

Time for a Boston Tea Party in Your Town?

*** Be a Patriot * Save Our Country ***

Join the US Face to Face Voter Project!

The national movement of citizens educating citizens about the current administration in time for the 2004 election.

We feel there is no more urgent matter than to share these facts nationwide in order to counter "the spin," register voters, and support them all the way to the polls.

www.usfacetoface.org

© 2004, US Face to Face

Permission to copy, reprint, and distribute granted with credit to US Face to Face.

Jobs

1) How many American workers are unemployed?

8.3 million American workers are currently unemployed. Many of these individuals are the victims of trade and dislocation who will never get their old jobs back. In fact, more than 1.9 million workers were unemployed for more than six months in 2003, the highest rate of long-term unemployment since 1983.

Source: On the President's Fiscal Year 2005 Budget for the U.S. Department of Labor, Ross Eisenbrey, Submitted to the U.S. House Committee On Ways and Means on March 4, 2004,

http://www.epinet.org/content.cfm/webfeatures_viewpoints_FY2005_FedBudget_and_jobs

2) How many jobs have been created during this administration? (Net jobs created is the number created minus the number lost.)

None. We have lost 2.7 million jobs overall of these were 3.2 million lost in the private sector (small gains in the public sector)—making this the worst hiring slump since the Great Depression.

An estimated two million persons have given up the search for work and are thus not counted among active jobseekers, which if counted would put the unemployment rate at 7.0%.

Sources: "Labor market left behind: Evidence shows that post-recession economy has not turned into a recovery for workers," Jared Bernstein and Lawrence Mishel, Economic Policy Institute, Sept. 2003, http://www.epinet.org/content.cfm/briefingpapers_bp142

"Bush's Job-Loss Recovery the Worst on Record Since the Great Depression," Cynthia Green, Labor Research, Oct. 7, 2003, <http://www.laborresearch.org/story2.php/327>

3) What is the result of the tax cuts the Bush Administration said would produce jobs?

Only 294,000 jobs were created out of a total 2,448,000 jobs projected to be created in the first seven months after the 2003 tax cuts took effect. This is 2,154,000 jobs short of the prediction of the Bush Administration.

To reach the 5.5 million target by the end of 2004, job growth would have to average 473,000 per month over four times the level of job growth in January 2004.

Source: Bush Administration's tax cuts falling short in job creation, <http://www.jobwatch.org>, Missing the moving target: Meager job growth and the poor track record of the administration's job forecasts, by Jared Bernstein, Lee Price, and Isaac Shapiro, http://www.epinet.org/content.cfm/issuebriefs_ib197, February 12, 2004 | EPI Issue Brief #197, <http://www.jobwatch.org/creating/index.html>, http://www.epinet.org/content.cfm/webfeatures_econindicators_jobspict

4) What kind of jobs are being created?

In the last quarter, mainly low-paying service jobs were created. 40% of the new jobs were in temp and retail.

Source: “Agreement will just send more U.S. jobs overseas,” John J. Sweeney, *Miami Herald*, Nov. 16, 2003, http://www.miami.com/mld/miamiherald/news/special_packages/focus/7264446.htm

The new jobs typically pay barely half of what the old jobs did. Most don’t offer pensions or health insurance for retirees.

Source: “Iowa plant closings mirror nationwide manufacturing job loss,” Stephanie Simon, *Los Angeles Times*, Dec. 07, 2003, <http://www.post-gazette.com/pg/03341/247858.stm>

5) The unemployment rate, not including those no longer receiving unemployment benefits, reached 6.4% in June 2003. When was the last time it was this high?

The unemployment rate rose to the highest level in nine years.

“It’s hard to put a positive spin on this report,” said Ethan Harris, chief economist of Lehman Brothers. Not only did overall unemployment rise, he said, but also “the rest of the report didn’t look good, either.” The unemployment rate in May was 6.1%.

The Labor Department said that for blacks, the unemployment rate in June was 11.8%, up from 10.8% in May.

Sources: “National unemployment rate hits 6.4%,” *Seattle Post-Intelligencer* Staff and News Services, July 4, 2003, http://seattlepi.nwsource.com/business/129515_economy04.html

“9 Million Still Officially Jobless—More Like 15.5 Million,” AFL-CIO, Oct. 3, 2003, <http://www.aflcio.org/yourjobeconomy/jobs/ns10032003.cfm?RenderForPrint=1>

6) Why is this called a “jobless recovery”?

Employment growth at the moment is the lowest for any recovery since the government started keeping such statistics in 1939.

Source: “Mystery of the ‘jobless recovery’: As Americans celebrate Labor Day, they face a historically weak labor market and meager rise in paychecks,” David R. Francis, staff writer, *Christian Science Monitor*, <http://www.csmonitor.com/2003/0829/p01s02-usec.html>

We are now facing the unprecedented phenomenon of a “job loss” recovery: two years into the rebound, a net loss of 768,000 jobs.

Normally our economy creates millions of jobs when it recovers from a recession. The last recession — the one that cost Bush’s father his job — was considered exceptional in that it was followed by a “jobless recovery.” But even that “jobless recovery” had produced a net gain of 1.4 million jobs by the time two years had passed. The two previous economic recoveries in 1982 and 1975 produced 7.2 million and 4.7 million jobs, respectively, in their first two years.

Source: “Economy on upswing, but jobless recovery may do Bush no good,” Mark Weisbrot, *Salt Lake Tribune*, Dec. 5, 2003, <http://www.sltrib.com/2003/Dec/12052003/commenta/117189.asp>

7) Open: Do you feel secure in your job? Are you concerned about your job being contracted out, downsized, or privatized? Do you have lay-off protections such as are provided when working under protections provided by unions?

8) How many months in a row have manufacturing jobs been lost during this administration?

38 consecutive months. AFL-CIO-affiliated unions have been hit hard by the loss of 2.3 million jobs since January 2001, particularly in the manufacturing sector, which has cut payrolls.

Source: “200 AFL-CIO workers taking unpaid leave,” Leigh Strope, AP labor writer, Sat., Nov. 29, 2003, http://seattlepi.nwsource.com/business/apbiz_story.asp?category=1310&slug=Labor%20Money

9) How many manufacturing jobs have been lost in the United States during this administration?

2.6 million. When President Bush took office, about 17.1 million Americans worked in factories; today, only 14.5 million do. Last month (November 2003), another seventeen thousand manufacturing jobs disappeared.

Manufacturing employment has now fallen for forty straight months. In October, 73.5% of plants and equipment were in active use. Three years ago, more than 80% were.

Source: “The Talk of the Town,” John Cassidy, *The New Yorker*, Dec. 8, 2003, http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/?031215ta_talk_cassidy

10) What are workplace policies in place or being promoted by the Bush administration?

The administration wants to revoke overtime pay and has eliminated OSHA-based ergonomic standards that would protect workers. OSHA estimates the benefits of preventing work related injuries to be approximately \$9 billion per year saved and costing businesses only around \$4.5 million to implement.

Sources: “8 million may lose OT pay: Bush administration proposal would dramatically alter rules for paying overtime, study says,” CNN, June 27, 2003, <http://money.cnn.com/2003/06/26/news/economy/epi/>

“White House Wins Overtime Pay Flap,” CBS News, Nov. 22, 2003, <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2003/07/11/politics/main562735.shtml>

“Bush Repeals Ergonomic Rule,” CBS News, July 1, 2003, <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2003/07/01/politics/main561163.shtml>

<http://www.cnn.com/2001/TECH/industry/03/07/senate.osha.rules.idg/>

http://www.aft.org/publications/inside_aft/previous/2001/030501.html

http://www.natat.org/natat/WASH_REPORT_ISSUES/2001%20Wash%20Reports/washrepMarch2001.htm

11) How have wages been affected?

The real wages of the typical (i.e., median) worker stopped growing entirely in 2002, after growing at an inflation-adjusted rate of 2% per year through 2001.

Over the past year, real wages have been falling about 1% for low-wage and high-wage workers, and wages have been stagnant for middle-wage workers.

Source: “Labor market left behind: Evidence shows that post-recession economy has not turned into a recovery for workers,” Jared Bernstein and Lawrence Mishel, Economic Policy Institute, Sept. 2003, http://www.epinet.org/content.cfm/briefingpapers_bp142

12) How do American voters feel about their jobs and the economy?

The administration gets low marks on its efforts to create more jobs: 62% of voters say it has made either not much or no progress at all toward doing so. 79% of Democrats and 68% of Independents don’t see the administration making progress.

The issue of jobs is a pressing concern, as 41% of American voters say they’re at least somewhat worried about a possible job loss in their household.

Most voters (55%) say the national economy is in bad shape, and less than half think the administration is making much progress in improving it; 50% say the administration is not making much progress, or none at all.

Source: “CBS Poll: Bush Failing On Economy,” Sept. 7, 2003, <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2003/09/05/opinion/polls/main571872.shtml>

13) How do wages and profits compare at this time?

In short, corporate profits have soared while wages and benefits have lagged. Labor compensation’s share of total income growth averaged 61% in previous recoveries. In this current “recovery,” labor compensation accounts for only 29% of the total income growth.

Source: “Fast growth for profits, slow growth for wages and benefits,” Snapshot for Dec. 3, 2003, Josh Bivens, Economic Policy Institute, <http://www.epinet.org/content.cfm?id=1558> [Excellent graphic on this site]

14) Where is the job growth?

23 months into the recovery, private sector jobs are running nearly seven million workers below the norm of the typical hiring cycle. America is short of jobs as never before and offshore outsourcing [jobs overseas] is ramping up as never before. In China, foreign-invested enterprises employ about 3.5 million workers. That

number has tripled over the past decade. Add in the subsidiaries funded out of Hong Kong, Macao, and Taiwan, you've got another 3.25 million workers. Employment in the information technology business in India is 650,000 right now and is expected to go up another three to four times in the next five years.

Sources: "Outsourcing: The calculus of migrating jobs," Erika Kinetz, *New York Times*, Dec. 6, 2003, <http://www.iht.com/articles/120443.html>

"Who Wins and Who Loses as Jobs Move Overseas?" Erika Kinetz, *New York Times*, Dec. 7, 2003, <http://www.nytimes.com/2003/12/07/business/yourmoney/07out.html?ex=1071378000&en=9b0b3f301239bb62&ei=5062&partner=GOOGLE>

Productivity gains in this recovery are mostly the result of trimming workers from the payroll, which benefits business earnings. Alas, this elixir can't keep working forever. Look out.

Source: "Profits and Layoffs," A. Gary Shilling, 12.22.03, http://www.forbes.com/columnists/free_forbes/2003/1222/224.html

15) What is President Bush's attitude toward federal civilian workers?

