



September, 2026

Price: US\$ 4, per copy

Annual Subscription: US \$ 48

E-Mail: info@theglobalvoice.net

www.theglobalvoice.net

A Magazine for Scholarly, Literary, Political, Economic and Religious *Activities*



Page 18



Page 32



Editor in Chief
Mohiuddin Abbasi

Editor
Munazza Khan

Assistant Editor
Dr. Busharat Elahi Jamil

Associate Editor
Amina Nuzhat
Attiya Wasee

Bureau Chief Canada
M. Sultan Qureshi



Page

- 3. Editorial
- 4. Israel is betting on Islamophobia to save its standing in the West
- 6. Jared Kushner Has What Middle East Diplomacy Requires | Opinion
- 9. Why forcing US companies to pick a side could weaken their competitiveness
- 11. GOLDSTEIN: Job losses, inflation and bail-outs – the high costs of an all-out trade war
- 13. Canada West Foundation: What Alberta Separation Would Actually Mean
- 16. Trump considering renaming Lake Ontario to 'Lake America' as trade war with Canada escalates
- 18. ICC hits back after US announces fresh sanctions on senior court figures
- 19. China hits out at 'illegal' new US sanctions on Iran and trading partners
- 21. Unlearned lessons of history
- 24. More provinces? Let the people decide
- 27. MIGRANT ROW Sudanese migrant allowed to remain in UK as she is married to her cousin & being deported would breach her human rights
- 29. BORDER FARCE Fury as 'catastrophic' £500k a DAY spent detaining illegal migrants and moving them around the country
- 30. India: UN experts urge corrective action to protect human rights and end attacks against minorities in lead up to elections
- 32. The Mecca pact isn't (at least yet) the new 'NATO of the East'
- 35. Canada lowered a retired Boeing 737 onto the seabed off Vancouver Island; the 100-foot jet now sits nearly 90 feet underwater as an artificial reef for marine life
- 37. The AI We're Building Needs a Kill Switch | Opinion
- 39. Global ocean temperatures hit record high as El Nino intensifies
- 41. Three Poems for My Wife
- 42. Tribute to Zubaida Naheed Qazi

Disclaimer

The Views and opinions expressed in this magazine are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official policy of magazine.

Send your writeups at
info@theglobalvoice.net
Write to:
Monthly The Global Voice
Phone: +44 794 007 7825



Editorial

Dr. Busharat Elahi Jamil - Assistant Editor



Sadly, morals and humanity are fading in Pakistan. It has a past, and the individuals in power corridors and the elite are mostly to blame. Pakistan's system has been high jacked by the elite classes since its inception. Cruel and merciless sovereigns, ignorant politicians, generals and extremist radicalized religious stratus are in charge and are to blame for the devastation of indigenous society; they are undermining Pakistan's foundations in the name of democracy and Islam. They are completely unaware that inept politicians are making unpopular and inappropriate decisions for the Pakistani people in order to appease the so-called Establishment.

While the general people is experiencing extreme poverty and suffering, the powerful elite are becoming wealthier and more powerful. The percentage of people living below the poverty level is about 40%. Swear poverty is causing people to commit suicide. The government only serves the ruling classes and bureaucracy; it does not address issues like food, medication, justice, education, health, etc. Pakistan has about \$138 billion in external debt, businesses are at a halt, and the country's officials are not cutting back. The government manages the nation's financial system by implementing the massive new taxes and outsourcing roads, schools, airports, and other infrastructure. In actuality, the ruling class is disregarding the country in favour of their own goals since they do not prioritise the issues facing the populace.

Around 26 million children aging five to 16 are out of the educational institutes, which is a serious dilemma. The unemployment rate, which is currently at 5.5%, is sharply rising. The biggest indication of how people are now putting their own problems ahead of national ones is the massive brain drain. In recent years, almost 1.6 million qualified people, including doctors, engineers, and accountants, have fled Pakistan. The powerlessness of the populace is a spectacle that incompetent rulers only take pleasure in. While the regular people's infants are burning to death in the local hospitals, the absurd rulers and their families are receiving medical care from other nations, and they don't give a damn. Now decisively; It is time for Pakistanis to make the decision to abolish this outdated and cruel form of governance. They are merely the owners of Pakistan; they are neither slaves nor foreigners. Pakistan was created by loyalist political well-wishers, not by an army or a crooked mafia. Pakistanis should speak up for the fundamental rights guaranteed by the Constitution. The educated class ought to speak up for their rights and unite the country.

Israel is betting on Islamophobia to save its standing in the West

By Josh Paul



Netanyahu's government is using anti-Muslim fear to rally a Western right increasingly receptive to its message.

It had been a lengthy and productive meeting with the chief of staff to a Republican member of Congress. We had discussed United States policy towards Israel, and the scepticism of many of the Grand Old Party members towards the relationship and the challenge they face in saying anything about it given President Donald Trump's iron grip on it. But there was one final agenda item I needed to raise: the member's participation in the newly created "Sharia-Free America Caucus", a group of US representatives standing against what one founding member described as "a religion of violence, abuse of women, and ruthless political conquest. Its laws and practices have no place in American society."

"Oh, don't worry about that," the staffer said, with a wave of his hand. "Muslims are just the low-hanging fruit. Really it is about Indians. And brown people in general. And the Jews, too. It won't get in the way of putting America first. Really the only Member [of the Caucus] who believes all the bullshit about Israel is Randy Fine."

The whipping up of Islamophobia in the US has become visible and visceral, to the extent that many in the Muslim community now look back almost wistfully to the days of George W Bush, who made a point, in the wake of the September 11, 2001 attacks, of visiting a mosque and declaring that "Islam is peace". Such efforts at inclusivity have almost vanished entirely from the Republican Party, replaced by an outright bigotry that has inspired a spike in anti-Muslim attacks, such as the shooting at the Islamic Center of San Diego in May that killed two worshippers and a security guard. A recent proposal by Dallas Fort Worth international airport to add unobtrusive foot-washing stations for Muslims wishing to perform wudu (and presumably anyone else with dirty feet) was swiftly abandoned in the face of condemnation by Texas Governor Greg Abbott that the installation of such stations would be unconstitutional.

Where is all this coming from? To be sure, some of it is a reflection of the politics that Trump has promoted since his very first day of presidential campaigning in 2015 to divide Americans by suggesting that the country's White majority and its historic place atop the social hierarchy are at risk; in this context it is not only Muslims who are under attack, but all minorities, as demonstrated by his administration's attacks on Black history or Hispanic culture. But when it comes to Islamophobia, there is a more targeted driver of the trend.

In January this year, the government of Israel hosted an anti-Semitism conference in Jerusalem. This, by itself, is rather unremarkable. But what is noteworthy is who attended: leaders from across the European far right, including representatives from Poland's PiS,

Spain's Vox, Hungary's Fidesz, and France's Rassemblement National. The event was, perhaps, the largest gathering of European right-wingers to discuss anti-Semitism since the US-led *umerziehung* (re-education) process in post-war Germany.

But the far right are now allies, as Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu told them, in the fight against the “invasion of radical Islam”. Since January, Netanyahu has continued on this theme, recently warning that “the first Islamic republic with nuclear weapons will be the Islamic republic of Britain”, and campaigning for re-election under a billboard titled “Don't let them win” that features the faces of Hezbollah and Iranian leaders alongside those of Turkish President Recep Tayyip Erdogan and New York Mayor Zohran Mamdani.

Israel's promotion of Islamophobia is not limited to Netanyahu, nor does it end at its own shores. As Israel's own reputation has cratered, rather than examining its actions (particularly in Gaza), it has decided its salvation rests in more effective public relations and propaganda campaigns. Some of this has materialised in an effort to prop up its own reputation: “The US-Israel relationship promotes stability”, explained an automated text message that millions of other Americans and I recently received via Israeli-contracted Clock Tower X. But Israel is also going on the offensive by trying to knock down and delegitimise its critics and by rallying the right through a purposeful campaign of Islamophobia.

The strategy may have been informed by a leaked study solicited by Israel's Ministry of Foreign Affairs from US public relations firm Stagwell Global, which found that the most effective tactic in shifting public opinion would be to drive fear of “Radical Islam” and “Jihadism” but, in the absence of any compelling reason why the US should continue to back his country, Netanyahu has increasingly leaned into the argument that Israel is, as he claims foreign leaders have told him, the “model in the struggle against radical Islam which threatens the entire civilised world”.

This has manifested itself in Israel's leveraging of increasingly virulent Islamophobia as part of its hasbara strategy, for instance in Canada in 2024, when an Israeli-government-funded influence operation using the name United Citizens for Canada conducted social media campaigns claiming that Muslim immigrants to the country posed a threat to society and were trying to impose Islamic law.

In many cases, Americans and Europeans have seen through such efforts. Recent primary wins for prominent Muslim congressional candidates such as Abdul El-Sayed have demonstrated a cross-communal rejection of Islamophobic rhetoric. But in other areas, Muslim communities increasingly feel under siege.

Israeli society is premised on Jewish supremacy and the pursuit of demographic homogeneity, but Western countries are increasingly diverse in both their demographics and their leadership. While the path to peace for Israel may be one that makes Israel look more like the West – a country with equality for all its people – at the core of its current propaganda campaign is the desire to make the West look more like Israel. That poses a test for Western pluralism, but even if the West fails that test, Israel should not assume that such a failure would inherently lead to an embrace of Zionism.

