

**DEMOCRACY CORPS  
GROUP 4  
GOLDEN, CO  
MEN, AGES 30-45, 4-YEAR COLLEGE, HOUSEHOLD INCOME OVER \$50K, WEAK  
PARTISANS, VOTED FOR BUSH, NOW NOT APPROVE, RECRUITED FROM  
OUTSIDE DENVER  
JULY 7, 2005, 8:15 PM**

HOW MANY OF YOU GUYS HAVE DONE OF THESE BEFORE, DISCUSSION GROUP OR FOCUS GROUP? OKAY MOST OF YOU HAVE. IF YOU HAVEN'T DONE ONE BEFORE OR IT'S BEEN AWHILE, NOT A LOT OF MYSTERY TO WHAT WE'RE DOING HERE. WE'RE GOING TO TALK ABOUT A LOT OF DIFFERENT THINGS—YOU'VE PROBABLY GUESSED FROM THE THINGS YOU FILLED OUT, A LOT ABOUT CURRENT EVENTS, POLITICS, AND THAT KIND OF STUFF. THE MOST IMPORTANT THING THAT I WANT YOU TO KEEP IN MIND IS THAT I'M HERE FOR ONE REASON AND THAT'S TO HEAR YOUR OPINIONS ON THE STUFF WE'RE GOING TO TALK ABOUT. THERE ARE NO RIGHT ANSWERS, NO WRONG ANSWERS. THIS IS ENTIRELY ABOUT WHAT YOU THINK. I WANT TO ENCOURAGE YOU TO BE AS OPEN AND HONEST AND STRAIGHTFORWARD AS POSSIBLE BECAUSE THAT'S THE WHOLE REASON WE'RE HERE. WE'RE NOT GOING TO TALK ABOUT ANYTHING OVERLY PERSONAL OR CONTROVERSIAL BUT I DO WANT TO ASSURE YOU THAT EVERYTHING WE TALK ABOUT IS COMPLETELY CONFIDENTIAL. NOTHING YOU SAY IS EVER GOING TO GO TO YOU, YOUR FAMILY, YOUR EMPLOYER, ANYTHING LIKE THAT AND MOST IMPORTANTLY, AFTER TONIGHT, YOU'LL NEVER SEE OR HEAR FROM ME AGAIN. NEITHER I NOR ANYONE I WORK WITH CALL YOU AT HOME AND ASK YOU TO DONATE MONEY OR SWITCH LONG-DISTANCE COMPANIES OR ANYTHING LIKE THAT, SO DON'T WORRY ABOUT THAT. A COUPLE THINGS SO THAT YOU ARE COMFORTABLE. THERE IS A VERY WELL-HIDDEN MICROPHONE, THAT LITTLE BUTTON UP THERE. WE ARE AUDIO TAPING OUR CONVERSATION. WE'RE NOT VIDEOTAPING BUT WE ARE AUDIO TAPING, BASICALLY SO I DON'T HAVE TO SIT HERE AND SCRIBBLE NOTES THE WHOLE TIME, SO I CAN ACTUALLY TALK TO YOU, GO BACK AND LISTEN TO IT AGAIN LATER. AS MOST OF YOU PROBABLY KNOW THIS IS A ONE WAY MIRROR, NOT FOR US, IT'S FOR THE FOLKS BEHIND IT. THERE'S ONLY ONE PERSON BACK THERE, MY COLLEAGUE WHO TRAVELS WITH ME, AND HE'S SITTING BACK THERE WITH BIG BOWLS OF M&MS. JUST SO YOU KNOW THAT. OTHER THAN THAT I DON'T HAVE A LOT OF RULES OR ANYTHING FOR OUR CONVERSATION. YOU WANT TO GET UP AND GO TO THE RESTROOM, GET ANOTHER DRINK, WHATEVER, PLEASE GO AHEAD. I WOULD JUST ASK THAT NO MORE THAN ONE PERSON BE UP AT A TIME, JUST SO THAT WE CAN KEEP THINGS MOVING. WE HAVE A LOT OF GROUND TO COVER IN THE NEXT COUPLE OF HOURS AND WE NEED TO GET OUT OF HERE ON TIME, SO IN ORDER TO DO THAT WE JUST GOT TO KEEP THINGS GOING. LAST THING I WOULD SAY IS I'VE GOT NINE GUYS AROUND THE TABLE. I'M SURE I'VE GOT NINE COMPLETELY DIFFERENT SETS OF OPINIONS AND EXPERIENCES AND AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE I'D LIKE TO HEAR ALL

OF THEM, SO WHAT THAT MEANS IS IF YOU'RE NOT TALKING I WILL CALL ON YOU. I'M NOT TRYING TO PICK ON YOU BUT I'M INTERESTED IN WHAT EVERYBODY THINKS. AS IS MUCH MORE OFTEN THE PROBLEM, IF SOME PEOPLE ARE TALKING TOO MUCH AND OTHER PEOPLE AREN'T GETTING THE CHANCE TO TALK, IT'S MY JOB IN THIS CHAIR TO CUT YOU OFF. IF THAT HAPPENS PLEASE DON'T THINK I'M BEING RUDE. I WANT TO HEAR FROM EVERYBODY. ANY QUESTIONS FOR ME BEFORE WE GET STARTED? OKAY, LET'S GO AROUND THE TABLE REAL QUICK AND INTRODUCE OURSELVES. TELL US YOUR FIRST NAME, WHERE YOU LIVE, WORK, FAMILY, HOBBIES, WHATEVER YOU WANT TO TELL US IN TWENTY SECONDS OR LESS. I'LL GET STARTED. MY NAME IS KARL. I LIVE IN WILMINGTON DE AND YOU SEE WHAT I DO FOR A LIVING SO I WON'T BORE WITH YOU THAT. I'M MARRIED. I HAVE THREE GIRLS, 5, 2, AND 5 MONTHS, SO I TRAVEL SO I CAN SLEEP. HOBBIES—I PLAY VOLLEYBALL AND I CHASE MY KIDS AROUND.

My name is Al. I live in Lakewood. I work for Budget Truck Rental. I'm married with a four year old boy, play golf, fishing, camping, hiking, mountains, camping.

I'm Bruce. I live in Centennial. Married. Two boys and two girls. I like to go hunting, fishing, camping, and softball.

My name is Charlie. I live here in Lakewood. I work for a mortgage company down in Centennial. I'm married with two kids and they pretty much keep me busy.

My name is David. Live in Nervad. Married. No kids. Hobbies are golf and stand up comedy.

My name is Ed. I'm married, two kids, work for the city of Aurora. I like a lot of outdoor activities, golf especially.

My name is Frank, married, two kids. Love everything outdoors, sailing, hiking, camping, skiing.

My name is Gary. I live in Parker and I work for the University of Colorado School of Medicine. I have two girls.

My name is Hank and I live in Littleton. Got three boys. Work for the defense contractor Lockheed Martin and, oh yeah, outdoors.

My name is Ivan. I'm married and I have two grown kids and two grandkids. I spend as much time as I can at a property in the mountains. Live off the land when I can.

THANK YOU ALL FOR COMING OUT TONIGHT. I WANT TO START OUR CONVERSATION WITH A REAL BROAD QUESTION AND WE'LL NARROW IT DOWN, BUT THINKING ABOUT EVERYTHING THAT'S GOING ON WITH OUR COUNTRY THESE DAYS, DO YOU FEEL LIKE THE COUNTRY IS GOING IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION OR IN THE WRONG DIRECTION RIGHT NOW?

With all the things going on right now, oh it's going down the tubes.

Wrong direction.

Wrong direction.

**I'M HEARING MORE WRONGS THAN RIGHTS. WHAT THINGS ARE GOING ON THE WRONG DIRECTION?**

Budget deficit.

We're the world's police.

I don't like our environmental policies.

Energy crisis.

We have two political parties that stab each other in the back so that we really don't put out a united front to the rest of the world. That's my biggest issue.

I think the breakdown of what a family is and the change in what a family is—that affects future generations and I think we're seeing the effects of that.

The educational system is poor.

**WHAT ELSE?**

You need a good education system for the economy in terms of where jobs are going, how that's impacting people and so forth.

**WHERE ARE THEY GOING?**

Overseas. Not here.

**OH SO YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT JOBS GOING OVERSEAS OR CHANGING SECTORS, YEAH.**

Some of this has been bothering me for a long time. It seems like we're consumers but we don't produce anything anymore.

Yeah, the trade deficit continues and with everything going in, obviously at some point that's going to catch up with you if you continue importing more than you're exporting.

People need to start buying more American than foreign. It's been easy to say in the past I'm not going to drive an American car because foreign cars are better but that's changed in the last three

or four years, yet nobody talks about that and comes out and says we need to buy our own stuff first.

Most American cars aren't even made here. All those parts...Toyota is assembled here now too.

**ASIDE FROM CARS DO YOU THINK YOU COULD BUY AMERICAN IF YOU WANTED TO?**

We don't produce enough.

No you couldn't. That's exactly right. Unfortunately the quality—

If you really want to make the effort to go through sourcing just about any product you can buy American assembled. I won't say American made because most of the components are imported but even in electronic goods, if you source hard enough you can find them, here in Colorado not just in America. Most electronics you can find if you look hard enough and are willing to spend.

It wouldn't be as big of a deal if our educational system allowed all of our younger people to be white collar professionals where we're sourcing our manufacturing overseas but with our great job creation and a brain trust here that would allow our economy to continue to expand but that's not happening.

That ties to the family too. If you're there for your kids and you're pushing them in school, things like that, they have a better chance of doing better, but there's a lot of kids out there that don't have people pushing them behind them to even get through high school.

The way I grew up, and most of the neighborhood kids...

**I'M SORRY—WHAT?**

Latchkey kids. Both parents work and the kid comes home from school and he's there until 6:00 when Mom and Dad come home. They have a half hour conversation with him at night and that's it.

**OTHER THOUGHTS? TALK TO ME A LITTLE BIT MORE ABOUT THE ECONOMY. I KNOW YOU MENTIONED IT BUT HOW IS IT GOING?**

The energy policy—with gas prices going high it's going to stall out our economy and as a result it's going to keep us from growing.

I try to actively look at my 401K and I just see it as...there's only so much you can do.

I think that we did a pretty good job in terms of invigorating the economy after 9/11. I think we needed some deficit spending to keep us from going into a recession, but it prolongs the inevitable. We're just going to have stagnant growth going forward because of our deficit.

Biggest deficit we've ever had and yet still the administration is talking more about tax cuts. I'm all for having responsible tax breaks but the deficit is out of control.

**DO THE REST OF YOU AGREE WITH THAT? WHAT ARE THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE DEFICIT, THE LARGEST DEFICIT EVER AS MIKE SAID?**

Well if the government continues to borrow money, at some point it's going to push up rates, just a financial crisis at some point.

