



السنة الحادية والأربعون
ربيع أول ١٤٤٨ هـ
آب ٢٠٢٦ م



جامعية - فكرية - ثقافية

Al-Waie Magazine Issue 482

(Translated from Arabic) (Rabi ul-Awwal 1448 AH, August 2026 CE)

Global – Intellectual – Cultural

Al-Waie Magazine Editorial: A Review of the Book: “Department of Information and Communication Technology in the Khilafah Rashidah (Rightly Guided Caliphate)”

Artificial Intelligence and Independent Cybersecurity

Where Is the Trump Administration Leading the United States? (Part 3)

Europe Between Rearmament and Industrial Rescue: How Has the US-China Conflict Forced a Reshaping of the European Economic Model?

With the Noble Quran: Allah ﷻ Does Whatever He Wills

The Translation Anomaly Regarding the Term “Homosexuality” and the Islamic Perspective

Expanding the Abraham Accords: A Step Toward an Abrahamic Federation

Al-Waie Magazine

Published on the first of every lunar month, by a team of Muslim university youth in Lebanon.

Under License No. 166 issued by the Lebanese Ministry of Information on 15/11/1989

Contents

[Editorial: A Review of the Book: “Department of Information and Communication Technology in the Khilafah Rashidah \(Rightly Guided Caliphate\)” Page 2](#)

[Artificial Intelligence and Independent Cybersecurity Page 16](#)

[Where Is the Trump Administration Leading the United States? \(Part 3\) Page 25](#)

[Europe Between Rearmament and Industrial Rescue: How Has the US-China Conflict Forced a Reshaping of the European Economic Model? Page 40](#)

[Gardens of Paradise: Utbah ibn Ghazwan \(ra\) Page 50](#)

[With the Noble Quran: Allah ﷻ Does Whatever He Wills Page 54](#)

[News of Muslims Around the World Page 60](#)

[The Translation Anomaly Regarding the Term “Homosexuality” and the Islamic Perspective\) Page 66](#)

[Expanding the Abraham Accords: A Step Toward an Abrahamic Federation Page 70](#)

[End Piece: Freedom of Navigation:” A Lie Imposed Upon Us on Our Own Land Page 80](#)

[Back Cover: Warnings of an “Israeli” Plan to Seize 70% of Al-Masjid Al-Aqsa Page 83](#)

Official website of *Al-Waie* magazine: <http://www.al-waie.org>

Official *Al-Waie* magazine account on Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/alwaie.info>

Official *Al-Waie* magazine account on X (Twitter): <https://x.com/alwaiemagazine>

Official *Al-Waie* magazine channel on Instagram: <https://www.instagram.com/alwaiemagazine>

Al-Waie magazine page on Dailymotion: <https://www.dailymotion.com/alwaiemagazine>

A Review of the Book: “Department of Information and Communication Technology in the Khilafah Rashidah (Rightly Guided Caliphate)”

General Introduction and Overview:

Hizb ut Tahrir published the book “Department of Information and Communication Technology in the Khilafah Rashidah (Rightly Guided Caliphate)” in March 2026. This serves as another building block in the towering edifice the party has been constructing since its inception—an endeavor driven by the goal of resuming the Islamic way of life. The Hizb has released numerous publications regarding the Caliphate State—such as **“The Ruling System in Islam,” “Introduction to the Constitution,” “Institutions of the Khilafah State in Ruling and Administration,”** and **“Funds in the Khilafah State”**—to form a clear, detailed picture of what the future Khilafah State by the Permission of Allah ﷻ should look like, given that the Khilafah is a unique state, distinct from the forms of governance currently existing in the world.

This book is not a manual on computer engineering or programming. Instead, it is an intellectual and political project that outlines a vision for the role of information technology in managing state affairs. It comes in response to the profound impact of information and communication technology (ICT). In recent decades, ICT has become one of the most influential technologies in the lives of individuals, societies, and nations, evolving into the very infrastructure that drives most economic,

administrative, security, and military activities in the modern world. Technology is no longer limited to computers, phones, and communication tools; it has become an integrated system that manages information flow, interconnects institutions, plays a role in decision-making autonomy, and constitutes a key element of state power and influence in the digital age.

In light of these profound transformations, it was essential to present a comprehensive vision regarding the role of ICT within the state. It is viewed as a strategic sector that transcends mere technical application to become an integral part of the regime's governing control, security, administration, and development. Thus, the study is not limited to defining the technology and its components. Instead, it addresses the public policies that should govern its development, management, and protection, as well as its role in supporting state institutions and enhancing their capacity to perform their various functions.

The central theme of the book:

The book proceeds from the premise that Information and Communication Technology (ICT) is no longer merely a secondary technical sector. Instead, it has become a fundamental pillar upon which modern states rely for administration, the economy, security, warfare, media, and all other aspects of life. Consequently, possessing this technology and controlling its infrastructure has evolved beyond a mere technical or service-related matter into an issue directly linked to power, control, and liberation.

Thus, for states seeking to safeguard their interests and enhance their capacity to manage their affairs, relying on technologies produced by others is insufficient. Instead, they must build indigenous capabilities that enable them to advance and manage

technology, as well as protect their data and information landscape. The various topics and principles discussed in the book stem from this perspective, offering practical approaches to achieving this objective.

The success of this independent vision for ICT depends primarily on the state's ability to successfully navigate the transitional phase, break the global monopoly on chip supply chains and other critical components, retain specialized expertise and skilled talent, and strike a balance between security imperatives and the protection of citizens' legitimate rights.

Technology and Revival:

Historically, the revival of Muslims and the source of their strength did not stem from science, industry, or wealth alone. Instead, that revival—past and future—was driven by intellectual advancement grounded in a spiritual foundation; specifically, the intellectual framework upon which the state and the nation were built. The scientific, administrative, and military achievements of Islamic history were the fruits of that revival, not its cause. The Ummah's decline began when it lost the foundation upon which its civilization rested; consequently, science, industry, wealth, power, and unity declined alongside it.

Based on this understanding, technology serves as a tool and a means for managing state affairs and serving the people. It does not constitute the intellectual or political foundation of the state's existence. Thus, the objective is to demonstrate how the information technology sector must be managed within a rising state, recognizing it as an essential tool for administration, control, and influence.

It is worth noting that theoretical sciences provide the Ummah with knowledge and scientific principles; applied sciences

transform this knowledge into engineering solutions and designs; and technology subsequently embodies these designs into practical devices, systems, and products that serve the state and society. Therefore, building technological power is not achieved merely by importing technology. Instead, it requires possessing a scientific, engineering, and industrial base capable of producing and advancing technology.

We must never lose sight of the fact that the technology sector emerged and developed under the auspices of Western nations—specifically those holding a worldview contrary to Islam—who utilized it as an instrument of destruction and corruption. They transformed it into a colonial weapon used to plunder wealth, project influence, manipulate minds, cultivate collaborators, and impose the capitalist lifestyle—rendering the impact of technology even more devastating than that of military weaponry. Consequently, the Khilafah State must formulate a general policy rooted in its ideology and rebuild this sector from the ground up, ensuring it is founded upon the Islamic viewpoint towards life.

The true value of information and communication technology does not stem from the technology itself—as it is inherently a neutral tool—but instead derives from the civilizational and political project it serves. However, its importance should neither be underestimated, nor should it be viewed merely as an administrative tool. Instead, it must be seen as a significant instrument of power and authority. A state that relies on importing biotechnology remains vulnerable to dependency and external influence, whereas possessing the technology grants it greater independence and control over its resources and decisions, while bolstering its ability to safeguard its interests and achieve its objectives.

The Digital Revolution and Cyber Warfare:

In recent decades, the world has undergone a radical transformation driven by the digital revolution; information now travels at immense speeds, and computers, networks, and telecommunications have permeated nearly every aspect of life. The scope has expanded far beyond mere data storage and retrieval; digital technology and computerized software now drive a vast array of production processes, machinery, power plants—including nuclear and electrical facilities—water utilities, and more.

This massive development in information systems, computing, telecommunications, and networking has made most vital civilian and military facilities dependent on digital technology. Its impact extends to sectors such as the economy, education, administration, media, security, and warfare. Given the capacity of these technologies to breach systems and enable the remote, cross-border control and management of facilities, states have recognized the potential threat to their independence, security, and control over critical infrastructure. Consequently, they have moved to safeguard their digital domains and counter attempts at cyber intrusion.

Information technology has also redefined the concept of military power. While military strength was traditionally rooted in conventional armies, energy sources, and natural resources, it now increasingly relies on technical and informational capabilities. Major powers are better able to project influence by dominating the electronics, software, operating systems, telecommunications networks, data, information, and military technology sectors.

Furthermore, this technology has transformed the nature of military operations themselves; unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs), guided missiles, command-and-control systems, and surveillance and reconnaissance tools now rely heavily on computers, communications, and software. Thus, they have become integral components of military power instead of merely auxiliary tools. As a result of these factors—and the entry of technology into the arena of political, economic, and military conflict between nations—major powers have formulated specific security and military strategies for the cyber domain. This gave rise to the concept of cyber warfare: a silent strategic conflict waged in digital space, where traditional weaponry is replaced by software-based arms—such as malicious code, control and self-destruct viruses, exploits targeting undiscovered security vulnerabilities, and electronic jamming. These digital battles aim to breach an adversary's critical systems, paralyze their command-and-control networks, or disable air defense systems, power plants, water facilities, and airports. The result is near-total administrative and military paralysis, achieved without the need to cross borders or fire a single shot.

Consequently, the information and communications technology (ICT) sector must be regulated in alignment with the state's overarching policy of protecting its citizens and safeguarding their interests. This is achieved through two fundamental approaches: first, by building an industrial and technological base capable of producing the hardware and equipment that underpin digital systems—such as the manufacture of microchips and integrated circuits; and second, by establishing a clear policy for technology management and usage regulation. This entails managing communication networks, securing systems, controlling connectivity with the outside world, and gaining a

deep understanding of operating systems and the mechanisms by which devices and machines communicate.

Furthermore, the emergence of cyber warfare as a modern theater of conflict between nations requires Muslims to develop the necessary technical and digital capabilities—as part of the broader effort to amass a force that deters the enemy. In this context, cyber warfare becomes an element of *Jihad* aimed at protecting the state and its interests, while supporting efforts to carry and propagate the Islamic message.

The Need for a Central Information and Communication Technology (ICT) Department:

Information and Communication Technology (ICT) has become an integral part of a state's operations and vital facilities, transcending the role of mere support tools. Administration, security, the economy, warfare, and public services all rely on it. Furthermore, it plays a fundamental role in preserving data and records, facilitating communication between state agencies, operating military and security systems, and managing critical infrastructure. As ICT has become the lifeblood of the modern state—intertwined with various state affairs—any malfunction directly impacts the performance of state agencies and national interests. This underscores the urgent need to establish a specialized, central ICT department.

Leaving this sector fragmented and distributed across multiple departments—without unified management and integrated coordination—creates dangerous vulnerabilities and entry points. Adversaries could exploit these to compromise state facilities or breach vital systems, potentially weakening the state, paralyzing certain functions, or disrupting the interests of the citizenry. Consequently, this department is tasked with the state's

technical planning, regulating the telecommunications sector, managing digital infrastructure, protecting systems and networks, coordinating technical operations across various agencies, and bolstering the state's strategic capabilities.

The ICT department maintains close ties with key state entities—foremost among them the Office of the Caliphate, the provinces (Wilayat), the courts, the Department of War, the Department of Industry and Internal Security, and the state's administrative apparatus. It is viewed as an enabling entity that provides the technical tools, systems, and software required by these agencies and departments to carry out their functions. It must be directly linked to the Khilafah (Caliphate) centrally, as its impact extends to the majority of decision-making autonomy, administrative, and security-related functions. It is not merely an ordinary service department but an entity with a direct influence on the conduct of state affairs domestic security, foreign relations, military capabilities, and economic strength.

Key Components of Information and Communication Technology (ICT):

ICT is not a singular entity but an interconnected system comprising several layers. It is essential to highlight the fundamental components upon which this system rests, as follows:

First: Electronic chips, devices, and equipment, which constitute the physical foundation of the entire technology. Computers, phones, communication devices, servers, and modern military hardware all rely on electronic circuits and microchips to function.

Second: Operating systems, software, and applications, which enable these devices to operate. Electronic hardware alone

performs no function without the software and operating systems that control and manage its various operations. Software represents the logical or operational aspect of technology.

Third: Communication technology, comprising the means that allow devices to exchange information. The mere existence of computers and software is insufficient; there must also be mechanisms to transmit data between individuals and various devices.

Fourth: Networks and the Internet, which form the infrastructure connecting devices to one another, whether within a single facility or on a global scale. The Internet is the largest global network, linking millions of devices and systems and enabling the near-instantaneous exchange of information and services. Network control and management represent a crucial aspect of a state's technological sovereignty.

Fifth: Electronic warfare, which is one of the most significant facets of modern conflict. Conflict between nations is no longer confined to conventional weaponry; it now encompasses system breaches, intelligence gathering, cyber-espionage, signal jamming, service disruption, and the protection of digital infrastructure. Consequently, control over cyberspace has become an integral component of modern military and security capabilities.

Modern technology, therefore, is not merely a matter of computers or phones; rather, it is an integrated ecosystem—ranging from microchips to global networks and cyber warfare—where each component relies upon and complements the others. The mission of the Information and Communication Technology (ICT) department is to build indigenous capabilities for hardware

and software production, thereby achieving self-sufficiency and complete digital sovereignty for the state.

ICT Management Policy:

The Information and Communication Technology (ICT) sector must be governed by a general policy. The competent department is responsible for formulating the state's general policy for this sector, devising strategic plans, and overseeing their implementation. This department is tasked with building and developing the electronics industry and the software sector, digitizing government operations to ensure fast, accessible, and highly efficient service delivery, providing high-quality, rapid communication services, and supplying the necessary technology to various sectors.

