

## Answer to Question

# The Reality of the Disputes between the Agent States of a Major State

### Question:

Assalamu Alaikum wa Rahmatullah wa Barakatuhu

Can agent states or satellite (orbiting) states be in conflict with each other? If this is possible, then how can we explain this, if they follow the same major state? Wouldn't this conflict affect the interests of the major state that they follow? If there is no such conflict taking place, then how can we explain, for example, what is going on between Iraq and Turkey, or between Iran and Saudi Arabia, or between Turkey and Iran? Thank you.

### Answer:

Wa Alaikum As-Salaam Wa Rahmatullah Wa Barakatuhu

The broad outline of the subject is as follows:

1. **It is inconceivable that the agent states** to the major states will undertake an action that would harm those major states, because following the major states in foreign policy means following the plans drawn by the major states for them or in the policies they implement in every detail. Therefore their external actions are subject to the will of the major states and they cannot carry out any action without consulting the major states and following their orders, like Jordan with Britain: Jordan's rulers carry out the orders of Britain in foreign policy only after consulting with it. Unless the policy is well-known and was followed previously, it can take an action within that policy such as when Jordan contacts Qatar, which also follows Britain, to undertake an action that serves the British policy.

2. As for the follower state to a major state "i.e. revolves in its orbit", they are linked to major state based on interest and not subordination, it may leave the "orbit" in one aspect of the foreign policy because it is looking for its interest, while it revolves in the orbit of the major state, and this depends on the influence exercised by the major state in the arrival of the rulers of those state to power, as stated in the answer to a question on 30/7/2013: *"...it should be noted that there are factors of influence and pressure used by the major state, which prevent the orbiting state from partially exiting its orbit. The strength or weakness of this prohibition depends on the extent of the impact that the major state has stretched out on the ruling class in the orbiting state. If the impact of the major state is strong, then even the partial detachment of the orbiting state is extremely difficult. The smaller the impact of the major state on the orbiting state is, the more the latter will be able to detach from the foreign policy of the major state be it in one fraction or more."* For example, Canada revolves in the orbit of America as well as the orbit of Britain according to its benefit. However, Canada announced on 29/9/2015 that Iran is a state that harbors terrorism, and it closed down the Iranian embassy in Canada. It even considered Iran to "pose the most danger to global peace and security in the world today", as mentioned by its Foreign Minister John Baird.

This took place after the nuclear deal orchestrated by America to engage with Iran openly in the so-called attainment of peace and security in the region. This action by Canada that revolves in the orbit of America disagrees with America in this aspect of the policy and it is not supportive of the US policy. It is America's interest that Canada accepts Iran as a country seeking peace and security, and not to cut relations with it and declare it a terrorist state that threaten international peace and security. Thus the follower state that revolve in the orbit of a major state can disagree in some parts of the policies with the major state, if there was no influence of the major state on the rulers coming to power.

As for Turkey, it is stated in the answer to the question mentioned on 30/7/2013: *"America's influence on bringing the ruling class to power is strong, so Erdogan feels that he cannot reach power and reinforce his authority internally except with America's help, so he sees that his fate is tied to America which has great control in Turkey so that it is able to command the government, rulers, judges, economy, army and security forces... And therefore America's influence on the government in Turkey is strong, and consequently Turkey's stepping out of line of any American foreign policy is extremely difficult"*. The conclusion to the answer to the question was: *"i.e., Turkey currently revolves in America's orbit, and the impact of America in Turkey's affairs is strong, so if the situation continues as it is now of Turkey's strong links with America, Turkey would then become closer to the full subordination to America and it revolving in its orbit would then become questionable!"*

Therefore, Turkey is not at the level of Canada, but the United States' influence on it is very strong to the point that Turkey has not been able to depart in any part from American policy, but it worked to bolster its relations with America and agreed with it in every major and minor issue, when Turkey said in the words of Assistant Turkish Foreign Minister, Feridun Snarli Oglu to (CNN, the American channel) on 11/8/2015: "The two countries (Turkey and the United States) have agreed to the establishment of a safe area with a length of about 100 kilometers and width of about 50 kilometers." And the Turkish Foreign Ministry statement that "the Syrian opposition forces will take control of this region, while America and Turkey will provide air cover." The United States denied that through the words of US State Department spokesman, Mark Toner on the next day, i.e. 12/8/2015, when he said: "there is no agreement on a safe area, and that he had not seen the Turkish statements and cannot comment on it." He also said, "We were clear from this podium and on several other occasions, that there will be no safe area ..."

