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A Quagmire? More Like a Presidential Fixation

By Walter Pincus

Sunday, August 31, 2003; Page B05

It has all the elements of a summer potboiler: a president obsessed with overthrowing a foreign leader, an intelligence chief on the hot seat, and the clash of cultures between American soldiers abroad and the people of a proud foreign nation.

But the book I've been reading is no potboiler. It's "A Look Over My Shoulder," the recently published memoir by the late Richard Helms, the legendary CIA director whose retrospective account of the use and misuse of intelligence during his experience with Cuba and Vietnam four decades ago bears a sobering resemblance to what appears to be happening today with Iraq.

The word that comes to mind about U.S. policy when reading Helms isn't "quagmire." It's ignorance or maybe arrogance -- combined with a willful disregard of facts that do not correspond with the personal or political priorities of American decision makers. And for this reason, Helms's story is one that deserves attention, not just on the pages of book review sections, but in the White House itself.

Helms, who took over the running of Cuban covert operations during the Kennedy administration, describes how President John F. Kennedy and his brother, then-Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, were fixated on ousting Fidel Castro almost to the exclusion of other, more serious, world problems. To readers today, there is an obvious parallel to President Bush and his administration's singular focus on Saddam Hussein and regime change in Iraq while pushing aside the war on terrorism and other international issues.

The Kennedy fixation on Castro stemmed from the disastrous Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba. The Bush fixation arises in part from his view and the view of those around him that his father should have taken out Hussein in 1991 at the time of the first Gulf War. Bush is also settling a score over the alleged 1993 Iraqi plot to kill the senior Bush.

"It was the ouster of Castro and his unelected government that interested the president," Helms wrote of the early 1960s. "The agency's operational arm was stretched taut and thin. Our response to President Kennedy's demands had already resulted in what must have been the largest peacetime secret intelligence operation in history."

Yet Kennedy failed in a task that many thought would be, to borrow a more recent phrase, a cakewalk. Helms quotes then-CIA inspector general Lyman Kirkpatrick, who back in 1962 attributed the Bay of Pigs failure to a series of miscalculations:

* "An overall lack of recognition on the part of the U.S. Government as to the magnitude of the operation required to overthrow the Fidel Castro regime.

* "The failure on the part of the U.S. Government to plan for all contingencies at the time of the Cuban operation including the necessity for using regular U.S. military forces in the event that the exiled Cubans could not do the job themselves."
"The failure on the part of the U.S. Government to be willing to commit to the Cuban operation as planned and executed those necessary resources required for its success."

Sounds familiar, particularly when you substitute the name Iraq for Cuba.

The U.S. focus on Cuba as a potential communist threat in the midst of the Cold War became self-fulfilling as the Soviets arrived with their missiles, creating a major confrontation. The Bush administration's unproven allegations of Iraqi links with terrorists who threatened the United States also have become self-fulfilling. The charges helped justify the U.S. invasion and now Islamic fighters from throughout the Middle East are joining up inside Iraq to attack Americans.

Perhaps the most distressing parallels arise from Helms's retelling of incidents from the Vietnam War period. In both cases, there was a tendency to accentuate the positive -- and suppress the negative.

When Helms's deputy testified before Congress and mentioned the high number of civilian casualties caused by the U.S. bombing of North Vietnam military and industrial targets, President Lyndon B. Johnson got hold of the CIA director the next day and told him, "'The next time you or one of your fellows plans to mention civilian casualties in North Vietnam, I want you both to come down and have a drink with me before you go to testify on the Hill.' There was no more sensitive subject for President Johnson than civilian casualties in that war," Helms writes.

When was the last time anyone heard a Bush administration official discuss Iraqi civilian casualties?

CIA Director George J. Tenet has probably suffered the same discomfort over Bush's public statements about Iraq that Helms had when Johnson repeatedly publicized the good news about the war in Vietnam.

This disregard for the negative wasn't just for public consumption. In the cases of both Vietnam and Iraq, policymakers often disregarded what they didn't want to hear. "Policy advocates occasionally tend to overstate -- or ignore -- relevant data," Helms writes in describing how intelligence information came up at top-level meetings he attended in the Kennedy and Johnson eras. "My role," he writes, "was to keep the game honest . . . I remained on the sidelines as policy discussions developed and spoke up only when information crept into the dialogue which seemed to be at odds with the facts as I knew them." But Johnson often refused to discuss the negative estimates that came out of Helms's CIA.

Like Helms, Tenet has, at times, tried to play the honest interpreter in the National Security Council and other White House meetings. Tenet spoke up when intelligence was going to be misused in one of Bush's speeches on Iraq in October 2002, but it is less clear what interventions the CIA director made later.

Tenet has another dilemma that Helms also faced. As CIA director dealing with the Vietnam War, Helms had what he describes as "two quite different responsibilities." The analysts in his Directorate of Intelligence had "to judge the success or lack thereof of the U.S. military and civilian activities designed to win the war," he writes. On the other hand, his clandestine operatives, in the Directorate for Plans [now the Directorate for Operations] were "to spy upon and penetrate North Vietnam; to monitor and penetrate the Viet Cong operations in South Vietnam; to train the South Vietnamese in counterinsurgency techniques . . . to go all-out to maintain the conviction that there was -- in the worn phrase of those days -- light at the end of the tunnel."

The dilemma came when it became apparent that the intelligence analysts "held a pessimistic view of the military developments" while the operations personnel "remained convinced that the war could be
won." The latter group had to feel that way because, he wrote, "Without this conviction, the operators could not have continued their difficult face-to-face work with the South Vietnamese, whose lives were often at risk."

As Helms described it, "In Washington, I felt like a circus rider standing astride two horses, each for the best of reasons going its own way." The question today is how is Tenet handling those two horses.

Inevitably one thinks of Iraq today when you read Helms talking about Vietnam in this manner: "Not the least of the operational and policy problems in Vietnam was our national ignorance of Vietnamese history, society, and language. . . . No series of background lectures can be counted on to replace serious study of the history and society of a distant country, and even this should be buttressed with a measure of in-country experience."

Or what about substituting Iraq in this remembrance: "The pervasive presence in South Vietnam of numbers of brash, self-confident Americans who had but scant understanding of the local culture and customs and who -- given their brief assignments in Vietnam -- could make little effort to learn the language gave the VCI [Vietcong Infrastructure] propagandists a ready-made manifestation of yet another imperialist foreign power bent on exploiting Vietnam for colonial purposes."

Finally, when it comes to what the Bush administration has described as its commitment to bring democracy to the Middle East, think of our past commitment to now-communist Vietnam: "In a decade, the right operatives might achieve command of the necessary languages and the desired in-country familiarity with the cultures and terrain," Helms writes. "With commitment and effort, there might develop personal relationships and identity of interest strong enough to survive political fallings-out that might follow. The possibility of funding such an effort in half a dozen likely areas and finding personnel willing to make the necessary commitment to the job would be a major undertaking. In the absence of any such unrealistic strategic commitment, the tactical solution is obvious. Do not intervene on the ground unless prepared to make an all-out effort. And do not count on a secret intelligence agency being able to pull political folly away from the blaze."

One thing Helms did was to commission the Office of National Estimates to prepare an assessment of the U.S. stake in the Vietnam conflict. At the time a motivating factor was the so-called domino theory, which held that if South Vietnam fell to communism, Thailand, Cambodia and Laos would topple in turn. Ironically, a major argument for those who pushed invasion of Iraq was a reverse domino theory, that if democracy were planted in Iraq it would spread throughout the Middle East.

The study Helms ordered turned out to be a 33-page paper entitled "Implications of an Unfavorable Outcome in Vietnam." It concluded that although "an unfavorable outcome would be a major setback to the reputation of U.S. power and would to some degree influence and prejudice our other interests to a degree not easily foreseen; the net effects would probably not be permanently damaging to this country's ability to play its role as a world power." The worst potential damage it found would be the "self-inflicted kind; internal dissension would limit our future ability to use our power and resources wisely and to full effect and lead to a loss of confidence by others in our capacity for leadership."

Overall, the paper concluded, "the risks [in an unfavorable outcome] are probably more limited and controllable than most previous argument has indicated."

Recognizing that it was "politically explosive," Helms gave the report to Johnson in a sealed envelope, but to no one else. "President Johnson never mentioned the document to me, nor, to my knowledge did he raise it with anyone else," Helms wrote. The obvious question is whether Tenet has had the wisdom
to order up such a study. And if he has, will Bush pay any attention to it?

