

Answer to Question

Political Developments in Respect to the Syrian and Libyan Arenas

(Translated)

Question:

By following the course of events in the latest truce in Syria up until now, it appears that America is serious this time in respect to the truce and convening negotiations to establish a secular government in Syria consisting of the opposition and the regime. So is this correct? And does that mean that America has turned away from the idea of bringing about a replacement agent for its current agent Bashar whilst it has relied upon Bashar continuing in the position of ruling?

And another question if I may and it is: In regards to the circumstances in Libya; every time a solution is brought near, the situation returns to being complicated once again. So they made an agreement in Skhirat and the agreement established the legitimacy of the Tobruk parliament representing an accomplishment for Tobruk... However, it is still postponing giving the vote of confidence to the government whilst Sarraj had responded to them by reducing the number of ministers from 32 to 18, so how can this procrastination be understood? Jazaak Allahu Khairan.

Answer:

We have previously issued an 'Answer to Question' on 19/01/2016 titled: "The Most Recent New Developments in the Libyan Crisis" and we clarified in it the subject of the Libyan problem... Similarly, we issued a leaflet about Syria on 11/12/2015 titled: "Two Prevalent Evils Bound Together..." which was about the Riyadh Conference and the formation of the High Negotiations Committee. We also issued another leaflet of 24/02/2016 under the heading: "Regime's Security Truce in Munich is the Bloody and Fatal scheming of America..." in which we explained and clarified the subject of the current truce and negotiations. That was detailed and it is possible to understand the answer from it. That is because the map of events remains within the borders of the general outline that we have explained in the publications... Despite that the following represents further explanation and clarification... However, before that, I will clarify a difference between Syria and Libya in respect to the struggle that is taking place in each of them:

The subject of Libya differs from the subject of Syria because the struggle in Syria is between America, its allies and followers and the people of Syria whilst it is not a struggle between America and another major state. That is because Russia is implementing the American plans as the result of a dirty deal whilst Putin believes that his service to America in Syria will lead to relieving the problems in Russia's southern borders in regards to Ukraine... As for Europe, then it revolves around America, repeating what it says in order to attain something or even just a part of something from it! That is because both Russia and Europe realise that the influence belongs to America and so they do not covet competing with it in gaining influence in Syria... As such, the struggle is between America and the people of Syria in addition to every sincere and truthful Muslim behind them in support.

As for Libya, the struggle over influence is between America and Europe; particularly Britain, France to an extent and then Italy to a lesser extent... Consequently, America has been astonished and taken aback by what it has seen in terms of the resilience of the people of Syria in the face of the American plans throughout the five years of the Syrian revolution. On the other hand, in Libya it is reassured by its power by which it is combatting Europe and as such takes part in the struggle with Europe with this power whilst feeling a certain level of assurance...

After explaining this difference, we will now mention some further explanation and clarification about what was mentioned in your question:

Firstly: The subject of Syria:

As for America being serious in respect to the subject of the truce and negotiations, then that is correct... As for it turning away from seeking another replacement agent for its current agent Bashar, then that is not correct. That is because, at the time that it finds an alternative, it will end Bashar's role just as it did with its subordinates previously. The explanation for that is as follows:

America has put all of its weight into stopping the revolution and finishing it off under the headings of ceasefire, cessation of fighting and the halt of aggressive acts... It held conferences in Geneva, Vienna and Riyadh and issued resolutions in the Security Council... This is without mentioning its work to abort the revolution by military actions undertaken by its agent Bashar, Iran and its party in Lebanon, and Russia. This is in addition to America itself being involved and its drawing in of other states alongside it under the cover of an international alliance with the pretext of fighting against ISIS and terrorism... And most recently it has found some breathing space as a result of the Munich meeting on 12/02/2016 in an attempt to stop the revolution within a week through a ceasefire. Then, when this did not come to pass, its Secretary of State Kerry met with his Russian counterpart Lavrov on 22/02/2016. They then announced in a joint statement that the ceasefire will begin to be implemented on Saturday midnight 27/02/2016. All of that was an introduction for establishing its secular plan within the negotiations which it was preparing for within the coming days following that in Geneva... The evidence indicating America's seriousness is the measures that it has undertaken linked to this direction and particularly since the two days 9-10/12/2015 when the Riyadh Conference took place to prepare the formation of opposition committee for holding negotiations with the regime. These measures included:

