

THE BIG LIE

An Answer To Collier's Magazine

by
David Baxter

Columnist for the Santa Ana (California) Register, and many other Western papers

In the May 26, 1951 issue of Collier's Magazine, Bill Fay authored an article entitled: "Cancer Quacks." This was primarily an attack on the Koch Treatment.

In this leaflet are photographically reproduced six columns by David Baxter which analyzes the Collier's attack on Dr. Koch and the Koch Treatment. These columns appeared in a number of Western newspapers on the dates indicated.

(For extra copies of this leaflet, see back page at bottom)

Printed and distributed by

THE LUTHERAN RESEARCH SOCIETY, Inc.

751 East Grand Boulevard

Detroit 7, Michigan

The Big Lie

BY DAVID BAXTER

PART ONE

The big lie is said to have originated with modern dictators, one of whom is said to have remarked, "tell a lie—a big lie—the bigger the better, for if it is big enough people are more likely to believe it."



I couldn't guarantee whether or not any magazine ever adopted such a policy but I can flatly state that after years of experience with Winchells and Pearsons and the rank and file of smear artists I have at last discovered a masterpiece—the absolute in distortion, half-truth and venality.

The article "CANCER QUAKES" by Frank Fay in COLLIER'S of May, 26 is one of the cleverest jobs of taking "a little here and a little there," presenting facts about one person and then associating with them the names of others, that I have thus far come across.

The Collier's story begins logically enough by giving alleged statistics on the number of cancer quacks and other charlatans in the United States. Some personalities who may or may not be guilty of the quackery charged to them are trotted out and special emphasis is placed on the remedies concocted by one or two of them.

That, of course, is "window dressing." It gets the reader's suspicions aroused and he is then

ready to take it for granted that ANYBODY named in the story must be shady and guilty of quackery.

With the stage properly set, the writer finally gets around to his principal character, Dr. William Frederick Koch. Great care is taken not to bring the star performer before the audience until the proper atmosphere has been created—an atmosphere of fakery and exploiting of suffering people by heartless medical hucksters—or so the writer paints them. By the time he had worked up to Dr. Koch the reader has lost faith in anyone not officially approved by the American Medical Association or the Damon Runyon Cancer outfit (backed by Walter Winchell) or other self-appointed "guardians" of the public health. Even chiropractors are reflected upon by inference in the writer's singling out of chiropractor Leo Spears of Denver. "Some" cancer patients were said to have actually died at Dr. Spears' sanatorium although no mention is made of those who recovered. The article makes much of Dr. Spears' advertising, as though advertising were a crime simply because the medical monopoly frowns upon it. Incidentally, I noted how the article carefully avoids mentioning the number of people who had died under treatment by "approved" methods of the medical union. I note that it religiously skips the widely-heralded story of the little girl in Atlanta, Georgia, whose parents were told by the "approved" doctors that their daughter had eye cancer and the only hope of saving her life was to remove her eyes immediately. The Collier's story doesn't say one word about that, or the fact that the child's parents refused to permit the operation and flew the child to Mayo

Brothers, where it was discovered that SHE DIDN'T HAVE A TRACE OF CANCER.

Nothing is said about cases like that, of which there are hundreds. The "union" doctors who made the wrong diagnoses and performed well-nigh criminal operations are not "quacks" of course. They just don't know their business. If you don't know beans about your profession but belong to the right organizations, you are "ethical," and above reproach. But if you do happen to be highly efficient but do not go along with the union monopoly or "join up" you are a single hopeless patient, who would die anyway, that is proof of your "quackery." Collier's may write you up in righteous indignation, the collectivists will point accusing fingers at you and even the government can be persuaded to work you over in such a way as to give your reputation a first rate smearing.

The whole effect of the Collier's piece is to at one sweep destroy public confidence in ANY AND ALL practitioners outside the "approved" fold while at the same time to buck up the sadly lacking ethics of the union racketeers and create an aura of respectability about the heads of the big monopolies. Dr. Koch, for example, was once a professor of medicine at the University of Michigan. Yet he is called a "quack." He bucked the A. M. A. On the other hand, nothing is said of the former president of the A. M. A., "Dr." Morris Fishbein, who, it is reported, could not make higher than 48 in anatomy. "Dr." Fishbein, of course, is "ethical."

