

# THE LAST STRAW!

## DESTROYING A 'STRAW-MAN' ARGUMENT

### REFLECTIONS ON THE STATEMENT

#### "I WOULD PREFER MUSLIM WOMEN NOT TO WEAR THE NIQAAB" (!?)

- 16<sup>th</sup> RAMADAAN 1427 AH

- 8/10/06 -

---

Indeed, all praise is due to Allaah, we praise Him, we seek His aid, and we ask for His forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allaah from the evil of our actions and from the evil consequences of our actions. Whomever Allaah guides, there is none to misguide and whoever Allaah misguides there is none to guide. I bear witness that there is no god worthy of worship except Allaah and I bear witness that Muhammad is the servant and messenger of Allaah.

To proceed:

In light of the recent remarks that have been expressed by a member of the British government that he considers it a hindrance to 'communication' when Muslim women wear the *nikaab*, the salafimanhaj.com team feel the need to clarify the 'straw-man argument', as it were and expose its more sinister and disturbing aims. The 'Straw-mans' argument is just one of a long line, of no doubt many more, attempts to shake, disturb and attack Islaam and the

Muslims in the UK. It follows on from a list of high-profile attacks on the *deen* by a variety of *kuffaar* who all of a sudden are becoming much bolder in revealing what is truly in their hearts about Islaam. Indeed, Allaah says,

**“O you who have believed, do not take as intimate confides those other than yourselves (i.e. believers), for they will not spare you (any) ruin. They wish you would have hardship. Hatred has already appeared from their mouths, and what their breasts conceal is far greater. We have certainly made clear to you the signs, if you will use reason.”**

{*Aali-Imraan* (3): 118}

This noble verse of the Qur’aan is particularly pertinent to those thousands of Muslims who voted for the individual, via ‘democratic elections’ (!) who has now attacked the *niquaab* and he has repaid their servitude to him in this way!

In Islaam modesty in dress and not wearing tight-clothing has to be adhered to by both men and women and in Islaam although women and men are equal, they are different and different things attract each one to the other, hence the injunction of the *niquaab*.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> So for example, the clothing for Muslim men should cover the area between the navel and the knee; it should not be tight-fitting; it should not be see-through; it should not be specifically women’s clothing; it should not be specifically the clothing of non-Muslims; it should not be ostentatious; it should not be silk;

## **THE NIQAAB AS A BEING 'INTIMIDATING' AND 'A CLEAR INDICATION OF SEPARATION AND DIFFERENCE'**

What is also sinister is the way in which the 'Straw-man's argument' claims to merely aim to 'facilitate debate on the issue of the necessity of *niquaab* in Britain' and this is false. If anyone was sincere in talking to the Muslims about the issue then why did he not approach Muslims about the issue instead of airing the issue to the tabloid press in the UK, which is not exactly the best way to 'facilitate discussion' with Muslims! So in keeping with the recent implication of Muslims with all that is evil in the West, ranging from accusations that Islaam was spread by the sword and discussions about Muslim ghettos, Muslims have been accused by a senior British government minister of being the main culprits in eroding 'community cohesion.' He knows that his position commands influence and as a result he has certainly used it to this effect. This whole issue was also brought up as a careful strategy in order to defer any blame from those who have been responsible for going to war against Muslim countries without justification and manufacture a situation wherein Muslims are being isolated as being the primary concern in the UK.

This time however, the dress-code of the Muslim woman is now the main focus and has been singled-out, whereas the filthy dress-codes of others which equally make people feel "uncomfortable" are not being assessed, discussed or targeted at all! There was no reference made whatsoever to those who pierce their tongues, lips, and brows, to those who tattoo themselves all over, or to those who walk the streets in hooded gangs.<sup>2</sup> Indeed, within the 'Straw-mans'

---

the lower garment should be raised above the ankle; gold it not permitted for men; beards must be grown; moustaches trimmed; shaving of facial hair in the area wherein the beard usually grows should not shaved.

<sup>2</sup> And with regarding this, there is no doubt that this is in fact what the likes of those who utter the likes of the 'Straw-mans' argument, actually want to see and hence they have no problem with this whatsoever, yet

argument, he made no mention of the Jewish communities of the UK and their codes of dress, clearly singling out the Muslims for being those who make ‘clear indications of separation and difference.’

Moreover, let’s see the fruits of ‘Straw-mans’ argument and what it has led to, it has led to every ignorant disbeliever all of a sudden becoming an expert on the *deen* of Islaam and putting forward their foolish ideas about *niqaab*.

