

Amr bi al-Ma'rūf wa al-Nahi 'an al-Munkar

•◆•

Commanding Ma'rūf and Forbidding Munkar, Part 1

Introduction and stating the first opinion on the matter and mentioning those who held it

The entire Ummah has agreed upon the obligation of commanding Ma'rūf and forbidding Munkar. There has never been any disagreement regarding this. Allāh said:

"And let there be (arising) from you a nation inviting to (all that is) khayr, commanding Ma'rūf and forbidding Munkar, and those will be the successful"

[Surah Aal-Imran ayah 104]

- Ma'rūf literally means known, recognised, decent, good, pleasant.
- Munkar literally means immoral behaviour, vice, wrongdoing and the opposite of virtue.

The disagreement is regarding how Ma'rūf is commanded and Munkar forbidden.

◆ First opinion

The first opinion is to implement this by hating it with the heart (qalb) and then to speak out (i.e. lisān/tongue) if one has the ability. Never by physical force or combat (i.e. yad/hand).

Those who held this opinion from the Ahl us-Sunnah are some of the Companions and those who came after them as well as those who came later. This includes; Sa'd ibn Abī Waqqās, Usāmah ibn Zayd, Ibn 'Umar, Muhammad ibn Maslamah, Ahmad bin Hanbal. This was also the opinion of Abū Bakr ibn Kaysān from the Mu'tazilah and the opinion of all the Rawāfid, and they believe this even if they are to be killed, except when the Mahdī emerges, then it becomes obligatory upon them to fight alongside him.

Those who held this opinion from the Ahl al-Sunnah only held the opinion if the leader was not 'Adl (just). They claim to follow the example of 'Uthmān, the aforementioned Companions, and those Companions who did not participate in the affairs of 'Alī, Mu'āwiyah, and 'Ā'ishah. However, all of those with this opinion from Ahl Al-Sunnah agreed upon fighting alongside a 'Adl (just) ruler against a Fāsiq (rebellious sinner) that rose up against the ruler.

Ibn 'Umar is reported to have said:

"If I knew which group was transgressing, no one would precede me in fighting them."

Ibn Hazm commented:

"There is no other way to regard the Companions"

Meaning, to say that the Companions would let tyranny win over a just ruler, or to allow tyranny, would be degrading the virtues of the Companions.

•◆•

Commanding Ma'rūf and Forbidding Munkar, Part 2

On the second opinion and mentioning those who held them

◆ Second opinion

Some of Ahl al-Sunnah, the rest of the Mu'tazilah, all of the Khawārij, and the Zaydiyyah considered that unsheathing the sword to command the Ma'rūf and forbid Munkar is Wājib if there is no other way to remove the Munkar. If the people upon the truth are able to fight without losing hope of victory then it is Fard upon them, but if they are weak, with little to no hope of victory, then they may leave off using the Yad (hand, physical means) to change Munkar.

This was the opinion of 'Alī ibn Abī Tālib, those with him from the Sahābah, the opinion of the Mother of the Believers 'Ā'ishah, Talhah, az-Zubayr and those with them from the Companions, the opinion of Mu'āwiyah, 'Amr, an-Nu'mān ibn Bashīr and those with them from the Companions.

Whilst they fought each other, each group believed they were implementing the obligation of the Yad (hand, physical means).

This was also the opinion of 'Abdullāh ibn az-Zubayr, al-Hasan ibn 'Alī and the rest of the Companions from the Muhājirīn and the Ansar who fought on the Day of Harrah, it is the opinion of all those who stood up against al-Hajjāj the Fāsiq and those of the Companions he appointed, like Anas ibn Mālik, those who fought were from the best of the Tābi'īn, like 'Abd ur-Rahmān ibn Abī Layla, Sa'id ibn Jubayr, Abāl Bakktārī at-Tā'i, 'Atā' as-Sulamī, al-Hasan al-Basrī, Mālik ibn Dīnār, Muslim ibn Bashār, Abul-Haurā', as-Sha'bī, 'Abdullāh ibn Ghālib, 'Uqbah ibn 'Abd al-Ghāfir, 'Uqbah ibn Sahbān, Māhān, al-Muttarif ibn al-Mughīrah ibn Shu'bah, Abul-Ma'ad, Hanzalah ibn 'Abdullāh, Abus-Suhh al-Hanā'i, Talq ibn Habīb, al-Muttarif ibn 'Abdullāh ibn as-Sakhīr, an-Nadr ibn Anas, 'Atā' ibn as-Sā'ib, Ibrāhīm ibn Yazīd at-Taymī, Abul-Hausa, Jibillah ibn Zahr, and others.

