

**National
Health
Federation
BULLETIN**

September, 1972

35c

**CONSUMER AFFAIRS
REPORT
●
WASHINGTON
ROUNDUP**

**Victory In the
Bruce E. Butt Case**

**Court Decisions in
Religious Freedom Cases
●
How these may affect Health Freedoms**

Bill To Weaken Delaney Amendment Must Be Defeated

Chiropractic Patients in Louisiana Suffer Rampant Injustices

Dedicated to the Protection of Health Freedoms

THE NATIONAL HEALTH FEDERATION BULLETIN

Protection of Health Freedoms

Published Monthly

Volume XVIII — Number 8

September, 1972

CONTENTS

Victory In the Bruce E. Butt Case Charles Orlando Pratt, NHF Washington General Counsel.....	1
Charles Orlando Pratt Retires.....	2
Freedom of Religion Includes Health Freedom John Joseph Matonis, J.D.....	10
49 Lawmakers Seek Stepup In Ban On Leaded Gasoline.....	10
Bill To Weaken Delaney Amendment Must Be Defeated Clinton R. Miller, NHF Legislative Advocate.....	11
New Life Members.....	12
Rampant Injustices To Chiropractic Patients Hugh B. Exnicios, Jr.....	13
A Very Grim Picture.....	17
AMA Affiliate Admits Nearly \$700,000 In Political Contributions.....	20
The Family Circle — Fred J. Hart.....	21
Consumer Affairs Report — Treasa Drury.....	24
Washington Roundup.....	26
Senator Magnuson Acknowledges NHF Support.....	28
Alabama Doctors Advocate Health Institute for Healthy People.....	29
Doctor Criticizes Medical Wastes.....	30
International Federation of Practitioners of Natural Therapeutics Plans World Congress.....	31
News Bits.....	32

The Bulletin serves its readers as a forum for the presentations and discussion of important health issues including the presentation of minority or conflicting points of view, rather than by publishing only material on which a consensus has been reached. All articles published in the NHF Bulletin—including news, comments and book reviews—reflect the individual views of the authors and not necessarily official points of view adopted by the Federation.

National Health Federation Bulletin, published monthly January through December, except July-August which are combined, at 211 West Colorado Boulevard, Monrovia, California 91016. By National Health Federation, a nonprofit corporation, Fred J. Hart, Managing Editor; Raymond H. Houser, Editor. \$1.50 of the annual membership dues is paid as a yearly subscription to the National Health Federation Bulletin. Single copies, 35 cents. Second-class postage paid at Monrovia, California 91016.

Victory In the Bruce E. Butt Case

By CHARLES ORLANDO PRATT
NHF Washington General Counsel

A landmark victory for Mr. Bruce E. Butt, The National Health Federation, the Harrisburg Area National Food and Health Association, the International Association of Cancer Victims and Friends, and all Americans was won finally, after more than two years of criminal prosecution in two Courts of Pennsylvania.

Unlike the landmark victory won on May 3, 1971, in Los Angeles, Calif., by NHF and IACVF, the Pennsylvania case was *not* won with a prompt decision by a courageous American, whose courage and faith in ultimate justice were defended by NHF throughout the course of the incredible events which occurred in the two Pennsylvania Courts.

It is a pleasure and a great relief to report officially that The National Health Federation, which defended Mr. Butt in the Pennsylvania case for more than two years, won a complete victory. The case was dismissed. Mr. Butt was exonerated. The seized motion pic-

ture, "Laetrile, Nature's Answer to Cancer," was returned to me with the help of the Office of the Attorney General of Pennsylvania after the case was won. The film has been mailed to NHF headquarters in Monrovia, California, to be delivered to its owner, IACVF.

I am pleased to report also that, as a result of this victory and of my preparing press releases for the Associated Press in Harrisburg, Pa., and for individual newspapers throughout the Harrisburg Area, the newspaper carried stories exonerating Mr. Butt; and announcements to that effect were made on the radio in several cities.

The National Health Federation, at the request of Fred J. Hart, Chairman of the Board of Governors, Charles I. Creelius, President, and the Executive Committee, being seriously and deeply concerned with the State of Pennsylvania's attempt to deny freedom of speech, freedom of press and freedom of assembly, decided unambiguously to fight the unwarranted

(Continued next page)

and unjustified court action involving the arrest and criminal prosecution of Mr. Butt, even up to the Supreme Court of the United States if necessary. Accordingly, your General Counsel was authorized and directed to defend Mr. Butt as long as necessary and in as many courts as necessary until victory was won for him and all Americans standing for justice.

The criminal charges and indictment were attributed apparently at the request of federal agencies, including FDA, and brought by the Pennsylvania State Department of Health. Mr. Butt, President of the Harrisburg Area Natural Food and Health Association, was arrested for the showing of the motion picture, "Laetrile, Nature's Answer to Cancer," at its public meeting held on March 12, 1970, at the First Federal Savings and Loan Association building in Camp Hill, Pa. He refused to plead guilty to the charges of which he was innocent. He was released under a One Dollar (\$1.00) bond; and thereafter, he stood his ground. As a consequence of his determination and faith in the principles of justice, as provided by our forefathers in the Constitution of the United States and in the Constitution of Pennsylvania, he won.

On April 17, 1972, this case was argued in Court. The circumstances relating to this day in Court are set forth in the July-August, 1972, issue of the *NHF Bulletin* in an article entitled "Since 'The Day Justice Died'."

On June 5, 1972, Edgar B. Bayley, First Assistant District Attorney of Cumberland County, Pa., submitted to the Court a written Petition, with attached sheet. In the Petition he informed the Court that he did not desire to further prosecute the case; and he requested that the Court grant leave to the District Attorney to enter a *Nolle Prosequi* in this case upon payment of the court costs. He requested that the Nolle Prosequi be entered for the reasons set forth in a sheet attached to his Petition.

The sheet attached to the said Petition setting forth Mr. Bayley's reasons for not wanting to prosecute Mr. Butt any further and for requesting a Court Order to grant leave to nolle prosequi (dismiss) this case is *not* part of the Court Order or Judgment. It is *only* his opinion; and it is a part of the public record filed with the Clerk of the Court by him.

On that day, June 5, 1972, Dale F. Shughart, President Judge of the Cumberland County Court in Carlisle, Pa., granted the Petition and issued an Order of Nolle Prosequi in this case. He further ordered the County to pay the court costs, *not* Mr. Butt. The Order by the Judge was entered on the Court Records on June 6, 1972. This Order closed this tragic case of injustice.

The painful wounds, which were inflicted and endured for more than two years, will heal from this miscarriage and travesty of justice in this case; but the battle scars will remain always in the hearts and

minds of those who love America and cherish its Constitution as its only real bulwark of freedom against arbitrary and capricious dictatorship by bureaucratic actions of federal, state and local governments. We shall look upon these scars as little lights of hope in future hours of darkness; and The National Health Federation will continue, with all of you, the perennial struggle for freedom.

Now, Mr. Butt is a free man again; and our faith in the American Judicial System has been restored. However, we must be ever mindful that eternal vigilance is the price of freedom, and that only loyal Americans united can pay that price.

Mr. Butt and his faithful family are, indeed, American Patriots. Because of their patience, courage and faith, their friends and the friends of NHF have had the privilege of standing by them until a complete victory was won. All together, we can cherish and enjoy this victory in one battle in the total war for freedom in health matters.

For many years, I have had the honor and pleasure of serving The National Health Federation as General Counsel. During that time, it has grown great and powerful, because of its worthy aims, purposes and victories in matters of health in the Halls of Congress, state legislatures, and in federal, state and local courts.

America needs The National Health Federation now more than

ever. Its membership, causes and burdens have grown greater each passing day.

It is now time for me to retire and pass my duties on to younger lawyers. Therefore, respectfully I have submitted my resignation to Charles I. Crecelius, President, and Fred J. Hart, Chairman of the Board of Governors, to be effective August 31, 1972.

I have gained great happiness, pride and satisfaction in my legal work for the Federation during the many years in which I have served as Counsel; because I believed sincerely, and shall always believe, in its aims and purposes, and because of the kindness, appreciation and many other courtesies extended to me by its members and friends throughout America and by all those dedicated Americans holding responsible positions for the success of NHF over the years.

NHF believes in, and has worked always for, freedom of choice in health matters. In closing my career working for the glorious aims and causes of the Federation, may I suggest humbly that each member cherish and protect other's ideas of freedom of choice in health care as each would wish and expect the other to respect his or her choice.

In my farewell, please accept my thanks for your help, guidance and prayers. Remember, America needs you. With this go my prayers for your health and your joy in helping others through The National Health Federation.

