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believe that the United States today is part of the problem, not the solution. The prominent Swiss Muslim intellectual Tariq Ramadan, whose U.S. visa was recently revoked, thus denying American students the freedom to listen to an important Muslim voice, captured the ambiguity of the reformers’ situation in September 2004, in *The New York Times*:

I believe Muslims can remain faithful to their religion and be able, from within pluralistic and democratic societies, to oppose all injustices. I also feel it is vital that Muslims stop blaming others and indulging in victimization. We are responsible for reforming our societies. On the other hand, blindly supporting American or European policies should not be the only acceptable political stance for Muslims who seek to be considered progressive and moderate. In the Arab and Islamic world, one hears a great deal of legitimate criticism of American foreign policy. This is not to be confused with a rejection of American values. Rather, the misgivings are rooted in five specific grievances: the feeling that the United States’ role in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is unbalanced; the long-standing American support of authoritarian regimes in Islamic states and indifference to genuine democratic movements (particularly those which have a religious bent); the belief that Washington’s policies are driven by short-term economic and geostrategic interests; the willingness of some prominent Americans to tolerate Islam-bashing at home; and the use of military force as the primary means of establishing democracy.19

A Concluding Thought

It is clear that we cannot ascertain whether Arab political reform can survive the American embrace simply by examining the American side of the equation. The political reform movement in the Arab world has indigenous roots, and in its current incarnation it has been around at least since the 1980s. Some political scientists (e.g. Hudson 1988;15 199616; Norton et. al.17; Sajame et. al.18; Brynen, Korany and Noble19), though mindful of the obstacles, detected emerging challenges to the region’s entrenched authoritarianism. In hindsight, perhaps some of the early analyses were overly optimistic; but most, I think, would contend that the reform currents are still significant and perhaps irreversible. While a “helping hand” from Washington can have limited positive results, it undermines liberal reform efforts and provides unintended support for radical Islamist and nationalist reform currents.

National Assembly Elections: Prelude to Democracy or Instability?

Eric Davis, professor of political science, Rutgers University

[The following text was not part of the roundtable.]

The Iraqi National Assembly elections of January 30, 2005, constitute an event of historical significance. Not since the June 1954 parliamentary elections have Iraqis had the freedom to vote in national elections.20 Despite insurgent threats that “the streets would run with blood,” millions of eligible Iraqis went to the polls and cast their votes.21

114
Indeed, the election turnout reached almost 60 percent, high by any international standard. Conducting these elections was highly significant for Iraq, but also for the entire Middle East. Democratic reformers in neighboring Syria, Iran, Jordan, Saudi Arabia and Kuwait will all be heartened by the ability of Iraqis to hold national elections. The "ripple effect" of Iraq's national elections will be felt in other authoritarian countries of the region as well, such as Egypt, Libya and Algeria. Nevertheless, it is one thing to hold national elections. It is quite another to forge a sustainable democracy.

The Election Environment

The most notable fact about the National Assembly elections is that they were held at all. Virtually all of the political actors outside Iraq, and many inside the country, opposed the elections. Despite its rhetoric about being committed to establishing democracy in Iraq, the United States never completely supported free and open elections after toppling Saddam Hussein's Baathist regime in April 2003. Under the plan put forth by L. Paul Bremer, the administrator of the U.S. Coalition Provisional Authority (CPA), national elections were to be preceded by a series of caucuses that would have chosen candidates. Designed to ensure that the majority of candidates were not opposed to U.S. interests in Iraq, this idea quickly floundered in the face of strong opposition by the Hawza, the loose coalition of Shi religious organizations led by Grand Ayatollah Ali al-Sistani. It was Sistani's insistence that national elections not be delayed and that they be based on one person, one vote, that paved the way for the January 2005 polling.

