

S-WJ

DANBURY, CT 06811

Sept. 18, 1995

Dear Mr. Lamb:

Bravo to you for making it public that today's guest, Maureen Ouch of Vanity Fair, is married to Tim Russett. This is the impetus for my letter.

I'd get up in the middle of the night to see the program on which you provide a list of husband and wife "teams" actively involved in the media, print and electronic, whose reporting, analysis, etc enter

our homes. "Linkage" is important for the private citizen to evaluate reporting and commentary. I wish you would do it.

On a different topic brought up by a listener today, single-issue voting, I don't think it's as black or white as your response implied. There is a third alternative. To: 1- a capable candidate, pro-choice
2- an incapable candidate, pro-life
please add: 3- 2 capable candidates, one pro-choice and one pro-life.

I would say that most people will vote for a capable candidate vs an incapable one. If both happen to be capable, then the single-issue of abortion is a decider.

When abortion arises again as a topic of discussion, I would like you to keep in

"centrist?" Why "pau?"

So many of your listeners who call in or fax-in are expressing impatience as well as dissatisfaction with the political "status-quo" in America. From your observations, does anyone in Washington truly comprehend the climate outside the Beltway? Band-aids are not enough.

I do wish that you would bring up the question of "cost-of living areas" to the politicians espousing mans-testing for anything. Also applicable ~~are~~ income tax, student loans, etc. A vast number of people must live in high cost-of-living areas, yet their income equals those of people living in lower cost-of-living areas. Perhaps this could be a topic for debate?

Sincerely,

mind two things. 1- most people are pro-choice in that the woman has the right to choose pregnancy. Pro-lifers agree with this.

However, 2- when conception occurs, pro-lifers believe the choice period is over and another human life, the product of human conception, has the inalienable right to continue to live in the womb and then on the outside. This is a normal life cycle.

As Mr. Clinton and Sen. Powell call for abortion to be safe, available and rare, please concentrate on the "rare." Why "rare" if abortion is morally, legally and socially acceptable? Is it dangerous for the woman? Overly expensive? Embarrassing? Morally repugnant? Economically short-sighted? Why "rare"? Politically correct and