

# National Health Federation



## VITAMIN REGULATION NUMBER

<i>Food and Drug Statement</i>	Page 2
<i>It Pays to Be Organized</i>	Page 3
<i>A Letter from Me to You</i>	Page 6
<i>N.D.F.A. Convention</i>	Page 7
<i>Sixth Midwest N.H.F. Convention</i>	Page 9
<i>Representative David S. King Speech at Carnegie Hall</i>	Page 19
<i>Compulsory Vaccination Bill</i>	Page 21
<i>Bill for Promotion of Fluoridation</i>	Page 30
<i>Chiropractors and Civil Service Employees</i>	Page 31

## AMERICANS CRUSADING FOR BETTER HEALTH

Volume VIII — Number 9

September, 1962



Life of our Washington Office  
1012 - 14th St. N. W.

# BULLETIN



## FOOD AND DRUG STATEMENT

The following is a composite of letters being sent, by the Food and Drug Administration, to Senators and Representatives who are contacting them because of the thousands of communications being sent to members of Congress. The emphasis is ours. In this connection please note that the Food and Drug Administration published the proposed ruling in order that the public would have an opportunity to object or approve.

The original regulations in this field were issued in 1941 and only minor amendments were added in the intervening 21 years. Meanwhile, the science of nutrition has made rapid strides and, in our opinion, these regulations need updating.

**We hope that all concerned will recognize that the June 20 publication is not a final action; on the contrary, we are most anxious to receive views and comments from all concerned.**

**Following the closing date, it will be our purpose to give very careful consideration to all of the communications received by the Hearing Clerk and we will then publish our decision on the various points.**

With that publication, a period will be given for the filing of objections. If there are objections accompanied by reasonable grounds which call for a public hearing, the law provides at that time that such a hearing will be announced. **After such a hearing, the procedure calls for the issuance of regulations based on the testimony at the hearing with a proviso that anyone still adversely affected may appeal directly to the Federal Appellate Courts.**

As far as food supplements are concerned, we have proposed regulations which we hope will authorize the marketing of such items for what they are so that they may be intelligently purchased and used.

It is not the purpose of these proposals to drive health food stores out of business. The proposals are not intended to stop the marketing of natural products; neither should they prevent truthful non-misleading statements about the contents of various foods. Thus, a statement that orange juice is a good source of vitamin C does not make that orange juice subject to these regulations.

If we can supply further information, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,  
(Signed)  
John L. Harvey  
Deputy Commissioner

### Editor's Note:

Shortly after this letter was written by Mr. Harvey, the Food and Drug Administration granted our request for a hearing and has postponed the deadline for public protest for 60 days, so urge your friends and neighbors to advise F&DA and Congress as to their desires in this important matter.

## The NATIONAL HEALTH FEDERATION BULLETIN

VOLUME VIII

NUMBER 9

*Adventures on Health Frontiers*  
*Published Monthly*

SEPTEMBER

1962

### It Pays for the People to Be Organized

The National Health Federation was the organization that first alerted the general public, drugless doctors and health food stores to the drastic proposals to revise Section 125 of the Food and Drug Act being considered by the Food and Drug Administration. We pay tribute to Stanley Phillips, Secretary of the National Dietary Foods Association, for his prompt and efficient co-operation with the Federation in this project.

The Federation sent out over ten thousand letters alerting the public and other interested parties. With each letter two sets of four post cards were sent containing the following message:

"I object to the proposal to revise the Food and Drug Act, Sec. 125, relating to food supplements, because:

"1. The revision would deprive the consumer of the information necessary to make an intelligent choice.

"2. The revision would exclude all vitamins and minerals, not only from the label but also from the product, except those few set forth in the proposed unreasonable change.

"I believe this, or any other fundamental change of the present time-tested and proved dietary food regulations should be made only by an Act of Congress after full and public hearings.

"I respectfully request that a hearing on this proposal to revise the dietary

food regulations be held by the Commissioner of Foods and Drugs."

These cards were prepared in such a manner that the recipient could send one to each of his two state Senators, one to his Representative in Congress, and one addressed to the Hearing Clerk of the Food and Drug Administration.

The purpose of the post cards was fourfold:

1. To provide the Food and Drug Administration with the public's reaction to the proposal which they as public servants desired;

2. To let members of Congress know of the radical and dangerous revision proposed by the Food and Drug Administration;

3. To serve notice to all concerned that the approximately 30 million people who believe in natural and drugless approaches to health intend, by united effort, to put a stop to such high-handed methods; and

4. To advise members of Congress that American citizens feel that that body, as representing them, should recapture those legislative powers which it has allowed governmental bureaus to gradually usurp, and, where it is impossible to recapture such lost powers, to regulate or nullify such by refusing appropriations to bureaus which misuse this authority.

(Continued next page)



Hundreds of thousands of post cards, letters and telegrams have already arrived in Washington and every train and plane brings added thousands. We urge that all who have not written or sent a post card do so at once. The Federation's original goal was one million. Now that the Food and Drug Administration has extended the time for hearing from the public to October 18, this goal should be increased. This is America's greatest opportunity to let government officials know the thinking of the public on this subject. This they desire, for by and large, government officials want to do the will of the people.

#### Beware

In legislative and regulatory matters, there are always those who say don't do this — don't do that — don't write — don't sign petitions — don't send form letters or post cards — just wait and all will come out right in the end. Such advice is based on ignorance of the facts, selfish reasons, or pride of leadership. The Federation urges you to analyze such advice very carefully, for those who have accomplished things legislatively and in the field of governmental regulations have done so by using the reverse of the above methods. The National Health Federation's aggressive mail program has already secured the co-operation of Congress and the Food and Drug Administration to the extent of the granting to the public of an additional 60 days in which to express their desires in this important matter and by granting our request for a hearing before final action is taken. See the following letter from Congressman Clement J. Zablocki:

"Mr. and Mrs. A. S. K.  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin  
Dear Friends:

"Thank you for your correspondence

of recent date in which you asked me to request on your behalf a hearing on proposals to revise Section 125 of the Food and Drug Act.

"I appreciate hearing from you on this matter. In line with your request I have personally contacted the proper officials in the Food and Drug Administration. They have informed me that a hearing **will** be held sometime after **October 18**. The proposed revisions, of course, will not go into effect in the meantime.

"Moreover, the **Food and Drug Administration has extended, by 60 days, the period during which written comments on the proposed revisions will be accepted.** If you wish to make a personal statement detailing your reasons for opposing the revisions, you may do so until October 18. Such statements should be sent to:

Hearing Clerk  
Food and Drug Administration  
Department of Health, Education,  
and Welfare  
Washington 25, D.C.

**"In view of your feelings in this matter, I am happy to report that the Food and Drug Administration is taking the action you proposed. I am certainly in favor of giving full discussion to this controversial issue.**

"With best wishes, I am

Yours sincerely,

(Signed)

CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

Member of Congress"

(Emphasis added)

That you may know what type of letters your post cards inspired Senators and Congressmen to write to the Food and Drug Administration, we are pub-

(Continued next page)

lishing the following letter from Senator Wallace F. Bennett of Utah to Mr. G. P. Larrick:

"Mr. G. P. Larrick  
Commissioner  
Food and Drug Administration  
Washington 25, D.C.

Dear Mr. Larrick:

"Many citizens in my state are disturbed by proposed changes in the regulation of dietary foods. Your proposal was published in the **Federal Register** of June 20, 1962.

"Based on my analysis of your proposal, you would, among other things, exclude from the label of vitamin products, and therefore in effect from the product itself, all but eight specific vitamins and four minerals. Examples of some of the excluded nutrients are Vitamins E and K and others which you state are recognized as being essential.

"One question which arises in my mind is, would a person desiring to purchase these nutrients as supplements be required to do so by prescription?

"One of the employees in the Division of Nutrition advised one of my staff members that the basic purpose of the new regulations is to take into account changes in the food supplement industry which have occurred since the original regulations first went into effect in 1941. It seems to me, however, that by restricting the vitamins and minerals that can be put on a label, you are in fact failing to take into account the potential discovery of new vitamins or new nutritional elements.

"I am not a doctor and I am not fully acquainted with all the details connected with your new regulations, but because of the interest of many of the respected citizens of my state, I, as their Senator, urge you to reconsider your proposal.

"I also urge you to grant a hearing

to those interested parties affected by your proposed changes.

Sincerely,

Wallace F. Bennett"

It is interesting to note that the Utah Health Federation printed and distributed 54,000 cards, had them signed and mailed, and raised the funds to pay for the printing. They also sent to the National Health Federation a check for \$70 to help with the over-all campaign.

In addition to the post card and letter writing campaign, the National Health Federation instructed its Washington General Counsel, Charles Orlando Pratt, to file on behalf of the Federation a detailed application for a hearing. This is the legal approach to the problem. The Federation has urged other organizations interested in the vitamin and food supplement business to do likewise.

This is a life or death struggle, and the Federation, as the voice of the people, urges that no stone be left unturned. We who believe in the natural approach to health must win this contest — even if it has to be carried to the floor of Congress or, in the last analysis, to the United States Supreme Court. The Federation is committed to this end.

As Commodore Perry said, "We have just begun to fight!"

#### Get More Cards Signed and Mailed

It is important that each of you secure additional cards and have your friends, relatives and others fill out, sign and mail them. Additional cards may be secured from the National Health Federation in lots of 10 sheets or more at the rate of five cents per sheet of four cards. Send your orders direct to the National Health Federation, 709 Mission Street, San Francisco 3, California.

**OUR GOAL IS ONE MILLION POST CARDS SIGNED AND MAILED BEFORE THE NEW SEPTEMBER 30th DEADLINE.**

**National Health Federation Bulletin**, published monthly January through December, at 709 Mission St., San Francisco 3, Calif., by National Health Federation, a nonprofit corporation. Fred J. Hart, Editor-Publisher. Subscription rate of \$3.00 per year included in membership dues. Single copies 25¢. Second-class postage paid at San Francisco, Calif.



## Family Circle

### A Letter From Me to You

I wish I could write an individual letter to each of you, in which I could express my personal appreciation for your kindness and co-operation in this great work.

Without your prayers, generosity, unselfish efforts, news items and well-wishes, the Federation would never have attained its present position of prestige, power and influence. I have enjoyed every minute of my association with you. It is indeed a great privilege to be working together with each one of you.

We, together, have a very large program before us, and with the program a great responsibility. We must not fail to measure up. I am sure we will not.

At the moment of the writing of this letter, the Federation is in the midst of a campaign to stop the Food and Drug Administration in its present efforts to usurp the prerogatives of Congress and by bureaucratic edict destroy the drugless approach to health, in their rewriting present regulations covering labeling of vitamins, minerals and food additives. We expect to be able to tell you in the October issue that because of the fine work of Federation members, the Hearing Clerk of Health, Education, and Welfare will have received approximately one million letters, cards and telegrams opposing this contemplated arbitrary action on the part of the Food and Drug Administration. In addition, every Senator and every member of the House of Representatives will have been made aware of what this bureau of government is doing, or trying to do, to the sick and suffering of this great nation. I thank each and every one of you for your part in this great effort.

As most of you know, I have served as your president without pay since the founding of the Federation seven and

one half years ago. I shall continue in that capacity so long as you desire and my health permits. However, the Federation has now reached a place in its growth where its program and its future service demand that it be adequately staffed. To accomplish this purpose, three months ago the Federation launched a drive for 300 life members at \$100 each, this goal to be reached not later than December 31 this year. To date we have 75 of this number. The funds received from these members is to be used to properly staff the Federation at Washington, D.C. and at the home office.

