



Ar-Rayah Newspaper

Issue 606 (1 July 2026)

(Translated from Arabic)

[Editorial: Mobilizing America's Regional Allies Page 2](#)

[Feature Article: Question and Answer: The Current Reality in Iran and the Renewed Strikes Between It and America Page 6](#)

[America's Trap for the Integration of Afghanistan into the Secular Global Order Page 21](#)

[Changes in the Media Office of Hizb ut Tahrir / Wilayah Syria Page 24](#)

[Political Perspectives: China: The Absent Presence at the G7 Summit in France Page 25](#)

[The Sudanese Government's Economic Policies Page 30](#)

[The Rulers of the West Never Cease to Bring Out the Rancor of their Hearts Page 35](#)

[The Situation in Sudan and the Siege of El Obeid Page 37](#)

[Will Maghreb Trilateral Coordination Withstand Colonialist-Style Security Approaches? Page 42](#)

[The Arab League Must be Buried in a Deep Valley Page 46](#)

The Islamic Ummah falls ill when it distances itself from its mission and neglects its Shariah obligation. Yet it swiftly regains its vitality once it recognizes the path to its salvation from the misery of Western civilization. It then returns to being the best Ummah brought forth for humanity, ascending once again to the heights of glory and rising anew, in fulfillment of Allah's promise of succession in authority, empowerment, and security. Allah ﷻ said, ﴿وَعَدَ اللَّهُ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا مِنكُمْ وَعَمِلُوا الصَّالِحَاتِ لَيَسْتَخْلِفَنَّهُمْ فِي الْأَرْضِ كَمَا اسْتَخْلَفَ الَّذِينَ مِن قَبْلِهِمْ وَلَيُمَكِّنَنَّ لَهُمْ دِينَهُمُ الَّذِي ارْتَضَىٰ لَهُمْ وَلَيُبَدِّلَنَّهُم مِّن بَعْدِ خَوْفِهِمْ أَمْنًا﴾ "Allah has promised those among you who believe and do righteous deeds that He will surely grant them succession in authority in the land as He granted it to those before them; that He will surely empower their Deen for them, which He has chosen for them; and that He will surely replace their fear with security" [TMQ Surah An-Nur:55].

Mobilizing America's Regional Allies

By: Ustadh Saeed Fadl*

Despite America's failure to achieve the objectives of the war it launched against Iran—and the exposure of its flaws and inability to realize the goals of its aggression—its agents and followers in the region have not taken this well. Consequently, they have known no sleep since the outbreak of America's war on Iran some four months ago. They are striving to secure a victory for their master, Trump, or at the very least, to help him extricate himself from his predicament while saving face.

It was within this context of shared concern that the fourth consultative meeting of the foreign ministers of Egypt, Turkey, Saudi Arabia, and Pakistan was held in Cairo on June 21, 2026. The meeting took place within the framework of a “quadrilateral coordination mechanism” that had been taking shape over the preceding months against the backdrop of regional tensions—specifically the Iran issue. The meeting served as a platform for exchanging views on regional and international developments, while reaffirming the commitment to ongoing consultation and coordination among the four states in support of peace, security, stability, and prosperity across the Middle East and the wider region. Unlike the gatherings of “agent states” convened to discuss issues of national concern—meetings that typically amount to a squandering of the wealth of Muslims and a waste of time for both participants and observers—this meeting was not limited to a mere ceremonial event. Instead, it was directly linked to an attempt to formulate a regional stance regarding the US-Iran rapprochement, while also considering the potential

repercussions for the security of the Gulf and Ash-Sham, as well as for energy, shipping lanes, and international supply chains. Furthermore, diplomatic reports indicated that the “Cairo Quartet” discussed the possibility of expanding this mechanism beyond the Iran issue, aiming to transform it into a more institutionalized and enduring framework.

According to an official statement from the Turkish Foreign Ministry, the meeting was held in Cairo at Egypt’s invitation. The statement noted that the gathering provided an opportunity for an in-depth exchange of views on regional and international developments and reaffirmed the importance of continued consultation and coordination among the four states. Arab media coverage added that discussions extended beyond the Iran issue to include the war on Gaza, the situations in Sudan and Libya, and developments in the Horn of Africa. Nevertheless, the Iran issue remained at the top of the agenda due to its direct link to US-Iran negotiations and the Memorandum of Understanding signed in Islamabad. These reports also suggest that the meeting coincided with broader diplomatic maneuvers aimed at supporting a negotiation track through which the US could achieve objectives it had failed to secure militarily against Iran, while also drawing the country further into the US project for a “New Middle East” and the Abraham Accords—thereby paving the way for normalization with the Jewish entity. Since America’s agents in Pakistan acted as the architects who lured Iran into the trap of negotiations, the joint statement explicitly welcomed the signing of the Islamabad Memorandum of Understanding between the US and Iran on June 18, 2026. It hailed the move as a constructive step toward de-escalation and ending a conflict that posed significant risks to regional security and stability—risks that primarily threatened colonialist powers in the region, led by the

US, as well as global energy markets, maritime corridors, supply chains, and international trade. Indeed, the economic impact on these colonialist powers far outweighed the impact on the states of the region—states ruled by thieves who have no intention of alleviating the people’s suffering caused by the crisis. Instead, their only “solutions” have been to raise taxes, fees, and commodity prices, citing rising global oil costs. Furthermore, these thieving agents emphasized the importance of swiftly and successfully advancing to the next stage of negotiations to empower their American masters, bring the “new Iran” under the US fold, and prevent it from breaking free of the American orbit.

Driven by America’s fear of regional rebellion—especially given how the Iranian example had emboldened those seeking liberation from Western, and specifically American, hegemony—the ministers, acting under US direction, conditioned their support for the negotiation process on addressing the security concerns of regional states, particularly regarding the security of the Arabian Gulf and Ash-Sham. This phrasing reveals that the official stance of the four states is not merely to endorse any US-Iran agreement, but instead to support a deal contingent upon Iran’s genuine capitulation to the US—ensuring that the agreement does not revive a pattern of bilateral understandings that bypass American interests. Since the meeting was not a consultation between genuine rulers—but instead between agents performing a service for their master, America—it did not yield publicly announced executive decisions in the strict institutional sense. However, it did produce a set of clear political outcomes that reflect the meeting’s true nature, motivation, and objective. The first of these outcomes is the consolidation of the quartet’s support for the US-Iran Memorandum of Understanding as a foundation for preserving America’s presence in the region

and serving its interests and hegemony. The second is an explicit call to accelerate subsequent negotiations toward a final settlement that would enable America to impose its will on Iran. The third is the entrenchment of the principle that security considerations regarding America's influence over regional states must be factored into any final agreement. Furthermore, diplomatic sources indicated discussions about transforming this Cairo Quartet coordination into a broader mechanism that could extend to other issues, such as Palestine and Sudan. If these details prove accurate, the meeting represents not merely a momentary stopover, but a building block for a conspiratorial Cairo Quartet forum aiming to play a broader, treacherous regional role in implementation of America's plans and projects across Muslim lands.

The Cairo Quartet meeting suggests a growing regional consensus favoring a negotiated settlement with Iran over a military conflagration. However, this consensus remains conditional and fraught with clear reservations regarding the imposition of American hegemony over the Gulf and Ash-Sham, as well as the future of regional security arrangements from an American perspective.