Charles Orlando Pratt Retires

Culminating more than 42 years in the practice of law, Charles Orlando Pratt, NHF Washington General Counsel, retired effective August 30th. Although an active participant in the organization of The National Health Federation, Mr. Pratt did not officially assume his position as the Washington General Counsel until 1959. Prior to that time, however, he was most helpful to the organization, giving freely of his time and wise guidance without thought of compensation or personal gain. But then, this is the type of man he has always been — wholly dedicated to causes and principles which he feels are just and right.

In accepting Mr. Pratt's resignation from his NHF post, the members of the Executive Committee unanimously expressed their mixed feeling — the deep regret of losing the services of a distinguished member of the NHF staff, but at the same time, the happiness of knowing that now their valued friend and colleague can, deservedly, begin to do the things he has dreamed of doing for several years. Mr. Pratt has always shown unusual devotion to his responsibilities and could always be found, day or night, ready to give of his wise counsel or to pursue any necessary action. Last year, NHF honored Mr. Pratt by giving him NHF's highest recognition for distin-

guished service, The National Health Federation Humanitarian Award. In accepting Mr. Pratt's resignation, the Executive Committee sought to bestow a further continuing honor on him by bestowing on Mr. Pratt the title of General Counsel Emeritus.

Mr. Pratt's legal career has been punctuated with more distinguished legal affiliations than can be enumerated here. In 1936, he became legal advisor to the Food and Drug Administration which began a background for his special expertise in food and drug matters. It is especially noteworthy that, in his long legal career, Mr. Pratt has never lost a case in which a constitutional issue was involved.

Both Mr. Pratt and his gracious wife, Louise, are well known and loved by thousands of NHF members through their presence at the annual NHF conventions. Mr. Pratt's convention addresses have always been a popular and significant feature of the program and Louise could always be found volunteering her services wherever help was needed, usually at the registration desk. The devotion of both of them to the principles and objectives of the Federation has earned for them the gratitude and affectionate good wishes we know their thousands of NHF friends would like to personally convey.

The courts' latitude in the interpretation of "religious freedom" will surprise many readers. Here are some interesting speculations by a practicing Washington, D.C. attorney who proposes that some of the court precedents established in certain religious freedom cases, be applied in selected health freedom cases.

Freedom of Religion Includes Health Freedom

By JOHN JOSEPH MATONIS
Member of the District of Columbia Bar

Three Wisconsin teenagers, Frieda Yoder, Barbara Miller and Vernon Yutzky, stayed away from school and, as a result, the Law was changed. And the new Law can be used by those interested in health freedom. Legislatures change the law by enacting statutes, but the courts, especially the Supreme Court of the United States, also change the law by making precedents. Often the courts change the law quicker and more directly than

the legislature. This is the way the body of law, *the corpus juris*, grows.

The parents of those three Wisconsin teenagers allowed their children to "play hokey." Moreover, the parents insisted that their children stay away from school from the eighth grade on! The Yoders, the Millers, the Yutzys were members of the Amish religion, a religion that teaches the evil of modern living and the good of simple life. High school, the Amish believe, endangers the salvation of their children by teaching them modern values contrary to the values of the simple life.

As a boy in Pennsylvania, I remember seeing the Amish folk dressed in plain black and white clothes, riding in plain horse-drawn carriages. While attending law school in Philadelphia, and later while writing for Rodale Press in Emmaus, I purchased organic pro-

(Continued next page)

John Joseph Matonis is the president of the District of Columbia Chapter of NHF. As a practicing attorney, he has successfully used the First Amendment as a shield against government attacks on health freedom. Most recently, he won, for Scientology, the right to use their E-Meter, an electrical instrument, without FDA interference. He has also used religious freedom to regain custody of children taken by welfare agencies from vegetarian parents. He frequently is invited to lecture on such subjects as the legal aspects of nutrition, natural healing, consumer rights, medical and psychiatric malpractice, and health rights.

duce and natural foods from Amish farmers, who were discovering that the products of their old-fashioned methods of farming and food preparation were increasingly in demand.

Rejecting modern machines and chemicals, making and selling food the old-fashioned way, staying to themselves, holding to long-held customs—you can see how the Amish were headed for trouble. And when they remained faithful to their religion and refused to send their children to school past the eighth grade, the government started to persecute them. The paternalistic bureaucrats can't stand people educating their own children and keeping them away from such benefits of modern schooling as sex education, tranquilizers, and federal lunch programs with overcooked, dead food. These do-gooders couldn't really complain about the Amish organic farming and aversion to modern conveniences, but they could get at them through their children by justifying this interference of Amish privacy in the name of "child welfare."

Let's look at the Supreme Court decision in the Amish case and see if we can extract from it principles of law which can be used by health-minded, freedom-loving individuals who zealously guard their rights to be left alone in the way they live or raise their children. But before we do this, it is necessary to understand the tricky nuances of freedom of religion when applied to health issues. We veterans of health free-

dom battles see the courts allow persons, who gird their loins with religion, survive government assaults while others who rely on science and bare individual rights without religion, get slaughtered.

We see Christian Scientists given special exemptions from compulsory vaccination statutes. The Scientists' E-Meter, according to the District of Columbia federal court, is "immunized" from FDA law and regulations by the First Amendment of the Constitution. If you are a parent, why should you be forced to have your child vaccinated while the child of your neighbor, a Christian Scientist, can sit next to your child in school without any vaccination? How come some chiropractors and independent, innovative health practitioners cannot use their electrical diagnostic and treatment devices while Scientology minister can use the E-Meter, a skin galvanometer, as a "confessional aid" in diagnosis and treatment of a wide range of physical ills believed by Scientologists to be spiritually caused? The answers are: your child *should* be allowed the same rights as the Christian Science children and your unorthodox doctor should be allowed to use unorthodox methods of healing without FDA harassment. Religion should make no difference in freedom of choice in health matters. Just as there is a "wall of separation" between church and state, there should be a similar wall between health practices and state. But freedom of re-

ligion does give you more freedom in choosing health disciplines.

The innovators in health have looked at *freedom of religion* for the freedom they need to teach and to heal. It is not necessary to have a choir, robes, incense, or holy pictures to be a "religion" as the law defines the term. The law has its own dictionary and some of the legal definitions bear no relationship to reality. A case in point is the word "drug." Under the U.S. Code, Title 21, Section 321, seawater has been held by a federal court to be a "drug" as can any article used, or intended to be used, in the "cure, treatment, mitigation or prevention of disease."

Likewise, an atheist can belong to a "religion" which does not require belief in a Supreme Being, and he can avoid the draft on religious grounds! Also, as has been shown, one child of atheist parents can silence prayers and the whisper of the name of God in a school district or an entire state by going to court. And what does the atheist's lawyer argue to the judge? You guessed it: *freedom of religion!* This is not to criticize anyone's beliefs about God. I merely wish to point out that the word "religion" means something more to laymen and judges than to lawyers, and *freedom of religion* provides freedoms that have little or nothing to do with "religion" as the term is generally understood.

This broad definition of the word, "religion," is explainable. Religion includes philosophy, a way of life, a code of conduct, and a recogni-

tion of a relationship between Man and Nature, and religious symbols or specific dogma is not an absolute requisite. If we look at it in this light, we can see how *health freedom* is, in a broad constitutional sense, a type of "religious" freedom.

The recent Amish victory in the Supreme Court may then be a victory for freedom for parents, their children, and all who merely want their government to leave them alone, so that the government can concentrate on the more serious problems such as pollution, dangerous drugs, food chemicals, and poor nutrition.

The Amish discovered that by just saying the magic words, *religious freedom*, was not enough. They were harassed and hounded for years because they refused to allow their children to go to high school. Claiming to be more interested in the Amish children's welfare than the Amish parents were, state authorities prosecuted Amish parents for truancy. The state government claimed that they had an interest in universal education and that the only way to carry out the state interest was to force the Amish children to go to high school. Now, freedom of religious belief is absolute, but freedom of religious practice is limited, and the government can limit the freedom of persons to practice their religion if the practice is harmful and if the state has both a substantial interest in preventing the harm and no alternate means of control exist.

(Continued next page)

In *Wisconsin v. Yoder*, the Amish stopped the government interference in their lives by proving that they were sincere in their beliefs, that they lived their religion, and that they provided for their children a program of vocational education. Moreover, the U.S. Supreme Court balanced the state's interest in education with the rights of the Amish families. Chief Justice Burger delivered the opinion: "Thus, a state's interest in universal education, however highly we rank it, is not totally free from a balancing process when it impinges on other fundamental rights and interests..."

Now, let's play a word game—everywhere I mentioned the law relating to this Amish case, substitute the words "universal medication" for the words, "universal education" and substitute "vegetarian," "natural hygienist" or "persons interested in natural health" for the term, "Amish." Remember, religion-at-law is more encompassing than the more narrow, familiar impression of religion.