Author's e-mail: pincusw@washpost.com

Walter Pincus covers intelligence issues as a reporter for The Washington Post's national staff.
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No Child Left Behind: Correcting the Democrat Leadership’s Myths About Education Spending

July 18, 2003

Despite the twin challenges of war and economic uncertainty, President Bush has maintained or expanded funding for all of America’s education priorities. More than ever is being spent – and more than ever is being expected. Here are the facts:

Federal education funding has dramatically increased by $11 billion since President George W. Bush first took office in January 2001.

☐ As a result of NCLB, the federal government is now spending far more money for elementary and secondary education than at any other time in American history. States and schools will receive a staggering $23.8 billion this year (FY2003) for implementation of NCLB, including a $1.3 billion increase in Title I funding to disadvantaged students and at least $380 million to support state assessments.

☐ This increase builds on the whopping $4.3 billion (24%) increase in Elementary & Secondary Education Act (ESEA) spending provided to states and schools during the first year of the No Child Left Behind Act.

☐ The FY04 education spending bill passed by the U.S. House last week would provide yet another massive increase for education ($2.3 billion), including a substantial boost ($666 million) in federal funding for Title I of the No Child Left Behind Act. This would mark the third significant increase in Title I funding since NCLB became law. In FY2003, Title I funding was increased by $1.3 billion, which was on top of the $1.6 billion increase provided in FY 2002. As a result of these increases, Title I spending increased more during the first two years of President George W. Bush’s administration than it did during the previous seven years under President Clinton.

Democrats funded education in the same manner when they controlled Congress and the White House.

☐ They used exactly the same approach we’re using in 1994, the last time the Elementary & Secondary Education Act (ESEA) was reauthorized – yet not a single Democrat back then accused President Clinton of “cutting education.”

☐ The last time the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) was re-authorized prior to No Child Left Behind was in 1994 (Improving America’s Schools Act), under a Democrat Congress and a Democrat President – and (surprise) authorized funding levels were billions of dollars above appropriated levels that year, too.

☐ The total authorization level of the IASA for FY 1995 was $13 billion. However, IASA activities were appropriated at $10.3 billion for FY 1995 – a “cut” of $2.7 billion under the twisted math being employed by partisan Democrats today.

Democrat claims that President Bush is underfunding “No Child Left Behind” are false.

☐ Minority Leader Pelosi and other Democrats have claimed – inaccurately – that President Bush has underfunded the No Child Left Behind Act by $8 billion (The White House Bulletin. "House Democrats Charge House GOP Labor/HHS Appropriations Bill 'Cuts' Education Funding," 7/9/03).

☐ In fact, the No Child Left Behind Act did not authorize any specific overall amount for FY2003 and beyond, and there is absolutely no basis for Rep. Pelosi’s claim in existing law.

☐ The New York Times (1/16/03) corrected the Democrats’ spin. After initially reporting Democrat leaders’ claim that the No Child Left Behind Act authorized a specific number ($29.2 billion) for FY 2003, the paper later issued a correction, stating, "An article last Thursday about the debate between President Bush and Democrats in Congress over education policy referred incorrectly to spending provisions in legislation signed by Mr. Bush last year. While the No Child Left Behind Act did authorize specific funding levels for a handful of specific programs, it did not, as some claim, authorize $29.2 billion or any other specific overall amount in No Child Left Behind spending for this fiscal year (FY 2003) or any other remaining years."
No Child Left Behind: Spending More Than Ever – And Expecting More Than Ever

July 23, 2003

Nineteen months ago, President George W. Bush signed the landmark No Child Left Behind Act into law – linking federal education spending to accountability and results for the first time ever.

States are making significant progress in implementing No Child Left Behind. On June 10, 2003, President Bush announced that all 50 U.S. states (as well as Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia) have successfully submitted “accountability plans” to the U.S. Department of Education detailing their plans for complying with NCLB. The plans describe how each state will meet NCLB’s call for annual testing of public school students in reading and math in grades 3-8, providing report cards for parents on school achievement levels, and ensuring that new options are offered for parents with children in underachieving schools.

Despite the successful start to NCLB implementation, considerable myths and distortions about NCLB are being perpetuated by Washington-based education lobbying groups and leaders of the Democrat party. The following document provides an overview of some of these major myths, and the facts to set the record straight.

Fiction: The No Child Left Behind Act is an “unfunded mandate.”

Fact: No Child Left Behind is neither unfunded, nor a mandate. Every penny promised by President Bush and congressional Republicans is being delivered, and all states are free to opt out of receiving federal education funds at any time.

Federal education spending has increased not once, but twice since President Bush signed NCLB into law, and it is on track to increase a third time under the education spending legislation for FY 2004 recently passed in the U.S. House.

As a result of NCLB, the federal government is now spending far more money for elementary and secondary education than at any other time in American history. States and schools will receive a staggering $23.8 billion this year (FY2003) for implementation of NCLB, including a $1.3 billion increase in Title I funding to disadvantaged students and at least $380 million to support state assessments. This increase builds on the whopping $4.3 billion (24%) increase in Elementary &
Secondary Education Act (ESEA) spending provided to states and schools during the first year of the No Child Left Behind Act.

The FY2004 education spending bill, which passed the U.S. House on July 10, 2003, provides yet another massive increase ($666 million) in federal funding for Title I of the No Child Left Behind Act. This increase would mark the third significant increase in Title I funding since NCLB became law. In FY2003, Title I funding was increased by $1.3 billion, which was on top of the $1.6 billion increase provided in FY 2002. As a result of these increases, Title I spending increased more during the first two years of President George W. Bush's administration than it did during the previous seven years under President Clinton.

As Brian Riedl of the Heritage Foundation wrote recently regarding NCLB, "Washington hasn't mandated that any state implement this law. It merely suggested a model, and offered to subsidize states willing to implement it. States that dislike the federal model, or find the funding insufficient, are free to opt out and run their own programs." (Riedl, "What Unfunded Mandates?" Heritage Foundation, 03 June 03)

**Fiction:**

NCLB's testing requirements for reading and math in grades 3-8 are an "unfunded mandate."

**Fact:**

The testing requirements in NCLB are completely funded, and several studies show states are receiving more than enough money from the federal government to pay for all of NCLB's testing requirements.

Since NCLB's enactment, Congress has appropriated $771.5 million for states to design and implement their annual tests, and President Bush has requested an additional $390 million for fiscal year 2004. In both FY2002 and FY2003, as a result of No Child Left Behind, states were provided with $387 million and $384.5 million respectively to design and develop their annual tests in reading and math, which aren't due to start until 2005/06 school year. If a state already has 3-8 testing, it can use these funds to implement or upgrade its tests if needed. In addition, the federal government has been providing money to states since 1994 in various forms for the development of state academic standards and assessments.

A 2002 study by the AccountabilityWorks project found education reform opponents have significantly exaggerated the cost to states of implementing No Child Left Behind's annual testing requirements, and that the new federal funds made available by NCLB to help states develop and implement their tests are sufficient to cover the costs. This well-documented and widely-publicized report is available at [http://www.accountabilityworks.org/press-20020227-elic_summit.php](http://www.accountabilityworks.org/press-20020227-elic_summit.php)

Similar conclusions can be drawn from a May 2003 study by the independent General Accounting Office (GAO). The GAO report concludes Congress is providing more money than necessary for all states to design and implement reasonable, reliable and valid measures of student achievement in reading and math, which is what is required by NCLB. GAO estimates the cost of implementing such basic tests will collectively cost states about $1.9 billion
between fiscal years 2002 and 2008. The $1.9 billion figure assumes states do not independently opt to implement more complex testing systems than they are required to do under the law. The NCLB law requires Congress to provide at least $2.34 billion for state testing costs between fiscal years 2002 through 2008.

The GAO report shows education reform opponents – who have claimed the cost to states of meeting NCLB's testing requirement will actually be as high as $7 billion – are exaggerating the costs of implementing the testing provisions of NCLB by billions of dollars. GAO estimates testing costs could be higher for states only if states independently choose to design and implement more intricate testing systems than are required under NCLB. In such instances, GAO concludes, state testing costs could range from $3.9 billion to a worst-case scenario of $5.3 billion - still significantly less than the $7 billion claimed by reform opponents. What this means is that even if every state in the nation chose to implement the most complex and expensive testing system possible – which is far more than they are required to do under No Child Left Behind – the total cost to states would be nearly $2 billion less than claimed by education reform opponents.

