The crumbling tower of lies

ISIS: The history of deceit in retroperspective

Snowball lies

This article is aimed to cure those who still support ISIS from the deceiving misunderstandings on which their support is built. Exposing the crooked fundamentals on which the support of many misinformed brothers is built will shatter the whole tower of lies inshaAllah. Furthermore, if you still support ISIS after reading this article then one should seriously question his motives. Nothing but facts will be mentioned in this article by the will of Allah. Like the Bible is refuted by its own contradicting tongue, likewise the lies and deceit of ISIS will be refuted by their own tongue. May Allah accept and bless this effort, may it be purely for Allah, wanting nothing else but good for this Ummah and hoping that this will benefit the fields of Jihaad greatly. This article could be considered complementary to the article "Methodological Difference Between ISIS and Al-Qaeda" written by Shaykh Ahmad Al-Hamdan and translated recently by Al-Muwahideen Media. So we advise everyone to read both articles. Although the issue is much bigger than Al-Qaeda or ISIS, nor any other group. This project is a project of the Ummah, and the dangers lurking over it from various sources will harms us all if we do not neutralize them. And one of the biggest dangers today on the Jihadi fields is that of reckless extremism, currently represented and introduced by ISIS, which caused many infights. We have already seen its destructive effects on the popular Jihaad of Algeria in the 90's. So we must not repeat such mistakes, thus refuting this deviance is necessary.

Everyone by now is familiar with the infamous Mubahalah of ISIS made by their media spokesperson Abu Muhammad Al-Adnani. Which many supporters unfortunately raised to the status of Divine Revelation or Pre-destiny. Every event which pleased them, and every misfortune which would befall upon their opponents, was the result of the Mubahalah according to them. But it did not work the other way around of course, the Mubahalah was not relevant when misfortunes would befall upon ISIS and when major victories were gained by their opponents. This was just one of the many deviances concerning the Mubahalah, which we will discuss in length. We hope for your patience and attention, as we will pass through them.

Abu Muhammad Al-Adnani quickly pronounced the Mubahalah in front of everyone in the beginning of the Fitnah in Shaam in his speech "Then let us invoke the curse of Allah upon the liars". In it he invoked the curse of Allah on the opponents of ISIS, namely Jabhat Nusra, which ISIS did not consider to be disbelievers at the time, at least not openly and officially. This hastiness would have been blameworthy enough, a Muslim should not hasten to curse his brothers, not even in a dispute. But in addition to this hastiness he even made Islamic mistakes which actually could render the Mubahalah invalid, as we will explain down the line. He even repeated these mistakes in a second Mubahalah, in his speech filled with lowly accusations and Takfir on Al-Qaeda, titled "This is not our methodology, nor will it ever be." Furthermore, on top of that, the most amazing thing is that he lied multiple times in these Mubahalat.

We recently saw how ISIS in Yemen lied in their media propaganda, acting out a battle as if they were attacking and killing two Houthis, while filming two actors from ISIS lying on the ground smeared with fake blood. This came after Al-Baghdadi insulted the Mujahideen in
Yemen in his speech "Even if the Disbelievers despise such" with the shameless statement: "If the Rawafid in Yemen found Muwahideen to fight them, their evil would not have festered." But the mighty Caliphate could not even kill two real Houthis, so they tried to fool the Ummah by acting out a fake media battle. And this is just one of their many propaganda lies and deceit. We also found out how they lied to Shaykh Abu Muhammad Al-Maqdisi about the Jordanian pilot Muad Al-Kasasbah, they had already burnt him before demanding the release of Sajida Rishawi, thus gambling with her life and that of other Muslim prisoners in Jordan. They lied to the Ummah, convincing us about their concern to release here. Unfortunately she was executed when the regime found out that ISIS indeed already had burnt Muad.

We saw how they lied about their currency of golden Dinars and silver Dirhams in a major propaganda campaign to fool the Ummah. While their soldiers are still being payed in American dollars, and Zakaat likewise is still being spread in paper money. These golden Dinars and silver Dirhams and copper Fulus are nowhere to be found in everyday business life. We do not need a Caliphate which only exists in media propaganda without any real presence on the ground. We do not need John Cantlie to tell us that ISIS has complete control over Kobani in a slick propaganda video. While in reality ISIS was losing thousands of men on the ground in this meaningless battle, wasting Muslim lives which could have liberated large parts of Shaam.

Every time when they lose a position they keep denying it until the whole world knows that they have indeed lost it. We saw this embarrassing denial every time when they lost a crucial position. They also lied about their oath to Al-Qaeda. And after all of these lies, they expect us to believe that they downed a Russian airliner with a simple soda can? The lies are too many to count. Lying is not the trait of a Mujahid, especially not a Caliphate which claims to be on the Prophetic methodology.

However lying and deceit are traits not unknown to ISIS. Their lies have been exposed many times. Abu Sulayman Al-Utaybi even complained about this to the general command of Al-Qaeda nine years ago. He said "Many operations which are published by the brothers in the media productions of Al-Furqan Foundation are either old, and re-produced in another production like "The battle of rescuing the prisoners". It is a production about releasing prisoners which happened in the time of Abu Musab Zarqawi, may Allah have mercy upon him, and now it is re-published again in a new production of ISI. Or it is an actual true event but it is blown up and exaggerated, many things which are published are either lies or exaggerated. They for example claimed that the Mujahideen attacked the prison of Badush in Mosul and released the prisoners, but this is not true. Rather they agreed with the guards and gave them an amount of money, then they showed us it as if it was a battle and a victory. But the enemy knows that this was not a battle, so the lie here is against the brothers not against the enemy. And the examples are many many many." (Page 12)

One of their lies was the stories about Mujahiraat being raped in Northern Aleppo by other factions, they used this lie to hurdle an army of supporters who were ready to execute suicide operations against other Mujahid factions. They even titled their campaign against the other factions in Northern Aleppo "Revenge for our chaste women". They used this lie to attack and capture the liberated villages in Northern Aleppo, which they still are attacking and trying to capture until this very day, while they leave the Nusayria alone who are advancing against them in the same region.
This story turned out to be a big lie like one of their own defected soldiers explained Abu Ahmad Al-Muhajir Al-Misri. Shaykh Abdullah Al-Muhaysini also tried to investigate this accusation, but not one single piece of evidence was presented until this very day. He even questioned the widow of Haji Bakr, the leader of ISIS in Syria at that time, and she denied the accusations that she was kidnapped and she denied the accusation of rape, saying "We only heard about it on Twitter like everybody else but we did not see anything." While she lived in Tal Rifat among the sister who were supposedly raped. Muslim Abu Walid Sheeshaani, leader of Jund Shaam, and Salahuddinne Sheeshani, former leader of Jaish al Muhajireen wal Ansar, also tried to investigate the case in Aleppo. But not one single evidence was presented, they couldn't even point out one woman who was supposedly raped.

Even if there were sisters raped by some individuals from other factions, then what is the rule of Allah concerning this crime? Blowing up Mujahid bases and positions with suicide attacks? They even bombed general gatherings like water stations, bus stations, Sharia courts, and even Mosques. By Allah these incidents are recorded, and they will be presented on the Day of Judgment to all those who denied them or even approved of them. Everyone with an grain of knowledge and Taqwa will reject this kind of revenge and retaliation. The ironic thing is that ISIS themselves started slandering the chaste wives of the Mujahideen in Syria, openly without any shame, by Umm Summayyah Al-Muhajirah in their magazine Dabiq, and by their jurist Abu Muysarah Al-Shami in several despicable Fatawa, accusing them of Zinah and other lowly slanders. While they killed numerous innocent Muslim civilians and Mujahideen, claiming to avenge the honor of Muslim women!

