The True Reactions Toward the Hashshashin

Introduction

Assassin. The very mention of the word captures the imagination. When one thinks of an assassin, perhaps one envisions a stealthy, calculating killer who carries out his orders with brutal efficiency. The assassin stalks and dispatches his target without making his presence known. The triumphant killer then returns to his secluded hideout and rejoins his brothers, awaiting his next assignment. This is the image most people have of assassins. Why are assassins so fascinating? Where does the idea of assassins as unseen foes with the quick-strike ability to kill come from?

A little bit before the First Crusade around 1080, the Hashshashin separated from the Fatimid Caliphate following the death of the ruler, Ma’ad al-Mustansir Billah. The founder of their sect, Hasan-I Sabbah wished to strike against his enemies, so the Ismaili Assassins were formed to aid in this undertaking. After Sabbah’s death, the assassins selected a new grandmaster and continued their existence. At this time they were known as the Nizari; Hashshashin was a western term that these Ismailis would receive once they came in contact with the crusaders. The term Hashshashin was somewhat derogatory since it implied the
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assassins used Hashish and other drugs. The cult’s grandmaster called them Ashishin which meant ‘foundation of the faith.’ This is where the word ‘assassin’ comes from.

The history of the Hashshashin is twisted, bloody, and at times, a bit unbelievable. They expanded their power and influence throughout the Middle East and any ruler that dared challenge or defy them usually paid the price with his life. By the time of the Third Crusade in 1189, the cult of assassins was a force to be reckoned with. During the Third Crusade the Hashshashin became involved and assassinated several high-profile people including Conrad of Montferrat, who was the King of Jerusalem at the time of his death. Prior to the Third Crusade, the assassins fought against other Muslims, most notably the Seljuk Turks. The guild had dealings with Muslims and Christians alike and caused other to have varying opinions of them.

The Hashshashin were a cult of Islamic assassins that were involved in many clandestine operations. Killing people quietly like that is a trait that does not go over well with other people. I intend to argue that the viewpoints on the Hashshashin cannot be lumped into Eastern and Western camps. Not all Muslims approved of the assassins and likewise, not all Europeans disapproved of them; they were pretty much universally disliked by everyone. The assassins were on their own in terms of ways of thinking and garnered little support from others, save those that followed the Hashshashin way of life. Some of this negative attitude towards the assassins stems from tales about their exploits. However, Farhad Daftary, a noted scholar and author of several books on the subject such as The Assassin Legends: Myths of the Ismailis and The Ismailis: Their History and Doctrines, argues that most commonly held beliefs about the order of assassins, known as the Hashshashin from the twelfth century, are nothing but exaggerations. Daftary believes that negative experiences with Muslims, as well as a lack of
knowledge about them is what led to European myths about the assassins.\(^2\) Moreover, in
discussions of the Hashshashin, a controversial issue is whether they can be linked to modern
day Islamic extremists. A better understanding of the opinions of the assassin’s medieval
contemporaries could be applied to today and the attitude toward Muslim fanatics. Although I
concede that the Hashshashin were not as enigmatic as typically thought based on Daftary’s
evidence, I still maintain that the assassins were not favored by the majority of Muslims in the
twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

**Historiography**

The secondary sources can be divided into three different camps, and consist of books.
There are those written from a western perspective, those written from an Arab point of view.
As one might imagine, the reception of the assassins differs depending on the author of the book.
Any bias detected in these sources could very well apply to how the west and east felt about the
assassins back in twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

The majority of my sources were written by westerners from a western point of view.
These sources obviously tell the tale of the crusades and the assassins from a European
viewpoint. At first glance, Christian Europeans look to have a different take than the Muslims
on the assassins and the Crusades. These sources often describe the assassins as secretive and
cunning; a deadly force to be reckoned with. However, Authors such as Bernard Lewis and
James Waterson, noted historians in their own right and authors of *The Assassins* and *The Ismaili
Assassins* respectively, present a serious, professional image of the Hashshashin. Despite the
stereotype that westerners are in awe and fear of the assassins, these two do not let popular myths

and legends about the Ismaili cult sway their viewpoints, since there is more knowledge on the subject available to western scholars this day in age. During the twelfth and thirteen centuries, western historians often wrote negatively of the assassins and speculated about the Muslim killers’ lifestyle and perceived brutality. Such speculation is evident in the primary sources written by Europeans, discussed later.

