

The Shariah Rulings Regarding Khurooj Rebellion Against Rulers

(Part 1)

(Translated)

Dr. Mahmoud Abdelhadi

<https://www.al-waie.org/archives/article/18244>

Issue No. 429

37th Year, Shawwal 1443 AH, corresponding to May 2022

Introduction

What is meant by Khurooj rebellion against rulers is breaking their allegiance, revoking their right to obedience, and confronting them to overthrow them, even by force. This matter has its precise rulings and conditions due to its significance and potential danger. There must be a general awareness of this within the Ummah, just as there must be an awareness of its right to sovereignty and its responsibility for upholding Sharia law. The Ummah's awareness of its rights and responsibilities in maintaining the application of Islam, and activating the means to achieve that, is the strongest guarantee for preserving the Islamic governance system. Another important guarantee is the piety and justice of the ruler himself. However, the Khaleefah is not infallible, whilst the Ummah may fall short in fulfilling its role, and its institutions may fail in their responsibilities, allowing the Khaleefah to continue his violations. He may even take measures that enable him to control the powers of the Ummah, disregarding accountability or objections, and engaging in deceit and manipulation.

This gradually happened after the era of the Rightly Guided Khaleefahs, beginning with the coercion to pledge allegiance to Yazid bin Muawiyah bin Abu Sufyan [1], leading to the transformation of the Khilafah into a hereditary system [2]. This situation necessitates the intervention of the judiciary specialized in disputes with the Khaleefah. If the judiciary rules against the Khaleefah in any matter, its ruling is binding. If the Khaleefah complies with the ruling, then the matter is resolved. However, if he refuses and fortifies himself with his influence, the relationship between him and the Ummah shifts from love, kindness, and mutual counsel to resentment, suspicion, and oppression. He would then have violated the principles of the sovereignty of Sharia and the authority of the Ummah, effectively becoming a usurper of power. In such a situation, where all other mentioned means to preserve the application of Islam have failed, it becomes necessary to depose the ruler. This is where the issue of Khurooj rebellion against him arises, to overthrow him and his accomplices in oppression, in violating the sovereignty of Sharia, and in infringing upon the authority of the Ummah. Based on the indications of the texts that command obedience to the Khaleefah, and patience with what people may dislike from him, the decision to depose him is extremely delicate.

This matter carries significant risks due to the differing opinions on when it is permissible to annul a ruler's allegiance and disobey him, as well as the potential consequences of making Khurooj rebellion against him, such as bloodshed, destruction, and civil strife. Because of this, some opinions emerged advocating for the necessity of obeying a ruler who seizes power by force and overcomes others. Additionally, certain religious texts were adapted and interpreted in ways that they were never meant to be, in order to justify the ruler's tyranny and autonomous actions, as though he were an independent sovereign. This led to the acceptance of the idea that someone who seizes power in a region, or a wilayah province, and imposes himself as its ruler can be considered a legitimate leader or emir, within the Khilafah system.

The term "sultans" was applied to some governors in certain periods, and even to some ministers. As a result, the prevailing Islamic political thought no longer accurately reflected what was ordained by Shariah. Instead, it became a mix of what Shariah prescribed and

what had become the reality. In some aspects, it became more a reflection of the reality than of Shariah. It became common for the Khaleefah to appoint someone who had seized control of a wilayah province as its wali governor, thus maintaining the appearance of a legitimate rule! This practice was then considered to be preserving Sharia and safeguarding the religion.

Al-Mawardi stated that general governance has two types, إمارَةٌ استكفاءً بعقدٍ عن اختيار، وإمارَةٌ استيلاءً بعقدٍ عن اضطرار... أما إمارَةٌ الاستيلاء التي تُعقد عن اضطرارٍ فهي أن يستولي الأمير بالقوة على بلادٍ يقبضه الخليفة إمارتها، ويُفوض إليه تدبيرها وسياستها، فيكون الأمير باستيلائه مستبداً بالسياسة والتدبير، والخليفة بإذنه منقداً لأحكام الدين ليخرج من الفساد إلى الصحة ومن الحظر إلى الإباحة. وهذا وإن خرج عن عُرفِ التقليد المطلق في شروطه وأحكامه، ففيه من حفظ القوانين الشرعية وحراسة الأحكام الدينية، ما لا يجوز أن يُترك مختلاً مدخولاً، ولا فاسداً معلولاً، فجاز فيه مع الاستيلاء “An Imarah of choice, contracted by agreement, and an Imarah of force, contracted out of compulsion... As for the Imarah of force, which is contracted out of compulsion, it occurs when a ruler seizes control of a land and the Khaleefah appoints him as its wali, delegating its management and policies to him. In such a case, the ruler, by his forceful seizure, becomes independent in governance and policy, whilst the Khaleefah, by his permission, implements the rulings of the Deen, in order to transition from corruption to soundness, and from prohibition to permissibility. Although this deviates from the absolute norms of appointment in its conditions and rulings, it preserves the Shariah laws and safeguards the Shariah rulings in a way that must not be neglected or corrupted. Therefore, what is prohibited in an appointment of choice becomes permissible in one of force and compulsion, due to the difference between the conditions of capability and incapacity.” [3]

This explains the emergence of opinions that justice is a prerequisite for the initial appointment of the Khaleefah, but not necessarily for his continuation in office.

The issue of Khurooj rebellion against rulers has been a subject of discussion and disagreement, both in the past and present. It is notable that the more widespread opinion is the one that prohibits Khurooj rebellion against rulers, regardless of their actions. This is largely due to rulers who are keen on holding onto power and its benefits, even at the expense of violating Shariah. These rulers promote ideas that suit their desires, suppress those that do not, and accuse those who permit Khurooj rebellion against them of extremism and causing unrest. This has led to fear of oppression and repression, the silencing of the voice of truth, and the emergence of opinions and fatwas that are pleasing to the rulers. These views are then given platforms in sermons and the media, and are granted access to educational forums and institutions. Consequently, the Ummah has become ignorant of the fact that authority belongs to it, and a prevailing opinion has spread that it is not permissible to annul the allegiance to the Khaleefah, or to revolt against him, as long as he does not commit blatant disbelief or as long as he prays. It is believed that obedience to him is obligatory, no matter how immoral or negligent he may be, and that patience with him is required, no matter how tyrannical or oppressive he becomes, under the pretext that rebellion would lead to greater evils than those already present [4].

Discussion of Opinions on the Dismissal of Rulers and Revolting Against Them

Islamic law has clearly defined the conditions under which it is permissible to revolt against rulers.

