

Abdul Wahhab and First Saudi state:

Firstly, we must mention that within Islam there is no clergy.

In the Jewish religion the rabbis say Moshe passed the Torah down to the elders, the elders passed the Torah down to the prophets, all the way down to the Talmud. The Jewish understanding of history is that there were no changes to Judaism. In other words what the rabbis are saying today is merely minor refinements of what the rabbis had said during the time of the Elders- the time of the Mishna and the Talmud.

Ofcourse the major problem with this history is that it is completely baseless and secondly it has historical problems which persist to this day where the religion of Judaism has been frozen in time for over 1800 years. Generally speaking Rabbinical Judaism as it appears in the Talmud, unlike what is generally taught in secular schools, the source of Judaism is not the Old Testament, instead the source is the Talmud and it is the authors of the Talmud who decided on which books would enter into the Biblical Canon.

For example, while the Catholic church included the Books of the Maccabees in its version of the canon. Judaism did not preserve them and only the Greek versions survived, (whether there was ever a Hebrew or Aramaic version is an interesting question for another time) the point being that only Christianity preserved them in the same way Christianity preserved the Book of Judith, The Book of Tobias and many other books, mostly dealing with the Jews of the Diaspora. The Judaism which preceded rabbinical Judaism was pretty much expunged from history.

We know fragments of history on the Sadducees and the Pharisees (rabbinical Jews) but we know next to nothing on the Essenes and the reason is because their enemies, the rabbinical Jews, were victorious. The Pharisees established more than ten religious holidays to celebrate their victories over the Sadducees, erasing them from history in the process

The Christians then inherited a form of religious authority based upon Peter the rock, of course the Jerusalem Church started out with James who was later killed and perhaps the reason for the insurrection against the Romans, which ended up with the destruction of the temple/church in Jerusalem & the rise of Pauline Christianity.

The matters of marriage and death do not require a specific religious authority to conduct the affairs within Islam in contradistinction to the Jewish and Christian faiths. The clergy in those religions are endowed with authority to conduct marriage births and deaths. An example would be the wedding scenes in any movie where the priest says words to the effect: "By the power invested in me from God I now pronounce you Man and Wife. This initiation by an ordained minister or man of the cloth has no Islamic equivalent.

In Islamic marriage there is a guardian for the woman, and when a woman is of age and sound mind, she can marry herself off with the conditions of offer from her suitor and acceptance on her part. The matter of writing the contract is good but not necessary and even witnesses are disputed upon in terms of necessity amongst the schools of thought.

Similarly, in death there is no requirement to go to a church and have specific materials used to enshroud the deceased, indeed the family of the deceased can wash, bury and lead the prayers. The leader of the prayer itself which is integral to the din and specifically on the day of Jumu'ah (Friday) the only requirement is that the people agree to a leader and that agreement is contingent on who is the most learned in the Quran and if they all know the same there are other conditions as per the hadith on the issue.

The point here is that the leader of prayers itself is chosen on his knowledge of the Quran and not any type of sanctity bestowed by a pope or a Sanhedrin.

So, in Islam there is no sanctified person who conducts marriage nor prayers nor death. So there is no

religious establishment in Islam.

As for what occurred in History, the Ottoman State established what was known as Shaykh al-Islam who had the special privilege of being relied upon for legal opinions or Fatawa. This was a major problem and was taken from the Byzantine Christians or the Catholic Church.

As for the Jurist who was influential in the lives of people, the jurist was a thinker alongside many other thinkers but the key distinction to be made is that the jurist was not appointed or ordained from any one place. The very purpose of a church was to send out priests who were ordained to carry out matters which others could not. As for Judges, they are an organ of the state; so if the state is an 'Islamic' one then the judges will be Islamic. If the state is Buddhist; then the judges will be Buddhist. If the state is communist then the judges will be based on material dialectics and if the state is secular then the judges will be secular. So, judges are an organ of the state.

So those states in history which claimed to be Islamic would, by necessity, appointed judges who would reflect the states outlook similar to how in the UK only qualified practitioners of the law can be seen to become judges.

In reality what exists is an Islamic state which is a human endeavour or a human state built upon Islamic creed and Islamic rulings, in the same way the British state is built upon common law and precedent law.

After the Ottomans established their state you found across the Islamic world, whose leaders were tyrants or military leaders, not a single one amongst them being a shari' caliph, not even the latter days of the Othmani Khilafah were free from this appellation however we will use a broad description of Islamic, ie. those who identify as such.

Ibn Hazm said about Hisham Ibn Malik that he would ride his donkey in the markets without a guard and he was a tyrant amongst tyrants. This tyranny or tyrant entails being above the law. His will is the law. From the time of Muawiya until today we have been inundated with tyrants.

The religious establishment then, was developed naturally through borrowing the format from Judaism and Christianity as per the Prophetic hadith: You will follow the patterns of those who came before.

As for governance and states, the leaders were tyrants being above the law and the matters of governance was not in mutual consultation. It was these tyrants who saw the utility in having a religious establishment maintaining control over the masses, as the most important thing in the mind of the masses was the religion. In Britain the most important thing in the mind of the masses is the secular outlook of the country and her individual liberty and so the state reflects the wishes of the masses. In a situation where homosexuality is rife and accepted in society the state calls it same-sex and introduces legislation to the effect of allowing same-sex marriage under the aegis of sexual freedom.

So, you find across the board both pre and post colonialism, a religious establishment which benefitted the ruling class.

Muhammad ibn Abdul Wahab became convinced of Ibn Taymiyyas thoughts and built upon it in terms of extremism, originally from Al-Huraym, he was rejected by his people, even his own father and his brother rejected him and they were against him until the end of their days. Ibn Abdul Wahhab then moved to Al-Uyana which is north of Diriyah, in the heart of Najd, in the vicinity of Riyadh today. In Diriyah Ibn Muammar was the leader and Ibn Abdul Wahhab struck a close friendship with the man and was supported by him being convinced by Ibn Abdul Wahhab during these years.

Ibn Abdul Wahhab then went above and beyond his station by carrying out a punishment for a woman who was accused of committing adultery. This woman was stoned to death (whether stoning is abrogated with the verse in Surah al-Nisa is another issue for another day) this displeased the emir of Bani Khalid Ibn Er'er' who wrote a letter to Ibn Muammar warning him that he went beyond his place. The Salafi propaganda machine paints this incident as the Emir Er'er' as being against the establishment of the punishment. The issue is carrying out a punishment without the authority or permission of the legitimate Sultan in the

region which was Er'Er. In this we can intuit that al-Uyana was under the suzerainty of Er'er (contrary to the claims of some salafis that Najd was under the authority of the Sherif of Makkah at that time) and Er'er was under the suzerainty of the Ottomans. The central issue was then, how does one carry out the punishment without the authority of the legitimate Sultan?

It is the Sultan who dispenses justice and applies the punishments and not the people. It is an executive decision to be made by the executive, that is the Sultan.

At this point Ibn Abdul Wahab was instructed to leave Al Uyana by the Amir Ibn Muammar as he could not possibly face the Emir of Er'er and as such Ibn Abdul Wahab then left for Diriyya which was south of al-Uyana. In Diriyya, Ibn Abdul Wahhab had already established contacts through his ideology with the wife of Muhammad Ibn Saud ibn Miqrin ibn Murkhan (Mordecai), the origins of the family are disputed, with some saying they originate from Basra (and others from the Donmeh in Turkey). In actuality this doesn't have value in the hereafter as then it is only a matter of what you yourself thought and did.

The wife of Muhammad Ibn Saud, the emir of Diriyya (small village population approx 1,000) was agreeable to Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab, perhaps having come across his ideas while the latter was still resident in al-Uyana (see Tarikh Najd by Ibn Ghannem student of Ibn Abdul Wahhab), she convinced her husband to take Ibn Abdul Wahhab in and to build him up and support him. Muhammad Ibn Saud was himself convinced, whether it was ideologically or practicality, that he saw a golden opportunity for expansion. In any case the emir of Diriyya met with Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab and agreed with him on the following conditions:

- 1) Muhammad Ibn Saud would have exclusive claim to this dawah remaining with the family
 - 2) Muhammad Ibn Saud would have exclusive claim to power and political authority, and religious authority would remain with the family of Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab & this was the beginning of the religious establishment (qahanoot) (there shouldn't be this dualistic split, there is either a state or there isn't).
 - 3) Muhammad Ibn Saud insisted that he needed to levy taxes and fines on the people of Diriyya while the Hanbali madhab viewed these taxes and fines to be Mukoos which were haraam. The response by Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab was to dispense an excuse of 'necessity' and went along with it.
- Another dangerous point

The agreement was thus concluded, and the people were informed of the matter. The bay'ah or pledge of allegiance was then taken and for around ten years this group remained confined to Diriyya. Then the agitation began in the reign of Abdel Aziz ibn Muhammad ibn Saud who began military expeditions with Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab who would organise the armies. Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab acted in the capacity akin to a president and this state of affairs and continued in this role until Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab removed himself "to focus on worship". In reality, according to Abdel Aziz Ibn Abdullah Ibn Hassan aal al Shaykh, Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab was side-lined by Abdel Aziz Ibn Muhammad Ibn Saud signalling the first fault line between the church and state.

This was a historical necessity because it is impossible to have in the inception of a state two equal partners, either the church, or the state wins the day. The political leader was given the pledge in front of the people with Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab being the first to pledge allegiance, the only way out would be for a coup of sorts to occur if Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab called the state and its leader to be a kafir which practically was not possible.

The expansionist project continued, with the marital focus being directed at Riyadh who's leader was Dhaham Ibn Dawas. This continued for some thirty years. In these years according to Ibn Ghanem the raison d'être for war was Shirk. After some years according to Ibn Ghanem the leader of Riyadh appeared to be Muslim, then in a turn of events that no-one at the time could explain the man Dhaham ibn Dawas, perhaps imagining that resistance was futile left Riyadh with his family to the north in the days of Saud Ibn Abdel Aziz.

With the taking of Riyadh (the capital of Najd/Yamamah, originally known as Riyadh al-Aarid) into the estate of Aal-Saud becoming the capital, the situation on the ground had changed. From only controlling

villages which only had population of up to 1,000 the burgeoning state had secured a city with a population of anywhere between 20,000 to 40,000. It is at this point that the second phase of expansionism began.

Saud Ibn Abdel Aziz Ibn Muhammad Ibn Saud began thinking seriously about how to subdue the surrounding areas through military battles. Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab was still alive at this point and acceding to the decisions being made, signing off as the most senior religious figure of the clergy.

The unrestricted rulership entailed that Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab was not the second in command as the leader Saud Ibn Abdel Aziz was number one and everyone else was zero in political terms. Completely distinct from modern polities, wherein the executive may be in conflict with itself that is the president with an underling as was the case between Trump and Tillerson.

Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab agreed to this state of affairs as there was no alternative and he himself was concerned with spreading his school of thought. All of what occurred in terms of battles and slaughter was with acquiescence of Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab and his explicit permission and agreement. (This point addresses the Salafi propaganda which tries to depict Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab as a saint reluctant to do takfir i.e. excommunication).

Saud Ibn Abdel Aziz Ibn Muhammad expanded into the north (of Riyadh) reaching the borders of Hejaz in the north and his son Abdullah fought in the Hejaz and slaughtered and massacred pilgrims who had made their way to Makkah, this being the final straw which caused the Ottomans to send out troops to subdue the upstarts.

The Ottomans had reached their zenith which was around 1600-1650 A.D after which the Ottomans began their terminal decline, being known as the Sick man of Europe at which point the Ottomans were a shell of their former glory.

Now there are documents proving that Saud Ibn Abdul Aziz Ibn Mohammed Ibn Saud Ibn Muqrin Ibn Morkhan, was in contact with the British, and the British communicated with him and complained to him around 1780-90, that was when the Saudis were communicating with the British, and the latter complained to him about the Qawasim— these Qawasim were Wahhabi jihadis – who were attacking the British vessels at sea. So, Saud Ibn Abdul Aziz stopped them— Saud the First, or Saud the Elder, as he's called.

He stopped them from engaging in these activities and even arrested one of the Qawasim, detaining him at his place in Riyadh. So, from early on they had established contacts with the British.

Some say that they held the British back from the Islamic world. This is simply not true. In fact, they were collaborating with the British since the first state, and this fact was not previously known until the emergence of documents recently showing that. We will get to the relationship with the British later, and the relationship with the Qawasim, who were eliminated in 1820, or around 1817. But, if you will, let's go back— there are important moments. Mohammed Ibn Abdul Wahhab pledged allegiance to Mohammed Ibn Saud, in 1160 Hijri, 1740-50. This is found in Ibn Ghannam's chronicles. It was confined to Al-Dir'iyyah for decades, but as a state and an entity, there was a pledge of allegiance to an individual, an Imam leading a missionary movement.

Now there may be a question, which is: what was the significance of Wahhabism at that point in time, and was it really the one that gave support to the Saudi state and was its lifeblood? Is it right to say that Mohammed Ibn Abdul Wahhab was the one that established the first Saudi state? The answer would be: most definitely! The Al-Sauds were of little significance. They were a small family of no significant status.

Many question their lineage, but we won't delve into that because this is not very important. But, it was not among the major tribes— it was in the middle of Najd, and in the middle of Najd, there are fearsome tribes and there are tribal Sheiks that would shake the earth— like the Dawasir, Qahtan, Sibay', 'Utaybah, even Mutayr reach down to — of course, Mutayr are in Qaseem in the north. Whereas the tribe that the Al-Sauds claim to come from, which is the tribe of 'Anizah, which is an umbrella name that encompasses all the tribes of Rabi'ah of the earlier times, so that even tribes like Wa'il, Taghlib, etc are included within it.

And incidentally, some of the Taghlibites have merged with the Dawasir. This tribe's greatest sphere of power and influence is in the north of Najd and in the Levant. It didn't have any influence in the middle of Najd. So, that man had no tribal credentials that would make him eligible to be more than the emir of a small village due to his wealth and the fact that people gathered around him. Nothing more or less than that. So, the inception of a state in this manner, was based on a pledge and an ideological mission. Its main ideologue and the main executive was Mohammed Ibn Abdul Wahhab. There is no doubt Muhammed Ibn Saud was in fact a mere stooge.

