

SmartGroups

SmartGroups Ad

imad@townends.co.uk

[Your Groups](#) [Your Details](#) [Events](#)[Logout](#)[Group](#) [Message](#) [Help](#)[List By Discussions](#) [List by Date](#) [Post Message](#) [Reply](#)

Political Thought & Analysis Forum

Puppet or not a puppet

[Prev](#) [Next](#)

Created by on 25 Jan 2001 15:38:02

Messages 1 to 10 of 19

Search for

Message

1 **Date Posted:** 25 Jan 2001 15:38:02 by «**No Name Set**» [Reply](#)

Assalaamu alaykum all,

I think that this discussion is extremely important as it underlines the very basis from which we make analysis. The discussion has been going very deep into the degree to which a ruler is a puppet, or not, and so I thought it apt to change the header to this topic in my mail, as it has become a subject in itself, separate from the Iran discussion that triggered it.

Maybe a basis needs to be established before going into this depth as to why any ruler would become a puppet in the first place. When this is established it becomes easier to see how the rulers are so subdued and the degree to which they are subdued.

Why does a ruler become a puppet/client of another superpower?

IN societies that have no ideological revival, there is a fundamental lack of consensus on how to run the affairs. There is a lack of a unified basis from which policies are extrapolated and designed. It can be either that there is no basis at all, or that if there is such a basis it exists amongst a small faction of that society, and a different faction carries a different basis. However, whatever the case, there is no consensus.

What does this scenario lead to? This scenario leads to a situation where factions emerge in society, each with a different way to solve the problems that emanate from a lack of consensus. These factions differ not just on the peripherals (like the Republicans and the Democrats) but rather they differ on fundamental issues, issue of opposing Ideology, or lack of it. Thus they cannot co-operate by defintion, since one factions' government, is constantly opposed by another faction, regardless of it's policies, since the opposing facton doesn't even recognise the basis from which those policies were extracted. An example can be the faction of the company in Uzbek, which fundamentally opposes any policy of the ruling faction. The Ideological societies don't have these factions since they have a consensus upon the basis that society should be run by, and so they only differ upon policy matter (like a kufr form of Ikhtilaaf - which is tolerated by them).

In the declined world, since these differences are so vast (across Ideologies) they lead to a nebver ending conflict and competetion amongst these factions to take power, and wipe out the others (as by defintion no Ideology can exist alongside another). So , for example we would eliminate

any Secular or Communist factions if we took power, and they would do the same to us. Now, in a scenario where the competing factions are not sincere or Ideological (so let us exclude the company) it becomes easy for a foreign power to intervene and support one faction over the other, which is exactly what happens.

Now, which state could intervene in such a manner. Well, it would mostly be Ideological states since they are the ones with a consistent foreign policy based upon a fixed principle, and they are the ones who lack their own domestic competing factions, so they have the time and the energy to look abroad for their interests.

When these Ideological states look towards the declined states they perceive the existence of such competing selfish factions, and also they perceive the existence of resources that they know they can only exploit if they manoeuvre one sympathetic faction into power (so they become "King-Makers"). In a case where there is no sympathetic faction, they will use all styles to create one (like U.S.A's creation/backing of the Iraqi opposition led by Ahmed Chalabi the U.S. agent). So, when they succeed in manoeuvring one sympathetic faction into power, aided by military technology, Ideological warfare (ie: aided a faction by making them the champions of Freedom against the dictator - like the Iraqi eg) they then proceed to use that agent, who has now become a puppet.

However, things aren't so simple, as other Ideological nations exist, each of whom want a slice of the cake, so they will aid the other factions against the existing agent, and so the conflict and competition will grow. Sometimes these factions court the western intervention as they see it as the only way to get into power, sometimes they are courted by the West. Now, as a result of the other nations backing these other factions there results a continuous struggle and fight for power, assassinations and coup's are the norm. This is all possible because of the lack of Ideological consensus in that societies powerful factions on how to run the society.

When these various competing factions exist, the ruling faction is in a precarious position, it has to balance these interests with the demands of their "king maker", who put them there. They can also be toppled by their own "King maker" if they deem that another nation would gain influence if they didn't (eg: U.S. toppled Nawaz Shareef for Musharraf). So this threat forces them to comply, as their "king maker" who put them there knows all their security issues and weaknesses as they put them there initially. However, the ruler must also consider the other factions, which will gain support if he sacrifices too many national interests for the sake of his "King maker". Otherwise he will get toppled and the "King-Maker" will lose its client regime and its client to a competing power. Also, there is the company faction to consider which will continue to gain strength (Insha_allah) and they fear this too.

What about non-Ideological independent nations?

Well, as far as I can see, these are those that used to be Ideological, and lost their consensus internally, and as a result they declined. However, as the same faction ruled in the Ideological days, that does now, they weren't dependant upon anyone to bring them into existence. Thus they preserved some national integrity. Look at those nations which are not ideological yet Independent, and one can perceive that they were never directly colonised, thus they never "succeeded" a coloniser. Also, they used to be Ideological, Russia and China are a case in point. There may be exception to this observation.

This is the reality of the precarious balance of interests that the client regimes of the Muslims world must content with. So as for the question, to what degree are they agents, let us answer in this light.

From the reality they must balance the interests of their "King-Makers" with the threat from the competing other factions, who will not hesitate to remove them if they are perceived to be too subservient. In fact "The King-Makers" themselves must balance these interests and so will be careful not to demand explicitly too many things from their clients.

So, it can be seen that the relationship is by nature, strained and

delicate, the ruling faction themselves could switch, if they were offered a more lucrative security arrangement via another competing ideological nation (as the party adopted leaflet said that Karimov switched from the Russian camp to the U.S. camp). This proves that they are not slaves and nor are they completely subservient, rather it is a game of PURE BENEFIT and competing interests, within which these client rulers become slaves to their desires and he who in the current reality offers them the best deal for their survival.

Another important point to note is that rulers never come to power on their own, even dictators. Saddam, for eg, has his Revolutionary Security Council (made up of Generals). It is the strongest faction that comes to power, not an individual. So this is another reason why it is difficult to preserve the balance between the "King-Makers" demands, and the national integrity, because if any of the rulers' entourage decides to do a coup against him, they could rebel to another ideological state camp, and remove him. So all this needs to be balanced.

In summary therefore, what I am saying is that the relationship is very tense and complicated, full of mistrust and hatred and jealousy. It's purely a benefit bond, and the fact that the U.S. removes old clients for new clients proves that sometimes they fall out of favour (when they are no longer expedient) and that sometimes they switch (Karimov) thus, they are not as fully dependant as my dear brother "aaa" has alluded to.