1. Even neo-Nazis supported the outburst of the ‘Straw-man’ argument saying it **“quite rightly, observing the problems of communication arising from the wearing of veils by Muslim women”** by not **“allowing the country's native majority to descend headlong into a state of dhimmitude.”**<sup>3</sup>
2. In one report: A 49-year-old mother’s veil was torn from her at a bus stop in Liverpool. Her daughter Ilham Ali said: **“The man was shouting, “Pull that scarf off your head, you Muslim!” I’m 100 per cent certain the racist attack on my mum was a direct result of the comments Jack Straw made.”**<sup>4</sup> The 49-year-old, from Toxteth, was at the junction of Kensington and Holt Road when her veil was snatched by a tall white man in his 60s. Inspector Sa’eed Mostaghel, of Merseyside Police, said: “This was a despicable attack, which has left the victim feeling extremely shocked and upset.”<sup>5</sup>

---

a women wearing a *niqaab* poses a ‘communication problem’?! The reality is that there is an increase in porn and the use of women as sex objects in the West and Muslim women should not be singled out for opting out of all of this.

<sup>3</sup> From the ‘Islamophobia-watch’ website quoting an article by the *BNP* dated 6 October 2006 CE. The quote also indicates that even the far-right are utilizing the arguments of the likes of Bat Ye’or (the Egyptian Jew) who coined the term ‘dhimmitude.’

<sup>4</sup> Mentioned in an article in *This is London* (7 October 2006 CE)

<sup>5</sup> BBC, 6 October 2006 CE

3. In another report: “A young Muslim girl wearing a veil in Blackburn was confronted by three youths on Friday night. One threw a newspaper at her and shouted: **“Jack has told you to take off your veil.”**”

So here we have it, all of this is as a result of the ‘Straw-man’ argument as he claimed to want to **“open up a national debate on the issue of niqaab.”**<sup>6</sup> One ignorant journalist stated in the aftermath of the attack on the *niqaab* that “the issue of women has to be addressed if Islaam is to move forward.” As if the *deen* of Allaah has to succumb to the invented falsehood that changes with time in accordance to the desires of some *kuffaar*.

**“They wish you would disbelieve as they disbelieved so you would be alike.”**

{*an-Nisaa* (4): 89}

The issue of the *niqaab* was mentioned by a disbelieving female journalist earlier in the year wherein she stated that “the sight of veiled women offends” her.<sup>7</sup> She stated that the *niqaab* for her represented **“physical manifestations of outdated, cruel and degrading traditions”** and this is akin to ‘Straw-mans’ argument, they have no reason to be concerned as Muslim women who wear the *niqaab* cause absolutely no harm to anyone within the society, they neither raise their voices in an abusive manner nor wreak havoc within communities, they clearly have a level of modesty and self dignity that others do not! The Muslim women who cover their faces are not infringing upon the ‘rights’ or

---

<sup>6</sup> See ‘Straw blamed for ‘racist’ backlash’ in The Independent on Sunday (8 October 2006 CE): <http://news.independent.co.uk/uk/politics/article1819668.ece>

<sup>7</sup> *The Independent*, Saturday 8 July 2006

beloved ‘freedoms’ of any non-Muslims. The article reinforced the stereotypes that were noted in light of the recent ‘Straw-man’ argument, that the *niquaab* is associated with oppression. The journalist also made the gross error of thinking that the *niquaab* is about being “ashamed of being a woman” and there is nothing within the Islamic source texts at all which indicate that this is the intent of *niquaab* and *jilbaab*. The *kuffaar* also over-emphasize women’s issues as if Muslim women are frantic to be ‘liberalised.’<sup>8</sup> The reality is that in many cases husbands do not want their wives to wear the *niquaab*! But some people need to think that all these factors are the real case and reasons for wearing the *niquaab*.

The likes of these naïve and unjustified opinions are borne out of both ignorance of *Islaam* as well as falling victim to the ludicrous understanding that a woman’s freedom is based around what she wears. Indeed, if those who claim that the *niquaab* is a symbol of oppression would only bother to talk to those who wear them, they would see that it is anything but such a symbol.

Some non-Muslims even incorrectly say that **“non-Muslim women have to cover their hair in Saudi”** when the reality is that *kuffaar* women do not have to cover their hair, but they do have to put on an ‘*ayaba*! Let’s turn to the author, a Muslim woman and a western convert to *Islaam*, who wears the *niquaab*, Naima B Robert in her superb book *From My Sister’s Lip’s*, she states:

**“The first effect that the hijab, the headscarf, seemed to have on us was to encourage modesty – in dress and in conduct. After a life-time spent showing off our clothes and our bodies, we suddenly felt shy to flaunt ourselves in public. The hijab reminded us of the standards of behaviour that were expected of us as Muslims, and more specifically, as Muslim women. We became more aware of upholding Islamic manners – trying not to be rude or to lie, to be kind and generous. When it came to the**

---

<sup>8</sup> See an interesting article at: <http://www.islambradford.com/ib/jsp/body/78>

opposite sex, we no longer felt comfortable having conversations that were too personal or familiar and the hijab made flirting a definite no-no. although we were only wearing scarves at this point, we grew to feel less comfortable about showing the other parts of our body and, consequently, our style of dress began to change...

