

MARK O. HATFIELD
OREGON

*Could this be called swallowing camels for
12 years and now "gagging on quats?"*

Enclosure #1
(10 of 10)

Would you consider this an honest response?
I objected to his filibuster.
Underlining is mine.
Perfected not Date responded.

United States Senate
WASHINGTON, DC 20510-3701

June 18, 1993

[Redacted]
Eugene, Oregon 97404

000594 JUL 13 93

Dear [Redacted]:

Thank you for taking the time to contact me.

Over the past month, there has been a great amount of discussion over a supplemental appropriations bill often referred to as the "stimulus package." Debate on this bill in the Senate could not be brought to a close because members of both political parties questioned the approach of increasing spending by over \$16 billion, while promising to pay for it later by increasing taxes or finding budget cuts.

In my role as the Ranking Republican on the Senate Appropriations Committee, I attempted to forge a compromise (including budget cuts to offset new spending) so that much of the money requested by the President in areas such as highway projects, summer jobs, immunizations, and small business loans could be spent quickly and effectively this summer. While further attempts to pass some of these proposals are still possible, it was disappointing to me that an agreement could not be reached when this bill was first presented to the Senate.

I will continue to advocate for fiscally responsible approaches to those programs which represent important investments in our communities and our people.

Kind regards.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Mark O. Hatfield
United States Senator

MOH/sch
7097

cc - Eugene Register-Guard and Portland Oregonian

Reference: My paper of June, 1993 entitled "[Redacted]"

[Redacted] sent to approximately 150 addressees. How do we break into the mind-set inside the beltway with four 2/3 of us voted in November? How has that gotten lost?

PRINTED ON RECYCLED PAPER

*Is anyone hearing my frustration, resentment, and anger?
Sincerely, don't want to be lied to anymore!*

which have been allowed to stand by Lumps without questioning. They include: (1) "Cut spending first." He was not prepared to shut down, since it is such an important principle, a Republican President program for 12 years. These are the present, approximate budget expenditures: Entitlements - 50%; Military - 20%; Interest - 15%; all of the rest of the U.S. Government (the entire thing) - 15%. The point is that we could do away with the entire Federal Government, exclusive of military, and still have a deficit larger than the one that Dole's party (and Packwood and Hatfield) inherited in 1980. That magnitude of growth has not been disputed by Dole, Packwood, and Hatfield. Realistic deficit reduction will require both cuts ^{and} tax increases, of necessity, and regardless of party propaganda slogans. (2) "Interest savings are not to be counted as deficit reduction." They were counted for 12 years, with their co-operation and supervision. (3) "One can't count Congressional appropriation decreases in the future." They were counted that way for 12 years, with their co-operation and supervision. (4) "One can't count user fees as spending cuts." When fees are raised, the amount that must be allocated can be reduced. At least, that was the logic for 12 years under Republican Presidents, with their co-operation and supervision. (5) "We're voting for the taxpayers, not for gridlock." How has "Americans" and "tax-payers" become everybody when Clinton's program increases income taxes only on the top 5%, not everybody? (6) "We can't increase taxes on those we are asking to produce jobs for our people." I have made the point previously, that wealthy people aren't stupid enough to risk their energy and money in starting a new small business. (7) "The American people know whose on the side of the American people and American tax-payers." Again, he is saying the top 5% of tax-payers are the American people (to Dole, Packwood, and Hatfield, they are). Their view only leads out 19 out of 20 of us. I'm nearing 60; this is the first tax increase in my life that has fallen on the wealthy, more than me, relative to my ability (not counting the Reagan "adjustments for over-doing"). The Clinton program is an extremely good deal for 19 out of 20 of us (everyone except the top 5% whom Dole, Packwood, and Hatfield represent). (8) Raising taxes has never worked to help an economy. How could Dole, Packwood, and Hatfield know?; this is the first time the bottom 19 out of 20 of us can keep our money in circulation.

