The dominant subjects in the pages of *Foreign Affairs* this year were terrorism, war, and their widespread effects on American foreign policy. In the summer and fall the magazine focused on the Bush administration’s new national security doctrine of preemptive war, and during the winter it turned to its implementation in Iraq. When the war finally came, it ended quickly after another display of America’s high-tech military prowess but left in its wake not just a difficult reconstruction job but also much institutional damage—to the United Nations, the transatlantic alliance, and U.S. relations with the international community. Through it all was threaded the question of America’s role, in Iraq and in the world.

Among the highlights from the pages of *Foreign Affairs* this year were the following: G. John Ikenberry of Georgetown University provided a penetrating critique of the Bush administration’s national security doctrine, warning that its arrogation of sweeping powers to the United States and its unilateral tendencies would leave America in a more hostile and divided world. *Newsweek* correspondent Michael P. Hirsh, meanwhile, questioned whether President Bush was paying enough attention to bolstering the international community for the multifaceted response that terrorism requires.

Fouad Ajami of the Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies at Johns Hopkins University delivered an eloquent rationale for modernizing the Arab world, starting with the military intrusion into Iraq, arguing that a reforming foreign power’s guidelines offered a better way than the region’s age-old prohibitions, defects, and phobias. Princeton’s Michael S. Doran agreed, arguing that the Israeli-Palestinian conflict should not stand in the way of a showdown with Saddam Hussein.

In neighboring Iran, nearly a quarter of a century after the revolution, economic failure and a bankrupt ideology have discredited the Islamic Republic, wrote Jahangir Amuzegar, finance minister in Iran’s pre-1979 government. The real story, Amuzegar said, is the growing discontent among the generation born after the 1979 revolution. This rising tide will eventually topple the regime, and the United States should just watch and wait. As for Arab anti-Americanism, Middle East scholar Barry Rubin chalked up much of it to propaganda fostered by leaders to divert attention from their own internal mismanagement and corruption. Countermeasures should include more effective American public diplomacy, according to Peter G. Peterson’s chairman’s report on the findings of a Council-sponsored Independent Task Force.

For post-Saddam Iraq, scholars Adeed Dawisha and Karen Dawisha proposed a federated democracy that would rely on indigenous assets, including an educated middle class and a past history of pluralistic politics. Former National Security Council staffer Kenneth M. Pollack outlined a plan for regional security in the post-Saddam Persian Gulf. And former U.S. ambassador to Israel Martin S. Indyk argued that the Bush administration’s “road map” for Mideast peace was insufficiently ambitious, and that to move successfully from war in Iraq to Arab-Israeli peace-
making, the administration might have to consider controversial ideas such as a trusteeship for Palestine.

On the other side of the globe, North Korea brought on another major crisis by threatening to restart its nuclear weapons program, and Korea experts James T. Laney and Jason T. Shaplen laid out a plan for handling the situation. Jessica E. Stern of Harvard’s Kennedy School analyzed how terrorist organizations were adapting to the Bush administration’s countermeasures, while Thomas Carothers of the Carnegie Endowment noted that one unfortunate casualty of the “war on terrorism” could be America’s efforts at democracy promotion abroad.

As for the repairing of America’s bridges to the rest of the world after the guns fell silent, Professors Michael J. Glennon, Anne-Marie Slaughter, and Edward C. Luck offered contrasting opinions on whether the UN Security Council has suffered lasting damage from its members’ prewar squabbling. Philip H. Gordon of the Brookings Institution argued that the differences between the United States and key European powers were often exaggerated, and Harvard’s Andrew Moravcsik called for a new postwar transatlantic bargain that recognizes each side’s valuable contributions.

The year’s output also featured essays on China’s leadership transition; Russia’s mixed performance under President Vladimir Putin; the future of NATO; Japan’s incredibly slow return to economic vitality; prospects for Lula’s Brazil; and examinations of the vexing problems of Turkey, Colombia, and Kashmir.

Lastly, considerable attention was given to problems requiring global management: the spread of AIDS to China, India, and Russia; the difficulties of humanitarian relief efforts in the midst of substate conflicts; the challenges of foreign assistance in an aging world; and increasing pressures on the poor in a globalizing economy.

**Benchmarks**

Buoyed by Americans’ intensified interest in world events, readership of *Foreign Affairs* continues to climb, bringing paid circulation to 125,000, up from 112,000 a year ago. International readership has also surged, now accounting for 25 percent of the total. The magazine continues to hold the distinction of being one of the only serious periodicals to be consistently profitable.

The past year saw the publication of several new textbooks for the college classroom, composed of *Foreign Affairs* articles and articles from other journals, and the introduction of the magazine’s Russian-language version. *Foreign Affairs* has been available in Japanese since 1990 and in Spanish since 2000. The magazine’s website was relaunched in March with a clean new design and expanded functionality and content. The site’s 200,000 visitors a month now have access to articles back to 1973, background briefings, and a biweekly e-mail newsletter.
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