

receiving a minimally adequate education." He indicted the quality of the city's teaching force, surging class sizes, minimal use of instructional technology, and dilapidated school buildings as sources of the city's sagging test scores and 30-percent dropout rate and concluded that "increased educa-

tional resources, if properly deployed, can have a significant lasting effect on student performance."

If Rebell prevails on appeal—the national trend suggests he likely will—New York will be faced with an additional annual outlay of about \$3 billion on top of its \$13 billion annual education budget. That's a

Who's Who

By PAUL GLASTRIS

Those who have lost family members to terrorism often speak of the frustration and powerlessness they feel at not being able to do anything personally to help bring the guilty to justice. This is one emotion that perhaps Solicitor General **Theodore Olson** has been spared. Ever since his wife, conservative commentator **Barbara Olson**, was killed in the jet that crashed into the Pentagon Sept. 11, Olson, the Bush administration's top lawyer, has been one of the driving forces behind tougher anti-terrorism laws, including the new executive order requiring military trials for suspected terrorists.

Postmaster General **John Potter** drew a hail of criticism for his lax response to the anthrax contamination that swept post offices. If **George W. Bush** is inclined to replace him, he might consider *National Journal* publisher **David Bradley**. Bradley was so spooked by anthrax that he arranged for two physicians to hold open hours for *National Journal* staffers, convinced **Dr. David Parenti**, director of infectious disease at George Washington Hospital, to be on call, and set up an email address for worried staffers to send questions: drquestions@nationaljour-

nal.com. Bradley is also hoping to team up with *The Washington Post*, NPR and NBC News to irradiate the magazine's mail.

James Dobbins is sort of the Mr. Cleanup of American diplomacy. The career foreign service officer was tapped by the Clinton administration for such thankless jobs as extricating the U.S. from Somalia in 1994 and overseeing peace operations in Haiti and Kosovo. Two years ago, Capitol Hill conservatives, eager to upend Clinton's Kosovo policy, accused Dobbins of lying to Congress regarding his knowledge of investigations into a politically motivated killing in Haiti. Former Clinton administration officials say the charge was bogus and that Dobbins is a first-rate diplomat. The Bush administration seems to agree. Dobbins is now the new U.S. envoy to the fractious Afghan opposition, responsible for pulling together a new government.

Speaking of thankless jobs, consider the new position that former Montana Governor **Marc Racicot** now has in the Bush administration: special envoy to Canada for soft lumber. This is the same Marc Racicot who is a longtime Bush buddy and was thought to be a shoe-in for attorney general last winter, until right-wingers decided he was too liberal and convinced Bush to choose **John Ashcroft**. As it happens, the soft lumber job, while not prestigious, is actually pretty important. Canada is awash in oil and gas, which we need, as well as Islamic ter-

rorist cells, whom we want Canada to lock up. But right now, Canadian Prime Minister **Jean Chretien** is furious with Washington for slapping a 12.6 percent duty on Canadian softwood lumber exports based on a largely-trumped-up dumping claims. If Racicot can mend fences, there's probably a bigger administration job for him down the road.

The Bush administration showed the U.N. nothing but contempt prior to Sept. 11. So how did it manage three weeks later to convince the Security Council to pass a resolution that binds member states to adapt their anti-terror laws and pursue terrorists? A big part of the answer is the close relationship between Secretary of State **Colin Powell** and U.N. Secretary General **Kofi Annan**, notes **Gregory Maniatis** in *New York* magazine. The two talk several times a week by phone. Annan also serves as Powell's back channel to Iranian President **Mohammad Khatami**, a central player in any future Afghan settlement.

Ever since Sen. **Phil Gramm** announced plans to retire in 2003, the speculation has been that he would become president of Texas A&M University, where he once taught economics. But a long-time GOP friend of Gramm's says the senator isn't much interested in the job because, like all university presidencies, it mostly involves fundraising. Rather, Gramm hankers either to succeed **Alan Greenspan** when the Fed chairman's term ends in 2004, or to replace **Paul O'Neill**

bigger boost for just New York City than the entire \$24 billion increase which Bush originally had planned for the entire federal education budget. (Democrats eventually pushed the total to \$7 billion.)

And New York is just the latest example of this trend. It echoes the recent experiences of states like

New Jersey, Ohio, and Wyoming, where judges have been equally sympathetic to claims of educational inadequacy and have required the states to spend more money to fix it. Those states currently rank among the biggest spenders (per student) in the country.

as treasury secretary.

Top White House political adviser **Karl Rove** had his fingers in just about everything until Sept. 11, when he suddenly found himself shut out of the meetings where the national security boys (and **Condoleezza Rice**) were plotting war strategy. But Rove has managed to get somewhat back in the game by working with the team of four women who are coordinating the administration's worldwide counter-propaganda effort. They include presidential counselor **Karen Hughes**, vice presidential adviser **Mary Matalin**, Pentagon spokesperson **Victoria Clarke**, and undersecretary of state for public diplomacy **Charlotte Beers**.

