

The Operation of 11 Rabi Al-Awwal: The East Riyadh Operation and Our War with the United States and Its Agents

September 3, 2003

[Please note: Images may have been removed from this document. Page numbers have been added.]

Introduction:

In the Name of God, the Merciful, the Compassionate
Praise be to God, the Lord of the Universe, and prayers and peace be upon the most righteous Messenger.

God is great, abundant thanks be to God, and praise be to God morning and evening. The Center's custom has been to issue a statement about every operation carried out by the mujahidin. However, the operation of 11 Rabi al-Awwal 1424 AH [corresponding to 12 May 2003] was special in several respects and demanded that we devote this book to it. The operation was just the first bullet, God willing. The mujahidin needed this detailed statement to explain the demands of jihadi activity in the Arabian Peninsula and to remove some of the ambiguities from the religious and military standpoints.

This book "The Operation of 11 Rabi al-Awwal: The East Riyadh Operation and Our War with the United States and Its Agents" is divided into four chapters:

First: The Situation in the Islamic World

Second: What is the Solution?

Third: Why Riyadh?

Fourth: Have You Not Become Acquainted with the Mujahidin Yet?

CHAPTER ONE: The Situation In The Islamic World

Since the collapse of the Soviet Union, one superpower has been leading the world: the United States. Students of history know that two powers have dominated the world in all ages, except in few eras mentioned in history and expositions, like the eras of Solomon, Dhu-al-Qarnayn, Al-Namrud, and Alexander. The fact that two powers checked each other in the world was a mercy from God to humanity. The Almighty said, "And did not God check one set of people by means of another, the earth would indeed be full of mischief."

Judging the current world situation in the light of this historic fact leads us to one of two conclusions:

1. The United States was able to deviate from this rule by virtue of its comprehensive economic, social, and military power, as happened to Solomon--peace be upon him--Dhu-al-Qarnayn, and others. The current situation of the United States rules out this possibility.

2. We live in an unstable international situation or more correctly in a transitional period to which the rules applied in normal conditions do not apply. It also does not have the prerequisites to survive for long.

The second conclusion is definitely the situation that exists in the world today. The United States, which has become the uncontested sole superpower, is adapting to the situation. It got rid of the restrictions, which the conflict with the Soviet Union had imposed on it, and adopted a new policy. This policy is summed up in taking a direct approach to secure its interests in the world without regard to the interest of others, because it considers itself the sole power in the world and the world should adapt to what it wants.

The talk about the United Nations as an independent party ruling the world is nonsense. Perhaps the United Nations was a body whose judgment was sought and accepted by the nations that established it, including the United States. However, today, it is a toy in the hands of World Zionism. The United States ignored the United Nations when it shyly opposed its invasion of Iraq. Three Crusader countries officially participated in the war with it, disregarding the UN resolutions.

Something called the New World Order has recently appeared. The United States designed it as a map for the world it is seeking to shape. Writer Louis Atiyatallah wrote his new book about it: A Clarification of the Reality of This Order.

In view of the above, the situation of the Muslims will only be a reflection of what the United States wants. The situation in some Islamic countries, however, might require some gradual progress in the implementation of the plans to ensure safety against negative results.

We can sum up the issue and say: The Muslim countries today are colonized. Colonialism is either direct or veiled.

Veiled Colonialism:

The past century was the century of the direct colonization of the Muslim countries, under which they languished for many years. This was a time when the Islamic World had reached the highest degree of ideological deviation, polytheism, and disregard for jihad. Colonialism could not find any significant resistance in most countries, particularly at the beginning.

Toward the end of the colonialist era, the colonialist countries were no longer able to bear the painful blows they received from the mujahidin in the colonized countries. They clearly realized that the new generations were moving toward resisting colonialism. They found themselves struggling between the strong desire not to give up their colonies and the painful deterrent posed by the jihad, which they saw growing day after day.

At this stage, Zionism intervened and put its touches on a colonialism that would ensure the interests of the colonialists and save them from the predicament that they faced. It masked colonialism in a very naïve way--a way that only can fool the gullible. The colonialist plans did not change. The colonialists changed the face of their policies. Why could they not respond to the wishes of the resistance men and remove their men with the blue eyes and the blond hair from their midst and replace them with people of their kind who spoke their language and wore lambskin over wolf hearts?

What is wrong with replacing the name of John and Napoleon with Muhammad, Anwar, and Abd-al-Aziz?

Because that period had gone and today's generations have forgotten it, the colonialists decided to repeat the process of masking colonialism before their eyes so they can imagine what happened in the past. This is exactly what happened in Afghanistan when the United States occupied that country and installed an Afghan agent, Hamid Karzai. As everyone can see, this agent has been more eager to promote the interests of the United States than the United States itself, although he has been less successful because of the mujahidin attacks that God ordained against his government.

The Karzai system is the system officially in use in all the Muslim countries. The Karzai method is the same method by which all the rulers were installed, with some difference in details. The legitimacy of every such Karzai is no different from the other. There is no difference between the Karzai of Yemen, the Karzai of Pakistan, the Karzai of Jordan, the Karzai of Qatar, the Karzai of Kuwait, the Karzai of Egypt, and the long list of Karzai traitors ruling the Muslim countries.

The rulers of the land of the Two Holy Mosques [Saudi Arabia] are no different in the above details from others, although the masks the colonialists put on them are so good that they fooled many people. However, the accelerated events and the successive pressures made the situation become clearer. The idol rulers started to say what they used to deny before and make public what they kept secret before.

In the past, Sultan [the Saudi defense minister] denied the presence of foreign forces on Saudi territory, and some people believed him.

Today, they admitted this openly when attention started focusing on the Crusader bases in Al-Kharj and other places, which commanded the Crusader war against Afghanistan and more recently against Iraq. They no longer could make the same mistake of denying the American presence.

In the past, they strongly denied their subserviency to the United States and stressed that their alliance with it was an alliance of mutual interests, and nothing more. When the American pressures increased, Bandar Bin-Sultan [Saudi ambassador in Washington] and Al-Faysal [presumably Foreign Minister Prince Sa'ud al-Faysal] rushed to admit some of the shameful deeds that had no precedent in history.

If one talked about the United States exploitation of the land and its resources, the other announced that the government removed the education of girls from the religious department to satisfy the United States. If one mocked everyone who engaged in the jihad for the sake of God, the other boasted of the secular trend in the Saudi leadership.

This is as far as words are concerned. As for deeds, there is much to say. The aircraft of the Crusader campaign took off from Saudi Arabia. They were supplied with fuel from bases in Saudi Arabia. The supreme command of the war was in the Sultan Base in Saudi Arabia.

There is also much to say about their absolute support for John Garang in southern Sudan in killing the Muslims, their support for communism in southern Yemen before it fell and their support for it when it tried to come back after it fell, their support for the agent Algerian

government against the mujahidin when that government was about to fall, and their support for the Russian government when it was killing the Muslims in Chechnya.

The latest episode in their subserviency was their broad cooperation with the United States in pursuing the mujahidin in the world, collecting intelligence information about the mujahidin, and helping the United States arrest them. Because of information collected by the Saudi intelligence agencies, many mujahidin were arrested and many operations in the world and in the United States itself were foiled.

Because of this despicable cooperation, the prisons in Saudi Arabia have become full of prisoners, held on charges of fighting with al-Qa'ida and Taliban against the United States or fighting with Khattab, and recently on charges of attempting to infiltrate into Iraq to fight there. The shari'ah duty imposed on all the nation has become a punishable crime. They are doing all this to please the United States.

No one reviewing ancient or modern history can find an example of agency or treachery greater than this.

This brings us back to the issue of the veiled colonization of the Islamic countries. No sensible person can disagree that the Saudi government is a cover for the colonialists. Colonialism is manifested in the economy, in the military bases in the country, in political decision-making, and in international relations. Veiled colonialism has reached a point unmatched by direct colonialism. It reached the point of violating honors and removing the education of girls from the authority of the religious department at the orders of the United States, as Al-Faysal said. The 11 September events were not the reason for the Americanization of the system; it only accelerated it, as Bandar Bin-Sultan said.

Could The United States have obtained 1 percent of these interests if it had tried to occupy Saudi Arabia militarily and rallied the Muslims in the entire world?

Was it not better for it to install someone in its place to achieve all its interests?

This was a brief review of the situation in Saudi Arabia. The same--if not worse--is taking place in the other Muslim countries. Look at what is happening in Yemen, Egypt, Kuwait, and other Muslim countries. You can see various pictures of subserviency and treachery that have one thing in common: finding different ways to fight God and his prophet.

One of the important principles observed by veiled colonialism was establishing states combining the largest possible number of Islamic contradictions. They govern by ungodly laws, pay allegiance to The United States and the Crusader countries, turn for justice to the international body in all their cases, embrace the infidels and help them against the Muslims, turn against the religion, pursue the mujahidin, spread evil and atheism and defend them with troops and laws, and participate with The United States and the Crusader countries in their war against the honors, religion, people, and country.

The ruler of a country is the one that has the authority in it. Unless he is an atheist, he can rule even if he lacked the shari'ah conditions, as Shaykh al-Islam Ibn-Taymiyah maintained in the Minhaj al-Sunnah and elsewhere. A ruler who represents lack of sovereignty, reflects subserviency, pays primary attention to the interests of the enemy of the nation, disregards the shari'ah intentions and the interests of his people when they contradict the desires of the enemy

of God, his apostle, and his believers is an agent without authority, according to jurisprudence. The real ruler is the Crusader United States. The subserviency of such rulers is no different from the subserviency of the amirs or governors of provinces to the king or the president. The rule of the agent is the rule of the one who made him his agent. Fighters really will be fighting those who put them in this position and made them rulers over the Muslims.

Direct Colonialism:

In view of the above, there is no doubt that to the colonialists, veiled colonialism was better than all other forms of colonialism and the best means for achieving their interests. Therefore, no country is free of it today. The colonialists are seeking to achieve their goals through veiled colonialism because of the strength of the Muslims and not because the enemies of Islam had renounced colonialism, which their religion and economic interests dictate.

However, the Jews--may God's curse be upon them--became so arrogant they could not be satisfied with the veiled colonialism acceptable to the Crusader states. Their occupation of Muslim Palestine was based on an ideology they were unable to give up or abandon or else they would become apostates from Judaism, just as the Arab rulers have become apostates from Islam to which they are affiliated.

The Jewish occupation of the first qiblah used other masks to cover the occupation and many concepts associated with it.

The Palestinian issue became the issue of the Islamic World, the issue of every Muslim, and part of the religion that could not be separated from the Muslim conscience--and this is a fact.

The effort of the Zionist and agent media to neutralize the non-Arab Muslims by calling the Palestinian issue the Arab issue--and repetition has a great effect in falsifying awareness and concealing facts--made every non-Arab Muslim disinterested in the Palestinian issue. Instead of Palestine being their "cause," it became a "cause that they sympathized with and attracted some of their attention." It became the "cause of the Arab Muslims with whom they sympathized and who received part of their attention."

The trumpets of Zionism then focused on the confrontation states and tried constantly to make the Palestinian issue a central issue for Syria, Lebanon, and Jordan and make it an important issue for other Arabs, but not for them.

The Jewish intrigue reached its climax with the establishment of a Palestinian entity to fulfill the role of direct colonialism in areas that were not under Jewish occupation because of the fierce resistance and heroism of the mujahidin in them, like the Gaza Strip.

The establishment of a Palestinian state removed the issue from the hands of the confrontation states. They established a state with an agent government headed by the most despicable agent in history: Yasir Arafat, who will receive what he deserves from God. The issue became secondary to the confrontation states. Attention was focused on the Palestinian state and its leadership. This was accompanied by some acting roles, the latest being the famous siege on Yasir Arafat.

When a Palestinian leadership assumed power and people started looking to it as the official mouthpiece of the Palestinian cause, the Palestinian leadership began playing its despicable

historic role, which is to perpetuate colonialism and change the view and treatment of the usurping Israeli entity. It launched a peace process and established coexistence with Zionism as an established fact and as a neighbor with whom it must deal on this basis, even as it was killing Muslims everywhere and at any time.

When the relationship with Israel was hostile, the efforts of Zionism were focused on neutralizing the enemy and confining the confrontation to the least number of Muslim countries. However, when the relationship turned into a relationship of peace, Israel sought to export the peace to the other countries. It began entering one Arab state after another. Initiatives for peace and capitulation were launched. Abdallah Bin-Abd-al-Aziz [the Saudi crown prince] launched his famous initiative to normalize the relations with the Zionist enemy and sell the issue cheaply and, in fact, without anything in return except to continue his subserviency. Shaykh Nasir Bin-Hamad al-Fahd--may God release him from prison--published his book then, entitled "Clarifying the Dangers of Normalization to Muslims." This is a valuable book dealing with the primary issue of the Muslims with unique shari'ah documentation.

It is important to know that the colonialist enemy might give up veiled colonialism and establish, through its armies, explicit colonialism when there is little fear of resistance or the agent leadership could not achieve the interests of colonialism or had deviated--even in a small way--from its hegemony. For this reason, the United States chose to invade Iraq militarily and might choose to invade any Muslim country near or far from Iraq at any time.

The situation of the armies in the agent Islamic states clearly confirms that they almost cannot resist an aggression, particularly an American aggression, because of improper ideological and religious education of the troops and their military preparedness.

The Situation of the Army of the Saudi Government:

There is a special importance to Saudi Arabia. Besides being the subject of this book, it is the cradle and bastion of Islam and the region from which the first conquerors set out.

The sensitivity of its situation demands that this country have a strong army, just as all Muslim countries, as the Almighty said, "Against them make ready your strength to the utmost of your power, including steeds of war, to strike terror into (the hearts of) the enemies of God and your enemies, and others besides, whom ye may not know, but whom God doth know."

As for the army of the government of Saudi Arabia, the government has spent huge sums of money over many years on the pretext of equipping it with weapons. However, when the country felt the danger of Saddam, the rulers of Saudi Arabia simply announced that the army was unable to defend the country. They allowed the American Crusader armies--in the first precedent in the history of this blessed region of the world--to enter the country and establish fortified bases on the pretext of defending the country. There is no doubt that every occupier defends the country it occupies and exploits its resources for its own benefit, and this is what happened.

The small state of Israel, which has a population of no more than six million people, has an army of more than one million soldiers, and all men able to carry arms are in the reserves. However, in Saudi Arabia, the army is the smallest and weakest in terms of armament, men, equipment, and preparedness to defend our religion and honor.

The defense treaty with the United States prevents the army from procuring weapons except from the United States and its allies. Purchasing Chinese missiles has even become tantamount to disobedience and offense to the American patron.

The American presence in sensitive positions in the army command and American intervention in the country's affairs are no longer a secret. No command and control center in any sector, whether the navy, air force, or army, is without American officers. American technicians also are present in various highly secret sectors, such as in the AWACS [Airborne Warning and Control System] aircraft and satellite communication centers. They are providing abundant information to Israel, which is keen on maintaining its military superiority, because the areas covered by the Saudi AWACS aircraft are within its range of interest. They are also present in other sensitive military sectors, including radar control centers.

The radar system in Saudi Arabia is unique. The equipment in the Kingdom is used only in the United States, Israel, and the Kingdom. All the activities in the Saudi army depend on this radar system, which American satellites can operate much easier than humans in Saudi military bases can.

More clearly, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia can fire Chinese-made strategic missiles at Israel, but the United States can control the missile after it is launched the same way it can control any American missile fired from Sultan Base. The United States can guide this missile to hit any vital installation in Riyadh.

The intention here is not to exaggerate the American strength. The United States can do this not because of its strength, but because of the subserviency of the leadership of Saudi Arabia. If any country can run the radar equipment, the AWACS reconnaissance aircraft, and the air, land, and sea command and control centers, it can occupy a country whenever it wants, and this is exactly what the United States is doing in Saudi Arabia.

The above should not prevent us from drawing attention to all the shari'ah violations and contradictions in totally depending on Western systems in the army. These include such abominations as allowing military law and not God to be the judge, the polytheist method of standing up for the royal anthem, and the military salute, which includes beating the ground with the feet and saluting the rank and not the one who carries it, and copying Western laws shamelessly. If a military rank were placed on a dog, you must salute it, because it is a "royal decree," as they call it. Scholars have written about this, warning against and criminalizing such practices, beginning with the Shaykh Muhammad Bin-Ibrahim--God bless his soul--several contemporary scholars who are being held in prison, and the council of senior ulema, the official fatwa council of the Saudi government. Nevertheless, the situation has remained the same without any change. Is this an army destined to strive in the way of God? Is this an army to be depended upon, after God, in dangerous and gloomy times?

This and other things clearly show that the army was not created to defend the country and carry out the inevitable duty of liberating the Muslim holy places. If people have forgotten about the cause of the Muslims in Palestine and about defending the oppressed Muslims in the entire world, have they forgotten the enemy laying in wait for them who does not find a deterrent in a country if he wanted to occupy it anytime? No one can excuse himself by depending on God. God on whom you want to depend has said to you, "Against them make ready your strength to the utmost of your power, including steeds of war, to strike terror into (the hearts of) the enemies of God and your enemies." He is the one who also said, "Then fight in God's cause--

thou art held responsible only for thyself--and rouse the believers. It may be that God will restrain the fury of the unbelievers; for God is the strongest in might and in punishment."