The Federation program calls for the launching of a national "Natural Health Youth" movement—very comprehensive legislative program—an educational program on the use of vitamins, minerals and food supplements—a lecture bureau, so set up and operated as to provide sound, practical educational leadership in the natural approach to health. To this date, this leadership has been provided mostly by well-informed lecturers who have supported themselves in the work by selling products. The present apparent combination of the federal government and the drug interests is bringing an end to this era. The natural approach to health movement owes a great deal to these men and women, even though there were some among them who were not too scrupulous. This condition is true of all branches of the healing art and probably always will be.

The **Bulletin** must be enlarged and improved by increasingly providing the public with the truth about the value of all natural approaches to disease prevention and the maintenance of health.

On October 15, the Federation will move to new and larger headquarters at

(Continued next page)

211 West Colorado, Monrovia, California. Because of certain circumstances the Federation will be given the present equity in this building, which equity is sufficient that by paying a monthly sum for eight years, which sum will be the equivalent of the Federation's present monthly rent, the premises will be entirely paid for and become the property of the Federation.

Because of other fortuitous circumstances the Federation is, for the first time in its short life, out of debt and is the proud owner of all its office equipment, etc. **Truly the Lord has been good to us during this year 1962.** I know that most of our members belong to the Federation at a real sacrifice, but there are many members whose circumstances are such as will enable them to take out a life membership. To such we appeal in this issue to do so before the end of this year. The dues need not be paid until December 31 this year, but we must know those who will make this sacrifice for the good of humanity. The \$100 life membership fee can be paid in installments, as long as the entire amount is paid in by December 31.

Whether I can continue to carry the load as President of the Federation will depend, in large measure, on whether the Federation will have these funds to properly staff the work, both in the home office and the Washington office. The National Health Federation must move forward. It must continue to grow and serve. It will, if each of us continues to Pray, Work and Give.

That God may richly bless each of you is my prayer as I conclude this letter.

Sincerely,  
Fred J. Hart

### Your Pen and RD

We suggest that you write to **Reader's Digest**, Pleasantville, New York, and request that a condensed version of Linda

Clark's great book, "Stay Young Longer," be carried in an early issue of that publication.

### N.D.F.A. Convention

It was our pleasure to have attended the best National Dietary Foods Association convention we ever have had the privilege to attend.

There was a new spirit of unity and fellowship, coupled with a determination to stand up and be counted on the side of all natural approaches to health.

While many members may not have agreed with some of the policies adopted, they nevertheless joined in raising \$50,000 to be used by the executive committee toward the expense of a legal attack on proposed Food and Drug Administration regulations, which, if enacted without change, would destroy the entire health food industry.

It was a great gathering and Stanley Phillips and those who so ably assisted him are to be congratulated on a job well done.

Clinton Miller, assistant to the president of the National Health Federation, did an outstanding job as one of the featured speakers. We are proud that he was chosen to represent the National Health Federation in a program of speakers who were all outstanding.

The elderly woman was upset when the young doctor gave her a clean bill of health.

"Don't tell me there's nothing wrong, young man. I was in failing health before you were born."—San Diego Union.

### June and July-August Bulletins

So great has been the demand for the June Fluoridation issue of the **Bulletin** that we have had to have a rerun made. The same is true of the July-August Drugless Health Approach issue. This means that from this date on there will be plenty of these issues available, at the following prices: 25¢ each, 7 for \$1, 35 for \$5, 100 for \$12. Orders can now be filled the day they are received.



## Friends of the Cause

During the 87th Congress (1961-62) outstanding support for bills designed to give the public freedom of choice in matters of health has been given by the following Senators and Representatives.

### Senators

1. Senator Tower, Texas
2. Senator Quentin N. Burdick, North Dakota
3. Senator Wallace Bennett, Utah
4. Senator Walter G. Magnuson, Washington.

### Representatives

1. David S. King, Salt Lake City, Utah
2. Ralph J. Rivers, Alaska
3. J. Arthur Young, San Mateo, Calif.
4. Edgar W. Hiestand, Altadena, Calif.
5. James B. Utt, Santa Ana, Calif.
6. Peter H. Dominick, Englewood, Colo.
7. A. S. (Syd) Herlong, Jr., Leesburg, Fla.
8. Roland V. Libonati, Chicago, Ill.
9. John D. Dingell, Detroit, Mich.
10. Martha W. Griffiths, Royal Oak, Mich.
11. Morgan M. Moulder, Camdenton, Mo.
12. Walter S. Baring, Reno, Nev.
13. Otis G. Pike, Riverhead, N.Y.
14. James J. Delaney, Long Island City, N.Y.
15. Emanuel Celler, Brooklyn, N.Y.
16. John Ashbrook, Johnstown, Ohio
17. Francis E. Walter, Easton, Pa.
18. Walter Rogers, Pampa, Texas
19. Henry C. Shadeberg, Burlington, Wisc.

Many other Senators and Representatives have been very helpful and sympathetic to our cause, so this listing is not to imply that others, not listed above, have opposed health freedom legislation. However, those listed above have given unique and superior help toward beneficial legislation in the health field, as such legislation has been related to the Federation's program.

## Organic Garden Clubs

Sixteen organic farm and garden clubs scattered throughout Michigan will convene at the Reo Club House in Lansing on September 15 and 16 for their 10th Annual Fall Roundup.

J. I. Rodale of Emmaus, Pennsylvania, "father" of the organic farming and gardening movement in this country, will be a featured speaker. Author of **Pay Dirt** and other books which were instrumental in introducing Sir Albert Howard's composting methods to America, Mr. Rodale is editor-in-chief of **Organic Gardening and Farming** and **Prevention** magazines. He will speak on Sunday afternoon, September 16.

The Roundup will get off to a start Saturday morning with a farm and garden tour. Club members will compete for awards for the best produce which will be judged at noon on Saturday. A symposium of orchardists will discuss their fruit-growing methods and problems in the afternoon.

The assembly will hear talks on Saturday evening and Sunday morning by Heinz Grotzke of Greene, Rhode Island, farmer and seed specialist. The final speaker, following Mr. Rodale on Sunday afternoon, will be Joe D. Nichols, M.D., of Atlanta, Texas. Dr. Nichols is national president of Natural Food Associates.

The two-day meeting is expected to attract upwards of a thousand farmers and gardeners from Michigan and neighboring states. The public is invited to any or all of the sessions which are being held under the auspices of the Federated Organic Clubs of Michigan. Harold Doster, Plainwell, Michigan, farmer and president of the organization, will preside over the meetings.

## Thumbnail Sketches of the Sixth Midwest N.H.F. Convention

By Don Matchan

COLUMBUS, Ohio — Described by President Fred J. Hart as "one of the most successful and significant of any similar sessions to date," the Sixth Annual Midwest Convention of the National Health Federation came to a close after an action-packed program starting with an address by Rep. John M. Ashbrook of Ohio and concluding four days later with a description of the proposed Youth for Health movement offered by Mr. Hart.

"Sessions were stimulating, helpful, inspiring to the membership and leadership alike," Mr. Hart declared. "If I were looking for a single word to describe the convention, it would have to be 'successful.' Particularly gratifying to those of us who have held leadership responsibility was the spirit of harmony and unanimity prevailing in Columbus. The Board of Governors' meetings held in conjunction with convention sessions were exceptionally well attended, and out of them came actions of transcendental importance.

"An atmosphere of singleness of purpose and accord on objectives was particularly inspiring at the climax on the Fourth of July, a period of rededication to American ideals by American citizens bound together in a continuing struggle for freedom of choice."

Eclipsing all other decisions and action was the unanimous support by the Board of Governors of the suggestion by the president that the organization launch an all-out drive to block a recently-announced proposal by the Food and Drug Administration to revise Section 125 of the dietary food regulations— an action which, if successful, would limit the number of vitamins in food supplements to eight, minerals to four, and would provide that persons desiring more

than the new "minimums" would have to get them through a doctor's prescription.

National Health Federation has spearheaded a massive campaign to seek a hearing before FDA, and to obtain congressional support against the proposed restrictions. More about this appears elsewhere in this issue.

### Representative John M. Ashbrook Speaks

The Columbus convention got off to a good start with an address by Rep. John M. Ashbrook of Ohio who declared vigorously that "Americans must decide what the goals of education should be, and must awaken to the fact that unless there is a redefinition of goals, little by little basic freedoms in economics, politics and education are being lost."

Rep. Ashbrook is author of a bill about which N.H.F. members already have heard much—HR-10508—requiring that parents be informed as to contents of school guidance tests and be given the right to say whether their children must take them.

Congressman Ashbrook has long been interested in the philosophy of such testing, he said, and for six or eight months studied the matter intensively preparatory to introduction of the resolution.

He paid tribute to the zeal of Clinton R. Miller, Washington representative of N.H.F., who told the convention, "Rep. Ashbrook's bill does not ban testing, but those parents who want their children to have the tests may let them have them and those who object won't have to take the tests."

Describing himself as "a conservative, a Republican," Rep. Ashbrook declared, "I believe that unless people wake up, little by little we shall lose our freedoms.

(Continued next page)



We must decide whether we are going to become part of a collectivized state....

"What should education be in America? I believe the goal is (1) to inform the mind, (2) to develop intellect, and (3) to teach the youngster how to think—not necessarily what to think, but how to think, so that the student will be able to sift through the various challenges and assertions and come to conclusions.

"Many educators think education should develop attitudes. I believe this has happened in the case of testing. Some people who have been involved in guidance testing for a long while believe they have the answers—and want to shape attitudes. These tests are being made with federal funds.

"Of course, many guidance counselors are trying to help people on an academic basis, but others in the field—as evidenced by the type of tests being used—want to pick children's brains. Such test items as "why I don't like my father," "my father is a tyrant," "my allowance is too small," are negative, and for eighth-graders simply not right.

"We find also that these tests are shrouded in secrecy. Parents can't see the tests, and naturally not the answers. I think I'm a reasonable person; I look for a reasonable approach and can see no reason for secrecy.

"In my research I have learned that there is a responsible group that is persuaded that certain of these personal-inventory-type questions are not right—a least that parents should have opportunity to say whether their children must submit to them."

Mr. Ashbrook asserted that the trend toward this type of testing had its inception after the second world war, "when a group of men sat down and decided to change the destiny of the world—such men as Dr. Chisholm and John Dewey. They believe that psychiatry

ought to be able to change human nature, to point the way to world peace and world government. We find the world-government idea very prevalent in the thinking of these people.

"In his lectures Dr. Chisholm says there are four goals: overcoming the nature of man, that human beings must be made over, there must be a drastic re-adjustment of personality, and the concept of right and wrong must be eradicated.

"Now I happen to think that the understanding of right and wrong is a balance toward keeping people on an even keel—that we must have an understanding of right and wrong, and that this is the realm of home and church and should not be pre-empted by the school.

"The Chisholm philosophy also believes there should be a change in economic systems, that a sort of Big Brother type government headed by people who think they know what's best for the public should take over, and sell us on their ideas of what's best for us.

"Any absolute, any imposed loyalty that cannot be changed, or any certainty given to children that cannot be thought about—only accepted—prevents implementing the concepts of United Nations," Dr. Chisholm says.

"Hundreds of questions pit one kind of loyalty against another. For instance, it is pretty difficult for an eighth-grader to decide who contributed most to the world, St. Paul or Abraham Lincoln. Here, loyalty to religion is pitted against loyalty to our country's heroes.

"If we go too far in the direction of having people tell us what we're to do and where we are to go, we won't have much left of the freedom we've always believed is important."

