



SAMPLE A

Diploma Programme subject in which this extended essay is registered: Politics

(For an extended essay in the area of languages, state the language and whether it is group 1 or group 2.)

Title of the extended essay: (U.S. Intervention in Iraq) Why the Prospect of an Ideal Democratic Government in the State of Iraq is Unattainable.

**Candidate's declaration**

*If this declaration is not signed by the candidate the extended essay will not be assessed.*

The extended essay I am submitting is my own work (apart from guidance allowed by the International Baccalaureate).

I have acknowledged each use of the words, graphics or ideas of another person, whether written, oral or visual.

I am aware that the word limit for all extended essays is 4000 words and that examiners are not required to read beyond this limit.

This is the final version of my extended essay.

Candidate's signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: 08/01/09

IB Cardiff use only:

A: [Signature] B:

## Supervisor's report

The supervisor must complete the report below and then give the final version of the extended essay, with this cover attached, to the Diploma Programme coordinator. The supervisor must sign this report; otherwise the extended essay will not be assessed and may be returned to the school.

Name of supervisor (CAPITAL letters) \_\_\_\_\_

## Comments

Please comment, as appropriate, on the candidate's performance, the context in which the candidate undertook the research for the extended essay, any difficulties encountered and how these were overcome (see page 13 of the extended essay guide). The concluding interview (viva voce) may provide useful information. These comments can help the examiner award a level for criterion K (holistic judgment). Do not comment on any adverse personal circumstances that may have affected the candidate. If the amount of time spent with the candidate was zero, you must explain this, in particular how it was then possible to authenticate the essay as the candidate's own work. You may attach an additional sheet if there is insufficient space here.

It was truly a learning Experience for *x* to finish his EE.  
He felt he tremendously learned about various - political - aspects dealing with his subjects - defining democracy. He even expressed his satisfaction & joy, after receiving his feedback, at learning about *x* from critics about his subject/topic. Indeed, since *x* was alerted to the fact that his approach is one sided & could be placed in one school of thought, he, on his own, researched & learned about the counterargument.

I have read the final version of the extended essay that will be submitted to the examiner.

To the best of my knowledge, the extended essay is the authentic work of the candidate.

I spent 2 hours with the candidate discussing the progress of the extended essay.

Supervisor's signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: 2/27/2009

**Extended Essay**

(U.S. Intervention in Iraq) Why the Prospect of an Ideal Democratic Government in the State of Iraq is Unattainable



2<sub>v</sub>

Word Count: 3,060

IB ID #:

School #:

## Abstract

The question that this essay will adhere to is: If the primary intention of the United States government through the invasion of the state of Iraq was to create a fully functioning democratic government, rather than to gain power and control over the tremendous amounts of cheap oil, would it have been successful? The essay will approach such a question by going through evidence and analysis of the social and economic aspects of the state of Iraq prior to and after the American invasion, the previous Baath government and its impact on the people of Iraq, expand on the notion and meaning of democracy in order to understand the requirements of a nation and its people in order to follow a democratic rule and way of life. It was concluded in the essay through analysis and understanding of evidence that the state of Iraq seems as though it is far from handling such a form of government as democracy.

*confusion  
here*

Table of Contents:

Introduction.....pg. 1-2  
Body.....pg. 2-10  
Conclusion.....pg. 10-11  
Bibliography.....pg. 12

### Introduction:

Since the year 2003, the United States government under the Bush administration and Iraq have been involved in an ongoing conflict (U.S forces occupying Iraq). The

United States had invaded the state of Iraq with intentions of "freeing the state of their ruthless dictator, creating a form of democratic governmental rule in Iraq" and

"uncovering weapons of mass destruction". These were intentions merely stated to the

general public; they were used to gain the support needed to invade the country in the

first place, enabling them to carry out their actual objective of gaining control over a

large portion of the oil industry in the state of Iraq. This, however, could not have been

carried out without an attempt to create a new form of government in the state. After

invading the country, the Bush Administration has used a great deal of power and

political influence to create a new form of governmental rule, one that follows a U.S

example of democracy. The question that faces and will continue to face the nations of

Iraq and the United States of America is whether or not a country such as Iraq is actually

capable of following such a form of government as democracy. In order to address such a

question, one must analyze the social and economic aspects and issues of the state of

Iraq, what democracy actually means, and what traits or values a nation must have to

pertain to such a form of government. This essay will expand on the notion of

democracy, explaining the different forms and ways that democracies work, and will

"conclusively" relate this to and explain why the state of Iraq has not and most probably

will not fully conform to such a political system as democracy. The significance of this

topic is that it adheres to the question that lies in the minds of many people and political



analysts alike: even if the priority of the United States government in the invasion of Iraq was to instigate a democratic form of government, would it be possible? To begin addressing this question, the definition of a democratic government must be explained.

