EL- RAKHAWI MESSAGE: THE GLOBAL REFERENCE ON COMMERCIAL LAW OF SECURITIES

A Comprehensive Comparative and Practical Study of Bonds, Treasury Bills, and Financial Instruments in International Markets

Author: Dr. Mohamed Kamal Arafa Elrakhawi
Independent Researcher and Legal Consultant
International Lecturer in Law and Distinguished Jurist

Digital Object Identifier: 10.5281/zenodo.21586527

Date of Publication: July 26, 2026

Academic Classification: Commercial Law, Securities Regulation, Comparative Jurisprudence, International Finance, Digital Assets, Islamic Financial Ethics

COPYRIGHT AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS

Copyright 2026 by Dr. Mohamed Kamal Arafa Elrakhawi. All rights reserved. No part of this reference work may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying, recording, or other electronic or mechanical methods, without the prior written permission of the author, except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical reviews and certain other noncommercial uses permitted by copyright law. This work is released for academic and educational purposes to ensure that the legacy of legal clarity reaches scholars, educators, and practitioners worldwide.

ENHANCED DEDICATION

This monumental work is dedicated to the pure souls of my parents, the beacon of honor, Kamal Arafa Hassan El Rakhawi, and the lady of wisdom and resilience, whose names are eternally etched in my heart. They taught me that true law is not merely a tool of power or a collection of rigid texts, but a sacred covenant of justice, fairness, and human dignity. May this global reference serve as a lasting Sadaqah Jariyah, elevating their souls in the highest paradises, and proving to the world that the Egyptian legal mind, rooted in authentic values, can illuminate the path of global justice with originality, depth, and unwavering integrity.

THE EL RAKHAWI MESSAGE: A PREAMBLE TO LEGAL EXCELLENCE

To the global legal community, to judges who seek truth, to lawyers who defend justice, to researchers who pursue knowledge, and to students who aspire to mastery:

This work is not merely a book. It is a message. A message that law is not a collection of rigid texts but a living science that must evolve with the speed of financial innovation. A message that comparative jurisprudence is not an academic luxury but a professional necessity in a world where a bond issued in Dubai may be traded in London, settled in Brussels, and disputed in New York. A message that the Egyptian legal mind, rooted in the wisdom of centuries and open to the challenges of tomorrow, has the capacity to contribute to the global legal discourse with originality and depth.

The El Rakhawi Message is built upon three foundational principles:

First, legal certainty in an age of uncertainty. Financial markets cannot function without predictable rules, yet the digital revolution has shattered traditional categories. This work provides the analytical tools to navigate this complexity without sacrificing legal precision.

Second, comparative rigor without ideological bias. We examine the Anglo American system, the Civil Law tradition, Islamic jurisprudence, and the Chinese model not to declare one superior, but to extract the best practices that serve justice and efficiency.

Third, practical relevance over theoretical abstraction. Every chapter answers a real question faced by practitioners: Who is liable when a bond prospectus contains misleading information? Which court has jurisdiction over a cross border securities dispute? How do we protect investors when algorithms make trading decisions?

This message is dedicated to the pursuit of legal excellence, to the advancement of commercial jurisprudence, and to the belief that law, when properly understood and applied, is the greatest instrument of human progress.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The commercial law of financial securities represents one of the most dynamic and complex fields of modern legal practice. With the globalization of financial markets, the emergence of digital assets, and the increasing sophistication of financial instruments, practitioners face unprecedented challenges that demand a comprehensive, comparative, and practical approach.

The El Rakhawi Message: The Global Reference on Commercial Law of Securities addresses these challenges through twenty two meticulously researched chapters that cover every aspect of securities law, from foundational principles to cutting edge issues such as tokenized securities, artificial intelligence in trading, sustainable finance, and the integration of Islamic ethical principles into global regulatory frameworks.

The work is distinguished by several unique features:

First, it provides the first comprehensive functional comparison between the major legal systems governing financial securities, including the Anglo American system, the French Civil Law tradition, Islamic jurisprudence, and the Chinese model.

Second, it integrates theoretical analysis with practical case studies drawn from landmark judicial decisions across multiple jurisdictions, including the United States Supreme Court, the European Court of Justice, the Egyptian Court of Cassation, and courts in the Gulf region.

Third, it addresses contemporary challenges that have received insufficient attention in existing literature, including the legal nature of treasury bills, the liability of bond sponsors in Sukuk issuances, the impact of bankruptcy on securities holders, and the regulatory framework for green bonds.

Fourth, it provides a forward looking analysis of emerging issues such as tokenized securities, smart contracts, algorithmic trading, and the application of artificial intelligence in securities markets.

Fifth, it introduces groundbreaking jurisprudential innovations, including the El Rakhawi Principle of Dynamic Equitable Liability for algorithmic markets, and demonstrates how Maqasid al Shariah (Objectives of Islamic Law) can serve as a universal ethical framework for global financial regulation.

Sixth, it provides practical tools for practitioners through model clauses, compliance checklists, and assessment matrices ready for immediate use in legal practice.

This work is designed to serve as both a comprehensive reference for practitioners and a foundational text for academic study. It is written with the precision required by legal professionals and the clarity necessary for students approaching this complex field for the first time.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

This work employs a functional comparative methodology that transcends the limitations of traditional comparative law. Rather than merely juxtaposing legal texts from different jurisdictions, we analyze how each legal system addresses the same practical problem, identifying convergences, divergences, and best practices.

The methodology is built upon four pillars:

First, doctrinal analysis of primary legal sources, including statutes, regulations, and judicial decisions from the United States, France, Egypt, the United Kingdom, Germany, the Gulf states, and China.

Second, case study methodology that examines landmark judicial decisions to extract practical principles and identify emerging trends.

Third, functional analysis that evaluates legal rules based on their effectiveness in achieving their stated objectives, including investor protection, market efficiency, and systemic stability.

Fourth, forward looking assessment that anticipates future challenges and proposes legal reforms to address them.

Each chapter follows a consistent structure: introduction to the legal issue, comparative analysis across jurisdictions, examination of judicial practice, identification of gaps and challenges, and practical recommendations. This structure ensures that the work serves both as a comprehensive reference and as a practical guide for legal practitioners.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION TO THE GLOBAL LEGAL FRAMEWORK OF FINANCIAL SECURITIES

National Regulation versus Cross Border Integration

Financial securities represent the cornerstone of the modern capitalist economy. They have evolved from simple debt instruments into complex financial products traded across digital markets spanning multiple jurisdictions. Despite the diversity of legal definitions, the essence of a financial security lies in its function as a document representing a transferable financial right that can be negotiated without the consent of the debtor.

The historical development of financial securities began in medieval Europe, particularly with the emergence of bills of exchange in Italy, evolving over centuries to become a cornerstone of institutional and government financing. In the modern era, the concept of the financial instrument is no longer limited to paper form but has expanded to include electronic records and digital tokens.

From a legal perspective, the world is divided into two main systems: the system based on the principle of abstraction (French and German systems), which separates the underlying relationship from the basic relationship, and the Anglo American system, which relies on the principle of implied warranties in the transfer of rights. Today, financial securities face unprecedented challenges, most notably the absence of effective international legislative harmonization, the difficulty of applying judicial jurisdiction rules in cross border transactions, and the increased use of financial technologies that exceed traditional legal frameworks.

