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Salah al-Din is one of the best-known figures of the Middle Ages. As the Muslim Sultan of Egypt, Syria, Yemen and Palestine, Salah al-Din, was very well known as a noble man, pious and devout Sufi. One of his greatest victory was liberating Jerusalem, on 27th Rajab 583 AH/ 2nd October 1187 AD ending its 88-year occupation by the Crusaders. His generosity and magnanimity towards his opponents or rivals predominantly in that holy war was contrasts strongly with the attitude of his predecessors. These distinction attitudes in Salah al-Din’s character had brought great attention not only to Muslim world but also to the West. In this article, several questions regarding Salah al-Din’s attitudes will be raised; a) how Salah al-Din treated the non-Muslims during and after the second re-conquest of Jerusalem?; b) What is his attitudes towards the non-Muslims holy places at that time?; c) What made him behave like that? Did Salah al-Din implement Umar’s Assurance of Safety after liberated Jerusalem from the Crusaders in 1187 AD? Therefore, this article attempts to examine and analyze Salah al-Din’s attitudes at that particular time and event towards non-Muslims and their sacred shrines till arrive to the conclusion regarding the above questions. The methodology used in this study is by analyzing the historical primary and secondary accounts in order to obtain a comprehensive understanding of the Salah al-Din attitudes.
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INTRODUCTION

In order to understand and assess his attitude objectively it is essential to know the background of Salah al-Din, specifically his family and education background and his military career. Salah al-Din means ‘honouring of faith’ (P.H Newby 2001: 11) was born in 532 AH (1137-8CE) in the castle in Tikrit (Ibn Shaddad 2004: 17) in Iraq. His full name is Salah ad-Din Yusuf Ibn Ayyub and known to the West as Saladin. Salah al-Din's family, the Ayubbids, was Kurdish origin (David Nicolle 2005: 14).

Salah al-Din’s uncle, Asad al-Din Shirkuh was appointed as an army officer of Nur al-Din Mahmud who controlled virtually all Syria and became the most powerful ruler in the Muslim world. Salah al-Din joined his uncle in the Syrian Army as a junior army in his mid-twenties (Glubb 1999: 53, David Nicolle 2005: 14), and this is the defining moment where he started his military career.

In addition to that, Salah al-Din was a very pious and devout Muslim. His education background was full of reverence for the practices of the religion, and his creed followed the straight path, agreed with the canon of true judgement and was approved by the greatest of the ulama (Ibn Shaddad 2004: 18).

In 1163 CE, Salah al-Din accompanying his uncle, Asad al-Din Shirkuh to Egypt although he was reluctant, because Shirkuh is so relied on him and made him commander of his forces and and his advisor. Salah al-Din joined the campaign which had a decisive effect on the conflict between Muslims and Crusaders (Ibn Shaddad 2004: 41)

After the death of his uncle, Salah al-Din who was still under 30 years old, was appointed his successor. As a wazir of Egypt, Salah al-Din held responsible in transforming Egypt’s political system and society where he determined to bring Egyptian society back to majority Sunni sect, and also strengthen Sufi ideas to bring individual Muslims closer to God. After the death of the Fatimid Khalifa, al-‘Adid, on Monday 10 Muharram 567 AH/ 13 September 1117 AD, Salah al-Din became formally ruler of Egypt (Ibn Shaddad 2004: 47).

On 11 Shawwal 569 AH (15 May 1174 CE), Nur al-Din Zanki died and leaving his 12 year old child, al-Malik al-Salih Ismail who was unable to govern the state. Hence, a struggle for succession between its most powerful military commanders threatened to plunge Syria into a civil war and destroy everything Nur al-Din had achieved (Glubb 1999:58).

Al-Isfahani correspondent with Salah al-Din asked him to intervene to prevent the country being fragmented by the power struggles. However, Salah al-Din could not leave Egypt immediately, because of the internal conflict and the Sicilian attack against Alexandria. After the internal revolt in Egypt had been defeated, Salah al-Din marched to Syria in October 1174 AD and entered
Damascus without any bloodshed. He emphasized that he regarded this as step on the road towards recovery of Jerusalem (Glubb 1999:58).