Principles of ICT Policy:

A system for managing ICT policy in the Khilafah State must be established. As a foundation for this, a set of ICT policy principles has been formulated; the book outlines nineteen such principles, accompanied by their respective Shariah evidences. While this context does not permit a detailed presentation of these principles and their evidences, we will provide an overview, categorizing them into three major conceptual frameworks or pillars: technical independence, information independence, and strategic administration.

Technical independence refers to the state's ability to control the fundamental architecture of the technology upon which it relies. Rather than merely consuming technologies produced by others, the state possesses the industrial and scientific capabilities to develop the systems, devices, and digital infrastructure it requires. This pillar encompasses principles related to the ICT industry, the development of inventions and technical devices,

the establishment of public data centers, the management of digital infrastructure, the regulation of wireless waves and frequencies, and the protection of the State's digital space.

Information independence relates to controlling information and data, which have become among the most significant sources of power and influence. Data is no longer merely a set of records stored within departments; it has become a strategic resource enabling the management of societies, the economy, military forces, and various state apparatuses. This pillar encompasses regulations regarding cybersecurity, the monitoring of external threats, the protection of networks and systems, the preservation of individual privacy, the safeguarding of confidential state data, and the regulation of connectivity to the internet and the outside world.

Administrative and strategic independence, meanwhile, concerns how technology is utilized to serve the state and achieve its overarching goals. The objective is not to boast of technological advancement, but instead to harness these capabilities to improve the management of state institutions, enhance public services, boost performance efficiency, and strengthen planning and decision-making capacities. This pillar covers regulations concerning electronic documents, digital signatures, electronic payments, digital systems, remote judicial proceedings, and the application of artificial intelligence in administrative tasks, as well as the regulation of the relationship between the Information Technology Department and other state bodies.

The book provides specific details regarding Rule 19—which addresses information and communication technology policy in relation to the departments and agencies of the Khilafah (Caliphate)—that merit mention: the department's general policy regarding these entities is founded on establishing and managing

local data centers; protecting systems and networks; overseeing the production and development of software and security hardware; safeguarding the state's confidential and sensitive information; providing official communication channels and digital systems for all state agencies; and coordinating with various state bodies to develop artificial intelligence and modern technologies and their applications.

Secondly, the department focuses more on the services and systems it provides to the various state departments and agencies than on formulating new policies. It demonstrates the enabling role the Department plays in supporting the office of the Khilafah; the departments of War, Internal Security, Foreign Affairs, and Industry; and the state's administrative apparatus—including its various components such as the administrations for Health, Education and Curricula, Masajid, Citizenship, and Hajj and Umrah—as well as other government bodies. This support is provided by supplying the systems, software, communication networks, databases, and digital infrastructure required for them to perform their functions. Furthermore, the Department is responsible for upgrading, maintaining, and securing these systems, while ensuring their integration and the secure, organized exchange of information among them; this contributes to enhancing operational efficiency, improving the management of State affairs, and strengthening the State's capacity for planning, decision-making, and the realization of its supreme interests.

Conclusion:

The book concludes that Information and Communication Technology (ICT) has become a pivotal element of power and sovereignty in the modern era, transcending its status as merely a technical sector or a set of supporting service tools.

Consequently, possessing this technology and controlling its infrastructure is a strategic necessity for ensuring the state's liberation (تحرير tahrir) from colonial influence and safeguarding its interests.

The book emphasizes that establishing technological independence requires developing indigenous capabilities in electronics, software, telecommunications, data centers, and cybersecurity, alongside managing the information domain. It also highlights the importance of leveraging technology to serve various state institutions, enhance administrative efficiency, improve services, support decision-making, and utilize modern technologies—particularly artificial intelligence—while maintaining human accountability in tasks and decisions that carry sovereign implications.

Thus, the book's core message is that the state requires an integrated system combining the development of indigenous technical capabilities, the protection of the information domain, and the harnessing of technology to serve administration, security, and development. In this way, ICT becomes a strategic pillar for bolstering state power and independence, as well as the state's ability to utilize digital technology to achieve its objectives.

Finally, this book—like those preceding it—underscores the seriousness and dedication of the advocates calling for the establishment of the Khilafah (Caliphate). It demonstrates the clarity of their political and intellectual vision and their commitment to formulating the practical frameworks necessary for managing the state's various affairs. It also reflects their tireless efforts to cultivate public support for this project within the Ummah by offering detailed approaches to contemporary issues and highlighting Islam's capacity to organize the affairs of

life and the state. This effort reveals the awareness and sincerity inherent in the Islamic project, as well as its proponents' possession of an intellectual and political vision aimed at building a genuine state—one that bears and disseminates the message of Islam as a civilizational project addressing the problems of the individual, society, and the state. May Allah ﷻ grant success; in Him we place our trust.

Artificial Intelligence and Independent Cybersecurity

Abdel-Halim Al-Hourani

I write these lines knowing that much of what follows will soon seem familiar; the pace of change in this field has outstripped our ability to document it. The issue is no longer merely a subject of research; artificial intelligence has actively entered the realm of cyber warfare and permeated the details of our daily lives. A state that lags in building its defenses today stands to lose not just a system or two, but its entire margin of maneuverability—precisely at the moment it needs to exercise its sovereign decision-making power most. While preparing entails high costs, the regret of failing to prepare will prove far costlier when the time comes.

How Has Artificial Intelligence Changed the Rules of the Game?

There is a common confusion regarding the different types of artificial intelligence that affects our understanding of the threats involved. To simplify this for the general public, we can distinguish between them as follows:

- **Discriminative AI:** This is the oldest and most prevalent form; its function is to sort and classify items. It operates much like email filters that automatically identify and categorize spam messages.
- **Generative AI:** This is the type seen in modern models like ChatGPT; it is capable of creativity and generating entirely new content based on the data upon which it was trained.

Before the advent of generative models, cyberattacks required organized teams and substantial budgets for reconnaissance,

keeping offensive capabilities largely in the hands of major powers and a select few groups. Today, however, artificial intelligence has drastically reduced the cost of offensive operations, enabling small groups or individuals with moderate skills to inflict serious damage at a negligible cost. Key Offensive Shifts:

- **Smart Reconnaissance:** Tasks that once required weeks of human effort to gather intelligence and map out a target are now performed by digital agents in mere hours—surpassing current defensive capabilities.
- **Automated Vulnerability Generation:** AI tools scan software for vulnerabilities and convert them into actual exploit code in record time, outpacing the target's ability to patch their systems.
- **Smart Spear-Phishing:** The era of clumsy phishing emails is over; AI analyzes a victim's digital footprint and communication style to craft personalized messages that are difficult to detect, even for seasoned professionals.
- **Deepfakes:** Moving beyond mere demonstrations, a short audio sample is now sufficient to mimic a voice with high fidelity, enabling the creation of fake audio or video conversations to deceive victims and persuade them to authorize massive financial transfers.
- **Polymorphic Malware:** Malicious software that alters its form and code with every transmission, confounding traditional detection systems and allowing the virus to persist within the system undetected.

Attacks on the “Brain” of AI:

A fundamental shift has occurred: the target is no longer just network systems, but the AI "brain" itself. These attacks take three primary forms:

- 1. Deliberately Feeding AI Incorrect Information (Data Poisoning):** Attackers inject misleading information during the training phase, causing the system to adopt flawed logic without detection. An example is a construction contract auditing system secretly trained to ignore delay penalties in specific contracts.
- 2. Misleading the system with clever, fabricated inputs (deception attacks):** After training is complete, an attacker introduces precisely modified inputs to fool the model—such as a subtle tweak to a virus file that causes the security system to read it as a standard text file, or an imperceptible alteration to an image that confuses a facial recognition system.
- 3. Stealing system secrets and internal data (model extraction):** Retrieving sensitive data or stealing the algorithm itself; if a system has been trained on a company's trade secrets, an attacker might use clever queries to trick it into revealing that confidential information.

Critical sectors in the eye of the storm: What does the disaster look like?

Not all systems are of equal value; critical national infrastructure is the top priority for protection. Here are four realistic scenarios illustrating how artificial intelligence can transform the nature of the threat:

Scenario One: Collapse of the electrical grid and energy sector

An AI-coordinated attack targets multiple substations simultaneously by exploiting vulnerabilities in industrial control systems. Within minutes, cascading failures begin; within hours,

the country is left without power, and backup batteries in hospitals and data centers are depleted. The disaster lies not in the darkness itself, but in the immediate, total paralysis that follows as communications, banking, and electronic payment systems fail. In this AI-enhanced scenario, the conflict is not “point-versus-point”—as seen in Ukraine in 2015—but rather “algorithm-versus-algorithm,” where the attack coordinates multiple strikes and adapts to defensive measures in real time.

Scenario Two: Paralysis of the Banking and Financial System

A multi-layered attack begins with a deepfake call from a high-ranking financial official, coinciding with ransomware striking the banking settlement system. Within hours, instant payments cease; within a day, people queue at ATMs for mass cash withdrawals, while automated accounts spread rumors that undermine confidence in the national currency. This mirrors the 2022 incident in Costa Rica, where a ransomware attack paralyzed state institutions and forced a declaration of emergency; however, with the advent of AI, the situation escalates from operational paralysis to a full-blown crisis of monetary sovereignty.

Scenario Three: Erosion of Social Trust and the Information Space

This is the most dangerous scenario, as it requires no technical breach but instead exploits the open nature of the internet. AI generates thousands of coordinated automated accounts that disseminate high-fidelity deepfake videos of officials and articles mimicking established media outlets. The goal is not to convince everyone, but to sow widespread doubt, leaving citizens unable to distinguish between the real and the fake. This paralyzes the state’s ability to manage crises, as every official statement is met

with skepticism. Researchers call this the “liar’s dividend,” and it carries the highest probability of occurrence.

Scenario Four: Hijacking Weaponry and Defense Systems

With the proliferation of drones and autonomous systems, a threat emerges regarding the targeting of control systems to disable a drone fleet or turning it against its owner. This requires compromising the software supply chain or poisoning target-identification data. Several fronts have witnessed incidents of navigation system jamming that caused drones to turn back against friendly forces; furthermore, as AI-driven attacks evolve, it becomes possible for friendly radar to misidentify a friendly asset as an enemy, or vice versa.

Can a state truly collapse?

The answer depends on the type of collapse:

- **Sudden, total collapse:** Unlikely; modern states possess multiple redundancies that prevent sectors from failing all at once. Military forces operate on isolated networks, and critical infrastructure systems often have manual override capabilities.
- **Gradual, multi-stage paralysis:** Far more likely; a coordinated attack striking three or four sectors in rapid succession—coupled with a disinformation campaign—can push a state to the point of losing effective control. The difference between the two is akin to the difference between an explosion and a slow, corrosive fire: a state might recover from a physical earthquake in months, whereas a “cyber-earthquake” that shatters trust takes years to heal.

The Triple Firewall: How can a state protect its independence and decision-making autonomy?

Effective defense is not built from disjointed measures but from an integrated system comprising three fundamental pillars:

1. Governance and Legislation (Regulation)

Establishing a cybersecurity and artificial intelligence authority with independent management, a subordinate cyber command, and a direct reporting line to the state's highest leadership. Its mandate would be to enact binding regulations and directives for sensitive sectors, establishing minimum standards and control measures.

2. Independence Technical Capabilities (The Machine)

Independence entails full control over critical nodes by establishing an independent cloud infrastructure for storing and processing sensitive government data, and by building specialized computing centers and foundational AI models trained locally on independent data.

3. Human Capital (The Human)

Technology without a workforce is an empty shell. A successful plan places humans at the forefront by preparing highly skilled, specialized teams and research centers capable of producing an army of professionals across diverse disciplines—including intelligence, engineering, psychology, economics, and political science—to create an integrated defense and offense ecosystem.

The Army of Defensive Systems and the State Protocol

The concept of an “AI Defense Army” stems from the reality that a high-speed machine cannot be countered by slow human minds alone; attacks occur at lightning speed, and personnel behind screens cannot repel them. Instead, we require defensive “automation” capable of responding in fractions of a second. This framework comprises three components:

First: Intelligent Digital Systems

- **Intelligent Operations Center:** A monitoring hub that filters out thousands of trivial alerts and automatically resolves minor issues, while referring major, sensitive decisions to human managers.
- **Proactive Hunter:** Deploying digital agents to scour the system for any hidden traces of intruders before an attack begins; prevention is less costly than remediation.
- **Ethical Offensive Testing Teams:** Software and hackers tasked with continuously attacking state systems to identify and patch vulnerabilities before adversaries can exploit them.

Second: Digital Independence and Content Protection

- **Digital Sealing:** Applying an invisible digital authentication mark to official data to protect society from rumors and information ambiguity; any statement lacking this seal is deemed fake.
- **Technical Independence:** Developing indigenous artificial intelligence that understands our culture and safeguards state data privacy, rather than relying on external companies that might leak data.

Third: State and Individual Strategy

- **Comprehensive Cyber Exercises:** Testing the response of the entire government—not just technical teams—to identify gaps and train leaders in managing digital emergencies.
- **Critical Business Continuity Plans:** An annually tested plan for every sector, covering scenarios such as total system failure, the shift to manual operations, and the use of alternative communication channels.

- **Multi-Source Technical Reserves:** Avoiding reliance on a single technology provider or nation, as such dependency creates a dangerous strategic vulnerability.
- **Pre-established Local Response Protocol:** Defining a clear decision-making hierarchy and specific authorities to activate pre-legislated cyber emergency laws; a crisis is not the time to draft protocols.
- **Societal Security Culture:** Implementing continuous awareness campaigns, staff training, and integrating security fundamentals into educational curricula so that citizen awareness becomes the first line of defense.