Santa Ana Register

Page B2 — Wed., May 30, 1951

The Big Lie

BY DAVID BAXTER

PART TWO

One of the things about the Collier's "cancer quack" story which proves the author guilty of theory instead of fact is the instance of one Dr. Hett.



I don't know Dr. Hett and had never heard of him prior to the Collier's quack piece, but the article says a nurse had been operated on for cancer by a surgeon.

That's a fact. She was afterward "weak, underweight and experienced severe attacks of nausea." That, too, is probably a fact. Then she underwent treatment by this Dr. Hett, supposed to be a "quack" and, to quote the story, "gradually... gained weight and strength. Within a year, she was back at work in the hospital, apparently fine, and firmly convinced that Dr. Hett's secret serum saved her life after surgery and x-ray treatments failed."

The author himself admits THAT MUCH to be FACT. But then, what does he add? "...According to medical experts she was NOT cured by Dr. Hett's serum." In other words the implication is that she was REALLY cured by the operation a year before and only imagined Dr. Hett's serum had anything to do with it.

There is where the author takes a few facts, but paints an entirely different picture by adding THEORY to them. He doesn't say who the "medical experts" were

who said the nurse was NOT cured by Hett's injection. And I am going to say right here that THERE ISN'T AN EXPERT OR AUTHORITY IN THE WORLD WHO COULD SAY POSITIVELY WHETHER OR NOT SHE WAS CURED BY THE ORIGINAL SURGERY PERFORMED ON HER. That's pure theory—or wishful thinking, if you like.

I'm not defending Dr. Hett. He may be a fake for all I know. But I do know that the claim by "experts" in the Collier's story about the nurse having been cured THEIR way is not FACT and cannot be PROVEN. How do THEY know?

That the country has many cancer and other fakers I do not doubt. And that very fact enables a slick propaganda writer to point some of them out—and by inference smear and create distrust of every health practitioner in the country who is not "approved" by the organized monopoly. It is the same technique used, for instance, by anti-semites to single out certain bad Jews who get into trouble and use them to tar and feather the whole Jewish race. The experienced smear artist will build up a scapegoat—some person he can hang something on, someone the public has it in for. Then, having worked up his devil, he will smear others he dislikes by simply associating their names with his "devil's" in an article. That's old stuff, easily detected by trained journalists.

Having carefully built up his scapegoat, even including Bernarr MacFadden, the Collier's writer finally works up to the doctor he is set to do a job on—William Frederick Koch. The fact that he recognizes Dr. Koch as his supreme target is made clear by his introductory remark, which reads, "However, the hard core of cancer quackery in this country comprises the more than 3,000 less ingenious fakers who peddle Dr.

William Frederick Koch's Glyoxylide."

THE HARD CORE. Now we begin to see what he's getting at after all the window-dressing and scapegoat-building. And we also see WHY Dr. Koch is his man—because more than 3000 DOCTORS (whom he calls "fakers") dare to defy the organized medical monopoly and union racketeers by using the Koch method. That's a lot of doctors, yet by inference every one of them is called a faker."

Once Fay gets down to business on Dr. Koch he really goes to town. Everything else is dropped like a dead cat with sore eyes. This is what the politicians behind the "ethical" health monopoly have been waiting for. They are practically drooling as Fay goes to work on the biggest rebel since Pasteur and only slightly ahead of the non-conformist Sister Kenny. Get Koch and other independents are likely to see the light and fall into line like obedient union members. Smear a few doubtful practitioners, give facts about real quackery, then bring Koch's name in, mix it around with theirs, and the job is about accomplished—or so the master-minds THEORIZE. By all means create distrust, at the very least.

Of course, as is usually the case, over-cleverness almost always defeats itself. The best-laid plans sometimes go awry and there are times when an article such as Collier's can have a terrific backfire.

I shall now undertake to give you some facts. You can compare them with the Collier's tale and you can be the judge of just how truthful the article is.

