



Why do we still Trust the West to Protect us?

The blatant violation of the ceasefire by the Jewish entity, with the support of the USA and the rest of the world, sends us a clear message – they have absolutely no qualms ignoring the laws that are supposed to protect us. We live in a world where we are told that if we live in the Western countries we will be safe, we will be happy because, at least, they have laws and there is accountability.

Where is this accountability now?

It disappears every time they need to pursue a goal – sometimes blatantly, sometimes not, but if we continue to believe that it is not done, we are fooling ourselves.

The West, and its agents, understand that Islam could return. They understand what that will mean – the end to their dominance in the Muslim lands, the lands that they need to exploit for its wealth, and so they will do anything to stop it.

US Intelligence chief Tulsi Gabbard said that the Trump administration is focused and committed to defeat "Islamist terrorism" globally," In her remarks she spoke about the ideology of an "Islamic Caliphate" and how extremist elements and terror groups globally aim for such an outcome. "The threat of Islamist terrorists and the global effort of different terror groups are routed in the same ideology and objective - which is to rule or govern with an Islamist Caliphate, ([Source](#))

It is not a coincidence that they are forcing Muslims across the world to choose a side – Bush said it after 9/11, either we are with them or against them. With them, means compromising on our Deen. It means living in their lands, according to their rules and values, it means allowing the events in Gaza to continue.

Do we think it is a coincidence that they are enacting laws across the Western countries to push us to accept this? In France, they passed a law that bans religious symbols, which affects Muslim girls wearing headscarves. Belgium and the Netherlands have banned face veils in public places. There are also reports that schools in the Netherlands are placing a ban on prayer during school hours while states in Germany have banned judges and prosecutors from wearing headscarves in court.

In Denmark, they have banned halal slaughter methods while also banning foreign preaches who oppose Danish values. Germany has also introduced a new citizenship law that requires applicants to declare their recognition of the Jewish entity right to exist in an attempt to combat antisemitism and ensure that citizens adhere to German values.

France passed the "Law to Reinforce the Principles of the Republic" in 2021, which includes measures to combat what is termed "Islamic separatism." This law also regulates mosque finances and bans foreign imams, and Austria has implemented laws targeting "political Islam," including banning foreign imams and increasing surveillance of suspected Islamist activities. Then in the UK, there are laws which are aimed at countering Islamist extremist ideology, such as the PREVENT programme.

We may think that these laws will not affect us, that if we keep quiet we will be fine, but that is precisely the point – how far are we willing to go? How far are we willing to compromise on our Deen? They want us to embrace their values and ideals, and they are pushing this by slowly chipping away at our ability to practice Islam in any small shape or form.

The use of words like ‘separatism’, ‘extremism’, ‘political Islam’ serves as a guise, which makes us believe that they are only an enemy to a part of Islam – not the whole of it. However, what we need to remember is that these terms serve a purpose – they allow them to target the Muslim Ummah when and how they wish, using these terms as justification for doing so.

They see Islam as a threat – and thus any Muslim is also a threat. So, what happens when they decide to do something about the Muslim threat that lives within their borders? When do they deem Muslim citizens a security threat?

There are examples of this in history, when they targeted groups that lived within their countries under the guise of national security. One such example, of how they can make the internment of citizens legal, can be found in the events following the Pearl Harbour attack.

Following the attack, the Roosevelt administration adopted a drastic policy toward these residents, alien and citizen alike. Virtually all Japanese Americans were forced to leave their homes and property and live in camps for most of the war. They did this on the basis of a national security requirement, claiming that Japanese Americans might be spies for Japan. Roosevelt’s Executive Order 9066 authorized the forced relocation of Japanese Americans to internment camps, which the government called “relocation centers.” The order affected over 117,000 Japanese Americans, including many US citizens. The internment violated many of the constitutional rights of Japanese Americans. In 1944 The Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of the internment in *Korematsu v. United States* (1944). Though they issued an apology and compensated survivors in 1988, this doesn’t change the fact that they did this and it certainly doesn’t mean that they cannot or will not do so again.