Aal-Saud were nothing compared to their northern neighbours Ibn Muammar & Dahwan ibn Dawas emir of Riyadh. Nearly all the other villages in Nejd were larger and stronger than Dir'iyya.

The connection between the Wahhabis & the First Saudi State with the British is embarrassing from the point of view of the Salafi Wahhabis. Those who are directed by the Quran would not accommodate the British in the lands of the Muslims nor would they acquiesce to the British suzerainty of the seas in the region. It is dishonourable. Saud Ibn Abdel Aziz was a dishonourable man for working with the British from their point of view.

In the book "Saudiyya & the Islamic solution" Abdel Aziz was exposed for his many shortcomings and these revelations continued with the Saud al-Sabaani. This is opposite to what Saudis are taught however time has revealed all, including the connection between the Saudis and the British in the First Saudi State. Al Mahanna has released information that when the Qawassem were fighting the British in the sea and insisted on fighting the British at sea, earning the appellation of pirates in the process.

Saud Ibn Abdul Aziz captured some of the Qawassem for the benefit of the British, indeed there are unconfirmed reports that there exists a letter penned by Saud Ibn Abdel Aziz to the French when the latter took control of Egypt. A case of hedging one's bets. The result ultimately was the cessation of hostilities from the Qawassem against the British and a free reign for the British in the Arabian peninsula and her seas.

Practically the First Saudi state was in conjunction with the British and was instrumental in reigning in the Qawassem from attacking the British on the pretext that the Qawassem were highway robbers and the Saudis held a measure of clout in the region. Of course the Arabian Sea was vital as it is today for the waterway to the Indian subcontinent. The British's main concern was to keep these waterways to India (the jewel in the crown of the British) open and free from piracy, they used the Saudis to achieve that end.

The Ottomans, during this period, were busy with internal dissension and intrigue. Once Saud had passed and Abdullah entered the fray the Hejaz was the target. It was during this time that the slaughter of the pilgrims in Makkah occurred around the year 1810-1812*. This incident reverberated across the Islamic world, it also provides an explanation as to why the Ottomans wrote to their governor of the region in Arabia, Muhammad Ali Pasha, to fight the Saudis.

Muhammad Ali Pasha, concerned with his position and authority, was reluctant at first sending his son, not even his eldest. A negligible outcome resulted in pressure from the Ottomans and the British. Here it must be stated that the British pressure on the regions' governor Muhammad Ali Pasha was not because the British were anti Saudi but because of the Muslim contingent in India who were numerous and powerful.

The British had control over vast swathes of India indirectly through the East India company, which resulted in the wealth of India being extracted back to the mother land of Britain. An Indian Muslim group of pilgrims were massacred by the Saudis. The nominal Sultan from the family of Akbar of the Mughals (still present until the 1896 revolution) became the focus of the furore.

The British, then fearful of their prized possession, sought to remediate the massacre by applying pressure on Muhammad Ali Pasha, causing him to send his son Ibrahim, his eldest son.

As a result he was able to subdue and capture Abdullah (the fourth Imam) sending him to Istanbul where Abdullah faced the charges of killing Muslim pilgrims on the basis that these pilgrims were Mushriks and Kuffar.

Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab built his particular understanding of Tawhid (the three categorisations; Uloohiya, Rububiya, Asmaa' wa Sifaat) from Ibn Taymiyya's.

Before Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab, the contravention of this tawhid might have resulted in a smack with a wooden stick but in the time of Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab that stick became a sword. The people of Najd in the time of Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab were considered to be mushrikeen (polytheists) who worshipped trees, stones and graves. That is the inhabitants were guilty in his view of Shirk Akbar (Greater Idolatry). This is ascertained from reading Ibn Ghanem (the most important primary source for the history of the first Saudi state) who states (in the first edition by Halabi published in 1949:

"In this year (the year is not mentioned) Sulayman ibn Khoth was killed because he fled into Huraym and that village is a place of war (that is in a state of war against the dawah) so he wrote to Sulayman Ibn Abdul Wahhab (the brother of Muhammad who was against Muhammad) Of al-Uyana wherein..."

To recap then, there is no religious establishment within Islam (qahanut) nor religious state, in fact it is a human, civil state. Judges are an organ of the state. The Prophetic hadith which indicates that the Muslims would follow the pattern of those who came before was actualized. In so far as the perceived Imperial, divine right to rule was taken from the Sassanids and the Byzantines and the religious establishments was also copied from those empires from the Umayyad times until the Ottomans.

Islamic thought is characterised by its view that the Prophet PBUH transmitted and delivered the message of Islam, then the companions spread Islam to the surrounding areas, transforming Kufa and Basra from desert backwaters into functioning metropolitan cities wherein the intellectual traditions flourished; engineering, astronomy, medicine, philosophy and mathematics until it reached its peak around the 5/6th century Hijri 10/11th century AD.

The main reason for decline, succinctly had to do with abandoning of the Quran and an over reliance on the narrations be they sahih or da'eef. This is because the Quran should be the leader and guide and if it is abandoned then some degree of decline will occur.

As with all civilizations that decline, there are a few centuries before the eventual decline in which authorship (sharh or explanatory texts as opposed to original works) and **consolidation** is prevalent. This was the era of Ibn Qudama, Ibn Taymiyya, Ibn Kathir. In the era of Ibn Hajar around 9th century Hijri the decline began with as-Suyuti complaining that he knew tens of different branches of knowledge which were not requested by anyone. The Ottomans had expanded into Europe and itself began to weaken, abandoning any issues with which it was at one point concerned. The most important issue was the banning of print by the Ottomans which signalled the terminal decline and loss of scholarship across the Islamic world. This in turn led to scholarship being limited to one or two individuals in a wide geographic area such as India or Hejaz and a widespread illiteracy amongst the mass of Muslims.

It was at this historical point that Ibn Abdul Wahhab appeared in the world. Ibn Ghanem states: (fourth edition edited by Nasr Din Asad) Ibn Abdul Wahhab was born 1115 Hijri that is 1703 AD & died 1206 1792 AD. His father had moved from al-Uyana to Huraym as a Judge until his death 1153 Hijri 1740 AD, after which Ibn Abdul Wahhab moved back to al-Uyana and cozied up to the leader Ibn Muammar whose name was Uthman Ibn Hamd Ibn Muammar and married Jawhara bint Ibn Muammar. Then a break of relations occurred in the year 1157 Hijri 1158 Hijri when Ibn Abdul Wahhab established a punishment without consulting the ruler which resulted in Ibn Muammar expelling Ibn Abdul Wahhab as the emir above Ibn Muammar, who considered the act of establishing a punishment without the approval of the Sultan to be an act of rebellion.

This also establishes a point about how al-Ahsa controlled al-Uyana, that is the latter was dependent on the former, the act of Ibn Abdul Wahhab jeopardised the stipend that al Uyana received from al-Ahsa, who in turn would receive funding from the Ottomans. Muhammad Ibn Saud went to Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab at his home in the year 1745. It was this year that signalled the establishment of the First Saudi State. On two conditions:

- 1) Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab would not leave Muhammad Ibn Saud until death
- 2) Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab would sign off the **mukooos** that Muhammad Ibn Said was charging his

inhabitants

Huraym, the place where Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab's father was a judge and died, was the first place that was subject to the war by the First Saudi State. It was described as the land of war in the year 1172 Hijri 1759 AD. This means that from the establishment of the state for about 15 years the Wahhabis were in and around the area of Dir'iyya skirmishing with the area up to Riyadh (which occurred for over thirty years).

The brother of Ibn Abdul Wahhab, Suleyman, was the judge in Huraym who stayed in conflict with Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab for his entire life. Another interesting point is the attack by Urayra Ibn Jayd the leader of Kharid and Ahsa on Najd in the year 1172 Hijri 1759 A.D, the fighting was around South Riyadh to be more precise.

In the year 1179 Hijri 1765 A.D Muhammad Ibn Saud died. This was approximately thirty years before the death of Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab. Abdel Aziz Ibn Muhammad Ibn Saud then became the leader with Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab pledging allegiance along with the people behind him in Dir'iyya. According to Ibn Ghanem the 'fath' of Riyadh occurred in the year 1187 Hijri corresponding to 1773 A.D. The time from the establishment of the First Saudi State to the taking of Riyadh was around thirty years.

This was the end of the war, according to Ibn Ghannem, the war was between the Muslims (the camp of Ibn Abdul Wahhab) & the people of Riyadh. The insinuation is of course that the people of Riyadh were not Muslims. After this, in 1802, Abdul Aziz ibn Muhammad Ibn Saud led a force towards Karbala where he took possession of the golden dome decorating the tomb of Hussein Ibn Ali, who was murdered by Yazeed's forces, at Karbala and killed over 3,000 people, stealing enormous wealth and returning back to Nejd. Abdel Aziz ibn Muhammad ibn Saud was then killed in 1218 Hijri 1803 A.D.

Saud Ibn Abdul Aziz then took over after the death of his father, having been trained as a military leader during the latter days of his father. This training paid dividends for the family, as it was under Saud's rule, that the First Saudi State extended to its furthest reaches. Saud ruled from 1803 until 1814 AD 1229 Hijri. After this Abdullah ibn Saud became the leader and he committed atrocities against the pilgrims in Makkah and generally in the Hejaz region, preventing the Egyptians pilgrims from performing their Hajj. This in turn caused the Ottomans to pressure Muhammad Ali Pasha to send his younger son first who only managed to repel the Wahabbis back into Najd, then Ibrahim Pasha was sent by Muhammad Ali who reached Dir'iyya, and besieged the place. This occurred in the year 1233 Hijri or 1818 A.D Ibrahim Pasha went on to capture Abdullah and transported him back to Topkapi palace. This occurred in the year 1233 Hijri or 1818 A.D

Ideologically, Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab took some ideas from Ibn Taymiyya (though he was not, despite our differences with Ibn Taymiyya a philosopher like Ibn Taymiyya, learning the six books of hadith and studying the philosophy of Basrans and the philosophy of the Baghdadis).

Not being able to comprehend the ideas of Ibn Taymiyya, Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab was unable to develop and build upon the ideas he read. Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab took the extreme ideas which were academic to a certain extent (evidenced by Ibn Taymiyya offering protection to a man who, on paper was problematic, and who viewed Ibn Taymiyya as problematic when the state was looking for him). Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab took the ideas pertaining to that which occurred in practice amongst the Muslims such as, seeking blessings from the righteous, and graves were used as *raison d'être* for the movement. In the view of Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab these issues were tantamount to shirk Akbar, this contradicts with the opinion of Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn Qayyim who did not view these acts as shirk which would take a human outside of Islam. In any case the original sources of the Quran is preserved and available to review.

In short Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab viewed 'god' to be that which was worshipped and worship as these specific acts mentioned as well as bowing down. This is wrong because bowing down is a physical act which can be done to fix one's posture, in that it wouldn't be an act of worship. The important point is what is the purpose of a physical act and what is the presumption on which that physical act is done, i.e. what does the person think he is doing it for. These questions eluded Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab and so the

mere act was enough to condemn a human. This is the trait that Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab shared with the Khawaarij who considered any act of disobedience to be tantamount to Kufr. For example the mere act of zina' would be enough to take someone outside of the fold of Islam according to the Khawaarij. However the reality is that denying a forbidden act is forbidden is what takes one outside of the fold of Islam and into Kufr and not the merely the act itself as evidenced by Adam AS committing a wrong act and not being a Kafir as opposed to Iblis who hated and refused the command of Allah thus turning him into a Kafir.

Practically as per Ibn Ghanem and Durur as-Saniyya Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab considered everyone around him that was outside his group to be non Muslims from the 6th century Hijri (which is ironic because Ibn Taymiyya lived in the 7th or 8th century Hijri). In the view of Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab his mission was to return the Islamic world to Islam. He charged the Muslims around him as worshipping the awliya and trees and graves. The appeal of such ideas was the simplicity, it was very easy to comprehend and as such became popularised amongst those who hadn't studied jurisprudence.

INSERT QUOTE FROM IBN GHANEM ON HURAYM/AHSA/QATIF/RIYADH

Practically even those who came to discuss with Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab and had a differing point of view would still be killed. This is contrary to the Islamic way and the Prophetic example, only those who fight against the Muslims are to be fought in a situation of war. If these people laid down their arms then hostilities would cease. After the success at Makkah the Prophet PBUH did not force anyone into Islam, those who wanted to join did and others who decided not to were left alone. Fundamentally there is no forcing someone to enter Islam.

Thus concluded the First Saudi State. Turki Ibn Abdullah Ibn Muhammad Ibn Saud managed to evade capture by the Egyptian/Turkish forces who had captured his father and after keeping a low profile for a while, he went on to establish the Second Saudi State by extending the nascent state eastwards (eastern province). Turki initially worked with Ibn Muammar (before turning on him) & even the Ottomans given what had happened to his father.

Ultimately Turki fell victim to intrigue on the part of his uncle's son but most importantly for us the role of the religious establishment remained the same (despite some children from Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab studying at Azhar and shocking the Najdi's with their particular dress). Faisal Ibn Turki who was deputised to fight at al-Hasa by his father, Turki rushed back to Riyadh after the demise of his father at the hands of assassins, Faisal was initially imprisoned in Egypt being part of the family of Abdullah Ibn Saud who was sent to there after the besieging and capture of Dir'iyya by the Ottoman/Egyptian forces. Turki was pardoned before making his way back into Najd and fighting for his father Turki before Turki was assassinated.

Turki had a marriage of convenience with the Ottomans and there was a measure of stability in the region of Najd (bar the internal intrigue) with the religious establishment reigning over the everyday affairs of the people. There was not the war fervour that characterised the first Saudi State. There was internal intrigue between the children of Faisal Ibn Turki (Abdullah & Muhammad & Saud with the former two being allied with the state of Rashid and by extension the Ottomans & Saud being aligned with the British, ultimately winning the day and managing to have the religious establishment excommunicate his brothers for their treachery with the 'Romans' i.e Turkish Ottomans whilst hiding his own connections with the British).

The Second Saudi State ceased with internal dissension and intrigue between the ruling factions of the Al Saud themselves, specifically the dispute between the three brothers Abdullah, Muhammad and Saud, the former two allying themselves with al-Rashid resulting in al-Rashid controlling the whole region of Najd. This skulduggery on the part of the ruling faction within the Al-Saud was the cause of the downfall of the Second Saudi State.