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

Question and Answer: The Current Reality in Iran and the Renewed Strikes Between It and America

Question:

[With the exchange of strikes between America and Iran for the second time in two days, the Revolutionary Guard (IRGC) stated in a statement today, Sunday, that (the violation of the ceasefire by the United States contravenes Article 1 of the Memorandum of Understanding signed on June 18th between Trump and Masoud Pezeshkian). In response, Trump threatened a return to war, writing in a post on his Truth Social platform earlier today: "There may come a point when we are no longer able to be reasonable, and will be forced to militarily complete the job that we very successfully started..." The US military announced on Saturday night that it had carried out airstrikes on targets on Qeshm Island, hours after Iran targeted an oil tanker in the Strait of Hormuz... [Al-Arabiya.net, 28/6/2026]. Trump, along with his crony Netanyahu, had launched an attack on Iran on 28/2/2026, during which the Supreme Leader and about forty senior officials were killed, and significant damage was inflicted. Despite this, Iran signed a memorandum of understanding with Trump on 18/6/2026, to establish peace between them, as if the bloodshed and destruction had never occurred! As for the rest of the Muslims, whether near or far from Iran, they watch what is happening as if they are neutral parties between Iran and America, or rather, closer to America! How long will Muslims remain divided, buffeted by the winds of the kafir (disbelieving)

colonizers, after they were once the masters of the world, spreading light and justice?

I ask you for an answer that clarifies the reality of these events. And how can this Ummah return to being alive and dignified? Thank you.

Answer:

To answer the questions above, we will review the reality of events and the return of the Ummah, alive and dignified. And Allah is the One from whom help is sought:

First: The Reality of Events:

1- On 17/6/2026, Bloomberg published a draft of the 14-point memorandum of understanding (MoU) between the United States and Iran. Its content was identical to what the semi-official Iranian news agency Mehr reported on 14/6/2026, citing a source close to the Iranian negotiating team. Then came the unexpected signing of the memorandum suddenly between Iranian President Masoud Pezeshkian and his American counterpart, Trump, at the Palace of Versailles in France on the sidelines of the G7 Summit on 18/6/2026. Although the signing was scheduled to take place in Switzerland, the tyrant Trump wanted to remind Muslims of the Treaty of Versailles after World War I, which led to the demise of the Khilafah (Caliphate), the state of the Muslims, and shattered their unity. It is as if, by choosing the Palace of Versailles, which previously altered the course of history by abolishing the Khilafah, Trump is trying to market himself as a leader who makes history in the footsteps of his predecessors! And so, the memorandum was signed remotely, electronically, at the Palace of Versailles, under the supervision of the mediator between the two parties, Pakistani Prime Minister Shehbaz

Sharif. Thus, it was declared to have officially entered into force. This took place between America and Iran, despite the fact that America, along with its “crony Netanyahu”, had launched a surprise military operation at the end of last February targeting the regime's top political and military leaders, most notably the Supreme Leader, the ultimate decision-maker. The war was initially planned to last four days, but it lasted for forty days, failing to achieve its objective of overthrowing the current regime or installing agent leaders to transform Iran from a state orbiting America into an agent state. Iran's 47 years of orbiting America had emboldened America to seek to make it an agent (subordinate) state, especially as America began to push it out of areas where it had previously been permitted to operate in, such as Syria, Iraq, Lebanon, and Yemen.

However, this situation led some in Iran to consider independence from the regime. The Revolutionary Guard (IRGC) played a significant role in this, as we explained in our “Answer to a Question” issued on 3/6/2026 We stated: (...as happened in Venezuela when US forces kidnapped its president, and his vice president and her entourage surrendered to America. However, this did not happen in Iran after the assassination of its Supreme Leader, Ali Khamenei, and some of the regime's leaders. The Revolutionary Guard stood firm and decided to confront this aggression and attack the enemies... seeking independence from America, unlike the political faction, which desires to engage with America and work with it as a satellite state, at least, rather than a subordinate state...). The Revolutionary Guard's steadfastness, strength, and influence stemmed from its prior involvement in selecting the new Supreme Leader, Mojtaba. He supported them and relied on them to maintain his rule. He did not approve of the memorandum of understanding and peace with the US after

they assassinated his father, the previous Supreme Leader, and a number of officials.

2- However, this changed after the political leadership in Iran (the President, the Speaker of Parliament, and the Foreign Minister) managed to convince the Supreme Leader that the Memorandum of Understanding was in Iran's best interest. The President exerted considerable effort in this regard, and subsequently, the Supreme Leader's written approval was published on the X platform and other social media pages on 18/6/2026. In it, he stated: "I, as a matter of principle, held a different view; however, out of the commitment that the esteemed president—as the head of the Supreme National Security Council—gave to me on his own behalf and on behalf of the other members regarding the safeguarding of the rights of the Iranian nation and the Resistance Front, and his explicit acceptance of that responsibility, I granted my permission." It was as if he was holding the president of his country and other officials accountable for any negative consequences for Iran resulting from the agreement. Thus, the Memorandum was signed, and Iranian President Masoud Pezeshkian declared on the X platform on 18/6/2026, following the signing: " This is a historical document and a message from a powerful Iran: Peace will be realized in the shadow of mutual respect. The Islamic Republic of Iran has always been committed and steadfast to global peace while preserving its dignity and independence, as well as to progress and regional cooperation."

The Revolutionary Guard's voice then fell silent in obedience to the Supreme Leader. Iranian parliament member Mohammad Manan Raisi revealed the Supreme Leader's position at a gathering of his supporters, declaring his opposition to the

memorandum: (Supreme Leader Mojtaba Khamenei asked the members of the Supreme National Security Council to respond to these questions 'related to the memorandum of understanding' separately, and unusually, he stipulated the approval of 75% of its members for the memorandum to be ratified. Only one member of the National Security Council opposed it, while the rest voted in favor. It cannot be said that the Supreme Leader accepted the agreement with complete satisfaction, but he cannot be considered opposed to it either (Iran International, 18/6/2026)).

Their approval, with one exception, of the memorandum of understanding and their readiness to sign a final agreement with America indicate that this paves the way for their country's return to its former status as a satellite state, unlike the previous opinion of the Revolutionary Guard advocating for independence!3- Thus, the political wing gained the upper hand whose ultimate goal was for Iran to return to its former orbit within America's sphere of influence, like Turkey, rather than becoming an agent state like Egypt, Syria, and other regional countries. Consequently, the political wing of the government took the lead in events and negotiations, while the Revolutionary Guard retreated somewhat. I say somewhat because the IRGC's influence hasn't been completely extinguished; it remains at odds with the political faction. For example, Iranian television announced on Friday the establishment of a communication line with the US regarding the Strait of Hormuz. (Al-Arabiya, 26/6/2026). However, the Revolutionary Guard denied this: (Revolutionary Guard spokesman Hossein Mohebbi denied on Friday evening what he described as claims by US officials about the establishment of a hotline between Iran and the United States concerning the Strait of Hormuz, asserting that it was pure

fabrication. Earlier on Friday, Press TV had reported the establishment of a communication line between Iran and the United States regarding the Strait of Hormuz. (Al-Araby Al-Jadeed, 26/6/2026)). Furthermore, the Revolutionary Guard responded to US attacks on Iran's eastern coast: (Sepah News published a statement from the Revolutionary Guard: "The United States had launched an attack on Iranian coasts, prompting a response in which the Revolutionary Guard Navy bombed US military positions in the region. The statement accused Washington of violating its commitments under the memorandum of understanding signed between the two parties." (Al Jazeera, 26/6/2026).

4- Signing the Memorandum of Understanding meant Iran's acceptance of a permanent ceasefire with its aggressors and its pledge not to fight them. The first clause of the Memorandum of Understanding states that they will "declare the immediate and permanent termination of military operations on all fronts, including in Lebanon, and undertake from now on not to initiate any war or any military operation against each other, and to refrain from the threat or use of force against each other..." This means that Iran has abandoned its resistance against America, which attacked it, killed its senior leaders, and destroyed its nuclear and vital facilities. Although the second clause stipulates non-interference in internal affairs, the other clauses of the agreement contradict this. For example, Article 8 of the Memorandum of Understanding between the United States and Iran states: [The Islamic Republic of Iran reaffirms that it shall not procure or develop nuclear weapons. The United States of America and the Islamic Republic of Iran have agreed to resolve the disposition of stockpiled enriched material, pursuant to a mechanism that will be mutually agreed upon... (Al-Sharq,

18/6/2026)]. Sky News reported on 24/6/2026: [US President Donald Trump said on Tuesday that Iran would not be allowed to possess nuclear weapons, indicating that Iran was not in a good position to negotiate while its military and capabilities were being destroyed. Trump added that nuclear inspectors would be on the ground in Iran in due course]. Simply stating this constitutes interference.

