



# REVEALING THE TRUTH

## Khalid bin Walid; Portrait of a War Criminal

**Work file:** khalid\_war\_criminal.pdf  
**Project:** Answering-Ansar.org Articles

### Revisions:

No.	Date	Author	Description	Review Info
1.0.0	18.04.2008	Answering-Ansar.org	Created	

## **Contents**

### **Table of Contents**

<b><u>1.CHAPTER ONE - INTRODUCTION.....</u></b>	<b><u>3</u></b>
<b><u>2.CHAPTER TWO - THE INCIDENT OF KHALID KILLING SAHABI MALIK BIN NUWAYRAH AND COMMITTING ZINA WITH HIS WIDOW.....</u></b>	<b><u>4</u></b>
<b><u>3.CHAPTER THREE - FURTHER INCIDENTS EXPOSING THE NASIBISM AND HOOLIGAN MENTALITY OF KHALID.....</u></b>	<b><u>18</u></b>
<b><u>4.CHAPTER FOUR – ANALYZING THE DEFENSES OFFERED FOR KHALID AND HIS FORGIVING KHALIFA.....</u></b>	<b><u>27</u></b>
<b><u>5.CHAPTER FIVE – THE IMPLICATIONS STEMMING FROM THE INCIDENT OF MALIK BIN NUWAYRAH.....</u></b>	<b><u>35</u></b>
<b><u>6.COPYRIGHT.....</u></b>	<b><u>38</u></b>

## 1. Chapter One - Introduction

If we analyze history, particularly during times of battle, we see that some of the biggest war crimes were those perpetrated by senior commanders who co-coordinated all manner of transgression against the enemy. Whilst in the past war crimes could be covered up by the State, the world wide media provides little opportunity for such misdeeds to be hidden from the public domain. When we see tragedies like the slaughtering of innocent civilians in Iraq, or the torture of prisoners in Abu Gharaib we see how such offences are often overseen by senior army officials. As Muslims, we are outraged and distressed by such actions, and we are even more angered when we hear 'excuses' offered to explain such tragedies. Unfortunately if we analyze Islamic history, we will see similar accounts of war crimes by commanders. Justice would suggest that we condemn such actions and particularly those that behaved in such a manner in the same way that we see war crimes being committed today in the name of 'freedom'. It is indeed tragic that rather than condemn such criminals, those individuals have been admired and forgiven for their actions. It is tragic that our opponents have deliberately elevated individuals who were possessed all manner of inhumane / irreligious traits and then awarded them revered titles. They overlooked such crimes and in fact offered all manners of excuse for them. What better example can there be than the Sahabi Khalid bin Walid. As a Kafir he posed a serious threat to Islam and played a lead role against Muslims during the battle of Uhud, wherein the Prophet (s) was injured. When he apparently accepted Islam, (as history reveals) rather than mending his ways, he pursued the same attitude and actions thus causing damage to Islam from within. Adhering to the same old stubbornness, the cruelties committed by Khalid bin Walid did not hinder our opponents from extolling him, purely because he was a Sahabi. We therefore decided to dedicate a small piece of work to reveal the actual characteristics possessed by this notorious Arab thug, and for this reason we shall:

1. unveil the incident wherein he unjustly killed a Sahabi Malik bin Nuwayrah, in order to earn war booty and to marry her widow for which he didn't even made her observe Iddah, rather he raped her on the very night of her husband's murder.
2. expose the brutal mentality possessed by Khalid by citing other incidents

## 2. Chapter Two - The incident of Khalid killing Sahabi Malik bin Nuwayrah and committing Zina with his widow

### 1. Weren't Malik bin Nuwayrah and his brother Mutammim believers?

Ansar.Org stated:

Shortly after the demise of Rasulullah r 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 zakah. From Madinah Sayyiduna Abu Bakr t dispatched a number of punitive expeditions. Khalid ibn al-Walid was placed in command of one such expedition.

### 2. Observation – Ansar.Org's refusal to refer to Malik and his associates as believers

Notice how the author seeks to tactically place those that didn't pay Zakat within the same category as apostates, thus muddying the waters. First and foremost, does refusal to pay Zakat to Abu Bakr make one an apostate (Murtad)?

If you analyze the article of Ansar.Org you, will notice that at no point do they offer a position on whether or not Malik was a Muslim. On the contrary they present conflicting reports intentionally so that the reader goes away unsure over whether or not Malik and his associates were believers! This 'sitting on the fence' is a common method used by Nawasib who don't want to declare their position, as it may in turn invite questions about the conduct of their heroes. They do exactly the same thing with Yazeed (la), if you notice they will not have a stance, they won't call him good or bad.

### 3. The Truth: Malik bin Nuwayrah and his brother Mutammim were companions of the Holy Prophet [s]

Let us allay doubts introducing both personalities involved in this incident. We know that the filthy Nawasib try their best to legitimize the brutal killing of people by their hero Khalid bin al-Walid on the premise that those killed were Murtad (apostates) and the legitimate Shari penalty was exercised on them. We will counter this particular 'allegation' later in the chapter but in case the Nawasib make any attempt to pollute the 'past' of Malik bin Nuwayrah and his brother Mutammim bin Nuwayrah and suggest they were mere common Muslims who (allegedly) became Murtad after the Prophet's death, we deem it appropriate to shed some light on them. The reality is that both individuals were not common Muslims, but were like all other companions of Holy Prophet [s] who had entered the pale of Islam. Whilst writing about Mutammim, Imam Ibn Hajar Asqalani records in Al-Isaba, Volume 5 page 566:

أسلم هو وأخوه مالك

#### "He and his brother Malik converted to Islam"

Khairuddin Zarkali records the following about Mutammim in his famed work Al-Alaam, Volume 5 page 274:

متمم بن نويرة بن جمرة بن شداد اليربوعي التميمي، أبو نهشل: شاعر فحل، صحابي، من أشرف قومه، اشتهر في الجاهلية والاسلام. وكان قصيرا أعور، أشهر شعره رثاؤه لاختيه

**Mutammim bin Nuwayra bin Jamrah bin Shadad al-Y'arbui al-Tamimi, Abu Nahshal: a great poet, Sahabi, amongst the noble ones of his tribe, he was renowned during the times of Jahilya and Islam. He was short and one eyed. His most famous poems are the eulogies for his brother.**

Imam Ibn Abdul Barr records in Al-Istiab, Volume 3 page 1362:

وأما متمم فلا شك في إسلامه

**"Verily there is no doubt in Mutammim being a Muslim"**

Malik bin Nuwayrah was not an ordinary Sahabi, but he was assigned the important task by the Holy Prophet [s] of alms-tax collection (sadaqat). Imam Ibn Hajar Asqalani records in Al-Isaba, Volume 5 page 560:

مالك بن نويرة بن جمرة بن شداد بن عبيد بن ثعلبة بن يربوع التميمي اليربوعي يكنى أبا حنظلة ويلقب الجفول قال المرزبانى كان شاعرا شريفا فارسا معدودا في فرسان بني يربوع في الجاهلية وأشرفهم وكان من أزداف الملوك وكان النبي صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم استعمله على صدقات قومه

**Malik bin Nuwayrah bin Jamrah bin Shadad bin Ubaid bin Thalba bin Y'arbu al-Tamimi al-Y'arbuei, his nickname is Aba Handhla and also known as al-Jeful. Al-Marzebani said: 'He was a poet, honorable, a knight counted among the knights of Bani Y'arbu (tribe) during the days of ignorance and he was amongst the noble ones (of his tribe), he was the representative of kings, the Prophet (s) appointed him to collect alms-tax from his people.**

Imam Ibn Habban records in al-Thuqat, Volume 2 page 145:

وكان ولاية رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم على الصدقات حتى توفى عدى بن حاتم على قومه ومالك بن نويرة على بنى الحنظلة وقيس بن عاصم على بنى منقر والزبيرقان بن بدر على بنى سعد وكعب بن مالك بن أبى القيس على أسلم وغفار وجهينة والضحاك بن سفيان على بنى كلاب وعمرو بن العاص على عمان والمهاجر بن أبى أمية على صنعاء وزباد بن لبيد على حضرموت

**Those who were appointed by Allah's Messenger [s] to collect the alms-tax until his [s] death were Uday bin Hatim for his people, Malik bin Nuwayrah for Bani Handhla, Qais bin Asim for Bani Manqer, al-Zurberqan bin Badr for Bani Saad, K'aab bin Malik bin Abi Qais for Aslam and Ghifar and Juhaina, al-Dhahak bin Sufyan for Bani Kelab, Amro bin al-Aas for Oman, al-Muhajir bin Abi Umaya for San'a, Ziyad bin Lubaid on Hadhrmut.**

#### 4. A short account of Malik bin Nuwayrah from a Shia source

It would be relevant to mention the Shi'a view of Malik bin Nuwayrah, so that after reading the entire article, all knowledge seekers (amongst both Sunni and Shi'a) can make a more informed conclusion. Ibn Shazan records in Al-Fadael, page 75:

**Al-Bara bin Azeb said: When we were sitting with Allah's Messenger [s] a delegation from Bani Tammim (tribe) came to Him [s]. Malik bin Nuwayra said: 'Oh Allah's Messenger, teach me faith (Iman). Allah's Messenger said: 'To testify that there is no god but Allah only, and I'm the messenger of Allah, pray the five prayers, fast during the month of Ramdhan, pay Zakat, perform pilgrimage to (Allah's) house, and follow my Wasi after me, and he (prophet) pointed his hand to Ali. And don't shed blood, don't steal, don't betray, don't eat orphan's money, don't drink alcohol and follow my laws, permit what is lawful and forbid what is unlawful, give the**

rights from your own self to the poor and strong, to the old and young. Till (the prophet) mentioned to him the Islamic laws. (Malik) said: 'Oh Allah's messenger, I'm a man who quickly forgets, please repeat again'. Then He [s] repeated, then he (Malik) left pulling his cloth and saying: 'By the God of the house, I learnt faith (Iman).'

When he (Malik) went far away from Allah's messenger, He [s] said: 'Who ever wants to see a man of heaven, he should look at this man.' Abu Bakr and Umar said: 'Oh Allah's messenger, who are you referring to?' He [s] looked down to the earth, then they (Abu Bakr & Umar) followed him (Malik) and said to him: 'Good news from Allah and His messenger to you to have been promised Paradise.' He (Malik) replied: 'May Allah bless you if you are testifying by what I testify, because you learnt what Prophet Muhammad taught me. But if you don't, then may Allah not bless you.' Abu Bakr said: 'Don't say that, I'm the father of Ayesha, the wife of the prophet.' He (Malik) said: 'What do you want?' They (Abu Bakr & Umar) said: 'You are from the people of Paradise, so ask for forgiveness for us'. He (Malik) said: 'May Allah never forgive you, you leave the Messenger of Allah who owns intercession and ask me for forgiveness!' Then they returned back and signs of sadness appeared on their faces, when Allah's Messenger saw them, He smiled and said: 'Is their sadness because of truth?'

When Allah's Messenger died and Bani Tamim (tribe) returned to Madina with Malik bin Nuwaira being with them, he went to see as to who became the successor after Allah's messenger, he entered the mosque on Friday and Abu Bakr was giving an address on the pulpit. He (Malik) looked at him and said: 'Oh brother of Taim'. (Abu Bakr) said: 'Yes'. He (Malik) said: 'Where is the Wasi of Allah's messenger, who ordered I was ordered to follow?' They (people) said: 'Oh you desert Arab, things have changed.' (Malik) said: 'By Allah, nothing has changed, but you betrayed Allah and His messenger.' Then he (Malik) got closer to Abu Bakr and said: 'Who allowed you to climb onto the pulpit while the Wasi of Allah's Messenger is here?'. Abu Bakr said: 'Throw out this desert Arabian who urinates on his heels from Allah's Messenger mosque.' Qunfud and Khalid bin al-Walid went to him and kept pushing him until they removed him from the mosque.

Then he (Malik) rode on his camel and said (poem): 'We obeyed Allah's messenger as long he was amongst us, Oh people, what I have to do with Abu Bakr....' When every thing was under Abu Bakr's control, he sent Khalid bin al-Walid and said to him: 'You heard what Malik said in front of the people, I'm worried that he would cause a crack we wont be able to fix. Kill him.' When Khalid arrived (to Malik's land) he (Malik) rode on his horse and he was a knight equal to thousand knights, hence Khalid was scared of him, therefore he (Khalid) gave him oath, and then when (Malik) dropped his weapon, Khalid betrayed him he killed him, placed his head in a cooking pot, and married his wife the same night, raping her like a donkey.'

Also according to the Shia source al-Estighatha by Abu al-Qasim al-Kufi (d. 352 H), Volume 1 page 7, Malik's tribe refused to submit Zakat to Abu Bakr because they believed that they were supposed to submit it to Ali bin Abi Talib [as].

