

Page 1

In the name of God, the merciful and compassionate

The noble brother, the esteemed Professor Mustafa Hamid, may God protect and preserve him.

May God's peace, mercy and blessings be upon you.

We ask Almighty God that you are well in the faith and in the world.

We are well, praise God for the blessing. And we ask God to gather us and you together and in well being in this world and the next.

My noble brother:

I and a group of the brothers - whom you know and they know you and you have trusted them and lived with them for many years in battlefields and the turmoil of battles and the dust of the march for God's sake - learned about some of the books and articles published in your name about the jihad and the mujahidin in Afghanistan, particularly what appeared in the two books, "A Cross in the Sky of Qandahar," and "The War of the Fugitives."

Our attention was turned to some of what these publications contained, especially things that the book, "A Cross in the Sky of Qandahar," contained that warrant pausing over them. For, aside from some things that are true, the book contains other things that have no connection with reality or any semblance of truth!!

And, by way of general brotherly advice that is the right of the believer toward his brother believer, and by virtue of the special brotherly relationship that bound me to you for years in the land of jihad, and by way of stating the truth to everyone and documenting it, I felt obligated to transmit to you my comments and the comments of the brothers regarding some of the things that the book contained that contradict the facts that you and I and they witnessed along with the other brothers who are still alive!!

I hope your heart may be extended for me, as among your well-known traits are your boldness and intensity in criticizing

sometimes, for whoever grants himself this right will not withhold it from his brothers.

Page 2

I will try to have my commentary on some of what the book contained be represented by examples of the facts and the realities that I lived (or most of them) with you and that many brothers (who are the object of my trust and yours and are still alive, praise God) lived with us.

Before beginning with the heart of the matter, I want to emphasize two important facts:

1- Until I read the book two months ago, I thought that Mustafa Hamid would only say and write what he believed at the very least to be the truth, and his problem among some of his friends was the way in which he published the truth and not a lack of trust in him in transmitting it.

Perhaps you remember that I sent a message to you and suggested to you that you postpone publishing some of the facts during the days of "Hashim al-Makki" because I felt that the time was not right for publishing it in those circumstances. The ones who would benefit from publishing it at that time were the rivals and the enemies, in my opinion. I did not disagree with you at the time that much of it was the truth.

However, after reading the recent books, and especially, "A Cross in the Sky of Qandahar," my previous conviction was shaken, and I discovered that the volume of distorted facts in the book made it difficult to explain or justify or find an appropriate outlet!

It was difficult for me and the other brothers to remain silent while the truth was slaughtered and history was fabricated for the sake of goals that I know you would be the first to label as blasphemous.

This has made me suspicious about attributing the book to you in fact, for I reject the idea that your noble person would publish things like these.

Therefore, in this commentary, I attribute the book's statements not to you personally (even though I will state my words in the form of a reference to you because it was published in your

noble name) because I reject the notion that you were the one who wrote these reprehensible things.

No matter what, our noble Shaykh, your status and your place and what you did previously in the jihad will remain preserved with me and with God and with the people, God willing.

2- I do not doubt that it is a critical book that criticizes one phase that has positive and negative aspects. However, it is well known among fair-minded critics that criticism does not come in the form of absolute destruction and hate mongering and disparaging and accusing

Page 3

some directly, to the extent that it sometimes borders on treachery. All of that is without evidence and proof, which reveals to the reader that there is a battle still ablaze between the author and some of his contemporaries who lived with him, and he found the appropriate opportunity through his pen to even the score with them without considering what that would lead to in terms of deadly negative results. That would be if the accusations were true, and how could they be, as they are suspect and there is no evidence for it.

3- It is clear that the author was left in a harmed state after the events. It is as if he always wants success for his ally and the ally is whoever is with him. It is as if he does not know there are mistakes and tribulations and examining and clarification and choosing so that God can differentiate the wicked from the good. Because I and the brothers know you well and we know your candor, we can say Abu al-Walid is seeking revenge through his words on the one who got him into this predicament. Although he (Abu al-Walid) was among the biggest and most prolific defenders and supporters of him, today he criticizes him and attacks him and accuses him, in fact he was deservedly his political advisor.

My noble brother,

Before entering into the details of the commentary and mentioning examples, I want to make some general observations about the book.

The first observation: The reader of the book, from its beginning to its end, easily realizes that the book is essentially - with cause and without cause - a sweeping attack

on one of the most important groups of mujahidin, and first among them are the mujahidin that you describe as Salafists. You portray them from your perspective (al-Qa'ida and its emir, Shaykh Usama) and those mujahidin like them in Chechnya or Bosnia, etc.

