

**Unveiling the Great Deception in
al-Zawahiri's 'Exoneration of the Nation'**

Al-Sayyid Imam Abdul-Aziz al-Sharif
Dr Fadl

November 2008

Part I

“Al-Zawahiri’s book is full of lies, calumnies, jurisprudential fallacies, and indirections”

Dr Fadl, the mastermind of the jihadists

Recently, The Middle Eastern newspaper ‘*Al-Sharq Al-Awsat*’ has published several sequels of Dr Fadl’s “Unveiling al-Zawahiri’s Deceptions in His ‘Exoneration of the Nation’ ” (*Mudhakkirat al-Ta’riya li Kitaab al-Tabri’a*), which the author wrote as a response to the book written not long ago by the second man in command in al-Qaeda, under the title ‘Exoneration of the Nation of the Pen and the Sword of the Denigrating Charge of being Undetermined and Powerless’. In this response, Dr Fadl not only debunks the ideas of al-Zawahiri, but he also divulges many aspects of his life and personality that are usually unknown to the general public

Tuesday the 20/Dhu al-Qi ‘da/ 1429 AH – 18/ November/ 2008, Cairo

Issue No 10948

Al-Sharq Al-Awsat

By Muhammad Mustafa Abu Shama

A year ago [in 2007], al-Sayyid Imam Abdul-Aziz al-Sharif,

Dr Fadl, the former mastermind and ideologue of the Jihad Organization (*Tanzeem*) of Egypt, launched his jurisprudential reviews on jihadi activity, in a booklet titled “*The Document for the Guidance of Jihadi Action in Egypt and the World*”. These reviews, which came in the form of disavowals of the prevailing jihadi philosophy in the Muslim world, have had a significant impact among the jihadists and were since then considered a turning point in the history of the Islamist movements. This impact and popularity that the reviews enjoyed did not obviously go down well with the current leader of the Jihad (*Tanzeem*), and second man in command of the al-Qaeda organization, Dr Ayman al-Zawahiri, who moved quickly to retort the charge against Dr Fadl’s document in a book titled ‘*The Exoneration of the Nation of the Pen and the Sword of the Denigrating Charge of being Undetermined and Powerless*’. This book was, in turn, followed by a rejoinder which Dr Fadl titled *Unveiling the Deception in al-Zawahiri’s ‘Exoneration of the Nation’*. In it the author, discusses his long relationship with Dr al-Zawahiri and reveals for the first time aspects of the latter’s life and

personality which have hitherto remained unknown. The Middle Eastern newspaper *Al-Sharq Al-Awsat* has obtained publishing rights to publish all of Dr Fadl's recent rebuttals and is delighted to release them in sequels starting from today.

As a preliminary to these sequels, it is worth mentioning, albeit briefly, a few things about Dr Fadl's position among the jihadists and the nature of his long relationship with Dr al-Zawahiri. Certainly, Dr Fadl had for years been regarded as *the* mastermind and ideologue of jihadi activity, so much that the Jihad Group (*Jamaa'at al-Jihad*) of Egypt had no hesitation conferring on him the title of "The mufti of the jihadists worldwide". Also his friend Ayman al-Zawaheri was so convinced of his credentials that he vehemently urged him to take on the role of leader (*Amir*) of the Jihad Group when they met in the city of Peshawar on the Afghani-Pakistani border during the eighties of the past century. This title of Amir that al-Zawahiri was eager to bestow upon Dr Fadl does in fact reflect his yearning to imitate and at the same time rival the Islamic Group (*al-Jamaa'a al-Islamiyya*) which had at its helm another great legal scholar in the person of Sheik Omar Abd al-Rahman.

Al-Zawahiri met Dr Fadl fifty eight years ago in the corridors of the medical faculty at Cairo University in 1968. This collegial environment of the university allowed the two to meet regularly and converse about all kinds of issues beyond their common interest in medicine, and to ultimately form a friendship that would last many years after the two had graduated. This friendship, it is worth recalling, was to take on other proportions about forty years ago, particularly in the wake of the collapse of the grand Nassiri project, and was to consolidate further during the wave of political Islam that swept through Egypt during the era of the late president Anwar al-Sadat and reached its peak after the assassination of the latter in 1981. Following this event, Dr Fadl left for Saudi Arabia where he was soon joined and by al-Zawahiri after his release from jail in 1986. From there, they went to Afghanistan and were at the heart of the jihadi resistance to the Soviet invasion, and then both made their way to Sudan where they finally parted ways in 1994, following a growing difference of opinion between the two of them regarding the jihadi philosophy of the *Tanzeem*, notably after al-Zawahiri had succeeded in swaying the Group towards the course of violence and armed confrontation with the Egyptian regime, and before the latter had finally joined al-Qaeda following his infamous deal with Osama Bin Laden in 1998, which saw the birth of the International Islamic Front for Jihad against the Jews and the Crusaders (*al-Jabha al-Islaamiyya al-'Aalamiyya li Jihad al-Yahud wa al-Nasaara*)

After Sudan, Dr Fadl went to Yemen where he worked as a doctor under his real name, al-Seyyid Imam Abdul-Aziz. However, the authorities in Yemen handed him over to Egypt to face the sentence of life imprisonment in a court trial known the case of “The returnees from Albania”. While Abdul-Aziz was doing time in jail, his friend continued on the path he had chosen for himself along his new companion Osama Bin Laden. Both al-Zawahiri and Bin Laden had dreams in the Afghani caves that soon turned to crazy quests that Muslims all over the world had to pay the price for. When Dr Fadl published his Document for the Guidance of Jihadi Action about a year ago, it fell like a bombshell whose impact was most disruptive to the jihadi planners of al-Qaeda. The die-hards of the organisation were so taken aback by Dr Fadl’s document; they wasted no time nor spared effort in mounting a response to it. Al-Zawahiri and his ilk were naturally fully aware of the weight of such a document: it was after all authored by the Sheik Abdul-Qader Bin Abdul-Aziz (Dr Fadl) who may not only be regarded as the foremost ideologue of jihadi activity in the organization (*tanzeem*), but also of al-Qaeda if one takes into consideration the fact that his books and ideas have become the very basis of the organisation’s ideology after it had formed an alliance with the Group. It was due to this trepidation that *The Document* had caused in the ranks of al-Qaeda, that the book of al-Zawahiri, ‘*The Exoneration of the Nation*’ appeared encyclopaedic and contrived: despite attempts to embellish it with all kinds of fakeries, and using all sorts of arguments, al-Zawahiri’s book is trite and fails to make an impression on the reader or evoke his interest, let alone convince him. Commenting on the failures and shortcomings of al-Zawahiri’s book, Dr Fadl writes:

“In 1988 AD/1408H, I had already written a book on some issues relevant to the jurisprudence of jihad, under the title of *Al-‘Umda fi I’daad al-‘Udda* (The Reliance of the People of Jihad), which was the fruit of my experience of jihad against Communism, in Afghanistan. During those ten years (1983-1993) I had certainly noticed that the Arab brothers who participated in this jihad paid a lot of attention to military issues, while often ignoring the demand of the Sharia, which resulted in many of their actions being mainly impulsive and guided by their emotions rather than the rulings of the Law. Equally, during those years in the Afghani front, I came to notice that some of the brothers were so blindly attached to some of the ‘leaders of jihad’ that they would defend them tooth and nail and also to the detriment

of the Sharia. It is owing to all of these deviations and inconsistencies that I felt impelled to write about the importance of learning about religion and holding onto the rulings of the Sharia in my book '*Al Jaami' fi Talab al-Ilm al-Shareef*' (The Complete Source on the Quest for Noble Knowledge), published in 1423 AH/1993 CE”

Commenting further on the behaviour of the Arab *Mujahedeen* in Afghanistan, Dr Fadl went on to say:

“This emotionality and impulsivity appears to have taken a much tighter grip over the action of the jihadists and have become in time their hallmark, such that in recent years they were led to commit mass-killings and genocides in the name of Islam and jihad. I know the people who perpetrated those crimes, just as I know the extent of their religious knowledge and their stance vis-à-vis religion. Indeed, not only have these people committed crime, they have even had the audacity to find a jurisprudential basis for it in Islamic law. I have pointed to some of the salient features of this ‘exonerative jurisprudence’ and have exposed it in my *Document for the Guidance of Jihadi Action* and in the journalistic interview which was later added to that document. But the followers of this corrupt doctrine and jurisprudence from the members of al-Qaeda were led by arrogance to more crime and so after months were able to summon up a reply to the document, though it seems that they have begun preparing their response well before my document was published, and that more than one attempt was tried prior to the present response. Indeed, the first attempt appears to go back a few years and came to an end in July of 2007, when one of those members who took on the task of replying to the document was killed in Sana'a, Yemen, this was followed by a second attempt which was discontinued in January 2008 when another member was killed in Waziristan in Pakistan, and finally that most hapless wretch from among them, al-Zawahiri, rushed forward to commit his evil deed in March of the same year, and wrote his own response to the “document” in a book he named '*The Exoneration of the Nation*'. Al-Zawahiri had no qualms tampering with the truths of Islam and seemed to have completely ignored the lesson in the death of his two precursors, no doubt thinking that he could not possibly meet the same fate as theirs. Concerning such behaviour, God, may He be exalted, has said: “*And, indeed, We tested them through suffering, but they did not abase themselves before their Sustainer; and they will never humble themselves*” (23:76), and also:” *And*

we threaten them, but it increases them not except in great transgression” (17: 60), and to that effect Imam Malik said: “You may be able to resort to circumvention in some of your other dealings but do not try to use tricks in matters of religion”. Indeed, al-Zawahiri’s book ‘The Exoneration of the Nation’ is but a prime example of what I have called ‘exonerative jurisprudence’ whose sole purpose was to provide alibis for this corrupt sect which is al-Qaeda. In fact, it contains but three things: lies and calumnies, jurisprudential fallacies, and indirections.”

The following is the first sequel of Dr Fadl’s book titled *Unveiling the Deception in al-Zawahiri’s Exoneration of the Nation*:

Al-Zawahiri claimed that *The Document for the Guidance of Jihadi Action* was written at the instigation of the American and Jews. In fact more than ten times, he asserted in his book that it was written “under the aegis of the American Embassy, American Secret Services- CIA and FBI- and the Jews”. I want to ask what his evidence for this is, and on what basis does he make such a testimony? Is it based on what he saw and heard or is it based on an attestation of a credible source? If the answer is neither the former nor the latter then he is a liar and if he is uncomfortable with that, I invite him to gather with me to pray and invoke the curse of God on the liars as God Almighty says: “*If anyone disputes in this matter with thee now after (full) knowledge hath come to thee say: "Come! Let us gather together then let us earnestly pray and invoke the curse of God on those who lie!"*”(2: 61). Why should he decline to join me in this prayer? This was after all done before by a number of scholars like Ibn Abbas and Mohammad Bin Abd Al-Wahhaab and many others. So here is my invocation: “O God! You have full knowledge that I in writing *The Document for the Guidance of Jihad* I had only sought to further the standing of religion and that the accusations of al-Zawahiri against me are but lies, so I pray to you to curse whoever between the two of us is lying”. I now wait for him to join me in this invocation in writing if he must, but preferably in audio-visual format since, unlike me, he has access to that technology. I ask this calumnious liar to bring forward his evidence, for God – May He be exalted- says “*Produce your proof, if you should be truthful.*” (2: 111), and the Prophet (pbuh) has said: “*The burden of proof lies with the party that is making the allegation*”. Indeed, I ask him, what legal proof (*bayyina shar’iyya*) have you got against me? I swear he is imagining things and incriminating innocent people...I swear the man is a brazen liar! All that al-Zawahiri is claiming today, specially his allegation that the document was written under the aegis and at

the instigation of America and the Jews, he has alleged previously against his current Sheik, Bin Laden, accusing him of being an undercover agent working for the Saudi secret service inside the Islamic Movements, when the latter did not provide him with financial support in 1995. Notice how al-Zawahiri, because he thinks that everyone else is like him, is always ready to accuse others of treason”

As for my allegations against him (al-Zawahiri), when I accused him of working for the Sudanese Secret services, I swear to God that they were based on what he had personally intimated to me in the year of 1993 in the Sudan, when he confided that he had entered into a committed contact with the Sudanese who had hired him to carry out ten operations in Egypt and that he had in return for these operations received from them 100,000 dollars. These were his exact words to me, and if he denies that is true, then I am inclined to invite him to gather with me in a second invocation: I say: “O God! Al-Zawahiri said these words directly to me and if he denies it O God I beseech you to curse whoever among the two of us is lying”. It is he himself who approached the Sudanese security service to offer his services!

This event occurred nearly a year after my relationship with them was severed. During that time, I saw al-Zawahiri enticing the Sudanese brothers in the Jihad Group to collide with the Egyptian forces and carry out military operations in Egypt, so I sat down with these brothers and warned them about this course of action. I told them that such operations were of no benefit and that above all they were not obligatory in the eyes of the Sharia. However, against my advice, al-Zawahiri, who had already accepted the bribe of the Sudanese, decided to go ahead with his treason and trade in the innocent blood of his brothers. So he bamboozled them with fiery speeches, which were utterly baseless from the point of view of the Sharia, and promised them that he would fight in Egypt till the last man. Obviously, he had lied to them as neither he nor his brother [Muhammad Rabi‘ al-Zawahiri] had gone to fight there, and neither had undergone the ordeals they pushed their brothers towards.

In the end, all that al-Zawahiri had achieved in return for his treachery is only sending more men to their graves or their jailors, for upon seeing that this adventure in Egypt was a total failure and having suffered massive losses, he had no choice but to declare an end to all the operations and fled with his brother from Sudan. This is the fate of every traitor: they ran away but with the burden of their sins and every drop of innocent blood weighing on their conscious, for every human being will be held in pledge for whatever evil he has wrought; there is no

escape from that. But al-Zawahiri, and despite all of that, claims that wrote his book *The Exoneration of the Nation* to make the religion of Islam prevail!

O assembly of Muslims! Know that God may He be exalted did not relate to us the story of *Bani Isra'eel* as He does throughout the Qur'an, dwelling on how He bestowed on them His favours and how they have earned His wrath and His curse thereafter, only to narrate to us a mere story. Nay! It is but to draw lessons from their demise and to be on guard against their treacheries, for failing to do so we would follow the same path. Indeed, the Prophet (pbuh) has said: "*Beware! You may indeed follow the ways of yester nations... the Christians and the Jews*" (Agreed upon hadith). But did not al-Zawahiri do to me precisely what the Jews did to Abdullah Bin Salam in the past? For indeed it is "*they used to say "he is the best among us"* [when Abdullah said things that pleased them], *but no sooner did he say what was not to their liking they would say "he is the worst among us"* (Agreed upon hadith).

In 1991, al-Zawahiri himself said to me: "Since your association with us we no longer feel embarrassed in front of with the members of Islamic Group, because they recognize that you are just as knowledgeable as their Amir the Sheik Omar Abdul-Rahman". Also, in the beginning of 1994, after he had had the opportunity to read my book *al-Jaami'* while I was working on the final draft, al-Zawahiri said to me: "This book is a victory from God the Almighty". Indeed, in their magazine "*al-Mujahidun*", which used to be issued in London, they even went as far as declaring that I was "The mufti of jihadists worldwide", and describing as "the fighting mufti". However, now that I have written 'the document', they have changed: they now call me 'the scholar of the Marines' who has brought a new religion suited to the taste of the Americans, and they describe *The document of Guidance* as a fraud written at the behest of the Jews and the Christians. How ironic is the parallel! Notice how I have become now the 'worst among them' just as Abdullah Bin Salam was among the Jews? It is God who freed Omar Abdul-Rahman, and freed us as well as all the Muslim prisoners!

al-Zawahiri alleges that the 'document' was written at the behest of the Americans whilst at the same acknowledging repeatedly in his book, that many of the ideas in the 'document' are just 'old stuff' culled from my book *al-Jaami'* written over a decade ago: in light of his own reading of *al-Jaami'*, he affirms for instance that it was I who was responsible for stopping the clash with the Egyptian authorities fourteen years ago, and that it was I who criticized the course of confrontation adopted then by the Islamic Groups, and also that it was I who prohibited treachery in the Abode of War to those who enter it with a visa, on the basis that

such a travel document and such a procedure amounted to a pledge of security which a Muslim is not allowed to breach. My question to him is this: was I under any security surveillance when I wrote that book in 1994? Did I write it to gain anyone's favour? If not, how can he keep maintaining that the ideas put forward in the *al-Jaami'*, which he once described as a 'divine victory', are now fakes written to please the Americans, and are a product of pressure and blackmail? Indeed, when we were banished from Pakistan in 1993, I was given the option to take Political asylum in Europe and I turned it down just like I did on previous occasions. I have always preferred to live among fellow Muslims in 'backward' countries, very often at my own risk. Based on this, can al-Zawahiri claim that what I wrote in the *al-Jaami'* then was under the auspices of the Crusaders and the Jews? If that was not the case then, why should it be now? The Prophet (pbuh) has said: "*shall I tell you of the most serious of the major sins?*" They said: "*Of course, O Messenger of God!*" He said, "*Associating anything in worship with God and cutting ties with one's parents*". He then sat up straight from his reclining position and added: "*And indeed perjury!* He repeated it ever so ubiquitously; "*we did not think he was going to stop*" they said" (Agreed upon hadith). Perjury is certainly one of those greatest sins which al-Zawahiri is not ashamed of committing against me, even while the disbelievers themselves are ashamed to lie. Do you recall that dialogue between Heraclius the Roman emperor and Abu Sufyan? It is worth quoting some excerpts of that dialogue in full for our purpose:

The emperor Heraclius was so eager to know about the Prophet (pbuh), after the latter invited him to Islam, that he asked his guards to bring before him some Arab people to answer some of his queries. This they did and a group of Arabs, including Abu Sufyan who was still a disbeliever, were then presented to the emperor. Heraclius asked his Arab audience: "who among you is the most closely related to this man who claims to be a prophet?" Once Abu Sufyan announced he was that person, the emperor asked for him to be brought forward but insisted that the other Arabs present remained just behind so they could hear their exchange. The emperor then said to his translator: "Tell his companions that I am about to ask him (Abu Sufyan) some important questions about that man (the Prophet). If he should tell a lie to me, they need to give him the lie". Abu Sufyan said: I swear to God that if it was not for the fear of being shamed for lying, I would have lied about him" (Agreed upon hadith).

Notice how embarrassed Abu Sufyan may God be pleased with him- felt about lying in front of his companions whilst still a disbeliever, and how al-Zawahiri, the

so-called sheikh and *Mujahid*, spreads lies in his books before the whole world without feeling the slightest shame!

Al Zawahiri's second lie in his book *The Exoneration of the Nation* is found on page 199 where he claims that I refer in the document to some operations carried out by the Jihad Group in Egypt, and particularly to my attempt to assassinate the then interior minister of affairs Hassan al-Alfi and the then prime minister Atif Sidqi. Al-Zawahiri does not stop there; he went on as far as to assert that in relating these events, I also dared giving the full the name of one the executor of those assassinations attempts, a person by the name of Dhiya' al-Deen. This is but utter nonsense and utter lie: I have never related those events that he is referring to let alone the name of that person; for I do not know this person and I only came upon his name in Al Zawahiri's book. If that was not enough, al-Zawahiri even started to make up findings based on these lies, and as we all know "that which is based on corruption leads only to another corruption" and further fallacies. Of these fallacies, is his conclusion that in writing the document I was following "someone's guidelines and dictates", suggesting by that the document was concocted in the back room of some secret service agency and in compliance with their intelligence data. I actually would like to draw attention to a subtle point here and one which is worth bearing in mind for the remainder: information the secret services have is not always correct in that the brothers who are under interrogations often lie in these instances, and al-Zawahiri should know that: upon my return to Egypt in February of 2004, I was under investigation myself, and I was taken aback by what al-Zawahiri had said about me in 1981, when he was under investigation. He took full advantage of my absence to tell a load of lies only in order to clear his name.

Another one of al-Zawahiri's fallacies in his following assertion:

"Unfortunately, the reader will see that the counterterrorism centre in the American army was more equitable than the proselytizer of jihadi guidance; they reported the narration from my book (Knights under the banner of the prophet, prayers and peace be upon him) *regarding the Atif Sidqi incident.*" These are his words! Concerning people like this the Prophet (pbuh) has said: "Lying is but the quality of the uninhibited" (Related by Muslim). I would like to add something else about al-Zawahiri's conclusions and ultimately about his credibility: I know a great deal about the hadith principles of "discrediting and restoring" (*al-Jarh wa al-Ta'deel*) and in light of these principles, I can assure you that al-Zawahiri does not make the grade of credibility. Indeed, following those principles of hadith transmission, it would be forbidden in our religion to transmit from him because

he would be deemed a fabricator who has no integrity. Thus, all of his transmission and attestations would be regarded as invalid, exactly as the ruling regarding the liar in the Sharia stipulates. I actually wonder why should I quote from him or transmit anything from him particularly when I can rely on my own experience, and the experience and insights of other jihadists from among those who have been in jail in Egypt or the Yemen. Why should I be in need of the insights of a betrayer of trust and a liar even if he claims to be a knight under the banner of the prophet, prayers and peace be upon him.”

The second sequel: What is it exactly that made al-Zawahiri not stand the publication of *The Document*?

Part II
**What is it exactly that made al-Zawahiri not stand the publication
of *The Document for the Guidance of Jihadi Action*?**

Dr Fadl, the mastermind of the jihadists

“Among the knaveries of al-Zawahiri is his intentional disregard of one of my books which deals clearly with the topic of Jihad and the preparation for it”

“I worked in Yemen using my true name so that I would not live on charity as al-Zawahiri and his ilk did”

Al-Sharq al-Awsat Newspaper; Issue No 10949.

Cairo: Mohammad Mustafa Abu Shama

Wednesday the 21st of Dhu al-Qi‘dah / 1429 AH - 19 /November/ 2008

Although, Al-Sayyid Imam Abdul-Aziz cut off all his ties with the Jihad Group of Egypt and eventually resumed his private life using his real name, he did not break away without leaving behind a legacy to the members of that Group, notably his book *Al Jaami’ fi Talab al-‘Ilm al-Shareef* (The Complete Source on the Quest for Noble Knowledge), in which he recanted many of his previously held ideas on jihadi activity. The recantations of Dr Fadl in that book came as a shock to al-Zawahiri, who, for fear that it may sway his followers away from his vision, decided to omit large sections of it and subsequently published it after disregarding a great deal of the original author’s ideas. Years later, however, Al-Sayyid Imam Abdul-Aziz, Dr Fadl, was able to reinstate these very recantations and revisions in his book *The Document for the Guidance of Jihadi Action*.

Commenting on the reasons that made al-Zawahiri not stand the publication of the ‘document’, Dr Fadl says:

“Once I finished the writing of my book *al-Jaami’*, in the middle of 1994, I left a copy for al-Zawahiri in the hope that they could learn from it, publish it and possibly reap the dividends arising from its publication. However, al-Zawahiri, after finding that the book contained some criticism towards the Islamic movements, betrayed the trust erasing many things it without my permission and behind my back, and also changing the title of the book before publishing it. But his knaveries did not stop there: he and his group have, for instance, clipped material from my book and used it for a publication related to the rulings of the faith (*Ahkaam al-Imaan*) and another related to the governance according to the Sharia (*al-Siyasa al-Shar’iyya*), but without once acknowledging their original author. This is how al-Zawahiri and his group used *al-Jaami’* to make a living but also to recruit and

widen their following. But little did al-Zawahiri imagine that the materials that he failed to include in 1994 would reappear again. When these materials reappeared in the ‘*Document*’ in 2007, al-Zawahiri rushed to attack the ‘*Document*’ even before it was published, and had done all he could to defame it, resorting, as I will show later, to lies, jurisprudential fallacies, and indirections that deceive the reader. I hope this background will now assist the reader in understanding what is actually going on in this dispute.”

In the following sequel, Dr Fadl continues to uncover the lies, which appeared in Ayman al-Zawahiri’s book *The Exoneration of the Nation* saying:

“One of the dishonesties that al-Zawahiri resorts to in his book appear on pages 5 and 99. There he makes mention of a strange co-existence between myself and the Yemenite authorities, which, he claims, at some stage decided to arrested me and extradite me to Egypt on US orders, in order that I start work on the publication of the ‘*Document*’. But where is his evidence and proof in all these lies? Al-Zawahiri is certainly under a lot of illusions, and often builds on them to mount wrong accusations against innocent people, just like they were mounted once against Aisha - may God be pleased with her.”

Dr Fadl further adds:

“As for the Yemenite authorities, I had no such connection with them, and al-Zawahiri’s followers know this well. I was working there, and it was actually my employer at the time that was responsible for renewing my stay. What happened was that when the September 11 incidents occurred, the authorities in Yemen, in pursuing their own agenda, saw fit to arrest me to square up accounts with Egypt, and I was not alone when this happened: there were a number of Egyptian witnesses who had met the same fate at the time. In fact, the head of the Yemenite security service told us: “We have presented your names to the Americans but they did not want anything from you”, and in the beginning of 2002, I remember distinctly the same person had told me: “Why don’t you get together with some of your Egyptian brothers and form an Egyptian opposition party abroad and we will support you.” When I replied that: “I could not accept to be a president, let alone form a party”, they chose to arrest us wrongfully for nearly two and a half years. It was only when the President of the House of Representatives, Al Sheik Abd Allah Bin Hussein al-Ahmar, raised our case in the last meeting in 2003 decrying the way we were treated, that our ordeal in Yemen had come to an end, and we were subsequently sent by the authorities to Egypt in 2004.

Al-Zawahiri acted as if he were at sea over the fact that I lived in Yemen under my real name, while knowing full well the reason that led me to that, but he but prefers to mutter defamations and devious insinuations. Can’t he see that I simply wanted to work in my profession and with my degree and that for that reason I needed to resume using my birth name? A decision which was not without risk considering the constant surveillance around me, but I was resolute to earn a living by practicing my medical profession rather than live

on charity and donations like al-Zawahiri and his lot. Indeed, one of the hadiths says: “*The best produce that you will eat is the produce of your own labour*” (related by Bukhari), and another says: “[*In the sight of God*], *the hand that gives is better than the hand that begs*” (agreed upon hadith).”

Dr Fadl then goes on to say:

“Al-Zawahiri also lied about me when he maintained in his book that I did not voice a single criticism against the regime in Egypt. How can that be when I have devoted a whole sequel [chapter] in the ‘*Document*’, the fourteenth in particular, to that very purpose, and where I actually advise the rulers on the necessity of implementing the Sharia and restoring justice and so forth? Al-Zawahiri is also being dishonest when he says in his book (p. 79) that I have failed to mention the need to prepare for jihad, because if he dared to read again the end of clause 15 in conjunction with my commentary on the Qur’anic verse 8: 60 “*And prepare against them whatever you are able of power and of steeds...*” he would see it there in front of him. But al-Zawahiri has even overlooked a large book of mine on jihad and the need to prepare for it, called *Al-‘Umda fi I’daad al-‘Udda* (The Reliance for the People Who Prepare for Jihad), so one should expect much I guess.

As for al-Zawahiri’s assertion that the ‘*Document*’ has been written for the benefit of the Americans (p, 4), I say those who support the Americans and the Jews are al-Zawahiri and his sheik Bin Laden, for they are certainly are the ones who brought them to Afghanistan and Iraq, causing the death of hundreds of thousands of Muslims, the imprisonment of large scores and hardship all over. He and his followers lie when they claim that they are the ones fighting back the American-Jewish onslaught and that they represent Islamic public’s resistance against the Crusader-Zionist campaign (p, 193 and p, 199). How on earth can they be, when they were the first ones who fled in front of the Americans when Afghanistan collapsed after the seventh of October 2001? Why was it right for al-Zawahiri to seek a truce and enter into negotiations with America, but not right for others? And were they able to make a dent into this sprawling Crusader campaign with their *résistance* or negotiations?”

“The international liar” is the sobriquet that Dr Fadl uses to describe al-Zawahiri when he relates how the latter offered his services to the Sudanese to fight the Egyptian regime. Dr Fadl says: “Al-Zawahiri worked as an agent for the Sudanese intelligence services which had used him and the Jihad Group to settle their accounts with the Egyptian authorities in 1993. Al-Zawahiri had lied to the Sudanese, telling them that he had under his orders ten thousand highly trained fighters in Egypt, when in fact he only had tens of them who are still languishing in the Egyptian jails. So effective were his lies even on these prisoners that one of them said: ‘I would only leave jail, when the tanks of al-Zawahiri roll in!’, another said: ‘ Do not rush to look for a détente with the authorities; al-Zawahiri has ten thousand

men that he still has not used yet!', and a third one said: 'I will begin negotiations with the government only when al-Zawahiri has mounted two or three operations in Egypt, for then I will be in a stronger position.'

The Sudanese authorities engaged with al-Zawahiri on the basis of this big lie and gave him one hundred thousand dollars to start the operations in Egypt. The first one of these operations aimed the assassination of the Prime Minister Atif Sidqi towards the end of 1993 and failed. Following this failed attempt, the Egyptian security services arrested all of the brothers who were involved in the operation, sentencing six of them to death. They were subsequently able to infiltrate the Jihad Group, and brought it down, thus putting an end to the Group's other planned operations in Egypt. However, while the six men sentenced to death were on their way to be executed, al-Zawahiri was chatting with his friends in the Sudanese security service, telling jokes instead of talking to them about the questions of the hour as expected. Indeed and not before long, the Sudanese realized that al-Zawahiri was no more than a whippersnapper who had nothing to bring to them, and got sick of his jokes and parodies him in the end. They even complained his behaviour to his entourage, saying to them: "can you find another person other than al-Zawahiri for us to talk to; each time we talk, the man seems to have nothing to say; except tell jokes about Abu Lam 'a." This is al-Zawahiri for those who know him: he is not the jihadist sheikh and international liar, the slicker, the joker and buffoon who is not moved in the slightest by the execution of his brothers nor the women and children bereaved."

Commenting further on al-Zawahiri's prevarications, Dr Fadl says:

"Al Zawahiri's claim in his book (p, 193) that the decision to carry out operations in Egypt was taken solely with the purpose of keeping the verve for jihad in that country is absolute nonsense. Al-Zawahiri, in fact, enticed his brothers to collide with the Egyptian authorities only because he was desperate to make a name for himself and gain in status, for he was green with jealousy towards the al-Jama'ah al-Islamiyyah (Islamic group) and wanted to imitate them come what may; if only he knew that this duplicity and this compliance was akin in the end to 'associating partners with God- may He be exalted'. Indeed, al-Zawahiri had rushed to offer his services to the Sudanese only with that aim in mind. I know this and I have proofs for it: for instance, when, in the middle of 1992, the Jihad Group consulted me about those operations in Egypt, and I refused to lend them my support, he and his followers retorted to me" that the people are poking fun at us, saying that the al-Jama'ah al-Islamiyyah (Islamic Group) is active in Egypt but we [Jihad Group] do not hear anything about you [Jihad Group]!"

Equally, in 1993, when I took him [al-Zawahiri] to task about those operations in Egypt, he said to me: "the youth in the [Jihad] Group had exercised an immense pressure on him and he had to give in the end", but when I pressured him further, and told him that this was

not a convincing motif, he said to me: “I have entered into a committed contact with the Sudanese who had hired me to carry out ten operations in Egypt”.

I remember also that after their attempt to assassinate Atif Sidqi, the members of the [Jihad] Group went into frenzy. Bent on promoting their image and that of their leader, al-Zawahiri, they had seized every media opportunity opened for them at the time. Indeed, in one long interview with the newspaper, I think, *al-'Arabiyy al-Nassiriyy*, al-Zawahiri has declared: “Now, the Egyptian people will feel the presence of the sons of the Jihad Group in the street once again,” exactly as if the whole thing was a show or an exhibition. Naturally, that which al-Zawahiri promised did not take place because soon after his interview the sons of the [Jihad] Group were either in their graves or their dungeons. How such a liar and traitor who has sold his brothers and their blood cheap to the Sudanese is able to ask us “to consider if the principle of loyalty [to Islam] and enmity [to the disbelievers] (*al-Wallaa' wa l' Baraa'*) should be regarded as a pillar of the creed” (p, 19), is quite astonishing and pathetic at the same time. But, He talks about these things so un-bashfully only before people who do not know his history.

Personally sat down for a newspaper interview. In this meeting he said that the Egyptian people will see jihadi group in their street once again. It almost sounded like this failed operation was simply a demonstration. But obviously, we know that this so called demonstration will not be repeated because most of those individuals in the jihadi group were killed while others were sent to jail.

Al-Zawahiri goes on to talk about loyalty and innocence on page 19 of his book. How can he? Is he not ashamed of the people he has betrayed and all the bloodshed he has caused? What we can say for sure is that al-Zawahiri has no shame and he is not afraid to take advantage of peoples' ignorance.

Al-Sheik [Dr Fadl] goes on to say that “some people pay money just for fame and to advertise themselves. Al-Zawahiri on the other hand uses the blood of his brothers, their souls, and the years they spent in jail for his own personal fame. He is the one who is receiving all the charity, recognition and publicity when it is the young youth who are sacrificing their lives for everything. He is the one who is carrying out the Crusader-Zionist plans and is always finding excuses to justify their acts. Al-Zawahiri will use any means possible to convince his audience even if it means lying. Therefore my fellow Muslims you should learn the principles of “wounding and amending” and the meaning of “Sharia Justice”. We cannot trust al-Zawahiri since he is an unjust fabricator and storyteller, so how can we accept what he says with regards to things that have to do with Sharia and its rulings? I on the other hand say that Allah is the only one who will pass judgment across al-Zawahiri and all those who made up lies and falsehoods.

