



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN SOCIAL SCIENCES & HUMANITIES

An International Open-Access Peer Reviewed Refereed Journal

Impact Factor: 8.909

E-ISSN: 2249 – 4642

P-ISSN: 2454 - 4671

A CONTEMPORARY READING OF THE FIRST POLITICAL WARS IN ISLAM (THE SO-CALLED APOSTASY WARS)

***Hanaa Saadoon Jabbar, **Hassan Taher Melhim**

*Kufa Technical Institute, Al-Furat Al-Aswat Technical University, 31003, Al-Kufa, Iraq

**Qur'anic Studies Department, College of Islamic Science, The Islamic University, Najaf, Iraq

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.37648/ijrssh.v12i04.034>

Paper Received:

02 August 2022

Paper Accepted:

03 September 2022

Paper Received After Correction:

12 November 2022

Paper Published:

26 November 2022



How to cite the article: Hanaa S.J., Hassan T.M.(2022)

A Contemporary Reading of the First Political Wars in Islam (The So-called Apostasy Wars), *International Journal of Research in Social Sciences & Humanities*, Oct-Dec 2022 Vol. 12, Issue 4; 646-663 DOI: <http://doi.org/10.37648/ijrssh.v12i04.034>

ABSTRACT

Contemporary historians and writers based on what was reported by the forerunners in the news of those who abstained from paying zakat after the death of the Messenger (peace and blessings be upon him) and the first caliph's receipt of the ruling in what they called the wars of apostasy and that the people had renounced their religion. Some of the Companions have them, as we explained in the addendum to the research, and from here it is clear to many historians and writers that the designation of these wars that was waged against them are purely political wars and have nothing to do with religion. Thus, the news of those who abstained from paying the zakat mixed with the news of the apostates from the time of the Messenger originally, as in the news of Musaylimah, who apostatized and was derived from his apostasy after the death of the Messenger. Since the truth of history is that it is news, and the news according to the words of Ibn Khaldun, al-Tabari and others is not safe for truthfulness due to reasons including the ramifications of opinions and doctrines, trust in the transmitters, and evasion of the intentions. All the news This research briefly clarifies the news of that turbulent period of time after the death of the Prophet.

Keywords: *wars of apostasy, the concept of apostasy, the principles of penance, Islam's position on the apostate.*

INTRODUCTION

The Islamic religion that the Messenger Muhammad brought was and still is a religion of affection, tolerance and sympathy, and the Messenger was sent only as a Messenger of mercy, and all that happened in the wars of apostasy, was for purely political purposes and not for a religious purpose, and from here it should be noted that what is said about a limit Apostasy, which is killing, is not true, and it is not part of Islam in anything. God says in his dear book: [There is no compulsion in religion], there is no room for neglecting this verse and building a new Sharia based on a hadith whose authenticity is questionable saying: whoever changes his religion, kill him, and

some even consider him one of the strict limits in Islam, and this is a clear contradiction and rejection. Expose the words of God Almighty, O God, make us among those who hear the saying and follow the best of it.

Perhaps what many of us are ignorant of is that the real reason for those wars, which were called the wars of apostasy, was not apostasy from Islam, leaving the religion and converting to another new religion, as happened in the case of Musaylimah the liar and Sajah bint Al-Harith, both of whom apostatized and left the religion and declared themselves a prophet at the time of the Prophet. But the reality of the apostasy wars was to fight those who refrained from paying the zakat, who were

considered outside the Islamic state, and perhaps it is more correct and safer to call them the wars of rebellion and rejection, not apostasy.

And the wars that took place at the time of Abu Bakr's assumption of the caliphate fall under the phenomenon of sacred violence that practiced jihad through religious interpretations with a divine mandate.

THE FIRST TOPIC.

Uncover the truth about wars called apostasy

It is almost in the construction of every civilization that violence is taken as a means to a further end, accompanying the course of societies and the emergence of the institutional state and its defense and ideology from the group and ideology, and the defense of its interests, as there is taking the principles of violence towards the other through wars, and this is what happened at the time of the first receipt of the caliphate Islam after the death of the Prophet.

These so-called wars of apostasy, which Caliph Abu Bakr fought during his rule of Muslims after the death of the Prophet, bear more than one problem, in which the confusion between what is religious and what is political is attributed.

Was it the right for Abu Bakr, after his succession to the Prophet, to legislate for himself the harvest of religious legitimacy that would allow him to fight those who withheld zakat? The one who originally disagreed with him was Omar Ibn Al-Khattab! Was the apostasy, which in its concept was the apostasy from one thing to another, i.e., the exchange of one religion for another? Was the description of this concept identical to the event and its circumstances?