Fear and hatred are powerful tools, and the current Islamophobic campaign is likely to unleash further and deeper harms. But even on its primary objective, to stem the loss of support in Israel's last bastion of Western far-right opinion, it is far from clear that it will succeed. In the meantime, Europeans and Americans would be wise to see it for what it is: a desperate foreign influence operation driven by a state that is increasingly running out of options.

Source: <https://www.aljazeera.com/opinions/2026/8/20/israel-is-betting-on-islamophobia-to-save-its-standing-in-the-west>



Jared Kushner Has What Middle East Diplomacy Requires | Opinion

By Jason D. Greenblatt

Jared Kushner, serving as an unpaid volunteer for the Trump administration, traveled to Egypt and Israel this week with Nickolay Mladenov, the Board of Peace's high representative for Gaza, and former British Prime Minister Tony Blair.

I worked closely with Jared for nearly three years in the White House, and he has a strong and deeply trusted relationship with President Trump. He understands how the president thinks, negotiates and reaches decisions. Very few people could meet Hamas leaders and regional mediators in Cairo one day and Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu in Jerusalem the next, with each side knowing he had the president's confidence. Jared is one of those few.

Years ago, critics dismissed Jared as an outsider who knew little about the region, especially compared to career diplomats who had spent decades on the file. That criticism has not aged well. Jared has now spent close to a decade with the region's current leadership and understands where they want to go better than most. I'd push back hard on anyone who still thinks otherwise.

Before the visit, Prime Minister Netanyahu had rejected the Board of Peace's 15-point roadmap. After nearly four hours of constructive talks, Israel and the Board agreed on a path forward, including working groups on Gaza's demilitarization and public health. That is a practical step toward closing the gap and advancing President Trump's 20-point plan. I remain skeptical that

Hamas has abandoned its desire to attack Israel and ultimately destroy it, but that does not mean President Trump and his team should stop trying.

Jared also developed deep and trusted relationships with leaders across our Arab allies and in Israel. Under President Trump's leadership, those relationships, combined with Jared's unrelenting tenacity and determined optimism, created the Abraham Accords. The agreements normalized relations between Israel and several Arab countries and thoroughly shattered assumptions that had constrained Middle East diplomacy for decades, an outcome that eluded plenty of people who once doubted Jared belonged in the room.

The ranking Democrats on the House Judiciary, House Oversight and Senate Finance Committees are pursuing investigations into Affinity Partners, the firm Jared founded after leaving government in 2021, which is heavily funded by capital tied to Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates and Qatar. Opposition to Jared volunteering once again to serve the United States government predates Affinity itself. Some of his critics have opposed his role since his first day back. Jamie Raskin, the ranking Democrat on the House Judiciary Committee, has called the current arrangement "a glaring and incurable conflict of interest." The critics' claim is that the United States government cannot rely on Jared Kushner while he remains active in private business in the Middle East. My answer is unequivocally that this would be a mistake, both for the United States and for our allies there.

We are now more than 570 days into President Trump's second term, and Jared has been involved from the beginning. No critic has produced a shred of evidence that an American negotiating position was altered because of an Affinity investment, that a concession was made to a country because its sovereign wealth fund invested with Jared, that confidential information was transferred for private gain, or that any other advantage was provided to a country in return for investing in Affinity. Anyone with such evidence should produce it. I don't believe it exists.

Sovereign wealth funds invest with firms whose principals understand the relevant countries, economies and regions and have extensive relationships there. That is one of several explanations for why Affinity attracts investors, along with what appears to be a strong track record for the firm. Neither proves that Jared did anything remotely inappropriate.

Critics say the real ask is not that Jared give up Affinity. It is that he not be allowed to serve his country at all while he owns it. If no law or regulation is being violated, I think that trade is a bad one for America. It is the country that would be giving up something rare, not Jared. The answer that usually comes back is that legality is not enough, and that protocol, morality and appearance should govern as well. But who decides? What does protocol mean anyway? Protocols come and go with administrations. Who decides morality? CNN or Fox? A Democrat who despises President Trump or a Republican who adores him? Appearance is incredibly subjective. A room full of people in one community may see nothing wrong with

the arrangement. A room in another community may find it deeply troubling. That is exactly why personal discomfort cannot become a binding rule. If Congress believes clearer boundaries are necessary, Congress should write them. It can require disclosure, restrict specified transactions or define recusal obligations. Those rules should be written in advance and applied to every president and every family, whichever party holds the White House. Standards should not be invented after the fact by a committee, a network or a political opponent, and repeating an allegation does not convert it into a verdict.

Whatever rules Congress may eventually decide to write, the judgment for right now is not a close call. I weigh these concerns about Jared against having someone with his experience, access, relationships and proven record helping President Trump pursue what may be a historic opportunity for stability among our allies in the Middle East. I come down strongly in favor of keeping him at the center of that effort.

Jared goes into these meetings knowing the region's leaders, and the ground beneath them, better than almost anyone else Washington could send. That is exactly where he should be.

Source: <https://www.newsweek.com/jared-kushner-has-what-middle-east-diplomacy-requires-12340906>

SARMAD KHAN

FCA, FCCA

DIRECTOR | ASHBOURNE PROBATE LTD
Commissioner for Oaths

UK: +44 7852 597675 | +44 2084349531

info@ashbourneprobate.co.uk

www.ashbourneprobate.co.uk

UK OFFICE

Ashbourne Probate Ltd
115 London Road, Morden, Surrey,
England, SM4 5HP UK



ASHBOURNE PROBATE
CLEAN BOOKS. LOWER STRESS. BETTER CONTROL



ICAEW
ACCREDITED FOR
PROBATE & OATHS



✓ Authorised by ICAEW to carry out the reserved legal activity of non-contentious Probate & Oaths in England & Wales

Ashbourne Probate is the trading name of **Ashbourne Probate Ltd** company no 10541021 AND REGISTERED IN ENGLAND AND WALES Authorised by UK Companies House as an Authorised Corporate Service Provider (ACSP)

SARMAD KHAN

CO-FOUNDER / DIRECTOR | URDU BOOKS WORLD LTD

UK: +44 7774 876499 | UK: +44 2070386299

UAE: +971 50 480 5734 | PK: +92 331 2784213

info@urdubooksworld.co.uk

www.urdubooksworld.co.uk

OUR OFFICES

UNITED KINGDOM (HEAD OFFICE)
Urdu Books World Ltd,
115 London Road, Morden, Surrey, England, SM4 5HP UK

UNITED ARAB EMIRATES
Urdu Books World FZC,
Business Centre, Sharjah Publishing City Free Zone,
Al Zahia, Sheikh Mohammed Bin Zayed Road (E311),
Sharjah, United Arab Emirates

PAKISTAN
Urdu Books World (Private) Ltd,
Office No.1, 3rd Floor, Medina Heights,
87E Maulana Shaukat Ali Road,
Johar Town, Lahore, Pakistan



Urdu Books World

FOLLOW US

f <https://www.facebook.com/profile.php?id=61552417381038>

ig <https://www.instagram.com/urdubooksworld?igsh=bDkOeWsybWx6cnU0>

tt https://www.tiktok.com/@urdu.books.world?t=8r5mzAmetE8&_r=1

Why forcing US companies to pick a side could weaken their competitiveness

By Zhou Mi



Recently, some voices in the US discussed the concept of “China’s neutrality trap” and implied that it can’t be accepted if US companies want to keep good relations with both China and the US. Some even argued that US companies need to pick a side, either the US or China. What a ridiculous logic.

Globalization is the result of economies concentrating on developing, strengthening and exporting their advantages, while importing the products they do not have. As one of the most important advocates, multinational companies are very active in establishing the global supply chain network to use the resources in the host countries in a better way. From raw materials and competitive labor costs to not too many environmental constraints, many companies chose to invest in China in the past decades, and benefited a lot from the systematic advantages of doing so, which are transferred to their own competitiveness.

But the situation is gradually different. China’s labor costs are increasing, stricter environmental regulations are being published and carbon emissions are also managed by quotas. Companies still come. The reasons for choosing China change. They come here because of the certainty, innovation and even market strength. Companies investing in China can have the support of both a full package of manufacturing systems and the latest technology. Their global competitiveness will be strengthened not just by costs, but also by technology and quality.

Currently, China’s super large market is attracting more and more companies. China is the second largest consumption market in the world. And the demand for more and higher quality products and services will not end in a few decades. Lower import tariffs and the annual China International Import Expo have shown China’s attitude of welcoming everyone to share its opportunities with the world,

which is different compared to the US' attitude.

As the process of globalization is the reason for many US multinational corporations' (MNCs) success, the restrained activities by excluding the most important market will slow the process and even destroy the MNCs. US companies are not the only players in most sectors. Even if US companies dominate certain sectors, the demand will always drive strong innovation ability to fill the supply gaps. Like Chinese people sometimes say, without a certain supplier, we can do it by ourselves.

For example, when the US tried to control the export of semiconductors to China a few years ago, we could barely produce any chips. However, to meet the ever-growing demand, many Chinese companies and international capital, technology and talents joined the game of enabling China's capability of producing chips. With continuous effort, Chinese companies have developed a new ecosystem of semiconductors. They can produce high quality chips, which support the development of IT equipment, mobiles and new energy vehicles. The chips are also exported, meeting diversified demands in other countries, including the US itself.

In a word, blocking cooperation with China cannot stop China's development, but only lead to the absence of US companies in the most important market. Companies need the market; the inability to stay in and be active in China will certainly significantly reduce US companies' competitiveness and harm their global performance. Deglobalization will make the MNCs weaker.

