

## HOW THE SENATE INVESTIGATED CANCER UNDER SENATOR HARRIS' DIRECTION

by  
Annie Riley Hale

In March, 1930, there was staged at Washington, D.C., under the aegis of the Federal Government, a very remarkable and somewhat grotesque performance officially designated as a "Senate Cancer Hearing". It was held pursuant to a resolution introduced into the U.S. Senate in the closing days of the previous session by the Hon. Wm. J. Harris, of Georgia, which read as follows:

"Resolved, that the Commerce Committee or a sub-committee thereof is authorized and directed to make a thorough investigation of the means and methods whereby the Federal Government may aid in discovering a successful and practical cure for cancer, and to report to Congress as soon as practicable the results of such investigation, together with its recommendations for legislation and appropriations".

On the face of it, this Harris Cancer Resolution appears a praiseworthy act, designed to aid suffering humanity and bring hope to the hopeless. However, if this were its real purpose, we would naturally expect the investigating committee - of which Senator Harris was chairman - to avail itself of every potential contribution to the subject of its inquiry, to listen to all intelligent opinions and theories - seeing that nobody knows anything about it - and give respectful audience to any witness bringing proper credentials and having a straightforward tale to tell -- would we not?

And when, as it actually transpired, this so-called "investigating" Senate Commerce Committee would hear only one set of witnesses and one side of the cancer argument - the so-called "local theory" - and absolutely refused to admit the testimony of exponents of the constitutional or blood theory of cancer - although among them are numbered some of the most eminent medical authorities of all times and all countries, then what are we to think of this ostensibly "thorough investigation" of the cancer problem by Congress, instituted by Senator Harris and conducted under his personal direction?

It may shed some light on the puzzle-picture of the Senate Committee's action to state that the most conspicuous supporters and zealous propagandists for the local theory of cancer in this country are a powerful clique of surgeons and radiologists calling themselves the "American Society for the Control of Cancer", and that these completely dominated the "Senate Cancer Hearings" in Washington.

There is a grim irony in the name of this organization, in that every year since its inception in New York City in May, 1913, there has been a steady rise in both the incidence and death-rate from cancer which in the past ten years has climbed from fourth to second place in the disease column in the United States under this Society's "control" of the situation! The present yearly death-toll from cancer in this country is 125,000, according to the latest Census returns.

But if the "Society for Control" cannot justify its name in the control of cancer, it can and does very effectually control the line of talk about it that gets out to the public. Hence the average person never heard of the constitutional theory of the disease, although it is backed by common sense, physiological law, and some of the most eminent names in the medical profession. Moreover, treatment of cancer on this basis - detoxicating the system and building up the blood on a normal basis without the use of surgery or cautery - has yielded much better results than the local remedies which can promise nothing except recurrence.

Yet wherever this has been attempted, the iron hand of the medico-surgical trust has promptly intervened to put the blood-theorists out of business and close the channels of publicity to their preachments. Proofs of this are abundant and concrete but space forbids more than one or two instances. There was the case of the venerable Dr. L. Duncan Bulkley, founder of the New York Skin and Cancer Hospital and one of the conspicuous exponents of the blood theory of cancer, who was thrown out of his own hospital that he had devoted 40 years of his life to up-building, and was expelled from the Americal Society for Cancer Research, of which he had been a life-long member - and all because of his temerity in calling the public's attention to the futility of surgery and radium in cancer treatment and proving his contention by official figures!

The San Francisco ARGONAUT, in its March 1, 1930, issue, related two instances of private sanitariums - one in West Virginia and one in Illinois - where cancer was being successfully treated without surgery, which were closed up and put out of commission by the A.M.A. for the sole reason that they were helping cancer patients to get well without any assistance from the surgeons and radiologists.

When we consider in this connection that these gentlemen reap a harvest of over 80 million dollars a year from cancer operations alone - exclusive of hospital

bills and physicians' attendance; consider it further in the light of Dr. Francis Carter Wood's illuminating remark that, "If cancer is a blood disease, then no operation can reach it"; the surgeon's hostility to the constitutional view of cancer will surprise no one who recognizes the principle of "economic determinism" as operative in the doctor business as in any other.

