

So here is the second issue. The formatting has improved greatly, at least so far as the typing goes, anyway. Thank you to all of you who responded to my challenge of last issue; those responses will appear later. If I have the time and energy I may even retype them. It is truly amazing what a word processor does to an aversion toward typing. Also in this issue are answers to some of the questions concerning the game, a copy of the seven basic issues for those of you who haven't gotten a copy yet, and a deadline for the opening moves. I still don't like calling them moves; do we have any better suggestions out there?

Let me start with the answers to a few questions I have received. First up is Mark Lattelere:

Who is the elected official? ((Dave Frick is an Alderman for the newly created city of Meadows, Texas, population about 2000. I had the privilege of acting as his campaign manager in a very close battle which he won by eleven votes. He won in a recount, since the original tally showed a tie.))

How will the convention work to select the Pres. and V.P. candidates? ((The players will each cast a ballot for the number of delegates they control, and the convention will assume as their platform the issue stands of the Presidential candidate.))

New players entering the game after week one deadline has been set? ((No. It wouldn't be completely unrealistic and not without precedent to allow late entries, but I can't figure out a way to let them start without inadvertently giving them a huge advantage.))

Further explanation of Houserule #2 on Organizations. ((I was hoping everyone would pretend to understand this one. OK, I will try an example. In Iowa the organization is worth 60 voter points. One weeks organization is good for 24 voter points. Two weeks of organization is worth 38, which is 24 for the first week and 14 (40% of (60 - 24)). Three weeks is worth 47, or 24 + 14 + 9. Thank God nobody asked about the Travel!))

What a great segue into Mr. Wilcox's interrogatories:

Can organizations be set up for the first caucuses? If so what is the cost and the benefit? ((Yes, we will have organizations for all the campaign stops. Add this to your rule books for this game only: Iowa: organization price: 10 cfp/week, voter points 60. Mississippi: Price 10 cfp/week, points 50. Oklahoma: Price 10 cfp/week, points 90.))

Can organization be set up prior to the beginning of the game? ((A well worded question that. Uh, yes. The opening moves required are the issue stands on the seven basic issues. Once I have received that I will announce the players, their party, their stands, and set a deadline for week one. The week one orders will include Organization for any and all states that you want, for any period of time that you desire. In other words, if you want you can announce that you have had an organization in New Hampshire for 15 weeks. Once that turn is over, however, that luxury is done with. You will need to submit a "check" to pay for each of your organizations, and set them up in advance. Should you want to have ten weeks of organization in California you need to tell me in week ten, and pay for it every week in between. The same will be true of the Travel. A candidate can start making campaign trips as early as ten weeks before the Iowa caucus. Actually they can travel for eight years before the Iowa caucus, but it won't do them any good beyond ten weeks. In order to keep all of you from spending two weeks in Des Moines or Oklahoma City I will add this stipulation: You must have organization set up in at least one state before any travel counts toward the game. If you want to travel ten weeks prior to Iowa, then you have to set up an organization someplace that same week. Not incredibly realistic, but it gets the job done.

Does it cost anything to enter the primaries? ((Yes, 20 cfp each. The caucus states, however, are free. Theoretically, the 20 cfp pay for the petitions necessary to get your name on the ballot, and there are no ballots in the caucuses.)) How will you determine the Time Factor? ((I will announce a date for everyone to check the Dow Jones. The last digit is the amount to add to the time factor; 0 counts as 0, not 10.))

How many weeks are there in 100 days? ((Smart ass.)) ((OK, we have had several questions on how to run the final election; I propose we table that issue until we get the game started. All in favor say Aye. The chair declares the motion to table passes. Next question.))