These are only the most prominent, unquestioned points; I have one more: Has Lumps' income rates affected their journalism?

Sincerely, H. Diggs
 Samuel H. Diggs
 P.S. What are the salaries of the persons appearing on your call-in programs, C-Span staff and other media personalities?

Dole, Gramm, Gingrich, Limbaugh, Armer, and Bennett, I didn't ask you to recite your ingrained superstitions. I asked "what are the empirical results; the data of history, the facts that one can glean from at least a cursory observation of that history?" These are the facts: (1) In spite of 12 years of massive transfers to the wealthy (Ref: p. 12-18 of my June, 1993 paper), there was no increase in the rate of investment. If one considers the new, huge pools of money (not capital, but money), the rate of investment in the U.S. went down (Lou Dobbs doesn't tell us about the decreased rates of U.S. investment, so I don't know the exact amounts), (2) the amount of refinery capacity in the U.S. did not go up, but went down drastically (Lou Dobbs does not tell us about our reduced refinery capacity, so I don't know the exact losses we incurred), and (3) our machine tool production capacity did not go up, but went down drastically (Lou Dobbs does not tell us about our reduced machine tool capacity, so I don't know the exact losses we incurred). In Lou Dobbs, Dole's, Gramm's, Gingrich's, Limbaugh's, Armer's, and Bennett's superstitious, little, abstract world, our real reduced rates of investment (versus money available), our real reduced refining capacity, and our real reduced tool-making capacity are irrelevant to an industrial economy. So much for science.

Lumps share that superstitious, little, abstract world-view and, hence, automatically buy Dole's assertions about our situation, condition, and agenda. They fail to see to ask the simplest of questions "Where did the money go?" If the theology doesn't explain where the money went, how do we have to change that superstitious, little, abstract world-view to correspond with reality? Instead of accepting the prescribed, superstitious "truths" of production reality, let me say again succinctly: There are no necessary connections between pools of money and progress of our production system (Ref: p. 32-43 of my June 1993 paper for more empirical data, particularly p. 34-36 and 40).

I will close this paper by noting some examples of Dole's hypocrisy and double standards (and Packwood's and Hatfield's)

We voted to do something about our problems and the economy besides cut taxes on the wealthy, which plainly doesn't work. The top 5% in income can buy their way out of the problems; the other 95% of us can't. So we don't have a choice; we have to seek solutions (for 95% of us).

The theology of money holds that salvation occurs when we cut taxes on the wealthy, which creates large pools of money which the wealthy then rush out to invest in new, small businesses, thereby causing manna from heaven to fall on all. What would you do if all of a sudden you had \$1,000,000 tax-free? I am sure you would rush out to find a situation where you could expend 60 to 90 hours a week and then after that energy expenditure, be 90% assured of losing the whole wind! The theology of money assumes wealthy people are stupid! And they are not, of course; they would do exactly what you would do: after spending a little "mad money," they would invest in T-Bills or Bonds, JGB's, Tax-Free Municipals, a few listed stocks maybe, depending upon one's daring, etc. So how do Lou Dobbs, Dole, Gramm, Gingrich, Simbaugh, and Bennett in good conscience recite the catechism? And how do Lumps pass on the Preaki's regurgitations unquestioningly and with a straight face?

Let me approach the theology of money scientifically (sic). A contemporary, industrialized economy requires huge energy inputs; in our era, that non-renewable source is primarily petroleum. The ability to handle and refine petroleum is central to our economy. Additionally, an industrialized economy depends most fundamentally upon the ability to design and manufacture tools themselves, that is, the hard, manipulation stuff required for manufacturing anything. So, in advance one can correlate increases in investment in both fundamental categories with progress in the production system.