**Salah Al-Din’s Campaign To Conquer Jerusalem**

Undoubtedly, Syria would have remained fragmented with two larger kingdoms of Damascus and Aleppo and several smaller states, each ruled by an ambitious general striving to conquer its neighbours. A struggle then arised between Salah al-Din in Damascus, who maintained that he was determined to preserve the unity of Nur al-Din’s kingdom in order to to defend Islam against the Crusaders (Glubb 1999:59).

In that crucial situation, Salah al-Din eventually gained control of Nur al-Din’s kingdom with full supports from al-Qadi al-Fadil, al-Isfahani, al-Shahrazuri and Qadi Sharaf al-Din of Aleppo. Hiyari (1990: 166) stated that Salah al-Din was regularly reminded by learned men especially Imad al-Din al-Isfahani of his duty to liberate Jerusalem from the Crusaders since he was a commander in the service of Nur al-Din. He (1990: 165) also quoted from Bertrand of Blanquefort master of the Order of the Templars (1156-1169 CE) and William of Tyre, who expressed that the ‘Muslim Prince’, who would reunite two most powerful realm, Cairo and Damascus, and abolish the very name of Christian was to emerge in Salah al-Din.’ The researcher agrees with Hiyari and Abu Munshar arguments since the unification of al-Syam and Egypt was the most important task for Salah al-Din to enforce to gain his vision to liberate Jerusalem.

Salah al-Din took about nine years to eliminate the threat from his rivals and successfully united Muslims to fight against the Crusaders. Consequently, he carried out his purpose, used his position to conduct a successful campaign against the Crusaders and liberated Jerusalem. He fought several battles against the Crusaders and defeated them in order to re-conquest Jerusalem. The most important and decisive battle was that of Hittin, 24th Rabi’ al-Thani 583 AH (4th July 1187 CE). At this battle, the Muslim army under the lead of Salah al-Din, defeated the Crusaders where they suffered heavy losses either killed or captured (Abu Munshar 2003: 211).

Moreover, Abu Munshar (2003: 211) explicitly explained that Salah al-Din had put the liberation of Jerusalem as a top priority, as Ibn Shaddad (2004: 26) mentioned that he heard Salah al-Din said, ‘When Allah enabled me to gain Egypt, I realized that He willed the conquest of the coast (Syrian coast), because He had put the idea in my mind.’

Glubb (1999: 64) also argues by saying, ‘the great importance which Saladin attached to Jerusalem is indicated by the care he took regarding the sermon preached in the first Friday prayers in Al-Aqsa Mosque after the liberation. Saladin invited the greatest Muslim preachers of his time to prepare draft sermons and submit them to him.’ Consequently, Salah al-Din chose draft sermon prepared by Abu al-Maali Muhammad Ibn ‘Ali Ibn Zaki al-Din, which most clearly reflected the ideas he wanted to inspire in people’s minds after the liberation of Jerusalem. Hence, the researcher agrees that this event could be regarded as a significant example that obviously showed a great attention given by Salah al-Din to Jerusalem.
MUSLIM TREATMENT TO NON-MUSLIM FROM THE QUR'ANIC PERSPECTIVE

It is to be stressed that Islam teaches its believers to interact with all people and wish good for the whole of mankind. Muslims are taught to care for all people regardless of their faith or their beliefs. In the Qur'an and Sunnah states clearly the treatment of non-Muslims citizen under Muslim rule. According to Muhammad Mustafa al-Zuhayli (1989: 112-122) and Al-Syeikh ‘Abd al-Hamid al-Saikh (1989: 13-15) that non-Muslims were generally referred in to in ARabi’ as Ahl al-dhimmah, the ‘People of the Pact,’ and Ahl al-Kitab, the ‘People of the Book.’ Ahl al-dhimmah refers to the non-Muslims who live under the Muslim ruler where their life, their property, their honor, their families are to be protected as well as their freedom in practicing their own religion. Ahl al-Kitab refers to the monotheists mentioned in the Qur'an, Jews and Christians, since their religions were originally based on revealed books; the Torah and the Bible.

