

---

**Item ID Number** 01669

**Author** Shepard, Barclay M.

**Corporate Author**

**Report/Article Title** Memorandum: Subject Amendments, from Barclay M. Shepard to Director, Office of Procurement, March 5, 1984

**Journal/Book Title**

**Year** 0000

**Month/Day**

**Color**

**Number of Images** 2

**Description Notes**

MAR 05 1984

Director, Agent Orange Projects  
Office (10A7H)

Director, Office of Procurement  
and Supply (91)

VA/EPA Interagency Agreement  
VIAI (91) P-52016, Amendment  
Number 4 and Proposed Amendment  
Number 5

1. Attached are copies of the subject agreements for your information and consideration.
2. Amendment number 5 shows Dr. Joseph S. Curra replacing Dr. Frederick B. Rutz as Project Officer for EPA and requires approval by the VA. Signed Amendment number 4 is forwarded for your information.
3. Please feel free to contact Larry Stoddard, on extension 5535, if further information is needed.

BASILEY A. SHINARD, K.D.

Attachments

cc: 10A7  
Janet Remmers, EPA  
Dr. Michele Flicker, WAMC Kansas City, MO  
Dr. Alvin Young ✓  
101B11

MAR 15 1984

10A7B

Joseph S. Carra, Ph.D.  
Project Officer  
Exposure Evaluation Division (TS-798)  
Office of Toxic Substances  
Environmental Protection Agency  
401 M Street, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20460

Dear Dr. Carra:

Amendment number five (5) to our interagency agreement (V101 (91) P-82016) was signed by the Veterans Administration's authorizing official on March 7, 1984. A signed copy is enclosed for your agency's records.

I am pleased that you are assuming the role of Project Officer for the study. Dr. Han Kang is also looking forward to working with you.

Sincerely,

BARCLAY M. SHEPARD, M.D.  
Director  
Agent Orange Projects Office

Enclosure

cc: 10A7  
10A  
101B11  
Elaine  
Jim Jeffries (91)  
Dr. Young ✓  
Dr. Michelle Flicker, VAMC Kansas City, MO  
Dr. Barnes, EPA  
Dr. Kutz, EPA

STOCK#02:jm

3/12/84

10A7B

10A7A

10A7

---

**Item ID Number** 01670

**Author** Flicker, Michele

**Corporate Author**

**Report/Article Title** Letter: from Michele Flicker to Alvin L. Young, January 4, 1985

**Journal/Book Title**

**Year** 0000

**Month/Day**

**Color**

**Number of Images** 5

**Description Notes** Enclosures: a letter from F.D. Hileman providing results from tissue samples he analyzed for TCDD and 2 newspaper articles discussing the study and Flicker's involvement.



### REFERENCE SLIP

TO (Name or title-Mail routing symbol)	INITIALS-DATE
1. B. Al Young	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	

REASON FOR REFERENCE

- |                                       |   |   |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> AS REQUESTED | <input type="checkbox"/> FOR YOUR FILES   | <input type="checkbox"/> NOTE AND RETURN  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> COMMENTS     | <input type="checkbox"/> INFORMATION      | <input type="checkbox"/> PER CONVERSATION |
| <input type="checkbox"/> CONCURRENCE  | <input type="checkbox"/> NECESSARY ACTION | <input type="checkbox"/> SIGNATURE        |

REMARKS

Dear Al -  
 Thanks for your nice note + the Canadian questionnaire.  
 Here is a copy of Fred Hillman's data plus some recent fairly good press coverage.  
 Rick Kestig + Joe Lanza will help in the statistical study design.  
 I have been revising the protocol + will send you the new paper soon.  
 Happy New Year to you + yours.

FROM  Michelle	Schedule: Mon, Thurs KLVA 8 - 754-1620 Tues, Weds 8-758-6781	DATE 1/4/85
		TEL. EXT.

# Monsanto

---

**MONSANTO COMPANY**

Dayton Laboratory  
1515 Nicholas Road  
P.O. Box 8, Station B  
Dayton, Ohio 45407  
Phone: (513) 268-3411  
TWX 810-459-1681

2 November 1984

Dr. Michele Flicker  
Veterans Administration  
Mail Code 11C  
4801 Linwood Blvd.  
Kansas City, Missouri 63167

Dear Michele:

I apologize for not writing sooner but it has taken the past two weeks to recover from the trips taken in October. I have gone back and gathered together the TCDD data I had on three human tissue samples that have been analyzed over the past year. The results, in parts per trillion, are shown below:

