

Full Translation begins:

(Page 1 of 21)

In the name of God the merciful the compassionate

1- Evaluating the material of the speech and the benefit of the Shaykh's appearance in the present stage:

As for the material of the speech, it is fine and not specified on the midterm elections, but is good for publishing in any time, God knows best. But I have a warning about what was mentioned of a statement by (a previous president of yours) who is the person? If what is meant is what was referred to (Benjamin Franklin), who was mentioned by Shaykh Ayman in one of his statements, we should remind that (Benjamin Franklin) was not a president, but a "statesman" and one of the founders of the United States and its Constitution. I have not heard about what is quoted from him, but from Shaykh Ayman. I do not know the source of the story, or its popularity amongst the Americans. But such a mistake may be used to slander the Shaykh, and accuse him of talking about something he does not master (politics). The evidence is his mixing between the presidents and non-presidents. Although plenty of the Americans may also think that (Franklin) a president, because of his picture on the currency that usually carries the photos of the presidents. But this mistake is not usually committed by those talking in politics, analyzing and discussing. It is a common mistake among general people and not between specialists.

All of this, if the one desired is -"the previous president" (Benjamin Franklin). If another person was intended, then there is no need for my previous words.

As for the benefit of exposing the Shaykh at this stage, we should look at this matter from all angles. We should also consider the following points:

- Irrespective of the passing of the mid-term elections, the timing now is very suitable for the Shaykh to show with this speech. This is because all the political talk in America is about the economy, forgetting or ignoring the war and its role in weakening the economy. Just as what a Pakistani journalist residing in America has said, that the press conference held by Obama after the midterm elections, all the questions were on the bad economy, and the means to get out of the crisis. Nevertheless not one of the journalists dared to embarrass Obama

by questioning him about the influence on the American budget and the national economy of spending the billions yearly on the two wars of Afghanistan and Iraq.

- It is all right if the Shaykh appeared now, then appeared in the 10th anniversary of the attacks of Manhattan and Washington. Every exposure of him, as long as it is not daily or semi-weekly, should have an influence. The repetition of his exposure, irrespective of the vicious campaign that is waged against al-Qa'ida, everywhere, is by itself something that attracts attention.

(Page 2 of 21)

- We should not forget that there are millions of admirers of the Shaykh in the Islamic world, who are eager for his appearance to ensure his health and that he is well. Those should be targeted in our speeches and messages, before the Americans and Europeans, who do not listen to or evaluate what is being said.

- We should also not forget the Mujahidin brothers in the fronts, who are passing through crucial times and facing disaster after disaster. They also will be happy to see the Shaykh again; his appearance will raise their morale with the help of God. I would think that it is suitable for the Shaykh to address a video speech to the Mujahidin in all the arenas, consoling, urging them to endure, confirming their steps and guiding them. The message that he sent when Shaykh Sa'id -may God bless his soul- was strong and influential, so may God reward him well. Many people do not read, and even if they read, they are more influenced by visuals.

The bottom line, since there is no security precaution from having a video appearance, and there is no error or something in the speech which may need reconsideration, and as long as the Shaykh is satisfied to publish it after the elections -being silent is a sign of acceptance- I see that it is produced with no hesitation or delay, and God knows best.

2- The Issue of preparing for the Tenth Anniversary, and how it will be marketed in the Media, and How to Exploit the Media in General:

As far as the American channel that could be used to deliver our messages, whether on the tenth anniversary or before or after, in my personal opinion there are no distinct differences between

the channels from the standpoint of professionalism and neutrality. It is all as the Shaykh has stated (close to professionalism and neutrality) it has not and will not reach the perfect professionalism and neutrality, only if God wants that.

From the professional point of view, they are all on one level-except (Fox News) channel which falls into the abyss as you know, and lacks neutrality too.

As for the neutrality of CNN in English, it seems to be in cooperation with the government more than the others (except Fox News of course). Its Arabic version brings good and detailed reports about al-Sahab releases, with a lot of quotations from the original text. That means they copy directly from the releases or its gist. It is not like what other channels and sites do, copying from news agencies like Reuters, AP and others.

I used to think that MSNBC channel may be good and neutral a bit, but it has lately fired two of the most famous journalists -Keith Olberman and Octavia Nasser the Lebanese - because they released some statements that were open for argument (The Lebanese had praised a Shia Imam Muhammad Husayn Fadlallah after his death and called him "One of the marvels of Hizballah" it seems she is a Shia.)

(Page 3 of 21)

CBS channel was mentioned by the Shaykh, I see that it is like the other channels, but it has a famous program (60 Minutes) that has some popularity and a good reputation for its long broadcasting time. Only God knows the reality, as I am not really in a position to do so.

ABC channel is all right; actually it could be one of the best channels, as far as we are concerned. It is interested in al-Qa'ida issues, particularly the journalist Brian Ross, who is specialized in terrorism. The channel is still proud for its interview with the Shaykh. It also broadcasted excerpts from a speech of mine on the fourth anniversary, it also published most of that text on its site on the internet.

In conclusion, we can say that there is no single channel that we could rely on for our messages. I may ignore them, and even the channel that broadcast them, probably it would distort them somehow. This is accomplished by bringing analysts and experts

that would interpret its meaning in the way they want it to be. Or they may ignore the message and conduct a smearing of the individuals, to the end of the list of what you know about their cunning methods.

But if the display -in the next anniversary for example- of a special type, like a special interview with Shaykh Usama or Shaykh Ayman, and with questions chosen by the channel, and with a good camera, we might find a channel that would accept its broadcasting. But they would accept this time, so as to get an exclusive press scoop: The first press interview of Shaykh Usama or Shaykh Ayman since 10 years ago! Particularly if the Shaykh is the one to be interviewed. This is because of the scarcity of his appearance during the last nine years. Because of the poor photographic quality of the last two releases -I do not know the photo quality this time- this led those believers in conspiracy theory to speculate if the person was the Shaykh, and you may have seen the program (Ben Ladin, alive or dead?) that was broadcast by Al Jazeera.

Accordingly, a high quality speech (HD) may receive some interest by some channels in the tenth anniversary. If the quality of the new Shaykh's speech is high, relative to the two previous speeches, you may think to compress it or take some measures to decrease the quality, to be similar to the previous ones, and I am talking seriously.

In general, and no matter what material we send, I suggest that we should distribute it to more than one channel, so that there will be healthy competition between the channels in broadcasting the material, so that no other channel takes the lead. It should be sent for example to ABC, CBS, NBC, and CNN and maybe PBS and VOA. As for Fox News, let her die in her anger. That is if there was no agreement with a specific channel to publish a specific material, or conduct an interview, or the like.

