

**DEMOCRACY CORPS  
GROUP 2  
DES MOINES, IA  
NON-COLLEGE MEN, 45-60  
INCOME UNDER \$50,000  
OCTOBER 24, 2001, 8:00 P.M.**

MODERATOR -- INSTRUCTIONS/INTRODUCTION.

Steve - I'm a Sales Rep. and I live in Urbandale.

Larry and I live Des Moines, the west part, and I'm a Registered Nurse at the hospital.

Jim, I live here in Des Moines, the east side, and work for part sales.

Dante and I write programs and design computer systems for a mainframe computer business, and I live in Des Moines.

My name is Mark and I'm bus mechanic and I live a couple of blocks down the street.

John, I live in [North Brook], entrepreneur. I would be easier to tell you what I don't do than what I do do. I do everything and I live here in Des Moines.

Michael, I live Des Moines and I work at (inaudible) Dairy.

Fred, I live in Des Moines and work for Boeing.

Tom, Head Custodian for our schools and I live here in Des Moines, a couple of blocks away.

Jeff. I'm a semi skilled Worker.

MODERATOR -- SINCE THE ATTACKS AND EVERYTHING THAT HAS BEEN GOING ON SINCE THEN, HOW IS THE COUNTRY RESPONDING?

I think it is responding well.

MODERATOR -- WHY?

Well, we are not falling apart.

It is a good thing to see the patriotism that is being pulled together.

It brought back the unity that we needed. We were dividing ourselves to much there.

They haven't drafted anybody yet.

I think our leader has been able to show his leadership abilities. That he is the right man for the time.

I don't agree. I think that some of this stuff - like the airlines, people aren't flying and things like that, personally I kind of question that, because I don't really deep down in my heart think there is any real security, I mean why change you life or cancel trips. I mean if it is going to happen, it is going to happen. Law changing can't - you know. Where there is a will there is way and these people are willing to kill themselves to get to their way and when somebody is willing to die for it, I just don't think you can provide that security. It is kind of like a false sense. To me, you just go with your life and what is going to happen is going to happen anyway.

Sometimes we need are attention gotten. I think this brought everything into perspective. We have been rolling along pretty smooth, easy, everything has been going our way. Maybe it is time a good time to get our attention, bring us around and start thinking that things aren't always the way we assume them to be.

We are not indestructible. A lot of people have been thinking that we are the United States - they are not going to come after us - we're world power. They showed us.

I think we have gotten away from the patriotism over the last quite a few years, and I don't know if anybody else remembered, but thinking back when we use to go to movies, they use to have the National Anthem before, or you stood up before the movie started and you don't see that now, and when I was in the military or in Thailand, they always started out with their National Anthem that pictured the King. Everybody stood whether you were a National or not. You know they showed their patriotism. You showed your respect for that country's leadership and I think that maybe something we should do here like on the first movie or something - you start out.

I think if bin-Laden really wanted to do damage to the United States - not that I advocate any of this, but I think if he really wanted to do all damage, I think should have sent all this heroin/opium over here. I think it would have done more damage than what he did do. All he did was slap a waking dragon in the face, get him on his face, get him on his feel and say; Okay, now we're mad. I mean it took down a lot of people but he didn't do it good.

You just hear everything, really, you think something is bothering your life but really it is no big deal now. You know the problems they are having here, what we are having here really is looking a lot different now.

Nowadays you see a lot more flags than you used to see.

MODERATOR -- TELL ME IN JUST ONE OR TWO WORDS, WHAT COMES TO MIND WHEN YOU SEE THE FLAG?

Pride.

A sense of security.

Unity.

Freedom.

Yeah, that is the main thing I think is freedom.

MODERATOR -- MIKE HAS KIND OF TOUCHED ON THIS. HAS THE WAY YOU THINK ABOUT LIFE AND THE MAJOR THINGS IN LIFE CHANGED SINCE THE ATTACKS AT ALL?

You mean what is important or not important?

MODERATOR -- YEAH. THE BIGGER THINGS IN LIFE - HAS YOUR THINKING CHANGED?

I think it has pretty much been the same with maybe the exception of doing the things you thought you wanted to do, but just didn't have the time to do them. Now it is like, you know maybe I should have done those things. Maybe I should get up and do what I was working for.

Well, there is a sense of attacking the America the mainland, the homeland, where a lot of previous of this century, the war was kind of over there an external component, you know pretty much the Continental United States was safe.

Now we don't know what direction they are coming from. They could be living next door.

The last time I felt this vulnerable was the John Kennedy assassination because I felt if they could kill a president, I mean who am I. And then this comes along and it just made me feel vulnerable. But on the other hand, I guess I have gone through enough, cancer, heart-attack, bypass surgery, all that kind of stuff to where the way I think about life is different anyway. I kind of want to go along with him. There are too many things that I haven't done, or too many - I guess I have misplaced my priorities most of my life, so now I think differently about a lot of things that I used to think were important that are not now. Like spending time with my grandkids and that kind of thing is more important.

I don't - you know he says he feels more vulnerable. I don't. As long as you are in an open society as we are, we go back and forth with Canada, literally, no checks, no nothing, back and forth between Mexico and everything. As long as we live in a society that we allow everything to be open, airlines - whatever it is - you are going to have this kind of thing. You can't live in a military state and I'm not willing to give that up, even over this here. We are in the open. We are going to get these things.

You can get mugged or shot at by a guy who just doesn't like the way you look going across the street.

Right.

Exactly.

They are not always from someplace else. We've lived with a lot of people that aren't playing with a full deck and they got different agendas and what, and they think their agendas are more important than everybody else's.

Oklahoma City proved that.

You don't know how true that is until you live on the border of the 'hood.

I've never heard this question come up. They had the Olympic bombing - this is a little bit off, but it is still along the line. And the individual that they chased into the mountains wherever it is out there. Now we're classifying people as terrorist that come from Saudi Arabia, wherever. We want to get into the people who are financing them and everything else and protecting them. What about the people out there in the mountains that protected that individual maybe gave him shelter and gave him food and everything else? They still haven't caught him, but that was one of the reasons. Do we now classify them as harboring a terrorist? We don't have to go far.

You don't have to go far - no you don't. I believe there are laws for someone who helps a criminal that they will be charged if they can be charged.

That is like SLA and Patty Hearst and that. I used to live in the Santa Cruz Mountains, not very far from where she was being held, and I'll tell you what, from where I lived, you can look and look and look and you can send the entire army up there and look, you wouldn't have found me, but I was out in the open. I mean I wasn't hiding. There are places that you'd never be found if you didn't want to be found.

MODERATOR -- WHAT DOES IT MEAN TO BE AN AMERICAN?

Good question.

Freedom. We can make our own choices whether they are right or wrong, as long as they don't harm somebody else intentionally, it is freedom.

Yeah.

MODERATOR -- WHAT ELSE?

Freedom of expression.

Religion. There is the bottom line right there, of all of the nationalities from religions and we got flowing through here and you look all over the world, Ireland and them Protestants and

Catholics, and we have that. We have a mix and nobody seems to care what you are or what your faith is.

It is a different system.

That is what drives them nuts because the fact we can show respect. You're a Buddhist, fine. As long as you don't harm me or force your religion onto me, let me make my choices - they can't stand it over there.

I think we've lost track of what this country is founded on and what we would actually call the American way, and it seems like all the cultures that are coming into the United States, we are going towards, what I'm trying to say, is that they are not adhering to the American Way that everybody is fighting for.

MODERATOR -- WHAT DO YOU MEAN BY THE AMERICAN WAY?

Just freedom . . .

Christian.

. . . One Nation Under God. I mean all of us immigrants and we built culture and a lot of foreigners are coming in and we are trying to blend them into our culture but yet we are getting away from what's established.

We have been able to strive for the American dream. You know reach out and achieve your goals that you think are a priority to your life.

I think some of this still falls back. I don't know - I've noticed this gentleman down at the end was obviously in the military, but as a first generation person, like from my uncles and dad that fought in World War II and all the reasons they fought for it and laying their life on the line for this country and the flag, - I guess what - and like my son and my grandkids - the kids growing up don't have that. They further away we get from that kind of thing, the less of importance it has. I mean if you ask a kid today about dropping the atomic bomb Hiroshima and you talk to an ex-marine who was in those islands, you would get two completely different yes or no is we should have done it or not. That marine says; Thank you , I'm alive. The kid says; Well maybe we shouldn't have done that. Things like that, I think it changes generationally too.

And then some of these kids don't even know what you are talking about.

Because they try to use today's morals and put them back in 1945, not thinking that if it was my kid that was in the South Pacific, I would want them to drop that bomb and get my kid home, rather saying, no, lets invade Japan. Something interesting I saw on the Discovery Channel was about the invasion of Japan and plans for it, and they ordered 500,000 purple hearts. They expected the casualty rate to be like half a million and today they are still using that same order of purple hearts. That is an incredible figure if you think about it.

MODERATOR -- WHY DO YOU THINK THIS IS HAPPENING TO THE UNITED STATES?