Santa Ana Register

Page C2—Thurs., May 31, 1951

The Big Lie

BY DAVID BAXTER

PART THREE

The COLLIER'S article on Dr. Koch quotes Oliver Field, "a former Federal Food and Drug agent," as calling the Koch treatment "the answer to a quack's prayer." But isn't it noteworthy that this same Oliver Field is now the head of The American Medical Association's Bureau of Investigation? Besides



that, I might ask, just what does a supposedly private organization like the A.M.A. need with a bureau of investigation? Or does the A.M.A. imagine itself to be a sort of super government over the health of the nation? It is undoubtedly a trade union and, like most trade unions, seems to assume to itself the authority to "protect" not only its own members but the public as well. The individual is presumed to be unable to decide for himself what service he wants to pay for or who he wants to pay for it. He needs a "guardian," a "brother's keeper."

Admitting that Dr. Koch really is a doctor, the article then points out that he was once tried on Federal Trade Commission charges, although no mention is made of who put the FTC up to do the job. After recounting some of the worst-sounding of the government's arguments, writer Fay gets around to reluctantly admitting that after a couple of trials the government dropped its charges.

Why was this done, if the government, with unlimited funds, had any kind of a clear, provable case against Dr. Koch?

Next, the story takes up the Christian Medical Research League, which has championed the Koch treatment. Nothing really tangible is pinned on the League but one of its leaders, Dr. Sam Swain, is made the target of much ridicule. At one point the writer says "a spokesman for the Akron Ministerial Association has described Swain as 'an itinerant preacher with a low rating of respectability in the community.'" The alleged "spokesman" isn't named and no definition of "respectability" is given but the clear implication is that Swain is a sort of low-down character.

Quoting Swain on Dr. Koch, Fay records him as saying, "He's developed some marvelous new drugs. He's got a cure for hypertension that has everything else beat a mile, and he's got another one that's a sure cure for sterility. We've tried it on about 20 married couples here in Detroit and every one of them's had a baby inside 10 months. We tried the same stuff on a bull everybody thought was too old and he was back 'in service' in 18 hours."

Fay made no attempt to refute Swain or to show that his claims were false. Instead, he simply describes the evangelist as "dark, balding, fiftyish, sharp-featured," thus attempting to create his own impression in the reader's mind. In fact, I was surprised by the lack of any tangible proof or reasonable suspicion of actual wrongdoing in the Collier's story and the clever substitution of innuendo implication and ridicule. In an article of such length one would at least expect to find a solid fact of law-breaking or quackery or something

tangible with which to accuse Dr. Koch. Yet, I failed to find one single instance, one single fact of any falsehood or wrongdoing or fakery on Koch's part.

Failing that, Fay mentions some convention held by Koch's "disciples," as he called them, attended by many doctors from various areas. I can't for the life of me see anything wrong with that.

And then, vainly seeking some means of embarrassing Dr. Koch and his treatment, Fay eventually gets around to a subject that is "old stuff" to many of us but which Fay seized upon with all the glee of a cackling old hen who has scratched up a choice morsel from the manure pile. He found out somewhere that Rev. A. C. Wahl, father of Dr. Albert Wahl and Rev. John Wahl, both strong Koch treatment backers, had died of cancer. Rev. Wahl died two years ago.

Of course the Collier's writer didn't mention that Rev. Wahl had never taken the Koch treatment—nor that "approved" doctors had told Rev. Wahl that he was in perfect condition until too late, when an exploratory operation showed him to be loaded with cancer.

Fay also reported the deaths of Dr. Albert Wahl and his sister, Mrs. Marion Lyons, both of whom died of cancer. But he does not give the true circumstances of their passing, so I am going to do so. In our next column I will give you a signed statement I have from John F. Wahl of Pasadena, California, the brother of Dr. Albert Wahl and Mrs. Lyons and a strong backer of Dr. Koch.

SANTA ANA REGISTER
Friday, June 1, 1951

The Big Lie

By DAVID BAXTER

PART FOUR

Having promised you a statement by John F. Wahl, an active backer of Dr. William Frederick Koch's treatment, here it is:

May 19, 1951
Collier's says that my brother, the late Dr. Albert L. Wahl, died of leukemia, and infers, therefore, that the Koch treatment has no therapeutic value. But they do not tell the rest of the story. They do not say that Dr. Wahl, who was graduated from McGill University School of Medicine with the degrees of Doctor of Medicine and Master of Surgery, and who was a Flight Surgeon, serving the 22nd Transport Group in its epic flights over the Hump from India to China, was injured so severely when his plane exploded in mid air and he fell 500 feet without a parachute, that no one gave him a chance to live.

