

Kafir Methods of Indoctrination -

We delve into how mankind is being brainwashed by the **Zionist's Jews**.

Worship at the Altar of Celebrity

“Say: How do you worship besides Allah something which has no power either to harm or benefit you? But it is Allah Who is the All-Hearer, All-Knower”

[TMQ Al-Ma'idah: 76]

January 2001 saw the world's biggest gathering of human beings, by the banks of the River Ganges. The rituals that the Hindus at the Kumbh Mela participated in were diverse. One man held his hand up above his head for twelve years, several people stood for years on end, and thousands bathed in the polluted waters of the Hindu's holiest of rivers. Others merely soaked up the atmosphere whilst smoking the "weed of wisdom", or even sipping from cow's urine. The congregation itself was also diverse. It comprised of weird and wonderful factions, or perhaps just weird factions. Take, for example, the Aghoris, a small sect who are the followers of Shiva, the Hindu god of destruction. They have a morbid fascination with death, many of them spend their time surrounded by corpses, and drinking from human skulls.

A couple of months after the Kumbh Mela, members of another faith participated in a different type of ritual. This mass gathering was conducted in a very twenty-first century manner. It crackled over the cable and satellite receiver networks, the World Wide Web, mobile phones and by word of mouth. The spirit of worship ran freely through acres of column inches in tabloids, broadsheets and magazines. Every faith has its equivalent of the Ganges, and for this cult it is Hollywood, the 'Mela' here being the Oscar's ceremony. To date there are no authorised accounts on how many members of the faith exist. The members of this faith dub themselves with no official title for their group, with many even denying being members, whilst others publicise with pride their commitment to the faith. Although they have no unified body in terms of administration and structural organisation, it is estimated that there are millions of members of the cult that worships celebrity.

In a way not dissimilar to Hinduism, the rituals of this faith are extremely diverse. These involved camping out all night just to see a glimpse of an Oscar nominee, or queuing up in the rain for hours to be able to claim to be one of the first of "the public" to see the fourth sequel to a film whose original was released in the 1970s. Rituals also include the daily reading of the verses of the celebrity magazines. These scriptures giving detailed accounts of the celebrities' daily lives, whilst the photographs they provide give something they can aspire to. The worship of celebrity is an issue that seems to dominate the flow of information to the public. This is supposedly the epoch of the information revolution. However the channels of information seem to be clogged up with information on celebrities. More, defiantly, has become to mean less in terms of information.

This insatiable desire for information on the trivial, untrue and tragic is merely a by-product of a mindset that has been instilled in the general public by the powers that be. This is the nature of capitalism. In order for the system to work the people's minds have to be disabled or disengaged. Thinking has to be discouraged. However Allah (swt) created us as humans with an enquiring mind, and the desire to seek out the truth of what life is about. The system cannot beat this trait out of humans, so as an alternative the system ensures that minds are occupied with the trivial. Western society has lost its sense of reality. When this happens societies have to seek refuge in various forms of escapism. The dispirited, confused and hopeless people of the West retreat into the inner world of subjectivism and fantasy. Materialism and self-absorption take the place of true worship, an enquiring mind and community spirit. The pathological symptoms that manifest are a retreat into fiction, a desire not to participate, but to remain as an onlooker, and to hold reality at an arm's length. It is in this atmos-

phere that the film industry comes into its own. This explains how films have come to play such a major role in the western way of life. Films have become a metaphor for real life. People speak, write and communicate in clichés taken from film scripts.

The mere passive occupation of the human mind is actually only half the story. There is also the active indoctrination of the human mind with corrupt thoughts and emotions. Films and the mass media industry have an important role to play in this process. The history of Hollywood movies is a history of corporate America messing with people's minds. Hollywood has epitomised the upholding of the golden rule of the American way of life, the rule being that, those who have the gold make the rules. Films have painted a picture of Blacks, Native Americans, women and just about every non-American creed, race and culture in a manner that came to define these groups in the 20th and 21st century. The Apache, Blackfoot and Xu have been portrayed to the world as being the bad guys and the cowboys were the gallant heroes of *How The West Was Won*. The European marauders invaded the land of North America. They farmed the land in an intense and exploitative manner, clearing out acres of natural animal habitat in order to herd cattle. They built railroads to transport livestock and other booty around the country and also to bring the wealth from the west and mid-west to the colonial capitals of the east of the Union. They had to massacre the Native Americans in these earlier times. Then, to add insult to injury, Hollywood portrayed these proud tribes that lived at peace with the environment, as bloodthirsty savages that killed at will just to obtain a scalp as a trophy. The Native Americans now live in economic deprivation in communities riddled with social problems, drug and solvent abuse, poor housing, and no prospects of competing on an equal footing with those that raped and plundered their land.