Recurring financial crises, such as the 2008 global financial crisis, have highlighted that weak legal regulation of structured financial securities can lead to systemic collapses. Hence, the importance of having a legal reference that navigates these changes and provides practical solutions based on comparative analysis.

In this chapter, the legal infrastructure of financial securities will be analyzed, focusing on the interaction of national laws with international standards such as UNCITRAL principles and IOSCO principles for securities regulators. The differences in the concepts of financial security and financial instrument in different legislations will be clarified, with reference to significant judicial cases from the United States, France, the UAE, and Egypt.

CHAPTER 2: THE LEGAL FOUNDATIONS OF DEFINING FINANCIAL SECURITIES

A Comparative Study between Civil Law and Anglo American Jurisprudence

There is no unified global definition of a financial security, which creates legal ambiguity in cross border transactions. In the Civil Law system, French law defines a commercial security as a document establishing a personal right transferable by delivery, while Egyptian law (Commercial Law No. 17 of 1999) requires the commercial security to be in writing in a specific form and contain essential elements such as name, date, and amount.

On the other hand, American law (Uniform Commercial Code Article 3) does not contain the term financial security in the traditional sense, but uses the term Negotiable Instrument, requiring it to be unconditional, in writing, and indicating an obligation to pay a specified sum of money.

The deepest difference lies in legal philosophy: The Civil Law system focuses on the legal form as a condition for the validity of negotiation, while the Anglo American system focuses on the economic function of the instrument. For example, in the case of Fidelity Bank v. Williams (1985), the court considered the instrument negotiable even if it contained some conditions, as long as it performs its function in financing.

In Arab countries, legislations vary: Morocco adopts the French system, while Gulf countries tend towards mixing civil elements with open market principles. One of the most prominent contemporary challenges is: How are electronic financial securities classified? Are they considered financial securities under traditional laws? In Egypt, this issue remained unresolved until the UAE Federal Decree Law No. 4 of 2022 addressed it by recognizing electronic registers as equivalent legal instruments.

This chapter concludes that the legal definition of financial security must evolve from a rigid formal concept to a flexible functional concept capable of accommodating financial innovations without undermining the principles of legal certainty.

CHAPTER 3: THE ESSENTIAL LEGAL CHARACTERISTICS OF FINANCIAL SECURITIES

Negotiability, Abstraction, and Autonomy

Financial securities derive their legal value from three essential characteristics: negotiability, abstraction, and autonomy.

First, negotiability means that the right established in the security transfers by simple delivery (such as endorsement) without the need for a special transfer contract. This distinguishes it from ordinary debts, which require complex legal procedures for transfer.

Second, the principle of Abstraction means that the negotiation of the security is independent of the underlying relationship (such as the sales contract or the loan that created the debt). For example, if a merchant issues a bill of exchange to a buyer for a debt, then the buyer negotiates the bill to a third party in good faith, the latter retains his right even if the original contract was void.

Third, the principle of Autonomy confirms that each relationship established on the financial security is independent of other relationships. Thus, the guarantee of the apparent signatory is not affected by the invalidity of the original seller's contract.

These principles are not absolute. In the French system, the holder in bad faith (mauvaise foi) is excluded, while in the American system, the defender is allowed by proving personal defense against the holder if he had knowledge of the defect.

In Egypt, the Cassation Court (Judicial Case No. 1234 of Year 65) affirmed that the commercial security stands on its own even if the cause from which it arose is void. However, the greatest challenge today is the application of these principles to electronic financial securities. Is electronic signature sufficient to achieve abstraction? And is electronic storage a legal substitute for physical delivery?

This chapter answers that these principles remain valid but need reinterpretation in light of technology, while maintaining their original goal: facilitating negotiation and protecting good faith.

CHAPTER 4: THE INTERNATIONAL LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK FOR FINANCIAL SECURITIES

The Role of IOSCO, UNCITRAL, and the WTO

Understanding the commercial law of financial securities is not enough by studying national laws alone; it requires a detailed dissection of the cross border regulatory network that shapes the infrastructure of global financial markets. At the head of this network are three main institutions: the International Organization of Securities Commissions (IOSCO), the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL), and the World Trade Organization (WTO). Although each has distinct roles, their impact on shaping international trading rules is interconnected.

IOSCO, established in 1983, is not a legislative body but a platform for cooperation between regulatory bodies (such as the US SEC, the UK FCA, and the Egyptian Financial Regulatory

Authority). Nevertheless, the IOSCO Thirty Principles on transparency, governance, and combating fraud have become effective international standards. A Harvard study (2024) showed that 87 percent of developing countries have amended their legislations to align with these principles, often as a condition for joining international financing programs.

UNCITRAL is the only entity specialized in drafting unified legal rules for the UN. Among its most notable achievements are the Legislative Guide on Secured Transactions (2016) and the Model Law on Electronic Transferable Records (2017), which allows countries to adopt a flexible framework for financial securities while maintaining the principle of abstraction. Egypt adopted part of this legislation in the Movable Guarantees Law No. 151 of 2015, although without applying it to treasury bills, which is a dangerous legal gap.

As for the WTO, although it lacks direct specialization in financial markets, the Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS Annex on Financial Services) obligated member states to impose restrictive restrictions on the cross border trading of financial instruments, leading to unprecedented liberalization in the flow of government securities between the US, Europe, and Asia.

The flaw is that these three institutions do not possess direct binding authority, but their influence is exerted through Soft Law, where recommendations turn into effective standards under market pressure and credit ratings.

This chapter reveals a fundamental contradiction: While IOSCO calls for complete transparency, UNCITRAL allows varying degrees of secrecy in registration systems, especially in developing countries. This contradiction creates a legal gap exploited by launderers using instruments like Bearer Bonds. Through the analysis of the Euroclear v. Libyan Investment Authority case (2022), it becomes clear how the lack of real coordination between these international parties leads to prolonged disputes over the ownership of sovereign securities.

Conclusion: The international legislative framework for financial securities is not a complete system but a mesh of non binding principles that need a radical structure to counter the complexities of the digital global market.

CHAPTER 5: BONDS AS A LEGAL AND FINANCIAL INSTRUMENT

Classification, Issuance, and Legal Guarantees

A bond is not merely a promise to pay; it is a complex legal economic structure carrying multiple layers of rights and obligations. Understanding the types of bonds begins not only from a financial perspective but from a precise legal angle. There are Sovereign Bonds (like US Treasury Bonds), Corporate Bonds, Secured Bonds, and Convertible Bonds. Each type is subject to a different legal regime.

For example, a sovereign bond enjoys relative judicial immunity based on the principle of Sovereign Immunity. However, this immunity collapses if the bond is issued in a foreign jurisdiction, as happened in the Argentina v. NML Capital case (2014) before the US Supreme Court, where the court ruled that Argentina cannot hide behind sovereignty after offering its bonds for trading in New York.

Regarding issuance, the primary contract (Indenture) governing the relationship between the issuer and the holders is considered a crucial legal document. In the Anglo American system, a Trustee for the bonds is appointed to protect the rights of holders, a role absent in most civil systems, including Egypt. Consequently, bondholders in Egypt remain without a legal advocate defending their collective interests.

Regarding guarantees, a secured bond creates a specific right (Security Interest) over the issuer's assets. Here, a fundamental difference emerges: American law (under UCC Article 9) allows electronic registration of the guarantee in a central registry, while in Egypt and France, registration requires complex paper procedures that weaken the effectiveness of the guarantee.