- In a hadith narrated by Ubadah ibn al-Samit (ra), he said, «دَعَانَا النَّبِيُّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ فَبَايَعَنَا، فَقَالَ فِيمَا أَخَذَ عَلَيْنَا أَنْ بَايَعْنَا عَلَى السَّمْعِ وَالطَّاعَةِ فِي مَنْشَطِنَا وَمَكْرَهِنَا، وَعُسْرِنَا وَيُسْرِنَا، وَأَثَرَةَ عَلَيْنَا، وَأَنْ لَا نُنَازِعَ الْأَمْرَ أَهْلَهُ إِلَّا أَنْ تَرَوْا كُفْرًا بَوَاحًا عِنْدَكُمْ مِنَ اللَّهِ فِيهِ بُرْهَانٌ» **“The Prophet (saw) called us and we pledged allegiance to him. He took from us a pledge to listen and obey in what we like and dislike, in our ease and hardship, and in preference over ourselves, and that we would not dispute the authority of those in charge unless you see clear disbelief (kufr bawah) for which you have proof from Allah.”** (Reported in Sahih Muslim)

• Another narration by Awf ibn Malik al-Ashja'i (ra) states that he heard the Messenger of Allah (saw) say, «خَيْرُ أَمْتِكُمُ الَّذِينَ تُحِبُّونَهُمْ وَيُحِبُّونَكُمْ، وَيُصَلُّونَ عَلَيْكُمْ وَتُصَلُّونَ عَلَيْهِمْ، وَشِرَارُ أَمْتِكُمُ الَّذِينَ تُبْغِضُونَهُمْ وَيُبْغِضُونَكُمْ، وَتَلْعَنُونَهُمْ وَيَلْعَنُونَكُمْ» قِيلَ: يَا رَسُولَ اللَّهِ، "أَفَلَا تُنَادِيهِمْ بِالسَّيْفِ؟" فَقَالَ: "لَا، مَا أَقَامُوا فِيكُمْ الصَّلَاةَ، وَإِذَا رَأَيْتُمْ مِنْ وُلَاتِكُمْ شَيْئًا تَكْرَهُونَهُ، فَانْكُرُوهُ عَمَلُهُ، وَلَا تَنْزِعُوا يَدًا مِنْ طَاعَةٍ» **"The best of your leaders are those whom you love and who love you, and who pray for you and you pray for them. And the worst of your leaders are those whom you hate and who hate you, and whom you curse and who curse you."** It was said, "O Messenger of Allah, should we not fight them with the sword?" He said, **"No, as long as they establish prayer among you. If you see something from your rulers that you dislike, then dislike their action but do not withdraw your obedience."** (Reported in Sahih Muslim)

• Additionally, in a narration from Umm Salama (ra), the Prophet (saw) said, «سَتَكُونُ أَمْرَاءُ فَتَعْرِفُونَ وَتُنْكِرُونَ، فَمَنْ عَرَفَ بَرِيءًا، وَمَنْ أَنْكَرَ سَلِيمًا، وَلَكِنْ مِنْ رَضِيَ وَتَابَعَ» قَالُوا: "أَفَلَا نَقَاتِلُهُمْ؟" قَالَ: "لَا، مَا صَلَّوْا" **"There will be rulers, and you will recognize some of their actions and disapprove of others. Whoever recognizes and disapproves has absolved himself, but whoever is pleased and follows, he is not absolved."** The Companions (ra) asked, "Shall we not fight them?" He said, **"No, as long as they pray."** (Reported in Sahih Muslim)

These three hadiths indicate the conditions under which it is permissible to revolt against rulers. Some jurists have concluded that Khurooj rebellion against the Imam is not allowed unless he commits clear and undeniable disbelief (kufr) that cannot be interpreted in any other way. Others have interpreted the condition to refer to serious sin (ma'siya) rather than disbelief. In both cases, it should be something certain and not open to interpretation.

Some jurists have taken the hadith, «لَا، مَا صَلَّوْا» **"No, as long as they pray,"** literally, concluding that no matter what the Khaleefah does, it is not permissible to depose or rebel against him, as long as he establishes the five daily Salah prayers. Supporters of this view also rely on texts that command patience in the face of injustice or undesirable actions by rulers, such as the previously mentioned hadith of Awf ibn Malik al-Ashja'i, as well as the hadith narrated by Abdullah ibn Mas'ud (ra), where the Prophet (saw) said, «إِنَّهَا سَتَكُونُ بَعْدِي أَثَرَةٌ وَأُمُورٌ تُنْكِرُونَهَا، قَالُوا: يَا رَسُولَ اللَّهِ، كَيْفَ تَأْمُرُ مَنْ أَدْرَكَ مِنْ ذَلِكَ؟ قَالَ: تَوَدُّونَ الْحَقَّ الَّذِي عَلَيْكُمْ، وَتَسْأَلُونَ اللَّهَ الَّذِي لَكُمْ» **"After me, there will be favoritism and matters you will disapprove of."** They asked, **"O Messenger of Allah, what do you command us to do if we encounter that?"** He replied, **"Fulfill your obligations and ask Allah for your rights."** (Reported in Sahih Muslim).

After careful consideration, it becomes clear that this opinion is incorrect because deriving a Shariah legal ruling in any matter, requires taking into account all the relevant legal texts. It is not permissible for a jurist to focus on some texts, while ignoring others, as the texts clarify each other. It is established in the Usool of Jurisprudence that a jurist must not issue a ruling based on general evidence, if there is a likelihood that specific evidence exists that might alter the ruling. This is especially true when the specific texts are well-known to ulema and widely recognized, or when they pertain to fundamental principles of Shariah, such as the obligation to rule by all that Allah (swt) has revealed, the prohibition of injustice and usurpation, and the duty to remove evil.

For example, the Prophet (saw) said, «إِنَّ النَّاسَ إِذَا رَأَوْا الظَّالِمَ فَلَمْ يَأْخُذُوا عَلَى يَدَيْهِ أَوْشَكَ أَنْ يَعْمَهُمُ اللَّهُ» **"When the people see an oppressor and do not restrain him, Allah is likely to inflict punishment upon them all."** (Reported in Sunan Abi Dawood)

He (saw) also said, «مَنْ رَأَى مِنْكُمْ مُنْكَرًا فَلْيُغَيِّرْهُ بِيَدِهِ فَإِنْ لَمْ يَسْتَطِعْ فَبِلِسَانِهِ، فَإِنْ لَمْ يَسْتَطِعْ فَبِقَلْبِهِ، وَذَلِكَ أَضْعَفُ الْإِيمَانِ» **"Whoever among you sees an evil, let him change it with his hand; if he is not able, then with his tongue; and if he is not able, then with his heart, and that is the weakest of Iman."** (Reported in Sahih Muslim)

He (saw) further said, «وَالَّذِي نَفْسِي بِيَدِهِ لَتَأْمُرَنَّ بِالْمَعْرُوفِ وَتَنْهَوْنَ عَنِ الْمُنْكَرِ أَوْ لَيُوشِكَنَّ اللَّهُ أَنْ يَبْعَثَ عَلَيْكُمْ عِقَابًا مِنْهُ ثُمَّ تَدْعُوهُ فَلَا يَسْتَجَابُ لَكُمْ» **"By Him in Whose Hand is my soul, you must enjoin what is good and forbid what is evil, or Allah will soon send upon you a punishment from Him, then you will call upon Him, but He will not respond to you."** (Reported in Sunan At-Tirmidhi)

