



Ar-Rayah Newspaper

Issue 599 (13 May 2026)

[\(Translated from Arabic\)](#)

[Editorial: What Is May 9th to Us? Page 2](#)

["Operation Project Freedom" And the Shifting US Approaches Towards Iran Page 6](#)

[Hizb ut Tahrir/ Wilayah Lebanon Campaign: "Muslims Against Normalization" Page 11](#)

[The Khilafah Will Save the Ummah, Restore Its Glory, and Strengthen Its Power Page 14](#)

[Is China Changing the Rules of Conflict? Page 16](#)

[Highlights of the 2026 Military Roadmap Agreement Between Morocco and the US Page 21](#)

[The UAE's Withdrawal from OPEC: Its Reasons and Implications Page 26](#)

[Until When Will Our Dignity Remain Humiliated and Our Independence Taken Away?! Page 31](#)

[What Is Happening Today Through These Major Events Are Glad Tidings Page 33](#)

[Sinai: Between Formal Independence and Strategic Subjugation Page 35](#)

[Are Europe and America Heading Towards a Separation? Page 40](#)

[The Sudanese Government Increases Electricity Tariffs by More Than 72% Page 46](#)

[The Voice of Women Used to Shake the World When the Islamic State Was Established Page 49](#)

The honor and strength of the Islamic Ummah can only be restored through the return of its unifying political entity that gathers its energies, protects its sacred places, and safeguards its lands namely, the Khilafah Rashidah (Rightly Guided Caliphate) on the Method of the Prophethood. Through it, the Ummah regains its dignity, its enemies are deterred, and they are made to think a thousand times before daring to aggress against it. Allah ﷻ says, ﴿يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا اصْبِرُوا وَصَابِرُوا وَرَابِطُوا وَاتَّقُوا اللَّهَ لَعَلَّكُمْ تُفْلِحُونَ﴾ "O believers! Patiently endure, persevere, stand on guard, and be mindful of Allah, so you may be successful." [TMQ Surah Ali Imran: 200].

What Is May 9th to Us?

By: Ustadh Mumtaz Mawara Al-Nahri

There is no doubt that the largest war in modern history was World War II. These days, the victorious parties in this war widely celebrate May 9th as “Victory Day.” Among these countries is Kyrgyzstan, where Muslims constitute the majority of the population, and this day is also considered an official holiday.

To understand the true significance of May 9th, we must first delve a little into the pages of history:

In 1919, World War I ended with the Treaty of Versailles. Under this treaty, Germany withdrew from the territories it had occupied, and the Austro-Hungarian Empire was divided into two. The League of Nations was also established under the pretext of maintaining international security. In the Treaty of Sèvres, England and France divided most of the Ottoman State’s territories, in addition to the German colonies.

England and France established the League of Nations to maintain these colonies. The slogans of this organization became the preservation of peace and disarmament. However, England supported and encouraged Germany’s rearmament to counterbalance France. With a degree of facilitation from both England and Russia, Germany regained its major power status and reignited the flames of a new world war.

First, Germany clung fiercely to Nazi ideology and sought to dominate all other nations. Second, it was no longer content with merely recovering the spoils it had lost after World War I; it now aspired to seize the wealth of the entire world.

In World War II, which began in 1939, the Axis powers, Germany, Japan, and Italy, fought against the Allied powers, the Soviet Union, Britain, France, and later the United States, with more than 60 other countries joining the conflict. A total of 25 million military personnel and 38 million civilians were killed in the war. The majority of these casualties, approximately 20 million, were citizens of the Soviet Union. The war ended with the defeat of the Axis powers.

To divide the spoils and ensure their future security, the victors signed an agreement at the Yalta Conference of February 1945. Under this agreement, Germany was divided into four occupation zones under the influence of the United States, the Soviet Union, Britain, and France. Later, it was divided into two zones: a western zone under American influence, and an eastern zone under Soviet influence.

The Soviet Union was initially slated to enter the war against Japan, but this plan was thwarted by the United States' atomic bombing of Japan, which effectively ended the war. Japan then became a country under American influence. Korea was also divided into two states, one under the influence of the Soviet Union, and the other under the influence of the United States.

The victorious powers decided to establish the United Nations, which was created by the United States, the Soviet Union, Britain, France, and China.

In short, these five countries divided the entire world amongst themselves after World War II. To prevent the emergence of a sixth power that might share in the division of global interests, these five countries agreed to create the United Nations as a trap to force nations into submission and subjugation. The lofty phrases used in the organization's definition, such as the central

mission of the “maintenance of international peace and security,” are merely intended to deceive the public, who are unaware of its true nature.

In 1947, the Paris Peace Conference was held, resulting in Italy losing its colonies and falling under the influence of the United States, the Soviet Union, and Britain. Hungary, Romania, and Finland were also forced to pay reparations.

In conclusion, World War II was nothing more than a war between the major powers for hegemony and resources. Why should we consider the outcome of a power struggle between the major powers a “great victory”? What difference does it make to colonized nations whether one side or the other wins? For example, what significance does a US or Russian victory hold for us today in their struggle for influence in Central Asia? If the major powers are the ones who define “homelands” for us as they see fit, isn’t it naive to consider them our homelands?

Just yesterday, the Soviet Union was our homeland. Where is it today, and what remains of its legacy? Why aren’t we permanent members of the UN Security Council? Why isn’t Kazakhstan considered a nuclear state, even though nuclear tests were conducted there during the Soviet era? In fact, nuclear weapons still exist there, but they belong to Russia. And tomorrow, if America, in its conflict with Russia, establishes a Turkestan state for the Turkic peoples, will we then stand and sing its praises as “our homeland”?

In truth, from the dawn of history until the Day of Judgment, conflicts between nations have stemmed from only two causes: first, the desire for hegemony and dominance; and second, the pursuit of material interests.

The first is further divided into two parts: the desire to establish and spread a fundamental ideology, and the desire for nationalistic dominance, fanaticism, and arrogance. For example, the Islamic state possessed the desire to establish and spread Islam for nearly 1300 years, while the communist state possessed the desire to establish its ideology for approximately 30 years.

As for German Nazism and Italian Fascism, which were the causes of World War II, their motivations were the desire for nationalistic dominance and the pursuit of material interests.

Thus, Muslims must learn from history. If they do not strive with their wealth and lives for the sake of their Islam, they will remain victims of the world wars waged between disbelieving (kufr) states, or of the local conflicts ignited by those states. At the same time, we must not knowingly become victims of the conflicts of disbelieving states. We are responsible for that before Allah ﷻ.

“Operation Project Freedom” And the Shifting US Approaches Towards Iran

By: Ustadh Asaad Mansour

It is noticeable that whenever the US administration fails with a particular approach, is unable to achieve its objective, or perceives its losses as outweighing its gains, it quickly changes course.

When it failed to topple the regime in Iran or subdue it into submission by assassinating the first and second tiers of leadership, and after continuing its aggression for forty days, it announced a two-week cessation, then an indefinite one, and turned to negotiations to reach an agreement with Iran, with Trump claiming that he had changed the regime.

When Trump saw that there had been no significant change in the stance of those in power, he resorted to blockading Iranian ports. However, this did not achieve the desired outcome of forcing Iran to surrender, and Iran, in fact, gained control of the Strait of Hormuz. Hundreds of huge tankers became stranded in the Gulf.