Also, the Taliban movement received an appreciable portion of this attack.

There was no one safe from this sweeping attack, except for a few Uzbek and Tajik brothers whose relationship with you and the Islamic Republic brought them supportive words, as it appears. So they were safe from this sweeping attack. In fact, they received an abundant share of flattery and praise!!

The other things that the book contains, in truth, were cited to serve this goal.

Page 4

At a time when you had the right to employ constructive criticism, I believe your criticism of the mujahidin and their leaders was not objective and balanced. In fact, it was unjust and biased. You treated them unjustly when you leveled a false charge against them. You did not compel yourself and attempt to prove them. You were unjust to them another time when you did not mention to an appropriate extent their good deeds and sacrifices, given their size, despite the fact that you were aware of them in detail.

What follows are detailed examples of this talk.

To begin, at a time when you held those of "the correct doctrine," according to your expression, responsible for the plotting against the jihad and the mujahidin and the tragedies that it caused, you did not hold those of "the corrupt doctrine" responsible for the role they played - that was revealed and about which they still boast - in plotting against the jihad and the treachery against the mujahidin. And you are fully aware of it!!

So, is this fair treatment and justice, my noble brother?

The second observation: The book is for the benefit of serving his idea of destroying this jihadi trend that was previously discussed and its notions, and holding it responsible for what

it did and did not do, collecting an enormous amount of baseless and arbitrary accusations.

This is what we will see from the sample accounts and examples that we will mention as follows:

The first example: Concerning the September 11 operations

The book talks about the September operations from several angles, and most of what it discussed was contrary to the truth and filled with fallacies.

With regard to the group that conducted the attacks, the book adopted an amazingly strange perspective. Once, he doubted that al-Qa'ida was the one that conducted it. He says, for example, "And if the American claims were correct that Bin Ladin, the star of Jalalabad was behind the destruction of the World Trade Center buildings..." (The Cross, page 46)

Once, he admits the fact that al-Qa'ida is the one that conducted the operations. However, he is keen on depriving it of any honor in that, as he claims that American intelligence agencies were the ones who lured it into the operations and made its mission easy to conduct!!

Page 5

The book literally states, "However, the theory that the author has adopted is that the United States had been preparing for operation "Storm of Planes" since 1997 and lured the al-Qa'ida Organization into it through a security infiltration of the organization by elements living in Europe and Pakistan."

Once, he goes even further when he adds another role in the operations for the Israeli Mossad.

(See page 311 from the book, "A Cross in the Sky of Qandahar.")

Another time he views the American role in the operations was limited to not stopping it while having knowledge of it!

Read all of that with me in the following text:

The book states: "...and during the Arab storm of planes (2001) there is a lot of evidence that points to American security agencies knowing about operation "Storm of Planes" before it was

conducted. And the American officials received several high level warnings and they were all ignored."

Notice that in this text, he merely proves the Americans' knowledge of the operations, and in the text before it he proves that they were the ones who were "preparing for the operations"!!

Another time he thinks the American role went beyond the level of ignoring the threats to the level of facilitating the mission.

Follow with me the words of the book:

"Yet, what's worse than that is evidence that the way was cleared for those who conducted the operation, and their accomplishing it was facilitated."

"The single measure that the United States took was the Jewish employees on that day - and they numbered 4,000 - not going to their jobs in the Trade Center Towers, and their Jewish colleagues did not go to their jobs in the Pentagon, which was hit by another plane, according to a claim by the American authorities."

Page 6

"Then what happened on September 11, 2001 was simply a conspiracy that the American Administration hatched against its people in order to lure it into supporting its imperialist project "and its military acts of intimidation" through which it changes the political facts in the world. What is more amazing is that it lured an international terrorist organization and facilitated the work so as to destroy installations and kill citizens that that government was supposed to protect. This is what happened to justify "the global war on terror (Islam)," which began with the war against Afghanistan."

"Also, the charge of possessing weapons of mass destruction was a charge used collectively between Afghanistan and Iraq to justify the war. We note that the charge of "terrorism" was also a shared charge. So al-Qa'ida was caught red handed in the crime that the American government prepared and facilitated for it to conduct in the most simple and complete form."

"If Saddam Hussein practiced state terrorism with open eyes and a clear agreement with the American government - then al-Qa'ida

practiced "international organization terrorism" with eyes closed and completely lured by the Americans."

(The previous texts were quoted from the book, "A Cross in the Sky of Qandahar," starting from page 280)

It is amazing for a book that talks about a subject of this level of importance to adopt the strange theory that contradicts the story of those who conducted the operations, those who were the target of them, and those who witnessed them!!