On another note, al-Zawahiri saw two of his fellow men fall dead as they were trying to reply to my “*Document*”.

Dr Fadl starts the second part of his book by saying: “I would like to remind the reader that we are not simply dealing with a man who committed errors regarding jurisprudential matters, but rather we are dealing with the formation of a corrupt sect doctrine of which I will talk about in more detail, explaining how it was formed and on what principles it is based.

The writer [Dr Fadl] proposes a question to clarify how this sect came about, and he answers it by saying that it first emerged in the beginning of the nineties with its own motifs and we cannot truly explain it here in this context. Towards the end of the nineties, this sect became even bigger when it fell into the hands of Osama Bin Laden and Khalid Sheik Mohammad whose intention was to kill the largest number of Americans possible. Their intentions transformed into a reality with the bombing that took place on September 11th of 2001. This act of crime was carried out without differentiation between civilians and military personnel.

If we look at the Sharia laws that this doctrine [al-Zawahiri-Bin Laden-al-Qaeda’s doctrine] has violated, we can see that a lot of what had occurred was carried out by a group who justified it by a judicial and that it was to commit jihad in the name of God. This is exactly what Osama Bin Laden did before and even after the events of September 11. Bin Laden left to his followers the task of justification which al-Zawahiri had gathered in his last book the “*Exoneration*”

Al Sheik Abd Al Qader [Dr Fadl] explains the basis of this sect by clearly stating: “In order to kill the largest number of Americans who are outside or inside their country, they must jump over some legal parameters. The whole basis of Al Qaeda’s policy is built on corrupt principles and ideologies and it is it that has manipulated the idea of jurisprudence. Here is some supporting evidence:

A- An example of this can be seen when Al Qaeda takes the issue of fighting America (a personal issue) and makes it an issue which concerns the entire Islamic nation. In order to achieve this, Bin Laden relied on two things; the first was to create a negative image of America that it is the one responsible for all the problems and hardships in the Muslim World. He even found a way to connect the Jewish people to this problem because of what has been happening in Palestine over the years. The second method Bin Laden used to achieve his goal was to try to receive Fatwas and Advisory opinions from the largest number of Pakistani and Afghani Sheiks possible. He wanted them to support the idea of “the need to fight America” and in turn change this notion from a personal issue to a national issue. Al-Zawahiri points to this in his book the “*Exoneration*” on pages 39 through to 41. Bin Laden succeed in receiving Fatwas and the required signatures, so when he wanted to carry out the bombing of September 11 he did not have to consult anyone since to him it seemed like that

they had agreed upon his actions in the previous fatwas. He did not even consult his Sharia committee before going ahead with his plans but rather he took advantage of all of them and carried out his plans from behind their backs.

B- Another example that shows that the entire basis of Al Qaeda's policy is corrupt and dishonest is when they aimed to gather the largest number of people possible to attack America. For this reason, al-Zawahiri denied repeatedly the following in his book the "Exoneration" and stated that as there are numerous options for the Muslim to deal with his enemies (depending on the circumstances), there are also conditions and contraindications for Jihad. Al-Zawahiri is a big liar since he wants everyone to fight everywhere without choice and without consideration for the conditions and contraindications, while he and his Sheik Bin Laden flee from the enemy and we will talk more about this in more detail soon.

C- The fact that Bin Laden and al-Zawahiri pledged allegiance to the Taliban leader Mulla Mohammad Omar and called him Amir of the believers. Based on Sharia, their pledge needs them to seek Mulla Omar's permission especially for Jihad. Bin Laden and al-Zawahiri are aware that Mullah Omar does not like them to cause conflict with America and forbade them from any action against America. To get away from his agreement, Bin Laden defrauded an illegal idea 'local leadership' meaning that his agreement with Mulla Omar is only accounted for inside Afghanistan but not outside it. Thus, Bin Laden-al-Zawahiri's activities are bound to Mullah Omar's agreement only inside Afghanistan not outside it.

D- As a result of this, a heated argument took place between Bin Laden and his Sharia committee both after and before the events of September 11. On June 2001, Bin Laden told them that there would be a big attack against America without mentioning where it would take place or the exact details. Therefore in conjunction with Mohammad Omar's authority the Sharia committee refused Bin Laden's proposal.

E- "Getting rid of all the Sharia Contraindications that prevent the killing of Americans in masses": To achieve this Bin Laden and al-Zawahiri laid some principles. These Principles are not lawful but indicate their crimes. Most of these were used by al-Zawahiri in his book the "Exoneration" to support his argument. Among these principles are:

- ❖ Fighting the far enemy "America" is more important than fighting the close enemy

- ❖ Kill according to nationality because it shows evidence of loyalty and belonging and satisfies with the laws of *Kaafir* countries
- ❖ You have the right to kill anyone who pays levies to the infidels
- ❖ You have the right to kill civilians who live in infidel countries
- ❖ You have the right to kill Muslims who are involved with the infidels
- ❖ You have the right to kill without differentiation
- ❖ Fighting America is considered self-defense and you do not require your parent's or anyone else's permission to go there and fight
- ❖ If a Muslim enters the infidel's country, the Visa is not considered an agreement or a Contract of Security so therefore he must kill them
- ❖ If the Visa is considered a Contract he must break the agreement for reasons we will see soon
- ❖ It is not safe for tourists to enter the Islamic Countries because they may be kidnapped or even killed

These are the main principles of “killing as wholesale” that “Al Qaeda” relies on. Now I will reply to this.

F- Al-Qaeda took a number of defense strategies against those who criticize their criminal doctrine, among these steps are that: Nobody should talk about these things unless they are involved in the matter. These include the Jihadi Sheiks who live in the mountains and are on the frontlines. Those who criticize this act are discouraging Jihad, attacking the Mujahedeen, and in turn harming the nation. Hence they will be considered as serving the Crusader-Zionist's interests. Al-Zawahiri then goes on to enter in discussion about “the document regarding the rationalization of the jihadi work” despite his confession that what I denied in the document I had also denied previously in my book “the whole” in 1993 and even before that”

The third sequel: The reasons for the failure of the Islamic Movements

Part III

“The number of Muslims killed and displaced due to al-Qaeda’s actions is much greater than the number killed by Israel”

Dr Fadl, the Mastermind of the jihadists

In a book for which the newspaper *al-Sharq al-Awsat* has obtained the rights of publication, Dr Fadl responds to the stances adopted by al-Qaeda and the fatwas issued by Bin Laden and al-Zawahiri.

Thursday/22 Dhu al-Qi‘da/ 1429 AH- 20/November/2008

Issue No.10950

Al-Sharq Al-Awsat Newspaper

Cairo: Muhammad Mustafa Abu Shama

The Stances of al-Qaeda and the Fatwas Advanced by Bin Laden and al-Zawahiri

The appellation “Al-Qaeda” emerged at the end of 1987 when it was first used by Sheikh Abdullah Azzam and at a time when Osama bin Laden procured the funds necessary for its launch. The aim of the organization then was clear: mounting a resistance to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, though as early as 1989, when Bin Laden took the pledge of allegiance as leader of the organization from the Arab volunteer a groups, the objectives have been expanded beyond Afghanistan. Indeed, in 1990, Bin Laden had travelled to South Yemen, and then he moved to Sudan in 1993, where he began to entertain the ambition of standing up to the major powers. This new aspiration resulted in his infamous alliance with Ayman al-Zawahiri, which gave birth in 1998 to what was called then ‘The International Islamic Front for Jihad against the Jews and the Crusaders’ (al-Jabha al-Islaamiyaa al-‘Aalamiyya li Jihad al-Yahud wa al-Nasaara), an alliance which eventually led them to masterminding 9/11. Soon after those events, the two men appeared to have entered into a dark tunnel, and have not left it since.

Over the course of the four coming sequels from his book, Un-veiling the Great Deception in al-Zawahiri’s Exoneration, Dr Fadl challenges the legality of al Qaeda’s ideology, refuting the legal edicts (fatwas) they used to mislead thousands of young people in various parts of the world. In the following, he relates the story of al-Qaeda from its early glimmerings and analyses its ideas:

“The first pillar of al-Qaeda around which the ideology of the organization revolves, resides in the notion that America and the Jews are the cause of all the plights and the misfortunes of the Muslim world. It is by advancing this notion that Bin Laden brings Muslims together with him against America and the Jews, converting in the process this confrontation from a personal issue, which only reflects his desires and priority, to an issue which concerns the whole Muslim community. But this idea is manifestly wrong and is in stark contradiction with the words of the Quran. Muslims must be aware that Bin Laden is insulting their intelligence. It is only the Muslims that are responsible for their misfortunes. When Muslims were defeated in the Battle of Uhud, God certainly did not put the blame on Quraysh, but on the Muslims for the error they have acquired, despite the fact that they were the best of the Prophet’s (pbuh) nation, based on his saying: *“The best of my nation are those who live in my century”*(Agreed upon hadith). If Muslims, not of the first century, but those even contemporaneous and in the very company of the Prophet (pbuh) tasted defeat, and found themselves in all kinds of ordeals due to the error they have acquired, why should it not be the case for Muslims today, who do not live in the Prophet’s century? In the aftermath of the Battle of Uhud, the Almighty God revealed to the Muslims who were still not able to fathom their defeat: *“those of you who turned back on the day of when the two hosts met, Satan alone who caused them to backslide, because of some of that which they have earned...”* (3: 155), also: *“And was it so, when a disaster smote you, though you had smitten twice, that you said: How is this? Say it is from yourselves”* (3: 165). It is clear these verses are directly addressing the Muslims who partook in that Battle and upon reading them we are in doubt that responsibility for defeat that day rested solely on their shoulders. Elsewhere, God- May He be exalted- says: *“Whatever of misfortune strikes you; it is what your hands have earned”* (42: 30). Muslims have to understand that their misfortunes are only the consequences of their actions and not due to America. These are the words of God in the Qur’an and he who denies them, he disbelieves. Indeed, the Almighty God says: *“And none deny our revelations but the disbelievers”* (29: 47).

Besides being taught that the misfortunes of Muslims are primarily due to their own actions and not due to the actions of the disbelievers, we also are taught this fundamental truth in the divine hadith: the Prophet (pbuh) has said that the Almighty God revealed to him: *“O Muhammad! If I have pre-ordained a matter, nothing can stop it: I have seen to it your nation will not perish with starvation, and not be at the mercy of an enemy (of disbelievers) and under his rule, as long as they do not kill one another, fight with one another, and take each other captive”* (Related by Imam Ahmad).

It is obvious those who say the misfortunes of Muslims is due to America or the Jews are denying the Qur’an and Sunnah, but Bin Laden, al-Zawahiri and their friends lack depth of knowledge, and so they look at things superficially without having full grasp of the revealed Law. Why is it difficult for them to realize that it is owing to our sins that are

finding ourselves in this calamitous situation and that God can do that to us even as Muslims! Did not the caliph ‘Umar Ibn al-Khattab- may Almighty God be pleased with him- bid his soldiers before battle one day, saying to them: “ *While you are fighting for the way of God, commit neither sins nor think your enemy is so far more wicked that he will not come to have the upper hand on you; for it is possible that a wicked people may have the upper hand over those who far less wicked...Recall how God set up the disbelievers from among the Zoroastrians of Persia as absolute masters over the Jews of Banu Israa’eel, only because the latter have sinned.*”? The Almighty God says that the misfortunes of the Muslims are due to their ill-conceived and unlawful actions, while Bin Laden and al-Zawahiri maintain against all authority, they are due to the actions of America. Let every Muslim decides whom to follow: the Almighty God or Bin Laden and al-Zawahiri. Indeed, al-Zawahiri book, *The Exoneration of the Nation* is, for the most part, trying to instil this corrupt idea in the minds of Muslims only to justify their evil actions and silence their critics.

I ask them: who is behind the loss of Palestine? Did not the Arabs fought against the Ottomans and expelled them from Palestine in the First World War only to hand it over to Britain in 1916? Wasn’t it just after that shameful betrayal that Britain granted Palestine to the Jews according to the Balfour Declaration, signed in 1917? Who kills the Palestinians today, their leaders in particular? Are they not the Palestinians themselves, those who choose to act as traitors and agents for Israel? Who builds the Jewish settlements in the West Bank today to consolidate further Israel's occupation? Are they not the Palestinian workers? And who introduced America to Afghanistan in 2001? Is it not Bin Laden and al-Zawahiri.? I ask you to tell me who encouraged the U.S. to open the prison of Guantanamo Bay in Cuba to imprison Muslims? It is not the folly of Bin Laden? Who introduced the Mongols to Baghdad long ago in 1258? Was it not the Minister Ibn al-‘Alqami? Equally, who introduced America to Baghdad in 2003? Is it not the treason of the senior Iraqi army officers? Who killed the Lebanese people for a period of 15 years (1975-1990)? Were they not the Lebanese themselves? Who occupied Kuwait and killed its people in 1990? They are the people of Iraq, not America or Israel. Who is killing the tens of thousands of Sudanese in Darfur today? They are the Sudanese themselves and the same applies to the Yemenis in Yemen.

Putting aside the legality of their presence, the U.S. troops killed no Muslim in Saudi Arabia during their presence after the Iraq's invasion of Kuwait in 1990, but Muslims have been killed by al-Qaeda in Saudi Arabia. Indeed, the number of Muslims killed and displaced in Kenya, Afghanistan, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Algeria, Pakistan and other countries in a few years, due to the actions of al-Qaeda, far exceeds the number of people killed or displaced by Israel in-and-around Palestine in sixty years. The idea that al-Qaeda is defending Muslims is a myth, rather it is killing and displacing them. Al-Zawahiri and Bin Laden

insult the intelligence of the people when they proclaim al-Qaeda is defending the religion of Islam. How can that be when all this organization has done over the years amounts to a distortion of the rulings of Islam and a rejection of the Word of God? Is it at all conceivable that a man who is ignorant about religion becomes its defender? Is this Islam? “*Say: It is from yourselves*”, (3: 165).

Blaming others for delinquency and considering oneself infallible, as Bin Laden and would have it, is typical of the devil, who blamed his debauchery on God and not al-Zawahiri his malice and wickedness. Ibn Taymiyah- may God have mercy on him- said: “*if Muslims were to find themselves weakened to the extent that they are dominated by their enemy, this would be due to their sins and errors: either they would have neglect the performance of their duties inwardly and outwardly, or because of their transgressing the bounds fixed by the Almighty God, both inwardly and outwardly*”. This idea was also echoed by his student Ibn al-Qayyim who wrote in his book *Ighaathat al-Lahfaan min Masa'id al-Shaytaan*: “God- may He be exalted- has promised victory to His religion, His party and His true servants who observe their faith both at the intellectual level and the level of praxis, He did not promise it to support falsity however those who are behind it may be convinced of the righteousness of their actions ... so when a calamity befalls a believer, such that his person or assets are badly affected or his enemy is made to prevail over him, he should quickly come to his senses and realize that this situation arose only as a consequence to his sins, which usually follow from the fact that he abandoned a religious obligation, or transgressed the Law, and hence was weak in faith.”

Certainly, the good of the Muslims is achieved only when they take the step of plumbing the depth of their souls to remove the wickedness within, in compliance with the Qur'anic verse: “*God changes not the condition of a folk until they change that which is in their hearts*” (13: 11). So, the Almighty God says, and those who deny His words are the disbelievers.

We reiterate what we have said in many occasions, namely that jihad against an overt enemy aggression is dutiful when possible, but crossing the oceans to attack your enemy on his land and destroying his buildings, so that in return he is presented with a golden opportunity to destroy [an Islamic] state (Taliban) is a folly and not a strategic move of a Mujahid. How true are the words of the poet: “*The enemy harms not the ignorant; tis the ignorant who harms himself*”!

Bin Laden and al-Zawahiri want us to believe that America is the cause of our misfortunes, and woe betide whoever opposes them or unveils their deception, even if their supporting evidence is the word of God. Indeed, al-Zawahiri advances the plans of the Crusader-Jewish coalition but he still wants to come out smelling like a rose, claiming in the most insolent fashion that instead it is our ‘document’ which is cooked in the backroom of the CIA. Since

Bin Laden believes that his cause is the cause of the Islamic nation, why did he flee along with his companion in jihad, al-Zawahiri, leaving behind a trail of destruction and the nation of Islam with a hefty bill to pay? As a result of their folly and sordidness Muslims have lost two states (Afghanistan and Iraq), the souls of hundreds of thousands, with many more injured, imprisoned and destitute. If it is not they, then who else is responsible? The legal maxim states: “He who causes damage to an object indirectly is just as liable as the one who is directly responsible for damaging that object” (*I’laam al-Muwaqqi’een*, vol 2, p 65, and also *al-Turuq al-Hukmiyya*, p, 58).

The second most important pillar of al-Qaeda resides in their rejection of the alternative that the Sharia puts before the Muslims for their dealings with the enemy. Al-Zawahiri is adamantly opposed or totally oblivious to the fact that jihad has conditions that need to be fulfilled and nullifiers that need to be surmounted before it is declared. He denies that beside jihad, Muslims have other lawful options like seeking a truce, cease fire, faith concealment, withdrawal or forbearance, and other alternatives the details of which I have outlined in ‘the document’. How can he for instance deny the conditions of jihad and its nullifiers or its prohibitory grounds when they are instrumental in establishing the difference between ‘unconditional’ or universal obligation and the ‘specific’ obligation, for indeed, an obligation, even when it enjoys a legitimate origin in the Sharia (*waajiban bi asl al-shar’*), may not be deemed obligatory in the case of some Muslims, either due to some conditions which have not been fulfilled or to some preventives which have not been overcome.

Having thrown out the window these conditions and preventives, al-Zawahiri was left with no other choice but to resort to force, as he attested himself, when he wrote: “It was clear to every equitable person then, just as it is today, that this corrupt state of affair would not come to an end through the observance of leniency and toleration but through force” (Exoneration, p193). Following this logic, he considered any other option and our ‘document’ in particular, as some poison prepared in the labs of the state security services, under the supervision of their masters, the Americans, to cripple jihad activity (Ibid, 74). These words of al-Zawahiri do actually cause him to slip into disbelief because they constitute in fact an insult to the words of the Almighty God, and the Prophet (pbuh): to the Mujahid Sheikh, whether it is the story, in the Qur’an, of the believer who concealed his faith from Pharaoh and his entourage, or that of the People of the Cave who withdrew from their society and infidelity, or a Qur’anic verses like: “*And if they incline to peace, incline you to it*” (8: 61), or the practice of the Prophet (pbuh) in the “Peace Treaty of al Hudaibiyya”, or the Prophet’s (pbuh) praise of Khalid Ibn al-Waleed’s decision to retreat from the battle of Mu’tah, they are all poisons aimed at bringing jihad to its knees, and causing paralysis to jihadi activity. If al-Zawahiri was to rehearse the verse in which God – may He be exalted- says: “*Say: was it at God and His revelations and His Messenger that*

you did scoff. Make no excuse. You have disbelieved after your confession of belief.” (9: 65-66). This is the maximum knowledge – oh Muslims – of al-Zawahiri and the sheikhs of the mountains who want to retain exclusive rights to Fatwa.

Al-Zawahiri has confined the lawful alternatives that are available to Muslims in dealing with their enemies to only the one that promotes the use of force. For this, al-Zawahiri behaves like a doctor who does not know of treatments but only one medication, and prescribes it to all his patients without taking into account their different conditions, and thus causing many to die in the process. Worse still, al-Zawahiri, being the doctor that he is, when he meets another one in the profession, who prescribes different medications to suit the different needs of his patients, he vilifies and accuses him of ignorance, and of promoting American medicines made by the American Intelligence service, even while these alternatives such as those outlined in the ‘*Document*’ derive from the ocean of the Sharia: he has the gall to consider them American propaganda just because they oppose his opinion, which after all is starkly in contradiction with the Qurán and the Sunnah.

The reader should also know that al-Zawahiri’s lies and deceits go further than this. Besides prescribing the blind use of force as the only lawful course of action, this incompetent doctor uses other drugs in secret: in 1993, he had pushed his brothers to a clash in Egypt with funds provided to him by the intelligence service of the Sudan, and preferred to flee from that country in 1995, rather than enter Egypt to fight alongside his brothers to the last man and to the last dollar do as he had promised them.

Still today, al-Zawahiri feels no shame in ordering people to fight the Americans, while he in private and behind their back seeks to open channels of negotiations with them, and while his Sheikh Bin Laden looks to offering them a truce. Are they doing this because of change in circumstances? If so, why don’t they openly acknowledge there are lawful alternatives to military confrontation and aggression, as we have argued in the ‘*Document*’? Or are they going to maintain obstinately that when Khalid Ibn al-Waleed had retreated in the Battle of Mu’tah and was praised by the Prophet (pbuh) for doing so, he capitulated to the Americans, or that when 'Umar Ibn al-Khattab - may God be pleased with him- said: “*May God have mercy on the soul of Abu Ubayd, had he listen to me and rallied my forces, I would have given him full support*” was also under the American thumb?

O Muslims! All the alternatives that we have outlined in *The Document* represent lawful options to deal with the enemy; Muslims are entitled to choose from them whichever they see fit according to the requirements of knowledge and their capacity. Forget about Bin Laden and Al Zawahiri, they are neither a people of knowledge and Fatwa nor a people of piety, for he who is truly pious and fears God, does not behave like a thief who climbs on the back of others to jump over the fences to reach his goal, betraying his Amir, double-crossing his enemy and bringing disasters to Muslims in the process. That is who they are in

the sight of God, if truly in God you believe. I have known Bin Laden and al-Zawahiri for several decades, I beg you not to succumb to their discourse and their tergiversations; surely, they do not have a better grasp of Islamic jurisprudence and Jihad than Umar Ibn al-Khattab and Khalid Ibn al-Waleed- may God be pleased with them. So, do not let them insult your intelligence and know that they are but ignoramuses bent on taking advantage of the zeal of Muslim youth, and their little knowledge of Islamic law.

Al-Zawahiri, in fact, has a great aversion towards any discussion that delves into the principle “Conditions and Preventives” (*al-shurut wa al-mawaani* ‘) which is a well-known pillar in the Islamic legal rulings as in this legal maxim: “A ruling may be obtained from a cause only when the conditions are fulfilled and the preventives overcome”, only because he would rather the youth remained oblivious to the legal knowledge and thus more amenable to his fiery speeches.

The “Conditions and the Preventives” surrounding a ruling are paramount in Islamic law, such that the difference between a scholar and an ignorant, and an established jurist and adventurer is known based on their knowledge of and deliberation on these, and I know al-Zawahiri to be one of the biggest adventurers, who cannot see beyond the end of his nose. He is also the most odd of the lot: al-Zawahiri does not jeopardise his own property, his own person or his own life, but that of others as he did to his brothers in Egypt when he sent hundreds of them into their dungeons or into their graves, and then fled without keeping the promise of fighting alongside them to the last man. He jeopardises the existence of states and their peoples like he did to the state of the Taliban and the people of Afghanistan and Iraq. He always risks what he owns not and runs away; leaving it to the Muslim nation to pick up the bill of his adventures, without achieving for it anything to speak of in return. It is not at all surprising, therefore, that the adventurer that he is, would not want the Muslim youth to know that there are conditions and preventives for jihad, which if taken into account may very well realize the goal of jihad with minimal losses. Anyone who looks critically at the causes which have led to the failure of the Islamic movements in being *established on earth* and caused them to experience one fiasco after another- Taliban being the latest-will no doubt find that their neglect of the conditions of the jihad and its preventives is among the prominent of all.

The third pillar upon which this devious sect is founded is the heresy of “the localization of the Amir’s realm of authority” by which they meant to confine the realm of the Amir to Afghanistan and its borders. Indeed, the preparation for the 9/11 bombings had started two years before they occurred, and once they were completed, Bin Laden had announced in June 2001 that there would be a huge operation against America, without specifying the location or giving any other detail. Some of his followers, especially those who were in his Sharia committee, voiced their objection to his plans, reminding him that their leader

Mullah Mohammad Omar had forbidden them to clash with America, because neither he nor his state were in a position to afford such a course of action. It is then that Bin Laden had contrived this heresy, the localization of the Amir's realm of authority, to silence the criticism of his followers, arguing on the basis of this innovation that Mohammed Omar is well and truly their Amir inside Afghanistan but that he had no authority over them in relation to matters which beyond the borders of that country. This notion of Bin Laden is found wanting on two fronts: the command to obey the Amir is not confined to the location (inside or outside), as when the Prophet (pbuh) says: "*Whosoever obeys me, obeys God, and he who disobeys me, disobeys God; and whosoever obeys the Amir, in fact, obeys me; and he who disobeys the Amir, in fact, disobeys me*" (Agreed upon hadith). equally, the foundational texts which menace those who disobey the Amir in no way give us a sense that the command of obedience is restricted to a particular location, in that according to another hadith of the Prophet (pbuh) we are taught that: "*Whoever withdraws his hand from the obedience (to the Amir) will find no argument (in his defence) when he stands before God on the Day of Resurrection*" (Related by Muslim). So from where does Bin Laden get his argument that the obedience of the Amir is limited to the area over which the latter rules? He is indeed swayed by the whispers of the Deceiver. Otherwise, how could he bring himself to restrict texts of the Qur'an and the Sunnah that have a general important, and hope to disguise his passionate plea for heretical idea which was the localization of the realm of the Amir? These are indeed but deceptions to lure the ignorant and a way of undermining religion and the [Islamic] states.

Know that there is no dispute among the scholars that the obedience to the Amir is compulsory in all matters, including jihad, and that jihad, according to them, does not take place in the abode of Islam, but outside of its borders, but Bin Laden is more interested in tricks than in what the scholars have to say. Commenting on the discourse of Abul-Qassim al-Khirqi, Ibn Qudaamah al-Hanbali said, in his *Mughniyy*: "Jihad is the prerogative of the Imam and based on his ijtiḥad, the subjects are then to obey whatever instructions he sees fit in that regard". Notice how the heresy of the localization of the Amir's realm of authority is in fact but an obtuse stratagem of Bin Laden which he used to circumvent the permission of the Amir Muhammad Omar, and deceive his followers. How can Bin Laden maintain this notion of the locality of the realm of the Amir and his authority while he had been planning for the bombings of 11/9 for a period of two years from within the land over which Mohammad Omar exercised his authority, and while the perpetrators of 9/11 took off from there, and he was protected in that land before and after the bombings? Is he not insulting people's intelligence with such nonsense? Bin breached the allegiance of his Amir, betrayed him and destroyed his country, and these are all major sins.

Our taking Bin Laden to task should not relieve Mullah Mohammad Omar from the responsibility of participating in the destruction of Afghanistan, because he ought to have

acted firmly and wisely when the signs of danger arose. But instead of that he slacked and was not able to avoid committing prohibitions himself. The best that can describe his case is what a poet has said:

You were given a reign, but you failed to bring it under control

It is the fate of the squanderers to lose their realm

What is ironic is that when the Taliban ruled Afghanistan, they used to punish the women if they came out of their houses without their face covered or without being accompanied by *mahram*, and today, they kill the Afghan soldiers who collaborate with the occupation forces of the United States and its allies, but they never held Bin Laden or any of his followers accountable, even though they are the direct cause for the American occupation of their country, the loss of their state, the dismemberment of their movement and the killing of thousands of innocent Afghans. Is there any negligence greater than this?

There is no doubt that during his stay in Afghanistan, from 1996 until the occupation in October 2001, Bin Laden was taking the Taliban government and its Amir Mohammed Omar for a ride, despite his pledge of allegiance. All along, he was only using them as a means to achieve his personal goal, which was to fight America, even at the detriment of Afghanistan and its government. Indeed, while under a pledge to the Taliban, he had no qualms entering into all kinds of agreements with his old and permanent ally, the Pakistani military intelligence, and with Gen. Mahmud Ahmad, in particular, acting as if he were a state within a state.

Part IV

“The members of al-Qaeda had fled disguised in women clothes...but al-Zawahiri still consider them the jihadist vanguard of the nation”

Dr Fadl, the mastermind of the jihadists

In a book for which the newspaper *al-Sharq al-Awsat* has obtained the rights of publication, Dr Fadl argues against the doctrines of fighting the far-enemy, the permissibility of killing the human shield, charging others with non-belief (ex-communication), and the permissibility of killing on the basis of citizenship, all of which al-Qaeda profess and adopt in their jihadi strategy.

Friday, 23rd Dhu al-Qi‘da / 1429 AH - 21/November/ 2008

Issue No 10951

Al-Sharq Al-Awsat Newspaper

Cairo: Muhammad Mustafa Abu Shama

Today, we are completing the second part of the criticism that Dr Fadl, the mastermind of the jihadists, made about the pillars of the thought al-Qaeda. We have already presented three of these pillars in the previous sequel: the first was their saying that America and the Jews are the cause of the misfortunes of the Muslims; the second was al-Zawahiri’s objection to the lawful alternatives Muslims have in dealing with their enemies, as to the third it revolved on the one hand around his opposition to the existence of Conditions and Preventives which must be taken in consideration before jihad is declared, and on the other around the heresy of the localization of the Amir’s realm of authority, [which was Bin Laden’s]. Today, we begin the second part of the criticism that Dr Fadl, the mastermind of the jihadists, made about the fourth pillar of the thought of al-Qaeda, namely their principle of targeting the far-enemy as a way of bringing down the nearby enemy.

The following is what Dr. Fadl had to say regarding this issue:

In defiance of both the Qur’an and the Sunnah, al-Zawahiri had devised this principle of targeting the far-enemy before the enemy nearby, as part of an ‘exonerative jurisprudence’ project which he contrived to support the vision of Bin Laden in his fight against America. Through this, they had both sought to bring together the efforts of all the Islamic groups from all over the world under one umbrella, to prioritise and focus on the fight against the far-enemy (America), and relegate all confrontation with ‘the enemy nearby’ to the backburner. These ideas, however, not only clash with the Words of God and the Sunnah of

His messenger, they actually stand as a substitute to the rules of religion, for God- may He be exalted- says: “*O you who believe, fight those who are near to you of the infidels ...*” (9:123). Commenting on this verse, al-Qurtubi - may God have mercy on him – said: “God has shown the Muslims how to make jihad: first to fight the closest enemy, then the next closest. Herewith, the Messenger of God (pbuh) first fought the Arabs, and when he finished from that, he moved to fight the Romans in Syria”. In the same vein, Ibn Taymiyya- may God have mercy on him- said: “He [the Messenger] was fighting the closest of his enemies from among the polytheists and the People of the Book, and whoever carry out his jihad after this manner, he has followed the pattern of the Sunnah”(Majmu‘at al-Fataawa, vol. 21, p, 317). This is indeed what is indicated by the Qur’an and the Sunnah, so do not pay any attention to those who violate them. When al-Zawahiri advanced his ‘theory’ of targeting the far-enemy, he had clearly disobeyed the Qur’an and the Sunnah, only to accommodate the whims of his Sheikh Bin Laden, which is yet another violation of the Sharia and another attempt to find substitutes to it by relying on one’s opinion. Again, Ibn Taymiyya said: “Whenever anyone legitimizes that which has been deemed forbidden (*haram*) by consensus or forbids that which has been deemed lawful (*halal*) by consensus, or alters in any way the Law upon which there is consensus, he would be regarded a disbeliever and an apostate by consensus of the jurists”, (Majmu‘at al-Fataawa, vol., 3, p, 267).

For thirty years al-Zawahiri has been calling to fight the near enemy (the Egyptian regime), until 1998 when all of sudden it dawned on him that the most important thing is actually to fight the far-enemy. But this change of heart, as it were, was not a result of an insight; it was rather following his total fiasco in Egypt both practically and financially. So he joined Bin Laden to form the International Islamic Front for Jihad against the Crusaders and the Jews in February 1998, even though America had not clashed with the Jihad Group before that date, and he came up with the theory of the localization of the realm of the Amir’s authority which is contrary to the dictates of Islamic law, only to comply to the wishes of Bin Laden. As a matter of fact, it is following this new strategy inspired by Bin Laden that America had started to kidnap al-Zawahiri’s companions, including his brother, from all over the world, but despite the heavy losses that the al-Zawahiri’s Jihad Group suffered because of Bin Laden, the latter did not trust him, and would not even make him privy to the 9/11 attacks before they occurred.

If this brief overview shows anything, it shows that al-Zawahiri has contradicted the Sharia and brought destruction to his group as a result of his shift of strategy: He sought to fight the far enemy, America. But this enemy has come all the way to his doorstep in Afghanistan. Only, when this happened, that is when finally jihad was an absolute obligation that no one could dispute or deny, and when finally no conditions needed to be fulfilled for declaring it as he often maintains in his book, when the enemy was obvious and

his disbelief manifest; what did the Mujahid Sheikh al-Zawahiri do? You would expect him to fight don't you? Well, he did not, he chose to flee. He fled together with other members of al-Qaeda to save his own skin, and did not even bother about the fate of his wife and his children; they were left behind for the Americans to kill.

O Muslims, I swear in the name of the Almighty God, they have fled from Afghanistan to Pakistan, disguised in women clothes because the border guards were only interested in arresting the Arab fugitives to sell them to America, and were not searching women as per custom. Such was the disgrace that one of them is reported to have said: "Each time I joined a battle in Afghanistan I left its borders feeling like a man, only this time, after the American occupation, I have left it as a woman."

But despite all this al-Zawahiri feels no shame, and he continues to describe himself and his companions as 'the jihadist vanguard of the nation', and other times as 'the symbol of the popular resistance against the Crusader-Zionist campaign' on the Muslim nation (*The Exoneration*, pp, 74, and 199). Mind you Bin Laden did not do any better, he too run for his life, leaving the task of jihad against the Americans to the Afghans, especially to the Taliban, who were ultimately the direct victims of the theory of 'the enemy afar'. For all their hospitality to Bin Laden and his companions, the Afghans were rewarded with death and the large scale destruction of Afghanistan.