Our government is going to be paying out money to people all over the world who are buying our bonds.

The strength of the American dollar versus the Euro or the yen is going to continue going down so we're losing all that leverage. That's why it affects our 401Ks.

That's why the ski season had the most skiers in the last few years is because foreigners are able to come over and actually ski over here.

It also would help our exports if the value of the dollar goes down.

**SOMEONE MENTIONED GAS PRICES. HOW HAVE WE GOTTEN TO THE POINT WHERE WE ARE NOW? TWO YEARS AGO WE WERE PAYING ALMOST HALF OF WHAT WE'RE PAYING NOW? HOW HAS IT GOTTEN TO THIS POINT? IS THERE ANY GOING BACK?**

Supply and demand. I mean China is using a lot more oil than they used to. The supply is at this level, the demand is up here, and naturally the prices go up.

Gas in other foreign countries has historically been much higher than it is here. I think it's just catching up to us.

Most of that is Texas.

It is.

You take our number two oil producer out of the Garyet basically in Iraq and eliminate them as a supplier to the world Garyet, you're going to basically cause prices to go up. Supply and demand is very apparent there and when you take out the supply that Iraq was sending to Russia, China and all those countries there that they admit that we're taking from them—all of a sudden that amount is gone. Now there is less oil in the Garyet going everywhere else, so it's going to push up prices.

Lack of conservation certainly doesn't help.

And how many refineries—American refineries have closed down in the last ten years.

And they've built almost none.

Exactly. They haven't done any in 25 years.

They did just open one though up in the Dakotas. It's producing like 40 million gallons a year now, ethanol plant. I heard on the radio today but that's not what I've heard in the past.

If you compare it to the world we have cheap gasoline. Five years ago when the price of oil was \$10/barrel, we paid \$1/gallon. The price of oil today is \$60/barrel so it's inevitable that the price of gasoline is going to continue to go up.

I think inflation adjusted it's cheaper than it probably was in the seventies.

Yeah, we have cheap gas, compared to any other place—maybe Ecuador, Venezuela—maybe Saudi Arabia.

WELL YOU'VE LAID OUT THE BASIC PROBLEM OF SUPPLY AND DEMAND. THE SUPPLY IS PRETTY CAPPED RIGHT NOW BECAUSE OF REFINING PROBLEMS. DEMAND AS AL SAID AS CHINA CONTINUES TO GROW CONTINUES TO GROW. HOW ARE WE AS AMERICANS GOING TO DEAL WITH THAT? ARE WE GOING TO BUILD MORE REFINERIES AND PUMP MORE GAS OR ARE WE GOING TO—

Take over Iraq.

That's the problem is the alternate fuels.

Fuel cell research. Fuel cell development. It's happening, it's not just...

From a consumer standpoint we need to all be looking at vehicles that get better gas mileage. I'm about ready to give up my truck.

Yeah.

I can't control—that's a ton of things that you guys are talking about—but I control whether my decision of buying a Ford truck or a Toyota or a Honda that gets 38 miles/gallon versus my 15 mile/gallon Explorer. Me personally I'm looking at trading in for a fuel efficient vehicle.

I think it's sad that we've been behind the curve in terms of manufacturing energy efficient vehicles too.

If we can put a man on the moon, how come we can't invent a carburetor which gets 50 miles to the gallon, which I know is already out there and some of these companies must have bought the patents or something. Something is out there because I guarantee you that something's been invented and somebody's bought the patents so that they won't be mass produced. I guarantee it. At least that's what I feel like.

I just bought a 1997 Buick today in Omaha. Drove it back this morning. I got 30 miles to the gallon on the highway. It's a Buick LeSabre. That's as good or better than any mileage I got off my Camry, but nobody knows that. I didn't really know that until I grabbed this car and I researched it on the Internet. You think of a LeSabre, a GM car, you're thinking highway 25, lower 20s, but it got 30 miles to the gallon.

That's better than my motorcycle.

Yeah.

It is.

It's really hard to believe that a GM car from 1997 gets better mileage than a Toyota Camry, and it's a bigger car.

**DO YOU THINK THAT OUR COMPANIES AND/OR OUR GOVERNMENT HAVE MADE A SUFFICIENT COMMITMENT TO GET US TO THE POINT WHERE WE'RE GOING TO HAVE ALTERNATIVE ENERGY?**

No.

No.

No.

We should have had hydrogen fuel cells ten years ago.

Funding for that research was cut back six years ago and it was slowly put back but it was cut and they couldn't cut a lot of programs that were going on.

**ARE WE ON THE RIGHT TRACK NOW?**

No.

I think the last time, I can't remember if I got this correctly when I saw some speech of Bush's, more centered toward reducing our dependence on foreign oil by research here as opposed to alternate fuels.

Like drilling more here, right?

We can raid the wilderness but that's it.

In the seventies they mandated mileage from the auto manufacturers that they increase their fuel efficiency and the car companies bitched, bitched, bitched, but they ended up doing it.

You see commercials for Toyota, Honda, the fuel efficiency—and then you see car commercials for Cadillac and Ford biggest motor—everything is bigger and badder versus fuel economy, so the American cars that you can buy, they don't advertise anything like the other ones do about fuel efficiency, and they don't say it on there, but that's not the focus of the commercial. The focus is the biggest, the baddest, the most luxurious.

**NOBODY HAS REALLY MENTIONED HEALTHCARE, SOMETHING I'VE HEARD A LOT FROM OTHER GROUPS.**

I don't really have any issue with healthcare personally.

**OKAY. THAT'S WHY I'M ASKING.**

I had no insurance a couple months ago and I was in the ER for maybe 2-3 hours and it cost me about \$1500.

Even with insurance at this point, my wife has a lot of medical problems, a year ago my daughter fell and had a lot of injuries, so she's at home with me now and I average almost \$400/month and I have insurance. My out of pocket expenses are almost \$400/month for medical situations. It's ridiculous.

We have some of the best healthcare in the world and one of the most litigious societies in the world and litigation I think is what causes a lot of our healthcare costs.

Canadian drugs—we were buying drugs for half price from Canada and—when they cut it off—had to go into the pharmacy and the pharmacist says 'Oh this is brand new.' 'Really? We've been using it for two years.' Getting it from Canada. I mean where does that put us as a world leader? That's ridiculous.

That's FDA holding things back for approval.

Yeah. It is and it's all the big drug company money.

The drug companies control so much of the research that's happening, even at the university hospital, every clinical trial we have is funded by a drug company. We may have independent funding to follow behavioral changes but those programs are all funded by the drug companies.

They're going to get their money back somehow. They got to get it with that initial sell.

It's going to come back. There is a tremendous Garyet, if Canada can produce the same drug for 30% of what we're paying, then something is wrong. Also just the national health programs, hospitals are closing because they can't keep up. I just read last week that 20 hospitals in Southern California have closed in the last five years because they were overwhelmed. Their ERs were overwhelmed, they can't keep up with demand and they can't get payment, and the subsidy that they're getting from the state is not enough to stay afloat.

Healthcare [changed from] a right for those who can afford it to I'm entitled to anything. New lungs, new kidneys, new knees, new hips—it gets expensive.

Litigation like you were talking about, they got to put a cap on that somehow. Who needs \$30 million dollars? Give me \$3 is what I'm saying.

See we're run by lawyers. The government is run by lawyers.

John Edwards, that's it.

They're not going to do anything about it. That's the sad reality. It's a popularity contest and lawyers are going to pad their own pockets first before anybody else.

It takes doctors on a strike, like they've started.

**HOW ABOUT THE SITUATION IN IRAQ. WE HAVEN'T TALKED ABOUT THAT. WHAT ARE YOUR FEELINGS?**

Talking to a couple soldiers that have come back over, I'm glad we did it. The conditions over there, everything that was going on over there, it was, in my opinion, needed to be cleaned up because it was basically that, Afghanistan and Syria are a hotbed for them to make attacks towards us and what happened this morning is another example of it.

**HOW ABOUT THE REST OF YOU?**

I'm all for it. I was for it. What I didn't like is through the election Kerry and the whole campaign, Democrats versus Republicans, the bashing that was going on. On something like that I think the US has to put out a united front and the press didn't really get it out there that Kerry was basically backing war too. I mean I talked to a lot of people who voted Democratic in the election and they're going 'Oh we got to get Kerry in there so we can get out of Iraq.' Kerry wasn't going to get out of Iraq, but the press didn't put that out to anybody. It just wasn't reported right and bottom line that went overseas is us not knowing what we want and basically fueling the rebellion.

I think he was a mass murderer who killed hundreds of thousands of people but that happens all over the world. I was definitely for it. In retrospective if we would have gone into Afghanistan and poured a lot of resources into there and neighboring countries toward other projects, goodwill type projects in Pakistan and maybe Palestine—maybe we'd be better off but I don't know. That's speculation.

**REGARDLESS OF HOW YOU FELT ABOUT WHETHER OR NOT WE SHOULD HAVE GONE, GIVEN WHERE WE ARE TODAY, WHAT ARE YOUR FEELINGS? WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE? WHERE ARE WE TODAY AND WHERE DO WE GO?**

Bottom line is we got to quit being so damn nice. I mean we're over there worrying about their mosques and everything when the terrorists are running into the mosques and then they're

protected and we can't go in after them. It's just like in Vietnam. We couldn't cross over into the DMZ Zone to go after the people coming over and killing our guys. Their needs to be no rules. War is war and they need to be able to go wherever they want to get and do what they need to do.

We have to be politically correct. They don't have that.

Yeah, America is politically correct. It's sickening.

I agree. Where we are right now—I guess when we went to Iraq I was kind of willing to stay sort of neutral and let the jury be out. Since then I became more and more opposed to the decision for several reasons. One is that the very reason we went in, WMD, turned out to be false. Obviously there is many other hotbeds throughout the world and we're still bedfellows with the Saudis who are producing more terrorists, active terrorists, maybe not by numbers but active terrorists, than Afghanistan or Iraq. Yet we still have this wonderful relationship with them. With what's going on in Korea... There are so many things. Obviously here is a horrible person who was a mass murderer but it truly isn't our responsibility to go in and take care of all those. If we do we have to, and if we truly are going to take a stance then we can't kiss the Saudis behind the tree and murder others.

I agree.

I think we're training the troops—we're headed in the right direction—we're training their troops for them to take over and I think we'll have an exit strategy hopefully sooner than later.

Another thing is that we're there because of what we did 15 years ago. Our policies, we supported, we armed Saddam Hussein because we hated Iran and I think so many of our situations that we're involved in is because of policies of the past had such grey hair. I'm convinced that our policy now toward Saudi Arabia will come back and bite us in the ass bad.