There are signs that we should refer to, and they are the foundational texts for legislating the punishment for apostasy, such as the hadith of the Prophet i: I was commanded to fight people, until they say there is no god, but God and that Muhammad is the Messenger of God (Al-Baqarah: 256).

The hadith (whoever changed his religion, kill him), which was mentioned in Sahih al-Bukhari, quoting from Abu Bakr al-Jaza'iri (Al-Waqidi,1991, pp.32-36) These are the foundational texts in support of the legitimacy of Abu Bakr's work, to fight the Arab tribes that were named under the concept of those who withheld zakat.

It created a fertile arena in support of the legitimacy of the first caliph, so the main reason, as stated in the history books

that carefully researched, was the issue of refusing to accept the mandate of the first caliph, so I refused to pay zakat to him. Although she was giving zakat to the Prophet voluntarily

Dr. Ahmed Sobhi says in his book (The Limit of Apostasy): ... What Abu Bakr did is not a source of legislation, and that is why Omar and some of the Companions disagreed with him in his political jurisprudence, although he was correct in his political and military stance (Al-Waqidi, 1991, p.28).

This can be clarified in the issue of Abu Bakr, which his soldiers carried. The word apostasy was not mentioned. Rather, he addressed them with:

It can be said that Abu Bakr's disagreement with Omar Ibn Al-Khattab about the legitimacy of fighting those who witness the two testimonies suggests that the cause of the fighting was not belief, but rather the political and economic measures necessary for the establishment of the state (Mansour, 2008, p 42).

As we mentioned above, the early Muslim historians in general, and Seif bin Omar in particular, called the wars on the island without justification, and in Saif's news he stands out as a model for

inaccuracy, as he talks about a second apostasy (Shafiq, 2019).

He narrates a story, as usual, from his legendary imagination in the case of Qais and that he mobilized the war around him in the country of Yemen.

Thus, the statement is made that the hero of the apostasy narrations was Seif bin Omar, then the Sheikh of historians al-Tabari took it from him and sent it in full.

In the eyes of Seif and other historians, the local conflict could become a throwback to Islam.

From all this, the Muslim narrators considered all the opponents of the Islamic state in Medina immediately after the death of the Prophet (apostates) and thus called the fighting against them (the apostasy wars)

In the traditional accounts of apostasy, the basic assumption is that it is a religious movement directed against Islam, and for the narrators, the leaders of these movements against Medina were (false prophets) who preached religions that did not rise to their level in Islam (Melhem, p 157).

After this, it becomes clear to us that the takfiri or apostasy relationship has gone through two stages through the two

most important and dangerous hadiths after the death of the Messenger and the succession of Abu Bakr.

The first event: Saqifat Bani Sa'idah (the meeting), which is the most dangerous event that later generated grave events, as it was the first nucleus in the emergence of strife and conflict between Muslims themselves after the conflict was between Muslims and their enemies.

The Saqifa crisis has caused the most serious causes, the emergence of the crisis of Islamic legitimacy, which can grant the Caliph the right to decide on the apostates, and the legitimacy of the violence he will impose on them, and this is what actually happened...

The second event: is the movement of those withholding zakat, which they called (apostasy), in which the accusation was associated with unbelief?

Was the shed really a ground for atonement?

The manifestations of infidelity do not seem explicit in the meeting of the saqifa, but the spirit of exclusion was present in the relationship of the immigrants with the supporters, and in not giving any value to the absence of Ali bin Abi Talib, and the speed with which a new caliph was appointed remained the object of

opposition from many parties, all of these factors represented the ground Disagreement, through the combination of these factors formed the nucleus of atonement that will appear in the movement of explicit apostasy... Thus, the meeting of the shed was the beginning of the legitimacy crisis (Shufani, 2009, p 141).

The historian or researcher hardly notices that the meeting of the saqifa is overshadowed by a mixture and a touch of holiness during the inauguration and the conferring of charismatic qualities on the Quraish dynasty. The image of Abu Bakr was exaggerated in the official (political) blog as the second of the two (in the cave) and the most worthy companions to succeed the Messenger of God, although he declared More than once that it is not the best, and the evidence is recorded and well-known... The victory of Abu Bakr over Saad bin Ubadah is the victory of Quraish over the Ansar, who was led by Saad bin Ubadah. shed meeting. Abu Bakr said, resolving the dispute: The Prophet is from the Quraysh and his clan is more deserving of him.

