

NUSRAH

MAGAZINE

MARCH/ APRIL 2014

JUMADAL I/ JUMADAL II 1435

ISSUE 17

THE PRINCE OF MARTYRS

IRAN INFLAMES
SUNNI-SHIA
SECTARIAN STRIFE,
BENEFITING
AMERICAN
INTERESTS ALONE

STRATEGIC
DECEPTION:
FROM ONE WAR
TO TWO WARS

SHEIKH ATA IBN KHALIL ABU AL-RASHTA
(AMEER OF HIZBUT-TAHRIR)

THE TIME LIMIT FOR THE MUSLIMS TO ESTABLISH THE KHILAFAH

OPEN LETTER TO
GENERAL RAHEEL SHARIF

PROTESTS:
END AMERICAN RAJ,
CLOSE AMERICAN
BASES AND EMBASSIES

Nussrah Magazine Issue 17

March / April 2014 CE – Jumadal I / Jumadal II 1435 AH

Contents

Editorial: The Real Internal Threat	01
Shaikh Ata ibn Khalil Abu Ar-Rashta: Tafseer – Al-Baqarah 101-103	02
Feature Article – The Prince of Martyrs	07
Ibn Nusrah – The Intolerance of Tolerance in the Secular Liberal West	09
Moez Mobeen – Strategic Deception: From One War to Two Wars	12
Leaflet – Open Letter to General Raheel Sharif from Hizb ut-Tahrir Wilayah Pakistan	14
Leaflet – End the US Presence in Pakistan, the Cause of Bombings and Insecurity	16
Abu Hashim – Iran inflames Sunni-Shia sectarian strife for America	18
Leaflet – The Coalition Drown all the way to its Head in Geneva’s Crime	21
Q&A – The time limit for the Muslims to establish the Khilafah	24
Press Release – End American Raj, Close American Bases and Embassies	30

Price: Rs. 30/-

Its a Matter of Constitution

23 March, Pakistan Day, marks two significant events in the history of the Muslims of Pakistan. The first is the Lahore Declaration of 1940, seven years before Pakistan was finally established. This declaration was an outcome of the desire of Muslims to govern their own affairs, after over nearly two centuries of occupation by the British Empire. The second event is the transition of Pakistan from being a British Commonwealth dominion with a British Queen to an Islamic Republic in 1956. And this was an outcome of a more specific desire of Muslims to govern their affairs by Islam.

Since then the exact form of an Islamic Republic has become a matter of debate. This debate becomes inflamed during numerous constitutional crises, reforms and reviews. A significant recent turn in the debate is that today the whole notion of Islamic Republic itself is being questioned. Interestingly, this challenge comes from two opposing ideological movements, the liberal democrats and the advocates of the Khilafah.

The liberal democrats maintain that Pakistan should be a republic only. They have strong grounds for this claim, founded in the ideology of capitalism which asserts that religion must be separated from life's affairs. They cite that no other republic or democracy has religion added to its name, whether Christian, Jewish or Hindu. They maintain that pride in the notion of being the world's first Islamic Republic is misplaced because the entire concept is wrong. They claim that Pakistan should be a Republic alone and if a

prefix is required it should be Democratic Republic of Pakistan.

As for the advocates of Khilafah, they too maintain that the idea of Islamic Republic is wrong, but of course for entirely different ideological reasons. Indeed, there is no room in Islam for Democracy or its Republic. Whilst the ruler in the Khilafah is elected by the people and rules for the people, he does not rule by the whims and desires of the people. In other words, sovereignty is not for the people, it is for Allah ta'ala alone. Moreover sovereignty is never for the people, whether in origin as is the case in a Democratic Republic, or after transfer from Allah ta'ala as is the case in the current Islamic Republic. Constitutionally this means that each law must have its evidence from the revelation of Islam, the Quran and the Sunnah. Accordingly, the elected assembly in the Khilafah does not legislate but ensures that the Khaleefah adopts laws that are based on the Quran and Sunnah.

The debate about Islam and Democracy is now reaching a climax. The majority in Pakistan desire Islam and explicitly proclaim Democracy's contradiction with Islam. The liberal democrats have recognised this fact. They have moved on from claiming that there is a misguided minority trying to hijack Pakistan, to conceding that the majority could be wrong! The natural outcome must be the proclamation of Pakistan as an Islamic State, a Khilafah, with the immediate implementation of a constitution whose every article is rooted firmly in the Deen of Allah ta'ala.

Tafseer Al-Baqarah 101-103

From the Book “Introduction to the Tafseer of the Quran” by the Ameer of Hizb ut-Tahrir, the eminent jurist and statesman, Shaikh Ata ibn Khalil Abu Ar-Rashta:

وَلَمَّا جَاءَهُمْ رَسُولٌ مِّنْ عِنْدِ اللَّهِ مُصَدِّقٌ لِّمَا مَعَهُمْ نَبَذَ فَرِيقٌ مِّنَ الَّذِينَ أُوتُوا الْكِتَابَ كِتَابَ اللَّهِ وَرَاءَ ظُهُورِهِمْ كَأَنَّهُمْ لَا يَعْلَمُونَ

“And when there came to them a Messenger from Allah (i.e. Muhammad) confirming what was with them, a party of those who were given the Scripture threw away the Book of Allah behind their backs as if they did not know!” [Surah Al-Baqarah 2:101]

وَاتَّبَعُوا مَا تَتْلُو الشَّيَاطِينُ عَلَىٰ مُلْكِ سُلَيْمَانَ وَمَا كَفَرَ سُلَيْمَانُ وَلَكِنَّ الشَّيَاطِينَ كَفَرُوا يُعَلِّمُونَ النَّاسَ السِّحْرَ وَمَا أُنزِلَ عَلَى الْمَلَكَيْنِ بِبَابِلَ هَارُوتَ وَمَارُوتَ وَمَا يُعَلِّمَانِ مِنْ أَحَدٍ حَتَّى يَقُولَا إِنَّمَا نَحْنُ فِتْنَةٌ فَلَا تَكْفُرْ فَيَتَعَلَّمُونَ مِنْهُمَا مَا يُفَرِّقُونَ بِهِ بَيْنَ الْمَرْءِ وَزَوْجِهِ وَمَا هُمْ بِضَارِّينَ بِهِ مِنْ أَحَدٍ إِلَّا بِإِذْنِ اللَّهِ وَيَتَعَلَّمُونَ مَا يَضُرُّهُمْ وَلَا يَنْفَعُهُمْ وَلَقَدْ عَلِمُوا لَمَنِ اشْتَرَاهُ مَا لَهُ فِي الْآخِرَةِ مِنْ خَلْقٍ وَلَبِئْسَ مَا شَرَوْا بِهِ أَنفُسَهُمْ لَوْ كَانُوا يَعْلَمُونَ

“They followed what the Shayatin (devils) gave out (falsely of the magic) in the lifetime of Suleiman. Suleiman did not disbelieve, but the Shayatin disbelieved, teaching men magic and such things that came down at Babylon to the two angels, Harut and Marut, but neither of these two (angels) taught anyone (such things) till they had said, "We are for trial, so disbelieve not (by learning this magic from us)." And from these (angels) people learn that by which they cause separation between man and his wife, but they could not thus harm anyone except by Allah's leave. And they learn that which harms them and profits them not. And indeed they knew that the buyers of it (magic) would have no share in the Hereafter. And how bad indeed was that for which they sold their own selves, if they but knew.” [Surah Al-Baqarah 2:102]

وَلَوْ أَنَّهُمْ آمَنُوا وَاتَّقَوْا لَمَثُوبَةٌ مِّنْ عِنْدِ اللَّهِ خَيْرٌ لَّوْ كَانُوا يَعْلَمُونَ

“And if they had believed and guarded themselves from evil and kept their duty to Allah, far better would have been the reward from their Lord, if they but knew!” [Surah Al-Baqarah 2:103]

Allah (SWT) clarifies in these verses the following:

1- The Jews opposed the Messenger of Allah (SAAW) and they challenged him with the Torah in which they questioned him from the Torah, asking the Messenger (SAAW) about the soul, the people of the cave and Zhul- Qarnain. The Messenger of Allah (SAAW) used to answer them by what Allah (SWT) has revealed to him from the Quran. Moreover, the Messenger (SAAW) used to expose the ways they would twist and distort, such as their distortion of the stoning of the adulterer and the distortion of the description of the Messenger (SAAW) that came in the Torah, which mentioned his (SAW) appointment as the Prophet. Once they found that the outcome of the challenge using the Torah was not how they wished, they turned away from it and discarded it behind their backs (كَأَنَّهُمْ لَا يَعْلَمُونَ) as if they don't know , i.e. their rejection of the Torah was as if they are from those who do not believe in it and did not know the truth that came within it, including the description of the Messenger of Allah (SAAW). This indicates the extreme reluctance to accept what was in the Torah of the signs of the Prophethood of the Messenger of Allah (SAAW). They were reluctant despite being aware. When they failed to show their opposition to the Messenger of Allah (SAAW) with the Torah, they began looking for other issues in sources other than the Torah to challenge the Prophet (SAAW) with.

2- When Allah (SWT) revealed to His Messenger that Suleiman was a Prophet, إِنَّا أُوحَيْنَا إِلَيْكَ كَمَا أُوحِينَا إِلَىٰ نُوحٍ وَالنَّبِيِّينَ مِنْ بَعْدِهِ وَأَوْحَيْنَا إِلَىٰ إِبْرَاهِيمَ وَإِسْمَاعِيلَ وَإِسْحَاقَ وَيَعْقُوبَ وَالْأَسْبَاطِ وَعِيسَىٰ

وَأَيُّوبَ وَيُونُسَ وَهَارُونَ وَسُلَيْمَانَ وَآتَيْنَا دَاوُدَ زَبُورًا
 “We have sent Thee inspiration, As we sent it to Noah and the Messengers after him: we sent inspiration to Abraham, Isma'il, Isaac, Jacob and the Tribes, to Jesus, Job, Jonah, Aaron, and Suleiman, and to David we gave the Psalms.” [Surah An Nisaa' 4:163]

The Jews stated that Suleiman was a magician and he was not a prophet; then they collected the books that the magicians wrote with the help of the Shayateen at the time of Suleiman (AS). They were spread between their hands in Madinah and they said that these are the books that Suleiman judged by. They used them and they made these books the material with which to argue with the Messenger of Allah (SAAW) وَاتَّبَعُوا مَا تَتْلُو الشَّيَاطِينُ عَلَىٰ مُلْكِ سُلَيْمَانَ “And they followed that which the Shayateen recited at the time of Suleiman.”

وَمَا تَتْلُو الشَّيَاطِينُ ; what the Shayateen recited or what they whispered to the magicians to write in their books, يُوحِي بَعْضُهُمْ إِلَىٰ بَعْضٍ زُخْرَفَ الْقَوْلِ غُرُورًا “inspiring each other with flowery discourses by way of deception” [Surah Al-Ana'm 6:112.] The Shayateen before Islam used to listen to the heavens and mix with it several kinds of lies and reveal it to their associates. RasulAllah [SAAW] said, فَيَسْتَنْخَبُونَ مِنْهُ خَبْرًا وَيُرْوَاهُ لِقَوْمِهِمْ فِي يَوْمٍ ذُو عِلْقٍ “Then the dwellers of heavens seek information from them until this information reaches the heaven of the world. In this process of transmission the Jinn snatches what he manages to overhear and he carries it to his associates. And when the angels see the Jinn they attack them with meteors. If they narrate only which they manage to snatch that is correct, but they embellish it with lies and make additions to it.”

The Jinn have been forbidden from eavesdropping after Islam, وَأَنَّا كُنَّا نَقْعُدُ مِنْهَا مَقَاعِدًا لِلسَّمْعِ فَمَنْ يَسْمَعِ الْآنَ يَجِدْ لَهُ شِهَابًا رَصَدًا “We used, indeed, to sit there In (hidden) stations, to (steal) a hearing; but any who listen Now will

find a flaming Fire watching Him In ambush.” [Surah Al-Jin 72: 9]

As for عَلَىٰ مُلْكِ سُلَيْمَانَ it means at the time of Suleiman (AS) .

3- These magician’s books were written in two ways :

- First: whispers of the Shayateen of magic.
- Second: what was taught by the angels of Harut and Marut to the people. Allah (SWT) sent them in Babylon, teaching the people magic and warning them not to practice it. They informed the people that both of them are a Fitna and a test for them وَمَا يُعَلِّمَانِ مِنْ أَحَدٍ حَتَّىٰ يَقُولَا إِنَّمَا نَحْنُ فِتْنَةٌ فَلَا تَكْفُرْ “but neither of these two (angels) taught anyone (such things) till they had said, "We are for trial, so disbelieve not (by learning this magic from us)." And Allah (SWT) revealed in this land the good and the evil to test his slaves, وَتَبْلُوَكُمْ بِالشَّرِّ وَالْخَيْرِ فِتْنَةً “and we test you by evil and by good by way of trial.” [Surah Al-Anbiya 21: 35]

And the teaching of magic to people was a test for them; the one who learns magic and practices it will be from the Kafir, and the one who doesn't believe nor practice it will be safe إِنَّمَا نَحْنُ فِتْنَةٌ فَلَا تَكْفُرْ “We are for trial, so disbelieve not (by learning this magic from us).”

