

Page 1

Brother ((`Abd-al-Hamid)), may God grant you success, these are questions from the Jaysh al-Islam brothers (in Gaza) along with responses to same from Shaykh Mahmud. For your reading, it may be of benefit.

In the name of God, the merciful, the compassionate

Peace be upon you, and God's mercy and blessings.

Praise be to God, and blessings and peace upon God's prophet, his family, companions, and those loyal to him...to wit:

These are questions which we ask you, our brothers, to show to the people of knowledge (TN: i.e. scholars), the crowns atop our heads, so that they can furnish us with their opinions, God willing...

First question: Is it permitted for funds to be taken from other organizations as support for us in jihad, as in the following examples:

Al-Jihad al-Islami (TN: Islamic Jihad) movement: Receives vast sums from abroad (Iran, in particular), and some of their people have adopted Shi'ite thought, God forbid. However, they have offered funding to us, in exchange for which we are to work with them and participate jointly in qualitative operations, as a sort of propaganda; the catch being that we would conduct the operation with funding through them, and afterwards it would be announced that we cooperated with them (TN: in the operation).

- The Fatah organization has also offered us funds purportedly to (TN: support) jihad, but there is another reason, namely their fear of becoming the target of our swords.

These funds would go directly towards the purchase and manufacture of weapons, and to support operations which we will conduct, God willing. When taking into consideration the suffocating siege against us, whether by the Jews, God's curses upon them, or by other organizations such as Hamas, who fear the growth of our influence and dominion...

Second Question: Is it permitted to invest funds in the stock market, buying and selling shares, for the goal of supporting jihad, or investing some donation-derived funds in stock markets and shares?

Third Question: Is it permitted to strike drug traffickers, eliminate them, and kill them, or (TN: not)? The technicality of the issue: Is it permitted to take the funds which they have gained from drug trafficking, and is it permitted to make use of the drugs which we obtain from them in:

1. Luring fallen addicts to serve as double agents against the Jews.
2. Selling them to Jews in order to harm them and take their money.
3. Bringing down Jewish soldiers, particularly border guards, by means of drugs.

This, by God, the Lord of success

Your brothers in Jaysh al-Islam

Page 2

In the name of God, the merciful, the compassionate. Praise be to God, the Lord of all worlds. There is no power or strength save in God almighty. He is our Lord almighty and in Him we seek aid. We pray and wish peace upon the servant and messenger of God, our prophet Muhammad and all his family and companions and those who followed them in benevolence until Judgment Day.

First question: Is it permitted for funds to be taken from other organizations, on the premise of supporting us in jihad, as in the following example:

- Al-Jihad al-Islami (TN: Islamic Jihad) movement: Receives vast sums from abroad (Iran, in particular), and some of their people have adopted Shi'ite thought, God forbid. However, they have offered funding to us, in exchange for which we are to work with them and participate jointly in qualitative operations, as a sort of propaganda; the catch being that we would conduct the operation with funding through them, and afterwards it would be announced that we cooperated with them (TN: in the operation).
- The Fatah organization has also offered us funds purportedly to (TN: support) jihad, but there is another reason, namely their fear of becoming the target of our swords.

These funds would go directly towards the purchase and manufacture of weapons, and towards supporting operations that we will conduct, God willing. When taking into consideration the suffocating siege against us, whether by the Jews, God's curses upon them, or by other organizations such as Hamas, who fear the growth of our influence and dominion...

Response:

What I understood from the question is that the brothers are asking about the legitimacy of accepting funds from other organizations, if such is offered and given.

Doubtless there are technicalities in this... based upon, first of all, the intrinsic nature of these funds, permissible or forbidden, and then what interest, legitimate or corrupt, comes as a consequence to taking these funds.

So let us divide up the question on this basis, upon which I say the following, (TN: in knowledge that) success is (TN: only through) God:

If the money is intrinsically permissible, meaning it is not forbidden money. In principle, accepting it is permitted, as long as there are no other factors that prohibit this, as will come (TN: later in this discussion).

Permissible money is (TN: money) that which we have no knowledge of being forbidden; there are two types of impermissible money:

One of the two being: Intrinsically forbidden, such as wine, pork, the meat of improperly slaughtered animals, and the like, all of which can only be considered permissible to one in exigent circumstances.

The second one being: Forbidden by virtue of the means by which it was gained; there is much exposition and difference amongst scholars (TN: on this topic).

