



THE
CRISIS
IN ISLAM

Is Islam in a Crisis or is the Crisis in Islam?

ABDUL-HAQ AL-ANI

The Crisis in Islam

Is Islam In A Crisis Or Is The Crisis In Islam?

Abdul-Haq Al-Ani

BSc, MSc, PhD, CEng, MIEE, MBCS
Dips (Law), PhD (Law)

MSc (Kn. Eng.), MA (Philosophy)

Member of the Inner Temple London

Member of the Chartered Institute of Arbitrators

Editing and Translation

Dr. Tarik Al-Ani

Middle East Book Review

London

MEBOR

Middle East Book Review

Published by
Middle East Book Review
London – 2016

© Abdul-Haq Al-Ani

Cover: Yasir Al-Ani

ISBN: 978-0-9935720-0-5

All rights reserved: No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Dr. James Thring helped us during the preparation of this book. He provided us with valuable comments, suggestions and corrections. Without his help, the book would not have been completed in this form. We are indebted to him. Any factual error or failure in presentation is completely ours.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1	
What is Political Islam Today?	7
Chapter 2	
Roots of Political Schism in Islam	17
Chapter 3	
The Conflict between House of 'Ali and House of 'Aisha	41
Chapter 4	
The Birth of Muslim Invasions	55
Chapter 5	
Islam Came Only to the Arabs Not to Spread by Sword	69
Chapter 6	
Islam, Jizya or Death	87
Chapter 7	
Wars of Apostasy	101
Chapter 8	
Misinterpreting the Qur'an	119
Chapter 9	
Intellectual Terrorism of Shari'a	133
Chapter 10	
Inventing Wahhābism	149

Chapter 11 Wahhābism in the Service of Imperialism	165
Chapter 12 The Rise of other Sunni Islamic Movements	179
Chapter 13 The Confusion in Understanding Political Sunni Islam	195
Chapter 14 Shi'a Political Islam	201
Chapter 15 Wilāyet Al-Faqih	215
Chapter 16 Political Shi'ism in Lebanon	229
Chapter 17 The Imperialist Role	243
Chapter 18 What Future for Muslims?	267
Notes	279

Chapter 1

What is Political Islam Today?

I do not aim in what I write to re-write history, because history is mostly not what actually happened, but what people believe to have happened. In other words, it is the sum of convictions and not necessarily of facts. That does not mean that all of those convictions are wrong, but it could equally mean that some are false or imaginary or wishful thinking! My objective in writing this is to understand the cause of what is happening now in the Arab world in particular and the Islamic world in general, because it is inconceivable that people from all corners of the earth gather to ruin a country that is not related to them, and some do not even know where it is and why they are in it, just because men that claim to represent religion have poisoned their minds with hatred for the people of Syria or Iraq's Shi'a. Understanding the causes of what is happening may help us to stop it or prevent its recurrence, enabling us to get out of the dark tunnel where the world finds Muslims today.

Imagine that a group of people from outer space, who have never heard of any of our religions, were to land on Earth tomorrow. And imagine that among the matters, they would get exposed to, are a few of the religions on our planet. They would hear the Pope, for example, talking of the Merciful Lord who sent his only son to sacrifice himself to redeem us. They would hear the Dalai Lama

speaking of the great sin in killing any soul. Then they would hear the Muslim cleric Al-Qaradhāwi¹ encouraging his Muslim followers to kill other Muslims on the ground that his Lord had ordered it. Would any of those aliens take on Islam as their religion?

I know that there will be many murmurs and hums spinning around the argument that what Al-Qaradhāwi says, does not represent true Islam. But it is not sufficient to claim that such statements are not in accordance with true Islam without someone telling us first what True Islam is.

It is not enough for some Muslim clerics to stand up and tell the world that what is happening is not the real Islam. If this is not Islam at all, where did it come from and why all those who are killing and destroying and spreading havoc in Syria, Iraq, Afghanistan, Libya, Somalia, Tunisia and Egypt are Muslims, and how did they gather and assemble, and who gathered and assembled them? Such events do not happen by accident. If terrorism is not integral to Islam as is said, Muslim clerics and leaders of sects today should come out with a plan to stop terrorism, starting with the distorted and disastrous education in mosques, which offers Imperialism a free service which its fleets and aircraft have failed to achieve. But the truth is that the clergy even today offer nothing more than empty and regurgitated talk, which scratches the ears about how 'true religion' is against terrorism and against murder... and against ... But at the same time, those same clergy

today glorify all that the Muslim Caliphs did in the past millennium. This claim of rejecting terrorism does not correspond with the content and glorification of the policies of the early Caliphs.

I plan to carry out a rational investigation of the history of Islam in an effort to find out, whenever possible, what really happened and how it was written in order to understand how it reached us, and where we are today. Maybe such realization will enable us to put an end to the crimes of today committed in the name of Islam.

Muslims today live in a multi-ethnic, multi-lingual and multi-religious world precisely as Allah wanted to have it when he made it: ".....We have created you from male and female and made you peoples and tribes that you may know one another." (Al-Hujuraat 49:13)² and "And of His signs is the creation of the heavens and the earth and the diversity of your languages and your colors. Indeed in that are signs for those of knowledge." (Ar-Room 30:22) These realities should, for the Muslim, mean that Allah has willed that the world has neither had nor will it ever have one language or become one nation. It follows that a Muslim could not overcome this pre-ordained reality by claiming that he has a mission to convert the world into Islam because the Qur'an states the impossibility of that. The recognition of such fact leads to the acceptance that the world in which we live expects us to offer a plausible explanation for our behavior, whether it is regarding what

we do to each other as Muslims, or in our dealings with others, be those adherents to other religions or not. To argue that we Muslims are acting in accordance with a Divine scheme is not an argument in our favour but rather one against us if we cannot be rational in its interpretation and justification.

How could a Muslim explain to a non-Muslim the cause of what is happening today in the world at large and especially in the Muslim World in the form of the killing and destruction at the hands of Muslims? This, of course, assumes that he is not required to explain the matter to other Muslims first, some of whom are equally bewildered.

How could a Muslim explain to others what brings a Chechen, an Afghani, a Yemeni or even a British to Aleppo or Raqqa of Syria, for example, to kill people whom he had never known or who had never caused him any ill or harm?

How could a Muslim explain to others the secret of this hidden rancour - that could not even be described as monstrous because no such monster exists - the rancour that would push a man to disembowel another human while at the same time claiming to pray five times a day to the same God who told him of the loss of the son of Adam when he failed to bury his slain brother?³

How could a Muslim explain to the others why so many millions of people follow the orders of men who urge them to kill, rape, and slit the throats of children claiming that Allah had ordained such acts?

How could a Muslim explain to non-Muslims who this Lord is, who created people and dispersed them, then ordered them to kill each other? Wouldn't such a Lord be dallying, if that were truly His Will?

How could a Muslim explain to non-Muslims why thousands of Muslims would send money to people they have never met in order for those to kill other people whom those senders have never met, instead of sending some of that money to the millions of the hungry and needy Muslims of the world? Hundreds of useless millionaires in Arabia and the Gulf have been doing just that since the formation of Al-Qaeda and its activities in Afghanistan in the 1980s.⁴

How could any Muslim explain the cause of this grotesque backwardness in the Muslim world, where a billion of whom produce little, while five million Finns have succeeded in giving them sophisticated products like the Nokia mobile phone, with which they waste their time in frivolous chats, considering that Finland was not even an independent state until WWI, while the Muslims keep talking about their great Empires that spanned most of the world some thousand years ago?

How could a Muslim explain to any human being why the Muslim world is the only place on the Planet today where despots rule by the principle of Divine Right, which has been rejected by the rest of humanity, such that a few Bedouin (Sa'udis) control the money, freedoms and souls of millions of hapless others?

How could a Muslim explain the reason why their women are being treated like an imprisoned commodity when they were granted economic independence by Islam 14 centuries ago through the right of inheritance? What happened to the women of Iraq, who enjoyed almost equality during the Ba'ath rule, after the installation of 'US democracy' following the invasion, which put them back in the Stone Age, is a testimony to that fate.⁵

How could any Muslim explain to a non-Muslim the reason why the US Chief of Staff can visit any Muslim state (except two today) without an official invitation or pre-arranged agreement, contrary to all norms of international protocol and etiquette, and then go and meet, on his demand, any leader, be that King 'Abdullāh of Arabia or President Sulaymān of Lebanon or Sheikh Hamad of Qatar? ⁶ No Muslim Chief of Staff would be able to visit the US without proper official invitation, and even then he would not be received by anybody higher than a General in the US army. And if there is a large military deal to be signed, he may be given a courteous audience with the Secretary of State for Defence.

How could a Muslim explain to himself why the US Ambassador to Lebanon is capable of meeting any politician from the President to the head of a local municipality whenever she demands? Why is she able to meet the Speaker of Parliament and then stand outside the building to make derogatory statements about some Lebanese parties and members of that same Parliament? Has anyone heard that a Muslim Ambassador in London had ever visited the British Parliament officially and met its speaker? If we hypothetically assume such a meeting ever took place, would that Muslim Ambassador be able to stand outside the House of Parliament and meddle in internal British politics or make derogatory statements about any specific political party? Would he not be declared persona non grata and asked to leave within twenty-four hours and his story would soon become the talk of London's swinging nights?

How then after all this ignominy could a Muslim be able to turn to his son and tell him that we Muslims are the ones addressed by Allah when he said: “You are the best nation [Umma] produced for mankind.” (Aal-Imran 3:110)⁷

How could a Muslim turn to his children and declare that the Muslims are the faithful who have been promised by Allah to inherit Paradise, when he is not able to explain to them the meaning of the verse “Allah will judge between you on the Day of Resurrection, and never will Allah give the disbelievers over the believers a way [to overcome them]” (An-Nisaa 4:141), having seen that Allah has

enabled a handful of infidels, as described in Qur'an, to have their way with the Muslims? How would the Almighty, who had made a covenant not to allow the infidels to have the upper hand over those whom He has bestowed his name, 'Mu'min', allow that?⁸

How and How? So many relevant questions beg to be answered. But this is only the tip of the iceberg.

It is time for enlightened Muslims to make a sincere and frank stand with themselves and review history in order to find out why they are where they are today. What is happening today and the servile state in which millions and millions of Muslims find themselves could not be solely blamed on the attack of Jews and Christians, as some Muslim clerics keep telling us. Part of its cause is as old as Islam's history, having been handed over from generation to generation through teaching at home, school, and mosque in accepting events as having been in conformity with Islam and in glorifying aggression in the name of religion.

Slitting peoples' throats is not a completely new phenomenon to Muslims. Historically some Muslim leaders, whose actions were later glorified by Muslims, practiced such atrocities and similar ones at some stages in the history of Islam, yet they are still called the 'righteous predecessors' whose practices are considered to be in line with Islam and should be followed according to most Muslim clerics today.⁹

Some Muslims have overlooked these crimes contrary to Allah's will in His saying: "...We decreed upon the Children of Israel that whoever kills a soul unless for a soul or for corruption [done] in the land - it is as if he had slain mankind entirely". (Al-Maaida 5:32) Muslim fuqahā (jurists) ¹⁰ seem ready to find an excuse for many un-Islamic acts. When confronted with the crimes against Muslims by some people of Mecca who later adopted Islam, they came up with a fabricated Hadith¹¹ "Islam effaces previous misdeeds", which is untrue both logically and in its contradiction to the Qur'an, in order to exonerate these Meccans who went on to assume positions of authority. Later some of those fuqahā tried to justify crimes committed by some Muslim leaders in disguising them as acts in defence of Islam overlooking the Lord's dictum in saying: "Fight in the way of Allah those who fight you but do not transgress. Indeed. Allah does not like transgressors." (Al-Baqara 2:190)

Chapter 2

Roots of Political Schism in Islam

The conflict in Islam was, still is and will remain political. Most attempts at portraying what happened in the history of Islam as ideological or intellectual have not been successful. They were mostly attempts to camouflage the political struggle so as to prevent the embarrassment caused by people discovering that the damage done to Islam had resulted from a struggle for power and not as Fuqahā want us to believe, that it was an ideological struggle to interpret the will of Allah. Understanding the political conflict in early Islam will enable us to trace the cause of current events.

But in order to find the roots of that political struggle, we need to go back to the social environment in which Islam was born.

Mecca differs from most cities in history in having been the site of pilgrimage for thousands of years. Not many other cities have received such honor, as most cities in human history rose and fell over a period of centuries, except Mecca, which was respected and revered before Islam and continued to be so after its birth. The Arabs used to visit Mecca for other reasons than those for which Ibrāhim (Abraham) built his house in it.¹² Pre-Islam Mecca was the centre of religion, trade, poetry and culture. In short it was the pre-Islam Arab's political, economic and cultural capital; the metropolis of its era, despite the

absence of a proper political entity or order holding that together. The verse referring to Mecca (Al-Qasas 28:57) “Have we not established for them a safe sanctuary to which are brought the fruits of all things as provision from Us? But most of them do not know.” This (28:57) could not be interpreted as Allah was describing Mecca after the birth of Islam, but rather as since Ibrāhim erected the foundation of his house. Most Muslims believe that it shall remain like that until the Day of Judgment.

It thus becomes apparent how much power and prominence anyone who controls Mecca would wield. The elders of the tribe of Quraysh¹³ made sure that their hold on Mecca was firm as it gave them power over all of Arabia, and the loss of their control would have deprived them of that power and authority.

Islam was born into that reality of Mecca. Prophet Muhammad was born to a less influential house of the clans of which Quraysh was composed. His clan 'Banu Hāshim (the Hāshemites)' was neither as large in number nor as wealthy as other clans of Quraysh such as Makhzoom, Zuhra and Umayya for example.¹⁴ The elders of the powerful clans of Quraysh despised the less fortunate Hāshemites. It thus becomes naturally understandable that when Muhammad declared his message and invited Quraysh to follow him, the elders of these haughty clans were up in arms against him. They realized quite early that the success of that Hāshemite would lead to the erosion of their rule and power. They

also believed that, should Muhammad succeed, Arabs would turn away from Mecca, and that would finish their prosperous trade and deprive them of their riches, which were their means of maintaining power.

Most of Quraysh was hostile to Muhammad's call so much so that the Qur'an orders Muhammad to limit the call in the early days to his inner circle "And warn [O Muhammad], your closest kindred" (Ash-Shu'araa 26:214). Hence Muhammad appealed early to his clan, and only a few of them followed and even fewer from the rest of Quraysh and a few Arabs from outside it who had gathered from all over Arabia and beyond in anticipation of the call.¹⁵ In fact most of Muhammad's life was fighting back Quraysh so much so that one cannot but ask by what right has Quraysh held on to power throughout Islamic history?

When the enmity of Quraysh did not succeed, they offered Muhammad money and authority but he declined. Eventually they resorted to coercions and imposed total blockade on Muhammad and his followers. They made a pact among themselves banning all dealings with the Muslims, banishing them to a small barren valley outside Mecca belonging to Muhammad's uncle and patron 'Abu Tālib'. There are no exact details of the suffering by the Muslims during the three years they stayed in the 'Abu Tālib's Valley'. There are, however, anecdotes telling of the serious hardship suffered by them in what would be classified in today's language as a total blockade, which in

turn exposed the enmity fostered by the powerful clans of Quraysh towards the Hāshemites in general and Muhammad in particular.¹⁶ I believe that this episode of Islamic history had been purposely removed from the annals of history to avoid the embarrassment caused by exposing some of the oppression carried out by some of Quraysh elders who later allegedly converted to Islam and assumed high positions. It is by no means the only such episode in Islamic history that received such a purposeful omission.

This is the starting point of understanding how the struggle around Islam and later within Islam has always been political. I doubt if any of Quraysh elders was fighting in defence of Al-Lāt and Al-'Uzza¹⁷, but rather was, first and foremost, fighting in defence of his social, political and economic position. It is inconceivable to suggest that when 'Utba Ibn Rabi'a Ibn 'Abd Shams (Mu'āwiya's maternal grandparent) took up arms to fight the Muslims and get slain in the Battle of Badr at the hands of 'Ali or Hamza, he was indeed fighting for Hubal.¹⁸ This political struggle that existed inside Quraysh at the birth of Islam permeated Islam and propagated in one form or another through the centuries and reached us as an historical and cultural heritage, which Muslims live consciously or subconsciously today. It delineates the borders of the conflict today.

When Islam prevailed and the Prophet entered Mecca without a fight, Quraysh adopted Islam willingly, forcedly

or hypocritically. These three categories of Qurayshis adopting Islam were summed up in the famous saying of the Prophet in which he is reported to have said after entering Mecca: "He who entered the House of Allah is safe; he who entered the house of Abu Sufyān is safe and he who entered his own house and closed its door is safe".¹⁹ The believers would have naturally entered the House of Allah (Ka'ba); the non-believers would have entered the house of Abu Sufyān, the head of Quraysh opposition to Islam, while the doubters would have stayed indoors. But there were among them many hypocrites whose identity would never be known, as the Prophet did not intend these deep wounds in Quraysh to be exposed. Indeed there were even Bedouin hypocrites in Medina where the Prophet set up his State of the Faithful. These hypocrites were referred to repeatedly in the Qur'an: "And among those around you of the Bedouin are hypocrites, and [also] from the people of Medina. They have become accustomed to hypocrisy. You do not know them, We know them. We will punish them twice; then they will be returned to a great punishment." (At-Tawba 9:101). So if at the time of the Prophet both Mecca and Medina had so many hypocrites, would it be surprising to find them today deeply entrenched among Muslims?

The political struggle inside Quraysh did not completely disappear even after the victory of the Prophet in entering Mecca; it seemed superficially weakened but it remained nevertheless. This was manifested during the last illness of

the Prophet before his departure. His close companions comprising of many elders of Quraysh gathered in his house on the infamous Thursday four days before his death. There are several stories of what happened that day differing in some of the details, but the gist of the event is not in question. The Prophet asked for ink and paper in order for him to dictate a testament, after which they would never go astray. Some of those present realized that the Prophet might nominate a successor, which would have put an end to any pretender to power from Quraysh. There arose some commotion in the room and some of those present went as far as to insult the Prophet, when one of them is reported to have said that the Prophet was raving. Another is reported to have said that they did not need a will from the Prophet as they had the Qur'an. This angered the Prophet, who had never seen such poisoned atmosphere among his companions, and ordered them out declaring that there should be no disputes in the audience of a Prophet. They all left. The Prophet passed away on the following Monday with none of those who were with him on Thursday having returned to see him before his death. The famous Hadith pontiff and Prophet's cousin Ibn 'Abbās described that grave incident as 'The Thursday's Calamity'. Would any researcher in history be able to describe what happened on that Thursday, as had been reported, except to have been a political incident in addition to its having been a serious disobedience to Divine Command "And whatever the Messenger has given you - take; and what he has

forbidden you - refrain from. And fear Allah; indeed, Allah is severe in penalty. "(Al-Hashr 59:7).²⁰

Collectors of Hadith and historians have filled books in which they categorize the Prophet's Companions and early Muslims. Repeatedly they wrote about how pleased and satisfied the Prophet was with this and that Companion. How is it possible that the Prophet was happy and satisfied with the Companions he threw out of his house of Thursday and never saw after that? Is there not enough ground to doubt such description regarding those Companions and to carry on repeating the famous ending when describing that Companion by saying: 'The Prophet died satisfied with him'?

The political struggle within Islam erupted into an open confrontation on the day the Prophet passed away. On that day, while the Prophet was still being buried, the most significant political conference in the history of Islam took place. But despite its gravity and its impact on Islamic history since that day, little has reached us on who attended it and the details of what took place. The little that had transpired is based on sporadic tales and tangential comments made on other occasions about it. It is generally accepted that when a dignitary dies, he receives the respect and burial worthy of him and his position among his people. Muhammad is the most important Arab that ever lived. Yet on his death, his closest companions decided that it was more important to convene a conference to select a successor. Those Muslim

elders could not wait until the Prophet was buried. A few of the elders of Medina (Ansār) met in the 'Shed of Banu Sa'ida', one of the main clans in Medina, to discuss the matter of the management of their affairs after the departure of the Prophet. As soon as the elders of Quraysh (Muhājireen) heard of the meeting, they left Muhammad's uncle, cousin and few of their supporters to bury him while they rushed to the 'Shed of Banu Sa'ida' to fight the political battle for a successor.²¹ They were among those who refused the Prophet's request to write a testament or nominate a successor claiming they had the Qur'an. If there is any need for a proof to the political nature of schism in Islam, then the timing and nature of the conference in the 'Shed of Banu Sa'ida' should be a sufficient proof.

The elders of Quraysh wanted to ensure that the Ansār of Medina were not left alone in case they decided to choose a successor to lead the Muslims and create a de facto state difficult to challenge. It seems that the significance of the political conference in the 'Shed of Banu Sa'ida' and what took place in it was so serious that the political establishment, in the following decades, ensured that as little as possible of it got recorded in any of the historical annals, so that the conference remains until today one of the greatest secrets of Islam. The few bits of information of what happened during that conference enable us to piece together a rather incomplete story about what took place.²²

Before I look into what happened in the 'Shed of Banu Sa'ida', it is important to shed some light on the whole concept of Caliphate and how it came to be because it is at the heart of politics in Islam. There is no reference in the Qur'an or the Hadith to Caliph or Caliphate as a political concept or system for Government²³. It is for this reason that the Prophet did not set up a state apparatus despite the twelve years he spent in Medina managing the affairs of the believers. He acted as a leader of the Umma and not a head of a state, giving a clear message that whoever comes after him should emulate that practice. Yet no sooner had he gone than the clans of Quraysh decided that political power as they experienced it before Islam had to be resurrected and thus came up with the term 'Caliphate'. The historical records show that the first time the word 'Caliph' was used was when Abu Bakr was called 'the Caliph of Allah' to which he is reported to have said: 'I am the Caliph of the messenger of Allah'. It is in the light of this fact that Caliphate and Caliph should be understood as political terms created in order for religion to be used as a justification to exercise power.

It may be summed up in this way: the Ansār wanted the Caliph after Muhammad to be from among them, while the Quraysh elders argued that it should be from among them as they were the Prophet's tribe. The Muslims in Medina heard from the top of minarets a declaration that Abu Bakr, (Muhammad's Companion and father-in-law) was chosen as the first Caliph to succeed Muhammad. The

elder of the Ansār, Sa'd Ibn 'Ubāda, who refused to swear allegiance to Abu Bakr, stayed in Medina until 'Umar succeeded Abu Bakr. There was a short encounter between the two after which Sa'd left Medina to Syria where he died mysteriously.²⁴ Despite my unwillingness to delve deeply into details of historical events, I need to pause and look at the relevance of Sa'd's position on the 'bay'a'²⁵ of Abu Bakr as the first Caliph to succeed the Prophet.

There are numerous references in the Prophet's biography and books of history that demonstrate the elevated position of Sa'd Ibn 'Ubāda in Islam²⁶. These reports demonstrate the position of Sa'd in the eyes of the Prophet and consequently in his own community. In short Sa'd was the head of the Medina Ansār. Whatever one thinks of Sa'd, his position regarding the political decision to appoint Abu Bakr as first Caliph is very significant. Needless to say, Sa'd was not alone in his rejection of 'bay'a' of Abu Bakr as there were others from Ansār who objected to it, but with so little having reached us about who did what and why, we are not in any position to make definite conclusions. But the killing of the head of Ansār, who fought every battle with the Prophet and was steadfast in the battles of Uhud and Hunain²⁷ when many Muslims fled, raises another question which the history of Islam had simply glossed over. Is it not a natural right of his family, the Ansār and Muslims in general, to know why Sa'd was assassinated? Who was behind his assassination

and who benefited from it? Is it not the right of Muslims in general to know the secret behind the assassination of the leader of those Ansār described in the Qur'an as "...who gave shelter and aided - it is they who are the believers, truly" (Al-Anfaal 8:74), who had not committed a crime against the Prophet and Islam, and did not need to fabricate the Hadith "Islam effaces previous misdeeds",²⁸ to argue his belief? Or was it politics, which found it expedient to turn a page?

It is necessary to pause and make a careful consideration of the conference in the 'Shed of Banu Sa'ida', because its impact on Islam and its relevance are active today. During the last weeks of the Prophet's life, he ordered the formation of a battalion to be sent to fight Sherhabeel Ibn 'Amro Al-Ghassāni, and his Roman allies in the area of southern Syria to avenge the defeat and killing of Zaid Ibn Hāritha earlier in the battle of Ma'uta in the year 8AH.²⁹ This came to be known as 'Osama Ibn Zaid's Battalion', as he put Osama Ibn Zaid Ibn Hāritha in its command.³⁰ The battalion, which the Prophet ordered all able Muslims to join, consisted of all the Muhājireen and Ansār, including their elders and the Prophet's closest companions from Quraysh. Some of the elders reacted with indignation at having to serve in a battalion led by a man who had just come of age. The Prophet is reported to have said that he did not do that out of his own desire, implying Divine order. Indeed when he realized that there was some hesitation in joining the battalion, he is reported to have

said "May Allah curse whoever lagged behind the army of Osama".³¹ The army of Osama departed from Medina during the last week of the Prophet's last illness. It would be reasonable to expect that all the elders and Companions followed the Prophet's order and joined the army. The following relevant question becomes therefore inevitable: If the battalion had left Medina with all the elders in it, how did they come back on the day the Prophet died to hold their political conference in the shed, considering that they were quite some distance away from Medina? Why indeed there was such an urgency to select a successor even before the Prophet was buried? There had been some suggestions that the urgent need for selecting a successor for the Prophet was predicated on a need to protect the Umma. Anyone who was so concerned that Muslims were going to go astray after Muhammad's death ought to question his own faith. The Lord who sent Muhammad as his messenger and then called him to his side ought to know how to protect His religion.

It is unavoidable to ask some relevant questions about the conference. Who attended it and what was discussed or argued? Knowing who attended would verify once and for all the claim made later that the conference, which resulted in swearing allegiance (bay'a) to Abu Bakr, was indeed proper having been made by the majority of the Prophet's Companions and in proper consultation within the Umma. Knowing what was discussed or argued would eliminate the conjecture about the bases on which the

Caliph was chosen. Was the consideration for the selection based on piety, jihad and early belief or was it really based purely on the trivial argument that Quraysh was entitled to it because it was the Prophet's tree? It is reported that when 'Ali Ibn Abi Tālib, the Prophet's cousin and son-in-law, was told after he finished burying the Prophet that Abu Bakr was chosen as the Caliph, he enquired as to what had happened in the meeting. When he was told that Quraysh argued that it was entitled to it by virtue of being the Prophet's tree, he is reported to have commented, "they held on to the tree but lost the fruit"!³²

As we do not have solid historical records of what went on during that conference, all that is left to us is conjecture based partly on piecing together scattered comments made by some of the Prophet's Companions. One significant indicator of what dominated the discussions inside that conference came in the often-quoted statement made by one member of Quraysh to one Hāshemite: "Quraysh hated that you should combine both the Prophecy and the Caliphate".³³

It is difficult for anyone reading such a statement not to conclude that it is anything but political. Quraysh's desire has little to do with Divine Will, religion and whether or not there was an Hāshemite whose early belief, jihad and piety entitled him to be a Caliph. In short, the elders of Quraysh decided that no Hāshemite should succeed the Prophet irrespective of his competence for that responsibility. So the first Caliph came from Taim clan, the

second from 'Uday clan, and the third from Umayya clan until it unavoidably reached an Hāshemite.³⁴

The political conference in the 'Shed of Banu Sa'ida' also established a very serious principle in the history of Islam in preventing the succession of any of the Ansār to the Caliphate. The principle that the Caliphate should rest with Quraysh has been an accepted principle not to be breached. Even today, when people aspire to claim positions in fundamentalist Islamic movements, they seem to count on being from the Prophet's tree as legitimizing these claims. When Ibrāhim Al-Badry (Abu Bakr Al-Baghdādi) declared himself as the new Caliph in the newly established 'Islamic State', he made sure to highlight that he is a descendant of Muhammad through his lineage to Imām Hussein, Muhammad's grandson.³⁵

The natural consequence of the principle established in the 'Shed of Banu Sa'ida' conference was the total barring of the Ansār from taking positions of authority in the new Islamic state. So much so that the sons of Tulaqa' (released)³⁶ as they were known, assumed positions of authority to the exemption of early 'Muhājireen' and Ansār "...who gave shelter and aided -" (Al-Anfaal 8:74). In fact the history of Islam that was carefully written in the following decades and centuries, omitted the names of the early Ansār and made us forget them. How many a Muslim today, who would readily recognize Abu Sufyān, who only converted to Islam after the fall of Mecca to Muhammad, knows anything about or even heard the name of Al-Bara'

Ibn Ma'roor Al-Ansāri? Al-Bara' was one of the early Ansārs who adopted Islam; swore allegiance to Muhammad (bay'a) in what came to be known as 'First 'Aqaba' and is reported to have prayed towards Mecca even before the divine command "So turn your face toward Al-Masjid Al-Haram" (Al-Baqara 2:144).³⁷ How many a Muslim know Abul-Haytham Mālik Ibn At-Tayhān Al-Ashhaly, one of the first six who made 'bay'a' to Muhammad and witnessed both First and Second 'Aqaba?³⁸ How many Muslims know the names of the twelve 'Nuqaba' (Elite Leaders) of Medina whom the Prophet chose as the guides and leaders of their clans prior to Hijra to Medina?³⁹ After arriving safely among them in Medina, the Prophet chose to 'Āakhā/ Fraternize' between each of them and one of the Meccan 'Muhājireen'. Allah referred to them in the following verse "And [also for] those who were settled in Al-Medina and [adopted] the faith before them. They love those who emigrated to them and find not any want in their breasts of what the emigrants were given but give [them] preference over themselves, even though they are in privation. And whoever is protected from the stinginess of his soul - it is those who will be the successful." (Al-Hashr 59:9)

There are several more Hadiths in praise of the Ansār than there are in favour of the Muhājireen. This would make sense because, while most of Quraysh was persecuting the Prophet and his followers, the Ansār in general chose

Islam willingly; inviting Muslims to Medina and giving them shelter and protection at great sacrifice. There was less room for hypocrisy among the Ansār than among the Meccans, some of whom chose Islam once they realized its potential of victory.⁴⁰

The decision by Quraysh to monopolize the rule of Muslims did injustice to non-Qurayshi and denied them their right to equality. The question that has never been addressed in Islamic history remains valid today: why were the Ansārs prevented from Caliphate or any higher position of authority in the Muslim State? Who decided that and by what justification? Why else would Khālid Ibn Al-Walid, who killed the Muslims in the battle of Uhud, assume first line leadership ahead of any knight from the Ansār, were it not for the fact that he represented the powerful Makhzoom clan of Quraysh who had the political backing of Umayya, Zuhra, Taim and 'Uday?⁴¹

This political discrimination crept even into prayer. Most Muslims hear the Friday prayer's sermon being concluded for a praise of the so-called 'Promised Ten'.⁴² These are the ten men who we are told were at different times promised Paradise by the Prophet. I am not contesting the authenticity or otherwise of the reporting, but I believe that it is proper to ask why the 'Promised Ten' are all from Quraysh? Is it conceivable that the Prophet never promised a single Ansāri to enter Paradise and thus be entitled to be mentioned among those promised ones during the sermon? Why is 'Ammār Ibn Yāsir not among

the ten considering that he was, together with his parents, the first to be publicly promised Paradise by the Prophet? In fact 'Ammār Ibn Yāsir became a Muslim before eight of the Ten mentioned in the sermon.⁴³ Should this fact not be enough to have his name leading the list of those promised Paradise? Is it not at the root of the faith that Allah has ordained that those who responded to the call of Islam earlier (forerunners) assume a higher position in His saying: "And the first forerunners among the Muhājireen and the Ansār and those who followed them with good conduct - Allah is pleased with them and they are pleased with Him, and He has prepared for them gardens beneath which rivers flow, wherein they will abide forever. That is the great attainment." (At-Tawba 9:100)?

'Ammār is an example of the 'Sabiq/Forerunner' from Muhājireen. The 'Sabiq /Forerunner' from among Ansār are those who swore allegiance 'bay'a' at 'Aqaba and were ahead in belief long before any Qurayshi who converted after them, irrespective of how high a position he held in Quraysh. If an objector objects to this assertion, then he should come up with evidence from the Qur'an and not revert to a statement from one of the latter 'fuqahā' about how revered this companion or that had been. Or indeed to rely on some fabricated Hadith like the one: "Those who were best among them before the advent of Islam would continue to be the best among them after Islam"⁴⁴. Such Hadith, and others in the same vein, were invented in order to lift the status in Islam of some of the evil men in

Quraysh, who opposed Islam, killed Muslims and caused great hardship and harm to early Muslims, simply because they later adopted Islam. If such Hadith has any credence, then Allah would not have chosen Muhammad from a small clan in Mecca to deliver his message, but would have rather chosen one of the respected elders in Quraysh to deliver his message, as he mocked them in his book saying: "And they said, "Why was this Qur'an not sent down upon a great man from [one of] the two cities?""(Az-Zukhruf 43:31) Indeed if the Hadith is true then Allah would appear to be unfair and partisan!

The conference in the 'Shed of Banu Sa'ida' furthermore set in motion a sequence of events that led to creating serious precedents in Islam. In the decades and centuries that followed that conference, one of the so-called theological differences between Sunni and Shi'a, which I still define as political, has been that the Sunni fuqahā considered the Shi'a to be at fault in insisting that the Caliphate was a Divine Order to rest in the descendants of Muhammad through his daughter Fātima. The Sunni fuqahā have argued that the Imām of the Umma and subsequently the Caliph should be left to the Umma to choose freely through consultation and proper 'bay'a'. I doubt if many would challenge such a doctrine if it were really ever implemented in Islam. But the truth of the matter is that it never took place.

'Umar Ibn Al-Khattāb, the second Caliph after the Prophet, is reported to have described the 'bay'a' of Abu Bakr as 'a

slip'.⁴⁵ I doubt that 'Umar meant that Abu Bakr was not eligible for the position of Caliph. But he was referring to the seriousness of the way it took place. The 'bay'a' of Abu Bakr was undoubtedly a political decision! Abu Bakr on his deathbed nominated 'Umar as his successor. This was the beginning of nominations that were to follow and then superseded by inheritance. But most Sunni fuqahā insist that the Prophet did not appoint a successor, although Shi'a fuqahā dispute that and insist the Prophet indeed nominated his cousin and son-in-law, 'Ali, to be his successor. The Sunni fuqahā's argument has always been that the Prophet need not nominate a successor because all the Companions were around and the Qur'an was their guide to enlighten them on what to do. However, they seem unable to explain why Abu Bakr felt the need to appoint a successor or indeed whether he was wise in having done so. Was Abu Bakr more concerned for the protection of Islam than his Noble Master? Or was the decision of Abu Bakr no more than a political one to prevent the Caliphate from reaching an Hāshemite?

'Umar, for his part, appointed a committee of six from among whom the next Caliph was to be chosen. This decision had nothing to do with consultation or proper public 'bay'a'.⁴⁶ All the members of the committee were from Quraysh. Not one member of the committee was from the Ansār, however early and pious a Muslim he was, even though they constituted half the Muslim Umma. Not one member of the committee was a non-Qurayshi

Muhājir – people like Al-Miqdād Ibn Al-'Aswad, Abu Dharr Al-Ghifāri, and 'Ammār Ibn Yāsir, all of whom were early Muslims who adopted Islam before some members of the committee of six converted to Islam and certainly before 'Umar himself became a Muslim.⁴⁷ How could that committee be described as anything but political in order to keep the Caliphate in Quraysh and possibly out of reach of an Hāshemite?

'Umar's committee did not stop at being truly non-consultative and formed of six from Quraysh, and constituted such that it would certainly have to lead to a non-Hāshemite Qurayshi, but had a few more twists to it. 'Umar ordered that if the committee did not agree within three days, then members of it who objected should be beheaded. If the committee ended up divided in two halves, then his son 'Abdullāh Ibn 'Umar should make the judgment but if that failed, then the side of 'Abdur-Rahmān Ibn 'Auf should prevail and the other be killed if they refused.⁴⁸ A new precedent in Islam was set by 'Umar - that of legitimizing the killing of a Muslim simply because he refused to agree with the others on the outcome of a consultation to select a Caliph, a measure which has no foundation in Islam. 'Umar knew that 'Ali and 'Abdur-Rahmān Ibn 'Auf would not be on the same side, and because of the family connections among the six, it was almost guaranteed that 'Ali was not intended to be selected. This reality did not escape the sharp observation of 'Ali when he later referred to the committee of six and

its expected outcome.⁴⁹ It is reported that 'Abdur-Rahmān Ibn 'Auf offered 'Ali the 'bay'a' provided that the latter swore to adhere to the Qur'an, the Sunnah of the Prophet and the path of the two predecessors (Abu Bakr and 'Umar). However, when 'Ali agreed to follow the Qur'an, the Sunnah of the Prophet and his own 'Ijtihād' (independent reasoning), Ibn 'Auf offered the same to 'Uthmān Ibn 'Affān who readily accepted the 'bay'a'. Needless to say, no public consultation took place and none of the Ansār or non-Qurayshi Muslims were consulted.

The Caliphate had thus moved from Abu Bakr (Taim), to 'Umar ('Uday) to 'Uthmān (Umayya). A reader of history ought to pause here and reflect on why 'Ali was eliminated? Why did Ibn 'Auf insist on the next Caliph being chosen only if he committed himself to the path of his predecessors and rejected the right of independent reasoning? Did this incident establish the latter policy of the Sunni fuqahā that the gate of 'ijtihād' had long been closed leading to the dark ages into which Islam had slipped, denying the freedom of thinking and interpretation?

I believe that it is time that the selection and Caliphate of 'Uthmān be looked at from within Qur'anic text. The question to be asked is: Irrespective of the process of his selection, was 'Uthmān entitled to become a Caliph?

I shall not discuss any historical merits of the man or what he was supposed to have sacrificed in the cause of Islam as related in books of history, as it concerns me the least. I am interested in Qur'anic dicta on which Muslims seem nominally to agree. There are a few verses in the Qur'an which, when read together, seem to suggest that 'Uthmān should have never become a Caliph.

In the eighth chapter, Allah orders the faithful not to turn away from battle when facing their enemies saying:

"O you who have believed, when you meet those who disbelieve advancing [for battle], do not turn to them your backs [in flight]. And whoever turns his back to them on such a day, unless swerving [as a strategy] for war or joining [another] company, has certainly returned with anger [upon him] from Allah, and his refuge is Hell - and wretched is the destination." (Al-Anfaal 8:15-16)

Moreover, in the ninth chapter Allah puts the Muslims on notice regarding what happened in the battle of Hunain saying:

"Allah has already given you victory in many regions and [even] on the day of Hunain, when your great number pleased you, but it did not avail you at all, and the earth was confining for you with its vastness; then you turned back, fleeing. Then Allah sent down His tranquillity upon His Messenger and upon the believers and sent down soldiers angels whom you did not see and punished those

who disbelieved. And that is the recompense of the disbelievers.” (At-Tawba 9:25-26)

There could be no dispute regarding Allah's curse on those who fled in the battle of Hunain by virtue of his eternal determination cited in verse (Al-Anfaal 8:16) that whoever turned his back away in battle shall incur his wrath. But almost all books of history and Sirat refer to ‘Uthmān as one of those who fled in the battles of Uhud and Hunain⁵⁰. How then a man who incurred Allah's wrath could be selected the 'Prince of the Faithful', and Allah's Caliph on Earth? The question that arises here is: Had ‘Uthmān not been made a Caliph, would Islam's history have been different?

When ‘Uthmān was finally killed by Muslims who allegedly travelled all the way from Egypt to Medina in protest at his policies including having let his clan of Umayya rampage throughout the Muslim land, the Caliphate landed with ‘Ali by default as there was no other Qurayshi contender to it and the Muslim Umma was in turmoil. Again there was no proper 'bay’a' as suggested by some.

So when was the 'bay’a' achieved through consultation as Muslim fuqahā keep telling us?⁵¹ Was it achieved in the 'bay’a' of Abu Bakr, ‘Umar, ‘Uthmān or ‘Ali? Or was it achieved during the dynasty of Banu Umayya, which established the inheritance rule that had existed from the first century Hijri until the end of the Ottomans? Why have

the Shi'a been blamed for short-sightedness for having believed that the Imām had to be a descendant of Fātima and 'Ali when the Sunnis have had no problem in having the Caliph being a descendant of Umayya or Abbās? There is no dispute between Shi'a and Sunni fuqahā based on ideological or theological principles as they claim. The conflict is a political one between different clans in Quraysh that existed before Islam; carried on to Islam and continues to be powerful and active today. The struggle has been between the 'House of 'Ali' and the 'House of 'Aisha',⁵² which is commonly known as Shi'a and Sunni. I know that such a statement will draw rejection from many. But I believe that it is time we cast an eye over our history. This is what I am trying to do. The fundamentalists of the so-called 'Islamic State' and other armed groups today are in fact only fighting along these lines calling for the elimination of those whom they claim belong to the 'House of 'Ali' as I define it.

Chapter 3

The Conflict between House of 'Ali and House of 'Aisha

My friend wrote to me saying: “..... But for the Imāmate and Caliphate to be a political issue is better than being a religious issue.”

But this is the essence of what I aim to achieve here. What I want to show is that the history of Islam as it exists today is a political history and not a religious one; that the Caliphate was political and not religious; and that the Shari'a was not a result of any Divine assignment, but instituted by the fuqahā and politicians to serve the state. I do not, however, mean in any of this that they were all wrong, but I want to state that these policies were not necessarily religious and that we must stop brainwashing peoples' minds as we have done for the past thirteen centuries, telling them that it was all Divine assignment for the good of 'the best nation produced for mankind' and all is of the essence of religion itself. This recognition will allow us to deal rationally and objectively with our history without hiding under a religious cover, attributing every happening, no matter how significant or insignificant it is, to Divine assignment to the Muslims in order to amend this world and whoever is in it.

If this were to happen, it would in turn stop the destruction and killing and devastation carried out today by the gullible among the Muslims, who have been

indoctrinated by the history they study in schools and hear in the mosques, which tells them that there is glory in killing people, and there is right in looting their wealth and desecrating their honour, believing that they are doing the right thing. Those gullible simpletons, who are motivated by "...devils from mankind and jinn, inspiring to one another decorative speech in delusion." (Al-An'aam 6:112) rely in their mobility on the animal instincts of eating, drinking and fornication in a fictitious promised paradise!

We Muslims may not succeed in achieving what we seek, but we could at least succeed in identifying some serious faults. If we do not try to do even that, we will remain stripped of dignity at the bottom of the list of human beings, and our adversaries will continue to afflict us with the worst abuse. Those ignorant of our rulers will continue to control our lives as long as there are hypocrites, who stand preaching at prayers, glorifying and invoking, in the name of religion, for rulers who not only have nothing to do with religion, but because of their corruption, even the devil is no longer able to find excuses for them!

I will continue from where I finished in the previous chapter.

In essence: **The conflict in Islam was and still is between those loyal to the house of 'Ali and those loyal to the house of 'Aisha.**

It is important to clarify what I mean by these words, and how this fact has influenced our history and what we are today, in order to try to find the way, if any, out of this fateful crisis.

My assertion above does not mean that 'Ali or 'Aisha founded a political project which was followed by others. That could not have happened. I do not mean that there was an ideological conflict between 'Ali and 'Aisha in interpreting the religion, because of the impossibility of making a comparison between the two. 'Aisha, according to Islam, could not be asked for an advisory opinion in religion; did not have the right to sit in judgment between people; her view of the piety of one man is not acceptable; and could not lead people in prayer: all of which are open to 'Ali.

However, the undenied truth is that there was no lost affection between the two. This is not a new discovery of my invention, but narrators who lived through that period unanimously agree upon it. A number of those narrators were wary of the fact that one was the Prophet's cousin, son in law and his minister, and the other his wife. Out of concern for the nation, they tried not to engage in this matter nor give it a large space in the narrations. But this did not diminish the reality of the lack of affection between the two from reaching us.

Led by Banu Umayya, those Qurayshis, who were enemies of Banu Hāshim and greedy for power, and who had not been able to challenge Muhammad, whom his Lord had reinforced with the words of truth and with five thousand distinctly marked angels,⁵³ realized that the only option was to attack the second symbol of Banu Hāshim: 'Ali. But 'Ali's contributions to Islam cannot be refuted or ignored even by its most powerful enemies. What was there to be done then?

They started by attacking his father, Abu Tālib. They created Hadiths and wrote stories of his Polytheism and his immortality in hell despite, as they claimed, the Prophet's pleadings with him to enter into Islam.⁵⁴ They filled pages with such fabrications, at the same time when they did not bother to write more than a few lines about Abu Bakr's father and his rejection of faith, even after the succession of his son. We may find an excuse for some of those writers who were of non-Arab origins, which fact made it difficult for them to comprehend Arab identity even after their conversion to Islam. But Arabs consider poetry the interpreter of their identity, and before the Qur'an they had only poetry, which was the memory of the Arabs and the mirror of their lives, and it was and continues to be the source of their language and the reflection of their identity.

Abu Tālib was a poet, and all his poetry was in praise of the Prophet. Several collections of his poetry have been published, and I made a similar attempt over twenty years

ago when I published his poetry which I collected only from Sunni sources.⁵⁵

How do we judge every Arab poet from his poetry and exempt Abu Tālib? Was there a single polytheist who said poetry in praise of the Prophet and remained a polytheist? Hassān Ibn Thābit and Ka'b Ibn Zuhayr praised the Prophet only after converting to Islam, both having insulted him before that.⁵⁶

If Abu Tālib had not said anything except what he said of the Prophet Muhammad:

Luminous, with a face that invokes rain from the clouds
Orphans' refuge and guardian of widows

that would have been enough to guarantee him entrance to paradise.

History did not convey to us that Abu Sufyān had said a single good word of Muhammad, even after the announcement of his conversion to Islam, which only occurred after the conquest of Mecca and the imposition of political reality with the triumph of Muhammad on the polytheists of Quraysh.

The political reality of the conflict between some clans of Quraysh and Banu Hāshim gets further backing when the scribes of history and Hadith collectors were quick to blacken pages with stories of how Abu Sufyān (the leader

of Banu Umayya) converted to Islam after the conquest of Mecca, and how he became a 'good Muslim'. That is because narrators of Hadith and scribes of history think they alone have the right to decide who of the people became a 'good Muslim'. They have not seemingly read the verses of Surat Al-Munaafiqoon (the hypocrites): "When the hypocrites come to you, [O Muhammad], they say, "We testify that you are the Messenger of Allah." And Allah knows that you are His Messenger, and Allah testifies that the hypocrites are liars."(Al-Munaafiqoon 63:1); "So do not claim yourselves to be pure; He is most knowing of who fears Him" (An-Najm 53:32). "He knows that which deceives the eyes and what the breasts conceal" (Ghafir 40:19)

More important is that, in the midst of their fabrications and compositions, they missed Allah's words: "Indeed, those who have believed and emigrated and fought with their wealth and lives in the cause of Allah and those who gave shelter and aided - they are allies of one another. But those who believed and did not emigrate - for you there is no guardianship of them until they emigrate" (Al-Anfaal 8:72). Needless to say, Abu Sufyān did not emigrate!

The enemies of Banu Hāshim found in the animosity between 'Ali and 'Aisha another opportunity to pounce on 'Ali and insult him, and through him to insult the Prophet. All of that was political because politics to them was more important than religion. With the triumph of Islam they had lost the authority they had before it, and they had to

play politics to recover power from the family of Muhammad. They, therefore, gathered around 'Aisha, inventing sayings and attributing them to her to discredit 'Ali and derogate the Prophet. It was not love for 'Aisha that motivated them but hatred of 'Ali, for whoever hated 'Ali hated the Prophet, just as much as whoever hated 'Aron hated Mosses. This is because whoever rejected the Prophet's actions hated the Prophet, and the Prophet did not raise anyone's position higher than he did 'Ali's.⁵⁷ Therefore, Banu Umayya gathered around 'Aisha, but not everyone who grabbed the reins of the camel loved her,⁵⁸ because it has been reported that she called for the killing of the Umayyad 'Uthmān Ibn 'Affān.⁵⁹

However, there is no doubt that everyone who grabbed the reins of the camel hated 'Ali.

This is how politics were instituted in Islam; starting with the opposition of the clans of Quraysh to Banu Hāshim before Islam and evolving after its triumph to fighting Banu Hāshim, in the person of 'Ali and those around him. The massacre of his son Hussein and seventy two members of his family and companions is but one example.⁶⁰ It continued in the form of slaughtering and killing his sons and their followers and culminated with cursing 'Ali for decades from the minarets of mosques in the land of Muslims during the Umayyad dynasty's rule.⁶¹ This policy had nothing to do with religion. The Message is inseparable from the Messenger; whoever fights the

Messenger is fighting the Message, and any attempt at justifying this is flimsier than a cobweb!

The political conflict erupted when the Umayyad Mu'āwiya Ibn Abi Sufyān rose against 'Ali. The reason was a quest for authority and power. Mu'āwiya's character raises more than one issue in the history of political Islam. Muslim Sunni fuqahā tried to avoid wading in it in an attempt to protect the nation, out of comprehension that there is not much room to defend him in his rise against 'Ali. There is no possibility to hold a comparison between the two, though these fuqahā may be excused because their desire to protect the nation took precedence over historic accuracy. In addition to that, they were, first and foremost, not interested in studying history.

Today we have a different situation. A group of semi-literate men from the scholars of the Wahhābi sect,⁶² who have made it their goal to promote Mu'āwiya in a desperate attempt to make his political behavior seem like belonging to the essence of religion, by finding excuses from fabricated Hadiths to allow what Allah and His Messenger did not allow. But they all, perhaps deliberately, eschewed taking a stand at the verse: "But whoever kills a believer intentionally - his recompense is Hell, wherein he will abide eternally, and Allah has become angry with him and has cursed him and has prepared for him a great punishment" (An-Nisaa 4:93). No words are above Allah's words and no judgement after His. Mu'āwiya

Ibn Abi Sufyān killed ‘Ammār Ibn Yāsir, the first believer promised paradise by the Prophet at a time when Mu’āwiya, his father and his mother were worshipping stones and idols. The Prophet told ‘Ammār: “You will be killed by a wicked band of men”⁶³. None of the followers of Banu Umayya dared say that the Prophet promised Mu’āwiya or his father or mother paradise. ‘Ammār was not of Banu Hāshim and not even of Quraysh. His only crime was standing with ‘Ali because he was one of the most knowledgeable people of ‘Ali's stature with the Prophet.

If someone were to say that 'Islam effaces previous misdeeds',⁶⁴ then that can be refuted in two ways. Firstly, killing ‘Ammār happened after Islam and not before it. Secondly, and more importantly, is that Allah's eternal order to prohibit killing a believer cannot be 'effaced' by anything. That is because killing His name 'the mu'min', and the believer (mu'min) is His name, is a sin eternally and forever.⁶⁵ Allah ordained that a mu'min could not kill another mu'min except by mistake making it impossible to happen intentionally. “And never is it for a believer to kill a believer except by mistake.” (An-Nisaa 4:92). Thus the murderer of a mu'min cannot himself be a mu'min.

Before moving away from Mu’āwiya's period, it is necessary to give an indication of the political nature of his rise against the guardian, ‘Ali. There was an exchange of correspondence between ‘Ali and Mu’āwiya that reveals much of the political nature of the conflict. That exchange

can be found from history books, should anyone want to learn more. I will quote some sentences from a reply of 'Ali to Mu'āwiya:

"As for your demand to me to (hand over) Syria, I cannot give you today what I denied you yesterday. As regards your saying that the war has eaten up Arabia save its last breath, you should know that he whom right has eaten up goes to Paradise and he whom wrong has eaten up goes to Hell. As for our equality in (the art of) war and in (numbers of) men, certainly you cannot be more penetrating in doubtfulness (of belief) than I am in certainty (of belief), and the people of Syria are not more greedy for this world than the people of Iraq are for the next world.

As for your saying that both of us are sons of 'Abd Manāf, it is no doubt so, but Umayya cannot be like Hāshim, nor Harb like 'Abdul Muttalib, nor can Abu Sufyān be like Abu Tālib. The muhājir (emigrant) cannot be a match for him who was set free Tulaqa' (on the day of fall of Mecca), nor can one of pure descent be a match for him who has been adopted, nor the pursuer of truth be a match of the adherent to wrong, nor a believer be a match for a hypocrite. How bad are the successors who go on following their predecessors who have fallen in the fire of Hell!

۱۱۶۶

Any observant can read in the sentences of the above correspondence the gist of the reality of the political conflict that began between Hāshim and Umayya before Islam and lasted more than a thousand years, emerging today as a political struggle between Wahhābism and those loyal to the members of the Prophet's House manifested in the mobilization of the simple Muslims to fight the Zionist war destroying the Arab world under the guise of fighting Shi'a Islam.

This also renders the accusation that Abu Tālib did not embrace Islam baseless as 'Ali clearly differentiates between Abu Sufyān and Abu Tālib, with the former in the camp of non-believers and the latter in the camp of believers.

We must pause here to understand the reason for Mu'āwiya's political stand against 'Ali and his family. Mu'āwiya only declared his conversion to Islam after the conquest of Mecca at the age of 23 years. This means that he spent nearly twenty years in the house of polytheism, hearing his mother (Hind bint 'Utba) and his father (Abu Sufyān Ibn Harb) cursing Muhammad and defaming everything he represented. He saw his mother crying for her father and her brother after the Battle of Badr, including the Prophet's uncle, Hamza Ibn 'Abdul Muttalib, and 'Ali Ibn Abi Tālib in her curses. He then witnessed his mother's joy with the killing of Hamza Ibn 'Abdul Muttalib

in the battle of Uhud,⁶⁷ hearing his father singing the words of their poet gloating after killing Hamza:

We have killed the master of their lords,
and straightened the balance with Badr.

Any person raised up in such a house could not but be affected by this hatred of Muhammad and 'Ali and the people of their house. Thus, we see that the reason for the political stand of Mu'āwiya with 'Ali and that of his son, Yazid, with Ali's son Hussein, is that of venom and hatred towards the house of the Prophet, extending from Muhammad to his Minister and to their descendants afterwards.

The succession of Yazid Ibn Mu'āwiya marked the first politically disastrous precedent in Islam. The bequest Abu Bakr made leaving the Caliphate to 'Umar after him was carried further, when Mu'āwiya bequeathed the Caliphate to his son Yazid, making it the tradition in Islam until the end of Ottoman rule. Where is religion in all this? Where is the Shura they claim? And where is the bay'a of the Umma of which they talk? Is the Muslim obliged anymore to pay allegiance to a guardian in whose appointment or removal he has no role?

Is that not exactly the policy that has turned religion into a tool, making the bequeathing of the Caliphate the rule, with the Muslim fuqahā calling on people to follow and

obey the guardian in whose appointment those Muslims had no role?

Yazid Ibn Mu'āwiya opened his rule with one of the biggest massacres in history against a single family, when he slaughtered Hussein and his family and a group of his supporters in Karbala in Iraq in the year 61 AH; an event that has become the symbol of martyrdom upon which the Shi'a Ja'fari jurisprudence was built. I'm not about to hold a comparison between Hussein and Yazid because I believe that such an attempt would be denigrating Islam and its Message, and a show of contempt of the Prophet and what he did and said.

What is of importance in all this is its political dimension and its impact on the history of Muslims?

Yazid decided then - with the apparent concurrence of many Muslims in Syria at the time, and the betrayal of the people of Iraq of Hussein and the mobilization of the people of Syria to kill him - that it was permissible for a Muslim to slaughter another Muslim if he disagreed with him. They also accepted the permissibility of killing Muslim women and children who were not party to the political power struggle. Should we wonder today if we found some Muslims issuing fatwas of the permissibility of killing people and raping their women and robbing them of their money,⁶⁸ as long as they glorify what Yazid did under the pretext that he was the guardian who had the allegiance

of the people, without telling us who had pledged allegiance and how that allegiance was achieved?

Should we be surprised if the Muslim mob commits murder, slaughter and rape today under the guise of supporting Allah's religion? Yazid's murder of the last grandson of the Prophet and his family begs the question: If that was what Muslims did to the household of their Prophet in order to acquire autocratic power, what would they do to other non-Arab nations whom they violated? Supporters of the 'Islamic State' today can easily remind people that they are doing no more than following precedents set by Yazid and some of the Caliphs that followed.

Setting precedents started early in Islam. Yazid Ibn Mu'āwiya, the second Caliph in the Umayyad Dynasty ruled for three years. In the first year he killed the Prophet's grandson; in the second he destroyed the Prophet's town of Medina; and in the third he burnt the House of Allah in Ka'ba!

Chapter 4

The Birth of Muslim Invasions

I ended the previous chapter with an enquiry about what Muslims did to Muslims and non-Arabs whose land they invaded. I intend to elaborate on this, not out of a wish to discredit what Muslims have glorified for centuries, but to understand the reasons behind what is happening today. I believe that today's culture is very much connected to that history, and we must be able to admit that and accept a critical review of our history. We should aim at achieving a rationality that will enable us to understand our message to mankind, if we have any message left.

No sooner had the Prophet departed this world than the age of Jāhiliya (ignorance) raised its head again.⁶⁹ That should not be surprising, as ethics and norms do not change overnight. It may not be easy for every man to shed the dress of ignorance just by reciting the Shahāda (declaration of faith).⁷⁰

The first symbol of Jāhiliya that was revived was glorifying murder, as the pre-Islamic poet 'Amro Ibn Kulthum At-Taghlibi said:⁷¹

With young men who see glory in killing

And the old experienced in war

But there is a difference. While in Jāhiliya they used to raid each other, which Islam forbade, they decided after

converting to Islam, to raid others outside of their people and their lands. They therefore amassed armies; sent them outside Arab lands; killed people on the grounds of infidelity; looted their wealth calling it spoils of war, and raped their women and claimed that these women were what “their right hands possessed”⁷². In order to give legitimacy to these crimes against humanity, they claimed that it was a Divine Order for the propagation of Islam. Was it really so?

My starting point in answering this question is my conviction that Islam came to the Arabs or Arabic speakers. This is contrary to what is believed by most Muslims, as I think I am in the minority of people who believe this. I have written this in an article in Arabic entitled 'To whom was the Umami Prophet Sent' in which I showed, through Qur'anic verses alone, how the Message was intended for the Arabs and the Arabs alone⁷³ I shall borrow from that article three Qur'anic examples to prove this conviction.

In His assertion that no people were left without a messenger, Allah said: "And We did not destroy any city except that it had warners" (Ash-Shu'araa 26:208). He then addressed the Prophet: “that you may warn the Mother of Cities (Umm Al-Qura) and those around it" (Al-An'aam 6:92), thus showing us that our Prophet came to warn Arabs in Umm Al-Qura (as Mecca was called) and those around it. Lest people go astray trying to figure out who follows whom and against whom the argument would

be, Allah has committed Himself in saying “And We did not send any messenger except in the language of his people to state clearly for them, and Allah sends astray whom He wills and guides whom He wills. And He is the Exalted in Might, the Wise” (Ibrāhim 14:4) that all people have a Messenger speaking their language so that His justice is achieved. In this justice of His, He can ask, if He wishes, for their obedience or the reason for their disobedience after he had warned them in their language.

