



THE RULING ON NORMALIZATION TREATIES

AHMADJIBRIL.ORG

The Ruling on Normalization Treaties

Ash-Shaykh Al-Imām Ahmad Mūsā Jibrīl (حفظه الله)

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ



Question: What's the ruling on normalization treaties with the occupiers in Filastīn (Palestine)?

First of all, there's no doubt that Muslims can engage in treaties with the Kuffār. They're generally referred to as a Hudnah in the books of Fiqh, or Musālamah or Muwāda'ah, or Mu'āhadah or Musālahah. And what they are is truces with the Kuffār, and even the Kuffār from Dār Al-Harb. That's not an issue here. There are conditions, certain situations, and stipulations that must be met. When those conditions are fulfilled, it's permissible for the Imām of the Muslimīn, who seeks the benefit of the Muslimīn, to have a Hudnah with the Kuffār. The Ulamā' spoke about this matter in depth in the books of Fiqh. Some even related an Ijmā' on the permissibility of a Hudnah with the Kuffār — of course, with the stipulations and conditions. However, an Ijmā' might not be so accurate because Adh-Dhāhiriyyah and Ibn Hazm stated that a Hudnah with the Kuffār is not permissible because it's abrogated. It's abrogated by what? They said it's abrogated by the Verse of the Sword, or the Sword Verse. What verse is that?

فَإِذَا انْسَلَخَ الْأَشْهُرُ الْحَرَامُ فَاقْتُلُوا الْمُشْرِكِينَ حَيْثُ وَجَدْتُمُوهُمْ وَخُذُوهُمْ وَأَحْصُرُوهُمْ وَأَقْعُدُوا لَهُمْ كُلَّ مَرْصِدٍ

And when the inviolable months have passed, then kill the polytheists wherever you find them and capture them and besiege them and sit in wait for them at every place of ambush.¹

So they said it was abrogated. However, the overwhelming majority of the Ulamā' stated that a Hudnah with the Kuffār is permissible. As I said, to the extent that some related an Ijmā' on its permissibility.

¹ [9:5]

The term “normalization” itself, that’s a term used for the so-called peace treaties with the Yahūd (Jews). It’s a term used to manipulate the terminology in order to deceive the Ummah, to cover up the crime and danger behind what they’re doing. Just like they called alcohol “spirits”. They called Ribā “interest”. They called Shirk “democracy”. They called Shirk “nearness to the Awliyā’”. They do that to get them accepted in society, to manipulate the masses, and to diminish the magnitude of their Hurmah (forbiddance), but that never changed the ruling on them. الحكم يدور مع الحقيقة, لا مع اللفظ. The reality of normalization is similar to that of interfaith. Simply put, it’s the utmost, deepest Walā’ to the Kuffār. Just like interfaith, it’s aimed at demolishing one of the most unique traits of this Ummah — the trait that’s become nearly forgotten by the Ummah due to the heavy dosages of anesthesia that have been injected in the Ummah by the Tawāghīt and their Shuyūkh. The trait of Walā’ and Barā’. The purpose of normalization is not a simple truce from fighting, its purpose and goal is to Judaize the minds of the Muslims. It’s to snatch Barā’ah of the Yahūd specifically, and Kuffār in general, from the hearts of the Muslims and to raise a generation with an identity crisis, a generation confused in their 'Aqīdah and in their Tawhīd. The invasion into the 'Aqīdah of the Ummah is more dangerous than any land invasion.