This was very clearly brought out in the testimony of the two California professors, who came to tell the Senate Committee about their new discovery with the "sheep extract" treatment for cancer. Their method of administering it - by subcutaneous injection - is predicated, of course, on the constitutional nature of the disease; and in the beginning, medical officialdom, sensing the danger to the surgical preserves in this, very sharply condemned the California "experimenters". A California senator's presence on the "Cancer Investigating Committee" was probably responsible for bringing the Berkeley "experimenters" to Washington, they and their "cure" having also obtained considerable newspaper notoriety which made it difficult to ignore them in the ostensible Senate investigation. By the time they arrived in Washington, however, the "big guns" from the "Society for Control" had been brought into position also - Bloodgood from Johns Hopkins, Ewing and Little from New York - to sternly silence any impertinent intimation that sheep-extract could ever take the place of surgery and radium.

The Californians had evidently been properly coached before going on the witness stand - as appeared from Senator Copeland's purring introduction and endorsement of them, Copeland being peculiarly qualified for the task by reason of his New York experiences with Public Health boards and Civil Service Reform leagues - and under the lynx-eyed vigilance of these high priests of official medicine, they were as meek as the docile animal from which they claimed to have extracted their "cure". They stoutly denied ever having claimed to have found a "cure", said they were "only experimenting", and never had they injected the sheep potion except into the patients "bringing certificates from their physicians that the case was inoperable" - in other words about to die anyway, and the evidence they brought of the value of their treatment in destroying cancerous growths had been obtained from autopsies!

Thus when it was established that the California "discovery" was not to enter into competition with surgery and radium, peace and good fellowship reigned between the discoverers and the "Society for Control"; but Dr. Wm. F. Koch of Detroit - and

one-time professor of medicine in the Michigan Medical School - who also had made a discovery and perfected a remedy for cancer based on the constitutional nature of the disease, met a very different reception when he asked to appear before the Senate Commerce Committee "investigating" cancer. Both he and his Washington representative, Dr. Elnora Folkmar, were curtly denied audience before the Committee, and Dr. Folkmar for 30 years a practicing physician of the District of Columbia, a highly esteemed and estimable lady, was forced to resign from the Washington Medical Society because of her espousal of the Koch method. The annoyance and worry consequent upon this persecution undoubtedly contributed to Dr. Folkmar's death a short time ago. However, Dr. Koch, unlike the California experimenters, not only claimed his treatment could supplant and supersede surgery and radium, but that it had proven its superiority to them in actual operation, and this was an unforgivable offence in the eyes of the dominant element at the "Cancer Hearing" in Washington.

The suppressive tactics and dog-in-the-manger attitude of the surgical clique in the cancer business is understandable from the economic viewpoint, if one holds that doctors are no better than other people, but why should the Federal Government, acting through the United States Senate, lend itself to a farcical "investigation" whose outcome was prearranged, to open the United States Treasury to a group of self-centered and self-seeking bigots who had not changed their cancer technique in 3000 years?

Their star prescriptions today - cutting and burning - were used in cancer practice when Babylon was young and the Shepherd Kings ruled Egypt; and if they could not find out anything different and better in all these centuries, it seems a fair inference that they are either too stupid to learn or that they do not want anything different - and the latter is the obvious answer.

Some one explained Senator Harris' attitude by saying that his brother, a surgeon in Birmingham, is a prominent member of the "American Society for the Control of Cancer" - propaganda; but the explanation does the Georgia senator little credit. Exploiting the public to aid private business is bad enough when the exploitation is aimed at the pocketbook only, but where human lives are at stake it is much more despicable.

The two theories of the origin and nature of cancer are diametrically

opposed to each other and mutually exclusive. Whoever believes in one cannot believe the other and the senators on that Committee had a perfect right to give their faith as individuals to the "local theory" of the disease and the efficacy of the local remedies - if that view appealed to them. But it is unthinkable that a group of public officials, sitting as a deliberative, investigating body on a matter of such vital concern to the public and involving the expenditure of public funds, should refuse to listen to the exponents of both theories of cancer and give their findings to the public.