The book builds onto its theory these important things and conclusions - it believes that the Americans did not respond to the destruction of their Destroyer (Cole) in Aden because if that had happened before the storm of planes, for which it was planning with al-Qa'ida, it would cancel the American plan for its war against terrorism, according to the book's claim.

This text appeared in the book, "Directing a powerful strike against al-Qa'ida before conducting 'the storm of planes,' in revenge for the strike of the Destroyer Cole, would cancel the American plan to launch a global war on Islam with the claim of 'combating Islamic terrorism.' Therefore, the Cole operation took place without any punishment." (The Cross, page 181)

Page 7

I will not, of course, comment on this statement, which you undoubtedly well know is not true. However, I will ask a question, which is: If the United States had been luring al-Qa'ida since 1997 into the storm of planes, according to the book's claim, and it did not strike al-Qa'ida after the strike on the Destroyer Cole so as not to miss the chance to launch a full war on terrorism, as the book claims, then why was a barrage of cruise missiles launched in 1998 on Afghanistan and Sudan, and this was a year after the beginning of its supposed planning for the storm of planes and luring al-Qa'ida into it?!!

Why was it not quiet about its two embassies being hit in East Africa so as not to miss the ripe opportunity that it had begun to lure al-Qa'ida into preparing.

The book has completely adopted the view of the Iranian intelligence agencies. It is a theory, which the author knows before anyone else, is an inferior theory with its drawbacks supported by the fabrication of lies and the promotion of them, motivated by sectarian and political hatred.

Next, let's move on a little to the book "The War of the Fugitives." It deals with the September events from another side. We find that the book contradicts itself on more than one topic. For when the book talks about dealing with the enemy during a war, he promotes the principle of the obligation to deal with the enemy in kind while using destructive weapons that surpass his ability to endure.

This text appeared in the book, "An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth, and the one who started it is the more unjust one."

"The Muslims made a big mistake when they discarded that simple law, despite it being a proverb." (The Fugitives, page 60)

"This program of destruction will not stop if we do not confront the enemy with destructive strikes that surpass his ability to endure." (The Fugitives, page 84)

"Fugitive forces possessing an extremely deadly deterrent capability of advanced weapons has become a necessity and a matter of life and death." (The Fugitives, page 84)

This book's talk about the importance of the fugitives possessing deadly weapons with a destructive force that surpasses the enemy's endurance

Page 8

- we support it completely. However, when the book commented on the September events it contradicted itself when it stated, "It is generally not merciful to kill women and children and noncombatants." (The Fugitives, page 59)

During its comments on the September events it noted a dangerous point of weakness in the moral and legal aspect of the course of events. (The Fugitives, page 77)

We wonder if we can use the deadly weapons that the book talked about above, adopting the principle "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth, and the one who started it is the more unjust one" without there being any victims, such as the types of victims at the Pentagon and the Trade Center Towers on September 11?

If we adopted the logic "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth and the one who started it is the more unjust one" that

the book asserted was necessary to adopt, do we stick with that in this moral and legal dilemma?

If the book believes that killing noncombatants is a moral and legal dilemma, then does it sense this dilemma when Hizballah of Lebanon bombs Israeli cities in Palestine?

Of course, it did not feel this way but instead commended that action, as is the case when every impartial person views things with objectivity and fairness.

If only it would view with that same objectivity and fairness the operations of September. Justice cannot be divided, and the dispute with some party does not grant it justification to be unfair in evaluating its actions.

The second example: The volume of random accusations against al-Qa'ida and Shaykh Usama

The book is loaded from beginning to end with accusations directed, without any accounting, toward al-Qa'ida and Shaykh Usama, without the author having burdened himself with searching for the evidence indicating the veracity of those accusations, of which the enemies, aside from anyone else, do not believe most of them.

As an example, among those accusations are:

1- That Shaykh Usama Bin Ladin was working under the direction of American intelligence agencies and that the United States was the one that chose him to play the role that it determined for him so as to achieve its goals through that!!

Page 9

When the book talked about the Americans choosing their enemy, it stated: "In their view, there was no one better than Bin Ladin, as they knew from experience his operational and intellectual capabilities and his organizational abilities. They consciously chose him to play the role before them as the fierce Islamic terrorist enemy.