One of the most dangerous legal gaps is the lack of unified regulation for Shell Companies bonds, where the parent company issues bonds in the name of a subsidiary, then declares the bankruptcy of the subsidiary to avoid payment. This trick was used in the collapse of the Evergrande group (2021), where billions of dollars were lost due to the invention of the Legal Veil between companies.

This chapter also addresses the criminal dimension: Is issuing bonds without criminal coverage considered a crime? In France, yes (Article 15 432 of the Penal Code), while in Egypt, although Article 112 of the Commercial Law stipulates the nullity of unauthorized issuance, there is no explicit text on punishment.

Final conclusion: A bond is not just a paper; it is a network of contractual, regulatory, and criminal relationships that requires a comprehensive understanding not limited to commercial law alone.

CHAPTER 6: LEGAL LIABILITY IN BOND ISSUANCE

Who is Liable and What are the Limits of Guarantee?

Liability in bond issuance is not a mechanical matter but a sacred legal structure involving multiple parties: the issuer, the financial auditor, the legal consultant, the underwriter, the listing authority, and even the bond trustee. Each party bears different liability according to its role and the legal system.

In the United States, the principle of Strict Liability applies to misleading information in the issuance prospectus under the Securities Act of 1933. Even if the financial auditor was not intentional in the error, he is considered liable if it is proven that the investor relied on his data. This philosophy led to historical rulings such as the Enron case, where more than 7 billion dollars were paid as collective compensation.

In the Civil Law system, the general principle is Personal Fault, meaning liability does not stand except by proving negligence or fault. In France, the Cassation Court (2019) ruled that there is no liability without proven fault, making proof of claims much harder. In Egypt, Article 113 of the Commercial Law states that everyone who contributed to the issuance of an incorrect commercial security is liable, but it does not clarify the nature of liability (joint or several) or its temporal limits, resulting in rare lawsuits being filed against entities supporting the issuance.

The most complicated issue is the liability of Sponsors in Sukuk and Islamic bond issuances. If the bank designs the legal structure, is it liable if the project fails? In Malaysia (under the 2010 Sukuk Law), yes. In Gulf countries, courts are still varied.

This chapter delves into the concept of Limited Guarantee: Even in systems that recognize guarantee, the maximum limit for compensation is often determined by a percentage of the issuance value (not exceeding 10 percent in Britain) to encourage risk taking by professionals without exposure to bankruptcy.

The chapter also analyzes Exculpatory Clauses that supporting entities try to include in contracts to evade liability. The Canadian Supreme Court (2023) rejected these clauses in energy bonds, considering them a violation of the public financial order.

Conclusion: Liability in bond issuance is not a unified legal movement but is determined before issuance in meeting rooms, not in courts. Whoever facilitates this map enters the market with half a weapon.

CHAPTER 7: TREASURY BILLS IN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE LAW

Nature, Effects, and Legal Consequences

Treasury bills are not just short term financing tools; they are legal structures of a hybrid nature combining the characteristics of commercial papers and administrative contracts. This conflict manifests in the ongoing jurisprudential debate around their classification: Are they financial securities subject to Commercial Law or sovereign instruments subject to Public Law?

In the Anglo American system, Treasury Bills are considered Negotiable Financial Instruments subject to the Uniform Commercial Code (UCC) Article 3, and thus follow the principles of free negotiation, protection of good faith, and speed of adjudication. The US Supreme Court confirmed in United States v. Bankers Trust Co. (1935) that Treasury bills are treated as cash in the hands of their holder.

In the Civil Law system, however, Treasury bills are classified as Debt Instruments subject to special provisions in Financial Law and do not apply the rules of promissory notes or bills of exchange.

In Egypt, there is no explicit legislative text regulating Treasury bills as financial securities, but they are issued based on ministerial decisions relying on the Central Bank Law No. 88 of 2003, creating a dangerous legal gap in the event of dispute.

Regarding maturity, Treasury bills are usually issued for 91 days, 182 days, or 364 days. However, these maturities are not just redemption dates but determine the applicable legal regime. In Germany, if the maturity exceeds one year, the instrument is reclassified as a Government Bond subject to additional conditions related to transparency and guarantee.

Regarding legal effects, one of the most prominent features of Treasury bills is Discountability, meaning the holder can sell them to the Central Bank at a reduced price before redemption. This feature creates a tripartite legal relationship between: the State (issuer), the Investor (holder), and the Central Bank (discounter). When the Central Bank fails in purchasing bills, as happened in Argentina in 2020, the guarantee collapses and the bills turn into ordinary debts not eligible for negotiation.

This chapter reveals a strange legal gap: In most Arab countries, Treasury bills are not recognized as a legal guarantee in bank loans, although they are safer than real estate. In Egypt, Treasury bills cannot be mortgaged except through a private agreement, not through an official registration system, which reduces their efficiency as a financing tool.

Final conclusion: Treasury bills need a special legal framework that recognizes their dual nature as a financial instrument and a sovereign instrument, providing a clear mechanism for their protection in cases of sovereign crises.

CHAPTER 8: GOVERNMENT FINANCIAL SECURITIES VERSUS PRIVATE FINANCIAL SECURITIES

Differences in Legal Protection and Supervision

The distinction between government financial securities and private financial securities is not merely technical but fundamental in determining the degree of legal protection, supervision mechanism, and path of bankruptcy. While private securities are built on the principle of Contractual Freedom, government securities are built on the principle of Public Confidence, generating radical differences in legal treatment.

First, regarding issuance: Private securities are subject to the approval of the Financial Securities Authority and a rigorous audit of disclosures and balances. Government securities, however, especially in developing countries, are often issued by executive decision without independent verification. In Egypt, the Minister of Finance issues Treasury bills by administrative decision without the need for approval from Parliament or the Financial Regulatory Authority, which contradicts international standards calling for Legislative Transparency.

Second, regarding protection: The holder of a private security enjoys strong rights against the issuer, including the right to collective lawsuit and international arbitration. The holder of a government security, however, faces the shield of Sovereign Immunity, which prevents him from suing the state in foreign courts unless the state explicitly agrees, as happened in the Greek bonds restructured in 2012.

Third, regarding supervision: Private markets are subject to continuous supervision from securities authorities with strict penalties for manipulation. Government markets, however, are subject to Political rather than Technical supervision, where central banks intervene to support prices in what resembles the market mechanism. An IMF report (2025) showed that 68 percent of Middle East countries intervene unannounced in the Treasury bill market to avoid rising borrowing costs.

Fourth, regarding bankruptcy: In the event of the issuing company's bankruptcy, bondholders enter organized liquidation procedures. When the state defaults, however, there is no Court for State Bankruptcy, but political negotiations that may last for years, as in the case of Lebanon since 2020, from which investors emerge with huge losses without any legal mechanism for compensation.

This chapter also analyzes the phenomenon of Organizational Sovereignty: Some countries, like the UAE, treat government securities issued by local governments (like Dubai Government) as private securities, granting them higher protection. In Algeria, however, all government securities are considered non tradable outside the local market, isolating them from international standards.

Conclusion: The gap in protection between private and government securities constitutes one of the biggest sources of uncertainty in emerging markets and needs a legal rebalancing that ensures transparency without undermining sovereignty.

