

THE POWER OF THE A.M.A. AND ITS JOURNAL

In the mid-nineteenth century, the failure of "Heroic Medicine", as practiced by the allopathic physicians in America, was slowly being replaced by homeopathy, a new and more scientific philosophy of medicine that had its origin in Germany. At about this same time, the allopathic doctors formed their first national medical organization, the American Medical Association, in an attempt to upgrade their own medical standards and to establish their own code of ethics. Their newly developed code of ethics contained a "Consultation Clause" which clause prohibited any AMA allopathic physician from consulting with and/or associating with an unapproved form of medicine including homeopathy. This condemnation of the homeopathy was later expanded to include any other unapproved theory of medicine and/or form of treatment including osteopathic and chiropractic medicine. The AMA could also control the medications used by licensed allopathic physicians by black-listing an unapproved medication. Through the power of the Journal of the AMA, it could and did exert pressure, not only upon its own members to keep them in line, but also upon medical schools, hospitals and governmental agencies to force them to follow its dictates.

Over the years, the AMA could and did bar state licensed allopathic physicians from using the AMA approved hospitals when it found out that this allopathic physician was using some other forms of treatment or medication that the AMA had not approved. In practice, the AMA also used its power in several states, through its state and local societies, to cause a physician to put his medical license in jeopardy and/or lose his license to practice medicine when that physician used a method of treatment that had been disapproved by and/or that had been "Black-listed" by the policies of the AMA. As an example, the use of Dr. Koch's medications by a licensed physician was considered proper grounds for the local and state medical societies to go after a license allopathic physician and to try to take his license to practice medicine away.

Not only were licensed doctors at the mercy of the American Medical Association and its state and local societies, but also politicians could be and were under their influence. If a politician did not follow the dictates, of the AMA, that politician could be voted out of office through the political spending and efforts of the local AMA societies. As for example:

The following article appeared in the New York Times.

In 1950 the A.M.A. lobby spent approximately \$2,500,000. and distributed 43,000,000 pieces of literature in the campaign against so-called 'socialized medicine.' This placed it at the top of lobbies reporting to Congress." Also "Former Representative Andrew J. Biemiller of Wisconsin calls it "the most massive and heavily financed lobby in the country." He

was beaten in the 1950 elections, and the A.M.A. accepts partial responsibility for the fact that he no longer is in Congress.¹

On November 14, 1951 the New York Times also printed the following article which illustrated the power of the American Medical Association.

ILLINOIS U. Vice President Censured in Ethics Case

Special in The New York Times

CHICAGO, Nov. 13 — Dr. Andrew C. Ivy, noted physiologist and vice president in charge of the professional schools of the University of Illinois, was found guilty tonight of unethical conduct and ordered suspended from the Chicago Medical Society for three months for the part he played in introducing Krebiozen, the controversial cancer drug.

The verdict was reached at a meeting of the society's council. Dr. Ivy appeared before the tribunal to plead his own defense, but what he said was not disclosed to reporters, who were barred from the hearing.²

These are but a few examples of the many ways the officials of the American Medical Association have acted to accomplish their goal. It can act as prosecutor, judge and jury when a licensed physician and medical researcher steps out of line and does not agree with the dictates of the official A.M.A. policies. The Yale Law Journal's³ eighty four page report on the A.M.A. included the editors criticism and praise of the A.M.A., mostly criticism. On page 1018 the following statement was made:

Limitations on AMA Power

No other voluntary association commands such power within its area of interest as does the AMA. It holds a position of authority over the individual doctor, wields a determining voice in medical education, controls the conditions of practice, and occupies a unique position of influence in shaping governmental health policies. Despite the dangers inherent in such a concentration of power, no interest group enjoys more freedom from formal control than organized medicine. The individual physician, subjected to disciplinary authority of the medical society in his local community, has little redress outside the framework of organized medicine. Courts, comparing society membership to affiliation in fraternal or benevolent organizations, find that expulsion or denial of membership deprives the doctor of no property rights, and are reluctant to interfere unless the society's own prescribed formalities were not observed. Even if the scope of judicial review encompassed an examination of the merits, and resulted in admission or reinstatement of unreasonably disciplined physicians, the remedy might still be of little use. Legal process cannot prevent informal sanctions and ostracism. And within the framework of organized medicine, the doctor who challenges AMA authority to determine his method of practice is tried and judged by fellow physicians who may have an economic interest in proscribing his allegedly offensive conduct. (687)

¹ New York Times, Sunday, June 15, 1952, Sec. 4, p. 7, Col. 6.

² The New York Times, Wednesday, November 14, 1951, p. 22, col. 5.