Domestic relations and Foreign policy:

As for domestic relations and foreign policy, I am of the view that there is no difference to the level of subservience based upon the above model. This delicate and mistrusting relationship between a client and "king-maker" exists in domestic policy, such as IMF loans and structural/fiscal policy, as well as in foreign policy matters. However, the relationship is delicate and fragile in essence. THIS DOES NOT MEAN THAT THEY ARE NOT PUPPETS, but rather that the reality of this term must be realised. They are controlled, they are clients, they are puppets, they are traitors, they make policy for the West, they are subservient, BUT only for as long as another benefit (from another state) or a greater risk comes along forcing them to switch. Thus they can afford to have a level of autonomy to ward off that risk, or to pacify that greater benefit (here the "King-maker" would give them that autonomy). So, it is conceivable that they may make some decisions on their own.

Example:

We say Taliban are (probably) a U.S. design

We adopt that Iran is a U.S. client

We adopt that Karimov is a U.S. client

Iran military supports and funds the Afghani opposition faction against the Taliban. Uzbekistan, also, actively supports them and has joined the Shanghai five to force an alliance against them.

This is an example of competing interests of national integrity and the "king-makers policy".

However, it is the case that no-matter what the case, ALL RULERS WILL BE DEPENDANT UPON ONE FACTION OR THE OTHER TO GET INTO POWER, and thus be dependant upon their "King-maker" mostly. And this is what brother "aaa" was trying to get at, and I agree. They are all dependant upon Kufur, but not one particular form of Kufur, they can switch, and they are expendable.

Wallahu Alim

Wassalaamu alaykum

abu Ammaar

(Maajid)

Get Your Private, Free E-mail from MSN Hotmail at <http://www.hotmail.com>.

*** This message has been edited by Abu Hakim on 26 Jan 2001 17:36:32 ***

2 Date Posted: 25 Jan 2001 16:13:03 by **Yamin Zakaria** [Reply](#)

Salam Maajid,

Yes I absolutely agree as you state

"This proves that they are not slaves and nor are they completely subservient, rather it is a game of PURE BENEFIT and competing interests, within which these client ruler become slaves to their desires and he who in the current reality offers them the best deal for their survival."

The political concept refers to this by saying that even the subordinate nations their foreign policy is tied to other more powerful states. Hence it is not master commanding the slaves as was suggested earlier by 'aaa' with regard to Iran. There is always a form bargaining process going on, puppets can be replaced by other puppet but equally masters can also be replaced by other masters. I don't believe any country in the world is 100% subservient to another nation like slave master relationship. If you examine the reality by the detailed examples that you have stated, this is not how international situations are shaped or conducted.

Yamin Zakaria

--- Maajid as-Saleemi <maajidnawaz@hotmail.com>; wrote:

> Assalaamu alaykum all,
>
> I think that this discussion is extremely important
> as it underlines the
> very basis from which we make analysis. The
> discussion has been going very
> deep into the degree to which a ruler is a puppet,
> or not, and so I thought
> it apt to change the header to this topic in my
> mail, as it has become a
> subject in itself, separate from the Iran discussion
> that triggered it.
>
> Maybe a basis needs to be established before going
> into this depth as to why
> any ruler would become a puppet in the first place.
> When this is
> established it becomes easier to see how the rulers
> are so subdued and the
> degree to which they are subdued.
>
> Why does a ruler become a puppet/client of another
> superpower?
>
> IN societies that have no ideological revival, there
> is a fundamental lack
> of consensus on how to run the affairs. There is a
> lack of a unified basis
> from which policies are extrapolated and designed.
> It can be either that

- > there is no basis at all, or that if there is such a
- > basis it exists amongst
- > a small faction of that society, and a different
- > faction carries a different
- > basis. However, whatever the case, there is no
- > consensus.
- >
- > What does this scenario lead to? This scenario
- > leads to a situation where
- > factions emerge in society, each with a different
- > way to solve the problems
- > that emanate from a lack of consensus. These
- > factions differ not just on the
- > peripherals (like the Republicans and the Democrats)
- > but rather they differ
- > on fundamental issues, issue of opposing Ideology,
- > or lack of it. Thus they
- > cannot co-operate by definition, since one factions'
- > government, is
- > constantly opposed by another faction, regardless of
- > it's policies, since
- > the opposing faction doesn't even recognise the basis
- > from which those
- > policies were extracted. An example can be the
- > faction of the company in
- > Uzbek, which fundamentally opposes any policy of the
- > ruling faction. The
- > Ideological societies don't have these factions
- > since they have a consensus
- > upon the basis that society should be run by, and so
- > they only differ upon
- > policy matter (like a kufr form of Ikhtilaf - which
- > is tolerated by them).
- >
- > In the declined world, since these differences are
- > so vast (across
- > Ideologies) they lead to a never ending conflict
- > and competition amongst
- > these factions to take power, and wipe out the
- > others (as by definition no
- > Ideology can exist alongside another). So, for
- > example we would eliminate
- > any Secular or Communist factions if we took power,
- > and they would do the
- > same to us. Now, in a scenario where the competing
- > factions are not sincere
- > or Ideological (so let us exclude the company) it
- > becomes easy for a
- > foreign power to intervene and support one faction
- > over the other, which is
- > exactly what happens.
- >
- > Now, which state could intervene in such a manner.
- > Well, it would mostly be
- > Ideological states since they are the ones with a
- > consistent foreign policy
- > based upon a fixed principle, and they are the ones
- > who lack their own
- > domestic competing factions, so they have the time
- > and the energy to look
- > abroad for their interests.
- >
- > When these Ideological states look towards the
- > declined states they perceive
- > the existence of such competing selfish factions,
- > and also they perceive the
- > existence of resources that they know they can only
- > exploit if they manoeuvre
- > one sympathetic faction into power (so they become
- > "King-Makers"). In a

