



“They stole the Caliphate”

and their hands were not cut off from the opposite side!

Many late historians became increasingly lenient with the emergence of the Ottoman Empire regarding the history of the title of the Caliphate and its transfer to the era of modern history, including neglecting the terms of the Caliphate and not checking their availability in the political application of this Islamic position. Thus, they manipulated the title and granted it to someone who did not deserve it, its legal concept, and it was emptied of its true meaning that it was created upon its appearance in the first Islamic state. The title of the Caliphate became subject to the convictions of the Sultans of the Turanian state and their whims. They use it when they saw the importance of being called the Caliphs. When the sultan was indifferent to it, it had no effect during his reign. Some of them were even dubbed the Sultan and the Caliph at the same time, to use whatever he wanted according to the requirements of the state and the situation. All this was to preserve his prestige in history and before the world, and lie to them as well. This has created confusion among historians in the overlap between the title of Sultan and Caliph. Historians have conflicted choices for them, so you see the same historian one time calling them caliphs and another time calling them sultans.

In the Ottoman Empire, the "Caliphate" was subject to the whims of the sultans by seducing and intimidating historians.

From this, we can understand that some historians were not reluctant to grant the first Ottomans the title of caliphs, until the people accepted the claim that the last successors of the Banu al-Abbas in Cairo, Al-Mutawakkil 'ala Allah, made a concession to Salim I (926 AH / 1520 AD). For them, the matter has become without a concept, conditions, or value for this position.

Forcing to recuse, not to abdicate:

As for the historical manner in which the title of Caliph was transferred to the Royal Court, there are no convincing reasons or logical explanations on which the relevant neutral researcher relies. However, the documented story about this was deceived by the collusion between the sultans and the subservience of historians to the prestige of the Ottoman Empire, which seems great in their eyes. Corruption and conspiracies lie within the Ottoman Empire and reveal its truth. These historians attribute the appointment of the Ottomans to the caliphs to the moment of Salim I's seizure of Cairo, and the overthrow of the Mamluk state in (923 AH / 1517 AD). Later historians of them assert, inaccurately, that Al-Mutawakkil 'ala Allah (Died: 950 AH / 1543 AD) ceded the Caliphate to Salim I. This matter and that incident have no validity in the historical sources that contemplated the event, as the narration in them is completely contrary to what has been mentioned, and opposes it at many times.

Historians have many sayings about this story. For example, the doctor Ali Hassoun asserts in his book on the Ottoman Empire that the Abbasid caliph gave up the Caliphate to Salim I and handed over the prophetic holdings: the banner and the Burdah, and that the Sharif of Mecca "Abu Numay bin Barakat" (Died: 992 AH / 1584 AD) came to Egypt and offered his obedience to the Sultan after he handed him over the Keys of the Two Holy Mosques. Thus, he says verbatim: "And from that time on he became the caliph of the Muslims.". But Hassoun, in order to get away from the fact that Salim I insulted Al-Mutawakkil 'ala Allah and dealt with him in a way not befitting the Abbasid Caliph of Qurayshi lineage, said that Al-Mutawakkil was sent to Istanbul with his family and some of the senior Mamluks, and when rumors spread between them, Salim was forced to imprison him.

The matter developed for Mansour Abdel Hakim, so that he said in his book that the Caliphate was open to the aspirations of all who sought it. He says that the idea of the Caliphate struck the dreams of Salim the First, so he sought to attack Egypt, the seat of the Abbasid Caliph, who gave up his right to Caliphate to Salim, even though Salim had declared himself caliph in Damascus before that. Abdul Hakim asserts that since that date, every Ottoman sultan has been called Amir Al Mo'menin and Caliph of Muslims, and from that time the Ottoman Empire moved from the Sultanate to the Caliphate.