The fifth pillar which is fundamental to al-Qaeda is the heresy of ex-communication of Muslims (*takfeer: charging others with non-belief*), and the killing of people on the basis of their citizenship. Indeed, as part of their dissemination campaign for mass killings, Bin Laden and some of his followers have ubiquitously called for the indiscriminate killing of the Americans, making it unnecessary for instance to draw any distinction between the civilian part of the population and the military personnel during their attacking operations. It was left to al-Zawahiri to concoct the jurisprudence that would exonerate such a crime in his book *The Exoneration of the Nation* (pp, 145-154), where he affirms, contra the thesis of *The Document*, that the citizenship status of a person does not just provide us with general information concerning his identity, [such as his language, culture, and which part of the world he comes from], but denotes, in the case of the Western citizen in particular, his allegiance to disbelief and his acceptance to live by the laws of the disbelievers voluntarily. Indeed, building on that premise, he goes as far as to affirm that a Muslim who is a citizen of any of the countries of the abode of disbelief is either very close to becoming a disbeliever or has become one already (p, 154). He actually clearly states elsewhere in his book that naturalized Muslims who reside in the abode of disbelief have committed apostasy (p. 149). It is obvious that this ruling of al-Zawahiri is fallacious: he assumes for instance that all Muslim citizens in the land of Disbelief must serve in the army, and engage in combat against fellow Muslims, but this ruling is false because its premise is false,

following the rule which says: “That which is based on corruption is corrupt” (*al-mabniyy ‘ala al-faasid faasid*). Is he aware that some countries, like Switzerland for example, do not have an army to begin with, and that in other countries, America in particular, military service is not compulsory even while an army may very well exist? This idea that every citizen of the land Disbelief is inevitably going to fight against Muslims, as al-Zawahiri alleges, is certainly untenable.

Moreover, this position of al-Zawahiri, if it were pursued to its logical conclusions, would entail the ex-communication of hundreds of millions of Muslims, particularly those living in India, China, Russia, Europe, North and South America, Ethiopia, Kenya and the like, owing to the fact that those Muslims reside in countries that are not governed according to Islamic law. But does al-Zawahiri have any strong evidence to prove beyond doubt that every single Muslim citizen of these countries has wholeheartedly accepted to live by their laws? Does he at all take in consideration the fact that migration to the abode of Islam in this time is virtually impossible for those people if they so wished? We are indeed in the realm of probability and the legal maxim states: “Where there is probability, the evidence is inconclusive”. Yet, this is precisely what al-Zawahiri has done: he has accused others with disbelief based on probabilities and based on the corollaries of belief rather than belief itself, and thus has erected legal arguments which lead to pronounce millions of Muslims disbelievers. As I have already mentioned in the tenth sequel of *The Document*, it is not permitted to accuse other Muslims and hold them as disbelievers by relying on probabilities or by simply checking whether their ‘outer’ behaviour tallies with the exigencies or corollaries of the faith. I have insisted there that we needed it to be more discerning and [establish that empirically]. I ask you: do you see al-Zawahiri providing any conclusive evidence in that matter? If not, how can he make such a charge and derive such a ruling? God- may He be exalted- says: “*And had it not been for the believing men and believing women [in Mecca], whom you might have unwittingly trampled underfoot, and on whose account you might have become guilty, without knowing it, of a grievous wrong -: [had it not been for this, you would have been allowed to fight your way into the city: but you were forbidden to fight so that [in time] God might admit to His grace whomever He wills*” (48: 25), and with these words, He completely demolishes al-Zawahiri’s and his followers’ argument. It is clear from this verse that Muslims may very well be residing in the abode of disbelief, and that they remain Muslims although such an abode is called the abode of disbelief by virtue of the prevalence of its ungodly laws (*Al-Siyar Al-Kabir*, vol. 5). And elsewhere God Almighty says: “*But excepted shall be the truly helpless - be they men or women or children - who cannot bring forth any strength and have not been shown the right way*” (4:98). Can anybody deny that all these people who resided in the abode of disbelief are Muslims in the sight of God? To the Almighty they are indeed Muslims, but alas! Al-Zawahiri and his Sheikh feel neither guilt nor shame; to them they are disbelievers or on the

verge of becoming one, by virtue of their citizenship or their country of residence, as if this mere fact alone was proof of their allegiance and enlistment to the abode of disbelief.

Even if we assume -counterfactually- that the whole population of country professed disbelief, we, as Muslims, are still not permitted to kill every one of them. I have already provided a detailed discussion in sequel seven of *The Document* specifying whose killing is prohibited in the Sharia and have backed that up with evidence. But I will add here a reference to Muhammad Ibn al-Hasan al-Shaybani – may God have mercy on him, who, commenting on the verse: “*Fight in the way of God against those who fight against you*” (2: 190), argued that women, boys, mad people and the elderly should not be killed during war, because they cannot fight (*Al-Siyar Al-Kabir*). If we take into consideration the hadith of the Prophet (pbuh), we could add other categories of people such as the bondservants, which may include the workers, and the peasants, who also should not be killed, and all of these together do certainly represent the majority of the people. How on earth can they, in defiance of clear scriptural prohibition, permit to themselves to kill these people *en masse*?

The sixth pillar of the sect of al-Qaeda is the heresy of the permission of killing the taxpayers to the disbelievers, on the basis that these taxes contribute to the financing of the war, and turn them into fighters of a kind or another. Because Bin Laden and his followers have collided with the foundational texts (*nusus*) which forbid the killing of the categories of people mentioned above, but were still adamant about killing these people *en masse*, they have had to resort to this heresy to circumvent the scriptural hurdles that were in their way. In his *Exoneration of the Nation*, al-Zawahiri has maintained that taxpayers are fighters because their taxes are paid to their governments which, in its turn, use them to fund their army’s onslaught against Muslims. Again by this saying, al-Zawahiri permits at the drop of a hat the killing of hundreds of millions of Muslims in India and in Russia on the basis that Muslims in these countries pay taxes to governments who are fighting their fellow Muslims in Kashmir and Chechnya respectively, and the same applies to Muslims residing in Europe, America and elsewhere in the non-Muslim world. This heresy is fundamental to their doctrine for the permissibility of large scale indiscriminate killing, and its corruption is so manifest it hardly needs be brought to light. As you can see these are not mere jurisprudential mistakes, these are concrete steps taken for the establishment of a criminal sect. It is sufficient to quote here the words of Umar Ibn al-Khattab to his armies prior to the invasion of Persia and Byzantium: “*Fear God in farmers who are not fighting you*” (Related by al-Bayhaqi) to show the unsoundness of their opinion, because then in both Persia and Byzantium, peasants were the most significant taxpayers to the rulers, paying taxes on the yields and on the capital. This is indeed one of the strongest evidences against Bin Laden’s and al-Zawahiri’s heresy: the mere payment of taxes to the state or government of disbelief that is at war with Muslims does not constitute an act of fighting and it is not permitted therefore to kill those who pay them. Umar Ibn al-Khattab says not to kill the

taxpayers; Bin Laden and al-Zawahiri say the contrary. They also resort to other techniques to bypass the texts of the Sharia which prevents them from getting away with mass killing, such as their interpretation of the laws regulating the killing of infidel human shield (*al-turs al-kafir*), by which they attempt to make it permissible to kill civilians in the abode of disbelief, and also their interpretation of the laws regulating the killing of the Muslim human shield, by which they attempt to make it permissible to kill Muslims who live alongside disbelievers everywhere and wherever they may be. The first time al-Qaeda had adopted the jurisprudential principle which purports to allow the killing of both the infidel and Muslim human shield was when Bin Laden resorted to it, following the Nairobi and Dar Es Salam explosions in 1998, and al-Zawahiri is in fact only reiterating it in his Exoneration of the Nation. I have already dwelt on these issues in *The Document*, and have shown the extent of their misguidance regarding them, so the reader may refer to those sections.

The ninth [seventh] pillar of this sect is yet another heresy of theirs, and it is to do with their principle of reciprocity, which they use and understand without qualification in order to expand the scope of their killing. It is worth noting that this principle of reciprocity, fundamental to al-Qaeda's justification for mass killing, has been contrived to primarily target Americans. We have already seen that al-Qaeda was launched initially to fight America, the bane of our existence and the cause of all our misfortunes. After Bin Laden had obtain signatures of support and fatwas from the scholars in Pakistan and Afghanistan to back his new vision, we have shown how he and his followers endeavoured in the end to bypass the conditions and preventives of jihad by claiming they were involved in a defensive war, though it seemed they had to cross the Atlantic to stop their enemy's advance. We have also explained how the leadership of this organization had absolved itself from its commitment and pledge to the Amir, Mullah Omar on the basis of the localization of the realm of the Amir's authority, also how they brushed aside the Qur'an and the Sunnah in order to fight the enemy afar before the enemy nearby, and how they maintained the killing of any American would be permissible by virtue of their citizenship, or because they all pay taxes which are used to finance their government's wars, or still because Americans, even those who are Muslims, are, at best, regarded as human shields whose killing Islamic law allows according to their interpretations of the principle of *tatarrus* (shield). And now this: if all of the above doctrines were not enough to render the killing of the Americans permissible, the ideologues of al-Qaeda, have advanced, in addition to these doctrines, the principle of reciprocity, which is really a doctrine of blind vengeance, even while the Prophet (pbuh) says: "*Whoever desires not to be screened from paradise should not shed more blood than be gathered in a palm of one's hand*" (Related by Bukhari). Indeed, al-Zawahiri and Bin Laden use all kinds of tricks and legal stratagems, which have no basis in the Sharia, only in order to give themselves more latitude and widen the scope of their killing spree, even while Abdullah Ibn Umar had said: "*One of the worse predicaments*

which can befall a Muslim and one from which he would not be able to get out, is unlawful killing” (Related by Bukhari). This deviousness of al-Qaeda is again at work and is obvious to anyone who looks critically at their understanding of reciprocity. They argue, as al-Zawahiri does in his book, that the principle of reciprocity permits, for instance, the killing of the disbelievers, without distinction between civilians and military personnel. This is wrong for the following reasons: to begin with, the leadership of al-Qaeda has a very myopic view of the Sharia, and so an important caveat to this principle, which I have by the way highlighted in *The Document*, has evaded them. Indeed, the legal rule pertinent to reciprocity states clearly that reciprocal actions are permitted *as long as they are in keeping with the Sharia and are not prohibited by it*, al-Zawahiri and his ilk, however, are only interested in reciprocal action which borders on blind vengeance and ignore the caveat, precisely because that which is not in keeping with the Sharia and is clearly prohibited by is their indiscriminate killing of the disbelievers. The other source of their fallacy stems from their defective legal reasoning, such that for instance they are unable to aptly choose between the various legal proofs of the Sharia. Thus, it is not unusual for them, while they are looking at an issue of law, to rely on foundational texts of general import and neglect those that have a specific one. For instance, they have adduced the Qur’anic verse: “... attack him like the manner as he attacks you”, (2: 194) as an evidence of general command, but they have ignored at the same time the ‘specific’ texts, in this case the hadiths of the Prophet (pbuh) that forbade the killing of women children, bondservants, peasants, and monks among others. Little do they know that by this omission they have departed from the right path, because the ‘specific’ is always hierarchically prior to the ‘general’ as attested by Ibn Taymiyya— May God have mercy on him. Our Sheikh said in his *Fataawa*: said that the specific evidences are put before the general ones: “None of the scholars had opted for making one text abrogate the other, whenever the general and the specific textual evidences opposed each other, and one when one, at the same time, not sure about which one of them came about first chronologically. The school of Malik, al-Shafi‘i, and Ahmed, all maintained that in those situations it would be preferable to put the ‘specific’ prior to the general or to simply abstain, [but I would argue] that even when it is known that the ‘general’ came before the ‘specific’ in those situations, the latter ought to still be made prior hierarchically if not chronologically.” (*Majmu‘at Al Fatawa*, vol, 21, p, 262). In our case, the specific evidence pertains to the prohibition of killing those whose killing is prohibited from among the disbelievers (women, children, bondservants etc..) which ought to be put prior to the ‘general’ evidence from which the permissibility of reciprocal action is derived, and our putting the specific before the general in our case would entail that even if the disbelievers were to kill our women and children, it would still not be permissible for us to kill their women and their children.

Had they taken in consideration all of the verse they had adduced as a general proof for their principle of reciprocity, they would have found a rebuttal to their position there in front of them. God-May He be exalted- says: *“And one who attacks you, attack him like manner as he attacked you. Observe your duty to God, and know that God is with those who Fear Him and are conscious of Him”* (2: 194). It is clear from this verse that reciprocity is qualified and restricted by the fear of God (*taqwa*), whose chief characteristic is steering away of the unlawful. Understand that it is because of this intimate relationship between reciprocity and *taqwa* that the legal maxim above insisted that acts of reciprocity or retaliation would only be permissible if they were not prohibited by law. Al-Shafi‘i - may God have mercy on him- has also in the same vein said: *“During war the disbelievers may do to us things for which it would be at times licit to retaliate and other times not; for, even if they killed our children and women we would still not entitled to kill theirs, however easy and however at hand. Nor are we to retaliate by killing their monks”* (al-Umm). Also, al-Shaybani said: *“Know that their treachery does not constitute a ground for the permissibility to act treacherously in retaliation, nor is permissible for us to kill their hostages even if they kill ours.”* (*Al-Siyar Al-Kabir*)

O assembly of Muslims! Bin Laden and al-Zawahiri only argue on the basis of discourse which suits their desires and they do not care if it is to the detriment of the Sharia. It is only this attitude and their whims that led them to ignore the Qur’an, the Sunnah and the words of the Imams such as al-Shafi‘i and al-Shaybani, to name but two of the leading scholars of Islam. So much that choosing and referencing (al-tarjeeh) between the legal proofs is done in their case in compliance with capricious plans and passions not the Sharia. It is ironic how through their desire they have managed to make specific that which the Sharia did not, like the localization of the realm of the Amir’s authority, and how through their desires again they manage to make ‘general’ that which the Sharia has clearly specified like the principle of reciprocity and retaliation.

The Fifth Episode:

The Crimes of America should not be taken as Pretext to Start the Distortion of Religion

Part V

“The followers of Bin Laden who knew of the plans for 9/11 are Khalid al-Shaykh, Abu Hafs al-Misriyy and a third person who is not al-Zawahiri”

Dr Fadl, the mastermind of the jihadists

In a book for which the newspaper *al-Sharq al-Awsat* has obtained the rights of publication, Dr Fadl responds to al-Zawahiri and ascertains that those who carried out the September 11 attacks went against Islamic Law as they violated the terms of their entry visa which is, for all intents and purposes, akin to a pledge of security.

Saturday 24th of Dhu al-Qi‘dah / 1429AH- 22nd November/2008,

Issue No. 10952

Cairo: Muhammad Mustafa Abu Shama

In yesterday’s sequel, al-Sayyid Imam Abdul-Aziz al-Sharif, Dr Fadl, discussed the doctrinal apparatus of al-Qaeda organisation, refuting its most fundamental elements, alongside the fatwas which were issued on the basis of those doctrines. Today, we publish a section from his book, *Al-Ta‘riyah* (Unveiling the Great Deception in al-Zawahiri’s Exoneration), which touches on some other fundamental doctrines of al-Qaeda. Here, Dr Fadl draws our attention to the fact that Bin Laden had been going through a crisis well before 9/11/2001 because he had not been able to kill the large number of Americans he had set out to kill, and that he had gradually become convinced that this objective would only be attained if combat operations were carried out inside America.

Dr Fadl resumes his critique focussing on the remaining pillars of al-Qaeda:

“The tenth pillar of this corrupt organisation [al-Qaeda] is their view that *“The entry visa issued for a Muslim to enter a non-Muslim country does not constitute a pledge of security”*. None of the followers of Bin Laden in Afghanistan had prior knowledge of the details of the 9/11 operation before the attacks, except Khalid al-Shaykh [Muhammad], Abu Hafs al-Misriyy and a third person –not al-Zawahiri- who was notified of the attack only 24 hours before.

Since June 2001, the rest of Bin Laden’s followers only knew of plans being made for a huge operation to be carried out against America, but were not informed of its exact location or any other details. On the basis of that information, al-Qaeda’s Sharia committee did in fact object to what they perceived to be clear violations against Islamic law: they did not accept that these attacks could be carried out without the permission of their Amir,

Mullah Muhammad Omar and they also opposed the killing of civilians on the basis of *tatarrus*. But the committee did not raise the issue of committing treacherous acts against the enemy – America- after entering its land with a visa, as they were not aware that the operation would involve such a thing.

After the bombings of 9/11, when it became clear that the perpetrators of the attacks entered America after obtaining visas, some pointed out that the visa amounts to a pledge of security and that these operations, having violated the terms of such a pledge constitute an act of treason vis-à-vis the enemy. Others tried to absolve Bin Laden and his followers from treason and breach of pledges, denying that the visa has anything to do with such a pledge. Al-Zawahiri, for instance, has boldly taken this stance in his book *Exoneration (Al-Tabri'ah* p, 97 and onwards), but he built his argument by relying on foreign dictionaries and foreign laws, and thus departed from the established practice of the Muslim jurists. This is another good example of that exonerative jurisprudence whose evil has intensified these days: committing stupid acts, nay major sins, and major transgressions and acts of hypocrisy and then justifying these to come away scot-free.

What al-Zawahiri and his ilk ignores is that when we make a ruling on new and emerging concepts such as visa, democracy, socialism etc., we do not base such a ruling only on the definitions given to them in the laws of the foreign people who invented these concepts, but we must, in addition to this, describe these concepts in Islamic legal terms in order to know their legal reality from the viewpoint of Islamic Law. This is known in *qiyas* [analogy, an interpretative tool in Islamic Jurisprudence] as the ‘derivation of the basis of a legal ruling’ (*takhrij al-manat*) which means identifying the characteristic attached to a legal ruling in the new case in question. Then we remove from it the characteristics which are incompatible with the Cause of the Ruling (*ta' lil al-hukm*) [i.e. to identify the effective cause, the *raison d'etre* of the ruling]. This process is called the refinement of the ‘basis of the ruling’ (*tanqih al-Manat*). Once we find the identified and refined basis of that legal ruling which is the ‘*raison d'etre* of the ruling’ found in the ‘original case’ and whose sharia ruling is known to us, the new case in question for which a sharia ruling is sought takes the same ruling as that of the ‘original case’. This is the last and the final step in analogical reasoning [*qiyas*] and it is known as the verification of the basis of the legal ruling (*tahqiq al-manat*). I have tried to simplify this matter to the non-specialist reader, [I hope it helps].

Regardless of the dictionary and law definitions of the term visa, its reality, according to the sharia, is that it constitutes an entry permit to a country with the condition that the life and wealth of its people must be respected. This is the characteristic and the basis upon which the visa ruling is based and this also is the basis of the pledge of security. Indeed, the visa is akin to pledge of security even if this was not clearly stipulated in their laws or in the visa stamp in the passport. In explaining this, Ibn Qudamah- may God have mercy on him-

stated: “The case: ‘One who enters the land of the enemy on the basis of a pledge of security [*aman*], must not betray them and must not conduct business with them on the basis of usury’. Then he mentions the overall evidence for the prohibition of usury and goes on to say: “As regards treachery, that is forbidden, and this is because the enemy granted him [a Muslim] security on condition that he does not betray them and with that they have assumed they have secured themselves from any harm that might arise from him, for even though this guarantee may not be explicitly stated in the pledge , it is customarily implied”(al-Mughniyy along with al-Sharh al-Kabir).

The meaning of Ibn Qudamah’s statement is this: The pledge of security that a Muslim enters into with the enemy before he is granted permission to enter their land contains implicit conditions, which he is obliged to honour even if they did not explicitly state these conditions to him. Consider Ibn Qudamah’s statement: ‘*even though this guarantee may not be explicitly stated in the pledge, it is customarily implied*’ so that you may realise that the crucial factor in Sharia rulings rests on the signification and verities of the words and is not confined to their literal meaning as al-Zawahiri, who obtains his information from Encyclopaedia Britannica and Encyclopaedia Encarta, professes. He brazenly affirms: “Thus, with this, it is clear from the definition of ‘visa’ and its meaning that it does not have any affinity with a pledge of security” (*Exoneration*, p. 95) even though the definition that he quoted clearly states that a visa is a permission of entry to a country. It is strange that al-Zawahiri accepts the stance of Sheikh Nasir al-Fahd of ‘unqualified reciprocity’ but he ignores his statement that, “a visa constitutes a pledge of security”. Obviously, al-Zawahiri chooses from among statements what suits him, without any legal proof in order to protect his criminal organisation. In the following, we shall deal with al-Fahd’s stance and how al-Zawahiri falsified it.

Ibn Qudama is not the only scholar who made clear reference to pledges of security between Muslims and their enemies and how they ought to be observed from the viewpoint of Islamic law. Al-Shafi’i is also one such scholar. He said: “If they pledge to him [a Muslim] or to a group of them [Muslims] they would guarantee their security- even when they were capable of taking them on- and permitted them to enter their lands according to conditions which are customarily assumed in their pledge, the Muslim individuals and/or groups in that situation would be under obligation to honour it by being committed to their safety even if this condition was not explicitly stated by them... For their [provision of] security for him constitutes a guarantee of security [from harm] to them by him. Thus, there is no way he can commit murder or betrayal against them” (*al-Umm*). Now consider again the statement of Ibn Qudama: “*even if this was not explicitly stated as a condition*” (*wa in lam yakun mazkuran fi al-lafz*) and that of al-Shafi’i, “*even of this was not explicitly stated by them*” (*wa in lam yaqul zalika*) and compare these with al-Zawahiri’s statement that the wording of the encyclopaedia does *not explicitly state* that the visa is a security pledge in order that

you may know the extent of the man's limit in knowledge and how his ignorance of the Sharia led him to oppose its established rulings only to justify the treachery of his sheikh, Bin Laden, who in the end did not even bother to inform him of the treacherous plans of 9/11. Lest I forget, you should know that at the end of his deliberation on this issue, al-Shafi'i affirmed: "We do not know of anything that has been narrated which is at variance with our conclusion" (*Al-Umm*).

The Muslim jurists had been as careful as not to commit treason against an enemy, they went as far as affirming that even if a Muslim person were to enter the lands of the enemy through deception and the enemy fell for that, that person would still be under obligation not to betray them. Thus, Imam al-Sarakhasy stated, "This is because there is no way for them – that is the enemy – to find out what is really concealed in their – Muslims' – hearts. Such a ruling is based on their manifest behaviour because it is necessary in Islamic law to take extreme precautions against committing treachery. This is in keeping with what we have explained above, namely that the terms of a pledge of security are so serious, that even the most minute of them deserves full attention" (*Al-Siyar Al-Kabir*). Al-Zawahiri tries to argue his way out of this, claiming that nowhere is it stated that a visa is a grant of stay even though the encyclopaedia from which he quoted his definition clearly stated that the '*visa permits the traveller to remain in the country for a specific duration*' (*Al-Tabri'ah*, footnote No 136). Clearly by this definition the visa is a permit authorising entry into a country, and, we maintain that by virtue of this permission, it does amount to a grant of security.

Listen with me to what the jurist al-Shaybani has to say on the matter to appreciate the gravity of the matter at hand. He says: "If a group of Muslims approached the borders of the People of War and said to the enemy in an attempt to deceive them, 'We are envoys of the Caliph and showed them a letter which resembles the letter of the Caliph or did not show anything, and in return they [non-Muslims] said to them 'enter' and the Muslims entered into the Abode of War, these Muslims would not be permitted to kill anyone or take anyone's wealth from that territory throughout the duration of their stay there" (*al-Siyar al-Kabir*). Notice how al-Shaybani deemed just one trivial word: 'enter' uttered by non-Muslims enough to constitute a pledge of security. Similarly Ibn Abd al-Barr also deemed a permission of entry akin to a pledge of security, when he stated: "Whatever the enemy has come to regard as a pledge of security shall be viewed as such: whether that pledge was stated verbally or through gesture, all Muslims must abide it either way" (*al-Istidhkar fi Sharh Madhahib al-Amsar*). Now add the statements of Ibn Qudama and al-Shafi'i, already mentioned, to those of the other scholars who join them in their stance, despite the disparity in time and place, and you will surely be in a position to establish for yourself how al-Zawahiri, notwithstanding his audacity in calling for the implementation of the Sharia, only tries to circumvent its rulings: his exonerative jurisprudence which desperately seeks to make licit acts of betrayal and treachery drove him to not only commit 9/11 and other attacks like

it, but to completely ignore also the statements of Muslim jurists, having recourse instead to the laws of the non-Muslims and their encyclopaedias. Al-Shaybani was from Iraq and he was a student of Abu Hanifa and Abu Yusuf and Malik. He is the one who collected and compiled the writings of the Hanafi Law School and he died in 189 AH [805 CE]. Al-Shafi'i is the founder of a School of Law and died in Egypt in 204 AH [819 CE]. And Abu Umar Ibn Abd al-Barr is a leading scholar of the Maliki School of law and a jurist from Muslim Spain, he died in 478 AH [1085 CE]. As to Muwaffaq al-din Ibn Qudama, he is among the greatest imams of the Hanbali School of law and was from Syria. He is the author of the encyclopaedic work of Islamic Law, *al-Mughniyy*, and died in 620 AH [1223 CE]-may God grant His mercy to all of them. Their schools of law, their countries and their times are different, but their stances as regards the pledge of security and its legal ramifications are the same. Al-Zawahiri relinquishes the Muslim jurists and prefers to issue fatwas based on Encyclopaedia Britannica. Indeed, concerning such people the Prophet (pbuh) has said: "*People shall take the ignorant as their leaders and these will issue them with guidance but without [proper] knowledge, they will go astray and will cause their followers to go astray too*" (Agreed upon hadith).

We have already of course dealt with this misconception of theirs and others like it, in the eighth clause of *The Document* where I brought forward all the evidence against treachery to show that such act constitutes a major sin, a transgression and hypocrisy, even when committed against non-Muslims, and have buttressed that position by making reference to al-Shafi'i, al-Sarakhasi and Ibn Qudama among others. Now notice how al-Zawahiri, owing to his commitment to his exonerative jurisprudence, is impelled to refer me to the Encyclopaedia Britannica, while I referred him to those guiding lights of Islamic legal scholarship, and how, when he ran out of tricks in this debate, he had to say that this matter was of the realm of independent judgement (*The Exoneration*, p, 97), by which he meant that, in relation to this issue, it was permissible for them to follow any opinion they see fit. But he has lied as this matter is definitely not of the realm of independent legal judgement: al-Shafi'i, more than 1200 years ago stated loud and clear "We do not know of anything that has been narrated [in relation to his matter] which is at variance with our conclusion" (*Al-Umm* V. 4. p.88). Besides, they are not even qualified to make independent legal judgment (*ijtihad*) in matters related to the religion of Islam; nay, they are people who lie and commit treachery.

As regards the eleventh pillar upon which al-Qaeda fanatic ideology of indiscriminate killing is founded, it is based on another heresy; namely that 'even if the visa constitutes a pledge of security it is still permissible to violate it'.

O Muslims! No intelligent person will disagree regarding the crimes America committed against Muslims and others. However, these crimes cannot be a stalking-horse for undermining religion and distorting it: How can we accept that anyone who disapproves these distortions of the religion of Islam be labelled a stooge of the American and the Jews and working for their interests. I will later give examples of such accusations from history to enlighten the reader on what is at stake here, but for the moment let us state clearly our position that jihad constitutes a true dimension of our faith, but no sooner is it conducted without the rules controlling its legitimacy, it turns into an instrument for immoral war.

Realising that his statement about the visa, namely that it did not constitute a pledge of security, turned out to be something no one had uttered before him - and he cannot be counted among the people of knowledge, having deviated from the generality of the scholars of the early generations – al-Zawahiri wanted to correct himself and stated: “Even if the visa were to be considered a pledge of security, it would still be permissible to violate it”. And he tried to substantiate this argument of his by resorting to their sheikh, Nasir al-Fahd, whose repulsive ideas on reciprocity and retaliation, as mentioned earlier, has led to the killing tens millions of Americans, including Muslims, women, children and the elderly, with a single attack. Nasir al-Fahd deliberation on the legality of the visa is no less repulsive and stands in stark contradiction with the Qur’an, the Sunnah [of the Prophet] and the consensus of the early generation of Muslims. After acknowledging that the visa is akin to a pledge of security, Nasir al-Fahd later added that it is permissible to violate it and gave two reasons for that judgment: firstly, on the basis that it was a ruse consistent with fair tactic and secondly, on the basis that it was America which violated first its pacts and pledges with Muslims. His first reason can be shown to be false from three different angles:

1. Nasir al-Fahd based his ruling on an error even if he had relied on and attributed his argument to Ibn Taymiyya. This position, we maintain, without trouble, for, even the Companions did not hesitate rejecting the statements of Umar Ibn al-Khattab and Uthman Ibn Affan, when it became clear to them these statements contradicted the Sunnah, as attested by Ibn Abd al-Barr in *Jami’ Bayan al-‘Ilm*. As regards the error here, it is his statement that the Companions assured security to Ka’b only to ensnare him in a trap and then kill him, and then using that to permit the treachery committed by the executors of 9/11. This is yet another case of a corrupt outcome resulting from a reliance on a corrupt premise: the real story was that the Prophet (pbuh), after his migration to Medina, made a peace contract with the Medinan Jews among who was Ka’b Ibn al-Ashraf. Only, after the Battle of Badr, when Ka’b began to incite the people against Muslims and flirt with Muslim women, the Prophet (pbuh) has said: “*Who is ready to kill Ka’b Ibn al-Ashraf. He had indeed harmed God and His Prophet*”. Muhammad Ibn Maslama then stepped forward and asked “*O Messenger of God! Do you want me to kill him?*” to which the Prophet replied: “*yes*”. Ibn Maslama then said, “*Allow me to say something*”, and the Prophet

(pbuh) agreed.” Ibn Maslama then went to him [Ka’b Ibn al-Ashraf] and said, “Indeed this man [the Prophet] had asked from us charity and that is really burdensome; I have come to you seeking a loan”, to which Ka’b said, “You will soon find him burdensome too” (Related by Bukhari). It is clear that what Ibn Maslama sought permission for was to utter words not befitting the Prophet (pbuh) such as suggesting that he, (pbuh), was an encumbering person. Otherwise, the order was clear: the Prophet (pbuh) gave instructions to kill Ka’b because he had violated the peace contract he had with the Prophet and by extension with the Muslim community. There is nothing in the words of Ibn Maslama or in his conduct indicating or even remotely suggesting that he had offered to enter into a pledge of security with Ka’b . On the contrary, the statements of Ibn Salama themselves are clear and there is no equivocation concerning a pledge of security, but that is precisely the part of his statement which al-Fahd and al-Zawahiri chose to ignore even though they could have made reference to it particularly that it is there in the same book from which they took their account of Ka’b (*Al-Sarim al-Maslul* of Ibn Taymiyya). I do not have this book with me now but I remember what is in it. There it is related that “During the caliphate of Mu ‘awiya Ibn Abu Sufyan, he had with him Muhammad Ibn Maslama and some other man. This man said: ‘ Ka’b Ibn al-Ashraf was not killed except by way of treachery.’ Then Ibn Maslama said to Mu ‘awiya: ‘This is said in front of you and you remain silent! [Then he said to the man]: ‘No, by God! We may not come under [the same] roof except the roof of the mosque!’ If I were to be alone with this [man], I will indeed kill him”.

It is clear that Ibn Maslama is furious because this man had insinuated that the Prophet (pbuh) permitted treachery, which is impugning his character and an insult on him. The fact that Ibn Maslama, and he is the person involved in the story of Ka’b Ibn al-Ashraf, got angry in this instance, also clearly shows that there was no treachery neither in the Prophet’s (pbuh) order to kill him nor in the statements of Ibn Maslama or in his conduct with Ka’b.

So know that the statement of al-Fahd, purporting that ‘the Companions assured security to Ka’b only to ensnare him in a trap and then kill him is but fallacy and that any judgment or ruling based on a corrupt premise is always corrupt and false. Notice again how their exonerative jurisprudence made them attribute treachery to the Prophet (pbuh).

2. Nasir al-Fahd asserts that “It is not permissible to treat the violation of a pledge of security as a trick or deception when the aim is to kill an unbeliever”. This stance is similar to that of al-Zawahiri, and it is the kind of statement, which al-Zawahiri has so desperately sought to support his argument for indiscriminate killing at a massive scale. The fact is, however, that both he and al-Fahd are out of line with what has been established by the scholars (ulama). Indeed, in his commentary on the hadith, ‘war is deception’ (Agreed upon hadith), Ibn Hajar stated: “al-Nawawi said, ‘They [Muslim scholars] agreed to make it permissible for Muslims to deceive the unbelievers in war in whatever way possible except

if that deception constituted a violation of a contract or a pledge of security, for in that case it would be prohibited” (*Fath al-Bari*). With this is a self-evident and clearly explained statement which does not need further elaboration, we close this second aspect.

3. Finally, they have conflated the issues and sought to substantiate a case with reference to another which was not related to it: the case of Ka’b b. al-Ashraf relates to ‘the ruling regarding a non-Muslim who has been given a pledge of security in Muslim lands’, whereas the case of the perpetrators of 9/11, relates to ‘the ruling regarding the Muslim who has been given a pledge of security in non-Muslim lands’. Surely there are differences between the two cases and the Islamic Law books attest to that, but what to do? Notice how confused and mixed up they are, nay notice how ignorant they are!