The Prophet (saw) also said, «إِنَّ مِنْ أَعْظَمِ الْجِهَادِ كَلِمَةً عَدَلٍ عِنْدَ سُلْطَانٍ جَائِرٍ» **“The greatest form of jihad is to speak a word of justice to an oppressive ruler.”** (Reported in Sunan Abi Dawood)

Additionally, he (saw) said, «سَيِّدُ الشُّهَدَاءِ حَمْزَةُ بْنُ عَبْدِ الْمُطَّلِبِ، وَرَجُلٌ قَالَ إِلَى إِمَامٍ جَائِرٍ فَأَمَرَهُ وَنَهَاهُ فَفَتَنَهُ» **“The master of martyrs is Hamza ibn Abdul-Muttalib, and a man who stood up to a tyrannical ruler, commanding him to do good and forbidding him from evil, and was killed by him.”** (Reported in Mustadrak Al-Hakim)

These are a series of hadiths that command enjoining what is right and forbidding what is wrong. They are general in application, covering all acts of good and evil. They apply equally to Muslims and their leaders. If a ruler persists in wrongdoing or fails to heed the commands of Shariah, these hadiths command confrontation, even if it leads to death. The one who is killed in confronting oppressive rulers because of their injustice is a martyr, and indeed the master of martyrs. Furthermore, these texts command changing evil with one's hand when able, “let him change it with his hand,” and “restrain him.” They are general and thus include the misdeeds of rulers. Among the gravest of these misdeeds is the violation of Shariah's sovereignty and ruling by something other than all that Allah (swt) has revealed. This is an injustice that must be lifted, an evil that must be eradicated. It is for this purpose that Allah (swt) created humankind and sent the Messengers. They planned, endured hardships, and strove for this cause. Therefore, the oppression and injustice of the Khaleefah contradict the very purpose of his appointment, and violate the principles of Shariah, necessitating his removal, even if it requires Khurooj rebellion against him.

The texts that prohibit people from revolting against the rulers unless they see clear disbelief (kufr bawah), or as long as the rulers establish prayer, do not contradict what has been previously explained. The hadith of Ubadah ibn al-Samit, which states, «وَأَنْ لَا تُنَازِعَ الْأَمْرَ» **“And that we do not dispute the authority of those in charge unless you see clear disbelief (kufr bawah) for which you have proof from Allah,”** does not imply that the ruler himself must commit disbelief. The text says, «إِلَّا أَنْ» **“unless you see kufr,”** and does not say «إِلَّا أَنْ يَكْفُرُوا» **“unless they disbelieve.”** The witnessing of disbelief is realized by seeing its laws and systems being implemented. For example, the state's authorization of usury (riba) is an application of disbelief. Implementing systems in people's relations based on Western liberal permissiveness, or personal freedoms, even in a single ruling, is an application of disbelief. Implementing a non-Islamic penal system, even in one ruling, is an application of disbelief. This undermines the fundamental principle of recognizing Allah's sole sovereignty and the supremacy of Shariah, which are absolute principles.

Thus, whoever witnesses the implementation of a system of disbelief or the application of a ruling of disbelief has indeed seen disbelief. If the ruler openly applies disbelief (bawah), even in one ruling, then clear disbelief has appeared. The term “bawah” (clear) means that the ruler is aware of it and remains silent, indicating his consent. This necessitates immediate action to correct the deviation or to remove the ruler. Such a deviation must be rectified, and if the ruler refuses and clings to his position, then rebellion against him becomes obligatory.

It is irrelevant here whether the ruler considers these wrongdoings or violations as permissible or not, whether he is merely disobedient by deviating from Shariah, or whether he is a disbeliever. The issue at hand is not about whether the ruler is a disbeliever or a Muslim, but whether the governance is based on Islam or disbelief. The hadith states, «إِلَّا أَنْ» **“unless you see disbelief,”** and disbelief has indeed been seen. This interpretation of the hadith aligns with the principles of Shariah in maintaining the supremacy of Shariah, and exalting the word of Allah, with the Shariah objective of appointing the Imam, and with the rulings on removing wrongdoings.

This understanding is further reinforced by other versions of the same hadith, which say, «مَا لَمْ يَأْمُرْكَ بِإِثْمٍ» **“unless there is clear disobedience to Allah”** and «إِلَّا أَنْ تَكُونَ مَعْصِيَةَ اللَّهِ بَوَاحًا»

بَوَاحًا “as long as they do not command you to commit clear sin.” Therefore, the intended meaning of seeing disbelief in this hadith is actually disobedience.

Al-Nawawi said, والمراد بالكفر هنا المعاصي، ومعنى عنكم من الله فيه برهان أي تعلمونه من دين الله تعالى، “The disbelief referred to here means disobedience, and the meaning of ‘with proof from Allah’ is that you know it from the Deen of Allah Almighty” [15].

Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani in his explanation of the hadith, said, قوله، إِلَّا أَنْ تَرَوْا كُفْرًا بَوَاحًا، قال الخطابي، معنى قوله بواحا يريد ظاهرا باديا، من قولهم باح بالشئ... إذا أذاعه وأظهره... ووقع في رواية حيّان أبي النصر المذكورة: إلا أن His statement “unless you see clear disbelief,” Al-Khattabi said: [The meaning of bawah (clear) is apparent and manifest, as they say 'bāḥa bi-shay'... when it is disclosed and revealed... It was also reported in the narration of Hayyan Abu al-Nadr: ‘unless there is clear disobedience to Allah.’” [16].

In the Musnad of Ahmad, from the narration of Umair bin Hani' on the authority of Junadah, it is reported, ما لم يأمروك باتم بواحا “as long as they do not command you to commit clear sin.” [17]. His statement عنكم من الله فيه برهان “for which you have proof from Allah” means a text from a verse, or an authentic hadith, that does not allow for interpretation. This implies that it is not permissible to revolt against them as long as their actions are open to interpretation.

Al-Nawawi said, المراد بالكفر هنا المعصية “The disbelief referred to here means disobedience.” Others have said, المراد بالإثم هنا المعصية والكفر “The sin referred to here means disobedience and disbelief.”

Ibn al-Tin [18] transmitted from al-Dawudi [19] who said, الذي عليه العلماء في أمراء الجور أنه إن قُدرَ على خلعه بغير فتنة ولا ظلم وحب، وإلا فالواجب الصبر. وعن بعضهم، لا يجوز عقد الولاية لفاسيق ابتداءً، فإن أحدث جوراً بعد أن The consensus among ulema regarding tyrannical rulers is that if it is possible to depose them without causing strife or injustice, then it is obligatory to do so; otherwise, patience is required. Some have said that it is not permissible to initially appoint a corrupt person to leadership, and if injustice arises after he was just, ulema have differed on the permissibility of khurooj rebellion against him. The correct opinion is that it is prohibited unless he commits disbelief, in which case Khurooj rebellion becomes obligatory against him.” [20].