"For, the enemy whose capabilities are known is better than an enemy whose origin and capabilities and ideas are unknown. This is something that must occur by virtue of the fact that a nation like the nation of Islam, cannot give in to a plan like this without displaying fierce resistance. So it is better then, by

virtue of logic and intellect, that one chooses his enemy or the one who will play that role before him." (The Cross, page 50)

I ask you, my noble brother, did you know about this dangerous fact when you were working with Shaykh Usama Bin Ladin as a close advisor and you played with him this role determined for you by the Americans, or did you learn this fact after the mission that you were entrusted with by the Americans had ended?

The one responsible for an accusation of this size must present the evidence that proves it, otherwise he is a partner in it.

We do not know really if he was asked by the biggest enemy of the nation to discredit a mujahid like Shaykh Usama. What can he say that is worse than this?!

There are a lot of things that you could criticize about (your personal friend) Shaykh Usama other than this false claim.

2- And in this same manner, there was something that appeared in the book about the United States' attempt to prevent Shaykh Usama from leaving Afghanistan. The following text appeared in the book, "We mention that Da'if was aware of the pressure that the United States was putting on the Taliban to prevent Bin Ladin from leaving Afghanistan, and Bin Ladin was about to leave while there was no emirate to fight. However, that would hinder the plan to invade, so the United States opposed it. Then Da'if was arrested so that the secret that showed that the decision to invade was made prior to the September events would not be revealed." (The Cross, page 194)

If the United States had put pressure on the Taliban to prevent Bin Ladin from leaving Afghanistan, then why did the Taliban not announce this fact to the world so as to lift the pressure placed on it because it was harboring the Shaykh? So, why

Page 10

did the Taliban not say that Shaykh Usama wants to leave Afghanistan by his choice and the United States is the one that asked us to prevent him from doing this?

Or perhaps the Taliban was another one entangled in this wicked plan that the web of American and Jewish intelligence agencies was hatching with the leaders of the mujahidin?

Was this subject a secret between the Americans and Mullah Da'if, while the leaders of the Taliban were not aware of it?

Wasn't Mullah Da'if, an ambassador for the Islamic emirate, informing it about these claimed American communications?

How could the Americans expect their request to be fulfilled by the emirate at the time when this request was a secret between them and Mullah Da'if in Islamabad?

Or was the ambassador able to undertake the mission from the embassy headquarters with the knowledge of Mullah Omar?

An amazing thing!!

We and you were in Afghanistan during this timeframe, so would you be so kind as to remember for us the country that was on the verge of receiving the Shaykh after his departure from Afghanistan?

We and you know that if there was a place where the Shaykh could go he would have left so as to eliminate the dilemma for the Taliban on the one hand and eliminate the restrictions on his work on the other hand.

3- And among the most bizarre accusations in this same manner, the book claimed that the United States was just about to kill Mullah Omar during the first night of the war on Afghanistan but it canceled the mission at the last moment to preserve the safety of Shaykh Bin Ladin, who was in that place!!

The book stated, "And the important question here is: why did the United States miss the rare opportunity to end the war... and kill Mullah Omar inside the mosque during the first air strike?"

"And was the existence of Bin Ladin near the emirate complex... and the possibility that he might be there by coincidence while the missiles poured down on the mosque and the complex... did that affect the decision to cancel the bombing of Mullah Omar's headquarters and killing him?"

"If that is true: doesn't that contradict the American claim that Bin Ladin was the biggest danger that the United States faced in the world and that he was the cause of the war on Afghanistan?"

"Was it not the suitable opportunity for the United States to bring an end to the two biggest dangers that it faced in Afghanistan... with one missile... while the American planes were in the sky carrying dozens of guided missiles and modern and advanced ground spying devices with information from satellites."

"Does this incident not clearly indicate the existence of American spies within the circle close to Bin Ladin and Mullah Omar and in contact with the American satellites using advanced devices so as to monitor the movement of the two men?"

"It is likely that the United States sacrificed its man that was monitoring and accompanying Mullah Omar, and who was likely killed in the car waiting in front of the mosque because , since that time, no similar attempts against him have been recorded, even his departure from Qandahar.]"

"And based on the same analysis, assuming it is accurate, an American man accompanying Bin Ladin had the continuous mission of determining his position so that aircraft would avoid bombing him, so as to preserve his safety."

"Why was there this amazing determination and rush to kill Mullah Omar in three consecutive attempts by aerial assassination... while not even one attempt against Bin Ladin was recorded throughout the duration of the war?"

"Did Bin Ladin represent a case of defiance from a security standpoint... or did he represent to the United States a political necessity that provided it excuses for policies that would be hard to accept internationally?" (The Cross, page 225)

The emergence of the fallacy of this claim precludes the need to respond to it.

