

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library

Digital Library Collections

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

Collection: White House Office of Records

Management: Presidential Handwriting File, 1981-1989
(COPY SET)

Series II: Presidential Records

Folder Title: Folder 179 (04/22/1985 con.-04/25/1985

Box: 12

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digitized-textual-material>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Inventories, visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/white-house-inventories>

Contact a reference archivist at: **reagan.library@nara.gov**

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/research-support/citation-guide>

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

Last Updated: 03/18/2025

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

Collection: PRESIDENTIAL HANDWRITING FILE: Records

Archivist: ggc

File Folder: Folder 179 (4/22/85cont.-4/25/85)

Date: 3/26/99

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
1 Memo	McFarlane to the President re Wick proposal, 1p <i>R, 6/28/00 NLSF98-014 #1</i>	4/22/85	P1

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P-1 National security classified information [(a)(1) of the PRA].
- P-2 Relating to appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA].
- P-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA].
- P-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA].
- P-5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA].
- P-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA].
- C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- F-1 National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA].
- F-2 Release could disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA].
- F-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA].
- F-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA].
- F-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA].
- F-7 Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA].
- F-8 Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA].
- F-9 Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA].

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

The President has seen _____

THE WHITE HOUSE

2885

WASHINGTON

April 22, 1985

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~INFORMATION

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: ROBERT C. MCFARLANE *RM*

SUBJECT: Wick Proposal to Exchange TV Appearances With Soviets

Charlie Wick has written a letter (Tab A) informing you of two proposals he has made to the Soviets:

1. To arrange for a top U.S. official to appear on Soviet TV while a top Soviet official would appear on U.S. TV; and
2. To arrange for Soviet journalists to interview top U.S. officials on Worldnet, while American journalists would interview top Soviet officials.

These were designed to introduce a greater element of reciprocity in the media appearances between us and the Soviets, who constantly appear on our media while we almost never appear in theirs. These proposals have attracted widespread and bipartisan Congressional support. Since the Soviets have not responded in over two months, we propose to raise the issue with them at the working level.

Attachment:

Tab A Letter from Charles Z. Wick, April 5, 1985

DECLASSIFIED
NLS F98-014 #1
BY alb NARA, DATE 6/28/00

cc: Vice President

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Declassify on: OADR

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

9
**United States
Information
Agency**

Washington, D.C. 20547

A. Kingon

501 218

271413 Director
FO 005-03



April 5, 1985

Dear Mr. President:

I wish to apprise you of a recent development concerning the proposal made by me to Mr. Leonid M. Zamyatin, Chief of the International Information Department of the Soviet Communist Party, for a constructive dialogue via international satellite television.

On January 25, I extended two concrete offers to Mr. Zamyatin:

1. To arrange for a top level Soviet official to appear on American television if Mr. Zamyatin would do likewise for a top American official on Soviet television;
2. To plan a one-to-two hour satellite television dialogue on USIA's WORLDNET satellite facilities in which Soviet journalists would interview U.S. officials on issues of mutual concern. This would be reciprocated by a similar program in which American journalists would freely and spontaneously question senior Soviet officials. (See Tab A)

As you may recall, this proposal was in response to an article published by Mr. Zamyatin in the Russian language magazine Literaturnaya Gazeta entitled "Impasses of Confrontations and Horizons of Cooperation." In this article, Mr. Zamyatin sharply criticized the international activities of USIA and charged it with "television propaganda aggression."

In response, I said that "permitting a free flow of information is in the best interests of both our societies and a necessary response to the times." And, for this reason, I urged him to respond favorably to my proposal.

To date, we have received no reply.

The President
The White House

However, domestic support is beginning to grow. On March 28, I received in my office a letter signed by 66 members of the U.S. House of Representatives. This letter, bipartisan in nature and representative of a broad political spectrum, expresses strong support for the Zamyatin initiative. (See Tab B).

I shall keep you informed of other developments on this matter as they unfold.

Sincerely,

Charles Z. Wick

(Dictated but not signed by the
Director in his absence from the office.)

**United States
Information
Agency**

Washington, D.C. 20547

Office of the Director

2885



April 9, 1985

Dear Kathy:

Enclosed is a letter to the President which the Director dictated prior to his trip to Europe.

Mr. Wick would appreciate it if you could bring it to the attention of the President as soon as possible.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

Patricia Siemien
Special Assistant
to the Director

Ms. Kathleen Osborne
Personal Secretary to the President
The White House

**United States
Information
Agency**

Washington, D.C. 20547

Office of the Director



January 25, 1985

Mr. Leonid M. Zamyatin
Chief, International Information Department
Central Committee, Communist Party of The Soviet Union
Staraya Ploshchad' 4
Moscow, USSR

Dear Mr. Zamyatin:

In recent months Soviet media have levied a number of attacks on U.S. public diplomacy and the U.S. Information Agency, especially on the Voice of America and our new WORLDNET satellite television service. Your article in Literaturnaya Gazeta ["Impasses of Confrontations and Horizons of Cooperation," November 28, 1984] summarizes most of the charges and typifies the underlying mindset. I am prompted to respond at this time to the continuing stream of attacks because in a period when our two governments are engaged in serious exploration of vital issues, such attacks are a disservice to more positive relations.

My hope is to generate a constructive dialogue. To initiate that dialogue I extend two concrete offers. First, I ask that you offer your good offices to facilitate using broadcast media to further mutual understanding. In this regard, I suggest that you arrange for Soviet television to carry an address by one of our top leaders which would be reciprocated on American television by one of your top leaders. There is a precedent for this: Mr. Brezhnev and Mr. Nixon made such speeches several years ago with considerable positive effect.

Second, I propose that we carry further the dialogue by having you and other Soviet officials and journalists take part in the WORLDNET program of which you are so critical. Let us jointly plan a one- to two-hour satellite television dialogue on WORLDNET in which Soviet journalists interview senior U.S. officials on issues of mutual concern. At the same time, you should plan with U.S. media a similar program in which American journalists freely and spontaneously question senior Soviet officials. Coming at this important time in our relations, such ventures could help make communication more reasoned and reciprocal.

Incidentally, I am not surprised by your unwarranted criticisms of WORLDNET and of our Agency. I have come to expect it. However, you should understand that our country does not claim, as you do, that opposing ideas "subvert" our system. We recognize instead that diversity of public opinion is one of the great strengths of America. Thus, our society freely permits Soviet spokesmen

to state their views on American television and in print. In this regard, I might note that Soviet journalists and Soviet officials are interviewed on American television literally dozens of times per year. Surely the time has come for greater equality of treatment.

If the United States can confidently tolerate opposing views without fears of "loosening" the system, why then should the Soviet government act so restrictively, even to the point of jamming our broadcasts in direct violation of several international agreements to which the USSR is a signatory? Why not allow greater independent public inquiry about your government's decisions and policies? Why should American officials, in turn, not be permitted to state their views on Soviet television and in the Soviet media? Our society has never walked away from a fair challenge, and we look forward to engaging in a peaceful contest of ideas with the USSR.

Your article is evidence of the need for this reasoned and open dialogue. Charges of "piracy of the air," "radio warfare," "subversive purpose," and "television propaganda aggression" only exacerbate the "impasses" and "confrontations" to which you allude and delay our search for "horizons of cooperation." Coming at this time, when the leaders of our two countries are seeking new means for considering meaningful arms reduction efforts and ways to stabilize relations, your attacks are most unfortunate. Surely, everyone concerned about U.S.-Soviet relations has a right to expect greater restraint and accuracy.

Although I will not attempt in this letter to deal with the many errors and distortions in your article, I would like to clarify the role and purpose of the U.S. Information Agency, particularly the Voice of America and WORLDNET.