The same reasoning applies to the hadiths that prohibit Khurooj rebellion against rulers as long as they establish prayer, such as the hadith of Awf ibn Malik al-Ashjai، «قيل: يا رسول الله، «It was said: ‘O Messenger of Allah, should we not fight them with the sword?’ He said: ‘No, as long as they establish prayer among you,’” and the hadith of Umm Salama، «قالوا أفلا نقاتلهم؟ قال: لا، ما صلوا،» “They said: ‘Shall we not fight them?’ He said: ‘No, as long as they pray.’” If these hadiths are understood in their literal sense, it would create a contradiction with other texts. It is known from the rulings of Sharia that a ruler who violates the sovereignty of Shariah, usurps the authority of the Ummah, and is untrustworthy in safeguarding the interests of Muslims, and who does not stop after being advised and warned, must be deposed. If he refuses and resists, it becomes obligatory to make Khurooj rebellion against him to remove him, when there is a reasonable chance of success, or at least to strive toward that end.

Thus, the meaning of Salah prayer in these hadiths refers to the prayer that prevents immorality and wrongdoing, as Allah (swt) has stated in His Book، «وَأَقِمِ الصَّلَاةَ إِنَّ الصَّلَاةَ تَنْهَى عَنِ الْفَحْشَاءِ» “And establish Salah, indeed, Salah prohibits immorality and wrongdoing.” [Al-Ankabut, 45]. When it is said that the ruler establishes Salah, it means that he is upholding the Deen. It is reported in the hadith that prayer is the pillar upon which Islam stands. Muadh ibn Jabal (ra) said that the Messenger (saw) said، «ألا أخبرك برأس الأمر عليه وعموده، وذروة سنامه؟ قلت: بلى يا رسول الله، قال: رأس الأمر الإسلام، وعموده الصلاة، وذروة سنامه الجهاد» “Shall I not tell you of the head of the matter, its pillar, and its peak?” I said: ‘Yes, O Messenger of Allah.’ He said, ‘The head of the matter is Islam, its pillar is Salah, and its peak is jihad.’” (Reported in Sunan At-Tirmidhi) [21].

Since Salah is the pillar of Islam, establishing it is a kinayah metaphor for establishing Islam. Therefore, a ruler who violates the commands of Shariah in his governance, does not enjoin what is right, or does not forbid what is wrong, cannot be said to have established Salah, because he has undermined Islam, and nullified its rulings, instead of upholding them.

Ibn Taymiyyah said, فإن الصلاة إذا أتى بها كما أمر نهته عن الفحشاء والمنكر، وإذا لم تنهه دلّ على تضييعه لحقوقها، وإن كان مطيعاً. وقد قال تعالى (فَخَلَفَ مِنْ بَعْدِهِمْ خَلْفٌ أَضَاعُوا الصَّلَاةَ وَاتَّبَعُوا الشَّهْوَاتِ فَسُوفَ يَلْقَوْنَ عَذَابًا) [مریم، 59]، وإضاعتهَا علم التفریط في واجباتها وإن كان يصلّيها، والله أعلم. "If Salah is performed as commanded, it prevents immorality and wrongdoing, and if it does not, it indicates a neglect of its rights, even if the person prays. Allah Almighty said, 'But there came after them successors who neglected prayer and pursued desires; so they are going to meet evil.' [Maryam, 59], and neglecting it means failing in its obligations, even if one prays, and Allah knows best." [22].

Shaykh Abdul Qadeem Zallum stated, والمراد بإقامة الصلاة الحكم بالإسلام، أي تطبيق أحكام الشرع، من باب تسمية الكلّ باسم الجزء، كقوله تعالى، (فَتَحْرِيْرُ رَقَبَةٍ) [النساء، 92] و[المجادلة: 3]، والمراد تحريْرُ العبد كلّهُ، لا تحريْرُ رقبته. وقال، «مَا أَقَامُوا فِيكُمْ الصَّلَاةَ»، والمراد إقامة أحكام الشرع كلّها، لا إقامة الصلاة وحدها. وهذا من قبيل المجاز، من إطلاق الجزء "What is meant by establishing Salah is ruling by Islam, meaning applying the rulings of Sharia, by referring to the whole by naming a part of it, as in Allah's saying, 'then [the penalty is] the freeing of a slave' [An-Nisa, 92 and Al-Mujadila, 3], where the meaning is to free the entire slave, not just his neck. And He said, 'as long as they establish Salah among you,' meaning the establishment of all the rulings of Sharia, not just the prayer alone. This is a majaaz metaphor, using the part to indicate the whole." [23].

As for the view that one should be patient with a tyrannical ruler, meaning to remain silent and be content with him no matter what he does, and that it is forbidden to work for his removal because he is a Muslim and establishes Salah, and to allow him to strike the back and take wealth; this is a reprehensible opinion.

Ibn Hazm said, أما أمره عليه السلام بالصبر على أخذ المال وضرب الظهر، فإنما ذلك بلا شكّ إذا تولى الإمام ذلك بحقّ، وهذا مما لا شكّ فيه أنه فرضٌ علينا الصبرُ له. وأما إن كان ذلك بباطل، فمعادٌ الله أن يأمر رسولُ الله صلى الله عليه وسلم "As for the command of the Prophet (saw) to be patient with the ruler who takes wealth and strikes the back, this is undoubtedly when the Imam does so justly. There is no doubt that it is obligatory upon us to be patient in such a case. However, if this is done unjustly, Allah forbid that the Messenger of Allah (saw) would command us to be patient with that." [24].

Ibn Hazm offers valuable insight on this topic in response to those who prohibit rebellion against a tyrannical ruler, no matter what he does, as long as he is a Muslim and prays. He says, ويُقال لهم: ما تقولون في سلطانٍ جعل اليهود أصحابَ أمره، والنصارى جنده، وألزم المسلمين الجزية، وحمل السيف على أطفال المسلمين، وأباح المسلمات للزنا، وحمل السيف على كلّ من وُجد من المسلمين، وملاك نساءهم وأطفالهم، وأعلن العيب بهم، وهو في كلّ ذلك مقرّ بالإسلام، مُعلنٌ به، لا يدع الصلاة؟ فإن قالوا: لا يجوزُ القيامُ عليه. قيل لهم: إنه لا يدع مسلماً إلا قتلته جملةً، وهذا إن تركَ أوجب ضرورةً ألا يبقى إلا هو وحده وأهل الكفر معه. فإن أجازوا الصبرَ على هذا، خالفوا الإسلام جملةً وانسلخوا منه "It is said to them: What do you say about a ruler who appoints Jews as his officials, Christians as his soldiers, imposes the jizya on Muslims, wields the sword against Muslim children, permits Muslim women to be violated, kills any Muslim he finds, seizes their women and children, and openly mocks them, while all the while professing Islam, declaring it openly, and not abandoning Salah? If they say that it is not permissible to rise against him, it is said to them: He would not leave a single Muslim alive but kill them all, which would necessarily result in him remaining alone with the disbelievers around him. If they allow patience in such a case, they have contradicted Islam entirely and renounced it." [25].

