


# **DRESS ACCORDING TO THE SUNNAH**



By:  
Mujlisul Ulama of S.A. – PO Box 3393 –  
Port Elizabeth – 6056 – South Africa

## **THE BAROMETER OF IMAAN**

Choice of dress style is the effect of Imaan and kufr. It is precisely for this reason that the Fuqahaa have ruled that adoption of kuffaar dress-style is kufr. The dress itself is not kufr. But the attitude of the heart which constrains a Muslim to adopt a non-Muslim dress-style is kufr since it displays a preference and a desire for something which belongs to the kuffaar. This attitude implies that the kuffaar style is better and more preferable than the style of the Ambiyaa, Sulaha and the Ummah. This is the attitude which exposes a Muslim to the grave danger of kufr.

Qaadhi Baidaawi in his Tafseer of the Qur'aan Majeed states:

*"Verily; wearing the clothes of aliens (kuffaar), tying a zunnar (the holy thread of idolaters or the crucifix) and similar other acts have been proclaimed kufr because the acts display (or imply) rejection (of Islam). Most assured, a person who has accented the Rasool (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) will obviously not be so audacious to commit these acts."*

Leaving aside the technical argument pertaining to haraam and Makrooh, the question which has to be asked is:

*Why would a Muslim give preference to the dress-style of the kuffaar? Why would a Muslim love to walk around with a bare head when 124 000 Ambiyaa, 120 000 Sahaabah and the entire Ummah of Islam from the very inception of this Deen, always covered their heads with a special type of headgear which belongs exclusively to Muslims? If your Nabi (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) and his Sahaabah always covered their heads, why do you who claim to be their followers, love to bare your head in public like the kuffaar do?*

A question for meditation is:

Whose style is it to wander around bare-headed and whose style is it to cover the head in public?

The barometer of a man's Imaan is in his dress-style. For some it is a barometer for ascertaining the very validity of Imaan, and for others a barometer to test the quality of their Imaan. At the least, kuffaar dress-style is fisq.

IS KUFFAAR DRESS, PART OF THE USWAH-E-HASANAH (BEAUTIFUL LIFE PATTERN) OF RASULULLAH SALLALLAHU ALAYHI WASALLAM, OR IS ISLAMIC DRESS PART OF THIS HOLY LIFE PATTERN?

***Contents***

THE BAROMETER OF IMAAN .....1

THE STYLE OF RASULULLAH'S GARMENT ..... 6

    THE TROUSERS .....6

    THE REASON.....7

    CATEGORIC PROHIBITION.....8

    THE AHADITH ..... 8

    COMMENT ..... 10

    THE THRUST ..... 10

    PRIDE..... 12

    THE HIDDEN DISEASE ..... 12

    HADHRAT ABU BAKR..... 13

    IMAAM SHAAFI..... 14

    THE ACTUAL POSITION ..... 15

        THE FACTORS..... 15

ISLAMIC HEADGEAR..... 16

NECK TIE – SYMBOL OF SHIRK..... 24

SYMBOL OF SHIRK ..... 25

DRESS FOR SALAAT..... 26

DIVINE PRESENCE..... 27

GARMENTS FOR SALAAH..... 27

IMPORTANCE ..... 29

BASELESS ARGUMENTS..... 30

RASULULLAH'S KURTAH ..... 30

ISLAMIC DRESS - A SYMBOL OF ISLAM..... 31

## **THE STYLE OF RASULULLAH'S GARMENT**

When a modernist Muslim criticizes the dress style and appearance of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Sahaabah, we in this age in which kufr preponderates, are not surprised. Immersed in the kufr concepts and liberalism of the western kuffaar, it is just natural and logical for modernists to denigrate every teaching of the Sunnah which conflicts with the tastes and hues of western culture. In fact, even Ulama have become so terribly desensitized with the kufr of the modernists as a consequence of their mutual association and their dubious and baseless policies of 'hikmat' and diplomacy, that they (the Ulama) too have become chronic victims of the maladies of kufr and liberalism.

So while we cannot be surprised when modernists criticize, mock and sneer at the dress styles and appearance of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and his Sahaabah, there is not only surprise but shock when molvis —products of Darul Ulooms - who purport to be followers of the Ulama of the Sunnah, resort to labyrinthal arguments in order to justify styles which are in conflict with not only the practical example of the Nabi, but in diametric opposition to his explicit statements of prohibition pertaining to certain dress styles.

## ***THE TROUSERS***

Every molvi is aware or should be aware that ALL the Books of Hadith contain many authentic ahadith clearly explaining the style of Rasulullah's izaar. There is absolutely no difference of opinion among any of the innumerable authorities of the Shariah from the very inception of Islam that Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and his Sahaabah always wore their izaar and trousers above their ankles.

In addition to their practical example, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Sahaabah verbally propagated in explicit terms the prohibition of wearing the trousers below the ankles. This style is completely unrelated to age and time. There was no incumbency of the

era to wear the trousers in this manner nor were there any physical or geographic restraints or factors which compelled the adoption of this style. On the contrary, the age and the people of the time demanded that the trousers be worn below the ankles in exactly the same way as modernists, kuffaar and Muslim ashamed of the Sunnah Culture are advocating today.

### ***THE REASON***

In order to accommodate the liberal fancies of the western kuffaar, molvis in this age of corruption, have hooked onto a legless and baseless argument to justify, propagate and even praise the kaafir style of wearing the trousers below the ankles—a style which is in clear opposition to the style and command of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

The modernist molvis of the liberal cult of westernism are arguing that the reason for the prohibition to wear the trousers below the ankles was pride. Their argument goes that on account of pride, the style was prohibited. But if there is no pride then wearing the trousers below the ankles is permissible, in fact commendable by implication of their baseless and satanic arguments which they voice over their radio channels.