The religious establishment sided with the victors and wrote rulings excommunicating the Muhammad and Abdullah al Said as collaborators with the 'Romans' Ottomans.

The First Saudi State (1744-1818) was directed by Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab, even when Abdel Aziz

Ibn Saud marginalised him. In Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab's latter years (under the pretext of busying himself with worship) Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab was still relied upon for opinions and decisions as a point of reference. But for Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab, the zeal of the bedouins would have had no direct outlet, and so fundamentally it was considered that Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab was the driving force for the First Saudi State.

Abdulaziz ibn Abdul Rahman ibn Faisal ibn Turki ibn Abdullah ibn Muhammad Al Saud founder of the third Saudi State (est.1902) retook Riyadh from the Rashidis (mortal enemies of Al Saud & Ottoman allies) with the help of the British. He remained in the Najd region for around 15 to 20 years in and around Riyadh. He then relied heavily on the religious establishment/clergy, marrying a daughter from the family of Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab (Aal-Shaykh), with Faisal Ibn Abdul Aziz's mother being from the Aal Shaykh. Ofcourse marrying for political reasons and cementing allegiances has a long tradition in the region and beyond. Once Abdel Aziz did this he had a stroke of genius by inverting the long held traditions amongst the Wahhabis of basking in the glory of Arab/Bedouin culture (as understood by them) questioning the religiousness of such a lifestyle and making the backbone of the society move into colonies (or perhaps proto-Kitbbutz) as opposed to the nomadic lifestyle they had known.

This was a stroke of genius because it fundamentally changed the sociological condition by concentrating the religious zeal of scattered bedouins into a force that could be called upon at short notice. This force was known as the Ikhwan. This concentrated power was then used by Abdel Aziz for his political plans working hand in glove with the British to scupper the Ottoman hold in the region. The religious establishment including figures such as Hamid Ibn Atik' (who was in receipt of a handsome pay packet) signed off on the historic move by Abdel Aziz. The religious establishment facilitated training and positioned members of the establishment in perpetuity so that even the most untalented children could be educated and make something of themselves.

The third Saudi State was established by Abdel Aziz in 1902 and was a thoroughly British affair. Abdel Aziz had fled with his father from Riyadh when just a child after Ibn Rashid had conquered Riyadh. They fled to Qatar first, then moved to Kuwait, a British protectorate par excellence, ruled by the al-Sabah family, a British protectorate to stave off the Ottomans. Mubarak AlSabah was an open sinner, to the extent that he would openly flout the strictures of Ramadan and his relations with the Ottoman Muslims were very dire. In any case Mubarak al-Sabah decided to lay his eggs with the British Empire and signed (the secret) Anglo-Kuwaiti treaty in 1899 which was bolstered in 1901-2.

The Ottomans at this time were in steady decline with the Caliph a mere figurehead. The real power lay with the non-Muslim Grand vizier (Mehmet Talaat Pasha) and his underlings: Ismail Enver Pasha (1881–1922), the Minister of War; and Ahmed Djemal Pasha (1872–1922). This was indicated by the overthrow of the Caliphate (de-facto 1913 de jure 1922) by the Young Turks and the Committee of Union and Progress. The Ottomans committed many atrocities in its final stages against the Armenians, Greeks and Arabs. The Ottoman state was **chauvinistic** and though it kept a veneer of religiosity about it, in reality, they were **chauvinistic** attempts to force Turkish as a language on its inhabitants, this was perhaps a reason as to why the Sherif of

Makkah felt oppressed and was receptive to the British promises (made by Captain William Shakespear) of Arab independence on the condition that the Sherif ally with the British against the Ottomans. Indeed the Sherif of Makkah was in receipt of fiscal support from the British and was in contact with Lawrence of Arabia as depicted famously in the well known film of that name.

The Hejaz and the Sherif were categorised (by the British in their division of the world) as belonging to the East of the Suez, though historically, the ruling power of Egypt or Cairo would control the Hejaz, Greater Syria and everything else West of the Suez including Africa and the Americas. East of the Suez fell under the Indian office and these offices operated with a measure of autonomy which bred healthy competition.

The Indian office supported Abdel Aziz while the Cairo office supported the Sherif of Makkah, it is the Cairo office which is more renowned due to Lawrence of Arabia being stationed there as well as its instrumental role in the Arab revolt in the midst of the First World War.

Abdel Aziz returned to Riyadh in the year 1900-1901 which was a failure (and as such not taught in the Saudi textbooks) and included in his army was British as well as Kuwaitis (including Shia which to the Wahhabis were a red line (hamran and rawafid)). Mubarak al-Sabah who was like a father to Abdel Aziz had reproached the young Abdel Aziz for having in his troops British and Kuwaiti Shia, advising him to instead go with a retinue of slaves and allies and find a way.

Abdel Aziz followed this advice and with his small retinue of about fifty men returned to Riyadh and snuck over the walls killing anyone who was in his way. Ibn Ajlan, who was the designated leader of Al-Rashid's who controlled Riyadh up until that point, was killed for his troubles through means of subterfuge. Abdel Aziz declared himself the new ruler and was not challenged. We are talking about simple people for the most part, when the first car appeared in Riyadh a man insisted that there was a genie in the car, anything that moves must be animate, they aren't deep thinkers but very simple people.

In reality Al-Saud had rebelled against the ruler of his time, the Al-Rashid's were in control of Riyadh and they were governors for the Ottomans. The religious establishment of the Wahhabis adjusted to this turn of events and rallied behind the ruler in a pragmatic way. Abdel Aziz then went on to consolidate his control in the region but made sure not to pass the red line of Ha'il and Qassim. The Ottomans, weakened by internal troubles, took a pragmatic approach and appointed Abdel Aziz as the Pasha of the region that Abdel Aziz had managed to get a hold of.

Abdel Aziz consolidated his hold on Riyadh and the area around it with the south of Najd also coming under his control while the north of Najd was still in the hands of the al-Rashids. Abdel Aziz was named Pasha of Najd by the Ottomans and so was officially subordinate to the Ottomans, legally and constitutionally. At the same time Abdel Aziz was being financed by the British secretly.

The stroke of genius mentioned earlier, whereby Abdel Aziz instituted a new agrarian policy centered on moving the nomadic bedouins into colonies (proto-kibbutz), was widened. The religious angle to this policy was the idea (in Hanbali fiqh) that one had to be 'settled' as a precondition for offering the Jumu'ah prayers. This was used to manipulate the bedouins into settling into the new colonies as they were made to feel that, religiously they were lacking. The move was a very important one sociologically speaking. All the supporters of al-Saud who were scattered across the desert were now concentrated and available on call. They were settled in forts, in this manner, many goals were achieved by this stroke of genius on the part of Abdel Aziz including:

- 1) He rid himself of the menace that the bedouin forces posed to his power
- 2) He equipped those who were previously bedouins with an ideology that was in his service
- 3) He turned these bedouins into an army concentrated and not scattered
- 4) He snuffed out any independent agitation by centralising and concentrating the bedouins who were historically staunchly independent

Abdel Aziz struck the Qatif agreement with the British in 1916 secretly whilst he was Pasha of the Najd. During the first world war Abdel Aziz, egged on by the British began harassing the al-Rashid family. This was done in the midst of the First World War and on the pretext that the al-Rashid family were unbelievers. Talal Rashid stated that when Abdel Aziz besieged Ha'il (which itself was Wahabbi but perhaps a little less extreme & so it was besieged), Sultan ibn Mubarak, leader of the 'Utayba (one of those who settled in the colonies made by Abdel Aziz) sought an audience and said: 'Abdel Aziz do you not believe in the day of Judgement & Heaven and Hell? These people in Ha'il are Muslims, we hear the call to prayer and we have not seen any graves nor idols, why are you fighting them? What is your reason for fighting them?'

The response by Abdel Aziz went as follows: 'I am innocent in front of Allah, it's not me who made this decision it was the sheikh (religious scholar from the Wahhabi establishment)' so the man was called in and asked if he had indeed signed the religious ruling allowing fighting the people of Ha'il to which he responded in the affirmative. The sheikh was further pressed as to the fact that the call to prayer was being heard and the response was startling: 'That doesn't mean anything because their disbelief is evident from two issues;

- 1) They allow the rafida from Kuwait to enter for trading purposes
- 2) They allow the sale of ti'tin or cigarettes

This was enough for takfir. Ibn Mujad stayed quiet as he was in the face of a religious scholar and took him on his word and that was the end of that affair.

Once the Sherif of Makkah realised that the British were treacherous (a little too late, given the revelations of Sykes-Picot which was released by the Russians headed up by Lenin after the revolution in that country) with the close of the First World War. It was clear Britain had no intention of honoring her promises. With this realisation the Sherif of Makkah decided to fight the British and make things difficult for them by not signing off on any agreement to do with the division of the region and specifically the case of Palestine. The British then did the divide and conquer tactic they know so well, pitting Abdullah and Faisal, the children of the Sherif of Makkah against their father as the two children favoured working (for) with the British. Ali the son of the Sherif of Makkah stayed with his father in Hejaz.

Around 1917-18 the conflict between the Saudis and the Sherif of Makkah begun and concluded in 1925 when the Saudis took Makkah. This campaign by the Saudis occurred when the Sherif of Makkah turned away from the British. Abdullah and Faisal, the two children of the Sherif, went northwards with Abdullah being given the kingdom of Jordan by the British (his family ruling until this day) & Faisal was placed as king in Greater Syria which irked the French. As the French had been promised Greater Syria in the Sykes-Picot agreement, they would not give it up easily and sent an army from Lebanon into Damascus where killing occurred and the king was deposed. Faisal then fled and roamed around Europe for a couple years complaining to the British who then gave him Iraq and placed him as king there around 1927-28.

The British also helped Abdel Aziz in fighting the al-Rashids sending him munitions and a stipend of £5,000 a month, which at that time in that place was an enormous sum. All this helped Abdel Aziz in doing away with the al-Rashids and expanding his control across the Arabian peninsula, with the exception of the Gulf states which were under the protection of the British as they were vital for resupplying ships from India on their way back to Europe. Another important condition placed upon Abdel Aziz was that he not make the same mistakes as his ancestors by jeopardizing the pilgrim routes as the sheer number of Muslims in India could cause problems for the British should any massacre or atrocity occur. The British had a clear memory of the mutiny in 1857 by the sepoy's.

The Qatif agreement struck in 1916, while Abdel Aziz was still pasha of Najd, was very embarrassing. The agreement stipulated that Abdel Aziz would only appoint a successor with the agreement of Britain, as well as not allowing any external power to interfere in the affairs of the Arabian Peninsula except with the permission of Britain, and if a power were to intervene it would be Britain who would decide whether to engage or not. The Ottoman's envoy to Gallipoli during the First World War was unable to keep track of Abdel Aziz and his expansive moves in the region.

From 1918 to 1923 there was back and forth between Hussein the Sherif of Makkah and the British, where the British convinced themselves that this Sherif was to be a problem for their designs on the region and it was only then that Abdel Aziz was set loose upon him. British airplanes were used in the subjugation of Jeddah from the Sherif to Abdel Aziz. It was at this point that the Ikhwan, the settled ex-bedouins, began to ask questions regarding the involvement on the British. Up until this point, in an attempt to explain the money that he was receiving from the British, Abdel Aziz insisted that the stipend was jizya extracted from the British. The fact that the people believed this is reflective of the simplicity of their mindsets.

Abdel Aziz then called himself King of the Hejaz and Sultan of the Nejd. The Ikhwan took offence at this, they knew mulk or dominion to belong to Allah and not a human, they began to become disillusioned.

Abdel Aziz called for a convention in Riyadh and did a show of giving up power and offering the people to choose their own leader given the dissatisfaction among the Ikhwan, of course his own supporters stepped in and refused singing the praises of Abdel Aziz very similar to how Gamal Abdul Nasser had villagers bussed into the capital to demonstrate and show their love and support for him when his power was threatened in 1967.

The religious establishment was sought for reconciliation between the Ikhwan and Abdel Aziz whereby the former wrote up their list of grievances, which ultimately went unaddressed and snowballed into further grievances given the reluctance of Abdel Aziz to continue his expansionist project and refusal to root out the British from Iraq. From the point of view of the Ikhwan this was unforgivable. The Ikhwan then took it upon themselves to fight the British in Iraq and this is reflective of their lack of political acumen given that they had an unresolved conflict with the titular lead of the Arabian peninsula and were now going out to fight a foreign power in Iraq.

The Ikhwan first struck at Busayya in Iraq (late 1927) then Kuwait in early 1928. The Ikhwan were heavily bombarded by the Royal Air Force for their troubles and this was to be a permanent feature in the destruction of the Ikhwan, Royal Air Force support giving Abdel Aziz the upper hand in all his battles with the Ikhwan thereafter from Sabilla to Hafr al-Batin with Sabilla being a watershed moment where the disillusionment turned into outright rebellion by the Ikhwan against Abdel Aziz for his capitulation to the British. Ofcourse Abdel Aziz had been working hand in glove with the British for quite some time however this cooperation had been secret.

This was a watershed moment whereby the diffusion of 'commanding the good and forbidding the evil' had worked against the Saudis. Whereas the state had expanded and built itself on this turn of phrase, the fact it was not restricted to any one particular group allowed for upstarts and zealots to usurp and overthrow the government. This needed remedying and so around 1927-28 this right to command the good and forbid the evil was established as an office and restricted to the religious establishment, specifically a member of the family of Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab in service of the political class. The Saud were able to use the episode to elevate the religious establishment into a more formalised entity, which in the absence of an opposition would hold the executive to task. Abdel Aziz took the command of enjoining the good and forbidding the evil away from the amassed throng of people (as the Ikhwan showed you could be more catholic than the pope) and gave it to the religious establishment.

This was the inauguration of the ministry of commanding the good and forbidding the evil in 1928, this also undermined the task, as understood by the Ikhwan, that the executive could prior to this point have been held to task by employing the right to command the good and forbid the evil. In effect restricting the powerful concept of commanding the good and forbidding the evil (which was done from the time of Muawiya where it was seen as rebellion against the ruler & arguably Uthman) and watering it down to the mundane aspects of daily life. This was to such an extent that until the 60's at least mosques in Saudi Arabia would have a register/roll call of local citizens that would be read out at the Fajr/ Dawn prayer, one can imagine if an absence was logged a punishment would be meted out.

