

# OFFICE OF CABINET AFFAIRS TENTATIVE CABINET COUNCIL SCHEDULE

<p>1/16</p> <p>CCLP (2:00 pm) -Legal Equity for Women/CM185 -Immigration Plcy/062 -Crime Bill Legislation/CM383 -Bankruptcy Judges/CM283</p>	<p>1/17</p> <p>CCEA (8:45 a.m.) -Tax Refund Offsets/CM100 -Effects of an Item Veto on Government Spending/ CM412 *CCNRE w/ President (2:00 pm) -Administration Environmental Initiatives/CM450</p>	<p>1/18</p>	<p>1/19</p> <p>*CCLP w/ President (2:00 p.m.) -Women's Legal Equity/CM185 *CCEA w/ President (2:30 p.m.) -Reaching Full Employment/CM407 -Budget Reform/CM412</p>	<p>1/20</p>
<p>1/23</p> <p>MONDAY</p>	<p>1/24</p> <p>TUESDAY</p> <p>CCEA (8:45 a.m.)</p>	<p>1/25</p> <p>WEDNESDAY</p>	<p>1/26</p> <p>THURSDAY</p> <p>CCEA (8:45 a.m.) *CCCT w/ President (2:00 p.m.) -Poultry and Eggs/CM439 -Wine Equity Act of 1983/CM440</p>	<p>1/27</p> <p>FRIDAY</p>

\* ISSUES SCHEDULED FOR WEEK OF

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20500

MARTIN FELDSTEIN, CHAIRMAN  
WILLIAM A. NISKANEN  
WILLIAM POOLE

January 7, 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR CABINET COUNCIL ON ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

FROM: William A. Niskanen **WAN**

SUBJECT: **The Effects of an Item Veto on Government Spending:  
Evidence from the States**

This memorandum is a note of caution against claims that Presidential authority to reduce or veto specific items in an appropriation bill would reduce total Federal spending.

Evidence from the states indicate three general patterns:

1. Total general expenditures per capita are somewhat higher in states where the governor has authority for an item veto.
2. Moreover, this difference is almost as large when controlled for the major economic and demographic conditions that affect the distribution of spending per capita among the states.
3. Authority for an item veto may affect the composition of spending. States where the governor has authority for an item veto, controlling for other conditions, appear to have somewhat higher spending per capita for education and highways, about the same spending for welfare and health, and possibly lower spending for all other activities.

These differences are not strongly significant by statistical criteria. They do not, however, support a conclusion that authority for an item veto has reduced total state spending. (The attachment summarizes this evidence in more detail. Any analyst can replicate these results in a few hours based on generally available information.)

An item veto may be valuable even if it does not reduce total spending. A President of either party usually has a more national perspective than any member or group of Members of Congress. This usually leads a President to have higher preferences, for example, for defense and free trade and lower preferences for the large set of activities with local benefits. An item veto would probably reenforce the President's preferences on the composition of spending and other activities. This objective is worth seeking. We would undermine our case, however, by making an overstated claim about its effects on total spending, a claim that could be easily refuted.

## Attachment

### The Sample

Most of the tests reported below involve comparisons of the State and local general expenditures per capita between states where the governor has authority for an item veto and in states where there is no such authority. In general, it is best to use the combined level of state and local spending, rather than state spending alone, because of the different distribution of responsibility between State and local governments among states.

The sample includes only the 48 contiguous states. Alaska, Hawaii, and the District of Columbia are excluded because spending in these governments is much higher than the average of other states. Since the executive in each of these governments has authority for an item veto (indeed, the vote necessary to overturn an item veto in Alaska is the highest of any state), excluding these governments understates the average difference between spending in the veto and non-veto states.

Most of the variation in state and local spending per capita, of course, is dependent on conditions other than the item veto. The partial effects of an item veto are estimated from regressions that include the following other variables:

- personal income per capita
- federal revenue per capita
- percent of population of school age
- percent of population who are poor
- percent of population in metropolitan areas
- population per square mile

All data are for 1980, with the exception that 1979 data are used for the percent of persons who are poor.

A complete file of the sample data and the test results are available on request.

### Effects of an Item Veto on Total Spending per Capita

The table below presents the difference in total spending per capita in states where the governor has authority for an item veto and in states where there is no such authority. A positive difference, thus, indicates that spending is higher in states where there is authority for an item veto.

Total General Expenditures per Capita

	<u>State</u> (Average)	<u>State and Local</u> (Average)      (Partial)	
Difference	\$31	\$92	\$78
Standard Deviation	72	98	50

This table indicates that spending per capita is somewhat higher in states where the governor has authority for an item veto. The average differences in spending are not significant. The partial difference, controlling for the other conditions identified, is moderately significant.

Effects of an Item Veto on Spending per Capita by Function

The table below presents the partial differences in general expenditures per capita by the major functions of state and local governments.

State and Local General Expenditures per Capita by Function

	<u>Education</u>	<u>Highways</u>	<u>Welfare</u>	<u>Health</u>	<u>All Other</u>
Partial Difference	\$60	\$21	\$4	\$4	\$-12
Standard Diviation	27	17	22	17	27


The table above indicates that state and local general expenditures per capita is higher for each function except the 'all other' category in states where the governor has authority for an item veto. This partial difference is strongly significant only for education, moderately significant for highways, and is not significant for other functions.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

January 16, 1984

MEETING OF THE CABINET COUNCIL ON  
NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT

DATE: January 17, 1984  
LOCATION: The Cabinet Room  
TIME: 2:00 P.M. (60 Minutes)  
FROM: Craig L. Fuller 

I. PURPOSE

To review a set of environmental initiatives.

II. BACKGROUND

An interagency group has been developing a series of environmental initiatives. Jack Svahn has developed the attached memorandum which explains each issue and recommends a course of action. The issues that will be discussed concern:

- 1) legislation for the reauthorization of the Superfund program,
- 2) additional funding for Chesapeake Bay rehabilitation,
- 3) a six point acid rain program,
- 4) requesting \$150 million for parkland, wetlands and refuges,
- 5) removal of regulatory impediments to methanol for fuel utilization; and,
- 6) support of legislation for wetland acquisition and enhancement.

The acid rain program represents a major effort to reach a consensus on this complex issue. However, there still is sharp disagreement on the subject. And, the proposal offered will be met with opposition by several factions outside of the federal government. The proposal to be discussed does not commit the Administration to an expensive control plan but will present a balanced and responsible first step toward the mitigation of this problem.