The president has finally begun to find new ways to engage the American people in the war effort beyond asking them to go shopping. In a primetime speech last month, he called for 20,000 AmeriCorps members to serve in homeland security rolls and announced a new White House task force to dream up other ways for citizens to be involved. The brains behind this push for citizen service is White House deputy domestic policy director **John Bridgeland**.

Before joining the administration, Bridgeland was chief of staff to Rep. **Rob Portman** (R-OH), the low-key but influential House leadership chairman. Portman is the only GOP House member who worked in the administration of **George H.W. Bush**. That means a lot to an

administration that values loyalty and service to the Bush dynasty. Portman has three other former staffers on the White House payroll: **Joe Hagin**, deputy chief of staff; **Brian Besanceney**, press secretary in the domestic policy shop; and **Melissa Bennett**, executive assistant to chief of staff **Andrew Card**.

To help battle bioterrorism, pharmaceutical executives have generously offered to send scores of scientists, now on industry payrolls, to work in government agencies. But the drug companies have also managed to stave off actions detrimental to their bottom lines, such as violating patents or forcing them to supply free drugs. *The New York Times'* **Leslie Wayne** and **Melody Peterson** note that the industry has many friends in high places, including Defense Secretary **Donald Rumsfeld** (former CEO of the drug maker G. D. Searle) and Office of Management and Budget Director **Mitchell E. Daniels Jr.** (former Eli Lilly executive). Indeed, more than half the drug industry's 625 registered lobbyists are either former members of Congress or former congressional staff members and government employees, according to a report from *Public Citizen*. They include such former lawmakers as **Beryl F. Anthony Jr.**, **Birch Bayh**, **Dennis DeConcini**, **Vic Fazio**, **Norman F. Lent**, **Robert L. Livingston**, **Bill Paxon**, **Robert S. Walker** and **Vin Weber**.

The threat of bioterrorism and the revolution of biomedicine have

combined to make the post of director of the National Institutes of Health one of the most vital in government. Amazingly, the Bush administration has yet to nominate anyone for job. But among those being considered is **Dr. Anthony S. Fauci**, the high-profile and highly-respected head of the NIH's office of allergies and infectious diseases.

Bill Clinton prosecuted and won two difficult wars, in Bosnia and Kosovo, without the loss of a single American in combat. Yet national security experts have nothing but contempt for his military leadership, largely because he failed to follow their advice. Instead of committing U.S. ground troops, as the experts demanded, Clinton improvised a new strategy: precision air strikes, and other peoples' ground troops (the Croats in Bosnia, the KLA in Kosovo). **George W. Bush**, who came to office similarly dismissive of Clinton's war leadership, wound up employing Clinton's strategy in Afghanistan, with the Northern Alliance serving as the proxy ground force. This fact has driven some arm-chair strategists over the bend. On November 8, *The New Republic* published a cover story, "The Case for Ground Troops," which ridiculed Bush for following Clinton's lead: "it appears the Taliban will rule Afghanistan through the winter, thereby handing the United States a humiliating and gratuitous defeat." A few days after the article went to press, the Northern Alliance took control of 90 percent of Afghanistan.

How Courtrooms Can Fix Classrooms

If Bush's education bill, or some version of it, passes Congress, it will mean big business for Rebell and his allies. Requiring states to test students in grades 3 through 8 every year in reading and math, as Bush's plan does, will produce detailed measurements of how many students are meeting states' standards. That sounds like common sense, but most states don't do this. And the veracity of these state tests will be checked against a nationally administered test. If done properly, states will have much higher quality data than they do now—and tons of it.

While only 15 states currently test that much, soon every state will, which means every state will be exposed to lawsuits arguing that the reason students in poor school districts don't measure up is that the states are not spending enough on those students.

Thanks to Bush's plan, Washington itself could be liable—lawyers may soon have high-quality, nationally comparable state test scores which will allow them to prove what the plaintiffs in *Rodriguez* 30 years ago could not. If they're able to link this data to particular kinds of reforms—say, smaller class sizes—then lawyers could provide the courts with a remedy to increase test scores in poor districts. With such comprehensive evidence, it may be possible to argue to the Supreme Court that national government's failure to pay for such reforms violates the 14th Amendment—a possibility of which education activists are fully aware. "We will never have a better chance," says Bruce Hunter, the director of public policy at the American Association of School Administrators. "In five or 10 years, the people who gave us this [annual testing] are going to rue the day that they did."

