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The State of the Planet

The good news: population growth is slowing, life expectancy is rising, and the hole in the ozone layer, which shields us from ultraviolet rays, is expected to shrink. But our climate and biodiversity are in peril, and food and water supplies will be tight in the decades ahead.

**POPULATION/HEALTH** Life expectancy is increasing except in Africa, where AIDS and other infectious diseases have taken a toll. Lower birth rates will start to level the global population by mid-century.

**CLIMATE/ENERGY** The phaseout of chemicals called chlorofluorocarbons will help reduce the hole in the ozone layer, but the continued burning of fossil fuels will lead to hotter times in the future.

**INDICATORS**

**Fertility rate** (average births per woman)

**Life expectancy at birth** 1995-2000

**Infectious diseases**

Deaths worldwide, in millions

**Sources of energy supply** worldwide

**Annual energy consumption** by region in 2000, in quadrillions of BTUs (British Thermal Units)

**Range of temperature projections**

**Actual**

13°C to 14°C

15°C to 16°C

17°C to 18°C

19°C to 20°C

**Future**

13°C to 14°C

15°C to 16°C

17°C to 18°C

19°C to 20°C

**Approx. 66°F (19°C)**

**Approx. 61.5°F (16°C)**

**Approx. 66°F (19°C)**

**Approx. 61.5°F (16°C)**

**Sources for charts**

One Year After 9/11: TIME/CNN Poll

What We Think

Americans are less supportive of a war with Iraq than we were last month, and less approving of the President, according to a TIME/CNN telephone poll of 1,004 adults conducted by Harris Interactive on Aug. 28–29. A separate online survey of 1,176 Americans ages 8 to 18 conducted for TIME/Nickelodeon found that young people have many of the same concerns—and fears.

Do you think President Bush is doing a good job handling foreign policy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUGUST</th>
<th>JULY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What kind of job would you say that President Bush has done in responding to the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUGUST</th>
<th>JULY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you think the U.S. should use military action involving ground troops to attempt to remove Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUGUST '02</th>
<th>DECEMBER '01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Should</td>
<td>Should</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should not</td>
<td>Should not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you think President Bush should have the option of using military force against Iraq without Congress’s authorization?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use force without authorization</th>
<th>Only with authorization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are you worried that a terrorist act will occur in the U.S. on Sept. 11, 2002?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes, worried</th>
<th>Not worried</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How likely do you think it is that an act of terrorism will occur somewhere in the U.S. in the next 12 months?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUGUST</th>
<th>MAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td>Very likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>likely</td>
<td>likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very</td>
<td>Not very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>likely</td>
<td>likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you think Sept. 11 should be a national holiday every year like Veterans Day or Memorial Day?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADULTS 18 or older</th>
<th>CHILDREN 8 to 18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which of the following are you likely to do on the first anniversary of the terrorist attacks?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADULTS 18 or OLDER</th>
<th>CHILDREN 8 TO 18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fly the American flag</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pray by myself</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend a memorial service</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch a program about 9/11 on television</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk to people about 9/11 on the Internet</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Margin of error is ±3.1% for the adult poll and ±2.9% for the children’s survey. “Not sure” generally omitted.
Charts and Graphs in Focus

On pages 2 and 3 of the Current Events Update, you’ll find a feature titled “Indicators,” a set of charts and graphs with population projections and poll data reporting public opinion on a war with Iraq. The graphics are packed with information, but what do all the statistics mean? Use this page to sharpen your skills in reading and interpreting graphics.

World Population/Health and Climate/Energy

1. According to the graph on page 2, what is the current world population?

2. What is the projected world population for the year 2050?

3. What is the life expectancy for residents of North America? For residents of Africa? What do you think accounts for this difference?

4. How and why are global temperatures expected to shift between now and the year 2100?

5. Has worldwide usage of oil increased or decreased since 1973? How has consumption of natural gas changed over the same period?

6. In your opinion, are the data on this page cause for concern or relief? Why?

What We Think: Interpreting Poll Data

7. According to the poll data on page 3, what percentage of Americans approved of President Bush’s job performance at the time this poll was taken? How had the numbers changed since July?

8. What percentage of Americans polled in August 2002 ranked Bush’s response to the terrorist attacks as good or very good?

9. Among young people age 8 to 18, what percentage think about what happened on Sept. 11 every day or several times a week?

10. Between December 2001 and August 2002, did support for U.S. military action against Iraq increase or decrease? By what percentage?

11. Among adults surveyed, what percentage planned to fly the American flag on the first anniversary of 9/11? How many planned to attend a memorial service?

12. What percentage of young people age 8 to 18 believe that Sept. 11 should be a national holiday? Do you share this view? Explain.
Death on the Campaign Trail

A plane crashes, a Democratic Senator dies and suddenly both parties must adjust their strategies for Election 2002

By JOSH TYRANGIEL

In 1990, a few weeks after Paul Wellstone—a wiry 5-foot 5-inch ex-college professor, liberal ideologue, professional agitator and extreme long shot—unseated an incumbent Senator in an election no one thought he could win, he sat down for breakfast with one of the few Establishment politicians he genuinely admired. Fellow Minnesotan and former Vice President Walter Mondale congratulated Wellstone on the upset but warned that the aggressiveness Wellstone had shown on the campaign trail (he starred in a series of ads in which he stalked his opponent) might not go over well on Capitol Hill.

“Remember,” said Mondale, “you have six years in the first term, not six days. Don’t be so impatient, charging into everything.”

Wellstone didn’t hear a word. As Senator-elect in his first month, Wellstone said of new colleague Jesse Helms, “I have detested him since I was 19.” Then, on his first trip to the White House, on the eve of the Gulf War, Wellstone pelted President George H.W. Bush with antiwar arguments.

Over 12 years and nearly two Senate terms, Wellstone never wavered in his convictions, but he gradually adjusted his style to the courtly atmosphere of the Senate. Just how well he had adapted was evident in the hours after his campaign plane crashed two miles from a small airport on Friday, Oct. 25, 175 miles north of Minneapolis. (Also aboard were Wellstone’s wife Sheila, daughter Marcia and two pilots. There were no survivors.)

“Despite the marked contrast between Paul’s and my views on matters of government and politics,” said Helms, “he was my friend. And I was his.”

Wellstone had been locked in a tight re-election campaign against Republican challenger Norm Coleman and had begun to pull away in recent weeks, in part because this year’s chapter in the Iraq saga provided Wellstone with an opportunity to remind Minnesotans that his maverick streak remained as sharp as ever. No other member of the Senate was on the losing side of so many 99-to-1 or 98-to-2 votes. As the only vulnerable incumbent to vote against the resolution that would give President Bush war powers, Wellstone told the Senate, “Acting now on our own might be a sign of our power, but acting sensibly and in a measured way in concert with our allies ... would be a sign of our strength.” Soon after, private G.O.P. polls predicted that Wellstone would be re-elected.

Senators on both sides of the aisle broke down as they talked about Wellstone, but it wasn’t long before they returned to the cold calculus of midterm elections. With Wellstone’s death, the Senate is divided 49 to 49 to 1. If Coleman were to win, he would fill the vacancy immediately, and Republicans would suddenly have an advantage that could help them push through President Bush’s struggling Homeland Security bill before the new year. Optimism, though, was hard to find among G.O.P. officials, who fear a possible repeat of what one Senator called the “Jean Carnahan syndrome.” Two years ago, Carnahan’s husband, Missouri Governor Mel Carnahan, died in a plane crash while campaigning. His name remained on the ballot, and the deceased Carnahan defeated Republican incumbent John Ashcroft. Jean Carnahan was then appointed to fill his seat for two years.

Republicans fear that former Vice President Walter Mondale is precisely the kind of party patriarch who could ride the coattails of Wellstone’s legacy to victory. “Politics is all about emotions,” says a Republican Senator. “Paul was beloved, and with his death he’ll be even more beloved.”

Questions
1. For what will Paul Wellstone be remembered?
2. How did Wellstone’s death affect Election 2002?
The Battle Hymn of the Republicans

It’s hallelujah time in the White House as the Democrats discover (again) what a mistake it is to underestimate the appeal of George W. Bush. Here’s how far the President plans to go with his new mandate

By ROMESH RATNESAR

“NO GLOATING,” READ THE E-MAIL THAT greeted euphoric Republican leaders as they sleeplessly stumbled into work last Wednesday. The command came directly from the White House, which hours earlier had pulled off the biggest presidential triumph in a midterm election in nearly a century. George W. Bush and his strategists were worried that excessive celebration by congressional Republicans could infuriate Democrats, polarize the electorate and poison the slim, precious mandate the President had at last won.

But in private some Republicans just couldn’t resist. At 2 A.M. on election night, shortly after incumbent Missouri Democrat Jean Carnahan conceded defeat, an aide to Trent Lott sneaked into his empty Capitol office and placed a bronze plaque engraved with the words MAJORITY LEADER on Lott’s desk. The plaque had been stowed in the bottom drawer of the desk since the Republicans lost control of the Senate 18 months ago, when Vermont’s Jim Jeffords abandoned the G.O.P., but Lott never threw it away, just in case he returned to the Senate’s top job. “I just feel exhilarated about having another opportunity,” he told TIME.

In the Oval Office early Wednesday, Bush surprised his senior staff by bounding in on five hours’ sleep for a 7 A.M. meeting and laying out his post-election strategy. “Right off the bat he said we’re going to focus on the economy and unfinished business,” says an official. Bush instructed the aides—Karen Hughes, National Security Adviser Condoleezza Rice, Vice President Dick Cheney, chief of staff Andrew Card, communications director Dan Bartlett and strategist Karl Rove—to “tone it down. Let it speak for itself.” But the President was smiling. “This,” he said, “is a great day.”

Until last week, the presidency of George W. Bush was not so much historic as shaped by history, created out of the mold of an extraordinary election and given form by the terrorist attacks of September 2001. Despite broad support for his campaign against al-Qaeda, Bush, in the eyes of his detractors, has never fully shaken his image as a fortunate son whose approval ratings would eventually collapse under the weight of a sagging economy. Democrats figured that would be enough to at least hold their ground, but last week Bush’s appeal blindsided them. After gaining control of both houses of Congress and winning unanimous approval for a new Security Council resolution against Iraq, Bush has the potential to become the most powerful American politician since Ronald Reagan.