## **5. Sahabah were ignorant of the Islamic punishment for those who believe in Zakat but do not submit to the caliph**

The Nawasib, sought to justify the brutal anti Islamic acts committed by Khalid ibn al Walid against Mailk and his companions on the premise that their failure to pay Zakat to the Caliph rendered them Murtad, that carried capital punishment. Could these people direct us to the precise Islamic injunction for those that refuse to hand over Zakat to the caliph? The answer is,

that even 'esteemed' Sahabah including Umar bin Khattab were unaware of the Islamic injunctions for such an individual. Imam Hakim records:

**Umar bin al-Khattab said: 'Had I asked Allah's messenger about three issues, I would like that more than hum al-Nyam (flock of reddish camel).**

**Who is the Caliph after him?**

**If a group of people admit that they believe in Zakat but don't submit it to us, is it lawful for us to fight them?**

**and the kalala (who dies and doesn't have son or parents)**

 [Mustadrak al-Hakim, Volume 2 page 332 Tradition 3186](#)

al-Hakim said: '**Sahih according to the conditions of the two Sheikhs'**

The underlined words indicate that Umar was referring to the same incident that had caused such controversy, namely the incident of Malik bin Nuwayrah, who believed in Zakat, yet failed to submit to Abu Bakr & Co. since he did not deem him the rightful caliph. The implications were that the murder warrants issued against Malik bin Nuwayrah and their subsequent execution were illegal! We all know that one who believes in Zakat but does not submit it to the ruler (for some reason) cannot be deemed a Non-Muslim, this can be evidenced by the fact that we read explicitly in Kashaf al-Qena, by Bahuti al-Hanbali, Volume 2 page 297:

ولا يكفر مانع الزكاة

**"The one who refuses to submit to Zakat is not a Kafir"**

The present day Nawasib have no grounds for deeming Malik bin Nuwayrah a Murtad for refusing to hand over Zakat to Abu Bakr!

## **6. The Sahabi Abu Qatadah exposed Khalid's objective behind murdering Malik and his supporters**

Ansar.Org stated:

It has even been reported that they encountered armed resistance from Malik and his men at an oasis called al-Ba'udah.<sup>6</sup> Those who put up the resistance, including Malik, were captured and brought before Sayyiduna Khalid. He decided that they must be put to death. This is how Malik ibn Nuwayrah was killed.

In Sayyiduna Khalid's party was the Sahabi Sayyiduna Abu Qatadah t. He was amongst those who claimed that they had seen Malik's people making salah. He was thus understandable upset at the decision of Sayyiduna Khalid, and returned immediately to Madinah to complain to Sayyiduna Abu Bakr t.

## **7. Observation One – Why have Ansar.Org cast doubts upon the direct eye witness testimony of a Sahaba?**

Look carefully at these paragraphs. The text begins with confrontation on the basis of rumor. Then we have two opinions amongst the spies of Khalid over whether / or not they pray. When one has two conflicting reports then it is obvious that someone is lying, is there any evidence that Khalid sought to personally investigate the matter and ascertain the truth? Then, as cited

by Ansar.org we have the eye witness testimony of Abu Qatadah confirming that they offered Salat, so why did Khalid reject this eye witness testimony? Moreover why are Ansar.Org the loyal defenders of the Sahabah not willing to accept this Sahabi's testimony? Ponder carefully over the wording:

Ansar.Org stated:

In Sayyiduna Khalid's party was the Sahabi  
Sayyiduna Abu Qatadah t .

The word claim is an unsubstantiated allegation. When Ansar.Org believe that all the Sahabah are just and truthful, why are they describing the eye witness testimony of a just and truthful Sahabi as merely a claim? Why are Ansar.Org casting doubts over the truthfulness of the Sahaba? Why do they refuse to accept his claim as fact? It is amazing that when it comes to protecting the crimes of Khalid ibn al Walid, Ansar.Org are even prepared to cast doubts over a Sahabi's eye witness testimony.

It is also amazing that this Nasibi refers to Abu Qatadah being 'understandable upset at the decision of Sayyiduna Khalid' – shouldn't we all be understandably upset at the fact the Khalid bin Walid slaughtered Muslims that observed Salat?

## 8. Observation Two – Ansar.Org have intentionally watered down this incident, to cover up this war crime

The deceitful Nasibi author has:

- played with the words and rationalized Malik's murder with a few sentences
- failed to present the gravity of the incident
- presented the episode in a very light manner,
- failed to cite the testimony of Sahabi Abu Qatadah wherein the 'actual reason' for killing Khalid bin Walid was mentioned

Let us reveal the actual incident:

**Abdulrazaq – Mu'amar – al Zuhari –from- Abu Qatadah said: During Reda (days), we marched to Ahl Ayyat and reached there at sunset, then we raised our spears, hence they asked: 'Who are you?' We replied: 'We are slaves of Allah.' They said: 'We are slaves of Allah too.' Then Khalid arrested them and when it was morning he ordered their beheading. Then I said: 'Oh Khalid! Fear Allah, this is not allowed for you.' He (Khalid) replied: 'Stay (back); this is not your business.' Then Abu Qatadah swore by Allah never to march with Khalid for any war. Qatadah said: 'The desert Arabs encouraged him (Khalid) on killing them for the sake of booties and that was Malik bin Nuwayrah's case.'**

[Al-Musanaf, Volume 10 page 174 Tradition 18721](#)

**Abdulrazaq:** Dahabi said: '**Thiqah**' (Siar alam alnubala, v9 p563), Ibn Hajar said: '**Thiqah**' (Taqrrib al-Tahdib, v1 p599). **Mu'amar:** Dahabi said: '**Hujja**' (Tazkirat al-Hufaz, v1 p190), Ibn Hajar said: '**Thiqah Thabt**' (Taqrrib al-Tahdib, v2 p202). Al-Zuhari: Dahabi: '**The Hafiz of his time**' (Sial alam alnubala, v5 p326), Ibn Hajar said: '**There is an agreement on his magnificence**' (Taqrrib al-Tahdib, v2 p133).

If you show this tradition to any unbiased individual, he would conclude:

1. The people were believers of Allah [swt]
2. Khalid heard the testimony from the captives that they were believers, and did not challenge their claim

3. The Sahabi Abu Qatadah objected to Khalid asking him to fear Allah [swt] and warned him that killing such people was unjustified.
4. Despite this, Khalid had them executed
5. Abu Qatadah testified unequivocally that the sole objective for killing them was to attain war booty.

It was this unjustified killing that led to Abu Qatadah lodging a formal complaint with Khalifa Abu Bakr. In Ahle Sunnah eyes are not all the Sahabah just and truthful? So why was the eye testimony of this just and truthful Sahabi rejected by Abu Bakr?

## 9. Abu Bakr paying Diyat (blood money) to the family of Malik bin Nuwayrah proves that he was Muslim

Though there shouldn't be any need to mention the known Islamic laws pertaining to the payment of blood money (Diyat), since our opponents comprise of those that share their genealogies with men of deceit, we deem it appropriate to shed some light on the matter and make it clear that blood money (Diyat) is not given to the family of a deceased Murtad. Shaykh Muhammad bin Ahmad Sharbini popularly known as Khateeb Sharbini (d. 977 H) in his book Mughni al-Muhtaj, Volume 4 page 17, Shaykh Abdul Hamid Sherwani (d. 1118 H) in Hawashi al-Sherwani, Volume 8 page 401, Shaykh Zakaria al-Ansari (d. 936 H) in Asna al-Matalib, Volume 18 page 308 and Abu al-Barakat (d. 1201 H) in his authority work Al-Sharh al-Kabir, Volume 4 page 268 record:

ولا دية لمرتد

### "There is no Diyat for a Murtad"

The Nawasib of Ansar.Org likewise acknowledges the issuing of Diyat to the brother of Malik:

Ansar.Org stated:

In not punishing Khalid for the execution of Malik ibn Nuwayrah, and not dismissing him from his post as commander, Sayyiduna Abu Bakr t was thus completely justified. His interrogation of Khalid revealed that Khalid had committed an error of judgement, and the insistence of Sayyiduna 'Umar t that Khalid be dismissed was met by a resolute answer from Sayyiduna Abu Bakr t : "I will not sheath the sword that was drawn by Allah."<sup>13</sup> Like Rasulullah r did in the case of Banu Jadhimah, **Sayyiduna Abu Bakr paid out blood money to Malik's brother Mutammim, and ordered the released of all captives taken by Khalid.<sup>13</sup>**

The fact that Abu Bakr paid blood money (Diyat) to Malik's brother Mutammim is sufficient to prove that Malik bin Nuwayrah was Muslim and he was unjustly murdered by the thug whose actual motives were to earn the war booty and seize Malik's wife whose beauty was known in the area. Hafiz Ibn Asakir quoted the following episode from Allamah Khalifa bin Khayat's authority work 'Tarikh Khalifa bin Khayat' page 68 in the following manner:

**Ali bin Muhammad – Abi Daeb – al-Zuhari – Salim – his father that he said: Abu Qutada came to Abu Bakr and informed him of the murder of Malik and his companions, hence he (Abu Bakr) became extremely aggrieved. Abu Bakr then wrote (a message) to Khalid, and he (Khalid) came to him. Abu Bakr said: 'Can it be more than Khalid interpreted and made a mistake? Then Abu Bakr sent Khalid back**

**and paid blood money for Malik bin Nuwayrah and returned the booty.**

[Tarikh Ibn Asakir, Volume 16 page 254](#)

**Ali bin Muhammad:** Imam Dahabi said: '**Seduq**' while Imam Yahya bin Moin said: '**Thiqah Thiqah Thiqah**' (Tarikh al-Islam, v16 p289). **Abi Daeb:** Dahabi said: '**Thiqah**' (Al-Kashif, v2 p194), Ibn Hajar said: '**Thiqah**' (Taqrib al-Tahdib, v2 p105). **Al-Zuhari:** Dahabi: '**The Hafiz of his time**' (Sial alam alnubala, v5 p326), Ibn Hajar said: '**There is an agreement on his magnificence**' (Taqrib al-Tahdib, v2 p133). **Salim bin Abdullah:** Dahabi said: '**Hujja**' (Tazkirat al-Hufaz, v1 p88), Ibn Hajar said: '**Thabt**' (Taqrib al-Tahdib, v1, p335). **Abdullah Ibn Umar (Salim's father):** A Sahabi.

The concerns shown by Abu Qatadah for the act of Khalid, Abu Bakr (apparently) becoming aggrieved on hearing it and then most importantly his paying the blood money to the Malik's brother proves that Malik bin Nuwayrah was not a Murtag and whatever was done with him and with his wife was unislamic. Yet, Abu Bakr did not waste a minute in offering the excuse that Khalid committed a mistake. Notice how Abu Bakr does not ask Khalid to explain his behavior, he justifies in his own mind that Khalid must have been mistaken and then absolves him. Is it not the duty of a Khalifa to ensure the implantation of Islamic Shari'ah to the letter? Does Islam allow you to exempt a murderer and a fornicator because he is your ally? Is that was Islam teaches us? The Ahle Sunnah themselves have clear traditions that prove that no one can evade the Shar'iah no matter who they are. We read in Sahih Bukhari, Kitab al Hudood Book 017, Number 4187:

**'A'isha reported that the Quraish had been anxious about the Makhzumi woman who had committed theft, and said: Who will speak to Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) about her? They said: Who dare it, but Usama, the loved one of Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him)? So Usama spoke to him. Thereupon Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) said: Do you intercede regarding one of the punishments prescribed by Allah? He then stood up and addressed (people) saying: O people, those who have gone before you were destroyed, because if any one of high rank committed theft amongst them, they spared him; and it anyone of low rank committed theft, they inflicted the prescribed punishment upon him. By Allah, if Fatima, daughter of Muhammad, were to steal, I would have her hand cut off. In the hadith transmitted on the authority of Ibn Rumh (the words are):" Verily those before you perished."**

With this tradition in mind what gave Abu Bakr the right to ignore the Shariah in this instance? It is not like there were no witnesses to this heinous crime. We have previously learnt that Abu Qatadah personally witnessed this group offering Salat, and objected to the orders to have the men executed. He had also exposed the objective of Khalid was 'for the sake of booties'. Clearly these issues would have been reported back to Abu Bakr. Does eye witness testimony bear no value in Islam? Clearly not, after all this was the same Judge that rejected the testimonies of Fatima [as], Umm Ayan (ra), Ali [as], Hasan [as] and Hussain [as] in the Fadak dispute! When it came to ruling in this heinous war crime even the eye witness testimony of a Sahabah was rejected, why was the stance of this just, truthful Sahaba ignored, and Khalid absolved? Is this how a judge should act in Islam, base decisions not on eye witness testimony, but purely on personal deduction? Why was his crime interpreted as a 'mistake'? This was clearly a political decision and why not, politics is always about keeping your allies and supporters content, how could the Khalifa take action against a thug that he could unleash on those who opposed his caliphate, when he gave the order.