A report issued in February 2003 by the Josiah Bartlett Center for Public Policy (www.jbartlett.org) estimated that the state of New Hampshire would receive $6 million more this year in federal education aid than the costs associated with implementing NCLB, debunking claims by education reform opponents that the new law is an "unfunded mandate" on New Hampshire. The study estimated the New Hampshire's costs associated with complying with No Child Left Behind – providing highly qualified teachers and paraprofessionals, new testing requirements, technology plans, and special education – to be approximately $7.7 million for this year. Factoring in the $13.7 million in increased federal education aid coming to New Hampshire from NCLB, the study concluded New Hampshire will have an extra $6 million in federal education aid to spend on other state and local education priorities as a result of the new federal law.

Fiction:  
President Bush is not "fully funding" NCLB.

Fact:  
There are NO overall funding levels authorized for NCLB for FY 2003 (the current fiscal year), FY 2004, or beyond. The law simply authorizes Congress to spend "such sums as may be required" overall to implement the education reforms authorized or promised by NCLB for FY 2003, FY 2004, or any other year beyond FY 2002.

While NCLB does authorize specific funding levels during these "out years" for a few specific programs, such as Title I and Reading First, authorization levels are spending caps, not mandatory spending levels or "promises."

Furthermore, during the 1994 reauthorization of the Elementary & Secondary Education Act – the previous reauthorization of the K-12 education law reauthorized by No Child Left Behind – appropriated spending levels were significantly below authorized levels as well, and the nation was not then at war. This reauthorization occurred under a Democrat Congress and Democrat White House. Education lobbying organizations such as the National Education Association (NEA) did not attack President Clinton for "underfunding" education or
accuse him of "promising" more funding than was delivered to implement his proposed reforms.

An article in *The New York Times* in January 2003 on federal education spending incorrectly reported that the No Child Left Behind Act authorized Congress to spend up to $29.2 billion overall this year to implement the new education reform law. Several days later, the paper ran a correction regarding this error: "An article last Thursday about the debate between President Bush and Democrats in Congress over education policy referred incorrectly to spending provisions in legislation signed by Mr. Bush last year. While it called for specific increases for a number of educational programs, it did not authorize an overall increase this year to $29.2 billion from $22.2 billion." (corrections, *The New York Times*, January 16, 2003, emphasis added)

**Fiction:** President Bush "promised" or "called for" far more education spending in FY2003 and FY2004 than he actually requested in his budgets.

**Fact:** What was "promised" by President Bush and congressional Republicans in No Child Left Behind was that federal K-12 education spending would increase substantially -- linked for the first time to accountability and high standards -- and is precisely what has happened. *Title I* aid to disadvantaged students -- the primary spending program in the No Child Left Behind Act -- increased more during the first two years of President George W. Bush's administration than it did during the previous seven years combined under President Clinton. This would have been the case even if Congress had provided the exact amount requested by President Bush for Title I for FY 2003 (it provided more).

The problems in American education are not the result of a lack of spending. This is precisely why No Child Left Behind was enacted. Americans agree with President Bush that high standards, accountability for results, and increased parental involvement -- not unlimited spending -- are the keys to closing the achievement gap and giving every American child the chance to learn.

**Fiction:** The No Child Left Behind Act is an "intrusive federal program" that takes decision-making powers away from local educators.

**Fact:** Every local school district in America has greater freedom and flexibility in the use of federal education funds as a result of No Child Left Behind. Federal education dollars are flowing to local schools with fewer strings attached than ever before. NCLB gives local school districts significantly more decision-making authority over how federal education funds are spent. Decisions previously made by federal bureaucrats in Washington are now being made on the local level. As long as federal education funds are being used to get results, local school districts have more freedom and flexibility than ever in the use of federal education funds under No Child Left Behind.

Under NCLB's transferability provisions, every school district in America now has the authority to make spending decisions with up to 50 percent of the non-Title I federal funds it receives. These transfers can be made independently by school
districts and require no special permission from the U.S. Department of Education or the state educational agency. In addition, 150 local school districts across the nation can apply for the flexibility to make transfers with up to 100 percent of their non-Title I funds. Such school districts receive a near-total exemption from federal education requirements as long as student achievement levels are improving and achievement gaps are closing.

The law puts new information, new tools, and new options in the hands of parents so they not only know whether or not their children are getting a quality education, but can also do something about it if they aren't.

**Fiction:** Requiring a “highly qualified teacher” in every classroom will “cost too much” to implement.

**Fact:** Federal teacher quality aid to states and local school districts has increased dramatically as a result of No Child Left Behind. NCLB resulted in a 35% increase in federal Teacher Quality State grants in FY2002 — increasing federal teacher quality aid to $2.85 billion, $787 more than President Clinton's final enacted budget. As a result of the FY 2003 education spending bill enacted in February, federal teacher quality grants for FY 2003 increased to $2.95 billion, a $100 million increase. These funds can be used for a variety of purposes, including teacher recruitment and retention, professional development, and the reform of teacher certification requirements.

NCLB also allows local school districts unprecedented flexibility for how they spend non-Title I federal funding without applications or prior approval needed. Such funds can be used in addition to teacher quality funds to train, recruit, and retain quality teachers.

Since enactment of NCLB, President Bush and Republicans in Congress have followed up by proposing and/or enacting an array of bills aimed at supporting states and local school districts in their efforts to put a highly qualified teacher in every classroom. These include enactment of the “Crayola credit” (tax deduction of up to $250 annually for teachers’ out of pocket classroom expenses) proposed by President and Mrs. Bush; House passage of legislation to dramatically expand federal student loan forgiveness for Americans who teach math, science, or special education in disadvantaged schools (proposed by President and Mrs. Bush, introduced in the House this year by Rep. Joe Wilson, R-SC); House passage of legislation by Rep. Phil Gingrey (R-GA) to strengthen America’s teaching colleges (the Ready to Teach Act); House introduction of legislation by Rep. Heather Wilson (R-NM) to create a tax credit for teachers in Title I schools; and legislation proposed by Rep. Dave Camp (R-MI) to expand the “Crayola credit” from $250 annually to $500 annually.

The Bush administration and congressional Republicans have also supported reform projects such as the American Board for Certification of Teacher Excellence (ABCTE) aimed at making it easier for qualified professionals to change careers and become school teachers through alternative routes to certification. The American Board is expected to play an important role in helping states recruit and retain high quality teachers as NCLB is implemented.
Fiction: The No Child Left Behind Act requires states to use a “national test” that is not “compatible with current state assessments.”

Fact: NCLB actually forbids a “national” test and allows states to set their own standards and design their own tests for reading and math in grades 3-8. Many states have decided to expand their current testing systems to accommodate the additional assessments required by NCLB. All 50 states have successfully submitted plans to the U.S. Department of Education for complying with the testing requirements of NCLB (see below).

Fiction: Testing requirements mandated by No Child Left Behind are “unworkable” on the local level.

Fact: Not only are the testing requirements workable, but states are making significant progress in implementing No Child Left Behind.

On June 10, 2003, President Bush announced that all 50 U.S. states (as well as Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia) have successfully submitted “accountability plans” to the U.S. Department of Education detailing their plans for complying with NCLB. The plans describe how each state will meet NCLB’s call for annual testing of public school students in reading and math in grades 3-8, providing report cards for parents on school achievement levels, and ensuring that new options are offered for parents with children in underachieving schools.

Fiction: Testing will only make teachers “teach to the test;” it will not show that children are actually learning.

Fact: As President Bush has said – if you’re teaching to the test, and the test is designed to confirm that children are making progress in reading and math, that’s the whole idea. The American public overwhelmingly supports requiring public schools to show that children are making annual progress in reading and math, and surveys show support for such reforms has only increased since NCLB became law. A report by the Center for Civic Innovation at the Manhattan Institute confirms academic accountability tests such as those at the heart of the President Bush’s bipartisan No Child Left Behind Act are a reliable way to ensure that students in public schools are truly learning and that education funds are being used to produce results. The report is available online at http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/cr_33.htm.

Fiction: Disaggregating the scores of students with disabilities, minority students, and students with limited English proficiency will cause good schools to fail.

