Egypt’s regime and Its War on Islam

(Translated)

Al-Rayah Newspaper - Issue 627 - 25/11/2026

By: Ustadh Saeed Fadl

The Cairo Criminal Court designated 35 entities in Europe and 36 individuals as terrorist entities and terrorists for a period of five years. The listed entities included numerous Islamic institutions, associations, leagues, and councils across European countries, among them the Council of European Muslims and its various branches, the Muslims of France, the Muslim Association of Britain, the Swiss Muslim League, the German Islamic Community, the Islamic Association in Sweden, and the Islamic Association in Italy, in addition to several other entities in various European nations.

To clarify the background, purpose, and implications of this ban, the following points should be recalled:

First: Egypt’s regime’s hostility toward Islam and Muslims is not a new or transient phenomenon; rather, it is deeply ingrained. Since the 1952 Revolution led by America’s agent Gamal Abdel Nasser and his coup against King Farouk—the last of the English agents in Egypt—Egypt’s regime has made it its mission to oppose Islam and Muslims, considering them its sworn enemies. It has proceeded to imprison, brutalize, and execute anyone who opposed it or called to Allah (swt).

Second: Despite Egypt’s regime’s reconciliation—particularly during Sadat’s era—with those whom some choose to call “Islamists,” their integration into the official political scene, their entry into the People’s Assembly under the guise of the opposition Wafd Party, and the permission granted to them for investments and free operation, the regime remained wary of them. It kept a watchful eye on them for fear of a coup—not because they held an Islamic project or sought to rule by what Allah (swt) has revealed, but due to their ties with Europe, especially Britain, which had occupied Egypt and aspired to return to its colonies. Consequently, the ban extended to institutions and organizations operating in European countries under European law—entities subsumed under it that posed no threat to those counties. In fact, they were advocates for integration into European societies and assimilation within them, through participation in governments and parliaments, and the establishment of interfaith dialogue aimed at normalizing Islam’s relationship with other religions, with the goal of altering Muslims’ perspective on the misguidance of distorted religions such as Judaism and Christianity. This serves as an example.

Third: Although Sadat and Hosni Mubarak pursued and imprisoned the sincere workers for Islam, they simultaneously tolerated those among the “Islamists” who accepted playing by the regime’s rules—that is, operating within the boundaries it set for them. The reason for the differing approaches to dealing with Islamic groups stems from the concept held by America, the master of the regime, regarding these groups and their differing allegiances. Those whose allegiance was to Allah (swt) and His Messenger (saw) were not to be reconciled with, whereas those who were pragmatic and accepted compromise solutions were acceptable for reconciliation—even if their political allegiance was to Europe. These are players to be dealt with according to the rules of competition over interests and influence, not ideology.

Fourth: After the outbreak of the 25 January 2011 revolution against Hosni Mubarak, and the pragmatic “Islamists” accepting a deal with America and temporarily handing over power to save the regime from collapse, America changed its policy toward them and decided not to tolerate or reconcile with them, despite their adherence to their pragmatic approach. It became clear to America that it could not win their allegiance and that they were closer to the British and Europeans than to any other party, so it ordered its agent El-Sisi to suppress them and ban all their activities. This indeed happened; after the events of Rabaa Square in August 2013 and the killing of thousands of protesters there, thousands were imprisoned and many were executed.

Fifth: A number of the regime’s opponents, most of them “Islamists,” managed to flee abroad, particularly to Türkiye and European countries. As for Türkiye, it hosted them in order to contain and control them. After several years, once Egypt’s regime had tightened its grip on the Egyptian street, El-Sisi asked Erdoğan to silence the voices of the opposition and hand some of them over to him—and he did. Many channels and websites that had been platforms for the opposition in Türkiye were shut down, and Erdoğan handed over a number of activists to Egypt’s regime, while some others moved to Europe. Thus, the presence of “Islamist” opponents of Egypt’s regime in Türkiye ended, due to Erdoğan’s betrayal and his collusion with El-Sisi, as they both serve the same master: America.

Sixth: Egypt’s regime cannot demand the pursuit of opposition figures present in Europe, as it did with Türkiye, because Europe is America’s rival in colonizing the lands of Muslims and exerting influence within them. However, the most it can do is employ the dirty game used by the West itself: the game of pursuing opponents under the pretext of combating terrorism—a pretext that encompasses any opponent of any claimant against them. This serves as a prelude to demanding that European countries hand over his opponents and shut down their institutions. And, of course, with pressure from America on the European countries, the chapters of liquidating the opposition can be completed, clearing the stage for America and its agents in Egypt.

The enmity of Egypt’s regime toward Islam and Muslims is unmistakable, and no one should think that this hostility is confined to El-Sisi and a few around him. The regime has enlisted elements from the intelligence services and the forces of repression, all of whom harbor enmity toward Islam and Muslims. At times, the scene becomes confusing in determining who holds more animosity—is it the servant or the master? There is no power nor strength except by Allah (swt).

Egypt’s regime will inevitably be removed by the hands of the sincere people of Al-Kinanah (الكنانة Quiver of Arrows), whether they are from the descendants of Amr ibn al-As (ra) within the ranks of the army or from the general public and their ‘ulema—the descendants of Al-Izz ibn Abd al-Salam. For Egypt is Allah’s Kinanah on His earth, and it is never devoid of sincere individuals who see the path toward rallying around the party that has never changed or altered since its inception, and that does not believe in half-solutions or pragmatism—it is the pioneering guide Hizb ut Tahrir who does not lie to its people.

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