³ The Yale Law Journal, 1952, pp 938-1022,

Footnote 687 stated:

'A physician may be brought up for discipline before a committee of doctors that might include his chief competitors in his private practice. In our civil or criminal courts we would not tolerate a situation in which the judges might profit financially as a result of the verdict they rendered. We should not permit such a situation to exist in medicine.' Letter from Thurman Arnold, Esq., to Channing Frothingham, M.D., dated July 2, 1947, copy on file in Yale Law Library)

Dr. Morris Fishbein succeeded Dr. George H. Simmons as the Editor of the Journal of the American Medical Association during the 1920's and continued in this job for over twenty five years and then was asked to leave. Milton Mayer, in his article "The Rise and Fall of Dr. Fishbein"⁴ wrote:

Last June the American Medical Association withdrew its Seal of Acceptance from Morris Fishbein. Then, just so there would be no misunderstanding, it beat his head in, cut his heart out, and kicked him into the street. "If the atmosphere becomes unpleasant," said the Voice of American Medicine, picking himself up and straightening his necktie, "I'll quit in five minutes."

Neither he nor anyone else had ever supposed that "Dr. A.M.A.," might be fired. "Some people believe I run the A.M.A.," he often said. Some people certainly did. In the course of thirty-seven single-minded and single-handed years, he had converted a pantywaist professional society into the most terrifying trade association on earth. He had made it what it was today, and it wasn't satisfied. Why not?

The answer is childishly simple. He had become indispensable; he had to go. *Sic semper Fishbeinnis*.

To be sure, the deed had to be done publicly; there was no other way to persuade the public that Fishbein wasn't American Medicine. But at last, the insult, if not injury, might have been dealt in private. Instead, the announcement of his dismissal specified that he was not to speak, write, or be interviewed on 'controversial subjects' until such time as the Association, which would 'retain his talents until his successors could be trained, was through with him for good. He was being 'retired' after 'long and faithful service' at the lusty age of sixty.

Morris A. Bealle, in his book on American medicine; *Medical Mussolini*,⁵ wrote the following comment about Dr. George H. Simmons and Dr. Morris Fishbein:

The commercialization of medicine, taught to too many doctors and hospitals of the country by the two Medical Midases of Modern Times – Dr. George H. Simmons of doubtful medical antecedents and Dr. Morris Fishbein, the IL Duce and Fuhrer of the Medical World....

By 1953, the AMA became so powerful that it was able to arrange for the appointment of a special assistant to the Secretary for Health and Medical

⁴ Harper's, November, 1949, p 76

⁵ Medical Mussolini, p.25, Columbia Publishing Co., First Edition, 1938

Affairs, a presidential cabinet post. An article that appeared in the AFL News-Reporter said:

The American Medical Association admits that the special assistant to the Secretary for Health and Medical Affairs, the new Eisenhower cabinet post, will be a watchdog and censor for the AMA. 'All our suggestions were received with interest and were largely adopted,' reported Dr. Louis H. Bauer, AMA president, in the March 28 (1953) issue of the Journal of the American Medical Association. 'As a result, the reorganization plan introduced, provided a new position, that of a special assistant to the Secretary. All medical activities within the new department, as well as all medical phases of any activities within education or social security, must be cleared through this special assistant to the Secretary. This will include appropriations and budgets as well as policies.'... "The same special assistant will also be representative of the Secretary at all interdepartmental meetings at which health will be a topic for discussion and also at Congressional hearings where appropriations involving health will be discussed, the AMA magazine continued." The Journal also pointed out that the special assistant whose powers will in many cases be even greater than that of the Secretary, will probably be selected subject to AMA approval.⁶

This political power and influence of the American Medical Association and its Journal is almost "unbelievable"! To further illustrate the power of organized medicine in the United States, one only has to read the "Merry-Go-Round", Drew Pearson's August 20, 1953 article.

Drug Report Raps AMA

WASHINGTON – Ohio's statuesque Sen. John Bricker ordered it suppressed before even reading it, but a confidential report on cancer has been sent to his desk highly critical of the American Medical Association for attempting to suppress a new drug which helps to relieve cancer.

This blistering report was prepared under the direction of the late Sen. Tobey as chairman of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and was submitted to Bricker, the new chairman, by the investigator appointed by Tobey.

The report charges: (1) that 'the AMA has been hasty, capricious, arbitrary, and outright dishonest' in its opposition to the cancer drug, krebiozen; (2) that AMA's treasurer, Dr. J. J. Moore, 'attempted to get the distribution rights' for krebiozen for two Chicago businessmen, and, after failing in this, 'he embarked upon a course to ruin . . . the drug'; and (3) that 'public and private funds have been thrown around like confetti at a country fair to close up and destroy clinics, hospitals, and scientific research laboratories which do not conform to the viewpoint of medical associations.'

Finally the report suggests that 'the machinations of Dr. J. J. Moore could well involve the AMA and others in an interstate conspiracy of alarming proportions.

⁶ AFL NEWS-REPORTER, WASHINGTON, D.C., Friday April 10, 1953

These shocking charges are based upon the investigation of Senate Agent Benedict Fitzgerald, who was given a secret assignment by the late Senator Toby to investigate alleged AMA hamstringing of cancer research. The probe was kept secret because Toby feared the powerful doctors' lobby which last year was listed as the No. 2 lobbyist in Washington. The lobby spent \$309,514.93 last year to influence Congress, making it second only to the electric power lobby.

* * *

BRICKER SAYS NO – After Toby's death, Bricker, who replaced him on the Interstate Commerce Committee, promptly ordered the investigation stopped. He refused to so much as see Fitzgerald, though the investigator offered to fly to Ohio at his own expense for an interview.