**Body:**

The definition of Democracy depicts a system in which supreme governing powers of a nation are chosen either directly by the people of that nation or through agents elected by the people<sup>1</sup>. Democracy can be generally divided into two different systems. These two systems are called direct and representative democracy. Direct democracy entitles citizens to simultaneously meet in groups in order to make decisions about laws for the communities they live in<sup>2</sup>. The more modern and commonly used form of democracy today is indirect or representative democracy, which is a system allowing the citizens of a city, state, or country, to elect representatives who will make decisions for that specific area<sup>3</sup>. This is the general election process in which Democratic governments undertake to designate officials to rule and manage the laws of a nation. However, the definition of Democracy can be expanded upon. Democracy is a system that enables the practice of free and open speech and press<sup>4</sup>, political trust within a government, social tolerance, economic development, support and evidence for equality between males and females, and participation of every individual (exceeding the legal

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/democracy>

<sup>2</sup> World Book, Inc. Staff. The World Book Encyclopedia. 4th ed. Austin: Steck-Vaughn, 2004. Book D, pg. 120

<sup>3</sup> World Book, Inc. Staff. The World Book Encyclopedia. 4th ed. Austin: Steck-Vaughn, 2004. Book D, pg. 120

<sup>4</sup> Wellek, Alex, ed. The Encyclopedic Dictionary of American Government. 4th ed. Guilford, Connecticut: The Dushkin Group, 1991. Pg. 86

voting age) within a society in decision making.<sup>5</sup> Liberal democratic systems usually stress the importance of liberty, and tend to prioritize it among economic and social equality, while socialist democratic systems are in favor of the complete opposite<sup>6</sup>.

*Really?*

Contract theorists, utilitarians, and recent theorists have defined democracy as a form of government emphasizing life, liberty, and prosperity, and the greatest amount of happiness for the greatest number of people<sup>7</sup>; democracy is a government by the people, for the people. In summary we are able to say that democracy is a form of government

that enables a society to be proactive in the future of their nation with <sup>few</sup> no restrictions on

speech or press, and with indifference towards and equality between the male and female

sexes. After explaining the traits and meanings of democracy, we are able to relate and

use its definition in order to come to the question at hand; we can conclusively use these

traits and definitions to examine whether or not the state of Iraq is capable of undertaking

a democratic government. In order to do so, however, the context of the events leading to

the attempt to instigate democracy in Iraq must be understood. The next paragraph of the

essay will explain the intentions of the United States government in the invasion of the

state of Iraq, and the process that lead to the United States trying to create some sort of

democracy in the Iraqi state.

In the year 2003, the United States of America under the Bush Administration had launched a campaign to invade the state of Iraq. The president of the United States,

George W. Bush, had given a speech in November of 2003 to the National Endowment

for Democracy claiming that the main reason for the invasion was to bring democracy to

<sup>5</sup> Basham, Patrick. A Democratic Iraq? Don't Hold Your Breath. 2003. Www.cato.org. 31 Mar. 2003. CATO Institute. [http://www.cato.org/pub\\_display.php?pub\\_id=3042](http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=3042).

<sup>6</sup> Wellek, Alex, ed. The Encyclopedic Dictionary of American Government. 4th ed. Guilford, Connecticut: The Dushkin Group, 1991. pg. 86

<sup>7</sup> Wellek, Alex, ed. The Encyclopedic Dictionary of American Government. 4th ed. Guilford, Connecticut: The Dushkin Group, 1991. Pg. 86