(Page 4 of 21)

As for the second method, which I suggest, it is close to what the Shaykh mentioned of communicating with 'Abd-al-Bari Atwan and Robert Fisk. I suggest that we send the material-or materials-to a group of writers and professional or independent journalists, who have shown interest in al-Qa'ida issues, from different countries. In Britain, the two journalists Atwan and Fisk, and probably others, in America Brian Russ, Simon Hirsh and Jerry Van Dyke and others, in Canada Eric Margolis and Gwynne Dyer. In Europe, the Norwegian journalist who spent some

time with the students in Kroner and released a film that was condemned in the West because he shows that the students are humans that have families and children and that they laugh and eat as the rest of the people. In Pakistan, Hamid Mir and Salim Safi, the owner of the program (Jerga) at Geo channel, also Rahimullah Yusuf Zia and Jamal Ismail, and at Al Jazeera (Put their names here if they exist). In Egypt, Dr. Muhammad 'Abbas and others, in Jordan Dr. Karam Hijazi, in Yemen 'Abd-al-Ilah Haydar Sha'i -if he is released by the government and is still concerned with al-Qa'ida issues, and so on. It would be good if we send it to 30-50 of those journalists and writers. We would inform each that he has been chosen to be amongst a group of international journalists and writers, and that they will receive special media material on the tenth anniversary of 9/11. It will be favorable if the message sent to them also includes what was mentioned by the Shaykh, of reasons that call them to be interested in this material and to cooperate in publishing its mission for the world, plus other convincing arguments. There would be a password and a site address to download the materials at the right time, let it be 5 days before the anniversary, for example. This is easy -as I think- on our brothers working in the networking.

Suppose that one-third of those corresponded with are interested, then we would have 10 international journalists that will display our mission in the newspapers and channels. If the experiment works, then I suggest to repeat it on every important occasion, and any instant we want to increase the number of those informed about some message or statement.

To rely only on Al Jazeera and the Jihadi forums on the internet is not useful. Al Jazeera channel, now seems to put requirements like other channels and agencies and papers to cover al-Qa'ida announcements. Namely to include a threat or to claim responsibility for an act. As for the messages of diplomatic tone, like the two Shaykh's messages about the flooding, is not suitable for publication in their media, as this face of al-Qa'ida should not be exposed to people.

As for the Jihadi forums, it is repulsive to most of the Muslims, or closed to them. It also distorts the face of al-Qa'ida, due to what you know of bigotry, the sharp tone that characterizes most of the participants in these forums. It is also biased towards (Salafists) and not any Salafist, but the Jihadi Salafist, which is just one trend of the Muslims trends. The Jihad Salafist is a small trend within a small trend.

(Page 5 of 21)

By the way, Dr. Muhammad al-Misa'ri has excellent comments on Jihadi forums, although his forum (al-Tajdid) is not any better, actually worse as it seems to me. Al-Misa'ri was also correct in his analysis about Iraq, in comparison with other Jihadi arenas. To end the suspicion I would say: Whoever read my comments on the Dr.'s book knows that I said something similar to what he mentioned about the forums and the Islamic State of Iraq. All of that before the al-Misa'ri announcement that he issued after the killing of the State Emirs. My comments on the Dr.'s book were two months earlier, so I did not stem my thoughts from al-Misa'ri at all. But, there was some agreement on opinions -only on these two issues. (As for the other issues, like his definition of unification, some Fiqh theses, his exaggerated stiffness with Shia, those adhering to the buried, rejuvenators of myths and pagan appearances, not at all).

I would like to emphasize that I was at ease with declaring the State for a long time. I was not at ease with al-Zarqawi's -may God bless his soul- moves, which he took in the name of al-Qa'ida. All of this is known to the Shaykhs Ayman, 'Atiyah and Ubayd (Munir). My stand is not a new one, but I followed the official stand of the organization, being afraid not to create a seduction, and because I used to accuse my own opinion. This is to note now, although I have accepted my own stand, I do not discuss this topic except with the scholars like you and sometimes with my brothers at al-Sahab. After all, it is but a set of advice and opinions, I wish you give it some consideration and discuss it, may God lead you and me to the right opinions. I am not biased in my opinion, neither do I ally with or differ from accordingly. If there was some sharpness in introducing the matter, it is the style that I am used to in conversation and in writing. I am, however, trying to make my style more flexible and less sharp, and help is from God.

3- Showing the Fairness of our Case to the Whole World and the European Peoples in Particular and the Obstacles placed in front of that:

The virtuous Shaykh has talked about the importance of exposing the justness of our case to the world and the Europeans in particular, and that is when talking about the preparation for the tenth anniversary to Manhattan battle. The Shaykh has emphasized that context -as concerned the Europeans- in previous messages and statements.

I was -in response to those directives, and after consulting brother Ubayd- starting to prepare a message to the Irish, and I started searching for the information and materials necessary for that to be collected. This was after I noticed the sympathy of the Irish people to the Palestinian issue, and the soft treatment by the Irish Judicial system of the Muslims accused of terrorism, and also not participating with its troops in Bush's Crusade wars (although it is participating within the European Union forces in training the Somali army). Also, what helped to prepare the message was the last economic crisis that affected Ireland a lot, thus forcing its youth to look for sources of living in the outside. The other matter is the increasing anger in Ireland towards the Catholic Church

(Page 6 of 21)

after exposing a number of sex scandals and others. The people there are moving towards secularism, after it was the most religious of atheist Europe, and why do not we face them with Islam?

Also I was thinking of preparing an Arabic message to the Christians of the Arab region, calling them to Islam, and to caution them from cooperating with invader enemies of Islam who oppose the Islamic State. They should welcome the Islamic advance, as did their forefathers when the Muslims liberated Jerusalem during the time of 'Umar Ibn al-Khattab - May God be satisfied with him.

Then the attack on the Catholic Church in Baghdad took place, launched by the organization of the Islamic State of Iraq that we support, which is -if we like it or not- known to people as (al-Qa'ida in Iraq). This attack halted me, and I thought twice about my two project messages. As actions are more effective than words, their act and the contacts they carried during the attack, and the statement they issued later, do not help to gain people's sympathy. This attack came days after the declaration by the Catholics of the Middle East, of their disagreement with Israel in a way that made the Jews and their allies angry, the Catholics refusing to utilize the Bible to justify the occupation and seizing of Palestine.

