

# The Guardian Who Contradicts His Own Book

*Islamic Supersessionism, Wilayat al-Faqih, and the Quranic Case Against Shia Clerical Authority over the Question of Israel*



## Abstract

This article examines Islamic supersessionism—the doctrine that Islam constitutes the final and definitive Abrahamic revelation, superseding both Judaism and Christianity—and its specific political expression within Twelver Shia Islam through the doctrine of Wilayat al-Faqih (Guardianship of the Islamic Jurist). It demonstrates that both the Hebrew Bible (Tanakh) and the Quran itself—Islam’s own foundational text—contradict the theological premises upon which Islamic anti-Zionism is constructed. The Tanakh asserts an irrevocable covenant with Israel and promises physical restoration from exile in unambiguous terms confirmed by manuscript evidence predating Islam. The Quran contains explicit affirmations of the divine covenant with the Children of Israel, including their designation as recipients of the Holy Land. The article then

contrasts these textual realities with the anti-Israel ideology developed by Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini and institutionalised in the Islamic Republic of Iran. It argues that Khomeinist anti-Zionism is not merely a geopolitical posture but a structural necessity for the legitimacy of Wilayat al-Faqih—and that this necessity places the Iranian theocratic model in triple contradiction: with the Tanakh, with the Quran, and with over a millennium of Shia quietist tradition. It concludes that anti-Jewish and anti-Israel narratives serve a parallel function in Shia political theology to that which supersessionism serves in the Catholic and Orthodox Christian tradition: they are load-bearing elements in an architecture of clerical authority that cannot survive the acknowledgement of Jewish covenantal continuity.

## **I. Introduction: A Second Supersessionism**

The previous companion article in this series examined how Catholic and Orthodox Christian supersessionism—the claim that the Church replaced Israel as God’s covenantal community—provided the theological foundation for European ecclesiastical authority and sacral monarchy, from the Church of Rome to the House of Windsor. It demonstrated that the Hebrew Bible’s explicit assertions of eternal covenant and national restoration, combined with the modern re-establishment of the State of Israel, introduce a fundamental challenge to that theological architecture.

This article extends the analysis to a second, parallel supersessionist tradition: Islam, and specifically its Shia political expression. The central thesis is direct: Islamic supersessionism, like its Catholic and Orthodox Christian predecessor, claims to have inherited and completed the Abrahamic covenant—but it does so in contradiction with its own scripture. The Quran, far from denying the Jewish connection to the Holy Land, explicitly affirms it. The anti-Israel posture of the Islamic Republic of Iran therefore rests not on Quranic authority but on a political theology—Wilayat al-Faqih—whose legitimacy requires the denial of Jewish sovereignty. As with Catholic and Orthodox Christian supersessionism, the denial is structurally necessary, not scripturally mandated.

## **II. Islamic Supersessionism and the Doctrine of Tahrif**

Islam presents itself as the final and most authentic expression of Abrahamic monotheism. According to Islamic theology, God sent a succession of prophets—including Abraham, Moses, David, and Jesus—each bearing a portion of a single divine message. Muhammad is held to be the “Seal of the Prophets” (Khatam an-Nabiyyin), and the Quran the final, uncorrupted revelation.

Central to this framework is the doctrine of *tahrif* (corruption)—the claim that earlier scriptures, specifically the Torah (Tawrat) and the Gospel (Injil), have been altered or misinterpreted by their custodians, the Jews and Catholic and Orthodox Christians. This doctrine serves a function

analogous to Catholic and Orthodox Christian supersessionism: it displaces the earlier covenantal communities from their scriptural authority and positions Islam as the corrective successor.

The Quran itself provides the textual basis for this claim. Surah 2:75 states that a party among the Jews “used to hear the words of Allah and then distort them.” Surah 5:13 accuses them of “displacing words from their proper usages.” These verses became the foundation for a theological tradition—elaborated by scholars such as Ibn Hazm in the eleventh century—asserting that the Jewish scriptures had been textually corrupted (*tahrif al-nass*), not merely misinterpreted.

