

The American Air Attacks over Libya

Question:

Consecutive American air attacks have been undertaken upon Sirte at the request of the Siraj government as "Military sources close to the forces of the presidential council in Sirte confirmed that American planes had undertaken 8 air strikes upon strongholds of the IS organisation within the city last Monday..." (Al-Arabiya.net 09/08/2016). However, it is known that the Siraj government in Libya was set up in accordance to the dictates of the Skhirat agreement in Morocco and that the main player in this agreement was Europe and Britain in particular.... And the policy of the government had been in line with European policy which rejected American military intervention. So why have they agreed now? Has Siraj's policy changed from the European line? Jazaakallahu Khairan.

Answer:

The Siraj government is still proceeding upon the European line and more precisely the British line. Its agreement to American military intervention does not mean that it has become politically loyal to America. Rather Britain pushed it towards this as a step upon the path of enticing America to make the parliament of Tobruk agree to the government of Siraj. That is because, in spite of America's outward agreement to the government of Siraj due to the political promotion within the public opinion that Britain generated for the Siraj government, America has nevertheless remained opposing it practically and has been generating problems for it through Haftar and his group, and so it has not made the Tobruk parliament agree to the government of Siraj. The step undertaken by Siraj to request American military intervention was therefore motivated by Britain in order to entice America in hopes that it would make the Tobruk government agree to the Siraj government... To make this clear we will present the following matters:

1 – The Siraj government was formed with European support and particularly the support of Britain which was able to contract the Skhirat agreement on 17/12/2015. It had obstructed the military intervention in Libya because it was not in need of it due to its dominance over the political medium and because the government was subservient to it. It sought for international resolutions to be issued to prevent the military intervention. However, America was adamant about such intervention and has undertaken individual strikes since November of last year and the last of such strikes was last February when it killed 49 people in a military camp in Libya, the majority of whom were Tunisians. That is because America's presence inside Libya is weak and so America wishes to rely upon the military intervention whilst it has supported its agent Haftar to proceed in this role... America has admitted the weakness of its presence in Libya. Pentagon spokesman Peter Cook said on 17/05/2016: "The United States still has a "small presence" in Libya tasked with trying to identify the players and which groups might be able to assist the United States in its mission to combat ISIS." (Shorouq Tunisia, 17/05/2016). The obstacle before easing of the work of the Siraj government was America's stipulation of Haftar having a fundamental role within the army and then the Tobruk government would acknowledge the legitimacy of the Siraj government. However, the Skhirat agreement stated otherwise and the international envoy repeated this matter on a number of occasions. The international UN envoy to Libya Martin Kobler mentioned on 07/08/2016 on Al-Ghad Television that: "The political agreement states that the presidential council is the supreme leader of the Libyan army and all parties of Libya must respect this agreement and it must take decisions that specify who will be the head of the army leadership, chief of staff, chief of naval and air forces and for it to be under the umbrella of the presidential council". He also said, "I have been attempting for weeks to communicate with the team of Khalifa Haftar to discuss the issue of unifying the Libyan army..." and requested, "For the Libyan Council of Representatives, with all of its

members, to convene an agreement upon the government of national reconciliation... And that the Council of Representatives had agreed upon the political agreement with reservations about one article". He is indicating here to the 8th article that relates to the position of Haftar and states 'that all of the mandatory powers of military, civil and high security matters that have been stated in the texts of the Libyan laws and legislations will belong to the ministerial head immediately upon the signing of the agreement'. It is this article which is the subject of disagreement.

