

**DEMOCRACY CORPS  
GROUP 3  
SEATTLE, WA  
COLLEGE WOMEN, 27-42  
INCOME OVER \$50,000  
DECEMBER 13, 2001, 5:45 P.M.**

I'm Robin and I live in Renton. I grew up there and I'm a flight attendant, and I'm in law school.

I'm Tina and I live in Kirkland, grew up on the East coast in the Washington DC area. I'm married with two kids, a 3 year old and a 1 year old.

I'm Melanie and I grew up in Bellevue. I'm an accountant for a restaurant corporation and I have two kids, 5 and 2.

I'm Stacy and I live in Bellevue, married, no kids. I work for Wells Fargo.

I'm Deborah and I live in Redmond. I work for Citgo. I'm engaged.

I'm Cindy, grew up in North America, married with a 10 year old. I work for a temporary agency.

I'm Mandy and I live in Kirkland, grew up in (inaudible). Married, no kids. I'm heading out to Australia on December 26<sup>th</sup>. Six wake-up days left for work. I work for Boeing.

I'm Diane and I live in Seattle. Grew up in various places. I'm married, have several cats. I work for an insurance broker.

I'm Linda and I live in Bellevue. I grew up on Long Island in New York. I have three teenage girls and I work for Design Tech as a project manager.

I'm Sue and I'm from Chicago. I'm an executive chef, that's what I do for a living, and I live in Renton.

**MODERATOR—WOULD YOU SAY THAT THINGS ARE GENERALLY HEADED IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION OR THE WRONG DIRECTION IN THE COUNTRY TODAY?**

I'm a little nervous with the stance the U.S. is taking on the Israel/Palestine relations. The U.S. has gone a little bit overboard in supporting Israel. That's making me uncomfortable.

Generally positive. There are different things that I might not agree with, but....I tend to be a pacifist, however, I'm pleased to have a president that stands up to people that seems more a president than a diplomat.

I agree. I'm very pleased with the foreign policy in the country right now. I think economically we are staggering a little bit. I don't know whether we are going forward or backward, depending on which day of the news you are listening to. Having been an Al Gore supporter, I'm very pleasantly surprised at the foreign policy that's going on right now.

Part of it is hard for me coming from....in my 20's and not having gone through such a difficult time like a recession. That's hard to think about and really get hold of for our generation right now. More and more people are trying to get more educated on it. But, I agree that the Bush administration is doing a good job. After it was found out that he was finally elected, then there was a whole lot of wavering, great, now we've got Bush, what's going to happen. I think he's done a good job with what's happened in the last few months.

I think economically it is kind of a scary time, but when I think of it in relation to, we had the 90's and the 80's were such a boom time, that this in comparison and with 9/11 and everything, there have been really, really big issues that have happened. But, again, I think it's in contrast to so many years of boom times that that's really what makes it seem so much worse than times were bad back in the 60's and 70's.

Unemployment was nearly double digits in the 80's.

When you hear statistics like that, it really puts it in perspective for you. Again, it's what you are used to. And we are used to, especially in this area, how it has been booming for years and years, it's hard to swallow that everybody is getting laid off.

Wasn't there a point in time when we were thinking, we are not going to do as well as our parents. This is going to be the first generation that is not going to do as well. And then, the dot coms happened and everybody was doing wonderfully. I remember gasoline embargo and all that.

MODERATOR—WHAT DO THE REST OF YOU THINK ABOUT THE ECONOMY RIGHT NOW?

It's a little shaky. But as far as moving the right direction, I feel like it's a speed bump. It's a time for people to kind of think about where they are and reassess and like someone said, we've been there before. It's not all doom and gloom.

I think it's still going down, but I don't think it will be for much longer. It's going to start climbing soon. Let's say by May.

I think the economists are banking on the first quarter next year, it's supposed to start picking up. This area is actually going to be more toward the end of next year. That's what I heard recently.

I know in our business we hit the brick wall in March. What was it last week, they said that the recession started in March. We already knew that. This past month, though, our business has picked up quite a bit so we are very hopeful that this is an indicator, since we were so on target when it started.

I think the economy is doing very well actually, considering everything that has happened. And I think from where I work and what I see and hear, barring any other very horrific things that happened to our nation, it will progress positively. I think that's fairly naïve to think that nothing else is going to happen.

I think it's doing pretty well actually. I'm in the airline business and we are not out of business yet. So, that's good. I work for Alaska Airlines and we are doing really well, so I think it's going okay.

MODERATOR—WHAT DO YOU THINK IS THE BIGGEST CHALLENGE FACING OUR COUNTRY TODAY?

I would say race relations. There still is, we just watched "Color of Fear" and it's talking about racism in America, and how we really...the ones that don't feel it just ignore it and don't think it's going on, but for the ones that do, there still is an issue with that. I think that in order for us to get out of our own little segregated unities, we need to all start coming together to become one United States. This has helped us to become, but I think we need to do more of that because the more you become individualist, it's going to make our country fall apart. I think that 9/11 helped us in that respect. People are coming together. But, now we are starting to see that it is kind of subsiding again. That's an issue that we need to keep together.

To not overreact...and I'm probably going to be contrary to the group here...the homeland security team that they are putting together, to not take away some of the civil liberties that we already have. And I understand it's a challenge. Things are different. Things have changed forever, and I agree with that. But, to not go to the rights so much that we lose some of the rights that we take for granted.

What rights are you talking about though? Having been somewhat of a liberal all my life, I don't know that I really mind...I guess I have nothing to hide so I don't know if I really mind the government listening in on my phone conversations if they are trying to stop another 9/11. I'm not clear when people say that. What do you mean?

It's funny for me to feel this way even because I consider myself a liberal too. I find myself surprised that I'm feeling this way. For instance, just because your skin happens to be olive, the FBI wants to talk to you. Terrorists all don't have olive skin, that kind of thing.

The real biggest challenge for us as a nation and before 9/11, is to put the priorities that our world is not all about money and getting to the top and greed, it is about maybe thinking about safety first in what we do, and how we educate our children and how we run our businesses, and how we lead our lives. Safety fell way down on the corporate ladder as something that we put our money towards. And anybody that has had a budget and dealt with that over the last 20 years, knows that we did a lot of cuts and we did it because we needed to get a bottom line dollar that was much more lucrative. So, safety kept falling and falling and falling. So, what we have is the aftermath of safety becoming secondary. So, the biggest challenge isn't maybe our personal freedoms because personal freedoms is another political shoe in football, whatever, that's being abused because what we really need to focus and spend our time on is how we are safe in everything we do. It starts way with how we run our lives and our kids and our businesses. It's still money is the number one thing. Our focus is still to get rich, it's not to become a safe society.

Safe as in like terrorist safe?

Safe as in our streets, women being raped, people having the freedom to blast you in their car down the highway. Safe is on my block, it's in my schools, my high schools.

Do you mean like law enforcement or organizations like....in that area so as to....like our culture.

So if the focus of our government is chasing the economy, that takes the focus away from our culture chasing a safe society.

MODERATOR—HAS WHAT HAPPENED ON 9/11 CHANGED YOUR THINKING AT ALL?

Yes.

Yeah.