the Middle East<sup>8</sup>. This was announced as the number one priority of the United States government through the invasion of the Iraqi State, among other priorities on the agenda; Global status and uncovering weapons of mass destruction that were believed to be a threat to the national security of the United States. Though President Bush had claimed these to be valid goals, the truth of the matter was most likely that the United States government wanted to control the oil industry in Iraq. A poll had been taken in Baghdad slightly before the invasion began which asked local Iraqi's why they thought the United States government wanted to invade the country; 1 percent thought that the United States was concerned with the spread of democracy and bettering the government of the state of Iraq; 5 percent thought it was to help the people of Iraq; 4 percent believed it to be a pursuit of weapons of mass destruction; 43 percent claimed that the Americans were after the gratuitous amounts of cheap oil in Iraq<sup>9</sup>. Political analyst Noam Chomsky comments on this: "I think that's approximately correct. Iraq has enormous energy reserves - actually they're unknown, because they're uncharted - but they're generally thought to be the second highest in the world, after Saudi Arabia; also they're extremely cheap and accessible. You don't have to dig through permafrost or play with tar sands - you just put a pipe in the ground. We've already discussed how policymakers understood that if you control the energy resources of the region, you have tremendous power - what George Kennan referred to sixty years ago as "veto power" over your rivals.<sup>10</sup>" This very reason was the motivational tool that president Bush needed to invade the state of Iraq;

<sup>8</sup> Chomsky, Noam, Gilbert Achcar, and Stephan R. Shalom. Perilous Power : The Middle East and U. S. Foreign Policy Dialogues on Terror, Democracy, War, and Justice. New York: Paradigm, 2006. Pg. 83

<sup>9</sup> Chomsky, Noam, Gilbert Achcar, and Stephan R. Shalom. Perilous Power : The Middle East and U. S. Foreign Policy Dialogues on Terror, Democracy, War, and Justice. New York: Paradigm, 2006. Pg. 83

<sup>10</sup> Chomsky, Noam, Gilbert Achcar, and Stephan R. Shalom. Perilous Power : The Middle East and U. S. Foreign Policy Dialogues on Terror, Democracy, War, and Justice. New York: Paradigm, 2006. Pg. 83

potentially tremendous power over a region full of his rivals. Gilbert Achcar (political analyst) claims that the United States wanted to make Iraq an addition to the countries under their control in the Middle East (in addition to Saudi Arabia)<sup>11</sup>. In order for such an accomplishment to happen, the United States government under the Bush Administration needed enough public and congressional support; this is where the “priority” of spreading democracy can be referred. In order to persuade the public that their intentions were sincere, the Bush Administration needed to show some effort towards building some sort of democracy in the state of Iraq. Washington was able to put some sort of pressure on its traditional clients to create minimal (cosmetic) changes, which was done with the intention of showing the public that it was serious about spreading democracy<sup>12</sup>. Bush had seen this opportunity to invade and control, to “articulate a grand vision of America’s role in the world at large and in the Middle East specifically”<sup>13</sup>. The president claimed that through this invasion, there would be a “regime change”, and also that America was “defending itself from the menace of Saddam’s regime.”<sup>14</sup> The Bush Administration at this point began to have more substantial amounts of influence in Iraq, both within and apart from its formal structures of government. Several influential governmental figures of the Bush Administration, such as Douglas Feith, Condoleeza Rice, Donald Rumsfeld, Richard Perle, Paul Wolfowitz, and Dick Cheney, were all part of Bush’s major influence<sup>15</sup>. President Bush’s plan to democratize Iraq was premised upon the implementation of a constitution that would be effectively implemented in the short-term

<sup>11</sup> Chomsky, Noam, Gilbert Achcar, and Stephan R. Shalom. Perilous Power : The Middle East and U. S. Foreign Policy Dialogues on Terror, Democracy, War, and Justice. New York: Paradigm, 2006. Pg. 85

<sup>12</sup> Chomsky, Noam, Gilbert Achcar, and Stephan R. Shalom. Perilous Power : The Middle East and U. S. Foreign Policy Dialogues on Terror, Democracy, War, and Justice. New York: Paradigm, 2006. Pg. 45

<sup>13</sup> Karava, Mehran. The Modern Middle East. University of California P, 2005. pg. 205

<sup>14</sup> Karava, Mehran. The Modern Middle East. University of California P, 2005. pg. 206

<sup>15</sup> Karava, Mehran. The Modern Middle East. University of California P, 2005. Pg.207

by sets of Iraqi leaders negotiating among one another. As was mentioned earlier in the paragraph, the influence and changes that were instigated were merely of a cosmetic nature; used in order to further the objective of gaining control of the oil industry in Iraq. This brings us back to the initial question of the essay; if the actual intention of the United States government was to introduce a functioning democratic government to the state of Iraq, would it have prospered? The essay will continue to address this question through further analysis.

