

# National Health Federation BULLETIN

SEPTEMBER 1975

50c

HICKLE ON  
ENVIRONMENT  
ENERGY  
PEOPLE —  
EXCLUSIVE!



*'For Solutions, Must Be  
Willing to Experiment'*

*If No 'Hitches'*

## 'Major Victory' in Vitamin Struggle



**Dean Burk: Evidence  
Supports Invocation  
Delaney Amendment  
To End Fluoridation**



**Delaney Asks Congress  
For Ban Pending Probe**

CONGRESSMAN DELANEY

**NCI's Former Chief  
Chemist Completes  
Further Statistical  
Analysis of Initial  
Yiamouyiannis Study  
And Finds 25,000  
Cancer Deaths Linked  
to Water Fluoridation**



DEAN BURK, PH.D. DR. YIAMOUIYANNIS

Dedicated to the Protection of Health Freedoms

THE  
**NATIONAL HEALTH FEDERATION**  
**BULLETIN**

Protection of Health Freedoms

Published Monthly

Volume XXI—Number 8

September 1975

**CONTENTS**

End of the Tunnel in Vitamin Controversy? .....	1
'Fluoridation Causing 25,000 Cancer Deaths a Year'—Dean Burk .....	4
Congressman Delaney Asks Halt Pending Investigation .....	13
Midwest Regional Convention Set for Chicago .....	15
Why Did Los Angeles Times Ignore Fluoride Story? (Editorial) .....	16
N.H.F. Welcomes New Perpetual, Life Members .....	18
Hart Memorial Fund Contributions Total \$1,700 at Start .....	19
Exclusive Interview With Former Secretary of Interior Hickle .....	20
New FDA Regulations "Abort" Court Decision, Says Dilling .....	25
Jay Patrick Renews Aspartame Defense .....	28
County Meddling in Fluoridation Fight Sparks Law Suit .....	30
Beilenson's Office Says S.B. 211 'Not Dead' .....	32

The Bulletin serves its readers as a forum for the presentation 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 212 West Foothill Boulevard, Monrovia, California 91016, by National Health Federation, a nonprofit corporation. Don C. Matchan, 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.

*Rogers Agrees to Most Amendments*

**Long Vitamin-Mineral Battle Appears to be Nearing End**

The 13-year struggle to maintain freedom of choice in the use of vitamins and minerals appears to be drawing to a close — in most aspects at least.

Following a four-hour session between Milton Bass, counsel for the National Nutritional Foods Association, and Congressman Paul Rogers, with telephone communication with Attorney Kirkpatrick Dilling, representing the National Health Federation, Congressman Rogers as chairman of the House Subcommittee on Health and Environment agreed to include five of six proposed amendments to H.R. 6807, with partial agreement on the last amendment, concerned with advertising.

The NHF position has been consistently consumer-oriented — and vigorously opposed legislation to give the Food and Drug Administration the right to classify vitamins and minerals as drugs or additives. Following a court ruling, FDA dropped its insistence on thus categorizing high-potency single vitamins as drugs. But other objectionable features remained in what was known as the compromise bill introduced by Mr. Rogers and Senator Proxmire.

The 1975 Rogers bill was supported by the Committee for Responsible Nutrition, but the National Nutritional Foods Association, the Federation of Home-

makers, and the National Health Federation held out for more consumer safeguards. Then in mid-July agreement was reached on outstanding differences, with Congressman Rogers committed to include in his bill most of the desired amendments. As it stands, if the amendments are written as agreed, and new restrictive amendments are not added, the public will be protected against undue bureaucratic interference with basic health freedom, and FDA will have authority to regulate advertising at the manufacturing and wholesale distribution level, a provision which as of that time, industry spokesmen accepted.

**SOME HISTORY**

A review of NHFs role in the food supplement battle is contained in the following statement by NHF President Charles I. Crecelius:

"Let's go back to the time the Hosmer and Proxmire food supplement bills, which we supported, were gaining strong grass roots backing across the nation. This culminated last year in the Senate's passage of the Proxmire Bill by an 81-10 margin. When this bill reached Representative Rogers' Health Subcommittee, it was set aside. A short time prior to this uncalled-for-action, the Rogers Committee held hearings on the Hosmer and related bills, introduced

(Please turn the page)

by various members of the House of Representatives. At this point our adversaries devised a clever strategy. Although these fine bills already had been heard by the Rogers Committee and more than half the members of Congress had shown full support during the markup session, the Rogers Subcommittee refused to consider any of those bills, but instead drew up an entirely new bill called the Kyros Bill.

"After careful evaluation, the National Health Federation expressed its strong opposition to this cleverly-worded piece of legislation, conceived by FDA and 'midwived' by Paul Rogers. Quick to join NHF in its opposition to this totally unacceptable bill was the Federation of Homemakers and the National Nutritional Foods Association, representing the health food industry. Through this long, hard-fought struggle, NNFA has shown a unique capacity to stand steadfastly for what was right and best for the consumer. Much credit must go to Max Humberman, president of NNFA, and to Milton Bass, its counsel. Then imagine our bewilderment when the Council for Responsible Nutrition, representing some of the giants in the health food industry, came out in support of the Kyros bill! In effect they were cheering the moves of our opponents, giving them moral support. This delayed the victory we had fought so hard to achieve. Our task became more difficult. Pressures were exerted on NNFA and NHF to capitulate at different points in

the struggle. We were told, 'Give your support. This is all we are going to get.' But at each turn of the road our joint determination was to stand for what we believed to be right."

#### 'AN OBLIGATION'

"We felt a continuing obligation to protect the interests of the consumer. Abraham Lincoln put it this way: 'I am not bound to win but I am bound to be true. I am not bound to succeed but I am bound to live up to what light I have. I must stand with anybody that stands right. Stand with him when he is right, and part with him when he goes wrong.' Thus the year 1974 ended without passage of a food supplement bill.

A new Congress ushered in 1975. Senator Proxmire's food supplement bill was reintroduced with 38 cosponsors. Countering that move once again was Representative Rogers. As is often the case in Washington, the bad influences exert pressure to bring about negotiations and compromise with the good influences. When good is compromised, the result is evil. In the so-called compromise move, the Rogers bill prevailed, but was introduced as a compromise measure in both the Senate and House. Evil had temporarily prevailed."

#### THE 'MIRACLE'

"NHF continued its strong opposition. NNFA said that unless six amendments were accepted to change the bill, it would be vigorously opposed. Then what is being termed almost a miracle happened: Five of the six amendments were

accepted. The amendment which failed would have taken control over advertising of food supplements out of the hands of the Food and Drug Administration.

"In the past, control over advertising has been under jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission, and in all probability would receive more judicious administration if it remained in that department. It is possible that down the road we may need to engage in another campaign to permit freedom of the manufacturer to honestly advertise food supplement products.

"In supporting this amended bill, we have won the consumer's right to buy high-potency, multi-vitamin-mineral products, in combinations as well as single tablets. Since all the leading manufacturers of food supplements are willing to accept FDA control over advertising—and they will be the only parties directly affected if the Food and Drug Administration misuses its power—we look upon this new legislation as a complete victory for the consumer.

"We only wish that Fred J. Hart, our founder, first president of NHF, and later chairman of the Board, could have known of this coming victory before his recent passing. But he always talked as if he knew it was coming. Perhaps he had some of Honest Abe's philosophy when Mr. Lincoln said, 'I say try. If we never try we never succeed . . . He sticks through thick and thin. I admire a man like him.'"

"Our philosophy has been that might makes right if we will but

fight for it. NHF in its militant stand for truth and right has at times stood almost alone. As you know, Clinton Miller, our legislative advocate in Washington, fights hard when principle is involved and the stakes are high. We sincerely believe that his and NHF's continuing strong stand against the damaging legislation which was proposed, along with the stand taken by NNFA and Ruth Desmond of the Federation of Homemakers, was the deciding factor in bringing about amendments to improve the so-called compromise bill."

#### PROUD OF NNFA STAND

"We are proud of the stand taken by NNFA throughout this struggle. It has well represented not only the best interests of the industry, but of consumers as well. With some other groups, the strategy seemed to involve compromise when compromise was inappropriate, premature, and unwise. Those who would have short-circuited the food supplement victory had as much to lose as the consumer of food supplements if bad legislation had permitted the Food and Drug Administration to destroy this vital industry. Perhaps a few of the industries have other departments and ventures which could have taken up the slack should their food supplement business fail.

"It is unfortunate that vested interests, using strong pressure, carry so much influence in legislative halls. It is regrettable that

(Please turn the page)

## Delaney Amendment Could Be Death-Knell to Fluoridation

Information that may signal the beginning of the end of fluoridation in the United States is contained in a statement to veteran Congressman James J. Delaney signed by Dr. Dean Burk, retired National Cancer Institute researcher, and Dr. John A. Yiamouyiannis, science director of the National Health Federation. (The statement is abstracted from a more detailed paper titled *Fluoridation-Linked Human Cancer and the Delaney Amendment*, scheduled for publication by The McNaughton Foundation, P. O. Box A, Sausalito, Calif. 94965).

Author of the protective Delaney Amendment, Congressman Delaney, now in his fifteenth term, is a longtime foe of those who trifle with human life by adding cancer-causing substances to food and drink.

reason and common sense are so often ignored.