He continues to say، ونسألهم عمّن قصد سلطانه الفاجرُ الجائرُ زوجته، وابنته، وابنه ليفسقَ بهم، أو ليفسقَ به بنفسه، أهو في سعةٍ من إسلام نفسه، وامراته، وولده، وابنته للفاحشة، أم فرضٌ عليه أن يدفع من أراد ذلك منهم؟ فإن قالوا: فرضٌ عليه إسلام نفسه وأهله، أتوا بعظيمةٍ لا يقولها مسلمٌ. وإن قالوا: بل فرضٌ عليه أن يمتنع من ذلك ويقا تل رجوعوا إلى الحق، ولزم ذلك كلّ "We ask them about a ruler who, being wicked and tyrannical, intends to violate a man's wife, daughter, or son, or even the man himself, is he free to surrender himself, his wife, and his children to such corruption, or is it obligatory to defend them from such an attack? If they say it is obligatory to surrender oneself and one's family, they are espousing a grave error that no Muslim would say. However, if they say it is

obligatory to resist and fight, then they have returned to the truth, and the same obligation applies to every Muslim regarding every other Muslim and wealth as well.” [26].

As for the hadiths that command patience with rulers and governors when people witness from them acts of favoritism and sin, such as, «أَلَا مَنْ وُلِيَ عَلَيْهِ وَإِلٍ، فَرَأَهُ يَأْتِي شَيْئًا مِنْ مَعْصِيَةِ اللَّهِ، فَلْيَكْرَهُ مَا يَأْتِي مِنْ مَعْصِيَةِ اللَّهِ، وَلَا يَنْزِعَنَّ يَدًا مِنْ طَاعَةٍ» **“Anyone who has a ruler appointed over him and sees him committing an act of disobedience to Allah, let him dislike what he does of disobedience to Allah, but he must not withdraw his obedience,”** and, «سَتَكُونُ أُمَرَاءٌ، فَتَعْرِفُونَ وَتُنْكِرُونَ فَمَنْ عَرَفَ بَرِيءًا، وَمَنْ أَنْكَرَ سَلِيمًا، وَلَكِنْ مَنْ رَضِيَ وَتَابَعَ. قَالُوا أَفَلَا نُقَاتِلُهُمْ؟ قَالَ لَا مَا صَلَّوْا» **“There will be rulers whom you will recognize some things and deny others. Whoever recognizes the good will be absolved, and whoever denies the bad will be safe, but whoever is pleased and follows is neither. They said: ‘Shall we not fight them?’ He said: ‘No, as long as they pray.’”**

In another hadith by Ibn Mas'ud, the Prophet (saw) said, «إِنَّهَا سَتَكُونُ بَعْدِي أُنْتَرَةٌ وَأُمُورٌ تُشْكِرُونَهَا، قَالُوا يَا رَسُولَ اللَّهِ، كَيْفَ تَأْمُرُ مَنْ أَدْرَكَ مِنْكَ مِنْ ذَلِكَ؟ قَالَ: تُوَدُّونَ الْحَقَّ الَّذِي عَلَيْنَا، وَتَسْأَلُونَ اللَّهَ الَّذِي لَكُمْ» **“There will be selfishness and matters that you will disapprove of after me.”** They asked, **“O Messenger of Allah, what do you command us to do if we encounter that?”** He replied, **“Fulfill your obligations and ask Allah for your rights.”** [28].

Reconciling these hadiths with those that command the removal of wrongdoing and taking action when possible, and harmonizing all of them together, shows that these hadiths specifically refer to the Imam who rules according to Islam. The Imam has many duties, such as adopting opinions in disputed matters, appointing walis, judges, and other officials, managing state affairs that may involve different legal opinions, and making decisions that might not always be apparent to the public. He needs trusted advisors and confidants, and his decisions, whether he is pious and sincere or otherwise, will always be subject to differing interpretations based on people’s varying mazhab school of thoughts, fiqhi opinion, and philosophies, as well as their political interests and loyalties.

No matter how pious, skilled, and wise the Imam may be, there will always be those who accuse him, see him as corrupt or negligent, or accuse him of favoritism or being unworthy of his position. Some may even view him as a disbeliever. If everyone were allowed to withdraw their Bayah pledge of allegiance or make Khurooj based on their individual opinions, it would lead to chaos and strife. Therefore, Shariah has established rulings for these situations: monitoring and holding the ruler accountable, while bearing any hardships endured in this process, until the ruler is conclusively proven guilty in a way that leaves no room for interpretation «إِلَّا أَنْ تَرَوْا كُفْرًا بَوَاحًا عِنْدَكُمْ مِنَ اللَّهِ فِيهِ بُرْهَانٌ» **“Unless you see clear disbelief for which you have proof from Allah.”** Such suspicions are not considered valid in Shariah [29], and it is not permissible to depose the Imam, annul the Bayah pledge of allegiance, or make Khurooj rebellion against him based on assumptions, and opinions that may or may not be correct.

Moreover, the Imam is not infallible. He may follow his desires at times or in certain situations, leading to favoritism, sins, or errors in judgment, which could result in harm. However, not every sin, error, or personal desire necessitates his removal from office, as not all such actions disqualify him from justice or trust, nor do they render him a transgressor unfit for the position. Otherwise, infallibility would be a condition for the Khilafah, and no one would qualify for it. Therefore, patience with the ruler is prescribed in what one dislikes, alongside advising him and rebuking him in hopes of reform. The ruler should not be deposed unless it is established with certainty that he is guilty of injustice, tyranny, or moral corruption, and that his integrity has indeed been compromised.