The structural parallel with Catholic and Orthodox Christian supersessionism is precise. In both traditions, the earlier covenantal community is displaced—not through annihilation, but through theological reclassification. Jews become bearers of a corrupted text rather than a living covenant. Their scriptures are treated as historically interesting but spiritually superseded. Their political and national claims are rendered theologically void.

### **III. The Quran’s Own Testimony: The Holy Land Belongs to the Children of Israel**

Here, however, the Islamic supersessionist framework encounters a problem that has no analogue in Catholic and Orthodox Christian theology. The Quran—the very text that Islam holds to be uncorrupted, final, and definitive—contains explicit affirmations of the Jewish covenant with the Holy Land.

#### **The Divine Assignment of the Land**

**Surah Al-Ma’idah 5:21** records Moses addressing the Children of Israel:

*“O my people! Enter the Holy Land which Allah has destined for you. And do not turn back or else you will become losers.”* — Quran 5:21

The Arabic word translated as “destined” is *kataba*—literally “prescribed” or “ordained.” This is the same term used elsewhere in the Quran for divine commandments. The Holy Land is not offered as a suggestion; it is assigned by divine decree to the Children of Israel.

#### **The Promise of Ingathering**

**Surah Al-Isra’ 17:104** states:

*“And We said to the Children of Israel after him: Dwell in the land; and when the promise of the Hereafter comes to pass, We will bring you forth in a mingled crowd.”* — Quran 17:104

This verse speaks of a future ingathering—a gathering of the Children of Israel into the land. Far from negating the Jewish connection to the land, it anticipates its eschatological fulfilment.

## **The Inheritance Fulfilled**

**Surah Al-A'raf 7:137** describes the aftermath of Pharaoh's destruction:

*“And We made the oppressed people successors of the eastern and western lands which We had showered with blessings.”* – Quran 7:137

## **Divine Election**

**Surah Al-Jathiyah 45:16** affirms:

*“We gave the Children of Israel the Scripture, wisdom, and prophethood; We provided them with good things and favoured them above all peoples.”* – Quran 45:16

The cumulative weight of these verses is substantial. The Quran—which Islam holds to be the uncorrupted word of God—assigns the Holy Land to the Children of Israel by divine decree, speaks of their ingathering, and affirms their election above other peoples. No verse in the Quran assigns the Holy Land to any other community, nor does any verse revoke the assignment explicitly made in Surah 5:21.

This creates a textual contradiction at the heart of Islamic supersessionism that has no equivalent in the Catholic and Orthodox Christian case, that supersessionism reinterprets the Hebrew Bible; Islamic anti-Zionism must contradict the Quran itself.

## **IV. The Tanakh: The Source Text That Refuses to Be Superseded**

Islamic supersessionism, like its Catholic and Orthodox Christian counterpart, ultimately depends on the claim that God's covenant with Israel has been completed, replaced, or rendered obsolete. The doctrine of tahrif attempts to neutralise the Hebrew Bible by declaring it corrupted. But even if one were to set aside the Quran's own affirmations of Jewish covenantal rights—examined in the preceding section—the Tanakh itself presents an insurmountable obstacle to any supersessionist framework, Islamic or Christian.

The Hebrew Bible does not merely assert a covenant with Israel. It asserts a covenant that is, by its own terms, eternal, irrevocable, and tied to physical restoration after exile. No doctrine of tahrif can circumvent this without confronting the internal logic of the very texts Islam claims were originally divine.

## **The Covenant as Irrevocable**

**Jeremiah 31:35–36** establishes the permanence of Israel's national existence in terms that admit no qualification:

*“Thus saith the Lord, which giveth the sun for a light by day, and the ordinances of the moon and of the stars for a light by night... If those ordinances depart from before Me, saith the Lord, then the seed of Israel also shall cease from being a nation before Me for ever.”* – Jeremiah 31:35–36

The covenant’s duration is pegged to the existence of the natural order itself. So long as the sun and moon endure, Israel endures as a nation before God. This is not ambiguous language. It is a conditional statement whose condition—the departure of the celestial order—has manifestly not been met.