They say nothing of the fact that it was a miracle that he did live and was able to resume a limited practice even though his lungs were filled with scar tissue as a result of the heat of the explosion which he endured and which had killed all the other passengers and crew members of the flight. They do not say that it was while he was so physically disabled he contracted severe pneumonia, and that while in this condition so close to death that there was not left in him enough vital energy to fight any disease, that he contracted leukemia and died.

Collier's also says that my father, the late Rev. A. C. Wahl, who



was much interested in the work of Dr. Koch, died of cancer, and infers, therefore, that the Koch treatment has no therapeutic value. BUT THEY FAIL TO MENTION THAT MY FATHER NEVER HAD THE KOCH TREATMENT. They also fail to mention the circumstances of his death. They do not mention that the "best" medical doctors and pathologists of one of Pittsburgh's finest hospitals, after giving my father every conceivable test for cancer they knew, conclusively affirmed that he absolutely and beyond a shadow of a doubt HAD NO CANCER. But when they opened him for exploratory surgery, as the chief surgeon told me, they almost "fell over dead" at the great mass of cancer they discovered.

They do not say that when it had thus been determined that my father was in the very terminal stages of the disease, and they admitted that they could do absolutely nothing for him, that they would not under any circumstances give the family permission to have a recognized medical doctor administer the Koch treatment while father was in the hospital. He passed away before he could be dismissed, NEVER HAVING HAD THE TREATMENT, although Collier's Magazine would scarcely be interested in the whole truth about that.

Collier's says that my late sister, Mrs. Marion Lyons, passed away in February of 1951 with lymphosarcoma and infers, therefore, that the Koch treatment has no therapeutic value. But they do not tell that in 1946 she was already then in the last stages of the disease, having been examined by biopsy at one of Pittsburgh's finer hospitals, and having been given only a few weeks to live by all who examined her at that time. They do not say that a miracle was recorded when after the administration of the treatment her life, under God, was lengthened by almost FIVE YEARS.

during which time she cared for her fine family and gave birth to a healthy child. And this, in spite of the fact that she did not closely follow the necessary dietary regulations of the treatment.

If Collier's had been interested in the truth, they would have come to us and asked about these things, but it seems that there are those who, for the purpose of selling a few more magazines through sensationalism, find that half truths serve their purpose much better than the whole truth.

I have known Doctor Koch for some years. I admire him as one of the world's great scientists, even as did the late Dr. Willard H. Dow, former president of the Dow Chemical Company, when he wrote: "... I consider him (Dr. Koch) one of the outstanding scientists in the medical profession, and he is so far ahead of the thinking of his profession that he is naturally being ridiculed somewhat". In the words of Doctor William J. Hale, world-renowned chemist: "Doctor William Frederick Koch is the Modern Pasteur".

Over a period of years I have known many sincere doctors who have used the treatment with exceptional results. I have personally seen unbelievable things happen in the field of small animal experimentation work.

It is significant that, although there are many who would have been glad to co-operate with Collier's in finding the truth about Glyoxylide disposition on the part of Collier's representatives to investigate the matters about which they proposed to write. They completely ignored all the scientific evidence which was offered them.

John F. Wahl

Santa Ana Register

Page 24 — Sun., June 3, 1951

The Big Lie

By DAVID BAXTER

PART FIVE

Having given you an analysis of the Collier's attack on Dr. William F. Koch and likewise having presented a signed statement I secured from John F. Wahl, a Koch treatment backer and a Lutheran minister who was named in the Collier's cancer quack article, I should like to present some more evidence before closing this subject.