"The 170,000 employees . . . will not receive civil service protection" and private contractors will increasingly take over jobs now in the federal workforce. "President Bush's current plan, as shown in the creation of the Department of Homeland Security, is nothing less than the privatization of the federal government," writes Professor Ezra Suleiman in *Dismantling Democratic States*, just published by Princeton University Press.

Source: "Dissing Government," Jim Hoagland, Nov. 30, 2003, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A20245-2003Nov28.html>

As of November 2002, Bush announced plans to allow the private sector to compete for nearly half the nation's 1.8 million federal civilian jobs, a move that enraged labor unions and their Democratic allies in Congress.

"This proposal means that the safety of our communities could be entrusted to the administration's favorite companies and their lobbyists, instead of to dedicated, trained federal workers. Now we see the real White House agenda — it's not homeland security; it's union-busting," said Sen. Edward Kennedy (D-MA), the senior Democrat on the Labor and Human Resources Committee.

Source: "Bush plans to privatize jobs," Edwin Chen, *Los Angeles Times*, Fri., Nov. 15, 2002, <http://www.dfw.com/mld/dfw/news/4526019.htm>

16) What is President Bush's attitude toward the well-being of our servicemen and women?

"For example, last week the *Army Times* ran a story with the headline "An Act of 'Betrayal'" and the subtitle "In the midst of war, key family benefits face cuts." The article went on to assert that there has been "a string of actions by the Bush administration to cut or hold down growth in pay and benefits, including basic pay, combat pay, health-care benefits, and the death gratuity paid to survivors of troops who die on active duty.

"It's hard to deny the stunning insensitivity of Bush's remarks back on July 2: 'There are some who feel like that, you know, the conditions are such that they can attack us there. My answer is bring 'em on. We got the force necessary to deal with the security situation.'"

Source: "Spurned soldiers of the U.S.," Paul Krugman, *New York Times*, Nov. 15, 2003, <http://www.dfw.com/mld/dfw/news/opinion/7270187.htm>

A Democratic presidential candidate assailed Bush for having announced that "he was going to cut the combat pay" for soldiers in Iraq and Afghanistan and for having "cut 164,000 veterans off" from health care benefits.

As a Pentagon spokeswoman noted, Bush signed a bill last week that boosts monthly combat pay from \$150 to \$225, along with family separation benefits.

But the *San Francisco Chronicle* reported that the administration changed its stance only after publicity about its position last summer.

Source: "Dean Assails Bush on Defense: Rival Cites Combat Pay, Veterans' Health Benefits," Howard Kurtz, *Washington Post* staff writer, Dec. 1, 2003, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A23741-2003Nov30.html>

17) What is the trend in health care costs for American workers?

One survey found that the average health benefit cost per employee rose 10.1% this year and increased 14.7% in

2002, according to a new study by Mercer Human Resource Consulting.

Companies lowered their costs, the survey found, by shifting more of the burden to workers.

Sources: "Texas HMOs keep profitable streak going," Darrin Schlegel, *Houston Chronicle*, Dec. 10, 2003, <http://www.chron.com/cs/CDA/ssistory.mpl/business/2283563>

"City workers must pay more for health plan," Dec. 7, 2003, <http://www.coloradoan.com/news/stories/20031207/opinion/782054.html>

The Economy

1) What percentage of the latest Bush tax cut will go to the wealthiest Americans?

Estimated tax savings over the next four years:

36.3% will go to the wealthiest 1% (income of at least \$337,000; average income \$938,000)

53.3% will go to the wealthiest 5% (income of at least \$145,000; average income \$210,000)

7.8% will go to the bottom 60% of taxpayers (income of \$0 to \$45,000)

0.3% will go to the poorest 20% of taxpayers (income of \$0 to \$16,000)

Source: Citizens for Tax Justice, "Final Tax Plan Tilts Even More Toward Richest – House-Senate Agreement Scales Back Middle Income Relief" (Institute on Tax and Economic Tax Policy, Tax Model – May 22, 2003), <http://www.ctj.org/bushlist.htm>

2) What is the national debt now (as of March 18, 2004)?

\$7.11 trillion, an increase of 25% since the Bush administration took office.

Source: Bureau of the Public Debt – Department of the Treasury, <http://www.publicdebt.treas.gov>

3) What does each American owe on our national debt of 7.11 trillion as reported by David Walker, the comptroller general of the United States in his op-ed piece in the New York Times?

Roughly \$24,000 for every man, woman and child in the country.

Source: Fiscal future somewhat frightening, Walter Cronkite, *Seattle Post Intelligencer*, Friday, March 5, 2004, http://seattlepi.nwsource.com/opinion/163282_cronkite05.html

4) What is the projected deficit which Bush's budget will produce over the next decade according to the Congressional Budget Office?

\$2.75 trillion. The forecast is \$737 billion worse than expected.

Source CBO: Bush budget would mean \$2.75 trillion deficit - <http://www.cbo.gov>

The Associated Press, *The Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, 02/27/04

5) What was the budget deficit when this administration took office?

\$236.4 billion surplus in 2000.

Source: Congressional Budget Office, <http://www.cbo.gov/showdoc.cfm?index=1821&sequence=0#table1>

6) What is the budget deficit now (as of Nov. 7, 2003)?

\$374 billion deficit in 2003.

Source: Congressional Budget Office – Monthly Budget Review – Nov. 7, 2003, <http://www.cbo.gov/showdoc.cfm?index=4718&sequence=0>

7) At what rate has government spending been increasing since Bush has been in office?

An average of 12% per year.

Source: Congressional Budget Office – Monthly Budget Review – Nov. 7, 2003, <http://www.cbo.gov/showdoc.cfm?index=4718&sequence=0>

8) At what rate was government spending increasing over the previous decade?

An average of 4% per year.

Source: Congressional Budget Office – Monthly Budget Review – Nov. 7, 2003, <http://www.cbo.gov/showdoc.cfm?index=4718&sequence=0>

9) Open: Do you think it is conservative to give tax cuts and drive up budget deficits?

10) How much is it costing per month to run the war with Iraq and Afghanistan?

\$5.4 billion (\$4.4 billion in Iraq, \$1 billion in Afghanistan).

Source: “Disparity in Iraq, Afghanistan War Costs Scrutinized,” Bradley Graham, *Washington Post* staff writer, Tues., Nov. 11, 2003, p. A13, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A23970-2003Nov10.html>

11) Over the past 40 years, how has the balance between individual and corporate taxes shifted?

Currently corporations are paying less than half the percentage of federal tax they were paying in 1962. In 1962 individuals paid 69% and corporations paid 31%. (Individuals paid \$45.6 billion, corporations paid \$20.5 billion.) In 2003 individuals paid 86% and corporations paid 14%. (Individuals paid \$794 billion, corporations paid \$132 billion.)

Source: Congressional Budget Office – historical data, Congressional Budget Office – Monthly Budget Review – Nov. 7, 2003, <http://www.cbo.gov/>

12) What was the national debt before the Bush administration took office?

\$5.67 trillion in 2000.

Source: Bureau of the Public Debt – Department of the Treasury, <http://www.publicdebt.treas.gov>

13) How has the trade deficit changed since the Bush administration took office?

It has increased 32% (from \$105 billion in January 2001 to \$138.7 billion on 11/7/03).

Source: Bureau of Economic Analysis, <http://www.economicindicators.gov/>

Health Care

1) What is the corrected cost of the Medicare bill which Bush signed in December 2003?

President Bush last year signed a Medicare prescription drug benefit with an estimated price tag of \$395 billion. A month later, the White House said the actual cost was more like \$534 billion.

Source: Bush Team's Fuzzy Math, Jarrett Murphy, CBS News, Feb. 24, 2004 <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2004/02/24/politics/main601960.shtml>

2) What was the average cost for each American to have health care during 2002?

About \$5,440. For 2001, this country spent 47% more per person than Switzerland, the second biggest spender per capita. Health care spending in the US surged to \$1.6 trillion in 2002 and outpaced growth in the rest of the economy.

Source: “U.S. Health Care Spending Surges Again,” Mark Sherman, Associated Press, *Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, Jan. 8, 2004, http://www.ajc.com/health/content/shared/health/ap/ap_story.html/Health/AP.V0341.AP-Health-Care-Spe.html

3) How many adults are estimated to die each year in the US because they don't have health insurance?

18,000. The Institute of Medicine, an independent, nonprofit group that advises Congress and the federal government on health matters, said taxpayers are paying for 43 million uninsured Americans anyway — and footing a much bigger bill than they would if those people had decent health care.

Source: "U.S. Advisers Call for Universal Health Care," Maggie Fox, Reuters, *Wired News*, Jan. 14, 2004, http://wireservice.wired.com/wired/story.asp?section=Breaking&storyId=813915&tw=wn_wire_story

4) How many Americans were uninsured for a month or more in either 2001 or 2002?

72 million, or 30% of all Americans under the age of 65.

Source: http://www.fightforthefuture.org/bushrecord/bush_healthcare.cfm

5) How many people in the United States had no health coverage for the entire year of 2002?

43.6 million, or 15.2% of the US population. This figure has seen a 9% increase over the past two years.

Source: US Census document "Health Insurance Coverage in the United States: 2002," <http://www.census.gov/hhes/hlthins/hlthin02/hi02t1.pdf>

6) What percentage of adults, ages 18-64, lacked health coverage for the entire year of 2002?

19.5%, up from 17.8% in 2000.

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau documents "People Without Health Insurance for the Entire Year by Selected Characteristics: 2001 and 2002" and "People Without Health Insurance for the Entire Year by Selected Characteristics: 2000 and 2001," <http://www.census.gov/hhes/hlthins/hlthin02/hi02t1.pdf> and <http://www.census.gov/hhes/hlthins/hlthin01/hi01t1.html>

7) Patented drugs cost how much more in the US than in Canada?

1.69 times as much, on average, to more than 3 times as much for some drugs.

Source: "Drug Pricing: A Comparison between Canada and Other Countries," published by Canada's Patented Medicine Prices Review Board, <http://www.pmprb-cepmb.gc.ca/CMFiles/sp02-irpp-e14NLB-482003-8592.pdf> (see page 9).

Specific examples, expressed in US dollars:

Mirapex (for Parkinson's) — costs \$157 in Canada and \$263 in the US (168%).

Seroquel (for insomnia) — costs \$33 in Canada and \$124 in the US (376%).

Source: ABC World News Tonight with Peter Jennings, "Health, Critical Condition," Wed. 22-Oct-2003.

8) Currently Medicare is prevented from negotiating for better prices on drugs with the US pharmaceutical industry, while neighboring Canada and Mexico *can* negotiate prices. Do you think Medicare should be able to negotiate with pharmaceutical companies for better pricing?

Section 1860D-11(i)(2) of the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003 prevents this type of negotiating with the pharmaceutical industry, thus protecting the industry's profits.