Post-Quantum Cryptography

A looming threat exists—one that is not “cyber” in the traditional sense: super-powerful quantum computers. Once matured, these machines will be capable of cracking most encryption algorithms currently used to protect government data. The terrifying danger is not merely in the future; it is unfolding right now through an adversarial strategy known as “Harvest Now, Decrypt Later.” Adversaries today are capturing and storing encrypted data transmitted via undersea cables and satellites, awaiting the future moment when encryption is broken by the advent of super-powerful computing systems. Consequently, an immediate plan is required, comprising the following steps:

1. Conducting a comprehensive inventory of the algorithms used in critical government systems.
2. Classifying data according to its “independent lifespan,” the duration for which the data remains sensitive and warrants protection.

3. Initiating a gradual transition to approved quantum-resistant standards and ensuring that any new development supports cryptographic resilience from day one.

Conclusion and Strategic Recommendation

The real threat today is not the sudden collapse of a state, but instead the loss of its strategic room for maneuver and the erosion of trust in its institutions at a critical juncture. The difference between a state that thrives in this environment and one that falters lies not in the volume of its resources, but in its management mindset: a state that treats cybersecurity and artificial intelligence merely as technical issues to be handled by a communications ministry or an IT department will find itself generations behind, whereas a state that treats them as matters of independence managed at the highest political level will position itself for readiness and influence. The window of opportunity is open now, yet a delay of just one year in this arena is equivalent to a decade-long lag in other fields, given the staggering pace of technological development and progress.

Where Is the Trump Administration Leading the United States? (Part 3)

By Essam Al-Sheikh Ghanem

US President Trump exploits, in economic matters, the fact that the US market is the largest in the world and that countries with strong economies need it. He has become more boastful, portraying America as an “indispensable nation.” Against this backdrop, he announced the imposition of significant tariffs on all countries of the world, including China, which received the largest share of these tariffs. He also imposed severe restrictions on China's export of electronic chips. When China did not stand idly by and imposed reciprocal tariffs, American farmers began pressuring Trump to ease his tariffs to allow them to supply agricultural goods to China. China also imposed restrictions on the export of rare earth minerals and intensified its search for alternative markets for its exports. At this point, Trump began to back down on his tariffs. Here, it became clear to him and to the world that China has become a true competitor to America, and even surpasses it in several economic sectors, including renewable energy, electric vehicles, and rare earth production. China has invested tens of billions of its abundant dollars in establishing a substantial chip industry of its own, genuinely threatening to become independent of America in the near future. Likewise, Chinese internet and technology companies compete with their American counterparts remarkably well, although they still lag slightly behind.

China plays a considerable role in reducing reliance on the dollar in its international trade, following the sanctions imposed by America on many countries, including Russia, which disrupted their international commercial dealings. China is moving

confidently toward increasing its international trade transactions in its currency, the yuan, to the point that 40% of China's international trade now takes place without the dollar. This represents a significant figure and threatens the dollar's global standing. This trajectory is a major source of annoyance for America, as the dollar is considered the cornerstone of its financial supremacy and one of the pillars of its global economic dominance. However, President Trump's policies and his harsh criticisms of the US Federal Reserve regarding interest rate hikes or cuts are causing global upheaval, prompting dollar-dependent countries to reduce their reliance on it due to the Trump administration's influence over its value. As for the tariffs imposed by Trump, he collected approximately \$260 billion from them during 2025, a cost borne by the American citizen due to the higher prices of these goods. Meanwhile, other countries collected roughly \$220 billion from the reciprocal tariffs they imposed on American goods. In other words, Trump's policy resulted in little gain for the US treasury, extracted from the pockets of its own citizens, while American companies became less competitive abroad due to the retaliatory tariffs imposed by other countries on America.

According to his stated policy, Trump aspires to bring back the American manufacturing engine, a large part of which relocated to China over two decades ago. At that time, America wanted to increase the competitiveness of its companies by moving them to China and other countries where labor was cheap, and it succeeded in doing so. America had outsourced its industry abroad – especially to China – under deeply held convictions about its ability to control the global economy, because it possessed the strongest weapons, the most money, and held the reins of scientific research. In other words, it was the strongest

militarily, and it dictated the direction of investment and its development. However, this American vision has completely failed with regard to China.

American companies transferred their expertise entirely to China, in line with the Chinese policy of technology transfer, which forced foreign companies to fully share their know-how within China. Chinese engineers acquired this expertise and transferred it to competing Chinese companies. Over time, America lost that expertise; moreover, it cannot easily bring it back to America in a short period. Likewise, these American companies are resisting Trump's policy, and the majority of them do not want to return to America. This is due to the advantages they found in China, such as reduced taxes, cheap labor, and easy access to the Chinese market – a market that has also become vast and highly competitive, one which major companies cannot afford to sacrifice. It is true that dozens of companies have announced their readiness to invest anew in America – especially in the semiconductor sector – but this has not been reflected in job growth in America, meaning it is still just talk. When President Trump began harshly implementing his anti-immigration policies and started deporting thousands of Latin American workers, this resulted in heavy losses for American investors in the agricultural sector, and agricultural product prices rose significantly inside America amid the labor shortage.

As for the other side of the American failure in transferring industry to China, it has manifested in China becoming a wealthy country. It then began developing its military, building ships, aircraft, and nuclear capabilities, and its international investments surpassed those of America. It poured hundreds of billions of dollars into its universities, until it rivaled America in research and came close to it, then overtook it in 2015 in

innovation and patents, with patent applications in China reaching double those in America. The tables have completely turned, and today America finds itself trying to catch up with Chinese innovation. All of this is happening at a breakneck pace, leaving America in a position that becomes more precarious year after year in comparison with China.

To secure resources and bolster its economy and its dollar, America aspires to maintain itself as the world's financial hub. To achieve that today under current circumstances, it must raise interest rates in America and strengthen the dollar's value to attract funds. However, Trump wants to lower interest rates to boost American exports. This inclination of Trump accelerates the processes of de-dollarization and moving away from the dollar, due to its trajectory toward weakness under the Trump administration. In other words, Trump's financial policies are weakening America's international financial standing. This happens amid the emergence of the Chinese competitor, which has made China an international financial center and is challenging the American hub. Yet, the financial policy of the Trump administration is also geared toward serving America's wealthy—a consistent state policy—and it undermines America's ability to compete. Government financial support in America, as seen during the COVID-19 pandemic, focuses on supporting the wealthy, most of whom operate in stock markets, equities, and other financial trading sectors, not in manufacturing. Therefore, US government support, taxpayer money, has led to further bloating of financial trading companies, without reflecting on employment or reducing unemployment in America. Today, some leaders within the Trump administration at the Federal Reserve and the Treasury Department want to reverse this direction—that is, to raise interest rates to attract money to America and

focus government support on manufacturing. Apart from being late, this also reveals, from another angle, the depth of internal disagreements within America, and even within the Trump administration itself, regarding financial policies and their impact on the state in what is almost an emergency time—a time that cannot afford experiments or waiting for results. Instead, America needs any financial lifeline to stop the ballooning debt. In essence, Trump’s policy on economic and financial matters—whether domestically, such as immigration policy, or externally, such as tariffs and reindustrialization—is not guaranteed to succeed, and Trump’s efforts to generate new resources for America from the international arena are not bearing fruit. When Trump and the Pentagon requested Congress to approve a fantasy military budget for 2026 amounting to 1.5 trillion dollars, this announcement came with almost no sources of funding other than increasing debt—debt that, at its current size, already poses a looming threat to America and is a noose around its neck that nearly chokes it, so what of increasing it further?

If Trump plans in a certain direction, he finds another obstacle in his way. For example, America incurs massive financial losses from its war on Iran to make it a subordinate state. Through this, America wants its companies to plunder Iranian oil and gas, but the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps did not surrender to America. America imposed a naval blockade on Iran, which increased its war costs. Then Gulf oil exports were cut off, and Gulf state budgets needed money, so they began withdrawing their investments from inside America. All these war expenses and Gulf withdrawals occur without America being certain whether its companies are getting closer to plundering Iran’s oil and gas or moving further away from that. This explains

President Trump's nervous state regarding the quagmire with Iran.

The Trump administration operates on the logic that weakening others strengthens America, but it works to weaken everyone, making no distinction between its allies and its enemies. The result we see so far is industrial stagnation in Germany, comprehensive economic weakness across Europe, and the British economy standing on the brink of collapse. In other words, American policies have indeed weakened Europe, but they have not weakened China. The outcome is that European countries are suffering and struggling just to provide more military spending, while China is dangerously ramping up its military production. That is to say, America weakened its alliance and its allies in Europe and failed to weaken China. This is how America is today: when it plans an economic policy, it quickly finds its negative effects manifesting in other areas unrelated to what it planned for. In this way, it is incapable of comprehensive planning as it once was, as matters slip through its fingers, and today's global winds do not blow in the direction America's ships desire.

Today, President Trump frequently describes America as the strongest military power, with the world's best industries, and with superior capabilities in every aspect. These statements reveal the extent of American anxiety over the rapid shift of power toward China. Indeed, the transfer of power and its slipping from the hands of America and the West in general has become a comprehensive phenomenon in light of the failure of America and the West and the near-bankruptcy of this capitalist system. Even non-major countries like Iran and Turkey have developed autonomous or semi-autonomous manufacturing of drones, whose participation and importance in modern warfare is

increasingly growing, and major powers—including Russia—have turned to them to obtain these drones.

Against the backdrop of this American weakness, which is being revealed day after day, the prominent conservative American media figure Tucker Carlson stated that Iran's closure of the Strait of Hormuz has exposed the limits of America's military power, as America cannot remain a superpower if its control over the world's vital straits is undermined. This control means control over international trade and control over global wealth. Iran's success in closing the Strait of Hormuz during the war has revealed that America's military hegemony and its dominance over global trade and wealth have weakened and suffered a real frailty. This weakness and frailty deepen when Americans themselves say that the cost of maintaining hegemony is far greater than the return from it. For example, the US military cannot reopen the Strait of Hormuz except through a full-scale war with Iran, and the US military might be capable of fighting and winning it, but such a war would be in no way less than America's quagmire in Iraq. In other words, such a war to regain control of Hormuz could drain America's power in Iran, leaving it without enough strength to fight any other war—for instance, around China, or anywhere else in the world. For example, when America struck Iran with fourteen bunker-buster bombs on the Fordow facility in 2025, America no longer had the capacity for a similar operation, as manufacturing such bombs requires years and vast sums of money. The same applies to the guided bombs and missiles that America used heavily during the 2026 war. This explains Trump's retreat from his demands that Iran offer “unconditional surrender.” This war, which the Trump administration waged against a country within its orbit, represented a major setback for American power—on top of the

setback in confidence in US policy among America's allies, followers, and agents.

Amid these repeated American setbacks, America must consider shedding some of its international burdens—that is, withdrawing from certain regions of the world so that it can retain the highest-priority areas. This is a major challenge. America is gradually withdrawing its troops from Europe today, and if Europe is begging America to keep its military umbrella over it to protect it from Russia, America is leaving no room for that even in the future, rebuking these countries and telling them they must defend themselves. In other words, Europe, which for decades represented the center of American policy, did not remain so compared to the greater importance of China and the Islamic region, where the major risks lie—China's economic might and Islamic ideology—each of which threatens America's greatness and international supremacy.

America failed to push the Gulf states into a war against Iran—that is, it failed to push its agents and followers to fight its war with their resources and armies, leaving the US military to fight the war alongside its ally, the Jewish entity. This demonstrates the sterility of the Trump administration's policies, which provoke both enemies and allies, thereby weakening America's ability to mobilize its allies. Trump's intransigence pushes America to bear the greatest burden of wars to maintain global control, meaning further draining of its resources. The Trump administration also failed to capitalize on the state's global prestige. In Iran, America did not take a stance that frightened the Iranians from sliding into a war with it; quite the opposite—America began assassinating top leaders, including the Supreme Leader, which prompted Iran to activate its full strength, attacking US military bases in the region, attacking its allies, and

attacking the Jewish entity. Thus, the Iranian offensive stripped the prestige from US bases and its allies, causing America to lose prestige and bleed in terms of troops, equipment, and spending—all resulting from this intransigence. Trump declares he wants to achieve 100% of his demands and is not satisfied with even 95%. This American intransigence led to the exposure of America's weakness and frailty when Iran challenged America and closed the Strait of Hormuz, and America could not reopen it. Trump subsequently began backtracking to reach an agreement not far in essence from the Obama-era agreement with Iran in 2015.

In the region of Muslims, the Trump administration's tendencies manifested in the following events:

First: In the Jewish entity's war on Gaza, the Trump administration provided full support to the Jewish entity. Even the small stockpile of heavy bombs that the Biden administration had withheld from the Jewish entity, Trump forcefully reopened access to. He demanded that the rulers, in the face of this Jewish criminality, normalize with the Jewish entity, and demanded they coordinate with it to deter Iran. He declared his admiration for the Jewish entity's criminal operations, including the pager explosions that targeted thousands of Lebanese, many of whom were civilians and not military personnel. The Jewish entity's criminality reached new extremes under the Trump administration, as its bombing reached Arab capitals—Beirut, Damascus, and Doha—to impose a new fait accompli, placing the rulers of these countries under the scalpel of intense pressure and intimidating other rulers.

It is true that the agent rulers of the region have submitted and accepted this coercive hegemony, which resembles a crushing defeat in a war they never fought. However, its repercussions do

not bode well for America or even for the Jewish entity. It is true that the first-tier rulers accept submission and further humiliation in the face of these crimes and accept coordination with the Jewish entity, due to their deep-seated vileness and their view of their own peoples as enemies, and because they tie their future to America and the Jewish entity. However, these rulers have lost the very last layer—however small—of certain popular sectors that still harbored some hope in them. Moreover, trust and loyalty have been lost even among the lower tiers of the ruling factions, who are now disintegrating from the system and standing by, waiting for horizons of change, and waiting for new leadership to emerge as an alternative to the old leadership, after these tiers witnessed that what is happening surpasses any reasonable bounds in life.