Fact: The National Education Association (NEA), as part of a series of “technical amendments” proposed to dismantle bipartisan education reform, has proposed that schools be excused from demonstrating progress in teaching limited English proficient (LEP) students in key areas for at least the first three years of their education in U.S. schools. This proposal is the embodiment of what President Bush has blasted as the “soft bigotry of low expectations.” It would mean states and schools would not be accountable for providing a quality education to an LEP
student until that student had been in school for three years – essentially writing off the first three years of the student's K-12 education. If we fail to assess limited English proficient students in their first years at schools in the U.S., we would essentially be sending the message that their progress is not as important as that of their peers. This undermines the entire framework of NCLB and plays into the soft bigotry of low expectations that President Bush and U.S. Education Secretary Rod Paige often mention.

**Fiction:**

The requirements in the No Child Left Behind Act will burden rural school districts.

**Fact:**

The No Child Left Behind Act provides unprecedented flexibility for rural schools and districts, giving them more control than ever before in deciding how to use the federal education funds they receive. NCLB also includes the Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP), which includes two initiatives – the Small, Rural School Achievement (SRSA) program and the Rural and Low-Income Schools (RLIS) program – specifically designed to address the unique needs of rural schools.

The SRSA program provides eligible rural schools and districts with greater flexibility in using the formula grant funds that they receive under certain state-administered federal programs. It also provides formula grant awards directly to eligible schools and districts to support a wide range of local activities that support student achievement. The RLIS program authorizes formula grant awards to states, which in turn make either competitive or formula grants to eligible rural schools and districts, which may use RLIS funds to support a broad array of local activities to support student achievement.

Rural schools and districts also benefit from historic levels of federal education funding under NCLB. For example, funding for teacher quality has increased by more than 35 percent over President Clinton's final budget as a result of No Child Left Behind. Title I aid to disadvantaged students has been dramatically boosted twice as a result of No Child Left Behind and special education funding under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) has increased by more than 50 percent since President Bush took office.
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WASHINGTON

September 8, 2003

TO: Harriet Miers
    Karl Rove
    Margaret Spellings
    Jay Lefkowitz

FROM: Brett Kavanaugh


Pete-
Check out the book-
see if there's anything new
that would be useful.

[Signature]
September 5, 2003

Brett Kavanaugh
Assistant to the President
and Staff Secretary
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, DC 20502

Fax: (202) 456-2215

Dear Brett,

I write at the suggestion of Rachel Brand and Ed Warren. My colleague, Elizabeth Warren, who is no Republican (though I am), has written a very useful book, some of the ideas in which are summarized in the enclosed New Yorker one pager. It is about the miseries and anxieties of the middle class, and includes a strong case for a more vigorous use of school vouchers. As we move into the election campaign it is important to develop ideas in this area. Elizabeth has been asked to brief several of the Democrat candidates, but tells me she would be eager to share her ideas with the Bush White Hoes as well. It is the problem, not who solves it that interests her. She is, incidentally, a live wire, very well organized, and lots of fun. If nothing else, you would enjoy meeting her.

Yours,

Charles Fried
THE NEW YORKER
THE TALK OF THE TOWN

THE FINANCIAL PAGE
LEAVE NO PARENT BEHIND

issue of 2003-08-18 and 25
Posted 2003-08-11

To hear American politicians tell it, nothing matters more to good public policy than the family. Bill Clinton campaigned under the slogan “Putting Families First.” George W. Bush promised to “Leave No Child Behind.” John Kerry, Joe Lieberman, and Howard Dean are squabbling over what they will do for “working families.” And in the past two weeks Washington has shown its high regard for parenting by sending out twenty-five million tax-credit checks to people with kids. Roughly speaking, this means that eight per cent of taxpayers are subsidizing the twenty per cent who are eligible for the checks.

You might, then, expect American families to be luxuriating in good fortune. But, compared with people who don’t have children, people who do are in worse economic shape than they’ve ever been. The Harvard law professor Elizabeth Warren and her daughter Amelia Warren Tyagi demonstrate, in their forthcoming book “The Two-Income Trap,” that having a child is now the best indicator of whether someone will end up in “financial collapse.” Married couples with children are twice as likely as childless couples to file for bankruptcy. They’re seventy-five per cent more likely to be late paying their bills. And they’re also far more likely to face foreclosure on their homes. Most of these people are not, by the usual standards, poor. They’re middle-class couples who are in deep financial trouble in large part because they have kids.

In the past two decades or so, the cost of having children has risen much faster than the cost of being childless. Conventional wisdom aside, this has little to do with spoiled kids, acquisitive parents, or PlayStation 2. Instead, it’s the result of two things: housing and education. According to the Federal Reserve Board, between 1983 and 1998 the price of housing for married couples with children rose seventy-nine per cent in real terms, roughly three times as much as it did for childless people. One reason is that houses are bigger now. But, according to Warren and Tyagi, the real reason is that parents get into bidding wars for homes in safe neighborhoods with good public schools.

http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/030818ta_talk_surowiecki 9/5/2003
Then, there's college. Thirty years ago, middle-class parents could feel they'd done a good job of raising a child if he or she made it through high school—decent jobs for unskilled and semi-skilled labor were readily available. Today, such jobs are much harder to find, and college is considered a necessity. Needless to say, it is also extremely expensive.

The solution seems simple enough: have fewer kids or none at all. This may seem coldhearted, but it's a choice that many Americans, particularly in the middle class, already find themselves making. Between 1980 and 2000, the percentage of women between forty and forty-four who had no children doubled; the percentage of women who had only one child nearly did, too. Economists have long argued that a child is analogous to a "consumer durable," like a refrigerator. Parents invest time, energy, and money in the child, and in exchange, as the child grows up, they get what the economist Gary Becker has called "psychic income"—as opposed to the real income that children in, say, an agrarian economy could bring in when they grew strong enough to help with the harvest. Becker observed a correlation in the United States between birth rates and the business cycle. When the economy is bad, people tend to have fewer kids. When it picks up, they have more. Although there are obvious limits to this point of view (we're evolutionarily programmed to want children but not refrigerators), it does suggest that, as with most goods, if kids are more expensive, people will accumulate fewer of them.

The problem is that while it may be economically rational for a middle-class professional to forgo having kids, the effect of a baby embargo would be economically disastrous, and not just for the producers of SpongeBob SquarePants. Parents may have to bear the costs of rearing children, but it's society as a whole that reaps the benefits. We all gain from having more people going to college and becoming productive workers. And all of us—even those who have no children—expect that we will be taken care of by others in our old age. The United States has $6.7 trillion in debt and forty trillion in potential obligations to the elderly or soon-to-be-elderly, and we're sticking future workers with the bill. Even if the American birth rate stays where it is, we're headed for serious trouble. If it drops, look out.

In a sense, children are what economists like to call a "public good," like national defense or scientific research. The essential characteristic of a public good is that everyone benefits from it even if not everyone pays for it. Government usually plays a valuable role in making sure that a public good is paid for. This doesn't mean that the state has to take over driving the kids to soccer practice—or, God forbid, require each couple to have 3.2 "Heroes for the Homeland"—but it should certainly help spread the financial burden of raising a family. There may be some sense after all in having those taxpayers who don't have children subsidize those who do, and there's little sense in cutting back on
programs like Head Start. All of us, it turns out, have an interest in improving public schools. It may not take a village to raise a child, but these days it seems to take a village to pay for one.

— James Surowiecki

http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/030818ta_talk_surowiecki
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FAX TRANSMISSION

REQUEST FOR APPOINTMENT

TO: KARL ROVE
   SENIOR ADVISOR TO THE PRESIDENT
   OFFICE OF STRATEGIC INITIATIVES

FAX: 202 456-0191

FROM: JOANNE JONES
   WASHINGTON, D.C.
   202 722-1808

NO. OF PAGES INCLUDING COVER PAGE: (2)

DATE: SEPTEMBER 9, 2003
September 9, 2003

Karl Rove
Senior Advisor to the President
Office of Strategic Initiatives

Dear Mr Rove:

I am an African-American and a Republican, and I am writing to request an appointment with you, to share a strategic initiative, which I know would have exceptional impact on the natural constituency of the Republican party, in the African-American community.

Without exaggeration, it could be a "slam-dunk". It is a Project that is already established with all Approvals in place. President Ronald Reagan signed off on it originally. U.S. Congress has mandated this Project. It's extraordinary historical significance has been established, and it segues naturally into President Bush's newly established Historical Commission.

My telephone and fax numbers are listed below. Thank you for your time in reading this, I sincerely hope that an appointment can be arranged. I would be pleased to adjust my schedule to suit your convenience.

