Khālid ibn al-Walīd
and the alledged killing of Malik ibn Nuwayrah
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ً</td>
<td>'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أ</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ا</td>
<td>ā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ب</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ت</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ث</td>
<td>th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ج</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ح</td>
<td>ḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>خ</td>
<td>kh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>د</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ذ</td>
<td>dh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ر</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ز</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>س</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ش</td>
<td>sh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ص</td>
<td>š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ض</td>
<td>ḍ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ط</td>
<td>ṭ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ظ</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ع</td>
<td>ʿ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>غ</td>
<td>gh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ف</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ق</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ك</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ل</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>م</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ن</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>و</td>
<td>w, ū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ه</td>
<td>ḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ي</td>
<td>y, ī</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question: It is alleged that during the khilāfah of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr, Khālid ibn al-Walīd, the Ṣaḥābī military commander, killed Mālik ibn Nuwayrah, and married his widow on the very eve of his murder, without even waiting for her ‘iddah to expire. What is the truth of this allegation?

Answer: The incident of Mālik ibn Nuwayrah is one of those cases which are frequently cited by Shīʿī propagandists whose first step in the direction of convincing and converting the Ahl al-Sunnah almost invariably assumes the form of an attempt to prove how innately corrupt and evil the Ṣaḥābah were (naʿūdhu billāh).

These are historical issues, and must be treated as such. This means that in judging their historicity one should firstly include all the evidence which exists around the issue, both general and specific, and secondly, be objective enough to look critically at the authenticity of one’s material. Seeking to brand persons, and more especially the Ṣaḥābah, as corrupt and irreligious on grounds of only one side of the available evidence, and stubbornly refusing to critically scrutinise the historical material upon the basis of which a claim of this serious nature is made, can only point to the fact that the accusers have an agenda — an agenda which they are committed to promote and uphold, no matter to what extent truth and honesty might be compromised in the process.

It is indeed a sad indictment of the objectivity of the Shīʿī propagandists that they refuse point blank to take into consideration, when discussing the Ṣaḥābah, the wealth of āyāt in the Qurʾān which announce the merits of the Ṣaḥābah. Similarly, they refuse to pay any attention to the numerous aḥādīth, both general and specific, in which Rasūlullāh himself extolls the virtues of his companions. Thirdly, they cannot bear to even cast a glance at the services rendered to the cause of Islam by any particular Ṣaḥābī. To them the vaguest notion of a black spot on the character of a companion of Rasūlullāh and a champion of Islam — even if amounts to nothing more an unsubstantiated, or even forged, report in a book on history — is enough to render null and void
decades of dedicated service to the cause of Islam, despite the fact that his service had been rewarded with approval by Allāh and His Rasūl  

Let us turn now to the actual issue. We will discuss it under two headings:

1. The execution of Mālik ibn Nuwayrah
2. Khālid’s alleged marriage to Mālik’s wife

The execution of Mālik ibn Nuwayrah

Shortly after the demise of Rasūlullāh  a number of tribes in the Arabian peninsula turned away from Islam. With many of them apostasy was expressed in the form of a refusal to pay the zakāh. From Madīnah Sayyidunā Abū Bakr  dispatched a number of punitive expeditions. Khālid ibn al-Walīd  was placed in command of one such expedition.

After his victory against some of the apostate tribes, Khālid set out for Banū Sulaym, another of the apostate tribes. On his way towards Banū Sulaym he passed through the lands of Banū Tamīm. Mālik ibn Nuwayrah was a member of this tribe, and he had been appointed zakāh - collector of Banū Tamīm by Rasūlullāh . Reports had been circulating that Mālik too, was withholding the zakāh.1 There were even more disturbing reports about him having started to speak ill about Rasūlullāh , and referring to him in derogatory terms.2

Sayyidunā Khālid  had orders from Sayyidunā Abū Bakr  to inspect the practices of the people of the various locations he passed by in order to find out whether they were Muslims or whether they too, had forsaken Islam. If they heard the adhān and saw the people performing ṣalāh they could conclude that they were Muslims, and if they did not see them upholding the ṣalāh that would be an indication that they were not Muslim.3 In the case of Banū Tamīm, Sayyidunā Khālid’s spies differed: some claimed that they did not make ṣalāh, while others claimed that they did.4
According to one report, their mu‘adhin, a person by the name of Abū al-Jalāl, was absent, which was the reason why no adhān was heard. It has even been reported that they encountered armed resistance from Mālik and his men at an oasis called al-Ba‘ūdah. Those who put up the resistance, including Mālik, were captured and brought before Sayyidunā Khālid. He decided that they must be put to death. This is how Mālik ibn Nuwayrah was killed.