Ref.: Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003 (Enrolled as Agreed to or Passed by Both House and Senate)[H.R.1.ENR], <http://thomas.loc.gov>

9) Why do Americans pay so much more for prescriptions than citizens of other industrialized countries do?

The US is the only industrialized country without price controls on drugs. Canada, for example, has a Medical Prices Review Board which controls prices for citizens as follows:

- Existing drugs prices may rise no faster than inflation.
- New drugs may not cost more than similar drugs for the same illness.
- A breakthrough drug may not cost more than its median price among other countries.

Source: ABC World News Tonight with Peter Jennings, "Health, Critical Condition," Wed. 22-Oct-2003.

10) Have price controls in Canada limited Canadians' access to drugs?

No, there are only 6 drugs and 3 contraceptives sold in the US that are not sold in Canada.

Source: ABC World News Tonight with Peter Jennings, "Health, Critical Condition," Wed. 22-Oct-2003.

11) How much more do Americans pay for health care per person than do the citizens of the next highest

spending nation?

For 2001, this country spent 47 percent more per person than Switzerland, the second biggest spender per capita, according to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. In 2002, health care spending in the United States surged to \$1.6 trillion — about \$5,440 for every American — and outpaced growth in the rest of the economy for a fourth straight year.

Source: “U.S. Health Care Spending Surges Again,” Mark Sherman, Associated Press writer, Jan. 8, 2004, http://abcnews.go.com/wire/Living/ap20040108_1578.html

12) How many administrators are there in the US health care industry compared to the number of doctors and nurses?

In 2001 administrators outnumbered doctors and nurses combined by 300,000.

Source: ABC World News Tonight with Peter Jennings, “Health, Critical Condition,” Tues. 21-Oct-2003.

13) What’s the Bush Administration’s policy on limiting world population?

They withdrew \$34 million to the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) in July 2002.

Source: The United Nations Population Fund, “Statement on U.S. Funding Decision,” 22 July 2002, <http://www.unfpa.org/news/news.cfm?ID=146&Language=1>

14) What happens when funding to the UN Population Fund (UNFPA) gets cut?

UNFPA officials estimated that the loss (in July 2002) of the United States contribution of \$34 million, representing fully 13% of UNFPA’s budget, could result in 2 million additional unwanted pregnancies, 4700 maternal deaths, 60,000 cases of serious maternal injury and illness, 77,000 infant deaths, and 800,000 abortions.

Sources: The Library of Congress, House Resolution 1196 in the year 2003, <http://thomas.loc.gov/> [type HR1196 in “Bill Number” field]

United Nations Population Fund, <http://www.unfpa.org/news/news.cfm?ID=146&Language=1>

15) What did Republican William Milliken, the longest-serving governor of Michigan, have to say about this Bush administration policy in August 2003?

“The right wing is seeking to impose an entire set of doctrinaire beliefs that will sharply restrict health care for women and, as a result, actually increase the number of abortions worldwide.

“We know that the lack of access to basic family planning services and information undermines a woman’s ability to determine her own destiny. It also increases illness and mortality rates of women and their children, and inhibits the ability of families to climb out of poverty.

“The GOP is allowing itself to become identified with an agenda on family planning that threatens to reverse the decades of progress in empowering women in the United States and abroad.”

Source: *Detroit Free Press*, Aug. 10, 2003, http://www.freep.com/voices/columnists/emil10_20030810.htm

Civil Liberties

1) What is the USA PATRIOT Act?

Delivered to Congress two days after 9/11/2001 and passed in October 2001, it expands the federal government’s powers to gather information about both US citizens and non-citizens, removing privacy protections and without accountability. It is Public Law #107-56.

The Patriot Act expanded many federal surveillance capacities, including allowing:

- FBI to investigate American citizens without probable cause for “intelligence purposes”
- Secret searches of private property without notice to the owner, including phone and internet surveillance (Section 213, 214)
- Records searches: Access to highly personal medical, financial, mental health, religious, charitable,

library, and student records with minimal judicial oversight (Section 215)

- Collection of *foreign* intelligence information to searching information on US citizens (Section 218)
- Wiretapping and surveillance of political organizations
- Non-citizens may be jailed based on suspicion and be denied readmission to the US for engaging in free speech
- Suspects convicted of no crime may be detained indefinitely in 6-month increments without meaningful judicial review.

Sources: <http://www.aclu.org/SafeandFree/SafeandFree.cfm?ID=12263&c=206>

http://www.fcni.org/issues/item.php?item_id=238&issue_id=68

http://www.fcni.org/issues/item.php?item_id=243&issue_id=68

<http://www.aclu.org/SafeandFree/SafeandFree.cfm?ID=13246&c=206#FileAttach>

Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman Patrick Leahy (D-VT), “Leahy ‘Deeply Troubled’ About Monitoring Of Conversations Between Detainees And Their Attorneys; Asks Answers From Attorney General Ashcroft,” Nov. 9, 2001, as reported at http://www.truthout.org/docs_01/11.11A.L2A.htm

2) What amendments to the US Constitution are threatened by the USA Patriot Act?

- First Amendment — freedom of religion, speech, assembly and the press.
- Fourth Amendment — freedom from unreasonable searches and seizures.
- Fifth Amendment — No person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law.
- Sixth Amendment — Right to a speedy public trial by an impartial jury, right to be informed of the facts of the accusation, right to confront witnesses and have the assistance of counsel.
- Eighth Amendment — No excessive bail or cruel and unusual punishment shall be imposed.
- Fourteenth Amendment — All persons (citizens and non-citizens) within the US are entitled to due process and the equal protection of the laws.

Source: “Summary of the USA Patriot Act,” ACLU, <http://www.aclu.org/SafeandFree/SafeandFree.cfm?ID=11813&c=207#FileAttach>

3) How many communities have passed resolutions opposing the Patriot Act, and why?

As of December 2003, an overwhelming 200 cities and counties, along with 3 states (Alaska, Hawaii, and Vermont), have passed resolutions opposing the Patriot Act. There is not another example of so many cities, counties, and states coming out with resolutions against any other similar act.

Public officials have voted for the resolutions against the Patriot Act for many reasons, including:

- Concerns about detaining and questioning immigrants who are not suspected of a crime;
- Doubts about the effectiveness of the Patriot Act against terrorism;
- Desire to protect constitutionally protected free speech and dissent;
- Worries about the intrusion of the FBI into local policing;
- Memories of the McCarthy era and other repressive periods of US history.

Sources: Bill of Rights Defense Committee, <http://www.bordc.org/Successes.htm>

“Patriot Revolution? Cities From Cambridge to Berkeley Reject Anti-Terror Measure,” Dean Schabner, ABC News, July 1, 2003, <http://abcnews.go.com/sections/us/DailyNews/usapatriot020701.html>

“Forward Thinking: Cantabrigians Stand up for Civil Rights,” Kristen Lombardi, *Boston Phoenix*, July 1, 2002, <http://www.bostonphoenix.com/boston/news%5Ffeatures/this%5Fjust%5Fin/documents/02288873.htm>

4) Open: The Department of Justice, under Attorney General John Ashcroft, introduced the Patriot Act

into Congress on September 13, 2001 — a mere two days after 9/11. Since it obviously could not have been written in the day between the terrorist attacks of September 11 and the day it was put before Congress, when do you think this act was written?

Sources: For the complete text of the Patriot Act, see <http://www.aclu.org/Files/OpenFile.cfm?id=12250>

For a legal analysis, see <http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/10091.pdf>, especially page 5.

See also: <http://www.aclu.org/Files/OpenFile.cfm?id=11812> <http://www.epic.org/privacy/terrorism/hr3162.html>
<http://www.epic.org/privacy/terrorism/usapatriot/>

5) Was the Patriot Act subject to debate in Congress?

No. With the name “USA Patriot Act” it was overwhelmingly passed into law in both the Senate (98-1) and the House of Representatives (356-66) on Oct. 26, 2001, after the Republican-controlled House and Senate had *no* discussion of its merits and problems. Many members of Congress admitted they had not even completely read the legislation before voting for it.

Source: <http://www.aclu.org/SafeandFree/SafeandFree.cfm?ID=12263&c=206>

6) What’s the major change in the way the US government can investigate US citizens?

Without probable cause, the Patriot Act allows FBI agents, under the claim of “intelligence purposes” to investigate US citizens for crimes. This is a major departure from civil liberties protection. Under Section 215 of the Patriot Act, the FBI can now demand:

- Personal belongings, such as books or computers, and searching other private property without notice to the owner;
- A list of persons who visited a website;
- Membership lists of organizations and houses of worship;
- Lists of people who subscribe to a magazine or have borrowed a particular book from the library.

The law also prohibits the holders of the information, like librarians, under risk of going to jail, from ever telling patrons that they have disclosed their records. Judicial oversight of these new powers is essentially non-existent. The government must only certify to a judge — with no need for evidence or proof — that such a search meets the statute’s broad criteria, and the judge does not even have the authority to reject the application.

Sources: http://www.fcni.org/issues/item.php?item_id=344&issue_id=68

<http://www.aclu.org/SafeandFree/SafeandFree.cfm?ID=13246&c=206>

7) What are some of the effects of the Patriot Act?

The Patriot Act has emboldened Attorney General John Ashcroft to direct the FBI to perform surveillance on, and take photographs of, US citizens participating in legal, peaceful protest and in nonviolent protest training programs.

There is no judicial oversight for authorizations for investigation called “National Security Letters,” which allow the FBI to access information about citizens under the Patriot Act. This lack of judicial oversight is in violation of our former rights and protections under the US Constitution. Also, this information on citizens picked up by the FBI can now be shared with the CIA, without judicial oversight.

Sources: “A Guide to the Patriot Act, Part 1: Should you be scared of the Patriot Act?” Dahlia Lithwick and Julia Turner, Sept. 8, 2003, <http://slate.msn.com/id/2087984/>

“Trash Patriot Act and start over from scratch,” Susan Ives, *San Antonio Express-News*, Dec. 6, 2003, <http://news.mysanantonio.com/story.cfm?xla=saen&xlb=1090&xlc=1094813&xld=1090>

http://www.aclu.org/patriot_foia/

<http://www.aclu.org/SafeandFree/SafeandFree.cfm?ID=12302>

http://www.fcni.org/issues/item.php?item_id=238&issue_id=68

For a proposed bi-partisan Congressional response to the effects of the Patriot Act, see “Protecting Rights of

Individuals Act (PRIA)”: S 1552, Sen. Murkowski (R-AK) and Sen. Wyden (D-OR), fall 2003.

8) How has this act affected Muslim Americans?

Because the FBI is able to gain membership lists more easily, membership in and donations to mosques in some areas have sharply decreased. The ACLU has initiated a lawsuit, *Muslim Community Association of Ann Arbor et al. v. John Ashcroft*, filed in US District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, to address this chilling effect of the Patriot Act.