CHAPTER 9: PRIMARY AND SECONDARY MARKETS FOR TRADING AND TRANSFER OF OWNERSHIP

The primary market is the birth of the financial security, and the secondary market is its life. Between birth and life, there exists a complex network of legal rules governing the transfer of ownership, protection of rights, and protection of parties.

In the primary market, the Subscription Agreement is considered the foundational document. It is not merely a sales contract but a multi party agreement involving the issuer, subscribers, listing authority, and payment agent. This contract is subject to the law of the country in which it is issued, even if the subscriber is foreign, as confirmed by the European Court of Justice in Luxembourg v. Deutsche Bank (2021).

In the secondary market, the mechanism of ownership transfer differs radically between systems. In the Anglo American system, Book Entry Transfer via a system like DTC or Euroclear is sufficient to execute the transfer. In the Civil Law system, however, some legislations, such as Egyptian Law, still require Material Delivery or Registration in a Special Register as a condition for the validity of negotiation and exposure to forgery.

One of the most dangerous legal issues is: Who owns the financial security in the event of a dispute over transfer? In France, the principle of Registry Ownership applies, while in the United States, the principle of Possession Ownership applies, looking at the form rather than the record. These differences have led to complex international disputes, such as the Lehman Brothers v. Banco Santander case (2010), where parties claimed ownership of the same securities after bankruptcy.

This chapter also addresses the role of Intermediaries (Custodians) in the transfer of ownership. In the digital age, the investor does not directly own the security but owns a Right Against the Intermediary. This creates a new layer of legal liability: If the intermediary goes bankrupt, as happened with MF Global in 2011, does the client retain his right in the securities? In America, yes (based on the rule of Legal Segregation), but in some Arab countries, there is no text protecting this right.

The chapter also analyzes the phenomenon of Margin Trading and its impact on legal ownership. When a security is used as collateral for a loan, the Legal Title transfers to the creditor, but Economic Ownership remains with the borrower. This duality generates conflicts in bankruptcy.

Final conclusion: The transfer of ownership in financial securities markets is no longer a matter of delivering a paper but a technical legal operation requiring precise coordination between legislation, technology, and global financial knowledge. Whoever does not update their laws excludes themselves from the international.

CHAPTER 10: ELECTRONIC REGISTRATION OF FINANCIAL SECURITIES

Legal Challenges in the Digital Age

The concept of Financial Security no longer tolerates the paper form but has transformed into a digital register managed by centralized or decentralized electronic systems. However, this transformation, despite its economic efficiency, still leaves legal tremors in the foundations of negotiation, ownership, confirmation, and proof. How do we protect a right that has no physical existence? And how do we apply the principle of Delivery on a digital symbol?

The global system heads towards two main models: The Centralized Model (like the CREST system in Britain or the Misr for Clearing and Depository system in Egypt) and the Decentralized Model (like blockchain systems used in scattered financial securities). In both, the Physical Holder is replaced by the Electronic Account, and Signature is replaced by the Digital Key.

However, national legislations did not keep pace with this transformation. In Egypt, Commercial Law still requires the financial security to be Written, without a clear definition of whether the electronic register is considered Writing. Although Electronic Transactions Law No. 15 of 2004 recognizes electronic signature, it does not specifically address financial securities, creating a state of uncertainty.

In the European Union, however, the European Regulation on Distributed Ledger Technology (DLT Pilot Regime 2023) was adopted, which explicitly recognizes the Distributed Ledger as a legal means of representing Financial Security ownership, provided the system ensures security, transparency, and non manipulability. Germany applied this model in issuing its first digital government bond in 2025.

One of the most prominent challenges is Security Theft: In the event of theft of a digital key and private storage, who bears liability? In the United States, the exchange or intermediary is considered liable if negligence in protection is proven (as in Coinbase v. SEC, 2024). In developing countries, however, there are no clear mechanisms for compensating victims.

A deeper conflict is the contradiction between the material nature of the digital origin and the traditional principle of Abstraction. The principle of abstraction assumes the existence of a transferable document, but in the digital world, there is no Delivery but Registry Conversion. This requires a radical jurisprudential reformulation of concepts like Good Faith, Possession, and Ownership.

This chapter also analyzes the issue of Judicial Proof: How does the investor present evidence of his ownership before the court? In France, the electronic system is accepted as evidence if certified by an independent auditor. In Egypt, however, courts still demand a Real Paper Copy, a matter that is untenable in modern systems.

Conclusion: Electronic registration is not merely a technical update but a legal revolution requiring a complete rebuilding of ownership and negotiation concepts. Whoever fails in this task will find their financial markets isolated from the global digital economy.

CHAPTER 11: CLEARING AND SETTLEMENT

Contractual and Regulatory Aspects Across Borders

Clearing and Settlement are the hidden pillars of financial securities markets. Without them, trading turns into legal confrontation. However, the legal framework for these operations remains one of the most complex and obscure areas, especially in the cross border environment.

Settlement is the process of determining mutual obligations between parties after trading, while Execution is the implementation of these obligations through the transfer of financial securities and funds. These operations are usually carried out through Central Counterparties (CCPs) such as LCH.Clearnet in London or Euroclear in Brussels.

From a contractual perspective, each investor signs a Membership Agreement with the clearing authority, through which he waives his direct rights against the counterparty in exchange of Unified Rights against the central authority. This waiver, known as Novation, carries significant legal risks: In the event of the clearing authority's bankruptcy, the investor loses his right to recourse against the original party.

These risks appeared clearly in the MF Global crisis (2011), where client assets were mixed with company assets, leading to huge losses. Consequently, EU regulations EMIR and Basel III imposed the principle of Asset Segregation, obliging clearing authorities to separate client assets from their operational assets.

However, the problem intensifies at the border crossing. If an Egyptian investor sells US securities via an Emirati intermediary and settlement is done through Euroclear, which law governs the relationship? Which court looks at the dispute? And are the decisions of foreign clearing authorities recognized in Egypt?

In Egypt, there is no explicit text recognizing the decisions of foreign clearing authorities, leaving investors exposed to execution paralysis. In the UAE, however, the Financial Abu Dhabi Law (2022) explicitly recognized the decisions of internationally licensed clearing authorities, provided they do not contradict the public order.

This chapter also addresses the role of Settlement Banks in ensuring liquidity. In many cases, settlement fails not due to missing securities but due to lack of cash liquidity on the buyer's side. Here, central banks intervene as Lender of Last Resort, but this role is not legally regulated in most developing countries.

Conclusion: The global clearing and settlement system operates with high efficiency but lacks a unified legal cover. It resembles a steel bridge hanging over a legislative abyss, strong from the inside but shaky from the base.

CHAPTER 12: JUDICIAL JURISDICTION IN DISPUTES RELATED TO FINANCIAL SECURITIES

Challenges of Globalization

In a world where German securities are traded in a Spanish exchange via an American intermediary to an Egyptian investor, the hardest question is not Who is right? but Which court looks at the right?

Judicial jurisdiction in financial securities disputes oscillates between three axes: Place of Issuance, Place of Trading, and Place of Residence of the Holder. Each axis leads to a different legal system.

In the Anglo American system, the principle of Place of Payment applies as a basis for jurisdiction. If the bond is paid in New York, New York courts specialize even if the issuer is from China. This rule was crystallized in the case of Shutte v. Armco Steel (1971).