When the Almighty commissioned the Meccan Prophet to call upon Arabs to follow the Message, He showed his Prophet the route to this call by saying: “Invite to the way of your Lord with wisdom and good instruction, and argue with them in a way that is best” (An-Nahl 16:125), commissioning him to call them to the faith only through this route. He then reminded the Prophet in man's freedom to choose in saying: “There shall be no compulsion in [acceptance of] the religion. The right course has become clear from the wrong” (Al-Baqara 2:256). The Almighty reminded His Prophet in His saying: “Not upon you is [the responsibility for] their guidance, but Allah guides whom He wills” (Al-Baqara 2:272), following that with His saying: “And if We had willed, We could have given every soul its guidance, but the word from Me will come into effect [that] I will surely fill Hell with jinn and people all together” (As-Sajda 32:13). He decided that His Prophet was not able to guide those whom He did not want to guide to the faith. How then

could anyone, who came after the Prophet, claim that he wants to guide all the people? If he were truthful in his claim that he was charged with guiding people and would kill them if they did not follow, then such a God who charged him with that would be an unjust and dallying God. How could Allah be just if He created a soul and did not guide it to the true path “Whoever Allah guides - he is the [rightly] guided; and whoever He sends astray - it is those who are the losers” (Al-A’raaf 7:178), then sends someone to kill this soul without even charging this soul of having killed another soul or aggressed or caused corruption on earth?⁷⁴

It would be worth stopping here to ponder record keeping generally in Islam. It is generally agreed that the Prophet Muhammad forbade the codification of anything other than the Holy Qur'an during his life.⁷⁵ Therefore, the first record was about the Prophet's biography, before the Hadith was gathered.

The first biography of the Prophet that has reached us is the biography of Ibn Ishāq Ibn Yasār who died in (151 AH)⁷⁶. This means that the first text written about the Prophet was 100 years after the Hijra (emigration from Mecca to Medina), which makes it difficult to believe that Ibn Ishāq narrated from contemporaries of the Prophet: That was the beginning of the use of secondary sources (العنعنة).⁷⁷ Ibn Ishāq's biography did not attain the desired attention even though it is the oldest. This is not the place to go into this subject because it is outside the scope of

this work. Then Abdul-Malik Ibn Hishām, who died in the year (218 AH) took Ibn Ishāq's biography, left some parts of it and produced the famous and better known biography (Sirat Ibn Hishām).⁷⁸ The collection of the Prophet's Hadith came only late when Al-Bukhāri who died on the year (256 AH) produced the first book of collections of Hadith, way before the history books.⁷⁹

What do we deduce from these dates?

The writing of the biography of the Prophet and the collection of Hadith as well as documenting the history of early Islam did not begin until the end of the Umayyad dynasty in the year (132 AH). This no doubt means that the Umayyad Caliphs ruled with their minds and independent reasoning in understanding the Qur'an, as there was nothing like a biography or a Hadith or jurisprudence to bind them otherwise. This necessarily means that politics not religion defined the outlines of the early Islamic state since not even the founder of the dynasty Mu'āwiya himself was versed in Islam as he was a very late convert to it. Thus more precisely, it means that politics forced religion to adapt to it accordingly. Historians and collectors of Hadith and fuqahā have found themselves facing the reality of the political legacy of the Umayyad Caliphs, having to choose one of two options: Either to oppose such policies in the light of their understanding of the religion and what could be the consequent challenge in some of the policies that were in conflict with Islam, or to

accept those policies and find solutions and religious justifications for their interpretation.

It is not difficult to figure out the position chosen by these officials. They decided to recognize the legality of the policies of the Umayyad Caliphs and claim that they were of the essence of religion, proceeding afterwards towards finding justifications and explanations. Some of those officials have done so because of their belief that it was for the good of the nation whereas challenging some of the policies as contradictory to religion would have exposed the nation to a major conflict that might have led to sedition "And fear a trial which will not strike those who have wronged among you exclusively" (Al-Anfaal 8:25). Some of them did so because of ignorance, because a number of Persians and others who entered Islam, were not truly able to absorb the Qur'an due to the difficulty of its language even to Arabs. They therefore believed that the Muslim Caliphs from Quraysh must have known the innermost intricacies of religion and did what they did rightly.

The first action introduced by historians into Islamic behavior was the word 'invasion' (Ghazu); a word from the age of ignorance (Jāhiliya) which never appeared in any form nor did the verb 'to invade' (Ghazā) or any of its conjugations appear in the Qur'an describing Muslims. But when the Almighty said: "O you who have believed, do not be like those who disbelieved and said about their brothers when they travelled through the land or went out

to fight, "If they had been with us, they would not have died or have been killed," so Allah makes that a regret within their hearts. And it is Allah who gives life and causes death, and Allah is Seeing of what you do" (Aal-Imran 3:156), He was referring to the unbelievers as invaders and the subject of rebuke. The Almighty did not associate Muslims anywhere in the Qur'an with invasions. The absence of that word in relation to Muslims in the Qur'an was neither a coincidence nor inadvertent, for the Almighty is above forgetfulness. There was a clear reason for this. An Invasion is a Jāhiliya norm of behavior that Islam came to revoke, and Allah forbade it to Muslims and did not invite them to carry on doing it. But when the early Muslim historians had to explain the invasions carried out by the Umayyad Caliphs, they did not find an easier way to justify them than to attribute invasions to the Prophet Muhammad. They wrote about his invasions, citing the first as the 'Invasion of Badr',⁸⁰ as described by Ibn Ishāq in the biography and repeated and quoted afterwards. But Arabs know that an invasion, as defined by Ibn Mandhooir in *Lisān Al- Arab*,⁸¹ means: 'Marching to fight the enemy and looting him'. This is precisely what Arab tribes did before Islam. An invasion is the polite word for 'aggression'. How can people's marching to fight and loot others be described as anything but aggression, which is forbidden in the Qur'an? Moreover, how was the 'Battle of Badr' in this sense, an invasion?

Quraysh organized the massing of one of the largest armies in the history of the ancient Arabs to advance on Medina and put an end to the state of Islam, which was threatening its position. Quraysh's army had reached such a size that Allah, in His Mercy, supplied the believers with five thousand angels fighting with them and strengthening them.⁸² Had Abu Sufyān's army been composed of a small number, the believers would not have needed this Divine support. What did the Messenger do except confront them in defense of himself, his people and his belief? How can it be said that the Battle of Badr was an invasion by the Prophet? How can a defender be an invader? The historians continued to label all the wars of the Prophet as invasions. Even the Battle of the Ditch, in which Medina was besieged, was called an invasion.⁸³ I do not know how the Prophet could have invadeed anyone or anything when he was sitting in a ditch?

The use of this word (invasion) was not arbitrary but was intended in order to implant the concept of invasions in the minds of Muslims as a normal behavior of the Prophet. Once it was implanted in the minds of the people, talking about the invasions of the Caliphs became legitimate and acceptable, so much so that no one could dispute them so long as the Prophet was responsible. Thus Muslims were raised for a thousand years, studying this in all stages of their education, in the mosques and on every religious occasion that (Ghazu) 'Invasion' was essential in the mission of Islam!

The compilers of history books decided that their recording begins in basing Islam on invasions of people outside the land of the Arabs. They soon found out, just like their jurists, that they needed to find support for the invasions in the Qur'an or in the Hadith. If that would be possible to do, it would have been a relief: If they were to fail in finding support for that behavior from the Qur'an, it would then be necessary to find a Hadith to back it up even if they had to invent that Hadith! When they failed to find an explicit verse calling for the invasions, which would make the behavior of the Umayyad Caliphs compliant with religion and not just politics, they took verses in the Qur'an out of context and made them the bases for justifying these acts. This penetrated the conscious and subconscious of Muslims for centuries to an extent that may make it seem impossible to dislodge it or to awaken people to denigrate such invasions.

No better example than in the (Surat Al-Baqara) Cow Chapter of Qur'an where fighting is mentioned in detail in several verses. Allah says: "Fight in the way of Allah those who fight you but do not transgress. Indeed, Allah does not like aggressors" (Al-Baqara 2:190). He ordered the Muslims to fight those who fight them, but forbade aggression, and that was an irreversible prohibition. No one can claim that the Almighty allowed aggression elsewhere in order to spread his religion, because He is incapable of contradicting Himself. His orders are neither restricted, limited in time, nor are they affected by

happenings, and His words are final and absolute. The prohibition on aggression is a Divine Law beyond any interpretation. No Caliph or faqih, no matter how good a Muslim he could be, or how high his status would be, can change that or add to it, unless out of Jāhiliya zealotry! This is the way every verse that refers to fighting should be read and understood: through the perspective of absolute prohibition on aggression. Whoever cannot do this, should not indulge in interpreting His Divine words, because he would be unjustly ascribing to the Lord what He did not say.

I am, sometimes, baffled when I hear what some Muslims say about them being assigned the duty of spreading Islam, even if that necessitated killing people. I ask myself how those people can believe in this when the Qur'an and the Sunnah of the Prophet order otherwise. But I am soon awakened by His words: "Have you seen he who has taken as his God his [own] desire, and Allah has sent him astray due to knowledge and has set a seal upon his hearing and his heart and put over his vision a veil? So who will guide him after Allah? Then will you not be reminded?" (Al-Jaathiyah 45:23).

The generosity of the Lord has no boundaries. He has instructed His subjects that moral obligations take precedence over religious solidarity, saying in the description of a Muslim aiding a Muslim against a non-Muslim: "And if they seek help of you in religion, then you must help, except against a people between yourselves

and whom is a treaty. And Allah is Seeing of what you do" (Al-Anfaal 8:72). Is there nobleness greater than that of Allah's given morals to us, when he instructed His believing subjects that a treaty, which is a moral obligation, takes precedence over the right of the believer towards another believer? Is it conceivable that such a Lord ordered his servant to kill non-Muslims for no reason other than the latter's refusal to accept Islam as his faith?

If we want to take a lesson from the Sunnah of the Prophet, we will not find in his life any act or directive allowing assault on anyone who rejected Islam as a religion. This is because the Prophet was knowing of Allah's command: "You are only a warner, and for every people is a guide" (Ar-Ra'd 13:7). There were Jews and Christians in the Arabian Peninsula, and we have never found any record of Him offering them Islam or threatening them with death if they refused. When Jews of Medina asked Him to arbitrate between them, He directed them to rule according to the Torah.⁸⁴ He did not fight them until they conspired against Him and assaulted Him in Medina, doing so in accordance with the Almighty's words: "So whoever has assaulted you, then assault him in the same way that he has assaulted you" (Al-Baqara 2:194).

As to the Christians of the Arabian Peninsula, the Prophet did not even offer them Islam. When the Christians of Najrān came to him, what transpired was that a debate took place between both sides without a fight or spears

and swords, ending with the conversion of some Christians to Islam in peace. That was achieved after the Prophet boasted during the debate of the people of 'His house'. The Qur'an described that in saying: "Then whoever argues with you about it after [this] knowledge has come to you - say: "Come, let us call our sons and your sons, our women and your women, ourselves and yourselves, then supplicate earnestly [together] and invoke the curse of Allah upon the liars [among us]" (Aal-Imran 3:61).⁸⁵

We must consider the lesson from the story of the incidents described in the biography of Ibn Hishām of which most Muslims are unaware because they have not read the biography. Those who read it have either forgotten the incident or tried to forget it for the same obvious reason that made the Umayyad Caliph, Abdul-Malik Ibn Marwān, 'wished that no one should be occupied with the Prophet's biography because of its elevation of Banu Hāshim and Ansār'⁸⁶, in what can only be seen as a clear admission that Quraysh was antagonistic to the Prophet throughout his life.

The Prophet's biography tells that the Prophet Muhammad sent missionaries inviting Arabs to Allah but he did not order them to fight. Among those he sent was Khālid Ibn Al-Walid whom he sent to Banu Jadhimah in the Lower Mecca.⁸⁷ The standoff ended with the people of Banu Jadhimah putting down their arms. Ibn Hishām quotes Ibn Ishāq: 'As soon as they laid down their arms,

Khālid ordered their hands to be tied behind their backs and put them to the sword, killing a number of them. When the news reached the apostle, he raised his hands to heavens and said: "Oh God, I seek penitence before Thee from what Khālid has done.... The apostle summoned 'Ali and told him to go to these people and look into the affair, and abolish the practices of the pagan era'⁸⁸. Every Arab understands the meaning of 'penitence' that has reached its peak when the Almighty excluded the Penitence Chapter 9 (Surat At-Tawba) from beginning with the Basmalah as every other Chapter does, so as not to include those He disassociated Himself from in the mercy and compassion included in the Basmalah⁸⁹. If the Prophet was angry to the limit of penitence because Khālid had killed innocent people while calling them to Islam, then what about what the Umayyad, 'Abbāsid and Ottoman Caliphs did in the name of Islam to the peoples they invaded? If the Almighty had ordained that Islam be spread by the sword, why did the Prophet not order his missionaries to use the sword in the call? And why did the Prophet not kill any of the Infidels of Mecca after Allah granted him power over them? He did not even offer them the option that was used by the Caliphs after him, to choose between Islam, Jizya and death.⁹⁰

Where did this option come from then? How was the culture of killing in Islam that is being used today to incite those imbeciles to kill and ruin, founded after Allah and His Prophet forbade them?

Chapter 5

Islam Came Only to the Arabs Not to Spread by Sword

The previous chapter was concluded by questioning whether the origin of the culture of killing in Islam was religious or political. It is relevant that before searching for the roots of the culture of killing, we need first to consider punishment in Islam.

Reward and punishment, as every Muslim knows, are in Allah's hands. Allah has willed, in His absolute wisdom, to punish or forgive, as He wants, in this life or in the hereafter. The Almighty also distinguished between offences that call for punishment, dividing them into two parts: an offence that affects the general public being a public offence, and an offence that affects only its owner being a private offence. When the Almighty laid down His rules for nations, He decided that the community has the right to punish for the public offence, but He did not give that community the right to punish for private offence, as He kept that for Him to punish or forgive as He pleases.

The Qur'an stipulated the punishments that the community has the right to impose and which are public crimes such as unlawful killing, theft, adultery and perjury. However, the Almighty did not provide for the punishment for the private offences, which hurts the perpetrator himself and not the community, such as drinking alcohol and apostasy. This is because these offences, and those

similar to them, do not harm the community and it is not the community's right to impose punishment on the perpetrators, as is the case in the punishment for murder and theft, for example. I believe that most Muslim scholars had not paid attention to this fact and to the Divine Wisdom behind it. When they attempted to justify for a ruler the use of a punishment - because politics and public interest necessitated its imposition - that did not appear in the Qur'an and for which they could not find a religious foundation, they reverted to analogical reasoning (Qiyās)⁹¹. This they did in the punishment of a drinker, which was built on the likelihood that the drunk would invent falsehoods as a result of the impact of alcohol. They said: 'when he drinks, he becomes intoxicated, and when he becomes intoxicated, he talks confusedly, and when he talks confusedly, he lies.'⁹² This allowed them to inflict the punishment for perjury as stipulated in the Qur'an. This analogy seems to suffer from two flaws.

The first is that Allah did not stipulate that, and if He had wanted to do so, He would have done so. Secondly, the analogy is not sound because it does not automatically follow that every drunkard loses the ability to control his mind and give false testimony. Punishment cannot be inflicted merely on the basis of the suspicion or assumption that the drunkard would do so despite the lack of evidence that he was going to do it!

Where is killing permissible in Islam and where is it prohibited?

By this I mean what the Almighty has ordered in the Qur'an and not what some Caliph or faqih said later, because what Allah has said is His order in creation, which is also the essence of Islam. What Caliphs and fuqahā said, which He did not say, is merely politics, and must be described as such. No one should say that the Almighty left it to His creation on Earth to create rules in His name. There is a big difference between the case where the text in the Qur'an explicitly stipulated a rule, and the text deliberately left out stating a ruling. What the text of the Qur'an stipulated as a ruling, no creature has the right to change and claim it to be part of religion. No jurist, no matter how knowledgeable he is, can say that the Messenger can abrogate a Qur'anic ruling. This is because it is possible to invent a Hadith or tradition and attribute it to the Prophet, and there is neither protector nor guardian against that happening. According to Islam, Allah willed that only the Qur'an be protected from falsification.⁹³ What the Almighty decided deliberately to leave out, not inadvertently nor in vain, without specifying a penalty is left to us to judge with our minds and independent reasoning. We may make correct judgments and we may err, but this is all part of this life and the volatility and change that accompany it. That is to say, as long as it is part of human reasoning, then it is subject to change.

The death penalty is one punishment stipulated by the Qur'an and is no longer subject to independent reasoning among Muslims. The Almighty had permitted the taking of

a life in the Qur'an in only three cases: Killing in wars in which Muslims are fighting in self-defence, and not as aggressors or invaders, because as submitted before, Allah fully forbade aggression and said: "Do not transgress. Indeed. Allah does not like transgressors." (Al-Baqara 2:190)

The other two cases for the permissibility of killing other than in defensive wars are stipulated in His saying: "whoever kills a soul unless for a soul or for corruption [done] in the land - it is as if he had slain mankind entirely. And whoever saves one - it is as if he had saved mankind entirely" (Al-Maaida 5:32). This means that Allah authorized the community to punish with death two offences only; for killing a human unjustly and for corruption on Earth. There is no other offence in which the nation is entitled to impose a death sentence. No person is allowed to invent this or impose his reasoning. The sanctity of the soul is so great with Allah that He made whoever takes it unjustly as one who kills all humanity. How, therefore, can anyone impose the death sentence on someone who had committed an offense that Allah did not stipulate as deserving death? We must always remember that in Islam the creator of life is Himself the creator of death!

This argument will no doubt antagonize many people, but it is a sincere call for a rational dialogue to arrive at the roots of the culture of killing that faces us now like devils'

heads,⁹⁴ eating everything and everybody. How can we stop it without knowing its roots and what it feeds on?

When I say that the Almighty did not authorize killing for Islam except in defensive wars, I mean that no offensive war can be carried out by a Muslim killing people without committing a sin in that attack. This means, by extension, that every attack based on the pretext of spreading Islam becomes an offense one under this Divine stipulation. My guide in what I am saying is the Qur'an, which Muslims believe to be the immutable word of Allah, which falsehood cannot approach from before it or from behind, which I consider to suffice as my proof!⁹⁵ No verse in Qur'an calls on Muslims to spread Islam by force; in fact the Qur'an forbids aggression and calls for wisdom and good advice, and the distance between these and murder is like the distance between Heaven and Earth.

If anyone finds a verse in the Qur'an calling on Muslims to fight others without those having assaulted them first or started killings, let him come up with it! We have got used to reading verses brought as evidence, but they are mostly indications taken out of an integrated context, just like saying: "Do not approach prayer" and then stopping before completing the rest of the verse: "while you are intoxicated."

What are the verses in the Qur'an that urge to fight, which a Muslim relies on in explaining that Allah commanded him to fight the infidels and spread Islam by force?

Let us read together the main verses where fighting is mentioned:

1. “Fight in the way of Allah those who fight you but do not transgress. Indeed. Allah does not like transgressors.” (Al-Baqara 2:190)

This verse forbids aggression, and makes fighting conditional on it being a response to an attack and not initiated by the Muslim. It is in the light of this verse that every other verse in the Qur'an that calls to fight must be understood, because as long as the Almighty categorically forbade aggression and stipulated that He does not like aggressors, then no fight is legitimate unless it would be in response to an attack or assault. The Qur'an is an integral message and verses must be read in conjunction with each other and not in isolation. The Message is one unit!

2. “And kill them wherever you overtake them and expel them from wherever they have expelled you, and 'fitnah' sedition is worse than killing.”(Al-Baqara 2:191)

In this verse, fighting is mentioned in conjunction with His saying “....and expel them from wherever they have expelled you”. Fighting, in this case, is in response to an aggression committed in expelling Muslims from their land.

3. “[Fighting in] the sacred month is for [aggression committed in] the sacred month, and for [all] violations is legal retribution. So whoever has assaulted you, then assault him in the same way that he has assaulted you. And fear Allah and know that Allah is with those who fear Him.” (Al-Baqara 2:194)

This verse states that an attack must be in response to an attack “fight them in the sacred month if they fight you during it.” In addition to that, retribution can only be a response to an injustice, as you cannot initiate retribution because then it would not anymore be retribution!

4. “Would you not fight a people who broke their oaths and determined to expel the Messenger, and they had begun [the attack upon] you the first time? Do you fear them? But Allah has more right that you should fear Him, if you are [truly] believers.” (At-Tawba 9:13)

This verse states that fighting is in response to the aggression started against you first by people who were about to expel the Messenger and renege on their Covenant. This is self-defence, not taking the initiative to fight to spread Islam.

5. “Fight those who do not believe in Allah or in the Last Day and who do not consider unlawful what

Allah and His Messenger have made unlawful and who do not adopt the religion of truth from those who were given the Scripture - [fight] until they give the jizya willingly while they are humbled.” (At-Tawba 9:29)

This verse needs more elaboration, to which I will attend later on in another chapter when I will deal with jizya, its origins and what is determined in the Qur'an.

Which of these verses calls for a fight without it being in response to aggression or defence of self and religion?

After this display of evidence from the verses of the Qur'an, how could pages be blackened glorifying murder, invasion and aggression under the pretext that Allah ordered them? Let whoever challenges this contention produce a single alternative verse. It is no good arguing that this or that fallible Caliph did it.

In addition to all this, the Merciful Lord of Heavens and the Earth willed that His mercy, which encompasses all things,⁹⁶ should not exclude amnesty and forgiveness if the aggressor stops his aggression. Evidence of that are many in the Qur'an, like His saying about the polytheists:

"And if any one of the polytheists seeks your protection, then grant him protection so that he may hear the words of Allah. Then deliver him to his place of safety. That is

because they are a people who do not know." (At-Tawba 9:6)

He said: ".. deliver him to his place of safety", not: 'and then cut off his head'. Where did those demonic evil scholars of the Muslims come up with the invention of beheadings, when the Messenger released polytheists unharmed giving them the benefit of the doubt?

The Almighty ordered us to uphold peace, stating that in more than one place:

"And if they incline to peace, then incline to it [also] and rely upon Allah. Indeed, it is He who is the Hearing, the Knowing." (Al-Anfaal 8:61)

"Except for those who take refuge with a people between yourselves and with whom is a treaty or with those who come to you, their hearts strained at [the prospect of] fighting you or fighting their own people. If Allah had willed, He could have given them power over you, and they would have fought you. So if they remove themselves from you and do not fight you and offer you peace, then Allah has not made for you a cause [for fighting] against them" (An-Nisaa 4:90).

We must stop and consider these two verses, to see to whom Allah is referring. As the victim is not able to offer you peace because he does not have the capacity to do so, then it must follow that Allah is describing the behaviour

of the perpetrator or aggressor, which confirms what I said before, that a Muslim is forbidden from initiating aggression. Thus, when the enemy wants to stop his aggression and turn to peace, then Allah had ordered Muslims to accept peace in saying: "Allah has not made for you a cause [for fighting] against them".

I started this book by stating that, if a group of people from outer space were to land on Earth tomorrow, and they would hear what some Muslims say and do, none of them would turn to Islam as his religion.

I do not intend to enter into a philosophical religious debate about the origin of religions of the Semites, because this is a subjective issue, believed by those who believe and rejected by those who reject. I have no problem with that, because I am not trying to convince anyone that Islam is better than Christianity or any other religion. I am committed to a saying of His, which most Muslims have not noticed and Muslim jurists avoided: "O you who have believed, upon you is [responsibility for] yourselves. Those who have gone astray will not harm you when you have been guided. To Allah is your return all together; then He will inform you of what you used to do" (Al-Maaida 5:105). How is it my business what those whom Allah did not want to guide, or he who did not want to purify himself, do: "He has succeeded who purifies it, And he has failed who instils it [with corruption]" (Ash-Shams 91:9).

But I need to point out here that I think that religions are, in essence, one, and every religion came to people in their tongue to get them out of the darkness of physical matter to the light of mental serenity. It cannot be logically acceptable that one Creator, as agreed upon by all religions, created the universe and yet this Creator was confusing his creation by sending different messages. He did not change His message between sending Ibrāhim, Moses, Jesus, or Muhammad as Muslims believe the series to be. All of them came from this Creator and the bond that bound them when the Lord took from the children of Adam ⁹⁷ their descendants, each came speaking his people's tongue, warning them and not guiding: "You are only a warner, and for every people is a guide" (Ar-Ra'd 13:7). This great Lord could not have ordered Jesus to call his people to love and tolerance, then order Muhammad to call his people to carry out killing, aggression and invasion. He who prevented believers in this world from killing the As-Sāmiri is the ONE who prevented believers from killing Judas Iscariot, and prevented believers from killing Abu Sufyān.⁹⁸ That is because killing is His; he kills if He wishes and punishes whenever He wishes and forgives if He so wishes!

These religions came to certain peoples in their tongues. Thus the Torah was in Hebrew, the Bible in Aramaic and the Qur'an in Arabic. Every book of these came to warn the people who spoke that tongue. Without delving into the history of religions of this region, it suffices to restrict

the research to the Qur'an and its message, and those to whom it came.

When I blogged that Islam is the religion of the Arabs, some of my friends did not like what I said. I find it important to explain to them because I am confident that they have no intention of defaming me, but they may simply be reluctant to accept what I say, probably because of the depth of the roots of what they have learned and the desire to learn more.

One wrote me that my argument, that Islam came to the Arabs, based on the verse "that you may warn the Mother of Cities and those around it", is not enough evidence, because if it were a sound basis, we must accept the Almighty's saying "And warn, [O Muhammad], your closest kindred"(Ash-Shu'araa 26:214), and the Prophet would have contented himself with warning Banu Hāshim. It is a reasonable objection but more than one Qur'anic and logical evidence disproves it.

When the Prophet was ordered to convey the Message, he declared it and the first who heard it were his household; his wife Khadija and his cousin and protégé 'Ali and Zaid Ibn Hāritha, who embraced Islam immediately. Then came the Divine command to "warn your closest kindred". He therefore gathered the Banu Hāshim and showed them what he was commanded to communicate. Around him gathered a group of close believers, who had accepted the First Call in His saying "And [mention] when your Lord took

from the children of Adam - from their loins - their descendants and made them testify of themselves, [saying to them], 'Am I not your Lord?' They said, 'Yes, we have testified.' [This] - lest you should say on the day of Resurrection, 'Indeed, we were of this unaware' " (Al-A'raaf 7:172). Allah has commanded him to warn the Mecca, Mother of Cities, and those Arabs around it in saying:

"And thus We have revealed to you an Arabic Qur'an that you may warn the Mother of Cities [Mecca] and those around it and warn of the Day of Assembly, about which there is no doubt. A party will be in Paradise and a party in the Blaze" (Ash-Shura 42:7).

Before considering this verse, and what supports it in Qur'an, it must be said that there was no Divine Order after that telling the Prophet to warn the people of China or warn the Romans, for example, but He limited it to the Mother of Cities and those around it who have not had a warner. An enquirer may ask why did the warning stop at the Mother of Cities and those around it?

The answer is in the same verse, which is that the Qur'an is in Arabic, and the warning cannot be but in the tongue of the people it intends to warn. The Almighty has committed himself to this when he said:

"And We did not send any messenger except [speaking] in the language of his people to state clearly for them, and

Allah sends astray [thereby] whom He wills and guides whom He wills. And He is the Exalted in Might, the Wise" (Ibrāhim 14:4). And He would never renege on His words!

The Almighty confirmed the Arabic nature of the Qur'an in eleven verses, all clearly stating that the Qur'an is Arabic and that its legislation is Arabic:

"And thus We have revealed it as an Arabic legislation. And if you should follow their inclinations after what has come to you of knowledge, you would not have against Allah any ally or any protector" (Ar-Ra'd 13:37).

When He distinguished it from the book of Moses, despite the fact that Moses' Tablets are identical to Muhammad's Testament in everything, He said:

"And before it was the scripture of Moses to lead and as a mercy. And this is a confirming Book in an Arabic tongue to warn those who have wronged and as good tidings to the doers of good" (Al-Ahqaf 46:12)

And when The Almighty said:

"And if We had made it a non-Arabic Qur'an, they would have said, 'Why are its verses not explained in detail [in our language]? Is it a foreign [recitation] and an Arab [messenger]?' Say, 'It is, for those who believe, a guidance and cure. 'And those who do not believe - in their ears is

deafness, and it is upon them blindness. Those are being called from a distant place" (Fussilat 41:44), He cut the road on all those who say that Islam came to all people on Earth and that all they are charged with following it. This is because He allowed the Arab to ask, if the warning had come in a non-Arabic language, is it foreign and Arabic? How can He be just with the Arab when He allows the Arab to ask this question, and not be just, for example, with the Chinese, if we assume that he would be asked on the Day of Judgment about the Qur'an, would he not ask: Why are its verses not explained in detail [in our language]? Is it a foreign [recitation] and Chinese?

"And even if We had revealed it to one among the foreigners, And he had recited it to them, they would not have been believers in it" (Ash-Shu'araa 26: 198-199)

How is it possible for Muslims to claim today that the Qur'an was sent to all people on Earth when Allah told them in the above verse those non-Arabs would not believe it simply because it was not sent in their tongue?

Islam is the religion of the Arabs that was sent in their tongue "That you may warn a people whose forefathers were not warned, so they are unaware" (Yaseen 36:6). It is the identity of the Arabs, and they are its people. The Arabic identity of the Qur'an is not the subject of debate or conflict, as it is quite briefly the Qur'an of the Arabs! That is why I find it difficult to hear some Indian or African

or Albanian, who does not know the basics of Arabic language, lecturing in jurisprudence and explaining the Qur'an, when he does not know why every Sura in the Qur'an starts with the letter (Ba') and not any other character. Even Surat at-Tawba (Penitence) - which does not start with the Basmalah - starts with the letter (Ba') in the word (Bara'a).⁹⁹ Or how does Allah inspire his Prophets with the letters "Ha', Meem 'Ayn, Seen, Qāf"? ¹⁰⁰ and a thousand other questions.

The Jews have succeeded in something in which Muslims failed, when they did not allow a person to be a Jew unless he understood the Torah in its native language, in addition to having been born to a Jewish mother. The Jew learns, from a Jewish mother and wherever he is, Hebrew, to understand the words of God with which Moses was singled out. How many Muslims, who have exceeded the billion in number, know Arabic? How can their Islam, in this case, be of value without an honest sense of knowledge of the Qur'an? Islam is not simply prostration in ignorance, because animals would then be more Muslim than humans would, for they are eternally prostrating with their heads in the ground "If We willed, We could send down to them from the sky a sign for which their necks would remain humbled"(Ash-Shu'araa 26:4).

No one should think that I am trying to prevent a person choosing, as I am not going to turn away any non-Arab who wants to convert to Islam. But I say that he is not

commanded to do so. If he wants to convert to Islam, he should first be Arabized in order to be able to embrace it. After that he is entitled to what Arabs are entitled to and bound by the same obligations in religion.

So what did the Messenger of Mercy do in calling non-Arabs to Islam, and did this happen?

Chapter 6

Islam, Jizya or Death

In the previous chapter, I concluded that Islam came to the Arabs in their tongue and it did not come to others, because Allah has committed Himself that He would not punish until He sends a messenger, and He would warn every people in their tongue. That is what He did with the Hebrews in Hebrew, with Arameans in Aramaic, and no doubt with the Chinese in Chinese and with the Indians in Hindi and the like. Thus He equally did with the Arabs in Arabic.

This is His wisdom and His justice and they cannot be but that.

When His non-Arab servant stands before Him, how is He going to judge that servant for not accepting the Qur'an, which came in a language foreign to him? Isn't that servant entitled to ask the Almighty, why he was told to follow a Messenger in a language he was not created with, and to read a book that was sent to another people, telling them stories and lessons from their history, without this book mentioning one story or lesson of what happened to the people of that servant, now standing before Him?

More than one has commented that I have overlooked the Sunnah of the Prophet,¹⁰¹ and pointed only to the verses in the Qur'an. I have no doubt that what the Prophet said and did is binding and what he did not say or did not do is

not binding "And whatever the Messenger has given you - take; and what he has forbidden you - refrain from" (Al-Hashr 59:7). What those who followed the Prophet said or did may have been right or wrong, because Allah did not say (And whatever the Messenger and his companions have given you - take). Let no one say that one of his companions arrived at a juristic deduction, and that makes it part of religion because religion is the Qur'an, and the Sunnah of the Prophet. Anything outside that is mere politics. Why am I required to accept what someone invented or deduced as being from Allah, while that person was not given more abilities than what is given to us? If there is to be interpretation of Allah's will, we stand equal, and no one has precedence in knowledge simply because he came before us. Even among the forerunners in Islam, who knew the Messenger, were hypocrites, which the Almighty mentioned and of whom He warned.¹⁰² Thus, their precedence in witnessing the Message is not enough to make them ahead of us in knowledge and faith. In addition to that, some of the companions will go to hell because this companionship did not prevent misguidance. It is narrated that the Prophet had said that on the Day of Judgment some of his companies are brought and diverted from Heaven to Hell, and when he enquired about them and was told that they had gone astray, he would curse them!¹⁰³

The Prophet had been adamant in saying that his people are not protected from aberrance into which people

before them have gone astray. He said to them in his last sermon in the Farewell Pilgrimage "Do not return to unbelief after me by striking the necks of one another"¹⁰⁴. If he did not know that this would happen, he would not have said it, "Nor does he speak from [his own] inclination. It is not but a revelation revealed." (An-Najm 53:3-4)

The question that comes to mind is this: did the Prophet make it his Sunnah to invite Jews and Christians to Islam?

If it can be proven that he did that, and as his Sunnah complements the Qur'an and does not contradict it, then we should adopt it. If on the other hand it cannot be proven that he called Jews and Christians to Islam, then the matter is closed and there are no grounds for a debate on it. By 'calling to Islam' I do not mean to argue or have a dialogue, because it is obvious that this must have happened. It is not possible for a religion that had shaken the Arabian Peninsula and uprooted idolatry, to pass without creating a dialogue and debate with the Jews and the Christians, especially since the Qur'an talked a lot about these two religions that preceded Islam. But what we are looking for in history is whether the Prophet Muhammad had invited the Jews and Christians among the Arabs to it, which was instilled in subsequent years, in the choice between Islam or jizya or death, and which later became the option of killing in the name of religion!

The Arabian Peninsula had Jews and Christians, and the Jews were in constant contact with Muslims because of

their presence in Medina as well as their presence in Yemen, where Christians also lived. Nowhere in the Prophet's biography is it mentioned that he made any of those two groups choose one of the above three options, i.e. Islam, jizya or death. He let the Jews live in Medina according to their religion, and Ibn Hishām wrote in the biography 'Said Ibn Ishāq the apostle wrote a document concerning the emigrants and the helpers in which he made a friendly agreement with the Jews and established them in their religion and their property, and stated the reciprocal obligations as follows.'¹⁰⁵ When he was asked to arbiter in some of their differences, he directed them to rule in accordance with what the Torah brought. Some Jews converted to Islam voluntarily. Otherwise they remained so until they conspired against him and fought him, which forced him to fight back and expel them from Medina. "And if not that Allah had decreed for them evacuation, He would have punished them in [this] world, and for them in the Hereafter is the punishment of the Fire" (Al-Hashr 59:3). The biography does not tell that a messenger had even been sent to the Christians calling them to Islam, but the Christians of Najrān came and challenged him, and some of them converted. All of this happened without the option of Islam, jizya or death.

This behaviour of the Prophet was neither tactical, interim, nor because Islam came gradually with its principles as most ordinary Muslims say. But it was consistent with the Qur'an, which he no doubt knew better than all of us.

Evidence from the Qur'an agrees on the inadmissibility of fighting the People of the Book, as the Jews and Christians are called in Qur'an, except in the case of their committing an aggression against Muslims in which case fighting would be in self-defence and in response to aggression. Here are some examples to demonstrate this.

The Creator of Heavens and the Earth advised His prophet and us that He and not us is the arbiter between religions, when He said: "Indeed, those who have believed and those who were Jews and the Sabeans and the Christians and the Magians and those who associated with Allah - Allah will judge between them on the Day of Resurrection. Indeed Allah is, over all things, Witness." (Al-Hajj 22:17). If He is the one who judges His servants, how can we judge when we do not know His judgement?

The Almighty outlined the minimum rule for obeying him in saying: "Indeed, those who believed and those who were Jews or Christians or Sabeans, those [among them] who believed in Allah and the Last Day and did righteousness - will have their reward with their Lord, and no fear will there be concerning them, nor will they grieve." (Al-Baqara 2:62). Allah made belief in Him and the Last Day together with good deeds, conditions to His blessings. How can a Muslim then doubt as to whom of the People of the Book these conditions apply? Perhaps even more important is how does a Muslim know whether the non-Muslim before him is not one of those whom Allah had blessed in this verse? How in this case can

someone issue a fatwa calling for fighting the People of the Book without them having committed an aggression on Muslims?

It is also conveyed that the Prophet emphasised these facts when He is quoted as saying: "The Jews split into seventy-one sects, one of which will be in Paradise and seventy in Hell. The Christians split into seventy-two sects, seventy-one of which will be in Hell and one in Paradise. I swear by the One in Whose Hand is the soul of Muhammad, my nation will split into seventy-three sects, one of which will be in Paradise and seventy-two in Hell"

¹⁰⁶ In this Hadith he is telling us that in every one of the three religions a sect survives. How can he, after that, call for the killing of a person who may be of the surviving sect, because the intentional killing of a believer is a crime punishable in Hell: "But whoever kills a believer intentionally - his recompense is Hell, wherein he will abide eternally, and Allah has become angry with him and has cursed him and has prepared for him a great punishment" (An-Nisaa 4:93).

The Qur'an emphasizes the core of the above Hadith in more than one verse. Of the children of Israel, Allah says "O Children of Israel, remember My favour that I have bestowed upon you and that I preferred you over the worlds" (Al-Baqara 2:47), which is an absolute preference. The Almighty says of them "And We certainly chose them by knowledge over [all] the worlds" (Ad-Dukhaan 44:32), and said "And among the people of Moses is a community

which guides by truth and by it establishes justice" (Al-A'raaf 7:159). These and others tell us that the children of Israel are a group of believers. It must be pointed out here that there is a grave mistake that occurred when most Muslims, including scholars, are unable to distinguish between "Jews" and "Children of Israel" in the Qur'an. This confusion in understanding has led to major blunders in interpreting verses 4 to 8 of Chapter 17, Surat Al-Israa,¹⁰⁷ because they are verses in praise and not in slander as some of the half-knowledgeable had written. If the children of Israel are a group of believers, how can a Muslim know whether the Jew in front of him is not from among the children of Israel whose killing would end him up in Hell?

As to the Christians, then the Qur'an said more explicitly that we should be cautious in dealing with them. He said "and you will find the nearest of them in affection to the believers those who say, 'We are Christians.' That is because among them are priests and monks and because they are not arrogant" (Al-Maaida 5:82). There are among the Christians those who are believers as was the case with Waraqa Ibn Nawfal, the Meccan Christian, whom the Prophet favoured, even though it is not reported that he converted to Islam.¹⁰⁸

One verse which all Muslims should heed is His saying "[Mention] when Allah said, "O Jesus, indeed I will take you and raise you to Myself and purify you from those who disbelieve and make those who follow you superior to

those who disbelieve until the Day of Resurrection. Then to Me is your return, and I will judge between you concerning that in which you used to differ” (Aal-Imran 3:55). There is more than one piece of Qur'anic evidence in this verse and a call for Muslims to ponder. If Allah willed that the Christians should prevail on Earth until the Day of Resurrection, our Prophet cannot repeal this will and call for fighting Christians to divert them from what they are in, because Christians must prevail as Allah willed! This verse also calls more than ever today to wonder about the meaning of the rule of the Christians on Earth now!

If the Prophet did not call Arab Christians and Jews to one of three options of Islam, jizya or death, how would He call on non-Arabs to convert to Islam?

Someone wrote to me asking about the Prophet's call on Kings outside the land of the Arabs to Islam, a topic that is almost taken for granted that very few have ever questioned. Let us look at the background of this issue to see how accurate the historical narrative is.

The starting point is what is stated in this regard in Ibn Hishām's biography of the Prophet:

"The Apostle of Allah, peace be upon him, sent messengers of his companions, and wrote with them letters to the Kings inviting them to Islam; he sent Dihya Ibn Khalifa Al-Kalbi to Caesar who was Heraclius King of

Rome; and sent ‘Abdullāh Ibn Huthāfa As-Sahmi to Chosroes, King of Persia; and sent ‘Amru Ibn Umayya Al-Damri to the Negus, king of Abyssinia; and sent Hātib Ibn Abu Balta to the Muqauqis ruler of Alexandria; and sent ‘Amr Ibn Al-‘Ās to Jayfar Ibn Julanda and his brother Iyadh the Azdis rulers of Oman; and sent Salit Ibn ‘Amru of Beni ‘Amir Ibn Lu'ay to Thamama Ibn Athal and Hudha Ibn ‘Ali rulers of Al-Yamāma; and sent Al-‘Alā Ibn Al-Hadrami to Al-Munthir Ibn Sāwa Al-Abdi ruler of Al- Bahrain; and sent Shuja’ Ibn Wahab Al-Asadi to Al-Hārith Ibn Abi Shimr Al-Ghassāni ruler of the surroundings of Sham”.¹⁰⁹

It is possible to accept the idea that the Prophet sent messengers because he had established a state and it was natural to send emissaries to other states to achieve recognition of the emerging state and establish peace and good neighbourly relations as should be. There is no reason for us to doubt that he sent emissaries to Arab kings and princes like the kings of Oman and Yamāma and the king of the surroundings of Sham and Hamadan and many others, because he was charged with warning Mecca and its surroundings and these were undoubtedly the towns around Mecca in question. But we must stop at the calling of non-Arab kings like the Caesar of Rome, Chosroes of Persia, Muqauqis of Egypt and Negus of Abyssinia. Ibn Hishām may have confused the two and thus generalized by stating that all the emissaries were sent to call to Islam, while it would have been much wiser to distinguish between those who were sent to the Arab

kings with the call to Islam and those sent to non-Arab as ambassadors of peace and good neighbourly relations when it was not proven otherwise.

The reader would have to pause and ask: If the Great Prophet really wanted to call the Negus to Islam, why did He not charge his cousin, Ja'far Ibn Abi Tālib, to carry out the mission of calling Negus to accept Islam when He sent him with a group of believers in the first migration to Abyssinia?¹¹⁰ 'Amru Ibn Umayya Al-Damri did not precede Ja'far in Islam, nor was he more assiduous than Ja'far in communicating the message of the Meccan Prophet who had been reported to have said "no one should communicate the Message on my behalf except me or a man from my family."¹¹¹ Ja'far Ibn Abi Tālib was a man from his family.

But doubt does not stop at this. Subsequent tellers have narrated stories about texts of letters which they claimed were the Prophet's messages to the Kings. I am skeptical of the credibility of these texts, because if they were true, they would have been known at the time of Ibn Ishāq and Ibn Hishām. And if they were well-known in their time, which was closer to the Messenger, then it would have been logical to have been included in their biographies. But Ibn Hishām, who cited the provisions of contracts and covenants and letters, much inferior in value, did not cite the text of a single one of the alleged letters from the Prophet to the Kings of the world. Those appeared only in a later period!

The second reason, which calls for doubt in these texts that emerged later, is evidence from the history of others. I will not go into what was written or not written by the Persians or the Ethiopians, but I am concerned with the Romans. This is because one of the sciences in which the Romans excelled was the science of history and its codification. Roman historians did not leave anything small or large undocumented. Is it conceivable that an event of this seriousness, like a letter from the Prophet of the Arabs and their rising commander, who was threatening the borders of the Roman State, had reached the court of Caesar and remained undocumented by Roman historians of that period, when they documented the events of less importance than the relationship of their Caesars with others? The lack of Roman historical documents of any reference to this letter is powerful evidence that indicates that these texts were inserted later for political reasons. It suffices to say that it confirms the doubt that I put in front of scholars searching for truth in history.

The third reason for doubt is Arabic and Qur'anic, overlooked by researchers, dismissed by Arab linguists and undoubtedly unknown to religious scholars. I do not want to turn this writing into a linguistic research to show the faults in the texts, because the western reader would not be able to follow the grammatical argument. But it would suffice to say that the use of some words casts doubt on the authenticity of the alleged letter, because it contains incorrect words that the Prophet would have never used.

It is difficult to understand, though, why Arab linguists have kept quiet about attributing letters with poor language to the Prophet. I don't think they did not appreciate that reality, but perhaps they were apprehensive about questioning what the religious scholars have narrated.

Had the matter stopped at language mistakes, it may be somehow overlooked. But it also extended to touching the essence of religion and its jurisprudence. The text still contained the same confusion in which every Muslim scholar has participated, and that is the inability to distinguish between the (Rooh) Spirit and the (Nafs) Soul, using the words alternately as synonyms for the same essence. The Spirit and Soul are not the same, because the Soul in Islam is created while the Spirit is an uncreated entity. Without going into details explaining this, it is enough to read Allah's words: "And they ask you, [O Muhammad], about the Spirit (Rooh). Say, "The Spirit is of the affair of my Lord. And mankind have not been given of knowledge except a little" (Al-Israa 17:85). Our Prophet is knowledgeable and would not make the mistake expressed by the ignorance of the scholars in this confusion and say about Jesus, son of Mary that "God created him from His Spirit." That is impossible because God did not create from His Spirit anything, because His Spirit is indivisible for Him to create something from it, as He told us that he created everything from a Soul not a Spirit! Allah explained to us the creation of Jesus as

follows: "Indeed, the example of Jesus to Allah is like that of Adam. He created Him from dust; then He said to him, "Be," and he was" (Aal-Imran 3:59). Where in this verse is there any mention of creating Him from His Spirit as allegedly attributed to the Prophet as having said in his message to the Christian Romans?

If Muslims were honest in attributing these texts to our Prophet, there is an easy, scientific and firm way. Why not subject these parchments which they claim are the original messages sent by the Prophet to the Kings of the world to scientific examinations and tests to determine their history accurately, because nowadays it is even possible to determine the age of the ink used quite accurately. Once this is done, this controversy can be brought to an end and one side will have to acquiesce. Should I be proven wrong, I will be the first to apologize.

Fourteen centuries after our Prophet we stop to read what was attributed to Him of sayings and acts, in some of which we find faults and inconsistency. Is it not time that we face this reality and do justice to our Prophet and cleanse our religion from all that has entered it which defies Allah's infallibility?

Chapter 7

Wars of Apostasy

The search for the roots of the culture of killing and its glorification as part of the heritage of civilized Islam is the only way to cope with what is happening in the world today by a number of Muslims; from the brutal killing and beheading and ripping bellies open, to rape and looting in the name of Islam. If we find that this is actually what Islam wanted, and I do not think this will happen, Islam has no future on earth. But if we find out that the Qur'an and the Prophet did not say what the advocates of the culture of killing are saying, then it is our rational, civil and religious duty to eradicate them from the centre of Islam and disown them publicly without shame or hypocrisy.

Every Arab student has studied Arab history in school and read something about the 'wars of apostasy' that occurred after the Prophet Muhammad departed. The gist that was cemented in the mind of every student is that some people in Arabia forsook Islam; rebelled against the authority of the Caliph, who then sent his armies to fight them and subject them to the authority of the State. Some of them returned to the loyalty, and some of them were killed, while some no doubt did not express what they felt inside them and kept silent and submitted. But what is importantly significant today is not what really happened then but the fact that almost all Muslims believe that those rebels were apostates. But were they?

There is no problem in accepting such political behaviour of any head of state, because the duty of the head of state is to secure stability throughout the country and put down any rebellion, which may put its interests and security at risk. But the history which we have studied and continue to study does not treat this as a political action, but it goes on to treat it as a Divine Order required by Islam, which was carried out by the Companion after the Prophet, for the protection of the religion of Allah. And that's what I will try to discuss here.

Lest anyone think I want to say that what was political was not religious and what was religious was not political, I would like to stress that it is not so. The political decision may be in conformity with religion or contrary to it, and it may be the subject of a religious conflict. It is also possible that the religious attitude is not in the interest of politics. Such contradiction requires that the ruler should decide which path to follow and, while doing so, he will no doubt expose himself to criticism from one of the parties. This undoubtedly belongs to the difficult choices of any ruler, and whoever takes on the burden of ruling should learn to live with it!

Perhaps one would ask what is the use of talking about 'wars of apostasy' now and how would considering them benefit us? The answer to that will be seen through this treatment, which will show how they established a serious precedent in the history of Islam whose realities we still live and depend upon in spreading the culture of killing. It

is precisely what the propagators and supporters of the 'Islamic State' claim to be doing in fighting and killing Muslims, accusing them of being apostates, relying on that precedent set out in the early days following the Prophet's departure, and how the fuqahā later identified who the apostates in Islam are.

What is the truth of what happened before the 'wars of apostasy' and afterwards?

What has reached us from the 'wars of apostasy' is a bunch of sporadic news that drew more than one picture of the event and the reason for some Arab tribes rising against the Caliph. Some said that a number of tribes rose because they believed that their allegiance (bay'a) was for the Prophet, and it had since been dissolved when He was gone and they owed no allegiance to any successor. Some said that a number of tribes did not accept Abu Bakr as the Caliph, while other stories tell us that a number of tribes refused to pay zakāt and did not rise against the Caliph.¹¹²

And here we must pause and ask: What really happened?

A number of Muslims have fallen victim to suspicion in their interpretation of the verse "Take from their wealth a charity by which you purify them and cause them increase, and invoke [Allah's blessings] upon them. Indeed, your invocations are reassurance for them. And Allah is Hearing and Knowing" (At-Tawba 9:103) which they took to mean that the Messenger of Allah alone had the right to take

zakāt and alms, and when he departed they were absolved of that obligation. That is what they said when they came to Medina to argue with Caliph Abu Bakr. A number of companions, including ‘Umar Ibn Al-Khattāb, Abu ‘Ubaida Al-Jarrāh and Salim Mawla Abu Huthaifa, were of the opinion that these were not unbelievers as long as they had fulfilled their duties towards the other pillars of religion in the shahāda (declaration), prayer and fasting. They argued with Abu Bakr about that and it is narrated that ‘Umar said to Abu Bakr: "How do you fight them when the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon Him, had said: I have been commanded that I should fight against people till they declare that there is no God but Allah, and when they profess it that there is no God but Allah, their blood and riches are guaranteed protection on my behalf except where it is justified by law, and their affairs rest with Allah."¹¹³ Abu Bakr is reported to have responded: "I will fight whoever separates prayer from zakāt. By Allah, if they withhold from me a young goat that they used to give to the Messenger of Allah [SAW]¹¹⁴, I will fight them for withholding it."¹¹⁵ Abu Bakr was quoted elsewhere as stating "By Allah! If they withhold even (camel) tethers which they used to give to the Messenger of Allah, I will fight them for withholding it."¹¹⁶

I shall report herein what happened to Mālik Ibn Nuwaira At-Tamimi, as evidence of the historical records we have of the 'wars of apostasy':

"It was the commandment of Abu Bakr that when they enter an area they should call for prayer. If people answered the call, they were to leave them alone, but if they did not answer, then kill them. If they answer you and repeat the Muslim formula, ask them about zakāt, if they concur accept it from them and if they refuse fight them. Khālid Ibn Al-Walid's horsemen brought Mālik Ibn Nuwaira in a group of Beni Tha'lebe Ibn Yarbou'. The company was not in agreement, one of whom was Abu Qatāda, who testified that they had responded to the call for prayer and prayed. When there was disagreement, [Khālid] ordered them to be held in custody on a cold night without anything. Khālid ordered a caller to announce: 'warm your captives', which in the language of the Kenāna tribe meant 'killing', and Kenāna was Khālid's tribe. People thought he wanted them killed, when he only wanted warmth, and they killed them. Dhirār Ibn Al-Azwar killed Mālik, and Khālid married Um Tamim, Mālik's woman."¹¹⁷

I will not indulge in the interpretation of historians and scholars about Khālid Ibn Al-Walid's killing of Mālik Ibn Nuwaira and using his head as firewood to cook his food, because discussing that is without benefit, as Muslims are split between themselves regarding Khālid; not today but since 'Umar Ibn Al-Khattāb dismissed him from leadership in the midst of the peak of his victory.¹¹⁸ But I would like to conclude from what happened in the killing of Mālik Ibn Nuwaira and the likes of him who refused to pay zakāt in particular, and the 'wars of apostasy' in general: One

conclusion is that they created two dangerous precedents in Islam adopted by Muslims from that day to this day and contributed to the establishment of the culture of killing in Islam.

The first precedent created by the 'wars of apostasy' is that a Muslim should be killed if he renounces Islam.

The second precedent is that whoever refuses to pay zakāt is considered an apostate and infidel who should be killed according to former precedent. Perhaps the followers used this as a guide and subsequently considered that whoever rejected any of the obligations of Islam would be considered an infidel, on the grounds that Islam is an integral whole and that its pillars are indivisible and each of them is a basis of religion.

Is it really so, and what is the effect of these precedents on Islam today?

I will begin with the second precedent before the first, and adopt the Qur'an, without undermining what the Prophet said, but I am wary of relying on a Hadith lest someone accuse me of selectively choosing one and leaving the other, especially when I am not confident of the credibility of a number of the narrators, which is a natural right of any researcher. Muslims do not differ on the truthfulness of the Qur'an, and this is sufficient for me in what I want. I also do not necessarily accept what the companions did after the Prophet because they made their own

independent reasoning, and likewise every Muslim is entitled to his/her own independent reasoning: Whoever says contrary to that is trying to deny Divine Wisdom, and this is unacceptable.

The first fact that can be asserted is that the Qur'an is devoid of a single verse that refers even implicitly to a punishment for whoever fails to observe any of the obligations of religion. It is also impossible for anyone to assert definitely that every one of the obligations of religion is equal to any of the other obligations, and that if he defaults on one he defaults on all, assuming that the Qur'an in fact did identify these as pillars which it did not do. I do not think anyone can really say that the hajj (pilgrimage) religious duty is identical to the duty of prayer, for Allah has made the first for whoever is able; as He said: "And [due] to Allah from the people is a pilgrimage to the House - for whoever is able to find thereto a way" (Aal-Imran 3:97), which is subject to more than one interpretation. But Allah ordained that "Indeed, prayer has been decreed upon the believers a decree of specified times" (An-Nisaa 4:103), which is not subject to any interpretation and there is no excuse to refrain from it. It is no doubt a statute and a pillar of religion greater than others. A Muslim may be excused for not performing the hajj and remains a Muslim, but he is not excused for failing to pray, which may be performed even when one is fully incapacitated. Similar exemptions may be argued regarding fasting.

When it comes to zakāt, then its religious basis is the betterment of the Muslim nation through the contribution of Muslims in supporting the state in fulfilling its obligations. Zakāt in Islam is not different from the tax imposed by non-religious states in order to enable them to carry out their obligations in the governing of the state. That is to say that the imposition of zakāt in Islam is a political action complementary to religion and not more important, since both the Muslim in his state and the non-Muslim adheres to it in her/his state. While Allah defined the times for prayer, He did not specify the amount of zakāt. Muslims differed on that, where the Shi'a Muslims said it should be one fifth of wealth earned, the Sunnis said it should be one eighth of that fifth. Each party came up with its argument, and every Muslim has to decide where he/she stands on this issue. Therefore, Allah did not stipulate the percentage of zakāt while He defined prayer times, which gives a different value for each religious obligation. If the obligation of zakāt is no less important than the obligation of prayer, would it not be natural for the servant to expect his Lord to provide the percentage of what he has to pay? Does leaving the percentage undetermined mean that Allah made its amount subject to change, depending on the needs of the community, while He did not make the prayer times subject to change or diligence? Did not the Almighty say "And from their properties was [given] the right of the [needy] petitioner and the deprived" (Adh-Dhaariyaat 51:19), and made it an absolute right and not a known right as stated in another

verse? Is this not evidence that zakāt is a flexible obligation that changes depending on the need and circumstance? What I want to say is that the value of zakāt in Islam is not the same as the value of prayer, and it is not a fact that it is such a religious obligation that makes it a basic pillar with which religion is invalidated if it is compromised.

However, this does not diminish its seriousness if it is declined, because declining it hinders the state's ability in fulfilling its obligations. In this, the Caliph's decision to fight decliners to pay zakāt was a correct political decision, but not necessarily the correct religious decision, because it has not been proven in the Qur'an that whoever declines to pay zakāt removes himself/herself from the community, even though he/she defies the state. Here is where the division between state and religion occurs, whether the Caliph likes it or not!

I have no doubt that scholars accept this even though they do not dare to declare it. By this I mean that they accept that their support for fighting those who decline to pay zakāt is a political stand and not at the heart of religion. Otherwise, they would have called for fighting those who decline to fast and those who do not do the pilgrimage, despite their ability to do so. What about the millions of Muslims who do not pray? Should they all be labelled apostates and put to death? But they have done none of

that. Why then have they called for fighting decliners to pay zakāt if it were not purely politically motivated?

Fighting decliners to pay zakāt and killing them raises more than a question regarding the meaning of faith and its essence, because the obligation of fighting decliners to fulfil any of the obligations of Islam, as in the case of zakāt, necessarily means that violating any of the religious obligations is a violation of faith! Is this a sound conclusion?

It would be correct if Islamic rituals would coincide with faith, but they are different. The Almighty has confirmed this in more than one place in the Qur'an, and the most comprehensive one is His saying "The Bedouins say, "We have believed." Say, "You have not [yet] believed; but say [instead], 'We have accepted Islam,'" (Al-Hujuraat 49:14). He ordained that whoever becomes a Muslim is not a believer until he believes, distinguishing between the two cases. The essence of faith is the same in all religions, but the religious obligations vary from religion to religion. Had the obligations of Islam been eternal and original in faith, they would have been imposed on the Jews and the Christians as they were imposed on Muslims in all their types and limits, but we know that it was not like that.

The essence of faith is the same in all religions and examples of evidence from the Qur'an are many. The Almighty said "They are not [all] the same; among the

People of the Scripture is a community standing [in obedience], reciting the verses of Allah during periods of the night and prostrating [in prayer]" (Aal-Imran 3:113), telling us that among the People of the Scripture are believers even though not Muslims, which calls for Allah's blessing, even if we do not know it.

Where then is the Qur'anic evidence that indicates the obligation and permissibility of fighting those who refuse to pay zakāt, despite their faith in Allah and the Last Day, when the Lord reminds us in more than one verse that "Indeed, those who believed and those who were Jews or Christians or Sabeans - who believed in Allah and the Last Day (Day of Judgment) and did righteousness - will have their reward with their Lord, and no fear will there be concerning them, nor will they grieve"? (Al-Baqara 2:62).

And that those who "believe in Allah and the Last Day, and enjoin what is right and forbid what is evil and hasten to good deeds, those are among the righteous" (Aal-Imran 3:114).

And "and he who hopes to meet his Lord, let him do a good deed and not associate in the worship of his Lord anyone" (Al-Kahf 18:110).

The Lord has thus ordained that whoever believes in Allah and the Last Day, and does righteous deeds is saved. No verse in the Qur'an requires that whoever violates a religious obligation, is irredeemable. What is even worse is

that there is no verse that gives the guardian the right to kill anyone who violates all the obligations of Islam, let alone only one of them.

Allah has pointed out a serious matter regarding faith when he said: "O you who have believed, do not invalidate your charities with reminders or injury as does one who spends his wealth [only] to be seen by the people and does not believe in Allah and the Last Day. His example is like that of a [large] smooth stone upon which is dust and is hit by a downpour that leaves it bare. They are unable [to keep] anything of what they have earned. And Allah does not guide the disbelieving people." (Al-Baqara 2:264). He also said: "And those who spend of their wealth to be seen by the people and believe not in Allah nor in the Last Day. And he to whom Satan is a companion - then evil is he as a companion" (An-Nisaa 4:38).