Mr. Ashbrook said that his college tutor never quite forgave him for insisting that he would make a career of law,

(Continued next page)

journalism and political science rather than engineering, "which the tutor said tests showed was what I was most qualified to do. I may not be qualified in law, journalism or politics, but at least I'm doing what I want to do, not what I am told to do."

He said the guidance-testing psychiatrist today "wants the whole student—he wants to develop not only intellect, but his concepts of democracy, his concepts of right and wrong, his concepts of parental relationship. I cannot go along with that idea. I think that several of these properly belong with home and church, not in school."

The speaker described John R. Ludington and E. Glenn Featherstone as advocates of the "life-adjustment concept" in education. Dr. Ludington is in a "sensitive" post in the U.S. Department of Education, he added.

"It is my thinking," continued the congressman, "that aspects of family group life still fall within the area of parental responsibility. I think the best hope of our country is diversity—letting people pursue the vocation of their choice, not forcing them into a mold, but permitting them to follow their own line of thought so long as it does not injure others."

Referring again to Dr. Chisholm, he continued: "He is not an ordinary person, indeed. He has in fact, achieved pre-eminence in his field. In 1957-58 he was president of the World Health Federation; he has been a director of World Health Organization and a vice-president of World Federalists. He has said: 'Let us be our own authority. There is no room for authoritarian dogmas in human relations. Let us stop prostituting man's intellect to fear, guilt and shame....'

"These people believe in transforming humanity. My contention is that some areas should be left to family and church, that education's role should be to assist

academic improvement, to teach the individual how to think....

"HR-10508 requires that the parent be informed as to contents of the tests, and have the right to determine whether the child must take them. I hope we can muster support for the bill, so that, in future, funds from Health, Education, and Welfare may not be used to promote these tests in schools across the land. I believe freedom must be fought for. While we still have it, let's strike a blow for it."

July 2—11 a.m.

"Political and Medical Aspects of Fluoridation" was the subject of an address by Jonathan Forman, M.D., Columbus, Ohio, authority on fluoridation of public drinking water, member of the board of directors of Natural Food Associates, writer and lecturer.

He was introduced by Jack Alkire, member of the National Health Federation board of governors, former Ohio NFA president, and active in the natural foods movement.

Dr. Forman said that as a physician he opposes fluoridation of drinking water because among several reasons, it is "mass medication—forcing an individual to subject his body to treatment not desired—which is a violation of the Hippocratic oath."

"This is the first time in the history of medicine when mass medication has been proposed," he declared. "And it is totally unscientific.... The original work with which the report recommending use of one part per million of fluoride in drinking water is concerned was based on a 21-city study. Conclusions were reached by averaging averages, coming up with a guess arbitrarily arrived at, setting the dosage at one part per million."

(Continued next page)



"This conclusion not only was reached by unscientific methods, but the means of controlling the dosage is unscientific. In some water mains we find heavy concentrations of fluoride, in others not even the minimum."

Dr. Forman declared also that "one p.p.m. of a potent drug or poison can be a lot," adding that "a blood-pressure-reducing pill containing three fourths of one part per million of fluoride is considered a sufficient dosage to, in combination with other elements, bring the pressure down in two or three days."

He said, "It is hard not to get a little emotional when one is called crackpot, quack, when told 'you'll cut your own throat' by taking a position contrary to the official stand of the profession. But the fact still remains, the endorsements which have been given to fluoridation are based on statistics which are erroneous and an honest person who has studied the issue can take no other position."

He said that a small group within the Public Health Service—"perhaps half a dozen dentists and doctors"—have persuaded the American Dental Association, the American Medical Association, the American Hospital Association, and the World Health Organization to issue an endorsement of fluoridation. "It's a known fact that I could go out on the street with a petition and nine out of 10 people would sign a petition calling for their own murder," he said.

"You will find, if you examine the record, that it's the same six guys who went to these various groups, persuading them, on the basis of erroneous statistics, to make the endorsement. Make no mistake about it, the argument for fluoridation of public drinking water supplies rests on poorly analyzed and false data."

Dr. Forman described ways of educating community leaders as to the dan-

gers of fluoridation, and urged listeners to "adopt a program of action. It is much easier to do this before a council has acted to fluoridate than to wait, although of course the avenue of referendum still is open. But it's expensive and time-consuming."

He suggested that those interested in obtaining information to pass on to mayors, councilmen, chambers of commerce, clergymen, editors, etc. may obtain it from Natural Food Associates, Atlanta, Texas; or from Greater New York Committee Opposed to Fluoridation, 342 Madison Ave., New York 17.

"You who are faced with this issue—and if you aren't now you will be one day—can get Dr. Exner's piece, soon to be published, telling the reasons for all the enthusiasm from the Public Health Service about fluoridation, from Mildred Hatch, 8 Pine St., St. Johnsbury, Vt., or from American Opinion, Belmont 17, Mass. Copies are only 50 cents, and should be in the hands of mayors, councilmen, chamber presidents, and clergymen. In case they won't take time to read it—and many won't—briefly review it for them when you hand it to them. It explains that the enthusiasts for fluoridation are not vicious, they don't want to poison the population, they are enthusiastic for other reasons. . . .

"To explain the ethics of the fluoridation issue, we recommend Dr. Exner's book—also available from the Hatch Library. For your physician friends, Dr. Waldebott has written an excellent book on fluoride metabolism. Another good book, 'Errors and Omissions,' by Dr. Sutton of the University of Melbourne, Australia, dental research department, is valuable. Every three months, try to get a new document into the hands of community leaders.

"This is a fight to the death between technologists of inadequate information

(Continued next page)

and those with an appreciation and understanding of the biological aspects of the human body. One of our troubles is that the country is being overrun by bureaucracy. Dr. Davis of the Federal Reserve System says Washington is full of people who made a statement 10, 20 or 30 years ago and they spend the rest of their lives defending it whether it's true or not.

"The ethics involved in this matter are no different than those for which we hanged Germans during the Nuremberg trials for forcing people to do with their bodies something they did not want to do. Within the framework of our religious concepts is the belief that the body is our temple, and we should not be compelled to do with it that which we believe may be harmful to it."

#### In the Afternoon

President Hart presented Federation state and local officers who brought brief messages to the convention. This was followed by presentation of the President's Report.

"Report from Washington" was presented by NHF's Washington representative, Clinton R. Miller, who summarized high lights of important bills now in the legislative hopper, and of bills the organization expects to have introduced soon.

Mr. Miller likened dedicated members to Gideon's army of 300, declaring that "the odds against Gideon were far greater. . . . We're more interested in the kind of people who will go right to the end than in numbers. . . . It is important to remember that every congressman can be won. He wants to know that the reason a person is calling on him asking his support is because of truth and righteousness. I can't wine and dine congressmen—I can't even buy them a sandwich—but I can be truthful with them. I can provide them with information which may help in deciding their position on

pending legislation. . . . A congressman is a great man. There are 537 great men in the legislative halls in Washington. . . ."

Mr. Miller urged his listeners to visit their congressman when at home during recesses, to learn his stand on certain issues as well as to communicate their views to him.

"Take him a loaf of homemade bread if you're a good baker. Let him know that what you stand for is not only wholesome but good! If he is the kind of man you believe you can support, tell him so. If he isn't, tell him that, too, in a friendly but firm way. Talk to him about the Ashbrook bill. Ask him if he believes the parents should have the right to know what kind of tests are given their children in school, and whether they should be able to say whether their children must take them. If he says 'yes' to each question, ask him to offer a bill designed along the lines of HR-10508. If he says he doesn't believe parents should have a right to know the content of guidance tests and the right to determine whether their children must take them, tell him you'll do whatever you can to defeat him—with his own words."

Mr. Miller described Mr. Hart as "the greatest statesman in America." He said NHF needs "one or two goals we can win." One of these, he believes, is the Ashbrook bill, "the key to which is the parents' right to know. When you are discussing this bill with your congressman, don't start talking about federal aid to education, UNESCO, Communism—keep to one thought—parental knowledge and parental consent!"

Mr. Miller described S 917, a bill providing HEW with funds to promote fluoridation of drinking water, as "a bill providing Health, Education, and Welfare with funds to ridicule (those opposing fluoridation). We have come across material showing that HEW officials actu-

(Continued next page)



ally have instructed their organization to use ridicule against fluoridation opponents!"

He told of work already under way to initiate legislation providing that a label on food products be held by the Food and Drug Administration to be legally acceptable **if the label states the truth**, even if the truth might not conform to "consensus of medical opinion." Under existing interpretation, "consensus of medical opinion" supercedes scientific fact, if the fact happens to differ from accepted opinion.

Charles Orlando Pratt, NHF's general counsel in Washington, presented a report covering the work of his office as related to matters of legal, legislative, administrative, and public relations.

Mr. Pratt said that recently he was called by a health food store in Washington and told of a letter which had been received from the D.C. Bureau of Pharmacy listing items that could be sold only in drug stores.

"I knew there is no law with such a provision so I called the Department of Licenses, finally got the head man who said he knew nothing about the mailing except that his department had been asked to give a copy of its mailing list to the Pharmacy Board. The mailing had come out of a Madison Avenue office, and this has been going on for at least 12 years. I told him he had no constitutional, statutory or delegated authority to do what he had done..."

The attorney asserted that the proposal by Food and Drug Administration to limit the number of vitamins to eight and minerals to four in food supplements is motivated by a desire to "cut out the 500-million-dollar industry they call a food racket. But it is well to remember that in the ruling they have not proposed to change the definition of a dietary food supplement.

"The number of constituents in a product would be limited to 'only those nutrients recognized by competent authorities as essential and of significant dietary supplement-value in human nutrition that are present in amounts consistent with nutritional requirements for such nutrients.'

"The FDA says there 'is no convincing evidence that the ordinary diet requires supplementation with Vitamin E, Vitamin K, folic acid, pantothenic acid, linoleic acid, copper, magnesium, manganese, zinc, sodium, potassium.' "

Mr. Pratt said that National Health Federation "is known in Washington and highly respected by those in Congress and Government who believe in its program of freedom of choice in the healing art field. This respect is growing. It will take several years' work and association with our nation's leaders and the leaders in civic affairs to earn the recognition and prestige that will benefit the National Health Federation by winning friends and influencing administrative, executive and congressional leaders.

"I am ever ready and willing to assist in carrying out the worthy aims and purposes of the National Health Federation, its officials and board of governors. This has been my pleasure and privilege the past few years. We shall all work with faith and new hope for positive legislation for the protection of reasonable rights in health matters. The New Horizon of Hope will be brightened as the Federation grows in influence in the health field in proportion to its acts to carry out its worthy aims and purposes to protect the public health and the individual rights of the people."

#### Dr. Lee Speaks

In an address, "We Are Fighting for Our Lives," Dr. Royal Lee described "how federal laws and federal courts are

(Continued next page)

illegally used by organized medicine to maintain its medical monopoly."

Dr. Lee recently signed a consent decree agreeing to discontinue use of literature that does not "conform to the consensus of medical opinion." An FDA action charged him with seven violations of regulations and he was ordered to pay a fine of \$1,000 on each count and sentenced to one year in prison, the latter suspended during a three-year probation.

His firm had asked the government what it could do when it could prove that statements made for certain products were true, despite the fact the truth did not happen to conform to consensus of medical opinion.

**The government refused to answer the question.** Dr. Lee asked the court to agree to inclusion of a statement in the decree that he would not be required to "suppress facts or contribute to a medical monopoly." This request was denied.

"On the basis of the finding," Dr. Lee said, "we can't even tell a doctor what's true."