Furthermore, Article 6 provides America with an avenue to interfere in Iran's affairs, as it stipulates that "The United States of America undertakes with regional partners to develop a definitive, mutually agreed plan with at least \$300 billion for the reconstruction and economic development of the Islamic Republic of Iran. The mechanism for the implementation of this plan will be finalized as part of a final deal within 60 days." This is not only an avenue for interference, but something even worse!

5- Despite all this, the agreement is manipulated with terms. On one hand, it could be interpreted as serving Iran's interests, while on the other, it could be interpreted as serving America's interests. In other words, it is fraught with problems, and its sixty-day timeframe may not be sufficient to resolve them, leading to an extension. This includes issues such as lifting the embargo and opening the Strait of Hormuz.

[Iran warned against what it considered "vague arrangements" regarding passage through the Strait of Hormuz, given its status as a littoral state... (Sky News, 26/6/2026)]. This ambiguity was further highlighted in the clashes between Iran and America today: The Revolutionary Guard stated in a statement on Sunday that "the US violation of the ceasefire contravenes Article 1 of the Memorandum of Understanding and will lead to a complete halt in the negotiation process. It also claimed that the

arrangements necessary to control navigation in the Strait of Hormuz are in Iran's hands, according to the Memorandum of Understanding signed on June 18 between Trump and Masoud Pezeshkian” (Al-Arabiya.net, 28/6/2026)). **The memorandum also stipulate** that (The United States of America further undertakes to remove its forces from the proximity of the Islamic Republic of Iran within 30 days after the final deal). It should be noted that Iran had previously demanded the withdrawal of US forces from the entire region, and for America to release \$12 billion of frozen Iranian funds on the condition that they be used to purchase American agricultural and food products! Trump's Vice President, Vance, told reporters at a press conference on Monday that “the released frozen Iranian assets would be allocated to "buy American soy, American corn, and American wheat for the benefit of the Iranian people" (Al-Arabiya, 25/6/2026)). Iran has denied this. Ghalibaf asserted on Thursday (that the US claim that Tehran would use the unfrozen assets to purchase American agricultural products was false. (Al-Arabiya, 25/6/2026)). Then came the final agreement's ratification by the UN Security Council! One side interprets this as Iran's inability to renege on its commitment, while another sees it as a guarantee of US adherence, as if it weren't in its interest! Furthermore, Reuters reported on 18/6/2026, citing an informed source, that a reconstruction and development fund, stipulated in the memorandum of understanding, exists. The report stated that "the fund's objective is to create an economic incentive to reach a final agreement between Tehran and Washington, and this fund will only be established upon the signing of the final agreement." This is a deceptive ploy to entice Iran to continue negotiations until the final agreement is signed, while awaiting a

fund that will do more harm than good! All these are ambiguous and vaguely worded clauses!

6- Trump realizes that he has failed to achieve his objectives through military action and has been shocked by the resistance of the Revolutionary Guard to his aggression. Reality is now putting pressure on Trump, who has lost much in this war he launched. His prestige has plummeted, and trust in him has weakened worldwide, even within the United States and among his own party and supporters. This will undoubtedly affect the midterm congressional elections in November and subsequently the general elections two years later. Articles 4 and 5 of the Memorandum of Understanding, which pertain to the Strait of Hormuz, are indirectly linked to the US midterm congressional elections. As is well known, Iran's closure of the Strait of Hormuz and the US imposition of a naval blockade on it—a waterway through which one-fifth of the world's oil and liquefied natural gas passes—have paralyzed maritime traffic, resulting in a sharp rise in fuel and gas prices, which has naturally been followed by a parallel increase in food prices.

This automatically impacts the midterm elections, which is why Trump was keen to sign the agreement with Iran to restore traffic flow through the Strait of Hormuz. Reopening the Strait would quickly lower global oil prices. Thus, Trump found his opportunity in negotiations and the Memorandum of Understanding to land a negotiated victory he couldn't achieve through military aggression! When the Revolutionary Guard stood against him with its heroic resistance, he found refuge within the political establishment (the President, the Speaker of Parliament, and the Foreign Minister). These figures played a major role in persuading the Supreme Leader to accept the negotiations and the

Memorandum of Understanding, thereby silencing the Revolutionary Guard. America's eagerness to reach an agreement with Iran is underscored by Article 3, which states: "The United States of America and the Islamic Republic of Iran commit to negotiating and achieving the final deal in maximum 60 days, extendable with mutual consent." Even if an extension is required! After America failed with the military option to change the regime into a subordinate state, it showed a strong desire to negotiate and reach a final agreement and accepted its return to being a satellite state as it was, after voices emerged calling for complete independence from America, especially from the Revolutionary Guard. Trump considered this a victory and the political wing, especially the president, facilitated it for him! Iran's readiness to negotiate and then sign a final agreement, with its view that America did not achieve its goals towards it through war, means its return to square one as a satellite state.

7- After that, following the signing of the agreement, Trump attempted to improve relations with Iran and Muslims in general. On the one hand, Trump mentioned in an interview with the American news website Axios on 19/6/2026, "...and I sadly hurt the other Ayatollah This came after the Supreme Leader's approval of the memorandum of understanding, as if he were thanking him. On the other hand, he pretended to be pressuring the Jewish entity while they were acting at his behest in their wars and peace negotiations! Trump publicly rebuked Netanyahu, stating in Evian, France, at a press conference on the sidelines of the G7 summit on 16/6/2026: "I'm not happy with the way 'Israel' is handling themselves with Lebanon...Bibi has to be more responsible with respect to Lebanon... Without me there would be no Israel..." (Al Jazeera,16/6/2026). His deputy, Vance, said at a press conference: (If I was in the cabinet of the 'Israeli'

government, I might not be attacking the only powerful ally that I have anywhere left in the entire world... Two-thirds of the defensive weapons that have protected your homeland have been built by American hands and paid for by American tax dollars" (New York Times, 18/6/2026)).

Trump and his deputy's statement would be true if they were being honest, but how can it be when the Jewish entity only acts with America's backing in its aggression against Palestine, Lebanon, and everywhere else?! The Jewish entity is too insignificant to be considered on its own, as Allah ﷻ says: ﴿لَنْ يَضُرُّوكُمْ إِلَّا أَذًى وَإِنْ يُقَاتِلُوكُمْ يُؤَلُّوكُمُ الْأَدْبَارَ ثُمَّ لَا يُنصَرُونَ﴾ **"They can never inflict harm on you, except a little annoyance. But if they meet you in battle, they will flee and they will have no helpers"** [Aal-i-Imran: 111]. The Jewish entity has no inherent strength except through divine support and human backing. They severed their connection with Allah since the time of their prophets, leaving them with only human support! America supports them in their aggression against Lebanon and what they call the buffer zone. Trump is behind their aggression and the continued existence of their entity, as evidenced by his statements mentioned earlier. May Allah ﷻ fight them! How they are deluded! They still occupy parts of Lebanon and bombard Lebanese areas with American weapons, justified by American claims of self-defense!