The Republican takeover of the Senate was close to two years in the making, the strategy hammered out by Rove and various high-ranking G.O.P. activists in secret meetings held everywhere from Capitol Hill brasseries to West Virginia golf courses. By the eve of the election, G.O.P. polls projected a big turnout by Republican voters energized by Bush’s full-court press: he visited 15 states in the past five days. Democratic strategists, meanwhile, underestimated his pull. “Bush’s coattails were far more effective than anybody on our side thought,” says a top Democratic operative. “We thought his popularity numbers were soft.”

They weren’t. Twenty-one out of the 23 House members and 12 of the 16 Senate candidates Bush campaigned for won their races. The results were momentous. Only three other times in the past century has a President’s party gained seats in the House in an off-year election, and not since...
the Civil War has the President’s party won back a Senate majority in a midterm contest. Bush will be the first Republican President since Dwight Eisenhower to enjoy outright majorities in the House and Senate.

Democrats could do little more than insist on their relevance. “We’re not going away,” Senate Democratic leader Tom Daschle said. “We’re going to be fighting for the things we believe in.” The loss of control may actually give Daschle more flexibility: sources tell TIME that as majority leader he often held his fire to guard against the defection of Georgia Democrat Zell Miller, who threatened to leave the party if Daschle came down too hard on the President. But Daschle and the rest of the party leadership have yet to lay out a compelling alternative to the President’s agenda, in part because party members can’t decide whether or not to fight it. Democrats in the Senate are divided over whether to support the White House’s push to make its tax cuts permanent, and all but the most liberal members have gone silent on the Administration’s hawkish foreign policy.

In the House, the resignation of minority leader Richard Gephardt set off a fight for the soul of the party. His probable replacement, Nancy Pelosi of San Francisco, is an unapologetic member of the party’s liberal wing—most recently she led the fight against the President’s drive for congressional authorization to strike Iraq—and a descendant of a minor Democratic dynasty: her father served in Congress and as mayor of Baltimore, a job her brother also held. (Her daughter Alexandra grew friendly with Bush while making Journeys with George, a documentary about his presidential campaign.) The apparent anointment of Pelosi, a strong fund raiser who would be the first female party leader in Congress, cheered Republican strategists, who expect her to try to revive the party by picking fights with the White House. Pelosi says she’s ready for combat: “We cannot allow Republicans to pretend they share our values and then legislate against those values without consequence.”

How the White House plans to act on its new mandate, though, isn’t clear. Members of both parties say Bush has stockpiled all the support he needs to go to war against Saddam Hussein. “You won’t hear as much complaining out of Congress about not being consulted,” says a senior House Republican aide. Tuesday’s election suggests that Bush has loosened the country’s 50–50 deadlock—Republican candidates won 53% of all votes cast in congressional and gubernatorial races—but not by much. In his first two years, Bush kept his conservative base happy but was also known to compromise on issues like education and campaign finance. Like Eisenhower’s, Bush’s popularity rests heavily on his prestige as Commander in Chief rather than on deep support for his domestic policies. Even with the Senate in G.O.P. hands, Bush will still have to court Democrats if he hopes to accomplish his goals and preserve his appeal to swing voters. It’s no coincidence that in his Nov. 14 news conference, Bush identified passage of homeland-security legislation as the top priority on his agenda and bristled at the suggestion that he takes cues from his conservative base.

But even with its newly won bipartite control, the White House doesn’t command a “governing majority” in the Senate: the 60 votes needed to break a filibuster. Members of Congress from both parties say Bush will still have to cut deals with Democrats and ditch pet projects in order to get things done. “The President asked for the Senate, and he’s got it,” says one top Democrat. “He can no longer blame us if something doesn’t go right.”

Questions
1. What was historic about the election of 2002?
2. What did Bush identify as his top agenda item?
**Why the Senate Is Now Back In G.O.P. Hands**

Credit Democratic apathy and a hustling campaigner-in-chief

**SENATE RESULTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>Winner</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ore.</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>50.4%–48.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calif.</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>50.1%–48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>47.4%–47.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyo.</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>51.6%–48.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mont.</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>51.6%–48.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash.</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>50.1%–48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colo.</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>50.1%–48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.M.</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>50.1%–48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colo.</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>50.1%–48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>50.1%–48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D.</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>50.1%–48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minn.</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>50.1%–48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash.</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>50.1%–48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tex.</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>50.1%–48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kans.</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>50.1%–48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neb.</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>50.1%–48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okla.</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>50.1%–48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colo.</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>50.1%–48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.M.</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>50.1%–48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colo.</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>50.1%–48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>50.1%–48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D.</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>50.1%–48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minn.</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>50.1%–48.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TEXAS**

Republican attorney general John Cornyn defeated Ron Kirk despite the Dallas mayor’s moderate record.

**SOUTH DAKOTA**

Tom Daschle’s fellow Democrat Tim Johnson beat Congressman John Thune by a total of only 528 votes.

**ARKANSAS**

Mark Pryor defeated Republican Senator Tim Hutchinson in the Democrats’ only pickup of the night.

**LOUISIANA**

Mary Landrieu succeeded in defending her seat against Republican Suzanne Haik Terrell in the Dec. 7 runoff.

**HOUSE RESULTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>Winner</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ala.</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>229 (Gain of 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.Y.</td>
<td>Democrats</td>
<td>205 (Loss of 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ALABAMA**

3rd District
G.O.P. wins
50.4%–48.2%

Democrat Joe Turnham challenged Republican Mike Rogers to a skeet-shooting contest to prove he wasn’t a liberal. The tactic didn’t work.

**NEW YORK**

1st District
Democrats win 50.1%–48.6%

Tim Bishop, who campaigned on a pro-environment platform, won a surprise upset against first-time Republican Felix Grucci.

**COLORADO**

7th District
G.O.P. wins 47.4%–47.2%

Republican Bob Beauprez claimed victory here; Democrat Mike Feeley conceded defeat in early December, following a recount.

**KENTUCKY**

3rd District
G.O.P. wins 51.6%–48.4%

Incumbent Anne Northup got a break and challenger Jack Conway took a hit when his boss, the Governor, was hit with a scandal.

**FLORIDA**

5th District
G.O.P. wins 47.9%–46.3%

Half of this redrawn district’s voters were new to Democratic Representative Karen Thurman, giving Ginny Brown-Waite an upset victory.
Independent

1

Missouri

Jim Talent

Two years after being appointed to succeed her late husband, Jean Carnahan lost to Talent, who made an issue of who would be more loyal to the President as he continues the war on terrorism. Talent won—by just 1% of the 1,867,432 votes.

The Key to Victory

Republicans attacked Carnahan for not voting to make the tax cuts permanent.

Georgia

Saxby Chambliss

In a big upset, Chambliss beat Max Cleland. Republican ads accused the Democrat, a Vietnam vet and triple amputee, of being soft on national security. Chambliss is chairman of a sub-committee on terrorism.

The Key to Victory

President Bush visited the state three times and told voters that Chambliss would be a strong ally.

New Hampshire

John E. Sununu

Democrat Jeanne Shaheen built a reputation as a moderate during three terms as Governor and outspent Sununu by $1.3 million. But he successfully painted her as a tax-and-spend liberal—dirty words in this state.

The Key to Victory

Shaheen was able to attract only 4% of independent voters.

Tennessee

Former Education Secretary Lamar Alexander won the fight to keep Fred Thompson's seat in the Republican column.

South Carolina

Republican Representative Lindsey Graham won retiring Strom Thurmond's seat. Will Graham serve 50 years too?

North Carolina

Despite a shrinking lead just before the vote, Elizabeth Dole held on to beat Clinton chief of staff Erskine Bowles.

New Jersey

After two years off, Frank Lautenberg, 78, is back on Capitol Hill after stepping in for Bob Torricelli.

...Democrats Gain Governors

With G.O.P. incumbents stepping down, Democrats had a shot at gaining up to seven seats. But with Bush fueling turnout, they picked up just three, giving them a total of 24 governorships. Georgia got its first Republican Governor since Reconstruction.

Text by Mitch Frank
The house has approved it. The White House is behind it. And now the Senate has—painfully—voted to implement it. We’ve heard a lot about the Homeland Security Department over the past six months. But what exactly can we expect from this new division of government—and what effect will it have on the country?

In the 24 hours after the 9/11 terrorist attacks, employees from nearly every department of the government were struggling to help, but running into barriers due to red tape or communication failures. And so the Office of Homeland Security was born, fronted by former Pennsylvania Gov. Tom Ridge. The White House later pushed to make the office a Cabinet-level agency, a push that is now coming to fruition.

It hasn’t been an easy road to passage for the HSD, but now, after the Senate defeated attempts by Democrats to strip the bill of G.O.P.-sponsored add-ons, the White House has achieved victory. And while the first signs of transition will be limited to moving vans and packing boxes, they will signal the largest reorganization of federal agencies since the 1947 merger of the War and Navy departments, which formed the Defense Department, and the first major restructuring since 1977, when the Energy Department first came on the scene. The HSD would employ 170,000 people, culled primarily from the staff of 22 agencies, including the Secret Service, Coast Guard, Border Patrol, Transportation Security Authority and INS. Duties of the new agency will include coordinating counter-terrorism measures as well as preemptive defense. The four divisions: border and transportation security; emergency preparedness and response; countermeasures for chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear attacks; and a new intelligence clearinghouse. Ideally, this synergy means that if, for example, someone came into the country and aroused suspicion, the INS will have a direct link to the intelligence needed to clear or arrest that person at once. It also means that in the case of the next terrorist attack, the government will have a cohesive, prepared response to deal with damage and simultaneously ward off further attacks.

The cost of this massive overhaul? An estimated $40 billion, according to several independent analysts. That’s $37.5 billion initially set aside to run the 22 agencies marked for inclusion in the new department, as well as an additional $2 billion for costs associated with starting a new agency from scratch. Those figures are disputed by the Bush Administration, which claims it can run the department on the budgeted $37.5 billion.