If it is attested (meaning that it is something witnessed) that the one who earned it did so illicitly, then the proper thing is that it not be permitted to be taken, such as (TN: gains from) theft or robbery, just as gaining it through an imperfect transaction, such as profits from interest, and funds gotten from trafficking in wine, drugs, and the like. It can neither be eaten of, nor accepted... with exception of the "thuman" (TN: 1/8th sales tax) on wine and pork can be...

Page 3

...taken from the people of the dhimma (TN: non-Muslim subjects of an Islamic state), as our lord 'Umar said: "Let them sell it, and take the 'thuman' from it." This is a proper "athar" (TN: one of the utterances of Muhammad or his companions), and is the basis used by Islamic jurists in this regard.

If it is not attested, and it is a matter of the mixing of permissible and forbidden (TN: monies), then this is an issue in which there are many differences and expositions, and we will most probably mention these later.

If it is (TN: money taken) from an infidel, does it differ from (TN: money taken) from a Muslim? Because the Prophet, God's blessing upon him, and his companions ate of the food and gifts of Jews and other infidels, and they did not ask them (TN: for the nature by which they were obtained). Likewise, in the story of our lord Ibrahim Khalil, which follows. This is also a source for dispute amongst scholars, and it requires exposition.

This applied jurisprudence is within the realm of that which needs exposition, by which I mean knowledge of (TN: the nature of) the monies, what is permissible to take and accept and eat of it, what is not permissible, from Muslim or from infidel, in the event of attestation (TN: of its impermissible nature) or in the event of mixture (TN: of permitted and non-permitted funds).

Jurists speak of these issues in various chapters of books on jurisprudence and in fatwas. Among the passages which I point out to you to serve as a reference in this regard are as follows:

- "Kitab al-Halal wal-Haram" (TN: "Book of the Permissible and the Forbidden"); this is the fourth book in the "al-'Adat" (TN: "Customs") quarto within his "Kitab Ihya' 'Alum al-Din" (TN: "The Book of Reviving the Sciences of Religion") by imam Abi-Hamid al-Ghazali, God's mercy upon him. It is the basis for this issue, and has no precedent of which I am aware. If (TN: he made some) comments and researches on his choices within areas of applied jurisprudence in this regard, he (TN: wrote at great length) on issues of piety and the consideration of suspicions...!

- A collection of Shaykh al-Islam Ibn-Taymiyah's fatwas, particularly the 29th volume, which contains a number of fatwas on this issue. It includes writing and gems found nowhere else.
- "Jami' al-'Alum wal-Hukm" (TN: "Mosque of Sciences and Wisdom") by Ibn-Rajab al-Hanbali, God's mercy upon him, in his explanation of the hadith "That which is permissible is clear, and that which is forbidden is clear."
- Applied jurisprudence texts of Ibn-Miflah al-Hanbali.
- Al-Nawawi's collection regarding Sahib al-Mahdhab's statement "It is not permitted to swear allegiance to one whom it is known that all of his money is forbidden..."

In short, if we know, (TN: based upon) what has been decided in this matter (the matter of monies), that the money being given is not permitted to be taken and eaten of, then the matter is clear... and if we do not know that it is forbidden, then either there is suspicion, and caution is advised, or if it seems most probable to us that it is permissible or if its permissibility is certain, then it too is clear.

- If the money in and of itself is permitted to be taken, then it remains to us to consider what comes as a consequence to accepting and taking it, in which there are many scenarios which (TN: can be) envisioned, including: if doing so brings shame and degradation to a Muslim.

And: If doing so causes a Muslim to become obligated to an infidel or a libertine, which draws him into affection and adulation for them, and the like.

And: If dominion of the profligate or the infidel follows as a consequence (interference in affairs, dictation (TN: of orders), (TN: interference in) circumstances and the like).

And: If, as a consequence, an infidel or a libertine becomes stronger, greater, and increases in influence, i.e. strengthening the infidel or the libertine and aiding them.

Page 4

It might not be something as this: The infidel or libertine may have some sort of benefit in giving it, which does not affect us much nor does it harm Muslims. The infidel may offer a Muslim money for the sake of kinship or the nation (for nationalist

motivations and the like) and none of the corrupt consequences considered above will result. These are some of the things which affect the issue.

If it is taking (TN: money) from a just and proper Muslim, then this is clear. We will not discuss it and it is not a matter of question.

If the question is taking (TN: money) from organizations accused by our religion of being either infidel or libertine clothed in "innovation" or iniquity, and has committed grave offenses or perhaps even blasphemy through corrupt interpretations (TN: of Islam), and our judgment upon that in Islam still remains (TN: the same)!