Explain the National Committee and how votes for that are figured. ((OK. The National Committee can be used to determine a number of things that may arise during the course of the game. Should any rule adjudication be questioned that I feel is open to interpretation it can be settled by the National Committee. Should no candidate get a majority of delegates by the time the convention rolls around, the N.C. can help determine a method to declare a winner, ie. refusing to seat the delegates of the last place candidate, thereby reducing the number that the winner needs for nomination. Obviously the leader in the N.C. members can be considered the early frontrunner. The N.C. will be made up of 100 delegates (two from each state, although that doesn't really make any difference) and will be apportioned according to the stands on the seven basic issues. National vote totals for these issues are as follows:

ISSUES	REPUBLICAN		DEMOCRAT	
	FOR	AGAINST	FOR	AGAINST
Windfall I	146	10	90	173
Nuclear Moratorium	23	121	112	133
Panama	25	132	196	68
Draft I	83	69	176	87
Alaska Lands	66	90	202	67
Busing Amendment	114	40	95	176
Chrysler	209	48	62	88

I will figure the number of committee members the same as I will for the voter points during the game, with each Republican candidate that is "for" the Windfall I issue splitting 146 votes evenly. After calculating all the issues, the totals are determined for each candidate and the results announced. Whichever candidate gets 26% of the vote gets 26 National Committee members as his puppets.))

And now a question that nearly everyone asked: "Are you talking about Stephen Douglas, or Frederick Douglass?" ((Stephen Douglass. I can't help it if the man spelled his name wrong. I am expecting to hear about this for about a year. So I didn't look it up. sue me! If that is the only misprint you people find, you aren't reading anything but the front inside cover.))

So much for the question and answer period. Deadline for the issue stands is October 15, 1984. Remember that you have to take a stand on at least 5 of the seven to qualify for National Committee members. Sorry it is taking so long. Included in this issue, with permission from the author, are the regional profiles for the states not included in your game sets, as well as the seven basic issues for those of you still waiting to get your books. If you still do not have a game set by the time you get this, write me (or call!) and I will get you one.

MY PHONE NUMBER IS (512) 926-5255

CALENDAR

Pregames: stands on the seven basic issues.

WEEK ONE: Organization for any amount of time and for any states. Deadline to declare candidacy in New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Florida. Media bids due for Iowa, Oklahoma, and Mississippi. Spotlight issues for Iowa, Oklahoma, and Mississippi. Travel for up to ten weeks (nine weeks plus this week) before week one caucuses.

WEEK TWO: Elections in Iowa, Oklahoma, and Mississippi. Declare candidacy for Illinois and Alabama. Media bids and Spotlight issues for New Hampshire. Continuation of any organizations set up and travel for each week will be due on a week to week basis from this point on.

WEEK THREE: Declare candidacy in New York. Media bids and Spotlight issues for Massachusetts. Election in New Hampshire.

WEEK FOUR: Declare candidacy in Wisconsin. Media bids and Spotlight issues for Florida. Election in Massachusetts.

WEEK FIVE: Declare candidacy in Louisiana, Indiana, and Pennsylvania. Media bids and Spotlight issues for Illinois and Alabama. Election in Florida.

WEEK SIX: Media bids and Spotlight issues for New York and the New England Regional Caucus. Elections in Illinois and Alabama.

WEEK SEVEN: Declare candidacy in Texas. Media bids and spotlight issues for Wisconsin. Elections in New York and New England Regional.

WEEK EIGHT: Declare candidacy in Virginia. Media bids and Spotlight issues for Louisiana and Indiana. Election in Wisconsin.

WEEK NINE: Declare candidacy in Michigan. Media bids and Spotlight issues for South Atlantic and Border States Regional caucuses. Elections in Louisiana and Indiana.

WEEK TEN: Declare candidacy in Maryland. Media bids and Spotlight issues for Pennsylvania. Elections in South Atlantic and Border States Regionals.

WEEK ELEVEN: Declare candidacy in California and Ohio. Media bids and Spotlight issues due for North Plains Regional. Election in Pennsylvania.

WEEK TWELVE: Declare candidacy in New Jersey. Media bids and Spotlight issues due for Virginia. Election in North Plains Regional.

WEEK THIRTEEN: Declare candidacy in Kentucky. Media bids and Spotlight issues for Texas. Election in Virginia.

WEEK FOURTEEN: Media bids and Spotlight issues for Rocky Mountain Regional. Election in Texas.