The Qur'anic Perspective

There are several Qur'anic verses explaining how to treat the non-Muslims in general.

Allah does not forbid you respecting those who have not made war against you on account of (your) religion, and have not driven you forth from your homes, that you show them kindness and deal with them justly; because Allah loves those who are just.²

In the above verse, it is clearly spelled out the guideline on the treatment of Muslim to non-Muslim who did not fight against Muslims, which is to be just, kind and fair. So, for non-Muslims who respect Muslim's religion and human rights, then Muslims should deal with them in kindness and courtesy and have good dealings with them especially in matters of human welfare and well-being.

Another related Qur'anic verse regarding the Muslim treatment to non-Muslim is:

O ye who believe! Stand out firmly for Allah, as witnesses to fair dealing, and let not the hatred of others to you make you swerve to wrong and depart from justice. Be just: that is next to piety: and fear Allah. For Allah is well acquainted with all that you do.³

According to Zamakhshari (1995: 1:600) the above verse mentioned that Muslims should not act unjustly against non-Muslims by killing their children and women or breaking agreements with them, just because they hated them. He concludes; despite the fact that non-Muslims are enemies of Allah, Islam has strongly commanded Muslims to be just in their dealing with non-Muslims. Justice should be applicable to everybody, friends and enemies.

From the Qur'anic perspective discussed above, it is very clear that Islam had put guidelines to Muslims to treat non-Muslims without any discrimination and

² al-Qur’an, Al-Mumtahanah 60:8
³ al-Qur’an, Al-Maidah 5:8
to be just, fair, generous and kind to them. These are the basic and crucial values that Islam emphasizes on every mankind. These values are universal for all human beings to care for all people regardless of their faith, their race or their nation.

**DISCUSSION ON THE ATTITUDE OF SALAH AL-DIN TOWARDS NON-MUSLIMS AND THEIR HOLY PLACES DURING AND AFTER THE LIBERATION OF JERUSALEM**

In this section, the researcher will divide into three subsections in order to examine Salah al-Din’s attitudes towards non-Muslim and will be discussed starting from Salah al-Din’s victory during the Battle of Hittin.

**Salah Al-Din’s Attitudes Towards The Crusaders’ Captive Of The Battle Of Hittin**

Muslim treatment to non-Muslim actually started after the victory of Muslim army led by Salah al-Din in the Battle of Hittin on Saturday, 24 Rabi’ al-Thani 583 AH/4th July1187 AD (Ibn Shaddad 2004: 72) where the Crusaders were heavily defeated either killed or captured. Among those who were captured were King Guy de Lusignon and his brother, Reginald of Chatillon, Joscelin of Courtenay, Humphrey of Toron, the Masters of the Temple and Hospital and many other nobles (Lane-Poole 1985: 1187).

Being a captive during war is a very hard condition to everyone. However, Salah al-Din had showed his brilliant attitude toward his captive, King Guy where he had gave him a cold water to drink when King Guy was parched with thirst. Indeed, according to Islamic teaching, the well-being and safety of a war captive must be observed. His generosity and magnanimity toward King Guy received full attention whether from Muslim and non-Muslim historians. On the other hand, Salah al-Din had showed his toughness to Reginald of Châtillon, the truce-breaker, in order to be just, where Reginald unfaithfully killed the caravan from Egypt who had passed through his land at Shawbak during the state of truce. This event had made Salah al-Din vowed to kill Reginald if he got him in power (Ibn Shaddad 2004: 74, Lane-Poole 1985: 214-216, Amin Maalouf 1984: 193).