Turkey has not been able to depart from America in this part, and when it wanted to establish the safe areas, it stated that it had agreed with the United States, i.e. it cannot undertake any action in foreign policy before coordination with America and its approval, and if there is no approval then the action will not be taken. The moderate opposition's training, for example, which began a year ago by the United States and approved by Turkey without objection, as well as the opening of the US base that serves American interests. The Turkish Foreign Ministry has announced on 29/7/2015 the signing of an agreement with the United States of America of opening the Incirlik Air Base to the US to carry out attacks in Syria; and there are many other incidents. Therefore, it is difficult to imagine that Turkey under Erdogan will break away from the American policy in any area. Its actions in foreign policy shows full subordination to the United States, and did not disagree with it since the arrival of Erdogan to power 13 years ago. Erdogan has recently visited King Salman in Saudi Arabia, which is an American agent state, and announced on 30/12/2015 the establishment of a 'strategic cooperation council' for closer ties between them. Turkey has agreed with Saudi Arabia to establish a military alliance to fight terrorism, as was announced by the second Saudi Crown Prince, Muhammad the son of King Salman.

3. As for Iran, it is revolving in the orbit of America and did not depart from any part; it has almost reached the point of becoming a subordinate state, especially at the time of the current President Hassan Rouhani and his team at the Foreign Ministry, headed by Javad Zarif, who is an American agent. Iran has coordinated with Turkey on the issue of Syria, the spokesman for the Turkish Foreign Ministry Levent Jamrkaji revealed on 28/11/2013 the existence of "full agreement on the development of bilateral relations between the two countries" and for having "positive talks on Syria", and "full agreement on commitment of Cooperation between the two countries to resolve the crisis in Syria and stop the bloodshed in it." Erdogan visited Iran on 7/4/2015 to strengthen relations between their two countries; this means that the ideological difference between them did not prevent their agreement in foreign policy and following the US line. Turkey supported Iran's nuclear program negotiations.

4. A conflict in the sense of the conflict between the states or countries that are subordinate or revolving the orbit of a state, if they follow the same major state, is unlikely, because the major state is the one that run the foreign policy in general, and this policy is usually what

controls the conflict ... this is in terms of the conflict. But in terms of having a dispute while not being in a conflict with each other - it is clearly explained in the case of the follower states (revolving the orbit of major states) - it is possible in three cases:

**The first case:** If it is through the distribution of roles to serve the interests of major state.

**The second case:** If the dispute was due to an internal motive without external influences affecting the major state's foreign policy, which these countries revolve in its orbit.

**The third case:** if it is a matter of supporting one of the agents by "stirring up" an event- if he "was calm"- between him and another agent, and then the calm returns after the end of the requirements of the support.

**An example of the first case:**

Turkey and Iran are implementing US policy in the Kurdistan region of Iraq, but in different roles, on the surface it seems in contradiction, but the reality is different, each of them plays a role for the benefit of America that fits both of them:

- Iran is supporting the American agents in this region. Massoud Barzani is one of the British agents, so Iran supports the American agents there against him, including the Gorran movement, a secular political party that is active in the Kurdistan region. It was founded by the Kurdish politician, Nuchiran Mustafa, in 2009, after his resignation from the Kurdish National Union Party, loyal to America after the weakness of this party in Kurdistan, since its President and Founder Jalal Talabani became president of Iraq. The party became involved in acts of corruption along the lines of Barzani's party, so America saw a need to establish another party with a new look, and so the party of Gorran's movement emerged, to raise the slogan of the fight against corruption and became active in the opposition against Barzani and works to weaken him or topple him. The Party demanded elections for the presidency of the region by a parliament and not by popular vote, and demanded to reduce the powers of the President of the region and give them to the parliament, It participated in parliamentary in elections held in the region in 2013 and won 24 seats out of 111 seats, and it became the second largest party after Barzani's party, which won 38 seats. Meanwhile, Talabani's Party slipped to third place with 18 seats.