Instead, Bricker's office ordered Fitzgerald to "forget" the whole thing and above all, not to talk to the press. If he followed these instructions, Fitzgerald was told, he would be 'taken care of.'

However, Fitzgerald wrote a sharp letter to Bricker, saying he was 'surprised and even shocked' at the runaround. He then sent copies of both the letter and his report to every Senator on the committee.

Fitzgerald's report does not claim that krebiozen is a cure for cancer. It simply sets forth the results of the research so far, adding: "The heavy toll of life being taken by cancer requires a searching investigation."

* * *

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN DOCTORS – In particular, the report cites the findings of Dr. Andrew C. Ivy, Vice President of the University of Illinois Medical School, who directed medical research for the Navy during World War II and discovered a chemical to make sea water drinkable and an ointment to protect the skin against extreme heat and cold.

He has also made other important medical discoveries such as enterogastrone for treating peptic ulcers. Dr. Ivy is so respected in medical circles that he was also called upon to evaluate cancer therapy for the American Cancer Society and expose quack treatments.

In the case of krebiozen, however, Dr. Ivy did not find that it was a "quack" drug. He tested it first on animals to make sure it was nontoxic, then he tried it out on cancer patients.

On the conclusion of his preliminary study, the Fitzgerald report states, "he issued a statement that 70 per cent of the cancer patients receiving krebiozen derived benefits from the new drug ranging from relief of pain to complete healing. A 1000-page compilation prepared by him, supplemented by laboratory records, gives case history on 500 patients treated by 232 doctors in 150 clinics and hospitals throughout the Country."

Though Dr. Ivy had once served on its board, the AMA promptly censured him and expelled him for three months from the Chicago Medical Society. Because of the controversy, he also took a leave of absence from the University of Illinois and was prevented from continuing his research there.

The Fitzgerald report points to Dr. J. J. Moore, for 10 years treasurer of the AMA, as "the spearhead behind attempts to have the drug ostracized."

NOTE 1 – Sen. Bricker's office when queried, stated flatly that Bricker intended to do nothing about the cancer report. Asked whether Bricker had read the report, the reply was 'no'.

"NOTE 2 – Many doctors disagree vigorously with the American Medical Association, feel that it has gone too far in engaging in politics.

Drew Pearson should have asked Dr. William F. Koch about his personal experiences with the American Medical Association and the dictatorial power it and its Journal has over "the medical doctor and his practice" in the United States. Mr. Pearson could have gotten, from Dr. Koch, enough information to write over one hundred columns on the A.M.A..

This is the same American Medical Association, with its District of Columbia affiliate, that years before had been charged with and convicted of the violation of the Sherman Anti-Trust Law as a result of their joint actions in 1937 and 1938. It was alleged that they combined and conspired against the Group Health Associations, Inc. in its business of providing medical care and hospitalization and that they restrain the doctors on its staff, as well as other doctors, in the pursuit of their calling, and that they conspired to restrain Washington hospitals in the operation of their business, etc in the District of Columbia. This conviction was upheld by the United States Supreme Court in January 1943. (Detroit News – January 18, 1943)

Another example of the power of the American Medical Association and its local societies and how they exercise their absolute power and control over their members, the local doctor, is best illustrated by the following:

Dr. John W. Kannel, a surgeon, who had practiced medicine in Fort Wayne, Indiana, for over 35 years and who had been a member, in good standing of the American Medical Association and its local societies during this period of time, became another target of the A.M.A. In July, 1942, Dr. Kannel received the following letter from the Medical Center Hospital, an A.M.A. approved hospital, denying him the privilege of the further use of its facilities because he had elected to use the Koch Treatment in treating some of his patients. Subsequently, in 1943, Dr. Kannel received two additional letters from his local medical society after his medical society had learned that he had testified in support of the Koch Treatment for cancer in the 1943 Food & Drug trial in Detroit, Michigan. At this trial Dr. Kannel presented one of his cured cancer patients, Mr. S. W. Roebuck, as a witness to illustrate the therapeutic effectiveness of the Koch Treatment. Dr. Kannel had been using the Koch Treatment for his cancer patients, since he first learned about the Koch Treatment in 1925, without any prior complaints from the local medical authorities or his medical society.

**MEDICAL CENTER HOSPITAL
Wayne Pharmacal Building
Fort Wayne, Ind.**

July 29, 1942

Dear Doctor Kannel,

The Allen County Medical Society does not approve the Koch Cancer Treatment, and it has also been disapproved by the American Medical Association.

Since I must depend on my good standing in these Societies for my business I think it advisable to ask you to discontinue to use our hospital.

Yours regretfully,
Daisy McCallister (signed)

and

**FORT WAYNE MEDICAL SOCIETY
Fort Wayne, Indiana**

January 19, 1944

Dr. J. W. Kannel
1405 Vermont Street, City

Dear Doctor:

By order of the Board of Trustees, you are hereby notified that your case will be presented to the Society at the regular business meeting to be held at the Chamber of Commerce at P.M. Tuesday January 25, 1944.

Ample opportunity will be given you to present your side of the case. After all the evidence has been presented, a vote will be taken.