As regards the second reason which Nasir al-Fahd advanced for the permissibility of violating the pledge of security contained in the visa, it may be summarised as follows: that while the Americans may have entered into a pledge of security with us, they had breached that pledge by their hostility towards Muslims, and that consequently, those Muslims who had previously entered into such pledge of security with the Americans are no longer to feel bound or committed to it, they are permitted to kill them irrespective of these pledges and regardless of what the terms of the visa granted to them subsequently might stipulate. In brief this is how al-Fahd has reached the conclusion that what the perpetrators of 9/11 did was right. In *The Exoneration of the Nation* he is quoted as saying:

“The argument of those who forbid fighting them and killing them in countries other than the ones in which they happen to be fighting, revolves around a couple of dubieties. The first one pertains to their argument of the pledge: they say that they have a pledge and that whoever kills someone possessing one will not enjoy even a whiff of the scent of paradise, as stated in the Hadith. The second pertains to their argument on the social benefits and harms: they say that fighting them will bring down on the nation trials that it hardly bear.

In response it will be said: As regards the pledge: No, by God! There is no such thing between them and us. On the contrary they are at war with us wherever they go and stay, even if they were clinging on to the coverings of the Ka’ba. Indeed, the contract that governments have made with these crusaders is not legal; it is based on the idolatrous charters of the United Nations... And even if this contract were to be considered legal in principle, it still remains that there factors nullifying its legality in reality, and these nullifiers number not in the tens but in the hundreds. Indeed, not only they fight us because of religion, they have proclaimed against us the crusade, and they have expelled Muslims from their lands... If the contract between the Prophet (pbuh) and Quraysh, was annulled when the latter helped secretly the tribe of Bakr against the tribe of Khuza‘ah even for once, how much more appropriate it would be [to annul our contract with them] bearing in mind

the countless breaches America has committed against us at this time?" (*Al-Tabri'ah*, p, 150)

Also, in responding to the question, 'Does a visa constitute a pledge of security? If it is, should the mujahidin who blew up the twin towers of the American trade centre be considered to have broken that pledge?', Nasir al-Fahd replied as follows:

"It is true that a visa is to be considered a pledge of security in customary law and this pledge must be abided by. Indeed, anyone who enters the territory of the nonbelievers, even if they are enemies, by means of a visa has given them a pledge of security; he may not act treacherously afterward, either toward their lives or their property. Anyone who does this falls under the category of those whom God has menaced with His severe punishment.

As for the September 11 operations, we consider them rightful based on the fact that the Americans represent the epitome of non-belief in this age and are among those who have offended God and His Prophet most injuriously.

As a people they form a whole whose parts complement each other: neither the President nor the Pentagon nor the army have any weight without the backing of the people. Indeed, if any of these institutions went against the wishes of the people in their policy, the people would pull the carpet from under their feet... If you know this, it will become clear to you that they constitute a single legal entity, which in many respects is not unlike the person of Ka'b b. al-Asraf whose killing the Prophet (pbuh) had called for. Muhammad Ibn Maslamah too led Ka'b into thinking that he was giving a promise of security, but then he killed him for having offended God and His Messenger... and this situation applies to the Americans in this age" (*Al-Tabri'ah*, p, 110).

Now these are the statements of al-Fahd's that al-Zawahiri adduced to substantiate his argument regarding this issue. Only, they contain a great deal of distortions, and ignorance, as well as, a clear contradiction to the self-evident texts [of the Qur'an and the Sunnah].

The sixth episode: "Responding to the arguments of al-Qaeda regarding the case of the 'pledge of security.'

Part VI

“The visa constitutes a ‘pledge of security’ and, hence, it is forbidden to any Muslim, who enters the countries of the disbelievers on its basis, to commit treachery against them, during his stay”

Dr Fadl, the Mastermind of the jihadists

In a book for which the newspaper *al-Sharq al-Awsat* has obtained the rights of publication, Dr Fadl responds: al-Zawahiri has relied on opinions which contradict the rulings of Islamic Law to justify al-Qaeda’s operations.

Sunday 25[/]Dhu al-Qi‘dah /1429 AH - 23[/] November/ 2008

Issue No. 10953

Al-Sharq al-Awsat Newspaper

Cairo: Muhammad Mustafa Abu Shama

Al-Sayyid Imam Abd al-Aziz al-Sharif, Dr Fadl, discussed in the sequel published yesterday from his book *al-Ta‘riya li Kitab al-Tabri‘ah* (Unveiling the Deception in al-Zawahiri’s Exoneration) the doctrinal foundations of al-Qaeda and some other essential elements of their philosophical approach to things. He dealt with the question of entry visa and whether this permission of entry constituted a pledge akin to the pledge of security as understood in Islamic Law.

Dr Fadl pointed that Ayman al-Zawahiri in his book *Exoneration* had recourse to the Encyclopaedia Britannia to explain the meaning of the word ‘visa’, and that he also relied on the fatwa of Nasir al-Fahd to support his opinion that it is permissible to violate the terms of the visa, even though it is akin to a pledge of security. Moreover, he stated that al-Zawahiri had become like “someone who stands in a supermarket, and chooses from every shelf whatever satisfies his desires”, and likening thus his approach to “the approach of abusers in explaining religion”. Dr Fadl who is also referred to as Shaykh Abd al-Qadir Ibn Abd al-Aziz reserved his discussion in the last sequel to the criticism of the eleventh pillar of al-Qaeda’s ideology of indiscriminate killings, particularly to their statement, which purports that “even if a visa constituted a pledge of security, it is still permissible to violate it”. Dr Fadl’s discussion ended halfway through his deliberation on the second reason why he thought Nasir al-Fahd’s stance for the permissibility of violating the pledge of security contained in the visa was fallacious. In today’s sequel, Dr Fadl resumes this discussion, affirming that:

“This statement of Nasir al-Fahd contains confusion and much ignorance and contradicts self-evident texts [from the Qur’an or/and the Sunnah]. As regards confusion, he has confused between treaties of security between states and pledges of security between states and individuals. As regards his statement that the Companions entered into a pledge of security with Ka‘b and then killed him, it is false, in that Muhammad Ibn Maslama, as we saw, refuted this in his encounter with Mu‘awiyah. Concerning his ignorance and contradiction of clear texts which he conveniently brushed aside, we say this: whatever the degree of enmity the US has towards Muslims today, it cannot be of the same criminal category as someone who fought the Prophet, may God’s peace and blessing be upon him; for surely, he who fought the Prophet had committed a crime of a degree far worse than he who fought someone other than the Prophet from among the Muslims.

Furthermore, any disbelievers who come to this world after Quraysh and until the Day of Judgement, are but followers Quraysh in their opposition to Islam, whatever their degree of disbelief or enmity to Muslims may be, and this fact is attested to by the hadith of the Prophet (pbuh) as he has said: *“People are similar to the tribe of Quraysh; those who are Muslims are like their Muslims and those who disbelievers are their disbelievers”* (related by al-Bukhari). Based on this, The US and every other nation of disbelief are akin to Quraysh who forced the Prophet (pbuh) out of his home and his country and insulted him with the worst of insults including poetry. We need to remind ourselves, however, that even when faced with such hostility, the Prophet (pbuh) never trampled on pledges: when Hudhayfah Ibn Yaman promised Quraysh that he will not fight them in the Battle of Badr, the Prophet (pbuh) commanded him to fulfil his pledge even though Quraysh had come out to fight him (pbuh). Hudhayfa said: *“Nothing prevented me from being present at the Battle of Badr except this: I set out with my father Huzayl [to participate in the battle], but we were caught by the disbelievers of Quraysh. They said: ‘[Do] you intend to join Muhammad?’ We said: ‘We do not intend to go to him, but we wish to go to Medina’. So they took from us a covenant in the name of God that we would go to Medina and would not fight with him [Muhammad]. Then, we came to the Messenger of God, may God’s peace and blessings be upon him, and reported the incident to him. He said: ‘Both of you proceed [to Medina]; we shall fulfil the pledge and seek God's help against them’”* (related by Muslim). Truly, this text relates directly to the question in dispute and should be ample to remove all source of disagreement, for although the forces of the enemy in this context too had clearly come out to fight the Prophet himself, he (pbuh) still ordered Hudhayfa to fulfil his pledge to them, for the simple reason that a personal contract between a Muslim and the disbelievers – and the visa is no different– amounts to a pledge that the enmity of the disbelievers towards the Muslims does not nullify. Indeed, beside the hadith of Hudhayfah, there also evidence in the Qur’an: God- may He be exalted- says: *“If they seek your aid against religious persecution, it is your duty to help except against a people with*

whom you have treaty of mutual alliance”(8: 72). This is why al-Shafi‘i- may God have mercy on him- stated: “Chapter on the Person who was given security in the Abode of War]: If the event where Muslims enter enemy territory on the basis of a pledge of security [visa], they must not do any harm to the enemy until they leave [that territory] or the duration of the pledge has ended, but while it is effective, they must neither wrong them nor betray them. Even if the enemy had captured Muslim women and children, I still would not recommend it to them to betray, and would rather they seek to annul the pledge they have entered with enemy and insist that he oblige. Once the enemy comes to the party, those Muslims can fight on behalf of their children and women” (*Al-Umm*)

Nasir al-Fahd has brushed aside all of this, and instead employed stratagems in order to exonerate those who carried out the 9/11 attacks. Little did he know that in doing so, he was led to accuse not only the Companions but also the Prophet (pbuh) of treachery in the incident of Ka‘b Ibn al-Ashraf. The ruling against anyone who makes such an accusation is well known for the followers of Islam, and that is certainly the punishment for him who shunned the self-evident Sharia texts and employed various stratagems only in order to circumvent them and establish in their stead their exonerative jurisprudence, which I discussed in the second clause of *The Document*.

God- may He be glorified- described the disbelievers as people who commit treachery and aggression in His statement, “*In a believer, they do not respect the tie of kinship or of covenant. They are indeed the aggressors*” (9:10). But even then, He instructed us to fulfil our obligations when we make treaties or enter into pledges with them, and has thus said, “*Fulfil the covenant of God when you have entered into it*” (16: 91), and also, “*O you who believe, fulfil [your] contracts*” (5:1), because while the unbelievers may act treacherously to secure some gain in this world, Muslims, must fulfil their pledges as part of their worship and obedience to God.

Nasir al-Fahd was not content with just seeking to exonerate those who carried out the 9/11 attacks from having breached the terms of their visas; he also sought by his previous statement to exonerate them from the indiscriminate killings of Americans in the twin towers of the World Trade Centre by inventing another villainy of his; the heresy of ‘the legal personality’, through which he equates 300 million Americans to one individual like Ka‘b Ibn al-Ashraf, and permits their killing on the basis that their leaders could not carry their hostilities towards Muslims without their support. It is with these sorts of excuses that al-Fahd gave legitimacy to the killing of their civilian population including the American Muslims in their midst. This is not unlike the killing of people because of their nationality or because they pay taxes, it is a heresy for many reasons. To begin with God did not place the disbelievers at the same level but God Almighty says: “*They are not the same*” (3:113),

although, God- may He be exalted- condemned the People of the two Books for their mutual rejection of whatever truth or merit the other may have had, in His statement: “*The Jews assert: ‘The Christians have no [valid ground for their beliefs], while the Christians assert, ‘The Jews have no valid grounds for their beliefs’, - and both quote the divine writ!’*”(2: 113)]. Nor did the Prophet (pbuh) place the disbelievers of Quraysh at one and the same level; he praised some of them such as Mut ‘im Ibn ‘Adiyy, Abdullah Ibn Jad ‘an and Abu al- ‘As Ibn al-Rabi ‘ and forbade the killing some of them, such as his uncle al-Abbas and Abu al-Bukhtari Ibn Hisham, even they coming out to fight him in the Battle of Badr. There is also the fact that the leaders of Persia and Byzantium too were insignificant except with the backing of their peoples, but when the Companions fought them, they did not implement on them the concept of ‘legal personality’, which al-Fahd invented. Far from it, they fought only those who stood up to fight the Muslims, and this point has been raised previously with conclusive evidence: The prohibition of Umar- may God be pleased with him- against the killing of peasants. Another reason is that in spite of all those killed by the Pharaoh from among the Israelites and in spite of the obedience of the population to him, as God Almighty stated: “Thus he incited his people to levity and they obeyed him; indeed they were a people, depraved” (43:54), Moses (pbuh), was still considered to be in grave error for having killed one man from among that population. Indeed, in all of these instances God did not consider the disbelievers a single entity or a single legal personality, but He made distinctions among them. Besides, the Byzantines (they are today the people of Europe and the USA) had many moral qualities which the Companions acknowledged: a hadith related by Muslim in his *Sahih* from al-Mustawrid al-Qurashiyy stated: “*I heard the Messenger of God, may God’s blessings and peace be upon him, say, “The world would come to an end only when the Byzantines would form the largest of all peoples’. Then ‘Amr Ibn al- ‘As said, “Even if you say that, they still have four good qualities: they are the most patient among peoples when faced with hardship; they are the quickest among peoples to come to their senses when disaster strikes them; and the hastiest among peoples to [return to the battle field and] attack after their retreat; and they are the best among people to [any] destitute or orphaned or weak person... [they actually] have a fifth one which is beautiful: they are the most steadfast against the oppression of their kings”* (Related by Muslim).

Due to these good qualities, many Muslims, especially these days, flee to them to avoid religious persecution or economic hardships, and they largely end up exercising the freedoms and securing a the wealth they did not find in their countries. What ‘Amr Ibn al- ‘As bore witness to regarding them - (the most resistant among peoples against oppression of leaders) – stands true even today. Since the occupation of Iraq in 2003, for instance, some of these peoples removed there prime ministers for having allied themselves with America: The Spaniards removed Aznar [José María Alfredo Aznar López the Prime Minister of Spain

from 1996 to 2004] and the Australians removed John Howard [Prime Minister of Australia from 11 March 1996 to 3 December 2007] from office, and there are still demonstrations going on in the lands of America and its allies to his day. Obviously, they do not constitute a single legal personality. How can this be when a few days ago, the greatest priest of Britain took a stance in favour of Muslims? God Almighty says: “*And never let the hatred of anyone lead you into the sin of deviating from justice. Be just [to all]: this is closer to being God-conscious*” (5: 8)... Tony Blair, the British prime minister [from 1997 - 2007] at the time of the occupation of Iraq and Afghanistan, was also removed.

With such a deviant understanding of the notion of ‘legal personality’, Nasir al-Fahd founded the ideology of indiscriminate killing, and al-Zawahiri, following him, has abandoned the word of God and the word of the Prophet (pbuh), the words of al-Shafi‘i, al-Shaybani and other scholars of the early generations to substantiate his argument with his knaveries instead. It is after this manner that Islam gets distorted and indiscriminate killings become justified. Imam Malik- may God have mercy on him- said: *Are we going to relinquish what God has revealed to Muhammad, peace be upon him, each time an astute soothsayer comes along?* And we in turn say: Are we going to relinquish the hadith of Hudhayfah Ibn al-Yaman and opt instead the heresy of Nasir al-Fahd?

As regards their insulting the Prophet (pbuh), it does not nullify any contractual agreement reached with the disbelievers of enemy territory because their religion does not prohibit it, as Ibn Taymiyya mentioned in his *Majmu‘at al-Fatawa*. Indeed, the Prophet had concluded with the disbelievers of Mecca the Treaty of Hudaibiyya, even though they had insulted the Prophet and had not acknowledged his prophecy, demanding the attribute ‘messenger of God’ after his name be removed from the clauses of that treaty, and despite ‘Urwa Ibn Mas‘ud’s insulting of the Companions, describing them as ‘a pack of riffraff’ in front of the Prophet (pbuh). It is the *dhimmi* who lives under Islamic rule in the Abode of Islam, whose contractual obligation gets nullified by insulting the Prophet, in that the *dhimmi*, by virtue of his status, is obliged to be governed by the laws of Islam. This matter is mentioned by Ibn Qudamah at the end of the chapter on jihad in *al-Mughni ma‘a al-Sharh al-Kabir*, where he explains that “among the things that nullifies the ‘protected status’ of the *dhimmi* is blaspheming God Almighty or His Book or His religion [Islam] or His Prophet [Muhammad]”. See for yourself now, the extent to which they confuse and mix up distinct cases in Islamic Law with one another, only in order to justify the expansion of the spectrum of victims targeted by their killings. As I have said earlier, and based on the stance of Ibn al-Qayyim in *I‘lam al-Muwaqq‘in*, this ignorant Shaykh, Nasir al-Fahd, must be prevented from issuing fatwas as his fatwas go against the principles of Islamic Jurisprudence, and must also be made liable to what was destroyed as a result of his fatwas.

To sum up: Know that whoever enters the countries of the disbelievers with a visa, it is prohibited for him to betray them even if they commit an act of aggression against other Muslims: in his case the visa constitutes a pledge which he has entered into with the disbelievers, he has to be personally committed to it, as attested by the hadith of Hudhayfah.

The twelfth pillar of the sect of al-Qaeda's revolves around their saying: "The entry visa granted to tourists for the purpose of travel in Muslim countries does not constitute a pledge of security, and so does not protect those visitors from being killed or abducted during their stay" as maintained by al-Zawahiri in his *Exoneration*. I responded to this in great detail in the seventh clause of *The Document*. It suffices here to quote, from what I mentioned there, namely the statement of Abu Umar Abd al-Barr: "Whatever the non-Muslim from the enemy territory come to regard as a pledge of security, whether verbally, through a gesture or by written permission, ought to be regarded as such and all Muslims would have to abide by this" (*Al-Istidhkar fi Sharh Madhahib 'Ulama al-Amsar*), hence, the safety of anyone entering our countries with a permit granted to him by any of our representative authorities, ought to be protected. If anyone from among the non-Muslims enters our country without a proper permit, the ruling on such a person is not death and abduction., rather, following the position of al-Shafi'i- may God have mercy on him- we affirm that: "We have to return them to a country where they would be safe and we must not expose them to any physical or financial harm, because they presumably do not differentiate between who can and who cannot give them a promise of security in our camp" (*al-Umm*). This position is entirely in keeping with the words of God- may He be exalted when He has said: "*Escort them to the place where they would be safe*" (9: 6), meaning 'to a place where they would find themselves safe'.

But against the word of God and the words of Muslim scholars, al-Zawahiri and his followers say: 'kill the tourists, abduct them; they do not have a pledge of security', he himself has travelled to many countries in Europe, America and elsewhere where he conducted his business and returned safe and sound without anyone causing him death or abducting him. Indeed, God Almighty says: "[There are also signs] in your own selves! Can you, then, not see?" (51: 21).

Al-Zawahiri is not content with implementing the heresy of 'legal personality' of al-Fahd to legitimise the annulment of the pledge of security for Muslims when they enter non-Muslim countries. He also uses the same heresy to also legitimise the killing of tourists in Muslim countries because of their governments' aggression towards Muslims. He says: "I have explained that the group who refuses peace and commits aggression is like single person" (*Al-Tabri'ah*, p. 154). These are his words and they testify to his ignorance, for they go against the Qur'an and the Sunnah: Against the wishes of Nasir al-Fahd and al-Zawahiri, the

Prophet (pbuh) never regarded the non-believers who committed aggression as a single person. On the contrary, He (pbuh) made a distinction between the ones who were fighting and the ones who were not, and applied to each group the rulings commensurate with their status: when his uncle al-Abbas was captured in the Battle of Badr, he (pbuh) implemented in his case the rulings of captivity and ransom applicable to the disbelievers, but he forbade the killing of those who did not fight such as the women, children and the labourers, even when there was an on-going war with their camp. So, they all did not constitute a single entity as al-Zawahiri tries to claim, but al-Zawahiri wants to legitimise the killing of any individual from among the people whose armies is engaged in fighting in any Muslim country. This is how he legitimised the killing of tourists from any country which is hostile towards Muslims, without bothering to consider that these statements of his lead to the killing of millions of tourists and expatriate workers in our countries. To al-Zawahiri and al-Fahd, the tourists, the foreign expatriates, their governments and their armies are like one single entity, but this is clearly against the Sunnah of the Prophet (pbuh).

Furthermore, it needs to be stated that the deliberate killing of civilians in buildings, trains, markets and in mosques among other places, is a tacit acknowledgement of their inability to confront the military forces of the enemy, and to reach real military targets, and in either case it shows their cravenness. Indeed, both their inaptitude and cravenness have forced them to resort to targeting those whose killing the Sharia has forbidden, notably the civilians, from among the enemy who were not engaged in fighting, and among whom there are Muslims, while God Almighty, in relation to a reckless action of one person which led to the killing of one fighter from the ranks of the disbelievers, revealed in disapproval of that incident Qur'anic verses that Muslims are to recite in their worship, until End Times. Thus, God- may He be exalted- commanded us twice to use our discernment, and to that effect, He has said: *“O you who believe, when you go forth [to war] in God’s cause, use your discernment”* – to – *“You, too, were once in the same condition, but God had been gracious unto you. Therefore, use your discernment”* (4:94). The Prophet (pbuh) too strongly disapproved that action of Usama Ibn Zayd which led to the death of that fighter. These verses and hadith that were revealed and said in relation to this incident are there to serve as a reminder and in order to restrain us from rushing to commit murder, but al-Zawahiri is relentless in his justification of excessiveness in indiscriminate killing and the killing of innocent civilians who are not engaged in fighting; if it is not on the grounds of their citizenship, then it is on the grounds of their payment of taxes, and if it is no that then it is on the grounds of tatarus (the permissibility to kill the human shield), or the principle reciprocity or the unity of their legal personality. All these various justifications reflect only one thing: Bin Laden’s, al-Zawahiri’s and Nasir al-Fahd’s insistence in broadening the scope of their murderous and criminal activity, and their insatiable appetite for bloodshed.

Finally, the last pillar of this sect, which is another of their heresies, resides in their saying: “Only the leaders actively involved in jihad are entitled to speak about it”. This is certainly an ugly heresy which betrays ignorance in matters of religion, but they resort to it to stir up the crowds against those who criticise them. But this heresy goes against the statement of God Almighty, “If you do not realise, ask the people of [previous] revelations” (16: 43), for indeed the essential qualities of a mufti, for instance, are well known in the scholarly works and in the works of Islamic Jurisprudence and these qualities do not include their aforementioned condition. Also, in relation to this the Prophet (pbuh) has said: “Any condition which is not in the Book of God is null and void even if there were a hundred of them”(Agreed upon hadith). In addition to this, there is no disagreement among the *‘Ulama* that the fatwas of the blind, the lame, the sick and women are acceptable so long as they are qualified to issue them. Indeed, many of the companions belonged to one of such categories of people, and gave fatwas, even though they were not among those who were actively involved in, or leaders of, jihad. Is Bin Laden’s school telling us that the fatwas of such Companions cannot be accepted? Also, the founders of the four schools of Islamic Law – Abu Hanifa, Malik, al-Shafi‘i and Ahmad b. Hanbal - and the leading scholars of hadith such as al-Bukhari and Muslim were neither leaders of jihad nor were they stationed in some frontier-town or harbour defending the abode of Islam. But does this mean that their fatwas cannot be accepted? May God have mercy on them all! Muhammad b. al-Shaybani, the author of *al-Siyar al-Kabir*, which ranks among the oldest and largest work on the laws of jihad, was not among the leaders of jihad either. Before writing his *al-Siyar al-Kabir*, al-Shaybani first wrote *al-Siyar al-Saghir*, which Imam al-Awza‘i, a native of Beirut, found a bit odd because while his city was then a frontier of jihad, Iraq, where al-Shaybani resided was not. Then al-Shaybani wrote *al-Siyar al-Kabir* and finally al-Awza‘i attested to his scholarship, may God be merciful to both of them.

Before I close this sequel, I need to remind you that the people of this heresy who are now my detractors had once bestowed on me the titles of ‘the mufti of the jihadists worldwide, ‘the scholar in the frontline’ and ‘the jihadist mufti’. I should also bring it to your attention that these leaders of jihad [al-Zawahiri - bin Laden and their followers] who call themselves as defenders of the borders of the abode of Islam were among the first to flee from the battlefields during the days of jihad against the Soviets and after the American occupation of Afghanistan, and that in their recent flight from Afghanistan some of them had even disguised themselves in women clothes. This is not the place to give details of these events, but suffice is to say that they take advantage of people’s ignorance about what really happened. Their leader Mullah Muhammad Omar was supposedly from the leaders of jihad, but did they bother to seek his fatwa or permission regarding 9/11? The answer is no.

The seventh sequel: No country rejoices in the spectre of al-Qaeda as Iran and Syria do.

Part VII

“No country rejoices in the spectre of al-Qaeda as Iran and Syria do”

Dr Fadl, the mastermind of the jihadists

In a book for which the newspaper *al-Sharq al-Awsat* has obtained the rights of publication, Dr Fadl responds to al-Zawahiri's distortions of matters in Islamic Law

Monday/ 26 Dhu al-Qi 'dah 1429 H - 24/ November/ 2008

Issue No. 10954

al-Sharq al-Awsat Newspaper

Cairo: Muhammad Mustafa Abu Shama

In this sequel, which is part of the third chapter of *Mudhakkirat al-Ta'riah li Kitab al-Tabri'ah* (Unveiling the Deception in al-Zawahiri's Exoneration), the author, Dr Fadl, begins by bringing to relief the equivocations of Ayman al-Zawahiri, the second in command in al-Qaeda organization. Indeed, this chapter contains the most direct responses to al-Qaeda's ideas that al-Zawahiri had summarised in his book *al-Tabri'ah*; a book whose publication constitute in itself a tacit admission, by al-Qaeda and its second man in command, to *The Revisions* of al-Sayyid Imam Abd al-Aziz (al-Shaykh Abd al-Qadir Ibn Abd al-Aziz or Dr Fadl) having had a decisive impact on the jihadi scene

Dr Fadl opens this chapter of his book stating:

In the first chapter of this book, I have endeavoured to expose the lies of al-Zawahiri, whereas in the second I aimed at bringing to relief his equivocations in matters pertaining to Islamic Law, and how these equivocations, having annulled all Islamic Law rulings preventing unlawful killing, became the foundations of al-Qaeda's crimes and thought which permits indiscriminate killings. In this third chapter, I shall endeavour, with God's permission, to expose his distortions of matters and his intent to bamboozle the reader, and leave him in such a cloud of confusion and mental chaos that he can neither know the facts of the matters being discussed, nor see their author veil himself behind the trail of smoke billowing out of the hundred questions, left unanswered, in *The Exoneration*. Indeed, al-Zawahiri should know that if he wants to teach people, he should impart to them his knowledge not burden them with queries.

Lets us now deal with these distortions of his:

1. The distortions of al-Zawahiri include presenting contradictory statements regarding issues discussed in Islamic jurisprudence. He entices, for instance, the readers to believe that there are differences of opinions among Muslim scholars of Islamic Law regarding a

particular case and then suggest to them there is no harm in holding to any of their opinions. This is exactly what he is doing when he mentions that some Muslim scholars permitted the annulment of the pledge which Hudhayfa Ibn al-Yaman gave to the unbelievers of Quraysh in the Battle of Badr, in order to infer that even if the visa granted the perpetrators of 9/11 constituted a pledge of security, it was permissible for them to breach it. But in so doing he resorted to an invalid opinion and ignored the words of the Prophet (pbuh) to Hudhayfah, when he has said to him: “We will fulfil the pledge we have with them...” and also when he has said: “Whoever does something which is not in keeping with our Way [Sunnah], will see it rejected by God” (related by Muslim). Indeed, an opinion which contradicts the Sunnah is null and void and is rejected. Moreover, when there are differences in opinion, God did not command us to choose any of the opinions, but to compare these and look at their merits in light of the Qur’an and the Sunnah, for the truth is on the side of the opinion that concurs with them and whatever contradicts them is false. This is also, by the way, how we proceed in giving preference (*tarjeeh*) to one legal opinion over another. God clearly commands in the Qur’an, saying: “...if you differ in anything, refer it to God and the Messenger if you believe in God and the Last Day.” (4:59).

This deviant method – the method of choosing an opinion over another without recourse to the principle of preference (*tarjeeh*) – is what made al-Zawahiri abandon the Qur’an, the Sunnah as well as the statements of the early generations of Muslim scholars (the *salaf*), opting instead for the opinion of Nasir al-Fahd who prescribed for him the heresies of ‘unqualified reciprocity’ (*itlaq al-mu’amalah bi al-mithl*) and ‘collective personality’ (*al-shakhsiyyah al-‘itibariyyah*) in order to justify indiscriminate killings; even though opting for an opinion among different legal opinions without the process of preference (*tarjeeh*), that alone ascertain which among the differing opinions is correct, is prohibited and not permitted in the religion of God, the Almighty. Ibn Taymiyya - may God have mercy on him- states in his *al-Ikhtiyarat al-Fiqhiyyah* (The Process of Preference Jurist opinion): “There is consensus among jurists that it is forbidden to issue rulings and fatwas, according to one’s desires or based on an opinion which has not been put to the scrutiny of the process of preference (*tarjeeh*)”. Also, Abu Amr Ibn al-Salah- may God have mercy on him- said, “Know that whoever is content with the fact that his fatwa or action concurs with some statement or opinion pronounced on a given issue, and is in the habit of choosing freely between these opinions, without ever examining their status in light of the process of preference and abiding by it, is an ignorant and one who has committed a violation against the consensus of the scholars”(from the book *Adab al-Mufti wa al-Mustafti*). After insisting that the examination of different opinions in light of the process of preference was obligatory, Ibn al-Qayyim- may God have mercy on him- wrote: “to sum up, it is not permissible for the scholar to act or give fatwa in the religion of God based on desires, personal choice or interest such that he is free to seek from the legal opinion those which

concur with his personal inclinations or works for the interest of those on behalf of whom he acts, and those which disadvantage his foe when it suits him. This is the most serious transgression of all, and the most extreme of all the major sins; May God protect us from this” (*I’lam al-Muwaqqi’in*). These are, indeed, the words of the scholars of the Muslim nation! Compare their discourse with that of Bin Laden’s, al-Zawahiri’s and Nasir al-Fahd’s.

2. Among al-Zawahiri’s distortions is also his statement that he wrote his book *al-Tabri’ah* (*Exoneration*) because of his concern for Islam. I doubt his words really reflect this concern, if we bear in mind his distortions of Islamic Law which made him turn his back on the Qur’an and the Sunnah as well as the statements of the scholars of this Islamic nation, and his taking refuge, instead, in the words of Nasir al-Fahd in order to justify for Bin Laden desires. This he does to the extent that he became bold enough to defy the words of God according to which fighting the enemy nearby or the one closer to home is the jihad which ought to be regarded obligatory. Indeed, the Qur’an says: “*O you who believe! Fight of those disbelievers who are near you and let them find in you firmness and know that God is with those who are conscious of Him*” (9:123). But al-Zawahiri is bent fighting the enemy afar—America – and so he affirms that it that jihad which ought to be regarded as obligatory. Now we are in a situation where God states such and such and al-Zawahiri retorts back with the opposite, and where God commands such and such, and Bin Laden declares the opposite. So, where is the concern for Islam? Al-Zawahiri adopted the ideas of Bin Laden and defended him to the extent that in his book *al-Tabri’ah* (*Exoneration*), he demands that oil be sold according to its real price. This means that it is now the duty of Muslims “to wage jihad in the way of oil prices”, after which we may coin those who die in this battle “the oil martyrs”. Could he have written his book *al-Tabri’ah* because of his concern for Islam while defying God at the same time? Was he really chagrined by the insult heaved upon the Prophet (pbuh) by some Europeans while in that book, he resorted to all kinds of tricks, holding onto the statements of this or that person, only in order to circumvent the rulings of the Prophet, peace and blessings be upon him?

3. Al-Zawahiri’s distortions also include his statement that I [Dr Fadl] make accusations without any evidence or proof. Indeed he has lied in this.

As far as the rulings of Islamic Law are concerned, I did not mention anything except with evidence from the Qur’an and the Sunnah and the statement which the scholars of this nation had favoured; this is especially true in the book *The Document* (*al-Wathiqah*). As far as facts related to events and statements are concerned, some of them have a universal import and so I did not see the need to substantiate them each time by making reference to a specific source,

even when I knew that source full well. This I have done in *The Document* so that all can benefit from the advice, and in compliance with the Prophet's method of giving admonitions: rather than being specific, he (pbuh) would for instance say: "*He whose migration was in pursuit of the worldly gain or in pursuit of a woman so that he could marry her, his [reward for his] migration is [based] on the purpose of his migration*" (agreed upon hadith). As to those matters or facts or events which are specific, such as those mentioned in the newspaper interview which was included in the appendix of *The Document*, I have made reference to their details along with the names of the people involved in them, and trust me, what I have concealed about them is much more than what I have divulged.

4. Among the repeated statements that he uses to flummox his readers is his statement that 'a captive enjoys no authority'. Did I ever say that I have authority over anyone? I have dissociated myself from them [al-Zawahiri-Bin Laden] for the last 15 years [since 1993] and have no regrets for doing so. I have already said that the Yemenite intelligence, had asked me, while I was under arrest in their jails, to form an Egyptian opposition party in exile, but I refused and said to them that "I have no interest in becoming a head of a state, how can you want me to form a party!"