Abdel Aziz formed shura councils as early as 1927 and it was in one of these Shura councils that the episode as described above, whereby he offered to relinquish power but was 'talked down' by his trusted advisers who spoke of the dangers that would arise in a power vacuum, happened. The Ikhwan were partly taken in by this political theatre and took the religious establishment at their word but were unconvinced and went on to commit a strategic and tactical mistake by moving into Iraq to rid the country of British influence. In essence it was a rump of the army with their leader behind and the British in front of them, a big mistake.

In summary then the three hundred years period spanning the First to the Third Saudi State was characterised by a relationship between the religious establishment and the political establishment, with the religious establishment providing zeal and religious justification for the many wars and expansions that occurred. This religious zeal which was spread across the bedouins was then concentrated in the Third Saudi State by Abdel Aziz who created colonies or proto-kibbutz of sorts, where the scattered power was concentrated, his powerbase began to become disillusioned first at al-Ha'il, then with the reluctance of Abdel Aziz to fight the British in Iraq. This disillusionment spilled over into full blown insurrection by the Ikhwan which was circumvented by a Saudi-British partnership which signaled the once secret relationship becoming open.

In 1926 Abdel Aziz Sultan of Nejd and 'King' of Hejaz had rid himself of the Ikhwan problem and established the Committee to enjoin the good and forbid evil (which had been in a proto-form in both the First and Second Saudi State as an extension to the market inspector of old) with a member of the religious establishment heading the committee up while the rest operated as religious scholars.

In an attempt perhaps to gloss over the decimation of the Ikhwan, Abdel Aziz turned his attention to the pre-existing elected councils from the time of the Ottomans with political parties that were official and registered. The Ottomans as per the law passed in 1905/06 allowed for political parties to be set up and registered. One of these political parties, the 'Hejazi National party' had a prominent member by the name of Mohammed Suroor Sabban (1898–1971). Initially he had fled into Egypt being uninterested in placing all his eggs with Abdel Aziz, however he later changed his mind, returning to the Hejaz becoming the finance minister and leader of the Islamic conference, becoming a millionaire in the process. All the political parties were wound up and dissolved as the ruling power now had the religious clout to consider any opponents to be 'innovators' and 'misguided'. The time was akin to the Middle Ages in Europe where the Church ruled over all things.

It is said that the Shura council in Hejaz advised that (or did Abdel Aziz advise the Shura council?) the country be renamed to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and Abdel Aziz agreed to it. The name Nejd being dropped out due to historical issues outlined earlier. So there are two major problems with this name:

- 1) Kingdom (a problem for the purists amongst the ideology of the Najdi ideology)
- 2) Arabia (Instead of Islamic)

Islam in the minds of the Wahhabis, is centered upon not having graves which you wipe or seek blessing from, this was their conception of Tawhid. They did not consider Tawhid to be Willaya and Mu'wala (allegiance) to be only for Allah. As an anecdotal reference a teacher in Saudi Arabia was asked why he considers Saudi Arabia to be a country of kufr and his response was: 'Its all in the name...Kingdom of Saudi Arabia... kufr, kufr, kufr).

This brings us to the year 1923. The now King Abdel Aziz cemented his power by ensuring the succession of kingship to his family. This was a watershed moment with Islamdom because, although power had been passed on before, it had been done in a non-official capacity by gathering the pledges of allegiance to the crown prince in the lifetime of the father. Harun Rashid did that for his children Amin and Ma'mun, then his children fought for power but there was not a law which stipulated power would be inherited, i.e. passed down from father to son.

In Britain there has been a long-held tradition captured in the saying: The King is dead, long live the King. An automatic written or non-written tradition where power is passed on from father to son. In Islam if the leader is killed or dies the new imam must seek legitimacy from a pledge of allegiance. The scholars of Nejd did not pay attention to this deft political move on the part of Abdel Aziz. A racist aberration where power was limited to one particular family based upon tribalism.

This tribalism is seen in the name 'Arabia' which is built on an enmity toward the Turks. Abdel Aziz worked against Turkish/Ottoman interests in Kuwait in favour of British interests. This was done in order to scupper the plans of the Sherif of Makkah who sought remedy to the Arab question in the interwar period as the Sherif was championing the Arab cause. Perhaps the reason why Abdel Aziz didn't choose 'Islamic' was due to British influence, who in fighting the Ottomans didn't want a state to establish and name itself as anything remotely Islamic. What occurred in the interior of the country was of no real import to the British. The importance for the British was that any state which was to establish itself would do so on tribal or pan tribal/ national lines. The British also worked against Ottoman interests for quite a few centuries and were successful when they managed to agitate agents from within the country including the Committee of Union and Progress and the Young Turks. This resulted in the Ottoman state being turned into a racist, nationalist and secular endeavour.

In the early 1930's the religious establishment set up a conference in Nejd, where they condemned the Zionist project. In 1932 oil was found in Dhahran. The very next year a deal was struck between the Kingdom and the Standard Oil California company (SOCAL). This situation of having non-muslims in the Arabia peninsula was justified by the religious scholars by claiming that they were being served by the foreigners and that they would be limited to areas where they were extracting oil. Soon after, in 1935/6, Abdel Aziz sent his son, Prince Saud, to Palestine to quell the growing insurrection against the British imploring the natives to accept the British deal on the table regarding the division of Palestine. In 1938

Princes Saud and Mohammed visited Britain and in 1939 the first tanker of oil was exported from Saudi Arabia.

The "Church's" dealings with the King can be explained with the following: When Nasser Ibn Abdul Aziz was amir of Riyadh (TRANSLATION TO BE RECHECKED: his son Turki Ibn Nasir the husband of Ibn Sultan who was in the ritz cartoon caught up in MBS's purge paid his fee and left) with Prince Faisal as his superior, as Prince Faisal was the deputy of the King in the Hejaz. The mother of Prince Faisal was from the aal-al shaykh and he himself had an aptitude for reading, writing and jurisprudence. Nasser Ibn Abdul Aziz was the amir of Riyadh and a known wine imbiber (more widespread than you would imagine) and was caught by the Committee to enjoin the good and forbid evil. The committee was of course caught between a rock and a hard place, one mentioned that they should inform the King Abdel Aziz about the situation and offered that they carry out the proscribed punishment then take him to the king and excuse themselves by saying that they did not wish to cause alarm and distress to the king, thinking the best course of action was to punish and rectify the behaviour. So they lashed Nasser and took him to the king in that state of having been lashed. Ofcourse this had broken Nasser's spirit and when brought in front of the king, playing up the committee the King stood up and reproached him going as far as to hit the broken man to such an extent that the committee pleaded on Nasser's behalf saying that they had already inflicted the punishment. This is an example of how the king would play up to the church and keep them on side.

The hands off approach by the religious establishment is predicated on the idea that the Imam is to be trusted in once the pledge is given to them and it is an old idea stretching back to the time of Muawiyah. Islamically the community should remain vigilant and holding power to account so it is the complete opposite to the position taken by the religious establishment.

Around 1942-1943 in Kharj Sheikh Abdel Aziz Ibn Baz was asked on the ruling of Zakat. The ruling of Zakat is that it is taken from the rich and given to the poor. A complaint was raised that money was being taken from the rich in Kharj and distributed in Riyadh while the poor and old in that region were dying from hunger in their homes. Sheikh Abdel Aziz Ibn Baz said that only surplus should be taken out of the area and gave instructions that the people in that region of Kharj spend on their needy and the surplus be given to the leader, wali al amr. King Abdel Aziz asked for Ibn Baz and met him in Riyadh reproaching the sheikh for not coming to him directly and instructing him to go back to the people and set them 'right'. The people had reached half way to Riyadh from Kharj intent on demonstrating and were turned away by Sheikh Abdel Aziz ibn Baz.

Muhammad ibn Ibrahim Al ash-Sheikh was the first grand mufti of Saudi Arabia in 1953. The state was still a rudimentary one at this point with around 30-40 people around Abdel Aziz in the Majlis-as-Shura with all matters being discussed and dealt with there. At this point in time there were not even departments. The hands off approach by the religious establishment is predicated on the idea that the Imam is to be trusted once the pledge is given to them, it is an old idea stretching back to the time of Muawiyah. Islamically the community should remain vigilant and hold power to account, so it is the complete opposite of the position taken by the religious establishment. The basis of study in that time was based on Zaa'd al Mustaqir and Kitab atTawheed which taken together in the 70's and 80's was not even be enough for a beginners class however in the 1940's and 50's (and indeed before that) whoever learnt these texts would be qualified to be a judge. It was a simpler time, difficult to imagine. Thus concludes the reign of Abdel Aziz.

The now deceased Abdel Aziz had instructed his children not to teach the masses lest they revolt against the monarchy. Abdel Aziz had also advised his children, after his meeting with Roosevelt and then Churchill in 1945 in the Suez, to strengthen relationships with the throngs of Egyptian youth as Abdel Aziz understood full well that the agitation in the country was at the behest of the USA against the interests of the UK. King Saud was on the throne now. King Saud was closer to **lahw – (TO CHECK WORD)** in a positive way in that he sought modernization, development and inaugurating schools, his head of ministers was Prince Faisal. This is the same Prince Faisal who was very bright and when he was a still a prince went to Britain, so he was a man with a modern outlook befitting the 20th century. King Saud was focused on play and frivolity so matters of state were for the most part left to Prince Faisal, who began the modern state building process with all of its corollary institutions. Due to King Saud's negligence the economy of Saudi Arabia had suffered.

Abdel Aziz had struck a deal with Roosevelt which secured the Saudi monarchy under the protection of the USA due to strategic oil interests. A base was decided to be built at Dhahran to protect the area from any external forces and to keep the Soviets out of the region. Although the Soviets were technically allies at the time of the Second World War, U.S strategists knew that a time would come when it would be the biggest threat to the Bretton Woods world built on the ashes of the Second World War. The base at Dhahran held nuclear weapons until the early 60's carried by B-52 Bombers. This outlines the U.S - Saudi relationship at the time.

Internal strife between Faisal and Saud as well economic mismanagement caused a family meeting of sorts where the character of Fahd came to the fore who secured his role in the future of the country. Ofcourse Faisal's time would be first, Fahd positioned himself to be the successor to Faisal.

The religious establishment was informed of the fact the King Saud was spendthrift and mismanaging the economy causing problems for the country, this issue escalated and caused wider contention leading to the religious establishment agreeing to remove him. The fatwa was written by Muhammad ibn Ibrahim Al ash-Sheikh. This was the justification for the coup that occurred against King Saud. The fatwa was the deciding factor and most likely prevented blood being spilled as it removed the legitimacy from the King Saud.

The Mufti could not be removed, the markaz of the government at this point in time was in the Hejaz headed up by Abdullah Ibn Hassan, indeed the capital was in Hejaz and not Riyadh which was later to become the capital around 1955-56. King Abdel Aziz had flirted with the idea of making Makkah the capital in a symbolic fashion to bolster the islamic angle of his kingdom, it was King Saud who was to make Riyadh the capital and revive the city which was beneficial politically as it was the hometown of the Saud's.

King Faisal sought to develop and take the country forward as Gamal Abdul Nasser was seriously exerting pressure in Egypt while pushing ahead in terms of modernisation. In Yemen there was a revolution that removed the Zaydi Imam. This turn of events would have troubled the Saudi monarchy as the Zaydiyya held an esteemed place for their Imam, though that did not prevent the overthrow of the Imamate. The Saudis had fought a few battles against the Yemenis with the Imam not being too fond of the British but being more amenable to the Italians. The

Saudis had a hot and cold relationship with Yemen over the years which at a one point in time had (exact date) allowed Yemenis to enter Saudi Arabia without visas through to the current climate where the Saudis are bombarding Yemen. The British, unable to fulfil their aims of winning the Imam over, struck a deal with Yemen which was a compromise but that compromise left the issue of the border between Saudi Arabia and Yemen contested and unconcluded until this day.

In regards to King Faisal he was in a difficult position due to his need, on the one hand he had to find workers (which would be a hotbed of communist agitation) and on the other, adhering to his fathers instructions of not educating his people, if he was to modernise the country.

In the Hejaz there had been an intelligentsia from the time of the ottomans, not widespread but present nevertheless. Women had been included in this endeavour to educate but that too caused some pushback from the conservatives in the country and the religious establishment.

King Faisal responded to this pushback by insisting on the need to educate children and that educating women would be a pre-requisite. In a stroke of genius King Faisal gave over the education to the religious establishment, turning an unofficial organ of the state into an official organ of the state, whereas historically education had been the remit of Awqaf and a private affair as opposed to a public one.

Government schools were opened for mass education and private schools continued to exist alongside the government schools. However the church of najd began at this point its inevitable clash with state in its current form. Let us take a closer look at the state of the church of najd in the reign of King Faisal.

The reality was that up until the 50's or 60's a lot of religious scholars in the Najd region were blind and this was partly due to widespread eye diseases prevalent across the country. Those afflicted with these diseases would focus on religious knowledge and dedicate themselves to its attainment through hifdh or

learning by memorisation. At that time in the Najd region, knowledge was attained through learning through memorisation as it was across the Islamic world. This was especially the case in the Najd region as they disliked matiḳ and kalaam, so the only option available was learning through memorisation. In Egypt many of the qurra or reciters of the quran were blind as the avenue of learning the quran through memorisation was one for these people to earn a wage in a society without a social safety net or disability benefits.

Another reason would be weak character and an amenable disposition. People like Abdul Aziz Ibn Abdullah aal al sheikh would be an example. This man was chosen due to his weak personality and amenability to being paid off, this doesn't apply to Ibn Baz who had his first run in with the monarchy under Abdel Aziz because of the people of Kharj and the issue of Zakat as outlined earlier (assistant to the judge mentions) where the people of Kharj asked Ibn Baz about the issue of Zakat and how people in the area were dying from want of charity. The second run in of Ibn Baz and the monarchy occurred when King Saud was celebrating the marriage of his daughter to Mansur and in the midst of the celebration a young man burnt an expensive Iranian prayer mat by accident which cost millions of riyals. This story was widely spread across Riyadh when it occurred in the 50's causing Ibn Baz to criticise the situation. This landed Ibn Baz the scorn of the monarch Saud who transferred Ibn Baz to the Islamic University in Medina as Naib. Ibn Baz remained in that position until King Faisal became monarch who then returned Ibn Baz to his original position as judge/Qadi.