Second: The rulers—America’s agents and followers in the region—witnessed how America turned its back on Iran’s services in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Syria, then launched two wars against it alongside the Jewish entity in 2025 and 2026, seeking to strip it of all nuclear and missile capabilities, even though Iran repeatedly declares day and night that it does not seek to manufacture nuclear weapons. The Trump administration does not value anyone who previously served America, and this frightens the followers in the region and terrifies them that America could disown them, fight them, and topple their thrones. Therefore, despite their deep-seated vileness, these rulers, under Trump’s tenure, have come to fear America and be wary of its plans—meaning trust has vanished. When trust is absent, these rulers’ initiative to serve America and its interests ceases, limiting them to merely executing demands, and even then at a minimum. This in itself is a loss for American policy that the Trump administration does not realize.

Third: America established its military bases in the region, especially in the Gulf states, largely funded by those states' own money, because the rulers believed the American propaganda that these bases were there to protect their countries and their thrones. Then, when America launched its war on Iran and the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps began shelling these bases, the rulers realized that these American bases had actually brought calamities upon them. In fact, it is the armies of these rulers that provide protection for them through air defense. The likelihood of these countries being drawn into a war with Iran persists because of these bases. Despite the continued American propaganda about the role of these bases in protecting the rulers and their thrones, the new reality emerging after the Iran war thoroughly refutes these American claims. These rulers—despite their vileness—no longer believe American propaganda. Thus, America loses ground in deepening its influence due to the recklessness of the Trump administration and its one-sided vision. The Gulf states witnessed the genuine American protection given to the Jewish entity—America's defense of the entity from multiple countries, from the sea, from within the entity itself, and its interception of Iranian missiles aimed at it—while nothing similar was done for these countries. If one adds to this the losses suffered by the Gulf states due to Iran's closure of the Strait of Hormuz, then the rulers' calculations with America have certainly entered the realm of doubt.

Fourth: Tom Barrack and other envoys of the Trump administration to Syria and Lebanon spoke openly and arrogantly, with no ambiguity, stating that it is the duty of the rulers in Syria and Lebanon to protect the Jewish entity, even if it required them to engage in civil war—as in the matter of disarming the Hezb of Iran in Lebanon. Similarly, with Egypt,

pushing it to intensify pressure on Hamas to disarm and expose its tunnels, which the Jewish entity had failed to accomplish over three years. These rulers push forward in this direction due to their deep-seated vileness and their conviction that their own peoples are their enemies. However, this makes the ruling system in each country consist of multiple tiers in terms of the degree of affiliation with America, such that the upper tiers issue orders while the tiers layers obstruct them as much as possible. Not all instructions and orders are equal. Instead, if instructions lose their justifications, they become very weak and inapplicable. This is extremely dangerous for the upper ruling tiers, from whom the Trump administration demands beyond their capacity, without the American calculus realizing what is beyond capacity and what is below it of tiers. America also does not realize the medium- and long-term consequences of this. This lack of awareness is a trait of dictators like Pharaoh, who want others to see only what they see.

Fifth: Nor does the Trump administration cease attacking Islam under various headings. During his election campaign, he promised to close America to Muslims. Even his US Secretary of War, Pete Hegseth, has a tattoo on his hand with the word “Kafir” (disbeliever) in Arabic. Terrorism remains a label applied against enemies, and the Trump administration has added new groups to it that were previously described as moderate. The Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs at the US State Department monitors the curricula of Muslim countries and demands their alteration. Rulers, driven by their vileness, rush to alter Islam to please America. Saudi Arabia, which is accustomed to declaring itself the number one Muslim country, searches for pre-Islamic archaeological artifacts in an attempt to change its people’s culture, and holds licentious parties near the sacred

sites to please America. In Egypt, they transgress against what remains of Shariah rulings within the family domain. Overall, the deep-seated hatred of Islam has driven America to demand that rulers fight any manifestation and any Shariah ruling, no matter how small. So, you see them sometimes casting doubt on the Sunnah, and at other times, some of their pens attack the noble Companions (ra). This is on top of elevating the vile and the debauched and giving them high positions in society, broadcasting their news as if the Ummah is concerned with following the garbage that these vile ones have reached.

Upon careful examination of all these points, we find that American policy is retreating in the region of Muslims, not advancing. We also find that it is generating deep-seated hatred and sharp animosity among Muslims, which are gradually seeping into the lower ruling classes. This is because the Gaza war, the alignment of the West—especially America—with the Jewish entity, its military support, political cover, and defense of the genocide committed by the Jews as self-defense in response to October 7, as well as the imposition of sanctions on international judges for pursuing cases against Zionist leaders, followed by the American-Jewish war on Iran—all of this and more has firmly entrenched a fundamental idea: that America is the head of disbelief and the head of enmity, and that it is leading or standing behind the new Crusader campaigns that kill Muslims and destroy their homes almost everywhere. This has also generated an urgent conviction about the necessity of getting rid of this reality in which rulers stand with America and the Jewish entity. All of this has further strengthened the adherence of the peoples of the Islamic Ummah to their Deen, and the belief that they are antagonized for being Muslim. These collective convictions have begun to spread, expand, and deepen within Muslim populations,

constituting a collective and new intellectual shift toward Islamic identity, replacing nationalisms and ethnic loyalties—because the disbelieving states, led by America, attack Muslims as a unified Western bloc that primarily targets their Deen. In other words, the Trump administration's policy and the momentum of its rush into the region of Muslims are accelerating America's losses in the region, exacerbating Islamic sentiment, and bringing it closer to turning into a real political danger, especially as the lower ruling tiers are detaching from the upper tiers. There is no clearer evidence of all this than America's own consideration of abandoning many of its military bases in the region and relocating them inside the Jewish entity.

Thus, it becomes clear that the Trump administration is leading America from one loss to an even greater one—whether at the level of international policy, confronting China, or domestic American divisions. If the artificial momentum accompanying the numerous statements made by President Trump still obscures the reality of American weakness, making them appear to express American strength—much like Gorbachev's slogans in Moscow about reforms and moving forward at the end of the 1980s, which turned within a few years into a debacle that devastated Russia and squandered its international standing—then the reality is stark. If China's opportunity to strategically benefit from this weakness is very slim, as China wants America to remain economically strong so it can continue to profit from its markets, and it does not think of replacing it, nor is it capable of that, then the great calamity that is hoped to befall America is a decisive and imminent battle awaiting in Muslim lands. America could not defeat Iran, even though Iran's army did not move its borders forward, and America is absolutely incapable of

defeating any Muslim country that fights it resolutely and moves beyond a defensive posture to offense, mobilizing new energies from Muslims every day that increase America's despair, pushing it backward and returning it to where it belongs.

Those who think that the silence enveloping Muslim lands in the face of Jewish massacres in Gaza, Lebanon, and Syria, and the American-Israeli wars on Iran, is a state of defeat or despair are mistaken. Instead, it is a state of shock sweeping the peoples of the nation and the lower ruling classes, resulting from a serious discovery of political realities: that the West is an enemy of Muslims, and that Muslims have no path to salvation except through Islam and its ruling governance. By the permission of Allah ﷻ, it will not be long before this shock causes a real fall of one of the rulers in some country, bringing down the system with him, ending the era of forceful, oppressive coercive rule and the age of the contemptible meddlers, and a new Khilafah (Caliphate) for Muslims will be established. Then, the wave of change will spread like a tsunami, sweeping away the remaining rulers, and the peoples of the Muslims will unify to become one Ummah under one Book and one Khaleefah (Caliph).

Europe Between Rearmament and Industrial Rescue: How Has the US-China Conflict Forced a Reshaping of the European Economic Model?

Nabil Abdel Karim

Europe today faces not merely a fleeting economic crisis—one manageable through stimulus packages or monetary policies—but a structural dilemma that impacts both its economic and strategic future. The continent that spearheaded the Industrial Revolution for decades now finds itself compelled to rebuild its military capabilities, even as its industrial base faces unprecedented pressures: soaring energy costs, intensifying Chinese competition, and the transformation of the United States into an economic rival every bit as fierce as its traditional competitors.

The paradox lies in Europe's need to fund two simultaneous strategic undertakings: first, rearmament and the bolstering of defense capabilities following the erosion of security certainty caused by the war in Ukraine; and second, the rescue of its civilian industrial sector, which underpins its economic strength and competitiveness. Yet, with limited financial resources, high public debt, and sluggish economic growth, achieving both goals simultaneously presents an immense challenge.

First: The Collapse of the European Model: The End of One Era and the Beginning of Another

What Europe has witnessed since 2022 was not merely the fallout from a regional conflict on its eastern borders; it marked

the collapse of an economic model that had remained stable for decades and was considered one of the world's most successful. Europe's modern industrial resurgence was built upon a seemingly stable equation: low-cost Russian energy, vast Asian markets, open global trade, and a US security umbrella that minimized the need for heavy military spending. This equation enabled European companies—led by German firms—to achieve high levels of competitiveness. Factories operated using low-cost energy and exported their products to China and emerging markets, while governments channeled resources into education, scientific research, and infrastructure rather than military armament.

However, the Russia-Ukraine war completely altered this equation. Mutual sanctions, the halt of Russian gas supplies, and the sharp rise in energy prices revealed that economic interdependence could turn into a strategic vulnerability. The question is no longer how Europe can achieve the highest growth rates, but rather how it can sustain production amidst an increasingly risky international environment.

Concurrently, European governments realized that long-standing security reliance on the United States was no longer sufficient in a world of rapidly accelerating geopolitical shifts. Washington has increasingly focused on the Indo-Pacific region to counter China's rise, prompting European questions regarding the sustainability of the US security umbrella in the form the continent has known since the end of World War II.

Second: Rearmament—A Strategic Necessity or An Economic Burden?

Amid these changes, most European states have announced their largest rearmament programs in decades. Defense spending is no

longer merely a policy choice; it is now framed as a necessity for protecting national security, securing borders, and rebuilding military capabilities that had eroded during years of spending cuts.

Yet, this return to rearmament raises a crucial economic question: who will foot the bill?

European economies are already grappling with sluggish growth, high debt levels, and mounting pressure on public budgets due to aging populations and rising social welfare costs. Adding hundreds of billions of euros to defense budgets inevitably means reducing resources available for investment in other equally vital sectors—such as industry, energy, education, and scientific research.

Herein lies the fundamental paradox: defense requires a strong economy to fund it, while the economy requires massive investment to remain competitive. If this balance is disrupted, military spending risks shifting from a source of protection to a burden that undermines the very economic foundations upon which security itself rests.

Third: European Industry Facing an Existential Crisis

The crisis facing European industry today extends beyond soaring energy costs; it has developed into a comprehensive crisis of competitiveness. Production costs have risen relative to competitors, and sustaining energy-intensive industries has become increasingly difficult. This is occurring at a time when China is expanding industrial production at an unprecedented pace and the United States is attracting global investment through generous financial and tax incentives.

Faced with this reality, some European companies have begun relocating production lines abroad—to regions where energy is

cheaper, government support is greater, and markets are more attractive. Europe now faces the threat of “reverse industrialization”—the relocation of industries away from the continent, rather than their expansion within it.

The losses involved go beyond factories alone, extending to jobs, supply chains, innovation, and technological development capabilities. Every factory that leaves Europe leaves behind a vast network of suppliers, research centers, and skilled workers, making it increasingly difficult to bring these industries back in the future.

Consequently, European governments have returned to policies that, until recently, were considered a departure from free-market principles—such as providing direct industrial subsidies, encouraging the reshoring of production, imposing import restrictions, and shielding strategic sectors from foreign competition.

Fourth: Europe’s Ambivalence Toward China—Between Partner and Competitor

While Russia prompted Europe to rethink its energy security, China has compelled it to reconsider the future of its industry.

China is not merely a trade rival; it has emerged as an industrial and technological powerhouse capable of challenging Europe in sectors once considered the exclusive domain of European industry—such as electric vehicles, batteries, solar panels, and industrial equipment.

Consequently, Europe has moved to impose tariffs and launch investigations into Chinese state subsidies, seeking to shield European companies from competition that Brussels views as unfair and lacking a level playing field.

Yet, the paradox is that Europe cannot do without China. China is one of Europe's largest export markets and dominates critical segments of global supply chains; it produces a significant share of refined Rare Earth Elements (REEs) and essential components required for the digital transformation and the transition to clean energy.

For this reason, Brussels has adopted a policy of “de-risking” rather than “decoupling.” The goal is not to sever economic ties with China, but to reduce reliance on it in sensitive sectors while maintaining trade cooperation wherever possible.

However, this balance appears fragile. As European protectionist measures intensify, so does the likelihood of Chinese countermeasures targeting European exports or companies operating in the Chinese market—rendering the relationship between the two sides a complex mix of economic cooperation and strategic rivalry.

Thus, Europe finds itself caught between the need to protect its domestic industry and the need to maintain relations with the world's second-largest economy—a situation representing one of the most complex paradoxes in contemporary international economic policy.

Fifth: The United States—Security Ally and Economic Competitor

As Europe seeks to reorder its priorities, another equally significant paradox has emerged: the United States, while serving as the continent's primary security guarantor, has simultaneously become one of its leading economic competitors.

Amid escalating competition with China, Washington has adopted a new industrial policy centered on channeling massive investments into advanced technology, semiconductors, clean

energy, and strategic industries—backed by tax incentives and extensive government funding designed to attract global companies.

This policy has had a direct impact on Europe; numerous European firms have begun reassessing their investment plans, drawn by lower energy costs in the U.S., generous subsidy programs, and easy access to capital. Consequently, Europe is losing a portion of its investments—not to China, but to its closest ally.

It is evident, then, that the transatlantic relationship is no longer defined solely by security cooperation; it is now increasingly intertwined with economic and technological competition. The United States is striving to bolster its domestic industry and reduce external reliance, even at the expense of its European partners.

This reality presents Europe with a dual challenge: it must maintain its strategic alliance with Washington while simultaneously safeguarding its economic interests and preventing the erosion of its industrial base.