5. Among al-Zawahiri's bemusing statements is also his claim: "If these recantations [of Dr Fadl] were genuine and spontaneous, why did we hear about them only after their authors [Dr Fadl] became captives of the agents of crusaders". Here, al-Zawahiri did not really burden us to respond to his allegation, since he dismisses his own allegation in his book when he stated: "The author of *The Document* [Dr Fadl] criticised his companions [the Jihadis including al-Zawahiri and Bin Laden] for more than fourteen years ago". However, I have some further comments here:

In his attempt to discredit us, al-Zawahiri has indeed resorted to the methods of the enemies of the prophets, who were wont to describe the truth with repulsive names: the enemies of the Prophet (pbuh) were actually in the habit of calling him with disparaging names like poet, soothsayer and a sorcerer, whereas I, after choosing to title my book *The Document for the Guidance of Jihadi Action in Egypt and the World*, al-Zawahiri strove to turn away people from it by depreciating it, calling it *recantations*, though as we saw above, he had given the lie to his words with his own. How can he acknowledge that I had criticised them fourteen years ago and then turn around and call these same stances in *The Document* recantations? Clearly, he only wants to insult the intelligence of the reader. Now these criticisms of the jihadists, which I mentioned in my book *al-Jami'* since 1993, includes what al-Zawahiri had decided to omit when he fiddled with my book without my permission, committing in the process theft, betrayal of trust, lies and concealment of knowledge, which are all major sins, "and depths of darkness, one above another". They went ahead with these omissions, because

neither he [al-Zawahiri] nor his clique wanted people to know about the failings of the Islamic movements, but having found themselves, when I reinstated them in *The Document*, unable to steal them and distort them, they turned to insolence and defamation as a last resort. Moreover, recantations is not a defect if it is synonymous with a return to the truth, nay it is obligatory and praiseworthy. These are the words of Umar Ibn al-Khattab - may God be pleased with him- in his instructions to judges, “*Let not your judgement in a previous case prevent you from abandoning it in favour of another, if upon reviewing it you have been guided to the truth, for the truth is infinitely eternal and hence going back to the truth is better than persisting in falsehood*” (Quoted from *I’lam al-Muwaqqi’in*). These are the words of the Companions, the people of knowledge.

6. Al-Zawahiri’s distortions also include his claim that *The Document* “ignores the real criminals - the Americans and their collaborators”. This also contains both a lie and an equivocation. As regards his lying, let me [Dr Fadl] make it clear my book *The Document* does not spare anyone. I advised the Islamic movements, just as I advised the rulers in the clause number fourteenth and I did not mince my words when I addressed the enemies of Islam in the clause number fifteenth. As regards his equivocation, it is to do with the fact that al-Zawahiri had indeed suspended his reasoning and had become a blind follower of his leader Bin Laden to the extent that he had adopted his corrupt ideas in *Toto* and then justified them for him in defiance of the Book of God Almighty and to the extent that he had adopted also Bin Laden’s interests in oil issue. God states, “*Fight those who are nearer to you ...*” (9: 123), but al-Zawahiri calls for the fight against the far enemy. God states, “*Whatever has befallen you, it is what your hands have earned*” (37: 30), but al-Zawahiri, following his leader, maintain that whatever has befallen you, is the responsibility of America.

O Muslims! The real criminal, in the sight of God is he who knows God’s Sharia and turns away from it intentionally and deceitfully as Bin Laden and al-Zawahiri and their followers do. Listen with me to God’s words concerning such recreants: “*And who does greater wrong than who is reminded of the revelations of his Lord and then turns away from them. We shall indeed requite the guilty*” (32: 22). This is what real criminal activity is and this is why I called their falsification of Islamic Law a work of a criminal organization: it certainly defies the Sharia of the Almighty God.

If America was the real criminal, the cause of all our misfortunes and the one that launched the crusader campaign, why did Bin Laden hasten to offer it a truce and why al-Zawahiri offers negotiations? Have America’s crimes suddenly ceased?

In his offer of truce, Bin Laden said, “There is no objection in responding to you with the offer of a long term truce on conditions that are just and which we will fulfil. We are a nation

on whom God has prohibited betrayal and lying. After this manner, both sides can enjoy safety and stability in this truce and both sides may build Iraq and Afghanistan, the two countries destroyed by war.” In offering negotiations to America, al-Zawahiri said: “You have not negotiated with the real custodians of power in the Islamic world and it appears that you are engaged in painful and protracted negotiations that are bound to fail. But then, you will be forced to return to negotiate with the real power brokers” – in a reference to al-Qaeda organisation.

If America was the real criminal why are they offering it truce and negotiations? Has America desisted from its crimes? Have Afghanistan, Iraq and Palestine been liberated? Has America left the Persian Gulf or taken her hands off Somalia? Are not these the very grounds for their confrontation against America? Or has it dawned on them that they may achieve with a truce what they did not achieve with confrontation? Indeed, apart from securing their personal safety, there is no other explanation for their seeking a truce. Besides, how can Bin Laden talk about fulfilling promises while he is drowned up to his neck in betrayals and treason with both friends and foes?

When America declined both truce and negotiations, al-Qaeda’s branch in Algeria carried out bombings against foreign interests in which tens of Algerians died. Their aim behind these attacks was to force the west to submit to the demands of the al-Qaeda and its leader. As if the Algerian people, who are still leaking their wounds, must pay with their blood for the safety of Bin Laden and al-Zawahiri and be sacrificed so as to force America to accept their truce offer. And thus, al-Qaeda’s branch in Algeria, following their bombings on 11/12/2007 in which 62 people died and more than 200 were injured, announced that the aim of the attacks was ‘to remind the west that they must listen well to the demands and statements of our shaykh and Amir Osama Bin Laden’. As if to say, the blood of Algerians is just a means to pass a message and a ransom to be paid for the safety of Bin Laden and al-Zawahiri, as was the blood of Afghans and others before. This is the level of understanding these shaykhs have reached when it comes to Jihad: on the one hand, they kill the Algerians and on the other, they cry over the killing of the Palestinians by the Jews. Al-Zawahiri finds fault with Hamas for their use of crude missiles, which may kill innocent Jewish children but he does not say a word about those killed by the god-damned 9/11 attacks, and the death of thousands of Afghans, which ensued those attacks. Not only this; al-Zawahiri also justifies their committing of these crimes with the theory of the ten million in the single legal personality, which we tackled in the second chapter.

An Important Point:

There is no justification for remaining silent about the errors of a Muslim under the pretext that the disbelievers are also committing crimes. God Almighty says: *“They ask you concerning fighting in the prohibited months. Say fighting therein is a grave [offense] but*

graver in the sight of God is preventing access to the path of God, to deny Him, to [deny access to] and drive out its members (2: 217). This verse was revealed concerning the envoy of the Companions who the Prophet (pbuh) had sent - after migration to Medina - under the leadership of Abdallah Ibn Jahsh to near Mecca to gather intelligence about Quraysh. Whilst in this mission, the Companions found a caravan of Quraysh, and one of the Companions killed one of them during the Sacred months. Hence, this verse was revealed to explain that even though the disbelievers' actions – including their rejection of God, their blocking of access to God's path and their expelling the people of the Sacred mosque (expelling the Prophet and followers from their country Mecca) – were graver; it did not for that matter justify silence about the Muslims' mistake of killing a non-Muslim man from Quraysh during the Sacred months. Therefore God - may he be exalted- said, “*Say, fighting therein is grave...*” He did not say that it is permissible in retaliation for the crimes committed by the disbelievers; for indeed it is among the destructive sins. As such the Prophet (pbuh) paid blood money on behalf of Ibn al-Hadrami, the disbeliever who was killed by the Companions, because he was killed in a way that Islam does not permit (related by al-Bayhaqi and mentioned by Ibn Kathir in *al-Bidaya wa al-Nihaya*).

From this you can gather that al-Zawahiri's ubiquitous statement that the author of *The Document* is bent on criticising them while they confront America, is not only fallacious it also contradicts the Book of God. He does not want anyone to criticise them because America's crimes are graver and only they can confront them. If any ignorant person comes to confront you with such befuddling misconceptions, say to him what God Almighty said to the Companions who are the best of the Muslim nation: when they erred, God did not turn a blind eye over what they did or deemed it retaliation for the crimes of the disbelievers of Quraysh. Also, say to him that the Prophet (pbuh) disapproved of Usamah b. Zayd's and Khalid b. al-Walid's haste to kill; he spoke up against it, and paid blood money for those they killed, as I have detailed in *The Document*.

It is as if they are telling us that the evils committed by Muslims are not be condemned by anyone so long as the evils and crimes committed by the disbelievers persist. That is wishful thinking, for theirs will not cease but will rather increase as attested by the Prophet (pbuh) when he has said:

“*There will not come unto you a time except that what will come after it will be worse, until you meet your Lord*”(related by Bukhari).

“*The righteous will disappear one after the other and there will only remain dregs like the dregs of barley or date and God will not care for them at all*” (Related by Bukhari).

“*It is in its early days that this nation of yours will have its peace; during its later days, it will be afflicted with trials and things that you will have denounced. It will be visited by one trial*

after the other, and each trial will make the previous one appear insignificant” (related by Muslim). So no doubt, evil and trials will not cease but they will increase.

Is there an evil similar to al-Zawahiri’s corruption of religion as his attempt to justify Bin Laden’s view of indiscriminate killings? Do we corrupt our religion whenever an enemy like America appears?

From the preceding, you should be now in a position to understand why al-Zawahiri repeatedly poses questions in his book regarding the crimes of America and Israel, and why he showed a great concern over the issue of Palestine. He did all of this only to justify their criminal ideology: as long as the crimes of America and Israel existed, he believed he could deflect all criticism against him. He clearly indicated to this when he said that *The Document* criticises only those who oppose the crimes of America, which is a clear attempt to confuse people.

It has been made clear above that the Book and the Sunnah indicated that crimes of the disbeliever do not in any way justify that we keep quiet about the errors of a Muslim. Therefore beware of al-Zawahiri’s deceits and equivocations.

7. Included among al-Zawahiri’s distortions and reversal of facts is also his statement: “the jihadists are the ones who foiled the American plans in the region and yet they are the primary object of the criticism of those recantations”, and he means by jihadists al-Qaeda.

This line of argument, however, is not different from that of Gamal Abd al-Nasir, whom al-Zawahiri described as the anti-Christ, albeit in a different form. After the 1967 defeat, Abd al-Nasir raised the slogan, “There is no voice above the voice of the battle” in order to silence his critics. Al-Zawahiri is doing exactly what the anti-Christ did in a desperate attempt to avert criticism: he too is busy fighting America.

But this is a reversal of the facts because they are the ones who brought America to the region and caused it to occupy Afghanistan and Iraq and they are the ones who gave America false information about Iraq’s connection to al-Qaeda and about the existence of weapons of mass destruction there, thus providing with all the ammunition it needed to wage war against that country. They supposedly did this to lure America into the battleground and exhaust it, but it later transpired that al-Qaeda, after they charged the Iraqi people with wholesale disbelief, killed Iraqis many times more than the Americans. Indeed, they wronged the Iraqi people twice: firstly by falsely fabricating reasons for America to attack them and secondly by calling the Iraqi people disbelievers in order to kill them indiscriminately in their desire, mind you, to confront America. For every drop of blood that was shed and is being shed in Afghanistan and Iraq, Bin Laden, al-Zawahiri and their followers must bear responsibility. The legal maxim clearly states, “He who causes damage to an object indirectly is just as liable as the one who is directly responsible for damaging that object” (*I’lam al-Muqaqqi’in*).

Al-Zawahiri claims that they foiled the American plan; the fact is the opposite of this: wherever al-Qaeda goes destruction follows. This happened in Afghanistan, Iraq and Somalia and in the region of Waziristan in Pakistan. Just like Musaylamah, the liar, they brought with them one destruction after another. Those who benefit today from the madness of killing in Iraq are firstly Iran and then Syria. Will Syria facilitate the passage of anyone who wants to fight in Iraq because they love to fight in the way of God or because they love the Iraqi people or because it serves their interest? Aren't the leaders who incite fighting in Iraq, from among the top ranks of al-Qaeda, including Bin Laden residing in Iran? Is the fight in the interest of Iran and Syria a jihad in the way of God, and for the supremacy of His word? And did not al-Zawahiri before entice his brothers with his fiery sermons to fight in Egypt, but only to serve the interests of the Sudanese intelligence service?

Are the killing of the people of Iraq in mosques and in markets and in funerals and by blowing up their homes – as the Jews do to the homes of some Palestinians – a jihad in the way of God or a rampart against the American plans in any way? Are mosques and markets, military barracks in which civilians, women and children are killed following their sectarian interpretation of the human shield (*tatarrus*)? Or is it a deliberate mass murder of civilians and worshippers in the mosques? Regardless of all this, was Iraq, before the American occupation and during the rule of Saddam Hussein, an Islamic state? Was not al-Qaeda the one who kindled the fire of the sectarian civil war in Iraq when Abu Mus'ab al-Zarqawi launched his campaign of indiscriminate killings of Shi'ites? And did not the Sunnis pay the price of those killings with death, migration and displacement? Or have they forgotten that the principle of 'precluding the means of harm' is a principle of this religion? It is not right for anyone to assume that killing Shiites in Iraq is against the interest of Iran: the killing of Sunnis weakens them and clears the ground for others, whereas the killing of Shiites strengthens their connection to Iran because it will grow as their protector in their eyes, even though some Iraqi Shiites may oppose Iran and its dominance.

The Prophet (pbuh) talked about the 'victorious party' which will support Islam and Muslims in posterity, but what we are witnessing during these times is the 'mad sect' which brings disasters to Muslims and causes havoc to the states and the communities. Can we expect from the mentality that destroyed an Islamic state in Afghanistan (the Taliban) to establish an Islamic state in Iraq on the ground rather than the internet? Have Muslim peoples become guinea pigs for Bin Laden and al-Zawahiri to experiment their frivolous ideas with and practice their hobby of indiscriminate killings?

There is no doubt that no other country today rejoices in the spectre of al-Qaeda as Iran and Syria do. So much that they would probably have founded such an organisation, if it was not around: all these countries want is someone to play the role of the middleman who is capable of getting others who are prepared to blow themselves up for their interests without them having to pay even the smallest fee; all they have to do is look the other way when those

involved in those crimes pass through their territory. The scenario is about youth blowing up themselves, middlemen cashing in on death and leaders scoring political points and laughing all the way to the bank.

8. Al-Zawahiri's ignorance comes to the fore when he thinks that he can advance the number of his followers as evidence for his rectitude. He for instance claims that "The author of *The Document* has depicted Shaykh Bin Laden in all sorts of ways and called him all sorts of names" and then asks "but who among the two has more influence among Muslim youth and among the Muslim masses and in international politics?" Al-Zawahiri disapproves of anyone who criticises Bin Laden as if he is infallible or he has never committed a crime against anyone. Did he not wipe out an Islamic state (The Taliban), and destroy Afghanistan and its people? Did he not following that fiasco make its children orphans and its women widows? Did he not betray or commit treachery? God willing, in Chapter four, we will explain why al-Zawahiri sanctifies Bin Laden, even though in 1995 he had accused him of being a Saudi agent.

This argument of al-Zawahiri that is based on the number of followers and popularity is the same as that used by the disbelievers when they wanted to argue that they were right and that prophets, may God's blessings and peace be upon them, were wrong. Concerning them God-may He be exalted- said: "*Or do they [Pharaoh and his supporters] say, 'We are a group [united and larger in number and thus will] prevail [over Moses] ?'*" (54: 44). In another reference to Pharaoh and his description of Moses and his followers, the Qur'an also states: "*These [Moses and his followers] are a small band*" (26:54).

Indeed, the truth cannot be based on mere number of followers as al-Zawahiri thinks; rather what matters is whether that following conforms to the proofs of the Sharia. As for me, I did not invite anyone to follow me, I only convey to people what I see as the truth based on Sharia- knowledge, a way of orienting people towards the good, no more. If al-Zawahiri had any knowledge he would not be gloating over the number of Bin Laden's followers he had amassed, because from now on he will have to bear the sins of every follower of his corrupt sect, which would in the end only increase his own sins. That statement of his shows how limited his knowledge and understanding of Islam is: certainly, God- may He be exalted- has decreed that the truth of the matter is different from what al-Zawahiri thinks and that those who follow the truth are always a few in number. Aren't those who applaud Bin Laden today are themselves the ones who applauded Saddam Hussein before?

The Eighth Sequel:

Al-Qaeda and the Palestinian issue: the story of the flea, the dog and the elephant.

Part VIII

“Why have the Jihadists not carried out operations in Palestine?”

Dr Fadl, the mastermind of the jihadists

In a book, which *al-Sharq al-Awsat* has obtained the rights to publish, Dr Fadl accuses al-Zawahiri of riding on the back of the issues of the hour and of using his followers as a bargaining chip to promote his own agenda.

Tuesday/ 27/ Dhu al-Qi ‘dah 1429 AH – 25/ November/ 2008

Issue No. 10955

Al-Sharq al-Awsat Newspaper

Cairo: Muhammad Mustafa Abu Shama

In this sequel, al-Sayyid Imam Abdul-Aziz, Dr Fadl, resumes his response to Ayman al-Zawahiri with a focus this time on al-Qaeda’s stance on Palestine, which he examines from the view point of Islamic Law. He describes the connection between al-Qaeda and Palestine as perplexing and tries to tease apart the elements of their relationship through the parable of the flea, the dog and the elephant. In addition to this, the master of the jihadists also questions the accountability and transparency of al-Zawahiri’s financial dealings, and calls for an audit report to investigate how the second in command in al-Qaeda organization used the donations and gifts that flowed to him over the years, and what his priorities were in spending these contributions.

In dealing with how al-Zawahiri used the issue of Palestine, Dr Fadl states:

“It is common knowledge these days that the quickest way to gain popularity among the Arab and Muslim masses is by locking horns with America and Israel and by playing the refrain of the Palestinian issue over and over again, as did Gamal Abd-Nasir, Saddam Hussein and Ahmadinejad among others; even though in the case of some of them, especially Gamal Abd al-Nasir, they contributed something to Palestine and its people.

Bin Laden and al-Zawahiri have also trodden the same path to gain in popularity but neither of them has contributed anything to mention towards Palestine, except perhaps empty talk. Many years ago, al-Zawahiri had actually divulged what he and his leader really think about Palestine, making it explicitly clear that they are only interested in riding on the back of its popularity, peddling slogans to win the masses and attain the leadership of the Islamic nation. Indeed, He had stated: “The slogan that Muslim masses understand well and respond to – since the last fifty

years – is the slogan of the call to make jihad against Israel, and since the last decade, the Muslim nation has also been burdened by the struggle against the American presence in the heart of the Muslim world.” He had also stated, “We have to resign ourselves to the fact Palestinian issue is the issue which inflames the feelings of the Muslim nation”, and adding elsewhere: “This issue is an effective weapon in the hands of the Islamic Jihadi movement... [They] must avail themselves of the slogan of liberating the three holy places of Islam, the Holy Ka’ba, the Prophet’s Mosque and the Aqsa Mosque, for the appeal to these Sacred sites ensures its success in securing the reigns of governance over the Muslim nation and is an ideal emblem for rallying the hearts of Muslims all over the world. (Cited from al-Zawahiri’s book, *Fursan Tahta Rayat al-Nabiyy, [Knights under the Banner of the Prophet]*). This is what these treacherous and destructive traitors seek: to attain the leadership of the Muslim nation by means of a few trivial slogans.

In order to show his great concern for Palestine, al-Zawahiri raises tens of questions about it in his book *The Exoneration (al-Tabri’ah)*. For instance, he asks: ‘what is your legal opinion and what is the ruling of the Sharia concerning the embassies of Israel and America in Cairo; the presence of the military attaché of the Israeli embassy; peace and normalization of relations with Israel; the legality of the state of Israel; the Oslo and the Wadi Araba Peace Accords; the Arab Initiative; the Annapolis Conference; fighting Israel?’, and in another place, he does fail to remind us that Bin Laden issued a statement entitled, ‘Enticing the Nation to do jihad for the Liberation of the Ka’ba and the Aqsa Mosque’, as if it were a must to court the Aqsa mosque in every turn! Al-Zawahiri also brings to our attention how al-Qaeda won ‘the love, support and the sympathy of the Muslim masses, becoming thus the symbol of popular resistance in the face of the crusader Zionist campaign against the Muslim nation’. Notice that while he has described al-Qaeda, in his previous statement, as a jihadist movement, he still concluded that its aim was to gain popularity among the masses. So, it is all rhetoric and propaganda without any real accomplishment on the ground, nay, it is all loss and total destruction as mentioned before. Now with popularity comes, of course, donations and wealth. This is not the case with Gamal Abd al-Nasir or Saddam Hussein or Ahmadinejad who at least made palpable contribution: beside money, they also sent soldiers who died for the Palestinian cause. As for al-Zawahiri, he could not find anything to offer to Palestine except inciting the Bedouins of Sinai to do jihad for its sake. I did suggest to the noble reader before, to say to anyone who incites you to make jihad in any place, “if you are truly my imam then lead from the front” and proceed in fighting in front of me as did the Prophet (pbuh), in compliance with the command of his Lord to fight by himself first before calling others to do so.

In order to gain popularity, Bin Laden also repeatedly talked about the Palestinian children and their safety. What about the children of Afghanistan who became destitute, orphaned and dispersed after he brought upon them the destructive wrath of America? Are they not all Muslims? And of course, al-Zawahiri does not talk about the tragedy of the Taliban and the tragedy of the Afghani people whose blood is shed daily; to him that is a can of worms and it is no wonder you will find them always ignoring this disaster as if nothing has happened there. However, this does not exempt Bin Laden and al-Zawahiri and their followers being legally, historically and directly responsible for the destruction of the Islamic State of the Taliban and the ensuing occupation of that country by America. Al-Qaeda's leaders must be held accountable for all this so that such futile actions would not be repeated and so that no adventurer is allowed to commit such grave crimes and leaving others to face the consequences of his action while he takes flight.

Why was al-Qaeda unable to carry out its operations against Jews in Palestine?

This is due to two reasons: The first reason is that fighting Jews is not a priority for Bin Laden; all along his project was to confront America and his talk about Palestine was only for propaganda purposes. The second reason is that al-Qaeda is an organization without a state. As such, in whichever country it settles, it is a foreign body to its environment and cannot carry out its operations except with the cooperation from some of the people of that country, and this has been the trend in many instances. Bin Laden and his followers were not able find this cooperation in Palestine because al-Qaeda failed to forge any alliance among any of the Palestinian organisations. This is due to many reasons and I mention here only four.

Firstly the Palestinian organisations do not trust Bin Laden. This place would not be the appropriate one to delve into all the reasons that led to that mistrust; but it has been there ever since the days of the Afghani jihad against the Soviets.

Secondly the Palestinian organisations are much more advanced in terms of military technology than al-Qaeda. It is well known that al-Qaeda's nucleus had formed around certain cadres of the Jihad Group and continued to rely heavily on such an organization all the way until 9/11. Meanwhile, the Jihad Group had acquired advanced military skills as a result of training with some Palestinian organisations, notably, in Lebanon during the period between 1990 and 1992. Among the things they had learnt then, was how to make various bombing devices and how to booby-trap cars, individuals and so forth. Many of operations that are carried out these days in Afghanistan, Iraq and elsewhere are based on the knowledge acquired through such training or transfer of expertise. In short, neither Bin Laden nor al-Zawahiri has anything to offer to the Palestinians militarily.

Thirdly, there is a difference in military tactics between the two sides when it comes to the use of force: While Bin Laden uses the method of blind force in order to kill the largest

number of enemies possible, and is unfazed if this would lead to the destruction of his organization or to 'organisational suicide, the Palestinian organisations use the method of limited force to achieve gains at the expense of the enemy and at the same time guaranteeing the survival of their organisation and its continuity. These organisations follow the traditional guerrilla warfare tactics, 'the war of the flea and the dog' whereas Bin Laden is engaged in a new warfare; his is the war of the elephant, which aims primarily at indiscriminate killing.

Fourthly, these Palestinian organisations are not in need of Bin Laden's wealth as they have their own resources, and in addition to this, they are far more resourceful than him politically.

It is due to these and other reasons that al-Qaeda has failed to make an alliance with the people of Palestine and as a result failed to find a footing for itself in Palestine. Such was its failure, al-Zawahiri in his last statements had to turn to the Bedouins of Sinai to make Jihad in Palestine – This is pure propaganda. When the Palestinian organisations did not respond to al-Qaeda, even after repeated references to the Aqsa Mosque, Jerusalem and the Palestinian children, al-Zawahiri resorted to attacking and constantly criticizing the Palestinian organisations: he never misses an opportunity to poke his nose in Palestinian affairs, and accusing the Palestinians of all sorts of inadequacies and acts of disloyalty.

Al-Zawahiri, for instance, blamed Hamas for shooting rockets that kill Jewish children. Is this a person of sound intellect? What about al-Qaeda's killing of Muslim children in Afghanistan, Iraq, Algeria and other places? Or are such killings permitted to them and forbidden to Hamas? Al-Zawahiri grieves for Jewish children while he kills Muslim children! During the time of the Companions, a man from Iraq asked whether the blood of the flea which came in contact with clothes would render these clothes ritually unclean for prayer. Abdullah Ibn Umar responded by saying, "You, people of Iraq, have killed al-Husayn the son of the Prophet's daughter, may God's blessings and peace be upon him, and yet you enquire about the blood of the flea!" (Related by al-Trimidhi who considered it a sound hadith, also Bukhari related a similar version).

Al-Zawahiri blamed Hamas for taking part in elections based on a secular constitution. Why blame only Hamas? Why doesn't al-Zawahiri blame his holy sheikh, Bin Laden? Bin Laden was spending huge sums of money in support of Nawaz Sharif in parliamentary elections in Pakistan against Benazir Bhutto, with the money the Saudis were donating for jihad. When I came to know about this in 1992, I said to Abu Hafs al-Misriyy, the one who handed the money to Nawaz Sharif, "O Abu Hafs, By God, Bin Laden is leading you all to hell." As for me, I am of the opinion that Palestine is not an issue that belongs strictly to al-Qaeda, Fatah or Hamas; it is an issue that concerns the Muslim nation as a whole. Palestine was occupied only after the Ottoman Caliphate was abolished and, in my thinking, it will

not return to Muslim hands except with the re-establishment of a Muslim caliphate. Jihad in Palestine is obligatory for those who are able to do so but this is not going to establish an Islamic or non-Islamic state. This Jihad will only result in punishing the enemy and postponing the worse which is yet to come. Once the Jews are able to establish themselves in a place and come to own it, they would not want to be encumbered by any one, and so will never allow the Palestinians to have a state or even less than that voluntarily.

Furthermore, the Palestinian issue, in my opinion, should not be regarded as the pivotal or the key issue for the Muslims. This fixation on the Palestinian issue, which is promoted by some malicious quarters, causes the Muslim mind to be oblivious towards an important matter, namely, the establishment of an Islamic caliphate which will reunite all Muslims and returns to them their glory, as was promised to us by the Prophet (pbuh). You may refer to the evidence I have provided for this in the beginning of the fifteenth clause of *The Document*.

A Note of Clarification Regarding the Acceptance of Israel and Making Peace with it

Following the defeat of the Arabs by Israel in 1967, Gamal Abd al-Nasir raised the slogan: 'No peace, no recognition, and no negotiations with Israel'. The Arab summit was held in Khartoum towards the end of 1967 and this slogan of 'no's' was adopted. However before his death in 1970, Nasir had begun negotiations: recall the Rogers Initiative (William Pierce Rogers 1913-2001 U.S.), which was later followed by the Peace Treaty with Israel. Years after that, Bin Laden and al-Zawahiri came into the scene, raising the same slogans in their desperate campaign to also capitalize on the Palestinian issue. They raised the bloodied shirt of Palestine and began to clamour about treason. In his book *The Exoneration*, al-Zawahiri repeatedly condemned the recognition of, and making peace with, Israel, stating that this constitutes a breach of the Islamic faith. As for Bin Laden, he issued on 30/12/1994 his "An Open Letter to Bin Baz Regarding the Invalidity of his Fatwa permitting Peace with the Jews" in which he mentioned that Israel does not even constitute an 'established' infidel state with whom peace would be permissible but 'an ambulant' warring enemy, who is occupying Muslim lands. I intend here to make the following clear to Muslims:

Firstly, the question acknowledging the other or not is but an American innovation. The first to have said it was a previous American president, James Monroe, in 1821 after America's independence from Britain in 1776. America wanted to follow the colonial path of its mother Britain in interfering with the internal affairs of other countries and came up with the innovation of acknowledgement in order to punish those with whom it is not pleased (see *Modern Political History* by Dr Fayiz Abu Jabir, published by Dar al-Bashir, Jordan). Bin Laden and al-Zawahiri are following the American innovation, because in Islam, there is no such innovation in any of the books of Islamic Law: surely, when the

Prophet made a truce with the non-Muslims of Mecca in the Treaty of Hudaibiyya or when he endeavoured towards achieving similar treaty with the disbelievers of Ghatafan, who were laying siege to Medina in the Battle of the Confederates, he was not acknowledging their infidelity or their rightfulness? Islam deals with reality and as for the innovation of acknowledgement and legality, these are of the domain of Bin Laden's and al-Zawahiri's ignorance. In fact, the Sharia has the opposite of what they think: it asks about the 'ex-appropriation by the disbelievers': Do the disbelievers have the right to ex-appropriate the property of Muslims or not? The Muslim jurists have different opinions on the matter. In this regard there is the saying of the Prophet (pbuh): "Has Uqayl left for us any house?" [This *hadith* refers to an incident during the event of the Conquest of Mecca. The Prophet, together with the Meccan Muslims, was earlier driven out of Mecca and their wealth and properties were then appropriated by his Meccan opponents. After his victory in Mecca, the Prophet was asked to enter what used to be his home in Mecca. He pointed out that his uncle Uqayl had taken everything. Dr Fadl here seems to quote this hadith as indicating to the non-Muslim ownership of appropriated Muslim wealth and property].

Secondly, peace is permissible with any infidel or apostate depending on Muslim public benefit as I [Dr Fadl] have shown in my book *The Document*, adducing the position of Muhammad b. al-Hasan al-Shaybani, may God's mercy be upon him. There is nothing in the rulings of Islamic Law that says we are allowed to make peace with the disbeliever in his land and then prohibits us from seeking peace with him when he occupies Muslim land, precisely because the legal texts related to this issue are universal. Didn't Bin Laden seek truce with America while they were occupying Afghanistan and Iraq? And didn't al-Zawahiri propose negotiations with America then? Indeed they did; why are they permitting to themselves that they have prohibited in their fatwa? There is nothing in Islamic Law that prohibits peace with any disbeliever or apostate depending if peace is congruent to the benefit of Muslims; rather what is of paramount importance in those situation the legality of the person who negotiates with them. For instance, the Christians continued to occupy Palestine and the entire coastal region of the Levant for about 200 years. Saladin [Salah al-din] used to fight them sometimes and make peace with them sometimes, and then finally he regained Jerusalem from them only through a Peace Treaty, after they had occupied it for a period of 92 years, in 583 A.H / 1187 C.E. when he won victory over them in the Battle of Hittin. Saladin allowed them to leave Jerusalem to their place of security in Tyre on the coast of the Levant, and signed a Peace Treaty with them in the years 571 AH/1175 CE, 576 AH/1180 CE and 582 AH/1186 CE. This was mentioned by Ibn Kathir who stated: 'Saladin did not take any action without consulting his judge al-Fadil' (*al-Bidayah wa al-Nihayah*). I wanted to clarify these matters in order to stop people abusing the Palestinian issue and use it as a stalking horse for their own agendas. The poet has described most fittingly when he said:

Everyone hails: Layla is my beloved!

But, Layla never acknowledged any of them as her lover.

Palestine is not the mother of all Islamic issues as Bin Laden has claimed. For instance the Prophet left Mecca and its sacred mosque and emigrated for the sake of religion. Mecca is a thousand times better than Palestine as far as the reward for praying in their mosques is concerned.

Among al-Zawahiri's confusing tactics are his crocodile tears over his jailed brothers in Egypt. In order to contain the impact of my book *The Document* and defame its author, al-Zawahiri shed crocodile tears over some of his jailed brothers in Egypt who had objected to *The Documents*, describing them, over and over again in his book, as being the vast majority inside the prison and as constituting 'the firm and steadfast group who are suffering the most'.

A clarification of facts is on order here, for the sake of the reader whose intelligence al-Zawahiri wants to insult once again. Did these opponents that he is referring to, end up in jail before my *Document* emerged or were they jailed after that? Indeed, they were jailed before that. And who caused them to be jailed? It was al-Zawahiri, was it not? I had prevented them from clashing with the authorities in Egypt since 1992, but he was the one who insisted on just following the Islamic Group (*Jama'ah al-Islamiyya*) blindly. And this was not a jihad for the sake of God but for the sake of fame, pretentiousness and propaganda, which is tantamount to shirk [associating partners with God]. Indeed, as a report from the Companions has it "[Even] a little pretentiousness constitutes *shirk*". I used to often hear them say things like: "People despise us because *al-Jama'ah al-Islamiyyah* is active in Egypt but we are not." So desperate was al-Zawahiri for fame, he accepted to be a hireling in the service of the Sudanese Intelligence Agency to whom he sold his brothers and their blood for his self-interest. Yet, while six of them were on their way to be hanged in Egypt because they tried, at his behest, to assassinate Prime Minister Atif Sidqi at the end of 1993, he was blithely telling jokes of Abu Lama to his friends in the Sudanese Security. Why now that *The Document* has appeared; does he shed tears over his brothers while he had previously forgotten them and had washed his hands of them ever since he became a follower of Bin Laden; a shift he had justified since 1998?