In an opinion submitted May 3, 1962, to Vitamin Products Co., the law firm of Holleopeter & Terry, 234 East Colorado Boulevard, Pasadena, Calif., stated:

"Under existing federal law, it is a misdemeanor, punishable by \$1,000 and one year in a federal penitentiary, to make any statement in labels or labeling which does not conform to the 'consensus of medical opinion.' It does not matter whether such statements are made to a layman or to a duly licensed doctor, the restrictions apply to all literature which relates to any nutritional or food product.

"It is advisable to warn all sales personnel, and those who may reply to letters of inquiry, of these facts. Letters are considered by the Food and Drug Administration, and by the Federal Courts, as labeling, just as any other printed item.

"It is important to keep in mind that even if the statement is true it is no legal defense. A statement which is true in fact may, under the definition put upon 'false and misleading' by the federal courts, be 'false and misleading' if that statement does not conform to the 'consensus of medical opinion.' The 'truth' is not the yardstick in determining what is false and misleading, but the yardstick is the 'consensus of medical opinion.' "

In his address at the N.H.F. convention, Dr. Lee recalled a statement by U.S. Attorney General Thurman Arnold who in 1941 successfully prosecuted the American Medical Association on an antitrust indictment. "Mr. Arnold charged that organized medicine had conveyed to the public the idea that its ethics represented the 'Ten Commandments and the Golden Rule,' (whereas) instead, organized medicine used these 'ethics' to promote its criminal methods of suppressing competition.

"An important trick of political criminals is to change the meaning of words so that confusion is created, under cover of which their nefarious plans can be put into effect," Dr. Lee continued. In framing the 1938 federal Food and Drug law, the neat trick was inserted somewhere, redefining drugs. Under this new definition, a drug became anything used to treat, prevent, diagnose, mitigate, or cure a disease, in addition to the older definitions of 'articles other than food intended to affect the structure or function of man or animal.'

"The earlier definition was the correct one. But the new classification put new weapons into the hands of the monopolist. Right at this moment in Arkansas, chiropractors are being prosecuted for violating the laws regulating the practice of medicine because they were recommending special foods for dietary deficient patients.

(Continued next page)



"They were accused of 'using drugs' in treatment of disease!

"Just what is medical treatment, as historically practiced by medical doctors as distinguished from the drugless profession? Medical science tells us that germs cause disease, that we are the healthiest people in the world (but with the most hospitals), that there is very little deficiency disease, that 'science has not discovered the cause of tooth decay,' nor does it know the cause of cancer or arthritis.

"Then, when we are ill, we are dosed with poisons of varying types and descriptions, pharmacologists having described a drug as being of necessity a poison. . . . The list of drug products is almost endless, with new antibiotics taking the places of old ones discarded by reason of a long history of unpleasant and often fatal 'side reactions.'

"The drugless professions have different ideas. They say germs are not the cause of most disease, that the real cause is lowered resistance due to poor food and bad environmental conditions, that viruses cannot cause disease like polio unless the victim has been prepared by malnutrition or other causes of an environmental nature.

"But if the definition of **drug** can be changed to mean **anything used to prevent, diagnose or mitigate disease**, once the drugless practitioner has discovered how to druglessly treat his patient, lo and behold, that remedy now automatically becomes a drug and he is prevented from its use.

"A neat trick . . . and it is being successfully used. The various states are passing laws copied from federal statutes, and state courts as well as federal are being used for the hatchet work of the medical monopoly.

"When drugs were defined as poisons, it was of course essential to have laws regulating their use and dispensing.

These laws never were intended to provide a means of steam-rolling competition, never intended to provide a weapon for use by a medical monopoly to destroy its enemies. The fights of osteopathy, chiropractic, naturopathy and homeopathy to get laws licensing their devotees are matters of history.

"Organized medicine never has missed an opportunity to smear and ridicule these upstart competitors. But as a matter of logic, who is operating in the biggest house of glass? Medicine, the healing of disease by using poisons in varying dosages, seems the most barbarous of all, now that most chronic disease is being found to be due to unbalanced or deficient nutrition. **We cannot afford to ridicule new ideas in any field of research.**

"We live in an age professing to abhor discrimination, but we certainly discriminate against new ideas in the healing art, discriminate against all competitors of allopathic medicine. As a matter of simple justice, all systems of healing should have equal opportunity. Any doctor with a license to practice should have equal privileges before any court, should have the same responsibilities and the same limitations.

"But when we investigate, we find the laws are so worded that there is stringent discrimination, a continual smear campaign against competitive schools of thought by organized medicine.

"Tampering with the meaning of words to destroy competition is a new type of criminality. Words do change in their significance over periods of time, but **usage** is the only legitimate standard to be used.

"Changes of meaning forced into existence by fiat of law are like fixing prices and wages by law. They are political dodges, historically the work of conning political schemers trying to re-

(Continued next page)

ward one group at the expense of another. . . .

"Another interesting situation arises in considering the use of placebo prescriptions (placebo is the Latin word for pacifier). It is a prescription for a phony remedy, a fake pill or powder that looks like medicine but without any effect. Often it actually helps the patient, according to our best authorities. **But how often is it used as an escape by the doctor** from admitting he is baffled, when an honest admission would permit the patient to try another doctor who might have had more experience in that particular problem?

"Here we encounter the curious attitude of many medical doctors that they are entitled to be as free as God to make decisions themselves that mean life or death to the patient, when the honest course would be to give the patient the facts and permit him to do his own steering of his life—or choose his counselor—something he cannot do if kept in ignorance of the truth by this artifice.

"No one condemns his carelessness with other people's rights more than the same medical doctor if he's talking about a drugless competitor.

"A good example of this 'we are God' attitude may be found in the April, 1961, issue of the **Bulletin** of the National Health Federation in which Joseph W. Wilson, M.D., of the Drosnes-Lazenby Cancer Clinic, Pittsburgh, Pa., described his efforts to interest the National Cancer Institute in making tests of Mucorhycin, which had been showing promising results. Dr. Wilson reported the attitude of N.C.I. as follows:

"We went to the Institute in Washington to try to get them to evaluate Mucorhycin, to find out whether or not it was, according to their standards, a cure for cancer. They were ready for us when we got there. They had about 15 doctors sitting around in a circle. I had

all the mice tissue slides, slides we had made up in our own crude way. We put them down and each doctor grabbed a slide, walked over to the microscope, took one quick glance, one twirl of the focus knob, and said "nothing there."

"I have been using a microscope many years and I don't think I can focus a microscope that fast, let alone look at the cells and identify them. These men were not pathologists; they were clinicians at the Institute. After it was all over they decided it didn't warrant even looking into and Dr. Shearer, who was working with Polysaccharides at the Institute, stated we should go home and forget about it. Even Dr. Spencer at one time said, "Say you did save these 250-000 people every year who died, what would you do with them? How could we absorb them into our economy?" . . ."

"Dr. Ivy in Chicago found the same attitude when he made preliminary tests of Krebiozen and found enough encouraging results to request similar help from the National Cancer Institute. . . .

"See the new book, **The Long Search for the Truth About Cancer** by Mark Boesch, Putnams, for the way organized medicine has obstructed cancer cures and ruined any doctor who, like Dr. Ivy, has tried to follow a scientific attitude. See also **The Cancer Blackout**, Maurice Natenberg, for a list of cancer cures that have been systematically destroyed by the medical monopoly. . . .

"Drugless doctors using their best judgment in selecting methods of treatment or diagnosis are ruthlessly prosecuted if they try to treat with reasonable methods patients having so-called 'incurable' disease, often a deficiency state. California is celebrated for this trick.

"In all honesty, how can the use of a placebo ever be justified? If the medical doctor is to have the privilege of deceiving the patient, how can any attempt to

(Continued next page)



regulate the healing art ever be successful?

"We must look to the old reliable Golden Rule for guidance. Laws must be applied without discrimination, certainly abhorrent to us in this country where we boast about social justice but allow vicious rackets to carry on. Read about Dr. Harvey Wiley and his lost battle over honest enforcement of the pure food law. Then look up the most recent developments in skulduggery within FDA—the story of Dr. Welch for instance—the control—or lack of control—of carcinogenic and poison food additives, of chemicals in food, of propaganda by FDA officials to sell foodless foods—you will find a lot to write your congressman about.

"There is no question but what, in time, the use of poisons as curative weapons will be looked upon as being as barbaric as the anesthesia of the ancients—a whack on the skull with a club—or the blood-letting of more recent respectability."

#### **TB And Antibiotics**

To the Editor of *The Inquirer*:

Reference the Editorial on TB and Home Treatment. It has been reported that the bacillus that causes tuberculosis is developing resistance against the antibiotics which are used to combat the disease. Will the drugs reach a point where they must be so strong that they will kill the patient quicker than the disease?

The Public Health Service should learn the true meaning of the word health and spend some of its millions to promote good health and not drugs. We are fighting a losing battle with drugs and insecticides as the germs and pests are continually becoming immune to the old method of killing them.

Only the body itself can cure disease.

(Continued bottom next column)

#### **Be Patient With Us**

We have been so busy with the N.H.F. campaign to alert the public to the dangers contained in the Food and Drug Administration's proposal to change vitamin and food supplement regulations that we have had no time to take care of our regular correspondence.

Before the campaign is over we will be at least five weeks behind in our work—so please have patience with us.

#### **AMA Raps Candy Sales**

CHICAGO — The American Medical Association came out recently against the sale of candy and soft drinks in school lunchrooms.

The AMA council on foods and nutrition contended that confections and carbonated beverages are inferior in nutrition to basic foods, fruit and milk.

It also theorized that the purchase of sweets instead of standard lunch items could lead to poor food habits.

We should learn how to work with nature and build up our natural immunity to disease. The Public Health Service should start to study healthy people and the reasons why they are healthy.

**Jack Spiegel, Philadelphia.**

**Editor's Note:** The foregoing was published in the Philadelphia *Inquirer* and contains so much good sense we are passing it along to you. It is part of the job of the National Health Federation to convince Health, Education, and Welfare leaders of the truth of the statements published above and to get them to do something constructive about health as suggested in this item by Jack Spiegel. The date of publication was October 7th, 1961.

**More about Convention in the October Bulletin.**

NATIONAL HEALTH FEDERATION BULLETIN

## **Representative David S. King at Carnegie Hall**

**Statement by Rep. David S. King to Meeting Held by American Academy of Applied Nutrition, May 9, 1962, Carnegie Hall, New York City**

As the government expands and intends its regulatory activities into almost every department of human activity, it becomes all the more important that its enormous power be exercised with restraint.

There have come to my attention in recent months, however, several instances of serious abuse of discretion by governmental regulatory agencies. A typical example is that of the Federal Trade Commission which recently summoned the heads of six supermarket companies to appear before a public "investigatory" hearing in Indianapolis. The FTC's announcement of the hearings—and its later press releases—made it clear that the hearing was being conducted in order to stop certain practices which it had already decided were illegal and not to find out whether or not the acts committed were illegal. This prejudgment seriously injured the stores in question, causing them to lose business and to suffer greatly in the eyes of their customers. This type of situation has occurred again and again. In every case the adjudication officer of some federal regulatory agency prejudged some person without proper hearing. Based upon such prejudgment, he made statements to the press or radio or made phone calls to various customers of this person, all of which had the effect of suggesting that the alleged wrongdoer was in serious trouble with the law. As a result, his business was seriously hurt—sometimes ruined.

Then the so-called culprit was summoned to a hearing, and to his amazement, he found that his judge was none

other than the man who had said derogatory things about him, based upon his prejudgment of the merits of the case.

It seems to me that this practice violates every American principle of fair play and justice.