- > case where there is no sympathetic faction, they
- > will use all styles to
- > create one (like U.S.A's creation/backing of the
- > Iraqi opposition led by
- > Ahmed Chalabi the U.S. agent). So, when they
- > succeed in manouvering one
- > sympathetic faction into power, aided by military
- > technology, Ideological
- > warfare (ie: aided a faction by making them the
- > champions of Freedom against
- > the dictator - like the Iraqi eg) they then proceed
- > to use that agent, who
- > has now become a puppet.
- >
- > However, things aren't so simple, as other
- > Ideological nations exists, each
- > of who want a slice of the cake, so they will aid
- > the other factions against
- > the existing agent, and so the conflict and
- > competition will grow. Sometimes
- > these factions court the western intervention as
- > they see it as the only way
- > to get into power, sometimes they are courted by the
- > West. Now, as a result
- > of the other nations backing these other factions
- > there results a continuous
- > struggle and fight for power, assinations and coup's
- > are the norm. This is
- > all possible because of the lack of Ideological
- > consensus in that societies
- > powerful factions on how to run the society.
- >
- > When these various competeing faction exist, the
- > ruling faction is in a
- > precarious postition, it has to balance these
- > interests with the demands of
- > their "king maker", who put them there. They can
- > also be toppled by their
- > own "King maker" if they deem that another nation
- > would gain influence if
- > they didn't (eg: U.S. toppled Nawaz Shareef for
- > Musharraf). So this threat
- > forces them to comply, as their "king maker" who put
- > them their knows all
- > their security issues and weaknesses as they put
- > them there initially.
- > However, the ruler must also consider the other
- > factions, which will gain
- > support if he sacrifices too many national interests
- > for the sake of his
- > "King maker". Otherwise he will get toppled and the
- > "King-Maker" will loose
- > it's client regime and it's client to a competing
- > power. Also, there is the
- > company factoin to consider which will continue to
- > gain strength
- > (Insha_allah) and they fear this too.
- >
- > What about non-Ideological independant nations?
- > Well, as far as i can see, these are those that used
- > to be Ideological, and
- > lost their consensus internally, and as a result
- > they declined. However, as
- > the same faction ruled in the Ideological days, that
- > does now, they weren't
- > dependant upon anyone to bring them into existence.
- > Thus they preserved
- > some national integrity. Look at those nations
- > which are not ideological
- > yet Independant, and one can percieve that they were

> never directly
> colonised, thus they never "succeeded" a coloniser.
> Also, they used to be
> Ideological, Russia and China are a case in point.
> There may be exception
> to this observation.
>
> This is the reality of the precarious balance of
> interests that the client
> regimes of the Muslims world must contentd with. So
> as for the question, to
> what degree are they agents, let us answer in this
> light.
>
> From the reality the must balance the interests of
> their "King-Makers" with
> the threat from the competing other factions, who
> will not hesitate to
> remove them if they are percieved to be too
> subserviant. In fact "The
> king-Makers" themselves must balance these interests
> and so will be careful
> not to demand explicitly too many things from their
> clients.
>
> So, it can be seen that the relationship is by
> nature, strained and
> delicate, the ruling faction themselves could
> switch, if they were offered a
> more lucrative security arragnment via another
> competing Ideological nation
>
=== message truncated ===

Do You Yahoo!?

Get your free @yahoo.co.uk address at <http://mail.yahoo.co.uk>
or your free @yahoo.ie address at <http://mail.yahoo.ie>

3 **Date Posted:** 25 Jan 2001 16:29:45 by [tanveer](#) [Reply](#)

Assalaamu alaykum

JazakAllah khair for the detailed analysis on why leaders become puppets. However i think it should start from an even more basic understanding of needing support itself.

If you think about any nation, it has power and ideas. Not all nations have great ideas. Ideological nations excel in ideas, whilst nations where dictators, kings and the like tend to have few ideas. Some nations also have millitary and political power. They can either be powerful, and/or be able to muster the support of other nations to proceed in its cause. Or they may be weak, barely able to defend themselves, and having very few allies.

For a leader of a nation that is not too powerful, and one that has few ideas of its own, the situation is bleak. He must make friends, alliances quickly to prevent aggression against himself. He will see around him, powerful nations, friends and allies of these powerful nations, and the designs that these powerful nations have for him and his surroundings.

Simply sitting there, not wanting to get involved,

or speaking out about the situation will get him killed. He must therefore sure up his chances of survival by taking support from the one who aided him to power, or by switching allegiances to one that can guarantee his survival. He may be approached and bribed, by incentives of aid and arms from many more powerful nations, and he must make his choice carefully.

By taking support in this situation, he must ensure the support for him remains from his protector. This can only remain if he plays the game for them. Hence he will do this, as long as playing the game wont lessen his chances of surviving than if he stopped playing their game.

This is why nations become 'puppets'.

It may not totally describe the reality, but i think it clarifies the situation for WHY puppets exist.

--- Maajid as-Saleemi <maajidnawaz@hotmail.com>; wrote:

> Assalaamu alaykum all,
>
> I think that this discussion is extremely important
> as it underlines the
> very basis from which we make analysis. The
> discussion has been going very
> deep into the degree to which a ruler is a puppet,
> or not, and so I thought
> it apt to change the header to this topic in my
> mail, as it has become a
> subject in itself, separate from the Iran discussion
> that triggered it.
>
> Maybe a basis needs to be established before going
> into this depth as to why
> any ruler would become a puppet in the first place.
> When this is
> established it becomes easier to see how the rulers
> are so subdued and the
> degree to which they are subdued.
>
> Why does a ruler become a puppet/client of another
> superpower?
>
> IN societies that have no ideological revival, there
> is a fundamental lack
> of consensus on how to run the affairs. There is a
> lack of a unified basis
> from which policies are extrapolated and designed.
> It can be either that
> there is no basis at all, or that if there is such a
> basis it exists amongst
> a small faction of that society, and a different
> faction carries a different
> basis. However, whatever the case, there is no
> consensus.
>
> What does this scenario lead to? This scenario
> leads to a situation where
> factions emerge in society, each with a different
> way to solve the problems
> that emanate from a lack of consensus. These
> factions differ not just on the
> peripherals (like the Republicans and the Democrats)
> but rather they differ

> on fundamental issues, issue of opposing Ideology,
> or lack of it. Thus they
> cannot co-operate by definition, since one factions'
> government, is
> constantly opposed by another faction, regardless of
> it's policies, since
> the opposing faction doesn't even recognise the basis
> from which those
> policies were extracted. An example can be the
> faction of the company in
> Uzbek, which fundamentally opposes any policy of the
> ruling faction. The
> Ideological societies don't have these factions
> since they have a consensus
> upon the basis that society should be run by, and so
> they only differ upon
> policy matter (like a kufr form of Ikhtilaf - which
> is tolerated by them).
>
> In the declined world, since these differences are
> so vast (across
> Ideologies) they lead to a never ending conflict
> and competition amongst
> these factions to take power, and wipe out the
> others (as by definition no
> Ideology can exist alongside another). So, for
> example we would eliminate
> any Secular or Communist factions if we took power,
> and they would do the
> same to us. Now, in a scenario where the competing
> factions are not sincere
> or Ideological (so let us exclude the company) it
> becomes easy for a
> foreign power to intervene and support one faction
> over the other, which is
> exactly what happens.
>
> Now, which state could intervene in such a manner.
> Well, it would mostly be
> Ideological states since they are the ones with a
> consistent foreign policy
> based upon a fixed principle, and they are the ones
> who lack their own
> domestic competing factions, so they have the time
> and the energy to look
> abroad for their interests.
>
> When these Ideological states look towards the
> declined states they perceive
> the existence of such competing selfish factions,
> and also they perceive the
> existence of resources that they know they can only
> exploit if they manoeuvre
> one sympathetic faction into power (so they become
> "King-Makers"). In a
> case where there is no sympathetic faction, they
> will use all styles to
> create one (like U.S.A's creation/backing of the
> Iraqi opposition led by
> Ahmed Chalabi the U.S. agent). So, when they
> succeed in manoeuvring one
> sympathetic faction into power, aided by military
> technology, Ideological
> warfare (ie: aided a faction by making them the
> champions of Freedom against
> the dictator - like the Iraqi eg) they then proceed
> to use that agent, who
> has now become a puppet.
>
> However, things aren't so simple, as other