He informed us that it is not only insufficient to pay zakāt and alms to achieve faith, but that it would be hypocritical if not accompanied by belief in Allah and the Last Day, which He clearly indicated to be the true pillars of the faith.

This merciful Lord, whose mercy encompassed everything, went further than that in forgiveness, clemency and amnesty, and said: "and do not say to one who gives you [a greeting of] peace 'You are not a Muslim'" (An-Nisaa 4:94). How then can those who only refuse to pay zakāt be

called infidels and must be fought, when Allah has denied killing a soul except by right?

Then there is the second precedent created by the 'wars of apostasy', namely, the obligation of fighting the apostate from Islam. If we assume for the sake of argument, that there exists Qur'anic evidence that abstention from paying zakāt is a violation of religion and apostasy from Islam, the question that arises from this is: Should we, or is it even permissible to, fight the apostate?

It is not a secret that almost all of Muslim scholars since the 'wars of apostasy' until today, agree on the necessity of fighting the apostate from Islam. They have devised a mechanism to achieve this killing that requires among other things that the apostate should be given the opportunity to repent to save him from being killed.

Has the Almighty ordained that the apostate from Islam should be fought and killed? The brief and unequivocal answer is: No!

If we look at what the Forgiving and the Merciful said, away from what someone did, or a fatwa by one or two fuqahā, we will find that Allah not only has not ordained the killing of an apostate, but in fact ordained that the killer of an apostate should be punished if that killing had happened simply because the victim was an apostate and not because he carried a weapon and killed Muslims or caused corruption in the land.

The first Divine Rule is the eternal text decreed upon believers since our last Adam, according to what He told us, as we have no knowledge except what He has taught us, which stipulates:

"Because of that, We decreed upon the Children of Israel that whoever kills a soul unless for a soul or for corruption in the land - it is as if he had slain mankind entirely. And whoever saves one - it is as if he had saved mankind entirely" (Al-Maaida 5:32).

How can anyone, whether a Prophet or Caliph or guardian, order the killing of a soul outside this Divine Decree? The apostate is neither a murderer nor spreading corruption in the land. If he had fallen victim to uncertainty or infidelity, his affair and judgement rest with Allah and not with man.

Allah strengthened that decree by saying "No compulsion in religion, the right course has become clear from the wrong" (Al-Baqara 2:256). If the Almighty had decreed that no one shall be compelled to enter Islam, how can He enjoin killing whoever chooses to voluntarily leave it like he entered it? He instructed His Prophet in saying: "And had your Lord willed, those on Earth would have believed - all of them entirely. Then, would you compel the people in order that they become believers?" (Yunus 10:99).

He concluded this by telling the faithful: "O you who have believed, upon you is [responsibility for] yourselves. Those who have gone astray will not harm you when you have

been guided. To Allah is your return all together; then He will inform you of what you used to do" (Al-Maaida 5:105). He is telling His servants that it is not their affair whoever believes or disbelieves if they are concerned with guiding and validating themselves. That is because the Almighty took over the affairs of the unbelievers in this world and of their torment in the Hereafter, and evidence of that in the Qur'an is plentiful!

Had the Almighty not mentioned the apostate in the Qur'an, we might have found a way to interpret how to deal with him/her. But He says in His Book:

"O you who have believed, whoever of you should revert from his religion - Allah will bring forth [in place of them] a people He will love and who will love Him [who are] humble toward the believers, powerful against the disbelievers; they strive in the cause of Allah and do not fear the blame of a critic. That is the favour of Allah; He bestows it upon whom He wills. And Allah is all-Encompassing and Knowing." (Al-Maaida 5:54)

Allah told us that if people revert from Islam, then He would make that up for Muslims by bringing other peoples who will strive for Him with the striving due to Him, but He did not tell us to fight those apostates. Had He wanted that, He would have charged us with fighting them when He talked of their apostasy.

Then He said: "And they will continue to fight you until they turn you back from your religion if they are able. And whoever of you reverts from his religion [to disbelief] and dies while he is a disbeliever - for those, their deeds have become worthless in this world and the Hereafter, and those are the companions of the Fire, they will abide therein eternally" (Al-Baqara 2:217).

He thus ordained that whoever reverts from religion and dies as an infidel that his judgement with His Lord is eternal Fire, and not in our hands as scholars have mistakenly decreed.

The Forgiving and Merciful Allah did not leave the matter there, but alerted us to a serious matter when he said: "Indeed, those who have believed then disbelieved, then believed, then disbelieved, and then increased in disbelief - never will Allah forgive them, nor will He guide them to a way" (An-Nisaa 4:137), telling us that the unbeliever could come back to the faith. If so, how is it permissible to kill him/her if Allah enabled the possibility of his/her return to the faith?

So what has reached us from this culture produced by the 'wars of apostasy'?

The obligation of killing an apostate from Islam and even one who rejects any of the religious obligations of Islam, has become a part of the culture of Islam, according to

which Muslims have been raised for thirteen centuries. Let us take two examples from the Shi'as and Sunnis.

Rouhullāh Al-Musawi Al-Khomeini, herald of the theory of 'Wilāyet Al-Faqih'¹¹⁹ and founder of the Islamic Republic of Iran, issued a fatwa for the killing of Salmān Rushdie, the Indian-born British writer, on the grounds of apostasy from Islam, where all scholars agreed on Al-Khomeini's fatwa that it is a duty to fight anyone who abuses the Prophet.¹²⁰ Perhaps it was the biggest service Al-Khomeini did to the miserable book, which made Salmān Rushdie, who previously was an insignificant writer like tens of thousands of writers in English, who produce mediocre work every year and are forgotten in the next year, a famous writer worldwide, and even made his book of interest to the world, translating it into dozens of languages, spreading his wretched tales of our Prophet and His household. Had Al-Khomeini kept silent on the book, he would have benefited Islam more, but he committed himself to the consensus of scholars, committing a mistake no doubt!

The second example is adversity caused by the Bedouin scholars in the past two decades which called for the killing of Muslims and non-Muslims, more precisely, calling for the killing of anyone who differs with Bedouin backward interpretation of Islam. The devastation and killing that we have seen and continue to witness today in Iraq, Syria, Libya, Egypt, Yemen, Tunisia, Afghanistan,

Pakistan, Somalia and Algeria can all be attributed to the culture of killing born of the 'wars of apostasy' which decreed the necessity of killing a Muslim apostate. All that a simple-minded Muslim requires today during his brainwashing process is to be told that this group of people have reverted from Islam, for him to impose murder, rape and ruin, just as Muslims in the 'wars of apostasy' did!

So if the 'wars of apostasy' have made the killing of a Muslim apostate a religious obligation, would it be difficult to make a Muslim fundamentalist believe that the killing of non-Muslims is more of a religious obligation?

Chapter 8

Misinterpreting the Qur'an

I ended the previous chapter by reaching an important conclusion proven by history, which is that, since the first year of the departure of the Prophet, Muslims have accepted killing a Muslim if he/she withholds from the Caliph a camel's tethers.

Would the observer today be surprised seeing the culture of takfir (accusations of apostasy) and murder, being revived in this horrific way, having had its foundations set since the first year after the death of the Prophet?

This is an extremely serious issue because deeming so easy the killing of a Muslim cannot but lead to the belief and conviction, apparent or hidden, that killing non-Muslims must be still easier. That is how the culture of killing in Islam began growing gradually as we will see.

As soon as the 'wars of apostasy' were over, Muslims began looking for new wars outside the borders of the Arabian Peninsula. Thus began the new page of 'Islamic Invasions' that colored the history of Islam from that day until the end of the Ottoman Empire in the early twentieth century.

I have already demonstrated how Muslim history glorifies 'invasions', to the extent that it calls the wars in which the

Prophet fought in defense of the Muslims 'invasions' (Ghazwat). This invasion is nothing but a word of rebuke in the Qur'an, where the Almighty uses the word 'invade' (Ghazu) only for the unbelievers. The word was not even once used to describe the Muslim believers. How then did historians and scholars permit themselves to use this word in the biography of the Prophet?

Muslim Historians and scholars went on and borrowed another beautiful Qur'anic word 'fat'h' (victory) to describe Islamic invasions, alleging that the invasion by Muslims of any land is a victory from Allah. They forget that there is no relationship between the verse: "Indeed, We have given you, [O Muhammad], a clear victory, that Allah may forgive for you what preceded of your sin and what will follow and complete His favour upon you and guide you to a straight path" (Al-Fath 48:1-2), and the material invasion of any land, because most of them did not realize the metaphysical dimension of creation and its causation. They considered it no more than eating, drinking and fornicating, since their lives and jurisprudence only revolved around these! If what I say angers anyone, let him bring forth a single epistle from one of the Imāms of jurisprudence or sects arguing the cause of the creation of Heavens and Earth, in spite of His saying: "[Those] who remember Allah while standing or sitting or [lying] on their sides and give thought to the creation of the ', [saying], "Our Lord, You did not create this aimlessly; exalted are You [above such a thing]; then protect us from the

punishment of the Fire" (Aal-Imran 3:191). When he fails to achieve that, I will point out to him hundreds of epistles from those scholars and Imāms of sects discussing purity, menstruation and ablution nullifiers, and the difference between 'bahirah' and 'sa'ibah' and similar transient mundane issues.¹²¹ It is enough to prove their ignorance in Islam that they did not differentiate in what they wrote between the 'soul' and the 'spirit' despite the clear distinction having been made in the Qur'an!¹²²

Islamic invasions do not differ from any invasions in human history: Every invador claimed a reason for invading others. The invador may be truthful to himself in his claim, and he may be lying. But the result is the same in that the invador imposes his will if and when he achieves victory.

We must pause here to ponder an important issue, namely that the invasion was done in the name of religion, as it seems that almost every religion has been used as a reason for invasion, superiority and hegemony. Let the Coptic, who is partial to Islam, not say that the brutal crusader invasions of Syria were not in the name of religion: One of them wrote, no doubt viewing things with one eye, the following few lines (keeping their grammatical structure as it is):

'Many add the Crusades to the religious wars ... But they do not fulfill the specifications of the religious wars (Type III), though they were holy wars in the

eyes of its followers because, in the belief of the simple Christian of Europe, they were under the protection of God (Type I). They may carry political or economic marks too, but they were not codified by a law of Christianity, and was not originally aimed at spreading Christianity, but the restoration of Christian holy lands that fell under Muslim occupation from the seventh and eighth centuries AD. ¹²³

So how is it not but blindness of those who say that the Crusades were to restore Christian holy land that fell under Muslim occupation? Does the British from North Britain have the right to claim Jerusalem? And when did he convert to Christianity to even demand that right? And how different is this from the Muslim claiming that it is his right to guide people by the sword? And what is this wordplay in distinguishing between 'religious' and 'divine' wars to negate aggression from the actions of the Crusades? Every invasion in history is an aggression that aims at subjugating others to the dominance of the invador. Any justification otherwise is mere nonsense! It may be appropriate to remind people that what the Crusaders did in Syria when they violated it is many times worse than what the Muslims did when they drove them out of it. This is without mentioning the crimes the Crusaders committed against Christians along their way from Europe to the Holy Land.

Were Muslims' wars in Syria and Iraq aggressions or guidance? No one can overlook the seriousness of such a question because it touches the foundations of inherited Islamic history upon which a great deal was built.

The answer to this question has two parts: The first deals with whether Syria and Iraq are considered part of what the Prophet was charged with in warning Mecca and those around it. The second deals with whether the Prophet was obligated to impose Islam on the Arab Jews and Christians of Iraq and Syria.

I have argued earlier that Islam came to the Arabs and the Arabs alone, just like every nation has had its own religion and a warner "And We did not send any messenger except [speaking] in the language of his people to state clearly for them, and Allah sends astray [thereby] whom He wills and guides whom He wills. And He is the Exalted in Might, the Wise" (Ibrāhim 14:4). Allah identified to His Prophet the limits He assigned him from among all the prophets "That you may warn a people whose forefathers were not warned, so they are unaware" (Yaseen 36:6), defining these people when He described them: "And thus We have revealed to you an Arabic Qur'an that you may warn the Mother of Cities and those around it and warn of the Day of Assembly, about which there is no doubt. A party will be in Paradise and a party in the Blaze" (Ash-Shura 42:7). This permits a Muslim to claim that fighting the Romans and the Persians was a defensive war because the aggression originally occurred in the invasion of the land of

the Arabs by the Romans and the Persians. This statement is not an attempt to find excuses, but an historical fact as the existence of the Persians and the Romans in the land of the Arabs was an aggression, and responding to it can only be through war as the Almighty decreed: "Fighting in the sacred month is for [aggression committed in] the sacred month, and for [all] violations is legal retribution. So whoever has assaulted you, then assault him in the same way that he has assaulted you. And fear Allah and know that Allah is with those who fear Him" (Al-Baqara 2:194). Thus sending the army to Syria and Iraq was in support of the Arabs of those lands and of the implementation of Allah's verse: "That you may warn the Mother of Cities and those around it" (Ash-Shura 42:7), as long as Mecca is the Mother of Cities, Syria and Iraq are of those cities. This is what the Prophet did when he sent an army to aid the people of 'Ma'uta' in southern Syria and repel the Roman aggression. And before his death, the Prophet appointed Osama Ibn Zaid Ibn Hāritha to lead the army and repel the aggression again and avenge the death of his father Zaid Ibn Hāritha, Ja'far Ibn Abi Tālib, 'Abdullāh Ibn Rawāha and other martyred believers before Khālid Ibn Al-Walid retreated with a defeated Muslim army!¹²⁴

However, the conclusion regarding the permissibility of fighting the Romans and the Persians in Syria and Iraq does not answer the second part, namely: Does fighting them lead to imposing Islam on the people of the Book in those two countries or simply to invite them to it? This

question is inseparable from the question that has already been put regarding whether the Prophet had been assigned to impose Islam on Christians and Jews of the Arabian Peninsula who were in the Medina or Mecca or Yemen. I have previously answered this question by concluding that the Prophet did not call Jews or Christians in Arabia to Islam. When some of the Christians of Najrān converted, they did that voluntarily after arguing with the Prophet and not because of any invitation or call from Him or offer to them the three options as happened during Muslim invasions. Even if He were to call the Jews and the Christians of the Arabian Peninsula to Islam, he would have done so as his Lord ordered him to "Invite to the way of your Lord with wisdom and good instruction, and argue with them in a way that is best. Indeed, your Lord is most knowing of who has strayed from His way, and He is most knowing of who is [rightly] guided" (An-Nahl 16:125), not by the sword!

Furthermore, the Muslim wars in Syria and Iraq were characterized by a principle unknown to Muslims during the time of the Prophet, which was to offer the three options of Islam, jizya or death. I am unable to accurately determine who instituted this military rule that has become the norm of all Muslim invasions since then.¹²⁵ I am not convinced that it was the Prophet who did so as there is not one single historical record of Him having imposed this rule or collected it from the Jews of Medina. This is not important for this work, but what is important is

the legal ground on which the author of this rule relied, and how this rule was applied to the invaded land.

Any reader of history, not necessarily a scholar or a researcher, would stop to ask a very simple question: How can any people respond to the demand of an army standing on its borders, asking them to choose between a book whose language is unknown to them, or between paying a tax if they refused, or to be killed if they refused the previous two options? In other words, is it not equally ridiculous to expect people to accept that Muslims have given the others real options before fighting them, when they offered them to choose between similar options while their armies were standing on the borders of their towns and villages?

We must first consider the jizya (tribute) and its imposition. The first thing a reader of history would face is that the word jizya came only once in the Qur'an in the verse:

"Fight those who do not believe in Allah or in the Last Day and who do not consider unlawful what Allah and His Messenger have made unlawful and who do not adopt the religion of truth from those who were given the Book - until they give the jizya willingly while they are humbled" (At-Tawba 9:29):

The tribute (jizya) is not a punishment, as some may believe, and it originates from the Arabic verb 'Jazya' to

mean 'reward'. It is a tax denoting a 'personal tax'. Thus when the Holy Qur'an mentioned it in relation to non-Muslims that one time, Arab dictionaries inserted the new meaning to say that: 'Jizya is what is collected from non-Muslims'; a new use that was not known before Islam. Thus it emerges that one of the meanings of jizya is the tax imposed on the People of the Book in contrast to zakāt which was imposed on Muslims.

If it were so, why didn't the Prophet impose jizya on the Jews of Medina, if we consider only the Jews and not the Christians? The Prophet established his rule in Medina in the first year of hijra (migration) and Jews lived with Muslims for several years before they were evicted. Wouldn't it have been expected of the Prophet to impose jizya on the Jews if it were a Divine Order, like those who came after the Prophet claimed it to be?

The only reason for the Prophet's abstention from imposing jizya is his accurate reading of the verse on its imposition. For whoever looks closely would notice that the Almighty mentioned fighting People of the Book in certain instances identified by the verse, namely: "They do not believe in Allah or in the Last Day, and they do not consider unlawful what Allah and His Messenger have made unlawful, and they do not adopt the religion of truth." However, we cannot read this verse without being governed by the eternal prohibition of aggression in the verse: "Do not transgress. Allah does not like transgressors" (Al-Baqara 2:190). The conclusion from all

this is that the Almighty addressed Muslims telling them that: You will be called to fight some of the People of the Book attacking you, and they will attack you because they do not believe in Allah or the Last Day. "They are not [all] the same; among the People of the Book is a community standing [in obedience], reciting the verses of Allah during periods of the night and prostrating [in prayer] "(Aal-Imran 3:113). If they do not believe in Allah and the Last Day, they will assault you, and then you should fight them until they submit by paying the tax. This must be the reason why the Prophet did not impose the jizya on Medina's Jews, because he did not find them fighting or disbelieving in Allah and the Last Day. Had he found that from them and not imposed jizya, he would have disobeyed his Lord, and that is utterly excluded, for he is the infallible!

It is clear that from the above argument that the imposition of jizya on the People of the Book is neither normal nor automatically applicable to every non-Muslim not embracing Islam, but that conditions of the previous verse should be fulfilled before imposing jizya. If those conditions are not met, then jizya may not be imposed.

It also appears from the foregoing that the three options have nothing to do with religion at all; they are neither from the Qur'an nor from the Prophet's legacy or Sunnah. It would not be proper for anyone to say that he had heard the Prophet calling for taking jizya from People of the Book, because a saying like this is not based on facts and is no more than artificial interpretation and may even be an

invention. Had the Prophet wanted to impose jizya on all the People of the Book who did not convert to Islam, he would have done that in his lifetime. Not having done that does not give anyone after him the right to do that, and claim that it was Allah's order. It may be understandable that a Muslim ruler finds it necessary to impose taxes on his non-Muslim subjects, but he should not say that it is from the code of Islam, which was brought by the Prophet and ordered by the Lord!

I know that more than one person will raise the question that many ask: How would Islam have spread if invasions of lands outside the Arabian Peninsula did not take place, starting from Syria and Iraq through Iran, Turkey, India and North Africa to Spain? The answer to this question has two approaches: Metaphysical and realistic. The metaphysical says that if Allah willed that Islam spreads, it would spread whether or not invasions took place. Judaism reached all corners of the world without many wars. Christianity had spread in an area wider than Islam with fewer religious wars. The realistic answer stands before our eyes, because the number of people, who converted to Islam without war, is larger than the number of those who converted with war. Muslims today outside the areas invaded by force is larger than the number of Muslims in the land occupied by the sword. Indonesia, for example, which is the largest Muslim country by population, converted to Islam and remained Muslim without a single Muslim soldier having invaded it. Although Muslims settled in

Spain for eight hundred years, when they were forced out of it, not a single Muslim house remained, not even out of prudence! What remained were palaces and an architectural style.

Thus, we find that Muslim invasions outside the Arabian Peninsula were political acts, above all, which may have served political Islam, but it was neither the command of Allah nor guided by the legacy of His Prophet. If it is so, we must ask: were all of the People of the Book killed during the wars of Syria, Iraq and Spain among those whom Allah described as not believing in Allah and the Last Day, and who did not consider unlawful what Allah and His Messenger have made unlawful? How was that established before killing them?

The invasion of Syria and Iraq, and the invention of the options of Islam, jizya or death were not in themselves only serious and important, but their importance and seriousness increase when we realize that they have become the Law of Islam from that day to our time. The scholars gave themselves the authority of making them juristic rules, making it legal to kill non-Muslims, and legal to kill a Muslim apostate, and legal to exact tributes from the People of the Book. These prerogatives, like many others, which constituted Islamic Shari'a, lack any Qur'anic bases upon which they can rely.¹²⁶ However, the scholars interpreted them in many ways. Some of them argued on the basis of the biography of a companion, claiming it to be right since that companion must have been right.

Others reverted to analogy (Qiyās), despite all the dangers of analogy, because the devil used analogy, and made a mistake and entered hell.¹²⁷ And some of them used independent judgement, which is subject to error. I have no objection to any of this, as I am not against being guided by the conduct of the companions, and I'm not against the analogy of the scholar, nor am I against independent judgement. But I am against those who claim that these are the laws of Allah and offer them to Muslims as such, because they are man-made and must be presented as such. They may conform to the laws of Allah, which only He knows, and may not conform. But we do not always know the essence of His laws, and we should not claim that of which we are ignorant!

I cannot recall how often I have found myself amazed hearing an educated Arab Muslim insisting that there is a verse in the Qur'an that orders the stoning of the old adulterer man and the old adulteress woman.¹²⁸ If the learned Arab, believed in the practices invented by Muslims as the laws of Allah, despite being in contradiction with text of the Qur'an, without bothering to search the Qur'an in his hands, then what would a Muslim who cannot read or write do? How did these principles, instituted by scholars and historians as the Divine Law, affect the formulation of Islamic Thought for fourteen centuries?

I intend to show in the next chapter, and before moving on to the internationalization of the culture of killing outside

the land of the Arabs, the role played by the invented Shari'a in the formation of Islamic thought.

Chapter 9

Intellectual Terrorism of Shari'a

Nowhere in the Holy Qur'an does the word 'jurisprudence' (fiqh) or any of its derivations appear except once in the verse: "And it is not for the believers to go forth [to battle] all at once. For there should separate from every division of them a group [remaining] to obtain understanding in the religion [fiqh] and warn their people when they return to them that they might be cautious" (At-Tawba 9:122). In spite of this, generations of scholars worked and wrote in the centuries that followed the revelation of the Qur'an, not on the deep study of jurisprudence as Allah instructed, but in reality on the study of Earthly matters and got involved in the affairs of state, as the latter and the ruler needed new rules. No books or dissertations have reached us which deal with Allah's saying in the verse: "And I did not create the jinn and mankind except to worship Me" (Adh-Dhaariyaat 51:56), in order for us to understand the reason for creation. We have not received any studies that show an understanding of the verse: "And reflect on the creation of the Heavens and the Earth, [saying], "Our Lord, You did not create this aimlessly; exalted are You [above such a thing]; then protect us from the punishment of the Fire" (Aal-Imran 3:191). Nor have we seen any reflection on His saying: "It is Allah who has created seven Heavens and of the Earth, the like of them. [His] command descends among them so you may know that Allah is over all things competent and that Allah has encompassed all

things in knowledge" (At-Talaaq 65:12), so that we may know the reason for His creation of seven Heavens and seven Earths and where they are.

We have not seen studies in jurisprudence that deal with the reason for the Devil's sin, or with where the devil learnt deductive analogy from, on his own when the rest of the angels said: "Exalted are You; we have no knowledge except what You have taught us. Indeed, it is You who is the Knowing, the Wise" (Al-Baqara 2:32). Nor did we receive jurisprudential studies dealing with the Almighty's prohibitions on asking about the Spirit "And they ask you about the Spirit. Say, The Spirit is of the affair of my Lord. And you [mankind] have not been given of knowledge but a little" (Al-Israa 17:85). No scholar is known to have written about the difference between the soul and the spirit that I may even wonder if any knew the difference between them! But we have dissertations in the 'rituals' of worship and marriage and sales, which are all Earthly matters. There is no waste in having rules governing the lives of the people, but they remain only that: guidelines that regulate Earthly not religious affairs. If it is so, why were those people called fuqahā when Allah decreed that fuqahā should reflect on religion while they concentrated on this materialistic world?

One may argue, as we are used to hearing and reading that Islam differs from other religions in that it is both temporal and spiritual. This is in fact contrary to the reality of things as Allah intended them to be. Religion is static

and the world is dynamic, and Islam cannot combine the static and the dynamic. Prayer times are fixed and don't change with the change in the world, but a contract of sale has changed between the time of Abu Hanifa¹²⁹ and today. The conditions that were imposed then have disappeared and it has become accepted today that the transaction takes place through the Internet or e-mail. Worldly rules have changed but rules for religious affairs have not. The Almighty said: "Every day He is bringing about a matter" (Ar-Rahmaan 55:29). That no doubt relates to our worldly affairs and not His affairs, for He was and still is; has neither changed nor ceased nor moved from one state to another!

In order for those jurists to set up a framework for the rules of politics, they borrowed another Qur'anic term to give their ideas a semblance of religious and Divine order. They therefore called their rules 'Shari'a', adding to it the word 'Islam' to make it 'Islamic Shari'a' which means that it has become a Divine Code, which Islam brought. Some of those rules may be in line with Islam, but it is difficult to say that everything the scholars wrote and was pursued by the Caliphates is the Code of Allah as He wanted. Had this been the case, Muslims would be today as Allah described: "And if only they upheld [the law of] the Torah, the Gospel, and what has been revealed to them from their Lord, they would have consumed [provision] from above them and from beneath their feet. Among them are a moderate community, but many of them - evil is that

which they do" (Al-Maaida 5:66). Although, the verse referred to Jews and Christians it would equally apply to Muslims had they followed their Book.

Where did the scholars come up with the word 'shari'a' that came to mean Allah's Rule in the land? If we go back to the Qur'an, which is the first and decisive source of Islam, we find the verb 'shara'a' and what was derived from it as follows:

"To each of you We prescribed a Divine Law and a method. Had Allah willed, He would have made you one nation [united in religion], but [He intended] to test you in what He has given you; so race to [all that is] good. To Allah is your return all together, and He will [then] inform you concerning that over which you used to differ" (Al-Maaida 5:48).

"He has ordained for you of religion what He enjoined upon Noah and that which We have revealed to you, [O Muhammad], and what We enjoined upon Abraham and Moses and Jesus - to establish the religion and not be divided therein. Difficult for those who associate others with Allah is that to which you invite them. Allah chooses for Himself whom He wills and guides to Himself whoever turns back [to Him]" (Ash-Shura 42:13).

"Or have they other deities who have ordained for them a religion to which Allah has not consented?" (Ash-Shura 42:21)

"Then We put you, [O Muhammad], on an ordained way concerning the matter [of religion]; so follow it and do not follow the inclinations of those who do not know" (Al-Jaathiya 45:18).

Which reader of these verses can say that Allah was referring in any of them to worldly things in the 'shari'a'? Are not all of them linking 'shari'a' to matters of religion and religion alone? Isn't the scholars' use of the term 'Islamic Law' in worldly matters the wrong adaptation of a Qur'anic term in order to portray their policies as being Allah's law, when Allah has nothing to do with what they decided or did not decide in worldly matters?

There is no doubt that the establishment of the new Islamic state required the development of policies to govern it. It is not difficult to understand the need to subjugate the people to it, nor is it difficult to understand the easy way to do it, namely to claim that everything determined by the Caliph and supported by scholars is Allah's Law. Thus were born the rules of intellectual terrorism in Islam! Each policy named 'shari'a' became binding and every opposition to it became an act of apostasy. It is not difficult, however, to evaluate the strength of this weapon in the hands of the ruler, any

ruler! This intellectual terrorism continues unabated among Muslims even though it has taken different forms.

The possibility of contesting these policies must have been clear to the ruler and the scholars who supported him, and there was therefore a need to find justifications for them. But scholars found the Qur'an too tight on this matter, even restricting them in some cases, and they reverted to relying on the Hadith. Thus was born the profession of collecting the Hadith undertaken originally by 'Arabized' Muslims.

Someone may ask: what is wrong with that?

The answer is that the ignorance of those Arabized Muslims of Arabic resulted in problems in the narrations of some Hadiths, which burdened Arabic books, as none of the Arab grammarians dared challenge those Hadiths for fear of being accused of opposition of the community. Searching for explanations tired them, while courage would have required them to simply state that the Hadith was invented and was not uttered by the Prophet Muhammad. Whoever narrated that Hadith was either ignorant or the Hadith was collected by an Arabized person who did not have a good command of Arabic. The proof to that is that Arabic language grammarians, such as Abu 'Amr Ibn Al-'Alā', Al-Khalil, and Sibawayh of the Basrah grammarians, and Alkesa'i, Al-Farrā', 'Ali Ibn Mubarak Al-Ahmar and Hishām the Blind of the Kufah grammarians, did not cite much narrated Hadith of the Prophet because

they knew they were taken from Arabized Muslims, and that the narration is not accurate because in the majority of cases it was hearsay of hearsay. The top linguists based their grammar on the Qur'an and the poetry of Arabs. It is not accepted to answer, as some have done, that the non-Arab origin of the person is not a disadvantage, arguing that the great, Sibawayh, was Persian in origin.

The problem is that the Muslim from non-Arab origin found it difficult to sense the tongue of the Arabs and understand similitudes. One of the latter writers wrote: 'Early grammarians had a peculiar attitude towards avoiding references to the Prophet's Hadith. They did not even trouble themselves to debate the issue or declare acceptance or rejection. We rather see that the Hadiths they have referred to were either used timidly and minimally, without any proclamation, or verification in some cases. Ash-Shātibi says about this: '.... in none of their grammar books can we infer a Hadith reported from the Prophet (S), but only in a way which I later on will indicate, God-willing. This while they quote the speech of the insolent and uncivil men among the Arabs, and their poems which include obscene words and abomination.This is the tafsir [interpretation] of the backward Bedouins (who urinate on their heels)!! ... Therefore we see so many differences in the traditions as for the same Hadith on one event we find the expressions differ greatly between what is agreeing with what was commonly known of speech of Arabs and what was unknown. Hadn't

the case been another way, it was unjustifiable for the narrators to report Hadith on basis of meaning, in contravention to the case with transmitting poetry and utterances of Arabs, as the intention in quoting them being the words not the meaning, as indicated by tongue rules. Hence the grammarians cared much for inference from the speech of Arabs reported from trustworthy men, leaving the traditions reported due to possibility of the narrator's perverting the wording of the Hadith from the Arabic criterion (standard), the fact leading to base it on other than the origin, and that was one of the things they prohibited for safeguarding the tongue rules. If we make a glance at their ijtihād in taking from the Arabs we would be astonished, as it was not abominable in their view to refrain from inferring the Prophetic traditions and deducing from them.'¹³⁰

If it had only stopped at a fabricated word or Hadith with the wrong word, the matter would have been easy. But it went beyond that. When it became slowly acceptable to contradict the Prophet, Hadiths that contradicted the Qur'an and its rules were invented in order to justify policies opposed to the Qur'anic text. I am not able to see how the 'scholars' allowed themselves this while knowing that the Prophet would have never fabricated lies against his Lord. Let us take an example on the subject of adultery and stoning of adulteresses.

The Qur'an specifies the punishment for adultery in two verses:

"Adulterer and the adulteress, lash each one of them with a hundred lashes, and do not be taken by pity for them in the religion of Allah, if you should believe in Allah and the Last Day. And let a group of the believers witness their punishment" (An-Noor 24:2).

"Those who commit unlawful sexual intercourse of your women - bring against them four [witnesses] from among you. And if they testify, confine the guilty women to houses until death takes them or Allah ordains for them [a] way" (An-Nisaa 4:15).

Allah did not add anything else to these two punishments. Had He wanted, He would have done so. The punishment for adultery is either one hundred lashes or confinement to the house until death or divorce. Scholars have said that the first punishment is for the unmarried woman while the second is for the married woman. If we, for the sake of the argument, were to accept this interpretation, we will still see that the harshest punishment in the case is one hundred lashes, while it is the confinement to the house for the married woman.

But we know that the era of ignorance had not been eradicated from the hearts of Arabs even after accepting Islam. As soon as the Prophet departed, people wanted to return to the era of ignorance out of which the Prophet pulled them. They were as Allah describes them: "A faction worried about themselves, thinking of Allah other than the

truth - the thought of ignorance, saying: 'Is there anything for us [to have done] in this matter?' Say, 'Indeed, the matter belongs completely to Allah'" (Aal-Imran 3:154). They decided to return to the era of ignorance, although the Almighty forbade the judgement of ignorance, saying: "Then is it the judgement of [the time of] ignorance they desire? But who is better than Allah in judgement for a people who are certain [in faith]" (Al-Maaida 5:50).

One of the earliest manifestations of this return to Jāhiliya (Ignorance) was that of treating women. It should be emphasised that some of the converts to Islam, including some who later became known as the Prophet's Companion, used to bury girls born to them alive. This is how Qur'an describes the practice:

"And when one of them receives tidings of the birth of a female, his face becomes dark, and he suppresses grief. He hides himself from the people because of the ill of which he has been informed. Should he keep it in humiliation or bury it in the ground? Unquestionably, evil is what they decide."(An-Nahl 16:58-59) Allah has treated this as such a great sin against Him and against humanity that he reminds us that on the Day of Judgment one of the question put to us would be:

"And when the girl-child that was buried alive is asked. For what sin she was killed?" (At-Takwir 81:8-9)

It is not difficult to understand that some of those who converted to Islam may not have been able to completely shun such practices when it came to treating women in general. It might have been difficult to bury girls alive after Islam, but the treatment of women manifested itself in killing them when they committed adultery, which was a practice inherited from Jāhiliya too.

Mahmoud Shukri Al-Ālusi told us about the history of the Arabs before Islam as follows:

'Among their punishments was killing the adulteress – adultery to them was one of the greatest evils and the most terrible and infamous sin. For that reason they made it punishable by the loss of life and killing, which is the greatest punishment. Evidence of that can be seen when Nu'mān Ibn Al-Munthir killed his wife Al-Mutajarrida and wanted to kill the poet An-Nābigha Ath-Thubiāny for his description of her in his famous poem.'¹³¹

So the people went back to the age of ignorance and decided to kill the woman if she committed adultery, even though Allah had decreed a different rule for adultery. How do they find a way out, knowing that they are contradicting the Qur'an? The second Caliph, 'Umar Ibn Al-Khattāb, is reported to have said that he had read a verse in Chapter 9, 'Surat At-Tawba' that orders the stoning of the adulteress. But no such verse exists in 'Surat At-Tawba' nor anywhere else in the Qur'an.¹³² So when it was impossible to insert such a verse in the Qur'an, they fell

back on the safe solution by claiming that the Prophet ordered the stoning, complementing Allah's rule, justifying that by the verse: "And whatever the Messenger has given you - take" (Al-Hashr 59:7).

But in the midst of such ignorance, they overlooked two important matters: Firstly, that the Prophet would have never fabricated lies against his Lord. Secondly, that the revelation according to them, was continuing until the Prophet's death. Why did the Almighty not supplant the lashing and confinement with stoning before calling His Prophet to Himself? I have already shown that killing an innocent soul is a major sin, so much so that He made killing one soul without just cause like killing all mankind. Is it conceivable that He who made killing that serious a crime, would have overlooked the need to decree in the text the application to cases other than for a soul or for corruption in the land?

I do not understand these people: "Will they not ponder the Qur'an, or are there locks upon [their] hearts?" (Muhammad 47:24). How did they miss Allah's words in which He determined the degrees of sin and warned the female believers when they came pledging loyalty to the Prophet: "O Prophet, when the believing women come to you pledging to you that they will not associate anything with Allah, nor will they steal, nor will they commit unlawful sexual intercourse, nor will they kill their children, nor will they bring forth a slander they have

invented between their arms and legs, nor will they disobey you in what is right - then accept their pledge and ask forgiveness for them of Allah. Indeed, Allah is Forgiving and Merciful" (Al-Mumtahana 60:12).

Allah thus made association with Him the gravest of sins to be followed by theft with adultery coming third, giving theft precedence over adultery. Had adultery been a worse sin than theft, He would have given it precedence, and made its punishment decapitation like He made the punishment of theft the cutting off of hands. But Allah did not do that because theft is more serious than adultery. The reason, as I have argued before, is that theft inflicts general harm in society requiring severe punishment, while adultery's harm is personal making its punishment milder.

There are several other verses in Qur'an that make the mere suggestion of the existence of the punishment of stoning of an adulteress impossible. The first such verse I take from chapter 4 (The Women), which reads:

"... But once they are sheltered in marriage, if they should commit adultery, then for them is half the punishment for free [unmarried] women. This [allowance] is for him among you who fears sin, but to be patient is better for you. And Allah is Forgiving and Merciful." (An-Nisaa 4:25)

But if stoning was indeed what Allah had ordained for an adulteress, then how could it be halved as this verse determined it to be? Is it not only possible if the punishment was some other infliction less than death, which seems to be in line with the one hundred lashes stated earlier?

The second verse I take from Chapter 33 (Al-Ahzaab) which reads:

"O wives of the Prophet, whoever of you should commit a clear immorality - for her the punishment would be doubled two fold, and ever is that, for Allah, easy." (Al-Ahzaab 33:30)

If death by stoning is the punishment ordained by Allah, then how could any of the Prophet's wives, who committed adultery, be punished twice? Would it make sense to stone her after death?

The scholars and collectors of Hadith did not stop at slandering the Prophet, but came up with a tale similar to the 'Thousand and One Nights' tales, claiming it was part of the Prophet's biography. They told of a woman who came to the Prophet Muhammad admitting that she had committed adultery and that she got pregnant from that act. The Prophet is reported to have told her to go and give birth first. When she gave birth and came to Him, He told her to go and breastfeed her baby until weaning. In

short, the adulteress waited three years before the Prophet ordered her to be stoned, as they claim. How did the scholars and narrators, throughout all these centuries, not notice the banality and impossibility of this story happening? One can only wonder. Who was the narrator who was sitting next to the Messenger of Allah each day during these three years and happens to be present every time that alleged woman came, in order for him to convey to us this falsity?¹³³

I must, before I finish the story of the stoning and its invention contrary to Allah's order, mention one of the scandals of the Hadith. The scholars found a Hadith attributed to the Prophet, which reads: "the child is for the bed and for the fornicator is the stone" ¹³⁴, and made it their further proof that the Prophet ordered the killing of the fornicator by stoning her, supporting their claim that he added stoning as a punishment because his Lord had overlooked it. If the scholars had pondered the Hadith, they would have found two faults: First, that it was never reported that the Prophet had ever used a word so crude as 'stone'. Second, and more important, is that had they contemplated the Hadith and referred it to the Qur'anic text, they would have found that the original Hadith was: "the child is the bed's and for the fornicator is confinement", as the original word was 'hajar' which means 'to confine' and not 'hajar' which is 'stone'. This is what was stipulated by the Almighty in the book as saying: "..confine the guilty women to houses until death takes

them..". Thus it is clear that what the Prophet said is not different from what was ordered by his Lord. The reason for the confusion between the 'confinement' and 'stone' is not difficult to understand if the Hadith was written down in the period when diacritical marks were not yet known, and narrated by an Arabized Muslim with no command of Arabic, who confused the two words and missed the truth. It may be understood that collectors or narrators may have their excuses, but what is the argument of scholars and where do they stand on Allah's order on reflection, before rushing to issue diktats to kill people?

Abul- 'Alā' Al-Ma'arri was right when he said:

I am astonished at Khosrow and his followers * and
washing faces with cow urine
And the Jews saying God loves the spray of blood * and
smell of grilled meat!
And the Christians saying God treated unfairly *
persecuted alive and doesn't victor
The people who came from far lands * to throw pebbles
and kiss the stone
I am amazed by their treatises * Are all human beings blind
to the truth!¹³⁵

Chapter 10

Inventing Wahhābism

The objective of my writing on this subject is the attempt to figure out the origin of the culture of killing in Islam: how it started and how it eventually controlled the minds of Muslims so much so that it has become accepted for the mosque preacher to stand and tell people about the glory of killing for Allah. Comprehending these facts may lead us to reconsider our inherited culture in order to correct our understanding of history. Otherwise we would not have a foothold in the world and, while others move forward, we will stay stuck in the same state of being, if not slide into decline, which is the essence of backwardness!

I wrote in the previous chapter on the emergence of a class of those called 'scholars' (fuqahā) who wrote on worldly matters more than on matters of spirituality and religion, but were able to dominate the minds of the people and terrorised them. They did this to the extent that no Muslim dared ask about any subjects not approved by those fuqahā for fear of being accused of heresy or blasphemy. This explains the reason for the failure of the Islamic mind to produce good independent thought. Although Muslims have done a lot in the fields of medicine and science, especially in mathematics and optics, no philosophical thought came out from among the Muslims that can be placed in the ranks of philosophies produced by the peoples of the world before or after Islam. This was

not because the Arabs are not able to reflect and ponder, because they succeeded in studying Greek philosophical thought and explained it and commented on it at length.¹³⁶ They did more than just commenting, in having saved for mankind the Greek philosophical heritage. The Arabic translations of that heritage saved it from loss. When Europe came back after the Renaissance to study Greek thought, it adopted the Arabic text as the principal reference to understand it. Arab contribution in the form of explanation and commenting on Greek thought is a good indicator of the ability of the Arab-Muslim mind to reflect on things. But the hegemony of jurisprudence and the tyranny of the Muslim fuqahā, who believed that they are more knowledgeable than others in the affairs of Heavens and Earth, curtailed and even terrified people from delving into philosophy, which is the mother of sciences. Thus no Arab-Islamic thinker with an original Arab Muslim thought was born into Islam. Calling the physician, Ibn Sina' (Avicenna), and the Andalusian polymath, Ibn Rushd (Averroes), for example, philosophers as compared to Aristotle and Plato is, in my mind, slightly stretching the meaning of the word. However, using the 20th century classification when US academics like Rawls are called philosophers for having written political essays justifying so-called 'just war' or defining fictitious terms like democracy and liberalism, it may not be unreasonable to classify Ibn Sina, Ghazālī and Ibn Rushd as philosophers.

The fuqahā encroached upon the Qur'anic phrase using it as they pleased. The Divine Victory (fat'h) became military invasion and the glorification of murder, looting and rape. Jihad (meaning to strive) became bearing arms, as if they did not read the saying of the Prophet: “We returned from the lesser jihad to the greater jihad”, and when asked: “What is the greater jihad, O Messenger of Allah?” he replied: “The Jihad of the self”¹³⁷. The Shari’a, which they invented to serve the state's policies, became Divine Law. Heredity became the basis of Islamic rule, although they never cease to assert that the rule in Islam is Shura (consultation)! What consultation was applied in the Umayyad, ‘Abbāsīd or the Ottoman Empires? And what Muslim was ever asked for his opinion of the reigning Caliph? How many fuqahā rose against the despotic guardian and questioned his handling of Muslim money, and his tyranny against the people of Islam, before we ask for fuqahā who asked the guardian about his right to invade other non-Arabs in their own homes; kill their men; steal their property and rape their women?

What verse in Qur'an permitted Muslims to steal other people's property? If they were the carriers of a Divine Message, what Lord had allowed stealing, which had been forbidden since time immemorial - be that stealing from the believer or the infidel? How then did stealing become booty? And how did the right of the fighter against the armor and horse of his slain rival in the war become an absolute right to steal everything in the violated country?

Thus it was through aggression and injustice, sanctioned by the fuqahā in the name of Islam, that riches were brought to Damascus, Baghdad and Istanbul during the respective three dynasties.

Indeed, the audacity of some who claim to be fuqahā went even further to the extent that they issued a religious decree (fatwa) that they and their followers are entitled to the souls and honour of some of the different Muslim sects who disagree with them, as did Ibn Taymiyyah!¹³⁸ The continuous persecution to which Ibn Taymiyyah had been subjected throughout his life might have affected his attitude and made him the bitter man he was. But it remains true to say that he had become the godfather of Salafi Islam and his views have more influence today than other Sunni faqih. Nevertheless, it was he who founded the culture of takfir (accusations of apostasy), which recently prevailed, because he and his ilk did not read Allah's words: "Is it they who distribute the mercy of your Lord?" (An-Nisaa 43:32). His fatwa regarding Shi'a in general and the Alawites and Druze in Syria has been at the heart of the campaign of the last few years, which turned the quiet peaceful Syria into a burnt out bloody country almost beyond repair.¹³⁹ Another feature of his influence is his edict that there is no need for one Caliph for the Muslims that has led to the mushrooming of so-called Muslim emirates where any group of fighters have chosen an Amir to whom they swear allegiance and create

an Islamic Emirate, leading to the possible fragmentation of many Muslim states.

Their domineering went beyond that when they decided that the 'gate of Ijtihād' (independent reasoning) had been closed and no one can make his independent reasoning, closing the minds of the people against considering seven centuries-old thoughts. Is it conceivable that Allah who told us about the Universe that "every day He is bringing about a matter" (Ar-Rahmaan 55:29) would authorize them to stop others from thinking whenever they wished? This explains why many Wahnābi clerics of today are still convinced that the Earth is flat and stationary with the Sun rotating around it, and that the Sun enters the so-called 'Sea of Power' every night, rising up the next day.¹⁴⁰ No less stagnant thinking than that of the Ibn Taymiyyah and his Wahnābi followers, believing in the fabricated Hadith, that Allah descends every night to our sky waiting for those seeking forgiveness!¹⁴¹ Believing in the occurrence of such an event is an indication of the backward thinking that cannot grasp the simple fact that the Earth is almost spherical and that means there is night somewhere on it at any second in time. Once such a fact is grasped, then there is no way of talking of His descending at night, otherwise He will be continuously there and needs not go up and down! It is only possible to accept such Hadith when you accept that the earth is flat and stationary which leads to the normal acceptance that there is only one night and one day all over it.

The 'Abbāsīd Era was over and Baghdad fell because of political corruption, initiated by the adulterous 'Abbāsīd Caliph Al-Mu'tassim Ibn Harun Ar-Rashid, when he brought the Turks to ruin the state and turn Samarra into a large brothel abused by maids and palace boys! Arabs entered into a state of hibernation and thinking stopped altogether. Then came the invention of the state of the Ottomans, who claimed their eagerness towards Islam, although they did not know of religion but its name or of the Qur'an's text but its script.¹⁴² I have already stated my conviction that those who are neither Arabs nor able to be 'Arabized', cannot be proper Muslims because Islam is Arabic and whoever does not know Arabic has little to do with Islam. Islam is not a favor, but a covenant between Allah and the Arabs just like the Torah was a covenant between 'Yahwa' and the Hebrews.

The Ottomans produced a new phenomenon in Islam. The Mufti of Istanbul, despite his ignorance of Arabic most of the times and being a servant of the Caliph, became the highest authority in Islam. If we were to realize that the Ottomans contributed very little to human civilization, be that in science, fiqh, theology or other fields of knowledge when compared to Baghdad, we would be able to understand what the Ottoman Mufti did to Islam. We would also see how he became a tool of the Caliph, issuing decrees for him to invade Europe and steal its riches, rape its women, and commit aggression against Muslims, and impose the Turkish language with its limited vocabulary as

a tool for learning. Perhaps the reader understands what is felt by some Europeans towards Islam, otherwise he should read about what the Ottomans did to the Serbians and Armenians, for example.¹⁴³ When the reader does that, he/she will realize that the European feeling toward Islam and what it represents is not without some justified roots. The Ottomans reflected an ugly image of Islam in their continuous invasion of Europe. And in order to understand how ingrained the culture of killing was in the Ottoman era, it would be sufficient to remember that most of the Ottoman Caliphs were involved in killing one of their sons or brothers or relatives in order to secure the transfer of power as they deemed necessary. If the Caliph could authorize in the name of Islam the killing of members of his family, what would happen to the foreign people of the lands under his control?¹⁴⁴

When Allah unburdened the Arabs by removing Ottoman oppression, they discovered the complete vacuum they were living in. They not only found themselves in an intellectual vacuum, but they found themselves without a language because the Turkification policy, pursued by those who claim to be 'keen' on Islam, produced generations of illiteracy among the Arabs and the best educated among them were only fluent in Turkish language.¹⁴⁵ There are two factors that deserve credit for saving Arabic from being lost forever. First, Qur'anic schools in mosques and 'madrassas' and, second, the linguistic renaissance founded by Christians Arabs in

general and Christians of Syria in particular. Perhaps one of the reasons for the weakness of Arabic language and the rampant spread of language failure today is that ninety years after the demise of Ottoman rule is not enough time for the Arabic language to recover!

It is worth reminding ourselves that the Arabian Peninsula has not witnessed any renaissance since the end of the era of the so-called 'Rightly Guided Caliphates' following the Prophet and the transfer of the Caliphate to Iraq, then to the Syria and back to Iraq. The bitter reality is that the Arabian Peninsula, which was never known as the Muhammadian or Bakri or 'Umari or 'Uthmāni state, and which today is called the Kingdom of Sa'udi Arabia,¹⁴⁶ entered into an era of deadly backwardness out of which it has not fully emerged even today. This is not surprising if we take a closer look at the nature of the Peninsula and its inhabitants.

The Bedouins, who make up the largest proportion of the population of the Arabian Peninsula, did not enter Islam in earnest, save for a few of them, and most of them adopted Islam only hypocritically when the Muhammadian Light rose among them. So how Islamic would they be after a thousand years? This is not a subjective view of them, because it is based on an understanding of the Divine Will, which is set in the Qur'an and the Hadith. In the Qur'an, Allah cursed three categories and defined them by name as the polytheists, the infidels and the

Bedouins! This curse has not been lifted off any of them.
He said of them:

"The Bedouins are stronger in disbelief and hypocrisy and better not to know the limits of what Allah has revealed to His Messenger. And Allah is Knowing and Wise." (At-Tawba 9:97).

"And among those around you of the Bedouins are hypocrites, and from the people of Medina. They have become accustomed to hypocrisy. You do not know them, [but] We know them. We will punish them twice; then they will be returned to a great punishment." (At-Tawba 9:101).

"Indeed, the hypocrites will be in the lowest depths of the Fire - and never will you find for them a helper" (An-Nisaa 4:145).

Allah has therefore ruled on the infidelity and hypocrisy of the Bedouins. But He used the word 'some' when He exempted part of them as in his saying:

"And among the Bedouins are some who believe in Allah and the Last Day and consider what they spend as means of nearness to Allah and of [obtaining] invocations of the Messenger. Unquestionably, it is a means of nearness for them. Allah will admit them to His mercy. Indeed, Allah is Forgiving and Merciful" (At-Tawba 9:99)

His eternal rule is not only about their aberration but more about prohibiting them from knowing the limits of religion. Perhaps it is good to stop to consider this fact, because the Almighty offered Islam to the People of the Book and did not prevent His Prophet from letting them know the limits of Islam, but He prevented him from letting the Bedouins know that. Is there a curse greater than that?

Nowhere in the Prophet's biography could one find a narration that many Bedouins converted to Islam. In fact there are several Hadiths derogatory of Bedouin. One such Hadith which had been reported in several different versions while still keeping the message in it is as follows: It is reported that the Prophet asked Allah to bless both Syria and Yemen but when asked about blessing Najd, the land or the Bedouin he refused to bless but chose to condemn them. That is how it is reported in Sahih Al-Bukhāri: "Narrated Ibn 'Umar: (The Prophet) said, "O Allah! Bless our Sham (Greater Syria) and our Yemen." People said, "Our Najd as well." The Prophet again said, "O Allah! Bless our Sham and Yemen." They said again, "Our Najd as well." On that the Prophet said, 'There will appear earthquakes and afflictions, and from there will come out the side of the head of Satan.'"¹⁴⁷ What stronger proof than this that, in addition to Allah condemning the Bedouin in the Qur'an, his Prophet informed his followers that Satan will come from among them at the end of time?

Books of language and literature are teeming with evidence on the ignorance of Bedouins of the Qur'an or even reading it. One example suffices here to show this. Al- Asma'i was quoted as follows:

"I was reciting: '[As for] the thief, the male and the female, cut their hands in recompense for what they committed as a deterrent [punishment] from Allah. And Allah is Forgiving and Merciful' (Al-Maaida 5:38). Beside me was a Bedouin who asked: 'Whose words are these?' I said: "the words of God." He said: "Repeat them" and I did. He said: "These are not the words of Allah." Then I realized and read: '[As for] the thief, the male and the female, cut their hands in recompense for what they committed as a deterrent [punishment] from Allah. And Allah is Exalted in Might and Wise.' He said: "Now you are right". I said: "Do you read the Qur'an?" He said: "No." I said: "How did you know then?" He said: "Listen, He was Mighty so He judged and cut. If he had forgiven and shown mercy, He wouldn't have cut".¹⁴⁸

This is an example from the 'Abbāsīd era when Islam had spread, of a Bedouin who mastered Arabic and intuitively corrected the grammatic mistakes of an Arab scholar in Baghdad. But at the same time he did not read the Qur'an. That is how they were and that is how they continue to be.

I know that there are those who may jerk and say that it was during the time of the Prophet and that Bedouins entered Islam after that and became good Muslims. But

whoever says this portrays the Qur'an as a book of history, telling us of an incident erased by time and no longer applies. This is more ignorance than ignorance itself! The Qur'an is not a history book and what is in it is eternally and forever happening. Whoever is cursed in it is cursed eternally by virtue of the Qur'an being the eternal word of Allah, and the Word of Allah is not subject to transformation, abrogation or loss. He has ordained that He is compassionate and He would forgive if he wished and punish whenever He wished. When He ruled that the Bedouins are stronger in disbelief and hypocrisy, he decreed them in aberration,"It is He who created you, and among you is the disbeliever, and among you is the believer. And Allah, of what you do, is Seeing" (At-Taghaabun 64:2), and His ruling can not be averted!

Then came the first wave of European colonization of our land, which became later known as the crusade wave, when Europeans settled in the Levant under the pretext of defending the Cross. That was only a pretext used by the Lords beneficiaries from the Pope to the princes and kings of European mini-states. This is the same argument to which Muslim Caliphs and leaders resorted to seize lands under the pretext of spreading Islam. The occupation of Syria by the Europeans under the pretext of defending the Cross and to reclaim the birth of Jesus Christ (with whom they have nothing to do because he was and still is our son), is not much different from the argument of Muslims to seize Spain under the pretext of spreading Islam! But

Europe, in its intellectual dark ages, had not yet reached the stage of maturity and political and scientific development to have been able to impose its hegemony upon the Arabs, who at that time were sliding towards intellectual and political collapse as well. The European colonial state in the Arab lands collapsed and they left before returning centuries later, but this time under the pretext of bringing civilization and democracy, which is no less trivial than their predecessors' pretext of protecting the Cross.

This time they had thought carefully and prepared a more solid base. They studied Islam and knew the impact of 'fiqh' jurisprudence in dominating the minds of Muslims. They found that dominating the region is to be done through the control of Islam, and controlling Islam must be done through the Arabian Peninsula, which most Muslims believe to be the land of revelation where no defect will occur. But the invasion of the Arabian Peninsula by European Christians may have been a taboo which was hard to imagine occurring in the eighteenth century.

However, it had not gone unnoticed by Orientalists, who had studied Islam even deeper than Muslims that the Bedouin inhabitants of the Arabian Peninsula were less knowledgeable of, or adherent to, or even interested in Islam. There had to be a way that would enable them to take control of the Bedouins and give them support in order to extend that control over all Muslims. The British

mind came up with one of the most brilliant ideas that may be considered one of the smartest deeds devised by the European mind to confront Islam and Arabs in a thousand years: inventing Wahhābism!

The British representative in the Gulf brought together a naïve Bedouin, Muhammad Ibn Sa'ud, with aspirations for power, and a bright Bedouin, Muhammad Ibn Abdul - Wahhāb, with leadership abilities. In the first Bedouin, they found the ability and willingness to do anything to secure power. The second Bedouin was transferred to Britain, where he spent six years between Oxford and London, being trained at the hands of experts who taught him matters of religion and the world, then took him back to declare his call for the resurrection of orthodox Islam, claiming that he came with monotheism because the others were polytheists! It is not difficult to understand the possibility of success of any such call to win the Arabs of the Peninsula at the end of the eighteenth century, as it would have reignited in them the hope in life and promised them a better life than the misery and frustration they were living in.

The British representative formed an alliance, which became the longest lasting alliance in human history, having lasted over two hundred years, according to which the state was shared between Al Sa'ud family for worldly affairs and Al Al-Sheikh (as Abdul-Wahhāb is known) family for religious affairs. The British were not stupid to believe

that this project would have swept the Islamic world in the blink of an eye, because the historical circumstances were not yet ready to accept it. In addition to that, the Ottoman Empire was still going and somehow strong. But the British were planning for the coming centuries. To this end they encouraged their friends in the Indian subcontinent, and a group of them came to the Arabian Peninsula and met with Muhammad Ibn Abdul-Wahhāb, took from him the new doctrine to the north-west of the Indian subcontinent, where it remained alive from the eighteenth century until the twentieth century, when it created the Taliban and Al-Qaeda and the like. I think very few Arabs are aware of this fact about the Wahhābi branch from the eighteenth century because the British were keen to keep it a secret.

The British supported their Sa'udi Wahhābi creation with everything possible in the prevailing historical and political circumstances. But the poverty in the Arabian Peninsula, because of the lack of any source of money from trade or industry or natural wealth, had hampered the Wahhābi movement's possibility of achieving significant progress in the implementation of the new-old Zionist project. The history of the Wahhābi movement since it was founded by the British until the discovery of oil is available in many books, and there is no point in repeating it. However, the discovery of oil changed the rules of the game and gave it the power to move faster than expected by its creators.

Chapter 11

Wahhābism in the Service of Imperialism

I explained in the previous chapter how Wahhābism was created as a nucleus for the Imperialist project that preceded all political activity in the Arab world and survived after most projects undertaken a century or two later had failed. But I also stated that the British, during Britain's golden age, were realistic in that they did not expect, and for several reasons, that the Wahhābi movement was going to swallow the Muslim world in the blink of an eye. One of these reasons, and perhaps not the least serious, was that the Ottoman Empire was still a force to be reckoned with and one must be wary of tampering with its areas of influence. Bringing a new doctrine, although it claimed to be renewing the Hanbali sect, would not be easy to accept in a world built centuries ago on prohibiting 'Ijtihād' (independent reasoning) and the suspension of thinking in Islam!

In addition, when the Wahhābi movement was born, the Arabian Peninsula was poor and created a burden on the British Imperialists. But all that changed in the light of two important developments. Firstly, the collapse of the Ottoman Empire opened the door to Imperialism to come and act freely in the Arabian Peninsula and the Gulf without much opposition. Secondly, the discovery of the unimaginable oil reserves in the region, turning it from an

economic burden to a financial source of which the Imperialists had not even dreamt!

The creation of Wahnābism formed the first stage of the plan to subject political Islam to the will of Zionism. I hope to follow examining the role of Wahnābism in the first stage by dealing with creation of the Muslim Brotherhood in the second stage, and conclude with the third stage on the wide Imperialist plan, that of the creation of Al-Qaeda. Perhaps sometime in the future there will be created another stage whose nature we do not know yet. But Imperialism has taught us that it's creativity has no limits, and it may bring something new as long as we live in repose, making the sleep of 'the People of the Cave' seem modest!¹⁴⁹

Before proceeding further, I need to clarify that when I talk about Zionist Imperialism, which leads to effective 'Zionification' of Wahnābism, the Muslim Brotherhood and Al-Qaeda, I do not mean that all of those who joined, endorsed, or supported these movements are Zionists in the sense of their belonging and believing. This is because the majority of those involved in these movements were naïve Muslims who are of the third category, as described by 'Ali Ibn Abi Tālib in saying: "People are three categories: A Rabbāni who devotes his knowledge to serving Allah, a learner who learns for the sake of saving himself, and the hooligan type of rabbles that follow anyone who cries out, turning whichever way the wind blows, not illuminated by

the light of knowledge and not fallen back upon support that offers safety, strength and security"¹⁵⁰. These are excused for having followed a project of whose true nature they know nothing. They honestly believe that they are serving Islam in whose absolute belief they were raised, and faith is blind!