Why is it haraam for a Muslim to wear a crucifix around his neck or arm? Why should it be haraam for a Muslim to keep a small idol of Bhagwan or Buddha in his pocket or display it in his home. Why should this be haraam if the Muslim concerned has no beliefs of shirk or kufr. He simply regards these items as 'artifacts' and symbols of 'history'. He does not believe in these idols. He does not worship them. But we can claim without fear of contradiction that even the modernist molvis have as yet not descended to the level of corruption which will constrain them to say that keeping such idols is permissible if the reason is not shirk/worship. Although this is still the case presently, we know that there will soon come a time when keeping and admiring even these instruments of shirk and kufr will be justified and made legal by the presentation of the argument that the reason for the initial prohibition was the belief of shirk which had not yet been completely eradicated from the hearts of the new converts to Islam.

### ***CATEGORIC PROHIBITION***

When the Shariah categorically prohibits an act or practice, the prohibition will endure regardless of the reason for which it was initially prohibited. Reciting the qira't jahran (aloud) in Zuhr and Asr was prohibited initially on account of a particular reason which soon after the prohibition no longer existed. But in spite of the disappearance of the reason for the prohibition, the hukm of Sirri (silent) recitation will endure until the day of Qiyaamah.

Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said that he who plays chess is like one who has dipped his fingers in the blood of a swine. Surely there was a cogent reason for this stern prohibition. Now, regardless of whether that reason exists in some cases or not, the prohibition of playing chess will remain until the day of Qiyaamah. In fact, the prohibition has been taken further by the Fuqaha (the Authorities of the Shariah). This prohibition has been extended to all similar games of the kuffaar.

### ***THE AHADITH***

We shall now present the relevant authentic Ahadith on the issue of the trousers below and above the ankles and then proceed to further refute and negate the utterly baseless and devious arguments tendered by modernists molvis to beguile the Ummah.

- (1) Abu Hurairah (Radhiyallahu anhu) narrates: Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: "Whatever of the garment is below the ankles will be in the Fire (of Jahannum)." (Bukhaari)
- (2) Ibn Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) narrates: "Verily the Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: Whoever hangs his garment in pride, Allah will not look at him (with mercy) on the day of Qiyaamah." (Bukhaari and Muslim)
- (3) Abu Saeed al-Kudri (Radhiyallahu anhu) narrates: "I heard Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) saying: The izaar of the Mu'min is halfway on the forelegs (i.e. midway between the knees and the ankles). There is no sin on him in that which is between it and the ankles. And, whatever is below this is in the Fire (of Jahannum). He (Rasulullah

(sallallahu alayhi wasallam) repeated this statement) three times, and he said: Allah will not look (with mercy) at the person who hangs his izaar in pride." (Abu Dawood and Ibn Maajah)

(4) Ibn Umar (radhiyallahu anhu) narrates: "I passed by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) while my trousers was hanging (i.e. below the ankles). He then exclaimed: O Abdullah! Raise your izaar. I then raised it (a bit). Then he (Rasulullah- sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: Raise it more! I then raised it more. Thereafter I was always conscious of it" Some people asked: "Until where (did you raise it)?" He (Ibn Umar) said: "Until midway of the foreleg." (Muslim)

(5) Ubaid Bin Khaalid (radhiyallahu anhu) narrates: While I was walking in Madinah, (I heard) someone behind me say: "Raise your izaar! Verily it (raising the garment) is better for piety and preservation (of the garment)." I then looked behind and observed that it was Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). I then said: O Rasulullah! It is a simple (of inferior quality and price) garment. Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) commented: "What, is there not for you in me an example (to follow)?" When I looked (at Rasulullah's garment), his izaar was midway on his forelegs." (Tirmizi)

(6) Salmah Bin Akwa' (radhiyallahu anhu) narrates: "Uthmaan (radhiyallahu anhu) would wear his trousers midway on his forelegs, and he would say:

"So was the izaar of my Companion, i.e. Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam)."  
(Tirmizi)

(7) Huzaifah Bin Yamaan (radhiyallahu anhu) narrates: Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) took hold of the flesh of my foreleg (or of his foreleg) and said: 'This is the location for the izaar. If you are not satisfied (with this position), then a bit lower. And if you are still not satisfied, than know that the izaar has no right in the ankles.'" (Tirmizi)

Commenting on these Hadith narrations, Hadhrat Shaikh Muhammad Zakariyya (rahmatullah alayh) writes:

"Severe warnings have been recorded for wearing the lungi, trousers, etc. below the ankles. That section (below the ankles) on which the garment hangs will be burnt in the Fire (of Jahannum). In view of this type (of severe) warnings (of punishment) in the ahadith, special attention should be paid to this matter. But, on the contrary in our age, the garments are specially (i.e. intentionally) worn below the ankles. To Allah does the complainer (register his complaint)."

### ***COMMENT***

Inspite of the many unambiguous ahadith explicitly prohibiting the kuffaar style of wearing the trousers below the ankles, molvis in this age are devoting special time on their radio channels to negate what Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) has commanded.

### ***THE THRUST***

Any level-headed and unbiased Muslim in search of the truth will understand after a perusal of the aforementioned ahadith that wearing the trousers below the ankles is haraam.

In Hadith No. 5, Ubaid Bin Khaalid (radhiyallahu anhu) was wearing his garment below his ankles. He was walking in the streets of Madinah. When Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) ordered him to raise his izaar above the ankles. In this Hadith, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) presented two reasons for wearing the trousers above the ankles in this style (of the Sunnah), is greater piety in view of the fact that it firstly is in conflict with the style of the kuffaar. Secondly, when a Muslim consciously abstains from emulating the style of the kuffaar, he rises in rank of taqwa. Following the method of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is an incumbent requirement of Taqwa, hence he said that wearing the trousers above the ankles is 'atqaa' (more pious). It thus flows from this reasoning presented by Nabi-e-Kareem (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) that wearing the garment below the ankles is not in conformity

with taqwa. Whether we understand the relationship between this style and taqwa is of no significance. Since Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) has offered this explanation, it is the fardh duty of every Mu'min to blindly accept it.

The second argument which Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) presented for his command to wear the garment above the ankles is that this style is 'abqaa' for the garment. In other words the garment will be better preserved against the dirt and filth of the road and in this way be better protected. The Mu'min's trousers should not serve the function of the street-sweeper.