1 – America's preparation of a supporting base for it within Syria by influencing its followers 'Turkey and Saudi' to generate promising atmospheres for negotiations without objection. The indications of that are as follows:

a - It delegated Saudi to gather the followers and subordinates in Riyadh and particular those from the armed groupings, and to form a negotiating committee using the carrot and stick approach oiled with cash and weapons... It was successful in respect to that and so this body or committee was formed from those who had sold their Akhirah (Hereafter) for the Dunya (life of this world) of others... In this way America was capable, for the first time since the beginning of the Syrian revolution, to insert armed groups into the negotiation committees which accept to negotiate in order to share with the regime within a single rule. "And in a press conference convened Thursday night Abdul Aziz As-Saqr, the Head of the Gulf Centre of for Studies, said that a delegation from the opposition will meet with a delegation from the regime within the first ten days of the coming January... and the agreement stated the formation of a high committee consisting of 32 members; 10 belonging to the (armed) groups, 9 to the alliance, 5 to the coordination body and 8 independents" (Al-Jazeera.net, 11/12/2015). The negotiators had previously been from those who resided outside of Syria and had no refuge internally... As such, those (armed) groups that joined the body or committee had betrayed the people and particularly those who had been supporting them because they had thought that they had been established to rid them from the tyrannical regime!

B – Erdogan's visit to Saudi and the discussion about the subject of the truce and negotiations in order to implement the American plan in Syria and to convince their (armed) groups within Syria to agree to the truce and to form a body or committee made up of the opposition to participate in the negotiations. "The Turkish President Erdogan arrived Tuesday in Saudi in a visit in which he will discuss the issues of the region, particularly Syria and Yemen, with officials during the visit. And shortly after his arrival in the King Khalid international airport

in Riyadh, Erdogan was transported to the Yamamah Palace where the Saudi King Salman Bin Abdul Aziz received him, as reported by the official Saudi news service” (Al-Quds 29/12/2015).

C – America held preliminary meetings with the negotiators to school them upon that which it intended for them to undertake in terms of solutions. Even when it was expected for the matters to proceed as they had wanted, this wish was sealed by the rapid and random convergence and drawing closer of ties between Turkey and Iran. As such Davutoglu’s visit to Iran came in spite of the heated statements exchanged between the two, and that was to coordinate between them the utilisation of their respective influences over their (armed) factions and followers within Syria, in order to implement the American plan in Syria... “The Turkish Prime Minister, Ahmet Davutoglu arrived on Friday night, the 4th of March, in the Iranian capital Tehran at the head of a delegation that consisted of a number of ministers, in the first visit by a Turkish Prime Minister to Iran since two years... and the Iranian Persian news agency mentioned that the Turkish Prime Minister will meet with the major Iranian officials to discuss the development and consolidation of economic and trade cooperation between the two countries...” (Russia Today, 04/03/2016). It appears that they covered up the visit in a ridiculous manner that would not convince the average people by making the meeting appear to be for trade purposes!!

2 – Throughout these cunning political actions from its agents to prepare the regional and internal environments for negotiations, it was generating pressuring environments to implement the American plan by actions ranging from fabricating and distorting the reality in order to give the appearance that the plan of negotiations being put forward by America represents the best solution for Syria... to military actions undertaken by it or Russia which is proceeding along with it as part of a dirty deal or by its followers and regional and local tools... These actions include:

a – America has worked to focus upon the idea that the people of Syria only have one of two choices; they either agree to the American secular plan for Syria via negotiations or Syria will be fragmented and divided... Because it grasps that the people of Syria will flee from the division and breakup of the land they thought that the people would accept to negotiate in order to settle its secular plan for Syria by forming a joint rule between the regime and the opposition... In order for America to make this idea believable, America and Russia made statements about the division as a source of pressure upon the negotiations to frighten the negotiators and to generate a severely heated environment upon the people of Syria, in the case where if the people of Syria were to not agree to the American plan to bring about a secular state consisting of the regime and the opposition within Syria, then Syria would never remain whole but would rather be divided. In accordance to that Kerry stated, “It may be too late to keep it as a whole Syria, if we wait much longer” (Reuters 23/02/2016)... And Russia spoke about a federal state in Syria as the Russian Deputy Foreign Minister Sergei Ryabkov said, “Moscow hopes that the participants in the Syrian negotiations arrive at the idea of establishing a Federal Republic and this is a demand that the Kurds are demanding” (Al Hadath Satellite Channel, 29/02/2016). All of which to apply pressure upon the negotiators from the opposition so that they approve of the political system that America will impose or otherwise there will be division... This is whilst America has forgotten or has been made to forget, alongside its allies, that the people of Syria, just as they reject the division of the land they also reject the American secular plan and that they regard both plans to be two prevalent evils that America has formulated and these will never pass through except by the traitors of the Ummah who are themselves heading to oblivion by Allah’s permission...