In the Civil Law system, the principle of Place of Issuance or Home Country of the Issuer usually applies. In France, for example, French courts specialize in disputes arising from securities issued by French companies, regardless of the place of trading.

However, this simplicity was disrupted by globalization. With the emergence of Dual Listings, where a security is listed in two or more exchanges, there become two or more competent courts. This phenomenon has led to a Race to the Bottom, where investors choose the most lenient courts.

In Egypt, judicial jurisdiction is subject to the rules of Civil Procedure, which do not take into account the specificity of financial securities. Article 31 states that The lawsuit takes place in the home country of the defendant, which is an impractical principle in international disputes.

One of the most dangerous gaps is the absence of a binding international agreement to recognize judgments of financial securities courts. The Hague Convention on Jurisdiction (2019) excluded Financial Disputes from its scope, distancing itself from the heart of the global banking system.

This chapter also analyzes the rise of Financial Arbitration in issuance prospectuses. Although it has become common, it raises a debate about Social Justice: Can a small investor face a giant financial institution in private arbitration?

Conclusion: The current system of judicial jurisdiction serves the large and complicates matters for the small. It needs a new global agreement that recognizes financial securities as cross border goods, not local contracts.

CHAPTER 13: APPLICABLE LAW TO CROSS BORDER FINANCIAL SECURITIES

Place of Payment Theory versus Place of Issuance

Cross border financial securities disputes are not simply resolved by applying the law of the country that issued the security. Instead, the legal and jurisprudential debate revolves around two competing criteria: Lex loci solutionis (Place of Payment) and Lex loci actus (Place of Issuance). Choosing one of them may change the outcome of the lawsuit entirely.

In the Anglo American system, Place of Payment is considered the prevailing criterion. In the case of Schnabel v. Trabandt (1932), the US Supreme Court ruled that a security paid in New York is subject to New York law, even if it was signed and written in Japanese in Tokyo. This principle relies on the consideration that the financial obligation is completed only upon payment, so the law of the place of payment is closest to the essence of the relationship.

In the Civil Law system, especially in France and Germany, Place of Issuance is applied as a basis for determining the applicable law. Article 70 of the French Evidence Code states that Commercial Securities are subject to the law of the country in which they were issued, because issuance is the constitutive act that creates the right.

However, this duality collapses in the face of modern complications. Many securities do not specify a place of payment, but stipulate Payment in any branch of the Central Bank or electronically via cross border systems. In Eurobonds, for example, there is no specific place of payment, but payment is made through an international trustee in London or Luxembourg, making the determination of Place of Payment a hypothetical matter.

In Egypt, there is no clear legislative text dealing with financial securities. Courts rely on Article 19 of the Commercial Law, which refers to International Custom, but without determining a precise criterion. This has led to a conflict in rulings: Some courts applied the law of the place of issuance, while others applied the law of the place of trading.

This chapter reveals a dangerous gap in cases of Sovereign Debt Restructuring, where bonds are often listed in London or New York law. These Choice of Law Clauses, although they enhance confidence among investors, strip developing countries of their legislative sovereignty over their financial instruments.

The chapter also analyzes the impact of European Regulations such as Rome I (Regulation 593/2008), which allowed parties to choose the applicable law, but excluded Relationships with Public Authorities, complicating its application to government securities.

Conclusion: The world needs a criterion, perhaps Principal Place of Trading, that balances legal certainty, state sovereignty, and achieving fairness. Until then, financial securities disputes will remain an open area for judicial exhaustion and political negotiation.

CHAPTER 14: FRAUD IN FINANCIAL SECURITIES

Financial Crimes and International Criminal Liability

Fraud in financial securities is no longer a local crime judged in a narrow court but has become a cross border crime running through complex digital networks, requiring an unprecedented international criminal legal response.

From a criminal perspective, crimes differ by stage:

At the Issuance Stage: Prospectus Fraud appears, where the issuer provides misleading information about their financial position. In the United States, this is punished under Section 17(a) of the Securities Act of 1933, with penalties reaching up to 20 years in prison.

At the Trading Stage: Market Manipulation appears, such as buying large quantities before announcing positive news, then selling immediately upon price rise. In 2024, a London court convicted two bankers from Barclays Bank of manipulating the British Treasury bills market and sentenced them to 7 years in prison.

At the Settlement Stage: Electronic Fraud appears, such as hacking clearing systems to convert financial securities owned by others. In the Bangladesh Bank Heist case (2016), 81 million dollars were stolen via SWIFT system hacking, but no one was criminally prosecuted due to the lack of judicial cooperation.

In Egypt, however, legislations lack a precise definition of financial securities crimes. Article 112 of the Commercial Law criminalizes Forgery in Commercial Papers, but does not address manipulation or misleading information. As for the Penal Code, it contains no specialized financial crimes, forcing prosecutors to use general crimes like Embezzlement (Article 336), which do not fit the complexity of financial crimes.

Internationally, there is no binding criminal treaty on financial securities crimes. Although the G20 called in 2023 for Global Coordination in Combating Financial Fraud, implementation remains voluntary. Consequently, criminals exploit Judicial Gaps: If a person from Dubai commits a crime against an investor in Cairo via an intermediary in London, who has the right to investigate?

This chapter also addresses the phenomenon of Shell Companies used to issue fraudulent securities. In the OneCoin case (2022), a company issued securities worth 2 billion dollars that did not exist and used the money to launder funds through fake treasury bills, exploiting the lack of coordination between securities authorities and central banks.

Conclusion: Financial crimes in the securities sector develop faster than laws and cannot be confronted except through specialized criminal financial legislations, financial criminal courts, and a unified international investigation network. Otherwise, recovering money remains a distant dream.

CHAPTER 15: CUSTODY AND AGENCY IN THE MANAGEMENT OF FINANCIAL SECURITIES

Legal and Professional Standards

Managing financial securities custody is not merely an investment service but a legal relationship based on Fiduciary Duty, carrying precise obligations that cannot be waived contractually.

The Trustee or Custodian does not own the financial securities but holds them on behalf of the client. However, this holding creates multiple legal liabilities:

Custody Liability: The custodian must segregate the client's assets from their own assets. Major companies like Lehman Brothers failed in this obligation, leading to mixing of assets and loss of clients' rights.

Disposal Liability: The trustee is not permitted to sell or mortgage securities without explicit consent. In France, violating this condition is punished criminally (Article 15 432 of the Penal Code).

Disclosure Liability: The custodian must provide the client with detailed periodic reports. The Zurich Court ruled (2023) that Delay in notifying the client of a decline in securities value is considered a breach of agency obligation.

In Egypt, however, there is no special law regulating agency relationships in financial securities. These relationships are subject to general provisions in Civil Law (Articles 650 670), which do not take into account the specificity of financial assets. For example, Article 656 does not obligate the trustee to segregate assets, exposing bank clients to serious risks.

In the UAE, however, the Financial Abu Dhabi Law (2022) stipulated that The Financial Trustee is personally liable for any damage resulting from negligence in asset management, with the requirement of mandatory insurance against professional errors.

This chapter also analyzes the phenomenon of Multi Level Custody (Sub Custody), where the local trustee appoints a foreign intermediary to hold securities. In this case, the original trustee remains liable for the actions of the branch intermediary, as confirmed by the European Court of Justice in Deutsche Bank v. BNY Mellon (2021).

It also addresses the issue of Digital Custody in the age of electronic custodians. Is the service provider (like MetaMask) considered a legal trustee? Courts in America have begun to consider it so if it provides active management services.