CHAPTER TWO: What Is the Solution?

Earlier, we discussed the situation in the Islamic World, which has been colonized through the agent governments and directly by its enemy. We talked about its bleeding wounds. We went into some length in explaining aspects of the situation, because the Riyadh events had revealed some ignorance or indifference about the situation of the Muslim nation and showed a desire to maintain the miserable situation for fear of losing something on this earth or fear of some tribulation that God couples with jihad. The hypocrites have never been exposed in the history of Islam as they have been during these events.

We also explained some of the American crimes against the Muslims. Even if religion did not urge us to fight the United States, its crimes are sufficient to move us to seek justice. Even if religion and manhood did not demand it, logic and a rational view of the situation demands that we deter the enemy as much as possible and not wait until he occupies the land, eliminate our religion, and violate our honor. In reviewing history, we cannot find a nation that did not fight and defend its sanctities by force, urge its people to do that, and glorify its fighters.

The Muslim countries range between those occupied by military armies that shed the blood of their people every day, violate their honor, and commit crimes that no Muslim would accept for his Muslim brother and countries colonized through agent local governments, which carefully carry out the plans of colonialism that the colonialists themselves are unable carry out.

The Muslim countries, which are in this state, need the jihad more than water or food, because jihad is the shari'ah solution. It is the duty of every Muslim.

People might disagree today on which of the two parties should be the subject of their jihad: the apostate agent traitors or the colonialist enemies. There should be no disagreement between rational people that the jihad is the solution and treatment to this and that.

The Prophet--God's prayers and peace be upon him--said that the jihad will continue until the end of days. A group of people in this nation is fighting in the cause of God, not disturbed by those who disappoint or contradict it and determined to fight the charlatans to the last man. If this painful situation and this flagrant Zionist-Crusader aggression is not the field of battle for this group of people, then when, where, and how will it be?

The almighty God has ordered us to fight the infidels who are fighting us. He ordered us to fight the infidels as they fight us. If what they are doing today by fighting us does not demand that we fight them, then when, where, and how will it be?

God has ordered us to fight in His cause and rally the people to stop the oppression of the unbelievers. The oppression of the United States, Israel, their patrons, and their allies falls into this category and demands that we fight them to end their oppression. If we do not do this, then when, where, and how should we do it?

The Almighty God enjoins us to fight to satisfy the believers. He said, "Fight them, and God will punish them by your hands, cover them with shame, help you (to victory) over them, heal the breasts of believers, and still the indignation of their hearts." If this indignation in the hearts of

the believers does not motivate them to fight the aggression of the infidels, then when, where, and how will it be?

There is no sense in what some people say about qualification for the duty of jihad. There is no disagreement that jihad is a duty of everyone. Only very few people are engaged in the jihad. All religious scholars believe it is a duty and those who do not fulfill it should be incriminated. Otherwise, what does it mean being a duty if a person who ignores it is not incriminated?

We must not neglect this great duty on the pretext that this is the duty of the mujahidin. If this is the duty of the mujahidin, the duty of the non-mujahidin is to become mujahidin. Where is the distinction among the Muslims in God's words, "God hath purchased of the believers their persons and their goods; for theirs (in return) is the Garden (of Paradise): they fight in His cause and slay and are slain: a promise binding on Him in Truth, through the Law, the Gospel, and the Qur'an: and who is more faithful to his Covenant than God? Then rejoice in the bargain which ye have concluded: that is the achievement supreme."

While your brother mujahidin in the al-Qa'ida Organization are keen to unite the jihad and praise the Almighty God for the big steps made in this respect, they confess that they are just a group of Muslims seeking to fulfill God's commandment to struggle in His cause. They do not compel anyone to work with the army of the al-Qa'ida Organization in this respect. They do not favor a mujahid with al-Qa'ida over another or show its loyalty or partisanship toward him. Every Muslim and every mujahid on every front is our brother in religion and jihad and has the right to receive support and help. A Muslim is the brother of a Muslim; he does not do injustice to him, disappoint him, or surrender him.

While the al-Qa'ida Organization is fighting in defense of the nation, it is not fighting on behalf of the nation. A Muslim cannot disregard the duty of jihad because he cannot join the al-Qa'ida Organization. Any Muslim earnestly seeking the jihad and is unable to join any jihadi fronts, after making every effort as if he was searching for an excellent doctor to treat a dreadful disease of a loved one, he is forgiven by God. He would be like those about whom God said, "Nor (is there blame) on those who came to thee to be provided with mounts, and when thou said, I can find no mounts for you, they turned back, their eyes streaming with tears."

Repulsing aggression by fighting the infidels is clear in the Koran. It is also a logical duty and a fact in history. Only through force and might, nations were able to repulse their enemies.

Have the Mujahidin Known Their Enemy?

When the mujahidin went out to fight in the cause of God against the Zionist-Crusader alliance represented by the United States, they assessed the enemy from all aspects.

Our enemy is the United States, which was one of the two superpowers in the world and then became the sole superpower in this period in history. It sought to complete its domination of the world by imposing American culture, the values of American society, and aspects of the corrupt life in the United States. It also sought forcefully to impose a system on the countries of the world similar to the systems governments impose on individuals. It is moving earnestly to Americanize the entire world, particularly the Muslim World.

The backbone of this strong enemy is its economic strength. The United States was able to survive through this economic strength and to bring down the Soviet Union. This US strength is manifested in two aspects:

First: The intrinsic strength of the country used in building huge projects, undertaking research, and promoting advanced industries to survive and achieve prosperity for the American people. The United States regards prosperity as one of the most important elements in shaping American society.

Second: Dominating other countries, subduing them to American policy, and enlisting them in the effort to secure American interests by using the economic weapon. To do this, the United States provides grants to some countries, forgives their debts, as with Egypt, terrorizes them by threatening to impose economic sanctions on them and by imposing economic blockade as happened in Iraq, Sudan, and Afghanistan.

One of the most important tools to control countries of the world was the World Trade Agreement project, which was the hanging rope for the economic independence of any state and its liberation from American hegemony. However, this project failed, thank God, after the heroes hit the Trade Towers in the 11 September operation.

The economy, which is the source of American strength, depends on the following pillars:

- Advanced technology
- Freedom
- Security

The successive attacks of the mujahidin have undermined the American economy and the sources of its strength. The 11 September blow led to a loss of three trillion dollars within one week. Losses are continuing because of its effects. The Center for Studies will issue a study about "the distortion of American losses," which will provide a detailed economic report about the situation in the United States.

As we have noticed, the United States has begun unwillingly to abandon its principles. It gave a free hand to espionage and violated its commitment to maintain individual rights. It restricted the freedoms of investors and account holders with many regulations as a precaution against terrorism. Its economy has lost security and capital has fled. Other capital stopped flowing into the country. The shares of American companies and corporations declined in world stock exchanges. Companies reduced their research and development investments. The three pillars of the American economy are quickly collapsing.

Regarding the American army, the mujahidin have tested it in many fields. The mujahidin gained experience in fighting the biggest power in the world then, the army of the Soviet Union. Whoever was engaged in the two wars can confirm that there is no comparison between the two armies. The United States superiority is in its air power only, and air power, as everyone knows, cannot decide a war. Advancing in enemy territory is impossible without ground forces. Although the US ground forces are strong technologically and in air support, their strength is inconsistent with the power of the United States and its international reputation. In all its history, the United States has not waged a successful ground war and has not depended on ground forces in battles in a large way. Its greatest strength was air power.

Air power can be neutralized in many fields. It is useless in jungle warfare, as in the Philippines. Therefore, it withdrew quickly after it tried to attack the mujahidin in the Philippines. Tunnels in mountains are also very effective in reducing the effects of air power in a war. Air power is ineffective in urban areas, unless there are important installations or bases for ground forces.

In short, the United States does not have the power that matches its international position and reputation. It depends mostly on the principle of deterrence. In deterrence, it mostly depends on the media with which it has fascinated the nations of the world. For years, American television exported American culture to the world, portraying the United States as the superpower that cannot be defeated. The magicians of the modern day pharaoh were the media people. "They bewitched the eyes of the people, and struck terror into them: for they showed a great (feat of) magic." [Koran verse]

However, the media image of the United States was more flimsy than the ropes and canes of magicians. When the valiant soldiers of Islam came to them with the rod of Moses and the mujahidin poured their fire on them, the Americans withdrew from Somalia in an unexpected haste. They also withdrew from Aden within 24 hours after the mujahidin showed them hell with explosive charges. The heroes proved that the United States could not protect its military installations, which were supposed to be on constant alert against strikes like the one that took place against the destroyer Cole. This gave the green light for attacking the United States at home, and thus the blessed 11 September operation took place. The attacks by the mujahidin against the United States and its interests in the world continued. They faced threats everywhere and at anytime. The attacks made the world wake up from the nightmare and illusion of the huge and absolute American power. Some people have even given them divine descriptions.

The mujahidin knew their enemy well, praise be to God, when they decided to confront the United States, continue on this path, and move in every direction to achieve their objective. They knew the enemy's weaknesses. They attacked the pillars of American economy and American weak points. Had it not been for the enormous American information capability and the muscles the United States flexed in several areas to restore some of its prestige and restore some security to its markets, its economy would have collapsed much sooner. The United States is now on the verge of exhaustion and only needs a few blows, which are coming, God willing. God has prepared brave soldiers to bring down calamities on it.

Are jihadi operations permitted if they lead to military reactions?

Needless to say, an enemy with some power will respond if attacked. It is, in fact, stupid for anyone with some knowledge of history who knows the reality to raise such a question.

Martyr Shaykh Yusuf al-Ayiri, God bless his soul, responded to this question in details in "Questions about the New Crusader War."

If jihad elicits enemy response:

First: The Prophet--God's prayers and peace be upon him--wanted to attack Quraysh in the Badr operation. His goal was to hit the enemy militarily and economically. Let us consider this operation:

It was possible and indeed almost certain that when the Prophet--God's prayers and peace be upon him--decided to raid a Quraysh trade caravan, he knew that the response will be fierce,

because Quraysh did not tolerate attacks on its trade and economy. The facts confirm this. Quraysh mobilized its forces to defend that caravan. It came out with its cavalry to punish those who carried out the attack. Nevertheless, although the Prophet--God's prayers and peace be upon him--knew that, did he consider it an obstacle for the implementation of that operation?

The Uhud operation was, in fact, a reaction of Quraysh to the Badr operation. The Muslims suffered a tragedy in this operation. Did blame come down from heaven for the Muslims' haste in the Badr operation and for drawing the enemy to them?

The Muslims scored a victory in Badr. The response did not change the result. The same can be said about the Hunayn, Tabuk, and other operations.

Second: The logic that any jihadi action could elicit a violent reaction by the enemy could ultimately hamper many aspects of jihad, and even the jihad orally, in writing, in giving advice, and in enjoining what is good and forbidding what is evil.

Actions disliked by the atheists, ignorant, and opponents will always be met with a reaction by them that ranges between strong and weak. If the atheist enemy or ignorant opponent sensed that the believers are afraid of such reaction, he will spread alarm and ideological terror and encourage the instilment of this feeling to build a defensive wall that will cost him nothing more than media campaigns and other disciplinary actions to confirm that strong reaction.

Whoever accepts this logic will not support any action in Palestine, because the Jewish reaction is strong. There are daily examples of this. Every mujahidin operation in the holy land in which a Jew is killed or wounded had always been met with fierce reprisal, which probably left scores of casualties and caused Israel to make it hard for Palestinian workers to work.

Although the example here is Palestine, this applies to every act of "legitimate" resistance carried out by the Islamists or nationalists. They are similar to the 11 September actions, although not in terms of achievements.

This applies to the current Islamic jihad in Afghanistan against the forces of atheism and their allies. This is legitimate resistance by all standards and laws. Governments that support the Palestinian issue and legitimate resistance against the Jews should support it everywhere. What is permissible, legitimate, and supported against the Jews should be the same against those behind the Jews, the treacherous head of the Jewish snake.

Third: Why should we measure matters by their immediate apparent results? The best measurement is to assess the original action as to whether it met the conditions. It does not matter after that if the action did not achieve its goal.

Measuring actions by their results only is not something that the believers should be concerned about, because they know that results are in the hands of the Almighty God. His servant must only do his best. That includes learning from previous experience, consulting with experts, and then making a decision and depending on the Almighty God, as He said, "And consult them in affairs (of the moment). Then, when thou hast taken a decision, put thy trust in God, for God loves those who put their trust (in Him]." If a believer achieves his goal, this will be good, and if he fails, his reward will be in the hereafter. To say that because your action did not achieve the desired result or caused certain harm is wrong and reckless is incorrect in measurement and

weight. The Almighty God says, "If you judge, be fair." He also says, "Give just measure and weight, nor withhold from the people the things that are their due."

The Almighty God told his Prophet--God's prayers and peace be upon him--"All you have to do is relay the message." He said, "Whether We shall show thee (within thy life-time) part of what we promised them or take to ourselves thy soul (before it is all accomplished), thy duty is to make (the Message) reach them: it is our part to call them to account." The Almighty also said, "It is true thou wilt not be able to guide every one, whom thou lovest; but God guides those whom He will and He knows best those who receive guidance." There are many verses that the servant should do what he is ordered to do and not be blamed for the outcome."

If a Muslim is defeated, killed someone, or taken prisoner, this is part of the jihad, and should not be considered a mistake as long as it is based on sound principles.

The Almighty says, "So lose not heart, nor fall into despair; for ye must gain mastery if ye are true in faith. If a wound hath touched you, be sure a similar wound hath touched the others. Such days (of varying fortunes) we give to men and men by turns that God may know those that believe, and that He may take to Himself from your ranks martyr-witnesses (to truth), and God loves not those that do wrong. God's object also is to purge those that are true in faith and to deprive of blessing those that resist faith."

All this is part of the rules of jihad and the will of Almighty God. Why should we subtract all this in quick temporal victory?

God willing, we will dwell further on all these verses from Surat Al Umran because of their great meanings, which might be overlooked.

Perhaps some people when they hear reports that some mujahidin or their families were killed or some of the families faced harm, shelling, and displacement they become sorry and sad and perhaps forget some of the above meanings and fall in a trap they have no control over.

Yes, our hearts are filled with sorrow and pain when we hear that a brother or sister was hurt. However, in no way we must forget the clear meaning of these Koran and Hadith verses, to which we must adhere. The afflictions they suffer are the will of God. Martyrdom and afflictions are the means by which we are tested and elevated and through which we give pride to Islam.

Women were involved in the jihad with the Prophet--God's prayers and peace be upon him, although there was a possibility they would be taken prisoners or killed. In the Sahih Muslim, Umran Bin-Hasin, relates a story about a Muslim woman taken prisoner.

We give the good tidings to the Muslims that there are female mujahidin raised to face any possibility, after seeking the help of the Almighty God. We pray to God to protect them and increase their strength and steadfastness.

Therefore, any Muslim striving in the cause of God must educate himself to tolerate changes and to take into consideration all possibilities. A Muslim should have faith, depend on God, and have some knowledge to survive in misfortunes.

One of the examples in this respect is that an Arab sister in Kandahar asked her husband to swear by God that if he embarked on a martyrdom operation he would take her with him to help

him in the jihad and attain martyrdom together in the cause of God. A bomb dropped by the patron of peace and defender of human rights killed both of them. May God gather them with the martyrs, amen.

If this is the affair of the believers, one of the characteristics of others is that they underestimate the results and blame the people and the actions that produced them.

The Almighty says, "O ye who believe! Be not like the unbelievers, who say of their brethren, when they are traveling through the Earth or engaged in fighting: If they had stayed with us, they would not have died, or been slain. This that God may make it a cause of sighs and regrets in their hearts. It is God that gives Life and Death, and God sees well all that ye do." He also says, "(They are) the ones that say, (of their brethren slain), while they themselves sit (at ease): If only they had listened to us they would not have been slain. Say: Avert death from your own selves, if ye speak the truth." The Almighty also says, "There are certainly among you men who would tarry behind; if a misfortune befalls you, they say: God did favor us in that we were not present among them. But if good fortune comes to you from God, they would be sure to say--as if there had never been ties of affection between you and them--Oh! I wish I had been with them; a fine thing should I then have made of it!"

Previous Operations against American Targets:

Al-Qa'ida's declaration of war against the Zionist-American alliance was a statement confirmed by deeds. The mujahidin of al-Qa'ida launched successive operations against the United States and its interests. The following is a list of the jihadi operations carried out by or attributed to the al-Qa'ida Organization. Some excerpts are quoted from the article of Abu-Ubayd al-Qirshi, may God grant him success, entitled "The 11 September Operation: An Impossibility that Had Become Possible."

- Somalia:

After the second Gulf War, American forces came to Somalia and killed 13,000 Muslims. Then, the lions of Islam, the Afghan Arabs, and their brothers challenged them on that land. They trampled their pride in the mud, killed some of them, destroyed some of their tanks and installations, and shot down some of their aircraft. The United States and its allies then fled under the cover of darkness. Thanks and praise be to God.

