathir, 1978 (1398)), Prophet Muhammad never said “people of Mecca”, but he said it to a few men of Quraysh. He intended to warn a group of the Quraysh leaders who had already tortured him and his companions, killed a number of the Muslims and had tried to murder him recently. Prophet Muhammad at that time was not in a situation to fight or take reciprocal measures against Quraysh leaders. He had to defend himself and save his life. So he threatened them so that they might let him go.
Suyuti in (Suyuti, 1985 (1405)) and Nabhani in (Nabhani, 1996 (1417)) write that there were three men sitting near the Kaba: Uqba ibn Abi Mu'ayt, Umayyah ibn Khalaf and Abu Jahl. After that these people tormented the Prophet, he told them: “I swear to God, you will not finish (your torment/ignorance) until the God’s penalty overwhels you in near future.” When they heard this all of them were trembling. After the Prophet went away, he told his companions: “Be of good cheer that surely, God will arise his religion, he shall perfect his word and support his religion. These people whom you see are among those whom God will slaughter at your hands soon”. Uthman ibn Affan said: I swear in God, I saw them when God slaughtered them at our hands.

According to (Suyuti, 1985 (1405)), it can be concluded that the Prophet warned only three men of Quraysh. Another interesting point is that since these men were killed in the Badr battle and were not beheaded, the meaning of the original Arabic word (translated as slaughter) is not cutting the heads. This has been discussed in the following lines in more details.

The strongest evidence that proves that Prophet Muhammad did not told that to the people of Mecca, is the fact that he forgave Meccan and Quraysh in the conquest of Mecca and told them: “Today is the day of mercy and forgiveness. There is no reproof against you. Go, you are set free (Al-Waqidi, 1989 (1409)).

The group of the Quraysh leaders who tried to kill Prophet in this event, were among the staunchest enemies of Prophet Muhammad and Muslims. They had always shown their brutality against Prophet Muhammad, Islam and its people. They used every moment to wage war against Muslims. They were finally killed in the battle of Badr, the battle they had eagerly participated in to slaughter the people who loved Prophet Muhammad, the Prophet himself and his teachings called Islam.

The word “slaughter” has been interpreted as cutting heads by the author of (Richardson, 2006, 2009), while it has also other meanings. Mark A Gabriel explains (Gabriel, 2004): “the Arabic word for slaughter presents the picture of a farmer harvesting his crop with a scythe. In other words, Muhammad was telling them, “Cut their necks from their bodies as you would cut the fruit from the branch of a tree.” None of the historical references verifies this claim made by Mark A Gabriel. He has only been verified by Joel Richardson in (Richardson, 2006, 2009).

The original Arabic word does not exclusively mean cutting the heads but it can also be a synonym of the verb killing. Bayhaqi in (al-Bayhaqi, 1985 (1405)) has written that in that situation, the latter meaning had been meant. In (I. A. N. a. Humaidi, 1995 (1415)) it has been also discussed that the original Arabic word has not been used to mean cutting the heads. Another evidence is that for example Abu Jahl (one of the main enemies of Prophet Muhammad who was among the Quraysh men in this event) was killed in the battle of Badr but he was not beheaded. In (Suyuti, 1985 (1405)), it has been mentioned that when Prophet saw Abu Jahl dead in Badr battle said: my God, you fulfilled what you promised me. This means that the words Prophet Muhammad used for threatening Quraysh had never meant slaughtering and the interpretation of Mark A Gabriel (Gabriel, 2004) and Joel Richardson (Richardson, 2006, 2009) are wrong. If Prophet really meant to slaughter him, he would certainly never forget that, because Abu Jahl never failed to harass him and his companions and he was the killer of Somayah and Yasir (Hasani, 1996 (1416); Majlesi, 1983 (1403)). As another evidence, based on (Suyuti, 1985 (1405)), the group of Quraysh near the Kaba were three men who were killed in the Badr battle but not beheaded. The Prophet Muhammad’s plan for bloodless opening of Mecca and his forgiveness of Meccans in the conquest of Mecca are another strong evidences which show that the Prophet always used to prevent bloodshed and he never intended killing or slaughtering people of Mecca. The situation in which Prophet Muhammad has told that, should be well understood. This situation is very different from what (Gabriel, 2004; Richardson, 2006, 2009) try to plant in minds. The Prophet said it as a means of self-defense against violent Quraysh leaders. The Prophet had to threat those few specific individuals who were among the leaders of Quraysh and had killed his friends and followers before and now they were
close to kill him (Naeem, 1991 (1412)). The historical evidences that report the people shouted and thought the Quraysh men killed the Prophet Muhammad (A. i. A.-a.-M. al-Hindi, 1981 (1401); Naeem, 1991 (1412)), show that they had intended that. So it is a rational reaction from Prophet Muhammad to try to save his life and defend himself by using a verbal threatening of those aggressive Quraysh leaders. It was absolutely wise and rational to confront them with threats and warnings, when their plots and aggression were reached such a level.