But we were not the only ones affected by our decision to cover. Because we were sending out such a clear message to the outside world – ‘I do not want to be bothered, I do not want to be approached sexually, I am off limits for you’ – men could not help but change the way they related to us.<sup>9</sup> They would no longer observe our movements, watch the way we walked, size us up or compare us. The old ways of relating to women’s bodies were no longer applicable because our bodies were not on display.<sup>10</sup> This endowed our interaction with men with a new level of respect and courtesy, however begrudgingly it was granted. We were clearly no longer sexual objects – we had to be treated differently.”<sup>11</sup>

Then she states:

“I think that, around this time, I came to the realization that wearing the niqaab was the least I could do as thanks to Allaah who had done so much for much for me...

The niqaab was not something I disliked – in fact, I quite liked it; it was not difficult for me to wear it – I was living in the East end, after all, and my husband was supportive. Wearing the niqab, choosing to cover in that way, seemed the least I could do to thank my Lord, to show my gratitude, to enact my submission. I didn’t have the time to waste on

---

<sup>9</sup> This is what the likes of the ‘Straw-man argument’ are totally frustrated with in reality, the fact that they, as *kuffaar* men and women, are not able to judge and intrude.

<sup>10</sup> This is what has confused the *kuffaar* and led to their recent attack on the *niqaab* in the UK.

<sup>11</sup> Naima B Robert, *From My Sister’s Lips*, (London: Bantam Press, 2005 CE), pp.114-15

petty concerns – I had been given this chance to do something better, and I decided to take it. And, at that moment, other people’s opinions, their hand-ups and points of view, faded into the background; my eyes were fixed on the pleasure of Allaah.”<sup>12</sup>

She also mentions:

“But how is it that we desired a thing that so many consider to be the ultimate symbol of oppression? How could the hijab ever be liberating? As a woman in this society, as in most others, one grows to expect certain things: to be judged by one’s appearance, to have fashion trends dictate one’s style and ideal body shape, to get both welcome and unwelcome attention from men, among other things. There is the woman who enjoys all of these things, considering them an essential part of her femininity – many of us felt this way too. But then, the charm begins to wear off – the constant preening and maintenance becomes tedious, the rush to acquire the latest Manolo Blahniks or dress from Ghost seems empty and futile, the seasonal shift towards and away from the hourglass figure and heroin chic begins to sour and appear as it really is: shallow and meaningless. And you begin to wonder, am I not more than the sum of my parts? What will be the consequences if I drop out of this race? What about when my body starts to change – from age<sup>13</sup>, illness or pregnancy? It is from these and other concerns that covering, with the hijab and everything else, liberates the Muslim woman. In our society, as in so many, women are judged by their appearance in a way that men are not. But the covered woman cannot be judged on her

---

<sup>12</sup> Ibid. pp.120-21

<sup>13</sup> In the West ‘age reversal’ and ‘anti-aging’ ‘remedies’, techniques and therapies are big business, along with horrific facial cosmetic and plastic surgery which is utilised by non-Muslims in order to stay ‘younger-looking.’



appearance because nothing personal about her can be seen. She has, in effect, taken her looks out of the equation. She does not feel the need to live up to society's changing expectations of women's bodies. Nor is she a victim of the various pressures to conform to the latest looks or project a 'cool' image. So whoever relates to her must relate to what she has presented – be it what she says, does or thinks...

It is natural for men to want to look at women: we are beautiful after all! And many women find it flattering and fun sometimes. But undoubtedly, there are other times when it is unnecessary and bothersome, stares, wolf whistles, catcalls, comments, phone-number missiles, advances – there is a thin line between flattery and sexual harassment. The covered woman is not available for this type of exchange. She is clearly not interested in men's advances, nor in being seen as attractive or sexy – she retains ultimate control of her body and how it is seen by others. The pressure on women and girls to look a certain way is immense and leads to all sorts of hang-ups and crises. Eating disorders such as over-eating, excessive dieting, bulimia and anorexia are some of the effects of this pressure. Dissatisfaction with our bodies can result in low self-confidence and increased anxiety about body shape.”<sup>14</sup>

On pages 127-133 she goes on to explain the implications of wearing the *niquaab* and non-Muslim's reactions to her wearing it in British society, indeed, the whole book is valuable on this issue and the fact that it was written in 2005 demonstrates that while Muslims were openly and seriously discussing the issue of *niquaab* anyway, the likes of 'Straw-man's argument' were busy conniving about how to make political gain from the issue.