Anyone, who has read something about Islam, could not overlook the fact that the Prophet Muhammad did not enter Mecca with an army, and did not take it by force. He entered it in peace and pardoned the hardened idolaters of Quraysh, to show the people an example that this land must remain peaceful and safe and Islam was a religion of love and forgiveness. His act in Mecca would fit perfectly with the Message of his brother Jesus in turning the other cheek. However, this Muhammadian desire, which embodied the Divine Sign of making it a 'safe sanctuary'¹⁵¹, was not preserved at the hands of Muslims in later times. Muslims after the Prophet did not all the time heed Allah's will or the Prophet's wish to keep Mecca a safe haven. It was attacked and burnt repeatedly, not just by heretics, but by armies ordered by Muslim Caliphs. A few examples from the past to illustrate this are cited here. Umayyad Caliph Yazid Ibn Mu'āwiya sent his army to ransack Medina and fight 'Abdullāh Ibn Az-Zubayr in Mecca and Al-Hajjāj Ibn Yusuf was sent by Abdul-Malik Ibn Marwān to attack Mecca in the year 73 AH (692 AD), burning even the cloak of the Ka'ba.¹⁵² Its destruction did not satisfy the

Qarmatians, who even stole the black stone in the year 317 AH (929 AD).¹⁵³

After centuries of relative calm in the Arabian Peninsula, the Wahhābis brought back violence, destruction and killing to Mecca when Abdul Aziz Ibn Sa'ud entered it in 1342 AH (1929 AD) by force with British support and put its people to the sword in the name of Islam.¹⁵⁴ With the fall of Mecca in the hands of Wahhābis and their other Bedouin allies, the first dream of Imperialist Zionism was realized by overtaking the most significant base of Islam. Everything that happened after that was a natural consequence of that victory.

When the Imperialists managed to put their hands on Mecca, they held the key to controlling the Muslim and Arab worlds, because the majority of Muslims sincerely believe that Allah could not deliver His House but to honest believers, and this means that anyone who controls Mecca must be virtuous and obeyed. Had they read Qur'an carefully and understood Allah empowering the devil to cause havoc in the land, they would not have arrived at this conviction, but they are far from having the ability to understand this. This is what the Imperialists have thought of for centuries and aspired to achieve, and they did.

Anyone who objectively reads the history of the area in the twentieth century away from sectarianism and partisanship, if possible, will discover that there is no

event or political stage in which the Zionist Wahhābis were not involved using their religious weight at the beginning and adding their oil wealth later. This is the reason why I use the term Zionist Wahhābis, because political affiliation is not a slogan raised by the political or religious movement, but the sum of its practices and its actions. In addition, whoever has followed what the Wahhābi movement had done in the twentieth century, will find that it was indeed riding on the coattails of Imperialist Zionism in every stage of the political development in the Arab lands during the past nine decades.

- They supported the Sykes-Picot agreement and drawing of borders by Percy Cox determining the borders between Iraq and Arabia. The pleading of Sa'ud with Percy Cox is well documented.¹⁵⁵

- they did not dispatch a single soldier to support the Palestinian people who were displaced in 1948.

- they supported the tripartite aggression against Egypt in 1956 over the Suez Canal, standing with the Zionists, the British and the French.¹⁵⁶

- they opposed and plotted against every project that sought to unite Arab lands, and were against the unity of Egypt and Syria in 1958 and against the unification of Iraq and Jordan in the same year.¹⁵⁷

- they intervened directly in Yemen when the republic was established after Al-Sellal's overthrow of the Imāmate (1962), and contributed to and supported the bitter and bloody fighting, which depleted Yemen and the Egyptian army that came to support the Republic.¹⁵⁸

- they contributed financially to the throwback that took place in Syria in 1961 and led to the collapse of the first Arab unity.¹⁵⁹

- In 1967, they incited the West and Israel to attack Egypt, strike it and eliminate the rule of Jamāl Abdul Nasser after having pinned down a large contingent of the Egyptian army in Yemen.

- they sought and succeeded in lifting the oil embargo, which they were forced to impose on Europe in the wake of the 1967 war, in September of the same year. This gave the Zionists what they needed to humiliate the Arabs in war and take their oil voluntarily. The argument that they needed money to support the Arab military effort was nothing but a fig leaf that did not cover their nakedness, because the money they had was enough for them to live for years if not decades, while Europe could not have afforded an oil embargo for one year.

- in spite of their disagreement and their hostility to the ruler of Jordan, King Hussein Ibn Talāl, they supported him

in September 1970 in attacking and killing the Palestinians at the time when those were fighting the Zionists, heralding a possible revolution. The events came to be known as the 'Black September' in which it was claimed that some 25000 Palestinians were killed and the PLO was thrown out of Jordan. Syria was on the side of the PLO while it is commonly believed that the US, Pakistan and Sa'udi Arabia helped Jordan.

- Although the oil embargo had caused significant damage to the Zionist capitalist economy, they were quick to lift it and ease the effects. Had they kept it up, something else might have changed!¹⁶⁰ They stood against the war in 1973 and made every effort to ease the burden on Imperialist Zionism, which would have made it possible for the Arab nation to put pressure on the Zionists to give back the land they had occupied in 1967.

- they founded the Gulf Cooperation Council to include the last authoritarian political regimes in the world in order to ensure the continuation of the Zionist plan in the Arabian Peninsula and the Gulf by securing that none of those states, some of which are fictitious, would deviate from the objectives of the plan.¹⁶¹

- they gave Imperialism bases and airports for the rapid deployment force established by President Jimmy Carter. During the invasion of Iraq, a US commander commented

that he had not seen facilities as ready and suitable anywhere else, not even in the United States.¹⁶²

- they succeeded in penetrating the nationalist movement in Iraq's and Syria's Ba'ath at a time when the Ba'ath Party in the two countries was involved in an unethical, irrational and incomprehensible internal conflict. They worked to push each of the two sides apart and conspired with one against the other, and that is how it went.

- they spent huge amounts of money to fight the Soviet Union in Afghanistan in the 1980s, despite the lack of any Arab interest in it, because the only benefit was for the Imperialist projects in the fight against the Socialist system.¹⁶³

- they secured full support for the Imperialist economic system by pumping quantities of oil exceeding ten times the need of the Arabian Peninsula, in order to maintain the level of prices of energy required by the Capitalist market without any consideration for Arab national security in maintaining the wealth of the Arabs for future generations.¹⁶⁴

- in 1991, they called on 'infidel' Zionist Imperialism to bring its armies to the land of 'Muhammad' in order for it to destroy Arab-Muslim Iraq.¹⁶⁵

- they supported Imperialism in its crimes in parts of the

world outside the land of Arabs and Muslims in many secret wars that most people have not heard about. They were exposed when their support for the terrorists called 'the Contras' in Nicaragua, who were fighting the leftist government in a war that had nothing to do with Islam and Muslims, came to light, which confirms that the Wahnabi movement was employed to serve Imperialism anywhere in the world!¹⁶⁶

- they put the Arabian Peninsula; its land, its air and its water, in the service of Zionist Imperialism to impose the unjust embargo on Iraq for 12 years, participating in killing millions of Muslims while claiming to be the trustees of Allah's religion!¹⁶⁷

- they imposed on the rest of the defeated Arabs the 'Arab Initiative' whose aim was to resolve the Palestinian issue without the Palestinians having a say in the project. They offered this project to the world knowing fully that Zionism will reject it because they want more which would mean that the Arabs would need to give still more.¹⁶⁸

- they participated in the invasion and occupation of Iraq in 2003 by providing access to US bases and way-leaves across the border.¹⁶⁹

- they recruited treacherous Muslims, provided them with money and weapons, and sent them to destroy Syria and blow up its facilities and kill its children, claiming the

reason to be the desire to change the regime for its injustices and its strong hold on power, even though they, and their Wahhābi rulers of the Gulf Cooperation Council, are the last people on Earth who have the competency to demand that!¹⁷⁰

Zionist Imperialism has succeeded in achieving all this at the hands of the Wahhābis for two reasons. The first is the availability of money that started pouring in with the flow of oil in the twentieth century. The second, and most important, is the nature of Islamic culture that has made religion a tool for politics, and helped them claim that they are establishing the law of Allah, although Zionism is not related to Allah!

What has Zionist Wahhābism done?

Wahhābism has had what is not available to any political movement or party in the world. It employed its fortunes in the construction of mosques across the globe and in sending half-educated Bedouin and its followers to manage them and preach to the simple Muslims anything written or decreed by their Zionists masters, and which can be veiled by religion. One would often find an invented Hadith from some period of falsified Islam. Our era is not the only era when Muslim rulers needed to find excuses and justifications for their behaviour and their policies. This was done by those who claimed indulgence in jurisprudence centuries ago.

Wahhābis regularly and progressively instilled the Takfiri *thought* (accusations of apostasy) which is based on considering anyone who disagrees with them to be suspect in his belief. The non-Muslim is an infidel, albeit the tone of the campaign was mild for known reasons. The rest of the Muslims were divided between the infidel and the confused. The 'Alawi, Isma'ili and Shi'a for example are infidels and apostates, while the rest of the Sunnis live in semi-aberrance and their elders in need of criticism and reform.

They then laid the foundation for a scary and strange culture, where they decreed, based on the teachings of Ibn Taymiyyah, that the soul, money and honour of the infidel is permitted for them, thus allowing the murder, theft and rape on the grounds that this is the religion of Allah. However, Allah and His Messenger have nothing to do with any of it. They hinted at their intent to demolish the tomb of the Prophet Muhammad, but the advice of their masters was to postpone that work until the Muslim reaction is tested first in the inevitable occupation and destruction of Al-Aqsa Mosque.

In the early nineteenth century, the Wahhābis attacked the graves of members of the Household of the Prophet when they ransacked Karbala, one of the most holy cities for the Shi'a Muslims, killing, looting and destroying.¹⁷¹ This culture gradually permeated two generations of

Muslims in the twentieth century, giving birth to Al-Qaeda's destructive movement, as we shall see later.

Thus, by exploiting Islam, Wahhābism had at its disposal what no other political or ideological movement in the world had. Mosques are open in the entire Muslim world five times a day for prayers, and between prayers for Hadith and preaching sessions. Millions of Muslims come to the mosque every day voluntarily. On the other hand, if a political movement or party would want to hold a conference for its members, it would endeavour and strain to get a small group to the meeting. Wahhābism gets people without effort five times a day all over the world, and all it has to do is corrupt their minds through controlled preaching, as it has succeeded in exploiting Islam to realize the centuries-old Zionist plan to control Muslim minds.

Wahhābism benefited from another fact related to the backwardness and poverty in the Arab world in particular. These two factors had led to the migration of tens of thousands of Arabs from Egypt, Syria, Iraq, Jordan, Sudan and Palestine to work in the Arabian Peninsula and the Gulf States, where they were embraced by the Wahhābi environment, with its ideology and mosques, and which fed them the thoughts it wanted to spread. A whole new generation of Arabs was born in the Arabian Peninsula and the Gulf who have not heard of Ammār Ibn Yāsir but know Ibn Taymiyyah! This is not surprising since most of these

were simple people, and simple minds need no more than simple ideas. Flat thinking easily accepts the theory that the Earth is flat!

When they returned to their home countries, many of these were saturated with Wahhābi ideologies and believed that it was the true religion, and that following the edicts of Wahhābi sheikhs is the right thing. Out of these came suicide bombers, killers, eaters of hearts, and belly-rippers, all in the name of religion. The behaviour could be understood because they have not heard anything else and in any case, it may be too late to change that indoctrination.

Arab political regimes outside the Peninsula in countries like Iraq, Syria and Egypt did not understand the scale of the plot and thus were not able to deal with it. They disregarded the mosques and what was going on inside them, thinking that they did not pose a threat to them. The Wahhābi movement took advantage of that vacuum and filled mosque with its followers. These evil preachers began brainwashing people, taking advantage of the failure of the Arab political system to reform the status of people in those countries, disregarding the fact that Wahhābism itself had failed to reform the status of people in the Arabian Peninsula and the Gulf.

When the Arab political system realized the danger of the plot, it was too late. The tide had intensified in Algeria,

Egypt, Libya, Iraq, and Syria. Some of the steps taken to avoid damage backfired. When Saddam Hussein comprehended the size of the catastrophe in Iraq, he wanted to alert people to it, but he committed a great folly when he launched the 'faith campaign' which gave the Wahhābis more than one opening to agitate people against the nationalist project and enticed them on sectarian grounds whose effects are still with us today.¹⁷²

I will deal with the project of the Muslim Brotherhood, how it was integral and parallel to the Wahhābi movement before arriving at the conclusion of the plot in the birth of Al- Qaeda, which was the outcome of what preceded it.

Chapter 12

The Rise of other Sunni Islamic Movements

As soon as Zionist Imperialism gained control of the Arabian Peninsula after enabling the Wahhābis of Mecca, it scrambled to contain the rest of the Arab world through Islam. The Orientalists and researchers in the Zionist institutes in Europe and America were not oblivious to the fact that the rest of the Arab world was not generally like the Arabian Peninsula and Gulf in backwardness. This meant that it would not have been easy to export Wahhābi ideology to the rest of the Arab world, especially if they took into account that the aspirations of the new educated population in Egypt, Syria and Iraq were toward freedom more than to return their thoughts to previous centuries about which these people had no knowledge save perhaps an idyllic vision that had no deep roots.

Eastern Arabs of the northern parts of the Arabian Peninsula would not have been satisfied with a simple call, such as that by Abdul-Wahhāb, which was no more than a superficial look at the meaning of monotheism, which he himself had not understood at all. These Arabs, by virtue of their intellectual antecedence over the Bedouin of the Arabian Peninsula and the Gulf, were looking to link the state and religion in a new world, where relations are governed by new principles, such as the nation-state, international relations and the so-called 'international law', as well as treaties and alliances mostly created

outside the scope of Islam without consultation with the Muslims. In other words, the nascent generation of Muslims of the East (which maybe is a loose term) wanted a political theory that may not be separated from Islam but able to deal realistically with the world where Muslims live after the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, which had for centuries been a distorted face of Islam. Wahnabi naïve ideology was not able to satisfy this aspiration, or even deal with the realities that surrounded the Muslim World.

It does not matter that Zionist Imperialists had contributed to the rise of Islamic movements in the Arab East or that it embraced these movements after their rise. What is important is that the religious movements that have arisen in the Arab East were mostly acting in accordance with the Zionist interests in the Arab world. This is not a conclusion reached after the events of the first decade of this century, but the objective reading of what happened in the aftermath of the First World War in the last century. A number of readers may find this an arbitrary attitude, which shows prejudice against some Islamic movements, but I call for an objective look at events. I do not know the innermost thoughts of Hassan Al-Banna, because that is unique to Allah.¹⁷³ Nevertheless, I base my views on what Al-Banna and his followers did, and how that work served the interests of international Zionism, after which I rest my case.

Egypt was ahead of the rest of the Arabs in its attempt to seek a new path between Islam and European intellectual and political development. Egypt gave birth to the Muslim Brotherhood movement, which called for the establishment of an Islamic state. The movement was not necessarily homogeneous in ideology nor did it have a comprehensive idea about the concept of the Islamic state it desired to see. In addition, those who supported the movement or joined it did not all have the same vision or aspirations. The carriers of the Islamic dream in Egypt in the early twentieth century can be categorized in a wide range extending from the secular Muslim to the blind Salafi!¹⁷⁴

Zionist Imperialism began realizing that the emergence of a nation-state in the Arab East, as a result of the Sykes-Picot agreement after the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, was probably not the best solution to ensure its interests in the Arab world. National and regional Arab movements were born, preaching the right to political and economic independence from Zionist hegemony. But Zionism was not going to give up its big plan to dominate the region for which it had worked for centuries, starting with the Wahhābi project a century and a half earlier. When it considered the situation in depth, it came to the conclusion that the Islamic movements were the best guarantee towards confronting the growing Arab National movement. Zionist Imperialism found itself facing two currents in the Arab world: The national movement calling

for the unification of 'The Arab Nation' and achieving some level of social justice, and the pro-Moscow Communist movement that believed in the unity of the world socialist movement and dreamt of a global state based on the principles of Marxism. However, both were opposed to the goals of Zionism. Zionist Imperialism had two ways to confront this historical reality active on the ground. The first was fuelling the conflict between the Nationalists and the Communists, in which the gullible leaders of both movements took part and ended with both of them killing and stultifying each other, and both ended up after eight decades politically in semi-bankruptcy! The second way was to support the Muslim Brotherhood movement. That is because the majority of Arab populace are intuitively religious and they can more easily follow a religious movement than a secular national movement.

Someone may ask - what is the evidence that the Muslim Brotherhood was riding the coattails of Zionism? One look at the history of the movement in Egypt from the thirties of the twentieth century until today would reveal that its policies were all consistent with the Imperialist project. Since this is not an analytical study of the history of political or religious movements, I will not deal with each stage of the last eighty years and the conduct and attitudes it contained, but I will borrow some examples to show that, leaving those who want more to take a closer look at history.

1. The Muslim Brotherhood movement in Egypt did not take a stand against King Farouq and his rule, which was in essence a pro-Zionist rule even if it was not its creation. Farouq's rule was corrupt, unjust and contrary to the laws of Allah, whose name they were invoking. There was a strong movement when Islamic figures called for the revival of Caliphate in the figure of the Egyptian king following its end in 1924 after the fall of the Ottomans.

2. The Muslim Brotherhood movement in Egypt found in the 1952 revolution, led by Jamāl Abdul-Nasser, an enemy and opponent even though it was a revolution of liberation that removed all restrictions imposed by the British colonialist. It should be sufficient as a confirmation of this to quote the words of a member of the Muslim Brotherhood, who used to keep council for preaching and corruption among the ignorant Gulf people, when he stated that he prayed two prostrations in thanks to Allah when Israel occupied the Sinai Peninsula.¹⁷⁵

3. The Muslim Brotherhood movement did not stop at reconciliation with Farouq's regime and hostility to the Egyptian liberation revolution, but it tried to assassinate the late Jamāl Abdul-Nasser, who was the expression of one of the most honest and faithful stages in the liberation of the nation. Any observer or reader of history cannot but judge the attempt to assassinate that symbol of Arab Nationalism and leader as a service to Zionist Imperialism. That attempt will remain until the day of judgement a

disgrace in the history of the Islamic movement in Egypt.¹⁷⁶

4. When the Muslims Brotherhood came to power in Egypt for the first time in 2011 following the ousting of Husni Mubarak, their veil of political hypocrisy, which they have spread among the people over the past decades accusing everyone of treason, was suddenly torn. The Muslim Brotherhood decided to recognize all the humiliating treaties signed by their predecessors with Zionist Imperialism in which Egypt recognized the Jewish state, which had usurped the Holy of Holies in Jerusalem.¹⁷⁷ They claimed that the necessity to build the promised Islamic state compelled them to do so. But they did not explain to the people the reason for the political philandering, which came in a letter from the Muslim Brotherhood's President of Egypt to the Zionist President of Israel!

Egyptian President, the first Muslim Brotherhood to assume such a position, wrote a message to Israel President. This is how the Jerusalem Post reported it:

'Mr. Shimon Perez (sic), president of the State of Israel,' Mursi's note read. 'It was with deep thanks that I received your congratulations on the advent of the holy month of Ramadhān. 'I take this opportunity to reiterate that I am looking forward to exerting our best efforts to get the Middle East peace process back to its right track in order to

achieve security and stability for peoples of the region, including [the] Israeli people. ' 178

After the birth of the Muslim Brotherhood movement in Egypt, similar movements were established in Syria and Iraq. The Muslim Brotherhood movement in Iraq did not have the same role it had in Egypt or Syria, due to the different religious and political conflict in Iraq, which was built on sectarian grounds, with which I will deal later. The Syrian Muslim Brotherhood proved to be the most violent and radical of the Arab Muslim Brotherhood movements and the fiercest enemy of the nationalist project, and thus the best friend for Zionist Imperialism. They reverted to killings and vandalism in an early stage of the Ba'ath Party rule. They may fool some naïve Arab and Muslim minds with the claim of today's Brotherhood in Syria that they are fighting 'infidel' 'Alawite authority as they call them. But without even giving a legitimate cover to show who gave them the right to label people apostates, and if this labelling occurred, who gave them the right to kill their opponents, even if they were infidels? No sooner such a question is raised, than they come back with a precedent dating back to Abu Bakr and throughout Islamic history of different practices by Muslim Caliphs. However, the facts reveal a different story because their first rebellion against the Arab Nationalist project happened during the period of the late Amin Al-Hāfidh in 1964, at which time their enemy the 'Alawite Hāfidh Al-Assad (father of current President Bashaar Al-Assad) had not yet assumed the leadership of

the party and the State. If their fight, as they claim now, is with the 'Alawites and not against the Arab Nationalist project, how do they explain their rebellion against Amin Al-Hāfidh and his leadership? The fact of the matter is that the Syrian Brotherhood wanted a religious state to their liking in contrast with history, and is thus aligning itself with the Zionist project, which does not have any problem with a hireling Islamic state. What harm would befall the Zionists if Muslims would pray twenty times a day and curse Shi'a, Druze, 'Alawites, Isma'ilis, Yazidis, Kashfis and others and fight them, as long as they consider Jews and Christians 'Dhimmis' (non-Muslim people of the book) who must be protected? Zionists will be delighted with such a Brotherhood as long as they do not object to the Capitalist system that governs everything and divides Allah's gifts as it pleases; takes what it wants and gives what it wants; confiscates what it wants and confines whom it wants? The Muslim Brotherhood in Syria was the first to have been proven to be following the Zionist plan when they attacked the Ba'ath Party rule during the reign of the Ba'athist President Amin Al-Hāfidh. What they are doing today in the devastating attack on the Arab Nationalist project is no more than a revived campaign, more aggressive and organized than that of fifty years ago.¹⁷⁹ They learnt the lessons from the failure of their first uprising against Amin Al-Hāfidh and trained their sons, some of whom were brought up in Arabia, to be better prepared and equipped for the new uprising.

This is only the tip of the iceberg, but a witness to the reality of the pro-Zionist policies of the Muslim Brotherhood. It is not difficult to understand these attempts, because the Islamic political movement in general is not interested in building an independent state with an independent political, national or liberal ideology. It is only concerned with establishing an Islamic State. If that State would emerge with the support and blessings of Zionism and under its dominance, then they have no objection so long as that State is established. This applies to most Islamic movements that have arisen in the Muslim world in a century, no difference whether it was the Sunni Wahhābi movement or the Muslim Brotherhood or Al-Qaeda or the Shi'a Da'wa Party.

Wahhābism was and still is openly and clearly in the bosom of Zionism in every political project of the last century. The Muslim Brotherhood movements in Iraq and Syria cooperated with Zionism at every stage against the national plan of the Ba'ath movement. It is public knowledge that Al-Qaeda was established at the hands of the CIA, and it was originally entrusted with the task of fighting the Soviet Union.¹⁸⁰ Al-Qaeda argued that they were conducting Jihad for Allah, as if Allah was a Zionist and anti-Communist! Hamas agreed to a truce with Israel as long as the latter was satisfied with the powerless meagre Islamic state in the Gaza Strip.¹⁸¹

Perhaps it would be proper here to consider an important

matter. During the past hundred years, we have not seen any Islamic writer who presented us with a theory on the desired Islamic State. Are we to accept such an Islamic State simply because it would carry such a name? Or do we have the right to ask what is that state and what does it intend to achieve? What laws is it going to apply? What kind of international relationships with others is it going to have? Where does it stand on international law if it contradicts Islamic law as they understand it? Where would the Islamic State stand regarding the capitalist economic system? Where would it stand on the rights of women in particular and human rights in general? Where would it stand towards non-Muslims who live within it? Where and Where? There is not a single book that can answer one who seeks information about this desired State. The talk about returning to the example of the 'righteous predecessors' is merely ridiculous in its absurdity. Who are the predecessors whose examples are we intended to follow? Would what was suitable for Al-Walid Ibn Yazid or Mu'tassim Ibn Hārūn be suitable for the twenty-first century atheist?¹⁸² Where does that fit with the verse: "Every day He is bringing about a matter" (Ar-Rahmaan 55:29)." And who says that these men were actually righteous? Their rule of the Muslims is not enough to prove their righteousness because there is no such Divine rule which establishes that everyone who had ruled the Muslims must have been righteous. If it were really like that, Allah would not have ordained that Baghdad be violated by Hulagu!¹⁸³

Someone may ask about the wisdom of creating more than one Islamic movement if one suffices. And the answer is not much different from the well-known human relationship rule prevailing in the world, which states that if you want to rule people divide them to keep them busy with their conflicts and differences, under which all would race to win your favours. When Zionist Imperialism discovered, as I mentioned earlier, that the Arabs outside the Peninsula were not like those inside it, it was natural to expect that Muslims in those areas would be looking for a movement that differs in its approach from Wahhābism; thus came the Muslim Brotherhood movement. If a dispute would take place between the Wahhābis and the Muslim Brotherhood, it would be in Zionist's interest because both parties were towing the Zionist cart, and whoever the victor would be, it is in its favour. Furthermore, the conflict between the two would weaken them, leading each side to do more grovelling to the Zionist master, which is what happened and is happening today, as expressed by Kissinger over the Iran-Iraq War; 'support both sides, we want them both to 'loose'.

For decades after the creation of Wahhābism and the Muslim Brotherhood, Zionism found it necessary to inflame the situation and stir the area after both movements lost their potency because of the partial success of the Arab Nationalist Movement represented by the Ba'ath in Iraq and Syria, and the military governments in countries like Libya, Algeria, Sudan and Yemen. It came

up with another novelty: Al-Qaeda, which Zionism has made no secret of founding or supporting with money, weapons, training and intelligence. We do not need to prove it since it has been stated by the Zionists, and if anyone is still unaware of that, he either does not know the facts or want to acknowledge the truth or else he knows and deviates!

Zionist cunning came up with the smart idea of exploiting Afghanistan as the field for the implementation of this phase of the Zionist domination of Islam, which started in the project of creating Wahhābism more than two centuries earlier. It was a smart decision for several reasons. Firstly, the use of Afghanistan as a field to create that movement would overcome the impossibility of achieving this in the Arab world in the eighties of the last century.

Secondly, it would have been easier to exploit Arab feelings and emotions to support a group outside the Arab world, which claims to be defending Islam, than it would have been to coax Arabs to defend an Islamic regime in their own land. This may not seem obvious to many people, the reason being that the Arabs consider Islam a natural result of their existence, and they therefore do not feel the need for emphasis. But it is different for non-Arab Muslims whose identity is Islam. The Pakistani considers Islam his identity to distinguish him from the Hindu. He would even resent it if he were described as an Indian.

Thus, the Arabs may strongly sympathize with the non-Arab Muslims if they wish to emphasize their religious identity.

Thus Zionism gathered whomever it managed to gather from Muslim lands and ordered its footmen in the Arabian Peninsula to finance the project fully, covering the cost of the weapons and the maintenance of the fighters and their families and the cost of training carried out by US special forces with coordination and control of the CIA. The rulers in the Arabian Peninsula acquiesced in this, despite their fears of the possibility of this act getting out of control causing them the loss of their claim to the leadership of the Islamic world.

Zionist Imperialism achieved two goals with the founding of Al-Qaeda and what was known as the Afghani 'Mujāhedeen'. The first goal was exhausting the Soviet army in a war terrifying in its nature for the army, as the Afghani 'Mujāhedeen' were fighting in a manner unknown before. It was enough for the Russian soldier to hear that the Mujāhedeen were playing football with the skulls of his comrades in an earlier battle to tremble with fear. Thus, Zionist Imperialism prepared the world to accept the culture of killing and belly ripping and beheadings under the pretext of combating Communism in Islamic Afghanistan. The killings and beheadings we see today in Iraq and Syria were born in the fighting of the 'Mujāhedeen' in Afghanistan in the eighties of the last

century under the auspices of the CIA. It makes me wonder when the Zionists express their surprise at the terrorism that has spread today in the Arab world as if they did not lay the ground for it over three decades ago. The so-called Mujāhedeen in Afghanistan in the 1980s are the current leaders of terrorist organizations in Iraq, Syria, Libya, Algeria, Tunisia and Egypt!

It is not difficult to find dozens of leaders of terrorist factions today who are proud that they fought in Afghanistan. Are we supposed to believe that the CIA, which recruited and trained these people, does not know anything about them or where they ended up after the end of the anti-Soviet war in Afghanistan? Or did they cut their ties with the CIA after the end of the US war in Afghanistan in order to suddenly reassemble and appear in the streets of Syria and Iraq?

Lest the reader get confused and imagine that the political and religious movements that I have limited to three categories: the Wahhābi, the Muslim Brotherhood and Al-Qaeda, differ in essence from each other, I would like to emphasize that they do not, even though it may appear that there are apparent differences between them. All of these movements aspire to build an Islamic State. Though they may not all agree on the form the desired state should take, they nevertheless do not have a clear picture of what they want because they do not really know what they want more than one state claiming Islam as its

ideology. Since all these movements are under Zionist hegemony, none of them has any faith in political independence because they do not believe in the modern state and instead believe that the establishment of an international Islamic State will obviate the need for a political system. It is not difficult for an observer to understand that Zionist Imperialism, which holds the reins of the world, cannot allow this dream to be achieved. But since it knows that these so-called Mujāhedeen are living with the infantile mentality based on a metaphysical conviction that Allah will support them when the time comes, Zionism is not in a hurry to shorten the rope and pull them by their necks. There is more than one reason for the differences that may occur between these movements, which may be true in some cases. It is not difficult to understand the conflict between urbanism and nomadism, and the desire of the Islamists of each party to lead the wished-for political stage. It is also not unusual for the conflict to be personal, tribal, or even local, as is the case in any party affiliation in the world. This fact may explain the ease with which individual fighters in the terrorist groups in Syria move from one to the other, and why no one has a problem with paying allegiance to a new movement or 'prince' whenever he wants, making any talk about classifying armed movements in Syria as moderate or extremist nothing less than a myth.¹⁸⁴ No terrorism covered in the name of religion can be moderate, because terrorism is extremism and fanaticism. He who kills the soul, which Allah has forbidden, cannot be but an

extremist killer outside the boundaries of humanity and has nothing to do with Islam, whether or not he recites one or a hundred invented Hadiths, or follows in the footsteps of one or more predecessors or a faqih.

Chapter 13

The Confusion in Understanding Political Sunni Islam

The problem with most writings on the conflict in the Muslim world today revolves around two facts. Firstly, it is almost impossible to find Muslim writers who have enough objectivity to present faithfully what is happening to enable readers to draw their own conclusions. Secondly, and invariably, the best of the Orientalists lack a true understanding of political Islam. It is not surprising, in view of the above two facts, that people in the world find it difficult to follow and understand what is happening in the Muslim/Arab world today.

I do not intend to take the reader through the development of political Islam as no such matter could be covered in one chapter or even one book. However, I would like to clarify a few matters for the independent minded, to enable them to better understand what is happening.

1. The schism in Islam is not theological. It is political and dates back to the first century AH. The oldest books on the history of Islam starting Sirat Ibn Hishām (on the Prophet's life) make this so clear that it needs little elaboration.
2. Islam has not gone through a stage of enlightenment. This meant that no independent analysis of Islamic history has ever been attempted by

Muslim scholars who have all been writing from their narrow sectarian points of view.

3. All research centres or academic institutes in the Muslim world have been dominated by dogmatic disciplines adhering to one sect or another; so much so that it took a thousand years and a secular political regime before Shi'a theology was recognized as a sect of Islam and taught at Al-Azhar University in Egypt along with the main four Sunni schools of thought.

4. Today's Shi'a Islam is politically dominated by Wilāyet Al-Faqih movement (which represents the political stage for the coming of the Mahdi) while Sunni Islam is dominated by the Salafi movement, which aspires to restore the rule of the Islamic Empires.

5. This observation does not result just from the fact that either of the above two political movements necessarily represents the majority of Shi'a or Sunni Muslims respectively. They are powerful and dominant for other reasons than the number of followers.

6. Shi'a Muslims, being a minority, have been alienated in most Muslim countries for centuries excluding Iran of the last few centuries. But even in the latter, they never felt they secured a Shi'a state until the coming of Al-Khomeini and the Wilāyet Al-Faqih, which raised hopes and expectations among Shi'a masses of a new era of the freedom to practice their beliefs. The more

the Shi'a outside Iran come under attack, the more they are moved to follow the Wilāyet Al-Faqih. The popularity of Hizbullah in Lebanon following the Israeli aggression is a good proof of this fact.

7. The Salafi movement basically calls for the return to the 'Golden' days of the Islamic Empire which has a nostalgic resonance with most Sunni Muslims who deplore the level to which the Muslim states have descended. The Salafi movement, which may not have a single ideology beyond the call to restore the past, is powerful because it is supported by both the Muslim populace and the Governments of the rich GCC.

8. The emergence of non-Salafi Sunni Muslim movements, such as the Muslim Brotherhood, has failed, being unable to de-establish the supremacy and power of the Salafi. The Muslim Brotherhood today is on the way out as has been demonstrated in Egypt, Syria and Libya.

9. There is a myth about having peaceful or moderate Salafi and violent Salafi. There is no such division. All Salafis believe in their God-given right to impose the Shari'a of the predecessors on the rest of the world. The variations are in the degree of violence only. The ascension and assumption of power by Wahhābism in Arabia in the 19th and 20th centuries was no less bloody and brutal than that of the Islamic State today.

10. The battle of the Salafis is first and foremost against other Muslims whom they accuse of having become apostate. This includes all sects of Islam outside Sunni Islam and some even among the Sunnis.

11. This belief among the Salafis has been what Imperialism latched onto since the end of the 18th century when they set up the modern Salafi movement under the name of Wahhābism in Arabia.

12. There is no real conflict inside the Salafi movement as it is purposely and confusingly made to appear. There is no conflict between Al-Qaeda and the so-called Islamic State as they are all in unison on what to achieve. They may differ on leadership or the pace of action but the ultimate objective is the same.

13. The bogus claim about the threat, which the Islamic State poses to Arabia or the other Gulf states, is so transparent that it baffles the mind that some writers even try to assert it. There is no conflict or difference between IS, Al-Qaeda, An-Nusra or Wahhābism. They are all a produce of the Sunni Salafi movement; derive their ideology from Ibn Taymiyyah and aspire to achieve one objective. The rules imposed by the Islamic State in Mosul and Raqqa are identical to those in Riyadh!

14. None of the Salafi movements has ever declared any of the states in Arabia or the Gulf to be non-Islamic

or apostate that needs to be replaced. The differences are easily settled by changing faces, as happened more than once during the last fifty years, when different people from the ruling families of the same despotic regimes assumed power.

15. The use by most writers of the word 'jihad' and its other conjugations, is defamation against Islam and Arabic language and plays into the hands of the Salafi terrorists, who try to hijack the beauty of Arabic and the decency from the Qur'an and use it for their evil pursuit. Any decent and objective writer should refrain from using this word and instead call the Salafis by their real name: 'terrorists', lest the true 'jihad' of the soul depicted in the Qur'an becomes so confusing that the whole of Islam veers towards terrorism as a means of salvation. Objective writing does not mean one should play to the tune of the transgressor.

It is within the above indicators that developments in the Arab world should be seen. Those writers who cannot see these facts will only be adding more confusion in people's minds.

After this short view of the crisis of the political project of the Sunni Islamic movements, I must deal with the Shi'a political movements and their roles during the last century and the present in the formulation of the Islamic and Arab political stage.

Chapter 14

Shi'a Political Islam

It should be evident for whoever read the previous chapters that I was talking about Sunni political Islam, and by this I mean Islamic political movements that were born in the doctrine of those who call themselves 'ahl as-sunnah wa l-jamā'ah', or literally 'people of the tradition and the consensus of the Umma.' This reality is born out of the political conflict in Islam which emerged since the beginning of Islam, which I have already explained as a political conflict between 'the house of 'Ali' and 'the house of 'Aisha,' where Muslims split in the political partisanship to one of the two houses. Later on, those who were called scholars detailed differences to confirm that divide. But the conflict was and continues to be, in essence, a political conflict between the two houses for power.

I can not dwell on the political Sunni Islam alone, despite its importance, because the entry of Shi'a political Islam into the political stage in an effective way, after centuries of Taqiyya (Religious dissimulation), became part of the complexity of the image and a partner in the crisis of political Islam in the present day, which is nothing but an extension of its inception too. When I talk about Shi'a political Islam, I mean Twelver Shi'a Ja'fari. This means avoiding talking about politics in other Shi'a groups such as the Isma'ilis, Zaidis and 'Alawites for example, because

these have political heritage as well but outside the influence of the Ja'fari.¹⁸⁵

Before dealing with the present political Shi'ism, we need to stop at two important phenomena in Shi'ism because of their relation with its development, namely 'Taqiyya (Religious dissimulation) ' and 'Taqleed (to follow a cleric) '. Taqiyya is an old policy which found its roots in the Umayyad rule when 'Ali ibn Abi Tālib was being cursed from the minarets of Muslim mosques. The Shi'a of 'Ali found life difficult if they declared their affiliation. In addition, since the essence of life is to protect it and not lose it, Shi'a Imāms who were descendants of Hussein, ordered their followers not to show their Shi'ism publicly and went further by allowing them to show hostility to Shi'ism if in that lay the conservation of the soul, property and honour. A saying of 'Ali Ibn Abi Tālib had been narrated which states that a Shi'a is allowed to insult people of the House of the Prophet, descendants of 'Ali, if he must do that but he must not disassociate himself from them, because the Shi'a must not disown the Imāms of the House of Muhammad, as disassociation is from the idolaters only as stipulated by the Allah in Surat "at-Tawba (Chapter 9)", which was originally known as (Bara'a) 'Disassociation'. The Shi'a expanded on that and narrated a saying from the sixth Shi'a Imām, Ja'far As-Sādiq, that 'Taqiyya is the religion of my fathers and grandfathers. He who has no taqiyya has no faith'¹⁸⁶, and other sayings in the same direction. Thus, Shi'a followed Taqiyya for

centuries. The need for Taqiyya was increased by the fact that the Shi'a were a small minority during the Umayyad, 'Abbāsīd and Ottoman rule. Had it not been for the success of the Turkic Safawids (and they were not Persians as propagandists say today) in making Iran Shi'a, today the Shi'a would be a negligible minority confined to those in Iraq, Pakistan and Lebanon! The adoption of the majority of the Shi'a of Taqiyya as described, led to a kind of submission, rather acceptance of caving and humiliation for centuries, bringing upon them denigration from some Sunnis and accusations of hypocrisy in showing other than what they conceal in their hearts.

'Taqleed' means that every Shi'a chooses a cleric as a reference to him for advice and guidance and as a model to be imitated in matters of religious and worldly affairs. This is not an old tradition in Ja'fari Shi'ism, albeit old for others like the Isma'ilis, Zaidis and Alawites, and for non-Shi'as like the Ibādhis, for example. Taqleed for Ja'fari Shi'a was born relatively late, but quickly turned to the largest force in political Islam generally. Taqleed also produced the 'Marji'iyah', which represents the position of the followed or imitated cleric who has the authority to make legal decisions within the confines of Islamic law for followers. The number of Marji's (followed cleric) varies as people choose to follow the cleric they trust in guidance and answering their queries. But the truth is that throughout time, there has always been one cleric followed more than others, which gave him power and

recognition over his colleagues. This way he represented the Marji'iyah in its religious and political meaning. This power was strengthened by imposing the Khums (literally one fifth of gain) to be paid by every Shi'a to the Muqallad (the followed cleric) in the Marji'iyah, by giving one fifth of his money to that Cleric thus exonerating himself in front of Allah as paying his Zakāt (alms) for that year. It is a fact that the one who has the money has the power, and there is no difference between the dealer in politics and the cleric. Thus, Shi'a Marji'iyah became an active force in the community sometimes exceeding its real size.

It must be evident how serious the power of the Marji'iyah is, because all that is required in order to influence or control millions of Shi'a is to infiltrate the Marji'iyah either through that Marji' himself, one of his sons or his immediate circle. The history of the Marji'iyah during the past century is full of such examples that I do not want to mention or list, but it is enough here to understand the seriousness of the power of the Marji'iyah. One example from the beginning of this century will suffice to show that power. The powerful Marji' 'Ali As-Sistāni decreed in 2005 to his followers that the legal duty obliged them to vote on Iraq's new constitution which was laid out by the US occupation, in order to establish a new political system in Iraq, based not only on accepting the occupation but also on accepting that all the laws enacted by the occupiers, including those that absolved them from all the crimes and responsibility for the blood of Iraqis that was unjustly

shed. Needless to say, the majority of Iraqi Shi'a, including the highly educated among them, voted for the constitution without knowing what they were voting for.¹⁸⁷ That is probably what 'democracy' is all about!

The political reality is that Iraq, Syria and Egypt were, are and will continue to represent the intellectual and historical weight of the Arab nation, and all that happens outside them in the rest of the Arab World is the result of what happens inside them. Whoever wants to dominate the Arab Nation can do so by dominating these countries and their geographies or weaken them to the extent that they lose their role in the event. A reader of the history of the region from the First World War until today will find this fact facing him. This fact is evident not only in major projects but evident even in the details. Hizbullah in Lebanon is part of a part of a part; it is part of Lebanon, which is part of Greater Syria, which is part of the Arab world. However, this party, despite its youth and the geographical limits of its activities, has an influence that surpasses its size exponentially, because it plays a major role in the heart of the event whose centre of gravity is represented by Greater Syria. In addition to that, the Shi'a political project in Iraq, despite its political backwardness having failed to provide any program for what it wants to achieve, has played a role disproportional to its capacity, not only in governance since the Zionist Imperialist invasion of 2003, but in the preparation and setup of the invasion of Iraq by the Imperialists. The presentation of

these cases is of significance to what I am saying because it was born out of Taqiyya and Marji'iyah cited above. The role of political Shi'ism in both Iraq and Lebanon makes it necessary to look at each of them, despite a difference in roots and attitude.

The credibility of the narrated event is not important, but what is important is that people believe it really happened because people act according to those accumulated convictions. The best proof of this is the belief of the Shi'as in Iraq in general of injustice that they have suffered. I will not indulge here into whether this belief and feeling has its reasons or justifications, because this will not change the important fact that most of Iraq's Shi'as believe that injustice has occurred, and point to the discrimination that befell them during the centuries of Ottoman rule. Since Allah has blessed me and spared me witnessing the injustice of the Ottomans to the occupied peoples of Arabs, Armenians, Kurds, Serbs and others, I am not able to estimate the size of the injustice done to the Shi'as of Iraq.

But it may be worth reminding the reader of another important fact, namely that sectarian fanaticism among Arab Muslims is generally weaker than among non-Arab Muslims. The Persian Shi'a, for example, is more biased to his Shi'ism than the Lebanese Shi'a, and the Sunni Chechen is more biased to his Sunnism than the Egyptian Sunni. The reason I think is that the Arab considers Islam part of his identity, and not all of his identity, because he does not

need to confirm it on every occasion. But for the non-Arab Muslim, Islam became his identity, and thus a Turk had no identity before Islam, and if he had it was long since lost; and the Pakistani has no identity other than Islam, without which he is Indian, and so is it to the Chechen, and to a lesser extent to the Persian.

The conviction of Iraqi Shi'as of this injustice reflected negatively on the political reality of Iraq after the collapse of the Ottoman rule at the beginning of the 20th century. Iraq's Shi'as generally withdrew from active participation in the new Iraq, which was born at the hands of the British occupiers, with Taqiyya and the Marji'iyah playing a major role in it. There was a prevailing belief that that new state was nothing more than an extension of the fanatic Ottoman regime, requiring caution in dealing with it, and to prevent subjecting oneself to harm. Thus being dormant was the safest way to protect oneself from professing and participation. Furthermore, the Marji'iyah also played a greater role when its majority ruled that the regime, which was contrary to Islam, as it saw it and as it was installed by the occupier, should be boycotted.

Thus, the monarchy in Iraq began relying, in the majority of the administration, on Sunni officers from the remainder of the Ottoman army and on managers originally trained at the hands of the Ottomans. In other words, it was somehow an extension of Ottoman rule in colour although not necessarily in its sectarianism. This

fact has led the military establishment to be transformed into an institution led by Sunni officers. As the military controlled the new Iraq for a long time, for even Nuri As-Sa'eed¹⁸⁸ was an extension of military rule, it necessarily meant the dominance of the Sunnis of the Iraqi political scene throughout the twentieth century.

But a change occurred in the Iraqi political scene between the two World Wars. Iraq's Shi'as began to participate more effectively in public and political life, though not intentionally from a sectarian perspective, rather a natural result of their children's learning and the birth of political movements in Iraq that exceeded denominational and sectarian lines. A new generation of college graduate professionals arose who played an important role in Iraq after World War II. Iraqi Shi'as entered the political arena, which was confined to the Sunnis who had outdistanced them. When the Revolution of July 14th 1958 ended the monarchy installed by the British occupier, Shi'as led three of Iraq's largest political parties. The Secretary General of the Iraqi Communist Party was 'Salām 'Ādil', the Secretary General of the national leadership of the Ba'ath Arab Socialist Party was 'Fouād Ar-Rikābi', and the leader of the Independence Party was 'Muhammad Mahdi Kubba' - all three Iraqi Shi'as. This reflects the amount of political change that took place in Iraq during the thirty plus years between the founding of the modern Iraqi state and the July Revolution. Iraq's Shi'as have become part of the active political reality in Iraq, as required by the reality of

their proportion in the community and their natural right to participate in the country and not as a matter of religious affiliation.

Parallel to the impact of Taqiyya, a new generation of learners was born who were no longer content to sit on the side-lines of the events. They were born and brought up, as is the case with the Shi'as all over the world, on the theory of the great injustice that was incurred in Islam on the 'People of the House of Muhammad' in the martyrdom of the Prophet's grandson, Hussein Ibn 'Ali. This theory necessarily means that injustice not only befell the People of the House, but it was inflicted on all their followers and loyalists throughout all ages, which means Iraq's Shi'as in the twentieth century. Whoever is unable to comprehend the depth of this theory and its originality in understanding the structure of the Shi'a personality, cannot begin to understand the history of Iraq specifically and the history of the Shi'as in general. This is because the Shi'a is breastfed the story of the martyrdom of Hussein in the tragic way it is told, and learns that the Sunni Muslims either participated in the crime or abetted it. Even though the Sunni would reply that this is not true because most of the Sunnis condemn the killing of Hussein and consider him a martyr, the Shi'a counter question about the reason for the Sunni glorification of the Umayyad state will not produce a clear answer from the Sunni! A Shi'a generation rose in Iraq after World War II, which aspired, consciously or unconsciously, to confirm its Shi'a identity. If he were

neither a communist to follow Salām 'Ādil in the Iraqi Communist Party nor a nationalist to follow Fouād Ar-Rikābi in the Ba'ath Party, he was more likely to have been embraced by the Shah of Iran who was keen on reviving the glory of Persia which he expressed more than once. Perhaps the most prominent expression was in the luxurious and extravagant celebration in 1971 celebrating 2,500 years of the founding of the Persian Empire.¹⁸⁹ This way he contributed to the birth of a new Shi'a political movement, which had no political principle but Shi'ism. Because even if that movement talked about injustice in Iraq in general and the injustice imposed by the Ba'athists in particular, it did not provide a political program for the state it aspired to build. Thus what was born out of this political movement, which later turned to the Da'wa Party, is still a party without a political program.

The religious Marji'iya in Najaf supported this move and blessed it, for several reasons. First, the Marji'iya in Najaf was and still is of Imperialist tendencies, even if it claims that it does not interfere in politics. This fact was summarized in the fatwa of Mohammad Muhsin Al-Hakim in 1959 prohibiting dealing with the Communists.¹⁹⁰ The Marji'iya found in its support for the emerging Shi'a political movement an enhancement of its position and a force it can use to bargain any political system, as did Abul-Qāsīm Al-Khoe'i in 1991¹⁹¹. The Marji'iya was for the most part, except for a few, either loyal to the Shah or content with him.

The Da'wa Party remained loyal to the Shah of Iran during the rule of the Ba'ath in Iraq. But when the Shah was deposed, the Da'wa Party found that its loyalty to Shi'ism is the only issue, and there was no objection to following in the footsteps of the rising Al-Khomeini. And so it was, although it was not really a believer in the theory of Wilāyet Al-Faqih (Governance of the Jurist) nor in anti-Zionism whose ally it was until the fall of the Shah, and which alliance it went back to after Al-Khomeini's death, publicly showing that such alliance existed before and after the invasion of Iraq, when Zionism handed to it the rule of Iraq as its proxy.

Although the Shi'a political movement in Iraq goes beyond the Da'wa Party, that does not make a big difference in the outcome. This is because the Shi'a political movement, which erupted in Iraq after the Imperialist invasion in 2003, mostly shares certain characteristics, namely:

1. They all came with the Zionist invasion either as an ally and employee, or with the Zionist consent and blessing. It would be insulting to human intelligence for someone to say, as it has indeed been said, that he participated in the government after the occupation against the occupier's will!
2. They do not have any political program for Iraq.
3. They do not have any economic theory. Talking of

Islamic economy based on the views of Mr. Muhammad Bāqir As-Sadr is nonsense, because the man did not draft an Islamic economic theory at all.¹⁹²

4. They do not have any national project related to the Arab identity of Iraq and Arab unity. In fact most are hostile to any Arab unity because if that were achieved, it would mean the loss of the Shi'a identity in a sea of Sunnism!

5. Their full support of the Zionist project in the Middle East is based on the new 'municipality states' or 'petty kingdoms'. This was clearly reflected in the Iraqi government's position on the aggression on Syria, where Baghdad asserted that it stands at equal distances from the Damascus government and the terrorist that it claimed to be fighting in Iraq! On more than one occasion, Iraq's Foreign Minister stated that Iraq stands neutral regarding the conflict in Syria equating the Damascus Government with the terrorists who later invaded Iraq¹⁹³.

6. Their contribution to the creation of administrative and financial corruption in Iraq during their years of rule; something Iraq had not been seen in its darkest times, putting Iraq near the bottom of the list of corruption in the world, according to the classification of their American and European agencies.¹⁹⁴

We can continue in this characterization, but all of it will lead to one fact: That the objective of all Shi'a political movements in Iraq today is one; which is the possession of the rule to acquire as much as possible of Iraq's wealth. Otherwise, how can the differences between these movements be explained if all were without any political or economic program and all want to build a Shi'a rule in Iraq? In other words, if the objective is one, why do they not agree on the sharing of power and relent and relax?

And where it is possible to talk about political Shi'ism in the Arab world separate from the theory of Wilāyet Al-Faqih and its role in the Arab political Shi'ism, I must reiterate what I said previously; that I believe that Islam is the religion of the Arabs and for them alone. I must bring this up again because I think that the role played by the Persians and Ottomans, and that played by the Albanian, Chechen, Indian, Pakistani and Pashtun newcomers is not true to Islam because it did not exist at the time of the original creation of Islam! But this does not change the fact that this intruder played and plays a major role in political Islam, Sunni and Shi'a alike. Part of that is the impact of Wilāyet Al-Faqih theory on the Arab political Shi'ism in Iraq and Lebanon.

Chapter 15

Wilāyet Al-Faqih

The concept of 'Wilāyet Al-Faqih', which has become common on everyone's lips during the past thirty years, is not a recent phenomenon in Islamic thought in general or political Islam in particular. It finds its roots in Islamic jurisprudence where Muslim scholars wrote centuries ago that Islam is not merely a religion but it is a way of life, and that it brought the solution for peoples' affairs in this world and the hereafter. As a result of this, the faqih has become more able than others to guide people in all private and public matters. This disdain for the people found different grades of response among the doctrines of Islamic political thought, manifested clearly in the theories of 'Governance of God' of the Muslim Brotherhood and the 'Wilāyet Al-Faqih' of Al-Khomeini's contemporary followers. It can be summarized as: The people follow a man who takes the place of the Prophet or Imām in all worldly and religious matters, so his opinion is not subject to appeal or objection; he is above the law and above any otherworldly authority. This is quite similar to the 'Pope' concept in the Catholic Church during the Middle Ages, albeit that the authority of the latter has become even tangentially religious.

As the Muslim Brotherhood failed, in 2012-2013, in their first attempt to rule Egypt, we are not able to evaluate the application of their theory. However, it is different to

'Wilāyet Al-Faqih', which has been applied in Iran for over thirty years. But there is another difference that is no less important between the 'Governance of God' and 'Wilāyet Al-Faqih'.

The Muslim Brotherhood movement was born in the aftermath of the fall of the Sunni Ottoman Empire, while 'Wilāyet Al-Faqih' was born under Taqiyya and the Shi'a Marji'iyā. The former was, and still lives, on the ruins of a centuries-old fatigued experience, which has lost any impetus, while the second is a relatively new theory in Shi'a jurisprudence, that has no precedent to feed upon, or a vision as to where it will end up.

'Wilāyet Al-Faqih' was born within the Shi'a Taqleed practice, which as I have shown previously was itself new. But 'Wilāyet Al-Faqih' differed from the traditional Marji'iyā in that it declared the end of Taqiyya and the public declaration of Shi'ism, and to announce that the faqih was not only the guardian in matters of religion, but in worldly matters as well. In other words, the faqih became the overall Guardian. There might be some simplification in this, because the real difference between the traditional Marji'iyā and 'Wilāyet Al-Faqih' is that the former was suffering from a kind of hypocrisy, while the latter had the courage to come out of that. Traditional Marji'iyā, though it claimed shunning worldly and political affairs, was in reality interfering in politics, albeit in a covert way. If it found the political situation in its favour, it would direct the Muqallads (the followed clerics) to

submit to the regime. If it found the political situation contrary to what it wanted, it was able to secretly agitate its loyal public.

'Wilāyet Al-Faqih', which was first discussed by Ahmed An-Naraqī who died in 1829 AD,¹⁹⁵ was born as a practical experience at the hands of Rouhullāh Al-Khomeini, the faqih who was exiled by the Shah of Iran to Iraq, where he lived in Najaf between 1963 and 1979 when Iraq asked him to leave in response to a request from the Shah.¹⁹⁶ This was a stupid step, which relied on a failure of the Baghdad Government in reading the Iranian political scene, because Al-Khomeini returned from Paris after months to displace the Shah and establish the first 'Wilāyet Al-Faqih' state in history.

As the 'Wilāyet Al-Faqih' requires that the faqih has the final say in matters of this world and religion, politics has climbed to the top of his authority and powers. But the Ja'fari jurisprudence has no rules, which define where the faqih should stand in matters of contemporary political affairs. If it was clear for the Shi'a fuqahā to decide where they stand from the Umayyad state policy, then it could be understood in light of the political conflict, founded by Quraysh between the 'House of 'Ali' and the 'House of 'Aisha' from the first century of Islam. But it is different in our time because it is not clear where the two parties in this political conflict should stand within the global political conflict. Wahhābi clerics in the Arabian Peninsula have found that the best interest of the doctrine was to

stand with the Imperialist Zionist political programs, and that has been their position for over a hundred years. Most of the Shi'a Marji's in Najaf and Qum have found that the interest of the Shi'a was to take the stand of support or appeasement of Imperialism, and so it was.

However, Rouhullāh Al-Khomeini differed from the prevailing situation in the Shi'a Marji'iyā in opposing the Zionist plan for the world. I do not want to engage in what I think is the reason for that stand of Al-Khomeini, since it has no significant impact on this theme. But it is important to understand that Al-Khomeini remained a lifelong enemy of the Zionist project, and he rose against the Shah, and defied the Shi'a Marji'iyā in Najaf, Qum and Lebanon on their appeasement of the Zionist regimes. When he lived in exile in Iraq, he was not in accord with the Marji'iyā represented by Abul-Qāsim al-Khoe'i.¹⁹⁷ Thus Al-Khomeini and 'Wilāyet Al-Faqih', which was enlivened by him, were opposed by most of the Shi'a clerics in the twentieth century. He was opposed in Iran by Hussein Ali Montazeri, Mar'ashi Najafi and Shari'atmadari, and in Iraq by Abul-Qāsim al-Khoe'i, 'Ali As-Sistāni, Ishāq Fayyādh and Bashir An-Najafi. In Lebanon he was opposed by Moussa As-Sadr and Mohammed Jawād Mughniyeh. These are only examples as the tendency was unanimously against him.

But Al-Khomeini had a distinct political sense of realities in the seventies of the last century. He sensed that the objective circumstances for the revolution in Iran had matured. A new generation of Persians arose who were

born after the Second World War and witnessed the experience of the failure of Mosaddeq's attempt at nationalising Iran's oil,¹⁹⁸ persons who aspired for true liberation from Imperialist Zionism, which had its hold on them as it had its hold on all other Muslims since the First World War. How could there be anything better than the injustice that had befallen the House of the Prophet, causing suffering to Hussein and his family and companions, as a fire lighting their path to achieve this freedom? Thus, the Al-Khomeini revolution came as a surprise to Zionism. We should not underestimate what happened in Islamic thought in 1979 or its impact. Perhaps not everything that has happened in the Muslim World was necessarily a natural outcome of Al-Khomeini's revolution, but much of what happened was influenced one way or another by the changes brought by Al-Khomeini. Al-Khomeini rekindled hope in Political Islam generally, giving a boost to existing movements and giving birth to others. Thus some Marxist Arabs, who were looking for a political line that would transfer them from their intellectual loss, supported the Mujāhedeen in Afghanistan or moved to Afghanistan to fight against the Soviets. But the most important outcome of Al-Khomeini's revolution in relation to Arab Nationalism and the conflict with Zionism and in a real dialectic way, was the birth of Hizbullah in Lebanon, which I will deal with later in a broader context.

I have first to pause to deal with an issue that I find of

major importance because it has neither been understood by the Arabs nor by non-Arab Muslims, and which has been exposed publicly by Al-Khomeini's revolution and which I have repeated throughout this book, namely that Islam is the religion of the Arabs just as Judaism is the religion of the Hebrews and Christianity is the religion of the Arameans. This is not my invention or imagination, but a Divine Reality, and whoever wants to object to it may refer it to Allah and ask Him why, even though the reason is evident to "whoever has a heart or who listens while he is present"(Qāf 50:37). This fact leads to another conclusion, that any movement or leadership for the Muslims must take place at the hands of the Arabs in their land. It would not do any good for Hizb-ut-Tahrir to demand the return of the Ottoman Empire to achieve the dream of an Islamic state.¹⁹⁹ If Hizb-ut-Tahrir really wanted an Islamic state, it should demand the return of Baghdad and the 'Abbāsid State, or something like that. The Ottoman Empire failed because it knew nothing of Islam but its name, and used it to achieve its plan for the domination by the Turks of the world around them. They corrupted, vandalized and when they departed, they did not leave any mark for the world to refer to as an honoured glory. Maybe Hizb-ut-Tahrir should address the question that any researcher in Islam would ask: if the Ottomans really represented Islam, why is it that none of the fifty or so of their Caliphs made the holy pilgrimage to Mecca considered by Muslims to be on the pillars of religion?

