Chapter 5
A Fatal Wound to the Head

Introduction. It should have killed him. The beast should have died.

The beast is satan’s masquerade, the cloak under which he covers. A wound to the head should have proved fatal – not just to the head, but to the beast from whom the head protrudes.

The beast? The beast is Islam – it should never have survived a wound to its head. But it did.

The head? The head is Muhammad. His untimely death should have ended Islam. But it didn’t.

Here is what the Bible says will happen. Here is what history says has happened. And here is how the two become one, and we will lay yet another piece to our puzzle!

The Beast from the Sea and the 4th Beast of Daniel 7 - They are One and the Same! We move now to the New Testament book of Revelation. The author is the Apostle John, the “beloved” of Christ (John 21:20, Revelation 1:1). In our previous chapters, our primary focus was on Revelation 12, Daniel 2, and Daniel 7. We established the existence of a spiritual war, i.e., a holy war, waged throughout periods of human history by the great red dragon, satan, against the children of God (Revelation 12:17).

Chapter 13 has this holy war in view as it introduces the “beast from the sea.”

Revelation 13:1 “... And I saw a beast coming up out of the sea, having ten horns and seven heads, and on his horns were ten diadems, and on his heads were blasphemous names. 2 And the beast which I saw was like a leopard, and his feet were like those of a bear, and his mouth like the mouth of a lion. And the dragon gave him his power and his throne and great authority.”

Here is what the text means. The beast is satan’s alter-ego, i.e., he acts in satan’s place with all the rights, power and authority of satan. The beast is of the same “nature” as the 4th beast of Daniel 7. We can conclude this by virtue of the presence of common characteristics on both beasts:

1. Ten horns (Daniel 7:7 and Revelation 13:1)
2. Blasphemies against God (Daniel 7:25 and Revelation 13:5)
3. Beast is like a leopard (Daniel 7:6 and Revelation 13:2), has feet like a bear (Daniel 7:5 and Revelation 13:2), and a mouth like a lion (Daniel 7:4 and Revelation 13:2).

The common “nature” of the two beasts is that they are both Islamic. The beast from the sea is a “composite” of the first three beasts of Daniel 7, all of which were defeated by the 4th beast of Daniel 7. The combined strength and brutality of historical Babylon, Persia, and Greece is communicated through the combined characteristics of the beast from the sea.¹ These three kingdoms were all destroyed and consumed by Islam.²
The beast from the sea and the 4th beast of Daniel 7 are both Islam by virtue of their common characteristics; but they depict Islam at different time periods. Daniel 7 depicts Islam in two stages – its birth (Daniel 7:7-8; 19-20); and its death and judgment (Daniel 7:9-11; 24-26). Revelation 13:1-10 depicts Islam throughout human history. This depiction includes Muhammad as its head; and continues through all seven of Islam’s successive empires. We will begin our review with Muhammad as the “head that dies.” Then, we will identify the six empires that succeed him for a total of seven heads of the ten horned beast from the sea.

The Head that Dies. A seven headed beast with ten horns. How do you even draw such a beast? What do you do with the three extra horns? Are the ten horns on the seven heads? If so, which heads don’t have a horn? What about the ten diadems? Is one diadem on one horn?

Pretty confusing wouldn’t you say? The ten horns, the ten diadems, and the seven heads, are present for a reason; and, each must be met to determine the identity of this beast.

The seven heads – One thing is clear – one of the heads is very significant. This head is the only one of the seven that seems to warrant special mention. The text tells us that the head is slain. Why is the death of this head so important that it is worth making special mention of?

The head represents Muhammad. His death should have ended Islam. But it did not.

Here is the text.

Revelation 13:3, “I saw one of his heads as if it had been slain, and his fatal wound was healed. . .”