Anyone who attempts to give a ruling on these current treaties, the ones they call “normalization” with the Yahūd, with the occupiers — they need to understand their reality and their effects, no matter what it’s called. The ruling revolves around the reality of the matter, not around the terms chosen by the traitors or the hypocrites or anyone else. Knowing the treaties that the Messenger ﷺ had with the Kuffār, that’s the easy part. Memorizing them is easy! Knowing their details and memorizing the Isnād, that's easy! That’s the easy part. That doesn't make one a Faqīh who can apply that knowledge onto current surrenderous treaties. One must understand the reality of the matter and its outcome in order to properly apply the ruling. Giving a ruling on a matter is a branch of understanding its reality. You must have a comprehensive understanding of the reality of the matter, how it plays out, and its effect before you can judge it. Why? So that the ruling or judgment that you give is consistent

with the reality. Some Shuyūkh, who allow normalization with the Yahūd, *who allow Walā' to the Yahūd* — that's what it's really supposed to be called — if a woman were to approach them and ask them about a simple, personal matter pertaining to her bleeding outside the menstrual days, they would interrogate her. They would ask her what color it is and what are its characteristics. They would inquire whether it happened before or not. But a dangerous issue that pertains to the destiny, fate, and future of the Muslims? Many foolishly and ignorantly spit out a ruling on it faster than the spit comes out of their mouths. Some do it recklessly, out of ignorance and foolishness, and that's a catastrophe. And then there are those who do it out of Nifāq and to please the Tawāghīt, and that catastrophe is even worse.

The reality of normalization between Arabic countries or Arabic leaders and the Yahūd, the occupying Yahūd, the one that's going on today, that's a violation on the 'Aqīdah level. It's not even on the Fiqh level. It's aimed at dismantling the layers of لا اله الا الله in the hearts of the Ummah. You don't even need to go to the details of the Fiqh of Hudnah to get the Hukm on this matter, it's at the 'Aqīdah level. The treaties with the Yahūd today, what they call normalization, is Muwāddah and Walā' to the Yahūd.

وَلَوْ كَانُوا يُؤْمِنُونَ بِاللَّهِ وَالنَّبِيِّ وَمَا أُنزِلَ إِلَيْهِ مَا اتَّخَذُوهُمْ أَوْلِيَاءَ

And if they had believed in Allāh and the Prophet and in what was revealed to him, they would not have taken them as allies...²

It's Mudhāharah and Mu'āwanah to an occupying enemy over the Muslims.

يَأْتِيهَا الَّذِينَ ءَامَنُوا لَا تَتَّخِذُوا الْيَهُودَ وَالنَّصْرِيَّةَ أَوْلِيَاءَ بَعْضُهُمْ أَوْلِيَاءُ بَعْضٍ

² [5:81]

*O you who have believed, do not take the Jews and the Christians as allies. They are [in fact] allies of one another.*³

It's not a Shar'ī Hudnah in any way. It's to plant a radical change in the minds of the Muslims towards normalizing the sovereignty of what they call "The State of Israel" and it's to beloyal them. It's recognizing the right of the occupiers to occupy Muslim lands, over Muslim bodies, over Muslim captives.

Countries who normalize will never *properly* teach that the Yahūd are the strongest in their enmity towards the believers.

لَتَجِدَنَّ أَشَدَّ النَّاسِ عَدُوًّا لِلَّذِينَ ءَامَنُوا الْيَهُودَ وَالَّذِينَ أَشْرَكُوا

*You will surely find the most intense of the people in animosity toward the believers [to be] the Jews and those who associate others with Allāh...*⁴

The proper meanings of that verse and its likes will be taken out of the curriculums, and they must exert all their effort into trying to take it out of the hearts and minds of their citizens — the *proper* meaning of it. Countries who were on their way to normalization, like in Bilād Al-Haramayn, were showing their good intentions to their masters by arresting anyone who merely spoke against normalization. Countries who normalize with the Yahūd must change their curriculums and manipulate and revise the meanings of the Qur'ān and the Sunnah. It aims to remove hostility and hatred against the Yahūd specifically, and the Kuffār in general. They want it removed from the beliefs, hearts, and minds of the Ummah. Verses like,

³ [5:51]

⁴ [5:82]

وَبَدَأَ بَيْنَنَا وَبَيْنَكُمْ الْعَدَاوَةَ وَالْبَغْضَاءَ أَبَدًا حَتَّىٰ تُؤْمِنُوا بِاللَّهِ وَحَدَهُ

and there has appeared between us and you animosity and hatred forever until you believe in Allāh alone...⁵