2 – Britain has realised that America wants military intervention and to practise it in actuality. Africa Gate News mentioned on 08/01/2016 that the American military leadership in Africa announced officially its military intervention in Libya according to a plan of action lasting 5 years, aiming to strengthen the chokehold over the terrorist groups in Africa and particularly in Libya. With that, America decided upon the policy of undertaking military strikes or military intervention without the issuance of an international resolution and began to undertake that it actuality because it had not accomplished what it wanted with direct political actions. Afterwards on 28/01/2016, the White House announced that President Obama is chairing a meeting of the National Security Council that has been specified to look into the situation in Libya and he was firm in that the US would continue its attacks upon ISIL in any country that it was located going into Libya if the matter required it. And he issued directives to his consultants in the field of national security to oppose the attempts of ISIL to expand in Libya and other country. Despite that, it concerns America from a legal perspective for its intervention to be by request of the Siraj government as a legal front... And so it was that Britain commanded Siraj to request the intervention from America so that its intervention would have a legal description. Then from this "service/favour" that it is providing to America it would hope that the result would lead to America lessening its support to Haftar and that it would make the Tobruk government give its confidence to the Siraj government...!

3 – In this way the American intervention began in an open manner via the request of the Siraj government i.e. from a government that views itself to be legitimate! This is just as US Pentagon Press Secretary Peter Cook mentioned on 01/08/2016 when he said: "at the request of the Libyan Government of National Accord (GNA), the United States military conducted precision air strikes". This request represents a major crime and the statement of Siraj on 01/08/2016 on official Libyan television doesn't benefit him. This is when he stated that the presidential council has decided, in its capacity as being the supreme head of the army has requested the direct assistance from the US to direct specific air strikes against the camps of the IS in the city of Sirte and its districts... And that these operations in this stage are taking place within a limited time scope and they will never go beyond the city of Sirte and its districts... and it will be limited to technical and logistical assistance. This will not benefit him because the Pentagon Press Secretary Peter Cook, said the opposite to that "The strikes do not have an end point at this time to be specific... And that in the future there will be coordination of each single strike with the government of accord and it will require the agreement of the chief of American forces in Africa." (Algerian news, 02/08/2016) Consequently, America or the first time has found an opportunity for the Libyan government to permit it, in an official manner, to carry out strikes inside Libya. That is whilst it is announcing that it will not stop at the limit of these strikes and that it will undertake more although it will inform the Libyan government when it carries out a strike where it merely informs under the name of coordination! In addition, it ties that to its (military) leadership in Africa i.e. within the American policy in Africa, and that its leadership there will take over the operations. Therefore, the target here is not Libya alone but rather the whole of North Africa...! Siraj's statement in respect to not agreeing to the entry of ground forces will as such not benefit him in reference to what France Press reported on 10/08/2016: The Prime Minister of the Libyan National Accord government, Fayez Siraj, said on Wednesday, that his land is not in need of foreign forces upon Libyan territories to assist the forces fighting the IS organisation and that was said in an interview with Italian Corriere della Sera Newspaper. That is whilst the American *Washington Post* Newspaper disclosed on Tuesday 09/08/2016: "That American special forces present upon the ground and are providing, for the first time, direct support to the Libyan forces fighting

the IS organisation in the Sirte region..."! It is clear from all of that that the statements of Siraj are for internal consumption and no other reason and that they are as far from the truth as they possibly could be!

4 – America looks to the intervention from the view that it is a concentration of its influence within the region and within this context the American President Obama, on the day following the strikes, 02/08/2016, announced that: "It is in the U.S. national security interest to support Libya's emerging government's fight against Islamic State... and the air strikes were undertaken to make sure that Libyan forces were able to finish the job of fighting the radical militant group and to increase stability there". He added that the United States, Europe and countries around the world "have a great interest in seeing stability in Libya because the absence of stability has helped to fuel some of the challenges that we've seen in terms of the migration crisis in Europe and some of the humanitarian tragedies that we've seen in the open seas between Libya and Europe" (Reuters 02/08/2016). Consequently, the US president considers that to be from the national interest of his country. The meaning of that is therefore that it represents an important issue related to the US presence in Libya. Otherwise, what is the relationship of the US national security with Libya unless that was related to the American interests there?! Obama claims that he is undertaking that, not only in his own country's interest, but rather the interest of Europe and the world. It as if it is the US that will realise the security for Europe in particular whilst it is struggling with it there, which means that is its working to extend the US interests there and thereafter make Europe fall under its control. Whereas it follows it, if possible, in colonising Islamic lands in the case as the Europeans had colonised it and plundered its resources...