One of the leaders (a head of the beast) dies. Yet, there is a healing that takes place. At first glance, one might read the text to mean that the head, i.e., the leader, is healed from his fatal wound. Look again. Does “his” refer to the “head” or to the “beast” from whom the head protrudes? One might expect a wound to the head to impact the body the head is attached to. Consider two more verses to help clarify the meaning:

Revelation 13:12, “. . .And he (the beast from the earth) makes the earth . . . to worship the first beast, whose fatal wound was healed. . . . 14 “And he deceives those who dwell on the earth . . telling those who dwell on the earth to make an image to the beast who had the wound of the sword and has come to life.”

Notice. Both verses 12 and 14 refer to the “beast” not the “head” as the one whose wound is healed.” The head dies; but, the wounded beast recovers.

Here is what happened when Muhammad died. According to the traditional biography of Muhammad, in 632AD, Muhammad died unexpectedly after complaining of headaches.3 Within ten years of the Hijra (migration from Mecca to Medina and inception of the Islamic era) and culminating with his claim of Mecca, Muhammad had calmed all of the Arabian Peninsula and united them under one god, Allah.4 The people
groups that comprised Islam at that time were nomadic bedouin tribes whose history within the Arabian Peninsula was comprised of fiercely independent clans, co-existing in the midst of constant battles and tribal conflicts. Islam, at Muhammad’s death, had not made advances outside of Arabia. Muhammad had, in fact, united a people group never before united under one banner. Karen Armstrong describes Muhammad’s success as follows:

“When Muhammad died in 632, in the arms of his beloved wife, Aisha, almost all the tribes of Arabia had joined the ummah (the “community” of Islam) as confederates or as converted Muslims. Since members of the ummah could not, of course, attack one another, the ghastly cycle of tribal warfare, of vendetta and counter-vendetta, had ended. Single handedly, Muhammad had brought peace to the war-torn Arabia.”

The Ridda Wars. In spite of having united Arabia through Islam, Muhammad’s feat was all but reversed upon his death. A crisis erupted. Muhammad not appointed a successor prior to his death. The Islamic empire was composed of bedouin nomads whose history together as Muslims was short lived and predicated upon Muhammad’s continued leadership as Messenger of Allah. When Muhammad died, all that had been accomplished by Muhammad was near to be lost. Historian Peter Stearns describes the situation this way,

“But when Muhammad died suddenly in 632, it appeared that his religion might disappear. . . . Many of the bedouin tribes that had converted to Islam renounced the new faith in the months after Muhammad’s death, and his remaining followers quarreled over who should succeed him. Although these quarrels were never fully resolved, the community managed to find new leaders who directed a series of campaigns to force those who had abandoned the faith to return to the fold (the “Ridda Wars”).

Abu Bakr was elected the first caliph (successor) to Muhammad. Historian Bernard Lewis describes the crisis Abu Bakr faced:

The first task of the new regime was to counter by military action a movement among the tribes known as the Ridda . . . This word, which means apostasy . . . (signified) the refusal of the tribes to recognize the succession of Abu Bakr. (It was, in effect,) not so much a relapse by converted Muslims to their previous paganism, but rather the simple and automatic termination of a political contract by the death of one of the parties. . . . Having taken no part in the election of Abu Bakr, they apparently felt no obligation to him, and at once suspended both tribute and treaty relations. To restore the hegemony of Medina, Abu Bakr had to make new treaties. While some of the nearer tribes accepted these, the more distant ones refused, and Abu Bakr was compelled to make military subjugation of the tribes a prelude to their reconversions.

Islamic Jihad Outside Arabia. In the months of the Ridda wars, Abu Bakr’s efforts to restore the apostates to Islam were impacted by an unintended benefit. Islam was successful in raiding parties in mighty non-Arabian lands, including Iraq, Syria, and parts of Palestine. The successful conquest of non-Arabian lands motivated the apostate Arabians to return to Islam. They saw the unexpected success as
the favor of God, and the possibility for the return of prosperity through plunder that had been theirs under Muhammad’s leadership. Bernard Lewis summarizes:

The wars of Ridda, begun as a war of reconversion, developed into a war of conquest which ultimately led far beyond the boundaries of Arabia. The two conquests, on the one hand of Arabia itself, on the other of the neighboring provinces of Iraq, Syria, and Egypt, were simultaneous and interlinked, not successive. The Arabian tribes might never have been conquered had not the conquests in the north provided an attractive solution to the internal economic problems of the Peninsula. The first northern expeditions were merely raiding parties aimed at plunder, not conquest. The latter only followed when the weakness of the enemy was revealed. . . .”