OTHER THOUGHTS ON IRAQ? AND ONE OTHER ISSUE I WANTED TO TACKLE, AS YOU GUYS PROBABLY KNOW, SANDRA DAY O'CONNOR RETIRED FROM THE SUPREME COURT ON FRIDAY RIGHT BEFORE THE HOLIDAY WEEKEND SO WE'RE NOW LOOKING AT THE FIRST VACANCY ON THE SUPREME COURT IN ESSENTIALLY A DECADE. WHAT HAVE YOU HEARD? WHAT ARE YOU EXPECTING AT THIS POINT?

I'm expecting two nominations to come forward from Bush probably in the next month, because the other guys is probably going to retire too.

REHNQUIST?

Yeah.

OKAY. WHAT ABOUT THE REST OF YOU? WHAT DO YOU THINK IS GOING TO HAPPEN?

He better put up a centrist or a centrist leaning right. Otherwise it's going to be a bloodbath.

And I think that's probably not going to happen. I envision probably anybody he puts up is not just going to be conservative but ultra-conservative and I think that is happening and they get into the court, it's going to be a bad day for everyone, unless you're wealthy and you can buy your way out of anything.

There's another issue too is that trying to get anybody in there is going to be ugly, no matter what. There's so much opposition. It makes us look like laughing stock.

Sandra Day was pretty much a pragmatist going both ways on certain civil rights issues. If this comes down to an abortion fight I think the Republicans are stupid.

**WHAT DO THE REST OF YOU THINK?**

I think that President Bush will feel obligated because of the power of the extreme conservative or hawk conservative or whatever term they use, to feel they have a right, that they were the ones who elected him and are already flexing their power—I mean already when Alberto Gonzalez was mentioned, they already proposed him and so—but I believe that he will follow that direction and eventually it will come to the nuclear option and a division in our country.

**OTHER THOUGHTS ON THE SUPREME COURT SITUATION? ALRIGHT, WHAT IF IT PLAYS OUT THAT WAY? WHAT IF THEY DO NOMINATE SOMEONE WHO IS CONSIDERED PRETTY FAR TO THE RIGHT AND REPUBLICANS SAY THIS IS THE GUY. PRESIDENT BUSH SAYS THIS IS MY GUY AND WE'RE STICKING WITH HIM. AS WE KNOW WHEN BUSH MAKES A DECISION HE USUALLY DOESN'T BACK OFF OF IT. DEMOCRATS SAY ABSOLUTELY NOT. THIS IS COMPLETELY UNACCEPTABLE AND WE'RE GOING TO DO ANYTHING WE HAVE TO OPPOSE IT. WE GET TO THE FILIBUSTER SITUATION IN THE SENATE. EVERYTHING SHUTS DOWN. REPUBLICANS ARE TALKING ABOUT THE NUCLEAR OPTION, ELIMINATING FILIBUSTERS ALTOGETHER. WHAT'S YOUR REACTION IF THAT'S WHERE WE END UP?**

Well I guarantee you if this happened during Clinton's administration and he had the upper hand or the Democrats had the upper hand, they'd be throwing in their liberals just the same way so what's fair for Ted Kennedy should be fair for George Bush too.

**OKAY. WHAT'S YOUR REACTION IF THAT'S HOW THINGS PLAY OUT—BUSH NOMINATES SOMEONE PRETTY FAR TO THE RIGHT, DEMOCRATS GO TO THE WALL TO OPPOSE IT AND EVERYTHING BASICALLY SHUTS DOWN?**

I think from our perspective it just makes us look stupid. There's got to be some way to get a compromise without taking it to the wall.

But Congress has to reverse the abortion laws anyway, first, before it even goes to the Supreme Court. I mean doesn't that have to be like a 60/40 vote or 2/3 majority to overturn an amendment? I want to say it's 2/3 to overturn.

**IT'S THE SUPREME COURT THAT DECIDED WHETHER THE SUPREME COURT WAS CONSTITUTIONAL.**

But I mean to even change it now it's going to take 2/3 of Congress to vote abortion as illegal before it would even have a chance to become law.

I think that's to amend the Constitution. But I don't think abortion is in the Constitution.

I don't think it's an amendment.

**ALL IT NEEDS IS A 5-4 VOTE AND THEY COULD REVERSE THE VOTE IN 1973.**

But it's still a law right now. Congress has to overturn that.

It's basically been down the center and they've had any success moving it out. They've had success at restricting the choices but they've not voted it out. They've had opportunities to cook up a new vote against abortion.

My personal feeling is they've restricted it enough as is. I don't think they're going to go after the guts of it. Bush is only going to have 2.5 more years and they're already doing an editorial cartoon where we just voted 2004 and the voters in the middle just crawling across the floor, beaten down, and they're talking about 2008. Bush is going to be out next time, so there may be some attempts at it but it's been more of a Republican sided Supreme Court for decades because they've all retired during Republican terms. I don't think it's really going to swing that much. I don't think that he's going to be able to get an ultra-conservative in there because the fight that will result will delay it. It could delay it for 3 years. As a result no judgments get taken care of, no business in Congress. It's not good for the economy so he's not going to drag it out that far. If they get voted down—I mean you're going to see probably three judges put up for nomination—their careers are going to be destroyed. They're going to find stuff out, pull stuff out of their background, they're going to destroy these people.

I think it's political suicide if you try to nominate ultra-conservative judges. Hopefully they're smart enough, pragmatic enough to know that's going to really hurt in the next election.

**ALRIGHT. WE'RE GOING TO DO SOMETHING A LITTLE DIFFERENT NOW. I WANT TO THROW OUT THE NAMES OF SOME PEOPLE, ORGANIZATIONS, STUFF LIKE THAT AND JUST DO WORD ASSOCIATION, WHAT IS THE FIRST THING THAT COMES TO MIND? WHATEVER THAT FIRST INSTINCT IS. I DON'T CARE IF IT'S RIDICULOUS, VULGAR, WHATEVER THE FIRST ONE IS. WE'LL START WITH ONE THAT EVERYONE KNOWS. BILL CLINTON.**

Cruiser.

THAT'S WHAT I'M LOOKING FOR, THE FIRST INSTINCT.

Cigars.

Master politician.

He was charismatic. He was just like Reagan, charismatic.

How do you pull that out? I don't consider him a great politician. I consider Chris Maddock to where he was able to step around everything he did, including..

That makes a master politician.

With Reagan he was a master actor, you know?

ALRIGHT. OTHER THOUGHTS ON CLINTON?

HOW ABOUT JOHN MCCAIN?

Likeable.

It's a popularity contest and that's the sad part. Bush won the popularity contest. I'd take McCain any day over..

I admire him. He may be our choice in 2008 on the Republican side.

That's fine with me.

He's more of a moderate and at least trying to reach out to both sides.

OTHER THOUGHTS ON MCCAIN? WHAT ABOUT TOM DELAY?

Texas Congressman.

His career is over.

He has a coconut head.

WHAT ELSE? WHAT DO YOU THINK OF WHEN YOU THINK OF DELAY? WHY HAS HE BEEN IN THE NEWS LATELY?

Fundraising scandals.

ANYTHING ELSE?

He just got caught at it. They probably all do it. They all do it.

HOW ABOUT THE MEDIA? WHAT DO YOU THINK OF WHEN I SAY THE MEDIA?

One-sided. Biased.

Very biased.

Very one-sided.

They tell what they think the general public wants to hear and they don't tell the complete story.

I think they sensationalize a lot of things for the purpose of the ratings, as opposed to really finding the truth and being on both sides. I firmly believe that. My wife works in the insurance industry and in many instances where the company that she works for is featured for whatever reason it's very very biased and one-sided.

I think there's little trust. I'm more of a conservative. It's an extremely liberal atmosphere and I don't know anyone who really trusts the media on either side.

You know I look at Bush all the time. 'We got to stay the course. We got to finish what we started.' He doesn't answer any questions. If you think about it, shit I wouldn't either. Anything you say is going to be held against you. It's going to be turned around and ripped up.

Yeah but look at the British. They have battles and he'll answer any question.

Yeah.

And there's still both sides of the press. Ours is so much more closed.

Yeah.

In terms of answering questions.

HOW ABOUT BIG CORPORATIONS? WHAT DO YOU THINK OF WHEN I SAY BIG CORPORATIONS?

Scandals. I worked for one of them and Dennis Koslowski, convicted on all the stuff he did.

Quest, Enron..

They control the purse strings.

WHAT ELSE?

Control is the word that comes to mind.

ALRIGHT. ANYTHING ELSE? HOW ABOUT GEORGE W. BUSH? FIRST THING YOU THINK OF WHEN YOU THINK OF PRESIDENT BUSH.

Texan.

Sticks his foot in his mouth.

Simple-minded.

Liar.

WHY DO YOU SAY LIAR?

I just feel that on several occasions he has lied to the American public about his motivations for things that he's doing.

WHAT ELSE?

He's extremely smart.

He's determined.

Yeah, he's determined, loyal, but I don't think he's smart. I think he's simple. I don't think he's a liar either. I think he's surrounded by smart people.

That's one of the things I like about him and one of the things I don't like is he is simple and I can relate to that but at the same time he's very ambiguous and I think he's very led by his party and his people.

Yeah for me when I see him he for the most part seems sincere. When you see him speaking after 9/11, this is a person, but he doesn't seem to know what he's doing, and Karl Rove and the people are guiding him, which makes you really wonder what the truth is.

Almost like a puppet.

Exactly.

It's all about oil, but you never read that. His whole thing is about oil.

Oil comes to mind when I hear George Bush. That more and more and more.

WHAT ROLE HAS OIL PLAYED?

He's a part owner in it through so many doors, hidden doors.

I mean he got elected B&B oil.

I don't think he's ever been personally to gain. I think he owes a lot of people in the oil business his favors.

I think he's definitely personally handing some out and we just don't know about it. We won't know about it.

I didn't agree with you—he's already gained from what he's trying to pay back now.

ALRIGHT. LET'S DIG INTO A LITTLE MORE DETAIL. TAKE ONE OF THESE AND PASS THEM DOWN. WE'RE GOING TO DO A LITTLE MORE DETAIL ABOUT YOUR FEELINGS ABOUT BUSH AND WE'LL WRITE THEM DOWN SO I CAN LOOK AT THEM LATER. FIRST YOU'LL SEE THERE'S A PLACE IN THE UPPER RIGHT HAND CORNER FOR YOUR FIRST NAME. WHAT I WANT TO DO IS JUST RIGHT NOW DO HANDOUTS 1 AND 2. ON HANDOUT 1 WRITE DOWN ALL THE AREAS WHERE YOU APPROVE OF THE JOB PRESIDENT BUSH IS DOING. HANDOUT 2 WRITE DOWN ALL THE AREAS WHERE YOU DISAPPROVE OF THE JOB HE'S DOING. ONCE YOU FILL OUT BOTH OF THOSE WE'LL GO BACK AND TALK ABOUT THEM. IF YOU'RE STILL WRITING TAKE YOUR TIME, BUT IF YOU'RE DONE, FLIP BACK TO HANDOUT ONE AND TELL ME WHAT ARE THE AREAS WHERE YOU APPROVE OF THE JOB PRESIDENT BUSH IS DOING.

