

Korea, Iran, and Syria. The strange idea expressed by some that America should bring democracy to the Middle East, by the sword if necessary, is fading. The ambition to manage a global empire to fulfill altruistic dreams has succumbed to the very real and very difficult problems of pacification and nation-building.

America can choose to ignore the lessons of Afghanistan and Iraq—let inertia prevail and opportunity pass. We can decide to remain cozy with Saudi leaders, even as they violate our values and support our enemies. We can patch up hurt feelings on both sides of the Atlantic so NATO can plod ahead unchanged. We can protect South Korea indefinitely and continue to treat the Japanese like unreliable partners entrusted with no real global responsibilities. And finally, we can embrace the lure of empire and greater military activism abroad. But in the rubble of war lies an opening: we can correct errors in all these areas and change the course of U.S. foreign policy.

The struggle to destroy bin Laden's terror organization is not over. America will need to remain vigilant for decades to ensure that al-Qaeda does not re-emerge in Afghanistan or take root in the chaos of post-war Iraq. The resources for that task can be found in our garrisons in Europe and Asia, kept there too long after the Cold War. That struggle, along with its aging alliances, is history. The future of American foreign policy is the road home. ■

Eugene Gholz is an assistant professor at the University of Kentucky's Patterson School of Diplomacy and International Commerce. Daryl G. Press is an assistant professor in the Department of Government at Dartmouth College. Harvey M. Sapolsky is a professor in MIT's Political Science Department and is Director of the MIT Security Studies Program.

The Bush White House is under pressure from Republican congressmen as well as a number of Senate moderates,

because the situation in Iraq is increasingly affecting overall Republican prospects in the November elections. At the end of April, a delegation visited President Bush's chief political advisor Karl Rove and urged that the White House take decisive action against Defense Department officials responsible for the lack of pre-war planning for Iraq and for a series of well-documented missteps in occupation policy. They cited errors like the original disbanding of the Iraqi army, the failure to reach accommodation with the Shi'ite leadership, and the inability to deal with the surge in Iraqi Sunni resistance. The Republicans stated their belief that President Bush remains extremely popular but stressed that some of his senior-level officials responsible for Iraq policy are receiving very high negatives from local and state-level constituencies. The evidence of widespread prisoner abuse at American-run prisons in Iraq and Afghanistan was not on the agenda for the discussions but is likely further to increase negative perceptions of the Defense Department. Rove told the Republican delegation that the president recognized there had been failures but was determined to rectify mistakes and stay the course and ensure security during and after the transition to Iraqi rule. Rove did concede, however, that the president would make some changes in his Defense policy team before November, including the early departure of Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz. Although not mentioned by Rove at the meeting, a knowledgeable White House source added that the Undersecretary of Policy at the Defense Department Douglas Feith will soon be asked to resign. Feith is the Defense official directly responsible for pre-war planning in Iraq.



Israel's foreign intelligence service Mossad has failed in a second assassination attempt against the overall Hamas leader, Khalid Meshal.

Meshal lives under Syrian protection in Damascus. Five Yemeni Jews were dressed as local Syrian Muslims and infiltrated into Damascus by way of Jordan. They sought to attend a ceremony at the Yarmuk refugee camp in Damascus where Meshal was commemorating Abdel Aziz Rantisi, the Hamas leader who had been assassinated two weeks earlier in Gaza. The five men were apprehended by Meshal's security guards and handed over to the Syrian intelligence service. Apparently, under torture the men confessed they had entered Syria on a Mossad-directed mission to kill Meshal. This was the second failed attempt to assassinate Meshal. During the prime ministership of Binyamin Netanyahu, Mossad agents were able to inject Meshal with poison. Meshal, living in Jordan at the time, became an international cause célèbre when former King Hussein announced that the Mossad agents would be executed if the antidote were not sent to Jordan within 48 hours. Meshal's life was saved after an Israeli doctor delivered the antidote. The affair was a huge embarrassment for Netanyahu and the latest failed attempt might become an additional embarrassment for current Prime Minister Ariel Sharon, who authorized the Mossad attempt. Sharon has vowed to kill all of the Hamas leadership. ■

Philip Giraldi, a former CIA Officer, is a partner in Cannistraro Associates, an international security consultancy.