It is significant that in this Hadith, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) did not tender the argument of pride. Since he was aware that the Sahaabi was not wearing his garment below the ankles on account of pride, he did not mention pride on this occasion. However, when the Sahaabi did not understand the argument, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) broached the subject from another angle. He asked: "Is my example and way not sufficient?" In other words, for the Mu'min the acts, practices and example of the Rasool are more than adequate. There is no need to search for reasons and wisdoms for the ahkaam (laws of the Deen). The example of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is compulsorily imposed on Muslims by the Qur'aan Majeed. There is no need to look elsewhere and further than this. It thus does not behove a Muslim, least of all a learned man, to dig out technicalities and by distortion present these in justification of the endeavour to negate the style and custom of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

In Hadith No. 6 Hadhrat Uthmaan (Radhiyallahu anhu), the third Khalifah, long after the demise of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) commented on the practice of wearing the trousers above the ankles. Everyone knows and accepts that he had no pride. If the order to wear the trousers above the ankles was based on pride, Hadhrat Uthmaan and all the Sahaabah would not have been so meticulous in observing this injunction. They would have worn their trousers below their ankles since they were bereft of pride. They had attained the loftiest heights in the

reformation of the nafs. There were no better, no more pious and no humbler community on earth than the Sahaabah who were thoroughly purified of all spiritual maladies by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Yet, in spite of their high stage of humility, they adhered meticulously to the style of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

Everyone who has studied a bit of the history of the Sahaabah, is aware that Hadhrat Ibn Umar (radhiyallahu anhu) was such a staunch and ardent follower of the minutest details of the Sunnah, that people believed that he would become insane. Pride was never the reason for him having worn his trousers below his ankles. When Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) saw this, he commanded him to raise his garment midway between the knees and the ankles. The issue of pride never featured in his wearing his trousers below his ankles nor in the argument of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) on the occasion when he issued his instruction to this devotee of the Sunnah.

### ***PRIDE***

In some narrations the reason for wearing the trousers below the ankles is stated as pride. While this was the actual reason in those times for this prohibited style, it was not always the case with everyone who would wear his trousers below his ankles. Hence, we find Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) issuing stern warnings and threats of the punishment of the Fire for those who wear their trousers in the fashion of the proud people. So whether one wears the trousers below the ankles for the sake of pride or not, one is undoubtedly, imitating the style of the proud ones and the style of the kuffaar. Imitating the kuffaar by itself is a factor of prohibition.

### ***THE HIDDEN DISEASE***

Now the question to be asked is: Why would a molvi advocate a style which Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had prohibited. He did not only present pride as the reason for the prohibition. So why is there so much concern to negate a Sunnah style? Leaving aside the technical questions and academic rulings, it can be simply understood that the

permanent practice and style of Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and his Sahaabah were to wear their garments above the ankles, not below their ankles.

That wearing the trousers above the ankles is an irrefutable Sunnah practice will be acknowledged by all Muslims, even the modernists and the liberal molvis. On the assumption that it is not haraam to wear the trousers below the ankles, then too, why should Muslims who claim to love Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) have a desire to scuttle this Sunnah practice and in its place follow the style of the kuffaar? Whose style is it to wear the trousers above the ankles? And, whose style is it to wear it below the ankles? What does the Imaan of a Mu'min demand, follow the style of Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) or the style of the kuffaar? Why is there such a strong aversion in the ranks of the Muslims for the style of Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam)?

What goes on in the heart of a molvi who advocates a style abhorred by Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam)? Surely there must be some hidden disease (mardh) lurking somewhere in such a heart. It is inconceivable that a Mu'min of healthy Imaan will ever stoop so low as to scrape the very bottom of the barrel of spiritual corruption. Remember that to negate a preference of Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), to feel ashamed of the style of Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and to present devious arguments to distort and deny what Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had commanded, are worse than consuming liquor, worse than fornication and worse than all the major sins put together. Such an attitude is kufr.

### ***HADHRAT ABU BAKR***

The solitary narration which the denigrators of Rasulallah's practice are able to produce as 'evidence' is the Hadith in which it is mentioned that Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) allowed Hadhrat Abu Bakr (radhiyallahu anhu) to wear his garment below his ankles. To present this Hadith in substantiation of the claim, the aim of which is to negate the style of Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), is ludicrous and utterly baseless.

The Hadith in question is very clear as for the reason of the permission granted to Hadhrat Abu Bakr (radhiyallahu anhu) who was highly perturbed by his inability to maintain his garment above his ankles. He therefore, discussed this matter with Nabi-e-Kareem (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Hadhrat Abu Bakr (Radhiyallahu anhu) was a man with a big stomach. In spite of all his efforts to keep his garment in place, he failed. His garment would repeatedly slide down over his ankles. The Hadith in question explicitly mentions this fact. In view of this condition and his inability to retain his garment in position above his ankles, he was exempted from the prohibition. But he had a valid reason. What valid reason do the modernists and the liberal molvis have? There are always exceptions to general rules. But the exceptions do not cancel out the law or the rule. The rule remains in place. Furthermore, why do the scoffers of Rasulallah's style cast a blind eye to all the ahadith of prohibition and cling onto this solitary narration which in no way negates the prohibition stated so emphatically in the other narrations?

### ***IMAAM SHAAFI***

Like a drowning man, the modernist molvi tries to cling to every floating straw that passes his way. Entirely bereft of proper Shar'i arguments to bolster his corrupt view and enmity for Rasulallah's dress style, the molvi claims that according to Imaam Shaafi (Rahmatullah alayh) it is permissible to wear the trousers below the ankles.

Let us for a moment assume that what the molvi tendered is correct. The question now is: Why does the Hanafi molvi resort to a view of Imaam Shaafi (Rahmatullah alayh), especially on an issue for which there is absolutely no need to adopt the view of another Math-hab? If it was a critical issue or an emergency or some urgent need, then in terms of the principles of the Hanafi Math-hab, a pious and experienced Mufti will have the right to issue a Fatwa on the basis of one of the other Math-habs among the Four Math-habs. But in this case of wearing the trousers, there is absolutely no such expediency.

When a Hanafi molvi ignores the views and fatwas of the authorities of his own Math-hab and clings to an opinion of another Math-hab, it

follows that there is no flexibility for his baseless view in his own Math-hab, hence he had to look elsewhere for aid. His act in itself is sufficient testimony for the claim that according to the Hanafi Fuqaha and Ulama and Auliya, wearing the trousers below the ankles is haraam.