In Sayyidunā Khālid’s party was the Ṣaḥābī Sayyidunā Abū Qatādah. He was amongst those who claimed that they had seen Mālik’s people making ṣalāh. He was thus understandably upset at the decision of Sayyidunā Khālid, and returned immediately to Madīnah to complain to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr. Sayyidunā ʿUmar insisted that Khālid be removed from his position as commander on account of his impetuousness. Khālid was summoned back to Madīnah and interrogated by the khalīfah, who concluded that Khālid’s deed was an error of judgement, for which it was not necessary to dismiss him.

Sayyidunā Abū Bakr was guided in this decision by two things. Firstly, the ḥadīth of Rasūlullāh wherein he described Khālid as “the sword which Allāh unsheathed against the unbelievers”.

The second was the fact that a similar occurrence took place in the time of Rasūlullāh, also with Khālid ibn al-Walīd. He was put in command by Rasūlullāh of an expedition to Banū Jadhīmah. When Khālid asked them to accept Islam they responded by saying: “saba’nā, saba’nā”, a word which literally means “We have become Sabeans”, but which had come to be used in the general sense of changing one’s religion. To Khālid this was not sufficient evidence of their acceptance of Islam, and he gave the order for their execution. When the news of their execution reached Rasūlullāh he lifted his hands and said: “O Allāh, I dissociate myself from what Khālid has done.” Although Rasūlullāh dissociated himself from the haste Khālid made himself guilty of, he did not punish him, since it was an error in judgement on his part. A very regrettable error it was, but it was still an error. It was for this reason that Rasūlullāh
did not hesitate to give Khālid command over other expeditions as well.

Shortly after the Banū Jadhīmah incident Rasūlullāh entrusted him with the mission to destroy the temple of the pagan goddess ʿUzzā at a place called Nakhlah. In Jumād al-Ulā in the year 10 A.H he was sent on a daʿwah mission to Banū Ḥārith ibn Kaʿb, and they accepted Islam at his hands without a drop of blood being shed. It was also to Khālid that Rasūlullāh entrusted the expedition to Ukaydir ibn ʿAbd al-Malik.

Above all there was the day, at the battle of Muʿtah in the year 8 A.H, when Khālid ibn al-Walīd would prove his valour and military genius by saving the day for Islam and the Muslim ummah in its first ever encounter with the Roman Empire. The three generals appointed by Rasūlullāh all attained martyrdom in succession, and the standard was taken over by the valiant Khālid, who through his sheer genius managed to save the honour of Islam by effecting a tactical withdrawal after what seemed like certain defeat. Rasūlullāh was informed by Allāh of what had happened at Muʿtah, and although his eyes were filled with tears at the martyrdom of his beloved cousin Jaʿfar ibn Abī Ṭālib, his adopted son Zayd ibn Ḥārithah and the poet ʿAbd Allāh ibn Rawāḥah, he saw reason to give the Muslims in Madīnah the glad tidings of Khālid’s victory, saying: “then the standard was taken up by a Sword from amongst the Swords of Allāh, and upon his hands did Allāh grant victory.”

