

## **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](http://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](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—3.2 million in the private 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](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](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](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](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>

## **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 the current national debt of 7.11 trillion as reported by David Walker, the comptroller general of the United States in his op-ed piece to 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](http://seattlepi.nwsource.com/opinion/163282_cronkite05.html)

## **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](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](http://wireservice.wired.com/wired/story.asp?section=Breaking&storyId=813915&tw=wn_wire_story)

### **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>

### **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.

## **Civil Liberties**

### **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/>

# War and International Affairs

## War Costs, Deaths, and Injuries

### **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](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>

### **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](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/talking_point/forum/1106746.stm)

## 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](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](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&notFound=true>

## **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>

## **3) 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 have 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>

## **4) 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>

## **5) 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&notFound=true>

## 6) 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\\_n.shtml](http://www.janes.com/security/international_security/news/jid/jid030214_1_n.shtml)

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

## 8) 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, [http://newyorker.com/printable/?fact/030331fa\\_fact1](http://newyorker.com/printable/?fact/030331fa_fact1)

## 10) 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](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](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:vBr0wbneTQJ:www.cdi.org/budget/2004/world-military-spending.cfm+200+united+states+military+budget&hl=en&ie=UTF-8>

## 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](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&>

**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>

**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&>

**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 CO<sub>2</sub> 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>

**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>

## **Education**

### **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](http://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](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](http://www.nhsa.org/press/index_news_041603.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](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](http://www.latimes.com) [type “Bartels” in Archive search]

**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.

Please consider sharing this information face to face with as many others as possible based on as much commitment you can muster in yourself for your country, your fellow Americans and for the world. For more referenced questions and answers please visit our website at:

[www.usfacetoface.org](http://www.usfacetoface.org)