### ***THE ACTUAL POSITION***

The liberal molvi claims that according to Imaam Shaafi (rahmatullah alayh) wearing the trousers below the ankles is permissible. His claim is baseless. Imaam Shaafi does not say that "it is permissible". According to the Shaafi Math-hab there are different degrees of prohibition for the style of wearing the trousers below the ankles. Explaining this, Imaam Nawawi (a Shaafi authority) states in his Sharhul Muslim:

"It is not permissible to hang the garment below the ankles if it is for pride. If it is for a reason other than pride it is Makrooh. The Mustahab requirement is midway of the calfs (the forelegs) as it is stated in the Hadith of Ibn Umar. Midway of the forelegs is Mustahab. Below this limit until the ankles is permissible without it being Makrooh. What descends below the ankles is Mamnoo' (prohibited). If it is for pride, then the prohibition is of the haraam category (i.e. Makrooh Tahrimi). And, if it is not for pride, the prohibition is of the tanzih category (i.e. Makrooh Tanzih)."

Makrooh Tanzih does not mean 'permissible'. It remains a detestable act in the Shariah. In fact, persistence on a Makrooh Tanzih act transforms it into Makrooh Tahrimi which is sinful and a punishable offence. It makes a man a faasiq. Clutching at straws is not Shar'i evidence for a claim.

### **THE FACTORS**

From the foregoing explanation it will be understood that there are several factors for the prohibition of wearing the garment below the ankles:

(a) It is the style of the kuffaar. Whoever imitates the kuffaar becomes of them.

(b) It is the way of the mutakabbireen (proud people). So whether one has pride or not, is immaterial. The fact that the mutakabbireen's style is adopted is in itself a grave sin.

(c) The opposite style (wearing above the ankles) is 'atqaa' and abqaa' according to Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

(d) Wearing the garment above the ankles is part of the Uswah-e-Hasanah (Beautiful Life Pattern) of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). The Qur'aan commands adoption of this Sunnah.

(e) The trousers has no haqq (right) on the ankles according to the explicit pronouncement of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

(f) What is below the ankles will be in the Fire of Jahannum.

In view of all these factors of prohibition, the arguments of the modernist and liberal molvis have absolutely no validity. These molvis should also understand that in airing their liberal, modernist and baatil views, they do not have the support of a single one of our Akaabir Ulama. Our advice is that they should utilize their radio channels constructively to aid the Deen, not to breakdown Islam and its Culture, for then, there will be absolute justification for branding their organs of transmission as radio shaitaan and channel shaitaan.

## **ISLAMIC HEADGEAR**

Style of dress is among the salient features (Sha-aair) of Islam. The Shariah accords great prominence to a Muslim's way of dress. Detailed rules enacted by the great rulers of Islam among the Sahaabah, Taabieen and- their followers illustrate the emphasis which Islam lays on the dress of a Mu'min.

Among the prohibited factors pertaining to dress is the emulation of non-Muslim dress styles. In all ages of Islam such emulation has been regarded as among the major (kabaair) sins. Tashabbuh bil kuffaar



(emulating the kuffaar) is an evil with far reaching effect on the heart of a Muslim. Hence, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

***"Whoever emulates a people becomes of them."***

In this article we propose to discuss one particular aspect of Islamic dressing, viz., headgear. In these times of intense ,kufr and dhalaal, when many Muslims have sacrificed their intelligence to become slaves of western culture, there is a great desire among modernists to abandon the wearing of Islamic headgear. Among the styles of Islamic headgear is the popular topee which innumerable millions of Muslims have donned over the past centuries of Islamic history. Now in this belated century modernists are at pains to discard this compulsory dress-style of Islam. Fallacious arguments are fabricated to deceive innocent and unwary people into accepting that the topee or Islamic headgear has no relevance in the Shariah.

It should be understood that the ways and styles of Islam did not originate from dubious sources nor were its originators non-entities as are the votaries of western styles. Furthermore, Islamic dress-styles were inherited by the Ummah from generation to generation. Each successive generation obtained its Islamic dress-style from its preceding generation. In this way the chain links up with the Sahaabah who disseminated nothing other than the Sunnah of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Headgear in Islam is not a new development The villifier of the topi must present his proof to indicate the point in time in Islamic history when this headgear became an accredited Islamic head-dress. If he contends that the topi has no Islamic relevance, let him prove his case with Islamic facts and Shar'i proofs. The assertion that many people presently in the Middle East pray without headgear is not Shar'i evidence for the fallacy that the topi has no Islamic status. What is presently being perpetrated in Muslim countries cannot be cited as Islamic evidence for a claim. Only an ignoramus who suffers from colossal ignorance will advance such puerile and ludicrous 'proof for his claim. When the weight of Islamic practice of the past fourteen hundred years upholds Islamic headgear as an integral and incumbent part of a Muslim's dress, then by what stretch of

intelligent reasoning can any Muslim decry and vilify such head-dress? When all the illustrious authorities of Islam from the time of the ahaabah emphasised the donning of headgear, not only for Salaat, but at all times, then it is only necessary to dismiss with contempt the arguments against the topi blustered out by the enemies of the Sunnah of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

The topi is the head-dress which distinguishes a Muslim from a non-Muslim. The importance of this headgear is amply illustrated by the following command of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam): "*The difference between us and the mushrikeen is turbans on top of qalaanis (topis).*"

Even mushrikeen were in the habit of donning turbans. Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) detested resemblance with them. Emulating non-Muslims is forbidden by Islam, hence Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) ordered that Muslims wear topis under their turbans even though the topis are totally concealed and not visible from under the turbans. Even the style of headgear which the Muslim adopts should not resemble the head-dress of the kuffaar, hence Shaikhul Islam Zakariyya (rahmatullah alayh) states:

"In our time it is not permissible to wear green and yellow turbans"  
(Husnus Siyar of Dimyaati Shaafi).

Since green and yellow turbans were among the particular dress-styles of the Yahood and Nasaara of that time, the authorities of the Shariah banned the wearing of such turbans so that Muslims do not violate the Shar'i prohibition of emulating kuffaar. The following verdict appears in Fataawa Khaazin and Fataawa Hindiyah:

"A man will be proclaimed a kaafir for adopting the head-dress of the Majoos (fire-worshippers)."