The violence of the founding of the US became sanitised for the white Europeans by Hollywood. The escapism of the movie theatre created a blurring between fantasy and reality. The public would leave the cinemas taking home whatever message Hollywood wanted them to take. On the way home from the theatre people could stop at a McDonalds, eat the beef of the Wild West, eat the apple pie of the wholesome mid-west, get the free toy of a Disney character, such as Pocahontas, and contemplate on how good the American dream really is. They could reflect on how the conquering of the "Red Man" was not pretty, but was necessary, in order to build this great American dream. Thus Hollywood would dispel any element of guilt that the conqueror may have harboured in their hardened hearts and at the same time reinforce the policy of destroying the Native American nation.

The Hollywood treatment of the Native Americans is paralleled in its treatment of Blacks. The very first moving images made by Thomas Edison portrayed stereotypes of black savages boiling people in pots

ready to be eaten. This theme was carried on to the first-ever Hollywood blockbuster, the silent movie of DW Griffith, *Birth Of A Nation*. The first ever feature with a soundtrack, *The Jazz Singer*, was one where a Russian Jew (Asa Yoelson aka Al Jolson) blacks up his face and re-enacts racial stereotypes and gets paid for doing this on the stage. The first glorious "Technicolor" movie, *Gone With the Wind*, was set on the Southern plantation. The film is a stream of subtle images of Blacks in Uncle Sam's intended role for them. There weren't any Black characters central to the plot nor did any have a major role, although Blacks appear throughout the film. They are always cooking, cleaning and generally serving the every whim and desire of the white stars and starlets in the film. The other image of Blacks, apart from servant or savage, was that of entertainer. Thus Blacks were shown as having rhythm, they were shown as dancers and singers and performers to please the white audiences.

This sent home another stereotype that had more resonance in the ghetto. The message being that the only thing that the Black people are good at is moving to the rhythm of 'black music'. This was given the grandiose title of dancing. Later on, the people of the ghetto started to believe in this myth themselves. That is, the myth that god had given black people brains in their feet, and that they could dance their way out of a life of poverty. So many aspired to degrade themselves by playing their dancing roles for the movies, whilst those good honest white folks insisted that they had no rhythm and could not entertain. However they were good at collecting money from the punters who wanted to see the Black people performing circus tricks. This is a tradition firmly established in the early days of Hollywood, and was seen in the first version of the musical *Showboat*. However the blatant racism of *Showboat* was toned down in the later remakes of the film. These were released at the time of the cold war, where the Soviets made an issue of the way the US exploited their own citizens. Hollywood was sensitive in that period to exposing any chinks in the armour of the "land of the free."

However this tradition continued with vigour through the "Blacksploitation" movies of the 1970s. Today this good American tradition of exploiting black-skinned bodies is kept alive on MTV. Today the music video fulfils the role of plantation slave master, African slave trader, pimp, player and hustler. Thousands of black kids all over North America and Europe practice their moves and study videos in the hope that they could one day be like their heroes of the three-minute music clips. Their only dream and aspiration in life is to gyrate their bodies in time to a programmed drum machine.

There are a substantial number of Blacks in the US. However the image of America to the outside world through Hollywood lies exclusively in white hands. So the images of Tarzan, spear throwing and cannibals that swing from trees, are the images that Hollywood provided the world with.

The other major group that has been given the Hollywood treatment is women. The misogynist, racist cartel that ran Hollywood exploited women more than any other sector of Western society. Women were used, and still are used, purely to appeal to the most base of human drives, which is the sexual instinct. The female form is exploited as part of story lines, the female form is exploited in trailers, and the female form is exploited in the hyperbolae generated by the general media in order to promote a film in more indirect advertising. The etymology of the maxim "sex sells" could easily be traced to Hollywood.