Another example how Salah al-Din treats the non-Muslim was his generosity by granted a safe-conduct to Balian of Ibelin who had escaped from the field of Hittin to go to Jerusalem to bring his wife, Queen Maria and his children back to Tyre. Balian agreed on the condition put by Salah al-Din to stay only one night in the city and not to bear arms against Sultan and Balian was welcomed with delight as a deliverer even though he was his enemy (Lane-Poole 1985: 225, Runciman 1990: 2: 463, Amin Maalouf 1984: 197, James 2002:129).

From these events, the researcher argues that Salah al-Din was a very gracious and just person where he had treated his captives in two different ways in one situation accordingly, where one of the captives deserved a kind treatment and the other one deserved the opposite. The generosity he showed towards Balian and his family was chivalry even though Balian had dishonoured his agreement with Salah al-Din. These attitudes; i.e. to be just and generous to non-Muslim were required strongly in Islamic teaches and was clearly practiced by Salah al-Din as a devoted Muslim in his military career.
The Attitude Of Salah Al-Din Towards Non-Muslim During The Siege And The Liberation Of Jerusalem

After the victory at the Battle of Hittin, Salah al-Din moved towards Jerusalem. On 15th Rajab, 583 AH/ 20th September 1187 AD, the Holy City was under siege. The Muslim army were very strong and skilful with mangonels. Realizing the inevitability of their defeat, and Muslims were about to take over Islamic Jerusalem, an agreement was soon achieved between Balian of Ibelin and Salah al-Din to avoid further massacre and bloodshed (James 2001: 76, Runciman 1990: 2: 465).

The city was to surrender unconditionally, but the Crusaders were granted safe conduct to leave the city, provided that they pay fixed ransom for the price of freedom; ten dinar for a man, five for a woman and one for a child and a lump sum of thirty thousand dinar to free seven thousand poor people. They were allowed to leave the city within forty days to pay their ransom and for those who cannot pay their ransom were to be enslaved. In addition to that, the Crusaders were allowed to bring with them their movable property (Amin Maalouf 1984: 198, Runciman 1990: 2: 465, Ibn Shaddad 2004: 78).

On Friday, 27 Rajab 583 AH/ 2 October 1187 AD, Jerusalem was surrendered coincidently with the same day with the Night Journey and Ascension of the Prophet Muhammad (Amin Maalouf 1984: 198, Runciman 1990: 2: 466). Salah al-Din and his army were very humane compared to 88-years before, in the time of Crusaders where they had waded through the blood of their victims, but not a building now was looted, not a person even injured. Moreover, Salah al-Din ordered guards patrolled the streets and the gates to prevent any offence to the Christians (Runciman 1990: 2: 466).

As agreed earlier, every Christian paid ransom for his freedom. As for Balian, he sought to raise the money needed to buy back the freedom of the poorest citizen. In addition to Salah al-Din benevolence, he also announced by himself that he would liberate every aged man and woman without payment of any ransom. The imprisoned man with young children would also be released and the Frankish widows and orphans were not only exempted from any payment, but also offered them gifts from his own treasury. His mercy and kindness were totally contrast to the deeds of the Christian conquerors of the first crusades (Runciman 1990: 2: 466, Amin Maalouf 1984: 199, James 2001: 83).

As for the Frankish noble women in the city, Salah al-Din’s treatment was gracious and courteous where he not only allowed Queen of Byzantine to leave without paying any ransom, but was allowed to take everything she wanted with her. Salah al-Din also allowed another noble woman, who was the wife of King Guy to leave the city unhindered with her followers and he even granted her safe conduct to visit her captive husband in Nablus (‘Asyur 1976: 2:792, Abu Munshar 2003: 230).

Indeed, Salah al-Din’s attitudes to Orthodox and Jacobites Christian, who were the natives Christians and not Crusaders, was also magnanimous where he agreed for them to remain in the city and required them to pay jizyah or poll tax in addition to their ransom, be his subjects and be treated as dhimmi, though many of
the poorer people were exempted from paying jizyah. Salah al-Din also allowed them to take over the Holy Sepulcher and to purchase the property of the Christians who had driven out. As dhimmi, they were allowed to practice their religion freely in their churches. The native Christians were very satisfied with Salah al-Din’s treatment to them and always looked back to the days when they were under Caliph Umar, where the Christians were freed to practice their religions (‘Asyur 1976: 2:794, James 2001: 83, Runciman 1990: 2: 467).

