Failed Implementation of Western Democracy in the Middle East

Fika Nurislamia
Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta
Email: Fika.nur.psc20@mail.umy.ac.id

Surwandono
Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta
Email: surwandono@umy.ac.id

Abstract

This article discusses how Peace Democratic Theory works as a foreign policy of the United States in spreading democracy around the world, especially in Islamic countries in the Middle East, and how the Islamic left criticizes the democratization process due to this foreign policy. Peace Democratic Theory ushers in Islamic Leftist Thought in assessing how the democratization process works out of conformity with Islamic Shari'a and the resulting chaos and prolonged conflict. The author brings a case study of the Iraq conflict due to the democratization process's failure in this article. Using a descriptive qualitative approach, the author concluded that Peace Democratic Theory gave birth to democracy that established oligarchic politics. This article contributes information for various parties on the reasons for thinking about criticism between Islam and Peace Democratic Theory. In addition, this article is information material for multiple parties related to strategy in the conflict between Islam and Peace Democratic Theory.

Keywords: Islamic Left; Critics; Peace Democratic Theory; Foreign policy

Abstrak

Artikel ini membahas tentang bagaimana Peace Democratic Theory bekerja sebagai politik luar negeri Amerika Serikat dalam menyebarkan demokrasi di seluruh dunia, khususnya di negara-negara Islam di Timur Tengah serta bagaimana Kiri Islam mengkritik proses demokratisasi yang berlangsung akibat politik luar negeri ini. Peace Democratic Theory mengantarkan pemikiran Kiri Islam dalam menilai bagaimana proses demokratisasi bekerja tidak sesuai dengan syariat Islam dan menimbulkan kekacauan dan konflik berkepanjangan yang ditimbulkan pada hasilnya. Dalam artikel ini penulis membawa studi kasus konflik yang terjadi di Irak dikarenakan gagal dalam melakukan proses demokratisasi. Dengan menggunakan metode pendekatan kualitatif deskriptif, penulis menyimpulkan bahwa Peace Democratic Theory melahirkan demokrasi yang memapankan politik oligarki. Kontribusi artikel ini adalah untuk memberikan bahan informasi bagi berbagai pihak terkait alasan adanya pemikiran tentang kritik antara Kiri Islam dan Peace Democratic Theory. Selain itu juga, artikel ini sebagai bahan informasi bagi berbagai pihak terkait strategi dalam pertentangan antara Kiri Islam dan Peace Democratic Theory.

Kata Kunci: Kiri Islam; Kritik; Peace Democratic Theory; Politik Luar Negeri

Introduction

Democracy is always interesting to discuss. A democratization process makes democracy a notion that is growing rapidly in society. Considered as one ideology that can be said to be perfect, democracy is believed to be able to change the state of a country. Democracy is in great demand by the people because sovereignty is in the hands of the people, not in the hands of the government. Thus, many people think that democracy is the key to resolving conflicts Democracy can be interpreted as modern politics. Robert A. Dahl described democracy in 5 criteria: (1) equality for the right to vote for the determination of a joint decision which will be binding in nature; (2) effective participation, in

this case, means equal or equal opportunities among all citizens in a country for the collective decision-making process; (3) a description of justification, where every citizen has the right to provide comments, views, and evaluations of the course of politics and government that can be thought of logically; (4) authority over the political agenda, the granting of an authority that is exclusive to citizens who are intended to be able to determine which decisions should and should not be made by the ruling government, in this case also including delegating that power to institutions or other people who are trusted to represent the community; (5) scope or coverage, including all the law. Dahl attached great importance to the involvement of citizens in decision-making and the course of politics and government in a country (Dahl, 1985)

However, Islamic countries do not fully understand democracy. Various question marks make Islamic countries in the third wave of democracy not fully believe that democracy will evolve a country. Islamic countries generally adhere to authoritarian politics in their countries, causing poverty, social inequality, and low welfare. The people are too immersed in traditional political traditions and also feudal or royal. It was this political system that caused Islamic countries in the third wave of democracy not to be interested in the concept of democracy, which they felt would pollute their traditions. Only one Islamic country democratized during the third wave of democratization. That country was Turkey.

In the course of its democracy, Türkiye certainly experienced many difficulties. The progress that Türkiye had dreamed of was not that easy to obtain. Since the general elections in Turkey in 1950, a party that has been in power for decades enjoys a monopoly. The party allowed itself to lose the election and seemed to give up its power to the people and tarnish people's trust. The Turks call it a "military intervention". Turkey has moved back and forth in implementing its democracy so that Turkey has succeeded in passing the test of democracy, not just once, but several times.

In Turkey, democracy is only recognized with various limitations and is carried out formally. Democracy does not touch on multiple

considerations related to respecting the civil rights of the people and minorities. However, democracy in Turkey has succeeded in solving ambiguous and structured things. It makes Turkish people more confident in democracy. The freedom to live as a citizen who fulfills welfare is a reason for Turkish society (Bernard Lewis, 1994).