4- Allah (SWT) exonerated his Prophet Suleiman (AS) from the lying and defamation of the Jews. Suleiman (AS) wasn't a Kafir, and it is elaborated that he was neither a magician nor a believer of witchcraft and thus he is not a Kafir. He is the Prophet of Allah (AS) وَمَا كَفَرَ سُلَيْمَانُ “And Suleiman did not disbelieve” i.e. he was not a magician nor a believer in witchcraft so as to become a Kafir! This significance was appointed because the Jews accused Suleiman (AS) that he was a magician: - "Ibn Jareer narrated from Shaheer bin Hawshab that he said; the Jews said, "look at Muhammad he is mixing the truth with the falsehood, he mentions Suleiman with the prophets, but he was a magician and used to ride the wind." Therefore, Allah (SWT)

answered them and said; **وَمَا كَفَرَ سُلَيْمَانُ** “And Suleiman did not disbelieve” i.e. he was not a Magician, but the metaphorical use of Kafir in this verse indicates the one who believes in magic and practices it will be Kafir, according to the language of the Arabs, as we mentioned.

Thus, Suleiman did not become a Kafir, but the Shayateen were kafireen **وَلَكِنَّ سُلَيْمَانَ وَلَكِنَّ الشَّيَاطِينَ كَفَرُوا يُعَلِّمُونَ النَّاسَ السِّحْرَ وَمَا أُنزِلَ عَلَى الْمَلَكَيْنِ بِبَابِلَ هَارُوتَ وَمَارُوتَ وَمَا يُعَلِّمَانِ مِنْ أَحَدٍ حَتَّى يَقُولَا إِنَّمَا نَحْنُ فِتْنَةٌ فَلَا تَكْفُرْ** “Suleiman did not disbelieve, but the Shayatin disbelieved, teaching men magic and such things that came down at Babylon to the two angels, Harut and Marut, but neither of these two (angels) taught anyone (such things) till they had said, "We are for trial, so disbelieve not (by learning this magic from us)."

5- The magic is displaying something in a way other than its reality, illusion, and this sense is coming from the verse **سَحَرُوا أَعْيُنَ النَّاسِ** “They bewitched the eyes of the people.” [Surah Al-Araef 7:116]. **يُخَيَّلُ إِلَيْهِ مِنْ سِحْرِهِمْ أَنَّهَا تَسْعَى** “then behold their ropes and their rods - so it seemed to him on account of their magic - begin to be in lively motion!” [Surah Taha 20:66] which mean the reality of the stick remains a stick, but for the onlooker it appears as a snake by illusion.

It was stated by Al-Jwahri in the book “The Language”: the magic is the spellbinding and everything that can be spellbound easily and exactly is magic; for example, when you perform magic in front of a boy, it means that you have tricked him. The magic was mentioned in the collection of the Arabs in the sense of the torment and severity in bewildering and lying, about which the poet said,

من عضة العاضة المعضة أعودُ بربي من النافثات

I seek refuge in my Lord from the sorcery
From the torment of the tormentor

The magic, in the sense of concealment, was used by Arabs as well; whereas, the magician is performing with secrecy. As for, what is

magic, they are skills that enable the magician to deceive the eyes of the people to see things as an illusion, other than reality. However, the reality does not change, in the sense that it does not nullify the reality; for example, if someone grabbed the snake that appears from the stick, he will confirm that it is a stick. So when the magicians threw their rods they were seen as sticks. However, they bewitched the eyes of the people so as to make them appear as snakes. And when Moses (AS) threw his stick, the magicians saw that it became a real snake. It was not a stick for it then swallowed up their rods, overturning the reality. They realized that this is not magic because magic does not nullify the reality. Therefore, they realized that it was not magic, rather it is Haq from the Lord of the Worlds as was said by Moses (AS) and they believed strongly.

6- **وَاتَّبَعُوا مَا تَتْلُو الشَّيَاطِينُ** “They followed what the Shayatin (devils) gave out (falsely of the magic)” and **وَلَكِنَّ الشَّيَاطِينَ كَفَرُوا يُعَلِّمُونَ النَّاسَ السِّحْرَ** “but the Shayatin disbelieved, teaching men magic” shows that the magic is reciting the words of Kufr. This means that the magic is a skill being executed by using the words of Kufr in its procedures or determinations. Other than this is not what is called magic as mentioned in this Ayah. Such as making matters appear as other than their reality, using trickery -such as fast hands or the like - or employing speech which is not kufr to give an illusion to the people, making things appear as they are not - as some charlatans do, including circles of elders. This is not the magic as mentioned in the Ayah.

7- The punishment of the performer of magic, as we have clarified, is death for it is the punishment of the Murtad. He is a Kafir as previously mentioned. The Companions (RA) have punished the magician by death. Hafsa, the mother of believers, (RA) ordered the killing of a sorceress once it was confirmed that she performed magic.

As for what was narrated that Uthman (RA) objected to what Hafsa did; that objection was because she did that without his permission as a Khalifah of the Muslims. However, he did

not deny the ruling of death for the magician. Similarly, in the time of Umar (RA) he killed the magician, i.e. it is the consensus of the companions over the ruling because it was a significant matter that happened in front of them without any denial. Ahmad narrated from Sufiyan from the son of Muawiya, uncle of Al-Ahnaaf bin Qays that he said, "we received a letter from Umar a year before his death to kill every magician, male or female."

As for what we have mentioned about some of the handiwork that endangers people if it is not clear to them, such as the trickery of some elders; the punishment is discretionary punishment "Ta'zeer" depending on how much harm they have done to those they deceived. It is known that the discretionary punishment in Islam could reach killing, depending on the type of the committed crime.

But the difference between the killing of "Hudood" and the killing of "Ta'zeer" is that in the first case, the killed is Murtad (Apostate from Islam). We do not pray over him and he can't be buried in Muslim cemeteries. The second case is a Muslim but he is either Fasiq or Fajir depending on the type of the crime and there is prayer over him and he should be buried in the Muslims' cemeteries.

8- فَلَا تَكْفُرْ فَيَتَعَلَّمُونَ مِنْهُمَا مَا يُفَرِّقُونَ بِهِ بَيْنَ الْمَرْءِ وَرَوْجِهِ وَمَا هُمْ بِضَارِّينَ بِهِ مِنْ أَحَدٍ إِلَّا بِإِذْنِ اللَّهِ "So disbelieve not (by learning this magic from us)." And from these (angels) people learn that by which they cause separation between man and his wife, but they could not thus harm anyone except by Allah's leave."

Allah (SWT) clarifies in this Ayah that those who learn magic and practice it are able to affect those who they act upon from the people, such as creating problems between them and their spouses which leads to divorce or separation. Allah (SWT) shows an important Aqeedah matter to remove what may enter the minds of people, that the magician has the ability of Allah or he can do things against the Will of Allah. Therefore, Allah (SWT) clarifies in this Ayah that nothing happens in His Dominion without his permission, against His will, and this is the meaning of the Will of Allah. Then nothing happens in the Dominion of Allah against His (SWT) Will i.e. everything that happens is

with His permission or His will وَمَا تَشَاءُونَ إِلَّا أَنْ يَشَاءَ اللَّهُ رَبُّ الْعَالَمِينَ "But you shall not will except As Allah wills,- the Cherisher of the worlds." [Surah At-Takweer 81:29.] But that does not mean that it is with His consent because Allah (SWT) does not accept the Kufir and the sin إِنَّ تَكْفُرُوا فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ غَنِيٌّ عَنْكُمْ وَلَا يَرْضَى لِعِبَادِهِ الْكُفْرَ "If you reject (Allah), truly Allah has no need of you; but He likes not Kufir from His servants" [Surah Az-Zumar 39:7.] This term has this meaning as we understood from the extrapolation of the texts, and His permission or His will can't be explained from the literal linguistic meaning of permission or willing, which means allowing or requesting things or satisfaction, but it is interpreted in terms of Terminology, as is known by the people of language or the people of Fiqh or the people of Uloom or any of the other Uloom (bodies of knowledge.)

And بِإِذْنِ اللَّهِ "With the permission of Allah" has significant and great meaning at this point, because what appears in the actions of sorcerers in front of people in terms of illusion and seeing some things that they may imagine that the magician is creating as Allah SWT creates or is doing things that Allah(SWT) cannot revoke. So, Allah stressed that nothing happens but with His authorization, i.e. not against His Will but within His Will in this sense, and Allah (SWT) can revoke their magic, and nothing happens in His Dominion against His Will.

And here someone may say, "So why does Allah not invalidate their magic?!"

Allah (SWT) clarifies the good from evil; and He clarifies to us that he rewards the goodness and punishes the evil. He then lets us know that Allah can make us, one nation on either good or bad وَلَوْ شَاءَ رَبُّكَ لَجَعَلَ النَّاسَ أُمَّةً وَاحِدَةً وَلَا يَزَالُونَ مُخْتَلِفِينَ "if your Lord had so willed, He could have made Mankind one people: but they will not cease to dispute." [Surah Hood 11:118]. But Allah SWT from wisdom He knows, left us to choose what we want from the evil or good and we will be recompensed over them accordingly, and some will enter Paradise and some will enter Hell وَلَوْ شِئْنَا لَآتَيْنَا كُلَّ نَفْسٍ هُدَاهَا وَلَكِنْ حَقَّ الْقَوْلُ مِنِّي لَأَمْلَأَنَّ جَهَنَّمَ مِنَ الْجِنَّةِ وَالنَّاسِ أَجْمَعِينَ "If we had so willed, we could certainly have brought every soul its true guidance: but the word from me will

come True, I will fill Hell with Jinns and men all together.” [Surah as-Sajdah 32:13] Therefore, there is no place to question why Allah (SWT) did not invalidate the evil of the sources. Or why Allah (SWT) didn't lead us to do the good in everything that He ordered us to do. Or why Allah (SWT) did not stop us from doing the evil and do only the good. ... Allah (SWT) clarifies for us the good from the evil, and He left us to choose, and that is the wisdom of Allah Almighty لَا يُسْأَلُ عَمَّا يَفْعَلُ وَهُمْ يُسْأَلُونَ; “He cannot be questioned for His acts, but They will be questioned (for theirs)” [Surah Al- Anbiya 21: 23] However, in all cases we must believe that nothing happens against His Will in the Kingdom of Allah, but with his permission and His will.

9- وَلَقَدْ عَلِمُوا لَمَنِ اشْتَرَاهُ مَا لَهُ فِي الْآخِرَةِ مِنْ خَلَقٍ
 “And indeed they knew that the buyers of it (magic) would have no share in the Hereafter.” This means that all magic is evil; this is a description of what they learnt of magic يُعَلِّمُونَ النَّاسَ السَّخَرَ and this description is significant and clear that what they are learning harms them and doesn't benefit them, because magic is evil and does harm without benefit.

And Allah (SWT) clarifies that the one who practices magic, as we have described it, does not have any chance of the afterlife because he is an unbeliever of Allah and His signs.

اشْتَرَاهُ مَا لَهُ means purchased, and it has been used here meaning of a metaphor which means he took it as a career for himself.

“And indeed they knew that the buyers of it (magic) would have no share in the Hereafter” is in the meaning of the prohibition on the practice of magic.

“And how bad indeed was that for which they sold their own selves, if they but knew.” It is evil that they sold themselves to magic, and they subject themselves for the punishment of Allah, and they wasted themselves against the fire of hell مَا لَهُ فِي الْآخِرَةِ مِنْ خَلَقٍ “He would have no share in the Hereafter.”

“if they but knew” which means that if they benefit from what they learned! Because the one who knows and doesn't

benefit from it, he is as if he does not know. Therefore the one who knows that the consequences of performing magic are dire and still practices it, he is as if he does not know, and this is a significant argument in the subject, SubhanAllah the Almighty!

The Messenger of Allah (SAAW) sought refuge with Allah from the non beneficial knowledge، أَعُوذُ بِاللَّهِ مِنْ عِلْمٍ لَا يَنْفَعُ، وَقَلْبٍ لَا يَخْشَعُ، وَعَيْنٍ لَا تَدْمَعُ “O Allah! I seek refuge in you from the knowledge which is not beneficial, and from a heart which does not fear (You), and from desire which is not satisfied.” [Muslim]. This use is a significant argument in the subject, as we said, and it is in different place in the book of Allah and it is used in other indications، أَفَلَمْ يَسِيرُوا فِي الْأَرْضِ فَتَكُونَ لَهُمْ قُلُوبٌ يَعْقِلُونَ بِهَا أَوْ آذَانٌ يَسْمَعُونَ بِهَا فَإِنَّهَا لَا تَعْمَى الْأَبْصَارُ وَلَكِنْ تَعْمَى الْقُلُوبُ الَّتِي فِي الصُّدُورِ “Do they not travel through the land, so that their hearts (and minds) may thus learn wisdom and their ears may thus learn to hear? Truly it is not their eyes that are blind, but their hearts which are in their breasts.” [Al- Haj 20:46] إِلَّا دُعَاءً وَنِدَاءً صَمٌّ بَكْمٌ غُمٌّ فَهُمْ لَا يَعْقِلُونَ “nothing but calls and cries: Deaf, dumb, and blind, they are devoid of wisdom.” [Surah Al-Baqra 2:171]

The one who does not benefit from his ears is as if he does not hear.

And the one who does not benefit from his eyesight is as if he cannot see.

And the one who does not benefit from his tongue is as if he does not speak.

And the one who does not benefit from his mind is as if he does not make sense.

And the one who does not benefit from his knowledge is as if he does not know.

وَلَوْ أَنَّهُمْ آمَنُوا وَاتَّقَوْا لَمَثُوبَةٌ مِنْ عِنْدِ اللَّهِ خَيْرٌ لَوْ كَانُوا يَعْلَمُونَ “And if they had believed and guarded themselves from evil and kept their duty to Allah, far better would have been the reward from their Lord, if they but knew!” which means that if they believe and obeyed and left the magic it was better for them لَوْ كَانُوا يَعْلَمُونَ “if they but know,” which means that if they were benefiting from what they knew about the severe consequences of magic in terms of the damage that they are doing against the people in this world, and in terms of punishment, which is Hell in the Afterlife.