Canon 20 of the Canons of Professional Ethics of the American Bar Association provides as follows:

"Newspaper publications by a lawyer as to pending or anticipated litigation may interfere with a fair trial in the courts and otherwise prejudice the due administration of justice. Generally they are to be condemned. If the extreme circumstances of a particular case justify a statement to the public, it is unprofessional to make it anonymously. An ex parte reference to the facts should not go beyond the records or papers on file in the court; but even in extreme cases it is better to avoid any ex parte statement."

This is so obvious that discussion of the point would appear superfluous. In the year 1742, the British Lord High Chancellor said, in the case of *Roach v. Garvon*:

"There is nothing more incumbent upon courts of justice, than to preserve their proceedings from being misrepresented; nor is there anything of more pernicious consequence than to prejudice the minds of the public against persons concerned as parties in causes, before the cause is finally heard. . . .

"There cannot be anything of greater consequence than to keep the streams of justice clear and pure, that parties may

(Continued next page)



proceed with safety both to themselves and to their characters."

On January 26th, 1940, the A.B.A. handed down an opinion (No. 199) discussing the ethics of the Attorney General's issuing statements to the public regarding the prosecution policy with respect to antitrust laws. The opinion reads in part as follows:

"The experienced trial lawyer knows that an adverse public opinion is a tremendous disadvantage to the defense of his client. While we may doubt that the effect of public opinion would sway or bias the judgment of the trial judge in an equity proceeding, the defendant should not be called upon to run that risk and the trial court should not have its work made more difficult by any dissemination of statements to the public that would be calculated to create a public demand for a particular judgment in a prospective or pending case.

"While we see no objection to statements reflecting departmental policy, nor to statements of fact relating to past proceedings in the nature of reports, when, as here, the statements relate to prospective or pending criminal or civil proceedings, they should omit any assertions of fact likely to create an adverse attitude in the public mind respecting the alleged actions of the defendants to such proceedings."

In an attempt to correct this situation I introduced H.R. 10058 into the Congress of the United States. This bill provides, in part, as follows:

"Where the reviewing court determines that, in the course of the agency proceeding leading to the agency action being reviewed, the agency issued or released any public statement tending to discredit any party to, or subject matter of, the proceeding, the court shall regard such statement as constituting a

## Read This Before You Read Further

The balance of this Bulletin is being given over to recording some of the presentations presented to Congress by Clinton Miller as Director of the Washington Office of the National Health Federation. We feel our members should read these presentations. They are full of good authentic information.

prejudging of the issues and may set aside any agency action against such party, or enter any other appropriate order."

The reform sought in this bill was originally recommended in the Hoover Commission Report of over 12 years ago, and subsequently has been advocated by the American Bar Association.

The bill will be heard by the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, presided over by Francis Walter, who is also chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

This bill would tend to restrain an administrative agency from prejudging a case assigned to it, and from then using its propaganda facilities to pressure the defendant into compliance, even before he has had a fair hearing. This improvement in the law is long overdue.

### Do the Best You Can

"I do the best I know how, the best I can, and I mean to keep doing so until the end. If the end brings me out all right, what is said against me won't amount to anything. If the end brings me out wrong, then ten angels swearing I was right would make no difference."

—Abraham Lincoln.

## Compulsory Vaccination Bill

**Statement by Clinton R. Miller, representing the National Health Federation, submitted as testimony AGAINST the proposed legislation H.R. 10541 as written at time of hearing**

The National Health Federation is a nonprofit, health rights corporation with its main offices at 709 Mission St., San Francisco, California. Our Washington office is in the Continental Building, 1012 14th Street, N.W., Washington 5, D.C.

The National Health Federation is a national organization, composed of thousands of members who believe in freedom of choice in matters of health where the exercise of that freedom does not violate the equal freedom of another.

We wish to appear as a witness and to file a statement for the record.  
Gentlemen:

The presentation of testimony by the National Health Federation in opposition to H.R. 10541 does not mean that the N.H.F. is opposed to vaccination as a means of protection of individuals against poliomyelitis, diphtheria, whooping cough, tetanus, and other diseases which may in the future become susceptible of practical elimination through vaccination.

The National Health Federation has members who believe in the efficacy of vaccination, who have had themselves and their children vaccinated, and who urge others to do likewise.

**Their urging, however, would stop short of supporting legislation to make their own views the official views of America. They would stop short of supporting legislation to require other members of the N.H.F. and of America, who do not believe in vaccination, to pay the cost of intensive community vaccination programs through taxation to support Federal grants.**

**Believe in Freedom of Choice**

**They believe in freedom of choice in matters of health with the same intensity that they believe in freedom of choice in matters of religion.** The only time they would feel justified in violating an American's exercise of his freedom of choice in matters of health would be when such exercise of freedom violated the equal right of another. Clearly at the present time no one is denied vaccination for themselves or their children if they desire it. Therefore, citizens who exercise their freedom of choice by choosing NOT to be vaccinated are not denying an equal right to another by the exercise of this freedom.

### Principle of Freedom More Fundamental

This principle of freedom is a superior and more fundamental consideration than that of vaccination. There are those people who so stoutly believe in the principle of vaccination that their enthusiasm leads them to an intolerance of anyone who just as stoutly does not believe in it.

### Government Should Be Neutral

So long as the government maintains a neutral role, and allows the exchange of ideas on vaccination or other health beliefs to be between individuals and groups of individuals, there will be a healthy exchange of ideas and approaches which will lead to "practical elimination" of the specific diseases mentioned in H.R. 10541, and others.

### What Freedom Is

It is granted that this insistence on freedom will allow some to make mistakes. It is acknowledged that some will make bad choices. But isn't that what freedom is—the right to be wrong? If

(Continued next page)



we are not free to make wrong choices, then we are not free. The tyranny that forces a man to be healthy is as much to be feared as the tyranny that forces a man to be good.

#### **Freedom Begets Responsibility**

To those who would argue that freedom in economic matters is one thing, but that a mistake in the matter of vaccination can be fatal, we would agree that this is true. Those who defend freedom must be prepared to share the responsibility for those who suffer from poor choices. But we would point out that if a person makes a poor choice in religion, some claim that they might be consigned to an eternity of torment. Yet we allow people in this country freedom in such an important matter.

#### **We Are Not Indifferent**

This does not mean that we are indifferent to God as a nation, or are unaware that individuals will make bad religious choices. It does mean that we believe as a nation, and the founders of our Constitution believed that the protection of the freedom of choice in these matters is the best way for the most people to make the right choice. It has the refreshing defense that those who make the wrong choice have only themselves to blame.

#### **Minority View May Become Majority**

Those who believe in freedom of choice in matters of politics, religion and health emphasize that minority views of one generation become majority views of another. History has a wonderful lesson to teach us here if we will learn it. History will record a man of one age as a wise man, even though subsequent research might prove his theories to be in error, if he refrained from force of any kind in sharing of his beliefs with his disciples and contemporaries. But it will record the same man with the same theories as a fool or a tyrant, who uses, or allows to be used, force of any kind—

not the least of which is governmental force—to gain acceptance for his beliefs.

#### **Humanity—Mark of Greatness**

Humility about the extent of one's knowledge or of the collective knowledge of any age is always the mark of greatness, progress, and understanding. It breeds tolerance, love, unity, and all the other human virtues that make for a happy existence while we individually and collectively live our earthly life.

#### **Freedom Dearly Bought**

Freedom in matters of religion was not lightly come by, for history records many martyrs who died to explain this yearning for freedom to later generations. The problem is still unresolved as to which martyr died for the truest religion, but it is clear that there was a unity among all martyrs in their belief that "Congress Shall Make No Law Respecting any Establishment of Religion or Prohibiting the Free Exercise Thereof. . . ." It remained for American patriots to embody this belief in a Constitution.

#### **Doctor Benjamin Was Right**

Dr. Benjamin Rush, a signer of the Declaration of Independence, and a Congressman, is quoted as saying, "The Constitution of the Republic should make provision for medical freedom as well as for religious freedom. To restrict the art of healing to one class of men and deny equal privileges to others will constitute the Bastille of medical science. All such laws are un-American and despotic. They are fragments of monarchy and have no place in a Republic."

We maintain that this right was implied, if not written. If his suggestion had been embodied in the Constitution as an article of the Bill of Rights, we would be considering this legislation in a different light today. Substitute the phrase "Intensive Religious Programs" for "Intensive Vaccination Programs" in

(Continued next page)

the Bill H.R. 10541, and you will see how clearly it would have violated such an amendment, had it been written, and included in the Bill of Rights.

#### **We Must Solve the Problem**

But the fact is that it was not written, and we are left to argue that it was certainly implied. At the time Benjamin Rush made this plea, it was argued that this "right" was assumed by the guaranteed freedom of religion and didn't need to be codified. This was true for his time. Dr. Rush's concern was for the future, not the then present possibility of abuse in this matter. **Incidentally, Dr. Rush was a strong believer in the vaccination theories of Jenner**, but emphasized the greater need for freedom in all health matters. It has fallen to the lot of this generation to solve this problem. The bill H.R. 10541 is one testing ground for the limitation or extension of governmental control in matters of health.

#### **Ratner Questions Salk Vaccine**

Herbert Ratner, M.D., Director of Public Health, Oak Park, Illinois, and Associate Clinical Professor of Preventative Medicine and Public Health, Stritch School of Medicine, Chicago, has raised some penetrating questions on the Salk vaccine and mass vaccination. In my written statement, I have included his letter to the editor published January 21, 1956, in the **Journal of the American Medical Association** (Vol. 160, No. 3, pages 231-232). At this time (1956) Dr. Ratner was a rather lonely voice, critical of the Salk vaccine promoters' inadequate information to the medical profession. He charged, "We should recognize that only one side of the ledger is being presented by the promoters of this vaccine."

#### **Other Doctors Support Ratner's Findings**

Other prominent medical doctors, biostatisticians and scientists were found

to share Dr. Ratner's concern to have both sides of the ledger fairly presented. The **Illinois Medical Journal** of August, 1960 (Vol. 118, No. 2) printed a panel discussion entitled "The Present Status of Polio Vaccines." This was presented before the Section on Preventive Medicine and Public Health at the 120th annual meeting of the ISMS in Chicago, May 26, 1960. I have included this article with Bibliography and Notes in my written statement. The distinguished panelists were Herald R. Cox, Sc.D., Pearl River, N.Y.; Bernard G. Greenberg, Ph.D., Chapel Hill, N.C.; Herman Kleinman, M.D., Minneapolis; and Paul Meir, Ph.D., Chicago.

#### **Prediction Misses the Mark**

In this article, Dr. Herbert Ratner points out that "In the fall of 1955 Dr. Langmuir had predicted that by 1957 there would be less than 100 cases of paralytic polio in the United States. As you know, four years and 300 million doses of Salk vaccine later, we had in 1959 approximately 6,000 cases of paralytic polio, 1,000 of which were in persons who had received three, four, and more shots of the Salk vaccine. So you see, expectancy of the Salk vaccine has not lived up to actuality, and Dr. Langmuir was right when he said the figures of 1959 were sobering."

#### **A Sobering Experience**

A quote by Dr. Langmuir pointed out the reason for the foregoing panel. He was in charge of polio surveillance for the USPHS, and had been an ardent proponent of the Salk vaccine even prior to the Francis report of 1955. In a symposium on polio in New Jersey the previous month, he had stated that a current resurgence of the disease, particularly the paralytic form, provides "cause for immediate concern" and that the upward polio trend in the United States during the past two years (1958 and

(Continued next page)



1959) "has been a sobering experience for over-enthusiastic health officers and epidemiologists alike."