The United States brought Peace Democratic Theory as one of its foreign policies to fulfill its national interests. His national interest is none other than to advance his own country. Under the pretext of being for the good of all nations, America has brought this national interest into a foreign policy. His foreign policy then slowly got most countries to uphold democracy.

Democratization of the Islamic State has encountered many obstacles. These obstacles come from something other than civil society but from the country's leaders. The rulers fear that there will be a transition in the transfer of power from being in the hands of the authorities to being in the hands of the people. Only a few Muslim countries have succeeded in using democracy as their ideology, even though they have not fully become a safe and stable democracy. Among these Islamic countries that have embraced democracy are Lebanon, Mali, Jordan, Kyrgyzstan, Jordan, Bangladesh, Albania, Pakistan, and Turkey. Rejection of democracy also occurs in several countries, such as Brunei, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Turkmenistan, Oman, and Egypt (Andiko, 2017).

There is something where there is a striking difference between the government and the people. In several cases of democratization of Islamic countries, the people often become victims of the authoritarian government in power. It then became a conflict that started from the great disappointment of the people. The people slowly revolted and saw a light of peace when democracy was introduced. Democracy brought by the United States through Peace Democratic Theory managed to attract the attention of the people who have been very tormented by the authoritarian government. Democracy is like an oasis in a hot, barren desert.

When Islamic countries begin to democratize with doctrinePeace Democratic Theory, it is

clear that he is enthusiastic about forming a new government that is more pro-people. There was a mistake when these countries were democratized. When entering democracy into their country, the people swallow what democracy means. The democracy they get should be adapted to the situation in their country. So, democratization, all they get is losses and prolonged conflicts. Promise Peace Democratic, which will make the country more prosperous and prosperous, will also get many allies to help them when they are in trouble. It turns out to be only wishful thinking. The failure of democratization is terrible and brings difficulties to the people's social life.

The foreign policy of a country depends on the interests of the country itself. Likewise, the United States has at least three attractions in the Middle East. According to Bowman (2008:78), America's interests are First secure, and there are no obstacles to oil flow from the Persian Gulf region to the United States and other industrialized countries. This interest is a long-term interest. Western governments need to protect oil reserves from terrorist attacks or interference from enemy countries. Second, the interest of the United States in the Middle East is to ensure that no State or non-state actors produce, acquire, or use weapons of mass destruction (Weapon of Mass Destruction) (Bowman, 2008: 79). The country that poses a threat to the United States at this time is Iran. Iran flaunts to the world its weapons of mass destruction that make America feel insecure. The third is to prevent the Middle East from becoming a hotbed or exporter of Islamic extremists (Bowman, 2008: 80). Islamic extremism here refers to Islamic groups trying to fight for the re-establishment of the Islamic State. It made the United States try to fight this extremism. Extremist groups are creating chaos that disrupts America's interests in the Middle East. Besides, America's fear increases if weapons of mass destruction fall into the hands of extremist groups. The victims will be many times more.

The Middle East region is strategic. Besides having an interesting past culture to study, the Middle East also has abundant natural resource potential. Mineral deposits such as copper, coal, and iron are of interest to other countries. The Middle East's valuable assets increased after the discovery of petroleum in the 1930s, especially around the bay areas (Ruslin, 2013)

Peace Democratic Theory brings a positive outlook for its allies. Peace Democratic Theory creates peace by spreading the understanding of demonstrations worldwide. The belief is that more democratic countries will make the world safer. Conflict will not occur between democracies. Therefore, democracy is voiced throughout the world. Some think that this theory is exaggerated. Opponents of the idea critically criticize the proponents' claims, generating methodological debate. Islam also has various criticisms of applying Peace Democratic Theory in the Foreign Policy of the United States of America.

Democratization seems impossible because of the religion adopted by Middle Eastern countries, namely Islam. Islam and democracy are seen as two things that cannot go hand in hand. The development of the Islamic thought that leaders are representatives of God and those elected as leaders are messengers from God has made the countries in the Middle East have a monarchical system of government.

Islamism emerged in the Middle East, where Islam became not only a religion but also entered the political sphere. Political Islam makes Islam a political ideology and not just a religion or belief. In this Middle East conflict, the Reform Group uses Islam to unite individuals usually involved in Islamic movements and then integrate them into a new social campaign to bring about democratic change, freedom, and social justice (Yasmine, 2015). But the Arab Spring happened not only because of the similarity of religions. However, the Arab Spring only happened because of the equal distribution of economic inequality and deprivation in society.