Jealousy, they don't have a life over there. I mean you get up in the morning, what do you do, go shoot a gun up in the air and scream. That's it. They beat their women. They don't (inaudible) their kids. 70% of them are illiterate. They don't try to learn. They are afraid of next bin Laden, right there. What do they do all day? Nothing.

You hit it right there. It is education. They have none.

They just don't have a life, bottom line.

But I read there is a separation between the youths of those area that they want something different than the elders and there is also that friction between them because they don't want to live that way. They are younger. They happen to somehow gotten educated about the rest of the world to the point where they know there is a different now. When you don't know there is any difference, what else are you going to do. When you grow up in it. Where I think now, even though they don't want these people to be educated, they get educated by osmosis because there is a lot of traffic of other people going abroad to travel and they see how Americans or English, or all the other cultures live, which is a lot better than their lifestyle. I mean all of them may not see it, but word of mouth takes over. So there is a separation right in their own countries about the younger generation verses the elders.

But truthfully, for how many centuries has this been going on. If you watch newsreels, you still see people over there riding a donkey and everything else. Now this nation is a baby compared to these people who were riding on donkeys when Moses was around. This big country is basically a baby and it is envious as to what we have taken and mixed. I don't care what your nationality of religion or anything has to do with it. We have taken something and mixed it, and we came out where we all have nice homes, we drive cars and everything - they are still living in clay mud huts of 7000 B.C. Truthfully, we see it on television. A lot of these people never see what we live like. They don't like us, but I don't think it is because they know us. They envy you.

I think these people just don't have the initiative of the curiosity and I think that is what America is actually based on because Columbus, for instance, he was curious about what was at the edge of the world. Everybody thought you would fall off the edge. Well, I don't think so. I want to see what is out there. Everybody that is here, wants to see what is out there. People there - I don't what is out there.

I wonder if they are worrying about their day to day existence, part of it.

They live in kind of a warm climate as far as they never have to heat for winter.

It is cold in Afghanistan.

MODERATOR -- THINKING ABOUT THE ECONOMY - HOW DOES THE ECONOMY LOOK THESE DAYS?

(Laughing).

It was kind on the slide before that. There was a lot of layoffs.

It was just the catalyst that made it kind of fall instead of just slide. It was just the wrong timing - like economically.

Where I work, we were heading for a slow down and after that it just dropped.

We were going to strong to long and companies were thinking that they could keep going at this rate without pulling the reign in a little bit (interrupted).

Expanded.

Yeah, they expanded, they bought, they over spent, they over hired.

Well, I don't think so. I think that the companies that got purchased and downsized could be like to the guy who went out and bought a new four wheel drive and then came home, put it up on block and sold the tires and talked about the (inaudible). Sure the tires were there, but it was more as a whole truck rather, you know. That is the kind of thing the downsizing has been doing.

Well not only that, but the companies have been expanding, thinking that this is a boom. They are building, over building and they ran out of customers.

With the Internet you can go worldwide real quick with not a lot of expense.

You got to remember too, what we make here, they pay a lot more for elsewhere. I mean for what we make here, you can buy over in Mexico for half price. So I agree with him. They should have got a little more conservative. They were going for the boom. Lets do more - hire more - lets keep making more, and then all of a sudden there is nobody there to buy it.

Well, they were all afraid that someone else was going to grab them, that they'd share and they were afraid that someone else was going to bit the major profit and they were all greedy.

There it is greed. That is a good word.

Because of greed we've turn into a use once, throw away nation.

In reality is there a whole lot of difference, not that we are all so smart, a lot of us got gray hair here and we've been through this cycle before. Like in the 80s. All you have to do is looking back at the 80s and seeing the buyouts, the takeovers, the same thing that you see going now.

My job went after 27 years - I'm not alone. Jillions of people did. We thought we would have a job until we retired. This is just a repeat of what has happened and probably other times ahead, but if you think about the 80s and you look at right now, and we had it taken away from us, so we know what it is like. We have a lot of people, I would say 40 down that haven't seen bad times. They haven't had to go get the unemployment check, the food stamps, or whatever. We are in that right now.

As a computer consultant, I take contract jobs and I worked around the country, and I have done this for a while and I can say about the Corporate America side, and I can see the downsizing because there are two factors. Y2K, there was a huge emphasis on changing all these computer systems to be able to handle the switch to 2000. Corporations and government spent billions and billions or dollars and of course there was no big crash in the computer system or anything. Well that is because they did spend those billions or dollars and we went line by line on all those computer programs and changed them all, testing them to make sure they work. Then the number of contracts that are available out there for people like me started to drop because Corporate American had this big swing of dollars and then now all the projects they were going to do, they had to shelve them because they didn't have the money, and then they started to come back up and then all at once, I can now, there are not as many jobs out there for me, so I got lucky. I got a three month contract here in Des Moines, but I just came from Madison, Wisconsin and I may have to go to Kansas City now in my trade. So, if I wasn't willing to travel - I'd be in a world of hurt. So, I've seen this, the hump, the lows and the highs, and it is just there, it is just timing.

MODERATOR -- WE TALKED ABOUT THEM - THERE ARE SOME THREATS TO OUR SECURITY HERE IN THIS COUNTRY AND THERE ARE SOME THREATS TO OUR ECONOMIC WELL BEING AS WELL. WHICH, WOULD YOU SAY YOU PERSONALLY WORRY ABOUT MORE - YOUR ECONOMIC SECURITY OR PERSONAL SECURITY?

Economic.

Economic.

Economic.

Economic.

Economic.

Ever since growing up in America, as a kid, I've always felt secured in this country. Any enemies have been kind of external. Even though they have attacked the fiscal mainland of the United States, there is still an over there kind of an enemy.

MODERATOR -- DO YOU THINK THAT THERE IS A SENSE THAT IT HAPPENED IN NEW YORK, BUT WE ARE HERE IN THE MIDDLE - WE ARE A LITTLE MORE INSULATED - WE ARE A LITTLE SAFER HERE?

No, I don't necessarily think that would be true because, say there are 50 terrorist groups out there. All it would take is one person for those terrorist groups to target the major city in every state at the same time, all of the got bombed, the entire country got wiped out, so we got that same fear as if we were in New York. The thing is, I don't think anybody here has the high enough role in society where we have to ourselves have to worry about being targeted or work in a large enough area where there is a large number of people, where we have to worry about someone targeting that particular installation or you know something of that nature. I was thinking about applying for a job at the Post Office. Well, I'm not so sure about that with the Anthrax threat, because that is a major installation.

I just don't think we would make such a big boom as it did in New York. If they did it here in Des Moines - took out the Federal Building, you know just like they did in Oklahoma City, it wouldn't have been such a big thing as taking out the World Trade Center. I mean that wasn't just the United States. That was every country.

40 countries were represented.

40 countries lost lives.

It got them their advertisements - what they were after.

(Many People Talking).

Terrorism operates on notoriety.,

Fear.

If it happened here in Des Moines - New York wouldn't care.

No.

Not saying that they wouldn't feel something towards us and wouldn't help, but it wouldn't have been the response that we got there.

I wrote to my two Senators and Congressman and I expressed my opinion about what they were doing to the U.S. Congress about changing the Terrorist Act Bill, because Terrorism for me is a broad term word, but it is all inclusive. You can pretty much massage it anyway you want, and I told them my biggest fear as an American citizen was the desecration of our Constitution, by allowing them - because they can say that you had terrorist activities or were suspected and they could come into your house without a Search Warrant and things like that, that I was more scared of losing what our Constitution and Bill of Rights stand for because I have relatives that died fighting for the piece of paper and I think that personally it really pisses me off that our Congress would even touch on that, because those are precious - that is what makes America. And I think be diluting our Constitution and Bill of Rights, I am more scared of that and they

mistakes and it is not obscured to the misuse of that power, because that is where it comes from this misuse of that power, because once they say they can walk into your house without a Search Warrant because they suspect something, I think us Americans have to really stop and think about that.

If they could do something like that you might as well call us Iraq and Judaism. They can walk in and do anything to us right?

MODERATOR—(HANDOUTS GIVEN OUT) I'D LIKE TO TALK ABOUT GEORGE W. BUSH. WRITE DOWN ALL THE GOOD THINGS THAT COME TO MIND WHEN YOU THINK OF GEORGE W. BUSH. THEN GO TO HANDOUT #2 AND WRITE DOWN ALL YOUR DOUBTS ABOUT GEORGE W. BUSH. LET'S TALK ABOUT THE GOOD THINGS FIRST.

Strong leader.

Like the job he is doing overall at this point in time.

Performing extremely well since 9/11.

After the first attack, he wasn't immediately on the air calling for some kind of reprisals before he had any idea who or where it came from. He took the time to stop and think and look at his intelligence, and kind of disburse the Congress a little bit for further safety.

I agree with that. Also, taking a stand and being able to stick to it. We are going to do this and then actually doing it.

He's surrounded himself with knowledge, good people, and he's listening to them. A good speech writer too.

He's upholding his Christian values. He's family oriented. He's even keeping the children informed on what's going on.

He thinks of the people, even before September 11<sup>th</sup>. \$600 was nice, but even if I hadn't got it, he was still thinking of us. Whatever President ever offered to give us any money back? Even considered it. Even Reagan, in a way, didn't come out and say anything like that. I'm not saying because of the tax rebate or anything, but he's thinking of the people. He's realizing that we are this country, not him. He is part of the country, yes, Senators, yes, they are all Americans. But, we are the ones who put them there.