Source: “Patriot Act Fears Are Stifling Free Speech,” Nov. 3, 2003,
<http://www.aclu.org/SafeandFree/SafeandFree.cfm?ID=14307&c=262>

9) How have immigrants’ rights been affected by this new “anti-terrorism” legislation and social climate?

Approximately 13,000 men from predominantly Islamic nations have been the deported without cause. In most cases, it was apparent that the INS had arrested men who were simply waiting for approval of their green card applications, or those with minor visa problems. During the process in 2002, thousands of boys and men from 25 Arab and Muslim countries were ordered to report to the INS in a Special Registration program (NSEERS). Many INS abuses occurred, including the separating of minors from their parents, ill-treatment of sick and elderly immigrants, and immigrants’ exposure to cold in long, outdoor lines. Some immigrants were flown to various INS holding centers far from their homes.

Update: In the first week of December 2003, the US government abruptly cancelled the second round of “Special Registration” without explanation.

Source: “Administrative Detentions And Right To Due Process,” Statement by Sen. Bingaman, July 14, 2003,
http://www.fcnl.org/issues/item.php?item_id=515&issue_id=70 and Congressional Record: July 14, 2003 (Senate), pp. S9321-S9323.

10) Without due legal process, how many people have been imprisoned and interrogated by the US military in Guantanamo Bay, a US naval base in Cuba?

663,660 men and three minors (boys between the ages of 13 and 16) from 43 countries, suspected by the government to have connections with Al-Qaeda, have been detained at Guantanamo Bay under the control of the Department of Defense. They have had no legal representation or contact with family members. None has yet been charged with a violation of law, nor had access to habeas corpus to determine if detention is justified. The US government has categorized them as “enemy combatants,” a label with no legal definition under the Geneva Conventions. The International Red Cross has called their conditions of detention “inhumane.” Over two dozen prisoners have made 32 unsuccessful suicide attempts. If the detainees are tried, the attorneys for both prosecution and *defense*, and the judges, would be members of the US military. If found guilty of certain crimes, their appeal would go through the Pentagon to President Bush, not to a court of law, and *they probably would be executed*.

Sources: http://www.fcnl.org/issues/item.php?item_id=625&issue_id=70

http://www.fcnl.org/civil_liberties/guantanamo.htm

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/11/20011113-27.html>

David Cole, *Enemy Aliens: Double Standards and Constitutional Freedoms in the War on Terrorism*, 2003, p. 42.

“Suicide Attempts at Guantanamo Reach 32,” Associated Press, Aug. 26, 2003.

11) How many times has the Freedom of Information Act been denied, and what order has been put in place to deny access to former presidents’ records?

In more than 300 separate instances, federal, state, and local officials have restricted access to government records by executive order or proposed new laws to sharply curtail their availability, according to the National Conference of State Legislatures.

In addition, President Bush signed Executive Order 13233, sharply restricting public access to the papers of former presidents. The Bush order overrides the post-Watergate 1978 Presidential Records Act, guaranteeing

that a president's papers must be made available to the public 12 years after he leaves office. Now George W. Bush can personally decide when the White House documents of his father and of Ronald Reagan will be made public. This executive order has provoked not only widespread, bipartisan outrage, but also remedial legislation and broadly supported litigation to block its implementation.

Source: "Freedom of Information Under Attack," Charles Lewis, The Center for Public Integrity, Sept. 22, 2003, <http://foi.missouri.edu/federalfoia/foiaattack.html>

12) What were some of the voting issues facing African American voters in Florida in 2000?

The Civil Rights Commission report found that black voters were nine times more likely than white voters to have their ballots rejected during the counting process. Faulty voting systems were more likely to be used in areas with higher percentages of minority voters, but even in counties where the voting systems were the same, black voters still had a higher rejection rate than white voters, the report said.

The commission's report found that voter disenfranchisement was "widespread" and that state and county officials, including Bush and Secretary of State Katherine Harris, "failed to fulfill their duties in a manner that would prevent this disenfranchisement."

The report said "countless unknown eligible voters" were wrongfully turned away from the polls or purged from voter registration lists because of procedures and practices used by election officials.

Source: "Civil rights commission approves report assailing Florida vote," CNN, June 8, 2001, <http://www.cnn.com/2001/ALLPOLITICS/06/08/florida.vote/>

Five months before the election, Florida Secretary of State Katherine Harris ordered the removal of 57,700 names from Florida's voter rolls on grounds that they were felons. Voter rolls contain the names of all eligible, registered voters. 90.2% of the people were completely innocent of any crime — except for being African American. We didn't have to guess about that, because next to each voter's name was their race.

Source: Greg Palast, *The Best Democracy Money Can Buy*, A Plume Book, Penguin Putnam, 2002, 2003, <http://www.gregpalast.com/detail.cfm?artid=217&row=2>

War and International Affairs

War Costs, Deaths, and Injuries

1) Open: Do you feel safer now than you did before we went to war with Iraq?

2) How much is it costing to run the war with Iraq and Afghanistan per month?

\$5.4 billion (\$4.4 billion in Iraq, \$1 billion in Afghanistan) per month.

Source: "Disparity in Iraq: Afghanistan War Costs Scrutinized," Bradley Graham, *Washington Post* staff writer, Nov. 11, 2003, p. A13, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A23970-2003Nov10.html>

3) How many US military deaths and injuries in the war and occupation of Iraq?

Death, injury, and illness have claimed 10,000 US victims in Iraq.

Source: "Death, injury, illness toll at 10,000 for U.S. in Iraq," Roger Roy, *Orlando Sentinel*, Nov. 29, 2003, http://seattletimes.nwsourc.com/html/nationworld/2001803475_senthome290.html

578 US service members have died.

Source: [US deaths in Iraq](#), Cleveland Plain Dealer, 03/23/04, <http://www.cleveland.com/news/plaindealer/index.ssf?/base/news/108004297563460.xml>

4) What are the total estimated deaths of Iraqi civilians?

The Medact report, *Continuing Collateral Damage*, estimates that 22,000 to 55,000 people on all sides, including those in the military, have died in the war and its aftermath.

Source: "Iraqi's 'Health Will Suffer for Generations'," James Meikle, Guardian Newspapers Limited, 2003, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/Iraq/Story/0,2763,1083106,00.html>

5) How many US military deaths in the war and occupation of Afghanistan?

97 US soldiers have died in Afghanistan.

Source: "US deaths in Afghanistan," *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, Nov. 27, 2003,
<http://www.cleveland.com/news/plaindealer/index.ssf?/base/news/1069936256100340.xml>

6) What are the total estimated deaths of Afghanistan civilians?

3,800 civilian deaths in Afghanistan as of December 2001.

Source: "Afghanistan's Civilian Deaths Mount," BBC News, Jan. 3, 2002,
http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/south_asia/1740538.stm

7) How much has the war in Iraq cost taxpayers so far?

The total spending allocated to Iraq is \$141 billion.

Source: "The Cost of War for States and Selected Cities," National Priorities,
<http://www.nationalpriorities.org/Issues/Military/Iraq/CostOfWar.html>

8) Do you know what depleted uranium is and what the main health and environmental effects of depleted uranium are?

Depleted uranium (DU), the byproduct of enriching uranium for nuclear weapons or reactors, is used in armor-piercing shells and becomes deadly immediately after hitting a solid object. Once detonated, DU bursts into a burning spray of radioactive dust, spreading as far as 26 miles from its point of impact. With such a wide range of radiation, DU has disastrous consequences for the nearby land, water supply, civilian population, and affected soldiers.

Described as a "serious health threat" by the US Defense Nuclear Agency, DU is a particularly lethal toxin because it poses the double risk of chemical and radioactive poisoning. Former US army colonel Doug Rokke, who served in the Gulf War to advise on radioactive clean up, says almost every person in his 30-member team is now seriously ill because of DU, and three have died of lung cancer. Yet DU poisoning doesn't stop there. In one military unit, 67% of children born to US Gulf veterans had severe illnesses or birth defects. And one Canadian study of a DU-affected site in Basra, Iraq showed cancer rates increase at seven times the normal amount after uranium weapons were used.

Sources: "Q&A: Depleted uranium weapons," Alex Kirby, BBC Environment Correspondent, BBC News, World Edition, Jan. 4, 2001, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/1101447.stm>

"Forum: Ask Alex Kirby," BBC News, Jan. 9, 2001, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/talking_point/forum/1106746.stm

9) According to Nuclear Posture Review, leaked to the press in January 2002, the US has targeted what countries for nuclear attack on hair trigger alert?

North Korea, Iraq, Iran, Syria, Libya, Russia and China.

Sources: Nuclear Posture Review, <http://www.globalsecurity.org/wmd/library/policy/dod/npr.htm>

Los Angeles Times article at www.latimes.com/news/opinion/la-op-arkinmar10.story

Iraq

1) Did the CIA claim that Iraq was an "imminent threat"?

No. In his first public defense of prewar intelligence, CIA Director George Tenet said that U.S. analysts had never claimed Iraq was an imminent threat, the main argument used by President Bush for going to war.

Source: CIA Boss: Iraq Not Called Imminent Threat, CIA Director Defends Intelligence Community, Says Analysts Never Called Iraq an Imminent Threat, *The Associated Press*, Feb. 5, 2004,
http://abcnews.go.com/wire/Politics/ap20040205_918.html

2) After concluding that Iraq had no Weapons of Mass Destruction, what advice did Kay give to

President Bush?

Since resigning last month, Kay has said repeatedly that U.S. intelligence was wrong in claiming that Saddam had stockpiles of chemical and biological weapons and advanced nuclear weapons programs. Those programs were the main justification for the Iraq war. Former U.S. weapons inspector David Kay is advising President Bush to acknowledge he was wrong about hidden storehouses of weapons in Iraq and move ahead with overhauling the intelligence process.

Source: Kay: Bush Should Admit Error on Iraq WMD: Ex-WMD Inspector David Kay Advises Bush to Admit He Was Wrong About Weapons in Iraq, The Associated Press, Feb 13, 2004, http://abcnews.go.com/wire/Politics/ap20040213_696.html

Bush, Aides Ignored CIA Caveats on Iraq, Washington Post - Feb 6, 2004, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn?pagename=article&node=&contentId=A20194-2004Feb6¬Found=true>

3) What other reports confirmed Kay's findings?

A report from UN weapons inspectors to be released this week says they now believe there were no weapons of mass destruction of any significance in Iraq after 1994. The report, which will be presented to the UN Security Council Friday, is the first outside study that confirms the statements Kay made in January to the US Senate. At that time, Kay told a Senate committee that he believed there were no WMD in Iraq.