It makes me think about my priorities, and from a personal standpoint versus the business standpoint. On the other side of that, the economic impact on that. People always say diversify, diversify. We have a long way to go in our investment plan, but it hits home when something like that happens. It's like reality.

It's made me realize that life isn't certain, eat dessert first. It's made me realize that and appreciate my family and my kids. And reevaluate, like she was saying, maybe it's not all about money. It's about things, detachable things that money can't buy.

MODERATOR—WHAT COMES TO MIND WHEN YOU SEE THE AMERICAN FLAG?

Proud for myself, but also more unified. Look at how people reacted to that and really came together. You didn't have a connection with somebody at work before but then all of a sudden it was like, we are all in the same boat. Everybody can feel what happened, all the way across the country.

Freedom.

I've always thought it was so pretty. I love our flag.

Pride.

For me, I've done some traveling overseas and I know when you say you're an American, and they look at you and they can kind of tell that you are anyway, but there are some preconceived notions that they have about....a little bit of greed or spoiled and a lot of them are on the negative side. And I guess, for me, when this whole thing happened and you saw people coming together and flying the flag or whatever, it just made me think that we are so much more than that. I wish that other countries weren't so putting these blanket statements about our negative qualities, and I think a lot of them do because we are a big country and there is the south and they have some stereotypes, just all over. But, all of them were negative. I don't think I'm explaining it that well. It made me proud, and hopefully it showed something bigger of what we truly are as opposed to those superficial things that we also are.

I see it as them being critical of what we have and .....

I think part of it is envy, I do. And I think that they would admit that.

Some of it is too that other governments that can provide for their people, so instead of saying we didn't do everything we were supposed to do, it's the United States taking from us. It's their fault, they should be doing more, they should be doing more.

MODERATOR—THINK ABOUT ELECTIONS FOR CONGRESS, WOULD YOU BE LOOKING FOR A MEMBER OF CONGRESS WHO IS FOCUSED MAINLY ON SECURITY AND TERRORISM, OR ONE THAT IS FOCUSED MAINLY ON THE ECONOMY AND DOMESTIC ISSUES?

I would say domestic.

I would say security for me because of my job. That's a big deal.

I think that too. I think the economy is going to eventually fix itself. I've lived through the 70's, my parents lived through the depression. It was bad, but we came out of it. I would like it to get better now, but I think that if we don't feel safe, and I feel that if there are other terrorist attacks, then what happens with the economy is going to be moot.

If you have security, then people will fly or travel and the economy will work itself out.

I'd say the domestic issues and the economy. When I think of domestic issues I think more of someone who is going to strive to combat the family or those things that we think about, what's important to you. Family life. Things in the community. Things that affect you.

I'm the opposite. I was going to say that terrorism...it seems like that that will be taken care of based on the events that have happened. We know that that is an issue, so those things will be taken care of.

I think I feel the same way about domestic. I don't know if I just compartmentalize well or one person said I'm in denial or something, but 9/11 didn't really....I mean it affected me, but not that drastically. I guess in a way I feel like that whatever is going to happen, is going to happen. I still open my mail. If I work in the mailroom, I don't wear gloves, things like that. I'm a little concerned about the safety and the security issues becoming so big and so popular, it's like everyone is concerned about it, that the other issues are going to be brushed under the carpet. And it concerns me a little bit.

I don't want one to be focused on either one. I want them to be focused on what we need to be focused on at the time. To be balanced. I don't like someone that is totally this way or totally that way, I want a balanced person that knows what way to go. I don't want him to be totally focused this way or this way, be balanced and know what you are talking about.

MODERATOR—(HANDOUTS GIVEN OUT)GO TO HANDOUT #1 AND #2.  
WRITE DOWN THE GOOD THINGS THAT COME TO MIND WHEN YOU THINK  
OF GEORGE W. BUSH AND THEN WRITE DOWN WHAT WORRIES YOU  
ABOUT HIM. LET'S TALK ABOUT THE GOOD THINGS FIRST.

He seems honest and genuine, a down-to-earth person.

Determined.

Good family values and runs a good balance.

Strength in him and decisive. He has chosen good advisors. People laughed at him for that, but I think that's a good thing. I also put down Laura. I like his wife.

I kept reiterating his foreign policy. That's what most impresses me about him at this point.

Courage. Anybody doing that job has got to be pretty brave.

Strength and his gung-ho attitude, I like that. A go-getter.

Strong leader. He's got really good leadership skills. Not one thing, but it's just a feeling that I have. He seems really confident. I didn't so much think this before he was elected as since he's been. In a lot of things I've read, it says that he is cutting into his own (inaudible) and I really think a lot of that is true.

MODERATOR—GO TO HANDOUT #2. YOUR DOUBTS.

He doesn't have a speech written.

I like that though because he's down to earth. He has all these little ways of putting things that makes me listen to him. It's not so boring. When they are perfect, you are just like, I don't even want to listen to him. But, from him, I really want to listen to him.

He's inaccurate with dates. That bugs me.

Sometimes he seems indecisive and not in the big picture enough. Like, and I know this is really picky but, when 9/11 happened, he was relying on his team of experts instead of making a decision for himself.

I could answer that, but...

It's just an impression, it's not.....

I guess what I don't understand is why Cheney is always under lock and key for security's sake. And Bush is not.

(many talking at once)

Cheney's heart is not good.

Conflict of interest in oil, lumber, energy, intellectually extremely weak, power hungry, leadership coming from ultra right cronies in the Republican party, lack of experience on domestic, anything outside of the state of Texas issues. Those are some things that really concern me. For me, a lot of it has to do with our environment and some of the policies with what's happening in the lumber and in the energy, oil fields. Things that are happening with our policy when it comes to where we are going to drill, kill and spill.

Think what would happen to this company if we didn't have to depend on oil. Just think of that for a moment. If we had cars that actually ran on electricity or what have you. We might not have had a 9/11. We would not be in this turmoil right now.

I put nothing. I like him.

I didn't have anything.

I didn't word it the way it sounds. He sometimes tends to not seem professional. He's a little too casual and sometimes says things that people might tend to think he is not as intelligent as he is.

His past, his drinking and drug use and all of that stuff. I just think it's kind of an odd thing for a president to have done that. You can't even work for the FBI if you've ever done that, but you can be president.

(many talking at once)

You can't even cross the border into Canada either.

That's the other thing, you can't go into Canada ever. You can't have a drunk driving arrest. They won't let you in.

MODERATOR—THINKING ABOUT THE ECONOMY, DO YOU TRUST BUSH TO HANDLE THE ECONOMY?

It's not just him.

I think that Allen Greenspan, as long as he is still kicking. Once he's done.....

Again, I think that as long as he's got the people in place that are good at that. Whether that is the case, I don't really know.

I remember with his father it wasn't until the 11<sup>th</sup> hour that he said, you know what, there is something wrong with the economy. And he lost the election. He had great popularity with Desert Storm and it just plummeted because he just didn't recognize that there was a problem. Whether Bush Jr. Handles it or not, at least he's going out there and he recognizes there is a problem, so he hasn't exactly said to everybody out there, you're crazy. There's no problem. So, I don't know that one man can do anything, but it do feel better that he's recognized that there is something wrong. We've got to try to do something.

I'm not sure. I'm really not sure. I hate to compare him to his father, but it's funny because it's almost a parallel in the same way. He gets elected, we are at war, we are in recession, it's kind of eerie.

