

Columbia University
Spring 2007 U6295

**Democracy, the World's Religions,
and Problems of the 'Twin Tolerations'**

Instructor: Professor Alfred Stepan as48@columbia.edu
CA: Anna Somos as2913@columbia.edu
Place: IAB 801
Time: Tuesday, 9:00 am – 10:50 pm
Office Hours: Tuesday, 3:00 pm – 5:00 pm and by appointment.
Office: IAB 833

Professor Alfred Stepan is the Wallace Sayre Professor of Government in SIPA and the Political Science Department. He is a comparativist with a specialization in the struggles between democratic and non-democratic movements. Since July 2006, Alfred Stepan is the Director of the new Luce-funded “Center for the Study of Democracy, Toleration and Religion” which will initiate and coordinate numerous Columbia-wide activities on this theme.

Purpose, Content and Goals of Course

In the first generation of democratization theory the two most neglected areas were nationalism and religion. From the mid-1990s, this vacant space has been dominated largely by a discourse generated by Samuel Huntington's The

Clash of Civilizations and by policy activists concerned with terrorism and intrigued by the possibility of the United States and some of the other large powers installing democracy from above.

Democratic theorists, comparativists and policy activists must attempt to re-examine the terms of this debate and to provide new conceptual and policy alternatives where appropriate. Unfortunately, though the role of religion in world affairs is one of the most important and difficult issue areas of our era, it has also been one of the least studied themes in political science. To address these problems, this course, the first of its kind at Columbia, has been created. We are fortunate that the Luce Foundation awarded SIPA a \$380,000 three-year grant to generate a series of other activities around the general themes of “Democracy, Toleration and Religion”. Information about the numerous visitors, seminars, and additional courses relating to the Luce Project that may be of interest to members of this course can be found on our website (www.sipa.columbia.edu/cdtr).

The course will be divided into four units, each devoted to a set of questions and problems that are now central to modern political debates about the role of religion in modern politics, especially to questions of democracy, and intolerance and tolerance within, and between, the major religions of the world. Unit 1 will feature Western Europe from the view-point of the core received theories about Christianity and democracy and actual practice. Unit 2 will test Huntington’s theories about the negative role of Confucianism and Orthodox Christianity. Unit 3 will explore and explain the very different patterns of religious conflict and tolerance in South Asia, with special attention to India’s “equal respect, equal distance” style of secularism. In Unit 4 we will integrate what we have learned so far to see if we can rethink some of the fundamental puzzles about Islam and politics.

Course Requirements and Grading Criteria

This course will work best if you do most of the reading before the lectures, as each week I will devote at least half an hour to your questions to me and to my questions to you.

The class will be restricted to 30 students to enable me to work with you to develop a research paper that is tailored to your interests. The requirement for the course is a thirty page paper on a topic you and I have agreed upon. So that you get a good start on your paper a five page discussion of your proposed paper is due on March 20th -- the first class after the Spring Break. The final version of your paper must be handed in by Friday at noon of the last week of regular classes, April 27. Writing and constructive criticism are a key part of the learning process. Therefore, I will personally grade, and write extensively on your papers, and then meet privately with you for an hour from May 2nd to 11th to discuss your research paper, writing style, your future plans, and if necessary, your understandings of the readings. I will put the sign-up sheet outside my office.

Roughly 70 % of your grade will be based on your final paper; 30% will be based on the quality of the draft ideas you showed me for your paper immediately after the Spring Break, your class participation, and our discussion between May 2nd to 11th.

Availability of Materials

Note: this is still a draft syllabus. I will not set the exact readings and pages until late December 2006, because I am still designing, and redesigning, the course. However, the required readings will be close to the norm for a 6000 level graduate course. Because the major requirement of the course is a 30 page

research paper, the syllabus is substantially longer than the norm so that I can indicate readings and possible topics that you may find of use when you select your research topic. In addition to this syllabus, I will also make some special collections of documents available as we produce them in the Luce project.

This syllabus will indicate where to find the required reading. All of the required readings (aside from the paperbacks I have ordered at Labyrinth Book Store) are accessible in electronic form through the Courseworks online system at www.courseworks.columbia.edu. Through the Courseworks website, you will find links to the specific journal article or section from a book you are required to read. Most of the time, you will be taken to sites such as JSTOR, Proquest, MUSE or Lexis-Nexus—all useful research tools for scholarly journals which I discuss later. Some of the readings, especially my works in progress, are also available on my website www.columbia.edu/~as48. I have placed most, but not all, of the non-required readings on reserve.