So, how can democracy develop in Muslim countries and also in Middle Eastern countries? Samuel P. Huntington said that Islam limits democratization. Religion can be a driver of life for an individual. For Muslims, Islam is a way of life, a moral philosophy, a belief system, or a spiritual commandment. Islam is the complete guide for its adherents. Islam in the Middle East

includes religious practices and social life (Cook & Stathis, 2012).

In the life of an ideal Islamic state, God must approve political activities or not contrary to His commands. As previously mentioned, religion regulates all forms of life, including political life, so that someone who adheres to Islam must adhere to Islam in all aspects of his life, including politics. The will of the autocracy or the ruling political elite does not form political decisions. However, by God's law, the state and the government ensure that all Muslims can practice their religion properly. It is what is called the ideal Islamic state.

Theoretical Framework and Research Method

Left Islam

A professor of Philosophy at Cairo University, Egypt, Hassan Hanafi, born on February 13, 1935, in the vicinity of the Al-Azhar village, Cairo, issued a thought about the Islamic Left, which was fairly new. This thought led Hassan Hanafi to become one of the critical thinkers of the West.

Hanafi studied philosophy at Cairo University, Egypt. The condition of Egypt at that time was very bad. The violent opposition between the revolutionary movement and the Ikhwan became one of the reasons for the poor state of Egypt at that time. At that time, Hanafi chose to be on Muhammad Najib's side rather than on Nasser's. Hanafi argued that Najib has a clearer vision and commitment to Islam than his opponent. Hassan Hanafi also had the opportunity to continue his studies in France. From here, Hanafi learned a lot to find basic answers to what was happening in his country.

Most of his free time is spent teaching at Cairo University and several foreign universities. Hanafi also does not only teach but also meets many big thinkers in various countries. As a result, Hanafi's life experience led him to become a thinker with great concern for the problems Islamic countries face.

Hassan Hanafi's thoughts gave birth to various works, including a book entitled Qadhaya Mu'ashirat fi Fikrina al-Mu'ashir, Qadhaya Mu `ashirat fi al Fikr al-Ghari, Al-

Turats wa al-Tajdid, Al-Istighrab (Occidentalism), Religious Dialogue and Revolution, as well as Dirasat al-Islamiyyah. However, the most monumental piece of writing is Left Islam in Journalsal-Yasar al-Islami.

A journal entitled al-Yasar al-Islami, published in 1981, became the beginning of the thought of Left Islam. A leftist Islamic figure, Hassan Hanafi, brought this thought (Shimogaki, 1993). In this journal, several combinations of essays discuss the rise of Islam, which is driven by the idea of "Left Islam." The first essay in this journal is entitled Maza Ya'ni al-Yasar al-Islami. This essay discusses the "editor," which is intended as the beginning of Hassan Hanafi's movement of thought about "Left Islam" (Shimogaki, 1993).

Hassan Hanafi observed that Muslims at that time were facing at least two major threats. These two threats, according to Hanafi, move to demand ideals about the revival of Islam. Left Islam thinking is intensifying in a major project of civilization al-Turas wa al-Tajdid, which is based on the 3 main concerns. These three concerns include the attitude of the ummah toward reality, attitudes towards Western traditions, and attitudes towards Islamic classical traditions.

These two threats certainly come from outside and within Islam itself. Hanafi mentioned capitalism, imperialism, and Zionism as threats from outside Islam. Then, the hazards from within Islam itself include oppression, backwardness, and poverty, which will slowly destroy Islam.

Hanafi said that the two threats resulted from a mindset formed by the West. Apart from that, Hanafi noted that the "right" Islamic tradition also contributed to creating this big threat. In "Right" Islam, Hanafi mentioned that Islam was not in its true sense. That is the Islamic order that existed then was not ideal. The ideal order was said to be surrender. The declaration mentioned does not follow what Hanafi said, causing "classiness" in society. In this case, there are two kinds of the most common classes. The two categories are divided into a class on the right, for the rulers and the elite, and then there is also a class on the left, the controlled class. As a result, "classy" in society gave rise to the

oppressor and the oppressed. Hanafi referred to the right class as Asy'ariyah and Mu'tazilah as the left class.

When examining historical reality, political history is relevant to Hassan Hanafi's mode of thought, namely that Ali bin Abi Talib and Husein belong to the left group, and Mu'awiyah and Yazid are believed to be the right group. This historical reality leads Islam to a double meaning First, Islam has submission controlled by various political forces regulated by the upper class. Second, known as Islam, which acts as a revolution governed by the non-ruling majority. In this case, both can be used, provided that they are under the conditions (Hanafi, 1991).

An outline of Left Islam thought from Hassan Hanafi is based on three main pillars. These three pillars include the revitalization of classical treasures in Islam, Islam, which opposes various civilizations originating from the West, and a critical analysis of the reality of the Islamic world. The steps taken by Hassan Hanafi are deconstruction, reconstruction, and integration. These steps will be better if done simultaneously. In this case, the three stages are believed to be ijtihad in a more advanced version.