Doubtless that some of these are damages in which the infidel and the libertine Muslim had some part in, and inevitably it is known that the libertine Muslim is not equivalent to the infidel in all aspects. For example: The internal ignominy brought upon us by a libertine Muslim is not equivalent to the internal ignominy brought upon us by the infidel. When a libertine Muslim obtains some form of dominion over us, it is not equivalent to dominion of the infidel over us, God forbid. All of these things are considered in their measure, based upon which there occurs a balance between the good and the bad.

As for exigency: As you know, exigency bears its own rules, and those in exigency deem it necessary in order to strengthen God almighty, and confines it to that situation (exigency is evaluated by its own measure).

Likewise, dire need, i.e., that which is close to but has not quite reached the threshold of exigency. In this event, the makruh (TN: acts/things discouraged but not forbidden) and the mushtabah (TN: acts/things of suspect permissibility) are allowed. The difference between exigency and dire need being that exigency justifies the prohibited (i.e. the forbidden), but need lifts away the "discouraged but not forbidden" status and the judgment of "suspect" (TN: from the thing) and brings leniency of judgment and so, we lift the sin/crisis from the individual in question whether or not a thing is "discouraged but not forbidden" or cause for suspicion, as we can bear the introduction of some ignominy in the interest of a greater good. As long as we are in need of taking money, then it is considered a "dire need"! God is all-knowing (TN: i.e. God knows better than I).

This response is my analysis, in brief, and the brothers know the circumstances, to which they (TN: can) apply what we have mentioned above...

On to something of an exposition on what came about in the question:

It is clear that you are in dire need and financial straits...!

As the al-Jihad movement's funding comes primarily from support (TN: provided by) the Rafidite (TN: "refuser"; common euphemism for Shi'ite) nation (Iran), which is not in and of itself harmful, by which I mean that it is permitted to eat of what is given of it and to accept it, God willing. It (TN: Iran) is to us an infidel state, and accepting monies from infidel states and kings is permitted, in and of itself, unless another prohibiting factor arises.

The evidence for this being the hadith (TN: utterance) of Ibrahim Khalil, God's peace upon him, and his acceptance of a gift from an infidel king. In this story of Sarah, when the king attempted to interfere with her, he was forbidden by God's will. He then gave her money and made a gift to her of a female servant (this being Hagar, peace be upon her). Ibrahim accepted this, and benefited from it. This hadith is in the two "sahih" (TN: the two texts containing properly attested hadith) and in others.

Al-Bukhari pronounced upon this:

Page 5

It was Abi-Hurayrah, may God be pleased with him, who said:

"The prophet, God's peace upon him, said, 'Ibrahim, God's peace upon him, was traveling with Sarah. The two of them entered a village, wherein was a king or a tyrant. It was said that Ibrahim entered with a woman of the finest sort. (TN: An emissary) was sent to him, who asked, "Who is this with you?" To which he replied, "My sister." He returned to her and said, "Do not put the lie to my words, as I have told them that you are my sister. By God, there are no faithful on earth save for me and thee." He sent her to him (TN: the king), and he came to her, and she began to perform ablution and pray. She said, "Oh God, as I have believed in you and in your Prophet, and kept my womb chaste to all save my husband, do not give the infidel dominion over me." (TN: Upon which) he started and ran. Al-'Araj stated

that Abu-Salmah bin-'Abd-al-Rahman stated: "Abi-Hurayrah stated that she said, 'Oh God, if he dies, it will be said that she killed him.' He sent (TN: for her again), and then came to her, and she began to perform ablution and pray. She said, "O God, as I have believed in you and in your Prophet, and kept my womb chaste to all save my husband, do not give the infidel dominion over me." He started and ran. 'Abd-al-Rahman said that Abu-Salmah said that Abu-Hurayrah said that she said "O God, if he dies, it will be said 'she killed him.' And he sent (TN: for her) a second or a third time, and he said, "By God, what you have sent me is naught but a devil. Send her back to Ibrahim and give her recompense. She returned to Ibrahim and she said, "I felt that God stayed the infidel and granted (TN: us) a servant girl."