Hard-won victory. The President’s initial proposal for the department, issued to Congress June 18, 2002: “I propose to create a new Department by substantially transforming the current confusing
patchwork of government activities into a single department whose primary mission is to protect our homeland.” As soon as the President made his announcement, the fighting began. Democrats, while supportive of a plan to protect the country, were outraged at the insistence by the President and his Republican allies that he should have the power to hire, fire and discipline any staff member for any reason—because, he reasoned, the sensitivity of this department’s mission demanded fast action. Democrats, along with union leaders, argued the employees of HSD should be given the same rights—reviews, protections—as any other federal employees. Finally, leaders on both sides returned to the bargaining table. The end result would provide unions with a “consultation” prior to any staffing changes. The President, however, would maintain ultimate control over employees.

Questions of security. Even as the Senate conflict comes to a close, battles still rage over security. Not national security—personal security. Critics of the HSD proposal say the legislation would permit the government virtually unfettered access to private information exchanged between U.S. citizens. The computer system in question, called “Total Information Awareness,” is being run out of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, or DARPA, which is in turn part of the Information Awareness Office, or IAO. The software would allow government surveillance of e-mail, credit card and banking records and travel documents. While more extensive legislation is needed to completely open the floodgates of heretofore private information, wording in the current HSD bill is enough to amend the Privacy Act of 1974, which put limits on what the government could do with personal information. Civil libertarians say the IAO program infringes on basic privacy rights, while proponents of the system say it only takes necessary measures—investigating suspicious spending or email threats—to make everyone as safe as possible.

Questions
1. What is the Homeland Security Dept.’s mission?
2. What concerns about civil liberties have critics of the new department raised?

NOW FOR THE HARD PART

Homeland Security Chief Tom Ridge is preparing to take on one of the toughest jobs in Washington

As the dust clears from the Senate vote creating a Cabinet-level Homeland Security Department, Tom Ridge is poised to take on one of the most critical and politically risky jobs in Washington’s history—and to head up the second largest federal agency after the Pentagon. Despite his new clout, the department will take months, if not years, to create—time that critics say the country just doesn’t have.

There’s a whole infield of hurdles waiting to be jumped, not the least of which is the enormity of the task at hand. While the White House insists the 170,000-person department will be up and running in one year, some General Accounting Office experts estimate the massive overhaul could take several years to finalize. In fact, if President Bush fails in his 2004 re-election bid, it’s quite possible Ridge will never get the chance to take on his new role.

Then there’s the departmental budget to consider: Because Congress failed to approve spending bills before the start of the fiscal year (on October 1st), the HSD, along with virtually every other federal endeavor, is operating under an assumed budgetary outline. There are sure to be battles—perhaps largely symbolic, given that come January, the G.O.P. will have control over both houses of Congress—over exactly how much money is appropriated to which security measure. There are also concerns among Democrats and Republicans over several last-minute provisions tacked onto the HSD bill, including one (which raised particular hackles) that provides Texas A&M University—a favorite of retiring Senator Phil Gramm—special consideration for the creation of an academic homeland security research center.
After the Election: Bush’s Agenda

With Republicans now in control of the House of Representatives and the Senate, President George W. Bush is expected to renew his efforts to pass legislation on a number of issues that he considers particularly important. Working individually or with a small group of classmates, use the questions below to learn more about one of these issues. Investigate the President’s agenda—then voice your own opinion on this issue.

ISSUES TO INVESTIGATE:
The Environment
The Economy
The War Against Iraq
Health Care
Homeland Security
The Courts

SUGGESTED WEBSITES FOR YOUR RESEARCH:
www.whitehouse.gov
www.time.com
www.cnn.com/allpolitics
www.washingtonpost.com
www.washtimes.com
www.onlinenewspapers.com

1. What issue from the list above do you plan to investigate?

2. What are the President’s key goals for new legislation and policies related to the issue you have identified? Use at least two websites to locate information in answer to this question. (Suggested sites are listed above.)

3. If the legislation that the President advocates does become law, what would the consequences and impact be?

4. How have Democrats responded to the President’s position on this issue? Quote the position of at least one Democratic member of the Senate or House on this issue.

5. Do you support the President’s stance on the issue you have investigated? Why or why not? Explain your position here, and continue on the back of this page if you need more space for your answer.
Give Us Your Tired... 
Just Not All of Them

The Somalis are settling in Maine at a rapid rate, prompting some to say, “Stop.”

By NADYA LABI/LEWISTON

AMESAM MOHAMED JUST WANTS A GOOD place to raise her family. It was what she prayed for when she and her husband Hussein fled war-scarred Somalia in 1991; what she dreamed of a decade ago, when they left a crowded refugee camp in Kenya to immigrate to the U.S.; and what she thought she had found when they settled in a five-bedroom house in the Atlanta suburb of Stone Mountain, Ga. Then, in the fall of 2000, when Mohamed, 39, broke her leg and was unable to work and help pay the rent, the family’s security seemed at risk again. A Somali friend living in Maine offered a solution: the homeless shelters there were so spacious, she said, that Mohamed could comfortably raise her six children in one.

Hussein was skeptical, but Samsam loaded the kids in a rental car and headed north. Soon after she arrived in Portland, a social worker told her there were vacant houses in nearby Lewiston. “Do they have a school there?” Mohamed asked. “A medical doctor? Groceries?” They did. “Then I’ll go,” she said.

Which is how Mohamed became among the first of some 1,100 Somalis who moved into this declining former mill town of 36,000 in just the past 1½ years. Lewiston’s mostly white, working-class residents were gracious at first. But as more and more Somalis streamed into the city, some of the natives began to grumble.

The only knowledge most had about Somalia was from Black Hawk Down—Ridley Scott’s graphic depiction of the 1993 raid in which Somali militias killed 18 U.S. soldiers, including one from a town that borders Lewiston. It didn’t help that many Somalis are dependent on social services, taxing the limited resources of the city.

Tensions first flared at Lewiston High School when nearly 80 new Somali students showed up for the first day of class last fall. More than 100 students, up from 20 the previous year, enrolled in English-as-a-second-language classes. Rumors spread that the Somalis, who are mainly Muslims, were washing their feet in the school water fountain before they prayed. Then fights broke out in the cafeteria between natives and newcomers. Friends told Mohamed’s daughter Hibat, 14, that their parents wanted the Somalis to go back home.

Earlier this month, Mayor Laurier Raymond issued an open letter to the Somali elders urging them to stop the flow of migrants. “The Somali community must exercise some discipline and reduce the stress on our limited finances and our generosity,” he wrote. “Now we need breathing room.” The Somali leaders accused the mayor of bigotry.

In an attempt to cool tempers, about 250 locals and Somalis, some carrying LOVE THY NEIGHBOR! signs, recently joined one another in a Sunday walk from a downtown church to the local mosque. Hibat told the gathering, “No matter what color, race, ethnicity or religion, we are all Americans and citizens of Lewiston.”

And the Mohamads are trying to be good neighbors. Mohamed is taking classes to improve her English. She has befriended an Irish-American girl nearby who calls her “Mom.” Her husband Hussein works a 12-hour night shift at a local rubber factory. On his days off, he helps his fellow Somalis look for work. The townspeople are trying too. Mohamed recalls that last year a policeman asked her husband to call if he had any problems after Sept. 11, and a concerned teacher asked Hibat if she felt scared. Mohamed says she nods hello to her neighbors and they usually smile back. Indeed, she likes Lewiston so much that she talked it up to her brother in Atlanta, who now lives in the area.

Questions
1. Why did the arrival of Somalis stir controversy in Lewiston? How did the town’s mayor respond?
2. How are residents trying to resolve differences?
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Stop! And Say Cheese

Wilmington police are snapping pictures of people in high-crime areas and taking names. Is this legal?

By NADYA LABI

Martin mills, 25, keeps a low profile in order to stay safe in his tough neighborhood. He cleans hotels for $250 a week and then goes straight home to a three-bedroom house in a predominantly African-American area on the north side of Wilmington, Del. He lives with five of his six children and his girlfriend. His younger brother was robbed at gunpoint and shot in the head a few years ago. “I don’t bother anybody,” he says. “I try to do right, keep a cool head.” He needed one on Sept. 3, when seven or eight cops descended on him as he was leaving the corner deli. They jumped out of an unmarked van and, according to Mills, knocked over his 1-year-old son in their haste to collar Mills. They frisked him, then shoved a camera in his face. He says he heard an officer say, “We are taking your picture now for anything you might do in the future.” They then let him go without charging him with any crime.

Wilmington police say they have “no record” of Mills’ case. But their chief, Michael Szczerba, makes no apologies for his department’s latest effort to crack down on drugs. This summer units of as many as 18 agents, known to locals as “jump-out squads,” began stopping individuals, usually African Americans like Mills, at drug-infested street corners in search of guns, crack and heroin. The police would then take a digital photo, even with no evidence of misbehavior, to file in a database that Szczerba says can be accessed “if we see a subsequent violation.” The department plans to continue indefinitely what it calls Operation Bold Eagle.

The notion of collecting mug shots of potential criminals has sparked comparisons to the futuristic thriller Minority Report, in which a fictional high-tech police unit identifies criminals before they commit crimes, an analogy that Szczerba says is laughable. He adds that it is “highly improbable” that innocent people were caught up in the sweeps. But police statistics show that nearly 20% of the more than 600 people detained thus far were not charged with any offense.

According to the 1968 Supreme Court decision Terry v. Ohio, police can conduct “stop-and-frisks” if they have a reasonable, particularized suspicion that criminal activity is afoot and a suspect is dangerous. But they cannot use these stops to go fishing for criminals in high-crime areas. Cops often blur that distinction. “Police stop generally young males in high-drug-traffic areas based on very little suspicion all the time,” says Bill Stuntz, a Harvard Law School professor. “The reality on the streets is some distance from what the law says.” In Wilmington, the police insist that they abide by the law by engaging in surveillance before they send out the jump-out squads. But what especially bothers the Wilmington operation’s critics, who range from civil libertarians to local politicians, is the pictures taken by the police. The A.C.L.U. is considering suing the police department if it continues the candid shots. Says one of the group’s directors, Barry Steinhardt: “The premise of the Fourth Amendment is that you don’t question people, detain them—and you certainly don’t take photos and enter them into a database—unless you have reasonable cause.”

Most experts believe that as long as the initial stop is legal, the police can take whatever photos they want. The Supreme Court has held that people can have no expectation of privacy when they are in public. That’s why the government was able to scan the faces of fans at last year’s Super Bowl and why it can videotape drivers to make sure they don’t run a red light. “Police can take photos of people in public places,” says Stanford law professor Robert Weisberg. “It can be ugly, immoral, authoritarian, but it’s not unconstitutional.”