Here is how Karen Armstrong describes the unifying effort to Islam of the successful conquest of non-Arabian lands.

“Under Umar’s leadership, therefore, the Arabs burst into Iraq, Syria, and Egypt, achieving a series of astonishing victories. . . . The Muslims were victorious (over the Syrians) at the Battle of Yarmuk (636) . . ., conquering Jerusalem in 638, and controlled the whole of Syria, Palestine and Egypt by 641. . . . This expansion continued. . . . The experience of conquest enhanced their sense that something tremendous had happened to them. Membership of the umma was thus a transcendent experience, because it went beyond anything they had known or could have imagined in the old tribal days. Their success also endorsed the message of the Qur’an, which had asserted that a correctly guided society must prosper because it was in tune with God’s law. Look what had happened once they had surrendered to God’s will. Where Christians discerned God’s hand in apparent failure and defeat when Jesus died on the cross, Muslims experienced political success as sacramental and as a revelation of the divine presence in their lives.”

Conclusion. The head that is slain is Muhammad who died in 632AD after leading Islam for ten short years. The Islamic faith should have disappeared following Muhammad’s death. But it did not. It recovered under Abu Bakr’s caliphate (632-634AD) and then Umar’s caliphate (634 - 644AD). Abu Bakr and Umar restored the Arabian apostates to Islam through the Ridda wars. Almost by accident, Islam experienced success outside of Arabia during this same period of time. The wounded beast was no more wounded. It had not only recovered, it had grown to a miraculous size. Islam was here to stay; and, the beast had only begun to feed.

The Seven Heads of the Beast. Having concluded that the “head that is slain” is that of Muhammad, we have a hint as to the meaning of the remaining six heads. They must be similar in function to that of Muhammad for they are all “heads.”

Consider the following list of the seven empires or dynasties that ruled Islamdom, beginning with Muhammad and the four “Rightly Guided Caliphs.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heads of the Beast</th>
<th>Muhammad and the Caliphates (or Empires) from the 7th Century AD to Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1                 | Muhammad (622 - 632AD), followed by his first four successors (the Rightly Guided Caliphs):  
|                   | Abu Bakr (632-634)  
|                   | Umar (634-644)  
|                   | Uthman (644-656)  
|                   | Ali (656-661)  
| 2                 | 1st Empire: Umayyads\(^{10}\) - Syria (661-749):  
|                   | Caliphs: Muawiya I, Yazid I, . . . , Marwan II  
| 3                 | 2nd Empire: Abbasids\(^{11}\) - Baghdad (749-932):  
|                   | Caliphs: Abu Abbas, al-Saffah, . . .  
| 4                 | 3rd Empire - Baghdad: Buyids\(^{12}\) (or Buwayids\(^{13}\)) (932-1055):  
|                   | Amirs: al-Qahir, . . . , al-Qaim  
|                   | 3rd Empire - Egypt: Fatimids\(^{14}\) (Isma'ilis) (909-1171):  
|                   | Caliphs: Ubayd Allay, . . .  
| 5                 | 4th Empire - Baghdad: Seljuk Turks\(^{15}\) (1055 - 1194):  
|                   | Sultans: al-Muqtadi, . . . , al-Mustasim  
|                   | 4th Empire - Egypt: Ayyubids\(^{16}\) (1169-1260)  
|                   | Sultans: Saladin . . .  
| 6                 | 5th Empire - Baghdad: Mongols\(^{17}\) (1258-1350)  
|                   | Sultans: Genghis Khan, . . .  
|                   | 5th Empire - Egypt: Mamluks\(^{18}\) (1260-1517) - Egypt and Syria  
|                   | Caliph: Baybers . . .  
| 7                 | 6th Empire: Ottomans\(^{19}\) (1342-1924):  
|                   | Sultans: Murad I, Mehmed II . . . , Mustafa Kemal Ataturk\(^{20}\)  