The holding (concise statement of the main rule of law in a court's opinion) after the substitution of words is: The state's interest in universal medication is not totally free from a balancing process when it impinges on other fundamental rights, and a group which can prove the sincerity of their beliefs and the adequacy of their alternative means of achieving health have a right to raise their children naturally and to live their lives without

government interference. Would not such a rule make you proud of the law rather than resentful? Would not this provide the individual freedoms envisioned by our Founding Fathers?

In order to become established law, such a holding, or premise, must endure the life cycle of the law. First, the facts occur; second, facts are alleged in a Complaint; third, the facts are proven at a trial; fourth, a Trier-of-Fact (judge or jury) decides which facts are proven; fifth, a rule of law is stated and a decision made; sixth, the losing party appeals, claiming that the trial was not fair or that the rule of law is wrong; seventh, the appeals court affirms or reverses the lower court and states a rule of law; eighth, other parties with different factual details take this rule and try to make it work for them—and the cycle begins again.

The Amish have opened a door; let us push our way through this door into the constitutional sanctuary of the Amish case. And why not? Are not those who prefer and accept the natural approaches to health just as sincere as the Amish? Are they not dedicated to a way of life that abhors harmful, so-called modern conveniences such as convenience foods, chemical preservatives in food, pesticides, surgery, and artificial fluoridation? Is there not a true sincerity on the part of those who object to the way our young people are taught values in school which are contrary to their own? The answer to all these ques-

tions is "yes." Not only are there adequate alternatives to the so-called modern conveniences authorized and often peddled by government, but also time and experience are showing the alternatives to be better. The results of the alternatives are healthy children, the elderly living longer and without pain, nutritious food, clean pure unfluoridated water, and fresh air.

The Amish need not be the only ones who can slam the door at paternalistic peddlers of protection. Just as the atheists have taken *freedom of religion* victories of the past and have used them in court to win freedom from religion over and over again, we, who are dedicated to natural health and nutrition as a way of life, can use the Amish case to win freedom to live a simple, natural life without such modern conveniences as food chemicals, drugs and surgery.

In the January, 1972 issue of the *NHF Bulletin*, I wrote "Courts Provide Hope for Freedom." The next month, Charles Orlando Pratt, Esq. prepared a cogent article on the 1971 *Winters* case where the U.S. Supreme Court allowed a civil rights lawsuit for forced medication over religious objections. Now, with the *Wisconsin v. Yoder* case, there is yet more "Hope for Health Freedom In the Courts."

Most of the health and diet court victories in recent years have been based on the *freedom of religion* guarantees of the First Amendment of the Constitution, "Congress shall make no law respecting the estab-

lishment of a religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." Religious freedom was the goal of the first settlers of our Country. Religious freedom is the first part of the First Amendment.

The government paternalists grit their teeth and begrudgingly allow us to say, teach and do things, as a part of religious practice, they would never allow otherwise, but, as a part of religion, must allow because of the First Amendment. As an assistant U.S. Attorney told the judge in the 1971 District of Columbia trial involving the Food and Drug Administration's seizure of Scientist's E-Meter, "The government is willing to take the risk of Christian Scientists' healing, for example, and their rejection of medical care, because Christian Science is a religion." The government's attitude, then, might be summarized as, "Your health practices better be orthodox and approved or else the government will interfere with your life and put a stop to those practices unless, unfortunately, those practices are associated with a religion, in which case the government cannot interfere." Finding no harm in using the E-Meter, the judge rejected the government's argument that the E-Meter was harmful because people would rely on it and would not seek "effective" and approved medical treatment. Consequently, the judge ordered the E-Meters returned to Scientist ministers.

Because many natural cures are safe, the government must strain to

(Continued next page)

prove that the natural treatment is dangerous in order to breach the wall of protection afforded by the First Amendment. So the government, particularly FDA, relies on the tired argument that the harm is not direct, but rather the reliance on the unorthodox treatment may delay too long the "effective" therapy afforded by the orthodox methods. This argument is now often rejected by judges... and it's about time.

Those interested in health and health freedom are members of many faiths. NHF does not support or advocate any specific religion. Yet, those who hold health and health freedom dear, have a dedication and commitment that are "religious" in the eyes of the law. The First Amendment is our amendment, too. We can thank the Amish stalwarts, who for years were oppressed, for providing new hope for changing the law for us to use.

49 Lawmakers Seek Stepup In Ban On Leaded Gasoline

In most major U.S. cities thumb-sucking children or those who eat without washing possibly can consume enough dirt to get seriously ill—all because of lead in gasoline.

Forty-nine members of Congress cited those possibilities in a letter urging the Environmental Protection Agency to step up its proposed ban on leaded gasolines.

A measure to ban lead in paint—purported to kill or cripple thousands of children annually—was passed unanimously, 82 to 0, in the Senate recently.

The letter, drafted by Sen. Philip A. Hart, (D-Mich.), said EPA's gradual reduction proposals would leave lead levels in dirt in 84 tested areas of the nation at more than 500 parts-per-million as late as 1977.

"Virtually all residual lead in urban dirt comes direct from auto exhausts," Hart said in releasing the letter.

"Even at 500 parts-per-million lead," the letter said, "a child would need to ingest only one-eighth of a teaspoon (about one-quarter of gram) of dirt daily to exceed the maximum daily permissible dose for lead, the dose above which actual poisoning could occur."

The letter cited studies which said an ordinary child consumes that amount of dirt every day.

A child with Pica, the craving for unnatural substances because of nutritional deficiencies, "could be expected to eat considerably more," the letter said.

—From (UPI) San Diego Evening Tribune

Washington Report

By CLINTON R. MILLER
NHF Legislative Advocate

Bill To Weaken Delaney Amendment Must Be Defeated

In 1958 Congress, with the support of the then newly founded National Health Federation, passed the Delaney anti-cancer amendment which prohibited the addition of any substance to food or drink if it caused cancer in man or animal. It was one of the greatest health bills ever passed by the U.S. Congress. It has stood the test of time. Billions of dollars worth of foods and beverages have been banned from sale by the enforcement of this great amendment.

Now a bill has been introduced (H.R. 15545) which, if enacted, will rip the heart out of the Delaney anti-cancer food additive amendment of 1958. H.R. 15545 was introduced June 15, 1972 by Rep. William J. Scherle (R-Iowa). It would allow the Secretary of Health Education and Welfare (HEW) to set "safe" limits for products known to cause cancer in man or animal. The Delaney amendment allowed the Secretary of HEW no discretion. If *any* can-

cer causing additive were found in a food, it was to be banned.

Since 1958, unenlightened leaders of the food industry have made every effort to weaken or destroy the Delaney amendment. Each time a serious effort was made, NHF beat it off with the help of friends in Congress and elsewhere. When he was forced by the Delaney amendment to ban cyclamates because it was discovered they caused cancer in test animals, the ex-Secretary of HEW did so, reluctantly, but promised he would propose legislation to change the Delaney amendment.

To block Sec. Finch's threatened attack on the Delaney amendment, Sen. Gaylord Nelson (D-Wis.) immediately introduced a bill (S. 3295) on Dec. 22, 1969, with strong NHF support. Sen. Nelson's bill would have strengthened and extended the Delaney amendment. Sec. Finch backed down and the issue was never brought before

(Continued next page)

Congress. See NHF Bulletins for Dec. and June, 1970.

Now, the battle over diethylstilbestrol (DES) has triggered another attempt to destroy the Delaney clause and NHF members and friends must make it clear, again, that under no circumstances do we want the Food and Drug Administration or any other government agency to be empowered with the authority to set a level for a carcinogen, no matter how small or minute the quantity may be.

H.R. 15545 has been referred to Rep. Paul Rogers' subcommittee on Public Health and Environment.

Letters, postcards, and telegrams should be sent to Rep. Rogers asking him to oppose any and all bills which would weaken or destroy the Delaney anti-cancer amendment of 1958. Similar letters should be sent to your own U.S. Representative, urging him to vote against H.R. 15545 if it is ever referred out of committee.

We will watch this bill carefully in Washington, D.C. There is a good chance, if enough NHF members and friends write at once, that hearings will never be held, and we will, again, have defeated an attempt to weaken the Delaney anti-cancer amendment of 1958. Send copies of all replies to your letters to me, Clinton R. Miller, 121 2nd St. N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002.

Remember, instruct your Congressman that **THERE IS NO SAFE LEVEL OF A CARCINOGEN.**

NEW LIFE MEMBERS

Ruth and Nathaniel Fairbairn
Robert O. Allman
Helen D. Perry
Marjorie S. Alseth
Jeff and Barbara Yamashita
Jack Raridon
Robert A. Peterson, D.O.
Mr. and Mrs. James Quirk
Mrs. Henriette Roberts
Willia Severson
Y. Fern Norton
Paul Zunaris
Susan F. Carlson
John B. Brehm
Elaine Jarvis
Mrs. Kenneth Naysmith, Sr.
Mabel Riggers
Louise Z. Osisy
Mrs. Jeannette N. Gouraud
George and Gertrude Rudiak
Gertrude L. Weber
Mr. and Mrs. Mark Freebairn
Frances N. Gibson
Mr. and Mrs. Victor Voorhies
Miss Lori, Incorporated
S.C. & E.G. Ramage

(Received mid-May to mid-July)

SPIRITUAL HEALING CASE

An important case will soon be tried in San Diego, Calif. involving the right of a minister to engage in spiritual healing. The defense attorney, Mr. John Joseph Matonis, 2603 P Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20007 would like to hear from knowledgeable experts in spiritual healing and in parapsychology phenomena.