Also the Catholics were historically the prominent enemies of the Jews, amongst the other Christians. They were also the original enemies to the Evangelist Protestant who were the vanguard of the Crusades. Their public in general, these days, is more sympathetic and understanding of the Muslims, than other

Protestant and Orthodox Christians. I do not eliminate the animosity, and do not say that if they had the chance they would not fight Muslims as did the Anglo-Saxon Protestants. I also do not deny the animosity of the Pope and other church heads to Islam and Muslims - why not, Islam is the biggest threat for the continuity of their power, particularly in Europe. I do not deny that they send missionaries here and there, asking Muslims to apostasy. But I am talking about the public and present situation, and the size of animosity, and the size of the missionary activities. We cannot compare their efforts against Islam to the efforts of the Evangelist Protestants or the efforts of the Coptic Church and other spiteful Orthodox.

Even in Bosnia, we saw the Catholic Croats standing next to the Muslims against the Orthodox Serb. I have seen lately, in a report about Venezuela, a picture of a wall, with (Islam is the heritage of all) written on it.

The conclusion is that, in general, the Catholics are a fertile ground for call of God and to persuade them about the just case of the Mujahidin, particularly after the rage expanding against the mother church (Vatican) as a result of its scandals and policies refused by many of its public.

(Page 7 of 21)

But the attacks on the Christians in Iraq, like the Baghdad attack and what took place earlier in Mosul and others, does not help us to convey the message. Even if the ones we are talking to have some grudge against the mother church, they will not grasp in general the targeting of their public, women, children and men in their church during Mass.

From the strangest matters of this case, and what was reported by the media, was the threat of the attackers to kill the hostages and start an all out war against Christians in Iraq and the region unless the Coptic church (Orthodox) released Wafa Qastantin and Kamelia Shihata that are detained in one of its Monasteries. It is well known, to whoever has any knowledge of the Christians and their factions, that there are no ties between the Catholic Church and the Orthodox churches. There is historical animosity between the factions, as each side considers the other an innovator. Because we are living in the age of peaceful coexistence and dialogue exchange, they would be spilling each other's blood, as they used to do in the past.

To make the analogy: this operation -from the Christians point of view at least- as if an armed group belonging to a given sect have assaulted a Sunni mosque in al-Fallujah -not the Awakenings mosque- but a regular mosque-they captured the praying audience and threatened to kill them and rage an overall war on the Sunnah in Iraq, if the rejectionists Shia would release Sunni prisoners in the Husayniyahs (TN: Shia prayer rooms) of Sadr city in Baghdad or the visiting sites of (The Iranian city of Qum) Does this satisfy any sane person? Were we going to understand the motives that armed group or who is behind it, or who is allying with it?

Is it not, this policy of (Islamic State of Iraq) is exactly the Bush policy that rebuffed Europe and the wise men of the world. Bush said (either with us or with the terrorists) and did not leave a space for neutrality. Here this group in Iraq is telling the Christians (Either with us or with al-Maliki government and no space for neutrality. Either you pay the "Jizya" (TN: nonbeliever tax) to our fictitious state that cannot defend itself, and has no chance of defending you, or we will destroy your goods). Is this is the justice that we are talking about, and that the Shaykh talks about in his statements and messages?

Where is the proof that the Christians of Iraq have stood with the government or the Americans as a sect? In my opinion -and I could be mistaken- the issue has no relation to the cooperation between the weak and marginalized Christian groups with the government or the Americans. But it has a relation that the (state) group who believes the authenticity of their fictitious State and are biased to what was stated by 'Umar al-Baghdadi. He claims that the Iraqi Christians should sign another contract according to the rules of the Islamic State and pay the "Jizya"... Against what? Nothing.

It is irrelevant to rely on the statements of the scholars (the root in the blood of the infidels is the resolution unless a pledge or safety or Islam). This is out of place and outside the discussion. We are here talking about the interest and the priorities not about the roots of the issue.

(Page 8 of 21)

How beautiful what Shaykh Usama mentioned lately -when talking about a media speech- that the strong statements that were mentioned by the ancestors were said during days of dignity and control, and therefore it is not fitting to the era of vulnerability. And I say: so are some of the rulings of the

scholars concerning Jihad, as they were released when Islam was strong, mighty and defensible. So it cannot be implemented on the days of weakness like our present days. (I mean here what was mentioned by some -for example- favoring or stating the necessity of demolishing churches and burning the devious religious books and things like that that may not fit our today's Jihad. Because the nature of our fight differs from theirs, and we have different priorities, defending against the assailant for example, while the scholars were talking about the demanding Jihad, etc...)

Praise to God, where is the stand of the Islamic State of Iraq on Christians, from the stand of Shaykh Usama in his speech (The Solution) three years ago? Where is their stand from the message of Shaykh Ayman's address to the Copts in -as I think- the book of acquittal - ? (I reviewed the book and found it actually in chapter 14 under "notes on what is mentioned in the tenth series" and I recommend that it be read, as it shows the extent of violation of the stand of (Fictitious Iraqi Caliphate) to the stand of the two Shaykhs Ayman and Usama). Where does this stand go, from the flexible stand of Shaykh 'Abdallah Azzam, from the Christians in the Arab lands (look at the interpretation of "al-Tawba Surah" and the resistance he encountered from the attending youth)? Where does their stand go from the position of Shaykh Abu Muhammad al-Maqdisi, who refuses the idea of detonating the churches - caution: Just exploding a church, even if it was empty, how about if it is full of people?

Strange -I swear- the conflict between the statements of our leaders and scholars, and the acts of those allied with them -or you may say: those claiming to follow them!

In summary, a position must be taken on these behaviors and not well studied or well understood stands by groups of Muslims before the infidels. The position of the leaders and the organization must be clearly defined.

I do not see any obstacle or bad act if al-Qa'ida organization declares its discontent with this behavior and other behaviors being carried out by the so-called Islamic State of Iraq, without an order from al-Qa'ida and without consultation. I see that this is done immediately or lately, favorably sooner. I see that the organization should declare the cutoff of its organizational ties with that organization (TN: Islamic State of Iraq). The relations between al-Qa'ida organization and (the state) have been practically cut off for a number of years. The decision to declare the State was taken without consultation

from al-Qa'ida leadership. Their improvised decision has caused a split in the Mujahidin ranks and their supporters inside and outside Iraq. What is left between al-Qa'ida organization and (the State), but the link of faith and Islam, which urges us to submit advise and apply the rule of propagating virtue and preventing vice, and the support of good deeds.