Verses like that must be tailored to suit the Yahūdi American interpretation. Normalization is to create a generation who fights the 'Aqīdah from within. It's changing the lessons of the Sīrah and history and the current events. It's to monitor the Khutab and Durūs in the Masājīd to coincide with what pleases the Yahūd and the United States. Walā' and Barā', for example, was taken out of some school curriculums. We spoke about that in the past. The correct teachings of Walā' and Barā', as it's revealed by Allāh and as the Salaf knew it, can't be taught in the Masājīd of countries that normalize with the Yahūd. They hide or distort principles of 'Aqīdah and they change the Salaf's meaning of Āyāt and Ahādīth to support this surrenderous move.

“Normalization” is not returning matters to their normal state. It's to normalize what should never be normal in our Dīn. It's to denormalize what should be normal in our Dīn, under the propaganda and disguise of fundamentalism and terrorism or extremism. The Tawāghīt have always had a Hudnah with the enemy, with the occupiers, but the normalization that's going on comes to take matters a step further. It's to plant in the hearts Muwālāh to the Yahūd. It's an aim to get the Ummah to permanently dismiss Jihād and to incline thier masses to this Dunyā and to forget the bright history and 'Izzah this Ummah once had when they lived under the shade of the Sharī'ah of Allāh. It's a treaty with the Kuffār that has 'Aqīdah concessions — concessions in the principles of this Dīn. That's not permissible in a treaty of Hudnah. That's being surrenderous and it's abandoning the Sharī'ah of Allāh.

⁵ [60:4]

Comparing that normalization treaty, the ones that go on today, to the ones the Messenger ﷺ had with the Yahūd or Quraysh — that, والعياذ بالله, is attributing to the Messenger ﷺ what he vigorously resisted in his weakest times and what he fought the world for in the strongest of his times. Never did our beloved Muhammad ﷺ compromise on the principles of the Dīn during his weakness, let alone during his strength. It's Kufr to allege that the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ compromised on the principles of the Dīn and it only gets worse when they do Qiyās based on that Kufr! Establishing economic, political, cultural, and tourism ties — that strengthens the enemy. That strengthens the occupiers so that they can step up their oppression towards our brothers and sisters and children in Filastīn. It strengthens the Yahūd to commit more genocides, to bring in more settlers, to build them more settlements, and it strengthens them in imprisoning Muslims and killing them over there. Most important of all that for them, is the security ties — sharing intelligence. Normalizing countries share intelligence. They have to. The enemy they share intelligence against is the Muslim Muwahhid who wants to uphold Tawhīd, and the friend is the Yahūdi occupier. Walā' goes to the enemy and Barā'ah goes to the Muslim, Muwahhid Mujāhid. They're treaties that aid the Yahūd against Muslims in general, but specifically Muslims who want to liberate Muslim Holy Lands and live under the Sharī'ah of Allāh سبحانه وتعالى. معاذ الله would the Messenger ﷺ ever agree to anything like that! Among the most basic terms that they have is to agree to recognize Israel's right to exist as a sovereign state on lands that 'Umar رضي الله عنه walked from Madīnah to Ash-Shām to liberate. It's to cede lands the companion Abu 'Ubaydah رضي الله عنه and his friends poured their precious sweat and blood on to liberate. Those treaties give the Yahūd full control and right over lands liberated by the Sahābah and it gives them full right over the necks of the Muslims living under their control.

Each life of the millions of lives that the normalizing countries put under Yahūdi control and put at risk is more precious, more significant, than if the world were to be destroyed. The few millimeters they give the Muslims must be governed by anything *but* the Sharī'ah of Allāh. It must have leaders approved or appointed by them who do the dirty work for them. Leaders to give them their

full Walā', share the intelligence, and cooperate with them against the Muslimīn. Some, like the Tawāghīt in Bilād Al-Haramayn, and even the leaders of Gaza, they talk about agreeing to a treaty with the 1967 borders, and they speak about agreeing to that as if they're the Salāh Ad-Dīn liberators of our times. Agreeing to that 1967 borders is like someone coming to your mansion or your house, taking your house, and telling you *"Hey, there's 2 feet over there in the corner by the fence. Go live over there."* Or someone stealing your loaf of bread and giving you a couple of crumbs to eat.