All of these proposals, to the extent funds are required, can be accommodated within the budget you have approved.

III. PARTICIPANTS

A list of attendees will be attached to the agenda.

IV. PRESS PLAN

White House photographer only.

V. SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

You will enter the Cabinet Room, take your seat and open the meeting. This is the first meeting of the Cabinet Council on Natural Resources and Environment since Bill Clark has become Secretary of Interior, and as you know the Interior Secretary serves as the Chairman pro tempore of the CCNRE.



December 15, 1983

The President  
The White House  
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. President:

I wish that I could express the pride and gratitude that I feel in having served you and the American people as Administrator of the General Services Administration.

As the grandson of immigrants who came to this land of freedom and opportunity, the fact that I have been able in some small way to return what we have received is an honor and a reward that is beyond my ability to express.

During the years that we all spent in the vineyards and the more than four years that have taken me from the mountains of New Hampshire to the banks of the Potomac, I have experienced rewards beyond my expectations.

In the time since I assumed my office at GSA, all of us here have reason to be proud of the significant progress that has been made, not only in cost control, efficiency, and economy, but also in helping to restore respectability to government service in this Agency. We are a long way from where we ought to be, but we have made solid progress and GSA is better now than it was. More importantly, it has been accomplished by a smaller, leaner, more effective bureaucracy. It has truly been done, not by the Administrator, but through the efforts of all the employees at GSA, responding to your leadership delegated through me.

Mr. President, I would like to share with you one of the first stories that I heard after arriving at GSA. It concerned one of our employees who had stopped going to church on Sunday because when he attended services with his wife and children, they suffered embarrassment and even ridicule because he worked at an agency where almost everyone was reputed to be lazy, incompetent, or dishonest.

That story burned its way into my heart. No organization should ever subject its people to that type of environment. To me, the mission of reducing costs and increasing effectiveness, cleaning out as much fraud as possible, would have been enough of a challenge. But the undeserved personal burden that our good, honest, and effective people were carrying became a focus for my strongest efforts.

The President

2

December 15, 1983

Today morale at GSA is better. Our people are proud that they work here. Indeed, many of them share with me the conviction that they are members of the Number One team in government. I treasure that achievement especially.

The personal relationship that I have had with you and your family, the senior staff, and your appointees on every level, has been equally rewarding. My memories are full of traveling with you on the bus in New Hampshire, of Nancy in her stormcoat in the snows of New Hampshire, and of my wife Anita traveling with Maureen to the campuses of our State, right straight through to my days in government, the Cabinet Council meetings in which I have participated, and the special projects that have been entrusted to me.

They have been an amazingly full four years for which I can never thank you enough. But time has moved on and many of the things that I came to do at GSA have either been accomplished or are well on their way to fruition. The ship has been turned around and is back on course. There are others who can give it the steady hand at the helm that is now needed.

It is with both sorrow and an anticipated excitement of what the future brings that I tender my resignation to you, effective February 29, 1984. You know that I will serve you and the American people in any future role that you request.

Very respectfully,

  
Gerald P. Carmen, Administrator

SUMMARY OF BUDGET STATUS\* TO DATE

<u>Budget Component</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>1986</u>	<u>1987</u>	<u>1988</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Budget Totals:</u>					
1) Outlays .....	923	1,000	1,072	1,136	4,131
2) Revenue .....	<u>744</u>	<u>814</u>	<u>887</u>	<u>978</u>	<u>3,423</u>
3) Deficit .....	-179	-186	-185	-158	-708
<u>Deficit Reduction Measures Reflected in Budget Totals:</u>					
4) Non-DOD spending cuts .....	5	11	15	20	51
5) DOD savings from FY 1984 topline .....	11	12	12	12	47
6) Debt service savings .....	2	5	7	10	24
7) Treasury tax code reform .....	<u>7</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>52</u>
8) Sub-total .....	25	39	49	61	174
9) Memo item: <u>Composition of Treasury tax code measures:</u>					
10) Health cap reform .....	3.7	6.3	7.7	9.6	27.3
11) State/local leasing abuse .....	1.8	2.8	4.2	5.9	14.7
12) All other .....	1.6	1.9	3.0	3.5	10.0
<u>Budget Shares of GNP:</u>					
13) Outlays .....	23.7%	23.6%	23.4%	22.9%	---
14) Revenue .....	19.1%	19.2%	19.3%	19.7%	---
15) Deficit .....	<u>-4.6%</u>	<u>-4.4%</u>	<u>-4.0%</u>	<u>-3.2%</u>	---

\* Based on approved FY 1985 economic forecast:

	<u>Real GNP Growth</u>	<u>Unemployment Rate</u>	<u>T-bill</u>	<u>CPI Increase</u>
1984 .....	5.3%	7.7	8.5	4.4
1988 .....	4.0%	5.8	5.5	3.9

ADDITIONAL DEFICIT REDUCTION OPTIONS

<u>Budget Option</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>1986</u>	<u>1987</u>	<u>1988</u>	<u>4-Year Total</u>				
<u>Option #1: All Budget Decisions to Date with no Additional Measures:</u>									
1) Deficit Level .....	-179	-186	-185	-158	<u>#1</u>	<u>#2</u>	<u>#3</u>	<u>#4</u>	<u>#5*</u>
<u>Option #2: Additional 7.5% Corporate/Individual Surcharge:</u>									
2) 7.5% Surcharge .....	22	33	36	40					
3) Deficit Level .....	-156	-149	-142	-110					
<u>Option #3: Additional 3% Outlay Cut (Excluding Social Insurance) and Matching Contingency Tax:</u>									
4) Additional 3% Outlay Cut .....	16	27	31	33					
5) Matching Contingency Tax .....	--	27	31	33					
6) Deficit Level .....	-163	-128	-115	-80					
<u>Option #4: Additional 3% Outlay Cut (Excluding Social Insurance):</u>									
7) Additional 3% Outlay Cut .....	16	27	31	33					
8) Deficit Level .....	-163	-156	-149	-119					
<u>Option #5: All Budget Decisions to Date plus Bipartisan Deficit Commission:</u>									
9) Commission Savings .....	--	50	65	83					
10) Deficit Level .....	-179	-136	-120	-75					
<u>Option #6: Bipartisan Deficit Commission plus Any Option Above</u>									
					<u>#1</u>	<u>#2</u>	<u>#3</u>	<u>#4</u>	<u>#5*</u>
					4.6	4.4	4.0	3.2	3.7
					4.0	3.5	3.0	2.1	2.1
					4.2	3.1	2.5	1.6	1.6
					4.2	3.7	3.6	2.4	2.4
					4.2	3.2	2.6	1.5	1.5
<u>Revenue</u>									
5) Treasury Pkg....	52	52	52	52					
6) Tax Increase ..	0	131	91	0					
7) Total Revenue..	52	183	143	52					
<u>Deficit</u>									
8) Deficit Total...	-708	-557	-486	-587					
<u>Deficit Share of GNP</u>									
					<u>1985</u>	<u>1986</u>	<u>1987</u>	<u>1988</u>	
					4.6	4.4	4.0	3.2	
					4.0	3.5	3.0	2.1	
					4.2	3.1	2.5	1.6	
					4.2	3.7	3.6	2.4	
					4.2	3.2	2.6	1.5	