"We regret, too, that Paul Rogers, representing the vested interests, delayed so long in accepting a reasonable and fair food supplement bill. His willingness to sponsor and support one now would make it appear that he could have done so in the beginning, saving much delay, effort, and cost for all who helped win this substantial victory.

Published in the July 21 issue of the *Congressional Record*, the statement suggests that the Delaney Amendment to the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act prohibiting use of carcinogenic substances in food or drink may be the means of ridding the country of the practice of adding fluoride to water.

### DELANEY ASKS FOR IMMEDIATE ACTION

In introductory remarks before entering the Burk-Yiamouyiannis statement in *The Congressional Record* (July 21), Congressman Delaney called for immediate action to halt fluoridation of public water supplies pending further studies relating to its safety. See page 13.

Based on findings in studies initiated several months ago by Dr.

"Our deep appreciation to each member of the National Health Federation who helped with the over-one-million communications that reached Congress urging passage of the Proxmire-Hosmer food supplement bill.

"Other important battles lie ahead. Please give each of them your best effort. If you promise to commit yourself fully to these undertakings, David will have no fear as he meets Goliath on new battlefields."

Yiamouyiannis, results of which were confirmed by his additional study and statistical analysis, Dr. Burk reveals that "25,000 or more excess cancer deaths per year occur in the United States in cities subjected to imposed public water fluoridation."

The congressman was advised in the statement prepared by the scientists that "Invocation of the federal Delaney Amendment to eliminate fluoridation would appear to be in order;" and that "the newly-discovered fluoridation-linked human cancer mortality rate increase may offer one quantitatively important explanation for the continued rise in U.S. cancer mortality and morbidity rates, following increasing public water fluoridation over past decades."

The statement points out that San Francisco, fluoridated since 1952, shows an average, annual, age-adjusted cancer death rate of 212.0 per (100,000) between 1950 and 1970, whereas the following rates are found in cities without fluoridated water: 179.1 in Oakland; 174.8 in Los Angeles; 164.3 in San Diego; 178.4 in Portland; 165.0 in Tacoma; and 180.5 in Seattle.

"San Francisco," Dr. Burk told a convention of Natural Foods Associates in Shreveport, La., "stood out like a house afire."

### DR. BURK'S CREDENTIALS

(Ed. note: Dr. Burk has impressive credentials as a researcher. Joining the National Cancer Institute in 1939, he was chief chemist upon retirement in 1974. He did guest research work in 1935 with

the USSR Academy of Sciences in Moscow, was recipient of the Dombag prize for cancer research in 1965, and decorated Knight Commander of the Medical Order of Bethlehem. He was a Fellow of the American Academy of Sciences (and organizer and chairman of

research conferences on cancer from 1942-1945), and a member of the following organizations: Science Resources Foundation board of directors, American Chemical Society (receiving the Hillebrand Award in 1952), American Society of Biological Chemists, American Association of Cancer Research, American Society of Plant Physiologists, Society of Experimental Biology and Medicine (chairman 1949-50, secretary-treasurer 1948-49), American Institute of Biological Sciences, Washington Academy of Science, Society of General Physiology, Long Island Biological Association, Harvey Society, Chemical Society of Washington, Max Planck Association, Institute for Cell Physiology in Berlin, Dolmetsch Foundation, Gamma Alpha and Sigma Xi clubs, Cosmos Club of Washington and Commonwealth Club in San Francisco. Dr. Burk is author of 250 scientific articles, including papers describing his work in cancer research and cell chemistry. Last year he founded the Dean Burk Foundation, Inc. 4719 Forty-Fourth St., N.W., Washington, D.C.).

Following introductory remarks by Congressman Delaney (and the opening summary described above), the statement by Drs.

(Please turn the page)

Burk and Yiamouyiannis was inserted in the Congressional Record:

#### THE STATEMENT

"According to the federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, no food additive 'shall be deemed to be safe if it is found to induce cancer when ingested by man or animal.' From the same Act, 'the term 'food' means articles used for food or drink for man or other animals.' Drinking water and its derived products constitute the most prominent example of drink for man.

"The Delaney Amendment, which is the law of the land, raises the question, 'Does fluoridation of public drinking waters, as widely practiced in the United States, increase cancer mortality in our population?' If any quantitatively significant demonstration or finding of fluoridation-linked cancer is obtained, then the Delaney Amendment would statutorily call for regulatory cessation of public water fluoridation throughout the United States, regardless of state, county, or city laws implementing such fluoridation, and regardless of any claimed benefits of fluoridation in other connections, such as tooth improvement.

"It has now become possible to obtain a definitive and positive answer to the question raised by the Delaney Amendment, as a result of the recent, extensive and monumental publication, *U. S. Cancer Mortality by County: 1950-1969*, issued late in 1974 by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (Publication

No. (NIH) 74-615, 729 pp.), and the *Fluoridation Census 1969*, issued in 1970 by U.S. DHEW (U.S. Govt. Printing Office: 0 - 380-791), and the U.S. Bureau of Census Report, *U.S. Census of Population for 1960*, vol. 1, issued in 1963."

#### YIAMOUIYIANNIS FINDINGS

"Such an affirmative answer was first issued early in 1975 by Dr. John Yiamouyiannis of the National Health Federation (cf. *NHF Bulletin*, 21, 9-11, April 1975, and later in 21, 1-13, July-Aug. 1975, and in the publication, *Let's Live*, 43, 58-60, June 1975). He reported increases in standard cancer mortality rates in large fluoridated American cities compared to large nonfluoridated American cities, with respect to gastrointestinal tract (mouth, esophagus, stomach, large intestine and rectum), kidney, and bladder and urinary organs, in white males, and breast and ovary and Fallopian tube, in white females. He found relatively little or no excess of cancer mortality with respect to lung, trachea, bronchus, biliary passages, liver, larynx, uterus, prostate, skin, brain, muscle, or in leukemia, aleukemia, lymphosarcoma, reticulosarcoma, or Hodgkins disease. Mortality rates due to cancer of the lip, salivary gland, testis, thyroid, other endocrine glands, bone, eye, nose, ear, connective tissues, and sinuses, were too small for statistically significant correlations to be made with respect to fluoridation.

"In our joint studies involving the possible role of the Delaney

Amendment, we have not been interested for the time being to make any exhaustive analysis of fluoridation-linked cancer mortality, but mainly to examine for any quantitatively and statistically significant fluoridation-linked human cancer, and this limited objective would appear to have been reached overwhelmingly in a positive sense."

#### BEFORE 1958

"We have limited our studies of fluoridated cities to those fluoridated since before 1958, and have eliminated those four large cities whose fluoridation did not commence until 1965-67 (New York, Detroit, Dallas and Fort Worth), since the mortality data covered the years 1950-1969 inclusive, and these four cities would involve only a relatively short period of fluoridation and therefore of potential cancer induction and mortality excess.

"There are obviously many possible types of comparisons possible with respect to fluoridated versus nonfluoridated cities, and we send to you here several interesting and meaningful-type instances, reserving still more such for our forthcoming more extensive paper. To go into exhaustive considerations will undoubtedly take years of effort on the part of many investigators, but for Delaney Amendment considerations this is quite unnecessary here, once any positive indication is obtained, a caveat one should never lose sight of — hair-splitting is out of place here."

#### FIRST COMPARISON

"As a first comparison, we will follow up the original Yiamouyiannis finding with respect to the nine organ cancer types where he reported evident positive correlations of excess cancer mortality with fluoridation, as already listed. We compare the sum of the mortality rates (average annual age-adjusted mortality rates per 100,000 population) for each of the nine organ sites, totaled city by city, with respect to the 10 largest cities fluoridated (since before 1957, actually 1952-6), as compared with the 10 largest non-fluoridated cities, as follows: Fluoridated: 121.0, 124.6, 119.2, 113.1, 121.9, 119.9, 125.9, 119.3, 112.1, 121.6, (respectively, Chicago, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington, Cleveland, San Francisco, Milwaukee, St. Louis, Pittsburgh, Buffalo). Non-fluoridated: 94.3, 82.7, 123.1, 104.1, 84.2, 85.6, 96.7, 72.8, 83.4, 85.8 (respectively, Los Angeles, Houston, Boston, New Orleans, San Antonio, San Diego, Seattle, Phoenix, Memphis, Atlanta). It is quite evident, by visual inspection, that the average for the fluoridated group is much greater than that for the nonfluoridated group, the actual calculated average values being 119.9 and 95.5 respectively, with a difference between the means of 24.5 excess mortality, at a statistical confidence level of greater than 99.9% ( $t = 5.1$ ,  $P = < 0.001$ ). Were the values in each group further weighted according to city population size, the differ-

(Please turn the page)

ence between the two groups would be negatively changed.

"The results reported on a basis of mean difference have been further confirmed by analyses based on the rank median test (C. Mack, *Essentials of Statistics*, Plenum Press, New York, 1967), which is little affected by greater range spread (distribution) in one group than in the other."