Ali bin Abi Talib remains absent from the meeting, and his absence has had more impact in Islamic history than the presence of the Ansar, and historians have lied in

their blogs that the matter was in the form of shura, because the events that occurred under the shade of the Saqifa of Banu Sa'idah declared that the matter was a predominance and a tribal conflict that was not It belongs to the spirit of Islam. The consultation that we knew about the Prophet was the one that took place in the mosque, where Muslims meet with the Messenger, discuss without discrimination, and take their opinion and advice. There is no difference to him between an Arab or a non-Arab, or between a young and old.

It can be said: that the Prophet did not explain to the nation the general characteristics that the nation must adhere to in the shura, but the issue of shura remained as a general concept that has some ambiguity (Shufani, 2009, p 98).

The role of the Sunni historian was inclined to justify this haste in making a fateful decision that concerns all Muslims, for fear of sedition, but the sedition with which they justified their haste was in fact a result and not a cause.

The Saqifa was a foundation for the caliphate and a platform for atonement between the disputants, as we explained in the fluorescence of the research of the infidelity of the Ansar and their hatred and enmity by the hardened Quraysh... after it

became clear that the tribal logic was present and no other.

It was this conflict that created the great events later on, represented in the making of a new enemy for Ali, who is Muawiyah. And who followed the custom of his father Abu Sufyan in his hostility to the Messenger and the succession of Yazid later, the fall of al-Hurra, the killing of al-Husayn a, the name of al-Hasan..

From behind the shed, the tribal affiliation that the Prophet had fought back, especially after Abu Sufyan entered the front line, on the day he saw an aggravation in it that could only be extinguished by blood, and asked, eager for war: (Where are the humiliations Ali and Abba (Ben Hamouda,2019, p 137).

And these are the sayings of a man who is an expert in war, who angered him that the ruling should be in the Quraysh al-Battah and not in the apparent Quraysh, and Abu Sufyan believed later, and sedition arose, not sedition afterwards...

It was the opinion of Abu Sufyan that the rule became in the least neighborhood of Quraysh (Al-Hakim, 2004, p 84).

The logic of Abu Sufyan was that the rule would be the strongest, so he wanted to rouse Ali bin Abi Talib and call him to rebellion, but Abu Bakr took the hand of

Abu Sufyan and stopped his massive revolution by giving him a mandate from the states of the Levant to his son Yazid bin Abi Sufyan to appease him.

Ali preserved the principles of Islam by rejecting Abu Sufyan's offer, and the others attacked the principles of Islam in order to maintain the rule.

The struggle for power, which they described as peaceful, has turned into an internal struggle between Muslims

themselves, and the takfiri thought became a means to legitimize the Muslim's war in his fight against the Muslim for ends in which the religious with the political and the Islamic with the tribal would be mixed.

Yes, the Quraysh obtained their privileges that were hated by other tribes, and in their view it became a tribal invitation, not an Islamic one. The tribes saw that the imposition of the tax and the tax are privileges for Quraysh and not for Islam alone.

THE SECOND TOPIC

The concept of apostasy

Linguists defined it: apostasy from Islam as turning back from it, and so-and-so apostates from his religion if he disbelieves after his conversion to Islam (), so whoever rejects something from God's commands, or the order of the Messenger

is outside Islam (Al-Jazari, 1987, pp 10-11).

On this definition, the Islamic sources relied, and no other was found in describing the movements of apostasy, and it is one of the many methods that were adopted to distort the image of the claimant of prophethood.

The historical sources were keen on many evidence, from (the camp of infidelity) itself confirming that the supporters of infidelity were convinced of the lies of their prophets, but the tribal interests were calling for their victory.

Ibn al-Atheer narrates (Al-Jazari, 1987, p 460): Talha al-Nimri came and asked Musaylimah about his condition, so he told him that a man was coming to him in the dark.

Most of the tales are intended to distort the claimant of prophethood, such as the story of a woman who coveted the dignity of a Muslim woman, so the matter turned into a curse on palm trees, wells and children (Ibn Manzoor, 1979, p 173). This news came after the death of the claimant of prophecy, although we realize that the claimant of prophecy has supporters who believe in their sacred world.

It is not surprising that the world of disbelief and its prophets has been distorted, which he called apostasy.

It was mixed in order to distort the news of those withholding zakat as apostates, even though they refrained from paying zakat, waiting for a clarification of the new reality after the death of the Messenger. Thus, the war became moral between truth and lies and the killing of infidels and Muslims alike.