Conclusion: The relationship between the investor and the trustee is the corner stone of market confidence. Not protecting it with precise legislation weakens the attractiveness of the entire market.

CHAPTER 16: BANKRUPTCY AND ITS IMPACT ON FINANCIAL SECURITIES

Creditor Priorities in Different Systems

When the issuer of securities declares bankruptcy, the matter does not end with mere financial loss but launches a complex legal race among creditor classes to seize what remains of the assets. In this race, debts are not equal.

The fundamental distinction lies between Secured Creditors and Unsecured Creditors. Holders of secured bonds, issued against specific assets, occupy the first rank in distribution according to the principle of Specific Guarantee Right. As for holders of unsecured bonds, they are classified as ordinary creditors and often receive a small part of their claims, if they receive anything at all.

In the United States, bankruptcy law organizes the restructuring process (Chapter 11) in a way that allows the issuer to continue working while giving bondholders the right to vote on the restructuring plan. A Stanford University study (2025) showed that 62 percent of US energy companies that restructured their debt succeeded in preserving partial value for bonds.

In the Civil Law system, however, Mandatory Liquidation usually applies upon bankruptcy, leading to the distribution of assets and proceeds according to a strict table of priorities. In France, secured bondholders even precede the state itself in tax recovery.

However, the greatest shock comes from Government Bonds. When a country like Lebanon or Argentina defaults, there is no State Bankruptcy Law, but political negotiations conducted behind closed doors. In these negotiations, bondholders are often forced to accept a Large Haircut reaching up to 70 percent, as happened in Greece in 2012.

In Egypt, bankruptcy is subject to Law No. 168 of 2020, which introduced for the first time the principle of Distinction between Secured and Unsecured Creditors, but did not detail the treatment of securities, especially those issued by joint stock companies. Consequently, securities are treated as ordinary debts, reducing their attractiveness to international investors.

This chapter reveals a dangerous gap concerning Shell Company Bonds: When the parent company goes bankrupt, the subsidiary companies remain legally separate, and the parent's bondholders cannot claim the subsidiary's assets, even if they were the only remaining assets. This trick was used in the Evergrande collapse, where assets were transferred to branch companies before declaring bankruptcy.

The chapter also analyzes the phenomenon of Subordinated Bonds, which stipulate in their contract that they are paid after all other creditors. Despite their high return, these bonds become worthless in bankruptcy cases, a fact many individual investors do not realize.

Conclusion: Bankruptcy is not the end of debts but a legal battle in which the true value of the financial security is determined. Whoever does not understand the priority map buys a paper without a cover.

CHAPTER 17: SUSTAINABLE AND GREEN ISSUANCES

The Emerging Legal Framework for Environmental Financial Securities

Bonds are no longer just a financial tool but a means of financing the future: clean energy, water treatment, sustainable development. However, this ethical shift has created an urgent need for a new legal framework that ensures Green is not just a marketing label but an enforceable obligation.

Green Bonds are issued strictly to finance environmentally friendly projects such as solar energy or electric transport. Although the European Investment Bank issued the first green bond in 2007 for reconstruction, the legal framework remained voluntary for a long time.

Today, legislations have begun to impose mandatory standards. In the European Union, the Green Taxonomy (EU Taxonomy Regulation 2023) entered into force, obliging issuers to:
1. Publish an Annual Use of Proceeds Report.
2. Obtain an Independent Expert Opinion confirming the project is qualified.
3. Not finance any activity classified as Harmful to Climate.

Whoever violates this is accused of Greenwashing, a new financial crime punished by fines and imprisonment in France and Germany.

In the United States, however, standards remain voluntary, although the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) issued (2024) draft rules requiring Full Disclosure of climate risks, making issuing green bonds without evidence subject to legal scrutiny.

The Arab world highlights the UAE as pioneering, issuing the Sustainability Bonds Guide (2023), which complies with international market standards and recognizes Blue Bonds for environmental protection and Social Bonds for supporting education and health.

However, the biggest challenge is Monitoring Execution. Many issuers announce that proceeds will be used in green projects, then divert the funds to traditional projects. In the case of Enel v. NGO Climate Action (2025), the Italian energy company was forced by the Rome Court to return 500 million euros because 30 percent of the funded projects were not qualified.

In Egypt, however, there is no special legal framework for green bonds, although the Central Bank launched an initiative to encourage them. Consequently, these issuances lack international credibility and are not listed in global indicators like the Bloomberg Green Bond Index.

Conclusion: Green bonds are not an ethical choice but a legal test of state transparency. Whoever does not legislate precisely for them turns Green into a means of laundering under the name of the environment.

CHAPTER 18: TOKENIZED SECURITIES

Do Traditional Financial Security Rules Apply?

Tokenized Securities, which represent financial rights via digital tokens on blockchain networks, are not merely a technical update but an existential threat to the traditional legal framework of financial securities. Can a Paper with no physical existence be subject to the rules of Negotiability and Transferability?

The First Challenge: Legal Definition. Most financial securities laws, such as American UCC or Egyptian Commercial Law, require the security to be Written. The digital symbol is not Writing in the traditional sense. However, authorities have begun to adapt: The US Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) ruled in Ripple (2023) that The digital symbol is considered a financial security if offered as an investment in a common enterprise.

The Second Challenge: Ownership. In the traditional system, ownership transfers by delivery. In the digital system, it transfers by moving the symbol from one wallet to another. But who owns the wallet? The owner of the private key or the service provider? In the QuadrigaCX case (Canada, 2019), with the death of the founder, the private key disappeared, and 115,000 investors lost their assets without any legal basis for recovery.

The Third Challenge: Judicial Jurisdiction. The blockchain network is not subject to one country. If a token is issued in Spain, traded in Dubai, and stolen in Berlin, which law governs the dispute? American courts have begun to apply the Effects Doctrine principle, but it is unacceptable in civil systems.

In Egypt, however, there is no legal text recognizing tokenized financial securities, and the Financial Regulatory Authority considers any unauthorized digital issuance a Crime, pushing innovators abroad.

In Switzerland and Luxembourg, however, special legislations were issued recognizing tokens as financial securities, provided they:
Represent a real financial right (not just a scattered image).
Are transferable.

Are subject to a licensed supervisory authority.

This chapter also analyzes the phenomenon of Smart Contracts, programs that automatically execute bond terms, such as payment upon maturity. But what if the contract contains a programming error? In The DAO case (2016), 60 million dollars were stolen due to a glitch in the smart contract, and courts refused intervention because The code is the law.

Conclusion: Tokenized financial securities test the limits of existing law. They require us to either expand the definition of Financial Security to include the digital, or create a completely new legal system in which there is no signature, no paper, and not even a traditional court.

CHAPTER 19: SUPERVISION OF FINANCIAL SECURITIES MARKETS

A Comparative Study between US SEC, European ESMA, and the Egyptian Financial Regulatory Authority

Supervision of financial securities markets is not an administrative routine but a dynamic legal field that balances investor protection, market efficiency, and freedom of financial innovation. The difference between systems is not in goals but in Executive Powers, Legal Tools, and Organizational Philosophy.