#### 25,000 EXCESS DEATHS

"The total populations for the two groups of fluoridated and non-fluoridated cities are (1960 census) approximately 11,000,000 and 8,000,000. If the excess rate of mortality of 24.5 per 100,000 population in the fluoridated group were extrapolated linearly by the long-established principle of William of Occam up to a total fluoridated population of some 90,000,000 in the United States, this would amount to some 22,500 excess deaths per year linked with fluoridation. Since it would appear that the nine-organ sites involved account for some 90% of all of the excess cancer mortality, a value of some 25,000 total excess mortality (one death every 20 minutes) is then linked with fluoridation, and this same value is attained by a quite different type of comparison reported below, with somewhat different underlying assumptions being involved.

"For instance, the individual city summed rates first cited above were based on white males for seven of the nine organ-sites, and on white females for the other two sites, with the assumption that excess values for white males, white

females, nonwhite males and nonwhite females were not too far different for the purposes of the Delaney Amendment calculations — an assumption we have found to be sufficiently true though cannot detail here, but will in our extended publication. We are well aware, of course, that we have somewhat unconventionally added together results for white males with those of white females, and neglected nonwhite males and females, but again analysis not detailed here shows us that, for purposes of the Delaney Amendment examination, no unredeemable error is involved, because whether the 25,000 number is actually 15,000 or 35,000 makes very little difference from this point of view, all being so very large in any event. For instance, if the female white data were totally excluded, the 25,000 number would be about 19,000 for white males only. We are interested here in the woods, not the trees, which is, again, a caveat one should never lose sight of: it is the order of magnitude that is of primary concern here. Even without the foregoing extrapolation to some 90,000,000 fluoridated population, one would still have a cancer mortality excess of  $24.5 \times 110 = 2700$  in the 11,000,000 fluoridated population, a quantity more than adequate to call for evocation of the Delaney Amendment. Over 20 years this would be 54,000 deaths."

#### SECOND COMPARISON

"In a second type of comparison between fluoridated and nonfluori-

dated groupings of cities, we have taken the only six large fluoridated cities available for which we have the cancer death rates for the cities *per se*, i.e., either the city population equals the county population, or the cancer death rate was actually given for the city. In this instance, the type of comparison now included all cancer deaths from all four of the following categories: white male, white female, nonwhite male, and nonwhite female. We then weighted the mortality rates for each of these categories in accordance with the actual number of deaths involved per category, to yield the total number of cancer deaths per given city. Then the total number of deaths per city were weighted according to the total city population, to yield, finally, the total number of cancer deaths in the entire group of six cities, which, divided by the total population of the six cities yielded the fully weighted average mortality rate.

"The same procedure then was carried out for the six largest non-fluoridated cities. The fluoridated cities were Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington, St. Louis, San Francisco, and Denver, Colorado (respective total populations, in 100,000's: 20.0, 9.4, 7.6, 7.5, 7.4, and 4.9), with a total population of 57 100,000's, and a fully weighted mortality rate (as described) of 188 cancer deaths per year per 100,000 population. The nonfluoridated cities were Los Angeles, Houston, Boston, New Orleans, San Antonio, and San Diego (respective total populations, in

100,000's: 24.8, 9.4, 7.0, 6.3, 5.9, and 5.7) with a total population for the group of 59 100,000's, and a fully weighted mortality rate of 163 cancer deaths per year per 100,000 population. The excess mortality in the fluoridated group was thus  $188 - 163 = 25$ , or 15%.

"If this excess rate of 25 deaths per year per 100,000 population for a total group populated 5,700,000 were extrapolated linearly up to a total fluoridated population of some 90,000,000 in the United States, as in the first comparison, this would amount to some 22,500 excess deaths in the United States per year linked with imposed fluoridation, the same value in order of magnitude as before above, though with a different grouping comparison, and with somewhat different underlying assumptions, which as already indicated, do not appear, from our more detailed studies, to be far removed from actuality. The value of 15% excess has a confidence level of  $\cong 99.9\%$  ( $P \cong 0.001$ )."

#### GROUP COMPARISON

"As another type of group comparison, related to 'geographical distribution,' we took the cancer death rates (per 100,000 per year) for each of the above six fluoridated cities (Denver, San Francisco, St. Louis, and Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington) and compared them, so far as possible, with major nonfluoridated cities in their respective geographical areas, with respect to white males:

(Please turn the page)

"Denver is fluoridated, but with a mortality rate much below that of the other five fluoridated cities (163.9 versus 221.0, 233.3, 203.7, 220.1, 212.0). But the value of 163.9 for Denver is still notably higher compared to nonfluoridated Boulder (134.7), Pueblo County (134.8), Cheyenne (142.6), Santa Fe (138.2), and Salt Lake City (142.6). These nonfluoridated 'neighboring' cities average  $138.5 \pm 5$  (99.9%) confidence level compared to Denver's rate of 163.9.

"San Francisco is fluoridated with a cancer mortality rate of 212.0, as compared to nonfluoridated Oakland (179.1), Sacramento (186.2), Los Angeles (174.8), San Diego (164.3), Portland (178.4), Tacoma (165.0) and Seattle (180.5). These nonfluoridated cities average  $175.5 \pm 11$  (99.9% confidence level), compared to San Francisco's 212.0. Between 1955-1972, the total cancer death rate per 100,000 in San Francisco increased 22%, compared to California's 9% (San Francisco Department of Public Health Statistical Report, 1955-72), California being a relatively unfluoridated state.

"St. Louis is fluoridated, and has a cancer mortality rate of 220.1 as compared to the nonfluoridated cities, Kansas City (182.0), Cincinnati (203.8), and Memphis (187.8). These nonfluoridated cities average  $191.2 \pm 12.2$  (99.9% confidence level), compared to St. Louis's 220.1.

"The following cities are fluoridated, and are all in the same general geographic area: Philadelphia

(221.1), Baltimore (233.3), and Washington (203.7). Unfortunately for this analysis, virtually every highly populated area in the vicinity has been fluoridated. Two nonfluoridated cities nearby are Dover, Delaware (152.3) and Harrisburg, Pa. (177.8). These data do not allow for a valid statistical comparison beyond visual inspection."

#### 'HIGHLY SIGNIFICANT'

"We have examined still other forms of comparison of fluoridated and nonfluoridated groupings (e.g., considering cities down to populations of one-quarter million, providing groups of about 20 cities each), but with little difference in qualitative conclusion. Obviously, the smaller the city size, the smaller will its weight be in relation to respective county size upon which nearly all the mortality data are reported, and so, in general, the City data are 'diluted out' and one reaches a lower limit of usable city size. Similar 'dilution' of true and pertinent excess mortality values may occur from a variety of reasons, e.g., (a) population migrations, or (b) the initial part of the 1950-69 period did not involve fluoridation until at least 1952, and even up until 1956, all of which could make the value of 25,000 excess deaths due to fluoridation too low, perhaps much too low.

"It need scarcely be pointed out that effects of public water fluoridation upon annual excess cancer mortality (ca. 25,000) that we have reported are a highly significant fraction of the annual can-

cer death rate in the United States, of the order of 350,000 deaths per year. From our studies, it is not likely that these excess mortality values will be reduced anywhere near to insignificance by any attempt to rule them out on bases of 'social status,' ethnic composition, sex, climate, other carcinogens conceivably introduced into the water supplies, and many other possibilities that have occurred to us. For example, it has been suggested that 'Much of the excess (mortality) in the cities with high rates that are cited (by us) is due to an excess of lung cancer.' But when we have subtracted, for instance, lung cancer death rates from total cancer rates from all sources, for, say, the cities Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York, Cleveland, Detroit, and Chicago, the percent increases in cancer death rates in these fluoridated cities remain almost unchanged, the reduction in percent increase averaging only a few per cent, about the same as in nonfluoridated cities similarly tested.

"Lung cancer death rates provide virtually no explanation for the fluoridation-linked excess mortality rates, and the same may be said of factors such as occupational exposure, air pollutants, organic pollutants in the water supply, etc., until so *demonstrated* as distinguished from hypothesized without solid basis. Even then, such demonstration would have to be total, not partial, by the Delaney Amendment, and/or Occam's Razor. Also, any such demonstra-

tion would have to explain why our observed excess mortality values refer mainly to *only* nine organ cancers, and why no such excess is found in cancers in the remaining large number of other organs in the body. The contrast here is striking and highly significant.

"We would emphasize that our results refer, in a strict sense, to data based on the *process of fluoridation*, without commitment as to whether it is the fluoride component that is wholly responsible for the effects observed and reported. This is perhaps an academic distinction, but the actual data used do refer to 'fluoridation' and so we say 'fluoridation-linked,' rather than 'fluoride-linked.' Thus, it is remotely conceivable that the fluorides used contain traces of some other contaminant that is the effective agent. But this is a problem for future investigation, and, at the moment, it is the total process of imposed fluoridation that is involved."

#### 'DILEMMA'

"And so, in view of the extensive fluoridation industry and commitment involved, a dilemma of no small magnitude is clearly raised: a choice is opened between otherwise claimed benefits of fluoridation on the one hand as ranged against the increased cancer mortality on the other; or elimination or alteration of the Delaney Amendment on the one hand as against relinquishment of endorsement of fluoridation of public drinking waters.

