

In These Pages

by James Kurth

The Bush administration justified its invasion of Iraq in 2003 with the claim that Saddam Hussein's regime was well advanced toward obtaining nuclear weapons. (Israel is the only state in the Middle East generally acknowledged to possess nuclear weapons.) That claim, we now know, was untrue. Nearly three years later, it turns out that the Middle East nation that was—and is—well advanced toward obtaining nuclear weapons is not Iraq, but Iran. And here the Bush administration's policy has been almost the opposite of its policy toward Iraq. From time to time, it leaks hints that it is contemplating military action to stop the Iranian nuclear program, but since Iran is three times the size of Iraq and since its program is widely dispersed, almost everybody—including the Iranian regime—knows that the administration's policy is a bluff. The administration is relying upon the once-derided "old Europe" to arrange a face-saving compromise with Iran, but even this option seems to be heading toward failure. And so, Iran's nuclear weapons potential continues to grow steadily toward a

capability that will eventually exceed anything ever conceived of by Saddam Hussein.

North Korea, Nuclear Weapons, and U.S. Intelligence

In the meantime, the third member of the "axis of evil," North Korea, has already achieved a nuclear capability that includes several nuclear weapons. Unlike the imaginary threat from Iraq and the potential threat from Iran, the North Korean threat to the United States and to U.S. allies Japan and South Korea is real, here and now. The Bush administration's policy toward this serious threat has been even more feckless than that toward Iraq and even more a bluff than that toward Iran. Once again, the administration is relying upon other nations, in this case North Korea's neighbors, to arrange a face-saving compromise with its adversary. But even this option seems to be heading toward something like the once-derided Agreed Framework that the Clinton administration produced in 1994.


The North Korean nuclear weapons program presents a clear

In These Pages

68	and present danger to the United	for both criminal organizations and	111
69	States. This issue of <i>Orbis</i> begins	Islamist terrorists to enter the United	112
70	with an analysis of that program	States. Jan Ting, a leading authority	113
71	by Ralph Hassig and Kongdan Oh,	on immigration law and practice,	114
72	two leading experts on North Korea,	discusses this threat. But there is also	115
73	who discuss its historical develop-	another southern border, Mexico's	116
74	ment, political imperatives, and	southern border with Central Amer-	117
75	intractable realities and evaluate	ica, through which many immigrants	118
76	U.S. policy options. The authors	come on their way north to the	119
77	reject as impractical and ineffective	United States. George Grayson gives	120
78	both the option of U.S. military	an on-the-scene depiction of this	121
79	action and the option of South	"third" U.S. border, along with a	122
80	Korean appeasement of the North	detailed analysis of the policies,	123
81	Korean regime (the "sunshine pol-	practices, and failures of Mexico's	124
82	icy"). Rather, they argue for a vigor-	Vicente Fox administration.	125
83	ous sunshine policy aimed at the		126
84	North Korean people as a whole	In the longer term, Mexican	127
85	(e.g., massive infusions of informa-	immigration poses a challenge—and	128
86	tion and communication).	some say a threat—to our national	129
87		identity. Samuel Huntington, Amer-	130
88	The non-existent nuclear	ica's most distinguished political	131
89	weapons in Iraq, the developing	scientist, has addressed this very	132
90	nuclear program in Iran, and the	question in his most recent book,	133
91	already-existing nuclear weapons in	<i>Who Are We? The Challenges to</i>	134
92	North Korea demonstrate the abso-	<i>America's National Identity</i> (2004).	135
93	lute importance of getting U.S. intel-	In our review essay, Stephen Schu-	136
94	ligence right, in both the analytical	cker, an eminent historian, presents a	137
95	and the operational arenas. Garrett	comprehensive and thoughtful com-	138
96	Jones, a career officer in the CIA,	mentary, both on Huntington's book	139
97	gives a comprehensive and penetrat-	and on the consequences of Mexi-	140
98	ing account of the distortions and	can immigration.	140
99	weaknesses embedded in the con-		141
100	temporary organizational culture of	<i>Transformed Sovereignty and</i>	142
101	the Agency. He also offers sensible	<i>Humanitarian Intervention</i>	142
102	and practical proposals for reform.		143
103		Students of foreign policy,	144
104	<i>Mexico, Immigration, and U.S.</i>	particularly those in the "realist"	145
105	<i>Security</i>	school, spend a good deal of time	146
106		observing international policies, but	147
107		almost no time in observing interna-	148
108	In its own, very important	tional law, which they largely leave	149
109	way, immigration into the United	to those in the "idealist" school.	150
110	States presents another serious	However, since the end of the Cold	151
	threat to the United States and its	War, there have been major, even	152
	national security. In particular, the	revolutionary, developments in	153
	U.S. southern border with Mexico	international law with respect to that	
	has become the major open door		