We won't elect another Bush, right?

MODERATOR—LET'S TALK ABOUT SPECIFIC ISSUES. THINKING ABOUT THE COUNTRY'S ENERGY POLICY TODAY, WHAT KIND OF CHANGES DO YOU THINK NEED TO BE MADE?

Less dependence on foreign oil, or for domestic oil for that matter. Less dependence on oil.

I find it hard to believe that we actually put a man on the moon twenty some odd years ago, but we can't figure out how to run a car without oil. I think that there's been no incentive to come up with that. I really think, my God, what a world we would live in if we did not depend on oil.

I hear all the conspiracy theories about the people that have found something. They are either hushed up or found dead because Detroit just can't deal with this. There might be something else out there.

You laugh, but we do have some brilliant people in this country and they can't do that?

My husband has been in the automotive industry all his life and some of the things he tells me, I'm just like....

It's almost like the tobacco industry.

I think there should be some incentive programs to develop alternative means of energy. Electric, solar, wind.

Solar was not going to be really good here.

Rain energy.

Yeah.

They were talking on the news yesterday about some new technology out that basically makes borax. It converts....it's a chemical reaction that runs the car and it makes borax as the bi-product instead of carbon dioxide.

That's kind of cool, but it boils down to money because oil has been so cheap. We've gotten so spoiled by the cheap oil. There's been no financial incentives to develop alternative energy. I don't know that we are willing to pay the price for developing the alternative sources. And look at oil now, it's....

There's always a strong learning curve and development curve in the beginning. Cars were astronomical when they first came on the market 100 years ago, but there hasn't even been much research done with an electrical car. You see a little junk car here and there, but....

Even now, there's the Toyota with that alternative one. It's a combination of a hybrid or something.

Especially when there's an energy shortage too, so electricity is not the answer.

I know, unfortunately out.

Water is not the answer because there's a water shortage sometimes.

MODERATOR—GO TO HANDOUT #3.

PRESIDENT BUSH AND REPUBLICANS IN CONGRESS HAVE CALLED FOR THE IMMEDIATE PASSAGE OF LEGISLATION TO REFORM OUR ENERGY POLICY. THEY SAY THE LESS DEPENDENT WE ARE ON OIL FROM THE MIDDLE EAST, THE MORE SECURE OUR NATION IS. WE NEED TO INCREASE ENERGY SUPPLIES TODAY THROUGH EXPANDED DOMESTIC PRODUCTION. OUR NATIONAL SECURITY REQUIRES THAT WE OPEN ALASKA'S ARCTIC NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE TO OIL DRILLING, SUBSIDIZE THE DEVELOPMENT OF CLEANER COAL TECHNOLOGY AND BUILD NEW POWER PLANTS.

DEMOCRATS IN CONGRESS SAY WE NEED A LONG-TERM 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 MORE 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.

WHAT DO YOU THINK?

I agree with the Democrats on that one.

MODERATOR—A QUICK SHOW OF HANDS. HOW MANY PEOPLE WOULD AGREE WITH THE FIRST STATEMENT? HOW MANY WITH THE SECOND STATEMENT? OKAY, 10 FOR 10. WHY THE SECOND STATEMENT?

The big thing for me is the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. The rest of it I could deal with, cleaner coal technology, power plants, even just incinerators could be done where it's so hot that really nothing comes out particularly. But, there are places in this world that need to be left alone. It just bugs me when people say, but no one goes there. So....

The second one talks about developing newer, cleaner energy sources and looking for some other alternatives. Just not figuring out where we are going to drill next.

The first one seems like a band aid approach to me.

And it's such a short term. Okay, you drill, you suck up all the oil from the Arctic and it's totally destroyed. Then what? We are still stuck.

And somebody's pockets are being lined. It's the people that are...it's interesting that we as a nation would think that this isn't something....the excuse of security becomes why we have to drill in Alaska now. It's just a big huge excuse.

It doesn't play into it.

Exactly. It's a substitute process for developing our kids and our folks and our universities to come up with solar engineering processes or whatever it is that we have to come up with to build a better world. And use our Yankee ingenuity for it.

MODERATOR—LET'S TALK A LITTLE ABOUT SOCIAL SECURITY. HAVE YOU HEARD ANYTHING LATELY ABOUT THIS?

You mean about the lock box?

About the what?

The lock box.

MODERATOR—ABOUT ANYTHING.

Just that everyone keeps saying that we are protected, but they keep borrowing from it. You know.

It's very quiet, it was a hot issue before 9/11. Lately, it's....the debates between individualized plans (inaudible). I think the big thing was individual control within it. And then the market crashed, and I thought maybe that's not such a good idea.

I personally tend to think that for the few people that would benefit from the self investment, there's a large percentage that would blow the entire money and they need to have it invested for them.

I've heard both ways. Are they thinking of making it an either or, or making it an option for some people? Are they thinking that everybody as of such and such a date, everybody will have to independently take care of their social security, or are they saying that that could be an option.

MODERATOR—GO TO HANDOUT #4.

PRESIDENT BUSH'S COMMISSION ON SOCIAL SECURITY JUST RELEASED A REPORT CONTAINING THREE OPTIONS FOR PARTIALLY PRIVATIZING SOCIAL SECURITY. THE COMMISSION SAYS UNDER EACH OF THEIR PLANS, FUTURE RETIREES CAN EXPECT TO RECEIVE BENEFITS THAT ARE AT LEAST AS HIGH AS THOSE RECEIVED BY TODAY'S RETIREES, WHILE GAINING THE OPPORTUNITY TO BUILD SUBSTANTIAL WEALTH THROUGH A VOLUNTARY PERSONAL RETIREMENT ACCOUNT. THEY SAY THIS IS THE

ONLY WAY TO ENSURE THE LONG-TERM FISCAL HEALTH OF SOCIAL SECURITY.

What does this saying, like a deal with....what is this voluntary personal retirement accounts?

MODERATOR—THOSE WOULD BE THE ACCOUNTS THAT THEY WOULD BE INVESTED INTO. THE DIFFERENT OPTIONS ARE YOU CAN DIRECT YOUR OWN OR YOU CAN CHOOSE FROM A COUPLE DIFFERENT PLANS.

You are talking about paying into it. We can do something else besides just throwing it at the government. That's a good idea.

Do you think there would be lawsuits further down the road when people said well I chose the stupid plan, and now I'm going to sue you? Seriously, some people no matter what you do, there's always going to be somebody whining about it.

I think it's a good idea.

There's always a lawyer wanting to take a case.

My husband is a very smart man and he can't do anything to save his money.

They have so many people....as a society we are so caught up in buying the bigger house, buying the bigger car, doing this or that, and people so many other times, spend their retirement money. They take it out of their 401K, they cash in their IRA's because something unexpected happened.

Or they transfer and it's....

Or not even unexpected, like, wow, I took money out of that but it's a down payment on my house.

You leave you job and instead of rolling it over you just take it. It's easy.

I think what Bush...somebody said that it scared me about the people because they are so irresponsible. He's trying to give the responsibility back to each individual person rather than the government being the Daddy. This is saying you are adults, you should be able to take care of it. If you can't, that's a problem. And so, I think, in that respect it's a good thing because I'm responsible for my own retirement. But, if you are talking about people that don't know what the heck they are doing, there's a lot of those people and that's their problem.

