

Ref: p. 384 - Treats, philosophical and sociological mutants from Conservatism to Reactionary Activism, are carriers of a virulent social disease, the inability or unwillingness to solve (or even to see) social problems with social resources. The unsolved problems of the social body will as surely "eat away and kill" the social body as surely as cancer "eats away and kills" a personal physical body.

Ref: p. 7 - UWSA's response to my 2 communications to Rose Perot.

Ref: 8-10 - My response for Rose to UWSA's response.

by: [REDACTED] © AUGUST, 1993, 10 PAGES

Summary of My Evolving Attempt at Basic Dialogue

Dear Brian Lamb & Producers,

I am having very little success in getting a dialogue begun Inside-the-Beltway concerning our real national historical situation and problems. Perhaps, that is because most people now consider hand-written papers, letters, and manuscripts unworthy automatically rather than being a mark of higher literacy; that mistake is increasingly made since WWII. Or perhaps, most persons simply do not now have time to read anything of any length, even if important in their profession or personal life. Or perhaps, finally, since it is unprinted and, hence, can't be on the NY Times or Washington Post best-seller lists, it couldn't possibly be considered worth reading. For whatever reasons, my success is limited to my personal therapy, that of giving voice to some concerns, frustrations, resentments, and anger. That is sufficient success for my writing one more paper, but is not what I intended when I began attempting to influence the dialogue Inside-the-Beltway.

Ref: My June, 1993 paper entitled [REDACTED]

(JN'93) (44 pp.).

(109)
(JL)

Ref: My July, 1993 paper entitled [REDACTED]

The ignorance emanating from Inside-the-Beltway is highly detrimental to the well-being, development, and evolution of not only all Americans but of all citizens of Spaceship Earth, crew-members and passengers of all classes (Boulding's? "paradigm"). Some explanation for focusing upon and passing along the false, deceptive, superficial, trivial, and irrelevant is required. I explain it as ignorance rather than as intentional deception, moral depravity, or selling out because of higher, media income levels. Most of my younger friends think it is the latter.

"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'. 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)." (JL'93, p. 627). This is one way in which I explained the November electoral result, my expression of Stan Greenberg's findings in his recent poll concerning Perot supporters. We didn't vote for Perot or Clinton as much as we voted against Trickle-Down, and Gridlock, and the unsolved problems those have contributed to and caused. There's a good reason why the dictum "Just fix it" caught on. Since the election, Perot has wandered off of these three themes and is now pursuing some agenda that I do not understand. He has had the opportunity to support some efforts which are probably the best that can be attempted in the present practical, political climate; he has chosen instead to throw grenades. I wrote him notifying him of my disappointment with his actions in relation to his words of the campaign; he is among the 150 addressees to whom I sent the two previously referenced papers. Plainly, no one in Dallas read, heard, or listened to what I had to say. I enclose a copy of the form response from UWSA and my response to the form letter as Enclosure #1, p. 7-10. I have sent my response by certified mail, return receipt requested. I have been hoping that he would become supportive and engaged. At least my Senators, Hatfield and Packwood, responded, even though with "snow," and deception and double-standards.

Another way of expressing ^{the} 1992 electoral outcome is this from JL'93, p. 2 & 3: "Notice that most on the list I had lists and definitions in the paper: 'Break' list, p. 2; 'Break' definition, p. 1 & 2, 3 & 4; 'Lump' list, p. 5; 'Lump' definition, p. 4 & 5; 'Break', 'Lump', and 'ignorant' are my only technical terms) 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. 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 these things." Both expressions I have quoted from my previous paper capture, I think, the central meanings of last November's electoral outcome. So, how has these meanings of our electoral outcome gotten lost in the Inside-the-Beltway culture? It's as if Freaks and Lumps didn't live through the election with us or that, somehow, their memory of our national history has become clouded since then for some reason.