Another marvelous thing that can be perceived from this event is that the Prophet Muhammad informed the men of the Quraysh from their future implying that their ignorance and their enmity will cost them their lives in future. This can also be considered as final steps of preaching aggressive antagonists still with the aim of shocking them to think about and reconsider their ignorant behaviors. It has been mentioned that when Prophet Muhammad was harassed by the hostile enemies of Islam, he used to ask God: “O Allāh guide my people for they do not know. They don’t know me and they don’t know you either (al-Hajjaj, 1998 (1419); al-Majlisi, 1983 (1403); al-Yahsabi, 1986 (1407)).

In this incident Prophet warned Uqba ibn Abi Mu’ayt, Umayyah ibn Khalaf and Abu Jahl whose bloody violence and extremely harsh hostility against Muslims was completely evident. They persecuted those who were in a weak position, oppressed women and old believers to turn them away from their religion by means of torture and murder and waged war against Islam and its people.

Uqbah bin Abi Mu’ayt was one of the staunchest and vilest opponents of the Prophet and the Muslims. He was determined to kill Prophet Muhammad cruelly by strangulation and throttling him. The incident severely hurt Prophet Muhammad (Naeem, 1991 (1412)), so that the eyes of the Prophet bulged out (Naeem, 1991 (1412)), and the people thought that Uqba killed the Prophet (Habban, 1975 (1395); Zubaidi, 1996 (1417)). His acts of hatred towards the Prophet include; insults, mockery, attempting to satisfy people that he is not a Prophet (al-Bayhaqi, 1985 (1405)), throwing dung to the door of the Prophet’s house (Al-Baladhuri, 1974 (1394)), trying to kill Prophet Muhammad [113]. He threw the entrails, blood, and waste of a camel between the Prophet’s shoulders when he went down in prostration as he prayed at the Kaba (Al-Baladhuri, 1974 (1394); al-Bayhaqi, 1985 (1405)). The Prophet had bent down his head in prostration and did not raise it, until Fatima (the Prophet’s daughter) came and removed the filth from him. In another attempt to injure the Prophet, Uqba stepped on the Prophet’s neck violently while he was in prostration (Al-Baladhuri, 1974 (1394)) and it was close that the Prophet’s eyes sustain a serious injury. His arrogance and impudence made him spit in the Prophet’s face (Al-Baladhuri, 1974 (1394)). He rejoiced at the death of the Prophet’s son Abdullah and called him with scornful words (al-Suyuti, 1994 (1414)).