And then there's the people who don't make that income where they are able to afford the luxury of investing. Some people live paycheck to paycheck.

Well, they can just take the regular. He's saying this could be partial or you could just have it flat out the old way. They could just have it the old way if they don't want to figure that out. That's still their responsibility to say that I want to do it the old way because I don't know how to do anything. If they choose to be gamblers and they are not good at it, well hopefully they've learned through it, and that's their problem.

The option. Allowing people that don't want to get into that or don't feel like they are educated enough to do that, just give it to the government. Let them handle it like they have been. For other people, to be able to take all or part....I mean I'd love to be able to take some of mine into the 401K plan at my work and things like that because it's growing a lot more than social security is.

I'd like to see being able to do it both ways, not just one or the other. Some people would have the ability to increase their social security by a lot more.

MODERATOR—HOW ABOUT THE PEOPLE THAT DON'T KNOW WHAT THEY ARE DOING?

That scares me.

It's just sad too.

(many talking at once)

They pay them for those people to live.

But, we are going to be paying for them anyway. It depends on how...

That's true.

We'll have more money in our own personal....

But, I mean, do you think these people who are going to blow that and not have anything left, are those the same people who are just relying on social security for their retirement income?

Probably.

So, it doesn't matter.

Hopefully, there's rules and regulations that go with this. There has to be something more than this.

Like, if you've lost a lot of money in your life, you can't do this.

(many talking at once)

MODERATOR—GO TO HANDOUT #5.

DEMOCRATS SAY PRIVATIZATION WOULD ENDANGER THE RETIREMENT SECURITY OF THOSE WHO NEED SOCIAL SECURITY TO MEET THEIR BASIC NEEDS, AND DESTROY THE PROMISE OF GUARANTEED BENEFITS FOR MILLIONS OF TAXPAYERS. DIVERTING FUNDS TO PRIVATE ACCOUNTS WOULD CREATE A ONE TRILLION DOLLAR HOLE IN THE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND IN JUST THE NEXT DECADE. THIS WOULD REQUIRE DRASTIC CUTS IN BENEFITS AND AN INCREASE IN THE RETIREMENT AGE. AND THE COMMISSION'S REPORT IGNORES THE FACT THAT THE CURRENT BUDGET TAKES HUNDREDS OF BILLIONS OF DOLLARS FROM THE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND TO PAY FOR TAX CUTS.

See this is the kind of thing I look at and I think, prove it. You can do so much with numbers and statistics, throw things out that I don't know.

I think she's right. Statistics, you can play numbers games.

I believe that one of the solutions for social security is to raise the retirement age. Look at the society. We are all living so much longer.

That's true.

65 used to be ancient and now it's nothing. My Dad....

65, you are still young.

My Mom retired at 62, she's 74 now, last 12 years have been the most active years of her life. She's been on every committee that comes her way. My Dad gets voted president of every single organization in their town that they live in, and I think, why are they living off of social security, they could be actually productive members....well, not that they aren't productive....I wouldn't be paying for them to be productive, they'd be paid through their companies.

When you think about it though, there's a lot of age bias out there in companies. There's discrimination in their 40's even. So, these older workers, they are just trying to....

Well, that wasn't the case with my parents. My mother was a teacher, she was very protected by tenure. My Dad was....

MODERATOR—THE LARGER IDEA OF PRIVATIZATION, WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT SOME OF THESE POINTS THAT THE DEMOCRATS HAVE MADE?

We are always in the trillion hole. We are in it now. With social security, we are always going to be in the trillion hole whether we invest or we don't. If we do it the way that Bush is saying, then at least people are going to be a little people happier because they are going to be responsible for the money and they can make it grow. And we will have less people to actually have to deal with when they do retire.

You have to ask yourself who is going to be happier because at this point social security does protect a lot of people that don't have any other protection. Children whose parents get killed. There's all kinds of things that social security pays for that if that money goes out, where does it go. Social security is something that is a blanket, it isn't what you may choose for your 401K or those other things, it's just like privatizing education or medical care. When you do that, there's a certain amount of people that, especially in our society where it is so "me" individual, I want to take care of me first and we'll worry about everybody later, the everybody later groups here are protected in some of these basic systems. Not that the system works well, but is the fix to make it more private, make it more individual? We are not thinking globally. It's another cultural dilemma that we face that we are going to take care of ourselves, to heck with....

Can't we just do the combo and just invest it? Have somebody that's good like Bill Gates to invest it. He knows what he's doing. He can make something....really look towards the people who know what they are doing, and they are smart business people and ask them what should we do with some of this money and how can we invest some of America's money. Look to stuff like that rather than just leaving it in some trust fund. We need to make it grow.

It makes me think that then something else is going go up. Income tax will go up, they will get the money somewhere.

MODERATOR—HOW MANY OF YOU THINK THEY SHOULD TRY PARTIALLY PRIVATIZING SOCIAL SECURITY? ABOUT HALF AND HALF, OKAY. GO TO THE NEXT HANDOUT. WE'LL TALK ABOUT ECONOMIC POLICY THIS TIME.

GEORGE W. BUSH SAYS WE NEED TO REVITALIZE OUR ECONOMY, WHICH REQUIRES PUTTING MONEY BACK IN THE HANDS OF INDIVIDUALS AND BUSINESS INVESTORS. WE MUST MAINTAIN OUR PLANNED TAX CUTS AND ENACT FURTHER TAX CUTS THAT WILL STIMULATE THE ECONOMY AND EXPAND INVESTMENT. TO ACHIEVE THAT, WE NEED TO RESTRAIN AND CUT FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SPENDING WHILE CONTINUING TO MEET OUR COMMITMENT TO SOCIAL SECURITY AND TO FUND OUR EDUCATION AND DOMESTIC SECURITY INITIATIVES.

THE DEMOCRATS SAY WE HAVE IMPORTANT NEEDS AS A COUNTRY AND MUST RENEW OUR ECONOMY. WE SHOULD CANCEL MOST OF THE MASSIVE TAX CUTS SCHEDULED FOR NEXT YEAR. ALMOST HALF OF THE MONEY GOES TO THOSE EARNING OVER \$375,000 A YEAR, WHICH IS IRRESPONSIBLE IN THESE TIMES. BY CANCELING THESE MASSIVE TAX

CUTS FOR THE WEALTHIEST, WE CAN CONTINUE TO CUT MIDDLE CLASS TAXES, RESTORE THE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND, AND SUPPORT OTHER NEEDS, INCLUDING PRESCRIPTION DRUGS, EDUCATION AND IMPROVED DOMESTIC SECURITY.

HOW MANY WOULD AGREE WITH THE FIRST STATEMENT MORE?

Did somebody that's a Democrat write these things? This could be, whoever wrote it, could have biased it to make it sound like this is a really good way and this is really bad. I was just curious. Are these directly taken from what he said or were these twisted in any way? I was just curious.

MODERATOR—BOTH OF THESE WERE TAKEN FROM HIS REPORTS.

Okay. I was looking at the two and the Democrats....

MODERATOR—HOW MANY PEOPLE WOULD AGREE MORE WITH THE FIRST STATEMENT? 7. THE SECOND STATEMENT? 3. WHY THE FIRST ONE?