The Prince of Martyrs

Musab ibn Umayr, Pakistan

O you who believe in Allah SWT and RasulAllah SAW!

RasulAllah SAW said in a hadith,

«سيد الشهداء حمزة ورجل قام إلى إمام جائر فنصحه فقتله»

“The prince of martyrs is Hamzah and the man who stood facing a tyrant ruler, gave him the correct advice and the ruler killed him.” [Reported by al-Haakim]

O you who account the tyrant rulers of today!

Our master, RasulAllah SAW, compared the man who accounted the tyrant ruler with the prince of martyrs, lion of Allah, beloved uncle of RasulAllah SAW, Hamza RA.

So who is this Hamza RA that we seek to be compared to? It is Hamza RA who was a shield for the Muslims in their time of need, due to his princely status amongst the Qur’aysh. It is Hamza RA who was the attraction for many to embrace Islam, from the tribes, due to that status. It is Hamza RA who embraced Islam and stood so firmly upon it that he angered the enemy to an extent they appointed a slave Wahshiy, bribing him with freedom and urging him to maintain a single focus in Uhud, the martyrdom of Hamza RA. It is Hamza RA about whom, when he SAW saw his martyred body declared, “I will never have a worse loss in my life than yours. I have never been more outraged than now... if Allah destines me to win over the Qur’aysh, I will cut thirty of them into pieces.” And it is upon these words from RasulAllah SAW about the prince of martyrs, Hamza RA, that Allah SWT revealed,

ادْعُ إِلَى سَبِيلِ رَبِّكَ بِالْحُكْمَةِ وَالْمَوْعِظَةِ الْحَسَنَةِ وَجَادِلْهُمْ
بِالَّتِي هِيَ أَحْسَنُ إِنَّ رَبَّكَ هُوَ أَعْلَمُ بِمَنْ ضَلَّ عَنْ سَبِيلِهِ وَهُوَ
أَعْلَمُ بِالْمُهْتَدِينَ

وَإِنْ عَاقَبْتُمْ فَعَاقِبُوا بِمِثْلِ مَا عُوقِبْتُمْ بِهِ وَلَئِن صَبَرْتُمْ لَهُوَ
خَيْرٌ لِلصَّابِرِينَ

وَاصْبِرْ وَمَا صَبْرُكَ إِلَّا بِاللَّهِ وَلَا تَحْزَنْ عَلَيْهِمْ وَلَا تَكُ فِي
ضَيْقٍ مِمَّا يَمْكُرُونَ

“Invite to the way of your Lord with wisdom and fair preaching, and argue with them with that which is best. Truly, your Lord best knows who has strayed from His path, and He best knows those who are guided.

And if you punish them, then punish them with the like of that with which you were afflicted. But if you have patience with them, then it is better for those who are patient

And be patient, and your patience will not be, but by the help of Allah. And do not grieve over them, and do not be distressed by their plots.” [Surah An-Nahl 16:125:127]

Indeed, this Ummah does not grieve over its martyrs, nor does it count them, for they are assured by their Lord of Paradise and their faces will be lit with glee at a time when those awaiting for judgment will be steeped in fear. Such is the status of martyrs, so what of their princes?

O you who aspire to be princes of the martyrs!

It is a path that RasulAllah SAW committed the Ummah to, to hold the tyrant to account. It is the highest of the worships, for which the minds do not slow, the limbs do not tire and the hearts yearn for the sweet rewards from it. Accounting the ruler, who is the origin of the Maroof, if he is good, and the Munkar, if he is evil, is obliged. Enjoining the good and forbidding the munkar, seizing the hand of the Oppressor is commended in the highest terms and neglect of it is condemned with the harshest of warnings. RasulAllah SAW said,

وَالَّذِي نَفْسِي بِيَدِهِ لَتَأْمُرَنَّ بِالْمَعْرُوفِ وَتَنْهَوْنَ عَنِ الْمُنْكَرِ أَوْ
لَيُوشِكَنَّ اللَّهُ أَنْ يَبْعَثَ عَلَيْكُمْ عِقَابًا مِنْهُ ثُمَّ تَدْعُوهُ فَلَا
يُسْتَجَابُ لَكُمْ

“By the One in Whose Hand lies my soul, you must order the ma’roof and forbid the munkar, or Allah will be about to send a punishment,

Feature Article – The Prince of Martyrs

then you will supplicate to Him and you will not be answered” [Tirmidhi]

لتَأْخُذَنَّ عَلَى يَدِ الظَّالِمِ وَلِتَأْطُرْتَهُ عَلَى الْحَقِّ أَطْرًا وَلِتَقْصُرْتَهُ
عَلَى الْحَقِّ قِصْرًا أَوْ لِيُضْرِبَنَّ اللَّهُ بِقُلُوبِ بَعْضِكُمْ عَلَى بَعْضٍ
ثُمَّ لِيَلْعَنَكُمْ كَمَا لَعَنَهُمْ

“Seize the hands of the oppressor and hold and restrict him to the Truth exclusively on the right, or Allah will strike your hearts against each other and you will be cursed as they (Bani Israel) were cursed.”

O you who tread the path of the princes of the martyrs!

Whilst upon this path of accounting the ruler, the Muslim does not fear any loss at the hand of the evil ones, who harass, imprison and torture, sometimes leading to death, as has been seen throughout the Muslim World. The Muslim does not fear losing the company of the loved ones, or losing the ability to provide Nafaqah for them, or even the loss of life itself, which is the origin of companionship and striving for maintenance for our most beloved. For the one who seeks to be the prince of martyrs is the one who considers the words of Allah SWT when He SWT says,

فَلَا تَخْشَوْهُمْ وَاخْشَوْنِي

“so fear them not, but fear Me!” [Surah al-Baqarah 2.150]

And he considers the words of RasulAllah SAW when he SAW said before a belligerent Quraysh

... فوالله لا أزال أجاهد عن الذي بعثني الله به حتى يظهره
الله أو تنفرد هذه السالفة

”...“By Allah, I will continue to strive for the mission for which Allah sent me, until either this (deen) is victorious, or they sever my neck”

He considers that the best of all provisions is that granted in Jannah and the best of its companionship is that found in its highest levels. He considers that those who love each other will be raised in status in the Akhira through this love. So these considerations propel him to strive more and more, sacrifice

more and more, yearning for the highest Jannah, the best of provisions and best of companionships for eternity, so that those whom he loves are raised with him, inshaaAllah.

So, why should the Muslim fear the loss of provision or the loss of the companionship, in this fleeting life? It is this resolve that inspires the loved ones and strengthens them when they falter. It is what is seen in the eyes and felt in the passion of movement towards the obliteration of kufr and falsehood. It is this resolve which inspires the loved ones to urge the Carrier of Dawa, “If you falter or are weak before the evil ones, you will not be welcomed on your return. Stand firm until you embrace the martyrdom and we will rejoice with you in the aakhira”

O you who seek to run along the path of the princes of the martyrs!

Let us plant firm footsteps on this path. Let us not falter even for a single footstep, either through fear of the oppressor or through love of our most cherished. Let us be assured of the reward that we will carry for ourselves and for those whom we love. Let us be assured that the tyrants are falling and weakening before the relentless march of this Ummah. And may we rejoice soon inshaaAllah at the end of the kufr rule and rise of the rule of Islam. May we live as princes and die as martyrs. Ameen

وَلَا تَحْسَبَنَّ الَّذِينَ قُتِلُوا فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ أَمْوَاتًا بَلْ أحيَاءٌ عِنْدَ رَبِّهِمْ يُرْزَقُونَ (٥) فَرِحِينَ بِمَا آتَاهُمُ اللَّهُ مِنْ فَضْلِهِ
وَيَسْتَبْشِرُونَ بِالَّذِينَ لَمْ يَلْحَقُوا بِهِمْ مِنْ خَلْفِهِمْ أَلَّا خَوْفٌ
عَلَيْهِمْ وَلَا هُمْ يَحْزَنُونَ

“Never take those killed in the way of Allah as dead. Rather, they are alive with their Lord, well-provided, happy with what Allah has given them of His grace; and they feel pleased with the good news, about those left behind them who could not join them, that there shall be no fear for them nor shall they grieve.”

[Surah Aal-Imran 3:169-170]

The Intolerance of Tolerance in the Secular Liberal West

Ibn Nusrah, Pakistan

The secular liberal West views any state established on a religious basis as fundamentalist, oppressive and intolerant – dogmatically forcing its people, like all totalitarian regimes, to think and act in fixed and specified ways. In contrast, Western civilisation is most proud to portray itself as the highest manifestation of tolerance for all: open and diverse, free of oppression and exploitation. Indeed, the secular liberal West attributes its success and global leadership to this very openness and diversity, explaining that this alone enables each individual to reach his maximum potential and contribute his best to his fellow man.

This idealisation of a free and liberal society is rooted in the West's own bitter experience with intolerance during the religious conflict between Catholics and Protestants in the early seventeenth century of the Christian era. The countries of Europe divided on sectarian lines fighting wars between each other and persecuting minorities at home. The West concluded that such conflict and oppression was the inevitable result of state-adopted religious doctrine.

The West claims that its philosophy of secular liberalism provides the solution to the problem of religious intolerance. By separating religion from life, and church from state, no religion is able to use the power of the state to oppress the peoples of other religions; all religions are equally tolerated. Accordingly, they consider secular liberalism to be not anti-religious but the best basis for building a society of tolerance, where religion can be practised without fear of oppression or conflict.

True tolerance and stability spread from the rule of religion and not from secular liberalism

Secular liberalism did not solve the problem of intolerance in the West – in fact, the imposition of secular liberalism was the result of the careful work of anti-religious thinkers who exploited the recent troubles of Christianity in order to impose their own creed and agenda. Prior to this, Christianity had provided the West with a thousand years of general peace, harmony and stability. Until the fifteenth century of the Christian era, the Roman Christian Church had, with reasonable success, accommodated many diverse views; for example, the Franciscans who had bitterly clashed with the Church were accepted within it - today's pope, Francis I, has even taken the name of his predecessors' opponent. It is true that the advent of Protestantism in the sixteenth century led to deep and extensive conflict within Europe but it should also be noted that this conflict was already being successfully resolved in the middle of the seventeenth century, before the secular liberal doctrine emerged. Christian thinkers had already begun to develop and implement concepts of toleration utilising evidences and arguments taken from the Christian religious texts.

This new Christian idea of tolerance was remarkably similar to the standard practice in Islam. Christian thinkers suggested that the state should continue to adopt a particular religious sect but, at the same time, should allow citizens to hold and practise religious opinions even if these differed from the state's adoption. This was the Islamic approach from the beginning. While Europe was developing its new ideas of religious tolerance, the Islamic State was already the highest model of toleration in the world: throughout the history of Islam, non-Muslims had prospered under the peaceful protection of Muslim rule, as evidenced by the large non-Muslim populations still existent in Muslim lands

today. Even Voltaire, the champion of secular anti-religious thought, wrote about the famed tolerance in Islamic lands in his ‘Treatise on Tolerance’:

Let us reach out from our narrow little sphere for a moment, and examine what goes on in the rest of the globe. The Turkish prince, for example, rules peacefully over twenty races of different religious conviction; two hundred thousand Greeks live in Constantinople in perfect safety, and the Mufti himself nominates and presents the Greek patriarch to his emperor; there is even a Roman Catholic patriarch living there. The Sultan nominates Catholic bishops to some of the Greek islands, with the following words: ‘I commend him to go and reside as bishop on the isle of Chios in accordance with its ancient customs and vain ceremonies’. This empire is stuffed with Jacobites, Nestorians, Monothelites, Coptics, Christians of St John, Jews, Gebers and Banians. The annals of Turkey bear no record of a revolt raised by any of these religious communities. Go to India, to Persia, to Tartary, and you will find the same evidence of tolerance and mutual respect.

This quotation makes clear that Western thinkers knew very well that religion was fully capable of solving the problem of intolerance. There was no need to separate religion from the state. Devout Christians were simply cheated by a small but elite faction of disbelieving thinkers into accepting the adoption of the secular liberal creed calling for the separation of religion from life.

The totalitarianism of the Secular Liberal creed

Secular liberalism claims to treat all religions equally in society, but it is more accurate to say that religions are made subservient, and secondary, to secular liberalism itself. This is because secular liberalism is not simply a policy prescription or even a school of thought; secular liberalism is in fact a complete creed in itself with its own distinctive views about the life of this world

and man’s purpose within it, from which solutions emanate for all of man’s affairs in life. The secular liberal creed gives rise to a whole host of other ideas, such as individualism, liberal democracy and Capitalist economics - an entire ideological framework that structures, directs and controls Western civilisation. The West is fiercely protective of its creed and fights to propagate it throughout the world. In contrast to its claims, the West is just as dogmatic as any totalitarian state; it is this dogmatic zeal, rather than any self-proclaimed tolerance, that has given the West superiority and domination over the world.