(Page 9 of 21)

This is the only solution facing al-Qa'ida organization, otherwise its reputation will be damaged more and more as a result of the acts and statements of this group, which is labeled under our organization (the blessed with God's will). And among the repulsive issues -and certainly forbidden- the targeting of mosques with explosives and others- as what is happening in Afghanistan and Pakistan and sometimes in Iraq. We still need to clarify our justified issue to the Muslims before we clarify it to the Europeans (look at the next chapter for more on this topic)

I have read a new article by Robert Fisk expressing his reaction -and other people's reaction- to the attack on the church in Baghdad, and allow me to translate to you the most important parts and gist the rest:

The title of the article: The West makes it easier for al-Qa'ida to attack... November 6 2010

The speed with which the Baghdad church massacre by al-Qa'ida has frightened the peoples of the Middle East is a sign of just how fragile the earth is beneath their feet. Unlike our western television news, Al Jazeera and al-Arabiya show the whole horror of such carnage. Arms, legs, beheaded torsos, leave no doubt of what they mean. Every Christian in the region understood what this attack meant. Indeed, given the sectarian nature of the assaults on Shia Iraqis, I am beginning to wonder whether al-Qa'ida itself -far from being the center of world terror, as we imagine- must be one of the most sectarian organizations ever invented. I suspect that there is not just one al-Qa'ida but several, feeding off the injustices of the region, a blood transfusion which the West (and I am including the Israelis) here feeds into its body. (That is as if Fisk is comparing these strange injustices to blood transfusion, just as a blood transfusion revitalizes the sick or wounded, the same token these tyrannies did not rejuvenate al-Qa'ida).

In fact, I am wondering if our governments do not need this terror - to make us frightened, very frightened, to make us obey to bring more security to our little lives. And I am wondering whether those same governments will ever wake up to the fact that our actions in the Middle East are what is endangering our security. Lord Blair of Isfahan always denied this -(Fisk in that sense compares Blair to the representatives of the old empire, during the Iraqi invasion Fisk used to say "Lord Blair" the owner of "Kut al-Amara." Now as the winds of war are directed towards Iran, he is calling Blair as "Lord Blair Sahib Isfahan")- even when the 7/7 suicide bomber carefully explained in his posthumous video that Iraq was one of the reasons

(Page 10 of 21)

he committed the slaughter in London -and Bush always denied it- and Sarkozy will deny it if al-Qa'ida fulfills its latest threat to attack France.

Now, as for al-Qa'ida, it is "All Christians" in the Middle East who are to be the targets as well, scattering these threats like cluster bombs around the region, up to two million of Egypt's Coptic community have to be protected at the two week Luxor religious festival. This is surrounded by hundreds of state security police, after the al-Qa'ida claim that that two Muslim women are being held against their will by the Coptic Church. That may have originated with a decision by the two women to divorce their husbands -by conversion to Islam- thus to end their marriage, since the church in Egypt does not allow divorce.

(Then Fisk talked on the problems evolving between the Sunnah and Shia in Lebanon, after the demand by Hizballah group to the government to reject the results of the international investigation concerning al-Hariri assassination. Then they discussed the acceleration of problems between Muslims and Christians in Lebanon, after the desecration of a Christian grave in Jiya, in southern Beirut. He also mentioned the statements of passionate Shia and Christians concerning the attack on the church in Baghdad).

The West does not have the necessary force to help the frightened Christians. The acts of faith-based politicians -the Christian faith- have brought about a new Christian tragedy in the Middle East.

(Then he mentioned a belief of the Americans that he met in the state of California that Christianity was a Western religion, rather than an eastern. Al-Qa'ida denied its responsibility for grave desecration in Lebanon, because of its triviality. But al-Qa'ida has a presence in Lebanon, as was stated by Bashar al-Assad, the Shia Iranian and Hizballah ally, which makes him an enemy to the organization of Bin Ladin. Then he mentioned a statement to al-Hayat newspaper by Bashar, where he said):

"We are talking about al-Qa'ida as if it has a presence as a strong and unified organization. This is not true, but it is present as an intellectual trend calling itself al-Qa'ida. This organization is the result of a situation and not a cause. It is due to anarchy and weak development, it is the result of political mistakes that represent some kind of political heading. To say that this organization is present everywhere, in Syria and all the Arab and Islamic states, that does not mean it is widespread nor does it have popularity."

But al-Assad cannot acquit his regime nor the regimes of other Arab states, whose security regulates all the political meetings other those conducted by the state representatives. This forced the Muslims, beginning a long time ago, to talk politics in the only institution that they visit,

(Page 11 of 21)

namely the mosque. The supreme irony this week has been to hear our lords and masters praising the helpfulness of the Wahhabi regime in Saudi Arabia for alerting the West to the aircraft package bombs, when it was this same Saudi Arabia that nurtured Usama Bin Ladin and his merry men over many years. (This is a reference to the legend of Robin Hood, and its hero, who disobeyed the British king during the Crusades and started to block the roads. He was famous for stealing from the rich and distributing it to the poor, and his gang was called "The Merry Men".

Because the Middle Eastern dictators also like to scare their populations (as if he wants to say that Saudi Arabia created al-Qa'ida to frighten its people) Egypt's poor are disgusted by their ruling elite. But that elite wants to ensure that there are no Islamic revolutions in Cairo. And the West wants to ensure that there are no Islamic revolutions in Cairo, or Libya, or Algeria, or Syria, or Saudi Arabia, and you name the rest. The immediate problem is that al-Qa'ida is trying to undermine these regimes, as well as the West. (They mean al-Qa'ida). So they lump Iraq itself -whether it is a democracy is a bit

irrelevant when it does not have a government, and is too busy executing its old Ba'athist enemies to protect its own people—along with the country's Christians and its Shia. And we are continuing to stage drone attacks on Pakistan and bomb the innocent in Afghanistan and tolerate the torture regimes of the Arab world. And to allow Israel to steal more land from the Palestinians. I am afraid that it is the same old story. Justice will bring peace, not intelligence wars against "world terror," but still our leaders will not admit this.

AH The Article

4- It has Become Unbearable and the Avalanche have arrived: The Tragedy of Tolerating the Spilling of Blood, Resources and Honor, and our Duty towards this Dangerous Phenomenon

The series of targeting the mosques and public places, by some who were referred to as the Mujahidin, is continuing and at its highest strength those days. So that the claims are not vacant, I will review some of the terrible events that I know, and what I did not know was graver.