I guess for me I think one of the things that I liked about George Bush in general, was that he was trying to limit the size of the federal government. And also another thing that he said when he was promoting his tax cuts, in a simplistic view he was saying, you'll get that \$300 or if you are married you'll get \$600, but that wasn't working for people. They were thinking more of the big picture obviously. I guess one of the points that he made that really made sense to me is everybody who pays into it, should get some back. So what if you make a gazillion dollars, you are still paying into it. Or if you made \$10,000, you still paid into it. Everybody who paid into it should get "X" amount back. I don't think the wealthy should be penalized for making a lot of money. That's kind of why I tended toward the first as opposed to the second.

I would like government to actually have a budget and live within it. I get so tired of the finding my money to do more things. I hear the description of fiscally conservative and socially liberal and I feel that way, and I haven't figured out how to do it. But, that's kind of how I feel about this one.

I tend to agree about the government needs to find a way to get the budget balanced, and if we keep throwing money at it, we are just going to create more holes that need to be covered.

I like the part about putting the money back into the hands of business investors. It just gives people more power and they want people to start saving more, and this is a step in that direction.

MODERATOR—THOSE WHO PICKED THE SECOND STATEMENT, WHY?

My husband's job basically depends on doing work for people that are willing to invest money to better their companies one way or the other. Even with the interest rates going down, he's not seeing that at all. And one of the reasons supposedly is because many of these companies are not getting the consumers to spend or buy their product, and even though the interest rates are coming down, and it's a time where they should really want to invest money to better whatever it is they want to better, everybody is holding back. This has been going on for several months with several companies, it's not just one or two that are just afraid. I don't know that it's the whole country but...

(end of side)

I don't think people that make that much money should be getting all the benefits.

MODERATOR—THERE'S A TRADE-OFF ON THIS FIRST ONE, IF YOU ARE GOING TO CUT TAXES THE RATIONALE IS TO GET MONEY BACK IN THE HANDS OF PEOPLE WHO WANT TO SPEND IT. THE TRADE-OFF IS THERE IS GOING TO BE LESS TAX MONEY COMING INTO THE GOVERNMENT. DO YOU THINK IT'S POSSIBLE TO CUT TAXES LIKE THEY ARE TALKING ABOUT WHILE STILL DOING WHAT THEY SAY THEY CAN DO?

That's why I didn't know which one to go with because the first one, I really don't think we need tax cuts, but I think it's good to give us more money for the economy to spend more money. You need to spend so that you don't go into depression. That is what you need to do. So, that's why I went with that one. On the other hand, on the other one, I don't think we should taxes because we don't need to. We need the money in there. I like to get money back. I'm going to be paying it again anyway.

I think there's always room to cut federal spending. They waste money left and right.

There's a dilemma when we think about it in such simplistic terms of what the media uses to explain that kind of thing. What we want to say is that we want our government to be efficient. And not to be totally stupid with what it does with nuts and bolts and forms and things. There's ways to cut money and be a more efficient government that don't have to do with a trade-off to education, a trade-off to our domestic security. And you don't have to take another political football, here's \$600 bucks...it just seems so simplistic and so naïve of us to think that that's really going to make a fundamental difference in how this world is going to change. If what you think is that people will have more money if they are big businesses, so they will open another factory and give you more jobs, well that's kind of an antiquated thinking, and we've proven in the past that that doesn't always work, and certainly has built our society in a way that that has come out. So, let's try something different, which says, get more efficient. Do what we've had to do in businesses all over America which says tighten up, get better process control, but still deliver the right services and things to our customers.

I agree with that. And it's not just federal either. The silly laws about always having to go with the lowest bidder. You get what you pay for. That sort of thing.

MODERATOR—THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION RECENTLY ANNOUNCED THAT THE FEDERAL BUDGET WILL RETURN TO DEFICIT IN THE NEXT YEAR, AND IT'S GOING TO REMAIN IN DEFICIT UNTIL AT LEAST 2005. WHAT'S YOUR GUT REACTION TO THAT?

What do you mean by return to deficit?

There was a surplus before.

That's because we are going to give money back.

Because of all this terrorism and big spending.

I think war would at least be a reason.

War costs a lot of money. One bomb is like \$500,000 or something like that. That's a lot of money.

(many talking at once)

War is expensive. We have to do it because it's going to help us out in the long run.

I don't think anybody saw this coming. I certainly don't think he saw this coming when he was running.

MODERATOR—IS THAT WHY WE WILL RETURN TO DEFICIT BECAUSE OF THE WAR?

I think so.

The economy too.

9/11 has accentuated the situation, but we were in a recession anyway. You could see it. Because I work in a restaurant corporation, restaurants tend to be the leading indicator, and there were good indications in the summer that the economy wasn't where it should have been.

(inaudible)

Less money in, less money out.

Just the fight against terrorism on a domestic front with all the manpower and the FBI and all the extra security. Even on a state level, not even a federal level, it's just....so many different facets of the country have taken really big financial hits just to protect themselves or secure themselves or whatever. Look at the airlines. They want money

and a lot of them were going out of business anyway, and now they have to be bailed out. Who knows who is next. The post office is now saying that they are going to have to stop their Saturday service. Travel agents.

To pay Clinton's salary in addition to Bush's salary. Every year.

MODERATOR—DEMOCRATS AND REPUBLICANS ARE DEBATING AN ECONOMIC STIMULUS PLAN IN RESPONSE TO 9/11 AND EVERYTHING THAT HAS HAPPENED. HAVE YOU HEARD ANYTHING ABOUT WHAT'S GOING ON WITH THIS?

No.

No.

They can't agree. I don't know why.

I bet it's on the next page.

I heard the term economic stimulus package, but nothing specific.

All the bail out packages. It's like everybody is lining up at the door for help.

MODERATOR—WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT THAT?

I think at a certain point where does it stop? It sounded great, and then it started cascading down. Life isn't fair.

All the small businesses, they had issues with their economy and the government is not bailing them out. They have to pay more. They are going to go under, so why do big businesses get bailed out when the small businesses don't? I don't understand that.

Now, the airlines are saying, well it's not enough money, we are going to go out of business anyway. Give us more. Well, why did you take the money then?

MODERATOR—TURN TO HANDOUT #7.

REPUBLICANS IN CONGRESS SAY WE DON'T NEED MORE GOVERNMENT SPENDING, WE NEED TO GET MORE MONEY BACK INTO THE HANDS OF THOSE WHO INVESTED IN OUR ECONOMY. THEY SAY WE MUST SPEED UP TAX CUTS PASSED EARLIER THIS YEAR TO GET OUR ECONOMY MOVING AND PASS FURTHER TAX CUTS INCLUDING TAX CUTS FOR BUSINESSES HIT HARD BY 9/11 WHO NEED MONEY TO INVEST AND CREATE JOBS.

DEMOCRATS IN CONGRESS SAY WE MUST ADDRESS OUR IMMEDIATE NEEDS INCLUDING REBUILDING AFTER THE TERRORIST ATTACKS,

HELPING THE NEW UNEMPLOYED, FUNDING NEW SECURITY PROJECTS, AND INCREASING SUPPORT FOR EDUCATION. RATHER THAN PERMANENTLY CUTTING TAXES FOR THE WEALTHIEST, WE SHOULD MEET OUR OBLIGATIONS WHILE PROVIDING INCENTIVES TO BUSINESSES AND INDIVIDUALS TO INVEST THIS YEAR.