---

<sup>14</sup> Ibid pp.123-125

With regards to the view that **“Muslim women talk about the dress-code of other women, so why can’t society talk about the dress-code of Muslim women”** then this is also akin to ‘Straw-mans’ argument. It is a false assertion, as Muslim women do not possess anything like mass-circulation media or positions of political power in a non-Muslim country! One of these ignorant journalists even tried to claim that the *niquaab* merely developed out of protecting women in the desert from sand-storms!!? This is again false, as in countries where Muslim women wear *niquaab*, men do not wear it! The fact is that the *niquaab* is not associated with terrorism or extremism in the UK and even those Muslim women who have been implicated in terrorism, none of them wore *niquaab*!<sup>15</sup>

## THE ISLAMIC BASIS OF THE NIQAAB

The first issue that we have to address is the Islamic justification for wearing the *niquaab*, which is clear in the Islamic source texts, despite the foolish rantings of the so-called ‘moderate’ Muslims!<sup>16</sup> In fact the same proofs that are used as proofs for covering the hair are the same (but with additional proofs) for

---

<sup>15</sup> Then there is the argument of “when in Rome, do as the Romans do (i.e. be like them)” however, the English throughout history have never applied this! In fact, during the epoch of British colonialism, they exported to Africa and Asia, the likes of cricket, English language and other aspects of British culture, they did not begin to implement aspects of the cultures which they found themselves in at all. Furthermore, many people from England when they go on holiday to countries such as Spain, Turkey, Morocco, Egypt and the likes, people from England generally make no attempt whatsoever to even speak the languages of the countries they are going to! So much for “when in Rome...”!

<sup>16</sup> What is very unfortunate with this is that there have been a number of ignorant statements and ‘polls’ which allegedly show ‘Muslim opinion’ on the issue of *niquaab* and that it should be outlawed in the UK!! Not only are such ‘polls’ and ‘surveys’ *baatil* due to the lack of verification and also due to the utter ignorance of *Islaam* that such Muslim participants have. Furthermore, the issue has been exacerbated by those Muslims that actually know very little or even nothing at all about *Islaam* and seek to justify every single statement, even if it is against the *deen*, of a non-Muslim politician.

covering the face. Scholars have differed over the *niquaab* being an obligation, yet the evidence for the *niquaab* is very strong indeed.<sup>17</sup> ‘Aa’ishah (*radi Allaahu ‘anha*) said: “Male riders would pass by us while we were in the state of *ibram* with the Messenger of Allaah. When they would approach us, each one of us would let her *jilbaab* fall down from (the top of) her head over her face. And when they had passed on, we would uncover our faces.”<sup>18</sup> It is also authentically reported that ‘Aa’ishah covered her face with the *khimaar* when she heard the voice of Safwaan bin Mu’attal as-Sulamee. She stated that he used to know her (i.e. what she looked like) before the *hijab* was obligated.<sup>19</sup> This proves that after the verse was revealed women were unrecognizable due to the *niquaab*.

Allaah says,

**“And tell the believing women to lower their gaze and guard their private parts and not to expose their adornment except that which is apparent**

---

<sup>17</sup> Therefore, as Muslims we need not pay any heed to the likes of *kuffaar* socialists who claim to ‘champion the Muslim cause in the UK’ when the reality is that they have openly and boldly claimed that the Qur’aan “**does not mention the niquaab**”?! as was stated by a well-known member of the socialist *Respect Party* in the UK, as if *kuffaar* opportunists are now an authority on the verses of Allaah’s Book!

<sup>18</sup> Reported by Ahmad, Abou Daawood and Ibn Maajah

<sup>19</sup> Reported by Bukhaaree, Muslim, Ahmad and Ibn Jareer

**and to draw their khimaars over their chests and not to expose their adornment (i.e. beauty) except to their husbands, their fathers, their husbands' fathers, their sons, their husbands' sons, their brothers, their brothers' sons, their sisters' sons, their women, that which their right hands possess (i.e. servants) or those male servants who have no physical desire or children who are not yet aware of the private aspects of women..."**

*{an-Noor (24): 31}*

This part of the verse:

**"...not to expose their adornment except that which is apparent..."**

...is where there is a difference of opinion amongst Muslim scholars, as some scholars hold that the face is from that which is apparent and thus does not have to be covered. However, regarding the basis of covering the face then the verse can still apply because the verse states that Muslim women are,

**"...not to expose their adornment (i.e. beauty)..."**

And there is no doubt that the face is something which is part of a women's beauty, and hence the view that it should thus be covered.