Moreover, al-Zawahiri had encouraged these brothers to remain in prison contrary to what the Prophet (pbuh) commanded in a hadith in which he has said: "*Obtain freedom for your captives*" (related by Bukhari). As usual, he brushes aside the Qur'an and the Sunni, and so instead of complying with the command to 'Free the captives' he says to his followers "Let the captives endure their captivity", just as when God commands to begin jihad against the enemy nearby, al-Zawahiri says: 'No, first make jihad against the far enemy'. In reality though, al-Zawahiri did not implement his instruction to endure prison on himself, when,

for instance, in 1996, he was operating in the region of Dagestan, south of Russia, and he got arrested there. Rather than resigning to his fate as a prisoner, he sent to get money from his brothers who channelled to him thousands of dollars which was paid as a bribe for his release. The amount of this bribe would have been enough to feed the families of those who were in jail in Egypt, but alas, they were of a concern to him neither yesterday nor today and they never received from him even a single dollar.

No, he did not think it was wise to endure imprisonment in Dagestan, and so he hastened to get himself freed. He acted similarly when he was in Pakistan during the days of the Afghani Jihad against Communism. Al-Zawahiri was spending large sums from jihad money in order to protect himself: he was constantly moving from one house to another, from one district to another and from one city to the next. He would pay large sums as rent in advance and then leave even when there was no real danger and he was not being followed. Also, while many of the brothers had to carry forged passports because they were scared of going to the Egyptian Embassy in Pakistan to renew their real passports, al-Zawahiri himself refused to carry a forged passport: he knew that the Egyptian Embassy in America would renew passports by post, so he, in 1990, travelled there, from Pakistan using jihad money. Thus he spent jihad money in order to ensure his personal safety and left his brothers to practice patience in jail.

Not long ago, al-Zawahiri had also sent a letter seeking help in getting donations from Saudi Arabia. In it he said: "The bearer of this letter is from among the brothers we trust. We hope that you grant a share of the donations which you allot to the hundreds of families of captives, may God free them from their imprisonment and for the families of the martyrs, may God have mercy on them, in Pakistan and Afghanistan". But what about the families of his jailed brothers and those who were killed in Egypt? What he did for them despite that he knows they were his victims there?

Al-Zawahiri is a specialist in creating disasters and then using them to his advantage: he enticed his brothers to confront the government in Egypt but then he fled to Sudan in 1995 and continued to flee until he got to Afghanistan. To this day, he does not want his brothers to get out of prison, but he still encourages operations in Egypt in order to continue enjoying the media publicity which he so desperately needs for the collection of donations and quite possibly in order to use these operations as leverage in his negotiation with Egypt in the future. After all of this, why does he cry for his brothers now and want to blame it on *The Document*?

As a matter of fact, *The Document* has contributed to freeing as many people as many as that al-Zawahiri has caused to go their dungeons or to their graves. Regarding those who objected to *The Document*, I have already discussed their situation. Some of them got out of prison; others had settled for the position previously agreed upon by their companions; as

regards some others, al-Zawahiri himself sent letters of warning against them to the brothers responsible over them in Egypt upon their return from their military training in Pakistan; and among them are some who while objecting had expressed their support for *The Document* in secret. But however their number may be, they do not constitute the majority; indeed they are a few. They were not harassed to back *The Document* but all were treated open-mindedly. If anyone had conveyed to him a different account then that person has deceived him. But the onus is on al-Zawahiri; if he were truthful, let him mention the names of the majority who objected. I am sorry to say that some of the brothers who convey information about this matter have lied.

It is worth noting also that those, over whom al-Zawahiri sheds crocodile tears, are, sadly, partners with him in betraying the trust. They kept quiet about his treason when he had sold them to the Sudanese intelligence and sent to the gallows or to the dungeons in Egypt while he rode to fame on their backs. At the same time, they killed a young lad they accused of cooperation with the Egyptian intelligence without providing him with the most basic requirements of a proper legal trial, such as a neutral judge; and a legal procurator, particularly that the accused was a minor. The Prophet (pbuh) has said: “*Indeed those nations who came before you met their demise because when the honourable among them committed theft, they let them go free, but when the weak in their midst commits the same crime, they are punished*” (agreed upon hadith). Thus they act in ways which bring the wrath of God and ignore the commandments of the Sharia- the implementation of which they call for- while they are oppressed, which makes one wonder what they will do if they were in a position to govern a state?

The real difference between me and the opponents (who in secret agree) has to do with the fact while they act on political basis; I act on legal (*shar‘iyy*) basis. They were since 2003 doing what I did in 2007 but with a crucial difference. For instance in 2003, their leader went to the brothers in prison and obtained their guarantee to avoid confrontation with the government as part of a political deal with the government– “Give me such and such and I will give you such and such”, but this leader of theirs kept delaying the deal despite the guarantees obtained. Asked by one of the brothers, “Why delay?” this leader said to him, “I am waiting for Ayman al-Zawahiri to carry out two or three operations in Egypt which I will use as bargaining chips in negotiations with the authorities”. This happened before I came to Egypt in 2004. The operations did not eventuate and I came to Egypt and wrote *The Document* from a legal basis: I have found that in spite of my opposition to and criticism of them since 1993, my books were still being used by the Jihad Group (*Jama‘at al-Jihad*) first, and then by al-Qaeda to recruit followers. Thus, when I wrote *The Document* in which I do get to express my opinion regarding their actions, I do so from the standpoint of legal responsibility, and not in pursuit of any political gain or as part of any political deal with the authorities. As I have already mentioned at the end of the Third Cautionary Remark, I had

indeed met with the leaders of those who objected to *The Document* but found they did not have any conclusive evidence preventing me from writing it. When I began presenting *The Document* to the brothers in prison, all of their contestations and argy-bargy revolved around two points:

Firstly, the one on whose books they relied on to recruit their followers is now criticising their actions.

Secondly, the appearance of *The Document* deprived them of the political leverage they wanted to have in their negotiation with the government. *The Document* appeared without a political deal having been struck between its author and the government, and they felt they did not have any more bargaining chips to use except voice rejection and objection. In 2/2007, one of them said to me openly: “We do not have any inducement left to use in our negotiations with the authorities except to show intractability”, while, one of the senior bothers said to me regarding those who objected – in front of witnesses – “They are not concerned with matters of the Sharia, they are only interested in political wheeling and dealing.”

So, know that they still they think on those terms, and that their objection to *The Document* today is part and parcel of this political attitude.

The Ninth Sequel:

Al-Zawahiri’s Role in the Demise of the Taliban and the Jihad Group

Part IX

“Al-Zawahiri has destroyed the Jihad Group three times over”

Dr Fadl, the mastermind of the jihadists

In a book, which *al-Sharq al-Awsat* has obtained the rights to publish, Dr Fadl accuses Bin Laden and al-Zawahiri of having betrayed Mullah Omar and destroyed the state of the Taliban

Wednesday/ 28/ Dhu al-Qi ‘dah 1429 AH – 26/ November/ 2008

Issue No. 10956

Al-Sharq al-Awsat Newspaper

Cairo: Muhammad Mustafa Abu Shamma

If you still insist on seeing the same doctor who has failed to save the life of your father, your uncle and brother, after each one of them had sought his treatment, then you are the one who is at fault, particularly if you are seeking a cure for the same illness. This is in short, how Dr Fadl, the mastermind of the jihadists, depicts the inexperience of al-Zawahiri, the doctor [physician] and second in command in the al-Qaeda organization. In his diagnosis of al-Zawahiri as a strategist, Dr Fadl continues to say in this book “*Unveiling*”: “Having sent so many people to the graves or to the dungeons, we can now see that al-Zawahiri may be aptly referred to as Doctor Death”. Elsewhere, Dr Fadl continued describing al-Zawahiri’s legacy: “Ever since he had devoted himself to his exonerative jurisprudence, the source of his recalcitrance vis-à-vis the Qur’an and the Sunnah, his life has been marked by ongoing failure” (ibid.).

In today’s sequel, we present sections of the *Unveiling the Great Deception in al-Zawahiri’s Exoneration of the Nation*, in which Dr Fadl resumes his analysis of the stratagems that the author of *The Exoneration* uses to bamboozle his reader in his book. He writes:

“Among the prevarications of al-Zawahiri is his talk about the preparation for jihad: indeed, in his book *The Exoneration*, al-Zawahiri writes: “Once again, the author of *The Document* [Dr Fadl] disregarded the obligation to make preparations for jihad- though he is well aware of its importance- which includes, among other things, collecting money. God- may He be exalted and glorified- says: ‘*Against them make ready your strength to the utmost of your power, including steeds of war*’ (8:60)”. These are his words in which he does actually make several references to the need for preparing for jihad financially. I have responded to this

allegation in the first chapter of the *Unveiling* and have demonstrated that it is baseless; I have indeed dealt with the issue of preparing for jihad when I commented on the very same verse of the Qur'an in the fifteen clause of *The Document*.

But let us address this preparation for jihad which he so cherishes and accuses others of disregarding by focussing on his contribution in that regard. What exactly has he done for jihad activity? In answering this question, my aim is to help people know who this person who is enticing for jihad really is and in order that Muslim youth, in particular, are enlightened on the person they have entrusted with both their worldly and other-worldly life.

The Role Played by al-Zawahiri in the Demise of the Jihad Group

Al-Zawahiri has destroyed the Jihad Group three times over. The **first** one was in 1981, when he astutely led the authorities to members of his group especially those who the Egyptian security could not round up like brother Isam al-Qumri, and then stood to testify against them in Court to save his skin. Amazingly, he now mourns them.

The **second** time was in 1993 when he enticed his brothers to mount operations in Egypt with the funds of the Sudanese Intelligence, in spite of my advice to them not to indulge in such a course of action. The first operation had actually failed and hundreds of them were jailed and many others were put to death. Following his capricious campaign of self-aggrandizement and follies which had led to the destruction of his group, al-Zawahiri fled from Sudan to Afghanistan. It is baffling how he tries to exonerate himself from this fiasco and asks himself, “Why we decided to confront the government?” and replies to himself saying, “We have decided to go ahead with this confrontation in order to stay alive” (*Exoneration: al-Tabri’ah*, p, 193). But in the end, it is he who stayed alive; his group was destroyed in that the confrontation with the government was suicidal. Does not this kind of rhetoric belie his discerning abilities and his overall aptitude?

The **third** time, it was in 1998, when he forged an alliance with Bin Laden to launch *The International Islamic Front for Jihad against the Jews and the Crusaders*, after his ruin in his native country Egypt. Then, America began rounding up the remnants of the Jihad Group dispersed in various parts of the world and handing them over to the authorities in Egypt. The Court-Case of the **Returnees From Albania** is the best illustration of the consequences of that alliance’s strategy. Commenting on that new alliance and its impact, Hani al-Siba’iyy said: “The alliance of al-Zawahiri with Bin Laden has dealt a decisive blow to the backbone of the Jihad Group, and caused it colossal damage. Furthermore, its alliance was completely foreign to the organization, and the members were never consulted over it. Indeed, had the alliance been forged following the acceptance of the majority and after the requisite consultation had taken place, we would have all just accepted these fatal blows and resigned ourselves to our fate, but the problem is that this whole thing had gone ahead without maintaining due process of consultation, and in defiance of the will of the majority of the members” (See Muntasir al-Zayyat, *al-Zawahiri kama ‘Araftuh: al-Zawahiri as I Knew Him*, Dar Uli al-Nuha, 2nd edition, p. 189).

No doubt, the repetitive misjudgement of al-Zawahiri and his destructive projects have led to the demise of the Jihad Group which had been able to attract the best minds and the most skilled people to its ranks. He neither played any role in recruiting these highly qualified numbers, nor did he contribute with anything towards their training. On the contrary, he

excelled in the destruction of these resources and achievements. To that effect, al-Siba‘i affirmed elsewhere: “that al-Zawahiri went from having twenty five consultants around him to having just five as a maximum, after the rest had been dispersed either as a result of imprisonment, assassination, persecution or internal division” (See Muntasir al-Zayyat, al-Zawahiri kama ‘Araftuh: al-Zawahiri as I Knew Him, Dar Uli al-Nuha, 2nd edition, P. 187).

How on earth is it possible for the man who excelled in the destruction of the jihadi organizations to now turn around and try to outdo everyone in jihad preparation?

I can only think of the celebrated words of that poet who said:

When are you going to complete your building?

If whenever you erect a wall, others have destroyed it?

Al-Zawahiri and the Destruction of the Nascent Islamic State of the Taliban

Throughout his life, al-Zawahiri has always called for the establishment for an Islamic state, and after thirty years of Islamic activism, he lived to witness the birth of such a state in Afghanistan. Al-Zawahiri and his ilk did not play any role in establishing this Islamic state, but they were pivotal in its demise, as they declared war against America when they launched *The International Islamic Front for Jihad of the Jews and Crusaders*, from within the borders of the Emirate, in 1998. Indeed, barely three years after the proclamation of such a confrontation America destroyed that nascent Islamic state in Afghanistan. Al-Zawahiri had decided to go against the word of God and fight the Far enemy, so this enemy came to his door step in Afghanistan. Al-Zawahiri then decided to flee Afghanistan leaving his family behind to the mercy of the Americans. In their hasty flight, many of them had disgracefully disguised in women clothes. Leaving the duty of jihad to the Afghans, al-Zawahiri retained his Jihad through the microphone, the camera, and money collection (financial preparations).

Is it at all permissible that a person who was the cause behind the destruction of an Islamic state to lecture others on the preparation for jihad? *‘The enemy harms not the ignorant; nay, tis the ignorant who harms himself’*, says the poet. Besides excelling in exonerative jurisprudence and showing irreverence to the word of God and the Sunnah, failure was writ large on al-Zawahiri’s life. His overall message to the Muslims could be summarized as follows: “Establish organisations and I will make sure they get destroyed or sold to the secret services that enjoyed my jokes! Establish Islamic states, and I will be the first to strive for their demise and the destitution of their peoples! Make jihad and I will not fail to flee leaving my family behind in order that I may collect donations on your behalf! Do not hesitate paying the donations to me, I will make sure they are spent to ensure my protection and my travels! Go to your dungeons and our graves, I will stay here doing Jihad by my

microphone and will continue to urge you for action if you ever relent! Show patience when you are detained, and I in turn will spend thousands of dollars to be set free of jail! Most importantly, fight America and Egypt for that will stand me in good stead in any future negotiations with them!

It is indeed most bewildering that a man who had destroyed so many people and squandered so many resources continues to brandish so brazenly the idea of jihad preparations. If you still insist on seeing the same doctor who has failed to save the life of your father, your uncle and brother, after each one of them had sought his treatment, then you are the one who is at fault, particularly if you are seeking a cure for the same illness, for surely then you will have shown not only a lack of judgment but also of religiosity and faith. Did not the Prophet (pbuh) say: "*A committed Muslim is not bitten from the same hole twice*" (agreed upon hadith)? Now, you can go on finding excuses claiming that this doctor has mesmerized you with his announcements and advertising which promote him as the 'famous doctor' or the 'doctor of the frontlines', but this will be of no avail to you, because reality has shown that he is 'Doctor Death' who sends people to die in the gallows or their dungeons.

Oh Muslims! Just as God has decreed this jihad in order for religion to be manifest, He has decreed it firstly in order that Muslims may protect themselves from harm and spare themselves from the unpleasant tribulations, as attested by the Qur'anic verse: "*Fight them until all opposition (fitna) ends and all submit to God*" (8:39). In this verse the phrase 'until all opposition (fitna) ends' pertains to the warding off of evil and harm, as to the phrase 'and all submit to God', it pertains to protect religion. This is corroborated by another Qur'anic verse in which God- may He be exalted- says: "*Why should you not fight in God's cause and for those oppressed men, women, and children who cry out, 'Lord, rescue us from this town whose people are oppressors! By your grace, give us a protector and helper'*" (4:75)

It is thus clear that if jihad brings misfortune and tribulation on Muslims, then jihad will be unlawful. Al-Zawahiri, of course, completely ignores these legal rulings, and has preferred to perform his abysmal stupidities in Egypt instead, all of which had led hundreds of brothers to their graves or their dungeons, and to hundreds of families left bereaved and bereft. He did this for the sake of fame, recognition, the limelight and an idea that he wanted to experiment with. He fled and refused to face the outcome they faced, and run away from the fate he had readily accepted for his brothers. The blunders did not stop there: he and Bin Laden had later on brought more catastrophes to the Afghani people, when they relied on treachery and treason, to attack several landmark buildings in America. Is it conceivable that actions which lead to the destitution of Muslims be considered a lawful jihad? Nay, is it conceivable that the perpetrators of such actions be

counted among the people of sound mind? Just look at their legacy; they have neither ensured the protection of Muslims, nor have they defeated the enemy! Imam al-Sarakhasi- May God have mercy on him- affirmed: “Since jihad aims primarily at maintaining the power of Muslims before it looks at curtailing the sway of the infidels, it would be incumbent on Muslims whenever they feel unable to curb their clout to retreat in order that they may preserve their position, and fight them another day” (*Sharh al-Siyar al-Kabir*). Listen to what these scholars are saying and then consider the performance of our adventurers, al-Zawahiri and Bin Laden, over the years!

This is but a snapshot of the life of al-Zawahiri and the preparation for jihad he has been consumed by. You would think that after thirty years of Islamic activism and talk of the need to prepare for jihad against the Americans, he would be fighting them with no holds barred, and with guns blazing, but when that opportunity was finally presented to him in 10/2001 he flew, leaving behind his wife and children to be killed. So where is the jihad and where has all that preparation for it gone? Disappearing in full flight in women clothes; was such a disgrace all he could muster after all those of years?

The Ethics of Thankfulness and Hospitality: The Difference between Islam, and al-Zawahiri and Bin Laden

Many Muslims, who have been for years tracked and pursued in many parts of the world, found no safe heaven except in the Islamic Emirate of Afghanistan (Taliban). They were able to enter the country without being asked to present neither passport, nor entry visa or residency permit. Moreover, it did not require of them to commit to an alliance with the Amir, Mullah Muhammad Omar, though it fulfilled its pledge of offering them protection, and security. Bin Laden has lived many years there and he was one of those who had given a pledge of alliance to its Amir. However, Bin Laden declared war against America from within Afghanistan in defiance of the authority of the Amir and in spite of the latter's opposition to such a military project. Indeed, in their concern for the future of the nascent Talibani Islamic state, many brothers have tried to sway Bin Laden to their position and get him to abandon his plan of confrontation with America. Among these brothers were Abu Mus'ab al-Suri and Abu Abdul-Rahman al-Kindi who did actually say to Bin Laden: "If you do not consider Taliban as an Islamic state, then at least consider it as one that has the potential to become such a state, and let us throw all our efforts to make that a reality", but Bin Laden and his followers were bent on colliding with America. For the sake of self-interest, Bin Laden has trampled on all sorts of ethical principles and moral etiquettes: he neither expressed thankfulness nor observed the rules of hospitality, and instead of honouring his pledge to his host, the Amir of Afghanistan, he betrayed him along with his state and government.

Concerning thankfulness, the Prophet (pbuh) has said: "*Recompense him, he who has shown you kindness*" (related by Ahmad and Abu Dawud), however, al-Zawahiri and Bin Laden profess the opposite; they say: "Whoever has shown you kindness, demolish him". This is typical of the jurisprudence of the sheikhs of jihad and of their moral conduct with people.

Concerning hospitality, the Prophet (pbuh) has said: "*He who believes in God and the Last Day should honour his guest. Provisions for the road are what will serve for a day and night; hospitality extends for three days; and it is not allowable that a guest should stay till he makes himself encumbrance*" (related by Bukhari). There is no doubt that the Taliban have carried their obligations as required by law and more, but as for al-Zawahiri and Bin Laden they simply tossed away the injunction of the Prophet (pbuh), namely his saying '*is not allowable that a guest should stay till he makes himself encumbrance*'. They did the opposite 'they stayed

till they brought calamity to their host'. This is the jihad of the sheikhs of the frontiers.

In one celebrated verse, the poet said:

He who shows kindness to who does not deserve it

Shall meet the fate of the mother of Amer.

The mother of *Amer* is the nickname the Arabs use to call the *dab'* (hyena). According to anecdotal accounts, a Bedouin had found this animal orphaned and lonely in the desert so he brought it over to his tent and had it suckle one of his ewes until it was full-fledged. One day, when the Bedouin was away, the *dab'* attacked the ewe that nursed it and killed it. Bin Laden and al-Zawahiri have behaved towards the Taliban exactly like that *dab'*; they have destroyed them after having been lodged and protected by them.

Riding on the Back of both Sheikh Abdullah Azzam and Omar Abd al-Rahman

In his book *The Exoneration*, al-Zawahiri was obviously paying lip service to both of these sheikhs in a desperate attempt to ameliorate his legal standing and status by using their good name. This is just bluff; in reality, his relationship with these two sheikhs is not as intimate and as smooth as he makes it sound, it was the opposite of that. As for the sheikh Abdullah Azzam, it is known that al-Zawahiri was his nemesis during the days of the jihad against the Russians. On many occasions and in the presence of the Arab brothers, he did not hesitate to attack his person. In one instance, he told him in front of everyone: "you are not the Azzam that we came to know; Abdullah Azzam is the one who authored *Al-'Aqeeda wa Atharuha fi Binaa' Al-Ajyaal*" (The Creed and its Impact on building the Generation). Indeed, people should know that al-Qaeda is but a group which has splintered from the sheikh Abdullah Azzam, at the origin it is but a group that seceded from the sheikh. As for the sheikh Omar Abd al-Rahman, you need to know also that al-Zawahiri was one of his most important opponents not so long ago. When they were both in prison for their jihad in Egypt from 1981 till 1984, the brothers who used to be divided into several groups, endeavoured to unite under the guidance and leadership of sheikh Omar. But then, al-Zawahiri avowed himself an opponent of all alliances, so much that the brothers at that time considered him the source of all the perturbation that was going on during that period. This is common knowledge amongst the brothers and the episode is well-

documented in “*Al-Jama‘aat al-Islaamiyya an Insight from Within*” [a book authored by Muntasir al-Zayyat the defence lawyer of Islamists in Egypt.

These are but snippets on the true personality of al-Zawahiri who uses the title of honourable sheikhs to conceal a glaring pattern of incompetence. Indeed, a drowning man will clutch at a straw, and so it is no wonder that he resorts to ruses like these and to lies, jurisprudential fallacies, half-truths and equivocations in this book of his.

Al-Zawahiri’s Charge of Calumny

Among the half-truths that al-Zawahiri states in his book is his saying that the author of *The Document* uses calumnious language, like ignoramuses, idiots in describing their trespasses against the Sharia. This really testifies to his ignorance of the Qur’an, the Sunnah and the ways of the Muslim ancestors (salaf). Anyone who looks with an impartial eye at their excessive lies and their villainies vis-à-vis *The Document* will conclude that it is they who should be sitting in the dock. As for me, I [Dr Fadl] have used concerning them only terms which are part of the nomenclature of in Islamic law. The following are a few examples:

A. In the Qur’an, the persons who have erred from the truth are said to be “like *cattle...*” (Al-Furqan: 44), and “... like a *dog...*” (Al-A’raf: 176), and “like an *ass*” (Al-Jumu’a: 5), and “... the *foolish* among the people will say...” (Al-Baqara: 142), and “...when you were *ignorant...*” (Yusuf: 89)

B. Also in the hadith we find expressions like, “*This knowledge will be carried in each generation by upright people who shall repudiate the distortions of the zealots, the equivocations of the sceptics and the construal of the ignorant*” (Related by al-Baghdadi and deemed sound by Ahmed). This is a clear example in which the Prophet (pbuh) shows that in our midst we may find those who are zealots, sceptics, and ignorant. He (pbuh) has also said: “*I doubt whether so and so knows anything about our religion*” (Related by Bukhari) and “*Lying is certainly evil*” (Related by Muslim)

C. Equally in the hadith of the Companions of the Prophet (pbuh, it is Muhammad Ibn al-Munkadir asked Jabir 'Do you pray in a single wrapper?' He said, 'I do this so that *an imbecile* like you might see me: which of us had two garments in the

time of the Prophet - may Allah bless him and grant him peace?" and in another narration, it is related that Jabir said: "I do this so that the *ignorant* like yourself see me" (Related by Bukhari). Also Ibn Jubayr narrated that when he conveyed to Ibn Abbas Nawf al-Bikali's claim that the person of Moses who accompanies al-Khidr is other than the Prophet Moses of *Bani Isra'eel*, he replied: "He has lied, the enemy of God" (Related by Bukhari).

D. When the judge Ibn Makhloof wanted to put Ibn Taymiyya on trial on account of what he perceived to be errors committed by the sheikh in his *Al'Aqeeda Al-Waasitiyya*, Ibn Taymiyya stated: "So when al-Tabarsi made reference to the judges without mentioning them by name, I said one of these judges would have to be Ibn Makhloof, because he is a liar, wicked, has little knowledge and lacks faith. [Al-Tabarsi] upon hearing this began to smile which suggested to me that he knew him to be like that, and that he was indeed notorious for having these moral failings" (*Majmu'at al-Fataawa*). Elsewhere, Ibn Taymiyya said: "As for your reference to the need for observing courteous language and to argue in the way that is best, you should know that I am one of those who is most consistent in that regard. However, each has its place: the Prophet (pbuh) has actually urged us not to conciliatory in tone when we address the enemy of the Qur'an and the Sunnah. Thus, with such people we are commanded to be rough and not argue in the way that is best" (*Majmu'at al-Fataawa*), and he added: "God- may He be exalted- says: '*And do not argue with the People of the Scripture except in a way that is best, except for those who commit injustice among them...*'" (29:46), so it is clear that whenever our addressee transgresses the bounds of religion, we are not longer obliged to address him with courtesy" (*Majmu'at al-Fataawa*).

Oh Muslims! These are the words of God Almighty, and the words of his Prophet (pbuh) as well as the words of the Companions and the honourable scholars who followed them. If a companion like Jabir Bin Abdullah had no qualms accusing the successor Muhammad Ibn al-Mukandir of imbecility and ignorance owing to his lack of familiarity with one of the Sunnah of the Prophet, and a companion like Ibn Abbas saw no objection in calling another successor, Nawf al-Bikali, a liar and an enemy of God, what shall we then call the duo Bin Laden- al-Zawahiri and their followers who betrayed their Amir, committed treachery against their enemies, brought disasters to Muslims, destroyed the brotherhoods and the states, filled the graveyard and the dungeons, and founded a criminal sect which excels in exonerating mass and indiscriminate killing and whose doctrinal features have been delineated and confirmed in al-Zawahiri's *Exoneration of the Nation?* I leave

the answer to the Muslim community. These people are worse than the drunkard, at least he only harms himself by indulging in such a vice, but as for them, they have harmed a whole community. In the seventh clause of *The Document*, I did mention that the killing of the tourists who visit the countries of the Muslim world in revenge for the crimes committed by their governments or the host government is redolent with the vengeance of the Times of Godlessness (*al-jahiliyya*), in compliance with the Qur'anic verse: "and no bearer of burdens will bear the burden of another" (6:164). Al-Zawahiri claims that my use of the expression 'vengeance of the Times of Ignorance' is a tactic reminiscent of those used by interrogation officers (*Al-Tabri'a*, p, 154). I am not sure what he is trying to insinuate, but he is the first to know that the author of the Document does not succumb to the thunder of tempests and storms. It seems that from the beginning of the book till the end, he had tried everything possible to drive people away from The Document and its author, and in doing so has succeeded in showcasing his deep-seated ignorance of religion. I ask al-Zawahiri, when the Prophet (pbuh) had said to one of the Companions: "*There are still remnants of the jahiliyya (ungodly) ways in your character*", was he (pbuh) swayed into using this language by any interrogation officers or did his speech reflect a concern for the values of the Sharia? And did sheikh al-Islam, Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Wahhab- may God have mercy on him- write his book *Masaa'il Al-Jahiliyya* (Issues Pertaining to Godlessness), was under the influence of police questioning? Indeed, did Sayyid Qutb - may God have mercy on him- used the word *jahiliyya* over and over under the weight of interrogation?

No doubt when the Prophet (pbuh) has said '*There are still remnants of the jahiliyya (ungodly) ways in your character*' it was owing to the fact that that companion had called another '*you son of a black slave*' (Agreed upon hadith). I shall leave it to Muslims to decide what to call these people, who kill people indiscriminately, and who justify their actions to exonerate from their crimes.

O assembly of Muslims! Know that all transgressions and evils committed are of the domain of godlessness (*jahiliyya*), however among these there are some which are tantamount to disbelief (*kufr*) and others which in spite of them being considered major sins fall short of disbelief. Bukhari had devoted a whole section in the chapter *Kitab al-Iman* of his *Sahih* to that very issue, and did actually entitle it *Al-Ma'aasi min Amr al-Jaahiliyya, wa laa Yakfuru Saahibaha bi Irtikaabiha Illa Bi Al-Shirk* (Evil Acts are a Sign of Godlessness, yet their Perpetrator, as long as does he does not Associate Partners with God, is not a Disbeliever).

Al-Zawahiri has obviously no knowledge of these things, and hence it is not surprising that he is upset by the legal jargon I use; such as my describing of their transgressions and evil acts as godlessness, to condemn his actions and that of his followers. This lack of knowledge of his does not seem, however, to make a dent in his knack for quarrelling, and that, in itself, is testament to his arrogant, unrepentant, and ungodly character. Ibn Taymiyya- may God have mercy on him- said: “The least that is required of a person who disapproves a proposition, is to have knowledge and understanding of that which he disapproves and to take in consideration of the ability of the people in all of that: no one has the right to overrule a position or prohibit an action except with the clout of the proof and the conclusive evidence. Failing to do so, that person would be like those about whom God says: *“Surely, those who argue against God’s revelations without proof are exposing the arrogance that is hidden inside their chests, and they are not even aware of it”* (40:56) and also, *“They argue against God’s revelations, without any basis. This is a trait that is most abhorred by God and by those who believe. God thus seals the hearts of every arrogant tyrant* (40:35).

The next is the Tenth Sequel:

Al-Zawahiri and the Pursuit of Fame and the Limelight

Part X

“Instead of joining his brothers, after enticing them to fight in Egypt, al-Zawahiri decided to flee to Afghanistan”

Dr Fadl, the mastermind of the jihadists

In a book, which *al-Sharq al-Awsat* has obtained the rights to publish, Dr Fadl lays bare al-Zawahiri’s personality and his pursuit of fame and the limelight.

Thursday/ 29/ Dhu al-Qi‘dah 1429 AH – 27/ November/ 2008

Issue No. 10957

Al-Sharq al-Awsat Newspaper

Cairo: Muhammad Mustafa Abu Shamma

Among the issues of critical importance that al-Sayyid Imam Abd al-Aziz, Dr Fadl, raises in his book, *Unveiling the Great Deception in al-Zawahiri’s Exoneration*, is his contention that the aim of al-Qaeda, and most notably Bin Laden and his henchman, al-Zawahiri, is to take hold of the reign of the leadership over the Muslim community by means of emotive slogans such as the liberation of the Holy Mosques of Islam; that is by relying essentially on propaganda and media stunts. In this sequel, Dr Fadl completes the third chapter of his book which has dealt mainly with al-Zawahiri’s ways of bamboozling the reader. The following is the full text of that final section:

Among the equivocations of Ayman al-Zawahiri is his recurring question: “What do you say about the Arab leaders?” I do not think that he needs to go too far, he should ask his brother Mohammad and his leader Bin Laden as they should be able to answer that or him!

As for his brother, Muhammad al-Zawahiri, he intimated to the security service in Egypt ‘his belief that the ruler is a Muslim’, and they were so happy with his declarations that they accorded him all kinds of special favours, though previous to that his brother used give lectures to the youth, and in of these lectures he told them: “ The ruler is a hypocrite that is why either he accepts our order to emigrate for the cause of God or else we would fight him” and following which he adduced the words of God:

“What is [the matter] with you [that you are] two groups concerning the hypocrites, while Allah has made them fall back [into error and disbelief] for what they earned. Do you wish to guide those whom God has sent astray? And he whom God sends astray - never will you find for him a way [of guidance] (4:88) They wish you would disbelieve as they disbelieved so you would be alike. So do not take from among them allies until they emigrate for the cause of God. But if they turn away, then seize them and kill them wherever you find them and take not from among them any ally or helper” (4:89)

These are the words of al-Zawahiri’s brother. Does this view have any merit that could link it to Sharia? The scholars of Islam are in agreement that in this worldly realm the hypocrite is considered a Muslim, as mentioned by al-Qadi ‘Ayyad in his *al-Shifa: Healing*. Also in agreement are the scholars over the prohibition of fighting against the ruler as I have explained in the Sixth Clause of *The Document*. And then as if his intellectual blunders were not enough, in June 2007, his brother had secretly given to the authorities a pledge that he would not collide with them anymore.

As for al-Zawahiri’s sheikh and Amir Bin Laden, he wanted to fight against Saddam Hussein in Kuwait in 1990 under the banner of the Saudi government, though some time later in 1994, when they stripped him of his citizenship and passport; he turned against them and charged them with disbelief. The *Khawarij* used to charge others with disbelief on the basis of major sins, but Bin Laden does so when someone cancels his passport or annuls his citizenship. I actually recall that when Bin Laden began issuing charges of disbelief against the Saudi government, at the time we were in Sudan, I [Dr Fadl] asked him [Bin Laden]; did not you fear the reaction of the Sudanese, and his reply to me was that it is they [Sudanese] who had been encouraging me to do so. Only, in 1996, when the Sudanese decided to kick him out of their country, he turned to the Saudi government and wrote to them a letter of apology so that they would allow him to come back to Saudi Arabia. His letter of apology, though it was delivered by a senior member of the Sudanese government. The Saudi rejected the apology and then Bin Laden left Sudan for Afghanistan. Before that when Bin Laden was in Saudi Arabia and decided to come to leave in Sudan in 1992, at that time I was in Pakistan, but I advised him to stay in Saudi Arabia and work for the cause of Islam from there in the same way as he supported the jihad in Afghanistan but he refused, and when he tried to do that, in 1996, it was too late. This is how he finally found himself sailing in the midst of oceans of blood without shores. Why then al-Zawahiri ask his sheikh and brother about the rulers? Let him also ask his brother and his sheikh about the parliamentary elections, which he supported and about the Pakistani military intelligence agencies with whom he has entered into a contract.