The following verdict appears in the famous Maaliki Kitaab, Mukhtasarul Khaleel:

## DRESS ACCORDING TO THE SUNNAH

"A Muslim will be proclaimed a kaafir if he wears the hat of the Nasaara."

Strutting about bare-headed is undoubtedly the style of western man who has discarded the norms of true civilization. It has never been the style of any Muslim community, anywhere in the world, right from the time of Rasulullah (saliailahu alayhi wasallam) to emerge in public with bare-heads. One who walks around bare-headed is mardoodush-shahaadah, i.e. his testimony in an Islamic court is not admissible. Those Muslims who are desirous of abandoning the Islamic topi are undoubtedly influenced by western fashions and styles. The fact that they have opted for a kaafir style at the expense of an Islamic style—a style which the Ummah has always accepted speaks volumes for their way of thinking. It points to the direction in which their hearts have inclined. Overtly they proclaim them-selves to be Muslims while covertly their hearts are saturated with love for the styles of kufr. But, Allah Ta'ala warns them:

"Do not incline towards the zaalimoon."

Inclining towards the kuffaar is banned by Islam in all aspects. A Muslim is not allowed to unnecessarily adopt the ways, methods, institutions and styles of the kuffaar. Islam demands head-dress—Islamic head-dress—for its adherents. Western modernity demands a bare-head in order to conform to western standards of dress, the westernized Muslim conjectures the most baseless arguments to bolster his case against the ways of Islam. This attitude borders on kufr and threaten the Imaan of such deviated modernists. Clarifying the Islamic ban of tashabbuh bil kuffaar, Hadhrat Umar (radhiyallahu anhu) despatched a detailed decree to the Muslims of Aazarbaijaan (now in Russia). Among the many prohibitions contained in this Decree the following appears:

"The dress of your father Ismaa-il (alayhis salaam) is incumbent on you. Beware of the luxuries and the styles of the Ajam (non Arabs)." Allaamah Ibn Hajar Haithami (rahmatullah alayh), in his Kitaab Azzawaa-jir an Iqtiraafil Kabaa-ir, records the following narration of Muhaddith Maalik Bin Dinaar (rahmatullah alayh):

## DRESS ACCORDING TO THE SUNNAH

"Allah revealed to one of his Nabis: Say to your nation:

Do not wear the garments of My enemies for then you will become My enemies like they are my enemies."

In Tafseer Ma-aariful Qur'aan Hadhrat Mufti Muhammad Shafi (rahmatullah alayhi) the then Grand Mufti of Pakistan, explains in the exposition of the aayat:

"O! The Sons of Aadam! Adopt your beauty at the time of every Salaat" (Aayat 31 Surah A'raaf)

From this aayat it is obvious that just as the compulsion of concealing the satr is based on the command in this verse, so too is based the significance and merit of donning good and clean garments according to one's means and ability.

Since only concealment of the satr is not adequate for Salaat, but the adoption of zeenat (beauty) is also commanded, therefore it will be Makrooh for a man to perform Salaat bare-head, bared shoulders and exposed elbows, whether he has donned short-sleeved shirt or has rolled up his sleeves."

Islamic headgear is an integral part of the Sunnah, so much so, that a turban will be described as Islamic only if it is worn on top of a qalansawah (topi). Abandoning this Sunnah is a sign of Imaani disaster. It is indicative of the Muslim's drift from Seeraatul Mustaqeem. There can be no other meaning for a Muslim who detests or regards as insignificant and unimportant the donning of Islamic headgear. While abandonment of any Sunnah invites the Wrath and Curse of Allah Ta'ala, adoption of the Sunnah brings in its wake great rewards and creates vitality and Noor in the heart of the Mu'min. In this regard, Rasulullah {saliailahu alayhi wasallam) said:

"Whoever protects my Sunnah, Allah honours him with four qualities: He becomes endeared to pious people, evil people fear him, increase in Rizq and steadfastness in Deen. In Al-I'tisaam, Imaam Zuhri

(rahmatullah alayh) narrates that Imaam Maa-lik (rahmatullah alayh) said:

“The Sunnah is like a ship. He who embarks on it is saved while he who remains behind (stranded in the ocean) will drown.” Thus, those who have adopted the process of abandoning the Sunnah will soon find themselves drowning in the raging ocean of kufr, immorality and baatil. Diversion from the Deen and abandonment of the Sunnah is an incremental process. It commences with the abandonment of the Aadaab (etiquettes), progressing to the abandonment of Mustahab acts, then deteriorating to the abandonment of Sunnatul Muakkadah, then Waajib acts and finally it leads to the neglect of Fardh acts.

One's very Imaan is exposed to the gravest dangers by the abandonment of Sunnat acts. Such abandonment leads to the total distintergration of Taqwa and Imaan. For this reason it is most dangerous for Muslims to view Islamic headgear as an insignificant item. Nothing in the Deen and Sunnah is insignificant. Every act of the Sunnah, be it an Adab or a Mustahab act is of great importance for the acquisition of the Pleasure of Allah Ta'ala. Every Mustahab act being part of Rasulullah's (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) Uswah Hasanah (beautiful example) plays a vital role in the rising stages of Taqwa. Of such importance is Islamic headgear and all other aspects of the Sunnah that the authorities of the Shariah have ruled:

"Using a Miswaak is Sunnat, but rejection of the fact that the Miswaak is Sunnat, is kufr."