It's our money he's giving back.

Yeah.

And it was to give a boost to the economy that was faltering.

It was his way to try to buy votes personally.

He didn't do funny things with interest rates and (inaudible).

MODERATOR—GOT TO THE NEXT HANDOUT. WHAT ARE YOUR DOUBTS?

I'm worried that he might try to use this for a political gain. Say in 3-5 years you wipe out this terrorism, I think we can walk through Afghanistan and take out Bin Laden a little quicker than what he is looking forward to. I think he's trying to stretch his term out a little longer.

It's hard to go into mountainous country and caves and everything like that.

I think only his experience in office is the only thing that I have any doubt about. Other than that, I went through Vietnam and we didn't do too good there, but you can't just go into a country and do anything. You have a lot of other countries that you have to consider, and you don't want them to go over to the other side. You need to balance what you do, and I think he's doing an excellent job of it.

He's untested.

He's a puppet on a string for his Dad and the CIA goons that go out there and screw over people all over the world. It creates the hate that comes back as reprisal. I'm scared because he's big oil, big money, and the fact that his Dad is involved in some parallel group with (inaudible) and somebody else to build a pipeline through Afghanistan. It seems the timing is perfect because they are in bed with the Bin Laden family in Saudi Arabia, and are now building this pipeline. Maybe I'm just too skeptical, but I just don't believe him.

I think he might get information to the people that we don't need. It doesn't need to be released. Some time ago, he was talking about different things and then he hesitated and then the said facilities. Postal facilities and different places like that, anthrax, news facilities. I think he may have known more than what he should have told the people at the time.

I'm not too sure that without the war coming along, I had my doubts about him before, if he had the ability to run the country. I'm not taking anything away from him, I think anybody that is put in the position he is with the situation he has, I do like some of the people he has got around him. But, as far as George himself, as far as having confidence in him around the country, I don't know without the war. I think the economy was headed where it is right now without the war.

MODERATOR—THINKING SPECIFICALLY ABOUT THE ECONOMY, DO YOU TRUST BUSH TO HANDLE THE ECONOMY IN THE MONTHS AHEAD?

I do. I just think he's thinking more of the people, plus he's big oil, but he's made big money. He was a CEO. Really, that's what this country is run on. Somebody has to know how to handle money when they are up there because we are getting into trillions of dollars.

They can't just walk in there and say, my hand's in the pocket now, let's just spend. You have to know how to handle this.

I think he knows how to get there and if he is willing to show us how to get there, that would be a good thing. Whereas, a lot of the Presidents...I mean, all the Presidents have money. They had money when they went in, they had money when they left. But, not any of them were willing to say, look, this is how you get it, this is how you make your way to it.

I think one of the things that I don't trust him about was when he was campaigning, he talked about using Social Security money or whatever to put it in the stock market, instead of just having Social Security the way it is. Personally, I think that's the sacred cow in this country because I am now in my 50's and I'm going to need it. I say to a person like that, well fine. If you are a multi millionaire, Social Security doesn't look like much. But, if you just grew up in small town Iowa and all you did was to struggle along, you didn't trust the stock market, you relied on that. Plus all my life, 40+ years of working, they took this money from me without my permission, and then at the end if they don't give it to me, what's the difference between that and stealing? There is no difference. I just say leave it alone. It bothers me that they take their benefits out of the Congress and the President's office keep going up. They have lifetime pay, all these things. As their benefits go up, I'd like to see a chart that shows how Social Security benefits decline. And they are the ones that already have the money. I do not trust this man. I don't think he's as honest as he is trying to say he is.

I thought that that was going to be an option, up to yourself. If you felt you could invest your money better than the government, instead of just letting it sit there and get \$1,000 a month, you could actually do something with it, investing it. Not so much maybe stock market, but something else.

It was an option, but I think it was something that they are trying to kill Social Security with anyway over the years. My question to people is, well, if you already have money and you make money, do you turn it down when you turn 65? I say, yeah, I go get it. They took it from me. I'm saying that I think it's such a sacred cow when you get to a certain age if you grew up in a certain time. To me, it's important, if they want to do something for me and let me make my choice with this money when I turn 65, if I live that long, then why don't they calculate out what the average span of my life will be and just hand me all my money plus interest in one lump sum payment, and say, you are on your own, you do what you want. If they really wanted to do something for me, that's what I would pick. Give it to me and let me do what I want with it.

90% of the people wouldn't know where to take that money and invest it. I wouldn't.

The Republicans started the idea of instead of running the country like an old lady with credit cards, they thought it would balance the budget over a period of time. Not trying to bankrupt the country.

No matter who the President is, it ain't him making all the calls. It's everybody around him. I'll make the announcement, it may not be right, but you guys think it is, so I'll make it. It sounds good to me. He can't have that much going on and control everything. There's no way that he could handle all that stuff at one time.

Not with the \$600. He couldn't give that back, not without Congressional approval.

MODERATOR—DO YOU THINK THAT DEMOCRATS ARE AS PATRIOTIC AS BUSH AND THE REPUBLICANS ARE?

Sure.

Yes.

Patriotic, yes. They are all Americans.

Patriotism is the same.

The only reason this is working, it's not Bush or Cheney or anybody else, it's the point when we forget we are Democrats, Republicans or Independents, it's now one. This is not credit to one individual, this is a nation as one. They have taken their party politics and put them over here and worked for a common good for everybody.

Isn't America so much better when you remove the labels?

Yes.

I get tired of you are a conservative, you are a bleeding heart liberal, you are a .....I'm an American and I want to make my choices based on being American, and yes, I might lean one way or another on one issue, but on some other issue I'll lean the other way because you can be conservative, a liberal.....look how liberal you can get when it comes to your own family. Look how conservative you can get when it's somebody else committing a crime. It's an emotionally based choice. And I'm tired of labels because I don't want to be a label. I just want to be a person.

MODERATOR—LET'S USE YOUR IMAGINATION HERE. GOING BACK TO LAST NOVEMBER AND INSTEAD OF GEORGE W. BUSH BECOMING PRESIDENT, IT WAS JOHN MCCAIN. WHAT DO YOU THINK HE WOULD BE DOING DIFFERENTLY?

I don't think he would have been any considerable difference.

I don't think anybody in the White House at this time would have handled it much different because first of all you are surrounded by military advisors and everything. Second of all, you know in that region of the world you need allies. It's a delicate balance and they all know.....they have to be careful.

If you get down to it, if Bush said, well they took our towers, but it's all right we'll leave them alone, I think the whole country would have had an uprising and it would be war all over again.

They pissed us off.

MODERATOR—HOW ABOUT IF IT HAD BEEN AL GORE?

Same thing.

He would have gone with most people, and at the time it happened, we want some ass kicking. There's no two ways about it.

It was a tough choice to make in the election. There were two good leaders there.

Not much differently.

I think he would have been a tiny bit more aggressive.

A President is a puppet, and it's the people around him that's telling him we have to do it this way.

MODERATOR—HOW ABOUT HERE AT HOME, WOULD GORE HAVE HANDLED THINGS DIFFERENTLY?

I don't know if Gore would have had the problem with the economy. I think it's a confidence thing with Bush. I don't think it would have had....you would have gotten the same thing out of Gore that you got out of Clinton. You see what I'm saying. The economy was booming and everything else, why would you rock the boat, why wouldn't you just keep going on the same tack? I honestly think that Bush has a problem, up until this point, with people really having confidence as to where he was going.

Longer speeches.

A lot longer.

For me, it's hard to say that anybody would have done much different, even any of us in this room than the White House. First of all you have to dig deep down into your own soul, and most people dropped all the labels and became American citizens, and I think it doesn't matter if you are sitting in the White House or here in Des Moines, Iowa. It's deep down inside how you feel

and it comes out. I think they would all do about the same thing. They are all surrounded by advisors.

MODERATOR—WHAT ABOUT BILL CLINTON? HOW WOULD HE HAVE RESPONDED?

Same thing.

What he did when Bush's life was threatened when he went to Kuwait. You don't tread on us. When you step in the White House, you have your fingers on the most powerful military the world has ever seen. It's not that hard to.....

I listened to a radio broadcast yesterday and they went on with (inaudible) and he was saying that when the bombing of our embassy, he said we will hunt down and find these people. He went on to list a number of things that Clinton had said, that we will hunt down and punish these people. I don't see that he did any of that.

There again, it was over there.

That's true.

But, it was still American citizens. The ship that got hit, all those were listed, he went on to list 10 of these that Clinton made a speech afterwards saying that we will hunt down these perpetrators. But, none were hunted down.

We go back to the same things. You go all the way back to the Marines in Beirut where we seem to be very passive when it wasn't at home. Lockerbie, Americans, it comes down....they finally treaded where they shouldn't have treaded. As far as Clinton, didn't he send cruise missiles to greet somebody after one of their terrorist things? The whole thing is, he can't do what he don't have the backing here to do. Basically, we have always said, we back off, we stay away from it. This time we didn't.