Books Available for Purchase

I have ordered the following books at Labyrinth Books, 536 West 112th St (between Broadway and Amsterdam). All are in paperback.

1. José Casanova, *Public Religions in the Modern World* (University of Chicago Press, 1994).
2. Diarmaid MacCulloch, *The Reformation* (Viking : 2004)
3. Pippa Norris and Ronald Inglehart, *Sacred and Secular: Religion and Politics World Wide* (Cambridge University Press, 2004).
4. Juan J. Linz and Alfred Stepan, *Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation: Southern Europe, South America and Post-Communist Europe* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996).
5. Jack L. Snyder, *From Voting to Violence: Democratization and Nationalist Conflict* (Norton, 2000).
6. Samuel Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* (Simon and Schuster, 1996).

7. Alfred Stepan, *Arguing Comparative Politics* (Oxford University Press, 2001).
8. Rajeev Bhargava ed., *Secularism and its Critics* (Delhi and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994).
9. Larry Diamond et al, eds., *World Religions and Democracy* (Johns Hopkins University Press: 2005).

January 16th Introduction to the main themes that will be addressed in the course, as well as the reading and requirements.

Unit 1

General Theories (Mainly based on Understandings of Western Europe and the United States) Contrasted With the Actual Historical Experience and Contemporary Practice in these two Areas.

Four sessions, January 23, 30, February 6, 13

How much separation of Religion and State is necessary for a democracy to function well? In an earlier article, I developed an argument about what I called the “twin tolerations” that concluded with the assertion: “Within this broad framework of the minimal freedom for the democratic state, and the minimal religious freedoms of citizens, it would appear, from a purely theoretical perspective, that there can be an extraordinarily broad range of concrete patterns of religion-state relations in political systems that would meet our broad definition of a democracy.” Does empirical evidence from Western Europe and the United States support or qualify this assertion?

Do we need to rethink our concepts of secularism? Could the concept of “multiple secularisms” be of more use? Are there some secular systems that violate the requirements of the twin tolerations and are thus not compatible with democracy?

Is it true that every major religion is “multi vocal” in the sense that it contains some components that are compatible with democracy and some components that are incompatible with democracy? If so, what does this imply about the need for “public argument”? For example, the major liberal political philosopher, John Rawls, has famously argued that in order to reach an “overlapping consensus” many religious questions must be “taken off” the political agenda of public argument. Is this possible or prudent in a cultural or political context where religion is part of the most salient conflicts?

We will explore these questions by a fundamental re-reading of the history of democracy, toleration, and religion in Europe from the 15th century to the present, with some references to the United States. Are there major “maps of mis-readings” that we need to be aware of? Can we construct new maps?

Unit 1 Readings and Questions

We will begin the course with a discussion of some of the basic concepts of democracy. For a classic statement of the eight necessary conditions for a “polyarchy,” or a political democracy, see Robert A. Dahl, *Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition*, pp. 1-16 (Reserve at Lehman and Courseworks).

For a very brief attempt to compare the five necessary democratic arenas for a well functioning democracy see the discussion of the tasks of “civil society” and the very different tasks of the arenas of “political society,” “the state”, “rule of law” and “economic society”, in Juan J. Linz and Alfred Stepan, *Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation: Southern Europe*,

South America, and Post-Communist Europe (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996), chapter 1. For the discussion of multiple and complementary identities see chapter 2, and Chapters 3 and 4 for the analysis of the four major modern regime types. Does each type present somewhat different problems for the crafting of the “twin tolerations”?

For a comparative survey based study of world attitudes and practices concerning religion see Pippa Norris and Ronald Inglehart, *Sacred and Secular: Religion and Politics Worldwide* (Cambridge: 2004).

For the history of intolerance during the religious wars in Europe, see the classic work by the Professor of the History of the Church (at the University Oxford), Diarmaid MacCulloch, *The Reformation* (Viking 2004). On page 460 (?), he asserts that for hundreds of years before and after the reformation, Western Europe was the most religiously intolerant area of the world -- more intolerant at that time than the Ottoman Empire, the Indian sub-continent, or central and Eastern Europe. We should learn about the attitudes and mechanisms that contributed to this intolerance, and also try to learn something about how a region where intolerance had been the norm, eventually became a region where a reasonable degree of tolerance became the norm.