A few sources are from the Arab perspective of the situation. Maalouf’s book, The Crusades Through Arab Eyes, is focused on the Muslim point of view of the events of the crusades. Daftary’s works are more about the Ismailis which is the sect of the Islam the Hashshashin came from. Daftary talks extensively about their history and beliefs and even devotes an entire book to debunking myths and fabrications about the assassins. He wants to make sure the truth is known, and it appears blatantly obvious upon further review that Daftary defends the Hashshashin from unfair assertions. While not necessarily condoning the guild’s actions, Daftary will not let them be labeled unfairly.

Some sources try to make connections between modern day Islamic extremists and the assassins of the past. A few take a broad approach such as detailing a history of Islam in war or even trying to connect the ancient Hashshashin with modern day Islamic extremists. For the most part, the sources do a good job, such as the books by Marshall Hodgson (The Secret Order of Assassins) and W.B. Bartlett (Assassins: The Story of Medieval Islam’s Secret Sect), in not labeling the assassins as good or bad. These authors discuss the actions of the Hashshashin without any superfluous commentary about the Hashshashin being good or evil. As stated earlier however, there are a couple sources that try to make a connection between the assassins and

---

modern day extremists. The writings of Dr. Haha Lung (*Assassin! The Deadly Art of the Cult of Assassins*) include a timeline of notable events involving Muslims and assassins from the twelfth century up to the 1990’s. He also provides commentary on what he sees as the evolution of the assassin. While the motives and tactics of the two groups are stark in contrast, this still does not paint the Hashshashin in a positive light. I believe a source such as Dr. Lung’s is worth making note of, as it brings up an interesting premise, but overall it does not fit into my argument.

**Primary Sources**

The primary sources are mostly written sources. They consist of letters written by notable people of the twelfth century, such as Aymeric, patriarch of Antioch, and accounts written by historians and chroniclers of the twelfth and thirteenth century that have been translated, and even an anthology of old Ismaili literature, mostly poems. There are accounts from both Christians and Muslims. Among my primary sources is an account from Marco Polo, who apparently encountered the Hashshashin in his journey to the east. Additionally, there are examples from *Life of Saint Louis* by Jean of Joinville, a Frenchman that accompanied King Louis IX on his expedition to the Holy Land. Louis encounters representatives from the Hashshashin assassins and Joinville documents the proceedings. Both of the aforementioned sources are instrumental to understanding the European contemplation of the assassins. The poems are part of Ismaili culture, which happens to be the sect of Islam from which the order of assassins came. Perhaps the most important source is the book *Arab Historians of the Crusades*, which is a compilation of writings from Arab historians that lived during the time of the Hashshashin. The book also explains who each of the writers were and what they did during the time of the crusades. This source proves useful in supporting the argument that the assassins were not universally loved by Muslims. Another useful source from the Muslim viewpoint is
Life of Saladin which is created from the works of two of Saladin’s biographers, Imad Ad-Din and Baha Ad-Din. This record of Saladin’s life includes his encounters with the assassins.

First off, many Europeans despised the assassins and everything they stood for. As far as most crusaders knew, the assassins were agents of Islam and were to be considered dangerous. Many Europeans did not like Muslims in general and had been at conflict with them for a while. The idea of a cult of Muslim assassins was terrifying to Europeans. In reality, the Hashshashin had killed far more Muslims than Christians, but the Europeans did not know this. Europeans were also unaware of the differences between different Islamic sects. In the scheme of things, the Hashshashin were a relatively small cult of people, within the Ismaili sect, which in turn was a sect of Shia Islam. Followers of Shia Islam are a small minority when compared to the followers of Sunni Islam. Thusly, the Hashshashin were a tiny part of the Muslim world; not all of the Hashshashin were even assassins, but because of their reputation as killers, they were stuck with the label as bloodthirsty murderers. Since the group was Muslim, Islam as a whole was tied to the image of the assassins. The crusaders made no distinction between Muslim sects and lumped them together as one entity. The following quote is typical of the feelings many Europeans had about the Hashshashin.