Umayyah ibn Khalaf was one of the fiercest antagonists of the Prophet and the Muslims. Ibn Athir writes that he had been the most evil persecutor of the Prophet Muhammad (A. i. Athir, 1965 (1385)). An abuser and ridiculer of a Prophet. He persecuted and tortured the believers for having adopted Islam. For example, he forced Bilal to lie on hot desert sand and pinned him down with a heavy rock on his chest letting him burn under the torrid sun in order to force him to abjure Islam (A. a.-M. b. Hisham, 1955). He always harassed the Prophet as much as he could and was one of the Quraysh men who planned to throttle the Prophet (Suyuti, 1985 (1405)). He encouraged Uqbah bin Abi Mu’ayt to spit in the Prophet’s face (Al-Qurtubi, 2006 (1427)). He was one of the Quraysh leaders who forced the Prophet to leave his homeland. He was one of the designers of the assassination of Prophet Muhammad in the midnight (al-Shami, 1993 (1414)). When the Prophet could get out of Mecca that night he chased him to the Thawr cave near Mecca in which Prophet Muhammad had been hided (al-Shami, 1993 (1414)). They were promised to kill the Prophet Muhammad if they achieved him. Prophet Muhammad had a prophecy that if Umayyah get out of Mecca to confront the Muslims he would be killed. Even after Umayyah knew the Prophet’s warning, he continued to go to the battlefield of Badr with the motive of killing Muslims (Al-Waqidi, 1989 (1409)).
Abu Jahl was a leader of the Quraysh and one of the main stubborn arch-enemies of the Prophet Muhammad. He was the killer of the Prophet Muhammad’s companions Sumayyah and Yasir who were from new believers (Hasani, 1996 (1416); Majlesi, 1983 (1403)). He blinded one of the weak women who believed in Prophet Muhammad under the torture (Al-Baladhuri, 1974 (1394)). Abu Jahl dragged the body of Yasir, Sumayyah and their son Ammar ibn Yasir into the hot sands of Mecca in the blazing midday heat and tortured them (A. a.-M. b. Hisham, 1955). He humiliated and tortured the believers who were close companions of the Prophet Muhammad (Razi, 1989). By the time he heard that someone has believed in Islam, Abu Jahl started threatening, confiscation of his property and torturing him (A. a.-M. b. Hisham, 1955). He returned his brother (who believed in Islam and migrated to Medina) to Mecca and imprisoned him (Sa’d, 1990 (1410)). He also imprisoned his other brother and prevented him from migrating to Medina (Al-Baladhuri, 1974 (1394)). He called the Prophet magician and made other to call him so (Tabresi, 1986 (1406)). He mocked the Prophet and the Quran verses (Tabresi, 1986 (1406)). In another brutal incidence, Abu Jahl threw a stone at Prophet Muhammad and injured his face while he was preaching (Majlesi, 1983 (1403)). The stone hit Prophet Muhammad between his eyes and blood flew all over his face. Abu Jahl and other men were chasing the Prophet and throwing stone at him and he ran into the mountains and hid there until his wife Khadijah and his nephew Ali found him and bound his wounds up. They were there until the night and then could come back to the city (Majlesi, 1983 (1403)). Quraysh stoned his home until Khadijah objected and dispersed them. Abu Jahl plotted the assassination of the Prophet Muhammad in the midnight. He proposed that each clan should provide a young warrior and each of them should strike a blow at the Prophet Muhammad and kill him. This way they wanted to prevent Banu Hashim from avenging (Sa’d, 1990 (1410)). He had sworn to step on the neck of the Prophet Muhammad if saw him prostrating (Tabresi, 1986 (1406)). Abu Jahl never stopped his enmity. He had told the Quraysh: I swear to smash the Prophet’s skull with the heaviest stone I can carry when he prostrates in prayer (b. J. M. b. J. al-Tabari, 1992 (1412)). After Muslims migrated to Medina, he continues his enmity. Abu Jahl encouraged people of Mecca to attend the war against Muslims (Al-Zamakhshari, 1987 (1407)). He waged the battle of Badr by insisting on the war and persuading the leaders of Quraysh to move their men to the battlefield (Al-Waqidi, 1989 (1409)). In the first battle of Quraysh with Muslims (battle of badr) Prophet Muhammad announced that he hates the war and tried to stop that (Al-Waqidi, 1989 (1409)). When the Quraysh were preparing to start the battle, Prophet Muhammad made his effort to avert the war (Al-Waqidi, 1989 (1409)). He sent a message to the Quraysh: return and leave the war, I would have preferred it if someone other than you had come to take control of this affair, and I would rather that I take control of the affair from other than you. One of the Prophet Muhammad’s companions told Quraysh: He invites you to justice, so accept his offer (welcome him). By God, if you insist on war, after he invited you to justice, you will not be victorious over him (Al-Waqidi, 1989 (1409)). In this condition, Abu Jahl replied: By our God, we will not return now that our God has made it possible to get them. We will not run after a shadow after we have seen the source. Our caravan will not be intercepted after this, ever (Al-Waqidi, 1989 (1409)).

It has been reported in that one day, these three men harassed the Prophet to an extent that he raised his voice and invoked Allah’s curse upon them. He supplicated thrice and named them one by one (Shaybah, 1988 (1409)). Umayyah ibn Khalaf and Abu Jahl were among the men that Quran has called them the dividers (Chapter 15, Verse 90). They had divided the Quran into arbitrary parts and each of them gave the lie to a part of the Quran and denied it. They prevented the people coming to Mecca to gravitate to Prophet Muhammad, Quran and Islam teachings. They also made abused allegations against Prophet and Quran calling him poet, magician, madman and else (Al-Qurtubi, 2006 (1427)). Abu Jahl and Uqbah bin Abi Mu’ayt insisted in moving the Quraysh forces to the battle against Muslims and encouraged other leaders of Quraysh to attend the war (Al-Waqidi, 1989 (1409)). Abu Jahl and Umayyah ibn Khalaf were the main financial supporters of the Quraysh army in the battle of Badr (al-Yaqubi, 1960 (1379)). As mentioned before, if these three men would had the opportunity, they wouldn’t hesitate to kill Prophet Muhammad.
From the character of Prophet Muhammad it can be understand that if these three men did not insist in waging the battle of Badr and did not fight in the battle of Badr which they were killed in, Prophet Muhammad would forgive them in the conquest of Mecca just like other Quraysh in Mecca who had harassed Muslims before and participated in several wars against Muslims but Prophet Muhammad forgave them.