Bush got more allocations as far as finances because of this, then probably Clinton did.

What about in Congress over that whole impeachment thing. Where were our priorities then?

(many talking at once)

I think that's a hard thing to say because up until this thing, it's been elsewhere. (inaudible) died of cancer, too bad, it's a sad thing to happen, but that's all right, it's him, it doesn't have any effect on me. My Dad died of cancer, now wait a minute, I am just stricken. People getting killed outside of our country and in other nations, well it's a terrible thing, but it's over there. They bomb the Trade Center, that's hitting home again.

MODERATOR—WOULD CLINTON HAVE HANDLED THINGS DIFFERENTLY HERE AT HOME?

I think Bush at the beginning, when he started using things like those words, kind of irritated some people. Like “want him dead or alive” or that cowboy “old west” type rule. I don’t think Clinton would have used those kind of things, he’d have been more passive here at home with the people, and not jump the gun so much. Try to keep things economically going and then try to deal with this issue too, but....

He did something else and got out of it every time. It started out with the “don’t ask, don’t tell”, then the military.....start making those kind of plans where otherwise you count on your military to be kind of patriotic.

If you are using the bombing itself as to base our opinion on what each president would do, as far as the bombing goes, they all would have done the same thing basically because that’s what we wanted. That’s what Congress, the Senate, the military wanted. If that wouldn’t have happened, they all would have done something totally different because they all have their ways of doing things. Clinton isn’t going to do the things Bush would have done. Gore would have done it his way or tried. I’m trying to decide, would he have done it differently, well it depends, if the attack happened or not.

You have to remember that it’s in their best interest to keep us happy economically because that’s how they stay in office and get what they want. They may try different ways to do it, but I think that’s their goal is to try to keep us happy, prosperous. You want to line yourself up with somebody that’s successful.

MODERATOR—THERE ARE A NUMBER OF ISSUES FACING THE COUNTRY TODAY AND I WANT TO TALK ABOUT OUR POLICIES ON SOME OF THOSE ISSUES. THE FIRST ONE I WANT TO TALK ABOUT IS ENERGY POLICY. WHAT IS OUR CURRENT ENERGY POLICY AND WHAT SHOULD WE BE DOING?

We buy way too much out of state or out of the country.

(many talking at once)

We’ve deregulated gas and made ourselves self sufficient. We had the ability to do that, too much money is to be made by not being self sufficient.

How can we do it?

Invest in research for alternative resources of energy to reduce our demand for foreign oil. Just reduce it. Even like a gallon of gas in each car that isn’t oil, multiplied by the millions of cars, multiplied by the millions of gallons of gas, is a huge dent in that oil pipeline.

The OPEC nations are trying to pay us back from WWII, to allow us to give us something, that's what they give us. They sell it to us, is the oil. In a way, that's how we kind of keep them under our thumb.

I think they keep us under their thumb. All they have to do is turn the spigot off and we are in trouble. All they have to do is say, we aren't shipping any more to you, then what do we do?

That's not our....cars don't run.

I think it's the money grubbing on that aspect that keeps us from going to more solar energy. I think we could be pretty well self supportive on solar energy. It's just that every time someone comes up with a solar idea, they are bought out, they are hushed up. We don't want to do that because we are going to lose money that way. I really think we should try to get back to that because that would clean up our nation a whole lot. Atmospherically, with the Earth itself, we wouldn't have as much pollution in our rivers.

And wind power. A number of years ago, there was a rising interest in wind power and all the alternative things. They hushed it down. Here in Iowa, wind is like 12 MPH year round, which we are a tremendous source right here in Iowa.

Today we could have generated a hell of a lot of power.

(many talking at once)

When it's 12 MPH, you can do a generator.

Oh yeah.

We could probably supply the rest of the country with wind power, electricity. We could export it to other states. There's money to be made just off generators alone. And a price to repair them.

I read an article where this guy was making payments on his acreage and stuff with solar wind power.

There's a guy up around Woodward that had some of those wind things. I was talking to him one day and he said that any excess power, they have to by law buy it back, so he sells it back. He only has two towers and he is making money selling it back.

It's a little less than what you would have to buy from them.

(many talking at once)

I think there's something out there that's stopping people from....they say it's not economical to recycle and other countries recycle one way or another. They may not get money back but....

The thing is, we wouldn't keep as many people busy if we recycled it. You'd keep more people busy mining than we do recycling.

We will run out of what we can mine.

We need to put the can back into the spot and mining it back again later. I think recycling would help a lot.

And technology for alternative sources to me is a big...because when our government wants to spend money for a common goal, it's amazing how good this country has been to basically do what it wants to do. Look at what we've accomplished.

MODERATOR—WHY AREN'T WE DOING IT?

I think it's because of greed. It's in their interests not to do it.

It isn't going to last forever. I'm sure they are getting into the wind farms and nuclear and the whole bit. Then you also have your EPA and all these other people saying, we can't have this nuclear plant here, but if we put the wind farm here, we are going to have to cut these trees down and now that owl has no place to live. It all boils back down to....we got it this way, we'll buy it from them, we don't have to do nothing. Oil companies.

Why are we shipping oil from Alaska to Japan instead of back here in the states? Because they say it's more profitable for the oil companies to bring the oil in from the Middle East than to bring it down from Alaska because they are selling it to the Japanese, and making tons of money on that, while they are making tons of money on the oil they bring in here. It's the greed for that next dollar and forget about it.

MODERATOR—NEXT ISSUE, HEALTH CARE. WHAT'S GOING ON WITH HEALTH CARE?

We are the only country that doesn't have universal health care. We can't afford it.

I can't afford it. I couldn't afford to pay for everybody else's health care.

Look at Canada.

England. Both of them. To get into a medical facility, unless you are absolutely falling down dying, even then you are going to have to wait. To get into see a doctor, it takes months and months and it doesn't work.

The Clintons tried to get the Congress to pass a national health care policy. There was no interest there. They couldn't get any support going.

We are all sitting here saying we don't have a national health care program, I'm going to differ on one thing. It's called Veteran's Hospital sitting right out here. We have them all over the U.S., we have them shut down,  $\frac{3}{4}$  shut down. That right out there has an 800 bed capacity, it's run at about 230. You are already paying for this. You are paying for (inaudible) Hospital over here. All of us around this table have always had good insurance, so we go to Mercy. We don't go to those places, so they are not up-to-date, they don't have the best equipment and everything else. So, we can look right back at ourselves folks as to why we don't have the best. But, we do have because if you are in the military and everything else, as he can verify, you can go to that Veteran's Hospital.

No, you can't. They've changed.

I'm a disabled veteran. I wasn't in the war time and I can't....they've done some policy change...

(many talking at once)

You as a Vietnam vet cannot go there?

Not according to my insurance company.

Isn't that a kick in the ass?

(many talking at once)

The vet population is dwindling daily. You have these in place, you have enormous facilities that's already run by the government that you already own and operate. The doctors that come to that hospital are the same doctors that operate in all of the rest of the major hospitals. Even if it isn't for people, just for the people that are uninsured alone to use those facilities. It's paid for

(end of side)

We don't get any of those benefits no matter what happened to me, there is nothing I can do to get into the VA, there's nothing that they would do for me.

I'd like to see less outpatient surgery. At least be able to stay overnight.

Your insurance company is going to sell you down the river and you are going to come up with a lot of money to pay for it.

It seems like they have a lot of control now. I've seen a large shift from....they say there's a nursing shortage, there isn't a nursing shortage, there's a lot of nurses out there, but they are just working in different fields. A lot of them are going to work for the insurance companies because of things happening within institutions. And that's where the insurance company is paying them a little more, maybe because they are hiring nurses and other doctors that are overseeing things

and they want the control, and I think they are making a hell of a profit somewhere. You can't go to Lutheran because you like it over there because your insurance says you have to go to Mercy. Or Methodist.

There again, it depends on if my doctor goes there.

Right.

It has to be in the book.

Right, it has to be in the book. You have to go through a gatekeeper.

MODERATOR—WHAT CAN WE DO ABOUT ALL THIS?

I don't know.

Premiums are getting high and now they are supposedly going lower than they were 20 years ago.

It seems like we are paying a little less in premiums, but we are also getting a hell of a lot less in benefits.

One thing is that the people don't really understand the medical field. I just recently found this out because I was in serious pain for four months and had no idea what's going on. And even now, it's only a guess as to what did happen. I found out that you don't just go to the doctor and say look I have a pain here and feel this way or that way, and they say, obviously you have da, da, da, da, da. They can't do that. It's a guessing game for them. They have to say, let's try this and that and let's see if this takes care of it. Then you go out and say, well, gee, he doesn't know what he's talking about. I'm going sue him for malpractice and that's what's causing the rate to go up. If we could cut down the rate of malpractice suit by raising the standard of how they can go about taking care of you, and educating people that hey doctors are playing a guessing game, for the most part they are. Just like anthrax, we've seen this before, we know exactly what it is. My ex had contracted bubonic plague and it hadn't been around in so long that they didn't know what it was. It took six months with four months in the hospital, getting \$1500 of antibiotics daily to conquer this, and another two months after that before they finally came back and said, oh, we finally found out what it was. Nobody had seen it in such a long time. Stanford University figured it out.