8- This is the reality of events in brief, and Trump should not have been given through negotiations what he could not take through war, especially since Iran is not a small or weak country. It has the power to withstand a long war, defeat America, and expel it from the region in humiliation, just as it was expelled from Afghanistan in 2021. Then it will finally become independent in its policies, neither remaining a satellite state nor falling to the level of a

client state. With a vast land area of 1.6 million square kilometers, diverse terrain including mountains, deserts, valleys, and a coastline, a population of approximately 90 million, and strategic importance, Iran possesses borders with numerous countries, providing access points against any potential blockade. It has energy resources such as oil and gas, as well as other natural resources, and the capacity to provide for its own food supply thanks to its ample arable land. It also has military industries capable of producing weapons for self-defense, such as long-range missiles and drones, all of which can be further developed, along with civilian industries. Indeed, Iran has nuclear capabilities. When Trump withdrew from the 2015 nuclear agreement in 2018, Iran was able to enrich uranium to approximately 60%, reaching around 440 kg, a significant increase from the 3.67% limit stipulated in the 2015 agreement.

Therefore, signing a memorandum of understanding and then beginning negotiations to finalize its terms is a major concession! It saves America, which lost the battle and became embroiled in a war that lasted over four months. However, the Iranian political leadership lacked genuine will and principled resolve, they even stood against the Revolutionary Guard when it sought independence from American influence and was prepared to sacrifice itself to repel American aggression and its crony, the Jewish entity. Instead, the president of the republic signed the memorandum, granting Trump what he couldn't achieve through war!

Secondly: As for how the Muslim Ummah will return to being alive and honorable after this humiliation in which it lives, the matter is not unknown, but it is written in the Book of Allah, Al-Qawi Al Aziz, and in the Sunnah of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, the

truthful and trustworthy; a Khilafah for the Muslims that rules them according to what Allah ﷻ has revealed. ﴿وَأَن أَحْكُمَ بَيْنَهُمْ بِمَا أَنزَلَ اللَّهُ وَلَا تَتَّبِعْ أَهْوَاءَهُمْ وَاحْذَرْهُمْ أَنْ يَفْتِنُوكَ عَنْ بَعْضِ مَا أَنزَلَ اللَّهُ إِلَيْكَ فَإِنْ تَوَلَّوْا فَاعْلَمْ أَنَّمَا يُرِيدُ اللَّهُ أَنْ يُصِيبَهُمْ بِبَعْضِ ذُنُوبِهِمْ وَإِنَّ كَثِيرًا مِّنَ النَّاسِ لَفَاسِقُونَ﴾ **“And judge between them ‘O Prophet’ by what Allah has revealed, and do not follow their desires. And beware, so they do not lure you away from some of what Allah has revealed to you. If they turn away ‘from Allah’s judgment’, then know that it is Allah’s Will to repay them for some of their sins, and that many people are indeed rebellious”** [Al-Ma’idah: 49]. And a Caliph who will fight with them in the cause of Allah; narrated by Muslim, on the authority of Abu Hurairah, on the authority of the Prophet ﷺ, that He ﷺ said, «إِنَّمَا الْإِمَامُ جُنَّةٌ يُقَاتَلُ مِنْ وَرَائِهِ وَيُتَّقَى بِهِ» **“The Imam is but a shield behind whom people fight and by whom they are protected.”**

Long centuries spoke of the greatness of the Islamic state, the Khilafah Rashidah (Rightly-Guided Caliphate), and the pride and justice of the Muslims. They supported Allah ﷻ by ruling according to what He ﷻ revealed, and He ﷻ supported them. When their state was destroyed by the conspiracies of the kafir colonizers and their agents in Muslim countries, the Muslims became humiliated, disgraced, and lived in miserable conditions. ﴿وَمَنْ أَعْرَضَ عَن ذِكْرِي فَإِنَّ لَهُ مَعِيشَةً ضَنْكًا﴾ **“But whoever turns away from My Reminder will certainly have a miserable life”** [Ta-Ha: 124].

But this will not last long, Allah willing, for the Khilafah will return, by Allah's true promise, ﴿وَعَدَ اللَّهُ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا مِنكُمْ وَعَمِلُوا الصَّالِحَاتِ لَيَسْتَخْلِفَنَّهُمْ فِي الْأَرْضِ كَمَا اسْتَخْلَفَ الَّذِينَ مِن قَبْلِهِمْ وَلَيُمَكِّنَنَّ لَهُمْ دِينَهُمُ الَّذِي ارْتَضَى لَهُمْ وَلَيُبَدِّلَنَّهُم مِّن بَعْدِ خَوْفِهِمْ أَمْنًا يَعْبُدُونَنِي لَا يُشْرِكُونَ بِي﴾ **“Allah has promised**

those of you who believe and do good that He will certainly make them successors in the land, as He did with those before them; and will surely establish for them their faith which He has chosen for them; and will indeed change their fear into security—**provided that** they worship Me, associating nothing with Me. But whoever disbelieves after this **promise**, it is they who will be the rebellious” [An-Nur: 55].

And the glad-tiding of His Messenger ﷺ will be rewarded after this coercive ruling in which we live. Ahmad narrated... on the authority of Hudhayfah, who said: The Messenger of Allah ﷺ said, **«ثُمَّ تَكُونُ مُلْكًا جَبْرِيَّةً فَتَكُونُ مَا شَاءَ اللَّهُ أَنْ تَكُونَ، ثُمَّ يَرْفَعَهَا إِذَا شَاءَ أَنْ يَرْفَعَهَا، ثُمَّ تَكُونُ خِلَافَةً عَلَىٰ مِنْهَاجِ النَّبُوءَةِ. ثُمَّ سَكَتَ»** “... Then there will be oppressive rule (ملكاً جبرية) for as long as Allah wills, then he will remove it when He wills, and then there will be Khilafah upon the Prophetic method. Then he ﷺ was silent.” The Khilafah will return, Allah ﷻ willing, and Allah's victory is for those who support His ﷻ Deen - a promise from Allah ﷻ. **﴿وَلَيَنْصُرَنَّ اللَّهُ مَنْ يَنْصُرُهُ إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَقَوِيٌّ عَزِيزٌ﴾** “Allah will certainly help those who stand up for Him. Allah is truly All-Powerful, Almighty” [Al-Hajj: 40].

However, Allah Almighty decreed that victory would not descend upon us from the heavens, carried to us by His angels, and that He would establish a Khilafah for us while we sit idly by. Rather, we must work, strive, and exert ourselves, seeking truthfulness and sincerity in our actions, and we would be reassured by Allah's promise of succession for those who believed and did good deeds. Thus, with these two things: belief and good deeds, **﴿وَعَدَ﴾** “Allah has promised those of you who believe and do good that He will certainly make them successors in the land” [An-Nur: 55].

All of this is evident in the life of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, how He ﷺ acted and how he endured harm... until the victory of Allah ﷻ came to him; Allah granted him victory, and this is the way of Allah ﷻ. ﴿سُنَّةَ اللَّهِ الَّتِي قَدْ خَلَتْ مِنْ قَبْلُ وَلَنْ تَجِدَ لِسُنَّةِ اللَّهِ تَبْدِيلًا﴾. **“This is Allah’s way, already long established in the past. And you will find no change in Allah’s way”** [Al-Fath: 23].

This is how the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, acted, and this is how his Companions (ra) followed his example. This is how we must be, and Allah’s victory will surely come, by His permission, and may it be soon.

This is what will save the Ummah, restore its glory, strengthen its power, and make its enemies think a thousand times before attacking it. This is only possible with 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 Caesars and the Chosroes, so too will it end the arrogance of their followers, such as the tyrant Trump and his ilk among the kafir colonizers.

