

There is, however, a third possibility—the most depressing of all. Opposition to the Iraq War caused one of the most important mass movements in recent European political history. Between one and two million people marched against the war in London in February 2003, and the war elicited the biggest ever rebellion by British members of Parliament against their own government. Huge marches were held in the other European capitals on many other occasions. In previous ages and in other circumstances, such vast numbers of politically motivated people in the streets could have generated a revolutionary situation, or at least exerted very substantial political influence on the government of the day: a contributory factor to the downfall of Margaret Thatcher, for instance, was the rioting against the poll tax in 1990.

But these marches and these protests achieved precisely nothing. Tony Blair and the other pro-war European leaders sailed on regardless. They managed to pull off an impressive feat of Marcusian repressive tolerance—tolerating dissent precisely to be able more easily to ignore it. The subsequent years gave rise to huge ructions in Britain, as the lies Blair told over Iraq were systematically exposed. Again, nothing happened. Blair remains in power through sheer tenacity of will and sheer brazen lying, as do the other leaders and politicians who supported the war, with the single exception of José Maria Aznar in Spain. The Iraq War, in other words, pitted public opinion against the collective decisions of the political class with an intensity seen only every few decades. Public opinion having decisively lost that battle, there seems little energy left to start another one now. ■

*John Laughland is a writer and author living in London. He is co-editor of Israel on Israel, to be published by Valentine Mitchell in May.*

Sibel Edmonds, the FBI Turkish translator turned whistleblower who has been subjected to a gag order, could provide a major insight into how neoconservatives distort U.S. foreign policy and enrich themselves at the same time. On one level, her story appears straightforward: several Turkish lobbying groups allegedly bribed congressmen to support policies favorable to Ankara. But beyond that, the Edmonds revelations become more serpentine and appear to involve AIPAC, Israel, and a number of leading neoconservatives who have profited from the Turkish connection. Israel has long cultivated a close relationship with Turkey since Ankara's neighbors and historic enemies—Iran, Syria, and Iraq—are also hostile to Tel Aviv. Islamic Turkey has also had considerable symbolic value for Israel, demonstrating that hostility toward Muslim neighbors is not a *sine qua non* for the Jewish state.

Turkey benefits from the relationship by securing general benevolence and increased aid from the U.S. Congress as well as access to otherwise unobtainable military technology. The Turkish General Staff has a particular interest because much of the military spending is channeled through companies in which the generals have a financial stake, making for a very cozy and comfortable business arrangement. The commercial interest has also fostered close political ties, with the American-Turkish Council, Turkish American Cultural Alliance, and the Assembly of Turkish American Associations all developing warm relationships with AIPAC and other Jewish and Israel advocacy groups throughout the United States.

Someone has to be in the middle to keep the happy state of affairs going, so enter the neocons, intent on securing Israel against all comers and also keen to turn a dollar. In fact, the neocons seem to have a deep and abiding interest in Turkey which, under other circumstances, might be difficult to explain. Doug Feith's International Advisors Inc., a registered agent for Turkey in 1989-1994, netted \$600,000 a year from Turkey, with Richard Perle taking \$48,000 annually as a consultant. Other noted neoconservatives linked to Turkey are former State Department number three Marc Grossman, current Pentagon Undersecretary of Defense for Planning Eric Edelman, Paul Wolfowitz, and former Congressman Stephen Solarz. The money involved does not appear to come from the Turkish government, and FBI investigators are trying to determine its source and how it is distributed. Some of it may derive from criminal activity, possibly drug trafficking, but much more might come from arms dealing. Contracts in the hundreds of millions or even billions of dollars provide considerable fat for those well placed to benefit. Investigators also are looking at Israel's particular expertise in the illegal sale of U.S. military technology to countries like China and India. Fraudulent end-user certificates produced by Defense Ministries in Israel and Turkey are all that is needed to divert technology to other, less benign consumers. The military-industrial-complex/neocon network is also well attested. Doug Feith has been associated with Northrop Grumman for years, while defense contractors fund many neocon-linked think tanks and "information" services. Feith, Perle, and a number of other neocons have long had beneficial relationships with various Israeli defense contractors.