Oh Muslims! Know that al-Zawahiri, Bin Laden and their followers represent a coterie of ignoramuses whose ignorance impelled them to invent a criminal organization, which

permitted mass killing, and insist on imposing this view on Muslims worldwide. So determined they are in achieving this goal, they accuse anyone who attempts to bar their road of being a postulant for the Jewish-Crusader campaign against the Muslim nation. Indeed, the Prophet (pbuh) has warned that lack of knowledge about religion is one of the greatest factors behind the spread of mass murders and this is exactly what we are witnessing these days. With his book, *The Exoneration of the Nation*, Al-Zawahiri serves to not only spread the specter of death and mass murder, but to also entrench it in our lives by providing it with a legal basis. The Prophet (pbuh) has said: “*Before the resurrection, there will be days in which true knowledge will be raised and ignorance will come to prevail instead, and following which a lot of killing will occur*” (Agreed upon hadith). Also, Umar Ibn Abdul-Aziz said: “Whoever seeks to obey God through ignorance ends up doing more harm than good” (cited by Ibn Taymiyya in his *Majumu‘ al-Fataawa*). Al-Zawahiri and his ilk can accuse me [Dr Fadl] of anything they like; my intention has been all along to warn people against them, particularly the youth who often fall prey to their deviant ideas and their fiery speeches, and who sadly discover only too late that what these Jihadis cannot achieve anything palpable on the ground apart from hot air in which they hope will distract people from their crimes and trickeries.

Bin Laden has certainly been able to utilize al-Zawahiri and got him to do the dirtiest job of all, namely, to distort religion and to snub the Qur’an and the Sunnah: whereas God- may He be exalted- says: “*Whatever misfortune happens to you is because of the things your hands have wrought*” (42:30), they turn around and say: “Nay, it is America, which is the source of our misfortune”, and whereas God- may He be exalted- says: “*O you who have believed, fight those adjacent to you of the disbelievers*” (9:123), they turned around and say: “Nay, fight the enemy afar”, also whereas God- may He be exalted- says: “*So ask the people of the message if you do not know*” (16:43), they turn around and say: “Nay, ask the sheikhs of jihad”.

Ibn Taymiyya-may God have mercy on him- said: “know that whenever anyone makes licit that which has been prohibited by consensus, or makes forbidden that which has been made licit by consensus, or has changed a Sharia ruling over which there is consensus, he becomes an apostate according to the agreement of the jurists” (*Majumu‘at al-Fataawa*). If these people are refractory to the divine will expressed in the Sharia and are not bothered in the slightest to alter its teachings to make it fit with their desires, and if these people have no qualms if their actions result in the destructions of countries and religious groups, leaving a trail of disasters behind them as they flee, I do not want to imagine what they would do if they were at the helm of a state! Can anyone imagine that?

I have related to you things I know firsthand and about people that I have known for years and years, and in doing that I have been mindful of the law, because I also know what is befitting and unbecoming from its viewpoint. We ask God to grant us success.

In his book *Unveiling the Great Deception in al-Zawahiri's Exoneration*, Dr Fadl has decided to title the fourth and last chapter "Unveiling the Seeker of fame and the Limelight". In it he says:

Al-Zawahiri has expressed his aim and the means by which he intended to achieve it in the most explicit fashion when he said: "It is necessary for the jihadi Islamic movement to avail themselves of the slogan of liberating the three holy places of Islam, the Holy Ka'ba, the Prophet's Mosque and the Aqsa Mosque, for the appeal to these sacred sites ensures its success in securing the reigns of governance over the Muslim nation and is an ideal emblem for rallying the hearts of Muslims all over the world" (*Furasaan Tahta Rayat al-Nabiyy: Knights Under the Banner of the Prophet*). I am not going to comment on the naivety of such statement; the Islamic cause is obviously not limited to holy mosques: for the sake of religion, the Prophet (pbuh) migrated from Mecca, despite the very sacredness of that place, and he (pbuh) had died before conquering the Sacred House in Jerusalem. In the same book, al-Zawahiri has also written: "The masses will not move into action before there is a leadership in which they can trust and without a clear enemy." (ibid)

So it is clear that the objective is to be at the helm of the Muslim nation, and the means for that is to raise slogan pertaining to the liberation of the holiest mosques in Islam, which essentially means to rely on propaganda and media stunts. This is what his activism without knowledge and foresight has led him to after forty years. With no further ado, al-Zawahiri and his followers presented themselves as "the Jihadi Vanguard of the Umma" and most notably as "the symbol of the popular resistance to the Zionist-Crusader campaign against the nation of Islam" (See *Al-Tabri'a*). To arrive to his ends, al-Zawahiri had no hesitation in resorting to the most revolting forms of opportunism: he has gone as far as to sacrifice Islam by distorting the rulings of religion as I have detailed in the second chapter, and he sacrificed the lives of Muslims, including of course his brothers in Egypt and in the state of Taliban which was their host. Such was the devastation that the number of Muslims killed as a result of their action, in a few years, is higher than the number of Muslims killed by Israel in sixty years (1948-2008). So know that these people are actually defending neither Islam nor the Muslims, but are only sacrificing them at the altar of their self-interests among which is undeniably securing the leadership of the Islamic nation.

Al-Zawahiri had in fact discovered the importance of the media and its role in bringing fame; it was during the prosecution in what is known as 'The Jihad Case'

in 1981. His interviews with the mass media during the trial made him to think that he is an important figure, though in reality his status was far less important and his role in the whole affair was very marginal role. This media coverage of him was such that it distracted people from looking at how he had dobed on his brothers and pleaded against them to save his skin. Ever since he discovered the power of the media, he has ubiquitously used others as props to get to the limelight and reach fame and be at the helm. I was among the first people he used at the beginning, in both a religious and worldly sense. He used to tell me: “with you among us, we are spared the embarrassment of having no legal credentials”. Indeed, as soon as I have dissociated myself from him and his followers, he betrayed and stole my intellectual property from my books in order to gain legal weight. I do not have so much of an issue with the fact that he is not a scholar; just like I do not have an issue with the fact that someone is a poor person, but it is absolutely shameful and forbidden (*haram*) that one steals the property of others to give others the impression that he is rich. The Prophet (pbuh) has said: “*He who feigns satiety with that which he has not been given is like someone whose inner and outer clothing are both fake*” (Agreed upon hadith). Being the opportunist that he is, al-Zawahiri had not recognized the kindness I showed towards him, and rebelled against me instead as a pupil against his teacher: in my case, he had definitely committed lying, and treason. But what to do; the poet said:

Each time you show kindness to the noble, be sure that you'll have swayed him to be beside you

But each time you show kindness to the ignoble, it'll only adds to his rebellion against you

He has committed treason because many years ago I left with them a manuscript of my book *Al-Jami'* in the hope that they would profit from its study and from its sale proceeds, but he took the liberty of omitting large chunks of it despite the fact that I had advised against any attempt to abridge it in the introduction. As for lying, he has committed it because he gave a new title and a new introduction to the book and attributed them to me, in addition to the fact that although he single-handedly made a botch of the book, he, shirked all responsibility as was his habit, and attributed the blunder to the legal committee. Al-Zawahiri can also be a thug: he contacted brother Yasser al-Sirriyy in London and threatened him with violence if he decided to publish the original manuscript.

Every criminal has the propensity to find an excuse or construct a scenario that absolves him from his act, and at the top of the list is their master in deceit, Satan, who justified his evil doing by his saying: "*I am better than him. You created me from fire and created him from clay*" (7:12). Al-Zawahiri did actually justify his lies and treason with more lies, and so I seize this opportunity to say to him and to those who perpetuate these lies 'let us invoke and lay the curse of God upon the liars':

Among these lies is his saying that my book *Al-Jami'* was a collective effort carried out by their group, and I swear before God, the One and Only God, that not a single person has written a single letter in my book, and that there was not among his group one single person who was qualified in the Sharia for me to consult him; I have written *Al-Jami'* in 1993 after I had dissociated myself from them and I have mentioned in its introduction that I did not belong to any group and that the book constituted a study of an independent research.

Among these lies is his saying that the name Abdul-Qadir Bin Abdul-Aziz was a symbol of the Jihad Group, and I swear by God, the One and Only God, that I have chosen this name for myself at my own initiative in order to avoid fame, I did not consult with anyone about it and I did force anyone to call me by it, it is they who have clung to it.

Among these lies is also his saying that by advocating certain theses in the Al-Jami', I have committed a treason against them, though treason would be appropriate in describe my actions only if I had pledged that I would write down something and wrote its opposite. I swear by God, the one and Only God, that I had never made a commitment to anyone that I would write a book such as the original, let alone any other book or parts of any other book, and that in writing Al-'Umda and Al-Jami' as well as other publications of the Jihad Group, I did not receive any payment in return; not before and not after. These were works I had volunteered to write for the sake of God, notwithstanding the fact that they were very demanding.

This is what al-Zawahiri has claimed and these are my responses to his claim, O God let your curse then be on the liar between the two of us. By the way, this is

now the third time in this book I have invited him and all those who perpetuate his lies to a *mubahala* (to curse one another through supplications).

He certainly has committed treason and the Prophet (pbuh) has said: “*He has no faith he who has no loyalty, and he has no religion he who does not fulfil his pledge*” (Sound hadith, related by Ahmad and Ibn Habban on the authority of Anas).

After he had made a botch up of my book, this liar and fabricator had the gall to advance that it was common practice among the scholars of the *salaf* to polish the drafts and manuscripts of other scholars and revise them, in another desperate attempt to attribute this time his crime to the *salaf*. However, in saying this fib he has overlooked a number of things. To begin with, I have cautioned in my introduction against any attempt to abridge the work for fear that the manuscript may fall in the hands of those who may be tempted to abuse it. He also should know that those who were renowned for polishing and revising the scholarly works of others, like Ibn Hajar was, were themselves scholars and he is far from being one. Moreover, those who were engaged in such scholarly activity did not conceal the original copy, nor did they threaten with violence those who decided to publish it: Ibn al-Jawzi came about a hundred years after al-Ghazali and endeavoured to polish and revise the *Ihya'* in his *Minhaaj al-Qaasideen*, then roughly a hundred years later, came Ibn Qudama and endeavoured to write an abridged version of the *Minhaaj* of Ibn al-Jawzi. So yes, this was common practice among the scholars of the *salaf*, but al-Zawahiri concealed my book, *Al-Jami'* and he threatened with violence Yasser al-Sirriyy if he dared to publish it. He also overlooks the fact that those scholars engaged in polishing and revising the books or manuscripts of others did not actually attribute to the original author ideas of their own, as he did when he went ahead putting a new title and introduction attributing to me when he was their originator. In a nutshell, al-Zawahiri indulges in lying, treason and thuggery where my books are concerned but he would like us to believe he is simply engaged in editing and revising. Nay, he went as far as arguing that statements of mine in *The Document* which had a universal import were actually ‘specific’ and targeted at certain individuals, but without showing any evidence for it. And this not only causes him to slip deeper in the quagmire of manifest slander but also to annul the quality of ‘indeterminate’ speech, particularly when giving admonitions.

In conclusion the reader should know that al-Zawahiri has wronged me and he has wronged my book, he should know that he has lied and betrayed the trust in order to woo some other Islamic groups. So he said “our brothers are being killed while performing the duty of jihad and others find it appropriate to criticise them in their books” and that seemed to have done the trick with his followers. They followed him because they are so ignorant: the importance of jihad did not prevent the Prophet (pbuh) from saying: “*O God! Absolve me from the action of Khalid*”, and from scolding Usama Bin Zayd. Nor did it prevent him (pbuh) from affirming “*that God may support the religion with an unchaste man*” and “*with nations that have no morals*”, but al-Zawahiri and his ilk have no understanding of these things. That is al-Zawahiri for you: he distorts my writings in the hope courting others to his cause; he woos Bin Laden and justifies his crimes by contorting the face of religion and being unrepentant before the will of God and His Law.

I have written a great deal about the Islamic movements and the causes of their failures. I have consistently argued that it was better to doubt the integrity of those who lead these movements than to doubt God’s promise, in that God says: “*...incumbent upon Us was support of the believers*” (30:47). The promise of God is true, and His victory is only delayed owing to lack of true faith, which is in itself a transgression, or to the spread of wickedness, for wickedness may reach such proportions that no amount of righteous men will stave off its evil effect, as attested in the hadith.

Al-Zawahiri used his brothers, nay the blood of his brothers in the Jihad Group, as props to reach fame and recognition. I had advised them well before the damage was done not to collide with the authorities in Egypt, but he, the hireling that he was, had already sold them to the Sudanese Intelligence Service to carry out operations there in 1993, though he had known all along that these operations were futile. He was so obsessed with being in the limelight when the media had failed to make mention of his name in the wake of the assassination attempt against Atif Sidqi, the then prime minister of Egypt, he hastened to contact the mass media and announced himself the culprit in an exchange he had by fax with *Al-‘Arabiyy Al-Nasiriyy* Newspaper. It is also worth noting that in this whole affair he had acted with a rare shrewdness: he made sure that the consultative committee was formally in charge of taking the decision of carrying the operation, equally he made sure that the responsibility of overseeing the operation be on the shoulders of a group of his brothers operating from outside Egypt, all of which was aimed to get him off the hook and from being pursued by the courts. Whilst his brothers were facing

the music, it was left to him to appear in the news and collect the monies from the Sudanese Intelligence Service. Mind you he was not able to do a thing with that money: the Sudanese had kicked him out of the country in 1995, and al-Zawahiri was nowhere to be seen; he was definitely not fighting on the Egyptian front as he had promised his brothers. But that is understandable; his aim was never fighting but becoming famous, and admittedly he managed to get bit of that. Rather than joining the fight, he chose to flee with his life and he kept on moving until he reached Afghanistan where he was finally safe. In other words, al-Zawahiri had enticed his brothers to fight in Egypt to the last man; they all ended up either put to death or imprisoned, but he refused that he or his brother meet the same fate. I want to ask him: since jihad was obligatory in Egypt as you have maintained on many occasions why then flee with your brother to Afghanistan? If you say that it was not obligatory then why did you sacrifice the lives and livelihoods of your brothers? My dear readers, you have to ask them these question too, because their consultative committee did not do it, they all fled from the Sudan as well in 1995. I mention all these things in order that the next generation of Muslims is well-informed about how the youth is being used and abused by such people and in order that no Muslim acts in matters like these without fatwa issued by trustworthy scholars. In his book, *Mukhtasar Minhaaj al-Qasideen*, the sheikh Ahmad Ibn Qudama stated: "If it is established that while a person is carrying his duty of maintaining public order and prohibit wrongdoing, exposes not only himself to beatings but his companions as well, then he would not permitted to work as part of the police deputed to work for the purpose of enforcing such laws (*hisba*), based on the fact that this state of affair testifies to his inability to prohibit wrong without causing another wrong." Now this of course is the position of the scholars, as for al-Zawahiri, not only he finds it unbearable to suffer as his brothers do, he entices them to fighting while he escapes through the back door: they suffer the consequences and he reaps the rewards...safety, fame, and wealth. As I said earlier, al-Zawahiri has always been fond of the media; to this day, he pursues his vocation of using them to lure the youth. But with his brothers and those he calls through the media, al-Zawahiri has not been man enough; his moral integrity in this regard does not even come near that of the Jewish infidel, Huyay Bin Akhtab. You may wonder who Huyay Bin Akhtab is. The following account might shed some light:

At the time the Prophet (pbuh) migrated to Medina, there were three Jewish tribes; the *Banu Qaynuqa'*, *Banu al-Nadeer*, and *Banu Qareedha*. The Prophet (pbuh) had entered into a pledge of security and peaceful coexistence with all of them, however, soon after these pledges were ratified, the *Banu Qaynuqa'* renegaded and

so the Prophet (pbuh) expelled them from Medina, and the same happened with *Banu al-Nadeer* who renegaded on their pledge too. Now Huya Bin Akhtab was the leader of this second tribe whose banishment from Medina is related in *Surah al-Hashr* (Chapter 59 of the Qur'an). After their eviction, Huya retired to Khaybar and from there he worked tirelessly at enticing the Quraysh and Ghatafan to invade Medina (The Battle of the Confederates or the Trench). As for the *Banu Quraydha*, they had pledged to the Prophet (pbuh) that they would remain neutral in the conflict, and that they would prevent the enemy from entering Medina, if it attempted to do so from their side. It is in these circumstances that Huya came to his Jewish companion, Ka'b Bin Asad, the leader of the *Banu Quraydha* tribe and did everything he could to prevail on him to renegade on his pledge, and join the Confederates instead. What is striking about Huya is that in these negotiations, he had offered to fight alongside the Banu Quraydha throughout the battle so that he would endure what they would endure themselves, and here lies his manfulness. In the end Ka'b was talked into it, and *Banu Quraydha* broke its pledge and their fate is well-recorded in the works of the *Seera*; they were defeated and lost many of their men, including Huya Bin Akhtab. This Jew rouse people to fight but he did not flee, rather he fought alongside the people he rallied to his cause and met the same fate as theirs. Consider for yourself the manfulness of this Jew and compare it with that of al-Zawahiri –if he has one- who rouse people to action with the buttons of his remote control!

Although in 1995 al-Zawahiri had issued an announcement in which he ordered his companions to stop their operations in Egypt, in 1997 when the Islamic Group launched its initiative to stop violence in Egypt, he attacked it and dragged its member through mud because such initiative, he realised, would prevent him from fishing in troubled waters, which are ideal for his dirty business.

Having failed utterly in Egypt, and after having fled from the Sudan, he went to ride on the back of the Islamic Group of Algeria (GIA), and kept on enticing to commit excessive killing through magazines like *Al-Mujaahidun* and *Al-Ansaar*, which are issued in London. For years, he spared no effort in justifying their actions, and he was happy to do so, as long as his name enjoyed wide circulation in the jihadi media, and he felt he was well regarded by that group, which, he then believed, was on the verge of gaining power in Algeria. But as soon as criticism against that group became wide spread, he washed his hands of the whole thing for fear he would lose face. Mind you, by then the damage was done: he had already justified for them all their crimes, just as he is doing today with Bin Laden.

After having utterly failed in Algeria, he saw another media stunt opportunity in the International Islamic Front for the Jihad of the Jews and the Crusader that Bin Laden had founded in 1998 and so he jumped on the bandwagon. The consequences of his association with this new front have been catastrophic for the Jihad Group as I have remarked before, but I can assure you that these things do not bother him in the least. So long as he is safe and a renowned *mujahid*, whatever happened to his brothers in 1998, 1993 and 1981 is the last thing on his mind, though admittedly he would share tear or two over them, here and there inside his books.

Furthermore, his association with International Islamic Front for the Jihad of the Jews and the Crusader compelled him to lay the ground for some kind of an 'exonerative jurisprudence', so he ,for instance, advanced the theory of the necessity to fight the enemy afar, America, as I have explained in the second chapter of this book, and to that end, he also wrote *Fursaan Tahta Rayat Al-Nabiyy: Knights Under the Banner of the Prophet*, in 2000 to basically warrant his alliance with Bin Laden and his international front.

Sequel Eleven:

How al-Zawahiri has turned the events of 9/11 to his advantage

Part XI

“What exactly led al-Zawahiri to revere Bin Laden after he had previously criticised him, and accused him of being an agent?”

Dr Fadl, the mastermind of the jihadists

In a book, which *al-Sharq al-Awsat* has obtained the rights to publish, Dr Fadl explains how al-Zawahiri has turned the events of 9/11 to his advantage

Friday/ 30/ Dhu al-Qi‘dah 1429 AH – 28/ November/ 2008

Issue No. 10958

Al-Sharq al-Awsat Newspaper

Cairo: Muhammad Abu Shamma

In this sequel, the mastermind of the jihadists, al-Sayyid Imam Abdul-Aziz, Dr Fadl, suggests to the second in command in al-Qaeda that he should change the title of his book *Al-Tabri‘ah* (Exoneration) to *Al-Tabreer* (exculpation) for the latter is more in line with the overall tenor of the book, which strives essentially to find excuses for the errors of Bin Laden and al-Qaeda and defending their crimes.

The things that are most dear to al-Zawahiri, according to Dr Fadl, can be summed up in three things: fleeing, the microphone, and the donation box. In this sequel, the author resumes the third chapter of his book, which he titled *Unveiling the Seeker for Fame and the Limelight*. The following is the full text of the remainder.

In the end, al-Zawahiri did not achieve what he aspired through his association with the International Islamic Front for the Jihad against the Jews and the Crusaders. Indeed, after the bomb attacks in Nairobi, in 1998, and the USS Cole navy destroyer, in 2000, money was flowing from everywhere to the coffers of Bin Laden, and so were the gazes of the Arab and foreign media. Like al-Zawahiri, Bin Laden was infatuated with mass media and he would not accept that anyone else except him face the camera. Bin Laden had certainly gained wealth and fame out of the launch of his International Islamic Front, as opposed to his associates who barely got a thing to mention out of it. For some like al-Zawahiri, it was

even worse: his association resulted in such great losses to the Jihad Group, it was finally sent to the wall. Only, he, as we said earlier, was not bothered by that, except that he came to realize that he could reach fame and the limelight on the back of Bin Laden and the al-Qaeda. He did eventually give allegiance to Bin Laden in 6/2001 along with eight members only of the jihad Group, but the consultative committee of the Group, upon receiving news of that allegiance, made an announcement, declaring the exclusion of those members: obviously the Jihad Group has refused the principle of collaboration with Bin Laden based on their prior knowledge of Bin Laden and they have expressed that in many of their communiqués.

Now in his book *Fursaan Tahta Raayat Al-Nabiyy: Knights Under the Banner of the Prophet*, al-Zawahiri has tried to argue that his alliance with al-Qaeda is motivated by his concern for the unification of the efforts of the Muslims. This is false, because Bin Laden and his ideas were there before him for fourteen years (1987-2001) and he had not once expressed the temptation to join him, on the contrary he was an avowed critic of the man, so much that he had accused him of being an agent of the Saudi Intelligence Service, and this was only because the donations towards al-Zawahiri's coffers had dwindled down in 1995. Then, he wrote a long article in their magazine *Kalimatu Haqq* against Bin Laden under the title *Jaad Al-Shabaab bi Arwaahihim wa Dhanna Al-Aghniyaa' bi Amwaalihim* (The Youth Give their Souls up Earnestly and the Rich Give off their Wealth Stingily). After all, only eight members have joined him in his alliance to al-Qaeda, but the rest of the members of the Jihad Group did not. The reason al-Zawahiri joined al-Qaeda as we already said is not the unification of the ranks as he would have believe, but he found in al-Qaeda the possibility to achieve certain goals that are dear to him, namely money and fame. He saw that these flowed easily to Bin Laden and he hoped that through his allegiance to him he may one day get a share of the spoils.

Bin Laden was not unaware of al-Zawahiri's motives: he knew that he was broke and that he was an incompetent who had failed at everything he had tried to do. As such he did not charge him with any particular mission. In reality al-Zawahiri had nothing to offer to Bin Laden, be it at military, political or legal level, to the exception perhaps of his name, so Bin Laden has changed the name of his organization from al-Qaeda (the Base) to *Qa'idat al-Jihad* (The Leader of Jihad); a name which al-Zawahiri repeats proudly at any opportunity. But other than that not much to mention; he did not even inform him on the plans of the 9/11 attacks. for years after he joined al-Qaeda al-Zawahiri was in the shadow of Bin Laden, and was hardly noticed because Bin Laden would not allow anyone else to appear in the media, though he was regularly going to Kandahar where the media and communication

committee was to take part in their activities, which were supervised then by Khalid Sheikh Mohammed.

Then came the events of 9/11 and with it the breakthrough: to al-Zawahiri these events were a rare opportunity presented on silver plate, and he made full use of them in his pursuit of fame and stardom.

Media savvy as he was; he realized that these were indeed momentous events out of which he could organize a unique publicity stunt, for although he had not partaken in any of the planning for the attacks, he still belonged to the organization that carried them out, albeit in the last three months leading to 9/11.

What helped turn these events to his advantage was the fact that most of leading figures of al-Qaeda had simply disappeared from the scene: Bin Laden, it appeared, decided to lay low and sing small for a while, and all of the others had also vanished; they had either been killed, imprisoned in Guantanamo, or compelled to reside in Iran. Hence, he was free to roam about as he pleased and he surely had free reign in their absence. Indeed *when the cat's away the mice will play*.

In light of all the preceding in this book of ours, it should not be difficult for the reader to appreciate the extent to which al-Zawahiri would go to turn the events of 9/11 to his advantage, and for the sake of achieving fame, stardom and the much coveted leadership of the Islamic nation. The following is a sample of the ways in which he had gone about his enterprise

1. *Glorifying the 9/11 Attacks*

Al-Zawahiri has consistently endeavoured to glorify the 9/11 attacks, and went as far as to consider as one of the most important Islamic conquest in the history of Islam, which is a ruse similar to that of the accursed Satan because it is a despicable attempt at bestowing the quality of goodness to something evil: just as the devil has likened the tree of sin and penitence to "*the tree of eternity and possession that will not deteriorate*" (20:120), so did al-Zawahiri liken the attacks of 9/11, which are a betrayal of a friend, a treachery against the enemy, and a catastrophe for the Muslims, to the 'blessed conquests'. Based on that topsy-turvy logic, he and his accomplices have granted to the perpetrators of those crimes the title of martyr who is assured paradise according to the hadith: "*The abode of the martyr is certainly paradise*", and after this manner they have set themselves as authorities whose prerogative it was to deliver absolution certificates to whomsoever they liked, and excommunicate whomsoever was not subservient to their vision: they believed that he who dares stand on their way, like the author of *The Document* did, must be an agent of the Zionist-American coalition, regardless of the fact that not long ago he was their master, and

the teacher whose books had not only served their education but were also instrumental for the recruitment of others to their cause. Clearly, the behavior of al-Zawahiri and his ilk in this regard is not unlike that of the Church which is wont to grant absolution certificates to those who bow to her and also wont to excommunicate from the Kingdom of God those who criticize her.

2. Justifying the 9/11 Attacks on the Basis of the Sharia

Al-Zawahiri had single-handedly driven the project of justifying the 9/11 attacks on the basis of the Sharia, and has to that end devoted his recent book *Al-Tabri'ah* (The Exoneration), which he really ought to have given the title of *Al-Tabreer* (The Exculpation), considering that what he does throughout the book is defending the crime of 9/11, and urging for more of the same and the shedding of more blood. He knows that these justifications by making the cycle of violence endure, is the best way to ensure the march towards fame, the limelight goes on and that money rolls and flows. There is no doubt that this book, bearing in mind all the distortion to religion that it contains, is but a punishment from God- may He be exalted-, against al-Zawahiri, for all his previous sins, which include notably his lies, his betrayals, his double-dealings, his flaunting of his sins, and his sheer shrewdness, which has led him to sacrifice his friends and throw them to the lions. Indeed his very vile distortion of religion is a chastisement from God as is confirmed by the verse: “*So they were struck by the evil consequences of what they did*” (16:34) and the verse, “*We only extend it for them so that they may increase in sin*” (3:178), and the verse, “*Then is one to whom the evil of his deed has been made attractive so he considers it good [like one rightly guided]? For indeed, God sends astray whom He wills and guides whom He wills. So do not let yourself perish over them in regret. Indeed, God is Knowing of what they do*” (35:8), and finally, “*And when they deviated, God caused their hearts to deviate*” (61:5).

3. Absolving himself from Direct Responsibility

Al-Zawahiri has gone to all lengths to exonerate himself and his accomplices from being responsible for the demise of [the original] al-Qaeda, Taliban and Afghanistan, doing all they could to decouple this series of blunders from the 9/11 attacks. One way of shirking their responsibility is to simply avoid the mention of Afghanistan in their speeches; they shift the focus to Palestine instead and prefer to dwell on the misery of the Palestinian people. Palestine, however, as I have said earlier, is used only as a stalking horse to hide their responsibility for the grand-scale destruction taking place in Afghanistan. In reality, no one should expect al-Zawahiri or Bin Laden to assume their responsibility for these

blunders and present their apologies; for doing so has a number of consequences which they are not ready to accept. Chief among these are:

A. Loss of face and Halo:

Al-Zawahiri believes that the 9/11 attacks have allowed the organization to enter the hall of fame, which is one his much sought after goals. He fears that by apologizing, al-Qaeda would lose that capital

B. Apology is Synonym of Guilt:

Al-Zawahiri fears that an apology may turn into a vindication of their error, betrayal, treachery, and bad judgment with regards to 9/11, and a testament to their legal and military ineptitude in matters of jihad and governance, which is after all their ultimate dream

C. Apology is Synonym of Compensation

Al-Zawahiri and his followers fear that by presenting an apology, they would be asked to pay compensation not just to the direct victims, but to all those who suffered as a result of their actions on 9/11 worldwide, and that includes first war reparations. They little realize if they were escape paying their dues in this world, they do not stand a chance to avoid these accounts on the Day of Judgment, nay on the day when they enter their graves.

Because the consequences of apologizing weigh them down, they have not presented a single one with regards to those events, although six years have passed since. So ‘the hell with the Afghani people and Mullah Omar... let us do away with completely with the Sharia rulings, and long live kudos and fame!... A new religion has dawned on us ...from now on it is what Bin Laden says and what al-Zawahiri says, instead of Islam and what God and His Prophet say’; this is what their tongue of disposition is saying. Well, that’s their little game

They can use all of their media wherewithal to conceal their crimes, but the contemporary and the next generations of Muslims are not ever going to forget Bin Laden, al-Zawahiri and their coterie; they will hold them all before the Sharia and before history for being directly responsible for the demise of a fully-fledged Islamic state in Afghanistan, and the destitution of a people whose only crime was to have granted them safety when all everyone else had closed it in their face. Is this jihad? Is it all they have been able to achieve after years of preparing for it?

4. Venerating Bin Laden

As I have explained in the third chapter, al-Zawahiri would hesitate to disown anyone who dares criticize Bin Laden, as if after the Prophet (pbuh), the Muslim nation was about to witness the coming of another infallible man. What is striking about al-Zawahiri is that for years he had been avowed critic of the Muslim Brothers, and then became a follower of one of theirs: Bin Laden. He justifies his crimes, turns his fallacies into truth and transforms his

debacles into rare successes and glories exactly like Goebbels, the mouthpiece of Nazism did for Hitler during the Second World War. And here a question is in order: What exactly led al-Zawahiri to revere Bin Laden after he had previously criticized him, and accused him of being an agent? There are in fact a few reasons for that:

A. Bin Laden gave al-Zawahiri a rare shot at fame and stardom: 9/11 was an opportunity presented to him on a silver plate, and al-Zawahiri sensed that he could turn these to his advantage in order to reach the fame he had failed to achieve by himself and with his own means for the last thirty years

B. His reverence to Bin Laden was in anticipation that he may be the one who will replace the sheikh at the helm one day. He knew full well how strong the attachment of the followers to their sheik Bin Laden was: they revered the person, not his ideas or his methodology, and so they followed him blindly. Al-Zawahiri understood he too had to revere him if he wanted to secure their allegiance, after Bin Laden's death, and inherit the brand name al-Qaeda. It is hard to imagine how a Saudi or a Yemenite would give allegiance to a person other than Bin Laden, but al-Zawahiri was nonetheless hopeful and he did shy from courting them still.

C. He also revered him because of money: 99% of the financing of al-Qaeda poured directly into the personal coffers of Bin Laden from Saudi Arabia. Al-Zawahiri revered Bin Laden because he certainly did not want the flow of money to discontinue upon his nomination at the helm of the organization. There is no doubt that al-Zawahiri awaits the announcement of Bin Laden's death to inherit also the bequests of his organization.

This is how, in gist, the traitor, and troublemaker Bin Laden had suddenly become the sheikh, the imam and the *mujahid* in the chronicles of al-Zawahiri and his followers, and how the bad blood that used to be between them had shifted elsewhere and to other individuals. He little realizes again that the changing of names and titles, as is established in the rules of Sharia, does not alter the reality of things one iota: Wine, like anything else that causes intoxication, is prohibited (haram) even if people coin for it different appellation.

5. Peddling Slogans in the Web

To accomplish his virtual leadership over the Muslim community via the web, it behoved al-Zawahiri to tackle all of the hot issues, and the issues of concern to the Muslim nation,

notably Palestine and the Palestinian question. He has indeed described it as the one issue which alone is able to rouse the feelings of the Muslim nation, and the slogan which alone can secure for them the reigns of the leadership over the entire community (*Fursan Tahta Rayat al-Nabiyy*). Since I have already dealt with this deceit in the third chapter, I will stop here.

So this is in a nutshell how al-Zawahiri had gone about turning the events of 9/11 to his advantage. He glorified the attacks and defended them just as he has defended the main culprit, Bin Laden. It is this total devotion to the glorification of the attacks and to the exculpation of their perpetrators which brought him fame and stardom, and God knows at what cost was that made possible! Al-Zawahiri reached the limelight only after climbing on a mountain of corpses, mutilated bodies, blood, destruction, incarcerations and a host of other human tragedies in which he took part and justified. This is but ill-fame and notoriety. Indeed, for the sake of this fame for which he has become notorious, al-Zawahiri had no time for the victims of his destruction, even these included his household, which he readily abandoned when the going got tough. And that is because throughout his life, there are only three things which are considered most dear to him: fleeing in disgrace to save his skin, using the tools of the media to make his name renowned, and collecting bequests, or we may say briefly that the things he covets the most are: fleeing, the microphone, and the donation box. I find the words the poet once said about al-Hajjaj Ibn Yusuf that might describe al-Zawahiri most fittingly:

You act like a lion with those reckoned weak, but behave like an ostrich when the battle is on

You really are like an eagle when you spread your wings, but you're scared silly from a whistle of a panicky oriole

Why then did you not face Ghuzala in battle? Nay, your heart wavered and you fled to your little hole

Ghuzala, to those who do not know her, was a woman from the khawarij who had fought against al-Hajjaj and his armies for a while, and he, al-Hajjaj would be scared stiff from confronting her, so he used to avoid her even though he was notorious for being cruel and forceful.