Conceited contradictions

However the Mubahalah of Al-Adnani is the best example which proofs their trait of lying and deceiving. This Mubahalah was the straw that broke the camel's back, it stood as a hallmark for their deception. There was no need to wait for the outcome of this Mubahalah, as this Mubahalah in and of itself was the proof we needed.

One of the iconic lies in the Mubahalah of Al-Adnani was his denial that ISIS made Takfir on everyone who fights against them, and that ISIS did not make Takfir on the basis of unintended consequences and uncertainties. Which he directly contradicted in his speech "Oh our people respond to the caller of Allah." In it he blatantly said: "By fighting against the Islamic State you (consequently) fall into disbelief whether you realize it or not." This political Takfir was clearly made to neutralize everyone who fought in self defence against ISIS, while they declared an all out war against all Mujahid groups, which we will proof inshaAllah. This deviant statement is one of the major innovations of ISIS, not even the rightly guided Caliphates claimed such a thing. Ali ibn Abi Talib for example did not make Takfir on Muawiyah when he fought against his Caliphate. So this is not from the nullifiers of Islam. But ISIS has raised their Caliphate to the status of the religion; by fighting this fictive Caliphate you are fighting Islam in their eyes.

But maybe the biggest lie of Abu Muhammad Al-Adnani was his denial that ISIS raised the dispute to Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri. After that, ISIS even denied that they had an oath of obedience to Al-Qaeda and Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri to begin with. While every true Mujahid would be proud to call a man like Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri his leader. Since these lies many witness reports have reached us which clearly proof that ISIS indeed did raise the dispute to Shayh Ayman Zawahari, and that ISIS indeed did have an oath of obedience to Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri. Shaykh Abu Sulayman Al-Muhajir for example was present when
Abu Bakr Al-Baghdadi stated that ISIS had a binding oath of obedience to Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri and that ISIS would obey his orders if he ordered them to retreat to Iraq. But the strongest witness report is maybe that of Shaykh Abu Abdul Aziz Al-Qatari, former leader of Jund Al-Aqsa, who is completely neutral in this dispute. Furthermore, Jund Al-Aqsa is even known to be sympathetic towards ISIS. And Abu Muhammad Al-Adnani also praised Shaykh Abu Abul Aziz Al-Qatari in his speech "This is not our methodology, nor will it ever be." So why didn't they accept his witness testimony? Was he lying? Al-Adnani of course praised him before his witness testimony leaked out, so it was too late to discredit him.

Furthermore, even their own jurist Abu Bakr Al-Qahtani testified to the fact that Abu Bakr Al-Baghdadi raised the dispute and accepted the judgement and order of Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri, even if he would order ISIS to retreat to Iraq. Rather the most amazing thing is that even Abu Muhammad Al-Adnani himself admitted that Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri was their leader in his additional speech "Apologies oh leader of Al-Qaeda" and he acknowledged that Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri gave them a binding order which they simply chose to reject with a bunch of flimsy excuses. After the audio message of Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri in which he proofed that ISIS had a binding Bayah to Al-Qaeda, in his legendary speech titled "A Testimony to preserve the Blood of the Mujahideen in Shaam", Al-Adnani commented by saying: "Everything that you have mentioned in your testimony is true, and I will add to that, not long ago we would answer those who would ask us about the relationship of the Islamic State with Al-Qaeda, that it's like the relationship between a soldier and his leader." Likewise Abu Bakr Al-Baghdadi, he also admitted that they refused to obey the order of Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri with some weak excuses, in his stubborn speech "It will remain! In Iraq and Syria." So a person does not even have to bother refuting their obvious lies, as they contradict and expose their lies with their own undisciplined tongue.

When Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri responded on the case, he ordered them to retreat to Iraq, ISIS however refused. But if they had listened to him, and returned to Iraq, to intensify their strength and efforts, they would not lose swathes of territory. Many cities and villages were lost in Iraq, more than 40% of their territory is lost since their refusal to return to Iraq. Tikrit, Ramadi, Beji, Haditha, Sinjar, Salahaddin, Jurf Sakhr, Barwana and the list goes on and on. And even in Syria they have lost and they are still losing swathes of territory. In Hasakah, Tal Abyad, Shadadi, Kuweirs, Sarrin, Tal Hamis, Tal Tamar, Al-Hawl, Jarabulus, Ayn Isa, Suluk, Tishrin Dam, and recently more than 25 villages in the Harariyah region of Western Aleppo, and who could of course forget Kobani. They have lost vast area's to the Kurds, the Syrian and the Iraqi regime. They lost around 20% of territory in Syria. They are on a losing streak, even in Afghanistan, in the Nangarhar province for example, and in Libya they are also losing territory in Ajdabiya and Al-Laythi area of Benghazi for example, and Boko Haram has lost nearly all 14 districts in Nigeria since they pledged alliance to ISIS, in addition to major defections in their ranks in Yemen, and so forth. The saddest part is that they first captured area's in Syria by force from other Mujahid groups who liberated them with their blood and lives, then they lose them to the regime and the Kurds. The Mubahalah could not prevent ISIS from loosing more than one third of their territory last year. Screaming and shouting that "It will remain and expand" doesn’t change the reality on the ground.

But loosing territory is not the problem. Every Mujahid group loses and regains territory, sometimes retreating sometimes advancing, this is normal for a guerrilla group, but not for a so-called Caliphate who called upon all the Muslims in the world to migrate to the land of the Caliphate. Which land of the Caliphate are they talking about? They still do not have any steady territory which they really control.
The Mujahideen are working towards steady and significant advances in Syria, especially in Idlib and Hamaa, and now they are piercing through the regime's heartland in Latakiyah, despite the ruthless Russian airstrikes and the dozens of militias pouring into Syria. We do not need quick victories which we lose the next day. The Mujahideen in Afghanistan, Somalia and Yemen are also making major advances. So if we would return to the Mubahalah of Al-Adnani, we could without a doubt say that its results are in the advantage of the opponents of ISIS who are steadily gaining ground, while ISIS lost nearly half of its territory since then. But victories nor losses are seen as evidence for the correctness of one's methodology.

ISIS and their supporters were short-sighted and didn't realize that temporary and quick victories come and go easily. And the sad thing was that they even saw these small worldly victories as evidence for the soundness of their methodology and beliefs, while Allah even grants the unbelievers major victories throughout the history of mankind. ISIS was tried with these victories, now they are tried with losses and retreats. Connecting our beliefs to victories is a characteristic of the hypocrites, such a methodology is bound to collapse, as soon as you are confronted with worldly losses. This collapse is inevitable if ISIS does not repent and reform. We should not be hasty, Jihad will last until the final hour, like the Prophet (saws) said. So we must place worldly victories in their correct context. ISIS should have listened to the order and the sincere advise of their leader at that time, Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri, and they should have intensified their campaign in Iraq. Unfortunately they did not listen, they even busied themselves with Yazidi slaves and infighting instead of prioritizing the defensive Jihad in Iraq first and foremost.

**Policy over militarism**

Furthermore, being obsessed with military achievements is actually one of the major causes which led to the reckless extremism of ISIS. As they prioritized military dominance while neglecting Sharia policy, Shaykh Atiyyatullah Al-Libi wrote years ago in a letter to Shaykh Abu Musab Zarqawi: "My dear brother, you are achieving successes and striking the enemies of Allah and hitting and doing much, which is a good and great thing that we are not lowering at all and we ask Allah to bless and increase, but this isn’t everything. The path is long and difficult, and the enemy isn’t easy, for he is great and numerous and he can take quite a bit of punishment as well. However, true victory is the triumph of principles and values, the triumph of the call to Islam. True conquest is the conquest of the hearts of people, and the regard for seeing the Treaty of Hudaybiyah as a victory. Policy must be dominant over militarism (!). This is one of the pillars of war that is agreed upon by all nations, whether they are Muslims or unbelievers. That is to say, that military action is a servant to policy. We as people of Islam are people of policy, wisdom, reason, and are good at applying the fundamentals of justice, mercy, good deeds, etc."