I name the Assassins, who are to be cursed and fled. They sell themselves, are thirsty for human blood, kill the innocent for a price, and care nothing for either life or salvation. Like the devil, they transfigure themselves into angels of light, by imitating the gestures, garments, languages, customs and acts of various nations and peoples; thus, hidden in sheep’s clothing, they suffer death as soon as they are recognized. Since indeed I have not seen them, but know this of them only by repute or by true writings, I cannot reveal more, nor give fuller information. I cannot show how to recognize them by their customs or any other signs, for in these things they are unknown to me as to others also; nor can I show how to apprehend them by their name, for so execrable is their profession, and so abominated by all, that they conceal their own names as much as they can. I therefore know only one single remedy for the safeguarding and protection of the king, that in all the royal household, for whatever service, however small or brief or mean, none should
be admitted, save those whose country, place, lineage, condition and person are certainly, fully and clearly known.⁴

This quote is from Brocardus, a German priest who was advising King Philip VI of France. Philip had been planning a crusade to the Holy Land and had asked about the potential dangers. Brocardus wasted no time in explaining the dangers of the assassins. According to Brocardus, they were brutal and nearly impossible to detect. It is important to note Brocardus’s position as a priest. By virtue of being followers of different religions, Christians and Muslims were often at odds. A priest would be even more adamant of Christianity as he had invested his whole life into the religion. The fact that the assassins used trickery to aid in their endeavors also contributed to western disdain. Sneaking around and killing people secretly was considered cowardly and not honorable. The use of subterfuge was the opposite of European chivalry which emphasized bravery and honor in battle. This feeling of disgust for the Hashshashin was shared by the majority of European crusaders, although there were those who were able to coexist with the cult.

The assassins were not completely berserk and could be reasoned with as some crusaders eventually found out. Some crusaders were able to get the assassins to pay tribute. The following excerpt from the *Life of Saint Louis* from Jean of Joinville explains the situation:

> At that time the Old Man of the Mountain made tribute payments to the Hospital and Temple because they had no fear of the Assassins. The Old Man could not gain anything by having the master of the Temple or the Hospital killed because he understood clearly that if he had one of them killed, another man, just as able would immediately replace him. Because of this he was unwilling to lose any of the Assassins when he had nothing to gain by it.⁵

In this instance the assassins pay the crusaders. The assassins are depicted as submissive to the brave crusaders who do not fear death. The assassins are shown as not wanting to risk losing men against the crusaders. Jean of Joinville, author of *Life of Saint Louis*, wrote about Louis IX expedition to the Middle East. During the trip, the king and Joinville met some assassin envoys who demand Louis pay tribute to their master. Louis told the assassins to come back and return with gifts from the master of the assassins. Once the envoys returned, only then would he send tribute to the leader of the Hashshashin. Joinville was the author of the above quote and this next one, which shows what happened next.

Within two weeks the Old Man of the Mountain’s envoys came back to Acre. They brought the king the Old Man’s chemise and on their lord’s behalf they told the king of its significance: just as the chemise is closer to one’s body than any other piece of clothing, so the Old Man wanted to keep the king closer in love than any other king. He sent the king his ring, which was made of very fine gold and had his name engraved on it; their lord informed them that with this ring he formed a union with the king, wishing them to be as one from this time forwards.  

The assassin’s master gave in to Louis’s demands and sent him gifts. Louis fulfilled his promise and sent gifts to the Old Man of the Mountain, which is the title given to the assassin’s leader. Joinville describes Louis as a brave and stalwart man in the face of these assassins who are described as cunning and ruthless in their attempts to squeeze tribute from Louis. Louis, being the charismatic figure that Joinville paints him as, not only refuses their demands, but orders the assassins to return to their master and bring back gifts from him. The assassins yield to Louis’s demands. It is important to note that Joinville is a close companion of Louis throughout the
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entire journey and thinks very highly of the French king. Joinville strives to paint Louis in the best possible light. The encounter with the assassins shows how brave and powerful Louis is and how quick to submit the assassins were. As mentioned earlier, the Templar and Hospitaller masters were also unafraid of the assassins. Joinville showed these important leaders, Louis and the masters of the knightly orders, holding power over the mysterious killers that many of his European contemporaries feared. In this particular context, the Europeans were unafraid of the Hashshashin and were unimpressed with the Muslim eliminators’ tactics. According to the text, the assassins agreed to pay tribute to the Europeans so if Joinville is to be believed, Louis and the knight masters did not buy into the tales of the Hashshashin enough to consider them to be a threat. This way of thinking is in stark contrast to Brocardus who was terrified of the assassins and warned against crusading just to avoid potential contact with the assailants.

Marco Polo met a group of assassins on his journey in the latter part of the 13 century. Polo met the leader of the assassins, called “The Old Man of the Mountain” and saw his headquarters as well as his ability to command his men. Marco Polo marveled at how much power the master wielded. To achieve this, the Old Man was aided by his paradise garden, which Polo witnessed first-hand.