Imaam Muhammad bin Saalih al-'Uthaymeen (*raheemahullaah*) stated:

**"And there is no doubt for one who has common sense that from the means that lead toward guarding the private parts is the veiling of the face. This is since exposing it is a cause for drawing looks towards it,**

reflecting on its attractive features and finding pleasure in that.<sup>20</sup> And consequently this leads to a man trying to communicate and get in touch with a woman.”<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> Indeed, even non-Muslim scientists and ‘sexologists’ have to admit that visual perception and facial attractiveness is one of the primary motivators and preludes to sexual relationships in humans especially males who are more stimulated by visual perception (also expressed in the idea of the male gaze), this is along with audition (how the opposite sex sounds) and olfaction (how the other smells). Scientists have noted that a sexually attractive visual appearance involves: a high degree of mirror symmetry between the left and right sides of the body, **particularly of the face**. Cunningham in his experiments (1986) regarding male response found that men were particularly attracted to women’s faces. The main determinants of female beauty involve assessing most of the face: hair, wide eyes, full lips, cheeks, teeth, forehead, dimples etc. men are stimulated by all of these characteristics. According to Devendra Singh in a piece of research she conducted for the *Journal of Sex Research* in February 2004 (entitled ‘*Mating Strategies of Young Women: The Role of Physical Attractiveness*’) she herself poses the question **“Why do males assign so much importance to attractiveness that when constrained (limited mating budget), they ignore personal attributes that appear to be critical for the viability of a long-term romantic relationship?”** she also states, in a definitive proof that uncovered beautiful faces can lead to strong physical attraction and then to promiscuity: **“Indeed, a meta-analysis of studies in attractiveness and behavior revealed that attractive females date more frequently, have more sexually permissive attitudes, engage in a greater variety of sexual activity, and have sexual intercourse at an earlier age than do unattractive females (Feingold, 1992). Some studies have also reported a positive relationship between physical attractiveness and number of sexual partners (Mikach & Bailey, 1999; Stelzer, Desmond, & Price, 1987; Wiederman & Hurst, 1998).”**

She then stated; **“To explore this possibility, I examined some mate attraction tactics used by females differing in attractiveness. Data from young U.S. females show that compared to less-attractive females, attractive females report higher frequencies of using attractiveness enhancement tactics (e.g., wearing makeup), flirting with other males to make a date jealous, and acting possessively.”**

Also see:

1. Perrett, D. I., May, K. A., & Yoshikawa, S. (1994). ‘Facial shape and judgments of female attractiveness’ in *Nature* (journal), 368, 239-242 and
2. Johnston, V. S., & Franklin, M. (1993). ‘Is beauty in the eye of the beholder?’ In *Ethology and Sociobiology* (journal), 14, 183-199.
3. Cunningham, M. R. (1986). ‘Measuring the physical in physical attractiveness: Quasi-experiments on the sociobiology of female facial beauty’ in *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50, 925-935.

The Imaam continued:

**“Regarding the statement of Allaah,**

**“...and to draw their khimaars over their chests...”**

The khimaar is that which a woman uses to cover and veil her head, such as a head cloth. So if she was commanded to place the khimaar over her jayb (bosom), then she was also commanded with covering the face, whether it is because wearing the khimaar necessitates that or because it is understood from general reasoning. This is since if covering the neck and bosom are obligatory, then veiling the face is an obligation for all the more reason, since it is the source of beauty and enticement. Indeed, when people seek the beauty of a figure, they do not ask except concerning the face. If it is beautiful, they do not look towards anything else in the same manner as possessing importance. This is why when it is said such and such woman is beautiful, one doesn't understand from these words anything except the beauty of the face. So it is clear that the face is the place of beauty that is asked about and informed of. And if it is this way, then how can we come to understand that this religion,

---

<sup>21</sup>Abou Maryam Ismaa'eel Alarcon (trans.), *Four Essays on the Obligation of Veiling* (New York: al-Ibaanah Publishing, 1426 AH/2006 CE), pp.28-29.