In fact, there are laws across the Western world that can be used as legal justification for such acts. One such law is found in the UK, under the Nationality and Borders Act 2022, which allows the government to revoke citizenship without notice. This law is rooted in the British Nationality Act 1981, which allows the Home Secretary to deprive a person of their British citizenship if it is deemed to be “conducive to the public good” or if the person obtained citizenship through fraud, false representation, or concealment of a material fact. The law does not require prior notice in certain circumstances, such as when it is not reasonably practicable to give notice or when doing so would be against the public interest. The Nationality and Borders Act 2022 further clarified these powers but did not fundamentally change the notice requirements. The Act has been criticized for potentially allowing citizenship to be revoked without notice in more situations, though the core principle of notice remains subject to exceptions based on public interest or practicality.

Then in Canada, they have the Strengthening Canadian Citizenship Act (C-24) (2015), under which dual citizens can lose their citizenship if convicted of terrorism, treason, or other serious national security offenses. While this law was partially repealed in 2017, placing limits on it, it still exists. As it does in Austria and the

Netherlands, where they can revoke the nationality of dual citizens who engage in terrorism or acts against national security. In France, they also permit the revocation for naturalized citizens who commit acts of treason or terrorism. Other EU countries, such as Belgium, Denmark, and Ireland, allow citizenship revocation for acts deemed disloyal or threatening to national security.

In the USA, they have used deportation laws for political repression in the past, targeting individuals based on perceived threats to national security, public safety, or political dissent. Trump is also using immigration laws to target individuals based on their political activities. He has done so while referencing the Alien Enemies Act, a law which potentially allows for mass deportations without due process. He has also expressed an interest in ending birthright citizenship, which grants citizenship to children born in the U.S., regardless of their parents' immigration status.

And once they take away someone's citizenship, the government removes any rights that they have and any legal responsibility that is owed to them.

So, the legal precedent for targeting the entire Muslim community exists. We cannot deny this. We cannot deny that they are stretching the meaning of what allows them to target us. So why do we still trust them to protect us? Why do we still trust them to follow the rule of law? To have any integrity or honour? They certainly haven't shown any in the case of Gaza – or in the many other examples of death and destruction that are taken place throughout history.

Why do we still look to them as an example of a system that works? As a system that we wish to live under? When can we see how they will turn on us in pursuit of their goals? يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا لَا تَتَّخِذُوا بِطَانَةِ مَن دُونِكُمْ لَا يَأْلُونَكُمْ خَبَالًا وَدُّوا مَا عَنِتُّمْ قَدْ بَدَتِ الْبَغْضَاءُ مِنْ أَفْوَاهِهِمْ وَمَا تُخْفِي صُدُورُهُمْ أَكْبَرُ قَدْ بَيَّنَّا لَكُمُ الْآيَاتِ إِن كُنْتُمْ تَعْقِلُونَ ﴿١١٨﴾ ***“O believers! Do not associate closely with others who would not miss a chance to harm you. Their only desire is to see you suffer. Their prejudice has become evident from what they say—and what their hearts hide is far worse. We have made Our revelations clear to you, if only you understood.” (Surah 3, Ayah 118)***

As an Ummah, we are living under a system which is the ideological enemy of Islam, and that means that, day by day, we find it harder to hold onto our Deen. In the Western world, they are making it painfully clear that they will only accept people who blindly follow any, and all, laws that they enact – no matter if they are illegal within their own system, or simply morally repugnant.

We need the Islamic State desperately. We need it for the people of Gaza and for every Muslim. We need it for the Muslims who are being killed across the rest of the Muslim World, and we need it for the future of the children who are living in the West – forced to decide which side they will land on.

We need to stop fearing this outcome, to trust in Allah and understand that only the re-establishment of the Islamic State will protect us in this life and the next.

Written for the Central Media Office of Hizb ut Tahrir by

Fatima Musab

Member of the Central Media Office of Hizb ut Tahrir