

# Europe's Refusal to Participate in America's War on Iran

(Translated)

[Al-Rayah Newspaper - Issue 594 - 08/04/2026](#)

**By: Ustadh Salem Abu Sbetan**

Before delving into the intricacies of the European stance refusing to join America in its war on Iran, it is necessary to look back a little, to understand the situation through the lens of the "Trump doctrine," which has reshaped the concept of American foreign policy. President Trump's statements were not mere campaign slogans, but instead sharp messages to both rivals and allies. Unbridled desires for economic and geographical domination surfaced, ranging from hinting at acquiring Gaza to transform it into major entertainment and economic projects, to unprecedented ideas of annexing Canada as the fifty-first American state, or purchasing Greenland.

These ambitions were not simply about geographical expansion, but instead a blow to the very heart of European sovereignty, given that Canada and Greenland are administratively and geopolitically tied to the European sphere of influence. This was accompanied by explicit threats to withdraw from NATO, within which Europe is considered the sole beneficiary, while exorbitant sums were imposed on Ukraine in exchange for military support, or for controlling its Rare Earth Elements (REEs). This approach, based on economic blackmail and the imposition of tariffs exceeding 200%, generated contempt and resentment among world leaders, especially traditional allies like Britain, who found themselves facing an administration behaving with unprecedented arrogance, while the Jewish entity became the favored child, whose demands were met without question.

American arrogance under Trump reached unprecedented levels in history, transforming the state into something resembling a transnational corporation that sets global codes of conduct, in isolation from international law and diplomatic norms, thus dismantling the international order established after World War II. Following the 700-day war in Gaza, Trump announced the establishment of a global "Board of Peace" as a replacement for the United Nations and its Security Council, claiming that these institutions had outlived their historical purpose.

However, Trump didn't stop there. The hegemony extended to an extreme version of the Monroe Doctrine, prohibiting any international intervention in the affairs of the Americas, from across the Atlantic. This manifested itself in the blockade of Venezuela, the persecution of its president, Maduro, and the complete control of Venezuelan oil flows. These actions paved the way for a major offensive in the Middle East: an attack on Iran.

The American plan was based on the "four-day" strategy: a lightning attack that would eliminate the top-tier leadership, including the Supreme Leader, with the aim of forcing Iran to surrender within 96 hours. The objective was to achieve the "America First" goal by seizing control of the Middle East, with its vast reserves of oil, gas, and Rare Earth Elements (REEs), and by controlling the straits and waterways that govern the lifeblood of global trade. American success in this would have meant fulfilling the prediction of Henry Kissinger and Zbigniew Brzezinski, that whoever controls the Middle East controls the world and becomes the sole leader without rival. However, even meticulously planned and executed strategies, practiced for decades, can overlook unforeseen aspects, due to the arrogance of possessing overwhelming power. America adopted a preemptive strike strategy to destabilize and paralyze its adversary, but Iran did not succumb to the initial attack. Instead, it launched a

swift and powerful response, using ballistic and hypersonic missiles, crippling American bases and rendering many inoperable. It also inflicted immense damage and destruction upon the Jewish entity, America's favored ally.

Here we ask: Why did Europe refuse to participate in this war? European capitals, along with Beijing and Moscow, understand that America's success in achieving absolute control over the Middle East would permanently place Europe under American influence. These countries felt compelled to break free from blind subservience, with broad-spectrum alliances, that had brought them nothing but losses.

Europe invoked the NATO treaty, which stipulates collective defense in the event of an attack on one of its members, a provision not applicable to the initial attack launched by the US and Jewish entity against Iran. Indeed, European intelligence reports confirmed that Iran did not pose a direct existential threat warranting a full-scale war. Adding to European resentment was America's abandonment of them in the Ukrainian crisis, where Europe was left to bear the exorbitant costs of the war. Furthermore, America exploited the disruption of Russian gas supplies, which it had helped to destroy, to sell American gas to Europeans at exorbitant prices.

As a result, an undeclared alliance emerged among the other major powers, Europe, Russia, and China, to prevent American unilateralism. This alliance was not driven by any affection for Iran, but instead by a desire to make America bear the bitter consequences of its decisions alone. Nevertheless, a complex geopolitical reality exists: these powers do not want America to collapse completely, or suffer a crushing defeat that would lead to its demise, as this would cause a massive political and security vacuum, that no existing power could fill.

Europe fears that a crushing defeat for America would lead to its retreat within its geographical borders, leaving the world, and the Middle East in particular, in a state of creative chaos and the law of the jungle, where the world's policeman is absent before a viable alternative emerges to maintain order. They want an America that is a partner, not a hegemonic power; an active state that respects collective interests, not a private corporation that plunders resources.

Iran's resilience and America's declining prestige in the eyes of the world have revealed a long-hidden truth: that the power once perceived as an invincible force is, in reality, a power that can be broken by unwavering resolve. This situation places the Islamic Ummah before its historical responsibility. The geopolitical vacuum left by the competing powers, and the inability of the major players, Europe, Russia, and China, to offer an alternative project that achieves justice, opens the door for the ideological Islamic project.

This is a golden opportunity to bring forth an exemplary state, based on divine justice, untainted by narrow self-interest, to serve as the alternative in a world teetering between the arrogance of power, and the chaos of competing interests. History establishes that thrones built on injustice eventually fall, and that the promised victory (nasr) is linked to the extent to which the Ummah adheres to its original project, in accordance with the saying, of Allah (swt) Who said, ﴿إِنْ تَنْصُرُوا اللَّهَ يَنْصُرْكُمْ وَيُثَبِّتْ أَقْدَامَكُمْ﴾ **“If you support Allah, He will support you and make your feet firm”** [TMQ Surah Muhammad: 7].