And a side issue: When Muslims in Gaza are being actively massacred, it's from the basic rules of Walā' and Barā' that every Muslim must give their full Walā' to the Muslim women, men, and children there. The focus must be that. Just as every Muslim must do when there's Muslims oppressed anywhere. We devoted, Alhamdulillah Rabb Al-'Ālamīn, many talks to that situation, the situation in Gaza. But just because we defend the Muslims in Gaza during that genocide while they're facing the most hostile people to the believers, not mentioning the reality of the leaders in Gaza is not an indication that we approve of them or that they're righteous. Every situation has a different discussion. The leaders of Gaza, like Ismail Haniyeh and his peers, they're filthy Tawāghīt. They're drenched in the slime of democracy and nationalism and love of the Rawāfid and the killing and imprisoning of the pure Muwahiddīn and the demolition of their Masājid, among many, many other issues. And I spoke about it and I've been speaking about it for over 15 years, if not more.

Agreeing to sign a treaty with the 1967 borders doesn't make one a hero. No one has the authority to give away lands Allāh سبحانه وتعالى described as blessed lands. It has the Masjid Al-Aqsā. It's our first Qiblah. It's the Masrah of our Messenger ﷺ. 'Umar رضي الله عنه conquered it. Salāh Ad-Dīn liberated it. There's a difference between the Muslims being weak and not being able to liberate the lands, and between giving them title, right, legitimacy, and control over the lands in Filastīn. It's an invalid, incorrect analogy or Qiyās to compare those surrenderous treaties to treaties of Rasūl Allāh ﷺ on a Fiqhi level. It's قياس مع الفارق. There's no valid 'Illah in this matter to conduct Qiyās. When the Messenger

ﷺ went to Madīnah and had treaties and agreements with some Jewish tribes, for example, they were not occupiers of Muslim liberated lands. They didn't forcefully take lands. Some were part of the community of Madīnah from before the Messenger ﷺ migrated there. He let them stay as they were. They were allowed to maintain what they had. They weren't evacuated or expelled until they betrayed the Messenger ﷺ. Some treaties were made during offensive Jihād. RasūlAllāh ﷺ was going to Quraysh and the Yahūd, in *their* lands, imposing treaties on them in *their* territories. That's Qitāl At-Talab, Jihād At-Talab. In Filastīn, it's Jihād Ad-Daf'. Each has its distinct rulings. The Messenger ﷺ never had a treaty with a combatant enemy who was actively killing Muslims on a day-to-day basis, in a back-to-back genocide, with daily demolition of Muslim houses and farms, and daily apprehension of women, children, and men. Has any treaty of the treaties you see today stopped any of that or lessened any of that? The treaties of the Tawāghīt today have only increased the aggression of the Yahūdi occupiers. Some get so desperate, they compare agreements and rules of the Mu'āhadīn — Mu'āhadīn are peaceful Jews and Christians who live under Muslim rule — they compare those to hostile, combatant Kuffār who are actively killing Muslims.

More important than that, is the violation of the 'Aqīdah in these treaties. In all the treaties that the Messenger ﷺ had, whether it was with the Yahūd or Quraysh or Kuffār in general, none of them ever dared nor ever thought about merely suggesting, let alone forcefully imposing changes on Muslims in aspects of their 'Aqīdah in their own lands. Don't use that the Messenger ﷺ agreed to take out from the righting “Ar-Rahmān Ar-Rahīm” in Sulh Al-Hudaybiyyah, or “RasūlAllāh” ﷺ in that same treaty, or that he allegedly surrendered a Sahābi. I debunked that all in detail in the Sulh Al-Hudaybiyyah series. In every surrenders concession they make to the enemies, consistently bring up Sulh Al-Hudaybiyyah or aspects of it as proofs to justify what they're doing, and that's why we had a series refuting their claims, and it's, Alhamdulillah Rabb Al-'Ālamīn, now a book. It's *Sulh Al-Hudaybiyyah - Falsehood vs Facts*, and I refer everyone to