- > Ideological nations exists, each
- > of who want a slice of the cake, so they will aid
- > the other factions against
- > the existing agent, and so the conflict and
- > competition will grow. Sometimes
- > these factions court the western intervention as
- > they see it as the only way
- > to get into power, sometimes they are courted by the
- > West. Now, as a result
- > of the other nations backing these other factions
- > there results a continuous
- > struggle and fight for power, assassinations and coup's
- > are the norm. This is
- > all possible because of the lack of Ideological
- > consensus in that societies
- > powerful factions on how to run the society.
- >
- > When these various competeing faction exist, the
- > ruling faction is in a
- > precarious position, it has to balance these
- > interests with the demands of
- > their "king maker", who put them there. They can
- > also be toppled by their
- > own "King maker" if they deem that another nation
- > would gain influence if
- > they didn't (eg: U.S. toppled Nawaz Shareef for
- > Musharraf). So this threat
- > forces them to comply, as their "king maker" who put
- > them there knows all
- > their security issues and weaknesses as they put
- > them there initially.
- > However, the ruler must also consider the other
- > factions, which will gain
- > support if he sacrifices too many national interests
- > for the sake of his
- > "King maker". Otherwise he will get toppled and the
- > "King-Maker" will loose
- > it's client regime and it's client to a competing
- > power. Also, there is the
- > company factoin to consider which will continue to
- > gain strength
- > (Insha_allah) and they fear this too.
- >
- > What about non-Ideological independant nations?
- > Well, as far as i can see, these are those that used
- > to be Ideological, and
- > lost their consensus internally, and as a result
- > they declined. However, as
- > the same faction ruled in the Ideological days, that
- > does now, they weren't
- > dependant upon anyone to bring them into existence.
- > Thus they preserved
- > some national integrity. Look at those nations
- > which are not ideological
- > yet Independant, and one can percieve that they were
- > never directly
- > colonised, thus they never "succeeded" a coloniser.
- > Also, they used to be
- > Ideological, Russia and China are a case in point.
- > There may be exception
- > to this observation.
- >
- > This is the reality of the prcarious balance of
- > interests that the client
- > regimes of the Muslims world must contentd with. So
- > as for the question, to
- > what degree are they agents, let us answer in this
- > light.
- >
- > From the reality the must balance the interests of

> their "King-Makers" with
> the threat from the competing other factions, who
> will not hesitate to
> remove them if they are perceived to be too
> subservient. In fact "The
> king-Makers" themselves must balance these interests
> and so will be careful
> not to demand explicitly too many things from their
> clients.
>
> So, it can be seen that the relationship is by
> nature, strained and
> delicate, the ruling faction themselves could
> switch, if they were offered a
> more lucrative security arrangement via another
> competing Ideological nation
>
=== message truncated ===

Do You Yahoo!?

Yahoo! Auctions - Buy the things you want at great prices.
<http://auctions.yahoo.com/>

4 **Date Posted:** 25 Jan 2001 16:49:50 by **Yamin Zakaria** [Reply](#)

Saalm All

Yes Tanvir, I agree very much with this. This is clear from the books of mafahim-syasia, and afkar-syasia and from the observation of the reality. Puppets exists in weaker position and hence they have to compromise to greater extent with the more powerful nations. There are always various forces at play in determining the situation as majid elaborated with many of the examples.

Most certainly we should not carry the concept of puppet in our minds literally.

Yamin Zakaria

--- ansaar ansaar <ansaar99@yahoo.com>; wrote: >

Assalaamu alaykum

>
> JazakAllah khair for the detailed analysis on why
> leaders become puppets. However i think it should
> start from an even more basic understanding of
> needing
> support itself.
>
> If you think about any nation, it has power and
> ideas. Not all nations have great ideas. Ideological
> nations excel in ideas, whilst nations where
> dictators, kings and the like tend to have few
> ideas.
> Some nations also have millitary and political
> power.
> They can either be powerful, and/or be able to
> muster
> the support of other nations to proceed in its
> cause.
> Or they may be weak, barely able to defend
> themselves,
> and having very few allies.
>
> For a leader of a nation that is not too

> powerful,
> and one that has few ideas of its own, the situation
> is bleak. He must make friends, alliances quickly to
> prevent aggression against himself. He will see
> around
> him, powerful nations, friends and allies of these
> powerful nations, and the designs that these
> powerful
> nations have for him and his surroundings.
>
> Simply sitting there, not wanting to get involved,
> or speaking out about the situation will get him
> killed. He must therefore sure up his chances of
> survival by taking support from the one who aided
> him
> to power, or by switching allegiances to one that
> can
> guarantee his survival. He may be approached and
> bribed, by incentives of aid and arms from many more
> powerful nations, and he must make his choice
> carefully.
>
> By taking support in this situation, he must
> ensure
> the support for him remains from his protector. This
> can only remain if he plays the game for them. Hence
> he will do this, as long as playing the game wont
> lessen his chances of surviving than if he stopped
> playing their game.
>
>
> This is why nations become 'puppets'.
>
> It may not totally describe the reality, but i
> think
> it clarifies the situation for WHY puppets exist.
>
>
>
> --- Maajid as-Saleemi <maajidnawaz@hotmail.com>;
> wrote:
> > Assalaamu alaykum all,
> >
> > I think that this discussion is extremely
> important
> > as it underlines the
> > very basis from which we make analysis. The
> > discussion has been going very
> > deep into the degree to which a ruler is a puppet,
> > or not, and so I thought
> > it apt to change the header to this topic in my
> > mail, as it has become a
> > subject in itself, separate from the Iran
> discussion
> > that triggered it.
> >
> > Maybe a basis needs to be established before going
> > into this depth as to why
> > any ruler would become a puppet in the first
> place.
> > When this is
> > established it becomes easier to see how the
> rulers
> > are so subdued and the
> > degree to which they are subdued.
> >
> > Why does a ruler become a puppet/client of another
> > superpower?
> >
> > IN societies that have no ideological revival,