The generosity of Salah al-Din did not stop there, as he granted the Copts a place in Jerusalem which is known as Dair al-Sultan. They were also allowed to visit the Church of Holy Sepulcher and exempted from paying fees for their visit to Jerusalem because they were his subjects. Salah al-Din also treated the Christians of Habsha kindly, where they were exempted from paying fees when visiting the holy places in Jerusalem (Abu Munshar 2003: 238-239).

‘Asyur (1976: 2:795) argues that after Salah al-Din took over Jerusalem, he allowed Jews families to reside in the city of Jerusalem, in contrary to what had happened during the Crusaders where the Jews were forbidden to stay in the city. James (2001: 89) states that ‘the great Muslim Sultan now became a hero to the Jews. To them God had stirred up the spirit of Salah al-Din. He had besieged Jerusalem, and the Lord gave it unto him.’

From all the points discussed above, the researcher concludes that the attitudes showed by Salah al-Din is truly reflects him as a real Muslim leader where it goes aligned with the teaching of Islam which ask its believer to treat non-Muslims specifically, and mankind generally in the best way he or she could, regardless their faith, colour and race. His kindness, generosity, amnesty and magnanimity towards his opponents, poor people, aged people men and women, widows, orphans, noble women, native Christians and Jews were undeniable and clearly portrayed in his attitude towards them. Salah al-Din’s personal character and exemplary attitude had made himself in great memorable amongst Muslims and non-Muslims historians.

The Attitude Of Salah Al-Din’s Towards Holy Places In Jerusalem

After being successfully liberated Islamicjerusalem without any massacre and bloodshed, Salah al-Din received many negative reactions from his friends and advisors regarding the most holiest place for the Christians; the Church of the Holy Sepulcher. Many of them had urged him to destroy it, in order to forbid the Christians’ pilgrims to visit the church. But, Salah al-Din refused the idea by the majority saying that it was not the matter of the church which is holy, but it was the site, and they will still wish to make pilgrimages there even if we destroy it (Runciman 1990: 2: 468, Lyons and Jackson 2001:276).

In this case, the church was closed for three days for the city to calm down (Runciman 1990: 2: 468). Abu Munshar (2003: 233) argues that the closure of the church was intended to give Salah al-Din and Muslims opportunity and time to discuss the future of the church after a long and tiring war. The church was re-opened and the Christian were granted the freedom of worship inside it and the Frankish pilgrims were only admitted on payment of a fee (Runciman 1990: 2: 468).
Since the Dome of the Rock and al-Aqsa Mosque had been transformed into Christian monuments i.e., a church, a palace, and a centre for the Templars, restoring them to Islam required ritualistic cleansing. Thus, the Muslims bathed both monuments with rose water, perfumed them with incense, and removed Christian symbols and Latin calligraphy, replacing them with Islamic inscriptions (Hadia Dajani-Shakeel 1996: n.p). The golden cross that had dominated the Dome of the Rock was taken down (Runciman 1990: 2: 468). Furthermore, Salah al-Din installed the minbar (carved pulpit) which was prepared during Nur al-Din’s life in al-Aqsa Mosque (Abu Munshar 2003: 235, P.H. Newby 2001: 22).

Salah al-Din also housed new religious institutions in buildings previously occupied by Christians, i.e., the Church of St. Anne converted to al-Madrasa al-Salahiya, a school for advanced study in Islamic law and theology, al-Khanqah al-Salahiya, a monastery for Sufis, was placed in the former residence of the Patriarch’s palace on the north western corner of the Holy Sepulcher and also, a hospital, al-Bimaristan al-Salahi, was established in a church in the Tanners Quarter. Salah al-Din also returned all the Coptic churches and monasteries which were taken by the Crusaders to the Coptic priest (James 2001: 90, Abu Munshar 2003: 235).