We have touched on a few issues to do with Hollywood's treatment of sections of American society, those being Blacks, Native Americans and women. This is the type of treatment they meted out to their own kind. One can only imagine what they had in store for foreign cultures. The red and yellow peril has become clichéd in an untold number of films from the cold war period. Then there were the propaganda films of the Second World War. In this day and age the world frowns upon the propaganda machine of Goebbels in Nazi Germany. However nothing that Goebbels could churn out could compare to the blatant racism and sheer power of mind manipulation that Hollywood produced during the Second World War. The other issue that is obviously more relevant to us is the image of Muslims on the silver screen. The whole American understanding of Islam and Muslims is seen through the eyes of Peter O'Toole in *Lawrence of Arabia* (1962). This is one side of the coin, whilst the other is the portrayal of the Jews.

The issue of the Jews in Hollywood is an epic in its own right. Jews built the very foundations of the studios, hence it would come as no surprise that their output of films were often to serve the Zionist cause. The blatant examples of the direct link between Hollywood and Israel can be seen in the 1960 film starring Paul Newman, *Exodus*, which traced the events of 1947 (in Hollywood style of course), and later Steven Spielberg's *Schindler's List* (1993). These two films were overtly pro-Jewish. *Exodus* had more effect on US public opinion for supporting Israel than decades of lobbying politicians had ever had. However, for every one, in-your-face, Zionist propaganda film there are ten that give a more subtle hint of pro Israeli support.

DW Griffith has already been mentioned, and is mentioned here again as being one of the key forgers of the den of iniquity called Hollywood. His biographic film, *The Birth of a Nation* (1915) helped to formulate and stabilise Hollywood's oft-recycled narrative style. This film became the template for almost every film ever made by Hollywood in term of its structure and presentation. Griffith's *Birth of a Nation* was an adap-

tation of *The Clansman*, a novel about the Civil War and reconstruction by the South. Griffith was a Kentuckian whose father had served as a Confederate officer. Griffith was deeply sympathetic to the material, and to the Ku Klux Klan. The blatant bigoted content of *The Birth of a Nation* prompted riots in northern states. Certain states even banned the film outright. However this did not prevent DW Griffith's so-called classic from becoming the single most popular film in history to date; in the year of its release nearly 3,000,000 people saw it. Griffith, a man famous for courting controversy, was totally unrepentant about the uproar his film had caused. He later issued a pamphlet about the film and the issue of free speech. Griffith was a significant figure in that he had been called the "the Shakespeare of the screen", and he has been widely accepted as being "the man who invented Hollywood." Hollywood was created by the likes of DW Griffith. Should we be surprised as to what DW Griffith's fledgling town, Hollywood grew into?

It was in 1915 that the collaboration in corruption began to take a strong foothold. The main studios then were Famous Players-Lasky Corporation (later Paramount Pictures, 1927) and Universal Pictures, founded by Carl Laemmle in 1912. Later on small independents started to merge; Samuel Goldwyn and Edgar Selwyn, Metro Picture Corporation and Louis B Mayer Pictures merged to form MGM in 1924. In the same year Columbia Pictures, Inc. became incorporated by Harry and Jack Cohn. Warner Brothers Pictures, Inc., was a year earlier founded by Harry, Albert, Samuel, and Jack Warner. These organisations became the backbone of the Hollywood studio system, and the men who controlled them shared one common trait: they were all first, or second-generation Jewish immigrants from eastern Europe, most of them with little formal education, while 90 percent of the audience they served was Protestant or Catholic. By the 1920s, when movies became a mass medium, this Jewish cabbala started to influence every American citizen. Hollywood went on to become the chief purveyor of American culture to the world.

