

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

[Pr](#) [Prev](#) [Next](#) [Ns](#)

Created by on 25 Jan 2001 15:38:02

Messages 11 to 19 of 19

Search for

Message

11 **Date Posted:** 25 Jan 2001 21:16:49 by **Yamin Zakaria** [Reply](#)

Salam All,

Who is being academic here I wonder!. From what evidence can anyone come to this form of conclusion is beyond me. It seems everyone are in agreement to ther point about master salve relationship and the meaning of being a puppet. The subject was being discussed prior to my entry into the discussion by tanvr(ansaar) and others etc.

Regarding the evidence the onus is on yourself to acquire or you can ask your relavent channels to get that.

Besides from the evidence the subject is also self evident from the reality, as was clearly demonstared by Maajid, Tanveer and Ahaamer and other shababs.

Yamin Zakaria

--- aaa <aaa@swiftmombasa.com>; wrote: > 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 military 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
>
=== 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>

12

Date Posted: 25 Jan 2001 21:16:51 by **AhmerF** [Reply](#)

Brother 'ansaar' - All I am saying is that when doing analysis you are trying to understand a reality/situation.

To my mind these words puppet-traitor -and the like are vague/generalised and for brothers have many meanings.....

People have literally taken them to be puppets on a string - or leaders who sit in their homes with a hotline to Washington/10 D Street and receive orders.....

Whereas when discussing Iran-US relationship if the term Satellite or Subordinate was applied it would project a more precise understanding (if people knew How Hizb ut TAhrir referred to them in Political concepts)

Puppet would mean many things to many people....

I think you misunderstood my initial point...

13

Date Posted: 25 Jan 2001 21:51:07 by [Yamin Zakaria](#) [Reply](#)

Salam All

--- aaa <aaa@swiftmombasa.com>; wrote: > Again Yamin you have misinterpreted my point. I > thought I had agreed that > there is no 100% master-slave relationship,

I have not mis-interpreted anything, your own words were regarding Iran was that they are "absolute puppets" and the context or the emphasis of your article seems to clearly indicate that. To this point almost all of the shebab including myself disagreed. The point was elaborated by myself and tanveer in detail with examples from the reality, as well as references from party books. Furthermore today this also elaborated in great detail by Maajid. If how ever you do not mean that and in the subsequent article you did clarify yourself further, then we all agree (Al-Hamdulliah).

>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!

In terms of subserviant I clearly explained to you and you agreed that most muslim countries are either sub-ordinate state or satalllite states, or a combination of the two.

Regarding the examples of muslim countries again I disagree with you on the reality of the situation. The US before the gulf war did go around and seduced many of the countries to participate in the war. This is very clear. It was not the command of US and all the other countries simply followed. A lot of carrot and stick was used.

Regarding the masses who opposes the secular regimes are not simply a monolithic block. Most muslim countries including Egypt, the society is POLARISED. You have the secular elite who are largely in control do form a section of the population, who also advocate the camp david agreement. At the same time you also

have the masses of which a significant section have Islamic sentiments and emotions. Hence these rulers and these regimies are not simply docile and follow western policies. They also have a degree of conviction in the current systems, and with the support of the secular elite and pressure from outside powers causes them to behave in this manner. Hence the risk is not as drastic as you put it, alongside the risk is also the carrot and the conviction of these secular regimes. This has also been elaborated also by Maajids article posted today.

The degree to which muslim rulers are subserviant also differs from country to country.

But I am pleased that we all agree that Muslim regimes do not simply execute commands from the west, it is not a puppet-master relationship. There are a lot of discussions and negotiations takes place before agreements are made, and executed. Muslim countries are either subordinate where their policies are tied to the foreign powers or they are at best satallite nations. I doubt any muslim countries are independent.

Most certainly the ideological Islamic state(Khilfah) will be in the future (Inshaa Allah).

Yamin Zakaria

> -----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 tey completely subserviant, 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 porcess going on, puppets can be replaced

> by other puppet but equally masters can also be

> replaced by other masters. I dont 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
>
=== 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>

14 **Date Posted:** 25 Jan 2001 22:13:10 by **Yamin Zakaria** [Reply](#)

Salam All,

I forgot one more point, as 'aaa' states after he has read the relevant pages he will decide to accept my interpretation or not. The question is, why is it being personalised to myself ? I am sure everyone else also agrees with the interpretation given from the passage in the book, Tanveer, Maajid, Ahmer etc etc. Surely everyone elaborated and agreed on the meaning of puppet regime.