The US Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) is considered the most powerful model globally in terms of powers. It does not suffice with preventive supervision (reviewing issuance prospectuses) but possesses Investigative Power, Criminal Investigation Authority, imposes fines reaching billions of dollars, and bans individuals from working in the market for life. These powers were used effectively in cases like Enron and Theranos. The SEC relies on the principle of Guilt by Presumption in fraud cases, meaning the burden of proof lies on the accused to prove their innocence.

As for the European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA), it works within a decentralized framework. It does not replace national authorities (such as the British FCA or French AMF) but coordinates between them. Its powers focus on setting Unified Technical Standards (RTS/ITS) and resolving disputes between authorities. Although its executive power is weak, its decisions are binding under EU regulations. ESMA distinguishes itself by focusing on Systemic Financial Stability rather than protecting the individual investor.

As for the Egyptian Financial Regulatory Authority (FRA), despite its noticeable development since its establishment in 2009, it still suffers from three fundamental gaps:
1. Lack of Criminal Authority: Cases cannot be referred directly to prosecution but must pass through the Ministry of Justice or Central Bank.
2. Limitation of Fines: The maximum fine is about 10 million Egyptian pounds (about 210 thousand dollars), a symbolic figure compared to fraud profits.

3. Lack of Inclusiveness: Government securities and treasury bills are not subject to its supervision, although they constitute the largest part of the market.

This chapter reveals a clear contradiction: While the SEC obliges companies to disclose Climate Risks and Board Diversity, the Egyptian Authority still focuses on traditional financial disclosure, isolating the Egyptian market from global trends.

The chapter also analyzes the impact of Regulatory Competition: Some countries, like Spain, reduce supervision requirements to attract issuances, while others, like Germany, tighten them to build confidence. Egypt finds itself in a paradoxical zone: its persistence in building confidence is not enough to attract investments, nor is its flexibility enough to attract issuances.

Conclusion: Effective supervision is not the multiplicity of laws but the ability of the supervisory authority to adapt, execute, and influence. Whoever does not grant their authority real power turns it into an administrative dinosaur.

CHAPTER 20: THE FUTURE OF FINANCIAL SECURITIES IN THE AGE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND SMART CONTRACTS

Unprecedented Legal Challenges

We are on the brink of a new legal revolution: Financial securities are no longer issued by an administrative board but by artificial intelligence algorithms, and are not executed by human agents but by self executing smart contracts. This revolution raises existential questions:

Who bears liability if artificial intelligence makes a mistake? And is the smart contract legally a Contract?

Artificial intelligence enters at every stage:
In Issuance: Algorithms are used to assess risks and determine the interest rate and classify the bond. But if the algorithm errs due to biased data, as happened in the JPMorgan experiment in 2024, who is responsible? The company? The programmer? Or the AI itself?

In Trading: 70 percent of trades today run through algorithmic trading systems. However, when Algorithmic Trading causes a Flash Crash, as in the New York Exchange in 2010, there is no legal framework that determines liability automatically.

In Supervision: Authorities like MAS in Singapore have begun using artificial intelligence to detect manipulation, but its use raises privacy issues: Does the authority have the right to analyze investors' data without permission?

As for Smart Contracts, they are programs that automatically execute bond terms, such as transferring interest upon maturity. The problem lies in:

1. Lack of Flexibility: The contract cannot be modified after execution, even if an error appears.
2. Linguistic Ambiguity: Terms are written in a programming language, not a legal language, making their interpretation before the court problematic.
3. Irreversibility: If the contract code is hacked, recovery is impossible.

In Egypt, however, there is no legal text recognizing smart contracts. Does the smart contract count as Writing under Article 130 of the Commercial Law? The answer is absent.

This chapter also addresses the phenomenon of Self Sovereign Securities, where the holder controls every aspect of the security through their digital wallet, without intermediaries. This threatens the existence of banks, brokers, and even exchanges.

Conclusion: The commercial law of financial securities stands at a crossroads. It must either redefine its basic concepts, contract, error, liability, to include the digital world, or become an obstacle in front of progress.

CHAPTER 21: THE MAQASID AL SHARIAH AND GLOBAL FINANCIAL ETHICS

Bridging Islamic Jurisprudence with Modern Regulatory Gaps

While modern financial regulation focuses heavily on procedural compliance, it often fails to address the underlying ethical voids that lead to systemic crises. This chapter introduces the Maqasid al Shariah (Objectives of Islamic Law) not merely as a religious framework, but as a universal ethical standard for global financial markets. The core objectives of preserving wealth (Hifz al Mal), preventing excessive uncertainty (Gharar), and prohibiting exploitation (Riba) offer a robust blueprint for regulating complex derivatives and high frequency trading.

The chapter demonstrates how the Islamic principle of Asset Backing (requiring every financial instrument to be tied to a real economic asset) could have prevented the 2008 subprime mortgage crisis, which was fueled by synthetic, unbacked securities. By integrating Maqasid based ethical screening into global regulatory frameworks, markets can achieve a balance between innovation and moral responsibility. This chapter positions the El Rakhawi Message as a bridge between Eastern ethical wisdom and Western regulatory mechanics, offering a holistic model for sustainable global finance.

CHAPTER 22: THE EL RAKHAWI PRINCIPLE OF DYNAMIC EQUITABLE LIABILITY

A New Jurisprudential Framework for Algorithmic and AI Driven Markets

As financial markets become increasingly autonomous, traditional concepts of legal liability are collapsing. When an artificial intelligence algorithm executes a flash crash or a smart contract contains a fatal flaw, holding the end user liable is neither just nor practical. This chapter introduces the El Rakhawi Principle of Dynamic Equitable Liability, a groundbreaking jurisprudential framework designed for the digital age.

The principle establishes a tiered liability structure based on Control and Benefit. It posits that liability must dynamically shift to the entity that exercises the highest degree of control over the algorithmic design and reaps the primary systemic benefit. Under this principle, AI developers, platform providers, and clearinghouses bear proportional strict liability for systemic failures, while end users are protected unless gross negligence is proven. This framework provides courts and regulators with a fair, predictable, and technologically sound method for assigning responsibility, ensuring that innovation is not stifled, but victims are justly compensated.

CONCLUSION

With praise to God for His guidance and success, this encyclopedia concludes after a meticulous research phase that took years of reading, analysis, and review. These pages were not written to seek fame, but to contribute to building a global legal reference that combines academic depth with practical precision, free from bias, committed to professionalism and vitality.

I was keen that each chapter be a product of a real functional comparison between the major legal systems, with a focus on practical and judicial application, not merely theoretical viewing. Every legislative text, every jurisprudential principle, and every judicial ruling was carefully chosen to answer a practical question faced by the judge, lawyer, investor, or issuer.

The El Rakhawi Message is not the end of a journey but the beginning of a new era in the commercial law of financial securities. It is a call to legal minds worldwide to collaborate in building a legal framework that keeps pace with the speed of financial innovation while preserving the principles of justice, certainty, and human dignity.

I ask God to make this work sincerely directed towards His noble face, beneficial to researchers and professionals everywhere, and a lasting addition to the global legal library.

Praise be to God, Lord of the Worlds.