The battle of Somalia was the first battle in which the mujahidin faced the United States. In this battle, the mujahidin learned the truth about the American army and tested its strength. They learned aspects of its combat plans. The myth of its mighty army collapsed before a small group of mujahidin. The guerrilla warfare experiment in Somalia was the most successful except for the problem of the shortage of water.

The Somalia battle convinced several leaders of the jihad about the possibility of confronting the United States and clarified the significance of the American army in the balance of power.

- Aden:

In Aden, the young mujahidin planted some explosive charges for the American army, creating alarm and terror among the Americans and forcing them to leave in defeat within 24 hours, praise be to God.

- Kenya and Tanzania:

In 1418 AH, following successive threats by the mujahidin to the United States and demands that it stop harming the Muslims in Palestine and withdraw its armies from the land of the Two Holy Mosques, Usama declared that he would hit the United States within weeks. The Americans prepared themselves for such a strike. However, the attack occurred in a place they did not expect or take into consideration. The mujahidin dealt two big blows to its embassies in Kenya and Tanzania, in east Africa, with two trucks loaded with explosives.

By the two operations, the jihadi elements proved that they have the logistic, technical, and human capabilities to carry out special complex operations. They were able to use the element of surprise to the maximum. They were also able to coordinate between the two operations and use huge destructive power.

- The Destroyer Cole:

In an unprecedented attack, God granted success to the mujahidin in attacking the American destroyer Cole. The presence of this destroyer near a Muslim country was a military aggression, tantamount to a declaration of war. American military media described it as a destroyer that cannot be destroyed.

The Cole operation took place in October 2000. The destroyer weighed 8600 tons and carried a crew of 350 seamen. Its price was more than one billion dollars. The mujahidin blew up a gap in it ranging between 6 and 12 meters in diameter. The explosion caused serious damage inside the destroyer, killed 17 American seamen, and wounded more than 30 others. A boat loaded with explosives rammed the destroyer, and the entire operation did not cost more than \$10,000.

The destruction of the destroyer Cole destroyed the American military myth. It was also a clear statement about the subserviency of the Yemeni Government, which supported the presence of such a force in a Muslim country. The Yemeni Government pursued those who carried out the operation. The agent Saudi Government joined it in pursuing suspects and handing them over. The time of the agents is coming, God willing.

- Al-Khubar:

In 1417 AH, an American housing complex in Al-Khubar was blown up, killing 19 Americans and wounding about 400 others, according to the American and agent media, but the number was much larger than this.

- New York:

The Cole operation was the real test for US capability, and could be considered the prelude to the blessed 11 September operation (the Manhattan Operation). Talking about this operation will require many volumes. It has continued to preoccupy the world since it was carried out and will continue to do so until the world becomes occupied with another story very soon, God willing.

- Post-11 September Operations:

Before 11 September, al-Qa'ida operations took place at the rate of one major operation every two years. However, after this date, God opened the jihad door and the average became two or more operations per year. Because of the enormity of the "Manhattan Operation," most people have not paid attention to the increased operations after it. This is because no similar huge operations have taken place until now. We pray to God to support the mujahidin and grant them success in their jihad.

The 11 September operation was followed by several operations about which statements were issued at the time. The latest was the blessed Riyadh operation. We pray to God to grant success to the mujahidin everywhere, make them aim right, increase the damage of their explosives on their enemy, and facilitate their paths to strike the enemy at his vital centers.

A book has been published about the blessed operation entitled "[The 11 September Operation](#)."

CHAPTER THREE: Why Riyadh?

Although many jihad lovers and mujahidin supported the bombing incidents against the United States and its interests in other countries, they have been surprised or have denounced the bombing incident in Riyadh. Here we want to respond to the question asked by many of them: Why Riyadh?

In answering this question, we must state that many things in many jihadi operations should remain secret, either temporarily until the mujahidin achieve the purpose for which they carried them out or permanently because they affect some military secrets regarding the type of mujahidin operations and pertain to the way they choose their targets.

Nevertheless, the amount of information we can reveal regarding every operation is sufficient to give the reader an idea and conviction about the operation, if he is unselfish and was seeking the truth and the interest of Islam.

A person who wonders why this operation was carried out in Riyadh should consider the shari'ah texts that command the Muslims to fight all polytheists. The Almighty God says, "And fight the polytheists all together as they fight you all together." He also says, "But when the forbidden months are past, then fight and slay the pagans wherever ye find them, and seize them, beleaguer them, and lie in wait for them." God has legitimized the fight against the infidels everywhere without exception. Action against the enemies of God is based on texts. The Americans were in Riyadh so we killed them in Riyadh.

We must also understand that the al-Qa'ida Organization has adopted a strategy in its war with the Americans based on expanding the battlefield and exhausting the enemy, who spread his interests over the globe, with successive and varied blows. The average strikes before 11 September was one every two years. However, after the blessed Manhattan Operation, the rate increased to two operations per year. Expanding the battlefield has invaluable benefits. The enemy, who needed to protect his country only, realized that he needed to protect his huge interests in every country. The more diversified and distant the areas in which operations take place the more exhausting it becomes for the enemy, the more he needs to stretch his resources, and the more he becomes terrified.

This strategy might cause some Muslims to endure some of the damage to protect the Muslim nation. This happens anytime and in every jihad. The Afghan people have endured war for many

years by taking a stand against the communist invasion, which intended to occupy other countries, including Saudi Arabia. The Soviet Union had indeed established a foothold in the southern Arabian Peninsula represented in the defunct communist government in South Yemen.

Even the agent states act according to this principle and endure war, but not for the benefit of Islam. They endure it for their own benefit or the interests of the United States or for some nationalist interests. Because some Muslims benefit from it is secondary to the leaders that make the war decision. Iraq was involved in war against Iran. All the countries in the region supported it in this war, because they had a common interest in it. The people of the country of the Two Holy Mosques, or what is called Saudi Arabia, tolerated living in the atmosphere of the war and endured its effects. They endured the danger of the Iraqi army, which was then considered the fifth strongest army in the world, for the benefit of Kuwait. The Saudi government is now making the people pay for its campaign against the mujahidin under the name of the war against terrorism. The government imposed strict military measures in the country. Its excuse was that damage is inevitable to achieve the interests of the people. Is it not more worthy for the people to endure some damage for the sake of the supreme religious interests than to bear that to entrench the positions of the rulers and agents?

If the people knew this, then there is no sense in the question: Why the operation was not carried out in a place other than Riyadh?

Because operations are possible outside Riyadh does not mean we should cancel a possible operation in Riyadh. Your al-Qa'ida brother mujahidin are striving with God's help and fighting the Americans in Afghanistan and Iraq. They are preparing operations against the United States everywhere, which you will see and hear about soon, God willing.

Every Muslim should have a broader outlook than the narrow region in which he lives. As long as an operation in Riyadh is sanctioned by the shari'ah, is possible, and would be successful in military calculations, we must carry out this successful operations enjoined by the shari'ah. Whoever asks why in Riyadh should ask himself--if he was honest--why in Chechnya, why in Kabul, why in Jerusalem, why in Bali, and why in Mombassa. These countries are ruled by agent Karzai-type rulers and occupied by Americans or Jews who are considered infidels and untrustworthy in God's book.

Opponents of this operation who speak in the name of the "internal front" have made it clear that they are not talking about Islam in general or about the interests of the Muslims everywhere. They are speaking in the name of the internal front, within the political borders, and ignoring the interests of all Muslims. Even if they paid attention to these interests, they are putting the interest of the "internal front" ahead of the general interest of the Muslim people. Anyone with such claims should keep silent when those who shoulder the burdens of the nation speak and sacrifice their blood to keep the word of God supreme.

If we should remove the Americans from the Muslim countries in accordance with the correct and explicit texts that enjoin us to fight the aggressor infidels, we should remove them from the Arabian Peninsula in particular, because this is what our Prophet--God's prayers and peace be upon him--commanded us to do after his death. By God, no commandment deserves more consideration and implementation than the commandment of our beloved Prophet Muhammad--God's prayers and peace be upon him.

If the Muslim countries in general are more pure and honorable than to be desecrated by the Crusaders, the most honorable and the purest of them all, the country of the Two Holy Mosques, is more deserving to be cleansed. Removing the Crusaders and cleansing the country are our most important duty.

Removing the Americans from Saudi Arabia is a definite duty. However, removing them becomes a greater duty when they use Saudi Arabia as a Crusader base and launch the third crusade from it against the Muslim country of Afghanistan, kill the Muslims in Iraq, and defend Israel's security against its enemies.

The Crusader bases exist everywhere in the country. The Sultan Base in Al-Kharj, built as a command and control center for American operations, was used in the US war on Afghanistan. There is also the Tabuk Base from which they launched air operations against Baghdad and the Ar'ar Base from which American ground forces set out to occupy Iraq. They exist east and west of Saudi Arabia.

Is it not appropriate for the mujahidin, who see that the Saudi government is preventing them from going to Iraq, blocking all exits, and jailing those who try to go to support their brothers, and who see that aircraft are taking off from Saudi Arabia to kill Muslims in their country--is it not appropriate for them to attack their Crusader enemy and his interests where it is possible? Would this not be the least of their duty and the least expected of them?

The East Riyadh Operation:

On 11 Rabi al-Awwal 1424 AH [corresponding to 12 May 2003], a group of Muslim youths attacked Crusader complexes in eastern Riyadh in one of the most powerful operations. Some American officials admitted that this was a commando operation carried out with careful planning.

The attacks targeted three American complexes. The first was the complex of the American intelligence Vinyl Company, one of the largest and most obscure intelligence companies in the world. The second was the Al-Hamra housing complex in Gharnatah [Seville]. The third was the Jadawil complex.

These operations caused great damage to the Crusaders, praise be to God, and shuffled the cards of the American officials. They reminded the Americans that they would never dream of security until the Muslims can live in security in Palestine and until all the Crusader armies leave the peninsula of Muhammad--God's prayers and peace be upon him.

The East Riyadh operation was a link in the long chain of war against the Crusaders waged by your brothers, the al-Qa'ida mujahidin, in Afghanistan, Iraq, and other places. The mujahidin are carrying out significant operations against American interests wherever they exist. The first stage of this war culminated in the Manhattan Operation on 11 September, and God willing, it will result in operations that will bring joy to every believer.

As we explained earlier, this war is based on a strategy to widen the battlefield. The entire world has become a battlefield in practice and not in theory. They cannot ensure that another operation will not take place in a country where an operation had taken place against the Americans before. The Americans could also become a target to create lasting terror among

them in a country in which the mujahidin have not carried out operations, as the shaykh of the mujahidin, Usama Bin Ladin--may God support him--has pledged.

Since the 11 September operation, no months have passed without the Americans being the target of a painful blow and a terrifying attack. With God's help, they will not feel secure anywhere in the world, particularly in Saudi Arabia.

Facts About the Operation:

The Nineteen Wanted Men:

The Seville raid preceded the Riyadh operation. Three mujahidin were raided during it, but all escaped, thank God.

The Interior Ministry hastened to issue a statement accompanied by the pictures of nineteen men whose pictures had been circulated in certain ministries sometime before the Seville incident. One should bear in mind that they were group of mujahidin united only by their being fighters against United States known for the damage they had caused to unbelievers. They were wanted by the FBI long before the incident. Three religious scholars wrote a statement revealing the true story of the nineteen, and the late Shaykh Yusuf al-'Ayiri refuted the story with a number of proofs in a statement. We shall attach the text of these two statements. I. The Statement of Sheikhs Nasir al-Fahd, 'Ali al-Khudayr, and Ahmad al-Khalidi:

In the Name of God, the Merciful, the Compassionate

Praise be to God, the Lord of the Worlds, and blessings and peace be upon our Prophet, Muhammad, his family, and all his companions. To proceed:

A group of brothers have asked us about the names and pictures published of the nineteen mujahidin and what has been said about them, the position to be taken regarding this, and what we know about them.

Our response: Praise be to God, the Lord of the Worlds, and blessings and peace be upon our Prophet, Muhammad, his family, his companions, and those who take him as their friend. To proceed: God the Exalted has enjoined justice, fairness, and honesty, and He has forbidden calumny and injury. He has said: "And those who hurt believing men and believing women, without that they have earned it, have laid upon themselves calumny and manifest sin." (Koran 33:58). It is documented in the Sahih from Abu-Hurayrah that the Messenger of God, God's prayers and peace be upon him, said: "Be servants of God, brothers. A Muslim is the brother of a Muslim; he does not wrong him, he does not abandon him, and he does not despise him. The fear of God lies here." (He pointed three times to his breast.) "Sufficient evil it is for someone to despise his Muslim brother. The whole of a Muslim is forbidden to a Muslim: his blood, his property, and his honor." Another tradition from Abu-Hurayrah is that the Prophet said: "One believer is the other's mirror, and one believer is the other's brother: he prevents him from suffering loss and he protects him." The texts on the subject are many, and we therefore have written this statement to clear our conscience and give sincere advice to the Ummah. And so we say:

First: We know some of those whose names and pictures have been published. They are excellent mujahidin in the Way of God, god-fearing, righteous men. Thus we deem them, and we

vindicate no one against God. They are men who have given of themselves, their property, and their blood for God the Exalted. They engaged in the jihad against the malevolent Crusaders in Afghanistan and scored noteworthy deeds of bravery and heroism in the battles of the Tora Bora Mountains. The vengeful took revenge on them only because they waged war on God's enemies. God has said: "They took revenge on them only because they believed in the All-mighty, the All-laudable." (Koran 85:8).

Second: God rescued these mujahidin from the Crusaders and their helpers, thanks be to God, so that the latter were unable to do away with them in Afghanistan or to seize them when they departed thence, although the Crusaders distributed their pictures and names to their lackeys as soon as the battles of Tora Bora ended.

Third: These mujahidin, who offered what they possessed in service to God's religion, who gave their lives in the Way of God, and who scored noteworthy deeds of bravery ought to be the pride of every Muslim. The sad fact is that when they returned from the land of jihad, the world shut its heart to them. They were greeted with frowns. Prison camps were opened for them. They were subjected to terrible torture. They were either killed, imprisoned, made fugitives, or persecuted. Jihad became a crime; the mujahid became a terrorist. Accusations were heaped on them, and they were subjected to calumny -- God help us!

Fourth: The Investigation Bureau long ago distributed their pictures and names to the police in response to American demands for their arrest. When the forces of the police proved unable to do so, they decided to exploit this alleged operation -- we do not know about its truth -- to publish their pictures to the public, so as to enlist the rest of the Muslims in the crime of pursuing and arresting the mujahidin in the service of the Crusade.

Fifth: These mujahidin are too god-fearing and pious to kill a Muslim, wreck the homes or establishments of Muslims, terrorize them, or violate their families, property, or honor. How could they do so when they have given their lives only to defend Muslims against the Crusader enemy? The attempt to bring such charges against them is a vile act -- God help us!

Sixth: This having become clear, we say to all Muslims that it is utterly forbidden to abandon these mujahidin, take a stand against them, mar their reputation, give aid against them, report them, publish their pictures, or pursue them. Doing these things in fact means helping the Americans, who are doing all they can to arrest them and achieve their goals that they have not been able to achieve. Beware, my Muslim brother, of being an aide to the Crusaders against the mujahidin! Anyone who does anything of the sort has committed an outrage and aided sin and enmity. God has said: "Do not help each other to sin and enmity." (Koran 5:2). The Prophet, God's prayers and peace be upon him, said: "Help your brother, wronging or wronged" -- an accepted hadith transmitted through Jabir. The Sahih documents that Humam Ibn-al-Harith, may God have mercy on him, said: "A man used to relay conversations to the Commander. We were seated in the mosque. The men said, 'This is one of those who relay conversations to the Commander.' He came and sat with us. Hudhayfah, may God be pleased with him, said that he had heard the Prophet say, 'No talebearer will enter heaven.'" The Sahih documents that Abdallah Ibn-Umar, may God have mercy on him and on his father, said that the Prophet had said: "The Muslim is brother to the Muslim: he does not wrong him or betray him. Whoever satisfies his brother's need, God will satisfy his need. Whoever dispels a Muslim's grief, God will dispel his grief on the Day of Resurrection. Whoever covers a Muslim, God will cover him on the Day of Resurrection." Al-Bukhari transmits a hadith from Ibn 'Abbas, may God be pleased with him and with his father, that the Messenger of God preached to the people on the Day of Sacrifice, saying: "People, your blood, property, and honor are as inviolable to you as the

sacredness of this day in this territory of yours and this month." Having repeated it several times, he raised his head and said, "O God, have I communicated the message? O God have I communicated it?" Ibn-Abbas continued: "By Him who holds my life in his hand, that was his testament to his Ummah. Let those who were present tell those who were absent!" Among the hadiths transmitted by Ibn-Abbas is that the Prophet said: "Whoever covers the nakedness of his Muslim brother, God will cover his nakedness on the Day of Resurrection; and whoever uncovers the nakedness of his Muslim brother, God will uncover his nakedness so as to expose him for it in his own home." (Ibn-Majah included the hadith in his collection.) A hadith is transmitted from Abu-Hurayrah that the Messenger of God said: "Whoever helps in the killing of a believer with half a word will meet God the Mighty and Exalted with it written between his eyes that he has despaired of God's mercy." (Ibn-Majah included it in his Sunan in the chapter entitled, "Stern Warnings Against the Killing of Muslims." Ahmad Ibn-Hanbal also included it.) Jabir Ibn-Abdallah and Abu-Talhah Ibn-Sahl al-Ansari transmitted a hadith that the Prophet said: "Anyone who abandons a Muslim in a place where his sanctity is being violated and his honor demeaned, God will abandon him in a place where he wants God to help him. Anyone who helps a Muslim in a place where his honor is being demeaned and his sanctity violated, God will help him in a place where he wants His help." (This is included by Ahmad Ibn-Hanbal and Abu-Dawud.) A hadith is transmitted from Abu-Umamah Ibn-Sahl, who had it from his father, that the Prophet said: "He in whose presence a Muslim is humiliated and who does not help him, being able to help him, God will humiliate him before all creatures on the Day of Resurrection." (Ahmad Ibn-Hanbal included the hadith.) A hadith is transmitted from Imran Ibn-Husayn that the Prophet said: "Whoever helps his brother secretly, when he is able, God will help him in this world and the next." (The hadith is included by Al-Bazzar.) We fear God's punishment and vengeance against anyone who gives aid against them and abandons them; for they are God's friends, whom God and His Messenger love, and we likewise account them so. We can vindicate no one against God, for God will take vengeance for His friends. The Prophet said: "Whoever attacks a friend of mine, I have declared war on him." (Al-Bukhari includes it as a hadith transmitted by Abu-Hurayrah.) Yet -- God be praised! -- instead of standing with them and helping them against the Crusaders, the Muslims have been mustered against them! They are being described in the vilest terms, that they are terrorists! The media speak against them and slander them in terms they do not use against the tyrants of the United States who have burned much Islamic territory and killed many Muslims!