- USIA is not in the business of misrepresenting Soviet foreign policy, as you allege. Its primary purpose is to present America to the rest of the world and to explain U.S. foreign and domestic policies to people around the world. In so doing, we present the news, good and bad.
- The Voice of America is a distinguished source of news and information about the United States -- our policies, society, culture, and values. By U.S. law, VOA is required to present "accurate, objective, and comprehensive" information, to be truthful, and to be "seen as a consistently reliable and authoritative source of news." Over 100 million people throughout the world listen to VOA each week, all voluntarily, many of them at risk to their safety.
- In modernizing and improving our communication facilities and seeking a wider audience, our purpose is to allow a greater proportion of the world's population to know what is going on in the world and be better able to reach independent judgments on these events.
- WORLDNET is a modern television system linking Washington via satellite with U.S. embassies, information centers, and a number of TV studios throughout the world. WORLDNET is not forced on receiving nations.

Journalists in the participating nations freely choose the programming that they wish to broadcast or write about or not use at all.

- WORLDNET enables foreign journalists to ask probing, unrehearsed questions instantaneously, via satellite, directly to high-level American officials. Your representatives from TASS, Pravda and other Soviet publications are welcome at official U.S. press conferences. They are welcome, too, as observers in our WORLDNET studio.


Permitting a free flow of information is in the best interests of both our societies and a necessary response to the times. The irreversible revolution in communications, enabling prompt and comprehensive dissemination of news, will make it increasingly harder to limit peoples' access to information.

All nations should ultimately welcome this: misunderstanding and ignorance only serve to exacerbate tensions in the conduct of international relations. Our nations need to know more about each other; we Americans are firmly committed to providing the peoples of the Soviet Union -- and the world community -- with an accurate picture of the United States. Similarly, we hope to broaden our nation's understanding of the USSR.

I hope that you will enable Soviet journalists and television commentators to participate actively, and very soon, in WORLDNET interviews of U.S. leaders to be broadcast in the USSR. In turn, American journalists should have an equal opportunity to interview your leaders for broadcast in the USA. This direct dialogue would broaden the "horizons of cooperation" that you did not discuss in your article, but that you, too, must want to see attained.

I look forward to your response to my offers that we exchange televised interviews by top U.S. and Soviet leaders and that Soviet journalists and officials participate in a WORLDNET dialogue with senior U.S. officials on issues of mutual concern.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, reading "Charles Z. Wick". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large, stylized initial "C" and a prominent "Z".

Charles Z. Wick
Director

End
Case
File

311684
ME001

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

April 22, 1985

Dear John:

Thank you very much for your very kind letter and generous words. Thanks, too, for the support you've given me over the years.

I know there are many "perks" that go with this job, but also some sacrifices. One of the greatest sacrifices is having to absent myself from the Rancheros ride and the general fellowship. I'm counting the years.

Again, thanks and very best regards.

Sincerely,

Ron

Mr. John B. Quigley
1055 California Street
San Francisco, California 94108

85 428

Mr. John B. Quigley - 1055 California St. S.F. Calif.
94108

Dear John

Thank you very much for your very kind letter & generous words. Thanks too for the support you've given me over the years.

I know there are many "fares" that go with this job but also some ~~that~~ sacrifices.

One of the greatest sacrifices is having to absent myself from the Rancheros side and the general fellowship. I'm counting the years.

Again thanks & very best regards
Sincerely Ron

1055 California Street
San Francisco, California 94108


Dear President Reagan,

In 1978 we were talking in the then Gringo Camp on Rancheros. I said to you, "Having supported you in three campaigns, it makes me sick that you are not President." You replied, "Maybe next time!" and I told you you would certainly have my support. So you will understand me when I say that I go along with Jimmy Stewart in saying, "You can't know how much pleasure it gives me to address you as above."

The one bad thing about your being in office is that we are denied the privilege of your "fouling up our Ranchero rodeo" according to Frank Bogart. One privilege we gladly but ruefully give up.

So until we can see you again, God bless you and your charming wife, Nancy.

Yours faithfully,



John B. Quigley RV 1941

April 14, 1985

End
tase
File

311685
TA

April 22, 1985

Dear Mr. Summerfield:

Thank you for your message. I understand and share your concern about our trade situation with Japan.

We have made and continue to make good progress in opening Japanese markets. Prime Minister Nakasone is working with us and I have great confidence that the outcome will work to our advantage.

I am grateful for your support and I assure you that I shall continue to work hard to merit your confidence.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

RONALD REAGAN

Mr. Arthur E. Summerfield, Jr.
1735 Genesee Towers
Flint, Michigan 48502

RR:KCS:AVH:vml-4pmnd

DRAFT/Date 4/19/85

RR / KCS / (Rev. I) / (Rev. II)
(Drafter)

AVH / /

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosures:

Other:

Handwritten signature and initials
5/1/85

Dear Mr. Summerfield:

Thank you for your message. I understand
our trade

50 ✓

CAD

We have made & are making progress - good progress in opening Japanese markets. The Prime Minister is working with us to do this.

RR

MAR 2 10:56

1-007622A092 04/02/85
ICS IPMNDWA WSH
00090 TDBN FLINT MI 205 04-02 1022A EST
PMS (4-0081445092 3132322821 1024)
PRESIDENT RONALD REAGAN RPT DLY MGM, DLR
WHITE HOUSE DC 20500

DEAR MR PRESIDENT

PLEASE UNDERSTAND THAT I AM AND HAVE BEEN AN ARDENT SUPPORTER OF YOURS FOR MANY YEARS. HOWEVER I AM BECOMING INCREASINGLY DISTRESSED WITH THE ONE WAY STREET THAT WE HAVE ALLOWED THE JAPANESE ON THE MATTER OF IMPORTING THEIR JAPANESE PRODUCTS INTO THIS COUNTRY AND WITH THE EXPORTING OF OUR WEALTH AND JOBS.

ALTHOUGH I ADMIRE YOUR STAND ON FREE AND FAIR TRADE I DON'T THINK THAT THE JAPANESE QUALIFY TO COME UNDER THIS UMBRELLA.

AS A WORLD WAR II VETERAN I BITTERLY RESENT YOUR ALLOWING THEM TO TAKE BOTH JOBS AND MONEY AWAY FROM OUR COUNTRY. THE TIME HAS CERTAINLY COME FOR YOU TO TAKE STRONG AND AGGRESSIVE ACTION.

I WOULD AGREE THAT THEY ARE ENTITLED TO RECIPROCAL TRADE BUT CERTAINLY OUR PRESENT SITUATION IS DISASTROUS. IF IT KEEPS ON I AM FEARFUL THAT ONE OF THE LEGACIES THAT YOU LEAVE MIGHT WELL BE THAT DURING THE 8 YEARS OF YOUR OTHERWISE VERY FINE PRESIDENCY THIS PERIOD WILL BE KNOWN AS A TIME WHEN WE EXPORTED MORE JOBS AND MORE MONEY THAN ANY OTHER 8-YEAR PERIOD IN OUR HISTORY.

I THINK THAT YOU, ALL OF US, AND OUR COUNTRY DESERVE BETTER.

PLEASE BEGIN TO TAKE AGGRESSIVE ACTION, THE HOUR IS LATE.

ARTHUR E SUMMERFIELD JR
SON OF FORMER POSTMASTER GENERAL
1735 GENESEE TOWERS
FLINT MI 48502

1053 EST

End
class
file

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

April 22, 1985



MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: Alfred H. Kingon
SUBJECT: Motor Vehicle Occupant Protection Requirements

On the way to the Cabinet meeting Monday, you referred to a letter that objected to Federal Government coercion regarding seat belts and possible air bags. While we thought that there was no federal coercion, I asked Elizabeth Dole, who responded with the memo attached.