## **10. The Sahabi Mutammim testified that his deceased brother was a Muslim and condemned Khalid for his murder**

Having proved that Abu Bakr paid Malik's blood money to his brother Mutammim, we should also mention Khalid's condemnation by Mutammim for the murder of his brother Malik bin

Nuwayrah, a Sahabi. Imam Tabarani records the following words of Mutammim in Muajam al-Kabeer, Volume 8 page 294:

**Abu Khalifa al-Fadhli bin Habab narrated from Muhammad bin Salam al-Jumahi from Abu Ubaida, who said: Dharar bin al-Auwzor the one who killed Malik bin Nuwaira, therefore Mutammim bin Nuwaira said a (poem) in that case condemning Khalid bin al-Walid :... 'you gave him an oath in the name of Allah and then you killed him? Surely if he (Malik) gave you an oath, he would never betray...'**

Imam Abi Bakr al-Haythami also recorded this tradition from Tabarani and stated:

**"The narrators are reliable"**

 [Majm'a al-Zawaed, Volume 6 page 222 Tradition 10391](#)

These words of Mutammim clearly allude to the fact that prior to the murder of Malik, Khalid and Malik exchanged oaths and that too, in the name of Allah [swt]. This proves that Malik was a Muslim, not a Murtad. Moreover, the condemnation of Khalid by Mutammim also proves the same. We also read in Al-Istiab, Volume 4 page 1455:

ليس لأحد في المرثي كأشعاره التي يرثي بها أخاه مالكا

**"No one has poems for mourning the dead as his (Mutammim) poems for mourning his brother Malik"**

Allamah Shibli Numani al-Hanafi records this event in his esteemed book Al Faruq, Volume 2 page 234 published by Taj Company Ltd Karachi:

**"The greatest poet of the day was Mutammim bin Nuwaira, whose brother had been slain by mistake by Khalid in the reign of Abu Bakr. He was so shaken by the event that he wept unceasingly and sang elegies over his dead brother. Men and women followed him as he passed and made him recite the elegies. He read and wept and others wept with him. When he came to see Omar, the Caliph asked him to recite his elegies. He recited a few verses; the last two ran as follows:**

**"For a time we were together with the courtiers of Jadhima, until people said we would never part**

**Then we parted, it was as if we had never spent a night together"**

**Omar said if he knew how to compose an elegy, he would have composed one for his brother Zaid.**

 [Al Faruq, Volume 2 page 234](#)

Mutammim recited elegies for his deceased brother just like Adam [as] had recited elegies for Habel (al-Bidayah wa al Nihaya, v1 p181), Hasaan bin Thabit for Holy Prophet (al Bidayah wa al Nihaya, v5 p485), which is a further proof that his brother Malik bin Nuwayrah was a Muslim otherwise it would mean that a Sahabi, Mutammim was reciting elegies for a deceased 'Murtad' which would have been a great sin, moreover Umar bin al-Khattab's approval to the elegies for Malik bin Nuwayrah recited in front of him by Mutammim also attest to the fact that Malik bin Nuwayrah was a Muslim, and fell prey to the viciousness of Khalid bin al-Walid.

## **11. The administering of ablution and shrouding Malik's body by his father in law proves that Malik was not a Murtad**

It is indeed unfortunate that the shameless Nawasib try to excommunicate a Sahabi to cover up

the heinous crime committed by their hero Khalid bin al-Walid, backed by the caliph of the time. Now, let us prove Malik bin Nuwayrah's faith from a different angle and for this, allow us to introduce the father in law of Malik namely al-Minhal al-Tamimi. Imam Ibn Hajar Asqalani records in Al-Isaba, Volume 6 page 249:

المنهال التميمي: من رهط مالك بن نويرة. له إدراك ذكره الزبير بن بكار في الموقفيات عن حبيب بن زيد الطائي أو غيره. قال: مر المنهال على أشلاء مالك بن نويرة هو ورجل من قومه حين قتله خالد بن الوليد فأخرج من خريطة له ثوباً فكفنه فيه ودفنه

**Al-Minhal al-Tamimi: Amongst Malik's bin Nuwayrah's relatives. He [Lahu Idraak] converted (during Prophet's time), al-Zubair bin Bakr mentioned him in al-Muwafaqyat (book)...He said: 'al-Minhal passed by Malik bin Nuwayrah's body when Khalid killed him, then he brought a cloth from his bag and shrouded him (Malik) and then buried him.'**

For those readers who are unaware of the context of the Arabic term 'Lahu Idraak' and also for the shameless followers of Khalid, we should cite the words of Sunni scholar Ahmad bin al-Sidiq (d. 1380 H), who wrote in his book Ergham al-Mubtade, page 9:

له إدراك أي أنه معدود من الصحابة

**"Lahu Idraak" means he was counted amongst the Sahaba.**

Ibn Hajar Asqalani in his book al-Isaba fi Tameedh al-Sahabah that records the biographies of the Sahaba included a number of people for whom "Lahu Idraak" has been used (e.g. Translation Nos. 452, 787, 3659, 4135 etc). Whilst recording details about Malik's wife and his father in law, we read in the footnote written by Sheikh Ali Sheri for the book al-Futuh by Ahmad bin Atham, Volume 1 page 20:

هي أم تميم بنت المنهال بن عصمة الرياحي وهو الذي كفن مالكا

**"She is Um Tammim bint al-Minhal bin Esma al-Reyahi, and he is the one who shrouded Malik"**

Now having proved the belief (Iman) of Minhal al-Tammimi and the fact that he (a Sahabi, or at least a Muslim) gave ablution to the body of Malik bin Nuwayrah and then shrouded him, there should be no grounds to doubt the faith of Malik bin Nuwayrah, because the ablution and shroud is not given to a Murtad but to a Muslim only. To substantiate this, let us mention the text of an esteemed Sunni book on Fiqh namely Al-Bahr al-Raiq, Volume 5 page 361:

أما المرتد فلا يغسل ، ولا يكفن ، وإنما يلقي في حفيرة كالكلب

**A Murtad should neither be washed nor shrouded, but must be thrown into a ditch like a dog.**

[Al-Bahr al-Raiq, Volume 5 page 361](#)

Khalid bin Walid unjustly killed a Muslim who was from amongst the Sahabah; hence Khalid was the one who deserved the treatment mentioned in the above cited text!

## 12. Khalid 'marrying' the widow of Malik

The deceitful Nasibi author of Ansar.org creates a topic titled "**Khalid's alleged marriage to Malik's wife**" under which he writes:

Ansar.Org stated:

With the passage of time the incident of Malik ibn Nuwayrah became the object of the attention of certain unscrupulous transmitters of history. An obnoxious tale was soon introduced into the story in the form of Malik's wife, who is named as Umm Tamim bint Minhal. Khalid, it was said, was so enamoured of the beautiful Umm Tamim that he saw fit to slaughter Malik 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".

 [Screenshot from Ansar.org](#)

### 13. Reply

No matter how many attempts the Nawasib make to cover up the war crimes of their ancestors any rational minded person reading history that General Khalid bin Walid's slaughtering innocent people and also marrying the widows of one of his victims is fact not fiction. Ibn Asakir records (from two variant chains, one from Abu Ghalib al-Bana and the rest of the narrators while the other from Abu Abdullah al-Bana with the same remainder narrators):

**Abu Ghalib al-Bana and Abu Abdillah al-Bana narrated from Abu Jaffar bin Maslama from Abu Tahir al-Mukhalis from Ahmad bin Sulaiman from al-Zubair bin Bakr from Mus'ab bin Abdullah, who said:....Umar said: 'I admonished Khalid for breaking the orders and for what he did with the money., Khalid would distribute the booty amongst the soldiers without informing Abu Bakr. He made decisions that contravened those of Abu Bakr, he killed Malik bin Nuwayra and married his wife. He made peace with the people of Yamama and married the daughter of Maj'a bin Marara. These were met with disapproval by Abu Bakr and he issued Diyat (blood money) to Mutammim bin Nuwayrah and ordered Khalid to divorce Malik's wife....'**

 [Tarikh Ibn Asakir, Volume 16 page 274](#)

**Abu Ghalib bin al-Bana:** Dahabi said: "**A'ali al-Isnad**" (*Tarikh al-Islam*, v36, p151), Imam Ibn al-Jawzi said: '**Thiqah**' (*Tarikh al-Islam*, v36 p151), Imam of Salafies Al-Albaani declared him '**Thiqah**' (*Silsila Sahiha*, v3 p349).

**Abu Abdullah bin al-Bana:** Dahabi said: '**Pious**' (*Tarikh al-Islam*, v36 p260), Imam Al-Andlasi praised him (*Tarikh al-Islam*, v36 p260).

**Abu Jaffar bin Maslama:** Dahabi said: '**Thiqah**' (*Siar alam alnubala*, v18 p213), Ismail bin al-Fadhl said: '**Thiqah**' (*Siar alam alnubala*, v 18 p214). Abu al-Fadhl bin Khayroon said: '**Thiqah**' (*Siar alam alnubala*, v18 p215).

**Abu Tahir al-Mukhalis:** Dahabi said: '**Seduq**' (*Siar alam alnubala*, v16 p478), Ibn Kathir said: '**Thiqah**' (*Al-Bidaya wa al-Nihaya*, v11 p382), Al-Khatib said: '**Thiqah**' (*Siar alam alnubala*, v16 p479).

**Ahmad bin Sulaiman:** Dahabi said: '**Seduq**' (Tarikh al-Islam, v24 p98), Al-Khatib said: '**Seduq**' (Tarikh Baghdad, v4, p400). Al-Safadi said: '**Pious**' (A-Wafi bel Wafiyat, v6 p249). **Al-Zubair bin Bakr:** Dahabi said: '**Seduq**' (Al-kashif, v1, p401), Al-Khatib said: '**Thiqah Thabt**' (Tarikh Baghdad, v8 p468), Ibn Hajar said: '**Thiqah**' (Taqrīb al-Tahdīb, v1 p309). **Mus'ab bin Abdullah al-Zubairi:** Dahabi said: '**Thiqah**' (Al-kashif, v2 p268), Ibn Hajar said: '**Seduq**' (Taqrīb al-Tahdīb, v2 p186), Al-Khatib said: '**Well known for Arab's history**' (Tarikh Baghdad, v13 p113), Imam Ibn Haban included him in his book of Thiqah narrators (al-Thuqat, v9 p175).

## Umar bin Khattab hated Khalid bin Walid on account of his killing Malik and marrying his wife

Moreover, if we read the following episode, we will come to know that Umar bin Khattab was angry over Khalid bin Walid on account of his killing Malik bin Nuwayrah and also at the manner Khalid 'married' the widow of Malik, which serves as a proof that Malik bin Nuwayrah was a Muslim and Khalid did not marry Umm Tamim according to the Islamic method. Hafiz Ibn Asakir records:

**Abu Bakr al-Ansar from al-Hassan bin Ali from Abu Umar bin Haywiyah from Ahmad bin Maroof from al-Hussain bin al-Fehm from Muhammad bin Saad from Muhammad bin Umar from Muhammad bin Abdullah from al-Zuhari from Handala bin Ali al-Aslami who said: `...When Khalid arrived at Madina, he entered the mosque of Allah's Messenger wearing rusty armor and with his sword. There were some arrows in his turban, he passed by Umar but didn't talk to him, then he came to Abu Bakr, and he heard from Abu Bakr what pleased him, he then left happy. Umar therefore knew that Abu Bakr had pleased him, therefore he didn't talk to him (Khalid). Umar was angry at him (Khalid) because of what he had done, by killing Malik bin Nuwayrah and marrying his wife and also for what was in his heart against him (Khalid) about Bani Jadhima case'**

[Tarikh Ibn Asakir, Volume 16 page 258](#)

**Abu Bakr Muhammad bin Abdulbaqi:** Dahabi said: '**Musnad of his time**' (Siar alam alnubala, v20 p23), Albaani said: '**Thiqah**' (Silsila Daeefa, v4 p361). **Al-Hassan bin Ali al-Johari:** Dahabi said: '**Seduq**' (Siar alam alnubala, v18 p68), Khatib Baghdadi said: '**Thiqah**' (Tarikh Baghdad, v7 p393). **Muhammad bin Abbas bin Hayweh:** Dahabi said: '**Thiqah**' (Siar alam alnubala, v16 p409), Khatib Baghdadi said: '**Thiqah**' (Tarih Baghdad, v3 p121). **Ahmad bin Maroof:** Dahabi said: '**Thiqah**' (Tarikh al-Islam, v24 p102), Khatib Baghdadi said: '**Thiqah**' (Tarikh Baghdad, v5 p368). **Al-Hussain bin Fehm:** Dahabi said: '**Huge Hafiz**' (Tazkirat al-Hufaz, v2 p680), Khatib Baghdadi said: '**Thiqah**' (Tarikh Baghdad, v8 p91). **Muhammad bin Saad:** Dahabi said: '**Seduq**' (Al-Kashif, v2 p174), Ibn Hajar said: '**Seduq**' (Taqrīb al-Tahdīb, v2 p79). **Mohammad bin Umar Waqidi, Muhammad bin Abdullah:** Dahabi said: '**Thiqah**' (Siar alam alnubala, v7 p197), Ibn Hajar said: '**Seduq**' (Taqrīb al-Tahdīb, v2 p99). **Al-Zuhari:** Dahabi: '**The Hafiz of his time**' (Sial alam alnubala, v5 p326), Ibn Hajar said: '**There is an agreement on his magnificence**' (Taqrīb al-Tahdīb, v2 p133). **Handalah bin Ali:** Dahabi said: '**Thiqah**' (Al-Kashif, v1 p358), Ibn Hajar said: '**Thiqah**' (Taqrīb al-Tahdīb, v1 p250).