The *kuffaar* use the excuse that **“we are not perverts...”** which in itself is a statement that is questionable for anyone from the west to even have the audacity to state! **“..but we just want to get to know you better by seeing your face...”**, yet what business is it for a strange man to “get to know another woman better” if not to formulate designs in his sick *kuffaar* psyche, and the examples of this are daily, do they not contemplate?

which is based upon wisdom, would obligate the covering of the neck and chest and then allow the exposure of the face?”<sup>22</sup>

With regards to other textual proofs for covering the face then there is the verse,

**“O Prophet, tell your wives and your daughters and the women of the believers to bring down over themselves (part) of their outer garments. That is more suitable that they will be known and not be abused. And ever is Allaah Forgiving and Merciful.”**

*{al-Abzaab (33): 59}*

Ibn ‘Abbaas (*radi Allaahu ‘anhu*) said about this verse that *“Allaah commanded the believing women that when they come out of their homes for a necessity, they cover their faces from the top of their heads (downwards), with jilbaabs, and that they expose (only) one eye.”*<sup>23</sup>

Umm Salamah (*radi Allaahu ‘anha*) said that when the above verse was revealed *“The Ansaaree women came out of their homes, walking as if they had crows upon their heads due to the tranquility, and they were dressed in black garments.”*

Aboo ‘Ubaydah as-Salmaanee and others mentioned that:

**“The believing women used to cast their jilbaabs from (over) the top of their heads downward, to the point that nothing was visible except their eyes, for the purpose of seeing the road.”**

---

<sup>22</sup> ibid

<sup>23</sup> *Mukhtasar Tafseer Ibn Katheer*, vol.2, p.114

Ibn al-Jawzee (*raheemahullaah*) stated about the above verse:

**“It means that the women must cover their heads and faces so that they may be known as free women.”<sup>24</sup>**

Aboo Bakr al-Jassaas al-Hanafee said about the above verse that:

**“In this ayah is evidence that a young woman is commanded with: 1) covering her face in front of male strangers, 2) remaining covered and 3) refraining from going out (without it) so that the people will not place any doubt upon her.”<sup>25</sup>**

Imaam al-Aloosee (*raheemahullaah*) stated regarding the verse in Soorah al-Ahzaab:

**“The apparent meaning of the word ‘alayhinna (over themselves)’ is clearly to cover one’s body completely. Some have interpreted this ayah to mean the covering of the face and the head since in the Days of ignorance, the women usually left their faces uncovered.”<sup>26</sup>**

Jalaauddeen as-Suyooti (*raheemahullaah*) stated:

**“This is the ayah of hijab which applies to all women. There is proof in it that covering the head and the head face is obligatory.”<sup>27</sup>**

Al-Qurtubee (*raheemahullaah*) stated:

**“Since open displaying of oneself was the custom of the Arab women , i.e. they would expose their faces just as the slave-women did, this served as a means for a man to look at them and would increase the man’s desire for them. So Allaah ordered His Messenger to command the women to place their jilbaabs over themselves whenever they want to go outside to fulfill a necessity. The word ‘jilaabeeb’ is the plural of**

---

<sup>24</sup> Ibid. p.80

<sup>25</sup> *Ahkaam ul-Qur’aan*, vol.3, pp.371-372

<sup>26</sup> *Rooh ul-Ma’aanee*, vol.22, pp.88-89

<sup>27</sup> *Al-Ikleel*, p.180



**‘jilbaab’ and it is a garment that it is bigger than the khimaar. Ibn ‘Abbaas and Ibn Mas’ood have reported that it is a ridaa (loose outer garment). It is also said that it means a veil. The correct view is that it is a garment that covers the entire body.”<sup>28</sup>**

Al-Haadifh Ibn Katheer (*raheemahullaah*) noted:

“Muhammad ibn Seereen said “I asked ‘Ubaydah as-Salmaanee about Allaah’s statement

**“...to bring down over themselves (part) of their outer garments...”**

So he covered his face and his head (with a garment) and exposed his left eye.”<sup>29</sup>

Jalaaluddeen al-Mahallee (*raheemahullaah*) highlighted;

“It means that they should let some of it (*jilbaab*) fall over their faces...when they go out for their necessities,

**That is more suitable**

...or more closer to the fact,

**that they will be known**

...as free women,

---

<sup>28</sup> *Al-Jaami’ li-Ahkaam il-Qur’aan*, vol.14, pp.243-244

<sup>29</sup> *Tafseer Ibn Katheer*, vol.6, no.470, also see English translation of *Tafseer Ibn Katheer* (Riyadh: Darussalam Publishers, 2002 CE), volume explaining Soorah Ahzaab.

**“...and not be abused.”**

...by abuse against them, contrary to slave women, who do not cover their faces.”<sup>30</sup>

Jamaaluddeen al-Qaasimee (*rabeemabullaaah*) commented;

**“This ayah refers to the free women in that their dress should be different from the dress of the slave women, by them wearing loose outer garments (ardiyah) and cloaks (malaahif) and by covering their heads and faces so that they can guard and protect their chastity and no one will look at them with desire.”<sup>31</sup>**

Muhammad Ameen ash-Shanqeetee (*rabeemabullaaah*) said about the verse above from Soorah al-Ahzaab:

**“From the Qur’anic evidences that indicate that a woman must wear hijaab and cover her entire body, even her face, is Allaah’s saying**