(Page 12 of 21)

- The detonation of a mosque near the village of Sharsada during the Eid prayers, in an unsuccessful attempt to kill Aftab Ahmad Khan Shirbow; instead, more than fifty of the village commoners were killed, and that attack was ordered by Baitullah Mahsud.
- Detonation of a mosque in Khyber area, in an attempt to kill (Haji Namdar) the head of the Organization for Propagation of Virtue and Prevention of Vice, and an individual from the students of (Wazir) tribe. He was not killed, but instead 15 of the people who were in the mosque were killed. It was ordered by Baitullah Mahsud. Haji Namdar was killed, after a number of months, by bullets targeted him while he was in a meeting.
- The detonation of another mosque during Friday prayers, in (Jamrud) area near Peshawar. More than fifty were killed in the explosion and scores were injured. The mosque was close to a barracks for government soldiers, and some of them were among the ones killed, but the mosque is open to all. It is attended by the regional people and the travelers, because of its proximity to the main road.
- Numerous explosions in all the areas, targeting the invaders soldiers or the soldiers of the agent's army or police officers,

or small government employees, or employees of private companies with government contracts, on places most crowded with pedestrians, residents and shoppers, without a reason to justify. It would have been possible to attack them in a more accurate manner, or attack them outside the markets and away from the residential areas and crowded streets.

- An explosion at the celebration of doctors graduating in the Somali capital, for the sake of killing 3 government ministers; they were killed with a huge number of the graduates. The Shabaab movement has denied their involvement in the operation, and God knows best.
- Explosion on a public playground in the city of (Liki Marwat) in Sarhad governorate -then- and 100 people were killed who were attending the ballgame. The reason for targeting the playground was the presence of a few individuals who belong to the (Lashkar) or what is known as a (Peace Committee) that was formed there. It was not proven that this committee has targeted the Mujahidin even once. And now after this sinful operation, no bearded person could enter the area without being investigated for being a member of the Taliban. It was said that the person responsible is a Taliban leader in Northern Waziristan, and his name could be (Badr Mansur).
- Explosions at the checkpoints and control points in a number of areas in an illegal way. These target the points at the peak hours with the presence of cars and pedestrians. They could have been targeted at other times, where the traffic is slow. There is another issue; the suicide bomber could be heading to carry an operation in another location, but he is intercepted at the point or trying to search his car or his body, then he would immediately explode himself not caring what could happen of killings and injuries to the people around him. He should have been supplied with a firearm to fight with until he died

(Page 13 of 21)

or he may have used it to get the people away from him before exploding the bomb in a random way. I do not know who ordered that, or gave a fatwa about its legality?

-Explosion in a restaurant at the town of (Jandula) in southern Waziristan, in a failed attempt to kill (Turkistan Batani) and members of (Qara Zayn al-Din) allied with him. Only two were killed from the security guards of Turkistan and the rest (around 10 dead) were from the general public who were inside

and outside the restaurant, from the tribes of Mahsud and Batani.

-Explosion in a market in the tribal Mohmand area, three months ago, targeting a tribal (Jirga). The targeters thought that it would take place inside the place, but it took place in another place as a precaution. The number of killed was more than 100, all or most of them shoppers that had nothing to do with the movement. The Taliban movement claimed the operation as stated by Ihsanallah Ihsan, who expressed sorrow for the fall of dead among the public, and we thank him for his frankness, at least.

-The operation of exploding the Islamic University in Islam Abad, where a number of female and male students were killed. It was claimed by (Qari Husayn Mahmud).

-The targeting of the main mosque in Talaqan town, in the Pakistani governorate Takhar. The cause of the explosion was to kill the mayor (Wali) of Kunduz governorate (Engineer Muhammad 'Umar) and he was actually killed with thirty others of the praying public.

-The explosion of the mosque of (Mawlawi Nur Muhammad) at Wana in southern Waziristan tribal area, at the middle of Ramadan. Al-Mawlawi was killed with about 30 of those studying the Qur'an at the mosque. The Uzbek group was blamed, and the group of (Hakimallah Mas'ud), for the responsibility of the attack.

-Lastly -but not least- the attack on the mosque in Dir Adam Khel during Friday prayers, which resulted in 70 dead and scores of injured. The one responsible -as it was said- is the so called (Tariq Afridi) and the target was either one of the tribal Shaykhs in opposition to (Emir al-Mu'minin Tariq Afridi) or Talabani group members opposed to (Tariq Afridi) group who were praying at the mosque. As there is a long record feud between them, in assassinations and kidnappings. The group of Tariq Afridi claimed that attack. The opposing faction is headed by (Mu'min Afridi) and they said he is in good relations with students of Wazir tribe and that he resides in Waziristan. All these details were taken from the newspapers and I am not 100% sure about the accuracy. But from what I know about the black reputation of Pakistani Taliban, I am confident of what was stated, particularly as these information verify each other. They were stated by journalists aware of the Taliban affairs, like (Rahimullah Yusuf Zia) and God know best. On the evening of the same day, attackers threw a bomb inside a mosque on the outskirts of Peshawar during

(Page 14 of 21)

the evening prayers. The target was one of the tribal Shaykhs who opposed the Taliban, or the family of one of the policemen. Five were killed, between them the imam of the Afghani mosque, and many were injured.

Note: Tariq 'Azam and Wali al-Rahman Mahsud contacted the newspapers one day after the attack on Dera 'Azam Khel, and insisted on denying any responsibility for Taliban Pakistan Movement from the act. They accused Blackwater Company to be behind the incident. They claimed that the telephone calls that were conducted with the journalists under the name of Tariq Afridi were forged. What is funny is that Tariq Afridi, the man accused of the operation, did not contact the journalists to defend himself. Maybe his telephone was not working or there was some problem with his number, or maybe he is more cautious than Wali al-Rahman in using the phone. It should be mentioned that, when calling the newspapers, 'Azam Tariq denied any relation between Taliban Pakistan Movement and Faisal Shahzad, who tried to blast Times Square in New York. Then there was a film broadcast by ('Umar Studio) the media branch of Tahrik Taliban Pakistan! So who would believe the statements of 'Azam Tariq after that?

I would like to point out that (Umma Studio), I think a media branch for the Uzbeks, have produced a film where they pledged with all rudeness to explode the mosques, as revenge for the attack on the Red Mosque, and to bombard other mosques at the tribal areas. In that film there were training and battles at Dir Adam Khel, Kohut, Ur Kazay and Mohmand and others. They also threatened to kill journalists, and showed a photo of a correspondent for Al Jazeera English, where the reporter was denying the responsibility of Taliban movement for the market explosions, while others were blaming the Taliban. But this stand of his did not help him much with those sinners.