Thank you in advance for your co-operation, I am,

Very truly yours,

Harry C. Harvey, M.D.

Secretary

and one week later, on January 26, 1944,

FORT WAYNE MEDICAL SOCIETY
Fort Wayne, Indiana

January 26, 1944

Dr. J. W. Kannel
1405 Vermont Street, City

Dear Doctor:

At the regular business meeting of the Society last night, you were found guilty of unethical conduct in the practice of Medicine, and by more than the necessary three fourths vote, you were expelled from membership, with the understanding that you have the right to appeal to the Council of the Indiana State Medical Association. The next meeting of that body will be held the latter part of September in connection with the annual convention.

Very truly yours,

Ft. Wayne Medical Society
Harry C. Harvey, M.D.
Secretary

This case of Dr. Kannel is, but one of many examples, in which a honorable man, a humanitarian, an honest physician and a servant of the public, had been denied the use of hospital facilities, controlled by the A. M. A., for his patients. His refusal to bow down to the demands and dictates of the American Medical Association and its affiliated societies resulted in this denial of necessary hospital care for his patients. How many other ways does the A.M.A. control our health services that we, the innocent patients, do not know about?

Mr. Maurice Natenberg wrote about the Dr. Kennel matter in his book, *The Cancer Blackout*.⁷ He also wrote the following on Dr. Koch's medical research.

Allegations were also made that certain interests closely identified with official medicine tried to gain control of the Koch formula; unable to grab it, they resorted to a campaign of vilification and persecution.

This oppression was extended to those who dared to employ Glyoxylide. It became dangerous for physicians to endorse the Koch method, for they were immediately threatened with loss of their academic and professional standing in the medical profession. These threats were allegedly employed successfully against Dr. Carroll W. Allen, professor of surgery at Tulane University, and against Professor Bryan, head of surgery at Vanderbilt University. Both reported good results but were coerced into discontinuing the use of the Koch preparations.

⁷ The Cancer Blackout, Maurice Natenberg, Regent House, Chicago, p. 81, 1959

The Dr. Carroll W. Allen matter is another good example on how far some members of the American Medical Association can go, and are willing to go, to destroy a doctor, his good name, his reputation and his medical practice when that doctor tries to put scientific truth and the interest of his patients above the dictates of organized medicine. When Dr. Allen first read the negative propaganda about Dr. Koch and his treatment for cancer, that had been published by the Journal of the American Medical Association in the early 1920's, he believed that these false allegations about Dr. Koch and his cancer treatment were true. He considered Dr. Koch's treatment for cancer as a fraud and that was it. Nothing more to say.

It was not until after Dr. Allen had personally investigated the Koch treatment that he learned the truth about Dr. Koch, his research and his cancer treatment. It was when he started to speak out in support of the Koch Cancer Treatment and report on his personal investigation of Dr. Koch and his cancer treatment to other local doctors that Dr. Allen started to get into trouble with his local medical society. His position as Professor of Surgery at Tulane University and his right to successfully practice medicine were all put into jeopardy by his local medical society that was under the direct control of the American Medical Association and its state organization.

Based upon Dr. Allen's personal investigation of the Koch Cancer Treatment and the favorable information he had learned about Dr. Koch and his cancer treatment, he contacted several doctors in New Orleans to tell them of his investigation. Finally on April 27, 1925, he read his report, *SOME INFORMAL REMARKS ON THE TREATMENT OF CANCER*⁸ to the Orleans Parish Medical Society. This report included a brief history on how he became interested in Dr. Koch's cancer research and treatment and the results of his investigation. In this report Dr. Allen said:

Last October a patient of mine suffering from an inoperable cancer of the rectum asked my advice about the Koch treatment. I strongly advised him to have nothing to do with it, that it had been investigated and pronounced worthless, and that I regarded it as a fraud. He, however, was determined to go to Detroit and consult Dr. Koch. At that time he was emaciated, weighing less than a hundred pounds and was so weak that he had to be carried to the train on a stretcher. Two months later he returned to New Orleans weighing more than 130 pounds, and now weighs 170 and attends to business as usual though there is still some local evidence of his trouble.

I am frank to say that I was amazed at the wonderful improvement in this man. I then called on another patient here who was treated by Dr. Koch at the same time. After talking with these two afflicted persons I was deeply impressed, not only by their personal experience but also by statements concerning others with whom they came in contact while being treated.

A doctor friend whose wife was in a hopeless condition from carcinoma called on me to discuss the matter and as his wife was unable to

⁸ Printed in the September, 1925, issue of the Journal New Orleans Medical and Surgical Society Orleans, pp 169 - 174.

travel we wired Dr. Koch and received a treatment. In a similar way I received a dose for a hopeless bladder case of Dr. Walther's. With these treatments Dr. Koch sent some directions and information as to what would happen following its use.

The results were so strikingly as he predicted that I became extremely interested.