Trump did not request assistance from anyone when he began the aggression, because he is consumed by the arrogance of believing he can turn the world upside down and set the skies ablaze. However, Trump realized he was powerless against a country that possessed only a tenth of the weapons he had. He sent out distress signals for help in controlling the Strait, but his Western allies did not respond.

So Trump resorted to another tactic, announcing on May 4, 2026, an operation called “Operation Project Freedom,” ostensibly to assist ships from countries he described as neutral and uninvolved in the Middle East crisis, which were stranded in the Strait of Hormuz, in order to facilitate their passage.

When this failed, Trump halted the operation. On May 5, 2026, he announced its suspension, stating on Truth Social, “Based on the request of Pakistan and other Countries, the tremendous Military Success that we have had during the Campaign against the Country of Iran and, additionally, the fact that Great Progress has been made toward a Complete and Final Agreement with Representatives of Iran, we have mutually agreed that, while the Blockade will remain in full force and effect, Project Freedom (The Movement of Ships through the Strait of Hormuz) will be paused for a short period of time to see whether or not the Agreement can be finalized and signed.” Then on May 6, 2026, he claimed, “They want to make a deal. We’ve had very good talks over the last 24 hours, and it’s very possible that we’ll make a deal. Iran cannot have a nuclear weapon, and they won’t, and they’ve agreed to that.”

When none of the claims of Trump materialized, and Iran did not respond to his nine-point proposal, instead presenting a fourteen-point counter-proposal, he resorted to engaging in naval skirmishes with them. He said this was not a return to war, so as not to appear to be resuming hostilities, because if it were a resumption of hostilities and achieved nothing, he would have failed a second time, and would also have to seek congressional approval for war. It appears he will employ this tactic: strike and then stop.

On May 5, 2026, Secretary of State Rubio announced that the United States had ended its offensive operations against Iran and was now in a defensive posture. He stated that Operation Epic Wrath had concluded, as President Trump had informed Congress. “The operation is over. Epic Fury, as the president notified Congress, we’re done with that stage of it. We’re now on to this Project Freedom,” he said. He added, “it’s to rescue like almost 23,000 civilians from 87 different countries that are trapped inside of the Gulf and left for dead in the Persian Gulf by this Iranian regime... They’re isolated, they’re starving, they’re vulnerable, and at least ten sailors have already died as a result of this – civilian sailors.” He called on Iran to come to the negotiating table and accept American terms, noting that US envoys Witkoff and Kushner were continuing to work toward a diplomatic solution. He stated that “As far as a negotiation is concerned, I think the President’s been clear that part of the negotiation process has to be not just the enrichment, but what happens to this material that’s buried deep somewhere that they have – still have access to if they ever wanted to dig it out. That has to be addressed. And that’s being addressed in the negotiation.”

On May 1, 2026, Trump informed the leaders of the House of Representatives and the Senate that offensive operations against Iran had ended, following pressure from Congress to seek authorization to continue the war, which had entered its third month. He affirmed his compliance with a law stipulating that the president must obtain authorization from the legislative branch before deploying troops for more than 60 days.

When Iran did not respond and refused to resume negotiations for an agreement, he returned to threatening and announced on May 9, 2026, a project he called “Project Freedom Plus,” which he

did not elaborate upon. However, US officials stated that it included increasing the US military presence in the Gulf, tightening the naval blockade on Iranian ports, and enhancing response operations in the Strait of Hormuz. It was reported that the previous version of Project Freedom was limited to sending a small number of warships to escort commercial oil tankers and deployed approximately 15,000 troops and 100 aircraft. It only partially succeeded in saving some ships because it was met with Iranian threats.

On May 6, 2026, the American website Axios quoted a Pakistani source as saying that the United States and Iran were close to agreeing on a one-page memorandum to end the war. The agreement includes Iran's commitment to suspend uranium enrichment, the United States agreeing to lift its sanctions, the release of billions of dollars of frozen Iranian funds, and both sides lifting restrictions on passage through the Strait of Hormuz.

This means Trump is compelled to reach an agreement with Iran because resuming hostilities requires congressional approval, which is not guaranteed, and because the outcome of renewed fighting is also uncertain, as he has already tried and failed. Similarly, his plan to rescue the ships stranded in the Gulf requires considerable time to succeed and is fraught with risks. It is noticeable that Trump wants to secure quick, profitable deals, thus measuring political action against his business dealings, and this is the secret to his downfall.

Changing tactics is a good thing, but changing them frequently is not commendable. Instead, it indicates confusion and a lack of in-depth and informed analysis of the situation and its potential outcomes. It is like someone floundering without a plan, saying, 'Let's try this method, and if it doesn't work, we'll try another,'

and so on. This undermines trust in those who devise strategies, because a strategy must be designed to achieve a goal after thorough study, not improvised. This indicates that America is not as formidable as many fear it is, and that defeating it is possible. This will happen, by the Permission of Allah ﷻ, when the Khilafah Rashidah (Rightly Guided Caliphate) on the Method of Prophethood is established, and when there is a sincere, aware, and resolute political leadership, like that of Hizb ut Tahrir.

Meanwhile, the rulers of Pakistan, who are oblivious to the value and the actual potential of their country, which is not intrinsically dependent on America, are attempting to rescue it from its predicament. They are acting as intermediaries and messengers, eager to serve their master Trump so that he can escape his predicament and implement his projects in the region. Instead of siding with him, declaring their independence from America, working towards the unification of Muslims and their lands, and handing over ruling authority to Hizb ut Tahrir so that America can experience what the Khaleefah (Caliph) Umar (ra) imposed on Persia and Rome as experiences, they are failing to do so.

Hizb ut Tahrir/ Wilayah Lebanon Campaign: “Muslims Against Normalization”



المكتب الإعلامي لحزب التحرير في ولاية لبنان

In light of the Lebanese authority engaging in direct negotiations that will certainly lead to peace and normalization with the usurping and criminal Jewish entity, and as part of the campaign by Hizb ut Tahrir / Wilayah Lebanon to visit politicians, muftis, scholars, the political sphere, and public figures, delegations from the Central Communications Committee and regional Activities Committees carried out visits.

These began in the city of Sidon in southern Lebanon with a visit to Member of Parliament Dr. Osama Saad, Secretary-General of the Popular Nasserist Organization, and a visit to the Mufti of Sidon and its districts, Sheikh Salim Sousan. This was followed by a visit in the capital, Beirut, to the Deputy Chairman of the Higher Islamic Shia Council, the scholar Sheikh Ali Al-Khatib.

These visits emphasized Hizb ut Tahrir's clear and decisive stance rejecting negotiations, reconciliation, and recognition of the Jewish entity. They focused on the necessity of adopting a clear position regarding the authority's course in this direction under any name, such as peace, ending the war, reducing losses, or economic promises. Under no circumstances can anyone approve the continuation of the occupation of Jerusalem and its surroundings by those who usurped it, regardless of the justification. This is in addition to the criminality of this entity and its aggression against Gaza, Lebanon, and Iran, carried out openly without any deterrent, especially with overt American support.

The delegations affirmed that Lebanon, like other countries, is part of the Islamic lands, which in principle should be under a unified state for the entire Ummah under a Khilafah Rashidah (Rightly Guided Caliphate) upon the method of Prophethood. Without such unity, Lebanon and others will remain arenas for manipulation by colonial disbelieving states, foremost among them America and its proxy, the Jewish entity.