In only two states, Louisiana and Mississippi, has strong medical opposition thus far prevented the passage of legislation that would give legal recognition, and regulation, to the practice of chiropractic. An unknown number of chiropractors do practice in these two states however, though they do so under the constant threat of arrest for practicing medicine without a license. Here, a practicing attorney in the State of Louisiana discusses the consequent injustices affecting both the patients and the doctors of chiropractic and the problems which confront them both.

Rampant Injustices To Chiropractic Patients

By HUGH B. EXNICIOS, Jr.
Attorney at Law

It is generally thought, by the people residing within the State of Louisiana, that if a person has sustained an injury from another, the expenses connected with it together with some compensation for pain and suffering would ordinarily be recoverable. However, if the same person with the same injury seeks chiropractic help to relieve his distress, it is generally thought that he no longer may recover anything, not even the chiropractor's bill for services.

It is generally accepted by the chiropractors within the State of Louisiana, that because they have no license to practice in Louisiana and are subject to criminal charges and civil injunctive suits for prac-

Mr. Exnicios is a member of the Board of Governors of NHF. As a practicing attorney in Metairie, La., he has, for a number of years, represented chiropractic patients and their interests and thus is well acquainted with the problems of both the patients and practitioners of the non-medical professions.

ticing, it is in their best interest not to counsel patients to see a lawyer. Because in doing so they would endanger themselves. This is so even though one of the best sources of evidence to prove the extent of injury and the pain and discomfort connected with an injury is the physician who treated the claimant. Another aspect of importance in this situation is that should the chiropractor prepare a report or give testimony concerning his patient's discomforts or injuries, it is possible that this may be used in some subsequent action as proof against the chiropractor that he illegally engaged in the "practice of medicine without a license." It would make no difference though he may be the best qualified chiropractor in the whole State of Louisiana and conscientiously limits his endeavors to his well qualified field of study and expertise.

Most adjustors working for insurance
(Continued next page)

ance companies can be observed to express a subdued chuckle when informed by an injured claimant that "rather than going to a medical doctor" they prefer to see their Doctor of Chiropractic in whom they have built up a bond of trust and confidence over the years.

Claims Managers of liability insurance companies generally put very little stock and worth into otherwise well founded claims of clear liability with serious injuries wherein the claimant has presented himself to a chiropractor for his own personal relief from the distressing injuries.

Likewise, because of ignorance on the part of most lawyers in the State of Louisiana it is generally thought among plaintiff lawyers that if a client seeks chiropractic relief for his acute distress, there is somehow a derogatory cloud cast over the whole case that otherwise has good recovery potential. The lawyer then often seeks some pitance of a settlement rather than taking a chance on an excellent recovery through the courts of the State amounting to a judgment for thousands of dollars to which this injured citizen would have been entitled. All of this is because the lawyer does not feel confident about handling this unusual type case and its peculiar field of evidentiary problem.

Every defense attorney will put slight, if any, import into any evidence of chiropractic care regardless of the extent of injury, length of treatment, obvious favorable results of chiropractic care, even

though the cost of chiropractic method of treatment is only a fraction of the cost of treating the same injury through the medical field. Of equal importance is the fact that the patient would have suffered months longer in agony and pain and, more often than not, only being given pain pills to mask the symptoms of the injury.

Medical physicians will never admit in any court testimony that the chiropractic methods have helped the patient. This is so even after many months of submission by the patient to the assorted army of medical experts, technicians, practitioners, and legions of diagnostic tests. Still the patient has not been relieved of many of his symptoms. Very often only then will the patient himself, or loved one, take him to a chiropractor whose care brings immediate permanent help and relief.

There is not a hospital within the State of Louisiana which will admit a chiropractor, regardless of how well trained he may be in his specialized field, to enter the hospital to administer chiropractic care to an admitted patient, either on an in-patient or out-patient basis.

Even our judges are elected from the ranks of the insurance law firms and from politically interested aspirants of our legal community. The chances are extremely rare wherein an injured litigant will receive an impartial analysis of the nature of the injury and the extent to which chiropractic services assisted his recovery and relieve his

(Continued next page)

distressing disability. They are, and would be, more impressed by hundreds of dollars of medical bills, rolls of drug receipts, bags of pill bottles, and used hypodermic syringes, neck collars and back braces. Since they were "doubting Thomases" when practicing as lawyers, there is no reason to believe they did not take their doubts and ignorances to the bench when it comes to chiropractic care.

Few employers will permit an injured employee hurt on the job to seek relief from a chiropractic physician and assuring him his job will be there upon his recovery. They believe if you had a "legitimate injury" the injured employee would have sought a neuro surgeon or orthopedic expert, rather than a "bone cracker."

There is not a single insurance policy written in the State of Louisiana which puts in the tenants of its contract that chiropractic services are covered and given equal weight and considering disability. They will not put in writing that they will honor chiropractic bills for services rendered nor chiropractic statements supporting a man's inability to return to work.

With all of these factors directly in opposition to a fair and just recovery of the thousands of Louisiana citizens who each year prefer, by their own choice, to obtain a chiropractor to assist them, how can they get justice or equal treatment in the judiciary system and legal system of the State?

The key lies in the extremely careful and deliberate selection of a

legal advocate! They must select a lawyer who will not be discouraged when his client wants chiropractic care. They must select a lawyer who will not have to be first sold on the benefits of a chiropractor before he can effectively advocate chiropractic to be used by his client. A lawyer must be selected who will not be dismayed by the reluctance of a chiropractor to discuss the case. A counselor must be selected who will not be intolerant to the insulant insurance adjuster's attitude; a lawyer who will not accept a claims manager's lack of appreciation of the benefits of chiropractic. A plaintiff's attorney must be selected who will be able to speak directly against the attitude of the defense attorney who represents the insurance company.

A strong counselor must be selected who can force a medical physician to admit that there are other courses of acceptable study used effectively across America and the world leading to effective recovery from an injury of particular disease. A lawyer must be selected who can develop a rapport with the judge if he is favorable to chiropractic or not hesitate to get a civil jury if he is not. A lawyer must be selected who can protect an employee from an ignorantly bigoted, informed employer who is adverse to chiropractic.

The legal advocate of a chiropractic patient must have the ability to perceive how to put the foundation down that will support the edifice of an injury and claim

(Continued next page)

that must subsequently be adequately dealt with by either the insurance company, their counsel or upon failure therein, by the courts.

Since there is no specialization yet practiced de facto of the legal profession in the State of Louisiana the selection of such an attorney is an extremely difficult one.

Even the Bar Association of the State of Louisiana is not permitted to make a single recommendation of eminently successful lawyers known to be capable of the handling or representing the interest of a chiropractic patient.

In view of the difficulties enumerated here, it is a difficult task to select a competent attorney to represent a chiropractic patient who is seeking some recovery. There still is no reason to believe that the patient or claimant would receive any less compensation if he is represented by a competent, chiropractically-informed attorney.

The key is being able to pick the right man. The author over the years has witnessed somewhat of a relaxing type of attitude on the part of some of the major insurance liability carriers doing business within the State when they meet with a strongly represented claimant. With the onset of chiropractic and the acceptability of chiropractic care in some of the Federal agencies, there seems to be something more of an acceptance on the insurance company's part if the case is strongly and effectively put before them.

With the onset of the recognition

of the right of the criminal, the addict and the deprived throughout the state and federal legal systems, there seems to be a slight acceptability of the rights of the United States citizen residing within the State of Louisiana to avail himself of a freedom of choice in his selection of the chiropractic road back to health. But, these rights are only guaranteed when effectively and vigorously pressed by competent representing counsel.

BEQUESTS and GIFTS

BEQUEST IN WILL: Here is a suggested statement for the convenience of those who wish to incorporate into their wills a bequest to The National Health Federation:

"I give, devise and bequeath to The National Health Federation, a non-profit corporation, incorporated under the laws of California, with headquarters at Monrovia, California, the sum of..... (\$.....) (and/or property herein described) for its discretionary use in carrying out its general aims and purposes."

INSURANCE POLICY GIFT: For those who wish to name The National Federation as sole beneficiary, or one of the beneficiaries, in an insurance policy, it is suggested that you obtain from your insurance agent the necessary legal form or application for your signature, before witnesses if required. The following designation is suggested:

"The National Health Federation, a non-profit corporation, incorporated under the laws of California, with headquarters at Monrovia, California, the sum of..... (\$.....) for its discretionary use in carrying out its general aims and purposes."