Through this understanding, the defects of Al-Khomeini's revolution seem obvious. Al-Khomeini, as all his contemporaries knew, hated Arabs in general. He was in fact prejudiced against them to the extent that he refused to talk in Arabic, even when he lived in Najaf, in spite of his knowledge of it. I do not mean that he had to speak Arabic, because it was his right to be proud of being Persian, as does every human being belonging to any ethnicity. But he was speaking in Farsi in matters of Islam and Hadith to an Arab congregation, which could not be correct, because the Qur'an was not revealed in the language of the Persians even if Al-Khomeini wished it. "And even if We had revealed it to one among the foreigners [non-Arabs], And he had recited it to them [perfectly], they would [still] not have been believers in it" (Ash-Shu'araa 26:198-199). The reason for his hatred of Arabs may be that he blames them for the killing of Hussein and his family, and this sense of criminalization prevails among a group of non-Arab Muslims. Al-Khomeini and his ilk had a growing feeling that the Arabs were not eligible for the leadership of Islam, and they as non-Arab Muslims are more capable of doing that. Thus, Al-Khomeini thought he was capable of leading the Muslims to safety. And that is how the concept of 'exporting the Iranian revolution' outside Iran was born, which has become a 'scarecrow' used by the Zionists to scare others in the Arab world. I am not saying that because I believe in the correctness of the project to export Iranian Shi'a-identity revolution to the Arab world, but I say this in an

attempt to deal with history objectively. This is because I have not heard from those who wrote or spoke about the dangers of exporting the Iranian revolution to the Arab world speaking about the danger of exporting Turkish New Turanism²⁰⁰ to the Arab world! Is it so that the Arabs, who were ruled by the Turks with an injustice that ended in stultification and 'Turkification' to the limit that Arabic was almost forgotten in the land of Islam, are not really afraid of the return of that darkness, and fear only the dangers of the Persian tide? Or do those who are keen on 'Zionized' Arabism have a different understanding of history?

It would not escape anybody's mind that the Al-Khomeini revolution in Iran has not fully succeeded. The proof is that the presidential elections brought two presidents opposed to the theory of 'Wilāyet Al-Faqih', although they hypocritically claimed otherwise. President Rouhāni had made several statements asking the Revolutionary Guard (the arm of Khamenei) to refrain from interfering in politics. Both Khatami and Rouhāni represent Rafsanjāni's opinion.²⁰¹ While the latter is not a scholar, he nevertheless represents the opinion of Iranian clerics who oppose the theory. There is a line of clerics in Iran who oppose the theory of 'Wilāyet Al-Faqih' today just as much as they did before Al-Khomeini became victorious. It seems also that the majority of the Iranian people support them in that.

It should also be clear that Al-Khomeini's revolution failed

to achieve any distinct attraction in Iraq, where he had desired to have a large base among the oppressed, as he liked to call them. During the Iran-Iraq war, Iraq's Shi'a fought with honour in defence of their country without the consideration of sectarian affiliation, and national loyalty won over denominational loyalty. Let no one say that they fought for fear of the regime's injustice, because no one can frighten a soldier in the battlefield who does not see in front of him anything but death!

As for the political movement of Iraqi Shi'a, the failure of Al-Khomeini's revolution was no less evident. Both the Supreme Council for the Islamic Revolution in Iraq (SCIRI) and the Da'wa Party found themselves, in the midst of Al-Khomeini's victory, forced to ride the wave. SCIRI adopted the theory of 'Wilāyet Al-Faqih' and the Da'wa party swore allegiance to Al-Khomeini. But both were hypocritical, because SCIRI was linked to Zionism due to the historical links of the Al-Hakim family to it. The Da'wa party was a product of the Shah, and how can a Party produced by the Shah be non-Zionist? Noble principles can only be carried by noble people. And so it was that, when the Zionists invaded Iraq in 2003, SCIRI and Da'wa Party returned to share power with the other Zionist traitors. In case someone claims that I am being partial, I refer them to what the commander of the Islamic Republic 'Ali Khamenei said of those in Iraq and their supporting clerics. He is quoted as saying: "They say that 'Ali is their Imām, but they refrain from saying one word against the US."²⁰²

So if Khamenei was not talking about the Shi'a Marji'ya in Iraq and Iraq's Shi'a parties, whom was he talking about?

As non-Arabs cannot lead Islam, even if they are Arabized, then the theory of 'Wilāyet Al-Faqih' cannot continue without having an Arab breeding ground. The case of Hizbullah may be an indicator of the success of the theory in having an Arab breeding ground, which I will discuss later. But the great hope since the era of Al-Khomeini was pinned on Iraq. Yet the theory failed to gain any ground in Iraq and is on the verge of failing in Iran.

In Iraq, despite all the talk and rumours about Iranian hegemony, it still has a political sectarian dominance, which has succeeded through sectarian coherence between the intelligence apparatus of the Iranian state and the Shi'a Parties in Iraq, and not because of any adherence of Iraq's Shi'a Parties to the theory of 'Wilāyet Al-Faqih'. This complexity of relationships is perhaps the reason for the difficulty in understanding this relationship, and of the Iranian influence in Iraq among some. In addition, this complexity gives others, who understand it for what it is, the ability to simplify matters and try to portray this complex relationship as a US-Iranian agreement on sharing Iraq in a comprehensive plan written in ancient times. But those biased people know that it is not so! The religious influence of 'Wilāyet Al-Faqih' in Iraq was non-existent.

In Iran, the theory is in decline. This does not mean that it is going to die soon, because it still holds many powers. The Revolutionary Guards, which represent its military arm, is still a powerful force capable of defending the revolution as understood by the guards against any internal or external threat. These guards consider themselves entrusted with the revolution, and have a view beyond the elected institutions by the people, even though it is backed up by the majority opinion, because the concept of revolution in the eye of the Revolutionary Guards is the opinion of the elite and the minority in all stages of history. This is a sound historical theory. No revolution has erupted without being led by a devoted elite, and there is no people's revolution, because what is called people's revolution is mobilizing the mob to move in the direction decided by the elite. Unless the mob is properly led, it would frustrate the endeavour. Imām 'Ali described this historical truth in saying: "The mob when they assemble together, they cause harm, and when they disperse they cannot be recognized."²⁰³ It does not escape the notice of an observer of the scene in Iran to see this growing conflict. But whoever understands the movement of history understands the reason for the split in Iran today, which did not exist on the same level twenty years ago.

The Iranians who came out against the Shah of Iran, and fell in the street, rose against the unjust rule and for a cause they considered legitimate. But they are no longer

present, and their children's generation did not witness nor lived the injustice of the Shah's rule and do not know the experience endured by their parents in order to be part of it. This new generation has a different ambition because the experience is different and the global environment is different. They are not able to understand the cause of war between the Islamic Republic and the United States, especially when the environment around them from the media, film and television portray the latter as a civilized nation and 'democratic.' Most of them are not concerned with the question of Palestine and Jerusalem, which they see, though a great injustice, as far from their reality and immediate needs. The revolution, any revolution, would die if it does not create for each generation a new challenge, put in front of it and force it to confront. The generation of Iranians born after the Iran-Iraq war faces no challenge worthy of such confrontation. And so the State of 'Wilāyet Al-Faqih' finds itself unable to persuade most of the young Iranian people that they have to bear the hardship for steadfastness and confronting America, because they do not honestly believe that America should be faced with these options. If 'Wilāyet Al-Faqih' wants to draw the Iranian people towards the revolution, it needs to create a real heated confrontation after which the people will rally around it as they did in 1980 when the Iraqi army entered its territory and Iran was on the brink of the abyss. A revolution, any revolution, needs to renew itself in order for it to continue, and it can not continue to talk about deep dangers in a complex

political analysis no matter how objective it may be. The Bolshevik Revolution failed, despite being one of the biggest active revolutions in contemporary history, because it could not renew itself. Why should, 'Wilāyet Al-Faqih', then succeed?

Chapter 16

Political Shi'ism in Lebanon

I have concluded that one of the most important outcomes of the birth of 'Wilāyet Al-Faqih' in Iran for the Arab world has been the birth of Hizbullah, because of the role this Party has played in the national and regional battles, exceeding its real size and exceeding military and political axioms that prevailed in the region for decades. The political and historical observer must stop to enquire about the reason for the success of 'Wilāyet Al-Faqih' in attracting the Shi'a public in Lebanon while failing in Iraq. This is what I will try to attend to here.

Shi'ism is not a new phenomenon in Lebanon. Jabal 'Āmel, which is the mountainous region of Southern Lebanon, and whose geographical borders are differently defined in every age, has known Shi'ism from the fourth century AH.²⁰⁴ Some would even go so far as to say that Shi'ism in Jabal 'Āmel was born at the hands of the Companion Abu Dharr Al-Ghifāri. He used to get out of Syria to tour and talk with people in areas such as Jabal 'Āmel before he was sent under arrest by the governor Mu'āwiya Ibn Abi Sufyān to Caliph 'Uthmān who exiled him to Ar-Rabdah²⁰⁵ where he died alone, asserting the words of our Prophet: "God have mercy on Abi Dharr. He walks alone and he will die alone and he (will be) raised alone".²⁰⁶

Whatever the story, Shi'ism in Jabal 'Āmel is as old as the Islam of people in those parts of Syria. In other words, it is not the result of the rule of Banu Hamdān in Aleppo or the Fatimid in Egypt or the Persian expansion, as some might imagine. We should not be surprised by this fact, as Al-Maqdisi, one of the historians of the fourth century, has been quoted as saying: "The people of Tiberias, half of the people of Qaddas (a town in the Jabal) and also half the people of the city of Nablus and most of the people of Amman were Shi'a"²⁰⁷. As to the residents of Jabal 'Āmel, the books of language and history and what they tell about themselves all point to one fact, that they originate from Yemen, as Banu 'Āmela of Saba' (Sheba) who migrated after the flood. Abul Fida wrote: "Banu 'Āmel are a phratry from the Saba', a Yemeni ancient Arab tribe which migrated from Yemen in 300 BC, after the flood and the destruction of the Ma'rib Dam and the end of the Kingdom of Saba', and encamped near Damascus at a mountain known as Jabal 'Āmela."²⁰⁸

Whatever the reality of the lineage, the only result is that the people of Jabal 'Āmel are genuine Arabs who inhabited the region that was later named after them because of that long habitation, and that they were Shi'a early on in Islam. The realization of this fact is very important for understanding the reason where they stand today in the Arab-Zionist conflict first, and the reason for their difference from Iraq's Shi'a second. This is because the Shi'a of Lebanon have lived all their lives in an Arab

environment; they were surrounded from the north, east and south by Arabs: Sunni Muslims, Druze and Christians. That is, when they were persecuted by the Europeans Crusader invaders and by the Ottoman rule, which was unjust towards all peoples, they had nothing but their Arab identity to take refuge in. They found out before others that Arab nationalism is the right expression of their Islam and Shi'ism.

This is where the difference with the Shi'a of Iraq occurred, because Iraq's Shi'a found in escaping from the religious persecution of the Ottoman a haven that brought them closer to the Safawid Shi'a state in Iran. Thus, the geographical adhesion and the large number of Shi'a holy shrines in Iraq have led to a long intermingling and intermarriage between Iraq's Shi'a and Iran's Shi'a. This gradually led to a growing sense among the Shi'a of Iraq of closeness to Iran. Thus, the Arab sense of belonging among the Shi'a of Iraq slowly weakened and was replaced by a sectarian affiliation, which found Iran closer to them than Syria, for example. There is no doubt that the Ottoman rule and discrimination against the Shi'a has contributed in pushing them to this alignment. Furthermore, a large number of Iraq's Shi'a chose to be registered as Persian subjects during the Ottoman rule to avoid being drafted to fight the wars of the Ottoman rulers. The Shi'a of Jabal 'Āmel did not go through a similar experience having lived at all times in an Arab environment, and they were not forced by geography or

history to depart from their Arab sense of identity. That is why we find the sense of Arab nationalism among the Shi'a public of Lebanon strong and distinct, contrary to that in Iraq. I do not mean by this a total lack of Arab national sentiment among Iraq's Shi'a, because I have already shown that a number of distinguished national leaders in Iraq were Shi'a, but it was and still is an elite and not the public at large. The fact is that the Shi'a public in Iraq does not have great enthusiasm for belonging to an Arab nationalist project, as is the case with the Shi'a of Lebanon represented by Hizbullah and its popularity.

It is not within historical integrity for anyone to claim that the reason for this difference is the policy of the Ba'ath, which pitted the Shi'a public in Iraq against it. Perhaps the policies of the Ba'ath during the thirty years of rule did not help to change this reality, but its roots are deeper and older than the Ba'ath Party rule. This fact may explain to the observer of the Iraqi political scene the reason for its lack today, and in the absence of the Ba'ath, of a single party that embraces an Arab nationalist project, at a time when almost all of the Kurdish parties are nationalist parties. Furthermore, the Ba'ath in Syria is allied with Hizbullah, which counters the claim that the Ba'ath was responsible for the Shi'a departure from the Arab nationalist project. And let no one say that the Ba'ath in Syria is different in ideology to that in Iraq. They are identical in ideology and practice but only differ on leadership.

The Shi'a of Lebanon lived for centuries treated as second-class citizens. The Ottoman state discriminated against the Shi'a. The Christians received the protection of the French, which gave them a large share in managing Lebanon even before the fall of the Ottoman Empire. The Shi'a in Lebanon remained oppressed for a long time. However, this situation began to change in the twentieth century, with education and the religious Marji'iyah playing an important role in alerting people to their rights and to the means adopted by the other peoples of the world to achieve these rights.

The first credible political Shi'a organized movement in Lebanon was the Amal (Hope) movement. Mousa As-Sadr, who was head of the Supreme Shi'a Council in Lebanon, launched in 1975 what he called 'The Movement of the Deprived' (Amal) to defend the Shi'a in Lebanon in facing the continuing Israeli attacks on south Lebanon amid lack of protection from the Lebanese failed state, preoccupied with corruption and political deals. The relationship of 'Amal' with the Shah of Iran was, as expected, good as the Shah was the only Shi'a ruler in the world and Mousa As-Sadr had come to Lebanon from Qum with the blessing of the then Shah, who must have played a major role in granting As-Sadr Lebanese citizenship in record time.

It is no wonder that when Al-Khomeini ruled Iran in 1979, he was not so keen on As-Sadr, and this disaffection was increased by the rejection by the latter of the theory of

'Wilāyet Al-Faqih', which Al-Khomeini brought as the only solution to the Islamic state. This disaffection was exacerbated by the lack of response by Al-Khomeini to the demands of 'Amal' to make Libya return Mousa As-Sadr, whom it detained and most probably killed later, though Al-Khomeini had a good relationship with, and a big influence on the Libyan leader, Mu'ammad Gaddāfi.

In 1982 Israel invaded Lebanon and swept through the south and reached Beirut, in the first invasion and encirclement of an Arab capital since the Sykes-Picot time.²⁰⁹ The South was boiling and 'Amal' was not able to cope with the invasion because it was not actually established on revolutionary bases, and continues even today in not being revolutionary. There was a need for the birth of a movement to fill the void created by 'Amal' which claimed to confront the Zionist attack, but failed to do so. Political necessities create events. And so it was that Hizbullah was born, a unique phenomenon in the Arab politico-religious history.

This is because the young Lebanese Shi'a were not really much interested in the theory of 'Wilāyet Al-Faqih' and its feasibility, because their problem was confronting the barbaric Zionist invasion which was swallowing their land, history and culture. These young revolutionaries in southern Lebanon and Beirut did not find an Arab political regime or nationalist movement able to give them the support they wanted in order to carry out the task of

confronting Zionism. But they found what they sought outside the Arab world in Iran, where Al-Khomeini was declaring at every opportunity that 'Wilāyet Al-Faqih' considered World Zionism the epitome of world imperialism and the enemy of the oppressed. The Shi'a of Lebanon were oppressed and victims of that Imperialism which had occupied their land and crushed their villages and burned their figs and olives! This means that Hizbullah was not born because it really believed that 'Wilāyet Al-Faqih' was the solution to the nation's problems, but it was born because it wanted to solve the nation's problem which was threatening its existence, and found that 'Wilāyet Al-Faqih' suited this, and so it adopted it.

It is not belief in 'Wilāyet Al-Faqih' which drove Hizbullah to Al-Khomeini, but the fact that 'Wilāyet Al-Faqih' was the only political movement then that made confronting Zionism its objective. Hizbullah, in other words, did not arise from the belief in 'Wilāyet Al-Faqih' to confront Israel, but the need to confront it was what drove Hizbullah to 'Wilāyet Al-Faqih'. Understanding this fact is very important for the understanding of the relationship between Hizbullah and Iran as a state, and the difference between that relationship and the relationship with the faqih. Hizbullah is an Arab Party, not a Persian one, and this resulted in differences in the positions that the Party had to overlook for the sake of the larger issue.

One of those differences was in the relationship with the

Shi'a Parties in Iraq. At a time when Iranian intelligence is active in supporting and controlling these Parties, Hizbullah is not comfortable with establishing strong ties with Shi'a Parties in Iraq as the sectarian affiliation demands. But the political ideology in which the Party believes in opposing Zionism, forces it to keep away from these Parties because of the ties between those Iraqi Shi'a Parties and Zionism that are voluntary and direct and not out of ignorance or by proxy. It is no secret to those who have followed the relationship between Hizbullah and the Iraqi Shi'a Parties, that the Secretary-General of Hizbullah, Sayyid Hassan Nasrullah, has not acknowledged the role of a single political figure of Iraq's Shi'a in any speech during the past ten years. He avoided meeting any of their men visiting Lebanon regularly in search of a conference or an opportunity to clean their dark faces.

For this reason, Hizbullah's relationship with Iran is complex. It is not reasonable to simplify it either with general phrases or with a superficial analysis based on an event or a particular incident, because it is more complicated than that. When Hizbullah finds that there is nothing wrong in following the example of the Iranian 'faqih' and his fatwas and opinions, it would be basing it on the belief that the faqih is the basis for the project upon which the Party was established, in that the Party's existence is linked to the fight against world imperialism in the immediate form of the State of Israel. In this, the Party is fully linked to the faqih and the institutions around him

like the Revolutionary Guards. But the Party is not linked to the Iranian State and finds itself free even to disagree with it. The Party may one day find itself at odds with the Iranian state if, for example, the plan of those in Iran who are termed by Zionists as 'moderates', represented today by Rafsanjāni and/or Rouhāni, dreaming of reconciliation with the United States, goes ahead, even though this possibility does not seem feasible today as long as the faqih still holds the reins of affairs. But in theory the possibility exists that the state of Iran may reconcile with Imperialist Zionism someday if the moderates' line prevails.

We need to pause here to respond to the charges levelled at Hizbullah accusing it of being a hireling and a vassal of Iran. These charges mostly come from those who stand in the anti-Shi'a camp, and the existence of this camp is not in doubt, just as there is an anti-Sunni Shi'a camp. The irony is that those who accuse Hizbullah of being an Iranian stooge do not find anything wrong with the glorification of the Ottoman Empire and loyalty to it. They are right in that if they were convinced that Islam is a universal religion and that no nationality should have guardianship over other nationalities, which would make the Ottoman Turkish rule acceptable and legitimate as the personification of the Islamic State. Some of them went so far as to advocate following the ruling Justice and Development Party 'AK Parti' in Turkey because of its religious roots, although the said Party is allied with

Zionism and recognizes it. If that is the case, what is wrong with having a Persian, Chechen or Pashtun Caliphate? In other words, where is the fault if Hizbullah wants to follow the example of an Iranian Muslim leader if it is acceptable to follow the example of a Turkish Muslim leader?

The birth of Hizbullah was a big event in Lebanon, which quickly transcended the borders of Lebanon to become a powerful force in the Arab-Zionist conflict. The Party has benefited from the experience of the Iranian Revolutionary Guard, which contributed to its training and equipping and developed a military doctrine unknown to Arab armies or liberation movements active in the twentieth century. This ability to develop previously unknown strategy and tactics has had a significant impact on changing the rules of the game of the Zionist enemy. The latter was used to relying on its striking air force which enabled it to bomb the battlefield without interception from any resistance force; after which it could send its ground forces on “a stroll” to take Arab land after their air power has neutralized defences and crippled the capacity of the troops exposed without air cover. But Hizbullah created new rules of war to which the Zionist enemy has not been able to adapt to this day. The defeats of the Zionists in the war of liberation in 2000 and the 2006 war are testimonies to that fact. This is because the People's Liberation War had acquired a new concept with Hizbullah, which the Israeli army does not have the ability to deal with yet. Air force, which is suitable for hitting

airports and fixed bases and large armies, has little impact against small groups of fighters moving in tunnels. Israeli advanced tanks are unable to cope with missiles carried by youths with the hearts of men. But most of all it is Hizbullah's success in the use of missiles that are no less, if not more serious, than the Air Force in inflicting losses on the enemy at the lowest financial cost and without the need to train pilots and maintain the infrastructure needed by them.

Since the aim here is not to explore Hizbullah's ability to fight as much as it is to prove its uniqueness to the rest of the religious movements in its transfer of jihadist theory from slogans to real use against the single enemy of the Arab nation, I would just say that Hizbullah has been a unique phenomenon which has changed the rules of the conflict.

There is another matter that Hizbullah added to the Arab national project. By confirming the Arab national nature of the battle and its transcending of geographical boundaries, and by entering with the Syrian army to resist the Zionist terrorism at the hands of the gangs of Syrian Free Army, the Islamic Army Al-Qaeda, An-Nusra, and others who openly boast of their Zionism, Hizbullah has created a new reality at a time when the Ba'ath project in Iraq and Syria failed.²¹⁰ The involvement of Hizbullah in the civil war in Syria on the side of the Ba'ath not only confirms the Party's belief in the unity of the battle and national

destiny, but it cancelled the Sykes-Picot borders, sparking the ire and the objection of the Zionists outside Lebanon and inside it, because Zionism considers the Sykes-Picot borders sacred, inviolable and could not be scrapped even if one of its products is the 'watermelon' Republic of Lebanon.

But in spite of all my deep appreciation for Hizbullah and the sacrifices it has offered and its exemplary dedication to the defence of the Arab nation, I still have more than one question regarding the possibility of contradiction between its loyalty to the Arab national project and its Islamic alignment, which is not necessarily Shi'a. The reason for this question is the Party's position on ' Hamas' which the Party found itself, just as Iran itself found, unable to be decisive on when Hamas betrayed Syria and supported the Muslim Brotherhood which took up arms against the national state in Syria and contributed to the civil war and destruction of Syria.²¹¹ Even though Hamas chose to stand with the enemy of Hizbullah's ally, the Syrian state, Hizbullah did not sever relations with Hamas nor did it even criticize its disgraceful behaviour. Hizbullah continued to support Hamas arguing that it was in essence anti-Zionist.

However, this duality cannot last long. Religious Movements, including Hamas and Hizbullah, are based on the concept that religious affiliation comes first. This is what Hamas did because its adhesion to the Muslim

Brotherhood movement was its base, and even preceded the goal of the Liberation of Palestine. This is because the religious goal of the project, whatever it is, is to establish a theocratic state and not achieve peoples' liberation, as we secularists understand it. Therefore, the establishment of a religious state in Gaza would be enough for Hamas for a long time and it may keep silent about the liberation of Palestine objective if it would lead to a secular Palestinian State. That was the case with the Muslim Brotherhood when it ruled Egypt for a short period. They claimed that confronting Zionism could be postponed until the state building is achieved, and that respecting the humiliating treaties with the enemy was necessary in order to build that state. It is not surprising that they failed, because the general public were not interested in building an Islamic state as much as they aspired for freedom, liberty, the right to work, ensuring education, health and a minimum of a decent living.

Where will Hizbullah stand if it were to be tested whether it stands with the Arab national project or with the Persian project, when the authority of 'Wilāyet Al-Faqih' in Iran ceases to exist and Iran becomes, as it is entitled to, a strong nation-state in the region?

Chapter 17

The Imperialist Role

I shall try in this chapter to show how the role of Imperialism in the crisis in Islam, whether in setting up political movements, supporting others, or subjugating Muslims, has been a major element in the crisis and how it has benefited Imperialism in pursuing its objectives.

The year 1492 is a significant year in the modern history of humankind. It signals the beginning of the last 500 years of modern Western Imperialism that has gone uninterrupted in one form or another. In that year, two major events took place. In one, Christopher Columbus landed on the East coast of the Americas, which landing led to the most 'disgraceful' ethnic cleansing of the land, part of which was documented by the American writer Helen Jackson as having led to the killing of millions of ethnic Americans in one century in the USA alone.²¹² Two consequences of that landing are worthy of note. Firstly, it set the precedent that Europeans have a natural right to settle any land even if that meant the extermination of its original inhabitants. This has gone on since 1492 and manifested itself in such places as Australia and Palestine with this conviction becoming part of the European psyche. Secondly, it exposes the sense of superiority at the heart of European intellect, which has manifested itself when we read of Columbus having 'Discovered' America. It seems that the Europeans believe they have a natural right to decide

when history starts in having decided that the Americas and their inhabitants did not exist until the Europeans came, just as much as they have the right to decide the 'End of History'²¹³.

The second significant event of 1492, which is related to the cleansing of the Americas, is the fall of the last Muslim kingdom in Spain²¹⁴. The clearly striking Imperialist feature about the end of Muslim rule in Spain is that, to my knowledge, this is the only incident in history in which an invasion led to the total eradication of a religion in one state. Islam, which prevailed in Spain for some eight centuries, did not exist after 1492.

Since 1492, European Imperialism has consisted of a chain of roles by different European states. From the Portuguese Colonialism to the Zionist Imperialism they all share the common features of being based on Judeo-Christian values, intending to subjugate, exploit, and dominate.

In the last few decades, a lot was said and written about the so-called 'Clash or Dialogue Among Civilizations'²¹⁵, in an attempt to refer to a conflict between Christianity and Islam. I believe that the use of the term 'civilization' in characterizing the conflict is unfortunate. In order to talk about a conflict between Civilizations, we need to identify these Civilizations, which are supposed to be in conflict. However, I submit that there are no such Civilizations today. There is neither an Islamic Civilization nor a Christian Civilization in existence to have a dialogue.

Without entering into a philosophical discussion about the definition of civilization, it suffices to say that if we assume that they existed in the past, such as under the Holy Roman Empire or the 'Abbāsīd Empire, they do not exist today. What could unite a Norwegian and a Namibian to form a Christian Civilization or an Iraqi and an Indonesian to form an Islamic Civilization?

There is no conflict between Civilizations today. The Conflict is between European Imperialism (which includes all offshoots of Europe such as the EU, US, Australia, Canada and Israel) and the ideology of Islam.

European Imperialism discovered as early as the Crusades that Islamic ideology was a formidable challenge to its design to dominate the world. It should be made clear that Imperialism does not have an issue with the political Islamic order but it does oppose Islamic ideology. Islamic ideology, which Imperialism confronts, consists of the principles, which Muslims consciously or subconsciously assimilate from the Qur'an and the Prophet's conduct. Principles like refusing to submit but to Allah and refusing the Capitalist system of exploitation and accumulation of wealth are only a small sample of how Islam is anathema to Imperialism. It is Islamic ideology, which Zionist Imperialism today finds the true opponent. Thus, it has no problem with some fifty so-called Muslim states but considers Hizbullah a serious threat to its objectives in the Arab World.

The European Imperialists played two major roles in the formation and evolution of the current crisis in Islam. It did not escape the notice of the numerous Orientalists, some of whom have studied Islamic history more deeply than modern Muslim scholars, the nature of the political schism in Islam that dates back to the beginning of the mission. It is not so hard to realize that the Caliphate system of Government was a political system with some religious connotations. It was the decision of clans of Quraysh to assume political power using the Prophet's legacy as legitimization. In doing so, the clans of Quraysh, which I have already identified in previous chapters, ensured that their rejection of the House of Muhammad, which later became the 'House of 'Ali' as the Prophet had no descendants except through Fātima and 'Ali, was maintained.

In order to achieve that, the elders of these clans of Quraysh created their hierarchy of Companions of the Prophet upon whom they bestowed titles and praise all alleged to have been made by the Prophet. The practices and policies of those Companions later became an extension of the Prophet's Sunnah and thus an integral part of Islamic Shari'a and Islam in general. Any attempt to question the assumption that the Companion's practices were not Sunnah amounted to near apostasy: a label that most Muslims wanted to avoid. This political establishment, which I referred to in this book as the 'House of 'Aisha', was set up on the day the Prophet

passed away by 'Aisha's father, Abu Bakr. Most of the Arabs outside Quraysh were indifferent to the political struggle inside Quraysh and thus had no problem with the new political set up so long as it provided them with stability and prosperity with money pouring in from invaded land outside Arabia. The non-Arabs who converted to Islam had no option but to accept Islam as offered by the Quraysh political establishment, who to them logically appeared as having been a true representation of the Prophet's will having been his Companions.

The small percentage of Arabs and non-Arabs who chose to identify themselves, in varying degrees and for different reasons, with the 'House of 'Ali' came to be considered by the Sunni fuqahā as outside mainstream Islam. Those followers of the 'House of 'Ali' who came to be known as Shi'a of 'Ali or simply Shi'a, despite being a small twenty percent of Muslims, have played a role much greater than their size because of geography. If we exclude those in the Indian subcontinent, the Shi'a live in the vital area on both sides of the Gulf through Iraq, across southern Turkey, down through eastern Syria to south Lebanon in the area, which the Wahnābis call 'the Shi'a Crescent'. This enclave in the Muslim world is not just significant in geopolitical terms as it bridges Europe and Asia, but is also significant in being rich in gas and oil reserves.

It would be difficult for any Imperialist power considering action to dominate the world, to overlook this reality and

consider ways of exploiting it to its advantage. The British Imperialists, having realized that eradicating Islamic ideology was impossible, decided that the only way was to contain Muslims. Containing them was easiest through controlling Arabia because the Bedouin by nature are the weakest in belief leading to the possibility of easy control and manipulation. More significant is the fact that controlling Mecca means controlling Muslims especially outside the Arab world. Thus, Wahhābism was invented as outlined earlier.

The creation of Wahhābism sowed the seeds of today's destructive campaign. Wahhābism is a revival of Salafi ideology as expanded by Ibn Taymiyyah. That Salafism asserts that Shi'a in general and the esoteric among them specifically are apostates and infidels who must be eliminated. It is obvious even for the novice in politics to appreciate the potential of such a weapon when required to set Muslims against each other in the location and time required. Setting Wahhābis against Shi'a is the best weapon the Zionist Imperialists have discovered. One quick look at the scene in the Arab world today suffices. Fifty years ago, everyone talked about the Arab-Israeli conflict. Today everyone talks about the Sunni-Shi'a conflict. This is Zionism's golden age!

The Imperialists went on, as outlined earlier in this book, to back and support other Islamic fundamentalist movements in the Arab world to oppose both Communist and Arab Nationalist movements. Although the

Imperialists understood the formidability of Islamic ideology, they also believed that the fundamentalist Islamic movements represented aspirations to power and not the implementation of ideology and thus constituted no danger to the Imperialist objective.

Massive reserves of oil were discovered in the 20th century in the Arabian Peninsula, which dramatically changed the scene and opportunities. The Imperialists started pumping oil like water from wells to run their machinery and support their economy. But part of that massive revenue was given back to the Bedouin in return for guarding its fields and ensuring no locals agitate or question that exploitation. The Bedouin were advised by their Imperialist masters, once they satisfied their lustful desires, to put some of that money to good use in promoting their image in the Muslim world. Large sums of money were spent on extending and improving the holy shrine in Mecca, which ensured them merits with the massive naïve and gullible Muslims, who have never read the verse: “Have you made the providing of water for the pilgrim and the maintenance of al-Masjid al-Haram equal to [the deeds of] one who believes in Allah and the Last Day and strives in the cause of Allah? They are not equal in the sight of Allah. And Allah does not guide the wrongdoing people.” [At-Tawba 9:19] They also embarked on a massive campaign of building mosques all over the Muslim world and providing them with Wahhābi preachers. That in my mind was their greatest political success, as no other political

system has ever had such an opportunity like that which the Mosque in Islam grants in the form of a political platform camouflaged as religious.

Equally significant in the Imperialist role of assisting the Salafi Wahhābi movement has been the design and implementation of a strategy to control the media, which has become, with the advent of digital communication, the most powerful tool in manipulating public opinion and consequently affecting political decisions. The setting up of satellite TV channels like Al-Jazeera, which initially portrayed independent impartial reporting to acquire the confidence of its viewers, could be cited as one example. Once the trust of the public was acquired, it was easy to use it as the powerful tool to manipulate public opinion as has been demonstrated clearly in reporting the civil war in Syria. The number of TV channels spanning the waves of satellites in the service of Salafi ideas and in every language are too many to count. The Wahhābis bought most publishing houses ensuring no books exposing their history and politics are available to read.²¹⁶ I believe that there are only a few Arab dailies which are neither fully owned by one Wahhābi or another nor have a pro-Sa'udi editor or reporters in its staff.

It is not difficult to appreciate the scale of the Imperialist success in having enabled the Wahhābis to dominate the media in the Muslim world in general.

By the 1980s, the Soviet Union had stagnated to the extent that enabled the testing of its will. Afghanistan was a good place to do so. The Wahhābis were called upon to do their part in serving their masters the Imperialists. They recruited men from all over the Arab world; had them trained by the CIA; paid for the whole operation and sent them to fight the Soviet army which was supporting the communist government of Afghanistan. The outcome of this operation is more serious than has been yet acknowledged. Firstly, it showed the weak resolve of the Soviet Union, which gave rise to activities that led a few years later to its early disintegration. Secondly, it signaled the new political role of Salafi Islam. Thirdly, it created the new CIA mercenaries in the Arab world who came to be known as the Arab 'Mujāhedeen', so much so that the word has entered the English dictionary. It was from among those Mujāhedeen that Al-Qaeda was born with the Wahhābi money and the Imperialist training and equipment. Those Mujāhedeen went back to their respective countries to recruit more members for Al-Qaeda and await the next move. It is not inconceivable that Osama bin Laden and his colleagues had already had or developed later their own ambition of separating themselves from the Imperialists and setting up their own Islamic state. But that does not change the fact that all those Mujāhedeen and their whereabouts were known to the Zionist Imperialists. It is ludicrous to suggest, as some seem to imply today, that the CIA did not know those men who came later to be leaders of Al-Qaeda and its offshoots

in Iraq, Syria, Libya, Egypt, Yemen and elsewhere. Intelligence services are not charities.

The beginning of the 21st century and following the mystery of 9/11 witnessed the ascension of Zionism to the highest state of Imperialism, which gave birth to the Zionist Imperialism I use in this book. Zionist Imperialism indicated that its plans for the century are going to do away with the UN Charter that was drafted and agreed upon by the World States post WWII, and to breach most principles of International Law that have been agreed upon over the last two centuries. The manifestation of this policy came in the invasion, occupation and dismantling of Iraq, a founding member of the UN. Once this was achieved, the revival and activation of sectarian strife was initiated. The details of these policies as implemented by the US ruler of Iraq Paul Bremer are documented in other books.²¹⁷ Firstly, Bremer armed the Shi'a militia on the grounds that they fought Saddam Hussein. Once they completed the dirty work, which the US could not carry out, the US moved to arm the Sunni awakening (Sahwa) militia on the grounds that they needed to defend themselves against the Shi'a militia excesses. Between 2005 and 2007 and under US watch, some horrendous sectarian crimes were committed in Iraq by both sides. Following that short sectarian war, Al-Qaeda became an attractive recruiting network for dissatisfied Sunnis who either lost power, members of families or wealth or their homes. The sectarian appeal prevailed and Al-Qaeda, to

the delight of the Imperialists and with their backing, continued to build their cells. When the time came, they defeated the not-so-professional Iraqi army, which was built by the US after having dismantled the professional Iraqi army in 2003, and succeeded in extending their control from the small enclave in Syria to include the Governorates of Mosul, Salāhuddeen, Diyāla and Anbar in Iraq.

Syria was the next country to be dismantled after Iraq as part of the Zionist plan to rewrite the borders of the Arab world, having scrapped the failed nation-state system created by the Sykes-Picot agreement. In the case of Iraq, it was possible to invade after having blockaded it for more than twelve years, depleting its military and destroying its economy and instilling desperation in its people. However, no such situation existed in Syria, which still maintained a relatively strong army with a serious arsenal of chemical weapons and a missile capability to deliver them to Israel, whose superiority in the Middle East remains the main objective of Zionist Imperialism. Following the invasion of Iraq, the US offered President Assad of Syria a proposal, which ensured that the regime would be safe so long as it recognized the hegemony of Israel and dissociated itself from Iran.²¹⁸ When Assad rejected the Imperialist offer, the signal went out to the Salafi movement in Syria to go into action. This was timed with the preparation in Northern Africa for regime changes, which the Imperialists refer to as the 'Arab

Spring', although it has been anything but a Spring. Libya, which had been a stable and prosperous state for some forty years, ceased to exist as a state and degenerated into gangs of killers and looters on tribal and town bases. Tunisia is in serious turmoil looking into the dark tunnel of fundamentalist threat. But Syria, because of a multitude of reasons, needed a more elaborate scheme than those implemented in Libya and Tunisia. The Muslim Brotherhood, Al-Qaeda and some disgruntled other groups were all activated by different outside handlers. Turkey, Sa'udi Arabia and Qatar put all their resources to that effect. The result has been more than four years of massive destruction, suicide bombing and killings the like of which would have been assumed fantasies a few years earlier. Parts of Syria have since been outside the Government's control where the Salafis run their own model of the dark ages which they call an Islamic State. But the important outcome so far has been the destruction of the Syrian economy beyond repair, the weakening of its army and the removal of chemical weapons, all for the benefit of Israel.

The expansion of an Al-Qaeda offshoot, which called itself IS, then ISIS or ISIL as more commonly known, from Syria to Iraq, may not have been precisely what the Zionist Imperialists wanted when they supported it to destroy Syria. But it should be accepted that such fundamentalist movements might develop their own agendas despite the resistance of their masters and sponsors. The Imperialists

planned the destruction of Syria to end the last Arab Nationalist stronghold in the Arab world. They did not intend the Salafi control to reach Iraq where the regime and Government were installed by the US as a reliable ally after the eradication of the Ba'ath Nationalist there. But the Salafi found an opportunity to expand into Iraq where corruption has become the norm and people were dissatisfied with phony democracy brought by the US. The Salafi had their own independent reason for expanding into Iraq. Iraq was being run by Shi'a Muslims for the first time since the rule of 'Ali bin Abi Tālib between 656 and 661 AD. There is no bigger enemy for the Salafi than Shi'ism and thus once they established their rule on the Euphrates in Syria, it was a golden opportunity to link that with Iraq and set up a Salafi Caliphate to the exclusion of Shi'a, 'Alawites and Sunni alike.

I am not going into an argument about who created Al-Qaeda and consequently the ISIL as it will not serve the purpose of this analysis. The creation of a political movement is relevant to its functions and objectives. But failing to do so does not diminish the possibility of deciding the objectives of that movement by deciding who benefits from those objectives. All that those Salafi movements have done so far has been destruction, killing and creating instability in the countries in which they have been active. Their call for the setting up of a Salafi Islamic State means the elimination of all others; something which has been demonstrated in the destruction of all religious

sites, enslaving war-captive women and killing people on evidence of belonging to a sect that is not affiliated to Salafism as they define it. The natural outcome of such ideology and practices means the disintegration of these states, like Iraq, Syria and Libya today, into splinter statelets based on sectarian or ethno-sectarian bases. That is precisely the Zionist objective in the area so that Israel can lawfully be called a Jewish state as one of the many religious and sectarian entities and the most powerful and dominating among them. It also fits the Oded Yinon Plan to cause internal friction within neighboring Islamic states, thereby neutralizing their consolidated objection to the atrocities of the Zionist entity.²¹⁹

The theatrical display of the Imperialist in the so-called coalition fighting ISIL does not convince anyone. Fighting ISIL needs no display of air power. If the Imperialists are genuine about fighting ISIL, the method is clear and had already been tested by them before in Iraq. For the sake of brevity I shall summarize is as follows.

1. Three main clients of the Zionist Imperialists in the Middle East, Turkey, Sa'udi Arabia and Qatar, have been supporting ISIL according to US Vice-President, Joe Biden.²²⁰ Both Sa'udi Arabia and Qatar should be ordered and not requested, to desist and they will both comply just as fast as Hamad bin Jāsīm, former PM and Foreign Minister of Qatar, packed and left without a single comment once ordered by the US to

do so.²²¹ Once money and media support for the Salafi cease, the movement could hardly afford to recruit new fighters from among the impoverished brainwashed Muslim masses.

2. Turkey, which may not be easy to order, has to function within the rules of NATO and not is allowed to get the latter entangled in a conflict in which it has no interest. NATO could advise Turkey that it would not be in its best interest to have a fundamentalist Islamic state on its borders and that Turkey should close its borders to ISIL. It would be difficult for Turkey to refuse despite its aspiration for a revival of the Ottoman rule of the Middle East, which may not particularly be an objective of NATO.

3. Closing the Turkish borders against ISIL will end the insurrection in Iraq and Syria in a few months. ISIL needs the Turkish borders because all its supplies of equipment and men come through it. ISIL has no factories in its small enclave in Syria or Iraq to manufacture tanks, armored carriers and the thousands of four-wheel drive cars, which have to pour in from across the Turkish borders with approval and support of the Turkish authorities. As there are no indigenous Chechens, Uzbek, Tajik or their like in Iraq or Syria, then closing the Turkish borders would dry up the supply of men to ISIL.

4. The Zionist Imperialists who control the world banking system can stop the flow of money into the hands of ISIL and its affiliates. Every transaction in dollars in the world has to pass through New York. It is inconceivable that money paid by Qataris or Sa'udis going through that system could not be followed and verified. In the banking system of today, when the transfer of any large sum is investigated for money laundering, it would be very hard to see how the tens of millions allegedly paid by the Qatari Government to free hostages in the hands of terrorists in Turkey could not have been followed and frozen later. Stopping the flow of money to terrorist stops terrorism!

5. In the slim likelihood of the above suggestions failing, the Imperialists could resort to the Iraqi model, which worked better than their wildest dreams. The UN Security Council should be summoned within hours as happened in the case of Iraq and a solid Resolution, like (661/1990) passed, imposing total blockade against the ISIL enclave in Syria and Iraq. It worked in Iraq for twelve years and led to the easy collapse of the Iraqi state. In the case of ISIL it should work in one year. We need not talk about the war against the ISIL taking years as President Obama has been telling us.

The above clear and lawful means do not escape the attention of any observer of the situation. So why is it that none of it has been even attempted? The answer is simple: the Imperialists are not serious about fighting the Salafi

movements in the Arab world, because the objective of Salafi movements serves the Imperialist objective. So long as the Salafi movements function within these limits serving the Imperialist objective then they would be supported. Once they become a threat to Imperialism, they will be taken out with a 'shock and awe' attack beyond anything they have ever imagined before.

Earlier I alluded to the possibility of deviation in objectives between the Salafis and the Imperialists. One such deviation happened when ISIL expanded into Iraq encroaching on an Imperialist client state. The help given to the Salafis was for dismantling Syria. Iraq has been a staunch ally of the Zionist objective since 2003 and its puppet regime has had several treaties with the Zionists for its protection, in return for its compliance with the Zionist policies in the new Middle East. This uncalculated outcome created a dilemma for the Imperialists. On the one hand, their main objective of eliminating the last Arab Nationalist base in the Middle East is being achieved at the hands of ISIL and all other Salafi movements. While on the other hand one of these Salafi movements has encroached on the Zionist ally in Iraq. The Imperialists had to come to save their Iraqi client regime, which they left without a professional army after they occupied it in 2003. The dilemma now is that they want to protect the regime in Baghdad and in order to do so they must weaken ISIL. But weakening ISIL will be enabling Damascus to defeat the ISIL and its affiliates, which means the victory of Damascus

and the failure of the plan to dismantle Arab Nationalism. This explains the half-hearted campaign by the imperialists against ISIL. I believe that if the choice is between saving the Iraqi regime leading to saving the regime in Damascus and losing the Iraqi regime and toppling the Ba'ath in Damascus, the Imperialists will opt for the latter.

Any party seriously interested in combating terrorism should support and cooperate with the only government in the World, which has been fighting terrorism for the last four years plus. Any power that does not support Damascus in its fight against terrorism is in fact an ally of the terrorist irrespective of what it does or says. Fighting terrorism must assume top priority and other matters of dispute relegated to second order. The truth of the matter, which has exposed Zionist Imperialist objectives, is that it is not interested in fighting terrorism. It is only interested in eradicating Arab Nationalism and protecting the Zionist enclave.

So far I have attended to one role of the Imperialists in the crisis in Islam, namely that of setting up or supporting fundamentalist Islamic movements. However, there is another no less serious role which the Imperialists played which has been contributing to fueling the recruitments to these movements.

The incursions of the European Imperialists ceased following the end of the Crusaders enclave in greater Syria in the thirteenth century. One reason was that going

through its transformation in separating the State from the Church, which kept them busy with their own internal affairs. The other reason was that the Arab World was generally under Ottoman domination in one way or another. Europe was not ready yet to take on the Ottomans. The situation started to change at the beginning of the 19th century when France invaded and occupied Algeria declaring it part of France until a bloody struggle costing some one million lives ended that occupation in 1962. The slow advance of other Europeans together with France led to all of Arab North Africa becoming occupied or under direct control of European Imperialists.

Similar encroachments were taking place in the Arabian Peninsula. Following the setting up of Wahhābism as explained earlier, the British Imperialists occupied South Yemen (Aden) in 1839 and stayed there until 1963. With the control of the Sultan of Muscat being nominal on the Omani coast, the whole southern coast of the Arabian Peninsula was under British control. On the eastern side of the Arabian Peninsula, the East India Company, the arm of the British Imperialists, started setting up its base on the west side of the Gulf. The 19th century was cleverly used by the British in creating alliances between different small Bedouin clans and encouraging them to settle along the western side of the Gulf. Although officially the area extending from the Basrah coast down to the borders of Oman was under the political and military control of the

Governor of the Wilāyet (Governorate) of Basrah, the Ottoman rule's weakness and corruption was so prevalent that it was not so difficult for the British Imperialist to assume a de facto control of that side of the Gulf.

On the eve of the WWI British Imperialism was not only in control of the whole Arabian Peninsula and Gulf but it had already strangled the future state of Iraq by having severed from it the district of Kuwait and its exit to the deep waters in the Gulf.

The end of WWI, which witnessed the end of the Ottomans and consequently the end of the Muslim Caliphate for the first time since 632, led to further control of the Arab World when the Sykes-Picot Agreement made between Britain and France in 1916 was implemented. In short, the whole Arab world post WWI was under control of European Imperialism either directly as in Iraq or by proxy as in Arabia.

The two decades between the major European wars of the 20th century witnessed questioning the right of the European to be in control of the Arab World, indeed just as much as it was in other parts of the world. Communists, Arab Nationalists and Islamists all took part in the struggle seeking an end to occupation and domination. The Islamists had the easiest task among the Arab masses. The appeal was very simple and effective. Muslims had lived under Muslim Caliphate and Islamic Shari'a for twelve centuries being masters of themselves and at time

prosperously. Now they were being enslaved by the infidel Europeans. The way to salvation would be to go back to Islam. It is not difficult to see how effective such a simple call has been. The Hāshemite ruling family in Jordan has never been able to rid itself of the charge that it had failed in its religious duty when it sided with British infidels against the Muslim Ottoman Caliph in WWI.

The more brutal the occupation and its oppressive measures became, the easier it was for the different Islamic movements to recruit. Equally significant was that the Islamic movements capitalized on the failure of the Arab Nationalist regimes to deliver on their promises.

The two major scenes of crimes committed by Zionist Imperialism in the Arab world stand out as the main trigger for the success of Islamic fundamentalism - Palestine and Iraq. The creation of the state of Israel and the massive cleansing of Palestine of its ethnic Arab inhabitants has been at the heart at Arab and Muslim disillusionment with Imperialism. No one, who does not attempt to understand what the Arabs call the 'Nakba' catastrophe of Palestine, will be able to understand the Muslim psyche today. I am not going to elaborate on the rejection by the Arabs of the expulsion of Palestinians or the failure of the Europeans to understand the refusal of the Arabs to accept ethnic cleansing as happened in Australia and the Americas. These are matters outside the scope of this book. But it suffices to say that nothing has

served the cause of the Muslim fundamentalists as much as the catastrophe of Palestine has.

The genocidal blockade of Iraq between 1990 and 2003 directly and indirectly killed a percentage of Iraqis greater than any conventional war has done to a single country in the 20th century. It was then followed by a brutal invasion and occupation which dismantled the Iraqi states; dissolved its military apparatus; killed hundreds of thousands and opened the gates to sectarian wars that killed hundreds of thousands more. This triggered so much hate among Muslims that led to recruitments for Al-Qaeda in droves from all over the Muslim world. The explanation used by Al-Qaeda has been simple: the Islamic State of Iraq was beginning to cause some irritation to the Zionist hegemony in the Middle East. The Zionist Imperialists have yet to refute that argument!

I believe that I have shown in the above presentation how the Imperialists have played two roles in fermenting the current crisis in Islam. On the one hand, the Zionist Imperialists occupied the Arab World; humiliated its people and dictated terms of surrender leading many people to find only refuge in returning to the promise which Islam gives in salvation. On the other hand, the Imperialists themselves assisted in setting up movements or in supporting existing or rising new movements calling for a return to Salafi Islam. The two roles are not mutually exclusive so long as the rising new Islamic movement does not represent a threat to the State of Israel. There are no

such indications as the Salafi movements have asserted that their objective is to build a purely Salafi state on Muslim land. That would mean cleansing that land of whoever opposes the Salafi ideals but that would not be adverse to the interest of Israel. Indeed, it may be a blessing in having such a backward state on the border of the technically advanced European enclave in the center of the Middle East.

Chapter 18

What Future for Muslims?

I started this book intending to look into the roots of the current crisis in Islam. I believe that I have outlined the main causes that gave rise to the intense current crisis, bearing in mind that it is not a new crisis but has been heightened by several factors including especially the horrendous attacks of Western Imperialism of the last century against three generations of aspiring Muslims lost in the myriad years of their history.

It is inconceivable that I can conclude my project without shedding some light on what I think awaits Muslims this century, and what they and others may do about it. Following on from my analysis, it becomes obvious that two parties need to consider what to do in order to break the vicious cycle of terror tearing the Muslim world apart and spilling over to other non-Muslim countries. Both Muslim religious and political leaders and Imperialist planners ought to heed this call.

It is not enough for religious or political leaders to appear day in day out simply stating that what the Salafis are doing today is not part of real Islam, like I have already argued throughout this book. Most of those politicians and all the clerics know that they are in a dilemma. On the one hand, they are eager to dismiss the murderous image of Islam which these Salafi movements are presenting to the world. But on the other hand they cannot refute the Salafi

argument that they are adhering to the path of the 'righteous predecessors', which the clerics themselves consider as untouchable.

Muslim leaders need to set up a Commission, whether under auspices of The Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC) or another forum, whose task would be to reread; reconsider and possibly reinterpret Islamic history and the theological legacy. Naturally, this call applies to other religions. Islam is not simply being singled out but Islam is in urgent need of this review because the religion itself is being used as an excuse for terror. No other religion is currently implicated in heralding such a campaign. This Commission should consider among other things the following issues.

Real Islam is exclusively embodied in what the Prophet delivered in the text of the Qur'an and what can be asserted within the Qur'anic principles as having been said or done by the Prophet: "And what Allah restored to His Messenger from the people of the towns - it is for Allah and for the Messenger and for [his] near relatives and orphans and the [stranded] traveler - so that it will not be a perpetual distribution among the rich from among you. And whatever the Messenger has given you - take; and what he has forbidden you - refrain from. And fear Allah; indeed, Allah is severe in penalty."(Al-Hashr 59:7) Any other action or principle added later by Companions or fuqahā should not form part of Islam, as has been accepted by Muslims generally in adding such political

constructs as consensus of the fuqahā, or by some analogous construct. It is an insult to Allah to claim that when He delivered His message He left a few things out for others to complete. It should be obvious that He only left things out because these matters were not integral to His message.

1. Since there is no reference in Qur'an or the life of the Prophet to indicate otherwise, then Islam should be accepted as a religion deciding the relationship between man and his creator and between man and man. It is not intended by Allah to be a political economic system for His Kingdom on Earth as has been propagated for centuries.
2. In asserting that Islam is a religion, there is no denial of the fact that moral obligations are imposed by Allah on His creatures to be good; do good deeds and refrain from harming life or nature. Muslims as part of this creation, who had the message delivered by the Prophet Muhammad at that particular juncture in human history, should be guided by the Hadith attributed to him when asked what is Halal and Haram, He replied that 'Halal [admissible] is clear and Haram [forbidden] is clear' indicating that instinctively we were created knowing the path.
3. While religious principles are static, state matters are dynamic: "Whoever is within the Heavens and Earth asks Him; every day He is bringing about a matter." (Ar-Rahmaan 55:29). Thus while matters

like prayers, their times and paying alms are unchanging, means of contracts and marriage ceremonies for example should change with time as part of the changing nature of the state.

4. Since the Qur'an does not specify the nature of the political or economic systems under which Muslims should live, then it is not axiomatic to argue that an Islamic State can be established. It is possible to argue that a political system may borrow some noble principles from Islam relating to man's obligations to his fellow citizens, but that does not mean that Allah has made that a Divine Law simply because some fuqahā had said so.
5. Allah has purposely left essential matters intended for the running of a state out of his message because it is His Eternal Will that religion and state should be separate, contrary to what people in the 'West' have been led to believe. One such example is that of the lack of a coherent philosophy of punishment, which every state requires in order to establish peace and security. Allah's wisdom determines that such matters are dynamic and should be adjusted according to time and place and not eternal principles.
6. The fact that the principle of a Caliphate did not exist in Qur'an or Prophet's life indicates that the later assertions of the fuqahā that, at the heart of Islam was the setting up of the Caliphate, has no basis. The Prophet himself, despite living more

than twelve years in Medina, did not set up a state in the political and economic sense or create a state apparatus as required by a state nor declared himself a Caliph. He ruled a community of the faithful just like Jesus did. It would be bizarre to suggest that as soon as the Prophet departed it was discovered that Islam needed a state apparatus, which the Prophet had overlooked.

7. The Islamic State created by Abu Bakr, and practised since, was an innovation imposed by necessity to legitimize authority and not according to Allah's Will.
8. Islam was meant for the Arabs, as the Qur'an determines that every people should have a message in their own tongue before they are punished for disobeying. "And We did not send any messenger except [speaking] in the language of his people to state clearly for them, and Allah sends astray [thereby] whom He wills and guides whom He wills. And He is the Exalted in Might, the Wise." (Ibrāhim 14:4), "Whoever is guided is only guided for [the benefit of] his soul. And whoever errs only errs against it. And no bearer of burdens will bear the burden of another. And never would We punish until We sent a messenger." (Al-Israa 17:15)
9. Spreading Islam by the sword is and would always be contrary to Allah's will. "Fight in the way of Allah those who fight you but do not transgress. Indeed.

Allah does not like transgressors.” (Al-Baqara 2:190)

10. Islamic invasion of states outside the land of the Arabs is a heinous crime as determined in the Qur'an.
11. Killing a soul contrary to the principles set out in Qur'an in three stated occasions is as unforgivable a crime as that of killing all humankind.
12. The Killing, pillage, capture of slaves and so on are totally alien to Islam and repugnant barbaric acts carried out by the pre-Islam Arabs which Islam came to put an end to "Then is it the judgement of [the time of] ignorance they desire? But who is better than Allah in judgement for a people who are certain [in faith]" (Al-Maaida 5:50)
13. No principle not specified in Qur'an or clearly proven to have been decreed by the Prophet should be automatically assumed to be Islamic because one of the Prophet's companions had decreed it. Infallibility should be restricted to the Qur'an and the Prophet. "Nor does he speak from [his own] inclination." (An-Najm 53:3)

These are but some of the essential matters which leaders of Islam need to discuss and come to a consensus upon. Once such a task is accomplished, then history should be rewritten for the new generations in the objective light of the above considerations and they should not be restricted by the fear of criticising the 'predecessors'. The

only restrictions Muslims should impose on their rereading of their history are the Qur'an and Sunnah of the Prophet.

In considering the Sunnah of the Prophet, Muslim leaders ought to carefully consider all the Hadiths and practices which have been attributed to the Prophet in the light of the Qur'anic principles, common sense and basic moral values, before attributing them to the Prophet. The most simple argument to refute a Hadith or practice attributed to the Prophet is that since there are no means of verifying events or reporting, then errors are possible especially since matters are being reported from times when even writing was scarce and language was going through a major transformation even in its writing as the alphabets did not have dots or diacritic, being a sign placed above or below a or letter to indicate that it has a different phonetic value, is stressed, or what vowel is associated with it.

Having looked at what the Muslims need to do in order to understand where they stand in human history, it is time to shed some light on what the Imperialist ought to do, not out of generosity or good heart of the Imperialist, but out of necessity dictated by the facts of Globalization, which some Imperialists thought that human history had ended up with. Imperialism thrives on the principle of the open market which marks its channels of exploitation. Thus any process that would hinder such freedom of movement of capital or goods or investments ought to be resisted because it effectively hinders the principles of a

free market on which Imperialism thrives. It is imperative for the Imperialists to come to terms with the current state faced by Muslims. It is not enough for them to rely on the old policies of buying some leaders, threatening some and intimidating others.

But in order for the Imperialist planners to understand the current state of affairs they need to appreciate the core roots of their rejection of Islam as a formidable force. Although I said earlier in the book that the West has found Islam a formidable obstacle to Capitalism on which Imperialism pins its objectives, the rejection has even deeper philosophical reasons, which I shall try to present.

The West has held a sense of superiority above the rest of humanity during the last five centuries brought about by its ability to subjugate the rest of humanity and produce the long and durable technological advances and improvements in the general standard of life. However, the West has been consciously or subconsciously suffering from an inferiority complex in its need to borrow its religions. Despite all the material and intellectual achievement, Europe had had to borrow its religions from the Semites. All the West religious beliefs come from the Semites; the Prophets are Semites; the Holy Books are in Semitic languages, and the codes of behaviour are Semitic. This reality has created a deep resentment as to why these superior people have to borrow the beliefs of the lesser Semitic people.

Such resentment has been displayed in different forms with some being so violent and bloody as happened in the treatment of Jews by the German Nazis which found great favour among many Europeans at its time. Christianity has been easier to accept through the clever mechanism of having presented Jesus as partly European through Paul, Rome and the Holy Roman Empire as if Jesus was slowly Europeanized. This may also explain why sects have arisen in the West among Christians, like the Pentecostals, the Laestadians or the Mormons, all claiming to be Western home-grown churches.

But not so for Islam which still seems alien, so much so that many European cities refuse to allow mosques with minarets to be built, not because of the architecture which some of them exhibit, because the rejection is not based on architectural or urban considerations. The rejection of Islam and what it represents, as a formidable intellectual barrier to the arrogant Western ideologies, baffles the mind. The more resistance the Muslims put up the more vicious the European reaction becomes. The invasion and destruction of Iraq is one of the most evident and recent examples of this conflict. It really had nothing to do with a fictitious threat, which Iraq allegedly posed to Europe, but was more as a lesson to a disobedient Muslim state refusing to accept to submit to European domination. Maybe in six centuries from now when Islam will be as old as Christianity is today, attitudes will change but six centuries is a long way to go.

