



FATAAWAA FROM THE IMAAMS OF SALAFIYYAH
CONCERNING RALLIES AND DEMONSTRATIONS
AND ADDITIONAL GUIDELINES CONCERNING REVOLT AND TAKFEER
IN LIGHT OF THE ALGERIAN AFFAIR

From the *Fataawaa* of Imaam Ibn Baaz (d.1420H)
al-'Allaamah Ibnul-'Uthaymeen (d.1421H) and
al-Muhaddith Muhammad Naasirud-Deen al-Albaanee (d.1420H)

V e r s i o n 1 . 0

Allaah the Glorified and Exalted said, “**And do not kill a person whom Allaah has declared unlawful, except with due right.**” [Sooratul-An'aam 6:151]

Allaah - the Lord of the Worlds - said, “**And whoever kills a believer intentionally, his recompense is Hell to abide therein, and the wrath and the curse of Allaah are upon him, and a great punishment is prepared for him.**” [Sooratun-Nisaa' 4:93]

Said Imaam Muhammad Naasirud-Deen al-Albaanee (d.1420H) - *rahimahullaah*, “We support everyone who calls for the refutation of those who come out against the Rulers, and those who encourage the Muslims in coming out against the Rulers.” [*Fataawaa al-'Ulamaa'il-Akaabir* (p. 97)]

Said al-'Allaamah Ibn Baaz (d.1420H) - *rahimahullaah*, “If anyone from amongst the callers in Algeria said about me that I said to them, ‘Assassinate the police, or use weapons in the call to Allaah,’ then this is wrong, it is not true. Rather, it is a lie!”

Said Imaam Muhammad Ibn Saalih al-'Uthaymeen (d.1421H) - *rahimahullaah*, “We view it obligatory upon them to put down their swords and to meet in peace. And if not, then they must endure the continuance of those who fight and take wealth by force and rape the women. Since they are responsible for it in front of Allaah the Mighty and Majestic. And the obligation upon them is to come back.”

Adapted by: Shaykh 'Abdul-Maalik Ramadaanee al-Jazaa'iree

Translation: Maaz Qureshi

Source: www.troid.org

BENEFIT - IMPORTANT ISSUES OF REVOLT AGAINST THE RULERS:

The following questions were asked to Imaam 'Abdul'Azeez Ibn Baaz (d.1420H), this discussion was taken from *ash-Sharqul-Awsat* (no. 5289), as is found in *Muraaji'at fee Fiqhil-Waaqi'is-Siyaasee wal-Fikree* of Dr. 'Abdullaah ar-Rifaa'ee.

[Q.1]: 'From the matters that have caused controversy is the affair of the connection between the ruler and the ruled, and the *Sharee'ah* principle surrounding this connection. Noble Shaykh, there are those who hold that the perpetration of major sins by the rulers obligates revolting against them, and endeavoring to remove them, even if this causes some harm to the Muslims in the country. And recent occurrences like this have started to happen in places within our Islaamic world, so what is your opinion - O noble Shaykh - concerning this?'

[A.1]: "With the Name of Allaah, the Most Merciful, the Bestower of the mercy. The praise is due to Allaah, Lord of the Worlds. And may the Prayers and Peace of Allaah be upon the Messenger of Allaah, and upon his Family, and upon his Companions, and whosoever follows his guidance. To proceed: So indeed Allaah the Mighty and Majestic has said,

"O you who believe! Obey Allaah, and obey the Messenger, and those who are in authority over you. So if you differ in anything, then refer it to Allaah and His Messenger, if you believe in Allaah and the Last Day. That is better and more suitable for final determination." [Sooratun-Nisaa' 4:59]

This *aayah* explains the obligation of obeying the caretaker of the affair (*waliyyul-amr*), and that is the rulers and the scholars. Indeed there occurs in the authentic *Sunnah* that the Messenger of Allaah (*sallallaahu 'alayhi wa sallam*) explained this obligation to be a duty, and it is an obligation in that which is good.

The texts from the *Sunnah* explain the meaning of this *aayah* to refer to obeying them in that which is good. So it is obligatory upon the Muslims to obey the rulers (*wulaatul-umoor*) in goodness, not in evil. So if he commands you with sin, then do not obey him in sin. However, this is not a reason for revolting against him, due to the statement of the Prophet (*sallallaahu 'alayhi wa sallam*), "Whosoever sees something from his leader of sin, then let him hate whatever occurs from sin. And let him not remove his hand from obedience, since whoever removes his hand from disobedience and splits off from the *Jamaa'ah* (united body), then he dies the death of *Jaahiliyyah* (pre-Islaamic times of ignorance)."¹ And the Prophet (*sallallaahu 'alayhi wa sallam*) said, "The person must obey in whatever he loves, and in whatever he hates, in ease and in hardship, in willingness and un-willingness; except

¹ Related by Ahmad (2/296) and Muslim (no. 1848) from the *hadeeth* of Abee Hurayrah (*radiyallaahu 'anhu*).