The Qur'aan Majeed commands Muslims to adopt the Sunnah of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and to refrain from every act which the Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) has forbidden:

"Whatever the Rasool has given to you, take hold of it and whatever he has forbidden you of refrain therefrom." The Rasool has given us the way of dress which includes the Islamic headgear. We are bound by the Qur'aanic command to adopt it and uphold it. He has forbidden us from emulating the kuffaar. Muslims are, therefore, under Qur'aanic obligation

to abhor and refrain from the styles of the kuffaar. There is no gainsaying that a bare-head is among the styles of the kuffaar. To strut about without headgear is undoubtedly the way of the kuffaar, especially the libertine western kuffaar. A Muslim in whose heart is embedded Islam cannot find pleasure in the adoption of a style of the kuffaar. Every kufr emulation necessitates abandonment of a Sunnat. Thus, by adopting the kaafir style of walking about bare-headed and entering the Musjid bare-headed, the Sunnah style of Islamic headgear is abandoned. Like kuffaar enter their places of worship bare-headed and like the kuffaar attach no significance to headgear, so too does the westernized Muslim who follows in the footsteps of the enemies of Allah Ta'ala. In opposing the Command of Allah Ta'ala, viz. the Sunnah, Muslims are invoking the chastisement of Allah Ta'ala Who says in the Qur'aan Shareef:

"Those who oppose His Command should fear a disaster reaching them or that a painful punishment will overtake them."

Spelling out the calamity of confrontation with Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), the Qur'aan Majeed says:

"Whoever opposes the Rasool after the guidance (of Shariah) has been made dear for him and he then follows a path which is not the way of the Mu'mineen, then we shall allow him to do as he pleases. And We shall cast him into Jahannam. Indeed it is an evil place."

It is significant and noteworthy that in this aayat, the Qur'aan-e-Hakeem describes 'opposition to the Rasool' as being a path other than the path of the Mu'mineen. Thus, any practice which the Mu'mineen have inherited from the Salf-e-Saaliheen is in fact the Sunnah. An item of this practice is the Islamic headgear. Discarding this important item of Islamic dress is in fact a path other than the path of the Mu'mineen. The Path of the Mu'mineen is given authority and Divine sanction in the aforementioned Qur'aanic Aayat in view of the fact that it stems from the teachings, of the Sahaabah who were the first and the most authoritative

expounders and upholders of the Sunnah. Diversion from this path of the Mu'mineen leads to Jahannum according to the Qur'aan.

In the sphere of Islamic belief and practice, the Path of The Mu'mineen cannot be ignored. The Qur'aan Shareef explicitly declares Jahannum to be the consequence of adopting a path other than the Path of The Mu'mineen. While all Muslims who truly believe in Allah, His Rasool and the Divine Law are Mu'mineen, the uppermost echelons of The Mu'mineen are, undoubtedly the Sahaabah, the Taabieen and the Tab-e-Taabieen The Mu'mineen of these three noble eras, described by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) as the Khairul Quroon (the Noblest Ages), are undoubtedly the first of the Ummah whom we have to emulate and whose Path the Qur'aan commands us to follow. Islamic headgear has come to us from these illustrious Mu'mineen whose Path can be abandoned only at the peril of Imaan.

In the satanic conspiracy to wean Muslims away from the Sunnah and Islam itself, the liberal influences of the western kuffaar are adopted in degrees. In the initial stage of diversion from the Sunnah, the Muslim simply abandons his Islamic headgear in public, at home and on the streets. Still believing that such headgear is necessary for only Salaat, its importance is diminished for other occasions and as a permanent item of Islamic dress. Later, when his outlook has changed on account of having become habituated to strut around bare-headed in public and he has become sufficiently audacious by virtue of his Imaani conscience and Deeni convictions becoming paralysed, he rebelliously steps into the Musjid without Islamic Headgear and in this abominable way performs his Salaat without even realizing that he has despoiled the value of his Salaat. Salaat performed without headgear is Makrooh. Such Salaat has to be compulsorily repeated within the confines of the time. If it has not been repeated within the confines of that particular Salaat, the Fardh (i.e. the obligation) while having been discharged, is short of its rewards and blessings. Such defective discharge of such an important and fundamental institution of Islam will undoubtedly have far reaching consequences for Muslims in both this transitory world and in the Aakhirah.

From the abovementioned discussion it will be clear that dress-style is of vital importance for the Muslim. It is essential for his spiritual development that the Muslim differentiates himself from non-Muslims by even his external appearance. His external appearance must testify that he is a Muslim. A Muslim dressed in the style of the kuffaar cannot be recognised as a Muslim by another Muslim who is not acquainted with him. A Muslim in western garb and western appearance can reasonably be mistaken for a kaafir and he (the imitator of the kuffaar) is solely responsible for such a serious mistake committed genuinely. In so far as the Shariah is concerned, the topi or any Islamic head-dress is essential for a Muslim in Salaat as well as at all times. The arguments of the denigrators of the topi arise from kufr mentality and should be dismissed with contempt.

## **NECK TIE – SYMBOL OF SHIRK**

In Pakistan and other Muslim countries there appears no justification to hang on to the western dress in utter disregard of our own graceful costumes and derive a false sense of elevation with a rope around our neck (necktie). The necktie is designed by the Christian world as a sign of the Cross symbolizing Jesus's crucifixion and thus is an insignia of the Christian faith.

Extract from Muslims in Alien Society, by Muhammad Samiullah of Pakistan In the footnotes of this book, the author presents the following information on the necktie:

"The practice of the necktie started at the insistence of the Pope in 1700. By 1850 all Christian nations had accepted and implemented this order of the Pope.....Necktie in reality is a symbol of the cross." (Dr Akhtar Ali, Qaumi Tashakh-khus, pages 5-6)

Towards the end of the 19th century the Europeans omitted from dictionaries and encyclopedias the introductory phase about the necktie, that it is a symbol of the cross....If one looks at the dictionaries and encyclopaedias printed before 1898 one will find clear indication of the

cross-symbol relationship in the meaning of the necktie/ (Ehsan Qureshi Sabri, Daily Nawa-e-Waqat)

(THE MAJLIS VOL.8 NO.6)

## **SYMBOL OF SHIRK**

(Hadhrat Mufti Muhammad Shafi)

Acts which are considered to be signs and salient features of shirk, also fall within the scope of shirk (polytheism). This is borne out by the command of Rasulullah (saliailahu alayhi wasallam) when he saw Hadhrat Adi Bin Hatim (radhiallahu anhu) with the crucifix around his neck. Hadhrat Adiwho had converted to Islam from Christianity, once came into the presence of Rasulullah (saliailahu alayhi wasallam) with the crucifix around his neck. Rasulullah (saliailahu alayhi wasallam) commanded:

"Remove this idol from your neck "