"Will the dilemma be resolved (Please turn the page)

by sophistry and winking at, or by federal law and demonstrated fact? Will the National Cancer Institute and Division of Dentistry continue to dismiss now-demonstrated fact as a 'fluoride scare report'? (cf. Appendix B). The material in Appendix B (NCI response to Yiamouyiannis report) is unresponsive to the major numerical data reported by Yiamouyiannis, presumably because no substantive and interdicting response was possible and had to be replaced by sophistry, nitpicking, and wishful generalities. Eliminating the Delaney Amendment would not remove the flow of fluoridation-induced excess cancer mortality — quite the contrary."

#### 'NATURAL FLUORIDATION'

"To consider 'natural fluoridation' (fluoridation provided by nature) is beyond the scope of this report, but any such consideration will have to go into the full nature of natural fluoridation, including certification of analytical methods currently used to measure it. For instance, natural fluoridation may involve more than simple fluoride ions, if positively charged groups (such as proteins, and even inorganic complexes) may bind fluoride in ways not assayed by standard methods of analysis or not eliminated in defluoridation processes. If natural fluoridation is involved in cancer mortality rates, it may offer some explanation for the refractoriness of many cancers to successful treatment, and why so relatively little progress has been made in recent decades in the

treatment of many human cancers. On May 14, 1975, the HEW News reported that deaths from cancer 'continued upward in 1974. The rate of death increased 1.3 per cent from 1973.' Defluoridation may become important just as decreased imposed fluoridation would also appear to be indicated. Since it is rather generally conceded that a very large fraction of human cancer is induced by environmental and industrial conditions (cf. *Newsweek*, p. 42, July 7, 1975), elimination of imposed fluoridation, together with more extensive defluoridation, would appear to offer a relatively easy means of reducing that very large fraction, not only with respect to cancer mortality but also morbidity, which is ordinarily much larger than mortality. A comparable example, but here on a national scale, is the eventual elimination of Minamata disease, in Japan, caused by decade-long pollution by methyl mercury from industry."

#### NOT 'A FEW RATS'

"We are not now here dealing with such instances as where the Delaney Amendment has indeed been invoked regulatorily on a nationwide basis as a result of a few hundred rats, at most, developing cancer following dosage with enormous 'inhuman or inhuman' quantities of a compound such as a cyclamate. No, here we are dealing with *millions* of Americans — some 90 million of them — being fluoridated with dosages otherwise regarded as 'optimal' as far as teeth are concerned, but without

## Veteran Fluoridation Foe in Congress 'Concerned'

# Delaney Asks Immediate Halt to Fluoridation

Expressing "deep concern" over implications of the Burk-Yiamouyiannis statement detailing the correlation between fluoridation and cancer deaths, and declaring "the American public must be protected," Congressman James J. Delaney (Ninth District, New York) on July 21 urged Congress to impose "immediate suspension of all artificial fluoridation pending further investigation."

any regard heretofore to cancer mortality potentials. Perhaps it is as well that the people of Los Angeles very recently chose by a good majority not to fluoridate. And certainly it would be well for states now contemplating compulsory statewide water fluoridation to take pause before committing themselves to a course of action leading to conflict with the force and logic of the Delaney Amendment, and the numerical values reported in this statement. Any show of error in the latter must be *total*, to avoid evocation of the Delaney Amendment; partial error will not suffice.

"As of 1970, public water fluoridation was banned in Austria, Denmark, France, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, Norway, Spain, Yugoslavia, and, except for a very few experimental cities, in Belgium, Finland, Germany, Holland, Portugal, Sweden, and Switzerland.

"The questions raised by this epidemiological study are of vital importance to our 90 million citizens who drink artificially-fluoridated water," Congressman Delaney declared.

The full text of his remarks before introducing the Burk-Yiamouyiannis statement into the *Record* follows:

"Mr. Speaker, are the American (Please turn the page)

land. What now will the United States do?

"All people drink water, so far as I know, and nearly half of them in the United States drink imposed fluoridated water. At such time as these people become acquainted with the potential cancer mortality involved thereby (and even greater cancer morbidity and, presumably, still greater incidence), one may wonder what they will be thinking about as every glass of water or water-derived fluoridated product goes down their throats? We venture, something more important than teeth of mainly pre-adolescents, which can be maintained by various means other than via fluoridation of the public drinking water. Some other means of disposing of the large amounts of industrially-produced fluorides will have to be found, we venture, than fluoridation of public drinking waters."

people guinea pigs? Over 23 years ago, my Select Committee to Investigate the Use of Chemicals in Food and Cosmetics initiated a widespread examination of chemical additives. I introduced and was successful in obtaining passage of legislation prohibiting the use of such unsafe chemicals in food and establishing a zero tolerance for carcinogens. Many supposedly 'safe' products in use for years were subsequently shown to be harmful. No one, Mr. Speaker, had taken the trouble to thoroughly explore their negative impact before marketing them."

#### LONG OPPOSED

"My Committee in 1952 devoted seven days of public hearings to the issue of imposed fluoridation of public water supplies. At that time a number of scientists expressed fear that the safety of fluoridated water was not sufficiently demonstrated.

"In November 1963, in a statement before the Joint Hearings on Fluoridation of the City of New York, I strongly opposed the addition of fluorides to our New York drinking water as 'an unnecessary health risk and unwarranted intrusion on the rights of our citizens.' In a letter to *The New York Times* on December 12 that year, I noted there was 'nothing holy or infallible in the opinions of American public health officials,' nor was 'there reason to label competent physicians and respectable citizens as 'antidental health' because they disagreed with the current position of the medical hierarchy.'"

"Then, in 1966, the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare received a lengthy statement from me on the need to investigate all the effects fluorine might have on vital organs.

"Now, Mr. Speaker, I have before me a communication dated June 6, 1975 from Dean Burk, Ph.D., recently retired head of the Cytochemistry Section of the United States National Cancer Institute after a distinguished career of 50 years of research on the cancer problem, and John Yiamouyiannis, Ph.D., Science Director of the National Health Federation.

"On the basis of their analyses of reports issued by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the U.S. Bureau of Census, these two eminent scientists have drawn to my attention some new and very disturbing information which warrants immediate action."

#### 'REAL PEOPLE'

"Their study of newly available official mortality and fluoridation statistics covering a 20-year period indicates that 25,000 or more excess cancer deaths occur annually in U.S. cities subjected to imposed water fluoridation . . . a death every 30 minutes . . ."

"Mr. Speaker, these findings are based on experience with real people — with our fellow Americans — not on experimentation with test animals. How many of us have felt the pain of personal loss of loved ones among family and friends from this dread disease —

## Midwest Regional Convention in Chicago

sociation; and Jay M. Hoffman, Ph.D.

Lectures will be presented in the Grand Ballroom, and Exhibits (more than 50 scheduled as of mid-June), will be in the adjoining Chrystal Foyer, according to Carole Smith, NHF convention manager. Admission is \$2 per day or \$5 for three days. Sleeping accommodations may be made with the Sheraton-Chicago. Rates are \$28 for singles, \$36 for twins or doubles.

### C.C.S. CONVENTION

The third annual convention of the Cancer Control Society will be held Sept. 26, 27, 28 in the Ambassador Hotel, Los Angeles. Speakers will include Dr. Dean Burk, Charlotte Gerson Straus, Dr. John A. Yiamouyiannis, Charles I. Crecelius, Dr. Paavo Airola, and Betty Lee Morales, who also will emcee.

### MIAMI SYMPOSIUM

Local members of the National Health Federation and Citizens for Consumer Protection will conduct a Health Symposium Sept. 19-21 in the Bayfront Park Auditorium, Fifth St. and Biscayne Blvd., Miami. Speakers will include Jay Patrick, Dr. Paavo Airola, and Dr. John A. Yiamouyiannis.

**YOUR CONTRIBUTIONS  
TO N.H.F.  
GET THE JOB DONE**

## Our Nominee for Ostrich Award . . .

Except for the 72-point (big) headline across its front page announcing "L. A. Fluoridation Defeated," and except for a May 25 editorial comment that fluoridation was "one of the issues we consider of major importance," a *Los Angeles Times* reader would have no reason, on the basis of preselection coverage, to think the issue was anything to get excited about. More pointedly, the coverage was nothing a conscientious editor could be proud of.

As a newsman I have admired the enlightened thrust of the newspaper in many interest areas. I have been struck by its independence on a variety of issues, and delighted with some of its environment coverage. Science Writer George Alexander did a creditable job with a comprehensive roundup of the hazards of chlorofluorocarbons in aerosol sprays to ozone in the stratosphere.

Thus, when the campaign started, I looked for articles dealing with fluoridation. Veteran *Times* readers told me it was useless to look, predicted a virtual blackout of fluoridation material. How right they were! In retrospect, it was naive to think we could communicate with someone at the *Times* to at least learn why the story wasn't being developed. I could only conjecture that personalities in the top echelon had decided it was a nonstory. Dr. Yiamouyiannis and I visited the *Times* to try to learn why or by whom the story was being muzzled. We got exactly nowhere. We didn't make it past the armed guard on the ground floor, but after several calls a young reporter was sent down and we told him about the study linking fluoride to cancer. He was interested, said he would get the material to George Alexander and "probably he'll call you Monday." The call never came. Two weeks later I wrote to the *Times* expressing disappointment that the pros and cons of fluoridation had not been touched upon — "an issue vital to health, life." I suggested that since there is "a substantial body of scientific data challenging the claims of the profluoridation people as to efficacy and safety of adding fluoride to drinking water," the newspaper "could perform a real public service by assigning staff — perhaps the environmental editor — to examination of some of the data which is a source of deep concern to those opposing fluoridation."