if he is commanded to disobey Allaah. So if he is commanded to disobey Allaah, then he should not listen, not should he obey.” And the Companions asked him, ‘O Messenger of Allaah! When you mentioned that there will be rulers, ‘you will approve of some things from them, and disapprove of others things.’ They said, ‘So what do you command us to do?’ He said, “Give them their right, and invoke Allaah, since He is with you.” ’Ubaadah (*radiyallaahu ’anhu*) said, “We gave the oath of allegiance to the Messenger of Allaah (*sallallaahu ’alayhi wa sallam*) that we would not oppose the command, not its people.” He said, “Except if you were to see clear disbelief (*kurfan bawaahan*) about which you have a proof from Allaah.”² This proved that it was not permissible for them to oppose the leaders (*wulaatul-umoor*), nor to revolt against them, except if they saw clear disbelief from them about which they had a clear from Allaah, and nothing less. Since revolting against the rulers is the cause of great corruption and evil. So, by this the trust is betrayed, and the rights are denied, and prevention of the transgressor is not made easier, nor are the oppressed aided; and the paths are deceived, not trusted.³ So endeavouring to revolt against the ruler is the cause of great corruption and evil, except if the Muslims see a clear proof from them about which they have a proof from Allaah, then there is no problem if they revolt against this ruler to remove him, if they have the power to do so. As for when they do not have the power to do so, then they must not revolt, or their revolting will be the cause for a greater evil. So they must not revolt out of consideration for the safety of the common-folk. And the *Sharee’ah* principle upon which there is *ijmaa’* (consensus) is: that it is not permissible to remove an evil with that which is a greater evil.⁴ Rather, it is obligatory to avert the evil by removing it.⁵ As for averting the evil with a greater evil, then that is not permissible by consensus of the Muslims. So if this group which wishes to remove the ruler who has committed clear disbelief, has the power to remove him, and to replace him with a good righteous leader, without bringing about that which is a greater evil and corruption upon the Muslims, and a greater evil than this ruler, then there is no problem. And for if this revolting will bring about a greater corruption, and betraying the trust, and oppression upon the people, and murdering those who do not deserve it, and great evils other than this, then it is not permissible.⁶ Rather, it is obligatory to patiently

² Related by Muslim (6/17)

³ Umar Ibn Yazeed said, ‘I heard al-Hasan al-Basree during the days of Yazeed Ibnul-Mahlab, and there came to him a group of people. So he commanded them to stay in their houses and to close their doors. Then he said, ‘By Allaah! If the people had patience when they were being tested by their unjust ruler, it will not be long before Allaah will make a way out for them. However, they always rush for their swords, so they are left to their swords. By Allaah! Not even for a single day did they bring about any good.’ It is related by Ibn Sa’d in *at-Tabaqaat* (8/164), and by Ibn Abee Haatim in his *Tafseer* (3/178).

⁴ Imaam as-Suyootee said in *al-Ishbaah wan-Nadhaa’ir* (p. 87), “Preventing *mafsadah* (harm) is given precedence over procuring *maslahah* (benefit).” And Shaykhul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah (d.728H) - *rahimahullaah* - said in *al-Hisbah fil-Islam* (p. 124), “Ordering the good should not result in the loss of a greater good, nor cause a greater evil (than before). Likewise, forbidding the evil should not result in a greater evil, nor in the loss of a greater good.”

⁵ Reflect upon this, since it is priceless! That is the fact that the Shaykh does not act upon this principle, except after fulfilling this condition which he mentioned before. Indeed the disbelief of the ruler depends upon the text of the preceding hadeeth. Likewise, the action of those firmly grounded in knowledge

⁶ Imaam Aboo Bakr al-Aajurree (d.360H) - *rahimahullaah* - said, “It is not permissible for the one who sees the uprising of a *khaarijee* who has revolted against the leader, whether he is just or oppressive - so this person

persevere, and to listen and obey in that which is good, and to advise the rulers sincerely, and to call them (*da'wah*) to the good, and striving to avert the evil and to increase the good. This is the correct path which it is obligatory to traverse, because in that is the general benefit of the Muslims; and because in that is the decreasing of the evil and the increasing of the good; and because in that is the trust and the safety of the Muslims from a greater evil.⁷ We ask Allaah to grant all of us the success and the guidance.”

[Q.2]: ‘Noble father, we know that these words are a foundation from the foundations of *Ahlu-Sunnah wal-Jamaa’ah*. However, regretfully, there are some youth from *Ahlu-Sunnah wal-Jamaa’ah* who see this as defeatist thought, and indeed it is said that these words contain subservience. Due to this, they call the youth to being severe in opposition.’

[A.2]: “This is an error from the one who said it, and it is due to lack of understanding, since they do not understand the *Sunnah*, not do they know it as they should. They only run upon feverish zeal and pride in removing the evil, despite falling into that which opposes the *Sharee’ah*; as what occurred with the *Khawaarij* and the *Mu’tazilah*. Their basis is loving to aid the truth, or pride for the truth, they run upon that, even if it means falling into falsehood, to the extent that they perform *Takfeer* upon the Muslims due to sins, or testify to them abiding in the Fire due to their sins, as the *Mu’tazilah* did.

So the *Khawaarij* performed *Takfeer* based upon sins,⁸ and they enter the sinner into the Fire, and the *Mu’tazilah* agree with them in saying that their end is in the Fire abiding therein. However, all of them are upon misguidance, and that which *Ahlu-Sunnah* is upon is the truth. The sinner does not become a disbeliever due to his sins if he does not

has revolted and gathered a group behind him, has pulled out his sword and has made lawful the killing of Muslims - it is not fitting for the one who sees this, that he becomes deceived by this person’s recitation of the *Qur’aan*, the length of his standing in Prayer, nor his constant fasting, nor his good and excellent words in knowledge when it is clear to him that this person’s way and methodology is that of the *Khawaarij*.” Refer to *ash-Sharee’ah* (p. 28).

⁷ Imaam ‘Abdur-Rahmaan Ibn Naasir as-Sa’dee (d.1376H) - *rahimahullaah* - said, “As for advice to the *imaams* of the Muslims - and they are their leaders; from the main leader to the ministers and judges, to everyone who is appointed over them with a general or specific type of leadership - then it is to believe (*i’taqad*) in their leadership, and to listen to and obey them. And it entails invoking the people to do likewise, and to strive according to that which is feasible to guide them. And it is to inform them of everything that benefits them and benefits the people, and to the establishment of their obligation.” Refer to *Bahjatul-Quloobil-Abraar* (p. 19).