*Philip Giraldi, a former CIA Officer, is a partner in Cannistraro Associates.*

# Where Have All the Conservatives Gone?

The Republican Party's top contenders for 2008 aren't paleoconservatives—or any other kind.

By W. James Antle III

COME 2008, who will succeed George W. Bush at the helm of a troubled Republican Party? Though the next presidential race is far off, the question is already on conservatives' minds.

The last few months haven't been kind to Republican operatives who assumed President Bush's slide in popularity would be temporary. Instead, his approval ratings have settled below 40 percent, averaging 38 percent over the last four Gallup polls, and the president appears determined to drag the rest of his party down with him. Bush remains committed to an increasingly unpopular stay-the-course position on Iraq and is actively pushing amnesty for illegal immigrants in defiance of the GOP base.

So far the grassroots have been generally reluctant to defy Bush in return. But public discontent with the White House's immigration and foreign-policy initiatives could create as many opportunities for traditional conservatives as Democrats, something Bush Republicans are beginning to sense. The president has begun sprinkling his speeches with denunciations of "isolationism." Fred Barnes declared, in the pages of *The Weekly Standard* no less, "It's a paleo moment in America."

If so, it's a moment the leading contenders for the 2008 Republican presidential nomination seem content to let pass. The field is dominated by candidates who support the Bush line on immigration and Iraq or are inclined to go even further. In a March Fox News/Opinion Dynamics poll, the top three

Republican hopefuls were former New York Mayor Rudolph Giuliani at 29 percent, Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) at 22 percent, and former House Speaker Newt Gingrich drawing 8 percent. Not a paleoconservative among them.

The sole Iraq skeptic, Sen. Chuck Hagel (R-Neb.), is at the bottom of the pack with just 1 percent. The Fox poll is no outlier. Giuliani and McCain lead in most surveys—in November, Rasmussen Reports had Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice joining them in the top tier—while mavericks like Hagel languish in the low single digits.

Rice isn't sounding like someone who plans to be a candidate in 2008, and Gingrich is running on the fumes of 1994 nostalgia. Giuliani and McCain are the beneficiaries of near-universal name recognition and fawning press coverage. But few of the dark horses offer paleos—or the growing majority of Americans who disapprove of Bush's handling of Iraq and immigration—much reason for optimism. Unless something changes dramatically over the next year and a half, rather than taking the opportunity to repudiate the current president's mistakes, Republicans are poised to nominate someone who favors repeating them.

If something does change, it will likely be due to one of two potential candidates. While foreign-policy realists dream of Hagel breaking out of his asterisk status, many immigration realists pin their hopes on Congressman Tom Tancredo (R-Colo.). Tancredo has graduated from House backbencher to the

leader of an effective congressional immigration-reform faction. In December, he and his allies fashioned a tough enforcement-only border-security bill that passed the House. Tancredo has been touring the country as the Senate prepares to undo his handiwork.

Tancredo is realistic about his presidential chances. He tells reporters that he would prefer to see a first-tier candidate take up the immigration issue—"someone taller and with better hair"—but is considering a run if no one obliges. "Soon we may see some of the princes in waiting jockeying to become the Tancredo of the Senate," predicts Will Adams, the congressman's spokesman.

A Senate version of Tancredo would be a welcome addition to the field, given how inhospitable many leading Republicans have been to the real one. He was excluded from the Southern Republican Leadership Conference (SRLC), with organizers citing schedule and ballot space constraints and Tancredo's office calling it "a clear snub from the leadership." "Congressman Tancredo may have been kept off the stage," says Adams. "But the immigration issue wasn't off the stage."

Hagel has also gotten a poor reception from Republican regulars. He garnered just 0.2 percent of the vote at the SRLC straw poll and is unpopular with conservative activists. Despite a solid lifetime American Conservative Union rating of 85 percent, he has been tagged with the GOP Right's favorite epithet—RINO, or Republican in name only.