The individual who adopts the secular liberal creed develops a particular orientation of personality with defined thinking and attitudes. By separating religion from life, secular liberalism has made man himself sovereign in place of his Creator; man lives a self-centred life - serving his own aims and wishes in whatever manner he so desires. Those who adopt this creed are given wide latitude and tolerance to live as they wish. They may speak or act very differently from others in society but this is tolerated as long as they say that they are doing this to please themselves, and that they are not stopping anyone else from also following their own personal pleasures. The West views its society as tolerant because it allows its citizens to pursue different paths in life in accordance with whatever they wish. However, this tolerance quickly ends when someone says that he does not want to follow his own desires but instead wishes to obey his Creator, preferring the pleasure of his Lord over his own personal pleasure. Such a person is frowned upon and discouraged and his thoughts and actions are viewed with suspicion. This is why most religious people in the West portray themselves as ‘moderates’ saying that they only follow religion because of their own desires and who further prove their moderation by mixing religious belief with the violation of its commands. Those who are openly God-fearing, placing their

worship and obedience above their own desires, are easily branded as rigid fundamentalists and dangerous extremists - undeserving of enjoying the toleration that is reserved for the liberal-minded.

The impact of all this on religion can be clearly witnessed in the continuous secularisation of Western society over the past three hundred years. Religion is marginalised and suppressed as society becomes immersed in a flood of irreligious principles and values. By assigning sovereignty to man, secular liberalism has made man his own god; 'self-worship' has become the actual religion of the West and utilitarian hedonism its pagan ethos, resulting in self-centred materialism triumphing over ethics, humanity and spirituality. Christians have conceded a long list of issues to secularist thinking, from creedal matters such as open blasphemy or the false theory of evolution, to practical matters such as the erosion of the institution of marriage: obscenity, adultery, abortion and now homosexuality have become the proud social lifestyle of Western civilisation.

The Liberal would say that it is up to the individual to choose as he wishes. But in any public forum, the Liberal easily wins against the Christian since the Liberal's creed is publicly acknowledged while the Christian's creed is considered to be private to him alone. The Liberal comfortably justifies his arguments by direct reference to the creed of secular liberalism while the sincere Christian, unable to refer directly to his creed, effectively faces censorship. Instead of simply quoting scripture, the Christian is forced to rephrase divine commands in secular liberal terms, thus seriously damaging and weakening his position. The argument against evolution, for example, becomes limited to saying that freedom of opinion should permit 'creationism' to also be taught. The argument against abortion is limited to the assertion that the mother should not have the right to infringe upon the freedom of the unborn child. And, of course, the Christian must accept

complete defeat wherever it is impossible to construct arguments from the secular liberal basis, for example adultery and homosexual activity between consenting adults – deviant practices that have widely infected Western society – against which no sound argument can be made from the secular liberal creed. Issues that are clear and without disagreement or debate in Christianity, or indeed any religion, become subject to doubt, controversy and ridicule in secular Western society. How then can it be said that Western civilisation has solved the problem of religious intolerance?

The West's concept of tolerance is designed to benefit only those who fully adopt the West's antireligious secular liberal thinking. Through a process of slow poisoning, the West has been working towards the complete elimination of Christianity, indeed all religion, from Western society. The West has successfully masked its deep hatred of religion by blaming the religious for being extremists and fanatics who simply do not deserve to be tolerated. The results of the West's irreligious ethos can be seen in the tearing apart of the Western social fabric and the economic exploitation of their own people as well as of the rest of the world; Capitalist imperialism continues today as aggressively as ever changing only in its outward appearance and form. The final collapse of the failed Communist Eastern bloc has merely served to further incite Capitalism's insatiable appetite; the Western elite have tasted blood and will not stop until they have devoured the world.

Only Islamic world leadership can return the world to religious tolerance

Only by providing a religious basis for societal life can man's materialistic drive be balanced with ethical, humanitarian and spiritual concerns, thus ensuring that society is in harmony internally and refrains from exploitation abroad.

Continued on Page 23

Strategic Deception: From One War to Two Wars

By Moez Mobeen, Pakistan

To the political mind armed conflict is not just a clash of material resources rather of political wills. Whether the armed conflict was for ideological reasons or imperial or economic objectives material resources alone are not the only determinant of winners and losers. Moreover a conflict may be lost materially and won politically and vice versa. It is therefore not surprising that states, when entering in to conflicts, do not just focus on material resources rather deploy political means to win conflicts.

It is therefore necessary to analyze the Afghan War in this context. Long wars have a tendency of suffering from continuously changing narratives which cloud and often confuse the judgment of the masses as to why a war is being fought and which party has the high moral standing and just cause and hence the political support of the masses. Sometimes political support also comes for expedient reasons, however in such a scenario as soon as the reason for expediency disappears, political support wanes. As for the changing narratives they change because the states or the warring parties continuously try to keep the political support of the masses behind them. For no state can afford to enter a war and expect to win it without the support of the local populace. These changing narratives are sometimes clear and explicit and sometimes contradictory and confusing. The aim of war narratives is never to present the narrative correctly rather to present a narrative which will win the political support of the masses. It may be that a narrative wins political support for the war temporarily but becomes obsolete as the economic and material costs of the war increase or some political parties and movements are able to propagate a counter narrative which is much more powerful than the one currently peddled out by the state. In

such a scenario of changing narratives it is generally the original narrative at the start of the conflict which can be considered as the most accurate.

For the Muslims of the region the Afghan War was one war being fought by the Muslims of Afghanistan and Pakistan, mainly the Pashtun tribes on both sides of the Durand line, against the American occupation of Afghanistan. America entered the Afghan War relying on the support network of regional countries like Pakistan, Iran, India and some Central Asian states with Pakistan being the front line state in the war effort. The strong and overwhelmingly Pashtun dominated resistance to American occupation of Afghanistan narrowed the war between America and Pashtun insurgents in the border areas of Afghanistan and Pakistan where America sensed that the resistance to American occupation in Afghanistan cannot be subdued without subduing the Pashtun tribes both in Afghanistan as well as Pakistan. This led to the operational strategy of viewing the Afghan war theatre as a single theatre although it spread across two countries. Hence the term “Af-Pak” was coined to refer to the war against Pashtun Tribes on both sides of the Durand Line. This was the operational aspect of the American war strategy.

As for the political strategy America faced stiff resistance from the Pakistani populace who was and remains fiercely opposed to American occupation of Afghanistan. This fierce political opposition complicated American war strategy as it relied upon using the Pakistani military to target the Pashtun tribes on the Pakistani side of the Durand line while American and Afghan Security Forces would target the Pashtun tribes on the Afghan Side of the Durand line. When the Pakistani populace refused to lend political support for its army to be deployed in the tribal areas for

Moez Mobeen – Strategic Deception: From One War to Two Wars

stopping the native Pashtun tribes from helping the insurgency across the border America decided to change its political strategy for the Afghan War.

Initially the Mushraf regime presented the Afghan War as an American War in which Pakistan had no choice but to support the mighty super power or face American military and economic wrath. Such an expedient narrative helped Musharaf subdue opposition to Pakistani State's support for the Afghan War. However with all expedient narratives this narrative lost political support in Pakistan as soon as it became clear that American military capability is exaggerated, especially after the humiliation which America faced in Iraq. To conjure political support for its war effort in Afghanistan and find an excuse for the deployment of Pakistani military in the tribal areas America changed the political narrative of the Afghan War from one war to two wars.

In this narrative one war was being fought between America and the Pashtun insurgents in Afghanistan and the other war was to be fought between Pakistani state and the Pashtun tribes in FATA region. To operationalize this strategy America instigated a war between the Pakistani military and Pashtun tribes residing within Pakistan. This new policy was put in to practice by the support of the Musharaf regime and came in to effect with the highly publicized siege and subsequent military operation against the administration of Islamabad's Red Mosque. The bloodshed in the Red Mosque infuriated the Pashtun tribes. Using the animosity generated from the Red Mosque Operation, American intelligence network started a campaign of bomb blasts across urban Pakistan targeting the security apparatus and civilian populations. These false flag attacks were used to instigate the war between Pakistani military and Pashtun tribes and helped create the perception of a second war. From the womb of the Afghan War between America and the insurgents in Afghanistan came the second war between Pakistan Army and the insurgents residing in Pakistan,

midwifed and sustained by American intelligence or the Raymond Davis Network.

It is this second war which was supposed to provide America the political support and cover for the first war. So the new narrative is that the Pakistani military is deployed in the FATA region to fight a home grown insurgency while infact America needs Pakistani military in FATA to cut off the support the native Pashtun tribes are providing to the Afghan insurgency. This is America's strategic deception, of making two wars out of one. By perpetuating a misleading war narrative in Pakistan America is trying to fool the Pakistani public and political medium on concentrating on the war between the Pakistani State and Pashtun tribes, a war which is sustained by the continuous instigation of America intelligence. Such a narrative serves the dual purpose of listing the military support of Pakistani state for American war effort in Afghanistan as well as implementing the new American policy of outsourcing the War on Terror to regional countries. As America pulls out majority of its troops from Afghanistan without defeating the insurgency it requires the services of Afghanistan and Pakistan's militaries to continue the war effort on her behalf. Such a policy requires that a local narrative, independent of America, is present to help continue counter terrorism operations against the insurgents.

The Afghan war remains one war, that of America occupying Afghanistan for the purpose of establishing permanent military bases for power projection in the region. America executed the strategic policy of making two wars out of one war to protect and consolidate its military, intelligence, diplomatic and political presence in the region. This region will not see peace and security unless the political medium in Pakistan views the Afghan War as One War, a war of occupation of Afghanistan which must be ended by targeting the complete eradication of American military, intelligence, diplomatic and political presence in the region.

Open letter to General Raheel Sharif from Hizb ut-Tahrir Wilayah Pakistan

الحمد لله والصلاة والسلام على رسول الله وعلى آله
وصحبه ومن والاه وبعد

“All Praise be to Allah and peace and blessings be upon the Messenger of Allah SAAW and his family and companions and those who follow him.”

We begin our address to you, General Raheel, with that which is Khair, as a reminder both for us and for you. Allah SWT says,

قُلِ اللَّهُمَّ مَالِكَ الْمُلْكِ تُؤْتِي الْمُلْكَ مَنْ تَشَاءُ وَتَنْزِعُ الْمُلْكَ مِمَّنْ
تَشَاءُ وَتَعَزُّ مَنْ تَشَاءُ وَتُدَلُّ مَنْ تَشَاءُ بِبَيْدِكَ الْخَيْرُ إِنَّكَ عَلَىٰ كُلِّ
شَيْءٍ قَدِيرٌ

“Say: "O Allah! Possessor of the power, You give power to whom You will, and You take power from whom You will, and You endue with honor whom You will, and You humiliate whom You will. In Your Hand is the good. Verily, You are able to do all things.” [Surah Aali Imran 3:26].

Thus, it was the will of Allah SWT, Al-Qadeer, that you should become commander of the Muslim World's largest army, the Pakistan Army. We remind you that commanding the Muslim army is an Amaanah, a trust, providing a great opportunity to be elevated before Allah SWT, His Messenger SAAW and the believers. Indeed, RasulAllah SAAW himself first held the honoured post of commander of the Muslim army, setting a glorious example for all the ages and all the peoples. And in our Islamic history, the army commander who emulated him SAAW was honoured and a means for blessings for the Ummah, whether he was Khalid RA, Salahudin or Muhammad bin Qasim. So, woe to the one who squanders such an Amaanah, may Allah SWT forbid!

O General Raheel: You assumed command of one of the world's most powerful fighting

forces at a critical time for Pakistan. As you know too well, for several long years the Pakistan Army has been ensnared in a war within the tribal areas, which is accompanied by a barbaric campaign of bombings and assassinations that have spread terror throughout our lands. Hizb ut-Tahrir directs your attention to the fact that this calamity is the direct outcome of American foreign policy, specifically the policies of low intensity conflict and covert, "black" operations. It is this low intensity conflict which destroys internal stability, strains our capability, strangulates our potential and justifies repeated American interference to ask us to “do more.” And it is the covert operations, such as “false flag” attacks in the name of the enemy, which are an American ploy, practiced by its intelligence agencies all over the world from Latin America to South East Asia, to make sure that conflict continues by burning the country in the fires of insecurity.

Thus, without doubt, General Raheel, our real internal threat is from the substantial American presence within Pakistan. It is this American presence which is the source of the intricate planning, huge funding and sophisticated arms supply that has allowed the targeting of military and civilian targets for so long. As long as these foreign assets exist on our soil, we will never see an end to this devastating war, even if we were to lose far more than we have already lost.

Moreover, it is only upon the return of our Khilafah that our armed forces will be mobilized without delay to seize or seal these foreign assets, securing us from mischief, whether it is from the political and military points of contact, or the intelligence assets such as the CIA or private military organizations staffed by armies of Raymond

Leaflet – Open Letter to General Raheel Shareef from Hizb ut-Tahrir Wilaya Pakistan

Davis's, or even the embassy and consulates. This is because, unlike democracy, Islam's unique ruling system, the Khilafah, binds the ruler to implement the Quran and the Sunnah, which categorically forbids alliance with the enemy forces who fight Muslims, occupy our lands and desire only our ruin. For Allah SWT said,

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا لَا تَتَّخِذُوا عَدُوِّي وَعَدُوَّكُمْ أَوْلِيَاءَ

تُلْفُونَ إِلَيْهِمْ بِالْمَوَدَّةِ وَقَدْ كَفَرُوا بِمَا جَاءَكُمْ مِنَ الْحَقِّ

"O you who believe do not take My enemy and your enemy as allies, meeting them with softness. Indeed, they disbelieve in that which has come to you of truth." [Surah Mutahina 60:9]

And Hizb ut-Tahrir assures you, General Raheel, that this matter can be settled in but a few hours, were you to take the required steps to liberate our armed forces from the snare in which they were ensnared in for America's benefit.