However, with that, I will leave it for you to respond to it in another topic from your book, where you discuss the insanity of American technology and its unprecedented use in hunting Bin Ladin and attempting to kill him, "B2 Stealth Bombers that are undetectable by radar were hunting a group of no more than five Afghan fighters, then an F16 plane supported them in that "complicated" mission... or drone aircraft struck a group of no more than 15 Afghans with guided missiles because it, meaning the plane, noticed that the group was treating

one of its members with excessive respect!! So the smart plane, with its laser guided missiles, assumed that the person [might] be Bin Ladin, so it killed them all. (The Cross, page 304)

So, do we understand from these words that the Americans were keen on keeping Bin Ladin safe or were they keen on killing him and on using the most modern technology for that?

4- Among the strange accusations against Shaykh Usama is that he was hampering efforts being made by some of his aides to obtain non-conventional weapons??

It was stated in the book that Shaykh Usama, "hampered all the efforts of his minister of defense to make and possess one of those means... until his minister of defense was killed in an American bombing of his work headquarters in Qandahar. Also, his predecessor had drowned five years earlier in an African lake in murky circumstances; he was on a mission to follow those weapons to obtain one of them from brokers who travel the African coast." (The Cross, page 186)

The bizarre nature of this accusation is not concealed in the absence of any evidence of its accuracy. Rather, all the evidence and facts were testimony that completely disputed it. For many of the brothers who were present knew that the Shaykh was the most eager among the people about obtaining weapons like these, and he had dispatched several brothers to various places to pursue this mission; some of them were arrested and are still in custody.

The search for those weapons was not in Africa, as Africa is not an environment for those weapons, as everyone knows. Abu 'Ubaydah al-Banshiri, may God have mercy on him, was not on a mission of that nature when he died, may God have mercy on him, as the brothers who are knowledgeable of the matter know. Assuming he was on a mission of that nature, he could not pursue that without the knowledge, approval, and financing of Shaykh Usama.

Let's assume that you do not have knowledge of all the efforts of the Shaykh in this area. Isn't the personality of the shaykh who specializes in "the jihadi tragedy," according to your expression, a personality suitable for striving to obtain a weapon of this nature? Its use by way of al-Qa'ida might form

one act of the non-conventional jihadi tragedy that completes the acts of the continuing tragedy of a quarter century?

Page 13

Let's assume that the Shaykh had obtained a weapon of this nature, then how would he have used it without you feeling a "moral and legal dilemma" when he killed some "innocent people"!!!

5- Then there is the accusation that appears in the book that Shaykh Usama was offered an advanced weapons deal by the Russians and at a cheap price, yet he abandoned it in favor of the old ineffective weapons available in the market!!

- This is the text from the book, "Bin Ladin was offered a rare opportunity presented to him by Russian generals in Tajikistan to supply him with shoulder-carried, modern anti-aircraft missiles, by way of military leaders from the Northern Alliance. A similar offer came to the Islamic emirate with Russian willingness to supply it with military helicopters or any type of weapon desired under the provision that the emirate pay half the price in US dollars and the other half in heroin powder.

So how could anyone - sensible or insane - refuse an offer like this?

(We cannot fathom this volume of accusations and against a man you were the first to encourage and the first to stand with. You supplied him with his political and military views and blessed his efforts and made him the mantle of the nation. We can only say that there is a conspiracy theory that dominates the book, rather the books, and from there the spirit of settling accounts that the book pursues, because of the predicament that the author landed in after the events.)

Among the accusations directed at al-Qa'ida in the book, it states, "For, al-Qa'ida was not capable of creating an Islamic jihad with authority that was non-Saudi... and Bin Ladin was not able to create a very organized young leadership... to control a part of the world that might be able to detach itself from international hegemony, which did not exist except in his imagination, which was controlled by the global media."

"In fact, the Islamic movement was under unbearable pressure to by some of the Arab jihadi organizations in Afghanistan, especially al-Qa'ida, to create a Salafi splinter group that

would leave the steel (tyrannical) grip of Muhammad Tahir... and that wing joined al-Qa'ida under the lure of money... and fame. And from here the crisis emerged that killed the spirit of jihadi brotherhood among the Uzbeks and the Arabs."

Page 14

"For, the Uzbek leadership arrested two Russian spies and held them in their prison for interrogation. However, these escaped and went to an al-Qa'ida guest house in Kabul and requested protection from the tyranny of their Uzbek organization that persecuted them because they were Salafists"!! (The Cross, page 146)

These are false accusations that have no basis in truth, and you know well that al-Qa'ida is the one global jihadi organization that took upon itself the mission of supporting the jihadi movements in various parts of the world, despite their school of Islamic jurisprudence.