WEEK FIFTEEN: Media bids and Spotlight issues for Maryland. Elections in Rocky Mountain Regional.

WEEK SIXTEEN: Media bids and Spotlight issues for Kentucky. Elections in Maryland.

WEEK SEVENTEEN: Media bids and Spotlight issues for Pacific Regional. Election in Kentucky.

WEEK EIGHTEEN: Media bids and Spotlight issues for California, New Jersey, and Ohio. Election in Pacific Regional.

WEEK NINETEEN: Elections in California, New Jersey, and Ohio.

WEEK TWENTY: Conventions.

LETTER COLUMN

Several interesting and informative letters were received, and as of now I should be able to fit all of them in. Michael Lee suggested that for the letters sent in as constructive arguments, as opposed to rebuttals, I should hold off my response until the next issue. Although it is certainly within my editorial prerogative to answer immediately, I can understand the argument and even agree with it. So, the submissions sent as an original case will stand alone. Anything sent as an argument toward my article, however, may or may not have a response. One more note here that may raise a bit of controversy. I received my very first NFP letter, and I intend to honor the authors wishes. But from now on I do not want to get any more NFP letters. If you do not have the courage to back up your statements in front of the rest of the hobby, then I don't want to hear them. So from this point on any "Do not quote" or "Not for print" or any variation thereof will be ignored. Now, on to Mr. Lee's case for a vote for Walter Mondale.

CONSTRUCTIVES

When this campaign began I was ready to work for my favorite idealist, George McGovern, I realized that his candidacy was anything but destined for victory, however, the primary is a time to support your ideal candidate rather than a compromise. Anyway, after McGovern's withdrawal I began looking at the other democrats in depth. None of them fit my ideal but of the three I was drawn toward Gary Hart. With his defeat I am now an ardent supporter of Walter Mondale. Of the democrats he was not by any means my first choice but after the others were rejected I now stand by Reagan's opponent for the following reasons...

Mr. Mondale's speech of acceptance outlines a philosophy of leadership which captured the beauty of a hopeful future and the rationality of pragmatism. His outline of actions for the next four years convinced me that he would make a worthy precedent. He is committed to a nuclear freeze, committed to justice in Central America, and committed to social justice at home. I will discuss these four commitments individually.

In my opinion there is no more important issue in this election than an end to confrontationism between ourselves and the Soviets. There is no other way to release the tensions between us that to begin communicating with the goal of the communication being an end of nuclear proliferation. To those who say that we can never bargain with the Soviets, I say you are doomed. Fear and hatred must come to an end before our race does. The stakes are too high for us to go on pretending that might makes right. I have many friends who I correspond with in the USSR and I know that they are ready to make peace. Soviet people are demanding nuclear negotiations daily in Pravda. But how can they negotiate with Reagan? His religion of hatred is all too well known to them. I am not saying that they are any better than us what I am saying is that we need to work for a freeze and Mondale is clearly the only candidate that has a chance to achieve one.

I can't claim to understand modern economics. I can barely comprehend my own financial affairs, however, I know that in my home town Reagan has failed. High interest rates have severely damaged the timber industry leaving local unemployment sky high. The tax cut did not benefit those of us whose income is in the lower brackets. I can say that from first hand experience no matter what Reagan's yes men would have you believe. Mondale knows that a tax increase

is the only way to reduce the deficit and partially restore social programs like social security. If you think Reagan didn't cut social security--think again once again I speak from experience. Since my father died when I was sixteen I have seen my benefits dwindle to nothing. Students have been eliminated from benefits leaving my aspirations to attend a music conservatory shot. I realize that life does not owe me an education, however, when a man pays into a program for fifty years and then sees his heirs cut from that program something is wrong. Clearly Reagan sees higher education as the heirloom of the wealthy rather than the poor. I am confident that Mondale's program to cut military spending on nuclear weapons will benefit America's deserving poor in the long run. As I said, I'm no expert, but from my vantage point the trickle down doctrine is failed policy--although I'm sure that the wealthy would disagree.