There is a hadith that needs to be explained for a complete discussion of this issue. It is narrated by Mu'awiyah ibn Sallam from Hudhayfah ibn al-Yaman, who said, «قُلْتُ يَا رَسُولَ اللَّهِ، إِنِّي كُنَّا بِبَشْرٍ فَجَاءَ اللَّهُ بِخَيْرٍ، فَفَحْنُ فِيهِ، فَهَلْ مِنْ وَرَاءِ هَذَا الْخَيْرِ شَرٌّ؟ قَالَ نَعَمْ. قُلْتُ هَلْ وَرَاءَ ذَلِكَ الشَّرِّ خَيْرٌ؟ قَالَ نَعَمْ. قُلْتُ فَهَلْ وَرَاءَ ذَلِكَ الْخَيْرِ شَرٌّ؟ قَالَ نَعَمْ. قُلْتُ كَيْفَ؟ قَالَ يَكُونُ بَعْدِي أَيْمَةٌ لَا يَهْتَدُونَ بِهَدَايِي، وَلَا يَسْتَنْتُونَ بِسُنَّتِي، وَسَيَقُومُ فِيهِمْ رَجَالٌ قُلُوبُهُمْ قُلُوبُ الشَّيَاطِينِ فِي جُثْمَانِ إِيْسَ، قَالَ قُلْتُ كَيْفَ أَصْنَعُ يَا رَسُولَ اللَّهِ، إِنْ أَدْرَكْتُ ذَلِكَ؟ قَالَ تَسْمَعُ وَتُطِيعُ لِلْأَمِيرِ، وَإِنْ ضَرَبَ ظَهْرَكَ، وَأَخَذَ مَالَكَ، فَاسْمَعْ وَأَطِعْ» **“I said, ‘O Messenger of Allah, we were in evil, and Allah brought us good. Will**

there be evil after this good?' He said, 'Yes.' I said, 'Will there be good after that evil?' He said, 'Yes.' I said, 'Will there be evil after that good?' He said, 'Yes.' I said, 'How?' He said, 'There will be leaders after me who do not follow my guidance, nor adhere to my Sunnah. There will stand among them men whose hearts are the hearts of devils in the bodies of men.' I said, 'O Messenger of Allah, what should I do if I reach that time?' He said, 'Hear and obey the ruler, even if your back is beaten and your wealth is taken; hear and obey.'" [30].

There is a difference of opinion regarding the authenticity of this hadith. Some scholars say it is mursal (a type of hadith with a missing link in the chain of narrators), while others say it is munqati' (interrupted), as Mu'awiyah ibn Sallam did not hear directly from Hudhayfah. Al-Daraqutni criticized the hadith and declared it weak, a view also held by Al-Nawawi, who considered it mursal but acknowledged that it has a supporting narration [31].

Khalid Al-Hayek, in his study of this hadith, stated, وهي مناقضة للمتن، وفيه مناقضة للمتن، فكيف يكون هؤلاء الأئمة الذين لا يهتدون بهديه ولا يستنون بسنته، وقلوب بعضهم قلوب الشياطين، ثم يأمر النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم بطاعة واحد منهم "This addition to the hadith is munkar (rejected), as it contradicts the content of the hadith itself. How can these rulers, who do not follow the Prophet's guidance or his Sunnah, and whose hearts are like those of devils, be commanded by the Prophet (saw) to be obeyed?" [32]. He added, وعمومًا فهذا الإسناد منقطع، "Overall, this chain of narration is interrupted" [33]. The phrase he refers to as rejected is, «وإن ضرب ظهرك، وأخذ مالك، فاسمع وأطع» "Even if your back is beaten and your wealth is taken; hear and obey."

It is evident that this interpretation of the hadith contradicts the obligation to remove evil and confront oppression. It attributes to the Prophet (saw) an order to obey those who do not follow his guidance or adhere to his Sunnah, and who base their authority on satanic influences! This interpretation also conflicts with established Islamic texts, such as the Prophet's statement, «من قُتِلَ دُونَ مَالِهِ فَهُوَ شَهِيدٌ» "Whoever is killed defending his wealth is a martyr." [34].

Furthermore, it contradicts the agreed-upon version of the hadith found in Sahih al-Bukhari and Sahih Muslim, narrated by Abu Idris al-Khawlani from Hudhayfah ibn al-Yaman, «كَانَ النَّاسُ يَسْأَلُونَ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ عَنِ الْخَيْرِ، وَكُنْتُ أَسْأَلُهُ عَنِ الشَّرِّ، مَخَافَةَ أَنْ يُدْرِكَنِي، فَقُلْتُ يَا رَسُولَ اللَّهِ، إِنَّا كُنَّا فِي جَاهِلِيَّةٍ وَشَرٍّ، فَجَاءَنَا اللَّهُ بِهَذَا الْخَيْرِ، فَهَلْ بَعْدَ هَذَا الْخَيْرِ مِنْ شَرٍّ؟ قَالَ: نَعَمْ. قُلْتُ وَهَلْ بَعْدَ ذَلِكَ الشَّرِّ مِنْ خَيْرٍ؟ قَالَ: نَعَمْ، وَفِيهِ دَحْنٌ قُلْتُ وَمَا دَحْنُهُ؟ قَالَ: قَوْمٌ يَهْدُونَ بِغَيْرِ هُدًى، تَعْرِفُ مِنْهُمْ وَتُنْكِرُ. قُلْتُ: فَهَلْ بَعْدَ ذَلِكَ الْخَيْرِ مِنْ شَرٍّ؟ قَالَ: نَعَمْ، دُعَاةٌ عَلَى أَبْوَابِ جَهَنَّمَ، مَنْ أَجَابَهُمْ إِلَيْهَا قُدْفُوهُ فِيهَا. قُلْتُ: يَا رَسُولَ اللَّهِ صَفْهُمْ لَنَا، قَالَ: هُمْ مِنْ جِلْدِنَا، وَيَتَكَلَّمُونَ بِأَلْسِنَتِنَا قُلْتُ: فَمَا تَأْمُرُنِي إِنْ أَدْرَكَنِي ذَلِكَ؟ قَالَ: تَلْرَمْ جَمَاعَةَ الْمُسْلِمِينَ وَإِمَامَهُمْ قُلْتُ فَإِنْ لَمْ يَكُنْ لَهُمْ جَمَاعَةٌ وَلَا إِمَامٌ؟ قَالَ فَاعْتَرَلْ تِلْكَ الْفُرْقَ كُلَّهَا، وَلَوْ أَنْ «People used to ask the Messenger of Allah (saw) about the good, but I used to ask him about the evil out of fear that it might overtake me. So I said, 'O Messenger of Allah, we were in ignorance and evil, and Allah brought us this good. Will there be any evil after this good?' He said, 'Yes.' I said, 'Will there be good after that evil?' He said, 'Yes, but it will be tainted.' I said, 'How will it be tainted?' He (saw) said, 'There will be people who guide others according to principles other than my guidance. You will approve of some of their actions and disapprove of others.' I said, 'Will there be any evil after that good?' He said, 'Yes, there will be people calling at the gates of Hell, and whoever responds to them will be thrown into it.' I said, 'O Messenger of Allah, describe them to us.' He said, 'They are from our own people and speak our language.' I said, 'What do you advise me to do if I live to see that?' He said, 'Adhere to the community of Muslims and their leader.' I said, 'What if there is no community and no leader?' He said, 'Then keep away from all those different factions, even if you have to bite the root of a tree until death overtakes you while you are in that state.'" [35].

The contradiction between the hadith of Mu'awiyah ibn Sallam and the established principles of Shariah necessitates either interpreting it in a manner consistent with Shariah, if possible, or rejecting it.