Historical sources convey that Abu Bakr dealt sternly with those who withheld zakat, who were called apostates.

The dangerous internal wars at the time of the caliphate of Abu Bakr can be divided into two types:

1- The apostates who declared their apostasy from Islam, the first of them was Musaylimah the Liar Ras Bani Hanifa in the east of the Arabian Peninsula. He claimed prophethood at the time of the Prophet, then Al-Aswad Al-Ansi in Sana'a. Then the prophecy claimed Sajha bint Al-Harith after the death of the Prophet. As for Taliha bin Khalid Al-Asadi, he claimed the prophethood during the illness of the Prophet in the country of Bani Asad.

2- Another group, tribes who were not satisfied with the pledge of allegiance to Abu Bakr, so they refrained from paying zakat to him, some of them withheld it, and some of them awaited what would happen to the caliphate, and some of them

said: We take it from our rich and give it to the poor.

After that, Abu Bakr resolved to fight them, without distinguishing between an apostate, and one who withheld the zakat, or was late in it, or who led it to his people rather than the caliph.

Here, there was a lot of controversy over Abu Bakr's treatment of the second sect withholding zakat, as he was able to get out of it with great firmness, with which he cut off disputes with a decisiveness that is not tainted by hesitation.

He was able to portray the position of these tribes as a position that refused to perform the obligation of zakat only, and that he lowered a thick curtain in front of their objection to the caliphate, which was the origin and the basis for their refusal to pay zakat to Abu Bakr?

These tribes had a clear statement in opposition to the pledge of allegiance to Abu Bakr and recalling the position of the Quraish in removing the caliphate of the Prophet from his family represented by Ali bin Abi Talib (peace be upon him).

This is Harith bin Saraqa, for example, and he is one of the sheikhs of Kinda in Hadramout, he says: We only obeyed the Messenger of God, if he was alive, and if a man from his family had risen, we would have obeyed him.

Then he sang a few verses of poetry, the first of which are:

We obeyed the Messenger of God when he was among us
How strange it is who obeys Abu Bakr (Al-Razi, 2002, P 12).

And another example, the leader of Kinda al-Ash'ath bin Qais used to say to his people: If you are as I see it, let your words be the same, stick to your countries, protect your harem, and withhold zakat on your money, for I know that the Arabs do not approve of the obedience of Banu Taim bin Murrah, and leave the masters of Batha from Banu Hashim to Jealous (Al-Jazari, 1987, pp 35-36).

The Banu Dhuhl of Kinda had a similar position as well, because they refused to pay zakat to Abu Bakr. On the day Ziyad bin Labid, the governor of Hadhramaut, called them to listen and obey, they said to him: You are calling for the obedience of a man who has not been entrusted to us or to you in whom a covenant has been made!

Ziyad said: You are right, for he was not entrusted to us, nor to you in it, but we chose him for this matter.

They said to him: Tell us, why did you forbid the people of his household, and

they are the most entitled to it? Because God says

:But kindred by blood have prior rights against each other in the Book of Allah (Al-Jazari, 1987, p 23).

Ziyad said to their speaker: The Emigrants and the Ansar see themselves from you.

Al-Harith Al-Dhahili Al-Kindi said to him frankly: No, by God, you did not remove it from its people except out of envy from you for them! And what settles in my heart is that the Messenger of God, left this world and did not establish some knowledge for people to follow!! So, leave her, man, for you are calling for dissatisfaction.

These voiced the call of instinct and intuition, and they came up with arguments that do not withstand all the arguments that came out of the choice of the shed.

Where is this position from the claim of preventing zakat and disrupting the limits of God (Ibn Atham, 1978).

If the Quraysh had chosen from where God and His Messenger chose for them, as some have stated, then these people and their ilk would have been among the most obedient to them, and none of these fierce wars that took thousands of souls, men, boys and women, would have been for Islam and its security to be strength over strength (Al-Anfal: 75).

It is true what Ammar bin Hamouda and Saeb Abdul Hamid said that the saddest thing is that history has included these among the apostates, so we find no mention of them in the records of our history except in a section under the titles (wars of apostasy:(

Al-Tabari's History: Hadramawt was mentioned in their response!! (Saeb, 2005, p 428).

In Fattouh Ibn Atham: ((He mentioned the people of Hadhramaut's apostasy from Kinda and the Muslims' war against them!! (Saeb, 2005, p 428).