He had caused a certain valley between two mountains to be enclosed, and had turned it into a garden, the largest and most beautiful that ever was seen, filled with every variety of fruit. In it were erected pavilions and palaces the most elegant that can be imagined, all covered with gilding and exquisite painting. And there were runnels too, flowing freely with wine and milk and honey and water; and numbers of ladies, and of the most beautiful damsels in the world who could play on all manner of instruments, and sung most sweetly, and danced in a manner that it was charming to behold. For the Old Man
desired to make his people believe that this was actually Paradise… And sure enough the Saracens of those parts believed that it was Paradise!  

The Old Man had this garden that his followers believed was Paradise. The drinks of his minions would be drugged and they would awaken in Paradise. If the Old Man needed someone from the garden, the individual would be given another drugged drink and taken to the Old Man’s palace. Once awake the assassin would then be tasked to do something by the Old Man, with promise of returning to Paradise when finished. Marco Polo explains,  

So when the Old Man would have any Prince slain, he would say to such a youth: “Go thou and slay So and So; and when thou returnest my Angels shall bear thee into Paradise. And shouldst thou die, nathless [sic] even so will I send my Angels to carry thee back into Paradise.” So he caused them to believe; and thus there was no order of his that they would no affront any peril to execute, for the great desire they had to get back into that Paradise of his. And in this manner the Old One got his people to murder any one whom he desired to get rid of.  

The followers of the Old Man believed him to be a god of sorts. They would do anything he asked if it meant returning to Paradise. Even if they failed, the assassins still believed they would return to Paradise. The promise of Paradise no matter the outcome was a powerful tool of persuasion. Marco Polo was in awe of the methods of the Hashshashin. Polo took note of the grim determination of the assassins to carry out their assignments without fear of death. The Italian held quiet respect for the cult, and amazed by the influence and power the Old Man held. Still, one must realize that stories of assassin leader with paradise gardens, exerting their talents for leadership over their minions, were widespread over the Middle East. Polo could easily
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have written down a tale told to him by a stranger in an inn. It is also important to note that at
the time of Polo’s visit to the Middle East, the Hashshashin were getting cracked down on and
eliminated by Arab leaders. I highly doubt the leaders of the endangered guild would allow
visitors to see their most intimate secrets. Polo’s writing just goes to show, that even on the
verge of their demise, the assassins were still largely a mystery to Europeans.

The Europeans were not the only ones that largely disliked the Hashshashin. Other
Muslims also held varying perspectives on the guild of assassination. The assassination of
Conrad of Montferrat brings to light the fact that the assassins were disliked even by their fellow
Muslims. Conrad had been selected to be King of Jerusalem by the barons of the kingdom.
Shortly afterward he was killed by two men in the city of Tyre. The men were captured and
revealed to be Hashshashin. Various theories spread around about who had ordered the hit.
Muslim reactions contained some deviations. While almost universal in their gladness of
Conrad’s death, the Muslim writers of the time could not agree on who had hired the assassins.
The Muslims also held different reactions when learning of assassin involvement. The following
passage is from a manuscript by Imad Ad-Din.

The Franks seized the two companions, and found that they were two apostates of the
Brotherhood of Ismailites. They asked them who had commanded them to commit this
murder, and the assassins said it was the king of England. They also said that they had
been Christians for six months and had begun a life of asceticism and purification,
frequenting churches and living lives of rigorous piety. One in service with Ibn Barzan
and one with the Prince of Sidon so that they could both be close to the Marquis, ensuring
his confidence in them by their constant presence. Then they sized hold of his saddle-
bow and slaughtered him. They were both subjected to cruel punishments and were
reduced to the depths of degradation. An extraordinary case of two Unbelievers shedding
an Unbeliever’s blood, two criminals killing a criminal! When the Marquis was dead and
hung head downward in Hell, the King of England assumed control of Tyre and
conferred it upon Count Henry, arranging it all with him. Henry married the Marquis’
wife on the same night, maintaining that he had first right to the dead man’s wife. She
was pregnant, but this did not prevent his uniting himself with her, something even more
disgusting than the coupling of the flesh. I asked one of their courtiers to whom paternity
would be awarded and he said: ‘It will be the Queens child.’ You see the licentiousness of these foul Unbelievers! The death of the Marquis in such circumstances was of little benefit to us, although he was one of the ringleaders of error, because he was one of the King of England’s enemies, his rival for the kingdom and the throne and his competitor in all and for all.\textsuperscript{10}