Most of the explanation for focusing on trivia away from our two electoral outcomes resides, I believe, in this fact I've observed: "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: JN'93, p. 20, 22, 24, 29). 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's meanings are tilted too far to the right," (JN'93, p. 1), so far right that our left is way far right than any other industrialized country's right. The new Canadian (Conservative) Prime Minister is trying to preserve and extend a national, single-payer medical system. Helmut Kohl in Germany, John Major in Great Britain, etc. all preside over national, single-payer health care systems, a major plank of a social safety net platform of their Conservative parties. In their systems (everywhere except the U.S.), that is Conservative. That position is way left of our Liberal Democrats; i.e., their Conservatives would be our Socialists or Communists. When Conservatives become Socialists, it's time to junk the schema and begin using progressive-reactionary as our fundamental distinction. We must begin calling our anti-social mind-set what it is: Reactionary Activist, not conservative, just Freakish. The primary distinction now in human affairs is between those willing to look at and solve social problems which will require social resources, progressives, and those not willing to look at and solve social problems, reactionaries. Real liberals and conservatives are both progressive in my scheme; I am conservative, yet progressive (Ref: JN'93, p. 20, 22, 24, 29; my background). The philosophic mutants who have changed from conservative to reactionary to reactionary activist are Freaks, carriers of a philosophic anti-

social disease comparable in a social body to that of cancer in a personal body; it is deadly to the social body eventually in that problems will continually eat away the social body, so to speak. Breaks must be isolated; they are carriers of a virulent social disease. ^{I am} speaking here of national, social health, prophylaxis. This category of persons includes Bob Dale and Ross Perot. Hey, Bob and Ross, our social problems are too serious for your game-playing! You're old enough to be grown up by now. Grow up, Bob! Grow up, Ross! Get real, Bob! Get real, Ross!

The other main grouping of persons besides Breaks Inside-the-Beltway are Lumps (excluding the natives, primarily southeast). I have explained both's not focusing upon our fundamental problems as ignorance. Breaks are doubly ignorant; their philosophy and world-view preclude social problem solving; hence, they are either ignorant conservatives or liberals by my schema, but not reactionaries. I am conservative, yet progressive (cf: p. 20, 22, 24, 29 - my background; JN'93), and not quite as ignorant as I was. The distinction is best seen by skiving the Break list, p. 2 of JL'93, and the Lump list, p. 5 of JL'93. I suspect that most of on the Lump list would consider themselves as knowledgeable liberal progressives, certainly not ignorant. In fact, they are ignorant and some may even be Breaks in hiding (Leher, Koppel, etc.).

"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 Breaks, are Lumps. These persons pass along Breaks' assertions unquestioned; some who seemingly question (i.e. Brit Hume) focus on the trivial and irrelevant. Brit Hume is a Lump by my definition (JL'93, p. 425)." 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 Limbaugh (JN'93 Ref: p.5, 8, 13, 14, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, and 41; he's my favorite Break!), and then make an analogy: Communists are Liberals who know what they are doing; Breaks are Lumps who know what they are doing. Were I to compare them to a comedy team, the Lumps act as straight men for the Breaks. It is their function to ask or declare the prescribed and proper questions and answers according to the Breaks' agendas. If one wanted to be not quite as kind, one would say 'Lumps are in bed with Breaks.' Remember what 'L', 'U', 'M', and 'P' mean! Remember what 'Break' means! And apply 'ignorance' to both. (JL'93, p. 526).

"The question is: How can Lumps (and Breaks) with such high exposure (to universities, knowledge, and learning situations) be so ignorant? And the only answer I've been able to devise is the one above: Lumps have the three epistemological failures (JL'93, p.6) and the logical failures (JN'93, p. 27-30) that Breaks have. And those failures have resulted in our national dialogue's parameters having been changed completely since last November's election" (JN'93, p.6). We have shifted away from our electoral focus against Trickle-Down and Gridlock into one of trivia, haircuts, firings, "gotcha" questions, etc. There is seemingly no recognition that the present disastrous trends must be reversed for the benefit of all. Instead we hear "cut taxes first," "keep taxes off of the table," etc.