listen to those lectures or read that book.⁶ I don't need to repeat what I stated there. Even though I wasn't talking about normalization treaties specifically, the answer to this question can be found there in detail. Bring one proof that the Messenger ﷺ or the Khulafā' Ar-Rāshidīn entered in any treaty with the Kuffār who forcefully occupied Muslim lands, where they agreed to cede or relinquish Islāmic lands that were liberated, or they agreed to accept a few millimeters that will not be governed by the Sharī'ah of Allāh, with combatant enemies who are actively killing and imprisoning and oppressing Muslims and ordering them to change their 'Aqīdah in their own lands. Show me one example where the Messenger ﷺ or any of the Khulafā' had a treaty of that nature.

And now let me make a point for the Juhhāl. Let's assume, for the sake of argument and only for the sake of argument, that all those normalization treaties that are going on and that are on the way, let's assume they're valid because they're all treaties that are similar to the treaties of the Messenger ﷺ — والعياذ بالله. Assume that for the sake of argument. What did the Messenger ﷺ do when there was any type of hostility on Muslims from those he had treaties with? What did the Messenger ﷺ do when the Yahūd or Quraysh merely attempted to betray him? When *one* woman was violated? When a person was killed? When it was rumored that a person might have been killed? When it was rumored that they killed 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه in the midst of the negotiations of Sulh Al-Hudaybiyyah? It was just one man, not a genocide. Without preparation and barely any weapons, Sulh Al-Hudaybiyyah was going to be dismissed and it was war until the death of every last one of them. One Sahābi, one man — not a continuous, ongoing genocide and imprisonment of men, women, and children who are besieged and raped and starved. Ka'ab Ibn Asad from Bani Quraydhah from the Yahūd, he had a treaty with the Messenger ﷺ. They didn't commit a genocide, they didn't imprison Muslims, they didn't rape and level towns and houses down. Ka'ab Ibn Asad agreed to help the coalition, the Ahzāb. For merely agreeing to do that and intending on doing that, it was a breach of the treaty, the agreement, and it was a declaration of war. The Messenger ﷺ affirmed the famous

⁶ Link to series can be found [here](#).

judgement for Sa'ad Ibn Mu'ādh رضى الله عنه and he rendered that tribe into history. It was a declaration of war and of breach of the treaty when Bani An-Nadhīr attempted to assassinate the Messenger ﷺ. When the Messenger ﷺ merely heard that Bani Al-Mustalaq were gathering to fight him, the treaty was over and it was a declaration of war. Bani Qaynuqā', they had a treaty with the Messenger ﷺ, but when a woman was dishonored and a man was killed defending her, it was a declaration of war. How many hundreds of thousands of women, men, and children have the Yahūd dishonored and killed and imprisoned? Don't ever think that the opponents of the Messenger ﷺ were weak tribes. Some of them had shielded forts, they had strong fighters, and some of them manufactured weapons, but the Messenger ﷺ didn't take any of that into account when Muslims were violated. With Quraysh in Makkah, the treaty Sulh Al-Hudaybiyyah, why did the Messenger ﷺ declare war on Quraysh and head to Makkah with 10,000 men, رضى الله عنهم أجمعين? Quraysh violated the treaty by helping a tribe fight a tribe that was in alliance with the Messenger ﷺ. A tribe called Bani Khuzā'ah entered into an alliance with the Messenger ﷺ. Bani Bakr entered into alliance with Quraysh. Those two tribes fought each other. Quraysh helped Bani Bakr. The Messenger ﷺ considered that a breach of the treaty and a declaration of war. My point is, those who use the treaties of the Messenger ﷺ to support their betrayal of the Ummah — okay. Now follow along and do what the Messenger did when a single woman was violated, when a single man was killed, when there was an attempt or intent on betrayal. We can discuss other side issues that they bring up that are irrelevant — they're irrelevant because the current normalization treaties are a violation on the 'Aqīdah level.