Sincerely,

Joanne Jones

Tel: 202 722-1808; Fax: 202 722-1808 (start key) or 202 722-1898 plus (* key) plus (51)
This marker identifies the original location of the withdrawn item listed above. For a complete list of items withdrawn from this folder, see the Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet at the front of the folder.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLECTION:</th>
<th>Records Management, White House Office of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SERIES:</td>
<td>Subject Files - FG006-27 (Office of Senior Advisor - Karl Rove)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOLDER TITLE:</td>
<td>536133 [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRC ID:</td>
<td>9712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OA Num.:</td>
<td>10736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARA Num.:</td>
<td>10794</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESTRICTION CODES**

- **Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]**
  - P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
  - P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
  - P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
  - P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
  - P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
  - P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]
- **PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).**
- **Deed of Gift Restrictions**
  - A. Closed by Executive Order 13526 governing access to national security information.
  - B. Closed by statute or by the agency which originated the document.
  - C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.
- **Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]**
  - b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
  - b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
  - b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
  - b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
  - b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
  - b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
  - b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
  - b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]
- **Records Not Subject to FOIA**
  - Court Sealed - The document is withheld under a court seal and is not subject to the Freedom of Information Act.
Date: 9/9/03

To: Hazel Westine, Abel Givens

From: Strategic Initiatives, BJ Groeger

[ ] FYI
[ ] Appropriate Action
[ ] Direct Response
[ ] Prepare Response For My Signature
[ ] Per Our Conversation
[ ] Let's Discuss
[ ] Per Your Request
[ ] Please Return
[ ] Deadline
[ ] Other

Comments: __________________________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________________________________
URGENT FACSIMILE

PLEASE DELIVER TO:

KARL ROVE
SENIOR ADVISOR TO THE PRESIDENT
(202) 456-0191

THANK YOU.
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September 9, 2003

NEWS CONTACT:
Jodie Pozo-Olano (804) 647-0730 or
(804) 741-9081

POLL REVEALS HISPANIC VOTERS REJECT POLITICAL TOKENISM

UNIVISION-HBC MERGER APPROVAL COULD HURT PRESIDENT BUSH,
SECRETARY MARTINEZ AND GOVERNOR BUSH WITH HISPANIC VOTERS

Cultural, Economic Concerns Fuel Opposition to Univision-HBC Merger

WASHINGTON, DC – As politicians from both parties pursue Latino voters, a poll released
today reveals that 68% of Florida’s Hispanic voters think politicians who attend Hispanic events
and use Spanish-language campaign ads do so “only because they want Hispanic votes.”
According to those polled, 65% of Hispanic voters said politicians “use” their community for
political gain “all the time” or “most of the time.”

The statewide poll of Florida Hispanic voters includes a large cross-section of Miami-arca
Republican Hispanic voters who currently support the President. However, linking President
Bush to the proposed merger between Univision and Hispanic Broadcasting Corporation (HBC)
could cost the President as well as other politicians seeking Latino votes the support of this
critical electoral group.

Independent of the findings of this study, the Latino community has become increasingly aware
of the proposed merger, its implications to them and the President’s role in its passage. Student,
religious and community activism have linked President Bush to approval of the merger, with
strongest opposition to the merger coming from South Florida’s Hispanic Republican
strongholds. Such linkage could hurt the President’s standing with the Hispanic community, even
in South Florida’s traditionally pro-Bush Cuban community.

Hispanic leaders have pledged to continue highlighting the issue even after a decision on the
merger has been reached.

“Here in the U.S., just as in their countries of origin, Latinos attribute responsibility for
government decisions to the top of government. As they held V.P. Gore responsible for the Elian
Gonzalez debacle, they will similarly attribute to President Bush awareness of, role in, and
responsibility for the Univision/HBC merger,” Federico Subervi, Ph.D. Director of The Latinos
and Media Project.
Over half of Florida’s Latino voters (56%) said they would be less likely to support President Bush if they knew he supported a merger that would put control of 70% of Spanish-Language media in the hands of a non-Latino. The poll also demonstrates negative merger-related consequences for Florida Gov. Jeb Bush and HUD Sec. Mel Martinez. These results are significant given that over half of respondents are registered Republicans.

Moreover, 76% of Latino voters expressed a preference for Hispanic ownership of Spanish-language media, citing issues of “trust,” “understand[ing]” and “responsive[ness].” The same percentage of voters thought Spanish-speaking consumers are best served by “two smaller, competing” radio companies.

In the poll, “Jobs and the Economy” topped Hispanic voters’ list of concerns, which follows the national trends for both Hispanics and non-Hispanics.

This statewide survey of Florida’s Hispanic voters was conducted on September 3 - 4, 2003. This bilingual survey included 400 registered voters and has a margin of error of ±4.9%.

The poll was commissioned on behalf of LatinoHOME, a coalition of merger opponents, including Hispanic religious leaders, student leaders, senior citizens, advertising agencies, the National Association of Hispanic Publications, radio station owners, record producers and a Miami-based group of Cuban American citizens. It is a follow-up to a frequently cited March 2003 poll conducted by Latino Opinions. The March poll demonstrated the deep importance that the Hispanic community attaches to non-Hispanic takeover of its media, culture, and news. Eighty-seven (87%) percent of Hispanics believe that they are better served by radio and television stations owned and operated by Hispanics.

LatinoHOME (www.latinoHOME.org) was formed in opposition to the merger and has established the goal of using the outcome of the merger as a basis for educating Latino voters for the 2004 campaign about the manner in which Latinos are often used as props for political campaigns and events but receive less than equal treatment when policies are enacted.
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TO: Scheduler  
Office of Mr. Karl Rove

FAX: (202) 456-0191

FROM: Amanda Whipkey (t) 202/266-6003

DATE: September 8, 2003

NO. OF PAGES TO FOLLOW: 2

REGARDING: The Atlantic Monthly/Microsoft salon dinner

Please find the attached invitation to an Atlantic Monthly/Microsoft dinner conversation on Tuesday, October 7th. We expect a group of 20 local leaders from the political, business and media arenas, and very much hope that Mr. Rove will join us. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me on (202) 266-6003.

Warm regards,

Amanda Whipkey  
Events Manager  
The Atlantic Monthly

[Signature]

600 New Hampshire Avenue Washington DC 20037 Telephone: 202-672-5600 Fax: 202-672-5700
September 8, 2003

Mr. Karl Rove  
Senior Advisor to the President  
The White House  
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Mr. Rove:

Steve Ballmer, CEO of Microsoft, will join us on October 7th for our next *Atlantic Monthly*/Microsoft "salon dinner." We hope you will be able to attend.

We have asked Steve to discuss the future of the technology sector and the challenges we face in realizing the potential of that future, such as security, spam and innovation complacency. Jim Fallows, who has the dual distinction of being both the national correspondent for *The Atlantic* and a former Microsoft employee, will lead our small group in engaging Steve in what we expect will be a dynamic, wide-ranging and enlightening conversation.

The dinner will be held in the Anderson Room of the Metropolitan Club, 1700 H Street, NW, beginning with a short cocktail reception at 6:30 p.m. (Complimentary valet parking is available; please note that the club requires gentlemen to wear a jacket and tie.)

Please RSVP to Amanda Whipkey at your earliest convenience (awhipkey@theatlantic.com; 202-266-6003) or feel free to contact us directly (jsullivan@theatlantic.com; 202-266-7201 or jackk@microsoft.com; 202-263-5900).

We hope to see you next month.

With all best wishes,

John Fox Sullivan  
President and Group Publisher  
*The Atlantic Monthly*

Jack Krumholtz  
Managing Director, Federal Government Affairs  
Associate General Counsel  
Microsoft
ATLANTIC MONTHLY/MICROSOFT SALON DINNER

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 7, 2003

THE METROPOLITAN CLUB
1700 H STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC

SCHEDULE FOR THE EVENING

6:30 pm        Cocktail Reception
               Anderson Room
               2nd floor

7:15 pm        Dinner and Group Conversation

9:30 pm (approx) Conclusion

RSVP INFORMATION

Please respond to Amanda Whipkey at 202-266-6003 or at awhipkey@theatlantic.com, including any special dietary or other needs

SPECIAL NOTES REGARDING THE METROPOLITAN CLUB

Complimentary valet parking is available.

Please observe the dress code – coat and tie for gentlemen and commensurate attire for ladies.

No cell phones or personal communication devices are permitted to be used in the Clubhouse.