⁸ Imaam Ibn Abil’Izz (d.729H) - *rahimahullaah* - said, “We do not say about a particular individual from amongst the people of the *Qiblah*, that he is from the people of Paradise, or from the people of the Fire, except about those whom the truthful (*sallallahu ‘alayhi wa sallam*) has informed about, that he is from amongst the people of Paradise, such as the ten who were given glad tidings of Paradise, may Allaah be pleased with them. And if we say that whomsoever Allaah wishes to enter into the Hellfire, from amongst the people who commit major sins will - by necessity - enter the Hellfire, and that he will be brought out of the Hellfire by the intercession of those who are entitled to intercede, then we would refrain from attributing this to a specific individual. So we do not testify for him that he will enter Paradise, nor that he will enter the Hellfire, except due to knowledge, because the reality is hidden, and what an individual dies upon cannot be encompassed by us. However, we do hope for those who do good, and we fear for those who do evil.” Refer to *Sharhul’Aqeedatit-Tahaawiyyah* (p. 378).

declare them lawful. So therefore, the adulterer does not become a disbeliever, and the thief does not become a disbeliever, and the drinker of wine does not become a disbeliever. However, he becomes a disobedient sinner, weak in *eemaan* (faith) upon whom the prescribed punishment must be established.

So he is not declared a disbeliever, except if he declares the sin to be lawful, and he says: Verily it is lawful. And whatever the *Khawaarij* say concerning this is false, their *Takfeer* of the people is false. And due to this, the Prophet (*sallallaahu 'alayhi wa sallam*) said about them, "Verily they leave from Islaam, then they do not return to it, they fight the people of Islaam, and call upon the people of idols."⁹ This is the condition of the *Khawaarij*, due to their extremism, and their ignorance, and their misguidance. So there is no difference whether it is the youth, they blindly follow the *Khawaarij* and the *Mu'tazilah*. Rather, it is obligatory to be upon the way of *Ahlu-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah* in sticking to the *Sharee'ah* proofs, so they suffice with the texts as they have come, and it is not upon them to revolt against the ruler on account of a sin, or sins that have occurred. Rather, it is upon them to sincerely advise him, in written or spoken form, with good manners and wisdom, by debating in a manner that is good; until they succeed, and until the evil is decreased and the good is increased. So these are the texts which have come from the Messenger of Allaah (*sallallaahu 'alayhi wa sallam*),¹⁰ and Allaah the Mighty and Majestic says,

"And by the mercy of Allaah, you were kind and gentle with them. And had you been harsh and hard-hearted with them, they would have broken off from you." [Soorah Aali-'Imraan 5:159]

So the obligation upon those who wish to honour Allaah, and upon the callers to guidance is to stay within the confines of the *Sharee'ah*, and to advise those whom Allaah has placed in authority over them with kind words, wisdom, and good dealings, until they increase in goodness and decrease in evil, and until the callers to Allaah increase, and until they become active in their call, with goodness, not with harshness and severity. And they

⁹ This is part of a *hadeeth* related by Muslim (no. 1067) and Ibn Maajah (1/170).

¹⁰ Imaam Ibn Abee 'Aasim said in *Kitaabus-Sunnah* (2/251), "Chapter: How are the leaders of the common-folk to be advised?" And he related, 'From Shurayh Ibn 'Ubayd al-Hadramee and other than him who said: 'Iyaad Ibn Ghunm was whipping a person of a land which was conquered. So Hishaam Ibn Hakeem spoke harshly with him, until 'Iyaad became angry. So he stayed the night (like this) through the night, then he came to Hishaam Ibn Hakeem and sought an excuse from him. Then Hishaam said to 'Iyaad, 'Have you not heard the Prophet (*sallallaahu 'alayhi wa sallam*) saying, 'Verily the person who shall suffer the severest punishment is the one who is most severe in punishing the people in this world.'" So 'Iyaad Ibn Ghunm said, 'O Hishaam Ibn Hakeem! Indeed we have heard what you have heard, but you have not heard the statement of the Messenger of Allaah (*sallallaahu 'alayhi wa sallam*), 'Whosoever wishes to advise the ruler concerning a matter, then let him not do it openly. Rather, he should take him by the hand and take him into seclusion. So if he accepts his advice, then he has achieved his objective, and if he does not accept from him, then he has still conveyed that which was a duty upon him.' And verily you - O Hishaam - are a reckless fool - therefore, you dare to come out against the ruler of Allaah. So why are you not scared that you may be killed by the ruler, so you will be one who was killed by the ruler of Allaah the Blessed and Exalted!'" In addition to Ibn Abee 'Aasim, this *hadeeth* was also related by Ahmad (3/403), and it was authenticated by Shaykh al-Albaanee in *DhilaalulJannah fee Takhreejis-Sunnah* (no. 1096).

should advise the one whom Allaah has placed over them in authority in many ways which are good and secure, along with supplication for the ruler – openly and in secret – that Allaah will aid him and guide him and give him success upon the good, and that Allaah will help him to leave of the sin that he has committed, and to establish the truth. This is how Allaah is to be called upon and beseeched that He guide the rulers, and aid them upon the truth, and that He helps them along with that to leave the falsehood, and to establish the truth, with beautiful manners and goodness.¹¹ This is how his brothers should sincerely advise, exalt and mention him, until they succeed in calling to that which is good, not with harshness and severity. So with this, the goodness will increase and the evils will decrease, along with Allaah guiding the rulers to goodness, and keeping them steadfast upon it, and there will be a praiseworthy result for the community.”

[Q.3]: ‘If we appoint a *Jamaa’ah* from the *jamaa’aat* to revolt in accordance to the *Sharee’ah*, does this justify fighting those who help the ruler, and everyone who works for that government, like the police, and other then them?’