Tissue 2275519-1

November 1983	1.7, 1.9, 2.0
July 1984	2.1, 2.0

Tissue 2275519-7

June 1983	9.5
November 1983	9.2, 8.6, 8.0
July 1984	7.4, 7.2, 6.4

Tissue 2275519-8

November 1983	10.6, 9.5, 6.3
July 1984	6.5

In interpreting these results it should be kept in mind that the results generated in June and November of 1983 were done using a base digestion technique and a 2,3,7,8-TCDD standard prepared in our laboratory. The samples run in July 1984 were done using an acid digestion and a 2,3,7,8-TCDD standard provided by EPA. We are currently preparing to reanalyze these tissues again using acid digestion and standards prepared in our laboratory. This should provide information as to whether the lower results obtained in July were the result of storage losses or due to the variability in the analyses and analytical standards. When these analyses are complete, I will write and inform you of the results.

It was pleasant to have a chance to meet you again in Canada and if I can be of any further assistance, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,



F. D. Hileman

# KC doctor may study dioxin

By Joe Lambe

**A** Kansas City researcher is seeking final federal approval for a study to determine whether more dioxin is found in the fat tissue of Vietnam veterans than in other Americans.

Dr. Michele Flicker and a research team at the Midwest Research Institute want to find out whether veterans exposed to dioxin in Agent Orange herbicide carry higher, possibly more dangerous, levels of the toxic chemical than the general population.

Agent Orange was used extensively in Vietnam as a jungle defoliant.

Dr. Flicker's research, approved by the Veterans Administration, could play a role in addressing concerns of thousands of Vietnam veterans who blame dioxin for health problems in themselves and their children, including skin diseases, cancers and birth defects.

It also would help future dioxin and Agent Orange research by revealing the normal background levels of dioxin in U.S. residents, Dr. Flicker said.

Dr. Flicker also is a staff physician at Veterans Hospital in Kansas City and principal national co-investigator with the proposed Veterans Administration Agent Orange Project.

Her study would look at only the most toxic of the family of dioxins, the type found in Agent Orange and at Missouri sites contaminated by waste oil containing the substance.

"This is the one study that will get at any differences in dioxin levels in veterans and non-veterans," Dr. Flicker said. It would involve staff of the Veterans Administration and the Environmental Protection Agency and make use of 11 laboratories across the nation, including the Midwest Research Institute.

E  
ac

By E  
The St

**G**  
spre  
mid  
haze  
hang  
sun  
ber.

En  
Agen  
poun  
Frids  
Corp.  
befor  
down  
proce

Ma  
ment;  
said  
plant  
posec  
ple in

The  
mosp  
desig  
the  
move  
came  
er.

W  
vato  
com  
gral  
to

gui  
B  
luti  
Ka  
Cot  
sak  
low

182  
yed  
sion  
fall

R  
ag  
cia  
due  
spl  
dev  
of

The study is expected to cost between \$500,000 and \$1 million, Dr. Flicker said. It still must be approved by the president's Agent Orange Working Group, a multi-agency organization established to oversee Agent Orange research.

To do the work, Dr. Flicker said, researchers would use more than 21,000 preserved samples of fatty tissue.

Of the 21,000 samples, she said, about 600 are from people born between 1957 and 1955. Statistically, about 30 to 60 are expected to be Vietnam veterans.

Lab work could tell if dioxin in the fat came from Agent Orange exposure or other sources, Dr. Flicker said.

Traces of the same kind of dioxin have been found in fly ash, cigarette smoke, charcoaled steak and automobile exhaust.

Since 1948 the most toxic dioxin has been a byproduct and often a contaminant of trichlorophenol, a chemical formerly used in some cleansers and still used in some industrial processes. Trichlorophenol is an ingredient of Agent Orange.

Science still has not determined how dangerous dioxin is to humans. The toxin earned its reputation as the most lethal man-made chemical because a minute quantity will kill a guinea pig. Its effects on different species vary greatly, however, and humans appear to be among the most dioxin-resistant animals.

Dr. Flicker noted that no research has tied skin cancer or circulatory problems to dioxin, although an Air Force study of 1,200 fliers who sprayed Agent Orange in Vietnam showed higher rates of skin cancer and circulatory problems. The higher incidence could be caused because the men got greater exposure to the sun and because many of the men smoked cigarettes, she said.

The probabilities are stacking up that many veteran health problems are not associated with dioxin, Dr. Flicker said.

Veterans and seven chemical companies that produced Agent Orange reached an out-of-court, \$150 million settlement earlier this year, with the money eventually to go to veterans who have suffered proven health damage from exposure to the herbicide.



# Vietnam lessons fading fast

By Repps Hudson

a member of the editorial staff

The dear colleague letter from the History Department chairman stated the problem succinctly: "It has come as something of a shock to many of us to discover we are now teaching students to whom the Vietnam War and the social upheaval of that era is no more than a remote childhood memory."