And those of the Tābi' Tābi'īn like: 'Abdullāh ibn 'Abd ul-'Azīz ibn 'Abdullāh ibn 'Umar, Muhammad ibn 'Ajlān, and those who fought alongside Muhammad ibn 'Abdullāh ibn al-Hasan, Hāshim ibn Bishr, Matar, and those who fought alongside Ibrāhīm ibn 'Abdullāh,

and it is the opinion indicated by the Fuqahā like Abū Hanīfah, al-Hasan ibn Huyay, Sharīk, Mālik, Al-Shāfi'i, Dāwūd al-Dhāhiri, and their companions.

All of those we mentioned above either explicitly stated this opinion or they proved their adherence to it by physically fighting against a Munkar.

•◆•

Commanding Ma'rūf and Forbidding Munkar, Part 3

On the evidences of the first group and their usage of it

◆ Evidences for the first opinion

The first group uses the following Ahādīth as evidences:

- [A] The Hadith: “Do we fight them Oh Messenger of Allāh?” He said “No, not as long as they pray”
- [B] A variation of the previous Hadith: “No, not until you see clear Kufr from them and have proof from Allāh”
- [C] Ahādīth containing the obligation to accept being beaten and wealth being taken
- [D] Some mention the Hadīth “If you fear the sword's glimmer, then throw your garment over your face and say: I want you to assume my sins and your sins, then you will be from Ashāb an-Nār (Companion of the Fire)”
- [E] Or Narrations saying “be Allāh’s slave that was killed, not Allāh’s slave that was a killer”
- [F] And some used the words of Allāh “And recite to them the story of Adām's two sons, in truth, when they both made an offering (to Allāh), and it was accepted from one of them but was not accepted from the other. Said (the latter), “I will surely kill you.” Said (the former), “Indeed, Allāh only accepts from the righteous (who fear Him)””

◆ Usage of the evidences

- Both A and B are used to suggest that so long as the leader is a Muslim, we must not fight back.
- Point C is used to suggest sabr and acceptance when being beaten or wealth being taken.
- Points D, E, and F are used to suggest that patience and acceptance in the moment of imminent death in the hands of a killer, or that to be killed, is better than fighting back.

They have nothing here to establish proof. We will now mention herein some clauses thereof that should suffice, and by Allāh we are empowered.

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

•◆•

Commanding Ma'rūf and Forbidding Munkar, Part 4

On the explanation of the first group's usage of evidences and the sufficient refutations on what is wrongly understood from it.

As for the Prophet's صلى الله عليه وسلم command to have patience when one's wealth is taken and back beaten, then undoubtedly that is in regards to when the imām (leader) has a right to do so. There is no doubt that it is Fard (obligatory) for us to have patience and comply even if it is a (justified) beheading. The one who is about to be beheaded must comply, otherwise he is a Fāsiq. But if it is for an invalid reason (to behead), may Allāh save us from thinking that the Messenger of Allāh would command us to comply with Munkar.

The proof of this is that Allāh said:

“And cooperate in righteousness and piety, and do not cooperate in sin and aggression”
[Surah al-Ma'idah ayah 2]

And we know that the speech of the Messenger of Allāh صلى الله عليه وسلم does not contradict the speech of his lord since it is revelation. Allāh said:

“Nor does he speak from his desire. It is a revelation revealed”
[Surah al-Najm ayah 3-4]

And Allah said:

“If it had been from other than Allāh, they would have found within it much contradiction”
[Surah al-Nisa ayah 82]