> there
>> is a fundamental lack
>> of consensus on how to run the affairs. There is
> a
>> lack of a unified basis
>> from which policies are extrapolated and designed.
>
>> It can be either that
>> there is no basis at all, or that if there is such
> a
>> basis it exists amongst
>> a small faction of that society, and a different
>> faction carries a different
>> basis. However, whatever the case, there is no
>> consensus.
>>
>> What does this scenario lead to? This scenario
>> leads to a situation where
>> factions emerge in society, each with a different
>> way to solve the problems
>> that emanate from a lack of consensus. These
>> factions differ not just on the
>> peripherals (like the Republicans and the
> Democrats)
>> but rather they differ
>> on fundamental issues, issue of opposing Ideology,
>> or lack of it. Thus they
>> cannot co-operate by definition, since one
> factions'
>> government, is
>> constantly opposed by another faction, regardless
> of
>> it's policies, since
>> the opposing faction doesn't even recognise the
> basis
>> from which those
>> policies were extracted. An example can be the
>> faction of the company in
>> Uzbek, which fundamentally opposes any policy of
> the
>> ruling faction. The
>> Ideological societies don't have these factions
>> since they have a consensus
>> upon the basis that society should be run by, and
> so
>> they only differ upon
>> policy matter (like a kufr form of Ikhtilaaf -
> which
>> is tolerated by them).
>>
>> In the declined world, since these differences are
>> so vast (across
>> Ideologies) they lead to a never ending conflict
>> and competition amongst
>> these factions to take power, and wipe out the
>> others (as by definition no
>> Ideology can exist alongside another). So, for
>> example we would eliminate
>> any Secular or Communist factions if we took
> power,
>> and they would do the
>> same to us. Now, in a scenario where the
> competing
>> factions are not sincere
>> or Ideological (so let us exclude the company) it
>> becomes easy for a
>> foreign power to intervene and support one faction
>> over the other, which is
>> exactly what happens.
>>

> > Now, which state could intervene in such a manner.
>
> > Well, it would mostly be
> > Ideological states since they are the ones with a
> > consistent foreign policy
> > based upon a fixed principle, and they are the
> ones
> > who lack there own
> > domestic competing factions, so they have the time
> > and the energy to look
> > abroad for their interests.
> >
> > When these Ideological states look towards the
> > declined states they percieve
> > the existence of such competing selfish factions,
> > and also they percieve the
> > existence of resources that they know they can
> only
> > exploit if they manouvre
> > one sympathetic faction into power (so they become
> > "King-Makers"). In a
> > case where there is no sympathetic faction, they
> > will use all styles to
> > create one (like U.S.A's creation/backing of the
> > Iraqi opposition led by
> > Ahmed Chalabi the U.S. agent). So, when they
> > succeed in manouvering one
> > sympathetic faction into power, aided by military
> > technology, Ideological
> > warfare (ie: aided a faction by making them the
> > champions of Freedom against
> > the dictator - like the Iraqi eg) they then
> proceed
> > to use that agent, who
> > has now become a puppet.
> >
> > However, things aren't so simple, as other
>
=== message truncated ===

Do You Yahoo!?

Get your free @yahoo.co.uk address at <http://mail.yahoo.co.uk>
or your free @yahoo.ie address at <http://mail.yahoo.ie>

5 **Date Posted:** 25 Jan 2001 17:30:46 by **AhmerF** [Reply](#)

Perhaps it would be easier if people more regularly used terms such as Independent
- Subordinate - Satellite
nations when passing anlysis.

They are distinct and portray a certain reality....

Whereas Agent - Traitor - Puppet etc are somewhat emotive terms.

Whilst we may understand the sentiment that drives people to use these...it
may portray and incorrect perception of events if these words are misapplied
or misunderstood. I think some of the postings on this site and subsequent
confusion has demonstrated that.

But certainly the discussion about this has been excellent and something
that was long called for.

6 Date Posted: 25 Jan 2001 17:33:51 by [Yamin Zakaria](#) [Reply](#)

Salam Aamir,

In fact I was thinking the same thing as you mentioned here. I think you are right the term may have lead some people to construe this kind of understanding.

Yamin Zakaria

--- AhmerFeroz@aol.com wrote: > Perhaps it would be easier if people more regularly

> used terms such as Independent - Subordinate -

> Satellite

> nations when passing analysis.

>

> They are distinct and portray a certain reality....

>

> Whereas Agent - Traitor - Puppet etc are somewhat

> emotive terms.

>

> Whilst we may understand the sentiment that drives

> people to use these...it may portray and incorrect

> perception of events if these words are misapplied

> or misunderstood. I think some of the postings on

> this site and subsequent confusion has demonstrated

> that.

>

> But certainly the discussion about this has been

> excellent and something that was long called for.

>

>

>

> --

> Leave Group: send blank mail to

> PATF-unsubscribe@smartgroups.com

> Email Help: send blank mail to

> PATF-help@smartgroups.com

>

> <http://www.smartgroups.com/groups/PATF>

>

Do You Yahoo!?

Get your free @yahoo.co.uk address at <http://mail.yahoo.co.uk>

or your free @yahoo.ie address at <http://mail.yahoo.ie>

7 Date Posted: 25 Jan 2001 17:49:01 by [tanveer](#) [Reply](#)

I dont think thats necessary actually. We should just remember that making "analysis" and speaking about analysis is different to "dawa".

When we make dawa or give analysis to the ummah we link it to their emotions, and we give the analysis in line with our objectives.

When we make analysis and talk amongst employees (these terms are becoming awful! :)) , then we should remember that we dont need to convince each other that we find the realities in our countries repugnant. To this respect when we write... ' Karimov (the evil kaafir) ' ... there is no need to do this, as this is now mixing the emotion with the analysis. You will never see the reality clearly if you allow your

emotions to interfere with how you are seeing things.

Similarly, if one were to send a message to this forum, about some massacre of muslims in the world, and there was no 'political texts' in the article, you must ask why he posted it? The article may cause emotions in the minds of the recipients, but in terms of political focus on this forum, the article had no value.

We should be careful about achieving the desired objective in this forum. I believe the objective is to understand the political reality, and inshAllah produce the political concepts in all of us. Lets stick to that task inshAllah.

So we should use our 'terms' but we should understand these terms in the light of political analysis and not dawa.