#### **Proponents Change Statistic Formulas**

Dr. Ratner pointed out that "Prior to the introduction of the Salk vaccine, the National Foundation defined an epidemic as 20 or more cases of polio per year per 100,000 population. On this basis there were many epidemics throughout the United States yearly." After its introduction, a community was considered to have an epidemic when it had 35 cases of polio per year per 100,000 population. No reason is given for changing the rules. But a community that, before the Salk vaccine release and by the old rules (of 20 per 100,000), would attract headline attention because of an "epidemic," could have the same number and more cases after 1955, and not a word would be printed. True, there were fewer "epidemics" after the introduction of the Salk vaccine in 1955. But it was because they had changed the definition of an epidemic. It was not a real but a semantic elimination of epidemics. It is no wonder that some physicians who remained skeptical about the original theories behind the vaccine became increasingly bold in exposing the fallacies used in its evaluation.

#### **Misleading Handling of Statistics**

Dr. Bernard Greenberg, the panel's statistician, states: "...as such, (a statistician) my primary concern, my only concern, is the very misleading way that most of this data (on the Salk vaccine) has been handled from a statistical point of view."

He deals a devastating blow to the arguments of the Public Health Service that the increase in paralytic polio for 1958 and 1959 could be blamed on those who refused to be vaccinated (about 49 per cent of the American population). Professor Greenberg is head of the department of biostatistics of the Univer-

sity of North Carolina, School of Public Health, and former chairman of the Committee on Evaluation and Standards of the American Public Health Association. Follow carefully his excellent argument, for it is a sound rebuttal against the need for the mass vaccination bill—H.R. 10541.

Dr. Bernard Greenberg: "There has been a rise during the past two years in the incidence rates of paralytic poliomyelitis in the United States. The rate in 1958 was about 50 per cent higher than that for 1957, and in 1959 about 80 per cent higher than in 1958. If 1959 is compared with the low year of 1957, the increase is about 170 per cent. At the same time, the rates for non-paralytic polio have been declining in relation to the 1957 base.

"As a result of this trend in paralytic poliomyelitis, various officials in the Public Health Service, official health agencies, and one large voluntary health organization have been utilizing the press, radio, television, and other media to sound an alarm bell in an heroic effort to persuade more Americans to take advantage of the vaccination procedures available to them....

#### **Misinformation Fed Public**

"One of the most obvious pieces of misinformation being delivered to the American public is that the 50 per cent rise in paralytic poliomyelitis in 1958 and the real accelerated increase in 1959 have been caused by persons failing to be vaccinated. This represents a certain amount of 'double talk' and an unwillingness to face facts and to evaluate the true effectiveness of the Salk vaccine. It is double talk from the standpoint of logical reasoning: If the Salk vaccine is to take credit for the decline from 1955 to 1957, how can those individuals who were vaccinated several years ago contribute to the increase in 1958 and

(Continued next page)

1959? Are not these persons still vaccinated?

#### **Less, Not More**

"The number of persons over two years of age in 1960 who have not been vaccinated cannot be more, and must be considerably less, than the number who had no vaccination in 1957. Yet a recent Associated Press release to warn about the impending threat referred to the idea that the 'main reason is that millions of children and adults have never been vaccinated.' If they were never vaccinated, undoubtedly many more than were reported were unvaccinated during 1955, 1956 and 1957 when the same officials were claiming that the reduction in rates was due to the vaccine....

"A scientific examination of the data, and the manner in which the data were manipulated, will reveal that the true effectiveness of the present Salk vaccine is unknown and greatly overrated."

Dr. Greenberg further reveals two instances where the PHS revealed bias in faulty statistical manipulations in the Poliomyelitis Surveillance Unit study. The PSU had reported about 80% effectiveness in North Carolina for a single shot when in fact one dose was practically ineffective!

#### **Now They Change the Rules**

But the most incredible discovery is a change in the rules by changing the definition of "paralytic poliomyelitis" for use after the 1955 introduction of the Salk vaccine. It is like comparing a sneeze and pneumonia. "Prior to 1954," Joan Beck, in reporting this same panel in the *Chicago Sunday Tribune* (3/5/61), observes, "any physician who reported a case of paralytic poliomyelitis was doing his patient a favor because funds were available to help pay his medical expenses (from a large voluntary health organization). At that time, most health departments used a definition of paralytic poliomyelitis which specified 'partial

or complete paralysis of one or more muscle groups, detected on two examinations at least 24 hours apart.' Laboratory confirmation and the presence of residual paralysis were not required.

"In 1955, these criteria were changed. Now, unless there is paralysis lasting at least 60 days after the onset of the disease, it is not diagnosed as paralytic polio.

"During this period, too, 'Coccaceae virus infections and aseptic meningitis have been distinguished from paralytic poliomyelitis,' explained Dr. Greenberg. 'Prior to 1954, large numbers of these cases undoubtedly were mislabeled as paralytic polio.'"

#### **The Lid Blows Off**

One cannot expect these startling facts to be kept under cover in America, no matter how strong the national desire to believe in the Salk vaccine. As I have indicated, the *Chicago Sunday Tribune* featured a three-page article by Joan Beck entitled "The Truth About the Polio Vaccines" (March 5, 1961) which I have included in full in my written statement.

#### **A Political Tie-in**

This was followed by "A Note on Polio" in the *Saturday Review* of April 1, 1961. I have included the note in full with its chart in my written statement, but a significant political tie-in is worthy of note here: I quote the *Saturday Review*:

"During the month of March, 1961, the President of the United States, John F. Kennedy, announced that in the name of the American people he had authorized a gift of Salk 'killed virus' polio vaccine to the people of Cuba to fight a polio epidemic on that unhappy island.

"At least one physician who heard of the President's action wired the White House an immediate warning that the Salk vaccine is known to be ineffective

(Continued next page)



in stopping the spread of a going epidemic.

"The warning wire pointed out that the Russian wooers of Cuba's Fidel Castro are well acquainted with the superior effectiveness of oral live virus vaccines (the Sabin vaccine is only one of three) developed in this country and used widely in the USSR but not then available here.

"It was after that wire was delivered that President Kennedy asked the Congress to appropriate special funds for a stand-by supply of oral live virus polio vaccine.

**"Who gave the President the poor advice that led to the meaningless gift to Cuba?"**

"SR's Science Editor does not pretend to know. But normal routes of responsibility in such matters lead to the U.S. Public Health Service, which, along with the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, has been pushing the Salk vaccine.

#### **Salk Vaccine Said to Be Worthless**

"Around the same time that the President was being taken off balance, the **Journal of the American Medical Association** published, in answer to a doctor-reader's question, a statement by Dr. Herbert Ratner, public health officer of Oak Park, Illinois (largest village in the world), that 'it is now recognized that much of the Salk vaccine used in the United States has been worthless . . . because it is an unstandardized product of an unstandardized process.'"

It should be observed here that H.R. 10541 is an amendment to Sec. 2, Part B. of title III of the Public Health Service Act, and we assume would be administered by the Public Health Service. A subsequent issue of the **Journal** carried a series of articles by three U.S. Public Health Service officials admitting that the Salk vaccine's value had been greatly overestimated, but still insisting that it

was highly effective.

#### **Salk Vaccine May Cause Cancer**

We are now faced with the possibility that it causes cancer. In the **Chicago Sun-Times**, Monday, April 16, 1962, there is an article by Earl Ubell on SV-40, a newly discovered "something" in Salk vaccine. The article contains three conjectures:

"Conjecture No. 1: SV-40 may cause cancer in human beings. This, of course, is the most frightening idea. Millions of persons have received Salk injections (killing the polio virus does not mean killing SV-40).

"Now the latest work shows that SV-40 can grow in the tissue of human beings and can make cells grow faster. But many viruses can do this without causing cancer. However, the report on the chromosomes makes the cancer possibility somewhat stronger."

#### **No Unanimity of Opinion**

The purpose of the National Health Federation in reading this testimony into the record is not, we again emphasize, that we are opposed to vaccination, and certainly not to the Salk vaccine as singled out from the others. As strong a case can be made against the oral vaccines (there are now three), and the vaccines used for diphtheria, whooping cough, and tetanus, the other three specific concerns of the Bill. We simply want to be sure that there is a clear understanding that there is far from unanimity of thought in America on the subject even among those who believe in the principle of vaccination. To rush through H.R. 10541 without fully amending it to allow no whisper of force or coercion to be exercised against those who might oppose the particular vaccination approach chosen would be less than wise.

#### **Freedom of Choice Should Be Maintained**

Here we wish to point out that, in  
(Continued next page)

local and state laws, it has been customary to allow those who have contrary religious convictions to be allowed to refrain from participation in otherwise compulsory vaccination programs. **We believe that this protection (of religious conscience) should be included in any legislation on vaccination, but further, that it should clearly specify that a person can refuse vaccination if it is contrary to his beliefs. They do not have to be religious.**

#### **Not Compelled If Contrary to Beliefs**

We are aware that there is no provision for compulsion in H.R. 10541, but the phrases "intensive community vaccination programs" (p. 2, lines 3, 10, 19, etc.) and "the immunization over the period of the program of all, or practically all. . ." (p. 3, lines 7, 8, and 9), and especially, "and which includes plans and measures looking toward the strengthening of ongoing community programs for the immunization of infants and for the maintenance of immunity in the remainder of the population. . ." (p. 3, lines 10, 14), raises questions of compulsion. Many "ongoing community programs" have compulsory requirements, often tied into registration for public schools. This would be a possible place for the insertion of the amendment—"provided that any person may refuse vaccination if it is contrary to their belief which includes, but is not restricted or limited to religious belief."

If, in the light of all the testimony given to this committee, it is decided by the majority that the bill is desirable, we most strongly urge that this guarantee of freedom be included as an amendment.

#### **No Money Should Be Granted Unless**

We further urge that no money be granted to support an "ongoing community program" unless that local program carries the protection of this freedom of conscience amendment.

People feel very deeply about their religion, health and politics, and should have freedom under the law from compulsion in these fields, so long as by the exercise of this freedom they do not endanger the health of others and thereby deny them an equal freedom. Clearly, a demand for protection against force or compulsion to participate in mass vaccination programs does not deny any citizen an equal right to participate in them nor the protection that such participation provides.

#### **The Question of Side Effects of Sera and Vaccines**

At this point in my written statement, I have included seven pages from the book, **Side Effects of Drugs**, compiled by L. Meyler, M.D. This reports on the unwanted effects of drugs, sera, and vaccines, as reported in the medical literature of the world during the period 1958-1960. It was published in 1960 by The Excerpta Medical Foundation, Amsterdam, London, and New York. We have reprinted pages 194-200. H.R. 10541 does not concern itself with the matter of side effects of vaccines. It assumes that there is either a broad general knowledge among the public of this ugly, dangerous (and sometimes fatal) side effect of vaccination, or else that such information is not needed or wanted by the mass of United States citizens to be vaccinated. **We disagree with either assumption. We insist that the American public has the right and the intelligence to evaluate the good with the bad of any vaccination program. They should be fully informed of the expectations, limitations, and most certainly of the side effects of vaccination.** The critic of the program should have the same right to file a "minority report" which should accompany press releases lauding the efficiency and stressing the urgency of any particular vaccination program. **This should be a built-**  
(Continued next page)



in safeguard of check and balance in medical experiments with mass populations. There is no more validity here for the argument that "this is a matter for the experts" than there is in the field of politics. After all, in politics we are concerned with a possible loss of freedom, and in vaccination programs with loss of life or health. There are some cures that are worse than the disease.

#### Vaccines Cause Illness

Consider the following from page 197 of Dr. Meyler's book:

"Pertussis vaccine (whooping cough). Up to now some 100 cases of encephalitis have been reported. In half of the cases, the phenomena set in within six hours after the injection, and never later than 72 hours. About half of the patients made a complete recovery, about one third had serious, permanent neurological lesions, and about one sixth died. . . . **The increased susceptibility to poliomyelitis is stressed.** . . . The value of pertussis immunization is stressed, but so is the grave danger of further inoculations when a previous one has produced any suggestion of a neurological reaction.