From the discussion above, the researcher argues that Salah al-Din’s magnanimous and generous attitude did not restricted to person or people or inhabitants of Jerusalem only. His generosity and magnanimity goes beyond that, where he had showed his respect and honour towards the non-Muslim holy places and sacred shrines by not destroying or inhabit them when he successfully re-conquest Islamicjerusalem from the Crusaders. He reflected the Qur’anic teaches which are strong in his inner self in his practices as a Muslim ruler.

**DID SALAH AL-DIN IMPLEMENTS UMAR’S ASSURANCE OF SAFETY AFTER LIBERATED JERUSALEM FROM THE CRUSADERS IN 583 AH/ 1187 AD?**

After analyzing and examining Salah al-Din’s attitudes and treatment towards the non-Muslims during and after the re-conquest of Jerusalem from the Crusaders, the researcher finds that Salah al-Din had implemented Umar’s Assurance of Safety. This is very clear when Salah al-Din allowed the native Christians who were not Crusaders, to stay in Jerusalem by paying jizyah and was treated as dhimmi. They were assured their personal security in Jerusalem where their right, their family, their honour to be protected under Muslim ruler in Jerusalem. In addition to that, they were given freedom in practicing their religion and worship in their churches.

In the other case, Salah al-Din explicitly adopted Umar’s approach towards the Christian’s sacred places, where Salah al-Din did not destroy or inhabit their churches and holy places, as same as when Caliph Umar Ibn al-Khattab conquered the city, he had not given orders to destroy it. Karen Armstrong (1997: 14-15), mentioned that ‘when Umar conquered Jerusalem, he was faithful to the inclusive vision which Muslims did not attempt to exclude others from Jerusalem’s holiness. Umar was careful to ensure that the Christian’s holy places remained in their possession.” This means that Muslims are very tolerate with others, and revealed that Muslims have no intention at all to change the Christian character in Jerusalem immediately.
Indeed, Salah al-Din’s treatment to the Crusaders was generous and similar to Umar’s practices during his time, when the Crusaders were leaving Jerusalem, their lives and properties were safeguarded until they reached in territories held by the Christians. Another example that proved Salah al-Din implemented Umar’s Assurance of Safety when he allowed Jews families to reside in the city of Jerusalem, in contrary to what had happened during the Crusades where the Jews were forbidden to stay in the city. In the time of Umar, he had included the Jews in the city of Jerusalem (El-Awaisi 2000:59-62).

Thus, the justice and generosity brought by both Muslim rulers to the inhabitants of Jerusalem regardless their race, faith and tribe reflected truly the Islamic teachings and the inclusiveness of Jerusalem which did not deny the existence and devotion of others, but respected their rights and celebrated plurality and coexistence.

CONCLUSION

From the discussions above, the researcher concludes that Salah al-Din’s attitudes towards non-Muslim were really benevolent and chivalrous. His kindness, generosity, amnesty, magnanimity and justice towards his opponents, poor people, aged people men and women, widows, orphans, noble women, native Christians and Jews were undeniable and clearly portrayed in his attitude towards them. As a devout Muslim, where Salah al-Din came from a very strong religious background, he practiced the teaching of Islam in his personal life, his military career, as leader and as a ruler. Thus, he obeyed the guidelines in the Qur’an and Sunnah regarding the treatment to non-Muslim; to be just, kind, tolerate and respect their holy places, as mentioned in the Qur’an:

Allah does not forbid you respecting those who have not made war against you on account of (your) religion, and have not driven you forth from your homes, that you show them kindness and deal with them justly; because Allah loves those who are just.⁴

Salah al-Din represented himself as a skilfull military leader with the sharp and firm use of force. His reputation as a generous, virtuous, just ruler and firm and his steadfast devotion to the teaching of Islam that made him contrasts strongly with most of his opponents which enabled him to fight the greatest champions of Christendom to a draw. Salah al-Din’s personal character and exemplary attitude as a real Muslim ruler had made himself in great memorable amongst Muslims and non-Muslims historians.
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