Over eight decades later this same cartel of carpetbaggers are in charge of delivering the cheap and nasty all-American culture, the main cash export from the US, to the world. Only now they have many more tools at their disposal. The companies such as Fox, Warner, and United Artists also control TV networks and the mainstream music record labels, hence the magicians of these companies can adopt a multi-pronged approach. The United States has many tools at its disposal for dominating the globe, economically, politically and militarily. However the drive in these fields is supplemented by the US's striving for World cultural domination. There is no one single industry that augments the cause of subjugating the world in terms of hearts and minds to American cultural Imperialism, than the film industry. So worshipping at the altar of celebrity may seem pernicious enough. However it is only the tip of the iceberg in terms of the sinister monstrosity that looms below the surface of the film industry.

It is unfortunate that the world, that had previously seen

the justice of Islam, has become dominated by the capitalist nations such as Britain, the United States and France, looking to secure as many interests for themselves as they could. Islam, and only Islam, will liberate the world from the ills of the capitalist dominated world, by solving the problems that it has caused and establishing a system of justice for all peoples, and only the Islamic Khilafah will establish Islam in the affairs of life. This chaotic situation, which is witnessed throughout the world, is a direct result of the capitalist way of life that is characterised by the poisonous ideas of freedom, democracy and pluralism. It is also the consequence of the absence of the Islamic Khilafah, which is the method that Allah (swt) ordained to practically establish his deen on the earth.

We ask Allah (swt) to help this Ummah to rise to her greatest duty, which is for her to choose an Amir, sincere to her deen of truth, so that he may lead her with it, returning the Islamic Khilafah as the number one state in the world, and on that day the believers will be happy with the victory of Allah (swt); and all praise is to Allah (swt), the Lord of the worlds.

“Know that the life of this world is only play and amusement, pomp and mutual boasting among you, and rivalry in respect of wealth and children. (It is) as the likeness of vegetation after rain, thereof the growth is pleasing to the tiller; afterwards it dries up and you see it turning yellow; then it becomes straw. But in the Hereafter (there is) a severe torment (for the disbelievers) and Forgiveness from Allah and (His) Good Pleasure (for the believers). And the life of this world is only a deceiving enjoyment” [TMQ Al-Hadid: 20]

Salim Fredericks

Source: Khilafah Magazine May 2001 Edition

Slaves and Slavery

Most people believe slavery no longer exists.

However it has been estimated by some international agencies that there are at least 27 million people are currently in bondage - indeed more slaves in the world than ever before.

Take India, where between 200,000 and 300,000 children are involved in the handmade woolen carpet industry, one of the largest export earners for the

country. Indeed many children are entrapped in a system of debt bondage still widespread in Asia and the subcontinent. Where families have pledged their own labor and that of family members as security against a loan taken in a time of crisis. Tragically, the original sum is hardly ever repaid: exorbitant interest rates ensure families will pass on their ever-mounting debt to their children for generations. People are thus born into slavery.



In Southeast Asia hundreds of thousands of Asia's children, mostly girls but also boys, have been taken from their homes and delivered to bordellos, where they fuel a sex industry that thrives in great part by servicing Western and Japanese men. Indeed, sex slaves are captured in much the same way as Haitian cane cutters, India's carpet weavers, and Persian Gulf camel jockeys. They are lured with false promises of decent employment, caught in debt bondage, kidnapped, or simply sold outright by parents, friends, or people they know. When Islam was revealed fourteen hundred years ago the issue of slavery was much the same then. The following is the first of a two part series taken from the book "The Islamic Personality Volume 2" by Shaikh Taqiuddin an-Nabhani (Hizb ut Tahrir) in which it is detailed how Islam through the Khilafah remedied the position of slaves and effectively treated slavery.

THE POSITION OF ISLAM ON SLAVES AND SLAVERY

Islam came while slaves existed in all areas of the world, and slavery was a system common in all areas of the world with all peoples and nations. It is not known of the existence of any area of the earth except that slaves were traded and free persons were enslaved. It is not related of the existence of any land without slavery. Islam viewed that this problem related to two aspects. Firstly, it related to the slaves who had been enslaved in practice and those whose consideration had fallen from the upright consideration of others who were free and were considered as goods like other goods sold and bought and bargained over. So it was necessary to treat it with a treatment that resulted in freeing these slaves and making them free persons. As for the second aspect, it related to slavery. It is necessary to treat it with a treatment placing a limit on slavery. Hence there came ayah and ahadith treating these two aspect with a beneficial treatment for mankind based upon the reality of mankind and the reality of the relationships existing between its individuals and nations.