Sixth: From Market Economy to National Security Economy

Over the past three decades, the world has witnessed the dominance of an economic model based on free trade, the international division of labor, and the pursuit of the lowest possible production costs. However, successive crises have demonstrated that economic success alone is insufficient to guarantee security and stability.

Consequently, major powers have begun to redefine the concept of economic strength. Industry is no longer merely a driver of growth; it has become a component of national security. Supply chains, microchips, energy, rare minerals, and artificial

intelligence have emerged as fundamental elements in the balance of power between states.

In this context, European governments no longer hesitate to intervene directly to support strategic industries, impose restrictions on certain foreign investments, or offer incentives to reshore production within the continent—measures that were previously viewed as departures from free-market principles.

Europe is not abandoning the market economy. Instead, it is reshaping it in light of national security considerations. This shift reflects the global transition from an era of economic globalization to one of geopolitical competition, wherein the state acts as a direct partner in shaping industrial policy rather than merely a market regulator.

Seventh: Is Europe Returning to a War Economy?

Security challenges are prompting some politicians to view military industries as a new engine for economic growth, citing the potential for investment, job creation, and technological advancement.

Undoubtedly, expanding defense industries would stimulate various sectors—such as metallurgy, engineering, electronics, and scientific research. However, shifting toward an economy increasingly reliant on military spending entails strategic risks.

A war economy differs fundamentally from a civilian-oriented productive economy. The former is tied to persistent tensions and conflicts, whereas the latter is driven by innovation, productivity gains, improved living standards, and the creation of new markets. Moreover, regardless of its significance, military spending cannot substitute for long-term investment in education, universities, infrastructure, and advanced civilian industries.

Another dilemma arises here: a substantial portion of the increase in European defense spending goes toward purchasing military equipment from the United States. This means that European funds are contributing more to stimulating the US industrial sector than to bolstering Europe's own industrial autonomy.

Consequently, calls are mounting within the European Union to establish an integrated European defense industrial base, transforming defense budgets into a driver of growth within the continent rather than a means of boosting foreign economies.

Eighth: Europe's Future... Between Strategic Autonomy and International Pressures

Europe is entering a pivotal phase in its modern history. It can no longer return to the economic model that prevailed after the Cold War, yet it has not yet succeeded in formulating a new model that balances economic openness with strategic sovereignty.

The success of this transformation will hinge on the European Union's ability to answer three key questions:

Can it build an industrial base capable of competing with the United States and China in technology and advanced industries?

Can it achieve greater defense autonomy without undermining its strategic relationship with Washington?

And can it succeed in reducing its reliance on China without losing one of its most important trading partners?

The answers to these questions will determine Europe's future for decades to come, as the true challenge is no longer merely economic or military. It concerns the continent's standing in an international order shifting toward multipolarity, where major

powers compete over technology, energy, industry, and geopolitical influence.

A major economic paradox reveals that Europe is not facing a cyclical crisis that can be resolved through fiscal or monetary measures. Instead, it is undergoing a fundamental restructuring of its economic and strategic model. The continent—which once flourished through globalization, free trade, and low production costs, and which relied on colonialism—now finds itself compelled to revisit concepts of economic sovereignty, industrial security, and strategic autonomy. Yet, the success of this transformation will not depend on the volume of funds European governments spend, but rather on their ability to craft an integrated vision that weaves security, industry, technology, and energy into a single, cohesive civilizational project. The world has entered a new era where power is measured not merely by the size of armies or Gross Domestic Product, but by a state's ability to possess an advanced industrial base, secure strategic resources, master technology, and build resilient supply chains. In this new landscape, Europe faces a historic test: it must either succeed in transforming its crises into an opportunity to rebuild its strength, or remain trapped between Chinese industrial supremacy and American economic allure—gradually slipping from its former role as a shaper of events to a mere observer, and ultimately to a passive subject of them.

Perhaps the deepest paradox is that Europe's battle is no longer about choosing between rearmament and industrial revitalization. Instead, it lies in recognizing that each has become a prerequisite for the other. There is no security without a productive economy, no strong economy without an industrial base, and no advanced industry without a strategic vision that grasps the nature of the new international order—an order in

which geopolitics has once again come to drive the economy, reversing decades where the economy drove politics.

Utbah ibn Ghazwan (ra)

Ibrahim Ahmed – Yemen

He is the noble Companion Utbah ibn Ghazwan ibn Jabir al-Mazini; his lineage traces back to the tribe of Qays Aylan. He was known by the kunyah Abu Abdullah, though it is also said he was known as Abu Ghazwan or Abu al-Jabr. He was born in Makkah forty years before the Hijrah.

Utbah ibn Ghazwan (ra) was among the earliest reverts to Islam; he embraced the Deen during the initial days of the call in Makkah, even before the Prophet ﷺ entered the House of Al-Arqam ibn Abi al-Arqam.

Imam Muslim narrated in his Sahih collection that Utbah said, «لَقَدْ رَأَيْتُنِي سَابِعَ سَبْعَةٍ مَعَ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ ﷺ، مَا لَنَا طَعَامٌ إِلَّا وَرَقُ الشَّجَرِ، حَتَّى قَرِحَتْ أَشْدَافُنَا» **“I recall being one of seven people with the Messenger of Allah ﷺ; we had no food other than tree leaves, to the point that the corners of our mouths became sore.”** This indicates that he was the seventh person on earth to embrace Islam, and it highlights the severe hardship and trials he endured during the early stages of the Dawah to Islam.

Utbah undertook both Hijrahs: he first migrated to Abyssinia to preserve his Deen from the persecution of the Quraysh, then returned to Makkah before undertaking the Great Migration to Al-Madinah. There, the Prophet ﷺ established a bond of brotherhood between him and Simak ibn Kharashah (Abu Dujanah).

Utbah did not miss a single military expedition led by the Messenger of Allah ﷺ; he participated in the Battle of Badr, the

Battle of Uhud, the Battle of the Trench (Khandaq), the Pledge of Ridwan at Hudaibiyyah, and all other major engagements. He was renowned for his exceptional skill in archery and horsemanship.

During the Khilafah (Caliphate) of Umar ibn al-Khattab (ra), Utbah distinguished himself as a seasoned military commander and administrator; Umar dispatched him at the head of a small army—numbering around 800 fighters, though some sources say 300—to the region of Al-Ubulla, the Persian port on the Gulf, to cut off the Persian supply lines reaching their armies in Iraq. Through his military acumen, Utbah succeeded in defeating the Persians and capturing Al-Ubulla.

After establishing a foothold in the region, Utbah recognized the Muslims' need for a winter encampment—a central gathering place that would not be separated from the capital of the Khilafah (Caliphate), Al-Madinah, by any river or sea. He wrote to Umar (ra) seeking permission to build a city; upon receiving approval, he laid out the city of Basra and founded its masjid, making it the first misr (a fully integrated military city) established by Muslims outside the Arabian Peninsula.

Despite serving as the governor of Basra and achieving great conquests, worldly success did not alter his character. He remained deeply committed to abstention, shunning the displays of luxury that had begun to appear among some Muslims following the conquests.

One day, he stood before the people of Basra and delivered a famous khutbah—documented in the books of Sunnah—reminding them of their harsh past and their current state, and warning them against being deluded by worldly life. Among his words were, «ولقد رأيته سابع سبعة مع رسول الله ﷺ، ما لنا طعام إلا ورق»

الشجر حتى قرحت أشداقنا... وإني أعوذ بالله أن أكون في نفسي عظيماً، وعند الله صغيراً» I recall being one of seven men with the Messenger of Allah ﷺ; we had no food other than tree leaves, to the point where our mouths became sore... And I seek refuge in Allah from being great in my own eyes while being insignificant in the sight of Allah.”

Utbah (ra) disliked holding positions of authority and governorship, fearing that the temptation of power might compromise his Deen. In the year 15 AH (or 17 AH, according to some accounts), he sought Umar ibn al-Khattab's permission to perform the Hajj pilgrimage and traveled to Makkah. After completing the pilgrimage, he met with Umar and asked to be relieved of his governorship of Basra. Umar (ra) adamantly refused to relieve him of his duty, uttering his famous words, (تضعون أماناتكم في عنقي ثم تتركوني؟ لا أعفيك) “You place your trusts upon my shoulders, only to abandon me? I will not release you.” He ordered him to return to Basra. Utbah obeyed the command of the Khaleefah (Caliph) and mounted his riding beast to return, yet he sincerely supplicated to Allah, saying, اللهم لا تردني إليها، اللهم لا اللهم لا تردني إليها “O Allah, do not let me return there; O Allah, do not let me return there.”

Allah answered his Dua supplication; on the journey back to Basra—specifically in an area known as Ma'dan Bani Sulaym—he fell from his mount and died, though it is also said that death overtook him due to illness. His soul departed to its Creator at the age of fifty-seven, leaving behind a noble legacy of Jihad and the founding of a great city like Basra.

Such was the life story of the Companions of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ; they governed the world with strength and piety, understood their mission, and illuminated the world with the light of Islam. Today, after the disbelieving West—aided by Arab

and Turkish traitors—conspired to dismantle the final Islamic state on the 27th of Rajab, 1342 AH corresponding to March 3, 1924 CE, the world has been plunged into darkness. It is therefore a Shariah obligation upon us to restore this state so that justice and goodness may return with it; and for this, let the competitors vie.

References:

- 1- Sahih Muslim by Imam Muslim (Section on the Virtues of the Companions (ra); Hadith regarding the sermon of Utbah bin Ghazwan)
- 2- Siyar A'lam al-Nubal* by Imam al-Dhahabi (Volume 1; Biography of Utbah bin Ghazwan)
- 3- Al-Isaba fi Tamyiz al-Sahaba by Al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani
- 4- Usd al-Ghaba fi Ma'rifat al-Sahaba by Ibn al-Athir al-Jazari
- 5- Al-Tabaqat al-Kubra by Ibn Sa'd
- 6- Al-Bidaya wa'l-Nihaya by Al-Hafiz Ibn Kathir (Events of the years 14 and 15 AH and the founding of Basra)

Allah ﷻ Does Whatever He Wills

Khalifa Muhammad – Jordan

In the Name of Allah, the Most Gracious, the Most Merciful

Allah ﷻ says, **﴿إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يَسْتَحْيِي أَنْ يَضْرِبَ مَثَلًا مَّا بَعُوضَةً فَمَا فَوْقَهَا فَأَمَّا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا فَيَعْلَمُونَ أَنَّهُ الْحَقُّ مِنْ رَبِّهِمْ وَأَمَّا الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا فَيَقُولُونَ مَاذَا أَرَادَ اللَّهُ بِهَذَا مَثَلًا يُضِلُّ بِهِ كَثِيرًا وَيَهْدِي بِهِ كَثِيرًا وَمَا يُضِلُّ بِهِ إِلَّا الْفَاسِقِينَ﴾** “Indeed, Allah is not ashamed to present an example—that of a mosquito or what is above it. As for those who have believed, they know that it is the truth from their Lord. But as for those who disbelieve, they say, ‘What did Allah intend by this as an example?’ He misleads many thereby and guides many thereby. And He misleads not except the defiantly disobedient.” [TMQ Surah Al-Baqarah: 26]

This verse was revealed in response to the disbelievers and the Jews who objected to—and mocked—the use of the spider and the fly as examples. They questioned how Allah ﷻ could cite such lowly creatures as parables. Their objection stemmed from obstinacy and arrogance; for no two rational people would disagree on the wondrous nature of Allah’s creation, nor on the fact that everything perceptible to human senses is a magnificent sign of Allah. All of humanity is incapable of creating a fly, a mosquito, or a spider. Thus, Allah ﷻ has the right to cite whatever He wills from His creation as an example, just as He has the right to swear by whatever He wills of His created beings. He has indeed done so; His actions are truth, and His words are truth. It escaped their notice that the eloquent poets and prose writers among the Arabs frequently cited such creatures in their verses and proverbs—examples too numerous to recount here.

Yet, the true significance lies in the proverb's aptness for the subject at hand and the striking resemblance between the image used and the reality it illustrates.

They also failed to realize that citing such lowly creatures was entirely fitting for the deities they claimed to worship alongside Allah ﷻ for those alleged gods were even more contemptible than the creatures themselves, and thus fully deserved to be likened to them.

The statement of Allah ﷻ Who said, **﴿إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يَسْتَحْيِي أَنْ يَضْرِبَ مَثَلًا﴾** **“Indeed, Allah is not ashamed to present an example...”** (أما يستحي رب محمد أن يضرب الأمثال بالذباب والعنكبوت؟) “Does the Lord of Muhammad not feel shame in citing the fly and the spider as examples?” This verse belongs to the category of mutashabih (ambiguous) verses that must be interpreted in light of the muhkam (unambiguous) verses—specifically, the statement of Allah ﷻ Who said, **﴿لَيْسَ كَمِثْلِهِ شَيْءٌ﴾** **“There is nothing like unto Him”** [TMQ Ash-Shura: 11]. Thus, the general meaning is that nothing prevents Allah ﷻ from citing whatever example He wills; He may cite any example whatsoever—a meaning underscored by the indefinite, non-specific particle *ma* (ما) in the phrase **﴿مَثَلًا﴾** **“an example of any kind,”** which signifies absolute generality regarding the type of example. The word *darb* (ضَرْبٌ striking) here is used metaphorically to mean “designating” or “setting forth”—that is, designating or setting forth a particular matter as an example. As for *ba’udah* (بَعُوضَةٌ a mosquito), it is the singular form of *ba’ud* (بعوض mosquitoes); it is a small, flying insect with a slender proboscis that hovers around humans to suck their blood for nourishment, and it is known as *namus* or *has-has* in various contemporary Arabic dialects. As for the phrase **﴿فَمَا فَوْقَهَا﴾** **“or anything above it”,** the particle *fa* (ف)—while linguistically

denoting sequence and immediate succession—here signifies a progression in degree. The intent is to cite the small mosquito as an example, followed by something even smaller. Although the word *fawqa* (فَوْقَ above) fundamentally denotes spatial elevation, it is used metaphorically to indicate an increase in the quality or attribute under discussion; appearing after the mention of the mosquito, it signifies an even greater degree of insignificance and triviality. This aligns with the parables Allah ﷻ drew regarding the deities claimed by the disbelievers, implying that nothing prevents Allah ﷻ from citing the mosquito—or something even more insignificant and trivial than the mosquito—as a parable for the disbelievers gods.