The Metropolitan Club is made available through the courtesy of Mr. Jack Krumholz, Director of Federal Affairs of Microsoft’s Washington office.
DEAR Dustin,

I want to thank you for the way you served us "over and above the call of duty," WE were all so very blessed to receive the individualized autographed photos of our beloved President. You are a wonderful representative of the White House. Not only were you extremely efficient, but your thoughtful follow-up impressed me to no end. I pray on you all the time. We pray for the President and all his staff everyday. We are proud of all of you who serve us so well, because you first serve Our Lord God.

Thank you again for your attentive help in our recognition of our family's veterans. You truly made this 2003 Family Reunion the very best one yet!

Sincerely,

Judy White
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Karl Rove

Sept. 4, 2003

Dear Karl;

Just returned from a trip to Asia.

I believe that Snow is doing the right thing in pressing our Asian friends to allow their currencies to appreciate somewhat. In years past I used to have to deal with this problem as Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, and it is never easy. You have to be prepared to use real leverage—such as the Senators' threats of tariffs—or you get nothing except expensive raw fish for your efforts in Japan, and a visit to the Great Wall in China.

I didn't get your phone message of last week until I returned to the office yesterday. Obviously, I'm at your disposal. My cell telephone is [redacted].

Thanks for all you are doing for the country and this President.

Best Wishes,

Richard McCormack

Attachment: Note to Ambassador Abshire on Japan visit results.
September 4, 2003

Dr. David Abshire
President
Center for the Study of the Presidency
1020 19th Street, N.W., Suite 250
Washington, D.C. 20036

Dear David:

Just returned from a week in Japan where I attended a conference which included some key private and public sector Japanese.

As you know, the Japanese stock market has risen sharply from its oversold condition earlier this year. But no one I talked with felt this was a sign of permanent improvement in the Japanese economy. Rather, it was the result of renewed growth in U.S. financial markets, and the broader U.S. economy. Toyota’s sales in the U.S. are now rising sharply, as an example.

However, the Japanese export-oriented sector of the economy is only about 10% of the GNP. This section is relatively efficient. Unfortunately, the other 90% of Japanese economy continues to be mired in debt and inefficiency.

Japanese banks still face major debt problems worsened in recent weeks by huge losses in their holdings of Japanese Government Bonds, where interest rates have more than doubled since the first of June. In the short term, bonds have probably stabilized now. But the large Japanese debt guarantees that this problem will return at some point.

Government Fukui of the Bank of Japan has been expanding the money supply at a faster rate than his predecessor, and has also spent nearly 80 billion dollars intervening in the currency markets since the first of the year. This displeases the Secretary of the Treasury. Both Japan and China were the targets of his efforts to allow Asian currencies to appreciate. For a short time, I would expect Japanese intervention to slow, in deference to Snow and to the White House’s election interests. And, indeed, the Yen appreciated to 116 to the dollar in recent days. But there will be limits to the willingness of Japan to refrain from intervention, since currency speculators are likely to start buying Yen if they think the Bank of Japan is out of the intervention business. Japan’s trade surplus, and the U.S. deficit guarantees this vulnerability.
Dr. David M. Abshire  
September 4, 2003  
Page Two  

Naturally, the Japanese want China to allow its currency to appreciate, to delay the hollowing out of the Japanese manufacturing sector. Ironically, China is using the same tactics against Japan that Japan used against the U.S. in the 1980s. Also the same financial vulnerabilities are being created in China that caused the Japanese economy to jump the tracks in 1990.

**Bottom line:** structural adjustment is moving too slowly in Japan, and the build up of public debt and contingent liabilities continues apace. Nothing new here. So, I would expect Japanese financial markets to continue to follow their pattern of the past ten years; modest temporary rises, followed by a return to weakness. It is going to take a real crisis to speed up this process, but the debt build up guarantees that this crisis is ultimately likely to prove very costly to the savers and financial institutions of Japan, who hold the great bulk of Japan’s public debt.

Best wishes.

Richard McCormack
SHOW: THE BELTWAY BOYS (18:20)

August 30, 2003 Saturday

Transcript # 083002cb.257

SECTION: News; Domestic

LENGTH: 1453 words

HEADLINE: Interview With Joe Garcia

GUESTS: Joe Garcia

BYLINE: Mort Kondracke, Fred Barnes

BODY:
KONDRAVERSE: Welcome back to THE BELTWAY BOYS.

Karl Rove, President Bush’s senior adviser, said recently that Florida is again ground zero in the 2004 campaign. If that’s the case, the president has one heck of a fight on his hands. One of his main constituencies, the Cuban-American community in south Florida, has threatened to withhold its support for the president, support critical to Bush’s hopes for winning Florida for a second term.

Here to tell us all what that’s all about is Joe Garcia, the executive director of the Cuban-American National Foundation.

Thanks for being with us.

JOE GARCIA, CUBAN-AMERICAN NATIONAL FOUNDATION: Pleasure.

KONDRAVERSE: Now, what is this fight all about? Why might Cuban-Americans withhold their support for Bush?

GARCIA: Well, I mean, there’s a great amount of expectation we had for this president, and we still do, and we’re good friends. He received 82 percent of the Cuban-American vote. That’s better than he did in Crawfordville.

9/2/2003
And he had a lot of promises, and we want him to meet those promises.

BARNES: Well, Joe...

KONDRAKKE: (UNINTelligible)...

BARNES: ... the precipitating event, though, was, wasn't it those 12 Cubans who were escaping from Cuba, were caught by the Coast Guard on the high seas, sent back to Castro in Cuba, where, and, and the Bush administration negotiated jail cells, jail sentences for them.

What was going on there? What should the Bush administration have done in that case?

GARCIA: It's just plain un-American. Look, the existing wet foot-dry foot policy, in other words, high tide, you're, you're, you have no chance, low tide, welcome to America, is absurd. That isn't what the greatest country built by immigrants should have its policy designed by.

This president criticized it severely before he came into office. And yet here we are not only implementing Clinton's Castro accords, but now we've got the Bush Castro accords, where Bush, the same government that goes to Geneva every year and talks about the inhumane conditions in Cuba's jails, is literally negotiating jail sentences for people trying to escape the most repressive and longest-lasting dictatorship in the history of the hemisphere.

It's unacceptable.

BARNES: Well, Joe, look, I've talked, I've talked to people in the Bush administration, as you have, and they say their biggest fear is, if they don't go along with Castro and send these people back from the high seas, the ones who don't actually touch ground in Florida, if they don't send them back and, and, and continue, basically, the Clinton policy, then what will happen is, a, another Mariel boatlift from, like the one more than 20 years ago where hundreds of thousands of Cubans will be sent to Florida.

Is that a legitimate worry?

GARCIA: It's not a legitimate worry, especially for a nation like ours. Our policy shouldn't be designed by a two-bit dictator in the Caribbean. What we need to have is a policy that rewards those who seek freedom, instills freedom, and promotes it. And we shouldn't be scared of what Castro's going to do. We should have a policy that tells Castro, Look, you do the wrong thing, you're going to pay a price.

But when you turn people around, I mean, imagine throwing people back over the Berlin Wall, imagine us saying no every time a Soviet defected, we'd say, No, we've got enough. Look, this is the last dictatorship in this hemisphere. People fear for their lives.

And what we need to do is take control of immigration policy and have an immigration policy that promotes freedom, have a policy, a foreign policy, that helps dissidents on the island, so that the fight can be taken to the streets of Cuba, not to the, not to the straits of Florida.

KONDRAKKE: So is, is the Cuban-American community really going to boycott President Bush against, say, Howard Dean or somebody like that, in a, in a general election, and let, let a Democrat be president, who is likely to, to lift the embargo, maybe?

GARCIA: Well, well, maybe, maybe not. What I do find is that this administration created tremendous high expectations. Three years after they've been in power, they haven't done anything. We started, you
know, demanding that they take action on some basic points that they had promised well before they came into power.

Last week, we saw the first steps. They indicted two pilots and a, and a general who shot down three American citizens that were flying over the straits of Florida. They also made a renewed commitment to make TV Marti work, which is a government broadcast station to Cuba.

We're hoping those are the first steps for them to live up to the promises they made this community. If they do that, look, Cuban-American support is not up to Cubans or Democrats, it's up to the president of the United States. If he lives up to his promises, I don't think he's going to have problems in south Florida. If he doesn't, I think there's going to be a competitive race.

Think about it, less than 1 percent of Cuban-Americans would have changed their vote in the last election, and we'd be, I'd be complaining about Al Gore.

BARNES: Well, you had Jeb Bush, the governor of the Florida and the president's brother, on your side. He criticized his brother for his Cuba policy. What, you mentioned the things the president has done just recently. What should he do next?