Imam Ahmad also narrated this hadith with the wording, «ثُمَّ تَكُونُ دُعَاةُ الضَّلَالَةِ، فَإِنْ رَأَيْتَ يَوْمَئِذٍ خَلِيفَةَ اللَّهِ فِي الْأَرْضِ فَالْزَمَهُ، وَإِنْ نَهَكَ جِسْمَكَ وَأَخَذَ مَالَكَ، فَإِنْ لَمْ تَرَ فَاهْرَبْ فِي الْأَرْضِ، وَلَوْ أَنْ تَمُوتَ وَأَنْتَ عَاصٍ بِجِدْلِ شَجْرَةٍ» "Then there will be callers to misguidance. If you see a time when there is a Khaleefah of Allah on earth, adhere to him, even if he exhausts your body and takes

your wealth. However, if you do not see him, then flee across the earth, even if death overtakes you while you are biting the root of a tree.” [37].

The interpretation that reconciles this hadith with Islamic principles is that Muslims must adhere to the rightful Imam, fulfill their Bayah pledge to him, and support him, even if it costs them physical harm and financial loss. They should not pledge a Bayah of allegiance, to or support rulers who do not follow the Prophet’s guidance, even if they are persecuted or have their wealth taken. Instead, they should flee from their oppression, even if it leads to isolation until death. Thus, the meaning of the text that aligns with Shariah is the opposite of what tyrannical rulers and their propagandists claim. If the ruler is unjust or rules by something other than Islam, even in one ruling, and does not retract after being advised and warned, or if he loses a fundamental qualification of leadership, such as Islam or justice, he must be deposed. If he refuses, it becomes obligatory to rebel against him if the capability exists. The following outlines the reasons and legal conditions for doing so and provides the necessary documentation.

(End of Part 1)

1. Refer to: Ibn Qutaybah, *Al-Imamah wa al-Siyasah*, pp. 263-300, and Al-Suyuti, *Tarikh al-Khulafa*, pp. 150-160.

2. This marks the beginning of the coercive rule that the Prophet (saw) foretold. Hudhayfah ibn al-Yaman narrated, **تَكُونُ النَّبِيُّهُ فِيكُمْ مَا شَاءَ اللَّهُ أَنْ تَكُونَ، ثُمَّ يَرْفَعُهَا إِذَا شَاءَ أَنْ يَرْفَعُهَا، ثُمَّ تَكُونُ خِلَافَةً عَلَىٰ مِنْهَاجِ النَّبِيِّهِ، فَتَكُونُ مَا شَاءَ اللَّهُ أَنْ تَكُونَ، ثُمَّ يَرْفَعُهَا إِذَا شَاءَ أَنْ يَرْفَعُهَا، ثُمَّ تَكُونُ مُلْكًا جَبْرِيَّةً، فَتَكُونُ مَا شَاءَ اللَّهُ أَنْ تَكُونَ، ثُمَّ إِذَا شَاءَ اللَّهُ أَنْ يَرْفَعُهَا، ثُمَّ تَكُونُ مُلْكًا عَاصِيًا، فَيَكُونُ مَا شَاءَ اللَّهُ أَنْ يَكُونَ، ثُمَّ يَرْفَعُهَا إِذَا شَاءَ أَنْ يَرْفَعُهَا، ثُمَّ تَكُونُ خِلَافَةً عَلَىٰ مِنْهَاجِ نَبِيِّهِ ثُمَّ سَكَتَ** **“Prophethood will remain among you as long as Allah wills. Then He will remove it when He wills. Then there will be a Khilafah on the prophetic model, and it will remain as long as Allah wills. Then He will remove it when He wills. Then there will be coercive rule, and it will last as long as Allah wills. Then He will remove it when He wills. Then there will be tyrannical rule, and it will remain as long as Allah wills. Then He will remove it when He wills. Then there will be a Khilafah on the prophetic model.”** (Musnad Ahmad, Hadith of al-Nu'man ibn Bashir, Hadith 18406, Vol. 30, p. 355).

3. Al-Mawardi, *Al-Ahkam al-Sultaniyyah*, pp. 40-45.

4. See, for example: Mahmoud bin Ahmed Jum'ah, *Al-Ilma' fi anna al-Man' min al-Khuruj 'ala al-Hakim al-Ja'ir fihij ljma'*, Tripoli, Imam al-Bukhari Center, 1436 AH/2015 CE. Topics include: "It is not permissible to revolt against the ruler even if he is sinful or oppressive as long as he is a Muslim" and "The obligation to be patient with rulers even if they are innovators."

5. Agreed upon: Al-Bukhari, (-256 AH/870 CE), *Al-Jami' al-Sahih* known as *Sahih al-Bukhari*, edited by Muhammad Zuhayr ibn Nasser al-Nasser, Beirut, Dar Tawq al-Najah, 1422 AH, *Al-Jami' al-Sahih*, Book of Tribulations (92), Chapter on the saying of the Prophet (peace be upon him) "You will see after me things you disapprove of" (2), Hadith 7056, 9, 47. And Muslim, (-261 AH/875 CE), *Al-Musnad al-Sahih* known as *Sahih Muslim*, edited by Muhammad Fu'ad 'Abd al-Baqi, Beirut, Dar Ihya al-Turath al-Arabi, 1412 AH/1991 CE, *Al-Musnad al-Sahih*, Book of Governance (33), Chapter on the obligation of obedience to rulers in what is not a sin (8), Hadith 1709, Vol. 3, p. 470. The wording is from Al-Bukhari.

6. Al-Musnad al-Sahih, Book of Governance (33), *The Best and Worst of the Ummah* (17), Hadith 1855, Vol. 3, p. 1481.

7. Muslim, *Al-Musnad al-Sahih*, Book of Governance (33), Chapter on the obligation to disapprove of rulers in what is against Sharia and to avoid fighting them as long as they pray (16), Hadith 1854, Vol. 3, p. 1480.

8. Agreed upon: Al-Bukhari, *Al-Jami' al-Sahih*, Book of Virtues (61), Chapter on the Signs of Prophethood in Islam (25), Hadith 3603, Vol. 4, p. 199. And Muslim, *Al-Musnad al-Sahih*, Book of Governance (33), Chapter on the command to fulfill the pledge to the first Khaleefah (10), Hadith 1843, Vol. 3, p. 1472. The wording is from Muslim.

9. Refer to: Iyyad bin Nami al-Salmi, *Usul al-Fiqh al-Ladhi La Yasa' al-Faqih Jahlahu*, where he said: "Some have reported consensus on the impermissibility of acting on a general text before searching for a specific one, while others argued the consensus on acting on the general until a specific is found," pp. 364-365.