We have presented a tradition that evidences that Umar bore a grudge Khalid for this very filthy deed. Whilst Ansar.Org automatically accuse the Shi'a of attributing 'An obnoxious tail' to Khalid, what do they say about the stance of their beloved Khalifa Umar? Was this just and truthful Sahabas hatred of Khalid due to his being influenced by an obnoxious tale? Umar bore a grudge against Khalid for the very act that Ansar.Org denies. Now we appeal to Ahle Sunnah, whose opinion is more reliable, Ansar.Org that deny the event, or Umar who believed in it, and accordingly hated Khalid on account of it?

Moreover, this tradition supports the Shia tradition cited earlier according to which the task to remove Malik bin Nuwayrah [ra] was assigned to Khalid by Abu Bakar, that is why according to the above cited tradition, Khalid approached Abu Bakar directly without any hesitation and according to his expectations, Abu Bakar was pleased with the 'achievement' of Khalid.

#### 14.A narration from Kanz ul Ummal

Imam of Ahle Sunna Mullah Muttaqi Hindi (d. 975 H) in his famed work Kanz ul Ummal quoted a tradition from the esteemed Sunni work 'Tabaqat al Kubra' by Imam Ibn Saad which was sufficient to unveil the actual role of Khalid in the case of Malik bin Nuwayrah but the Sahabah worshippers could not tolerate this and tampered with 'Tabaqat al Kubra' and removed it. But, the presence of this tradition in Kanz ul Ummal shall make our readers realize why it was essential that the children of Muawiyah delete the primary source. We read the following tradition in Kanz ul Ummal:

**Ibn Abi Aun and others narrated that Khalid bin al-Walid claimed that Malik bin Nuwayrah had become Murtad according to the information that he (Khalid) had received. Malik denied this and said: 'I am a Muslim, I never changed.' Abu Qutada and Abdullah ibn Umar testified that (Malik is Muslim) but Khalid ordered Dharar bin Al-Auzwar to behead him (Malik). Then Khalid took his (Malik's) wife. (Umar) said to Abu Bakr: 'He (Khalid) has performed adultery, you have to stone him'. Abu Bakr said: 'I can't stone him; he interpreted hence made a mistake'. (Umar) said: 'Then dismiss him'. He (Abu Bakr) said: 'I cannot put the sword back in the sheath which Allah has pulled out on my opponents.'(Ibn Sa'ad).**

[Kanz ul Ummal, Volume 5 page 619 Tradition 14091](#)

#### 15. Acceptance by the Sunni scholars of Khalid's crime

We have until now relied on traditions to expose the despicable war crimes of Khalid bin Walid. Let us now submit the testimonies of some esteemed Sunni scholars in Khalid's case. No matter how many attempts Nawasib make to prove Khalid's was right to kill Malik because he deemed him a Murtad and then married his widow, the Imams of Ahle Sunnah have expressed their personal reservations about calling Malik bin Nuwayrah a Murtad. The Sunni Ulema have in the same context testified that Khalid then married Umm Tamim, the widow of Malik. The acceptance of these facts by certain notable Sunni scholars who were obviously more competent for determining the authenticity of the text than today's Nawasib, shall suffice to refute all attempts by our opponents to absolve their hero Khalid. Imam Ibn Abdul Barr gives a very diplomatic response in Al-Istiab, Volume 3 page 1362:

واختلف فيه هل قتله مسلماً أو مرتداً وأراه والله أعلم قتله خطأ

**There is disagreement about him (Malik) did he (Khalid) kill him as a Muslim or Murtad. In my opinion he (Khalid) was mistaken in killing him and Allah knows best.**

Allamah Zamakhshari states in Al-Faiq, Volume 3 page 65:

وقد تزوجها خالد بعد قتل زوجها فأنكر ذلك عليه

**Khalid married her after her husband's murder and he (Khalid) has been condemned for that.**

Let us now read the views of the beloved scholar of Nawasib Ibn Kathir who in his book Sirah al-Nabawiyah, Volume 3 page 595 stated:

ولهذا لم يعزله الصديق حين قتل مالك بن نويرة أيام الردة ، وتأول عليه ما تأول حين ضرب عنقه واصطفى امرأته أم تميم

**Therefore the Sidiq (Abu Bakr) didn't dismiss him (Khalid) when he killed Malik bin Nuwayrah during the days of Reda, because he (Khalid) interpreted when he beheaded him and took his wife Um Tamim.**

If you read any polemical article written by Ansar.Org, they will seek continual reliance upon the writings and views of Ibn Kathir. To them, he is the sole word of authority for the Sunni Sect. We would therefore suggest that they adopt that same loyalty when their beloved Imam affirms that Khalid took the wife of Umm Tamim. We would have welcomed the opportunity to know what interpretation of the Deen entitled Khalid to execute a Muslim and sleep with his wife.

Imam Ibn Athir testified as follows in Gharib al-Hadith, Volume 4 page 15:

وكانت جميلة وتزوجها خالد بعد قتله

**"She was pretty and Khalid married her after killing him [Malik]"**

One of the pioneer reliable Sunni historians Ahmad bin Atham (d. 314 H) records in Kitab al-Futuh, Volume 1 page 20:

فيقال إن خالد بن الوليد تزوج بامرأة مالك ودخل بها وعلى ذلك أجمع أهل العلم

**It has been said that Khalid married Malik's wife and had sexual intercourse with her and that is what the scholars agreed on.**

Among the defenders of Khalid & Co. there was a Sunni scholar Hussain bin Muhammad al-Diyarbakri (d. 966 H) who too in his famed book Tarikh Khamees, Volume 2 page 309 testified that after killing Malik bin Nuwayrah, he committed adultery with the widow of Malik, yet Diyar Bakri tired his best to argue Khalid's case on the basis of mere conjectures, which was indeed an useless attempt. He stated:

فأمر بهم خالد فقتلوا وقتل مالك بن نويرة وتزوج بامرأته أم تميم من ليلته وكانت جميلة ، قيل لعلها كانت مطلقة قد انقضت عدتها الا انها كانت محبوسة عنده فاشتد في ذلك عمر وقال لأبي بكر ارحم خالدا فانه قد استحل ذلك ، فقال ابوبكر والله لا أفعل ان كان خالد تأول امرأ فأخطأه

**"Khalid ordered them to be killed and killed Malik bin Nuwayrah, marrying his wife on the same night and she was pretty. They said, she might have been divorced (by Malik) and her Idda was over but she was imprisoned by him (Malik). Umar was very angry because of that and said to Abu Bakr: 'Stone Khalid because he made it lawful for himself.' Abu Bakr said: 'By Allah I will not do so if Khalid made an error because he did Taweel'.**

One of the pioneer Sunni scholars in the field of History (Siar alam alnubala, v10, p651) namely Ibn Salam al-Jamhi (d. 232 H) in his book 'Tabaqat al-Fahawal al-Sh'ura' page 27 stated:

غير أن الذي استقر عندنا أن عمر أنكر قتله، وقام على خالد فيه وأغلظ له، وأن أبا بكر صفح عن خالد وقبل تأوله

**"But what is confirmed according to us is that Umar condemned the murder (of Malik) and he stood against Khalid and was very rude towards him while Abu Bakr forgave Khalid and accepted his excuse."**

We also read:

فيقول من عذر مالكا: إنه أراد بقوله: " صاحبك " أنه أراد الفرشية. وتأول خالد غير ذلك فقال: إنه إنكار منه للنبوّة

**Those who excuse Malik say: 'That he (Malik) by his statement 'your companion' meant 'Quraysh', while Khalid interpreted that differently and said: 'He denies the prophet'.**

 [Tabaqat al-Fahawal al-Sh'ura, page 27](#)

### 3. Chapter Three - Further incidents exposing the Nasibism and hooligan mentality of Khalid

In this chapter, we will cite some incidences which shall unveil the picture as to what kind of brutal and inhuman traits Khalid bin Walid possessed.

#### 16. Khalid legitimized his junior officer's rape of a woman captured in war

Imam Bayhaqi records the following incident involving the two best mates, Khalid bin Walid and Dharar bin al-Auwzwar:

**Abu al-Hussain bin al-Fadhl al-Qatan** narrated from **Abdullah bin Jaffar bin Darestweh** from **Yaqub bin Sufyan** from **al-Hassab bin Rabee** from **Abdullah bin al-Mubarak** from **Kahmas** from **Harun bin Al-Asam** who said: **Umar bin al-Khatib** may Allah be pleased with him sent **Khalid bin al-Walid** in an army, hence **Khalid** sent **Dharar bin al-Auwzwar** in a squadron and they invaded a district belonging to the tribe of **Bani Asad**. They then captured a pretty bride, **Dharar** liked her hence he asked his companions to grant her to him and they did so. He then had sexual intercourse with her, when he completed his mission he felt guilty, and went to **Khalid** and told him about what he did. **Khalid** said: 'I permit you and made it lawful to you.' He said: 'No not until you write a message to **Umar**'. (Then they sent a message to **Umar**) and **Umar** answered that he (**Dharar**) should be stoned. By the time **Umar's** message was delivered, **Dharar** was dead. (**Khalid**) said: 'Allah didn't want to disgrace **Dharar**'

[Sunan al-Bayhaqi, Volume 2 page 365 Tradition 18685](#)

**Abu al-Hussain ibn al-Fadhl al-Qatan:** *Dahabi said: 'There is an agreement about his authenticity' (Siar alam alnubala, v17 p331).* **Abdullah bin Jaffar bin Darestweh:** *Dahabi said: 'Thiqah' (Siar alam alnubala, v15 p531).* **Yaqub bin Sufyan:** *Dahabi said: 'Thiqah' (Al-Kashif, v2 p394).* **Al-Hassan bin al-Rabee:** *Dahabi said: 'Hujja' (Siar alam alnubala, v10 p399).* **Abdullah bin al-Mubarak:** *Dahabi said: 'Sheikh ul Islam' (Tazkirat al-Hufaz, v1 p274).* **Kahmas bin al-Hassan:** *Dahabi said: 'Thiqah' (Al-Kashif, v2 p150).* **Harun bin al-Asam:** *Imam Ibn Haban included him in his book of Thiqah narrators (al-Thuqat, v5 p508).*

The same incident has also been recorded by another chain i.e **Abu Nasr bin Qutada** from **Abu al-Fadhl bin Khamirewh** from **Ahmad bin Najdah** from **al-Hassan bin Rabee** from **Abdullah bin al-Mubarak** from **Kahmas** from **Harun bin Al-Asam**.

We learn following things from the tradition:

1. The beautiful woman captured by Khalid's friend Dharar (according to the tradition) appears to have been a newly wedded bride.
2. She came into the possession of Dharar's colleagues, he was infatuated by her, his colleagues handed her to him, and he slept with her.
3. In Islam, a woman captured at war doesn't become lawful to someone until she performs Istebra (waiting period). Below we will cite the exact rulings about Istebra for our readers.

Shaykh Abu Bakr Ahmed bin Ali Jasas Razi (d. 370) records in Ahkam al-Quran, Volume 3 page 587:

واتفق الفقهاء على جواز وطء المسبية بعد الاستبراء

**The scholars agreed on the permissibility of having sexual intercourse with the captured woman after performing Istebra.**

If it is said that the woman captured were Murtaad and were disbelievers, that too would

not lessen the heinous crime (Haram) committed by Dharar legitimized by Khalid, rather the punishment will be more serious. Imam Nawawi records in his authority work Al-Minhaj, Volume 10 page 34:

أن المسيبة من عبدة الأوثان وغيرهم من الكفار الذين لا كتاب لهم لا يحل وطؤها بملك اليمين حتى تسلم فما دامت على دينها فهي محرمة

**The captured woman from the pagans and other kinds of disbelievers who don't have a book, it is not permissible to have sexual intercourse with her as 'right hand possess' until she converts to Islam, as long she is on her religion (paganism) she is unlawful.**

4. Despite this, Dharar's lust sex drive made him unable to decipher between Halal and Haram, he immediately raped her.
5. Later on, with sexual tension released, Dharar exhibited guilt and sought the counsel of his noble senior officer Khalid.
6. Since Khalid was himself brutal murderer and fornicator, he sanctioned the rape committed by Dharar, rather than applying the Islamic punishment on him. It is fascinating that he took the position of the prophet by 'making' something Halal for a person, and that too, an act which any religion would deem impermissible. What have him the legal Islamic mandate to deem rape halal?
7. The duty of Khalid was to implement the Islamic punishment, in accordance with the following verse of the Holy Qur'an (005.045):  
**And We prescribed to them in it that life is for life, and eye for eye, and nose for nose, and ear for ear, and tooth for tooth, and (that there is) reprisal in wounds; but he who foregoes it, it shall be an expiation for him; and whoever did not judge by what Allah revealed, those are they that are the unjust.**
8. Upon receipt of this incident, Umar ruled that Dharar be stoned, which is the Islamic punishment for fornication, but by that time, Dharar was already dead.

By now, our readers will realize the motives behind war for Khalid and his fellow hot blooded males was to acquire riches and ravage beautiful women. The above incident and that of Malik bin Nuwayrah attests to this fact. The nature of 'victories' achieved by Khalid & Co that Nawasib have pride in, have been unveiled. Despite this, these Sahabah worshippers still blindly praise such thugs as they were 'Sahabah', issues such as killing Muslims, raping their women and personally taking the position of the Prophet by deeming an act as halal, have no negative bearing on these individuals, they remain just, truthful men that deserve respect! Shame on these people, we just don't understand what audacity they have to invite us to embrace a school of thought that praises, defends and loves murderers and rapists!