Western Imperialism has to understand and accept this realization and deal with it not because of love for Muslims or kind consideration for humanity but out of self-interest. Imperialism depends on Capitalism as its arm of control and domination. Capitalism needs free movement of people, goods and money. Instability preventing such a safe movement would be detrimental to Imperialism. In the past Imperialism dealt with disobedience by threat of force. This will not work with young men and women who are chasing death. How can you intimidate a teenager who drives a car loaded with explosives straight at you?

With millions of young men and women, some of whom have been born and raised in the West, willing to die and take people and property with them, Imperialism has to rethink its ideas and practices in earnest. It is time the West stopped denigrating Islam and humiliating Muslims as it has been doing for two centuries. It is time the West stopped sending its armies to invade Muslim land, providing the Muslim fundamentalists with the fuel needed to mould young people's minds about the Western conquest. More importantly, the West has to stop believing that it has a divine right to impose its will on others and tell them how they should live. Europe should reconsider the use of such ludicrous phrases as 'Judeo-Christian values' to distinguish itself from others in general and Islam in particular. There are no such values in reality. There are no common values uniting a Sri Lankan Catholic

to a Norwegian Protestant to a Falasha from Ethiopia in order for such a phrase to have any meaning other than being a euphemism for Imperialism.

There is a serious element in the new wave of Salafi terror. It is not comprised of illiterate peasants who can be bought or appeased. Most of those enlisting are highly educated with specific engineering, medical and scientific skills. When some of those are born in the West it becomes a serious domestic matter to deal with and cannot be dismissed as a problem across the seas, or as one of mind-altering indoctrination.

Both Muslim leaders and Imperialists planners must consider taking notice of the above suggestion as one way of tackling the crisis in Islam. Failing to do so would only mean looking into the abyss where more violence against Muslims will feed more terror and more suicide bombers all over the world – a dark prospect indeed- although not for the oligarchs who thrive on the ensuing chaos to use force to grab resources and impose their restrictive laws.

NOTES

¹ Al-Qaradhāwi is one controversial Sunni cleric of Egyptian origin, currently a citizen of and resident in Qatar with full support from the authorities. He has been active in inciting hate among Muslims advocating setting up an Islamic state in Syria and actively calling for financial support of armed rebels there. It has not missed the observation of many that Al-Qaradhāwi seems to be content with Qatar whose political system is an affront to Islam and all that it represents.

² All the English interpretations of Qur'anic verses in this book were taken from the "Electronic Qur'an" of the King Sa'ud University: quran.ksu.edu.sa

³ The story of the two sons of Adam as told in the Qur'an is similar to that recited by tradition among the Semites and told in the Bible. The verses in the Qur'an describing the vent end with the lament of cane on his failure.

"And recite to them the story of Adam's two sons, in truth, when they both offered a sacrifice [to Allah], and it was accepted from one of them but was not accepted from the other. Said [the latter], "I will surely kill you." Said [the former], "Indeed, Allah only accepts from the righteous [who fear Him]."

If you should raise your hand against me to kill me - I shall not raise my hand against you to kill you. Indeed, I fear Allah, Lord of the worlds. Indeed I want you to obtain [thereby] my sin and your sin so you will be among the companions of the Fire. And that is the recompense of wrongdoers."

And his soul permitted to him the murder of his brother, so he killed him and became among the losers.

Then Allah sent a crow searching in the ground to show him how to hide the disgrace of his brother. He said, "O woe to me! Have I failed to be like this crow and hide the body of my brother?" And he became of the regretful."(Al-Maaida 5:27-31)

⁴ Al-Qaeda was created when Osama bin Laden and his fellow so-called Arab Mujāhedeen set up an organization in which Muslim volunteers from all over the world were trained by CIA and financed

and supported by the Sa'udi Government and thousands of individual Arabs especially from Arabia and the Gulf, in order to fight the Soviet army, which was backing the communist government in Afghanistan in the 1980s. This reality is not in dispute today. It suffices to remind people that Hillary Clinton, the former Secretary of State appears on video admitting that the US created Al-Qaeda. See for example: <http://tv.globalresearch.ca/2012/05/hillary-clinton-admits-us-government-created-al-qaeda>

⁵ For an expansion on this see for example: Al-Ani Abdul-Haq & Al-Ani, Tarik (2015) '**Volume II, Genocide In Iraq: The Obliteration of a Modern State**', Clarity Press, Atlanta, GA., pp. 189-192

⁶ These were the rulers of their countries at the time this chapter was originally written in Arabic.

⁷ Umma is an Arabic word that has come to hold a religious connotation despite its having originally many meanings such as religion or time, among other meanings. However, in this verse the word is accepted to mean the group of people around the Prophet. This led to the concept that Muslims form a Nation (Umma) in that sense, and thus the call of Muslim fundamentalist for the unity of the Muslims of the world as opposed to the call of Arab Nationalists for the unity of the Aran people.

⁸ There are numerous verses in the Qur'an describing Allah. Scholars and fuqahā have disagreed on whether Allah has names only or names and attributes. In one verse He describes himself as:

"He is Allah, other than whom there is no deity, the Sovereign, the Pure, the Perfection, the Believer (Mu'min), the Overseer, the Exalted in Might, the Compeller, the Superior. Exalted is Allah above whatever they associate with Him." (59:23)

As He has bestowed his name Mu'min on people who truly believe in Him then it has been accepted that the believers have acquired some holiness through his benevolence.

⁹ There will be examples of these atrocities cited throughout this book. The term 'righteous predecessors' will appear recurrently in the book. It stands for the Arabic term 'As-Salaf As-Sālih'. The Arabic word

'Sālih' means good or right, while the word 'Salaf' means predecessor. It is this last word which gave rise to the generic word 'Salafi' meaning "one who identifies with the predecessors" and the word 'Salafiyya' meaning the movement aspiring to take the Muslim Umma back to the rule of the 'righteous predecessors'.

¹⁰ Fuqahā is the plural of faqih. The origin of this word is found in the following verse of the Qur'an: "And it is not for the believers to go forth [to battle] all at once. For there should separate from every division of them a group [remaining] to obtain understanding in the religion (yetefeqqahu), and warn their people when they return to them that they might be cautious." (9:122). From the verb (yetefeqqahu) meaning to gain sound religious knowledge the subject (faqih) has been derived meaning the man versed in religion. The closest word in English for 'fiqh' is 'jurisprudence'. It is generally accepted that there are three main schools of 'fiqh' in Islam, Sunni, Shi'a and Ibādhi with each of them having its own sub divisions.

¹¹ The Arabic word Hadith generally means a 'saying'. However, it has become accepted when used on its own to mean the saying of the Prophet which in fact means any of the saying that has been reported as having been said by the Prophet. The study of gathering, compiling and commenting on Hadith has become a discipline within the study of Islam. There is no unanimity regarding the authenticity of these Hadiths. This dispute is very serious because Muslims accept that a Hadith from the Prophet has the same authority as a verse of the Qur'an. As there are three main schools of fiqh, it follows that each of them has had its own collection of 'Hadith'. Among the Sunnis the collection of Hadith has been referred to as 'Sahih' meaning 'correct or authentic'. Among such major collections which are considered authorities in Sunni Islam are '*Sahih Al-Bukhāri*' and '*Sahih Muslim*'. Other schools of Islam apart from Sunnis such as 'Shi'a' and 'Ibādhi' have different collections of Hadith narrated by different people. Some of these Hadiths agree with the Sunni narrations in meaning and not necessarily in text but others differ widely giving rise to strong feelings on the different views in interpreting what the Prophet did and did not say.

¹² Arabs in general and Muslims in particular call Ibrāhim (Abraham) the Father of Prophets, as all the Prophets of the Semites until Muhammad descended from him. The tradition about Ibrāhim among the Arabs and that of the Bible are similar but not identical. Among the discrepancy is the building of Ka'ba by Ibrāhim. According to Arab tradition, Ibrāhim who was neither a Christian nor a Jew, built it as the house for his Arab wife Hajir and his eldest son Isma'il. This house became the Holy house for the Arabs before Islam in which they kept their Idols, and when Islam victored, became the centre of worship and pilgrimage. There are scattered references in the Qur'an supporting this tradition. Three examples are given here.

"And [mention] when Ibrāhim was raising the foundations of the House and [with him] Isma'il, [saying], "Our Lord, accept [this] from us. Indeed You are the Hearing, the Knowing." (Al-Baqara 2:127)

"Our Lord, I have settled some of my descendants in an uncultivated valley near Your sacred House, our Lord, that they may establish prayer. So make hearts among the people incline toward them and provide for them from the fruits that they might be grateful." (Ibrāhim 14:37)

"Have we not established for them a safe sanctuary to which are brought the fruits of all things as provision from Us? But most of them do not know." (Al-Qasas 28:57)

¹³ Quraysh is the name given to a number of clans that constituted the tribe. These clans go back to Nadhar Ibn Kenāna Ibn Khuzaima Ibn Mudrika Ibn Ilyās Ibn Mudhar Ibn Nizār Ibn Ma'd Ibn Adnān. Adnān is accepted by Arab Historians as being a descendant of Isma'il son of Ibrāhim but there is no agreement on the full lineage between them. As-Saqqa, Mustafa, Al-Abiari, Ibrāhim & As-Shibli, 'Abdul-Hafidh, eds., (1955) "**Sirat Ibn Hishām**" by "Abdul-Malik Ibn Hishām, (Arabic), Al-Halabi Bookshop, Cairo, Vol. 1, pp. 1-3, Reproduced electronically at: Shamela.ws/browse/book-23833#page-24

There are several stories about where they originated before dispersing. One slightly credible story is one related to several quotations from the Imāms descendants of the Prophet which all

seem to repeat an often quoted statement made by 'Ali Ibn Ali Tālib as quoted by Ibn Mandhoor in Lisān Al-Arab:

"A man asked 'Ali (PBUH): Tell me Amir of Faithful about your origin you Qurayshis. He responded: We are people from Kutha". Ibn Mandhoor goes on to tell us that Kutha is in fact the town in Iraq where Ibrāhim was born. (See entry of word: **Kutha** in Lisān Al-Arab produced electronically in:

<http://www.baheth.info/all.jsp?term=%D9%83%D9%88%D8%AB%D9%89>)

It is also called **Cuthah**, or **Cutha** (Sumerian: **Gudua**) modern **Tell Ibrāhim**.

These clans remained dispersed until they were united together by the powerful Qusay Ibn Kilāb (400-480 AD) the fourth grandfather of the Prophet, who settled in Quraysh in Mecca.

Al-Baghdādi, Muhammad Ibn Habib (1985) "**Al-Munammaq fi Akhbār Quraysh**", (Arabic) Khursheed Ahmed Farouq (ed.), A'alem Al-Kutub, Beirut, pp. 19-22

¹⁴ It was stated earlier that Quraysh consisted of several clans. The most important for us in relation to Islam and understanding what happened later are the following clans:

- Hāshim Ibn 'Abd Manāf (Prophet's family)
- Umayya Ibn 'Abd Shams Ibn 'Abd Manāf ('Uthmān Ibn 'Affān and Umayyad Dynasty)
- Asad Ibn 'Abdul 'Uzza Ibn Qusay (Prophet's wife, Khadija, family)
- Zuhra Ibn Kilāb Ibn Murra (Prophet mother's family)
- Taim Ibn Murra Ibn Ka'b (Abu Bakr's family)
- Adey Ibn Ka'b Ibn Lu'ay ('Umar's family)
- Makhzoom Ibn Yaqdhe Ibn Murra Ibn Ka'b (Khālid Ibn Al-Walid's family)

Ibn Hazm, Abu Muhammad 'Ali Ibn Ahmed Ibn Said (undated) "**Jamherat Ansāb Al-'Arab**", ed. 'Abdus-Salām Muhammad Haroon, (Arabic) Dar Al-Ma'ārif, Cairo, Fifth edition, Reproduced Electronically at: <http://www.reemoshare.com/files/4023.pdf>

¹⁵ There are stories about people like Salmān Al-Fārisi who came from Persia, suffered hardship and converted from Magus faith to Christianity; sold as a slave and arrived in Arabia to await the call of the Prophet of whose coming he was advised by the last Christian monk he met in Syria. One version of his story is told in: As-Saqqā, Mustafa et al, "**Sirat Ibn Hishām**", op.cit., Vol. 1, pp.214-220, Reproduced electronically at: Shamela.ws/browse/book-23833#page-237

¹⁶ Abu Tālib's Valley: The events of what happened to the Prophet and the Hāshemites is told in many of the biographies and history books. We reproduce part of one such report.

"Around the sixth year of the Prophet's mission the elders of Quraysh met and signed an agreement in which they took oath to boycott the Hāshemites so that they would not deal with them; contact them; sell or buy, marry from or marry to until they disown Muhammad and hand him over..... Muhammad's uncle, Abu Tālib, gathered Banu Hāshim and a few of their followers in his valley outside Mecca where they stayed for three to four years ending just before the order to immigrate to Medina on the tenth year of the mission..... The Hāshemites suffered great hardship during these years because they were not able to deal with the people of Mecca and Arabs from outside who visited Mecca dared not deal with them as they stood the risk of having their property confiscated by Quraysh. The Hāshemites managed through these difficult years on Khadija's wealth and items smuggled by some sympathisers from Mecca and silent believers. They had another access as they were allowed to attend the two trades seasons of Mecca held every year in the seventh and twelfth months of the lunar year and thus were able to trade with Arabs from outside Quraysh"

Al-Ghorawi Muhammad Hadi (1417H) "**Mawsui'at At-Tārikh Al-Islami**", (Arabic), Mejma' Al-Fikr Al-Islami, Qum, Reproduced Electronically at:

<http://www.al-shia.org/html/ara/books/lib-tarikh/mawsua1/tar00024.htm#link105>

¹⁷ Al-Lāt and Al-'Uzza are two of the idols worshipped by Arabs before Islam. They are mentioned in the Qur'an in: "So have you considered

Al-Lāt and Al-'Uzza" (53:19). Al-Lāt was worshiped mainly by the tribe of Thaqeef. There had been many explanations about the meaning of the word. I believe that it is the feminine word for Allah where the masculine letter (ha) was converted to the feminine letter (ta). Al-'Uzza was worshiped by Quraysh along with other tribes. It is worth reporting that one of the Hadiths attributed to the Prophet states that: "With the passing of day and night Al-Lāt and Al-'Uzza will be worshiped again".

See: **Sahih Muslim** 2907 a, Book 54, Hadith 65, Reproduced Electronically at:

Sunnah.com/muslim/54/65

¹⁸ 'Ali, Jawād (2001) "**Al-Mufassal fi Tārikh Al-'Arab Qabla-l-Islam**" (Arabic), As-Saqi House, Volume 11, pp. 252-253, Reproduced Electronically at: shamela.ws/browse.php/book-7299#page-3774

¹⁹ As-Saqqa, Mustafa et al, "**Sirat Ibn Hishām**", op.cit., Vol. 2, pp.442, Reproduced electronically at:

Shamela.ws/browse/book-9896/page-996

²⁰ One version of the details of what happened on that Thursday as reported told by Ibn Abbās is given here.

When Allah's Messenger was on his deathbed and in the house there were some people among whom was 'Umar Ibn Al-Khattāb, the Prophet said, "Come, let me write for you a statement after which you will not go astray." 'Umar said, "The Prophet is seriously ill and you have the Qur'an; so the Book of Allah is enough for us." The people present in the house differed and quarrelled. Some said "Go near so that the Prophet may write for you a statement after which you will not go astray," while the others said as 'Umar said. When they caused a hue and cry before the Prophet, Allah's Messenger said: "Go away!". Narrated 'Ubaidullah Ibn 'Abbās used to say, "It was very unfortunate Allah's Messenger was prevented from writing that statement for them because of their disagreement and noise."

Sahih al-Bukhāri 5669, Vol. 7, Book 75, Hadith 30, Reproduced electronically at: Sunnah.com/bukhari/75

²¹ The Arabic word 'Muhājireen' (accusative form of Muhājiroon) means migrants and refers to the early Muslims who migrated from Mecca to escape the torture of Quraysh. The first such migration took place in the fifth year of the mission to Ethiopia, but the main migration took place in the thirteenth year of the mission when all the Muslims were ordered to migrate to Medina after which the Prophet set up his community. The word 'Ansār' means 'supporters' as it is derived from the Arabic verb (Nesere) meaning to lend support. The word 'Ansār', when used on its own, has come to mean the people of Medina who converted to Islam and lent support to the Muhājireen from Mecca. The Arabs of Medina before Islam consisted mainly of two tribes, Aws and Khazraj, who went on feuding until Islam put an end to it. There are several references in the Qur'an to them and their position Islam and in the Kingdom of the Lord. Two such examples are given here:

"And the first forerunners [in the faith] among the Muhājireen and the Ansār and those who followed them with good conduct - Allah is pleased with them and they are pleased with Him, and He has prepared for them gardens beneath which rivers flow, wherein they will abide forever. That is the great attainment." (At-Tawba 9:100)

"Allah has already forgiven the Prophet and the Muhājireen and the Ansār who followed him in the hour of difficulty after the hearts of a party of them had almost inclined [to doubt], and then He forgave them. Indeed, He was to them Kind and Merciful." (At-Tawba 9:117)

²² Ibn Al-Atheer in his history gives one short version of the events in the Shed of Banu Sa'ida. He reported a speech given by 'Umar Ibn Al-Khattāb during his reign as the second Caliph.

"We came and saw the Ansār holding a meeting in the Shed of Banu Sa'ida. Among them was a man wrapped up in thy raiment. When I asked who he was I was told he was Sa'd Ibn 'Ubāda being ill. One man from among the Ansār stood up and blessed Allah and then said: 'We the Ansār, the regiment of Islam and you Quraysh are among us and a group of you has slowly come to us who turned out to be planning to usurp our rights. By the time he finished I had planned to say something but as I wanted to do so I was told by Abu Bakr to hold my

tongue. Then Abu Bakr stood up; blessed Allah and said all I wanted to say. He said: 'You Ansār do not mention favour to Islam without being worthy of it. But the Arabs only know this matter in Quraysh who are the centre of the Arabs in place and lineage. I have chosen you of these two men'. He then took my hand and that of Abu 'Ubaida Al-Jarrāh. I had never hated a moment like this when he said that as I would have had wished my neck cut rather be ruling people among whom was Abu Bakr. When Abu Bakr finished one of the Ansār stood up and said: 'I am the solid root of the tree against which camels rub their bodies to heal and the support of the Palm tree, (Meaning I have had enough experience in life and am like the support required in great times). Let us have one prince from among you and one prince from among us'. This was followed by some noise and clamour. As it quietened I said to Abu Bakr 'Stretch your hand so that I swear allegiance to you' I did and then others followed me in swearing allegiance. We then all jumped on Sa'd Ibn Ubāda. One them said: 'You are going to kill Sa'd'. I said: 'May Allah kill Said'."

Ibn Al-Atheer, Izzud-Deen(1997) "**Al-Kāmil fit Tārikh**", (Arabic), ed. Tedmuri, 'Umar 'Abdus-Salām, Dar Al-Kitab Al-'Arabi, Beirut, Vol. 2, p. 189, Reproduced Electronically at: Shamela.ws/browse.php/book-21712#page-880

²³ The word "Caliph" appears twice in the Qur'an, [Al-Baqara 2:30], [Saad 38:26]. In the first verse Allah advises His Angels that He had chosen Adam as a 'Caliph' in the sense that man has been entrusted to inherit the Earth and all that is on it, acting as caretaker on behalf of its creator. This honour had been bestowed on man when Allah chose to create him in His image. The use in the second verse is different as Allah addresses David as having been chosen as 'Caliph' to rule. This honour has not been bestowed on any other Prophet in the Qur'an. Its uniqueness makes all the more reason that no man should use it in that sense as Allah chose it for David and David alone. Not even Muhammad used it to describe his role on Earth. How could any other Muslim assume it for himself or for others?

²⁴ Ibn Sa'd reports towards his biography of Sa'd Ibn 'Ubāda the following:

When 'Umar became Caliph he met Sa'd in a Medina road and said "Greetings Sa'd", and Sa'd said "Greetings 'Umar". 'Umar then said: "You are a companion of whom you accompany". Sa'd said: "that I am. The Caliphate has reached you and your companion (Abu Bakr) was dearer to us than you and I hate your company". 'Umar responded: "He who hates the neighbourhood of his neighbour has moved you from him". Sa'd said: "I am not pleased with it and am moving to the neighbourhood of better than you". Shortly after that he moved to Syria and died in Hourantwo and a half year into 'Umar's reign. Ibn Sa'd goes on to tell us how the myth about the Jinn having killed Sa'd reciting the famous line of poetry alleged recited by the Jinn:

We killed the head of the Khazraj, Sa'd Ibn 'Ubāda
Hit him with two arrows and not missed his heart.

People in Medina only heard of his death later and little concern was shown by the Muslim community about the mysterious death of one of the early believers among the Ansār.

Ibn Sa'd, Abu 'Abdillah (1990) "**At-Tabaqāt Al-Kubra**", (Arabic), 'Ata, Muhammad 'Abdul-Qadir, ed., Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiya, Beirut, vol. 3 p. 463, Reproduced electronically at:

Shamela.ws/browse.php/book-1686#page-1124

²⁵ Bay'a: The word bay'a and the verbs conjugations have been widely used in Islam and are even relevant today when we hear about people making Bay'a to the so-called Islamic State or any of the mushrooming fundamentalist Islamic movements. This is an attempt to understand the root of the word and its meaning in Islam. The origin of the word is the verb 'bā'a' meaning he sold or purchased. From it the verb 'Tebāy'a' was derived meaning made a deal and thus the word 'bay'a' meaning a deal as evolved. Although it has been used for making deals it also has come to mean making allegiance in the sense that when one does that he/she is explicitly selling himself to the man he is swearing allegiance to. The word 'bay'a' has not appeared in the Qur'an but the verbs from which it is derived have appeared in the Qur'an. The following four verses give the verb in which allegiance is intended. (Bargain here is allegiance)

"Indeed, Allah has purchased from the believers their lives and their properties [in exchange] for that they will have Paradise. They fight in the cause of Allah, so they kill and are killed. [It is] a true promise [binding] upon Him in the Torah and the Gospel and the Qur'an. And who is truer to his covenant than Allah? So rejoice in your transaction which you have contracted. And it is that which is the great attainment." (At-Tawba 9:111)

"Indeed, those who pledge allegiance to you, [O Muhammad] - they are actually pledging allegiance to Allah. The hand of Allah is over their hands. So he who breaks his word only breaks it to the detriment of himself. And he who fulfils that which he has promised Allah - He will give him a great reward." (Al-Fath 48:10)

"Certainly was Allah pleased with the believers when they pledged allegiance to you, [O Muhammad], under the tree, and He knew what was in their hearts, so He sent down tranquillity upon them and rewarded them with an imminent conquest." (Al-Fath 48:18) (This has since been referred to as 'The Tree bay'a')

"O Prophet, when the believing women come to you pledging to you that they will not associate anything with Allah, nor will they steal, nor will they commit unlawful sexual intercourse, nor will they kill their children, nor will they bring forth a slander they have invented between their arms and legs, nor will they disobey you in what is right - then accept their pledge and ask forgiveness for them of Allah. Indeed, Allah is Forgiving and Merciful." (Al-Mumtahana 60:12) (This is the 'The women bay'a' which the Ansār made in the first Aqaba).

²⁶ The position of Sa'd in Islam may be seen from the books of biography of the Prophet and other books of history. I shall take three examples from the biography of Ibn Kuthair to highlight his position in Islam and with respect to the Prophet. See:

Ibn Kuthair, Abul-Fida' (1976) "**As-Seera An-Nabawiyah (The Prophet's Biography)**" (Arabic), ed. 'Abdul-Wahid, Mustafa, Dar Al-Ma'rifa Liltiba'a WenNehsr Wet Tawzee', Beirut, Reproduced electronically at: <http://shamela.ws/browse.php/book-930>

In his coverage of the battle of Badr, the first battle between Muslims of Medina and the army of Quraysh, Ibn Kuthair talks of the Prophet calling on Muslims to make a stand saying:

'The Prophet, on hearing the arrival of Abu Sufyān, consulted his people. Abu Bakr spoke but the Prophet ignored him. 'Umar spoke but the Prophet ignored him. Sa'd Ibn 'Ubāda said: 'The Prophet means us the Ansār. I swear by He who holds my soul in his hands that if you wanted us to cross the oceans we would do; if you ask us to cross to hell we would do'. (Vol.2, p.394)

Later Ibn Kuthair quotes Ibn Abbās describing the battle of Badr saying:

'In the battle of Badr there were seventy of the Muhājireen and two hundred and thirty six of the Ansār. The flag of the Muhājireen was in the hand of 'Ali Ibn Abi Tālib and the flag of the Ansār was in the hand of Sa'd Ibn 'Ubāda'. (Vol. 2 p. 508)

On the Prophet's victoriously but peacefully entering Mecca Ibn Kuthair quotes Jābir Ibn 'Abdullāh saying:

'On the day of conquest of Mecca the Prophet pushed the flag of the army to Sa'd Ibn 'Ubāda who shook it and shouted 'Today is the legend day even the forbidden will be allowed.' ' (Vol. 3, p. 559)

²⁷ Uhud and Hunain are the two major battles which the Prophet fought and suffered failure which almost reached disaster but for last minute Divine intervention. But whose lessons were not lost to the faithful believers as it was intended. 'Uhud', which is the name of the mountain on which the battle took place, is not mentioned in the Qur'an but Hunain is. In both battles Muslims fled and left the Prophet with a handful of the faithful companions around him. Allah reproached the Muslims who fled from the battle. The verse of Uhud may be disputed but there is no dispute on Hunain.

“Allah has already given you victory in many regions and [even] on the day of Hunain, when your great number pleased you, but it did not avail you at all, and the earth was confining for you with its vastness; then you turned back, fleeing.” (9:25)

²⁸ There are two simple reasons that lend weight to the argument that Hadiths were fabricated. Firstly, it has been commonly accepted that the Prophet forbade anyone to write down his Hadith and insisted

that only the Qur'an be written. It was even narrated by Muslim in his Sahih (**Sahih Muslim** 3004, Book 42, Hadith 7147). Secondly, the massive number of Hadiths, running into tens of thousands, and the length of some of them makes it physically impossible for the Prophet to have said them in the short time during which some reporters had accompanied the Prophet. It is quite obvious why Hadiths were fabricated. Muslims would never refuse to follow an order from the Prophet. Any ruler after the Prophet needed to create a Hadith to impose any policy he desired. Without some of the fabricated Hadiths it could have been impossible for these policies to have been adopted. Even the laws of Islam would not have been developed as they did.

²⁹ Zaid Ibn Hāritha has a unique position in Islam because he is the only Muslim, apart from the Prophet, to be mentioned in name in the Qur'an. ".....So when Zaid had no longer any need for her, We married her to you in order that there not be upon the believers any discomfort concerning the wives of their adopted sons when they no longer have need of them. And ever is the command of Allah accomplished." (33:37) The position of Zaid and his son Osama in the eyes of the Prophet as will be seen here is very relevant to the poetical orientation of the elders of Quraysh who objected to any non-Qurayshi assuming any high position in Islam, which lends credence to my contention throughout this book. The following is a summary taken from **Ansāb Al-Ashrāf** which is not very different from other sources on both Zaid and his son Osama.

He is Zaid Ibn Hāritha Ibn Sheraheel Ibn 'Abdul-'Uzza Al-Kalbi. While his mother was visiting her parents, a group from the tribe of Qudhā'a attacked them and took Zaid as a slave. They sold in him 'Ukadh (a market in Mecca) to Hakeem Ibn Huzām Ibn Khuweilid who bought him for his aunt Khadija bint Khuweilid. When she later married Muhammad she gave him Zaid. Muhammad adopted him and he was called Zaid Ibn Muhammad.... When the Qur'an was revealed Allah ordered: "Allah has not made for a man two hearts in his interior. And He has not made your wives whom you declare unlawful your mothers. And he has not made your adopted sons your [true] sons. That is [merely] your saying by your mouths, but Allah says the truth, and He guides to the [right] way.

Call them by [the names of] their fathers; it is more just in the sight of Allah. But if you do not know their fathers - then they are [still] your brothers in religion and those entrusted to you. And there is no blame upon you for that in which you have erred but [only for] what your hearts intended. And ever is Allah Forgiving and Merciful.” (33:4-5). A group from Al-Kalbi tribe made pilgrimage to Mecca and recognized Zaid. On informing his father of their discovery he travelled with his brother and others on to seek Muhammad. They asked him to release Zaid and Muhammad gave him the choice and Zaid chose Muhammad over his people.

It is almost unanimously accepted that Zaid was the first man to believe in Muhammad's mission as he, Khadija and 'Ali shared Muhammad's house..... There are several Hadiths in which the Prophet is reported to have said that “Zaid is from me and the closet of people to me.” The Prophet married him to Um Aimen who gave him Osama.... When the Prophet paired the Muhājireen Muslims he paired Zaid to his (Prophet's) uncle Hamza Ibn 'Abdul-Muttalib and later when he paired the Muhājireen and Ansār he paired Zaid to Usaïd Ibn Hudhair, the elder of the Aws and one of the earliest Muslims in Medina... 'Aisha, the Prophet's wife, is reported to have praised Zaid on more than occasion. One such occasion is her description of that she never saw the Prophet half naked except once when Zaid came back from one mission and as soon as the Prophet heard his voice he rushed semi-naked to hug him and kiss him.... She summed up his position in Islam in having said: “The Prophet never sent Zaid in a military battalion except as its leader. He never left him in Medina except as his Caliph”.

Zaid was killed at the age of fifty in the battle of Ma'uta in southern Syria fighting the Romans and their Ghassāni allies in the year 8AH.

Osama Ibn Zaid whom the Prophet chose at the age of eighteen to lead the Muslim army in which he put all the elders like Abu Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthmān as soldiers, was so dear to the Prophet that Muslims used to call him 'the Love of Muhammad'. This favour was not well accepted by some people in Quraysh. When 'Abdullāh Ibn 'Umar compared himself to Osama Ibn Zaid, 'Umar told him 'He was closer to the Prophet than you and his father was closer to the

Prophet than your father'.....On one occasion Mu'āwiyā is reported to have said to Osama 'May Allah bless Um Aimen (Osama's mother)' To which Osama replied: 'By God she was better than Hind (Mu'āwiyā's mother) and noblest'. Mu'āwiyā questioned: 'And noblest?' to which Osama responded: 'Yes. "Indeed, the most noble of you in the sight of Allah is the most righteous of you. Indeed, Allah is Knowing and Acquainted." (49:13). It reports like these and the story of things said which angered the Prophet in his last few days that all add up to the political nature of the intentions of some of the elders of Quraysh on assuming power for the sake of power and not for the sake of Islam.

When the Prophet passed away and Abu Bakr was declared a Caliph he requested from Osama to relieve 'Umar Ibn Al-Khattāb, whom Abu Bakr needed, from his duty to serve in his battalion as the Prophet ordered Muslims to do. It is reported that Osama consented. However, it remains debatable whether Abu Bakr or even Osama had a say in defying the order of the Prophet even his passing away: "And whatever the Messenger has given you - take; and what he has forbidden you - refrain from." (59:7).

See: Al-Belāthuri, Ahmed Ibn Yahya Ibn Jābir (1996) "**Ansāb Al-Ashrāf**", ed. Zakkar, Suhail and Az-Zarkeli, Riyadh, (Arabic), Dar Al-Fikr, Beirut, 1996, Vol.1, pp.467-476, Reproduced electronically at: Shamela.ws/browse.php/book-9773

³⁰ The story of the battalion of Osama Ibn Zaid had been reported in most books of biography and history. Its significance is in that it reveals the political infighting even before the Prophet's passing away. I shall take a summary from the version given in **At-Tabaqāt**.

'On Monday four nights before the end of Safar (second lunar month) of the eleventh year AH, the Prophet ordered the people to prepare to fight the Romans (as a revenge for the battle of Ma'uta which the Muslims lost in the year 629AD /8AH). On Tuesday morning he called Osama and said: 'March to the site where your father was killed and trample upon them as I have given you command of this army. Invade them in the morning; move fast so that you are ahead of the news. If Allah grants you victory do not sat long. Use guides; send spies and

vanguards ahead'. On Wednesday the Prophet suffered from fever and headache. But on Thursday (the same Thursday referred to in note (9) above) he gave Osama the flag saying: 'Invade in the name of Allah in the cause of Allah and fight who disbelieve in Him'. Osama left and camped outside Medina.

None of the elders of Muhājireen or Ansār but joined the battalion of Osama including Abu Bakr, 'Umar Ibn Al-Khattāb, Abu 'Ubaida Ibn Al-Jarrāh, Sa'd Ibn Abi Waqqāss and others. Some people started complaining and whining saying: 'He (meaning the Prophet) appointing this young boy to lead these elders of the Muhājireen'. It reached the Prophet and extremely angered him. He came out despite his fever with a head-band and climbed the alter and said after blessing his Lord: 'Oh people what is this talk that had reached me about my appointment of Osama to lead you. You have challenged my appointment of Osama just as you did when I appointed his father Zaid to lead you. By Allah he was worthy of the leadership and his son is equally worth of leading you. He was one of the closest people to me. And they both are destined to great good. Follow him well as he is of your best'. He came down and entered his house. That was Saturday. The Muslims came to bid the Prophet farewell to join the battalion while the Prophet continuously saying: 'Send Osama's battalion'.

See: Ibn Sa'd, "**At-Tabaqāt Al-Kubra**", op.cit., Vol. 2, pp. 145-146

³¹ There has been a dispute on this Hadith between Sunnis and Shi'a throughout history. While the Sunnis refute it because its acceptance would mean that the Prophet had cursed some of the companions who are held in high esteem in Sunni theology, the Shi'a believe that it is a genuine Hadith. My reading of the events that surrounded the Prophet's order to send Osama's battalion and the hesitation of some to oblige lend support to the credence of it. I shall quote one non-Shi'a source in support of my belief, that of Ash-Shahristāni in '**Al-Milal wan-Nihal**' writing on the disputes between the Prophet's companions:

'The second dispute was during his illness when he said: "Prepare Osama's battalion. Allah curse whoever lagged behind the army of Osama". Some said we should obey his orders and follow Osama who

has left Medina. Others said that as the Prophet was so ill and we could not leave him then we should stay until we see the end of it'.

See: Ash-Shahristāni, Abul-Fath Muhammad Ibn 'Abdul-Kareem, "**Al-Milal wan-Nihal**" (Arabic), Al-Halabi Publishing, vol.1 p. 21, Reproduced electronically at: Shamela.ws/browse.php/book-11812

³² 'When the news of the 'Shed of Banu Sa'ida' conference reached 'Ali Ibn Abi Tālib, he asked: 'What did the Ansār say?' The responded: 'They said a prince from among us and a prince from among you (Muhājireen)'. He (PUH) said: 'had you not objected that the Prophet (PUH) enjoined that he who does good should be rewarded and he who does evil should be forgiven'. They responded: 'How is that to weigh against their demand?'. He responded: 'If the Caliphate was in them then there would have been no testament from the Prophet to care for them'. Then he asked: 'what did Quraysh say?' They said: 'That Quraysh contested that they were the Prophet's tree. He then said: 'The held on to the tree and lost the fruit'. (Sheikh Muhammad 'Abdeh commented saying: 'He meant by the fruit the Prophet's family').

See: 'Ali Ibn Abi Tālib (1412 AH),"**Nahjul Balāgha**" (Arabic), ed. Muhammad 'Abdeh, Iran, Vol. 1, p. 116.

³³ The dispute on the Caliphate between Banu Hāshim and other clans of Quraysh is as old as Islam. Its political nature could be best demonstrated in one conversation that took place between 'Umar Ibn Al-Khattāb and 'Abdullāh Ibn Abbās as reported by Ibn Abi Al-Hadeed Al Mu'tezili:

'Umar said: 'Oh 'Abdullāh what do your people say about preventing you from the Caliphate?'. Ibn Abbās responded: 'I don't know'. 'Umar said: 'Allah forgive! Your people (Quraysh) hated that you combine the Prophecy and the Caliphate; and you go in the sky wasteful and haughty...'

See: 'Ali Ibn Abi Tālib, "**Nahjul Balāgha**" (Arabic), ed. Ibn Abi Al-Hadeed Al Mu'tezili, Vol. 12, P. 53, Reproduced electronically at: www.balaghah.net/old/adm/_files/library/12.pdf

³⁴ See note 23 above.

³⁵ The Islamic State released his lineage to Muhammad as follows:

Ibrāhim 'Uwaid Ibrāhim decedent of Armoosh Ibn 'Ali Ibn Eed Ibn Bedri Ibn Badr Ad-Deen Ibn Khaleel Ibn Hussein Ibn 'Abdullāh Ibn Ibrāhim Ibn Yahya Ezzul-Deen Ibn Bashir Ibn Majed Ibn 'Atyyah Ibn Y'ali Ibn Duaid Ibn Majed Ibn 'Abdur-Rahmān Ibn Qāssim Ibn Idrees Ibn Ja'far Ibn 'Ali Al-Hādi Ibn Muhammad Al-Jawād Ibn 'Ali Ar-Ridha Ibn Mousa Al-Kādhim Ibn Ja'far As-Sādiq Ibn Muhammad Al-Bāqir Ibn 'Ali Zain Al-'Abedeem Ibn Al-Hussein Ibn 'Ali Ibn Abi Tālib and Fātima bint Muhammad.

<http://akhbardawlatislam.wordpress.com/>

³⁶ When the Prophet entered Mecca victoriously without a fight he had a short and significant conversation with its people. It is reported in his biography as follows.

'When the Prophet entered Mecca he gathered the people and asked them: 'What do you see me doing wit you?' They responded: 'A Magnanimous brother and a son of a magnanimous brother'. He said 'Go. You are Tulaqa' (the released)'.

As-Suhaily, 'Abd Al-Qāssim 'Abdur-Rahmān (2000) "**Ar-Rawdh Al-Ā'nif**",(Arabic) As-Salami, 'Umar 'Abdus-Salām, Dar Ihya' at-Turath Al-Arabi, Beirut, Vol. 7, P. 232, Reproduced electronically at: [Shamela.ws/ browse.php./book-1514](http://Shamela.ws/browse.php./book-1514)

It was a real example of forgiveness because many of the people of Mecca had killed and tortured Muslims and held enmity against them for twenty years. Yet the Prophet did not punish a single Meccan after he took the town. There is another important point to note here. As no one really knows who of the people of Mecca truly converted to Islam and how many pretended to have done so. the expression 'sons of Tulaqa', has come to stigmatize people on the ground that when one is referred to as such then there a presumption that his belief had not been established.

³⁷ The story of Al-Bara' praying to Mecca had been reported in many sources. This is an abridged version of it taken from Sirat Ibn Hishām.

"Ka'b Ibn Al-Qain, a forerunner from Ansār who had already witnessed Aqaba and swore allegiance to the Prophet, said that he went with a group of polytheists from Medina to pilgrimage in Mecca. Among the group was the elder and leader Al-Bara' Ibn Ma'roor. As they left Medina Al-Bara' said: 'I have an opinion and I am not sure whether you agree with me or not.....I believe that I shall never give my back to this structure (meaning Mecca) and should pray towards it'. We said that we have not heard our Prophet praying except towards Syria and we could not differ with him. Al-Bara' insisted so that when time of prayer arrived we used to pray facing Syria and he would pray facing Mecca.... He carried on parrying on towards Mecca long before Muslims were ordered to do so.

As-Saqqa, Mustafa et al, "**Sirat Ibn Hishām**", op.cit, Vol. 1, p. 439

³⁸ The two Aqaba referred to the swearing of allegiance by Ansār to Muhammad at the gully of 'Aqaba as shown in the following narration taken from Sirat Ibn Ishāq

First Aqaba

"In the following year (11th year of mission) 12 Helpers (Ansār) attended ..and met at Al-'Aqaba –this was the first 'Aqaba-.....These men were: As'ad Ibn Zurara, 'Auf Ibn Al-Hārith, Mu'adh Ibn Al-Hārith, Rafi' Ibn Mālik, Dhakwan Ibn 'Abdu Qays, 'Ubāda Ibn As-Sāmit, Abu 'Abdur-Rahmān Yazif Ibn Tha'lebe, Al-Abbās Ibn 'Ubāda, 'Uqba Ibn 'Āmir, Qutba Ibn 'Āmir Ibn Hadida, Abul-Haytham Mālik Ibn At-Tayhān, and 'Uwaym Ibn Sa'ida.....'Ubāda Ibn As-Sāmit told him that 'We gave allegiance to the apostle that we would associate nothing with God, not steal, not commit fornication, not kill our offspring. Not slander our neighbour, not disobey him in what was right; if we fulfilled this paradise would be ours; and if we committed any of those sins we should be punished in this world and it would serve as expiation; if the sin was concealed until the Day of Resurrection, then it would be for God to decide whether to punish or to forgive'..... When these men left, the apostle sent with them Mus'ab Ibn 'Umayr Ibn Hāshim.... And instructed him to read the Qur'an to them and teach them Islam and to give them instruction about religion. In Medina Mus'ab was called 'The Reader'; he lodged with As'ad Ibn Zurara.

Second Aqaba

Mus'ab returned to Mecca and the Muslim Ansār came to the fair there with the pilgrims of their people who were polytheists (the year was the 13th of the mission)...

'We slept that night among our people in the caravan until when a third of the night had passed we went stealing softly like sand grouse to our appointment with the apostle as far as the gully of Al-'Aqaba. There were seventy three with two of our women.....We gathered together in the gully waiting for the apostle until he came..... The apostle spoke and recited the Qur'an and invited men to God and commended Islam and then said: 'I invite your allegiance on the basis that you protect me as you would protect your women and children'. Al-Bara' (Ibn Ma'roor) took his hand and said:'By Him Who sent you with the truth we will protect you as we protect our women. We give our allegiance and we are men of war possessing arms which have been passed on from father to son'. While Al-Bara' was speaking, Abul-Haytham Ibn Al-Tayhān interrupted him and said: 'O apostle we have ties with other men (he meant the Jews) and if we sever them perhaps when we have done that and God will have given your victory you will return to your people and leave us?. The apostle smiled and said: 'Nay, blood is blood and blood not to be paid for is blood not to be paid for. I am of you and you are of me. I will war against them that war against you and be at peace with those at peace with you'.....The apostle said: 'Bring out to me twelve leaders (Nuqaba') that they make charge of their people's affairs' They produced nine from Al-Khazraj and three from al-Aws. (see note 39 on Nuqaba')

See: Sirat Ibn Ishāq, ed. Guillaume, A., ed. (1955), "**The Life of Muhammad- A Translation of Ishāq's Sirat Rasul Allah**", Oxford University Press, pp.198-204

³⁹ The twelve Nuqaba' according to Al-Belāthuri in Ansāb Al-Ashrāf are: From Aws Tribe: Usaid Ibn Hudhair, Abul-Haytham Mālik Ibn At-Tayhān, and Sa'd Ibn Khuthaime.

From Khazraj Tribe: As'ad Ibn Zerārah, Rafi' Ibn Mālik Az-Zarqi, Sa'd Ibn 'Ubāda, Al-Munthir Ibn 'Amro, Al-Bara' Ibn Ma'roor, Sa'd Ibn Ar-Rabee', 'Abdullāh Ibn Rawāha, 'Ubāda Ibn As-Sāmit, and Abu Jābir 'Abdullāh Ibn 'Amro.

See: Al-Belāthuri, “**Ansāb Al-Ashrāf**”, op.cit., vol. 1, p. 252

⁴⁰ One such Hadith in favour of the Ansār is narrated in Sahih Muslim: When Mecca was conquered, he (the Holy Prophet) distributed the spoils among the Quraysh. Upon this the Ansār said: It is strange that our swords are dripping with their blood, whereas our spoils have been given to them (to the Quraysh). This (remark) reached the Messenger of Allah, and so he gathered them and said: What is this that has been conveyed to me about you? They said: (Yes) it is that very thing that has reached you and they were not (the people) to speak a lie. Upon this he said: Don't you like that the people should return to their houses along with worldly riches, whereas you should return to your houses with the Messenger of Allah? If the people were to tread a valley or a narrow path, and the Ansār were also to tread a valley or a narrow path, I would tread the valley (along with the) Ansār or the narrow path (along with the) Ansār.

See: **Sahih Muslim** 1059 e, Book 12, Hadith 177, Reproduced electronically at:

Sunnah.com/muslim/12

⁴¹ See note 23 above.

⁴² The origin of the ten promised Paradise seems to be a hadith attributed to ‘Abdur-Rahmān Ibn ‘Auf who is himself one of the ten. The authenticity of the Hadith is challenged by the Shi’a in general. The ten are all from Quraysh with clan shown against each of them:

Abu Bakr Ibn Abu Quhāfa (Taim)

‘Umar Ibn Al-Khattāb (‘Uday)

‘Uthmān Ibn ‘Affān (Umayya)

‘Ali Ibn Abi Tālib (Hāshim)

Az-Zubayr Ibn Al-‘Awwām (Asad)

Talha Ibn ‘Ubaidullah Ibn ‘Uthmān (Taim)

‘Abdur-Rahmān Ibn ‘Auf (Zuhra)

Sa’d Ibn Abi Waqqāss (Zuhra)

Abu ‘Ubaida Ibn Al-Jarrāh (Harithi)

Sa’id Ibn Zaid Ibn ‘Amro (‘Uday)

See: Jami’ at-Tirmidhi, Book 49, Hadith 4112, Reproduced electronically at: Sunnah.com/urn/736260

See also: Ibn Hanbal, Ahmed (2001) "**Musnad Al-Imām Ahmed Ibn Hanbal**" (Arabic), Al-Arna'out, Shuaib, Murshid, Adil et al, Ar-Risala Establishment, Vol.3, p. 177

Shamela.ws/browse.php/book-25794#1182

⁴³ The following are excerpts from Ansāb Al-Ashrāf, Vol. 1:

'Ammār Ibn Yāsir Ibn 'Aāmir Ibn Mālik, p. 156.

First to declare Islam were Abu Bakr, Bilal, Khebbab, Suhaib, and 'Ammār, p. 158

'Ammār, his father Yāsir, his brother 'Abdullāh and his mother Sumayya were tortured for believing in Islam. The Prophet passed them (while they were being tortured) and said ' Be patient Yāsir's family. Your fate is Heaven', p.160.

Shamela.ws/browse.php/book-9773

⁴⁴ Narrated Abu Huraira:

Allah's Messenger said, "You see that the people are of different natures. Those who were the best in the pre-Islamic period, are also the best in Islam if they comprehend religious knowledge.

See: **Sahih al-Bukhāri** 3493, 3494, Book 61, Hadith 5

<http://sunnah.com/bukhari/61>

⁴⁵ The following is the narration of Ibn Abbās as reported in Sahih Al-Bukhāri in which Ibn Abbās reported a speech by 'Umar Ibn Al-Khattāb:

"(O people!) I have been informed that a speaker amongst you says, 'By Allah, if `Umar should die, I will give the pledge of allegiance to such-and-such person.' One should not deceive oneself by saying that the pledge of allegiance given to Abu Bakr was given suddenly and it was successful. No doubt, it was like that, but Allah saved (the people) from its evil, and there is none among you who has the qualities of Abu Bakr. Remember that whoever gives the pledge of allegiance to anybody among you without consulting the other Muslims, neither that person, nor the person to whom the pledge of allegiance was given, are to be supported, lest they both should be killed."

See: **Sahih al-Bukhāri** 6830, Book 86, Hadith 57
<http://sunnah.com/bukhari/86>

A different version of the same is given in *Ansāb Al-Ashrāf* as follows:
"Some men are saying the Bay'a of Abu Bakr was slip, Allah had saved us its evil and that the Bay'a of 'Umar was without consultation (Shura). The matter after me will be one of consultation (Shura).
See: **Ansāb Al-Ashrāf**, vol.5, p. 500.

⁴⁶ Following from the last note in which it was reported that 'Umar declared that the Caliph after him would be selected through consultation (Shura), it had been that after his stabbing, 'Umar decided to create a system of consultation in which the Caliph was to be chosen from a committee of six men whom he appointed. They were all from Quraysh with the clan and relation as shown:

'Ali Ibn Abi Tālib (Hāshim)

'Uthmān Ibn 'Affān (Umayya)

'Abdur-Rahmān Ibn 'Auf (Zuhra)

Sa'd Ibn Abi Waqqāss (Zuhra)

Az-Zubayr Ibn Al-Awām (Asad Ibn 'Abdul-'Uzza)

Talha Ibn 'Ubaidullah (Taym)

⁴⁷ 'Ammār Ibn Yāsir has already been covered in note 43 above.

Al-Miqdād

He is Al-Miqdād Ibn 'Amro Ibn Tha'lebe Ibn Mālik called Ibn Al-Aswad taking the name of his step-father who adopted him pre-Islam. (Sirat Ibn Hishām vol.2, p.561)

He was of the earliest Muslims in Mecca, emigrated to Ethiopia when life became difficult for Muslim especially for non-Qurayshis. He later emigrated with the Prophet to Medina and took part as a gallant night in all the Prophet's battles. Two samples of the numerous records of his position in Islam may be cited here.

In preparation for the decisive battle of Badr his commitment of behalf on Muhājireen is common knowledge and repeatedly quoted, He stood up and said: 'O Messenger of Allah, Go forth to what Allah ordered and we are with you. By Allah we will not say to you what

Banu Israel said to Moses “..so go, you and your Lord, and fight. Indeed, we are remaining right here.” (5:24). But we say 'Go with your Lord and fight and we are fighting alongside you. By Him who sent you with the Truth if you asked us to go along to 'Berk Al-Ghimād' (a place in Ethiopia) we would struggle to get there' (Sirat Ibn Hishām, vol. 1, p.651).

One Hadith narrated by Anas Ibn Mālik put Al-Miqdād in paradise. The Prophet is reported to have said: 'That Paradise longs for four: 'Ali, Abu Dharr, 'Ammār and Al-Miqdād' (Ansāb Al-Ashrāf, vol.2, p.122).

Abu Dharr

He is Jendeb Ibn Jenāda Ibn Sufyān Ibn 'Ubaid Ibn Hurām Ibn Ghifār. He is reported to have prayed before Muhammad declared his mission and was the fifth man to convert to Islam (Ansāb Al-Ashrāf, vol. 11, p.124).

He was a close companion of the Prophet so much so that when he did not join him in a battle or pilgrimage, the Prophet left him in charge of Medina. It is reported that he was in charge of Medina, in the Prophet's absence, during the battles against Banu Muhārib and Banu Tha'lebe in Najd in the fourth year of his mission and the battle against Banu Al-Musstaliq of Khuza'a in the sixth year of his mission (Sirat Ibn Hishām, vol. 1, pp. 203,209). The Prophet left Abu Dharr in charge of Medina during his pilgrimage to Mecca in the seventh year of his mission. (Ansāb Al-Ashrāf, vol.1, p. 353)

When the Prophet fraternized between the Muhājireen he paired Abu Dharr to Al-Miqdād (Sirat Ibn Hishām, vol.2, p. 561). And when he did that between Muhājireen and Ansār he paired Abu Dharr to Al-Munthir Ibn 'Amro As-Sa'idi, one of the Nuqaba' of Al-Khazraj. (Sirat Ibn Hishām, vol.1, p. 506)

Abu Dharr has been reported to have narrated many Hadiths as reported in the Sahihs. There are many Hadiths in praise of Abu Dharr. On such Hadith is that narrated by Al-Wāqidi saying that the Prophet said: 'The green (Earth) has not carried and the dust (Heavens) has not overshadowed one more truthful man than Abu Dharr'. (Ansāb Al-Ashrāf, vol. 11, p. 127)

⁴⁸ At-Tabari wrote one version of the events in the selection of 'Uthmān process which is abridged here.

'They (the six) entered and argued and then voices were raised and 'Abdullāh Ibn 'Umar said 'Glory Be to Allah, the Caliph has not died yet'. 'Umar heard and said: 'Leave it all of you. If I die then consult for three days.....Not a fourth day should come without you having selected a leader. 'Abdullāh Ibn 'Umar should attend as an advisor..... I believe no one but either of these two (Ali and 'Uthmān) will be chosen.....: Then he said to Abu Talha Al-Ansāri: '..choose some fifty strong men to encourage these men to select one from among them.' The he said to Suhaib: 'Lead the people for three days in prayer. Then enter these six and bring 'Abdullāh Ibn 'Umar and stand by. If five agree and one of them objects then cut his head. If four agreed and two refused cut the heads of the objecting two. If three choose one and the other three choose another then seek the judgment of 'Abdullāh Ibn 'Umar and the side he chooses should select one from among them. If they refuse the judgment of 'Abdullāh Ibn 'Umar then be with the side in of 'Abdur-Rahmān Ibn 'Auf. Kill the rest if they refuse to accept what the people agreed upon'.

See: At-Tabari, Muhammad Ibn Jarir (1387 AH), "**Tārikh At-Tabari**" (Arabic) vol. 4, p. 229, Dar at-Turath, Beirut, Reproduced electronically at: Shamela.ws/browse.php/book-9783

⁴⁹ 'Nevertheless, I remained patient despite length of period and stiffness of trial, till when he went his way (of death) he put the matter (of Caliphate) in a group (committee of six) and regarded me to be one of them. But good Heavens! What had I do with the 'consultation'? Where was any doubt about me with regard to the first of them so that I am now considered akin to these ones? But I remained low when they were low and flew high when they flew high. One of them turned against me because of his hatred (Sa'd is 'Abdur-Rahmān cousin and his mother is Hemle bint Sufyān Ibn Umayya of whom 'Ali killed so many), and the other got inclined the other way due to his in-law relationship ('Abdur-Rahmān was 'Uthmān's step son-in-law), till the third man of these people ('Uthmān) stood up with heaving breasts between his dung and fodder. With him the children of his grandparents (Umayya) stood up swallowing up Allah's wealth like a camel devouring the foliage of spring.....'

See: 'Ali Ibn Abi Tālib (2003) "**Nahjul Balāgha**", Peak of Eloquence, Translated by Sayyid 'Ali Reza. Ansāriyan Publications, Qum, p. 131.

⁵⁰ There are a few sources reporting the fleeing of 'Uthmān in both battles of Uhud and Hunain. One example of each is chosen here. On the battle of Uhud this is narrated in Al-Bukhāri:

" (the son of Muhib) An Egyptian who came and performed the Hajj to the Ka'ba saw some people sitting. He enquired, "Who are these people?" Somebody said, "They are the tribe of Quraysh." He said, "Who is the old man sitting amongst them?" The people replied, "He is 'Abdullāh Ibn 'Umar." He said, "O Ibn 'Umar! I want to ask you about something; please tell me about it. Do you know that 'Uthmān fled away on the day (of the battle) of Uhud?" Ibn 'Umar said, "Yes." The (Egyptian) man said, "Do you know that 'Uthmān was absent on the day (of the battle) of Badr and did not join it?" Ibn 'Umar said, "Yes." The man said, "Do you know that he failed to attend the Ar-Ridwān pledge and did not witness it (i.e. Hudaibiya pledge of allegiance)?" Ibn 'Umar said, "Yes." The man said, "Allahu Akbar!"

See: **Sahih al-Bukhāri** 3698, Book 62, Hadith 49, Vol. 5, Book 57, Hadith 48,
<http://sunnah.com/bukhari/62>.

In the battle of Hunain so many Muslims fled that the stories mostly talked about those who stood put around the Prophet and not those who fled as it was easier to remember the few than the many.

⁵¹ The noun Shura (Consultation) and verbs derived from it appears sparingly in Qur'an. Here are the relevant verses:

"..... And if they both desire weaning through mutual consent from both of them and consultation, there is no blame upon either of them. And if you wish to have your children nursed by a substitute, there is no blame upon you as long as you give payment according to what is acceptable. And fear Allah and know that Allah is Seeing of what you do." (Al-Baqara 2:233)

" And if they both desire weaning through mutual consent from both of them and consultation, there is no blame upon either of them. And if you wish to have your children nursed by a substitute, there is no

blame upon you as long as you give payment according to what is acceptable. And fear Allah and know that Allah is Seeing of what you do." (Aal-Imran 3:159)

"And those who have responded to their lord and established prayer and whose affair is [determined by] consultation among themselves, and from what We have provided them, they spend." (Ash-Shura 42:38)

The Muslim fuqahā, especially the Sunni among them, have written extensively that the Umma had chosen its Caliphate through consultation. But when asked to give evidence about the process and who took part in which stage, they would respond that it had always been the small group of faithful around one Caliph who had been consulted. How that amounted to Consultation among the Umma has not yet been demonstrated.

⁵² 'Aisha bint Abu Bakr is one of the Prophet's wives. She is held in high position by the Sunni Muslims and despised by Shi'a Muslims. Her enmity with 'Ali is no secret. Without going into reasons of the enmity, it suffices to say that being the Prophet's wife and daughter of the first Caliph she had become the centre of the circle around which all the enemies of 'Ali congregated. Equally for that reason she had become the focal point of hate for the Shi'a in general. The Sunnis reported many Hadiths in favour of 'Aisha, which the Shi'a contest. It should be pointed out that most of the Hadiths praising 'Aisha originate from her nephew 'Urwa Ibn Hishām which must impact negatively when it comes to objectivity. One example of the enmity is shown in the following narration in Al-Bukhāri which shows that 'Aisha did not even want to say 'Ali's name.

"'Ubaidullah Ibn 'Abdullāh told me that 'Aisha had said, "When the Prophet became sick and his condition became serious, he requested his wives to allow him to be treated in my house, and they allowed him. He came out leaning on two men while his feet were dragging on the ground. He was walking between Al-'Abbās and another man." 'Ubaidullah said, "When I informed Ibn 'Abbās of what 'Aisha had said, he asked me whether I knew who was the second man whom 'Aisha

had not named. I replied in the negative. He said, 'He was 'Ali Ibn Abi Tālib."

Sahih al-Bukhāri, 2588, Book 51, Hadith 22, Reproduced electronically at: <http://sunnah.com/bukhari/51>

⁵³ "Yes, if you remain patient and conscious of Allah and the enemy come upon you [attacking] in rage, your Lord will reinforce you with five thousand angels having marks [of distinction]." (3:125)

⁵⁴ One example from **Sahih Al-Bukhāri** goes like this:

"That he said to the Prophet "You have not been of any avail to your uncle (Abu Tālib) (though) by Allah, he used to protect you and used to become angry on your behalf." The Prophet said, "He is in a shallow fire, and had it not been for me, he would have been in the bottom of the (Hell) Fire."

Sahih al-Bukhāri 3883, Book 63, Hadith 109, Reproduced electronically at: <http://sunnah.com/bukhari/63>

⁵⁵ **Diwān Abu Tālib**. Collected with commentary by Abdul-Haq Al-Ani, Kufaan Publishing, 1991, London

⁵⁶ Hassān Ibn Thābit, (born c. 563, Medina, Arabia—died c. 674?), Arabian poet, best known for his poems in defense of the Prophet Muhammad.

Hassān had won acclaim at the courts of the Christian Arab Ghassānid kings in Syria and the Lakhmid kings of Al-Hirah in Iraq, where he met the poets an-Nābighah Ath-Thubyāni, and 'Alqamah. He settled in Medina, where, after the advent of Muhammad, he accepted Islam at about the age of 60. Hassān, who is said to have lived to be more than 110 years old, became Islam's earliest poetic defender. His poetry thrived under the traditional requirement that literary attacks be countered with satires on the offending poets. His writings in defense of Muhammad contain references to contemporary events that have been useful in documenting the period. He was also Islam's first religious poet, using many phrases from the Qur'ān in his verse. Much of the work ascribed to him in his diwān (collection of poetry) appears to have been falsely attributed to him from a very early date.