**Leviticus 26:44** addresses the specific scenario of exile and explicitly denies that it constitutes covenant termination:

*“And yet for all that, when they be in the land of their enemies, I will not cast them away, neither will I abhor them, to destroy them utterly, and to break My covenant with them: for I am the Lord their God.”* – Leviticus 26:44

This verse anticipates the very argument that supersessionism makes—that exile signifies rejection—and pre-emptively refutes it. Even in exile, even in the land of their enemies, the covenant holds.

## **The Promise of Physical Return**

**Deuteronomy 30:3–5:**

*“Then the Lord thy God will turn thy captivity, and have compassion upon thee, and will return and gather thee from all the nations, whither the Lord thy God hath scattered thee... And the Lord thy God will bring thee into the land which thy fathers possessed, and thou shalt possess it.”* – Deuteronomy 30:3–5

**Ezekiel 36:24:**

*“For I will take you from among the heathen, and gather you out of all countries, and will bring you into your own land.”* – Ezekiel 36:24

**Isaiah 11:11–12:**

*“And it shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord shall set His hand again the second time to recover the remnant of His people... and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth.”* – Isaiah 11:11–12

## **The Tanakh’s Challenge to Islamic Supersessionism**

The doctrine of tahrif asserts that these texts have been corrupted. But this claim faces a fundamental logical problem. Islam acknowledges that God sent the Torah (Tawrat) as genuine

revelation to Moses. The Quran itself instructs Jews to judge by what God revealed in the Torah (Surah 5:43). If the Torah was divinely revealed—as Islam affirms—then its core covenantal assertions cannot be dismissed as human fabrication without undermining Islam’s own scriptural framework.

Moreover, the manuscript evidence does not support the tahrif thesis in its strong form. The Dead Sea Scrolls, dated to approximately 250 BCE– 68 CE, demonstrate the substantial textual stability of the Hebrew Bible across centuries. The covenantal passages cited above are not late insertions; they are integral to the oldest recoverable strata of the text. To claim that these passages are corrupt is to claim that the corruption occurred before the Quran was revealed—which means God instructed Jews to judge by a text He knew to be already falsified. This is theologically incoherent.

The Tanakh’s framework is unambiguous: the covenant is not revoked; exile is disciplinary, not terminal; restoration is national, geographic, and physical. These assertions stand whether one reads them through a Jewish, Christian, or Islamic lens. They constitute the bedrock text against which all supersessionist claims—whether from Rome, Canterbury, or Tehran—must be measured. And by that measure, Islamic supersessionism faces the same textual failure as its Christian counterpart: the source text refuses to be superseded.

The establishment of the State of Israel in 1948—the physical ingathering of Jewish populations from over a hundred countries, the revival of Hebrew, the reconstitution of national sovereignty in the same geographic locus described in these passages—constitutes an empirical fulfilment that aligns with the Tanakh’s predictions and contradicts every supersessionist expectation, Islamic and Christian alike.

## **V. Shia Political Theology: From the Imamate to Wilayat al-Faqih**

To understand why the denial of Jewish sovereignty became structurally essential to the Islamic Republic of Iran, it is necessary to trace the theological chain of authority within Twelver Shia Islam.

### **The Doctrine of the Imamate**

Shia Islam holds that legitimate political and religious authority after the Prophet Muhammad belongs to a divinely appointed line of Imams, beginning with Ali ibn Abi Talib (the Prophet’s cousin and son-in-law) and continuing through his descendants. Twelver Shia Muslims recognise twelve such Imams, the last of whom—Muhammad al-Mahdi—is believed to have entered “occultation” (ghayba) in 939 CE. The Mahdi is expected to return at the end of days to establish universal justice.