**“O Prophet, tell your wives and your daughters and the women of the believers to bring down over themselves (part) of their outer garments.”**

This is because several scholars have stated that the meaning of

**“...to bring down over themselves (part) of their outer garments.”**

**...is that a woman must veil her whole face and not reveal anything from it except for one eye with which she can see. Among those who held this**

---

<sup>30</sup> *Qurrat ul-‘Aynayn ‘alaa Tafseer il-Jalaalayn*, p.560

<sup>31</sup> *Mahaasin ut-Ta’weel*, vol.13, pp.4908-4909

opinion were Ibn mas'ood, Ibn 'Abbaas, 'Ubaydah as-Salmaanee and others. If it is said "The wording in the noble ayah does not necessitate the understanding that a woman must veil her face, linguistically and there is no text from the Book, Sunnah or ijmaa' (consensus) that says that this is required. Furthermore, the sayings of some of the scholars of tafseer are that hold that it is required is contradicted by the sayings of other scholars who say that it is not required. So because of this, using this ayah as evidence for the obligation of veiling the face becomes nullified."

The response is: There is a clear implication in the noble ayah, that what falls into the phrase

"...to bring down over themselves (part) of their outer garments."

...is the understanding that women must veil their faces by placing a jilbaab on themselves and letting it fall downward. This implication is found in His saying

"...tell your wives..."

There is no disagreement amongst the Muslims on the fact that Prophet's wives were obligated to wear the hijab and veil their faces. So Allaah's mentioning of the Prophet's wives and daughters, along with the believing women indicates that it is an obligation for all women to

veil their faces by placing the jilbaab over themselves, as you have seen...

As for the one who says that there is a Qur'anic implication in Allaah's saying

**“...to bring down over themselves (part) of their outer garments.”**

That indicates that covering the face does not enter into the understanding of this verse, and that this implication is found in His words:

**“...That is more suitable that they will be known...”**

So the words,

**“...that they will be known...”**

...is proof that the women exposed their faces, since someone who veils her face cannot possibly be known (or recognized). Know that this statement is false and incorrect, and the futility of it is quite clear since the context of the words in the verse restrict that absolutely, since Allaah's words,

**“...to bring down over themselves (part) of their outer garments.”**

...clearly restrict that (i.e. uncovering the face)...”<sup>32</sup>

So with all of this, the ‘Straw-mans’ argument, and vain searching to deny this Islamic basis, or the claim that the wearing of *nikaab* is a ‘contemporary political fashion statement in order to be rebellious’, is all demolished and exposed! Some ignorant Muslims<sup>33</sup> in the UK have even stated that the *nikaab* is only an ‘Arab cultural dress’ or an ‘Ottoman cultural mode of dress’ or a “desert storm protection” (!!!!) which has no basis in *Islaam*! Rather it would be better for those individuals to think about where they learned the religion of *Islaam* from before they make such claims.

### **DOES HE HAVE THE RIGHT TO ASK MUSLIMS TO REMOVE THE NIQAAB?**

He does have the right to ask Muslims, particular in the context of living in a non-Muslim country, however in the same way a Muslim woman has the right to say “no!” especially within an abode which constantly claims to represent ‘freedom, equality and liberty.’ But the question remains is, if the Muslim woman does not take it off, does that mean that he is not going to help her in

---

<sup>32</sup> *Adwaa ul-Bayaan fee Eedaah il-Qur’aan bi’l-Qur’aan*, vol.6, p.586

<sup>33</sup> On another note it is worth noting how certain countries which have Muslim majorities have outlawed and made illegal the wearing of the *hijaab* within schools, colleges and universities. In one of these North African countries, whose leader in the 1980s drank on TV during Ramadaan claiming that the economy was doing too well for fasting to be permitted, even had the nerve to say that the *hijaab* is “not from the cultural traditions of our country”!! Recently, in another country which has a Muslim majority, all references to covering have been removed from Islamic textbooks under the *baatil* pretext that the *hijaab* and the beard are ‘political symbols’, see: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/africa/5413808.stm>

There is no doubt that these lands merely wish to pander to other *kuffaar* states for recognition and acceptance. In Morocco they even removed from the Islamic studies textbooks the verse from Soorah al-Ahzaab regarding the *jilbaab*.

his surgery?<sup>34</sup> If so, then this is clear discrimination and prejudice as he would feel that he cannot help her as he does with everyone else. In any case a lot of work these days is largely via correspondence over the phone, mail and the Internet. Most people do not use video-phones, so in order to say that it is an issue of communication is flawed. Furthermore, GPs are already accused of discriminating against people on the basis of their appearances and judging people based on their looks, which affects the type of medical treatment they receive and these are not people who are covering their faces!<sup>35</sup> In addition, many non-Muslim teachers in the UK have noted that they have no problems whatsoever in communicating with Muslim women who wear the *nikaab* and it does not prevent them from communicating in anyway whatsoever. Even though they find the *nikaab* strange, in terms of communication it is something which they do not really notice when as the eyes and voice are enough.