Not only did ISIS refuse the orders of Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri, and not only did ISIS misuse the Mubahalah to flee from an independent or even shared Sharia court, as we will explain later on in this article, and not only did Abu Muhammad Al-Adnani lie and deceive in his Mubahalah. No. All of this was not enough. ISIS began to show its true colors when they officially published a number of media publications in which they slandered Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri. They accused Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri of numerous deviations, which was clearly a lowly attempt of character-assassination when we look at the falseness of these accusations. They for example said that Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri was holding on to the Sykes-Picot borders and agreement because he ordered the soldiers of ISIS to retreat to Iraq. This is one of the biggest slanders towards the Shaykh, as he spent his whole life exposing and confronting
the Sykes-Picot agreement, he was the one who spread awareness in the Ummah about this agreement and these enforced borders by the West.

The strategic order of Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri was not new. Al-Qaeda has reorganized its branches before in the very same way. They for example retreated and reorganized their Jihadi branch in Saudi Arabia into a new front in Yemen. They also retreated and reorganized their branches in Libya and Tunisia into one front in Algeria. So why didn't ISI at that time accuse Al-Qaeda of sticking to the borders of Sykes-Picot in these instances? And afterwards we even discovered that Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri was correct when we witnessed the major losses of ISIS in the Iraq, as this front indeed needed much more effort and strength than ISIS thought.

Indeed the current borders are enforced on the Muslim Ummah, but this does not mean that the Muslim world does not known the concept of borders. The Prophet (saws) said that there will be an army in Shaam, and an army in Yemen, and an army in Iraq. These regions have borders. Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri's order was in line with this Prophetic revelation. The Arabian Peninsula, Khurasan, Egypt, etc. All of these regions have borders in the Islamic history. So dividing armies over these regions is nothing new nor strange. If Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri said that all Iraqi's should return to Iraq and all Syrian should stay in Syria, they would have something to hold on. But he did not order this, he simply re-organized his army branches. Furthermore, even ISIS shares this organizational strategy, as they have a branch in Nigeria which is active in Nigeria only, and a branch in Libya which is active in Libya only, and a branch in Yemen, Khorasan, etc. Who all work within their territory.

And Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri didn't even ask all the fighters of ISIS to return to Iraq, he simply ordered that the state should remain in Iraq, as it was not appropriate to establish and enforce this state in Shaam, while there were Mujahideen from numerous other factions who also have a say in the matter. The fighters of ISIS could however stay in Shaam and fuse together with the fighters of Jabhat Nusra, under a new name "The Organization of Al-Qaeda in the Land of Shaam" changing the name of Jabhat Nusra. Shaykh Abu Muhammad Al-Joulani even proposed that he would resign, and let Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri choose a new leader for the Al-Qaeda branch in Shaam. But ISIS, in their quest for power, of course refused.

Not only did ISIS refuse to retreat to Iraq and annul their Islamic State in Syria. No. They were so full of themselves that they even declared a Caliphate, and they forcefully tried to expand into different Jihadi fronts all over the world, trying to break up the ranks and divide the Mujahid groups who were united before that; in Yemen, Libya, Somalia, Egypt, Afghanistan, the Islamic Maghreb, the Caucasus, and so forth. The true intentions of ISIS were revealed in the speech of heir official spokesperson Abu Muhammd Al-Adnani in which ISIS announced their Caliphate. Three months after the meaningless Mubahalah they published the speech "This Is the Promise of Allah." In it Abu Muhammad Al-Adnani boldly said: "We clarify to the Muslims that with this declaration of the Caliphate it is binding upon all Muslims to pledge allegiance to the Caliph and support him (may Allah preserve him). The legitimacy of all emirates, groups, states, and organizations, becomes null by the expansion of the Caliphate's authority and arrival of its troops to their areas."

It became clear that ISIS did not wage Jihad to defend the weak and oppressed Ummah, rather they waged Jihad for authority, for followers, for oaths and rulership. And when nobody listened Abu Bakr Al-Baghdadi repeated the irrational nullification of all Mujahid groups in
his speech "Even if the Disbelievers despise such." In it he said: "We give the good news by announcing the expansion of the Islamic State to new lands, to Saudi-Arabia and Yemen, to Libya and Algeria. And we announce the acceptance of the Bayah of the brothers who gave Bayah to us in those lands, and the nullification of the groups therein, and announce them as new provinces for the Islamic State and appoint new governors for them. We also announce the acceptance of Bayah given by the groups and individuals in all of those mentioned provinces and others. And we ask from every individual among them to join the closest province to them, and to hear and obey the governor appointed by us for it."

The enemy within

They are willing to lie and deceive in their media propaganda, they are willing to break up the ranks and divide the Mujahid fronts, they are willing to wage war against other factions and groups, everything is used and done to collect oaths and pledges, without any consideration for the blood of Muslims nor their affairs.

Like Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri said: "We have endured much harm from Abu Bakr Al-Badghadi and his brothers, and I decided to respond with as little as possible, because we were keen to extinguish the fire of turmoil, and we wanted to leave space for the people of good to re-conciliate between the Mujahideen. But Abu Bakr Al-Baghdadi did not leave us a choice, they have requested from all the Mujahideen to break their authentic oaths, and to give their pledges to what they claimed was a Caliphate. Furthermore the issue of these brother has reached to them appointing themselves leaders over the Muslims without any consultation, and without any care for their misery and suffering. Their only concern was collecting pledges and breaking ranks. At the time when our brothers in Somalia were confronted by the Crusaders in a fierce campaign, when the local and international enemies allied against them. And at the time when they were tried with the Martyrdom of the scholar, the leader, the Mujahid Mukhtar Abu Zubayr and his companions, may Allah's vast mercy be upon them. The only concern of these brothers was them requesting Harakat Al-Shabaab to break off from their Emirate, and to give their pledge to what they appointed as a Caliphate without consultation from the Muslims.

And at the time when our brothers in the Islamic Maghreb were confronted with French Crusader and American campaigns, which they mobilize against them, and they establish bases to fight against them. The only concern of these brothers was them requesting the Mujahideen from the Islamic Maghreb to break off from their Emirate, and to give their pledges to what they appointed as a Caliphate without consultation from the Muslims. And at the time when our brothers in the Arabian Peninsula were confronted with a Crusader Safawi secularist Houthi campaign. The only concern of these brothers was them requesting the soldiers of Al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula to break off from their Emirate, and to give their pledges to what they appointed as a Caliphate without consultation from the Muslims. Rather the issues has even reached to Abu Bakr Al-Baghdadi stating in his speech that the Houthis did not find anyone who would confront them. And at the time when Gaza was burning from the Israeli bombs, Abu Bakr Al-Baghdadi did not support them with merely one word. Rather his only concern was that all the Mujahideen would pledge their oaths, after he appointed himself as a Caliph without consulting them.