Another aspect that must be examined while addressing such a question is how the previous government of the state of Iraq worked and what impact it had on the people of the state. Prior to the American invasion of 2003, the Iraqi government was run by the Baath party, which controlled all branches of the government and completely restricted any sort of political opposition<sup>16</sup>. The party was secular, and was lead by one of the most loathed rulers ever to control Iraq, Saddam Hussein, from 1979 till they were overthrown in 2003<sup>17</sup>. Saddam ruled the state of Iraq with dictatorial power, and lead a governmental party who's Ideology was pan-Arabism. The fundamentals of this sort of government completely contradict those of democracy. With the Baath party in power, freedom was greatly limited, seeing as they seized any attempt at opposition towards them<sup>18</sup>. Also, having a country lead by a dictator completely inhibits any public opinions/participation in decision/law making, which is a fundamental trait of having a democratic government.

<sup>16</sup> World Book, Inc. Staff. The World Book Encyclopedia. 4th ed. Austin: Steck-Vaughn, 2004. Book 1, Pg. 209

<sup>17</sup> Kafala, Tarik. A Democratic Iraq? Don't Hold Your Breath. News.bbc.co.uk. 25 Mar. 2003. BBC News Online. 7 Jan. 2009 [http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle\\_east/2886733.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/2886733.stm).

<sup>18</sup> Kafala, Tarik. A Democratic Iraq? Don't Hold Your Breath. News.bbc.co.uk. 25 Mar. 2003. BBC News Online. 7 Jan. 2009 [http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle\\_east/2886733.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/2886733.stm).

The difficulties of creating a successful form of democracy in a state such as Iraq are outlined by several political scientists, one being Ronald Inglehart. He refers to a list created by Patrick Basham (a senior fellow at the Center for Representative Government at the Cato Institute), which lists the more or less essential traits for a stable democracy. He states that in order for a democratic government to thrive, a nation must have the following political and social traits:

1. "Political trust, i.e., the assumption the one's opponent will accept the rules of the democratic process and surrender power if he loses an election;"
2. "Social tolerance, i.e., the acceptance of unpopular groups (e.g. Homosexuals);"
3. "Economic development (a high standard of living legitimizes both democratic institutions and incumbent politicians);"
4. "Popular support for gender equality;"
5. "High priority on freedom of speech and popular participation in decision-making;"<sup>19</sup>

Political analyst Eric Hobsbawm, author of *Globalization, Democracy and Terrorism*, also writes in concurrence to this list. He states, "The conditions for effective democratic government are rare: an existing state enjoy legitimacy, consent, and the ability to mediate conflicts between domestic groups. Without such consensus there is no single sovereign 'people' and therefore no legitimacy for the arithmetical majorities. When this consensus – be it religious, ethnic, or both – is absent, democracy has been suspended (as in the case with democratic institutions in Northern Ireland), the state has split (as in Czechoslovakia), or society has descended into permanent civil war (as in Sri Lanka)<sup>20</sup>". In reference to this list, Inglehart argues that most Islamic societies fall short, in levels of political trust, social tolerance, economic development, gender equality, and priority to

<sup>19</sup> Basham, Patrick. *A Democratic Iraq? Don't Hold Your Breath*. 2003. [www.cato.org](http://www.cato.org). 31 Mar. 2003. CATO Institute. [http://www.cato.org/pub\\_display.php?pub\\_id=3042](http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=3042).

<sup>20</sup> Hobsbawm, Eric J. *Globalisation, Democracy and Terrorism*. New York: Little, Brown Book Group Limited, 2008. Pg. 117 - 118

social and political activism, in comparison to states with flourishing democracies<sup>21</sup>. This argument falls true not only in Iraq, but also in additional Islamic societies in the Middle East. Several if not most Islamic societies controlled by secular governments (such as Iraq) have a lack of political trust (hence sectarian violence between different religious political parties), a lack of social tolerance (homosexuality looked down upon in Islam), an obvious distinction between the rights of men and women (women being the less dominant of the sexes), and very little accepted political activism. However one trait (economic development), sets Iraq apart from other Middle Eastern nations who make their money primarily off natural gas reserves and oil. After the American-imposed regime in Iraq, the nation had a reduced amount of control over the money produced from exporting oil. Instead of sending the oil profit directly to Iraq, the money was “deposited in a UN-controlled escrow account in Paris”<sup>22</sup>. What this did to the Iraqi economy was cause it to collapse; oil was the main reserve in which Iraq’s economy thrived on. This set Iraq apart from other Middle Eastern nations economically. Basham states, “The condition of Islamic democracy is tied to the respective political culture, which is clearly tied to the respective level of economic development. This is because democratization is much more likely to occur – and take hold – in richer rather than in poorer nations. A higher standard of living breeds values that demand greater democracy.”<sup>23</sup> Because of Iraq’s immense economical plunder, economy played a role in the failure of democracy

---

<sup>21</sup> Basham, Patrick. *A Democratic Iraq? Don't Hold Your Breath*. 2003. [www.cato.org](http://www.cato.org). 31 Mar. 2003. CATO Institute. [http://www.cato.org/pub\\_display.php?pub\\_id=3042](http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=3042).