Leadership.

Responsible tax cuts.

Reorganization of the intelligence agencies and litigation reforms.

GARY YOU MENTIONED THE TAX CUTS EARLIER. DO YOU FEEL ALL THE TAX CUTS UP TO THIS POINT HAVE BEEN RESPONSIBLE?

Right. I feel that the tax cuts are a good—tax cuts helps businesses grow—but you can't out of the one hand give the tax cuts and continue to spend. It's not the tax cuts, it's the out of control spending.

What I like is he has strong foreign policy even if I disagree with it. I respect anybody that stands up for what they believe in and does it, even if I disagree with it.

I think he was willing to address Social Security even though his plan wasn't necessarily very popular. At least he had a plan whereas other people just sit back and bitch and say it's broken.

And not do anything. Nobody else has done anything. He's doing something.

Yeah. He says 'I've got a plan' whereas everybody else says 'No that doesn't work.' Well come up with something else then.

OKAY. WHAT ELSE?

I think overall his economic policy has been good. The problem is that with the war in Iraq it's caused some major hiccups in the issue. As a result the economic policy of the past is no longer applicable to what our economy is today so you have to reinvent the wheel now. That's where people are trying to do. Trying to think what do we do now? You can't go back and say 'When this happened, we did this. Let's do it now.' It's no longer...so they're having to work with that. But on the whole our economy is growing, it is accelerating, just not as fast as some people would really like it to. But when it grows really fast, guess what, it's going to slam really fast too.

Portions of his economic policies. He doesn't control spending. Congress controls spending and they're a bunch of hoars. They spend money for their constituents, trying to get as much money as they can back into their states. You only have so much control over that but I agree that the majority of his economic policies are fairly sound.

I think the issue for Congress is what can I do for my state not necessarily the betterment of the country.

OKAY. WHERE ELSE DO YOU APPROVE OF THE JOB HE'S DOING?

I think the strategy in Iraq as far as trying to turn it over to them and not coming out and saying when we're leaving to encourage the insurgents to keep fighting, so, I think people like Ted Kennedy and these other guys that want him to set a timetable are—it's almost treason what they're doing, in my mind.

OTHER POSITIVES FOR BUSH?

I think his stance against the terrorists is good and that we are going to go and fight them where they are and we're going to try to deter them.

Yeah he's willing to commit troops if necessary for issues like that, whereas I think in previous administrations it was the absolutely last resort. Obviously you don't want to commit them if you don't have to but if you screw with us then...

I wrote that too. Tough stance on terrorism.

And in that maintaining relationships with allies. You hear us trying to keep the alliances.

World negotiations. I mean he told the French the truth. They didn't support us. He slammed them. He slammed the Germans. He's not afraid to tell them if you don't support us, we're not going to support you either.

ANYTHING ELSE? ALRIGHT. FLIP TO HANDOUT TWO. TELL ME WHERE YOU DISAPPROVE OF THE JOB HE'S DOING.

Environmental issues.

Ecology.

Stem cell research. Catering to the religious right on stem cell research.

Yeah.

Immigration enforcement.

Women's rights. I'm sorry. Stem cell research. Environment and alternative energy policy.

I think banning the stem cell research was terrible and also the programs to deter sexual diseases, especially AIDS, his administration has cut funding to programs that will not promote abstinence only programs and therefore now again the rise of AIDS throughout the world is incredible.

I think he needs to be more assertive in his handling of the Democrats in the media. He just stands back and lets them bash him and he doesn't say anything to them. He doesn't have any rebuttals to them about anything they say. Kerry bashed him about not forming a coalition with Iraq and then when he goes and he forms a coalition with six other countries to deal with North Korea, Kerry bashed him there, and he didn't say 'What the hell do you want? Do you want me to form a coalition or don't you?' But you never heard a word about that in the paper, and no response from him.

I feel Bush has done a very good job at alienating the young voters up and coming. I mean we're all probably 40+ in this room and the Gen X or whatever, they're totally different from us. Their attitudes are different, they lean more toward the Democratic side than the Republican side in the staunch positions that he takes on a number of things has alienated a lot of those kids even more over there to where they're going to have a lot more power here in the near future when they decide that they're going to get out and vote and really push the buttons.

Traditionally though younger folks lean toward more Democratic and then Republican as they get older.

You know the old saying. If you're not a Democrat in your twenties, you have no heart. If you're not a Republican in your fifties, you have no money.

Or no brain...

I was part of the Young Republicans in college. I was staunch. I was going business. I wanted to move to Chicago and get on the Garyet. I was really gung-ho.

Frank had no heart when he was younger.

No, I had no heart, but it was surprising how many Republicans there were in college but they were always quiet ones whereas the Democrats were always on their soapbox ranting and raving.

OKAY. OTHER AREAS WHERE YOU DISAPPROVE OF THE JOB BUSH IS DOING?

I don't think he's doing anything—and there's a lot of debate on this—but protection of US jobs, in terms of coming up with some long term plans to make sure that we as an economy and a country have adequate employment growth in all the different areas. I think there is going to be more of a gap between the minimum wage individuals and retail type workers versus the professionalism. There's nothing left in between. I think that's going to become more and more of an issue. I don't think that's being addressed.

What I disapprove of is the lack of effort in truly protecting our borders and to me it is sheer lip service and our southern border is just out of control.

Mmm-hmm.

We were just going through with the English language thing and the Spanish thing in our schools.

When a group of citizens who tried to, right or wrong, go out and do this patrolling a few months ago, he openly condemned them, and yet still to this day there's millions of undocumented people. Most of them great people, wonderful people, but one or two are going to cross that border and do major damage to us.

And the damage—I won't get into that.

But how do you seal off a border that big?

I mean it's the Canadian border that they say is more the problem than the Mexican border. How do you shut it off when we've always been a very open country?

Well if you're talking about terrorism or you're talking about immigration, they're two different things.

Immigration is part of it, but the terrorists come across as worldly though.

I'll speak to terrorism first of all. It is another subject, you're right. There is a plan that utilizes 36,000 troops for border control. Now when you compare that to the troops that we have throughout the world, that's not that many. Is it worth that for us to have more safety?

ALRIGHT. I WANT TO SHIFT GEARS NOW FROM TALKING ABOUT INDIVIDUALS TO TALKING ABOUT THE PARTIES, DEMOCRATS AND REPUBLICANS, THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THEM. I KNOW A LOT OF FOLKS PROBABLY TELL ME THAT WHEN YOU VOTE FOR A CANDIDATE YOU VOTE FOR THE INDIVIDUAL AND NOT BASED ON PARTY LINES, AND I UNDERSTAND THAT, BUT THE WAY THINGS

WORK IN WASHINGTON, WE KNOW THERE ARE CERTAIN THINGS DEMOCRATS DO THIS, REPUBLICANS DO THIS, AND THAT'S WHAT I WANT TO EXPLORE IS THE ATTITUDES YOU HAVE TOWARD THE PARTIES AND THE THINGS THAT THEY DO AS A WHOLE. SO FLIP TO HANDOUT 3 THERE AND BEFORE WE TALK ABOUT IT I'M GOING TO HAVE YOU WRITE SOME THINGS DOWN HERE. LET'S START WITH DEMOCRATS. TOP HALF OF THE PAGE, WHAT DO YOU LIKE ABOUT DEMOCRATS? WHAT DO THEY GET RIGHT? BOTTOM HALF, WHAT DO DEMOCRATS GET WRONG? WHAT HOLDS YOU BACK FROM THEM? IF YOU'RE DONE, TELL ME WHERE DO THE DEMOCRATS GET IT RIGHT?

I think they have the right point of trying to take care of those who need help.

When I think of the Democratic Party I think of social programs and quality social programs.

Here's where I have a hard time. I put down that they're less likely to try to legislate morality, but then on what holds me back from them, they're less likely to try to legislate morality.

(laughter)

They're more in tune with social programs and what holds me back from them aren't in the social programs. There's a line though where it's a good thing and there's a line there where it's a bad thing.

IF I'M HEARING YOU RIGHT YOU LIKE THAT THEY DON'T TRY TO LEGISLATE MORALITY MAYBE BUT...

Maybe we should to a certain degree.

BUT YOU FEEL THE SOCIAL PROGRAMS DISCOURAGE PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY?

No, no, no. They are two separate things. I think the social programs are good and I like how they're more in tune with small business and individual people and the union stuff but at the same time I don't want to start handing out houses down the street to welfare families that I paid good money for. I don't want to start handing my money out.

(End Side A)

At the same time I think maybe we need to legislate a little morality in like the right wing. I'm not right wing conservative but I am conservative.

Can I paraphrase? I think that their social concept—social programs—is great. I want to help the needy because I think we're a generous people, but government programs have proven to be failures and have not succeeded.

There are too many of them.

They have not succeeded in doing what we want them to do. We've wasted a ton of money, but we all want to help folks who are unfortunate.

I think I got on the positive side, when I think of Democratic Party, I think of social programs, human rights, things like that. Negative is socialism because if you take social programs too far you have socialism. You don't have to go to the old Soviet Union to see it. Just go to an Indian reservation and you'll see socialism.

On paper it's wonderful. So is Communism.

It's against human nature and so it doesn't work.

Yep.

OKAY. WHAT ELSE DO DEMOCRATS GET RIGHT?

Women's rights.

They think more global.

You think so?

Yep.

Oh, I don't.

I totally don't. I think their foreign policy sucks.

I didn't say they had great foreign policy. They just think more globally.

Like in terms of energy conservation and things, they tend to be more in tune with like the Kyoto Treaty—

Oh so environmentally?

Environmentally as well as supporting other programs throughout the world.

WHERE DO DEMOCRATS GET IT WRONG?

Taxes.

Public education.

Economic plans. Morals.

Too politically correct.

Spending instead of educating and training.

Race based preferences. Social security reforms. Litigation reforms. Free trade.

Speaking of litigation it seems like it's law after law after law—I mean we'll have California as a nation here if we keep going on with Democratic Party. They're going to want to legislate everything.

High taxes.

I'd rather have states involved in a lot more of the programs than the federal government. I think the states can do a better job.

They want to grant access in some areas that we've talked about but it seems like one issue we haven't touched at all is how they want to limit gun rates.

**DO THE REST OF YOU THINK THAT? DEMOCRATS ARE PROTECTING GUNS?**

I'll say it. I think guns need to be controlled.

Absolutely.

Especially automatic weapons. Nobody needs a multi-clip rifle or whatever. Even a lot of semi-automatics they don't need. They don't need it. If you're going to kill somebody, one shot can do it. You just don't need those guns out there and the interpretation of the Constitution is way out of control. I mean there's less murders everywhere else in the world because they have gun control.