And at the time when Waziristan was burning from a campaign by the treacherous Pakistani army in cooperation with American espionage planes. This campaign which was announced officially approximately twenty days before Abu Bakr Al-Baghdadi announced himself as a
Caliph without consultation from the Muslims. At this time Abu Bakr Al-Baghdadi did not bother himself to mention Waziristan with merely one word. And his only concern was that the soldiers of Al-Qaeda would break off from it, and that they would give their pledges to the Caliph who they appointed without consultation from the Muslims. And at the time when our brothers in the patient and defiant Afghanistan were fighting one of the biggest battles in Islamic history, and were writing a noble page in it, under the leadership of our leader and the leader of Al-Baghdadi who broke his oath, the leader of the Muslims Mullah Muhammad Umar Mujahid. At this time Al-Baghdadi did not mention them with merely one word, while they are confronted by American airstrikes and NATO campaigns, and while the prisons of Pakistan and Afghanistan are filled with tens of thousands of their prisoners. The only concern of Al-Baghdadi and his brothers was that the soldiers of the Islamic Emirate would break their oath to the leader of the believers." (From the 1st episode of the series titled "The Islamic Spring")

While ISIS was creating disunity the Mujahideen were calling towards unity. Even the son of Shaykh Usama bin Laden felt compelled to comment on the growing division in a very rare audio statement. Hamza bin Usama bin Laden said: "My Mujahid brothers in Iraq and Shaam. The enemies of Islam, despite their various differences, religions, and denominations, have united to fight you. They are the Crusaders, the Jews, the Alawite Nusayris, the Safawid Rafidah, and the apostate mercenaries from various countries. They gathered to eradicate you. We will not be able to repel their aggression, break their union, and destroy their structure unless we unify our ranks and pass over our differences. We realize the size of the danger that threatens our Ummah and the Muslims. Our Lord is one, our religion is one, our Prophet is one, our Book is one, and our enemy is one. So why do we disagree and argue in fighting a unified enemy?" (From "The greetings of Salaam to the people of Islam")

But ISIS insisted on division as they declared an all out war against all Mujahid factions and organizations in the shocking speech "Say to those who disbelieve; You will be overcome." In it Al-Adnani shamelessly said: "We will divide the groups and break the ranks of the organizations! Yes, because there is no place for groups after the revival of the Jamaah (Caliphate). So away with the organizations! We will fight the movements, assemblies, and fronts! We will tear apart the battalions, the brigades, and armies, until, by Allah’s permission, we bring an end to the factions, for nothing weakens the Muslims and delays victory except the factions. Yes, and we will liberate the liberated places!" Indeed it is like the Prophet (saws) said: "He told you the truth, though he is a liar." He uttered this ludicrous declaration of war after he swore in his Mubahalah that ISIS did not start the fight against others. He made this promise of dividing the groups and breaking up the ranks after he invoked the punishment of Allah upon those who split the ranks in his speech "This is not our methodology, nor will it ever be." In it he said: "Oh Allah, deal with all of those who split the ranks of the Mujahideen, and who divided the word of the Muslims."

This is the major difference between ISIS and Al-Qaeda. While Al-Qaeda focuses on the main enemies of this Ummah, ISIS however busies the Ummah with senseless infighting which only weakens us from within. When Shaykh Nasr ibn Ali Al-Ansi was asked: “The project of Al-Qaeda differs from the project of ISIS, what is the difference between the two projects?” He answered: “The project declared by both, is the return of the Islamic Caliphate, but the manner of operating on the battlefield differs. The strategic plans and manners of Al-Qaeda are not hidden for those who follow these facts. It could be summarized in, Dawah towards Tawheed, and the Rule of the Sharia, and holding firmly to it. While aiming the power and capabilities of the Muslim Ummah to confront the central power-base of
worldwide disbelief represented by America, uniting the Ummah in this direction, and keeping away from numerous other projects (secondary fronts) to the best of our capabilities. America is the one who moves all the other players and unites them in the war against Islam, they are the axis around which all the other parts of the conflict turn; and these parts are loyal to America and seek support from it.

Even in Iraq for example (the power-base of ISIS). Who is the one is aiding the regime which wages war against the Sunnis there? And who is the one who is waging worldwide campaigns against the Muslims in Iraq and all the other parts of the world? So why are we blind to it and consider it a far-away enemy? While in fact they are the ones who are leading the battle against us. If you could eliminate one enemy and by that get rid of all the other enemies, than it is necessary to begin with this enemy, especially considering the fact that this enemy has reached a stage of clear weakness and is wavering and unstable. As for prioritizing the fight against the apostates while we have a long index of descriptions for the various forms of apostasy, then this will mean that we will busy ourselves with long wars; this is not the appropriate and suitable moment nor time for it. And this will give an opportunity for the enemy to catch his breath, and organize his masses and ranks again.

But this does not mean that we do not support the weak and oppressed Muslims, send brigades to them, aid them and strike the enemies of the religion in every (necessary) place. However if America falls and her strength weakens to a level which does not allow it to intervene in the matters of the Ummah, it will make it easy with the permission of Allah to uproot these apostate regimes which sits on the chest of the Ummah. And this is the declared project of Al-Qaeda since two decades ago. And this was the project of Shaykh Usama ibn laden and this is the path Shaykh Dr. Ayman is continuing on to establish a Caliphate on the Methodology of the Prophet with the consultation and the participation and the felicitation of the Ummah.”

(Source: The first international press conference. Al-Malahim Media.)

Empty bravado

Al-Adnani also swore to the fact that ISIS does not use lies to cover up its real methodology, and that it does not slander its opponents from Al-Qaeda and others, and that they do not consider Jabhat Nusra and all their opponents to be Sahawaat. But everyone by now has discovered the Takfir of ISIS on nearly all the factions in Syria, and Mujahid groups outside of Syria. Something which they kept hidden until they gradually revealed it. Everyone who has read the issues of Dabiq will realize how ISIS slanders the best of scholars and Mujahideen. Even the wives of the Mujahideen were not spared by their slandering jurist Abu Maysarah Al-Shami. This evil-tongued jurist officially called Shaykh Abu Muhammad Al-Maqdisi and Shaykh Abu Qatadah Al-Filistini donkeys and sissy pimps, and he called Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri foolish and senile, and called the leaders of Al-Qaeda the Jews of Jihad. He even called the Taliban a Taghut and Mullah Akhtar Mansor a Dajjal. The list of despicable slanders and name-calling goes on and on. So how could Abu Muhammad Al-Adnani swear in his Mubahalah that ISIS does not slander its opponents, and how could he fearlessly invoke the curse of Allah on the liar?

The slanders and lies of Abu Muhammad Al-Adnani himself about the Mujahideen of Al-Qaeda in his many speeches are not hidden for anyone. After the order of Shaykh Ayman Zawahari came, in the dispute between ISIS and Jabhat Nusra, we witnessed an unimaginable
smear campaign towards Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri and Al-Qaeda; in a treacherous attempt to flee and reject the orders of Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri. In the speech "Apologies oh leader of Al-Qaeda" Abu Muhammad Al-Adnani for example said that ISIS didn't attack Iran before out of respect to the leadership of Al-Qaeda, who had ordered them to refrain from attacking the Rawafid in Iran, despite their potential to turn Iran into a pool of blood, as he claims. He concluded without any shame "So let history record that Iran owes an invaluable debt to Al-Qaeda." Well, several years have passed since this speech, and since ISIS broke off from Al-Qaeda, but we did not see ISIS execute one single operation in Iran, let alone turn it into a pool of blood. So what is his excuse this time?

Al-Adnani said: "The State remained committed to the advices and guidance of the elders of Jihad and its symbols. It was for that reason that the State did not strike the Rafidah in Iran since its establishment, and it left the Rafidah safe in Iran, and tried to restrain its soldiers who were fuming with anger, despite its potential to transform Iran at that time into a pool of blood, and it repressed its rage all these past years bearing the charges of being collaborators with Iran, its bitterest enemy for not having targeted it, leaving alone the Rafidah to enjoy security in compliance with the command of Al-Qa'idah to protect its interests and supply lines in Iran. Yes, it held back its soldiers and repressed its rage over the years to preserve the unity of the word of the Mujahidin and the unity of their ranks. So let history record that Iran owes an invaluable debt to Al-Qaeda. Yes, and due to Al-Qaeda as well the State did not operate in Bilad Al-Haramayn, leaving alone Al Salul to enjoy their security, singling out the scholars of the Ummah there and the youth of Tawhid who fill their prisons. Due to Al-Qaeda the State did not interfere in Egypt, Libya or Tunisia, and it remained repressing its rage and holding back its soldiers over the years, and sadness fills its corners and its surface due to the abundance of vulnerable people calling for its help."