Al-Hafiz Ibn-Hajar, God's mercy upon him, said:

The (TN: morals contained in) this hadith are the legitimacy of the brothers of Islam, the authorization of (TN: acceptance of) offers, license to submit to the tyrant and the rapacious, and to accept the gift of an oppressive king, and to accept the gift of the polytheist, and response to a prayer of sincere intent, and the Lord's satisfaction with he who is sincere in prayer and proper in deed. The counterpoint to this can be seen in the story of Ashab al-Ghar (TN: "owners of the cave") in which (TN: can be seen) the tribulation of the righteous in order to raise their qualities (TN: "degrees").

It is said that God revealed to Ibrahim, so that he could see the king with Sarah, and that he obtained naught from her, he mentioned this in "al-Tijan" (TN: "The Crowns") and pronounced: "He ordered that Ibrahim and Sarah be brought in to him; he then bade Ibrahim outside the palace, and came to Sarah. God made the palace as clear as a flask to Ibrahim, and he saw them and heard their speech." (TN: The moral of this being) that if one is beset by grief, he must take refuge in prayer. (TN: Another moral of this being) that ablution was practiced by peoples prior to our own, and is not limited to just our people, nor only to the prophets, so proved by Sarah, as the majority (TN: states that) she was not a prophet. So ends his words; I mention them in full for (TN: your) benefit.

Such is also found in al-'Ayni's exposition.

And this is the basis for this issue. There is more proof than this.

Including the prophet's companions', with the prophet's knowledge, acceptance in exigency of the gift of the infidel. And the Prophet accepted the gifts of infidels when no ignominy would result, and so accepted some of the gifts of infidels, as is found in many hadith, and he refused some of them, rejected them, and did not accept them, and said "I refused the dross of the polytheists," as was relayed by Ahmad Abu-Dawud and al-Tarmadhi. The meaning of "dross" being "their gift, present, and the like."

If you are not today capable of financing yourselves through legitimate means devoid of that which is objectionable, then accepting monies from other organizations, such as from some Islamic movements including Hamas or al-Jihad al-Islami movement, or even from nationalist movements who participate with you in striking the Jewish enemy, then (TN: accepting these monies) for the sake of using it to conduct jihad and to strike the Jews is better than abandoning the jihad due to paucity of funds.

So take it, if there is no other way, and strike the Jews..

Page 6

Consider this further, and you best know your situation...!

And aim well (TN: "aim and be close")!

Because those movements (Jihad or Hamas, or even Fatah) are exploiting these acts and adopting them as their own, it is less damaging than would be the damage of abandoning the fight against the Jews, and God is all-knowing.

And if God opens the path for you, and you are able to fund yourselves and have no need for them, then abandon them, and work independently on your own path, granted to you by God.

We ask God the almighty to open the path for you, guide you, and strengthen you (TN: and purge you) of weakness, and make you rightly guided guides...Amen.

The second question:

Is it permitted to invest funds in the stock market, buying and selling shares, for the goal of supporting jihad, or investing some donation-derived funds in stock markets and shares?

The response:

The judgment upon this also depends upon the circumstances and regulations of these stock markets. I know nothing of the circumstance and regulations of these stock markets which would qualify me to speak about them. The methods of selling in (TN: the stock markets) have many complications, and are full of tricks, and I have no ability in this. May God strengthen us and you.

It is advised to ask some scholars who are specialized in this area, after editing your question well, and explaining the circumstances and regulations of the stock markets at which you are able to trade. May God make you successful and aid you.

Third question:

Is it permitted to strike drug traffickers, eliminate them, and kill them, or (TN: not)? The technicality of the issue: Is it permitted to take the funds which they have gained from drug trafficking and is it permitted to make use of the drugs which we obtain from them in:

1. Luring fallen addicts to serve as double agents against the Jews.
2. Selling them to Jews in order to harm them and take their money.
3. Bringing down Jewish soldiers, particularly border guards, by means of drugs

The response:

Praise God

As far as striking drug traffickers, eliminating them, and killing them: Yes, there is a technicality (TN: to the issue), which is according to the capability and authority of the mujahidin. The guiding principle for this, which you must learn and adhere to in this issue, is as follows: This is an issue within the realm of "propagating virtue and preventing vice," the guiding principle for its legitimacy being that it not lead to a greater vice.

This is the guiding principle; keep it, and may God bless you.

And so: If the mujahidin in some area or region are capable of carrying out hudud (TN: prescribed punishments for specific offenses in Shari'a law) and establishing Shari'a law or more, meaning that if they apply it, then the resulting outcome is in accordance with Shari'a law, and no greater harm or corruption is consequent, then this is up to them.

But we may say that at such time, it is their duty, the basis for which is this: It is (TN: their) duty to set up hudud, and to propagate virtue and prevent vice, and to do so by deed.