The thoughts echoed by Hassan Hanafi clearly cannot be included in the category of traditionalism, even though Hanafi's ideas have a close relationship with traditions in Islam. According to Hanafi, he only took this tradition with the thought that it was not taken entirely but only dismantled. Therefore, there is an opinion that what Hanafi brings is not the same as Westernist thinking, which wants renewal based on "Westernism," but Hanafi's thinking is very clear against various attitudes of Western superiority (Shimogaki, 1993).

Peace Democratic Theory, which is one of the foreign policies echoed by the United States, is contrary to the leftist Islamic thought brought by Hassan Hanafi. In Peace Democratic Theory, there is an ingrained thought that fellow democracies will not have a war because if a fight occurs, various losses will arise. Failures destroy a country. Therefore, many countries are looking for security using this democracy.

This thinking is not far from what Francis Fukuyama explained in his "The End of History and The Last Man" article. The article was published during the Summer of 1989. Fukuyama argued that the extraordinary legitimacy of liberal democracy as a system of government is very feasible, even if it is a worldwide consensus. Democracy is believed to have defeated other ideologies, such as communism and fascism. This phenomenon then brought Fukuyama's thought that liberal democracy is the closing or the end point of various evolutions in human ideology. Fukuyama also said liberal democracy is the ultimate form of human government, so Fukuyama concluded it with "End of History"(Jabpar, 2015).

If we compare it with the thoughts of Hassan Hanafi, who upholds the classical tradition of Islam, called Mu'tazilah rationalism, there is a great contradiction. According to Hassan Hanafi, democracy is not under the values of the classical Islamic tradition. It comes from the events of the Dark Ages, which then directed the breakers of church power to be free from the confinement of the church. The result is a theological awareness that used to be controlled by God and has changed to become human power. They believe that the world's life is not for the life of God. So, human beings must be more powerful without involving God. As a result, these thoughts then change human consciousness with free-thinking, freedom, and sovereignty for humans. Therefore, a ruling and ruling class will be formed. Even though independence is in the hands of the people, it does not mean justice and equality will be achieved. The failure of democracy in Islamic countries in the Middle East is a real example that can be seen by all people in the world (Hanafi, 1992).

In this regard, Hassan Hanafi summarizes Islamic leftist thought in three conclusions. The first is limiting Western culture to its natural limits and dismissing Western ambitions that want to become the center of culture and the standard for the progress of world civilization. Second, awakening Western thought by restoring its society and culture and emphasizing that there are many paths that all

countries in the world can take without having to follow Western culture. Third, Hassan Hanafi responded to Western ambitions with a science called Occidentalism to fight Orientalism, which the West formed.

The author used a research methodology through a descriptive qualitative approach. The data collection technique used by the author is a literature study analyzing journals, scientific works, articles, and books related to Islamic criticism and Peace Democratic Theory. This study aims to learn more deeply about the Islamic criticism of thought Peace Democratic Theory. The focus of this research consists of:

1. Collecting data from various aspects and underlying factors of various Islamic criticisms of democracy.
2. The strategies that Islam has implemented to criticize Peace Democratic Theory, which has various things that contradict Islamic thought itself.
3. The factors that are the subject of criticism of Islam against democracy, so that one can see the difference between Islam and thoughtPeace Democratic Theory.

Results and Discussion

The United States made a foreign policy that actually can be said to be contrary to Islamic thought. The United States' ignorance of Islamic thought regarding shura and democracy has made the United States accept criticism from modern Islamic leaders. In the records of the United States, democracy will be the same as deliberation in Islam. But not. United States Foreign Policy viz Peace Democratic Theory, which brings democracy and is distributed especially to Islamic countries, has a big weakness. Peace Democratic, which was supposed to bring peace to the countries he visited, was the opposite. Countries that have democratized as a product of the United States Foreign Policy have experienced prolonged conflicts, even causing many casualties and material losses.

Doyle wrote in the journal Philosophy and Public Affairs in 1983 (Doyle, 1983) about the differences in the liberal practices of a country with other non-liberal countries. In a liberal society, liberalism has produced a cooperative foundation that causes fellow liberal countries to not go to war with each other. Doyle's research is based on the Correlates of War Project (COW), the work of David Singer from Michigan University, in which there is a list of wars since 1816 (Singer, 1994). From these data, Doyle then observed that liberal countries rarely go to war with other liberal countries, and there are two examples of two liberal countries that went to war, which happened when new liberalism was founded.

Peace Democratic practice forces Islamic countries to implement democracy as their ideological understanding. Peace Democratic brings a procedural flaw, the belief that the people are the most powerful. So that peace will be easier to obtain when power is in the hands of the people. The way people gain control, according to Peace Democratic, is to hold general elections. A general election is considered the same as shura or deliberation in Islam. The United States believes that leaders in power will listen to the people more through elections. However, when viewed from the perspective of modern Islamic thought, general elections do not follow shura.