Source: Kay calls on Bush to 'come clean' about WMD, Christian Science Monitor, March 4, 2003, <http://www.csmonitor.com/2004/0304/dailyUpdate.html?s=entt>

4) Did Bush order the Pentagon to explore an invasion of Iraq prior to September 11, 2001?

“President Bush ordered the Pentagon to explore the possibility of a ground invasion of Iraq well before the United States was attacked on Sept. 11, 2001” an official told ABCNEWS, confirming the account former Treasury Secretary Paul O’Neill gives in a book written by former Wall Street Journal reporter Ron Suskind. The official, who asked not to be identified, was present in the same National Security Council meetings as O’Neill immediately after Bush’s inauguration in January and February of 2001. O’Neill says that from the very start of his administration, Bush was focused on ousting Saddam.

Source: “Corroborating O’Neill’s Account: Official Confirms Claims That Saddam Was Bush’s Focus Before 9/11,” John Cochran, ABC News, Jan. 13, 2004, http://abcnews.go.com/sections/wnt/US/oneill_charges_040113.html

5) What specific evidence came from former Treasury Secretary O’Neill and others concerning Bush’s plans to take over Iraq prior to 9/11/01?

A Pentagon document dated March 5, 2001, “Foreign Suitors for Iraqi Oilfield Contracts,” includes a map of potential areas for exploration and outlines contractors around the world from 30–40 countries.

An earlier document marked Secret (January 2001), “Plan for post-Saddam Iraq,” envisioned peacekeeping troops, war crimes tribunals, and even divvying up Iraq’s oil wealth.

Source: “Bush Sought ‘Way’ To Invade Iraq?” 60 Minutes, CBS News, Jan. 11, 2004, <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2004/01/09/60minutes/main592330.shtml>

6) The administration claimed that Iraq was a threat to our security while countries neighboring Iraq were not threatened. Have any nuclear, biological, or chemical weapons been found in Iraq as of 10/3/03? No such weapons were found according to the UN weapons inspectors, the CIA-led Iraq Survey Group (ISG), and the Pentagon’s own Defense Intelligence Agency.

Sources: “Search in Iraq Finds No Banned Weapons,” Dana Priest and Walter Pincus, *Washington Post* staff writers, Fri., Oct. 3, 2003, p. A01, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn/A35638-2003Oct2?language=printer>

“2002 Report Found No Iraqi Arsenal,” Bryan Bender, *Boston Globe* article, reprinted in the *San Francisco Chronicle*, Sat., June 7, 2003, p. A-1, <http://sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?file=/chronicle/archive/2003/06/07/MN208710.DTL>

7) During the 1980s who sold weapons to Iraq — and what kind? What kind of assistance did the US

provide and who was a special envoy to the Iraqi regime?

US, British, and German companies sold deadly weapons to the Iraqi regime. Even with well-known reports of Hussein's malicious use of weapons against his own people, the Reagan and Bush Administrations both authorized the sale of lethal weaponry to Iraq, including poisonous chemicals and deadly biological viruses, such as anthrax and bubonic plague. The Pentagon has since identified these strains of anthrax as a central element of the Iraqi biological warfare program.

US assistance to Iraq in the war against Iran also included the supply of cluster bombs through a Chilean front company. Donald Rumsfeld, then a special presidential envoy, helped to secure this "special relationship" at a time when Iraq was using chemical weapons on an almost daily basis. The Commerce Department also facilitated the export of insecticides to Iraq, despite growing evidence that they were "highly toxic" to humans and could be used for chemical warfare — a direct contravention to the Geneva Protocols of 1925. It should come as no surprise, then, that the same American-mandated UN weapons inspectors found USA brands on many of Iraq's chemical and missile components after the Gulf War.

Source: "U.S. Had Key Role in Iraq Buildup," Michael Dobbs, *Washington Post* staff writer, Dec. 30, 2002, p. A01, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn/A52241-2002Dec29?language=printer>

8) The administration claimed there was a connection between Al-Qaeda and Iraq. What is or was the connection?

To date, the administration has not come forward with any evidence of a close relationship between Iraq and Al-Qaeda.

Discrediting the significance of a leaked Pentagon memo purporting a connection, one former senior intelligence official likened the memo to a series of "data points . . . among the millions of holdings of the intelligence agencies, many of which are simply not thought likely to be true." The Pentagon followed suit, issuing its final word on the memo soon after the leak had been released to the press. "News reports that the Defense Department recently confirmed new information with respect to contacts between al Qaeda and Iraq . . . are inaccurate." The Pentagon also said the memo "was not an analysis of the substantive issue of the relationship between Iraq and al Qaeda and drew no conclusions."

Source: "CIA Seeks Probe of Iraq-Al Qaeda Memo Leak," Walter Pincus, *Washington Post* staff writer, Nov. 18, 2003, p. A18, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn?pagename=article&node=&contentId=A54452-2003Nov17¬Found=true>

9) Colin Powell made a case before the UN to go to war with Iraq. From what sources was Colin Powell's report plagiarized, and how old were these sources?

Colin Powell's speech before the UN Security Council cited a 19-page British dossier that was plagiarized, in large part, from an academic paper on Iraq based on the 1991 Gulf War. Glen Rangwala, a lecturer in politics at Cambridge University, affirmed that pages 6-16 of the dossier were copied almost verbatim from the 12-year-old paper by Ibrahim al-Marashi. The other two plagiarized sources, which constituted a further 6 pages of the dossier, came from the commercial publication *Jane's Intelligence Review*, dated 1997 and 2002.

Sources: "Britain's Intelligence Crisis," *Jane's Intelligence Digest*, Feb. 14, 2003, http://www.janes.com/security/international_security/news/jid/jid030214_1_1_n.shtml

"UK accused of lifting dossier text," CNN, Feb. 7, 2003, <http://www.cnn.com/2003/WORLD/meast/02/07/sprj.iq.uk.dossier/>

10) Open: Do you approve of unilateral military action by the US or do you think we should cooperate with other nations to work out non-military solutions to our international problems?

11) Were the administration's claims that Saddam Hussein was working on buying nuclear materials from Africa based on facts?

No. According to the International Atomic Energy Agency, the claims that Iraq had attempted to buy 500 tons of uranium, known as "yellow cake," from Niger were based on crude forgeries and falsified documents.

Source: "Who Lied To Whom?" Seymour M. Hersh, *The New Yorker*, March 31, 2003,

12) Open: President Bush in the State of Union address reported that Iraq was buying nuclear grade materials from the African nation of Niger despite a report to the contrary by the CIA and former Ambassador Wilson. When Wilson's report became public, the White House retaliated by outing his undercover CIA agent wife in the national press, putting her and all her contacts in the area of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) at grave risk. How do you feel about this behavior on the part of this administration toward agents who risk their lives on a daily basis for the sake of our country?

Source: "Open Warfare: Bush vs. the Intelligence Community," Ivan Eland, Senior Fellow and Director of the Center on Peace & Liberty, The Independent Institute, Sept. 30, 2003, <http://www.independent.org/tii/news/030930Eland.html>

13) How many tons of depleted uranium have we used and left in Iraq, violating the Geneva conventions? "The Pentagon and United Nations estimate that US and British forces used 1,100 to 2,200 tons of armor-piercing shells made of depleted uranium during attacks in Iraq in March and April — far more than the estimated 375 tons used in the 1991 Gulf War."

Source: "Use of depleted uranium weapons lingers as health concern," Larry Johnson, *Seattle Post-Intelligencer* Foreign Desk Editor, Aug. 4, 2003, http://seattlepi.nwsourc.com/national/133581_du04.html

US Foreign Policy

1) Is preemptive war legal?

Preemptive war violates Article 51 of the United Nations Charter (a treaty ratified by almost every nation in the world, including the US), which prohibits the use of force by one country against another except in two situations: where necessary for self-defense, or where approved by the UN Security Council.

The prohibition against aggressive war, like that against slavery and torture, is a fundamental international law. In clear violation of this fundamental law, the Bush Administration's radically new "preemptive strike" doctrine proclaims that the United States may use military force against any state it perceives to be hostile; any state which seeks to acquire biological, chemical or nuclear weapons; or any one that "aids" terrorism.

Source: "Bush's Illegal War," Elizabeth Haddix, http://www.nlg.org/news/articles/haddix_oped.htm

Preemptive force "is extremely dangerous and flat-out illegal," says Jordan Paust, professor of international law at the University of Houston. "Implying a right to take out a regime that threatens us — that is quite threatening to the international legal order."

Source: "As Attack on Iraq Begins, Question Remains: Is It Legal?" Peter Ford, March 21, 2003, <http://www.globalpolicy.org/security/issues/iraq/attack/law/2003/0321question.htm>

2) How many international security-related treaties has the Bush administration violated, refused to participate in, or withdrawn from?

At least nine. They include, but are not limited to, the following.

Violations:

- United Nations Charter — preemptive war; unauthorized invasion of Iraq; use of depleted uranium.
According to an August 2002 report by a UN subcommission, laws which are contravened by the use of depleted uranium shells include: the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; the Charter of the United Nations; the Genocide Convention; the Convention Against Torture; the four Geneva Conventions of 1949; the Conventional Weapons Convention of 1980; and the Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907, which expressly forbid employing "poison or poisoned weapons" and "arms, projectiles or materials calculated to cause unnecessary suffering." All these laws are designed to spare civilians from unwarranted suffering in armed conflicts.
- The Geneva and Hague Conventions — treatment of prisoners; use of depleted uranium.
- Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty — refusal to engage in verified and irreversible reduction and

elimination of nuclear forces; planning for maintenance and modernization of a large nuclear arsenal for the indefinite future (in violation of the obligation to negotiate nuclear disarmament in good faith).

Refused participation:

- Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty — does not support ratification.
- Verification Protocol on Biological Weapons — refused to support completion of negotiations on an agreement to verify compliance with the existing ban on biological weapons contained in the Biological Weapons Convention.
- Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court — in unprecedented action, notified the UN that the US would not ratify this treaty that was signed by President Clinton.
- Treaty Banning Antipersonnel Mines — has taken no action to move towards US participation in the ban on landmines as projected by the Clinton administration.

Withdrawn:

- Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty — withdrawal effective June 2002.

Sources: “U.S.: Geneva Conventions Apply to Guantanamo Detainees,” Human Rights Watch, New York, Jan. 11, 2002, <http://www.hrw.org/press/2002/01/us011102.htm>

“US Forces’ Use of Depleted Uranium Weapons is ‘Illegal,’” Neil Mackay, *Sunday Herald*, Scotland, March 30, 2003, <http://www.commondreams.org/headlines03/0330-02.htm>

Nicole Deller and John Burroughs, “Jus ad Bellum: Law Regulating Resort to Force,” Human Rights, winter 2002, <http://www.abanet.org/irr/hr/winter03/lawregulatingresorttoforce.html>

Rule of Power or Rule of Law? An Assessment of U.S. Policies and Actions Regarding Security-Related Treaties, Nicole Deller, Arjun Makhijani, John Burroughs, eds. (Apex Press, 2003).