You know that the mujahidin from Tajikistan and Uzbekistan whom you commend intellectually and militarily and organizationally were trained in al-Qa'ida's camps. You personally gave them political courses in these camps.

Al-Qa'ida's financial support, within the bounds of its limited capability, continued to the Uzbek brothers and their emir Muhammad Tahir after that. It is assumed, by virtue of your ties with both sides, that you are knowledgeable of that.

In turn, as you know, Iranian intelligence was behind the tragedy that Hizb al-Nahdah and its jihad faced in the end, whether through the evil role undertaken by Rabbani and Mahsud or through the mediation between Hizb al-Nahdah and the Tajik government that resulted in the situation that exists now.

So who is the first to be blamed - al-Qa'ida, which trained the elements of Hizb al-Nahdah in its camps - or the Iranians who drove it to its tragic end?

Then there is your amazing accusation against al-Qa'ida that it is striving to impose a Saudi jihad in the world, even though you certainly know that the dispute with the Saudi regime and its religious scholars is one of the more prominent ones that characterizes al-Qa'ida in its political and intellectual speeches. As for what you stated concerning how al-Qa'ida was striving to split the ranks of the Uzbek brothers and was

tempting them with money so as to achieve this goal, we have never heard this talk except from you. We have lived for years in the heart of events, and we have never heard a complaint of this type, not even from Muhammad Tahir.

The incident that you promoted as evidence of this claim, you promoted it in a distorted way, as it intentionally avoided the truth, unfortunately.

For, the Uzbek brothers who sought refuge in al-Qa'ida's guest house were not spies as you stated, as is evident in the fact that Muhammad Tahir retrieved them to put them to work after the problem. And the whole problem was that they

Page 15

had chosen to go to the front with some of al-Qa'ida's guys, and you know that.

You know that al-Qa'ida did not promote a specific school of Islamic jurisprudence. Rather, it called upon it and others to respect the Hanafi school that is prevalent in the country and to not stir doctrinal disputes. The legal institute in Qandahar that many of the Taliban would not only frequent but also studied there is testament to that.

It was felt that if there were to be a departure from some of the customary practices during the prayers and other things, this would stir divisions and disharmony among the Muslims.

The way that Muhammad Tahir took the two brothers from the al-Qa'ida guest house was a stupid way that almost led to a gun fight if not for God, then some sensible people (Abu Bilal al-Nabawi, may God have mercy on him) who were at the place intervened and calmed things down.

Muhammad Tahir realized this and apologized for his mistake.

From the humiliation that al-Qa'ida experienced from this behavior, Shaykh Usama did not demand anything more than a legal judgment of the matter by the Islamic emirate's court. So who is more worthy of blame in this matter?

6- Among the bad words that the book gathered against Shaykh Usama was its statement that most of the Arabs, "entered under his influence from conviction or obedience." (The Cross, page 128)

I ask you a question: Do you know one man among the Arabs or non-Arabs who entered al-Qa'ida or remained in it out of obedience?

If there was anyone there of this nature, you would have known about it, as you were the man who lived with the organization for nearly 20 years and you had the strongest of ties with its leaders and members.

7- Among the disgracefully injurious words against al-Qa'ida in general is your gracious and utmost generous description of them with various shameful and inappropriate characterizations when you said, "They were struck by an arrogance and haughtiness and extreme sense of self-confidence, and making light of the affairs of others or sometimes scorning them. They were confident to the point that they thought that the entire Islamic movement had to join them and be loyal to them." (The Cross, page 115)

8- It was very noble of the author to describe the innocent mujahidin as "pack mules" and other expressions of destructive, injurious criticism,

Page 16

may God forgive you and reward you with justice and fairness by what the response is to some of this injustice.

These are examples of some of the accusations that the book meted out haphazardly against al-Qa'ida and Shaykh Usama Bin Ladin without bothering to give evidence indicating their veracity.

There are additional accusations other than these that are too many to recount.

If al-Qa'ida gained the lion's share of the book's attacks, then the Taliban movement was the other one whose share was not bad.

And among the examples of that:

1- What was stated in the book that they had given "secret commitments" to some states about not entering "the Salang Pass from the south."

The book states, "The Americans drew a red line regarding the Taliban passing through the Salang Pass... and another for the Hindu Kush mountain range, and this is in line with the Russian view expressed by 'Alexander Labid' as was previously mentioned."