GARCIA: Well, I think he needs to take control of immigration policy. (UNINTELLIGIBLE)...

BARNES: But what does that mean, though?

GARCIA: That means we give Castro 20,000 visas a year. But the problem is, Castro decides who gets them and who doesn't. Look, when we give a visa, if we give one to Fred Barnes, a dissident in Cuba, Fred Barnes gets out or no one gets out. We should control our visas.

Secondly, there should be a reviewable process. If we stop you at high seas, and you've taken a boat, and you're going to suffer persecution in Cuba, we should give you an opportunity; to get out.

Thirdly, we should have an immigration -- (UNINTELLIGIBLE) dissidents, the same way that Ronald Reagan helped all those dissidents in Eastern Europe to bring about the change, this president promised to do that over a year and a half ago. Promised to do that before he came to power. And he's done nothing. The dissidents have gotten little to nothing.

Yes, they're getting meager (UNINTELLIGIBLE), meager things compared to what Clinton did, but we need to really help the dissident movement and put money in their hands...

KONDRAJKE: So...

GARCIA: ... so that they can fight this system.

KONDRAJKE: So your policy is not that anybody who gets picked up by the Coast Guard, no matter how many there are, automatically gets into the United States.

GARCIA: Absolutely not. We need a policy that promotes freedom and promotes freedom seekers. I think people who are coming for economic reasons can apply for a visa just like everyone else does, and we've got 20,000 a year through the U.S. interest section.

What we've got to realize is not let Castro control those visas. The United States should control them.
BARNES: One final question. We only have a few seconds left, Joe. And that is, remittances from Cuban-Americans sent to relatives in Cuba help keep the Castro government afloat (UNINTELLIGIBLE) less keep the country alive. Should those be stopped or not?

GARCIA: No, I don't think so. I think if we're going to do that, we've got to do it across the board, and that requires third countries to help us. And I don't think, with all the things we've got on our plate, we can do that.

That being the case...

BARNES: OK.

GARCIA: ... we've got to use remittances to foster the growth of civil society in Cuba.

BARNES: Joe, thanks a lot.

GARCIA: Thank you. Waiting for your piece on this.

BARNES: Good.

When we return, Mort and I will have all the latest buzz.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

KONDRACKE: Here's the buzz, Fred.

Congress is back. One of the things that's going to happen next week is gay marriage is back on the agenda before a Senate Judiciary subcommittee. I predict that the, that the constitutional amendment goes nowhere, unless Massachusetts declares gay marriage legal.

BARNES: Mort, why is much of the media now saying Iraq and not the economy will be the issue that will decide the presidential election next year?

KONDRACKE: Why?

BARNES: Because the economy's doing better...

KONDRACKE: Oh, see, a biased press...

BARNES: ... and the reporters don't like it.

KONDRACKE: ... I know.

BARNES: Liberal bias, as usual.

KONDRACKE: That's all for THE BELTWAY BOYS for this week. Watch us on "SPECIAL REPORT WITH BRIT HUME" weekday evenings at 6:00.

BARNES: And join us next week when THE BOYS will be back in town.
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MEMORANDUM

TO: Karl Rove
FROM: Tom Tellefsen
RE: Monday Night Football
DATE: 8/11/03
CC: Brad Freeman

Karl:

As a follow up to my recent memo, I just spoke with Al Michaels and understand that "Zenka" (sp) of ABC/Disney has been in direct contact with you regarding the September 4 NFL season opener game. It appears that President Bush does not want to inconvenience the 80,000 fans by attending the game, but that the possibility exists for a remote interview between Al and President Bush, with the President watching the game from the White House.

Al believes the remote concept will not only work but provide him the opportunity to express to the public the President's consideration of the fans. ABC is also asking President Bush to participate in an opening "skit" to launch the season. Something comfortable that works for him.

I trust you may already have this information, but I wanted to get it to you in case you did not. For your information, coincidentally, I plan to be in DC on September 4 and hope to see you. Maybe we can all watch the game together.

In any event, Al mentioned his producer is generating a wish list for the President to consider and I will forward it to you as soon as I receive.

If it would be easier for you to receive emails, please forward your email address. By the way, are you receiving these memos? I have no way of knowing.
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THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

Date: 9/16/03

To: Ruben Baradur

From: Strategic Initiatives B.J. Georger

FYI

Appropriate Action

Direct Response

Prepare Response For My Signature

Per Our Conversation

Let's Discuss

Per Your Request

Please Return

Deadline

Other

Comments: Please handle as appropriate
September 16, 2003

Mr. Karl Rove, Senior Advisor to the President
Executive Office of the President
1600 Pennsylvania Ave NW
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. Rove:

First, let me tell you how much your hard work and dedication is appreciated on behalf of our nation. We on the state level are extremely proud of this administration and all you have accomplished.

I am particularly appreciative of the President’s leadership in addressing the threat to our domestic steel industry. As you are well aware, dozens of steel companies and tens of thousands of jobs - many here in Michigan - were on the verge of being lost. But thanks to the President’s three year plan to stabilize prices, attract new investors to the industry, and recover lost jobs, we are back on the right track.

Obviously, a healthy steel industry is vital to our national economy. Therefore, I encourage the continuation of the President’s plan so that American companies may fully recover and compete fairly with their global competition.

Again, I applaud the President’s leadership on this issue and encourage your continued dedication to assisting the steel industry.

Sincerely,

Sandy Caul
Michigan State Representative
99th District
Carl M. Cannon

Carl M. Cannon is the White House correspondent for National Journal, Washington’s highly respected non-partisan weekly journal on politics and government.

Before joining the magazine in May of 1998, Mr. Cannon worked for six newspapers over a 20-year span. And before coming to Washington in the first Reagan term, he covered police, courts, local and statewide politics, education and race relations during stints at newspapers in Virginia, Georgia and California.

Working in the mid-1970s in Columbus, Ga., Mr. Cannon wrote an exposé that resulted in capital murder charges being dropped against a mentally impaired defendant coached by police into confessing to a string of murders he didn’t commit. In California, Mr. Cannon’s reporting on a 1937 Los Angeles murder helped secure a pardon based on innocence in 1982 for the man wrongfully convicted, then-80-year-old Pete Pianezzi.

While on vacation in San Francisco in 1989 to see the Bay Area World Series, Mr. Cannon found himself covering the Loma Prieta earthquake instead of watching baseball. He was a member of the San Jose Mercury News staff awarded the Pulitzer Prize for that coverage. As a reporter in the Washington bureau of Knight-Ridder Newspapers from 1982 to 1993, he covered the California congressional delegation, technology policy, western lands issues, politics and the presidential campaigns of 1984, 1988 and 1992.

In 1993, he was hired by the Baltimore Sun to cover President Clinton. He remained on the White House beat after switching to National Journal in 1998. The following year, Mr. Cannon was honored for his White House coverage by winning the prestigious Gerald R. Ford Prize for Distinguished Reporting of the Presidency. He is the incoming president of the White House Correspondents’ Association and also serves as the in-house writing coach at National Journal.

Mr. Cannon is a co-author of “Boy Genius,” a recent biography of top Bush White House aide Karl Rove. Mr. Cannon has also written for numerous other magazines, including The Atlantic Monthly, New Republic, Forbes, Brill’s Content, George magazine, Mother Jones, Civil Rights Journal, Reader’s Digest, the National Review and the Weekly Standard.

A native of San Francisco, Carl attended the University of Colorado, majoring in journalism. He lives in Arlington, Virginia. He and his wife Sharon have three children ranging in ages from 8 to 22. Carl’s passions include fly-fishing in Montana, thoroughbred racing, opera, and playing amateur baseball in an adult hardball league.
Department of the Army
Office of the Assistant Secretary (FM & C)
Washington, DC 20310-0109

FAX

To:  
Organization:  
Fax: 202-456-0191  
Phone: 202-456-2369  
Subject: FT. STEWART TRIP

From:  
Office of the Assistant Secretary  
Fax: 703-614-2910 DSN: 224-2910  
Phone: 703-614-4356  
Pages (including covers): 6

□ Urgent  ☑ For Review  □ Please Respond

CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIED

INFO: CLOSE HOLD

RE: FT. STEWART TRIP AND 3ID (OIF)

If there are any problems with the transmission of this document please contact (703) 614-4356. Please note the contents of this fax are intended for the recipient only and should not be duplicated without permission.
SUSAN.
I SPOKE W/ YOUR OFFICE THIS MORNING.
ENCLOSED IS INFO ON THE TWO COMMANDERS WHO LED GROUND OPS FOR 3ID (COIF). AFTER THEIR TOUR THEY WERE SELECTED AND PLACED ON JT. STAFF AT PNT.
PLEASE FEEL FREE TO GIVE ME A CALL AT 703-614-4356 THANKS.
COLONEL DANIEL B. ALLYN
Assistant Deputy Director for Joint Operations

Colonel Daniel B. Allyn is a native of Berwick, Maine, and a graduate of the United States Military Academy at West Point, New York. He currently serves in the Joint Operations Directorate, J-3, of the Joint Staff. He recently relinquished command of the 3rd Brigade Combat Team, 3rd Infantry Division (Mechanized), upon completion of service during Operation Iraqi Freedom. Prior to serving in the Marine Division, Colonel Allyn served two tours of duty with the 82nd Airborne Division, two years with the 2nd Infantry Division, and three tours of duty with the 75th Ranger Regiment.