More ever I thought he agreed with us regarding the concept of what it means to be a puppet.

Yamin Zakaria

--- aaa <aaa@swiftmombasa.com>; wrote: > 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 military 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 shore 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 defintion, since one
>> factions'
>>> government, is
>>> constantly opposed by another faction,
> regardless
>
=== 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>

15

Date Posted: 25 Jan 2001 22:29:07 by «No Name Set» [Reply](#)

I further agree to "Ansaari's" point, but didn't I say that when I spoke about the need for survival :) ? anyway, JazakAllahu khayr.

abu ammaar

>From: Yamin Zakaria <yaminz@yahoo.co.uk>;

>Reply-To: patf@smartgroups.com

>To: patf@smartgroups.com

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

>Date: Thu, 25 Jan 2001 16:47:31 +0000 (GMT)

>

>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
>weker position and hence they have to compramise 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 military 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 defintion, since one
> > factions'
> > > government, is
> > > constantly opposed by another faction, regardless
> > of
> > > it's policies, since
> > > the opposing factor 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
> > > becomees 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
> > > sypathetic 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>
>

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

16

Date Posted: 25 Jan 2001 22:35:43 by «No Name Set» [Reply](#)

Assalaamu alaykum

Yes, I agree, but I wouldn't go as far as to say that the words :

"Client regime" and,

"agent" - which doesn't give the connotation of a puppet on strings

and "traitor"

are emotive, they can be used without giving a connotation of a puppet on strings. The word puppet is particular to this objection.

abu Ammaar

>From: AhmerFeroz@aol.com

>Reply-To: patf@smartgroups.com

>To: <patf@smartgroups.com>;

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

>Date: Thu, 25 Jan 2001 12:30:24 EST

>

>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>

>

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

17

Date Posted: 25 Jan 2001 22:38:04 by «No Name Set» [Reply](#)

This is what i was trying to say, but in more eloquent wording.

So, puppet may and even should (maybe) be used in talks to enrage the ummah.

abu Ammaar

>From: [ansaar ansaar <ansaar99@yahoo.com>](mailto:ansaar99@yahoo.com);

>Reply-To: patf@smartgroups.com

>To: patf@smartgroups.com

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

>Date: Thu, 25 Jan 2001 09:48:30 -0800 (PST)

>

>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 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.
> >
> >
> > --
> > 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>
>

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

18

Date Posted: 25 Jan 2001 22:53:59 by «No Name Set» [Reply](#)

Assalaamu alaykum my brother,

I agree that at times you have been misinterpreted, and I tried in my analysis not to do that, if you feel that I have, then forgive me and also forgive brother Yameen.

However, regarding your example below: if we used the framewrk that I outlined in my analysis then we can explain such actions of the rulers when they do things against their own interests.

You mentioned that surely the threat of living in constant fear of an Islamic uprising and/or assination is worse than US aid? Actually, the reality is that this is not the trade off, and if it was, you would be perfectly correct. The reality is that people like Sadat, or Mubarak, are living in constant fear of the following trade off:

Implement their "King-Maker's" policy or get assassinated (or replaced) by their "King-Maker" via what looks like an Islamic or Socialist lone-ranger(a bit like Nawaz Shareefs dilemma).

or

live in fear of the possible assination/uprising by the people.

or

get assassinated by another faction backed by another Ideological "King-Maker" other than your own.

This is the real trade off. These are the matters that need to be balanced out by the Client ruler.

In such a scenario he will use a Cost-Benefit analysis and think that since it is most likely that his "King-Maker" could assassinate him / replace him the easiest, then he should obey them.

Any other way of explaining the situation needs to explain WHY is the Client a Client?

In your example, it seems that pure loyalty alone makes him obey. This is not the case as Clients do and have switched. It cannot be Intellectual subservience to Secularism and mesmorsisation with it's ideas, because that same subserviance could be given to the U.K. and not necessarily the U.S., and so it cannot be that either, why do they obey their Patrons? It also cannot be pure love and loyalty, as we know from Chapter 3 that this is not a bond, and what this really means is benefit. So it can only be for their survival.

Try think about this bro,

Why, other than what I say in my analysis, would a Client switch sides like Karimov did (adopted company law)?

Why would a "King-Maker", other than what I say, switch his Client (like Us did to nawaz Shareef?)