Of what are Breaks and Lumps ignorant? "Lumps (and Breaks) do not question the effect on the bottom 95% of us of the economic (macro-economic through taxation) 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." (JL'93, p.5). I attempted in my last communication with Ross Perot to lay out that general situation more definitively (Enclosure #1, p. 7-10 of this paper, particularly p. 8-10; if you read nothing else, much of this paper, read that part). I introduced there what I call "our socio-economic focus" (particularly p. 10 - L. Other). I had already introduced a critical analysis of the science (sic) of economics in JN'93. "I noted the catechism of the faithful in many places (Breaks'

recitations 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. 2 & 3 (also JL 93, p. 7-9 for two refutations). 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). (JL 93, p. 2). (Also JN 93, History, p. 6-12 & trends, p. 12-18).

I have treated the "economic part" of our socio-economic focus to the degree I can in this space (I have referenced much material from my two previous papers, JN 93 & JL 93). I also want to introduce the "socio part" by noting some social problems and the fact that nowhere will get one get a good treatment of them by Breake or Lumps. Ignorance again? As in the case of our real economic situation?

I have surveyed some of our social problems to the degree I can with no help from Breake and Lumps Inside-the-Beltway. My most basic findings are: (1) What should be high is low and what should be low is high, (2) the should-be-high things that are low are trending lower at a higher rate, and (3) the should-be-low things that are high are trending higher at a higher rate. These spell social disaster this generation if large resources are not committed. As in the case of the real economic trends and the rates of rates, Breake and Lumps display no knowledge nor interest in them. I can do no more here than mention some rates of certain things as social indicators of a very sick social body: pre-natal care, infant mortality, child immunization, literacy for reading basic documents, older student test scores, those taking foreign languages, suicide rate, teen-age suicide rate, homicide, violent crime, violence in inner cities (spreading elsewhere), incarcerations, homeless, hunger, poverty, children in poverty, women in poverty, people with no health and medical care, one-adult families, no-adult families, runaway children, child abuse, wife abuse, elderly abuse, children on the street, etc. This isn't a complete list, why isn't there one that has the appropriate rates for each indicator which widely distributed and known? Only Breake and Lumps know why there isn't. Ignorance?



(7 of 10)
Enclosure #1
(1 of 4)

UNITED WE STAND AMERICASM

P.O. Box 516087
Dallas, Texas 75251

June 30, 1993

GREENVILLE TX 75401

Dear [REDACTED]

We have recently received your comments and ideas on United We Stand America. The volume of suggestions and support we have received has been far greater than we could have ever imagined. Thank you for your time and effort. The information you have sent will contribute to the interactive information we will use to analyze our members' views on a variety of issues.

Your interest and input are important to the success of UWSA. It is our firm belief that, through the energy of individuals such as yourself, we can continue to have a positive, constructive impact on our government which cannot be ignored by our elected officials.

Currently, UWSA organizations in all fifty states are forming groups of active members at the state, city, county and Congressional district levels. We encourage you, if you have not already done so, to join the group in your area. If you are unable to locate your state's office, please call the UWSA Information Center at (214) 960-9100.

Our strength is in our numbers. Therefore, we have enclosed two membership applications for you to share with your friends and family.

Thank you again for your important involvement.

Sincerely,

Joe J. Grant

Joe J. Grant
Correspondence Manager

UNITED WE STAND AMERICA, INC.