## 17. Khalid unjustly fought Tulaiha bin Khuwailid

We would like our readers to recall the incident of Malik bin Nuwayrah we cited from Ibn Shazan in the previous chapter because the causes linked to the murder of Tulaiha are similar to those of Malik bin Nuwayrah's. Prior to the campaign that culminated in the murder of Malik bin Nuwayrah, Abu Bakr had launched a similar campaign against a person called Tulaiha, who (like Malik) rejected the illegitimate caliphate of Abu Bakr. Abu Bakr deemed it paramount that this opponent be silenced, he connoted a claim that Tulaiha had claimed Prophethood for himself, and should hence be killed. This task was also given to his loyal pet Khalid bin Walid. The present day Nawasib would no doubt make feeble attempts to support the allegation of Abu Bakr against Tulaiha with the help of some weak narrations, but for our open minded readers, let us cite the words of the reliable Sunni historian, Ibn Atham (d. 314 H), who in his book Al-Fatuh, page 14 records:

وجعلت بنو أسد وغطفان وفزارة يقاتلون بين يدي طليحة بن خويلد أشد القتال وهم ينادون لا نبايع أبا الفصيل يعنون أبا بكر الصديق رضي الله عنه

**Bani Asad, Ghatfan and Faraza (tribe) fought sternly in Tulaiha bin Khawaild's army and they stated: 'We wont give baya to Abu al-Fasil that referred to Aba Bakr al-Sidiq [ra]'**

Imam of Ahle Sunnah Ibn Habban has also testified to this in his authority work Al-Thuqat Volume 2 page 167:

وكانت بنو فزارة وأسد يقولون والله لا نباع أبأ الفصيل يعنون أبأ بكر

**Bani Fazara and Asad used to say: 'By Allah, we don't give baya to Aba al-Fasil, by it they meant Aba Bakr.**

Aba al-Fasil means a person who has'nt any merit.

## 18. Khalid exhibited his 'bravery' towards women

Imam of Nawasib Ibn Kathir records in Sirah al-Nabawiyah, Volume 3 page 638:

**Ibn Ishaq said: 'Some of our companions narrated that Allah's Messenger [s] passed by a woman who had been killed by Khalid bin al-Walid, the people were gathered around her, then He [s] said to some of his companions: 'Go after Khalid and say to him: 'Allah's Messenger orders you not to kill a child, woman, or slave.'**

[Sirah al-Nabawiyah, Volume 3 page 638](#)

Imam Ahmed records a tradition in his Musnad that has been declared as Sahih according to Shaykh Shoib al-Arnaut in the margin of the book:

**Rabah bin al-Rabee said: Handhala al-Katib marched with Allah's messenger to a battle and Khalid bin al-Walid was at the front, then Rabah and the companions of Allah's Messenger passed by and killed a woman, who had been killed by the front troops. They stopped and stared at her and wondering of her looks, until Allah's Messenger [s] arrived, they then moved away (to let the Prophet pass) then Allah's Messenger [s] stood next to her and said: 'She wasn't a warrior'. Then He [s] said to some one: 'Go to Khalid and tell him to not to kill children or slaves'.**

[Musnad Ahmad, Volume 3 page 488 Tradition 16035](#)

## 19. The butchery committed by Khalid towards the tribe of Jadhima

The following incident will also give a sketch to our readers about Khalid bin Walid inhumane characteristics. We read in Sahih al Bukhari Volume 5, Book 59, Number 628:

**Narrated Salim's father:**

**The Prophet sent Khalid bin Al-Walid to the tribe of Jadhima and Khalid invited them to Islam but they could not express themselves by saying, "Aslamna (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)." Khalid 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 Khalid 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 Khalid has done."**

It should be noted that Khlid was sent by the Prophet [s] to invite people to Islam not to kill them. Despite this Khalid personally killed those he was unable to convince to embrace the

faith, and asked his colleagues to likewise kill those that they had captured, and on what grounds? Just for fun! Thank god his colleagues adopted sense and opted to utilise their humanity, and rejected these orders that later on turned out to be the correct decision as the Holy Prophet [s] in automatically distanced himself from the brutality committed by Khalid. Are these the types of acts these Nawasib evidence as the 'bravery' of Khalid? Ofcourse Ansar.Org put this tragedy down to a mere mistake, they state:

Ansar.Org stated:

When the news of their execution reached Rasulullah r he lifted his hands and said, "O Allah, I dissociate myself from what Khalid has done."<sup>8</sup> Although Rasulullah r dissociated himself from the haste Khalid 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.

The reality is this was more than just an error of judgement, it was a calculated cold blooded murder of Muslims, merely to settle some old scores. We shall seek to evidence this through the testimony of the Sahaba themselves...

## The Sahabi Abdulrahman ibn Auf exposed Khalid bin Walid's actual motive behind slaughtering the Muslims of Bani Jadhima

It is interesting that Ansar.Org rely on Sahih al Bukhari to narrate the Bani Jadhimamassacres, that in reality provides a heavily edited version of the event, so as to intentionally portray Khalid bin Walid as the victim of a mere understanding. If we look at another tradition we can better understanding the reality behind this tragedy that in turn exposes the true nature of this war criminal:

**"Abu Bakr Muhammad bin Abdulbaqi from al-Hassan bin Ali from Abu Umar Muhammad bin Abbas from Abdulwahab bin Abi Haya from Muhammad bin Shuja from Muhammad bin Umar from- Abdullah bin Yazid from Eas bin Salamah narrated from his father that when Khalid bin al-Walid came to the Prophet [s] after what he had done to the tribe of Jadhima, Abdurrahman bin Auf discredited Khalid on his deed and said: 'Oh Khalid, you adopted the manner of Jahiliyah and killed them to avenge your uncle al-Fakeh, may Allah curse you.' Then Umar bin al-Khatab supported him against Khalid. Khalid said: 'I avenged your father.' Abdulrahman ibn Auf said: 'By Allah, you have lied, I killed the killer of my father with my own hands and Uthman bin Affan is witness to that'. Then he (Abdulrahman) looked at Uthman and said to him: 'I appeal to you by Allah, do you witness that I killed my father's killer?' Uthman said: 'Yes.' Then Abdulrahman said: 'Oh Khalid, shame on you, even if I didn't kill the killer of my father, would you kill Muslims to take avenge my father?' Khalid said: 'Who told you that they were Muslims!' (Abdulrahman said): 'All the soldiers testify that you saw them building mosques and testifying that they were Muslims, and then you struck them with the sword.' (Khalid) said: 'I had received a message from Allah's messenger to invade them, therefore I attacked them on the orders of the Prophet [s]'. Abdulrahman said: 'You have attributed a lie to Allah's messenger.' Then (Khalid) became rude with Abdulrahman and Allah's Messenger became angry and turned his face from Khalid because of what he did to Abdurrahman..."**

[Tarikh Ibn Asakir, Volume 16 page 234](#)

**Muhammad bin Abdulbaqi:** Dahabi said: '*Musnad of his time*' (Siar alam alnubala, v20 p23), Albaani said: '*Thiqah*' (Silsila Da'eefa, v4 p361). **Al-Hassan bin Ali al-Johari:** Dahabi

said: '**Seduq**' (*Siar alam alnubala*, v18 p68), Khatib Baghdadi said: '**Thiqah**' (*Tarikh Baghdad*, v7 p393). **Muhammad bin Abbas bin Hayweh**: Dahabi said: '**Thiqah**' (*Siar alam alnubala*, v16 p409), Khatib Baghdadi said: '**Thiqah**' (*Tarih Baghdad*, v3 p121). **Abdulwahab bin Isa bin Abi Haya**: Darqutni said: '**Thiqah**' (*Tarikh al-Islam*, v23 p585), Khatib Baghdadi said: '**Seduq**' (*Tarikh Baghdad*, v11 p30). **Muhammad bin Shuja**: Dahabi said: '**Thiqah**' (*Siar alam alnubala*, v20 p74), Ibn Naja said: '**Seduq**' (*Al-Wafi bil Wafyat*, v3 p123). **Muhammad bin Umar Waqidi**. **Abdullah bin Yazid**: Ibn Hanbal said: '**Thiqah**' (*Al-Elal*, v2 p484), Yahya ibn Moin said: '**Thiqah**' (*Tarikh ibn Moin*, v1 p155). **Eas bin Salamah**: Ibn Hajar said: '**Thiqah**' (*Taqrib al-Tahdib*, v1 p114), Albaani said: '**Thiqah**' (*Erwa al-Ghalil*, v5 p55). **Salamah bin al-Akwa**: A Sahabi.

This reference debases whatever defenses Nawasib offer for Khalid bin Walid's slaughter of the Bani Jadhima. If the Shi'a had accused Khalid bin Walid of utilizing the methods of jahilyya then Nawasib would quickly attack us for slandering a 'son of Islam', so what is their opinion here? The accusations leveled against Khalid ibn Walid are not made by the Rafidha; they are made by an esteemed Sahabi accusing Khalid of settling old scores by using the methods of jahiliya. Let us not forget that this is not merely the opinion of a normal Sahabi, Abdurrahman bin Auf is he who (according to Sunni traditions) was of the ten Sahaba guaranteed paradise. Are the Ahle Sunnah not prepared to accept the testimony of a truthful paradise bound Sahabi? He says explicitly that Khalid killed Muslims because they had murdered his uncle. Then we have Umar ibn al Khattab and Uthman bin Affan also supporting Abdurrahman bin Auf, so we now have three renowned Sahaba having a unified voice against Khalid ibn Walid.

Ansar.Org had sought solace in suggesting that Khalid slaughtered these tribesman on account of a misunderstanding in Arabic grammar, Abdurrahman bin Auf exposing a more chilling reality. Whilst Bulhari as happy in producing this narration that gave Khalid a potential defence, this tradition rips such a defence to shreds. That is because we have the testimony of all the Sahaba participants that accompanied Khalid ibn Walid attested that the tribe were believers, and this before they were slaughtered. Abdurrahman conveys the stance of the others as follows:

**'All the soldiers testify that you saw them building mosques and testifying that they were Muslims, and then you struck them with the sword.'**

We now have the witness testimony of scores of Sahaba that prove that there was no honest mistake on the part of Khalid, it was cold blooded unjustified slaughter, done merely to avenge an old tribal killing.

**'I had received a message from Allah's messenger to invade them, therefore I attacked them on the orders of the Prophet [s]'**.

We know that this is not the case, Khalid had been asked by the Prophet (s) to invite the people to Islam, not to slaughter them. It is indeed atrocious that he sought to justify his sin, by claiming he was merely enforcing the directive of the Prophet (s). This lie was immediately refuted by Abdurrahman bin Auf who said:

**'You have attributed a lie to Allah's messenger'**.

The implications for attributing a lie to the Prophet (s) are clearly set out in the Sunnah. We read this Hadith in Ibn Majah that has been authenticated by Shaikh Al-Baani in Sahih Sunan Ibn Majah vol.1, p.7, no.12.

**Abdullah Ibn Masoud (radhi allahu anhu) reported on the authority of his father, that Allah's Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wa-sallam) said: "He, who deliberately attributes a lie to me, let him take his seat in the Hell-Fire."**

When Khalid bin Walid attributed such a serious lie to the Prophet (s) where does that leave his

credibility in Islam? The Ahle Sunnah believe that all the Sahaba are just and truthful, how can this be the case when we have a Sahaba Abdurrahman bin Auf exposing Khalid bin Walid for attributing a lie to the Holy Prophet (s)?

## 20. The ferocious treatment given to the head of Malik by Khalid

Previously we just shed light on the fact that Khalid bin Walid unjustly killed the Sahabi Malik bin Nuwayrah by alleging that he was a Murtad. He then slept with his wife. Let us now reveal the post murder activity done by Khalid to the severed head of this martyred Sahabi. Ibn Kathir records:

وأمر برأسه فجعل مع حجرين وطبخ على الثلاثة قدرا فأكل منها خالد تلك الليلة ليهرب بذلك الأعراب من المرتدة وغيرهم

**He (Khalid) ordered that the head (of Malik) be placed with two stones and inserted into a cooking pot, he (Khalid) then ate from it that night in order scare the Arabs and others from being apostates.**

*al-Bidayah wa al-Nihaya, Volume 6 page 354*

The Holy Prophet [s] always emphasized the prohibition of mutilating the dead bodies as we read in Musnad Ahmad, Volume 4 page 436:

**Samara bin Jundub and Imran bin Husain said: 'Whenever the prophet addressed us, he ordered us for charity and forbade us from mutilation'.**

*Shaykh Shu'aib al-Arnaout said: 'Sahih' while Albaani said: 'The narrators are authentic' (Erwa al-Ghalil, v7, p292).*

Is this treatment of the dead in accordance with the Sunnah of Muhammad (s)? Let us leave the Sunnah aside this is not the Sunnah of a human being. Despite this you will still read Ansar.Org describing the killing of Khalid as an 'honest mistake'. Was placing his decapitated head in a cooking pot also an 'honest mistake'?