Briefly summarizing the Vehicle Safety Act of 1966, this Act imposes on the Secretary of Transportation an obligation to "reduce traffic accidents and injuries to persons resulting from traffic accidents" through the issuance of Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards.

In 1981 the Department of Transportation did away with the rule requiring front seat positions in all new cars to be equipped with automatic restraints. In 1983 the Supreme Court held that an inadequate basis had been provided for the recision and required the Department to reopen the rulemaking.

Interpretating the Supreme Court's mandate, DOT announced a rule last July that allows for alternate approaches. The rule required phasing in of automatic occupant protection starting September 1, 1986, for 10% of passenger cars manufactured for sale in the U.S., until September 1, 1989, when all such cars will be required to have automatic occupant protection, unless a sufficient number of states enact seat belt use laws.

This requirement can be rescinded prior to 1989 if seat belt use laws are mandated by the states to cover two-thirds of the population of the U.S.

To date, six states have enacted safety belt use law. A number of others indicate that they will come forward soon. Legislation is pending in 25 other states. Public interest is rising. Secretary Dole has expressed to me the belief that a sufficient number of states, along with auto manufacturers' cooperation, may make the rule null before the required dates.

Attachment



THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

APR 17 1985

MEMORANDUM TO: Alfred Kingon, Assistant to the President
for Cabinet Affairs

FROM: Elizabeth Hanford Dole 

SUBJECT: Motor Vehicle Occupant Protection
Requirements

The debate about automatic crash protection for motorists has been in progress since the 1960's. The National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 directs the Secretary of Transportation to "reduce traffic accidents and deaths and injuries to persons resulting from traffic accidents" through the issuance of Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards. Since the initial issuance of the section of the standards dealing with protection of occupants, there have been approximately 60 rulemaking documents issued with respect to it.

In 1981, the Department rescinded the Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard that would have required the front seat positions in all new cars to be equipped with automatic restraints. Law suits were filed and on June 24, 1983, the Supreme Court held that an inadequate basis had been provided for the rescision. The Court required the Department to reopen the rulemaking, and unless certain very stringent standards could be met, reimpose the rule.

The rulemaking record and the Supreme Court's strict interpretation of the statute led us to the conclusion that passive restraints must be mandated unless motorists could be convinced to wear manual safety belts. With this evidence in hand, I announced a rule last July that provides the American people a choice between the two approaches.

The rule I announced requires the phasing-in of automatic occupant protection for all passenger cars manufactured for sale in the United States after September 1, 1989, unless sufficient states enact seat belt use laws.

The requirement for automatic protection will be rescinded if belt use laws meeting specified conditions are passed by a sufficient number of states before April 1, 1989, to cover two-thirds of the population of the United States.

Manufacturers may comply with the regulation through use of any means that meet the standard's test requirements. Means of compliance could include air bags, automatic safety belts or so-called passive interiors. The rule encourages the development and use of technologies that do not rely on automatic belts. To stimulate such technologies during the phase-in period, the rule provides manufacturers "extra credit" for each car produced with air bags, or other non-belt technology on the driver side and any type of automatic protection on the passenger side.

In conjunction with the regulation, a comprehensive public information and education program is underway. Public attitudes towards motor vehicle occupant protection are changing rapidly. Six states have enacted safety belt use laws since I announced the rule and legislation is pending in another 25 states. A number of public interest groups, such as the American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC), are participating in the education program. Many corporate, medical and public interest groups, including the automotive industry, are actively supporting belt use legislation. Despite the fact that the Department is again being sued by insurance interests who want all cars to be equipped with air bags, the decade long debate over this issue is subsiding.

End
Case
File

~~To Mr. Martin H. Lox - Ramada Inn~~
~~24-587~~

To Mrs. William Loebe - P.O. Box 720
Manchester N.H. 03105

Dear Mackey

I share your view about compulsory ~~seat~~ seat belts but unfortunately we are victims of circumstance, at least that's one way to put it.

The Vehicle Safety act of 1966 imposed on the Sec. of Transportation an obligation to "reduce traffic accidents & injuries to persons resulting from traffic accidents" through the issuance of Fed. Motor Vehicle Safety Standards.

In 1980 (~~consequently~~) the dept. did away with the rule requiring front seat positions in all new cars to be equipped with automatic restraints. In 1983 the Supreme Ct. got into the act and ruled that an inadequate basis had been provided for the decision and required the dept. to reopen the rule making.

Under that mandate the dept. announced a rule last July allowing for alternate approaches. The rule required phasing in automatic frontiers starting Sept. 1 '86 for 10% of cars manufactured for domestic sale until Sept. 1 '89 when all such cars will be required to have automatic protection, unless a sufficient number of states enact seat belt laws. This requirement can be rescinded prior to '89 if seat belt use laws are mandated by the states to cover two thirds

of the population of the U.S.

Sec. Dole tells me she believes a sufficient number of states along with auto manufacturers cooperation may make the rule null & void. This will have to occur before April 1 '89.

Incidentally the dept. is being sued by insurance interests who want all cars to be equipped with airbags.

As you can see "big brother" is watching & he aint no.

It was good to hear from you. I wish I could have provided a different answer.

Best Regards
Ron

312 134
5A002

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

April 23, 1985

Dear Nackey:

I share your view about compulsory seat belts but, unfortunately, we are victims of circumstance. At least that's one way to put it.

The Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 imposed on the Secretary of Transportation an obligation to "reduce traffic accidents and injuries to persons resulting from traffic accidents" through the issuance of Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards.

In 1981, the Department did away with the rule requiring front seat positions in all new cars to be equipped with automatic restraints. In 1983, the Supreme Court got into the act and ruled that an inadequate basis had been provided for the recision and required the Department to reopen the rulemaking. Under that mandate, the Department announced a rule last July allowing for alternate approaches. The rule required phasing in automatic protections starting September 1, 1986 for 10% of cars manufactured for domestic sale until September 1, 1989 when all such cars will be required to have automatic protections, unless a sufficient number of States enact seat belt laws. This requirement can be rescinded prior to 1989 if seat belt-use laws are mandated by the States to cover two-thirds of the population of the United States.

5A0025

Secretary Dole tells me she believes a sufficient number of States, along with auto manufacturers' cooperation, may make the rule null and void. This will have to occur before April 1, 1989.

Incidentally, the Department is being sued by insurance interests who want all cars to be equipped with air bags.

As you can see, "big brother" is watching and he ain't us.

It was good to hear from you. I wish I could have provided a different answer.

Best regards,

Ron

Mrs. William Loeb
Post Office Box 780
Manchester, New Hampshire 03105

April 5, 1985

The Honorable Ronald Reagan
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Ron:

This is of minor importance compared to your other responsibilities but nevertheless it is of concern to myself and I am sure to others as well.

I am speaking of the drive to enforce seat belt use nationwide. I understand if a certain amount of states do not pass laws within a required time forcing drivers to use seat belts, we are threatened with air bags being mandated nationwide.


Now, I am all for seat belts being used as they do save lives, but I think this should be because of a personal sense of responsibility rather than because of Big Brother's enforcement. I suspect you would feel the same way.

This mandatory seat belt use policy is completely opposed to the Reagan philosophy of less government control and more personal responsibility and I cannot understand its being part of your conservative platform. The regulation just doesn't make sense.

Fortunately today the New Hampshire legislature turned it down, but it will come up again in the future. I would hope that you would look into this attack on good old American freedom and our right to control our own lives.