The delegations also stressed the necessity and obligation of political confrontation against the Lebanese authority's approach of negotiating with the Jewish entity. This should be undertaken by all political groups that recognize the criminality of the Jewish entity and do not accept its occupation. The political circles opposing this path, along with scholars and public figures, must work to establish public opinion that fortifies this stance against rulers aligned with America.

Dr. Muhammad Jaber, head of the Hizb's Central Communications Committee in Wilayah Lebanon, visited Ustadh Khaldoun Al-Sharif, a political and social activist, at his home in Beirut on 6/5/2026.

It was an opportunity to renew communication and clarify the party's position on the path of negotiation leading to recognition of the usurping and murderous entity, which is not permissible, either in Shariah or in reality, to legitimize for the Ummah. Also, to remind everyone of the need to raise the voice publicly and clearly in the media and in open and closed political councils, to warn against this path and this matter. The attempt to drag the region, including Lebanon, into dangerous sectarian strife that serves only the usurping enemy was also discussed.

Ustadh Khaldoun Al-Sharif listened attentively to our point of view, considering that there are always common areas among all Lebanese to maintain the unity of their position and strengthen it with consensus. Both parties stressed the need to stand against sedition among the people of the country in all its forms, and the need for continuous communication between the wise people of all sides to ward off sedition and reject normalization and surrender to the usurping entity.

We affirmed to him that our project for the unity of Muslims, through the establishment of the Khilafah Rashidah (Rightly Guided Caliphate) on the method of Prophethood, is the only one that can guarantee Muslims' unity and prevent the enemy from violating our lands and our people. Indeed, it is the only project capable of eliminating the enemy as an occupier of Muslim lands.

The Khilafah (Caliphate) Will Save the Ummah, Restore Its Glory, and Strengthen Its Power



What will save the Ummah, restore its glory, strengthen its power, and make its enemies think a thousand times before attacking it, is only the return of the Khilafah so that the earth may shine with its goodness and justice. Just as the Khilafah ended the arrogance of the Roman Caesars and the Persian emperors, so too will it end the arrogance of their followers, such as the tyrant Trump and his ilk among the disbelieving colonialists. As for the Jewish entity, it is too insignificant to be given any weight. It is as Allah ﷻ said, ﴿لَنْ يَضُرُّوكُمْ إِلَّا أَذًى وَإِنْ يُقَاتِلُوكُمْ يُؤَلُّوْكُمْ الْأَدْبَارَ ثُمَّ لَا يُنْصَرُونَ﴾ **“They will not harm you except for a slight annoyance; and if they fight you, they will turn their backs in retreat, and then they will not be aided.”** [TMQ Surah Aali-Imran: 111]. It is incapable of standing on its own. It is not capable of fighting except with the

support of people, as Allah ﷻ said, **﴿ضُرِبَتْ عَلَيْهِمُ الذَّلَّةُ أَيْنَ مَا ثَقَفُوا إِلَّا أَلَّا بِحَبْلِ مِنَ اللَّهِ وَحَابِلٍ مِنَ النَّاسِ﴾** **“They were covered with humiliation wherever they were found, except by a rope, without support.”** [TMQ Surah Aali Imran: 112]. They have severed the Rope of Allah ﷻ and are only left with the rope of the people from America and Europe, and their agents from among the treacherous rulers in the lands of the Muslims, who do not lift a finger in the face of the brutal aggression of the Jews. The problem is with the states that exist in the lands of the Muslims these days, for their rulers are loyal to the disbelieving colonialists, the enemies of Islam and the Muslims. Thus, the calamity of the Muslims is in their rulers, and their loyalty to the disbelieving colonialists. The rulers obey their commands and refrain from what they forbid, instead of their loyalty being to Allah ﷻ establishing His Shariah Laws and fighting Jihad in the Way of Allah ﷻ and following His Messenger ﷺ so that Islam and the Muslims may be honored and disbelief and the disbelievers may be humiliated. **﴿وَيَوْمَئِذٍ يُفْرِحُ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ * بِنَصْرِ اللَّهِ يَنْصُرُ مَنْ يَشَاءُ وَهُوَ الْعَزِيزُ الرَّحِيمُ﴾** **“And on that day the believers will rejoice * in the victory of Allah. He gives victory to whom He wills, and He is the Exalted in Might, the Merciful.”** [TMQ Surah Ar-Rum: 4-5].

An excerpt from an answer to a question issued by the eminent ‘alim Ata ibn Khalil Abu al-Rashta, the Amir of Hizb ut Tahrir

Is China Changing the Rules of Conflict?

By: Ustadh Nabil Abdel Karim

In a world where wars are no longer always declared on media platforms, nor decided solely by the roar of warplanes, a different kind of conflict is taking shape; a silent, transnational conflict, extending beyond geography, where the balance of power is being reshaped, and the limits of influence among major powers are being tested.

In this developing landscape, Iran appears not merely as a country facing sanctions or military threats, but as a player attempting to redefine its position through unconventional means, capitalizing on the convergence of interests with China, and the transformation of technology into a readily available commodity in an open global market. America views this rapprochement with suspicion, as the question transcends the mere agreement here or deal there, reaching a deeper core: Are we witnessing the beginning of a new international order in which monopolies of power are dismantled, or merely a redistribution of power through more complex and opaque means?

Since 2016, when the idea of a strategic partnership between Tehran and Beijing was first proposed, the extent to which this relationship could develop has remained unclear. However, the signing of a long-term cooperation agreement in 2021 laid the foundation for an alliance that transcends economics and extends into geopolitics. China, through its Belt and Road Initiative, is not merely seeking a trade route, but also strategic footholds, and

Iran—with its geographic location and resources—represents a cornerstone of this project.

This agreement, for those unfamiliar with it, was first conceived in 2016 during Chinese President Xi Jinping’s visit to Tehran and his meeting with Iranian Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei, where the idea of a long-term strategic partnership between the two countries was proposed. In 2019, Iran initially stated that it was merely an idea and not a final agreement. Later, it evolved until its official signing on April 27, 2021, under the name “Strategic Cooperation Agreement,” with a duration of 25 years (Al Jazeera Net, April 27, 2021). This agreement served as a general framework, not a detailed treaty with all its specific provisions. The agreement was not renewed in 2023, but cooperation was strengthened and several subsidiary agreements were signed during reciprocal visits (Al-Arabiya, February 14, 2023). It is not entirely secret; it was officially announced, its duration of 25 years was known, and it includes economic, political, and possibly security cooperation. However, it is not entirely transparent, as many of its details have not been officially published. Therefore, it is sometimes described as vague or semi-secret. Among the leaked details are the following:

1. Oil for Investment – “The Core of the Deal”: China will receive Iranian oil at discounted and fixed prices for a long period, potentially up to 25 years, in exchange for investments in energy, infrastructure, ports, railways, and the construction of Iranian oil storage facilities in China and elsewhere.

2. Connecting Iran to China’s Belt and Road Initiative: Developing ports and railways linking Asia to Europe via Iran, thus transforming Iran from an isolated country into a global trade corridor.

3. Military and Security Cooperation: Joint military exercises, intelligence sharing, and the development of surveillance technologies.