P.O. Box 6

Dallas, Texas 75221

ROSS, AS YOU'VE SAID "THE DEVIL IS IN THE DETAILS." YOU'VE NOT FACED THE DEVIL YET, ROSS. HE'S A MEAN "BOOGER." I STARTED LISTENING TO YOU WHEN YOU PROPOSED RAISING GAS TAXES SOME GALLON. YOU ARE THE FIRST PERSON (I THOUGHT) WHO WAS WILLING TO "FACE THE DEVIL." I've checked below [REDACTED] issues facing our country. I suggest we focus on these immediately. I am with you in the effort to bring about reform. hold our political leaders accountable AND HOLD ROSS PEROT & UWSA ACCOUNTABLE.

- A. ☒ Eliminate the deficit
- B. ☒ Implement the line item veto
- C. ☒ Pass a balanced budget amendment
- D. ☒ Prohibit foreign lobbyists and foreign political contributions
- E. ☒ Reform our healthcare system
- F. ☒ Make our educational system the finest in the world
- G. ☒ Develop fair free trade agreements
- H. ☒ Make "Made in the USA" the world's standard of excellence

- I. ☒ Rebuild our cities
 - J. ☒ Get rid of waste, fraud and abuse in the federal government
 - K. ☒ Prohibit "cashing in" on prior government service
 - L. ☒ Other: TOO MANY TO BE ENUMERATED; SEE LIST OF SOCIAL INDICATORS (p.6) FOR BEGINNING EFFORTS.
- DON'T WAIT UNTIL 1995 OR

1997. START HELPING. STOP THROWING GRENADES. GET IN AND START ROWING. YOU ARE LOSING CREDIBILITY, ROSS. THE DEVIL IS IN THE DETAILS: YOU'VE NOT FACED THE DEVIL YET, ROSS. BELOW IS MY FACING OF THE DEVIL.

Dear Ross,

I am greatly disappointed with your actions in relation to your words of the 1992 campaign. I told you that before in two communications, each containing one of my papers. I have finally received in response the preceding polite letter from UWSA which plainly means that no one in Dallas is hearing (or even reading) any negative criticism or question. I understand from your response that I am now counted by UWSA as among the faithful; I am not and you would know that had anyone read my communications (or papers). I understand that my attempt will probably again not get to you, or to influence you if it does. But it will be good expressive therapy for me; I'm trying.

I am disappointed with your behavior because you've done nothing but throw grenades at a very critical time in this new Administration. We can't wait until 1997 for action and we can't change Presidents until then. I'm also disappointed because you've spelled nothing out specifically but just keep saying "Just fix it" and "you understand"? Ross, who doesn't want it fixed? You've not followed through on "How?". Here is my "facing of the devil" (Notice my preceding send-in card).

A. Eliminate the Deficit - Deficit reduction and Medical reform are merely means, not ends in themselves, for beginning to get our economic house in order. Of the current budget entitlements are approximately 50%, the military is 20%, and interest is 15%. The entire federal government, exclusive of the military, the balance of the budget, is 15%. If one eliminates the entire federal government, one still has an annual deficit larger than the one Bob Dole and Reagan/Bush took over in 1980. It is not possible to eliminate the deficit except by a combination of spending cuts and tax increases. "Cut spending first" is deceitful. Ross, the sooner you realize this arithmetic, the better off we will be. You should not be following Bob Dole and the Republicans in this; they aren't just shooting themselves in the foot but are blowing off both legs. $50\% + 20\% + 15\% = 85\%$; $100\% - 85\% = 15\%$; $15\% \times \$1.5 \text{ trillion} = \$22 \text{ trillion} = \$220 \text{ billion}$; $\$325 \text{ billion (S.S.) minus } \$220 \text{ billion (the entire federal government) equals } \$105 \text{ billion left-over deficit}$; $\$105 \text{ billion left-over deficit minus } \$60 \text{ billion deficit in 1980 equals } \$45 \text{ billion more deficit now than in 1980 after eliminating the entire federal government.} Ross, I expect$

a grade-schooler to be able to do the arithmetic on this level. So why shouldn't I expect you and Bob Dole to be doing your arithmetic on a grade-school level? Prescriptions of "cut spending first," "cut the deficit first," etc. are rationalizations for inaction, Republican Party propaganda slogans, and/or reactionary ideological dictums, all of which we've had for 12 years, Ross. That's exactly what two-thirds of us voted against: Reagan/Bush Trickle-Down and Gridlock. We can't wish the arithmetic away, Ross.