154	most fundamental reality of interna-	197
155	tional politics: the national state and	198
156	its sovereignty. These legal develop-	199
157	ments have had concrete manifesta-	200
158	tions in humanitarian interventions	201
159	undertaken by international organi-	202
160	zations against rogue nation-states; in	203
161	the burgeoning and dense network	204
162	of transnational and nongovernmen-	205
163	tal organizations, aspiring to “global	206
164	governance”; and even in the Bush	207
165	doctrine (perhaps already overtaken	208
166	by its failures in Iraq) of preemptive	209
167	action (actually preventive war)	210
168	against states that harbor terrorists.	211
169	Amitai Etzioni, the distinguished	212
170	sociologist and communitarian, gives	213
171	us a concise and useful overview and	214
172	account of these developments and	215
173	their future potential. In my own	216
174	article, I discuss the bleak prospects	217
175	for humanitarian intervention in the	218
176	future, particularly where it will	219
177	be most needed, in Africa. Indeed,	220
178	the chances that the United States—	221
179	the central military power for most of	222
180	the humanitarian interventions to	223
181	date that have been effective—will	224
182	undertake such interventions in the	225
183	next decade or so are virtually nil,	
184	given the dismal consequences of the	
185	Iraq War.	
186	All is not bleak, however, in	
187	Africa, particularly with respect to	
188	Uganda. Edward Lynch discusses	
189	some of the successes of Uganda’s	
190	president, Yoweri Museveni, and	
191	some of the paradoxes of U.S. policy	
192	toward that country.	
193	<i>The EU, the European Origins of</i>	
194	<i>Democracy, and U.S. Policy</i>	
195	In recent years, some Ameri-	
196	cans—particularly neoconser-	
	vatives, as well as the Bush admin-	197
	istration during the period 2002–	198
	04—have been annoyed and dismis-	199
	sive with respect to Europe and the	200
	EU and have acted almost as if they	201
	wish these would go away. Indeed,	202
	with respect to the latter, many Eur-	203
	opeans have acted the same way. In	204
	counterpoint, however, Leslie Lebl,	205
	an experienced analyst of European	206
	affairs, argues that the EU is here to	207
	stay and that the United States both	208
	can and should advance its own	209
	national interests by working more	210
	closely and more intelligently with	211
	that institution.	212
	William Anthony Hay dis-	213
	cusses a different, historical way in	214
	which Europe remains relevant. He	215
	emphasizes the distinctive European	216
	characteristics of the liberal institu-	217
	tions and political culture that nur-	218
	tered the growth of stable	219
	democracy. He concludes that there	220
	is little basis for expecting any U.S.	221
	democratization project to succeed	222
	in countries that do not partake of	223
	some part of this European institu-	224
	tional and cultural legacy.	225
	<i>Russia, the Putin Government, and</i>	226
	<i>U.S. Policy</i>	227
	As always, Russia remains	228
	something of an enigma and, for	229
	many Americans, the government	230
	of Vladimir Putin is even more so.	231
	Two of our articles, however, shine	232
	a clarifying light upon these topics,	233
	by telling us how Russians them-	234
	selves think of their country, their	235
	government, and their relations with	236
	the United States. Andrei Tsygankov	237
	gives a comprehensive account of	238
	the competing foreign policy groups	239

In These Pages

240	and tendencies within the Russian	Russian students. For them, the cur-	248
241	elite, along with an analysis of the	rent era is both another Russian	249
242	challenges and choices facing Putin.	time of troubles and a period when	250
243	Laurence Jarvik, who taught at a	once again there is the prospect of	251
244	Moscow university in 2005, gives	rebirth. He concludes that it would	252
245	an empathetic and sensitive por-	be best for America and for	253
246	trayal of the distinctive values and	American national interests	254
247	views of many Russians, particularly	to let Russia remain Russia.	255
			256