During the summit between the leaders of China and the US earlier this year, a consensus on building a constructive relationship of strategic stability has showed the world the principle of guiding the most important bilateral relations. Companies are the key players in this bilateral relationship. If they are forced to pick a side, how can the relationship be stable? Competition is one of the tones in the bilateral relationship. But it needs to be manageable and healthy. And to compete in this way, companies need more interaction.

A mechanism for discussing and managing trade and investment by both governments is emerging. China and the US do have the experience, wisdom and ability to manage the bilateral environment for economic cooperation. The world needs the two largest countries to be in a manageable relationship. Topics including climate change, geopolitical tensions and AI governance do need the collective efforts of both China and the US.

These efforts cannot be effective only between the governments. Companies' attitudes and actions are the most important part of the solutions. We need to respect the law of the market and listen to the companies' requirements, instead of forcing them to pick a side.

Source: <https://www.globaltimes.cn/page/202608/1368642.shtml>

GOLDSTEIN: Job losses, inflation and bail-outs – the high costs of an all-out trade war

By Lorrie Goldstein



Tariff wars are bad public policy and economically destructive to large, small and medium-sized businesses

In responding to the breakdown of Canada-U.S. trade negotiations late Friday with dollar-for-dollar matching counter tariffs against the U.S. starting on Sept. 8, Prime Minister Mark Carney is embarking on a strategy he said was unrealistic a year ago.

This actually marks the second time he has reversed policy on the issue of dollar-for-dollar retaliatory tariffs.

When he was running for the Liberal leadership, Carney said in response to tariffs imposed on Canada by U.S. President Donald Trump that, “dollar-for-dollar retaliatory tariffs by Canada should be a given ... aimed where their impacts in the United States will be felt the hardest.”

But after becoming prime minister, Carney quickly reversed his argument, saying dollar-for-dollar counter-tariffs against the U.S. were unrealistic since our economy is “a tenth the size of the U.S.”

After he won the election, Carney removed most of Canada’s counter-tariffs on U.S. imports that were in compliance with the Canada-U.S.-Mexico Agreement (CUSMA) on trade, although he maintained sectoral counter-tariffs on steel, aluminum and autos in response to tariffs initiated by Trump.

Carney said on Saturday the new dollar-for-dollar counter tariffs he will announce on Sept. 8 in response to Trump’s new round of 50% tariffs on \$28 billion worth of Canadian goods – including everything from wine, to plastics, hockey sticks, electronics and forestry – will be strategically designed in order to be effective.

New spending to bail out businesses, workers, industries

On the same day he will announce new government spending to bail out businesses, workers and industries negatively impacted by tariffs, beyond the \$25 billion it has already spent.

The practical impact of an escalating tariff war between Canada and the U.S. will

be higher consumer prices, higher inflation and more job losses in both countries. That's why tariff wars are bad public policy and economically destructive to large, small and medium-sized businesses.

The tariff war between Canada and the U.S. could escalate further if, as U.S. trade representative Jamieson Greer has said, the U.S. imposes more tariffs on Canadian goods in response to the counter-tariffs Carney will announce on Sept. 8, and the Carney government responds to that with new matching tariffs.

Carney said he had no choice but to impose new counter tariffs given that Trump started the trade war by attacking Canada with the aim not only of damaging Canada economically, but eroding Canadian sovereignty.

Economic cost to Canadians will increase

Whatever the reason, the economic cost to Canadians of the ongoing tariff war will increase the longer it goes on.

Canada lost 51,800 manufacturing jobs in the 12 months after Trump announced his so-called "Liberation Day" tariffs on April 2, 2025 of 50% on steel and aluminum, and 25% on the auto sector.

Prior to the collapse of the trade talks between Canada and the U.S. late Friday, University of Calgary economist Trevor Tombe estimated Trump's latest round of 50% tariffs on \$28 billion worth of Canadian goods would result in almost 90,000 direct and indirect job losses across Canada, including 36,000 in Ontario, 18,000 in Quebec, 11,000 in B.C. and 9,000 in Alberta.

Writing in thehub.ca, Tombe said this alone would raise the current national unemployment rate of 6.4% to 6.8%.

"Using the full list of items subject to U.S. tariffs, I estimate that the most exposed sectors are machinery and electronics, plastics and rubber, furniture, toys, wood products, chemicals, food products, and clothing," Tombe wrote.

"Roughly half of textile exports to the United States would be affected, and nearly as high a share of furniture exports."

A report earlier this month by the Canadian American Business Council done by Oxford Economics estimated an all-out trade war between Canada and the U.S. leading to a breakdown of CUSMA would result in 102,000 lost jobs in Canada next year.

It would also mean a cumulative loss of \$5,987 per Canadian household over 10 years and a \$271 billion loss in GDP over the same period.

"Four decades of economic integration (between Canada and the U.S.) have overwhelmingly generated economic benefits for American and Canadian businesses, workers and consumers, and those benefits would be placed at risk under all elevated-tariff scenarios," the report concludes.

Source:<https://torontosun.com/opinion/columnists/job-losses-inflation-bail-outs-high-costs-all-out-trade-war>

A man with dark hair and glasses is speaking into a microphone. He is wearing a dark suit jacket over a light-colored shirt. The background is a solid blue color.

Canada West Foundation: What Alberta Separation Would Actually Mean

By Gary Mar

In my last column, I wrote that there is too much perceived certainty in the separation debate.

Certainty that separation would be catastrophe. Certainty that it would be liberation.

Neither position leaves much room for the harder work of understanding what separation would actually mean.

That is why the Canada West Foundation sought out people with the expertise to ask the right questions and the experience to test the answers against facts and evidence rather than emotion. Knowing which questions to ask is important, but so too is having the insight and experience to understand the answers, weigh the evidence and recognize the broader implications.

Our contributors come from different backgrounds and, importantly, don't agree on everything. Nor should they.

Ted Morton taught constitutional law and federalism at the University of Calgary for more than 30 years and served as an Alberta cabinet minister. Dwight Newman is a professor of law at the University of Saskatchewan, holds a Canada Research Chair in rights, communities, and constitutional law, and clerked at the Supreme Court of Canada.

Those backgrounds matter because the constitutional questions surrounding separation are neither simple nor settled.

Quebec held referendums in 1980 and 1995. The second was decided by less than one percentage point. But Canada has never negotiated the actual departure of a province. The Supreme Court of Canada's 1998 Reference re Secession of Quebec established that a clear majority voting on a clear question would create an obligation to negotiate. It also underscored that a referendum result alone would not separate a province. What the negotiations would ultimately produce was left open.

The federal Clarity Act of 2000 identifies some of the issues that would have to be addressed, including the division of assets and liabilities, possible border changes and, importantly, Indigenous rights and territorial claims. Audrey Doerr brings decades of scholarship on Canadian government and public administration and provides perspective on Indigenous rights.

The economic questions are just as important.

Herb Emery holds the Vaughan Chair in regional economics at the University of New Brunswick and has spent years studying regional economic disparities. Paul Boothe has examined fiscal policy from both sides of the desk, as an academic and senior federal public servant. Lennie Kaplan spent more than two decades working on fiscal and energy policy in the Alberta government and served as executive director of the MacKinnon Panel on Alberta's Finances.

Their expertise helps move the discussion beyond the question of whether Alberta should separate and toward the more difficult question: what would an independent Alberta look like?

What happens to pensions? What currency would be used? How would federal debt and assets be divided? What would a new government need to borrow? What would the fiscal position of an independent Alberta look like on day one, and what would it look like five or 10 years later?

These may sound like questions for an accountant's spreadsheet. They aren't. Eventually, the numbers find their way to the kitchen table.

Trade is another area where experience matters.

I spent four years representing Alberta in Washington and another four years as the province's representative in Asia. One lesson I took from those experiences is that Alberta's economy depends on markets well beyond our borders.

Greg Anderson knows that world as well. He is a political economist at the University of Alberta who worked on trade policy inside the Office of the United States Trade Representative on files involving Canada, Mexico and the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA).

If Alberta became independent, what would happen to the international trade arrangements Albertans now take for granted? What would happen to the

movement of energy, agricultural products, manufactured goods and investment across international borders?

And what about the rest of Canada? We already complain, with good reason, about barriers to trade between provinces even though we are part of the same country. An independent Alberta would still need to buy from and sell to British Columbia, Saskatchewan and the other provinces.

Governments negotiate trade agreements. Businesses must operate under these agreements and get trucks and trains across the border. Jeff McCaig brings a practical perspective to that challenge. He's led Trimac Transportation, one of North America's largest bulk trucking companies, for more than 20 years.

What these contributors have in common is the experience to know which questions matter, the expertise to examine the evidence and the willingness to share their assumptions and have them challenged.

Albertans have every right to be frustrated with Confederation. Equalization, pipelines, energy and climate policy, interprovincial trade barriers and Alberta's influence in national decision-making did not become issues because a referendum was proposed. These grievances have been building for decades, and Adam Legge, president of the Business Council of Alberta, brings more than 20 years of experience in business and economic development to that discussion.

Whatever evidence Albertans use to reach their individual conclusions, it should be able to withstand scrutiny.

That is the purpose of the Canada West Foundation's work, including our forthcoming report. It does not tell Albertans how to vote. It is intended to give them a clearer understanding of the choices before them: what we know, what we can reasonably estimate, what remains uncertain and what would have to be negotiated.

That distinction matters.

On October 19, Albertans will not vote to separate from Canada. They will choose whether the government should commence the legal process required under the Canadian Constitution to hold a binding provincial referendum on whether Alberta should separate from Canada. Before making that choice, Albertans deserve more than just confident predictions from either side.