That's a fact.

In the US, as they say, there's been more deaths in 2004 in Washington DC alone then there has been over with our troops in Iraq. That's just Washington DC. That's not our nation.

And Washington DC has handgun laws.

I was going to say the cat's out of the bag now. There's guns everywhere. You can't go and collect them all.

Yeah, it's an overhaul. You can't have one area like smoking—you can just go across and smoke.

**ALRIGHT. ANYTHING ELSE ON DEMOCRATS? ALRIGHT FLIP TO HANDOUT 4 AND DO THE SAME THING ON REPUBLICANS. WHERE DO REPUBLICANS GET IT RIGHT?**

This maybe sounds like a little bit like a contradiction from my other statement but I think they think more locally—states.

Good foreign policy. Not good, strong, let's go with that. Strong foreign policy.

Social security reform.

**DO YOU LIKE THE REFORM THAT'S GOING FORWARD OR DO YOU LIKE THE FACT THAT THEY'RE DOING SOMETHING ON IT?**

Both.

Certain taxes. They tend to lower taxes.

Less government and promote local and state rights.

**WHAT ELSE? ANYTHING ELSE REPUBLICANS GET RIGHT?**

Tax simplification. Not necessarily lower, just simplified.

Family and moral issues. They're more focused on those as far as making things better.

**WHAT SPECIFIC ISSUES ARE YOU THINKING ABOUT?**

Your specific family groups trying to get people in the families to do more with their family education-wise, things like that.

**WHAT DO THE REST OF YOU THINK? ARE THE REPUBLICANS BETTER WHEN IT COMES TO MORALS AND MORAL VALUES AND FAMILIES?**

No but I don't like the fact that they try to put their morals on to politics.

Yeah that's what I think is negative about them. Everything is...I mean I agree with what you said, that they tend to be more family focused and oriented—but to put religion into everything and use that as a platform to further your cause.

It appears to me in the last few years the Democrats have been—I view them as more anti-religious, almost opposing any kind of religion or propagate religion, like what happened in Colorado Springs a few weeks ago. At the same time Republicans seem to cave into the religious right, to the point that they promote state right but throw all that out the window and get involved in Terri Shiavo. Wait a minute. What happened there? There does seem to be little moderation when it comes to how religion is viewed.

YOU SEE BOTH PARTIES HAVING A DIRECTION YOU DON'T LIKE. THE DEMOCRATS ARE ANTI-RELIGIOUS AND THE REPUBLICANS ARE PUTTING IT ON TOO MUCH?

Yeah they need to get a little more in the middle where there's a little more room.

Yeah, you say you don't want the religious right out there and stuff, but at the same time, it starts to hit home with morals and values. I don't think people out there, a lot of them can't teach that anymore. I don't know if they don't know how or they don't have the time or they don't care. Some of it needs to be taken care of by the government as far as what's right and what's wrong.

You know when I was a kid you got in a fight, you got in a fist fight. You didn't get stabbed or shot when you got in a fight.

You can teach honesty and integrity without teaching religion.

Without forcing it. That's the middle ground.

Being able to treat each other right. That starts in the family.

And then there's military reform. There's been more military reform under Republican administrations because, you know, base closings, our strength in numbers have been more broke, military hardware, technology. There's been more technology growth during Republican years than there has in Democratic years.

ALRIGHT. WHERE DO YOU DISAPPROVE OF REPUBLICANS? WHERE DO THEY GET IT WRONG?

The environment.

They seem to have big money, big corporations, in their back pocket and if you took away the influence of the oil and the religious right, it would be a pretty decent party.

Money rules.

WHAT ELSE?

Same thing we talked about before. Women's rights, immigration.

Federal deficit control.

Same old same old. It doesn't seem like there's a lot of forward thinking like we talked about earlier with the cars and technology. It seems like same old same old, keep cruising on cruise control.

ALRIGHT. LET ME ASK ABOUT WHAT CHARLIE SAID, WITH SPENDING. WE'VE TALKED ABOUT DEMOCRATS, HIGH TAXES, SPENDING. BUT AT THE SAME TIME

REPUBLICANS HAVE HAD CONTROL OF CONGRESS NOW FOR MORE THAN TEN YEARS AND WE'VE SEEN RECORD DEFICITS. ARE REPUBLICANS REALLY ANY BETTER ON SPENDING THAN DEMOCRATS ARE?

It's just different sides. Either it's social issues that you spend the money on or \$500 toilet seats.

The war is a lot of that anyway. Since 9/11 and the war we're in now we're spending lots of money on that so that's where your deficit is coming from.

It's coming from that and also we're on our way out of a recession. When you go into a recession government spending always goes up.

Tax revenues go down.

Yeah tax revenues come down because they want to give the money back to the people, try to get them to spend it on consumer goods. The problem is this time it's going into your gas tank instead of into consumerism, so spending goes way up, and if you look at any recession, there's always high deficit spending.

And in that whole Internet bubble, stock Garryet bubble, there was a ton of tax revenue being generated from all that phoney-baloney, all that speculation, and when that pops, there is a tremendous amount of revenue that didn't come in.

MY QUESTION REMAINS. IS THERE A DIFFERENCE BETWEEN DEMOCRATS AND REPUBLICANS ON SPENDING?

No.

Are you talking about currently or historically?

CURRENTLY.

No I think they're all hoars. They all cater to their constituents and their states. They pass outrageous highway bills, ridiculous pork barrel spending, and every president since Reagan has asked for the line item veto and the Congress won't give it to them because it's all about power. If a President could just go in and cut things out of budgets that get sent to them instead of having all that shit tacked on to it and saying 'Sign it or don't sign it' and if he doesn't sign it, they say he hates healthcare for babies because there was one line in that whole budget that related to that, so my God.

If the media gets a hold of that, Geez, forget it.

The Republicans spend on defense where the Democrats spend it on welfare checks.

SO THE SITUATION WE HAVE IN WASHINGTON NOW. WE'VE GOT A REPUBLICAN IN THE WHITE HOUSE, WE'VE GOT EXPANDED REPUBLICAN CONTROL IN THE HOUSE AND THE SENATE, DO YOU APPROVE OF THE JOB THAT THEY'RE DOING?

No.

No.

CAN YOU POINT TO WHAT THEY'VE ACCOMPLISHED? YOU'VE GOT A REPUBLICAN IN THE WHITE HOUSE, REPUBLICANS IN BOTH CHAMBERS. WHAT HAVE THEY BEEN ABLE TO PUSH FORWARD AS AN AGENDA, PROMISES THEY'VE MADE? ACCOMPLISHMENTS.

Nothing comes to mind.

Tax cuts are about the only thing that we can say that we can put our finger on. Other than that there's not really been overall...There's Social Security reform on the table but the bickering that's going on will happen for another 10-12 years before anything gets done.

There's been some tort reform laws. The asbestos litigation settlement will be huge. Some companies will not have to go into bankruptcy and some people won't lose their jobs.

OKAY. OTHER ACCOMPLISHMENTS YOU GUYS CAN POINT TO?

Well he was able to move into Afghanistan and Iraq. He had the support of the Senate and the Congress.

But after what happened Ronald McDonald could have gotten that.

That's true.

That may be but if the Democrats were in control of the Senate and Congress and a Democratic President, what would we have done? I don't know. Maybe the same, maybe.

BUT OVERALL YOU GUYS ARE TELLING ME THEY HAVEN'T GOTTEN A LOT ACCOMPLISHED, WITH ALL THE CONTROL THEY'VE GOT. IS THAT A MATTER OF REPUBLICANS NOT REALLY HAVING PLANS AND IDEAS ON HOW TO DO SOME THINGS OR IS IT DEMOCRATS OBSTRUCTING THEM AND PREVENTING THEM FROM GETTING PLANS THAT THEY'VE GOT THROUGH?

I think we're our own worst enemy when it comes to that.

I think it's special interest groups and the way our political system is set up, where all the money comes pouring into parties and then all the lobbyists say 'You got do what I tell you to do. Push what I tell you to push.' They end up pushing other peoples' agendas rather than what's good for the country.

Exactly.

They push individual agendas. But I mean look back, what did Clinton really accomplish? What did the other George Bush accomplish? I mean about the only one that I can say definitely did something was Reagan putting through supply-side economics which people thought was a farce but nobody's changed it.

Well it was huge deficit spending. It was huge.

OKAY. LET'S NOT GO BACK TO REAGAN.

Nothing has really changed. It's really not much that has changed, even over the years with all the administrations.

ALRIGHT, SO CONGRESS ISN'T GETTING ANYTHING DONE. WHAT SHOULD THEY BE DOING?

Dealing with healthcare.

Working together, which is an impossibility.

I'M SAYING SPECIFIC ISSUES. WHAT SHOULD THEY BE TACKLING? WHAT SOLUTIONS?

You say deal with healthcare. What should they do?

Well litigation, letting people sue for 30 million dollars.

And the problem is that lawyers make the money off of that so they're not going to push that. It's a dead end road. Just like healthcare. It's a dead end road because there's too much money pouring into government from those special interests to kill those.

WHAT ELSE?

Education. Fight the teachers' union and promote other forms of education. I think they should take all the pork barrel shit that they spend and give all that money to free college tuition and encourage our kids to go to college. Give them hope.

WHAT ELSE?

Energy. Alternate forms of energy. Truly stop the special interest groups and find out what it is because—I don't know—whether it will last another 10 years, 30 years, 50 years, whatever, but at some point in time that resource is going to run out as well as the environmental damage that has caused. I think it's an environmental energy issue combined into one.

I really think we're going to see it. Ford has already tried to come to the table with a hydrogen cell, and so is GM. But they said—this friend of mine that is an engineer back in Detroit—he says it's a four year process just from the time that they can design it, get it into production, get the lines built, they're talking 4-5 years. It doesn't get built right away.

You know why? It's not mandated.

Bush didn't come out with a hydrogen initiative but he promised billions of dollars for it so that's a positive. On the other hand they're not promoting conservation in the meantime.

Yeah and I think that's input from our industry. There isn't any incentive for the automobile industry to really go down that path and change.

Either enforce the law or change it.

And nationalize identification cards. They should be going toward all of us having an ID card that is somehow scannable, readable.

OKAY. ALRIGHT. I WANT TO TALK A LITTLE BIT MORE ABOUT A COUPLE OF DIFFERENT POINTS OF VIEW ON THE POLITICAL SITUATION IN OUR COUNTRY RIGHT NOW. FLIP TO HANDOUT 5. THIS IS A POINT OF VIEW. I'LL READ IT OUT LOUD, YOU READ IT WITH ME, THEN LET'S TALK ABOUT YOUR REACTION TO IT. 'OUR COUNTRY IS MORE POLITICALLY DIVIDED THAN AT ANY TIME IN RECENT HISTORY. WHILE LIBERALS AND DEMOCRATS MAY BE WINNING IN SOME OF THE BIG CITIES IN THE STATES ON EITHER COAST, REPUBLICANS BETTER REPRESENT THE VALUES AND THE BELIEFS OF MIDDLE AMERICA AND THE MAJORITY OF AMERICANS.'