Ibn Baz then was not of weak disposition. Another incident which is worth mentioning is when Abdel Aziz was King and Saud crown prince, Saud was known for drinking and many people complained to Ibn Baz who sought an audience with King Abdel Aziz advising him to act in the case of Saud which earned the consternation of King Abdel Aziz, Ibn Baz reminded the king that he was not from any tribe and he was blind so the advice he was giving him was for the sake of Allah and this calmed King Abdel Aziz. The point is that Ibn Baz was of strong character.

Faisal before ascending the throne was, for all intents and purposes the power behind the throne of King Saud due to his intelligence. Faisal's mother was from the aal al sheikh. Faisal was placed as Naib of the Hejaz in the reign of Abdel Aziz which was very important for the kingdom nationally and internationally given its role in welcoming the pilgrims (from Jeddah port) and its position as harbouring the capital in the country, Makkah, despite the royal residence being in Riyadh. Faisal (prime minister since its inception and deputy prime minister) was then the de facto ruler of the country long before he became the de jure King of Saudi.

Prince Fahd who was known for his playboy antics, famously being photographed in casinos with women across the world. Fahd was in Miami when King Faisal sent him a letter demanding that he return to the country and take up public office. Being the pragmatist Prince Fahd (presumably surrounded by women realised that he needed to take up any public office that would keep the coffers filled so that he could continue in his escapades) decided to take King Faisal up on his offer and became the Education minister.

At this point Faisal was essentially ruling and in the last days of King Saud, international affairs were developing, especially in Egypt (which we now know was influenced in part by sections of the US intelligence apparatus) with the US policy still Wilsonian and seeking to remove the British from its overseas territories and the belief in self-determination (especially when that would weaken strategic enemies) was strong. King Saud saw no issues with the revolution in Egypt. Abdel Aziz had wanted his children not to make any issues with the youths of Egypt as Abdel Aziz had witnessed the revolution before his death. Faisal was not convinced and viewed the US with more suspicion preferring instead the British approach to (amenable) monarchs in the region and the long leash that came along with it.

Once Gamal Abdel Nasser started to denounce the US presence in the region as well as locking heads with the Saudis in the war that occurred in Yemen. Yemen, which was much more undeveloped than Saudi Arabia had a revolution and given that it was successful, the fear among the Saudis that their hold on power was threatened, took hold. The pushback against the eventuality that the Saudi people would demand an end to the monarchy began in earnest with the pro-American wing seeking closer ties with the US and the pro-British wing seeking to support British moves in the region and specifically in regards to Yemen.

The deposed monarch of Yemen had sought support from the Saudis after their revolution in Yemen, Gamal Abdel Nasser supported the revolutionaries for two reasons;

- 1) Gamal Abdel Nasser was known for his oratory skills in which he praised the revolutionary spirit
- 2) Gamal Abdel Nasser sought to remove the British from the region and the revolutionaries were anti British

The Saudi were pro-monarchy in Yemen however as it became increasingly clear that the revolutionaries were to win the day the Saudis influenced the jamhariyya by oiling the wheels of the tribal society in Yemen to make sure their interests were looked after in the post revolutionary landscape. The Muslims Brotherhood had a strong presence in Yemen and after the situation became untenable for them in Yemen they fled into Saudi Arabia for protection in around 1955-56.

Continuing the analysis on the reign of King Faisal who ruled from 1964 to 1975, we will now briefly analyse the Free Prince movement that existed from 1958-1964. Formed by Prince Talal, the Free Prince movement was geared towards political reforms and a constitution. This was influenced by the ideas of Gamal Abdel Nasser who espoused nationalism whilst curtailing the influence of the Muslim Brotherhood. In Saudi Arabia King Faisal faced the person of Muhammad Ibrahim, the head of the religious establishment. We will be exploring how King Faisal took the mantle of the Islamists, holding the Islamists in a tight embrace. The Free Princes movement was undoubtedly caused by the internal conflict within the ruling family, the members were sure that the throne would not be passed to them. Mansur the defence minister in the reign of Abdel Aziz was hoping to turn the Saudi military into a force to be reckoned with, with clout in the region. It is said that Mansur was poisoned by his family in skulduggery around the throne.

In the late 30's two prominent shuyukh from the Najdi church, Abdullah Qassimi and Abdullah Ibn Ya'bis oversaw the spread of the Najdi dawah to India influencing the ahl al hadith who later centered on the Deoband movement before spreading to Egypt which was land of tasawuf and a land of grave worship in the view of the Najdi movement. Egypt held a historic role in the region and it was Abdullah Qassimi who wrote scathing books against the scholars of Azhar charging them with shirk. Abdullah Qassimi was very bright but the intellectual air was grounded in the assumption that the Najdiyya were in the right and everyone else in the wrong which caused weakness in thought and ideology due to complacency. Abdullah Qassimi was acutely aware of this deficiency which caused him to rethink things. Abdullah Ibn Ya'bis recognised the danger and lived out his life as a civilian in the kingdom.

Abdullah Qasisimi wrote 'These are the cuffs' viewed as a bombshell within the kingdom. In the foreword he wrote a dedication to the King Abdel Aziz who was instituting reforms, freeing the women and industrialising the country to bring it into the twentieth century. These changes shook the religious establishment to the core as it was built upon two major issues:

- 1) destroying graves as where graves would be found then shirk was close by
- 2) Enshrouding the woman whilst she is alive

A royal decree was spread far and wide demanding that Abdullah Qassimi be arrested on arrival in Saudi Arabia and charged with apostasy which caused Abdullah Qassimi to remain in Egypt for some years.

The Free Princes movement was formed by Talal and included the likes of Mushari, Badr, Turki the second and Fawaz. The impetus was the fact the Kings word was law, the implementation of 'sharia' amongst the populace was arrested in front of any palace. Talal and his brothers traveled first to Lebanon then Egypt in 1958. Whilst in Egypt they refused to be called amir/ prince, after the second world war with the world opening up, education becoming widespread and the oil flowing, the sociological situation was changing fast. No absolute ruler could remain in his position without the consent of the governed. This was achieved through elections where the explicit consent is given or the implicit consent is given through the means of bribes. The (battir) of Rome said: The people of Rome must be pleased or satisfied, do not bar them from bread and circus.

Some of the oil wealth that was flowing then made its way to the people and a portion of that was spent on education. Talal's view on governance was at odds with the monarchy proper. It seemed that Talal was convinced of these ideological positions as late as the 80's when he was writing on these issues. It is said

that wealth bends the necks of men. Walid Ibn Talal was furnished generously so as not to follow in his fathers footsteps and of course the defeats of Gamal Abdel Nasser in 1967 dampened the excitement around his revolution. This caused many of the free princes to recalculate and seek reconciliation, and in the 70's being rehabilitated, Fawaz was named Governor of Makkah and Turki the second named naib to the wazir in the department of defence.

Talal and his brothers were aggrieved at the conflict between Faisal and Saud. Talal was well aware that the British were instrumental in establishing the kingdom and well aware that Abdel Aziz had a cozy relationship with the British, being cognizant of that in his later years Abdel Aziz grew closer to the US given its meteoric rise. Nationalism arrived in Saudi Arabia off the back of the speeches of Gamal Abdel Nasser, who was very popular across the Arab world. These speeches would be recorded and learnt by heart by many young people in Saudi Arabia. This caused many different factions to be born in Saudi Arabia some of them were secular, others were atheist, yet others were communist among the ARAMCO workers.

The Free Princes movement left the country in the reign of King Saud and returned just before King Faisal was assassinated in the late 60's early 70's. The nationalists in Egypt were weakening and due to the failures in Yemen and Israel the zeitgeist of the revolutionaries was one of lowered expectations. Prince Mishal had attempted the overthrow of the sitting monarch King Faisal, in 1968 or 1969 there was an attempt on his life which he narrowly escaped. This assassination attempt had Prince Mishal ibn Abdel Aziz behind it. Prince Mishal was amir of Makkah at this point, a very important position and was involved in the successful plot to remove King Saud from the throne. King Faisal left Jeddah for Makkah in a convoy of cars, a distance of approximately 60km, en route another car attempted to crash into the car that was carrying the king though the driver though was able to avoid the crash which caused the attacking car to hit the car behind in the convoy of the king.

The assailant was caught and admitted his guilt implicating Mishal in the plot. Prince Mishal was then brought before King Faisal who questioned the prince on the matter. Prince Mishal disclosed the plot and the fact that there were other plots against the King within the air force. The plot if successful would have declared a state of emergency in Saudi Arabia and pushed through with political reform and a constitution, two important ideas from the free princes movement, which would have placated the public and secured Prince Mishal's role as new monarch with the agreement of the religious establishment being a mere formality once the throne was secured.

Prince Mishal escaped the decapitation that would usually follow acts of treason in the country, this was perhaps due to King Faisal making a calculated decision which factored in the popularity of the free princes movement. The whole affair was hushed up with no official declaration. This was one of many internal issues which troubled King Faisal throughout his reign, these issues were not limited to palace intrigues but extended to the religious establishment which sought even more influence than that which it was already given amongst the populace.

King Faisal kept the religious establishment from peering into the affairs of the palace by giving the religious establishment a long leash when it came to dealing with the populace. This kept the religious establishment from engaging with issues of defence and politics and the burgeoning relationship with the US. The religious establishment itself was not very politically astute preferring to defer matters of politics to the wali al amr. It is no surprise that King Faisal was eventually assassinated given how many threats he faced within and without the kingdom.

King Abdel Aziz had two passing wishes before his death. Abdel Aziz wanted power to be passed amongst his sons by order of age and not by direct line as well as placing the name Saudi in the title of the new kingdom. The other wish was to have a system of inheritance to the throne, this second wish was not instituted and not because of any issues it had in terms of jurisprudence, at best the monarch could hope for succession and a pledge of allegiance. However a system which institutes inheritance of power to the eldest son or daughter such as Britain was not replicated in the Islamic world at all, not even in the Ottoman period where there was no inheritance but a succession of rulers with each ruler having to receive a pledge of allegiance.

Abdel Aziz feared that internal dissension would ruin the monarchy if he had instituted line of succession

through a favourite son, he preferred then that the throne would be passed on from son to son, Abdel Aziz feared Khalid and Muhammad some of his more unhinged sons. The strongest wing of the Saudi family in the time of King Faisal was the Sudairi faction (Sudairi seven) who counted the mother of Abdel Aziz amongst their cohort. This coupled with their numbers lent itself to behave in a beneficial manner to the Sudairi faction making it the preeminent faction within the Saudi family.

Another faction was headed up by Abdullah Ibn Abdel Aziz whose mother was from the Shemairiyya, this clan was locked in a battle with the Dawassir in historic rivalry between the north and south in the Arabian peninsula. The national guard did not exist until the reign of King Faisal. Before they were formalised in this way what did exist was the mujahideen, the remnants of Sultan Ibn Mujad and the Ikhwan ma'ta'Allah. Abdel Aziz initially transformed these remnants into a border guard who were on standby for a new jihad that was never to come, Abdel Aziz named them the murabiteen. They were also called the white army as well as the unflattering bare-foot army as they were known not to wear sandals.

Abdullah, on orders from Faisal inaugurated the National Guard in a copycat fashion to the Jordanian national guard. The clothing of the national guard, which was courser with military fatigue colours along with traditional head dress, required sanction from the religious establishment as trousers were viewed as an innovation. The National Guard of Saudi Arabia was seen to be a counterweight to the army proper as the army was controlled by the Sudairi faction. King Faisal sought to offset the influence of the Sudairi faction by inaugurating and strengthening the National Guard to face internal dissension as well as the army which was controlled by the members of the Sudairi faction. The National Guard is prone to excess as seen in its deployment in Bahrain recently.

Events in the region especially in Iraq and Syria had informed king Faisal that the army was a direct danger to the monarchy. A strong army would be cause for consternation with the possibility of revolution at any point. The Saudi army was not particularly renowned for its martial ability as it was not trained in a military manner with a chain of command and tight discipline. This independent status would threaten the system of governance so effectively the army was kept on a tight leash.

King Faisal, then astute as ever, saw that raising the flag of the Islamists would relieve pressure on the monarchy and secure its place in the world. King Faisal understood that the **nationalist flag was an American flag**, and that he was not American despite being aware that his father had turned closer to the Americans and in his later years realised that the Americans were anti monarchy and pro nationalism. King Faisal then saw it fit to draw nearer to the British, though this was to be difficult given the US were making inroads in to the country having nuclear weapon carrying b-52 bombers in the country as well as having an instrumental role in the exploitation of oil resources. After the second world war it was clear that ideas and ideology that would grip the masses was needed, in the absence of national projects and infrastructure development a new means would have to be found.

In order to achieve this end he welcomed the Muslim Brotherhood, who had been oppressed in Egypt. Saudi Arabia was to offer the veneer of ruling by the sharia despite their shortcomings, as opposed to the Egyptians who ruled by man made laws as well as turning a blind eye to zina and belly dancers. King Faisal funded mosques in the Indian subcontinent and enabled the Pakistanis to pursue their nuclear agenda which raised the status of King Faisal amongst the brotherhood and influenced groups in the Indian subcontinent. The islamist flag was in opposition to the nationalistic flag which was very popular amongst the Arabs, this strategy culminated in the authorship of Ibn Baz of a book entitled 'a refutation of Arab nationalism' which criticised nationalism on the basis of its tribalism. It may well be that the language of the book was not reflective of Ibn Baz and if so that would indicate that members of the brotherhood authored the work and attributed it to Ibn Baz.

The Islamic world conference was instituted, a historic event given that there was a vacuum in the Islamic world after the abolishment of the Ottoman caliphate. Hassan al-Banna formed the brotherhood in the latter years of the 1920's and in the 1930's sought support from the Saudis after being alienated by the western laws being implanted in Egypt as well as the decline and abolishment of the Ottoman caliphate. Abdel Aziz was reluctant to support the MB with Hassan al-Banna (who used to call King Fahd of Egypt prince of the believers) taking a classical position of massaging the ego of the ruler. Gamal Abdel Nasser crushed the MB by using members of the MB like Abdel Qader Oud to agree that the military should not

rule politically but to accept the current state of affairs on a temporary basis. Of course the British in the Suez helped this call amongst the populous who wanted a civilian government but would accept the military ruling temporarily.