"On account of the risk of encephalitis, it is advised not to vaccinate children if epilepsy, seizures, encephalitis, or mental disorders have occurred in their family history. If the child has had an infectious disease, the vaccination should be postponed until four months afterwards. Children who have recently been vaccinated against variola or polio should not be vaccinated. During an epidemic of poliomyelitis, no vaccinations should be given."

#### Congress Should Investigate

Here it should be noted that maybe there is room for a Congressional investigation into the problem of reporting epidemics. Is a polio epidemic 20 cases per 100,000 or is it 35 cases per 100,000? Who decides, upon what evidence, what constitutes an epidemic?

Was the importance of polio epidemic knowledge to parents about to consider whooping cough vaccinations taken into consideration when the rule was changed in 1955? Does the change in the rule of reporting polio epidemics present a hazard to children planning whooping cough vaccination because epidemics that were epidemics in 1954 are not now reported as epidemics in 1962? To what degree are other vaccinations contraindicated during polio epidemics?

#### Do We Make Our Children Ill?

On page 198 Dr. L. Meyler reports: "**Diphtheria vaccine.** A 1½-year-old child became severely ill after the second injection and died in coma four days afterwards. . . . The first injection had not produced any signs."

In mass vaccination programs, it is common practice to omit or ignore such information in presenting the case for vaccination to the public. There is a tendency to let the "experts" make the decisions, after which they summarize the evidence with such press release statements as "absolutely safe," and other statements designed not to educate, but to inspire absolute confidence.

#### People Should Not Be Herded

We point out that the tendency of a mass vaccination program is to "herd" people. People are not cattle or sheep. They should not be "herded." A mass vaccination program carries a built-in temptation to oversimplify the problem, to exaggerate the benefits, to minimize or completely ignore the hazards, to discourage or silence scholarly, thoughtful and cautious opposition, to create an urgency where none exists, to whip up an enthusiasm among citizens that can carry with it the seeds of impatience, if not intolerance, to extend the concept of the police power of the state in quarantine far beyond its proper limitation, to assume simplicity when there is ac-

(Continued next page)

tually great complexity, to continue support of a vaccine long after it has been discredited, to make a choice between two or more equally good vaccines, and promote one at the expense of the other, and to ridicule honest and informed dissent.

#### Controversy Is Hallmark of Healthy Change

President Kennedy, in the State of the Union message January 30, 1961, said: "Let it be clear that this administration recognizes the value of daring and dissent—that we greet healthy controversy as the hallmark of healthy change."

A bill such as H.R. 10541 without amendment safeguards could well discourage what little "healthy controversy" still exists in the field of vaccination.

John Stuart Mill has said: "It often happens that the universal belief of one age—a belief from which no one was free, nor without an extraordinary effort of genius could, at that time, be free—becomes to a subsequent age so palpable an absurdity that the only difficulty is to imagine how such a thing can ever have appeared credible."

#### Entire Concept May Change

It is conceivable that a future age may disdainfully look at our preoccupation with vaccination. Indeed, the entire concept may be replaced with another approach. In such an eventuality, it would record as statesmen or as tyrants the lawmakers who protected or trampled the rights of those who opposed the concept for one reason or another, in this age.

#### To Be Included in the Record

**Note:** I submitted or will submit with this summary, to the Clerk of the Committee, the following articles or abstracts of articles or books which I respectfully request be inserted into the record of this committee hearing:

1. A letter to the editor by Herbert

Ratner, M.D. to the **Journal of the American Medical Association**, January 21, 1956, Vol. 160, No. 3, pages 231, 232.

2. Part I and Part II of an article, "The Present Status of Polio Vaccines," a panel discussion, reprinted from the **Illinois Medical Journal**, Vol. 118, No. 2, August 2, 1960, and Vol. 118, No. 3, September, 1960.

3. Bibliography and notes on the article, "The Present Status of Polio Vaccines," **I.M.J.** prepared by Herbert Ratner, M.D.

4. An answer to a doctor-reader question by Dr. Herbert Ratner in the **Journal of the American Medical Association**.

5. A three-page article in the **Chicago Tribune Magazine**, March 5, 1961, by Joan Beck, entitled "The Truth About the Polio Vaccines."

6. "A Note on Polio," with chart, from April 1, 1961, issue of **Saturday Review**.

7. An article, "Polio Vaccine Virus Puzzles Scientists," from the **Chicago Sun Times**, April 16, 1962.

8. Pages 194 to 200 (chapter XXVI), *Sera and Vaccines*, from **Side Effects of Drugs**, compiled by L. Meyler, M.D., 1960.

9. Pages 138 to 150, and pages 163 to 172 from **Who Is Your Doctor and Why?** by Alonzo J. Shadman, M.D., House of Edinboro, Boston, 1958, Library of Congress catalog card number 58-10390. This briefly explains the homoeopathic medical doctor's approach to vaccination and polio.

10. "Diet Prevents Polio" by Benjamin P. Sandler, M.D. was not included in the printed record but committee members agreed to read the copy presented to them.

**Editor's note:** The complete hearing record can be obtained from the National Health Federation for the sum of \$1.00 while supplies last. We have 300 on hand. Those who oppose vaccination should have this 128-page record.



# Statement of the National Health Federation. Submitted as Testimony Against Proposed Legislation Embodied in S-917 by Senator Lister Hill

*This bill and an identical bill by Oren D. Harris, H.R. 4742 would produce a program for control of dental diseases and would give unlimited funds for the promotion of Fluoridation*

The National Health Federation is a rapidly growing national organization of individuals who believe in freedom of choice in matters of health.

The main offices of the National Health Federation are at 709 Mission Street, San Francisco, California. Our Washington offices are in the Continental Building, 1012 14th Street, N.W., Washington 5, D.C.

This testimony is prepared and presented to the subcommittee by Clinton R. Miller, Assistant to the President of the National Health Federation, and Director of the Washington Office.

We wish to compliment the Chairman of both the Subcommittee on Health Legislation and the parent Labor and Public Welfare Committee, the Honorable Senator Lister Hill of Alabama, for his lifelong interest and service in matters of the health of American citizens. We share this interest. A country can remain strong and free only if its citizens are healthy and strong.

It is our understanding that S-917 was introduced by the Chairman at the request of the American Dental Association, who favor the bill. The opponents of fluoridation have tried, unsuccessfully, for many years to have the basic issue resolved which this bill raises. The basic question involved in the bill is **whether or not it is a proper function of the FEDERAL GOVERNMENT to intervene in the field of dental hygiene.** We feel it is **not** except in communicable disease that cannot be controlled at a State level.

Fluoridation is the key issue. It is not even mentioned in the language of the bill, but it was made abundantly clear by the witnesses supporting the bill during oral testimony, Thursday, May 24, that it was their intention to use the funds that this bill authorizes to "educate" the people of America to the need and value of mass fluoridation of community water supplies for the prevention of tooth decay.

In America we are ruled by law and precedent. Fluoridation has become a testing ground to see if an American precedent of "limited constitutional government" should be broken and if the power of government should be expanded.

The precedent in America has been to allow freedom of choice in matters of health consistent with safety. The members of the National Health Federation believe in freedom of choice in matters of health where the exercise of that freedom does not endanger the life or health of another and thereby deny him the same right or freedom. We defend the American precedent of freedom and declare it applies with the same logic in matters of health as it does in matters of religion. When we defend freedom of choice in matters of health, we have to answer the problem of safety.

We believe there are many proper areas for the police power of the State to be exercised where freedom of choice by some individuals has clearly endangered the lives and health of others, and thereby must be controlled, or curbed.

(Continued next page)

Air pollution, water pollution, waste elimination, poison sprays, food additives, preservatives and colorings, etc. are proper areas of concern by government.

A key word to remember in considering the proper function of government in health is the word—**COMMUNICABLE.** It is also expressed by the phrase—**HAZARD TO OTHERS.**

It is obvious that the power of quarantine should be considered as a proper function of the State, for no person has, in the exercise of his freedom of choice, the right to endanger the life and safety of another.

There are some dental diseases that would call forth the proper exercise of police power in their control. Trench mouth, if communicable, would be an example. The control should be at the closest level to the individual that is consistent with solving the problem.

Now we wish to emphasize the fact that tooth decay is **not** contagious. An individual, exercising his freedom of choice, however poorly, in preventing tooth decay, is not a clear and present health hazard to his neighbor who might be more wise or prudent. The "benefits" of fluorine are available to those who wish them in several different forms, including, but not limited to, fluorides in drinking water on an individual basis for those who are convinced that there is some special merit in taking it in this form.

There are certain fundamental areas of health behavior that should be free from governmental control. Federal control of the toothbrush is improper. How a man cares for his teeth is no more a proper concern of the Federal Government than how he combs his hair, so long as he does not become a health hazard to his neighbor.

The American constitution and tradition is based on **LIMITED** government control of individuals. Fluoridation of

public water supplies is extending the concept of public health way beyond its proper function or concern. Chlorination of water is the treatment of water to prevent communicable disease. Fluoridation is not for treating or purifying water, but is for treating individuals—and for a noncommunicable disease. If we shatter precedent and pass legislation that acknowledges that the government can properly enter any area of treatment or prevention of noncommunicable disease, it will completely destroy the concept of a limit to government in matters of health. The ultimate could be—"Be well, or go to jail." It is just as improper to force a man to be healthy as to be holy.

We wish to compliment the American Dental Association for its excellent service to America as an organization of dentists. We are aware of the magnitude of the problem of dental caries in America. We support the efforts and work of the ADA to improve the dental health of America within the framework of freedom of choice. We have the same goal. We respectfully differ in our approach to the goal in respect to the function or role that the Federal Government should play.

## A Socialized Medicine Approach

It is understandable that a close, daily contact with a preventable disease should give rise to impatience, if not intolerance with the traditional American practice of education and persuasion. There is a temptation to lower the standard of freedom for just this one exception.

The American Dental Association has rather consistently supported the stand of her sister organization, the American Medical Association, in keeping socialized medicine out of the front door. And yet, both organizations have endorsed a back door approach to socialized medicine.

In an editorial, the **Santa Ana Register**

(Continued next page)



pointed out: "Medicine which you must take whether you want it or not, which you must pay for whether you want it or not, is socialized medicine, isn't it?"

### **Representative Baring Is Opposed to S-917**

The Honorable Representative Walter S. Baring, of Nevada, on September 27, 1961, warned against Senate bill S-917. He said: "Another aspect of this fluoridation problem is need to bring to the attention of this Congress the unethical methods used in promoting fluoridation, starting with the fourth annual conference of the State dental directors and the Public Health Service held in Washington in June 1951, culminating in a now new accelerated high-pressure program of the U.S. Dental Public Health Division that will be conducted through the use of undetermined funds now being requested, under House bill 4742 and Senate bill 917.

"Mr. Speaker, these are not good bills. They would permit uncontrolled use of Federal funds for promotional schemes not in the best public interest."

Attached to this statement is a reprint from the **Congressional Record**. I should like to request that it be printed in the record of this subcommittee hearing. It is the full text of Congressman Baring on this matter of fluoridation.

Rep. Baring has pointed out that—"During the past year, voters representing some 2,500,000 water users in 43 out of 56 cities rejected fluoridation with little more than about 50,000 having accepted."