All of these cases beg the question of whether more money actually will improve schools. The short answer is: It depends. It hasn't in New Jersey, which now spends more per student than any other state. According to last year's statewide tests, more than half of New Jersey's fourth-graders can't read proficiently, even though the state spends more per pupil than any other. On the other hand, money appears to have helped in Kentucky, where the court ruling required an overhaul of the school system that focused on setting goals and measuring student's progress. It pumped more money into poor schools, established tough standards, and boosted teacher pay. The performance in state and national tests of students in every racial and economic category has improved over the last decade, even though

overall performance remains low. And 10 years after Kentucky's reforms, the funding gap between rich and poor districts has only narrowed from \$1,199 per student to \$757 per student.

Using courts to obtain that money has a number of downsides. Like all legal remedies, it's inefficient. Lawsuits can take years to play out because they are subject to endless appeals and finagling by politicians. After 28 years, the New Jersey case is still being fought; Ohio has spent a decade in court; and experts expect Rebell's New York case to drag on for at least another five to 10 years. Already, the legal fees are approaching \$25 million.

In addition, court-ordered remedies short-circuit the political process, which angers voters. Indeed, it cost at least one politician his job. In 1993, then-New Jersey Gov. Jim Florio lost his re-election bid after he raised taxes to pay for \$1 billion that the courts had required.

Some, especially in Bush's camp, also charge that lawsuits could stall the accountability movement. Erik Hanushek, a senior fellow at Stanford University's Hoover Institute who advised Bush's presidential campaign, argues that testing-inspired litigation could stall any other school reforms until the suits run their course because the state legislatures are so preoccupied with responding to the court's demands that little else can be done on education. "These lawsuits, at least when they're successful, tend to, in fact, impede significant reform in the schools," he said. "I think it would be very bad for U.S. education."

But there are ways out. The easiest way to avoid lengthy legal battles is to close the test-score gap, so that lawyers like Rebell don't have a case. The catch is that doing so will probably cost many states billions of dollars, just as they're struggling to ward off deficits. Of course, states which get dragged into court for allowing that test-score gap to persist are likely to be forced to pony up not just for reforms, but for millions in legal fees as well.

If he wants to preempt the lawyers, Bush might consider a bigger role for Washington. Given that the federal government's primary responsibility in education is to make sure—as Bush would say—that no child is left behind, he could offer some version of a matching grant to give states an incentive to equalize per-pupil funding. That arrangement could not only stave off "big trial lawyers" but also give the president a chance to ensure that the money boosts student achievement instead of fattening bureaucracies—another of his favorite targets. ●

Nationalism and its Discontents

In the wake of Osama bin Laden's global religious terrorism, old-fashioned nationalism is looking better and better.

BY MICHAEL LIND

HOW DID EDUCATED WESTERNERS come to make enemies of an inspiration that has changed the lives of billions of people?" Robert H. Wiebe writes at the beginning of his eloquent and profound new study of the phenomenon of nationalism, *Who We Are*. During World War I, American progressives like Woodrow Wilson viewed national self-determination as one of the building blocks of a new, more humane global order. "But disillusionment after the First World War turned to revulsion after the Second, and at mid-century Western intellectuals dug in to battle the nationalist spirit."

Following the Cold War, the conventional wisdom on any the North Atlantic democracies held that there was a new struggle between the enlightened, progressive forces of internationalism—symbolized by the global market and/or supranational regional blocs like the European Union—and nationalists, who were dismissed contemptuously as racists, xenophobes, and protectionists who failed to understand economics. Murderous Serb chauvinists intent on ethnic cleansing, not the peaceful, enlightened nationalists of the Baltic republics who initiated the overthrow of the Soviet empire, were treated as the archetypal representatives of nationalism. The blood-

less divorce of the Czech and Slovak republics was ignored by statesmen and pundits who claimed that national secession invariably produced wars and spasms of ethnic cleansing such as those that accompanied the breakup of Yugoslavia. Although scholars like Walker Connor and Anthony D. Smith insisted on the deep roots and persisting power of national sentiment, they tended to be drowned out by critics of nationalism like Orientalist Elie Kedourie and the Marxist Eric Hobsbawm, who unwisely predicted in the 1980s that nationalism was about to fade away. In most elite circles, one who had anything favorable to say about nationalism met with suspicion or contempt.

September 11 ended the era of post-national liberal utopianism that began with the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989. Today, talk of a Manichaean struggle between the forces of enlightened globalization—represented, depending on your politics, by multinational corporations or nongovernmental organizations—and reactionary nationalism seems archaic. Now, the greatest threat to liberal civilization seems to come not from secular nationalism, but from transnational religious fundamentalism. International banking, instead of promoting western values, has been manipulated by anti-Western terrorists. The military and the police, those instrumentalities of the allegedly obsolete nation-state, suddenly seem more important to world order than foot-loose corporations, international investors, and transcontinental lobbies for human rights and the environment.

In this period of conceptual as well as geopolitical



WHO WE ARE:
A History of Popular Nationalism
by Robert H. Wiebe
Princeton University Press, \$24.95

MICHAEL LIND, a senior fellow at the New America Foundation, is the author with Ted Halstead of *The Radical Center: The Future of American Politics*.