A Specter Haunts the GOP

Bush wades in to save the Republican Party from principle.

By Timothy P. Carney

ARLEN SPECTER—who has cast more liberal votes than any other Republican in the Senate—was saved by President George W. Bush and Sen. Rick Santorum last month.

Specter, a four-term incumbent, edged out conservative Rep. Pat Toomey (R-Pa.) by fewer than 13,000 votes out of more than one million cast in the Republican Senate primary. In the final push, he relied on over \$300,000 from the National Republican Senatorial Committee, recorded phone calls from President Bush broadcast to the middle of the state, an 11th-hour fly-around with Santorum, and a final-week fundraiser with President Bush. If not for this tireless work by these so-called conservative leaders, Specter would have lost badly.

Rank-and-file conservatives are not happy. When Santorum addressed the National Catholic Prayer Breakfast in Washington the day after the primary, some walked out. In closed-door meetings around Washington, Bush's liaisons were pummeled with angry questions in the days after Toomey's defeat at Bush's hands. Conservatives who have watched Specter shrink tax cuts, battle against school choice, kill tort reform, defend abortion, and invent the art of "Borking" conservative judges that has poisoned Capitol Hill wanted to know why Bush and Santorum did it.

The answer does not rest in mere political expediency, but in the vision Bush and the GOP establishment have for the future of the party—specifically

the role of cultural issues and the makeup of the courts.

The conventional wisdom says Bush and Santorum went to bat for Specter because party politics demand the establishment back the incumbent. But consider the GOP's treatment of conservative former Sen. Bob Smith (R-N.H.). Smith in 2002, like Specter this year, faced a primary challenge. He had the official endorsement of the White House and the RNC. Karl Rove even made an appearance with him. But Smith's primary opponent, Rep. John Sununu, also had some clout on his side.

On April 17, 2002, Sununu held a fundraiser, headlined by Conference Chairman Santorum, Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott, and Senators Ted Stevens (now the senior Republican in that body) and Kit Bond. Had Specter received the Bob Smith treatment, Pat Toomey would be the Senate nominee.

Concern over control of the Senate also cannot explain Bush's and Santorum's work for Specter. Even granting that Toomey would be more vulnerable than Specter in November, Democrats would not realistically be in striking range of 51 seats. With Pennsylvania in play, Democrats would still need to win eight of 10 competitive Senate races to gain a majority. Bush and Santorum battled for Specter for more subtle reasons.

More than a few grassroots Pennsylvania Republicans explained their votes for Specter as votes to help Bush in

November. Having Specter on the ballot in November, the media and the Specter campaign had told them, would help Bush win Pennsylvania. While widespread, this perception is false, and it doesn't fully explain why the White House backed Specter so forcefully.

Wouldn't the White House want Toomey on the ballot to help turn out Pennsylvania's share of those four million Christian conservatives who Karl Rove says stayed home in 2000 (as well as those right-wingers less than pleased with Medicare expansion and empire-building)?

With 445,000 more Democrats than Republicans in Pennsylvania, Specter backers point out that a Republican needs Democratic votes to win the Keystone State, regardless of conservative turnout. But which kind of Democrats does Bush want to court?

In the 2002 Democratic gubernatorial primary, more than 702,000 Democrats voted for former Philadelphia Mayor Ed Rendell, while state Auditor Bob Casey, Jr. pulled in a little less than 540,000. Rendell is a friend of Bill Clinton and pro-choice. Casey is pro-life and the son of the former governor who tried to overturn *Roe v. Wade*.

Outside of Philadelphia, Rendell lost nearly every county but won big in the "collar counties" of Montgomery, Bucks, and Delaware. In these white-bread, upper-middle-class, socially liberal suburbs, thousands of Republicans reregistered as Democrats so that they could