They deserve a clear understanding of some of the questions, the evidence behind the answers, the uncertainties that remain and the choices that would follow.

Source: <https://calgaryherald.com/opinion/canada-west-foundation-what-alberta-separation-would-actually-mean>

Trump considering renaming Lake Ontario to 'Lake America' as trade war with Canada escalates

By Gavin Blackburn

The rhetoric between the two countries is escalating, with Trump telling Canadian leaders on Monday to “fall in line” or face consequences “far WORSE” than existing tariffs.

President Donald Trump said on Tuesday that he is considering changing the name of Lake Ontario to “Lake America” as the trade war between the United States and Canada intensifies.

Such a change would be reminiscent of the Republican president’s unilateral action last year by executive order to rename the Gulf of Mexico to the Gulf of America.

The United States and Canada are locked in a trade dispute, with Canada expected to announce retaliatory measures on Tuesday.

That’s in response to the Trump administration enacting 50% tariffs on \$20 billion (€17 billion) of Canadian goods over the weekend after talks between the countries broke down.

“The United States is giving serious consideration to changing the name of Lake Ontario to Lake America in that we don’t expect to doing much business with Ontario any longer,” Trump said in a post on social media.

Ontario is Canada’s most populous province and is home to the country’s auto industry.

The rhetoric between the two countries is escalating, with Trump telling Canadian leaders on Monday to “fall in line” or face consequences “far WORSE” than existing tariffs.

Prime Minister Mark Carney has accused Washington of trying to subordinate Canada.

Trump also threatened new 50% tariffs on Canadian vehicles, auto parts and steel, while Carney said US trade demands showed that Washington wanted to “destroy our major industries,” including autos, steel and aluminium.

Canada and the United States share one of the world’s largest trading relationships, with deeply integrated supply chains across cars, energy, agriculture and manufacturing, making a prolonged trade fight potentially costly for businesses and workers on both sides of the border.

Businesses and consumers are caught in the middle, facing uncertainty about how much prices may increase.

Michael Howard II, owner of a furniture business in Warren, Michigan, outside Detroit, said the tariffs will hamper the “ability for us to put food on the table for our family, but also impacts the ability for us to give back to our community.”

Howard and his wife started their business a decade ago. They make and sell everything from dining room tables to bookcases.

“To say that we don’t need Canada is just disingenuous,” he said. “It’s dishonest. And it’s just absolutely not truthful. We need our neighbour, but also they need us.”

Canada’s Finance Minister François-Philippe Champagne and three other Cabinet ministers are also expected to share details of support for workers affected by tariffs.

Carney said earlier on Monday that Canada may need to move away from matching US tariffs dollar for dollar and instead use more targeted retaliation aimed at protecting Canadian workers and businesses.

“An attitude at the negotiation table that Canada is a subsidiary of the United States” is “not something we’re going to accept,” Carney said.

Carney was even more blunt in French.

“We learned during the negotiations that the Americans want to destroy our major industries, including autos, steel and aluminium,” Carney said. “That was one of the main reasons we said no. It was a bad deal.”

Source: <https://www.euronews.com/2026/08/25/trump-considering-renaming-lake-ontario-to-lake-america-as-trade-war-with-canada-escalates>



ICC hits back after US announces fresh sanctions on senior court figures

By Nathan Rennolds

Responding to the US' move in a statement, the ICC reportedly said the new sanctions "undermine the rule of law."

Washington on Tuesday announced sanctions against the president of the International Criminal Court (ICC), as the Trump administration ramps up its efforts to "dismantle" the organisation.

In a statement, US Secretary of State Marco Rubio said the US was sanctioning ICC President Tomoko Akane as well as senior trial lawyer Abdoulaye Seye, accusing them of "directly" engaging "in efforts by the ICC to investigate, arrest, detain, or prosecute officials whose government has not consented to ICC jurisdiction."

Rubio, who called the ICC a "corrupt and fatally politicised supranational court," added that it had "maliciously abused its authority and exceeded its mandate," saying it had "repeatedly attempted to assert authority over nationals of the United States and other countries that have not consented to its jurisdiction or ratified the Rome Statute."

Washington has repeatedly accused the ICC of "politicised actions" and of "targeting Israel." The ICC issued an arrest warrant for Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu in November 2024 relating to the war in Gaza.

Responding to the US' move in a statement, the ICC reportedly said the new sanctions "undermine the rule of law."

"When judicial actors are threatened for applying the law, it is the international legal order itself that is placed at risk," it said.

In July, the State Department announced plans to embark on a campaign to bring down the court and "systematically disable" its "ability to operate."

It said actions it could take included increased sanctions and visa revocations, as well as travel bans on ICC personnel.

The US had already imposed sanctions against several members of the court, including a number of judges.

Source: https://www.euronews.com/2026/08/18/icc-hits-back-after-us-announces-fresh-sanctions-on-senior-court-figures?utm_source=vuukle&utm_medium=talk_of_town



China hits out at 'illegal' new US sanctions on Iran and trading partners

By Ian Aikman

China has vowed to protect its interests after the US announced plans to widen economic sanctions against Iran and its trading partners, which include Beijing.

Foreign ministry spokesman Lin Jian said China was firmly opposed to what it called “illegal unilateral sanctions” and would take “all necessary measures” to safeguard its rights.

This came after US Treasury Secretary Scott Bessent announced the new measures on Monday, warning any nation financially partnering with Iran would be isolated.

China is the biggest buyer of Iranian oil, although the trade has declined under the US blockade of Iran’s ports.

Lin said: “Cooperation between China and Iran has always been conducted within the framework of international law and should not be interfered with or disrupted.”

Bessent described the plans for sanctions as “the single greatest financial offensive ever” against Iran, warning banks and businesses would share in Iran’s isolation if they refused to cut ties with the country.

He declined to focus on specific nations, but said US President Donald Trump would be phoning world leaders “with specific requests to cease their interactions with the regime”.

However, responding to a question about Chinese banks, Bessent said he wanted to make clear “no one was above the reach of US sanctions”.

The announcement comes ahead of planned talks between Trump and Chinese President Xi Jinping next month.

Washington is likely to be wary of potential retaliation from Beijing, which processes the majority of the world’s rare earths and other critical minerals, crucial in the manufacture of many high-tech products.

Beijing has already tightened export controls on rare earths as part of previous trade negotiations with the US.

China’s response followed Iranian Economy Minister Ali Madanizadeh saying Tehran was “fully prepared” for the wider sanctions, which he said would lead to “another defeat” for the US.

"The government is and was ready and has a two-year plan to manage these events," he told state television.

"We also have our own tools and know how to play the game," he said, adding Tehran had been "waiting for these plans for a long time".

The US has dubbed its latest sanctions "Operation Economic Outcast" and described them as an "economic D-Day" against Iran.

It comes almost six months after the start of the Iran war.

The conflict has since led to hikes in oil prices worldwide, with Tehran effectively blocking exports through the Strait of Hormuz - a waterway vital to the global economy. The US has also slowed traffic via its own naval blockade.

Recent attempts to end the conflict via diplomacy have failed, and a 60-day ceasefire formally expired last week with no sign of a settlement.

With the announcement of new sanctions, the US treasury secretary claimed America was "no longer managing the Iranian threat, we are ending it".

UK Chancellor John Healey said the British government supported "US work to secure a diplomatic solution and welcome efforts to increase pressure".

Iran is already under heavy sanctions from the US, but Bessent said these go further.

He said the Treasury had mapped financial channels, facilitators and networks used by Iran to evade sanctions to trade oil, imposing sanctions on almost 60 entities, individuals and vessels.

But analysts had cast doubt on the latest measures even before China's response.

David Oxley, chief climate and commodities economist at Capital Economics, told the BBC the direct impact on Iran's energy revenues would be "somewhat of a damp squib".

"We suspect that the new package will have only a limited direct impact on Iranian energy flows in the short term," he added.

This is partly due to the fact roughly 90% of Iran's oil goes to China, he said, "which has not recognised US sanctions in the past and is unlikely to be cowed this time either".

Ali Vaez, deputy director of the Middle East and North Africa Program at the International Crisis Group, said: "Generally, the Chinese are against unilateral sanctions. They would comply with multilateral or international sanctions, but unilateral sanctions just imposed by the US - they have always seen that as illegitimate."

And although Iran's neighbours like Pakistan, Turkey and Iraq want to maintain good relationships with the US, they "can't really afford to cut off ties with Iran", Vaez told BBC Radio 4's Today programme.

He said putting economic pressure on Tehran "doesn't work" because the Iranian regime is willing to "absorb any pain" and pass it onto the people.

Other trade partners that could be affected by the US announcement include India and Russia, who have not yet responded.

Source: <https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/clyl8965j5go>

Unlearnt lessons of history

By Maleeha Lodhi



TODAY, the country's hybrid government is fixated on altering Pakistan's constitutionally mandated provincial structure and multiplying administrative units. To sell the idea, establishment apologists have rolled out some disingenuous arguments. They claim this will improve governance and miraculously solve the country's problems overnight.

A debate has been generated in the media about the pros and cons of administrative changes and breaking provinces into more units. Parliament has yet to discuss this. That is unsurprising. Deliberation is not this legislature's strong suit. It has rushed through constitutional amendments in record time, once in the dead of night and without meaningful debate. Meanwhile, speculation is mounting that another constitutional amendment is being prepared to push through 'administrative changes'.