TREATING SLAVES

Islam treated slaves with a treatment resulting in making easier the position of the slave imposed upon him, and resulting in freeing him compulsorily and voluntarily. It placed many rules in this matter which the fuqaha detailed in complete detail. These rules are summarized in the following issues:

1. Islam found people owning slaves so it treated the problems of slaves between the owners with a treatment giving the slaves rights and preserving him his consideration of being a human being like the free person in relation to the natural attributes man was naturally endowed with. Allah ta'ala exhorted in the Noble Qur'an as did the Messenger (SAW) in the honoured hadith with kindness to

slaves and living with them kindly. The Supreme said: *“Worship Allah and do not associate anything with Him and be kind to parents, relatives, orphans, the poor, the neighbour who is a relative and the unrelated neighbour and the unrelated (sahib) and the wayfarer and those whom your hands possess”* [TMQ]. The meaning of *“those your right hands possess”* is your slaves (arqa). And he (SAW) said: **“They are your brothers whom Allah placed under your hands. Feed them with what you eat, clothe them with what you wear and do not impose duties upon them which will overcome them. If you so impose duties, then assist them”** (narrated by Muslim). He also narrated via the way of Abu Hurayra of his saying: He (SAW) said: **“One of you should not say: My slave (abd) and my slave-girl (amati). All of you are the slaves of Allah and all your women are the slave-girls of women are the slave-girls of Allah. Rather let him say: My boy (ghulam) and my girl (jariyah) and my (fata) and my (fatati).”** The Shar’a lifted the rank of the slave and made him like the free person when it made his blood protected (ma’sum) so the free person is killed for it because Allah ta’ala says: *“O you who believe, retaliation has been imposed upon you in deliberate murder”* [TMQ 2:]. Retaliation is (mumathala) and punishing the sinner as retaliation is used (linguistically) for recompense for the sinner, and it is used for doing upon the doer similar to what he did. The meaning of *“retaliation has been imposed upon you”* as recompense for the sin in murder to kill the killer. This is general covering the male and female, free person and slave. This is strengthened by what ibn Majah narrated via the way of ibn Abbas of his (SAW) saying: **“Muslims are equal in their blood”** which is general. The free person and slave are equal in that the blood of each of them is protected and it is haram to kill him, so the killer is killed whoever he is. Hence Islam made the life of the enslaved slave like the life of the free person equally, and his blood is protected like the blood of a free person. He (SAW) said: **“Whoever kills his slave, we will kill him”** (narrated by Ahmad and Abu Dawud via the way of Sumra bin Jundub). Also Islam gave the slave the right to marry, divorce, study and he is a witness upon others whether a free person or slave. As for what Islam gave as a right to the owner of a slave-girl to enjoy (istimta’) with her, this lifts the rank/status of the slave and result in his freedom because the enjoyment of the owner with his slave-girl is like the enjoyment of the husband with his wife, lifting the status of the slave girl to the status of the free wife and gives her a status before her master. In addition to what results from this enjoyment of pregnancy and childbirth which prepares this slave-girl to be freed compulsorily after the death of her master.

2. Islam encouraged the freeing of slaves. It made the freeing of the slave as helping the human being to be grateful for the favour of Allah al-jalalah and assists him to climb (iqtiham) the (‘aqabah). The Supreme said: *“He has not climbed the (‘aqabah). And what will let you know what is the (‘aqabah). Freeing the (raqabah)”* [TMQ]. *“Al-iqtiham”* is the

entry and cross over (mujawaza) with strictness and difficulty, and (‘aqabah) is difficulty. It made the righteous deed as (‘aqabah) and made its performance as climbing for it due to what is therein of (mu’anat) the difficulty and the struggling with the soul. *“Freeing the neck”* is liberating it from slavery so Allah encouraged the freeing of slaves in this ayah. Similarly did the Messenger (SAW) encourage the freeing of slaves. He (SAW) said: **“Which-ever man frees a Muslim man, Allah ta’ala will liberate for each of his organ an organ from the Fire”** (narrated by Al-Bukhari and Muslim). This demonstrates that Islam urged the freeing of slaves and gave it a great reward.