MEMORIAL FUND: Should the donor desire to create a Memorial Fund in a will or insurance policy, state, after the sum of property described in the beneficial gift, that the fund is to be known and designated as the ".....(name)..... Memorial Fund."

A Very Grim Picture

Statements from the Proceedings of the Sixth National Cancer Conference sponsored by the National Cancer Institute and the American Cancer Society, held in Denver, Colorado on September 18-20, 1968.

"There has been an enormous undertaking of cancer research to develop anticancer drugs for use in the management of neoplastic diseases in man. However, progress has been slow, and no chemical agents capable of inducing a general curative effect on disseminated forms of cancer have yet been developed." Robert D. Sullivan, M.D., Department of Cancer Research, Lahey Clinic Foundation, Boston, Mass., p. 543-, on "Ambulatory Arterial Infusion in the Treatment of Primary and Secondary Skin Cancer."

"Human cancers are refractory in large part to cure by the chemotherapeutic approaches which have been tried. Since uptake of drug into rapidly growing transplanted animal tumors does lead to some cures, the disparity in the two systems requires explanation. We must investigate the causes for failure in human neoplasms in terms of the aforementioned three phases: uptake of the drug, rapidly growing, and transplanted." James F. Holland, M.D., Roswell Park Memorial Institute, New York State Department of Health, Buffalo, New York, p. 609-, On "Systemic Chemotherapy 1968."

"Clearly, drugs, even in 1965, were causing complete and long lasting regressions of a few tumors, and each of these tumors was characterized by rapid growth. Conversely, in reviewing the data on most slow-growing tumors, no such striking drug control had been observed." C. Gordon Zubrod, M.D., National Cancer Institute, Bethesda, Md., p. 605-, on "Present Status of NCI Chemotherapy Program."

Radiation, General

"Although preoperative and postoperative radiation therapy have been used extensively and for decades, it is still not possible to prove an unequivocal clinical benefit from this combined treatment... Even if the rate of cure does improve with a combination of radiation and therapy, it is necessary to establish the cost in increased morbidity which may occur in patients with or without favorable response to the additional therapy." William Powers, M.D., Director, Division of Radiation Therapy, Washington University School of Medicine, St. Louis, Mo., p.33-, on "Preoperative and Postoperative Radiation Therapy for Cancer."

(Continued next page)

Radiation, Lung Cancer

"With thousands of lung cancer patients treated by irradiation, the value of radiation therapy should be clearly established or disestablished. The indictment of radiotherapy in the treatment of this disease by Kraut ("The Question of Irradiation Therapy in Lung Cancer," J.A.M.A., 195, 177-181, 1966) is a carefully researched document that has to be considered. The clinical evidence and statistical data in numerous reviews are cited to illustrate that no increase in survival has been achieved by the addition of irradiation." Philip Rubin, M.D., Chief, Division of Radiotherapy, University of Rochester Medical School, Strong Memorial Hospital, Rochester, New York, with S. Ciccio, M.D., and B. Setisam, M.D., p. 855, on "The Controversial Status of Radiation Therapy in Lung Cancer."

Lung Cancer

"Lung cancer is recognized as one of the most lethal of all cancers. The American Cancer Society estimates that this year it will cause 55,000 deaths in men, and that 61,000 new cases will be diagnosed, of which only 1 in 20 will survive five year." Wendell G. Scott, M.D., Professor of Clinical Radiology, Washington University School of Medicine, St. Louis, Mo., p. 822, on "The Use of Special Radiographic Procedures in the Overall Diagnosis of Lung Cancer."

Breast Cancer

"Shimken ("End Results in Cancer of the Breast," Cancer, 20, 1039-1043, 1967) has shown recently that in carcinoma of the breast, the mortality rate still parallels the incidence rate, thus proving that there has been no true improvement in the successful treatment of the disease over the past 30 years, even though there has been technical improvement in both surgery and radiotherapy during that time." Vera Peters, M.D., Princess Margaret Hospital, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, p. 163, on "Radiation Therapy in the Management of Breast Cancer."

"The thirty year monotonous plateau of the death rate for breast cancer has persisted despite physicians' awareness of breast cancer, refinements of methods of inspecting and palpating the breast, educating women in self-examination, improvements in radiotherapy that include supervoltage use of more extensive surgical procedures, and the use of chemotherapy and hormones." Robert L. Egan, M.D., Professor of Radiology, and Chief, Mammography Section, Emory University School of Medicine, Atlanta, Georgia, and R. Waldo Powell, M.D., Associate Professor of Surgery, Department of Surgery, p. 153, on "Mammography and Diseases of the Breast."

Gastric Cancer

"Patients with cancers of the intestine also merit our attention from

the viewpoint of prognosis for survival . . . By the time diagnosis is made, the cancer is already spread beyond the confines of the bowel wall and cure is not likely to be achieved for most of these patients." Victor A. Gilbertson, M.D., University of Minnesota Medical School, Minneapolis Minnesota, p. 439, on "Bowel Cancer Detection: Experience with 75,000 Proctosigmoidoscopic Examinations."

"Since there is yet no sign that either radiotherapy or chemotherapy can offer real therapeutic benefit to patients with gastric cancer, the main hope at present for either cure, or useful palliation, rests with surgical treatment. The many varied surgical approaches do not seem to have made a great difference to the over-all outcome in large series of patients, and it seems unlikely that much improvement can be expected from further developments of surgical technique." I. E. Gillespie, M.D., H. T. Debas, M.D., and F. Kennedy, University Department of Surgery, Western Infirmary, Glasgow, Scotland, p. 421, on "Gastric Cancer."

Gynecological Cancers

"At the present time chemotherapy of gynecological tumors does not appear to have increased life expectancy except in sporadic cases . . . There appears to be no satisfactory method of determining to which drug a tumor will be sensitive. The only basis of selecting a drug is by past experience. The problem of blind chemotherapy means not only a loss of the effect of the drugs, but also a lowering of the patient's resistance to the cancer cells owing to the toxicity of these agents . . . At the present time there is no satisfactory method of stimulating or mobilizing the host's immunological defenses to aid in controlling or eradicating a patient's malignancy." John D. Trelford, M.D., F.R.C.S., Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Ohio State University Hospital, p. 379, on "A Discussion of the Results of Chemotherapy on Gynecological Cancer and the Host's Immune Response."

Editor's Note: We are indebted to Dr. Dean Burk for the above material and we are grateful to him for reviewing the "Proceedings" of the cancer conference (published by Lippincott, July, 1970) and for extracting these pertinent statements which he has so kindly shared with us. Some of the foremost cancer specialists and researchers presented papers at the conference and thus their statements must be considered as authoritative and as accurately reflecting their scientific conclusions. Reading these extracted statements forces one to conclude that much of what we frequently hear about "proven" cancer remedies is a myth. When unorthodox cancer treatment methods are mentioned, orthodox

(Continued next page)

immediately warns that not only are such methods valueless but also their use may cause a dangerous delay the beginning of "proven" methods of treatment. One might question, "What proven methods?" Where is the great progress that is generally reported whenever a new appeal is made for more funds to continue cancer research? In spite of such a poor record of achieving success in the development of effective cancer therapies, the orthodox quarters, including the FDA and the American Cancer Society, still continue to oppose even the testing, on humans, of non-toxic cancer remedies used with reported success in other countries. Laetrile is but one example of such remedies.

AMA Affiliate Admits Nearly \$700,000 In Political Contributions

It has never been a secret that organized medicine is a generous contributor to the political campaigns of those candidates who can be counted on to favor the AMA position in any health legislation that may come up. A deliberate attempt to "buy" Congress becomes very evident when one notes that in the 1970 campaign, AMA's political arm, the American Medical Political Action Committee (AMPAC) acknowledged that the organization contributed \$700,000 to various congressional candidates. This was the "above board" amount acknowledged by AMPAC in accordance with the Corrupt Practices Act. How much was contributed "under the board" is unknown.

Only two other organizations contributed more in the national political campaigns that year—labor's COPE and a liberal peace group topped the list. Of course the

\$700,000 does not include huge sums donated by the pharmaceutical industry to help elect politicians who will maintain and strengthen the medical-drug monopoly. Likewise, of course, these sums do not include the still greater amounts spent in lobbying efforts.

It has become very evident that a large percentage of the rank and file members of the AMA do not favor the AMA's meddling in politics to the extent which it does. During recent years, many thousands of physicians have dropped their membership in the AMA. The chief single complaint voiced by most of these physicians is that they object to the political activities of the AMA, the huge sums spent for these activities, and that the organization seems to have abrogated their responsibilities in the field of medical science and health care in favor of the political maneuverings.