\* Commission deficit reduction target shown in deficit line only

FURTHER DETAILS ON DEFICIT REDUCTION OPTIONS

All Options: Treasury Would be Directed Now to Study and Develop New Tax Simplification Approach Based on Following Principles:

- o The tax system must be made more simple
- o The tax system must be made more fair
- o Incentives for work, savings, investment and economic growth must be increased
- o Taxes must be easier to pay and easier to collect
- o Cheating must be substantially reduced

Option #2: Additional 7.5% Corporate/Individual Surcharge

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o Immediate transmittal and active Administration support of 7.5% surcharge.</li><li>o Entitlement savings sought on parallel track "best efforts" basis.</li></ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o Surcharge effective January 1, 1985 but triggers on <u>only</u> if FY 1985 non-DOD appropriations do not exceed Administration request.</li><li>o Automatic expiration in 1987 -- replace with structural spending/ tax reform. Triggers-off before 1987 if deficit below <u>2.5%</u> of GNP.</li></ul> |
|---|---|

Option #3: Additional 3% Outlay Cut (Excluding Social Insurance) and Matching Contingency Tax

	Distribution of Additional 3% Cut				4-Year Total	% of Total
	1985	1986	1987	1988		
1) DOD .....	8	15	17	18	58	54%
2) National Interest .....	2	2	3	3	10	9%
3) Other Domestic .....	6	10	11	12	39	36%
4) Total .....	\$16	\$27	\$31	\$33	\$107	100%

Memo Item: Impact on Defense Budget Authority vs. January FY 1984 Topline:

o Cut agreed to by DOD .....	-17	-10	-11	-11	-49	N.A.
o Additional 3% Outlay Cut .	-19	-19	-19	-19	-76	N.A.
o Total B.A. Cut .....	<u>-36</u>	<u>-29</u>	<u>-30</u>	<u>-30</u>	<u>-125</u>	<u>N.A.</u>
o Revised DOD B.A. Level ...	<u>286</u>	<u>328</u>	<u>359</u>	<u>394</u>	<u>1,367</u>	

Description of Additional 3% Outlay Cut and Matching Contingency Tax

- o 3% outlay cut from previously approved FY 1985 levels for all budget accounts except social insurance programs (Social Security, Medicare, UI, etc.).
- o 10% cap on 1985 Budget Authority cut from previously approved levels to protect slow-spend programs. Proportionate B.A. cut in out-years.
- o Matching contingency tax not transmitted or supported by Administration until both previously approved and additional 3% domestic spending cuts enacted. Matching contingency tax triggers-on in FY 1986 if deficit above 2.5% of GNP and no recession.

Option #4: Additional 3% Outlay Cut (Excluding Social Insurance)

- o Same pro-rata outlay cut as in option #3.
- o No additional contingency tax.

Option #5: Details of Bipartisan Deficit Commission

- o Comprised of outsiders.
- o Recommendations non-binding.
- o Reporting date: December 1984.
- o Tax proposals: referral to Treasury for review as part of simplification study.
- o Spending cut proposals: referral to OMB and Congress.

THE CASE FOR OPTION #2

- 1) Without the 7.5% surcharge, recovery period deficit levels would dramatically exceed prior historic experience.

Deficit Share of GNP

	<u>1st Yr.</u>	<u>2nd Yr.</u>	<u>3rd Yr.</u>	<u>4th Yr.</u>
o Tentative FY 1985 Budget (Option #1)	<u>1983</u> 6.0%	<u>1984</u> 5.2%	<u>1985</u> 4.6%	<u>1986</u> 4.4%
o 1976 recovery cycle	<u>1976</u> 4.0%	<u>1977</u> 2.4%	<u>1978</u> 2.3%	<u>1979</u> 1.2%
o 1971 recovery cycle	<u>1971</u> 2.2%	<u>1972</u> 2.1%	<u>1973</u> 1.2%	<u>1974</u> 0.3%

- 2) Strong economic recovery and more people working will cause existing tax receipts to automatically grow by 31% or \$205 billion between this year (FY 1984) and FY 1987. But our planned spending level after all cuts will grow even more -- by \$219 billion -- causing the deficit to remain above \$180 billion.

	<u>1985 vs 1984</u>	<u>1987 vs 1984</u>
o Approved FY 1985 spending ..	+71	+219
o Current law taxes .....	+71	+205

3) After proposed cuts, planned social insurance spending will grow slower than current law social insurance taxes. The social insurance deficit will continue to fall.

	<u>1985 vs 1984</u>	<u>1987 vs 1984</u>
o Medicare .....	+7	+22
o Social security & other .	<u>+14</u>	<u>+46</u>
o Total .....	+21	+68
o Social insurance taxes ..	+29	+80

Social Insurance Budget Trends  
(billions)

	<u>1983</u> <u>Actual</u>	<u>1984</u> <u>Actual</u>	<u>1985</u> <u>Proposed</u>	<u>1986</u> <u>Proposed</u>	<u>1987</u> <u>Proposed</u>
o Outlays .....	279	285	305	328	352
o Current law taxes ..	<u>209</u>	<u>245</u>	<u>274</u>	<u>300</u>	<u>325</u>
o Deficit .....	-70	-40	-31	-28	-27
o Revenue/spending dollar .....	75¢	86¢	90¢	91¢	92¢

4) Planned general budget spending growth after cuts exceeds current law tax growth substantially. But 93% of planned general budget spending growth is for:

- o defense
- o national interest programs
- o debt service

This guarantees that the extra surcharge revenues will be used for appropriate purposes. Without the surcharge, the general budget deficit will rise substantially each year.