I observed also, "It is no longer a matter of liberals vs. conservatives, or intellectuals vs. know-nothings." On the basis of what is known about the toxic effects of fluoride, 13 countries in Europe and Scandinavia have outlawed its use. Ralph Nader points out, "There has been no extensive research on side effects. New research — particularly by a professor at Cal Tech — indicates the whole matter of fluoridation requires further study . . ."

The letter was not published. In a followup letter 10 days later I said it was "too bad" (the newspaper was ignoring the issue) since it "affects the health and welfare of the millions in Los Angeles who drink tap water. The *Times* usually meets issues head-on. But this one is a

no-no, apparently because those who make the decisions are content to take the word of medico-dental politicians, none of whom have done up-to-date original research, but who rely on now-discredited reports from the era of the fifties."

That letter didn't see the light of day either. (The *Times* did carry four letters to the editor opposing fluoridation, six or eight favoring it). The election is over. As my wife Geri points out, "Everybody won."

And quoting Dr. Yiamouyiannis, "some people lost face, but healthwise everybody was a winner" — (even the *Times* editors who refused to look at the facts against fluoridation and petulantly chastized the city council because it "bowed . . . to the political pressures of an antifluoride lobby . . .").

On May 20 the *Times* finally carried a story containing two paragraphs listing objections to fluoridation. A week later another story repeated the objections — in two sentences (eight lines of type).

Now no one expected the *Los Angeles Times* to editorially oppose fluoridation. Its connections with "the club" are too intimate. For years it has been fashionable among "liberals" to be "for" fluoridation. We want to trust *someone*, and we like to think we can trust our dentist, our doctor, university people, and until Watergate even Washington officials such as those in the Public Health Service, long associated with the profluoridation element. So one could hardly expect the bonds between *Times* personnel and the professionals to result in an about-face editorially.

The *Times'* editorial position is the *Times'* business. But the public has a right to expect that the bias would not be so intense as to exclude an honest examination of the data which has been accumulating in recent years. Profluoridationists quote from studies long since found to draw erroneous conclusions. A reporter doing an in-depth story on the pros and cons of this issue could have pointed this out. That reporter also could have told *Times* readers that a brand new study has revealed that the cancer death rate in fluoridated cities is substantially higher than in nonfluoridated cities. That study was delivered to George Alexander. Either he or a superior decided to "not touch it." Don't ask me why.

Fortunately, the *Times* is not the only newspaper in Los Angeles. Its chief daily competitor, the *Herald-Examiner*, took the opposite editorial position, urging a "no" vote. Several weekly newspapers also aired both sides of the issue. And thanks to the "fairness doctrine," radio and television provided a forum for presentation of the convincing and well-documented antifluoride position. One station, powerful KNX, came out against Proposition F.

Thus, despite the head-in-the-sand posture of the *Los Angeles Times*, the electorate was able to learn about the dangers of adding another pollutant to the water supply, and armed with the facts, turned it down in a 56% to 44% vote. Praise the Lord!

— D.C.M.

**THE WELCOME MAT'S OUT TO THESE  
NEW LIFE AND PERPETUAL MEMBERS**

**PERPETUAL**

STUART WHEELWRIGHT  
Ogden, Utah

**LIFE**

BILL and ANITA LITTLE  
Santa Monica, Calif.

OPAL V. GAWF  
Chula Vista, Calif.

LESTER A. SWAN  
Escondido, Calif.

JOHN and MAE ASTIN  
Escondido, Calif.

MARY N. KNOEFLER  
Riverside, Calif.

BETTY F. CONNORS  
La Mesa, Calif.

BESSIE D. DAMRON  
National City, Calif.

MAUDE STRANG  
San Marcos, Calif.

MARCELLA KING  
San Diego, Calif.

DORIS ROSENBERG  
San Diego, Calif.

REJUVENESCENCE INTERNATIONAL  
Lancaster, Calif.

MARY MAC GILVRAY  
Burbank, Calif.

JOHN M. KULPINSKI  
San Diego, Calif.

ANN KULPINSKI  
San Diego, Calif.

ISABEL P. MACE  
Aspen, Colo.

OTTO C. GRIMM  
Oakland, Calif.

MR. and MRS. J. F. KOSINSKI  
San Rafael, Calif.

GOLDIE MILLER  
Stockton, Calif.

KENNETH FELDMAN  
Los Angeles, Calif.

LEE MC COMB  
Lee's Fruit Co.  
Leesburg, Florida

WILLIAM SCHLEE, D.C.  
Albany, Calif.

CHARLES BRENNIMEN  
Wheat Ridge, Colo.

MR. and MRS. RON WEIDNER  
Beaverton, Ore.

MILO THOMSON  
Estacada, Ore.

R. W. and AUDREY PERRY  
Virginia Beach, Va.

JEANNE A. MOELLER  
San Francisco, Calif.

CHARLOTTE PHILLIPS  
San Francisco, Calif.

MYRNA H. SMITH  
Encinitas, Calif.

MRS. E. M. BERG  
Visalia, Calif.

JULIA Mc CLAIN  
Monroe, Utah

LAYERA Mc CLAIN  
Monroe, Utah

MR. and MRS. HOMER S. DAVIS  
Oceanside, Calif.

FRANKLIN and MARGARET Mc COY  
Netarts, Ore.

DR. ALFRED W. STEEVER  
Linwood, N.J.

JOE GRAZIANO  
Phoenix, Az.

*'All Gifts Appreciated — Even to Widow's Mite'*

**Hart Memorial Fund Contributions  
Total \$1,700 During First Month**

With three contributions of \$100 each, one of \$300, and 88 in lesser amounts, the Fred J. Hart Living Memorial Fund, 30 days after its establishment, totaled more than \$1,700.

Expressing unrestrained pleasure with the response, NHF Board Chairman Kurt W. Donsbach and President Charles I. Crelius revealed that the names of donors are being inscribed in a book, placed in a specially-fitted-out area in the reception room with memorabilia presented at various times in the past to the late founder of the National Health Federation. The names of those who contribute more than once will be duly entered each time the donation is received.

"We want to express the gratitude of the Board of Governors for the wholehearted, spontaneous response to the announcement in June of the setting up of the Fred J. Hart Living Memorial Fund," said Dr. Donsbach and Mr. Crelius. "It is a tribute to the memory and the work of our founder, and we trust this memorial will be a continuing expression, through the years, of Fred Hart's contribution to the cause of freedom in choices of health care. We note with full appreciation the substantial sums given by some, and we note with equal appreciation the contributions in lesser amounts,

even to the widow's mite — those who have given to the extent they are able. All gifts are appreciated, all will be used in the continuing struggle for freedom."

Following is the list of those who gave to the Memorial Fund during its first month of existence: Lodi (Calif.) Chapter of NHF, \$300; Mrs. W. J. Bassett, publisher of *Let's Live*, \$100; Dr. V. L. Young, \$100; Mrs. Royal Lee, \$100; Frank H. Thayer, \$50; Annie Fraser, \$2.50; Lucy Starr, Roberta Morrison, Kelda Harver, Robert E. Andersen, Mrs. J. E. Langhler, W. E. Lyman, Mrs. L. H. Fuhrro, and Madeline Ryan, \$5; Melvin Overton, \$11; Dr. and Mrs. Miles Robinson, H. E. Hughes, Mr. and Mrs. E. A. Hershberger, San Diego Chapter NHF, Gordon E. Vaughan, Mrs. M. Ash, Mrs. M. D. Shipp, Selma A. Norton, Ethel Waggoner, Mrs. Katie D. Nelson, and Mr. and Mrs. A. Ellis Baker, \$25; Elizabeth Hess, Bruce and Gladys Helvie, and Mr. and Mrs. S. S. Eldridge, \$20.

H. F. Cutting, \$18; Raymond H. Houser, Helen Taylor (Mansfield Chapter), Mrs. B. R. Smith, Mrs. M. F. Krupa, Mr. and Mrs. H. G. Marquardt, Louise Otterstatter, David Krauss, Mafalde Talacci, Mrs. E. T. Carl, and Myron Goldenberg, \$15; Louise Vanderlinden, \$12.50.

(Please turn the page)

## 'Compassion, Dedication' Needed To Solve Environmental Crisis

JEFFREY M. ELLIOT, PH.D.

Environment is "where you live, how you live," and its problems will be solved by "sensitive, compassionate leadership" and a citizenry "willing to fight."