Although neighboring Iran was obviously pleased with the prospect of a Shi electoral victory in Iraq, it too had misgivings about free and open elections. As the 1980-88 Iran-Iraq War demonstrated, Iraq's Shia considered themselves Iraq's first and Shiis afterward. The war was the first Shi-Shi war fought in the modern era. That nationalism trumped religion in the war certainly gave the leadership of the Islamic Republic pause when contemplating whether Iraq's Shia were really their allies.

Following the fall of Saddam, the young firebrand Muqtada al-Sadr, son of the highly respected Shi cleric Muhammad Sadiq al-Sadr, whom the Baathist regime assassinated in 1999, created his so-called Mahdi Army. Seeking to take advantage of what he perceived to be a power vacuum in the Shi community, one of al-Sadr's first acts was to assert that only those clergies born in Iraq should be allowed to exercise political power. This was a clear reference to Sistani, who was born in Iran, and represented not only an effort to usurp Sistani's power but a rejection of Iranian influence in Iraq's domestic politics as well.

Iran's conservative leadership knew that Iraq elections would only spur further calls for liberalization inside Iran. The prospects of Khomeini, secularists, democratically minded Sunnis Arabs and other minorities taking office in an Iraqi parliament held little appeal for Iran's hardline clerics. Iran only supported elections if it could be assured that groups it had supported, such as the Supreme Council for the Islamic Revolution in Iraq, would come to power as a result.

Iraq's other neighbors abhorred the idea of free elections as well. Syria's Baath party was deeply shaken by the deposing of Saddam Hussein's Baathist regime. Already beset by struggles within the political elite between hardline supporters of the deceased president
Hafiz al-Asad and younger supporters of his son and current president, Bashar, who favored limited reforms, the Syrian regime also faced calls for greater freedoms from a rapidly growing Islamist movement as well as a smaller liberal democratic reform movement. The Syrian regime viewed free elections in Iraq, which would only add to pressures for reforms at home, as very troublesome. By allowing large numbers of Iraq’s ex-Baathist leadership to take refuge in Syria, the regime also opened itself to greater pressure from the United States to curb financial support for the insurgency from within Syria.

Saudi Arabia had other reasons to oppose elections in Iraq. Throughout the 1990s, the Saudi monarchy resisted U.S. and international efforts to aid the Shia of southern Iraq, who suffered most from the UN sanctions regime imposed on Iraq after the 1991 Gulf War. Fearful that Saudi Arabia’s own restive Shia population, concentrated in the oil-rich northeastern area of the country, would demand greater rights and perhaps even a measure of local autonomy, the Saudi monarchy did not want to see a democratic model, which its own Shia could emulate, develop in neighboring Iraq.

The Hashemite monarchy in Jordan also opposed free elections in Iraq. Facing pressures to democratize from Islamist forces, many of which denounced violence and called instead for winning power through the ballot box, King Abdullah feared that truly free elections would give Islamists and a smaller number of Western-oriented reformers a landslide victory in the Jordanian parliament. Yet the Jordanian monarchy had other fears more regional than domestic in nature: an extension of Iranian influence to their common border with Iraq. Just before the elections, in an obvious attempt to encourage a high voter turnout among Iraq’s Sunni Arab population, King Abdullah warned of a “Shi crescent” extending from Iran through Iraq and Syria and into southern Lebanon. The balance of power in regional politics, he warned, would be tilted in a dangerous direction.

But above all, Iraqis committed to democratic elections had to worry about the violent insurgency that has led to the loss of thousands of Iraqi lives. In a strange reconciliation among former enemies, ex-Baathists joined forces with Islamic radicals, some of whom were foreigners drawn to Iraq to fight the United States.44 Radical Islamist groups such as Abu Musab al-Zarqawi’s al-Qaeda in Iraq and the Army of the Adherents of the Sunna, as well as a number of smaller groups, claimed that democracy was “anti-Islamic” and a plot by Western imperialism to undermine Iraq’s Muslim character and cultural traditions. In their words, polling stations were “centers of atheism.”45 A number of blunders by the CPA, especially the wholesale dismissal of the Iraqi army during the summer of 2003, helped fuel opposition to the American occupation of Iraq and to many Iraqi politicians that cooperated with it.46