What role did state actions play in helping to control religious violence and contain the Wars of Religion? Do what extent did some states “impose” tolerance?

Until recently the major contemporary European political philosopher, Jürgen Habermas, has been silent about the role of religion and tolerance. He recently broke this silence with an important article, “Religious Tolerance -- The Pace Maker for Cultural Rights”, *Philosophy*, Vol. 79 (2004): 5-18.

An influential approach to religion and politics is found in John Rawls, *Political Liberalism*. In his desire for a liberal discourse that can arrive at an

“overlapping consensus” he normatively favors the use of “free standing propositions”, and urges that many religious questions should be “off” the political agenda. See, in particular, the introduction, especially pp. xix, pp. 151-154, and pp. 220-230 (Reserve at Lehman and Courseworks). Empirically, to what extent, and how, have successful democratization movements been able to keep religious conflicts “off” the political agenda? If religion has almost never been completely off the agenda of democratic polities what are the theoretical implications? For democracy? For Rawls? Charles Taylor in his “Modes of Secularism” offers a political-philosophical alternative beyond Rawls in Rajeev Bhargava, ed., *Secularism and its Critics* (Labyrinth).

I explore these types of questions, with empirical examples from democratization movements within most of the major religions in the world, in my “The World’s Religious Systems and Democracy: Crafting the Twin Tolerations”, in my *Arguing Comparative Politics*, pp. 213-254.

What does democracy actually require, and not require, vis-à-vis secularism? For a thoughtful analysis of why the “secularization thesis,” as an empirical prediction and a normative prescription, was shared by almost all of the founders of modern sociology, see José Casanova’s chapter “Secularization, Enlightenment, and Modern Religion” in his *Public Religions in the Modern World* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), 11-39. For a trenchant essay about the antidemocratic quality of some arguments that insist on secularism, see John Keane, “The Limits of Secularism,” *Times Literary Supplement*, Jan. 9, 1988, 12-13. For a valuable reader that brings together important new statements about secularism by Charles Taylor, “Modes of Secularism,” Amartya Sen, “Secularism and its Discontents,” as well as articles by Michael J. Sandel, Jean Bauberot, (on secularism in France) and T.M.

Scanlon, see Rajeev Bhargava (ed), *Secularism and its Critics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998).

R. Stephen Warner sparked off a new academic debate about the status of secularism in the United States with his “Work in Progress toward a New Paradigm for the Sociological Study of Religion in the United States,” *American Journal of Sociology*, 98 (Mar. 1993), 1044-93 (JSTOR).

Many thinkers assume that the norm in West European and North American democracies is the separation of church and state. Others, the minority, argue that the 1905 French version of “secularism” is too extreme. Evaluate these two positions. A place to start would be a careful examination of the role of religion in modern constitutions. You will be surprised by what you will find.

Whatever the normative theories of secularism and democracy may be, empirically democracy seems to co-exist with a great variety of patterns of separation of religion and the state. This is important for us to be aware of when judging patterns in new democracies. For two articles based on a long-term project and an index on degrees of separation of Church and State which will give you data from 1973-2003 for all the European democracies see Jonathan Fox, “ World Separation of Church and State into the Twenty First Century,” *Comparative Political Studies*, Vol. 39, No 5 (June 2006):537-569, and Jonathan Fox and Shmuel Sandler, “ Separation of Religion and State in the Twenty-First Century”, *Comparative Political Studies* ,Vol. 37, No 3 (April 2005).

An interesting paper might be to analyze the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 passed by the US Congress. Which countries have been the major targets of sanctions? For what types of activities? Do some EU countries carry out state policies concerning religion that could in theory make

them subject to US sanctions? A good place to start on this question would be the Act itself and the discussions revolving around the passage of the law. To begin see the article by a member of the Barnard Department of Religion, Elizabeth A. Castelli, "Praying for the Persecuted Church: US Christian Activism in the Global Arena", *Journal of Human Rights*, 4 (2005):321-351. One of the research projects of the Luce program is an evaluation of the first decade of this law. If you would like to get involved in this research project as part of your paper, and possibly get some travel support to conduct interviews in Washington D.C., contact me or Paul Martin.