--- AhmerFeroz@aol.com wrote:

- > Perhaps it would be easier if people more regularly
- > used terms such as Independent - Subordinate -
- > Satellite
- > nations when passing analysis.
- >
- > They are distinct and portray a certain reality....
- >
- > Whereas Agent - Traitor - Puppet etc are somewhat
- > emotive terms.
- >
- > Whilst we may understand the sentiment that drives
- > people to use these...it may portray and incorrect
- > perception of events if these words are misapplied
- > or misunderstood. I think some of the postings on
- > this site and subsequent confusion has demonstrated
- > that.
- >
- > But certainly the discussion about this has been
- > excellent and something that was long called for.
- >
- >
- >
- > --
- > Leave Group: send blank mail to
- > PATF-unsubscribe@smartgroups.com
- > Email Help: send blank mail to
- > PATF-help@smartgroups.com
- >
- > <http://www.smartgroups.com/groups/PATF>
- >

Do You Yahoo!?

Yahoo! Auctions - Buy the things you want at great prices.

<http://auctions.yahoo.com/>

8 Date Posted: 25 Jan 2001 17:55:22 by [Yamin Zakaria](#) [Reply](#)

Salam All

YEs thats true but what Aamir saying, if you avoided such terms then it can help to prevent mis understanding in our minds. Dont forget as there are more and more people, the words get to them without the formal definitions and hence the possible confusion.

Yamin Zakaria

--- ansaar ansaar <ansaar99@yahoo.com>; wrote: > I dont think thats necessary actually. We should

> just

> remember that making "analysis" and speaking about

> analysis is different to "dawa".

>

> When we make dawa or give analysis to the ummah we

> link it to their emotions, and we give the analysis

> in

> line with our objectives.

>

> When we make analysis and talk amongst employees

> (these terms are becoming awful! :)) , then we

> should

> remember that we dont need to convince each other

> that

> we find the realities in our countries repugnant. To

> this respect when we write... ' Karimov (the evil

> kaafir) ' ... there is no need to do this, as this

> is

> now mixing the emotion with the analysis. You will

> never see the reality clearly if you allow your

> emotions to interfere with how you are seeing

> things.

>

> Similarly, if one were to send a message to this

> forum, about some massacre of muslims in the world,

> and there was no 'political texts' in the article,

> you

> must ask why he posted it? The article may cause

> emotions in the minds of the recipients, but in

> terms

> of political focus on this forum, the article had no

> value.

>

> We should be careful about achieving the desired

> objective in this forum. I believe the objective is

> to

> understand the political reality, and inshAllah

> produce the political concepts in all of us. Lets

> stick to that task inshAllah.

>

>

>

> So we should use our 'terms' but we should

> understand

> these terms in the light of political analysis and

> not

> dawa.

>

>

>

>

> --- AhmerFeroz@aol.com wrote:

> > Perhaps it would be easier if people more
> regularly
> > used terms such as Independent - Subordinate -
> > Satellite
> > nations when passing analysis.
> >
> > They are distinct and portray a certain
> reality....
> >
> > Whereas Agent - Traitor - Puppet etc are somewhat
> > emotive terms.
> >
> > Whilst we may understand the sentiment that drives
> > people to use these...it may portray and incorrect
> > perception of events if these words are misapplied
> > or misunderstood. I think some of the postings on
> > this site and subsequent confusion has
> demonstrated
> > that.
> >
> > But certainly the discussion about this has been
> > excellent and something that was long called for.
> >
> >
> > --
> > Leave Group: send blank mail to
> > PATF-unsubscribe@smartgroups.com
> > Email Help: send blank mail to
> > PATF-help@smartgroups.com
> >
> > <http://www.smartgroups.com/groups/PATF>

> Do You Yahoo!?
> Yahoo! Auctions - Buy the things you want at great
> prices.
> <http://auctions.yahoo.com/>

> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> > --
> > Leave Group: send blank mail to
> > PATF-unsubscribe@smartgroups.com
> > Email Help: send blank mail to
> > PATF-help@smartgroups.com
> >
> > <http://www.smartgroups.com/groups/PATF>
> >

Do You Yahoo!?
Get your free @yahoo.co.uk address at <http://mail.yahoo.co.uk>
or your free @yahoo.ie address at <http://mail.yahoo.ie>

9 Date Posted: 25 Jan 2001 21:01:39 by «No Name Set» [Reply](#)

Again Yamin you have misinterpreted my point. I thought I had agreed that there is no 100% master-slave relationship, but I do insist that the degree of subservience of the rulers of Muslim lands is of an incredible degree such that they sometimes risk their very existence for an interest of their patrons which does not really achieve anything for them locally e.g. Anwar Sadat's Camp David agreement which was never really accepted among the masses in Egypt (as he should have known if he kept in touch with such sentiments) and ultimately led to his demise. Now you have Mubarak supporting a similar betrayal process against the wishes of the Egyptian masses. As for the carrot of more aid from the US, what is this in comparison to living your life in constant fear of an Islamic uprising and/or assassination? Even on a cost-benefit capitalist analysis, their acceptance to be used by their patrons against their own masses' sentiments in such a manner is stupid!

-----Original Message-----

From: Yamin Zakaria [<mailto:yaminz@yahoo.co.uk>]

Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2001 7:13 PM

To: patf@smartgroups.com

Subject: Re: [PATF] Puppet or not a puppet

Salam Maajid,

Yes I absolutely agree as you state

"This proves that they are not slaves and nor are they completely subservient, rather it is a game of PURE BENEFIT and competing interests, within which these client ruler become slaves to their desires and he who in the current reality offers them the best deal for their survival."

The political concept refers to this by saying that even the subordinate nations their foreign policy is tied to other more powerful states. Hence it is not master commanding the slaves as was suggested earlier by 'aaa' with regard to Iran. There is always a form bargaining process going on, puppets can be replaced by other puppet but equally masters can also be replaced by other masters. I don't believe any country in the world is 100% subservient to another nation like slave master relationship. If you examine the reality by the detailed examples that you have stated, this is not how international situations are shaped or conducted.

Yamin Zakaria

--- Maajid as-Saleemi <maajidnawaz@hotmail.com>; wrote:

> Assalaamu alaykum all,

>

> I think that this discussion is extremely important

> as it underlines the

> very basis from which we make analysis. The

> discussion has been going very

> deep into the degree to which a ruler is a puppet,

> or not, and so I thought

> it apt to change the header to this topic in my

> mail, as it has become a

> subject in itself, separate from the Iran discussion

> that triggered it.

>

> Maybe a basis needs to be established before going

> into this depth as to why

> any ruler would become a puppet in the first place.