I looked up Dr. Koch's earlier contributions to medical literature and learned that he had written several creditable papers on the parathyroid glands, such as one would expect from a high class laboratory man. Dr. Koch's method of procedure in the above work was quite original and his deductions and conclusions were at first not accepted but later were recognized and the proper credit given him. Paton of Glasgow won a triennial prize by a paper on the same subject in which he gave Dr. Koch due credit for what he had done. These papers will be found in the Jour. Biol. Chem., 1912, XII. 313; Jour. Biol. Chem., 1913, XV. 43-63; Jour. Lab. & Clin. Med., 1919, 1,299; and Jour. Med. & Surg. Jan., 1918, 1-9; that by Paton will be found in the Quart. Jour. Phys. 1917 Nos. 3 and 4.

In the A.M.A. Journal of 1913, Page 1049, there is a lengthy editorial devoted to Koch's work on the toxic bases in the urine of parathyroidectomized dogs. Dr. Lewellys Barker on the subject of tetany in a paper read at the Southern Medical Association, in 1922, quotes extensively from Dr. Koch. These papers, are however, of more than passing interest in this investigation as it was through the application of methods of reasoning in cancer similar to those that he used in his work on the thyroid (parathyroid gland) that he feels he was able to recognize the specific toxins which formed the basis of his work on cancer.

Dr. Koch had a bachelors', a master's and a doctor's degree before he obtained the M.D. degree to give him clinical opportunities to pursue his study of cancer. He, however, does not care for practice of medicine and is not a clinician but strictly a chemist and physiologist.

I was so deeply impressed with the conviction that Dr. Koch had discovered something that at least brought about certain more or less definite reactions indicating some direct or specific effect on cancer that I decided to go up there and make a personal investigation.

Arriving there December twenty-seventh I began a systematic study of his cases and saw many in all the various stages of reaction. Everything was absolutely open to my closest scrutiny and Dr. Koch was often not present during my examinations though always available to answer all questions, which he did with perfect frankness, both to me and the patients. Results were not always favorable, some were slow and uncertain, and he expressed doubt regarding others. He stated that 20 percent of his cases failed to react. All this was done in a spirit of perfect candor and openness that disarmed at once any feeling of the possibility of subterfuge or evasion that may have existed in my mind.

"The most interesting and impressive thing was the cured cases; of these I saw a large number and questioned them most closely. There remained no doubt but that they had had cancer as they all gave a perfect

clinical history. Some were primarily inoperable, many had been operated with recurrence, the majority had had the usual routine of X-ray and radium. They all had been hopeless surgically and had come to Dr. Koch as a last resort.

The interesting thing in questioning these cured cases was that they all had gone through the same course with its varied reactions and toxemia as those I saw under treatment. This naturally increased my interest and encouraged my closer study of the phenomena which they presented. While many of these were quite sick it was apparent that they were not running a cancer course. The typical cancer symptoms were slowly giving way to a toxemia in which nausea, vomiting, temperature and prostration were the most prominent features with a progressive diminution of pain and finally just a soreness to remind them of their former suffering. During this time, or as long as the toxemia and temperature persisted there was a steady loss of weight until they were reduced to an extreme degree. As convalescence set in, recovery was at first slow later more rapid, and many of them told me that their physical condition and general health was better than they had ever enjoyed formerly.

The preparation used is a delicate, synthetic chemical compound clear and colorless. It is injected subcutaneously in one cubic centimeter dose. The treatment is based on the germ theory of all malignancy and upon the theory that the cancer mass is an attempt at protection by the host towards the invading organism. The organisms being killed the cancer becomes a foreign proteid mass which must be absorbed to be removed. The absorption of this mass is a highly toxic process and produces the various symptoms which occur during the treatment; fever, nausea, vomiting, and depression. These symptoms and reactions of the cancer tissue are subject to considerable variation. At times the mass may swell and there may be an increase in all symptoms including pain, in other cases there is an immediate subsidence in the size of the mass and a lessening of pain. The reason for these variations is not well understood. The cancer mass takes on a bluish color and there is an ingrowth of angioblastic tissue during the stage of absorption. As this vascularized tissue contracts frequent small hemorrhages occur and it may require six to nine months for all of this tissue to disappear. Cases that are badly exhausted before treatment, where the mass to be absorbed is very large, or when the heart and kidneys are weakened are not likely to survive the toxic period.

My duty was apparent. I should take some steps to bring this matter to the attention of the profession and I felt that the best means of accomplishing this as well as for further proof for myself was first to treat a few of my hopeless cases here and properly check this work with the aid of the laboratory. This appeared to me to be the best plan of procedure and I accordingly arranged with Dr. Koch to furnish me with as much of his formula as was needed.

My understanding with Dr. Koch was that should any recognized group of reputable physicians make a calm unbiased investigation of his treatment and accord him due credit for having discovered something useful in the treatment of cancer, he would then make the formula public in some way, such as was done with insulin.

I know that a great many of my friends and associates feel that I have made a mistake in going into this subject but I hope that none will question my honesty or sincerity and just as soon as sufficient time has elapsed for me to arrive at a definite conclusion, based on personal experience, for or against the further use of this remedy I propose to make a frank, positive statement of the results.

In conclusion I wish now to present a brief summary taken from the records of cases treated.