Allah ﷻ says, **﴿فَأَمَّا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا فَيَعْلَمُونَ أَنَّهُ الْحَقُّ مِنْ رَبِّهِمْ وَأَمَّا الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا فَيَقُولُونَ مَاذَا أَرَادَ اللَّهُ بِهَذَا مَثَلًا﴾** **“As for those who believe, they know that it is the truth from their Lord; but as for those who disbelieve, they say, ‘What did Allah intend by this as an example?’”** [TMQ Surah Al-Baqarah: 26]—details the state of people regarding the parables set forth by Allah ﷻ. Regarding Allah’s address, people fall into two groups: believers and disbelievers. The particle *fa* (فَ) here indicates sequence and immediate succession—specifically, a sequence in mention, meaning the people’s reaction is stated immediately after the parable itself is cited. The particle *ammaa* (أَمَّا as for) introduces a conditional structure where the *fa* (ف) appears in the response clause **﴿فَيَعْلَمُونَ﴾** **“they know.”** Thus, the state of the believers is that they recognize the parable as the truth from their Lord, which serves as a cause for their guidance and an increase therein; conversely, the state of the disbelievers is characterized by obstinacy and arrogance, causing the parable to lead to their misguidance and an increase therein—as evidenced by the remainder of the verse.

The pause after the words of Allah ﷻ ﴿مَاذَا أَرَادَ اللَّهُ بِهَذَا مَثَلًا﴾ **“What did Allah intend by this as an example?”** is a waqf taamm (وقف تام complete pause). If one were to continue reading without pausing, the subsequent text might be misconstrued as an adjective describing the parable itself, which is not the case; the parable does not, of its own accord, cause misguidance or guidance. Instead, this serves as an explanation and clarification of the two clauses introduced by ammaa (أَمَّا as for): one group finds guidance through this parable ﴿فَأَمَّا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا﴾ **“As for those who believe...”**, while another group goes astray because of it ﴿وَأَمَّا الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا﴾ **“But as for those who disbelieve”**. Consequently, this clause has no grammatical function within the sentence structure because it is an explanatory clause—meaning, ﴿يُضِلُّ بِهِ كَثِيرًا وَيَهْدِي بِهِ كَثِيرًا﴾ **“He misleads many thereby and guides many thereby.”** Regarding the saying of Allah ﷻ Who said, ﴿يُضِلُّ بِهِ كَثِيرًا وَيَهْدِي بِهِ كَثِيرًا﴾ **“He misleads many thereby and guides many thereby,”** the most likely interpretation is that it serves as a response to the previously mentioned question posed by the disbelievers, ﴿مَاذَا أَرَادَ اللَّهُ بِهَذَا مَثَلًا﴾ **“What did Allah intend by this example?”** For although a parable illustrates the very reality for which it was cited, Allah ﷻ has also made it a means of guidance for the rightly guided and a cause of misguidance for those who go astray. This meaning is attested to by numerous verses, such as the saying of Allah ﷻ Who said, ﴿وَإِذَا مَا أُنزِلَتْ سُورَةٌ فَمِنْهُمْ مَّن يَقُولُ أَيُّكُمْ زَادَتْهُ هَذِهِ إِيمَانًا فَأَمَّا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا فزَادَتْهُمْ إِيمَانًا وَهُمْ يَسْتَبْشِرُونَ﴾ **“And whenever a Surah is revealed, there are among them those who say, ‘Which of you has this increased in faith?’ As for those who believe, it has increased them in faith, and they rejoice. But as for those in whose hearts is a disease, it has added filth to their filth, and they died while disbelievers”** [TMQ Surah At-Tawbah: 124–125], among others.

Regarding the saying of Allah ﷻ Who said, ﴿وَمَا يُضِلُّ بِهِ إِلَّا الْفَاسِقِينَ﴾ **“And He misleads thereby only the defiantly disobedient,”** Fisq (الفسق defiant disobedience) signifies an exit from an original state—much like a bird emerging from its egg after breaking the shell. Thus, departing from the rulings of the Shariah Law constitutes fisq. The faasiqoon (فاسقون defiantly disobedient)—those whom Allah ﷻ leads astray through His signs and parables—are those who have stepped outside the bounds of the rulings He ordained. This does not mean, by any stretch of meaning, that Allah ﷻ compels the misguided to go astray or the rightly guided to find guidance. Instead, Allah ﷻ recompenses every person according to their deeds in this world. Whoever chooses guidance and the straight path of Allah ﷻ, Allah facilitates the ways of guidance for them. Allah ﷻ says, ﴿وَالَّذِينَ﴾ **“And those who are guided—He increases them in guidance”** [TMQ Surah Muhammad: 17]; Allah ﷻ says, ﴿وَالَّذِينَ جَاهَدُوا فِينَا لَنَهْدِيَنَّهُمْ سُبُلَنَا﴾ **“And those who strive for Us—We will surely guide them to Our ways”** [TMQ Surah Al-Ankabut: 69]; and Allah ﷻ says, ﴿وَيَزِيدُ اللَّهُ الَّذِينَ اهْتَدَوْا هُدًى﴾ **“And Allah increases those who are guided in guidance”** [TMQ Surah Maryam: 76]. Whoever deviates from the Shariah rulings of Allah ﷻ and chooses error finds that Allah ﷻ facilitates the means of that error for them. Allah ﷻ said, ﴿قُلْ مَنْ كَانَ فِي الضَّلَالَةِ فَلْيَمْدُدْ لَهُ﴾ **“Say, ‘Whoever is in error—let the Most Merciful extend for him a long extension in it’”** [TMQ Surah Maryam: 75]. Furthermore, after mentioning the number of the inhabitants of the Fire, He ﷻ said, ﴿وَلَيَقُولَ الَّذِينَ فِي قُلُوبِهِمْ مَرَضٌ وَالْكَافِرُونَ مَاذَا أَرَادَ اللَّهُ﴾ **“And let those in whose hearts is disease and the disbelievers say, ‘What does Allah intend by this as an example?’ Thus does Allah send astray whom He wills and guide whom He wills”** [TMQ Surah Al-Muddaththir: 31].

We conclude by noting the similarity in the state of disbelievers across different times and places. We observe how atheists and the irreligious today fabricate lies against Allah ﷻ, attempting to turn believers away from their Iman. Just as we saw disbelievers in the time of the Messenger ﷺ objecting to Allah’s use of parables, we see them today on social media claiming that Allah insults Abu Lahab and his wife in an entire Surah, as well as Al-Walid ibn al-Mughirah and other disbelievers. They express astonishment—as their minds, whims, and devils have deluded them—at the idea of an Allah ﷻ who would insult any of His servants. In doing so, they project an image of the Divine based on their own flawed, limited intellects, drawing an analogy to earthly kings, presidents, or rulers who do not insult their subjects—while conveniently ignoring what such rulers might do in private. They thus measure the Creator against the created using their imperfect, limited minds; how evil is the judgment they make! Allah ﷻ is ﴿فَعَالٌ لِّمَا يُرِيدُ﴾ **“the Accomplisher of what He wills”** [TMQ Surah Al-Buruj: 16], and He wrongs no one, ﴿وَلَا يَظْلِمُ رَبُّكَ أَحَدًا﴾ **“And your Lord wrongs no one”** [TMQ Surah Al-Kahf: 49]. Instead, He ﷻ recompenses every doer according to their deeds. He is as He described Himself ﷻ Who said, ﴿لَيْسَ كَمِثْلِهِ شَيْءٌ﴾ **“There is nothing like unto Him”** [TMQ Surah Ash-Shura: 11]—and not as the devils portray Him in the minds of atheists.

News of Muslims Around the World

Hazem Abu Ismail Sentenced to 14 Years in Prison Because His Popularity Surpasses That of Abdel Fattah al-Sisi

Lawyer Khaled al-Masry, via his official Facebook page, denied recent reports circulating on social media and some news pages indicating the imminent release of preacher and politician Hazem Salah Abu Ismail this month. He asserted that this information is inaccurate and contradicts the legal facts of the case.

Al-Masry clarified that the total of the final court rulings issued against Hazem Salah Abu Ismail amounts to 14 years of rigorous imprisonment, not 9 years or less as some have claimed online.

He added that this total sentence is distributed across three main cases: beginning with a seven-year sentence for falsifying his mother's nationality during his 2012 presidential campaign; followed by a five-year sentence for storming and besieging the Nasr City Court; and finally, a two-year sentence for contempt of court, not one year. Based on this information, the lawyer indicated that the actual prison term of politician Hazem Salah Abu Ismail began in July 2013, which legally means that the official date for the end of his sentence and his release will be July 2027.

It is worth noting that Hazem Salah Abu Ismail is an Egyptian lawyer and Islamic preacher who rose to prominence following the events of January 2011. He announced his intention to run for the Egyptian presidency before being disqualified from the race by a decision of the Presidential Elections Committee. He was then arrested following the events of July 2013 and brought before the investigating authorities, who referred him to criminal

courts in the aforementioned cases. Final and binding judgments were issued in these cases, upheld by the Court of Cassation.

Jordan Denies the Existence of US Military Bases Within Its Borders, While the US Confirms the Deaths of Its Soldiers There

Jordanian officials use the term “security agreement” to describe the legal framework for defense and military relations with the United States, amidst the recurring controversy surrounding the presence of US military bases in the Kingdom. Although the agreement does not explicitly stipulate the establishment of US military bases in Jordan, it regulates what former officials have described as the United States' right to use certain Jordanian military sites within joint defense arrangements.

This aligns with statements by Jordanian Foreign Minister Ayman Safadi regarding the absence of US military bases in the country. Amman maintains that the American presence is limited to defense cooperation programs that permit the use of specific areas within Jordanian military camps.

Activists and experts believe that the United States has obtained special privileges for using certain military sites, including the presence of troops and equipment on occasion, within the framework of bilateral defense agreements and programs.

The security agreement between Jordan and the United States was signed in 2021 and submitted to the House of Representatives without being put to a vote or debate. At the time, the government emphasized that it was not a military treaty but instead a regulatory agreement within its executive powers.

Opposition figures at the time demanded that the agreement's clauses be presented for parliamentary debate, arguing that some of its provisions raised questions regarding sovereignty and the use of Jordanian territory for military purposes.

In contrast, Jordanian military experts assert that there are no American bases in Jordan, explaining that the presence involves limited technical use of certain sites under defense agreements, including training and advisory teams and air defense personnel.

According to specialized sources, the number of American soldiers in Jordan reaches approximately 3,000 during joint training exercises, while under normal circumstances, the number drops to less than 1,000. Defense cooperation between the two countries is part of ongoing military relations that have lasted for years. Oman seeks to strengthen its air defense systems and is among the most prominent beneficiaries of US military aid in the region.

Al-Waie Magazine: In part of a response to a question posed to the ameer of Hizb ut Tahrir, Ata bin Khalil Abu Rashta, entitled “What is Happening in Jordan,” issued on the 7th of Ramadan 1442 AH (April 19, 2021), the following was stated:

1- The King was able to thwart America’s plan to bring about a change of government by removing King Abdullah and installing Hamza in his place. This was achieved through the joint defense agreement, granting America what it wanted in terms of violating the country’s land and airspace. This embarrassed America from intervening to support Hamza against its partner in the agreement, the King!

2- It is possible to say that a lull in the American-British conflict will occur in Jordan, but it will be temporary. America considers itself the successor to British colonialism in the region, and it is

not unlikely that America will exploit the agreement for purposes other than those for which the King rushed to conclude it!

3- The international conflict in Muslim lands to divide hegemony and influence will not end except with true change, which is the resumption of Islamic life through the establishment of the Khilafah (Caliphate), the rightly guided state who strengthens Islam and Muslims and eradicates the disbelievers. ﴿وَيَقُولُونَ مَتَىٰ هُوَ ۖ قُلْ عَسَىٰ أَن يَكُونَ قَرِيبًا﴾ **“And they say, ‘When will it be?’ Say, ‘Perhaps it will be soon.’”**

Canada: Mob Attacks a Muslim Woman in Front of Her Child

A Muslim woman was attacked in a parking lot in Moncton, Canada, while trying to attend a car show with her family. A group of people confronted her and hurled racist insults at her. The confrontation, during which the attackers told the woman to “go back to her country,” escalated into a physical assault in front of her seven-year-old son, an incident that sparked outrage and condemnation both locally and nationally. The Royal Canadian Mounted Police confirmed they have opened an investigation into the incident, which occurred Saturday evening on Mountain Road in Moncton. They received the report around 7:30 p.m. and responded to the location, which is known for informal car shows.

The police said they are working to determine whether hate played a role in the attack, without providing further details at this stage. The National Council of Canadian Muslims released a video documenting the attack, which they confirmed was provided by the family. The council stated that the woman suffered serious injuries, including a concussion and a nosebleed.

Council spokesperson Steven Chu explained that the incident has had a profound psychological impact on the victim's seven-year-old son, who witnessed the attack on his mother, describing it as “one of the biggest tragedies of this incident.”

He added that the family had tried to sit down and enjoy the parade when the harassment and insults began, then escalated into a physical assault. The video, in which the faces of those involved have been blurred at the council's request, shows a woman approaching another and repeatedly punching her in the head and face, while bystanders attempt to intervene. In a related context, Ali Eternishi, president of the Moncton Islamic Association, expressed the shock of the local Muslim community, noting that the incident came just days after an Islamophobic attack targeting a mosque in the area and another incident in Halifax, further heightening the community's anxiety.