On other matters, reading the news, I commend you on your excellent handling of the stick and the carrot, both in Washington and abroad. Keep it up and best wishes.

Sincerely,



Mrs. William Loeb

End
Case
File

311711
TRICS-01

April 23, 1985

Dear Elsa:

Just a line to thank you for your letter. You brightened my day considerably. It was kind of you and typical. The press has been out for blood on the subject of the trip to Germany. I'm going to do what I believe is right, and you've made me feel a lot better. Thanks, and God bless you.

Sincerely,

Ron

Mrs. Elsa Sandstrom
Apartment 112
8860 Villa LaJolla Drive
LaJolla, California 92037

RR/AVH/ams

ELSA SANDSTROM
8860 Villa LaJolla Drive #112
LaJolla, Ca. 92037


April 20, 1985

President Ronald Reagan
The White House
Washington, D. C. 200

Dear Mr. President -

Our sincerest commendations to you for the steadfastness and strength you have shown in dealing with your opposition since entering your second term. We are indebted to you; and we know you will continue to have our country's best interests at heart.

Kudos to you also for standing firm on your commitment to place a wreath in the German cemetery. Having been invited to do so by the German Chancellor, it would have been most discourteous to refuse. We are all aware of the atrocities of war; and deplore them with all of our hearts and do not forget. However, as you have so eloquently stated, there is also a time for reconciliation . . .

Sincerely,

Elsa Sandstrom (Mrs.)

"Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath: for it is written, Vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord." Romans 12:19

"Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord; and the people whom he hath chosen for his own inheritance. Psalms 33:12

"But his delight is in the law of the Lord; and in his law doth he meditate day and night." Psalms 1:3

311710
TR 001

April 23, 1985

Dear Ruddy:

It was good to hear from you and to be with you at the circus. I thought you were pretty quiet that day and I'm glad to know the reason and also glad to know you are alright now.

I'm sorry to hear about your problem with Raymond. You did right in telling him you were sorry. Maybe you need to do a little more if he's still acting not so friendly. Go to him when you can talk quietly, without others around. Tell him good friends aren't easy to come by, and that you want to be his friend. Tell him you were upset and not thinking straight when you called him what you did, but you didn't mean it and you want him for your best friend.


Thanks for the pictures. I really enjoyed them. You brought back some memories for me. I used to be in school plays -- also some pageants and plays in Sunday School.

Stick with that French. I didn't do as well as I should have in French, and I sure was sorry when I found myself in France. I could manage a little, but I realized for the first time how wonderful it would be if I could make myself understood in their language.

Speaking of languages, we are off to West Germany April 30th for what's called an economic summit. I don't know a word of German.

Well, give my best to your folks.

Sincerely,



Rudolph Hines
607 Savannah Street, S.E.
Washington, D.C. 20032

85 424

RR/AVH/ams

607 Savannah Street, S. E.
Washington, D.C. 20032

April, 1985

Dear President Reagan:

I have learned if you hurt a friend they don't like you as well as before. I called my best friend, Raymond, a bad name because I was very mad at him. I didn't mean to say it. I told him I was sorry, but it hasn't been the same. What do you think I should do? I hope things get better between us.

Our class play is coming along fine. I am called Otis Lee in this play and it is a large part. We are practicing how to sing clearly and to speak loudly. We are getting costumes and wigs and everything.

We had kite flying day at our school on a very windy Friday. I had a kite with "Snoopy" on it but it didn't do well because I couldn't figure out how to attach the guide string. All the students had kites to fly. Some bought kites at the store and a lot of students made their own. It was a good day.

We have a new vice principal at our school named Dr. Van Buren. She tells the students to go home when they are disobedient or late to school. We also have a new french teacher. She comes every Wednesday to teach us french. I can say a few words but not much more than that. I am also poking along slowly with my piano lessons. Sometimes it is hard to remember all the notes.

It was good to see you at the circus. I wasn't feeling well that day but I had a good time. Thank you again for the "whistle". I will add it to my collection. It blows real loud. Well I have to go now, but I'd like to send to you some pictures my mom took over the holidays. Hope to see you again soon.

Your Pen Pal,

Ruddy

Rudolph

April 23, 1985

Dear Ruddy:

It was good to hear from you and to be with you at the circus. I thought you were pretty quiet that day and I'm glad to know the reason and also glad to know you are alright now.

I'm sorry to hear about your problem with Raymond. You did right in telling him you were sorry. Maybe you need to do a little more if he's still acting not so friendly. Go to him when you can talk quietly, without others around. Tell him good friends aren't easy to come by, and that you want to be his friend. Tell him you were upset and not thinking straight when you called him what you did, but you didn't mean it and you want him for your best friend.

Thanks for the pictures. I really enjoyed them. You brought back some memories for me. I used to be in school plays -- also some pageants and plays in Sunday School.

Stick with that French. I didn't do as well as I should have in French, and I sure was sorry when I found myself in France. I could manage a little, but I realized for the first time how wonderful it would be if I could make myself understood in their language.

Speaking of languages, we are off to West Germany April 30th for what's called an economic summit. I don't know a word of German.

Well, give my best to your folks.

Sincerely,

Rudolph Hines
607 Savannah Street, S.E.
Washington, D.C. 20032

RR/AVH/ams

311709

MAGZO

April 24, 1985

Dear Barney:

I've put my O.K. on Jimmy for the medal.
Thanks for the piece on him. Here I am
in Washington and I have to get a story
in the Congressional Record by way of
California.

Your story on Jimmy was great, and I
learned something. I had never heard the
story about his appearance at the Military
Reception Center W.W. II.

Thanks again.

Best Regards,

Ran

Colonel Barney Oldfield, USAF, Ret.
Litton
360 North Crescent Drive
Beverly Hills, California 90210

RR/AMH/ams



Litton

360 North Crescent Drive, Beverly Hills, California 90210 213 859-5905

Col. Barney Oldfield, USAF (Ret)
(Consultant)

April 8, 1985

Dear President Ron:

While lolling and enjoying a lollygagging ranch restup, I thought you might like to see this Congressional RECORD pickup on Jimmy Stewart. The "after-life" of a Variety Daily piece is considerable, as this attests. It is my understanding that Senator Pete Wilson is lobbying you for a Presidential Medal of Freedom for the slowest drawl in the west, so you can add this to reasons in favor thereof. Hide all the field mice from Nancy, as she might grow to love them and take some back to the White House when you go.

I had a letter from Dr. John Wickman, of the Dwight D. Eisenhower Library in Abilene, Kansas asking me to be their reception speaker when the "Flag of Liberation" arrives there on the eve of the 40th Anniversary of D-Day, and I've said YES. That's only a few miles up the road from Dodge City. Do you think Errol Flynn really made it safe in 1939?

Best always,

President Ronald Reagan,
The Western White House,
Rancho del Cielo,
Santa Barbara, CA 93102

that the beneficiary once qualified as their "child" within the meaning of section 101(b)(1) of the act. Adopted children are included in the definition of "child" as defined by the section. However, adoptions must conform to the applicable laws of the jurisdiction where it occurred and the statutory requirements of the act. The law requires the petitioner to establish eligibility for the benefits sought.

In this case, the Burrs were unable to meet the burden of proof that they complied with the laws of the State of Chihuahua, Mexico, at the time of the adoption activities. Lori is now 18 years old and her adoption at this time would not satisfy the requirement of section 101(b)(1)(E) of the act which requires that an adoption take place before the child reaches age 16. The Chairman of the Board of Immigration Appeals acknowledged that sympathetic factors were present in the case but had to dismiss the appeal as a matter of law.