Dr. Allen then briefly reviewed ten case histories and then said:

I feel that your careful consideration of the above cases must convince you that they have not run a normal cancer course and if Dr. Koch has not discovered what he thinks he has, he has at least found something which profoundly affects cancer tissue and I feel it should be accorded a most liberal investigation both clinically and in the laboratory as it may at least be the beginning of tremendous possibilities.

I have been persistently at work on the two objectionable features in the use of this preparation; its cost and its secrecy. The cost has been substantially reduced and I feel the problem of its secrecy is open to solution."

The meeting was then open for discussion. During the discussion period, the issue of the secrecy of the Koch medication was brought up as if this was the most important issue. The issue of therapeutic effectiveness was over looked. It should be noted that at that time Dr. Koch did not have patent protection because it was necessary to prove the therapeutic effectiveness of his product through recognized testing of his discoveries before he could get a patent as was the case with Dr. Banting and the production of insulin. Dr. Banting did not release to the medical profession or the public the method to produce insulin until after he received his first Canadian patient.

Dr. F. W. Parham of New Orleans opened the discussion period with the following statement:

It is with considerable reluctance that I rise to take the position of opposing Dr. Allen. I want to say first that if Dr. Koch had presented the matter in the same scientific spirit as has Dr. Allen, I do not believe there would have been so much feeling. I want it understood that anything I have to say shall not be construed as any reflection upon the sincerity of Dr. Allen. While I think he is mistaken in his advocacy of the treatment, I believe he is sincerely of the opinion that the treatment is of value....

Dr. Parham, after expressing his anti Koch opinions went on to say:

"Contrary to our Code of Ethics we are dealing with a secret remedy; it is not professional for a physician to prescribe a secret remedy; many of us do it sometimes, but this is an aggravated case."

Dr. Parham continued his comments and then closed his speech with the following statement:

Dr. Allen is sincere and I do not reflect on any statement he has made. We have talked frequently on this subject and he knows how I feel about it. He knows that I am opposed to going on with this thing as a secret remedy.

Dr. F. W. Parham asked the following question:

Would Dr. Koch be willing to make known this remedy, patent it and turn the patent over to Tulane University or some institution that we regard as reliable? Of course, **we understand in the case of insulin that that was the necessary thing to do to prevent the remedy from being improperly prepared and hastily used.** After the period of probation it had met with the requirements and it then became a generally accepted remedy. Now we have insulin, which we all regard as one of the most valuable remedies, under certain conditions, that we have.

If Dr. Koch has a remedy of value, as medical men, we ought to have nothing to do with it until he patents it and turns it over to an Institution. I do not believe the profession can be got together and acknowledge Koch's remedy as a good thing until he has removed the veil of secrecy.

Answer by Dr. Allen:

Dr. Koch has discussed some plan for an Institution which I will mention in closing, but he does not think the remedy should be made public until better understood."

During this long discussion period, the issue of secret remedy came up several times and had become more important to the members of "official medicine," as controlled by the American Medical Association, then the actual proof of therapeutic effect of the Koch treatment for cancer.. Subsequent to this report on his investigation of Dr. Koch's cancer treatment, Dr. Allen was called before the judiciary committee of his local medical society for his investigation and use of an "alleged secret treatment for cancer" in violation of the Principles of Medical Ethics of the American Medical Association. Although Dr. Parham had already publicly stated at the April 27, 1925 meeting that: "it is not professional for a physician to prescribe a secret remedy; **many of us do it sometimes,**..." it was heresy for Dr. Allen to investigate the Koch Treatment. He was told that if he continued to investigate this remedy further, he should resign from his medical society. If he were to resign from his local medical society he would have to resign from the American Medical Association and this would mean he would lose all his rights to use the A.M.A. controlled hospitals and his standing in the A.M.A. controlled medical community. On June 26, 1925 the following letter was sent to Dr. Allen:

The College of Medicine
School of Medicine
TULANE UNIVERSITY OF LOUISIANA
1551 Canal Street
New Orleans, La.

OFFICE OF THE DEAN

June 26, 1925

Prof. C. W. Allen, M.D.
City

Dear Dr. Allen:

I wish to inform you that at a meeting of the Executive Faculty of the School of Medicine, held on June 24, 1925, your reappointment for the session of 1925-26, was considered.

A copy of the letter from Prof. Matas to you, dated June 23, 1925, and your reply to Prof. Matas, dated June 24, 1925, relative to your connection with the Koch Cancer cure were read.

There was considerable discussion and expressions from different members of the Faculty indicating their recognition of the importance of the situation and the discredit and criticism of yourself, the School of Medicine and particularly the Department of Surgery in which you have served, that has resulted from your association with Dr. Koch as a promoter and endorser of the secret remedy of cancer.

The following formal action was taken:

"That re-appointment of Prof. Allen be postponed until after he has sent a copy of the same letter addressed to Prof. Matas under date of June 24, 1925, to Dr. W. F. Koch and also to the Orleans Parish Medical Society and the same has been acted upon by the Orleans Parish Medical Society."

It is sincerely hoped that your renunciation of the Koch secret remedy for cancer will, in some measure at least, remedy the harm that has been done.

It is also the hope of the Faculty that there will be no occasion to recall this unfortunate circumstance again.