Questions
1. What is Operation Bold Eagle?
2. What are the pros and cons of this program?
Martha Parry had had it all figured out when she sold her small insurance firm in Massapequa, N.Y. Her house was paid for, and she would be receiving monthly payments over the next two years from the sale of her business. Those proceeds would cover her expenses until she turned 65 and started collecting Social Security benefits. Meanwhile, the $1 million she had managed to save in tax-advantaged accounts would grow to $1.3 million or so. Only then would she start tapping the income from her nest egg.

That was two years ago. Now the payment stream from her business has come to its scheduled end, and Parry’s plan has fallen apart. Her accountant recently floored her with awful news: the stock market has whacked her savings to $600,000, and she can no longer afford the lifestyle she had tasted so briefly. “I’m looking for part-time work,” she says bitterly. “But something tells me it will end up being full-time work.”

Stung by a jobless recovery on the heels of the first recession in a decade and by a 2 1/2-year slide in stock prices, Americans are more worried about their financial future than at any other time since the turbulent ’70s. They flocked to stocks in the roaring 1990s, only to see $7.7 trillion of paper wealth incinerated. If the scandal and collapse at Enron had been isolated, the nation’s deflated sense of opportunity might have been repaired by now. Instead, the lid has been lifted on bogus revenue-generating schemes throughout the energy and telecom industries; earnings deception on an even broader scale; and the frightening failure of accountants, stock analysts, board directors and regulators to protect the nation’s retirement assets. “These people have all lost credibility and should be prosecuted,” says Parry. “I’ve lost faith in the whole darn market.”

These unsettling developments have forced many of today’s retirees to return to work and have confronted the next generation—the baby boomers, turning 50 at the rate of 10,000 a day—with dire financial issues for the first time in their lives. A powerful set of trends will leave many of them unable to call it quits until after they turn 70—possibly long after.

Stocks and other investments are expected to grow more slowly than usual for years to come. Health-care and college costs are rising fast. Many middle-aged Americans who had children relatively late in life are being hit with tuition bills at the same time they’re footing at least part of the cost of nursing care and other expenses for their parents, who are living longer than anyone expected or planned for. Full Social Security benefits, which have kicked in at age 65 since the program began in 1935, will get pushed back starting next year and gradually recede to age 67. Dozens of companies have scaled back health-insurance benefits for retirees. A smaller percentage of Americans (now just 16%) receives guaranteed-benefit pensions from their employers. Americans are more dependent on 401(k) savings plans—in which balances have been shrinking (4% in 2001, to $10.9 trillion) despite record amounts of new investment ($140 billion last year). “

Questions
1. Why are Americans worried about their financial future?
2. How has the number of older workers changed since the 1970s?
From depleted forests to dying reefs, distress signals dot the globe. Even in the U.S., with its relatively clean environment, excessive carbon emissions fuel global warming.

**Trouble Spots**

- **Sea ice** thickness
    - 1958-76 average: 5.6 ft. (1.7 m)
    - 1993-97 average: 9.8 ft. (3 m)

**Map Key**
- Evergreen forest
- Seasonal forest
- Cropland
- Savanna, grassland
- Shrub land
- Barren
- Urban/city
- Deforestation in the Amazon
- Coral reefs
- High threat
- Medium threat
- Low threat

**Urban areas with more than 10 million people**

- **Urban/city**
  - New York: 16.6 million
  - Los Angeles: 13.1 million
  - Mexico City: 18.1 million
  - São Paulo: 17.8 million
  - Buenos Aires: 12.6 million
  - Rio de Janeiro: 10.6 million

**Coral reefs**
- The U.S. produces more greenhouse gases than any other country—and by far the most per person.

**Deforestation**
- Burning of forests to create cropland and unregulated timber harvesting has destroyed more than 15% of the Amazon in only 30 years.

**Antarctic warming**
- Since 1945 the Antarctic Peninsula has experienced a warming of about 4.5°F (2.5°C). The annual melt season has increased by 2 to 3 weeks in just the past 20 years.

**Food**
- Hunger continues to plague poorer countries, especially in Africa, as badly managed agriculture leads to soil salinization and degradation.

**Percentage of population undernourished, 1997-99**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All developing regions</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia, Pacific*</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America, Caribbean</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near East, North Africa</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Africa</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Africa</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Africa</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Excludes China

**Extent and causes of land degradation, 1996**

- Overgrazing: 6.7
- Deforestation: 5.7
- Industry and urbanization: 0.2
- Fuelwood consumption: 1.4
- Agricultural mismanagement: 5.4

**WATER**

As more of the limited amount of fresh water access to supplies could produce competition...
If India does not curtail population growth, by 2050 it will surpass China as the most populous nation, with a projected 1.5 billion people.

As much as 86% of Indonesia’s coral reefs, home to thousands of marine species, are severely damaged by overfishing, sedimentation and pollution.

Droughts caused by two years of drought may kill as many as 10,000 people in southern Africa in next six months, according to the UN. Countries hardest hit include Zambia, Lesotho, Zimbabwe, Mozambique and Malawi.

Water is used each year, unequally distributed among nations per capita, by subregion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Water resources</th>
<th>Per capita (cubic meters per person per year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td>53,711</td>
<td>36,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe</td>
<td>36,988</td>
<td>20,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>14,818</td>
<td>16,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>14,818</td>
<td>20,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North and Cent. America</td>
<td>-1.04%</td>
<td>15,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>-1.85%</td>
<td>11,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total World</td>
<td>-2.43%</td>
<td>11,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>-4.19%</td>
<td>11,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>-8.01%</td>
<td>11,580</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regions with the most and least water resources

- Water-stressed countries have less than 2,000 cubic meters per person per year
- Water-rich countries have more than 10,000 cubic meters per person per year

Destruction of forests has helped cause the worst spasm of extinctions since the dinosaurs were wiped out 65 million years ago.
An explosion in a karaoke bar in Zamboanga on Mindanao Island in the Philippines kills three people, including an American Green Beret. The local Abu Sayyaf group is suspected.

The French oil tanker Limburg is rammed by an explosives-laden boat off the coast of Al Mukalla, Yemen. One Bulgarian crew member dies, and 90,000 barrels of oil leak into the Gulf.

Two Kuwaiti attacks U.S. Marines at an island training facility in Kuwait, killing one.

An explosion in a church frequented by Westerners in Islamabad is suspected to be al-Qaeda linked.
May 8 A bus bombing in Karachi kills 11 French nationals.

June 14 A car bombing outside the American consulate in Karachi kills 12 Pakistanis. Pakistani police accuse the International Movement of Mujahedin, an al-Qaeda ally.

June 14 A car bombing outside the American consulate in Karachi kills 12 Pakistanis. Pakistani police accuse the International Movement of Mujahedin, an al-Qaeda ally.

April 8 A car bomb in Kabul kills 32 Afghans. An al-Qaeda member tries to kill Afghan President Hamid Karzai in Kandahar a few hours later. American troops kill the gunman.

May 14 A car bombing outside the American consulate in Karachi kills 12 Pakistanis. Pakistani police accuse the International Movement of Mujahedin, an al-Qaeda ally.

Sept. 5 A car bomb in Kabul kills 32 Afghans. An al-Qaeda member tries to kill Afghan President Hamid Karzai in Kandahar a few hours later. American troops kill the gunman.

SOUTHEAST ASIA

Al-Qaeda has been active in Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore and the Philippines. Allies include the regional Jemaah Islamiah and local groups like the Philippines' Moro Islamic Liberation Front.

PAKISTAN

Many al-Qaeda members continue to hide in Pakistan. They've co-opted local groups such as Jaish-e-Muhammad and Lashkar-i-Jhangvi to launch attacks on foreigners.

CENTRAL ASIA

Gangs like the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan and the Eastern Turkestan Islamic Party, whose members trained in Afghanistan under al-Qaeda,

PAKISTAN

Many al-Qaeda members continue to hide in Pakistan. They've co-opted local groups such as Jaish-e-Muhammad and Lashkar-i-Jhangvi to launch attacks on foreigners.
Al-Qaeda: Back on the Attack

With new bases and a looser structure, the group strikes again at the U.S. and its allies. A look inside the ongoing battle to break up the plots

By MICHAEL ELLIOTT

The Sari Club, in the town of Kuta on the Indonesian island of Bali, was one of those places where the world comes out to play. By 11 p.m. on Oct. 12, it was packed with the usual crowd—tanned Australian kids in shorts and halter tops dancing to house music, surfers in from the beach downing beers and Jell-O shots, sports teams from Hong Kong and Singapore, backpackers from around the world—the children of globalization, mobile phones in hand. David Fielder, 46, a British rugby referee in town from Hong Kong for a game, was standing with a group of friends, having what was planned to be the night’s last drink, when he heard an explosion. Ten seconds later, he says, came something more: “There was a huge bang, and I felt I was lifted up. There was just light and sound—it was like someone knocked me out.” Fielder remembers hearing screams and noticing that he could see the sky: the roof of the club had been blown off. Picking himself up from the rubble, he tried to stumble out of the bar, only to fall into a mess of blackened dead bodies.

Investigators with the Australian Federal Police, assisting local Indonesian authorities, think there were three bombs in Bali synchronized to wreak maximum havoc. The first explosion—quite small—was inside Paddy’s Irish Bar, a popular watering hole. A few seconds later, a slightly more powerful bomb exploded in front of the Sari Club. Then, as terrified customers poured into the street from the bars, came the real thing; a Mitsubishi L300 minivan had pulled up to the sidewalk, packed with C4 high explosive and ammonium nitrate—around the world, the car bomber’s favorite recipe. “Why Bali?” asked Fielder. The only answer is another question: Why anywhere?

Though the Bali bombing was particularly sickening, it was part of a greater spasm of violence that has counterterrorism officials bracing for more. The CIA believes that the outrage was the work of Muslim extremists belonging to the Southeast Asian group Jemaah Islamiyah, which the U.S. believes is closely linked with al-Qaeda, the terrorist network headed by Osama bin Laden. And al-Qaeda, CIA Director George Tenet said in congressional testimony last week, is now in “execution phase.” Indeed, senior U.S. intelligence sources tell Time that they fear a recent spate of terrorist attacks around the world may be a warm-up for a much bigger strike against American interests. Al-Qaeda prisoners now being interrogated, says a senior U.S. counterterrorism official, “keep talking about a spectacular event. And I don’t think we saw that event in Bali.”

