

REGARDING THE LEAFLET OF "DENYING THE MUNKAR IS FARD AND USING THE PHYSICAL POWER TO REMOVE IT DEPENDS ON THE ABILITY".

Dear Brothers,

Assalamu alaikum wa rahmatullahi wa barakatuhu.

The leaflet of "Denying the munkar is fard ,and using the power to remove it depends on the ability" has raised many questions and enquiries, even criticism some of which amounted to describe the party of deviation , and some other criticism considered the contents of the leaflet as a radical change in the course and the method of action and adopted a new method, beside other enquiries and criticism. These questions, enquiries and criticism did not come from one person or from one place, rather they came from many people and from many places.

I honestly tell you dear brothers that these questions, enquiries and criticism were alleviation and peacefulness that brought delight to the soul, pleasure and tranquility to the heart, because they proved the commitment to the unity of thought, and unity of structure; and they proved that the shabaab enjoy a high level of honesty, sincerity and great endeavour to protect the party and to necessarily abide, as shabaab and a leadership, by the thought which we believed in, adopted and structured ourselves on its basis, and which we deduced by the Book of Allah and the Sunnah of His Messenger and from those sources indicated by these two; and that any change or alteration has to depend on the divine evidences, otherwise it has to be rejected. All this is of the favour of Allah upon us and upon the people; and which preserves the unity of thought and the unity of structure (entity) and protects us from the error of deviation.

Now let us, dear brothers, return back to the subject of the leaflet, the motivation to issuing it and the purpose of it, and to explain that it does not contradict that we adopted, and that it was not meant to make any change or alteration by that leaflet.

The motive to issue that leaflet was a question that came from some of the shabaab who carried out discussions with some sincere Islamic groups, where they asked an explanation about the hokm of using the physical power to remove the munkar. An answer (a reply) was sent to them, in which a distinction has been made between the work to resume the Islamic way of life and establish the Khilafah, the group must abide by the Seerah of the Prophet (saw) in his course of action in Makkah till he established the state in Al-Medina..i.e. to abide by the three stages which the Prophet (saw) followed. Then it was explained to them the subject of enjoining the good and denying the bad (munkar). It was later on decided to send the subject of the hokm of denying the munkar to the shabaab and to the people.

The purpose of answering this question from the shabaab and then passing this answer to the rest of the shabaab and to the people, is to explain that what the Islamic groups do of using the physical power the way they practice, and what they adopt, is an action contradictory to the subject of the hadiths related to the duty of denying the munkar by hand (by power), and to the hadiths which make it obligatory (upon muslims) to rebel against the ruler when he opens kufar, that we have a proof from Allah on it, appears; and to let the shabaab continue discussing this matter with the Islamic groups so they may convince them and gain them (to the party); moreover to motivate the ummah to practice its duty of removing the rules of kufar and restoring the rule by the revelation of Allah. The purpose had not been other than these matters by any case.

Therefore it was not the aim to give up the method which the party adopted, and to adopt a new course of action (method), a matter which never, even slightly crossed the mind.

In regard with the agreement (non contradiction) of the contents of the leaflet with our adoption is explained as follows:

1. When the leaflet dealt with the munkar practised by individuals, it mentioned that the one who removes it by hand (power) is the state and the individuals; and it did not mention the groups, understanding that removing by hand the munkar practised by the individuals is not of the function of the groups.

When it also mentioned the removing of individuals to the munkar by hand, it stated specifically certain munkars, which are not allowed according to the laws of the state. Thus stealing, making

adultery and murder are not allowed in the muslim lands, therefore it is a duty upon every muslim person who sees a person trying to steal from a place at night, or he sees a man drawing a woman for making adultery with her or drawing a person to kill him, he is by shar'a, if he is able to prevent this munkar by his hand (power), on duty to stop it. If he did not stop it, he will be sinful in view of Allah, because he did not perform a duty decreed to him by Allah.

But in regard with the munkars which the laws of the state allow for women in the public life, such munkars are of the ruler's munkars though they originated from individuals, because they are practiced according to the law and system which the ruler applies. Such munkars are removed by removing the system which allows them, not by destroying the bank or ruining the disco, nor by preventing the woman who does not wear the legal (shar'ai) dress from going out in the public life, by the individuals.