Thus, it is true to say that the official history differs greatly from the history of the nation, which preserves its issues with a degree of honesty.

Kinda struggle :

The truth is that we do not read in the history books except that this Kinda and the people of Hadhramaut did not start a dispute nor did they declare their condemnation of this until Prince Ziyad bin Labid provoked them, and then strengthened them by what he sent them of the threat of war, after he drove the charitable camels that they had initially given and moved away from their homes! And all those who called for this threat, who dragged behind him long wars, quarrelling over one she-camel, yes, one. The emir took it and branded it with the name of alms, and its owner was fond of it, so the emir begged to return it to him and take its place as he wanted, but the emir refused, so this interceded for the chief of his people, Al-Harith. Ibn Saraqa, the prince did not intercede, so Al-Harith went to the she-camel and returned it to its owner. Ziyad got angry and went out and drove with him the alms until he moved away from their homes, so he sent the alms to Abu Bakr and he and his army stayed. So he sent to the people of Hadramawt threatening them with war, and he intended to be astonished, so he heard from them what he heard of their denunciation of the Quraish, the advance of Abu Bakr and the delay of Banu Hashim, so he returned to Abu Bakr telling

him the news of these tribes, ((They were determined to apostasy and disobedience)) This is how history described the situation, and this is how it was written The story, so Abu Bakr prepared an army for him to fight them, and provided him with Ikrimah bin Abi Jahl among his soldiers (Al-Tabari, 2001).

THE THIRD TOPIC

Khalid bin Al-Waleed and the Al Sahabi Malik bin Nuwayrah

[And whoever kills a believer intentionally, his recompense is Hell, he will abide therein. And God is angry with him, and he curses him].

On the authority of Ibn Abbas, he said: A man came to him and said: Have you seen a man who intentionally killed a man? He said: His reward is Hell to abide in it...) He said: It was revealed at the end of what was revealed. Nothing copied it until the Messenger of God

He said: To demolish the Kaaba stone by stone is easier than killing a Muslim. And another saying: He who takes up arms against us is not from us (Ibn Atham, 1978, p 62).

The first roots of takfir:

The growth of the phenomenon of takfir emerged and became aggravated during the period of the Wahhabi tide in the countries of Najd and Hijaz, and it is in fact an extension of the political conflict witnessed by periods of Islamic history, and it cannot be separated from the complex political conditions that prevailed in the early days of Islam. Rather, it can be said that some of its signs were during the era of The Noble Prophet.

By carefully reading some of the narrations, we will see what reinforces what we have previously said:

First story:

Al-Bukhari reported on the authority of Abu Saeed, who said: While the Prophet was dividing the spoils that the Muslims had acquired, Abdullah bin Dhul-Khuwaisrah al-Tamimi came and said: Be just, O Messenger of God. He said: Woe to you? It is amended if I do not amend.

Omar Ibn Al-Khattab said: O Messenger of God, permit me to strike his neck. He said: Leave him, for he has companions. One of you belittles his prayer with their prayers, and his fasting with theirs, they pass from the religion as an arrow passes from the shooter (Al-Tabari, 2001).

The second story:

Ali, while he was in Yemen, sent a gift to the Prophet, and he divided it among four, and a man said: O Messenger

God, fear God. He said: Woe to you! Am I not the most worthy of the people of the earth to fear God? Then the man turned away. Khalid ibn al-Walid said, O Messenger of God, should I not strike his neck? He said: No, perhaps he is praying. Khalid said: How many worshipers say with their tongues what is not in their heart, so he said: I am commanded to dig through people's hearts and not cut open their stomachs (An-Nisa: 93).

These two narrations refer to two important issues, the first of which shows that the early beginnings of the emergence of the phenomenon of takfir in Islam, by ruling the two persons objecting to the division of the Messenger implicitly and impliedly, not explicitly, by Omar Ibn Al-Khattab and Khalid Ibn Al-Walid, asking them to cut off the heads of the objectors, It means that they were condemned to infidels without the permission or approval of the Messenger of God, bearing in mind that the objectors are Muslims. Otherwise, they wouldn't have attended the division and the evidence of Khaled's saying and how many men say with his tongue...)... according to Khaled's theory above.

As for the second issue: what came from the precise description of the people of the takfiri thought on the tongue of the Prophet i: He has companions who belittle his prayer with theirs..). What happened in the two cases is the first terrorist act in the history of early Islam that is fully consistent with the concept of terrorism or what is termed today as (terrorist act): in form and content. Unlawful use or threat of force or violence with intent to achieve political goals.