- > When this is
- > established it becomes easier to see how the rulers
- > are so subdued and the
- > degree to which they are subdued.
- >
- > Why does a ruler become a puppet/client of another
- > superpower?
- >
- > IN societies that have no ideological revival, there
- > is a fundamental lack
- > of consensus on how to run the affairs. There is a
- > lack of a unified basis
- > from which policies are extrapolated and designed.
- > It can be either that
- > there is no basis at all, or that if there is such a
- > basis it exists amongst
- > a small faction of that society, and a different
- > faction carries a different
- > basis. However, whatever the case, there is no
- > consensus.
- >
- > What does this scenario lead to? This scenario
- > leads to a situation where
- > factions emerge in society, each with a different
- > way to solve the problems
- > that emanate from a lack of consensus. These
- > factions differ not just on the
- > peripherals (like the Republicans and the Democrats)
- > but rather they differ
- > on fundamental issues, issue of opposing Ideology,
- > or lack of it. Thus they
- > cannot co-operate by definition, since one factions'
- > government, is
- > constantly opposed by another faction, regardless of
- > it's policies, since
- > the opposing faction doesn't even recognise the basis
- > from which those
- > policies were extracted. An example can be the
- > faction of the company in
- > Uzbek, which fundamentally opposes any policy of the
- > ruling faction. The
- > Ideological societies don't have these factions
- > since they have a consensus
- > upon the basis that society should be run by, and so
- > they only differ upon
- > policy matter (like a kufr form of Ikhtilaf - which
- > is tolerated by them).
- >
- > In the declined world, since these differences are
- > so vast (across
- > Ideologies) they lead to a never ending conflict
- > and competition amongst
- > these factions to take power, and wipe out the
- > others (as by definition no
- > Ideology can exist alongside another). So , for
- > example we would eliminate
- > any Secular or Communist factions if we took power,
- > and they would do the
- > same to us. Now, in a scenario where the competing
- > factions are not sincere
- > or Ideological (so let us exclude the company) it
- > becomes easy for a
- > foreign power to intervene and support one faction
- > over the other, which is
- > exactly what happens.
- >
- > Now, which state could intervene in such a manner.
- > Well, it would mostly be
- > Ideological states since they are the ones with a
- > consistent foreign policy

> based upon a fixed principle, and they are the ones
> who lack their own
> domestic competing factions, so they have the time
> and the energy to look
> abroad for their interests.
>
> When these Ideological states look towards the
> declined states they perceive
> the existence of such competing selfish factions,
> and also they perceive the
> existence of resources that they know they can only
> exploit if they manoeuvre
> one sympathetic faction into power (so they become
> "King-Makers"). In a
> case where there is no sympathetic faction, they
> will use all styles to
> create one (like U.S.A's creation/backing of the
> Iraqi opposition led by
> Ahmed Chalabi the U.S. agent). So, when they
> succeed in manoeuvring one
> sympathetic faction into power, aided by military
> technology, Ideological
> warfare (ie: aided a faction by making them the
> champions of Freedom against
> the dictator - like the Iraqi eg) they then proceed
> to use that agent, who
> has now become a puppet.
>
> However, things aren't so simple, as other
> Ideological nations exist, each
> of whom want a slice of the cake, so they will aid
> the other factions against
> the existing agent, and so the conflict and
> competition will grow. Sometimes
> these factions court the western intervention as
> they see it as the only way
> to get into power, sometimes they are courted by the
> West. Now, as a result
> of the other nations backing these other factions
> there results a continuous
> struggle and fight for power, assassinations and coup's
> are the norm. This is
> all possible because of the lack of Ideological
> consensus in that societies
> powerful factions on how to run the society.
>
> When these various competing factions exist, the
> ruling faction is in a
> precarious position, it has to balance these
> interests with the demands of
> their "king maker", who put them there. They can
> also be toppled by their
> own "King maker" if they deem that another nation
> would gain influence if
> they didn't (eg: U.S. toppled Nawaz Shareef for
> Musharraf). So this threat
> forces them to comply, as their "king maker" who put
> them there knows all
> their security issues and weaknesses as they put
> them there initially.
> However, the ruler must also consider the other
> factions, which will gain
> support if he sacrifices too many national interests
> for the sake of his
> "King maker". Otherwise he will get toppled and the
> "King-Maker" will lose
> his client regime and his client to a competing
> power. Also, there is the
> company faction to consider which will continue to
> gain strength

> (Insha_allah) and they fear this too.
>
> What about non-Ideoogical independant nations?
> Well, as far as i can see, these are those that used
> to be Ideological, and
> lost their consensus internally, and as a result
> they declined. However, as
> the same faction ruled in the Ideological days, that
> does now, they weren't
> dependant upon anyone to bring them into existence.
> Thus they preserved
> some national integrity. Look at those nations
> which are not ideological
> yet Independant, and one can percieve that they were
> never directly
> colonised, thus they never "succeeded" a coloniser.
> Also, they used to be
> Ideological, Russia and China are a case in point.
> There may be exception
> to this observation.
>
> This is the reality of the prcarious balance of
> interests that the client
> regimes of the Muslims world must contentd with. So
> as for the question, to
> what degree are they agents, let us answer in this
> light.
>
> From the reality the must balance the interests of
> their "King-Makers" with
> the threat from the competing other factions, who
> will not hesitate to
> remove them if they are percieved to be too
> subserviant. In fact "The
> king-Makers" themselves must balance these interests
> and so will be careful
> not to demand explicitly too many things from their
> clients.
>
> So, it can be seen that the relationship is by
> nature, strained and
> delicate, the ruling faction themselves could
> switch, if they were offered a
> more lucrative security arragnment via another
> competing Ideological nation
>
=== message truncated ===

Do You Yahoo!?

Get your free @yahoo.co.uk address at <http://mail.yahoo.co.uk>

or your free @yahoo.ie address at <http://mail.yahoo.ie>

--

Leave Group: send blank mail to PATF-unsubscribe@smartgroups.com

Email Help: send blank mail to PATF-help@smartgroups.com

<http://www.smartgroups.com/groups/PATF>

10

Date Posted: 25 Jan 2001 21:01:50 by «No Name Set» [Reply](#)

wa alaykum salaam

Since we are attempting to be politicians not academics, and we seek to clarify concepts to apply them on the reality, I will hold onto my immediate response to today's posting on this issue in order to:-

Refer to an authoritative book on these matters which we all accept i.e. Political Concepts and Afkar Siyasia. I would like Yamin to post via scanning or attachment the relevant texts from Political Concepts which he believes supports his argument since I unfortunately lost the same when I moved. As for Afkar Siyasia, he can do the same and/or refer to page number and specific paragraphs since I have it. After I have read the same, I will then respond since I may accept his understanding as correct or not. Till then, I will refrain from posting my views on this subject as we need to view this as a practical forum for politicians and would be statesmen to improve their understanding for practical application upon the establishment of Islam soon Insha'Allah not mere academic discussion which can run forever without any resolution (not that I think any one of you aims for that...).