This is as the mujahidin today are doing in some sub-districts of Iraq, Afghanistan, Waziristan, and other places. For one in such as your case, it is obvious that you are not in this position, may God strengthen you and open the path for you.

What I believe (TN: is best) for you is not to do this, as I fear that great corruptions may result, and you will open yourselves up to things which are not within your power (TN: to control), and you will be beset with problems while you are yet weak. These sinful ones (if they be Muslims): There are technicalities pertaining to the permissibility, or lack thereof, of killing them. They are basically protected within Islam, and it is not permitted to kill them, although it is permissible in specific circumstances. Doubtless there is another exposition on this aspect.

However, if you are capable of taking their monies, in some cases, without there following any greater corruption, as we mentioned, then this is to you, and you may spend the monies for jihad in God's name.

And, in my conjecture, these cases are quite limited, if they exist at all. Such as: You stumble upon their monies, or one of their (drug merchants') convoys fall into your hands, and you then take their monies (not the drugs themselves), and spend them for jihad in God's name.

However, remember that the stipulation in this is always that it not lead to a greater corruption. God is all-knowing.

The second portion of the question, by which you also mean: The question regarding acceptance of gifts, presents, or alms from drug traffickers who are Muslims. This is what I understood from your question.

If this was the intended meaning, then: A man takes for himself, and accepts from them for himself, as in accepting their gifts, and eating of their food, then there is an exposition on this, and there is a difference amongst scholars regarding (TN: this point of) jurisprudence, as previously noted.

If their monies are solely derived from forbidden (TN: acts/items) i.e. all of it is from that which is forbidden (TN: acts/items) (such as drug traffickers), then most scholars (the mass of them) state that it is not permissible to take from them, or to eat of their monies (TN: sic)... some scholars choose (TN: the position that) it is permissible, saying: their sins are upon them, and nothing is upon he who takes of it. However, the former is most likely, God is all-knowing.

If their monies are mixed, then it is permissible to eat of the monies, and to accept what they give. However, it must be restricted, so as not to exceed the portion of their monies which are of the permissible sort.

Discourse on this issue is long, and (TN: you can) refer to some of the sources which we have indicated above.

If these traffickers, however, who traffic in forbidden (TN: items), such as drugs, give their monies as alms for jihad in God's name, then it appears to me, and God is all-knowing, that it is permissible to spend these monies for jihad in God's name

Page 8

Because these monies were derived from forbidden (TN: items), then it is incumbent upon its owner to repent, and through repentance, relinquishment of these monies so that they are no longer in his possession. The way to do this being to place them in a "bayt al-mal" (TN: treasury), where they are used for the benefit of Muslims, including jihad and conquest in God's name, or to be given as alms.

Some scholars state: They would destroy these funds, as they are derived from forbidden (TN: items/acts).

This is quite weak, as God almighty has never ordered the destruction of monies, but proscribed the wasting of it. And in this case, destroying them would be a waste of the monies which contains no benefit, as there is no obligation to destroy it (nothing exists to indicate that this would be an obligation),

and the clear good stipulates that it be spent in the interests of Islam and Muslims, and so should enter a "bayt al-mal" and become part of the resources of the "bayt al-mal" such as monies taken (seizure) from the corrupt, a punishment we have condoned, and the like.

This is what Shaykh al-Islam Ibn-Taymiyah, God's mercy upon him, chose, and expounded upon in sections of his fatwas (he expounded upon this issue in more than one fatwa in the 29th volume, and in others as well).

If the (TN: original) owner of the funds has not repented, but rather continues to commit sin, in this case the trafficking of drugs, then it is the duty of Muslims to take him to task, and it is the duty of the "wali al-amr" (TN: chief, or senior member) of Muslims to take this in hand, in which case the seizure of his money is permitted, to according to the most proper statements of scholars, by the "wali al-amr".

In brief: If the trafficker in wine or drugs donates some of his monies for jihad in the name of God the almighty, it is permitted to accept this and spend it on jihad in God's name, along with the duty of continuing to preach to him and to all men to submit to God, and to repent by abandoning vices and turning away from the forbidden. This is (TN: in order to) be cautious of assisting his trafficking in the forbidden. God is all-knowing.

If the mujahidin have no need of those (TN: funds), then perhaps it is best to leave them alone.

As for your question:

1. Luring fallen addicts to serve as double agents against the Jews.
2. Selling them to Jews in order to harm them and take their money.
3. Bringing down Jewish soldiers, particularly border guards, by means of drugs

All of this is not permitted..

