

Dear Mr. Varter, After completing this four-page letter, I felt, after your complaint of yesterday, that you might regard it as of excessive length. You will find, on reading it, that it consists of a half-dozen appeals of the specific nature you solicited, as you put it, to clean these things up. Where what you said yesterday indicates pretty clearly that you have not been fully informed, indeed, not sufficiently informed to reach a decision, I have undertaken, at least in part, to inform you and to guide you to other information I think you will agree you do require to render any kind of a decision other than as a rubber stamp. I do not believe, from the way you spoke, that this is your intent. Where I felt it appropriate, I have cited contracts and regulations of which you indicated you were unaware. As I told you yesterday, the appeals machinery within the AEC has been misinformed in the past. I cite a specific instance where you were, I emphasize in my belief quite innocently, involved. I do not accuse you of dishonesty. I see no point in bludgeoning you with such an item, but I am prepared to document, should you desire it, in some instances, because of this record, I felt it necessary to give you the history, as with the second and third items. I have also underscored the beginning of each item so you can see for yourself that the others are briefly stated. I attach this note to the first page in the hope of diminishing what I anticipate will be your discouragement at receiving a four-page appeal. If you desire any additional information, please ask me. Harold Weisbe g