b – The intensification of Russian air strikes during the negotiations as a message directed to the negotiators to accept negotiating to settle the America plan and if they don’t then the attacks will further intensify. As such the Russia attacks significantly intensified during the Geneva 3 talks that began on the 1st of February 2016 and the intensifying of the siege of Halab (Aleppo) represented a means to pressurise the negotiators...

c – Alluding to an implicit or even explicit threat to anyone who rejects the negotiations and in this context Kerry stated on 24/02/2016: “There is a significant discussion taking place now about a Plan B in the event that we do not succeed at the [negotiating] table,” (Reuters 24/02/2016). And Al-Jubeir repeated his teacher’s words saying: “...but if the truce did not continue, there would be other options including the U.S. Secretary of State’s statement on the existence of a plan (b) if it turns out that the Syrian regime and its allies are not serious. Then, the other option can be considered and focus will be on it” (CNN Arabic site 28/02/2016 and Alriyadh.com 29/02/2016).

From the aforementioned, it is clear that America is really serious about the truce and the negotiations in order to accomplish its secular plan for Syria.

It appears that these means have been successful to act as an excuse and justification for the opposition negotiating committee to continue with the negotiations with the regime as: “The special UN envoy to Syria Steffan De Mistura announced that a new round of talks aimed at ending the conflict will be held in Geneva between the 14th and 24th of March under the supervision of the international organisation” (Ar-Riyadh, Thursday 10th March 2016). Then the opposition committee for negotiations began the preparation of the environments to agree to the negotiations. “The High Negotiating Committee that represents the Syrian opposition groups said on Wednesday the 9th of March 2016 that it viewed the action framework put forward by the UN for the peace talks to be positive and that it had noticed a retreat in the violations of the government forces to the truce in the previous day. And Salim al-Muslat, the spokesman for the High Committee for Negotiations said that it will make a final decision soon in respect to participating in the negotiations decided to take place in Geneva” (AFP, DW 09/03/2016). Then the news site ‘Russia Today’ reported on 11/03/2016, “The High Committee for Negotiations Syrian opposition announced that it will participate in the upcoming round of negotiations in Geneva next Monday...” (Russia Today, 11/03/2016).

2 – As for America having turned away from looking for a replacement agent then this is not correct... That is because Bashar has lost the ability to guarantee a stable rule in Syria that is capable of serving the American interests. America only wishes for him to stay in the transitional stage so that it is able during that period to search for a new agent with a face that is less black or marred than the face of Bashar which is capable of fooling the people so that he can implement its interests whilst smiling at the people! America is therefore keenly concerned to establish a secular agent-rule in Syria that serves its interests just as Bashar and his father had done before. Even the rotten air of division that it has broadcast is far off to being sought in Syria unless it fails to establish a replacement agent for Bashar the current agent... For that reason, what is important to America now is the ceasefire so that it can work within the calm to implement its plans and bring about a secular rule made up of the regime and the opposition, and that will be until it finds the replacement to take Bashar’s place... America considers this ceasefire and the commitment of the opposition to it, in particular as it has been able to involve some of the so-called Islamic groups to accept the truce and negotiations, it considers that to represent the greatest success for it since five years in regards to confronting the revolution taking place against its influence and agents in Shaam... In addition, Russia has considered that to be a great success as well and an opportunity to consolidate the regime. For that reason, the Russia’s envoy Vitaly Churkin to the UN, said to the Kommersant Newspaper whilst commenting upon the Munich agreement, “Damascus, as I hope, understands this is a unique chance for Syria after five years of unremitting destruction.” (AFP 19/02/2016). And following that Bashar Assad announced his readiness to accept the ceasefire.

3 – These are the calculations of America and Russia in addition to the followers and subordinates... As for the calculations of the sincere people of Syria then this is something else that will strike down the plans of the disbelievers and the colonialists, their agents and all those who revolve in their orbit whilst their plotting will mean their destruction by the permission of

Allah. ﴿وَمَا كَيْدُ الْكَافِرِينَ إِلَّا فِي ضَلَالٍ﴾ “But the plan of the disbelievers is not except in error” [Ghaafir: 40].