The killing of Malik and his people is considered one of the greatest crimes committed in the name of Islam because it represented a crime that was not known at the time in beheading and genocide, along with mutilation of corpses that the Prophet (peace be upon him) forbade. From this event, justifications and pretexts to legitimize such actions in the name of religion began. What Khaled did to Malik by cutting off his head, then cooking it over a burning fire, and then committing adultery with his wife, can be compared to what ISIS did, and it is easy for us to match the images in thought and approach.

And from that day, the treachery of the opponents began, as Khalid bin Al-Walid betrayed the people of Malik when he met them, Khaled's soldiers told them that we are Muslims, and Malik's people

responded to them, and we are Muslims. If so, put down your weapons...

Then everyone prayed the Islamic prayer, and when the prayer ended, they betrayed them and suffocated them and took them captives to Khalid.. So, Abu Qatada Al-Ansari and Abdullah bin Omar rushed to defend Malik and his people and testified to their Islam and the performance of prayer. However, Khalid did not listen to their testimony, and Malik defended himself against accusations of infidelity, but to no avail, and Khalid tempted the mission to Dirar ibn al-Azwar (Al-Tirmidhi, 1975).

Historians mentioned that when Malik met Khaled and told him that he embraced Islam, but what Khaled thought in his heart was more resonant, so he ordered Dirar to strike his neck and the attempts of Abdullah bin Omar and Abu Qatada failed after they tried in vain to prevent Khaled from killing Malik.

This is famous in history that Khaled was in love with Malik's woman for her beauty and was one of the most famous Arab beauties, and so everything was done simply by cooking your head for dinner that night...

Abu Qatada became angry with the Ansar to the extent that he promised God

that he would not witness a war with Khalid after it (Ibn Katheer, p 107).

And when Khalid returned to Medina and entered its mosque, Omar Ibn Al-Khattab stood up to him and grabbed the arrows from his turban, saying to him: Arya killed a Muslim woman, then I ran off on his wife, and by God, I will stone you with buckets. Umar became very angry, until he said to Abu Bakr: He committed fornication, so I stoned him, but Abu Bakr refused.

Umar said: How do people fight, and the Messenger of God said: I have been commanded to fight the people until they say there is no god but him (25) Abu Bakr said in response to him: Lift your tongue from Khaled, I would not sheath a sword, may God bless them (Al-Akkad, 2003, p 99).

Omar was not convinced by Khalid's diligence, nor by the diligence of his companion (Abu Bakr), so we see him when he took over the caliphate. His first decision was to remove Khalid from the leadership of the Muslim army. And let go of the fabricated and fabricated justifications that the dismissal of Khalid was due to the fear of Muslims being fascinated by his victories (Al-Akkad, 2003, p 129).

It suffices us to stand on the firm belief that Khaled has no right to kill Malik. And Malik had more right to send him to the Caliph (Ibn Katheer, p 464).

Thus, Islamic jurisprudence found a strong basis for us, with the words of the first caliph (He interpreted and erred) to be a slogan and an excuse for every treacherous and immoral person who explodes in the honor of Muslims.

Islam's position on the apostate:

The Qur'anic evidence almost indicates that the Prophet was a bearer of good tidings and a warning to the people, for God specified for him the type of authority (by al-Bashir) only. And He knows best of the guided) (Al-Bukhari, 2001, pp 174-210). with the evidence of the verses: [And We have not sent you except as a bearer of good tidings and a warner] [Do you then hate him?]

It has not been proven in the heritage books that the Noble Messenger killed someone who apostatized from the religion, and if the Messenger had ordered the killing of the apostate, he would have killed the Bedouin who had apostatized from his religion in front of the sight and hearing of the Messenger, as Al-Bukhari mentioned that in more than one chapter in his book. As for the one who ordered the

Prophet to kill them, it was for one of two reasons: they had no third place, either because they killed a soul, or they corrupted the land, by inciting against Muslims or revealing their secrets, and this confirms that the ruling on apostasy and naming apostasy was a purely political ruling, not a legal ruling.

No matter how much the commentators and historians drummed about the interpretation of verses and events, such as Al-Qurtubi, Ibn Kathir, and others, and Al-Hakimah Bardah who abstained from paying the zakat, an objective reading of history confirms that they were not apostates at all, as stated by Judge Nouredin Al-Testari in his book Al-Sawarim Al-Muhriqa in Criticism of the Holocaust Lightning (Al-Akkad, 2003, p 100).