3. Islam legislated practical rules obliging the freeing of slaves. So it legislated rules obliging the freeing when it made the freeing on an enslaved slave to the related mahrem as being accomplished (aliy) upon mere ownership whether the owner consents or not, or frees or not. Each human being who owns a relative (dhu rahm) mahrem by purchase or inheritance, his relative is freed from him completely due to mere ownership without need for his freeing him. Abu Dawud narrated from Al-Hasn from Sumra that the Prophet (SAW) said: **“Whoever owns a (dhu rahm) mahrem, then he is free.”** It made punishing the slave by burning, cutting an organ, spoiling him or striking him with a painful strike as obliging his freedom. So if his owner does not free him, the ruler frees him completely from his owner. He said: **“Whoever slaps his slave or strikes him, his atonement (kaffara) is to free him”** (narrated by Muslim by the way of ibn Umar). [November 2000: pp. 201-230 (document)/pp. 255-284 (Arabic book); 11,277 words]

The meaning of the strike is the painful (mubrih) strike due to their coming of ahadith permitting the owner to strike his slave a disciplinary strike. Islam made the freeing of the slave as a compulsory atonement (kaffara) for many sins. So whoever kills a believer accidentally, his atonement is freeing a believing slave. The Supreme said: *“It is not (allowed) for a believer to kill a believer except by mistake. And whoever kills a believer by mistake, then freeing a believing slave and blood money (diyya) to be delivered to his people except if they give (it as) charity. If he is of a people between them and you is a covenant, then blood money delivered to his people and freeing a believing slave”* [TMQ]. And whoever perjures his oath, then among what atones his mistake is freeing a slave. The Supreme said: *“Allah does not punish you for the (laghw) of your oaths but He will punish you over what your oaths (‘aqada). Its atonement is feeding ten poor persons of the average that you feed your family or clothing them or freeing a slave”* [TMQ]. Whoever (dhahara) his wife by saying to her, ‘You are like my mother’ then he returns to her, his atonement is freeing a slave. The Supreme said: *“Those who (yudhahiruna) their women/wives then return over what they said, then freeing a slave before they touch”* [TMQ]. Whoever invalidates the fast of Ramadhan by sexual intercourse, his atonement is

freeing a slave. From Abu Hurayra who said: "A man came to the Prophet (SAW) and said: **I have perished, O Messenger of Allah. He said: And what has caused you to perish? He said: I (waqa'a) my wife in Ramadhan. He said: Do you have what would free a slave? He said: No. He said: Are you able to fast two months consecutively? He said: No. He said: Do you possess what would feed sixty poor people? He said: No. So he sat down, then there was brought to the Prophet (SAW) an ('urq) (i.e. basket or panier/dry gourd) within which were dates. He said: Give sadaqa with these. He said: Are there people more poor than us? There is none between these two (labt) more needy of them than us. The Prophet (SAW) laughed until there appeared his canine teeth and said: Go and feed your family with them."**

The first the Prophet (SAW) commanded with was freeing the slave, and he did not change to anything else except after the inability of doing so was clear to him. All these rules of atonements oblige the atoner to free the slave.

Nor was Islam satisfied with this, but it also made more the slave a way to work to free himself as it made for the owner a way to be compensated the value of the slave by it. This is in the encouragement of the manumission contract (mukatab). Islam encouraged this and Allah commanded it by the Qur'an. The Supreme said: *"As for those among you whom you possess who seek the manumission contract, then contract them if you know good in them and give them of the wealth of Allah which He gave you"* [TMQ]. If the master contracts his slave by saying to him: If you give me so much in such and such time then you are free, it is obligatory upon the master to free his slave so that he works to attain the money which he contracted upon him. It is obligatory upon him to free him if he brings the money nor is it correct for him to revert from this manumission contract. The fuqaha recognised the manumission contract as the immediate freeing of a slave and his neck in time (ma'alan), and that if the contract is validated then the slave leaves the hands of his master and whenever he pays the substitute he leaves the ownership of his master.