I have a copy of a letter written by Dr. W. A. Dewey, for many years an honored official of the University of Michigan and who trained Dr. Koch in his early days. This letter was written by Dr. Dewey to Dr. Koch and had to do with an odd "investigation" the Wayne County (Mich.) Medical Society made of the Koch treatment. Among other things, Dr. Dewey wrote to Koch:

"For a studied intent to falsify, a premeditated determination to condemn everything, and an unscientific, un-American assumption to be judge, jury and prosecuting witnesses, the report of this so-called committee outstrips in bias, unfairness and mendacity anything that it has ever been my lot to observe in a medical practice of forty-four years. The frankness with which you presented these cases, giving the committee all

the details and referring them to original records and family physicians, showed your honest desire to have an honest investigation of your method."

After pointing out that the committee which "investigated" Koch was mostly made up of radium and X-ray "experts" whose methods Koch disagreed with, Dr. Dewey continued, "The greatest American authority on cancer is doubtless Dr. L. Duncan Bulkley, senior surgeon of the New York Skin and Cancer Hospital. He has probably seen and treated more cases, ten times more than has been seen or treated by the combined membership of this 'official' committee. Dr. Bulkley declares first that cancer is not a surgical disease and that neither surgery, x-ray or radium have changed in any way whatever the ultimate mortality of cancer in forty years. It was 90% in 1884. It is 92% in 1924. This is the result of surgery, x-ray and radium treatment."

Later on in his letter to Koch, Dr. Dewey comments, "I hope that some day your treatment will have an investigation before a body of seekers after the truth."

Perhaps Collier's would like to tell us that Dr. Koch had fooled such men as Dewey and Bulkley!

Next Collier's makes much of the claim by Koch's enemies and some A.M.A. "experts" who testified for the government at Koch's trial that his Glyoxylide formula was simply distilled water.

Oh yes, there is no doubt about that. But what about THE CHEMICAL COMPOSITIONS added to the distilled water? Why was nothing said about that? In fact, this distilled water claim was so damaging that the Dow Chemical Co., one of the largest chemical corpor-

ations in the world, felt that its own integrity was being attacked by such a claim BECAUSE DOW'S TOP CHEMISTS THEMSELVES HAD ANALYZED DR. KOCH'S GLYOXYLIDE. Dr. Willard Dow himself wrote Koch a glowing letter about the Glyoxylide discovery and I have a copy of that letter.

I also have a copy of a letter written by James V. Sheridan of Dow Chemical to Dr. D. H. Arnott, M.D. dated April 21, 1947 in which Mr. Sheridan corroborates the testimony for the chemistry of Glyoxylide. In one place he writes, "We had observed that certain chemical structures within the molecule appeared to be the center of desirable catalytic effects. Naturally we were interested when we discovered that Dr. Wm. F. Koch of Detroit was using certain chemicals containing these structures and on the same theoretical basis."

Expressing amazement over an article in the A.M.A. publication which said that most of Koch's chemistry was "pure nonsense" and that some of the structures were "incomprehensible," Mr. Sheridan writes, "Our chemists leaned over backwards in their proofs in order that we might protect the good name of Dow from such a vigorous assault."

Mr. Sheridan then goes into details concerning the ingredients of Glyoxylide and presents the claims of Koch's enemies whom he refutes by plain chemical facts.

Santa Ana Register

Page B2 Mon., June 4, 1951

The Big Lie

By DAVID BAXTER

PART SIX

After shooting to shreds the claim that Koch's Glyoxylide was only distilled water, Mr. Sheridan



of Dow Chemical wrote, "The Dow chemists who took part in this program testified at the Koch trial held in the spring of 1946 in Detroit. It is significant that NO Rebuttal Testimony Was Offered By The Government."

I should say not. The government dropped the Koch case like a scorching hot potato.

Concerning the statements made in the Collier's "quack" story about the Koch chemical being so diluted that it couldn't have much, if any effect, I have secured expert testimony by a man universally known as one of the greatest research authorities in American history, Dr. William J. Hale. Dr. Hale had this to say: "Of outstanding effect here is the extreme dilution at which these antibiotic agents appear to function best. No one ever dreamed of such dilutions till penicillin made its entrance upon the stage of medicine, and here 1 part to 32,000,000 is nothing out of the ordinary. Dr. Koch has merely stepped up this dilution some thousandfold when ideal results were found to arise."