At this time Hadhrat Adi's belief was already purified. He did not believe any longer in the cross. (The wearing of the crucifix was merely by force of habit). However, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) ordered its removal. He considered it important to command abstention from displaying even the external symbols of shirk. But, alas! Today, thousands of Muslims are, in defiance and audacity, donning this very symbol of the crucifix (viz., the necktie), thus making them guilty of the crime of shirk. THE MAJLIS VOL 9 NO. 12

One may well consider the claim of the tie being a form of the crucifix as being ludicrous, but consider the following:

"The neck tie was designed by the Christian world as a sign of the Cross symbolising Jesus's (Eesa AJS.) crucifixion and is an insignia of the Christian Faith. The practice of the necktie started on the insistence of the Pope In 1790. By 1850 all Christian nations had accepted and implemented this order of the Pope". (Extracted from Encyclopaedia Britannica),

Consider also the following discovery: Towards the end of the 19th century, the Europeans omitted from dictionaries and Encyclopaedias the Introductory phrase about the necktie being a symbol of the cross. A glance of encyclopaedias printed before 1898 will confirm this point (E. Quraishi Sabri).

Those with any vestige of Islamic dignity and honour will immediately abandon such flagrant displays of shirk. Keep in mind the severe reprimand of Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and let our love for him come to the fore. Those who derive a false sense of elevation and pride from aping the dress of the West should consider what fools they are. They are feeling proud about having a rope tied around their necks. Editor.

Al-Jamiat (South Africa) Nov 1995. Vol.2 No. 15

## **DRESS FOR SALAAT**

The Qur'aan Majeed says:

"O Son's of Aadam, adopt your beauty at the time of every Salaat"

The validity of Salaat requires concealment of the satr (that portion of the body which has to be compulsorily covered). The satr for males is from the navel to just over the knees which have to be concealed. If any part of the satr is exposed, the Salaat will not be valid.

However, apart from the validity of Salaat, Allah Ta'ala requires more from His servants when they stand in His Presence. They have to be properly, decently and Islamically clad as is clear from the term zeenat (beauty) which appears in the foregoing Qur'aanic verse. Zeenat does not refer to only the Satr. It refers to decent and Islamic dress.

Salaat performed in garments which lack Islamic decency is Makrooh (detestable) and should be repeated.

## **DIVINE PRESENCE**

During Salaat, the servant stands in the special presence of his Creator, Allah Azza Wa Jal. He is, therefore required to adopt dignity, reverence and respect. He cannot act with an indifferent attitude. He is not allowed to be immodestly and improperly dressed when performing Salaat. When man visits a worldly king or has to be present in a court of law presided over by a non-Muslim judge or he has to attend a conference or any other meeting which he regards to be of importance, he adorns himself, he dresses in his best garments to present a proper and a decent image of himself. But, some people having more respect for worldly personalities, have no regard for the Masjid and the Divine Presence. They come dressed shabbily in jeans, T-shirts, tight-fitting pants which reveal the form of the *satr* and of even the *satr-e-ghaleezah* (i.e. of the private Parts). They come into the Masjid for Salaat with *kuffaar* T-shirts decorated with stupid emblems and slogans in emulation of the *kuffaar*. In *Ruhul Ma'aani* it is mentioned:

"When *Hadhrat Hasan (radhiyallahu anhu)*—the grandson of *Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam)*—engaged in Salaat, he would don his best garments. It was said to him: "O Son of *Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam)*: 'Why do you don your best garments? He replied: "Verily Allah is beautiful and He loves beauty. I, therefore adorn myself for my Rabb. It is He who says (in the *Qur'aan*) "Adopt your beauty at every Salaat." I, therefore love to wear my most beautiful garments."

## **GARMENTS FOR SALAAH**

The authoritative Book of the Shariah, *Badaaius Sanaa'i* states that for the purposes of Salaat, garments are classified into three categories:

(1) **Mustahabb (preferable)** It is *Mustahab* to perform Salaat in three garments: *Izaar* (trousers), *Qamees* (kurtah-long shirt) and *Ridaa* (outer shawl). An *Amaamah* (Turban) or Islamic headgear is also included. Some authorities say that it is *Mustahab* to have at least two garments- an

upper and a lower garment since both concealment of the *satr* and *zeenat* are achieved.

(2) **Permissible without any *Karaahat* (i.e. without it being abominable in any way):** Performance of Salaat in two garments—*Qamees* and *Izaar*—is permissible since both concealment of *satr* and *zeenat* are achieved. This is also described as *Mustahab* by some.

(3) **Makrooh (Repugnant):** Performance of Salaat in a single garment, viz., in only a trousers (*saraaweel*) or *izaar* (lower cloth covering from the navel until just above the ankles) is *Makrooh* even though the Salaat is validly discharged. The repugnance of performing Salaat in this way is on account of the prohibition stated by *Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam)* who prohibited performance of Salaat in a single garment. In *Badaaius Sanaa'i* it appears as follows:

"*Makrooh* dressing is that a man performs Salaat in one garment (viz. a lower garment) while his shoulders are bare. Although *satr-e-aurah* is achieved, *zeenat* is not. Allah Ta'ala says in the Holy *Qur'aan*: "O *Bani Aadam* adopt your *zeenat* at (the time of) every Salaat." It is narrated that someone asked *Abdullah Ibn Umar (radhiyallahu anhu)* about performing Salaat in a single garment. He responded: If I send you for some work will you walk in a single garment?" The man said: "No!" *Abdullah Ibn Umar* replied: "Allah is more deserving that you beautify yourself for Him."

*Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh)* said: "Verily Salaat in one garment is the act of unjust (shameless) people. Salaat in detestable garments is worst than injustice, and Salaat in (two garments *izaar* and *ridaa'* is among the noble qualities (of character)."(Badaa'i)

*Mufti Muhammad Shafi* says in *Ma-aariful Qur'aan*: "Since, in Salaat, the only demand is not only covering of the *satr*, but the command is to adopt *zeenat* as well, therefore it is *Makrooh* (abominable) for a man to perform Salaat with bare-head or with his shoulders exposed or with elbows exposed whether it is a short-sleeved shirt or whether the sleeves are rolled up. In every case the Salaat is *Makrooh*."