“Arms Control Abandoned: The Case of Biological Weapons,” Nicole Deller and John Burroughs, *World Policy Journal*, summer 2003, <http://www.worldpolicy.org/journal/articles/wpj03-2/deller.html>

“A Call to Arms Control,” Jim Wurst, *Washington Times*, Nov. 12, 2001, <http://www.lcnp.org/disarmament/op-edinwash.htm>

Institute for Energy and Environmental Research and Lawyers’ Committee on Nuclear Policy Briefing Paper, “Multilateral Treaties Are Fundamental Tools for Protecting Global Security; United States Faces Choice of Bolstering These Regimes or Allowing Their Erosion,” <http://www.lcnp.org/pubs/RuleofLawbriefing.htm>

3) How much is the US military budget for 2004?

\$401.3 billion.

Source: “Bush Signs Defense Authorization Bill,” Fred Barbash, *Washington Post* staff writer, Nov. 24, 2003, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A9983-2003Nov24.html>

United States military spending is 6 times the next highest country’s spending.

“For 45 years of the Cold War we were in an arms race with the Soviet Union. Now it appears we’re in an arms race with ourselves.” — Admiral Eugene Carroll, Jr., US Navy (Ret.), Vice President Emeritus, Center for Defense Information.

Source: “Last of the Big Time Spenders: U.S. Military Budget Still the World’s Largest, and Growing,” Center for Defense Information, March 19, 2003, <http://216.239.57.104/search?q=cache:vBr0wbnreTQJ:www.cdi.org/budget/2004/world-military-spending.cfm+200+united+states+military+budget&hl=en&ie=UTF-8>

4) Open: How do you feel about the fact that we are spending more than all of the next 20 top-spending nations combined and 52% of the yearly discretionary budget goes to military expenses?

Source: See Federal Budget Pie Chart, <http://www.warresisters.org/piechart.htm>

5) Do you know how many nuclear weapons the US currently has stockpiled?

8,000 nuclear warheads.

Source: "Nuclear Posture Review Submitted to Congress on 31 December 2001,"
<http://www.globalsecurity.org/wmd/library/policy/dod/npr.htm>

6) Do you know how many tons of chemical weapons the United States currently has stockpiled?

In 1997, at the signing of the Chemical Weapons Convention, the United States admitted having about 31,000 tons of chemical weapons, including 3.3 million bombs, rockets, artillery shells and cartridges and 315,682 binary munitions, in which chemicals are mixed in flight to produce deadly gas. The US missed a key deadline of the convention in which 45% of existing chemical weapons should be destroyed (we have only destroyed approximately 23%).

Sources: "U.S. Lags in Destroying Chemical Weapons: Likely won't meet deadline to be rid of chemical stores," Kathleen Kenna, *The Toronto Star*, Sept. 28, 2003,
http://www.thestar.com/NASApp/cs/ContentServer?pagename=thestar/Layout/Article_PrintFriendly&c=Article&cid=1064700607877&call_pageid=968332188854

<http://www.commondreams.org/headlines03/0904-04.htm>

7) What is the administration's response to the international treaty called the "Chemical Weapons Convention," which is aimed at reducing and eliminating these chemical weapons?

The Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons, which enforces the Chemical Weapons Convention, has sought to examine facilities in the United States with the same rigor with which it examines facilities anywhere else. But, just like Iraq, the US has refused to accept weapons inspectors from countries it regards as hostile to its interests, and has told those who have been allowed in which parts of a site they may and may not inspect. It has also passed special legislation permitting the president to block unannounced inspections, and banning inspectors from removing samples of its chemicals. The United States, which is supposed to be the organization's biggest donor, has been twisting the arms of weaker nations, refusing to pay its dues unless they support its noncooperation, with the result that the OPCW could go under.

Source: "Chemical Coup D'Etat: The US Wants to Depose the Diplomat Who Could Take Away Its Pretext for War With Iraq," George Monbiot, April 16, 2002, published in *Guardian of London*, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/guardian>

Also available on <http://www.commondreams.org/views02/0416-07.htm>

8) How much military assistance is the Bush Administration asking Congress to give Israel in fiscal year 2005?

\$2.2 billion — \$60 million more than in 2004. Israel, which has nuclear capability, is already militarily more advanced than all the Arab countries combined and receives more US military aid than any other country.

Source: *New York Times*, Nov. 4, 2003.

9) According to the latest figures released by the Israeli Ministry of Immigration and Absorption, how many Israelis now live abroad?

760,000 — up from 550,000 in 2000, when the current Palestinian uprising began. This a 50% increase in population loss. The total Israeli population is 6,600,000.

Source: Nov. 20, 2003 article in *The Independent*, www.independent.co.uk/world/middle_east/story

10) Open: With an increase of 50% of the number of Israelis living abroad since 2000, do you believe that our policy of giving billions in military aid is actually supporting the survival of the state of Israel?

11) Open: Arms sales worth \$2.86 billion are being pushed to Egypt and the United Arab Emirates, while the US is providing \$2 billion in military aid to Israel. Is the US supporting peace in the Middle East by increasing military aid and arm sales in the region?

Source: "US pushes Middle East arms sales," Sept. 6, 2002, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/business/2241144.stm>

1) Open: If 15 of the 19 Al-Qaeda members on the planes that crashed into the World Trade Centers were from Saudi Arabia, why did the US go after Iraq instead of Saudi Arabia? (Note: We do not advocate going to war against Saudi Arabia.)

Source [for documentation of 15 out of 19]: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn?pagename=article&node=&contentId=A43079-2003Nov14¬Found=true>

2) Which elite American family does business with the Saudi royal family?

The Bush family.

Sources: “The Prince: How the Saudi Ambassador became Washington’s indispensable operator,” Elsa Walsh, *The New Yorker*, March 24, 2003.

“Saving the Saudis,” Craig Unger, *Vanity Fair*, October 2003.

3) Members of which Saudi family were allowed to leave the US without even being interrogated by the FBI in the first days after 9/11 (when supposedly no air travel was allowed in the country)?

The bin Ladens — 24 members of the bin Laden family who had been living in the US were flown out of the country after first being flown by private jet to a secret assembly point in Texas. The FBI was not allowed to ask them more than a few cursory questions.

Sources: “Fearing Harm, bin Laden Kin Fled from US,” Patrick E. Tyler, *New York Times*, Sept. 30, 2001.

“Saving the Saudis,” Craig Unger, *Vanity Fair*, October 2003.

4) With which government agency did Osama bin Laden train?

Osama bin Laden, the famous CIA-trained terrorist, quickly became the prime suspect as federal authorities identified the hijackers, many of whom had been in the United States for years, learning to fly big jets in Florida.

Source: “Events Related To Central Intelligence Agency,” *Harper’s Magazine*, <http://www.harpers.org/CIA.html>

Some people trained under CIA command in the 1980s turned into loyal fighters for the Taliban. For example, a man who played a significant role in the advent and growth of the Taliban movement was Mullah Mohammed Omar, the current chief of the Taliban and former fighter under a CIA-trained commander.

Sources: “Lessons from History: US Policy Toward Afghanistan, 1978-2001,” Reyko Huang, Oct. 5, 2001, Center for Defense Information, <http://www.cdi.org/terrorism/afghanistan-history.cfm>

“Anatomy of a Victory: CIA’s Covert Afghan War,” Steve Coll, *Washington Post*, July 19, 1992.

Some media outlets have reported that during Afghanistan’s conflict with the Soviet Union in the ’80s, the CIA trained bin Laden. Although the American government admits that it funded Afghanistan and assisted in training some Afghans, the official line — so far — is that it did not train bin Laden personally.

Source: “FAQs: Osama bin Laden,” Jessica Wong, CBC News Online, Sept. 2001, http://www.cbc.ca/news/indepth/background/wtc_questionbinladen.html

5) Were there warnings about the potential attack?

US intelligence officials had several warnings that terrorists might attack the United States on its home soil — even using airplanes as weapons — well before the September 11, 2001 attacks, according to a report released by two congressional committees on September 18, 2002.

Sources: “Report cites warnings before 9/11,” CNN, Sept. 19, 2002, <http://www.cnn.com/2002/ALLPOLITICS/09/18/intelligence.hearings/>

“American Morning: Secrets of 9/11,” Nov. 17, 2003, <http://www.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/0311/17/ltn.08.html>

6) FAA regulations require immediate dispatch of supersonic fighter jets to intercept airplanes off course or out of radio contact. Why were these FAA regulations not followed immediately after the hijacked planes lost radio contact?

NORAD, the North American Aerospace Defense Command, has never explained why two routinely scrambled

“anti-terror” interceptors on 15-minute strip alert at Andrews AFB just 10 miles from the Pentagon were held on the ground until after that target was struck.

Source: San Diego Union-Tribune, Sept. 12, 2001.

Retired Maj. Gen. Larry K. Arnold, who was in charge of NORAD on Sept. 11, told a national inquiry last May it was “physically possible” for the Langley Falcons to have intercepted the Pentagon plane had they been activated earlier. The FAA knew Flight 77 had been hijacked at 8:55 a.m. But instead of following regulations and procedures used at least once a week to scramble fighters to escort wayward civil aircraft, the FAA did not notify NORAD until 9:24 a.m.

Sources: AP Oct. 18, 2003; Boston Globe, Sept. 15, 2001.

The first pair of F-15s launched from Otis AFB on Cape Cod were capable of exceeding 1,875 mph. But NORAD’s official timeline shows the heavily armed “Strike Eagles” flew to defend their country at a leisurely 447 mph.

A pair of F-16s scrambled from Langley, Virginia, were also “12 minutes — 105 miles” away when Flight 77 dove into the Pentagon. NORAD did not explain why the “Fighting Falcons” flew to protect their nation’s capitol at 410 mph — instead of their top speed of over 1,500 mph.

Sources: “Air Force Says 911 Interceptors Flew Slow,” News Release, PR Newswire Europe Limited, Nov. 17, 2003, <http://www.prnewswire.co.uk/cgi/news/release?id=112242>

<http://globalresearch.ca/articles/THO311B.html>

7) Given the following timeline, if you were the President of the United States would you enter a meeting at a school after you knew a plane had crashed in the WTC and stay 20 minutes longer after hearing that a second one hit another tower? Is this the behavior of a president interested in the well-being of his nation?

8:13 Flight controllers suspect that Flight 11 has been hijacked.

8:46 Flight 11 hits the WTC.

9:00 President Bush arrives at the Booker Elementary school. By this time he is aware that Flight 11 has crashed into the WTC and that Flight 175 is also hijacked. He sits with the children and listens to a story about a girl and her pet goat.