﴿وَيَوْمَئِذٍ يَفْرَحُ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ * بَنَصْرِ اللَّهِ يَنْصُرُ مَنْ يَشَاءُ وَهُوَ الْعَزِيزُ الرَّحِيمُ﴾ **“And on that day the believers will rejoice * at the victory willed by Allah. He gives victory to whoever He wills. For He is the Almighty, Most Merciful”** [Ar-Rum: 4-5]. ﴿إِنَّ فِي ذَلِكَ لَذِكْرَى لِمَنْ كَانَ لَهُ قَلْبٌ أَوْ أَلْقَى السَّمْعَ وَهُوَ شَهِيدٌ﴾ **“Surely in this is a reminder for whoever has a ‘mindful’ heart and lends an attentive ear.”** [Qaf: 37]

The Thirteenth of Al-Muharram Al-Haram, 1448 AH

28/6/2026 CE

America's Trap for the Integration of Afghanistan into the Secular Global Order



Turkish President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, At the latest meeting of the United Nations Security Council, the United States representative once again stated arrogantly that any step toward normalizing relations between America and Afghanistan depends entirely on the actions and changes in the conduct of Afghanistan's rulers, particularly regarding women's rights and counterterrorism commitments.

Accordingly, a press release issued by the Media Office of Hizb ut Tahrir / Wilayah Afghanistan emphasized the following points:

1. What the West presents under the banner of "counterterrorism" is, in reality, a cover for its struggle against political Islam and its effort to prevent the re-emergence of the unified state of the Khilafah (Caliphate), whose objective is to dismantle colonial national borders and unite the Islamic Ummah.

Seeking America's approval and recognition within the international order is a path that leads to the incomplete implementation of Islam, retreat from Islamic values, and movement away from seeking the pleasure of Allah ﷻ. Ultimately, it prepares the ground for assimilation into Western values and standards.

2. By employing various instruments of pressure, both soft and hard, and through policies of inducement and intimidation, the colonial powers seek gradually to weaken the political will of Afghanistan's rulers to implement the Sharia in its entirety. Alternatively, they seek to convince them that accepting the international order, joining international organizations, engaging with colonial powers, and retreating from the complete implementation of Islam constitute the only possible path to gaining legitimacy, preserving their survival, and continuing to govern.

3. America has presented a new definition of "politics and political astuteness" to the rulers of the Islamic world. According to this definition, the intelligence and success of rulers are measured not by the extent to which they defend the Ummah and Islamic values, but by the degree to which they align themselves with Western interests.

Accordingly, Pakistan's rulers—who believe that they are practicing successful politics by serving America and suppressing their Muslim brothers in Afghanistan—or the rulers of the Gulf States and Türkiye, who safeguard Western interests, are presented as models of "realism" and "political astuteness." America expects the same form of political astuteness and realism from Afghanistan's rulers, so that they place the considerations of the international order and the demands of

Western powers above Sharia-based politics. Meanwhile, Muslim lands such as Gaza are burning in the flames of Western crimes, yet none of these “astute” rulers are genuinely concerned with devising an effective plan to rescue the Muslims.

4. The Sharia-based solution for confronting America’s arrogant global order cannot be achieved through material considerations, gradualism, preserving the nation-state, or pursuing economy-centered policies. The mission of Islam and the Islamic Ummah cannot be fulfilled by joining the global procession of “Pharaoh, Nimrod, and Qarun.” Just as the Messenger of Allah ﷺ established an Islamic order independent of the prevailing world system of his time—one dominated by the two powers of Rome and Persia—we, too, must today build an Islamic world order based on the standards of the Shariah and the Sunnah of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ. This objective can be achieved only through the establishment of the Khilafah Rashidah (Rightly Guided Caliphate) upon the methodology of Prophethood—a promise that will be fulfilled only at the hands of believers who possess complete certainty in the victory granted by Allah ﷻ, who compete with one another to bring it to fruition; and who proceed along this path while placing their trust in Allah ﷻ.

Changes in the Media Office of Hizb ut Tahrir / Wilayah Syria

To the print, visual, and audio media outlets, and to respected media professionals, Greetings,

We inform you that the Head of the Media Office of Hizb ut Tahrir / Wilayah Syria is now Ustadh Ali Mustafa Al-Bakri, effective from 1 Muharram 1448 AH, corresponding to 16/06/2026 CE, with thanks and appreciation extended to Ustadh Ahmad Abdul Wahhab for his efforts and dedication during his years of leadership of the office.

We also inform you that the office accounts and the accounts of its new head on electronic communication platforms are as follows:

- Email of the Head of the Office: alibakri1960.m@gmail.com
- Personal Facebook page of the Head of the Office: <https://www.facebook.com/people/-علي-مصطفى-البكري/61590454397210/>
- Email of the Media Office: syriatahrir44@gmail.com
- Official Facebook page of the Media Office of Hizb ut Tahrir in Wilayah Syria: www.facebook.com/tahrir.s2025

Accordingly, for communication with the Hizb regarding any matter, such as inquiries about any Hizb position, its political opinion concerning current events, arranging media interviews, or similar matters, you may contact the addresses listed above.

We hope that you will obtain information related to the Hizb from our Media Office and not from other media sources.

China: The Absent Presence at the G7 Summit in France

By: Engineer Wissam Al-Atrash

When G7 leaders gathered in France for a three-day summit starting June 15, 2026, China’s seat was empty at the table; yet, China was present in every corner of the hall, in every agenda item, and in most of the concerns Western leaders brought with them to the summit.

The picture appeared strikingly different this time. The G7—established in the 1970s as a club for major industrial economies and a guardian of the Western capitalist order—found itself discussing a non-member state that had become too big to ignore and too powerful to be pigeonholed merely as a traditional rival.

Perhaps the most telling indication of this shift was the virtual meeting convened by French President Macron on June 11, 2026—days before the summit began. It brought together the United States, China, Europe, international financial institutions, most notably the International Monetary Fund, and several invited nations. This was not merely a ceremonial gathering; it was a political and economic acknowledgment that the global system had reached a stage where its imbalances could no longer be addressed without China.

Macron did not speak of a “Chinese problem” requiring containment; instead, he spoke of “global imbalances” necessitating urgent coordination among Europe, the United States, and China. Crucially, he warned that a lack of such coordination could lead to “harsh economic and financial

adjustments” that threaten global stability. Underlying this rhetoric is an unmistakable admission: the West—now in retreat—is no longer capable of managing the global economy on its own. For decades, the G7 was accustomed to setting the rules of the economic game and then demanding that others abide by them. Today, however, one of its prominent leaders is calling on China to participate in reshaping the very balances the West once established. These two contrasting images encapsulate the story of the profound transformation currently reshaping the global capitalist system.

China—which four decades ago was merely a developing economy on the periphery of the global market—has evolved into the “world’s factory,” a central hub for international supply chains, a top trading partner for dozens of nations, and a technological powerhouse challenging the West in fields that were, until recently, its exclusive domain. Consequently, the West’s concern lies not merely in the sheer size of the Chinese economy, but in its rapid pace and trajectory.

Europeans, who for decades welcomed China as a vast market and a source of low-cost labor, have begun to realize that the giant they helped integrate into the global capitalist economy has transformed into a strategic rival threatening their industrial and technological supremacy. This context explains the escalating European rhetoric regarding Chinese electric vehicles, green industries, semiconductors, and an over-reliance on Asian supply chains. Yet, what worries the West even more than Chinese exports is Chinese influence.

A report issued by the Canadian Macdonald–Laurier Institute (MLI)—released just days before G7 leaders convened in Évian, France—indicated that Beijing is pursuing a long-term strategy to

penetrate the G7 sphere through a variety of economic, academic, technological, and cultural channels. The report characterizes this strategy as "systematic, adaptable, and deeply rooted." France warned of this scenario in its media coverage of the report's findings via the France 24 channel. Under this approach, China does not rely on direct confrontation with the West; instead, it pursues gradual infiltration into Western economic, scientific, and commercial structures, enabling it to build enduring influence that would be difficult to contain later.