A dream like a nightmare:

Wadih Abu Zaidoun has in his book: "Tarikh Al Imbratoriya Al Othmania Mn Al-Ta'sis Ela Al-Sokout," an understanding of the Caliphate, its connotations, and its conditions that are unclear to him. This is because when he discussed the issue of Bayezid II (died: 918 AH / 1512 AD), the father of Salim and the problem of his sons and their disagreement, he addressed the topic with the children of Bayezid and the dilemma of the Caliphate (Abu Zaidoun, 2011). In another part of the book, he deliberately reversed the historical facts reported by contemporary sources of Salim I's entry into Aleppo. He mentioned that the people of Aleppo did not allow the Mamluk army, which had withdrawn after the battle of Marj Dabiq in 922 AH / 1516 AD, to enter their city (Al-Rimal, 1998), but Salim entered it like the conquerors. On the contrary, the sources confirm the atrocities that Salim and his army practiced in Aleppo and all the other cities they entered after the ouster of the Mamluks, and that Aleppo was mainly affected by the betrayal of its ruler Khair bey, who agreed with Salim on the betrayal of Qansuh al-Ghuri (Died: 922 AH / 1516 AD). It is certain that his soldiers would conquer the city to the Ottomans without resistance, and the people did not welcome them completely (Abu Zaidoun). As for the succession of Salim I, he says about it: "Salim took the title of Caliphate and the Sultanate together, but this was not recognized except within the borders of the Ottoman Empire, and the Ottoman Caliph Sultan became the greatest figure in Islam at that time, as he inherited the status of the caliphs of Baghdad and the tsars of Byzantium together." (Abu Zaidoun, 82, 2011). He only mentioned the word "inherited" and did not refer to the abdication of the Caliphate. Rather, he mentioned that Salim had taken it for himself, as if it were a possession that he could take away. In another book, he says that one of the members of the court in the Ottoman Empire during the reign of Salim mentioned that Salim deserves the Caliphate, for seeing the Prophet Muhammad in his dream during his sleep when he decided to carry out his campaign against Egypt, and another dream of one of the Sultan's friends, in which he saw - as he said - the following text: "While we were sitting at the threshold as the door was knocked, I went to look at the door, and found it opened, and behind it a large number of people whose faces were enlightened, and their parts were Arabic, and they were standing waiting, holding the banner and the weapon, and at the entrance to the door there were four people with their faces lit, and the banner was in the hand of one of them. As for the one who knocked on the door, he carried the Sultan's white flag in his hand, and said to me: Do you know why we came here? This great crowd that you saw, they are the companions of the Prophet Muhammad and we are his messengers to you, and he recites Salim Khan the peace, and he says: Get up and faster, for you have been granted the service of the Two Holy Mosques, and the four people that you have seen are the Rightly Guided Caliphs, the first is Abu Bakr Al-Siddiq, the second of them is Umar Al-Faruq, and the third is Uthman, and I am Ali bin Abi Talib. Tell Salim Khan what I told you. Suddenly they were out of sight, and my family woke me up while I was sweating. ".

Dreams and visions have been accustomed to the readers and writers of Ottoman history since Artgrel (Died: 680 AH / 1281 AD) and his son Othman (Died: 726 AH / 1324 AD), founder of their emirate, to the reign of Abdul Hamid II (Died: 1336 AH / 1918 AD). As such dreams and visions are intended - always - to give sanctity to their family and their sultans, given that their sultanate is within the framework of the sacred divine truth. Regardless of the mention of visions and dreams and the extent of their validity, their contradictions and similarities throughout the history of the Ottomans make them abhorrent to the reader because through them they try to justify the sanctity that they surround themselves with.

Ali bin Abi Talib did not hand over the Caliphate to "Salim" except as a Turanian dream.

If we go back to a closer reading of this dream about the advent of the Rightly Guided Caliphs to Salim the First - assuming that it actually happened - we will find that Salim did not compare himself with the later caliphs, but jumped until he came after Ali bin Abi Talib. Because Ali, may Allah bless him, was the one who delivered the banner - as it was quoted from him - and that means that he surpassed Omar bin Abdulaziz (Died: 720 AH / 1320 AD). In addition to the fact that these dreams, which are closer to the fabrication orchestrated than the fact that they occurred in a dream, were intended by the Ottoman sultans. Thus, they want to confirm two important matters: The first is that what Salim did in terms of extracting the Caliphate falls within the framework of Islamic law, and that is the heart of concepts. The second thing is: incorrectly convincing people that the Ottomans were legitimate caliphs, just like the Rightly Guided Caliphs, Umayyads, and Abbasids, while they contradict one of the important conditions in the Quraishi lineage.

A return to Caliphate conditions:

If we moved to the Turkish historians they spared no effort in the abuse of the truth, with weak explanations for Caliphate transmission to the Ottomans. Here is the Turkish historian Khalil Inaljik (1437 Hijri- 2016 AD) says that the annexation of the Arabian region especially Mecca and Medina to the Ottoman empire is the reason why the Ottoman Empire became a Caliphate, and it moved from the concept of the border state to the concept of that its sultans considered themselves as the protectors of the Islamic world. This explanation is prosaic and courteous, this protection - As claimed by Inaljik- doesn't mean necessarily a justification for describing their country as the caliph State - if it is in the ideal shape which is as they mention, not the imperfect historical reality.