We submit that the overwhelming rejection by the American people is not a result of "lack of education." In areas where fluoridation comes to referendum, the newspapers, radio, TV, etc. have usually carried both sides of the argument, and never the side against it with-

out the side in favor. In some cities the proposal has been defeated several times. Citizens who oppose the measure on religious or political or health grounds are required to finance both the promotion and opposition to fluoridation because their tax money has been used to promote fluoridation at the Federal level. S-917 would extend this injustice.

### **Federal Level Promotion Denied**

This, however, has been denied in the past when constituents have petitioned their Congressmen for redress of this wrong. With monotonous regularity, the staffs of Congressmen have answered requests for relief from Federal promotion with a stock answer supplied to them by the Public Health Department: "We believe this matter should be decided at the local level." Rep. Baring and others have pointed out that the promotion for fluoridation does not originate at the local level. Fluoridation cannot stand the public gaze at the local level.

The proper course of action at this time should be to strictly prohibit any more promotion of any kind at the Federal level, rather than to take the exact opposite course, outlined in S-917, and increase the Federal support in an all-out program. Rep. Baring's H.R. 516 expresses the obvious will of the people, and we respectfully request that the substance of it be included in S-917 if the bill is not defeated. His resolution states, and we recommend as an amendment to S-917, the following:

**"The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in the administration of the laws of the United States relating to the public health, should not approve any program of a public or private agency to promote mass fluoridation of potable water."**

Up till now we have not submitted with

(Continued next page)

this statement any of the volumes of evidence available which indicates that fluoridation is not as safe or effective as the proponents declare. We do not believe this to be the main issue. Our entire argument till this point will stand regardless of whether or not fluoridation will accomplish what its most enthusiastic proponents claim it will. Medical beliefs and dental beliefs and techniques change from age to age, but the principle of freedom stands through history as the safest of all principles to defend.

John Stuart Mill has said, "It often happens that the universal belief of one age—a belief from which no one was free, nor without extraordinary effort of genius could, at that time, be free—becomes to a subsequent age so palpable an absurdity that the only difficulty is to imagine how such a thing can ever have appeared credible."

It is conceivable that a future age may disdainfully look at our American preoccupation with fluoridation as the key to dental disease. Some other nations have already rejected fluoridation. History may even record that England's newly declared tax on sugar, soft drinks, candy, etc. is a more direct attack on the fundamental cause of tooth decay. In such an eventuality, it would record as tyrants or fools those lawmakers who disregarded or trampled the rights of those citizens who preferred to exercise their freedom of choice in this fundamental matter. It would record as statesmen those who carefully protected individuals' right to freedom of choice in matters of health where the exercise of that freedom does not endanger the life or health of another and thereby deny him the same right or freedom.

Thousands of pages of testimony could be submitted at this point laboring the questions of toxicity, allergy, and chronic poisoning which can result from repeated

exposure over a long period to the toxic agent, fluorine, which accumulates in the body of different individuals at vastly different rates. Hundreds of physicians, dentists and scientists now join George Waldbott, M.D., F.A.C.P., who declared, "As a physician I am opposed to fluoridation because I am afraid of the hazards, as a scientist I am impressed by the contradictory evidence, and as a citizen I am shocked at the methods of promoting it."

I am making available to the clerk of the Committee, for the use of any Committee members who wish to investigate the overwhelming evidence against fluoridation, the book, **The American Fluoridation Experiment**, by F. B. Exner, M.D. and G. L. Waldbott, M.D., and other studies and works by nationally and internationally recognized authorities which disprove and discredit the fluoridation thesis.

I further place at the service of the Senate and House the facilities of the Washington Office of the National Health Federation to secure additional literature or answer any further questions on this problem.

The Washington phone number of the National Health Federation is REpublic 7-2333.

Thank you.

## **Californians --- Vote "NO"**

Appearing on the November ballot in California is proposition No. 22, which would, in effect, destroy an entire branch of the healing arts in that state.

You should fight the medical monopoly and help preserve the osteopathic profession and your right to use the healing method of your choice by voting "No" on proposition No. 22.



## Statement by Clinton R. Miller, representing the National Health Federation, submitted as testimony for the proposed legislation, S-1322 and S-1055, to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to include the services of Chiropractors.

Chairman Burdick and Members of the Subcommittee:

I am Clinton R. Miller, Assistant to the President of the National Health Federation. The N.H.F. is a nonprofit, health rights corporation with its main offices at 709 Mission Street, San Francisco, California. Our Washington office is in Room 303, Continental Building, 1012 14th Street, N.W., Washington 5, D.C. The N.H.F. is a rapidly growing national organization, composed of thousands of members who firmly believe in **freedom of choice** in matters of health where the exercise of that freedom does not endanger the health or safety of another and thereby deny him an equal freedom.

The presentation of testimony by the National Health Federation in support of S-1322 and S-1055 does not mean that the N.H.F. endorses any healing art over another. Specifically, we do not endorse or support the chiropractic practitioner over any other licensed practitioner or physician.

We believe in licensing as a proper function of State governments, and declare that individuals should have the right to the doctor of their choice as they are licensed by State law and within the scope of their practice as defined by State law.

We believe that it is consistent with these objectives and beliefs to support S-1322 and S-1055. We endorse the testimony of the International Chiropractors Association and the National Chiropractic Association, and all previous witnesses for the bill, and support their position on this bill.

We compliment the sponsors of the

legislation, the Hon. Quentin N. Burdick of North Dakota, and the Hon. Warren G. Magnuson of Washington, for their introduction of their bills. We believe that the bills are fair, and represent a statesmanlike approach which is in harmony with the Constitution and traditions of our great Republic.

It is a matter of common knowledge that chiropractic is the professional choice of millions of Americans for some or all of their health problems. It seems consistent that this choice should not in any way be denied an individual because he is an employee of the United States. The bill is designed to correct this inconsistency.

Thank you.

## Black Market in Drugs Reported

CHICAGO—Two doctors warned today that there is a black market in a powerful drug that can make people act as though they were insane.

Drs. Sidney Cohen and Keith S. Ditman called the recent appearance of the drug in underworld traffic "an alarming development."

The code name of the drug is LSD-25. The chemical name is lysergic acid diethylamide.

It can cause hallucinations and reactions resembling schizophrenia.

The physicians said there is illicit trade in LSD in the form of tablets, ampules and saturated sugar cubes.

One realizes how much credit buying has influenced our lives when, trying to pay cash for a purchase, one is told by the salesgirl: "Do you mind waiting? I have to ask the manager how to handle a cash sale."—Capsuled Comments.

## New Federation Pin

These are gold-filled and make a very attractive pin or insignia. They can be had in many forms: lapel pins, bracelet charms, brooches, for necklace piece, tie clips, etc. See price list below. These pins are very attractive and anyone can be proud to wear one.

Lapel Button or Pin or Charm .....	\$2.75
Tie Tac .....	2.95
Tie Bar .....	4.50
Tie Chain .....	4.95
Bracelet .....	4.50
Bow Knot Brooch .....	4.50

All orders or requests for illustrated pamphlet should be sent direct to L. G. Balfour Company, attention Fred G. Stambaugh, 121 University Place, Pittsburgh 13, Pennsylvania.

## Hair Sprays May Cause Cancer

ST. LOUIS (AP)—A medical study raises suspicions that hair sprays may cause lung diseases in some women, and in men who work as hairdressers.

There is no proof that this happens, and thousands of women have used the sprays without any apparent harmful effects, says a team of doctors.

But they tell of 15 women and men who possibly suffered lung damage from breathing in particles of resins used in hair sprays. They found evidence of lung damage in X rays, in examinations of bits of tissue, and in autopsies of three women.

It is known, they say, that people can breathe in the resin particles, but they didn't find the particles in the lungs. And animals exposed to the hair sprays haven't shown lung damage.

Nonetheless, Dr. Martin Bergman of St. Louis and six associates say they think the study raises a strong assumption that breathing in too much of the hair spray material can cause trouble in susceptible persons.—From **South Bend Tribune**, May 9, 1962.

## FOR WILLS

For the convenience of those who wish to incorporate into their will a bequest for unrestricted use in research and the general work of the National Health Federation.

*I give, depose, and bequeath to the National Health Federation, a corporation, located in San Francisco, California, the sum of \$..... (or property herein described) to be used by its Board of Governors as they deem advisable for the benefit of said institution and its program.*

Should the donor desire to create a Memorial Fund, insert after "property herein described," the same to be known and designated as the "..... Memorial Fund."

## The Lollipop Budget

Britons gobble more candy per capita (8 oz. weekly) than any other people in the world. As a result, they also have more toothaches than most—which has no apparent effect on candy consumption but causes a perpetual headache in the higher echelons of government, since the great majority of Britain's population gets its teeth fixed for nominal fees by the National Health Service. Though it collects taxes on every other luxury from dancing to death, the government has never levied a tax on sweets, as the British call their favorite vice.

Last week, Chancellor of the Exchequer Selwyn Lloyd, a man never hitherto famed for political audacity, slapped a 15 per cent tax on candy, ice cream and soda pop. Britons, shocked to their cavities by what many soon called "the Lollipop Budget," protested that it was a "tax on children," though craving for candy knows no age limits. The government will collect \$140 million a year from the sweet-tooth tax—which makes it a classic bit of budget balancing, since the government now pays exactly \$140 million yearly to dentists to repair the damage.



Published for Distribution to Members  
Without Extra Charge by the

## NATIONAL HEALTH FEDERATION

709 Mission Street

SAN FRANCISCO 3, CALIFORNIA

Return Postage Guaranteed

Entered as Second-class Matter

Subscription: \$3 Per Year (to Nonmembers)

The subscription price of the National Health Federation Bulletin is included in membership dues.  
**PRICE FOR ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THIS**

### ISSUE

25¢ each - 7 for \$1.00 - 35 for \$5.00 - 100 for \$12.00

- ☐ I wish to become a **REGULAR MEMBER** of the National Health Federation and am enclosing \$5.00 as dues, \$1.50 of which is for a subscription to the BULLETIN for the current year. Family membership, \$6.00.
- ☐ I wish to become an **ACTIVE MEMBER** of the National Health Federation and am enclosing \$5.00 as yearly dues, \$1.50 of which is for a subscription to the BULLETIN. I wish to form a local chapter, so please send me necessary literature and instructions.
- ☐ I wish to become a **SUSTAINING MEMBER** and am enclosing \$ (minimum fee, \$25.00) as membership dues for the current year. \$1.50 of which is for a subscription to the BULLETIN.

Name

Address

**NOTICE:** Regular Membership Dues have been raised from \$3.00 to \$5.00 per year as of June 1, 1962.

Mail direct to **NATIONAL HEALTH FEDERATION**

709 Mission Street, San Francisco 3, Calif.

Renewal ☐ New Member ☐

PLACE  
3¢ STAMP  
HERE

## SPECIAL BULLETINS

1. **The October Bulletin** will have as its main project complete details connected with the Food and Drug Administration's proposed revisions of Section 125 of the Food and Drug Act.
2. **We urge our members** to study its contents to the end that they may be able to explain this important matter to their neighbors.
3. **Mark your calendar** for January 2, 3, 4 and 5 and arrange your affairs so that you can attend the Eighth Annual Convention of the Federation at the Breakers Hotel, Long Beach, California.
4. **Do everything you can to get new members** to join the National Health Federation. Dues are \$5.00 per year.
5. **The National Health Federation** is the only organization, organized on a nationwide basis, that can front for those who believe in freedom of choice and the natural approach to health.
6. **As surely as night follows day**, the public must win in this present contest with the drug and chemical interests. **WE CAN—WE MUST—WE WILL.**
7. **WE'RE MOVING!** After October 15, 1962 our address will be 211 West Colorado, Monterey, California.