

Dear Harvey, with

12/15/72

To begin/the end of your letter of the 12th, I have been to Washington, George Quigley and Dr. Clyne S. Shaffner are still around, and I've been to the British Embassy for a copy of Dr. Alcroft's report.

Quigley has retired. He is still at Laurel but was not home yesterday. His phone is 725-2208. Shaf decided he wanted to be active but no longer head of the poultry school, so he has returned to his first love, research, and is still engaged in it (the U of Md's number for the poultry school is 454-3835 and Shaf's former secretary answers it). She did not know Jake Maness, who is in or was in agricultural economics and prepared our estimates but with both Quigley and Shaffner both unavailable, the latter in an all-day meeting, I pursued this no further, intending to when I go back to see them. I asked that Shaf call me when he has time. Unless he called this morning when we were grocery shopping he did not call today.

You discussed this as we were leaving and I think you have taken a better approach than Taft. Silard and Taft both turned them off by asking too much of them. I think the simple things you outlined are sufficient, and your promise to give them in advance the questions they would be asked would mean much to them and reassure them against the kind of thing Silard did and Taft wanted to. The dean of that school is always a politician and thin-skinned about court. Neither will want to embarrass or activate his political hackles. Unless you want to contact them yourself, if you can find time to write me a simple letter setting forth all you want them to testify to I will get in touch with both and show them the letter. If Jake is no longer there, this simple approach with enable me to get someone in that department to go over his figures and make a statement on them, about the value of the buildings. If there is anything in my notes about either that you would want them to testify to, I could later take these things up with them. I think after the holidays is now better, except for writing them to make a date, and for that I'd rather have the letter.

O.G. Williams is no longer in the office of the agricultural attache at the British Embassy. I spoke to a Mr. Mackwan, who says they are off on an efficiency kick and have a system of emptying their files of everything two years old. He will attempt to get a copy of Alcroft's report from London. He believes the reason it was classified is because it dealt with competitive commercial interests, the major breeding establishments. That situation should not obtain today and there should be no problem if it can be found.

Your 2. in your letter tells me what I'd forgotten if I knew, why Taft was talking about the Court of Claims on the taking. As I recall the estimate of the replacement value of our buildings it was over \$30,000 and they are, in fact, now valueless and a liability in the sale of the property because they will have to be removed and all have concrete floors.

The formulation "mental suffering" seems to me to be an over-simplification because it had physical manifestations and does involve specific diagnoses, at the least anxiety and a phobia. There is a new study on anxiety, in which the literature is deficient. I've heard that psychologist speak and seek her book. She spoke on the Public Broadcasting System. I

was driving, but I've written the station for her name and address and the title of her book. This is a subject the shrinks avoid, but she was quite explicit in her remarks and she dealt explicitly with physical manifestations as inevitable.

The things you say it was agreed to sort out seem to need it. I think there are more, one of which is if the government can't waive the time for filing after filing claims why they told me, or rather if they could properly tell me, the agreement we made could and would stop the statute. There were no fewer than five lawyers at that meeting, they all agreed on this, and there is substantiation for my word in the wording of the claims they accepted.

I had to lay going over the diaries aside to take care of financial emergencies which I have temporarily met by borrowing. I'll return to them as soon as I tend to others that accumulated while I was doing it. A chronological arrangement of it will, I think, be helpful to a medical expert. For example, while the records of my wife's collapse in the clinic disappeared and the prejudicial comment by the uninformed doctor remains, it is offset by two things I find in the diaries, a referral to the director of neurology and his sending my wife to the hospital for an EEG, which is a kind of brain-wave study. This is not a placebo and shows he took it seriously enough to incur that cost, not cheap. I think that I should make a tabulation of index of my own notes on these things, which you have, for the use of any expert or experts.

I know you think you should avoid the sonic boom thing, so I include the clipping identifying the lobbyist for The Friends of the Earth in the event you may want to speak to them for other purposes. The SST is not their only interest. Noise per se is one. The 12/7 New York Times story has pending litigation marked to save you time, if any is relevant.

I have a list of the other things and will proceed with them. If you want me to come to your office after the beginning of the tax season, I can still get there early by arranging transportation for my wife.

Sincerely,