For many advocates of strict separation of church and state the existence now of an Islamic influenced governing party in Turkey is an argument against the inclusion of Turkey in the European Union. But what would such critics say about ruling Christian Democratic parties in countries such as Germany, Holland, and Belgium? For how European Christian Democratic parties developed growing autonomy, vis-à-vis the Catholic hierarchy, and responded increasingly to democratic political incentives, see the excellent book by Stathis N. Kalyvas, *The Rise of Christian Democracy in Europe* (Cornell University Press, 1996), as well as his "From Pulpit to Party: Party Formation and the Christian Democratic Phenomenon" *Comparative Politics* (April 1998), pp. 293-312, and "Democracy and Religious Politics: Evidence from Belgium," *Comparative Political Studies* 31(3), (1998), pp. 292-321 (PROQUEST). An interesting paper might be to analyze whether this process is occurring now in Turkey. Did it partially occur for the Hindu neo-fundamentalist party, the BJP, in India? To the extent that it did not occur what, if any consequences did the BJP suffer (for readings see Unit 3).

Unit 2

A Brief Look at Huntington, Confucianism and Orthodox Christianity: Questions of Resistance to Authoritarianism and Support for Democracy

Two sessions: February 20, 27

Now that you have read something about the history of intolerance and tolerance in Europe, it is time to begin this unit with a close reading of Huntington's entire book, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of the World Order*. A major argument of Huntington's is that only some of the world's religions are compatible with democracy because they lack some of the key characteristics of Western civilization. "Western Christianity is historically the single most important characteristic of Western civilization". For Huntington, Western culture's key contribution has been the separation of church and state. "God and Caesar, church and state, spiritual and temporal authority, have been a prevailing dualism in Western culture". Of some of the other major religions Huntington asserts "In Islam, God is Caesar, in [Confucianism] Caesar is God, in Orthodoxy, God is Caesar's junior partner" (all quotes from p.70). Make your own assessment on how accurate an analysis of European history the above observation is. Let us now look at Confucianism and Orthodoxy.

Most great religious traditions are multi-vocal. One part of the Confucian tradition is quite hierarchical and places a positive value on discipline and submission to authority. But, in a strand of Confucian doctrine that until recently has been neglected (or repressed), Confucius also talks of the moral obligation of intellectuals to criticize the ruler if the ruler is abusing power. The largest NGO against corruption in Korea utilizes the latter aspect of the Confucian multi-vocal tradition. For a modern translation and a critical

commentary, read *The Analects of Confucius*, translated with notes by Simon Leys (Norton, 1997). For an important analysis of the contemporary uses and abuses of “Asian values” in the democracy debate, see Rosemary Foot, “Human Rights, Democracy and Development: The Debate in East Asia,” *Democratization*, Vol.4, No. 2 (Summer 1997), pp. 139-153. For an evaluation of the role of Confucianism in democratic transitions in Korea and Taiwan see the two articles in Larry Diamond et al., eds., *World Religions and Democracy* (Johns Hopkins, 2005), by Hahm Chaibong, “The Ironies of Confucianism”, and Francis Fukuyama, “Confucianism and Democracy”.

A possible paper might be to compare the new East Asian Democracy Barometer with three or four other regional barometers. What, if any, identifiable “Asian values” do you find? How non-supportive, or supportive, of democracy, are respondents who score especially high on some answers you identify as strongly associated with Confucianism?

For the role of Orthodoxy concerning non-democratic and democratic regimes, see my “Crafting the Twin Tolerations” article, pp.247-250, and the article by Elizabeth H. Prodromov, “The Ambivalent Orthodox”, in Diamond et al.

Unit 3

Hinduism, Democracy, Religious Conflict, Tolerance and Intolerance in India and South Asia

Three sessions: March 20, 27, April 3

India is the most linguistically and religiously diverse long standing democracy in the world. How have India’s political, spiritual, and institutional leaders attempted to manage this diversity?

On India's highly original, and increasingly influential, "equal distance, equal respect" model of secularism, see Gary Jeffrey Jacobsohn, *The Wheel of Law, India's Secularism in Comparative Constitutional Context* (Princeton University Press: 2003).