Al-Qaeda has always been a network of Islamic terrorist groups. But since the destruction of the Afghan training camps last year, it has had to decentralize many of its operations. That has not diminished its power. Many al-Qaeda operatives are now back in their homelands, or in third countries, making common cause with Islamic groups to wage jihad (that is, holy war) against the U.S. and its allies. These factions, inspired by the events of Sept. 11, 2001, do not require contact with one another, or a central authority, to act as al-Qaeda would want them to. “Bin Laden unleashed forces accumulating for many years, and all the gloves are off now,” says Magnus Ranstorp, a terrorism expert at the University of St. Andrews in Scotland. “Centralized clearance is not needed.”

Questions
1. Who is suspected of carrying out the Bali attack?
2. What is al-Qaeda’s status, according to the writer?
7 Questions To Ponder

With military action against Iraq increasingly likely, TIME steps back to consider the pros and cons of attacking Saddam Hussein’s country.

By JOHANNA MCGEARY

THINK ABOUT THIS. TWO MONTHS AGO, YOU had no idea that war with Iraq was necessary. Now, combat seems to be just around the corner. As Washington debates military action, do you know where you stand? One man who has clearly made up his mind is George W. Bush. The President has been masterful at speeding events over and around hurdles toward the point of no return; he massaged a resolution authorizing the use of force against Iraq just enough to win bipartisan support in the House of Representatives last week. The Senate, where many lawmakers harbor misgivings about Bush’s drive to overthrow Saddam Hussein, has begun to give the arguments their most thorough airing yet. But by the time the debate’s up and votes are cast, the Senators too are likely to grant the President approval to fight. Simultaneously, at the United Nations, other countries are wrestling with their roles, under intense U.S. pressure to underwrite a rapid go-ahead. Yet for the rest of us, the how-far-should-we-go-in-curbing-Saddam debate is just beginning to percolate. The choice isn’t clean: questioning Bush’s plans is not the same as calling for the continued survival of an offensive regime. The President this week intends to dwell in ever more demonizing detail on “Saddam’s evil bag of tricks,” as an adviser put it. But most Americans already get that. What sometimes is lost in the debate is a clear-eyed analysis of the risks and benefits of going after Saddam. Here are seven questions worth considering in the days ahead.

1 COULD INSPECTIONS ALONE DO THE TRICK? The White House is certain that renewed U.N. inspections won’t end the threat of Saddam continuing to accumulate weapons of mass destruction and that only his demise will do the trick. Former U.N. inspectors tend to agree. In eight years of policing the country, they found and destroyed sizable quantities of his weapons of mass destruction, but not all of the ones he was known to have. Since inspections broke off in 1998, Saddam is widely believed to have retooled and restocked chemical and biological agents and brought his nuclear program back into high gear, while vastly improving his capacity to hide it all. His history of deception and game playing makes a fresh attempt to root out the arsenal in this way difficult. Saddam, says former inspector David Kay, “will always defeat a U.N.-type of inspection made up of 100 to 300 people in a country as large as Iraq.”

Nevertheless, almost everyone outside the most committed hard-liner thinks inspections should be given one last chance. Bowing to that reality, the Administration’s fallback is to demand that the U.N. prescribe a new regime for unfettered inspections that is so in Iraq’s face that it might work. And if it doesn’t, as the Administration frankly would prefer, it would give the U.S. a legitimate pretext for war. In its view, either inspectors would find something that would trigger action, or they would be blocked by Saddam: either would be cause for green-lighting the bombers.

2 HOW BADLY DOES THE U.S. NEED THE U.N.? The Bush team says it very much wants U.N. support but that it will go to war alone if it has to. This is both true and a negotiating posture. The Administration believes only the fear that the U.S. will act alone can squeeze approval out of the Security Council. But if the U.S. does not get a resolution that fits Bush’s criteria, the Administration means it when it says it will go to war anyway.
IF IT’S WAR, WILL SAddAM COLLAPSE QUICKLY?
Saddam lost about 40% of his conventional force in the 1991 Gulf War. His current 375,000-man army is of uneven quality, his air force mostly grounded and his navy nonexistent. The CIA says he can’t project his power very far and has trouble moving his tanks and artillery swiftly. Does that mean Iraq will crumble on impact? Not necessarily. “You have to anticipate the worst-case scenario—that it will be a vicious, ferocious fight,” says Nebraska’s Republican Senator Chuck Hagel, a Vietnam veteran. The outcome probably turns on how vigorously the 60,000-strong Republican Guard fights. Most experts say it would be foolhardy to write off Saddam’s best-trained troops, especially if the fighting comes to the streets of Baghdad.

WHAT ARE THE ODDS OF HIS FIGHTING DIRTY?
Pentagon war plans assume that precision air attacks with smart bombs can find and safely destroy hidden caches of bio-chem agents that inspectors have failed to uncover. The plans also presume that this can be done before Saddam unleashes any of those weapons. The bombers also need to take out Saddam’s 20 to 30 Scud missiles (which they were not able to do in 1991) before he can fire warheads loaded with conventional explosives or perhaps chemical agents against U.S. forces as they gather. But chemical weapons are hard to control on the battlefield; shifting winds could blow them back on Iraqi soldiers. U.S. forces will go into battle in full protective gear. And the Administration says it plans to warn Iraqi generals and colonels who might order the use of bio-chem weapons that they will be arrested and tried for war crimes if they do.

IF SADDAM DOES GO, WHAT BECOMES OF IRAQ?
Bush long scorned nation building. But to hear Vice President Cheney tell it, good times will bloom in Iraq as soon as the shooting stops. “In other times, the world saw how the U.S. defeated fierce enemies, then helped rebuild their countries,” he said, calling to mind the Marshall Plan in Europe. The U.S., says Cheney, will shape an Iraq “that is democratic and pluralistic, a nation where the human rights of every ethnic and religious group are recognized and respected.”

WILL THE MIDDLE EAST BE BETTER OFF OR WORSE?
There’s anxiety that a war would unite Arab nations against the U.S., especially in an atmosphere charged by the unresolved Palestinian crisis. Bombing, refugees and casualties will fill Arab television screens in a way that was not possible 11 years ago, when networks like al-Jazeera did not exist. Some in the Administration, for their part, think that a democratic Iraq would act as a beacon of stability to the Middle East. The gravest concern in Arab capitals is that Israel will step in. Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon has made no secret of his readiness to hit back if Iraq strikes his country.

WHAT WOULD OSAMA BIN LADEN MAKE OF ALL THIS?
The Vice President has suggested that a successful strike against Saddam would discourage Arab zealots from embracing terrorism: “When the gravest of threats are eliminated, the freedom-loving peoples of the region will have a chance to promote the values that can bring lasting peace,” he said. But images of Americans killing Iraqis, say experts like Daniel Benjamin, a former National Security Council adviser on terrorism, might “further the jihadist cause” by “confirming bin Laden’s argument that the U.S. is at war with Islam.” The first Gulf War, he adds, “was a catalytic event for the Islamists who formed al-Qaeda” because it stationed U.S. troops permanently on sacred Islamic soil.

One side argues this war could stanch terrorism, while another argues it could breed it. The debate is abstract for now. But it is better to have it, with all of its frustrating hypotheticals, than to leave things unsaid. Bush may have handled the doubters masterfully so far. But he may find he needs them—and everyone else—in his corner if the war turns ugly.

Questions
1. What are the pros and cons of attacking Iraq?
2. What is the state of Iraq’s army?
The Trouble With Inspections

Saddam Hussein is playing nice as inspectors arrive in Baghdad, but exposing Iraq’s arms will take more than surprise palace visits

By JOHANNA MCGEARY

OPEN THE GATE. WE WANT TO COME IN.” With those words last week at the entrance to one of Iraq’s presidential sites, weapons inspectors in Baghdad made it clear they intended to go anywhere they wanted in the renewed hunt for weapons of mass destruction that Saddam Hussein may possess. After a few minutes’ hesitation by startled palace guards, the 23 U.N. and International Atomic Energy Agency inspectors were welcomed in—to enter rooms, poke in closets, even inspect a store of marmalade. Iraq was making it just as clear that the regime intended to make a show of its cooperation with the onerous terms of Security Council Resolution 1441. The inspection was largely symbolic for both sides: presidential palaces had been effectively off-limits during the eight years of previous searching, and Saddam’s regular refusal to grant access to sites by December 1998 precipitated not only the end of inspections but also four days of intensive U.S. and British bombing.

Iraqi officials say they believe Washington suggested the choice of al-Sajoud palace that day to U.N. Monitoring, Verification and Inspections Commission (UNMOVIC) chief Hans Blix for a different reason. Iraqi officials assert that the Americans directed inspectors to the compound because they thought Saddam was in the area and they wanted to see how accurately U.S. intelligence was tracking his movements. However the site was chosen, Baghdad believes Washington may have wound up with useful information. Since the Tuesday-morning destination was a secret, inspectors were surprised to be greeted within 10 minutes of their arrival by none other than Saddam’s personal secretary, Abed Hamid Mohmood, who, according to Iraqi officials, sticks close to his boss. These officials say that only Saddam could have granted the order to open up al-Sajoud.

The mix of motives illustrates the conflicting notions of what the inspections are all about. Iraq hopes that the process finally exonerates the regime from charges that it retains forbidden weapons of mass destruction, thus possibly paving the way for an end to economic sanctions. At the same time, Baghdad suspects the U.S. of exploiting the situation to spy. The U.S. expects the inspections to prove that Saddam is still hoarding illicit weapons and deserves to be forcibly disarmed. For many members of the U.N., a clean—or cleanish—accounting is the only possible hope for heading off war.

The procedure for arriving at one of those conclusions began last week with visits to 22 suspected sites in Iraq. A preliminary crescendo will be reached once experts have had time to digest the more than 11,000 pages of Iraq’s disclosure—the eighth one since the Gulf War ended—of what it has and is trying to obtain in the way of biological, chemical and nuclear weapons, plus missiles to deliver them into enemy territory. In theory, if analysts reading the declaration catch Iraq in any lies, that’s a “material breach” of the resolution and grounds for
“severe consequences.” Officials in Washington and London as well as at the U.N. say such a finding will not automatically start the guns firing. But what is or is not in Iraq’s declaration, they warn, could mark the point of no return in the Bush Administration’s deliberate march toward war.