For over a millennium following the occultation, mainstream Shia theology adopted a position of political quietism. In the absence of the infallible Imam, no human ruler could claim divine authority. Shia clerics guided believers on spiritual matters but accepted temporal governance by secular rulers—sultans, shahs, kings—as a pragmatic necessity. Political sovereignty belonged to the Hidden Imam; until his return, all earthly governance was provisional.

### **Khomeini’s Revolution: Wilayat al-Faqih**

Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini shattered this millennium-old consensus. In his 1970 lectures, later published as *Hokumat-e Islami: Velayat-e Faqih* (Islamic Government: Governance of the Jurist), Khomeini argued that a qualified Islamic jurist (faqih) should assume both religious and political leadership during the Imam’s occultation. This was not guidance or oversight—it was full sovereign authority.

The doctrine was institutionalised in Articles 5, 107, and 110 of the 1979 Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Iran, making Iran the first and only state in history constitutionally governed by this principle. The Supreme Leader—first Khomeini, then Ali Khamenei—holds authority that is, in theory, second only to the Hidden Imam himself.

This represented a radical theological innovation. As scholar Abdulaziz Sachedina has described it, Khomeini transformed traditional Shia quietism into “revolutionary messianism.” The clerical establishment was no longer waiting for the Mahdi; it was acting in his place.

## **VI. The Structural Necessity of Anti-Zionism**

Here the theological and the political converge. Wilayat al-Faqih’s claim to legitimacy rests on a chain of authority:

*God → Prophet → Imams → Faqih (Supreme Leader)*

This chain requires that Islam be the final and exclusive vehicle of divine authority on earth. If any prior covenantal community retains a legitimate, unrevoked relationship with God—including sovereign claims to specific territory based on divine decree—then the exclusivity of the Islamic chain is compromised.

The existence of the State of Israel introduces precisely this complication. If the Quran’s own assignment of the Holy Land to the Children of Israel remains valid—as the text plainly states—then:

First, the Jewish covenant is not fully superseded. Second, a divine land grant exists outside the framework of Islamic governance. Third, the Faqih’s claim to universal divine authority over the

Muslim world is weakened by the persistence of a parallel, Quranically-affirmed covenantal reality.

The denial of Israel's legitimacy is therefore not merely geopolitical. It is a theological prerequisite for the coherence of Wilayat al-Faqih. If Israel is acknowledged as the fulfilment of a divine promise—one recorded in the Quran itself—then the Supreme Leader's claim to be the sole representative of divine governance on earth becomes untenable.

## **VII. Khomeini's Anti-Jewish Theology: Imported, Not Indigenous**

A critical historical point deepens this analysis. The anti-Israel, anti-Jewish ideology that became central to the Islamic Republic was not organic to Shia tradition. It was imported.

Traditional Shia Islam, centred on the seminary city of Najaf in Iraq, maintained a quietist orientation for over a thousand years. Palestine was a Sunni issue. Jerusalem's significance in Shia tradition related to the Prophet's Night Journey (al-Isra' wa'l-Mi'raj), not to any territorial claim. Shia communities in Lebanon, Iraq, and Iran had historically maintained neutral or even cordial relations with Jewish communities.

The transformation came through Khomeini's absorption of Sunni Islamist ideology—specifically the writings of Sayyid Qutb, the Egyptian theorist of the Muslim Brotherhood. Qutb's works, which defined militant Islamist anti-Zionism, were translated into Farsi by Ali Khamenei—the man who would become Iran's current Supreme Leader. Khomeini fused Qutb's political anti-Zionism with Shia eschatology, casting Jews and Zionists not merely as political adversaries but as cosmic enemies whose destruction would prefigure the Mahdi's return.

In his writings and speeches, collected in the *Sahifa-yi Nur*, Khomeini described Jews as a “satanic” source of corruption, claimed they had “meddled with the text of the Quran,” and asserted that “from the beginning, Islam has had to contend with the Jews.” He called the Torah “a corrupted and altered one” that did “not meet the standard of even the speech commonly acceptable of a human being.”