Furthermore, says Dr. Hale, "Just as Pasteur identified the microscopic organisms that led to plant disease so Koch identifies the chemical agents that are cap-

able of combatting the work on these micro-organisms. Of course, Koch is the recipient of anathema aplenty heaped upon him by those unversed in organic chemistry and biochemistry and unwilling to learn from the clinical records of patients cured; even as was Pasteur in his day. There is, however, no need to be further concerned about the critics. The honored doctor has progressed so far that hundreds of physicians in this country have adopted his methods of treatment."

Another thing I would like to point out is that the A. M. A. publication's attack on Dr. Koch mentioned in our last column said that his chemistry was "incomprehensible." That means it can't be comprehended or understood. But, just because it may be "incomprehensible" to the A. M. A. or to Collier's doesn't mean that no one else can understand it. If, as the A. M. A. itself admits, it can't comprehend Koch's chemistry, then how in the world can it prove that Glyoxylide is no good? I don't understand botany but there are probably people who do. Who am I to set myself up as an authority that botany is a fake just because I don't comprehend it? The Dow chemical people and others seem to understand Koch's chemistry quite well.

In past articles I've already presented dozens of factual cases of cures and great improvements in people who took one of the Koch treatments for their specific cases. Besides, I have the full reports of authorities where Koch discoveries were used in experimentation on cattle and other animals, including the official report of the Department of Agriculture of the province of British Columbia, Canada, where wholesale experiments were carried out over a long period of time. The reports not only proved beyond any reasonable doubt the value of Dr. Koch's chemical assistance in helping nature repair

its own damage, but actually waxed enthusiastic. You can't laugh that off. A sick and dying cow doesn't get well by mental suggestion or distilled water or quack remedies.

For another thing, there are failures, just as there are always bound to be failures in any branch of healing. No one denies that. But why point to a few failures when there are so many successes? Even Collier's admits the testimony of a Franciscan nun about what Glyoxylide and the following treatment did for her, except that Collier's apparently didn't approve of witnesses being allowed to tell a court about their cases.

Besides talking to people taking the Koch treatment who sometimes drop in at my newspaper desk, I took the treatment myself. My blood pressure was around 70. The other day I had it checked and it was slightly over 90. Not bad, eh? Just a matter of helping nature help itself. I have also talked to people who have been benefitted greatly by Sister Kenny's therapy, by chiropractic and osteopathy, depending upon their cases. I am firmly convinced that there is good in various branches of the healing arts and I am likewise convinced that one of the worst things in the world is to permit any particular group of practitioners or unions or monopolies to get a strangle hold on the health market and use government as a bludgeon to knock out all competition.

The Collier's article in effect blasphemizes any and all healers not "approved" by so-called experts and monopolists. On the contrary I would say, "Let freedom ring"

Santa Ana Register

Page 84 Tues., June 5, 1951

Santa Ana Register Baxter's Views

BY DAVID BAXTER

**Southern California's Most
Consistent Newspaper**

We believe that one truth is always consistent with another truth. We endeavor to be consistent with the truths expressed in such great moral guides as the Golden Rule, the Ten Commandments and the Declaration of Independence.

Should we, at any time, be inconsistent with these truths, we would appreciate anyone pointing out to us how we are inconsistent with these moral guides.

Page B2 — Mon., July 30, 1951

Published daily and Sunday by the Freedom Newspapers Inc., Santa Ana, California. Entered in Santa Ana Post Office as second class matter. TELEPHONE Kimberly 2-6282; before 7:30 a.m. and after 7:30 p.m. Sundays and holidays call Circulation Dept. Kimberly 3-6090; Classified Advertising Dept. Kimberly 3-6105; Display Advertising Dept. Kimberly 3-6253; Editorial Dept. Kimberly 3-6380. Harbor Area — Harbor 711 or Harbor 712. Absorbed Times 1930. Journal 1938.
SUBSCRIPTION RATES in Orange county by Carrier or mail \$1.00 per month, \$9.60 for 6 months, \$19.20 per year. Outside Orange County \$1.85 per month, \$11.10 for 6 months, \$22.20 per year. Single copy daily 5c Sunday, 10c.