For how is it consistent in reason and logic to this alleged protection and the failure of the Ottoman state to support the Muslims of Andalusia, turning a blind eye to the campaigns of the Portuguese and those who came after them from the Europeans to the Arab Gulf, and their neglect of the interior regions in the Arab world such as the middle of the Arabian Peninsula, which was not counted among the interests of the state. To face its fate for centuries, while the importance was focused on the important, commercially rich Arab regions.

There is another group of historians who are not different from the previous group in respect to their target. They made rules for the Islamic Caliphate in proportion to the sultans of the Ottoman Empire. In addition, they agreed with their ambitions (The Sultrans Ambition). Like what Mohammed Al-Obeidi mentioned that the evidence is clear that the Islamic Caliphate it came after prophetic and prophecies. Also, it is a necessary fulfilled by the Ottoman empire.

It a duty in the Islamic law before any religious duty which fulfilled by the Ottoman empire from two aspects: The first, choosing wise people, Or the agreement of the Imam before, and because Al-Obeidi's saying is in the orbit of the Ottoman Empire and within the political propaganda that it aspired to during the author's period; His saying is not surprising in burying the truth, and in presenting and delaying religious duties according to political whim, and his saying is confirmed by the following: " Allah permitted youth after ageing, health after illness, a lot happened to who will live in the heavens Sultan Sleem khan, Mohammed Abu AL Barakat sent him the keys of the two Holy Mosques when he was in Egypt so he was the first holder of this title Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques, then he pledged allegiance to the Caliphate - abandoning it - the third, last Abbasid caliph Al-Mutwakel Alla Allah in the Hagia Sophia mosque, to fill in the testimonies of the king's men and common Muslims, and he was the first caliph of that good family, and that was in 922 and then it is still in its heels until now and still, Inshallah, to the end of time".

Of course, everything that Al-Obeidi and Inaljik said has nothing to do with the historical reality, and none of the contemporary historical sources of the event dealt with it, but rather a modern fabrication, and what was taught in history to justify the conquest of Slem I of the Caliphate, as the Caliph Almutawakel Alla Allah did not concede to him with it. It does not mean that the two Holy Mosques are affiliated politically to the Ottoman state, their entitlement to the Caliphate, and if only such a matter was really a rule, the race in Islamic history over political control of the Two Holy Mosques became fierce and clear, but this matter was not in the terms of the Caliphate or its concept.

Contemporary sources are the most truthful:

This twisted variable course in writing the history of the Ottoman Empire may be justified by some as religious fervor and passion raged towards the attitude towards the colonial attack, given that European colonialism transformed concepts gradually until they were changed and replaced, and much of history was absent, and another history was placed in its place that did not depend on original sources, although the writings of some of them invoke these sources and they did not review or discuss them, which calls for the return of the analogue in all what was written in that era, a historian like Saeed Al-Ghamdi referred to these contemporary sources without reviewing and examining them accurately, as he says: The Ottoman sultans inherited the title of the Caliphate according to the consensus of most sources, and that in the early period of the Ottoman state; the sultans did not care to manifest the quality of the Caliphate, so the Caliphate lost its stature in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries for political, religious and other reasons, but the truth confirms the opposite of what Al-Ghamdi mentioned, and that many significant sources that lived in this era and documented it did not mention this inheritance, for example, Ibn Tulun, a contemporary of Salim I, used to begin documenting the events of each year with one saying, for example, while talking about the year (924 Hijri / 1518), he says: "I started, and the Caliph, Amir al-Mu'minin, who trusts in God, Abu Abdullah Muhammad ibn al-Mustamsek Bellah, Abi Al-Sabr Yaqoub al-Abbasi." In reference to the Caliphate in the Abbasids did not leave them, and this continued throughout the reign of Salim I, who was called the king of the Romans, and if Al-Mutawakil had abdicated to Salim, Ibn Tulun would not have dared to continue describing Al-Mutawakil as the caliph and Amir al-Mu'minin.. In addition, Ibn Iyas did not mention (Died: 930 Hijri / 1524 AD) a contemporary of Salim's occupation of Egypt in his book "Bada'i' al-zuhur fi waqa'i' al-duhur" as the title of the Caliphate was not associated with any Ottoman sultan, Also Muhammad Al-Ghazi (Died: 1061 Hijri / 1651 AD) in his book "Al-Kwakeb Al-Sae'ra Bayan Al-Me'a Al-Ashera." When he translated for Salim I, he never referred to him as the Caliph, he just described him as the Sultan. In addition, Abd al-Malik al-Essami who referred (Died: 1111 Hijri / 1700 AD) in "Samt al-Nujoom Al-Awali fi Anba' al-Awa'il wa al-Tuwali" to Salim I as a king and a sultan.

