A Resilient Global Economy or Resilience on the Verge of Exhaustion? A Reading of the IMF Report October 2026

(Translated)

Al-Rayah Newspaper - Issue 626 - 18/11/2026

By: Ustadh Nabil Abdul Karim

When the International Monetary Fund (IMF) chose the title "Resilience Under Strain, Urgent Choices" for its World Economic Outlook, October 2026, it seemed at first glance to be sending a reassuring message to markets and countries. The gist appeared to be: the global economy has faced wars, energy crises, inflation, and trade tensions, yet it has not fallen into a comprehensive global recession. The IMF is not saying the global economy is doing well; rather, it is saying something more precise and more dangerous: the global economy remains resilient, but its capacity to continue being resilient has begun to run out.

The IMF expects the global economy to grow by 3.1% in 2026, then rise to 3.4% in 2027. However, this growth comes with an expected rise in global inflation to 4.7% in 2026 before it declines to 4.1% in 2027, while confirming that risks are skewed to the downside.

So, the number itself is not the problem; the global economy is indeed growing. The problem lies in the interpretation of the word 'growth'; growth does not necessarily mean the economy has become healthier. An economy can grow while debts accumulate, borrowing costs rise, purchasing power erodes, and countries deplete their financial reserves—and this is precisely what the IMF acknowledges. Its Managing Director, Kristalina Georgieva, stated that the global economy remains resilient in the face of repeated shocks, but this resilience appears to be reaching its limits, financial buffers and energy reserves are being eroded, while inflation remains high in many places.

Global Growth Conceals a Deep Economic Division

The most dangerous aspect of using a single number for global growth is that it suggests all countries are experiencing the same conditions. However, the IMF explicitly states that resilience has become increasingly unequal and costly. Countries within artificial intelligence supply chains or benefiting from favorable trade terms are achieving better performance, while low-income countries and energy importers, especially those outside the technological wave, are facing much more difficult conditions. This means the phrase "the global economy is growing" may be statistically accurate, but it is politically insufficient.

The Great Paradox: Artificial Intelligence Saves Growth… and May Become the Source of Danger

A significant portion of current global growth is driven by investment in artificial intelligence and its associated infrastructure. This is one reason for the global economy's ability to offset part of the negative impact of rising energy prices. The IMF describes the technology boom as a positive shock for demand, investment, and trade, but it warns of the other side: that AI supply chains are concentrated in a limited number of countries, sectors, and companies, which creates bottlenecks, and that a reassessment of AI profit expectations could lead to a financial correction and turbulent markets.

In other words, there is a paradox: the engine helping the global economy withstand challenges today may become one of its sources of fragility tomorrow. This is not entirely a theoretical hypothesis, as Asian markets have recently experienced strong fluctuations amid rising concerns about the sustainability of the artificial intelligence boom.

War and Energy: The Most Dangerous Test

The IMF considers the rise in energy and commodity prices resulting from the war a negative supply shock; meaning it raises prices while simultaneously putting pressure on economic activity. This is an extremely sensitive equation: rising energy, then rising inflation, then monetary tightening, then higher borrowing costs, then a decline in investment and consumption, and finally, slowing growth.

Therefore, the continuation or expansion of the war does not represent merely a geopolitical problem; it can transform into a global economic crisis. More importantly, some of the IMF's projections for 2027 rely on specific geopolitical assumptions, including the gradual return of navigation through the Strait of Hormuz to its normal state. According to a Reuters analysis, oil prices remaining above $130 per barrel during the first quarter of 2027 could reduce growth the following year by approximately half a percentage point.

Today, borrowing costs are rising, riba (interest) payments are increasing, and the fiscal space that countries can utilize when a new crisis occurs is shrinking. Therefore, the IMF is calling on countries with high debts and deficits to begin fiscal consolidation and place debt and deficits on a downward trajectory, and it is urging the urgent rebuilding of financial buffers. That is, the global economy did not collapse because countries and institutions used the cushions available under the system to absorb shocks, but every cushion used once becomes less capable of protecting the system the next time, and this is the essence of the warning contained in the report.

The IMF explicitly states that risks are skewed to the downside, and it warns of war, energy, debt, trade, artificial intelligence, and shrinking financial margins. If we strip its report of technical language, its message appears closer to saying: The global economy has succeeded in overcoming a series of consecutive shocks, but the cost of that has risen, and the margins that allowed countries to absorb shocks are narrowing. Therefore, reserves must be rebuilt before the next shock arrives. And this is not a purely reassuring message.

The truth of the IMF's forecasts can be tested over the coming months through five indicators:

First: Inflation. Will it continue to decline, or will energy and food prices push it back up?

Second: Bond yields. If they continue to rise, this means the markets are demanding a higher price from countries to finance their debts.

Third: Oil and energy prices. The persistence of the shock will put growth and inflation forecasts to a harsh test.

Fourth: Artificial intelligence. Will current investments transform into productivity and real profits, or are we witnessing a correction in valuations?

Fifth: Public debt. Will debt ratios begin to stabilize and decline, or will they continue to rise?

If these indicators improve, it will be possible to say that "resilience" was the beginning of real stability. But if they deteriorate together, the word "resilience" will seem closer to describing a temporary phase during which the system managed to postpone the problem, not solve it.

The IMF is not presenting us with a sound global economy; rather, an economy that is still standing despite its injuries. And this is a crucial distinction; the expected global growth of 3.1% does not mean that the risks have disappeared, the rise in AI investment does not mean the economy has become more stable, and the absence of a financial collapse does not mean that nations' capacity to withstand shocks has not been eroded. The clearest evidence is that the IMF itself says that margins for adjustment are shrinking, risks are tilted to the downside, and financial buffers and energy reserves are being depleted. Because the most dangerous aspect of the October 2026 report is not what it says about the resilience of the global economy, but what it says between the lines about its capacity to withstand the next shock.

Herein lies the political issue before the economic one: the system that consumes its reserves to appear stable may succeed in postponing the crisis, but it has not necessarily solved it.

And herein lies an essential truth: capitalism, with the contradictions inherent in its structure, generates the seeds of crises that then return to undermine the system from within. Today, the manifestations of dysfunction appear more evident; from widening economic disparities and the accumulation of wealth, to the dominance of the logic of profit and self-interest at the expense of humanity and society. Therefore, we witness growing restlessness across the world regarding the outcomes and repercussions of this system, and an inability to address its crises fundamentally, so long as the very tools that produced these crises are the ones intended to be used to escape them.

Indeed, Islam does not offer merely partial solutions to the symptoms of the crisis, but rather presents a different conception of man, wealth, economy, and society, and establishes values and rulings aimed at achieving justice, safeguarding human dignity, and preventing the exploitation of people's needs and the resources of society. From this standpoint, the search for a different future should not be limited to awaiting the collapse of an existing model, for real change requires awareness, will, and responsibility. Therefore, we call upon the people of military power and protection in our Ummah to take a stance that strengthens Islam and restores it to the international arena; this is done by granting the nussrah (military support) to Hizb ut Tahrir to establish the second Khilafah Rashidah (rightly-guided Caliphate) on the Method of the Prophethood.