5 – Britain, as mentioned above, ordered Siraj to request the US intervention with the "hope" that America would meet it by decreasing its support for Haftar and making the Tobruk parliament agree to the Siraj government... However, Europe, at the same time, realises that America is not concerned with Haftar or anyone else as much as it is concerned that those agents serve its interests. And if it is capable of sucking the blood of the Europeans from Siraj so that he becomes purely sincere to it (in loyalty), then it will be easy for it, at that time, to side line Haftar or even cast him aside if not on the highroad. However, that is if it was able to suck the blood of the Europeans from Siraj and if he was to be won over to them entirely, and not in return for the request for intervention! As such, Europe has taken into account that America would delay the agreement of the Tobruk parliament until it has accomplished more blackmailing of the Siraj government and thereafter extend the military intervention to serve its interests, so that its military intrigues continue and Siraj comes under the US military dominance... For that reason, Europe exploited the announcement of US intervention to announce its own intervention that it had been concealing, so that the military arena in Libya would not belong to America alone. Thereafter, the intervention would become disclosed and so the European countries could intervene and would no longer be in need of secret intervention as France had done and their troops ended up being killed... As such, the European forces would be in Libya preventing the US forces from accomplishing what they had wanted, rather leaving it with just a share of the cake! It was in this way that the talk about European intervention in Libya became disclosed in an open manner. The *Sunday Times* Newspaper disclosed on 07/08/2016 that: "Special British forces participated previously in fighting ISIS in Sirte alongside the Presidential Council's forces and they used new weapons to confront snipers of ISIS who had been positioned on roofs of high buildings in the 700 district". The British ambassador in Libya Peter Millet spoke on the social media site Twitter about "His welcoming of Libya joining the international alliance to fight ISIS" pointing to the US strikes that America launched upon Sirte... Similarly, French foreign minister Jean-Marc Ayrault expressed "The welcoming of his country to the step of the Libyan national accord government to request international assistance manifested in the US air strikes" that took place during a phone call between him and Siraj the details of which were published by the French foreign ministry. The French minister expressed to Siraj: "His country's readiness to strengthen its cooperation with the government of accord in all situations, at the head of which is combatting terrorism". France is attempting to play with both ends of the rope by supporting Haftar in the East in its fighting in the case where troops of its own were killed, whilst at the same time declaring explicitly its

support for the Siraj government in Tripoli in the West!... Italian foreign minister Paolo Gentiloni said: "Italy is welcomed in Sirte and which took place built upon the request of the national unity government to support the forces loyal to the government... and he expressed the readiness of his country to respond to a Libyan request for all forms of assistance including military" (Anadolu, 03/08/2016). And the Italian defence minister Roberto Pinotti said that: "Italy will most likely permit the use of its air bases and air space for strikes to be undertaken against the elements of ISIS in Libya if the US requested that" (Reuters, 03/08/2016).

6 – This then is what has come of the political regime in Libya that arose from the Skhirat agreement formulated by Britain, it has come to announce that it is permitting the Americans to intervene! They do not feel shy or shame before Allah, His Messenger and the believers in respect to requesting from a colonialist disbeliever state to intervene militarily in our land! Their intervention is due to the treachery and betrayal of the rulers in our lands but for that to happen based on a direct request from those rulers is more resourceful and more effective... Then, Siraj, like the rest of the agents, does not feel shame in conducting himself in one way on a day and then doing the opposite on the very next. Just yesterday he protested the French intervention, even if it was done shyly, and today he is acclaiming the US intervention, indeed he requested it with his own tongue!! That is because the agents do as they are commanded; dumb, deaf and blind and so they do not comprehend... And all of that was undertaken with the hope that America will make the Tobruk government give their confidence to Siraj and his government!