Imad Ad-Din was a scholar who served as secretary to Nur ad-Din and Saladin. He wrote a lot about Saladin. Francesco Gabrieli, the man who compiled together many portions of writing from Arab historians into a single volume, praised Imad Ad-Din as an invaluable authority on Saladin and Syria, but admitted that the Arab chronicler tended to be a bit long-winded in his writing. Anyway, Ad-Din clearly despised the Hashshashin as he referred to them as “Unbelievers” and “criminals.” The Hashshashin were Shia Muslims and had different beliefs from most other Muslims. This is the reason for Ad-Din’s labeling of the assassins as “Unbelievers.” He used the same terms to refer to Conrad. Imad Ad-Din hated the Crusaders with a passion. The death of one of the European leaders was a cause for celebration, but was also an inconvenience for the Muslims. As stated, Conrad was a rival to Richard the Lionheart, the King of England. Conrad’s death meant that Richard had fewer problems to deal with. Imad Ad-Din believes this is why Richard was behind Conrad’s killing. The Muslim historian hated the Crusaders and was disgusted by their possible motives for the killing. The fact that the Europeans enlisted the help of “renegade” Muslims made the whole thing that much worse. Imad Ad-Din already hated the Hashshashin for their beliefs, so helping the hated Crusaders only served to add to the contempt.

Of course Muslim support for the assassins was present. Manaqib Rashid Ad-Din wrote about the assassination of Conrad in a style that depicted the whole situation in a positive light.

First off, Manaqqib depicted Saladin and the assassin leader as on good terms. The following quote shows expresses this apparent friendship: “Then our Lord, who at that time was at the Fortress of Kahf said-peace be to us from him!-‘Our friend Saladin is now in a difficulty…tell him that I have sent you to his enemy the King of the Franks, to kill him that night.” Manaqqib Rashid Ad-Din was a writer of the Ismailite sect. He wrote *The Virtues of our Lord Rashid ad-Din*. This document was about the exploits of Rashid ad-Din who was the superior of the Syrian assassins during the time of Saladin. Glorification of Lord Rashid ad-Din was the primary concern and other things like informational accuracy were not to get in the way. Manaqqib ends his opus on the assassination with the following:

Then [Saladin] gave them robes of honour, made them sit beside him, and said: ‘Tell me whatever you desire, ask me for whatever you want. My duty is to content you.’ They replied: ‘God with His angels assist Your Majesty and cast your enemies into Hell! This world is nothing, and whoever deludes himself will repent when penitence is of no avail. We are of those who have turned away from worldly goods and renounced them. In truth, we ask nothing but two portions of flour, one for each of us, for our families.’ Then the Sultan Saladin ordained that in each province near the forts of the Company of right guidance ten villagers should be inscribed (as tributaries), and that in every city a ‘House of the Company’ should be built as a centre for the Company of right guidance. So in Cairo, Damascus, Hims, Hamat, Aleppo and other centres this was done, and all the houses are known by the name of ‘the Company’. As well as this he loaded the two Brethren with gifts and sent a splendid gift to our Lord Rashid ad-Din.

So not only does Manaqqib say the assassins survived the attack, but he insists they were sent by the master out of the kindness of his heart. Manaqqib Rashid Ad-Din has been established as something of a propaganda writer and his passage on the assassination of Conrad of Montferrat shows it. The leader of the assassins is shown as a kind-hearted figure that sent aid to his “friend,” Saladin. In reality, Saladin and the assassins were mortal enemies. Not only did the
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two parties have opposing beliefs, but the assassins had already tried to kill Saladin. Saladin would have never asked for their help, nor would the assassins have helped him in such a way for essentially nothing. The two killers asked for flour from Saladin after the deed was done, but they only said this because the master assassin told them to say it. Saladin then goes out of his way to provide much more to the cult of assassins. I interpret this as Manaqib trying to patch things up between the Hashshashin and other Muslims. By showing Rashid ad-Din and Saladin (leader of the Muslim armies and a hero to many) as getting along with each other, Manaqib may have been trying to stress that the assassins were not bad people at all and were in fact noble and righteous. This Muslim does show support for the Hashshashin, but it is important to realize that he subscribes to their beliefs and his writing has the lone goal of praising the cult’s accomplishments.