Rather, most of them wanted to inquire and explore matters and the incidents that happened in Medina, from which they understood that the caliphate belongs to the master of Bani Hashim and not to Sayyid Taym, who is inferior to the tribes despite his companionship of the Messenger, and this is what was mentioned.

They can be described as tribes of Muslims who did not accept the pledge of allegiance to Abu Bakr, so they refrained

from paying the zakat, some of them withheld it and some of them stopped waiting for what would happen to the caliphate.

Some of them said: We take it from the rich and give it to the poor.

Then I chant:

We obeyed the Messenger of God when he was our Prophet	We obeyed the Messenger of God	We obeyed the Messenger of God when he was our Prophet
--	--------------------------------	--

The leader of Kinda Al-Ash'ath bin Qais had also declared to his people not to accept the caliphate of Abu Bakr without the masters of Batha from Bani Hashim (Al-Akkad, 1980, p 178).

The problem, then, is the problem of who is the caliph after the Prophet, not the problem of religion. They are looking for tranquillity at that time, neither rebellion nor disobedience, with that, when the internal wars broke out, Malik forbade his people to gather, and ordered them to disperse at their time, to avoid what might be in the eyes of the ruler rebellion (Al-Akkad, 2003, p 101).

Dr. Khalil Abd al-Karim says in his book Shado al-Rababa, Chapter of Companions and Killing: The Companions

And they declared that publicly, not secretly. This Harith bin Saraqa, one of the elders of Kinda in Hadramout, says: We only obeyed the Messenger of God when he was alive, and if a man from his family had risen, we would have obeyed him.

killed each other, and perhaps many would denounce it... But that is what books of biographies, histories, and books of the Sunnah have carried, but in the later ages a widespread and deliberate process of arrogance took place (blinding arrogance).

Not about the incidents of murder, but on all the facts, even the simple jostling, to account for the illusory glorification and glorification... etc. This is, in our opinion, a wrong approach, because when we present the image of the Companions, it must be presented in all its aspects, bright and dark, and in all cases of anger, peace and war.. After that, the news of Malik bin Nuwayra is reported and shows that he was a companion of Islam and his brother

the poet Mutamam bin Nuwayra, al-Tabari says: The Prophet sent Malik bin Nuwayra to the charity of Banu Yarubu, and he confirmed by saying: Except that he did not show apostasy from him as in the lion of the forest ⁽³⁵⁾, but Khaled ordered his soldiers By killing them after he commanded them in the formula (warm your captives) this phrase was like the password, although the distinction between a Muslim and an apostate is clear, as happened in the establishment of prayer with them.

There was a motive behind Khalid's killing of Malik in particular, which is not hidden, which is that he was the husband of Umm Tammam, who is one of the most beautiful women in the Arabian Peninsula. Islam adored her and wished for her peace, and as soon as he killed her husband and before he healed her womb - and contrary to what happened from the established custom at (the ignorance not to tread on the battlefield) and the orders of the Messenger Muhammad were explicit and firm not to take them without waiting for their menstruation - Khaled rushed so he rode Umm Tammam Thus, he fulfilled his old dream, ignoring any custom or the hadiths of Muhammad in this regard (Al-Qasas :56)

The matter that frightened Omar Ibn Al-Khattab, so he ran to the Caliph Abu Bakr as soon as he heard the news, asking for the punishment of murder and adultery against Khalid (Al-Tustari, p 242).

The writer came out of all this with many evidence, including: that Malik affirmed that he is on the religion of Islam in addition to the testimony that each of: the two companions Abu Qatada Al-Ansari and Abdullah bin Omar, and they are considered among the best companions that Malik remained on his Islam and did not apostate, in addition to the saying of Omar bin Al-Khattab by Ibn al-Walid: I killed a Muslim woman. And it is another testimony to Malik, because Omar is not one who says the words arbitrarily, or they deceive, so the act of Ibn Al-Walid was terrorism in his own way in killing a Muslim man, he married his wife and had sex with her on the same night after her husband was burned at the scene of the tragedy, so Omar Ibn Al-Khattab considered a crime of murder and a crime of adultery and asked Signing the had punishment, had it not been for the policy taken by Abu Bakr that prevented that by declaring (He interpreted and erred), which became common later on to cover up many of the crimes and misdeeds that the Companions did later (Ibn Atham, 1978).