	<u>1985 vs 1984</u>	<u>1987 vs 1984</u>
	(billions)	
<u>General Budget Spending</u>		
<u>Increases:</u>		
o Defense .....	+33	+100
o National interest .....	+6	+11
o Debt service .....	<u>+10</u>	<u>+29</u>
o Sub-total .....	<u>+49</u>	<u>+140</u>
o Domestic spending* .....	<u>+2</u>	<u>+11</u>
o Total spending .....	+51	+151

General Budget Revenue Growth:

o Current law .....	+41	+126
o With Treasury code reform	+47	+139

General Budget Trend Without Surcharge

	<u>1983</u>	<u>1984</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>1986</u>	<u>1987</u>
	Actual	Actual	Proposed	Proposed	Proposed
o Outlays .....	517	569	619	672	720
o Revenue** .....	<u>392</u>	<u>423</u>	<u>470</u>	<u>514</u>	<u>562</u>
o Deficit .....	-125	-145	-149	-158	-158

General Budget Deficit With Surcharge

o Deficit with surcharge .....	-125	-145	-126	-121	-115
-----------------------------------	------	------	------	------	------

\* Means-tested entitlements and domestic discretionary programs.

\*\* Includes Treasury tax code reform package.

Additional Domestic Spending Cut Needed to Eliminate  
General Fund Deficit

	<u>1984</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>1986</u>	<u>1987</u>
o Domestic spending after FY 1985 cuts .....	<u>\$204</u>	<u>\$206</u>	<u>\$209</u>	<u>\$215</u>
o Additional % cut needed to eliminate deficit ....	71%	72%	76%	73%

5) Under our proposed FY 1985 budget, the domestic spending component of the general budget (means-tested entitlements and discretionary programs) will continue to decline:

- o in constant dollars
- o as a share of GNP
- o as a share of the general budget

While the remaining levels are still objectionable philosophically, it is totally unrealistic politically to reduce much further -- in either a pre- or post-election budget. The surcharge revenues are needed to:

- o Pay for the huge growth in the things we want (defense and national interest programs) or can't avoid (debt service)
- o Would not be used to fund "excessive domestic spending" in any practical sense

Trend in Domestic Component of  
Proposed FY 1985 General Budget

	<u>Constant Dollar*</u> <u>Means-tested</u> <u>&amp; Discretionary</u>	<u>Share</u> <u>of GNP</u>	<u>Share of</u> <u>General</u> <u>Budget</u>
o 1978 actual .....	\$238	7.5%	51%
o 1984 actual .....	204	5.7%	36%
o 1985 proposed .....	196	5.3%	33%
o 1986 proposed .....	191	4.9%	31%
o 1987 proposed .....	<u>188</u>	<u>4.7%</u>	<u>29%</u>
o % change: 1987 vs 1978 .....	-21%	-37%	-43%

\* Constant FY 1984 dollars

- 6) Not more than 10% of the additional surcharge revenue could end up financing unwanted general budget domestic spending if the Administration is willing to veto domestic appropriations which exceed our savings request (\$3 billion in FY 1985 and \$26 billion over FY 1985-87).

	<u>Additional Surcharge Revenue</u>	<u>Means- tested Entitlement Savings not Subject to Veto</u>	<u>Guaranteed Deficit Reduction if Discre- tionary Add-ons Vetoed</u>
1985 .....	+22	-3	19
1986 .....	+33	-3	30
1987 .....	<u>+36</u>	<u>-3</u>	<u>33</u>
Total .....	+91	-9	82

- 7) Even after 7.5% surcharge, net tax cuts from pre-Reagan law will total \$654 billion over 1982-88 -- compared to \$454 billion in non-DOD spending cuts.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Net tax cut after Surcharge*</u>	<u>Non-DOD Spending Cuts with FY 1985 Budget Savings</u>
1982 actual .....	-40	-32
1983 actual .....	-72	-44
1984 actual .....	-90	-56
1985 proposed .....	-86	-64
1986 proposed .....	-104	-76
1987 proposed .....	-125	-86
1988 proposed .....	<u>-139</u>	<u>-96</u>
Total, 1982-88 .....	-656	-454

---

\* Includes revenue effect of Treasury tax code reform package.

## Reasons for Favoring Option 2

- 1) Temporary surcharge is consistent with 1984 proposal, but reduced in amount because of stronger recovery.
- 2) Reduces deficit without decreasing defense outlays.
- 3) Contingency trigger forces total domestic spending to decline as proposed in budget.
- 4) Would result in flat nominal outlays for all domestic programs except social insurance.
- 5) Balanced package of spending cuts and increased revenue -- reduced outlays equal to surcharge revenue.
- 6) Temporary surcharge triggers off when not needed because of spending cuts, growth or tax reform.
- 7) Option 2 is the only deficit reduction option that can actually be enacted.
- 8) Enactment would strengthen the recovery, reduce interest rates and permit declining inflation.
- 9) Tax cut remains \$315 billion (below Carter tax law) for 1985-87 and \$656 billion for 1982-88.
- 10) Even with the surcharge, the tax in 1985 for a median income family remains \$393 (10 percent) below original 10-10-10 proposal (because of indexing, reduced marriage penalty and universal IRA) and \$1851 (34 percent) below Carter law.

January 9, 1984

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

file

Mr. Deaver:

Mrs. Roosevelt asked me to bring the attached to your attention.

Do you have any changes or suggestions?

This is to be published in the February issue of "Carrier Diplomat". An article in tribute to RR. DB

Very good!

My most rewarding duty as Chief of Protocol is the privilege of escorting world leaders to meet the President of the United States. During the two years I have been in this job, I have taken more than 75 distinguished leaders to visit President Reagan, who receives them with graciousness, with dignity, and with a keen intelligence and sensitivity. Whatever the difficulties of our relationship with a particular country, the President always manages to defuse the tension and make his meetings as productive and useful as possible.