I conclude these statements, with two stories that show the dangers of the situation and the ignorance that prevails amongst the ranks:

First story: A year ago or more, a discussion took place between me and one of the youth, from the sons of the Arab immigrants, about these explosions that are taking place in the mosques of Pakistan. I mentioned to him that this is not acceptable and that the leaders of the organization and the students of science

do not see the mosques explosions and ask the people to stop it. Even if the mosque is in a military or government compound, and that they have issued statements about that. Even Shaykh 'Isa - may God release him- I have heard him saying that he does not agree on detonating Shia mosques in Pakistan, although he considers them infidels, according to Pakistani scholars.

(Of course there are exceptions, as Shaykh 'Isa was planning to attack the highest leaders of the military and government during the Eid prayers, and it was conveyed to me that al-Qa'ida brothers have attacked the military mosque in Rawalpindi. That mosque requires -different from other government mosques- a membership card to enter) The young man did not accept my story, and replied that most -or maybe- all mosques now are mosques of evil full of informers, spies and government employees and they have no mercy on them, in accordance to a statement by Sayyid Qutb in his interpretation of

(Page 15 of 21)

"In the Shadow of the Qur'an" and that talk was stated to him by his father. I told him: fine, if you see that they are mosques of evil, tear them down, but do not explode them when the praying people are inside them. The discussion was ended and I did not know if he was convinced or not.

Imagine; a young man ready to detonate a mosque with what it includes, based on a generalization of what was stated by Sayyid Qutb, may God bless his soul.

The second story:

A group went to Kurum tribal area to fight the army, and they met with the local Taliban. They made an ambush for the enemy on one of the main streets. The army patrol was delayed. One of the people present asked (if the army did not come, what would we do), the leader of the Taliban group said (let us attack the Shia) the one asking replied (and if the Shia do not come), the leader replied (let us attack the hypocrites) meaning the general public and the passersby. The head of the outside group was angered and disputed him, the local leader was embarrassed and stated that he was joking. The head of the outside group replied (how would you joke like that in front of your soldiers and members?) This was conveyed to me by the brother who was heading the outside group.

-Thereafter: this is a drop from a flood, and a little from plenty, as I have tried to concentrate on events that I am sure

are true, according to Mujahidin and who are allied to them, or whom I thought they were so. Otherwise the list is quite long; also, I did not talk about events related to robbery, kidnapping and other crimes committed by those corruptors.

It is known that taking over of mosques and spilling the innocent, was known through history to be associated with the worst groups and individuals, like al-Khawarij, al-Qaramitah, al-Hajjaj Bin Yusuf, the Crusaders, the Mongols and Tamerlane the national hero of Uzbekistan (although he is not from Uzbekistan, but it seems that they liked his toughness and brutality) then the Jews and the rejectionists. Then in this period, the Americans, the Arab and foreign tyrants, like the kings of Hejaz and Najd, Syria's rulers, and the Pakistani ruler Pervez Musharraf. Now who are famous for such acts that are counted on the side of the Mujahidin, like Hamas Movement and Taliban Movement in Pakistan and Afghanistan?

I have no doubt that what is happening to the Jihadi movement in these countries is not misfortune, but punishment by God on us because of our sins and injustices, or because the sins of some of us and the silence of the rest of us. I do not see that my statement is an exaggeration and intimidation, as the Qur'anic verses, the Hadith and the scholar's statements are plenty, and there is no need to state them. Some were stated by Shaykh Abu Yahya within his document (*al-Rabiyun and the March of Victory*), and I have mentioned some of it in a draft of a statement I have prepared on the subject, and will state it here afterwards, with God's will.

You may say: (but we have denied those who have committed these trespasses, and are still denying it and we guided them to the right path at every instance and in all occasions). I would say to them: yes, I know that, and you have done well, as some of the information that I have mentioned about the detonations at the mosques came to me originally from some scholars who conveyed to me some of their experiences in advice and counseling (which had faced failure, unfortunately, in most cases, because of the narrowness of the visions of those spoken to, their small minds, and the inclination of their hearts to brutality, ruthlessness, excess and intolerance to the statements of men and their banners).

I would say: You have done well, in what you have done in efforts in this matter, but allow me to state my humble opinion in the style that you are following in your denial. It seems to me that this style does not rise to the level of the repudiated

acts and does not suit its type. You are sticking to secrecy in your denial and advice, and see in that a prevailing interest, and that pronouncing the denial is harmful,

(Page 16 of 21)

as it causes a break in the ranks, or an exposure of our weak spots to the enemy to exploit it, and other arguments that may have some consideration chances.

As for the possibility of breaking ranks, it is that: just a possibility, and the fact that those conducting those acts, maybe it is better for them not to be in the ranks of the Mujahidin, as they are just like a polluted spot that should be removed and sanitized and cleared from the ranks.

As for exposing our weak spots in front of our enemies to exploit it, these attacks are -I swear- a greater shame and more horrible weak points, and it has been exploited by the enemies to a great extent. It has been exploited to distort the picture of the pious and loyal Mujahidin. Now many regular people are looking at the Mujahidin as a group that does not hesitate to take people's money by falsehood, detonating mosques, spilling the bloods of scores of people in the way to kill one or two who were labeled as enemies. While they shy away from listening to music or looking at a foreign woman - while those issues means very little to the common public, who see it as trivial issues. They are not, but no comparison to the sins that we are talking about. From that juncture, the Shaykhs and sermon speakers described the Mujahidin on their forums and life on the air that they are free people of the era-or the (Qaramitah of the time). They were able to persuade many Muslims of what they are claiming. The blame -or most of it- is laid on our shoulders. We contributed to that by not clarifying our stand on those forbidden acts in a sufficient way. We also contributed to the continuation of the perpetrators in their acts, by deferring the accusation from the contributors and blaming Blackwater Company instead.

I have learned that Shaykh Abu 'Abd-al-Rahman 'Atiyatallah -may God save him- has mentioned in his draft fatwa about the markets detonations last year, the possibility of having those acts committed by some Jihadi groups. He stressed those with aggressive rotten attitudes, however he deleted that paragraph before publishing the fatwa, upon the advice of some brothers - may God guide them.

Those who advised him to delete that part, they argued that we should not admit that such acts were committed from within our ranks: that means we have to impose a media silence! And this is a mistake from many aspects: The matter is religious and a fatwa and an order for virtue and a prevention of vice, and not a simple (organizational secret) of the type that we may impose a media silence on. Hiding the right, and delaying its details when in need, has strong religious implications, as is well known. Now that the matter is exposed known to all, near and far, our silence will lead to be despised by people and despising ourselves, as we look in front of all as "Mute Satans." We see the forbidden committed, and make no move, or look like compromisers, praising the killers while they are alive, and condole them when dead, and count them as good doers, irrespective of what we know about them of immorality. We look in the best of cases as inattentive who are not aware of what is happening around us.