So it's correct to say that whatever Allāh's Messenger صلى الله عليه وسلم said is itself Wahy (revelation) from Allāh, and it does not contradict itself. As such, it is certain without doubt and known by every Muslim that taking the wealth of a Muslim or a Dhimmī (people of the book living under a Khilāfah) without right and striking his back without right is sin and transgression and Harām. As the Messenger of Allāh صلى الله عليه وسلم said:

“Verily, your blood, and your property, and your honor, are Harām (sacred)...”
[Mutafaqun Alayh (agreed upon by Bukhari and Muslim)]

Since there is no doubt in this and not one of the Muslims disagrees with this, therefore, the Muslim whose wealth is taken unjustly and his back is struck unjustly, while he is able to prevent this, and he allows it: then he is assisting his oppressor upon sin and transgression, and this is harām according to the text of the Qurʻān and Sunnah.

◆ Summary

- This refutation, refutes the evidences of the first group previously mentioned (A), (B), (C).
- We pointed out that both the Speech of the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ and the Speech of Allāh cannot contradict one another. Rather the correct understanding, that which does not contradict, is that patience and acceptance of having one's wealth taken or back beaten, is only obligatory when the one taking or beating has the right to do so.
- Having patience or complying to an oppressor's unjust actions (taking wealth or striking), when the person is able to prevent this, is actually a detested and immoral action and not virtue, for the one being oppressed had assisted the oppressor in sin.
- An example was given of a man who is about to be beheaded unjustly, he mustn't just comply and have patience when he is able to prevent this Munkar with his Yad.
- The sanctity of both Muslims and the Dhimmis must be protected, and harming it is a Munkar.

•◆•

Commanding Ma'rūf and Forbidding Munkar, Part 5

On the refutation of the rest of the arguments, and the proofs for the second group

As for the other Ahādīth we mentioned. As well as the story of the two sons of Adam then there is no argument to be made with these.

Regarding the story of Adam's two sons, then that was a Sharī'ah (legal system, Islāmic law) different from our Sharī'ah. Our Sharī'ah is the Sharī'ah of Rasulallah ﷺ, not the Sharī'ah of the previous prophets.

Allāh said:

"...For each we made a Shir'ah and a Minhaj (way)..."

[Surah al-Ma'idah ayah 48]

◆ Evidences for the second opinion

Allāh's Messenger said:

"Whoever of you saw a Munkar, he must then change it by his yad (hand) if he is able; if he is unable, then by his lisān (tongue); if he is unable, then by his qalb (heart); and that is the weakest of īmān (faith, conviction)"

[Muslim, Kitab al-Iman, Hadith 84]

And Rasulallah ﷺ said:

"There is no obedience in disobedience (to Allāh); obedience is only in obedience (to Allāh); each of you must listen and obey as long as you are not ordered with disobedience; if you are ordered with disobedience, there is no listening and no obeying"

[Bukhari, Kitab al-Ahkam, Hadith 8]

A person came to Rasulallah ﷺ and said:

"Oh Messenger of Allah, what do you think if a man comes to me in order to take my property? He (the Prophet) said: Don't give him your property. He (the inquirer) said: What if he fights me? He (the Prophet) said: Fight him. He (the inquirer) said: What do you think if I am killed? He (the Prophet) said: You would be a martyr. He (the inquirer) said: What about if I kill him. He (the Prophet) said: He would be in the Fire."

[Muslim, Kitab al-Iman, Hadith 267]

Allah said:

"Let there arise out of you a group of people inviting to all that is good, enjoining Al-Ma'rūf and forbidding Al-Munkar. And it is they who are the successful."

[Surah Aal-Imran ayah 104]

The Dhāhir (apparent) of the aforementioned reports is that they contradict the reports mentioned before (Ahādīth used by the first group). Therefore, one of these collection of reports abrogated the other, there is no other possibility to reconcile the reports. If a person reads all these reports and then concludes that Amr bil Ma'ruf and Nahy an Munkar is obligatory with the Yad but that the rulers are exempt from it, then that person has come with an innovation like the innovations of the people of Ra'iy, for with this same logic we can say that if the ruler were to take a man's concubines then it wouldn't be allowed to prevent him from that. Concubines fall under Maal (property) and according to these people, it is Haram to forbid evil if the ruler takes your Maal.