Seventh: We appeal to our brothers who are ulema, scholars, and preachers not to abandon them and to stand by them and explain the facts about them to the people. They cannot be silent while their brothers are being fought in this way. This is not a favor on their part; it is their duty.

Eighth: We ask our brothers to distribute this statement in all gathering places, to print it, duplicate it, and publish it in homes, mosques, markets, and everywhere in order to come to the aid of the victims of injustice and uphold their rights.

We ask God the All-praised to protect the mujahidin who fight in His Way. May He abandon those who abandon them and wrest away the protection of those who wrest away their protection. May He reward with the best of rewards those who protect their lives and defend them. May he give the best of Muslims charge over the Muslims and gladden us by aiding Islam and the Muslims; for He is the master of this and has power over it. May God bless our Prophet Muhammad, his family, and all his companions.

Ali Bin-Khudayr al-Khudayr, Nasir Bin-Hamad al-Fahd, Ahmad Bin-Hammud al-Khalidi

II. The Statement of the Shaykh and Martyr Yusuf al-'Ayiri:

Praise be to God, the Lord of the Worlds, and blessings and peace be upon the Imam of Mujahidin and leader of horses forehead-blazed and white-footed, the greatest of those who vied in patience and endured, the best of those who fought the jihad and were victorious; upon him be the best of blessings and fullest peace, and upon his family and all his companions.

To proceed:

From the Servant of God Yusuf Bin-Salih al-Ayiri to Muslims one and all:

I received news of the charge that the Interior Ministry fabricated against me and some of my brethren on Wednesday, 6 Rabi' I, 1424 [7 May 2003], when my picture was shown with some young people. They said that we were planning to commit a criminal act, as they termed it. I received the charge without amazement or surprise, for I had become used to such false charges in previous cases. As one of those wrongly and unjustly accused by the Interior Ministry in the case related to a number of young people, I am writing this letter to state what I hope will help clarify the truth, avert injustice, and stop those who have defiled our honor or insulted Islam or jihad on the basis of that false accusation. When I saw how our pictures were linked without evidence to the bombings, how we were accused in advance, and how a death sentence was pronounced against us by the Supreme Judiciary, the Board of Senior Ulema, and the Interior Ministry, I decided to write this letter to show the falseness of the charge and how we had no relation to it close or remote. Hopefully, this business will alert the unaware, bring back the straying, or deter the wrongdoer.

First: My brethren and I were glad that Muslims as a whole received the charge with disbelief and discovered some of the aspects of falsehood in the Interior Ministry's statement that brought this weighty charge against us. We were heartened by the expressions of rejection that we saw on the part of most Muslims of the cheap way in which the authorities aimed at achieving something greater than our arrest: namely, the liquidation of some mujahidin they had or the targeting of a larger sector of mujahidin and people of good will. This charge and the media campaign that followed the statement were contrived at night and had their effect. It is not unlikely that they may concoct another incident in order to draw the country into a bloody whirlpool that wreaks havoc and spares no one. We therefore warn Muslims of the effects and consequences of the charge if they do not publicly reject it and disapprove of it. Rather than condemning the accused before the charge is proved against them and they are heard from, their duty is to condemn and censure the actions of the Investigation Bureau, which is dragging the country into civil strife with these blatant conspiracies.

Second: The amount of falsification and lying in the Interior Ministry's statement has become clear to every informed person, thus confirming our innocence of what has been attributed to us. As only one example, the statement alleged that they found in the apartment "391 bars of a highly explosive plastic material." They showed on the screen some TNT in boxes. Anyone with the slightest amount of information about explosives knows that TNT is a solid, not a plastic. There is a difference between a plastic and a solid!

On the same day, a responsible source in the Interior Ministry told the newspapers, including Al-Sharq al-Awsat, that the high explosive that the statement mentioned was RDX. I say that this material is known to be a solid, crystalline substance. In addition to being solid, it is known to be the whitest of explosives. The material that was shown was yellow in color. There is a difference between yellow and white and between a plastic and a solid! Take note: if this indicates anything, it indicates that the statement was prepared away from the director's eyes. It was something concocted by night. Whoever wishes to ascertain this need only scrutinize the

statement and the officials' pronouncements that followed it to see that the wanted men had no connection to this incident. God help us!

Third: Strangely, the discovery of the apartment, or what they termed the thwarting of a major terrorist operation, took place on Tuesday afternoon, and the announcement came less than twenty-four hours later. This has never been the custom of the authorities, to issue a detailed and illustrated statement of any incident before twenty-four hours have passed since its occurrence. If such haste indicates anything, it indicates that the matter had been prepared previously. The strangest part is that the statement said: "The source stated that these terrorists had planned to carry out extensive sabotage. Their names were determined to be the following." We marvel at how quickly the names and pictures of all the suspects were obtained. How were the names and pictures determined during the pursuit? If they claim to have found the names and pictures in the alleged apartment, that is a lie. No rational person could imagine that a person wanted for more than a year could leave his picture or his name in an apartment full of explosives and weapons.

Fourth: As for me personally, no active connection links me to the people in the pictures that were displayed with my picture. The only link between me and them is the bond of belief in God's unity (tawhid) and jihad. I can only think that this was the real relationship; for they displayed pictures of youths not bound by a tie of terrorist activity, as they alleged, but bound by a single attribute, that of carrying on jihad against the Jews and Christians and of having been on the CIA's list for over a year.

Fifth: Some may ask: if they were not behind the terrorist operation that the government attributed to them, why are they being pursued?

I say that the reason we are being pursued is that the United States wants us. Immediately after the fall of Kabul, the United States sent a request for information about 141 names and aliases that had been obtained from the prisoners at Guantanamo during questioning supervised by a Saudi major general from the Investigation Bureau who headed the delegation assigned to Guantanamo to help the Americans in the questioning. The authorities were able to arrest some of them; others, having learned of the original request, decided to keep out of sight. I was among those who decided to do that. This request for me and many other brothers happened a year ago or a little more. Unable to determine our location and comply with the American request, which became more pressing after the fall of Baghdad, the authorities decided to enlist the help of the people to aid them. They fabricated this charge against us to justify publishing our pictures and names and announcing a reward for anyone who would give information about us. This request must have had a reason hidden from the people. The case was fabricated and inflated. The media were given free rein to magnify the crime so that it might be a strong motive for people to help apprehend us and give any information about us. The list, of course, was long; in subsequent days, sheikhs and businessmen were to be announced if they finished with this installment. This is what the Interior Ministry statement hinted at when, after enumerating our names, it said, "in addition to others who will be announced at the appropriate time." If, as the statement alleged, these others had participated with these (as the statement described them) "criminals," why was the announcement about them delayed, when, according to the statement, they were "a great danger to the country's security and people"? This only shows that the names had already been prepared some time earlier, that the incident had been fabricated, and that the list was long.

Sixth: I have seen what my brother, Ali Bin-Abd-al-Rahman al-Faq'asi al-Ghamidi, one of the accused in this open lie, wrote one day after the accusation. I confirmed the truth of the

ascription of the letter to him. I emphasize in this letter of mine what he said in his letter, that this blatant falsehood will not turn us from engaging in jihad against the Jews and Crusaders. It will not draw us into a confrontation with the police, although we reserve the right to repel any hostile attacker of whatever form, appearance, affiliation, or religion. We shall treat anyone who wants to convey us to the United States or carry out what the United States wants to do to us as if he were an American. We shall repel the injustice and enmity from ourselves by all means. Anyone who wants to be safe from us should not interfere with us. We will interfere with no one except the enemy whom we originally laid down in our project for jihad: the Crusader and Jewish enemy.

Seventh: I will also stress what my brother 'Ali said in his letter, that we have not raised the banner of jihad to kill believers. Sound minds, not to mention proofs from religious law, refute this charge against us. How could we leave, suffer hardships, face dangers and strife, and leave our country, an easy life, and safety, to go to Afghanistan, Chechnya, Bosnia, Somalia, Kashmir, and other Islamic lands? Why did we go there despite all the hardships and dangers? We went there to defend the honor, religion, and security of Muslims, to protect their lives, and to set our blood before their blood. Is it logical that we would ransom people far away with our blood, risk our necks for them, and then decide to terrorize our own people closest to us and shed their blood? No sound mind will accept this, not to mention the Muslim who knows God's law and the precepts of the Koran and Sunnah. We are not people of error and deviation, that we should turn our weapons against any Muslim. If anyone alleges that we declare the generality of Muslims to be unbelievers and countenance killing them, we take refuge in God from this error. If we held the generality of Muslims to be unbelievers, why did we go to defend our brothers in Bosnia or Chechnya, who know nothing of Islam except the profession of faith (shahadah)? If we are defending with our blood those who know of Islam only the shahadah, judging them to be Muslims and considering it our duty to ransom them with our blood, does it make sense that we would sacrifice our blood for those we considered to be unbelievers? -- and then that we would kill a Muslim who lives in a society that follows all the principles of religion? We declare no one who prays toward Mecca to be an unbeliever for any sin, as long as he does not consider it licit. Our method in this is that of the People of the Sunnah and Al-Jama'ah [Sunni Muslims]. We do not need to expound it, for it is well known to every Muslim.

Eighth: We say to our Muslim brethren everywhere that our crime, by God, is no more than carrying on jihad against the Crusaders. Our standing against them in Afghanistan and elsewhere upset them. They are afraid that we will stand against them in Iraq -- and this is what we have done by the grace of God Almighty. We proclaim to them that we will not retreat from this path. We shall fight the Crusaders until victory or martyrdom. These conspiracies will not frighten us; these lies will not intimidate us. We shall proceed on the way of jihad. We have put our lives at risk and donned our shrouds. We have left family and children, desiring what is with God Almighty. We pray that God will strengthen us on this path until we meet Him. Of our Muslim brethren, we ask that they back and aid the people of jihad by every way and means. Beware of slander against them. Beware of giving aid against them. Let anyone who does so know that he is a helper of the Crusaders against his Muslim brethren. What a great crime it is to help an unbeliever against a Muslim! Know that our foe is the Crusaders. They are the ones who have been demanding us dead or alive. Do not be a guide to the Crusaders against your sons and the people of your religion. They have demanded us only because of the religious practice of jihad, which has disturbed their rest and embittered their life. We shall continue on the path with our heads high, neither flagging nor tiring, God permitting.

Ninth: I was very saddened to see some people affiliated with the Islamic call and learning among those who defiled our honor, attacked us, and hurled the vilest epithets against us. We

received insults and abuse. Their evidence against us was the Interior Ministry's statement. It was as if the Interior Ministry's statement were immune to falsehood. Worse still, before they knew who had detonated the explosions in Riyadh, they accused us and judged us. There is no power and strength save in God! The duty of every Muslim is to proceed with caution before accusing anyone. God has said: "O believers, if an ungodly man comes to you with a tidings, make clear, lest you afflict a people unwittingly, and then repent of what you have done." (Koran 49:6). God also has said: "O believers, when you are journeying in the path of God, be discriminating, and do not say to him who offers you a greeting, 'Thou art not a believer,' seeking the chance goods of the present life." (Koran 4:94). The main thing is that our consciences are innocent of everything that the Interior Ministry has attributed to us. How then if our accuser's wrongdoing and injustice have become notorious? Whoever would place us in the position of criminals needs proof, evidence, and witnesses acceptable to a legitimate court. The burden of proof is upon the accuser, and upon the defendant to swear an oath. Yet, by God, we do not exonerate those who defamed our honor, who attacked us, gave aid against us, or slandered us explicitly or implicitly. We shall meet on the Day of Resurrection, when antagonists come together in God's presence: on the day when the hornless sheep's claim against the horned sheep will be taken, before Him in whose presence no one is wronged -- praised be He, who is qualified to administer right and justice, no god there is but He. Our meeting place with anyone who has defamed us in any way -- our meeting place is on the Day of Court; the day when all nursing women will be so amazed that they forget those whom they suckled; the day when you shall think that men are drunk, but they are not drunk; the day when the prophets shall say, 'O God, save, save from the terror of the place.' We have a meeting, you who have used your pulpits to censure and wound us. We have a meeting, you who have loosed your tongues against us. Do not say, "The Interior Ministry's statement misled us." You will stand before Him who knows treacherous eyes and what hearts hide. Will you rush into anathematizing us, declaring us dissolute, accusing us of heresy, and pronouncing us astray before you verify what has been attributed to us? -- before you know the truth of anything? -- instead of standing with us and redressing our grievance? Will you take this stand against us? They have persecuted us, driven us from our homes, seized our property, raided our houses, and separated us from our fathers and mothers, children and wives. They have deemed our blood forfeit, so that they open fire on us wherever they find us. They have laid wait for us everywhere, as if God had commanded them to carry on jihad against us, instead of against the United States. They have committed every abomination against us; they have subjected us to every injustice. They began by declaring us infidels and accusing us of being Kharijites. They considered our property subject to confiscation, and so they raided our homes and confiscated everything in them. Then they considered it permitted to wrong us: any of us whom they found they took; and there was no one to call them to account or oversee them save God. They kept no promise or oath to any of us. Anyone they could not take they pursued. If they got hold of him, they took him and shackled him. If they did not get hold of him, wherever they overtook him they opened fire on him, so that he was either killed or wounded. What is the charge? -- jihad! There is no power and strength save in God! Instead of relieving the injustice against us and defending us, we encounter this kind of unjust aid against us on the part of preachers and sheikhs. They issue the kind of judgments against us that were never issued against the Rafidites who blew up Al-Khubar, or against the British who blew things up everywhere, or against the Isma'ilis of Najran. They issued no judgments and made no pronouncements against the criminals. They did not even issue judgments against the United States, which has killed so many Muslims that only God can count them. They kept silent about the Jews and Christians. They kept silent about the people among them who associate other objects of worship with God. They kept silent about the people of heresy, unbelief, secularism, atheism, hypocrisy, and apostasy. They found naught but our flesh and honor to feed on. As if the Investigation Bureau had not done enough in wronging us or in declaring our property, honor, and blood fair game, they decided to volunteer their

assistance against us. All we say is that God is sufficient for us, and what a good defender He is against you all! Let anyone who would take us to task for defending ourselves with weapons know that we did not reach this point by choice; we were driven and forced to it by the actions of the Investigating Bureau, with the aid of the sheikhs.

Let everyone who has uttered a word against us in any form whatever -- journalist, student, preacher, or scholar -- know that he is a helper against us wittingly or unwittingly. Yes, he is a helper in the injustice against us, the spilling of our blood, and the delivery of us to these wrongdoers. Let each one of you fear God, for your words are only increasing the wrongdoer in his wrongdoing and further depriving the wronged of his rights.

We have no device save to raise hands of entreaty to God at all times and wait for His answer always. We say: "O God, avenge us against those who have wronged us. Help us against those who have attacked us. Do not cause us to be injured in our religion. Do not make this world our greatest concern or the limit of our knowledge. Do not give power over us to those who have no mercy on us." O God, fight those who have wronged us or helped in wronging us. O God, turn your prosperity away from them; remove your blessing from them; surprise them with your vengeance; send down wrath upon them all, and make death their fondest wish. O God, congeal the blood in their veins. O God, tread them down with vigor, and show us in them that which will relieve our hearts. O God, rend them utterly. Send down on them such disasters and blows to their property, lives, children, and religion as shall divert them from thinking of us. For Thou art the strong and the powerful.