4. Technology and Communications: Allowing Chinese companies like Huawei to enter the market, developing 5G networks, and conducting digital surveillance. As part of this cooperation, Iran acquired a Chinese commercial dual-satellite in 2024 through a private Chinese company, purchasing access to it or its future use. The satellite, known as TEE-01B (Earth Eye 1), is not officially owned by Iran but by a private Chinese company, and Iran purchased its services or data. Control, or at least some of its operation, is conducted from ground stations outside Iran, exclusively in China. The details of this satellite's operation remain unclear, but it is alleged that it was used in the war to monitor military bases and support military operations, according to Western claims (Reuters, April 15, 2026).

Iran saw several advantages in this agreement, enabling it to balance its relations with the US and China, especially after the shift in US policy towards it, the assassination of its leaders, the withdrawal from the nuclear agreement, and other developments. Among Iran's primary objectives in this agreement were: circumventing US sanctions, as China would provide funding, trade, and political cover; the rise of an Iranian-Chinese axis, which could potentially extend to include Russia in the future; and an indirect threat to energy routes, as China would gain a stronger presence in the Gulf, and Iran would gain greater confidence in managing crises such as those related to the Strait of Hormuz.

However, Iran was apprehensive about granting China excessively long-term concessions in the absence of transparency, fearing the

risk of falling into a debt trap. China itself was also cautious, as it did not turn this agreement into a full reality, and there was a slowdown in implementation due to the American sanctions on Iran, and investments did not reach the volume of \$400 billion as rumored.

It cannot be said that the war was solely a result of this agreement, but with its outbreak and repercussions, the agreement became a target of pressure, perhaps even an attempt to push Iran to reduce or outright cancel it, while maintaining other objectives.

Therefore, it seems that one of the unstated goals of any American escalation, or pressure, is not only to modify Iran's behavior, but also to reduce or even eliminate its ability to use this leverage. Controlling maritime routes, or neutralizing those who threaten them, has remained at the heart of Washington's strategic doctrine for decades, and any regional power capable of disrupting this flow is viewed as a destabilizing factor that must be contained, if not dismantled.

However, the paradox lies in the fact that attempting to strip Iran of this capability might push it to cling to it even more tightly, or to develop unconventional tools to compensate for it, whether through regional proxies or by employing modern technology, including space and surveillance. Here, the conflict transforms from a confrontation over geography to a struggle over tools, and from a dispute over waterways to a competition over who possesses the ability to disrupt or protect them. Therefore, America's eagerness to regain control at this sensitive juncture reflects not only its desire to contain Iran, but also reveals a deeper struggle: a battle over who sets the rules of the game globally and who has the power to close those routes when

necessary. At this level, the crisis is no longer merely a regional dispute, but part of a larger conflict over the very nature of the international order.

However, the final outcome of the negotiations will determine whether America has succeeded in transforming Iran into a state subordinate to the US, rather than a satellite state in the orbit of US influence, or whether Iran is attempting to avoid becoming a dependent state and is striving to become an independent state, benefiting from the agreement with China. This is contingent on the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC) remaining in power; if America manages to replace it, it may have succeeded in transforming Iran into a subordinate vassal state.

Noticeably, all these land, sea, and air routes lie within Muslim countries. Should Allah ﷻ grant the establishment of a Khilafah (Caliphate), these geographical and strategic factors will represent immense power. However, the activation of these capabilities remains contingent upon the existence of a political entity capable of harnessing them within a comprehensive vision, embodied in the emergence of the Khilafah (Caliphate), and redirecting resources towards achieving stability and justice.

Therefore, restoring influence on the international stage necessitates organized political and intellectual action aimed at rebuilding power on clear foundations, resuming the Islamic way of life, and enabling the Islamic Ummah to leverage its position and resources within a civilizational project capable of influencing the global balance of power.

Highlights of the 2026 Military Roadmap Agreement Between Morocco and the United States

By: Ustadh Munajji Muhammad

The Trump administration signed a defense agreement with Morocco on April 16, 2026, in Washington, D.C., entitled the “U.S.-Morocco Defense Cooperation Roadmap,” extending until 2036. This took place at the conclusion of the fourteenth session of the U.S.-Morocco Defense Consultative Committee (DCC). The Military Cooperation Roadmap Agreement was considered an extension of the 2020 Military Cooperation Agreement Against Common Threats, which was signed by the first Trump administration through Secretary of State Mark Esper following his tour of the Maghreb region. That agreement had a ten-year term, from 2020 to 2030.

Although the 2026 Military Cooperation Roadmap Agreement is considered an extension of the 2020 agreement, it is in reality a shift from traditional cooperation to actual operational integration, between the US military as the leader, and the Moroccan army as a subordinate. This integration is achieved through joint, real-time coordination of military operations and the immediate sharing of military data. Furthermore, this agreement is not merely a technical extension but a new US strategic framework at a critical juncture for American hegemony. It aims to transform Morocco into a component of the US strategic security architecture in the Western Mediterranean. Among its objectives is the complete subordination of the Moroccan army to US colonialist interests and strategic goals. It

has also been confirmed that the military and security partnership is now open-ended, extending until 2036, by mutual political will, which actually means the Moroccan regime's complete submission to American colonialist projects.

This agreement is part of a series of US military and security agreements with Morocco that have reached unprecedented levels in recent years. Trump's recognition of Moroccan sovereignty over the Sahara was the key to the US strategic penetration of Morocco, facilitated by the Moroccan regime's complete subservience. The previous 2020-2030 military agreement was strategically aimed at penetrating the western Muslim World and Africa. The Pentagon considered it a renewal of the alliance between the two countries as a cornerstone of peace in Africa. American "peace," however, meant colonialism and paving the way for it. This was followed by field military maneuvers in Morocco, most notably the African Lion exercises, the largest and most extensive American military training exercises in Africa.

America used its recognition of Moroccan sovereignty over the Sahara as a tool for direct penetration of Morocco and, through it, the western Islamic world in the Sahel and then Africa, with the complete subservience of the Moroccan regime. Morocco has become involved in all of America's colonial projects, and the most dangerous aspect is America's relentless pursuit of establishing its colonial military command for Africa (AFRICOM) in the heart of Morocco. The Hespress website reported that the Moroccan regime nominated several cities to host the command, such as Laayoune, Dakhla, Boujdour, and Agadir, but the Americans showed a preference for Kenitra or Ksar El Kebir, under the pretext of historical, technical, and logistical reasons. The

truth is that America wants to station its forces in the heart of Morocco, miles from Rabat, for a sinister purpose. As for this military cooperation roadmap agreement, signed by US Under Secretary of War Elbridge Colby on April 16, 2026, and extending until 2036 with the possibility of extension, its colonialist dimensions and strategic objectives have been expanded to include the northern coast of Morocco on the Mediterranean Sea, specifically the Strait of Gibraltar. This sudden interest in the northern shore is a result of current circumstances related to America's war on Iran and the Trump administration's strategic and geostrategic predicament. This predicament has been exacerbated by the added operational and logistical dilemma arising from the dispute between Spain and the Trump administration. Spain views Trump's policies regarding the Western Sahara and Latin America as a threat to its colonial enclaves, comprised of islands off the coast of the Western Sahara, and to its interests in Latin American countries, particularly Colombia. This led the Spanish government, under Pedro Sánchez, to insist on refusing the use of the Rota airbase for logistical support operations for the US military in a potential war against Iran. Consequently, the Trump administration found itself facing an operational and logistical dilemma, with a shortage of resources, equipment, ammunition, and supply and resupply sites, deepening its strategic predicament and reigniting the debate about the viability of maintaining its bases in Spain.

