



---

## 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** 01820

**Author** Eisen, Seth

**Corporate Author**

**Report/Article Title** Typescript: Report of Contact, June 6, 1984

**Journal/Book Title**

**Year** 0000

**Month/Day**

**Color**

**Number of Images** 3

**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 Seth Eisen's call to Jim Hagans regarding internal issues affecting the progress of the VETS protocol.



## 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  
 and more \_\_\_\_\_ Sounds  
 like they'll be a period of  
 inactivity for a while,

FROM

Seth

DATE

TEL. EXT.

CONFIDENTIAL  
REPORT OF CONTACT

CONTACTED: Dr. Jim Hagans, Chief, CSP (FTS 350 3669/366)  
DATE OF CONTACT: 6/6/84

Henderson suggested yesterday that I contact Hagans answers to a series of questions which I had add Henderson and which he could not answer.

I began by describing my reasons to Hagans for calling recent complete reversal in attitude about the need for review? what will the composition of the new review committee be? what is the timetable for review? etc).

Hagans began his answer by stating that he has no insight into activities in VACO relative to the information he will give me represents his opinion and given no greater validity than "reasonable hearsay". He said my questions were "reasonable". He doesn't know anyone for me to call who knows the answers and would be willing to tell them to me.

Hagans said he really didn't know just what precipitated the ferment about our proposal. In part, it could be due to retirement. The Acting CMD may have different attitudes. Custis, although Hagans does not know this to be the case.

He said that the original decision by the VA to see outside review for our proposal was based on several motivations. There was no uniformity of reasons, opinions, motivations, among those involved. Some probably had political reasons. Some hoped to find a supportive group to review our proposal favorably, others felt that outside review would look better, etc. Hagans said that from a purely scientific aspect the review could be criticized as not being objective because many members were also on the original planning committee and therefore would be reviewing a protocol they helped develop. However, Hagans said that this is not likely to have been an important reason for seeking outside review.

Hagans said that he thought the VA is now involved in the decision process about the VETS. Whether Protocol II is approved or not will not be based particularly on its merits. The decision on Protocol II is now an administrative

some who do not feel we have made much progress, he agree with them, nor does he understand what they are thinking. He believes our protocol will make a significant contribution to knowledge. Since we have been associated with the CSP our protocol has progressed significantly. "I am supportive of the VETS.....Not that that matters much

Although Hagans supports the proposal, he feels he is in a difficult position to function as an effective advocate in VAC because since our project is a CSP, his opinion will be interpreted as being biased. If his opinion is asked, we will certainly give it clearly. However, his opinion has not been asked. Hagans feels that anything he might do to try to influence the decision process is likely to result in more harm than good.

In the past, Hagans has been successful in keeping people out of the CSP. This certainly hasn't been the case with the VETS. Therefore, to a certain extent, the VETS may be doing us a disservice. However, he is certainly willing to continue to support our study.

Hagans said that it is clear that Greene has "placed a moratorium with regard to Protocol II". Hagans said that his own goals at present are to: a) Obtain firm funding for Protocol I for FY' 85. b) Maintain the integrity of the investigators and support staff until a decision on Protocol II is made. Hagans said that he has "an unofficial understanding with Greene that until there is a resolution, the present arrangement will be maintained." If the protocol is rejected, Hagans said that we will be given 90 days from the day of notification to find alternate salary support.

Hagans said he has no good feeling for how long it will take for things to settle down". We might have an answer in a few weeks. However, Hagans believes the delay is much more likely to be several months. After all, "there are so many things in the picture." Hagans mentioned that although Hobson and Shuman have been trying to encourage the approval of the VETS, he sometimes this has backfired and worked to the disadvantage of the project.

Hagans said that he was "delighted" to talk with me and that he understood my feelings. Several times during our discussion, he told Hagans how much we appreciate his advice and support.

Our conversation lasted about 25 minutes.