<sup>22</sup> Bennis, Phyllis. *Before and After: US Foreign Policy and the War on Terrorism*. Olive Branch P, 2003. Pg 91

<sup>23</sup> Basham, Patrick. *A Democratic Iraq? Don't Hold Your Breath*. 2003. [www.cato.org](http://www.cato.org). 31 Mar. 2003. CATO Institute. [http://www.cato.org/pub\\_display.php?pub\\_id=3042](http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=3042).

in the nation. Other Islamic nations with prosperous economic development such as Turkey and Iran show signs of democracy in they're governmental systems.

Thought the argument presented in this essay is in favor of the belief that the creation of a democratic government in the state of Iraq is far from being accomplished, there are suggestions that counter this argument. Noam Chomsky (political analyst) describes a potential for democracy in the Middle East (Iraq in specific). He claims that under the effective rule of the British, Iraq was developing a basis for parliamentary democracy<sup>24</sup>. He also talks about the importance of a strong labor movement having to do with the development of an effective democratic government: "And that included things like developing a very strong labor movement. In American political science, that's not supposed to be part of a democracy, but it is if you're serious. It's a way for a large part of the population to become involved effectively in political decision-making. And Iraq had quite a strong labor movement, a lot of which was crushed by the Baath coup in 1963."<sup>25</sup> Political analyst Gilbert Achcar (*Perilous Power: The Middle East and U.S. Foreign Policy*) agrees with the statement made by Chomsky, saying that there is justification for the claim that there is a potential for democracy in Iraq, referring to the Iranian Revolution as an example of a Middle Eastern nation gaining the aspiration for democracy. He further counters this counter argument however by emphasizing that the Middle East has been one of the only regions that has not begun to develop democratic governments. He claims, "On the other hand, as I've already emphasized, the oldest and dearest Muslim ally of the United States, the Saudi Kingdom, is the most extreme

---

<sup>24</sup> Chomsky, Noam, Gilbert Achcar, and Stephan R. Shalom. *Perilous Power : The Middle East and U. S. Foreign Policy Dialogues on Terror, Democracy, War, and Justice*. New York: Paradigm, 2006. Pg. 39

<sup>25</sup> Chomsky, Noam, Gilbert Achcar, and Stephan R. Shalom. *Perilous Power : The Middle East and U. S. Foreign Policy Dialogues on Terror, Democracy, War, and Justice*. New York: Paradigm, 2006. Pg. 39

antithesis of democracy – you can't imagine worse. And the fact that the Saudi Kingdom is the linchpin of the U.S. regional hegemony has had a very strong impact on the whole region, and is one reason why, when Arab secular nationalism and the progressive currents collapsed, this did not lead to some kind of democratic change like you had in Eastern Europe. The only exception to the "third wave" of democratic changes, as Huntington would call it – that is, the democratization process that kicked off in the 1980's – has been the Middle East.<sup>26</sup> Achcar also brings up a very interesting and paradoxical point; another reason for the failure of democracy in the Middle East is because, as he says, "the 'bad guys' would win". What he means by this is that if democracy was implemented in a Middle Eastern country such as Iraq, forces that are seen as hostile or in opposition towards the West may be elected to lead the government<sup>27</sup>. The West claims that it encourages and aids the spread of democracy in the Middle East, while also manipulating elections and preventing certain people from being elected, therefore limiting freedom, and defying the rules of democracy.