In Peace Democratic Theory, the United States emphasizes that the people are sovereign holders. Even Abu A'la Al-Mawdudi said, "Such a system of government is satanic rather than divine." According to modern Islamic thought Peace Democratic Theory is to associate partners with God. The article in the foreign policy issued by the United States blatantly negates God in the process of electing its leaders. So, Peace Democratic only brings harm to those who do. Procedural flaws caused by Peace Democratic made it endanger the faith of the Muslim people. Sovereignty places the people's voice as the highest absolute source of power to be recognized. In this way, God's will and decrees become unimportant (Maududi, 1960).

US foreign policy is one of the antithesis of political Islam. Many of them are the weaknesses of Peace Democratic, which one should Peace Democratic bring peace in its spread, but what happens is the opposite. War

and intervention colored this United States foreign policy. So, more losses are incurred than the benefits.

In modern Islamic thought, the ultimate authority remains with God. Humans do not have the right to determine the law (lawgiver). The law referred to here is what is permitted and what is forbidden. This law is related to norms as stated in QS Al-A'raf: 3. "Follow what has been revealed to you from your Lord and do not follow leaders other than Him. You take very little lesson (from it)" (QS Al-A'raf: 3)

The Kingdom of God is a designation for the absoluteness that belongs to God, known as theocracy in Western thought. The two are different. In practice, the theocracy used by the West is a unification between God's sovereignty and the power of Kings. In the Middle Ages, the concept of the clergy was united with the head of state's power. Unifying these two concepts creates an absolute theocratic unity that cannot be challenged. Therefore, the current description of theocracy is a state power that is cruel and full of crimes based on the name of God.

The idea of a cruel theocracy stemming from a system built by priests in the Middle Ages made people no longer believe in sovereignty in the hands of God. There is a clear difference between the sovereignty of God and the West and Islam. The chaos resulting from this Western theocracy is that Western theocratic power is better known as satanic power (Yusril Ihza Mahendra, 1999).

The United States brought Peace Democraticentered into an Islamic state, as happened in Iraq, which then got a prolonged conflict. The Iraqi people who are not ready to carry out democratization seem to be forcing the inclusion of this ideology. As a result, Iraq was trapped in a problematic regime. Iraq is a pluralist country where, according to Hurrell (2007), there was a failure in implementing policy decisions which then blamed the democratic system which aims to fight and eradicate terrorism in that country. There is a mismatch between Iraq's democracy and political culture. So, the tendency to continue democracy is very difficult. Democracy will only accentuate the inequalities in Iraqi public

life. The failure of democracy in Iraq illustrates the failure of democracy in other Middle Eastern countries.

Although it takes much time to look deeper into the failures of democratization carried through Peace Democratic by the United States, various analysis results can already be seen in the conclusions. The democratization process in Iraq will not restore the confidence of the Iraqi people back in the 1990s. However, it does not rule out the possibility that Iraqi society will maintain the pattern of liberalism produced by the Peace Democratic Theory. This liberal internationalization phase brought Iraq to the old realism and power politics style. The liberal internationalization commitment aims to protect democracy. It will continue to engage in humanitarian intervention, which aims to make people believe that liberal democracy is a path to peace and has many benefits for all humanity. The Middle East, which was originally balanced even with the dictatorship of its government, turned into conflict countries that originated from coercive democratization.

Therefore, a new international environment was created in post-democratization Iraq. Global democratization rhetoric and promises of peace pressed hard on Iraq. As a result, Iraq has become a country that has failed in democratization. The trend of liberal democratization in Iraq only gave rise to oligarchic politics for the ruling government officials.

Saddam Hussein's reign was filled with conflicts between Saddam Hussein's government and political opponents. The conflicts that occur are often violent. Internally, in Iraq, Saddam Hussein's power brought many trusted people and people who had the same ideology as him. Confidential people who come from relatives are taken from the city of Tiktrik, which is none other than the hometown of Saddam Hussein. Meanwhile, for those who came from ideological similarities, Saddam Hussein built partners with people who had an Islamic socialist ideology from the Baath Party.

When the United States intervened in Iraq, Saddam Hussein then weakened. Saddam Hussein was accused of possessing weapons of mass destruction, so the United Nations formed

an investigative team assigned to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to prove the accusation. The investigation confirmed that Saddam Hussein did not have weapons of mass destruction. However, the United States continued to apply military sanctions against Iraq. In 2003, the United States began its invasion. The United States invasion did not receive UN Security Council support. The American attack succeeded in bringing down Saddam Hussein's 30-year rule.

Through the invasion, President Bush said that weapons of mass destruction could threaten life in the Middle East. This pretext was only an alibi for Bush's interests in wanting to overthrow Saddam Hussein's government, which was against the United States, and then replace it with a regime that was pro and willing to cooperate with the United States. Bush promised peace if Saddam Hussein had been removed from government. New conflicts have emerged and are causing chaos to date.