### **IS THE NIQAAB A HINDRANCE TO ‘COMMUNITY-COHESION’ IN THE UK?**

‘Community cohesion’ includes a number of different domains and a ‘cohesive community’ can be defined, according to their own (*kuffaar*) rubric, as one wherein all communities feel a sense of belonging, people’s different values are respected and positively valued, there are similar opportunities for all and there are strong and positive relationships are being developed between people from different backgrounds in the workplace, in schools and within neighbourhoods.

---

<sup>34</sup> Part of the ‘Straw-mans’ argument was that at his surgery in the northern English city of Blackburn, he has asked Muslim women to remove the nikaab in order to “facilitate communication” and that these women have been happy to blindly follow him and remove the nikaabs and expose their faces to him, whilst there has been another female present in his surgery.

<sup>35</sup>

[http://www.lse.co.uk/ShowStory.asp?story=IF2829539A&news\\_headline=attractive\\_people\\_get\\_better\\_medical\\_help](http://www.lse.co.uk/ShowStory.asp?story=IF2829539A&news_headline=attractive_people_get_better_medical_help)

This is particularly for groups of people who live in a locality and getting together in order to defend or promote a common local interest. So if all of the above is included within the definition of ‘community cohesion’, then the individual who told Muslim women to take off the *nikaab* for ‘communication reasons’ has himself contradicted this very principle! Despite his futile assertion that the Muslims have!

Furthermore, the ‘community cohesion’ nonsense which was stated within ‘Straw-mans’ argument, is a misnomer, as if Muslim women don’t wear the *nikaab*, will we therefore all of a sudden have community cohesion? The answer is clearly no! So how can he use the few women who wear the *nikaab* as being an hindrance to ‘community cohesion.’ So therefore, the ‘Straw-mans’ argument was sinister in the way that he knew very well that due to his position he will be listened to within the country, but we reject his *kalaam* with no shame or blame.

So we can see that only the Muslims are being implicated as being those who are eroding ‘community cohesion’ within the UK, and this is a transgressing statement. There was no mention whatsoever to the likes of the Christian child-molesters, far-right neo Nazi terrorists<sup>36</sup> (who are more

---

<sup>36</sup> The *BBC* reported (Wednesday July 5 2006 CE) that: a man from East Sussex (in England) sent bomb-making instructions to a member of the far-right BNP. Allen Boyce, 74, of Farington Court, Old Orchard Road, Eastbourne, admitted incitement to possess explosives. He was sentenced by Lewes Crown Court on Wednesday, by Judge Anthony Niblett who described his actions as evil. The judge suspended Boyce's sentence for two years and placed him under a two-year supervision order. The offence took place between 4 April and 15 November 2004. Boyce wrote to 27-year-old Terry Collins, also from Eastbourne, who was jailed for five years in 2005 for a campaign of attacks and abuse against Asian families. He sent Collins plans of a hotel in Eastbourne and instructions on how to mix two chemicals.

Also from the *Burnley Citizen* newspaper (4 October 2006 CE, ‘Ex-BNP man faces explosives charge’ by Andrew Hewitt): **“FORMER British National Party member has been accused of possessing the largest amount of chemical explosives of its type ever found in the country. Robert Cottage, 49, of Talbot Street, Colne, appeared before Burnley magistrates charged with possession of an explosive**

numerous than all of the Muslims in the UK but are not asked to ‘integrate’), high crime rates, teenage pregnancy, anti-social families, yob culture, hooligans, binge-drinking and the likes! Only Muslims are mentioned in the context of the ‘erosion of community cohesion.’

**“And never will the Jews and Christians approve of you until you follow their religion.”**

*{al-Baqarah (2): 120}*

---

substance. Cottage was charged under the Explosives Substances Act 1883 on Monday night after forensic experts searched his home, allegedly discovering chemical components which could be used to make explosives. Police sealed off Cottage's home last Thursday and finished their search at the weekend. Officers claim that their find is the largest haul of chemicals of its kind discovered in someone's home in the country. However, the exact nature of the chemicals has not been revealed.”

Yet this did not make national front page news, because they were not Muslims even though they had the clear intent to bomb.

[http://www.burnleycitizen.co.uk/display.var.951775.0.exbnp\\_man\\_faces\\_explosives\\_charge.php](http://www.burnleycitizen.co.uk/display.var.951775.0.exbnp_man_faces_explosives_charge.php)