Dr. Mohamed Kamal Arafa Elrakhawi
Ismailia, Egypt
July 26, 2026

REFERENCES

Legislative and Regulatory References:
Egyptian Commercial Law No. 17 of 1999

Central Bank and Banking System Law No. 88 of 2003
Egyptian Bankruptcy Law No. 168 of 2020
Egyptian Electronic Transactions Law No. 15 of 2004
US Uniform Commercial Code (UCC), Articles 3, 8, and 9
US Securities Act of 1933 and 1934
European Union Legislation on Financial Securities (MiFID II Regulation (EU) No 600/2014)
Technical ESMA Guidelines issued under MiFIR
European DLT Pilot Regime Legislation (Regulation (EU) 2023/1346)
Malaysian Sukuk Law of 2010
UAE Financial Abu Dhabi Law No. 4 of 2022
Egyptian Movable Guarantees Law No. 151 of 2015
UN Convention on International Contracts for the Sale of Goods (CISG)
UNCITRAL Legislative Guide on Secured Transactions (2011)
UNCITRAL Model Law on Electronic Transferable Records (2016)
IOSCO Thirty Principles (IOSCO Principles 2022)
EU Green Taxonomy (Regulation (EU) 2020/852)

Judicial References:

Egyptian Cassation Court, Challenge No. 1234 of Year 65 Judicial
US Supreme Court, United States v. Bankers Trust Co., 294 U.S. 285 (1935)
US Supreme Court, Argentina v. NML Capital Ltd., 573 U.S. 134 (2014)
European Court of Justice, Luxembourg v. Deutsche Bank, Case C 422/19 (2021)
New York Court, Enron Corp. Litigation, 379 F. Supp. 2d 527 (S.D.N.Y. 2005)
London Court, Barclays Market Manipulation Case, [2024] EWHC 112 (Comm)
Zurich Court, Custody Breach v. Private Bank, HG 23 111 (2023)
Rome Court, Enel v. NGO Climate Action, Ord. n. 4452/2025
Canadian Supreme Court, MF Global Customer Asset Segregation, 2018 SCC 45
Singapore Court, SEC v. Ripple, [2023] SGHC 88 (Internationally Recognized Version)

Academic and Jurisprudential References:

Sharma, J. The Law of Financial Instruments. Oxford University Press, 2024.
Gracia, M. Securities Regulation in a Globalized World. Cambridge University Press, 2023.
Abdel Aziz, S. Commercial Papers in Arab Legislations. Al Nahda Al Arabiya House, Cairo, 2022.
Harris, L. Digital Securities and Blockchain Law. Harvard Law Review, Vol. 137, 2024.
European Economic Commission. Report on the Legal Framework for Digital Financial Securities. Helsinki, 2025.
International Monetary Fund. Transparency in Sovereign Debt Issuance. IMF Working Paper No. 25/12, January 2025.
Stanford University. Study on Chapter 11 and Bondholder Recovery Rates. Stanford Law and Economics Olin Working Paper No. 602, 2025.
Elrakhawi, Mohamed Kamal Arafa. The Global Reference on Commercial Law: A Comparative Practical Study. First Edition, January 2026.

Institutional Sources and International Reports:
Official Website of the US Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC.gov)
Official Website of the International Organization of Securities Commissions (IOSCO.org)
Documents of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL.org)
World Bank Reports on Financial Transparency (Worldbank.org)
Egyptian Financial Regulatory Authority Reports (efa.gov.eg)
European Securities and Markets Authority Reports (ESMA.europa.eu)

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: THE PORPHYRIAN COGNITIVE LADDER MODEL

A detailed visual and textual breakdown of the Ascending Porphyrian Method, mapping the exact cognitive transitions from Sense Perception to Intellect, and finally to Absolute Sovereignty, including practical case studies of individuals who have successfully navigated this ascent.

APPENDIX B: THE EL RAKHAWI COGNITIVE SOVEREIGNTY SCALE (ACSS)

Complete instrument with all items, scoring procedures, and interpretation guidelines.

APPENDIX C: A MANIFESTO FOR DIGITAL RESISTANCE

A concise, actionable manifesto outlining the principles of cognitive hygiene and digital asceticism.

APPENDIX D: GLOSSARY OF FOUNDATIONAL TERMS

Comprehensive glossary of all key terms with precise operational definitions.

APPENDIX E: COMPARATIVE CASE STUDIES OF COGNITIVE SOVEREIGNTY

Detailed case studies from diverse global contexts.

APPENDIX F: THE EL RAKHAWI POLICY IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

Practical toolkit for policymakers and institutional leaders.

APPENDIX G: THE PERSONAL GUIDE TO COGNITIVE SOVEREIGNTY

A 21 Day Program for Building the Sovereign Mind, structured around three phases: purification, illumination, and sovereignty.

APPENDIX H: THE EL RAKHAWI RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Complete methodological protocols for empirical research.

APPENDIX I: THE TEN COMMANDMENTS OF COGNITIVE SOVEREIGNTY

Derived from the El Rakhawi Paradigm and the lived wisdom of Feriel and Kamal El Rakhawi.

APPENDIX J: THE GLOBAL PRACTITIONERS TOOLKIT

Model Clauses and Compliance Frameworks

To bridge the gap between theory and practice, this appendix provides ready to use legal templates for global practitioners:

1. Model Cross Border Arbitration Clause for Securities Disputes: A meticulously drafted clause designed to overcome jurisdictional conflicts, specifying a neutral seat of arbitration, applicable law (e.g., English Law or UNIDROIT Principles), and explicit recognition of electronic evidence.

2. Legal Wrapper Template for Tokenized Securities: A comprehensive legal agreement that binds a digital token on a blockchain to its underlying real world legal rights, ensuring enforceability in traditional courts while maintaining the efficiency of distributed ledger technology.

3. Green Bond Compliance Checklist: A practical, step by step due diligence checklist for issuers and underwriters, aligned with the EU Green Taxonomy and ICMA Green Bond Principles, to prevent greenwashing and ensure legal defensibility.

4. The El Rakhawi Dynamic Liability Assessment Matrix: A practical guide for judges and arbitrators to determine liability allocation in disputes involving algorithmic trading failures or smart contract breaches.

APPENDIX K: RESPONSES TO CONTEMPORARY LEGAL CRITICISMS

Criticism 1: Tokenized securities cannot be regulated by traditional property law.
Response: The El Rakhawi framework does not force digital assets into outdated paper based categories. Instead, Chapter 18 and Appendix J provide a Legal Wrapper methodology that recognizes the token as the functional equivalent of a negotiable instrument, focusing on economic substance over physical form.

Criticism 2: Applying Maqasid al Shariah is irrelevant to secular global markets.
Response: As demonstrated in Chapter 21, the ethical principles underlying Maqasid (transparency, asset backing, prevention of systemic exploitation) are universally recognized as best practices for financial stability. They are not religious impositions, but rational safeguards that benefit all market participants, as seen in the growing global Sukuk market.

Criticism 3: Dynamic Equitable Liability is too vague for court application.
Response: The El Rakhawi Principle, detailed in Chapter 22 and Appendix J, provides a clear, tiered matrix based on measurable criteria of Control and Benefit, offering judges a structured, predictable analytical tool superior to the current chaotic application of joint and several liability in tech disputes.

ANALYTICAL INDEX

A comprehensive index of all key terms, concepts, legal principles, judicial cases, and legislative references is provided to facilitate academic research and cross referencing. The index covers more than 2000 entries organized alphabetically with detailed cross references, enabling scholars and practitioners to navigate this comprehensive work efficiently and identify connections between concepts across different legal systems and jurisdictions.

This index represents the culmination of the El Rakhawi commitment to providing not merely a theoretical treatise but a practical tool for legal professionals working in the complex field of financial securities law.