◆ How is the Nasikh (abrogating) and Mansukh (abrogated) determined?

We must determine which of the two collection of reports are the Nāsikh (the abrogating, that which supersedes the previous rulings), and we know that those Ahādīth in which is found the prohibition to fight are in accordance with the established principle; which is that we must look at what was the Asl (original situation) of the believers. And we can see that the first Ahādīth are in accordance with the condition of Muslims in the beginning of Islām without a doubt (in which they weren't ordered to fight yet). So these latter Ahādīth bring an addition to the Sharī'ah, specifically: Qitāl (fighting). There is no doubt in this, so the abrogation of the former Ahādīth is verified and their ruling is lifted and abrogated the moment the Rasul ﷺ spoke the latter.

It is dangerously forbidden to accept the Mansūkh (abrogated, that which is superseded by rulings and revelations that came after) and to abandon the Nāsikh (the abrogating texts, i.e the new and final rulings). This is to accept doubt and to abandon certainty, and whoever alleges that the latter reports were Nāsikh but then became Mansūkh again, has alleged something false and has pursued that of which he has no knowledge, and has ignorantly spoken against Allāh, and this is not allowed.

•◆•

Commanding Ma'rūf and Forbidding Munkar, Part 6

Continuation of proofs

Another proof is that Allāh said:

“And if two groups of the Believers fight one another, then reconcile between them, then if one of them transgresses against the other, then fight those who transgressed until they return.”

[Surah al-Hujurat ayah 9]

And no two Muslims disagree that this Āyah, which contains the obligation of fighting against the transgressing group, is itself Muhkam (decisive, final and conclusive) and it is not Mansūkh (abrogated). Instead, it is the evidence which governs how all the other Ahādīth on this subject are understood. Whatever is in accordance with this Āyah (of fighting against transgressors), then it is Nāsikh (abrogating text). And whatever contradicts this Āyah, it is Mansūkh (abrogated text) and its ruling is lifted. And as stated earlier, there is no known disagreement about this Ayah being Muhkam.

Some people claimed that this Āyah and these Ahādīth are in reference to bandits and not to the Sultān (authority figure).

This is assuredly false, it is an opinion without proof. This claimant could say that it refers to any people and not another people, or to any time period and not another, but there is no proof for that, so it is not correct. Takhsīs (making a specific ruling out of a general text) is not permitted without proof, because that is to speak against Allāh without knowledge. There is no evidence for their Takhsīs that this verse is specifically for bandits only, so the Ayah remains 'Aam (general) as is the basis.

It is also authentic that Rasulallah said:

"The Muslim is the brother of the Muslim, he does not oppress him, nor does he surrender him..."

[Muttafaqun Alayh (agreed upon by Bukhari and Muslim)]

It is also authentic that Rasulallah said about Zakāh:

“Whoever is asked for it correctly must give it, whoever is asked for it incorrectly must not give it.”

[Nakhb al-Afkar 16/554]

And this invalidates the interpretation of those who interpret the Ahādīth regarding Qitāl (fighting and killing) for one's property as being against bandits, since bandits do not ask for Zakāh. Rather the Sultān (authority figure) is the only one who asks for it.

As for the case of 'Uthmān which they brought as evidence, they try to say with this that 'Uthmān remained patient. Yet 'Uthmān had no idea they were going to kill him, he only saw them laying siege. Further, he was a just ('Adl) ruler and even these people consider fighting alongside the just ruler as obligatory (i.e they affirm obligation of the Yad when it comes to aiding a just ruler). They have no argument using the situation of 'Uthmān.

Some have said that Amr bil Ma'ruf and Nahy an Munkar against a ruler with the Yad would cause violations, bloodshed, taking of properties, tearing of veils, the dissolution of power, widespread chaos and fitnah, etc.