Lori has lived in El Paso since August 1972, when she was age 6, and is presently a senior in high school there. The Burrs were never challenged about Lori's citizenship until they applied for a Social Security card. They had assumed that her adoption conferred upon her U.S. citizenship.

Lori now faces the possibility of deportation under the laws of the United States. She has no other family and is without relatives in Mexico. She will encounter difficulty in finding employment or pursuing higher education under the circumstances. Certainly, the uncertainty of her status or the possibility of deportation will cause additional stress to Lori and the Burrs.

I am, therefore, introducing legislation which would grant Lori full citizenship and enable her to enjoy the benefits that such status provides. The equities are completely on her side and I would urge my colleagues to join me in assisting the Burr family in this matter. ●

THE JIMMY STEWART FALCON FOUNDATION SCHOLARSHIP

HON. JOE KOLTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. KOLTER. Mr. Speaker, Indiana, PA, in my Fourth District, has always been proud of one of its native sons, known far and wide through the movies—Jimmy Stewart. We have known him in our State, have met him on our streets, have seen him on the screen and our TV sets, and while he has gone many miles in many dimensions, we always feel that he has never left us. He is one of ours and will always be.

But he can still surprise us on occasion. And the 55th anniversary edition of *Daily Variety* in Hollywood, pub-

lished Monday, October 29, 1984, made us feel another stirring of pride when he is one of its major features. The headline said: Jimmy Stewart Serves Country in Peace as in War, Funding U.S. Air Force's Falcon Scholarship to Assist Cadets. California Youth is First to Benefit.

As it makes good reading, I commend it to the attention of my colleagues and, with your permission, enter it in the RECORD.

THE JIMMY STEWART FALCON FOUNDATION SCHOLARSHIP

(By Col. Barney Oldfield USAF (Ret.))

There's something special about Keith Brahms of Sherman Oaks, Calif., who came into the Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs last July 6 with the class of 1988. He got there by being the first Lt. Jimmy Stewart Falcon Foundation scholar, and attended Santa Barbara's Northwestern Preparatory School to ready him for his appointment.

That Falcon Foundation Jimmy Stewart Scholarship was announced in October 1983. It was made possible by the check which comes the middle of every month signed by Stewart in the amount of \$814.42, which represents his retirement pay as a Brigadier General in the reserve. The endowment now exceeds \$60,000—and checks still come.

The word that it would go into operation was passed before the whole U.S. Air Force command structure of four, three and two-star generals convened from all over the world by AF Chief of Staff, Gen. Charles Gabriel. More than 100 of the cadets who were in the Academy as Falcon Foundation-assisted students were in the audience, too.

So far, more than 1,000 young people have been financially, and prep school, assisted since the Foundation was birthed in 1958.

Jimmy Stewart never missed many formations, curtain calls, callboard instructions or failed to return an agent's message, but here at the Academy that October 28, health reasons blocked his personal appearance. And that was an event which will reach beyond his substantial professional credits—as there will be a Jimmy Stewart Falcon Foundation scholar every year in perpetuity.

Lt. Gen. Ben Bellis, the Foundation's president, told the audience that Stewart had first sent him a wire regretting that he would "... be unable to attend because of a health problem I have." That from Jimmy Stewart, a sort of indestructible Air Force icon!

He had enlisted March 22, 1941, even before the U.S. got into WW II. Nine months later, he was commissioned and made a pilot, flew 20 flak-strewn missions against myriad German targets including Bremen, Frankfurt and Berlin. Many who had known him in those times had flown to Colorado to be present for this salute to him.

The occasion included another aviation "great," the celebrated C. L. (Kelly) Johnson, who fathered everything from the early P-38 forked tail fighter through the U-2 and SR-71—headline makers all.

The custom for the Falcon Foundation honorees is that their portraits are unveiled at the ceremony, and then are hung in what the Academy calls its "Gallery of Great Airmen." Although Jimmy Stewart retired as a Brigadier General in 1968, he insisted that the Falcon Foundation artist, Darla Lockwood, portray him as a second lieutenant in his flight jacket. It's that one-barred "shavetail," rather than wearing the one star to which he's entitled, which will look down from the Academy walls for all time.

There has never been a request for narration for an Air Force film, or a spot announcement to help recruiting, or a speaking date at an Air Force function that Stewart could bring himself to turn down if he could squeeze it into his schedule. For the last year, he and Lt. Gen. James Doolittle have been cochairmen for the fund-raising drive for the U.S. Air Force Museum Fund. His old starer, "Strategic Air Command," is still brought out on flyboy occasions, too.

The Falcon Foundation came about when it was first learned what a differential there is in various community schools, and how short graduates were found to be in mathematics, English, physics and chemistry. Such grads might be in good health, proficient in sports, have the personality and poise which lends to command, but were academic shortfalls. They could neither pass the entrance exams, nor if they lucked in, keep up with the tough regimen over the four years. The Falcon Foundation scholarships have for the most part been made possible by gifts and endowments established by industrial and aerospace firms and individuals.

The Jimmy Stewart one is called a trustee scholarship, because it's been done on the "installment plan," all monies sent by him into the endowment on hold until it could produce the required annual income to make the scholarship roll on and on.

Jimmy Stewart was an actor, yes, but he had that extra spark going for him. He'd mothballed his film career in midstream to serve his country—and that always made him admired, and different. To those other wearers of uniforms, he has never been just a shadow on a screen or a disembodied soundtrack voice. His has been the real experience of bloody ordeal and wild adventure aloft.

At that 1983 Academy affair, they did bow to his enviable record as a performer. Those five Academy of Motion Picture Arts & Sciences nominations and one Oscar; two N.Y. Film Critics "best actor" awards, as many kudos from the Venice Film Festival in the same category and France's "Victoire." There was that big Screen Actors Guild 1968 one for "... outstanding achievement in fostering the finest ideals of the acting profession"; in 1980 American Film Institute's "Life Achievement Award"; 1981, the American National Theater and Academy's "national artist award," and in January 1982, he was Grand Marshal for the annual Tournament of Roses Parade in Pasadena. In all the history of the Air Force Reserve, Stewart is listed as one of only two who ever received the "distinguished service medal for exceptionally meritorious service to the United States."

That long ago Stewart enlistment caused one of pre-WW II's most amusing incidents. Harried classification clerks at reception centers asked each one who came before them—mostly without looking up—what sort of civilian employment they'd known and level of compensation. It provided the precomputer and punchcards period a profile on which to base judgments as to already possessed aptitudes and capabilities. From such State, indicated schooling could be selected and directed. Stewart said he worked for MGM in Culver City, and made approximately \$2,700 a week. At that point, the classification clerk looked up, but was evidently not a film fan and didn't recognize who was there before him.

"Come on, now," he said in exasperation. "Every \$25-a-week clown that comes in here tells me what a big shot he is, and makes that bull \$1,000 a week. Where is this MGM?" Stewart, never a fast talker, was nonplussed, but his honor impugned, gave

the clerk the phone number and told him to ask for the payroll department. The clerk decided to call his bluff and put in the query, telling the answering party he was at the U.S. Army Reception Center. Did they have a Jimmy Stewart at their employment roster? Yes, they did. "What'd you pay him?" the clerk asked. When the answer came, he almost dropped the phone.

Private James Stewart, his honor, veracity, and credibility restored, then walked into uniform and his considerable history.

When the Lt., or Gen. Jimmy Stewart Falcon Foundation scholarship was born at the Air Force Academy a year ago, everyone in the big room stood, applauded and faced his portrait in lieu of having him there in person among them. There was no projected collection of old film clips to stand in for him as each person there had his own personal cameo of him.

The real Jimmy Stewart that was, is, and always will be with them. As he will be with Keith Brahm, out of Sherman Oaks and Santa Barbara, Calif.—and who knows where all else once that class of 1988 begins serving.