Saudi Arabia under the reign of King Faisal seized the Muslim Brotherhood as a symbol of their taking up the Islamist mantle. The Muslim Brotherhood under Hassan al-Banna made overtures to King Abdel Aziz who was less forthcoming than King Faisal in his reception of the MB and its aims. Before using Saudi Arabia as its base the MB had supported the military overthrow of the King of Egypt on a temporary basis headed up by AbdelQadar Oudah, this alliance did not work out for the MB who were marginalised under the reign of Gamal Abdel Nasser. Some of the MB fled into Lebanon and others fled into the West such as the family of Ramadan, with Tariq Ramadan being the most prominent amongst them. Others yet went into Saudi Arabia and found refuge. After the collapse of the Ottoman caliphate it was Saudi Arabia who claimed to be ruling by sharia and no other country, besides Afghanistan, until of course the Iranian revolution.

Gamal Abdel Nasser in the late 50's and early 60's criticised Saudi Arabia for being a pawn of the West, the many US bases, some of which were nuclear bases, in the country as an example for that criticism. King Saud who was between King Abdel Aziz and King Faisal did not draw the MB nearer to the Saudi orbit because the marginalisation of the MB did not occur until the 80's. Arguably the raising of the Islamist flag is what saved the Saudi monarchy. The MB were given a long leash and were made to understand, in a very diplomatic way, that there would be no elections. Nor would Saudi Arabia suffer agitation for elections at all. What was promised is nizam asa'si and a consultation majlis which was only established in the reign of King Fahd some thirty years later around 1992.

The MB did not have a clear policy when it came to monarchy, Hassan al-banna used to call King Fuad of Egypt as prince of the believers not that he should be called prince of the disbelievers by a man of majesty as the title prince of the believers has a deep shari'i meaning not befitting someone who was a British agent and a witting accomplice of colonisation. Regarding the rights of women, her involvement in politics and workers rights, the MB was not at the cutting edge. In fact it was only when Hizb Tahrir emerged in the later 40's early 50's propping a form of constitutionalism, their ideas being built off the thought of Mawardi and Abu Ya'la al-Farra considering them to be Islam when in reality they were apologists for the Abbasids.

The MB in their inception did not create revolutionary ideas espousing instead **muroona** when it came to dealing with political entities, it was only recently that MB members engaged with modern political thought turning their attention to liberalism and democratic systems incorporating some aspects and eschewing other aspects. Azzam Tamimi is perhaps the most prominent of these MB members in the academic world.

The religious establishment in Saudi Arabia did not mind the new incomers from the MB but were mindful of the central issue in the eyes of the Wahhabis, that being the issue of Aqida. With the new arrivals settled, the question of Aqida became a means for a marriage between the religious establishment in Saudi Arabia and the organisational framework of the MB. This marriage birthed the Sururist movement which boasts the likes of Mohammed Suez abdideen & Salman al-Oudah amongst its ranks. This salafiyya ikhwani outlook was a very particular phenomenon borne out of a dialectic between the MB in Saudi Arabia and the Salafis. Mohamed suwed abideen preferred to be called Ahlul Sunnah wal-Jamah as opposed to the Salafi title and viewed the Ash'aris as Muslims and not innovators as they are viewed by the salafis.

The license from the religious establishment for foreign non-muslim powers to intervene in the war between Iraq and Kuwait was a watershed moment that kicked up a lot of dust. Ibn Uthaymeen had distanced himself from the fatwa that was attributed to him, insisting that he only ever mentioned a small contingent of approximately 1,000 soldiers to defend the Saudi border and repel any actions by Saddam Hussein against the Saudi homeland. The fatwa was in fact not spread far and wide, what was spread was the license for foreign forces to be used in national defence. There was no mention in the fatwa of Kuwait nor the defence of Kuwait. Sa'd al Abdullah the defence minister during the Iraq Kuwait war said outright that Kuwait did not have sharia but 'qanoon' so the rationale from the religious establishment was what business do we have defending a country which is ruled by man made laws and not sharia. That taken with the fact Kuwait was an independent sovereign nation would lead one to assume Ibn Uthaymeen was

correct and there was no real motive for issuing a fatwa in the defence of Kuwait, at least from the point of view of the religious establishment. The fatwa then was issued to defend Saudi Arabia and made on the basis of necessity, there was no necessity to engage in a war with Iraq nor was there a necessity to defend Kuwait.

The MB found a refuge to spread their thoughts having access to regional and international links, the Saudis were able to use the MB in the war against Gamal Abdel Nasser. The MB had a lot of problems, suffering from a partisanship, even its name alienated those who were not in the organisation. The MB became very popular in the Islamic world, in the Indian subcontinent especially. With the decline of Gamal Abdel Nasser's ideology, the new threat was Iran after the 'Islamic revolution', it was at this point that a contender to the ruling by Islam surfaced in the modern age. It was also during this time that many pamphlets and books were written making takfir of the Shias. The Suroists were used by the state to lift the flag of sectarianism as opposed to the Islamist flag that was raised previously to counter the threat of Gamal Abdel Nasser. Now the sectarian flag was to be hosted high to fight against the Shia. Similarly the ahl-al hadith on the Indian subcontinent were also instigated to pick up the sectarian flag with the Jamaat e Islami duly following the orders. Most prominent amongst these publications was the one authored by Dr Abdullah Ghareeb 'thus comes the turn of the zoroastrians (majoos)'. Widely distributed it was actually written by Mohammed Surur Zayn al-abideen founder of the Sururists and the head of the salafi-mb marriage.

Before the Iranian revolution Saudi Arabia enjoyed good ties with the Shah. Using the political excuse, state relations between the two countries was overall positive, despite the criticism from the religious establishment that the inhabitants were non muslim Shia. The Shah's father issued a decree which banned women from wearing headscarves which made some religious women stay in their homes for over seven years refusing to go to the bazaars as they did not want to set out without their headscarves. The Saudis had a troubled relationship with the Shia within Saudi Arabia with Abdel Aziz attempting to expel the Shias from the country which was rebuffed by the British as impractical and enshrined in the Qatif agreement as any mass expulsion would upset the demographics of Bahrain or Kuwait. Abdel Aziz was able to convince the religious establishment that expelling the Shia was impractical promising instead to prevent them from access to positions within the state and all-round marginalisation from society.

The real issue of the Saudis with 'Islamic' Iran was that Iran challenged the prime position of the Saudis in raising the 'Islamist' flag. The Islamist flag which was used against Gamal Abdel Nasser was threatened by the Shi'i Islamists and so the flag changed into one of sectarianism. Although sectarianism was rife in the books of the Wahhabis for years this sectarianism was revived with the distinction that in the period of the Islamic revolution in Iran these sectarian books were ghost written with the authors preferring to stay in the shadows.

The Egyptian MB took a different approach preferring instead to engage with the new regime in Iran, in this way the Egyptian MB was not used for the Saudi agenda. Once King Faisal was assassinated with intrigue amongst his family and certain sections of the US being behind the operation, the throne came to Fahd despite King Khalid being the de facto king. The reign of King Faisal was marked with economic austerity as King Faisal was holding the purse strings with an Iron fist. After the assassination the wealth started flowing across the country which resulted in a focus on economic issues amongst the inhabitants of Saudi Arabia. Fahd was a pragmatist and diplomat so he decided that the World Muslim congress was to have some of its budget taken away, reinvesting it in non political charity work. The world association of muslim youth was established by MB members in Saudi Arabia and well-endowed, in the days of King Faisal, to the tune of 20million riyals. Fahd slashed this budget to around 5million riyals with a sliding scale resulting in a budget of 0 riyals. This of course caused the association to seek other benefactors but this was part of the policy instituted by Fahd aimed at winding down the Islamist tinge within Saudi policy.

The golden age of the MB in Saudi Arabia was during the reign of King Faisal where many of the educated members of the MB who had fled into Saudi Arabia were put to use, honing their skills to benefit themselves and the Saudis who had decided to raise and champion the Islamist cause. This is despite the fact that in 1969 King Faisal declared that there was to be no central religious authority figure in the kingdom abolishing the grand mufti role. In its stead the high council of scholars and the department for research and if'taa was instituted. Ibn Baz was the person who would be accepted by the people to be the

preeminent member of the religious establishment. Ibn Baz was not a member of the family of Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab nor was he from any established tribe, Ibn Baz's grandfather was an Egyptian (the baz family still exist in Egypt today) who came with Ibrahim Pasha and then remained in the country after Ibrahim Pasha left establishing himself as a gunsmith and **hida'da**, amongst the Najdi's the hadadd was the lowest trade one could have. The championing of the Islamist cause continued until the Islamic revolution in Iran and the appearance of Juhayman which sent shockwaves reverberating across the Saudi society and made King Fahd rethink his policy of abandoning the Islamist cause.

As Fahd distanced himself from the Islamist cause, the issue of Aqida was once more brought into the fore as a defense from any criticism levelled at him for distancing himself from the Islamist cause. The fact that Saudi Arabia had no grave worship was seen as a net positive and the primary concern for the religious establishment. Given that Fahd was in agreement and sewed this motif to the religious establishment, reflected the deft political touch that was to characterise the reign of king Fahd. It was the siege of Makkah and the Islamic revolution in Iran that would shake up this state of affairs.

Before the revolution there were mass protests on the streets of Iran and King Fahd made diplomatic statements at the time to the effect that the Iranian people should solve Iranian problems.

The movement by Juhayman was one that got away from the religious establishment which sought to control any religious movement under its wise guidance. This stems from the human desire for power, this can manifest with a religious teacher guiding and instructing his student but at the same time it could be that the students guiding the teacher, and thus a dialectic is formed as espoused by the communist thinker, one characterised by conflict. By way of example Imam Hanbal made the statement that the Quran was not created, a philosophical question not linked to the creed of the Muslims as understood by the Usoolieen with grasp of Kalam. Imam Hanbal went to the extent that anyone who said otherwise was a kafir, so it may be that some of his students were saying the quran was created as well as students who wouldn't say either created or uncreated but simply that the Quran was the Word of God or Kalaam Allah. This state of affairs continued until the Mihna of the Hanabila in Baghdad and the burning of the house belonging to Jarir Tabari. Omar Ibn Shabba author of Tarikh Madina (history of Medina) said that the Quran was uncreated and the followers of Imam Hanbal responded that whoever didn't say that was a kafir to which Ibn Shabba responded I do not make takfir of anyone and he duly received a beating from the followers of Ibn Hanbal resulting in Ibn Shabba staying in his house for a full month.

Saudi **Arabia into the – missing text**

The pro-American and pro-British wings of the family clashed heads in terms of how to deal with Yemen and Gamal Abdel Nasser. This clash caused Faisal being removed from his position as head of the wuzara (govenors) with King Saud naming (**enter name here**) as his replacement and his son Mansur as defense minister. It was at this point that the head of the diwan of injustice, the most senior 'constitutional' court was headed up by Musa'id Ibn Abd'al'Rahman the uncle of King Saud. A very honourable man who resigned as head of the diwan when Faisal handed his resignation.

Fahd played a key role in removing King Saud in the hopes of clearing his own path to the throne whilst also being actually aware of the danger to the monarchy given the events transpiring in Yemen. This was easier said than done especially given that King Saud was the man whom everyone had pledged allegiance to and who's legitimacy hinged on his ruling by Islam making the ruler the wali al amr. A religious ruling would have to be sought out to remove King Saud **and one gained because of the following reasons:**

- 1) King Saud's interpersonal skills were not the best
- 2) Naming Faisal's replacement, a man who was said to be (his?) personal driver
- 3) **Involving women in politics**

All this convinced the grand mufti that the King was a danger to the Kingdom and sought a fatwa, and was given the fatwa allowing the people to remove their pledge of allegiance, and in 1964 this happened with Faisal becoming King immediately after.

It could be said that Faisal had a cozy relationship with the grand mufti and the Wahhabis generally as they allowed him to rule, however the issue can be viewed from another point of view. Faisal viewed himself as

using backward thinking simpletons and that he must keep them on side while they had power while at the same time curbing their influence. Faisal as naib in Hejaz was known for flaunting the law as a young prince with a tenuous relationship with Islam. This goes back to Abdel Aziz who had a very lax relationship with Islam, this was reflected in his children. While it may be that a righteous man has unrighteous/open sinners amongst his children, when all of ones children are unrighteous it reflects back onto the father and is a sign that they learnt the behaviour or irreverence from their father.

Juhayman known for the siege of Makkah was at one point a driver of the royal family and the insight he got before going on to become extreme was one of a general laxity when it came to religious expression amongst the royals, he has mentioned the following story where royal princes would be drinking in their palaces and when a member of the church of najd would visit them, some of them would clean up and use a miswak whilst applying copious amounts of perfume then proceeding to kiss the hands and foreheads of the shuyukh while others would continue to drink to their hearts content. This was a general theme amongst the royal princes.

This manner of dealing with the religious establishment was taught from father to son, Faisal simply being from the family of Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab on his mother's side does not entail religiosity. King Saud was forced to abdicate his power in 1958 with executive powers going to Faisal, the church of najd had a symbolic role in the deposing of King Saud. Fahd who was later to become king also had a role to play in the deposition of King Saud, in fact during the reign of King Khalid it was Fahd who ruled de facto. King Khalid was busy with his camels and dog racing. Fahd was not known for his religiosity and viewed the trajectory of the world as leading toward secularism. Whilst acknowledging the role of the MB in Saudi society starting during the reign of King Faisal, Fahd was a politician who preferred diplomacy, despite his irreligious leaning Fahd understood that he would need to court the support of the religious establishment as well as the MB. This explains why Fahd gradually removed the budgets of the Muslim youth association and the Muslim world league as opposed to in one fell swoop. This decision was also informed by the fact Fahd was acutely aware of the perception of Saudi Arabia both within and outside the country, as a nation of Sunni-Salafism. Fahd was also acutely aware that it was this status which prevented the popular movements, symbolically in the forms of Gamal Abdel Nasser, which were spread across the Arab world after the second world war, penetrating into Saudi society.