"The secret commitment by the Taliban movement to not intrude upon the Salang Pass from the southern entrance on Salang mountain led to a deep fissure in its strategic position on the political and military levels." (The Cross, page 109)

We say: Where is the evidence for the existence of such a commitment? If it was secret, how did the author learn about it? In whose interest was it for the Taliban to give this secret commitment? Or is the Taliban itself part of the conspiracy, even against itself?

Is it sensible for Mullah Omar to give such a commitment and thus abandon the entrance to the north through the Salang Pass, which he is able to do, to assume the burden and hardship of conquering the north through other very costly routes in terms of lives and supplies and time and effort??

Page 17

2- Another accusation leveled at the Taliban that appeared in the book is that after they occupied the Iranian Consulate in Mazar-i-Sharif, the group that occupied it received orders from Pakistan to kill the Iranian diplomats.

The following text appeared in the book, "When 'the ones taking revenge' stormed the Iranian Consulate building in the city, they killed 11 diplomats after waiting a short while."

"Witnesses said that there were telephone calls made during the short waiting period during which orders were given to kill the diplomats - and that these orders were... from Islamabad!!"
(page 100)

How amazing. Taliban forces taking their orders in the most precise detail from Islamabad and not from their leadership in Kabul or Qandahar!!

It is the Iranian story about the incident, which the author knows is merely an intelligence agency fabrication to justify the Islamic Republic's policy of aggression against the Islamic emirate.

It is amazing that Iran did not censure the Pakistani government that gave the order to kill its diplomats. Instead, it established warm relations with it in the war against terrorism and elsewhere. Yet, it punished the Islamic emirate, which did not give the order to kill the diplomats!!

3- The book slandered the Taliban movement to the core another time when it claimed that the Kabul line fell because of the dollar and not because of the American bombing, as it appeared in the book, "It is well known that the breaking of the Taliban's defensive line along the northern front of Kabul was done with the American dollar and not with B52 bombers or even seven-ton bombs." (page 138)

The truth is other than that, my noble brother. The truth is what former Iranian President Khatemi stated when he made a statement with his aid Muhammad Abtahi, and the Americans confirmed those statements of theirs.

The summary of those statements is that a month after the continuous bombing of the Taliban strongholds to no avail, the Iranian government presented to the Americans a military map of the positions that they should focus on to break the line. In fact, when the Americans took the Iranian advice, the line was broken, as a representative of the United States stated in the joint committee.

Page 18

These admissions that Iranian and American officials boast about was revealed in detail by more than one source, one of which was the program "Iran and the West" broadcast by the Al Jazeera channel, which I have with me, recorded.

It is amazing, my noble brother, that you know the secret hidden reasons for the catastrophes and you are certain about them, while you disregard the publicized reasons that the ones involved are boasting about.

4- Along this line, the following appeared in the book, "The Islamic emirate neglecting to secure the country's political capital rises to the level of a premeditated crime." (The Cross, page 191)

This is enough about the Taliban from among the many examples that the book metes out.

We now move on to other examples that appeared in the book about things that shun the truth, in short, among those:

1- There appeared in the book under more than one subject some accusations against the deceased martyr Khattab - and we are taking him into consideration also, as we do not vouch for anyone before God - and it is the kind of accusation leveled against Shaykh Usama.

It was the duty of the author to give the evidence that proves what he says.

2- There is what appeared in the discussion about the Shaykh of the al-Jami' Mosque in Mashhad who was threatened by the authorities several times, and they compelled him to flee to Afghanistan. They destroyed his mosque and his huge office with bulldozers and converted the place to a public garden. Then they resumed hunting the Shaykh in Afghanistan until they killed him in the large mosque in Herat along with a number of the worshippers after the Friday prayer, after several assassination attempts, during some of which he was injured.

As for this shaykh and imam, you mentioned nothing more about him other than describing him as "a Sunni Iranian adversary."

The Iranian intelligence services were acquitted of his murder, and they placed it on another party, despite the fact that the testimonies stated the opposite!!

It is the Iranian story once again, as we learned from them.

Page 19

3- Among the amazing things that appeared in the book are things about which the reader is amazed in terms of the advantage of fabricating and inventing them.

Among these things:

- What appeared in the book about some Arabs being slaughtered in front of their women and children. (page 212)

- What appeared about the suicide of some Arab families so as not to be imprisoned. "As the news rumored (and was then confirmed) about a group suicide of Arab families to avoid imprisonment." (page 254)

There appeared on page 143 that some of the mujahidin:
"preferred killing their families and killing themselves so as not to be arrested or return again to the culture of the West.."

