

# **The New US National Security Strategy: The Doctrine of Remote Decision-Making Sovereignty**

(Translated)

**Al-Rayah Newspaper - Issue 580 - 31/12/2025**

**By: Ustadh Khaled Ali**

On December 6, 2025, the Trump administration released its new National Security Strategy document, whose most prominent slogan was “America First,” intended to serve as the general framework for American foreign policy. This strategy constitutes a clear declaration of a radical shift in the nature of the new American role, particularly regarding allies and dealings with other countries. The document’s authors believe that the United States has reached a point where it can no longer bear the burden of protecting the world, or investing in foreign governing regimes that do not serve direct American interests.

The most significant aspect of the new strategy is the official announcement of a commitment to “reassert and enforce the Monroe Doctrine,” originally declared in 1823, and the introduction of what it calls “The Trump Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine,” which stipulates the pursuit of peace through strength. The Monroe Doctrine, declared by President Monroe in 1823, aimed to neutralize European influence in Latin America in exchange for Washington refraining from interfering in European affairs. It was a declaration of America’s isolation from the rest of the world. What is new in today’s declaration is that, in addition to affirming America’s sovereignty over the western hemisphere and preventing any external competitor, especially China, Russia, Europe, and perhaps Iran, it also affirms America’s sovereignty over the world, its uniqueness, and its control over sources of power, without direct intervention in the countries of the world, but through trade relations and cooperation deals based on American interests, along with the possession of the technological and scientific power, that qualifies it to lead the world in a manner that is similar to what can be called “remote sovereignty and leadership.”

As for America’s relationship with Europe and Russia, the message to Europe is that it is no longer a partner of the United States, but rather a region that needs redefinition within a Western order led by the US.

This new approach diminishes the importance of effective American intervention to counter Russian influence, and relies on European allies bearing the brunt of confronting the Russian bear. This signifies America’s abandonment of its historical responsibility for Europe, after decades of it being considered the cornerstone of American national security calculations. This new discourse seems to dismantle the traditional pillars of the Western alliance, and even explicitly warns of a civilizational decline in Europe, an unprecedented characterization in American national security literature. With America’s partial or complete absence from the European defense landscape, Europe becomes vulnerable to Russian threats, which have intensified their military and political presence in recent years. While the strategy does not explicitly declare a decline in American commitment to NATO, the document’s overall tone suggests that America no longer includes Europe in its national security calculations. Regarding its relationship with Russia, the document argues that Russia no longer poses an existential threat, but is merely an adversary with whom understanding is possible. The best course of action, the document suggests, is to contain Russia through negotiations and minimize direct confrontation.

As for its relationship with China, the document indicates that opening American markets to China has granted it an unprecedented opportunity for economic and technological

growth, making it today a near-strategic rival to the United States. Therefore, the strategy calls for readjusting the balance with China by encircling it through a broad network of alliances. The United States will not allow China to become an economic or military power that threatens American national security. The new strategy maintains that this cannot be achieved through American efforts alone. Regional countries themselves must increase their defense budgets, develop their military capabilities, and build collective forces that enable them to confront Chinese challenges jointly and sustainably. In conclusion, America's policy toward China is based on viewing it as a commercial competitor, not a culturally civilizational one, and believes it can be controlled through tariffs, technology transfer restrictions, and other tools of commercial competition.

As for the Middle East, a region that for decades constituted an absolute priority in American foreign policy, it is now presented as an important but non-central region in American national security. The first reason for this is America's transformation into an energy exporter, and the second is that conflicts in the region can be managed remotely through a network of regional alliances without becoming embroiled again in wars that drain its resources, as in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Despite downplaying the dangers of the Middle East, the US does not forget the threat of Islam within it. It has emphasized preventing the region from becoming a breeding ground for "terrorism" capable of striking the American homeland, and ensuring the security and supremacy of the Jewish entity. It seems that America wants to transfer the region's affairs to its proxies and partners, foremost among them the Jewish entity, through which it aspires to form a new regional order based on alliances between the Gulf States and the Jewish entity, and to expand the Abraham Accords to include additional Muslim countries. This would transform the Jewish entity from a security burden into a pillar of the regional security structure, as envisioned by Washington. As for the issue of Palestine, the new administration does not seem to have a clear vision for its resolution at present. Therefore, it describes conflict in the Middle East as a "most troublesome dynamic" and "thorny," contenting itself with ceasefires in Gaza and prisoner exchange deals, while maintaining the possibility of managing the conflict without fundamentally altering the balance of power, as long as it remains within the confines of military superiority for the Jewish entity.

It must be noted that America cannot ignore the threat posed by Islam. In its new strategy, it sees the possibility of controlling China and reaching understandings with Russia, as neither of these poses a fundamental or existential threat. Islam, however, cannot be ignored because it is the only threat that constitutes a fundamental civilizational danger. A fundamental threat cannot be dealt with or contained. Instead, the relationship with it is one of existence or non-existence. Therefore, America cannot disregard Islam, even if it does not explicitly state this in its new strategy.

Finally, America has been exhausted by the weight of global leadership, revealing its weakness in managing domestic and international crises and conflicts. This has driven it to adopt this new approach to dealing with the outside world. America does not want to lose its leading role globally, but at the same time, it does not want to bear the consequences of this role, which has exhausted and burdened it. Thus, it has introduced a new concept of leadership: leadership without consequences, or reaping the profits of trade, without engaging in the market. This is a form of ignorance and a decline in understanding the meaning of international leadership, or what it means to be the world's leading state. No matter what strategies it devises to maintain its decision-making sovereignty and hegemony, its train has nearly reached its final station, and its days are numbered. The time has come for the ideology of Islam, whose era has dawned. May Allah (swt) hasten its advent.