- As for Turkey, it is working to make Barzani under its influence and wants to contain him in favor of America, by establishing many economic projects in the region, and at the same time working to pressure him to cut any support for British agents within the PKK, who are based in Mount Qandil in northern Iraq and not to carry out military acts against Turkey. The Turkish planes bombs them in that region without Barzani's objection, because he is in need of Turkey, which receives him as head of state and has set up a consulate for the region in Turkey, and buys oil from him.

Thus they appear to be contradicting each other, but they are working harmoniously within US policy.

**An example of the second case:**

- The recent tension that took place between Saudi Arabia and Iran as a result of the execution of Al-Nimr. Al-Nimr have been sentenced to death over a year ago in 16/10/2014 at the time of the former King Abdullah who is loyal to Britain, but the king died before the implementation of the death penalty ... and that Sheikh Al-Nimr was calling for the separation of Qatif and al-Ahsa to annex them back to Bahrain to form a single independent province. And it is well known that Iran claims that Bahrain belongs to it, and it considers it as its fourteenth province. Not carrying out the execution may cause embarrassment internally for the current King Salman, who is loyal to America. Therefore he announced the execution of 46 people other than Al-Nimr, including 43 people that the regime considered as Kharijites, Takfiris and those belonging to terrorist organizations.

This is from Saudi Arabia's side, as for Iran, its sectarian and religious reality forces it to protest against the killing of such a Sheikh because of the internal situation that is sectarian and

religiously charged.

But this tension does not affect the implementation by the two parties to the American plans, and America has moved to defuse the tension. The US State Department spokesman John Kirby said, "We believe that diplomatic dialogue and direct talks remain essential tools to resolve differences and we will continue to urge the leaders of the region to take positive steps to calm the tensions." (Al-Quds Al-Arabi, 04/01/2016). US Secretary of State John Kerry contacted his Iranian counterpart Javad Zarif and discussed with him the situation, afterwards Kerry said, "We want to tamper tensions and establish a dialogue between them to reach a peaceful and diplomatic solution between them." (CNN 4-1/2016) ... then Foreign Minister of Saudi Arabia Adel al-Jubeir told Reuters 04/01/2016, "Tehran must act as a normal state for the severed diplomatic relations to return."

Abdullah Al-Mu'almi, the Saudi delegate in the United Nations said, "The crisis with Iran will have no impact on the peace efforts in Syria and Yemen. We will participate in the upcoming talks on Syria, scheduled in principle as of January 25th in Geneva under the sponsorship of the United Nations "... and the international envoy to Syria de Mistura, after his visit to Saudi Arabia and his meeting with Foreign Minister Jubeir, said: "Saudi Arabia confirmed that tensions with Iran will not impede the talks on the political process in Syria scheduled in Geneva this month" (Al-Jazeera, 05/1/2016). This means that these tensions between the two countries in internal issues do not affect the operation of the two countries for the implementation of the US project to end the Syrian Revolution and aborting its Islamic project and the preservation of the criminal secular regime in Syria.

Thus, the internal motivations may show a temporary dispute; until the removal of those motives or calming them down, but the dispute is within control and does not affect the interests of America.

### **An example of the third case:**

- The objection of Abadi on the presence of Turkish troops. He wanted to reinforce his position and the position of his government, whose credibility is degenerated to the lowest level, so America wanted to polish the image of its agent Abadi and his government by raising this issue to support him morally, and make him appear as the guardian of the country! Turkey has replied that it has entered Iraq based on his request a year ago to train his troops. Turkey responded to him, and carried out a partial withdrawal and redeployment of its troops, and then the Arab League issued a statement supporting the demands of the Government of Abadi and calling on Turkey to withdraw. It is known that the Arab League is controlled by America. Thus the matter was settled without a conflict!

Note that America not only supports Abadi morally, but on top of that, it does not want the government of Abadi to fall in these circumstances, and in particular after Abadi has appeared shaken after he promised the liberalization of Ramadi, but was incapable to deliver, so he needed a dose of support provided by American, so it launched sustained air strikes in Ramadi amounting to 630 raids, as was announced by the White House, on 30/12/2015, and then it announced that the Iraqi army is in control of the government complex in Ramadi.

In conclusion, it is unlikely that a conflict in the sense of an actual conflict will take place between the agent countries or follower countries that revolve in the orbit of the same major state, but a calculated dispute may occur, which falls under the distribution of roles, or internal motives or to support an agent, and in all cases it will not harm the interests of the followed major state.

**2 Rabi' II 1437 AH**

**12/1/2016 CE**