The report Iraq handed over Saturday was its last chance to come clean about its illegal arsenal. U.N. analysts dubbed Iraq’s previous weapons inventories “complete fairy tales.” Now Point 3 of Resolution 1441 again requires the regime to list in minute detail what prohibited weapons it has ever produced, stored or documented as well as something equally dangerous but more elusive: its intellectual and industrial capacity to make new illicit weapons after the inspectors go home. That means Iraq also has to report on thousands of so-called dual-use facilities such as paint factories, pesticide plants, hospitals and distilleries, which could conceivably be involved in making weapons, along with material-procurement networks and import lists. U.S. officials say a misleading or incomplete report will not trigger instant military action, since they want inspections to go on to document a convincing pattern of misbehavior before they act against Iraq.

By 1998, the U.N. had made considerable progress toward finding and destroying the prohibited weapons that Iraq admitted it possessed. But in its final report, the old inspection team emphasized how hard it had been to find a base line. Those inspectors left a long list of stuff they knew existed but never found or could not verify that Iraq had destroyed as claimed. Yet what really had them worried after eight years—because of Saddam’s record of being exposed in a lie—was how much weaponry they still had no inkling might exist. Last week the man preparing Iraq’s declaration, the chief of its inspections-monitoring directorate, General Hussam Mohammed Amin, repeated Saddam’s constant claim: Iraq has no more weapons of mass destruction. Whatever it once had was destroyed or uncovered in past inspections, he said. At the same time, he acknowledged in advance that the report would include some “new elements with regards to new sites and new activities,” suggesting that Iraq might fess up to items it believes the U.S. already knows about. But, says Richard Butler, head of the inspection team ousted in 1998, the real dirt will ultimately be mined by comparing the new documents with the million pages on file at the U.N. and teasing out inconsistencies in the new inventory. The length of the declaration is no doubt intentional, Butler tells Time. “Dumping a truckload of material is part of the process of obfuscation,” he says.

It is the U.N.’s responsibility to assess Iraq’s report. Officials there said they would not even share the declaration with Security Council members until they had purged any sections that serve as manuals for making illicit weapons. In any case, the highly skeptical Bush Administration will make its own judgments, looking at what is on the list—such as what the Iraqis did with tons of mustard-gas materials that have not been accounted for—and, just as important, what is not on the list. It will measure Iraq’s veracity by comparing its list with the one the CIA has in its pocket. Administration officials, from the President on down, continued to insist last week that they had “solid” evidence—which they had never made public—that Saddam did too have an extensive armory for mass murder. U.N. officials have repeatedly asked Bush to make that intelligence available to help the inspectors. The U.S., which preferred to let Iraq come forward with its inventory first, says it will begin sharing its intelligence to help inspectors undermine Iraq’s declaration. But the Administration wants to choose its own gotcha moment.

Questions
1. What goals do the U.S. and Iraq have for weapons inspections in Iraq?
2. What was the content of Iraq’s latest declaration?
Late in November, teams of United Nations weapons inspectors began arriving in Iraq. Their mission: to verify whether Iraqi President Saddam Hussein was telling the truth when he stated that his country has no weapons of mass destruction. In response to this development, commentators offered a variety of perspectives on Saddam’s motives and tactics. Study the images at left. Then answer the questions below.

1. How is Saddam Hussein depicted in each of the three cartoons at left? What similarities and contrasts do you see among the three portrayals of Saddam?

2. How does the creator of the top cartoon portray Saddam’s attitude toward the United Nations? How does the middle cartoon depict the relationship between Iraq and the U.S.? What prediction is contained in the bottom cartoon?

3. In which of the three images does Saddam appear most vulnerable? Most powerful? Most rebellious? What details and symbols convey these impressions?

4. According to The Trouble With Inspections on page 23, why was the inspectors’ visit to the al-Sajoud palace so significant? By what were inspectors surprised during the course of this visit?

5. Do you believe weapons inspections can be successful? Why or why not? How do you think each cartoonist would respond? Explain.
Look Who’s Got the Bomb

Confronted by the U.S., North Korea brazenly admits that it is building nuclear weapons. Now what does President Bush do in response?

By JOHANNA MCGEARY

Trial lawyers preach a cardinal principle: never ask a question to which you don’t know the answer. Diplomats generally operate on the same basis. So when the Bush Administration presented evidence to North Korean leaders on Oct. 3 that their country was developing nuclear weapons, it expected the regime to lie about it. A day later came the shocker. Yes, we’ve been secretly working to produce nukes, a top aide to “Dear Leader” Kim Jong Il told astonished U.S. envoy James Kelly. And, he added, we’ve got “more powerful” weapons—presumably meaning biological and chemical agents— to boot. He was not apologetic at all, says a U.S. official, but “assertive, aggressive about it.”

Tightly controlled countries like North Korea typically stonewall such sensitive inquiries. So the admission did more than just confirm long-held suspicions in Washington that North Korea, a charter member in Bush’s “axis of evil,” had pursued weapons of mass destruction despite a 1994 agreement to stop. The revelation also jerked a preoccupied world to attention. Why, everyone wondered, was Kim confessing now? And why had Bush pressed the issue, when he was already immersed in two major global confrontations? No wonder the Administration sat on the news for 12 days while it scrambled to figure out how to downsize the crisis. By the time the Bush team went public with the news last week, it was also trying to reassure citizens and allies that this standoff would be addressed, at least for now, with diplomacy, not military might.

Mistrust of North Korea has been a bedrock U.S. policy since war on the Korean peninsula ended in 1953. Pyongyang’s erratic behavior consistently confirms such skepticism. The latest confrontation was quite deliberate, says a senior Bush aide. For more than two years, the CIA had been collecting shards of information suggesting that North Korea was secretly pursuing nuclear weapons, despite the 1994 Agreed Framework requiring Pyongyang to freeze its program to extract plutonium from reprocessed reactor fuel. (The CIA has long thought that North Korea made—and kept—one or two plutonium-based bombs from before 1994.)

But North Korea apparently figured it could obtain nukes another way: using the slower but more easily hidden method of enriching uranium to weapons grade in gas centrifuges—the same method some now accuse Saddam Hussein of pursuing. To accomplish that, the reclusive North Koreans needed to buy know-how and equipment abroad, including high-strength aluminum for the whirling centrifuges. By late July, the CIA had picked up enough tip-offs to conclude that Pyongyang was procuring banned supplies. By late summer, a Bush aide says, “things fell in place, and we could say, Aha!”

So who assisted the Koreans? U.S. officials suspect Pakistan. China and Russia also make centrifuges, but surely neither wants a nuclear-armed North Korea.

NORTH KOREA ZIGZAGS

For years, the reclusive state has swung wildly between belligerency and aid-seeking diplomacy. Here are some highlights:

High point ▲

Low point ▼

▲ March 12, 1993
North Korea threatens to withdraw from the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty that it had signed in 1985

▲ Oct. 21, 1994
The crisis ends when the U.S. and North Korea sign the Agreed Framework, a pact that pledges North Korea to freeze its nuclear-weapons program in exchange for financial aid and two civilian nuclear reactors

▲ Aug. 31, 1998
North Korea test-fires an intercontinental missile, the Taepodong 1, over Japan, proving it possesses dangerous vehicles that can deliver nuclear weapons

▲ June 13–15, 2000
North Korea’s Kim Jong Il meets for the first time with Kim Dae Jung, the leader of South Korea, in Pyongyang, where they sign a historic agreement vowing to seek peace and reunification
North Korea next door. Islamabad and Pyongyang, however, made natural partners: Pakistan had the Bomb but no missiles to deliver it, and North Korea is the world’s most active missile proliferator, especially to customers who can’t shop elsewhere. In 1998 Pakistan tested a homemade Ghauri medium-range ballistic missile that the U.S. believes originated in North Korea.

That doesn’t mean the deal was government to government. Pakistani President Pervez Musharraf denies that his regime supplied Pyongyang’s enrichment program. But in 1998 Washington slapped sanctions on the lab of Abdul Qadir Khan, the so-called father of Pakistan’s Bomb. As head of the nation’s nuclear program, he made the Ghauri as a carbon copy of North Korea’s Nodong missile, say U.S. officials. Khan is believed to have established front companies and smuggling operations to gather and sell nuclear blueprints. Musharraf forced his resignation as the lab’s leader 18 months ago.

The Bush Administration has flip-flopped on North Korea. It recently had agreed to resume talks with Pyongyang, suspended since early 2001. But when Assistant Secretary of State Kelly took off for North Korea in early October, the purpose of his mission had changed dramatically. The CIA had briefed Bush in August about its new intelligence on Pyongyang’s secret enrichment program. The President decided to confront Kim with the evidence, but the Administration first shared it with several congressional leaders and key countries that the U.S. would need to help lean on Pyongyang: Japan, South Korea, China, and Russia.

The stakes couldn’t be higher. War with North Korea, Bush told his aides, was out of the question. He could not let Kim alter the fragile balance of power on the Korean peninsula, where 37,000 U.S. troops stand across the DMZ from a million-man army close enough to destroy Seoul, South Korea’s capital, in a blitzkrieg. By Bush’s own doctrine of pre-emption, the U.S. should strike against any state with weapons of mass destruction and an irresponsible dictator. But the consequences of attacking Pyongyang are unacceptable. What Bush apparently never anticipated was a brazen admission that the evidence was right.

The conundrum of Kim, who succeeded his father Kim Il Sung eight years ago as North Korea’s absolute ruler, has flummoxed Washington for years. The xenophobic leader can veer from aggressive hostility to quiet bids to mend relations with the outside world, particularly if other nations help leapfrog his poverty-stricken people into the modern era. Like his father, when Kim has been most desperate for foreign aid, he has used the rattle of nukes to frighten the U.S. and its allies into buying him off.

Few have enough to eat in North Korea, and 45% of children under the age of 5 suffer chronic malnutrition. At least 6 million of the country’s 22 million people depend on international food aid. Hospitals have no heat, no disinfectant, no anesthetic, no rubber gloves. Kim devotes nearly a third of North Korea’s GDP to military spending.