This strategy encompasses investment in critical infrastructure, an expanded presence in universities and research centers, and the deepening of trade ties and supply chains. It also involves fostering interdependence, making it difficult for Western nations to decouple their economies from China's without incurring heavy costs.

In other words, while the G7 viewed China as a foreign actor, China was quietly entrenching itself within the very economic sphere represented by the group. Thus, this Chinese expansion coincides with a period of relative decline in the West's ability to impose its will on the international order.

The war in Ukraine has drained a significant portion of the West's political and economic energy. Meanwhile, escalating tensions in the Middle East—alongside open conflict with Iran and its regional proxies—have exposed the limits of American influence and its capacity to manage multiple, simultaneous crises. Until recently, the U.S. was preoccupied with the movements of its warships and aircraft. Furthermore, divisions within the Western camp itself have become more pronounced than ever—highlighted by incidents such as Trump publishing a map depicting Canada and Greenland as parts of the United States,

and the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Germany—thereby further fracturing relations among NATO allies.

In contrast, China continues to build its influence at a different pace. It does not wage foreign wars or deploy military bases on the scale that the United States does. Instead, it relies on the economy, trade, investment, and diplomacy as primary tools to expand its sphere of influence. Consequently, it is now positioned to emerge as a key player in matters that were once the exclusive domain of Western powers—with the Iran dossier serving as a prime example.

China is not only Iran's largest trading partner but also maintains strong ties with Arab Gulf states and keeps open channels of communication with various international powers. This unique position grants it a growing capacity to play diplomatic roles—roles likely to become increasingly significant as regional crises grow more complex and the effectiveness of traditional Western tools diminishes.

It is quite possible that major powers may eventually find themselves in need of Chinese mediation, or require China's participation in new security or economic arrangements concerning Iran—particularly those related to the nuclear issue.

Perhaps the most striking matter lies in the issue of global economic imbalances—a matter the G7 insists on placing at the forefront. The issue topping the agenda will not conclude with the end of the France summit. Instead, it will carry over to the G20 summit scheduled for the end of the year in the United States—where China will be present at the table, not sidelined. This fact alone reveals the magnitude of the transformation the international order is undergoing. Western powers, accustomed for decades to managing the global economy from within their

own institutions and alliances, now find themselves compelled to acknowledge that any attempt to rebalance the global economy or rectify its major imbalances cannot succeed without China's participation. Between the G7 summit—which discusses China in its absence—and the G20 summit—which will address the same issues with China present—a rapidly changing world comes into view: a world where China is no longer merely a rising power seeking its place in the scenario, but an international power around whose economic and political equations the scenario itself has begun to orbit. Thus, the true absentee at the G7 summit was not China, but rather that era when the West could manage the world single-handedly.

Amidst the waning of the era of Western hegemony and the emergence of a more multipolar international order, the Islamic Ummah stands at a rare historical juncture. The issue lies not so much in China's rise or the West's decline, but in the opportunity these shifts offer to break free from the legacy of dependency and colonialist hegemony. It is a chance to embark on building an independent Islamic civilizational project—one that severs its reliance on the West and derives its strength from its own human and economic resources, legislative framework, doctrinal tenets, and civilizational values. If great nations are defined by their ability to seize moments of profound transformation, the present moment may well be one of those rare instances where the doors of history open but once. Allah ﷻ said, ﴿وَتِلْكَ الْأَيَّامُ نُدَاوِلُهَا بَيْنَ النَّاسِ﴾
“And We alternate these eras amongst peoples.” [TMQ Surah Aali Imran: 140].

The Sudanese Government's Economic Policies

By: Engineer Basil Mustafa*



The Sudanese pound continues its sharp decline, reaching record lows nearing 5,000 pounds to the dollar. This has triggered a new wave of price hikes and caused the currency to lose a significant portion of its value. This has directly impacted people's livelihoods, with 86% of families now unable to meet their basic needs, according to the International Organization for Migration. The suffering is evident in the simplest necessities; for example, filling a gas cylinder now costs around 120,000 pounds, an amount exceeding the salary of a ninth-grade teacher, 86,000 Sudanese pounds, while the first-class salary of 225,000 Sudanese pounds is not enough to cover the family's bread needs for one month!

The Sudanese pound has lost nine times its value against the dollar and other currencies, shedding 90% of its worth. The dollar has jumped from 570 pounds in 2023 to 4,700 pounds currently, with reports suggesting it could reach 5,000 pounds. The Saudi riyal has risen from 200 pounds to 1,050 pounds, and the Egyptian pound from 13 Sudanese pounds to 98 pounds.

This dramatic currency collapse has had a profound impact on prices and purchasing power. Prices of goods have increased tenfold; for example, the price of a gallon of gasoline has jumped from 3,000 to 30,000 pounds. Meanwhile, the value of wages has plummeted. Teachers' salaries, which were equivalent to between \$181 and \$498 a few years ago, are now worth only \$17 to \$84, even though their nominal value in pounds remains between 86,000 and 225,000 Sudanese pounds.

The primary cause of Sudan's economic crisis lies in the implementation of a capitalist economic system with its well-known tools of taxes, customs duties, and monopolies. Fees and taxes now constitute approximately 70% of commodity prices, while the customs exchange rate has risen from 2,000 to 3,222 Sudanese pounds since the beginning of 2025, an increase of 61%. With the importation of certain goods monopolized by specific entities that control their prices, the inevitable result is soaring prices and widespread hardship for the population.

The reasons for the currency collapse can be summarized in three main points. The first is the chronic trade deficit, with Sudan's exports amounting to approximately \$2.6 billion compared to imports of \$6.5 billion, resulting in a deficit of nearly \$3.9 billion. Whenever imports exceed exports, the demand for foreign currency to finance imports increases, driving up the price of the dollar and depreciating the value of the local currency.

Yet, Sudan is not a resource-poor country to suffer from this deficit. It is one of the largest gold producers in Africa, and produces most of the world's acacia gum, in addition to its vast agricultural, livestock, and mineral resources. However, corruption and government policies that undermine production have deprived Sudan of truly benefiting from these riches. A prime example is the gold sector. The Minister of Finance announced that Sudan's production in 2025 reached approximately 70 tons, while only 20 tons were officially exported. Despite government oversight of gold production, some was exported, while the remainder ended up in the pockets of officials. If only these 70 tons had been exported, without any other production, Sudan's exports would have reached \$9 billion, resulting in a trade surplus of \$2.5 billion. Furthermore, the government's tax and revenue policies were the destructive force that undermined production; the numerous taxes and fees crippled the foundations of production in both agriculture and industry.

Undoubtedly, the current war has exacerbated the crisis, but it is not its true origin. The decline of the Sudanese pound and the rise in prices predate the war by many years. However, the wartime conditions provided the government with an opportunity, akin to "creative chaos," to implement economic measures that would be difficult to implement under normal circumstances, such as currency devaluation.

The second reason for the Sudanese pound's decline lies in the nature of the monetary system itself. Currency is merely fiat currency, lacking a solid foundation. The state prints it whenever it wants without backing, and it is well known that increasing the

money supply leads to inflation, which devalues the currency and erodes people's hard-earned savings.

The third reason is the implementation of the International Monetary Fund's destructive economic conditions, including currency devaluation. The IMF demands that countries devalue their currencies against the dollar for colonial purposes, aiming to plunder their resources.

Government measures, however, only address the symptoms, not the root causes. The government initially blamed fuel importers for the price hikes and announced it would handle imports directly through its ministries. Two days later, it reversed its decision and demanded importers deposit 200 kilograms of gold to obtain import permits, a move that reflects the government's chaotic approach.