These claims are not Quranic. The Quran refers to the Torah as the Tawrat and, in Surah 5:43–44, instructs Jews to “judge by what Allah has revealed in it.” One cannot simultaneously instruct people to judge by their scripture and claim that scripture is worthless. Khomeini's anti-Jewish theology thus contradicts not only the plain text of the Hebrew Bible but the plain text of the Quran.

## **VIII. The Triple Contradiction: Against Tanakh, Against Quran, Against Tradition**

The Iranian theocratic model therefore faces a triple contradiction:

Dimension	Khomeinist Position	Countervailing Evidence
Tanakh (Hebrew Bible)	Earlier scriptures corrupted; covenant with Israel void	Covenant explicitly irrevocable (Jer. 31:35–36; Lev. 26:44); restoration promised and fulfilled
Quranic text	Israel is illegitimate; Jews have no right to the Holy Land	Quran 5:21 assigns the Holy Land to the Children of Israel by divine decree
Shia tradition	Clerics must govern; anti-Zionism is religious duty	1,000+ years of Shia quietism; Palestine was never a Shia cause before 1979
Source of ideology	Presented as authentic Shia doctrine	Imported from Sunni Muslim Brotherhood via Sayyid Qutb's writings
Theological authority	Faqih holds universal divine authority	The doctrine was rejected by major Shia jurists including Shariatmadari, Montazeri, and the Najaf seminary

The Iranian regime claims Quranic authority for its opposition to Israel. The Quran says the opposite. The regime dismisses the Tanakh as corrupted. The Tanakh's core covenantal passages are confirmed by manuscript evidence predating Islam by centuries, and the Quran itself instructs Jews to judge by their Torah. The regime claims Shia tradition supports its political theology. A millennium of Shia scholarship says the opposite. The regime presents anti-Zionism as indigenous to Shia Islam. The historical record shows it was imported from Sunni radical movements. This is not a double contradiction—it is a triple one: against the Tanakh, against the Quran, and against Shia tradition itself.

## IX. Parallel Architecture: Rome, Windsor, Tehran

The structural parallels between Christian and Shia Islamic supersessionism are now visible:

Element	Christian Model	Shia Model
Core claim	Church replaces Israel as covenantal community	Islam is the final, uncorrupted Abrahamic revelation
Mechanism of displacement	Supersessionism: covenant transferred	Tahrif: earlier scriptures corrupted
Political consequence	Church authority → Divine right of kings	Imamate → Wilayat al-Faqih
Institutional beneficiary	Church of Rome; House of Windsor	Iranian Supreme Leader; Islamic Republic

Element	Christian Model	Shia Model
Challenge from Israel's restoration	Disrupts claim of permanent Jewish displacement	Contradicts the Quran's own assignment of the Holy Land to Jews
Contradiction with Tanakh	Tanakh reinterpreted via supersessionist hermeneutic	Tanakh dismissed via tahrif, but Quran affirms Torah's authority; manuscript evidence confirms textual stability
Function of anti-Jewish narrative	Preserves theological basis of ecclesiastical and royal authority	Preserves theological basis of clerical governance



In both cases, the denial of Jewish covenantal continuity and national restoration is not incidental to the institutions' authority claims. It is foundational. Remove the denial, and the theological architecture requires fundamental revision.

## X. Wilayat al-Faqih Under Internal Challenge

It is worth noting that the doctrine of Wilayat al-Faqih was contested from the beginning—and the challenge came from within Shia Islam's own scholarly establishment.

Grand Ayatollah Mohammad Kazem Shariatmadari, a senior cleric who outranked Khomeini in the traditional seminary hierarchy, rejected absolute clerical governance. Grand Ayatollah Hossein-Ali Montazeri, who was initially designated as Khomeini's successor, ultimately broke with the regime and argued that sovereignty belongs to the people, with clerics limited to a

supervisory role. The Najaf seminary in Iraq—historically the most authoritative centre of Shia learning—maintained its quietist position and never endorsed Wilayat al-Faqih in its absolute form.