9:03 Flight 175 hits the WTC.

9:05 Chief of staff Andrew Card, whispers into the president’s ear, “A second plane has hit the World Trade Center. America is under attack.” The commander in chief of the American armed forces continues to sit with the kids.

9:25 Bush leaves school children.

9:31 Bush calls the crashes an “apparent terrorist attack on our country.”

9:43 Flight 77 hits the Pentagon.

9:55 President Bush authorizes the air force to shoot down hijacked planes.

10:06 Flight 93 crashed in Pennsylvania.

Compiled from: “September 11, 2001,” <http://pages.infinit.net/fmgoyeau/911c04a.html>

CNN, “September 11: Chronology of terror,” <http://www.cnn.com/2001/US/09/11/chronology.attack/>

*“A Timeline,” *Christian Science Monitor* staff writers, Sept. 17, 2001, http://www.csmonitor.com/lib/backgrounders/sept17_shell.html*

On being told of the second impact by Andy Card, Bush simply went on with the school visit and listened to children reading about a pet goat. For twenty minutes. [Watch the video!]

Source: <http://www.whatreallyhappened.com/schoolvideo.html>

8) What are the FAA regulations concerning hijackings?

Here are the FAA regulations concerning hijackings: “The FAA hijack coordinator . . . on duty at Washington headquarters will request the military to provide an escort aircraft for a confirmed hijacked aircraft. . . . The escort service will be requested by the FAA hijack coordinator by direct contact with the National Military Command Center (NMCC).”

Here are the instructions issued by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on June 1, 2001: “In the event of a hijacking, the NMCC will be notified by the most expeditious means by the FAA. The NMCC will . . . forward requests for DOD assistance to the Secretary of Defense for approval.”

Sources: “Nothing Urgent,” George Szamuely, *New York Press*, Vol. 15, No. 2.

<http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/SZA202A.html>

9) Open: In light of the biggest security disaster in US history, why was there no disciplinary action, firing, or demotion taken against the agencies that are charged with protecting our domestic security?

The Environment

1) Does the Bush Administration’s “Clear Skies Initiative” improve air quality?

No. These changes to the 1970 Clean Air Act actually *increase* allowable pollution levels by 42 million tons of additional pollutants released by 2020, and allow three times more toxic mercury, 50 percent more sulfur emissions, and hundreds of thousands more tons of smog-forming nitrogen oxides annually. It is estimated that 100,000 premature deaths will result, and that Clear Skies-related health problems will cost taxpayers \$115 billion per year.

Sources: “2 Studies Contradict EPA on New Rules,” John Heilprin (AP), *Washington Post*, Oct. 23, 2003, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A2549-2003Oct22.html>

Natural Resources Defense Council, <http://www.nrdc.org/air/pollution/qbushplan.asp#clearskies>

“Dirty Secrets,” Osha Gray Davidson, *Mother Jones*, Sept.-Oct. 2003, p. 83.

2) In 2003, the Bush administration’s EPA dropped active investigations into power plants for their violations of the Clean Air Act. How many power plant investigations were dropped?

Fifty. Bush administration changes in the underlying rules will allow the utility industry to avoid making pollution-control upgrades that directly affect our air quality. Representatives of the utility industry were among President Bush’s largest campaign donors.

Sources: “Lawyers at E.P.A. Say It Will Drop Pollution Cases,” Christopher Drew and Richard A. Oppel, Jr., *New York Times*, Nov. 6, 2003, <http://www.nytimes.com/2003/11/06/politics/06EPA.html>

<http://www.theblogproject.com/index.php?p=320&more=1>

3) How large is the untapped oil reserve in the environmentally pristine Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, which the Bush administration has repeatedly attempted to open to commercial drilling?

Estimated to be less than what we consume in 6 months — i.e., about 3.2 billion barrels of economically recoverable oil. Moreover, oil from the refuge would take about 10 years to begin reaching the market, and even when production peaks — in the distant year of 2027 — the refuge would produce less than 2% of the oil Americans are expected to use that year.

Sources: U.S. Geological Survey, <http://geology.cr.usgs.gov/pub/fact-sheets/fs-0028-01/>

“Arctic National Wildlife Refuge,” U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, <http://arctic.fws.gov/issues1.html#section2>

“Oil and the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge,” Natural Resources Defense Council, <http://www.nrdc.org/land/wilderness/arctic.asp>

4) How does the Bush administration’s “Healthy Forests Initiative” (HFI) affect our national forests and old growth forests?

The HFI and other Bush administration forestry policies accelerate aggressive “thinning” of valuable trees across millions of acres of backcountry forests. Changes to the Sierra Framework increase logging rates in the Sierra Nevada by 300%. Weakening the “Roadless Area Conservation Rule” exposes up to 58.5 million acres of our most pristine national forests to logging and environmental disruption, including Alaska’s Tongass rainforest — one of the rarest ecosystems in the world.

Sources: “New forestry bill has environmentalists worried,” Glen Martin, *San Francisco Chronicle*, Nov. 2, 2003, <http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?file=/chronicle/archive/2003/11/03/MNGJJ2ORBS1.DTL>

“Debunking the ‘Healthy Forests Initiative’,” The Sierra Club, http://www.sierraclub.org/forests/fires/healthyforests_initiative.asp

“Learn About Wild Forests,” U.S. PIRG, <http://wildforests.com/wildforests.asp?id2=4070&id3=wildforests&>

5) Are there provisions in the Healthy Forests Initiative to ensure citizens have the opportunity to make public comments and evaluate the environmental impact of logging plans?

No. The HFI severely restricts public, environmental, and judicial review of logging plans made by administrators of the US Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management. The US Department of Agriculture’s Mark Rey, who for nearly 20 years was a top lobbyist for the timber industry, is now the chief administrator responsible for the stewardship of 155 national forests.

Sources: “New forestry bill has environmentalists worried,” Glen Martin, *San Francisco Chronicle*, Nov. 2, 2003, <http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?file=/chronicle/archive/2003/11/03/MNGJJ2ORBS1.DTL>

“Debunking the ‘Healthy Forests Initiative’,” The Sierra Club, http://www.sierraclub.org/forests/fires/healthyforests_initiative.asp

“Learn About Wild Forests,” U.S. PIRG, <http://wildforests.com/wildforests.asp?id2=4070&id3=wildforests&>

“Meet Mark Rey,” Native Forests Network, http://www.nativeforest.org/campaigns/public_lands/reynolds_rey_5_30_02.htm

6) When the Bush administration took office, the EPA’s revised new safety standards set the allowable arsenic levels in drinking water at 10 ppb (parts per billion). Within how many months did the Bush administration roll the standard back to 50 ppb?

Two months.

Source: Environmental Protection Agency, <http://www.epa.gov/safewater/ars/implement.html>

7) How many years of research, consideration, and review went into the EPA’s establishing the new safety standards for reducing arsenic levels in drinking water from 50 ppb to 10 ppb?

Over ten years.

In 1993, the World Health Organization (WHO) set 10 ppb as the recommended limit for arsenic in drinking water. The 15-nation European Union adopted 10 ppb as a mandatory standard for arsenic in drinking water in 1998. The WHO reports that even at 10 ppb there is an increased risk of cancer and other diseases. Pending further study, the 50 ppb standard — which is five times the international standard — remains in effect in the US, to the economic benefit of the mining industry.

Sources: Environmental Protection Agency, <http://www.epa.gov/safewater/ars/implement.html>

“Bush Mandates Arsenic in Your Tap Water,” Rachel Massey, Organic Consumers Association, <http://www.organicconsumers.org/corp/arsenic.cfm>

8) How many acres of previously protected wetlands, lakes, and streams will be opened to development under the Bush Administration’s proposal to end federal oversight of “isolated waters”?

20 million acres, or up to 30%, of America’s wetlands will be opened to development, despite President Bush’s election campaign promises that there would be no net loss of wetlands under his administration.

Sources: “America’s Wetlands in Danger,” National Wildlife Federation, <http://www.nwf.org/wetlands/wetlandsatrisk.html>

“Statement of Senator Bob Graham (D-FL), Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife, and Water Hearing,

June 10, 2003," http://epw.senate.gov/108th/Graham_061003.htm

"The Bottom Line," *Mother Jones*, Sept.-Oct. 2003.

9) What share of "Superfund" toxic waste site cleanup costs are to be paid by corporate polluters under Bush's 2004 budget, and how does this compare to past budgets?

In 1996, corporate polluters responsible for creating toxic waste sites paid for 82% of Superfund cleanup costs while taxpayers paid 18%. The new 2004 Bush budget calls for corporate polluters to pay only 21% with taxpayers paying 79%. Because of inadequate funding, Superfund cleanups of toxic sites have decreased by 50% in the past two years.

Source: "Cleanup Slowdown: Superfund Sites Wait In Line For Cleanup," U.S. PIRG, <http://www.pirg.org/enviro/superfund/superfund.asp?id2=9449&id3=superfund&>.

10) How many members of the 63-person Energy Task Force that President Bush and Vice President Cheney assembled to create our new National Energy Policy did *not* have ties to corporate energy interests?

Only one. Moreover, at the insistence of the White House, records of the Task Force's behind-closed-doors proceedings remain secret despite repeated efforts to access them by the Government Accounting Office (GAO) and others. The GAO unsuccessfully sued the White House in an attempt to access the records, arguing that "allowing the Vice President to withhold basic factual information would also violate the principles of transparency and accountability that are essential elements of democracy."

Sources: "Fact Sheet of GAO's Access Case," Government Accounting Office, <http://www.gao.gov/accessfs.pdf>

"Chronology of the GAO's Attempts to Obtain Information from the National Energy Policy Development Group," GAO, http://www.gao.gov/press/chronologynepdg.8.21.03_1.pdf

"The Bush-Cheney Energy Plan: Players, Profits and Paybacks," National Resource Defense Council, <http://www.nrdc.org/air/energy/aplayers2.asp>

"Getting the Ear Of Dick Cheney," Michael Weiskopf and Adam Zagorin, *Time Magazine*, Feb. 3, 2002, <http://www.time.com/time/nation/article/0,8599,198862,00.html>

11) How many countries strongly disagree with the Bush Administration's claim that global warming is not a real threat?

The European Union, Japan, and more than 100 countries.

The National Academy of Sciences last year warned that global warming could trigger "large, abrupt and unwelcome" changes in our climate. The 2,500-member Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change says average earth temperatures could rise as much as 10 degrees over the next century, the fastest rate in 10,000 years. Announcing that 2001 was the second hottest year on record, the World Meteorological Organization recently confirmed that "temperatures are getting hotter, and they are getting hotter faster now than at any time in the past."