O General Raheel: It is only through providing the Nussrah to Hizb ut-Tahrir for the establishment of the Khilafah that our lands of Pakistan, the Pure, the Good, will be given the security they deserve. Moreover, you are capable of securing the return of the Khilafah within hours, by granting the Nussrah (Material Support). Thus, we urge you to consider your predecessors in this matter, the noble fighting men of the Ansaar RA. They RA responded to RasulAllah SAAW, when he called the fighting forces of the tribes to grant the Nussrah for establishing Islam as a state, through the Pledge of Men, of War, the Second Pledge of Aqabah. We love for you, General Raheel, to fully appreciate after deep reflection, that the Ansaar RA responded with vigor for they knew that granting Nussrah for the Deen of our Creator SWT is of great reward, as is the fighting in His cause. Indeed, upon the death of the commander of the Ansaar RA, Saad bin Maaz RA, his grieving mother was consoled by

RasulAllah SAW with the following glad tidings: ليرقاً (لينقطع) دمعك، ويذهب حزنك، فإن ابنك "Your tears would recede and your sorrow be lessened if you know that your son is the first person for whom Allah تعالى smiled and His throne trembled" [Reported in at-Tabarani.] So we ask you what greater prize could any Muslim military commander wish for? And we address here the one whose household has been honored by not one, but two, martyrs, Major Aziz Bhatti and Major Shabbir Sharif, may Allah SWT have accepted from them both.

Hizb ut-Tahrir assures you that there are many under your command that already covet this greatest of all prizes. The brave and sincere who would stand with you, behind you and before you, as you took the required steps! Moreover, Hizb ut-Tahrir under its Ameer, the eminent jurist and statesman, Sheikh Ata ibn Khalil Abu Ar-Rashta is fully prepared for ruling by Islam, if you give the Nussrah to Hizb ut-Tahrir for the establishment of the Khilafah Rashidah; achieving glory in this life and the Hereafter, and Allah SWT takes care of the righteous.

O General Raheel! O you of a household adorned by martyrdom! Here ends our sincere advice to you for the sake of Allah SWT. It is upon you to put a halt to the gloating of the Kuffar, their agents and all the enemies of Islam at the destruction of Pakistan. We have undertaken our duty towards you, to place before you a reminder of your duty before Allah SWT. So let the believer take heed for his own benefit! Allah SWT said:

فَإِنَّ الدُّكْرَى تَنْفَعُ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ

"For indeed, the reminder benefits the believers." [TMQ 51:55]

Hizb ut-Tahrir

11 Safar 1435AH

Wilayah Pakistan

14 December 2013CE

End the US Presence in Pakistan, the Cause of Bombings and Insecurity

In the build up for talks between Pakistan's rulers and their American masters in Washington, in the last week of January 2014, Pakistan was rocked yet again by a campaign of bomb blasts and assassinations, targeting both its civilians and its armed forces. The Raheel-Nawaz regime then mobilized to exploit this ruthless and bloody campaign for building support for military operations in Waziristan, an area that has been the launching pad for significant attacks against the occupying forces of America in Afghanistan, which have bruised their ribs and gripped their hearts with fear.

As for the evil campaign of bombings in Pakistan, those who are well informed of matters know well that American intelligence has infiltrated the loose tribal networks many years ago. This campaign of chaos is the direct outcome of American foreign policy, specifically the policies of low intensity conflict and covert, "black" operations. It is such low intensity conflict which destroys internal stability, strains our capability, strangulates our potential and justifies repeated American interference to ask us to "do more." And it is the covert operations, such as "false flag" attacks in the name of the enemy, which are an American ploy, practiced by its intelligence agencies all over the world from Latin America to South East Asia, to make sure that conflict continues by burning the country in the fires of confusion and insecurity. This is actually why on 1 December 2009, US President Obama declared, "There have been those who have said fighting against extremism is not their fight... as innocents have been killed from Karachi to Islamabad, it has become clear that it is the Pakistani people who are the most endangered by extremism."

Such chaos in Pakistan benefits America alone. It wants the Pakistan military to target tribal fighters who are crossing the border with Afghanistan to fight the American occupation in Afghanistan. America instigates such chaos as it knows well about the strong Islamic sentiments in Pakistan's armed forces which motivated it to play a major role in causing the collapse of the super power of its time, the Soviet Russia, by supporting the tribal Muslims against the Russian occupation of Afghanistan. However, having occupied Afghanistan itself, America now regards this goodness as a grave and imminent threat to its occupation in Afghanistan. And above all, America fears deeply that the armed forces will do their duty and grant support for the return of the Khilafah to these Muslim Lands, a matter that keeps them awake in their beds for it will mark the end of American hegemony in the region. In November 2009 an American press article called, "Defending the Arsenal- In an unstable Pakistan, can nuclear warheads be kept safe?" stated, "The principal fear is mutiny—that extremists inside the Pakistani military might stage a coup...A senior Obama Administration official brought up Hizb ut-Tahrir...whose goal is to establish the Caliphate (Khilafah). 'They've penetrated the Pakistani military and now have cells in the Army.'"

As for the operations in Waziristan themselves, America needs them now more than ever. With its economy collapsing if it has not collapsed completely already, its armed forces demoralized and steeped in cowardice, America is desperate to secure a permanent presence for itself in Afghanistan through negotiations, after a limited withdrawal. That is why it has mobilized traitors within the leadership of Pakistan to raise hue and cry for operations and negotiations. Not only does America seek to

achieve a victory that it could never achieve for itself, Muslims suffer further losses for the sake of America's security, just as they suffered during previous operations. Muslims are displaced from their homes, the country is plunged into insecurity and the largest Muslim army, with hundreds of thousands of brave men, yearning for martyrdom or victory, will be reduced to a mercenary force to defend the cowardly American military forces from certain humiliation. And Muslims on both sides kill Muslims yet again to advance the aims of the kuffar, earning the anger of Allah وَمَنْ يَقْتُلْ سَبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى Allah. سَبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ مُؤْمِنًا مُتَعَمِّدًا فَجَزَاؤُهُ جَهَنَّمُ خَالِدًا فِيهَا وَغَضِبَ اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ "And whoever kills a believer intentionally, his Recompense is Hell to abide therein, and the Wrath and the Curse of Allâh are upon him, and a great punishment is prepared for Him." [Surah An-Nisa 4:93] And RasulAllah صلى الله عليه وسلم said, إذا التقى المسلمان بسيفيهما فالقاتل والمقتول في النار, قلنا يا رسول الله هذا القاتل فما بال المقتول قال انه كان حريصا "When two Muslims face each other in fighting and one kills the other, then both the killer and the killed are in the hell-fire." The Companions asked, "O Messenger of Allah, this is the killer - what about the poor person who has been killed?" The Prophet, صلى الله عليه وسلم, said "He had the intention to kill his companion."

O Muslims of Pakistan!

Unless and until Pakistan is purified of all American presence, our armed forces and tribal people will burn in this war of Fitna. Our military must act to close American Embassy, expel US diplomats including its ambassador and expel its military and intelligence operatives. And our tribal people must eliminate all miscreants from within their ranks, who call for attacks on Pakistan armed forces, rather than seeking their support to establish Khilafah through them. It is upon us to ensure that our armed forces and tribal fighters both turn their fire and steel against the American presence, which is the source of the intricate planning, huge funding and sophisticated arms supply that has allowed the

targeting of military and civilian targets for so long. As long as this American presence exists on our soil, we will never see an end to this devastating war, even if we were to lose far more than we have already lost. And be assured, upon the return of our Khilafah, which is very soon inshaaAllah, both our armed forces and tribal fighters will be mobilized without delay to strike at America's presence in the region in a way that will strike fear in their hearts, scare the Shaytaan out from their beings and smash their ambition against this Ummah to smithereens.

So, join your nights and days in the noble work for re-establishing the Khilafah, as the shebaab of Hizb ut-Tahrir do. Stand side to side with the shebaab and mobilize the Muslims of Pakistan in a vibrant, powerful wave for real change. Let no Masjid, school, university campus, market, office be deprived of the call for the Khilafah. Use your ingenuity to use all the means and styles that Allah سبحانه وتعالى has availed for you to carry the call loud and clear, whether it is by discussions, bayyans, dars, SMS, e-mail, radio or even television broadcast. Let the call for Khilafah resound throughout this land and within this part of the Islamic Ummah. And call your sons, brothers, fathers and uncles in the Pakistan armed forces to deliver a death blow to the American presence in the region by giving the Nussrah to Hizb ut-Tahrir for the establishment of the Khilafah, which will end the tide of humiliation and defeat and usher in an era of honour, power and glory.

وَلِلَّهِ الْعِزَّةُ وَلِرَسُولِهِ وَلِلْمُؤْمِنِينَ وَلَكِنَّ الْمُنَافِقِينَ لَا يَعْلَمُونَ

“But honour, power and glory belong to Allâh, and to His Messenger (Muhammad [sal-Allâhu 'alayhi wa sallam]), and to the believers, but the hypocrites know not.”

[Surah al-Munafiqoun 63:8].

Hizb ut-Tahrir

30 Rabiul I 1435AH

Wilayah Pakistan

1 February 2014

Iran inflames Sunni-Shia sectarian strife, benefiting American interests alone

By Abu Hashim

With each passing day the depth and breadth of Iran's support for igniting sectarian hatred between Sunnis and Shias across the Muslim world becomes ever more apparent. The epicentre of Iran's sectarian mischief is Syria. Over the past couple of years, Iran and its surrogate Hizb-e-Iran (Hezbollah) have been at the forefront of providing unrelenting economic and military support to prop-up Assad's floundering regime.

On October 1st 2012, The Times newspaper reported that Tehran had given \$10 billion to prop up Assad and his faltering regime. The revelation clearly demonstrates the value Tehran places on supporting Assad despite the huge economic toll of international sanctions against the Iranian people. In September 2012, Guards commander Brigadier General Mohammad Ali Jafari admitted Iran's involvement in Syria. He said, "*A number of Quds Force members are present in Syria and Lebanon... we provide (these countries) with counsel and advice, and transfer experience to them.*" In June 2013, The Independent on Sunday revealed that the Iranian leadership had given the go ahead to send an initial contingent of 4,000 Iranian Revolutionary Guards to Syria. ("*Iran to send 4,000 troops to aid President Assad forces in Syria*", *The Independent Online*, (June 16, 2013)).

As for Hizb-e-Iran, its military involvement in Syria is deeply entrenched. Regional security officials told Reuters there are now between 2,000 and 4,000 Hezbollah fighters, experts and reservists in Syria. Hizb-e-Iran could not have undertaken such a stance without getting the green light from Tehran. Subhi al-Tufayli, who led Hezbollah from 1989 to 1991, said the decision to intervene had been entirely down to the Islamic Republic of Iran. "*I was*

secretary general of the party and I know that the decision is Iranian, and the alternative would have been a confrontation with the Iranians." (S. Nakhoul, "*Special Report: Hezbollah gambles all in Syria*", *Reuters*, (September 26, 2013)). Subsequently, Iran and its party Hizb-e-Iran have become indistinguishable in their efforts to support Assad.

The evil trio of the Iranian regime, Assad, and Hizb-e-Iran have redoubled their efforts to shed Muslim blood on an unimaginable scale, and in the process have committed horrific war crimes not seen before. The battle for Qusayr is just one example. On June 1, 2013, Sarah Leah Whitson, Middle East director at Human Rights Watch said, "Any forces that block civilians from leaving al-Qusayr are committing serious violations of the laws of war Syrian government forces must not target civilians and need to allow relief aid to get to the population at risk."

The focus of their anger is directed towards the Sunni population of Syria whom they regard as an existential threat to their influence in the region and an obstacle to Iran's broader goal of creating a Shia Crescent. They view the Islamic character of the uprising with deep trepidation. In September 5, 2013, Iran's Assembly of Experts issued a statement meant to tarnish the Islamic opposition in Syria. It read: "*We call on scholars of the Muslim world, the scientific and academic centers and the elites to deal with the Takfiri Salafi current, which is heresy in religion and is not in conformity with Qur'an and Islam...and to condemn this current and any form of fratricide.*" (B. Offiler, S. Lucas, "*Iran, Sept 5: Syria Front — Tehran Condemns 'Takfiris', Warns China*", *EA World Views*, (September 5th 2013)). Earlier in August 2013, Nasrallah had spoken

Abu Hashim – Iran inflames Sunni-Shia sectarian strife for America

of travelling himself to Syria to take on the Takfiris. He said, *“I will go myself to Syria if it is necessary in the battle against the Takfiris, Hizbullah and I will go to Syria to fight rebels trying to oust the Damascus regime. We are the ones to determine the battle's fate. Just as we won in all our wars against Israel, we will win the battle against terrorism and Takfiris.”* (*“Nasrallah Warns to Double Fighters in Syria in Case of New Attack: Takfiri Groups behind Dahieh Blast”*, Naharnet News Desk, August 16 2013)). Unsurprisingly then, Tehran has thrown in its lot with the heretical regime of Assad. Iran's deputy foreign minister for Arab and African affairs Hossein Amir-Abdollahian said, *“We will not allow the Syrian government to be overthrown.”*

Iran's meddling elsewhere has left similar scars between Sunnis and Shias. Consider, Iran's influence in Iraq. Leaked US diplomatic cables provide new details on the US assessment of how Iran's Revolutionary Guards Corps has promoted Tehran's influence in Iraq since the 2003 US led invasion. The cable read: 'Through his officers and Iraqi proxies, General Soleimani of the Qods Force employs the full range of diplomatic, security, intelligence, and economic tools to influence allies and detractors in order to shape a more pro-Iran regime in Baghdad and the provinces'. Another cable also stated: '[Soleimani] enjoys longstanding close ties with several top Iraqi officials such as President Jalal Talabani and Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki'. (S. Dagher, *“In Iraq, a Very Busy Iran”*, Wall Street Journal, (November 29, 2010)).