In central American I see Mondale as a genuine hope for the future. He understands that the real cause of revolution in this region is the result of poverty and oppression not communism. Communism can not materialize where there is no injustice. This truth is one that can not be refuted--heaven knows the Republicans have tried everything to link Nicaragua and Cuba to the El Salvadoran left. But I ask you, did the CIA document a single foreign soldier in El Salvador other than Americans? No! Revolutions can not be thwarted when they have already won in the hearts and minds of the people. The Russian, Vietnamese, and American revolutions are evidence enough of this. In the hearts and minds of the people of Latin America that revolution has already been won. Let's acknowledge that and end Reagan's exportation of violence and tyranny. Mondale is clearly the candidate to establish order in Central America. As he said in his acceptance speech, the time has come to work for justice not through arms but through understanding.

Reagan's record on internal justice speaks for itself. He has countered ERA, he has trampled on such programs as legal aid to the poor, and has acted on the behalf of the rich and powerful at every turn. In my opinion the rich and powerful can look after themselves it is the poor who need assistance. Mondale's record has been enlightened. He understands that the tax structure must be balance toward the average American. While Mondale does not intend to restore all the budget cuts he understands that the military must now tighten its belt so that social programs can at least be returned to a functioning level of funding.

While I have not yet begun to extoll all Walter Mondale's virtues I feel that I must discuss a few of Reagan's many short comings in depth.

Reagan's record on the environment has been a tragedy of epic proportions. The misappropriation of the EPA super fund to clean up toxic waste is just one example. What's more, Watt may be gone but his policies live on. Selling off America's land to be raped by America's out dated industries is a crime not only against us, but against all future inhabitants of this planet. No bird fouls its nest to the point of being uninhabitable. The human species should take a grave lesson from the species who share this planet with us. In the last few weeks Reagan has had to try to cover his tracks by claiming that his environmental policies are sound. Now we can add lying to Mr Reagan's crimes.

Mr. Reagan's re-election would also create a dangerous precedent. It would imply that a man who distorts facts to serve his purpose and be exposed through out the national press can still benefit from his actions. President Nixon lied once and was ruined for it. Reagan lies three of four times per press conference and is untouched. Call me old fashioned but I like to think that when I speak my integrity is at stake. My statements may be wrong now and then, but I did not knowingly say things that are lies. As voters we

can not reward hypocrisy, lies, and self-righteousness. Mr Reagan has a definite misunderstanding about the separation of church and state as he continually uses religion as his justification, and yet he frequently tampers with basic doctrines of his God. To me, this portrays a basic cynicism about the American people. He thinks he can fool us with his charisma (an attribute that has worn desperately thin by my reckoning). In November I intend to help tell this cynical man that Walter Mondale has the optimism of a more enlightened future on his side, and that Reagan's negativism can't be cloaked by a smile anymore.

Thanks very much for offering me a forum for my views. Based on what I know of the Diplomacy hobby I'm badly outnumbered by conservatives. Anyway, I'm very much interested in clarifying these general reasons in future letters, and I'm sure I'll have to.

REBUTTALS

The rebuttal section will be reserved for persons who are responding to earlier articles, and these letters will all be in response to my opening issue. First up is Nick Pellele:

I think there are many thinking Americans who will not vote for Reagan. Your editorial did sway me some, but I'm not won over yet.

I don't think our image has been improved. To Americans maybe, but not to the rest of the world. Our relations with the USSR and China have been worse since Reagan took over. Calling Russia the source of all evil in the world didn't help. Hey, would you negotiate as Arms deal with someone if he just called you the Devil? And at least Carter took action--with the grain embargo and boycott of the Olympics. Reagan's pro Taiwan stand didn't help with China any. When relations with Russia break down, the Europeans aren't happy, and they aren't happy with our high interest rates, or our latin American policy.