All of this shows that Rasūlullāh saw the Banū Jadhīmah incident, as regrettable as it was, as a mistake on the part of Khālid. In not punishing Khālid for the execution of Mālik ibn Nuwayrah, and not dismissing him from his post as commander, Sayyidunā Abū Bakr was thus completely justified. His interrogation of Khālid revealed that Khālid had committed an error of judgement, and the insistence of Sayyidunā ʿUmar that Khālid be dismissed was met by a resolute answer from Sayyidunā Abū Bakr: “I will not sheath the sword that was drawn by Allāh.” Like Rasūlullāh did in the case of Banū Jadhīmah, Sayyidunā Abū Bakr paid out blood money to Mālik’s
brother Mutammim, and ordered the release of all captives taken by Khālid.\textsuperscript{13}

**Khālid’s alleged marriage to Mālik’s wife**

With the passage of time the incident of Mālik ibn Nuwayrah became the object of the attention of certain unscrupulous transmitters of history. An obnoxious tail was soon introduced into the story in the form of Mālik’s wife, who is named as Umm Tamīm bint Minhāl. Khālid, it was said, was so enamoured of the beautiful Umm Tamīm that he saw fit to slaughter Mālik and his entire tribe in order to possess her, and barely was the slaughter over when he took her as his own wife.

In an allegation as serious as this, one would have expected the party levelling the accusation to produce reliable evidence to support their claim. However, all that is ever produced is fragments of statements by historians. The accusers consistently fail to realise that a quotation is of no value for as long as it cannot be authenticated. While they display great vigour in levelling the accusation and stating their references, complete with volume and page numbers, they conveniently and consistently forget to authenticate those “facts”. The great imām ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-Mubārak stated a most profound truth when he said:

\textbf{Isnād (stating the chain of narration) is part of dīn. Were it not for isnād, anyone could have said just what he wished.}\textsuperscript{14}

A study of the texts wherein reference is made to the story of Mālik ibn Nuwayrah reveals that not a single one of them is reported with an uninterrupted chain of narration that consists of reliable authorities. We may confidently say that we have looked at almost all the available material on the issue of Mālik ibn Nuwayrah, and we have found that they may be classified into two types:

1. reports in which no mention at all is made of Mālik’s wife, and
2. reports in which she is mentioned.
The former type includes material narrated via authentic as well as unauthentic chains of narration. As for the latter type (the reports which make mention of Mālik’s wife), they have been handed down exclusively through highly unreliable chains of narration. They all suffer from two deficiencies: untrustworthy or unknown narrators, and suspicious interruptions in the chain of narration. We might, for example, look at the reports about Mālik’s wife mentioned in sources like al-Ṭabarī’s *Ṭārīkh* and Ibn Ḥajar’s *al-Iṣābah*:

(1) Khālid married Umm Tamīm the daughter of Minhāl, and left her till her period of waiting ended.¹⁵

This report appears in a long narrative documented by al-Ṭabarī on the authority of the following chain of narration:

\[\text{Al-Ṭabarī} \quad \text{(narrates from)} \quad \text{al-Sarī} \quad \text{ibn Yaḥyā} \quad \text{(who narrates from)} \quad \text{Shuʿayb} \quad \text{ibn Ibrāhīm} \quad \text{(who narrates from)} \quad \text{Sayf} \quad \text{ibn ʿUmar} \quad \text{(who narrates from)} \quad \text{Sahl} \quad \text{(ibn Yūsuf)} \quad \text{(who narrates from)} \quad \text{Qāsim} \quad \text{(ibn Muḥammad)} \quad \text{and} \quad ʿAmr \quad \text{ibn Shuʿayb}, \text{who say...} \]

This isnād is extremely defective, on several counts. Firstly, it runs through the historian Sayf ibn ʿUmar al-Tamīmī, whose extreme unreliability is a matter of consensus among the rijāl critics. Ibn Ḥibbān has summed up their opinions of him in the words: “He narrates forged material from reliable narrators. They (the critics) say he used to forge ḥadīth.” He adds that Sayf was suspected of *zandaqah* (sacrilege).¹⁶ Of recent there has been much protest by Shīʿī authors about reliance upon Sayf’s narrations about ʿAbd Allāh ibn Saba’, (despite the fact that Sayf is not the only historian who mentions Ibn Saba’ and his role). However, it seems when the very same Sayf narrates historical material in which the Ṣaḥābah are maligned, a blind eye must be turned to his proven mendacity.