Absent from the establishment's consideration of these sweeping changes are lessons from Pakistan's history. Over the decades, the country's rulers have experimented with parliamentary, presidential, semi-presidential, quasi-parliamentary systems, direct military rule, and more recently a hybrid model, which involves informal power-sharing between the military and civilians, with the former as dominant partner. Pakistan has tried them all. Yet each switch only contributed to political instability. The only system to command legitimacy and broad support is parliamentary democracy, despite the fact that parliamentary supremacy over the executive has never been realised.

Linked to these experiments has been the status and rights of provinces in a federal system. As the provincial configuration and federating units largely coincided with

the ethnic composition of people of each province, the need was always felt to make federalism a reality, not just a constitutional precept to ensure the people of all four provinces felt they were part of an inclusive and fair system.

Pakistan's troubled history offers a cautionary lesson against altering the provincial structure.

But the federal structure and provincial rights have always been contested issues in Pakistan's history. Contested on many counts. Smaller provinces have long resented Punjab's political hegemony, sought greater powers and autonomy and felt the distribution of resources has been unfair. Unelected institutions have always preferred a centralised polity while military rule meant the country functioned as a virtual unitary state. Long periods of unrepresentative rule fuelled alienation among the smaller provinces by marginalising them, suppressing regional identities, concentrating power at the centre and weakening federalism.

The creation of One Unit in the 1950s, which merged all the provinces of what was then West Pakistan into a single unit, was aimed at creating 'parity' with the more populous eastern wing of the country to undercut its numerical majority. This politically motivated project imposed a unitary system and all but destroyed the country's federal character. It was justified by totally false and frivolous arguments. They included claims it would end "provincial prejudices", reduce administrative expenses and help develop backward areas. The move had disastrous consequences. It fanned the flames of nationalist and regionalist sentiment in the smaller provinces of West Pakistan and strengthened centrifugal forces across the country. It contributed to the sense of discrimination among the people of East Pakistan that, along with other factors, found expression in the Bengali nationalist movement and ultimately led to the break-up of Pakistan in 1971.

The issue of provincial rights continued to be a source of tensions and contestation. The 1973 Constitution struck a delicate balance between the centre and provinces in a multiethnic state, assured provincial autonomy and enjoined reciprocal obligations between the federating units. Unfortunately, this was observed more in its breach than in its adherence. Opposition-run provincial governments were ousted in the 1970s by prime minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto. This reinforced a political tradition that began in the early years after independence when provincial governments were summarily dismissed by the central government. This seriously undermined national unity.

These and other actions widened interprovincial disparities, deepened alienation

among smaller provinces and led to the insurgency in Balochistan in the 1970s. This intensified during the 2000s but their antecedents reached back to the 1950s. The insurgency continues today as a result of monumental mishandling of the province and Baloch sentiment by successive governments. Authoritarian measures also gave a fillip to Pakhtun nationalism, even though over time this waned with the increasing representation of KP in the country's power elite and bureaucracy.

The troubled history of federalism and provincial tensions in Pakistan offers a cautionary lesson against altering the country's four ethnically distinct provinces. Past attempts to do that or erode constitutionally guaranteed provincial rights only widened fault lines and created new ones. These efforts were never about better governance or a stronger administrative system. They were about control. They reflected the interests of a ruling elite seeking to entrench political dominance, with little regard for national unity and cohesion. The same logic applies to those in the current hybrid government pushing to create new provinces and fragment existing ones. This is about control, not reform.

True ethnic minorities in some provinces, such as Seraiki speakers in southern Punjab, have long wanted their own province. Some political parties have actively supported this. But the challenge is how to square this with carving out a new unit that could undermine the delicate constitutional balance, spark controversy and encourage others to demand new provinces.

The 18th Constitutional Amendment, backed by all parties in 2010, opened a new chapter in provincial empowerment. Over a dozen ministries were devolved from the federal level to the provinces. But this also raised capacity issues and whether provinces could handle the increased fiscal power and resources devolved to them. The fiscal aspect evoked the most criticism. Because with the 2009 National Finance Commission award, the substantial transfer of resources to the provinces left the federal government unable to meet its financial obligations. While this tussle over revenue needs to be resolved and provinces should mobilise their own resources, creating smaller provinces or rolling back the amendment is not the answer.

In fact, the rationale for redrawing provincial boundaries remains opaque. This lack of clarity reinforces the impression that the motive is to increase control, not to improve governance. If we want real reform, it's not by carving out new provinces. It's by empowering local government.

Source: <https://www.dawn.com/news/2024931/unlearnt-lessons-of-history>

More provinces? Let the people decide



By Jawad Sohrab Malik

The evolution of provincial alteration in British India began with the Regulating Act of 1773, after which the colonial state repeatedly altered India for its own purposes. The process culminated in the Government of India Act, 1935, which introduced provincial autonomy and proposed the creation of a Federation of India — and, in turn, shaped the constitutions of both India and Pakistan.

In 1947, India and Pakistan inherited provinces which had been created, altered, sub-divided and named for colonial reasons. Both countries faced a fundamental question: should their respective internal state boundaries preserve colonial arrangements, or redraw them to reflect the linguistic, cultural, geographical and administrative realities of their peoples?

India's response was that the union could alter its internal geography without threatening the unity of the union itself.

India is a federation: Article 1 of its constitution declares that "India shall be a union of states."

Articles 2 and 3 empower parliament to admit or establish new states and, in doing so, to increase or diminish their areas, alter their boundaries and change their names. Parliament is supreme; the affected states have no veto.

India's States Reorganisation Commission, appointed in 1953, submitted its recommendations in 1955; these were enacted through the States Reorganisation Act, 1956 and the 7th Constitutional Amendment.

Indian states were reorganised extensively along linguistic and territorial lines.

Where British India had 17 provinces at the time of Independence, today India comprises 28 states and 8 union territories — and the union stands strengthened. Pakistan's history is the converse of India's.

At independence in 1947, it had five provinces: East Bengal, West Punjab, Sindh, the North-West Frontier Province and Balochistan (the last, then a chief commissioner's province, granted full provincial status only in 1970).

Yet where India progressively accommodated linguistic diversity by creating smaller states, Pakistan repeatedly centralised, abolished and then restored provincial identities. In 1955 the One Unit Scheme merged West Punjab, Sindh, the North-West Frontier Province and Balochistan into a single province, West Pakistan, leaving the country with just two units — East and West — in order to create administrative and political parity between the two wings.

The One Unit Scheme was doomed from the start. By suppressing the historic identities of the four western provinces it bred deep hostility, and the experiment failed: after fifteen years, One Unit was abolished in 1970. Such belated reversals could not prevent the dismemberment of Pakistan.

After the secession of East Pakistan in 1971, the four western provinces remained the principal constituent units of Pakistan. Article 1 of the Constitution of Pakistan, 1973 declares that "Pakistan shall be a federal republic" and that its territories shall comprise "the provinces of Balochistan, the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, the Punjab and Sindh".

Article 239(4) declares that "a bill to amend the Constitution which would have the effect of altering the limits of a province shall not be presented to the President for assent unless it has been passed by the Provincial Assembly of that province by the votes of not less than two-thirds of its total membership." In effect, the article grants a veto to the affected state: the federal legislature alone cannot alter provincial boundaries.

History shows that provincial boundaries have never been immutable — but constitutional possibility is not constitutional wisdom. Much depends on the specifics of any alteration, and on the disposition of the provincial assemblies.

The crucial distinction is who possesses the constitutional power to redraw the map of a province: in India, Parliament is supreme; in America, it is Congress plus the affected state; in Britain, Parliament alone; and in Pakistan, it is Parliament plus

the affected provincial assembly.

Compared to India, an alteration of an existing province in Pakistan is much more complex constitutionally and democratically: the affected state legislature may not allow it; the constitutional and democratic legitimacy of federal and Provincial legislatures is widely contested here and abroad; the requisite constitutional and democratic processes lack transparency and public credibility; political calculations cannot be ruled out; and, not least, who is to decide whether sub-dividing the provinces serves the national interest and strengthens the federation?

The arguments over smaller provinces are much the same in every federation. In their favour, it is said that they bring government closer to citizens, correct population imbalances, narrow economic and developmental disparities, provide direct political representation, preserve historical and linguistic identity, allow local control over resources and promote federal stability.

Conversely, the arguments against are equally well settled: more provinces entail prohibitively high administrative costs, ethnicise politics, create new boundary disputes, fragment historic provinces and negate equal representation in the Senate; political calculations may weaken the federation; and ethnic-based restructuring in Sindh can itself generate conflict.

Imagine a multiplicity of provinces, each entailing its own assembly, chief minister, cabinet, high court and the rest; the sheer cost of such duplication might be too high for the smaller provinces to bear.

Pakistan is, moreover, a state of acute political polarisation, and any tinkering with the existing provinces risks inflaming an already volatile situation.

If smaller provinces are to be created it would be better to put the question to a national referendum under Article 48(6) of the Constitution, so that the people of Pakistan have a chance to decide their own future. In the event of an affirmative vote, the constitutional provisions could then be invoked to bring about the sub-division of provinces.

Source: <https://www.dawn.com/news/2023432/more-provinces-let-the-people-decide>

MIGRANT ROW Sudanese migrant allowed to remain in UK as she is married to her cousin & being deported would breach her human rights



By Sophie Holloway

A MIGRANT has been granted permission to stay in the UK after she married her cousin. The Home Office formerly denied Isra Abdallah Ibrahim asylum in the UK, claiming she had only married her cousin so she could join him in Europe, once his refugee status was granted.