Similarly (Salaat is Makrooh) if performed with a handkerchief tied around the head. An intelligent man will not go in the presence of his friends and others in this state. How then can he prefer to go into the presence of Rabbul Aalameen in this state? The Salaat being Makrooh when performed with bare-head, bared shoulders and uncovered elbows, is substantiated on the basis of the word *zeenat* mentioned in the Quraanic verse as well as from the explicit statements of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam)

## **IMPORTANCE**

The importance of correct dress for Salaat is stated in Hajjatullahil Baalighah by Shah Waliullah Muhaddith Dahlawi (rahmatullah alayh):

"Know that wearing of clothes distinguishes man from all animals. It is among his best conditions.... In dress is the honouring of Salaat and observance of the respects of supplication with Rabbul Aalameen. It is an original incumbency. It has been decreed a condition for the perfection of Salaat..."

The importance of dress for Salaat does not refer to the minimum *satr* coverage necessary for the validity of the Salaat. The reference is to correct dress which is such dress considered Islamically to be respectable. Thus, garments which are not regarded as respectable in Islamic culture are Makrooh and the Salaat too is rendered Makrooh. Salaat performed with sleeves rolled up or with the elbows exposed is considered disrespectful in Islam. It is not regarded as a decent form of dress. In Ahsanul Fatawa, the following is said in this regard:

"It is Makrooh Tahrimi to perform Salaat with sleeves rolled up without valid reason."

Ramali has said that Makrooh in this context refers to Makrooh Tahrimi which is a sinful act. The detestibility of performing Salaat with elbows exposed is mentioned in a number of Books of Fiqh.

## **BASELESS ARGUMENTS**

Some people claim that there is nothing wrong in performing Salaat with sleeves rolled up, with T-shirts, with tight pants and with western shirts and ties because the Shariah has defined the *satr* to be only from the navel to the knees. This is a childish, silly and ridiculous argument. Those who present such baseless arguments will not go into public or to court or to their business places with only loin cloths covering only their *satr*. They adorn themselves and present a stylish image, adding perfume and lotion and powder, etc. to perfect their appearance. But, for Salaat, when they have to stand in the special presence of Allah Ta'ala they are able to tolerate hooligan appearances.

If the requirement is only to cover the *satr*, then why on a hot day do they not come to Musjid with only a piece of cloth covering their *satr*? Why do they not wander around the streets in this nude fashion with only their *satr* covered? They refrain from such semi-nudity because they know that they may be rushed to the madhouse.

When Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) has prohibited performance of Salaat in a single garment, it testifies that the requirement for a perfect Salaat is not mere covering of the *satr*. Dress plays an important role in the perfection of Salaat. Salaat performed in the indecent dress of the *kuffaar* is Makrooh and has to be repeated. Defectively discharged Salaat is flung back into the feces of the *musallis*.

## **RASULULLAH'S KURTAH**

Hadhrat Umme Salmah (radhiyallahu anhaa) narrates:

"The most liked dress by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was the *qamees* (*kurtah*)." (shamaa-il Tirmizi)

*Qamees* is a *kurtah* (the upper garment-a long shirt). The *Qamees* which has the closest resemblance to the *qamees* of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and his *Sahaabah* is the *kurtah* adopted by our senior Ulama and Auliya, namely, the Ulama of Deoband.

The Qamees of Rasulallah (sallallahu alyahi wasallam) in length reached half the forelegs (nisf-e-saaqain)—well below the knees. It never reached the ankles. It is only the qamees (kurtah) of our Ulama which measure up to the dimensions of Rasulallah's (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) kurtah.

The long shirt worn by modern Arabs nowadays is a decidedly un-Islamic and Haraam garment. The factors of prohibition of the maxi-modern long western imitated shirt are:

- (1) It is ankle-length and below ankle-length is Haraam
- (2) Its shirt-like sleeves with cuffs is in emulation of the kuffaar.

Similarly, the knee and above knee-length kurtah worn by modernist molvis is also not permissible.

## **ISLAMIC DRESS - A SYMBOL OF ISLAM**

Allah Ta'ala has divided mankind into two classes:

Hizbullaah (the Army of Allah) and Hisbush Shaitaan (the Army of Shaitaan). The kuffaar- all of them — are members of the army of shaitaan. Rasulallah' (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) warned:

"Whoever emulates a people becomes of them."

Muslims who emulate the ways, styles and dress of the kuffaar should understand that in so doing, they show a strong preference for the army of shaitaan. By the styles and appearances of the kuffaar. Muslims ultimately become members of the army of shaitaan.

The issue of imitating the kuffaar in their dress styles is of such importance and of such a grave nature, that Hadhrat Umar (radhiyallahu anhu), during his Khilaafat, issued special instructions to his governors to prohibit tashabbuh bil kuffaar in matters of dress and daily life. In a

directive to the governor of Azarbaijaan which had come under the sway of the Islamic empire, Hadhrat Umar (radhiyallahu anhu) commanded:

"Adopt the dress of your Father, Ismaaeel (alayhis salaam), and beware of luxury. Wear simple, coarse and old garments."

Hadhrat Umar bin Abdul Azeez (rahmatullah alayh) known as Umar The Second, wrote to his governors:

*"Ban in your region the wearing or the garments of the Nasaara (Christians)...Be firm and strict in this regard\ Disseminate this order in written form so that it does not remain hidden from anyone.*

*It has been mentioned to me that numerous among the Nasaara have returned to wearing turbans and they have abandoned wearing their waist-girdles (which was exclusive to them). They have started to grow long hair (i.e. they had abandoned their Nasaara style and had begun adopting the hair style of the Muslims who were the rulers). By Allah! If all this is happening in your region then it is clear evidence of your weakness. Therefore, enforce what I have forbidden. Do not be lax in any of these things, and do not be unjust to anyone."*

Dress-style is a practice of great importance in Islam. For this reason the Khulafa-e-Raashideen, Hadhrat Umar ) in particular, went to great lengths to prevent Muslims from adopting the dress-styles of non-Muslims and vice-versa as it is clear, from the directive mentioned above issued by Hadhrat Umar Bin Abdul Azeez (rahmatullah alayh).