All of these rules are for freeing slaves. It is noted therein that they take the path of directing the encouragement and desire, and the path of legislating rules executed by the State forcefully if the individual does not execute them by the push of piety of Allah. All of these rules lead to creating thinking and action among the owners to free slaves, and lead to creating thinking and action among the slaves themselves to work to free themselves from slavery. This makes the course (sair) directed to ending slavery in society.

4 Nor was Islam satisfied with encouraging the freeing of slaves and formulating rules compelling freeing, but rather made in the Bait al-Mal of Muslims a specific category (bab) for freeing slaves when it made zakat expended to freeing slaves and

made this one of the eight categories. The Supreme said: *"Verily the sadaqat is only for the poor, the indigent, those who work upon it, those whose hearts are to be reconciled, for (riqab), debtors, for the way of Allah and the wayfarer, an obligation from Allah and Allah is knower wise"* [TMQ 9:60]. His statement: *"and for (riqab)"* means freeing slaves. It did not specify for this category a specific amount, so it is allowed for the State to make an amount of money for freeing slaves. Rather it is allowed for it to make all the zakat money for freeing slaves if there is not at that time a necessity for other expenditure of the expenses of zakat. This is because the expenditure of zakat is not obliged to be for the eight categories but rather it is allowed to be specified for one category of these categories according to what the Khaleefah of the Muslims views.

The categories of slavery in the ancient systems that were practiced in the world when Islam came were many. They would judge with slavery for the bankrupt debtor; so the creditor, when his debtor became indigent and bankrupt, could enslave him. They would also judge with slavery of the human being as punishment of some he committed of crimes and mistakes. They also ordained for the free person to accept slavery upon himself so he sells himself to another upon condition that he frees him after a period they agreed upon. The strong tribes allowed themselves to enslave individuals or weak tribes. Wars and battles would determine, in a general way, the enslaving of captives and allow enslaving all the people of a country if they conquered them. Some of them would limit slavery to those they took as captives in the war of men, women and children. Whoever was taken as a captive in a legal war and was enslaved therein was considered a slave and was acknowledged in his being a slave.

When Islam came, it imposed for the situations where slavery occurred Shari'ah rules other than slavery, and detailed the matter in the situation of war. It clarified in relation to the bankrupt debtor that the creditor should wait to a time of ease. The Supreme said: *"And if he is one in difficulty then waiting to a time of ease"* [TMQ]. It also clarified the punishments upon sins with detail particularly the punishment of stealing whose punishment used to be slavery which Allah indicated in the Qur'an: *"They said: His punishment, for the one in whose mount it is found, is his recompense/punishment"* [TMQ 12:]. So Islam clarified its punishment i.e. stealing as cutting the hand. The Supreme said: *"The thief, male and female, cut off their hands as recompense/punishment for what they acquired"* [TMQ 5:]. It made the contract between the slave and owner upon freedom, not upon slavery. It forbade the enslaving of free people with a decisive prohibition. He (ASS) said: **"Allah 'azza wa jalla said: Three (persons) I will dispute with on the Day of Judgement: A man given in My name then he betrayed, a man who sold a free man and ate his price, and a man who employed an employee who fulfilled for him but he did not give him his wage"** (narrated by Al-Bukhari). So Allah ta'ala will dispute with the