This is the opinion of Walter J. Hickel, former governor of Alaska,

Contributions of \$10 each have been received from Mr. and Mrs. Frank Cotten, Martha J. Pavisha, Dr. Fred Auerbach, Dora H. Lawhorn, Lee McComb, Mrs. Edna Swenson, Mrs. Stanley Stewart, M. Robba, J. W. Bollinger, Frances Garton, Helen Gilfillan, J. Nelson Kagarise, E. Kusich, Lee Hardy, Mrs. W. McCune, Otto Maus, Mr. and Mrs. M. J. Morris, Elaine Newton, Alma Nelson, Sylvia Sette, John Marchun, Olivia Noether, Louise Quart, Mary Oliver, Clarence Chestnut, B. M. Mack, Marie Wright, Clara Schlichtemier, Dr. Ruby Daniel, Lydia Witherspoon, Prycie Myers, Mrs. Minnie Krehm, Tom and Ella Copelan, Conrad O. Jessen, Antoinette Giamo, Helen Meusell, Anne Cowan, Nick Signorello, Bernice Green, Arthur W. Schraitle, M. A. Patterson, Mr. nad Mrs. John Lotz, Mrs. Katherine Bold, Iola L. Day, Mr. and Mrs. Paul Wysard, Maybelle Roth, Cliff Cundy, Agatha Duer, Harold Solem, C. S. Niemeier, and Helen M. Rice.

hired and later fired by former President Richard M. Nixon because as Secretary of the Interior he represented the voice of reconciliation between the generations. As governor, and secretary, he has become known for decisive actions on behalf of environment.

In this exclusive interview, with typical Hickel candor, he offers some thoughts on a variety of factors and groups affecting environment — from "special interests," narrow-minded environmentalists, short-range governmental planning, to the energy crisis and his role in showing that government can "care for people."

Born in Kansas August 18, 1919, the oldest son in a family of 10, he worked a gangplow on his parents' dustbowl tenant farm when he was eight. He attended school in Clafin, participated in football and track, became Kansas' Welterweight Golden Gloves boxing champion in 1938. Unable to get a passport to Australia because of his age, he went to Alaska where he worked as a logger and bartender, was married to Janice Cannon who died in 1943. During World War II he served in the Army Air Corps, was married to Ermalee Strutz, daughter of an old Alaska family, and following the war he became a builder, developer and civic leader. He became deeply

### About the Author

Dr. Jeffrey M. Elliot is Dean of Curriculum and Assistant Professor of History and Political Science at Miami-Dade Community College, North Campus, Miami, Fla. An authority on American government, he has written nearly 80 scholarly articles, book critiques, and film reviews. Senator Mike Gravel said of him recently: "Dr. Elliot has dedicated his career to help improve and enhance the quality of American education."

involved in Alaska's statehood fight, was elected Republican National Committeeman in 1954, served 10 years, and in 1966 was elected governor against heavy odds.

As governor, he put Alaska on a sound financial footing, upgraded the court system, initiated forceful environmental safeguards, and created a special commission to open Alaska's north while protecting its natural beauty.

### AS SECRETARY

While serving as Secretary of the Interior he strengthened offshore oil-drilling regulations following the Santa Barbara disaster, established the Parks-to-People program, reorganized the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and placed all eight species of great whales on the Endangered Species List.

Now in private life, Mr. Hickel is Chairman of the Board of the Hickel Investment Company which

builds and operates hotels and shopping centers in Alaska. A popular speaker on college campuses, he devotes about one week in each month to speaking engagements around the country. He is a member of the Board of the Salk Institute, serves on the World Advisory Council for Buckminster Fuller's Design Science Institute, and is a member of the Committee for Scientific Freedom and Responsibility of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. In 1972 he chaired the National Conference on Geothermal Energy sponsored by the National Science Foundation. That year he was a World Observer at the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment in Stockholm, Sweden.

In this exclusive interview, Mr. Hickel details his views on the environmental crisis confronting the United States. Below are highlights of the conversation:

### PLANNING, COURAGE

ELLIOT: In your recent book, *Who Owns America?*, you charge that government has failed to adopt a long-term view of the problems of environment. What can be done to broaden this perspective?

HICKEL: Strictly speaking, there are two things. First, we need long-term planning to solve the environmental crisis. Yet our legislative process is such that we authorize appropriations one session, and appropriate them the next. Unfortunately, most governmental

(Please turn the page)

planning takes place on a year-to-year basis. That's part of the problem. If we're serious about saving the environment, *we've got to plan for the future*. Second, we need good men who sincerely want to act. It's so easy, particularly in government, not to do something. *We need more men with the courage to act.*

**ELLIOT:** A major stumbling block in the environmental struggle is the role lobbyists play in influencing legislation. How can the public combat the power of these special interests?

**HICKEL:** Special interest is just that — the minority opinion of what should happen. If you make a decision for the total, you will also help the special few. It's only when you hide the decision, whether corporate or governmental, that it comes back to haunt you. Keep the fight in the open and you'll win.

**ELLIOT:** Although it is important to maintain openness in government, it is often difficult to achieve that objective. What can be done to insure that decisions are made in the public interest?

**HICKEL:** It takes dedicated people, willing to put the public interest first. Moreover, it takes the kind of person, not a Democrat or a Republican, *who really wants to make the system work*. When I was Secretary I told my staff, "Find me a reason so I can act." As you know, in Santa Barbara I had no authority to shut down the rigs for environmental reasons. I did it on the grounds the oil companies were wasting precious re-

few concrete actions have resulted. Why haven't conservationists been more successful in winning public support?

#### ON ENVIRONMENT

**HICKEL:** I think the commitment still exists — people are just as concerned. Right now, for many reasons, environment isn't as noisy as it was two or three years ago. However I am convinced the mood is deeper, and that it will be much more effective in the future. Most people realize that environment isn't just clean air and pure water. You can have a bad environment where the water runs pure and the air is clean. *Poverty can be a bad environment. So can hunger, disease, or poor housing. The environment is where you live. It's really how you live.* Most Americans understand this, and that's why the environment isn't going to go away. It's going to become a stronger issue, not only in this country but in the world.

**ELLIOT:** You have spoken frequently about the lack of compassionate and courageous leadership, particularly at high levels of industry and government. How has the environmental movement stacked up in this regard?

**HICKEL:** It boils down to this: I consider myself to be a sensitive human being, one who loves his country and is willing to fight for it. That doesn't mean other men don't have it, but such men are rare. Usually, the more human a man is, the less willing he is to fight. The prospect of a fight scares him. Well, no one is going

to hand it to you on a platter. You can't get there by talking. And you can't get there by wishing. And you can't get there by forming little groups. You've got to be willing to fight. Then you'll solve the environmental crisis. There's another thing, too. You must always fight for the total. *When I find a person who's more concerned with the tundra, or an elephant, or a panda than with a child, I find he doesn't understand the total.* We must make sure the human cares for the total, including the non-reasoning animal. It's the total that counts!

#### 'NARROW ATTITUDE'

**ELLIOT:** In a much-heralded speech you criticized several prominent conservation groups for their "narrow attitude." Generally speaking, how do you assess the performance of these groups?

**HICKEL:** Truthfully, I don't find this concern for the total in many environmental leaders. They're more interested in the little things. Let me give you an example: When I was Secretary of the Interior I wanted to set aside 10 million acres in the Wrangell Mountains National Scenic Area. You can't imagine how much that is. And in there I had wilderness. I had farming. I had fishing. I had parks. It was the total concept of land-use planning. But everyone opposed me. The Sierra Club opposed me. The Wilderness Society opposed me. Friends of the Earth opposed me. The mining industry opposed me. The business com-

(Please turn the page)

# New FDA Regulations 'Abort' Court Decision, Says Dilling

BY KIRKPATRICK W. DILLING

Counsel  
National Health Federation

The long-awaited crisis for the vitamin and health foods industry has at last come to fruition.

On May 28 FDA published new vitamin regulations, purportedly based upon the U.S. Court of Appeals decision rendered August 15, 1974, and which require immediacy of action by anyone manufacturing or distributing a special dietary product.

Although purporting to follow such decision, the new regulations actually distort, and in various ways abort, the Appeals decision.

The regulations, and preamble (40 typewritten pages), cover in substance:

1. No potency limit is placed upon products containing single vitamins or minerals deemed essential by FDA, with the exceptions of Vitamins A, D, folic acid, iodine, copper and potassium. However, repeated reference is made in the FDA publication to ongoing "OTC" drug reviews, and a "GRAS" food additive review, whereby this situation no doubt will be changed rapidly (and adversely) when the regulations become final. FDA also is attempting through the regulations to convert all nutrients to "food additives,"

(Ed. note: If H.R. 6807, with amendments, becomes law, FDA will not have authority to implement some of the regulations described here.)

with the severe regulatory implications flowing therefrom.

2. FDA, in response to the mandates of the U.S. Court of Appeals, designated various nutrients considered "essential," in addition to those decreed in 1973 to be permitted (13 vitamins and 8 minerals). (Vitamin K, choline, chlorine, chromium, fluorine, manganese, molybdenum, nickel, potassium, selenium, silicone, sodium, tin and vanadium are now to be considered "essential" or "probably essential.") FDA simultaneously decreed, however, that such essential nutrients (for which no "RDA" has been established) not be permitted in multicomponent dietary supplements, thus nullifying this portion of the Appeals decision.

3. Only vitamins and minerals could be combined in a dietary supplement. Protein, for example, or unsaturated fatty acids would continue to be barred. And, at least 9 of the amino acids, for example, are "essential," this circumstance also nullifying the Appeals decision.

4. "Non-essential" nutrients could not be included in any die-

(Please turn the page)

## FLUORIDE BILLS DIE IN FLORIDA

Two bills proposing mandatory fluoridation of drinking water died in committees of the Florida legislature without being brought to a vote. The measures, House Bill 1216 and Senate Bill 1149, would have outlawed the public's right to decide the issue by referendum.