It's noteworthy that the state is already heavily involved in the fuel market. Four government-owned companies import approximately 50% of the total fuel, while 38 private companies share the remaining half.

Furthermore, the government imposes a 31% tax on each liter of gasoline and state-level fees of up to 500 Egyptian pounds per liter for interstate transport. The government's capitalist tax policies are the primary cause of increased hardship and higher fuel prices.

To maintain the value of the Egyptian pound, it must be backed by a stable and robust foundation: gold. Printing currency without gold reserves is unacceptable. With a gold standard, the pound will have intrinsic value, eliminating the need for people to convert their savings into dollars or other currencies for fear of devaluation.

The fundamental solution to Sudan's economic problems lies in implementing an economic system based on the Shariah rulings of Islam, which originate from the All-Wise, the All-Knowing ﷻ. This system would utilize Sudan's resources and empower its people to benefit from them through production, industry, and trade. It would also sever the influence of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, institutions based on riba (interest), from interfering in economic policies, preventing them from devaluing our currency. Furthermore, it would eliminate the colonialist dominance of the dollar over our country and establish a stable monetary system based on the gold standard.

Gold has been the basis of currency for thousands of years, and Islam affirmed this hukum, linking a number of rulings to gold. It is a stable foundation, as the value of gold remains virtually unchanged due to its precious nature. This system requires a Khilafah, as the current agent regimes are incapable of implementing it.

***Council Member of Hizb ut-Tahrir, Wilayah Sudan**

The Rulers of the West Never Cease to Bring Out the Rancor of their Hearts



German Chancellor Friedrich Merz announced his opposition to the European Union imposing sanctions on the Jewish entity, while France announced that it would not agree to lift the sanctions imposed by the UN Security Council on Iran unless any final agreement on its nuclear program included addressing its ballistic missile program and its support for armed groups in the region.

Western leaders continue to reveal their malice and deep-seated hatred. While they witness the brutal crimes committed by the Jews against Muslims in Palestine, Lebanon, and Iran, and observe their arrogance and corruption on Earth, disregarding all values, norms, and agreements—killing children, women, and the defenseless, and destroying everything in their path—the German Chancellor declares his refusal to impose sanctions on

the Jewish entity, even though such sanctions might be merely symbolic and have no real impact on the ground. He rejects the idea entirely because Muslims and their lands are the victims. Similarly, France refuses to lift sanctions on Iran until it signs commitments and agreements guaranteeing that Iran will not rise again and threaten the Jewish entity.

This scene embodies the hatred that overflows from their sides towards everything related to Islam and Muslims. They cannot bear to keep this hatred locked in their souls, so it comes out to expose them and reveal their candid hostility towards Islam and Muslims and their love and loyalty to the usurping Jews, even if they commit atrocities and massacres that even the beasts of the jungle would refrain from.

This is the true nature of the kafir West, and whoever thinks otherwise is deluded. Muslims have no support or helper except themselves, after Allah ﷻ. Only their sons in the armies will liberate them and their lands from humiliation and colonialism. So, give your support (Nusra), O armies!

The Situation in Sudan and the Siege of El Obeid

By: Ustadh Abdul-Khaliq Abdoun*



The Rapid Support Forces (RSF) have continued to bombard the city of El Obeid with drones, causing dozens of casualties and destroying civilian infrastructure. This marks a significant escalation in the situation on the ground; on Tuesday, the UK and six European nations called for an immediate halt to the violence targeting El Obeid after the city was encircled by the RSF, according to a statement issued by the British Foreign Office. An international statement—endorsed by Norway on behalf of the “Coalition for Atrocity Prevention and Justice for Sudan,” which includes the Britain, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Ireland, and Canada, with the support of 21 other states,—warned of the risk of large-scale atrocities in El Obeid.

The statement demanded that maximum pressure be exerted on the Sudanese army and the RSF to protect civilians and ensure the delivery of humanitarian aid. Tormod Endresen, Norway's ambassador to the UN Human Rights Council in Geneva, warned of an imminent threat facing approximately 500,000 civilians in El Obeid—including over 100,000 displaced persons—exposing them to the risk of widespread violations and atrocities. Meanwhile, Washington warned of imminent mass atrocities in the city of El Obeid. On June 22, 2026, State Department Spokesperson Thomas “Tommy” Bigot issued a statement titled “Threats of Atrocities Around El Obeid by the Rapid Support Forces and Their Allied Forces,” which read, “The United States is deeply concerned by reports that the Rapid Support Forces (RSF) and their allied forces are massing forces around El Obeid, Sudan, in a manner that significantly increases the risk of violence against civilians, including attacks on civilian objects and further escalation of the conflict in El Obeid and across the Kordofan region.... The RSF and their allied forces must cease any actions that could endanger civilians, impede humanitarian assistance, or contribute to further atrocities and suffering. The United States calls on the belligerents to facilitate safe, rapid, and unhindered humanitarian access, uphold their responsibilities to protect civilians, and take immediate steps to prevent further atrocities. There is no military solution to this conflict. The belligerents must pursue a negotiated settlement, without preconditions, that ends the violence and addresses the immense suffering of the Sudanese people. The United States will continue working with our international partners and Sudanese stakeholders to advance a humanitarian truce, secure unhindered humanitarian access, and support a pathway to a civilian transition and durable peace.” El Obeid—the capital of North Kordofan State and known as the

“Bride of the Sands”—holds significant military and logistical importance for the army and its allied forces. It hosts the headquarters of the 5th Infantry Division and serves as a forward hub for coordinating and managing combat operations extending into North, West, and South Kordofan, as well as Darfur.

El Obeid is one of Sudan’s oldest and most significant cities in terms of commerce and geography. Situated in the heart of western Sudan, its strategic location has made it a vital center for transport and trade, where railway lines, national highways, and ancient caravan routes converge. The city is a pivotal link in the national transport network, lying on the main route connecting the Darfur region to Khartoum, and it also houses an airport that facilitates commercial and civilian traffic—factors that have made it a target for the Rapid Support Forces (RSF).

On Friday, June 19, 2026, both the Sudanese Armed Forces and the RSF continued to mass troops around El Obeid amidst intense fighting that has raged for a second consecutive week; the city is currently besieged by the RSF on three sides and is facing heavy aerial and artillery attacks. Observers believe that these combined factors explain the mounting military pressure on the city in recent months.

While the army downplays the likelihood of the city falling—maintaining that it retains control—platforms affiliated with the RSF have reported the withdrawal and flight of hundreds of soldiers and officers to neighboring cities. Many military assessments suggest that the outcome of the battles in Kordofan could determine the trajectory of the war across Sudan as a whole. Military experts state that the city of El Obeid is the key to Kordofan—much as El Fasher was the key to Darfur—and that

controlling it offers a significant advantage in managing movement routes between western and central Sudan.

States, as well as UN and local organizations, have warned of a catastrophic humanitarian situation in the city due to shortages of food and medicine, and the loss of basic services—including electricity and water supplies—across large parts of the city. This has driven hundreds of thousands of residents to flee to neighboring areas, where the humanitarian and security conditions are no less perilous than the deteriorating situation inside the city itself.

Despite mounting concerns, former Sudanese Chief of Staff Lieutenant General Hashim Abdel-Muttalib ruled out the possibility of El Obeid falling to the Rapid Support Forces. He argued that recent attacks are primarily intended to pressure the Sudanese army and disrupt its military operations toward the Darfur region, rather than serving as a prelude to an imminent takeover of the city.