The second problem is with the person who narrates from Sayf, namely Shuʿayb ibn Ibrāhīm. This person, we are told by Ibn Ḥajar in *Lisān al-Mīzān*, was virtually unknown. He quotes Ibn ʿAdī who says: “He is not known. He narrates aḥādīth
and historical reports which are uncorroborated to a certain extent, and in which there is an element of prejudice against the Salaf (early Muslims).” 

Is it in any way acceptable to use information that was handed down by a non-entity such as this to malign a man who was named “the Sword of Allāh” by Rasūlullāh, and who is one of those of whom it was stated in the Qur’ān:

لا يستوى منكم من أنفق من قبل الفتح وقتل قتل أولئك أعظم درجة من الذين انفقوا من بعد وقتلوا وكلاً واعد الله الخصين ووعد الله بما تعملون خيرًا

Those of you who spent (their wealth) before the conquest (of Makkah) are not equal (to the rest). They are greater in status than those who spent thereafter and fought. And all of them have been promised good by Allāh.

(al-Ḥadīd: 10)

Khālid ibn al-Walīd became Muslim before the conquest of Makkah.

The third point of criticism against this isnād is the person who appears as Sayf’s direct source: Sahl ibn Yūsuf al-Anṣārī. This person, like Shu‘ayb ibn Ibrāhīm, is unknown. The same may therefore be said of him as a narrator, and of the nature of his narration in maligning the character of a Ṣaḥābī who sacrificed so much for Islam, as was said of Shu‘aybs narration.

Finally, even if we were to assume, for argument’s sake, that this isnād is free from all defects right up to Sahl ibn Yūsuf, there remains one crucial problem. The persons who allegedly narrate the story appear here as Qāsim ibn Muḥammad and Ŭr ibn Shu‘ayb. Neither of these two figures were even born at the time when the incident of Mālik ibn Nuwayrah occurred. Whichever way one looks at it, this report simply does not conform to the two most basic conditions for authenticity: reliability of the narrator, and an uninterrupted chain of narration.

Let us now look at another narration in Tārīkh at-Ṭabarī:

(2) ʿUmar told Khālid: “You enemy of Allāh! You killed a Muslim man and
thereafter took his wife. By Allāh, I will stone you.”

The chain of narration on the authority of which this report reached al-Ṭabarī is as follows:

Al-Ṭabarī — (narrates from) — (Muḥammad) ibn Ḥumayd (al-Rāzī) — (who narrates from) — Salamah (ibn al-Faḍl al-Rāzī) — (who narrates from) — Muḥammad ibn İşāq — (who narrates from) — Ṭalḥah ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī Bakr — who says that it used to be Abū Bakr al-Siddīq’s instruction to his armies...

This isnād too, is defective and unreliable. It is unreliable on account of Muḥammad ibn İşāq, who was a much more truthful historian than Sayf ibn ʿUmar, but who used to commit *tadlīs*. Tadlīs is when a narrator intentionally omits the name of his direct source and ascribes his information to a source higher up in the chain of narration. Ibn Ḥibban states about him: “The problem with Ibn İşāq is that he used to omit the names of unreliable narrators, as a result of which unreliable material crept into his narrations. However, if he makes it clear that he has actually heard from the person whom he states as his source, then his narration is authentic.” When we look at the way in which Ibn İşāq has narrated this incident from Ṭalḥah ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿAbd al-Rahmān ibn Abī Bakr, we find that he has not explicitly stated that he heard this information from him. He uses the ambiguous term ʿan, which was a common device used by narrators committing tadlīs. Ibn İşāq, we are told by Ibn Ḥajar, was well-known for committing tadlīs by omitting the names of unreliable and unknown persons, and even from narrators who are regarded as unreliable for more serious reasons.

Besides Ibn İşāq himself, it must also be taken into consideration that Muḥammad ibn Ḥumayd al-Rāzī, who appears in the isnād as al-Ṭabarī’s direct source, has come under severe criticism from the muḥaddithīn. Many of them have clearly labelled him as an outright liar. He has also been proven to be dishonest in his claim to narrating the Maghāzī of Ibn İşāq from Salamah ibn Faḍl. Some of the muḥaddithīn who at one stage entertained a good opinion of him had to change
their opinions when it became clear that the man was a shameless forger. One critic expresses his opinion as follows: “I have never seen a natural liar, except for two persons: Sulaymān al-Shādhakūnī and Muḥammad ibn Ḥumayd. He used to memorise all of his aḥādīth, and his ḥadīth used to grow longer every day.”