The first is clear, as it is a proscribed means, the proscription against which is clear: Giving drugs or wine to people and contributing to and promoting this behavior to them..

all of this God has proscribed and forbidden, so by what evidence shall we permit it?! Just because those in question are "fallen addicts," it is of no matter to the (TN: applicability of) the verdict, and God is all-knowing. If they are Muslim youths who have committed this grave offense (taking drugs), then this is quite clear... if they are infidels...

Page 9

...then it is also not permitted to use this means with infidels, according to all scholars... although some scholars have given license in other issues in this same vein which differ from the issue at hand, namely:

Such as Abu-Hanifah, God's mercy upon him, and his sanctioning of transactions with ahl al-Harb (TN: "people of war") (warring infidels) in dar al-Harb (TN: "house of war", i.e. lands not under Islamic rule) with interest, as his companions mentioned in "Bada'i' al-Sana'i'" and others, and the mass of scholars opposed him in this, and the statement of this mass is correct, which is that this is forbidden from being done with ahl al-Harb, just as it is forbidden with a Muslim or with one not of ahl al-Harb, whether in Dar al-Harb or Dar al-Islam.

Like Sahnun, of the Malikite imams, who sanctioned paying ransoms of wine or pork for Muslim prisoners of war, should the infidels so request: Ibn-Jizzi in "al-Qawanin al-Fiqhiyah" (TN: "Jurisprudence Laws" stated: "Should the enemy request a ransom of a horse or a weapon, it is paid to him, unlike the case with wine or pork." Sahnun sanctioned using these two (TN: forbidden) items to pay the ransom for prisoners of war, while Ibn-al-Qasim forbade it for being injurious to Muslims, and he who was ransomed with payment of wine or the like (TN: remains as one) who never returned.

Like the statement of Shaykh al-Islam Taymiyah in his fatwas "Leaving the Tatars or others to drink wine and to become intoxicated is better than forbidding it to them, because wine does not prevent them from remembrance of God, nor from performing prayer, rather it prevents them from (TN: committing) depravity and sin, and should they become sober, they would become more corrupt," as he mentioned in his "Kitab al-Istiqamah". This is a matter which pertains to the promotion of vice and prevention of virtue, meaning to refrain from discouraging them from this, if it is preferable (TN: to do so). God is all-knowing.

As for the second (number two): This is an issue of selling wine, drugs, and that which is forbidden in our Shari'a to the infidels for the purpose of harming them... the proper answer is that it is not permitted.

All of this is forbidden, encompassed in forbidding the sale of things there is no difference between selling to a Muslim or to an infidel, neither in war nor in peace. This is proper, as previously indicated.

As for the third (number three): The verdict for this is clear from the preceding; it is also forbidden and not permitted, and this is the basis: The forbidding of selling wine and the like to infidels of the ahl al-Harb, and forbidding using them as gifts to ahl al-Harb for the purposes of espionage and plying them. All of these are forbidden means, and are not permitted. As evidence of this:

The totality of evidence of forbidding the sale of wine and the like, and forbidding giving or presenting them, or giving them for the consumption to one who drinks it, or carrying it, etc... There is much well-known evidence for this, which includes both selling to an infidel and selling to a Muslim.

- Because this is contribution to sin and wrongdoing..
- Because it is a denigration to the image of Islam and its pure and noble message, and is an impediment to God's will.

O God, unless there is exigency, and we have no other means by which to free a Muslim from their hands; if they ask for ransom of wine or drugs, for example, and Sahnun authorized it, as seen in the precedent of paying ransom of wine and pork for prisoners, then this may bear the semblance of exigency, as the (TN: of the image of Islam) is safe from the damage of denigration in this case, if the enemy requests this. God is all-knowing.

Whereas if you have decided that there is exigent need for this, then you must weigh it, and limit it to exigent circumstances alone, and is not (TN: to be treated as) a permitted thing...!

Page 10

Care must be taken to (TN: treat the matter) with secrecy and discretion, for fear of the spread of corruption to those who were faithful and for fear of denigrating the image of Muslims,

and alienation (TN: of the congregation); we place our trust in God.

God is all-knowing and all-wise.

Praise be to God, first and last, and God's blessings upon our Prophet Muhammad, his family, and companions.

Written by (('Atiyatallah))

Shawwal 1427 (TN: corresponding to the period of time from 24 October 2006 until 22 November 2006)