

Harold Hongju Koh

I think there can be an important substantive difference about what constitutes meaningful democracy promotion and a lot of it has to do with money. The Agency for International Development gets a lot of money from Congress to support democracy but often these things are political footballs that are developed by legislation. The irony I found is its easy to get money appropriated for hopeless causes: the Iraq Democracy Act, which we called the "Iraqi Opposition Fax Machine Support Act," because during the whole period in which the Iraqi Saddam was in power there were a lot of people running the opposition parties and they were getting a lot of support from the U.S. government. The dangerous thing of course is at what point does it go past support for civil society action and into some sort of military action: you don't know. Also, there is this whole issue about who are the genuine representatives of democracy. It's very dangerous to assume that the enemies of your enemy are your friends. If Saddam Hussein is the dictator the fact that someone is opposing him doesn't mean that the person opposing him is a democrat. The second Bush administration shifted their focus more toward democracy and diplomacy; it hasn't really worked. I think Condoleezza Rice has been more influential. They at least mouth the word diplomacy now which they didn't before. Bush's second inaugural was very much about democracy promotion. Democracy promotion is a principle on which the Iraq and Middle East policy can stand when before it stood on basically a realist's prevention of attack idea, a negative principle. I believe that we should have democracy in Iraq. I wish that we would support it. The first message is have you established preconditions for democracy. One thing that democracy promotion policy over thirty or forty years has done is actually develop a kind of craft and there are some basic ideas which is, you have to secure the security situation; they haven't done that. That means you need more troops than they have; that means you need a multilateral framework for peace-keeping before you engage in nation building. They haven't done that either. So there is a way in which by some objective craft of democracy preservation; they've just failed the examination. So there's nothing wrong with their aspiration. It's the way in which they've tried to implement the aspiration. I don't think that democracy promotion should get a bad name just because the Bush administration has done it poorly.