High interest rates increase the debt of many Latin American countries, and all of Latin America is against our policy towards El Salvador, Nicaragua, and Grenada. They approved of the Panama Canal treaty, but Reagan was against that. As far as our African policy, well, I don't think Reagan has one. Did you know that Carter was the first President to visit Africa while in office? And I think Carter had a better policy towards South Africa. The middle east is a disaster. Camp David is dead and the Gulf war still rages. Canada sees acid rain as a threat, and you know Reagan's policy on acid rain and the environment. I know I left Australia and Antarctica out, but I don't know how they feel about Reagan. And our attitude to the U.N. has been hostile. I am not saying that we should boycott South Africa, cut relations with Taiwan, or kowtow to the U.N.; I am just saying that Reagan has not enhanced our image.

You say that we should do what is in our best interests, but with each country looking out for number one, the whole world suffers. Sure, with Reagan in charge no one will take over an embassy again, but they will shoot down an airliner with Americans aboard, and bomb our troops in Lebanon. I don't think there are any easy answers to the Latin American question. In the past we could let them solve their own problems or intervene at will. Now with the Russians involved, things have changed. I guess we intervened in their back yard so often, they want to do it to us. as long as they don't intervene in our house, like we did to them after WWI.

Shifting to domestic policy. I don't believe deregulation and New Federalism adequately describes all U.S. domestic policy. Deregulation is great, but New Federalism has some drawbacks. I don't know if I want to shift the

power from Congress to our N.Y. State legislature. They are not much better, and since the end of Old Federalism we advanced in civil rights, among other areas. FDR's New Deal did not fail miserably. It helped keep the country together, when we could have had a revolution. You may not like the current Democratic agenda, but don't blame FDR. Blaming FDR for today's liberalism is like blaming Lincoln for court ordered busing.

You are ignoring Civil rights, Women's issues, and the environment. Many people will vote against Reagan on those issues alone. And what about the so called "alease factor?"

Actually I agree with most of your editorial. The deficit may not be such a big problem. The strong defense is important. The economy appears to be excellent. Deregulation is good.

And who will I vote for? Surely not someone who says "Where's the beef?" I don't like his politics or his catering to Special interest groups. The Republicans cater to them too much also. Please don't view this letter as hostile, or take this personally.

Still friends?
Nick

I included his closing for the obvious reason. You folks think this guy has gotten bit a few times in our friendly little hobby? Don't worry about me, Nick. I have had much worse things said to and about me, and I know the difference between a discussion of the issues facing us and a personal attack.

As an answer to issues you brought up, I have to say that I left certain things out of my original piece for two reasons: 1) I am not well enough versed in certain areas to speak out, and 2) I didn't have room to discuss everything, only those issues I deem important. In the area of civil rights, I don't see how a President who treats all the people equally, and furthermore helps all people equally can be hurting someone's civil rights. The minorities, as they are represented in the media and including women, are another special interest group who want special treatment. By and large the issues they raise call for actions that do not help equalize, but elevate. I agree that the racial minorities have been had a horrendous history in this country, and I certainly do not want that to continue. The solution, however, is not providing advantages above the majority, but seeing to it that an equal opportunity is provided to all. This is most necessary in the area of education, which is a state, not federal, responsibility. As for the environment, I am no expert, but I do hear that the total amount of acreage protected by the federal government has increased more under President Reagan than any other President ever. What the environmentalists argue is against the use of certain lands to help pay for the rest. I am sorry, but having the Department of the Interior pay for itself doesn't seem like a bad idea at all.

The "alease factor?" Do you mean like Bert Lance? Or Gerry Ferraro and her \$50,000 tax "mistake?" Spiro Agnew resigned the Vice Presidency because he had to plead no contest in a tax fraud trial. He was accused of taking deductions that the IRS wouldn't allow. He was fined \$10,000. We now have a woman already fined for five times that running for that same office. Maybe inflation has increased the amount you have to resign for.