THE FAMILY CIRCLE

By FRED J. HART
Chairman of the Board of Governors

The National Health Federation's continuing crusade for freedom of choice in matters relating to health, is moving forward with a rapid pace and is a splendid example of what can be accomplished when we pool our resources and work together under able leadership.

The victory in the Bruce E. Butt case pleases us all very much, of course. The dismissal of all charges against Mr. Butt is reported by Charles Orlando Pratt in another section of this issue of the Bulletin. We admire Mr. Butt for steadfastly standing his ground and declaring his constitutional right to show the movie, "Nature's Answer to Cancer"—the basis for the case against him. We also commend Mr. Pratt for the very able manner in which he defended Mr. Butt.

Another great victory has been won in the cause of health freedom which has special significance for cancer victims. We have been advised that a federal court has just ruled that the Food and Drug Administration has no legal authority to reclassify as "new drugs" those drugs or modalities marketed before the passage of the amendment of the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act in 1938 or the later Kefauver Amendment. These older drugs were permitted to continue on the market under the "Grandfather Clause." Recently, however, the FDA seemingly has seen fit to ignore the "Grandfather Clause" and has attempted to force the manufacturers of some of the old remedies to prove efficacy of the products through the very extensive (and expensive) testing procedures required of today's new drugs. The recent court ruling will stop FDA's attacks on these older products unless FDA can prove that the products are harmful to humans. Very likely, the case will be appealed to a higher court. NHF will be watching this case closely.

A few months ago, the Food and Drug Administration acted to ban the importation of certain Ginseng products. Although the NHF had no interest in Ginseng as such, we did feel that the FDA had acted beyond their authority and if they were permitted to succeed in this act, FDA would undoubtedly extend their actions to include other harmless products utilized by health seekers. Consequently, NHF engaged Kirkpatrick Dilling, a Chicago attorney especially skilled in Food and drug matters, to initiate an action against FDA to prevent their banning the importation of the Ginseng products. Following Mr. Dilling's preliminary encounter with FDA, the FDA withdrew their ban.

(Continued on next page)

The attention of NHF is now being centered on two other matters, namely, the reported attempt of FDA officers to illegally trap health food operators selling Squaw Tea, and the arrest, by the California Department of Health, of a Northern California physician charged with the use of Laetrile. It has always been the belief of NHF that a licensed physician should have the right to use any form of treatment he believes might be helpful to his patients so long as it is not toxic.

Naturally, NHF is vitally concerned about the recent FDA seizures of dietary supplements. Since the seizures reported in the last issue of the Bulletin, Mr. Kirkpatrick Dilling has informed us that in another incident in Kansas City, the FDA seized nearly all the dietary products manufactured by one company. We believe these recent seizures have been made illegally and, accordingly, NHF is preparing legal action against FDA on behalf of the public as well as the manufacturers. The products involved in the recent seizures were formulated and labeled in compliance with prior existing, legally implemented regulations. The seizures, however, were made on the basis of guidelines issued in April by FDA and released only to their field personnel. The guidelines, in effect, established new regulations but since these new "regulations" were not publically announced or legally published, the manufacturers had no way of knowing that they existed until their products were seized and declared in violation. Because of this, we feel that FDA has acted in an illegal manner and that such actions must be stopped.

For many years, NHF has opposed the use of DES for stimulating weight gain in animals intended for human food, and has more recently supported a bill to ban the use of the chemical. It is now encouraging to note that FDA, at long last, is preparing to publish, in the Federal Register, a proposed Order to ban the use of DES, thus opening up the matter for comment by all interested parties.

Because NHF has long opposed the rampant use of food additives, it is always gratifying to see evidence of the growing popular support of our position. Recently, the "Los Angeles Times" published two long articles pointing up the possible dangers arising out of the use of some of these chemicals prevalently used in our food. One article dealt with the dangers you risk in eating meat and the other article dealt with three major additives: nitrates and nitrites, artificial food colors, and BHT-BHA.

This writer wishes to personally thank all the members who have felt able to send a contribution to the Liberty Stamp Drive. We are sure that many other members have had good intentions but have neglected to send their contribution. Please take this item as a gentle reminder because we have not yet received sufficient funds to finance the legal programs that we believe are absolutely essential and that we are now launching.

We hope that each and every one of you who read The Family Circle are planning, if at all possible, to attend the 1973 Annual NHF Convention. The exact dates are January 18, 19, 20 and 21. It will be held at the Anaheim Convention Center (adjacent to Disneyland) in Anaheim, California. The meeting hall will seat 5500 people in comfort and we expect to fill every seat, however, this will require the help of every member to publicize the event. We will have space for 160 exhibitors, and at the rate exhibitors are presently reserving space, it now appears that we probably won't be able to accommodate all those who may wish to exhibit.

In closing the Family Circle for this month, the writer, as the founder of The National Health Federation, desires to express his appreciation to each and every one of you who have been so loyal in building NHF to its present position of power and prestige in America. At the same time, he feels compelled to warn all the loyal members that, probably, there will always be those individuals who affiliate themselves with the organization only for the purpose of using NHF's power and prestige for their own selfish purposes. This has happened on occasions in the past; it probably will happen in the future. Let us all remain alert to this possibility.

NEW REPRINTS AVAILABLE

The Federation now has available, to its members, four reprints, which we believe are so important as to warrant special notice in the Bulletin. The reprints are as follows:

1. A fifteen page reprint giving the truth about Laetrile. This reprint was prepared by Dean Burk, one of the foremost scientists of America.
2. "Time to Lift the Lid," by Clinton R. Miller. This reprint deals with the widespread drugging of our elementary school children by the school authorities.
3. A new authentic article of Hypoglycemia. This was written by William Cole, a noted authority on the subject.
4. A letter from a prominent attorney explaining the Federal Court ruling against the FDA concerning the "Grandfather Clause." This ruling could well open the way for the use of non-toxic cancer remedies in the United States.

These four reprints will be listed on our next reprint list and then available separately. At this time, however, we are making a packet, containing all four reprints, available for 50c postage paid.

Consumer Affairs Report

By TREESA DRURY

Buying Frozen and Canned Fruits

U.S. Grade Standards are measures of quality. They are not measures of wholesomeness. The U.S.D.A. has established such standards for most processed fruits. These standards are not mandatory. This is a voluntary service offered by the USDA for a fee to the processor, wholesaler, or packer. When a product has been officially graded under continuous USDA inspection, it may carry the official grade name and the statement packed under continuous inspection of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The grade name and the statement may also appear within shields. U.S. Grade A or Fancy are the very best with excellent color, uniform size, weight and shape. The use of Grade A or Fancy is important to the homemaker when she is particularly concerned with appearance.

U.S. Grade B or Choice signifies that the fruit is less than perfect in color, uniformity, and texture. However, they have good flavor and are suitable for most uses, particularly for baked dessert. U.S. Grade C or Standard may contain some broken and uneven pieces, flavor may not be as sweet, but these fruits are still good and wholesome. They are less expensive and the best buy where color and texture are not of great importance, such as in puddings, jams and frozen desserts. When you read the label of a canned or frozen fruit, remember that the net weight includes the syrup or liquid in which it is packed. When buying canned fruit, avoid cans that show signs of bulging or swelling at the ends or leakage. Check fruits in jars to be sure the lid has not been tampered with.

Frozen fruits should be frozen solid. Avoid those with stains on the package. Those in large poly bags should be free flowing. A solid lump indicates they may have been allowed to thaw and refreeze. The U.S.D.A. puts out a free pamphlet, "How to Buy Canned and Frozen Fruits." You may get a copy by writing to U.S. Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 and request Home and Garden Bulletin No. 191. Also, when buying fruits, remember that

whole fruits or halves or slices of similar size cost a good deal more than mixed pieces of various sizes and shapes. If appearance doesn't matter, you can save a good deal by purchasing the mixed pieces.

Protein Shampoos — A Hoax?

Consumers are used to disappointment when it comes to cosmetics. It is not headline news when a consumer says . . . Hey, I tried the stuff and it doesn't work. However, if a professor with good credentials makes the same statement it is apt to be headline news. This article appears in the July 9th edition of the *National Enquirer*. Dr. Philip Frost is an assistant Professor of Dermatology at the University of Miami.

The professor believes that advertising claims made for protein shampoos are false and that the shampoos themselves are a hoax. He explains that hair is made of protein but that rubbing the hair with a shampoo containing protein will not make it healthier. Frost says that hair, like your fingernails, is not a living tissue. Therefore, nothing can heal or repair a split end. A protein shampoo can coat the hair and make it appear and feel smoother, but this is camouflage which disappears if not continually reapplied.