While personal diplomacy is only one aspect of our foreign relations, I would say it is a singularly important ingredient of the Reagan Presidency. This President, by the sheer integrity and clarity of purpose that he exudes, cannot be misunderstood or misinterpreted when met face to face in the Oval office. You simply know that he is a man of great character, a man of honor and courage, whose word is to be trusted.

President Reagan is without question the most graceful man I have ever known. No matter how thorny the issues that divide our countries may be and regardless of the political leanings of his visitors, the President always shows a generosity of spirit and a far broader understanding and respect for another person's viewpoint than he is commonly given credit for.

Ronald Reagan truly has made a difference in every meeting and contact that he has had with foreign leaders. It is a source of great pride to me to be associated with him in this endeavor, for he reflects the very best of the American people and the American tradition.

By: Selwa Roosevelt  
Chief of Protocol



**JOHN P. YOUNG & ASSOCIATES (AUST.) PTY. LTD.**  
Management Consultants

Inc. in Victoria

Office of the Chairman

2 Fordholm Road, Hawthorn, Victoria, Australia, 3122

Telephone: National 03 8191185    Cables: Consultancy Melbourne  
International 61 3 8191185    Telex: 32 334

11th January 1984.

Mr. Michael Deaver,  
Personal Assistant to The President,  
The White House,  
WASHINGTON.    D.C.    U.S.A.

Dear Mike

A friend in the States has just sent me a copy today of the Wall Street Journal for Thursday, January 5, entitled "Manipulating the Media is a specialty for the White House's Michael Deaver".

I must congratulate you on the job you are doing and the way in which the staff reporter so rightly treats you.

This must be our week - what with this good article and my daughter Janet (Mrs. Langford) has just presented Dulcie and myself with our first grandchild (a daughter - Jennifer Louise) 48 hours ago.

Thank you very much indeed for arranging for Colin to see over The White House on his last trip.

All the best for 1984 - keep up the good work - I am sure The President will be re-elected, as I like Inaugurations!!

Cheers from all the Young family,

Sincerely,

John P. Young

# Jewelcor

JEWELERS DISTRIBUTORS

Gateway Shopping Center • Edwardsville, Pa. 18704 • Phone (717) 288-7441

January 11, 1984

Donna Blume  
The White House  
Washington, D. C. 20500

*paid 1/16/84*  
*[Signature]*

Total Amount Due at the Edwardsville Showroom.....\$ 76.50

Please remit payment to:

" Jewelcor Jewelers & Dist. "

Attn: Karen Agnew

*Some you owe*  
*\$ 36.99 ✓*

*Annoues 31.92*  
*of owe 6.59 ✓*

NAME: Donna Blume  
 ADDRESS: The White House  
 CITY: Washington D.C.  
 MEMBER ID. NO.: 11/3063

06738		STORE LOCATION	AUTHORIZATION	DATE PROMISED	STORE BOOKKEEPING
CATALOG STOCK NO.	CATALOG MBR. PRICE	MDA	DESCRIPTION		TOTAL MDSE.
1512/5321	5.22	①	SS 7" rope	522 (1499)	26136
1512/5388	14.55	①	SS 20" rope	1455 (3119)	
1084/2108	6.59	①	GF chair	659 (1494)	26136
					TAX
					SUB TOTAL
					DEPOSIT
					BALANCE DUE
MDSE.					26136

**CHARGE INVOICE**

CHARGE SALES INVOICE

ALL RETURNS MUST BE IN ORIGINAL CARTON AND ACCOMPANIED BY SALES RECEIPT  
 NO RETURNS AFTER THIRTY DAYS

FIG. 2

NAME: Donna Blume  
 ADDRESS: The White House  
 CITY: Washington D.C.  
 MEMBER ID. NO.: 11/3063

06715		STORE LOCATION	AUTHORIZATION	DATE PROMISED	STORE BOOKKEEPING
CATALOG STOCK NO.	CATALOG MBR. PRICE	MDA	DESCRIPTION		TOTAL MDSE.
1084/0180	36.99				39114
1084/0245	12.15	①			
					TAX
					SUB TOTAL
					DEPOSIT
					BALANCE DUE
MDSE.					5014

**CHARGE INVOICE**

CHARGE SALES INVOICE

ALL RETURNS MUST BE IN ORIGINAL CARTON AND ACCOMPANIED BY SALES RECEIPT  
 NO RETURNS AFTER THIRTY DAYS

FIG. 2

36.99 has dryer  
 12.15 camera  
 5.22 > silver  
 14.55  
 6.59

# Lancastrian



## Auction

T.S.

January 16, 1984

The Honorable Michael K. Deaver  
Deputy Chief of Staff and Assistant  
to the President  
The White House  
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. Deaver:

The Alexandria Community Y is a non-profit community service agency offering a wide range of services to the expanding metropolitan area through the work of 1500 volunteers. With cutbacks in federal, state and local funding and in the true spirit of communities helping themselves through volunteerism, we have begun a series of fundraisers to supplement the small amount of funds we receive through government channels.

To this end, we are holding a silent and live auction of goods and services March 2 - 3, 1984, and we are anticipating several thousand attendees. The event will take place at the Alexandria Community Y located on 418 South Washington Street in Old Town Alexandria.

We would be deeply appreciative if you could provide the Alexandria Community Y with an item or service that we would auction off. Specifically, we are hoping for unusual items that would be unique to you (e.g. an autographed book, a personal tour of the Capitol, a lunch in the House dining room, a significant photograph, etc.). We are relying very heavily on this auction to fund our budget and your participation would certainly go a long way to help make this a successful event.

Please do not hesitate to call me or Mrs. Mary Lee Crocker at 549-0111 with any questions you may have. We would hope to hear from you by February 15th.

Sincerely,

*Elizabeth-Anne Campagna*  
Elizabeth-Anne Campagna  
Executive Director

P.S. I have enclosed a brochure that more fully describes the services the Alexandria Community Y provides.

# Program

---

## SOCIAL SERVICE

**Project Pulse Point**, a program which operates with funds from the City of Alexandria, has a fifteen-year success record to its credit. Children participating in the various aspects of Pulse Point are most often latch-key children from single-parent homes. They may have suffered emotional and/or physical neglect. They lack supportive, responsible and constant role models. They may have behavioral problems and are often the victims of drugs, alcohol and possible child abuse.

The Alexandria Community Y seeks to better the lives of these young citizens by offering alternatives to despair, dependence and delinquency. The following is a list of programs within Project Pulse Point.