The only witness for the blood theory of cancer and for constitutional treatment at that hearing was a lay research worker, an intelligent, educated woman who had given much time to the study of cancer literature; and she was not permitted to testify before the full Committee nor in the presence of the surgeons and radiologists who were the preferred witnesses. She was given a private hearing on a separate day before the chairman alone and a group of outside spectators interested in the subject. She was permitted to speak for 20 minutes, at the end of which she was interrupted by the chairman, who would neither at her request nor that of a government official in her audience agree to accept the remainder of her statement for incorporation in the printed official report.

Later it developed that no part of this lady's testimony was included in the complete report of the Committee Hearings, as no stenographer was present to take down even what she was permitted to speak. Probably she would not have been heard at all, except that she represented ten organizations which had requested it, and was also the sister of an influential citizen of Georgia in a year when Senator Harris was seeking re-election. However, the manner of her appearance before the Committee and the refusal to print her testimony in the official report completely nullified the purpose of it, of course.

Hence it transpired that no hint of anything but the local theory of cancer and the alleged superiority of local remedies - surgery and radium - leaked out to the public from the much advertised "Senate Cancer Hearing"; and the net result of it was to hand out from the public treasury an initial \$100,000 - with a promise of millions to follow - to the "American Society for Control", to enable it to go on battenning on the miseries of the cancer-stricken in the future as it has in the past.

For some reason or other newspapers throughout the country devote a great deal of space to proclaiming what the American Society for the Control of Cancer is doing for the public in the treatment of that disease. Just why this free publicity is given to that Society no one seems to know, for certainly the results obtained by it in the control of cancer are pitiful and in no wise warrant such favorable consideration by the newspapers as a whole. This Society steadfastly advocates that the only proper methods of treatment for cancer are surgery, radium and x-ray. Let us see what has been accomplished. The Society was organized in 1913, at which time the death rate from cancer was 89.5 per 100,000 population. In 1926, after thirteen years of the methods of treatment advocated by the Society, the death rate from cancer had risen to 114.5 per 100,000 population, an increase of approximately 30%. These figures were compiled by Frederick L. Hoffman, Statistician for the Prudential Life Insurance Company, who introduced his figures with the statement: "The cancer record for 1926 is a dismal indictment of the failure of modern efforts to check the ravages of this dreadful affliction". The figures compiled at the end of 1928 show no change for the better.

The reason for this failure is obvious. Cancer has been treated by the surgeon and the radiologist as strictly a local disease and their treatment is based solely on the belief that the destruction or removal of the growth affects a cure. And this notwithstanding the fact that in case after case there is a recurrence of the growth in the same place or in some other part of the body. No account seems to have been taken of the fact that whatever caused the growth to come into existence in the first instance had never been removed or destroyed.

Happily the cancer picture is now becoming a little brighter, thanks to the fact that there are men in the medical profession who give thought to other matters than butchering or burning. It has long been felt by the best minds in the research field that cancer never was a local disease but rather a systemic or constitutional disease. Dr. Aldred Warthin, pathologist at the University of Michigan, has become convinced of this fact and recently stated: "Cancer is not simply a local disease. We know now that it is primarily a disease of the entire organism. The general constitutional predisposition determines whether an individual can have cancer, its particular site is the organ or tissue which is

most susceptible. The predisposition of the cancer proper is probably inherited". Mlle. Nadine Zadansky, an associate of Mme. Curie, stated in an address recently in New York: "I believe, so far as my experiments give evidence, that the constitutional factor plays a large part in cancer".

In 1919 Dr. William F. Koch, of Detroit, brought out his antitoxin treatment for this disease, a treatment devised solely on the theory that cancer could not possibly be anything but constitutional in its nature, that the disease itself was a poison in the bloodstream and that the growth was simply evidence of the disease. Dr. Koch's foundation work-for this discovery was his previous discovery of the function of the parathyroid glands, a research work that proved conclusively that the parathyroid glands were glands of internal secretion existing solely for the purpose of immunization against the guanidin poisons which exist in every person's body.

Dr. Koch's results in thus treating cancer as a constitutional disease have been remarkable and in no small way have helped to bring about the change of opinion as to the nature of cancer.

Wood  
stated