The Reagan Reaction of 1980 assumes that cutting taxes on the wealthy will greatly aid our production system by increasing investment by the wealthy in it. So, what are the empirical results of the raids on the treasury by the wealthy in the 80's? Please notice Lou Dobbs,

doing. Were I to compare them to a comedy team, the Lumps act as straight men for the Preaks. It is their function to ask or declare the prescribed and proper questions and answers according to the Preaks' agendas. If one wanted to be not quite as kind, one would say "Lumps are in bed with Preaks." Remember what L, V, M, and P mean! Remember what "Preak" means! And apply "ignorance" to both!

I explained Preaks' ignorance in my June, 1993 paper as the result of three failures: (1) to read or analyze for comprehending and understanding (instead of editing for propaganda), (2) to treat materials and meanings logically (according to logical rules without informal or formal fallacies), and (3) to apply appropriate truth tests, to check for truth (instead of taking truth for granted in passing it along). The three failures comprise approximately the lessons one learns in the epistemology portion of an Introductory Philosophy course. I there named Rush Limbaugh as the perfect example of an ignorant Preak and showed how he violates all three epistemological dictums (Ref: p. 27-32). I also named, and showed why, Newt Gingrich and Bill Bennett as perfect examples of ^{ignorant} P's in History and Philosophy. And I made this point about their differences: Rush Limbaugh has plainly never read for understanding anything of any import nor has he ever taken logic. That is, he has not been exposed to knowledge. But Gingrich and Bennett have had years-long exposure in university settings and do not have that excuse. Neither do Lumps have an excuse since they also have had high exposure. The question is: How can Lumps with such high exposure be so ignorant? and the only answer I've been able to derive is the one above: Lumps have the three epistemological and logical failures that Preaks have. and those failures have resulted in our national dialogue's parameters being changed completely since last November's election.

Two-thirds (not counting the south) voted against Reagan/Bush Trickle-Down and against the Gridlock that reactionary theology causes. We didn't vote to "cut spending first." We didn't vote to "cut the deficit first."

seemingly question (i.e. Brit Hume) focus on the trivial and irrelevant! Brit Hume is a Lump (by my definition). Other Lumps of the national TV culture are: Dan Rather, Tom Brokaw, Peter Jennings, Connie Chung, David Brinkley, John Chancellor, Sam Donaldson, etc. Lumps more associated with ^{the} Inside-the-Beltway culture are: Susan Spencer, Wolf Blitzer, Andrea Mitchell, Charlie Rose, Gloria Borger, Bernard Shaw, Gene Gibbons, Gwen Ifill, Jack Germond, Margaret Olson, David Broder, Susan Page, Michael Kinsley, etc. I list here only enough persons to make this point: Lumps do not question the effect on the bottom 95% of us of the economic class warfare initiated by the Reagan Reaction of 1980, nor do they question the future effects on our nation of our present disastrous trends. It's as if they did not have children or grand-children; or perhaps they are not on the same planet with us. Perhaps they've been beamed up! (Ref: p. 12-18 of my June, 1993 paper for beginning analysis of our trends). I expect Lumps to begin really questioning Breaks (My Expectations: Ref. p. 31-33, 38, 40, 41, 43 of my June 1993 paper). (If you find this paper worthwhile, please reproduce as many copies as you can afford and pass along to whomever you think appropriate).

From examining my two lists of persons, that of Breaks on p. 2 and that of Lumps above, one can distinguish an ideological difference. Lumps are not theoretically adverse to solving social problems of the status quo; they are just ignorant in their focus on our real problems and our situation. They are content to allow Breaks to define the problems and the focus of discourse and dialogue. They have no apparent base or background from which to delve into non-trivial issues and positions. When a Break defines a trivial issue as important, Lumps unquestioningly jump aboard for the feeding frenzy (We have to sell newspapers and TV advertising, too!). If I may borrow from Simbaugh (Refs p. 5, 8, 13, 14, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 41 of my June, 1993 paper) (He's my favorite Break!), and then make an analogy: Communists are Liberal Democrats who know what they are doing; Breaks are Lumps who know what they are

organisms whose bodies have become so crystallized (set; hardened) that they can't change even for survival of family, community, children, grand-children, future generations, etc. That is not conservative; that is reactionary to the core! The Reactionary Activists on my previous list are "ignorant" Preaks (by my definitions), since I have dismissed "moral depravity" as a cause for their position; some explanation for their behavior is required.