Apart from shaping the politics of the Iraq, the question arises what else has Iran been doing with its influence in Iraq. In 2007, Major General Rick Lynch, who commanded US operations south of Baghdad revealed the Iranian training of Shia militias. He said, *“They are facilitating training of Shia extremists. We know they're here and we target them as well.”* (*“Iran Trains*

Militiamen Inside Iraq, US Says”, Washington Post, (August 20, 2007)). Other reports tell of Hizb-e-Iran's involvement in training Iraqi Shia militias based in Iran. In the summer of 2008 the New York Times revealed: *“The training, the Americans say, is carried out at several camps near Tehran that are overseen by the Quds Force of the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Command, and the instruction is carried out by militants from Hezbollah. Hezbollah militants perform several important roles for the Iranians. First, the Iranians believe it is useful to have Arabs train fellow Arabs. Second, Hezbollah has considerable experience in planning operations and using weapons and explosives in Lebanon...”*. Clearly Iran and Hezbollah have become indistinguishable in their role to foment Shia- Sunni strife in both Syria and Iraq.

Beyond the Levant and Iraq, Iran has extended its drive to create Shia-Sunni tensions in the Gulf as well as Yemen. Bahrain has regularly pointed fingers at Iran for encouraging the Shias to take to the streets and protest against King Hammad. However, in February 2013, Bahrain accused Iran's Revolutionary Guard of setting up a militant cell to assassinate public figures in the Gulf Arab kingdom and attack its airport and government buildings. More recently, the Saudis have accused America of being naive in their engagement with Iran.

Yemen has also been critical of Iran's interference in the country and encouraging Sunni-Shia fighting. On November 10, 2013, The Yemeni Minister of Foreign Affairs, Abubaker al-Qirbi, accused Iran of providing the Shia rebels with arms, pointing out to the role of these arms in the fights in Sada province in the north of Yemen. The minister also asked Iran to stop the flow of weapons to his country, especially after seizing an Iranian ship loaded with weapons in the Yemeni waters was on its way to the Shia rebels. Even, Pakistan has not been spared by Iran,

Abu Hashim – Iran inflames Sunni-Shia sectarian strife for America

and has become embroiled in Sunni-Shia strife.

This is just a summary of some of Iran's activities in the region to ignite Sunni-Shia tensions, and it bolsters the political narrative that Iran is working tirelessly to create an arc of influence that stretches from Lebanon to Yemen. This arc is commonly known as the Shia Crescent and in the main consists of placing the oil of the region in the hands of Shias with Iran safeguarding the oil for the Americans to reap the benefits. In 2006, Vali Nasr recognised the power of the Shias and Iran in the region, and how it was an opportunity for America. He said, "*Yet the emerging Shia revival need not be a source of concern for the United States... it presents Washington with new opportunities to pursue its interests in the region. Building bridges with the region's Shias could become the one clear achievement of Washington's tortured involvement in Iraq. Succeeding at that task, however, would mean engaging Iran, the country with the world's largest Shia population and a growing regional power, which has a vast and intricate network of influence among the Shias across the Middle East, most notably in Iraq.*" (V. Nasr, "*When the Shias Rise*", *Foreign Affairs*, (July/August 2006)). Indeed the current negotiations between Iran and America over its nuclear weapons, when viewed in the context of the Shia crescent, preservation of Iranian power and American interests to control the oil of the Middle East, should help people understand that the Sunni-Shia strife across the region is not a random phenomenon, but part of a well crafted American plan.

Yet despite this, if anyone had any lingering doubts about the sincerity of Iran and its surrogate Hizb-e-Iran in defending the interests of the Islamic world they should look no further than Israel's attack on Damascus last year. Both were unashamedly exposed as they stuttered to offer muzzled responses. They clearly preferred the killing of Syrians instead of fighting their sworn enemy the

Jewish state. Yet, this is not the first time that Iran in particular has failed to come to the aid of the Muslim Ummah. The two Gulf wars, America's occupation of Afghanistan and Israel's war with Lebanon is ample of evidence of Tehran's duplicity and inactivity in defending the interests of the Islam.

While Iran is no friend of Sunni Islam, Tehran's treatment of fellow Shias is equally damning. In the second Gulf war, the Iranian regime watched silently as the Americans fought and killed Shias in the cities of Najaf and Karbala. Tehran's apathy was repeated again in 2006, when Israel attacked Lebanon. During the war, the Iranian regime did not even come to the aid of its staunchest ally Hezbollah and only offered moral support. In all of these examples, the Iranian regime was totally indifferent to the plight of the Shias and was only concerned with fortifying the hegemony of America and Israel.

The leadership of Iran and Hizb-e-Iran is of the same ilk as some of leaderships in the past who inflamed sectarianism to benefit the enemies of Muslims. They prefer to side with the enemies of Islam, and do not care what happens to Sunnis or Shias. In the thirteenth century, Ibn Al Alqami, part of the Caliph al-Mustasim's political entourage betrayed the Caliph motivated by sectarian inclinations and sided with a foreign power in the shape of Hulagu Khan and his army. Al Alqami offered him intelligence and advice and his treachery allowed Hulagu Khan to ransack Baghdad and in the ensuing slaughter Hulagu's army did not differentiate between the killing of Sunnis or Shias. Ibn Katheer then says, "*After the Caliph was killed, they went and stormed through the country, killing everyone they were able to from men, women, and children, old and young, sick and healthy....The killing continued until it was said that the number of dead reached one million eight thousand bodies.*"

Continued on Page 30

(سَيُصِيبُ الَّذِينَ أَجْرَمُوا صَغَارٌ عِنْدَ اللَّهِ وَعَذَابٌ شَدِيدٌ بِمَا كَانُوا يَمْكُرُونَ)

“There will afflict those who committed crimes debasement before Allah and severe punishment for what they used to conspire”. [Al-An’am: 124]

Commanded by Kerry and Ford, the Coalition Drown All the Way to its Head in Geneva’s Crime

The coalition’s leader, Al-Jarba, announced on this night, 18/01/2014 Saturday night, the coalition’s approval to attend the Geneva II conference as ordered by Kerry and Ford; surpassing all what was announced by the coalition from not to negotiate with the regime of Bashar, and even surpassing the coalition Law that it must be approved by two-thirds of its (121) members. So it forgot all that, or rather made to forget under the pressure of its masters, and announced its approval with the vote of fifty eight members instead of eighty one. Never would the slavishly, servile coalition to refuse America’s orders no matter how small; as the coalition is an American production, so how can it violate the orders of its Maker?!

The leader of coalition has said that they did not give up their constants at the time they had no constants remained! Thus, refusal to negotiate with the regime of Bashar has become rubble. Also, their assignment to negotiate with the guarantee of the demise of Bashar, this guarantee has become mired in oblivion! Therefore, there is no guarantee and no constants, but subservience and capitulation to America and its alliances, so as to find new ruling in which the American influence continues as before. It is all about a later Bashar taking the place of an earlier Bashar! This coalition had betrayed Allah and His Messenger and the believers since its inception. The owners of the coalition are calling for the same goals which are followed by the tyrant: a secular democratic republic, and recognize the same loyalty to America as recognized by the tyrant ... While some who

have haze in their eyes did not realize it at the emergence of the coalition, now, the dawn has exposed the darkness of the coal. The fact of this coalition is revealed even to the blind eyes after the coalition is stepping over all the blood that has been spilled and the sacrifices that have been made. And after approving to negotiate with the tyrant regime to share rule over the torrent blood, the destruction of homes, and killing life in humans, trees and stones; by the tyrant missiles, explosive barrels, and even by chemical weapons, as well as arson, looting and rape ...

Oh Sincere Muslims in the land of Ash-Sham... Oh you who have been stricken in your blood, your honors, your money and your homes...

This coalition has stabbed you in the back and also in the abdomen; it did not hide its betrayal but it displayed it in auction ... it did not cover its private parts with something of anything from clothing, but has lost shyness and modesty. The faces in the coalition were painted with the brazen crime in broad daylight, until their characteristic became an indication of their crime, as the Almighty said:

(يُعْرِفُ الْمُجْرِمُونَ بِسِيمَاهُمْ فَيُؤْخَذُ بِالنَّوَاصِي وَالْأُقْدَامِ)

"The criminals will be known by their marks, and they will be seized by the forelocks and the feet". [Ar-Rahman: 41]

So take the coalition by their hands to stop them, and discard them the way you discard seeds. Do not allow them to gain a passage or ground in the land of ash-Sham, the abode of Islam, and declare it loud as you started it "it

Leaflet – The Coalition Drown all the way to its Head in Geneva’s Crime

is for Allah, it is for Allah" ... And know that the Geneva Conference I and II is a trap; America has interweave its strings to be followed by intervention forces made by America to ensure the loyalty of the new system, such as the loyalty of the current system ... So cut these threads, and resist the international intervention. It is against the faithful of you, and do not be loyal to America and its agents, as no one befriend it but the treacherous and the ungrateful, who sells the Hereafter for little worldly gains. Who is ultimately going to reap from it only thorns, and will be afflicted by what afflicted his associates; the punishment of disgrace in the worldly life, that smashes him during days of misfortune.

(وَلَعَذَابُ الْآخِرَةِ أَكْزَىٰ وَهُمْ لَا يُنصَرُونَ)

“But the punishment of the Hereafter is more disgracing, and they will not be helped.” [Fussilat:16]

Oh Sincere Muslims in the land of Ash-Sham... Oh you who have been stricken in your blood, your honors, your money and your homes...

You have been fighting the tyrant for three years in an atmosphere filled with clouds of conspiracy; internationally from America and its alliances, and regionally from the Arabs and the non-Arabs who are following the international conspiracy hand span by hand span. Even those who have raised their voices, of those Arabs and non-Arabs, shouting to help you, their cry was but a noise without action. However, you have been patient and steadfast, and you filled the atmosphere with your “Takbirs”. And you have been afflicted by all kinds of aggression from the tyrant; however you have wounded the enemy without weakening your determination or softening your path... How dare the coalition that does not observe toward a believer any pact of kinship or covenant of protection, declares negotiation with the tyrant regime to share power with it as if nothing had happened?! You, Oh the people of As-Sham are able to thwart the conspiracies of America

and its alliances, and to suppress the Geneva Conference and the coalition ... Because you are the patient and the steadfast on the inside, you are the touchstone ... You who hold the cause of ash-Sham. The “star hotels” coalition, regardless of its betrayal and no matter how great its crime is, cannot do anything if you stand firm in its face on the right, faithful to Allah, and honest with the Messenger of Allah (saw); then the coalition will rebound humbled and fatigued... But the misfortune is that the coalition managed to penetrate some of your ranks. and worse, was to be able to penetrate the ranks of some of the factions, so it acquires them and take them reclined, leaning against it in finding a successor agent rule for the current agent rule. Thence these factions will be cursed by the blood that was shed, and will be disgorged by the sacrifices that have been made. Those factions and those who followed them, who are hauled by the coalition, will become as Allah described:

(كَالَّتِي نَفَضَتْ غَزْلَهَا مِنْ بَعْدِ قُوَّةٍ أَنْكَاثًا)

“Like she who untwisted her spun thread after it was strong” [An-Nahl: 92].

So they lose this world and the Hereafter, and that is the manifestation loss.

Oh Sincere Muslims in the land of Ash-Sham... Oh you who have been stricken in your blood, your honors, your money and your homes...

A guide can never lie to his people, and that Hizb ut Tahrir turns to you, warning and promising you:

It is warning you from falling into the fire of Geneva. For, the negotiation of the coalition with the regime follows a planned route that it cannot go beyond it. This is to produce a new tyrant that will not differ from the previous tyrant except in his name and the color of his face. So that America will freely enter and roam in and around as it was freely entering and roaming in and round its predecessor. And then hardship and misery will wrap your necks again, and you will

regret but it will not be a time for regret. And none of you should say I only take responsibility of myself, the sin and destruction on those who are going to Geneva only... Don't say that,, because if evil occurred in people who did not stand in its face to stop it and change it, the punishment will cover them all... It was directed by Abu Dawood in his Sunan from Abu Bakr, may Allah be pleased with him, that he said, after glorifying Allah and praising Him: O people ... I heard the Messenger of Allah (saw) said:

«مَا مِنْ قَوْمٍ يُعْمَلُ فِيهِمْ بِالْمَعَاصِي، ثُمَّ يَدْرُونَ عَلَى أَنْ يُغَيِّرُوا، ثُمَّ لَا يُغَيِّرُوا، إِلَّا يُوْشِكُ أَنْ يَعْزِمَهُمُ اللَّهُ مِنْهُ بِعِقَابٍ»

“If act of disobedience are done among any people and do not change them though they are able to do so, Allah will soon punish them all”. So protect yourselves from the punishment...

And promising you that if you become loyal to Allah the Almighty, and believed with the Messenger of Allah (saw), and persisted in words and deeds to the arbitration of Allah’s Law, by the establishment of the rightly guided Khilafah State, and you sincerely determined to eradicate the influence of America and its agents from the roots ... Then Allah surely is supporting you, and He will be withering your enemy.

(وَكَانَ حَقًّا عَلَيْنَا نَصْرُ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ)

“And incumbent upon Us was support of the believers.” [Ar-Rum: 47]

And who is more truthful than Allah in statement?