Some experts suggest that as North Korea’s rigid system breaks down around him, Kim is reaching clumsily for reform. But U.S. Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld shrugged off any notion that Kim’s confession augurs real change. “I don’t think there’s any way in the world anyone could say it’s a good sign,” he said.

Questions
1. How did North Korea respond when the U.S. accused it of developing nuclear weapons?
2. In what ways is Kim Jong Il “a conundrum”?
Arafat’s Last Stand?

As walls crumble around Palestine’s old soldier, his friends grow fewer and fewer

By SIMON ROBINSON/RAMALLAH

Trapped between the imminent threat of an Israeli army bulldozer crashing through a ground-floor wall or catching a bullet on an upper floor, Yasser Arafat spent much of last Friday and Saturday on the second floor of his Ramallah refuge telephoning Arab and European leaders to ask for support and fuming at the latest Israeli incursion into his West Bank compound. With his oldest enemies once again closing in around him and allies questioning whether they should continue to support him, Arafat was assailed from above and below.

The Israeli military operation, dubbed Matter of Time, was launched in response to two new Palestinian suicide bombings. By late Saturday night, the Israelis had ripped down all but a small section of Arafat’s office building and planted Israel’s flag after removing that of Palestine. Over loudspeakers, the Israelis demanded that a small group of what they claimed were terrorists vacate the building, even as their army continued to demolish what was left of the compound and hundreds of Palestinians began massing in the streets of Ramallah to protest Israel’s tightening siege.

The first suicide bombing, last Wednesday, claimed the life of a policeman near Umm al-Fahm junction in northern Israel. The following day, just after 1 P.M., a man boarded a crowded No. 4 bus in the heart of Tel Aviv. Before the driver could sell him a ticket, the man detonated his deadly payload, killing six and wounding more than 60. The double blows came just hours after the Israel Defense Forces lifted its three-month-long curfew in some West Bank cities and towns, following six weeks of relative calm in Israel. “As soon as we ease the pressure, they’re getting ready for another attack,” complained a senior Israeli intelligence official.

Four hours after the Tel Aviv attack, Prime Minister Ariel Sharon met with Defense Minister Binyamin Ben-Eliezer and senior military and intelligence officials. Sharon argued that Arafat should be forced into exile. But Ben-Eliezer and most of the other officials spoke against exile, believing it would give Arafat new life and a ready excuse for his inability—or refusal, as Israelis see it—to rein in militants. At 6:30 P.M. Sharon convened a meeting of his Cabinet and announced a plan to isolate his old enemy but not exile or kill him.

The latest operation draws on lessons learned from an earlier attempt to isolate Arafat during Operation Defensive Shield in March and from the May siege of Palestinian militants holed up in the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem. During both assaults, peace activists managed to get into the besieged compounds, limiting the Israeli army’s ability to operate “and creating a show,” as Israeli Communications Minister Reuven Rivlin puts it. This time around, some 500 soldiers from two infantry battalions—under orders not to harm Arafat deliberately, according to the Israeli army—surrounded the compound with tanks while members of the Diamond unit from the engineering corps, which specializes in controlled explosions, systematically destroyed every building except for the one housing Arafat’s sleeping quarters and office. The Palestinian Ministry of the Interior was dynamited. A bridge between Arafat’s office and the four-story headquarters of Palestinian military intelligence was pushed over by a bulldozer. Tractors dug a trench around Arafat’s building, which soldiers then filled with razor wire. And Israeli snipers killed at least two Palestinians. “We want to control anyone going in or out,” says Rivlin. “We have time, we have patience, and we are taking it step by step. Yesterday he had 100 rooms. Now he has only 50. And it is getting fewer by the hour.”

Questions

1. Why did Israel launch Operation Matter of Time?
2. What is the goal of the Israeli operation?
WASHINGTON’S BURSTS OF INTEREST IN Latin America rarely last long. Spanish-speaking George W. Bush came into office billing himself as the region’s *mejor amigo* in the new “Century of the Americas.” Yet when it came to Latin America’s economic travails, Bush adhered to the principle of tough love: no more bailouts. South Americans, however, weren’t prepared for the jibe they got from Treasury Secretary Paul O’Neill just before a visit to the continent. Even as a parade of U.S. CEOs stood accused of corruption, O’Neill remarked that Washington shouldn’t help save the region’s debt-choked economies because the money might wind up in Swiss bank accounts. His quip sent Brazil’s faltering currency, the real, into free fall.

Once O’Neill saw South America’s financial chaos up close during that quick tour of battered Brazil, Uruguay and Argentina, he wasn’t so flip. Before he reached home, the Bush Administration surprised everyone by signing off on a $30 billion International Monetary Fund (IMF) rescue loan for Brazil, which began to restore stability. O’Neill gave tiny Uruguay $1.5 billion from the U.S. Treasury to stop a run on that country’s banks. Now even profligate, bankrupt Argentina, which has sunk into bottomless recession through corruption and misguided policies, hopes to get in on the aid, though O’Neill has promised it nothing.

The abrupt policy change followed a familiar pattern for the Bush team: resist, resist, resist—especially if Bill Clinton championed it—then relent when reality intrudes. Brazil, with Latin America’s No. 1 economy and the world’s ninth largest, was simply too big to fail. The fallout would have rocked Wall Street, where major U.S. banks and businesses have huge exposure—more than $100 billion in loans and investments. While diehard ideologues cried betrayal, the business-first wing of the G.O.P. was delighted by the Administration’s about-face. “The bank stocks are all up,” said a Republican operative. “It helped add to the feeling that we might be out of the woods.”

Politics was the bottom line, after all. Investors set off Brazil’s crisis out of fear that the two leftist candidates leading in presidential election polls would reverse the country’s laudable efforts to adopt free-market reforms. A Brazilian default could upset the tenuous U.S. recovery and cost U.S. Republicans in November’s congressional elections. That vote also coincides with the start of new negotiations for a giant hemispheric free-trade pact. If Brazil’s economy continues to melt down, those talks will implode, causing Bush political embarrassment.

The Administration’s overdue attention to the region—the U.S.’s No. 1 export market—comes as the U.S. economic model that most Latin American nations adopted at Washington’s behest a decade ago has been failing. Despite rosy promises that open markets and budget austerity would improve living standards for all, more of the region’s 500 million people are stuck in poverty, and its economies look more like Global Crossing than the global players they aspired to be. The sense that Washington was losing influence in Latin America deepended last week when Marxist guerrillas fired mortar shells in Bogota, killing 20, during President Alvaro Uribe’s inauguration.
The backlash can be felt in the rise of left-wing politicians vowing to temper market coldheartedness with old-fashioned protections for workers and the poor. Erstwhile radicals like Luiz Inacio Lula da Silva, 56, fiery head of Brazil’s Workers Party, are running on rejection of “the Washington Consensus,” as the capitalist reforms have come to be called.

In an interview with Time, Lula made it clear that if he becomes President, Bush’s hemispheric trade plan may have to wait beyond its current 2005 deadline. “Latin America,” he says, “has to quit treating the U.S. as an empire.” Though Lula reluctantly said he would live up to the rather stringent terms of the IMF’s loan if he is elected on Oct. 6, neither he nor second-ranked Ciro Gomes, the candidate of the Workers Front coalition, is regarded with much enthusiasm in Washington. A former metalworker known for integrity, Lula insists he won’t nix the capitalist reforms but will make them fairer—starting with a crackdown on Brazil’s epic tax evasion.

Corruption is key. South America did need the discipline and budget austerity of U.S.-backed reforms, which freed the region from crippling hyperinflation and ushered in hundreds of billions of dollars in foreign investment. But they couldn’t whip the plague of corrupt elites, absentee judicial systems and addiction to foreign capital that made Latin American capitalism as ripe for abuse and collapse as an Enron office suite. Says Stanford University Latin America scholar Terry Karl: “The Washington Consensus just further concentrated economic and political power in a region that already had the worst inequality in the world.”

Bush’s Latin America team argues that this is why it refuses to bail out unreformed kleptocracies like Argentina. Buenos Aires, said O’Neill, still lacks a “crystal-clear idea of the rule of law.”

The Washington Consensus might have worked better had Washington preached open democracy as earnestly as open markets. In giant Sao Paulo, Lula’s home base, single mother Janecleide Batista, 24, lost her job as a telephone operator when her company was sold to a foreign firm. Now she lives in a squatters’ shack on a small vacant lot with eight other families. To her, free-market reforms mean that Brazil’s World Cup-champion soccer team “gets free new cars, while we sit here on the street and get nothing.” The Bush bailouts may buy time, but they may not be enough to prop up faith in the capitalist road to prosperity.

Questions
1. Describe the Bush Administration’s recent policy changes concerning financial assistance to nations in Latin America.
2. What was the impact of former Treasury Secretary O’Neill’s remarks on aid to Latin America?
Meet the Newest Nobel Prize Winners

At the time of his death, Alfred Nobel—a chemist who invented dynamite—established an annual prize to reward outstanding achievement in five fields: physics, chemistry, medicine, literature and world peace. (A prize in economics was added in 1968.) When the prestigious prizes were first awarded in 1901, recipients received $40,000; they now receive more than $1 million each.

**JIMMY CARTER PEACE**

As former Presidents go, Jimmy Carter is tops. This was confirmed when the Nobel Committee recognized him for his “untiring effort to find peaceful solutions to international conflicts, to advance democracy and human rights, and to promote economic and social development.” The committee acknowledged the role he played while President in the 1978 Camp David accords, when he forged a peace treaty between Egypt and Israel, and for the work he has done since leaving office in 1981. In 1982 Carter and his wife Rosalynn founded the Carter Center, which promotes human rights, democracy and health care. He has traveled the world from East Timor to Haiti mediating conflicts and monitoring elections, and promoted Habitat for Humanity, an organization that builds housing for low-income families. In its statement the committee noted that “in a situation currently marked by threats of the use of power, Carter has stood by the principles that conflicts must as far as possible be resolved through mediation and international cooperation based on international law.” Committee chairman Gunnar Berge said the choice of Carter, who opposes unilateral U.S. action against Iraq, should be viewed as criticism of the Bush Administration’s hard-line policy on Iraq.