The existence of the ignorant Preak mind-set does not explain the Inside-the-Beltway culture's focus on the trivial and irrelevant. I documented in my June, 1993 paper the importance of this Administration being successful in reversing the 13-year Reagan Reaction trends (Ref: p. 12-18). I also documented a history of the 60's and 70's against which the most aberrant form of the theology of money was a reaction (Ref: p. 6-12). The knowledge contained in elucidation of both themes is of a general nature; all persons living through those periods know, except for the more specialized academic readings, the material of both themes. So why isn't that understanding reflected in the behavior of the analysts, talking heads, and media reporters and gurus of the Inside-the-Beltway culture? Why are they focused on travel offices, haircuts, false interpretations of nominee's writings, and one-up-manship "gotcha" questions? But Hume's question is a logical extension of four months of attempting to assassinate an Administration with focus on the trivial and irrelevant; from whom are they taking their clue?

The only people with anything to gain by killing the Administration's efforts are Preaks, the self-appointed preservers and protectors (not conservers of the best) of the status quo, on behalf of the top 5% of income; Preaks don't want the 13-year reactionary trends reversed. But Hume is ignorant of his role as accessory in the assassination attempt. These ignorant, unquestioning accessories occur in all fields Inside-the-Beltway, so I've defined another technical term I need for exposition. Lobbyists, Unquestioning persons, Media persons, and Politicians, all accessories of the Preaks, are "Lumps." These persons pass along Preaks' assertions unquestioned; some who

Most of us are now in favor of beginning to look at our problems and to attempt solving them in a realistic way. We want the present disastrous trends initiated by the Reagan Reaction of 1980 reversed. If one excludes the southern states' votes, the percentage who voted against Trickle-Down and against Gridlock jumps to about two-thirds, an overwhelming mandate for change of those things (I will amplify both changes later). I notified my two Senators (and my permanent home state Senators) of our votes and of my understanding that they were on the wrong side on both of those basic election outcomes. Senator Packwood ~~did not respond; Senator Hatfield did~~ ^{responded the day I went to print} (His letter is on the last page as an Enclosure). This is probably the last chance, the last Administration, that we will have to reverse the present disastrous trends. I don't understand how my Senators can be that blind, or insensitive, or morally depraved, etc., so I explain it as "ignorance."

Bob Packwood and Mark Hatfield could not disregard the votes of two-thirds of their constituents in a major national election were they not receiving lots of support, nurture, and re-inforcement in furthering their electoral subversion. The individuals on my previous list are not isolated individuals but are part of a social whole, a culture existing Inside-the-Beltway, of which Packwood and Hatfield are parts. Or, to put my observation more succinctly, Packwood and Hatfield could not be disregarding the votes of two-thirds of their constituents were they being opposed or brought to task for such behavior in their social setting there. They are not being opposed there; they aren't even being questioned there about their behavior. But there are lots of people Inside-the-Beltway who don't naturally fall into the grouping of people on my previous list, ^{the} Reactionary Activists. So what are they doing? Why aren't they questioning Packwood and Hatfield about their behavior? Again, I have no other explanation except "ignorance."

I used two technical terms in my June, 1993 paper:
 (1) ignorant (p. 27) - standard dictionary definition, and
 (2) Break - a Reactionary Activist (p. 19-20) - one who has evolved culturally and philosophically from being Conservative to being Reactionary to being Reactionary Activist; host

that of the theology of money. The focus on this abstract realm has become a religion, a blind faith in money's productive capacity: money produces, not people with hands and skills, just money. In my June, 1993 paper, I noted the catechism of the faithful in many places (Ref: p. 3, 4, 11, 12-13, 29, 35, 42, 43). I introduced the tenets of the metaphysical system, the theology of money, on p. 23. And I showed how the concept of their god, money, was flawed (Ref: p. 37-43 for the evolution of the term "capital" and p. 40 for some empirical facts concerning our present permanent war economy, Melman's term).