So we are suppose to believe that you refused the order of Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri to annul the State in Shaam and return to Iraq, because this contradicts the orders of Allah, as you claim, but you obeyed the orders of Al-Qaeda not to attack Iran, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Libya, and Tunisia, despite the fact that you could have rescued the Muslims in these countries from oppression and imprisonment? So you obeyed Al-Qaeda and disobeyed Allah? Only because you didn't want to hurt the feelings of the Mujahid leaders of Al-Qaeda? So this is your lame excuse? Did Al-Qaeda also prevent you from liberating Baghdad which is still sitting right in front of your eyes! So you could have prevented the Shia Rawafid march from Iran into the current Muslim countries, but you chose not to because a simple human being ordered you this? This is an open sin of disobedience towards Allah! When Al-Qaeda advised you not to attack the general Shia gatherings in Iraq, you refused and continued to attack their public gathering and places of worship. But in the case of freeing Muslim prisoners from the dungeons of the tyrants and rescuing oppressed Muslims from injustice you come with this lame excuse? The orders of Al-Qaeda prevented you from all of this?

But do not fear, your obedience towards Al-Qaeda has ended years ago, so show us the pools of blood you will cause in Iran, and show us the scholars you will free from Saudi Arabia, and please do free the Muslims from oppression and tyranny in Egypt and Tunisia. Nothing is holding you back this time. We are still waiting for these grand promises. If you owned all these bombastic capabilities in the past when you were an isolated State in Iraq, then it will be even easier to accomplish all of this now that you have established a worldwide Caliphate. And the evil of Iran has increased, so we hope that you will also increase your attacks in Iran. SubhanAllah. Contemplating about all of this one does not know whether to laugh or cry.
Al-Adnani and many ISIS supporters did not even realize that complaining about the fact that Al-Qaeda ordered ISIS to refrain from attacking Iran, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Libya and Tunisia, is actually a complaint about Shaykh Usama bin Laden and not Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri. Because Shaykh Usama bin Laden was in charge when the leadership of Al-Qaeda supposedly ordered ISIS to refrain from these targets. So why blame Shaykh Ayman? And why claim that Shaykh Ayman deviated from the methodology of Shaykh Usama? Why claim that you are following the methodology of Shaykh Usama while you are clearly complain about his methodology? Al-Adnani and many ISIS supporters were blind to these facts by their envy and grudge towards Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri. This is one of the many foolhardy contradictions in the foolish smear campaign against Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri and Al-Qaeda.

From these accusations and from their reckless behavior it has become clear that ISIS does not have any insight in war strategy. There are many Ahadeeth which teach us that we must not provoke unnecessary enemies, especially if you are engaged in a war against all the world super powers who have gained against you. What would ISIS say about the advises of the Prophet (saws) about not provoking the Turks and the Coptic Christians of Egypt for example? Even Shaykh Abu Musab Zarqawi would not provoke and attack the Shia Rawafid who stayed neutral in Iraq, those who didn't ally with the US. He also didn't attack the Yazidis and Christian tribes in Iraq who stayed neutral. His war was against those who attacked the Muslims, he did not wage war against them because of their beliefs. Even if those who waged war against the Mujahideen were Sunnis, then they would be fought, despite their correct beliefs. But ISIS wants to turn a defensive war into an all out sectarian war, not differentiating between the general people and combatants, which will exhaust and busy us for years while the head of the snake America is rebuilding and enjoining its peace and security. And of course the situation concerning Iran and the Shia Rawafid march in the Muslim Arab region has changed over the years, this is self explanatory.

An open secret

Abu Muhammad Al-Adnani also tried to discredit Al-Qaeda and Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri with his accusation that Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri supported the revolutions of the oppressed Muslims in the Arab countries. And he also complained about the words and terms which were used. So he called upon Shaykh to renounce words like "popular uprising" and "the people". He even accused the Shaykh of pacifism. He basically tried to convince everyone that Al-Qaeda has changed and that it has deviated since the Martyrdom of Shaykh Usama. But he ignored the fact that Shaykh Usama bin Laden also praised the revolutions. He even praised them more than Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri did. Abu Muhammad Al-Adnani knew about this, but he simply didn't care. Because most people are not known with the facts he figured, so he could easily mislead them with false accusations. And sadly many youth who were new to the Jihadi movement indeed did not catch up on the Jihadi literature.

Right after the Arab Spring in May 2011 Shaykh Usama bin Laden praised the revolutions in his very last posthumous message. Calling these revolutions a revolution of dignity and defiance. He began his speech saying: "My Islamic Ummah: We follow with you these great historical events. We share with you the joy and happiness and the delight and gladness. We rejoice for your joy, and we grieve for your distress. Congratulations to you for your victories, and may Allah have mercy upon your Martyrs, treat your wounded, and release your prisoners. Thereafter: (poetry) 'Days of glory came to the people of Islam, and meanwhile rulers departed from the land of the Arabs. Possessing thrones until the news came to us with
indications of glad tidings.' The Ummah always directed its face expecting a victory to emerge from signs in the east. But instead the sun of the revolution rose from the west. The revolution radiated from Tunisia, and it pleased the Ummah, and the faces of the people were illuminated, the throats of the rulers were choked, and the Jews were alarmed by the closeness of the threat. With the fall of the tyrants also fell the meaning of humiliation, submission, fear and limitation. And the meanings of freedom, dignity, courage, and initiative arose. The winds of change were blowing with desire of liberation. And Tunisia took the lead. As quick as lighting, the nights of Egypt took what they learned from the noble people of Tunisia to Tahrir square. Another great revolution was launched and what a revolution it was."

Furthermore, not only did Shaykh Usama praise these revolutions, he even called for them. These revolutions were a direct result of his Dawah, he called upon the Muslims to overthrow the tyrants for years. These revolutions came right after Al-Qaeda exposed the tyrants in many of their publications. And not only did Shaykh Usama call upon the Muslims to revolt, he even predicted these revolutions and the fall of the Arab tyrants. Shaykh Usama bin Laden said in April 2007 in a message to the tyrants: "People have awoken from their slumber and have realized the great transgressions and corruptions you have committed concerning their property and money. You have two options in front of you: return what you have unlawfully taken to the rightful owners in a peaceful way. And let the Muslims choose a Muslim ruler who will govern by the Book of Allah and the Sunnah of His messenger (saws). Or secondly, refuse the first option and continue to oppress people, take away their rights, and manipulate a portion of the general public to beat and kill their brothers and kin who rejected your governing. However, you must know matters have exceeded what can be tolerated. You must also know that when the people move to reclaim their right, no one can stop them, not even the best security apparatus anywhere. Do not forget what came to pass for the Shah of Iran, despite the experience and power which his security agencies were famous for. Do also not forget the fate of Ceausescu in Romania. So it's better to seriously consider the first option."

So not only did Shaykh Usama bin Laden praise the Arab revolutions, he even praised them more than Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri, furthermore, he even called to them and these revolutions were a direct results of his Dawah. So why does ISIS blame Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri for supporting these revolutions and why do they claim that he and that Al-Qaeda has deviated from the methodology of Shaykh Usama bin laden while the Shaykh also supported these revolutions? Abu Muhammad Al-Adnani blamed Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri for using the exact same words used by Shaykh Usama bin Laden when he praised the revolutions. Al-Adnani called upon Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri to 'Renounce the words and terms which are alien to the Mujahideen such as 'the popular uprising' 'the Intifadah of the masses' 'advocacy movement', 'the people', 'the masses', 'strife' and 'struggle' and other words..'"