**IMRE KERTESZ LITERATURE**

It is hardly surprising that Hungarian novelist Imre Kertesz, 72, is not well known in the U.S.: only two of his books have been translated into English. But he is also somewhat of a stranger in his native country. His low profile may be in part because of the dense themes in his writing. Sent to Auschwitz at age 14 in 1944, Kertesz was transferred to, and subsequently liberated from, Buchenwald in 1945. He returned to Hungary only to endure communist rule for four decades. In his novels and essays he revisits the Holocaust, pondering, in the words of the Nobel Committee, “the fragile experience of the individual against the barbaric arbitrariness of history.” His 1975 novel, *Fateless*, concerns a young boy shipped to Auschwitz who survives by conforming in thought and behavior.

**DANIEL KAHNEMAN ECONOMICS**

A professor at Princeton University, Kahneman, 65, is a cognitive psychologist. In his studies he has shown that people are not particularly wise about assessing probability. His work, he has said, was inspired by such curiosities as finding that when polled, subjects said they would travel 20 minutes to save $5 on a $15 calculator but not spend the same time to save $5 on a $125 jacket. Kahneman won the prize, according to the committee, for “having integrated insights from psychological research into economic science.” Upon learning that he had won, Kahneman locked himself out of his house, proving again that rational thought and economics don’t always go hand in hand.

**Questions**

1. What political message did the Nobel Committee send through this year’s peace prize?
2. Describe the winner of the 2002 Literature prize.
## Current Events In Review

Test your knowledge of stories covered in the *Current Events Update* by answering the following multiple-choice questions.

### 1. Demographers predict that by 2050, the world population will reach what level?
- a. 7.3 billion
- b. 8.6 billion
- c. 9.3 billion
- d. 10.7 billion

### 2. In the November election, Republicans:
- a. regained control of the House but lost control of the Senate
- b. lost control of the House but regained control of the Senate
- c. lost control of the House and Senate
- d. gained control of the House and Senate

### 3. The former U.S. President who was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize is:
- a. Bill Clinton
- b. Jimmy Carter
- c. Ronald Reagan
- d. Gerald Ford

### 4. The Department of Homeland Security will be headed by:
- a. Tom Ridge
- b. Henry Kissinger
- c. Tom Daschle
- d. Nancy Pelosi

### 5. The new Majority Leader of the U.S. Senate is:
- a. Trent Lott
- b. Tom Daschle
- c. Nancy Pelosi
- d. Hillary Clinton

### 6. Operation Bold Eagle is an anti-drug effort that involves which of the following procedures:
- a. wiretapping
- b. digital photos
- c. Internet surveillance
- d. fingerprinting

### 7. Climate experts predict that, over the next 100 years, world temperatures will:
- a. rise steadily
- b. decline steadily
- c. remain unchanged
- d. rise steeply, then fall to current levels

### 8. The Democratic Senator from Minnesota who was killed in an October plane crash was:
- a. Walter Mondale
- b. Jesse Helms
- c. Paul Wellstone
- d. Norm Coleman

### 9. Critics charge that the Homeland Security’s “Total Information Awareness” program will allow government surveillance of:
- a. e-mail
- b. travel documents
- c. banking records
- d. all of the above

### 10. Prior to George W. Bush, the last Republican President to enjoy majorities in both the House and Senate was:
- a. Ronald Reagan
- b. Gerald Ford
- c. Richard Nixon
- d. Dwight Eisenhower

### 11. The President of this country admitted that his government has been developing nuclear weapons.
- a. Afghanistan
- b. Bali
- c. Brazil
- d. Hungary
- e. India
- f. Iraq
- g. Israel
- h. Japan
- i. North Korea
- j. Pakistan
- k. United States
- l. Uruguay

### 12. The U.S. Treasury gave this nation $1.5 billion to stop a run on banks.

### 13. The winner of this year’s Nobel Prize in Economics is from here.

### 14. If this nation does not curtail population growth by 2050, it will surpass China as the world’s most populous country.

### 15. The Bush Administration surprised observers by signing off on a $30 billion International Monetary Fund rescue loan for this country.

### 16. The President of this country denies that his regime supplied North Korea’s nuclear-enrichment program.

### 17. The winner of this year’s Nobel Prize in Literature is from this nation.

### 18. This country’s Prime Minister announced a plan to isolate, but not to exile or kill, his political enemy.

### 19. Al-Qaeda is suspected of bombing a nightclub on this island.

### 20. U.N. inspectors are searching for weapons of mass destruction here.
Answer Key

Charts and Graphs in Focus (page 4)
1. The current world population is 6.1 billion.
2. The projected world population for 2050 is 9.3 billion.
3. North America: 76.7; Africa: 51.4. The prevalence of AIDS and other life-threatening diseases in Africa helps account for this difference.
4. Projections vary; temperatures are expected to increase from 57.9°F to between 61.5°F and 66°F, largely because of the continued burning of fossil fuels.
5. Since 1973, worldwide use of oil has decreased. Consumption of natural gas has increased.
6. Answers will vary.
7. 65% of Americans surveyed approved of the President’s job performance at the time of the poll; this figure was down from 70% in July.
8. 80%.
9. 25%.
10. Support for military action decreased, from 73% to 51%.
11. 80% planned to fly the flag; 32% said they would attend a memorial service.
12. 61% of young people said Sept. 11 should be a national holiday.

Death on the Campaign Trail (page 5)
1. Wellstone will be remembered for his willingness to take unpopular stands and to vote against the resolution granting war powers to President George W. Bush.
2. Wellstone’s death left the Senate divided 49-49.
3. Republicans were pessimistic about being able to defeat the Democrat who would replace Wellstone on the ballot.

The Battle Hymn of the Republicans (pages 6–9)
1. Only three other times in the past century has a President’s party gained House seats in an off-year election, and not since the Civil War has the President’s party won back a Senate majority since Dwight Eisenhower to enjoy outright majorities in the House and Senate.
2. Bush identified passage of homeland-security legislation as the top priority on his agenda.

Homeland Security: A Primer (pages 10–11)
1. The mission of the Homeland Security Department includes coordinating counter-terrorism measures as well as preemptive defense.
2. Critics say that the new department will have the power to gather private information exchanged between U.S. citizens—including surveillance of e-mail, credit card and banking records, and travel documents.

After the Election: Bush’s Agenda (page 12)
Answers will vary depending on the issue selected and on students’ views about this topic.

Give Us Your Tired … Just Not All of Them (page 13)
1. The Somalis’ arrival in Lewiston prompted some of the town’s residents to suggest that the newcomers should go home and stop taking advantage of local services. The town’s mayor urged the Somali community to stop the flow of immigrants to Lewiston.
2. Residents held a Sunday walk from a downtown church to the local mosque and have befriended people from different ethnic groups in an attempt to build understanding.

Stop! And Say Cheese (page 14)
1. Operation Bold Eagle is the name for an effort by police in Wilmington, Delaware, to crack down on crime by stopping individuals and then taking digital photos, even with no evidence of criminal activity. The photos are then filed in a database.
2. Critics charge that the program violates the Fourth Amendment, because citizens are being photographed without reasonable cause. Proponents claim that the program is constitutional and that it is helping to reduce crime.

Everyone, Back in the Labor Pool (page 15)
1. The economic recession, a long decline in stock prices, and increasing rates of joblessness have all caused Americans to worry about their financial future.
2. In 1985, approximately 16% of men were working at age 70; today that number has risen to approximately 23%.

Al-Qaeda: Back on the Attack (page 20)
1. The Southeast Asian group Jemaah Islamiah is suspected of being responsible for the attack in Bali.
2. The writer states that although al-Qaeda has been decentralized, its power has not been diminished.

7 Questions To Ponder (pages 23–24)
1. A successful attack could end the threat posed by Saddam, who is suspected of continuing to accumulate weapons of mass destruction. But there is anxiety that an attack could unite Arab nations against the U.S. and could lead Saddam to order the use of bio-chemical weapons against U.S. troops.
2. Currently, the Iraqi army has 375,000 men; its air force is mostly grounded; and its navy is nonexistent. But the Republican Guard, an elite unit, has 60,000 highly trained members and is expected to put up a bitter fight.

The Trouble With Inspections (pages 23–24)
1. The U.S. believes it will find evidence of weapons of mass destruction; such a discovery could lead to military action. Iraq claims that there are no such weapons and hopes that the inspections will lead to the lifting of economic sanctions currently imposed on Iraq.
2. The latest declaration, which consists of 11,000 pages, contains Iraq’s official statement on what it currently possesses and is trying to obtain in the way of biological, chemical and nuclear weapons.

Saddam Hussein: A Gallery of Views (page 25)
1. The top cartoon portrays Saddam as deceptively and rebellious; the middle cartoon shows him as a cat about to be declawed by the U.S.; and in the bottom image he (along with Osama bin Laden) has outsmarted his opponents and is living comfortably in November 2003.
2. Saddam is defiant toward the U.N. in the top image. In the middle image, the figure representing the U.S. is dominating the frame and is about to strip Saddam of his power. The third cartoon predicts that Saddam will escape harm in the coming months.
3. The middle cartoon depicts Saddam as most vulnerable; the top image portrays him as most powerful; the top image shows him at his most rebellious.
4. North Korean leaders surprised the U.S. by admitting that they were developing nuclear weapons. They added that their country was also in possession of “more powerful” weapons, most likely chemical and biological agents.
5. Kim Jong II is sometimes hostile and at other times appears to want to improve relations with the outside world. He has been known to use the threat of nuclear weapons to garner aid from the U.S.

Arafat’s Last Stand? (page 28)
1. Israel launched Operation Matter of Time in response to new Palestinian suicide bombings.
2. The operation seeks to isolate Arafat, but not to exile or kill him.

Bush’s Lost Continent (pages 29–30)
1. Bush pledged that he would provide no bailouts for Latin American nations. Yet the Bush Administration later okayed a $30 billion rescue loan for Brazil, presumably because the collapse of Brazil’s economy would have caused serious problems for Wall Street and for the world economy.
2. O’Neill’s gip had the result of sending Brazil’s currency into a major decline.

Meet the Newest Nobel Prize Winners (page 31)
1. By awarding the Peace Prize to former President Jimmy Carter, the committee offered a criticism of the Bush Administration’s hard-line policy on Iraq.
2. Literature Prize Winner Imre Kertész is a Hungarian novelist who writes about the Holocaust and probes the “barbaric arbitrariness of history.”

Current Events in Review (page 32)
1. c. 2. d. 3. b. 4. a. 5. a. 6. b. 7. a
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