## 21. Khalid was conversant in raping, looting and killing innocent Muslims but didn't know how to offer prayers

**Abu Bakr Muhammad bin Abdulbaqi from al-Hassan bin Ali from Abu Umar Muhammad bin Abbas from Ahmad bin Maroof from al-Hussain bin al-Fahm from Muhammad bin Saad from al-Fadhl bin Dukain from Al-Waleed bin Abdullah bin Jamee said: 'A man whom I trust told me that Khalid bin al-Waleed led the prayer in Hyra (city), hence he read verses from different chapters, then he looked at the people and said: 'Jihad kept me busy from learning Quran'.**

[Tarikh Ibn Asakir, Volume 16 page 250](#)

**Muhammad bin Abdulbaqi:** Dahabi said: '**Musnad of his time**' (*Siar alam alnubala*, v20 p23), Albaani said: '**Thiqah**' (*Silsila Da'eefa*, v4 p361). **Al-Hassan bin Ali al-Johari:** Dahabi said: '**Seduq**' (*Siar alam alnubala*, v18 p68), Khatib Baghdadi said: '**Thiqah**' (*Tarikh Baghdad*, v7 p393). **Muhammad bin Abbas bin Hayweh:** Dahabi said: '**Thiqah**' (*Siar alam alnubala*, v16 p409), Khatib Baghdadi said: '**Thiqah**' (*Tarih Baghdad*, v3 p121). **Ahmad bin Maroof:** Dahabi said: '**Thiqah**' (*Tarikh al-Islam*, v24 p102), Khatib Baghdadi said: '**Thiqah**' (*Tarikh Baghdad*, v5 p368). **Al-Hussain bin Fehm:** Dahabi said: '**Huge Hafiz**' (*Tazkirat al-Hufaz*, v2 p680), Khatib Baghdadi said: '**Thiqah**' (*Tarikh Baghdad*, v8 p91). **Muhammad bin Saad:** Dahabi said: '**Seduq**' (*Al-Kashif*, v2 p174), Ibn Hajar said: '**Seduq**' (*Taqrib al-Tahdib*, v2 p79). **Al-Fadl bin Dukin:** Dahabi said: '**Thabt**' (*Tazkirat al-Hufaz*, v1 p372), Ibn Hajar said: '**Thiqah Thabt**' (*Taqrib al-Tahdib*, v2 p11). **Al-Walid bin Abdullah bin Jame:** Dahabi said: '**Authenticated**' (*Al-Kashif*, v2 p352), Ibn Hajar said: '**Seduq**' (*Taqrib al-Tahdib*, v2 p286).

## 22. Khalid's troops looting, raping and then enjoying alcohol; The perfect example of gangsters

**Abu Bakr Muhammad bin Abdulbaqi from al-Hassan bin Ali from Abu Umar Muhammad bin Abbas from Ahmad bin Maroof from al-Hussain bin al-Fahm from Muhammad bin Saad from Ibrahim bin Abdullah bin Hatim al-Harawi from Hashem from Awam bin Hushab who said: 'My people narrated from a man among them whose name is S'as'a: 'Alcohol was being spread in Khalid bin Walid's troop'**

[Tarikh Ibn Asakir, Volume 16 page 252](#)

**Muhammad bin Abdulbaqi:** Dahabi said: '**Musnad of his time**' (*Siar alam alnubala*, v20 p23), Albaani said: '**Thiqah**' (*Silsila Da'eefa*, v4 p361). **Al-Hassan bin Ali al-Johari:** Dahabi said: '**Seduq**' (*Siar alam alnubala*, v18 p68), Khatib Baghdadi said: '**Thiqah**' (*Tarikh Baghdad*, v7 p393). **Muhammad bin Abbas bin Hayweh:** Dahabi said: '**Thiqah**' (*Siar alam alnubala*, v16 p409), Khatib Baghdadi said: '**Thiqah**' (*Tarih Baghdad*, v3 p121). **Ahmad bin Maroof:** Dahabi said: '**Thiqah**' (*Tarikh al-Islam*, v24 p102), Khatib Baghdadi said: '**Thiqah**' (*Tarikh Baghdad*, v5 p368). **Al-Hussain bin Fehm:** Dahabi said: '**Huge Hafiz**' (*Tazkirat al-Hufaz*, v2 p680), Khatib Baghdadi said: '**Thiqah**' (*Tarikh Baghdad*, v8 p91). **Muhammad bin Saad:** Dahabi said: '**Seduq**' (*Al-Kashif*, v2 p174), Ibn Hajar said: '**Seduq**' (*Taqrib al-Tahdib*, v2 p79). **Ibrahim bin Abdullah bin Hatim:** Dahabi said: '**Thabt in narrating from Hashem**' (*Tarikh al-Islam*, v19 p162), Ibn Hajar said: '**Seduq**' (*Taqrib al-Tahdib*, v1, p58). **Hashem bin Bashir:** Dahabi said: '**Thiqah**' (*Al-Kashif*, v2 p338), Ibn Hajar said: '**Thiqah Thabt**' (*Taqrib al-Tahdib*, v2 p269). **Al-Awam bin Hushab:** Dahabi said: '**Authenticated**' (*Al-Kashif*, v2 p100), Ibn Hajar said: '**Thiqah Thabt**' (*Taqrib al-Tahdib*, v1 p759).

## 23. The abusive nature of Khalid

We read in Sahih Muslim Book 031, Number 6168:

**"Abu Sa'id reported there was some altercation between Khalid b. Walid and Abd al-Rahman b. 'Auf and Khalid reviled him...."**

## 24. Khalid bin Walid was a Nasibi (hypocrite)

It should come as no surprise to learn that Khalid bin Walid was a Nasibi, since one possessing habits to commit Haram acts commonly has this Nasibi affliction. In Musnad Ahmad, Volume 5 page 358, we read the confession of Sahabi Abu Buraidah that he was a Nasibi as was Khalid bin Walid:

حدثنا عبد الله حدثني أبي ثنا وكيع ثنا الأعمش عن سعد بن عبيدة عن بن بريدة عن أبيه انه مر على مجلس وهم يتناولون من على فوقف عليهم فقال انه قد كان في نفسي على علي شيء وكان خالد بن الوليد كذلك

**Buraida narrated from his father that he passed by a group of people abusing Ali, he stopped there and said: 'There is something in myself against Ali as is the stance of Khalid bin al-Walid.'**

[Musnad Ahmad, Volume 5 page 358 Tradition 23078](#)

Shaykh Shu'aib al-Arnaout in the margin of this tradition wrote: '**Sahih according to the conditions of two Sheikhs**' and so did Imam of Salafies Nasiruddun Al-Albaani in his book *Silsila Sahiha*, Volume 4 page 249.

## 25. Revealing the 'virtuous' lineage of Khalid bin Walid

We have already presented the testimony of the Sahabi Abu Buraidah that Khalid bin Walid had something against Ali bin Abi Talib [as] that made him a Nasibi that automatically renders him a hypocrite. Being a Nasibi is also dependent upon one being of illegitimate lineage. Imam of Ahle Sunnah, Fakhruddin al-Razi said correctly in Tafseer al-Kabeer, Volume 30 page 85:

ولأن الغالب أن النطفة إذا خبثت خبث الولد ولهذا قال عليه الصلاة والسلام لا يدخل الجنة ولد الزنا ولا ولده ولا ولد ولده

**If the seed is evil then the progeny will also be evil, therefore the Prophet (s) said: 'The son of adultery and his son and his grand son shall not enter heaven.'**

With this fact in mind allow us to reveal the 'virtuous' lineage of Khalid bin Walid bin Mughira, as attested to in verses 10-13 of the Pen and Paper Surah in the Qur'an

**"Heed not the type of despicable men,- ready with oaths, A slanderer, going about with calumnies, (Habitually) hindering (all) good, transgressing beyond bounds, deep in sin, Violent (and cruel), with all that, base-born"**

Following are the esteemed Sunni sources confirming that base-born (Zaneem) means of illegitimate birth:

1. Ahkam al-Quran, by Jasas, v3, p625
2. Tafseer Samarqandi, v3, p460
3. Tafseer Thalabi, v10, p13
4. Tafseer Sam'ani, v6, p22
5. Tafseer al-Nasafi, v4, p269
6. Zad al-Mesir, by ibn al-Jawzi, v8, p68
7. Tafsir Baydhawi, v5, p370
8. Al-Tashi le uloom al-Tanzil, by al-Ghurnati, v4, p138
9. Tafsir Jalalin, p758
10. Fath al-Qadir, by Shawkani, v5, p270
11. Ruh al-Ma'ani by Alusi, v29, p27

And the scholars who wrote the following authority Sunni works are in agreement that this verse descended with regards to Khalid's father Walid bin Mughira:

1. Tafseer al-Nasafi, v4, p269
2. Tafseer Qurtubi, v18, p231
3. Tafseer Baydhawi, v5, p370
4. Al-Tashi le uloom al-Tanzil, by al-Ghurnati, v4, p138
5. Tafseer Jalalin, p758
6. Tafseer Abi al-Suad, v9, p13
7. Fath al-Qadir, by Shawkani, v5, p270
8. Ruh al-Ma'ani by Alusi, v29, p28

For the sake of brevity we shall cite only the one source, Tafseer Nasafi, Volume 4 page 269:

**"It is narrated that he (Waleed) approached his mother and said, 'Muhammad described me by ten characteristics. I am fully aware of them with the exception of the son of adultery. Now if you do not tell me the truth, then I shall strike off your neck. she (Waleed's mother) replied 'Your father was impotent, I was worried that if he died his wealth would go to others, so I called a shepherd and slept with him and you are that shepherd 's son' "**

[Tafseer Nasafi, Volume 4 page 269](#)

We would ask our readers to ponder over the words of Razi **"If the seed is evil then the progeny will also be evil"** – this has exactly been proven in this article!

## 4. Chapter Four – Analyzing the defenses offered for Khalid and his forgiving Khalifa

### 26. Ansar.Org's pathetic attempts to justify the decision of Abu Bakr

Ansar.Org stated:

Sayyiduna Abu Bakr t was guided in this decision by two things. Firstly, the hadith of Rasulallah r wherein he described Khalid as "the sword which Allah unsheathed against the Unbelievers". The second was the fact that a similar occurrence took place in the time of Rasulallah r , also with Khalid ibn al-Walid. He was put in command by Rasulallah r of an expedition to Banu Jadhimah. When Khalid asked them to accept Islam they responded by saying "saba'na, saba'na", 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 Khalid 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 Rasulallah r he lifted his hands and said, "O Allah, I dissociate myself from what Khalid has done."<sup>8</sup> Although Rasulallah r dissociated himself from the haste Khalid 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 is amazing that Abu Bakr's advocates provide defences for their clients that they themselves never claimed. They suggest that Abu Bakr's decision was based on the above two things, could they show us any authentic source wherein Abu Bakr justified his decision on the basis of the above two things? Why are Ansar.Org placing words into the mouth of Abu Bakr that he never said? He actually based his decision by posing the rhetorical question '*Can it be more than Khalid interpreted and made a mistake?*' - so where are the two pieces of evidence that Ansar.Org claim shaped his judgment? Let us for arguments sake consider the so called proofs that influenced Abu Bakr's decision:

### 27. Does the title Sayfullah exempt Khalid from criminal prosecution?

Ansar.Org stated:

Firstly, the hadith of Rasulallah r wherein he described Khalid as "the sword which Allah unsheathed against the Unbelievers".

### 28. Reply One – Allah [swt] and his Prophet [s] would never reward a title to one undeserving of it

To answer this it is also important to quote this comment:

Ansar.Org stated:

All his services rendered to Islam, and even the title of "Sayfullah" given to him by Rasulullah r are simply ignored, and on the basis of nothing but a fable.

Let us consider the 'services' rendered to Islam by Khalid bin Walid that includes the:

- unjustified murder of a Sahabi Malik bin Nuwayrah
- 'marrying' of his widow
- maltreatment given to the severed head of martyred Malik bin Nuwayrah
- legitimizing the rape committed by his fellow comrade
- butchery committed to the tribe of Jadhima
- bravery exhibited towards feeble women
- grudge he bore against Ali bin Abi Talib [as]

If after such 'services' someone believes that Allah [swt] would give such a person the title of 'Allah's sword' then he is surely committing Kufr for he is indirectly attributing the legitimacy of committing fornication, the murder of innocent Muslims and the possession of an impure lineage to Allah [swt], an allegation that every fearful and devoted Muslim would refrain from.

## **29. Reply Two - Allah [swt] and his Prophet [s] would only give the title to he who proves that he is Sayfullah on the battlefield**

If one looks at war in any country at any time, we see that people are awarded medals of valor on the basis of their achievements on the battlefield. Titles are awarded on the basis of personal fighting excellence; the Head of State recognizes such valor and awards the individual accordingly. Is it logical or just to believe that a person that leads from the front and is proven to be the greatest warrior on the battlefield against the Kuffar, is overlooked when it comes to issuing an award and it is instead issued to a non participant? If we look at the history of those battles wherein the Prophet (s) was a participant, we see one name shine above all others in fighting the Kuffar, Ali ibn Abi Talib [as]). When it came to unsheathing one's sword against the Kuffar, it was Maula Ali [as] who excelled above all others. One only needs to pick up the books of classical history to see the manner in which Ali [as] came out to duel in Badr, stayed with the Prophet (s) when all around had fled in Uhud a fact testified by the Prophet [s] (see the scan below from Madarij un Nubuwwa, v2 p 210-211), he slew the leader of the Kuffar in battle at Khanduq (trench), and through his leadership conquered the main fortress at Khayber killing Mahrab in the process. These were the feats of Imam Ali [as].