“Israeli” Selling Targets the Vicinity of Tell Ahmar, South of Quneitra

On Thursday 30 July 2026, “Israeli” occupation forces fired three artillery shells toward agricultural lands south of the town of Tell Ahmar in the southern Quneitra countryside.

Local sources told Syria TV that the shells landed in the vicinity of the town, without causing any casualties or material damage.

The shelling comes amidst continued security tensions in the border areas of the Quneitra countryside, coinciding with escalating “Israeli” movements and violations inside Syrian territory. The Zionist occupation army's activities in the Quneitra and Daraa countryside during June included incursions, gunfire, artillery shelling, raids and arrests, as well as intensive aerial activity and the establishment of temporary checkpoints.

According to statistics, Quneitra province witnessed 85 incursions involving raids, searches, and arrests, while 23 similar incursions were recorded in the Yarmouk Basin area of western Daraa countryside.

The data also showed 39 incursions in Quneitra and 22 incursions in the Yarmouk Basin that were limited to military patrols inside Syrian territory without conducting searches, indicating the continuation of Zionist military movements in the border region.

The Translation Anomaly Regarding the Term “Homosexuality” and the Islamic Perspective

Khalil Musab, Wilayah Pakistan

There is an ongoing thread in today’s (mostly English-speaking) discourse and it’s the idea that one can be Muslim and be gay so long as one controls their desires. The idea being that one cannot be blamed for being born gay as that is outside of their control. However, one can be accounted for their deeds and their decision to act upon their desires. Hence, the gay Muslim must control their queer desires and avoid the sin of homosexual relations.

The problem in this line of thinking is clear to most Muslims. We understand from the Quran and Sunnah that Allah ﷻ creates all humans in a state of fitra (purity). In the Noble Quran, Allah ﷻ says, ﴿فَاقِمْ وَجْهَكَ لِلدِّينِ حَنِيفًا ۖ فِطْرَتَ اللَّهِ الَّتِي فَطَرَ النَّاسَ عَلَيْهَا ۚ لَا تَبْدِيلَ ۚ﴾ **“So be steadfast in faith in all uprightness (O Prophet) – the natural (fitrat) Way of Allah which He has instilled in all people. Let there be no change in this creation of Allah. That is the Straight Way, but most people do not know.”** [TMQ Surah Ar-Rum 30:30]. So how can it be accepted that one is born gay i.e. in a state that is inclining them towards sin? How can one reconcile the idea of being born gay with the idea of being born in fitra?

The reason for why Muslims today are falling into this conceptual predicament is because of the way Muslims have adopted the English language and the concepts (mafahim) embedded in it. Many scholars in the West have written about the history of the

word “gay” and related terms such as “queer”, “lesbian”, and “homosexuality” in regards to how they emerged in the West and became embedded in Western languages such as English. The main argument is that how the West understands sexuality and the terms it has created to capture this understanding is not something that has always existed throughout time and across places. Instead, these ideas were created at a specific time and place.

In his book, “Islam in Liberalism,” Professor Joseph Massad summarises the discussion as follows, “The important understanding that sexuality is a historically and culturally specific epistemological and ontological category and is not universal or necessarily universalizable” Concepts such as “homosexuality” and “heterosexuality” crystallized as medical, legal, and subsequently social classifications in Western Europe and the United States during the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The core idea here is that the term “homosexuality” signifies a particular conception of the human being and human nature—namely, that a person is a being whose desires shape their identity; in other words, what one desires defines “who one is.” Massad points out that this conception does not easily translate to non-Western contexts. Professor Massad mentions race in this paragraph to clarify a certain point: when Western colonialists went around conquering people, they categorized them based on what they believed these people to be like i.e. what their nature was. So for the Western colonialists, being “gay” is akin to being a “black man”.

It is this connection between sexual desires and “who you are” that leads many Muslims to accepting that one is “born gay.” If homosexual inclinations manifest, they are regarded as an

immutable part of that person's nature. Hence, the need arises to re-evaluate these concepts from an Islamic perspective.

Humans are born in a state of fitra (nature) and it is the nature in which Allah ﷻ made us that men find companionship in women and vice versa. Allah ﷻ said, ﴿وَمِنْ آيَاتِهِ أَنْ خَلَقَ لَكُمْ مِنْ أَنْفُسِكُمْ أَزْوَاجًا لِتَسْكُنُوا إِلَيْهَا وَجَعَلَ بَيْنَكُمْ مَوَدَّةً وَرَحْمَةً إِنَّ فِي ذَلِكَ لَآيَاتٍ لِقَوْمٍ يَتَفَكَّرُونَ﴾
“And among His signs is that He created for you from yourselves mates that you may find tranquility in them; and He placed between you affection and mercy. Indeed in that are signs for a people who give thought.” [TMQ Surah Ar-Rum :21]. Nevertheless, human beings may be afflicted by desires; Aadam (as), for instance, was tempted by Shaytan and ate from the tree. A sinful act can also evolve into a habit, such as addiction to alcohol or drugs. Yet, falling into sin does not imply that it is an immutable aspect of human nature. This distinction is crucial for understanding the terminology used by ulema in Islamic civilization, who focused on the act itself rather than on “identity.” Terms such as liwat (sodomy) and sihaq (lesbianism) were employed—with the perpetrator described as luti or sihaqiyya—without these terms being understood as definitions of a fixed identity. This is analogous to describing someone who drinks alcohol as a “wine-drinker” or someone who kills as a “murderer,” while the door to repentance remains open. Allah ﷻ says, ﴿إِنَّمَا التَّوْبَةُ عَلَى اللَّهِ لِلَّذِينَ يَعْمَلُونَ السُّوءَ بِجَهَالَةٍ ثُمَّ يَتُوبُونَ مِنْ قَرِيبٍ﴾
“Repentance is accepted by Allah only for those who do evil in ignorance and then repent soon after” [TMQ Surah An-Nisaa: 17]—with “soon after” interpreted as meaning “before death.”

From this perspective, scholars determined that same-sex attraction constitutes a deviation from innate human nature (fitra). It was understood that some such inclinations arise from emulating or being drawn to feminine traits—as seen in the case

of the amrad a beardless, effeminate youth. Imam al-Nawawi (d. 676 AH) said, *وكذلك يحرم على الرجل النظر إلى وجه الأُمرد إذا كان حسن الصورة* “Similarly, it is forbidden for a man to look at the face of a handsome beardless youth (amrad).” He explained that this is because such a youth is an object of desire just as a woman is—and may, in fact, be an even greater source of temptation. Thus, certain manifestations of contemporary same-sex behavior—such as the imitation of feminine traits—are understood within this framework as a departure from innate human nature.

Returning to the earlier point of language, the point is to emphasize the need for Muslims today to understand the concepts that Westerners adopted and transmitted through their language. Rather than allowing these concepts to influence their thinking, Muslims must study their deen, adopt its concepts, and speak the language that transmits these concepts. We must understand that viewing someone as “gay” is to fail to understand what Allah ﷻ tells us about how He created us and how we can be reformed and guided away from sin. Allah ﷻ said, *﴿لَهُ مُعَقِّبَاتٌ مِّن بَيْن يَدَيْهِ وَمِنْ خَلْفِهِ يَحْفَظُونَهُ مِنْ أَمْرِ اللَّهِ إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يُغَيِّرُ مَا بِقَوْمٍ حَتَّى يُغَيِّرُوا مَا بِأَنْفُسِهِمْ ۖ وَإِذَا أَرَادَ اللَّهُ بِقَوْمٍ سُوءًا فَلَا مَرَدَّ لَهُ ۚ وَمَا لَهُمْ مِّن دُونِهِ مِن وَالٍ﴾* “For each one there are successive angels before and behind, protecting them by Allah’s command. Indeed, Allah would never change a people’s state of favour until they change their own state of faith. And if it is Allah’s Will to torment a people, it can never be averted, nor can they find a protector other than Him.” [TMQ Surah Ar-Ra’ad 11]. We ask Allah to grant us success in understanding our Deen and acting upon it.

Expanding the Abraham Accords: A Step Toward an Abrahamic Federation

Ayman Salah – Palestine

While negotiations were underway between Iran and the United States to reach an agreement to end the war, U.S. President Donald Trump called upon states in the Middle East and beyond to join the so-called Abraham Accords. On Monday, May 25, 2026, CNN reported, “U.S. President Donald Trump demanded that Middle Eastern and other states sign the Abraham Accords—making it a mandatory requirement—following the conclusion of a deal to end the war with Iran, while simultaneously threatening military action ‘greater and more powerful than ever before’ should the parties fail to reach an agreement to resolve the conflict.”

In a lengthy post on his “Truth Social” platform, Trump stated, “I am mandatorily requesting that all Countries immediately sign the Abraham Accords, and that, if Iran signs its Agreement with me, as President of the United States of America, it would be an Honor to have them also be part of this unparalleled World Coalition.” Trump added that he had discussed the matter in phone calls with leaders from Saudi Arabia, the UAE, Qatar, Pakistan, Turkey, Egypt, and Bahrain. He asserted that joining the Abraham Accords should be a fundamental prerequisite. This indicates that the Trump administration has made the expansion of the Abraham Accords a key objective of its war effort and foreign policy, thereby raising questions regarding the nature of the Accords and the purpose behind their expansion. Years before the signing of the Abraham Accords, there was—and remains—considerable discussion in the West, as well as within

political and academic circles aligned with ruling regimes, regarding the concept of an “Abrahamic religion.” This idea advocates for merging the three Abrahamic faiths, Islam, Christianity, and Judaism—along with various offshoots, such as the Druze, Nusayris, and Ismailis—into a single new religion; efforts are even underway to incorporate faiths unrelated to Abraham, such as Buddhism.

Islamic institutions and figures have categorically rejected this concept, citing its explicit contradiction of Islamic creed and its implications for the Palestinian cause. It is evident that the “Abrahamic religion” project is a calculated scheme targeting religions—particularly Islam. Proponents of the project began by advocating for interfaith rapprochement, then moved toward unification, ultimately aiming to fuse these faiths into a single global religion. One manifestation of this is the “Abrahamic Family House” complex established by the in Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates which houses places of worship for all three faiths in a single location. This was followed by initiatives such as binding the Quran, the Torah, and the Bible within a single cover, and organizing joint prayer services—dubbed the “Abrahamic Prayer” or the “Prayer of the Children of Abraham”—that bring together Jews, Christians, and Muslims. These activities aim to dismantle the psychological barriers between the region's Muslim populations and the Jews occupying the Blessed Land.

A close observer will note that the term “Abrahamism” is not merely religious; it carries significant political dimensions, serving as a precursor to a political project for the region—variously referred to as an “Abrahamic Federation,” the United States of Abraham,” or the “New Middle East.” Such a political project requires a new cultural and civilizational narrative to provide it with legitimacy and continuity. Consequently, the Abrahamic

symbol is employed as a key tool to overcome obstacles hindering the phased progress toward achieving the long-term goal of “Abrahamism.” Tourism and economic normalization projects are also utilized for this purpose. Discourse regarding Abrahamic projects did not originate in the last five years, nor did it stem from the normalization agreements dubbed the “Abraham Accords” in 2020. Instead, it predates them by many years. Therefore, here is the outline the origins of these terms and the contexts in which they have been used:

First: Abrahamic Federalism or the United States of Abraham

When the phrase “Abrahamic Federalism” arises in contemporary Arab discourse, it rarely refers to a religious concept; instead, it signifies a political project or vision that leverages the Abrahamic symbol to justify a form of partnership, cooperation, or regional political union among the peoples and states of the so-called Middle East. This vision is grounded in the concept of a “shared Abrahamic heritage,” envisioning a leadership structure centered on the Jewish entity and Turkey—with Arab and Iranian participation—all under American auspices.

Discussions regarding these political projects began in the 1990s following the collapse of the Soviet Union, a period when U.S. President George Bush popularized the term “New Middle East.” In 1993, following the signing of the Oslo Accords, Shimon Peres championed this “New Middle East” concept and authored a book with the title “The New Middle East.” It is well known that Peres held several high-ranking positions within the Jewish entity over the years, serving as Foreign Minister, Prime Minister, and eventually President. Subsequently, strategic research on this subject began to emerge from American think tanks. Francis Fukuyama posited the idea of the American model's supremacy in his book “The End of History and the Last Man”; later, in 2010,

he revised his views, suggesting that this supremacy would be achieved through the fusion of religions. U.S. President Barack Obama employed the term "global religion" in a 2013 speech. Harvard University hosted various academic seminars and discussions regarding the concept of "Abrahamism," Abrahamic initiatives, and their political and economic implications—all years before the signing of the Abraham Accords.

In 2011, a specialized unit was established within the U.S. State Department known as the "Strategic Dialogue with Civil Society." This unit was less a traditional US State Department bureau and more an institutional initiative launched by US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton to establish regular channels of communication between the Department and civil society organizations worldwide. It brought together fifty diplomats and fifty individuals designated as "spiritual leaders" from the Arab region or the Middle East—referring to clergy from the three Abrahamic faiths, Islam, Christianity, and Judaism. The initiative's stated objectives included:

- Direct engagement with non-governmental organizations (NGOs), activists, and civil society associations, rather than solely with governments.
- Soliciting policy recommendations from civil society regarding democracy, human rights, governance, women's issues, labor, religion, and foreign policy.
- Supporting and protecting civil society organizations facing restrictions or pressure from their respective governments.

In practice, the initiative established specialized working groups and expanded communication between U.S. embassies and civil society organizations across dozens of countries. The U.S. administration also noted that the State Department adopted

several recommendations resulting from this dialogue into its policies. Thus, the initiative served as a vehicle for fostering civic engagement and supporting elites and NGOs, while influencing political and social discourse within other nations. Terms such as “Abrahamic Federalism” and “Abrahamic United States” circulated during these discussions. The underlying objective was to leverage the significant influence of religious figures in the Middle East and the Arab world to advance “Abrahamic” projects. During this period, the U.S. State Department employed the term “spiritual diplomacy” as a means of harnessing religion to serve political agendas—specifically, the broader U.S. strategy in the Middle East.