The oil crisis can be viewed as political theatre in as much as the oil did not completely stop flowing. Strategic supplies continued as normal and the oil embargo can also be seen as the flexing of Saudi muscles as much as British intrigue in seeking to scupper the ascendancy of the US as well as a response to the Suez crisis, in which the US took the side of the Egyptians to the detriment of the UK. In 1969 the UK, under the Wilson government, had declared that it would withdraw East of the Suez and focus on the West of the Suez. The oil crisis caused an economic catastrophe in Saudi Arabia with prices sky-rocketing and a huge gulf being created between the haves and the have nots, some of those able to speculate money (is this on currency trades)? were handsomely rewarded but the general populace were negatively affected by the economic crisis the likes of which were known a very long time ago in Europe/UK exemplified by the South Sea bubble. Some of those negatively affected were the likes of Juhayman and his motley crew.

The shortcomings of Marxist theory is that it places emphasis on the material conditions in society as a direct cause of action taken against the capitalist class, however in actuality what occurs is the material conditions force one to observe the society and the reasons for the gulf between expectation and reality. None of these issues were addressed by the religious establishment which had an Akhbarist view. One that stopped short of having an opinion of something that was not talked about in the previous generations and specifically the generation of the Prophet and the righteous predecessors. This being trapped in time is not exclusive to the Salafis, the Ottomans waited for three centuries before introducing the printing press amidst the Caliphate. A historical tragedy by any standards.

The religious establishment in Saudi Arabia was unable to keep up with the times, so in the late 70's during the oil crisis due to the establishment shoddy foundations and the fact that the establishment had more in common with the Hadithiyya or Akhbaris as opposed to the Usooliyyin. The Usooliyyin made up of the Asharis and the Maturidis in the ahlul sunnah wal jamaa, the real AHSJ that is the majority of the Islamic world, stand in contradistinction to the Shia Usooliyyin as the Shia Usooliyyin did takfir of the Shia Akhbaris and removed them from the intellectual scene some two or three centuries, this may go some way to

explain why Shia thought had developed new economic ideas exemplified by 'our economics' written by Muhammad Baqir al-Sadr which has been the basis of modern 'Islamic economics' and political thought as exemplified in the Wilayat al Faqih (WF) in Iran. This did not occur amongst the Sunnis, the akhbaris due to their ideological framework and foundation are unable to keep up with the times as they lack the heuristics and maxims on which anything can be built.

The sunni akhbaris or salafis and the religious establishment which housed them shared characteristics with the church in the Middle Ages where all spiritual matters were deferred to the priest who towed the church's line on any particular issue and the congregation would have to fall in line. The social situation also lent itself to this position taken by the religious establishment, when bicycles were introduced people were perplexed at how the bicycle could continue in motion after the cyclist had stopped peddling. The religious establishment was unable to keep up with the pace of the global **integrated ifnfacila** system and the institutions that went along with it. This shortcoming was exposed during the late 70's and throughout the 80's.

The issue of workers rights was addressed by importing wholesale Egyptian laws and calling them 'andhima', in this way the religious establishment was able to excuse itself by calling the new rules directive of the king and not sharia, even if it went against rulings of the sharia such as modern banks. This conflict at the core of modernity sent shockwaves across society with some people leaving Islam altogether, others yet criticised the religious establishment. This was due not to the novelty of modernity, as arguably when the Muslims after the Prophet PBUH met with the Sassanid empire and the Byzantine empire the issue was not one of inadequacy in the face of modernity or civilisation. The Muslims arguably had a deeper philosophical understanding as exemplified in the discussion between Rib' Ibn amir and Rustom where Rib' mentions how the Prophet PBUH came to remove the worship of humans to the worship of the Lord of humans and from the tightness of the world to the expanse of the world and the hereafter. In terms of institutions the Muslims were not beholden to antiquated norms, so when the Muslims encountered these institutions they did not get stumped by them. By way of example when Umar encountered the foreign Diwans he assembled a group of **remaking veteran for Badr to seek assistance from in juristic questions. - POOR TRANSLATION**

Later when told that the people of Yemen used the Persian script for the writing in the Diwan it was not a problematic issue and was allowed to continue. Even the use of a foreign language other than Arabic was not an issue because the framework was much higher than the Najdi religious establishment. The crisis and calamities that befell the Muslim community was due to the race towards the dunya and rulership. This is outlined in the following hadith: rather I fear you will be given the wealth of the world, just as it was given to those before you. You will compete for it just as they competed for it and it will ruin you just as it ruined them." Source: Şaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī 2988, Şaḥīḥ Muslim 2961

The competition for the wealth of this world is a human shortcoming which affects all humans to some degree and it is this which was the primary cause for the fit'an (plural of fitna) which occurred and not because of an inability to engage with the materially developed empires of Sassanid Persia and Byzantium. The issue with the Najdi religious establishment is their lack of a robust framework which was instigated for the protection of the Saudi state. This religious establishment was only ever concerned with fighting grave (worship) and enshrouding a women before death marginalising her from society. When the television stations were broadcasting what would be considered unvcovered women in the late night and without a peep from the religious establishment it was only a matter of time before a group outside of the religious establishment would take on the islamist mantle.

The issue of women driving was used as a tool to prevent any real dissension in the country, and due to having a formal ban, women in the Badiya region would and continue to drive. The issue of women owning their property and being able to steer a company was and remains banned, with women required to have a wali or guardian. In the late 60's and early 70's Saudi society was a reflection of the ideological battles that were raging across the Islamic world. These battles were characterised by the ideological positions taken, which can be broadly categorised into three major camps:

1. Islam was in danger because of its decline as a civilization and should accept the West's domination and adopt its legal codes and its technology – to secularize government – and strive

towards individual Muslim nationhood for geographical entities, if necessary by cooperating with the European colonizers. This was exemplified by King Abdul Aziz, King Faisal and King Fahd who began and developed the modernisation process with its accompanying infrastructure development in Saudi Arabia.

2. Islam is rational, democratic and can form the basis of effective government – it just needs to be tweaked. The colonizers can teach us many useful things, but they are also dangerous and must be resisted, as they will undermine our moral and spiritual way of life. The question is which aspects of the West will we refuse and which we accept. This was exemplified by the Muslims Brotherhood who sought and received asylum in the country using the trans national institutions such as the Muslim world league to spread their ideas.
3. The only basis for Muslim societies and mankind's general well-being is the Quran, and the practices and sayings of the Prophet. Through too much rapprochement with the West, too many deviant Islamic folkloric beliefs have entered, and with too little attention to the core of our religion, Islam has dangerously drifted away from its roots. We must return to the purity of the earliest Muslims if we hope to improve our lot. This was exemplified by the religious establishment.

The Islamist flag that was hosted against Gamal Abdel Nasser who was under threat by a challenger in the form of Iran. This flag was able to deflect criticism internally and externally to Saudi Arabia by the exclusive claim to the flag in the region and the world. The strategy of Prince Nayef in his role as interior minister was sought to embrace the Wahhabis and change the optics slightly by laying claim to the Sunni-Salafi title which could be used in a sectarian manner against Iran as well as defer any threat of rebellion. This was to be achieved by feeding into the strain of thinking found in the Tahawi creed wherein rebelling against the ruler is forbidden quoting part of a verse in support and hiding the other part of the same verse as the scholars of sultans do. This obedience was in effect comparable to the taa'aa Shamiyya.

Ta'aa Shamiyya was thus termed by Imam Awzai' who said 'from that which must be abandoned amongst the madhahib of the people in Shaam is the taa'aa shamiyya'. For this soft approach Mohammed Nashar terms Imam Awzai as an Umayyad 'ameel, haqeeer ill umawiyyin'. When Umar Ibn Abdel Aziz had died after inaugurating many serious reforms, the most symbolic being the repealing the cursing of Ali Ibn Abi Talib from the pulpit. The offenders would be punished and similarly punished those who called Yazeed a caliph. The reconciliation amongst the Muslims had started to occur. Umar was poisoned and killed and then Yazid ibn Abdel Malik ascended the throne and continued the reforms of Umar as they were very popular.

The Umayyad elite then moved to gather some 50 scholars (on the payroll) and they swore by Allah in front of the new caliph that the caliph would not be held to account on the day of judgement. This is a clear statement of kufr. Given the caliph is the caliph he can do no wrong according to these 'scholars'. Of course, the religious establishment in Saudi Arabia cannot use the exact same turn of phrase as it would be clear cut kufr however in effect the position of the religious establishment as pertains to the monarchy is the same. The apparatus built by Prince Nayef relied upon religiously austere people like Mohammed amaan Ja(h)mi who originally hailed from Ethiopia and was under investigation at one point until Ibn Baz involved himself and provided character witness being absolved by the state and given the kind of loyalty old enemies are prone to giving. Ja(h)mi became very zealous about the obedience to the ruler, general security and the preservation of the state. The religious scholars were used for religious ruling which bolstered the state against any potential rebellion. Where once the religious scholars were focused on the lengthening of a beard and the use of a miswak, they now began to focus on obedience to the ruler.

The efforts of Nayef was to this end supported by the Madhkalis who follow Rabee' al Madkhali who himself took over once Mohammed Amaan Jahmi died. The Muslim brotherhood was a target for the operations led by Nayef in that the MB sought political reform which would destabilise the obedience to the ruler. In seeking to buff up the state the focus returned to the issue of graves, Egypt had graves and so it was a kafir country, Iran had graves and so it was a kafir country. Saudi Arabia had no graves so it was not a kafir country and the only country to rule by Sharia which prevents any rebellion against the ruler. The correct aqeeda was boiled down to an issue of shirk and tawheed.

However the rebellious element within the bedouin Wahhabis could not be wiped out altogether. Some Hanbali scholars had said that rebellion against the ruler was forbidden even if the ruler became a kafir due to the fitna a rebellion would cause. The Sururists would go on to pen many works in defence and support of the monarchy under many titles one of which was 'obedience to the wali al amr: its guiding principles and conditions'. It was under Prince Nayef that religious establishment got their way in preventing women from driving officially. Prince Nayef also instituted the communiqué which went out across the country to all non muslims workers/ residents not to eat openly in Ramadan which goes against the mannerisms of the sharia where non Muslims should be encouraged to eat as the feeding of people is a praiseworthy act.

King Fahd delayed the secularisation process and Prince Nayef worked on mobilising the Jahmiyyin/Madhkalis to work for the state in lieu of the fact that the MB had fallen out of favour due to their calls for political reform being thoroughly disempowered in the late 70's and early 80's (much as they had been in the mid 60's and 70's in Egypt where in 1965 thousands of MB members were imprisoned and Sayyid Qutb was killed by the state) but not before being used in the case of Afghanistan with Abdullah Azzam taking central role. Women were the biggest group to be marginalised in this period as a sacrifice to keeping the religious establishment on side.

The movement of Juhayman gathered support for years prior to the the siege of Makkah, it could be that the movement started out as early the late 60's as a secret organisation. Abu Hamid alMaqdisi is the foremost scholar on the inner workings of the Juhayman group. This movement was borne out of a group which had studied under Ibn Baz. It was essentially a refusnik group intent on blocking the march toward modernity. Juhayman criticised the Saudi regime and went as far as to question their sharia compliance status, Juhayman's criticism can be summed up in 3/4 points:

- 1) This Kingdom of Saudi Arabia was in actuality not adhering to the Sharia and exhibited clear kufriyyat or actions which would entail the kufr of the actor such as the modern banks and the riba or usury/interest which works as a corollary to the modern banks.
- 2) The religious establishment had sold itself out to this kufr state, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
- 3) This widespread corruption had affected the society in a negative way as exemplified by the lax take on modesty.

The two most prominent members of this Juhayman group were Juhayman and Abdullah alQahtani who due to his mothers status as a member of ahl al Bayt was called the Mahdi. This phenomenon played upon the pre-existing belief amongst the Muslims of a Mahdi like figure.

Being unable to address the people in a manner which reflects the speaker having their finger on the pulse of the time, relying upon the ghaybiyyat is an easy ploy to galvanise the downtrodden. It is said Makkah was chosen on the strength of a dream amongst the group which was seen by all, however it seems that in actuality the group agreed on the vision or dream of one man. In any case it was this dream which moved the group to make tracks towards Makkah and the choice of Makkah as a base for their activities, this could have been due to the hadith which stipulates the pledge of allegiance to be given to the mahdi as occurring in the sanctuary, bay'n al rukni'... which played a role in the groups decision.

Juhayman and his group infiltrated the sanctuary disguised as pilgrims then proceeded to smuggle in arms and foodstuffs for their siege, the beginning of the siege was peaceful in so far as no force was used against the people when pressed for their pledge if they refused. The imam of Makkah at the time Abdullah Subayil refused to give the pledge as he had a pre existing pledge with the House of Saud, he was not forced to pledge and the doors of the sanctuary were open. That is until the governor of Makkah Fawaz Ibn Abdel Aziz, one of the members in the Free Prince moment and a known drinker, sent in the local police force in a bungled attempt at dislodging the group. At this point the group closed the doors of the sanctuary and the siege began. The siege continued for 2-3 weeks.

The major problem with Juhayman's movement was that it was not prone to be controlled by the teacher and not obedient. When Juhayman was inside the sacred city of Makkah and the operation against them began Ibn Baz was actually arrested, with all of his student fleeing. Ibn Baz was held for one night due to the assumption on the part of the security services that Ibn Baz was a teacher of Juhayman and spoke positively about Juhayman in the past calling him disempowered. The initial response from Fawaz after he

had received news that the followers of Juhayman had taken over the Makkah complex with the doors to the complex still being opened **endnote closed as said by** the Saudis, was for local police to be scrambled. Assuming that Juhayman was with a motley crew of 10 or 20, a critical underestimation, Fawaz sent the local police in a crazed attempt to dislodge Juhayman and his followers. In actual fact all that was achieved was the deaths of the police officers sent in, as the followers of Juhayman were armed and trained for a military confrontation. This debacle shook the regime in Saudi Arabia and it was in this shocked state that Ibn Baz was arrested.