7 – The official request from Siraj for the US military intervention and what followed that in terms of the European announcement for military intervention has made Libya a very hot arena, not only for the political struggle with all of its dangers but also to the military struggle and clash which is even more dangerous!!! It is a major crime that will yield the one behind it and those who participate in it disgrace in the life of this world and the punishment of the next:

﴿سَيُصِيبُ الَّذِينَ أَجْرَمُوا صَغَارٌ عِنْدَ اللَّهِ وَعَذَابٌ شَدِيدٌ بِمَا كَانُوا يَمْكُرُونَ﴾

"There will afflict those who committed crimes debasement before Allah and severe punishment for what they used to conspire" [Al-An'aam: 124].

Verily Allah, *Al-Qawwiy Al-Azeez* (The All Mighty All Powerful) has made it Haraam for the disbelievers to have a way over the believers and seeking assistance by the disbelievers means giving them a way over the believers:

﴿وَلَنْ يَجْعَلَ اللَّهُ لِلْكَافِرِينَ عَلَى الْمُؤْمِنِينَ سَبِيلًا﴾

"And never will Allah give the disbelievers over the believers a way" [An-Nisaa: 141].

And verily Allah *Al-Qawwiy Al-Jabbaar* has made it Haraam to turn in alliance to the disbelievers and made the one who does so from the *Munaafiqeen* (hypocrites) who has a painful punishment: ﴿بَشِّرِ الْمُنَافِقِينَ بِأَنَّ لَهُمْ عَذَابًا أَلِيمًا * الَّذِينَ يَتَّخِذُونَ الْكَافِرِينَ أَوْلِيَاءَ مِنْ دُونِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ﴾

﴿بَشِّرِ الْمُنَافِقِينَ بِأَنَّ لَهُمْ عَذَابًا أَلِيمًا * الَّذِينَ يَتَّخِذُونَ الْكَافِرِينَ أَوْلِيَاءَ مِنْ دُونِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ﴾ **"Give tidings to the hypocrites that there is for them a painful punishment. Those who take disbelievers as allies instead of the believers. Do they seek with them honour [through power]? But indeed, honour belongs to Allah entirely" [138-139].**

The Messenger of Allah (saw) prohibited seeking assistance with the disbeliever: **'Urwah related from 'Aa'ishah (ra) that the Messenger of Allah (saw) said: «إِنَّا لَا نَسْتَعِينُ بِمُشْرِكٍ» "We do not seek assistance with a Mushrik"** recorded by Ad-Daarami in his Sunan... And At-Tabaraani in his Mu'jam Al-Kabeer related from Khubaib Bin Abdur Rahman, from his father, from his grandfather who said: The Messenger of Allah (saw) said: «فَاتِنَا لَا نَسْتَعِينُ بِالْمُشْرِكِينَ» **"For verily we do not seek assistance with the Mushrikeen (polytheists and disbelievers)"**... And Al-Haakim in his Mustadrak upon the two Saheehs recorded from Abi Humaid As-Saa'idiy (ra) that he said: «فَاتِنَا لَا نَسْتَعِينُ بِالْمُشْرِكِينَ» **"For verily we do not seek assistance with the Mushrikeen (polytheists and disbelievers)"**...