The Prophet Muhammad never cursed all the Quraysh or all the Meccans, but he always said: I have not been appointed as prophet of God for punishment, but I was sent as a mercy to all the mankind (all the creatures), I do not curse my people, because they do not know (Majlesi, 1983 (1403)). This is in correspondence with a verse in Quran: We have not sent you (Prophet Muhammad) except as a mercy to all the worlds (chapter 21, Verse 107).

7.4. Lie Number 4

In (Gabriel, 2004) it has been mentioned that:

“As the soldiers entered the city on horseback, some women ran out and hysterically began hitting the horses in the face with their fists, begging the soldiers not to kill them and their children” (Gabriel, 2004).

In the following lines, it will be proved that the condition described in (Gabriel, 2004) by Mark A. Gabriel is nothing to do with the history and resembles more to a movie scenario written to create a false picture in the minds. In the following lines, the truth has been extracted from the original historical sources.

As it has been mentioned in (Kathir, 1978 (1398)), before entering Mecca, Abu Sufyan met Prophet Muhammad and returned to Mecca and warned the Meccans that there is no way to fight such a huge army and the best choice is to surrender. Prophet Mhammad had told him that anyone who enters the house of Abou Sufyan he is safe and whoever stays in his house or in the Mosque shall be safe. Abou Sufyan informed Meccans how to remain safe (A. i. Athir, 1965 (1385)). These were announced by the Muslims who were entering Mecca too. Prophet Muhammad’s plan for preventing battle and bloodshed while returning to his hometown (Mecca) had been succeeded and by these announcements he tried to inform the people of Mecca, the Quraysh, the women and the children that they are safe. Prophet Muhammad had commanded Muslims that they are not allowed to bother, injure or kill anybody unless Meccan start fighting and try to kill Muslims (A. i. Athir, 1965 (1385)).

There are 4 lies in the 2 line explanation in (Gabriel, 2004):

1. It has not been mentioned in the original Arabic source (Kathir, 1978 (1398)), and not in any other source that the women were begging the soldiers not to kill them and their children. Mark A. Gabriel has added this by himself.
2. Based on (Kathir, 1978 (1398)), the women did not run out hysterically.
3. This has not been mentioned in any source and has been added by the author of (Gabriel, 2004).
4. They did not hit the horses in the face with their fists. Nowhere has it been mentioned that they hit with their fist. In all the sources it has been written that they have slapped the horses in the face with their veils (Kathir, 1978 (1398)).
5. Based on (Kathir, 1978 (1398)), the Prophet had not yet been arrived in Mecca. This will be explained in detail in the following lines.

The exact translation of the sentences of Ibn Kathir in (Kathir, 1978 (1398)) is as follows: When Prophet Muhammad entered the year of the conquest and women began slapping the horses in the face.... Based on reliable original historical sources, it can be proved that this event had happened before Prophet’s entrance to Mecca. It has been written in (Kathir, 1978 (1398)) that when this happened,
Prophet Muhammad remembered a poem composed before by Hassan (Kalaei, 1999 (1420)) (an Arabian poet and one of the companions of Prophet Muhammad) in which he had used the statement “women slap the horses in the face”. In his poem, Hassan had predicted and explained the victory of Muslims on the Quraysh and described how the Muslims would enter Mecca. He had composed that Muslims will enter Mecca from Kada. (a high place near Mecca which is known as one of the upper entrance paths to Mecca). Prophet told his companions to enter Mecca from the same way that Hassan had said in his poem (Kathir, 1978 (1398)). Prophet defined the way from which Muslims should enter Mecca and this means that the slapping of the horses has taken place before entering Mecca. Ibn Kathir has never said that this has happened as the soldiers entered the city. It has been only mentioned that when the Prophet entered the “year of the conquest” (Kathir, 1978 (1398)). The same sentence has been mentioned in (Al-Asqalani, 2005 (1426); Tahawi, 2005 (1426)). None of the sources have talked about the exact location of the event. It might have happened in the way from Medina to Mecca. Definitely in order to manage such a huge army, the way for entering Mecca should have been planned earlier (before getting close to Mecca). The path traveled by Prophet Muhammad to reach the Mecca was passed through Marr-uz-Zahran (22 kilometers northwest of Mecca), then Zi Tuwa (6 kilometers of Mecca), and after that told parts of the Muslims to enter from Kada (a high passage near Mecca). He himself and his companions entered Mecca from Kada at the higher place of Mecca (M. B. F. Humaidi, 2002 (1423)). In Marr-uz-Zahran Abu Sufyan met Prophet Muhammad and Prophet informed him that he and his family will be safe (I. Hisham, 2000). Zi Tuwa is in the sacred precinct of Mecca (Haram) and Prophet Muhammad told Muslims which way they should enter Mecca (I. Hisham, 2000).

