



---

## Uploaded to VFC Website ~ October 2012 ~

---

This Document has been provided to you courtesy of Veterans-For-Change!

Feel free to pass to any veteran who might be able to use this information!

For thousands more files like this and hundreds of links to useful information, and hundreds of "Frequently Asked Questions, please go to:

[Veterans-For-Change](#)

---

*Veterans-For-Change is a 501(c)(3) Non-Profit Corporation  
Tax ID #27-3820181*

***If Veteran's don't help Veteran's, who will?***

We appreciate all donations to continue to provide information and services to Veterans and their families.

[https://www.paypal.com/cgi-bin/webscr?cmd=\\_s-xclick&hosted\\_button\\_id=WGT2M5UTB9A78](https://www.paypal.com/cgi-bin/webscr?cmd=_s-xclick&hosted_button_id=WGT2M5UTB9A78)

---

**Note:** VFC is not liable for source information in this document, it is merely provided as a courtesy to our members.

**Item ID Number** 01819

**Author** Eisen, Seth

**Corporate Author**

**Report/Article Title** Typescript: Report of Contact, June 4, 1984

**Journal/Book Title**

**Year** 0000

**Month/Day**

**Color**

**Number of Images** 2

**Description Notes** Alvin L. Young filed this item under "Vietnam Veterans Twin Study." Item includes cover note from Seth Eisen to Dr. Alvin Young and a Report of Contact describing Bill Henderson's call to Seth Eisen regarding internal problems which will affect the future of the VETS study.



### REFERENCE SLIP

TO (Name or title—Mail routing symbol)		INITIALS—DATE
1.	Dr Alvin Young	
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		

REASON FOR REFERENCE

AS REQUESTED

FOR YOUR FILES

NOTE AND RETURN

COMMENTS

INFORMATION

PER CONVERSATION

CONCURRENCE

NECESSARY ACTION

SIGNATURE

REMARKS

Alvin

The saga continues.

FROM

Seth

DATE

6/5/

TEL. EXT.

## REPORT OF CONTACT

CONTACTED BY: Bill Henderson

DATE OF CONTACT: 6/4/84

Called by Henderson with the following information.

Hagens called Henderson today, relaying information from Greene. OTA apparently is not eager to review the VETS. No explanation was provided. (Bill speculated that OTA does not wish to become involved in an intra-agency squabble.) Greene does not want to push Julie Susman (Senator Simpson's staffer) to place pressure on OTA to get them to agree to perform the review. Therefore, Greene's current thought is to develop another VA committee which will include some members from the present COG II and some new appointees. Henderson said that it is now up to Greene to form the committee. Hagens did not provide Henderson with any sort of timetable.

Henderson also said that Hagens asked that within 3 weeks we submit two alternative budget proposals for FY'85 to the CSP.

1. assuming that Protocol II is not approved,
2. assuming that Protocol II is continued in its present holding pattern and at its current funding level.

The budget should include both Hines and the SLVAMC staff. Assuming Protocol II is not approved, Henderson said that Hines could probably justify the following staffing for FY '85:

Goldberg - full time

Ed Barnes - computer programmer, full time

Susan Fisher - statistician, 1/2 time

He asked us to carefully consider the staff that we feel we could justify. We agreed to a conference call later this week to discuss staffing if Protocol II fails.

In the course of further conversation, Henderson suggested that we notify the SLVAMC administration that we may be requesting a return to our former clinical responsibilities. Henderson said that should research staff salaries be discontinued, we would probably have a 90 day period in which to find alternative funding sources, since this is standard CSP policy.

My Assessment - It remains difficult to assess the validity of the information we are receiving, since it travels from Greene to Hagens to Henderson to us. Who knows what happens in all those translations. However, Henderson agrees that Greene is increasing his control over the VETS evaluation. Since OTA does not wish to review the protocol (and Greene is apparently not arguing with OTA's position), he can justify appointing his own review committee, and therefore can take advantage of selecting reviewers who are more likely to be favorable to his point of view. Now I am beginning to wonder whether the protocol will even be reviewed. We are in deep trouble.....