Khalid bin Walid's sword was sheathed against the believers at Badr and Uhud. What military brilliance can Ansar.Org evidence is subsequent battles wherein the Prophet (s) was present? The answer is nothing, Khalid embraced Islam just before the conquest of Makka, and as such the Muslims did not benefit from his sword being unsheathed against the Kuffar at Khundaq or Khaibar. The only battle wherein the Prophet (s) would have personally observed the bravery of Khalid in war would have been Hunain and yet we so we see no example of his sword being successfully let lose on the kuffar in that battle. How is it then logical that the title Sword of Allah [swt] is given to a man whose bravery on the battlefield in the presence of Muhammad (s) is unsubstantiated, and restricted to just one battle? Nothing of the sort can be said of Imam Ali [as], it is only the die hard Muawiyah lovers that reject that Imam Ali [as] was the greatest warrior ever to unsheathe his sword against the unbelievers. How can anyone accept that Ali [as] despite being the greatest warrior of Islam, is totally overlooked when it comes to recognizing his abilities and instead the Prophet (s) gives the title Sayfullah to Khalid bin Walid? How could Khalid get this title of when we have the testimony of Gibrael [as] at Uhud: **'There is no brave young man but Ali, and there is no sword but Dhulfiqar'**

1. [📖 Madarij un Nubuwwa, Volume 2 page 210-211](#)

2. [History of al-Tabari Volume 7 pages 120-121](#)

*Shaykh Abdulwahab bin Sakina deemed as 'Thiqah and Sheikh ul-Islam' by Imam Dhahabi (Siar alam alnubala, v21 p502) deemed this tradition to be Sahih (see Sharh Nahj al-Balagha, by ibn Abi al-Hadid, v14 p251).*

Is it believable that Gibrael testifies to the bravery of Ali [as] and the greatness of his sword, yet when it comes to issuing the title Sayfullah it goes to a man that embraced Islam just prior to the conquest of Makka and showed no evidence of military brilliance in any of the remaining battles wherein the Prophet (s) was present?

There are also other traditions wherein Maula Ali [as] has been referred to as a sword. We read in Futuh al-Shaam by Waqidi, Volume 2 page 208:

**Umar said (to Hassan and Hussain):...Aren't both of you the grandsons of Allah's messenger, isn't your mother Fatimah al-Batul, isn't your father Sayfullah al-Maslool...'**

Ubaidullah Amretsari al-Hanafi records in Arjah al-Matalib, page 38:

**Ibn Abbas narrated that Allah's messenger said: 'This is Ali bin Abi Talib; he is Sayfullah al-Maslool for the enemies of Allah'**

We also read in Manaqob al-Imam Ali by al-Eyni al-Hanafi, page 57:

**Jabir narrated that Allah's messenger said: 'He is Sayfullah al-Maslool'**

Khawarezmi in Al-Manaqib, page 40 and Ibn al-Sabagh al-Maliki in Al-Fusul al-Muhima, Volume 1 page 98 while mentioning the nicknames of Imam Ali bin Abi Talib [as], included:

**'Sayfullah al-Maslool'**

The reality is these Hadeeth were unpalatable to Nawasib, and their father Muawiyah made it a priority in his reign to ensure traditions in favor of Imam Ali [as] were distributed to their supporters. These efforts can be evidenced from Ibn Abi al-Hadid in Sharh Nahj al-Balagha, Volume 11 page 45 and Muhammad Ibn Aqil al-Hadhremi in al-Nesayh al-Kafia, page 98:

**Mu'awiya wrote to his officials: 'The hadith in favor of various dimensions of Uthman have been multiplied and spread to every city. When this letter reaches you, ask the people for the hadiths regarding the merits of the companions and the first Caliphs. Do not leave any information that any Muslim narrates in favor of Abu Turab, except that you come up with another one that contradicts it from one of the Sahaba. This is dearer to me and of more delight to my eyes and of more refutation to the argument of Abu Turab and his party (Shi'a) and more damaging to them than recounting the good deeds and merits of Uthman".**

We leave it to those with logical minds to think about these points that we have raised.

### **30. Reply Three – The title Sayfullah could never be attributed to the one who flees from the Kuffar and deserts the battlefield**

It is logical that the responsibility that accompanies this title means that one i.e. the sword of Allah [swt], is he whose bravery is evidenced in the heat of battle. Khalid bin Walid was participant in two battles in the presence of the Prophet (s). If he had exhibited bravery there, then someone could have accepted that he was worthy of this honour since he remained steadfast and ensured that his sword was firm against the Kuffar. The reality is rather than

prove his bravery in the face of assault, and crucially protect the Holy Prophet (s), he fled along with the vast bulk of other Sahaba during the war of Hunayn and therefore Allah [swt] revealed the incident in his Holy book in the following manner:

**Truly Allah has given you victory on many battle fields, and on the Day of Hunain (battle) when you rejoiced at your great number but it availed you naught and the earth, vast as it is, was straitened for you, then you turned back in flight (Quran, 9:25).**

We read in al-Musnaf by Ibn Abi Shayba, Volume 8 page 553:

**Muhammad bin Fudail from Ashath from al-Hakam bin Utaiba who said: 'When the people fled from the Prophet [s] at the day of Hunayn, the Prophet [s] used to say: 'I am the Prophet no doubt \* I am the son of Abdulmutalib.' No one remained with Him except four: Three from Bani Hashim and a man: Ali bin Abi Talib, Abbas and they were in front of him, Abu Sufyan bin al-Harith holding the rein and Ibn Masud on his left side.'**

Other Sunni traditions cite the names of other Sahaba that stood with the Prophet (s), none mention the presence of Khalid bin Walid (see Tafsir Qurtubi, v8 p97). We appeal to justice! How can we accept that the Prophet (s) described Khalid as Sayfullah when his only achievement was to flee the arrows of the Kuffar and leave the Prophet (s) to their mercy?

### **31. Reply Four – The title Sayfullah could never entitle a person to murder and rape with immunity**

Let us for arguments sake accept this Hadeeth as correct and consider the wording "the sword which Allah unsheathed against the Unbelievers" – should we interpret this to mean that whoever Khalid raises his sword against is an unbeliever? If this was the case, then does this exempt Khalid from all actions, since he will always kill the unbelievers only? If Abu Bakr believed this to be the case then why did he pay blood money to the brother of Malik? In this instance the sword was used against the believers so why should Khalid bin Walid be afforded protection under this alleged Hadeeth?

### **32. Did the Prophetic immunity given to Khalid after he slaughtered the Banu Jadhima set a precedent that he should never be punished for heinous crimes?**

We had in the previous chapter discussed this tragic episode, and proven that Khalid slaughtered the innocent Muslims of Banu Jadhima so that could he could settle a personal grudge he had with them. Rasulallah (s) condemned the act, compensated the bereaved relatives but desisted from punishing Khalid for this aggressive. Whilst most people would feel ashamed at citing this incident, Ansar.Org seek to present it in a positive and misinterpret in a manner that suggests that Khalid was in effect permanently exempt from the laws of Shariah. Let us again ponder over what Ansar.Org said:

Ansar.Org stated:

... a similar occurrence took place in the time of Rasulallah r , also with Khalid ibn al-Walid. He was put in command by Rasulallah r of an expedition to Banu Jadhimah. When Khalid asked them to accept Islam they responded by saying "saba'na, saba'na", 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 Khalid 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 Rasulullah r he lifted his hands and said, "O Allah, I dissociate myself from what Khalid has done." Although Rasulullah r dissociated himself from the haste Khalid 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.

### 33. Reply One – There is no evidence to suggest that this event gave permanent immunity to Khalid bin Walid

Since Ansar.Org sought to present a sanitized version of this event allow us to present it fully from Sahih al Bukhari. If anything it proves that Khalid bin Walid had traits that would later expose him as brutal war criminal. We read in Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, Book 59, Number 628:

#### **Narrated Salim's father:**

**The Prophet sent Khalid bin Al-Walid to the tribe of Jadhima and Khalid invited them to Islam but they could not express themselves by saying, "Aslamna (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)." Khalid 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 Khalid 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 Khalid has done."**

Khalid was personally responsible for killing people who questioned his motives for attacking them, not only that he asked his colleagues to kill their respective captives, for what? Just for fun! Thank god that his colleagues at that particular time had sense and feared Allah (swt), thus they did not follow the foolish orders of Khalid that later turned out to be the correct decision as Holy Prophet [s] in reacted by showing his disassociation from the brutality committed by Khalid. Rather than be ashamed at such crimes Nawasib recollect Khalid's acts as evidence of his greatness!

Amazingly rather than feel ashamed, Ansar.Org seems to cite this example as the blanket immunity for Khalid bin Walid to do whatever he likes! There is nothing in this tradition that would suggest that Khalid had the green light to commit whatever heinous crimes he liked, since according to Ansar.Org he had permanent immunity from the Prophet (s).

The very fact that the Prophet (s) disassociated himself from this crime repeating twice "**O Allah! I am free from what Khalid has done.**" – proves that Rasulullah (s) did not want any association with an act wherein innocent blood had been shed. There is nothing in this supplication that would suggest that Khalid could do whatever he liked from that day on. Can we really accept that this tradition set a precedent, and that Khalid from that day on had the mandate to slaughter whoever appeared to him as an obstacle? How Ansar.Org have interpreted the tradition in this way, and then applied it to the judgment of Abu Bakr is indeed amazing!

### 34. Reply Two - Rasulallah did not implement the Shariah against a munafiq that blasphemed him

In this episode Khalid, Imam Bukhari intentionally presented the event suggesting that Khalid believed that he was killing those that had declared themselves Sabeans. We had previously proven that this was nothing of the sort, and we have the testimony of all of Khalid's troops that Khalid had concrete proof that they were Muslims and yet he still slaughtered them. This was not an innocent mistake, as Ansar.Org seek to suggest and we have no evidence from the mouth of the Prophet (s) that would suggest that he deemed this slaughter as an innocent mistake. If the Prophet (s) did not take action in this instance then he was merely doing so to address the tense situation that he was facing at the time. Rasulallah (s) was considering all factors that were around him, and his decision not to punish Khalid was no different to the immunity he had given to a munafiq that had blasphemed him in his presence. We read in Sahih Bukhari, Volume 6, Book 60, Number 428:

**Narrated Jabir bin 'Abdullah:**

**We were in a Ghazwa (Sufyan once said, in an army) and a man from the emigrants kicked an Ansari man (on the buttocks with his foot). The Ansari man said, "O the Ansar! (Help!)" and the emigrant said. "O the emigrants! (Help!) Allah's Apostle heard that and said, "What is this call for, which is characteristic of the period of ignorance?" They said, "O Allah's Apostle! A man from the emigrants kicked one of the Ansar (on the buttocks with his foot)." Allah's Apostle said, "Leave it (that call) as is a detestable thing." 'Abdullah bin Ubai heard that and said, 'Have the (the emigrants) done so? By Allah, if we return Medina, surely, the more honorable will expel therefrom the meaner." When this statement reached the Prophet. 'Umar got up an, said, "O Allah's Apostle! Let me chop off the head of this hypocrite ('Abdullah bin Ubai)!" The Prophet said "Leave him, lest the people say that Muhammad kills his companions." The Ansar were then more in number than the emigrants when the latter came to Medina, but later on the emigrant increased.**

The reference makes it clear that a hypocrite was sitting in the midst of the Sahaba, Umar offered to have him killed, but Rasul (s) said **"Leave him, lest the people say that Muhammad kills his companions;"** i.e. he (s) did not want his actions to be exploited / incorrectly interpreted by non Muslims. Ansar.Org would want us to believe the sparing of Khalid exempts him of all wrong doings, by that token shall we conclude that the exemption of the Munafiq from punishment likewise gave him immunity for life? Could he carry on blaspheming the Prophet (s) without fear of punishment because he had been spared on one occasion? Certainly not, if Rasul (s) spared Khalid from Punishment on this occasion, but at the same time distanced himself of this crime, then he was doing so because he did not want the Kuffar of Makka and Munafiqs to spread Fitnah that even those that are become Muslims will not be spared. He (s) did not want Munafiqs to exploit the situation saying **"Muhammad kills his companions"**. This was a poignant time in Islamic history as Makka had just been conquered, the Islamic State was about to be formed as such he (s) wanted a peaceful transition to becoming Head of State and did not want to risk enemy elements inciting false information. That is why Khalid was spared on this occasion. That is why the Prophet (s) exercised his discretion and ordered the bereaved relatives to be compensated. This in no way proves that Khalid was innocent, nor does it prove he was eternally exempt from the Shariah.