(إِنَّ فِي ذَلِكَ لَذِكْرَى لِمَنْ كَانَ لَهُ قَلْبٌ أَوْ أَلْفَى السَّمْعَ وَهُوَ شَهِيدٌ)

“Indeed in that is a reminder for whoever has a heart or who listens while he is present [in mind].” [Qaf: 37]

18th Rabii al-Awwl 1435AH

19/01/2014 CE

Hizb ut-Tahrir

Continued from Page 11

The world only enjoyed peace and stability when its people followed religion. For a thousand years Islam was the global superpower, establishing a peaceful and harmonious civilisation as a model for the rest of the world to follow. For much of this time, Christianity also ensured a decent level of peace and harmony in Western lands, especially when compared to the imperialistic ravages of the last three hundred years. The secularists like to point to the conflicts between Islam and Christianity but, including the Crusades, these were of lesser significance than the cultural and economic interaction between these two civilisations. It was exposure to the great Islamic civilisation that pulled Christianity out of the deep backwardness that it had fallen into at the collapse of the Western Roman Empire.

Under the leadership of religion the entire world was in peace and security. Such was the security and stability provided to the world order by the Islamic superpower that an advanced people, the Chinese, were able to cut back their military forces and unilaterally dismantle their navy while primitive peoples such as in southern Africa were able to live in simple tranquillity without external fear. Compare the stability of this era with the turmoil and conflict of the present Western civilisation, which has been responsible in its brief three centuries of existence for the unparalleled exploitation of the resources and the peoples of the world and the instigation of terrifyingly massive wars on a scale never before witnessed by mankind.

Ruling must be taken back from the secular liberalists and returned to its rightful religious trustees. The world must again take shelter in Islam, with the re-established Islamic Khilafah resuming righteous leadership of world affairs thus liberating mankind from the degradation of the self-worship of man and returning mankind to the worship of God alone.

Q&A - The time limit for the Muslims to establish the Khilafah

Question: Muafa Abu Haura

Jazak Allah for your reply... also is it possible to make the discussion open so that Muslims may benefit from their contents and to see the sincerity of Hizb ut Tahrir and its Ameer in accepting the truth, after they realise the weakness of the opinion?

The first idea that we want to discuss is the time limit for the Muslims to establish the Khilafah.

A brother named Aang Yulius wrote this article to me:

Is the narration used by Hizb ut Tahrir as an evidence for the fixed time limit for the Muslims to establish the Khilafah correct?

From the adopted thoughts of Hizb ut Tahrir is the appointment of a Khalifah for all Muslims; they say it is not permissible for the Muslims to be without a Khalifah for more than three days; if three days passes without any one appointing a Khaleefah for all Muslims, they all become sinful. After the destruction of the Ottoman Khilafah till this day the Muslims have lived for more than eighty years without a Bay'ah (pledge of allegiance to the Khaleefah) on their necks. Anyone who does not participate in the work to attempt to establish the Khilafah is sinful. Hizb ut Tahrir presents Ijmaa' as-Sahaba as an evidence for the three days time limit for the Muslims to establish the Khilafah; it is the famous narration of Umar Ibn Al-Khatab (ra): It was narrated that after he was stabbed and his death was imminent, he (ra) nominated six of the senior Sahaba so that one of them can be the Khaleefah through the method of consultation between them. He gave the instruction to kill anyone who disagreed with the group once the three days had lapsed. He ordered fifty of the Sahaba to execute his instructions; this took place with the knowledge of the senior Sahaba; no one objected or condemned such instructions. This is an evidence for their consensus that the time

limit to establish the state is three days. The origin of this idea is what is narrated from "The History of Tabari" (Tareekh at-Tabari) in this text:

"If five of them agree and one disagrees, then smash his head or break his head with the sword, and if four of them agree upon one man and two disagreed then break both of their necks..."

This is a core thought of Hizb ut Tahrir which is written in their adopted books and are published by the Shabab under the name of the Hizb or their own names. This idea is written in the book The Institutions of State in the Khilafah under the chapter of the time limit for Muslims to establish the Khilafah (page 53 of the Arabic version and p.35 in the English version) and the book The Ruling System in Islam under the chapter of the method of appointing the Khaleefah, and others.

The problem is the weakness of the narration because in its transmission there is a mention of Aba Mukhannaf and he was from the Shi'ar-Rafidha. Ibn Mu'een described him as untrustworthy. Also in the Isnad (transmission) there are other unknown narrators... and in the Isnad are narrators who are defrauders and they were mentioned in the "An" (from so and so) format.

There is also another narration regarding the meaning of the narration of Tabari, but it is also weak because the transmission is interrupted/cut.

It was narrated that Ibn Sa'd in Al-Tabaqat Al-Kubra had a similar narration that included Sammak Bin Harb Al-Zahli Al-Bakri who was described by Al-Khafath as "truthful but he changed" and he could not have met with Umar because the chain was cut.

In terms of the meaning, we find that which cannot be believable from the Tabari narration and others similar to it that contradicts the

Q&A – The time limit for the Muslims to establish the Khilafah

correct narration. Let us look at the following points: How can Umar (ra) order the killing of the prominent Sahaba?

How can Umar (ra) say this knowing that they are the best out of the Prophet's companions?

Therefore this clearly shows that this narration is weak. So it cannot be used as an evidence to say that the time limit for the Muslims to establish the Khilafah is three days, and it is false when glorifying the Khilafah to say: "Umar ordered the killing of the one who refuses to appoint the Khaleefah".

So what is your opinion? We await a comprehensive answer.

Answer:

Before I answer, I would like to point out some issues that drew my attention:

a) The Question came under the name Muafa Abu Haura but the article that you used in the question came under the name Aang Yulius!

b) You said, "Also is it possible to make the discussion open so that Muslims may benefit from their contents and to see the sincerity of Hizb ut Tahrir and its Ameer in accepting the truth, after they realise the weakness of the opinion?" How is it that you want a discussion when you have decided "after they realise the weakness of the opinion". Would you not want to wait until the end of the discussion to find out the strength or weakness of the opinion... it is best not to decide that the opinion is weak until after the discussion that you are keen to have, isn't this right?

c) You did not greet us, you did not say Assalamu Alaikum and yet you made a du'a, which we do not know if it is for us or against us; you said Jazak Allah for reply but you did not specify which type of reward it should be good or bad! You have ended the duaa with three dots and kept the rest concealed "in the belly of the poet".

Regardless of this or that, I will assume you have good intentions in coming to the understanding of the above points and will answer the article of your friend. And the success is from Allah:

1. Hizb ut Tahrir and its Ameer do not refuse a purposeful discussion to demonstrate the truth with the intention that it will be followed and to work based on it in order to resume the Islamic way of life by establishing of the Khilafah ar-Rashida, the great obligation in which no Muslim is permitted to stay without the appointment of a Khaleefah for more than a three day period or else all those capable to work for its establishment and do not do so will become sinful.

2. The writer of the article discussed Al-Tabar's narration that included "Abu Mukhanaf" and he accounted that he is untrustworthy. He also mentioned men in the narration that he said were unknown and others who narrate with the "An" (from so and so) format...

Then he mentioned the narration in Tabaqat of Ibn Sa'd and mentioned "Simmak Bin Harb" in its transmission and said that he was "truthful but he changed" and that Simmak never met Umar (ra).

3. The article's writer discussed a very important issue but from one narration, even though this issue of "waiting for three days and then to kill the one that disagrees" is not a secret, on the contrary, it was known to the Sahaba (ra)... and in many narrations. Also his saying that the men were unknown, this is not considered an evidence, he might not recognise them, but others with a stronger memory than his did.

The same is applied to the "An" (from so and so format) argument is an evidence that shows his ignorance in the science of hadeeth because the "An" (from so and so) format is accepted as long as it has met the conditions of the transmission.

4. Acceptance of the hadeeth or its rejection requires the knowledge and fiqh of the science of terminology of the hadeeth, its origins and branches. I will mention some of them for the sake of the answer to your friend's article, he might be able to recollect them if he is from the people of this Knowledge.

According to the Muhaditheen (scholars of hadeeth) some regarded trustworthy narrator and others did not regard them so, some

Q&A – The time limit for the Muslims to establish the Khilafah

regarded them as a known narrators but others did not. The Muhadtheen differed in considering what hadith to be from a correct chain and what is not; some considered a chain to be correct and others consider it incorrect, some hadeeth will be challenged by some while considered sahih or hasan according to one opinion or many opinions or all opinions and is an incorrect imposition and contradicting to the reality of the hadeeths.

When looking at the Ijtihad of renowned faqhees (Islamic jurists) you will find one them taking a hadeeth as evidence but another will not; because it is considered correct by the first one and incorrect by the second. You will find this with the Hanafi, Maliki's, Shafi'i's, Hanbali's and others.

It is best to have deliberation and thoughts about a hadeeth before challenging it or rejecting it, those who follow the narrators and Ahadeeth will find many difference in this between many Muhaditheen, there are numerous examples about this:

For instance, Abu Dawoud narrated from Amr Bin Shu'aib from his father from his grandfather that he said: The Prophet of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم said:

يَسْعَى بِذِمَّتِهِمْ أَدْنَاهُمْ، وَيُجِيرُ عَلَيْهِمْ. الْمُسْلِمُونَ تَتَكَافَأُ دِمَاؤُهُمْ»
أَقْصَاهُمْ، وَهُمْ يَدُّ عَلَى مَنْ سِوَاهُمْ يَزِدُّ مُشَدَّهُمْ عَلَى مُضْعِفِهِمْ،
«...وَمُتَسَرِّيهِمْ عَلَى قَاعِدِهِمْ»

"Muslim blood is one, they are equal in covenants, their furthest is protected and they are united when attacked, the strong responds for the weak, and the chivalry respond for those sitting."

The narrator of the hadeeth is Amr Bin Shu'aib; it is well known regarding Amr Bin Shu'aib from his father, from his grandfather, yet many used it as evidence and rejected by others.

Also the example in Al-Darqitni from Al-Hasan from Ubada and Anas Ibn Malik that the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم said:

« مَا وَزَنَ مِثْلُ مِثْلٍ إِذَا كَانَ نَوْعًا وَاحِدًا وَمَا كَيْلٌ فَمِثْلُ ذَلِكَ، «
«فَإِذَا اخْتَلَفَ النَّوعَانِ فَلَا بَأْسَ بِهِ»

"The weight and measure are of those of the same type, if the two types differ then it is acceptable".

In the transmission of this hadeeth is Al-Rabee' Bin Sabeeh, he is considered trustworthy by Abu Zar'a but some group said it is weak (transmission).

If this hadeeth is used as an evidence, or that another hadeeth that includes Al-Rabee' Bin Sabeeh in the transmission, it is accepted that he has used a Shari'ah evidence.

Another example: Narrated by Ahmad that Ibn Numair told us, Anas bin Malik told us, Abdullah Bin Yazeed told us, the slave of Al Aswad Bin Sufian, from Abi 'Ayash from Sa'd Bin Abi Waqqas that he said: The Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم was asked about the wet dates being weighed against the dry dates, He صلى الله عليه وسلم said:

«فَكَرِهَهُ». بَلَى: قَالُوا «أَلَيْسَ يَنْقُصُ الرُّطْبُ إِذَا بَيَسَ»

"Does not the weight of the wet dates decreases when dried?" they said yes. "He made it detestable"

In the narration of Abu Dawoud with this version: Abdullah Bin Maslama told us from Malik, from Abdullah Bin Yazeed, that Zaydan Aba 'Ayash, told him that Sa'd Ibn Abi Waqqas said: I heard the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم ask about buying dry dates with wet dates, the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم asked:

فَنَهَاهُ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ «قَالُوا نَعَمْ، «أَيَنْقُصُ الرُّطْبُ إِذَا بَيَسَ؟»
«صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ عَنْ ذَلِكَ»

"Does the wet date decrease in weight when they are dry?" They said yes, "The Messenger of Allah sallallahu alaihi wassalam prohibited us from doing so."

This hadeeth is considered Sahih by At-Tirmithi but was doubted by a group from the: Al-Tahawi, At-Tabari, Ibn Hazm, and Abdul Haq, because it has included Zaydan Aba 'Ayash and he is unknown. He said in the Talqees to an answer that Ad-Darqitni said that he is proved to be trustworthy (meaning Zaydan Abu 'Ayash). The Munthiri said that he narrated two from him; Malik approved it with severe criticism. So if any one used this hadeeth that includes Abu 'Ayash then he would have used a Shar' evidence.

Hence, to extract the hukm; it cannot be from one narration without considering the other narrations, it is not sufficient to get criticism

Q&A – The time limit for the Muslims to establish the Khilafah

and modification (Al-Jarh wat Ta'deel) from one party without looking at the other different parties, instead the issue must be studied from all aspects...

5. Now I will discuss some areas that are either unknown or were ignored by the article's writer:

In his commentary on At-Tabari's narration he focussed on Abi Mukhanaf but left his partner in the transmission. The narration of At-Tabari states that: "Umar Bin Shibhat told us, he said: Ali Bin Muhammad told us from Wakee', from Al-A'mash, from Ibrahim and Muhammad Bin Abdullah Al-Ansary, from Ibn Arooba from Qatadah from *"Shahr Bin Hawshab and Abi Mukhanaf"*, from Yusuf Bin Yazeed, from Abbas Bin Sahl and Mubarak Bin Fadhalah, from Ubaid Allah Bin Umar and Yunus Bin Abi Ishaq, from Amr Bin Maysoon Al Awdi that Umar Bin Al Khattab when he was stabbed..." (End of quote).