TECHNOLOGY AND THE FAMILY FARM

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, March 27, 1985, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

TECHNOLOGY AND THE FAMILY FARM

Farmers have struggled in recent years. A combination of factors, including low commodity prices, high interest rates, falling land values, unfair foreign subsidies and the overvalued U.S. dollar, which prices our exports out of the world market, has increased farm operating costs and reduced farm income. Nearly 30% of U.S. farmers are in serious financial trouble, and 10-15% of them may go out of business this year.

A new study by the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment (OTA) points out new challenges for midwestern farmers. The report predicts that new farm technology—especially biotechnology and information technology—will revolutionize agriculture in the next two decades. The benefits of this technology could be dazzling. Developments such as genetically altered plants that resist pests and disease, and computerized farm management promise dramatic increases in production and efficiency.

The new technology could help American farmers compete in world markets. Some countries, such as Argentina, already produce crops at prices lower than ours. They might continue to outstrip us if we do not adopt the new technology rapidly.

Eventually, advances in plant biotechnology will probably have the greatest impact on production. So far, however, more progress has been made in animal biotechnology. For example, emerging technology will soon transform the dairy industry. Embryo transplants, computerized feeding and monitoring, and growth hormones could increase milk production per cow by 40% or more in the next 15 years. One cow will be able to reproduce 60 heifers per year.

But there will be negative effects as well. The use of new farm technology could dramatically change the make-up of American agriculture, with some big winners and some big losers. The new technology will accel-

ate the trend toward large industrial farms, which will dominate agriculture. Many Hoosier farmers could be among the losers. The number of medium-size farms and farms in the Midwest and Northeast might continue to increase, but their share of net farm income will decline.

For example, increased production in the dairy industry resulting from new technology might create massive surpluses in the years ahead. Small dairies in the Northeast and the Midwest will experience increasing competitive pressure from large, efficient producers in other regions. Currently, 125,000 dairy farms meet U.S. demand. In the future, we will need only 5,000 large industrial farms. Fifty-cow dairy farms in the Midwest will be outpaced by 2000-cow operations in the Sun Belt. Drastic remedies—such as strict supply control programs with non-transferable quotas—may be necessary to maintain traditional dairy operations in the Midwest and Northeast.

Similar challenges are likely with other commodities. Plant and animal technologies are not in themselves biased toward large farm operations, but these farms will probably benefit most from them. The technology a farmer needs to be competitive is costly and complex, and large farmers are better able to acquire the necessary capital and expertise. In addition, large farmers have greater access to information about new technology, and they are often more willing to adopt it as it becomes available. If moderate-size farms are to survive, they will have to use the newest technology. If they do not adapt, they probably will have to expand into large operations, sell part of their assets and join the small, part-time farms, or quit agriculture. The challenges faced by Indiana farmers are significant: the average farm in Indiana is half the size of the national average.

Some observers argue that a new farming system based on large industrialized farms will be more efficient, improve competition in the export market, and lower food prices. Yet, in my view, there are good reasons to save medium-size farms. Moderate-size farms are crucial to the economic survival of many rural communities: the quality of life declines in rural communities as average farm size increases. Large industrial farms also raise concerns about water quality and quantity, the rate of soil erosion, and increases in air and noise pollution. Moreover, ensuring the existence of a large number of moderate-size farms helps protect our food supply from severe weather conditions or diseases in one sector of the country, and from price manipulation by a few major producers.

We should take several steps to help moderate-size farmers. We must improve education to make new technologies available to these farmers and train them in their use. We should also help some farmers adapt to new endeavors. We might make it possible for farmers to grow specified "new crops" as a way to test their viability in a particular region. We should remove biases against moderate-size farms in federal programs and policies. For example, we could better target farm income-support programs for moderate-size farms. One such proposal, which I favor, would limit income support payments (such as target prices) given to large farms. We could similarly revise our farm credit and loan programs. Finally, our tax code often works against moderate-size farmers. Generous tax write-offs encourage farm expansion, as well as the use of farms as tax shelters by non-farmers, which artificially pushes up production and land prices. I support legislation to limit "tax-shelter" farming.

Whether or not these predictions turn out to be accurate, we should not ignore them. We may not be able to reverse many of the basic economic trends that could harm small and medium-size farmers, but we can take steps to make the new technology work for them.

(NOTE: Much of the information in this newsletter is in a report by the Office of Technology Assessment entitled "Technology, Public Policy, and the Changing Structure of American Agriculture.")

EAGLE HOSE COMPANY NO. 1 OBSERVES 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. HENRY J. NOWAK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. NOWAK. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, volunteer firefighters play a vital role in protecting our society, a role they have been playing in our Nation for almost two and a half centuries.

In 1736, Benjamin Franklin founded the first volunteer fire department. Today, nearly 250 years later, there are more than 800,000 volunteer firefighters who receive no pay for their services. They represent more than three-quarters of our country's 1 million strong firefighting force.

That means volunteer firefighters must respond to the majority of our Nation's 2 million fires each year; fires which threaten man, animal and plant alike in our homes, workplaces and natural preserves.

But that's not all. A large part of their duty, and in a sense the most important, is fire prevention. Volunteers teach people about fire hazards and the safety measures necessary to reduce the chance of fire. They also conduct fire inspections of private homes and commercial properties.

The responsibility does not end with fire-related duty. Many of the calls volunteers respond to involve medical emergencies such as auto accidents, heart attacks, boating emergencies, and natural disasters.

In the 33d Congressional District, which I am privileged to represent, Eagle Hose Company No. 1 of Lancaster, NY, will be celebrating its 100th anniversary on May 11, 1985.

As part of that observance, the anniversary chairman Arthur J. Robinson, has provided my office a summary of its history. I'd like to extend my congratulations to Eagle Hose Company No. 1 on this occasion and share this summary history with my colleagues:

HISTORY OF EAGLE HOSE COMPANY No. 1

Organized—May 8, 1885.

First equipment was a white hose cart and was called the Old Bay, Eagle Hose Cart, the Old Reliable.

The first motorized apparatus was a Brockway four cylinder combination truck purchased from the American LaFrance Fire Company for \$3,300 and went into service in November of 1917. After a new truck was purchased from the Buffalo Fire Appliance Corporation in June of 1935, the old

To Mrs. E. Lee Sandstrom - 3860 Villa La Jolla Dr.

#112 La Jolla Calif.

94037

Dear E. Lee

I just a line to thank you for your letter. You brightened my day considerably. It was kind of you to type it. The press have been out for a week on the subject of the trip to Germany. I'm going to do what I believe is right and you've made me feel a lot better. Thanks & love to you.

Lovingly
Ran

To Rudolph Hines 607 S. Vermont St. S.E.

Dear Rudy

Wash. D.C. 20032

It was good to hear from you and to be with you at the circus. I thought you were pretty quiet that day and I'm glad to know the reason and also glad to know you are alright now.

I'm sorry to hear about your problem with Raymond. You did right in telling him you were sorry. Maybe you ~~did~~ need to be a little more if he's still acting not so friendly. He to him when you can talk quietly without others around. Tell him good friends aren't easy to come by and that you want to be his friend. Tell him you were upset and not thinking straight when you called him what you did but you didn't mean it & you want him for your best friend.

Thanks for the pictures & really enjoyed them. You brought back some memories for me.
(over)

I used to be in school plays - also some pageants
& plays in Sunday school.

Stick with that French. I didn't do as well
as I should have in French and I sure was
sorry when I found myself in France. I could
manage a little but I realized for the first time
how wonderful it would be if I could ~~have~~
make myself understood in their language.