seller of the free person. As for the situation of war, Islam detailed therein and prevented the enslaving of captives absolutely. In the second year of the Hijrah, it clarified the rule of the captive in that either they are favoured by releasing their (sirah) without any exchange or either they are ransomed for money or captives like them of Muslims of dhimmis, thereby preventing the enslaving of captives. The Supreme said: *"When you meet those who disbelieve then striking of the neck until when you have inflicted severe slaughter upon them then bind the fetters. Then either release afterwards or either ransom until the war lays down its burdens"* [TMQ]. The ayah is explicit upon this meaning: Release/favour (manaa) or ransom, and it absolutely does not bear any other meaning. The Arabic language requires restricting the rule of the captive in one of these two matters-release or ransom because "imma" is for giving a choice between two matters and for restriction in the two things. Herein it came giving a choice between release and ransom, and restricting the rule to these two, when it came expressing that with "imma" which gives sense (mufid) of the restriction in what is mentioned after it: *"then either release afterwards or either ransom"* [TMQ]. Here a question can be offered/raised which was a position of confusion for some fuqaha from whom it was taken that the Khaleefah can enslave captives if he so views. This question is that the Prophet (SAW) did enslave after this ayah. This ayah was revealed in the second year after Hijrah at the beginning of the war between the Messenger and the Quraysh disbelievers, and the Messenger enslaved in Hunayn. And the Messenger's action is considered legislation as it considered explanation for the ayah of Allah. So how could enslaving of captives be prevented by this ayah even though the Messenger enslaved after is revelation in Hunayn? The response is that the action of the Messenger and his speech in relation to the Qur'anic ayat is either detailing (tafseel) its (mujmal), restricting its unrestricted or specifying its generality. The action of the Messenger and his speech cannot be an abrogation to the Qur'an. The ayah of captives is neither (mujmal) such that it be detailed, nor are its words the words of generality so that they be specified nor unrestricted so that they be restricted. So if it be authenticated that the Messenger enslaved after its revelation, his action would be an abrogator for it and this is not permitted. In addition, the Messenger's enslaving captives is individually narrated news (khabr ahad) which contradicts the ayah: *"Then either(manna) afterwards or either ransom"*; and when the (khabr ahad) contradicts the definite ayat and ahadith the knowledge (diraya) of the (khabr ahad) is rejected. Accordingly, there is not consideration to what is narrated of the Messenger enslaving after the revelation of the ayah of captives. Actually what happened from the Messenger in the battle of Hunain was that

women and children accompanied the fighters of the polytheists to increase their numbers and incite their men, so when they were routed in the battlefield the women and children became (sabaya) and the Messenger divided them between the fighters among the Muslims. When they (ruji'a) in this (sabaya) the Muslims gifted what they had of the right in this (sabaya) voluntarily and returned their (sabaya) to their people. This indicated the permissibility of enslaving (sabaya) who are the women and children who accompany the men in the battlefield to increase the numbers and for encouragement. Despite that, the Messenger did not enslave the (sabaya) in Khaybar. When he (SAW) invaded Khaybar and conquered over its residents, he left them as free persons and left the land under their hands to farm it for half its (ghilt). Abu Ubaidah said about (sabaya): **'The Imam is given a choice in them as long as they have not been divided. Once they are divided there is no way over them except by gift and free will of those for whom they become like the action of the Messenger of Allah (SAW) with the people of Hunain. None of the (sabaya) was returned by anyone of them except by gift and free will since he had divided them. He did not do this with the people of Khaybar but rather left them as free persons nor were they gifted by anyone as division had not occurred over them.'**

As for other than the (sabaya) who are the fighters when they are taken as captives, the Messenger (SAW) never enslaved any of their men. It is not authenticated that he enslaved a captive of the fighting men from the Arabs or Jews or Christians. The word (aseer) when used unrestricted in the language (tansarifu) to the male fighter. As for the woman and child, the word used for them in the language is (sabiyy) not (usra). Accordingly this clarifies that Islam prevented enslaving captives of the male fighters, and gave the Khaleefah a choice in the (sabaya) between enslaving and liberation and there is no ransom in them. Just as the Messenger did in the (sabaya) of Hunain; he enslaved them then liberated them. And like he did with the (sabaya) of Khaybar; he left them free without enslaving them. This is if women and children accompany the army in war; if they stay at home, however, there is nothing upon them, neither captivity nor (sabaya). The action of the Khaleefah in the question of enslaving (sabaya) proceeds according to what the war policy requires in dealing with the enemy. Its objective is not enslaving rather it is merely one of the war transactions whose matter is left to the Khaleefah who does what he sees and what the position in relation to the enemy requires.

Accordingly this clarifies that Islam treated enslaving and prevented all situation in which enslaving occurred, and left for the Khaleefah

the choice in the situation of (sabaya) in following the position in relation to the enemy. Hence it has finished enslaving particularly when it invalidated the going out of women and children with the army to increase the numbers and for encouragement as in the situation in modern warfare for centuries today. There does not remain even one situation in which enslaving occurs at all. Accordingly Islam has prevented enslaving.

***Shaikh Taqi ud-Din An-Nabahani
(R.A.)
'Extract taken from the book
Shakhsiya'
16 August, 2001***

Source: Kcom Journal