

where prices are higher. In Iraq, with the second-largest oil reserves in the world, ordinary citizens are forced to wait in lines up to 24 hours to fill up their gas tanks.

FOREIGN POLICY & DEFENSE

Not-So-Great Guns

THE SOURCE: "Coming Full Circle: Replacing the 9mm with the .45 Caliber Pistol" by Maj. Craig R. Wonson, in *Marine Corps Gazette*, July 2006.

IN 1985, WHEN THE U.S. MILITARY changed its standard sidearm from the Colt .45 pistol to the Beretta M9 9mm, the decision seemed sound. The .45 had been in service since 1911, and though it was effective in battle, it was also much criticized: Its strong recoil made it difficult for inexperienced shooters to manage, it was too large for small hands, it was tricky to clean, and its single-action firing mechanism was a safety hazard. Not only was the M9 easier and safer to use, it also held twice as many rounds, and its 9mm ammunition

was the same size as the standard NATO cartridge, as well as cheaper and lighter.

But according to Maj. Craig R. Wonson, future operations planner with the First Marine Expeditionary Force in Iraq, one crucial factor was overlooked in the selection of the 9mm pistol: the weapon's effectiveness—or lack thereof—in "stopping" an enemy combatant. Now, with close-quarter combat becoming "the norm" for American troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, Wonson says, the 9mm pistol has been seeing a lot of use, and it is not getting rave reviews. "Recent reports of the M9's subpar performance . . . have left Marines with little confidence in the weapon," he writes.

The shortcomings of the 9mm will not come as news to federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies. Many of them once used the 9mm but switched to larger-caliber sidearms, including the .45, after incidents such as a disastrous 1986 FBI shootout in Miami in which suspects suffered multiple gunshot wounds but were still able to kill two agents.

The problem is "stopping power"—the gun's ability to take an opponent out of a fight immediately. Advocates of the 9mm argue that although it does not do as much damage as the .45, other factors—such as the "neurological effect" of a bullet entering the body, the pain of a gunshot wound, and skillful shot placement—should be sufficient to stop an enemy. Not so, says Wonson, especially if the enemy has taken drugs such as methamphetamines, as is reportedly the case sometimes in Iraq. And accurate shot placement is a risky thing to depend on in the less-than-ideal conditions of an actual fight.

Wonson advocates a return to a .45. Newer models by other manufacturers are easier to use than the old Colts, and just as effective. Indeed, the military had to learn this lesson once before: The switch to the .45 in 1911 came after smaller-caliber pistols failed to do the job in battle.

FOREIGN POLICY & DEFENSE

Saving Sanctions

THE SOURCE: "Making Sanctions Humane and Effective" by Uli Cremer, in *Internationale Politik*, Summer 2006.

TODAY'S LIBERALS EXPRESS far less confidence in the efficacy of international sanctions than did Woodrow Wilson, who said in 1919 that "a nation boycotted is a nation in sight of surrender." Sanctions are only as effective as the political will to implement them, writes Uli Cremer, the former foreign policy spokesman for Germany's Green Party, and many existing and aspiring trading partners of sanctioned countries are weak reeds indeed.



The safer, cheaper, and lighter Beretta pistol, chosen 20 years ago over the clunky Colt .45 for military use, often fails to stop enemies in close-quarter-combat conditions such as those in Iraq.

The United States indulged in “sanctions excess” in the 1990s, Cremer says, and the rest of the world was happy to capitalize on America’s actions. When Congress prohibited U.S. firms from doing business with Iran in 1993, French, Russian, Malaysian, and Chinese companies seized the opportunity.

Unilateral sanctions are almost always ineffective, but even multinational actions work no more than half the time, according to research cited by Cremer. Every relevant nation must be on board. Even then, sanctions often hurt the wrong people—the weak within the sanctioned nation, as well as nearby trading partners. When the United Nations imposed sanctions on Yugoslavia in the 1990s, neighboring Romania claimed that it suffered \$10 billion in damages.

Cremer advocates a “United Nations Sanctions Compensation

EXCERPT

Evangelical Foreign Policy

Evangelical power is here to stay . . . and those concerned about U.S. foreign policy would do well to reach out. As more evangelical leaders acquire firsthand experience in foreign policy, they are likely to provide something now sadly lacking in the world of U.S. foreign policy: a trusted group of experts, well versed in the nuances and dilemmas of the international situation, who are able to persuade large numbers of Americans to support the complex and counterintuitive policies that are sometimes necessary in this wicked and frustrating—or, dare one say it, fallen—world.

—WALTER RUSSELL MEAD, a senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, in *Foreign Affairs* (Sept.–Oct. 2006)

Fund” of about \$20 billion, underwritten by annual contributions from all UN members, to compensate legitimate trading partners and others and remove the economic imperative to cheat. He also calls for scrutinizing claims and ensuring that the

money is not siphoned off to the politically well-connected. In Iraq, where the nation’s own oil sales were used to finance a UN compensation fund between 1992 and 2000, a committee plowed through 2.6 million applications and reduced valid claims to only one percent of the requests, but “political approvals” increased final payouts above the original figures. Such massive corruption would have to be eliminated and the process made transparent for the initiative to succeed.

Since 1945, the UN has imposed sanctions on a rogue’s gallery of regimes, including ones in Angola, Cambodia, Liberia, Libya, Rhodesia, Sierra Leone,

and South Africa. Now Iran, with its vast oil wealth, is on the agenda unless it suspends moves toward developing nuclear weapons capability. Cremer argues that sanctions will work only if the UN first takes steps to head off the likely economic fallout.

POLITICS & GOVERNMENT

Founding Skeptic

THE SOURCE: “Jefferson the Skeptic” by Brooke Allen, in *The Hudson Review*, Summer 2006.

THOMAS JEFFERSON WAS NO Christian, writes critic Brooke Allen. He revered Jesus Christ as a

philosopher and moral leader, but he described Christianity as “our particular superstition” and rejected the Immaculate Conception; Jesus’ deification, miracles, resurrection, and ascension; plus the Eucharist, original sin, and

atonement. He thought the Holy Trinity “hocus pocus,” and the God of the Old Testament to be “cruel, vindictive, capricious, and unjust.” In his day, he was as popular among the clergy as atheist Madalyn Murray O’Hair was after she won her case against prayer in public schools in 1963.

Yet when Jefferson sat down to write the Declaration of Independence, he cited the “Laws of Nature