The Need for a New Conceptual Lens

No one predicted that the strongest advocate of democracy in Iraq would be its most prominent religious leader, Grand Ayatollah Sistani. When the CPA, under Paul Bremer’s leadership, ignored Iraq’s Shia, Sistani forced their interests onto the national political agenda. Although he never met with Bremer directly, Sistani sent messages through emissaries that made it clear he would accept nothing less than immediate elections without preconditions.
When, in August 2004, Muqtada al-Sadr’s Mahdi Army began a second uprising against U.S. and allied forces, Sistani left Iraq, supposedly to receive treatment for heart problems in London. After it became clear that Sadr could not dislodge American forces from Najaf and other cities in the Shi'i south, Sistani returned to Iraq via Kuwait. Wending his way north in an automobile caravan towards al-Najaf, Sistani gathered a huge following of supporters along the way who followed him into the shrine city. Once there, Sistani was able to accomplish what the United States had been unable to do: to have Sadr’s Mahdi Army surrender its weapons, dispense with violence and enter the political process. Prior to the recent elections, it was Sistani who issued religious decrees stating that it was incumbent upon all Iraqis to vote in the January National Assembly elections. Although he continued to distance himself from direct involvement in politics, Sistani played a major role in forging the United Iraqi Alliance; which emerged as the dominant political force in the elections, having won the largest number of seats in the new National Assembly.

What these developments suggest is the need to view Iraq through a different conceptual lens. This is especially true of American policy makers, who entered Iraq with little or no understanding and appreciation of the country’s political dynamics. That the major force behind Iraq’s democratization in the wake of 35 years of Baathist authoritarianism should be the spiritual leader of Iraq’s Shi’i community indicates that there is no necessary contradiction between Islam and democracy. Thus, the elections undermine the stereotype that Islam and democracy are necessarily polar opposites. While American and Western policy makers may feel uncomfortable interacting politically with members of the Hawza and their counterparts in the Sunni Arab religious establishment, clerics will need to be taken seriously as political actors as a result of the recent elections. Obviously, the U.S. efforts to marginalize religious elements was a failed policy.

The United States and many other Western and even regional states have traditionally viewed Iraq through an ethnic lens that assumes rigid and static political identities. However, meetings held between Shi'i and Sunni Arab religious parties and organizations after the January elections suggest that there may be considerable cooperation in the future by religious forces that transcend ethnic lines. In other words, the most important political cleavage in the wake of the National Assembly lessons may become that of secularists versus those political forces that seek to impose a more Islamist understanding of politics and society on Iraq. In this process, a cross-ethnic alliance of Shi'i and Sunni Arabs (and perhaps even some Kurdish Islamist organizations) could gain in strength.

The Role of the Kurds

One of the most important results of the Iraqi elections is the powerful showing of the Kurdistan Coalition List which constitutes an alliance between the two main Kurdish political parties, the Kurdish Democratic Party, headed by Massud Barzani, and the Patriotic Union of Kurdistan, headed by Jalal Talabani. The Kurds, who historically have been badly treated by the central government in Baghdad, have demanded that the new Iraqi constitution, that will be written under the auspices of the new National Assembly, structure Iraq along federalist lines. Having gained second place in the January voting, the Kurds stand ready to play an important role as power brokers in the composition of the
new National Assembly. If the Kurds throw their political support to the United Iraqi Alliance, it will allow Islamist groups to push their religious agenda within the new parliament. If, on the other hand, the Kurds decide to support secular forces, such as the Iraqi List of Prime Minister Iyad Allawi, and secular forces within the United Iraqi Alliance and among Iraq’s Sunni Arabs, the National Assembly’s agenda may take on a very different political hue.