MODERATOR—LET'S TALK ABOUT THE ECONOMY AND ECONOMIC POLICY.  
WHAT ARE WE DOING OR SHOULD WE BE DOING?

I was glad to see that \$600.

My economic policy is to just work everyday.

One of the things that would help the economics in the U.S. would be if they could somehow ban...there's no way that politicians should be able to accept money from outside of the United States. Corporations that dictate to them what they need to do to pay back. It is just getting ridiculous. A lot of the reasons, like the health care industry, you've got the hospitals, the HMO's, they are all piling money in there to make sure that these politicians vote a certain way in the Congress to make the laws go in their favor. That just keeps escalating. Whoever writes the biggest check gets the biggest bite. A lot of this...that cycle has got to impact the whole country economically because you are having all this money being shifted in big chunks between these corporations based on law.

Has anybody noticed how much money has come into this? It's pretty much all greed. If we stop paying politicians to do their job and make the politicians do what the people want them to do, not because of money, but because of need...take care of the country, take care of business the way business should be taken care of.

I think they should reign in the government a little bit. They should reign in themselves a little bit because I know from working at two levels of government, with the computer systems. I worked for the state, I worked for the county and the city. The only difference I saw was that the next level up had more money to waste. I think there is a huge amount of waste in government.

That's true. Just say look guys, we are going to cut taxes by this amount and you guys are just going to have to readjust for this, whatever it is, and cut out a lot of this fat. It's just there and .....

They are too ready to give it out.

It doesn't matter which side because it's in their best interest to make somebody happy. They want to spend the money, it's just whose side wants to spend it on which side to get what they want back.

I don't know about state and local, but I've heard that in the federal government, like ¾ of the budget is already locked in. To me, we should set up a schedule and say this part of the budget, we are going to look at this year. And piece meal it down. Everything is locked in already. Do we really need this, do we need to spend money on the mating habits of butterflies? There's things that they have that are already locked in, that just keeps on going. You've got a locked in 3 or 4 percent inflation. They just increase it that much every year, and nobody really has a handle on it. They need to get a schedule and say, do we really need this? Just piece meal it out. There's certain things that have to go on every year.

Lead by actually doing it, and not just lead by saying, okay you do it, let's take on the (inaudible). Right now we have different rates of taxes. You make more money, they are going to take more money. If you have this and this that you can deduct from that, you've all these different loopholes. Let's cut out all the loopholes. No loopholes whatsoever. Everybody has a 10 percent tax straight down the board.

MODERATOR—THINKING ABOUT CONGRESS, DO YOU THINK DEMOCRATS OR REPUBLICANS ARE TAKING THE RIGHT STEPS TO REBUILD THE ECONOMY, WITHOUT HURTING IT IN THE LONG RUN?

I think they are always going to look out for themselves first.

All their own agendas.

Yep.

Yes.

Parties, vacation houses.

It all goes back to the same thing. Getting re-elected to a position.

Getting that vote.

Even if you get somebody in there that is good and can make changes, it seems like eventually they like it, it's a lot of power. Senators and Congressmen carry a lot of power. It just keeps moving up. It's a sell off. Okay, I want to keep this, I'll deal with this, I'll deal with that.

MODERATOR--WELL, OBVIOUSLY DEMOCRATS AND REPUBLICANS HAVE DIFFERENT IDEAS ABOUT WHAT WE SHOULD DO. WHICH PARTY DO YOU WORRY MORE IS GOING TO DO THE WRONG THING?

See, I don't think they do have a lot of different ideas. We were talking about trading off our values and what this were all about, how many times do you hear them talking about going to Florida to get the votes, the Cuban vote. Going to Texas or California for the Hispanic vote. Going to New York or Chicago for the black vote. It isn't going to do them any good. If I cater to them, I give them this, they will give me their vote. So, we are coming back to the same circle.

MODERATOR—DOES ANYONE THINK THAT THERE ARE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PARTIES?

I think they are interchangeable.

I think the Republicans are more sided towards business and the wealthy who already have money. Just like somebody brought up here all these products they went gung ho and the economy was going like hell, and now everyone has these products that nobody can buy. While all the time this economy is going gung ho, you've got these big corporate layoffs. If there is nobody working to buy anything, in other words, you are shipping all your jobs out of the country, you are shipping foreigners in to take your jobs, it comes to a break point to where if you don't have any money, who are they going to sell these products to when there is nobody working any more?

Personally, I always thought that Democrats wanted to take care of you. Let Uncle Sam take care of you. Let the government take care of you, don't worry about taking care of yourself. Republicans, they say, do it yourself. I've got millions, you don't. There's nothing stopping you from getting these millions. Democrats turn around and say, we want your money so Joe Blow down here with 16 kids can have the same thing you've got. Even though you don't have any. I always felt that way.

On the other hand, I look at it as a quality of life for all citizens.

You get what you earn. This government wasn't put here to support you. You get what you get.

It's going to support somebody, why not the states?

I want to support myself.

(many talking at once)

Let's say that General Dynamics, multi billions, they get these contracts to build this stuff, they are late, they don't get done right and they keep paying them these bucks. Do you really think right now, you with the American dream, can go in there and get a government contract to do something General Dynamics already does? They would slash your head off.

(many talking at once)

That doesn't mean I can't make my money somewhere else.

No, but I'm just saying...

My opinion between Democrats and Republicans is that Democrats want to take care of you, Republicans want you to take care of yourself.

**MODERATOR—REGARDLESS OF PARTY, CONGRESSIONAL LEADERS OF TODAY, WHAT IS THEIR PRIMARY OBLIGATION, TO PROTECT US FROM TERRORISM OR TO PROTECT OUR ECONOMIC WELL BEING?**

One will take care of the other one. If you have a good solid economy, you can take care of the other part.

If you are living well, you are relaxed and the better you live. But, when you are living a little bit harder, it seems like....

I feel different when I get a big contract to work somewhere versus when I get this little dinky one. I have to worry. I just feel a hell of a lot better when I have this big contract. It makes life easy. Just enjoy it.

MODERATOR—LET'S FLIP TO HANDOUT NUMBER THREE. (INSTRUCTIONS)

EXTENSION OF UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS BY 13 WEEKS FOR THE UNEMPLOYED IN HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT AREAS. COVERING AT LEAST HALF OF THE COBRA HEALTH CARE INSURANCE FOR THOSE LOSING THEIR JOBS FOR UP TO ONE YEAR. FUNDING "READY-TO-GO" CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS, SUCH AS IMPROVEMENTS TO AIRPORT AND GROUND WATER FACILITIES, WHICH WILL CREATE JOBS WHILE STRENGTHENING OUR INFRASTRUCTURE AND SECURITY. TAX REBATES OF UP TO \$600 FOR THE 40 PERCENT OF AMERICANS WHO FILED TAXES BUT DID NOT RECEIVE A TAX REBATE THIS SUMMER. TAX INCENTIVES FOR BUSINESSES TO ENCOURAGE INVESTMENT THIS YEAR IN NEW PLANTS AND EQUIPMENT. DELAY THE TAX CUT FOR THE WEALTHIEST ONE PERCENT OF AMERICANS – THOSE EARNING MORE THAN \$375,000 A YEAR – TO ENSURE NO MONEY IS BORROWED FROM THE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND TO PAY FOR TAX CUTS.

WHAT DID YOU THINK OF THOSE?

Each one of those is going to help somebody somewhere along the line. It's going to help somebody out there.

MODERATOR—WHICH ONE DO YOU THINK IS THE BEST ONE?

I really like the extension of the unemployment compensation.

I think the construction projects and creating jobs. To me, creating jobs is the big thing.

It's allowing a person to help themselves.

That's right.

There's thousands of people that's losing jobs right now. We need to be creating jobs. (inaudible) I like to create jobs. I created a lot of jobs when I was in California and turned around and sold them to people for pennies on what they were worth and said take it and run and make good of it. Now I've gone on to other things. I think to create more jobs would be the best idea to go.

What would happen if they decided the interstate system which is a great interstate system in our country, if they put a third lane in for trucks so it's wider and you've got less wear and tear. For the whole interstate system for the whole United States, you know how many jobs that would create right here? In every state. Where this wouldn't be money that's allocated to this project in this state to the congress. This is unilaterally across all the states. That way jobs would be

created everywhere, create jobs in areas where they want to create them. Allocate money because they know it's going to come back to them or whatever.

Funding the ready to go, isn't that like the WPA, around the Depression. They created jobs?

MODERATOR—WHAT ELSE STANDS OUT IN HERE?

Tax incentives, invest in new projects. That would be nice because they're getting people back to work.

MODERATOR—WHAT DO YOU THINK OF THE HEALTH INSURANCE ONE?  
COVERING HALF OF THE COBRA HEALTH INSURANCE?

I think that's implausible. I have done COBRA. For a decent policy and everything, it's close to \$400 a month. I'm a heart patient, number one, so I can't go without getting insurance. So I would like to see it. I think a lot of people are affecting when they lose their job. When you lose your job, that health insurance is a huge one, especially if you're older. When I was younger, I wouldn't have gave a damn. But now I'm older, your body wears out, things happen.