In conclusion, the existing governments in West Libya and East Libya are subservient to the West represented in its two sides; European and American. It is therefore obligatory upon the Libyan people, who covet their Deen, country and Ummah to work to bring down those governments that have enabled the Kafir (disbeliever) West, the enemy of Islam and the Muslims, to have a free reign in the land of the Mujahideen and the memorisers of the Qur'an Al-Kareem... It is also their obligation to take those militias and armed organisations to task, those who are fighting amongst themselves, spilling Haraam blood and making Takfeer of one another. That is whilst spilling the Haraam blood and making Takfeer of Muslims are of the great sins with Allah (swt) and His Messenger (saw): As for shedding the Haraam blood then At-Tirmidhi narrated in his Sunan from **Abdullah Bin 'Amr that the Nabi (prophet) (saw) said: «لَرَوَالِ الدُّنْيَا أَهْوَنُ عَلَى اللَّهِ مِنْ قَتْلِ رَجُلٍ مُسْلِمٍ»** “Verily, the perishing of the Duniyaa (world) is less upon Allah than the killing a Muslim man”... An-Nisaa'i narrated from **Abdullah Bin 'Amr from the Nabi (Prophet) (saw) that he said: «لَرَوَالِ الدُّنْيَا أَهْوَنُ عِنْدَ اللَّهِ مِنْ قَتْلِ رَجُلٍ مُسْلِمٍ»** “Verily, the perishing of the Duniyaa (world) is less with Allah than the killing of a Muslim man”...

As for making Takfeer of the Muslim, Bukhari related in his Saheeh from Abdullah Ibn 'Umar (ra): That the Messenger of Allah (saw) said: **«أَيُّمَا رَجُلٍ قَالَ لِأَخِيهِ يَا كَافِرُ، فَقَدْ بَاءَ بِهَا أَحَدُهُمَا»** “Any man that says to his brother O Kaafir, then that (description) has befallen one of them”... And Muslim narrated from Ibn 'Umar the wording (Lafzh) that the Prophet (saw) said: **«إِذَا كَفَّرَ الرَّجُلُ أَخَاهُ فَقَدْ بَاءَ بِهَا أَحَدُهُمَا»** “If the man makes Takfeer of his brother then it (the description) has befallen one of the two”... And it was mentioned in Al-Adab Al-Mufrad from Abdullah Ibn 'Umar that the Messenger of Allah (saw) said: **«إِذَا قَالَ لِلْآخَرِ: كَافِرٌ، فَقَدْ كَفَّرَ أَحَدُهُمَا، إِنْ كَانَ الَّذِي قَالَ لَهُ كَافِرًا فَقَدْ صَدَقَ، وَإِنْ لَمْ يَكُنْ كَمَا قَالَ لَهُ فَقَدْ بَاءَ الَّذِي قَالَ لَهُ بِالْكَفْرِ»** “If it is said to another: Kafir. Then one of them has disbelieved. If the one whom it is said to is a Kafir then he has been truthful and if he is not as he has said, then what he said to him will return back to him in terms of disbelief”.

As such, the shedding of the Haraam blood of the Muslim is an extremely major sin and similarly making Takfeer of a Muslim is an extremely major sin.

And the final conclusion: We understand that there are in the good country of Libya many men, Mujahideen men, heroes, men of Taqwa and purity by the permission of Allah. These are those whom we are looking for goodness in so that they stand in a firm position of truth and honesty before this quartet of evil. The disbelieving colonialists, the traitor deserter rulers, those who oppose the Sharee'ah of Islam; the rightly guided Khilafah, and those who declare the Khilafah in false speech and spill the Haraam blood in its name and as a distortion to it... This evil quartet must be confronted by a stance of truth and honesty... With all of that we do not despair in respect to receiving the mercy of Allah, rather we give glad tidings of goodness of the return of the true Khilafah, the rightly guided Khilafah (Caliphate) upon the methodology of the Prophethood, which will safeguard the security of the people and look after their affairs, so that Islam and Muslims are honoured by it and the disbelievers and hypocrites are brought down:

﴿وَاللَّهُ غَالِبٌ عَلَى أَمْرِهِ وَلَكِنَّ أَكْثَرَ النَّاسِ لَا يَعْلَمُونَ﴾

“And Allah is predominant over His affair, but most of the people do not know”
[Yusuf: 21].

09th of Dhul Qi'dah 1437 AH

12/08/2016 CE