That is because the men of Shaam are not those who hover in the Intercontinental Hotel in Riyadh around money and misguidance, and then go on to form a negotiations committee... And they are not the traitors of the Ummah who incline towards the direction of dirty money... And they are not those who deceive themselves who say that the regime should be negotiated with whilst at the same time say that there is no place for the head of the state, because the one who does not accept a place for him would not negotiate with his regime! And they are not those who are dictated to regarding a secular civil state whilst nodding their heads in approval whilst at the same time they pretend that they are those who represent Islam! They are not those who talk about democracy and the making of Halaal and Haraam by men instead of the ruling of the Lord of all men whilst Allah the Most Wise of judges says: ﴿إِنَّ الْحُكْمَ إِلَّا لِلَّهِ﴾ “Verily the Hukm is for none but Allah” [Yusuf: 40].

They are not those... Rather they are the lions of Shaam whom the Ummah recognises by their truthfulness and sincerity whilst they recognise it and that the goodness will never cease until the Day of Judgement... They are those who proclaim and proclaim with their hearts and mouths “It if for Allah, it is for Allah”... They are those who desire for ash-Shaam that which Allah Almighty loves for it and His Messenger to be: «عَفْرُ دَارِ الْإِسْلَامِ بِالشَّامِ» “The Abode [centre homeland] of Islam is in ash-Shaam.” (Extracted by At-Tabarani in ‘Al-Kabeer’ on the authority of Salamah Bin Nufail). They are those who reject the division with the same force as they reject the secular plans of America in addition to all of the plans of the disbelievers and hypocrites... They are the sincere and truthful within the land of Shaam, steadfast upon the truth that they are upon, those who comprehend that the Baatil (falsehood) wins a round whilst the Haqq (truth) wins rounds, and so they do not bargain with their Deen and their Ummah... They are those who saw with complete clarity that their revolution is in truth a source that reveals and exposes as the conspirators have been revealed and the traitors exposed. All of those have been laid bare equally and so none are fooled by them, apart from the one who is not mindful and none apart from the ignorant gives weight to their plotting... They (the sincere people of Syria) are tranquil and assured that the plans of the disbelievers will be brought to failure from where they don’t suspect.

﴿وَسَيَعْلَمُ الَّذِينَ ظَلَمُوا أَيَّ مُنْقَلَبٍ يَنْقَلِبُونَ﴾

“And those who have wronged are going to know to what [kind of] return they will be returned” [Ash-Shu’araa: 227].

Secondly: The subject of Libya:

As we have mentioned above the subject of Libya differs from the subject of Syria because the struggle in Syria is between America, its allies and followers on one side and the people of Syria on the other. It is not a struggle between America and another major state like the situation in Libya where the struggle is between America and Europe; particularly Britain, France to an extent and Italy to a lesser extent. It is therefore fundamentally an international struggle even if local tools have been made use of within it...

After explaining this difference, we will add further explanation and clarification in regards to what came in the question about Libya:

1 – It is observed that America is not focused upon the political solution and its success in Libya which is the opposite to what it is doing in Syria. Rather, it is signalling towards military intervention and requested it within the Security Council whilst it has worked to obstruct and hamper the political solution. Indeed, it even began to launch sporadic attacks since November last year, when it stated that it had killed someone from its wanted list. This was then followed

by around 20 of its soldiers entering a Libyan base before leaving it, and thereafter came the last operation that the American planes undertook on 19/02/2016 when they killed 49 people claiming that they were affiliated to the Islamic State organisation (ISIS) the majority of whom were from Tunisia. This is regarded to represent the biggest of its operations that killed the largest number... and it appears that it will continue with strikes similar to these: "Obama will be chairing Thursday 28/01/2016 a meeting of the National Security Council that has been specially set up to look into the situation in Libya in the case where the major western states fear that a constitutional vacuum in Libya will represent a fertile ground for the growth of the terrorist organisation... And the White House said in a statement: "The president directed his national security team to continue efforts to strengthen governance and support ongoing counterterrorism efforts in Libya and other countries..." (nst.com 30/01/2016 and Middle East Online 29/01/2016).