Besides the above, it must not be forgotten that the final source for this narration was not even born when Sayyidunā ʿUmar allegedly spoke these words to Sayyidunā Khālid. These were events that supposedly took place in the time of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr, but the one who tells us about it is his great grandson — three generations later. Like the previous report, this one too, suffers from a huge gap in the chain of narration.

Shīʿī authors have the habit of supplying incidents like this with multiple references. In order to fully convince the uninformed Sunnī reader, they will quote not only al-Ṭabarī as the source for the incident, but also Ibn Kathīr’s al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah, Ibn al-Athīr’s al-Kāmil, etc. They conveniently forget that Ibn Kathīr and Ibn al-Athīr, and like them, most later historians, draw directly from al-Ṭabarī, and have stated as much in their respective introductions. It is thus of no benefit to quote them as separate references, since all they do is quote al-Ṭabarī. As for al-Ṭabarī himself, he has never claimed all the material in his huge work to be the truth. On the contrary, he states very clearly in his introduction:

Whatever is to be found in this book of mine as quoted from some past source, which the reader finds unacceptable or the hearer deems repugnant for the reason that he does not see any authenticity in it or does not find real meaning in it, let it be known that we are not responsible for it. The one responsible for it would be one of those who transmitted it down to us. We for our part have only reproduced what has been transmitted to us.

A third report mentioning the wife of Mālik ibn Nuwayrah, which is widely quoted by those wishing to add a tragically romantic flavour to their basic aim of harming the reputation of Sayyidunā Khālid, is the following:
Khālid saw the wife of Mālik ibn Nuwayrah. She was very beautiful. Thereupon Mālik told his wife: “You have killed me,” meaning that she will be the cause of his death. And so it happened.  

This twist to the story is usually quoted with Ibn Ḥajar’s work *al-Iṣābah* as reference. Closer inspection however of that work reveals that Ibn Ḥajar quoted it from a source called *al-Dalā’il* by one Thābit ibn Qāsim. Despite a lengthy search for information about this author or his book, we were unable to unearth a single fact about him in any of the biographical dictionaries available to us. Neither the classical works (such as the biographical works of al-Bukhārī, Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Ibn Ḥibbān and al-Khatīb al-Baghdādī) nor the works of later scholars (such as al-Dhahabī and Ibn Ḥajar) provide any clue as to who Thābit ibn Qāsim was, when his book *al-Dalā’il* was composed, and what it contains. Even a contemporary work like *al-A’lām* of al-Ziriklī contains no information whatsoever about a person called Thābit ibn Qāsim. Therefore we may say with a great degree of confidence that this report, as tragic and romantic as it may be, amounts to nothing more than a fable spurned by the fertile imagination of some unscrupulous person. A fable such as this would only be used against a Ṣaḥābī like Sayyidunā Khālid ibn al-Walīd by a person whose hatred of the Ṣaḥābah has blinded him against all truth and reason.

It is extremely unfortunate that the vicious and unscrupulous propaganda of the Shīʿī missionaries has succeeded in turning the sentiments of many a Muslim against this great son of Islam and the pride of its military commanders. Having swallowed the story about the wife of Mālik ibn Nuwayrah hook, line and sinker, they now cannot bear to think of Khālid ibn al-Walīd except in the vilest of terms. They find themselves unable to associate his name except with the concocted legend of the wife of Mālik ibn Nuwayrah. All his services rendered to Islam, and even the title of “Sayf Allāh” given to him by Rasūlullāh are simply ignored, and on the basis of nothing but a fable. It is heart rending to see the brazenness with which Shīʿī authors like Muḥammad Tījānī Samāwī in his book *Then I was Guided* challenge the title of “Sayf Allāh” (Sword of Allāh) bestowed upon Sayyidunā Khālid by none other than Rasūlullāh, and to see
them labelling him “the crippled sword of the devil.” Such, unfortunately, is the
destiny of those whose faith is founded upon fables and legends.