For Gandhi's mobilization of satyagraha and other religious symbols for modern democratic purposes, see Suzanne Hoeber Rudolph, "The New Courage: An Essay on Gandhi's Psychology," *World Politics* (Oct. 1963), 98-117, (JSTOR). Also see Lloyd L. Rudolph and Suzanne Hoeber Rudolph, *The Modernity of Tradition: Political Development in India* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967).

For a discussion of the new crisis of Indian secularism in the post-Nehruvian world and the rise of Hindu fundamentalism that contributed to the 1992 demolition of the Bhabri Mosque, see Stanley J. Tambiah, "The Crisis of Secularism in India," and Amartya Sen, "Secularism and its Discontents," both in Bhargava (ed.), *Secularism and its Critics*, 418-53, 454-85. For an analysis of the emerging crisis in India due to policies and actions of Hindu fundamentalists, see Sumit Ganguly, "The Crisis of Secularism in India", *Journal of Democracy*, Fall 2003.

Is there a viable normative and political alternative to the "nation state" in circumstances where, on grounds of language, religion, or culture there are more than one politically mobilized and territorially concentrated nation in the state? The search for such an alternative is important because, in the above circumstances "nation state building" and "democracy building" are often conflicting logics. See chapters from our forthcoming book where we explore the theory and practice of we call "state nation" policies as a response to this problem. The general theory and material on India in comparative perspective are found in Chapters 1 and 2 of Alfred Stepan, Juan J. Linz, and Yogendra

Yadav, *Democracies in Non- Nation States: The Theory and Practice of 'State Nations'* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007, forthcoming, see on my website www.columbia.edu/~as48). For a “matched pair” comparison of state nation policies conducive to tolerance and inclusion in Tamil Nadu in India, and nation state policies that contributed to civil war and exclusion in Sri Lanka, see Chapters 3 and 4. All these Chapters will be posted on courseworks.

Related to the above project is a survey conducted in the five countries of South Asia (India, Sri Lanka, Pakistan, Bangladesh, and Nepal) in 2005 called the State of Democracy in South Asia: 2005. (SDSA) The overall survey coordinator was Yogendra Yadav. Linz and I worked with Yadav on the design of a battery of questions on religion and politics, tolerance, multiple and complementary identities, and support for democracy. As in most surveys this rich data is somewhat under-analyzed. If a member of the class is interested in these issues, and has had sufficient methodological training in survey analysis (for example, with Professor Robert Shapiro), I could make this data set available to you to utilize in your research paper. One of the major counter-intuitive findings that has emerged from our analysis of the SDSA survey so far is that the greater the intensity of religious practice among Hindus and Muslims in India the greater the support for democracy. The survey also demonstrates the great contextuality of religion, eg., among Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs, Buddhists and Christians in South Asia, the religious group in the five states with the lowest support for democracy were Muslims in Pakistan (23%), and the religious group with the highest support for democracy were Muslims in Sri Lanka (68%). **ACS double check these figures.**

Unit 4

Islam, Tolerance, and Democracy

Three sessions: April 10,17, and 24.

Is Islam multivocal? Is there space in Islam for some form of modern democracy that would meet Robert Dahl's requirements for a polyarchy? In my article on the "Twin Tolerations", I cite a long list of writers who say no. However, also evaluate the work of some leading Islamic thinkers and activists who are attempting to integrate Islam and democracy. A leading liberal reformer in Iran is Abdolkarim Soroush. See his *Reason, Freedom, and Democracy in Islam* (Oxford University Press, 2000). Also see Dale F. Eickelman and James Piscatori, *Muslim Politics* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996) and Charles Kurzman, ed. *Liberal Islam: A Sourcebook* (Oxford University Press, 1998). If you are interested in the subject read, very carefully, the entire Koran. How multivocal is the Koran? Which specific sections create the most space for the evolution of democracy? Which create the most problems? On the poor treatment of women as a cause and effect of authoritarianism in many Muslim majority countries, see M. Steven Fish, "Islam and Authoritarianism", *World Politics* (October 2002) pp. 4-37.