I always come back to the wealthiest.

MODERATOR—LET ME GET A SHOW OF HANDS AND THEN WE'LL TALK ABOUT IT. HOW MANY AGREE MORE WITH THE FIRST STATEMENT?

What is the difference between these two except the way they say it?

MODERATOR—TAKE ANOTHER SECOND TO READ THEM AND THEN WE'LL TALK ABOUT IT. HOW MANY AGREE MORE WITH THE FIRST STATEMENT? 3. THE SECOND STATEMENT? 7. TELL ME ABOUT THE SECOND STATEMENT.

Increasing support for education for me. That's a big priority.

I think it's the right thing. I don't think we should put more money out.

We need to start working on...we've been in this downturn mode for the last three months and we need to start looking out in the future. And yeah, it might not be the near term future, but the long term future as to how we are going rebuild. For my company, Boeing as well. We are laying off about 9,000 or 10,000 people tomorrow. It's the most people that will have ever walked out the door on the same day from our company. We were almost 200,000 employees just a few years ago, and now we are going to be down to a lot less than that. And especially in the next year, we are going to lose a good 30% of our employees and we don't plan, at this point, to go forward. We need to really think about the rebuilding and knowing that the unemployment rate is going to go up a significant amount, and how are we going to deal with that. Where are those jobs going to be created to help those people.

I like funding the security projects. Anything that has to do with making the airlines safer.

You are teaching a man to fish, as opposed to giving him fish. I'm the guy who owns the fish market, I'll hand you the fish I want you to have. And I'll make the decision on what kind of fish you are going to eat and when you are going to eat it, and I'll decide what kind of factory is going to cut up the fish, instead of teaching me to fish. And you are going to teach everybody to fish in the second statement. You are going to educate people, teach them to deal with the future economy, with the hardships that are coming, but you are going to take that on as a culture, as a society, as a government. It is also foreign to me. I grew up with a republican mother, I was the biggest right wing. Grew

up in this different environment so to me, it's just coming back to which one is more culturally feasible to grow a better world.

I disagree about the fish. I think the fishing is the first one because even though I agree with the second one, I don't know if you are teaching them, but you are giving them the responsibility of the fisherman by giving them the fishing poles in the first one. Giving them the money, instead of having the government control it and saying I'm going to do this with the money, this with the money. Giving the money back to the people and say do what you need to do with the money, which is spending it. But, the reason I agree with the second one is that we always need to address the needs and we do have a lot of money that we need to be falling out right now. Rebuilding and people with jobs, there's layoffs at my job too, where I work so that's a big issue. I don't need my \$600 or my \$300 if I have a job right now. We need to use that money for the people that need it.

MODERATOR—THOSE OF YOU WHO CHOSE THE FIRST STATEMENT, WHY?

Thinking about the unemployment issue, and it seems that the first one is saying that if you can get things moving and create the jobs then to me it means that people won't have to be on unemployment. The second one seemed to me like we were going to help fund the unemployment. We were going to create some money, helping the unemployed, so enable them to just be on it until they found a job. That's kind of what happens now. The first one seemed like it was more proactive.

The new unemployed are, in many cases here, middle income people who have pretty good living, they are paying for a house, they are raising kids, and now out of nowhere, they are unemployed. These aren't people that really know how to be unemployed. These are people that have.....this is how they define themselves and all of a sudden they are going to get unemployment. These are not people that want to be unemployed, these are people who want to be employed but can't be employed, because there are no jobs.

It's not only just one person in a family.

These aren't the people sucking the system dry, these are the people that woke up one morning and it was like, oh my God, I don't have a job.

And it may be the husband and wife. There's a significant amount of people that are getting laid off.

MODERATOR—THINKING OF THE BROAD THEMES HERE. REPUBLICANS SAY GETTING MORE MONEY OUT THERE IS A WAY TO STIMULATE THE ECONOMY. DEMOCRATS SAYS WE'VE GOT A LOT OF NEEDS HERE, A LOT OF OBLIGATIONS AND WE HAVE TO MAKE SURE THAT THOSE THINGS ARE MET IN ORDER TO GET THE ECONOMY BACK ON ITS FEET. WHAT DO YOU THINK?

Both make sense. But, it's which one can we actually afford right now. The only one we can actually afford right now is the second one. We don't have the money to be handing out.

When Bush was campaigning and that was one of this big things, the tax cuts, that really turned some people off, but it really appealed to a lot of people too. Things have changed. They really have. It was only a year ago, but it has. What's wrong with stepping back and saying, okay, we did it this year, but guess what, that's it. I think it's kind of human nature to say that that was my plan. I said all these years and we were going to get that money and now we have to do it because that was my campaign promise. They don't really say that, but, what's wrong with saying, I'm sorry. 9/11 happened. That combined with the economy and stuff, it all changed. We've got to kind of regroup and we've got to go with something else. I think this republican view is really simplistic. Give somebody \$300 and that will stimulate the economy. They are going to hoard it. They are scared that they will lose their job. That's really a big, big thing. They don't want to spend it. And some of them have to. Or they'll spend it, but cautiously.

MODERATOR—DO YOU THINK THAT IF INDIVIDUALS GOT A TAX CUT THAT THEY WOULD SPEND IT?

Yes. Spend it.

Overall, they would spend it.

MODERATOR—HOW ABOUT BUSINESSES?

They have money that they need to spend it on right now. They are in deficit. My company certainly is anyway.

My husband is involved in trying to get business with a lot of companies who said yes, we want to do this and we want to do that, but no one is buying our products, so we really don't feel comfortable spending this, even though the interest rates are only 2% right now.

I think there's a lot of fear.

MODERATOR—WHAT IF THE DEMOCRATS AND REPUBLICANS DON'T COME TO AN AGREEMENT AND NO ECONOMIC STIMULUS BILL PASSES AT ALL?

I don't think...why couldn't they compromise and say we'll give you a \$150. And we'll take the other \$150 and keep it in the economy, why can't they do that? That would make me happy. If there were more women in congress.

I don't think that either one of these statements are evil incarnate. I think that there is a lot of room for compromise. I think this is really the wrong time to be getting very partisan about things. I do find that I do find that I get irritated when I hear about it.

Maybe it's not the right time, but dealing with money is a very, very touchy subject right now. Keep everything steady for awhile until it cools off and then have this discussion.

I guess I get a little anxious when the government says, we'll fix it. We will create an economic stimulus package that will fuel the country. I don't know. I'm not that old, but it doesn't seem like I can remember a whole lot of things they fixed. So often, if they just kind of leave people alone, we do okay.

The phrase that brings terror to everyone's heart, I'm the government, I'm here to help you.

It's not necessarily a bad thing because you get too hasty. And we will get out of this. It might take time and it might take longer than the second quarter like they are predicting, but we've got to move forward. We've survived. And even though, every (inaudible), historically it's incredible. I can remember in the 80's, what was it 11, 8, 9, 10 percent, something like that. In the double digits. 5.2, 5.6, big deal.

I remember being in college and they told you to expect a high unemployment rate.