I think it's true.

I think when you look at the red and the blue map there in the election I think this is pretty fair.

I think we're as politically divided as we were at the time of Hamilton and Bruceerson. I think that's the nature of our system, but I agree with the balance of the statement.

HOW IS IT THE REPUBLICANS BETTER REPRESENT THE VALUES AND THE BELIEFS OF MIDDLE AMERICA AND THE MAJORITY OF AMERICANS?

I think they want to maintain more of the values that America had in the past. I see the Democrats letting go of some of those. I hate beating the dead horse but families—I mean you look how things were back in the—I mean FDR was a Democrat, but if he was here today, he'd be a Republican, in my mind.

I think the pull yourself up by your bootstraps attitude are fathers and grandfathers of the work ethic.

I think that's just general. I think most people feel like they're entitled as opposed to 'When I was young my father was like get off your ass and go get it.' I'm not going to give it to you. You got to go get that.

**YOU THINK REPUBLICANS REPRESENT THAT?**

Absolutely.

Going back to a lot of our statements, Republicans do well in foreign policy and world policy and economic policy where the Democrats do very well in social policy and social policies at the state level, city and county level more than at the federal government level, and I think that's why you're seeing the change, split. On the west coast there is—I understand the statement but I don't agree with it completely.

**WHY NOT?**

It's too quick. I'd have to basically digest it a little bit to understand what it's trying to say.

**ANYONE ELSE ON THAT ONE. ALRIGHT, FLIP TO HANDOUT 6. HERE'S A DIFFERENT TAKE. 'REPUBLICANS IN CONGRESS HAVE DONE NOTHING ABOUT HEALTHCARE AND GAS PRICES AND HAVE BLOCKED DEMOCRATIC EFFORTS TO RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE, PROTECT PENSIONS, AND RESTRICT THE INFLUENCE OF LOBBYISTS. YET THEY TOOK EXTRAORDINARY MEASURES TO INTERFERE IN THE TERRI SHIAVO CASE, THEY VOTED THEMSELVES PAY RAISES, CHANGED CONGRESSIONAL ETHICS RULES TO PROTECT TOM DELAY, OPPOSED STEM CELL RESEARCH, CUT VETERANS BENEFITS, AND ARE STILL TRYING TO PRIVATIZE SOCIAL SECURITY DESPITE OVERWHELMING PUBLIC OPPOSITION. THESE ARE NOT THE PRIORITIES THAT CONGRESS SHOULD BE FOCUSED ON.' WHAT'S YOUR REACTION TO THAT ONE?**

I vote for the other one.

I think they have done something about gas prices, so I disagree with this first line.

**WHAT HAVE THEY DONE?**

I think they've worked with Saudi Arabia and other countries to try to increase production. Maybe done a little behind the scenes pressure to get them to stabilize prices.

**WHAT IS THE REST OF YOUR ALL'S REACTION TO THIS?**

That's a whole lot there.

Yeah.

**YOU DON'T HAVE TO TAKE IT ALL YES OR NO, BUT TELL ME WHAT STANDS OUT.**

Well here's what stands out to me is that the healthcare is a major issue that Republicans in Congress are not going to be able to handle in a year or two. Gas prices are always the thing on the surface. It doesn't even compare to what we pay now for healthcare, or even for a car. I bought a brand new car when I graduated from high school for 4,000 dollars. Today it's 40,000. Gas was .75/gallon and 2.00 now.

Where is it inflation adjusted though? It's all relative.

Yeah. I mean gas prices to me—no big deal—not compared to...

I mean you hate having to spend more.

Yeah, okay we spend 2.50. I used to spend 1.00 I think that I would agree with the thing about interfering with the Terri Shiavo case.

Me too.

Yep. Ethics rules and Tom Delay I agree with. Opposing stem cell research makes me crazy. Social security reform I totally support. The healthcare, I don't know what the hell you do about it.

They all vote pay raises—Democrats and Republicans both.

Yeah, I don't think they're overpaid.

That's no big deal.

Compared to the private sector, certainly, their pension plan is...

That's where it differs, when you get into the pension plan...as soon as you become a Senator, even if it's one term, you're on the pension plan.

Yeah, and some bitches don't pay Social Security taxes either. They have a separate retirement plan.

Yeah they have a separate retirement plan. They're not directly affected by it so they don't really have to do anything about it. They're taken care of and there's not much pressure. The problem is with the healthcare. Too much money comes in from the healthcare to get them elected so they're not going to go against the grain of who supplies them money or who supplies the party money for that. Pensions—okay—protecting pensions, yes, it's to protect the people but if the corporations are paying the money to them to get reelected, they're not going to do anything there.

With healthcare, like we said before, what they can do and how many of the healthcare issues out there are really self-inflicted? As an aging population as well as more of an unhealthy population—a lot of it is due to that.

I don't want to see them socialize healthcare anyway. I mean that's where we got the competition.

Free Garyet.

And that's where all of our stuff comes from with all the new drugs, all the new techniques and procedures.

The number one cost of healthcare is not drugs or anything like that. It's the malpractice insurance. That's huge. And that is the number one cost...

OTHER REACTIONS TO THIS ONE? DO YOU AGREE WITH THE BASIC PREMISE HERE? WE TALKED ABOUT THAT THEY'RE NOT ACCOMPLISHING A LOT. THIS ONE IS SAYING WELL YEAH THEY ARE ACCOMPLISHING A LOT. IT'S JUST NOT THE STUFF THEY SHOULD BE TAKING CARE OF.

I don't think this says they've accomplished a lot.

Nowhere in there does it say they've accomplished anything.

MAYBE NOT ACCOMPLISHED A LOT, BUT BEEN DOING A LOT. THEY'VE BEEN TAKING GOVERNMENT AND INTERFERING IN THE TERRI SHIAVO CASE. THEY TOOK THE TIME TO VOTE THEMSELVES PAY RAISES. THEY CHANGED THE ETHICS RULES. THEY BLOCKED STEM CELL RESEARCH. THEY CUT VETERANS' BENEFITS. THEY PASSED A LOT OF STUFF. THIS ONE IS SAYING IT'S JUST NOT THE STUFF THEY SHOULD BE PASSING.

I don't think they've passed a lot. I just disagree with that.

The one that bothers me—one of the ones that really bothers me is the cutting of veterans' benefits. That has an effect on me. When I went into the military I was promised certain things by the government would be there for me. Some of that is not there anymore.

How can we spend 80 billion dollars on a war and not support your veterans?

Exactly.

That's contradictory.

That's really one of the prime points in this that I have issues with.

ALRIGHT. LET'S TALK FOR ANOTHER MINUTE ABOUT THE HEALTHCARE SITUATION. HEALTHCARE HAS OBVIOUSLY BEEN AN ISSUE FOR A LONG TIME. IT'S GOTTEN WORSE AND WORSE. COSTS ARE INCREASING 40% IN THE LAST THREE YEARS. OBVIOUSLY MUCH MORE THAN WAGES OR PRICES OR ANYTHING ELSE. CAN YOU IN YOUR MEMORY THINK OF ANY POLITICAL LEADER, PARTY, WHATEVER, WHO HAS DONE SOMETHING TO IMPROVE THE SITUATION OR PUT FORWARD A PLAN THAT YOU THOUGHT WOULD ACTUALLY WORK?

FDR.

Let's talk reality. He's the only last one that really did anything about it.

Nobody has the political courage to come out and say 'Hey, you're 75. You don't get new lungs and new heart.' My old man got both of his knees replaced. He could have afforded it. The government paid for it. It probably cost taxpayers \$50,000 to have his knees replaced. Thirty years ago that wasn't an option. You just lived with bad knees.

Why is Medicaid paying for Viagra? That's a subject I don't understand.

You know political courage is what it all comes down to for me. I mean the FDRs are gone. You can please some of the people all of the time. You can't please all the people all of the time. That's a true statement. Why try? Do something. Get something done. Get off your ass and piss some people off.

**ALRIGHT, LET'S HAVE THE POLITICAL COURAGE TO DEFINE WHAT THE SOLUTION LOOKS LIKE. WE TALKED ABOUT MALPRACTICE. WE GOT THAT OFF THE TABLE. THAT'S A PIECE OF THE SOLUTION. WHAT ARE THE OTHER PIECES OF THE SOLUTION IN YOUR EYES?**

You have to limit healthcare. Everybody isn't entitled to everything just because they're sick.

**WHAT ELSE?**

I believe we embrace hospice care for end of life issues and not curative measures.

Yeah. There is a lot of people who would just like to end their life but they can't because the government won't allow them.

What the hell did Terri Shiavo cost? Was she on the public dole 15 years for healthcare? What did that cost? Just because technology could keep her alive doesn't mean you should.

And it starts with the education of our medical personnel who understand comfort care. I lost a daughter to cancer and when it came down to finally embracing that she was going to die, then they had comfort care. They managed her pain. They helped us with issues of the family. She died peacefully at home, but even until the day her suffering in pain I had oncologists saying 'Well let's try this experiment. Let's do this. Maybe we can do one more thing.' I mean after bone marrow...we as a society, we have to start embracing that we're going to die. It's okay.

**OTHER THOUGHTS?**

Privatize damn social security. At least do something with it. I want something, whether I have to do it myself or whether I'm going to be getting the check.

But the problem there is they do have IRAs, 401ks, and that is technically privatizing..

They're taking my damn money out of my check.

I agree with you but the problem is that what percentage of people truly contribute to those? I can't remember the number exactly but it was astonishingly low and privatizing—giving you the money to do with what you will—you could put it on a horse thinking that's a good investment and lose it all and then another 20 years down the road we're faced with all these people that went on to the private social security program that lost their money through one reason or another and now we have to cover them also. Today it sounds good...tomorrow..

Back to health care, you're going to have to eventually raise the ages at which people get all these benefits, because we're living longer. The government can't give you Medicare/Medicaid for the last 40-50 years of your life if you're going to live to be 90.

ONE OF THE BIG THINGS THAT WE TALKED ABOUT FOR YEARS AND YEARS IS THE IDEA OF INSURING THE UNINSURED. THE NUMBER OF UNINSURED PEOPLE IN THIS COUNTRY KEEPS GROWING. COMPANIES ARE CUTTING BACK BENEFITS. MORE AND MORE JOBS DON'T HAVE HEALTHCARE BENEFITS AT ALL. YOU GOT MORE ELDERLY WHO AREN'T WORKING ANYMORE, ETC. WHAT DO YOU THINK OF THE GOAL OF UNIVERSAL COVERAGE? IS THAT A REALISTIC GOAL?

