## "If applauding turns of phrases are used about the persecution going on in Bangladesh, they will show the same courage again."

"One might be guilty and even then he serves the time he deserves in prison.

Even then, there is no need for executions and violence."

"After the 1971 war an International Crimes Tribunal was established and soldiers from the Pakistani army were tried. There were no allegations regarding the members of Jamaat-e-Islami back then. Later in 2010 Hassina government wanted another International Crimes Tribunal. And in conflict with Roman international law they have formed a panel of judges consisting of their own people. And the members of Jamaat-e-Islami were tried in this Tribunal. As a matter of fact the Hassina government formed a coalition government with the Jamaat-e-Islami party before, meaning there were no such allegations regarding those people who they claim to be guilty right now, they just came up with those allegations later on."

**Adnan Oktar:** "One might be guilty, I can understand that, but even then there is no need to execute that person. We do not say that he should not be given a life imprisonment. He might be guilty, but why is there the need to execute him? There is no need for such violence. **He has already been given life imprisonment before.** When he filed an objection about the verdict saying, "I have done nothing to deserve a life imprisonment," they said, "Well then let us execute you!" First of all, this alone, is a grave ignominy.

"According to the Universal Law, in an appellate review made about verdicts of a court, a heavier sentence cannot be given."

In such legal objections, a heavier sentence cannot be given during the appeal and this is how it is all around the world. I mean this is the law throughout the whole world. They have done such a grave ignominy. For instance, if the man is given five years imprisonment, when he appeals this decision you cannot give him ten years imprisonment, you can only approve that five years imprisonment during the appellate review. This is the case all around the world. And these people went on and executed the man. You are hanging the man while he is expecting his acquittal. You have already given the man a life sentence, so put that into effect, put that man in jail. Why is there the need to execute him?

Well my brother, haven't you given him life imprisonment? You have. And the man objected to this verdict and according to law, you can only give him life imprisonment. How can you execute him? There is no such thing in law anywhere in the world. For instance when something like that happens in Turkey, the accused can challenge the decision and in the appellate review he can be given a maximum of that punishment."

See that they have formed a coalition government with those people; they were so close, they shook hands, they governed together. And later on, all of a sudden, how can you decide that these people are treacherous?"

"It is absolutely remorselessness to use execution as a campaign promise for the elections."

"Both the father of Hassina and also the father of another lady in the opposition right now were assassinated in 2010. Regarding those assassinations, even though there is no evidence to prove this claim, they are accusing members of the Jamaat-e-Islami party. And later on the Hassina government promised their voters that they will definitely execute the members of the Jamaat-e-Islami party; it is claimed that this promise is the reason behind these executions."

That is a grave ignominy as well. There might be many other slogans for the elections, one might say, "I will have dams built!" and that can be understandable. But how can killing a man be a campaign promise for the elections? What could be a graver ignominy than that? They are saying, "We will kill a man." They are saying, "If you elect us, we promise you we will kill the man." Is that even reasonable? On the contrary such a person should lose the elections. How can they feel respect for such a person? Such a person should not be accepted in any country of the world. How could assassination be a campaign promise for the elections? That is outrageous. Say, "I will have a dam built, I will have a port built." These can be promises for an election. How are they not ashamed of this, how do they not feel any pain in their conscience?"

"The celebrations held by the supporters of the party in power show how deeply the society is degenerated."

"The celebrations held after the execution are deep indicators of grave depravation; how can one celebrate an assassination? They would all be counted as assassins. See how people are trained to demand hanging, chopping people up, to demand blood. Actually let alone killing a person, just seeing one being killed is a horrible experience, even hearing about it is horrible.

See how quietly they have executed that person. No one knows what has happened? What kind of a defense was made, what was he accused of? No one really knows. And some journalists believed in what they have heard. They keep saying, "He did this, he did that." A person should be ashamed of saying something like that.

Alright, the Pakistani army might have done these things; the Pakistani army is completely another issue. Well my brother, if you are strong enough, go do all those you've done to the Pakistani army. They are all very afraid of Pakistan, right? All those allegations are about the Pakistani army, yet they have found three tofive poor men and they are taking all their revenge on them that is a grave immorality.

"A verdict of execution cannot be given based on conflicting statements of a single witness"

"It is outrageous that there is only one witness and the statements of that witness are inconsistent. You have given that person a life time sentence before anyway, that means you didn't find execution reasonable before. The man then challenges your decision saying, "I am innocent, let me explain myself, let me prove the truth." He makes an objection about the life sentence and you say; "Well, you are one to object! Come here then, I will hang you!"

The witness is controversial; she says one thing now, another later. How can a person be executed based on a statement of a single witness? That is something never been seen anywhere before.

"If applauding turns of phrases are used about the persecution going on in Bangladesh, they will show the same courage again."

An approach that invites such an immorality is not acceptable. One should strictly avoid that. One should strictly avoid writing articles that lack necessary facts. Using turns of phrases that applaud this persecution is not acceptable; that is because those who have carried out this execution should be ashamed of themselves. Or else they can repeat this immorality. I mean if they are encouraged, they would continue with such acts and they are doing so. There are other Muslims waiting for their turn, they will be executed as well. It should be openly seen that everyone condemns this execution. Writing articles in a supportive fashion or in a mediocre fashion would not comply with good conscience. It would be cruelty.

"We would not want anyone to be executed even if the person that will be executed is not a Muslim but an irreligious person"

They are executing a Muslim, an inoffensive person. God says if a Muslim is persecuted anywhere in the world, if a Muslim is being oppressed, if his rights are seized, Muslims of the whole world should unite and save him from that persecution. That is a verse of the Qur'an. That is the command of God and even if that person is not a Muslim, but an irreligious person, we would not want him executed. I mean that person might as well be a non-Muslim. Why would I want him executed? Even if he is a Christian or a Jew, I would simply not let him be executed.

"None of the Islamic countries said anything except for Turkey. The Organization of Islamic Cooperation did not make an attempt regarding this issue either."

"Without the system of the Mahdi, without feeling that fervor inside regarding the descent of Jesus Messiah, the great majority of Muslims are left scourged. They have become loveless and merciless. This is how a majority of them are; they do not pity those who are persecuted. Some people demotivate the masses by saying, "There is no Islamic Unity," "We are against Turkish-Islamic Union," " Mahdi will not come, Jesus Messiah will not come," day and night. And after that an egoistical, selfish understanding of Islam prevails in the world. These people would then be after becoming rich. Some are interested in becoming a merchant, some are after another personal gain.

That happens because they have emptied the souls of Muslims. The system of the dajjal has taken the souls of a majority of Muslims. There are only a few Muslims standing afoot. Almost 99 % of them are ruined by the system

of the Dajjal. That is why Muslims have no power to resist any longer. Had they resisted, the others wouldn't have dared to take such a step, they wouldn't even dare to breathe.

Had Muslims joined forces, no one in the world could even dare to persecute Muslims. That is why all Muslims should see this fact as soon as possible and instantly side with the Islamic Union. (Adnan Oktar, December 14th 2013: A9 TV)

https://www.harunyahya.info/en/articles/if-applauding-turns-of-phrases-are-used-about-the-persecution-going-on-in-bangladesh-they-will-show-