There was no response from the religious establishment as the regime put out the line that the followers of Juhayman and Juhayman himself had closed the doors of the Haram and started to kill pilgrims. So instantly it was a military confrontation and a battle where people were to be killed. The regime made out as though their hand was forced into killing and the religious establishment had no need to give a religious opinion. Mohammed al-Qahtani, who was said to be the Mahdi, was killed in the operation which dislodged the group of Juhayman.

While King Khalid was busy with camels and greyhounds the de facto king Fahd decided that imprisoning Ibn Baz was not the best strategy, in **fact re-rasing the** Islamist flag was to be his strategy of choice. Fahd decided to go against Prince Nayef who gave the order to have Ibn Baz arrested and honoured the scholar. This was a part of the propaganda campaign where the followers of Juhayman were made out to be criminals and vagabonds who had defiled the sanctuary with the shedding of blood of the pilgrims. Ibn Baz was on hand to make statements to the effect that rebellion against the ruler was not okay due to his positive treatment at the hands of Fahd. Hussein Najjar was perhaps the first to call the group around Juhayman as kafirs, Ibn Baz refused this and called the group Khawaarij which ought to be punished.

The Saudis worked for two weeks and relied upon Jordanian logistical and intelligence support as well turning Turkish workers in the sanctuary into ad hoc troops and the **troika** failed miserably in dislodging the group holed up in the sanctuary of Makkah. The group around Juhayman had for months stockpiled weapons in the lower part of the sanctuary disguised as coffin boxes. Also the group had taken precautionary measures to secure water and food supplies which meant that they were in it for the long haul, expecting the mahdi to arise from amongst them this group was also imbued with a sense of messianic fervour which also lent itself to zealous fighting when the time to fight eventually came. This ferocity translated into a success in repelling the local Saudi police and fighting the French special forces (who were eventually called and did eventually succeed) with such vigour as to cause sizeable losses amongst the French contingent.

The use of the French forces was only acknowledged after the fact around 15 years later. All the propaganda around the event in Saudi Arabia made out as though it was a Saudi affair along with her Muslim brother nations. Once force was used against the rebel group dynamite was used by the Saudis to soften the targets who were then apprehended and arrested. Qahtani was killed before the attack and was buried, then around 60 remaining members of the group were later tried and executed.

King Fahd had initially thought the trajectory of the world was leading toward secularisation, however the events in Makkah and the wider world had changed his mind, this turn of strategy from gradual secularisation toward an Islamist perspective was sealed with the decision by King Fahd to have the title 'Custodian of the two holy mosques' instead of 'sahib al jalala'. A clear indication that his focus was more on the correct aqida of the salafis as a means of defense of the regime. This direction was to lead the kingdom towards involvement in the Afghanistan crisis.

The new Iranian regime had initially criticised the movement of Juhayman as the optics of the whole siege was one where the group around Juhayman were criminals intent on killing pilgrims. The international standing of the Saudis was in a sense positively affected as the propaganda by the Saudis painted the situation as one where a group of rebels were subdued without recourse to indiscriminate killings. When an ideological adversary such as Iran criticised the rebels, claiming they are agents of the Americans, this undoubtedly supported the Saudis. Of course, the surrounding sunni countries fell in line and praised the Saudis for 'restraint' and effectively dealing with the rebels and the wider world accepted the Saudi line. All in all it was a net benefit for the Saudis.

What was the role of the wahhabis in the Afghanistan war against the soviets? How did King Fahd leverage his islamist pivot to exfiltrate extremists and hardliners over to the frontline in the battle against communism? How did the kingdom engage in the Cold War and to what end?

Herat & Sistan as it was known in the days before the Modern nation state was incorporated into the burgeoning Islamic polity under the reign of Uthman. During the first fitna Tang representative Peroz and the remainder of the Sassanid military apparatus expelled the Muslims and the rule was restored in the reign of the Umayyad's. specifically Muawiya, and remained in the orbit of the Umayyad and later Abbasid caliphate for many centuries and it was in Afghanistan with the local inhabitants, where the Genghiz khan was on the brink of defeat but he managed to pay off the heads of the tribes so that he and his men could get safe passage through. When the British as part of the great game in the nineteenth century attempted to take Afghanistan to sure up its Indian colony and block Russia from its place in the sun the army was not decimated but annihilated and only one man was left to tell the tale to the reinforcing British.

In terms of human history Afghanistan is very important geographically and was where it suffered its first defeat and was the host to many important world events such as the emergence of the Huns and the Mongols. Turkmen were a nomadic people, pastoralists in their occupation, this state of affairs was drastically changed by environmental changes which caused them to burst forth and change the face of the world. Of course in the future Afghanistan is poised to benefit from the rich mineral resources that the land mass sits on especially with the integration into the Belt and Road Initiative if it can overcome its security issues.

As it did elsewhere in the non western world, the onslaught of modernity brought with it a reaction, the top down approach taken by the rulers across the islamic world created a pushback. The last king of Afghanistan Zahir Shah was very vocal in his attempts to introduce modernity into Afghanistan, so much so that he decided to make a show of discarding one of his wives burka by calling a meeting of nobles and symbolically removing them stepping on the offending burka. Ostensibly as a sign of modernity.

This caused a lot of consternation from the tribal conservative population. Of course, this agitation was somewhat subdued with the usual excuses of "having to obey the wali al amr" "not rebelling against the ruler" and "preventing tribulations and dissension". As a corollary of modernity, communist groups started to form in Afghanistan, the most prominent being Khalq which in the eastern form of Persian known as Dari means people or masses. This party could even boast members of the royal family among its membership. In 1975 there was a palace coup in which the nephew held the reigns of power with the blessing and support of the communists, it was but a matter of years until the communists turned on the titular head of Afghanistan and reverted to a communist state proper. It was this communist regime which was in power on the eve of the Soviet invasion. At this point the rebellion in the mountainous regions began before the soviet invasion, against the communist government in Kabul. It was the government who sought support from the Soviets in facing the rebels.

This form of international affairs is the norm where the legally recognized authority in the state seeks support from allies. A modern example would be Saudi Arabia's **stayed – feigned or perceived?** legitimacy in destroying Yemen as it was invited by Hadi, similarly the Syrian government inviting the Russians in for support.

In terms of international law the Soviet's involvement in Afghanistan was without a speck of dust, around the same time as the soviet involvement in Afghanistan in the late 70's the Iranian revolution occurred as well as the siege of Makkah but juhayman and his group. America saw an opportune moment to serve the soviets with a Vietnam type quagmire. Reeling from defeat of the failure of American forces in Vietnam the US economy took a huge hit which forced Nixon's hand in removing the gold standard from the dollar.

America had suffered its biggest defeat to date in Vietnam and the defeat led to questioning the western model which had been in the ascendancy since after the First World War, indeed the official date of the end to the caliphate was 1924 in reality the caliphate collapsed some fifty years earlier when the secularists took power in the form of the Committee of Union and Progress and then later the Young Turks. The alliance between the Ottomans and Germany did not occur with the approval of the caliph but by the grand vizier of the time who was himself a secularist.

The communist takeover in Afghanistan was an opportune moment to provide the Soviets with their version of Vietnam, the Chief architect behind the plan was Zbigniew Brzezinski who is on record as saying that military strategists were seeking another way to bankrupt and overstretch the Soviets. Every Soviet offence to take back areas which had been claimed by the resistance was rebuffed through the foreign support that the resistance had. The overarching strategy was to rid the world of a strategic competitor. There was also a golden opportunity to utilise the Islamist block which had been cultivated in the reign of King Faisal and used against Gamal Abdel Nasser in a very devious way beneficial to the house of Saud. Fahd realised that the Juhayman incident expressed a dissatisfaction amongst some quarters within Saudi society. The dissatisfaction could be directed outside of the kingdom.

The intelligence services in Saudi Arabia did not act alone or without direction. Turki bin Faisal was head of the intelligence services at the time, however he acted only in accordance with the will of King Fahd who was in close communication with the American ambassador who would regularly visit King Fahd. After the communist takeover in Afghanistan, the Islamic world was up in arms at the communist aggression against Muslims, not much, if any, emphasis was put on the American strategic planning in the region. The Pakistanis were thoroughly integrated into the American alliance and became the conduit through which arms and financial support reached the 'mujahideen' in Afghanistan. This was only achieved after the Pakistanis convinced the Americans of their indispensable nature, the tribal Afghans would not take too well to foreigners and so the Pakistanis would be the bridge.

Pakistan's interest was in preventing the spread of communism, being of course firmly within the US orbit, their strategic plan overlapped with the US. After partition the US stepped in as a supporter for Pakistan and with India becoming the arch nemesis of Pakistan and as a strategic threat, Afghanistan was seen as even more important to the area. The Egyptians were also able to send their extremists into Afghanistan as was Jordan and other countries in the Arab world as well as Balkan countries. This was beneficial for the states as they could grow closer to the US, providing support for a US strategic end as well as rid themselves and their societies of the extremists elements who could stoke up tensions within the country and destabilise the various regimes.

So the US, Saudi Arabia and Pakistan for divergent reasons engaged in the crucible of war that was Afghanistan. The Saudis being especially pleased that any supporters of Juhayman would be morally compelled to go and spend their energy on the atheist communist Soviets in Afghanistan killing their brothers and sisters in faith. Of course a lot of people were asking where was the struggle for Palestine? Where was the support from the state institutions for our Palestinian brothers and sisters? The response was one of impracticality due to the support of the US for Israel. All the major factions within the Saudi society were convinced that this war was a legitimate war. It was only the Hizb Tahrir who were politically cynical enough to call out the war as an American stratagem which only fed the interests of the Americans to the detriment of the Muslims as the events were unfolding. The Sururist were parroting what the followers of Ibn Baz were saying that the war in Afghanistan was a legitimate avenue to support materially and physically. Azzam wrote a book entitled "the signs of the merciful in the struggle of the Afghan" (ayaat al Rahman fi jihaad al afghan) which supposedly elucidated some of the 'miracles' of the battlefield which served to create more zeal for those who were present in Afghanistan and inspire many more to join them.

Bin Laden was one of those inspired, originally an MB/Sururist member, went into Afghanistan with substantial sums of money, raising the profile of the Afghanistan war with OBL receiving a two page spread in major publications, significantly raising the profile of his family, himself and the Afghanistan struggle. His elder brother Bakr was a regular attendee at King Fahd's majalis, meeting King Fahd in a poker match.

The Salafi dawah and the Wahhabi school is what established the Saudi state and is a result of the dawah and not the other way around. The state then went on to sponsor the dawah in order to preserve the state and expand the state and justify the state. The Ikhwan started their rebellion and were put down by Abdel Aziz and the British. The religious establishment came out with religious rulings/opinions which prevented any rebellion and did not state the circumstances where rebellion would be justified. This state of affairs continued until the 70's when the Muslim Brotherhood sought refuge from the Gamal Abdel Nasser regime.

The Muslim Brotherhood then spread a Salafi inspired ideology to the rest of the Islamic world through the

propagation of a book written by Ibn Taymiyya which gave the ideology intellectual weight, as Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab and Ibn Taymiyya do not compare at all. One was a preacher and the other was a thinker and philosopher who despite his many shortcomings and absurd positions remains a thinker and philosopher. These were then spread across the Islamic world on the cheap and sometimes even free as a gift from King Saud (the predecessor to King Faisal) and contributed to the development of jihadist thinking.

This jihadist ideology owes a lot to Salih Sirriya, an Egyptian HT member who attempted a coup against Sadat aiming to kill the man. Salih Sirriya contravened HT norms that the political group HT would not engage in military actions which would be left to the mass of people or the military themselves to overthrow the current order and usher in the caliphate. The fallout from the operation ended with Salih being killed as well over 100 people involved in the attempted coup, was the start of the modern jihadist phenomena. Sayyid Qutb simply focused on Hakamiyya which is accepted by Muslims across the world, he mentions a narration that is sahih from Jafar as-Sadiq that if people ask if a group from among the people said to Allah and his Prophet PBUH why did you order such a thing then they would be mushrikeen. This is a point accepted by all Muslims. Hukm in the end resorts to Allah and the sultan is but an enforcer of this ultimate end.

Fundamentally any book of Islamic jurisprudence be it Sunni or Shia or Hanafi or Shafi'i as within the Sunni school there are two ways of approaching jurisprudence, the way favoured by the Hanafis has been to build upon juz'iyat then reaching the kulliyat and the Shafi'i have preferred to build on specific Usool which results in juz'iyat. Within the Shia perspective and the baab al hukm there is no Hakim or ruler besides Allah. It is an elementary point in Islam. The issue Qutb attempted to address is what do we do as Muslims when the state structures and political bodies are ruling by other than Islam, be it in punishment as well as the banking system. What are the limitations on rebellion and what are the conditions and limitations of rebellion, historically this has always been an issue even the time of Hajjaj at Jamajam the most esteemed of the Salaf went out against the ruler and they were not khawaarij, Zayd Ibn Ali was not a khawaarij nor was Muhammad Nafs az-Zakiyya.

When the afghans were receiving support from jamaat islamiyya in Egypt its titular head was Zawahri, OBL was influenced somewhat by the jamaat but OBL was more brotherhood leaning. The Islamists across the Arab world found an outlet for their ideology, a foreign invader of a Muslim land and the leash had been removed. The intellectual movement ceased, some of those personalities who were Salafi went to Afghanistan and turned into Salafi Jihadists such as Abu Qatada from Palestine. The Salafi Jihadists were characterised by their insistence that jihad was the way to establish the Islamic system and this jihad was not only directed to polytheists and kufar outside but also apostates and hypocrites within. It is another characteristic that Salafi jihadists refer to governments as kafir, the most prominent amongst the Salafi jihadists are Zawahri, Abu Qatada and Muhammad al Maqdisi and in terms of groups.

The more intellectual factions from within Salafiyya focus on study of hadith and the books of the predecessors be it books of tafsir, ilm al rijal etc. Nayef was focused on rearing a new generation of Islamists who would tow the ideological line and not cause any dissension in the kingdom seeking to solidify the connection between obeying the ruler and obeying Allah. Of course, supporting foreign forces against their sovereign governments created murmurings of hypocrisy.

The person of Mohammed Jahmi was the man for the job. He made it clear that the single most important issue is obeying the wali al amr and that the Muslim wali al amr was beyond being held to account as the security of the state is of paramount importance.