Don't they do that in Australia? I never hear any problems about them.

They do it in Australia, Netherlands and Switzerland with one major difference. The growth in those countries for the last twenty years has been less than 5%. The US has been 50% growth. We just added 100,000,000 people. We got to cover those. Sweden didn't add 100,000,000, or Australia.

And how many Mexicans have moved here? And of course they had zero health coverage in Mexico. Now they come here and it's like that we have to provide healthcare for all our immigrants too.

The human part of me wants to provide care for everybody and that's great but you have to be fiscally responsible. I'd love to take my girls to Disneyland every day but I have to be responsible and we have to have some kind of responsibility. A lot of the uninsured people, they're voluntarily uninsured! I got people who work for me. They don't want to contribute 100 bucks a month so they don't carry insurance.

And with the Netherlands—they pay over 40% in taxes.

DO YOU THINK PEOPLE IN THIS COUNTRY WOULD BE WILLING TO PAY MORE IN TAXES TO GET UNIVERSAL COVERAGE?

No.

No.

WHY NOT?

Because people already squawk about what they pay.

Well isn't there a tradeoff though?

Tradeoff for universal coverage meaning a higher tax for everyone but now my employer isn't making that contribution or I'm not having that taken out of my check, albeit very small. Is that what you're asking? I think a tradeoff might be better as opposed to just a higher tax.

Then they'd have to balance what they were getting in exchange for those funds compared to the situations they're in now because even as bad as it is now, if you're fortunate enough to have insurance then things go pretty smooth. It doesn't take much to get turned upside down either, if you have an emergency.

Even with insurance at this point, with the way the healthcare is. In the last five years, my personal situation, I've lost everything. I've lost my house. I've lost everything. And I carry insurance. I pay quite a bit of money for insurance. If you get a catastrophic health issue, the way insurance is now, it's still going to devastate you.

That's why I was saying it wouldn't take much to go upside down. Not at all.

I think more companies if it were that way would higher full-time, increase the wage—I know that with the city that I work with there is a ton of people that go on what they call contract and they do that specifically so they don't have to pay them benefits. I mean look at Wal-Mart. Do they have anybody that's a full-time employee?

ANOTHER DEBATE THAT IS INVOLVED HERE IS THAT IF YOU WERE TO MOVE TO UNIVERSAL COVERAGE OR SOME WAY OF EXPANDING COVERAGE, WHO IS PROVIDING IT? IS IT A GOVERNMENT PLAN OR DO YOU MAINTAIN PRIVATE INSURANCE PLANS AND THEN HAVE SOME KIND OF A GOVERNMENT POOL LIKE WE HAVE NOW WITH MEDICARE/MEDICAID, THAT PAYS FOR THE UNINSURED THROUGH PRIVATE INSURANCE COMPANIES. WHICH IS PREFERABLE? THE GOVERNMENT PROVIDED PLAN OR MAINTAINING PRIVATE INDUSTRY?

Sounds like Social Security.

WHAT DO YOU THINK IS THE BETTER PLAN?

I think that if the government gets involved they screw it up. If there are people who need healthcare, it should be run through private companies but if there's government assistance needed to provide benefits to those people it should be run by private companies.

It would be nice to see the government regulate some of those insurance companies.

Regulated but still competitive. A private company is the best of both worlds.

Yeah free Garyet with some restraint.

You have private companies they'll contract to bid, they'll do the best to be competitive.

YOU SAID FREE GARYET WITH SOME RESTRAINT. WHAT'S THAT RESTRAINT?

Well that restraint is some government oversight and regulation because like say with HMOs, an HMO on paper is a wonderful idea. Let's keep people healthy. Keep prices down. Problem is HMOs had to respond to their stockbrokers who want good dividends. Then they sometimes had to opt out of doing important surgeries and things.

I don't know if the government would be able to keep their costs down like the private insurers do where they go in and really negotiate the healthcare rates that they're paying. You know you get the reports where the hospital charged you \$2000. Well your insurance company can only pay them \$1200 and it was all to go. I don't know if the government could do that.

LET ME ASK YOU A COUPLE OTHER IDEAS THAT ARE THROWN AROUND A LOT AND GET YOUR REACTIONS TO THEM. ONE IS THE IDEA OF PRICE CAPS, SETTING CAPS ON HOW MUCH PHARMACEUTICAL COMPANIES CAN CHARGE FOR DRUGS, HOW MUCH INSURANCE COMPANIES CAN INCREASE PREMIUMS. IS THAT A PROPER ROLE FOR GOVERNMENT?

No.

I think that's part of the restraints and regulations.

I don't because it's free enterprise right now. I mean drug companies spend a tremendous amount of money to try to develop products, which a lot of them fail, so this money goes out there in order to come up with something that works. When it works they have a patent on that for a certain amount of time to protect their interests and reap their costs.

Making 100% profit.

They really don't. If you look at their numbers, on certain lines they do make a lot of money but if you look at everything that they do, basically if you restrict their ability to make money on products they sell and develop they're not going to develop that much anymore. There is no incentive so where is that incentive going to come from?

The law should be that they can't sell to different nations at different prices.

Exactly.

Everything has to be priced the same.

When I have to pay \$80 for it here, you can go to another country and pay \$5.

It's ridiculous.

It's absurd.

If you're not going to cap it then at least don't make me buy it from them. Let me go to Canada.

And the reason that you do that is that over there they don't have patent rights that they do in the US. Here in the US nobody else can produce it so we can charge whatever we want, where up in Canada anybody else can produce it, so we're going to sell it for what it truly is valued.

OKAY. LET ME GET YOU ANOTHER IDEA, WHICH IS PERCENTAGE CAPS ON THE PERCENTAGE OF WAGES THAT CAN BE SPENT ON HEALTHCARE PREMIUMS. IN OTHER WORDS, TAKING A NUMBER OUT OF THE AIR, PASSING A LAW THAT SAYS THAT EMPLOYEES CAN'T PAY MORE THAN 10% OF THEIR MONTHLY INCOME FOR HEALTHCARE PREMIUMS. SO IF YOU'RE MAKING 20,000/YEAR YOU'RE PAYING 2,000 TOWARD IT. IF YOU'RE MAKING 40,000/YEAR YOU'RE PUTTING 4,000 TOWARD IT. AND SO ON, SO COMPANIES HAVE A SLIDING SCALE BASED ON HOW MUCH YOU EARN. EVERYBODY GETS THE SAME PACKAGE BUT HOW MUCH YOU PAY IS BASED ON HOW MUCH YOU MAKE.

So it's like socialism.

Socialism.

THIS WOULD BE A WAY TO BALANCE—PEOPLE SAY 'MY WAGES WENT UP 2%. MY HEALTH INSURANCE WENT UP 20%. I LOST MONEY.' THIS WOULD BE SETTING IT SO THAT AS YOU MAKE MORE MONEY, AS YOU ADVANCE IN THE COMPANY, YOU PAY YOUR SHARE OF THE OVERALL HEALTHCARE BURDEN.

What is the incentive for making more money? More responsibility to get that promotion and then your health insurance kicks up..

It's the same as taxes.

It's more palatable if you say we won't give tax breaks to the rich, rich, rich. We're going to take that money and we're going to fund it for healthcare.

WHAT DO THOSE WHO THINK OF THIS IDEA OF SETTING PERCENTAGE CAPS OF INCOME—

There's companies out there that basically pay the entire premium for you—like my wife's company—

WELL THIS WOULD BE A CAP. IT WOULD BE MANDATED.

Very few companies pay 100% of the premiums for their employees. I mean maybe for upper management and upper level.

OKAY. I JUST WANTED TO GET GUT REACTION.

I don't know.

It's one of those things where I would have to hear more. Our company put out a questionnaire on healthcare of what was important to us and everything, and all of a sudden we get back this

memo this week... 'Wait that bit us in the ass.' They asked us questions about healthcare focused on living healthier instead of—

Wellness programs.

Yeah, and all of a sudden they're going to make some changes and we know that it's not going to be in our favor.

ALRIGHT. THE LAST THING I WANT TO DO IS—WE'VE TALKED ABOUT CONGRESS, WE'VE TALKED ABOUT THE WHOLE SITUATION THERE AND I KNOW IT WAS JUST EIGHT MONTHS AGO THAT YOU WERE VOTING IN 2004—BUT LOOKING AHEAD A LITTLE BIT TO THE 2006 ELECTION WHAT I WANT TO KNOW IS DO YOU SEE THINGS CHANGING A LOT? THE SITUATION THAT THE COUNTRY IS IN NOW—THE ECONOMY, HEALTHCARE, IRAQ—ALL THE DIFFERENT ISSUES THAT WE'VE TALKED ABOUT TONIGHT. DO YOU THINK THINGS ARE GOING TO CHANGE SIGNIFICANTLY IN THE NEXT 12-16 MONTHS OR DO YOU THINK THAT BASICALLY WE'RE GOING TO BE LOOKING AT THE SAME SITUATION AS NOW WHEN WE GO TO VOTE IN 2006?

Same I think.

Same.

Same.

YOU DON'T SEE A LOT OF THINGS MOVING ONE WAY OR ANOTHER?

No.

Nope.

It would be nice but.

OKAY SO GIVEN THAT CONTEXT AND BASICALLY SEEING US IN THE SAME POSITION, AND STILL TALKING ABOUT THE PARTIES, DEMOCRATS AND REPUBLICANS AND THE TRAITS THAT THEY HAVE, WHAT WOULD BE THE BEST REASON TO VOTE FOR A REPUBLICAN FOR CONGRESS IN THIS CONTEXT?

If they put up the ticket with Colin Powell and Condi—

That's 2006!

WHY WOULD YOU VOTE FOR A REPUBLICAN IN CONGRESS—ESSENTIALLY MAINTAINING THE SITUATION THAT WE HAVE NOW WITH REPUBLICAN CONTROL. WHAT'S THE BEST REASON TO VOTE FOR A REPUBLICAN, REGARDLESS OF WHICH WAY YOU MIGHT VOTE, WHAT WOULD BE THE BEST REASON TO VOTE FOR A REPUBLICAN?

I think for me it would be to maintain the situation that we have now. Even though I'm unhappy with it it's the lesser of two evils to me.

I agree.

Bush was the lesser of two evils.

ALRIGHT. FLIP TO HANDOUT SEVEN. WE'VE GOT A FEW REASONS THAT THOSE SYMPATHETIC TO REPUBLICANS MIGHT OFFER AS REASONS TO PICK REPUBLICANS. READ THROUGH THE LIST. PICK THE TWO THAT ARE IN YOUR OPINION THE BEST REASONS TO VOTE FOR A REPUBLICAN. DON'T CIRCLE IF YOU DON'T BELIEVE IT BUT CIRCLE THE ONES THAT WOULD BE A REASON FOR YOU TO VOTE FOR A REPUBLICAN FOR CONGRESS. ALRIGHT. I'LL READ DOWN THE LIST AND GET A REAL QUICK SHOW OF HANDS TO SEE WHERE YOU GUYS WERE ON THIS. HOW MANY OF YOU PICKED THE TOP ONE—REPUBLICANS SUPPORT PRESIDENT BUSH?