(Page 17 of 21)

Going back to the issue of our attitude in denial and adoption of secrecy, I would say: we are now facing a declared repudiated act, announced being committed on the people with no shyness or shame. It has engulfed the ranks like fire. The known repudiated act is judged differently from that of which no one is aware except the one committing it. The last type works on the secrecy, and not to announce it -with some exceptions- while the first type is where the denial is in the open. This benefits the others who would be willing or planning to do it or imitate the one doing it. And for other reasons, this disclosure of denial is what we ignored here. This made our denial incomplete and not qualifying to its basics, and God knows best.

At least, we should take our Prophet (PBUH) when he said: Oh my God, I disengage myself from what Khalid did, three times. He announced that until it reached us 14 centuries later, think about it.

Remark: What is basically required is not calling the actors one by one and to slander their personality that we might not know; what is required is to deny the act and to rather carry a renunciation, loving the actor for what it has in virtues and hating him for what he has of vices and deviating from the path of the Shari'ah. It would be required, in some instances, to caution the actors openly and caution people from them. It is as if this person or that organization became famous by committing atrocities, by the public and the private circles (and what he

is famous for was true and proven) and if these acts were repeated by him and he did not confirm by advice or warning.

I may add here that what is required in announcing the denial - particularly at this stage- is the inability of the scholars for a secret and direct denial. This is because of the bad security situations, and what it requires in taking precaution from meeting people and staying in the abyss of the house and so on. This is in addition to what I have mentioned of our occasional ignorance of those responsible for those crimes.

Building on what was said, and as a first step in that direction, and for the sake of correcting the path and repenting what has happened, and to call for victory and relieve the affliction that is encountering us, I have prepared this paper.

I hope that God would help the scholars to study and review and correct, or record similar statements - copying here is desired for documentation and influencing the receiving side. They should remember the words dispersed here and there, as those embedded in the books and the speeches are not enough to explain the problem. What we need is direct speeches, defined and specialized on that subject.

This is the suggested text:

(Page 18 of 21)

Acquittal and Warning

In the name of God the merciful the compassionate

God almighty has stated: "And fight those who are fighting you and do not be aggressive as God does not like the aggressors "

Qa'ida al-Jihad Organization has denounced, more than once, and on the tongue of its Emirs and scholars and symbols and those who speak in favor, any armed operation that targets the Muslims in the places of their gathering, and any operation that does not account for the sanctity of their blood, souls, bodies, belongings or money. This acquittal includes the explosive operations that takes place in the center of markets, streets, restaurants, hotels that are packed with Muslims. It also includes, as a first principal, the detonation of mosques on the heads of the innocent praying public, shattering their bodies. Associated with that is exposing the Qur'an and the religious books to indignation and destruction.

The acquittal of the organization was not just an empty media-driven step, but the organization was and still is giving advice after advice to those who commit those acts, directly and through its special channels. By denying them those horrible acts and guiding them to the right path, hoping to correct the path and stop the repetition of what happened. These efforts gave fruit in a few instances, and some people have returned to the straight path. But there are some who insist on following a wrong method and a distorted jurisprudence, for the sake of taking revenge from whoever wronged him or let him down or stood with his enemy, even if this revenge is carried out at the expense of innocent Muslims. This spirit of blind revenge and pre-Islamic (TN: religiously ignorant) intolerance is not from the manners of the Mujahidin, who are loyal and honest in their behavior.

Here we are, announcing it again in the open: We denounce any operation carried out by a Jihadi group that does not consider the sanctity of Muslims and their blood and money. We refuse to attribute these crimes to Qa'ida al-Jihad Organization. If it is to be proven that those responsible for it are connected with the organization, the organization will take the appropriate measures towards them. This position and the judgment is not to be changed if the act is carried out in the name of Jihad or under the banner of establishing Shari'ah and the legal measures, or under the name of promoting virtue and preventing vice. As long as it is forbidden in God's religion, we are disassociated with it. It is not acceptable to consider these personal crimes as a pretext to deny the duty of the compulsory Jihad duty, as a mistake does not justify a bigger mistake. We warn those responsible for those crimes, of disgrace in this lifetime and painful torture in the other. The consequences of injustice are grave, and injustice is the darkness of the Day of Judgment.

Injustice is one of the reasons behind defeat and disappointment, and the befallen miseries and sedition by the general public Muslims and the Mujahidin, as God has stated: (And fear tumult or oppression, which affected noting particular (only) those of you who do wrong and know that God is strict in punishment.) For those who insist on this criminal and pre-Islamic behavior should know that he is doomed to the same destiny that faced leaderships and groups and other trends in various arenas, after they shed the blood of Muslims, in bias to their group, doctrines and banners, by arguments that were weaker than the spider's web.

The Prophet (PBUH) has said (who left the obedience, and left the group and died, his death is a pre-Islamic death. Who fought under a blind banner, biased to a group or supports a group, and then dies, his death is pre-Islamic. Who diverted from my nation striking the good and the evil, and does not avoid the faithful, and does not honor a pledge, he is not from me and I am not from him) as narrated by Muslim.

(Page 19 of 21)

I am surprised from that one allows himself or others to detonate a mosque full of praying individuals, or any other place where Muslims gather, just for the sake of killing one of the individuals present in that location. My surprise increases when this takes place in areas famous in manufacturing various firearms, where it is sold cheaply and could be easily purchased. If that targeted person really deserves to be killed, why not employ another method rather than the random attacks, which is not tolerated by any mind or religion. Which does not differentiate between an enemy and a friend, the child and the old man, the man and the woman and the Muslim and the infidel? Have you not remembered that you are fighting in the Muslim towns and not in the infidel's fortresses?

And if you say that this barbaric style is known in your tribal traditions, or your people's traditions, or tolerated by your Shaykh or Emir, we would say: It is not allowed in our Islam, and down with these traditions and opinions. A fight that is not guided by the Shari'ah rules is not honored. If the fight adheres to the tribal traditions and human opinions that violate the Shari'ah, whose ruling is no different from the constitutions and manmade laws, we should repudiate from and those rules should not be followed.

My Mujahid brother: He who is satisfied with those acts, or who orders them, or conducts them, is either an ignorant that needs education, or an agent planted amongst the ranks for the benefit of the enemies of the Mujahidin.