For example, they allege — briefly, we'll take it briefly — they allege, for example, that these treaties are for the Maslahah and benefit of the Muslims. I mentioned, when I spoke about Sulh Al-Hudaybiyyah in detail, I mentioned in detail the great achievements and accomplishments and the strength that the Muslims gained in that temporary truce during Sulh Al-Hudaybiyyah. Islām spread in the Arabian Peninsula, they strengthened their military, economic, and political power, and they took time away from fighting Quraysh to crush other enemies. These current normalization treaties weaken the Muslims, and they only

strengthen the Yahūd. These are treaties that not only can't stop genocides, but they can't and don't save a single life from the aggression of the Yahūd, rather they aid the occupier in this hostility. These treaties can't release a single underage prisoner, let alone a male or an adult from the thousands of prisoners that the Yahūd have. The treaties impose a deviant 'Aqīdah on the Muslim masses in their own lands and territories. These treaties can't halt nor even pull out a nail — a single nail — from a single wall from the hundreds of settlements that are being structured there. There's absolutely nothing but harm to the Muslims in these treaties with the Yahūd. Its only benefit is for the Yahūd and to cement the throne of the Tawāghīt.

Other Fiqhi issues is the issue, for example, that that majority of the Fuqahā' spoke about, with the exception of the Hanafiyyah, that they said the Hudnah is only permissible if it's conducted by the Imām or his representative. Another issue that's discussed by many, it's whether the Hudnah or the treaties with the Kuffār, are they valid if they're permanent? And first of all, this is an issue that's discussed by many of the Talabat Al-'Ilm. Number one, there can never be a permanent treaty with the Kuffār, because it cancels out Jihād and because of the verse,

فَلَا تَهِنُوا وَتَدْعُوا إِلَى السَّلْمِ وَأَنْتُمُ الْأَعْلَوْنَ وَاللَّهُ مَعَكُمْ وَلَنْ يَتَرَكُمُ أَعْمَلِكُمْ

So do not weaken and call for peace while you are superior; and Allāh is with you and will never deprive you of [the reward of] your deeds.⁷

However, what confuses many in this matter is a dispute in this matter, and the minority opinion is what I believe is the correct one. The issue is, is it permissible to have treaties with the Kuffār without specifying a deadline? The minority opinion is yes — if, of course, it's a proper Shar'ī treaty that fulfills the

⁷ [47:35]

Shar'ī conditions. Proof clearly supports that. Meaning, it's permissible to have a treaty with the Kuffār that is Mutlaqah or Mu'aqqatah. Mutlaqah means there's no specified deadline in the treaty. It doesn't state for ten years or for four months, just an open-ended agreement that we're not going to fight. That's totally different than saying it's forever or agreeing to have it forever, which is not permissible. Mu'aqqatah means there's a specified, set time in the contract. And the Ulamā' who required a set time in the Hudnah, they disputed how long it can be, and it's not the time right now to discuss that. If it's Mutlaqah — Mutlaqah, we said, is with an unspecified deadline — if it doesn't have a deadline, it can't be لازمة التأييد, meaning it can't be forever. Yes, the treaty may not mention ten years or four months or five years, it's open-ended, but that doesn't mean it's forever — it *can't* be forever. When Muslims get stronger, and it's a benefit for the Muslims, they inform the enemy this treaty has come to an end. I want to reiterate: Al-Mutlaq in treaties with the Kuffār is not considered forever, it's just not mentioning a specific ending date in the treaty itself. The Mutlaq is عقد جائز أو غير لازم, meaning one or both of the parties have the right to terminate the contract without the consent of the other. That's very similar to other 'Uqūd that are Jā'izah, like power of attorney or contracts of wills and gifts. You write someone an open-ended power of attorney to handle some of your affairs, there's no specified ending date or expiration date on it. Once you change your mind about that, you no longer want it, you let him know that this contract is over.