In my June paper I named some Reactionary Activists in many fields: American Spectator (Tyrell), Aronson, Bennett, Boren, Buchanan, Buckley (National Review), Charon, Doherty, Dole, Doran, Falwell, Gingrich, Gramm, Hatch, Helms, Hollins, Hutchison, Kassenbaum, Kemp, Kennedy, Kistler, Latta, Limbaugh (my favorite Break-Next page for definition), Lott, Sugar, Martin, Mr. Fairlane, Michel, Miller (Jim), National Review (Buckley), North, Novak, O'Connor, Perot, Poindexter, Quayle, Rehnquist, Robertson, Roth, Rudman, Scalia, Simpson, Sauter, Sununu, Swaggart, Thomas, Thurman, Walker, Wallop, and Washington Times (Pruden). I inadvertently left out Thomas (Cal), Tsongas (Chief Democratic Trickle-Downer), Kinchlow, Will, Weber, Cheney, Martin, Evans, Barnes, Kirkpatrick (whose international political philosophy is somewhere to the right of Attila the Hun), Mr. Laughlin, etc. I could name more political and academic figures, but I think you get the idea. It speaks to the depth of the fault line occurring in these people's psyches that most on the list would consider it a distinct honor to be on such a list of notables. These people are not conservative; they are reactionary to the core. I am conservative, and yet progressive; there is no contradiction in the two terms. (Ref: my background p. 20^{22, 24}, 29)

Notice that most on the list are political and media figures located Inside the Beltway (or near); the political and media culture existing there is most responsible for thwarting the will of the 62% nationally who voted against Reagan/Bush Trickle-Down and against Gridlock.

A Follow-Up Letter

Dear Brian Lamb & C-Span Producers,

I sent you in early June my paper of June, 1993, entitled "The Progressive Reactionary Distinction in Human Affairs". Its primary point was this: What is now called conservative is not conservative at all; it is reactionary to the core. I am conservative, but also progressive. These two terms are not contradictory.

(Ref: my background - p. 20²²⁻²⁴). The progressive-reactionary distinction in human affairs is the primary one now in relation to problem-solving, not left-right or liberal-conservative, both of which distinctions have become highly ambiguous in United States usage and can no longer be used for productive dialogue and discussion. Both meanings are tilted too far to the right.

I am following up on that communication and paper sent to you because you have not responded. I did, and do, expect acknowledgement of receipt of my paper even if you don't have the 3 or 4 hours available immediately for a straight-through reading and note-taking. I guarantee to you that it will be worth your intellectual effort and energy when you do get the time. Did it get to you through your office bureaucracy? If you disagree with certain of its points, I am open to your constructive criticism and opening of dialogue concerning them. If you agree generally with the "stance" of the paper, I would like that re-inforcement also; my effective response to Reactionary Activism will be social.

This evolution in the post WWII period from Conservative to Reactionary to Reactionary Activist has gone largely un-noticed in our public media; hence, my paper points it out and documents it in many ways. The fundamental Reactionary Activist mind-set is adverse to recognizing any problems in the status quo. And since we are at a critical juncture in our nation's history that requires us to change our present disastrous trends, that mind-set is deadly for our system. Change isn't a nice thing; it is a necessary thing. This mind-set is a virulent social disease, and persons having this social disease have replaced their search for truth as to how things are with a focus on an abstract realm already deemed true by faith.

[REDACTED]
Eugene, OR. 97404



EUGENE OR 974 07-07-93 20:51 DCR # 1

Brian Lamb
C-Span
400 Capitol Ave. Suite #650
Washington, D.C. 20001