Al-Adnani even made indirect Takfir on Al-Qaeda by claiming that they believe in the Taghut, which is a clear act of disbelief. In his speech "This is not our methodology, nor will it ever be" he said: "The matter is a matter of crooked Religion and deviated methodology, a methodology which has changed declaring the Religion of Ibrahim and disbeliefing in the Taghut. A methodology which believes in pacifism and runs after majorities, a methodology which is shy from mentioning Jihad and declaring Tawhid, and replaces it with revolution, popularity, uprising striving and struggle. Al-Qaeda now runs after the bandwagon of the majority and calls them the Ummah and softens in their stance at the expense of the religion, and the Taghut of the Muslim Brotherhood (Mursi)." The
loudmouth Al-Adnani did not realize that Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri wrote one of the strongest refutations out there against the Muslim Brotherhood, which destroyed their crooked methodology. Read his divisive refutation "The Bitter Harvest" which he wrote in the early nighties, when Al-Adnani probably did not even lose all his calf's teeth yet. Everyone who is known with the speeches and the biography of Shaykh Usama bin Laden, and the leaders and scholars of Al-Qaeda, realizes how false the accusations of Al-Adnani are. The tone of speech and methodology of Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri does not differ from that of Shaykh Usama bin Laden.

Nevertheless Al-Adnani slandered and accused Al-Qaeda of deviance, and the accusation which he cited to proof the deviance of Al-Qaeda are beyond ludicrous. In his speech "This is not our methodology, nor will it ever be" he for example said: "Al-Qaeda today is no longer the Qaeda of Jihad, the one praising it is of the lowest, and the tyrants flirt with it." Clearly he could not find any real faults for citing these weak and poor accusations. Al-Qaeda is deviated because it is praised by the lowest and because tyrants flirt with it? Time magazine even selected Abu Bakr Al-Baghdadi as the runner-up person of the year in 2015. So how could ISIS be guided on the Prophet methodology when disbelievers praise its Caliph like this and elect him as the person of the year in one of their most famous Kufur magazines? Micheal Heart selected the Prophet (saws) as on number one in his book "The 100 - A Ranking of the Most Influential Persons in History." And this is just one many example. So do we say that the Prophet (saws) is deviant because he was and is praised by many disbelievers throughout history? Robbert Fisk, Michael Scheuer, Lawrence Wright and many others praised Shaykh Usama bin Laden extensively. So was Shaykh Usama bin Laden deviant? The stupidity of these accusations actually not need any deliberation, but there is an important conclusion we want to reach inshaAllah.

Abu Muhammad Al-Adnani also accused Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri of softening his stance towards Muhammad Mursi, in his speech "Apologies oh leader of Al-Qaeda" he called upon Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri to "Disassociate from Mursi and his party and declare openly his apostasy and to stop causing misconception amongst the Muslims. Yes, Mursi the tyrant.." Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri is considered deviant only because he used soft speech in doing Dawah to the imprisoned Muhammad Mursi. If this is the case. Then why does ISIS lyingly claim that they follow the methodology Shaykh Usama bin Laden? Shaykh Usama moved to Sudan, and was an honored guest of the Sudanese president Omar Bashiri and the political leader Hassan Turbani, and he was known to have close contacts with them in the early 90's. The loudmouth Al-Adnani should read the diplomatic letters of Shaykh Usmah bin Laden to King Fahd in the 90's. Like his letter "Our invitation to give advice and reform" dated from April 12, 1994. He opened the letter by saying "To King Fahd bin Abd Al-Aziz Al-Saud, of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, and to the people of the Saudi Arabian peninsula. Peace be with you and Allah's blessings and mercy." Image if Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri gave the greetings of Salaam to Muhammad Mursi, ISIS would not hesitate one bite to declare their Takfir on him.

However Abu Muhammad Al-Adnani and the blind followers of ISIS who are known with the statements and the biography of Shaykh Usama bin Laden do not have the guts to accuse him of the same accusations which they direct at Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri. These double standards proofs that ISIS in facts hides its methodology. ISIS misuses names of scholars and leaders like Shaykh Usama bin Laden, because they realize how accepted they are among the vast majority of the Mujahideen. Like one of their jurists Abu Musab Tunsi said in a recorded discussion: "That I openly declare the disbelief of the Taliban; declaring this openly clashes
with the benefits and harms. The people of knowledge spoke about rejecting evil which could clash with the benefits and harms. So I could consider it to be of benefit to not openly declare the disbelief of the Taliban. And if Shaykh Usama saw these acts of disbelief and didn't consider the Taliban to be disbelievers then his ruling is like that of theirs."

So ISIS keeps their chain-Takfir on Shaykh Usama bin Laden and many other scholars and Mujahid leaders hidden, and keeping such convictions hidden is the same Takiyyah the Shia Rawafid use. Contrary to Ahl Sunnah wal Jamaah who openly declare their convictions. Another similarity they share with the Rawafid is that they slanders the companions of Shaykh Usama bin Laden, much like the Rawafid slander the companions of the Prophet (saws), because they know that they cannot attack the Prophet (saws) directly, as this is unacceptable by everyone.

**Style over substance**

After listening to the publications of Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri one could not comprehend the baseless rants of the loudmouth Al-Adnani. He slandered a Mujahid leader who spent more than fifty years waging Jihad, while there is absolutely nothing wrong with what Shaykh Ayman said to Muhammad Mursi. On the contrary, it was spot on! The saddest part is that ISIS even declared war on other Mujahid factions and killed many Mujahideen on the basis of these flimsy accusations.

Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri for example said, in his speech "The democratic date idol" commenting on the failed democratic progress in Egypt: "We have to recognize that legitimacy isn’t in elections and democracy, but legitimacy is the Sharia, as the one who is outside the Sharia is also out of the legitimacy, and the one who is subordinate to the rulings of the Sharia is obedient and concordant with the legitimacy. The legitimacy which you should defend and adhere to is the governance of the Sharia and its supremacy over all the constitutions and laws.. You gave up the implementation of the Sharia and accepted citizenship, civil state, national association and governance of the people, and glorified the corrupt manmade judiciary, and recognized the sovereignty of the corrupt laws, and despite of all that they didn’t accept you. You agreed to respect the international treaties and the agreements of surrender with Israel and security treaties with America, despite of all that they rejected you. You forget that democracy is an exclusive privilege to the West and who belongs to Islamist work isn’t allowed no matter how much they offered from concessions to enjoy its fruits except with one condition: to be a slave to the West.. I call every Ikhwani to reject all the means and methods that contradict with the governance of the Sharia, and unite in an inciting mass Dawah movement for the Sharia to be ruler not ruled, commander not commanded, a leader not led."

We also advise everyone to look up his speeches like "Faith Defeats Arrogance" and the ten part series "A Message of Hope and Glad Tidings" and "Forty-Six years since Al-Naksah" and "Liberation from the circle of futility and failure" and "The sun of victory rising over the victorious Ummah and the defeated crusaders" and "Unity around the word of Tawheed" which were all published before the baseless rants of Al-Adnani. If it wasn't for the length we would have liked to quote more statements in this regard, which proof that ISIS did not criticize Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri because of this statements, as they were not new. The Shaykh made these statements years before Al-Adnani criticized them, so why didn't ISIS criticize these statements before? Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri was much softer in his criticisms towards the democratically elected Ikhwan of Hamas, in his speech "The Advice of One
Concerned” published in 2007. Al-Qaeda was known for refraining from Takfir on the democratically elected Ikhwan of Hamas. Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri said in the first part of "The open meeting" published in 2008: "I don’t agree with those who make Hamas and Fatah equals. Hamas is a movement which stresses its affiliation with Islam, whereas Fatah is a secular movement. And I don’t agree with declaring the leaders of Hamas to be unbelievers. Declaring individuals to be unbelievers is a serious matter in which there must be the presence of prerequisites and the absence of impediments. So I advise my brothers to abandon this issue and focus on supporting Hamas if it is correct and criticizing it if it errors in a fair, scientific, invitational way."