Dr. Frost claims that protein shampoo is no different than the many cream rinses or hair oils on the market which accomplish the same thing for a good deal less money. If it's economy you're interested in, Dr. Frost suggests you take any cheap commercial shampoo and mix a raw egg into it. This provides just as luxurious a shampoo as any advertised. The only way to nourish your hair, according to the professor, with protein is to eat protein. A good diet makes for healthy hair just as it does a healthy body. The only way a protein shampoo is going to nourish your hair is if you drink it and Dr. Frost suggests that you will find steak and eggs more palatable.

Treesa Drury can be heard nightly in the Los Angeles area, Monday through Friday at 9:30 p.m. with CONSUMER WATCH on KHJ-TV's NEWSWATCH—Channel 9. She also may be heard on a nationally syndicated show — check your local radio station schedules.

WASHINGTON ROUNDUP

Senate Passes S. 3419

By an overwhelming majority vote of 69 to 10, the Senate passed S. 3419, introduced by Senator Warren G. Magnuson, which would abolish the FDA and create, in its place, a new Consumer Safety Agency. The bill now goes to the House where it may face some stiff opposition. An administration backed bill has already been introduced in the House by Rep. Paul G. Rogers (D-Fla.) and has been reported out of committee. The House-introduced bill was intended to be a compromise bill to stop the Senate bill. The House bill would give the FDA more stature and authority and would keep it within the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

*

Bill to Regulate "Organic" Foods

Sen. Alan Cranston (D-Cal.) has introduced an amendment to the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act that: (1) Defines "organically grown" and "organically processed" foods and food supplements, (2) Directs the FDA to set standards under which food can be labeled or advertised as "organic," (3) Calls for federal registration of all farms and processing plants marketing organic foods, (4) Requires at least twice-

a-year inspections of organic farms and processing plants, (5) Bans the use of the words "organic," "organically grown" or "organically processed" by non-registered farms and businesses. Cranston said his bill is intended to "protect the consumer from being cheated, help the legitimate organic farmer obtain his rightful share of the market, and preserve the naturalness of the soil."

A similar bill (H.R. 14941) has been introduced in the House by Rep. Edward I. Koch (D-N.Y.). In the meantime, the Federal Trade Commission has begun investigation of possible deception in the advertising of nationally marketed "organic" foods.

*

Another Health Insurance

Bill Introduced

Rep. Al Ullman (R-Ore.), number two man on the Ways and Means Committee, has introduced H.R. 14140, a bill to establish a new program of health care and comprehensive health care benefits (including catastrophic coverage) to be available to employed, unemployed and low-income individuals at a cost related to income. It defines "physician" to include chiropractor in precisely the same terms

adopted by the Senate Finance Committee to include chiropractic care in Medicare.

The House Ways and Means Committee has concluded its hearings on National Health Insurance and has announced that it plans to consider reporting a bill out of committee this year.

*

DDT Cancellations Appealed

By Both Sides

No sooner had Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Ruckelshaus affirmed his cancellation of DDT registrations (effective December 31) for all but public health uses and for very limited agricultural uses, than suits were filed by parties on both sides of the fence. The Environmental Defense Fund entered a suit in the District of Columbia Court of Appeals for immediate cancellation, rather than on December 31, and for a ban on all agricultural uses of DDT. On the other side, 30 formulators of DDT are seeking through the New Orleans Circuit Court of Appeals to overturn the cancellations.

*

FDA Moves To Ban DES Use

The Food and Drug Administration has proposed a ban on the use of the livestock growth hormone, DES, which causes cancer, as a means of opening the question to a public hearing. The announcement was coupled with an Agriculture Department disclosure that it has found 15 more cases of illegal diethylstilbestrol in cattle, raising the rate to nearly four times that of last year despite tighter restrictions.

The final decision to impose the ban will be made following a period during which comments from all interested parties may be submitted, and possibly a public hearing.

*

Carrageenan Removed From FDA's GRAS List

A widely used red seaweed extract called carrageenan has been taken off the Food and Drug Administration's list of safe food additives because large amounts of the substance has been found to be capable of causing birth defects in animals. It has been used for many years as an emulsifier, stabilizer and thickener in foods including puddings, pie fillings, ice cream, beverages, baby formulas, imitation dessert toppings, and several dairy products. The use of carrageenan has not been banned, however, because in evaluating the substance, it was found that birth defects were produced only after prolonged, massive intake—an intake hundreds of times greater than that to which humans are apt to be exposed. Thus, based on present levels of use, it is not considered to present a human health hazard.

*

FDA Proposes Mercury Ban

A ban on most uses of mercury in cosmetics has been proposed by FDA. The lone exception would be eye-area cosmetics in which mercury compounds are regarded as effective in preventing pseudomonas contamination which can cause blindness.

Senator Magnuson Acknowledges NHF Support

The letter reproduced below really needs no further explanation. It is a letter written by Senator Warren G. Magnuson to Clinton R. Miller, NHF Legislative Advocate. It is reprinted here because the real credit belongs to the members and friends of NHF who took time to write a letter to Senator Magnuson and to their own Senators indicating their support for S. 3419 and urging a favorable vote on the bill. This is another indication that your letters DO make a difference and DO help influence legislation.

Mr. Clinton R. Miller
Legislative Advocate
National Health Federation
121 Second Street, N.E.
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Miller:

As you probably know by now, S. 3419 passed the Senate by a vote of 69 to 10. The legislation creates a new independent Food, Drug and Consumer Product Agency. One of the Commissions which is established is a Commission on Foods and Nutrition, a provision which the National Health Federation advocated.

I want to acknowledge the work that both you and the National Health Federation have done in promoting this legislation. My office alone received literally thousands of letters from your members throughout the entire country. In speaking with my colleagues, they also inform me that they have received numerous letters from your members. Both you and your organization can take pride in this significant victory.

Sincerely yours,

Warren G. Magnuson

Alabama Doctors Advocate Health Institute For Healthy People

Have you ever gone to a doctor for a checkup, told him you're well, and asked how to stay that way?

Chances are, he would be at a loss to answer that question, say a pair of researchers at the University of Alabama's Medical School.

The two, Drs. Emanuel Cheraskin and W. M. Ringsdorf Jr., both well-known nutritionists, are pushing the idea of setting up a series of health institutes that would teach people how to maintain good health.

"There's a need for an institute where you can learn to anticipate rather than identify diseases so that you can learn to stay well," said Ringsdorf. "We want people to say to heck with a medical center; where can I go when I'm well?"

The two scientists have written about a dozen books on nutrition aimed at the medical community, but they recently completed a lay book, "New Hope for Incurable Diseases," in an effort to focus public attention on how to use diet to avoid—and in some cases cure—chronic ailments.

"Nutrition is a big problem today," said Cheraskin. "There are many diseases that are rampant in the United States, and groceries have something to do with it.

"The health patterns of the U.S. are far inferior to what people think they are. We think we are number one, but we're not, in almost every measurement of health."

The book details a theory of Cheraskin and Ringsdorf that foods can basically be broken down into two categories—resistance agents, which tend to help the body fight off disease, and susceptibility agents, which have the opposite effect.

"What we show is that there is a common denominator in virtually all diseases—namely, if you don't want to get any of them the best way to prevent it is to use all the resistance agents and forget the susceptibility agents," said Cheraskin. "Give yourself the pluses and take away the minuses."

In virtually all of the dozen diseases dealt with in "New Hope for Incurable Diseases," the authors indict refined sugar and processed white flour coupled with deficiencies of certain vitamins and minerals, as conditions leaving the body open to chronic illness.

—From (UPI) in *The Bremerton (Wash.) Sun*

Editor's Note: In spite of the very sensible and logical approaches advocated by Drs. Cheraskin and Ringsdorf, their excellent book has been chosen as one of the targets for criticism by a group of Birmingham "nutritionists." The group says it is speaking out as members of the American and Alabama Dietetic Association. They state that their main goal is to defend the American system of processing and packaging of retail food items. This statement alone should classify the group in their proper category.

(Continued next page)

Though we know that not all processed foods are necessarily bad, a blanket endorsement of them all is most unscientific to say the least. Let's have more Cheraskins and Ringsdorfs who dare to explore new frontiers in the field of nutrition.

Doctor Criticizes Medical Wastes

The high cost of hospital and medical care will not be reduced until businessmen stop leaving the problem up to doctors and insurance companies, a leader in the health field said.

Dr. George W. Melcher, Jr., president of Group Health, Inc., a prime competitor of Blue Shield in New York State, told United Press International that it is stupid and wrong for an independent practicing pathologist to be making a profit of \$300,000 to \$400,000 a year on work hospitals should be doing.

He said there are unnecessary blood costs in anaesthesia, X-rays, blood tests and other diagnostic procedures. He also said there are discrepancies in the fees charged for surgery and other procedures that would not stand the test of a businesslike analysis.

"And," Dr. Melcher said, "a lot of unnecessary surgery is performed simply because, although we are supposed to have a shortage of doctors in the United States, we have a substantial surplus of general surgeons eager for work."