The Iraqi people have to face a severe internal conflict. The conflict was divided into two things: resistance from groups supporting Saddam Hussein, who came to take revenge, and battles between political ethnicities. Saddam Hussein's supporters then avenged all forms of defeat, which caused their leader to step down from the government and be given the death penalty. In addition, inter-ethnic political conflicts also add to the complexity of life in Iraq. Parties in Iraq carry religious identities, Sunnis and Shiites, as well as Arabs and Kurds who do not believe in the political process. In 2005, Sunni groups boycotted the elections because they considered the elections to have been intervened by the United States. There is dissatisfaction among Sunni groups with the election results won by Shia parties.

The newly formed government in Iraq did not bring peace and a stable life for its people. December 15, 2005, elections could not provide a light way out of the conflict. The conflict continued to heat up when the Shiite Mosque was attacked and damaged by a group of people. The killing of Shiites also occurred in the Sadiyah area. Shi'ite holidays are also not spared from attacks. Thousands of Shi'ites were killed in a panic attack by a bomb on a bridge.

Sunnis were the ruling group when Saddam Hussein had not yet been demoted. Now, Sunnis are the people who do not get power in the government of Iraq. In the 2005 elections, the Sunnis boycotted and carried out the elections in a violent way, which resulted in around 44 people being killed.

The political instability in Iraq due to horizontal conflict resulted in oligarchic politics. Parties based on religious ethnicity lead to instability in government due to the emergence of suspicion and a sense of distrust of the ongoing elections. In the 2005 election, there was a boycott by some Sunnis because they thought the United States had intervened in the election. Also, there was dissatisfaction from Sunnis with the election results, which many Shiite parties won.

In democratization, failure will occur if the people and elites do not agree with democracy. The practice of democracy in the form of various procedures, either in the form of government, political parties, or other democratic institutions, does not necessarily make Iraq a stable country. The arrival of democracy only makes Iraq full of conflict due to competition between religious groups and ethnicities. Then, in the political interests brought by the groups, political interests are something that they contest. Democracy makes the political battle very fierce. When viewed, the political competition that occurred in Iraq did not happen based on the experience of democracy in the past. However, the liberal political culture needed to achieve democracy is weak or even non-existent.

According to Basham, the Iraqi people have experienced periods of suffering that began when their country was colonized, Arab nationalism, and the era of Saddam Hussein's rule (Basham, 2004). So, it is no wonder that in Iraq, political trust, political freedom, tolerance among people, and gender equality are low. As a result, democracy, which requires the existence of these four aspects, cannot be fulfilled by the Iraqi people because of differences between Iraqi culture and liberal democracy.

Political parties formed in Iraq are not to achieve common interests but the interests of

certain groups. As a result, oligarchic politics make a group want to be in full power for a long time. The oligarchy formed based on the owners of capital and strong ethnic and religious groups made Iraq go through a complicated period of democratization. The Sunni group that initially had full control over Iraq was slowly defeated because the capital owners and officials who had full power over Iraq before the democratization period had lost. After that, it was replaced by the Shiite group, which dared to forcibly bring down the Sunni group when Saddam Hussein had no power to defend the government.

The political culture in Iraq is also seen in "identity politics." The Iraqi people prioritize group solidarity over their interests, in which political freedom exists (Basham, 2004). In this case, the political leader will only serve as a protective figure for his people. Therefore, liberal culture is very difficult to enter into Iraqi political culture.

Every political competition in Iraq becomes a competition over which ethnic group pursues power. The electoral system in Iraq that uses a proportional system causes inter-ethnic conflict. The proportional system is a system adopted by countries with ethnic heterogeneity. This system makes a country will have many political parties.

After the 2003 attack, Iraq had a very revolutionary change to the politics that took place in the country. The Tikrit tribe, the Ba'th party, and Sunni ideology are the only ones allowed to rule in Iraq. The political changes that took place in Iraq after 2003 had major consequences. Political conflicts do not only occur between the government and the opposition, as was often the case during Saddam Hussein's reign but between elites who are new to fighting for power. This conflict occurs between ethnic groups, even religious groups within the ethnic groups themselves (Sugito & Syifa, 2021).

The reshuffle of power that occurred after 2003 has made the Sunni group, which is a minority people in Iraq and has been in power for 35 years, lose its political direction. As a result, many Sunni elite groups who lost in politics became divided and then formed resistance groups against the regime that came to power after Saddam Hussein. The splinter group also established a political party that aims to be able to follow the instruments of democracy.