Yours very truly,

C. C. Bass, M.D., Dean

On July 2, 1925 the following letter was written to the Judiciary Committee by Dr. Allen.

New Orleans, La.
July 2nd, 1925

Judiciary Committee
Orleans Parish Medical Society
1551 Canal Street
New Orleans, La.

Gentlemen:

Fully recognizing the incompatibility of my duties as a member of Organized Medicine with any professional or business relations with secret or proprietary remedies as opposed to the principals of ethics which govern a liberal and humanitarian profession, I hereby declare that I have severed all professional and business relations with Dr. W. F. Koch of Detroit, Michigan, as the inventor, manufacturer and promoter of a specific treatment of cancer. I hereby make it also clearly and unequivocally understood that I shall have no further connection with the said Koch Cure as one of its advocates and endorsers, and that henceforth I shall cease to administer or distribute this treatment or recommend its administration to my patients or those of other practitioners as long as its composition and manufacture remains a secret monopoly, and only resume its use, if I deem proper, after its composition and manufacture has been wholly, clearly and definitely revealed to the profession through the recognized organs of the medical press.

I wish, however, to qualify in this otherwise absolute renunciation of the Koch treatment with the request that I be permitted to complete the observations on the patients to whom I have administered the treatment in a purely experimental way, and for which treatment there will be no fees charged or payments collected for services relative to the Koch Cure.

In making this declaration I trust that the objection to my continuance as a member in good standing of Organized Medicine will be removed.

I will furnish your Committee at an early date the list of cases now under treatment.

Yours very truly

Carroll W. Allen

This letter was followed by the following letter to the Editor-in-chief of the N. O. Medical and Surgical Journal.

July 30, 1925

Editor-in-chief
N.O. Medical and Surgical Journal
Whitney Bank Building
City.

My Dear Doctor:

In reply to your communication regarding the publication of my paper on the use of the Koch cancer remedy I feel it better for all concerned that this not be published, which request I have made before.

There are two sides to this question -- the ethical and the scientific and my discussion deals entirely with the scientific. I had been impressed with the merits of Koch's discovery and urged that something be done to make it right, feeling that if Koch did not have as effective a remedy as he thought, he at least had something that profoundly effected cancer tissue and my hope was that after putting the matter right it might serve as a key or starting point to the elaboration of something more effective when worked up and studied in our large laboratories. I did not pretend to defend the unethical side of the treatment but discussed the scientific side exclusively. The above views are amply brought out in my paper and the discussion that follows.

I feel that there are sufficient developments to bear me out in the statement that the treatment has merit. There are several cured cases here and others which have been tremendously benefited and look as if they may get well. In addition to this, other physicians, who visited Dr. Koch, came to the same conclusion I did and recently the Detroit City Council took action in the matter and requested their Board of Health to conduct an investigation. I enclose a letter received from the Board of health, which explains itself.

A careful consideration of the facts as revealed by this letter must suggest to your mind a situation, which is to say the least, very unusual in view of the fact that the treatment has already been twice condemned by both the local and national medical societies, which should logically be best qualified to pass upon such matters.

It is not necessary here to recite the details of how the investigation came about or character of evidence produced. Many of these facts I can give you if wanted. It would, however, seem sufficient that the common council of a city of a million and a half people would take such action and incur the political animosity of the medical profession and place themselves in a ridiculous light, subject to the severest criticism, if the evidence produced before them had been convincingly and overwhelmingly in favor of Dr. Koch.

It is also quite significant that the Board of Health, composed of such able men as make up its personnel, should have acceded to the request of the council if they could have taken any other course. One fact in connection with the action of the council I feel I should state as it has

been said that if Dr. Koch has accomplished anything those in his own community should be in a better position to know the true facts. This investigation was confined to what had been accomplished within the City of Detroit with residents of the city as the council could not concern itself with outside affairs.

It is also of interest to know that Dr. Koch was not in favor of the above procedure as he preferred to have the matter straightened out within the profession, but could not afford to stop it without having it appear that he was afraid of an investigation or wished to continue in his present status.

A notable feature in this affair is the absence of any newspaper publicity. A charlatan would have capitalized this to the fullest extent.

Immediately following the meeting at the Orleans Parish, at which I read my paper and feeling that the profession was not inclined to take any particular steps likely to result in righting the matter I wrote Dr. Koch and informed him that I had discontinued the treatment. I some time later wrote a more positive letter at the request of Tulane and agreed to absolutely discontinue both its use and advocacy in any way except to continue on the cases then under treatment, which was to be done under certain conditions.

Having renounced the further use of the treatment, on ethical grounds, I feel that publication of my paper will only have an unfavorable effect and may bring the Journal into discredit. It will certainly be gotten hold of by the lay press and as there is certainly enough to it to justify anyone trying it and there are a great many arguments that can be used which may be very hard to answer. There is also a great deal else that I feel will come out if it gets in the lay press, which I feel is very much better left out.

I cannot help but feel that careful consideration of the subject must convince you that the above view is correct.

I will be glad to hear from you as to what action is taken in the matter.