MEMBER AUDIT BUREAU
OF CIRCULATION

MORE CONFUSION ON THE HILL

The Pseudo economists on Capitol Hill, at the White House and at the Federal Reserve Board are privately agreeing—on what most of the nation has been sure of for some time—that they're confused and uncertain whether there'll be a new round of inflation during the next half-year or whether the price lull will go on.

One sign of this confusion among Mr. Truman's cronies will show up when the three man Council of Economic Advisers makes its annual mid-year report to the President.

The President's "three wise men" outline every July, for Mr. Truman's use, just what they think the economic state of the nation is, and predict what they think is probably in store for the months to come.

In that prediction they'll talk about more inflation. But they'll evade saying when this new wave of inflation will start.

Another indication of the uncertainty in Washington about the price outlook shows up in the Federal Reserve Board's decision to shelve for the time being a proposal it was about to make to Congress for fighting inflation.

The board spent months preparing an elaborate request for

KOCH TREATMENT

"The Koch treatment," a widely-known chemist told me the other day, "is absolutely worthless. It's just so much distilled water."

"But is there anything else in it?" I asked.

"Yes, but it's so diluted that it couldn't have any therapeutic value. The GOVERNMENT says it's no good. I was back there at Koch's trial."



"Have you analyzed it yourself?"

"No, but I know a chemist who has and he is absolutely reliable."

"The government, of course, isn't infallible in its pronouncements. It wasn't infallible when it allowed John Rogge and a bunch of Reds to bring me to trial and try to frame me several years ago. I understand it dropped the Koch case like a hot potato, too."

"Yes, it did, but with good cause. Nevertheless, the best chemists in the country will tell you that Koch's treatment hasn't any cancer-cure value."

"Like Dr. William Hale, for example," I ventured. "As the top chemist for Dow Chemical he is supposed to be quite an authority. He says the Koch idea IS good. He even called Dr. Koch himself 'a modern Pasteur' and pointed out that diluting the active agents makes it all the better, just as penicillin is often diluted 32,000 times."

The conversation went on in a good-natured way for some time but I couldn't help but feel that nothing had definitely been PROVEN against Dr. Koch. I had a fine chemist's opinion against him (although he admitted he hadn't analyzed it himself) but then I also had the opinions of fine chemists for him. In a case where a patient hasn't responded to other methods, I see no harm in trying it. If I were a doctor, rather than pronounce a patient "hopeless" I would at least figure, "well, the regular way hasn't worked. I'll try the thing, anyway. If it works it works, if it doesn't the patient was already incurable."

Another evidence of a reasonable attitude on the part of some top medical men came recently at Houston, Tex. when Dr. Fred Steward, pathologist of Memorial Hospital, New York, in the annual Bertner Lecture said (according to the nation will do about

the Houston Post):

"Throughout medical history there are documented instances where well developed cancers have spontaneously diminished or vanished—leaving the patient normal. If science could find the nature of this natural control within the body it would have gone a long way toward finding an answer to cancer."

Bless Bess! I was surprised upon reading that. Dr. Stewart even gave many case histories to support what he said. Why, that is exactly what Koch and others have been saying right along, except that their statements were not carried in much of the press because of the medical union's boycott of the ex-Michigan University medical professor.

Dr. Koch started right out on the belief that nature has its own way of curing disease and that since the cause of disease — not only cancer but many other diseases — lies in the body because something is not hitting on all its cylinders, likewise, the cure must be found by repairing what is causing the disturbance, just as you fix a balky auto engine.

In this connection Koch believed it wise to find out what the "oxidation" chemistry of the body is and when it breaks down, for one reason or another, to "step it up" by injecting the natural chemicals. Help nature to help itself, in other words. Don't cut out the cancer and leave the cause. Get the cause. The diet that goes along with the "shots" keeps the system free from being loaded with toxics while the chemistry is taking effect.

It probably isn't perfect, by any means, but doctor after doctor seems to be arriving at the same conclusion Koch did, as we note in Dr. Stewart's speech. Obviously, these men are more sincere and interested in helping people get rid of disease than in playing medical and drug politics. More power to them. It seems to me that some good is going to come of this whether or not Koch ever receives honors and recognition for his preliminary work, plus his theory.

Watching truth gradually spread out and "take hold" is very gratifying to those who respect it.