The Sunni elite who founded the political party were Muhsin Abd Al Hamid, Adnan Pachachi, and Sharif Ali Bin Al Husayn. Muhsin Abd Al Hamid founded the Hizb al Islami party with an Islamic ideology. Adnan Pachachi founded a political party that tends to be moderate and pro-Western, namely the Tajamu al Dimuqratiyyin al Mustaqilim party. Meanwhile, Sharif Ali Bin Al Husayn launched the party that brought the glory of the Hashemite empire. Sharif Ali's goal is to gain support from marginalized people (Sugito & Syifa, 2021).

In addition, the split from the Kurdish group colored Iraqi politics after 2003. The Kurdish group, which had been united by Barzani's descendants, in the 1960s divided into the Mullah Mustafa group and Jalan Talabani. Then, after the death of Mullah Mustafa, which occurred in 1979, the Kurdish group split again. The split was because Barzani's three children chose their paths. Barzani's eldest son, Ubaydallah, made a defection by conspiring with the Ba'ath regime, who later died because they were killed in 1980. Mas'ud, the successor of Mullah Mustafa, became the leader of the Kurdistan Democratic Party (KDP). The Patriotic Union of Kurdistan (PUK) party, which has an urban and modern ideology, was also formed after Mullah Mustafa died.

The oligarchy that was formed because of the hard world of politics after Saddam Hussein died is proof that the elite struggle is the main actor in the conflict in Iraq. Evidence of the political turmoil that occurred after Saddam Hussein's regime is the large number of violence between ethnic groups. This issue occurred before and after the election was held. The sense of fanaticism possessed by the Iraqi people has succeeded in making the political culture of choosing leaders based on individual freedom no longer exist. The oligarchic politics in Iraq proves that democracy will produce ruling groups and those in power. Democracy changes the awareness that was originally theological to

become people's sovereignty. Elite-based power struggles are the result of liberal liberties.

The failure of Iraq's democratization is proof that Peace Democratic is a tool of Western Orientalism that is forced to become a country's standard of peace. The Islamic left says that Islam has its way of building a country without having to localize Western culture. The imposition of this Western culture, Orientalism, then resulted in a prolonged conflict that never ended in Iraq. Peace Democratic paved the way for elites with capital to become rulers and form the ruling class in Iraq.

Conclusion

Each country has its foreign policy. The policy is based on the country's national interest, with the United States having a Peace Democratic Theory foreign policy. The allies of the United States believe that the Peace Democratic Theory is a breakthrough for the world to be safe. There is a belief that fellow democracies will not go to war with each other, which is a weapon issued from the Peace Democratic Theory. The possibility of fellow democracies in conflict is small. Democratic countries with other democratic countries will use more diplomacy rather than war because fellow democracies will greatly avoid losses in the form of human and material casualties.

Peace Democratic originated from a criticism brought by a liberalist, Immanuel Kant. In his view, Kant criticized international relations, which was filled with violence. According to him, world conditions can be peaceful if individuals know peace. This awareness will result in peace and includes ending wars between countries. Kant also said that every country must be bound by international agreements to be able to make peace.

However, in its journey to democratize the world, Peace Democratic Theory got much opposition. The biggest rival comes from Islamic countries. Some things are cons between Islam and Peace Democratic Theory. Islamic figures criticize sovereignty, which is fully in the hands of the people and not in the hands of God. In addition, the deployment of Peace Democratic Theory is not only a democracy but

also oligarchic politics where ethnic groups will fight to keep their ethnic groups in power all the time. According to Islamic leaders, Islam is a perfect religion regulating human life. The belief that prompted Islamic leaders to oppose democracy through Peace Democratic Theory is that ideology originating from the West (not Islam) will destroy the order that has been regulated in Islamic regulations.

Islamic leftist thought was brought by Hassan Hanafi, who highly upholds the classical Islamic tradition called Mu'tazilah rationalism. Hassan Hanafi expressly criticized liberal thinking that would destroy Islam. Islam is a perfect religion regulating human life, including the state's energy.

Hassan Hanafi said that liberal culture would invite Muslims to be far from their God. The liberal democracy brought by the United States through the Peace Democratic Theory will not make people between countries at peace. Sovereignty that should be in the hands of God in a liberal democracy has changed to be in the hands of the people. According to Hassan Hanafi, the people have no power over what has become God's business.

The consequence that can arise if God's power shifts to become the power of the people is that there will be an imbalance in the state's life. Another thing that Hassan Hanafi has criticized is liberal thinking, which says that the life of the world is only for the life of the world, so sovereignty that comes from God is not needed. In life, humans rule, not God. Therefore, something appears that changes human consciousness with the freedom of thought, opinion, and sovereignty under laws formed by humans.

The goals of democratization carried out by the United States through Peace Democratic are Islamic countries with abundant natural resources. Peace Democratic is used as a "political tool" by the United States to be able to intervene in Islamic countries with a lot of natural resources. In carrying out the democratization of Islamic countries, the United States brought an issue that was intended so that the world could agree with the interventions carried out by its government. Terrorists and weapons of mass destruction became an excuse

for the United States to start intervening in the region of Islamic countries in the Middle East.