What it'll do is say the construction industry where they lay you off when it starts to freeze up, it'll give you and your family year round coverage.

What did it say here, for up to one year. That gives you a chance to get back on your feet. You may not be off the whole year. But the first thing you may want to do is go get a job, because half of COBRA is still quite a bit of money if you don't have a job.

Wouldn't they kind of go together, between the 13 week extension on unemployment and the COBRA? If enacted, wouldn't they both kind of benefit the people that need it? If you get a 13 week extension on your unemployment, you've still got to buy insurance. You haven't gained anything. So the two of them together would help one another.

MODERATOR—HOW ABOUT THIS IDEA OF DELAYING THE TAX CUT FOR THE WEALTHIEST ONE PERCENT TO MAKE SURE NO MONEY IS BORROWED FROM SOCIAL SECURITY? WHAT DO YOU THINK OF THAT ONE?

I think it's a good idea, but you'd never get it to fly.

MODERATOR—WHY NOT?

They don't take Social Security from us. Aren't they at the income level that they can't draw it.

MODERATOR—THEY'RE SAYING DELAY IT FOR THESE PEOPLE TO MAKE SURE THAT THE GOVERNMENT DOESN'T HAVE TO TAKE MONEY OUT OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND TO PAY FOR THOSE GUYS' CUTS.

(inaudible) social security trust fund. It's not their money anyhow.

If they delay a tax cut on the wealthiest or not, they shouldn't. They should never even consider it.

That's what we paid into for our own security. That's not something they should say, well, we got this money here we can use it however we want.

That's where Medicare came from. They raided Social Security. I think these benefits, if they come up with some extra money, find ways to increase the benefits.

I don't agree with that.

MODERATOR--WHAT IF THEY'RE FACING THIS CHOICE? WE EITHER PAY FOR THE TAX CUTS BUT TAKE MONEY OUT OF SOCIAL SECURITY OR WE DON'T DO THE TAX CUT BUT KEEP THE MONEY IN SOCIAL SECURITY?

I'd say keep the money in Social Security.

Yeah. In some ways we've gotten kind of used to what we're already paying for taxes now. It's nice to do the tax cut, it's nice to get a little bit back. It's nice to get the \$600 or \$300 or whatever you got back. But in the long run, you didn't miss it in the first place.

You don't miss it if you don't have it.

I've heard people say that. I've heard people say that about inheritance. I've gotten along without it. Now it's nice to get it . . .

MODERATOR—LET'S LOOK TO HANDOUT FOUR.

CUTTING THE CAPITAL GAINS TAX RATE FOR THE SALE OF STOCKS. CUTTING THE CORPORATE TAX RATE FROM 35 PERCENT TO 25 PERCENT. ACCELERATING BY TWO YEARS TAX CUTS THAT WERE PART OF THE BUDGET PASSED EARLIER THIS YEAR SO THAT SINGLES MAKING OVER \$27,000 AND COUPLES MAKING MORE THAN \$45,000 RECEIVE A TAX CUT THIS YEAR. ADDITIONAL TAX CUTS FOR BUSINESSES TO RELIEVE THEIR FINANCIAL PRESSURE, INCLUDING \$25 BILLION IN PAYMENTS TO COMPANIES SUBJECT TO THE ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX. EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS FOR THOSE WHO LOST THEIR JOBS AFTER SEPTEMBER 11<sup>TH</sup>. \$13 BILLION IN TAX REBATES TO THE 30 MILLION WORKERS WHOSE INCOMES WERE TOO LOW TO ENTITLE THEM TO THE REBATES THAT OTHER TAXPAYERS RECEIVED THIS YEAR.

WHAT DO YOU THINK OF THESE?

I don't like the last one. There's reasons why those taxpayers didn't receive, unless they were self employed and weren't paying into the tax base.

And you've also gotta remember some of these people because their incomes were too low, whatever they paid in, they got back. They didn't keep any of it. They just sent it right back to them. The government made some interest off of it, but they got it all back.

A lot of these workers, I don't know what the percentage would be, but are students. Or even high school students.

They got all of it back.

I like 2 and 4. And I only say that with one reservation. Take that money and reinvest back in America instead of buying a building. In other words, they have a tendency to buy a corporation or buy a business and all that kind of thing. But if that money was allocated to creating jobs by building plants and not allow them to move out of the country or bring in a bunch of foreign labor, that kind of thing, to help. What's wrong with made in America, you live in America, you want to work and have a job? To me, it should be a no brainer. But it gets tougher and tougher sometimes. Depends on the industry you're in. I'm going to qualify this, but it does. I like those, because those stimulate the economy if business takes that money and pounds it back in instead of giving it to some executive that when they run the company into the ground, they give them \$10 million and say good-bye. Hell, when I lose my job, they might fight me for a screwy \$200 a week unemployment. But if you run a corporation into the ground, \$10 million bail outs. As long as they use this money in some sort of way to help people, I would agree, I think those two are very important.

**MODERATOR—WHAT DO THE REST OF YOU THINK OF THOSE?**

I think if they put the tax cuts back into, to relieve the financial pressures, put them back into the people that make the business, that's the workers. Rather than putting it into a new building because it looks nice. If they put it back into benefits.

**MODERATOR—WHAT DO YOU THINK WOULD HAPPEN IF WE CUT THE CORPORATE TAX RATE FROM 35 PERCENT TO 25 PERCENT AND WE MADE THESE ADDITIONAL TAX CUTS FOR BUSINESSES AND GAVE THIS MONEY BACK TO BUSINESSES TO STIMULATE THE ECONOMY, WHAT ARE THEY GOING TO DO WITH IT?**

The corporate heads would get bigger bonuses.

It makes richer people richer.

95 percent of them put it back in their pocket. But you'd have 5 percent of them out there to actually think of the people that work for them and would share the profit. But at least 95 percent of them just stick it back in.

MODERATOR—SO YOU THINK IF THEY ACTUALLY DID THIS IT WOULDN'T REALLY HELP?

(Many talking at once.)

You'll get this break if you show me you went and reinvested money all year long in something else. I wouldn't give it to them and expect them to do it.

(Many talking at once.)

MODERATOR—TAX INCENTIVES TO INVEST THIS YEAR IN NEW PLANTS AND EQUIPMENT?

Right.

Keep the doors open. Rather that, well, upgrade equipment, I think that would be fine, especially for employee health or safety. Just to spend it on buildings. You can find updates. Bring in some new equipment, and I'll pay you a bonus for putting it in.

And it depends on, if you've got businesses, a business here, and it's also operating in Mexico and everything else, and you start pumping money back into them saying all right, we're going to give you a cut but it don't really show up here, it shows up across the border, which they in turn shovel money both ways.

They put that plant next to the other one and hire that \$1.50 an hour worker.

If you're going to invest back into your factories or whatever.

A lot of people are misled by our government thinking that the jobs are going out of the country, too. In the data processing industry, there's this things called H1B visa where they bring in technicians for computer programming and stuff. Some Americans being replaced. I was. I've got a discrimination lawsuit going. It was the only way out for me. But they bring them in here under the guise that there's no Americans to program computers, so they bring them all here. And I think part of this is the corporations of America. I'll give one example. Microsoft, \$600 billion is in it for Bill Gates that doesn't want to hire an American worker versus a foreign worker. Not a fledging little company trying to survive. It's because of the difference in pay supposedly.

MODERATOR—FLIP TO HANDOUT NUMBER FIVE. (INSTRUCTIONS)

REPUBLICANS IN CONGRESS SAY THAT THE LESS DEPENDENT WE ARE ON OIL FROM THE MIDDLE EAST, THE MORE SECURE OUR NATION IS. WE NEED TO INCREASE DOMESTIC PRODUCTION OF OIL, COAL, AND NATURAL GAS. OUR NATIONAL SECURITY REQUIRES THAT WE OPEN ALASKA'S ARCTIC

NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE TO OIL DRILLING, SUBSIDIZE THE DEVELOPMENT OF NEW, CLEAN, COAL TECHNOLOGY, AND BUILD NEW POWER PLANTS.

DEMOCRATS IN CONGRESS SAY WE NEED AN ENERGY SECURITY PLAN THAT REDUCES OUR RELIANCE ON OIL FROM THE MIDDLE EAST. WE NEED TO USE AMERICA'S TECHNOLOGICAL KNOW-HOW TO DEVELOP NEWER, CLEANER ENERGY SOURCES, SUCH AS WIND AND SOLAR, AND TO BUILD ENERGY EFFICIENT CARS AND APPLIANCES. WE CAN SECURE OUR ENERGY SUPPLY USING CLEAN FUELS LIKE NATURAL GAS BUT WITHOUT DRILLING FOR OIL IN THE PRISTINE ARCTIC NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE.

HOW MANY AGREE MORE WITH THE REPUBLICAN STATEMENT? 1. DEMOCRATIC STATEMENT? EVERYBODY ELSE. TOM WHERE ARE YOU?

Democrats.

MODERATOR—SO MOST OF USE AGREED MORE WITH THE DEMOCRATIC STATEMENT. TELL ME WHAT IT WAS ABOUT IT.