This critical situation for America has accelerated the extension of the military and security agreement with the Moroccan regime and expanded its strategic dimensions and objectives to include the northern shore of the Mediterranean. America views Morocco as an alternative solution to its logistical dilemma, which arose with Trump's predicament resulting from his war on

Iran. In this critical juncture for America, discussions have begun regarding the Ksar Sghir naval base in northern Morocco, which is considered the most important naval base for the Moroccan army and is one of five naval bases. The discussion centers on its potential replacement for the Rota naval base for American forces, by relocating American troops, naval vessels, aircraft, helicopters, and military radars to the southern shore of the Mediterranean, in northern Morocco.

It should be noted that the Ksar Sghir naval base, inaugurated in 2010, is one of the most important naval bases for the Moroccan army. In addition to its strategic location on the Strait of Gibraltar, it is designed to advanced standards, having been carved into the rock and surrounded by terrain that provides it with high natural protection against threats. Furthermore, its location at the narrowest point of the strait grants it a superior ability to monitor, control, and manage navigation between the Mediterranean Sea and the Atlantic Ocean.

America's control of this base effectively grants it control over the Strait of Gibraltar and the western shores of the Mediterranean Sea and the Maghreb region. With America facing a suffocating strategic and geostrategic predicament due to the closure of the Strait of Hormuz, its colonialist ambitions to seize and control the Strait of Gibraltar have intensified. The Moroccan regime, subservient to all its colonialist conditions, uses the pretext of recognition as justification for its actions.

Trump's ill-fated ambition regarding the Moroccan Sahara is guaranteed to achieve all of this for him. This subservient regime has fully embraced America's war against Islam, joined the treacherous Abraham Accords with the usurping Jewish entity, and joined the "Board of Peace"—indeed, it was one of its

primary funders. It supported the usurping Jewish entity in its genocide against the people of Gaza and allowed the criminal American military to conduct its maneuvers on Moroccan soil. Currently, discussions are underway regarding the location of the headquarters of the colonialist United States Africa Command (AFRICOM) in the heart of Morocco. It is no surprise that this agent regime would hand over the Ksar Sghir base and the key to the Strait of Gibraltar to America in exchange for its survival.

The 2026 Military Cooperation Roadmap Agreement has its own colonialist dimension and strategic objective. After the regime acquiesced to America's colonialist projects in the Sahara, the Sahel, and Africa through previous agreements, America's ambitions are now expanding to include the northern coast of Morocco, the Mediterranean Sea, and the Strait of Gibraltar. This agent regime is the key to this, and this agreement is the framework governing this disgrace. Our burning issues, we Muslims, are in the hands of our most bitter enemies after our own insignificant people turned them into projects to serve colonialism, fight our Islam, colonialize our countries, and empower criminal America over them.

The UAE's Withdrawal from OPEC: Its Reasons and Implications

By: Dr. Mohammed Gilani

The UAE officially announced its withdrawal from OPEC and the OPEC+ alliance on May 1, 2026. This decision, which at first glance may seem like a mere technical economic step to increase production from 3.4 million to 5 million barrels per day, is in fact an indicator of significant changes that may occur in the current global financial order, reflecting various international conflicts. However, the UAE hopes to increase its oil production to finance massive projects it is undertaking, particularly the International Trade and Economic Cooperation (IMEC) project, which connects ports in western India with the ports of Jebel Ali and Khalifa in the UAE, and subsequently, the railway lines linking the UAE to the occupied port of Haifa via Saudi Arabia and Jordan. The UAE found in its need to raise its oil production ceiling a pretext for withdrawing from OPEC and OPEC+.

While this withdrawal weakens OPEC, at least formally and politically, OPEC and OPEC+ countries are not incapable of compensating for the UAE's production, and distributing its quotas among the remaining countries. As for the UAE, in order to market its oil independently of OPEC, it will have to sell at prices lower than OPEC prices, in addition to relying more heavily on international companies operating within it, such as the British oil companies BP and Shell, and the French company Total.

The Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) was founded in 1960 by five countries: Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Kuwait, Iran, and Venezuela. Notably, all of them, except Venezuela, were

under British influence, suggesting that OPEC, from its inception, served British interests. The United Arab Emirates joined OPEC in 1967, before it had gained independence; it was then known as the Emirate of Abu Dhabi. However, British political influence within OPEC waned after the United States replaced it in Saudi Arabia and Iraq, then militarily occupied Kuwait in 1991, and eliminated British influence in Iran starting in 1979. In other words, all the founding members, including Venezuela, became subject to American influence in one way or another.

The United States recognized the significant importance of OPEC after it decided to abandon the gold standard and the Bretton Woods Agreement, which had based the dollar on gold at a rate of \$35 per ounce. The US found its answer in oil, the lifeblood of the global economy. Although OPEC was not under American control, and King Faisal of Saudi Arabia was not a US agent, the US was able to influence OPEC and its leader, Saudi Arabia, by enticing them with the possibility of raising oil prices more than fivefold, from \$2.25 to \$12 between 1972 and 1974. This was achieved through the October War of 1973, waged by Egypt and Syria against Israel. Thus, the US exploited OPEC very effectively, leading to the creation of the petrodollar system, which stipulates that the issuance of dollars is proportional to the volume of oil trade conducted exclusively in dollars.

This petrodollar system remained largely stable until nine new countries joined OPEC, forming what has been known since 2016 as OPEC+. Since then, speculation has grown about the possibility of trading oil outside the dollar system, to the point where the volume of oil traded outside the petrodollar system has reached 20% of global trade. With the UAE now free from the obligation

to sell oil in dollars, the volume of oil sales outside the petrodollar system is likely to increase.

While it is true that oil-producing countries, whether in OPEC or OPEC+, own the oil fields, real control over oil prices remains in the capitals of both modern and old colonialist powers: the United States and Britain, and to a lesser extent France, through what are known as the Big Six: ExxonMobil, Chevron, and ConocoPhillips (USA), Shell, BP (UK), and Total (France).

These companies are not merely economic entities; they are political arms operating according to a strategy of external control. While the countries possess the physical reserves, the six companies control deep extraction technology, global refining networks, and, most importantly, they own the paper oil trade through the New York and London stock exchanges, where phantom barrels worth thirty times the real oil are traded, on paper. Here, the price is determined according to the interests of the major investment funds on Wall Street and the City of London, making oil-producing countries hostage to the fluctuations of stock exchanges in which they have no voting rights.

Viewing oil as a tool of colonialism is not merely a historical recollection, but a lived reality in 2026. Controlling energy resources and the waterways that transport oil across continents means controlling the pulse of global industry and wielding power over centers that need this vital resource but lack it, such as Europe and China. Today, America uses oil as a tool for sanctions, directly, as with Iran and the Gulf states, or indirectly, as with Europe and China. Russia and Britain, however, are largely immune to these sanctions due to their oil fields or giant oil

companies, such as Shell and BP, which acquired the American company Amoco.