Robert A. Wright said the Pinellas Pure Water Alliance, with its

munity opposed me. The State of Alaska opposed me. Everybody opposed me! You know why? They all wanted to live within their own little worlds. Industry in its isolation, the environmentalists in theirs. And the rest of the world could go to hell! *If you just look out for your own small thing, it becomes so narrow.* The whole world can't be wilderness. And it can't be mining. And it can't be power plants. The whole world can't be one thing.

### ENERGY CRISIS

ELLIOT: There is considerable talk today about the energy crisis. Dr. John Gofman, a well-known scientist, contends that nuclear power poses serious hazards. He suggests we look at other sources of energy. Do you believe nuclear power is a viable answer for the energy crisis?

HICKEL: Look, nuclear power is just one source of energy. It's true, the breeder reactor does pose several problems—the most serious is disposal. Once we stop spending so much just on nuclear research, we'll find some better

nucleus of NHF members and other opponents to such legislation, sponsored an ad in the Tallahassee Democrat with the table from the NHF study on the relationship between cancer death rate and fluoridation. It is his opinion this information "undoubtedly influenced a number of legislators."

answers. Energy is a multipurpose thing. It can be solar. It can be tide. It can be wind. It can be geothermal. It can be fossil. It can be hydro. It can be atomic. We must find out which fuels are best, which ones have the fewest hazards. That doesn't mean you stop the world, or that you do it the old way forever. I don't think either alternative is acceptable. *If you want a real solution you must be willing to experiment.*

ELLIOT: As you reflect on your experience as Secretary of the Interior, which of your accomplishments gave you the most satisfaction?

HICKEL: I think the thing that stands out, that will be the most lasting, was not really environmentally-related. It was an attempt to clean up the relationship between government and industry. That had to be done. We had to start with that. If you clean that up, you'll clean up the rest. I also feel we proved that government could work, that it could produce results. Most of all, we demonstrated that it cared about people—all kinds of people.

tary supplement (e.g., rutin, bioflavonoids, etc.), it being necessary to distribute such items separately. Thus, a combination, for example, of Vitamin C and bioflavonoids is barred.

5. In the absence of FDA approval of "new combinations," per the applications mentioned herein-after, future multicomponent dietary supplements are limited to the same stringent and unrealistic combinations decreed in 1973. A product containing Vitamin A and Vitamin D, or a product containing Vitamin C with one or more of the B Vitamins, would be barred.

6. The new regulations effectively bar the major portion of the products now sold to the American consumer and distributed by the vitamin and health foods industry.

#### EXCEPTIONS FILED

(Ed. note: Exceptions and objections to the tentative FDA regulations were filed by Mr. Dilling in mid-July. On behalf of the National Health Federation he asked for withdrawal of tentative regulations to which exception was taken, and if withdrawal is not made, that a public hearing be held to consider the objections.

(Countering the FDA claim that "there currently is no body of scientific evidence establishing that American diets are deficient in (certain vitamins and minerals)," the Dilling brief says "there is no

body of scientific evidence' establishing that American diets are not deficient in one or more of the essential nutrients in question... national diet surveys performed by various agencies of the government have not included such essential nutrients as a subject of study...")

(The brief maintains there "is no basis for excluding essential nutrients from combination dietary supplements." It challenges the logic of tentative regulations to establish "lower limits" for supplements without U.S. RDAs: "Nowhere in the tentative regulations is it explained why the lower limits of a nutrient when alone in a product would be any different than the same amount of such nutrient when in combination, since under both circumstances no 'RDA' has been established. How can anyone contend that choline, Vitamin K, and manganese are not equally essential when in combination than when in a single capsule or tablet? Thus, the entire basis for the 'lower limits' regulation is capricious to begin with...")

("It is fundamental that vitamins and minerals, among other nutrient factors, are 'foods,' not 'food additives'... The attempt to 'convert' foods into food additives is not warranted... and should be withdrawn as illegal and beyond the scope of any powers delegated to the Commissioner by Congress.")

#### APPLICATIONS TO FDA

Any "interested persons" could file, before July 12, applications for "additional formulations" other

than as decreed in 1973. These "additional formulations" comprise thousands of products currently on the market, and not meeting the restricted 1973 formulas. Such applications are required by the FDA in order to include a description of the formulations sought, a list of all vitamins and/or minerals to be included, the potency of each, an explanation of how the formulation differs from those previously decreed, together with the product name proposed. The application also must include "a statement of the nutritional or other physiological rationale which the applicant believes justifies the formulation, included with which are to be one or more affidavits by qualified experts, and/or copies of published scientific literature in support of any such rationale."

Applications also must include a "statement of any other rationale" which the applicant believes shows a "need" for the formulation. (The undersigned has been of the belief, however, that the "desire" of the consumer should prevail.) Further, by said FDA requirements, if a "consumer demand or market" is asserted, labeling for the existing product, including leaflets, shall be included, with accompanying documentation establishing "scope of the existing market," including "data on the number of units sold" and the "wholesale and retail value" involved.

Summarizing, the new FDA regulations can, if not properly met,

come all-too-close to accomplishing the long-term goal of the agency to exterminate the dietary supplement industry, in turn denying consumers "freedom of choice" as to those products they have so long desired and should be free to consume.

**Suggested Procedures:** As to products affected by the stringent new regulations, there should be a comprehensive review of same. As to products susceptible of joint action, the Food Supplement Legal Action Fund, Box 686, Monrovia, California 91016, administered for no net cost by The National Health Federation, is assembling funds from affected concerns for the purpose of providing such joint action. In turn, the Legal Action Fund will cooperate, jointly, with one or more industry groups in presentation of the applications aforesaid. As to products not susceptible of such joint action, separate applications must necessarily be in order. "Time is of the essence," obviously, and this office, can provide further information if desired.

## WATER BILLS IN WASHINGTON DIE

Three bills in the Washington state legislature dealing with the supply of "potable water for domestic, commercial and industrial use" as vital to the health and wellbeing of residents, have been killed. There was concern among NHF members that the legislation could have been used to impose fluoridation.

## Our Readers Write

# Olney Research on Aspartame 'Unscientific' Says Patrick

Editor:

In the February issue I wrote an article entitled "Are You On the Stuff?" in which I pointed out that sugar is indeed the major drug addiction of the world, and that among things I felt would be better if one must take sweeteners, is aspartame, a dipeptide of the two amino acids, aspartic acid and phenylalanine.

... Then on Page 25 of the March issue (was an article) "St. Louis Medical Prof Critical of FDA Ruling on Synthetic Sweetener," taking an entirely opposite view — and (claiming) that aspartame is a dangerous material likely to cause brain damage in young children.

The article I originally submitted to *The Bulletin* included three paragraphs (not published) which commented on evaluation of aspartame by one highly unscientific researcher, John W. Olney, M.D., of Washington School of Medicine in St. Louis. He forced concentrated aspartame powder down the throats of newly-born rats in enormous quantities within a few minutes. He then found that the substance had proved toxic to the tiny creatures.

"This was equivalent, based on the use dilution of aspartame," says Dr. (Don) Scott (of the G.D. Searle & Co. Biochemicals Division, a manufacturer seeking FDA approval of the sweetener) 'to giving

a 40-pound boy within five minutes 15 gallons of sweetened lemonade weighing 125 pounds, more than three times his own weight!

"There is probably no substance known to science which is not toxic if taken at some fantastically high level. Thus, everything considered, aspartame may be the safest way man has yet found to sweeten his food and beverages, if he must."

Dr. Olney, in concluding that use of aspartame represents a serious hazard to health, showed a special concern that the phenylalanine in the product would cause brain damage in young children who suffer from phenylketonuria (PKU). Since the two articles are diametrically opposed in their views, I have spent many additional hours to further research the subject.

I got together during a long lunch period with Dr. Richard Coch of Children's Hospital in Los Angeles. I asked him to describe PKU. "It's a genetic disease," he answered, "an inborn error of metabolism characterized by a deficiency of an enzyme that enables the body to convert the amino acid phenylalanine into another amino acid, tyrosine. This seems to interfere with formation of myelin, the sheath or covering of nerve fibers in the brain . . . Myelin formation usually is completed in the brain by age six."

## Marketing Delayed

Ed. note: G. D. Searle & Co.'s marketing of aspartame was delayed in May by the Food and Drug Administration, and the company has been asked for "further clarification" of a study submitted last October involving Diketopiperazine or DKP. The study showed microscopic evidence of an increased number of uterine polyps in rats fed intermediate-to-high levels of DKP.

Dr. Coch says only one in 15,000 children is born with PKU, and he says, in response to Dr. Olney's concern about brain damage in children, that 44 states, including California, have laws requiring testing for PKU at birth, and that in the other six states, "nearly everyone is screening, it is considered malpractice not to identify the PKUs at birth."

Dr. Coch continued: "We put the PKU babies on a special diet low in phenylalanine and they are kept on it for years. We now have a study going in which we are randomly discontinuing this diet at age six with one group and continuing another group on the diet. We believe that when we compare the two, results will show that at this age they can continue on normal diets."

Dr. Coch said that a person who eats a lot of aspartame — sugar sweetener — still might take only 100 mg. of phenylalanine a day, and one hamburger contains 5,000 mg. of phenylalanine, "so you can

see that if it were ever in the diet of a PKU child, the amount present would still be insignificant compared with countless other standard foods . . .