When Khamenei succeeded Khomeini in 1989, he held the rank of Hojatoleslam rather than Grand Ayatollah—a religious rank insufficient, by traditional standards, for the position he assumed. His subsequent promotion was politically engineered, not theologically earned. The current Supreme Leader’s authority thus rests on a doctrinal innovation rejected by major Shia scholars, implemented through a political revolution, and sustained by a state apparatus—not by the consensus of the Shia learned establishment.

## **XI. The Eschatological Dimension: Israel and the Mahdi**

Khomeini added a further layer by fusing anti-Zionism with Shia eschatology. Traditional Twelver theology held that the Mahdi would return in God’s own time, and believers were to wait patiently. Khomeini reinterpreted this: clerics must actively prepare the ground for the Mahdi’s return, and the destruction of Israel was cast as part of this preparation.

This eschatological anti-Zionism was amplified during the presidency of Mahmoud Ahmadinejad (2005–2013), who explicitly called for Israel to “vanish from the page of time,” denied the Holocaust, and hosted international conferences for Holocaust deniers. These were not aberrations—they were the logical extensions of Khomeini’s theological framework.

Yet the Quran itself, in Surah 17:104, speaks of the Children of Israel being gathered in the land as part of God’s eschatological plan. If anything, the Quranic eschatological vision anticipates Jewish presence in the Holy Land, not its elimination. The Khomeinist eschatological programme thus inverts the Quran’s own eschatology.

## **XII. Conclusion: The Guardian Who Contradicts His Own Book**

The architecture of Wilayat al-Faqih, like the architecture of Christian supersessionism and divine-right monarchy analysed in the companion article, depends on the denial of Jewish covenantal continuity and national restoration.

But the Shia case is, in one respect, more stark than the Christian one. Christian supersessionism reinterprets the Hebrew Bible—a text that Christians share with Jews but read through a different hermeneutical lens. **Islamic anti-Zionism must overcome a triple barrier. First, it contradicts the Tanakh—whose irrevocable covenantal assertions are confirmed by manuscript evidence predating Islam by centuries. Second, it contradicts the Quran—Islam’s own final, authoritative, and supposedly uncorrupted scripture, which assigns the Holy Land to the Children of Israel.** Third, it contradicts a millennium

of Shia quietist tradition that never treated Palestine as a Shia concern. The Quran assigns the Holy Land to the Children of Israel. The Islamic Republic of Iran denies it. The Quran instructs Jews to judge by their Torah. Khomeini called the Torah worthless. The Tanakh promises restoration from exile. History has delivered that restoration. The Quran speaks of the ingathering of the Children of Israel. The regime calls that ingathering an illegitimate occupation.

**Anti-Jewish and anti-Israel propaganda is not incidental to the legitimacy of the Islamic Republic of Iran. It is foundational.** Without it, the Supreme Leader's claim to universal divine authority is exposed as a twentieth-century political innovation that contradicts a millennium of Shia tradition and—most damagingly—contradicts the very Quran it purports to defend.

**The Guardian of the Islamic Jurist has built his authority on the denial of a truth that his own Book affirms. And once that contradiction is made explicit, the question is the same one that confronts every institution built on supersessionist foundations: what happens to the architecture of authority when the premise it rests upon is shown to be false—not by an external critic, but by its own scripture?**