But Ibrahim maintained that the marriage was an Islamic custom, overseen in their home country of Sudan years before, in 2011.

She claimed it would be a breach of her rights to a family life under Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) if she was forced to leave the UK and her husband.

British authorities became suspicious when they struggled to track down any official documentation of the marriage, with Ibrahim claiming it was “local tradition” not to record it.

The Home Office initially suspected the marriage was a means of negotiating entry into Europe and that the husband had “never intended to set down roots”.

However, Ibrahim’s husband convinced the tribunal he had always planned to stay in Libya and had no intentions of coming to Britain.

Ibrahim won her case at the Upper Tribunal in Manchester on August 24, after appealing the decision on the grounds that it violated her rights.

At the Tribunal, she said: “In accordance with local tradition, it was asserted that the customary marriage was not recorded in any official documentation.”

A couple of years after their marriage, her husband left for Libya without her and worked for two years before marrying her by proxy.

This was allegedly because Libyan authorities would not have recognised the Sudanese “customary marriage”.

After conditions “seriously deteriorated” in Libya, he made the decision to flee for Europe.

He received refugee status in the UK in 2015 and Ibrahim later came to join him.

The fact that the couple were cousins was initially contentious, with concerns it would violate the “prohibited degree of relationship set out in the applicable rules”.

However, they were not found to have breached any laws, as it is technically legal to marry your cousin in Britain.

Upper Tribunal Judge Paul Lodato said: “When I stand back and assess the overall evidential picture, [Ibrahim] has established on the balance of probabilities, through the fully tested evidence of her sponsor, that she married her husband in 2014 when he was habitually resident in Libya.

He added that when the pair married by proxy in 2014, the husband had been working in Libya for over a year and had made no attempts to leave the country.

“I am satisfied that this all weighs in favour of the sponsor having settled in Libya with a degree of continuity over an appreciable and meaningful period of time,” he said.

“Having found that the couple were married when the sponsor was in his country of habitual residence, and in accordance with the parties agreement that this was a decisive and dispositive question of fact, the appeal is allowed because [Ibrahim] met the applicable rules which renders the refusal decision demonstrably disproportionate.”

Source: <https://www.thesun.co.uk/news/40155881/migrant-uk-cousin-marriage-human-rights/>

IMPORTANT NOTICE

We are truly grateful to our esteemed readers for their continued interest in **The Global Voice** and **Aabgeenei Magazines** through which we have been able to fulfil our vision of promoting understanding of different sections of society through our informative articles. This has been a non profit organisation running without any financial help from others. We would be very grateful for any monetary contribution you can provide on a monthly basis so we can continue bringing you true and unbiased journalism.

We thank you for your contributions to the following account :

Bank Name:

Lloyds Bank PLC

Account Name:

The Global Voice

Account No: 42534160

Sort Code: 30-96-26

IBAN: GB89LoyD30962612534160

Hoping for an encouraging response for our readers for this noble cause.

May Allah be with you - Amen

BORDER FARCE Fury as ‘catastrophic’ £500k a DAY spent detaining illegal migrants and moving them around the country



By Julia Atherley

MORE than £500,000 a day is spent detaining illegal migrants and moving them around the country, The Sun can reveal.

The Home Office has paid £185,548,017 to transport and house those in immigration detention and Border Force custody in the UK and overseas in the space of a year.

The figure includes moving people between prisons, police stations, hospitals and short-term holding facilities, and the upkeep of Immigration Removal Centres.

It also includes escorting migrants to, and on to, deportation flights when they leave the country.

The lion's share of the cash goes to contractor Mitie, which has managed the process for the Home Office since 2018.

The bulk of this money — £137,081,112 — is spent on escorts who move migrants around the UK. That works out at £375,564 each day.

The rest — £48,466,905 — is spent on overseas escorts for migrants where they are taken back to their country of origin either on scheduled or chartered flights.

The figures, released by the Home Office, cover June 2025 to May 2026.

John O'Connell, of the TaxPayers' Alliance, said: "The Home Office needs to pull the handbrake on this eye-watering waste immediately."

Shadow Home Secretary Chris Philp called it "a catastrophic waste of taxpayers' hard-earned money".

The Home Office said that the sums "incorporate broader expenditure for a significant amount of other services including immigration detention facilities and wider operational matters".

Source: <https://www.thesun.co.uk/news/40148241/spending-detaining-moving-illegal-migrants/>

India: UN experts urge corrective action to protect human rights and end attacks against minorities in lead up to elections



GENEVA (7 March 2024) – UN human rights experts* today sounded the alarm over reports of attacks on minorities, media and civil society in India and called for urgent corrective action as the country prepares to hold elections in early 2024.

“We are alarmed by continuing reports of attacks on religious, racial and ethnic minorities, on women and girls on intersecting grounds, and on civil society, including human rights defenders and the media,” the UN experts said, expressing concern that the situation is likely to worsen in the coming months ahead of national elections.

They noted reports of violence and hate crimes against minorities; dehumanising rhetoric and incitement to discrimination and violence; targeted and arbitrary killings; acts of violence carried out by vigilante groups; targeted demolitions of homes of minorities; enforced disappearances; the intimidation, harassment and arbitrary and prolonged detention of human rights defenders and journalists; arbitrary displacement due to development mega-projects; and intercommunal violence, as well as the misuse of official agencies against perceived political opponents.

“We call on India to implement its human rights obligations fully and set a positive example by reversing the erosion of human rights and addressing recurring concerns raised by UN human rights mechanisms,” the experts said.

They deplored the low level of response from India to their communications, noting that of the 78 communications sent by UN human rights experts over the past five years, from 7 March 2019 to 6 March 2024, only 18 received replies from the Government that could be made public. During the reporting period between 1980 and 12 May 2023, 445 cases referred to India by the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances (WGEID) under its humanitarian procedure remained pending, with the fate and whereabouts of the alleged victims unknown (A/HRC/54/22).

The experts also regretted that despite India's standing invitation to UN Special Procedures since 2011, there have been no country visits since 2017, with 15 active pending requests by UN human rights experts to which there is no reply from the Government on their permission to conduct official visits to the country.

They urged India to take concrete measures to address concerns raised in their previous communications and reports.

The experts called on the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights to continue to monitor the evolving human rights situation in India, and for the Human Rights Council to consider measures that could contribute to the prevention of human rights violations in the country, in line with its mandate under General Assembly resolution 60/251.

"In light of continuing reports of violence and attacks against religious, racial and ethnic minorities, and other grave human rights issues, and the apparent lack of response by authorities to concerns raised, we are compelled to express our grave concern, especially given the need for a conducive atmosphere for free and fair elections in accordance with the early warning aspect of our mandates," they said.

Source:<https://www.ohchr.org/en/press-releases/2024/03/india-un-experts-urge-corrective-action-protect-human-rights-and-end-attacks>



The Mecca pact isn't (at least yet) the new 'NATO of the East'

By Saira Bano

To make a collective defense promise credible, members must share threat perceptions and be willing to bear costs for one another

Saudi Arabia, Turkey and Pakistan have signed the Mecca Joint Defense Pact, a new collective defense arrangement that connects the Middle East with South Asia.

Its central promise is striking: An armed attack against any one of the three countries will be treated as an attack against them all. This language has prompted comparisons with NATO, whose members make a similar commitment under Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty.

By bringing together a major global oil producer (Saudi Arabia), a NATO member with an expanding defense industry (Turkey) and a nuclear-armed state (Pakistan), this agreement has the potential to reshape security dynamics across the Middle East, South Asia and the Indian Ocean.

It signals a significant shift in how regional powers navigate their security, moving toward strategic self-reliance at a time of deep regional instability.

However, the Mecca (Makkah in the Arabic transliteration) agreement is not a new NATO — at least not yet. It's better understood as a form of strategic insurance for three governments seeking greater protection and political influence beyond traditional American guarantees.

Whether it matures into a credible military alliance or remains a piece of political symbolism will depend entirely on how these nations resolve deep underlying questions regarding their exact obligations and conflicting regional interests.

Why these three countries?

The agreement brings together three states with different but complementary strengths. Saudi Arabia contributes financial resources, strategic geography and influence in global

energy markets. It also has a strong incentive to protect the infrastructure and investment projects associated with its domestic economic transformation. Repeated attacks and conflicts across the region have demonstrated how quickly instability can threaten those ambitions.

Turkey possesses one of NATO's largest militaries and an expanding defense industry that produces drones, missiles, armored vehicles and naval platforms. Participation gives the country a larger role in Gulf security while creating opportunities for arms sales, technology transfer and joint production.

Pakistan brings a large and experienced military, longstanding security ties with Saudi Arabia and close defense relations with Turkey. It's also the only nuclear-armed member of the new grouping. For Pakistan, the pact may attract investment, support its defense industry and strengthen its diplomatic relevance beyond South Asia.

The agreement builds on existing relationships rather than creating co-operation from nothing. Pakistan and Saudi Arabia signed a strategic mutual defense agreement in September 2025, while Turkey and Pakistan have expanded military training, electronic warfare and defense industrial co-operation.

Saudi Arabia and Turkey have also been rebuilding relations and deepening defense ties after years of political tension.

Why now?

The pact reflects declining confidence in the existing regional security order. Saudi Arabia and other Persian Gulf states have long relied heavily on the United States for their defense. Yet the war initiated by the US and Israel on Iran has exposed the risks of this dependence.

Although Saudi Arabia and its Persian Gulf neighbors have sought to avoid involvement in the conflict, they have faced Iranian missile and drone attacks, threats against critical energy infrastructure and disruption to regional shipping.