"I think Dr. Olney is unaware of the work being done with PKU and the progress that has occurred in this field. I'm sure he doesn't know that all PKU babies are identified by newborn screening. He is way off base simply because he is coming at it from a different field and doesn't know this particular field. Too bad he didn't have some discussion with the people familiar with this field prior to publication of his data . . ."

If one looks in a Merck's Index he will find that phenylalanine is classified as an essential amino because it cannot be produced in the human body and must be obtained from other sources. He will further find that whole egg contains 5.4%, and skimmed milk, 5.1%. Why doesn't Dr. Olney tell people that the one out of every 15,000 infants suffering from PKU should also stay away from eggs, milk and meat, even mother's milk, which could easily provide the baby with some 60 to 100 times as much phenylalanine as the infant would be likely to get from the use of aspartame as a sweetening agent? Even a 3.3-ounce jar of Gerber's baby meat can contain 1,250 or more milligrams of phenylalanine compared with the 14 mg. or so in enough aspartame to be the equivalent in sweetness of one teaspoonful of sugar . . .

Dr. Olney also maintains that (Please turn the page)

## Los Angeles Supervisors Face Law Suit in Fluoride Battle

A taxpayers' suit charging illegal use of county funds to influence a city election has been filed against the Los Angeles Board of Supervisors by a group headed by Consumer Advocate Ida Honorof who accuses Dr. Gerald L. Vale, chief of the County Dental Health Ser-

monosodium glutamate (MSG) in baby foods also has a synergistic action with aspartic acid. But aspartic acid is produced in the human body. If Dr. Olney really can show that MSG has some synergistic action with the amino being produced daily in every healthy human, he should talk about the elimination of MSG from foods consumed by young children rather than about the small amount of aspartate that might reach the child from aspartame.

But Dr. Olney's scare headline report is only one of many unscientific highly-biased conclusions such as reach the American public nearly every day of the week. For this reason I am preparing an article which shows how a substantial proportion of the great mass of research data that reaches us, often through reporters of no scientific background and/or understanding of nutrition, is seriously misleading a major segment of the population.

JAY PATRICK  
7425 Orangethorpe  
Buena Park, Calif.

VICES, with using public funds to promote fluoridation during the preelection campaign in Los Angeles.

The Board also has been asked to dismiss Dr. Vale on grounds he engaged in "questionable activities such as distributing profluoridation propaganda in various schools and libraries."

In a document served on the Board, Mrs. Honorof asked not only that Dr. Vale be fired, but that "a full accounting of all county tax monies used to promote fluoridation" be made, and the money refunded "by the principals responsible." She further demanded that Los Angeles County register with State authorities "as a committee, and supply the appropriate accounting of funds spent by the county" in the campaign.

Mrs. Honorof alleges that county funds were "illegally used to influence a city election; that the county did not register as a committee as required by city statutes for organizations spending \$500 or more to influence an issue on the ballot; that county employees spent time as representatives of county government attempting to convince city voters to vote 'yes' on Proposition F; that some of the pamphlets printed at taxpayers' expense did not carry a disclaimer as required by law; that virtually all pamphlets printed on the issue

contained fraudulent statements such as 'The California State Department of Health . . . (endorses) . . . fluoridation,' when . . . Gerald Vale knew the statement was false; and that the profluoridation propaganda was not balanced with anti-fluoridation propaganda."

The action seeks recovery of approximately \$5,000 allegedly spent by the county Department of Health Services to promote a yes vote on Proposition F, the measure to fluoridate county water. An injunction preventing a possible recurrence of such expenditures also is asked.

At a press conference in the Los Angeles Press Club Mrs. Honorof accused Director Liston A. Witherill and 110 other department officials of using taxpayer funds to encourage a favorable vote.

Mrs. Honorof disclosed a letter from Mr. Witherill stating that an attorney general's opinion held such an expenditure to be legal. A court in mid-June ruled against the Los Angeles Board of Education for using public funds in 1972 to promote an affirmative vote on Proposition 14, an initiative to try to limit property taxes.

Attorney Roger Diamond is handling the case for Mrs. Honorof.

(Ed. note: Ida Honorof's June newsletter, *Report to the Consumer*, (P. O. Box 5449, Sherman Oaks, Ca. 91403), carries a four-page postmortem of the Proposition F campaign. It includes the information that of the nearly \$29,000 reported spent, in its initial

public accounting, by proponents of fluoridation, \$3,000 was contributed by the California and Hawaiian Sugar Company, while \$16,250 came from the California Dental Association. Total spent by the National Health Federation was \$4,279.05).

### YOUR CONTRIBUTIONS TO N.H.F. GET THE JOB DONE

#### 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 Health 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."

## Although Senator Beilenson May Call It Up

# California Fluoride Bill Resting at the Moment

Senator Anthony Beilenson, author of S.B. 211, a bill calling for mandatory fluoridation of public water supplies in California, has decided to not call the bill up for consideration in the finance committee this year.

The bill passed the Senate Health Committee and was referred to Finance, of which Senator Beilenson is chairman. On June 12 Betty Franklin learned of the action and called the National Health Federation. A telephone call to Mr. Beilenson's office in Sacramento confirmed the report.

According to Administrative Assistant Dan Strauss, the bill "is not dead, it is quite possible it will be

put over until January, but conceivably it could be heard in August."

With two-year legislative sessions in California, bills introduced the first year of a session, if they clear one committee, may be considered at any time until the close of the session the second year.

Mr. Strauss said that as chairman of Finance, Senator Beilenson "is so occupied with the budget, it is his preference S.B. 211 not be heard in the immediate present, or in the immediate future, simply because his other commitments don't give him the time to devote to this bill — not that he doesn't want to, he just isn't able to. The budget is a must."

## International Congress of Sciences Meeting

Betty Lee Morales has been invited to speak at the International Congress of Sciences for Natural Medicines Sept. 11-13 in Aix en Provence, France. Topics to be discussed are acupuncture, dietetics, hydrotherapy, auriculotherapy, aromatherapy, electromagnetism, chromotherapy, iridology, phytotherapy, cancerology, nutrition, osteopathy, naturopathy and vitaminotherapy. Dr. Bernard Jensen is president of the organization. The leadership includes Ph.D.s, medi-

cal and naturopathic doctors from Germany, Malaysia, Roumania, England, Brazil, Poland and Italy. A member of the Board of Governors of the National Health Federation, Betty Lee Morales and her husband, J. T. Clark spent a month last spring in Switzerland and Germany setting up the dietary program for a natural-methods clinic being established in Germany by a group of doctors planning several such institutions.

## 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 industry, 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 devitalization 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?

## ELECTED FEDERATION OFFICERS

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 — Vice-President

Kurt W. Donsbach — Chairman of the Board of Governors and Executive Assistant to the President. Address: P.O. Box 688, Monrovia, California 91016

V. Earl Irons — Vice Chairman of the Board of Governors

## PAID FEDERATION STAFF AND THEIR FIELDS OF ACTIVITY

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

Address: 4620 Lee Highway  
Arlington, Virginia 22207  
Phone: (703) 525-3014

John Yiamouyiannis, Ph.D. — Science Director  
Address: P.O. Box 688, Monrovia, California 91016  
Phone: (213) 358-1155

Convention Bureau — Plans and coordinates all convention activities.  
Address: P.O. Box 688, Monrovia, California 91016  
Phone: (213) 358-1155

Don C. Matchan — Editor of **NHF Bulletin.**

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

212 West Foothill Boulevard

MONROVIA, CALIFORNIA 91016

Telephone (213) 358-1155

Entered as Second-class Matter

\$8.00 Membership (includes **Bulletin** subscription)

PRICE FOR ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THIS

ISSUE

50¢ each—4 for \$1.00—25 for \$5.00—40 for \$7.50—

100 for \$17.00

(Plus Delivery Charges)

PLACE  
10c STAMP  
HERE

**Every family in America should belong to the National Health Federation to —**

1. Support the principle of freedom of choice and liberty in health matters.
2. Be a part of a strong and united consumer's voice in all health matters.
3. Work for beneficial and needed health legislation and, at the same time, oppose proposals which are detrimental to the health interests of the people or which do not provide for equality of recognition of all legally established health professions.
4. Support a united effort to reduce the cost of health care.
5. Oppose insults upon our ecology which have an impact on health
6. Oppose the use of chemical food additives which have not been proved absolutely safe or which are not needed.
7. Secure fair and impartial enforcement of food and drug laws and regulations.
8. Insist that all monies raised for health research and care be used exclusively for these purposes.
9. Compel all health fund-raising organizations to disclose in an annual report, the amount of funds collected and how the funds were expended.

THESE ARE THE THINGS THE NATIONAL HEALTH FEDERATION IS ORGANIZED TO DO — JOIN ITS RANKS AND TAKE PART IN THIS VITAL EFFORT ON BEHALF OF YOURSELF AND OF ALL AMERICA.

**UPCOMING NHF CONVENTIONS**

**Midwest Regional—Sept. 26-28**  
Sheraton-Chicago—Chicago

**Northeast Regional—Nov. 22-23**  
Statler-Hilton—New York

**HELP SAVE OUR HEALTH FREEDOMS**