10. Al-Tirmidhi, *Sunan al-Tirmidhi*, Book of Tribulations from the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) (31), Chapter on the descent of punishment if evil is not changed (8), Hadith 2168, and he declared it authentic, Vol. 4, p. 37. And Imam Ahmad, *Al-Musnad*, Hadith 30, 1, 180, among others.

11. Muslim, *Al-Musnad al-Sahih*, Book of Faith (1), Chapter on the clarification that forbidding evil is part of faith and that faith increases and decreases (20), Hadith 49, Vol. 1, p. 69.
12. Abu 'Isa Muhammad bin 'Isa al-Tirmidhi (-279 AH/892 CE), *Sunan al-Tirmidhi*, Chapters on Tribulations from the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) (31), Chapter on the command to enjoin what is right and forbid what is wrong (9), Hadith 2169, and he said: It is a hasan hadith, Vol. 4, p. 38.
13. Al-Tirmidhi, *Sunan al-Tirmidhi*, Book of Tribulations from the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) (31), Chapter on the best jihad is a word of justice before a tyrant ruler (13), Hadith 2174, and he said: This is a hasan gharib hadith from this route, Vol. 4, p. 41. And Abu 'Abd al-Rahman Ahmad bin Shu'ayb al-Nasa'i (-303 AH/915 CE), *Al-Mujtaba min al-Sunan*, known as *Sunan al-Nasa'i*, Book of Allegiance (39), Chapter on the virtue of speaking the truth before a tyrant ruler, Hadith 4209, Vol. 7, p. 161. And Ibn Majah Abu 'Abd Allah Muhammad bin Yazid al-Qazwini (-273 AH/886 CE), *Sunan Ibn Majah*, Book of Tribulations (36), Chapter on enjoining what is right and forbidding what is wrong (20), Hadith 4011, Vol. 2, p. 1329. And Abu Dawood Sulayman bin al-Ash'ath bin Ishaq al-Sijistani (-275 AH/889 CE), *Sunan Abi Dawood*, Book of the End Times (36), Chapter on enjoining and forbidding (17), Hadith 4344, and in it is an addition: "Or a tyrant ruler," Vol. 6, p. 400, and *Musnad Ahmad*, Hadith 11143, 17, 228, and Hadith 11587, p. 18, Vol. 133.
14. Al-Hakim, *Al-Mustadrak 'ala al-Sahihayn*, Book of the Knowledge of the Companions (31), Hadith 4950, and he said: Its chain of narration is authentic but they did not report it, Vol. 3, p. 234.
15. Abu Zakariya Muhyiddin Yahya ibn Sharaf al-Nawawi (-676 AH/1278 CE), *Al-Minhaj Sharh Sahih Muslim bin al-Hajjaj*, Beirut, Dar Ihya al-Turath al-Arabi, 2nd edition, 1392 AH/1972 CE, Vol. 12, p. 229. It is worth mentioning here that Al-Nawawi had conflicting opinions on the issue of rebellion against rulers. He said: "As for his statement, 'Should we not fight them?' He said, 'No, as long as they pray,' it means, as previously mentioned, that it is not permissible to revolt against the Khaleefahs merely for oppression or sin as long as they do not change the fundamentals of Islam," Vol. 12, p. 243. The implication of this statement is that it is permissible to revolt if they change the fundamentals of Islam. He also has a contrary statement that the Imam cannot be deposed, and it is not permissible to revolt against him at all because this would lead to great tribulations. He said: "The reason for not deposing him and forbidding rebellion against him is the chaos, bloodshed, and discord that would result, making the harm of deposing him greater than the harm of keeping him," Vol. 12, p. 229.
16. He is Abu Sulayman Hamd bin Muhammad bin al-Khattab al-Busti al-Khattabi (-388 AH/998 CE), an eminent scholar, linguist, and hadith commentator, known for his works such as *Sharh al-Sunan*, *Gharib al-Hadith*, *Sharh al-Asma' al-Husna*, *Al-Ghunya 'an al-Kalam wa Ahluhu*, *Al-'Uzlah*, *Islah Ghalat al-Muhaddithin*, among others. Refer to *Al-Dhahabi*, *Siyar A'lam al-Nubala'*, Vol. 17, pp. 23-28.
17. Ahmad, *Al-Musnad*, Hadith of Ubadah ibn al-Samit, Hadith 22737, Vol. 37, p. 404. An authentic hadith.
18. He is Abu Muhammad 'Abd al-Wahid ibn al-Tin al-Safaqsi (-611 AH/1214 CE), a hadith scholar and commentator known for his commentary on al-Bukhari named *Al-Mukbir al-Fasih fi Sharh al-Bukhari al-Sahih*, which was relied upon by Ibn Hajar and others in their commentaries on al-Bukhari. Refer to Makhluaf, *Shajarat al-Nur al-Zakiyya*, Vol. 1, p. 242.
19. He is Ahmad bin Nasr al-Dawudi (-402 AH/1012 CE), one of the leading Maliki scholars in Morocco, known for his works such as *Al-Nami fi Sharh al-Muwatta'*, *Al-Wa'i fi al-Fiqh*, *Al-Nasiha fi Sharh al-Bukhari*, *Al-Idah fi al-Radd 'ala al-Qadariyya*, among others. Refer to Ibn Farhun Ibrahim al-Yamari (-799 AH/1397 CE), *Al-Dibaj al-Mudhahhab fi Ma'rifat A'yan 'Ulama al-Madhab*, edited by Muhammad al-Ahmadi Abu al-Nur, Cairo, Dar al-Turath, Vol. 1, p. 166.
20. Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani, *Fath al-Bari bi Sharh Sahih al-Bukhari*, Book of Tribulations (92), Chapter on the saying of the Prophet (peace be upon him) "You will see after me things you disapprove of" (2), Vol. 13, p. 8.
21. Al-Tirmidhi, *Sunan al-Tirmidhi*, Book of Faith (38), Chapter on the sanctity of prayer (8), Hadith 2616, and he said it is hasan sahih, Vol. 4, p. 308. And Ahmad, *Al-Musnad*, Hadith of Mu'adh ibn Jabal, Hadith 22068, Vol. 36, p. 387.
22. Ibn Taymiyyah, *Majmu' al-Fatawa*, Vol. 22, p. 7.
23. 'Abd al-Qadeem Zallum, *Nizam al-Hukm fi al-Islam*, p. 254.
24. Ibn Hazm, *Al-Fasl fi al-Milal wa al-Ahwa' wa al-Nihal*, Vol. 5, p. 2
25. *Ibid.*, Vol. 5, p. 28.
26. Ibn Hazm, *Al-Fasl fi al-Milal wa al-Ahwa' wa al-Nihal*, Vol. 5, p. 24. Refer also to his valuable discussion titled: "Enjoining Good and Forbidding Evil," Vol. 19-28.
27. *Al-Musnad al-Sahih*, Book of Governance (33), The Best and Worst of the Ummah (17), Hadith 1855, Vol. 3, p. 1482.
28. Previous hadith references.