If it happens that a man kills one of the hens of his neighbor by accident, it is only normal that he should apologize to him and compensate him for his loss, but al-Zawahiri and Bin Laden do not even abide by these commonly shared rules of decency: the Afghani people bore the brunt of the invasion and to this day their blood is being spilled as a direct result of their actions, but they still have not presented them with an apology, as if the Afghani people were, in their eyes, no more than a heap of trivial insects. And it is not only the Afghani people, of course, who have suffered the consequences of al-Qaeda, but there are other people and nations in both the eastern and western parts of the world.

Also, if it happens that a man has been found to be wasteful with his money, people may deem that person impudent, and if brought before a court, the judge may find it useful to detain him for his squander and extravagance. The thing is that both al-Zawahiri and Bin Laden have squandered not their own property, they have wasted a state, the Taliban, which is not theirs, the Afghani people, who are not theirs, and many Islamic movements worldwide. Moreover, they have dragged the Taliban into a war with America, in spite of the advice of its Amir, Mullah Omar, who had ubiquitously advised against entering into a conflict with the United States. How would you describe such people; I am at loss.

Bin Laden had lived in the Sudan for four years (1992-1996), during which time he had spent millions of dollars on the Sudanese, particularly on their road system. He then moved to Afghanistan, where he lived for five years, that is from 1996 up to 9/2001. Despite all of the hospitality and safety that the Afghani had granted him, he did not build for them a single road, or a single school or hospital, though during all his stay there were hundreds of children who would die from hunger and from the winter cold. He only brought them misery and destruction and took their Amir, Mullah Omar, Taliban and the whole of Afghanistan as mere props that he could climb on to reach his goal. That was his way of returning the favor: an opportunism of the basest kind.

After Afghanistan, both Bin Laden and al-Zawahiri, entered into Iraq in 2003, riding on the back of the Kurdish group of Ansar al-Islam, but soon after they separated themselves from that group and operated independently in Iraq. Incidentally, the Amir of that group, Mullah Karikar, Abu Seyyid Qutb had informed in 1990 that he had translated my book al-‘Umdah into Kurdish. Once al-Qaeda was in Iraq, there members were mainly non-Iraqis and they were accused by some of being strangers to Iraq. These are of course godless ways of looking at things and not befitting of people engaged in jihad nor compliant with the hadith in which it is clearly stated that “A Muslim is a brother of a Muslim”. But al-Qaeda wanted to appease the apprehensions of their critics, so they sent one of their top leaders, Abdullah al-Iraqi who was based in Waziristan. Only, because the whole thing was a show-off and God does accept flattery and adulation as they are a form of associationism (shirk), al-Iraqi was arrested by the Americans when he was en route and did not make it to there.

I should also attract the attention of the reader to the fact that al-Zawahiri has always been influenced by the writings of Sayyid Qutb - may God have mercy on him- and the truth is that neither of them have been able to develop ideas that are beyond the domain of general knowledge. Indeed, both display a flagrant weakness in legal matters, and many of their notions are so basic they cannot be relied upon to derive legal rulings, particularly those pertaining to the permissibility of killing or appropriating the property of others. Only, there is a glaring difference between al-Zawahiri and Sayyid Qutb when it comes to moral integrity. Once Sayyid Qutb said: “This forefinger, which I raise in every prayer to witness for the unity of God, I will never use to write a plea of mercy addressed to an unjust ruler”. Now since these words of Qutb are the words that Al-Zawahiri has himself quoted in his book *Furssaan Tahta Raayat Al-Nabiyy: Knights Under the Banner of the Prophet*, you would expect that he would be of the same level of integrity and sincerity as his guide, or at least aspire to be of the same level, but that is not the case: Sayyid Qutb- may God have mercy on him- died but he did not waiver, as for al-Zawahiri he had doxxed on his brothers and testified against them in 1981 to save his skin, and he had sold them again to the Sudanese Intelligence Service in 1993 to achieve fame status, before fleeing the scene without even partaking in what he had enticed them to do. He also had destroyed his group as a result of his association with *the International Islamic Front for the Jihad against the Jews and the Crusaders* in 1998, and then fled from the front when the enemy afar, America, came knocking on his door in Afghanistan. And as if that was not enough, he then turned to distort religion in order that he may exonerate his crimes and the crimes perpetuated by his followers, as I have explained in the second chapter, and he turned also to lying and betrayal, as I have explained in the second chapter. So please don't compare al-Zawahiri to Sayyid Qutb- may God have mercy on him- when it comes to moral integrity and sincerity. I am confident that if Sayyid Qutb had lived longer, he would have addressed his lacunae in Islamic jurisprudence, for indeed he had devoted many of his earlier scholarship to the study of literature. But when you talk about al-Zawahiri, you are talking about a person whose intellectual development stopped at Sayyid Qutb and his period, which goes back to over thirty years ago. Hence, al-Zawahiri's knowledge of Islamic law has never matured; rather it stagnated despite the fact that I had repeatedly encouraged him to take up the study of the Sharia, but to no avail. The sciences of the Sharia require great diligence and the patience of a saint before they are harnessed properly and he was simply out of patience. This is not the first time I am raising this shortcoming of his, I had already referred to it years ago in my book *Al-Jami'*. However, instead of trying to remedy to this deficiency of his, he used to have no qualms attributing some of the books and treatises I had written during that period to his person, in a separate attempt to make up for his incompetence in the field of Sharia knowledge, and that practice of stealing and plagiarism has continued even after my association with them had come to an end. It is not therefore

surprising that in recent times, al-Zawahiri had become a burden on his followers, particularly those on those Libyan or Mauritanian students who have achieved a modicum of Sharia knowledge during their Sahri‘a studies in Mauritania, as is evident in his book *The Exoneration (Al-Tabri‘ah)*. Despite his reliance on them, the lack of expertise in Islamic law is obvious, so much that they have become like fishermen who, having lost all hope of making a catch, trolled whatever they could from the ocean of Islamic law, so long as these were sayings that justified their actions and exonerated their crimes. Indeed, they were in the words of al-Shafi‘i- may God have mercy on him- like “the collector of firewood at night, who owing to darkness could not distinguish whether he was collecting wood or adders”. This stagnation of al-Zawahiri at the period of Sayyid Qutb and at his idea has caused him to suffer not only intellectually but practically as well, to the extent that his discourse over the years has developed only to the level of delivering fiery speeches and peddling slogans, as he himself admitted, and to the point where he can no longer stand any mention of ‘conditions’, ‘prohibitory grounds’ or ‘lawful alternatives’ as can be attested from his book *The Exoneration (Al-Tabri‘ah)*.

This is in a nutshell the life of the fame seeking al-Zawahiri. I have known for forty years, which is well before many of his followers were born, and yet all of my attempts to dissuade these youths from following his path seem to have been in vain. I reiterate that what I have written here as well as in the *The Document* is intended to warn Muslims, particularly the youth, against these opportunist adventurers and others like them.

O assembly of Muslims! Jihad for the sake of God is a real and true. However, beware not to let these men and their ilk to use this noble truth to score some personal victories and gains: these people are pushing the youth to make the ultimate sacrifice, and they take actions which are the source of great catastrophes to Muslims, but they always make sure they themselves are out of harm’s way, and in a position to gain from the plight of others, without doing anything in return for Islam and Muslims. O assembly of Muslims! These people have wronged and acted unjustly against many peoples in many countries, so have no doubt that their demise is soon, because God does not grant His success to the wrongdoers and to the unjust. Indeed, God- may He be exalted- says: “... truly, God guides not a people unjust” (46:10). Nor should you be lured into slogans or be seduced by the justice a particular cause may indeed have before you know who is behind those slogans and what are their credentials. You need to make sure they are sincere, and that you are not just being ensnared into a trap set for the credulous. At first blush, the mosque of *Dhiraar* was certainly a mosque like any other, but the Prophet (pbuh) had forbidden Muslims to perform their prayers in it, because the intentions of those who run it were malicious. Concerning that Mosque and the people who put it up, God- may He be exalted- said: “*And*

there are those who put up a mosque by way of mischief and infidelity - to disunite the Believers - and in preparation for one who warred against God and His Messenger aforetime. They will indeed swear that their intention is nothing but good; But God doth declare that they are certainly liars. Never stand thou forth therein. There is a mosque whose foundation was laid from the first day on piety; it is more worthy of the standing forth (for prayer) therein” (9:107-8). I hope this makes clear that slogans in themselves mean nothing; it is important to know full well those who brandish them: just like not every mosque is a place worthy of our worship, also we should understand that not every slogan is worthy of our sacrifices, however noble its principle or cause may be. I have already warned against that jihad which seeks to make cheap gains on just cause by peddling slogans over the internet and so forth, so I will stop here.

In conclusion, know that nothing brings more damage to one's faith than the greed for power, fame and wealth, as attested by the hadith of the Prophet (pbuh) in which he has said: *“The havoc that two hungry wolves may cause in the midst of a herd of sheep is not worse than the havoc caused by man's love for wealth and reputation”* (Related by al-Tirmidhi and deemed sound by him); meaning that greed for wealth and fame may destroy a person's religion in exactly the same way hungry wolves destroy a flock of sheep if they should fall upon it.

Part XII (Final)

“The 9/11 attacks were executed successfully, and the sick man, which was the Emirate of Afghanistan, died, but then the doctors, Bin Laden and al-Zawahiri, fled”

Dr Fadl, the mastermind of the jihadists

In the end of *Unveiling the Great Deception*, a book which *al-Sharq al-Awsat* has obtained the rights to publish, Dr Fadl tackles the lures of the jihadists or what he describes as ‘depravity dressed up in a fascinating garb’.

Saturday/ 01/ Dhu al-Hijja 1429 AH – 29/ November/ 2008

Issue No. 10959

Al-Sharq al-Awsat Newspaper

Cairo: Muhammad Abu Shama

This is the last sequel of Dr Fadl’s *Unveiling the Great Deception of The Exoneration (Mudhakkirat al-Ta’riya li Kitaab Al-Tabri’ah* (which was written by al-Zawahiri). Dr Fadl is the first Amir of the Jihad Group of Egypt, and the man who used to be the teacher of Ayman al-Zawahiri, the second in command in the I-Qaeda organization. In this sequel which marks the end of his dialogue with al-Zawahiri, Dr Fadl passes under review the ideas that animate the ideology of al-Qaeda and examine the attitude of its leaders, particularly those of the first and second in command. He states:

By way of conclusion I say: if there are Muslims out there who are still seduced by the ideas of Bin Laden, al-Zawahiri and their ilk, and are unable to detect the ignorance of these two men, how on earth are they going to withstand the seducements of the Antichrist, the Dajjal, about which the Prophet (pbuh) has said: “*From the time Adam was created till the time of the resurrection, humanity will undergo no trials as momentous as those that will coincide with the coming of the Dajjal*” (Sound hadith). Indeed, what will make the trials of the Dajjal particularly daunting is the fact that Dajjal will begin his call on earth by insisting on goodness and welfare. Commenting on the traits of the Dajjal during his appearance, Ibn Hajar- may God have mercy on him- affirmed in his *Fath al-Baari* that: “Among the things this man will claim at the beginning is his commitment to goodness and welfare, then he will claim prophecy, and finally divinity as attested by the hadith related by al-Tabarani...

in which the Prophet (pbuh) has said, ‘ *The coming of the Dajjal will be manifest: he will rise from the east and call for religion, so he will have a following and will prevail. He will continue on this pace until he reaches Kufa where he will again further religion, and will be followed. After this, he will proclaim his prophecy; this news will shock those who have not lost their ability to discern and they will leave him. Finally, he will proclaim: ‘I am God’, after which one of his eyes went blind, and one of his ears was cut off, and on his forehead between his eyes will be written ‘disbeliever’, and every Muslim will be able to detect that, and he will eventually abandoned by anyone who has a grain of faith in their heart*’ (Weak hadith according to Ibn Hajar)

There has been example of ‘paradigmatic’ Dajjals in the history of Islam. We have for instance, the example of al-Mukhtar Bin Abi Ubayd al-Thaqafiyy who at the beginning of his career was much concerned with people’s welfare and righteousness, so he went to Iraq to avenge the death of Hussein the son of Ali. He indeed killed many of those who were involved in the assassination, but no sooner had he done so, he proclaimed himself prophet. Bin Abi Ubayd al-Thaqafiyy was in fact the imposter referred to in the hadith in which the Prophet (pbuh) has said: “*Among the people of Thaqeef there are an imposter and a righteous man*” (related by Muslim), and the righteous man here refers to al-Hajjaj Bin Yusuf al-Thaqafiyy. This was in the years 66-67 AH.

In more recent times, about ninety years ago, people were seduced by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk who drove the armies of the Europeans out of Turkey in the wake of the First World War. Kemal’s military feat was such that the poet Ahmad Shawqi described him as the Turkish Khalid Ibn al-Waleed, and sang his praises in a poem in which he said:

God is Great! How wondrous are the conquests?

O Khalid of the Turks, may you restore to life the Khalid of the Arabs

But that fascination did not seem to last long: soon after his heroic success, Mustafa Kamal turned against the Ottoman caliphate and annulled it, and turned against Islam. Then Shawqi wrote in disgust:

His fatwa was tarraddidle and his speech was sheer deviance

And his disbelief loomed large in the horizon

O assembly of Muslims! Do not be seduced by anyone who speaks about the importance of religion and jihad, until you have scrutinized their credentials against the yardstick of the Sharia, because the Prophet (pbuh) has said: “*Certainly, God may support this religion with an unchaste man*” (Agreed upon hadith), and he (pbuh) also affirmed that victory to Islam may come at the hands of “*a people without morals*”. Now this unchaste man, whom the

Prophet referred to in the hadith, was a man who had fought alongside him (pbuh) in the Battle of Khaybar. Almost single-handedly, he was able to deliver a crushing defeat to the disbelievers, he did not harm one single Muslim, but he took his life as he could not bear the pain arising from his wounds. I ask you, if this man is unchaste because of this deed, how much more unchaste and wicked are those whose actions destroy states and brotherhoods, distort religion, and erect innovations against the Book of God, and bring calamities to Muslims, causing tens of thousands of them to be thrown in jail?

What gains have we made by demolishing two buildings in America, when that action has led to the demolition of the state of the Taliban, the only one in the world which welcomed those Muslims who were chased everywhere else? Bin Laden had left the Afghans to the devices, and it was they who picked up the bill of his idiocy: widespread destruction, destitution and displacement. He now pops his head to lament the children of Palestine, and seem to completely ignore the Afghani children whose blood is being spilled every day because of his imbecilities. Why should he care you might say when al-Zawahiri is there to exonerate him and justify whatever he does?

All that mattered for Bin Laden was to achieve his personal goal of targeting America, even if at the expense of the country that had been sheltering him, and even if at the detriment of his own organisation, al-Qaeda. Indeed, after 9/11, the remnants of the organisation became occupied with his personal safety ever since the Battle of Tora Bora, while the bulk of his forces had fallen dead or were imprisoned by the Americans. Bin Laden in this fashion has used the organisation to achieve his personal goal, his personal safety, and his exoneration and exculpation for mass murder. In all three instances, notice that it is others who pay the price. Even Abu Hafs al-Misriyy, who had laid the groundwork of al-Qaeda, was forsaken by Bin Laden who did not want to extend to him even a small fraction of the security apparatus he allotted to himself. Consequently, Abu Hafs and his brothers who were around him died in the wake of the earliest bombardments on Afghanistan in 10/2001. In the maritime traditions, the captain is the last to jump ship when the vessel is in distress, Bin Laden and al-Zawahiri; however, were the first to desert their position and they allowed the ship to sink with all on board. Worse still, Bin Laden had trampled on the bodies of the passengers (the al-Qaeda and its members) to ensure his own safety. These are for you the sheikhs of jihad who entice the nation of Islam to carry out jihad, while they excel in fleeing, publicity stunts and the collection of donations. Neither al-Zawahiri nor Bin Laden had expressed any remorse or feelings of shame for letting down their brothers alone in the face of death, though this would simply have been considered undone in the eyes of a man from the era of godlessness (*jahiliyya*). Indeed, Abu al-Bakhtari Bin Hisham was a disbeliever, and when he joined the Meccans in their fight against the Prophet (pbuh) in the Battle of Badr, he (pbuh) had forbade his soldiers from harming him, because he had shown kindness towards the Prophet before he (pbuh) migrated to Medina. Abu al-Bakhtari was

with a companion of his during this military campaign, and was intercepted by the Companion of the Prophet al-Mujdhir Bin Ziyad al-Balwi who informed him that he was free to go but not his friend. Al-Bakhtari it is reported refused the offer and did not want to leave his friend alone. He said: “The son of an honourable woman shall not forsake his friend; either he dies with him or is free to go with him”, and he actually fought for his friend until he died (*Cited in Al-Bidaya wa Al-Nihaya*). Now compare the action of this man to that of Bin Laden who abandons his brothers to face death or imprisonment, or to that of al-Zawahiri who not only abandoned his brothers but also his wife and children to face the military might of the Americans. Despite this cowardice, this unchaste imposter has the gall to talk about the preparation for jihad, and about jihad in Palestine and elsewhere. Of what use is his preparation for jihad if it ends in a disgraceful flight where personal safety is put ahead of the safety of one’s family?

One of the most ignoble things they have done, both of them, is to have used the noble duty of jihad to distort the religion; so much that they were led to found a criminal sect which has surpassed anything we have known in the justification of indiscriminate mass murder (please refer to chapter two). Moreover, they have accused anyone who stand on their way as an agent of the Crusader-Zionist campaign against Muslims, and maintained that only the sheikhs of jihad have the prerogative to delve in the matters that pertain to fighting and resistance. So Bin Laden has ruled that *‘Only those who are in the Thick of Jihad can Discourse on it’*, but little did he realise that by advancing such a heresy, he had actually crossed over the names of the founders of the four sunni legal schools, and of the most prominent figures of hadith like al-Bukhari and Muslim, nay with that heresy he had even crossed over the name of Abu Hurayra- may God be pleased with him-; a real summity who had alone narrated more than seven thousand hadiths, while Khalid Ibn al-Waleed, a person whose jihad is almost peerless, only narrated three hadiths, with all due respect.

The jihad of Bin Laden, what is all the dither about? O Muslims! I swear by God he had retreated from all the battles that he oversaw against the communists, and he and his friends would have often ended in a real predicament if it weren’t for the support of the Afghans. Indeed, he had nearly been captured in one of the battles. Do not believe anyone who tells you that the Arabs played a significant role in the fight against the Russians during the Afghani jihad. That is an absolute lie.

And what knowledge does Bin Laden have? In 1994 when in the Sudan, upon hearing that Bin Laden was pre-occupied by an issue, I advised him to look up a particular book. His reply to me was that *‘he could not stand to read a book from beginning to end’*, and so it is not surprising therefore his sermons and speeches are written for him by his followers.

Does this man who destroys two towers full of residents and causes his enemy to retaliate by destroying a whole country and a large section of its population, possess any legal or military aptitude, which both requisite of the jihad leader?

And does this man who had send hundreds of his brothers to the gallows or the dungeons, as did al-Zawahiri in 1993, for the sake of fame and the limelight, possess legal or military aptitude, which both requisite of the jihad leader?

O assembly of Muslims! These men are adventures, nay they are gamblers. Why wouldn't they gamble one might say, since they do not pay for these adventures with their own money? Look up the Exoneration of the Nation (*Al-Tabri'ah*), notably the chapter titled 'The Passions of the Masses and the Financial Preparations for Jihad' (*Al-Tabri'ah*, pp, 79-199) if you want to have a sense of their penchant for fleeing, becoming famous and collecting monies.

You are before the sheikhs of jihad who have taken it upon themselves to distort religion in this day and age. Concerning them Imam al-Awzaa'iy said: 'When heresies appear, they should be denounced by the people of knowledge, otherwise the masses will lend them an ear and they will become a sunnah' (Cited by al-Khatib al-Baghdadi in *Sharaf Ashab Al-Hadith*, p 17).

God – may He be exalted- says: “*Whatever of misfortune strikes you; it is what your hands have earned*” (42: 30), but Bin Laden has another view of things, he says, 'whatever misfortune strikes you it is due to America'. It was left to al-Zawahiri to justify all of that, so he came with his 'exonerative jurisprudence', which is the doctrinal basis of a criminal sect which has made indiscriminate mass murder permissible. This was God's way of punishing him, for God Almighty says: “*And when they deviated, God caused their hearts to deviate*” (61:5), and it was in recompense for all of his treasons, lies, double-dealings, and treachery; indeed they are for him like “*...a wave, above which is another wave, above which is a cloud; (with layers of) darkness one over the other*” (24:40)

And what is the outcome of their jihadi activity and how far did their 'exonerative jurisprudence' go? Well, it has been summed as follows: the 9/11 attacks have been executed successfully, the sick man, which was the Emirate of Afghanistan, was killed, but then the doctors, Bin Laden and al-Zawahiri, fled. This was the outcome despite Bin Laden having received repeated advice from his brothers who have the expertise, against such action. They did all they could to protect Afghanistan as an Islamic state or at least as a project which had the potential for becoming one, and as a safe haven for Muslims, but Bin Laden did not lend an ear; he was bent to go ahead with his personal project instead, though

when push came to shove he fled, abandoning in the process some of his closest followers. And of course it was left to others to pick up the bill.

Gamal Abd al-Nasir did at least apologize for his debacles and took all the responsibility for the defeat in 1967 war, and put forward his resignation on 8/6/1967, which was only three days after the war had begun. Equally Sheikh Hassan Nasrallah was full of regret over what happened to the Lebanese people and presented his apologies to them one month after the war with Israel in 2006. Not only that, he also in that occasion promised that his organization would pay compensation for the victims of the war. Nasrallah had presented his apologies despite the fact that Lebanon was not invaded, but was only destroyed in certain parts and had a limited number of victims. Indeed, had Nasrallah owned an efficient anti-aircraft system, he would have been able to spare many more lives and limit the damages far more. As for the vainglorious Bin Laden and al-Zawahiri, they did apologize to anyone, even though six years has passed since the 9/11 attacks, which resulted in the invasion and total destruction of Afghanistan, not to mention the tens of thousands of Afghans killed and the hundreds of thousands displaced. All along they have behaved as if nothing had happened or as if the Afghani people were no more than a heap of insects, worse still, they were at it again with their legal methods of exculpating and justifying mass murder with their exonerative jurisprudence.

All of the flowers of Bin Laden will be dealt with in accordance with the ruling of treason, and betrayal which applies to him, and they will all be gathered with him underneath his banner on the Day of Resurrection if they die before repenting, following the verse in which God- may he be exalted- has said: "That day We shall call together all human beings along with their Imams" (17:71). Also, it needs to be made clear that anyone who has satisfied with their actions is from them in conformity with the hadiths in which the Prophet (pbuh) has said: "*People who have witnessed a wrong taking place on this earth and have loathed it, will be absolved from such wrong for they will be considered as if absent, but if those who have been actually absent when such wrong took place rejoiced in it[upon hearing of its news], God will consider them as if present [and serve them the punishment of partaking in that wrong]*" (Fairly good hadith related by Abu Dawud), and also: "*Whoever adopts the affectations of a particular people will be deemed from them, and whoever is content with the action of people will deemed a partner of theirs*" (this hadith has been extracted by Abu Ya'li on the authority of Ibn Masud)

I swear by God, the one and Only God, O assembly of Muslims, I did not intend to write a single word about neither Bin Laden nor al-Zawahiri or anybody else. I swear they did not even come to my mind when I set out to write *The Document* in 12/2007 and there are witnesses who can testify to what I say. Only, after I had put the manuscript of *The Document* before the consideration of some brothers who were with me in jail in 4/2007, an

avalanche of articles and a lot of noise in the press about it ensued. To put an end to the speculations that were running wild at the time, I had decided to issue a communiqué in 6/5/2007 in which I announced that *The Document* was an invitation to all of the Islamic groups without exception, and that it was for the purpose of guiding their jihadi action. In that same communiqué I had also warned the readers not to follow the rumours which surrounded *The Document* and insisted that it remained essentially a study concerning certain matters of jurisprudence and not a critique of any group in particular. But that was to no avail because al-Zawahiri, well before *The Document* was published and prior to his reading of it had started with his imbecilities and his mind games. In 6/2001, he issues an announcement titled 'Forty Years after the Demise of al-Quds' and in it he stated: "We now have before us a scholar from the entourage of the sultan, a jurist of the marines and one of the brokers of the 'Revisions', asking us to make peace with these criminals". He then added: "The last thing we are in need of is for someone to come along and spread among us the methodology of recantation and the culture of compromise". He went so far in his lies to the point of suggesting that "the prison cells have fax machines in them". All good, but what is exactly that pushed al-Zawahiri to attack *The Document* before it was even published? Since 1994, he had been aware that I did not agree with the Islamic movements; he knows that I perceive some of their ideas and actions to be misguided and about my rejection of operations carried inside the Abode of War by people who entered enemy territory with a visa as well as other matters which he chose to omit from my book *al-Jami'*. So, al-Zawahiri had definitely feared *The Document* would contain the ideas and content that he had previously omitted. This is what he himself admitted, unwittingly no doubt, when he said about *The Document* that it a replica of old ideas. There were also new ideas, though: I have kept a watch on their activities in Europe and elsewhere and have included these in *The Document* after 04/2007, so my companions in the prison were not aware of them. These were issues that I wanted to bring to the attention of the general public but without pointing the finger at them directly. The truth of the matter is that after six years since the attacks of 9/11 neither Bin Laden nor al-Zawahiri can bear to hear of anything or any ideas that do not fall in line with their criminal project. They think they are infallible and absolved from all sin, and so they have become like that person about whom God- may he be exalted- has said: "When it is said to him, "Fear God., He is led by arrogance to (more) crime. Enough for him is Hell;-An evil bed indeed (To lie on)!" (2:206). They do act as if they did not commit crime against anyone, and he, al-Zawahiri, has written the *Tabri'ah* only with the purpose of exonerating their evil actions with sheer self-justification. I have indeed debunked his knaveries in both *The Document* and the *Unveiling the Great Deception*, and I maintain my position and still say that if there is anything in my writings which is shown to me by my opponent to be at variance the conclusive and sound proofs of the Sharia, I will disavow it and recant from it and follow what is shown to me to be true.

But having said that, what am I to do when I say that God- may He be exalted- says: “*and no bearer of burdens will bear the burden of another*” (6:164), and my opponent say: “hundreds of millions of people may be considered as one legal entity and so are akin to single individual”. And what am I to do when I say to my opponent: “al-Shafi‘I says”, “al-Shaybani say” and “Ibn Qudama says” and the ignorant that he is says: “Nay! Naser al-Fahd says” or I say “reciprocity is permissible only in those ways which do not clash with the Sharia” and he retorts with: “Nay! Reciprocity is unrestricted and we are permitted to kill tens of millions of people indiscriminately with one stroke”.

O assembly of Muslims! Nay O assembly of the wise! These retorts of theirs are not what we call a legal argumentation, it is but a display of haughtiness and incompliance vis-à-vis the Sharia of God, and it is indeed but a display of a new criminal sect, which excels in defending mass murder and lending support to a vile idea; the idea of ‘all of the misfortunes are due to America’, which seemed to have attracted one individual but became rampant among the simpletons thereafter.

Know that when God wants to double the punishment of an individual, He makes him of those who profess their sins avowedly and let him have followers, which will increasingly push him even further from God’s forgiveness, as attested by the hadith: “*My entire nation is entitled to forgiveness except those unashamedly profess their sins*” (Agreed upon hadith). Also, the menace of God’s chastisement will increase in his case, following the hadith: “*Whoever institutes a bad practice in Islam, which is then followed by others, will bear not only the burden of his own sin but that of those who follow his practice, without it detracting from their burden in any way*” (Related by Muslim). This is where Bin Laden, al-Zawahiri and their followers are practicing: professing their sins so overtly, to the point of flaunting them, and enticing others to do the same.

The first trial that visited the Muslim nation and which caused thousands of death among the community was the trial which ensued from the death of the caliph ‘Uthman. That trial was sparkled when those who wanted to spread the upheavals raised the bloodied garment of Uthman Ibn ‘Affan to justify Mu‘awiyya’s secession from Ali Bin Abi Taleb. However, the history of depravity dressed up in fascinating garments did not end there: at times these were used to access power or wrestle it from others, and at other times they were used to distort religion. This was particularly evident, for instance, among the *Khawarij* who used the garment of devotion to religion as a smokescreen for their innovations, then came the use of the garment of love for the Prophet’s household, which was brandished as a smokescreen for the heresies of the Shiites, and the use of the garment of justice, which the Mu‘tazila employed as a smokescreen for theirs. Such was the trial of the Muslim

community at that time, if anyone dared challenge the *Khawarij* he would be labelled as lacking devotion to Islam, and if anyone dared challenge the Shiites, he would be accused of having no love for the Prophet's household, and if anyone dared challenge the Mu'tazila, he would face the charge of undermining God's justice. This was in the past.

As for today, we witness the raising of garments of reform (tajdid), ijihad, and public benefit (maslaha) as smokescreens for the distortions of religion and to other distortions that the People of knowledge are aware of.

Among these depravities dressed up in fascinating garments is that which is raised by Bin Laden and al-Zawahiri as a smokescreen for the justification of the distortion of religion. They have raised the garments of 'jihad' and 'war against America'. In their silly enterprise they were led to violate a number of the foundations of Islam, as I have already explained in the second chapter. They raise other garments if anyone opposes them: 'enemy of the mujahedeen' and 'agent of America'. I have diligently endeavoured to lay bare their tricks in this book and in *The Document* in compliance with the hadith of the Prophet (pbuh) in which he has said: *“This knowledge will be carried in each generation by upright people who shall repudiate the distortions of the zealots, the equivocations of the sceptics and the construal of the ignorant”* (Related by al-Baghdadi and deemed sound by Ahmed).

I have opted for brevity in my discourse so as not to bore the reader, though in reality things are not that simple. One day, the followers of Bin Laden and those who are in awe of him, like al-Zawahiri, will come to realize they were among the most conceited in this world. Indeed the poet said:

When all the sediments settle down

You will know whether under your feet there is a horse or a cow

An Important teaching:

“The matters pertinent to the masses are best left to the scholars (ulama)”

(I have dwelt upon this issue in the second clause of *The Document* for those who want to look it up)

Know dear reader that God- may He be exalted- will ask every one of us, Muslims and non-Muslims alike, to give accounts for our actions. Indeed, God Almighty says: *“Therefore, by the Lord, We will, of a surety, call them to account, for all their deeds”* (15: 92-3). Now every action that we do is either commanded by God or it is prohibited by Him, and we can only gain such knowledge of the Sharia from the seal of Prophecy, Muhammad (pbuh). Know that after the death of our Prophet (pbuh), the mission of transmitting this

knowledge landed on the shoulders of the scholars of Islam, as attested by the hadith of the Prophet (pbuh) in which he has said: “The scholars are the heirs of the prophets” (Sound hadith related by Abu Dawud and al-Tirmidhi). That is why no Muslim should decide to act in a matter before he has knowledge of its value and status in the sight of the Sharia. In the event where a person does not have that knowledge, it is incumbent on him to seek it from the people who are qualified to impart it, and this in compliance with the verse: “if ye realise this not, ask of those who possess the Message” (16:43). If a Muslim person finds himself in that situation, and then opts to ask an ignoramus instead and worse still followed his advice, he would engulfed himself in deviousness, for indeed the Prophet (pbuh) has said: *“God does not seize His knowledge by wrestle it out from people as some might expect, nay, He seizes it out by seizing the souls of the scholars. Then People shall take the ignorant as their leaders and these will issue them with guidance but without [proper] knowledge, they will go astray and will cause their followers to go astray too”* (Agreed upon hadith)

In his book, Ghayyath Al-Umam, Imam al-Juwayni affirmed that in places or during times where the Islamic caliphate is not functional, it is incumbent upon people to take their scholars as their political leaders, and have to abide by their orders and recommendations as if they were occupying that post acting in that capacity. There is indeed an indication in the Qur’an which supports the position of Imam al-Juwayni, as God- may He be exalted- has said: *“When there comes to them some matter touching (Public) safety or fear, they divulge it. If they had only referred it to the Messenger, or to those charged with authority among them, the proper investigators would have verified it from them (direct). Were it not for the Grace and Mercy of God unto you, all but a few of you would have fallen into the clutches of Satan”* (4:83). This verse does indeed make it clear that those who are supposed to be in charge of running the affairs of the Muslims need to be from the people who can verify knowledge (*ahl al-istinbaat*), and these none other than the scholars. One of the greatest ironies of our times is that the opposite seem to hold sway: ignoramuses who know precious little about religion, like Bin Laden and al-Zawahiri, dare thrust their persons between us and God and set themselves as our guides and as authorities over us. Dear reader, you will find what I have said about them in this regard in the second chapter of this book sufficient for you, but I wanted to warn you again at the close of this book of these people. This is what I have tried to do ever since I wrote *Al-Jaami’ fi Talab al-Ilm al-Shareef*, in 1993, so beware of the preachers of ignorance and deviance,