<http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/256671/Hassan-ibn-Thabit>

Ka'b Ibn Zuhayr was the eldest son of Zuhayr Ibn Abi Sulma, also a noted poet. He was also one of six men who refused the Prophet's call to accept Islam: All the other members of Ka'b's family (the Muzainah) became converts to Islam, and when his brother Bujair adopted the new faith, Ka'b wrote a bitter and sarcastic poem which came to the notice of the Prophet, and Ka'b was outlawed.

By means of a clever stratagem, however, Ka'b gained access to Muhammad and recited a famous eulogy, called, from the first two words, Bānet Su'ad. He was rewarded with the Holy Mantle that Muhammad was wearing (the Burda or Hirka-i Sharif), and converted to Islam. Ka'b is reported to have died soon after.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ka%27b_bin_Zuhayr

⁵⁷ The books of Shi'a Islam are loaded with Hadiths and stories about the merits of Ali. But the Sunni sources are not short of such Hadiths either. One such example is taken from Sahih Muslim.

'Amir b. Sa'd b. Abi Waqqāss reported on the authority of his father that Mu'āwiya b. Abi Sufyān appointed Sa'd as the Governor and said: What prevents you from cursing Abu Turāb (Hadrat 'Ali), whereupon he said: It is because of three things which I remember Allah's Messenger having said about him that I would not abuse him and even if I find one of those three things for me, it would be more dear to me than the red camels. I heard Allah's Messenger say about 'Ali as he left behind him in one of his campaigns (that was Tabuk). 'Ali said to him: Allah's Messenger, you leave me behind along with women and children. Thereupon Allah's Messenger said to him: Aren't you satisfied with being unto me what Aaron was unto Moses but with this exception that there is no prophethood after me. And I (also) heard him say on the Day of Khaibar: I would certainly give this standard to a person who loves Allah and his Messenger and Allah and his Messenger love him too. He (the narrator) said: We have been anxiously waiting for it, when he (the Holy Prophet) said: Call 'Ali. He was called and his eyes were inflamed. He applied saliva to his eyes and handed over the standard to him, and Allah gave him victory. (The third occasion is this) when the (following) verse was revealed:" Let us

summon our children and your children." Allah's Messenger called 'Ali, Fātima, Hassan and Hussein and said: O Allah, they are my family.

Sahih Muslim 2404 d, Book 44, Hadith 50, Reproduced electronically at: Sunnah.com/muslim/44

"Sa'd reported Allah's Apostle as saying to 'Ali:

Aren't you satisfied with being unto me what Aaron was unto Moses?"

Sahih Muslim 2404 e, Book 44, Hadith 51 Reproduced electronically at: Sunnah.com/muslim/44

It is unavoidable to notice that no Muslim had ever acquired such a position. Āron in Qur'an is a Prophet of equal status to Moses. By simply adding that there is no Prophet after Muhammad does not belittle 'Ali because it does not rule out that he was a Prophet alongside Muhammad relying on the much quoted verse: "And whatever the Messenger has given you - take; and what he has forbidden you - refrain from." (Al-Hashr 59:7)

⁵⁸ The Battle of the Camel

'Aisha, Talha and Az-Zubayr, both of whom had sworn allegiance to 'Ali and reneged on it, amassed an army and moved to fight 'Ali on the ground that he had not punished the killers of 'Uthmān. Both armies met outside Basrah of southern Iraq in Ramadhān in the year 63 AH. Needless to say that in the army of 'Aisha all opponents of 'Ali assembled, while in the army of 'Ali all his followers and those who kept their oath of allegiance united. This is a confirmation of my earlier assertion about the division between the House of 'Ali and the House of 'Aisha. In fact the battle of the Camel came to be known by this name because 'Aisha came from Medina on a camel and witnessed the battle while on its back. There is no book of history that had not covered the battle of the camel as a milestone in Islamic history. The following is a narration taken from ***Ansāb Al-Ashrāf***.

"As the two armies came close to each other it is reported that 'Ali advised Talha and Az-Zubayr not to fight and reminded them of the bay'a and invited 'Aisha to adhere to the Qur'anic order for the Prophet's wives to stay at home. Then he invited them to accept the judgment of the Holy Qur'an but that was refused. The battle then

ensued and ended before sunset. 'Ali won it after great deal of killing with one estimate making the number killed in 'Aisha's army to be around 4500. Talha and Az-Zubayr were both killed and 'Aisha was sent by 'Ali to Medina with a proper escort. There are several reports about who fought in Ali's army of the early Muhājireen and Ansār. They all agree that a large number of the early Muslims and Prophets' companion were on 'Ali's side. The number ranges from 80 to 130 men who fought with the Prophet in the first battle of Badr, who came to be known as the 'Badris'. The number of the other Prophet's companion who fought with 'Ali ranged between 800 and 1500. “

Al-Belāthuri, Ahmed Ibn Yahya Ibn Jābir (1996) “*Ansāb Al-Ashrāf*”, ed. Zakkar, Suhail and Az-Zarkeli, Riyadh, (Arabic), Dar Al-Fikr, Beirut, 1996, Vol. 2, pp.221-274, Reproduced electronically at: Shamela.ws/browse.php/book-9773

⁵⁹ Narrated in At-Tabari as follows:

“... When 'Aisha was on her way to Mecca she was met by 'Abd Ibn Um Kilāb. She asked him: what news? He said: they killed 'Uthmān and waited eight days. She said: what did they do then? He responded: the people met and reached the best result. They agreed on 'Ali Ibn Abi Tālib. She said: By Allah I wish my world ends if the matter ends up with 'Ali. Take me back. She left to Mecca saying: 'Uthmān has been unjustly killed. By Allah I shall seek revenge for his death. Abd Ibn Um Kilāb said: By Allah you were the first who turned against him. You used to say: 'Kill that old fool (Na'thal) as he has become an infidel'. She said: They offered him repentance and he repented and then killed him. My last saying in him is better than my previous one.

At-Tabari, Muhammad Ibn Jarir (1387 AH), “*Tārikh At-Tabari*” (Arabic) vol. 4, p. 458-459, Dar at-Turath, Beirut, Reproduced electronically at: Shamela.ws/browse.php/book-9783#page-2507

⁶⁰ The **Battle of Karbala** took place on Muharram 10, in the year 61AH of the Islamic calendar (October 10, 680 AD) in Karbala, situated in present day Iraq. The battle was between a small group of supporters and relatives of Muhammad's grandson Hussein Ibn 'Ali, and a much larger military detachment from the forces of Yazid I, the Umayyad caliph, to whom Hussein had refused to give an oath of allegiance.

Hussein and all his supporters were killed, including Hussein's six-month-old infant son, 'Ali Al-Asghar Ibn Hussein, with the women and children taken as prisoners. The dead are regarded as martyrs by both Sunni and Shi'a Muslims, and the battle has a central place in Shi'a history and tradition, and has frequently been recounted in Shi'a Islamic literature.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Battle_of_Karbala

The martyrdom of Hussein and massacre of Karbala has become so basic to Shi'a theology that it dominates every aspect of life for a Shi'a Islam. It has become the moving force behind all revolutionary Shi'a movements like Hizbullah in Lebanon.

⁶¹ Many books on Islamic history agree that a campaign to curse Ali in Mosques was initiated during the rule of Mu'awiya b. Abi Sufyān and only terminated by 'Umar bin Abdul Aziz. We refer to note 57 above where Sahih Muslim gives one version of it while outlining the merits of Ali.

⁶² Wahhābism is an Islamic extremist movement developed in the 18th and 19th centuries in tribal areas of the eastern Arabian Peninsula. The source of this new stream of thought was a Muslim scholar named Muhammad Ibn Abdul-Wahhāb, hence the name 'Wahhābism'. The premise of this new, narrow ideology was to reject traditional scholars, scholarship and practices under the guise of 'reviving the true tenets of Islam' and protecting the concept of monotheism. Ibn Abdul-Wahhāb's brand of 'purification' of Islam consisted of prohibiting many traditionally accepted acts of worship, reverence of the person of the Prophet Muhammad and the pious saints, and burning books containing traditional prayers, interpretations of law and commentaries on the Qur'an and Hadith.

<http://www.islamic supremecouncil.org/understanding-islam/anti-extremism/7-islamic-radicalism-its-wahhabi-roots-and-current-representation.html>

⁶³ "Ibn 'Abbās said to me and to his son 'Ali, "Go to Abu Sa'id and listen to what he narrates." So we went and found him in a garden looking after it. He picked up his Rida', wore it and sat down and

started narrating till the topic of the construction of the mosque reached. He said, "We were carrying one adobe at a time while 'Ammār was carrying two. The Prophet saw him and started removing the dust from his body and said, "May Allah be Merciful to 'Ammār. (He will be killed by the rebellious group, doing wrong). He will be inviting them (i.e. his murderers, the rebellious group) to Paradise and they will invite him to Hell-fire."

Sahih al-Bukhāri 447, Book 8, Hadith 96, Reproduced electronically at: <http://sunnah.com/bukhari/8>

"One who is better than I informed me that Allah's Messenger said to 'Ammār as he was digging the ditch (on the occasion of the Battle of the Ditch) wiping over his head: O poor son of Sumayya, you will be killed by a group that has gone astray."

Sahih Muslim 2915 a, Book 54, Hadith 86, Reproduced electronically at: <http://sunnah.com/muslim/54>

⁶⁴ See Notes 10 and 27.

⁶⁵ "He is Allah, other than whom there is no deity, the Sovereign, the Pure, the Perfection, the Believer (*Mu'min*), the Overseer, the Exalted in Might, the Compeller, the Superior. Exalted is Allah above whatever they associate with Him." (59:23)

⁶⁶ 'Ali Ibn Abi Tālib (1419 AH), "**Nahjul Balāgha**" (Arabic), collected by Ash-Shareef Ar-Radhi, ed. Faris Hassoan, (Letter 17 to Mu'āwiya), Iran, p. 494, Reproduced electronically at: <http://www.aqaed.com/pdf/nahj.pdf>

⁶⁷ This is an abridged version of the events as narrated in Sirat Ibn Ishāq.

When the unbelieving Quraysh met disaster at Badr and the survivors returned to Mecca and Abu Sufyān had returned with his caravans....a number of the elders of clans of Quraysh walked with the men whose fathers, sons and brothers had been killed at Badr, and they spoke to Abu Sufyān and those who had merchandised in the caravan saying: 'Men of Quraysh, Muhammad has wronged you and killed your best

men, so help us with this money to fight him, so that we may hope to get our revenge for those we have lost' and they did so..... So Quraysh marched with Abu Sufyān in command accompanied by his wife Hind bint 'Utba and the heads of clans of Quraysh with an army accompanied by their black Abyssinian troops and their adherents from Banu Kenāna..... The Prophet marched with his army to meet Abu Sufyān's army at the narrow gorge of Uhud..It is estimated that the Prophet's army was made up of several hundred while, Quraysh mustered some 3000 men with 200 horses led by Khālid Ibn Al-Walid. ... Abu Sufyān sent a messenger to the Ansār asking them to let him settle his dispute with his cousin (the Prophet) as he had no dispute with them. But his request was not heeded.... The Abyssinian slave Wahshi, skilful in the use of the spear, was hired to kill Hamza, the Prophet's uncle, in return for freedom and money managed to throw a spear piercing Hamza's body..... Mus'ab Ibn 'Umayr, who was the bearer of the Prophet's standard was also killed... After Mus'ab's death the Prophet gave the standard to 'Ali Ibn Abi Tālib (From there on in every battle which the Prophet conducted his standard was in 'Ali's hand).....The Prophet was injured when the Muslims disobeyed him and left their positions to take a share of the loot when the unbelievers were defeated... A great deal of chaos ensued after that and many Muslims fled when the rumour spread about the prophet having been killed..... 'Anas Ibn An-Nadhr, uncle of Anas Ibn Mālik came to 'Umar Ibn Al-Khattāb and Talha Ibn 'Ubaidullah with some of the Muhājireen and Ansār who were dejected. He said: what makes you sit there? They said: The Prophet has been killed. He answered: Then what will you do with life henceforth? Get up and die in the way the Apostle had died'.

Sirat ibn Ishāq, ed. Guillaume, A., ed. (1955), "*The Life of Muhammad- A Translation of Ishāq's Sirat Rasul Allah*", Oxford University Press, pp. 370-404.

⁶⁸ Yousuf Al-Qaradhāwi issued a *fatwa* in February 2011 calling for killing Gaddāfi

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=INZcxZ7JDNM>

A group of religious scholars (Qaradāwi, Arifi, Wajdi Ghaneem, Nasser Al-'Umar, Shoman, Sheikh Kisk, etc..) issuing *edicts* on the duty of killing Gaddāfi

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9vCQCwle5I0>

Fatwa by Hamid Al-Khalifa in Doha about the duty of Jihad in Syria against the government

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5J5CzKpn57Y>

Fatwa by Yāsir Al-'Ajluni allowing the Syrian woman the right to ask the man capable of supporting her to take her as his possession. That man can take 50 such women as slaves and concubines.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5c2-MIOI7Eg>

Fatwa by an Egyptian sheikh allowing taking women and children and sell them as slaves to make money

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KdVn3Gg1xb0>

Fatwa by a sheikh on allowing sexual intercourse with concubines

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DUFcfw6rgjw>

⁶⁹ Jāhiliya is the word appearing in Qur'an to describe the culture and practice of the Arab society especially in Mecca before the advent of Islam. Four references appear in Qur'an to describe this Jāhiliya as it applies to different aspects of life. Here they are:

"Then after distress, He sent down upon you security [in the form of] drowsiness, overcoming a faction of you, while another faction worried about themselves, thinking of Allah other than the truth - the thought of ignorance (Jāhiliya)" (Al-Baqara 3:154)

"Then is it the judgement of [the time of] ignorance (Jāhiliya) hey desire? But who is better than Allah in judgement for a people who are certain [in faith]." (Al-Maaida 5:50)

"And abide in your houses and do not display yourselves as [was] the display of the former times of ignorance (Jāhiliya)" (Al-Ahzaab 33:33)

"When those who disbelieved had put into their hearts chauvinism - the chauvinism of the time of ignorance. (Jāhiliya), But Allah sent down His tranquillity upon His Messenger and upon the believers and imposed upon them the word of righteousness, and they were more deserving of it and worthy of it. And ever is Allah, of all things, Knowing." (Al-Fath 48:26)

⁷⁰ Shahāda is one of the pillars of Islam and is generally taken to be the declaration of faith in Islam. Once said, it is assumed that the person has accepted the religion. It is simple and contains two statements: 'I testify that there is not God but Allah and that Muhammad is his messenger'.

⁷¹ 'Amr Ibn Kulthum, (flourished 6th century), pre-Islamic Arab poet whose *qasidah* (ode) is one of the seven that comprise the celebrated anthology of pre-Islamic verse Al-Mu'allaqāt. Little is known of his life; he became chief of the tribe of Taghlib in Mesopotamia at an early age and, according to tradition, killed 'Amr Ibn Hind, the Arab king of Al-Hirah, c. 568.

'Amr Ibn Kulthum lived to a very advanced age, highly respected for his noble character, for a poem, allegedly his, praising a Taghlib victory over the Bakr tribe, and for his successfully independent stance against the Lakhmid kings of Al-Hirah. In the early Umayyad period, 'Amr ibn Kulthum became something of a legend, although the stories of his exploits—including that of his death from drinking wine—were inventions based on verses from the Mu'allaqāt.

<http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/21810/Amr-ibn-Kulthum>

⁷² Several verses in the Qur'an refer to this. Some examples are given below.

"And if you fear that you will not deal justly with the orphan girls, then marry those that please you of [other] women, two or three or four. But if you fear that you will not be just, then [marry only] one or those your right hand possesses. That is more suitable that you may not incline [to injustice]. (An-Nisaa 4:3)

"And whoever among you cannot [find] the means to marry free, believing women, then [he may marry] from those whom your right hands possess of believing slave girls" (An-Nisaa 4:25)

"O you who have believed, let those whom your right hands possess and those who have not [yet] reached puberty among you ask permission of you [before entering] at three times: before the dawn

prayer and when you put aside your clothing [for rest] at noon and after the night prayer.." (An-Noor 24:58)

⁷³ Al-Ani, Abdul-Haq (1985) "*Ar-Rasool An-Nabi Al-Ummi*", (Arabic)
<http://www.haqalani.com/2012/08/%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%B1%D8%B3%D9%88%D9%84-%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%86%D8%A8%D9%8A-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A3%D9%85%D9%91%D9%8A/>

⁷⁴ "Because of that, We decreed upon the Children of Israel that whoever kills a soul unless for a soul or for corruption [done] in the land - it is as if he had slain mankind entirely. And whoever saves one - it is as if he had saved mankind entirely. And our messengers had certainly come to them with clear proofs. Then indeed many of them, [even] after that, throughout the land, were transgressors. "(Al-Maaida 5:32)

⁷⁵ Abu Sa'id Al-Khudri reported that Allah's Messenger said: "Do not take down anything from me, and he who took down anything from me except the Qur'an, he should efface that and he who attributed any falsehood to me- and Hammām said: I think he also said:" deliberately" -he should in fact find his abode in the Hell-Fire."

Sahih Muslim 3004, Book 55, Hadith 92
<http://sunnah.com/muslim/55>

⁷⁶ Muhammad Ibn Ishāq Ibn Yasār was born Medina about 85 AH and died in Baghdad in 151 AH. Yasār, who was a prisoner of the Persian king, was freed by the Muslims and sent to Medina where he became a slave of Qays Ibn Makhrama Ibn Al-Muttalib Ibn 'Abdu Manāf and was manumitted when he converted to Islam. His son Ishāq was born around 50 AH. At the age of thirty Ibn Ishāq went to Egypt to expand his knowledge on traditions. He became known for his thorough knowledge so much so that Az-Zuhri is reported to have said that Medina would not lack in knowledge as long as Ibn Ishāq was in it. However, it seems that Ibn Ishāq angered Mālik Ibn Anas. It seems that what angered Mālik most was the lost book of Ibn Ishāq '*sunan*', which dealt with the law based on the Prophet's practice on which Mālik seemed to have differed. He left Medina, and settled in Baghdad where he presented a copy of his book to Caliph Mansur and died in in 151AH.

Sirat ibn Ishāq, ed. Guillaume, A., ed. (1955), "***The Life of Muhammad-A Translation of Ishāq's Sirat Rasul Allah***", Oxford University Press, pp. xiii-xiv

⁷⁷ As no Hadith was recorded during the lifetime of the Prophet, then all that has reached us has been narrated through a chain of people of at least three to four generations. Thus each *Hadith* will start like this 'I was told by so and so that he heard from so and who had heard from so and so.....' This no doubt sheds some doubt about the authenticity of some *hadiths* especially so since different sources had come up with different text of the same alleged *Hadith*.

⁷⁸ Abu Muhammad 'Abdul-Malik Ibn Hishām, who died in 218 AH/ 833 AD, is reported to have grown up in Basrah and then moved to Egypt, where he gained a name as a grammarian and student of language and history. He edited the original work of Ibn Ishāq on the life of the Prophet Muhammad, known as "***Sirat Ibn Hishām***".

⁷⁹ Abu 'Abdullāh Muhammad Ibn Isma'īl Ibn Ibrāhīm Ibn Al-Mughira Ibn Bardizbah Al-Ju'fi Al-Bukhāri, commonly referred to as Imām Al-Bukhāri or Imām Bukhāri, was born 19 July 810 AD/ 13 Shawwāl 194 AH in the city of Bukhāra in Khorāsān (in present-day Uzbekistan). He was a follower of the Hanbali school of thought within Islamic jurisprudence. He is considered an Islamic scholar who authored the *hadith* collection known as ***Sahih Al-Bukhāri***. This book, a collection of 7,257 traditions, is highly regarded among Sunni Muslims, and considered the most authentic collection of *hadith*, even ahead of the ***Muwatta' Imām Mālik*** and ***Sahih Muslim*** of Bukhāri's student Muslim Ibn Al-Hajjāj. Most Sunni scholars consider it second only to the Qur'an in terms of authenticity.

See also Note 77 above.

⁸⁰ It is reported that the Prophet ordered his men to intercept and seize the caravan of Abu Sufyān with Quraysh money and merchandise. When Abu Sufyān heard of the plan he sent a messenger to Mecca to arouse the people to come and defend their caravan.....Quraysh amassed an army consisting of every elder and able man of every clan in Mecca and its supporters.. ..The apostle set

out in the month of Ramadhān. He gave the flag to Mus'ab Ibn 'Umayr Ibn Hāshim. The apostle was preceded by two flags, one with 'Ali called Al-'Uqāb and the other with one of the *Ansār*. His companions had seventy camels on which men rode in turns..... News came to him that Quraysh had set out to protect their caravan, and he told the people of this and asked their advice.....Then Al-Miqdād got up and said, 'O apostle of God, go where God tells you for we are with you. We will not say as the children of Israel said to Moses 'You and your Lord go and fight and we stay at home (...)', but you and your Lord go and fight, and we will fight with you. By God if you take us to Bark Al-Ghimād we would fight resolutely with you against its defenders until you gained it'. The apostle thanked him and blessed him.'Utba Ibn Rabi'a stepped between his brother Shayba and his son Al-Walid, and when he stood clear of the ranks gave the challenge for single combat. Three men of the *Ansār* came out against him... The Quraysh said: who are you? They answered 'Some of the *Ansār*'. The Quraysh said 'we have nothing to do with you....O Muhammad send forth against us our peers of our own tribe'. The apostle said: arise 'Ubaida Ibn Harith and arise Hamza and arise 'Ali.... The three battled and killed the three Qurayshis and 'Ubaida was injured. When he was brought to the apostle he said: Am I not a martyr apostle of God? 'Indeed you are', he replied. Then 'Ubaida said 'Were Abu Tālib alive he would know that his words:

We will not give him up till we lie dead around him
 And be unmindful or our women and children
 are truly realized in me".

Sirat Ibn Ishāq, ed. Guillaume, A., op.cit., pp. 289-314

⁸¹ Muhammad Ibn Mukarram Ibn 'Ali Abul-Fadhli Jamāl Ad-Deen Ibn Mandhoor Al-Ansāri (1232-1311 AD, 630-711 AH) was born somewhere in North Africa. He studied Arabic through his life and wrote a few books. But most significant among them is his dictionary "*Lisān Al-'Arab*" (The Arab Tongue) which is the most comprehensive of all Arabic dictionaries. He relied in compiling it on several earlier dictionaries, which he acknowledged throughout his work.

⁸² "Yes, if you remain patient and conscious of Allah and the enemy come upon you [attacking] in rage, your Lord will reinforce you with five thousand angels having marks [of distinction]"(3:125)

⁸³ The Battle for the Ditch took place in the year 5AH. A number of Jews from Medina went to Quraysh and invited them to take part in an attack of the apostle so that they can get rid of him altogether... Quraysh agreed and marched under the leadership of Abu Sufyān ...The apostle ordered a trench to be dug around Medina... When the trench was completed Quraysh arrived and encamped around it. Quraysh was accompanied by Banu Kenāna, Tihāma, Ghatafān and bedouins from Najd.... The apostle pitched camp on the other side of the trench...The siege continued without fight.. A few of the attackers led by the knight 'Amr Ibn Abdu Wudd managed to cross part of the trench after which 'Amr called for a fighter from among the Muslims. 'Ali bin Abi Tālib came and met him. After a short fight 'Ali killed 'Amr and the rest of the invaders fled...Then God sent cold winds in the winter nights which upset their cooking-pots and overthrew their tents.... leaving neither pot nor fire nor tent standing...Abu Sufyān decided that as their camels were dying and the wind was so forceful and the Jews did not keep their promise, it was no point to carry on with siege..... He and Quraysh returned to Mecca and their allies each returned to its land.

See: *Sirat ibn Ishāq*, op.cit., pp. 450-460

⁸⁴ “How come they unto thee for judgment when they have the Torah, wherein Allah hath delivered judgment (for them)? Yet even after that they turn away. Such (folk) are not believers”. (5:43)

⁸⁵ Islamic tradition as narrated in the Prophet's biography and history books tell of the story of a delegation of Christians who came from Najrān in North Yemen to argue about religion. It is reported that a long discussion took place between the Najrān delegation and the Prophet concerning Christianity, Jesus and Islam. The verse in the Qur'an talks about the Prophet inviting the delegation to nominate a group from among both sides and ask Allah to accept the curse of each side against the other for having failed in their dispute.

It is reported that the Prophet according to Allah's order called members of his family as reported in Sahih Muslim, 2404 d, Book 44, Hadith 50:

"...when the (following) verse was revealed: "Let us summon our children and your children." Allah's Messenger called 'Ali, Fātima, Hassan and Hussein and said: O Allah, they are my family."

The people of Najrān declined to enter into a cursing process in what Muslims considered as being an acceptance of surrender.

⁸⁶ See: Muhammad Ibn Ishāq (1978) "*Sirat Ibn Ishāq*", (Arabic) ed. Zekkar, Suhail, Dar Al-Fikr, Beirut, pp. 11-12, Reproduced electronically at: <http://sh.rewayat2.com/sirah/Web/9862/001.htm>

⁸⁷ Khālid was born around c. 592 in Mecca to Walid Ibn Al-Mughira, the chief of the Banu Makhzoom clan of the Arab tribe of Quraysh. Walid Ibn al-Mughira was one of the richest men in Mecca with a caravan trade estimated at one hundred camels.

When Muhammad came with the Message, Walid was one of his five principal offenders. He recommended that they call Muhammad a sorcerer who has brought a message by which he separated a man from his father, brother, wife or family. He was one of those Meccans who reviled, insulted and mocked the Prophet. Ibn Ishāq narrates that the five mockers suffered divine vengeance (*Ibn Ishāq*, Guillaume p. 187).

Khālid played a major role in the Battle of Uhud, ensuring Quraysh's victory against the Muslims. He also participated in Quraysh's campaign against the Muslims in the Battle of the Ditch.

It was in this environment and with this background that Khālid lived before he converted to Islam; raised in family that opposed Islam and himself fighting it and killing Muslims.

His story with Banu Jadhimah was narrated by more than one narrator. Ibn Ishāq narrated it (see note 20 below). Al-Bukhārī narrated it as follows: "Narrated Salim's father: The Prophet sent Khālid Ibn Al-Walid to the tribe of Jadhimah and Khālid invited them to Islam but they could not express themselves by saying, 'Aslamnā (i.e. we have embraced Islam), ' but they started saying 'Saba'na! Saba'na (i.e. we have come out of one religion to another). 'Khālid kept on killing (some of) them and taking (some of) them as captives and gave every one of us his Captive. When there came the day then Khālid

ordered that each man (i.e. Muslim soldier) should kill his captive, I said, 'By Allah, I will not kill my captive, and none of my companions will kill his captive. 'When we reached the Prophet, we mentioned to him the whole story. On that, the Prophet raised both his hands and said twice, "O Allah! I am free from what Khālid has done." (***Sahih Al-Bukhāri***, Book 64, Hadith 367 / <http://sunnah.com/bukhari/64>)

Ibn Sa'd narrates: 'Then (occurred) the sariyyah of Khālid Ibn al-Walid against Banu Jadhimah. A branch of Banu Kenāna, residing in Lower Mecca, at the distance of a day's (journey) towards Yalamlam in Shawwāl of the eighth year from the hijra of the Apostle of Allah, may Allah bless him. It was the day of Procyon. They (narrators) said: When Khālid Ibn Al-Walid came back after the demolition of Al-'Uzza and the Apostle of Allah, may Allah bless him, was still staying at Mecca, he sent him to Banu Jadhimah to invite them to embrace Islam ; he was sent not as a fighter but as caller to Islam....

.... his father: he said: I was with the horsemen who attacked Banu Jadhimah under the command of Khālid Ibn Al-Walid on the day of Procyon. We encountered one of their men with whom there were women. He began to fight us for them...

...related to me on the authority of his father; he said: The Apostle of Allah, may Allah bless him, sent us on the day of Nakhlah (when Al-'Uzza was demolished), and said: Slay the people as long as you do not hear a Mu'adhhdhin or see a mosque..

(Ibn Sa'd, Abu Abdilllah (1990) "***At-Tabaqāt Al-Kubra***", (Arabic), 'Ata, Muhammad Abdul-Qadir, ed., Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiya, Beirut, vol. 2 pp. 112-112, Reproduced electronically at:

<http://shamela.ws/browse.php/book-1686#page-486>)

⁸⁸ Sirat ibn Ishāq, ed. Guillaume, A., ed. (1955), "***The Life of Muhammad- A Translation of Ishāq's Sirat Rasul Allah***", Oxford University Press, part III, p. 561

⁸⁹ Basmalah is the acronym in Islam which stands for reciting 'Bismillah Ar-Rahmaan Ar-Raheem' (In the Name of All, The Merciful, The Compassionate) which is used for starting any action for a devout Muslim and for reciting any verse of chapter from the Qur'an except for Chapter 9. But Chapter 9 starts with the word 'Barā'a' meaning I free myself from any obligation or responsibility. What is of

significance here is that although chapter 9 does not start with 'Basmalah' it nevertheless starts with 'Barā'a' which also starts with the Arabic letter 'Ba' resulting in the fact reciting any chapter will start with the letter 'Ba'.

⁹⁰ See Note 19.

⁹¹ Qiyās (analogy) basically states that any issue that is not covered in Qur'an or Sunnah is left to the judge to adjudicate on it relying on making analogy with legal precedent.

⁹² Mālik's Al-Muwatta', Book 42, Number 42.1.2
<http://www.usc.edu/org/cmje/religious-texts/hadith/muwatta/042-mmt.php#042.42.42.12>

⁹³ "Indeed, it is We who sent down the Qur'an and indeed, We will be its Guardian." (Al-Hijr 15:9)

⁹⁴ "Indeed, it is a tree issuing from the bottom of the Hellfire. Its emerging fruit as if it was heads of the devils." (As-Saaffaat 37:64-65)

⁹⁵ "Falsehood cannot approach it from before it or from behind it; [it is] a revelation from a [Lord who is] Wise and Praiseworthy." (Fussilat 41:42)

⁹⁶ "..... [Allah] said, "My punishment - I afflict with it whom I will, but My mercy encompasses all things." So I will decree it [especially] for those who fear Me and give zakāt and those who believe in Our verses;" (Al-A'raaf 7:156)

⁹⁷ "And [mention] when your Lord took from the children of Adam - from their loins - their descendants and made them testify of themselves, [saying to them], "Am I not your Lord?" They said, "Yes, we have testified." [This] - lest you should say on the day of Resurrection, "Indeed, we were of this unaware;" (Al-A'raaf 7:172)

⁹⁸ "[Allah] said, "But indeed, We have tried your people after you [departed], and As-Sāmiri has led them astray." (Taa-Haa 20:85)

These are the symbols of the anti-Christ in the three religions - As-Sāmīri, who created the golden calf for the Jews, Judas who betrayed Jesus, and Abu Sufyān who represented Quraysh evil in Islam.

⁹⁹ See Note 89.

¹⁰⁰ There are several Chapters in Qur'an that start with a certain letters from the alphabet, some with one, mostly combination of three which have puzzled not just ordinary Muslims about even the learned among the Fuqahā. I do not want to go into their significance or what they could mean as this is not the place for it. But I chose Chapter 42 (Shura) as an example of the complexity of the issue. Here are the first three verses of it: "Ha', Meem 'Ayn, Seen, Qāf. Thus has He revealed to you, [O Muhammad], and to those before you." (Ash-Shura 42:1-3) Here the Qur'an does more than in others similar Chapters by not simply giving the letters in the first verse or two but in having added some significant verse to indicate that it is through the letters Ha', Meem 'Ayn, Seen and Qāf that Allah has inspired his Prophets. Does this not raise so many questions about the impossibility of a non-Arab to have any idea of what Qur'an is talking about? Could any of this language be translated?

¹⁰¹ The word Sunnah is used quite widely in Islam. The origin of the word is the Arabic verb 'Senneh' which means he set a path thus when one says 'Allah senneh' it is meant that He set a straight part. However, Sunnah on its own means a path be that the right or wrong path. It appears in seven verses in Qur'an. " [This is] the established way of Allah (Sunnah) with those who passed on before; and you will not find in the way of Allah (Sunnah) any change." (Al-Ahzaab 33:62) But when it is used on its own in Islamic jurisprudence it is intended to mean all that which the Prophet had done, ordered or said which had not been specifically stated in Qur'an.

¹⁰² "When the hypocrites come to you, [O Muhammad], they say, "We testify that you are the Messenger of Allah." And Allah knows that you are His Messenger, and Allah testifies that the hypocrites are liars. (Al-Munaafiqoon 63:1)

¹⁰³ Abu Huraira narrated that the Prophet said:

"On the Day of Resurrection a group of companions will come to me, but will be driven away from the Lake-Fount, and I will say, 'O Lord (those are) my companions!' It will be said, 'You have no knowledge as to what they innovated after you left; they turned apostate as renegades (reverted from Islam).

Sahih al-Bukhāri 6585, Book 81, Hadith 173, Reproduced electronically at: <http://sunnah.com/bukhari/81>

Narrated Sahl Ibn Sa'd:

I heard the Prophet saying, "I am your predecessor at the Lake-Fount (Kauthar), and whoever will come to it, will drink from it, and whoever will drink from it, will never become thirsty after that. There will come to me some people whom I know and they know me, and then a barrier will be set up between me and them."

Abu Sa'id Al-Khudri added that the Prophet further said:

"I will say those people are from me. It will be said, 'You do not know what changes and new things they did after you.' Then I will say, 'Far removed (from mercy), far removed (from mercy), those who changed (the religion) after me!"

Sahih al-Bukhāri 7050, 7051, Book 92, Hadith 3, Reproduced electronically at: <http://sunnah.com/bukhari/92>

¹⁰⁴ See: **Sahih Muslim** 65, 66a, 66b, Book 1, Hadith 129, 130,131, Reproduced electronically at: <http://sunnah.com/muslim/1>

¹⁰⁵ Sirat ibn Ishāq, ed. Guillaume, A., ed. (1955), "**The Life of Muhammad- A Translation of Ishāq's Sirat Rasul Allah**", Oxford University Press, part III, p. 231

¹⁰⁶ **Sunan Ibn Mājah** / Book of Tribulations 3992, Book 36, Hadith 67, Reproduced electronically at: <http://sunnah.com/ibnmajah/36>

¹⁰⁷ "And We conveyed to the Children of Israel in the Scripture that, "You will surely cause corruption on the earth twice, and you will surely reach [a degree of] great haughtiness. So when the [time of] promise came for the first of them, We sent against you servants of Ours - those of great military might, and they probed [even] into the homes, and it was a promise fulfilled. Then We gave back to you a

return victory over them. And We reinforced you with wealth and sons and made you more numerous in manpower. [And said], "If you do good, you do good for yourselves; and if you do evil, [you do it] to yourselves." Then when the final promise came, [We sent your enemies] to sadden your faces and to enter the temple in Jerusalem, as they entered it the first time, and to destroy what they had taken over with [total] destruction. [Then Allah said], "It is expected, [if you repent], that your Lord will have mercy upon you. But if you return [to sin], We will return [to punishment]. And We have made Hell, for the disbelievers, a prison-bed." (Al-Israa 17:4-8)

¹⁰⁸ This is a summary of what Ibn Ishāq said about Waraqa Ibn Nawfal: 'One day when the Quraysh had assembled on a feast day to venerate and circumambulate the idol to which they offered sacrifices, this being a feast which they held annually, four men drew apart secretly and agreed to keep their counsel in the bonds of friendship. They were (i) Waraqa Ibn Nawfal Ibn Asad Ibn 'Abdul-'Uzza Ibn Kilāb Ibn Murra Ibn Ka'b Ibn Lu'ay, (ii) 'Ubaidullah Ibn Jahsh Ibn Ri'ab..... (iii) 'Uthmān Ibn Al-Huwayrith Ibn Asad Ibn Abdul-'Uzza..... (iv) Zaid Ibn 'Amr Ibn Nufayl..... They were of the opinion that their people had corrupted the religion of their father Abraham, and that the stone they went round was of no account; it could neither hear, nor see, nor hurt, nor help. 'Find for yourselves a religion' they said; 'for by God you have none'. So they went their several ways in the land seeking the Hanifiya, the religion of Abraham. Waraqa attached himself to Christianity and studied its scriptures until he had thoroughly mastered them.

Sirat Ibn Ishāq, op.cit., pp. 98-99

Then she (Khadija) rose and gathered her garments about her and set forth to her cousin Waraqa Ibn Nawfal, who had become a Christian and read the scriptures and learned from those that follow the Torah and Gospel. And when she related to him what the apostle of God told her he had heard and seen, Waraqa cried 'Holy! Holy! Verily by him in whose hand is Waraqa's soul, if thou hast spoken to me the truth, O Khadija, there hath come unto him the greatest Namus (meaning Gabriel) who came to Moses aforetime, and lo, he is the prophet of this people. Bid him be of god heart'. (p. 107)

Sirat Ibn Ishāq, op.cit., p. 107

¹⁰⁹ *Sirat Ibn Hishām*, Book 4, 2006 (Author's translation from Arabic).

¹¹⁰ This is a summary of what Ibn Ishāq said about Emigration to Abyssinia:

'When the apostle saw the affliction of his companions and that although he escaped it because of his standing with Allah and his uncle Abu Tālib, he could not protect them, he said to them: 'If you were to go to Abyssinia (it would be better for you) for the king will not tolerate injustice and it is a friendly country, until such time as Allah shall relieve you from your distress. Thereupon his companions went to Abyssinia, being afraid of apostasy and fleeing to God with their religion. This was the first *hijra* in Islam.....Ja'far Ibn Abi Tālib went, and the Muslims followed one another until they gathered in Abyssinia, some took their families, others went alone'.

See: *Sirat Ibn Ishāq*, op.cit., p. 146.

¹¹¹ It is narrated by Ibn 'Abbās that 'the Prophet sent Abu Bakr with Chapter 9 (Surat Barā'a). He then sent 'Ali to take it from him. Abu Bakr came and asked the Prophet: 'Has anything been sent from Allah regarding me?' The Prophet replied: 'No, but no one should communicate the Message on my behalf except me or a man from my family '.

See: Al-Belāthuri, Ahmed Ibn Yahya Ibn Jābir (1996) "*Ansāb Al-Ashrāf*", ed. Zakkar, Suhail and Az-Zarkeli, Riyadh, (Arabic), Dar Al-Fikr, Beirut, 1996, Vol.1, p.383, Reproduced electronically at:

Shamela.ws/browse.php/book-9773#page-382

¹¹² The noun zakāt is derived from the Arabic verb 'zekka, yuzekki' which means to purify. It appears in one form or another in some eight verses in Qur'an meaning to purify the soul as in: Have you not seen those who claim themselves to be pure? Rather, Allah purifies whom He wills, and injustice is not done to them, [even] as much as a thread [inside a date seed] " (An-Nisaa 4:49). The noun zakāt appears in some twenty verses in Qur'an and generally accepted to mean the duty on every Muslim to pay an unidentified sum of money from his/her income to the Prophet which he would in turn distribute among the needy Muslims. One example of it is: "And establish prayer and give zakāt and bow with those who bow [in worship and

obedience].” (2:43). This has been assumed by most fuqahā in Islam to be one of the pillars of Islam although neither the Qur'an nor the Prophet had identified it so nor indeed had stipulated which are the pillars of Islam.

¹¹³ *Sahih Muslim* 21 c, Book (Book of Faith), Vol. 1, Hadith 35, Reproduced electronically at: <http://sunnah.com/muslim/1>

¹¹⁴ This is said of the Proper and it is short for “Salla-Llahu ‘Aleihi Wasallam” which means:”Allah prayers and peace be upon Him.

¹¹⁵ *Sunan an-Nasa'i* 3975, (The Prohibition of Blood Shed), Book 37, Hadith 10, Reproduced electronically at: <http://sunnah.com/nasai/37>

¹¹⁶ *Jāmi's at-Tirmidhi* 2607, The Book of Faith, Book 40, Hadith 2, Reproduced electronically at: <http://sunnah.com/muslim/1>

¹¹⁷ Ibn Al-Atheer, 'Izzud-Deen(1997) “*Al-Kāmil fit Tareekh*”, (Arabic), ed. Tedmuri, 'Umar Abdus-Salām, Dar Al-Kitab Al-Arabi, Beirut, Vol. 2, p. 213, Reproduced Electronically at: Shamela.ws/browse.php/book-21712#page-904

¹¹⁸ At-Tabari narrates the story of the dismissal of Khālid as follows: 'Ibn Ishāq, from Salama from Muhammad Ibn Humaid: 'Umar dismissed Khālid only owing to words that Khālid had spoken – according to what they claim. 'Umar did not stop being angry with him and disliked his behaviour during the whole of Abu Bakr's time, due to what he did to Ibn Nuwaira and what he did in his battle. When 'Umar succeeded to the Caliphate, the first words that he spoke were concerning Khālid's dismissal. He said: “He will never govern any province for me.” 'Umar wrote to Abu 'Ubaida: “If Khālid admits that he is a liar, then he remains in charge of what he had charge of. But if he does not admit that he is a liar, then you are in charge of what he had charge of. Then pull his turban off his head and take half of his property.” When Abu 'Ubaida mentioned that to Khālid, he said: “Let me consult with my sister about my affair.” Abu 'Ubaida did so, and Khālid went in to his sister Fātima Bint Al-Walid – who was the wife of Al-Hārith Ibn Hishām – and mentioned that to her. She said: “By God, 'Umat does not like you at all. He only wants you to admit that you are

a liar in order to dismiss you.” He kissed her head and said: “You have spoken the truth by God.” Thus Khālid remained at his stand and refused to admit he was a liar”.

See: At-Tabari, Muhammad Ibn Jarir (1387 AH), "*Tārikh At-Tabari*" (Arabic) vol. 3, pp. 436-437, Dar at-Turath, Beirut, Reproduced electronically at: Shamela.ws/browse.php/book-9783

¹¹⁹ Which translates as: The Authority of the Religious Jurist

¹²⁰ Salmān Rushdie was born in 1947 in Bombay, India to a British educated Muslim lawyer. He started his education in India but moved to Rugby School in Warwickshire and then King's College, University of Cambridge, in England. He started his life as a copywriter before becoming a full time writer. He wrote several novels like 'Grimus' and 'Midnight Children' which attracted literature notability. However, it was the 'The Satanic Verses', which caused the controversy; led to Al-Khomeini's *fatwa* and made Salmān an international figure showered by so many honours that he could not have dreamt of when he was a copywriter at the advertising agency Ogilvy & Mather, including a knighthood by the British monarch. 'The Satanic Verses' was considered by many Muslims an irreverent depiction of Muhammad and his family. This is how one report had it:

“The title refers to a disputed Muslim tradition that is related in the book. According to this tradition, Muhammad (Mahound in the book) added verses (*Ayah*) to the Qur'an accepting three goddesses who used to be worshipped in Mecca as divine beings. According to the legend, Muhammad later revoked the verses, saying the devil tempted him to utter these lines to appease the Meccans (hence the 'Satanic' verses). However, the narrator reveals to the reader that these disputed verses were actually from the mouth of the Archangel Gibreel.” (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Salman_Rushdie).

Whether Salmān Rushdie intended to defame Muhammad or not is not at issue here, as I think his knowledge of Islam is very superficial and he may have used the time and political anti-Islamic fervour following the victory of Al-Khomeini in order to gain fame. But what matters to me here is that Muslims have themselves to blame since they allow such stories to appear in their books of history as true

events. Had the books of history not talked about such an event in which the Prophet is alleged to have made such a blunder, then Salmān Rushdie and his ilk would not have had such an opportunity to write with such authority. Muslims need to reread their history first before making fatwas against their enemies.

¹²¹ On example of the inability of Muslim fuqahā to understand Qur'an is given here in their attempt at interpreting the meaning of the following verse:

"Allah has not appointed [such innovations as] Bahirah or a Sa'ibah or a Wasilah or a Hami, but those who disbelieve invent falsehood about Allah, and most of them do not reason." (5:103).

This is how Al-Bukhāri gives it:

"Narrated Sa'id Ibn Al-Musaiyab:

Bahirah is a she-camel whose milk is kept for the idols and nobody is allowed to milk it; Sa'ibah was the she-camel which they used to set free for their gods and nothing was allowed to be carried on it. Abu Huraira said: Allah's Messenger said, "I saw 'Amr Ibn 'Amir Al-Khuza'i (in a dream) dragging his intestines in the Fire, and he was the first person to establish the tradition of setting free the animals (for the sake of their deities)," Wasilah is the she-camel which gives birth to a she-camel as its first delivery, and then gives birth to another she-camel as its second delivery. People (in the Pre-Islamic periods of ignorance) used to let that she camel loose for their idols if it gave birth to two she-camels successively without giving birth to a male camel in between. *Ham* was the male camel which was used for copulation. When it had finished the number of copulations assigned for it, they would let it loose for their idols and excuse it from burdens so that nothing would be carried on it, and they called it the *Hami*. Abu Huraira said, "I heard the Prophet saying so."

Sahih Al-Bukhāri, Vol. 6, Book 60, Hadith 147, Reproduced electronically at:

<http://sunnah.com/bukhari/65>

It is sufficient here to question the purpose of both Allah and His Prophet wasting time and verse telling us about four different types of camels. Would it not have been more honorable for the Muslim fuqahā to save themselves the embarrassment by declaring that they had no idea what Allah is talking about?

¹²² This is not the place to discuss the serious problem of Muslim's inability to understand the difference between Spirit and Soul for which I intend to allocate a full chapter in my forthcoming book 'Questions from the Qur'an'. But something is needed here by way of shedding some light on the problem. The Qur'an repeatedly talks about the creation of the soul and the reality that it is the soul that is tempted, tested, punished, rewarded and finally ending either in heaven or hell. The plural of soul is repeated in the Qur'an signifying that every living creature has a separate soul. However, there is not one single verse in the Qur'an telling us about the creation of the Spirit. The Spirit is only mentioned in its single form, thus there are no Spirits in the Qur'an. But more importantly Muslims were rebuked for asking about the essence of the Spirit as it was beyond them to contemplate. Whoever needs further expansion on this should consult other sources or my forthcoming book.

¹²³ Al-Copty, Ibrāhim (17 October 2006) "**Islamic terrorism in History [1-3] – the wars of apostasy**" (Arabic), Al-Hiwār Al-Mutamaddin, <http://www.ahewar.org/debat/show.art.asp?aid=78464>

¹²⁴ Summary of the Battle of Ma'uta taken from Sirat Ibn Ishāq. 'The apostle sent his expedition to Ma'uta in Jumādil-'Ula in the year 8 and put Zaid Ibn Hāritha in command; if Zaid were slain the Ja'far Ibn Abu Tālib was to take command, and if he were killed then 'Abdullāh Ibn Rawāha. The expedition got ready to the number of 3000 and prepared to start.....They went on their way as far as Ma'an in Syria where they hear that Heraclius had come down to Ma'ab in Balqa' with 100,000 Greeks (Romans) joined by 100,000 men from Lakhm and Judham and Al-Qain and Bahra'.....The people went forward until when they were on the borders of the Balqa' the Greek and Arab forces of Heraclius met them in a village called Ma'uta.....When fighting began Zayed Ibn Hāritha fought holding the apostles' standard until he died from loss of blood among the spears of then enemy. Then Ja'far took it and fought with it until when the battle hemmed him in he jumped off his roan and hamstringed her and fought until he was killed. Ja'far was the first man in Islam to hamstring his horse.....when Ja'far was killed 'Abdullāh Ibn Rawāha took the standard and advanced with riding his horse.....He seized his sword

and died fighting. Then Thābit Ibn Aqram took the standard. He called on the Muslims to rally round one man and when they wanted to rally to him he demurred and they rallied to Khālid Ibn Al-Walid. When he took the standard he tried to keep the enemy off and to avoid an engagement. Then he retreated and the enemy turned aside from him until he got away with his men.....When (the retreating army) got near Medina the apostle and the Muslims met them. The men began to throw dirt at the army saying: 'You runaways, you fled in the way of God'.....'Abdullāh Ibn Abu Bakr told (that) Umm Salama the prophets wife said to the wife of Salama Ibn Hishām Ibn Al-'As Ibn Al-Mughira: 'Why is it that I do not see Salama at prayers with the apostle with the rest of Muslims?' She replied: 'By God, he can't go out. Whenever he goes out the men call out "Runaway! You ran away when in the path of God! until he has taken to sitting in his house and not going out at all'.'

See: Sirat ibn Ishāq, ed. Guillaume, A., ed. (1955), *"The Life of Muhammad- A Translation of Ishāq's Sirat Rasul Allah"*, Oxford University Press, pp. 531-536

¹²⁵ The noun jizya is derived from the Arabic verb 'Jezaa' meaning to suffice. The noun jizya according to major Arab dictionaries means 'land tax'. However, following the fuqahā's work, the dictionaries entered another meaning to jizya, namely that it is 'the tax imposed on the people of the book'. It is misleading to rely on Arab dictionaries whose entries have been amended according to work of fuqahā as it becomes impossible to understand the real meaning of the origin of the word. Dictionaries were amended according to the development of fiqh and not the other way around. It seems from scattered historical records that it was 'Umar Ibn Al-Khattāb who first imposed jizya during the Muslim invasions.

"Narrated 'Amr Ibn Dinār:

I was sitting with Jābir Ibn Zaid and 'Amr Ibn Aus, and Bjalla was narrating to them in 70 A.H. the year when Mus'ab Ibn Az-Zubayr was the leader of the pilgrims of Basrah. We were sitting at the steps of Zamzam well and Bajala said, "I was the clerk of Jaz' Ibn Mu'āwiya, Al-Ahnaf's paternal uncle. A letter came from 'Umar Ibn Al-Khattāb one year before his death; and it read:-- "Cancel every marriage contracted

among the Magians between relatives of close kinship [marriages that are regarded illegal in Islam: a relative of this sort being called Dhu-Mahram.]" 'Umar did not take the *Jizya* from the Magian infidels till 'Abdur-Rahmān Ibn 'Auf testified that Allah's Messenger had taken the *Jizya* from the Magians of Hajar."

See: *Sahih al-Bukhāri* 3156, 3157, Book 58, Hadith 1, Reproduced electronically at: <http://sunnah.com/bukhari/58>

¹²⁶ The word 'Shari'a' itself does not appear in the Qur'an but the verb 'Shara'a' and the noun 'Shir'a' appear three times in total. The verb 'Shara'a' meaning ordained appears in the verse:

"He has **ordained** for you of religion what He enjoined upon Noah and that which We have revealed to you, [O Muhammad], and what We enjoined upon Abraham and Moses and Jesus - to establish the religion and not be divided therein. Difficult for those who associate others with Allah is that to which you invite them. Allah chooses for Himself whom He wills and guides to Himself whoever turns back [to Him]." (Ash-Shura 42:13)

While the noun 'Shir'a' appears in the verse:

"..... To each of you We prescribed a (Shir'a) **divine law** and a method. Had Allah willed, He would have made you one nation [united in religion], but [He intended] to test you in what He has given" (Al-Maaida 5:48)

These words led the fuqahā later to devise the word 'shari'a' to mean the set of laws and rules which they claim to represent Allah's will for Muslims. These rules and laws became accepted by Muslims up until the beginning of the 20th century as divine law controlling their lives. The fallacy in Islamic history that has been maintained for such a long time is that these laws were man-made and had little to do with what Allah ordained. I am not suggesting that they necessarily oppose Allah's will, but I am stressing that they are not from him and should be declared as man-made.

¹²⁷ Sunni Islam assumes four sources for shari'a. These are the Qur'an, Sunnah, Consensus of fuqahā and qiyās. Qiyās may be defined as

'Joining a matter whose judgment is not provided by a principle with a matter that has been judged when both matters share the same cause in judgment'. The early use of qiyās reported is that of 'Umar Ibn Al-Khattāb who judged that one who drinks alcohol should receive 80 lashes in punishment. This judgment was reached because there was an assumption that if he drank he would lose control and tell lies, and once he tells lies he becomes entitled to punishment for false testimony which is stipulated in Qur'an as 80 lashes. The Shi'a on the other hand reject qiyās as a source of shari'a. They report a hadith from Imām Ja'far Ibn Muhammad As-Sādiq that it is a sin because the first ever to use qiyās was Iblis (the devil) who refused to prostrate to Adam arguing that he was created from fire and Adam from clay and fire was superior to clay.

See: <http://www.ahlalhdeth.com/vb/showthread.php?t=248925>
(Arabic)

¹²⁸ The only person who appears in Islamic record to have suggested the existence of such verse in Qur'an is 'Umar Ibn Al-Khattāb. Several reports of this exist. I choose only one.

'Abdullāh Ibn 'Abbās said:

'Umar Ibn Al-Khattāb gave an address saying: Allah sent Muhammad with truth and sent down the Books of him, and the verse of stoning was included in what He sent down to him. We read it and memorized it. The Messenger of Allah had people stoned to death and we have done it also since his death. I am afraid the people might say with the passage of time: We do not find the verse of stoning in the Books of Allah, and thus they stray by abandoning a duty which Allah had received. Stoning is a duty laid down (by Allah) for married men and women who commit fornication when proof is established, or if there is pregnancy, or a confession. I swear by Allah, had it not been so that the people might say: 'Umar made an addition to Allah's Book, I would have written it (there)."

See : *Sunan Abi Dawud* 4418, Book 40, Hadith 68, Reproduced electronically at: <http://sunnah.com/abudawud/40>

However there is no such verse in the Qur'an which Muslims read!

¹²⁹ Abu Hanifa is Nu'mān Ibn Thābit Ibn Zuta Ibn Marzubān, also known as Imām Abu Hanifa (699 – 767 AD / 80 – 148 AH), was the founder of the Sunni Hanafi school of fiqh (Islamic jurisprudence). He was of Persian origin as suggested by the etymology of the names of his grandfather (Zuta) and great-grandfather (Mah), born in the city of Kufah in Iraq, during the reign of the Umayyad caliph Abdul-Malik Ibn Marwān.

In 763, Al-Mansur, the 'Abbāsīd monarch offered Abu Hanifa the post of Chief Judge of the State, but he declined the offer, choosing to remain independent. His student Abu Yusuf was appointed Qādi Al-Qudhāt (Chief Judge of the State) instead. There are historical stories about Al-Mansur having imprisoned him and poisoned him. When he died he was buried in the Abu Hanifa Mosque which was built in the A'dhamiyah neighbourhood of Baghdad.

The sources from which Abu Hanifa derived Islamic law, in order of importance and preference, are: the Qur'an, the authentic narrations of the Muslim prophet Muhammad (known as hadith), consensus of the Muslim community (ijmā'), analogical reasoning (qiyās), juristic discretion (istihsān) and the customs of the local population enacting said law ('urf). The development of analogical reason and the scope and boundaries by which it may be used is recognized by the majority of Muslim jurists, but its establishment as a legal tool is the result of the Hanafi school of Fiqh. While it was likely used by some of his teachers, Abu Hanifa is regarded by modern scholarship as the first to formally adopt and institute analogical reason as a part of Islamic law. Abu Hanifa is regarded as one of the greatest jurists of Islam. Today his followers in the Hanafi sect of Islam make up something between 1/3 and 11/2 of all Muslims of the world.

See:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ab%C5%AB_%E1%B8%A4an%C4%ABfa

¹³⁰ Abu Ishāq Ibrāhīm Al-Andalusi Ash-Shātibi Al-Ghīrnāti, in his exposition (sharh) of *Alfiyyat Ibn Mālik*
<http://www.alseraj.net/maktaba/kotob/english/Hadeeths/MuhammaddanSunnah/books/other-lang/adhwaa/35.html>

¹³¹ Al-Alousi, Mahmoud Shukri, "*Punishments of Arabs in Jāhiliya and the Penalties for Sins some commit*" (1984), (Arabic) ed. Al-Athari, Muhammad Bahjat, Journal of the Iraqi Academy, Vol. 35, Part 2

¹³² See Note 128.

¹³³ *Sahih Muslim* 1695 b, Book 29, Hadith 35, Reproduced electronically at: <http://sunnah.com/muslim/29/35>

¹³⁴ *Sunan an-Nasa'i* 3483,(The Book of Divorce), Book 27, Hadith 95, Reproduced electronically at: <http://sunnah.com/nasai/27>

¹³⁵ Abul 'Alā' Al-Ma'arri was born in the year in (363AH/973AD) in Ma'arra in northern Syria. At the age of four he was blinded through smallpox. He was taught by his father and uncles in his early years. Later he went to Antioch, Aleppo and ended in Baghdad, which he left to go home after hearing of his mother's death. He locked himself in his home so much so that he came to be known 'captive of two prisons'. He became a recluse, a vegetarian. He slowly became bitter with the world around him, refused to marry and spent his time developing his philosophy and poetry. When he died in (449AH/1057AD) he asked for the following line to be inscribed on his grave: 'thus my father committed against me and I committed it against no one'.

Most of his work was lost, but most of his poetry and some of his prose is believed to have been saved. Among his most significant contribution is his *Resalat Al-Ghufrān*, meaning The Epistle of Forgiveness. This philosophical work is a book of divine comedy that concentrates on the Arabic poetical civilization but in a way that touches all aspects of life. The most interesting characteristics of *Resalat Al-Ghufrān* are its genius digression, deep philosophy, and brilliant language. *Resalat Al-Ghufrān* has clearly had an influence on, or has even inspired, Alighieri Dante's Divine Comedy.

See:http://darkazalli.blogspot.com/2006/10/blog-post_116203704943582158.html,
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Resalat_Al-Ghufran

¹³⁶ Examples of Muslim scholars' work on Greek philosophy are: Thābit Ibn Qurra translated Aristotle and his commentators into Arabic. Al-Kindi, wrote a commentary on Aristotelian logic. Al-Farabi wrote commentaries on Aristotle's Organon. Avicenna wrote a commentary on Aristotle. Averroes was especially distinguished as a commentator of Aristotle. His works had a huge impact in the Latin

West following the Latin translations of the 12th and 13th centuries. He also wrote a commentary of Plato's Republic.

¹³⁷ This Hadith appeared in several Sunni sources. But its authenticity had been challenged and it had been repeatedly rejected by Sunni fuqahā. Today's internet is awash with sites and links asserting this rejection. The reason is summed up by Ibn Taymiyyah who is reported to have written that 'It has no bases and no one knowledgeable in the Prophet's saying or action had narrated. The jihad of the infidel is the greatest of deeds. In fact it is best than man can offer'. It is clear from this statement which is copied in one form or another by many fuqahā or historians that their rejection of it is precisely what I have suggested in that it reduces fighting the infidels to a lesser position than striving against one's own self.

See: <http://www.ahlaldeeth.com/vb/showthread.php?t=227141>

¹³⁸ The following is taken from entry by Henri Laoust in Encyclopaedia Britannia. It is informative but my reproducing it does not necessarily indicate that I agree with the writer in all his analysis.

Ibn Taymiyyah, in full Taqiud-Deen Abu Al-'Abbās Ahmed Ibn 'Abd As-Salām Ibn 'Abd Allah Ibn Muhammad Ibn Taymiyyah (born 1263, Harran, Mesopotamia—died September 26, 1328, Damascus, Syria), one of Islam's most forceful theologians, who, as a member of the Pietist school founded by Ibn Hanbal, sought the return of the Islamic religion to its sources: the Qur'an and the sunnah, revealed writing and the prophetic tradition. He is also the source of the Wahhābiyyah, a mid-18th-century traditionalist movement of Islam..... acquired an extensive knowledge of contemporary Islamic sources and disciplines: the Qur'an (Islamic scripture), the *Hadith* (sayings attributed to the Prophet Muhammad), jurisprudence (*fiqh*), dogmatic theology (*kalām*), philosophy, and Sufi (Islamic mystical) theology.