As for our image and foreign policy I think you have missed an important point. Our image abroad starts with our image of ourselves. Under Carter both were bad. Under President Reagan at least some of it has improved. With the USSR changing leaders once a year, how could we have negotiated anything? They walked off, not us. Our allies in Europe asked for the protection of our missiles and we com-

plied. A weaker President may have succumbed to the Soviet demands and not honored our commitment to our allies. That, by the way, is a point the media continually fails to bring up. We don't just tromp off to whatever country we want and plant missiles. The host country has to request and/or ratify the agreement to do so first. Some people in Germany and England don't like the idea, as is natural, but their chosen representatives are the people we must deal with, and they asked us for help. The same holds true for the situation in Grenada and El Salvador. The other Caribbean states asked for our intervention, and we complied. The government of El Salvador, duly elected officials, have requested the aid. I suppose Tip O'Neil and his boys want to run down there and take a Gallup poll first. Enough sarcasm. Sorry about that folks. In short, Nick, I can't say that Reagan is perfect, or that I agree with all of his views. I can say that on the majority of the issues, and on the most important ones, he holds the key to keeping us strong and safe.

It is getting late, so I will cut and paste the responses from Jake H. and Jim Burgess.

I prefer to react to other people's comments, because it's easier and you know that you're not rambling off into space. I know . . . it's lazy, but here I come, fast and furious. Let me take up your issues point by point.

The Economy: "Inflation is significantly lower now than when the Republicans took office." True enough. But look at the cost? You claim that the rate of unemployment is significantly down from Pre-Reagan levels, but in fact it is in the same range that it was in when Reagan was inaugurated and the largest postwar recession came in between. However, the record is still relatively impressive, should we credit this to Mr. Reagan? I say perhaps, but probably not. Few would deny that a large measure of the credit should go to the Fed and its chairman (Volcker) for preventing inflation from rising during the recovery and although Reagan reappointed him, Volcker was a Carter nominee. Reagan is very much responsible for the deficit though. You claim that "we have yet to see the devastating effects predicted by some economists." There are two attributes of huge budget deficits that we must concern ourselves with. First, where does the government get the money today. Volcker and the Federal Reserve have refused to let the gov't print it (although the gov't can print money, the Fed oversees its distribution). Thus, the money has been borrowed and we face the highest interest rates that this country has ever seen. Now, you ask, does this jive with your more or less factual statement that the prime rate is lower than it was during the Carter Administration? The answer is that interest rates have two components. One compensates lenders for the fact that the money paid back to them will be worth less due to inflation. Because of the lower inflation you brag about above, the real interest rate (what is left after subtracting out the inflation effect) is what is higher than ever before. That measures the real cost of borrowing money and it is so high because the gov't is busy borrowing so much of the available funds. The second effect is the "time bomb" for the future. The deficits add up to a debt that must be paid back someday. There is considerable disagreement about whether this could cause problems or not. The rest of the world cares

be more than we owe them (still, but not for long) so if those loans are collectable the problem could be diverted elsewhere. However, though we have been very generous in the past about forgiving loans to other countries, no one will ever forgive loans made to us. This is an incredible oversimplification, but the idea should be clear. We haven't even begun to face the issue of how to deal with our huge debt and if it isn't handled very very carefully, then all sorts of "devastating effects" may appear. End of economics lecture. One comment on the folly of a

I Lied.

This is really the **PAGE 2**

balanced budget amendment. Reagan couldn't have done any of the things he cites as the great achievements of his administration (defense build-up, tax cuts, lower inflation) if we had a balanced budget amendment. Give me a break. One could accuse him of all sorts of hypocrisy, but we are avoiding ad hominem arguments, so I'll just say that it is grossly unfair to tie the hands of future administrations (i.e. one can't argue on one hand that the deficits aren't so bad and on the other that we must castrate ourselves to eliminate them).

Defense and Foreign Policy: I would hardly endeavour to defend the Carter administration's record here, but neither would I defend Reagan. It always amazes me when Diplomacy players (as most of us are) fail to see how poor Reagan is in this area. You properly note that it is very difficult to judge the record here. There are no "victory conditions" in the real world. Reagan and his administration grossly oversimplify the world to a case of "us vs. them" and then refuse to negotiate. Why? They say that the Russians can't be trusted. The Russians say we can't be trusted. Would a good Diplomacy player stop negotiating with a neighboring power because "he can't be trusted". That would be silly. Admittedly it makes the negotiating process much tougher, but it can and has been done. This good guy-bad guy stuff makes me sick. Reagan is simply not the man to turn this around.