For the historians among us, a short history of each dynasty is found in the endnotes to the chapter. The seven empires above are the successive dynasties that led Islam following the death of Muhammad through the present day. In Islam’s earlier centuries, these dynasties were rooted in particular tribes or families of Arabia, e.g., the Umayyads, from the “Umayya family,” a leading family of Mecca\(^{21}\); and, then, in later centuries, in conquering families whose “homeland” was outside of Arabia, e.g., the Mongols or Ottomans. We cannot use the term “caliphate” to refer to these dynasties as the term is not used through all of Islam’s history. Similarly, the term, “caliph.” The Buyids used the term, “amir,” the Seljuks, Ayyubids, Mongols and Ottomans, used the term “sultan.”

The Rightly Guided Caliphs are not counted as four separate empires but as one with Muhammad. The
reason for this is as follows: Historians refer to the Umayyads as the 1st “dynasty” of Islam following the death of Muhammad. The first four caliphs, although considered successors to Muhammad, are not considered “dynasties” by historians but referred to as individual successors to Muhammad, each serving for a relatively short period of time (as compared to the tribe of the Ummayyads, for example, who served for 90 years; and, the Abbasids for 175 years).

In addition, in the 4th, 5th and 6th dynasties, there are two separate empires listed, yet, the two empires are counted as only one empire. The reason is because each ruled simultaneously with its counterpart, one in Baghdad and the other in Cairo, Egypt; and, both of which considered itself to be the center of true Islam for the same period of time.

Modern Day Dynasty or Caliphate? Did you notice that our table ended in 1924 with the Ottomans? So what happened after the Ottomans? What about a modern day “caliphate”? There is none, at least at present. Islam has not been under one dynasty or caliphate since the time of the Ottomans. What about the Saudis? The Saudis, led by the al-Saud royal family, do not lead Islam. The Saudis do serve as the “custodian” of the holy places, Mecca and Medina, but their role as custodian is a far cry from the role unifying Islam under one caliphate. But never think that because there is no modern day “caliphate” of Islam uniting both Sunni and Shiite sects, that this is not the aim of Islamic jihadists today. Look at this Associated Press report by FOXNews on July 5th 2007:

**BAGHDAD — Al Qaeda's deputy leader sought to bolster the terror network's main arm in Iraq in a new video released Thursday, calling on Muslims to rally behind it at a time when the group is on the defensive, faced with U.S. offensives and splits with other insurgent groups. Ayman Al-Zawahiri defended the Islamic State of Iraq — the insurgent umbrella group headed by Al Qaeda — against critics among Islamic militant groups, saying it was a vanguard for fighting off the U.S. military and eventually establishing a "caliphate" of Islamic rule across the region.**

Conclusion. Seven heads of the beast from the sea; seven successive caliphates for Islam. We have a match. Coincidence, you say? *Call it coincidence if you want, but for me, we have a match. . . and another piece to our puzzle.*

Ten Diadems on Ten Horns. Remember those ten diadems? We said we had to figure out what they represented also. Consider the text:

> NAS Revelation 13:1 *And he stood on the sand of the seashore. And I saw a beast coming up out of the sea, having ten horns and seven heads, and on his horns were ten diadems, and on his heads were blasphemous names.*

_Ten diadems. Not seven, but ten._

Go figure. *Count them yourself.* Go back to the table and count them. This time, count each dynasty individually, whether ruling alone or simultaneously in Cairo or Baghdad.
1. Muhammad (the first head with the first horn that is slain)
2. Umayyads (the second head with the second horn; and 1st dynasty)
3. Abbasids (the third head with the third horn; and 2nd dynasty)
4. Buyids (the fourth head with fourth horn; and 3rd dynasty)
5. Fatimids (the fourth head with fifth horn; and 3rd dynasty)
6. Seljuks (the fifth head with sixth horn; and 4th dynasty)
7. Ayyubids (the fifth head with seventh horn; and 4th dynasty)
8. Mongols (the sixth head with eighth horn; and 5th dynasty)
9. Mamluks (the sixth head with ninth horn; and 5th dynasty)
10. Ottomans (the seventh head with tenth horn; and 6th dynasty).