So why didn’t ISIS criticize Shaykh Ayman or Shaykh Usama and the other Mujahid leaders of Al-Qaeda at that time, rather they even had an oath of alliance to Al-Qaeda under their leadership of Abu Umar Al-Baghdadi and Abu Hamza Al-Muhajir in Iraq. The reason why the current formation of ISIS didn’t criticize Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri then, nor the other Mujahid leaders, is obvious. As they only came with this criticisms and smear campaign when it was in the benefit of their power-move in Shaam; to still their hunger for authority and power.

How could someone lie so blatantly about a person like Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri? But the lies did not stop there. Al-Adnani also lied in his Mubahalahah when he said that ISIS does not make reckless and unjust Takfir on Muslims, while everyone by now has witness their reckless Takfir on nearly all the Mujahid factions inside Syria, including Jabhat Nusra, and even the Mujahid groups outside of Syria, including the Taliban. They have even made Takfir and massacred whole Sunni tribes like the Shuaytaat tribe in Deir Zor. If this is not the methodology of the Khawarij then what is? ISIS even makes Takfir on Muslims with terms which are vague and unknown in the Sharia, like the term Sahawaat. This term does not have any clear meaning, nor does it have any rulings and regulations in the books of knowledge. Which makes it impossible to proof the actual disbelief of someone with evidences, standards and regulations from the Quran and Sunnah. So how could such an arbitrary term be used in an important matter like legalizing Muslim blood? Al-Adnani demands from Shaykh Ayman that he stops using words like revolution, but he himself makes the blood of thousands of Muslims legal with terms which are totally unknown and baseless in the Sharia!

The most amazing thing is that they make Takfir on their opponents for acts (of disbelief according to them) in which they themselves have engaged. They make Takfir on Jabhat Nusra for example because they allied and fought alongside FSA against the Syrian regime, while they themselves allied and fought alongside FSA, and Abu Muhammad Al-Adnani even admitted this in his speech "You have Allah with you oh oppressed State" concerning the liberation of the Mennagh military airbase. ISIS also criticizes Al-Qaeda because they fight alongside the Muslim Brotherhood in Shaam and Yemen. Why would this be a problem? Even Shaykh Abu Musab Zarqawi said that he would ally and fight alongside innovators and Sufis, and he considered a Sufi who would wage Jihad better then the one who stays behind despite his seemingly correct Aqeedah. Even the current formation of ISIS fought alongside Izzat Douri and the Sufi Naqshbandis when they took over large parts of Iraq including Tikrit. And recently we even found out that the ISIS branch in Sinai cooperates with the Muslim Brotherhood of Hamas, which is known for its ties with Iran, according to a defected ISIS soldier from Gaza, Abu Abdallah Al-Muhajir, as he explained in a letter of complaint to Abu Bakr Al-Baghdadi.
Al-Adnani also swore in his Mubahalah that ISIS does not test people in regards to their beliefs and that they do not refuse the rule of Allah. While ISIS officially refused the initiatives made by multiple scholars to resolve the differences in an independent or shared Sharia court; until the other disputing parties would state their positions regarding the tyrant governments. Requesting this is testing people in regards to their beliefs. What would you call this invalid pre-condition? You could set this as a pre-condition for the judge of the court, but not for the disputing parties. A Muslim should accept the rule of Allah even in a dispute with a disbeliever, so why should someone refuse the rule of Allah in a Sharia court, and test the beliefs of the other Muslim first? Unless you are merely using this as an excuse to flee from the rule of Allah. Which is not befitting for someone who claims the implementation of the Sharia on the Prophetic methodology. Al-Adnani swore that ISIS does not refuse to submit to the rule of Allah. While they constantly refused the initiatives and judgment of multiple scholars. Like Shaykh Yusuf Al-Ahmad, Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri who called upon them to establish an independent Sharia court, they also refused the initiatives of Shaykh Abdullah Al-Muhaysini and Shaykh Abu Muhammad Al-Maqdisi, and the Sharia judgment of Shaykh Ibrahim Rubaysih, Shaykh Sulayman Al-Ulwan, etc.

How is it that all the other factions accepted these Sharia initiatives and judges, even factions like FSA who ISIS considers to be apostates, because they are secular and they do not adhere to the Sharia according to ISIS, while they themselves have rejected and still reject countless Sharia initiatives and judges!? How could a secular group accept the rule of the Sharia in an Islamic court while an "Islamic state" flees from it with all kinds of weak excuses? Scholars who are known for their sound methodology and beliefs supported these initiatives, like Shaykh Abu Qatadah Al-Filistini, Shaykh Abu Muhammad Al-Maqdisi, Shaykh Hussayn Mahmoud, Dr. Iyad Qunaybi, Dr. Akram Hijazi, and many other. So why was ISIS the only one who refused the rule of Allah, while they are the one who cream the loudest that they seeking nothing but the rule of Allah? From this is becomes clear that they merely use the banner of Sharia as a campaign slogan to deceive the truthful Muslims and especially their followers.

They have also refused debates with numerous scholars. They are brave enough to invoke the curse of Allah on the liar in a Mubahalah, but they are not willing to accept a debate with scholars to proof their position. What are they afraid of? If you are on the truth then it should not be hard to proof it with Sharia evidences. Of course the problem is that they do not have any scholars who could represent them in a debate. Instead of drawing nearer to the scholars they push them away and ridicule them.

Like they did with Shaykh Abu Qatadah Al-Filistini, Abu Muhammad Al-Maqdisi, Shaykh Nasr ibn Ali Al-Ansi, Shaykh Haarith An-Nadhaari, Shaykh Sulaymaan Al-Ulwaan, Shaykh AbdulAziz Al-Turayfi, Shaykh Umar Al-Hadoushi, Shaykh Haani Sibai, and many other Mujahid scholars and leaders who are known for their sound beliefs and truthfulness. They use the names of deceased scholars as if ISIS shares their metholodgy, and as if these scholars would support ISIS. They use the names of deceased scholars because a deceased person cannot refute their deviances. By Allah if these scholars and Mujahid leaders would be alive they would have rejected the deviance of ISIS, and by Allah ISIS would have slandered them like they slandered other scholars and leaders who sometimes have a much higher position then the names of deceased scholars and leaders they often misuse. Al-Adnani should read the letter of Shaykh Usama bin Laden to AbdulAziz Ibn Baaz, and how he used soft speech in Dawah with Saudi government scholars, addressing them with words like 'Dear Shaykh'. Maybe he could learn a thing or two about respect towards elders, Islamic manners in Dawah
and advising. Yes, even if you differ with them, and even if they have deviance statements and positions.

If Shaykh Usama bin Laden would be alive today then ISIS would without a doubt slander him the same way they slander his companion and right-hand Shaykh Ayman Zawahiri. It would not be the first time that Shaykh Usama bin Laden was attacked by a reckless Takfiri group, this happened before in Pakistan and in Sudan, these Takfiri groups even tried to assassinate him multiple times. ISIS already attempted to accuse Shaykh Usama of Irjaa in their 6th issue of Dabiq, claiming that he was hesitant to declare the apostasy of the Saudi rulers and their armies. However they retracted this when they witnessed the major backlash.

The level of desperation has sunken so low that they even claimed to have an oath of allegiance from Shaykh Nasir Al-Fahd to Abu Bakr Al-Baghdadi, written from prison in Saudi Arabia. What's interesting is that this letter was published exclusively by Al-Battar Media, not by his relatives or any neutral outsider. It's worth mentioning that this ISIS media foundation was run and co-founded by Hummam Al-Hameed, a spy responsible for the deaths of numerous high ranking Mujahid leaders in Yemen. Until he was caught and executed by the Mujahideen in Yemen. He also worked in the prisons of the Saudi regime, and was strongly connected to Saudi intelligence. So how could we trust such a media foundation? The ironic part is that ISIS refused to accept the letters of Shaykh Abu Qatadah Al-Filistini and Abu Muhammad Al-Maqdisi when they were in prison, because it did not suit their interests, with the excuse that a scholar in prison is not reliable, he could be manipulated, forced, misinformed, etc. Now they accept a letter from a scholar in prison because it suits their interests?