Iraq is a country that is the goal of intervention by the United States through democratizationPeace Democratic. The United States was adamant that it had to make Iraq a democratic country and get rid of Saddam Hussein's authoritarian regime at the time. The United States brought up the issue that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction that would threaten world security. In addition, Iraq is believed to be a terrorist nest. These terrorists will act recklessly and will not even hesitate to destroy human life for free.

The authoritarian power exercised by Saddam Hussein encouraged his people to agree to the United States offer in the form of democracy. The United States succeeded in luring a lasting peace if democracy could triumph in Iraq. The first process of democratization in Iraq was the overthrow of Saddam Hussein's regime, which also toppled the Ba'ath Party and its allies. As a result, there was conflict between Saddam Hussein's supporters and the opposition who wanted Saddam Hussein's rule to stop.

Saddam Hussein's regime was overthrown. But it turns out that peace promised by the United States did not come. The conflict after the overthrow of Saddam Hussein's regime grew bigger and lasted a very long time. Conflicts occur because of power struggles from ethnic groups who feel entitled to occupy the government. The civil war that occurred in Iraq resulted in a prolonged battle.

In the view of the Islamic Left, the failure of democratization carried out by Peace Democratic is an oversight of Western Orientalism, which imposes the standard of progress and peace it has made. The conflict between religious groups in Iraq is proof that the democratization carried out by the United States is not under the political culture in Iraq. Iraq's political culture is very weak, so what they control is not individual political rights but how royalty is towards groups. As a result, the proof from Hassan Hanafi's analysis is true. The democratization process carried out by the United States, which aims to spread the notion of liberal democracy by using the Peace

Democratic Theory, will lead to the formation of the rulers and the ruled. In the Iraqi example, it is clear that ethnic group elites fought over the title of ruling class. At the same time, the people who lose will be the people in power.

Bibliography

Book

Andiko, T. (2017). Kritik Dan Solusi Menuju Demokrasi Islam. Al -Imarah, 2(2), 99–114.

Dahl, R. A. (1985). Dilema Demokrasi Pluralis: Antara Otonomi dan Kontrol. Rajawali Press.

Hanafi, H. (1991). Agama, Ideologi, dan Pembangunan. Perhimpunan Pengembangan Pesantren dan Masyarakat.

Hanafi, H. (1992). Muqaddimah fî al-Ilm al-Istighrâb. Markaz al-Kitab li an-Nasry.

Hurrell, A. (2007). On Global Order: Power, Values and the Constitution of International Society. Oxford University Press.

Maududi, A. A. Al. (1960). The Islamic Law and Constitution, trans (K. Ahmad (ed.)). Lahore: Islamic Publications.

Ruslin, I. T. (2013). Memetakan Konflik di Timur Tengah (Tinjauan Geografi Politik). Profetik, 1.

Shimogaki, K. (1993). Between Modernity and Postmodernity the Islamic Left and Dr. Hassan Hanafi's Thought: A Critical Reading. Terj. LKiS.

Yusril Ihza Mahendra. (1999). Modernisme dan fundamentalisme dalam politik Islam: perbandingan partai Masyumi [Indonesia] dan partai Jama'at-i-Islami [Pakistan]. Paramadina.

Journal

Bernard Lewis. (1994). Why Turkey Is the Only Muslim Democracy. Middle East Quarterly, 1(1), 41–49.

Cook, B. J., & Stathis, M. (2012). Democracy and Islam: promises and perils for the Arab Spring protests. Journal of Global Responsibility, 3(2), 175–186. https://doi.org/10.1108/20412561211260485

Doyle, M. W. (1983). Kant, Liberal Legacies, and Foreign Affairs, Part 2. Philosophy & Public Affairs, Vol. 12, N (4), 323–353.

Jabpar, A. (2015). The End of History and The last Man (Sebuah Studi Deskriptif atas Pemikiran Francis Fukuyama) 2. An-Nûr Jurnal Studi Islam, VII (2), 121–145.

Singer, J. D. (1994). UK Data Archive Study Number 3441 Correlates of War Project: International and Civil War Data (Vol. 1992, Issue 3441). http://doc.ukdataservice.ac.uk/doc/3441/mrdoc/pdf/3441userguide.pdf

Sugito, & Syifa, D. (2021). FAKTOR-FAKTOR PENYEBAB ESKALASI KONFLIK ETNIS Oleh: Anggota: (Issue January).

Yasmine, S. E. (2015). Arab Spring: Islam dalam gerakan sosial dan demokrasi Timur Tengah Arab Spring: Islam within social movement and democracy in the Middle. Masyarakat, Kebudayaan Dan Politik, 28(2), 110–112.