## Notes

1. Quran, Surah Al-Ma'idah 5:21. Translation adapted from Mustafa Khattab, *The Clear Quran*.
2. Quran, Surah Al-Isra' 17:104.
3. Quran, Surah Al-A'raf 7:137.
4. Quran, Surah Al-Jathiyah 45:16.
5. Quran, Surah Al-Baqarah 2:75.
6. Quran, Surah Al-Ma'idah 5:13.
7. Quran, Surah Al-Ma'idah 5:43–44.
8. Jeremiah 31:35–36 (Hebrew Bible). All Tanakh quotations follow the King James Version for accessibility.
9. Leviticus 26:44 (Hebrew Bible).
10. Deuteronomy 30:3–5 (Hebrew Bible).
11. Ezekiel 36:24 (Hebrew Bible).
12. Isaiah 11:11–12 (Hebrew Bible).
13. On the textual stability of the Hebrew Bible, see the Dead Sea Scrolls corpus, dated c. 250 BCE–68 CE. See Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 3rd ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012).
14. On tahrif and its doctrinal development, see Gabriel Said Reynolds, "On the Quranic Accusation of Scriptural Falsification (tahrif) and Christian Anti-Jewish Polemic," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 130/2 (2010): 189–202.
15. Ibn Hazm, *al-Fisal fi al-Milal wal-Ahwa' wal-Nihal*, 11th century.
16. Khomeini, *Hokumat-e Islami: Velayat-e Faqih* (Islamic Government: Governance of the Jurist), lectures delivered 1970, published Beirut 1970.
17. Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Articles 5, 107, 110 (1979, amended 1989).
18. Abdulaziz Sachedina, *The Just Ruler (al-Sultan al-'Adil) in Shi'ite Islam* (Oxford University Press, 1988).
19. Khomeini, *Sahifa-yi Nur*, collected speeches and writings. Passages on Jews cited in Meir Litvak, "Iran and Israel: The Ideological Enmity and its Roots," *Iyunim be-Tkumat Yisrael* 14 (2004): 367–392.
20. On Khamenei's translation of Sayyid Qutb's works into Farsi: Hussain Abdul-Hussain, "Khomeini's War: Sunni Islamists Taught Shia Iran to Hate Israel," *Foundation for the Defense of Democracies*, June 2025.
21. On the rejection of Wilayat al-Faqih by major Shia scholars: Mohsen Kadivar, *Theories of State in Shi'i Fiqh* (Tehran, 1997); Montazeri's critiques are documented in multiple sources including his published memoirs.
22. On Khamenei's insufficient clerical rank at the time of succession: TRENDS Research & Advisory, "The Declining Legitimacy of Absolute Velayat-e Faqih," March 2025.

## **Selected Bibliography**

- Abdul-Hussain, Hussain. "Khomeini's War: Sunni Islamists Taught Shia Iran to Hate Israel." Foundation for the Defense of Democracies, June 2025.
- Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Iran. 1979, amended 1989.
- Ibn Hazm. *al-Fisal fi al-Milal wal-Ahwa' wal-Nihal*. 11th century.
- Kadivar, Mohsen. *Theories of State in Shi'i Fiqh*. Tehran, 1997.
- Khomeini, Ruhollah. *Hokumat-e Islami: Velayat-e Faqih (Islamic Government)*. Beirut, 1970.
- Khomeini, Ruhollah. *Sahifa-yi Nur*. Collected speeches and writings.
- Litvak, Meir. "Iran and Israel: The Ideological Enmity and its Roots." *Iyunim be-Tkumat Yisrael* 14 (2004): 367–392.
- Malicse, Angelito. "Ayatollah Khomeini's Doctrine of Wilayat al-Faqih: Redefining Religious and Political Authority in Twelver Shia Islam." *PhilArchive*, 2024.
- Novak, David. *The Election of Israel: The Idea of the Chosen People*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Reynolds, Gabriel Said. "On the Quranic Accusation of Scriptural Falsification (tahrif) and Christian Anti-Jewish Polemic." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 130/2 (2010): 189–202.
- Sachedina, Abdulaziz. *The Just Ruler (al-Sultan al-'Adil) in Shi'ite Islam*. Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Soulen, R. Kendall. *The God of Israel and Christian Theology*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996.
- Tov, Emanuel. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. 3rd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012.
- TRENDS Research & Advisory. "The Declining Legitimacy of Absolute Velayat-e Faqih: Security Implications for Iran, the Region, and the World." March 2025.