Tenth: These are words which I send to my daughters, since the apparatus of oppression and investigation has prevented me from seeing them and kept me away from them. I have become a stranger in my country, with the aid of men of eminence [the ulema]. I apologize, as I am not a person who is good at poetry and remembering verses.

I bless and pray for peace upon the Messenger of God, his family, and all his companions.

Written by Yusuf bin Salih al-'Ayiri Sunday 24 Rabi' I, 1424 [25 May 2003].

The Crusader Housing Complexes in the Land of the Two Holy Places:

Many reformers have spoken for many years about the Crusader presence in the Land of the Two Holy Places. The shaykh of the mujahidin, Usamah Bin Ladin, has alluded to it in a number of his written, broadcast, and televised statements and speeches. He has made it clear that this issue is a basic one for the mujahidin, like the issue of Palestine.

Since the American troops entered in such an immense number at the time of the Second Gulf War until today, American Crusader forces in the Land of the Two Holy Places have been increasing and settling in. Neighborhoods of Riyadh and Jedda are full of American housing complexes, and they have a large presence in the other cities.

There has been an agreement between the client government of the Land of the Two Holy Places and the United States that these complexes should be a piece of American land. Americans in them have religious freedom and are not forbidden anything of their religion and their desires. The complexes have churches and bars; they have dance halls and mixed swimming pools and various kinds of unbelief and licentiousness. Shari'ah law is not imposed on them; indeed, they

are not subject to the sovereignty of the government itself. The police, security forces, and organizations that command virtue and forbid vice do not enter them.

Those Who Carried Out the Riyadh Operation:

The client media, citing the Interior Ministry, announced that the perpetrators had been identified by means of DNA. In fact, identifying them all solely by this method is practically impossible. They would have to bring in every family member and take samples from them -- at least each family one of whose members was missing -- even those who were in Iraq and other theatres of jihad.

The fact is that during one of the raids they stumbled upon a group of testaments written by the mujahidin, among them those whose names were announced. They used DNA only to determine their genuineness.

The number announced in the media is not correct, because some of those who carried out the Riyadh operation did not suffer martyrdom and are now continuing to strike blows against the American enemies of God in Iraq, where they are recording the most wonderful acts of heroism.

Were it not for certain security precautions, we would mention some of the names that confirm this point. Perhaps the coming days will be sufficient for this, God permitting.

The Real Number of Dead and Wounded:

Eager to stop people from sympathizing with the bombers and from feeling satisfaction over what had happened to the Crusaders, the client government did all it could to lie about the number of American dead. They greatly minimized their number, lest those who heard the news should feel the relief that God had given to believers' hearts. Likewise, they did all they could to inflate the number of Muslim dead and to mention them repeatedly on every occasion to create the impression that they were many in number.

One should bear in mind that a complex as important as the Vinyl complex, which belongs to an intelligence company, is very unlikely to be occupied by anyone but company employees. This is something obvious when it comes to intelligence work.

As usual with the Americans, their hirelings announced that there were only seven Americans killed. They tried to minimize the number, but the American Vice President Dick Cheney's tongue slipped, and he mentioned that the American dead were ninety-four. NEWS TV announced that 140 Americans had been killed. The truth is that the number is even greater.

The number of people killed by the explosions is estimated to be 250 to 300, if not more. Those wounded number in the hundreds, not tens.

The National Guard hospital within the first hour received seventy charred bodies, all of them American, from the Vinyl complex, not counting the dozens of other wounded who died under the ruins before they could be rescued or who died on the following day. Also, 200 were taken from the Al-Hamra complex, which housed nearly a thousand foreigners. The number of them who died was very high.

Furthermore, with God's help, a number of commando groups, after opening the gate and setting off the car bombs, entered the buildings away from the blast and massacred the Crusaders with automatic weapons and hand grenades before leaving the scene of the operation.

As for the Muslim dead, the media mentioned only two or three. If there had been others, they would have mentioned it. This is apart from the guards, whose case is different. They fall into a different category, as will be explained later, God willing, when we discuss questions of religious law.

Questions About Whether the Operation Accords With Shari'ah:

A number of questions have been raised about the Riyadh operation. Some writers and students have taken it up on the internet and revealed the facts about it, as well as the decision to prevent any sympathy and the despotic government's threat to consider anyone who looked for a justification for the operation as an accomplice in the crime. In this, the despots followed the principle, "I show you only what I decide to show you, and I lead you only on the right way."

The martyred Shaykh Yusuf Bin-Salih al-Ayiri wrote an article entitled, "O God, Attack the Americans in Response to those who Wrote Fatwas Against the Operations." Husayn bin Mahmud wrote a number of useful articles on the subject, as did Bashir al-Najdi in response to questions about the bombings. Abu-Bashar al-Hijazi wrote, "Words About the Riyadh Bombings." Abdallah bin Nasir al-Rashid wrote a book entitled, *The Collapse of Objections to the Riyadh Bombings*. These and other studies and articles published on the net dealt with the specious arguments of opponents to the Riyadh operation, demolishing them with learning. We shall cite a few passages here in reply to specious arguments. We refer you to the articles and books published on the net for details on the questions.

Are the Americans Mu'ahadun?

To argue that the Americans are mu'ahadun [persons with whom a covenant of peace has been made] one must establish that the covenant is sound and not in violation of the religious law. In fact, the covenant violates shari'ah in that one of its provisions is that it is permanent and based on the legitimacy of the United Nations and international law, which we Muslims consider an idol [taghut] that must be disavowed. Furthermore, it is a covenant that requires violating the provisions of shari'ah that apply to mu'ahadun. The rule of Islam is not to apply to them. The person who concluded the covenant is a ruler who has betrayed the Muslims and who is unfit to conclude anything on their behalf.

If nevertheless one assumes that a covenant was made, it was undoubtedly invalidated by their making war on Muslims everywhere and by their using the Arabian Peninsula as a base from which Crusader armies could deploy to make war on Islam.

We shall quote at length from the book *The Collapse of Objections to the Riyadh Bombings*, by Abdallah Bin-Nasir al-Rashid on the subject of the Americans' covenants and their validity, because this specious argument [that the Americans have a valid covenant] has been repeated frequently.

Replying to the argument that the Americans in the Arabian Peninsula are mu'ahadun, he says on pages 9-21 of his book that four points must be established to validate the argument: 1. One must establish that there is a covenant and that it is sound in itself and in its formulation. 2. The

competence of the grantor of the covenant must be established, and that his promise is binding on Muslims. 3. It must be established that the covenant is not being invalidated by warfare against Muslims in another jurisdiction. 4. It must be established that the covenant has not been invalidated by something that occurred in the jurisdiction where the bombings took place.

If proof of these points is provided and the contender establishes them, then the Americans in the Arabian Peninsula are mu'ahadun whose lives are sacred and we shall say in reproof to anyone who fights them, "Killing a mu'ahad is a great sin." But barring from God's way, disbelief in Him, killing Muslims everywhere, betraying them, and expelling them from their homes are more heinous in the eyes of God. Allowing power to unbelievers, enforcing man-made laws, allowing forbidden things, and concluding an agreement of friendship and quittance on pagan principles is greater in God's eyes, and persecution is more heinous than slaying.

If one of these four points is not true, the conclusion that the Americans are mu'ahadun is also not true. Let us examine each of them. You will see that each point needed for those who hold that the Americans' covenants in the Arabian Peninsula are sound is contradicted in a number of respects.

The first point depends on the facts of covenants existing in this age, for the covenant has been established since the United Nations was founded or before. Hardly any ordinary person or religious scholar -- indeed, no religious students answering this question -- knows the terms of the covenant in detail. The amount that is known of the terms is sufficient to invalidate those covenants.

Covenants must be considered with regard to their term, the lawgiver of the covenant, and the juridical status of the covenant and its obligations.

As for the term, jurists have disagreed about the maximum term for which the imam may enter into a truce with unbelievers. The companions [of the Prophet] and some jurists fixed it at ten years, no more. They deduced the rule that the overall evidence indicated that fighting the unbelievers is a duty and that a covenant is an exception. It can be demonstrated that the practice of the Prophet was to make treaties for ten years. Thus, making concessions is limited to a place where there is specific provision; everything else remains subject to the general rule, namely its being banned.

Some thought that the term could be extended. This is correct: the imam may increase it beyond ten years when he deems that there is benefit (maslahah) in doing so.

As for entering into a truce without fixing a term, its form is as follows: The imam may enter into a truce without a term provided that he can rescind the treaty or dissolve it with them equally [cf. Koran 8:60]. This is as the Prophet said to the Jews of Khaybar, "I allow you to remain as long as God allows you to remain." Thus, the Muslims may end the covenant whenever they wish, provided they dissolve it with them equally and inform them in sufficient time. A form of truce without setting a limit is to set the length of the treaty with respect to its end, not its beginning. One can say, "I may rescind your covenant one year after I give notice," or the like. Some have held the view that every covenant whose length has not been fixed has a length of four months, based on God's words: "Journey freely in the land for four months." (Koran 9:2). They argue that God set this as a term for covenants with all the unbelievers whose covenants were ended in the verse.

Each of the two preceding forms of truce is different from the one that was signed between the Saudi government (and its likes) and the United States (and its sister countries). The latter is a perpetual truce, effective forever. This form clearly strays from the religious law and amounts to apostasy from the faith. As Abu-Abdallah, Usama [Bin Ladin] has said: "Whoever alleges that there is perpetual peace between us and the Jews has denied what was revealed to Muhammad, God's prayers and peace be upon him." The reason for this is that it is a contract to nullify and renounce God's rule completely. A similar case of denying the rule of the religious law would be for someone to promise or swear not to fast Ramadan or make the pilgrimage to the Kaaba until his death or to promise not to fight the unbelievers or a people of them until his death. Anyone who disagrees with this argument--if there is any Muslim who would disagree concerning this form--must either allege that fighting is a duty that can be abandoned because of a covenant with the unbelievers and a treaty with them in perpetuity to leave off fighting, so that its obligation lapses; or he must deny the obligation of fighting the unbelievers. Both of these things are unbelief. Furthermore, this treaty involves ceasing to abide by a precept of the religious law mandated by God. The abandonment of all or some of God's precepts is unbelief. Pronouncing one's renunciation of them is a second act of unbelief. Deeming their legitimacy to be derived from adherence to the law of the idolatrous legislator (international law) is a third act of unbelief. The fact that this is obedience to unbelievers is a fourth act of unbelief, because God has condemned for unbelief those who say to unbelievers, "We will obey you in some of the affair." (Koran 47:26).

Strangely, those who replied to the query quoted in their definition of a covenant something that negates their terming the Americans mu'ahadun and nullifies it because of the aforementioned stipulations for the term of the treaty. "A covenant," they say, "is a treaty between Muslims and people against whom Muslims have been commanded to make war [ahl al-harb] stipulating a cessation of fighting for a known period of time." I do not know whether they understand the meaning of what they have quoted and think that the covenant in effect now stipulates a known period of time. Or is it that they know the state of the covenants today and do not understand that what they have quoted is at odds with them?

We have been speaking about the term of the covenant; as for its legislator, Muslims are commanded by God's legal precept to fight the unbelievers. As is well known, God's precept is not to be opposed by the rule or whim of another. Muslims may not abandon legally mandated fighting, except by concession allowed by the shari'ah and by the judgment of God who commanded them to fight. God has made covenanting permissible for them. Whenever Muslims follow a covenant that God has permitted for them, they are obedient to God and abiding by his command. A covenant is valid in this way and no other. It is well known that every Muslim signs his covenants only under these conditions and that they must be interpreted in this way. However, we find the covenants of these men following other conditions than the aforementioned. That is to say, they agree in their covenants to the legitimacy of the United Nations. All their covenants are a practical application of their joining these United Nations and membership in its idolatrous pact, which is not based on the choice of every covenanter, but is an imposition by the United Nations, to which they have agreed to grant legislative power to interdict and criminalize, to forbid and command. They have the right to fight anyone who refuses to enter it and sign its unbelieving terms. The least of them in terms of unbelief is their agreement not to discriminate between Muslim and unbeliever and to deny matters known to be necessary parts of religion; indeed, they have deemed them to be among the things that they have agreed among themselves to be crimes: for example, terrorism, under which head they have classified fighting by Muslims against unbelievers for a religious reason. This covenant therefore does not safeguard the blood of the recipients who are unbelievers; rather, by God, it

endangers the life of those covenanting members of Islam who were protected by its sacredness before entering the covenant.

The covenant is legally based on idolatry (taghut). It derives its legitimacy from idolatry. When there is a dispute, the great idol [taghut] is appealed to for a decision. But whoever disbelieves in the idol and believes in God has grasped the most firm handhold.

As for the obligations of this covenant, the Prophet has said, "Every stipulation not in the Book of God is invalid." The precise meaning of this statement, though only God knows best, is that every stipulation that mandates what violates the shari'ah is invalid. This includes leasing that ends in ownership in the form in which it exists, as has been decided and written down in another place.(1)

These covenants permit, among other things, and among the things set down in the community of the United Nations, the building of churches in Muslim lands. There is a well-known consensus that the building of new churches is forbidden in Muslim lands. These covenants grant the unbelievers Muslim land that before their arrival had been ruled by the law of God; they make it land over which only the law of their country prevails, like diplomatic zones and like the housing complexes of these Americans. A more detailed discussion of them will come when we discuss the question of the prohibited religious sect in the response to the second question, God willing.

This insofar as the first point is concerned, namely the validity of the covenant in itself. It has become clear that it is invalid with regard to its term, its lawgiver, and the obligations it imposes. Each of these three things is enough to invalidate the covenant under the first point; and its invalidity under the first point is enough to invalidate it. However, we shall go into the three other points so that you can clearly see, may God protect you, that calling the Americans killed in the Riyadh bombings mu'ahadun is as false as can be and as far as can be from being the truth or anything like the truth.

As for the second point, the covenant that they claim for the Americans was made by the Saudi government. The Saudi government is not competent to enter into covenants for the Muslims in its territory. It is an apostate government that must be fought. How then can it grant protection to anyone else?

A discussion of the apostasy of the Saudi government would be a lengthy one. I have discussed it in sufficient detail elsewhere. I will summarize it in a few points.

First, the Saudi government gives rule to the taghut in the courts that operate under positive law, such as the Labor and Workers Court, the Trade Court, the Media Court, and the Bank Committees. It appeals for judgment to the idol of the United Nations and other organizations and accepts their judgment; indeed, it promises to combat anyone who rejects the decision of the taghut or whom the taghut rules must be fought.

Second, it puts unbelievers into positions of authority, allows them the highest ranks of office, allies itself with them against Muslims, obeys their orders, and gives them authority over Muslims in its territory in many matters in absolute obedience to them.

Third, it scoffs at God and the verses of the Koran in its newspapers. It makes war on religion and its people. It protects scoffers by force and laws.

I have explained the question of the unbelief of the Saudi government, along with the answer to the allegations against it, and discussion of the conditions and impediments, in a book.

Even if the covenant were from a Muslim, if it in fact is a betrayal of the religion and a befriending of unbelievers -- even if one concedes that the ruler was not an unbeliever -- it is invalid and sinful and it must not be followed or approved.

As for the third point, establishing that the covenant is not invalidated by making war on Muslims in another jurisdiction, the most they can muster as evidence for it is two things:

First, God's words: "Yet if they ask you for help, for religion's sake, it is your duty to help them, except against a people between whom and you there is a compact." (Koran 8:72).

Second, the fact that the Prophet repatriated the Quraysh believers under the terms of the Truce of Al-Hudaybiyah and that his covenant and warfare were independent of Abu-Basir, who used to fight those with whom the Prophet had entered into a covenant.

The first argument involves mutilating the verse and removing it from the context that clarifies it. It involves making absolute that which is mentioned with restrictions in the text. Here is the full verse:

"Those who believe, and have emigrated and struggled with their possessions and their selves in the way of God, and those who have given refuge and help -- those are friends one of another. And those who believe, but have not emigrated -- you have no duty of friendship towards them till they emigrate; yet if they ask you for help, for religion's sake, it is your duty to help them, except against a people between whom and you there is a compact; and God sees the things you do." (Koran 8:72).

The verse conditions the lapse of the obligation to help on the sin of omitting to emigrate. Whoever did not emigrate, his friendship with the Muslims lapsed. "You have no duty of friendship towards them." When the word for friendship, *walayah*, is pronounced with the vowel *a* in the first syllable, it usually means only help; if it is pronounced *wilayah*, with the vowel *i*, it includes help and other things. God made it a consequence of the lapse of their friendship that if they asked for the believers' help against a people between whom and the believers there was a compact, they should not be helped. God fixed their emigration as a limit to this.