-----Original Message-----

From: Yamin Zakaria [<mailto:yaminz@yahoo.co.uk>]

Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2001 7:48 PM

To: patf@smartgroups.com

Subject: Re: [PATF] Puppet or not a puppet

Saalm All

Yes Tanvir, I agree very much with this. This is clear from the books of mafahim-syasia, and afkar-syasia and from the observation of the reality. Puppets exists in weaker position and hence they have to compromise to greater extent with the more powerful nations. There are always various forces at play in determining the situation as majid elaborated with many of the examples.

Most certainly we should not carry the concept of puppet in our minds literally.

Yamin Zakaria

--- ansaar ansaar <ansaar99@yahoo.com>; wrote: >

Assalaamu alaykum

>

> JazakAllah khair for the detailed analysis on why
> leaders become puppets. However i think it should
> start from an even more basic understanding of
> needing
> support itself.

>

> If you think about any nation, it has power and
> ideas. Not all nations have great ideas. Ideological
> nations excel in ideas, whilst nations where
> dictators, kings and the like tend to have few
> ideas.

> Some nations also have millitary and political
> power.

> They can either be powerful, and/or be able to
> muster

> the support of other nations to proceed in its
> cause.

> Or they may be weak, barely able to defend
> themselves,

> and having very few allies.

>

> For a leader of a nation that is not too
> powerful,

> and one that has few ideas of its own, the situation

> is bleak. He must make friends, alliances quickly to
> prevent aggression against himself. He will see
> around
> him, powerful nations, friends and allies of these
> powerful nations, and the designs that these
> powerful
> nations have for him and his surroundings.
>
> Simply sitting there, not wanting to get involved,
> or speaking out about the situation will get him
> killed. He must therefore sure up his chances of
> survival by taking support from the one who aided
> him
> to power, or by switching allegiances to one that
> can
> guarantee his survival. He may be approached and
> bribed, by incentives of aid and arms from many more
> powerful nations, and he must make his choice
> carefully.
>
> By taking support in this situation, he must
> ensure
> the support for him remains from his protector. This
> can only remain if he plays the game for them. Hence
> he will do this, as long as playing the game wont
> lessen his chances of surviving than if he stopped
> playing their game.
>
>
> This is why nations become 'puppets'.
>
> It may not totally describe the reality, but i
> think
> it clarifies the situation for WHY puppets exist.
>
>
>
> --- Maajid as-Saleemi <maajidnawaz@hotmail.com>;
> wrote:
> > Assalaamu alaykum all,
> >
> > I think that this discussion is extremely
> > important
> > as it underlines the
> > very basis from which we make analysis. The
> > discussion has been going very
> > deep into the degree to which a ruler is a puppet,
> > or not, and so I thought
> > it apt to change the header to this topic in my
> > mail, as it has become a
> > subject in itself, separate from the Iran
> > discussion
> > that triggered it.
> >
> > Maybe a basis needs to be established before going
> > into this depth as to why
> > any ruler would become a puppet in the first
> > place.
> > When this is
> > established it becomes easier to see how the
> > rulers
> > are so subdued and the
> > degree to which they are subdued.
> >
> > Why does a ruler become a puppet/client of another
> > superpower?
> >
> > IN societies that have no ideological revival,
> > there
> > is a fundamental lack

> > of consensus on how to run the affairs. There is
> > a
> > lack of a unified basis
> > from which policies are extrapolated and designed.
>
> > It can be either that
> > there is no basis at all, or that if there is such
> > a
> > basis it exists amongst
> > a small faction of that society, and a different
> > faction carries a different
> > basis. However, whatever the case, there is no
> > consensus.
> >
> > What does this scenario lead to? This scenario
> > leads to a situation where
> > factions emerge in society, each with a different
> > way to solve the problems
> > that emanate from a lack of consensus. These
> > factions differ not just on the
> > peripherals (like the Republicans and the
> Democrats)
> > but rather they differ
> > on fundamental issues, issue of opposing Ideology,
> > or lack of it. Thus they
> > cannot co-operate by definition, since one
> factions'
> > government, is
> > constantly opposed by another faction, regardless
> of
> > it's policies, since
> > the opposing faction doesn't even recognise the
> basis
> > from which those
> > policies were extracted. An example can be the
> > faction of the company in
> > Uzbek, which fundamentally opposes any policy of
> the
> > ruling faction. The
> > Ideological societies don't have these factions
> > since they have a consensus
> > upon the basis that society should be run by, and
> so
> > they only differ upon
> > policy matter (like a kufr form of Ikhtilaf -
> which
> > is tolerated by them).
> >
> > In the declined world, since these differences are
> > so vast (across
> > Ideologies) they lead to a never ending conflict
> > and competition amongst
> > these factions to take power, and wipe out the
> > others (as by definition no
> > Ideology can exist alongside another). So, for
> > example we would eliminate
> > any Secular or Communist factions if we took
> power,
> > and they would do the
> > same to us. Now, in a scenario where the
> competing
> > factions are not sincere
> > or Ideological (so let us exclude the company) it
> > becomes easy for a
> > foreign power to intervene and support one faction
> > over the other, which is
> > exactly what happens.
> >
> > Now, which state could intervene in such a manner.
>

> > Well, it would mostly be
> > Ideological states since they are the ones with a
> > consistent foreign policy
> > based upon a fixed principle, and they are the
> ones
> > who lack there own
> > domestic competing factions, so they have the time
> > and the energy to look
> > abroad for their interests.
> >
> > When these Ideological states look towards the
> > declined states they percieve
> > the existence of such competing selfish factions,
> > and also they percieve the
> > existence of resources that they know they can
> only
> > exploit if they manouvre
> > one sympathetic faction into power (so they become
> > "King-Makers"). In a
> > case where there is no sympathetic faction, they
> > will use all styles to
> > create one (like U.S.A's creation/backing of the
> > Iraqi opposition led by
> > Ahmed Chalabi the U.S. agent). So, when they
> > succeed in manouvering one
> > sympathetic faction into power, aided by military
> > technology, Ideological
> > warfare (ie: aided a faction by making them the
> > champions of Freedom against
> > the dictator - like the Iraqi eg) they then
> proceed
> > to use that agent, who
> > has now become a puppet.
> >
> > However, things aren't so simple, as other
>
=== message truncated ===

Do You Yahoo!?

Get your free @yahoo.co.uk address at <http://mail.yahoo.co.uk>

or your free @yahoo.ie address at <http://mail.yahoo.ie>

--

Leave Group: send blank mail to PATF-unsubscribe@smartgroups.com

Email Help: send blank mail to PATF-help@smartgroups.com

<http://www.smartgroups.com/groups/PATF>

Result Pages: 1 2 **3**

P [Prev](#) [Next](#) **N**

Powered by Freeserve

[Home](#) | [Help](#) | [Find Group](#) | [Create Group](#) | [Feedback](#) | [Terms](#) | [About](#)