Deregulation and the New Federalism: Your arguments here are OK, but hardly support the President. First, it is too facile to blame everything on the Congress. The President sets priorities and these issues along with the so-called "family issues" that are used to rally certain groups around the president get extremely short shrift. Things will hardly get any better in a second term as his support erodes and the search begins for 1988 (we see it beginning already). The dominance of the selection process over operation of the gov't really stinks, but we'll come back to that. Your assessment of deregulation is more or less correct, but let's give credit where credit is due. I challenge you to name one area of deregulation initiated by this administration. All of the work here was begun under and led by Jimmy Carter. Some of it was completed under Reagan, but that's like giving Reagan credit for freeing the hostages, since they were released after he was inaugurated. Work on this issue is one of the little recognized achievements of Carter's administration.

always surprises me that Mondale doesn't make more of this. He may be saving it as a trump card, we'll see. As far as the Federalism issue, you don't really believe that the states could administer things better, do you? One of the biggest costs in all social programs comes from

Oh, actually, it

PAGE 3

the bureaucracy needed to sustain them. It is incredibly inefficient to create 50 different bureaucracies, each with their own rules, etc. There is too much of that as it is. I agree that things don't work, but throwing the problem back to the states (standard Reagan simplifying tactic) will only make things worse. I agree that education is important, but the real problem is that too many people are going to college and wasting their time. As I think you might agree, we have to get the poor people trained for jobs. This hardly strikes me as a goal of the Reagan administration, except in rhetorical terms. This is another problem for "the states".

Naturally, I strongly disagree with your conclusion that the President has done an outstanding job. I am personally worse off than I was four years ago, primarily because of Reagan budget cuts. However, I think that is bad reasoning to use in assessing the future and though I can trace my financial problems directly to Mr. Reagan, I am not bitter about that and support the cuts he made, I think. Maybe I'll comment on that further some other time. I'm sure that you are aware by this time of the recent study by the Urban Institute that clearly refutes your claim that "should the entire country follow that guideline, the President will be elected by a wide margin." This result is hardly surprising and we will hear much more about it in the months to come. As far as my opinions about the other side go, you'll have to wait until next month as I've surely gone on for long enough. As much as it pains me, sign me up as a Democrat in the Presidential Politics game. If you have the game filled without me, I'll be happy to sit on the sidelines and kibitz.

Take care, Jim Burgess

Thank-you Jim. Sorry this isn't typed, but I can only take so much typing! One quick comment on the Balanced Budget amendment: Texas has lived under these constraints for 100 years. And ya'll best not make any comments about cost-cutting down heck! I want the states to take over social programs because Texas pays out \$1.75 for every \$1 we get back. We could double our output, except we are being forced to subsidize Michigan, Oregon, Massachusetts, etc.!

Dear Greg:

I would be remiss in not taking the opportunity to rebut your defense of the Reagan administration, as well as thanking you for getting my heart started while reading it. I'd allowed myself to fall into the post-convention doldrums, while awaiting the second Reagan coronation.

I'm out of remission....

I, too, will preface my remarks by declaring that this is not a diatribe against the Republicans. I think there are several progressive party members, among them John Anderson, Charles Percy, Howard Baker to name a few. So there are viable alternatives to the incumbent within his own party.

It's the man at the top of the ticket that I've got the problems with.

You point at the economy as the issue of prime importance in considering the candidates this year, but then you fell on your face.

I'll ask for a time-out from debate in the Lincoln-Douglas (I'll assume you meant Stephen Douglas and not Frederick Douglass, a horse of a different color) tradition, and hope I don't confuse you with the facts....

To wit:

-An August 1, 1980 statement by the Department of Labor that unemployment had remained steady for the third consecutive month, at a 7.8 percent rate.

-An October 16, 1980 Commerce Department report that industrial production at U.S. factories and mines was up 1.0 percent, the largest increase in 16 months.

-Another Commerce Department report the next day, citing a one-percent rise in the gross national product for the third quarter, and that unemployment was down to 7.5 percent. Commerce then declared that the 1980 recession was over, and thus the shortest in modern times.