It is our hope that those in charge of those criminal acts that distort the Jihad and the Mujahidin only represents a gang of a few marginalized individuals. But we remind all about their duty in propagating virtue and preventing vice, and punishing the tyrant. As the Messenger of God (PBUH) said: (I swear by the one whose soul is in his hands, you would order the virtue and deny the vice, or God would send you a punishment from him, then you

would pray and he would not respond to you) narrated by al-Tirmithi and streamlined by al-Albani.

Or as he said, peace and prayers be upon (If the people saw the tyrant and they did not stop him, God would impose on them his punishment).

As stated by him, peace and prayers be upon him (Support your brother if he is a tyrant or if he is under a tyrant. They said: Messenger of God we would support who is under tyranny, but how about the tyrant? He replied: by preventing him from being a tyrant).

And therefore, every Muslim or Mujahid, if he knows about an individual or leader from the leaders -even if he was his Emir-with the intent of such banned and tyrant acts, which are totally forbidden, he should advise him. If the person did not yield to his or other people's advice, he should report him. But not to the police of the idolater or his army or his security forces, as these are a bigger injustice and a horrible mistake and a criminal act. But to one whose knowledge and faith from the Emirs of Mujahidin and their scholars he trusts to take the suitable action against the perpetrators. This is in implementation of the statement of God almighty: (O ye who believe! stand out firmly for justice, as witnesses to God, even as against yourselves, or your parents, or your kin).

(Page 20 of 21)

It is also banned on the Mujahid to obey his Emir in disobeying God, as stated by prayers by God be upon him (No obedience in a God's disobedience, obedience is only in doing favors). If the Muslim is ordered in a matter that violates the Shari'ah, he should not obey his Emir, even if his Emir was the drawn sword of God Khalid Ibn al-Walid -may God be satisfied with- (TN: a prominent army general in the early Islamic days). So how about when the one issuing the order is in a lower status? If he is mixed up about the order, and if it amongst the allowed or forbidden acts, and he was unable to consult a scholar, he should consult his heart, and to take care of his religion and his other life. He should remember that the original judgment on the Muslims souls, money and honor, the extreme forbidders. And that their blood is never allowed to be spilled, nor money taken or dishonor, or hurt him or branding him as an infidel, except upon a legal proof clearer than the sun in the middle of the day.

God stated: (If a man kills a believer intentionally, his recompense is Hell, to abide therein (Forever): And the wrath and the curse of God are upon him, and a dreadful penalty is prepared for him. O ye who believe! When ye go abroad in the cause of God, investigate carefully, and say not to anyone who offers you a salutation: "Thou art none of a believer!" Coveting the perishable goods of this life: with God are profits and spoils abundant. Even thus were ye yourselves before, till God conferred on you His favors: Therefore carefully investigate. For God is well aware of all that ye do(.The Women Surah 93-94. The Prophet (PBUH) stated: (The believer is within the realm of his religion as long as he did not target forbidden blood) narrated by al-Bukhari.

The Prophet (PBUH) stated: (The Muslim is who the Muslims are safe from his tongue and hand, and al-Muhajir is he who left whatever God has forbidden).

Finally, I remind my Mujahidin brothers that conducting the duty of Jihad and battle, and even dying for the sake of God, does not make us safe from the anger of God, if we spoil our Jihad by big sins and we did not seek repentance before it was too late. As a good example of that, the story of the group of people who were branded by the Qur'an for ridiculing God's verses, as they went out with Muslims in Tabuk battle. Another example is the story of the man who was killed in one of the Prophet's battles (PBUH). People said (he is a martyr), the Prophet (PBUH) denied him as a martyr saying: No, I have seen him in a robe in hell. Then the Prophet (PBUH) said: To 'Umar Ibn al-Khattab: 'Umar go and call on the people: Heaven is only entered by the believers. 'Umar said: I went out and called: That heaven is only entered by believers. Narrated by Muslim.

So, not every martyr in this world is a martyr in the Day of Judgment. Also, not all guilt is forgiven for the martyr of the second life. From the guilt that is not forgiven is the debt of money. As the Prophet (PBUH) said in the Hadith that was narrated by Muslim in his Correct book: (The martyr is forgiven of every guilt except the debt). Imam al-Nawawi -may God bless his soul-have said: (In his statement of May God pray and greet him (except the debt) is a notice on all the human rights. The Jihad and martyrdom and other good deeds do not eliminate the rights of the humans, but the rights of God violations are forgiven). If the individual is martyred and there were a few dinars of loan, he will be denied heaven until the debt is paid -as stated in some reporting. Now how about he who has killed

scores or even hundreds of Muslim souls that he killed in absolute injustice? He is more eligible to be denied the heaven.

(Page 21 of 21)

So let us take the initiative for repentance of our sins, the smallest to the biggest, with increased pleading for pardon and prayers, calling for God's victory and deferring his anger and punishment, almighty. We should avoid any wrongdoings of all types, and give justice to whom deserve it, before a coming day, where money and sons do not help except those who face God with a sound heart.

Our last request is to thank God, the Lord of Heavens, and may God pray on Muhammad and his kindred and his followers.

AH The Declaration.

If you are satisfied with this declaration, I suggest that it be reviewed by the wise men of Taliban Movements in both Pakistan and Afghanistan and the groups in other arenas. This declaration could be the beginning of a wider campaign in this context. Brother 'Ubayd had a good idea, and I add my voice to his, and that is to place at the end of every tape - which is sent presently from "Saladin Grandsons" and whatever - that it should contain in the future, programmed and Fiqh directives, cautioning from the common errors in Jihad. We would incorporate in it -for example- some Qur'anic Surah and Hadith that I have quoted in the suggested declaration like: (You the believers if you strike for the sake of God, make sure and do not say to those greeting you that you are not believers) or (The believer is within the realm of his religion as long as he did not target a forbidden blood) or (The Muslim is who the Muslims are safe from his tongue and hand, and al-Muhajir is he who left whatever God has forbidden) or similar Hadith. Ahead of it we place (The Mujahid Brother: remember the statement of God almighty...) or (To the Mujahid: remember the statement of the Messenger of God (PBUH)). We may place, instead of the Surah and Hadith, advice from us, like: No to detonating mosques and markets) or (spilling the denied blood and confiscating the stolen money is a tyranny, and aggression causes God's anger and delays victory) and so on.

There are other mistakes that may be confronted as much as possible, that I may discuss in another paper.

Finally, let us thank God the Lord of the heavens, you God we thank you and give witness that there is no God but God but you and we ask for your forgiveness.