He said hospital facilities are

used unnecessarily by workers who would rather lie in the hospital than work and by just plain inefficient practices.

No abuse that has made health costs skyrocket in recent years will be curbed so long as the businessmen address the health problem only by serving on fund-raising committees, he said.

"Businessmen help finance the bulk of the nation's health services through taxes, health benefits paid to employees and the cost of employee absenteeism due to illness," Dr. Melcher said. "They also are the only segment of the public with sufficient muscle to really put the reins on health costs."

He said business firms should get active on hospital boards, insurance company boards and special industry-union panels and conduct searching studies into the economic practices of hospitals and doctors, particularly on the utilization of facilities and wastful duplication of tests and X-rays.

Dr. Melcher said this duplication is one of the biggest causes of skyrocketing costs. "Hospitals perform duplicate tests on patients admitted only days or hours after the physician has had the identical lab and X-ray work done," he said.

If some of the same principles of economy were applied to health care that are normally used in business, there could be many reductions in costs, he said.

—From *United Press International*

International Federation of Natural Therapeutics Plans World Congress

The International Federation of Practitioners of Natural Therapeutics has announced plans for their 1st World Congress to be convened in Jerusalem, November 6 through 9, 1972. The Federation has, within its organizational framework, affiliated organizations and members in many widespread countries. Although representatives of affiliated member organizations have been meeting for several years, this is the first planned event to bring together the individual members. The Congress is open, however, to all who are interested in natural therapeutics.

The lecture program is planned to provide something of interest to everyone. The subjects to be covered include osteopathy, iridology, herbal medicine, homoeopathy, acupuncture, neuraltherapy, magnetic healing, plant pharmacology, balneotherapy, and yoga. Lecturers are being drawn from various countries. There will be simultaneous translation into English, French and German. Although lectures will be at practitioner level, interested lay participants are most welcome to attend. Interesting tours have been planned also in conjunction with the Congress.

Compass Travel Bureau, Inc., 55 West 42nd Street, New York, New York 10036, has been appointed the official travel agent for the event and any interested party may obtain from them a folder giving the program details, information concerning group travel arrangements, and group tour plans for those interested in extending their stay in Israel to either nine or fourteen days. Other details concerning the Congress or the Federation, as well as registration forms, are available from the Federation's secretary, Thomas G. Drummer, 21 Bingham Place, Off Nottingham Street, London W1M 3FH, England.

A warm welcome has been extended especially to the members of NHF.

New for Consumers

Here's help in choosing, buying and caring for consumer products. An Index of Consumer Product Information lists 200 government publication on all sorts of products. The Index, which is essential in ordering specific pamphlets you want, is available free by writing: Consumer Product Information, Washington, D.C. 20407.

NEWS BITS

A center devoted to treatment with the ancient Chinese practice of acupuncture, said to be the first facility of its kind in the United States, has been opened in New York City with a staff which includes an American specialist in internal medicine and four Chinese physicians. — **The Associated Press reports** that two National Institute of Mental Health psychiatrists charged, before the American Psychiatric Association meeting in Dallas, Texas, that patients in city and state hospitals, prison hospitals, and institutions for the mentally retarded are being treated by unqualified, unlicensed doctors and that there are approximately 3100 unlicensed foreign doctors staffing state mental facilities in this country. — **Seventh Day Adventists**, who are expected not to drink or smoke and to eat less meat than the average American, has a life expectancy of six more years than the average American male says a Loma Linda University Medical School heart researcher following a 10-year study of Adventists in California.

In the United States from 1961 to 1971, the number of marriages rose from 1,548,000 to 2,200,000 but the number of babies born fell from 4,268,000 to 3,559,000. — **Dr. Marshall Mandell**, founder of the Center for Clinical Ecology in Norwalk, Conn. says that he feels many of the mysterious ailments seen today are due to possible allergies to chemicals in the air, water and food and that it is a mistake to assume that the symptoms are due to emotional disturbances merely because they cannot be related to the usual physical causes of disease.

Two unions for M.D.s have been organized and are now functioning—one in Texas and one in Nevada, the latter being affiliated with the A.F.L.-C.I.O.—both hoping to become national. — **The AMA's Committee on Cutaneous Health and Cosmetics** has urged FDA to soften its stiff proposed restrictions on hexachlorophene citing absence of a suitable substitute as the chief reason for their request. — **The medical profession now has a new specialty**, The American College of Emergency Physicians which now has 2,300 members and some residencies in "emergentology" have been set up. — **The AMA has indexed American Health** after studying questionnaires completed by 134,000 persons from all parts of the country and have concluded that the Midwest is the healthiest place to be, followed by the Northeast, the South, and then the West.

THIS IS THE NATIONAL HEALTH FEDERATION

The National Health Federation is America's largest, organized, noncommercial health consumer group. It is a nonprofit corporation founded in 1955. Its membership is comprised of men and women in all walks of life, belonging to a variety of religious faiths and political persuasions, and engaged in nearly every profession and trade.

Its members believe that health freedoms are inherently guaranteed to us as human beings, and our right to them as Americans is implied in the words, "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." Yet, frequently, these freedoms and rights have been and continue to be violated. Too often, as a result of the unopposed pressures from organized medicine, the chemical industries, pharmaceutical manufacturers, and others, laws and regulations have been imposed which better serve these special-interest groups than the public at large. We see and hear of new instances daily. To name a few: spiraling health-care costs, consumer exploitation by leading industries, excessive devaluation and adulteration of our foods, restriction of certain types of treatment, banning of certain health books from the mails, the harassment of those who advocate natural methods of healing and natural foods, the poisoning of our air, water and soil through greed and carelessness, and many other health-related issues.

The NHF opposes monopoly and compulsion in things related to health where the safety and welfare of others are not concerned. NHF does not oppose nor approve any specific healing profession or their methods, but it does oppose the efforts of one group to restrict the freedom of practice of qualified members of another profession, thus attempting to create a monopoly.

The public needs a strong voice, such as the NHF provides, to speak and act in their behalf in these health-related matters. Legislators need your support to balance the pressures exerted upon them by the special interests. The National Health Federation, through a special legal and legislative staff in Washington, keeps its members apprised of all health legislation, opposes inadequate or undemocratic health legislation, while supporting or drafting bills to protect the individual's health freedom.

Will you join us in this worthy effort?

FEDERATION ELECTED OFFICERS AND THEIR RESPONSIBILITIES

Charles I. Crecelius — President and Executive Head of the Federation.
Address: P.O. Box 688, Monrovia, California 91016

Betty Lee Morales — Secretary
Dorothy B. Hart — Treasurer

Kurt W. Donsbach, N.D., D.C., B.T.S.,
Vice President

Fred J. Hart — Chairman of the Board of Governors and Managing Editor of the Bulletin.

Address: P.O. Box 688, Monrovia,
California 91016

PAID FEDERATION STAFF AND THEIR SPECIFIC FIELDS OF ACTIVITY

Clinton R. Miller — Vice President in charge of the Washington Office, which includes Legislation and Regulations.

Address: 121 2nd Street N. E.,
Washington, D.C. 20002
Phone: (202) 547-2547

Charles Orlando Pratt — General Counsel Emeritus

R. A. Laurye — Business Manager

Address: P.O. Box 688, Monrovia,
California 91016. Phone: (213) 358-1155

Hazel K. Stevens — Controller at the Main NHF Office, Monrovia, California.

Address: P.O. Box 688, Monrovia,
California 91016

Raymond H. Houser — Editor of the National Health Federation Bulletin.

Address: 5366 Auburn Drive, San Diego, California 92105

Opinions expressed in the Bulletin are those of the writers of the articles and are not necessarily the opinion of the National Health Federation.

NATIONAL HEALTH FEDERATION

P.O. Box 688
211 West Colorado Boulevard
MONROVIA, CALIFORNIA 91016

Entered as Second-class Matter

\$5.00 Membership (includes **Bulletin** subscription)

PRICE FOR ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THIS
ISSUE

35¢ each—5 for \$1.00—30 for \$5.00—50 for \$7.50—
100 for \$14.00

PLACE
6¢ STAMP
HERE

**YOUR INVITATION TO JOIN
THE NATIONAL HEALTH FEDERATION**

- 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.
- 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**.
- I wish to become a **LIFE MEMBER** of the National Health Federation and am enclosing the sum of \$100.00 in payment thereof; \$25.00 of this sum is for subscription to the **BULLETIN** so long as it is published.

Name.....

Address.....

City..... State..... Zip.....

CLIP OUT AND MAIL TODAY

COMING NHF CONVENTIONS

- Denver, Cosmopolitan.....September 16**
- New York, Commodore.....November 11-12**
- Palm Springs, Calif., Riviera..... December 16-17**
- Annual West Coast NHF Convention**
- Anaheim Convention Center.....January 18-21**

HELP SAVE OUR HEALTH FREEDOMS