Following the Obama administration, Donald Trump assumed the presidency for his first term, laying the practical and operational foundations for a broader framework known as the “Deal of the Century.” The US administration has maintained a degree of secrecy regarding the details of this plan. Jared Kushner, the US President’s advisor and Middle East envoy, indicated that this secrecy regarding the “Deal of the Century” project is intentional, as premature disclosure of details tends to drive politicians away from the plan. Kushner revealed some of these details during a private interview with Sky News Arabia on February 25, 2019, outlining the key principles of the Middle East peace plan. He explained that the plan aims to properly integrate the “Israeli” people into the wider region and noted the possibility of altering political borders, highlighting the plan's potential economic impact on the entire region. He stated, “The political plan is very detailed and focuses on delineating borders and resolving final-status issues. However, the goal of addressing the border issue is to eliminate those borders. If we can remove borders and establish peace free from intimidation, it could ensure the free

flow of people and goods, thereby creating new opportunities.” Many of the stances and statements made by Turkish officials—who align with the US orbit and implement policies serving American interests while paving the way for the integration of the Jewish entity into the region—fall within the context of promoting and laying the groundwork for the “Abrahamic Federation” project. A recent example is the political initiative discussed by Turkish Foreign Minister Hakan Fidan in an interview with the Japanese newspaper Nikkei Asia in Ankara on Sunday, May 31, 2026. He outlined a new, comprehensive vision for establishing a regional security architecture extending from Pakistan to the Arabian Gulf, noting the possibility of Israel joining this framework in the future, provided it recognizes an independent Palestinian state based on the 1967 borders. He described the initiative as a “golden opportunity” for Middle Eastern states to establish a cooperative system based on mutual recognition, sovereignty, and territorial integrity. The Foreign Minister explained that, in its initial phase, the proposed security platform would comprise Turkey, Pakistan, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and other Arabian Gulf states. Fidan indicated that Iran would likely join the framework as its normalization of relations within the region progresses. He further emphasized that, should the Palestinian issue be resolved, regional states would contribute significantly to ensuring the security of the Jewish entity.

Second: The Abraham Path

This is an international cultural and tourism project launched in 2007, aimed at creating a network of long-distance walking trails that—symbolically and with approximate historical accuracy—trace the journey attributed to the Prophet Abraham (as) across various parts of the Middle East. This project originated from Harvard University initiatives and the efforts of American

mediator William Ury—an expert in negotiation and conflict resolution and a co-founder of the Harvard Program on Negotiation. The concept emerged within Harvard academic circles in 2004 and evolved through exploratory trips and field studies. In 2007, the “Abraham Path Initiative” was officially launched as a US-based non-profit organization to develop the project. According to Ury, the idea was premised on the notion that the story of Abraham represents a “shared origin story” for the region’s peoples; establishing a long-distance walking trail connecting sites traditionally associated with Abraham’s journey could foster tourism, cultural exchange, and dialogue among diverse communities. Clearly, the Abraham Path project extends beyond mere tourism; it encompasses cultural and political objectives, aiming to normalize relations among people of different faiths, dissolve psychological barriers, and identify common ground—thereby paving the way for the concepts of an “Abrahamic religion” and an “Abrahamic federation.” The project relies on local partners across the various countries and regions traversed by the route associated with the journey of the Prophet Ibrahim (as). In the Palestinian territories under the jurisdiction of the Palestinian Authority, there is a segment known as “The Abraham Path;” this network of walking trails spans numerous Palestinian areas, passing through the northern, central, and southern West Bank and extending to the Hebron (Al-Khalil) region. This segment is considered one of the project’s most prominent and active sections. Similar hiking trails exist in northern Jordan and Turkey. Plans had been envisioned to extend the route into Syria, but the political and security conditions that emerged with the onset of the Syrian revolution hindered their implementation. In the Jewish entity, there are initiatives and trails linked to the project under the name “Netiv Abraham” or “The Abraham Trail” —routes planned or developed

in the Negev and Beersheba regions, linking them to the broader regional trail network. Turkey is a key area for the project; narratives suggest that the journey of Ibrahim (as) began in the Urfa (Şanlıurfa) region of southeastern Turkey. A developed route known as “Ibrahim Yolu” exists there, featuring established guesthouses and trained local guides, with local partners actively maintaining and developing the trail. In Egypt, there are partnerships and activities linked to the project, particularly in the Sinai Peninsula. Similar routes and plans exist in Iraq, especially in the Kurdistan Region.

Third: The Abraham Accords

This is a political, not religious, term referring to a series of agreements brokered by the United States to normalize relations between the Jewish entity and several Arab states. The process began in 2020 with the Gulf-Zionist agreement involving the UAE and Bahrain. Notably, the accords were not named after the sponsoring nation or the signing location—as is customary in political agreements. The US has worked—and continues to work—to expand these accords; Sudan and Morocco have since joined, and the US President is currently urging Saudi Arabia, Syria, and other Middle Eastern states to sign on. This expansion is a step toward the ultimate goal: the “Abrahamic Federation.”

Fourth: The Abrahamic Movement

The term “Abrahamic Movement” has recently emerged to describe a collection of movements, initiatives, and ideas advocating for rapprochement, dialogue, and the promotion of peaceful coexistence and political alignment among the region’s states and peoples, as well as cooperation among the followers of the three Abrahamic faiths: Islam, Christianity and Judaism, drawing upon the figure of the Prophet Ibrahim (as) as a shared

figure among these religions. Tom Wegner is considered the founding pioneer of these movements; he is a Jewish politician and strategic consultant who previously served as a spokesperson for former “Israeli” Prime Minister Ehud Barak and worked as a consultant and public relations director at the Peres Center for Peace. In 2025, he authored the book “The Abrahamic Revolution: A Middle East Peace Formula.” The book is presented as the founding manifesto for what the author terms “Political Abrahamism,” serving as the intellectual foundation for the Abrahamic movement. Wegner is regarded as a leading theorist of the concept of “Abrahamic Federalism.” The goals of these Abrahamic movements extend beyond cultural objectives to promote peaceful coexistence, political rapprochement, and the construction of a regional identity among the nations and peoples of the area.

The Abrahamic movement exists within the Jewish state under this explicit name, declaring that one of its goals is to support the “Abrahamic Federalism” project as a solution to the regional conflict. The movement is also present in certain Arab countries; for instance, it operates in Iraq with a dedicated Facebook page. Its statements there acknowledge Tom Wegner’s role in its founding—describing him as a mentor and strategic expert—and articulate its vision for the region’s future using the term “United States of Abraham.” Recently, the establishment of an Abrahamic movement branch in Syria was announced. Meanwhile, across other Arab nations and Turkey, there are various centers and initiatives operating under different names, suggesting that it is not a single, unified movement with centralized leadership or a specific global organizational structure. Examples include interfaith dialogue centers, Abrahamic heritage study centers, and the Abrahamic Family House in the UAE.

These are the primary contexts in which the term “Abrahamism” is employed. Consequently, we must remain aware of the long-term objectives whenever the West and its agents speak of Abrahamism, and we must focus on exposing the conspiracies and activities that pave the way for achieving those goals. It is insufficient merely to demonstrate that the concept of an “Abrahamic religion” conflicts with Islam and contradicts the Islamic aqeedah; nor should those participating in interfaith dialogue activities be viewed as individuals holding abstract intellectual opinions—rather, these are dangerous political undertakings. The same applies to those implementing joint tourism initiatives, as they serve as instruments of America and the Jewish entity. Since these are political actions, they must be countered with effective political responses.

“Freedom of Navigation:” A Lie Imposed Upon Us on Our Own Land

Musa Abdul-Shakoor

Since America’s recent war on Iran, hardly a day goes by without someone emerging to discuss straits, seas, the movement within them, and who controls them. Those who claim to be thinkers—yet who, regrettably, operate not from Islamic concepts but from Western ideas and pragmatic acceptance of the painful reality the Ummah is enduring—dominate the media landscape on channels like Al Jazeera and others, misleading the public and steering the compass away from its true direction.

Here, we offer a reminder:

The straits they discuss are located on Islamic land; their legal status is that of territory conquered and ruled by Muslims. They are subject to the Islamic rulings governing land, sea, and air—all of which are purely Islamic. Whether natural or man-made, control over these straits is the right of all Muslims. Hormuz, the Suez Canal, the Bosphorus, Malacca, Gibraltar, and the Dardanelles are indisputably Islamic straits, as are the associated seas: the Gulf, the Arabian Sea, the Mediterranean, and the Red Sea. These sensitive geographic points must be governed and controlled by the Islamic Ummah, not by the international law devised by disbelievers during their war against the Khilafah (Caliphate) to safeguard their own victories.

Then come the conspirators—particularly agent subordinate regimes—and the media, especially Al Jazeera, which hosts so-called experts in international law and maritime navigation to

speak of the “Law of the Sea.” Naïve Arab media figures and politicians fall into the trap, debating whether a strait is natural or artificial. They speak of respecting international law, freedom of navigation, and maritime movement, questioning how Muslims could possibly control these waters or levy fees for passage through them. They argue that this is a special case—unlike the Bosphorus Strait, where Turkey collects transit fees despite it being a natural waterway. Here, we see them interpreting the law to suit their own whims, the interests of disbelieving nations and puppet regimes, and the dictates of arrogant powers!

Yet, where are these justifications when Trump speaks of his sinister plans to seize control of the Strait of Hormuz and impose fees on shipping traffic there under the pretext of ensuring security? Why do these arguments vanish from sight and hearing, then?

Do they not understand that land, sea, and air belong to those who rule them? The legitimate ruling—which they fail to articulate—is that these are Islamic domains; the Ummah permits or denies passage through them in accordance with Shariah rulings on state relations, existing treaties, and the specific status of each state—whether belligerent or non-belligerent, treaty-bound or not.

Are they unaware that the Mediterranean was considered an Islamic lake for thirteen centuries—remaining so until 1820—when the criminal ruler of Egypt, Muhammad Ali Pasha, conspired with European fleets to cut off Ottoman supplies, leading to the destruction of the Islamic Ottoman fleet in Algiers?

The administration of seas and straits must return to Islamic control. We are unconcerned with the pretexts of colonialist

international law—laws enacted by colonialist disbelievers to dominate the Ummah and its resources, and indeed the entire world. We are committed solely to the Law of Allah (swt), as set forth in the true Shariah, including the Shariah rulings governing lands, seas, rivers, and public ownership. The time has come for the Ummah to reclaim its unity, sovereignty, wealth, seas, and straits. This can only be achieved by establishing the Khilafah (Caliphate) on the method of the Prophethood—to dismantle existing regimes, unify the Ummah, expel the colonialist disbelievers, pursue them and teach them an unforgettable lesson, and gain control over the remaining seas following their conquest; for this matter shall surely reach wherever the night and day reach. Allah (swt) said, ﴿وَيَقُولُونَ مَتَى هُوَ قُلْ عَسَى أَنْ يَكُونَ قَرِيبًا﴾ **“And they say, ‘When is it?’ Say, ‘Perhaps it is near.’”** [TMQ Surah Al-Israa 51].

Warnings of an “Israeli” Plan to Seize 70% of Al-Masjid Al-Aqsa

Warnings from human rights and sanctities circles are mounting regarding “Israeli” plans aimed at altering the historical and legal status quo of Al-Masjid Al-Aqsa.

Dr. Hassan Khater, head of the International Al-Quds Center, stated that since the occupation of Al-Quds in 1967, occupation authorities have ceaselessly attempted to impose direct control over Al-Masjid Al-Aqsa. He noted that the current situation marks a shift into a “more dangerous phase,” aimed at stripping the masjid of its Islamic identity and transforming it into a security zone subject to occupation measures.

Khater explained that a key current scheme targets the eastern area of Al-Masjid Al-Aqsa—including the Gate of Mercy (Bab al-Rahma) Salah hall and its surrounding courtyards—by gradually converting it into a closed zone under the security management of occupation authorities and isolating it from the rest of the masjid complex.

Regarding plans for partition, Khater pointed to a proposal submitted in 2023 by Likud Knesset member Amit Halevi, which calls for imposing “Israeli” control over vast sections of Al-Masjid Al-Aqsa.

Under this proposal, “Israeli” control would extend to the Dome of the Rock and the central courtyards, as well as the northern areas stretching from the Lions’ Gate (Bab al-Asbat) to the Al-Ghawanmeh Gate. Conversely, the Islamic presence would be

confined solely to the Al-Qibli Mashid located in the southern section.

Khater emphasized that implementing this plan would mean the occupation seizing control of approximately 70% of the total area (144 dunams) of the masjid, effectively shifting the division from a temporal arrangement to a permanent spatial partition—mirroring the scenario at the Al-Khalil Masjid in Al-Khalil (Hebron). These moves are part of a long series of “Israeli” measures initiated after the 1967 occupation of East Al-Quds, when the Jewish entity seized control of the keys to the Mughrabi Gate—a site that subsequently became a primary route for settler incursions.

In recent years, the “Israeli” military has intensified its targeting of the historical and legal status quo at Al-Masjid Al-Aqsa—an arrangement stipulating that the entire masjid complex, including its walls and underground areas, is the exclusive right of Muslims and under the administration of the Islamic Waqf.

Tel Aviv has also escalated measures against the masjid’s guards and Waqf staff through arrests, expulsion orders, and the obstruction of restoration and maintenance work. Simultaneously, it is working to clear the eastern area of Muslim worshippers while creating increasing space for settlers to perform Talmudic rituals under the protection of occupation forces.

Observers believe that current plans are not merely temporary security measures; rather, they represent a systematic “Israeli” strategy to alter the identity of Al-Masjid Al-Aqsa and impose a new reality on the ground by dismantling its geographical and administrative unity.