The required inference from this verse is that one say: The covenant of unbelievers is not invalidated if they make war on Muslims who have been remiss with the duty to emigrate to Muslim territory and who reside in the abodes of unbelief. However, the verse was abrogated when the duty of everyone to emigrate to Medina was abrogated; for there was no emigration after the conquest of Mecca. However, it is still an obligation for anyone in the abode of unbelief who cannot openly perform the rites of his religion, its outward fundamentals and observances, disclaim anything worshipped instead of God, and proclaim hostility to unbelievers. Under such circumstances, emigration does not cease until repentance ceases.

As for anyone who dwells in another Islamic country, he is not obliged to emigrate, not to mention those who are prevented from entering the country of the two holy places, whose ruler you consider to be a Muslim. How does the duty to help him lapse, when he is eager to emigrate and come but cannot do so, or when it is not in principle incumbent upon him and not demanded of him by the religious law?

The friendship of Islam is more fitting than any other to be preserved, cared for, its obligations maintained, and its duties fulfilled. The partisans of this thesis claim that a Muslim is in every respect like an infidel state that enters into a treaty with us: we must not help one of the two against the other.

Even conceding all this and classifying every Muslim throughout God's world outside this country as being among those whom we are not obliged to help if they wage war with people who have a treaty with us, the verse is about asking for help against the enemy, not about appealing for rescue. The difference is that one who appeals for rescue is one whom the enemy has taken by surprise or whose land and country he has seized. One asking for help is someone who, fighting the enemy as an attacker or as an equal, is unable to overcome him and therefore needs someone to help him. Someone asking for help is asking for help against the enemy; someone appealing for rescue is someone asking for rescue and safety from an assailing enemy.

Sometimes the word for helping (nashr) is used in an unrestricted sense and is intended in the sense of rescuing from the enemy; in which case one says, "he helped him from his enemy," not "against his enemy." Helping from has the sense of rescuing; helping against has the meaning of backing. The word for helping in the Koranic verse is construed with the preposition against: "It is your duty to help them, except against a people between whom and you there is a compact." This is if "against" in the verse is construed with the word help. However, if it is taken to qualify the phrase ask you for help, it includes both meanings. However, the plain sense is that the phrase beginning with "against" qualifies help.

If the enemy enters a Muslim country, repelling him is a collective duty [fard kifayah] incumbent upon the Ummah. It is an individual duty [fard ayn] for the people of the country. If they do not fulfill it, it becomes a duty for those around them, and then the duty expands, so that everyone sins if no one adequate to it undertakes it, as is well known in the case of collective duties. Can it be permissible to enter into a covenant with an enemy on condition of canceling one of the duties incumbent upon and obligatory for each Muslim? Every covenant with such content is null and void. God's Book has a greater claim; God's stipulation is firmer.

I do not know whether the author of this argument, if he found a Muslim woman at a crossroads in an infidel land being forced into fornication by an American, would consider it his duty to help her against someone "between whom and himself there was a compact" or whether he would pass on unconcerned.

If it is a duty to help her despite her not having a Saudi identity card, is it be a duty to help her if someone wants to kill her? Is it a duty only toward her, or toward the old men, children, and the helpless in Islamic countries? Is it a duty to defend only their bodies, or is one bound to defend their religion from the Crusader enemy trying to spread corruption and godlessness in lands and among peoples?

Suppose the United States decided to invade the land of the two holy places and mustered armies to occupy Mecca and Medina, would the advocate of this line of thinking adhere to the implications of his position and advise all the Islamic countries that it was forbidden to aid the Muslims in the holy places? Would he forbid them to defend Mecca and Medina and command them to abide by their covenant with the United States?

Is it only Mecca and Medina that must be aided and whose sanctity protected, to the exclusion of Muslims' other sanctities? Would he forbid aiding the Muslims in Najd and the rest of the Hijaz?

Would he enjoin silence if Riyadh were occupied and the country that they call "the state of Islam" fell?

As for their drawing an inference from those Muslims whom the Prophet sent back, the first thing in it is that the above invalid requisite is necessary for them.

When the Prophet's companions were reluctant to accept this condition, the Prophet said to them: "God will give them deliverance and a way out." Therefore, it was a matter exclusively for the Prophet, as shown by the prevalence of texts enjoining the defense of helpless Muslims.

Conceding that, it then is specifically for those whom we know that God will give a way out. Furthermore, even as the Prophet sent them back, he abrogated the pact with Quraysh to help them against allies of his outside Medina. Is an alliance more of an incentive and obligation to giving aid than faith? Or does the obligation to help a Muslim have precedence? For Islam is stronger, and its bond is firmer than an alliance.

The Prophet said: "A Muslim is a Muslim's brother: he does not hand him over, wrong him, or abandon him." This is one of the firm requirements of brotherhood for every Muslim.

God has made the condition of persecuted Muslims a cause for jihad, saying in more than one place: "How is it with you, that you do not fight in the way of God, and for the men, women, and children who, being abased?" (Koran 4:75). God urged the believers by reminding them of "those who, being abased, can devise nothing and are not guided to a way." (Koran 4:98). And, "Who say, 'Our Lord, bring us forth from this city whose people are evildoers, and appoint to us a protector from Thee, and appoint to us from Thee a helper.'" (Koran 4:75). This is the firm general precept, the fundamental rule; the action [of the Prophet] should be interpreted as a special case, contrary to the argument.

Ibn-al-Arabi said in *Ahkam al-Qur'an*, 4:1789: "No one after the death of the Prophet may conclude a treaty stipulating the return of those who have become Muslims. God permitted it for him because of the wisdom he knew to be in it and the benefit he realized. He subsequently manifested in it such a good consequence and praiseworthy effect on Islam that it made the unbelievers agree to its being repealed and made them intercede for its reduction."

Furthermore, the argument is about the downtrodden in infidel lands. It is not about unbelievers entering and occupying Islamic lands or attacking Muslims outside their governance; it is about those among them who have become Muslims and about the Muslims who are in their hands.

As for their attacking Muslims or their allies who are out of their hands, the Prophet made this an infringement of their covenant that would make their lives forfeit. He attacked Quraysh when some of them helped some of the Bakris against the tribe of Khuza'ah, who were allies of the Prophet.

If after this one still concedes it and accepts the position of someone who argues for the universality of the legal provision and its not being restricted to the Prophet, and if one makes no distinction between the Abode of Islam and infidel lands, its place must not be exceeded; for an act has no universality, and this act came in contravention of verbal universalities.

So it is restricted to Muslim individuals having no power or state, of whom it is known that they will not be tempted from their religion and for whom God will most likely appoint a way out; Muslims who before the treaty were in infidel lands and in infidel hands, or who were themselves unbelievers with a treaty who then converted to Islam. Thus, prisoners of war captured after the treaty are not joined to them.

Making concession after concession, God appointed it only for men. Concerning women, God revealed: "Return them not to the unbelievers." (Koran 60:10). If the arguer thinks the evidence really implies his position, he must exempt Muslim women from being covered by this precept.

The fourth point is to establish that the covenant has not been invalidated by something that has occurred in this country itself.

Some of the things whereby a covenant becomes null and void are things that we have mentioned previously under the first point. They are things with which the covenant could not be validly established initially. Their continuance is the continuance of what invalidates and nullifies the covenant. Among these things are their building of churches, such as the church damaged by the explosion in one of the complexes, houses of immorality, dance halls, and bars - and they did not restrict access to these things to themselves, but opened by them to Muslim men and women.

I have mentioned this issue elsewhere. Here I shall quote from what I have said before.

The entry of an unbeliever into Islamic territory generally, apart from the Arabian Peninsula, may take place only under one of the following conditions:

1. A Safe-Conduct (Aman)

There are two forms of this.

Form one is that a non-Muslim may request protection so that he may hear the words of God. He must be granted protection and given a safe-conduct until he hears the words of God; then he must be conveyed to his place of security.

This form is obligatory for Muslims whenever an unbeliever requests protection for this purpose: "And if any of the idolaters seeks of thee protection, grant him protection till he hears the words of God; then do thou convey him to his place of security -- that, because they are a people who do not know." (Koran 9:6).

Form two is that the unbeliever may request safe-conduct to enter Muslim territory for transit or for trade or to accomplish another end; in which case he may enter until his need is accomplished.

Muslims are permitted to grant this form of safe-conduct. The ruler chooses the benefit to be gained. For example, they [the non-Muslims] may allow Muslims to enter [their lands] as they enter [Muslim lands], or Muslims may need them for some work at which they excel, or the like.

2. A Covenant (Ahd)

If there is a covenant between the Muslims and unbelievers, that one of them may enter for such and such a purpose, entry is permitted under the conditions in which it is permitted by a safe-conduct, the difference being that the beneficiary of a covenant (a mu'ahad) does not need an individual safe-conduct; the covenant granted to his people suffices.

3. The Status of Being a Permanent Protected Alien in Muslim Territory (Dhimmah)

This is the status of the inhabitants of the countries that the Muslims conquer. They pay the poll tax (jizyah) "out of hand and are humbled," and they accept the rule of Islam over them.

4. Enmity (Udwan)

If an unbeliever enters Muslim territory not under one of the preceding conditions, there are two cases:

If a single individual who can be overpowered enters, his blood may be spilled and his life taken.

If a powerful group of them enters, it is attacking Muslim territory and must be fought and repelled. The same applies to an individual who enters, if he does so with the force and protection of his clansmen.

Falling under the latter category are the Crusader bases in the Arabian Peninsula. Their status is too obvious to escape notice. However, the obscurities of the obscurantists need to be dispelled. So the following things need to be said:

First, they entered bringing force and war materials with them. This is not the case of someone who enters with a safe-conduct, covenant, or the status of a protected alien (dhimmah) and who is subject to Muslim rule.

Second, the force that they brought in is superior to what Muslims have to repel it. Strength therefore belongs to them. Victory and dominance belong to their forces. Can a safe-conduct be granted to such people? Are not they the ones who should be giving the safe-conduct?

Third, they entered not subject to Muslim rule over them. Rather, they are entirely independent as regards their affairs.

Fourth, they announce and make it known that their entry is not by the permission of the country they are entering, but by virtue of international legitimacy (al-shar'iyyah al-duwaliyah). In addition to being an idol (taghut) that must be denounced, international legitimacy mandates first of all that Muslims renounce independent sovereignty and comes in as a ruler over them.

Fifth, they are using this power to secure their own interests. They are forcing the country that they entered to do things that harm it, things that are part of the unbelief that the New World Order advocates. Anyone such as this is a conqueror, a despot, a dominator. I do not know what occupation is if these things be not part of it!

Sixth, they are fighting Muslims, warring on them in every one of God's lands. If one assumes that they have a covenant and safe-conduct, it is nullified by what they are doing; the legal status of having a covenant and safe-conduct is lifted from them.

Seventh, the well of strength that they have placed in the peninsula is making war on Muslims. Armies waging war on God and His Messenger set out from it or rely on it. If their fighting Muslims were not a reason for fighting them, the fact that Muslims are fighting them in Islamic territory would be sufficient, as we have said. If their fighting Muslims were not enough with regard to our case, their using Muslim territory as bases for war would be sufficient.

- End of Citation *

Anyone who claims that the Americans have a covenant here must validate each of these four points. If one of them has been violated, he must rule that their covenant is void. It has already been proven and shown that each of the points is invalid and void.

Suppose someone says: "It is clear and indisputable that things that nullify the covenant have been done by the Americans. However, only the imam may break the covenant."

The response would be:

First, the ruler concerned is an apostate from his religion, a renegade from God, who has broken God's covenant that He established with him. How can covenants with them be concluded by him and not be nullified unless he nullifies them?

Second, they know very well that the ruler in question is a traitor to his religion, a friend of these unbelievers. It will be impossible for him to break their covenants until his rule is challenged in some way. His religion is a mere trifle for him to give. Even supposing that he is not an unbeliever, he is like a person who could not be trusted with any Muslim property in his hands. How then can he make a covenant with people who are waging war on God and His Messenger in every land?

Third, covenants with unbelievers become void if they do something that invalidates them. They do not need an imam's repudiation of them. This is what scholars have maintained and what explicit texts indicate.

Ibn-al-Qayyim says: "Concluding a pact of protection [dhimmah] is not the right of the imam; it is the right of God and the generality of Muslims. If they [viz. the beneficiaries of the pact] violate anything that has been stipulated for them, some have said that the imam must rescind the contract and that this is done by conveying the person back to his place of security and expelling him from Islamic territory. They suppose that a contract is not nullified merely by violation; it must be rescinded. So they maintain, but the argument is weak. This is because when the conditions are the right of God, not the treaty maker, the contract lapses in his absence, without rescission. The conditions that have been imposed on people with a pact of protection [ahl al-dhimmah] are God's right; neither the ruler nor anyone else may accept the poll tax [jizyah] from them and allow them to reside in Islamic territory unless they abide by them. Otherwise, he must fight them as specified in the Koran. (Ahkam Ahl al-Dhimmah, 3:1355).

"The Koranic evidence for this is explicit. God has said: 'How should the idolaters have a covenant with God and His Messenger? -- excepting those with whom you made covenant at the Holy Mosque; so long as they go straight with you, do you go straight with them.' (Koran 9:7). Thus, God disapproves of covenants with idolaters, albeit with an exception. God says: 'Excepting those of the idolaters with whom you made covenant, then they failed you naught

neither lent support to any man against you: with them fulfill your covenant till their term; surely God loves the god-fearing.' (Koran 9:4). Thus, God has exempted from the disavowal of covenants those who have neither failed the Muslims in anything nor lent support to anyone against them. Thus we know that the covenant of anyone who fails in anything or lends support to anyone becomes null and void. God says: 'But if they break their oaths after their covenant and thrust at your religion, then fight the leaders of unbelief; they have no sacred oaths; haply they will give over.' (Koran 9:12). God's judgment regarding such men is that they have no sacred oaths. He commanded that they be fought. A ruling that their covenant continues to exist contradicts the command to fight them." [End of citation from Ibn-al-Qayyim].

What Is the Legal Status of the Guards at the Crusader Complexes?

In answering this, we shall content ourselves with the fatwa of the late Shaykh Ahmad Shakir in his book *Kalimat al-Haqq*, pp. 126-37.

Cooperation with the English by any means of cooperation great or small is willful apostasy and manifest unbelief. No excuse can be accepted for it; no interpretation of it can avail; no stupid fanaticism, no foolish policy, and no hypocritical flattery can save from this judgment, whether it come from individuals, governments, or leaders. All of them are equal in unbelief and apostasy, save those who, having erred in ignorance, make amends and repent and take the path of believers. Perhaps God will turn toward them, if they are sincerely devoted to God, not to politics or people.

I think that I have been able to elucidate the legal status of fighting the English and that of cooperating with them with any kind of cooperation or dealings so that every Muslim who reads Arabic can understand it, from whatever class of people he may be and wherever he may be on the earth.

I think that no reader will now doubt that it is a self-evident proposition needing no clarification or proof that the French are the same in this regard for every Muslim on the face of the earth. The hostility of the French toward Muslims and their willful fanaticism in attempting to wipe out Islam and make war on Islam are many times greater than the fanaticism and hostility of the English. Indeed, they are furious with fanaticism and hostility. They are killing our Muslim brothers in every Muslim country in which they have rule or influence. They are committing crimes and atrocities in comparison with which the crimes and savagery of the English pale. Therefore, they and the English share the same legal status: their lives and property are lawful to be taken everywhere. No Muslim in any place on earth may cooperate with them in any kind of cooperation. The legal status of cooperating with them is that of cooperating with the English: it is apostasy and complete departure from Islam, whatever the kind, sort, or type of cooperation with them may be.

I have never been so foolish or naive as to believe that the governments in the Islamic countries would respond to the precept of Islam and sever political, cultural, or economic relations with the English or with the French.

I see myself as enlightening Muslims about where their feet are standing, what God has commanded them, and the shame He has promised them in this world and punishment in the world to come if they submit themselves and their minds to the enemies of God.

I want to make known to them God's precept concerning this cooperation with their enemies, who have humiliated them and waged war on their religion and lands. I want to make known to them the consequences of this apostasy in whose fury everyone who persists in cooperating with enemies wallows.

Let every Muslim in every place on earth know that if he cooperates with the enemies of Islam and enslavers of Muslims -- the English, French, and their allies and likes -- with any sort of cooperation, or if he makes peace with them and does not make war with them however he can, let alone helping them by word or deed against brothers in the faith; that if he does any of this and then prays, his prayer is invalid; or if he purifies himself by ablution with water or with sand, his purity is invalid; or if he fasts an obligatory or supererogatory fast, his fasting is invalid; or if he makes the pilgrimage, his pilgrimage is invalid; or if he gives the mandatory alms (zakat) or voluntary alms (sadaqah), his alms are invalid and returned to him; or if he worships the Lord in any religious rite, his worship is invalid and returned to him: he shall have no reward from any of this, but rather it shall be to him as sin and burden.

Let every Muslim know that if he commits such despicable actions, his work will fail, be it any religious act that he performed for the Lord before sinking into the mire of this apostasy that he has approved for himself. God forbid that any Muslim deserving so great a title and believing in God and His Messenger should approve of such actions!