Such evidence from the ancestral sources; contemporary to the ruling era of Salim I, along with others similar to it, which indicates beyond a reasonable doubt that the sources that emerged the Ottomans as caliphs were all written under the shade of the Ottoman Empire, as no historian would dare to write what provokes the Sultanate and the sultan who was being treated and described with some holiness.

In an attempt by some historians to defend the Ottoman Empire that it was subject to a fierce attack of hatred and fraud by the Europeans to distort it in the eyes of new generations, practicing the same error; but on the other hand; as confusion and causing ambiguity to the reader implies defamation of history, where emphasizing the Caliphate of the Ottoman Empire and placing it in a later historical context makes us marvel at this thesis that is far from scientific logic, which establishes the dismantling of history and discussing it in fragmented contexts instead of mixing them and losing intentions of the historical narrative, with the aim of serving a preconceived idea and a settled approach. Another team went to link the Caliphate with the Ottomans through the project of Abdul Hamid II; represented by the Islamic University because this project was an attempt by him to create a single association for Muslims under his rule to stand against the colonial movement, resist Arab nationalists, and his direction to strengthen the Caliphate and restore its prestige through this university, while it was possible for Abdul Hamid to pursue the idea of the Islamic University without confirming his Caliphate in which the conditions were not fulfilled in Sharia, in addition to not having a historical right.

The Islamic University was a bridge to the title "Caliph".

The Caliphate was stolen from Abbasid Cairo to the non-Arab Ottoman; Istanbul, and it became like a fez that the Ottoman Sultan wears whenever he wants and desires, and a sword to be drawn out according to the situation and the condition, and even employed the title of "Caliph" politically against the outside hostile to the state of Istanbul and inside against the Arab renaissance and the aspirations of the Arab peoples to return to their original Arabness and their pure Islam, and he forgot that the truth cannot be stolen, otherwise it would not be a truth.

References:

1. Ibn Zanjul al-Rammal, Akherat Al-Mamalik: The Case of Sultan Al-Ghuri with Salim Al-Othmani, edited by: Abdel Monem Amer, 2nd Edition (Cairo: The Egyptian General Book Authority, 1998)
2. Jan Albijsong, Basmat Khalida fi Al-Tarikh Al-Othmani, translated by Abeer El-Shenawy (Cairo: Dar El-Nile, 2015).
3. Khalil Inaljik, Tarikh Al-Dawla Al-Othmania min Al-nsho' Ela Al-Enidar, Translated by Muhammad Arnaout (Beirut: Dar Al-Mada Al-Islami, 2002).
4. Ali Hassoun, Tarikh Al-Dawla Al-Othmania, 3rd Edition (Beirut: The Islamic Office, 1994)
5. Magda Makhlouf, Al-Khilafa fi Khatat Ataturk (Cairo: Dar Al-Afaq, 2002)
6. Muhammad Al-Obeidi, Habl Al-E'tasam wa wjoub Al-Khilafa fi dein Al-Islam (Beirut: The Scientific Press, 1916)
7. Muhammad Al-Ghazzi, Al-Kwakeb Al-Sae'ra Bayan Al-Me'a Al-Ashera (Beirut: Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyya, 1997)
8. Muhammad Ibn Tulun, Moufakhat Al-Khelan fi Hawadeth Al-zaman (Beirut: Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyya, 1998).
9. Mansour Abdel Hakim, Al-Dawla Al-Othmania min Al-Imara Ela Al-Khilafa, 3rd Edition (Cairo: Arab Book House, 2013).
10. Wadih Abu Zaidoun, Tarikh Al-Dawla Al-Othmania min Al-Ta'sis Ela Al-Sogout, 2nd ed (Amman: Eligibility for Publishing, 2011).