ZERO. REPUBLICANS FIGHT FOR TAX CUTS.

FIVE. REPUBLICANS DEFEND THE ROLE OF RELIGION.

ONE. REPUBLICANS SUPPORT DECREASED REGULATION OF BUSINESSES.

FOUR. REPUBLICANS STAND FOR PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY.

ONE. REPUBLICANS WILL STAY THE COURSE IN IRAQ.

(UNCLEAR. SILENCE.) REPUBLICANS ARE STRONGER IN SUPPORTING OUR MILITARY.

FIVE. REPUBLICANS SUPPORT DECREASED REGULATION OF INDIVIDUALS.

TWO. OKAY. SO HALF OF YOU SAID REPUBLICANS FIGHT FOR TAX CUTS AND DECREASED GOVERNMENT SPENDING. WHY IS THAT THE BEST REASON TO VOTE FOR THEM?

That's more money in your pocket.

More responsibility.

It allows me to spend more money helping the economy grow.

AND YOU BELIEVE THAT REPUBLICANS DO FIGHT FOR TAX CUTS AND DECREASED GOVERNMENT SPENDING?

Mmm-hmm.

They fight for tax cuts.

(laughter)

I don't know about decreased spending.

That's why I couldn't circle it.

I think if we were in a non-war situation I would probably agree with the whole statement but right now with the war, it makes you spend money.

OKAY. REPUBLICANS ARE STRONGER IN SUPPORTING OUR MILITARY AND DEFENDING OUR COUNTRY. WHY DID HALF OF YOU PICK THAT?

I circled that but it's kind of a double edged sword. I think what we've done in Iraq, even though I support it, has pissed off the world so much that we're just going to have more and more terrorism and Republicans are more apt to support the military and defend our country in that respect, even though we may have inflicted that upon ourselves.

WHAT DO THE REST OF YOU THINK?

Even though I have had problems with some of the strategies over the last couple years I believe the Republican Party has operated from a stance of strength more so than Democrats.

More proactive than Democrats.

ARE DEMOCRATS WEAK IN DEFENDING THE COUNTRY? ARE THEY LESS LIKELY TO DEFEND THE COUNTRY?

That's not the right word.

I don't think they have the respect.

They're the peace lovers.

The rookies. Whoever heard of John Kerry until the last election? Where did he come from?

OKAY. YOU SAY THEY'RE STRONGER IN SUPPORTING THE MILITARY AND DEFENDING OUR COUNTRY. IS THAT DESPITE ALL THE STUFF WE TALKED ABOUT WITH THE OPEN BORDERS AND IMMIGRATION?

That's still a problem. I think they are still a little stronger at it than the Democratic party.

Yeah.

I agree with that.

OKAY, SO RELATIVE TO DEMOCRATS THEY'RE STILL STRONGER. ALRIGHT. FLIP TO HANDOUT EIGHT AND DO THE SAME THING FOR DEMOCRATS. AGAIN CIRCLE THE TWO THAT FOR YOU ARE THE BEST REASONS TO VOTE FOR A DEMOCRAT FOR CONGRESS. DON'T CIRCLE IT IF YOU DON'T BELIEVE IT. ALRIGHT AGAIN

LET ME JUST GO DOWN REAL QUICK. DEMOCRATS PROVIDE A BALANCE TO PRESIDENT BUSH.

(SILENCE, UNCLEAR). DEMOCRATS WILL PROTECT THE RETIREMENT SECURITY OF WORKING AMERICANS.

TWO. DEMOCRATS WILL PROVIDE CHANGE AND A NEW DIRECTION.

(SILENCE, UNCLEAR). DEMOCRATS REPRESENT THE INTERESTS OF WORKING PEOPLE.

FIVE. DEMOCRATS PROTECT AMERICAN JOBS.

FIVE. DEMOCRATS KNOW IT'S TIME FOR A NEW DIRECTION IN IRAQ.

(SILENCE, UNCLEAR). DEMOCRATS FIGHT FOR LOWER HEALTHCARE COSTS.

THREE. DEMOCRATS RESPECT THE RIGHT OF PRIVACY.

SEVEN.

A LOT OF LOVE FOR THAT ONE. WHY DID YOU PICK THAT ONE?

The Terri Shiavo thing.

Women's rights. Democrats are more...

Euthanasia in general.

Abortion.

FIVE OF YOU SAID DEMOCRATS PROTECT AMERICAN JOBS AND STAND UP TO CORPORATE ABUSE. WHY DID YOU PICK THAT ONE?

It's kind of a left-hand compliment because I think you would actually get more jobs by letting some of the big businesses and stuff go and some of the decreasing business regulations, but it is a union-type thing and yeah I think you'd have less of the Enron stuff getting as far as it did with the Democrats.

I think the Democrats support American jobs and workers' rights and so on but have the wrong view or the wrong plan on how to do that in terms of—I think unions are past their time and aren't necessarily right now able to wield too much power over a corporation—in terms of bring a corporation to its knees. From a Democratic perspective it's pretty pro-union.

I think there were more abuses under Clinton for NAFTA, jobs going out of the country. A lot of these service centers are going out of the country. Those all started back under Clinton basically looking the other way.

Well it's all part of free trade.

Yeah. Everyone supports that.

Everyone supports free trade but not they're saying no because they're starting to see their jobs going overseas.

**NOBODY SAID DEMOCRATS PROVIDE A BALANCE TO PRESIDENT BUSH AND REPUBLICANS IN CONGRESS. IS THERE NO FEAR THAT WITH THE CONTROL THAT THEY HAVE—**

They honestly provide more of an obstacle so I don't know that it would provide a balance.

Personally even as a Republican I think if we had a Democratic President in there and most of the House and Senate was Democrat I think I would try to go ahead and try to level the playing field out the rest of the way so they could get something done. Go ahead and vote Democratic just so they could get something done.

**ANYONE ELSE? ALRIGHT SO USE YOUR IMAGINATION FOR A MINUTE. IT'S ELECTION DAY. YOU'RE IN THE BOOTH. YOU'VE GOT TO MAKE YOUR DECISION. YOU VOTE REPUBLICAN. WHAT WAS IT THAT MADE YOU VOTE THAT WAY? WHAT WAS THE DECIDING FACTOR THAT MADE YOU CAST YOUR VOTE FOR A REPUBLICAN?**

Lesser of two evils.

Yep.

Yep.

**WHAT SPECIFICALLY—IN WHAT WAY—WHAT'S THE ISSUE THAT IS MAKING UP YOUR MIND?**

John Kerry or Bush, John Kerry or Bush..

**IT'S ELECTION DAY 2006. YOU'RE IN THE BOOTH AND YOU'RE CASTING YOUR VOTE FOR A REPUBLICAN. WHY ARE YOU CASTING THE VOTE FOR THE REPUBLICAN?**

My pocketbook. Economic policies.

My wife has her own business and we've done a lot better under Republican rules and taxes.

**ANY OTHER REASONS ASIDE FROM YOUR OWN ECONOMICS?**

I think that is why most people become Republicans is because they start thinking locally instead of globally.

**ALRIGHT. FLIP THE SCENARIO. YOU'RE IN THE VOTING BOOTH. YOU'VE JUST DECIDED TO VOTE FOR THE DEMOCRAT. WHY ARE YOU VOTING FOR A DEMOCRAT FOR CONGRESS IN 2006?**

Because he's a guy and the Republican is a woman.

Oh, that's vicious!

It goes over great in Saudi Arabia.

I think it all depends on who your choices are because in the early running Dean was a very favorable individual and he got all excited and everything. The problem is some of the ultra-conservatives of the Democratic Party didn't like that. Okay, he's out. They moved Kerry forward.

**BUT AGAIN STICKING TO THE GENERALIZATIONS THAT WE'VE TALKED ABOUT—IF YOU VOTE FOR A DEMOCRAT FOR CONGRESS IN 2006, WHY WOULD YOU VOTE THAT WAY? WHAT WAS IT THAT PUSHED YOU OVER THE EDGE TO VOTE THAT WAY? IT'S OBVIOUSLY NOT A NATURAL INCLINATION FOR ANY OF YOU SO WHAT WAS IT THAT PUSHED YOU OVER THE EDGE?**

Natural elements.

Somebody worse than Bush.

It depends on what happens with this war. If we started seeing something else that resembles Vietnam and I of course, even George Senior started out with 'This is not going to be another Vietnam.' If we're still over there in 2006 and we're still losing guys and I've had two friends come back in bags—maybe it's time to change the ship.

**OKAY. WHO ELSE? OTHER REASONS YOU WOULD VOTE DEMOCRAT IN 2006?**

I would agree with that. If it doesn't look like we're making progress on the foreign front.

I think if the Democrat was more of a centrist.

More moderate.

Maybe I could do that, if they were more of an independent type.

**OKAY. AND WHAT SIGNALS TO YOU THAT THEY'RE MORE OF A MODERATE RATHER THAN A LIBERAL?**

It would just have to be what the platform was at the time and what they were talking about leading up to the election.

The bottom line is that McCain was more middle of the road and he would have drawn a lot of Democratic voters to the Republican side because he was middle of the road. Same with Dean. Dean was middle of the road on the Democratic side and he had a very strong possibility of pulling Republicans to his side. But they had the two that ended up and that's really what determines—when you get to the final, who are the two that are there? If you have somebody that is worse than George Bush, guess what, it makes the Democrat look a lot better.

ALRIGHT. LAST THING I'M GOING TO ASK YOU TO DO BEFORE I LET YOU OUT OF HERE. IT'S NOT GOING TO HIM. I DON'T EVEN KNOW WHO IT IS FOR YOU, OR YOUR HOME ADDRESS, BUT ONE OF THE GREAT EXERCISES IN DEMOCRACY IS WRITING TO YOUR MEMBER OF CONGRESS. SO GIVEN ALL OF THE STUFF THAT WE'VE TALKED ABOUT, IF YOU WERE TO WRITE TO YOUR MEMBER OF CONGRESS, WHAT WOULD YOU SAY TO HIM?

Dear Shithead..

Oh God I hate her.

IF YOU HAVE STRONG FEELINGS ABOUT THAT INDIVIDUAL MAKE IT YOUR SENATOR OR SOMETHING. IF YOU'RE WRITING TO A MEMBER OF CONGRESS, WHAT DO YOU WANT TO SAY TO THEM? WHAT MESSAGE DO YOU WANT TO SEND? WHEN YOU'RE ALL DONE YOU CAN JUST LEAVE IT ON THE TABLE. THANKS A LOT GUYS.