There was that statement in the Republicans I didn't care for.

MODERATOR—TELL ME WHAT IT WAS ABOUT THE DEMOCRATIC STATEMENT THAT DREW YOU TO IT?

I think it's the wind and solar, cleaner energy sources, I believe we can reach that goal.

Yes, definitely. I think drilling into the Arctic, to search for more oil sources is asking for trouble. And putting more animals on the endangered species list.

We have a bunch of oil and gas lines capped down in Oklahoma right now. They were drilling 15 years ago, they were drilling like mad down there. And most of those are capped.

They sold limited partnerships to develop the oil wells down there, and they're mostly shallow draft oil wells and are limited in their production. They almost cost more to pull the oil out of the ground than they make. Though they were shallow draft oil wells. Deep oil wells, unfortunately, in that area, started hitting salt water. And once you start getting salt water into it, believe it or not, there's salt water in the ground down there. If you have a subsistent, a place that it's proven, they're just, at this point, we need to go to other alternatives, because oil isn't the answer.

We should use America's technological know how to develop new things, because that also stimulates our economy. Just look at the Apollo space programs, all the byproducts that came out, jobs, technology. That would be, to me, the same kind of way. Because when you start going after new technology, you create a lot of jobs.

He's talking about a deficiency. Bringing everything you've got, the stuff you need to make it way more efficient is what it is. And I do believe they can do that.

MODERATOR—WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT THIS WHOLE ARCTIC NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE ISSUE?

Leave it alone.

If you're talking about what we were debating about not too long ago, there wasn't enough down there to deal with. That would have played out in ten years if not sooner.

And who are we going to sell it to?

It would have gone to Japan.

The only reason we ought to even think about moving into that area is if our country gets so overpopulated we need the room to grow.

We're almost there.

MODERATOR—DO YOU THINK THE DEMOCRATIC APPROACH, THE CLEANER ENERGY SOURCES, MORE FUEL EFFICIENCY, THOSE KINDS OF THINGS, ARE GOING TO SOLVE PROBLEMS IN THE SHORT TERM, OR IS THAT ONLY A LONG TERM SOLUTION?

It's long term.

Long term.

Long term, yeah.

I think it's both short term and long term. In the short term it'd be opening up positions to people to start into making, creating more jobs for people, and by getting into it, it would give people more ideas of what they could do with what's coming to keep jobs going for the long run.

MODERATOR—LET'S GO TO HANDOUT NUMBER SIX.

DEMOCRATS IN CONGRESS SAY WE NEED TO DELAY TAX RATE CUTS PASSED EARLIER THIS YEAR FOR THE WEALTHIEST ONE PERCENT TO PREVENT BORROWING FROM THE MEDICARE AND SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUNDS. THEY SAY THIS IS THE ONLY WAY WE CAN MEET OUR IMMEDIATE NEEDS – REBUILDING AFTER THE TERRORIST ATTACKS, EXTENDING UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS FOR THOSE LAID OFF IN THE WAKE OF THE ATTACKS, FUNDING NEW SECURITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE

PROJECTS, AND INCREASING EDUCATION SPENDING – WITHOUT SACRIFICING MILLIONS OF AMERICANS’ LONG-TERM SECURITY.

REPUBLICANS IN CONGRESS SAY WE NEED TO EXPAND ON THE TAX CUTS PASSED EARLIER THIS YEAR IN ORDER TO GIVE MONEY BACK TO THOSE WHO WILL INVEST IT IN OUR ECONOMY. THEIR PLAN INCLUDES TAX REBATES FOR MANY FAMILIES WHO DIDN’T QUALIFY FOR THE EARLIER REBATE PLAN, ACCELERATES THE IMPLEMENTATION OF OTHER TAX CUTS FROM THE EARLIER PACKAGE, AND OFFERS NEW TAX CUTS DESIGNED TO PROMOTE IMMEDIATE INVESTMENT BY BOTH INDIVIDUALS AND BUSINESSES.

HOW MANY WOULD SAY THEY AGREE MORE WITH THE DEMOCRATIC MESSAGE?  
8. REPUBLICAN? 2. THOSE WHO AGREE WITH THE DEMOCRATIC MESSAGE, TELL ME WHAT IT WAS.

I don't want them to sacrifice the long-term security, that's for sure. Because it's not too far off for me.

May be a little ways off for me, although not that much farther off. I just don't show it. But I think our security, we're older age, when we're unable to get out and do work to support ourselves, I think that would be more important than spend it all now and the heck with tomorrow.

To me the Republican thing is telling me, okay, any one of us has a fairly good paying job. And me quitting my job, maintaining my same debts and going to work for McDonald's. I'd decrease my income, and I'd still have the debt there. It may even go up. I think the Democrats, we need to keep the income coming in so we don't get too far in debt.

What did we do with the money after I got my little check? I didn't run down and buy stock or reinvest it in the country. I just absorbed it in and went out and did something. I think before they do this kind of thing they should really say, where did all this money go? Did it go back into the country? Investments to help bolster? Or did they just go out and buy something like a TV or something, which does help the economy anyway. But when they say investment, to me it means stocks. You're investing. That's not going out and purchasing a good. And investing is a stronger way to go out and support American corporations than just buying the products, because you buy them from all these different companies. But this is something that helps everybody.

Like your heating bills.

That's a good way to spend it. With this new war going on, that's going to cost a lot of money. And they're going to need to get that right away. Give back some money and wait for it to come back.

MODERATOR—WE'VE GOT TWO DIFFERENT THEORIES HERE. DEMOCRATS SAY WE NEED TO REIN BACK ON THIS TAX CUTS SO WE CAN MEET THESE NEW SPENDING PRIORITIES, X, Y AND Z. THE REPUBLICANS SAY THE ONLY WAY WE'RE GOING TO GET THE ECONOMY BACK UP TO TAKING CARE OF THINGS IS IF WE INCREASE THE TAX CUTS, ACCELERATE THEM, GET MONEY OUT THERE, GET PEOPLE INVESTING, GET THE ECONOMY JUMP STARTED AGAIN. WHICH OF THOSE THEORIES DO YOU GO WITH?

I don't buy into the theory that we're going to take and, I got that money, too. It's sitting in the bank. I haven't invested in a new refrigerator or anything else. One, I'd just as soon it never came. And I don't want somebody to say, well, send it back. I'd just as soon in the first place, my \$600 ain't going to make this country, but all of our \$600's would. And right now we need a lot of money. We're spending tons of money right now. And as far as I'm concerned, if it's there, if the government's expensive and it's not breaking us, leave it alone. It don't make any sense to keep sending it back and we go further in the hole. Because we're going to be the ones that's going to pay the taxes to make it up.

We're going to still end up paying for it. Just like they're doing here with the local government.

The local player, the money he spends, the guy at the store gets more money, he spends it.

(Many talking at once.)

There's things I need to get to be able to do the things I want to do. If I can't afford those things I need to get, then I find a way of getting them cheaper. I find a way. I push a way to either make it myself or find a way to do it. And I make the way to do it.

MODERATOR—LET'S FLIP TO HANDOUT NUMBER SEVEN.

REPUBLICANS IN CONGRESS SAY WE NEED TO RENEW OUR COMMITMENT TO NATIONAL SECURITY. WE NEED TO INCREASE OUR DEFENSE SPENDING SO OUR SOLDIERS HAVE THE MOST ADVANCED WEAPONS IN THE WORLD AND PUSH FOR A MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM TO PROTECT OUR CITIZENS FROM ATTACKS BY ROGUE STATES. WE'LL WORK WITH OTHER COUNTRIES AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE, BUT WE NEED TO START PUTTING AMERICA'S INTERESTS FIRST AGAIN.

DEMOCRATS IN CONGRESS SAY WE MUST PROVIDE OUR ARMED FORCES WITH THE RESOURCES AND SUPPORT THEY NEED TO FIGHT AND WIN THIS WAR ON TERRORISM, BUT SEPTEMBER 11TH ALSO REMINDED US OF HEROES AROUND US EVERY DAY. WE HAVE TO STRENGTHEN COMMUNITIES THROUGHOUT AMERICA BY FUNDING THE RECOVERY FROM THE SEPTEMBER 11TH ATTACKS, IMPROVING OUR HEALTH CARE SYSTEM, PROTECTING OUR ENVIRONMENT, AND MAKING SURE EVERYONE SHARES IN THE REBUILDING OF OUR ECONOMY.

HOW MANY AGREE WITH THE REPUBLICAN MESSAGE? NOBODY. DEMOCRATIC MESSAGE? A LOT OF PEOPLE AREN'T VOTING.

I think that September 11<sup>th</sup> proved that high tech military, the defense system for ballistic missiles and stuff like that, they proved that some country doesn't have to have all this high tech stuff to hurt us. That's what bothers me about that.

And America as a whole, the people, are freely giving out of their own pockets, even people that don't have the money are freely giving out of their own pockets to help them make this recovery. I don't think the government needs to step in there. I think we can take care of our own.

I think we probably already have a missile defense system that can probably handle most anything aimed at us anyway. We just cut back the numbers. I think we still have a few around. We got subs that'll take care of that.