- What appeared about some of the mothers losing their children in the Pakistani buses is extremely frightening!! "Until the Pakistanis found recently born Arab children that had fallen from their Arab mothers in the public transportation system!! Most frightening, the mothers did not sense that they had lost their children... and that they were merely carrying empty wraps in their arms!! (page 254)

None of these things happened. Instead, they are an absolute fabrication to frighten and defame, for who would prefer to kill their families?!

Who fell in the transport cars?! For, we were at the heart of the events before and after the departure of all of the families, and our families were among the families that departed for Pakistan and we know for certain that none of this happened.

We wish you would mention, even if it is the name of one family, as we have become accustomed to you laying out many of the events. The jihadi tragedy that you say Bin Ladin specialized in - there is nothing like it with regard to its tragic nature except for the publicity tragedy that has been presented in these books.

My noble Brother

There remain two observations by which I will close this matter:

The first observation

Page 20

It is that in your writing about some of the things that you witnessed, you do not mention that you were a witness until when mentioning what supports your current view about the matter, while it was not necessarily your view when you witnessed it as it occurred. This is keeping in mind that we have one here from among the brothers with whom I participated in a session during which I tried to support your view. It was a heated session with a lot of give and take. When we asked him about the gist of the session, he told us that he did not attend it and was not there and did not see you other than one time in a brief session

during which there was not a discussion of this size and importance (and he is the one I described as the financial supporter for Bin Ladin from the Muslim Brotherhood). If only you would sit with him one day so that you would learn from him how much your suspicions and the conspiracy theory that dominate the book have removed you from reality and the truth.

As for when you discuss things that you witnessed but your mentioning that you witnessed them does not serve what you want, you don't mention that you witnessed them, aside from mentioning the role that you played in them.

The book is replete with examples of that.

The second observation

It is that you are keen on defining yourself in your books as a personal friend of Shaykh Usama. Does your eagerness in this regard flow from a true friendship as witnessed in what this book contains, or was the desired intent to give some type of credibility to what you wrote against the man, in truth or otherwise?!

Page 21

In closing

I have debated with the brothers present with me, and you know that the majority of them are in the Shura council of al-Qa'ida and all of them have lived the events that you mentioned moment by moment. It is truly amazing that you lived them with us!! The size of the fabrication and toppling of the facts and the adoption of the Iranian theory in explaining the events truly frightened them.

These lines that are between your hands in part flow from a long debate with the brothers. I believe I transmitted some of their comments in them in haste.

As for the others among them, the size of the fabrication forced them into a state of numbness and silence.

In summary, their opinion of what was published in your name is that among the goals that motivated the publishing of these books:

- 1- Striking the Sunni jihadi movement everywhere.

2- Wrecking and destroying any leadership of the Sunnah (accusing Shaykh Usama and Mullah Omar of treason) - and this is something that neither the United States nor the West dared to say or do.

3- Giving prominence to the parties that stem from the Iranian mantle (and their leaders) (Hizballah, the Uzbeks, the Tajiks).

For the sake of these goals, there was widespread fabrication of the events, which led to the appearance of many contradictions in the books, as if the producer prepared them in haste!!

There remains one imposing question: Do the people support Hamas completely?

The answer does not come from propaganda and the media. Or else, where are they among the cases of those Muslims being persecuted who are on the verge of being void of any state like Chechnya, Kashmir, Darfur, Somalia, and Bosnia. Rather, they conspired against some of them, like the Afghanis. This is obvious among the general populace, in addition to the specialists. Rather, the people have testified for themselves frankly on the "Open Dialogue" program on Al Jazeera

Page 22

with Muhammad Shariati, an advisor to Khatemi, where he said that supporting Hamas was for the sake of propaganda and publicity, and that was during an exhibition of his accusations and criticisms leveled against Ahmadi-Nejad.

Then, what are they doing with us now that involves kidnapping and expulsion and harm and denying our boys and girls their most basic rights to education and work and freedom - this is in the interest of the Muslims and the jihadi movement and its sons?? Or is it the secret that the book tried to neglect and ignore?!

There remains an awful lot, and perhaps in the coming days there will be room for it.

Our dear Shaykh, please forgive me and the other brothers if we overburdened you with blame, for the remaining trust between us allows me and them to do this without having an effect on our old sense of brotherhood.

I pray to God that He rescues us and you from their hands and that He gathers us once again as mujahidin for His sake, raising His banner and correcting what has gone astray in this blessed journey.

Until we see you in better circumstances, God willing, I commend you to God.

May God's peace, mercy and blessings be upon you.

Ahmad Hasan Abu al-Khayr

1 Ramadan 1430

22 August 2009