The seven heads each have a horn. In addition, the 4th, 5th, and 6th heads each have two horns. The three heads with two horns are shown in the table by two caliphs “competing” with one another – one from Baghdad, the other from Egypt. The diadems on each horn signify the representative caliph, sultan, amir, or king of the particular dynasty (just use whichever terms suits you). For this purpose, it really doesn’t matter that they served during the same time, just that they served. Their service is marked by the presence of a horn; the diadem represents the caliphate or dynasty.

Coincidence you say? No. For those who have eyes to see, we have laid yet another piece to our puzzle.
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1Robert L. Thomas, Revelation 8 - 22, An Exegetical Commentary, p. 156.

2Rome is oftentimes suggested as the identity of this beast since Rome was the next successor in conquest to Greece. See Robert L. Thomas, p. 156. However, Rome did not conduct a holy war against its opponents. Islam did; and, further, Islam conquered Rome.
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8Bernard Lewis, p. 50.


10Umayyads. The Umayyads were the first Islamic dynasty. Under the Umayyads, Mecca remained Islam’s holiest city, but the Islamic capital was established in Damascus, Syria, after the murder of Caliph Uthman. The Umayyad clan was comprised of descendants of Umayyah, a member of the Quraysh Tribe of Mecca. Caliph Uthman, the third of the Rightly Guided Caliphs, was a relative of Umayya, but not a descendant. Muawiya I (661) is considered as the first caliph of the Umayyads. It was Muawiya that opposed Ali and his sons, Hasan and Husayn, as legitimate caliphs of Islam. Under Muawiya I, and then his son, Yazid, the divide between Sunni and Shiite sects of Islam was solidified, reaching its peak in the Battle of Karbala, 680AD, when Ali’s son, Husayn, was brutally martyred along with his small band of followers. The Umayyad caliphs had the reputation of being cruel tyrants who favored their family members over other Muslims. The Dome of the Rock was constructed in 691AD by al-Malik, a Umayyad caliph. The rule of the Umayyads ended in 750AD when the Abbasids killed Caliph Marwan II at the Battle of the Zab River. See Glasse’, p. 408-409; 11, and Peter Stearns, et al., World Civilizations, The Global Experience, Volume I, Beginnings to 1750, p. 290.

11Abbasids. The Abbasids were the second dynasty of Islam. The Abbasids took their name from their clan – the House of Abbas. The patriarch of the clan was al-Abbas ibn `Abd al-Muttalib, the uncle of Muhammad. Hence, this clan claimed an indirect blood relationship with Muhammad, resulting in initial support among the Shiites. Al-Abbas led his armies in initial victories over the Umayyad armies in the mid-8th century. Al-Abbas recruited Shiites as his allies against the Umayyads by virtue of the claim of blood relationship to Muhammad. Persia and Iraq fell to the Abbasids in 750, and the ultimate victory was at the River Zab near the Tigris in 750 where the Umayyad Caliph Marwan II was killed. The Abbasids wanted to eliminate all future claim of the Umayyads and invited the remaining members of the Umayyads to a reconciliation banquet. As the Umayyads were enjoying the feast, the guards covered them with carpets and they were all slaughtered. See Peter Stearns, et al., World Civilizations, The Global Experience, Volume I, Beginnings to 1750, p. 294. Shortly after their defeat of the Umayyads, the Abbasids moved the capital to Baghdad in 762. They enthroned themselves as caliph and began persecution of the Shiites who had allied with them against the Umayyads. They sought to purge the various strands of Shiism from Islam. See Glasse, p. 11, and Bernard Lewis, Arabs in History, pp. 84f.