I agree. It's proven that they don't need missiles to get to us. We need to worry about home more than missiles in space. Because anyone who fires them on us knows that we have the retaliatory capability of annihilating any country or every country in the world. So I don't think that's the major thing. I think it's the here at home, the terrorism here at home that we need to worry about more than anything.

We worked for years at disarming all those missiles and making missile treaties with all the other big powers.

We disarmed the dirty missiles and built cleaner ones.

MODERATOR—LET'S FLIP TO HANDOUT NUMBER EIGHT. . . .

GIVE A \$15 BILLION BAILOUT TO THE AIRLINE INDUSTRY, WHICH GOES ENTIRELY TO THE AIRLINE COMPANIES BUT PROVIDES NOTHING FOR THE MORE THAN 100,000 AIRLINE EMPLOYEES LAID OFF AFTER SEPTEMBER 11<sup>TH</sup>. PERMANENTLY EXPAND CORPORATE TAX LOOPHOLES LIKE PROPERTY DEPRECIATION AND DEFERRAL OF TAXES ON INCOME EARNED OVERSEAS. REDUCE THE CAPITAL GAINS TAX RATE, 80 PERCENT OF WHICH GOES TO THOSE EARNING MORE THAN \$200,000 A YEAR. REPEAL A 15 YEAR-OLD CORPORATE TAX AND MAKE THE REPEAL RETROACTIVE FOR THE ENTIRE 15 YEARS. THIS MEANS FORD MOTOR COMPANY WOULD BE GIVEN A REBATE CHECK FOR \$2.3 BILLION, IBM WOULD BE GIVEN \$1.4 BILLION, AND GENERAL MOTORS WOULD BE GIVEN \$832 MILLION. STRICT ENFORCEMENT OF PATENTS SO DRUG COMPANIES WHO MAKE ANTIBIOTICS USED TO TREAT ANTHRAX AND OTHER POTENTIAL THREATS COULD SELL MILLIONS OF DOSES TO THE U.S. GOVERNMENT AT FULL COST WITHOUT ANY COMPETITION FROM SIMILAR GENERIC DRUGS. RELAX

ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS AND DRILL IN THE ARCTIC NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE, EVEN THOUGH IT WILL PRODUCE NO NEW OIL FOR 10 YEARS. REQUIRE THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO PAY PRIVATE INSURANCE CLAIMS ABOVE A PRE-DETERMINED AMOUNT IN THE EVENT OF FUTURE TERRORIST ATTACKS.

The last one's the only one I agree with.

MODERATOR—WHAT'S YOUR REACTION TO THESE OVERALL?

Sounds pretty scary.

This last one, the lost of life (inaudible) that put a ceiling on the value of human life.

MODERATOR—THIS WOULD MEAN THAT THE GOVERNMENT WOULD PAY FOR INSURANCE CLAIMS?

So the insurance companies wouldn't get hammered with all the claims.

MODERATOR—PRESUMABLY 5,000 PEOPLE LOST THEIR LIVES IN THE WORLD TRADE CENTER AND THE OTHER ATTACKS. A LARGE NUMBER OF THEM PROBABLY HAD LIFE INSURANCE POLICIES.

But the insurance companies are supposed to have the money there to cover those.

MODERATOR—SHOULD THE GOVERNMENT BE STEPPING IN AND HELPING INSURANCE COMPANIES IN A SITUATION LIKE THAT?

I think if they do it should be as a loan only.

I agree.

Take the ceiling out of it.

On a few shows, people have come in that lost loved ones and haven't received nothing from the Red Cross.

Yeah.

Nothing.

Not a penny.

Who cares about anything on here. If they're going to do anything, why aren't they getting the money. Nobody seems to know what the hold up is.

And yet they've made three times what it would take to rebuild the center.

But who's got the balls to walk up and say give me \$15 million when you just lost your wife and you've got kids and all that stuff and you need, here's \$100,000, just go. Who's got enough guts to go up and ask for this stuff? I haven't given to the Red Cross myself, especially after I heard they aren't giving the money. Why?

They gave \$15 billion to the airline industry, but 100,000 people aren't getting anything out of it. The employees is what makes industry.

All those people aren't out there buying products, they've got no money to spend, it's part of that cycle again. They've got no money to spend.

**MODERATOR—YOU OBVIOUSLY AREN'T BIG FANS OF ANY OF THESE. DO ANY OF THEM STAND OUT TO YOU AS BEING PARTICULARLY BAD?**

The last one.

(Many talking at once.)

I don't think we need to repeal that 15 year old corporate tax and make it retroactive.

No.

No.

Taking my Social Security away for that.

(Many talking at once.)

The patent laws, the drug companies get around that anyways, because when their patent's almost up, they'll use the side effect to rename the same drug, and then you'll see it on TV, it's the same drug, but they get the patent on that drug for another 10 or 15 years.

Gives you gas, it's a side effect.

Viagra was a heart medicine to start with. And so they found out one of the side effects was it made men more potent.

You can go across the border in Mexico and buy any of the drugs for half the price.

**MODERATOR—WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT THE PEOPLE THAT ARE GOING TO CONGRESS LOOKING FOR THESE THINGS?**

It's pretty sick. When you've got billions of dollars and you go ask for money.

MODERATOR—THESE THINGS ARE DIFFERENT STAGES, THE BAILOUT FOR THE AIRLINE INDUSTRY HAS ALREADY PASSED. THE NEXT THREE ARE PART OF A LARGER ECONOMIC STIMULUS PLAN THAT JUST PASSED THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TODAY. IT STILL HASN'T PASSED THE SENATE OR BEEN SIGNED BY THE PRESIDENT OR ANYTHING LIKE THAT, BUT IT'S AT LEAST PART WAY INTO THE PIPELINE, AND THE OTHERS ARE ALL BEING DEBATED NOW.

The rebate to Ford and GM?

MODERATOR—YES.

Tell me this. This is just part of number one, the \$15 billion to bail out the airlines, isn't this the same outfit that's paying off these big bonuses to their CEO's? It took four days to put this big business \$15 billion in the hole? What's so great about the people running it? They're getting \$3 or \$4 million bonuses, and we're paying to bail them out. They were closed four days. I don't buy that. That's just, here it is folks. We've got a lot of corporations in this country that are nationwide, worldwide or whatever, that have taken a shut down for 15 weeks. We don't bail them out. The people that are getting affected are the working class people, that's what it is. The benefits, I'll go along with that. But not to bail them out.

If they picked the benefits up for the rank and file, I'd go along with it.

So my question would be, how much, when these corporations get these big piles of money, how much goes back in the form of campaign contributions? I would love to see the chart. The more you're giving, the more that's gotta come back. That's a no-brainer.

They all play that game. Let's face it.

MODERATOR—WE'VE BEEN TALKING ABOUT A LOT OF DIFFERENT THINGS . . . REGARDLESS OF HOW YOU WOULD ACTUALLY VOTE A YEAR FROM NOW, WHAT WOULD BE THE BEST REASONS TO VOTE FOR A REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE FOR CONGRESS?

Tenure in office.

MODERATOR—NOT ASSUMING ONE HAS BEEN THERE LONGER THAN SOMEONE ELSE, NOT PUTTING ANY SPECIFIC NAMES TO IT.

Because you agree with some of the things they say more so than you do a Democrat.

MODERATOR—BUT WHAT WOULD BE SOME OF THE BEST REASONS TO VOTE FOR REPUBLICANS, FROM THE THINGS WE TALKED ABOUT?

Increased benefits for the military. Not weapons. Increase the benefits for the military. I've got friends in there that are just busting their balls trying to make ends meet. All they have is a wife and two kids. And the wife's having to work 10, 12 hours a day just to make ends meet, and this guy's standing on the front lines.

All the technology is great, but, see, it's one more example of not helping the rank and file. Someone was in the Air Force, they were offering F15 pilots \$100,000 for a two-year re-up because so many of them were going into the commercial industry, because they were running out of pilots and stuff. Yes, it's nice to have all the buttons to push, but you've still gotta help the people that are working day to day on those bases. It's the people.

You've gotta have that guy fixing that F15. Because that pilot can sit in the cockpit all he wants, but unless the damn thing flies, he ain't going nowhere.

(Many talking at once.)

They treat 'em like crap.

MODERATOR—ANY OTHER REASONS TO VOTE FOR REPUBLICANS BESIDES THE MILITARY PIECE?

They're a little more conservative, and sometimes that's good. That kind of makes someone vote for a person.

More ideas in renewable energy sources, steer away from oil. Things are going to run out. Someone who's really willing to invest some money into it, because we've got the knowledge. The oil companies are holding us up.

MODERATOR—FLIP SIDE. BEST REASONS TO VOTE FOR DEMOCRATS?

Stop supporting everybody. Tell them to get out there and work, get a job.

They're more labor oriented than business oriented. To make sure people have a job and they've got decent benefits. They've got a job where business don't care if you've got a job. They're more concerned, that kind of thing. And to me they've got a bigger heart.

MODERATOR—OKAY, WHO ELSE? REASON TO VOTE FOR DEMOCRAT FOR CONGRESS? OKAY. LAST THING, HANDOUT NUMBER NINE. (INSTRUCTIONS).

(end of session)