When I graduated, they told us...it took me about a year to find a job.

Yeah.

I had a job at the time, but not working in my field.

(many talking at once)

MODERATOR—GO TO HANDOUT #8.

DEMOCRATS IN CONGRESS SAY IT IS BETTER TO DO NOTHING THAN PASS A BILL THAT WOULD CREATE HUGE DEFICITS AND RAID THE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND TO PAY FOR HUGE TAX GIVEAWAYS FOR LARGE CORPORATIONS AND THE WEALTHIEST INDIVIDUALS.

REPUBLICANS IN CONGRESS SAY IT IS BETTER TO DO NOTHING THAN PASS A BILL PACKED WITH GOVERNMENT SPENDING THAT WOULD DO NOTHING TO STIMULATE THE ECONOMY OR GET MONEY BACK INTO THE HANDS OF THOSE WHO NEED IT TO CREATE JOBS.

I've never asked for (inaudible). I get so tired of them coming down on the wealthy. If they are going to pay me...

I feel like both statements are saying the same thing. Okay, let's just not do anything.

Yeah.

MODERATOR—IS THAT OKAY?

Yeah. Rather than making some really hasty decisions.

The airline bailout bothers me because it sounded great at the time, but then when they said we are going to go bankrupt anyway, could we have more. That bugs me.

MODERATOR—DO YOU THINK IT'S BETTER TO DO NOTHING?

This is telling me that they both don't want to do anything, so don't do anything.

They are agreeing on not doing anything.

Yeah.

Right.

Exactly.

But, they are blaming the other person.

MODERATOR—WHY CAN'T THEY JUST COMPROMISE? IS IT BETTER FOR THEM TO COMPROMISE OR FOR THEM TO SAY....?

I just don't think that they need to do anything right now. I think it's just that they need to make a statement because we are so bipartisan right now, they are trying to make their statements like we are better than you. I liked it better when everything was fine, and we are working together. Being nice to each other. It just seems like all of a sudden, everything seems to be cooling down, so now they are trying to make a statement from the parties.

I think it would be better if they came to an agreement. It's not the time to be so one way or the other. We all have the same goals and we need to keep it going.

MODERATOR—I'M GOING TO READ A SERIES OF STATEMENTS ABOUT SOME CANDIDATES FOR CONGRESS. GO TO HANDOUT #9. (RATINGS SCALE EXPLAINED)

DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE SUPPORTED THE PLAN THAT WAS SUPPOSED TO STIMULATE THE ECONOMY, BUT INSTEAD OF TRYING TO HELP THE ECONOMY, THE PLAN INCLUDED BILLIONS OF DOLLARS IN NEW

GOVERNMENT SPENDING, INCLUDING HUNDREDS OF PORK BARREL PROJECTS FOR INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.

Who is saying it? This one just sounds like yellow journalism or something.

Yeah, it kind of does.

Pork barrel politics.

Are the Democrats saying this?

MODERATOR—THIS WOULD BE SOMEBODY ELSE SAYING IT ABOUT THE DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE.

We are trying to vote for a Republican?

MODERATOR—YOU ARE SAYING HOW THIS STATEMENT MAKES YOU FEEL ABOUT THE DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE.

Oh. That's not a very good way to sell yourself.

A neutral party.

Oh, I see.

MODERATOR—HOW MANY PEOPLE GAVE IT A -3? 5. -2? -1? 2. 0? 3. TELL ME WHY THE -3?

I don't think you should do anything to benefit a certain individual member of congress.

The government spending.

I agree with that too. I don't like new government spending. I feel we are not that well off as it is right now, and then to have more government spending, it will make everything worse. I'd go for some government spending, but not billions of dollars worth.

MODERATOR—THE -1'S OR ZEROS, WHY?

It sounds like what republicans say about democrats all the time. I tend to vote democrat. I tend to vote the ticket. If I heard something like that, I would want to investigate the candidate a little bit more and I might normally not. It would influence me to go a little bit further. Exactly what did that person do or not do.

I wouldn't necessarily believe every part of it. I would tend to want to find out more. That's why I didn't rate it as strong.

MODERATOR—DOES IT SOUND BELIEVABLE?

I think so.

MODERATOR—GO TO THE NEXT ONE.

WHILE THE WHOLE COUNTRY WAS COMING TOGETHER TO SUPPORT THE PRESIDENT AND RISE ABOVE PARTISANSHIP, THE DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE WAS VOTING ON A PARTISAN BLOCK AGAINST THE PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC PROPOSALS. THEY EVEN HELD UP THE ECONOMIC STIMULUS PACKAGE WHEN THE ECONOMY WAS IN NEED OF EXTRA HELP.

-3? 1. -2? 1. -1? 5. 0? 3. MY -2'S AND -3'S, WHY?

It said that they held up everything.

They didn't care about us, they voted for the party.

MODERATOR—MY -1'S, WHY?

For the same reason, they are always slinging stuff back and forth. Half the time, I don't even know what they are talking about. So, I usually investigate on my own. I don't even listen to their ads. I don't. At first you do, and then they go back and forth and so...

You discount it. It doesn't sway me. It's such rhetoric, you hear it all the time.

MODERATOR—MY ZEROS?

I feel like they were piggybacking an issue that had nothing to do with the first issue. The country came together because of 9/11 so let's put this other issue in there too to make it sound like because they don't all agree, they are not patriotic or something. I just didn't like that statement at all.

MODERATOR—LOOKING AT THESE TWO, HANDOUTS #9 AND #10, WHICH ONE WOULD MAKE YOU LESS LIKELY TO VOTE FOR A DEMOCRAT? #9? 6. #10? 4. WHY IS THE FIRST ONE BETTER?

It sounds more powerful. It's talking about a lot of money and it sounds bad.

And also the funding for the individual members which I think is everybody's right but, congress.....

MODERATOR—HOW ABOUT THE SECOND ONE?

It really relates to 9/11. It's a real emotional issue.

The reality is probably not that, but it's definitely a gut reaction.

MODERATOR—GO TO HANDOUT #11.

THE REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE VOTED TO USE \$160 BILLION DOLLARS FROM THE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND TO PAY FOR BIG TAX CUTS FOR THE WEALTHIEST. HE SHOULD BE LISTENING LESS TO SPECIAL INTERESTS, AND MORE TO THOSE WHO COUNT ON SOCIAL SECURITY TO MEET THEIR MOST BASIC RETIREMENT NEEDS.

-3? 3. -2? 3. -1? 1. 0? 3. MY -2'S AND -3'S TELL ME WHY.

Again, provided that it's true, the first sentence conjures up an image to me that somebody has his hand in his pocket.

The first statement for me too, the taking from social security.

I think the special interests part of it as opposed to his (inaudible) base.

MODERATOR—MY -1'S OR ZEROS, WHY?

The rhetoric, plus the wealthiest people make the world go around, and they are always trying to drain the economy.

I just would have to have more information.

They are such biased statements, it's hard.

I wouldn't base my vote on that.

When somebody says "should", he should do this, then immediately I'm thinking that is not a good way to be promoting yourself.

(many talking at once)

It just sounds like, if you go to psychology....it doesn't sound like this.

MODERATOR—WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT THIS CONCEPT OF SAYING THAT THEY TOOK \$160 BILLION DOLLARS FROM SOCIAL SECURITY?