[A.3]: “I have already informed you earlier that it is not permissible to revolt against the ruler, except under two conditions: **Firstly:** the presence of clear disbelief (*kufr*) from him about which you have a proof from Allaah. **Secondly:** the power and ability to remove the ruler without bringing about a greater evil. And without these two conditions, it is not permissible.”

[Q.4]: ‘May Allaah preserve you, some of the youth have become agitated with the disbelievers who settle in the Islaamic countries, or visit them with due right, and due to that, some of them have declared it lawful to fight them, and to rob them if they see from them that which they disapprove of.’

[A.4]: “It is not permissible to fight the disbelievers who seek protection in the peaceful State, nor is it permissible to fight the sinners, nor to have enmity towards them. Rather, their condition is for the *Sharee’ah* courts to decide, these matters are to be judged by the *Sharee’ah* rule.”

[Q.5]: ‘What if we do not find *Sharee’ah* courts?’

[A.5]: “If you do not find *Sharee’ah* courts, then there is advice only. The advice is for the leaders, and to direct them to goodness, and to co-operate with them until they rule by the Law of Allaah. As for when one is commanding evil in fighting, or raising his hand, or beating, then no. However, the rulers are to be co-operated with in that which is good, until they rule by the *Sharee’ah* of Allaah amongst the servants of Allaah. Indeed it is obligatory to advise him, and it is obligatory to direct them to that which is good, and it is obligatory to oppose the evil with the good. This is obligatory.

¹¹ Imaam Ahmad Ibn Hanbal (d.241H) – *rahimahullaah* – said, “Verily I supplicate for the ruler, for his correctness, success and support – night and day – and I see this as being obligatory upon me.” Refer to *as-Sunnah* (no. 14) of Aboo Bakr al-Khallaal.

“So fear Allaah as much as you are able.” [Sooratut-Taghaabun 64:16]

Since opposing him with the hand will bring about a greater corruption and evil, and anyone who examine the affairs will without a doubt come to know this.”¹²

¹² This section can be found in *Fataawaa al’Ulamaa’ilAkaabir feemaa Ahdira min Dimaa’ filJazaa’ir* (p. 69-76) of Shaykh ‘Abdul-Maalik Ramadaanee al-Jazaa’iree (*hafidhahullaahu ta’aalaa*).

THE FATWAA OF IMAAM IBN BAAZ (D.1420H) CONCERNING PROTESTS AND DEMONSTRATIONS:

Imaam 'Abdul-'Azeez Ibn 'Abdullaah Ibn Baaz - *rahimahullaah* - was asked in Sha'baan of 1412H in the city of Jeddah, 'Are the demonstrations by men and women done against the rulers to be counted from amongst the means (*wasaa'il*) of *da'wah*? And is the one who dies in these rallies and demonstrations to be referred to as a *shaheed* (martyr) in the path of Allaah?'

So the Imaam - *rahimahullaah* - answered, "I do not view the rallies and demonstrations done by women and men to be from the treatment. However, I do see that they are from amongst the causes of *fitan* and from amongst the causes of evil and from amongst the causes of transgression upon some people and to have enmity towards some people without due right. Rather, the *Sharee'ah* means consist of writing letter, advice and calling to goodness by *Sharee'ah* legislated means that the people of knowledge have explained. And the Companions of the Messenger of Allaah (*sallallaahu 'alayhi wa sallam*) and their followers in goodness have all explained these means to be writing letters and speaking along with...¹³ and with the leader and calling him and advising him and writing to him, without publicizing the affair upon the pulpits that he did such and such and such and such emanated from him. And Allaah is the One from whom aid is sought."¹⁴

¹³ A word here is unclear.

¹⁴ Look at the contrast - O *Sunnee* - between the Imaam of Salafiyah, Ibn Baaz (d.1420H) and the *Qutubee* activist Muhammad Saalih al-Munajjid with respect to the affair of rallies and demonstrations. Munajjid was asked by a brother in Sweden about the issue of people protesting for the Muslims in Palestine. Says the Grand *Muftee of Qutubiyyah*, al-Munajjid, "There is nothing wrong with the Muslim community in Sweden protesting in order to reduce the pressure on the Muslims in Palestine and to draw the attention of the Swedish people and government to the crimes which the Jews are committing against the Muslims in Palestine, and using all effective and Islamically-acceptable means of doing so. But demonstrations may involve a number of things which are forbidden in *Sharee'ah*, so it is essential to guard against them. These include women going out wearing adornment and make-up; using music in the demonstration; shouting slogans that are incorrect, such as "Jerusalem is Arab and will remain Arab" (in fact, al-Quds is Islamic and is not for the Arabs only); stopping the demonstration in front of a *kaafir's* tomb and placing bouquets of flowers on his grave; begging the *kaafirs* for help by using phrases that are humiliating to the Muslims; holding up pictures or effigies of people; doing wrong to others such as blocking the road or preventing people from passing by; using slanderous and insulting words that are not permitted in *Sharee'ah*; men and women mixing during the demonstration; imitating the *kuffaar* in any of their unique characteristics such as clothing or symbols that the demonstrators may wear; committing acts of aggression against the property of innocent people, such as destroying their shops or breaking their windows, or starting fires in public facilities, and other *haraam* actions."