Colonel Allyn’s previous duties included command at the platoon through Brigade level and staff assignments at the Battalion through Division level. He served an overseas assignment in Korea and operational deployments for Operation Urgent Fury in Grenada, two peacekeeping deployments to the Sinai Peninsula in Egypt, Operation Just Cause in Panama, Operation Desert Storm in Saudi Arabia, and Operation Desert Spring and Enduring Freedom in Kuwait, followed by Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Colonel Allyn is a graduate of the Infantry Officer Basic and Advanced Courses at Fort Benning, Georgia; the United States Army Command and the General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas; and the Naval War College at Newport, Rhode Island, where he earned a Master of Arts degree in Strategic and National Security Studies.

His awards and decorations include the Silver Star, Legion of Merit, Joint Meritorious Unit Award, Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal with Bronze Stars and Spearhead, Combat Infantryman Badge, 2d Award, Master Parachutist Badge with Combat Star, and the Ranger Tab.

Colonel Allyn and his wife Debbie are the proud parents of Danielle (10) and Joshua (9).
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Colonel David G. Perkins

Graduated USMA 1980 and was commissioned Armor. Assigned to 1-13 AR, 1st AR DIV from 1981-1985 and was a tank platoon leader, tank company XO, battalion maintenance officer, and tank company commander. Following company command, attended the Infantry Officers Advanced Course. Then attended graduate school at the University of Michigan and subsequently taught mechanical engineering at USMA from 1988-1991. After attendance at CGSC was assigned to FT Carson CO and held the positions of assistant G3 for operations, tank battalion operations officer, and division deputy chief of staff. Following Ft Carson was assigned to Washington DC as the special assistant to the Speaker of the House. Commanded 1-63 Armor in 1st INF DIV from 1996-1998 during which he deployed to Macedonia and commanded Task Force Able Sentry. He then attended the US Navy War College. Following the war college was assigned back to the 1st INF DIV as the division G3 from 1999-2001 during which the division took part in operations in Kosovo. Took command of 2BDE, 3rd INF DIV in June of 2001. Deployed to Kuwait in SEP of 2002 and attacked into Iraq during OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM 21 Mar 2003. Currently serving as Division Chief for Europe and NATO Policy Division, J5, Joint Staff.
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RESTRICITION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P4 Release would violate trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]
PRM. Personal record misuse defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

Deed of Gift Restrictions
A. Closed by Executive Order 13526 governing access to national security information.
B. Closed by statute or by the agency which originated the document.
C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
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b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Records Not Subject to FOIA

Court Sealed - The document is withheld under a court seal and is not subject to the Freedom of Information Act.
### Deputy Assistants to the President
**The White House Office**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Current Salary</th>
<th>New Annual Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Initiatives</td>
<td>Henick</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Initiatives</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
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Records Not Subject to FOIA

Court Sealed - The document is withheld under a court seal and is not subject to the Freedom of Information Act.
Non-General Schedule/ Non-Commissioned Officer Employees
The White House Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Current Salary</th>
<th>Annual Salary after 4.6% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Initiatives</td>
<td>Benkie</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>41,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Initiatives</td>
<td>Kolton</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>52,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Initiatives</td>
<td>Nisbet</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>31,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Initiatives</td>
<td>Pipes</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>47,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Initiatives</td>
<td>Rallston</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>47,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Initiatives</td>
<td>Shannon</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>47,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Initiatives</td>
<td>Zimmerman</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>47,070</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Deputy Assistants to the President
### The White House Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Current Salary</th>
<th>New Annual Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political Affairs</td>
<td>Mehlman</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Current Salary</th>
<th>Annual Salary after 4.6% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political Affairs</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>57,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Affairs</td>
<td>Dyck</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>31,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Affairs</td>
<td>Hoelscher</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>31,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Affairs</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>57,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Affairs</td>
<td>Marinis</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>41,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Affairs</td>
<td>McCullough</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>57,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Affairs</td>
<td>Rodriguez</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>31,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Affairs</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>57,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Affairs</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>57,530</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Deputy Assistants to the President  
The White House Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Current Salary</th>
<th>New Annual Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Liaison</td>
<td>Westine</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PRM, Personal record misfiled defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

Deed of Gift Restrictions

A. Closed by Executive Order 13526 governing access to national security information.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Current Salary</th>
<th>Annual Salary after 4.6% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Liaison</td>
<td>Goldman</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>47,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Liaison</td>
<td>Guerra</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>47,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Liaison</td>
<td>Hayes</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>41,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Liaison</td>
<td>Estes</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>31,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Liaison</td>
<td>Peressutti</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>47,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Liaison</td>
<td>Sailor</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>47,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Liaison</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>41,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Liaison</td>
<td>Terpeluk</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>31,380</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PRM. Personal record misuse defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

Deed of Gift Restrictions
A. Closed by Executive Order 13526 governing access to national security information.
B. Closed by statute or by the agency which originated the document.
C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]
b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Records Not Subject to FOIA

Court Sealed - The document is withheld under a court seal and is not subject to the Freedom of Information Act.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Current Salary</th>
<th>New Annual Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental Affairs</td>
<td>Barrales</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This marker identifies the original location of the withdrawn item listed above.
For a complete list of items withdrawn from this folder, see the Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet at the front of the folder.

| COLLECTION: | Records Management, White House Office of |
| SERIES: | Subject Files - FG006-27 (Office of Senior Advisor - Karl Rove) |
| FOLDER TITLE: | 536133 [1] |
| FRC ID: | 9712 |
| OA Num.: | 10736 |
| NARA Num.: | 10794 |

**RESTRICTION CODES**

- **Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]**
  - P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
  - P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
  - P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
  - P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
  - P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
  - P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

- **PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).**

- **Deed of Gift Restrictions**
  - A. Closed by Executive Order 13526 governing access to national security information.
  - B. Closed by statute or by the agency which originated the document.
  - C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

- **Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]**
  - b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
  - b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
  - b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
  - b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
  - b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
  - b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
  - b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
  - b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

- **Records Not Subject to FOIA**
  - Court Sealed - The document is withheld under a court seal and is not subject to the Freedom of Information Act.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Current Salary</th>
<th>Annual Salary after 4.6%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental Affairs</td>
<td>Brancato</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>29,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental Affairs</td>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>52,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental Affairs</td>
<td>Farley</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>31,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental Affairs</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>52,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental Affairs</td>
<td>Rust</td>
<td>57,000</td>
<td>59,622</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This marker identifies the original location of the withdrawn item listed above. For a complete list of items withdrawn from this folder, see the Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet at the front of the folder.

**COLLECTION:**
Records Management, White House Office of

**SERIES:**
Subject Files - FG006-27 (Office of Senior Advisor - Karl Rove)

**FOLDER TITLE:**
536133 [1]

**FRC ID:**
9712

**OA Num.:**
10736

**NARA Num.:**
10794

**RESTRICITION CODES**

- **Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]**
  - P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
  - P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
  - P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
  - P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
  - P5 Release would disclose confidential advise between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
  - P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]
  - PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

- **Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]**
  - b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
  - b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
  - b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
  - b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
  - b(5) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(5) of the FOIA]
  - b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
  - b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
  - b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

- **Deed of Gift Restrictions**
  - A. Closed by Executive Order 13526 governing access to national security information.
  - B. Closed by statute or by the agency which originated the document.
  - C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

- **Records Not Subject to FOIA**
  - Court Sealed - The document is withheld under a court seal and is not subject to the Freedom of Information Act.