Speaking of languages we are off to
W. Germany April 30th for what's called an
economic summit. I don't know a word of German.

Will give my best to your folks.

Sincerely
RR

To Col. Barney Oldfield 360 No. Crescent Dr.

Dear Barney

Beverly Hills Calif. 90210

I've sent my O.K. on Jimmy for the medal. Thanks
for your piece on him. Here I am in Wash. & have
to get a story in the Congressional Record by way
of Calif.

Your story on Jimmy was great & I learned
something. I had never heard the story about his
appearance at the Mil. Reception center W.W.II.

Thanks again. Best Regards
Ron

End
Case
File

April 23, 1985

Dear Mr. Zoeman:

I'm sorry to be so late in answering your letter of March 30. I've been away, as you know, so it wasn't brought to my attention until a few days ago.

Believe me, I can understand your feeling of outrage and, yes, that of Mr. Rosensaft, but I would like to point out that the presentation of this episode in the media has been grossly distorted. Let me put the matter in proper perspective.

I will be in West Germany at the end of this month, as a guest of the German government, as we commemorate the 40th Anniversary of the end of World War II. Chancellor Helmut Kohl approached me some time ago as to what might be a proper observance of that event. I expressed the opinion that it was time for the world to view the day as one of gratitude that we have achieved friendship between former enemies, and forty years of peace. Of the seven nations represented at the Economic Summit, three were enemies of the other four in World War II. Now we meet annually as Allies.

Some time later, Chancellor Kohl asked me to be a guest of his government for a state visit following the Summit. He outlined a schedule which included our joint visit to the Bitburg Cemetery on our way to a visit with our American troops. Although the idea of a visit to Dachau had been raised, I had the impression that the German government preferred that I not visit that camp. I felt that for me to do this on my own while a guest of the German government would be taken as an affront to the people of Germany, and would be at odds with the spirit of reconciliation the Chancellor was trying to achieve. I am afraid I did not explain this very well when the question was asked in the press conference.

Only a short time ago did I learn that there had been some confusion, and that a visit to a concentration camp was being suggested by the German government as part of the official itinerary. I, of course, immediately accepted.

Mr. Zeeman, my feelings about the Holocaust can be summed up in the words I have used a hundred times, "we must never forget and it must never happen again." Since I have been President, we have regularly hosted gatherings in the East Room of survivors of the Holocaust. I am more pleased than I can say that the visit to a concentration camp will be a part of the official program.

Thank you for giving me a chance to explain and to respond to Mr. Rosensaft's article.

Sincerely,

RONALD REAGAN

Mr. Jesse A. Zeeman
2500 Virginia Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20037

RR/DLC/AVH/pt (4PMND)

Sample

JESSE A. ZEEMAN

*Can we get
covered?
RR*

March 30th 1985

The Honorable Ronald Reagan
The President of the United States
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. President:

I cannot conceive of any Jewish person in the United States disagreeing with the enclosed article, written by M. Z. Rosensaft, concerning your decision not to visit Dachau during your planned visit to Germany. I feel sure multitudes of people of other persuasions hold this view, as well.

In addition to the point stressed by Mr. Rosensaft that there are many Germans alive who participated in that infamous pogrom, the abuse and slaughter of six million Jews is a part of Germany's heritage and should not be allowed to be forgotten lest it happen again.

Please Mr. President, reconsider your plan and place Dachau on your itinerary.

Respectfully,

MIC. JESSE A. ZEEMAN
2500 VIRGINIA AVENUE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20037

[Signature]

To Mr. Jesse A. Zeeman 2500 Virginia Ave.
Wash. D.C. 20037

Dear Mr. Zeeman

I'm sorry to be so late in answering your letter of March 30th. I've been away as you know so it wasn't brought to my attention until a few days ago.

Believe me I can understand your feeling of outrage & yes that of Mr. Rosenhaft but let me say in my own defense that the media presentation of this whole episode is a gross distortion of fact. ~~I'll~~ ^{I'll} try to put the matter in ~~proper~~ ^{proper} perspective.

I will be in W. Germany as a guest of the govt. at the time of the 40th anniversary of V.E. Day. Chancellor Kohl approached me some time ago as to what might be a proper observance of that ^{DAY} ~~day~~ and expressed ~~my~~ ^{the} opinion that it was time for the world to view the day as one of gratitude that we have achieved friendship & 40 yrs. of peace between erstwhile enemies. Of the 7 nations represented at the economic summit 3 were enemies of the other 4 in U.W.W. Now we meet annually as allies.

Some time later he asked me to be a guest of ~~his~~ his govt. for a state visit following the summit. He outlined a schedule which included our joint visit to the Bitburg cemetery on our way to a church service with our American troops. At about this same time ^{it was told} a W. German political figure ^{had} asked me to pay a visit to Dachau. I felt that for me to do this on my own while a guest of the govt. would be taken
(over)

as an affront to the people of Germany and at odds
with the spirit of reconciliation the Chancellor was trying
^{Frankly I suspected the invitation had a political motive.}
to achieve. I'm afraid I didn't explain this very well
when the question was asked in the press conference.

Only a short time ago when the media blitz reached
Germany did I learn ~~that~~ there had been some mixup
or confusion & that the Dachau visit was part of the
official itinerary. I, of course, immediately accepted. ~~and~~
~~that it was evidence of Chancellor Kohl's sincerity.~~

Mr. Geeman my feelings about the Holocaust can
be summed up in the words I've used a hundred times;
"we must never forget and it must never happen again."
Since I've been President we have regularly hosted
gatherings in the East Room of survivors of the Holocaust.
I'm more pleased than I can say that the visit to a concentration
camp ~~is~~ will be a part of the official program.

In a few days from now & prior to my trip I'll be
attending a ceremony here ^{honoring survivors} ~~in honor of~~ of the Holocaust.

Thank you for giving me a chance to explain & to
respond to Mr. Rosenbergs article.

Sincerely
RR

The President has seen
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

April 24, 1985

MR. PRESIDENT:

You drafted the attached
response to Mr. Zeeman and NSC
has edited it to conform with
your recent public statements.

David L. Chew

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

DATE: 4/22/85 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: 2:00 P.M.SUBJECT: DRAFT LETTER TO MR. JESSE ZEEMAN RE VISIT TO A CONCENTRATION
CAMP DURING VISIT TO GERMANY

	ACTION FYI			ACTION FYI	
VICE PRESIDENT	☐	☐	OGLESBY	☐	☐
REGAN	☐	☐	ROLLINS	☐	☐
DEAVER	☐	☒	SPEAKES	☒	☐
STOCKMAN	☐	☐	SVAHN	☐	☐
BUCHANAN <i>no comment no Kase 4/22</i>	☒	☐	TUTTLE	☐	☐
CHEW	☐	☒	VERSTANDIG	☐	☐
FIELDING	☐	☐	WHITTLESEY	☐	☐
FRIEDERSDORF	☐	☐	RYAN	☐	☐
HICKEY	☐	☐	DANIELS	☐	☐
HICKS	☐	☐		☐	☐
KINGON	☐	☐		☐	☐
McFARLANE <i>no obj per staff + Kimmitt</i>	☒	☐		☐	☐

REMARKS:

The President drafted a response to Mr. Zeeman's letter at Tab A. As this draft has been overtaken by events, the NSC has prepared a revised draft at Tab B. We propose sending in the revised draft in for the President's signature this afternoon unless there are any objections.

RESPONSE:

David L. Chew
Staff Secretary
Ext. 2702

Dear Mr. Zeeman:

I'm sorry to be so late in answering your letter of March 30th. I've been away, as you know, so it wasn't brought to my attention until a few days ago.