B.C. - Tine Stem Veto and Balanced Budget Amendment - These are excuses for allowing our elected representatives to escape responsibility.

D. Prohibit foreign lobbyists and foreign political contributions - Ross, you left out the biggest problem, our own lobbyists inside the Beltway. As long as legislators have to raise the amounts of money they do to run, we have big problems with lobbyists, fat cats, the wealthy, etc. The only way to solve partially the lobbying/campaigning/cash/government reform problem is to have public financing for federal offices. Nothing short of that gives us back our government, Ross. We can't really own it until then.

E. Reform our healthcare system - This is another problem (arithmetic) you don't seem to understand (and Hillary Clinton from what I've heard). The biggest immediately realizable savings in healthcare is in the "cost-overlay" part of the medical system, paper work, checking and cross-checking, insuring and re-insuring, claiming, duplicating, accounting, reminding, etc. That part approximates 20% of the total \$900 billion annual cost, \$180 billion. Ross, this is a fact we can't change in our present system: One-fifth is paperwork. Do not nibble around the edges, we have to go to a national standards, single-payer by state, system. Nothing less can appreciably cut but the paper-work and garbage. I wish immediate, large savings were somewhere else, but they aren't. If we incorporate the 37,000,000 people that presently don't have care, we're going to need from \$50 to \$100 billion. If we can cut half of the "cost overlay" part of the system of \$180 billion, we will have about the required amount for coverage of all. Ross, these are the numbers which we can't do anything about. Do you mean to include everybody when you say "health care reform"?

If you do, you can't get away from this arithmetic. If you don't, why not? What's the purpose of your reform?
F. G. H. I. J. - Make our educational system the finest in the world, develop fair free trade agreements, make "Made in the USA" the world's standard of excellence, rebuild our cities, and get rid of waste, fraud, and abuse in the federal government. Ross, how could I disagree (or any Democrat, Republican, Socialist, Independent, or anything else)? You've said nothing to distinguish yourself from what Clinton is attempting to do in this 4-year period. The "devil is in the details" and you're now (since the election) leaving out the devil, the 50¢/gallon increase in price. I have dozens of ideas on all of these points; do you? What are they? Start helping in this 4-years and quit throwing grenades! 1997-2001 is another 4-year period and whether we have a Democrat or Republican as President, we will still need to continue working on all of these problems from where Clinton can get us to in the meantime (I believe Clinton will probably be re-elected).

K. Prohibit "cashng in" on prior government service - Clinton made a big first step; you didn't support him.

L. Other - Deficit reduction and healthcare reform are just means, not ends, for attempting to begin getting our economic house in order. The rest of the industrialized world already have "social needs" economies which mean that they are situated long term for economic competition in the 21st century. We are not so situated. We have been (and are still) organized as a "permanent war" economy (Seymour Melman's term) in the post-WWII "battle against Communism." Our socio-economic focus for half a century has been an external one, a geopolitical one. We are the sole industrialized power remaining with that focus since the collapse of the Soviet Union. All of the others have had a half-century internal socio-economic focus and development, a production for social needs rather than permanent war. We are at a huge disadvantage socially for the long-term competition of the 21st Century (the above areas and problems are examples of some deficiencies). Can we reverse the declining incomes, job losses, personal and social security, middle-class deterioration, lower-class deterioration bordering on the criminal^{ity}? It seems that you've lost that focus since the election, Ross, and that you are no longer in the game for some reason. Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
Eugene, OR. 97404



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

Personal:
Important Summary &
VOTE "AYE" REASONS