Ibn Taymiyyah left a considerable body of work—often republished in Syria, Egypt, Arabia, and India—that extended and justified his religious and political involvements and was characterized by its rich documentation, sober style, and brilliant polemic. In addition to innumerable *fatwas* (legal opinions based on religious law) and several professions of faith, the most beautiful of which is the Wāsitiyah, two

works merit particular attention. One is his *As-Siyāsah Ash-Shar'iyah* ("Treatise on Juridical Politics"), available in French and English translations. The other, *Minhāj As-Sunnah* ("The Way of Tradition"), is the richest work of comparative theology surviving from medieval Islam.

In politics Ibn Taymiyyah recognized the legitimacy of the first four caliphs, but he rejected the necessity of having a single caliphate and allowed for the existence of many emirates. Within each emirate he demanded that the prince apply the religious law strictly and rely on it for his legal opinion, and Ibn Taymiyyah demanded from those under the prince's jurisdiction that they obey the established authority except where it required disobedience to God, every Muslim being required to 'will the good and forbid the bad' for the benefit of the common welfare.

Though Ibn Taymiyyah had numerous religious and political adversaries in his own time, he has strongly influenced modern Islam for the last two centuries. He is the source of the Wahhābiyyah, a strictly traditionist movement founded by Muhammad Ibn 'Abdul-Wahhāb (died 1792), who took his ideas from Ibn Taymiyyah's writings. Ibn Taymiyyah also influenced various reform movements that have posed the problem of reformulating traditional ideologies by a return to sources.

See:<http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/280847/Ibn-Taymiyyah>

¹³⁹ Ibn Taymiyyah issued several fatwas regarding the Shi'a in general and the Alawites and Druze in particular. These are widely circulated on the internet. One source summed them up in the following: 'Their (Alawites and Druze) unbelief is a matter on which all Muslims agree. In fact anyone who doubts their lack of faith is himself lacking in faith. They are not even equivalent to the People of the Book or the polytheists. They are the unbelievers who have gone astray. Their food should not be eaten by Muslims. Their women should be sold as slaves and used as concubines. Their money should be seized. They are apostates whose repentance should not be accepted and must be killed whenever caught and cursed as described. Their elders and fuqahā should be killed lest they misguide others. They should not be

used as guards. Their company is sin and their homes should not be shared by Muslims. ¹

See for example: <https://www.tawhed.ws/r?i=5zcvwvuga>

¹⁴⁰ **Fatwa** number (18647) issued by the Permanent Committee for Scientific Research and Fatwa (the highest religious authority in Saudi Arabia) stated that: 'The earth is stationary and the sun rotates around it..... Whoever says that the earth rotates and the sun is stationary accuses Qur'an and who accuses Qur'an of lying is a great *Kufr* (.....)'

See: <http://www.ahlalheeth.com/vb/showthread.php?t=319853>

¹⁴¹ One version of such Hadith is taken from ***Sahih Muslim***:

'Abu Huraira reported Allah's Messenger as saying:

Our Lord, the Blessed and the Exalted, descends every night to the lowest heaven when one-third of the latter part of the night is left, and says: Who supplicates Me so that I may answer him? Who asks Me so that I may give to him? Who asks Me forgiveness so that I may forgive him? '

See: ***Sahih Muslim*** 758 a, Book 6, Hadith 201, Reproduced electronically at: <http://sunnah.com/muslim/6>

¹⁴² A statement to that effect describing the coming of the Day of Judgment is attributed to 'Ali Ibn Abi Tālib conveying a saying from the Prophet.

See for example: <http://www.binbaz.org.sa/mat/20366>

¹⁴³ There is a large amount of sources on Ottoman atrocities in the Balkans and the treatment of Armenians. This year, 2015, marks a hundred years of the Armenian Massacre, which was marked widely around the world.

On Ottoman forced policies and Crimes of Genocide, please see:

Akçam, Taner (2012) ***The Young Turks' Crime against Humanity: The Armenian Genocide and Ethnic Cleansing in the Ottoman Empire***, Princeton University Press

See also:

http://www.genocidetext.net/iags_resolution_supporting_documentation.htm

And: ***A Brief History of the Pontian Greek Genocide (1914-1923)***

<http://www.stbasiltroy.org/pontos/pontoshistory.pdf>

On Ottoman atrocities in Serbia, please see:

Carter, Grey (5 April 2013) ***"Demolishing the myth of the tolerant Ottoman Rule in Balkan"***

<https://mightynose.wordpress.com/category/islam-in-balkans/>

¹⁴⁴ See chapter 8 for a few examples.

¹⁴⁵ Turkification is an Arabic word coined to mean the campaign by the Ottomans to impose Turkish language on its Arab citizens as the only language of learning. It was so widely imposed that when the Ottomans rule ended in 1918, Baghdad did not have one single Arabic school. The irony in this is that the Ottomans, who claimed to be rulers of Islam as Caliphate of Muhammad, tried to eradicate the language of their Prophet and his Qur'an.

¹⁴⁶ This makes Sa'udi Arabia the only state in the world to be named after a man and makes its citizens carry his name and not that of their ethnicity, race or nationality.

¹⁴⁷ See: ***Sahih al-Bukhāri*** 1037, Book 15, Hadith 32, Reproduced electronically at: <http://sunnah.com/bukhari/15>

¹⁴⁸ See: <http://www.ahlalheeth.com/vb/showthread.php?t=174204>

¹⁴⁹ The People of the Cave is the title of chapter (18) of Qur'an and tells the story, according to Muslim tradition, of a few Christian men who took refuge in a cave to escape persecution and fell asleep only to wake up some 300 years later thinking they had been asleep for a couple of days.

¹⁵⁰ 'Ali Ibn Abi Tālib (1412 AH), ***"Nahjul Balāgha"*** (Arabic), collected by Ash-Shareef Ar-Radhi, ed. Muhammad Abdu, Dar Ath-Thakaer, Iran, p. 35-36, Reproduced electronically at: <http://file.ir/hadith-library/4.pdf>

¹⁵¹ Two verses from Qur'an expresses such promise: "Have We not established for them a safe sanctuary to which are brought the fruits of all things as provision from Us? But most of them do not know." (Al-Qasas 28:57) and "Have they not seen that We made for them a safe sanctuary (Mecca), while people are being taken away all around them? Then in falsehood do they believe, and in the favour of Allah they disbelieve?" (Al-Ankaboot 29:67)

¹⁵² In Muharram 64AH Yazid's army reached Mecca whose people and those of Hijāz had already swore allegiance to 'Abdullāh Ibn Az-Zubayr and whose army was supplemented by the Medina people who fled from the attack of the Yazid's army on them the year before. Both sides fought for two months until the beginning of Rabi' Al-Awwal when Yazid's army catapulted Ka'ba and set it ablaze.

See: Ibn Al-Atheer, Izzud-Deen(1997) "*Al-Kāmil fit Tārikh*", (Arabic), ed. Tedmuri, 'Umar Abdus-Salām, Dar Al-Kitab Al-Arabi, Beirut, Vol. 3, p. 221-222, Reproduced Electronically at: Shamela.ws/browse.php/book-21712#page-1662

In 73AH Al-Hajjāj laid siege to Mecca; put the catapult on Abu Qubais mountain (outside Mecca); hit the Ka'ba and set it ablaze. It was 'Abdul-Malik who criticised Yazid for attacking Mecca earlier. When his army repeated the attack people said that he was failed in his religion. See: Ibn Al-Atheer, "*Al-Kāmil fit Tārikh*", op.cit., vol. 3, p. 400

¹⁵³ In 317 AH Abu Tāhir Al-Qarmati reached Mecca; attacked the pilgrims; robbed them; and killed many of them even inside the Ka'ba. He removed the 'Black Stone' and sent to Hajar where it stayed for some twenty-two years and only returned in 339 AH. See: Ibn Al-Atheer, "*Al-Kāmil fit Tārikh*", op.cit., vol. 6, p. 742.

¹⁵⁴ On 16 October 1924, Sa'ud Ibn 'Abdul-Aziz entered Mecca with his army defeating the Sharif Hussein Ibn 'Ali who fled to Jeddah and then to Jordan where his son 'Abdullāh had just been made King by the British. There had been a well-planned campaign attempting to show how peaceful the entry of the Sa'ud army to Mecca had been. However, wherever is said the entry of an invading army is not what Allah wanted for the city to be a sanctuary.

¹⁵⁵ 'Ibn Sa'ud asked to see Sir Percy Cox alone. Sir Percy took me with him. Ibn Sa'ud was by himself, standing in the centre of his great reception tent. He seemed terribly upset. My friend; he moaned, 'you have deprived me of half my kingdom. Better take it all and let me go into retirement.' Still standing, this great strong man, magnificent in his grief, suddenly burst into sobs. '

From: Dickson, H.R.P. (1956) "*Kuwait and her Neighbours*", P. 282, quoted in: <http://english.al-akhbar.com/node/22253>

¹⁵⁶ On 26 July 1956, President Nasser nationalised the Anglo-French Suez Canal Company, declaring that he would take the revenue from the canal to finance his dam, (following the withdrawal of both US and British promise to finance the Aswan dam).... In October 1956, Guy Mollet, Anthony Eden and Israeli Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion met at Sevres near Paris and concluded a secret agreement that Israel should attack Egypt, thereby providing a pretext for an Anglo-French invasion of Suez....Ben-Gurion then ordered General Moshe Dayan, his chief of staff, to plan an attack on Egypt. On 29 October 1956, the Israeli attack was spearheaded by an airborne drop to seize control of the Mitla' Pass. Heavy fighting followed.

The next day, Britain and France issued ultimatums to both sides to stop the fighting immediately. The Israelis continued their operations, expecting an Egyptian counter-attack. Instead, Nasser's army was withdrawing.....

On 5 November, some three months and 10 days after Nasser had nationalised the canal, the Anglo-French assault on Suez was launched. It was preceded by an aerial bombardment, which grounded and destroyed the Egyptian Air Force...

At midnight on 6 November, a cease-fire was called on the insistence of UN Secretary General Dag Hammarskjöld. The Anglo-French forces had reached El Cap, just south of Port Said, but were not yet in control of the entire canal when they were stopped. Militarily, the operation was well on its way to being a great success.....Politically, the intervention in Suez was a disaster. US President Dwight Eisenhower was incensed. World opinion, especially that of the United States, together with the threat of Soviet intervention, forced Britain, France

and Israel to withdraw their troops from Egypt. In Britain too there had been widespread outrage.

BBC History,

http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/british/modern/suez_01.shtml

¹⁵⁷ The Sa'ud ruling family has always been wary of any move for Arab unity. In 1958 both monarchies of Iraq and Jordan formed a federation, The Arab Federation, and the republics of Egypt and Syria formed the United Arab Republic. The Sa'udi ruling family opposed both unions on different grounds. Their opposition of the federation between Iraq and Jordan, both of which were Western clients, was fear of future ambition of the federation to claim Hijāz, which was the Kingdom of Sharif Hussein the grandfather of both monarchs of Iraq and Jordan, who was ousted by the Sa'ud family. The opposition to the union between Egypt and Syria was for fear of the expansion of the Arab nationalist movement, spearheaded by Nasser of Egypt.

¹⁵⁸ On 19 September 1962, Imām Ahmed Ibn Yahya died and was succeeded by his son, Imām Mohammed Al-Badr. A week later, a rebellion of revolutionary forces led by the army overthrew the new Imām and proclaimed the Yemen Arab Republic. Following his overthrow, Imām Al-Badr managed to escape from San'a, the capital, and, with other members of the royal family, rallied the tribes in the northern part of the country. With financial and material support from external sources, the royalists fought a fierce guerrilla campaign against the republican forces. The revolutionary Government accused Sa'udi Arabia of harbouring and encouraging Yemeni royalists, and threatened to carry the war into Sa'udi Arabian territory..... The revolution was supported by Egypt which supplied troops and supplies, while Badr was supported by Sa'udi Arabia and Jordan. The newly emergent forces representing republicanism and social progress were concentrated in the major cities, while the monarchist, reactionary, and theocratic royalists launched a successful counterrevolution from the countryside with the support of the rural population..... The proximate cause of the conflict was the arrival of U.A.R. Egyptian troops in the Yemen to support a palace coup by republican revolutionists on the night of 26 September 1962. Sa'udi Arabia, fearing the revolutionary upsurge on its borders, reacted by sending supplies and money to the pro-royalist forces behind the

deposed Imām Muhammad al-Badr, who led the royalist counter-revolutionists.

Source: ***North Yemen Civil War (1962-1970)***,

<http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/war/yemen.htm>

¹⁵⁹ On 1 February 1958 a political union between Egypt and Syria led to the formation of the United Arab Republic which was ratified in nationwide plebiscites. This was the first attempt at forging an Arab union since the demise of the 'Abbāsīd Dynasty, which ended with the fall of Baghdad seven hundred years earlier in 1258. It was a dream of many young ASPIRING Arabs and the objective of all Arab nationalist movements that were born in the early decades of the 20th century following the end of the Ottoman rule. Such a union was unwelcomed by the Imperialists and their allies in the Middle East such as Israel and Sa'udi Arabia all of which acted overtly and covertly to undermine it. They succeeded and on 28 September 1961, Syria withdrew from the union following a military coup ending the first Arab dream of unity, which dream looks even more remote today.

¹⁶⁰ On 6 October 1973 the Egyptian and Syrian armies surprised Israel by crossing the Suez Canal and the occupied Golan Heights and managed in the first week in defeating the Israeli army to the extent that Israel considered using nuclear weapons. The balance was changed when the US landed with new tanks and anti-tank missiles straight to the Golan Heights and Sinai. The wars stopped with a ceasefire that has not been broken since. Under strong public pressure, the Arab states stopped oil production which caused a serious problem in the world. However as soon as the war ended, the Sa'udi campaigned for and convinced others to resume oil production which gave the Imperialist a relief from the hardship which would have forced them to make different decisions regarding the calamity of Palestine.

¹⁶¹ The Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf which came to be known as the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) was Established in Abu Dhabi on 25 May 1981, comprising of Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Sa'udi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates. The unified economic agreement between the countries of the Gulf Cooperation Council was signed on 11 November 1981 in Abu Dhabi. Among the

stated objectives of the union are: Formulating similar regulations in various fields such as religion, finance, trade, customs, tourism, legislation, and administration; Fostering scientific and technical progress in industry, mining, agriculture, water and animal resources; Establishing scientific research centers; Setting up joint ventures; Unified military (Peninsula Shield Force); Encouraging cooperation of the private sector; Strengthening ties between their peoples; Establishing a common currency.

The most important article of the GCC charter is Article 4, which states that the alliance was formed to strengthen relations among its member countries and to promote cooperation among the countries' citizens. The GCC also has a defense planning council that coordinates military cooperation between member countries. The highest decision-making entity of the GCC is the Supreme Council, which meets on an annual basis and consists of GCC heads of state. Decisions of the Supreme Council are adopted by unanimous approval.

Some of the most important achievements of the GCC include the creation of the Peninsula Shield Force, a joint military venture based in Sa'udi Arabia, and the signing of an intelligence-sharing pact in 2004. At a GCC summit in December 2009, an agreement was reached to launch a single regional currency similar to the euro.

Not all these objectives have been successful or pursued with the same force by all members. Sa'udi Arabia has been the dominant power in the GCC and its policies have been pursued. Most members have followed except for Oman, which had been reluctant to join in the most decisive policies such as taking part in invading or blockading Iraq, the intervention in Bahrain and establishing the common currency.

See for example: ***GCC, Encyclopaedia Britannica***

<http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/249154/Gulf-Cooperation-Council-GCC>

and, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gulf_Cooperation_Council

¹⁶² Following the 1973 war, US President Jimmy Carter set up the Rapid Deployment Force in order to enable the US to intervene in the Middle East speedily. But such force needed airports and other facilities to enable it to function. Sa'udi Arabia embarked on a massive

program to build such airports and facilities. So much so that when the US came to invade Iraq these facilities were ready to enable the US forces to carry out the mission.

¹⁶³ It is public knowledge as it has been acknowledged by so many US officials that the CIA trained and armed the so-called Arab Mujāhedeen who came mainly from Arabia in the 1980s with Sa'udi backing and finance to fight the Russian who were supporting the communist Government in Afghanistan. It was among these Mujāhedeen who were all indoctrinated by Wahhābi ideas that the Al-Qaeda was born. Today's many terrorist organizations under whatever name they operate were all born to Al-Qaeda which was created by Sa'udi Arabia in Afghanistan.

¹⁶⁴ It is well known that Sa'udi Arabia has been pumping something of the order of 11 million barrels a day for the last two decades way in excess of its economic need, depleting the oil reserves which ought to be saved for the future generations of the inhabitants of Arabia. One example of how the Sa'udi oil weapon has been serving the Imperialist came in a comment made in 2014 by Senator McCain saying: 'We should thank Sa'udi Arabia, which allowed the price of a barrel of oil to fall to the point that it significantly affected the Russian president, Vladimir Putin, [and] the [Russian] economy'. See: ***US Senator John McCain thanks Sa'udi Arabia because of its oil policy to destroy Russian economy and currency***, December 23, 2014, <http://beforeitsnews.com/alternative/2014/12/us-senator-john-mccain-thanks-Sa'udi-arabia-because-of-its-oil-policy-to-destroy-russian-economy-and-currency-3082088.html>.

¹⁶⁵ The role of Sa'udi Arabia in the destruction of the modern Iraqi state which started with the encouragement to go into war against Iran and ended up in the invasion and occupation of Iraq in 2003 is too long to be done justice in this short analysis. I have authored or co-authored three books on this topic. Anyone interested to read in depth analysis of the Sa'udi role should consult the following books and the bibliography in them:

Al-Ani, Abdul-Haq (2008) *“The Trial of Saddam Hussein”*, Clarity Press Inc.

Al-Ani, Abdul-Haq & Al-Ani, Tarik (2012) *“Genocide in Iraq – The Case Against the UN Security Council and Member States”*, Clarity Press Inc.

Al-Ani, Abdul-Haq & Al-Ani, Tarik (2014) *“Genocide in Iraq- Volume II – The Obliteration of a Modern State”*, Clarity Press Inc.

¹⁶⁶ The Sa’udi role in serving Imperialism during the last seventy years had extended beyond the Middle East and Arab world in general. One example that came to the surface has been the role of the Sa’udi in financing the Contras of Nicaragua on behalf of US Imperialism. A good survey of the role of Sa’udi Arabia in different parts of the world in the service of Imperialism was written by Jonathan Marshall for the MER.

See; Jonathan Marshall, *Sa’udi Arabia and the Reagan Doctrine*, MER155,
<http://www.merip.org/mer/mer155/Sa’udi-arabia-reagan-doctrine>.

¹⁶⁷ See Note 166 above.

¹⁶⁸ The Arab Initiative as explained in *Wikipedia*:

The Arab Peace Initiative is a comprehensive peace initiative first proposed in 2002 at the Beirut Summit of the Arab League by then-Crown Prince, King ‘Abdullāh of Sa’udi Arabia, and re-endorsed at the Riyadh Summit in 2007. The initiative attempts to end the Arab–Israeli conflict, which means normalizing relations between the entire Arab region and Israel, in exchange for a complete withdrawal from the occupied territories (including East Jerusalem) and a 'just settlement' of the Palestinian refugee crisis based on UN Resolution 194 (which calls for a diplomatic resolution to the conflict and resolves that any refugees 'wishing to return to their homes and live at peace with their neighbors' should be able to do so or, if they otherwise wish, should be provided with compensation).

Although a number of Israeli officials have responded to the Initiative with both support and criticism, the Israeli government has swiftly

rejected the initiative, saying it was a 'non-starter'. Then Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon said the new plan cannot be accepted because it would replace UN resolutions 242 and 338, which call for negotiations. In 2007, Benjamin Netanyahu, as opposition leader, as well as a number of Likud members, rejected the initiative outright. In 2009, President Shimon Peres expressed satisfaction at the 'u-turn' in the attitudes of Arab states toward peace with Israel as reflected in the Sa'udi initiative, though he did qualify his comments by saying: 'Israel wasn't a partner to the wording of this initiative. Therefore it doesn't have to agree to every word.' The Palestinian Authority strongly supports the plan and Mahmoud Abbās officially asked U.S. President Barack Obama to adopt it as part of his Middle East policy. Islamist political party Hamas, the elected government of the Gaza Strip, is deeply divided, with most factions rejecting the plan.
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Arab_Peace_Initiative

¹⁶⁹ See Note 166 above.

¹⁷⁰ One piece of evidence suffices here. It came in a speech delivered by Joe Biden US Vice-president to students at the John F. Kennedy Jr. Forum at the Institute of Politics at Harvard University in which he is quoted saying: 'Our allies in the region were our largest problem in Syria,' *he said, explaining that Turkey, Sa'udi Arabia and the UAE were 'so determined to take down Assad,' that in a sense they started a 'proxy Sunni-Shi'a war' by pouring 'hundreds of millions of dollars and tens of thousands of tons of weapons' towards anyone who would fight against Assad.* 'And we could not convince our colleagues to stop supplying them.'

See: RT News, "***Biden Blames US allies in Middle East for rise of ISIS***", October 03, 2014. <http://rt.com/news/192880-biden-isis-us-allies/>

¹⁷¹ 'In the year 1802, Ibn Sa'ud made for Karbala with his victorious army, famous pedigree horses, all the settled people and Bedouin of Najd, the people of Janub, Hijāz, Tihāma and others...The Muslims [i.e. the Wahnābis] surrounded Karbala and took it by storm. They killed most of the people in the houses and the markets. They destroyed the dome above Al-Hussein's grave. They took away everything they saw in the shrine and near it, including the coverlet decorated with

emeralds, sapphires and pearls which covered the grave. They took away everything they found in the town—possessions, arms, clothes, fabric, gold, silver, and precious books. One cannot even enumerate the spoils! They stayed there for just one morning and left after midday, taking away all the possessions. Nearly 2000 people were killed in Karbala. ' (Ibn Bishr, *'Unwan al-Majd*, Vol. 1, pp. 121–122) Quoted in "*The Wahhābi Sack of Karbala*" (1802 A.D.), Ballandalus, August 2, 2014.
<https://ballandalus.wordpress.com/2014/08/02/the-Wahhābi-sack-of-karbala-1802-a-d/>

¹⁷² See Note 166 above.

¹⁷³ This is taken from the entry in Encyclopedia Britannica on Hassan Al-Banna:

Hassan Al-Banna, (1906 – 1949), Egyptian political and religious leader who established a new religious society, the Muslim Brotherhood, and played a central role in Egyptian political and social affairs..... In 1927 he was assigned to teach Arabic in a primary school in the city of Ismailia (al-Ismā'īliyah), near the Suez Canal, which was a focal point for the foreign economic and military occupation of Egypt. There he witnessed scenes that acutely distressed him and many other Muslims. In March 1928, with six workers from a British camp labour force, he created the Society of the Muslim Brothers (Arabic: Al-Ikhwān al-Muslimun), which aimed at a rejuvenation of Islam.

In the 1930s, at his own request, Hassan Al-Banna was transferred to a teaching post in Cairo. By the advent of World War II the Muslim Brotherhood had grown enormously and had become a potent element on the Egyptian scene, attracting significant numbers of students, civil servants, urban labourers, and others, and representing almost every group in Egyptian society..... Many of the members came to view the Egyptian government as betraying the interests of Egyptian nationalism. For a while Hassan Al-Banna tried to maintain a tactical alliance with the government, but he and his followers had become a threat to the central authorities. In the turmoil of the postwar years many elements of the society passed beyond his authority, and members were implicated in a number of

assassinations, notably that of Prime Minister An-Nuqrāshi in December 1948. With the connivance of the government, Hassan Al-Banna himself was assassinated the following year.

Hassan Al-Banna, *Encyclopedia Britannica*,

<http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/256466/Hassan-Al-Banna>

¹⁷⁴ The words Salafi, Salafism and Salafi movement are all words derived from the Arabic word 'Salaf' meaning 'predecessor'. The modern use has come to mean the so-called 'righteous predecessors'. The adherent to this movement share a common objective, namely to create a state on the model of the 'Salaf'. However, there is no agreement on who are these 'righteous predecessors' that are to be followed. Some say they are the first three generations after the Prophet, while others say they are Muslims who lived in the first five centuries AH. The father of 'Salafism' is Ibn Taymiyyah who has been referred to more than once throughout this book. All fundamentalist movements in Islam, including the terrorist Islamic State, the Nusra in Syria, the Taliban and many others not so active militarily, derive their ideology from Salafism and form the bases of modern political Sunni Islam. Any attempt to understand what is happening and what is likely to happen in the Muslim world should be started with understanding Salafism.

¹⁷⁵ Muhammad Mutawalli Ash-Sha'rāwi (1911–1998) was an Islamic scholar and former Egyptian minister of Endowments. He was a popular and successful Islamic preacher, and 'one of the most-prominent symbols of popular Egyptian culture' in the decades of 1970, 80s and 90s and was host of very popular Friday afternoon TV program preaching Islam.

He started teaching in Sa'udi Arabia but as relations worsened between Egypt and Sa'udi in 1963, he took up a position of manager of office of Al-Azhar Imām. Later he travelled to Algeria as a head of the Al-Azhar expedition, where he stayed for seven years. During his stay in Algeria, the war of June 1967 occurred and Egypt suffered tremendous losses to Israel. Ironically, Ash-Sha'rāwi 'praised' the defeat, saying 'Egypt did not gain victory while the hands of

communism surrounds them and their religion remains uncorrupted. ' His prayer of thanks to Allah has been so well documented that no attempt by him to justify it was successful. It was widely reported on the net. One such post described that Ash-Sha'rāwi admitted it in a TV show.

<http://www.djelfa.info/vb/archive/index.php/t-1434177.html>

In November 1976, Mamdouh Sālem, then Prime Minister, chose the members of his Cabinet, among them was Ash-Sha'rāwi, appointed Minister of Endowments until October 1978.

See: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Muhammad_Metwali_Alsharawi

¹⁷⁶ Jamāl Abdul-Nasser was speaking to a large crowd in Alexandria on October 26, 1954 when eight gun-shots rang out. Nasser heard the bullets whizzing past his ears. Happily for him, the gunman, Mahmoud Abdul-Latif, a member of the Muslim Brotherhood, was a bad shot even at close range. Those seated on the dais heard popping sounds as the bullets struck an electric light above. Nasser didn't flinch. Interrupting his prepared speech, he cried out, "Let them kill Nasser. What is Nasser but one among many? My fellow countrymen, stay where you are. I am not dead, I am alive, and even if I die all of you is Jamāl Abdul-Nasser." (Mohammed Hassanein Heikal, *The Cairo Documents*, Doubleday, New York, 1973, 25. See also Peter Mansfield, *Nasser*, Methuen Educational Limited, London, 1969, 88.) Thornton, Ted (October 26, 1954) "*Nasser Assassination Attempt*", History of the Middle East Database.

http://www.nmhtthornton.com/mehistorydatabase/nasser_assassination_attempt.php

¹⁷⁷ Al-Aqsa mosque has a unique position in Islam second only to the Ka'ba. Its holiness is a matter on which all Muslims are united and it would be difficult to convince them to let it be in non-Muslim hands. The reverence of it is seen in two facts. Al-Aqsa mosque is the second site mentioned in Qur'an in addition to the Ka'ba. "Exalted is He who took His Servant by night from al-Masjid al-Haram (Ka'ba) to al-Masjid al-Aqsa (Al-Aqsa mosque), whose surroundings We have blessed, to show him of Our signs. Indeed, He is the Hearing, the Seeing.." (Al-Israa 17:1) The second indication is what I wrote earlier in chapter (2) that Muslims started praying and prayed for some time towards

Jerusalem (where Al-Aqsa was built later as ordered in Qur'an) until they were ordered to pray towards Ka'ba in Mecca.

¹⁷⁸ Keinon, Herb (7 July 2012) "***Mursi makes first Israel contact in Peres letter***", The Jerusalem Post, <http://www.jpost.com/Diplomacy-and-Politics/Mursi-makes-first-Israel-contact-in-Peres-letter>

¹⁷⁹ See Chapter 3.

¹⁸⁰ See Chapter 11.

¹⁸¹ Hamas has had a dilemma which has become formidable to solve. On one hand it is fighting Israel and ought to align itself with enemies of it. But on the other hand it owes allegiance to its Muslim Brotherhood roots and partners in Syria and Egypt. This duty of allegiance led it to the suicidal decision to side with the Muslim Brotherhood fighters who took up arms and have been fighting the Ba'ath regime in Syria. By doing this, they lost their greatest support which Syria had provided for three decades in the form of protection, safe heaven and military and financial assistance. But even more significantly they lost a great deal of their credibility among Arab intelligentsia which has not been able to come to terms with Hamas siding with the enemies of the Syrian regime which has been the only Arab regime opposing Israel, the archenemy of Hamas. Indeed some of those who have been fighting Damascus over the last four years have indicated their willingness to sign a peace treaty with Israel, something which the Ba'ath of Syria has refused in the darkest of its hours. It is fair to say that not all members of Hamas agree to this switch in policy by its leadership but what has happened, nevertheless, established the alignment of Hamas with Arab reactionary regimes in the Gulf which are clients of Imperialism and set them on antagonistic lines with their natural supporters in Iran and Hizbullah. Hamas dilemma continues.

¹⁸² Al Walid Ibn Yazid Ibn Abdul-Malik became caliph on 6 February 743. He was a libertine and a wine-drinker and a breaker of divine commands. He wished to make the pilgrimage in order that he might drink upon the summit of the Ka'ba. The people abhorred him for his profligacy and rose up against him..... when he was slain.... His brother

Sulaymān Ibn Yazid said..."I testify that he was a wine-drinker, licentious and profligate and he sought to seduce me into immorality". As Suyuti, Jalaluddin (1881) "**History of the Caliphs**", Translated by Jarrett, Major Henry Sullivan, Calcutta, pp. 254-255

Al-Mu'tassim was acknowledged as Caliph on 8 Rajab 218 AH in succession of his brother Al-Ma'mun...He affected to imitate the Persian monarchs and to adopt their manners; his Turkish slaves amounted to ten thousand.... He followed the course adopted by Al-Ma'mun in regard to questioning the people on the creation of the Qur'an and continued in it to the end of his life..... people suffered much tribulation on that account, and he put to death many of the learned therefore, and he scourged the Imām Ahmed Ibn Hanbal... he was solicitous to enlist Turks in his service. Wherefore he sent into Samarkand, Farghanah and the adjacent countries to purchase them and lavished wealth upon them and clothed them in various kinds of brocade and belts of gold. And they used to gallop through Baghdad and harass the people, and the city was reduced to extremities through them.

As Suyuti, "**History of the Caliphs**", op.cit., pp.349-350.

¹⁸³ Hulagu's forces besieged Baghdad from November 1257 until it surrendered on February 10, 1258 'leading to a week-long massacre by the Mongols, regarded as one of the most devastating events in the history of Islam'. It took Baghdad centuries to recover and the destruction of 1258 has become part of vernacular folk tales.

Battle of Baghdad, Hulagu Khan,

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hulagu_Khan>

¹⁸⁴ For over four years, the US has directly or indirectly supported terrorism in Syria until it spilled over to Iraq when it discovered that terrorism began to threaten its assets in occupied Iraq with potential threat to its interests and bases in the Gulf. It is inconceivable that US client states in the Gulf (SA, UAE and Qatar) or its NATO ally in Turkey would have gotten involved in military operations without US consent. Military allies do not go to war without the master approval lest the master get involved. Equally relevant is the fact that all arms sales are conditional on terms of their use which would be impossible to breach. We know none of these states manufacture its armaments

and are mainly relying on US arms. It is only natural to conclude that none of them had been able to supply the different terrorist groups in Syria without US approval. Recently we have been informed that the US has decided, contrary to principles of customary international law as supported by ruling of the International Court of Justice, to arm and train what it claims to be 'moderate Syrians' to fight the legitimate Syrian state. As we have shown that armed men in Syria have been switching allegiance in accordance with the availability of money, dominance of one group or simply because the religious leader had chosen so. How are these so-called 'moderates' going to be identified and kept in check, nevertheless, remains a mystery. At best, and if we accept that the US will be able to identify some moderates, then it remains true that in the poor economic situation in Syria one source of income may be selling the expensive arms which the US would be supplying to the highest bidder from among a terrorist group who have no problem getting funding from Arabia if no arms are forthcoming.

See for example: Osborne, David (14 June 2013) ***“Syria civil war: US will arm moderate rebels, says Barack Obama”***, The Independent, <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/syria-civil-war-us-will-arm-moderate-rebels-says-barack-obama-confirming-use-of-chemical-weapons-by-president-bashar-alassads-regime-8658368.html>

Cáceres, Marco (9/11/2014) ***“Obama's Move to Arm and Train 'Moderates' in Syria Is a Feint”***, Huff Post, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/marco-caceres/obamas-move-to-arm-and-tr_b_5804432.html

¹⁸⁵ Shi'ism is derived from the Arabic word meaning followers and it originated in the 'Shi'a of 'Ali' meaning the 'Followers of 'Ali' but the last part has since been dropped and using Shi'ism alone means the followers of 'Ali. There is no fixed time in history for its beginning as it is assumed to have existed since the beginning of Islam and the political schism between Banu Hāshim and their opponents in Quraysh. This simple reality about its foundation explains how it came later to develop into different sub-sects that are so different at times that some of these sub-sects are closer to Sunni Islam than to Shi'a Islam when it comes to question of fiqh. The most popular sub-sect of Shi'a today is the so-called Ja'fari. They claim to have taken their fiqh

from Imām Ja’far Ibn Muhammad As-Sādiq thus the name Ja’fari. They are sometimes called the Twelver Shi’a, meaning they believe in the twelve Imāms descendants of ‘Ali. However, that may not be a good description because there are other sub-sects of Shi’a who believe in the twelve Imāms. Throughout history tens of sub-sects of Shi’ism were born and disappeared for multitude of reasons. In addition to Ja’fari Shi’a today, there are the Isma’ilis who differ from Ja’fari in believing that the Imāmate went to Ismael, son of Ja’far, rather than Mousa as the Ja’faris believe. There are also the Zaidis, mainly in Yemen, who believe that the Imāmate went to Zaid son of ‘Ali rather than ‘Ali Ibn Hussein Ibn ‘Ali as the Ja’fari believe. The Zaidis are so different to Ja’fari that in many fiqh problems they are closer to Hanafi Sunni. There are also many other small Shi’a sub-sects which are considered to be extreme in their Shi’ism that are sometimes even disowned by Ja’fari. Most of them are considered to be 'Batiniyya' esoteric in interpretation of Qur’an. Among such sub-sects are the Alawites, Alevi, Baktashi, Kashfi, Ahlul-Haq and others. Sometimes the Isma’ilis are included among the Batiniyya sub-sects.

¹⁸⁶ Ja’far As-Sādiq (702-765) is Ja’far Ibn Muhammad Ibn ‘Ali Ibn Hussein Ibn ‘Ali Ibn Abi Tālib, the sixth Imām for all Shi’a Muslims except the Zaidis and better known as simply As-Sādiq (the truthful). He is the most influential person in formulating Shi’a doctrine. Although he did not set out to form a religious sect, the traditions related to him have formed the bases of Ja’fari jurisprudence. He is also highly respected by Sunni Fuqahā and his narration of Prophet's Hadith is accepted by most of them. Ja’far As-Sādiq had emphasised the value of two concepts among the House of Muhammad, namely that of Taqiyya and ‘Ismeh (the infallibility of the Prophet and Imāms).

¹⁸⁷ See: Al-Ani, Abdul-Haq & Al-Ani, Tarik (2012) *“Genocide in Iraq – The Case Against the UN Security Council and Member States”*, Clarity Press Inc., p. 137.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid, pp. 24-26.

¹⁸⁹ The Shah of Iran, in an effort to demonstrate Iran's long history and to show contemporary advancements under his rule, arranged

extravagant festivities in October 1971, on the occasion of the 2,500th anniversary of the founding of the Persian Empire by Cyrus the great. A tent city was erected at the city of Persepolis. Sixty members of royal families and heads of state participated in the grand gala dinner, with the catering served by Maxims.
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2,500_year_celebration_of_the_Persian_Empire

The 2,500th Anniversary of the Peacock Throne is speculated to be the most expensive party in history. The Shah of Iran spent \$90 million on the bash in 1971, which today must be way over \$600 million.
<http://stylecaster.com/throwback-thursday-the-2500-anniversary-of-the-persian-empire-was-the-most-expensive-party-in-history/#ixzz3YuMtnaQe>

¹⁹⁰ Muhsin Al-Hakim (1889-1970) became a Marji' following the death of Abul-Hassan Al-Asfehāni. His roots are still suspicious as he claimed to be a descendant of Hassan Ibn 'Ali Ibn Abi Tālib but there are many who believe that he is a Persian by lineage. It was he who created the new Shi'a hierarchy of Marji'iyā in which he claimed that there is a head Marji' and lesser ones after him. No such system existed before him despite the fact that he was preceded by several more knowledgeable and pious clerics. His influence in Iraq had survived his death by decades as a number of his sons played an important role in the Shi'a fight against the Ba'ath regime and collaborated with the invasion in 2003 and assumed positions of power in the new Iraq post invasion and occupation. His son's collaboration with the Zionists does not come as surprise to followers of politics in Iraq. On 20 February 1961, Muhsin Al-Hakim issued a fatwa forbidding Muslims from joining the Communist Party accusing communism of being blasphemy and atheism. Such fatwa had very serious consequence in treatment and persecution of communists in Iraq as it worked in favour of the reactionary forces in Iraq. It is suggested by some that it led to the death of some innocent communists.

See: Nabeel Al-Haidari, **Fatwa Shi'a Marji' Al-Hakim** (Arabic), Elaph, 3 November 2013, <http://elaph.com/Web/opinion/2012/11/771662.html>

¹⁹¹ Abul-Qāsim Al-Khoe'i (1899-1992) was one of the most influential Shi'a Marji'. He succeeded Muhsin Al-Hakim and like his predecessor

claimed to be a descendant of the House of 'Ali although that too has been contested without any clear answer. He had more Shi'a following than any other Marjis of his time including Al-Khomeini himself. In fact during his time the Marji'iyah became very powerful and established a true hierarchy as Muhsin Al-Hakim wanted it to be. He also amassed large wealth from the Khums (Shi'a Zakāt) so much so that Al-Khoe'i foundation assets are estimated to be worth over \$2billion. His power was manifested during the 1991 Shi'a uprising in which nearly all of Iraq was lost to the rebels who had some Iranian support. When Saddam Hussein sought Al-Khoe'i's assistance in combating the rebels, he was defiant and called on Saddam to show mercy, which was a calculated response, realizing his popular strength.

¹⁹² Muhammad Bāqir As-Sadr (1935-1980) was a highly respected Shi'a cleric. He achieved fame for two reasons. Firstly, he was outspoken in his political views as opposed to the normally quiet stand of Shi'a Marji's. Secondly, he wrote on issues, from which normally Shi'a clerics keep away. He is generally considered the ideological founder of the Da'wa Party, which assumed power in Iraq post invasion and occupation of 2003. Whether he was a member of the party or may never be known. However, Saddam Hussein arrested him for his connection to Al-Khomeini in Iran whom he knew when Al-Khomeini was in Iraq. He was later executed with his sister on 9 April 1980. He wrote a few books the two most famous are – Our Philosophy and Our Economics. Although his writing criticized both Capitalism and Socialism, he did not offer a viable alternative economic system. On philosophy, it is not so easy for a Muslim cleric to formulate an independent philosophical theory as he is always contained by religious dogma.

¹⁹³ *Al-Fridi, Noureldine (11 July 2013) "Iraqi Minister Explains Country's Stance on Regional Unrest",*

<http://www.al-monitor.com/pulse/politics/2013/07/iraq-foreign-minister-zebari-regional-unrest-syria-egypt.html>

¹⁹⁴ The ranking of Iraq by Transparency International, the global coalition against corruption. In its 2014 assessment Iraq ranked 170 out of 175, ahead of only Sudan and Somalia in the Arab world. Transparency International, **Corruption by Country, Iraq**, Corruption Perceptions Index <http://www.transparency.org/country#IRQ>

¹⁹⁵ Ahmed An-Naraqi (D. 1245 AH) emphasized the role of the faqih and granted him absolute authority in suggesting the theory of 'Wilāyet Al-Faqih' in a way that was considered a clear breach of the Shi'a fuqahā consensus. He stated that the faqih has the same authority as the Prophet and Imām unless excluded by a Qur'anic verse or consensus of views. He explained his conclusion on the ground that Allah is the source of all legislation and that He gave the Governance "wilāye" to the Prophets, Imāms and fuqahā. See: Shuqair, Shefeeq (3 October 2004) "**Wilāyet Al-Faqih Theory and its Effect on Contemporary Political Iranian Thinking**", (Arabic) AlJazeera.net
<http://www.aljazeera.net/specialfiles/pages/b89d2831-2b46-462f-9b5c-776d1b0edd80>

¹⁹⁶ On Al-Khomeini, see Al-Ani, Abdul-Haq & Al-Ani, Tarik (2012) "**Genocide in Iraq – The Case Against the UN Security Council and Member States**", Clarity Press Inc., pp. 31, 32, 34, 36, 157, 233, 235.

¹⁹⁷ See Note 191.

¹⁹⁸ Muhammad Mosaddeq, also spelled Masaddiq, or Mossadegh (born 1880, Tehrān, Iran—died March 5, 1967, Tehrān), Iranian political leader who nationalized the huge British oil holdings in Iran and, as premier in 1951–53, almost succeeded in deposing the shah..... In March 1951 the Majlis passed his oil-nationalization act, and his power had grown so great that the shah, Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi, was virtually forced to appoint him premier..... The nationalization resulted in a deepening crisis in Iran, both politically and economically. Mosaddeq and his National Front Party continued to gain power but alienated many supporters, particularly among the ruling elite and in the Western nations.... In August 1953, when the shah attempted to dismiss the premier, mobs of Mosaddeq followers took to the streets and forced the shah to leave the country. Within a few days, however, Mosaddeq's opponents, with U.S. support,

overthrew his regime and restored the shah to power. Mosaddeq was sentenced to three years' imprisonment for treason and, after he had served his sentence, was kept under house arrest for the rest of his life.

Mohammad Mosaddeq, *Encyclopaedias Britannica*,

<http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/393304/Mohammad-Mosaddeq>

¹⁹⁹ Hizb-ut-Tahrir (Party of Liberation) is an international pan-Islamic political organization. They are commonly associated with the goal of all Muslim countries unifying as an Islamic state or caliphate ruled by Islamic law (shari'a) and with a caliph head of state elected by Muslims.

The organization was founded in 1953 as a Sunni Muslim organization in Jerusalem by Taqiuddin An-Nabhāni, an Islamic scholar and appeals court judge (Qādi) from the Palestinian village of Ijzim. Since then Hizb ut-Tahrir has spread to more than 50 countries and by one estimate has about one million members. Hizb ut-Tahrir is very active in the West, particularly in the United Kingdom, and is also active in several Arab and Central Asian countries, despite being banned by some governments. The group also has a growing presence in North America, known as Hizb ut-Tahrir America, or HTA.

(http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hizb_ut-Tahrir)

The party official website has this to say:

"Hizb-ut-Tahrir is a political party whose ideology is Islam, so politics is its work and Islam is its ideology. It works within the Umma and together with her, so that she adopts Islam as her cause and is led to restore the Khilafah and the ruling by what Allah (swt) revealed. Hizb-ut-Tahrir is a political group and not a priestly one. Nor is it an academic, educational or a charity group. The Islamic thought is the soul of its body, its core and the secret of its life..... Its purpose was to revive the Islamic Umma from the severe decline that it had reached, and to liberate it from the thoughts, systems and laws of Kufr, as well as the domination and influence of the Kufr states.....

Its aim is to resume the Islamic way of life and to convey the Islamic da'wa to the world. This objective means bringing the Muslims back to living an Islamic way of life in *Dar al-Islam* and in an Islamic society

such that all of life's affairs in society are administered according to the Shari'a rules, and the viewpoint in it is the *halal* and the *haram* under the shade of the Islamic State, which is the Khalifah State . That state is the one in which Muslims appoint a Khalifa and give him the *bay'a* to listen and obey on condition that he rules according to the Book of Allah (swt) and the Sunnah of the Messenger of Allah (saw) and on condition that he conveys Islam as a message to the world through *da'wa* and jihad.

The Party, as well, aims at the correct revival of the Umma through enlightened thought. It also strives to bring her back to her previous might and glory such that she wrests the reins of initiative away from other states and nations, and returns to her rightful place as the first state in the world, as she was in the past, when she governs the world according to the laws of Islam."

<http://www.hizb-ut-tahrir.org/index.php/EN/def>

The site goes on to explain how the Party intends to implement its strategy to change the world to Islam. By reading what Hizb-ut-Tahrir wants, one cannot but wonder what is the difference between its aims and those of the Wahhābis, Muslim Brotherhood, Al-Qaeda, Islamic State, Nusra etc. Are we being fooled by the multitudes of parties and movements when in fact they are all one project manipulated by some common hands?

²⁰⁰ In the declining days of the Ottoman Empire, some Turkish nationalists adopted the word *Turanian* to express a pan-Turkic ideology, also called Turanism. As of 2013 Turanism forms an important aspect of the ideology of the Turkish Nationalist Movement Party (*MHP*), whose members are also known as Grey Wolves.
<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Turan>

²⁰¹ The trio represent the so-called pragmatic-conservative as opposed to the radicals represented by 'Ali Khamenei. These conservatives who are considered by the Revolutionary Guards and the radicals as being reactionary anti-revolution camp, have been powerful in their appeal to the general Iranian public. Their success has been shown in having maintained the leader of the group Hāshimi

Rafsanjāni in the powerful positions he has kept since the 1980s and in having secured two presidencies for Khatami and Rouhāni.

'Ali Akbar Hāshimi Rafsanjāni, was born in 1934 in south-eastern Iran to a family of farmers, he studied theology in the holy city of Qum with Ayatollah Al-Khomeini but did not become a jurist.Mr Rafsanjāni was speaker in the *Majlis* (Iran's parliament) from 1980-89. In the last year of the 1980-88 war with Iraq, Ayatollah Al-Khomeini appointed him acting commander-in-chief of the armed forces. In 2002, Mr Rafsanjāni was appointed head of the powerful Expediency Council, which arbitrates in disputes between the Majlis and the Guardian Council, which can block legislation. In 2006, he was elected to the Assembly of Experts and a year later was voted leader of the body which appoints the supreme leader. Domestically, he pursued an economically liberal policy that critics said failed to deliver on social justice.

In 1997 during the Mykonos trial in Germany, it was declared that Hāshimi Rafsanjāni has had a role in assassination of Iran's opposition activists in Europe. Rafsanjāni is currently sought by the Argentinian government for ordering the 1994 AMIA bombing in Buenos Aires.

He has been accused of corruption and considered to be one of the richest people in Iran today.

See: **Profile: Akbar Hāshimi Rafsanjāni**, BBC, 1 May, 2013.

<http://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-22494982>,

([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Akbar_Hashemi_Rafsanjani#cite_note-](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Akbar_Hashemi_Rafsanjani#cite_note-19)

19), Slackman, Michael, Former President at Center of Fight Within Political Elite, New York Times, 21 June 2009.

(<http://www.nytimes.com/2009/06/22/world/middleeast/22rafsanjan.html>)

Seyyed Muhammad Khatami was born 29 September 1943. He is an Iranian scholar, Shi'a theologian, and Reformist politician. He served as the fifth President of Iran from 2 August 1997 to 3 August 2005. He also served as Iran's Minister of Culture from 1982 to 1992. He was an outspoken critic of former President Mahmoud Ahmedinejad's government. On 8 February 2009, Khatami announced that he would run in the 2009 presidential election. On 16 March, he announced he was withdrawing from the race in favor of his long-time friend and adviser, former Prime Minister of Iran, Mir-Hossein Mousavi (another

member of the conservative camp in Iran) who went on to lose the election to Ahmedinejad.

(http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mohammad_Khatami)

Hassan Rouhāni was born 12 November 1948 is the seventh President of Iran, in office since 2013. He is also a former lawmaker, academic and former diplomat. He has been a member of Iran's Assembly of Experts since 1999, member of the Expediency Council since 1991, member of the Supreme National Security Council since 1989. (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hassan_Rouhani)

He is the architect of the new negotiations with the six states on Iran's nuclear program. It is undoubtedly that the outcome of this negotiation will determine the fate of the conservative camp led by Rafsanjāni and perhaps even the future of Iran and its revolution.

²⁰² Widely quoted on many site on the internet as part of a speech given by 'Ali Khamenei on the celebration of birth of 'Ali Ibn Abi Tālib as reported on Al-Manār web site on 17 May 2013.

<http://www.almanar.com.lb/wap/edetails.php?cid=41&eid=492849>

²⁰³ ***Selections from The Sayings And Preaching Of Amir Al-Mu'minin 'Ali Ibn Abi Tālib (Peace Be Upon Him) Including His Replies To Questions And Maxims Expressed For Various Purposes***, Hadith 199

<http://www.al-islam.org/nahjul-balagha-part-2-letters-and-sayings/selections-sayings-and-preaching-amir-al-muminin-ali#hadith-n-199>

²⁰⁴ Jabal 'Āmel is a mountainous region of Southern Lebanon. The Shi'a community in Jabal 'Āmel is said to be one of the oldest in history, second only to the Shi'i community of Medina, having been converted to Shi'ism by Abu Dharr Al-Ghifāri, a companion of the Islamic prophet, Muhammad and early supporter of 'Ali. The frequent occurrence of this account in many religious sources make it a credible belief although sometimes secular sources tend to suggest later dates for the emergence of Shi'ism in Jabal 'Āmel.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jabal_Amel#cite_note-2

However different views had been voiced. 'From Mohammad b. Hassan 'Āmeli (d. 1693, q.v.) to contemporary authors, Shi'ite clerics

the community's presence in Greater Syria (ash-Shām), of which Lebanon is a part, to Abu Dharr Al-Ghifāri, a Companion of the Prophet and partisan of Imām 'Alī b. Abi Tālib (cf. Mohājer, pp. 21-33). This allegation, however, appears not to be based on reliable historical sources, and historians are rather inclined to date the presence of Imāmite Shi'ites in Lebanon to the 9th century CE...

.. The Shi'ites centered at the Jabal 'Āmel, where they founded and kept up a tradition of erudition and transmission of religious knowledge. Shi'ism became established there in the 9th century and developed in the 11th, after which the region benefited from the population movements provoked by the withdrawal of the Shi'ites from Kesrawān.' (Sabrina Mervin, **SHI'ITES IN LEBANON**, *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/shiites-in-lebanon>)

²⁰⁵ A town 200 km to the north-east of Medina on the pilgrim route from Kufah to Mecca. Abu Dharr died there alone as the Prophet told him he would die alone as shown in the Hadith in the following note.

²⁰⁶ It was on the way to the Battle of Tabuk that this hadith originated. Here is how it is narrated by Ibn Ishāq: 'Then the apostle continued his journey and men began to drop behind. When the apostle was told that So-and-so had dropped behind he said, 'Let him be; for if there is any good in him God will join him to you; if not God has rid you of him'. Finally it was reported that Abu Dharr had dropped behind and his camel had delayed him. The apostle said the same words. Abu Dharr waited on his camel and when it walked slowly with him he took his gear and loaded it on his back and went off walking in the track of the apostle. The apostle stopped at one of his halting-places when a man called his attention to someone walking on the way alone. The apostle said that he hoped it was Abu Dharr, and when the people had looked carefully they said that it was he. The apostle said: 'God have mercy on Abu Dharr. He walks alone and he will die alone and he (will be) raised alone'. '

Sirat ibn Ishāq, ed. Guillaume, A., ed. (1955), "**The Life of Muhammad-A Translation of Ishāq's Sirat Rasul Allah**", Oxford University Press, P. 607.

²⁰⁷ Al-Maqdisi's statement as quoted in: Al-Muhājir, Ja'far (1992) "***At-Ta'sees Litareekh Ash-Shi'a fi Syria wa Lubnān***", (Arabic), Dar Al-Milak, Beirut, p.161.

²⁰⁸ Abul-Fida', Imād Ad-Deen "***The Concise History of Humanity or Chronicles***" (Arabic: 'Al-Mukhtasar fi Akhbār Al-Bashar), or ***Tarikh Abil-Fida'*** (Arabic), Egyptian Husseini Printing, undated, vol. 4, p. 22.

²⁰⁹ Towards the end of WWI when the Ottoman Empire was looking clearly at losing the war, British and French diplomats, Sir Mark Sykes and François Georges- Picot, were drafting the agreement that drew up the division of spoils of war between the two colonial powers of Britain and France. The agreement conjured up two new geographical entities on the nation-state model arguing that each of its constituents formed a homogenous mixture of people who could form a state. The agreement between Britain and France was later amended, in that the borders were drawn between the new Lebanon and mandated Palestine to suit the interests of both sides. For more details on the Agreement and its consequences see:

Al-Ani, Abdul-Haq & Al-Ani, Tarik (2012) "***Genocide in Iraq – The Case Against the UN Security Council and Member States***", Clarity Press Inc., pp. 13-15.

²¹⁰ The evidence of collaboration between Israel and the forces fighting the Syrian Army are overwhelming. Political statements by Israeli politicians of their desire for the rebels to topple the regime in Damascus are numerous. A few examples are given below.

".....a report from the UN Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF) reveals that Israel has been working closely with Syrian rebels in the Golan Heights and have kept close contact over the past 18 months.... The documents show that Israel has been doing more than simply treating wounded Syrian civilians in hospitals. This and a few past reports have described transfer of unspecified supplies from Israel to the Syrian rebels, and sightings of IDF soldiers meeting with the Syrian opposition east of the green zone, as well as incidents when Israeli soldiers opened up the fence to allow Syrians through who did not appear to be injured.'

See: Shwayder, Maya (12 July 2014), "***New UN report reveals collaboration between Israel and Syrian rebels***", The Jerusalem Post,

<http://www.jpost.com/Middle-East/New-UN-report-reveals-collaboration-between-Israel-and-Syrian-rebels-383926>

See also: Bryant, Christa Case (December 7, 2014) "**UN reports Israeli support for Syria rebels**", *Christian Science Monitor*, www.csmonitor.com/World/Middle-East/2014/1207/UN-reports-Israeli-support-for-Syria-rebels

"Israel's Shin Bet rearrested Golani Druze Sedki al-Maket (age 48). Until his **release in 2012** (Hebrew), he'd been the longest serving Israeli security prisoner, having spent 27 years detained..... Though Israeli security services haven't offered any reason for his arrest, it's likely they're angered because a week ago he followed Syrian rebels to a meeting inside Israeli-occupied territory. The rebels met with IDF forces who've **previously been shown** to receive **logistical and intelligence support** from Israel in previous reports here and in Israel and foreign media. Al Maket **filmed a video** while the meeting was underway, in which he described what he saw and offered it to Syrian TV. It was aired to the entire nation and likely monitored by Israeli security.'

See: Silverstein, Richard (March 03, 2015) "**Israel's IDF Supports Syrian Opposition Rebels: Shin Bet Secretly Arrests Golani Druze, Accusing Him of Exposing Rebel-IDF Collaboration**", Global Research, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/israels-idf-supports-syrian-opposition-rebels-shin-bet-secretly-arrests-golani-druze-accusing-him-of-exposing-rebel-idf-collaboration/5434175>

'Sharif As-Safouri, the commander of the Free Syrian Army's Al-Haramein Battalion, admitted to having entered Israel five times to meet with Israeli officers who later provided him with Soviet anti-tank weapons and light arms.'

See: Miller, Elhanan (13 August 2014) "**Syrian rebel commander says he collaborated with Israel**", *The Times of Israel*.
<http://www.timesofisrael.com/syrian-rebel-commander-says-he-collaborated-with-israel/>

²¹¹ See Note 181 above on Hamas Dilemma.

²¹² Jackson, Helen Hunt (1881), "**A Century of Dishonor**", Harper & Brothers, New York

²¹³ Fukuyama, Francis (1992) *“The End of History and the Last Man”*, Avon Books Inc., New York

²¹⁴ Noakes, George (1993) *“The Other 1492”* in “Cities of Light/ The Rise and Fall of Islamic Spain”, http://www.islamicspain.tv/Islamic-Spain/the_other_1492.htm

See also: <http://www.al-islam.org/al-tawhid/vol8-n3/end-islamic-spain-dates-names-and-places-dr-t-b-irving/fall-granada>

²¹⁵ The phrase 'Clash of Civilization' first appeared in 1926 in a book titled 'Young Islam on Trek: A study in the Clash of Civilizations' by Basil Mathews. Bernard Lewis used the same phrase in an article titled 'The Roots of Muslim Rage' published in the September 1990 issue of The Atlantic Monthly. This became a theory proposed by Samuel P. Huntington in a 1992 lecture at the American Enterprise Institute, which was then developed in a 1993 Foreign Affairs article titled 'The Clash of Civilizations'.

In response to Huntington’s theory, Iranian President, Muhammad Khatami introduced the idea of a 'Dialogue Among Civilizations', reviving a term which was initially used by Austrian philosopher Hans K ochler in 1972.

²¹⁶ I spent six years trying in vain to find an Arab publisher for the Arabic translation of my book ‘The Trial of Saddam Hussein’. I was told more than once that the Sa’udi owners of the publishing house opposed my book.

²¹⁷ See for example: Al-Ani Abdul-Haq & Al-Ani, Tarik (2015) *‘Volume II, Genocide In Iraq: The Obliteration of a Modern State’*, Clarity Press, Atlanta, GA.

²¹⁸ Baker visited Syria in 2003 and made an offer to Assad

see for example: Witt, Howard (4 May 2003) *“Powell Talks Assad Into Evicting Militant Groups”*, Sun Sentinel

http://articles.sun-sentinel.com/2003-05-04/news/0305030358_1_international-road-map-assad-syrian

²¹⁹ Yinon, Oded (1982) "A Strategy for Israel in the Nineteen Eighties"
<http://cosmos.ucc.ie/cs1064/jabowen/IPSC/articles/article0005345.html>

²²⁰ "...our biggest problem is our allies. Our allies in the region were our largest problem with Syria. The Turks who are great friends and I have a great relation with Erdogan... the Sa'udis, the Emiratis, et cetera. What were they doing? They were so determined to take down Assad and essentially have a proxy Sunni-Shi'a war. What did they do? They poured hundreds of millions of dollars and tens of thousands tons of weapons into anyone who would fight against Assad. Except that the people who were being supplied were An-Nusra and Al-Qaeda and the extremist elements of Jihadis coming from other parts of the world.... And we could not convince our colleagues to stop supplying them... The outcome of such a policy now is more visible".

From the speech by Vice President Joe Biden to students at the John F. Kennedy Jr. Forum at the Institute of Politics at Harvard University on 3 October 2014

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dcKVctg5dxM>

²²¹ Hamad Bin Jāsim Al Thāni was the most powerful man in Qatar between 2007 and 2013 who used to summon Arab leaders at will and dictate what decisions should be made. Yet when he failed to topple the Syrian regime as he promised, he was dismissed by the Imperialists with a single stroke of a pen. The change of ruling faces in the GCC over the last thirty years has been too frequent and too common to require further elaboration.