Thus, I refute your statement that that "the rate of unemployment is significantly down from pre-Reagan levels," as the current rate, according to our Rocky Mountain News of July 31, stood at 8.2 percent. It has been much higher under the Reagan regime.

Inflation was much higher, and productivity and the gross national product somewhat lower in the Carter years, but they had turned the corner before the election. We hit bottom in 1981-82, which were Reagan years.

A balanced budget amendment? Thank Providence the Democrats are fighting it! Where will the spending cuts come from? Tell us it won't be from such areas as social programs and education. We've got an Attorney General who has declared "there are no hungry Americans," and we've seen Reagan's support for tax breaks for private schools that practice racial and sexual discrimination. And this in Reagan's first term! What might we expect if Reagan is re-elected, and thus not accountable to the voters for four years?

In the field of defense and foreign relations, you say American image has been "significantly enhanced." Enhanced, indeed! Perhaps you aren't aware of the massive anti-American rallies in Britain, the Netherlands and West Germany (among others) as we began to deploy nuclear missiles in Europe. These countries are supposed to be counted among our best friends! We've got their citizens scared to death of us. You say "image is an important part of our defense." Is this the image we want?

Central America: you ask "how (can we) tell if the government truly represents the people? I ask how we can tell if the revolution truly represents the people? You seem to be expounding the terms of the Monroe Doctrine, a 173-year-old relic. Was this 1776, methinks you'd be a Tory!

We invaded Grenada, a spit of land one-eighth the size of the average Texas county. Reagan's comment? "We've regained our greatness."

Please!

While we were regaining our greatness, we also lost a bit of it,

as the press was quarantined from covering the event.

As a writer and former (and future) member of the press, I abhor this blatant violation of the First Amendment. But I expect it from a president who can be stifled in mid-sentence by his press secretary. And I expect it from someone who can approve Directive 84, bringing about censorship against government employees. And I expect it from a Commander-in-Chief who, after the Joint Chiefs of Staff voted 3-0 against sending troops into Lebanon, sent those troops in anyhow. God only knows where we might be able to regain even more greatness.

Deregulation? The moves to deregulate the telephone, computer, oil and rail industries all hit their stride under President Carter, not Reagan. If they're not moving fast enough....

The New Federalism? Sounds like the old States' Rights movement under a new label. And that brought us quite a different America in such places as Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, South Carolina....

No, I won't be voting for Reagan. While this is not a diatribe against the Republicans, neither is it a diatribe in favor of the man with the personality of a speed bump, Walter Mondale.

But rather than risk four more years of a man who's twenty years ahead of his time (and, unfortunately, his time is that of William McKinley), four more years of "The Great Communicator" who can't seem to communicate effectively with our friends or enemies, four more years of sabre-rattling and gunboat diplomacy, four more years of a 9-to-5 (10:30-to-3) president, I'm ready--for the third time in a row--to vote for the lesser of two evils.

Anybody but Reagan.

That was Jake Helmerstedt.

Only a couple of comments:

First: I refute all of the figures you quoted on the basis of lag time. Reagan's first budget did not take effect until fall of 1981, and couldn't have had any effect until much later. We are only now feeling the full effect of the tax cuts and spending cuts. The unemployment is all Carter's. The inflation - all Carter's. Our present economic growth can be attributed to President Reagan.

Second: Our image of ourselves has improved, and our allies now know they can count on us. Carter forced the Shah of Iran out of power and we now have to deal with the Iranian Gulf war. Carter or Mondale may have underwent the wiles of the elected governments in Germany and G. B., but President Reagan won't. Massive demonstrations? Germany elected one Green candidate. An obvious mandate from the people.

Third: I agree that the media should have been allowed into Granada and immediately. But I have a question about that. The Cubans knew we were coming. The Radio Granada was announcing it all night long. Why didn't the American press know? Too busy trying to find scandals than news.

Fourth: A Tory: Me? Probably.

Fifth: The Turkin Tax Credit used to have Ferraro vote too.

That's all folks. Page 3 is interesting, but it wasn't important anyway.

Any Republicans out there?