**The dead end**

The basis in a dispute is showing and proofing the arguments of both parties with evidences, and the dispute should be referred to a Sharia court. The Mubahalah is not something we should rely upon in the basis. Rather a judge should rule with the Sharia of Allah over the two disputing parties with evidence and arguments. This is what the Muslims fundamentally rely upon concerning a dispute. The Prophet (saws) would not call for a Mubahalah when two disputing parties would complain to him, rather he would judge between them with the Sharia of Allah. Add to this that a Muslim is also free to refuse a Mubahalah if the other party invites him to it, because it is not from the fundamentals. Fruthermore, a Mubahalah can not be done if the other wasn't invited to it or he didn't agree to it. A Mubahalah requires both parties. But a Muslim, contrarily to the Mubahalah, can not refuse the rule of the Sharia. Because it is the basis which we rely upon in Islam. This is important because ISIS did not invite the other party when they choose to speak out the Mubahalah. It doesn't work this way. Furthermore, ISIS refused to resolve the dispute with their opponents in a Sharia court when they were invited to it multiple times. So from this we understand that the Mubahalah was actually merely a means which they misused to escape from the Sharia of Allah; which is the basis we rely upon in a dispute.

Shaykh Abdullah Al-Muhaysini: "The reality of the Mubahalah is invoking the curse of Allah upon the liars. The Mubahalah didn't happen in the lifetime of the Prophet (saws) except once! And this was between him and the Christians! After that it occurred very little in the time of companions and those after them. So too much Mubahalah indicates a defect in Methodology, thought, and jurisprudence. In this there is proof that the followers of ISIS are attracted and dragged to the methodology of ISIS emotionally more than a legal and mental
conviction. And if not, their arguments would be stronger, and their evidences would be obvious. They wouldn't need to escape to the Mubahalah in every dispute in which they cannot respond and discuss. The basis is convincing with evidence, arguments and proof. The Mubahalah is only used in special cases, but they do the opposite, and this is a mistake.

Being convinced of any organization to the degree of willing to do a Mubahalah about it does not render the organization itself correct and truthful. Even the disbelievers of Quraish reached this degree of conviction, that they were on the truth and that the Prophet (saws) was on falsehood. So they asked for the destruction of whichever of the two parties is on falsehood. But this did not change the reality one bit. Zuhri narrated about Allah's Statement: "If you ask for victory and judgment, the judgment has then indeed come to you." (8:19) Zuhri said: "Abu Jahl asked a judgment saying "Oh Allah kill today whoever is most corrupt towards You and whoever breaks the ties of kinship the most." He meant Muhammad and himself. So Allah made Abu Jahl die on the day of Badr as a disbeliever and punished him in Hell." Mussanaf Abdurazzaaq (9725) and the Tafsir of ibn Kathir (2/296) - Hassan.

Even if I am correct and I have evidence for it, it does not oblige me to accept whoever invites me for a Mubahalah in every matter, and it does not mean that I will be upon falsehood if I reject. This statement is not true and illogical, not responding to the Mubahalah does not mean that I am hesitant or wrong. That’s why the scholars do not use this as proof for the correctness of the opinion of Ibn Abbas concerning issues in jurisprudence which were his unique opinions that contradicted the companions of the Prophet (saws), and he requested a Mubahalah but nobody from the companions did respond to this. The scholars did not use this as an evidence for the correctness of the statement of Ibn Abbas because nobody from the companions accepted the Mubahalah. No, they did not. It is not a sound evidence, and the incident also proofs that a Mubahalah is non-binding.

Finally I would like to state that the result of Mubahala is not ultimate, and that a person will perished within a year is not legally proven in the Sharia, rather this came from experience, like Hafid ibn Hajar said. And an experience is not accurate, so it cannot be evidence. We recall the Mubahalah of Al-Mubrak against the despicable Rawafidi named Yaser, a year has passed and nothing happened. And the Mubahalah of Al-Adnani was more than a year ago, and it was revealed that he was lying by his own saying, but nothing happened either. So in bother cases it is no evidence that they were right in what they made Mubahalah about."

(From the 9th refutation posted on his Telegram channel)

If the Muslim ruler would rely upon the Mubahalah every time there was a dispute between people, many rights would have been lost. Therefore, if a judge for example ruled between two parties, and one of them refused this rule because it is against him, and he wanted to annul this rule and resolve the issue with a Mubahalah instead, then this Mubahalah would not overrule the judgement of the Sharia court. Like Shaykh Abu Abdullah Shaami said in his response to the Mubahalah of Al-Adnani: "Even if we did a Mubahala, a Mubahala does not make one lose his rights!" You can not commit crimes against people and flee from justice with a Mubahalah.

So it is strange that ISIS, who claims to be on the Prophet Methodology did not accept to resolve the dispute in a Sharia court, but instead chose the Mubahalah, without inviting the other party to this Mubahalah, and without this party agreeing to it. Even if we would take the Sharia court out of consideration then a Mubahalah should also come after a dialogue with the
disputing party. A Mubahalah should be done for the benefit of the Ummah and Islam, not for the destruction of the Jihadi fronts who are protecting the Ummah and are defending Islam. A Mubahalah should come after the evidences, and after the arguments of both parties, who try to prove the truth.

Ibn Qayyim said: "The Sunnah in discussing with the people of falsehood is, if the evidences of Allah are presented to them, and they do not return, rather they stick to their transgression, then they are called to a Mubahalah." Only someone who is weak in his arguments and evidences would jump hastily to a Mubahalah. He is not able to convince his opponent, he is not able to refute his opponent, so he resorts to the Mubahalah. And this is contrary to the methodology of the Quran and Sunnah.

Ibn Qayyim also said: "The Mubahala is not permissible except in an important legal Sharia matter, and when there is confusion and stubbornness which cannot be solved except by a Mubahalah. It is done after the evidence is presented, and after an attempt is made to clear the confusion, and after advising and warning."

The Mubahalah is only considered when there is an important benefit for the Ummah, or a dangerous harm upon the Ummah could be prevented by it. So it comes as a last resort, he basis is proofing the evidences of your arguments, dialogue, advise, and resolving the issues in a Sharia court. A Muslim who fears Allah should not and will not jump to a Mubahalah in every dispute, because it works both ways. Only someone who does not fear the curse of Allah will jump to it, in that case the Christians of Najran fear Allah more than him, as they refrained from it, fearing the curse of Allah. So how could a Christian fear Allah more than a Muslim?

When the Prophet (saws) called them to a Mubahalah they first wanted to think about it, afterwards they rejected the Mubahalah, fearing the curse of Allah. So how could we jump to a Mubahalah not fearing the curse of Allah? Notice that the Prophet (saws) first invited them to a Mubahalah, and he did not oblige them to accept the Mubahalah, nor did he do the Mubahalah alone when they didn't accept it. Even though he knew that he was on the truth and they were on the falsehood.

The Prophet (saws) did not do the Mubahalah alone with the thought that "The destruction of these Christians is in the benefit of the Muslims, because this will proof that I was right and they were wrong." No, when they refused, he let them be. So how could a Muslim jump to a Mubahalah calling for the destruction of other Mujahid Muslims who are defending the Ummah against their enemies? Without even inviting them to a Mubahalah, and without their acceptance, and without their presence, and without debating them first like the Prophet (saws) did with the Christians, and without trying to resolve the dispute in an independent or even a shared Sharia court? Here we clearly see that ISIS does not stick to the Prophetic methodology, despite their haughty claims. They rushed to the Mubahalah calling for the destruction of other Mujahideen, without the rules and pre-conditions of the Mubahalah, and they even lied in it, not fearing the curse and punishment of Allah.

Written by: telegram.me/Al_Maqalaat