12Buyids. The Buyids were Shiites of Persian origin. In 945 they invaded the heartlands of the Abbasid Empire and captured Baghdad. The Buyids chose not to depose the Abbasid caliphs, but rather, to retain them to legitimize their own reign. The Abbasid caliphs were merely figure heads under Buyid reign. The Buyids controlled the caliph and his court but could do little to preserve the Islamic empire from further disintegration. They were supplanted in 1055 by another group of nomadic invaders from central Asia via Persia, the Seljuk Turks. See Peter Stearns, et al., World Civilizations, The Global Experience, Volume I,
13Bernard Lewis, p. 105.

14Fatimids. The Fatimids were Ismaïli Shiites (Seveners) who founded Islam’s “other” capital in Cairo, Egypt, in opposition to the latter reigning caliphate of the Abbasids of Baghdad. The Fatimids established their own caliph in Egypt thereby laying claim to both spiritual and political authority for all of Islam (contra to the latter Abbasid caliphate reigning in Baghdad). The Fatimids took their name from Fatima, daughter of Muhammad and wife of Ali, thereby claiming blood descent from Muhammad. The Fatimid Caliphs also were the Imams of the Ismailis, a sect of Shiite Islam, whose doctrine defines the Imam or Caliph as divine. See Glasse’, p. 123-125. The Ismailis are also known for the Shiite group referred to as “Assassins,” a group of fanatical followers who waged a campaign of terror and assassinations against the kings and princes of Islam in the name of a mysterious hidden Imam. See Arabs in History, p. 160-162.

15Seljuks. The Seljuks (or “Saljuks”) were Sunnis of Turkish origin. Their name comes from the military family that led them (See Bernard Lewis, Arabs in History, p. 160). The House of Seljuk was a branch of the Oghuz Turks who in the 9th century lived on the periphery of the Muslim world, north of the Caspian and Aral sea. In the 10th century the Seljuks migrated from their ancestral homelands into mainland Persia, in the province of Khurasan, where they mixed with the local population and adopted the Persian culture and language. The Seljuks supplanted the Buyid Amirs in Baghdad in 1055 and immediately removed all Shiite influence that had occurred during the Buyid reign, marking the beginning of Turkic reign in the Middle East. They seized control of the caliphate under their leader, Toghrul Beg (or “Bey”), who assumed the title, “Sultan.” The Seljuks continued the practice of the Buyids of not deposing the Abbasid Caliphs but using them as figureheads to legitimize their reign. According to Lewis, the Seljuk Turks were able to wrestle Syria and Palestine from local rulers, and from the declining reign of the Fatimids of Egypt in the West. Their conquest even extended to areas under the control of the Christian Byzantines in Turkey. Under the Seljuks, a large part of Islam was united under a single authority for the first time since the early Caliphate. See Arabs in History, p. 161 and Cyril Glasse’, p. 350. The Seljuk advance into Anatolia, Asia Minor, against the Byzantines, opened the door to nomadic peoples of Turkic origin. The region later formed the nucleus of the powerful Ottoman Empire. The Sultanate provided stability to Islam until the conquest of the Mongols in 1258.

16Ayyubids. The Ayyubids were a Sunni dynasty founded by Salah ad-Din al-Ayyubi or Saladin in the late 12th century when Egypt was under control of the Fatimids. In 1177, Saladin declared the Fatimid Caliphate ended. He restored the name of the Abbasid Caliphs of Baghdad as Egyptian caliphs and established himself as ruler of Egypt and eventually Syria and Palestine. It was Saladin who led Islam to reclaim lands lost to the Crusaders during the First Crusade (1193). See Arabs in History, p. 166 - ’67 and Cyril Glasse’, p. 59. The Abbasids continued their control of Syria, Palestine and Egypt until the arrival of the Mongols in 1258.