The Bush administration's position is to take no action to curb CO₂ and other greenhouse gasses pending additional study. Further, the administration has stated that the US would not participate in the Kyoto Protocol, which is intended to implement the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).

Sources: <http://yosemite.epa.gov/oar/globalwarming.nsf/content/NewsandEventsSpeechesBush-7-13-01.html>

"Do the Math: White House Global Warming Plan Cooks the Books," National Resource Defense Council, Feb. 14, 2002, <http://www.nrdc.org/media/pressreleases/020214a.asp>

12) Using the new "SUV tax break," how much can a small business deduct from its taxable income for purchasing one or more luxury SUVs?"

Up to \$100,000 per year.

Source: "Businesses Jump on an SUV Loophole," Jonathan Weisman, *Washington Post*, Nov. 7, 2003, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn/A10045-2003Nov6?>

13) What steps did the Bush administration take to increase the fuel efficiency standards for automobiles and to encourage consumers to purchase more fuel-efficient vehicles?

None. America's average fuel efficiency for passenger vehicles is now at its lowest point in 21 years.

Sources: "Fuel Economy Guide," US Department of Energy, Oct. 2003, <http://www.fueleconomy.gov/feg/FEG2000.htm>

"Bush Fuel Economy Numbers Show No Improvement At Best," Sierra Club, Oct. 3, 2003, <http://www.sierraclub.org/pressroom/releases/pr2003-10-23a.asp>

"Bush Fuel Economy Increase a Mere 'Drop in the Barrel'," Alliance To Save Energy, Dec. 2002, <http://www.ase.org/media/newsrel/CAFE1213.htm>

14) What grade did President Bush receive on the League of Conservation Voters 2003 presidential report card?

F. Even lower than the D- he received on the 2002 presidential report card. According to the League of Conservation Voters, "Bush's dismal Report Card is dominated by a disturbing trend: time after time, Bush favors corporate interests over the public's interest in a clean, safe and healthy environment."

Source: "LCV Releases the 2003 Presidential Report Card," League of Conservation Voters, <http://www.lcv.org/alerts/AlertsMain.cfm?AlertID=22>

15) Open: Do you feel it's important to protect the environment? What do you think would happen if there were no government restrictions on corporate use of the environment?

Education

1) How does the Bush administration's budgeting request for K-12 education funding for fiscal year 2004 compare to the actual amount approved by Congress for the preceding year?

It is \$1.2 billion less.

Source: <http://www.house.gov/owens/rap020503.htm>

2) How does the Bush administration's funding proposal for implementing "No Child Left Behind" compare with the amount of funding estimated to be required by education experts?

It is \$9.4 billion less than would be necessary.

Source: www.nea.org/presscenter/testingcosts.html

3) What is the Bush administration's "No Child Left Behind" program based on?

"No Child Left Behind" is based on the so-called "Houston Miracle," which was recently discredited when it was discovered that schools were falsely reporting high educational achievement and low dropout rates in order to meet program goals. Rod Paige was the head of the Houston School District at the time, and is now the US Secretary of Education.

Source: Now with Bill Moyers, Oct. 17, 2003, http://www.pbs.org/now/transcript/transcript238_full.html

4) "Headstart" is widely considered to be a very successful early childhood educational program. How much has the Bush Administration cut its funding?

President Bush has proposed to turn Head Start's services entirely over to the states. This could kill Head Start within 5 years, according to the National Head Start Association. The costs involved in shifting Head Start over to the states include the following:

1) The scarcity of states equipped to provide Head Start services. Of 30 states studied by independent researchers, only 3 — Delaware, Washington, and Oregon — were found to provide the equivalent of comprehensive Head Start services.

2) States' financial inability to provide Head Start services. Across the nation, 49 of the 50 states are facing a combined budget deficit of approximately \$100 billion. Ten states have reported large cuts in pre-

kindergarten programs.

3) The rise in administrative costs. The GAO has estimated that the rising cost of administering Head Start by the states will result in a \$418 million shortfall, the equivalent of 59,000 Head Start slots.

Source: www.nhsa.org/press/index_news_041603.htm

5) An “unfunded mandate” is a federal law that requires a state to implement a program even though the Federal Government is not funding or is only partially funding that program. What aspects of “No Child Left Behind” are educators unable to implement due to the lack of federal funding for these mandates?

According to a study by the General Accounting Office, it is estimated that states may have to spend up to \$5.3 billion to implement the testing provisions of “No Child Left Behind” between 2002 and 2008. Also, the provision of “No Child Left Behind” for ensuring the quality of teachers is an unfunded mandate. The President of the National Education Association has written that only \$1 billion, a meager amount, has been budgeted for this purpose.

Special education for the 6 million children with special needs is another unfunded mandate. Only 15% of the money needed to provide for these programs is coming from the federal government. This shift in funding to the states, many of which are suffering from severe budget deficits of their own, has resulted in massive further shortfalls. Also, the provisions of Title I allow students to go to any school that they choose, even if there is no room for them at that school.

Source: www.nea.org/newsreleases/2003/nr030702.html

6) How much funding for after-school and recreational programs has been cut by the Bush administration?

The current Bush budget cuts already inadequate levels yet another 40%, from \$1 billion down to \$600 million, leaving another 1/2 million children without after-school programs. “No Child Left Behind” called for \$1.75 billion for this purpose in fiscal year 2004. Thus, President Bush’s current funding proposal is a reduction of over \$1 billion, according to the Afterschool Alliance.

Source: www.commondreams.org/news2003/0313-08.htm

7) How much money is the public education system losing due to voucher programs?

According to the NEA, voucher programs in place in Milwaukee and Cleveland have cost public schools about \$32 million. Proposed voucher plans in California and Michigan are estimated to produce a loss to public schools of, respectively, \$3 billion a year and \$35 million a year.

Source: www.nea.org/issues/vouchers/02voutrack.html

8) How does standardized testing of No Child Left Behind constitute “the largest Federal intrusion into state administration of education”?

According to Paul Revelle, Harvard Professor of Education and an expert on education policy, the unprecedented intrusion of the federal bureaucracy has caused “resentment at both the state and local levels. It’s a very awkward marriage. . . . it threatens to overwhelm the system to the point where the system crashes.”

Source: <http://www.cnn.com/2003/EDUCATION/08/13/sprj.sch.overview/>

9) What are some of the tactics schools have been using to score high on standardized tests without actually improving the quality of their student’s education?

Richard Allington of the University of Florida has collected real incidents in which schools have used various tactics to inflate their test scores, and has compiled them in the following list:

- 1) Cheat: alter the answer sheets, or tell kids to answer only the questions they’re sure of, and fill in the remaining (correct) answers later.
- 2) Encourage kids to stay home, or send them on field trips.
- 3) Expel, or encourage the dropping-out of, low-achieving students.

- 4) Identify low-achieving students as students with disabilities. In many states, their scores won't count.
- 5) Use irregular test accommodations for students with disabilities. For example, take dictation for the writing tests.
- 6) Triage: target resources away from certain groups of students. Identify likely high-scoring students and spend all your time with them.
- 7) Invest in test preparation materials.
- 8) Flunk lots of kids. It will be more expensive in the long run, but in the short term, it will raise test scores because it will remove low-scorers from any given grade.
- 9) Make the test easier.
- 10) Lower the failing grade.

Source: <http://www.fairtest.org/k12/allington.html>

10) Over the next 10 years, how does the expected revenue lost due to the Bush tax cuts compare to the amount that will be needed for education?

According to a study by the Center for Budget and Policy Priorities, “just the portion of the tax cut that would go to the wealthiest 1% of Americans is larger than the total amount requested for all education, health, and other services. \$1.6 trillion (over 10 years) is 40 times larger than the 41 billion the budget table shows as the amount slated for improving the nation’s education system.”

Source: www.cbpp.org/pubs/fedbud01.htm

Poverty

1) What is the increase in the bankruptcy rate since 2000?

23%. From 2000–2002 the US had the highest rate of bankruptcies in its history.

Source: Administrative Office of the US Courts, “Judicial Business of the United States Courts: Annual Report of the Director, 2002,” <http://www.uscourts.gov/judbus2002/contents.html> [use “Judicial Business” link to download PDF file]

2) What was the average rate of increase in requests for emergency shelter in 2002?

19%, which is the largest annual increase since 1990.

Source: US Conference of Mayors, “Hunger, Homelessness On the Rise in Major U.S. Cities,” Dec. 18, 2002, http://usmayors.org/uscm/news/press_releases/documents/hunger_121802.asp

3) From 1947–2001 which party holding the White House has produced the highest unemployment rate?

The Republicans. 5 GOP presidents produced an average unemployment rate of 6.3% whereas 5 Democratic presidents produced an average unemployment rate of 4.8%. Unemployment under Bush now averages 6.1% (an increase of 1.4% since 2001), approaching the average unemployment rate of Republican presidents.

Source: “GOP Always Falls Down on the Jobs,” Larry M. Bartels, Director of the Center for the Study of Democratic Politics at Princeton University, *Los Angeles Times* commentary, Sept. 26, 2003, www.latimes.com [type “Bartels” in Archive search]

4) What must a worker now earn to afford the average rent and utilities for a 2-bedroom apartment?

\$15.21 an hour. The federal minimum wage now stands at \$5.15 an hour.

Source: National Low Income Housing Coalition, <http://www.nlihc.org/oor2003/introduction.htm>

5) In 2002 how many people in the US were living below the official poverty line (defined as \$18,244 for a family of 4 with 2 children)?

34.6 million (which is 12.1% of the population). This is an increase of 3.5 million from the year 2000 figure of 31.1 million (11.3% of the population). The year 2001 saw the first increase in the poverty rate since 1993.

Sources for questions 5-10:

<http://www.census.gov/hhes/poverty/poverty02/pov02hi.html>

<http://www.census.gov/hhes/poverty/poverty00/pov00hi.html>

<http://www.census.gov/hhes/income/income00/prs01asc.html> <http://www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/p60-214.pdf> [see page 8]

6) What was the total number of children in the US living in poverty in 2002?

12.1 million children (16.7%) which is about 1 in 6 children, up from 11.6 million (16.1%) in 2000 — an increase of a million and a half children.

7) How many families were living in poverty in 2002?

7.2 million families (9.6%), up from 6.2 million families (8.6%) in 2000 — an increase of one million families.

8) How many married couple families were living in poverty in 2002?

3.1 million families (5.3%), up from 2.6 million (4.7%) in 2000 — an increase of half a million families.

9) How many single parent households headed by a woman were living in poverty in 2002?

3.6 million households (26.5%), up from 3.1 million (24.7%) in 2000 — an increase of half a million households.

10) How many people from the suburbs were living in poverty in 2002?

13.3 million people (8.9%), up from 12.1 million (7.8%) in 2000 — an increase of nearly a million and a quarter people.