This is because faith is a condition for the validity and acceptance of every religious act, as is self-evident and known necessarily with regard to religion. No Muslim disagrees with this.

For God says: "Whoso disbelieves in the faith, his work has failed, and in the world to come he shall be among the losers." (Koran 5:5).

And God also says: "They will not cease to fight with you, till they turn you from your religion, if they are able; and whosoever of you turns from his religion, and dies unbelieving -- their works have failed in this world and the next; those are the inhabitants of the Fire; therein they shall dwell forever." (Koran 2:217).

And God also says: "O believers, take not Jews and Christians as friends; they are friends of each other. Whoso of you makes them his friends is one of them. God guides not the people of the evildoers. Yet thou seest those in whose hearts is sickness vying with one another to come to them, saying, 'We fear lest a turn of fortune should smite us.' But it may be that God will bring the victory, or some commandment from Him, and then they will find themselves, for that they kept secret within them, remorseful, and the believers will say, 'What, are these the ones who swore by God most earnest oaths that they were with you? Their works have failed; now they are losers.'" (Koran 5:51-53).

And God also says: "Those who have turned back in their traces after the guidance has become clear to them, Satan it was that tempted them, and God respited them. That is because they said to those who were averse to what God sent down, 'We will obey you in some of the affair'; and God knows their secrets. How shall it be, when the angels take them, beating their faces and their backs? That is because they have followed what angers God, and have been averse to His good pleasure, so He has made their works to fail. Or did those in whose hearts is sickness think that God would not bring to light their rancour? Did We will, We would show them to thee, then thou wouldst know them by their mark; and thou shalt certainly know them in the twisting of their speech; and God knows your deeds. And We shall assuredly try you until We know those of you who struggle and are steadfast, and try your tidings. Those who disbelieve and bar from

God's way and make a breach with the Messenger after the guidance has become clear to them, they will nothing hurt God, and He will make their works to fail. O believers, obey God, and obey the Messenger, and do not make your own works vain. Those who disbelieve and bar from God's way and then die disbelieving, them God will not forgive. So do not faint and call for peace; you shall be the upper ones, and God is with you, and will not deprive you of your works." (Koran 47:25-35).

Let every Muslim man and woman know that those who rebel against their religion and aid their enemies: whoever intermarries with them, his marriage is fundamentally invalid and cannot be made valid. No effect of legal marriage ensues, either legitimate progeny or inheritance. Anyone who has already married one of them, his marriage is likewise invalid. Anyone who returns to his Lord and his religion, makes war on his enemy, and aids his Ummah, neither the woman whom he married while in a state of apostasy nor the woman who herself apostatized while married to him is his wife or under his protection. Having repented, he must repeat his marriage to her and contract a legally valid marriage with her, as is self-evident and clear.

Let Muslim women in any part of the world be on their guard to ascertain before marriage that those who propose to them are not of this outcast group who have left the faith, to protect themselves and their honor, lest they live with men who suppose them to be wives when they are not husbands because their marriages are invalid under God's religion. Let Muslim women whom God has tested with spouses who have sunk into the morass of such apostasy know that their marriages are invalid and that they have become forbidden to these men. The men are not their husbands until they repent validly and in practice and then marry them in a new, valid marriage.

Let Muslim women know that any of them satisfied with a husband who is a man in this state and who knows his state or agrees to remain with a husband whom she knows to be involved in such apostasy, shares with him the same legal status of apostasy.

God forbid that Muslim women should accept any such thing for themselves, their honor, their children's legitimacy, and their religion!

The matter is serious, not jest. No law passed to punish those who cooperate with enemies will avail. How many legal devices there are to evade the provisions of laws! How many ways there are to exculpate criminals by means of specious arguments and distorting the evidence!

However, the Ummah is responsible for establishing its religion and working to aid it always at all times. Individuals are responsible before God on the day of Resurrection for what their hands commit and what their hearts enfold.

Let everyone examine himself. Let him be a protective fence to his religion against the scorn of the scornful and the treachery of the disloyal.

Every Muslim is on one of the frontiers of Islam. Let him beware, lest Islam be attacked through him.

Help comes only from God, and God will surely help whoever helps Him.

- End of Citation *

We must bear in mind that anyone who harbors doubt and confusion about the question and who has been taken in by the deceit of those who would insinuate to him that the Americans were mu'ahadun, having a covenant with the guards, and that their guarding was on this basis and foundation -- such a person has an excuse with God and will be judged on the Day of Judgment according to his intention.

This is not only in the Arabian Peninsula. It also is in every country where there are Crusader or other occupiers, be it Afghanistan in the American bases of the Northern Alliance or in Chechnya in the Russian bases of followers of the client Chechen government, and elsewhere.

What Is the Legal Status of Operations in Muslim Countries?

This objection has been answered in the book *The Collapse of Objections [to the Riyadh Bombings]*. The author [Abdallah Bin-Nasir al-Rashid] states:

There are a number of ways to reply to their argument from the fact that the country is an Islamic country.

First: This is a stronger reason for fighting the unbelievers, their armies, intelligence services, and their individuals. Their being in an Islamic country (for hostile purposes, as has been established) is one of the strongest reasons and causes for fighting them. There is no evidence for prohibiting surprise attacks on unbelievers in Islamic territory.

Second: If they mean by an Islamic country one whose ruler is a Muslim, the ruler of this country is an apostate. Conceding his Islam, prohibiting surprise attacks does not depend on the ruler's belief or unbelief. The proof is that if unbelievers seize an Islamic country, the dominion of the Muslim ruler over it does not cease, along with the permissibility of making surprise attacks on the hostile unbelievers there. If an American army attacked the land of the two sanctuaries and established a base in Najd, none of you would be prohibited from attacking it even though the land is an Islamic one and even its ruler in your view.

Third: If they mean by an Islamic country one over which the precepts of Islam hold sway, then these complexes by common consent are not governed by the precepts of Islam. Rather, among the precepts of Islam that did apply to them were the bombings done by the heroes.

Fourth: If they mean by an Islamic country one where Islam is the dominant religion of the people, again most of those in the complexes by common consent were unbelievers. Only two Muslims have been mentioned as killed there, as against hundreds of Americans.

- [End of Citation] *

What Is the Legal Status of the Muslims Who Resided in the Complexes?

Many brothers have proffered information about one of the Muslims killed in the bombings. They have mentioned that he was one of the greatest advocates of obscenity and debauchery. They have shown joy and gladness at this. One must call attention to a number of important points related to this:

First point: The debauchery and sins mentioned in connection with that victim killed in the complexes do not justify his killing. Rather, the killing of anyone who was present in the

complex, whatever the reason for his coming there, even if he was a righteous person, was based on other reasons. The mujahidin based their action in executing the operation on these reasons, not on the debauchery of some person or other. As for the bombing's being punishment for a person of such a character, that is possible, just as it is possible that it might be an atonement for his sin and bring him closer to his Lord.

The reasons justifying the killing of the Muslims who were killed collaterally in the bombing are too long to be expounded in this brief book. We cede to those who have discussed the question in detail. Let us list the overall reasons and basic issues of the question only.

The presence of Muslims in the complexes is beside the basic principle, which is that the legal status of the complexes was that of abodes of unbelief. This is because they were protected by force and because the precepts of Islam did not apply to them. The person carrying out the operation did not know about the presence of Muslims, though that was possible, as happens in most of the operations of the mujahidin in Chechnya, Palestine, Afghanistan, and elsewhere.

If their presence in the complex had been known, the operation still would not have been prohibited. At best, the Muslims in the complex would have been like human shields by means of which the unbelievers shielded themselves. Indeed, a human shield would have had a better status inasmuch as he would really be compelled, while the persons in question were not compelled to enter the unbelievers' complexes.

The Prophet was free of blame vis-a-vis those who lived among the idolaters. He paid compensation at half the normal rate for those whom Khalid killed who had been living among the idolaters. The jurists explained that they were giving aid against themselves by residing among the idolaters, and so he assigned half the normal compensation for them. It is like the case of someone who shared in the killing of a person and was obliged to pay half, and the half that they owed lapsed from the compensation.

Second point: Under the shari'ah it is not permissible to rejoice at the slaying of a Muslim, whoever he is and whatever his sinfulness. Rather, we grieve at what descends on Muslims, and we pray to God to forgive them and show them mercy, unless such unbelief be proved against the man as removes him from the community. At the slaying of such a man we rejoice, because he was an unbeliever, not because of his sinfulness.

However, if the rejoicing was over the ceasing of the evil and debauchery he was spreading, that is another matter. Conceivably, such rejoicing might be mixed with prayers for mercy and forgiveness for the dead man.

One must call attention to the fact that accusing a person of debauchery and the like is not allowed except with legally acceptable evidence. Even after it has been established by evidence, it is not permissible to disparage him with it after his death, save in legally exceptional circumstances indicated in the hadith, "Speak evil of her." But only God knows.

Third point: Some of those who used these arguments to infer the permissibility of the operations and who rebutted the sophistries of discreditors, set out from love for the mujahidin and eagerness to defend them. We would call attention to the fact that the mujahidin must not be defended by speaking about religious matters without knowledge. There is a difference between someone who says, "I do not know what is the reason why killing the man is permitted; perhaps the mujahidin had a valid reason, and presumably they would not venture to kill

without a clear reason someone whose life is protected," someone who defends them with words like this, and someone who draws inferences in their behalf from what does not justify bloodshed in the shari'ah and who argues on that basis. Muslims have an obligation to fear God and to speak what is right. We ask God to guide and lead the mujahidin and all Muslims everywhere.

What Is the Legal Status of Disturbing Security in Muslim Lands?

When the Prophet, God's prayers and peace be upon him, died, Abu Bakr al-Siddiq sent out the army of Usamah in obedience to the Prophet's command, "Send out Usamah's expedition." When he was about to send out armies to fight the participants in apostasy (riddah), some of the companions of the Prophet consulted him in the matter, lest Medina lack a force to protect it. Abu-Bakr said, "Even if the dogs should drag the feet of the wives of the Prophet, God's prayers and peace be upon him, I would not abandon this matter."

It is self-evident that anyone who fights the enemies of God will not be safe from their attack and retaliation. Security will then be shaken, whether he attacks them in their own country or attacks those of them who are attacking his country. See how Abu Bakr refused to abandon the fight against the apostates in order to protect the people of Medina. If a man wanted absolute security in the material sense, he would suspend many duties along with jihad.

Whoever risks his life in obedience to God's command, believing, and not overlaying his faith with wrongdoing, will have security from God, even in battle, as He will cover him with slumber as security from it. However, anyone who abandons God's command, and gives preserving himself from fear as an excuse, will be overcome by fear from his place of security.

Anyone who thinks he will be left alone and secure when he claims to have faith and that God will test him in nothing is ignorant of God's word: "Do the people reckon that they will be left to say 'We believe,' and will not be tried?" (Koran 29:2). Even more ignorant is someone who thinks he has a right to claim faith yet to be released from its requirements whenever he fears for something in this world, using security as an excuse.

Is not this like someone who "serves God upon the very edge -- if good befalls him he is at rest in it, but if a trial befalls him he turns completely over; he loses this world and the world to come." (Koran 22:11). Or it is like someone who says, "Give me leave and do not tempt me." (Koran 9:49).

Anyone who understands the real situation of the Muslim countries today knows that they are not in a state of security. They are in a period of respite. God gives a respite, but He does not forget. The danger they fear is hovering over all the Muslims lands, surrounding them. How is anyone to be blamed who preempts the enemy and repels him before he descends on the Muslim scene and attacks their homes?

The Benefits and Detriments in the East Riyadh Operation:

Abdallah Bin-Nasir al-Rashid has discussed this in some detail. This is the text of his discussion from the book *The Collapse of Objections to the Riyadh Bombings*, pp. 57-62. We quote at length:

They have spoken here about the alleged detriments resulting from the Riyadh bombings. Before going into what they have said, let us mention some important rules about benefits, beside what will come during the discussion.

Among the rules concerning benefits and detriments are the following:

1. A detriment is not to be taken account if despite its presence the legal precept remains firm with proof from a text, report, consensus, or analogy.
2. A detriment that cancels the legal precept is one that departs from what is usual in its like and that exceeds the detriment necessarily connected to the basic rule.
3. A detriment which when taken into account would lead to suspending one of the observances of religion is invalid.
4. Individual damage is tolerated in order to ward off public damage.
5. Whoever considers the benefits and detriments in a matter must consider in it all the Muslims whom the matter affects.
6. Abandoning the fundamentals of religion and the occurrence of idolatry are absolutely the greatest detriments.
7. Estimating the detriment in a matter is to be done by people with knowledge of the religious law and acquaintance with the world.
8. The judgment of the commander (amir) in evaluating benefits and detriments, as long as it is not a pure detriment, is given precedence over any other.
9. Someone who considers benefits and detriments is held accountable for anything whose signs were visible at the time of his consideration, not for what lay hidden in the affair; for only God knows what is hidden. Indeed, the Prophet as well as mujahidin after him estimated what would be beneficial in matters of jihad and yet they turned out differently from what he thought and estimated.
10. A detriment is not to be taken account if despite its presence the legal precept remains firm with proof from a text, report, consensus, or analogy.

The first rule excludes the argument of anyone who cites the existence of detriment in jihad while knowing that the same detriment was present in the time of the Prophet. For example, someone might argue that jihad damages the preaching cadres. He might say, "If they had been with us, they would not have died and been killed." Yet the Prophet used to send out in jihad everyone without distinction, and so did the companions, until, in the war with Musaylimah, hundreds of Koran readers were killed. So this argument is invalid, given that this detriment existed in the time of the Prophet without the precept [of jihad] being cancelled because of it by a specific text for its cancellation. The reply lies in the verses: "Say: 'Then avert death from yourselves.'" (Koran 3:168). And, "Say: 'Even if you had been in your houses, those for whom slaying was appointed would have sallied forth unto their last couches.'" (Koran 3:154).

It also excludes the argument of anyone who argues that it would draw the enemy into Muslim territory, since that possibility existed in the time of the Prophet, when he initiated fighting against Quraysh, and they then came to Medina at the battles of Badr and Uhud.

It also excludes the argument of anyone who cites damage to security and disturbance of the country. Abu Bakr al-Siddiq sent out armies and said, "Even if the dogs should drag the feet of the wives of the Prophet, God's prayers and peace be upon him, I would not abandon sending out armies" -- or however he phrased it. Although he was obliged to send out Usamah's army by specific injunction, fighting the apostates was not like this, and he knew that some of the Bedouins were lying in wait around Medina.

11. A detriment that cancels the legal precept is one that departs from what is usual in its like and that exceeds the detriment necessarily connected to the basic rule.

The second rule is because some precepts are based on a kind of damage. For example, if death results from the duty of commanding the right and forbidding the wrong, it is a damage for which the duty lapses. However, if death results from fighting [in jihad], the duty does not lapse, because the basis of fighting is the risk of damage to life and property.

Inherent in fighting is repelling the enemy, his retaliation, and his attempting to harm Muslims, and the inevitable accomplishment by him of some of these goals. At Uhud, the unbelievers captured a Muslim woman. Jihad is not cancelled because of such damages, because they are not out of the ordinary in the like; they are concomitants of every fighting and jihad.

This is the general rule in other precepts. Much wealth is spent for zakat, but the large amount does not cancel the obligation. However, if a rich man needs water for purification for prayer and he cannot obtain it except at more than the normal price, he is not obligated to buy it; he may purify himself with sand, even though he expends much more money for zakat -- and so on.

12. A detriment which when taken into account would lead to suspending one of the observances of religion is invalid.

As for the third rule, if one wishes to infer from damage that a particular precept is cancelled, if one desires to suspend it for a short time or in one particular place and not others, this is valid. This is not the case if one wishes to suspend the basic rule of the precept, as do those who want to suspend jihad, relying on some of their well-known arguments, which, if carried to their consequence, would completely close the gate of the religious duty of jihad.

13. Individual damage is tolerated in order to ward off public damage.

The fourth rule means tolerating the damage of killing a human shield, for example, to avert damage from the generality of Muslims. It also means tolerating the occurrence of a certain amount of fear, hunger, and the loss of wealth, lives, and resources in some Islamic territory to avert damage to the generality of Muslim lands.

14. Whoever considers the benefits and detriments in a matter must consider in it all the Muslims whom the matter affects.

The fifth rule replies to anyone who measures benefits and detriments in one of the Islamic countries and concludes that the damage would outweigh the benefit, without at all taking into account the benefits that would be obtained in the other Islamic countries. Jihad against the unbelievers realizes the benefit of injuring them, which is a way to repel them from Muslim territory. The wider the battlefield becomes, the greater the injury becomes due to the fear and terror, due to the security expenses that exhaust their economy, due to their expectation of operations in every country where there is a Muslim they fear, and due to impediment to their interests, which are to wage war on God and His Messenger in every country.

The project of al-Qa'idah is a worldwide project for jihad. Its yield is for the entire Ummah. These other people look only at the domestic front, leaving other Muslim lands out of their consideration, not paying attention to them, and not mentioning them. They neither attempt to

repel aggression from them by the means by which it can be repelled nor do they urge others to do so.