### 35. Reply Three – Khalid had no remorse for what he did

Normally tragic episodes like this have a profound effect on people. That is why we often here of people involved in tragic car accidents feeling so guilty that they drive with extra caution, or never get behind a driving seat again. Why? Because the event was so distressing and conjured up such awful memories they simply can't risk themselves in such a position again. This is an understandable human reaction. Now consider the slaughter of Banu Jadhimah, did Khalid express any remorse for what he did? Remorse would involve Khalid being more cautious

before unsheathing his sword against people in future, after all who would want to be implicated in a similar tragedy again? Surely in future Khalid would seek to investigate matters and ascertain the truth before attacking people in future, on the false premise that they are unbelievers! The reality is, this tragedy had no bearing on him, rather than exercise caution he continued to perpetuate heinous crimes, that evidences his vile, cruel nature. An offence like this on one occasion might indeed be a mistake, but when it is repeated again and again, the pattern unveils the true nature of an individual's criminal mentality, and the initial 'mistake' also becomes questionable. That is why when the police gather evidence to assist a criminal investigation they shall examine the suspect's criminal record to ascertain whether there exist any patterns of such behavior in the past. The first vile crime that Khalid did was during the lifetime of the Prophet (s). After the death of the Prophet (s) he continued to slaughter believers in the same way that proves that he had no shame, remorse for what he had done to the Banu Jadhima. With Banu Jadhima a 'misunderstanding' in words led to Khalid slaughtering the entire tribe! Rather than tread more carefully in future, when it came to Malik bin Nuwayrah and his people, he exercised even less caution. Despite this, the Nawasib of Ansar.Org want us to believe that the Banu Judhaima slaughter involving Khalid, set a precedent in that his sword was permanently protected from the laws of punishment. As they state proudly:

Ansar.Org stated:

All of this show that Rasulullah r saw the Banu Jadhimah incident, as regrettable as it was, as a mistake on the part of Khalid. In not punishing Khalid for the execution of Malik ibn Nuwayrah, and not dismissing him from his post as commander, Sayyiduna Abu Bakr t was thus completely justified.

Tell us Ansar.Org were the facts in both cases identical? This cannot be compared to the episode that we are analyzing. No such excuse could be offered in the Malik episode. No one from that group uttered a word from which it could be inferred that they were apostates. On the contrary they confirmed they were believers, and Abu Qatadah gave witness testimony that he witnessed them offering Salat. How could Khalid be absolved for killing in this instance?

### **36. Do the alleged 'military achievements' of Khalid bin Walid exempt him from Shari penalties?**

Ansar.Org stated:

It was for this reason that Rasulullah r did not hesitate to give Khalid command over other expeditions as well. Shortly after the Banu Jadhima incident Rasulullah entrusted him with the mission to destroy the temple of the pagan goddess 'Uzza at a place called Nakhlah.<sup>9</sup> In Jumada al-Ula in the year 10 AH he was sent on a da'wah mission to Banu Harith ibn Ka'b, and they accepted Islam at his hands without a drop of blood being shed.<sup>10</sup> It was also to Khalid that Rasulullah r entrusted the expedition to Ukaydir ibn 'Abd al-Malik.<sup>11</sup>

Above all there was the day, at the battle of Mu'tah in the year 8 AH, when Khalid ibn al-Walid 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 Rasulullah r all attained martyrdom in succession, and the

standard was taken over by the valiant Khalid, who through his sheer genius managed to save the honour of Islam by effecting a tactical withdrawal after what seemed like certain defeat. Rasulullah was informed by Allah of what had happened at Mu'tah, and although his eyes were filled with tears at the martyrdom of his beloved cousin Ja'far ibn Abi Talib, his adopted son Zayd ibn Harithah and the poet 'Abdullah ibn Rawahah y , he saw reason to give the Muslims in Madinah the glad tidings of Khalid's victory, saying,"then the standard was taken up by a Sword from amongst the Swords of Allah, and upon his hands did Allah grant victory."<sup>12</sup>

*There is a decorated American War General, loved by the army and public alike. He is a decorated soldier with many medals of valour. He dedicated his life to serving and protecting his country. Whilst on a tour of duty in Iraq, he receives reports from locals of an Iraqi village housing dozens of armed insurgents. At dawn the General co-ordinates a pre-emptive attack on the village before the alleged insurgents have time to fight back. The result is innocent unarmed men and women are slaughtered whilst sleeping in their beds. No weapons are located. A distraught woman that witnessed her husband being shot screams continually and slaps the General across the face. He responds by pushing her to the ground. One of his soldiers grabs her and takes her away and rapes her. The General hears the screams of the woman, but states that he is permitted to respond in this manner. Those serving in the army unit are horrified and report the matter to those above them in the chain of command. The episode attracts wide press attention and the whole world awaits the findings of an army investigation, with the Commander in Chief taking personal charge over it. He speaks to the accused General, who asserts that he had committed an error of judgment, Despite the insistence of other investigating officials that he be court marshaled, their concerns are staved off by the Commander in Chief who resolutely asserts that no action should be initiated against such a decorated war hero, who has achieved so much for the US Army. The report is published and concludes that whilst this was a tragedy and condemnable, the Generals intention was good it was a mere 'black spot' on what was other than that an unblemished record of a Son of the United States, he should not be stripped of his medals and should continue to fight Iraqi insurgents in the army.*

In light of this fictional scenario, we would ask our rational minded readers:

1. How would you feel about the decision?
2. Would you deem his past contributions as mitigating circumstances that counter his barbaric act?
3. Would you feel happy with describing the slaughter of innocent people as a mere 'black spot' on a previously unblemished career?
4. Do you think it acceptable that the General sanctioned the rape of distressed woman?
5. Would you accept the account of the General that he made a mere error in judgment?

We are sure that no rational mind would deem such a decision as correct, one that endorses rape and commits murder should be called a war criminal, no matter how great he has been in the past. Why then should a rapist and murderer be forgiven, protected and praised if we replace the word 'General' in this example with the word 'Sahabi'? Does this exempt him from the Islamic Shari'ah? Is he given the green light to do what he likes? As Shi'a we reject such an absurd notion, we judge a person on the basis of their actions in history. You can assess a person's character on the basis of his deeds. History hence acts as a litmus test that is why we see documentaries assessing the character of past leaders on the basis of their deeds. For the Ahle Sunnah history is not the litmus test. Their starting point is the blind belief that all the

Sahabah are just and truthful. When they open up history books they do so with this doctrine in mind, and as such when they see Sahabah committing heinous war crimes, such as those of Khalid bin Walid they are then forced to interpret it in a manner that upholds this belief. This means that even if a Sahabi commits a heinous crime it needs to be rationalized and explained in a manner that maintains their status as just and truthful! What better example can be than the conduct of Khalid bin Walid, he slaughters Muslims, 'marries' and fornicates with his grieving widow and yet all this is an honest mistake! This is nothing but the result of the belief coined by our opponents according to which 'each and every Sahabi is to be respected', even if he unjustly kills people for the purpose of booty and copulates with the wife of the deceased!

Alhamdulillah, we the Shi'a of Ahl'ubayt [as] through an analysis of history analyze every Sahabi on merit and then form their conclusion about him, rather than maintaining affiliation with a camp of murderers, rapists and drunkards and then revering them as 'Saints'! Perhaps,

Whilst we have proved that whatever Khalid bin Walid did, cannot be counted amongst the 'services' for Islam, if Nawasib remain adamant on counting the rape and murder of innocent people as 'services' rendered to Islam to prove Khalid being virtuous, we should point out that it was very difficult to find completely devoted and pious people during the lifetime of the Prophet (s), which is why his helpers comprised of a great number of transgressors, yet their help was taken in various Islamic tasks by Allah [swt] and His Prophet [s] with the view that they may become pious in the company of virtuous people. The Ahle Sunnah themselves believe that Allah [swt] can support His religion through Fajir men, as recorded in Sunnan al-Daremi, Volume 2 page 241 Tradition 2517:

أخبرنا الحكم بن نافع انا شعيب عن الزهري أخبرني سعيد بن المسيب ان أبا هريرة قال ان النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم قال إن الله يؤيد هذا الدين بالرجل الفاجر

**Abu Huraira narrated that the prophet (pbuh) said: 'Surly Allah supports this religion even through a dissolute [Fajir] man'**

*The margin writer of the book Hussain Salim Asad declared the tradition as 'Sahih' and so did the Imam of Salafies Nasiruddin Al-Albaani in his book 'Silsila Sahiha', Volume 4 page 393.*

In light of the Hadeeth one should realize the services to religion do not automatically evidence the greatness of a man. Why should they, after all if a vicious war criminal can be praised for his services by the Ahle Sunnah, then we all live in hope!

## 5. Chapter Five – The implications stemming from the incident of Malik bin Nuwayrah

Ansar.Org stated:

The incident of Malik ibn Nuwayrah is one of those cases which are frequently cited by Shi'i propagandists whose first step in the direction of convincing and converting the Ahl as-Sunnah almost invariably assumes the form of an attempt to prove how innately corrupt and evil the Sahabah were (na'udhu billah).

Corruption by definition refers to one that is marked by immorality and perversion and depravity. If Khalid's murder of Malik and his comrades, the fornication with his wife and maltreatment of his decapitated head, the act of legitimizing rape committed by his fellow does not prove he was corrupt, then Nawasib have a very different definition of word 'corrupt' to us. If despite such atrocious acts and the eye witness testimony of Abu Qatadah that Malik [ra] was

a believer, Abu Bakr sought to absolve Khalid putting the matter down to a mere mistake, then that is blatant evidence of corruption on his part.

The harsh reality is the deeds of Khalid bin Walid raise serious questions of the Sunni doctrine that all the Sahaba are just and truthful. We ask our readers to ponder over these questions:

1. How can the murder of innocent Muslims and the fornication with his dead wife prove that Khalid bin Walid is just and truthful?
2. Are the Sahabah duty bound to observe the Shariah?
3. Are they subject to the laws of Shariah if they commit criminal offences?
4. The killing of a mu'min is a clear violation of the Shari'a, and Allah [swt] sets out the punishment for such an individual:

**"And whoever kills a believer intentionally, his recompense shall be hell, he shall abide therein and God's wrath (Ghazibullaho) shall be on him and his curse (lanato), and is prepared for him a great torment" (Surah Nisa, v 93)**

Khalid bin Walid killed a Mumin so why is this verse not applicable to him?

5. Is the Khalifa not duty bound to implement Shariah?
6. Abu Bakr chose not to implement Shari'ah, what Qur'anic verse gives the Head of State such discretion?

Ansar.Org stated:

It is extremely unfortunate that the vicious and unscrupulous propaganda of the Shi'i 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 Malik ibn Nuwayrah hook, line and sinker, they now cannot bear to think of Khalid ibn al-Walid except in the vilest of terms. They find themselves unable to associate his name except with the concocted legend of the wife of Malik ibn Nuwayrah.

We appeal to justice! Khalid bin Walid unjustly killed Muslims, yet instead of condemning his act, the Nawasib are busy offering excuses for him. Face facts, the wrath of Allah [swt] is one that kills a believer, yet Khalid killed numerous innocent Muslims and is a respected 'son of Islam' whose war crime should be put down to a mere mistake.

We have proven in this article that Khalid bin Walid did indeed murder Malik and 'married' his wife. This fact was attested by the Ulema of Ahle Sunnah, even their revered Imam Ibn Kathir. Moreover his other war crimes against those that opposed Abu Bakr and killing of women has also been placed before our readers. If despite this you are still prepared to refer to a murdering fornicator as a 'great son of Islam' then we clearly have a very different understand of Islam, but then again this is not surprising since our opponents deem those that shed the blood of innocent Muslim men, women and children, as 'great sons of Islam' and why shouldn't they? They have great role models such as Khalid ibn al Walid to look up to. Any objective rational person that assesses these crimes would indeed assess Khalid in the vilest of terms. No logical person would wish to associate themselves with a war criminal. We would also ask these Nawasib to stop using double standards. The Muslim world was outraged by efforts in 2003 by the Catholic Church to canonize the notorious Queen Isabelle. This is how that matter was reported in a British Newspaper at the time:

**Spain's Roman Catholic bishops are to petition the Pope to canonise Queen Isabella**



## 6. Copyright

All rights, including copyright, in the content of these Answering-Ansar.org web pages are owned or controlled for these purposes by the Answering-Ansar.org team.

You can distribute the download version of "Adobe® PDF" documents of the Answering-Ansar.org articles, as long as the documents remain in their original state and none of the contents are modified in any format.

The Answering-Ansar.org reserves the right over the contents of the articles if they are used in the original format. You can freely distribute the Islamic references and quotes that we use in our articles in any format.

When using our articles in your websites or if in distribution in print format, please include the source as Answering-Ansar.org.

Our web site contains links to third party sites. These links are used for the convenience of our users; however, they are not under the control of Answering-Ansar.org. We are not responsible for their contents, nor should they be considered endorsements of the individual linked sites.

However, it is possible that the site could contain typographical errors. If such a condition is brought to our attention, a reasonable effort will be made to fix or remove it.

If you wish to reproduce, print and distribute our articles in book format, then you will need a written permission of Answering-Ansar.org. If you wish to do so, then please contact us for further details.