17Mongols. The Mongols were a people of the Siberian Forests of Asia. According to Glasse’, the Mongols were Shintoists who saw God as a spirit whose presence was active in nature. This caused them to be naïvely open to other religions, treating their own rites as magic that could be used in conjunction with the religions of conquered lands. After conquering Islamic lands, the Mongols adopted the religion of the conquered peoples into their Shintoist origins. Their leader was Genghis Khan who successfully united the Mongol tribes in 1206. The superiority of the Mongols lay in their tribal unity, their extremely strict discipline and ability to endure hardship, and their strategic use of spies, terrorism, and superior siege equipment. Mongols were known for their cruelty and barbarism. See Cyril Glasse’, p. 274. According to Bernard Lewis, Genghis Khan led the Mongols in 1221 in victorious conquest over Iran. Genghis died in 1227, resulting a pause in Mongol advance into Islamdom. Mongol Prince Huleku captured Baghdad in 1258, killed the Caliph, and abolished the Abbasid Caliphate. In spite of the decline of the caliphate to the point of figurehead only under both Buyid and Seljuk reigns, the caliphate represented the legal center of Islam and the token of its unity. In its destruction, the end of an Islamic ear occurred. The Mongol conquest of the Arab world was confined to Iraq and Iran. Syria and Egypt were saved from the Mongols by the Ayyubids. See Barnard Lewis, p. 168-169.

18Mamluks. According to http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mamluk, “The first mamluks served the Abbasid caliphs in 9th century Baghdad. The Abbasids recruited them mainly from areas near the Caucasus (mainly Circassian and Georgian) and in areas north of the Black Sea (mainly Turkic, most of whom were Kipchak Turks). Most of the captured were of non-Muslim origin. The
mamluks were often sold into slavery by impoverished steppe families or kidnapped by slave-traders. The mamluk system gave rulers troops who had no link to any established power structure. . . . The slave-troops were strangers of the lowest possible status who could not conspire against the ruler and who could easily be punished if they caused trouble, making them a great military asset. Mamluks were frequently used as mercenaries.” Ironically, the eventual commander of the Mamluks, Baybers, was earlier enslaved by the Mongols before he was sold to the Egyptians where he rose to power through his military service. See Peter Stearns, et al., *World Civilizations, The Global Experience, Volume I, Beginnings to 1750*, p. 488. Baybers united Syria and Egypt and repulsed the advancing Mongols from the east. Baybers also crushed the remnants of the Crusaders in Syria. An ingenious idea of Baybers was to invite a member of the Abbasid family to establish himself as Caliph in Cairo. The caliph was nothing more than court functionary of the Mamluk Sultan. The caliph had no authority or even right to express his opinion. He passed his time visiting the Mamluk officials and staging parties for them. According to Bernard Lewis, the Cairo Caliphs represented the final stage in the decay of the Caliphate. See *Arabs in History*, p. 170. The Mamluks remained in power in Syria and Egypt until the advance of the Ottomans in the sixteenth century.

Ottoman Dynasty. The Ottoman Dynasty takes its name from the Osman family of Turkey which became increasingly powerful during the early years of the 14th century. The Osmans populated an area of the world situated on the western edge of the Seljuk Empire in Anatolia from where it served as a buffer zone between the Byzantines to the west and the Seljuks to the south and east. In this context, the Osmans acted as mercenaries at different times for the Byzantines and then the Seljuks, expanding their own territory at the expense of both. See David R. Ringrose, *Expansion and Global Interaction*, p. 42. The Ottomans took advantage of the death of the Byzantine Emperor in 1341 which brought civil war there, and the bubonic plague in Europe allowed Ottoman invasion as far inland as Bulgaria. After conquering much of the Balkans and Southeastern Europe, the Ottomans turned their armies to the land of Islam. Beginning in the 15th century, Selim I, the Sultan of the Ottoman Empire, conquered Egypt. However, the prize for the Ottoman’s was the long cherished capital of Byzantium, Constantinople. In 1453 AD, Constantinople was taken by Mehmet the Conqueror and immediately renamed “Istanbul.” See Karen Armstrong, *Islam, A Short History*, p. 109-110. With the conquest of Constantinople, the age of the Ottomans began, reaching their zenith under Suleyman the Magnificent in 1566. Suleyman controlled Asia Minor, Syria, Iraq, Iran, Egypt, North Africa, the coast regions of Arabia, Azerbaijan, the Balkans, Hungary, and vassal states in the Volga regions and the southern steppes of Russia. Karen Armstrong states, “By the end of the fifteenth century, Islamdom was the greatest power bloc in the world. It had advanced into eastern Europe, into the Eurasian steppes, and into sub-Saharan, Africa, in the wake of the Muslim traders. . . . The whole world seemed to be becoming Islamic. Even those who did not live under Muslim rule discovered that the Muslims controlled the high seas, and that when they left their own lands they had to confront Islamdom. . . . Islam seemed invincible, and now Muslims were ready to establish new empires, which would become the most powerful and up to date in the world.” Karen Armstrong, *Islam, A Short History*, p. 110-111.