COMMENTS: So al-Munajjid does not see any problem with the demonstrations as long as they do not involve the certain prohibited affairs that he mentioned. So the question we have ask al-Munajjid is, has anyone ever witnessed a protest or demonstration completely devoid of these and other prohibited affairs? Then, it must be understood that Shaykh Ibn Baaz answered the question of protests and demonstrations by way of *manhaj*, whereas al-Munajjid avoided reflecting upon the *manhaj* aspect of this act and immediately jumped to the prohibited affairs that might be included within it. So we ask al-Munajjid, can we also

celebrate the birthday of the Prophet (*sallallaahu 'alayhi wa sallam*) if these same prohibited affairs that you mentioned are left out? Obviously, al-Munajjid's answer will be no, as he has already pronounced his *fatwaa* on the *mawlid*. So the reason why al-Munajjid will not celebrate the birthday of the Prophet with the exclusion of these prohibited affairs is because the act in and of itself is an innovation. So what about the demonstrations and protests O Munajjid! Where in the Book and the *Sunnah* did you ever find an evidence for such demonstrations? Rather, you have no evidence O Munajjid! Is there ever a protest or demonstration where the people protested without speaking against the Muslim leaders? Would al-Munajjid have us believe that this protest by the Muslims of Sweden for the brothers in Palestine did not include attacks upon the rulers? How come the issue of speaking against the rulers did not appear in al-Munajjid's list of prohibited affairs that occur within the protests? Whatever the case may be, we shall remind al-Munajjid of the severity of this affair of attacking the honour and backbiting the rulers.

Said Imaam Muhammad Ibn Saalih al'Uthaymeen (d.1421H) - *rahimahullaah* - about the condition of the people with respect to their leaders, "Some of the people speak about the rulers in all of their sittings. They sit and speak about the rulers and find fault with them and broadcast their sins and errors, thereby negating whatever they have of good qualities or correct views. And there is no problem in stating that traversing this path of finding fault with the rulers does not increase the affair, except in severity. Since the problem does not become solved, nor is the affliction lifted. It is only increases the calamity, and obligates hatred for the rulers and dislike for them and leaving off the affairs in which it is obligatory to obey them. And we do not doubt that the rulers commit sins and err, just like those other than them from the children of Aadam. Since all of the children of Aadam are sinners and the best of the sinners are those who repent. Likewise, we also do not doubt that it is not permissible for us to remain silent concerning the person who errs, until we have strived with whatever is available to us in giving *naseehah* (advice, sincerity) to Allaah, His Books, His Messengers, and to the leaders of the Muslims and their common-folk. So since the affair is like that, then we must call him or write him when we see an error from the ruler. So those who advise him in this manner are upon the best of paths in clarifying the truth to them and explaining the truth to them and clarifying their error. Then we admonish them and remind them about what is obligatory upon them in terms of sincerity towards those who are in their care and raising the affliction from them. Then, one must admonish them with the admonishment of the *Qur'aan* and the *hadeeth*. So this is what is required, but if he does not accept the admonishment of the *Hadeeth* and the *Qur'aan*, then we admonish him by reminding him that those under the ruler raise the affair to the ruler so that it may be settled. So if we were to raise the affair to those above whom there is none other from amongst the creation, then they are free from blame concerning that. And nothing else then remains for us to do, except to raise the affair to the Lord of the worlds. And we ask Him to rectify the affairs of the Muslims and their leaders." Taken from *Wujoob Taa'atis-Sultaan fee Ghayri Ma'siyatir-Rahmaan bi Daleelis-Sunnah wal-Qur'aan* (p. 23-24) of Shaykh Muhammad al'Areenee.

Said al'Allaamah Saalih Ibn Fawzaan al-Fawzaan - *hafidhahullaah*, "So speaking against the rulers is *gheebah* (backbiting) and *nameemah* (tale-carrying). These two acts are from the severest of the prohibited affairs after *Shirk*, not to mention that if the backbiting involves the Scholars and the rulers it is even more severe. It brings about corruption and divides the word and it creates an evil view of the rulers and makes the people despair in them." Refer to *al-Ajwibatul-Mufeedah* (p. 60).

Said al'Allaamah Muhammad Ibn Subayyil - *hafidhahullaah*, "*Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah* warn against attacking the rulers and putting them down, or supplicating against them, because this is from the affairs which are from the causes of malice and hatred between the rulers and the constituents. And it is from the causes of arousing *fitan* (trials, tribulations) and differing with the ranks of the *Ummah*." Refer to *al-Addilatul-Shar'iyah fee Bayaan Haqqir-Raa'ee war-Ra'iyah* (p. 325).

THE FATWAA OF IMAAM IBNUL'UTHAYMEEN CONCERNING REVOLT AGAINST THE MUSLIM RULERS:

Said Shaykh 'Abdul-Maalik Ramadaanee al-Jazaa'iree – *hafidhahullaahu ta'aalaa*, 'I asked the Noble Shaykh Ibnul'Uthaymeen about the issue of revolt against the rulers. So he said,

FIRSTLY: It is not permissible to revolt against the rulers and repudiate them, except when they disbelieve with clear disbelief, due to the statement of the Prophet (*sallallaahu 'alayhi wa sallam*), "Except if you see clear disbelief (*kufr bawaah*),"¹⁵ to the end of the hadeeth which is agreed upon.¹⁶

SECONDLY: There must be certain knowledge of their disbelief. And the Scholars are those who decide that. And I am not from those who decide the ruling upon their rulers, because I do not know it. And the previous *hadeeth* continues to state, "that which you have a proof from Allaah about."

THIRDLY: The benefit must be produced and the harm must be removed¹⁷ and the decision concerning this is with the people of knowledge as well.

FOURTHLY: The Muslims must have the power to remove the disbelieving leader."