Another reason that proves that this has not happened in Mecca is that it is written in (Al-Waqidi, 1989 (1409); Maqrizi, 1999 (1420)) that one of the Meccans (Ibn Khatal) got out of the upper side of Mecca on his horse. He then saw the daughters of Sa'id ibn al-As which had heard that the Muslims are coming. They had spread their hairs and had drawn their veils over the faces of the horses. This means that these women had not encountered the Muslims then.

Up to now, it is proved that this event has happened outside Mecca. Only brief explanations about the reason for this event could be found in a few reference. According to the evidences in the history, it can be concluded that there are 5 possibilities:

1. Based on (Al-Asqalani, 2005 (1426); Kathir, 1978 (1398)), Prophet Muhammad saw women slapping the horses in face by their veils. This could be a sign of discontent. If this is true, this is another evidence that these women were feeling safe to come out of their houses and dare to slap the horses.
2. According to (al-Zahiri, 1985 (1406)), it could have been a simple event. When the Muslims were passing, a woman turned a horse face away from the door of her home by using her veil.
3. Based on (al-Bayhaqi, 1985 (1405)), two concepts can be inferred. Mecca women slapped the faces of the horses of the Muslims to make them come back (as mentioned in possibility 1), or they slapped the faces of the horses on which their men were running away from Muslims, to make them come back and fight Muslims.
4. According to (Al-Waqidi, 1989 (1409); Maqrizi, 1999 (1420)), the daughters of Sa'id ibn al-As drew their scarves over the faces of their horses conceivably to keep them calm or as a sign of surrender because Muslim’s army would pass there toward Mecca in hours.
5. Based on (I. Athir, 1988 (1409); Kathir, 1997 (1418)), Prophet saw women slapping dust off the horse faces by their veils. They could have been Muslim women did this for honoring and cherishing their men or they could have been non-Muslim women trying to ask for mercy. According to (Qirwani, 1981 (1401)), the women were wiping the horse faces with their hands and slapped the dust off them by their veils. The same meaning has been mentioned in (al-Yahsabi, 2011; al-Zabidi, 1993 (1414); Kalbi, 2017 (1438)). From (Ghomni, 1996 (1416)), it is concluded that the Mecca women, when heard that the Prophet Muhammad has announced safety of Meccans, prohibited Muslims from fighting and prevented his companions from even verbal
aggressiveness, not only felt safe but also opened the doors of their houses and poured wine on the faces of the Muslim horses to show that they have surrendered.

According to repeated observations recorded in historical evidences, one can analyze the truth of the event and come to a conclusion. The behavior of the Prophet Muhammad has shown his mercy toward everyone. If women had been frightened by Muslims and Prophet Muhammad would not smile. His insistence on peaceful opening of Mecca, giving safe to Abu Sufyan, his wife (who had mutilated Hamza body), announcing the safe for the Mecca inhabitants and Prophet Muhammad’s condemning even verbal aggressiveness against Meccans (as for Sa’d ibn Ubada’s slogan) prove that he never intended to frighten or humiliate the Meccan. Undoubtedly, if Prophet Muhammad saw frightened women, not only he did not smile but also would order his companions to make the women sure that they are safe as he did when he saw that Abu Sufyan was frightened from Sa’d ibn Ubada’s slogan.

**Conclusion**

It was proved that Prophet Muhammad remained loyal to the Hudaybiyyah peace treaty until Quraysh violated the peace unilaterally. The claim of punishment flag was convincingly refuted. Several historical evidences were used to prove that Muslims used at least one black flag in the conquest of Mecca named Eagle. The claim has been a misunderstanding or mistranslating from Arabic or a Prophet Muhammad defamation plan based on some motives. The eagle had been the name of a distinct type of flag even before the Islam advent. It was shown that Prophet Muhammad never punished Meccans or Quraysh but forgave them in an announcement of clemency. Based on a comprehensive historical analysis which covered all kinds of Quraysh hostilities such as tortures and bloodshed against Prophet Muhammad, his family and companions and Muslims, the forgiveness of the Quraysh by Prophet Muhammad who had been robustly conquered Mecca and had the power and the reason to revenge, was referred to as the greatest forgiveness in the history. The extraordinary plan of the Prophet Muhammad for Peaceful opening of Mecca was discussed. Other lies about some of the event happened during the conquest of Mecca were disclosed based on historical records and the truth was revealed.
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