Believe me, I can understand your feeling of outrage and, yes, that of Mr. Rosensaft, but I would like to point out that the presentation of this episode in the media has been grossly distorted. Let me put the matter in proper perspective.

I will be in West Germany at the end of this month, as a guest of the German Government, as we commemorate the 40th Anniversary of the end of World War II. Chancellor Helmut Kohl approached me some time ago as to what might be a proper observance of that event. I expressed the opinion that it was time for the world to view the day as one of gratitude that we have achieved friendship between former enemies, and forty years of peace. Of the seven nations represented at the Economic Summit, three were enemies of the other four in World War II. Now we meet annually as Allies.

Some time later, Chancellor Kohl asked me to be a guest of his government for a state visit following the summit. He outlined a schedule which included ~~our~~ joint visit to the Bitburg cemetery on our way to a ~~church service~~ ^{visit} with our American troops. Although the idea of a visit to Dachau had been raised, I had the impression that the German Government preferred that I not visit that camp. I felt that for me to do this on my own while a guest of the German Government would be taken as an affront to the people of Germany, and would be at odds with the spirit of reconciliation the Chancellor was trying to achieve. I am afraid I did not explain this very well when the question was asked in the press conference.

Only a short time ago did I learn that there had been some confusion, and that a visit to a concentration camp was being suggested by the German Government as part of the official itinerary. I, of course, immediately accepted.

Mr. Zeeman, my feelings about the Holocaust can be summed up in the words I have used a hundred times, "we must never forget and it must never happen again." Since I have been President, we have regularly hosted gatherings in the East Room of survivors of the Holocaust. I am more pleased than I can say that the visit to a concentration camp will be a part of the official program.

Thank you for giving me a chance ^{to} to explain and to respond to Mr. Rosensaft's article.

Sincerely,

Ronald Reagan

End
Case
File

312107
ID # CO114

WHITE HOUSE
CORRESPONDENCE TRACKING WORKSHEET

- ☐ O - OUTGOING
☐ H - INTERNAL
☐ I - INCOMING
Date Correspondence Received (YY/MM/DD) 85104124

Name of Correspondent: Andy Ireland

☐ MI Mail Report User Codes: (A) _____ (B) _____ (C) _____

Subject: Relates that 500 people attended a town meeting in his district about the situation in Central America. Mentions that some constituents are apprehensive regarding direct military involvement by the U.S.

ROUTE TO:		ACTION		DISPOSITION	
Office/Agency	(Staff Name)	Action Code	Tracking Date YY/MM/DD	Type of Response	Completion Date YY/MM/DD
<u>LAOGLF</u>		ORIGINATOR	<u>85104125</u>	<u>NAN</u>	<u>85104125</u>
		Referral Note:			
		Referral Note:			
		Referral Note:			
		Referral Note:			
		Referral Note:			

ACTION CODES:

- A - Appropriate Action
C - Comment/Recommendation
D - Draft Response
F - Furnish Fact Sheet
to be used as Enclosure

- I - Info Copy Only/No Action Necessary
R - Direct Reply w/Copy
S - For Signature
X - Interim Reply

DISPOSITION CODES:

- A - Answered
B - Non-Special Referral
C - Completed
S - Suspended

FOR OUTGOING CORRESPONDENCE:

- Type of Response = Initials of Signer
Code = "A"
Completion Date = Date of Outgoing

Comments: see memo AB

Keep this worksheet attached to the original Incoming letter.
Send all routing updates to Central Reference (Room 75, OEOP).
Always return completed correspondence record to Central Files.
Refer questions about the correspondence tracking system to Central Reference, ext. 2590.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

April 24, 1985

TO: KATHY JAFFKE
FROM: MAX FRIEDERSDORF *mb*
SUBJECT: Attached letter to the President
from Congressman Ireland (R-FLA)

Kathy, Andy Ireland handed the President the attached letter when they met on Nicaragua.

I forward this FYI only, as the letter to Michel from the President should suffice. McFarlane has also seen.

ANDY IRELAND
10TH DISTRICT, FLORIDA

2418 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515
(202) 225-5015

PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE
COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS



312107

RCM HAS SEEN

3209

FLORIDA OFFICES:

120 WEST CENTRAL AVENUE
P.O. Box 9447
WINTER HAVEN, FL 33883
(813) 299-4041

1101 8TH AVENUE WEST
P.O. Box 1220
BRADENTON, FL 33506
(813) 746-0766

1803 RICHMOND ROAD AT BARTOW HIGHWAY
LAKELAND, FL 33803
(813) 687-8018

Congress of the United States

House of Representatives

Washington, DC 20515

April 17, 1985

The Honorable Ronald W. Reagan
President of the United States
The White House
Washington, DC 20006

Dear Mr. President:

You and I fully appreciate the seriousness of the threat to our national security posed by the existence of a communist dominated regime in Central America. As the Congress prepares to vote on aid to the region, the United States has become the object of a full-scale campaign to discredit those who are fighting for the freedom of Nicaragua.

In an effort to dispel false impressions and to present the true picture, I hosted a town meeting in my district on Tuesday, April 9, 1985 in Palmetto, Florida to discuss the issue with my constituents. I invited Ambassador Otto Reich, U.S. Department of State, to present a review of Administration policy and objectives in regard to Central America.

Both Ambassador Reich and I made brief statements detailing the broken promises of the Sandinista regime and the failure of the 1979 revolution to establish a democratic society in Nicaragua. Following our remarks, I opened up the discussion to the audience, asking them for any comments or issues they might wish to address.

Rather than my attempting to describe the concerns of those present, let me offer the comments of one of those in attendance who described the event in a letter recently printed in one of our local papers.

The crowded hall was surely a plus toward an informed electorate. Though somewhat dulled by an excess of facts and figures the presentation was clear, explicit and enlightening. Very truly a rare opportunity to ask explicit questions and gain insight into this vital part of our world.

As the meeting opened to questions from the floor a strange thing happened. In what a casual observer might perceive as a planned strategy, the line to the floor mike was dominated by a single thought group; a group that obviously had not listened to the presentations . . . We were appalled by this overt 'takeover' of the meeting. The rudeness certainly succeeded in turning the general audience away from their still somewhat obscure position.

As the Ambassador's presentation was loaded with facts and somewhat devoid of emotion, theirs seethed with emotional conclusions unsupported by facts.

The only sense of opinion from the audience had to be measured by the applause rendered by each speaker. The best we could discern was over 90 percent for the ambassador and less than 10 percent supporting the disrupters.

In addition to those who tried to verbally disrupt the meeting, the local sheriff's department received a call indicating a bomb had been placed on the premises. The anonymous caller shouted "Viva La Revolucion" before hanging up. Because of this threat we had to stop the meeting before the discussion was concluded.

Despite this unfortunate occurrence, I believe the meeting was both informative and helped to further the understanding of my constituents with regard to the complex issues surrounding U.S. assistance to the region -- an area literally in our very own backyard.

The interest and concern of my constituents was clearly demonstrated by the fact that over 500 people attended. However, despite their support for assistance to the Nicaraguan freedom fighters, I think it important to note their apprehensions regarding direct military involvement in Central America by the United States. As the Ambassador and I explained, the purpose of the proposed assistance is so we can avoid that kind of situation in the future.

Mr. President, I appreciate this opportunity to present to you the views of many of my constituents with regard to Central America and, in particular, Nicaragua. I hope that this meeting helped to clarify our position toward this region and that the general support which exists in my district for our policies is forthcoming from other areas of the country.

Warmest regards.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Andrew Ireland". The signature is stylized with a large, sweeping "A" and a long, horizontal stroke extending to the right.

End
Case
File