2 – This decision indicates the extent of the gravity of the situation in regards to America in Libya. Its cause is not the threats posed by ISIS as is being made to stand out since it is only an excuse to intervene, but rather there are major states preventing America from expanding its influence in Libya. It is for that reason that we see America acting freely whilst not paying regard to the final agreement signed in Skhirat, Morocco on 17/12/2015 and is not focused upon its implementation. That is whilst its talk about military intervention in Libya has been predominant against what it has called 'terrorism'. Had this agreement been in its favour it would have been eager to apply it with all that it has of power... This has all happened after it was unable through its agent Haftar since 2014 to gain control and spread its influence within Libya by making the regime fall into its hands. It therefore began to intervene in a direct manner without obtaining an international resolution from the Security Council when Britain obstructed the issuing of a resolution permitting military intervention inside Libya. For this reason, the application of the political solution will remain obstructed.

3 – America is giving the appearance that it accepts the political agreement made in Skhirat at the same time that it works to delay its implementation and we are able to confirm that through the statement of CIA Director John Brennan on 25/02/2016 acknowledged that the United States in practice was pursuing a two-track policy in Libya, in which it was engaged both in a diplomatic effort to knit together two competing, regionally based self-proclaimed Libyan governments while also conducting "counter terrorism" operations against a growing contingent of Islamic State militants." (AFP 25/02/2016). And the Secretary of State John Kerry said, "We have been working really hard for the last months, particularly, to bring together a government in Tripoli. If they cannot get themselves together, yes it will be a failed state." (Reuters, 24/02/2016). It is therefore making the claim that it has worked diligently for the formation of the government! Which means in accordance to the measures of America or otherwise it will cause it to fail and because the government agreed in Skhirat will not come to pass. In addition, it has worked to obstruct its formation by a flimsy excuse through its agent in the Tobruk parliament when they said that they reject its formation from 32 ministers. The head of the Government Fayez Sarraj went to Egypt on 22/01/2016 and met with its ruler Abdul Fattah As-Sisi in a visit that lasted for 6 days. Sarraj attempted to please the American agents and so he announced at the end of his visit his readiness to reduce the number of ministers. Then when Sarraj left Cairo Haftar landed there to find out the conclusions and to receive instructions in respect to what he should do and to ensure increased support for him. That means that America is not content about the formation of the government because its formation has not occurred in accordance to what it desires... Sarraj then reduced the number of members of the government and formed it from 18 ministers and presented it to the Tobruk parliament on 23/02/2016 which they then rejected. Even an armed gang, which they said were unknown assailants, attacked the parliament members who had come to vote and acted to prevent them from entering. The required amount was then not met in the case where 86 deputies from the 200 members of

parliament in total. As a result, the parliament chair dispersed the session and so America through its gangs and its loyal parliament members are working to obstruct it....

4 – As for the reason for this obstruction, then that is because the greater portion of the political medium in Libya are from the remains of Gaddafi's era, i.e. they are loyal to Europe... This means that any ministerial formation will be in accordance to this measure just as it is within the new ministry. This is whilst America is reliant upon Haftar and a band from amongst the military around him and it hoped that bases would be established for him alongside a new political medium which would have the greatest share within the rule and have control over it. However, until now, he has been unable and not all of his military actions have been successful, indeed they have been failing. For that reason, America is obstructing the political solution to the best of its ability by way of military intervention, by Haftar and its subordinates until it can guarantee a rule in which it has the lion share within it... Consequently, the military intervention represents a means to focus its political interests within Libya and it appears that it will never stop until it has accomplished what it desires.

5 – This is contrary to what Europe is doing as it is working to make the agreement succeed, the government to be formed and approved. Since it still has control or dominance over the political medium and the indications for that are numerous. So, the French president Hollande met with the British agent Muhammad the 6th, the King of Morocco, in France in 17/02/2016 and they discussed the situation in Libya. They then declared that they are urging the Libyan parliament to give its vote of confidence to the government of national reconciliation under the leadership of Sarraj. British Foreign Minister Phillip Hammond undertook a visit to Algeria and met with its Foreign Minister Ramtane Lamamra on 19/02/2016 and reiterated there that military intervention in Libya is not representative of the most appropriate solution to solving the crisis that the land has witnessed and he called for a political solution. The Algerian Foreign Minister supported his British counterpart and said Libya and Algeria do not believe that a military intervention to be regarded as the solution for solving the crisis in Libya. All of the efforts expended aim at enabling Libya to appoint a government of national unity that will be effective in the struggle against terrorism... (Algerian News, 19/02/2016). Therefore, Britain, supported by France, is utilising its regional forces as well to make the political process succeed and to obstruct the military intervention that America is promoting...