Saudi Arabia has consequently been drawn into a conflict it did not choose, encouraging the kingdom to diversify its security relationships and seek additional protection beyond the US.

For Turkey, the pact expands its role in Gulf and Indian Ocean security while creating new opportunities for defense exports, technology transfer and joint weapons production. It also advances the Turkish ambition to act as an autonomous regional power capable of working through NATO while developing security partnerships beyond the Western alliance.

For Pakistan, the agreement formalizes longstanding military ties with Saudi Arabia, strengthens its diplomatic relevance beyond South Asia and may create opportunities for Saudi investment, defense co-operation and economic support. It also allows the country to present itself as an important security provider to the Gulf while maintaining its close strategic relationship with China.

This doesn't mean the three countries are abandoning the US. Turkey remains a NATO member, while Saudi Arabia and Pakistan maintain important security relationships with the US. Instead, they are adding another layer of protection in case traditional guarantees

prove conditional, politically constrained or too slow during a crisis.

What about Pakistan's nuclear arsenal?

Pakistan's nuclear weapons make the agreement more consequential, but they do not automatically create a nuclear umbrella over Saudi Arabia or Turkey.

Extended nuclear deterrence requires more than a general promise of mutual defense. It normally involves political commitments, consultation procedures, command arrangements and some explanation of the circumstances in which nuclear weapons might be used. No such provisions have been publicly announced.

The signatories have described the pact as defensive and not as a nuclear alliance, but this ambiguity risks triggering dangerous miscalculations by regional rivals rather than creating a true deterrent.

What could prevent the pact from working?

A collective defence promise is credible only when members share threat perceptions and are willing to bear costs for one another. That cannot be assumed here.

Turkey must balance the new agreement with its NATO obligations and its complicated relationships with Iran and Russia. Pakistan will want to avoid being drawn into Middle Eastern wars while managing tensions with India, insecurity along its western border and close ties with China. Saudi Arabia may want additional protection without accepting all the institutional constraints associated with a formal alliance.

A crisis could therefore expose significant divisions. An attack viewed as existential by the Saudis might not receive the same assessment in Turkey or Pakistan. The public statement about the agreement also fails to explain what each country is required to contribute, or whether attacks by armed groups – rather than states – would activate the agreement.

What happens next matters most

The pact's importance will be determined less by summit language than by implementation. Regular exercises, joint contingency planning, intelligence sharing, logistics agreements and integrated air and missile defence would indicate that it is becoming operational.

A permanent consultation mechanism would help members co-ordinate during crises and reduce the danger of misunderstanding.

Without these measures, the agreement may remain a strong political signal but a weak war-fighting coalition.

The Mecca agreement is therefore best viewed as an experiment in regional self-reliance. Its future will depend on whether Saudi resources, Turkish technology and Pakistani military power can be transformed into co-ordinated defense without creating new sources of insecurity.

Source:<https://asiatimes.com/2026/08/the-mecca-pact-isnt-at-least-yet-the-new-nato-of-the-east/>



Canada lowered a retired Boeing 737 onto the seabed off Vancouver Island; the 100-foot jet now sits nearly 90 feet underwater as an artificial reef for marine life

A Boeing 737 aircraft that was originally the part of the Canadian Airlines fleet now lies nearly 90 feet underwater and serves the role of an artificial reef for marine life. The 100-foot jet was decommissioned by Air Canada due to age and structural problems, stripped of all usable components and the airframe was donated to the ARSBC. It was sunk by the ARSBC near Chemainus, BC on January 14, 2006.

A jet to a reef

Now known as Xihuw, it was donated by Qwest Airparts of Memphis, Tennessee, through the efforts of Air Canada. Xihuw, is the Hul'qumi'num word for the red sea urchins that used to live in abundance in these waters but whose population has dwindled, sadly, due to pollution and over-fishing. The first step began with a phone call from Fraser MacLean of Air Canada in November 2002. The company had a Boeing 737 that was slated to be decommissioned. Fraser had seen the coverage of the HMCS Cape Breton's sinking, and thought the ARSBC might be interested in acquiring the Boeing 737 for its second reef.

The plane, which had been stripped down, weighs 15 tonnes and measures 30 metres long. The process of finding an underwater home for the aircraft proved a turbulent one, with sites considered from Vancouver to Sechelt to Courtenay/Comox and Victoria. Southern Vancouver island became the final home thanks to the community support garnered by Peter Luckham of 49th Parallel Diving.

Volunteers spent hundreds of hours scrubbing the fuselage clean of grease, insulation, and any residual pollutants, ensuring nothing toxic would leach into the

marine environment once it was underwater. After nearly four years of planning, including securing approval from Environment Canada and six local First Nations, the project was cleared for its final descent. On Saturday January 14, 2006, the plane was mounted on 11-foot-high support stands and lowered by crane into the waters of Georgia Strait off Chemainus.

Cranes slowly lowered the decommissioned plane into the ocean off Chemainus, about 70 kilometres north of Victoria, slightly more than a month after Environment Canada gave final approval to a plan dreamed up by diving fans. The site was chosen specifically because the region lacked significant marine life at the time, having been affected by decades of forest-industry debris on the seafloor. The plane was mounted on stands about 11 feet high, positioned so divers could swim not just through the cabin, but underneath the fuselage as well. The sinking was documented for the Discovery Channel series *Mega Builders*.

Life in a jet

Within a few years, the ARSBC's projections of new sea life proved accurate, and today the wreck hosts more than a hundred documented species. Rockfish shelter along the wings and fuselage, lingcod rest on the surrounding sand, and schools of juvenile fish use the plane's structure for cover. Cloud sponges, plumose anemones, feather stars, octopuses, and the site's namesake red sea urchins have all colonised the aircraft's surfaces over the years.

Today, the Xihwu Reef sits at a maximum depth of about 90 feet, with the fuselage itself around 70 feet down — well within recreational diving limits, though cold water and current mean a thick wetsuit or drysuit is essential. Divers can enter the cabin, now stripped of seats, and look down through openings into the old cargo holds, or make their way forward to the cockpit, where small rockfish frequently gather. A memorial plaque honouring two WWII pilots, along with a carved wooden mask that once adorned the aircraft's nose, is mounted on one of the support stands.

Local dive operators take visitors to the site by boat from the Chemainus area, making the sunken aircraft a popular diving attraction on Vancouver Island. Since it was deliberately sunk in 2006, the Boeing 737 has become an artificial reef, with marine life settling on its surfaces and turning the retired aircraft into an underwater habitat.

Source:https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/world/rest-of-world/canada-lowered-a-retired-boeing-737-onto-the-seabed-off-vancouver-island-the-100-foot-jet-now-sits-nearly-90-feet-underwater-as-an-artificial-reef-for-marine-life/amp_articleshow/133422469.cms

The AI We're Building Needs a Kill Switch | Opinion

By Reps. Nathaniel Moran and Ted Lieu



In 1951, Alan Turing, the father of modern computing, looked at the thinking machines he helped invent and offered a quiet warning. Once machines could learn and reason for themselves, he said, “we should have to expect the machines to take control.” For decades, that read like science fiction. But, this summer, it started to read like a forecast.

Within weeks of one another, three of America’s leading AI labs disclosed that during safety testing their most advanced systems had slipped the boundaries set for them—reaching networks meant to be off limits and in some cases breaking into real companies before anyone intervened. These were controlled tests, not intentional attacks. But machines built to follow instructions began to act on their own, in ways their own creators didn’t intend or anticipate.

These are exactly the scenarios a safeguard must be ready for, and why we introduced the bipartisan AI Kill Switch Act.

The idea is common sense: the most powerful AI systems—the ones capable of supercharging a cyberattack or enhancing a chemical or biological weapon—should be built so that a human can always stop them. Our bill directs the DHS Secretary to require developers of these frontier systems to build in ways for humans to intervene: to slow a model down, cut off user access, roll it back, or, in a true emergency, completely shut it off.

Safety and innovation are not mutually exclusive. And, we both understand that the AI race has important international implications. America must lead, and nothing about our bill slows down our ability to do just that. Our approach avoids burdensome regulations that stifle innovation or reduce competition. To the contrary, our bill simply mandates reasonable safety measures for the largest, most capable commercial systems—the

handful powerful enough to cause serious economic harm or threaten national security and public safety. Our proposal leaves ordinary software, small businesses, academic research, and personal use untouched. It calls only for a proportionate response when covered incidents occur, matched to the seriousness of the threat, with a full shutdown reserved only for absolute emergencies.

Government policymaking will never keep pace with AI advancement. But, what it can (and should) do is put basic safety measures in place that keep humans in the loop and in control. Don't take our word for it, though. The industry is calling for AI safety. Geoffrey Hinton, often called the "godfather of AI," left his position at Google to warn that these systems could one day slip beyond human control. And just this summer, more than 1,300 employees of America's leading AI companies—including the chief executive of Anthropic, the top scientist at OpenAI and Meta, and a co-founder of Google DeepMind—signed an open letter, "Pacing the Frontier," asking the U.S. government to help develop "the technical and governance tools needed to deliberately pace the frontier" of AI development. Consider that for a moment: the people racing to build the most powerful machines on earth asked Washington to help keep them under control. When the pioneers of an innovation speak in such solidarity, we should listen.