There is another point which definitely merits mention in this regard. The
Imāmī (Ithnā ‘Asharī) Shī‘ah, for all their political rhetoric, have never in the
history of Islam been known for positive political or military action. It is for
this reason that the Shī‘ah, unlike the Ahl al-Sunnah, do not have military leaders
like Sayyidunā Khālid of whom to be proud, and whose names to invoke
as paragons of courage and valour. Thus, when the need arose for a person like
Khomeini to speak about Islam’s military successes of yesterday, he could not
find anything of that nature within the legacy of his own tradition. It was the
history of the Ṣaḥābah — those very same Ṣaḥābah whom he and his ilk
had been slandering and denouncing as apostates, hypocrites and unbelievers for
centuries— to which he was forced to turn. Look at the tongue-in-cheek manner
in which he writes in his book Kashf al-Asrār:

The rulers of Islam in those days did not sit in their courts upon silk
carpets, because the Prophet of Islam forbade its use. The religious spirit
was firmly implanted within them, to the extent that it led a great Muslim
commander to swallow a quantity of lethal poison in the firm belief that the
Rabb of Islam and the Qur’ān will protect him before the enemies of Islam.
That is exactly what happened when sixty persons from the Muslim army
attacked a Roman army of sixty thousand and gained the upper hand over
them. Similarly, a few thousand of them defeated seven hundred thousand
Romans, and a small number of Muslims overran the whole land of Iran.
All of that was achieved through the power of religion and faith, and not
because they thought of religion and its tenets as a shame and a disgrace.
What is there in you which resembles that which they had? They believed
that death and martyrdom is happiness, and that martyrs enjoy the life of
the hereafter by the favour and grace of Allāh. It was on account of this
that they achieved such astonishing success. The point is that they had a
great amount of love for dīn, belief in the Unseen and partiality towards
These words speak for themselves. They are in no need of commentary of any sort. However, there is maybe just one thing upon which light needs to shed, and that is the identity of the “great Muslim commander who swallowed a quantity of lethal poison in the firm belief that the Rabb of Islam and the Qur’ān will protect him before the enemies of Islam”. That leader was none other than the Sword of Allāh, Sayyidunā Khālid ibn al-Walīd. The incident is documented by al-Dhahabī in his work Siyar Aʿlām al-Nubalā from two separate sources, both of which we reproduce here:

Qays ibn Abī Ḥāzim says: “I saw poison being brought to Khālid, and it was asked: “What is this?” The answer was given: “It is poison.” He said: “Bismillāh” and drank it. I said: “By Allāh, this is a miracle, this is true courage.”

Abu al-Safar says: Khālid stayed in al-Hīrah at the house of the mother of the Banū Marāzibah. They said: “Be on your guard against the Persians, lest they poison you.” He said: “Bring it to me.” He took it and said: “Bismillāh”, and did him no harm.”

Maybe we can now understand why Khomeini thought it prudent not to mention the name of that “great Islamic leader.” But if one such as he could see and admit (albeit grudgingly) that men like Khālid ibn al-Walīd “had a great amount of love for dīn, belief in the Unseen and partiality towards religiousness” and that “we ourselves are different in all of those things, and thus will we remain” (in other words that we can never compare ourselves to men like Khālid ibn al-Walīd) then why is it that some Shīʿī neophytes, who regard themselves as followers of Khomeini, cannot bear to spare even a single good thought for the “great Islamic leader” Khālid ibn al-Walīd, and continue to spread calumnious falsehoods about him? Why does revolutionary Iran, which regards itself as the manifestation of Khomeini’s political philosophy, flood the Muslim world with literature in which
Sayyidunā Khālid ibn al-Walīd is acrimoniously denounced as “the crippled sword of the devil”? Is it in order to achieve the sanctimonious goal of Muslim unity, or simply to score a point for Shīʿism against the Ahl al-Sunnah?

We will leave the reader to ponder over these questions.
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