Then the Shaykh – *rahimahullaah* – gave a golden advice saying, "Whatever the case may be, these words are problematic, because the overwhelming reality is that the might and power is with the governments. So I advise deliberation and *da'wah* with wisdom and the abandonment of entering into these confrontations..."¹⁸

¹⁵ Related by al-Bukhaaree (5/13) and Muslim (6/17)

¹⁶ Reflect upon this and hold onto it with your molar teeth, since the Prophet (*sallallaahu 'alayhi wa sallam*) made *khurooj* (revolt) dependant upon the disbelief of the ruler. And they connect many of the revolutions today to benefit and harm, so in this is clear opposition to the Messenger (*sallallaahu 'alayhi wa sallam*). Then comes the traditional practice of Allaah concerning these people, that everyone who depends upon the benefit and harm for the revolt doubts in the revolt. So look carefully at the wisdom of the *Sharee'ah*!

There is no escape from reminding the reader that I embarked upon quoting the consensus of these three great Scholars – Ibn Baaz, al-Albaanee and Ibnul'Uthaymeen – in relying upon the disbelief as a basis for revolt, until no one could have said otherwise, yet with great regret, it is still said. Said ash-Shawkaanee – *rahimahullaah* – in *as-SaylulJarraar* (4/556), "It is not permissible to revolt against the ruler, no matter how much they transgress, as long as they establish the Prayer and clear disbelief (*kufr bawaah*) is not apparent from them. And the *ahaadeeth* mentioned with this meaning are *mutawaatir* (concurrent). However, it is upon the constituent to obey the ruler in what he commands of obedience to Allaah and to disobey him in whatever he commands of disobedience to Allaah. Since there is no obedience to the creation in disobedience to the creator."

¹⁷ This occurs after fulfilling the first two conditions, since the problem with the benefit and the harm, and likewise the power is that all of that does not resolve anything if the first two conditions are not met. So take note!

¹⁸ I presented this *fatwaa* to the Shaykh and he accepted it. Refer to my book, *Madaarikun-Nadhr* (p.19).

THE FATWAA OF IMAAM IBNUL'UTHAYMEEN CONCERNING PROTESTS AND DEMONSTRATIONS:

Imaam Muhammad Ibn Saalih al'Uthaymeen (d.1421H) - *rahimahullaah* - was asked in Muharram of 1416H, what follows, "What is the *Sharee'ah* ruling concerning what they have called 'staging sit-ins within the mosques' and they - as they claim - rely upon your *fatwaa* concerning the previous conditions of Algeria. They say that it is permissible, as long as there is no controversy or disturbance of the peace. So what is the ruling concerning this and what do you direct us to do?"

So he answered, "As for me, then how much I have been lied against! I ask Allaah to guide the one who lied upon me, until he repents from the likes of what he is upon. It is amazing to see a people doing with, whilst they do not realize what has already occurred in other countries whose youth utilized the likes of these methods! What did they achieve? Have they succeeded in anything?"

Yesterday the London news said that the number of those who were killed from amongst the Algerians throughout the last three years has reached forty thousand!¹⁹ Forty thousand!! This is a great number of Muslims to lose to the events of this chaos! And the first part of the Fire - as you may know - is a spark and then it is an inferno, because when the people hate each other and their rulers as well, and they begin to carry weapons, what will prevent them? So the affair will reach evil and chaos.

Indeed, the Prophet (*'alayhis-salaatu was-salaam*) commanded the one who saw an evil from his leader which he hated, to be patient.²⁰ He said, "Whomsoever dies without a leader dies upon a death of *jaahiliyyah* (pre-Islaamic times of ignorance)."²¹ The obligation upon us is to advise as much as we are able. As for competing in protests and staging public demonstrations, then this is in opposition to the guidance of the *Salaf*. Indeed, now you know that these affairs have no connection to the *Sharee'ah*, nor any connection to rectification. It is nothing except harm...

¹⁹ This was four years ago. As for today, then the statistics reports have indicated that the current number is three times as much! And Allaah knows best about those whose affair is unknown, nor is there any sign of them to be found.

²⁰ He is referring to the statement of the Prophet (*sallallaahu 'alayhi wa sallam*), "Whomsoever sees something from his leader that he dislikes, then let him be patient upon it. So whomsoever separates from the *Jamaa'ah* a hand-span, then he does not die, except a death of *Jaahiliyyah* (pre-Islaamic times of ignorance)." Related by al-Bukhaaree (no. 7054) and Muslim (no. 1849) from the *hadeeth* of Ibn 'Abbaas (*radiyallaahu 'anhu*). Said Shaykhul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah (d.728H) - *rahimahullaah* - commenting upon a *hadeeth* with this meaning, "So this is a prohibition from revolt (*khurooj*) against the rulers, even if he disobeys Allaah." Refer to *Minhaajus-Sunnah* (3/394).

²¹ **Saheeh:** Related by Ahmad (4/96), Ibn Abee 'Aasim in as-Sunnah (no. 1057), Aboo Ya'laa (no. 7357), Ibn Hibbaan (no. 4573) and at-Tabaraanee (17/769) and it is Saheeh. Ahaadeeth have been mentioned with the same meaning by al-Bukhaaree (no. 7053) and Muslim (no. 1747-1751) and other than them.

The Caliph, al-Ma'moon killed everyone from amongst the Scholars who did not speak of the creation of the *Qur'aan*.²² He killed a group of Scholars and the people were forced to say this false statement. We have never heard from Imaam Ahmad (d.241H), nor from other than him from the Scholars, that anyone from amongst them ever staged a sit-in within any mosque, nor have we ever heard that they used to spread the faults of the ruler due to the people having hatred, malice and repudiation for him...