The success of the Ottoman Empire was in no doubt impacted by the Ottoman’s mastery of gunpowder. According to Peter Stearns, p. 519, it was the use of huge cannons of the Ottomans against the Byzantine fortresses of Constantinople which paved the way to success; and, the use of field guns to supplement trained infantry was just as much the reason for the Ottoman’s success against the Middle East. See Peter Stearns, et al., *World Civilizations, The Global Experience, Volume I, Beginnings to 1750*, p. 519. The Ottoman Empire lost its status as a world power in the 17th and following centuries as battle after battle was lost and territories formerly within the great Empire were granted independence or claim of invading forces.

Dr. Timothy Furnish summarizes a final attempt to resurrect the caliphate by the Ottomans in the 18th century. He states, “The Ottomans, starting in the eighteenth century, resurrected the caliphate as a rallying point for Muslims against Russian, British, and French imperialism. Late Ottoman rulers were attempting to recapture some of the religious legitimacy that had been lost with utilization of the prosaic titles of padishah and sultan, by setting themselves up as the world’s preeminent Muslim rulers. This attempt ultimately failed to rally the Islamic world to their side at times of trouble, and Kemal Atatürk abolished both the sultanate and caliphate following the establishment of the Turkish Republic in 1924.” See [http://www.meforum.org/article/159](http://www.meforum.org/article/159) at June 13, 2007.

Amidst the decline of the Ottoman Empire, efforts were sought to modernize the Muslim state. “The process of reform is referred to as: ‘tanzimat’ (meaning reorganization of the Ottoman Empire). Tanzimat was a period of reformation that began in 1839 and ended with the First Constitutional Era in 1876. Tanzimat emerged from the minds of reformist sultans like Mahmud II and Abdülmecid as well as prominent reformers who were European educated bureaucrats, such as Ali Pasha, Fuad Pasha, Ahmed
Cevdet Pasha, and Midhat Pasha. They recognized that the old religious and military institutions no longer met the needs of the empire in the modern world." Tanzimat reforms had far reaching effects. Mustafa Kemal Atatürk and other progressive leaders and thinkers of the Republic of Turkey and of many other former Ottoman states in the Balkans, the Middle East and North Africa were educated in the schools established during the Tanzimat period. . . . The reforms peaked in 1876 with the implementation of an Ottoman constitution checking the autocratic powers of the Sultan. The details of this period are covered under the First Constitutional Era. While the new Sultan Abdülahmed II signed the first constitution, he quickly turned against it. See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Decline_of_the_Ottoman_Empire.

20According to Wikipedia, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ataturk “Mustafa Kemal Ataturk was an army officer, revolutionary statesman, the founder of the Republic of Turkey and its first president. Mustafa Kemal established himself as a successful military commander while serving as a division commander in the Battle of Gallipoli of World War I. Following the defeat of the Ottoman Empire at the hands of the Allies, and the subsequent plans for its partition, Mustafa Kemal led the Turkish national movement in what would become the Turkish War of Independence. His successful military campaigns led to the liberation of the country and the establishment of the Republic of Turkey. Mustafa Kemal implemented what are known as Atatürk's Reforms, which led to sweeping changes in the political, economic and cultural sphere of the Turkish nation and the drive to create a modern, democratic and secular state based on Western principles of governance shaped by Kemalist ideology.”


22See Cyril Glasse’ p. 408,