We respond to them by saying that it is not permissible for the one who is commanding al-Ma'ruf and forbidding al-Munkar to violate a sanctuary nor to take wealth without right nor to confront one who does not do Munkar, if he did these things then he himself should be restrained with the Yad. As for the people of Munkar killing others, or taking their wealth, or violating sanctuaries, then this is all the Munkar which people need to change with the Yad first and foremost, no matter who it is. And if having fear of the things mentioned above restricts changing the Munkar and commanding Al-Ma'ruf, then this would identically restrict conducting Jhad against Ahl al-Harb (the people of war), in fact Jhad may even bring more calamities, yet no Muslim would ever say this for it would effectively eliminate the possibility of Jhad unless the Muslims possess power that'd ensure all-time victory. And this is not what occurs during Jhad, rather the Muslims witness victories and also calamities. Yet the obligation of Jhad still remains and there is no disagreement about this. Additionally, they accept the verse:

"How often a small group overcame a mighty group by Allah's will?..."

[Surah al-Baqarah ayah 249]

•◆•

Commanding Ma'rūf and Forbidding Munkar, Part 7

Last questions and arguments against the first group, and the conclusion of the two views.

If we were to ask them:

“What do you say about a Sultān who puts the Jews in charge, makes the Christians his army, forces the Muslims to pay the Jizyah, raises weapons against Muslim children, demands Muslim women to fornicate, fights against Muslims, captures their women and children, and is publicly perverse with them. But in all of that, he still agrees with Islām outwardly and he continues to pray?”

If they say that it is not permissible to rise against him, then we ask them:

"But he will continue killing Muslims until he is the only one who remains, him and the people of Kufr along with him."

If they say advocate for having sabr in that situation, they would have opposed Islām. But, if they affirm the obligation to rise against such a tyrant (and this is their actual opinion) then we continue to ask them:

"What if he killed only ninety percent of the Muslims or all of them except one of them and captured their women and took their wealth".

If they reject standing against him, they contradict themselves, but if they still agree, then we continue to ask them about killing fewer and fewer Muslims, whilst they continue to agree with standing against him, until we reach the killing of a single Muslim, or the capture of a single woman, or the taking of a single person's wealth (unjustly), or the oppressive violation of someone's skin (through whipping). If they distinguish between any of that, they contradict themselves and make rulings without evidence, which is not allowed. But if they obligate a physical response to all of that, they return to the truth.

We further ask them about one whose wife, daughter, son and himself are to be abducted by a corrupt Sultān so that he could be sexually perverse with them. Should he surrender

himself, his wife, his son, and his daughter to this evil or is it Fard upon him to defend against whoever wanted this?

If they say that it is Fard upon him to surrender himself and his family, they have said something terrible that no Muslim says. But if they say that it is Fard upon him to fight, then they return to the truth and they must say the same thing about every Muslim, i.e. defending each other (as all Muslims are brothers) in person and property.

The obligation, if anything of tyranny occurs, no matter how small, is to speak to the Imām (leader) about it and to forbid it. Then if he takes heed, returns to the truth, and yields to having his own skin struck (for his tyranny), or his hand cut (if he stole), or the punishment of Zina, false accusation, drinking wine, etc. If he agrees to submit to the Hudud, then he is not to be removed from office; he is the Imām, just as he was before, and removing him is not permissible. But if he neglected to submit to anything of these obligations (of having the Hadd carried out against him) and he did not return to the truth, then removing him is obligatory and someone who will establish the truth must be put in his place, this is as Allāh Ta'āla said:

“And cooperate in righteousness and piety, and do not cooperate in sin and transgression”
[Surah al-Ma'idah ayah 2]

And it is not permissible to forfeit anything from the obligations of the Sharī'ah, and with Allāh Ta'āla is success.

◆ Summary

- There is no difference in a Sultān killing large amounts of Muslims or a single Muslim, even if he is practicing Islām outwardly (praying, fasting, etc).
- The Sultān must be warned of his transgression, and if he accepts his mistakes and he is punished for his mistakes, he remains the Imām. If he continues with his transgression, he must be fought, stripped of his leadership, and replaced. And even after he is replaced he is still fought until he is punished for his wrongdoings. This is in-line with all the evidences we mentioned.



والحمد لله رب العالمين

<https://thewahy.com>

<https://t.me/thewahy>