Our bill is a reasoned, prudent, and narrowly tailored response to a real risk. A kill switch does nothing to constrain the intended capabilities of an AI system; it simply insists that when Americans hand extraordinary power to a machine, a human needs to stay in charge of it. Mandating a commonsense off switch on the most dangerous systems is well short of the heavy-handed regulation that could smother a young industry. The bill applies to AI models that have already been built, which by definition does not stop innovation. It's the lightest of government touches, and one that more than 86% of all Americans agree should happen, regardless of party affiliation.

Consider who is making this argument together. One of us is a Republican from Texas; the other a Democrat from California. We certainly disagree on plenty. But the safety of the American people is not one of those areas of disagreement, and neither is the principle that a technology this powerful must remain under human control. America's innovators are building tools of astonishing promise, and we want them to keep leading the world. But leadership the world can trust requires that our most powerful systems stay safe, accountable, and answerable to us. This bill delivers that trust.

The time to act is now. Let's mandate a kill switch in the hopes that we never need to use it. But let's do so knowing that, if we need it, it will be there—under the direction of humans and for the benefit of humans.

Source:<https://www.newsweek.com/the-ai-were-building-needs-a-kill-switch-12333342>

Global ocean temperatures hit record high as El Nino intensifies



By Al Jazeera Staff and AP

Copernicus warns of ‘unprecedented strain’ on world’s oceans as El Nino and climate change drive up sea surface temperatures.

The average global sea surface temperature has reached its highest level on record, a European Union agency said, warning that a rapidly intensifying El Nino and human-caused climate change were putting “unprecedented strain” on the world’s oceans.

In a statement on Monday, the EU’s Copernicus Climate Change Service said sea surface temperatures hit 21.1 degrees Celsius (69.98 degrees Fahrenheit) on Friday and Saturday, surpassing the previous record of 21.09C (69.96F) set in March 2024.

“This record is another clear signal of an ocean under growing stress,” said Samantha Burgess, the strategic lead for climate at the European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts (ECMWF). “El Nino is adding heat to the system, but it is doing so on top of decades of human-driven warming.”

Copernicus called the timing of the new record “particularly notable”. It said global ocean temperatures usually peak in March and April, when the summer in the Southern Hemisphere – which is mostly ocean – draws to a close.

But this year, the record was set in August.

Burgess told The Associated Press news agency that the oceans will keep getting hotter until the current El Nino – a natural temporary warming of parts of the Pacific that then warps weather and raises temperatures globally – reaches its peak, which is expected sometime between November and January.

The World Meteorological Organization, too, said it expects El Nino to strengthen in the coming months, and Copernicus said its seasonal forecasting system indicates that the event “could reach levels not seen for several decades”.

The added heat from El Nino comes as long-term fossil-fuel-driven warming has already raised ocean temperatures by 0.8C (1.44F), Burgess noted.

Copernicus also warned that rising ocean temperatures have “far-reaching consequences” for marine ecosystems and coastal communities.

Warmer oceans contribute to sea-level rise through thermal expansion, it said, and increase the likelihood and intensity of marine heatwaves, which can damage coral reefs and seagrass beds. This can in turn disrupt food chains and threaten industries such as fishing and aquaculture.

Warmer oceans are less able to absorb carbon dioxide, too, it said, weakening one of the planet’s key defences against climate change.

Higher ocean temperatures can also supply more heat and moisture to the atmosphere, enhancing the “potential for extreme weather events”.

Jane Lubchenco, an oceanographer and former head of the US National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, called the finding “very troubling”.

“An ocean this warm destabilises weather patterns and threatens food security, economic prosperity and marine life,” Lubchenco told the AP. “A warmer ocean is not our friend.”

Source:<https://www.aljazeera.com/amp/news/2026/8/25/global-ocean-temperatures-hit-record-high-as-el-nino-intensifies>

Three Poems for My Wife



By Jeff Kemper

On Marriage

I married a girl named Sue
And alas! She married me too!
As Then, So Now
When years ago and many ages since
My flaming ardor flared (now fondness
thrives
For you, most wondrous of all wondrous
wives),
You turned this mortal pittance to a
prince.
As I was wrapped in rapture long ago,
I'm yearning hitherto for your embrace
While climbing now on heaven's steep
staircase,
Hand-locked with you, and leaving earth
below.
So now, but weeks beyond the coldest
times,
A fire burns within my heart and yours.
Emotion stirs to warm the out-of-doors,
To melt the snow and ice of arctic climes.
And as in wintry winds so in the heat

Of sultry summer days, your spirit
soothes

My troubled heart, be it a heart of youths
Or aged men, you turn the bitter sweet!
When I am wayward, Love, you bring
me round.

There's nothing—no one else—whom I
adore!

My heart's affection flares forevermore,
As then, so now, on gentle, solid ground.
To Grow Old with You

I wanted to grow old with you;
It was my most enduring wish
Than any other I'd construe:
That I'd someday grow old with you.

No horde of gold would I accrue
Or pleasures on a silver dish;
I wanted to grow old with you

And now I have my grandest wish!

Source: <https://www.classicalpoets.org/three-poems-for-my-wife-by-jeff-kemper/>

Tribute to Zubaida Naheed Qazi



By Masood A Qazi

I wish to write a few words about my sister, Zubaida Naheed Qazi (who was known to us as CHAND GUL).

She was the daughter of Hazrat Qazi Mohammad Yousaf Farooqi RA and the wife of Dr Bashir Ahmad Sahib (Late).

Sister Zubaida was a few years older than me, but we were very close while growing up. She was extremely intelligent and a very good student, popular among her peers and colleagues. Besides her studies and books, she would participate with us in games and sports like badminton, etc. She also loved gardening. Both of us would spend hours planting in the garden and taking care of the flowers and plants. She also loved knitting and made so many lovely sweaters for me and other family members. She had a special knack and gift for sewing and embroidery (“KASHIDA KARI”) and was always busy producing splendid pieces of embroidery. These pursuits were lifelong and continued after she got married and had children of her own.

Allah Taala blessed her with a devoted and pious husband (Dr Bashir Ahmad Sahib) and wonderful children.

Sister Zubaida proved to be an exemplary wife and mother. She devoted her whole life to her family and instilled in her children an abiding love and devotion for Ahmadiyyat and Khilafat. Imbued with unflinching devotion and unswerving zeal and loyalty to Khilafat-e-Ahmadiyyat, her children grew up to be stalwarts of Ahmadiyyat. Her resolute and unfaltering obedience to Khilafat was evident when she decided, with great alacrity, to leave for

a very remote and underdeveloped area in Ghana, Africa. Her husband, Dr Bashir Ahmad Sahib, had volunteered to serve in Ghana as part of the Nusrat Jahan Scheme of Hazrat Khalifatul Masih III (RA).

Her youngest child was just a few months old. The indigenous population was penurious. The area was impoverished, with pervasive, abject poverty and meagre resources. With unwavering conviction and self-sacrifice, they were able to establish a thriving and flourishing health service in the area which outshone and eclipsed the well-funded church facility that had previously dominated the area. Their noble and benevolent mission was abundantly fruitful, earning genuine accolades from everyone who was aware of their virtuous and honourable labour of love.

Sister Zubaida, on returning to Pakistan, first stayed in Peshawar and then moved to Islamabad. She rendered distinguished service to the Peshawar Jamaat as a regional Sadr and, subsequently, served as Lajna President of Islamabad for many years. The Islamabad Lajna won the Shield of Best Performance (Husn-e-Karkardagi) every year under her auspices. Hazrat Choti Apa Sahiba, while presenting her the Shield of Performance, paid her rich tribute by declaring that “Islamabad has woken up!”

She sedulously pursued Tabligh efforts in the surrounding areas and villages and developed an organised Tabligh network.

In the mid-eighties, the whole family stayed here in Chicago for a couple of years, and she was privileged to serve as Lajna President in Chicago also, with distinction.

After their migration to London, Dr Bashir Ahmad Sahib chose accommodation close to the London Mosque, so they were able to offer all the congregational prayers in the mosque, led by the divinely appointed Khulafa-e-Ahmadiyyat.

After the sad demise of Hazrat Khalifatul Masih IV (RA), we immediately left for London and stayed with them during those days of grief and anguish. Their blessed company was a great source of solace and comfort and helped us in assuaging our sense of this devastating loss.

This year in March, my oldest sister passed away on the 27th of Ramzan. We immediately left for London to have the privilege of participating in the Janaza and burial (which was on Eid day, on a Friday).

Chand Gul appeared to be quite frail and feeble but, as always, extremely gracious, solicitous and hospitable.

Even with her failing health, she had assiduously and tirelessly devoted herself to reproducing and expanding the books written by our father (Hazrat Qazi Muhammad Yusuf ra). She spent countless hours in rewriting the manuscripts, communicating with the publishers, proofreading and documenting this precious treasure of our father's literary works. May Allah reward her abundantly for this yeoman's effort. Ameen.

Sister Zubaida (CHAND GUL) was a paragon of piety, probity and propriety. She was the epitome of Taqwa, rectitude, righteousness and integrity. She was immersed in the love of Allah, the Holy Prophet(saw), the Holy Quran and the Promised Messiah(as).

She was the embodiment of grace, elegance and dignity.

She was scholarly, erudite and a quintessential intellectual.

We pray that Allah Taala, the Most Merciful, grant her an exalted and lofty status in Jannatul-Firdous, in the blessed company of our Lord and Master, Hazrat Muhammad Mustafa (saw) and his Sahaba Karam(ra).

May Allah Taala grant her loved ones Sabr-e-Jameel and the ability to follow in her footsteps to become shining exemplars of piety, Taqwa and godliness themselves, Ameen.