As for America's loss of 20% of its dollar production capacity due to oil sales outside the dollar system, the US has been working for years to establish a new dollar production system to compensate for its financial losses, or ultimately to completely replace the petrodollar system, especially if maintaining it requires ongoing geopolitical conflicts. For over 15 years, the US has been implementing a currency swap system, which the Federal Reserve calls swap lines. The US aims to eventually develop this system to replace the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, thus finally dismantling the remnants of the post-World War II financial system established by the Bretton Woods Agreement. Strikingly, the US abandoned the gold standard amidst a brutal war in the Middle East, and now it seeks to alter or dismantle what remains of Bretton Woods through an even more devastating conflict in the region, a move that will only exacerbate poverty and plunge populations deeper into hardship and destitution.

The ugliness of this colonialist influence is evident when one considers countries that possess black gold but live in darkness of poverty. Nigeria, Africa's largest oil producer, is the most painful example. While major companies like Shell and Total reap billions of dollars in profits from the Niger Delta fields, the country suffers from poverty rates exceeding 40%, catastrophic environmental degradation, and food insecurity. Similarly, Indonesia, once an active member of OPEC before suspending its membership, has been transformed from an oil exporter to an importer due to a lack of local technology and an excessive reliance on foreign companies for drilling and exploration. This has left its budget at

the mercy of global stock market prices, controlled by trading centers in Texas and London.

Oxfam reports in April 2026 revealed that the six largest oil companies generate profits of nearly \$3,000 per second, reflecting the scale of this systematic plundering of resources. While developing countries suffer from crippling debt and the consequences of climate change, these profits are used to bolster the financial power of Western shareholders, buy political allegiances, and wage wars against their own people.

True liberation for oil-producing states begins not merely with withdrawing from international organizations, as the UAE and Qatar have done, but with mastering technology and establishing independent pricing centers capable of breaking the monopoly of Western stock exchanges. Before and after all this, liberation from political dependence on America and Britain in all aspects of life is essential. Without this, the barrel of oil will remain a chain linking the destinies of nations in Nigeria, Indonesia, and other oil-producing countries to Western capitals and the millstone of colonialism, all under the guise of free trade and shared interests!

Until When Will Our Dignity Remain Humiliated and Our Independent Authority Taken Away?!



Al-Jazeera Net reported a news item stating that the German Foreign Minister, Johann Wadepuhl, during a joint press conference with his counterpart in the Jewish entity, Gideon Sa'ar who was on an official visit to Germany expressed support for the continued presence of Jewish forces in certain areas of southern Lebanon, under the pretext of protecting the north from attacks by the Lebanese Hezbollah movement.

Ar-Rayah: When the German Foreign Minister states that the presence of the Jewish army in southern Lebanon is necessary, this is not merely a political opinion, but a blatant expression of the extent of disregard shown toward the Islamic Ummah. Likewise, when Trump and other leaders of the Western colonialist powers interfere in the affairs of the Ummah and

dictate its orientations and policies, the matter goes beyond diplomacy into the imposition of guardianship.

Such interventions would not occur if there were a true leader within the Ummah, one who combines strength with piety, wisdom with determination. A leader who understands that his responsibility is not merely to protect his seat of power, but to safeguard Islam, the dignity of the Ummah, and its independence. Such a leader is absent, and thus the Ummah has weakened, its unity has been fragmented, and it has become vulnerable to every opportunist.

An Ummah that possesses a strong and righteous leader, and holds firmly to its Deen, cannot be humiliated or violated. However, if the state of weakness and division continues, foreign interventions will remain a recurring bitter reality, and independent authority will remain incomplete.

What Is Happening Today Through These Major Events Are Glad Tidings of the Coming of the Giant of Islam



The current events point toward the emergence of a new dawn for an ideology capable of overturning the crumbling international order. What is taking place today through these momentous events are glad tidings of the coming of the giant of Islam, soon by the Permission of Allah ﷻ.

The Ummah is preparing itself, and the Hizb capable of carrying the burdens of awakening this giant already exists. This will enable the Ummah to benefit from the phase of chaotic multipolarity. From the very first moment of its emergence, the Khilafah (Caliphate) State will declare the illegitimacy of international law, refusing recognition of any of its institutions or any of its resolutions. It will announce a new global order based solely on international customs and norms. The vast scope of this

state, under the concept of one unified Ummah, will allow it to move immediately from a position of establishment to becoming a global center influencing international affairs from its very first moment.

As long as we possess all that is required legislation derived from the Book of Allah ﷻ and the Prophetic Sunnah, a comprehensive method for conducting international relations, statesmen in the truest sense of the word, and a youth within the Ummah possessing a unique intellectual framework capable of advancing the state domestically and externally and solving every challenge it faces swiftly according to the Islamic perspective alone then Islamic life will once again return to the lands of the Ummah. The affairs of the people will be managed according to what the Lord of mankind has commanded, the earth will bring forth its blessings, and the heavens will pour down their abundance, in fulfillment of the saying of Allah ﷻ Who said, ﴿وَأَنْ لَّوِ اسْتَقَامُوا عَلَى الطَّرِيقَةِ لَأَسْقَيْنَهُمْ مَاءً غَدَقًا﴾ **“Had the deniers followed the Right Way, We would have certainly granted them abundant rain to drink.”** [TMQ Surah Al-Jinn 16].

Sinai: Between Formal Independence and Strategic Subjugation

By: Ustadh Saeed Fadhl



The 44th anniversary of the liberation of Sinai arrives as Egypt stands at a historic crossroads, not only due to crippling economic crises, but also because it is at the heart of a geopolitical storm reshaping the region with blood and fire. President El-Sisi's recent speech represents the culmination of the contradiction between the language of independence and the reality of subservience. This necessitates an analytical reading that reconnects the present with the past to expose the falsehood of the path the state has followed since signing the peace agreements with the occupying Jewish entity.

Over four decades, Egyptian presidential discourse has evolved from the language of diplomatic victory to that of existential anxiety. During Mubarak's era, the rhetoric was celebratory,

focusing on the return of Taba and legal autonomy, as if reclaiming a piece of sand were the ultimate goal. Meanwhile, Sinai was effectively being transformed into a demilitarized buffer zone in large parts, making it hostage to security arrangements that served the occupation's security more than Egypt's sovereignty! With the transfer of power, the core of the discourse remained constant: clinging to "peace" as the sole strategic option. This has gradually eroded Egypt's power and transformed the state from a regional leader into a mediator seeking appeasement at any cost!

When we reach the final part of the speech, we find a pivotal passage that should give pause to any discerning observer. El-Sisi indicated that the Middle East is going through a delicate and fateful period, witnessing deliberate attempts to redraw its map under the guise of extremist ideologies. This acknowledgment of a plan to redraw the map is a clear admission of the failure of the national security regimen, which was based on the premise that peace would protect the borders. The astonishing paradox here is that the speech, despite analyzing the processes of occupation, destruction, and bloodshed, did not dare to mention the Jewish entity by name, contenting itself with alluding to it through vague descriptions! This verbal inadequacy is not merely diplomatic caution; it is an admission of the limits of power and an indication that the independence being celebrated is an independence of compromised will, unable even to openly name its existential enemy that threatens its eastern borders!