You believe that Sadat/Mubarak obeyed the U.S. against all odds, their own survival and even against their benefit. Why would they do such a thing, except for what I've said?

may Allah reward you for your persistence in finding the truth

abu Ammaar

Maajid

>From: "aaa" <aaa@swiftmombasa.com>;

>Reply-To: patf@smartgroups.com

>To: <patf@smartgroups.com>;

>Subject: RE: [PATF] Puppet or not a puppet

>Date: Fri, 26 Jan 2001 00:00:40 +0300

>

>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 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 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 contend 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
> >
> >
>==== 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>
>
>
>
>--
>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>
>

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

19

Date Posted: 25 Jan 2001 23:03:14 by «No Name Set» [Reply](#)

Sorry, I forgot to address the mail to a particular brother, that was my polite response to brother "aaa"'s mail.

On a general note, brothers please let us love each other as brothers who love Allah's deen more than anything else, remember, we all want the same thing, and for the same reasons. Our aim is Jannah, and may Allah (swt) give it to you all, regardless of your Ikhtilafaat (differences).

Wassalaamu alaykum

abu Ammaar
Maajid

>From: "Maajid as-Saleemi" <maajidnawaz@hotmail.com>;
>Reply-To: patf@smartgroups.com
>To: patf@smartgroups.com
>Subject: RE: [PATF] Puppet or not a puppet
>Date: Thu, 25 Jan 2001 22:53:54 -0000
>
>Assalaamu alaykum my brother,
>
>I agree that at times you have been misinterpreted, and I tried in my
>analysis not to do that, if you feel that I have, then forgive me and also
>forgive brother Yameen.
>
>However, regarding your example below: if we used the frameowrk that I
>outlined in my analysis then we can explain such actions of the rulers when
>they do things against their own interests.
>
>You mentioned that surely the threat of living in constant fear of an
>Islamic uprising and/or assination is worse than US aid? Actually, the
>reality is that this is not the trade off, and if it was, you would be
>perfectly correct. The reality is that people like Sadat, or Mubarak, are
>living in constant fear of the following trade off:
>
>Implement their "King-Maker's" policy or get assassinated (or replaced) by
>their "King-Maker" via what looks like an Islamic or Socialist
>lone-ranger(a

>bit like Nawaz Shareefs dilemma).
>
>or
>
>live in fear of the possible assination/uprising by the people.
>
>or
>
>get assassinated by another faction backed by another Ideological
>"King-Maker" other than your own.
>
>This is the real trade off. These are the matters that need to be balanced
>out by the Client ruler.
>
>In such a scenario he will use a Cost-Benefit analysis and think that since
>it is most likely that his "King-Maker" could assassinate him / replace him
>the easiest, then he should obey them.
>
>Any other way of explaining the situation needs to explain WHY is the
>Client
>a Client?
>
>In your example, it seems that pure loyalty alone makes him obey. This is
>not the case as Clients do and have switched. It cannot be Intellectual
>subservience to Secularism and mesmerisation with it's ideas, because that
>same subserviance could be given to the U.K. and not necessarily the U.S.,
>and so it cannot be that either, why do they obey their Patrons? It also
>cannot be pure love and loyalty, as we know from Chapter 3 that this is not
>a bond, and what this really means is benefit. So it can only be for their
>survival.
>
>Try think about this bro,
>
>Why, other than what I say in my analysis, would a Client switch sides like
>Karimov did (adopted company law)?
>
>Why would a "King-Maker", other than what I say, switch his Client (like
>Us
>did to nawaz Shareef?)
>
>You believe that Sadat/Mubarak obeyed the U.S. against all odds, their own
>survival and even against their benefit. Why wpould they do such a thing,
>except for what I've said?
>
>may Allah reward you for your persistance in finding the truth
>
>abu Ammaar
>
>Maajid
>
>>From: "aaa" <aaa@swiftmombasa.com>;
>>Reply-To: patf@smartgroups.com
>>To: <patf@smartgroups.com>;
>>Subject: RE: [PATF] Puppet or not a puppet
>>Date: Fri, 26 Jan 2001 00:00:40 +0300
>>
>>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 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 manouversing 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 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 weaknessess 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-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>

>>
>>
>>
>>--

>>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>

>>
>
>

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

>

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

Result Pages: [Pr](#) [1](#) [2](#)

[Pr](#) [Prev](#) [Next](#) [N4](#)

Powered by Freeserve

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