Another point that some make is the demoralizing argument that Muslims are weak. Those who demoralize the masses alleging that Muslims are weak today, had they lived during the Messenger ﷺ's time, they would have deterred the Messenger ﷺ from every single battle or expedition that he led or ordered. Materialistically speaking, when were the Muslims more powerful than the enemy? When did the Muslims outnumber and overpower the enemy? Those who make this kind of argument, they would have deterred Abu Bakr As-Siddīq رضي الله عنه from fighting the Murtaddīn, and they would have deterred him and swayed him from all the conquests he had after that. They would have deterred 'Umar رضي الله عنه and Abu 'Ubaydah رضي الله عنه and Sa'ad Ibn Abi Waqqās and Khālid Ibn

Al-Walīd from nearly every battle, because in nearly every one of them, they were outnumbered and outpowered. There would have been no battles with the Romans and Persians. The Muslims are not weak, but there are Tawāghīt and their Shuyūkh who like to instill this defeatist mentality in the Ummah, as I've mentioned in previous talks.

The most important thing to know is that Allāh سبحانه وتعالى based victory on giving *Him* victory. He made giving Him victory, جل في علاه, the foundation and the condition and the base for victory.

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا إِن تَنصُرُوا اللَّهَ يَنصُرْكُمْ وَيُثَبِّتْ أَقْدَامَكُمْ

*O you who have believed, if you support Allāh, He will support you and plant firmly your feet.*⁸

Materialistic force wasn't a condition in that verse. Muslims don't take pure materialistic matters into account alone, especially when it's Jihād Ad-Daf'. They rely on Allāh سبحانه وتعالى, gather what they have, and set off towards the enemy, as the Messenger ﷺ did. It should not be misunderstood that Muslims fully ignore materialistic preparation, but it's not everything. When there's obedience to Allāh سبحانه وتعالى, Yaqīn, and proper Tawakkul on Allāh سبحانه وتعالى, Muslims gather what they can and what they have and they proceed, even if it's stones versus airplanes.

وَأَعِدُّوا لَهُمْ مَا اسْتَطَعْتُمْ مِنْ قُوَّةٍ

⁸ [47:7]

And prepare against them whatever you are able of power...⁹

Gather against them what you can of power. What *you can* of power. Material preparation is not ignored, but what's requested is just what you have. You don't say, "Let's wait another sixty years until we have nuclear weapons" while they're raping our sisters and killing our children. Muslims have enough capabilities to lead the globe, as they previously did. But when the defeatist mentality is taught in the Masājid and it's instilled in th hearts and minds, it paralyzes the limbs. When that happens, there's no worldly power on the face of the Earth that can get a person to stand up — let alone win — no matter how mighty it is. That, combined with the lack of Īmān, Yaqīn, and Tawakkul.

Normalization is to propagate a defeatist mentality among the Muslims. Normalization is to normalize Muslims being weak. It's to normalize that they will be oppressed, that they will live under foreign occupation, and under the direction, order, and command of the Yahūd and the United States. There's no share of victory that will be attained so long as people or Muslims take into consideration materialistic means only, cutoff from the aid of Allāh سبحانه وتعالى. There's a lot of details that I can add on this issue as it pertains to the Fiqh matters that are brought up, but they're not needed. What's needed to know is that normalization treaties are void and prohibited. The ones that are going on today, they're void and prohibited, because they're compromising on the principles of the Dīn of Allāh سبحانه وتعالى. One must fully know and understand their details, realities, and effects before giving a ruling on them. There's an old Fatwa by Ash-Shaykh Al-'Allāmah Al-Imām Nāsir Al-Fahd فكه الله بالعز أسره on this matter. It's better than anything I can say on this matter.

⁹ [8:60]