Surprising?

Yes, and no. College freshmen today were about 7 years old when the last regular American troops pulled out of Vietnam. The war in Indochina that shaped a generation and poisoned a nation's spirit has all the relevance of the Peloponnesian War for many of today's students planning their careers.

But the national experience in Southeast Asia, the politicization of foreign policy, doubts and bravado over armed intervention, the battle to stem inflation and deep concern over Agent Orange and environmental degradation share a common source in the Vietnam era. Certainly the politics of the anti-war protest movement has its offspring in the nuclear freeze movement and growing demonstrations against U.S.-supported military action against Nicaragua and in Central America.

Connections abound. Vietnam is relevant. One has only to be shown, as the recent panel discussions at the University of Missouri-Kansas City on the Vietnam War attempted for the several hundred persons who attended.

In his letter, Professor James Falls of UMKC was calling attention to the latest in a series of annual panel discussions co-sponsored by the History Department and the Kansas City branch of the National Archives, the federal agency that keeps records on many aspects of the American people and their experiences.

The series have shown documentary, commercial and government movies—some have been real jewels—and had discussions on World Wars I and II, the Korean War, the Great Depression, government propaganda and presidential politics. Vietnam was the freshest in terms of a national experience.

"It isn't possible to put this into perspective," said Alan Perry, the archivist who helped organize the series. "But we have to deal with current events, even if we don't have everything. The policy questions raised by Vietnam still are very much with us. For instance, the phrase, 'No more Munichs' (from the appeasement of Hitler before World War II), was one of the rationales used to buttress the arguments to get into Vietnam."

There is something very commendable about this outreach effort by the archives (which conjures images of musty, handwritten documents) and the local university. In fact, Mr. Perry believes this is the only effort of its kind outside of Washington. Hours and hours were spent by Mr. Perry and Mr. Falls and others to sort through film, TV newsreels and locate qualified panelists to discuss these pivotal events in modern U.S. history. For the price of time only, a member of the public could gain valuable impressions and information about a war like Vietnam or World War II. Mr. Perry would like to do Vietnam again in two years and hopes to preserve the discussion and

questions from the audience on videotape.

Mr. Fall's letter showed that historians and archivists can confront the recent past and try to do it well. Where they may fail in the eyes of some is in not showing the connections between recent history and modern events — almost always guaranteed to engender controversy. The Vietnam series could have used that touch.

Questions to the panelists and my own conversations with members of the audience, who ranged from high school children on assignment to grandparents, showed how much interest, curiosity and raw feelings hang on from Vietnam. One woman, concerned about the growing U.S. involvement in Central America, stood to ask former Rep. Richard Bolling what the United States has learned from Vietnam that can be applied to the present and the future. Mr. Bolling replied that a president cannot delegate responsibility for making war and peace. He added that Americans have little patience for long wars with no clear victory.

Suzann Settle, a Southwest High School teacher, assigned the series to her students for extra credit. "I see Vietnam as a trick bag," Ms. Settle said. "I believe we got tricked into it by our leaders. . . . We're studying the American Revolutionary War, which was not unlike Vietnam for the Vietnamese. The parallels are pretty handy right now. If we have war in Central America. . . ."

The series of panel discussions on Vietnam over seven weeks (Oct. 2 through Nov. 13) brought together former enemies—and no Viet Cong was on the panel. An active duty Army lieutenant colonel with two combat tours and a former enlisted man who organized draft resistance when he returned from Vietnam sat at opposite ends of the panel table the night I participated. The distance between them was more than the several meters from one to the other. At one point, the Army officer said he would not have been present with the former enlisted man a year earlier. His feelings of resentment to the protest movement were obvious.

In another session, the present controversy over possible effects on veterans and their offspring of Agent Orange, a defoliant used by the U.S. Air Force to rid the tropical jungle of its foliage, flared into the open. Dr. Michele Flicker, a staff physician at the Veterans Medical Center here, had the thankless task—for which she volunteered—of explaining repeatedly that no proof exists that Agent Orange causes birth defects in veterans' children or cancer in veterans.

Dr. Flicker was not believed, perhaps because some veterans need a scapegoat for their troubles since Vietnam. Agent Orange and the Veterans Administration may fill that role well.

And so it went, from the buildup in the mid 1960s to the use of technology to fight a guerrilla enemy to the massive student protests in the streets at home.

If a cardinal frustration remained from the series, it was that there wasn't more time, more of the public attending, more controversial panelists and more attention to what Vietnam means in terms of foreign policy, relations with Third World nations in transition, fighting wars of indefinite conclusions and effects on veterans and their families.

Editorial notebook