It happened that an answer for a question (without a date) has been issued at the time of the late (Takiuddin an-Nabahani), in which he explains that enjoining the good and denying the evil is an individual duty on every muslim and not a collective duty; and this is the text of the answer:

Enjoining the good and denying the evil is an individual duty on every muslim and not a collective duty, because it means the good as it is (good) and the evil as it is (evil), not a particular good nor a particular evil. If the reality of this point is understood, then there would be no sufficiency in performing that, as it occurs in every place and it is repeated in every time; and because the ahadiths came to explain the sin on the side of the individual who ignores that. The Prophet (saw) said, "Whoever of you had seen an evil he has to change it (prevent it) by his hand, if he could not (do so) he has to prevent that by his tongue (speaking), and if he could not (do so) then he has to change it (i.e. deny it) by his heart, and this is the weakest iman". So look in his saying "Whoever of you had seen" so he makes it obligatory on the one who sees, and he (saw) says "of you" and he did not say "if you (as a community) see". And the one who orders about good and forbids evil, if he ordered and forbade a person but the person did not abstain (from the evil), then it is haram on him to eat with him, drink with him, and sit with him as long as he did not abstain from the evil. This matter is different than the case of the worker (da'i) to resuming the Islamic way of life, so if he asked a muslim to work for resuming the Islamic way of life but he did not accept to it in its capacity as a collective duty, the da'i is allowed to eat with him, drink with him and sit with him. But within the work for resuming the Islamic way of life are certain actions which are considered of enjoining the good and forbidding the evil, and so they have their rule (hokm). So holding strongly against the hand (power) of the tyrant (zalim) until he gives up his zulm is an individual duty; but working to resume the Islamic way of life as it is, is a collective duty, though some of its actions are individual duties; and delivering the call (da'wa) is a collective duty.

2. When the leaflet talked about the evil which occurs from the ruler, the text which came in the three paragraphs, which started to say "and all this is of the evil which occurs from individuals or groups; but the evil which occurs from the ruler . . ." upto the beginning of the fourth paragraph which starts by saying, "and the duty (obligation) of rebellion against him depends on the ability" this text agrees with the text that came in the dossier under the subject of "Obedience is obligatory upon muslims to the ruler even if he committed zulm (unjust treatment), pages 65-70. As an example of the agreement is the text which came in page 68 line 22 that states "the ahadeeth indicate by their meaning the command of declaring the war against him and fighting against him and disputing his authority if this case (open kufr) occurred. The indication by meaning is equally legitimately binding as the indication by text, so these ahadeeth are an evidence that the law-giver demanded (from muslim) to declare war against the rulers, to fight them and dispute their authority if open kufr appeared".

In regard with the last paragraph in the leaflet, which made the confusion, it starts by saying, "And the Ummah in its totality, if it unified its will . . . etc", if its text was examined then there would be no confusion. When the groups were mentioned, the text limited their undertaking if they got the capability in three cases. The first: if they had an effective great power in the army. The second: if they had an effective great power in the large tribes. The third: if they had an effective great power in the Ummah. These three cases will not be available for any party except through the

political strife which will not be achieved unless we go through the three stages including seeking the nusrah (support), because making the effective great power in the army, and the large tribes would not result except through the nusrah, and making that in the Ummah would not result except through the long political strife.

But in regard with the Ummah and the large tribes, their motion depends on having the public awareness and the public opinion that they must move to demolish the laws of kufr and to restore the rule with the revelation of Allah. This matter would not result to the army and the tribes except by the leadership of a political party that practices political struggle, and the political actions.

By this explanation it is evident that there is no any contradiction between the contents of the leaflet and the adopted (thought). However the practical situation in regard with the party since 1965 until now, is that it gathers the material power through the way of the nusrah people to change the rules of Kufr and to restore the rule with the revelation of Allah, from within the system not from the outside, despite that it considers the home (dar) in all muslim lands as home of kufr not a home (dar) of Islam. It appears as if this practical situation and what the party practiced through many trials, all was absent from the mind when the questions, enquiries and criticism were made.

In regard with the obligation of preparing the material power which is capable to remove the Kufr law and restore the rule with the revelation of Allah, it is in our regard through the way of nusrah actions as we adopted, following the method of Rasool Allah (saw) in his course, and not through arming and military training of the party and its shebaab.

This is what we wanted to explain to you dear brothers in this letter, in reply to your questions, enquiries and criticism. And it appears from it that there is no any contradiction with what we adopted, and no giving up of the adopted method, and then, there is no new adoption of a new method.

We pray to Allah to provide us with help from Him, and to guide us all to the best of our matter (affairs) and to protect us of the error and deviation, and to support us with His deen and delivering His call till the day we meet Him, and not to waste any of our actions, nor disappoint any of our requests and hopes, and to make our work sincere to Him, and to speed to us the relief, and honour us in the near future with a strong mighty victory from Him, by which He enables us to establish the Islamic Khilafah and to raise the Islamic banner and to restore the ruling with His revelation. The last of our prayers.

Hizb ut-Tahrir

25 Muharram 1410

26 August 1989