The writer of the article focussed on Abi Mukhanaf and mentioned that he is weak, and left out Shahr Bin Hawshab, Abi Mukhanaf's partner. In the narration from Yusuf bin Yazeed, that Qatada narrated from (Abi Mukhanaf and Shahr Bin Hawshab) and they both narrated from Yusuf Bin Yazeed but he only mentioned Abi Mukhanaf, this is because Shahr Bin Hawshab was considered trustworthy by a group.

Al 'Ijli (died 261 AH) said in his book Athiqat: (Shahr Bin Hawshab: from Ash-Sham; Tabi'i, trustworthy)

Al-Haithami (died 807 AH) said regarding Shahr Bin Hawshab in Mujama' Az- Zawa'id and Manba' al Fawa'id in more than one place:

(Shahr Bin Hawshab, who was made trustworthy and who was disagreed on but made trustworthy by Ahmad and Ibn Ma'een and Abu Zur'ah and Ya'qoob Bin Sheeba), (Shahr Bin Hawshab who was disputed about has been made trustworthy more than once), (Shahr Bin Hawshab who was disputed about has been made trustworthy by a group).

Ibn Shaheen (died 385 AH) said in his book the History of Trustworthy Names Thiqat: (Yahya said Shahr Bin Hawshab is proved and in another narration about him that he is from Sham, and stayed in Basra, and was from Ash'aris and is trustworthy)

This is why Qatadah narrated from Abi Mukhanaf and Shahr Bin Hawshab and not just from Abi Mukhanaf, but the writer of the article did not mention Shahr Bin Hawshab because he was made trustworthy by more than one Muhadith.

This is regarding At-Tabari.

- As for the narration of Ibn Sa'd in At-Tabaqat:

The writer of the article mentioned one of the narrations in At-Tabaqat which included Simmak, this is the Sanad of the narration:

"He said: Abdullah Bin Bakr As-Sahmy told us saying: Hatim Bin Abi Sagheera told us from Simmak that Umar Bin Al-Khattab when his death approached he said If I choose my successor it is Sunnah and if I don't choose my successor it is Sunnah, the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم died and did not choose a successor, and Abu Bakr died but he chose a successor"

The writer of the article mentioned that Simmak who was described as "trustworthy and then changed it" Could not have met with Umar....

But it was mentioned in the History of Trustworthy Names Thiqat: by Ibn Hibban (died: 354H) from Simak Bin Harb the following: (Simmak Bin Harb Al-Bikri from the people Kufa....At-Thawri narrated from him and Shu'ba. Hamad Bin Salama used to say, I heard Simmak Bin Harb say I met eighty of the companions of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم, and he died during the rule of Hisham Bin AbdulMalik when Yusuf Bin Umar was made Wali over Iraq and he is Simmak Bin Harb Bin Aws Bin Khalid Bin Nizar Bin Mu'awia Bin Amir Bin Zuhl).

Also in the book of the History of the Names of the Thiqat by Ibn Shaheen the following:

Q&A – The time limit for the Muslims to establish the Khilafah

(He said Simmak Bin Harb is trustworthy, he told us Abdullah Bin Muhammad Al-Baghawi said he told us Muhammad Bin Ghailan said he told us from Hamad Bin Salamah from Simmak Bin Harb, he said: "I have met eighty from the companions of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم.

This proves that Simmak have met with eighty of the companions of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم, it is a reasonable number enough to make him met with Umar; If any of the companions is left out from the transmission it does not affect its correctness.

- Even though Ibn Sa'd have mentioned many narrations regarding the issue that does not include Simmak.

He said: Ubaidullah Bin Musa said: He told us that Israel Bin Yunus from Abi Ishaq from Amr Bin Maysoon said: "I witnessed when Umar was stabbed... then he said: Summon for me Ali, Uthman, Talha, Zubair, Abdullah Bin Awf and Sa'd. Then he said call for me Suhaib, he was summoned, he said: "Lead the people in prayer for three days and these men will have consultation in a house, if they agree upon one man, break the head of the one who disagrees with them.

Amr Bin Maymon Al Awdi had converted to Islam during the time of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم and he performed Hajj 100 times; some said 70 Hajj. He gave his Zakat to the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم as was mentioned in Asad Al Ghaba, he witnessed the stabbing of Umar (ra). He said: Muhammad Bin Umar said; Muhammad Bin Musa said; he told us from Ishaq Bin Abdullah Bin Abi Talha from Anas Bin Malik that he said Umar Bin Al-Kattab said to Abi Talha Al-Ansari an hour before his death and said: "O Abu Talha be with these men of shura and bring with you fifty of your men from Al Ansar, they will be meeting in one of the houses, so guard the door with your men, do not allow anyone to enter to them, and don't let the third day pass without them choosing one Ameer from them, by Allah you are my successor over them."

He said: Muhammad Bin Umar told us and said: Musa Bin Ya'qoob told me from Abi Al Howayrith that he said: Umar said in what he instructed: "If I die then let Suhaib lead you in prayer for three (days) then consult with each other and give Bay'ah to one of you..."

It is clear that Ibn Sa'd has more than one narration but the article's writer clutched on to the doubt (shubha) that he found in one narration that involved Simmak and left the others which proves that he is not in pursuit to reach the truth instead he wants to cast doubt on the people of Haq, but he will not reach this goal!

Together with all of this there are other narrations proved by Ibn Shabat in his book The History of Medina, and here I would like to mention three narrations:

Abu Bakr Al Ulaimi told us, he said: Al Nadhr Bin Shumail told us, he said: Ibn Al Mubarak told us: he said: a slave of the family of Ibn Affan told us: That Umar (ra) ordered Suhaib to lead the people in prayer for Three (days) and said: "Do not let three days pass or do not let three days set on you until you give Bay'ah (to one of you) i.e. the people of Shura (consultation), then fear Allah and make up between you and do not divide and dispute and obey Allah and His Messenger and the Ameer."

Haban Bin Bishr told us, Yahya Bin Adam told us, he said: Ibn Idris told us, he said, from Talha bin Yahya Bin Talha, from Isa Bin Talha and Urwa Bin Al Zubair, they said, he said: When Umar (ra) was stabbed: "Let Suhaib lead you in prayer for three (days) and consult Talha if he comes with the decision or consult each other in the matter, for the Ummah of Muhammad صلى الله عليه وسلم can be left for three with nothing."

Muhammad told us, he said: Musa Bin Uqbah told us, he said: Nafi' told us that Abdullah Bin Umar (ra) told hi that Umar (ra) was washed and shrouded and prayed on (Jinaza prayer), he was a Shaheed, and said that Umar (ra) said: "If I die then wait for three days, let

Q&A – The time limit for the Muslims to establish the Khilafah

Suhaib lead the people in prayer, do not let the fourth day descend on you and you are without an Ameer appointed over you and let Abdullah Bin Umar attend as a consultant and he should not be involved in the issue and Talha is your partner in the issue, if he arrives in the third day, let him witness your affairs and if three days passes before his arrival then carry on with your affair..."

He said to the Miqdad Bin Al Aswad: "If you put me in my grave, gather those people in a house until they choose one man from amongst them." He said to Suhaib: "Lead the people in prayer for three days and bring Ali, Uthman, Az -Zubair, Sa'd and Abd ur Rahman Bin Awf and Talha when he arrives and bring Abdullah bin Umar but he is not involved in the issue and supervise them, if five agree and one disagrees, smash his head with the sword, If four agree upon one man and disagree, then break their heads, if three agree upon one man, then make Abdullah Bin Umar as the Judge, so whoever he chooses from the two teams they choose a man from amongst them, if they do not agree with Abdullah Bin Umar's decision then choose one from the team that includes Abd ur Rahman Bin Awf and kill the rest, if they object to what the people have consented to".

- The mention of three days period is mentioned in the narration in general with no mention of the killing of the one who disagrees; e.g. "let him lead the people for three days", "Do not let three days passes you", "Do not let three days pass without you giving the bay'ah to one of you", "Let Suhaib Lead you in prayer for three" then seek consent in the issue and give bay'ah to one of you"

There are detailed narrations of the killing of the one who disagrees. "Lead the people in prayer for three....if they agree upon one man, break the head of the one who disagrees"...and so on, i.e. that the duration of three days mentioned in the narration are general without the mention of the details of the action to be taken to the one in disagreement. In other

narrations the details of the action to be carried out on the one who disagrees are mentioned, which is killing.

So why did the writer of the article focuses on the killing of the one who disagrees and left out the narrations of three days period which does not mention the killing of the one who disagrees? He wanted to bring up the issue of killing to get an emotional reception to his opinion even though the saying of Umar is known to people regarding the killing of the one who disagrees and it is an evidence for the three days which is very important.

- Therefore the writer of the article and his likes and followers as it seems are not seeking the truth as much as they want to bring confusion to the people of Haq and to find excuses for their cowardice and inaction, to undertake this great obligation that the Sahaba have prioritised over the burial of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم.

As for what the writer of the article mentions at the end of his article by saying:

"How can Umar (ra) orders the killing of senior Sahaba?

How can Umar (ra) say this knowing that they are the best out of the Prophet's companions?" (End of quote).

The Shari'ah rules are taken from their evidences and not taken by desire and assumption.

The one who reflects upon what we have mentioned and understands it will be guided to the truth by the permission of Allah and the one who took pride in his sin and wrote the article and insisting on not comprehending, then the answer will be of benefit to him, his matter is referred to Allah, it is He Jal Wa 'Ala Who Guides to the right path.

Your brother,

Ata Bin Khalil Abu Al-Rashtah

15 Sha'ban 1434

24 June 2013 CE

End American Raj, Close American Bases and Embassies

Hizb ut-Tahrir Wilayah Pakistan held demonstrations across the country for ending the American Raj in the region. Hundreds of people attended these demonstrations. People were holding banners and placards calling for **“Bombings, insecurity and instability.... The cause is America and treacherous rulers.... Khilafah is the only solution”, “End American Raj... Close US bases and embassies”**. Demonstrators expressed their anger against the ever-increasing American hegemony in the country and asked the sincere officers in the Armed Forces to end the War of Fitna which America has instigated. This can only be possible if these officers close the American embassy, consulates, bases and their intelligence offices and expel American diplomatic and military officials from the country.

Demonstrators also asked the sincere officers to fulfill their pledge with their Lord Allah (swt) and His Messenger (saw) that they will protect and defend this land and its people. They also asked the sincere officers that they must uproot the traitors with in the political and military leadership and give Nussrah to Hizb ut-Tahrir for the return of the Khilafah to Pakistan because it is the most important Islamic obligation and only the return of the Khilafah will completely end the Kufr Capitalist system and American hegemony.

People in these demonstrations expressed their resolve that they will continue the peaceful political and intellectual struggle to bring to an end to the American Raj secure the return of the Khilafah. They will bear hardships in this path with determination and patience.

Media Office of Hizb ut-Tahrir in Wilayah Pakistan

Continued from Page 20

Those who plunge themselves blindly into sectarian issues, should deeply reflect on whom their actions serve. They must resist in getting drawn into sectarian conflicts that serve to destroy the unity of the ummah. Allah says: *“Hold on fast to the rope of Allah and do not separate.”*

Furthermore, the regime in Iran must know that such destructive actions only benefit foreign powers like America and their agents in the Iranian regime. Instead they should support the re-establishment of the rightly guided Caliphate, where they can live in peace as citizens of the Islamic state. As Hizb ut-Tahrir forthrightly said in its Q & A about Iran being used by America to prevent the return of the Khilafah in Syria, “We also remind the rulers of Iran, even though they do not believe that the Khilafah is the obligation of their Lord, and whose mind, when it is mentioned, conjures up an unjust Khaleefah here or there, we remind them that the Khilafah which the workers work to establish it, is the Khilafah on the method of the Prophethood. The Khilafah, which was Abu Bakr, Omar, Othman and Ali, may Allah be pleased with them, were its leaders and its soldiers. So if the rulers of Iran stand in its face, then they will violate the Seerah (biography) of Ali (may Allah be pleased with him), who pledged Bayah (allegiance) to the three Khulafaa who preceded him, and was their assistant and was honest and sincere with them. So follow his Seerah, and do not ban the Khilafah by standing at its face in Al-Sham or in any other place. If you fail to support the workers for Khilafah, then at least not stand in their face... The best outcome is for the pious.”



Islamabad: Demonstration organized by Hizb ut-Tahrir against the American Bases and Embassies



Karachi: The flags of Rasool (SAW) are raised high during the demonstrations.



Lahore: The flags of Rasool (SAW) are raised high during the demonstrations.

IMPORTANT NOTICE

**FOR THE URDU-SPEAKING
MUSLIM WORLD**

HIZB UT-TAHRIR'S CENTRAL MEDIA OFFICE
HAS AN URDU-TEXT BASED WEBSITE.

THE URDU WEBSITE IS AN ESSENTIAL MEDIA SOURCE
FOR HUNDREDS OF MILLIONS IN THIS UMMAH OF
MUHAMMAD SAW,
WHO USE URDU IN THEIR DAILY LIVES.

WWW.HIZB-UT-TAHRIR.INFO/INFO/URDU.PHP

CONTENTS INCLUDE

PRESS RELEASES AND LEAFLETS ISSUED BY THE VARIOUS
WILAYAT OF HIZB UT-TAHRIR, FROM INDONESIA TO MOROCCO
MULTIMEDIA COVERAGE ABOUT THE VIGOROUS STRUGGLE OF
HIZB UT-TAHRIR
FOR THE RETURN OF THE KHILAFAH TO THE MUSLIM WORLD