- **Summer Daycamps** held at the housing projects.
- **Year-round Sports Leagues** for Alexandria youth.
- **Remedial Reading Tutorial Program**
- **Friends of the Courts** friendship program for children who have come to the attention of the courts.
- **National Runaway Switchboard** to aid runaway youths.
- **Youth Seminars** held in the schools bringing nationally-renowned leaders to address youth issues.

**The Headstart Program**, with federal funding and City of Alexandria participation, is administered by the ACY. Ninety pre-school children are served by a staff at the Headstart facility. The program seeks to better *family* mental/emotional health by working through its children.

Three *Extended Day Care* centers provide indispensable after-school care and recreation to enrich the lives of children of working parents. During the summer full-day programs are provided children at the centers.

## ADULT PROGRAM

The Alexandria Community Y conducts four, yearly adult class programs which offer education in language, arts, practical skills and exercise. Swimming opportunities are also available through the ACY.

**The Women's Room and Resource Center** is a program for women in transition and in crisis. A resource library and meeting room are located in the ACY building. Classes and support groups are offered which enable women to become more productive and fulfilled.

The **Parent Education Project** operates out of the Family Center in the Alexandria Community Y building. This program offers support to parents of infants and young children, and gives practical information on child-rearing.

Two other programs, the **Matrons' Matrons** which serves women prisoners in the Alexandria Correctional Institution, and **Fifty More or Less**, a mental health program which helps recently-institutionalized women reenter society, seek to offer compassion and creative solutions to women.

In all areas of human need the Alexandria Community Y works as an educator, a facilitator, referral service and community center for people of all ages.

ADDRESS BY  
AMBASSADOR JEANE J. KIRKPATRICK  
UNITED STATES PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS  
AT THE  
REAGAN ADMINISTRATION EXECUTIVE FORUM  
WASHINGTON, D.C.  
JANUARY 20, 1984

We have all, I suspect, learned a good deal in the past three years.

I personally have learned so many things I never suspected were true about government and politics -- that I feel like sending recall notices to my former students.

What I didn't know about the United Nations three years ago would fill a book I don't intend to write.

I didn't know that the Soviet Foreign Minister would attack us for interfering in the internal affairs of Afghanistan.

I didn't know that the Foreign Minister of the Ethiopian government--accused by Amnesty International of burning high school students in oil--would attack us for gross abuse of human rights.

I didn't know that the Poles that had just suppressed Solidarity would accuse us of totalitarianism.

I didn't even know that we would not be able to get subjects like the Libyan invasion of Chad or the repression of the Baha' in Iran onto the agenda of the General Assembly while "they" could keep Israel's "crimes" perpetually before us.

The fact is, I didn't know much about that institution in which, as Sam Levenson said, whole peoples are sentenced to death by elocution.

A few things, however, I did know.

I knew that the elections of 1980 marked the end of a national identity crisis -- that the period of great national self-doubt and self-denigration had given way to returning confidence in the legitimacy and success of our society, our institutions, ourselves.

I knew, too, that this returning confidence in the basic decency of Americans and the relevance of our experience to the contemporary world coincided with a time of unprecedented expansionism by the Soviet Union.

I knew they had never been stronger, and that we had never been as weak by comparison and that this "new correlation of forces" as they like to call it, constituted a dangerous threat to liberal, democratic, Western societies and to the independence and sovereignty of non-Western societies as well.

Like a clear majority of other Americans we all knew that the defeatism, delusion, self-doubt that had displaced our traditional American optimism during the Carter years was not as they liked to suggest, "a sign of growing American maturity in a complex world."

It was a symptom of despair.

Political scientists sometimes like to argue that it is impossible to tell what an election means--especially when they don't like the election's outcome.

But it was not, really, very difficult to understand the meaning of the 1980 elections:

The election of Ronald Reagan was a victory for those who rejected the idea of inevitable American decline.

The inauguration -- endowed with unique significance by the simultaneous release of our hostages, closing the most humiliating episode in our history -- signalled a new beginning for America; a beginning based on restoration of a strong economy and a strong defense, based above all on a vigorous commitment to freedom in domestic and foreign affairs.

Our nation's subsequent recovery in domestic and foreign affairs has been sustained by the consensus that brought the Reagan/Bush team to office and has in turn sustained growing national health and returning capacity to believe in ourselves, our worth and our future. That recovery has progressed so that today, the "sick society" Syndrome of the Vietnam era is finally behind us. The self-doubt, pessimism and associated paralysis of those dismal times have been replaced by new optimism.

A great many recent polling data relevant to broad, basic and significant orientations make this clear. Some 66 percent of all voters today approve the American quality of life. Some 62 percent believe this nation's best times are still ahead of us. There is also increased clarity and agreement about our principal adversary. Some 61 percent of Americans believe communism is the worst form of government, up from 54 percent only five years earlier. Today only 9 percent of Americans, the lowest point since 1956, have a favorable opinion of the Soviet Union. This negative opinion is associated with the widespread belief (by 81 percent of Americans) that the Soviets and Cubans are encouraging turmoil and terrorism

around the world and, more specifically, a substantial majority of both Democrats and Republicans think those same Soviets and Cubans promoted trouble and turmoil in Grenada and in Central America. Some 75 percent of Americans believe the U.S. Government should counteract these activities. Over 60 percent of Democrats as well as Republicans and Independents see the Soviet Union as an immediate danger to the United States. Over half of all three groups -- Republicans, Democrats and Independents --- agree that President Reagan's policy of firmness will prove effective in preventing greater problems. Ninety-three percent of Americans believe it would be better to fight if necessary than to accept Russian domination, though most of us believe that firm leadership will make it unnecessary. On a range of foreign policy questions, from the general to the particular, from Lebanon to Grenada, there are some differences between rank-and-file Republican and Democratic and Independents, but these differences are small as compared to the broad consensus about basic matters. Moreover, for the first time since 1964 the confidence of the public in the good sense and good faith of those who govern them is again on the rise.

Strangely enough, the broad consensus about ourselves, the goals of our foreign policy, the nature of our adversaries, and what we should do in various situations is not reflected--certainly not fully reflected--in the positions taken by leading contenders for the Democratic nomination today, anymore than it is reflected in many partisan discussions of foreign policy or in many votes in the Congress.