As mentioned briefly above, Saladin, the leader of Muslim forces during the Third Crusade, had his own problems with the assassins. The life of Saladin is well documented by the historians Imad Ad-Din (mentioned above) and Baha Ad-Din. Both men were contemporaries of Saladin and served as his biographers. They recorded much of what went on in Saldin’s life, including his run-in with the Hashshashin. While trying to take over Aleppo, the defenders used whatever methods were available as demonstrated in the following quote: “The amirs had recourse to the familiar expedients: the hiring of fidais from Sinan, the Old Man of the Mountains, to assassinate Saladin, an agreement with Raymond of Tripoli that in return for favours past and to come he should create a diversion by attacking Hims, and an appeal to Mosul in the name of family solidarity. The attempted assassination failed, but Saladin withdrew to defend Hims.”

Saladin was trying to conquer other Muslim lands for himself and the rulers of

---

these lands had many options open to them, including calling on the Hashshashin to eliminate Saladin. However, the assassination attempts failed. Saladin and all who followed him had no love for the assassins. Thus began Saladin’s conflict with the Hashshashin. This would not be the only time the Hashshashin tried to kill Saladin:

During the siege of Azaz, a second and still more determined attempt had been made on Saladin’s life by emissaries of the Assassins. On his return from Aleppo, therefore, he marched on Misyaf, the Syrian headquarters of the sect, and laid siege to it, while his troops ravaged the neighborhood. What followed is largely enveloped in legend; but Saladin withdrew to Damascus and dismissed his Egyptian forces to their homes. The only certain thing is that for the rest of his life he had nothing to fear from the Assassins.  

After the second attempt on his life by the Hashshashin, Saladin attacked the sect’s main base of operations and trashed the surrounding area. This action dealt severe damage to the guild, but to say that Saladin would never have to worry about the Hashshahin ever again, as Imad Ad-Din and Baha Ad-Din said, is going too far. While not explicit in the excerpt, Saladin never actually captured the fortress and instead settled for a truce. Truces can easily be broken and even if Misyaf had fallen to Saladin, the assassins had other hideouts. The text displays the Hashshashin as weak, under-handed fiends that crumbled easily against the might of Saladin. It is important to remember that this was written by Saladin’s personal biographers, so people he considered unsavory like the assassins would appear to have been easily dealt with. Regardless of the passage’s written style, Saladin would never forget the attempts on his life by the assassins, and anyone held in contempt by a person as powerful and influential as Saladin is bound to be held in contempt by a lot of other people.
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Such is the fate of the Hashshashin. They were hated and feared by the Europeans to the point that stories with no basis in reality were created about them. Their fellow Muslims hated them because of the Hashshashin belief system. In the west, the Hashshashin were often a reason for hatred of Islam, despite the fact the other Muslims typically despised them. The Hashshashin were a victim of their reputation. Not everyone who was Hashshashin was an assassin but since the Hashshashin assassins caught the notice of everyone, it became commonplace to label the Hashshashin as just a group of assassins. The assassins themselves only fought and killed when threatened or if hired to do a job. The idea of killing stealthily for money does not sit right with some people. The Hashshashin are in some ways comparable to the Muslim extremists of the modern day. They were/are despised by most people save for those that agree with their beliefs, but sometimes those in the west tend to forget that they are not the sole representative of everything a Muslim is. The Hashshashin assassins were perhaps hyped up a bit too much by western scholars during the twelfth and thirteenth century. The assassins had been a far bigger threat to other Muslims than they ever were to the Europeans, but this factuality was lost beneath the myths and stories. The Hashshashin were disliked by Muslims just as much as they were disliked by Europeans, whether the animosity was warranted or not.
Bibliography


An Affidavit which identifies an individual known by different names as being one and the same person, e.g. Joe Smith and Joseph Smith are one and the same person as executed the oil and gas lease dated January 1, 2010 covering Affidavit of Non-Production. An Affidavit which states certain facts in support of the declaration that an oil and gas lease terminated pursuant to the terms and conditions set forth therein due to the failure to either drill or timely develop. Draft final report. MAY 2011 Scott Wilson Mozambique Lda Av.: Emilia Dausse, no 83R/C Tel +258 21 312 878 Fax +258 21 304 870 Email: info@scottwilsonmozambique.co.mz. Â Draft Final Report. May 2011. 12. Training Contractors for Targeted Interventions on Low Volume Rural Roads in Mozambique. 7) Beira-Savane Â· Frequent rain delays seriously hampering ETB work Â· Lack of sufficient flexibility by the contractor leading to delay in work progress Â· Poor ETB work Â· Lack of appropriate equipment Â· Lack of adequately qualified and experienced staff on site. Â 18 Nov 2010 Chinhacanine-Nalazi BRIDE ConstruÃ§Ãµes. 9 Feb 11. Chinhacanine-Nalazi BRIDE ConstruÃ§Ãµes.