The Political-economy Dimension
Since the fall of Saddam and the Baath party, public-opinion polls have demonstrated a continued strong commitment to establishing democracy in Iraq. However, Iraqis give greater importance to personal security and a decent standard of living. The national unemployment rate is estimated at 65 percent, which is probably even higher among men and women under the age of 25. Clearly, Iraq’s political difficulties have been exacerbated by the poor state of its economy. Unfortunately, much of the funding that the United States has supplied to Iraq has gone to large infrastructural projects, while only a relatively small amount has been used to provide employment for Iraqis. The post-war inflation has only increased the economic problems for those who are without work. There is little doubt that many of the recruits to insurgent organizations are motivated by nationalist concerns. However, it is also clear that most of these recruits lack gainful employment. After the fall of the Baathist regime, many Iraqis were led to believe that the economy would experience a dramatic improvement due to an influx of U.S. economic assistance. Not only is the Iraqi economy very weak, but the discrepancy between the expectations of the populace and actual economic performance further embittered many Iraqis, especially young people who have little hope for the future.

One way to strengthen Iraqi democracy will require foreign donors such as the United States, the EU and prosperous Arab states to contribute funds that will provide employment for Iraqis until the economy can regain its strength, particularly after the oil industry has been able to reconstitute itself, a prospect that is still several years in the future. The political economy of Iraqi democracy will remain an important issue for the foreseeable future. Democracy cannot sustain itself in Iraq in the face of economic stagnation.

Strategies for Democratic Activists
Iraqis will not be inclined to support democratically elected governments if they cannot improve the economic life of the country as a whole. But improving the economy is closely linked to repressing the insurgency that continues to plague Iraq. If insurgent attacks are to end, a military strategy alone will not be successful. One strategy that the new Iraqi government can promote is “micropolitics,” an effort to encourage contending political parties and organizations to negotiate their differences. Such a strategy would establish an ongoing dialogue among Iraq’s major political groups not only to pave the way for solving the differences among contending political forces, but also to promote trust among Iraq’s key political actors.

Another strategy is to use historical memory to promote reconciliation among Iraq’s myriad political organizations. The positive accomplishments of the Iraqi nationalist
movement prior to February 1963, when the first Baathist regime seized power, included creating cross-ethnic alliances, establishing a nascent civil society, fostering associational life, including a large number of professional, labor, women’s and artistic organizations, creating a vibrant press, and promoting literary and artistic innovations that enhanced political and cultural tolerance.46 Although the mainstream of the Iraqi nationalist movement was dealt a serious blow in 1963 and afterward, the positive legacy of the broader Iraqi nationalist movement is still very much alive. The new Iraqi government might employ older nationalists, including artists, intellectuals and university faculty, to bring this positive historical memory to the attention of Iraqi youth. Through television and radio programs, folklore that emphasizes the shared traditions of all Iraq’s ethnic groups, films and artistic exhibitions, articles in the press – which now numbers over 200 newspapers – and secondary school textbooks, this positive history, which began before World War I, can demonstrate to Iraqis that democracy is not an alien form of government but one grounded in their own nationalist traditions.

Building “Thick” Democracy

The process of building democracy in Iraq will not be easy. Unlike the neconservative vision of democracy advocated by the Bush administration, which envisioned an Iraqi government with limited involvement in the country’s social and economic affairs – what some have referred to as the “night watchman state” – the new Iraqi government will have to eschew a “thin” version of democracy. “Thick” democracy implies active involvement by the government in the country’s social and economic affairs so as to promote national reconciliation. This has been necessary in other countries that have experienced severe social trauma, such as South Africa, the Balkan countries and Rwanda. Saddam Hussein’s Baathist regime promoted sectarianism and intentionally undermined trust among Iraq’s constituent ethnic groups. The challenge of the new Iraqi government will not only be to establish a viable coalition in the National Assembly but to reconstitute a sense of trust and hope in the future that will allow Iraqis to leave the negative legacy of Baathist rule behind.
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