The shared understandings and consensus broad enough to support a bipartisan foreign policy exist; but, much too often, public discussion of foreign affairs is still dominated by a harsh, bitter, polemical spirit that so deeply scarred the American conduct of foreign affairs in the period since debate on the Vietnam War turned mean and pushed our disagreements over the edge of civil debate to violence and beyond. Remember the nasty riots that were called "disturbances?" The Viet Cong flags? The most violent manifestations of that era are mercifully past, but the bitterness of many of those divisions remain and distort, I believe, national discussion of how to implement, through our foreign policy, the effective protection of democratic values and of the West.

Neither public opinion polls nor election outcomes have so far lured Democratic candidates and liberal media back from the attractions of adversary elitism, from what Mark Shields called "reflexive anti-Americanism." Democratic Congressmen and candidates doubtless know that great majorities of Americans support strong defense and a prudently assertive foreign policy, but many continue to embrace elitist liberal points of view. As Mark Shields put it in the most recent issue of Public Opinion magazine, "Democrats insist they favor some weapons system or another, but it's never the one which is before the Congress in any given year...Of course, say the Democrats, there is some place in the world where we should tell the Soviets: 'Enough,' but it is never the place where we are currently embroiled."

So far they just have not caught on to the fact that the people are no longer ready to give everybody except us the benefit of the doubt. Too many liberals remain bogged down in what they apparently consider the "good old days" of the anti-war movement and the counter-culture.

Most of us have moved on. Most Americans decline to be "willing victims," and are no longer ready to assist in the legitimization of our defeat and disappearance.

When I arrived at the United Nations someone asked what would be the difference between this new administration's policies and the previous one's.

I said, "We have taken off our 'kick me' sign."

He said, "Does that mean that if you're kicked, you'll kick back?"

"Not necessarily." I responded "but it does mean that if we're kicked, at least we won't apologize."

In his book on How Democracies End, the distinguished French commentator Jean-Francois Revel observed that in the West people are embarrassed to call the struggle between democracy and totalitarianism by its own name, that they prefer instead to speak of the "competition between East and West," or the "struggle between the superpowers," as if the "superpowers" were politically, morally equivalent.

The people know better.

In New York, at the UN, some people tried to suggest that the liberation of Grenada was the moral equivalent of the invasion of Afghanistan. We asked them: Where were the grateful Afghans lining the streets of Kabul shouting "God Bless Andropov"?

The Grenadians know the differences. So do the American people.

We know the difference, too, between a foreign policy that is based on appeasement and recklessness and a foreign policy that is steady and strong.

We know that in the past three years President Reagan has given us a strong, steady policy that has paved the way for a renaissance of freedom in the United States and in the world.

And let us be clear: in giving this nation strong, steady leadership, Reagan has been Reagan.

I feel certain you are as grateful as I that the President has given us an opportunity to participate in this extraordinary reconstruction.

Thank you.

Jerry W. Friedheim  
Executive Vice President

January 18, 1984

Michael K. Deaver  
Deputy Chief of Staff  
The White House  
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mike,

Thanks for your thoughtful participation in yesterday's session on press policy. There are plusses possible here for all hands.

And it would be widely-noted and appreciated leadership for the President to continue his proper role as coordinator and facilitator for the entire constitutional process by gently nudging the press and the military back into a mode of conversation and cooperation.

Sincerely,



Jerry W. Friedheim

Jan. 18, 1984

Mr. Michael Deaver  
Asst to the President  
White House

1600 Pa. Ave - NW,  
Washington, D.C. - 20500

Hi Again Mike -

Two items I have read and  
heard over TV and radio by  
various news people,

① President Reagan going  
to run because he hates Ted  
Kennedy's guts - What a  
reason for seeking a second  
term - I think that  
statement is hog wash -

② - The other item keep  
hearing and reading about  
is our U.S. Fleet in the  
mid east - many writers  
and TV personalities keep

hurrying up - Reagan will  
be departed Nov. 6, 1984  
when several on the Mary  
ships - like the New Jersey  
will be sunk a week or so  
before the election spelling  
down for President Reagan  
chances of a second term -  
Are our people in that  
area supplied with enough  
know how and knowledge to  
prevent a catastrophe of this  
magnitude - I hope we are  
not caught like setting  
charges at Pearl Harbor -  
I have read F. B. Rowland's  
trans and broken Japanese code and  
knew Dec. 7, 1941 was day Japanese  
would act - I know a leader friend  
who told me Hawaii was on fire for  
day alert from Thanksgiving to Dec. 6, 1941,  
and Japs let it fly on AM of Dec. 7, 1941 -

Mr. & Mrs. Roy A. Palmquist  
4525 Manchester Drive  
Omaha, Nebraska 68152  
1-402-455-3405

Cordially Yours,  
Roy  
(lets not let  
another Pearl  
Harbor happen)

EDWIN L. LAME, M. D.  
29 W. SUNSET AVENUE  
PHILADELPHIA, PA. 19118

January 19

Mr. Michael Deaver  
The White House

Sir: Congratulations on your efforts to guide the press - we need to have someone counter the bald propaganda put out daily - yes hourly by the Demo Television industry.

The anchor men generally are guilty of rankly loaded questions so slanted and left-leaning that no decent person should answer them. Tom Brokaw used to be a fair performer - but no longer. Robert Maxwell and his two female slaves have grown rankly slanted. The only witnesses I have heard that can handle these people

are ambassador Kirkpatrick and  
Peter Grace.

I do hope you can chastise  
these cowards hiding behind  
inadequate laws that permit  
statements which cannot be negated  
appearing routinely on our air waves.

Also listen to some of the  
stuff on Friday night "Washington  
Week in Review".

no ordinary group of citizens  
can reply without incurring fabulous  
expenses hiring TV "time". This is  
not much better than Poland today  
or Germany in Hitler's time!

And maybe you could ask some  
of these bandits which country they are  
working for.

Number 2 Request: Prevent S. 1  
Dole from being majority - or minority -  
when Baker resigns. Dole is a special  
spending, high tax Democrat in Repub  
clothes!

Sincerely yours,  
Edwin Lane

# STOCKS THAT COULD MAKE A DRAMATIC COMEBACK.

**MERRILL LYNCH OFFERS A WAY FOR SPECULATIVE INVESTORS TO PURSUE LONG-TERM CAPITAL GAINS IN AN EXCITING SEGMENT OF THE MARKET.**

Weak stocks don't always stay weak. And those that recover may do so dramatically.