The approach of Europe—and Britain in particular—has become evident in this war, which was instigated by the United States to displace European influence. Europe excels at highlighting violations committed by both sides. It convenes conferences, issues statements of condemnation, and displays sympathy for the Sudanese people. Yet, its sole objective is to regain its influence. It remains indifferent to the fate of the Sudanese people, even if the entire population were to perish. As for America, it incites the leaders of the army and the Rapid Support Forces (RSF) to continue committing atrocities against the people of Sudan, urging them to prolong the war without seeking a military resolution. The phrase “there is no military solution to this war” has become a constant refrain among American

politicians since the Biden administration took office. It serves as a green light for both sides to persist in their atrocities. America seeks to ensure that Sudan's political landscape is cleared of European-aligned figures—whether politicians or military officials—and aims to weaken the country to the greatest extent possible. It seeks to mobilize all factions, including centrist elements, to sever Sudan's vital arteries—an objective that can only be achieved by prolonging the war.

Sudan has suffered greatly from the conflict between international powers—America and Britain—indifferent to the consequences of this futile war that has inflicted untold suffering upon the people of Sudan. This comes as no surprise; what is surprising, however, is the silence of the country's own people regarding the conspiracies being hatched against it with the complicity of its agent rulers.

Action must be taken to eradicate the colonialist hegemony and sever the grip of colonialism on Sudan—and indeed on all Muslim lands. This can only be achieved by pledging allegiance to a man—based on the Book of Allah ﷻ and the Sunnah of His Messenger ﷺ—as a Khaleefah (Caliph) for the Muslims, one who governs the people according to Islam and severs these sinful, malevolent hands.

*** Member of the Media Office of Hizb ut Tahrir in Wilayah Sudan**

The Maghreb Trilateral Coordination: Will It Withstand Colonialist-Style Security Approaches?

By: Yassine Ben Yahia

Amidst a regional landscape where escalating threats from the Sahel intersect with the fracturing of NATO and shifting US priorities, trilateral security coordination between Tunisia, Libya, and Algeria has emerged. It represents an attempt to fill a strategic vacuum—one becoming increasingly apparent as reliance on traditional security frameworks diminishes.

Trilateral Coordination: A Maghreb Step Toward Shared Security

On June 16, 2026, the Libyan capital, Tripoli, hosted the second meeting of the Libyan-Algerian-Tunisian task force charged with securing shared borders—a body established in January 2025 through an agreement among the three nations' interior ministers. This gathering was far more than a routine technical meeting; it embodied a shared political will recognizing that cross-border threats—ranging from the smuggling of goods and people and the expansion of organized crime and terrorism networks to Europe's strategy of externalizing its borders to the southern Mediterranean—cannot be confronted without joint, on-the-ground coordination.

Crucially, the choice of Tripoli for this second meeting conveys a clear political message: despite the fragility of the domestic situation, the Libyan capital remains capable of serving as a hub for regional coordination, and security matters can indeed be managed through recognized state institutions.

Amidst NATO's Fracture: A Strategic Vacuum Seeking Alternative

What lends this trilateral coordination a deeper geopolitical dimension is the turbulent international context in which it emerged. Relations between the United States and its European NATO allies are experiencing unprecedented tensions, marked by repeated threats to scale back the U.S. military commitment in Europe and accusations that European allies are failing to shoulder their defense burdens. U.S. Secretary of State Marco Rubio has articulated this clearly, criticizing NATO allies for their reluctance to adopt a unified stance on Iran—a sign of a widening rift within the Western alliance.

This fracture has not been without repercussions for Africa. As reliance on NATO as an overarching security framework diminishes, Washington has begun seeking alternative regional partnerships—a shift that partly explains the growing U.S. interest in North Africa. Analyses suggest that the current tension between the U.S. and its NATO allies serves as a reminder that African security cannot be entirely outsourced to distant powers; instead, there is a need to strengthen continental institutions to provide a more robust framework for conflict resolution and economic cooperation.

U.S. Interests: Calculations and Contradictions

U.S. interest in the region is not new, but it has gained fresh momentum amidst escalating international competition for influence in North Africa—particularly between the U.S. and Europe—alongside the growing roles of Russia and China. This dynamic is evident in the intensive U.S. diplomatic engagement with Tunisia, a country that has become a focal point for Washington due to a complex mix of security, political, and strategic considerations.

Tunisia—designated a Major Non-NATO Ally since 2015—seeks to play an increasingly significant regional role, particularly in the maritime domain, and aspires to serve as a hub for regional military cooperation. This was exemplified by the visit of the U.S. Naval Forces Europe-Africa commander to Tunisia in June 2026, during which discussions focused on maritime cooperation in the Mediterranean.

However, the U.S. stance toward Algeria remains the most complex. While acknowledging Algeria’s expertise in counter-terrorism, Washington approaches the country with great caution due to its close ties with Russia and China, as well as its distinct position on sensitive regional issues. Washington seeks to pursue a dual strategy: leveraging Algerian security expertise while keeping the country neutral, rather than pushing it toward a full alliance with the West.

As for Libya, Washington views it as the key to security in North Africa, regarding its political stability as a prerequisite for genuine border security. Washington has launched diplomatic initiatives to bridge the gaps between Libyan factions, aiming to unify institutions and lay the groundwork for effective security coordination.

Towards an Independent Maghreb Vision

Amidst these shifts, the question arises: will the Maghreb states remain mere recipients of foreign strategies, or will they strive to forge an independent security vision? The trilateral coordination between Tunisia, Libya, and Algeria is a step in the right direction, yet it remains incomplete without a broader vision that encompasses the rest of the region's states.

The challenges facing North Africa—ranging from instability in the Sahel to illegal migration and organized crime—respect neither the artificial borders left by colonialism nor do they wait for solutions from distant capitals. The fractures currently affecting transatlantic relations confirm that relying on others to manage regional security—aside from the religious transgression involved—is no longer a viable long-term strategic choice; rather, it has become a perilous gamble.

Therefore, the call for a shared, independent vision is not merely a political slogan, but a Shariah obligation and an existential security and economic necessity. With its pivotal geographical location and its human and natural resources, the Maghreb is capable of building a regional security framework that protects its borders and safeguards its independence. This must be achieved independently of the colonialist schemes that, for decades, have reduced the region to a mere security buffer or an arena for international rivalry.

The challenge, then, is neither American nor European; it is an inherently Maghrebi one. It begins with the region's states—and the people of military power within them—recognizing the significance of this historic moment. It requires turning the page on the colonialism of the past to forge the unity of the future. True security is not built on patrols and surveillance cameras alone, but on a civilizational political project that restores the Ummah's independence and establishes a state capable of seizing the initiative and achieving security independence, free from the tutelage of major powers and the volatility of their agendas.

The Arab League Must be Buried in a Deep Valley



Egyptian President el-Sisi stressed the necessity of strengthening the system of joint Arab action and activating the role of the Arab League as “the primary umbrella and comprehensive framework for defending the interests of Arab states and peoples.” This came during his reception on Sunday of both Nabil Fahmy, the candidate for the position of Secretary-General of the League, and Ahmed Aboul Gheit, the current Secretary-General, whose term ends at the end of this month.

Commentary: El-Sisi’s eagerness to activate the role of the Arab League and keep it alive stems from his desire to keep the Ummah weak, fragmented, and subordinate to the colonial kafir (disbeliever). The Arab League is founded upon embodying division among the Muslim lands in the Arab region under the pretext of respecting the independence of states; i.e., respecting

that each state has its own borders, flag, and constitution different from the others. Any attempt to change this reality is considered an infringement upon the sovereignty of these alleged states and is deemed contrary to the Charter of the Arab League.

It is obligatory upon the Ummah to bury the Arab League in a deep valley rather than seek to activate or renew it. It has never been anything but a dagger in the heart of the Ummah, a tool for its division, and a means for America and the West to pass their projects and maintain their colonial domination over our lands. Instead of it, and instead of all harmful regimes throughout the Muslim lands, the Ummah must establish the second Khilafah Rashidah (Rightly Guided Caliphate) upon the method of Prophethood, which will unite it and lead it toward victory and empowerment.