You stopped there. They have for the wealthiest, you don't. I wouldn't like it either way, but it's just kind of....

It kind of gives it more of a zing when they say for the wealthiest.

MODERATOR—IS THAT BAD IF THE TAX CUTS REQUIRED TAKING MONEY OUT OF SOCIAL SECURITY?

Yeah.

Yeah.

If you are going to raid social security, it should be for more than just tax cuts.

And not just for the wealthy.

This statement could be crafted differently.

If it had something to do with education, maybe. Just to raid the retirement funds for some poor old lady and you are going to give it to somebody who is wealthy...

Even just tax cuts period. I don't think it should be messed with. I think it's been borrowed from way too much.

MODERATOR—GO TO THE NEXT ONE, #12.

THE REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE RUSHED TO GET FUNDS TO THE AIRLINE AND INSURANCE INDUSTRIES, AND TO USE 75% OF THE ECONOMIC STIMULUS FOR CORPORATE TAX BREAKS. BUT, THE CANDIDATE DIDN'T THINK IT WAS IMPORTANT TO HELP THE ORDINARY PEOPLE WHO LOST THEIR JOBS AFTER 9/11, MANY OF WHOM WERE INELIGIBLE FOR UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE.

-3? 1. -2? 3. -1? 4. 0? 1. +1? 1. MY -2'S AND -3'S, WHY?

I think it's very possible for the republican candidate just to think of the ordinary people right away. There was a rush to fix it and the airline industry and insurance industry...they were the first things on everybody's mind. I do know somebody that fit into that second statement that's hurting right now, so I think that was just something that...he didn't know that he was going to be ineligible for two weeks, so I think that was something that people realized right away. I don't think that everybody knew what was going to happen, what the real fallout was going to be.

I think the mentality was if you fix the big things...that was kind of the key. If the airlines go out of business and people can't fly, then the whole transportation system is down, that's not a good thing. I think there was a rush to bail them out quickly and get it moving and this individual stuff of thinking about the impact of that one event, how could one event impact so many different industries that aren't so called directly related.

And some of the individuals, they just go to work everyday and get their paycheck, and all of a sudden they are out of a job because of something like this.

What's different about this statement was that this guy basically says, I don't care about the little guy. Which wasn't really that apparent in any of the other statements. This candidate thinks this way. So, if that's how I know that the candidate thinks, I would certainly not vote for him. But, if it's just him voting for tax cuts because I believe that's going to stimulate...things that you believe to be good, but if you are saying that ordinary people aren't important, then I'm not going to vote for you.

MODERATOR—HOW ABOUT THE REST OF YOU, MY -1'S OR ZEROS?

If you didn't rush to get funds to the airlines and insurance industry, then you'd have to support a lot more people on unemployment.

You'd have a lot more people to support.

If this is all they have against this person, then it's not very much. He must be a pretty good candidate. Usually, they have all this horrible money stuff. Everybody was confused at that point, this has never happened in America. He at least was thinking like everybody else was thinking. He didn't have time to think of doing anything else. He had to do the immediate action, which was to give that much money to the airlines. That was why I gave it a +1 because this is actually pushing him up. It's not a negative thing to me because that's what everybody else is doing.

It seems like, too, as far as government bailouts, where else is a corporation going to get a bailout? Whereas the individual, it seems like there are a lot of other options. The Red Cross, things like that.

Why would someone be ineligible?

I don't know if you want me to tell that story here...He was one of the maitre d' of Windows of the World, broke his leg Saturday before, so he wasn't at work when the disaster happened.

Okay, I could see that.

But, isn't he eligible for unemployment?

He's not eligible because he was supposed to be dead. That's what they said to him.

(many talking at once)

MODERATOR—GO TO HANDOUT #13.

THE REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE GAVE INTO THE SPECIAL INTEREST LOBBYIST AND SUPPORTED A PERMANENT TAX BREAK OF 20 BILLION DOLLARS THAT ENCOURAGED COMPANIES TO INVEST IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES RATHER THAN IN THE UNITED STATES DURING OUR ECONOMIC CRISIS.

-3? 1. 2? 6. -1? 1. 0? 2. MY MINUSES, TELL ME WHY.

Because the words “gave into”. I just don’t like the whole connotation there.

And all the money going overseas. I think locally of our lumber industry. We have perfectly good sawmills here, but it goes overseas, and it bothers me. Especially that last part, rather than in the United States. The wording pushed the buttons, you know.

I agree with that. We come under attack, how many countries are willing immediately to drop everything and help us? I remember seeing an email come across that said...it was from a reporter up in Canada and it was actually written almost 50 years ago. Basically, it’s like we spend all this money for all these other countries for natural disasters or whatever, and what have they given back to us.

The investing in foreign countries.

Especially now, we need to worry about ourselves for awhile I think.

MODERATOR—MY -1’S AND ZEROS, WHY?

I don’t think that investing in foreign countries is necessarily a bad thing. It could actually be good for us, especially in foreign policy relations.

I still think it’s our responsibility. We are so lucky to live here and that is part of our job.

MODERATOR—WHY DO YOU THINK THEY WOULD GO FOR THIS?

You need allies during this time too, and that’s such a balance. The way that it was worded. If you really go to the rationale and you think of the actual way that it works in the government with other countries, you need to have allies, and that means giving them money. That means promoting and buying into their products. And that’s what I think really happens, but the way it was worded was not good.

It doesn’t seem to have been working. We’ve been giving a heck of a lot of money to a lot of places.

It’s not right, I’ll agree.

But, if you can buy all the parts to build the car from offshore with the cheaper car, then when you go to sell the car in America and it’s cheaper, more people can buy the car.

Therefore, you have more stimulus in the economy, which is a republican thing. There's that thinking that if you do that, you'll still operate your factories at a cheaper rate. And therefore, you'll have more money and more wealth to spread around for us all.

MODERATOR—LOOK BACK AT #11, #12 AND #13, AND TELL ME WHICH ONE MAKES YOU LEAST LIKELY TO VOTE FOR THE REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE. #11? 2. #12? 2. #13? 6. LAST QUESTION, THINKING ABOUT ALL THE STUFF WE TALKED ABOUT TONIGHT, REGARDLESS OF HOW YOU MIGHT VOTE, WHAT'S THE BEST REASON TO VOTE FOR A REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE FOR CONGRESS?

Smaller government.

(many talking at once)

I'm thinking personally, I'm not thinking....

Ethics have gone more, ethical standards lean more towards republican.

That could be because of Bill Clinton.

No.

Stimulates the economy in terms of anybody that's probably over a quarter million dollars and up.

MODERATOR—BEST REASON TO VOTE FOR A DEMOCRAT?

There's more feeling towards one fellow man, or for people who aren't as well off as we are. There's generally more caring there.

Better for the environment.

More money for education.

It does go more towards the people. More into investing into the people, rather than the business end.

MODERATOR—GO TO HANDOUT #14. IMAGINE THE ELECTION WERE HELD TODAY AND YOU HAD TO CHOOSE ONE OR THE OTHER, CIRCLE WHICH ONE YOU WOULD CHOOSE AND TELL ME WHY. THANK YOU ALL FOR COMING....

(end of session)