We've seen it happen before. We believe it could happen again.

The management of the Merrill Lynch Phoenix Fund focuses on depressed companies whose stock or bond prices have been driven far below what would appear to be justifiable levels—even those companies in bankruptcy proceedings.

In addition to the higher-risk, potentially higher-reward features of the Fund, you also enjoy broad diversification, full-time professional management and daily liquidity.

Because of its speculative nature, the Fund is not for every investor. You must have a net worth of \$35,000\* (excluding primary residence and automobiles) in excess of the amount of Fund shares you wish to purchase, and expect to have income of at least \$35,000\* during this and the next three tax years. For complete information and a free prospectus, call toll free Monday through Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 12 midnight Eastern Time, 1-800-637-7455, Ext. 1558 or mail the coupon today.

In Alaska or Hawaii, call the Merrill Lynch office nearest you.

\*\$50,000 in the case of Missouri residents

Mail to  
Merrill Lynch  
Service Center  
P.O. Box 2021  
Jersey City, NJ  
07303

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

Business Phone \_\_\_\_\_ Home Phone \_\_\_\_\_

Merrill Lynch customers, please give name and office address of Account Executive: \_\_\_\_\_

*Please send me a free prospectus and booklet containing more complete information including all charges and expenses on the Merrill Lynch Phoenix Fund. I will read the material carefully before I invest or send money.*

1558

**1 800 637-7455 EXT. 1558**



**Merrill Lynch**

Merrill Lynch Pierce Fenner & Smith Inc

**A breed apart.**

PRESERVATION COPY

3  
138  
789  
532  
417  
33  
56  
83  
60  
95  
76  
83  
76  
80  
43  
61  
70  
85  
73  
67  
85  
94  
96  
35  
45  
89  
ex  
00  
in  
e  
19  
y  
7,  
S  
IS  
i-  
i;  
ia  
jal  
378  
in  
58  
ia,  
of  
ed  
mt

## Manipulating the Media Is a Specialty For the White House's Michael Deaver

By RICH JAROSLOVSKY

Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

WASHINGTON—It was, says an admiring White House official, "a Deaver special."

Just before last spring's Williamsburg economic summit, presidential aide Michael Deaver invited Hedrick Smith, the New York Times's chief Washington correspondent, in for lunch. A few days later the Times ran a page-one story on President Reagan's vigorous preparations for the summit: how hard he was studying, even how he planned to take the official notes.

But the real payoff was how Mr. Smith's piece set the tone for the television networks' coverage of the summit. All of the TV broadcasts conveyed the image of a president firmly in charge. ABC News featured Mr. Reagan's note-taking on two successive evenings.

Actually, this all involved a little hype. Mr. Reagan's diligent preparations didn't prevent him from watching "The Sound of Music" on TV. His note-taking was hardly unusual, since every host has been the official note-taker for these economic summits.

As subtle media manipulation, however, it was remarkably successful. To people viewing the event, the image conveyed "really answered the question of whether Ronald Reagan could be a world leader," contends Michael McManus, an aide to Mr. Deaver.

As President Reagan gears up for his anticipated reelection race, this illustrates one of his considerable assets: This White House probably seems more successful than any of its Media Age predecessors in projecting the strengths and hiding the weaknesses of the man in the Oval Of-

istrator Anne Burford, late in the day, limiting the time the networks have to produce full-blown stories for the evening news. When embarrassing stories break early, they often rush out upbeat news in an attempt to overshadow the negative. They also love to send Mr. Reagan out into the country. The media treat presidents on the road as much more newsworthy, even if the message isn't any different from back in Washington.

Just about all the top White House political operatives, including chief of staff James Baker, are deeply involved in the media machine. The key player, though, is Mr. Deaver, a former public-relations man who over the past 17 years has developed almost filial ties with Mr. and Mrs. Reagan. "Mike has an uncanny sense for knowing what the president would feel, would want, and how he would react in a given situation," says Richard Darman, a top presidential aide.

The Deaver touch was everywhere on the president's meticulously planned, triumphal visit to Asia recently. At Guard Post Collier, a desolate frontline observation post in the Korean Demilitarized Zone, Mr. Reagan showed up in a green military parka to tour the facility. Gray masking tape with "The President" written on it showed him where to stand so the TV cameras could get the best angle. The pictures were captivating. The TV cameras also zeroed in on the Reagans' guests on the flight home—two little Korean children who were coming to the U.S. for critical heart surgery.

It "provided some of the best presidential television in a long, long time," exults White House communications director David Gergen. (Mr. Gergen, who is leaving his job this month, is another master at using the media.)

A major reason for the Reagan team's success is their consistency of approach.

Ve  
In  
Fe

By a

SU

said i

the se

"som-

earlie

Th

port t

less tl

for th

Th

comp

cline

by a

disks

In

porte

a she

share

idenc

TI

Verb

quar

proje

mont

only

TI

were

desig

edly

ror, i

we fa

with

presi

custo

delive

who h

Ve

North

tim d

Carte

and w

ment

### Notable & Quotable

Benjamin Franklin, in a 1789 essay on the proper means of controlling the liberty of the press, reprinted in "American Political Writing During the Founding Era, 1760-1805" (Liberty Press, 1983):

My proposal then is to leave the liberty of the press untouched, to be exercised in its full extent, force and vigor; but to permit the *liberty of the cudgel* to go with it *pari passu*. Thus, my fellow-citizens, if an impudent writer attacks your reputation, dearer to you perhaps than your life, and puts his name to the charge, you may go to him as openly and break his head. If he conceals himself behind the printer and you can nevertheless discover who he is, you may in like manner waylay him in the night, attack him behind, and give him a good drubbing. Thus far goes my project as to *private* resentment and retribution. But if the *public* should ever happen to be affronted, as it ought to be, with the conduct of such writers, I would not advise proceeding immediately to these extremities but that we should in moderation content ourselves with tarring and feathering and tossing them in a blanket.

If, however, it should be thought that this proposal of mine may disturb the public peace, I would then humbly recommend to our legislators to take up the consideration of both liberties, that of the *press* and that of the *cudgel*, and by an explicit law mark their extent and limits; and, at the same time that they secure the person of a citizen from *assaults*, they would likewise provide for the security of his *reputation*.

WSJ Jan 84