The conclusions we draw from tracing this trajectory confirm that the geographical return of Sinai was nothing more than a smokescreen to conceal the reality of political and economic surrender. Land has been traded for independence, and Egypt,

which once boasted of its regional ambitions and Arab nationalism, has become a hostage to aid, debt, and crippling agreements. True independence is not merely raising a flag over a piece of land; it is possessing the power to decide on war and peace, and developing the deterrent force that prevents others from even contemplating redrawing the map of the Muslim World. What is happening today in Gaza, and the direct threat to Egyptian national security along the Philadelphi Corridor, is the natural consequence of the policy of subservience and appeasement that the state has pursued for decades, under the illusion that adhering to treaties would bring stability. Meanwhile, the Jewish entity has been using this time to consolidate its settlement project and dismantle the surrounding states one by one.

Herein lies the fundamental question: What is the way out of this dark tunnel? The radical solution does not lie in improving the terms of dependency or changing the tone of the rhetoric, but instead in changing the very foundation upon which the state and the entire region are built. The crisis is not a lack of resources or a geographical advantage, but instead the absence of a civilizational project that draws its strength from the Ummah's Aqeedah (creed) and its Islamic identity. The solution begins with acknowledging that the treacherous path that began with Camp David has led to a dead end, and that the only remedy is a radical change of course.

This solution entails abrogating all treaties that shackle the Ummah's decision-making authority, breaking free from dependency on the international order led by imperialist America, and unifying the Ummah's energies under a Khilafah Rashidah (Rightly Guided Caliphate) on the Method of the

Prophethood. This Khilafah possesses the strategic depth, human resources, and capabilities that make it an equal to, and even surpass, the major powers. Only within this framework will Sinai be transformed from a hostage into a launching pad, and nuclear and technological power become an imperative of independence that no one dares to deny, because the Khilafah will then derive its legitimacy and strength from the authority of the Ummah, not from the international order.

Protecting Sinai and Gaza and preventing the redrawing of maps will not be achieved through political solutions and negotiations, which have proven ineffective over the past 44 years. Instead, it requires possessing genuine power that does not surrender its decision-making to foreign powers. Furthermore, the discourse that calls for cooperation and reconstruction with an occupier who is destroying the country and shedding blood is the discourse of someone trying to swim against the overwhelming current of the Ummah, hoping that the West will shield them from it!

Liberating the land without liberating the decision-making will is a larger prison with invisible walls. Sinai today stands as a testament to the impotence of a nation-state bound by humiliating agreements, incapable of protecting its security or supporting its people. Continuing down this path is not merely a political failure, but a gamble with the fate of an entire Ummah before an enemy that has no regard for any covenant or obligation.

Therefore, the burden today does not fall on the shoulders of the shackled preachers and politicians, but instead on the shoulders of the sincere members of the army of Egypt, Al-Kinana. O descendants of Salahudin and Baybars, the remedy for this failed

path lies in your hands, and changing course begins with your courageous decision. We call upon you sincerely, not to seek fleeting power, but to give nussrah (military support) to Hizb ut Tahrir so that it may establish the Khilafah, which will uproot the roots of subservience from our land, put an end to this humiliating subjugation, and lead the Ummah towards true liberation (tahrir), a liberation that will break the chains of Camp David, dismantle the Sykes-Picot borders, and unify the scattered armies under one banner, so that Egypt, and with it the entire Islamic Ummah, may begin its journey in the right direction towards glory and empowerment (tamkeen). History does not forgive the hesitant, and Allah ﷻ supports those who support Him. So, show Allah ﷻ the best of yourselves, and be the Ansaar (supporters) in a time when supporters are scarce.

***Member of the Media Office of Hizb ut Tahrir in Egypt**

Are Europe and America Heading Towards a Separation?

By: Ustadh Ahmed Al-Khatwani



It is clear that the gap between America and Europe has widened politically, economically, and strategically, to an extent not seen since World War II.

The issue between them is not limited to America imposing high tariffs on steel and aluminum imports, which were perceived as sanctions against Europe as if it were a rival or enemy state. Nor is it limited to the high prices of American energy supplies, which Europe increasingly imports from America after the war in Ukraine, which cut off cheap Russian energy supplies.

The confidence of European leaders in America had already been severely shaken, especially after Trump's demands to annex Greenland and Canada. It was shaken again when Trump disregarded them and did not include them in the US-Russian

negotiations on Ukraine. It became clear to them that the Trump administration was leaning towards Russia at the expense of Europe.

These blatant American stances were reflected in European countries, which began seeking new partnerships outside the Atlantic alliance. British Prime Minister Starmer and French President Macron both traveled to China to pursue their interests there, away from the American sphere of influence. This greatly disturbed Trump and his administration, as they were now coordinating with China, America's adversary, without any prior understanding.

For the first time in its history, France withdrew its remaining gold reserves from American coffers. Spain prohibited American aircraft bound for Iran from flying over its airspace, and both Spain and Italy suspended military memoranda of understanding with "Israel." Germany decided to rearm itself independently, moving away from the American security umbrella, and reinstated conscription for able-bodied men for the first time since World War II.

Talk of creating a new European NATO without the US began after Trump repeatedly attacked the alliance, deeming it a burden on America. He threatened to reduce America's contributions if European countries did not increase their defense budgets, prompting Europe to seriously consider its security outside the American umbrella.

Trump's withdrawal from numerous international agreements, most notably the Paris Climate Agreement, which clearly disregarded European security and environmental interests, harmed Europeans significantly. This led European countries to

view the United States under Trump as an unwelcome and imposed partner rather than a reliable and secure ally.

With many indicators suggesting that the Trump administration viewed Europe as an obstacle to the “Make America Great Again” campaign, as envisioned by the MAGA movement supporting Trump, Europeans observed that Trump's policies favored bilateral dealings with Europe rather than engaging with the European Union as a unified bloc. They also noted that the administration supported populist and far-right nationalist parties in individual countries, bypassing the European Union as a whole. These American policies have rapidly pushed Europe toward decoupling from the US, focusing on its own development, and strengthening its defense and industrial capabilities to counter the possibility of America abandoning its protection altogether.

After the Iran war, Trump unleashed his fury on European leaders for not joining him in the war against Iran. He reprimanded them, belittled their countries’ capabilities, and did everything in his power to harm, embarrass, and even humiliate them! Recent reports indicate that the Trump administration is currently reconsidering its historical support for British sovereignty over the Falkland Islands, located off the coast of Argentina. This reconsideration stems from Starmer’s lack of support for a US war with Iran, and the administration is using the Falkland Islands as a political bargaining chip to pressure Britain into joining the conflict. The Argentine government of Javier Milei, closely aligned with the Trump administration, exploited this rift between the US and Britain. On 25 April 2026, Argentina’s foreign minister Pablo Quirno posted on X, “The Argentine Republic once again expresses its willingness to resume bilateral negotiations with the United Kingdom that will allow for finding a peaceful and

definitive solution to the sovereignty dispute and bring an end to the special and particular colonial situation in which they are immersed.” Britain rejected this invitation, stating that its sovereignty over the Falklands is non-negotiable and that the 2013 referendum confirmed the residents’ choice to remain under British rule.

Thus, the Falklands have become a new bargaining chip used by the US in its political disputes with Britain, which was once considered its closest ally. Trump’s policies have created political chaos among allies and a wide rift that will be difficult to bridge. The disagreements between Europeans and America have transcended political and economic issues, extending to the realm of civilization and values. Trump has vehemently attacked European liberal values, focusing on evangelical Christian culture, white supremacy, and declaring a brutal war on immigration in a manner that Europeans cannot tolerate, given their dire need for immigration due to the aging populations plaguing most of their countries.