As for what is being heard from statements about military actions from some of the European nations then this comes from the angle of precaution so that the arena is not left open to America if no room remains for anything other than intervention. The news media reported that Britain sent a military force to Libya. The African portal reported on 12/01/2016 from the British site 'Socialist Worker' that, "The Tories have sent 1,000 British troops to Libya to defend oil fields threatened by the advance of Isis-supporting forces. A Royal Navy destroyer has been directed to the North African coast and the RAF has been asked to prepare for air-strikes against targets in Libya. This is a major escalation." The French Le Monde Newspaper published on 24/02/2016 that: "elite special forces unit are participating in a secret war against the extremists of ISIS in Libya." This means that France is preparing to intervene when that is necessary albeit in a secret manner whilst it sends special forces alongside Britain to prevent America being militarily alone there. France does not wish to expose that but rather does it covertly because it does not want to make military intervention a natural and legitimate matter in regards to Libya at this time. This is as it works with Britain to implement the political solution, the formation of the government and to provide support to it... Even when America attempted to embarrass Europe with the military intervention by making statements about interventions from Europe here and there, Europe was quick to deny those statements... "The Italian President Matteo Renzi denied Sunday that it was Italy's intention to send approximately 5000 troops to Libya saying that the conditions were not favourable for a military intervention in the former Italian colony. And Renzi said during a television discussion programme (Canale 5 television),

“As long as I am prime minister, Italy will not go to Libya for an invasion with 5,000 men.” “If there is a need to intervene, Italy will not back down. But this is not the situation today. The idea of sending 5,000 men is not on the table,” Renzi said. He had been responding to the American ambassador in Italy, John Phillips who expressed to the Corriere della Sera newspaper, on Friday, that Rome could send up to 5000 troops” (Source: News Agencies, Russia Today 07/03/2016) ... “And Italy stated that it specifies, before the dispatching of those troops, the receipt of an official request from the Libyan government after it has attained the confidence of the parliament” (Al Arabiya 08/03/2016). In this it is exposing an American intervention without waiting for a Security Council resolution or the decision of a legitimate government in Libya.

This all means that the situation will not be stable in the near future for Libya and that it is unexpected for a government with standing to emerge in Libya that is capable of preserving security or bring about stability. The most that can happen is for there to be a third government that has no power attached to it and that is particularly because America has been belittling its status whatever new government emerges: “... Experts warned that the signing of the members in the Tripoli and Tobruk parliaments, the agreement upon the formation of a national unity government will never lead to anything other than a third government in the country which will only exacerbate the fragmentation and chaos... “If a government of national unity is formed, there are likely to be factions from both (existing) governments that refuse to accept its legitimacy,” warned The Soufan Group, a US-based thinktank. “The fledgling government will likely have a fight on its hands before the ink is dry...” (Soufan Group) according to the British Guardian Newspaper,” (16/12/2015). So even if its formation takes place then it will never be more than a break from the warring which will then resume thereafter. What is apparent, is that America will never stop, on this occasion, from working until it has the main role within Libya. That is because, for the first time, it actually has agents in this way whilst it has the opportunity to intervene under the pretext and justification of fighting against ISIS.

In conclusion, there will never be stability within Libya until the hand of the colonial states is severed from interference. The most important matter is bringing down its cheap local tools who are in positions of authority in this state or that one, whilst they are traded with to prepare for their intervention. Indeed, they serve them in it and fight on their behalf by way of delegation! It is therefore a duty upon the sincere and aware to undertake diligent work to make all forms of foreign intervention fail and to cast out the colonialists from the land, whether they are Europeans or Americans. They must also reject all of their solutions and plans and cause them to collapse in addition to bringing down their agents whilst working to take over the reins of the affairs and to establish the rule of Allah upon His earth... Verily, we do not depreciate the goodness that exists amongst the people of Libya, the land of the memorisers of the Qur’an, as there are within it truthful and sincere men who are capable by the permission of Allah to cause the plans of those who harbour hatred against Islam and its adherents to fail and Allah is Al-Qawwiyy Al-‘Azeez who grants victory to whom He wishes.

﴿يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا إِن تَنصُرُوا اللَّهَ يَنصُرْكُمْ وَيُثَبِّتْ أَقْدَامَكُمْ * وَالَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا فَتَعَسَا لَهُمْ وَأَصْلٌ أَعْمَالُهُمْ﴾

“O you who have believed, if you support Allah, He will support you and plant firmly your feet. But those who disbelieve - for them is misery, and He will waste their deeds”
[Muhammad: 7-8].

3rd Jumada ath-Thani 1437 AH

Corresponding to 12/03/2016 CE