So we do not support the demonstrations and protests and whatever resembles that. We do not support under any circumstances, and rectification is possible without such things. However, there is no escape from the fact that there are hidden matters, inward or outward that are trying to spread these affairs."²³

COMMENTS: Indeed, Imaam Ahmad (d.241H) - *rahimahullaah* - was punished and jailed because he refused to make the preceding statement of disbelief. Despite that, he viewed revolt (*khurooj*) to be unlawful against he who punished him for all of that. Hanbal Ibn Ishaq relates in *Mihnatul-Imaam Ahmad* (p. 70-72), and al-Khallaal in *as-Sunnah* (no. 90) with a *Saheeh isnaad*, that Hanbal said, "During the rule of al-Waathiq, the jurists of Baghdaad gathered in front of Abee 'Abdullaah.²⁴ They included Aboo Bakr Ibn 'Ubayd, Ibraaheem Ibn 'Alee al-Matbakhee and Fadl Ibn 'Aasim. So they came to Abee 'Abdullaah, so I gave them permission. So they said, 'O Abee 'Abdullaah! Indeed, this affair has become aggravated and increased.' They were referring to him making manifest the issue of the *Qur'aan* being created and other than that. So Aboo 'Abdullaah said to them, "So what do you want?" They said, 'We want you to join us in saying that we are not pleased with his rule and leadership.' So Aboo 'Abdullaah debated with them for an hour and he said to them, "Keep opposing it with your statements and do not remove your hands from obedience and do not encourage the Muslims to rebel and do not spill your blood and the blood of the Muslims along with you. Look to the results of your affair. And remain patient until you are content with a righteous or sinful rule." And there was much said in this affair that I do not remember, and they left.

So I entered and my father was with Abee 'Abdullaah as they were leaving. So my father said to Abee 'Abdullaah, "I ask Allaah for safety for us and for the rest of the *Ummah* of Muhammad. And I do not like for anyone to do this." And my father said, "O Abaa 'Abdullaah! Is this correct in you view?"²⁵ He said, 'No, this is in opposition to the *aathaar* (narrations) in which we have been commanded to have patience!' Then Aboo 'Abdullaah mentioned that the Prophet (*sallallaahu 'alayhi wa sallam*) said, "Even if he beats you, then have patience...so be patient."²⁶ End of Ahmad's words.

²² The statement that 'the *Qur'aan* is created' is major *Shirk* by consensus (*ijmaa'*) of the *Salaf*. Refer to *ash-Sharee'ah* (1/489-550).

²³ Taken from the *al-Muslimoon* newspaper (issue 540/p. 10), dated Friday the 11th of *Muharram* 1416H.

²⁴ That is to say, Ahmad Ibn Hanbal.

²⁵ Referring to revolt.

²⁶ Related by Ahmad (5/403) and Muslim (no. 1847)

Reflect upon this puff of enlightenment and this genuine conformity to the *ahaadeeth* of the Prophet (*sallallaahu 'alayhi wa sallam*), yet he did not take revenge for it, even though he – *rahimahullaah* – was called to major disbelief. Rather, he was imprisoned and beaten due to him rejecting it! So where is this sincerity in these riffraff from amongst the activists who make moves without *Sharee'ah* texts and help themselves and stage protests out of a sense of honour for the Religion?! Rather, *gheerah* (sense of honour) for the Religion is only shown by adhering to its texts and regulations.

So it is amazing to see that during the time in which Imaam Ahmad – *rahimahullaah* – prohibited revolt against the leaders, he was incited to revolt by the *khaarijiyyeen* (revolutionists). Indeed, al-Khallaal relates in *as-Sunnah* (no. 115-119) with *asaaneed* that strengthen each other, from them is the narration of Husayn Ibn Saa'igh when he said, "When Baabik commanded (i.e. the one who revolted against Banil'Abbaas), Aboo 'Abdullaah was incited to revolt along with him and he wrote a message along with me to Abul-Waleed and to al-Basrah encouraging mutiny against Baabik." And it is amazing to find that this Baabik al-Khurramee revolted against al-Ma'moon and al-Mu'tasim, and these two were the ones that tried Imaam Ahmad in a severe trial and punished him grievously. So he attempted to stop him, out of submission to the truth, because there is no retreat for the one who desires the truth from ruling by the Book and the *Sunnah*.

So consider carefully his prohibition of revolting against the one who called him to disbelief and used his leadership to deride and punish him. When it became apparent that he was going to revolt against them, he did not hesitate just because he was a person from amongst the constituents. Rather, he encouraged fighting the revolutionary with the leader who was punishing him!! Rather, he – *rahimahullaah* – was of the view that fighting the rebels took precedence over waging war against the disbeliever. Indeed, al-Khallaal relates in *as-Sunnah* concerning Hanbal, "If a man wishes to wage war, yet the *al-Khurramiyyah* (i.e. the followers of Baabik al-Khurramee al-Khaarijee), then which of the two cases do you prefer?" He said, "And where does the man live?" I said, "He lives in this city." So he pointed to the *al-Khurramiyyah*." Meaning, he pointed out that fighting these revolutionists takes precedence. So take note!

Said al'Allaamah Muhammad al-Ameen ash-Shanqeetee (d.1393) – *rahimahullaah* – in *al-Adwaa'ul-Bayaan* (1/57-58), "So the reality in which there is no doubt is that it is not permissible to stand against him unless he has committed clear disbelief (*kufr bawaah*) about which there is an evidence from Allaah..." Then he brought the *ahaadeeth* concerning the topic and said, "So the *ahaadeeth* concerning this are many. So these texts prove the prohibition of standing against him, even though he may have done that which was not permissible. The exception is when he has committed clear disbelief concerning which there is a decisive *Sharee'ah* proof from the Book of Allaah and the *Sunnah* of His Messenger (*sallallaahu 'alayhi wa sallam*) that it is clear disbelief (*kufr bawaah*). That is to say, it must be apparent without any doubt. Indeed, al-Ma'moon, al-Mu'tasim and al-Waathiq called to an innovated statement, that the *Qur'aan* was created. And due to this, the Scholars were fought, beaten and imprisoned and subjected to all kinds of contempt.