15. Abandoning the fundamentals of religion and the occurrence of idolatry are absolutely the greatest detriments.

The sixth rule is important in replying to those who take unbelievers as friends, or who justify doing so, or who excuse those who do so on the pretext of benefit. They will gain no benefit greater than the strict monotheism (tawhid) they relinquish, and they will ward off no detriment greater than the polytheism and idolatry (shirk) into which they fall.

It is not to be alleged that by this rule it is necessary to fight every unbeliever immediately or rebel against every apostate ruler regardless of strength and ability. We are discussing balancing between a man's committing shirk and encountering detriment and his maintaining tawhid and obtaining benefit; we are not discussing postponing the removal of the shirk committed by the unbelievers.

16. Estimating the detriment in a matter is to be done by people with knowledge of the religious law and acquaintance with the world.

From the seventh rule you learn that someone who does not know the kind of benefits realized by jihad and who has no understanding of them from experience, study, or knowledge that stands in the stead of experience cannot judge whether a particular detriment is normal in jihad, one without which jihad cannot take place, or whether it is unexpected and too great to be tolerated.

Someone without knowledge of the religious law and a sound view, even if he knows the detriment, cannot balance worldly detriments that occur against religious damages. Each side has an importance that makes it forbidden for someone ignorant of it to speak about the matter.

17. The judgment of the commander (amir) in evaluating benefits and detriments, as long as it is not a pure detriment, is given precedence over any other.

The eighth rule exists in every army, such as the al-Qa'idah organization, that embarks on a jihad operation. The individuals of the army may differ in their assessment of benefits and detriments, but none of them can disobey his commander when the commander has done what he has been commanded to do, has given sound consideration to the matter, and chosen his command to his men.

The mujahidin who carried out this blessed action obeyed the order of their commander, whether it was Usamah or someone to whom Usamah gave command over them in the peninsula. They emanated from him. They did not have the right to leave jihad because of an assessment that one of them might make.

When you know this, their assertion that the question is not merely a weighing of benefits and detriments, until someone says to us, "You can keep quiet and not criticize, excuse and not condemn," is invalid in two respects.

First, anything beyond considering benefits and detriments has been answered in their reasoning. So there remains for them only looking at benefits and detriments. So they are told

that they can keep quiet until the benefits are considered and discussed, so that they can be told, the argument about benefits having been issued, you cannot remain silent; rather you can only support the bombings and abet them.

The second respect is that avoiding criticizing is not limited to matters in which pronouncement depends on consideration of benefits and detriments; rather [it extends to] those where there is disagreement over some proofs and about whose soundness there is conflict, as long as the disagreement is intense and sound in approach. Those who disagree with them over this question have a powerful, sound, and apparent proof. There is not with them any one who basically opposes it. The least of it, assuming the greatest concession, is to say that those who disagree with you are qualified jurists (mujtahidun) who have held to a strong place of adherence so that criticizing them is not permissible.

CHAPTER FOUR: Have You Not Become Acquainted With the Mujahidin Yet?

Sadly, words and deeds have become apparent on the part of some people that indicate that they really have not learned who the mujahidin are. They have not learned what they want and what they have gone out seeking. They have not learned who they are who have protected the Ummah from dark calamities and have given their lives, time, and money to preserve Islam and protect its lands.

They have not become acquainted with the heroes for fear of whom the enemy trembles and whose valor turns him from his designs. Indeed, does the United States fear the armies of the Islamic states today? American knows all about them. They were fashioned under her eyes and constructed under her domination, supervision, and direction.

They have not learned this, although the mujahidin have often made it clear, especially their shaykh, Abu-Abdallah, Usama [Bin Ladin], may God aid him and protect him, in his repeated written and voice messages for more than ten years. However, the media have brought a great charm and obvious lie by which they have enchanted people's eyes and frightened them.

Here we shall review some questions that remained in the minds of some excellent men after the blessed operation because of the effects of the media and journalists.

Do the mujahidin pronounce the generality of Muslims to be unbelievers?

The martyr Yusuf al-'Ayiri, may God have mercy on him, answered this question in his letter the text of which has been quoted above.

"Seventh: I will also stress what my brother Ali said in his letter, that we have not raised the banner of jihad to kill believers. Sound minds, not to mention proofs from religious law, refute this charge against us.

"How could we leave, suffer hardships, face dangers and strife, and leave our country, an easy life, and safety, to go to Afghanistan, Chechnya, Bosnia, Somalia, Kashmir, and other Islamic lands? Why did we go there despite all the hardships and dangers?

"We went there to defend the honor, religion, and security of Muslims, to protect their lives, and to set our blood before their blood. Is it logical that we would ransom people far away with our

blood, risk our necks for them, and then decide to terrorize our own people closest to us and shed their blood?

"No sound mind will accept this, not to mention the Muslim who knows God's law and the precepts of the Koran and Sunnah. We are not people of error and deviation, that we should turn our weapons against any Muslim. If anyone alleges that we declare the generality of Muslims to be unbelievers and countenance killing them, we take refuge in God from this error. If we held the generality of Muslims to be unbelievers, why did we go to defend our brothers in Bosnia or Chechnya, who know nothing of Islam except the profession of faith (shahadah)? If we are defending with our blood those who know of Islam only the shahadah, judging them to be Muslims and considering it our duty to ransom them with our blood, does it make sense that we would sacrifice our blood for those we considered to be unbelievers? -- and then that we would kill a Muslim who lives in a society that follows all the principles of religion? We declare no one who prays toward Mecca to be an unbeliever for any sin, as long as he does not consider it licit. Our method in this is that of the People of the Sunnah and Al-Jama'ah [Sunni Muslims]. We do not need to expound it, for it is well-known to every Muslim."

What is the sickness from which the mujahidin are suffering?

The media have squawked and the brains of the false gods (taghut) have screeched out all the obfuscation they have. They have tried with all their power and more to mar the reputation of the mujahidin and to dry up the pure spring of the Islamic call and veil its gleaming light. They have been no exception to and will not be an exception to what every tyrant does in every age. Among the charges they have heaped on the mujahidin is that they are mentally ill.

This is exactly what the polytheists said to the prophets and messengers: "We say nothing, but that one of our gods has smitten thee with some evil." (Koran 11:54). "Even so not a Messenger came to those before them but they said, 'A sorcerer, or a man possessed!'" (Koran 51:52). This is the device of someone who has no other device, the means of someone for whom all other means have failed. If they see the shining truth, they flee from reasoning to caviling. This is their habit and the habit of their forefathers.

If by the sickness of the mujahidin they mean that for which God urged them to seek healing, concerning which God said: "Fight them, and God will chastise them at your hands and degrade them, and He will help you against them, and bring healing to the breasts of a people who believe" (Koran 9:14) -- if they mean this, then all of us, thank God, are sick and all of us are seeking the healing that God commanded us to seek. This is what believers feel in their hearts. This sickness, in this sense, is one of the inseparable attributes of faith. Let the one who has termed the mujahidin sick then look for his faith, wherever it may be.

When the tyrants affirm this and repeat it, they are eager to turn people from listening to the summoner to truth and considering the plain evidence. How they resemble their first head, Pharaoh, when he said: "You have believed him before I gave you leave. Why, he is the chief of you, the same that taught you sorcery." (Koran 26:49). In other words, do not listen to his arguments or consider them; he is a sorcerer from among the sorcerers.

Do the mujahidin in their points of departure base themselves on knowledge of the religious law, or not?

The hired media and mercenary journalists have kept harping on the theme of ignorance. They have made the mujahidin out to be ignorant. They have wrested from them the attribute of knowledge and divested them of it, on the pretext that there is a monopoly of knowledge -- a pretext facilitated by the tyrants' untiring efforts to monopolize the ulema, until no one can give a fatwa except someone whom the tyrant selects and appoints, whose fatwas he approves, and whose statements he finds congenial.

The mujahidin, who have given their lives to God, possessing nothing more precious than their lives, would not have entered into the transaction with uncertainty; they would not have hurled themselves into a burning furnace without asking and learning God's precept.

Did anything impel them to give their heartblood and risk their lives except obedience to God's command, surrender to Him, being bound by His precepts, and being led by Him the All-praised and Exalted? How could they venture upon this in ignorance, or turn bedazzled onto the way of error?

This is not a discussion about hypotheses that ought to be; it is a discussion of the reality that the mujahidin are living, to which they are clinging, for which they are most eager, and which they follow as much as they are able.

Can you find anything that clarifies and proves this better than the writings of the scholars to whom the mujahidin turn for legal opinions? Look at the books of Shaykh Nasir al-Fahd, may God release him from prison, and the statements of the late learned Hammud al-Aqla, and the writings of Shaykh Yusuf al-Ayiri, may God accept him among the martyrs.

This does not mean exonerating the mujahidin in everything and in all respects. Error can take place at any time, as well as haste and legal violations, just as they occurred into the time of the Prophet, God's prayers and peace be upon him.

For example, Khalid Ibn-al-Walid, may God be pleased with him, killed those who took refuge in prostrating themselves and said, "We are Sabians, we are Sabians." [A religious sect that the Koran considers, along with Jews and Christians, to be "people of the book," and hence not to be converted by force.] Some of the Prophet's companions killed people who offered them the greeting [i.e., the Muslim greeting, al-salamu alaykum]. God thereupon revealed the verse: "And do not say to him who offers you a greeting, 'Thou art not a believer,' seeking the chance goods of the present life." (Koran 4:94). Usamah Ibn-Zayd, the beloved friend of the Messenger of God and son of his beloved friend, killed a man who said, "There is no god but God," because he supposed him to have said it merely to escape death. One of the commanders of the expeditions that the Messenger of God sent out lit a fire and commanded his companions to enter it. They refused, saying, "We have followed the Messenger of God only for fear of the fire"; and the Prophet said they had spoken truly. On one of the expeditions it happened that a man who had been wounded polluted himself in a dream; they commanded him to wash his entire body, and he died. The Prophet became angry and reproached them for it. There are so many other examples that it is hard to exhaust them and list them all.

Mistakes were committed by mujahidin in the time of the Prophet, God's prayers and peace be upon him. This undoubtedly was something reprehensible and not pleasing to God. It cannot be approved; it must be criticized and warned against. However, when it happens, one does not as a consequence utterly reject the mujahid and invalidate his fighting in the jihad.

This concerns a sin and violation of the religious law that has taken place. How then with regard to something that is an individual pronouncement on a legal question? How with regard to something that is a truth about which there is consensus and for which the violator has no proof?

Your brothers the mujahidin do not embark on an action before making certain of its conformity with the religious law and before asking knowledgeable people, such as those mentioned above and others. They act on the basis of the Koran and the Sunnah. They seek light from the guidance and understanding of the early Muslims (al-salaf). They give the ulema precedence as lamps and lanterns guiding them on the way. We pray that God will make them successful in knowledge and in works.

Do the mujahidin intend to bomb the two sanctuaries?

After the arrest of the sheikhs and some mujahidin in Medina and the raids in the al-Khalidiyah neighborhood of Mecca, many people believed the rumors circulated by the Ministry of Domestic Lying and Fabrication, that the mujahidin intended to bomb the two noble sanctuaries, for which every Muslim would give his life and prized possessions in ransom. Yet the mujahidin prepared their supplies of force and reserves only to terrorize the American occupying enemy, whom nothing would turn away from the two sanctuaries if he wanted them. The army of the client state is unqualified to protect an inch of Muslim territory, but for the protection and defense of Almighty God.

The media circulated the rumor that the mujahidin intended to bomb commercial establishments and places where people gather. I wish I knew why, if these open markets and gathering places without guards were a target of the mujahidin, they would trouble themselves to storm fortified complexes and confront the armored vehicles protecting the Crusaders.

Would not an attack on one of the markets or complexes of Riyadh have been much easier and have produced more victims, if that had been the intention of the mujahidin?

Does anyone doubt of these mujahidin that if an enemy were to attack the country or an occupier pollute its land, as the Americans are doing today, they would give their lives as a shield for land and honor?

Do you not see your brothers, the mujahidin -- how the Arab and national armies withdrew, and there remained only these heroes, the mujahidin of the people of Iraq and their brothers the Ansar in the Arabian peninsula, Syria, Morocco, and elsewhere?

The mujahidin have announced their goal many times. They target only the Crusader enemies of the faith and whoever stands in their ranks and helps them. They repel the attacker as much as possible. If he is repelled by a warning, then it is a warning; if he is not repelled except by more, then they do it by God's leave, whoever their attacker may be.

The Americans and the client governments that back them, be it the government of Karzai in Afghanistan, the government of Musharraf in Pakistan, the government of Fahd in the land of the Two Holy Mosques, or the government of Ali Abdallah Salih in Yemen, are legitimate objects for the mujahidin, targets for their fire. They and the Americans are equal in their war on religion and in their being targeted by the mujahidin.

Conclusion:

O our brothers on the frontiers of Islam and in the battlefields of jihad, in Palestine, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Chechnya, Iraq, the Arabian Peninsula (both Najd and the Hijaz), in north and east Africa and every part of Africa, and everywhere on God's earth, march forth with God's blessing. Pray for God's help; for God is your protector, and the unbelievers have no protector. However much they exalt themselves, God is more exalted and sublime. However many they kill, there is no equality: their slain are in hell; your slain are in paradise.

Be resolute and bind your hearts to jihad as long as you live. When you resolve, rely on God. Let their hosts not frighten you; for the hosts of the godless will be broken, though they be great in number, and the armies of the obstinate will turn back and be destroyed, for all their bold schemes. The resolves of men astray will be shown to be effeminate and humiliated, though their possessions be manly and great.

Do you not see that God the All-praised made each Muslim overcome two of them, and he gave the male the share of two females in intellect and planning? It is our duty to fly at them in groups and alone, to attack them on foot and horseback, and to risk with them lives and heartblood. We must travel the deserts of the land and billows of the sea to reach rank. We must cross the billows of brimming seas in ships like dark nights setting forth by day. We must go to live as foreigners among them in ravens that fly without wing in every airport and possessors of feet that race the long-bodied camels and the birds. We must unfurl the banners of Islam on vessels like high mountains. We must penetrate the deserts of bravery on footless thoroughbreds. We must cause to flow on the land a sea clamorous with smoke and with neighing fleet ones dashing waves -- until the floods of horses choke the hills and the dales, and the lands and towns flow with the swords of stallion-like men.

Let each of us spend the night with the sword and wrath as his bedmate. Let the field of fierce battle be for him a spring pasture. Let the heat of battle's furnace be for him a refreshing rain. Let him answer the summoner of death obediently and willingly. Let him betake himself to fame, though he be thrown down and left slain.

Let us strive to release every prisoner and troubled one and to face every chance and danger. Let us destroy with the hands of jihad the morass of idolatry and its helpers. Let us attack with sharp blades the proponents of unbelief so that we tear off their coverings. Let us cleanse ourselves with the blood of idolaters and unbelievers from the filth of sins and the impurity of guilt. Let us wrap ourselves in the cloak of patience in the fray of battle, when the hosts form their ranks with the brave and heroes, when the clouds of dust contend and spearman closes with bowman in the thick of the fray; when the shooters pelt each other with shafts and arrows; when the defenders are pressed in the places of conflict; when the ironclad ones show their bravery with thrusting long spears; when the knots of spear shafts meet with spear shafts; when men shake hands with the palms of blood shedders; when the eagle of death snatches the beloved of spirits; when souls are plundered by the hand of combat; when cups of death are passed round to possessors of nobility and generosity; when the white trenchant ones shine in the gloom of dust like darkness; when gushing blood flows from throats by means of daggers.

There the gates of heaven are opened. Its couches are raised and its cups are set down. The wide-eyed houris appear as their companions and mates. Their call arises for the brave on the foot of effort. So, they struck with the white blades of Mashrafi swords on necks. They deemed bitter-tasting death to be sweet. They sold transitory life for enduring life. They went down to drink deeply at the pool of martyrdom, never to thirst afterward. Their commerce bore profit,

and they became the most fortunate of the fortunate. They profit by the enterprise they have undertaken, "rejoicing in the bounty that God has given them." (Koran 3:170).

To Thee O God we stretch hands of beseeching, that Thou wilt make us to be of them, and not cause us to swerve from them when the Hour shall come; that Thou wilt bestow on us of Thy grace a martyrdom that shall cause Thee to be pleased with us, forgiveness for the sin that burdens the back and distresses, and acceptance for our souls, for we have offered them to Thee, of Thy grace and favor. Far be it from Thy generosity that we should return disappointed of what we desire and hope for; and Thou art the most merciful of those who have mercy.(2)

And God knows best. And God's prayers and peace be upon our Prophet Muhammad, his family, and all his companions.

NOTES:

1. The correct legal device, according to those who do not stipulate taking possession in the requirement for a security, is that the item for sale be sold and that an uncollected security be given for its price. See Ibn-al-Qayyim's discussion of valid legal devices in *A'lam al-Muwaqqi'in*.
2. From the book, *Mashari al-Ashwaq ila Masari al-Ushaq*," by Ibn-al-Nahhas [d. 1411, the book concerns the merits of jihad], may God have mercy on him.