### Conclusion:

Democracy is a type of government run by the people, for the people. It is a form of government that revolves around freedom, liberty, sovereignty, equality of gender, political trust, and economic prosperity. When the United States government carried out their campaign to invade the state of Iraq in 2003, their primary intention was to gain control over the thriving oil industry. In order to do so, the Bush Administration

---

<sup>26</sup> Chomsky, Noam, Gilbert Achcar, and Stephan R. Shalom. Perilous Power : The Middle East and U. S. Foreign Policy Dialogues on Terror, Democracy, War, and Justice. New York: Paradigm, 2006. Pg. 42

<sup>27</sup> Chomsky, Noam, Gilbert Achcar, and Stephan R. Shalom. Perilous Power : The Middle East and U. S. Foreign Policy Dialogues on Terror, Democracy, War, and Justice. New York: Paradigm, 2006. Pg. 42

convinced the general public that the main objective was to spread democracy to the Middle East. The question that we ask ourselves is whether or not the United States government would have been able to instigate an appropriate democratic government in the state of Iraq, if its intention was to do so. Through the use of several sources and pieces of evidence, we are able to address the question at hand. The Ideologies of previous Iraqi government (the Baath party under the leadership of Saddam Hussein) were completely contradictory to the traits of democracy; the state lacked any sort of freedom of opinion and speech and public participation in decision/law making. Also, the economic, social, and political traits of the state of Iraq are not ideal towards the construction of a democratic form of government. Economic development especially plays a large role in the success of a democracy; "A political culture shapes democracy far more than a democracy shapes a political culture."<sup>28</sup> Without these existing traits in the Iraqi state and government, democracy is within little or no reach. Though Iraq did have democratic elections, the actual democracy is virtually non-existent. The economy in the nation is still low, there still exists sectarian violence, and the equality between genders is still below an optimal level. Though the United States government would like to perceive the notion of the state of Iraq having a steady and strong democratic government, the reality of the matter is that if Iraq pertains to such sectarian divisionism, inequality between sexes, and economic plunder, the prospect of having democracy as a form of governmental rule in Iraq is far from attainable.

<sup>28</sup> Basham, Patrick. A Democratic Iraq? Don't Hold Your Breath. 2003. [www.cato.org](http://www.cato.org). 31 Mar. 2003. CATO Institute. [http://www.cato.org/pub\\_display.php?pub\\_id=3042](http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=3042).

There is a basic problem with this analysis, which is not fully resolved. It is indicated in the times used in the framing of the question, i.e. are we discussing whether regime change (to democracy) was ever feasible, or whether the US was ever seriously intending such a ~~big~~ project?



## Bibliography:

1. Chomsky, Noam, Gilbert Achcar, and Stephan R. Shalom. Perilous Power : The Middle East and U. S. Foreign Policy Dialogues on Terror, Democracy, War, and Justice. New York: Paradigm, 2006.
2. Hobsbawm, Eric J. Globalisation, Democracy and Terrorism. New York: Little, Brown Book Group Limited, 2008.
3. Wellek, Alex, ed. The Encyclopedic Dictionary of American Government. 4th ed. Guilford, Connecticut: The Dushkin Group, 1991.
4. World Book, Inc. Staff. The World Book Encyclopedia. 4th ed. Austin: Steck-Vaughn, 2004
5. Bennis, Phyllis. Before and After: US Foreign Policy and the War on Terrorism. Olive Branch P, 2003.
6. Karava, Mehran. The Modern Middle East. University of California P, 2005.
7. Basham, Patrick. A Democratic Iraq? Don't Hold Your Breath. 2003. Www.cato.org. 31 Mar. 2003. CATO Institute. <[http://www.cato.org/pub\\_display.php?pub\\_id=3042](http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=3042)>.
8. Kafala, Tarik. A Democratic Iraq? Don't Hold Your Breath. News.bbc.co.uk. 25 Mar. 2003. BBC News Online. 7 Jan. 2009 <[http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle\\_east/2886733.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/2886733.stm)>.

**Assessment form (for examiner use only)**

Candidate session number	0	0	
--------------------------	---	---	--

Assessment criteria		Achievement level		
		First examiner	maximum	Second examiner
A	research question	2	2	<input type="checkbox"/>
B	introduction	1	2	<input type="checkbox"/>
C	investigation	2	4	<input type="checkbox"/>
D	knowledge and understanding	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>
E	reasoned argument	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>
F	analysis and evaluation	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>
G	use of subject language	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>
H	conclusion	2	2	<input type="checkbox"/>
I	formal presentation	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>
J	abstract	1	2	<input type="checkbox"/>
K	holistic judgment	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>
Total out of 36		26		<input type="checkbox"/>

Name of first examiner: \_\_\_\_\_  
(CAPITAL letters)

Examiner number: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of second examiner: \_\_\_\_\_  
(CAPITAL letters)

Examiner number: \_\_\_\_\_