Thus, the motives of the policy called in our present day (national security) are what drive the princes to disregard the signing of the limits of God. And the poet's saying becomes true of this:

Killing someone in a forest is an unforgivable crime

The killing of a safe people is a matter for consideration (Saeb, 2005, p 440).

It is not surprising that the patient believer or the thinker or rebellious advocate for the truth would be a terrorist after a while in the language of political Islam that legislated for that, and issued fatwas that are shallow and forged in the planning and justification of such an order, and the expulsion of the inferior from the positions of inferiority to the positions of false supremacy (Abd al-Karim, 2009, pp 217-218).

Financial support and sponsorship: Nil

Conflict of Interest: None

REFERENCES

1. Abd al-Karim, A. (2009). *Shad Al Rababah in the Conditions of the Society of the Companions*. Dar Misr Al-Mahrousa Publications.
2. Abi Al-Fida, I, A. (2001). *The History of Abu Al-Fida (A Brief Fi Akhbar Al-Bishr)*, Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmia Publications.
3. Al-Akkad, A, M. (1980). *The Genius of Omar*, The Islamic Genius Series. Lebanon: Dar Al-Qalam.
4. Al-Akkad, A, M. (2003). *The Genius of Khaled ibn Al-Walid*, Egypt: Nahdet Misr.
5. Al-Akra, A. (1993). *Political Terrorism, Research on the Origins and Dimensions of the Phenomenon*. Dar Al-Tali`ah for Printing and Publishing.
6. Al-Bukhari, M, I. (2001). Lebanon, Beirut: House of Reviving the Arab Heritage. Sahih albakharii
7. Al-Hakim, M, B. (2004). *Islamic Judgment between Theory and Practice*, Dar Al-Tabligh Al-Islami Publications.
8. Al-Jazari, I, A. A. (1987). *Al-Kamil fi History*. Lebanon, Beirut: Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmia.
9. Al-Jazari, I, A. A. (2001). *Assd Al Gaba in the Knowledge of the Companions*. Dar Ibn Hazm Publications.
10. Al-Razi, F, O. (2002). *The Great Interpretation, or Keys to the Unseen*, Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyya.
11. Al-Tabari, M, J. (2001). *The History of the Messengers and Kings*. Lebanon, Beirut: House of the Princess.
12. Al-Tirmidhi, M, I, S. (1975). *The Great Mosque, Sunan al-Tirmidhi*, Egypt: Dar al-Tassir.
13. Al-Tustari, A, A. (n.d). (Ed) J, A. *Al-Sawarim Al-Muharqa in the Answer to the Burning Lightning*. (1). Dar Mashar Publications.
14. Al-Waqidi, M, O. (1991). (1), Jordan, Amman. Kitab alradati
15. Benhamouda, A. (2007). *Atonement in the Old Islamic Discourse, The Question of Legitimacy and Violence*. (1). Believers Without Borders Foundation, Moroccan Library.
16. Ibn Abi Al-Hadidm I, A. (2007). *explaining Nahj Al-Balaghah*. (1). Dar Al-Kitab Al-Arabi, Dar Al-Amira for Printing and Publishing.
17. Ibn Atham, A, A. (1978). *Al-Futuh*. (1). Egypt: Dar al-Adwaa.
18. Ibn Katheer, I, O. (n.d). *The Beginning and the End*. Lebanon, Beirut: Publications, College of Knowledge.
19. Ibn Manzoor, M, M. (1979). *Lisan Al-Arab*. Egypt Publications, Dar Al-Maaref.
20. Mansour, S, A. (2008). *Hadd Al-Rada*. (1) 42. Lebanon, Beirut: Dar Al-Intisar Al-Arabi.

21. Melhem, H, T. (2022). *First Fitna - Shura Al-Seyouf*. Beirut, Lebanon: Dar Al-Arif Publications.
 22. Saeb, A. (2005). *A History of Cultural and Political Islam*. Iran, Qom: Publications Department of Jurisprudence Encyclopedia.
 23. Shufani, E. (2009). *Wars of Ridda*. (1). Syria, Damascus: Dar Al-Hassad.
 24. The Holy Quran
2. Shafiq, K. (2019). The wars of those who refuse to pay zakat, a political, not religious, apostasy. *Believers Without Borders*.
 3. Wars of Apostasy,
 4. Withholding Zakat is a political and not a religious response on the Internet.
 5. <https://www.mominoun.com/auteur/1248>

Websites:

1. Ben Hamouda A. (2007). Atonement in the Old Islamic Discourse, The Question of Legitimacy and Violence. (1) 137. *Believers*