However, not one of them spoke of it being obligatory to revolt against them due to that. Yet the affair went on for ten odd years, until al-Mutawakkil was given the caliphate. So the trial was concluded and it was commanded that the *Sunnah* be made manifest.”

Know that the people of knowledge kept away from performing *takfeer* upon the likes of these Caliphs who put the people to trial by the innovation of the creation of the *Qur'aan*, and this is an issue of disbelief, as has preceded. So it stood as a preventative doubt concerning their *takfeer*, not to mention that the footsteps of Prophethood were hidden, ignorance was widespread and falsehood had been beautified by their *muftees* and judges who declared their views to be good. This was because they used to blindly follow a Scholar, and the *madhhab* that they blindly followed was the *madhhab* of their *muftee*, as is known.

Said Shaykul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah (d.728H) – *rahimahullaah*, “Verily the one who was called to the statement was greater than the one who said it, and the one who punished the one who opposed it was greater than the one who merely called to it. And the one who declared its opponent a disbeliever was greater than the one who punished its opponent. Along with this, the ones who were in charge of leadership used to say the statement of the *Jahmiyyah*, that the *Qur'aan* was created and that Allaah could not be seen in the Hereafter and other than that. And they called the people to that and they put the people to trial by that and punished them if they did not answer them and they performed *takfeer* upon those who did not answer. This went to the extent that if they were seized by the leader, he would not release them until they affirmed the statement of the *Jahmiyyah* that the *Qur'aan* was created and other than that. They were not given protection, nor were they given sustenance from the *Baytul-Maal* (treasury), except if they made that statement. Along with this, Imaam Ahmad – *rahimahullaahu ta'aalaa* – was merciful with them and forgave them, since perhaps it was not clear to them that they were rejecting the Messenger (*sallallaahu 'alayhi wa sallam*) and they should not have denied what he came with. However, they had an excuse, so they erred and they blindly followed whomsoever said that to them.”²⁷

Know that general *takfeer* is not like the *takfeer* upon the specific individual. So the one who has fallen into disbelief is not like the one upon whom disbelief has fallen upon, because the ruling of disbelief upon a specific individual differs due to the excuse, doubt or coercion for that person. Due to this, you will find that the *Salaf* performed general *takfeer* upon sects from amongst the Muslims, such as the *Jahmiyyah* and the *Raafidah*. However, they did not specify anyone with *takfeer*, except very large numbers (generally) who were clear in their hideousness, and the Scholars of the *Sunnah* had debated with them and they established the evidence against them, such as Bishr al-Maresee, al-Ja'd Ibn Dirham, Hafs al-Fard and al-Hallaaj.”²⁸

²⁷ *Majmoo'ul-Fataawaa* (23/348-349)

²⁸ Refer to *Majmoo'ul-Fataawaa* (23/349)

Said Shaykhul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah (d.728H) – *rahimahullaah*, “So Imaam Ahmad did not perform *takfeer* upon the specific individuals from amongst the *Jahmiyyah*, nor did he perform *takfeer* upon everyone who said that the *Qur’aan* is created, nor upon everyone who agreed with the *Jahmiyyah* in some of their innovations. Rather, he prayed behind the *Jahmiyyah* who called to their statement and put the people to trial due to it and punished whomever did not agree with them with severe punishments. Ahmad and his likes did not perform *takfeer* upon these people. Rather, he believed in their *eemaan* (faith) and their leadership and he supplicated for them and he was of the view that they were to be followed in the Prayers and *Hajj* and military expeditions were to be made with them. And he prohibited rebellion (*khurooj*) against them, it was never seen from the likes of him from amongst the Scholars. Yet he still opposed whatever they innovated of false statements, since it was great disbelief, even if they did not know it was disbelief. He would oppose it and strive to refute it with whatever was possible. So there must be a combination of obeying Allaah and His Messenger (*sallallahu ‘alayhi wa sallam*) in manifesting the *Sunnah* and Religion and opposing the innovations of the heretical *Jahmiyyah*, and between protecting the rights of the Believers, the leaders and the Ummah, even if they are ignorant innovators and transgressing sinners.”²⁹

So reflect upon this, since it is priceless. And it is with this that one will be saved, by the permission of Allaah, from engrossment in *takfeer* of specific individuals without due right and from using the people of knowledge as a cover in all of this, and from blindly following their affair and from falling short in research about the issue of *takfeer*. So since there is no escape from anything within that, then one must combine like the *Salaf* combined, then he will reach salvation by the permission of Allaah. And not to mention *takfeer* of the rulers, since its affair has already preceded, and therefore its effects are not of great importance right now. It has already been mentioned by al’Allaamah al-Albaanee and I have also explained from various angles. And Allaah is the Guardian.³⁰

Imaam Muhammad Naasirud-Deen al-Albaanee (d.1420H) – *rahimahullaah* was asked, “Is that which is known nowadays as a military coup against the ruler, mentioned in the Religion, or is it an innovation?”

So the Shaykh answered, “There is no basis for these actions in Islaam. And it is in opposition to the Islaamic *manhaj* with respect to the *da’wah* and creating the right atmosphere for it. Rather, it is only an innovation introduced by the innovators, which has influenced some Muslims. This is what I have stated and explained in my notes to al’Aqeedatut-Tahaawiyyah.”³¹

²⁹ *Majmoo’ul-Fataawaa* (7/507-508)

³⁰ The preceding comments were the words of Shaykh ‘Abdul-Maalik Ramadaanee (*hafidhahullaahu ta’aalaa*), taken from his book *Fataawaa al’Ulamaa’ilAkaabir feemeel Ahdira Min Dimaa’ filJazaa’ir* (p. 140-143).

³¹ Refer to the *alAsaalah* magazine (issue 10).