America’s war on Iran has widened the gap between it and Europe, leading Britain to pursue a policy of closer ties with the European Union, even as it distances itself from the United States. This is especially true given the series of American statements hinting at a break between the two former allies. The most recent of these statements came from US Secretary of Defense Pete Hegseth, who declared that, “What happens five or 10 or 15 years from now is part of a larger discussion that reflects the threat level, America's posture, our needs around the globe, but most significantly, the capability of European countries to step up. And that’s why our message is so stark to our European allies. Now is the time to invest, because you can’t make an

assumption that America's presence will last forever.” This has hastened Europe's consideration of its options beyond the American support it has relied on for the past eighty years, should the US suddenly decide to withdraw its defense shield—a possibility not entirely improbable, particularly given its protracted war of attrition with Russia in Ukraine.

For the past eighty years, European armies have depended on unlimited American support, and replacing that support will be a lengthy process, demanding significant resources and requiring substantial funding.

In an article entitled, “How Europe can defend itself without US help,” published on 19 February 2025, Theo Francken, Belgium’s defence minister, told the Financial Times that the majority of Europe’s key defence systems were from the US. “When we talk about F-35s...when we talk about a ground-to-air missile systems, they’re pretty much all American,” Francken said. When it came to heavy-lift helicopters, the US-made Chinook was the best option, the minister said, adding that a similar aircraft developed by a pan-European consortium, the NH90, was “horrible”.

Europe’s main problem is its lack of unity in crucial decisions. For example, the issue of defending Ukraine against Russia is one where its member states differ significantly, weakening their position considerably. Poland, a frontline state with one of the largest armies in Europe, objected to sending troops to Ukraine. A Polish official stated that Poland simply does not have the additional capacity to send troops to Ukraine, citing Poland’s long border with the Russian exclave of Kaliningrad and with Belarus, a Russian ally, which would need to be reinforced with Polish forces. The military burden of defending Ukraine appears to fall

solely on Britain and France, as they have agreed on the idea. Meanwhile, evading responsibility, German Chancellor Olaf Scholz described, on 17 February 2025, the idea of deploying European peacekeepers as “completely premature and completely the wrong time to have this discussion now” even though the war in Ukraine continues and the need for troops is urgent. In contrast, on 17 February 2025, British Prime Minister Keir Starmer acknowledged that, “The issue of burden sharing is not new, but it is now pressing, and Europeans will have to step up, both in terms of spending and the capabilities that we provide on Ukraine.” Europeans have begun to realize the need for increased defense spending and greater self-reliance. Dutch Prime Minister Dick Choof stated that Europe has understood the message from the United States that it must do more on its own.

This transatlantic rift will undoubtedly signal the approaching shift in the global order in favor of new powers, foremost among them the Islamic State, which, by the Permission of Allah ﷻ, will soon emerge.

The Sudanese Government Manufactures Suffering and Increases Electricity Tariffs by More Than 72%



Without prior announcement, the government—represented by the Electricity Company—has significantly increased electricity prices by more than 72%. The increases included residential consumption as follows:

- The first 100 kilowatts: from 4,000 pounds to 7,000 pounds
- The second 100 kilowatts: from 5,000 pounds to 9,000 pounds
- The third 100 kilowatts: from 6,000 pounds to 11,000 pounds ... and so on

The government's implementation of these large increases in electricity kilowatt prices, which have no justification other than consuming people's wealth unlawfully, increasing their suffering, and showing disregard for the reality in which the vast majority

live—those who have lost much of what they owned due to this cursed war—confirms that this government does not care about the people or their conditions. It carries out this action like thieves who steal from people secretly and in the dark, as it knows there is no justification for these increases; therefore, it imposed them without prior announcement and behind the scenes.

We in Hizb ut Tahrir / Wilayah Sudan, in light of this government's mismanagement, affirm the following:

First: Electricity is considered a necessity of life in this era, and it is part of public ownership, as stated in the saying of the Prophet ﷺ, «النَّاسُ شُرَكَاءُ فِي ثَلَاثٍ: فِي الْمَاءِ، وَالْكَأَمِ، وَالنَّارِ»، **“People are partners in three: water, pasture, and fire.”** The term “fire” in the hadith includes energy. Therefore, the basic principle is that it should be free of charge, or at worst provided at cost price.

Second: It is not permissible in Islam to transfer public ownership into private ownership, as is happening today in the issue of electricity, where it has been privatized in implementation of the orders of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank.

Third: Instead of providing electricity to the citizens free of charge or at its real cost, the government profits from it. Therefore, we see it increasing service prices whenever it faces a budget deficit, so that it and its corrupt inner circle can live in luxury at the expense of impoverishing the people through increased taxes, customs duties, levies, and, last but not least, by raising electricity consumption tariffs.

This government, which before and after the war has had no concern except creating poverty and crushing the poor, and shows neither covenant nor responsibility toward us, is not

worthy of ruling the best Ummah brought forth for mankind—an Ummah whose Prophet ﷺ said, «اللَّهُمَّ مَنْ وَلِيَ مِنْ أَمْرِ أُمَّتِي شَيْئًا فَشَقَّ عَلَيْهِ، وَمَنْ وَلِيَ مِنْ أَمْرِ أُمَّتِي شَيْئًا فَزَوَّجَهُ بِهِمْ فَارْزُقْ بِهِ» “O Allah, whoever takes charge of any matter of my Ummah and makes it difficult for them, make it difficult for him; and whoever takes charge of any matter of my Ummah and is gentle with them, be gentle with him.”

These false, corrupt, and oppressive systems do nothing but impose hardship on people. Therefore, the people of Sudan must work with those who are working to implement Islam by establishing the second Khilafah Rashidah (Rightly Guided Caliphate) on the Method of the Prophethood, which provides care and deals gently with the citizens seeking the pleasure of Allah ﷻ, the Lord of the worlds, not to satisfy usurious institutions of kufr, and which places public ownership in its proper position so that it reflects goodness and blessing upon the lives of the people.

The Voice of Women Used to Shake the World When the Islamic State Was Established

The suffering experienced by women in the West, which claims progress and renaissance, such as domestic violence, sexual harassment, and the burden of balancing work with family life, is among the most prominent challenges faced by women there. This does not even allow space to mention the frightening statistics and numbers reported in police stations regarding the killing of women by partners, rape, and lack of adequate healthcare and economic support.

Women once had a voice that shook the world when the Islamic state existed. It was the law of Allah ﷻ that protected her and made men willing to sacrifice themselves to safeguard her honor. Her voice reached the Khaleefah (Caliph) Al-Mutasim Billah when she was captured by the Romans, prompting him to mobilize an army to rescue her.

O West, enough hypocrisy and deception. Women around the world are now aware of their reality and recognize the corruption of your system. As for the Muslim woman today, she does not look to you, nor does she see in you anything except hostility and enmity toward her, her Deen, and her family. Indeed, you have failed in all your projects, including your so-called project of women's liberation.

The Muslim woman aspires to the revival of her Ummah, a revival based on justice that brings people out of the darkness of your capitalism into the light of Islam under the shade of the Khilafah Rashidah (Rightly Guided Caliphate).