One of the major puzzles about Muslims and democracy is that on purely socio-economic grounds, non-Arab, Muslim majority countries (Indonesia, Bangladesh, Senegal, Mali, Turkey, Albania, etc.) are some of the world's greatest "electoral overachievers", whereas Arab-Muslim majority countries, as a set, are the world's greatest "electoral underachievers." A major variable that two sets of countries share in common – Islam -- can not, by itself, explain this strong variation. What does? I helped start this discussion with two recent articles, but the comparative analysis must be carried much further, and deeper,

especially by Arab specialists familiar with the general literature on democratization. Ideally, someone in the class who has these interests and skills can deepen the debate with a paper. For the puzzle of electoral underachievement, and overachievement, within Muslim majority countries see Alfred Stepan with Graeme Robertson: “An *Arab* more than a *Muslim* Democracy Gap”, *Journal of Democracy*, July 2003, pp. 30-44 (Project MUSE). For a forum which has two articles criticizing Stepan/Robertson, and our response, see *Journal of Democracy* Vol. 15, No. 4 (October 2004): 126-146.

For Islam within the debate of the “Twin Tolerations” see Alfred Stepan, “The World’s Religious Systems and Democracy: Crafting the ‘Twin Tolerations’” in Alfred Stepan, *Arguing Comparative Politics*, esp., pp. 233-246. (Labyrinth).

An interesting paper would be to explore how Islam is managed -- by many believers and politicians of many stripes alike -- so as to be compatible with democracy in a country such as Indonesia, India, Senegal, Mali, or Bangladesh. What is the role of public discourse? Is religion “on” or “off” the agenda in the country you choose to write about?

We will end our course with questions about such key countries of concern for democratic theory and for public policy as Turkey, Iran, and Iraq.

For Turkey our question is: What, if any, consequences did it have for democracy in Turkey that the French version of secularism had such a strong influence on the Atatürk Turkey? Do you think the French legacy is helping or hurting Turkey to become a member of the European Union? For an interesting analysis of similarities and dissimilarities between secularism in France (especially after 1905) and Turkey see Andrew Davison, *Secularism and Revivalism in Turkey: A Hermeneutic Reconsideration* (Yale University Press,

1998) and a recent Columbia dissertation by Murat Akam, “ The Politics of Secularization in Turkey and France: Beyond Orientalism and Occidentalism” (Ph.D. Department of Political Science, 2005).

For Iran our question is: Given the current nuclear threatening crisis between Iran and some countries such as the United States and Israel, was there a “missed opportunity” for peaceful and democratic developments in Iran between September and December 2001? In this September - December 2001 period, the non-fundamentalist, democratically elected president of Iran, President Khatami (supported by February 2000 parliamentary elections which gave pro-democratic reformers a clear parliamentary majority) made four different peaceful overtures to the United States. None of these overtures was publicly recognized, possibly due to US’ fears that fundamentalists still in charge of the security forces and the judiciary were the more powerful part of this unusual “diarchy”. Should a normal balance of power international political strategy, or a regime change from above strategy, have been followed? Mirjam Künkler, who has carried out extensive research inside Iran, and I, along with Gary Sick, a fellow at Columbia’s Middle East Institute and a member of the National Security Council with duties toward Iran, under Presidents Carter, Reagan, Bush, and Clinton, will be conducting a re-examination of this question in 2007-8 as part of our Luce project. If anyone in the class would like to write a paper on the subject, (and possibly becoming a co-author for some of our possible publications) please consider joining us. Contact Mirjam from September 2006 on and she can lead you to the key documents and get you in contact with Gary Sick.

From the viewpoint of democratic theory and democratization theory, it might be useful to try to expand our imaginations by exploring three somewhat counterfactual questions relating to Iraq. First, Juan Linz and I, well before the

Iraq invasion, considered the then widely used analogy between the successful US role in supporting democracy in Germany and Japan after WWII and an analogous role in Iraq deeply fallacious. Why? Second, far from Iraq being a “most likely” case for democratization, Iraq, from the perspective of democratization theory, was a “least likely” case among the non Gulf Arab countries. Why? Third, four years ago, especially if the US and Iran had been experiencing a thawing of relations of the possible sort suggested above, would Morocco, Tunisia, Palestine and Lebanon have been better cases for internal democratization than Iraq, especially if the US, the EU, and some other major countries such as Japan, Indonesia, Egypt and Jordan participated with financial aid, trade, diplomatic support and with international peacekeepers for the process? If your answer to this hypothetical question is yes, what are your reasons?