With appreciation and thanking you for any trouble I may put you to, I am

Very truly yours,

CARROLL W. ALLEN

The average American does not know the full truth about the influence that the American Medical Association and its Journal has had upon the lives of all of us and the medical treatment we are all permitted to receive. The political power and influence of the American Medical Association and its Journal in the

past, and possibly today, is beyond belief. It is like a two edged sword: with one blade it can destroy evil and with the other blade it can do evil by destroying good. When it tries to destroy good, because that good was contrary to the financial interest of certain A.M.A. members, evil results and we all suffer. The leaders of the A.M.A. and editors of its journal have a moral duty to all of its members, to the medical profession and to the public to be morally honest and upright and a credit to the principles established by Hippocrates.

Dr. Fishbein Under Fire

Non-Belligeral Embark
of AMA Leader Hit

SAUL FRANKFURT, July 2. (AP)—The bodies of delegates of the American Medical Association, representing 125,000 doctors throughout the field, today attacked all-day sessions on the business of organized medicine and a closed meeting wherein the future of association spokesmen, Dr. Morris Fishbein, was expected to be settled.

At an evening meeting in Hamilton H. Robinson, of Nashville, Tenn., was held over the presidency of the AMA from Dr. Roger J. Lee, of London.

The Fishbein issue was a renewal of the fight California medical men had made at previous AMA conventions in 1941. Dr. Fishbein, editor of the American Medical Journal, is publicly criticized for his actions.

DR. FISHBEIN'S POSITION

As one physician who declined to be quoted said: "We have felt in the past that our public health have not been of the best, and that Dr. Fishbein is not the most suitable person for the position of president. We respect him for his editorial ability and want him to devote himself to that work."

Delegates were to consider a reorganization involving the establishment of a new board of public relations to lead the fight against government "interference" at Dr. Fishbein's suggestion. The delegates also considered plans pending before Congress.

The AMA showed in its opening session that it was ready to push its own voluntary program of medical service, which it had been conducting since 1941. The AMA showed in its opening session that it was ready to push its own voluntary program of medical service, which it had been conducting since 1941.

SEVERE FIGHT BEHIND

The five states without medical service plans were expected to adopt them before the end of the year, he said. With voluntary medical plans spreading rapidly, the AMA's council on medical service is looking for expansion of the program before the end of the year, he said.

AMA Admits Putting Censor In Health Post

The American Medical Association admits that the special assistant to the Secretary for Health and Medical Affairs, the new Eisenhower cabinet post, will be a watchdog and censor for the AMA.

"All our suggestions were received with interest and were largely adopted," reported Dr. Louis H. Bauer, AMA president, in the March 28 issue of the Journal of the American Medical Association. "As a result, the reorganization plan introduced, provided a new position, that of a special assistant to the Secretary."

Go Through Assistant

"All medical activities within the new department, as well as all medical phases of any activities within education or social security, must be cleared through this special assistant to the Secretary. This will include appropriations and budgets as well as policies."

(Testimony, including that of Secretary Hobby before the Joint Senate and House Committee on Reorganization, had been that the special assistant's duties would be "advisory" only. It was only through Sen. Hubert Humphrey and Rep. Chet Holifield that the committee, just before adjournment, learned of the actual job status of the "special assistant.")

Gets AMA Approval

"The same special assistant will also be representative of the Secretary at all interdepartmental meetings at which health will be a topic for discussion and also at Congressional hearings where appropriations involving health will be discussed," the AMA magazine continued.

The Journal also pointed out that the special assistant whose powers will in many cases be even greater than that of the Secretary, will probably be selected subject to AMA approval. Said the magazine:

"Furthermore, this special assistant must be selected from among persons who are recognized leaders in the medical field with wide nongovernmental experience."

AMA Warns of Plot by Government

WASHINGTON, (AP)—Dr. James H. Brown, president of the American Medical Association, said the Truman Administration is getting set for a "careful assault on medicine and free enterprise."

He told the Association the Administration is "conducting a surreptitious campaign to Europe at the expense of the American taxpayer's system to search for new destinations for surplus war goods."

AMA officials said today was reacting to a tip that Federal Security Administration Director J. Edgar Hoover and several aides are making a trip to Europe to study national health plans in England and elsewhere.

BROWN SAID the tip was intended to get information to carry on a drive for passage of Federal Reserve Act, a compulsory health insurance plan in the next session of Congress.

The AMA is fighting the President's proposals, which he has described as "careless meddling" in a proposed bill at the opening of the association's four-day clinical meeting.

The group is considering a move to collect some funds from doctors to carry on the campaign.

Today, a Chicago physician, said that "under the guise of the Federal Reserve Act, the nation is being led down the road to socialism with all its fighting efforts on political liberation and personal responsibility."

He described the "attack state, or nation" as a political program "based on the strenuous proposition that you can feel most at home in the arms of the state."

JIM ANNUNZIATO got a report of progress from Dr. Elmer Henderson, of Louisville, Ky., who heads a special committee set up last year to "rehabilitate the American people with the danger of compulsory health insurance."

Dr. Henderson said the special committee had used the office support of 1,812 national, state and local organizations.

The report also said that at Dr. H. A. L. a total of \$2,780,000 had been collected from 80 per cent of AMA members.

Under the AMA's plan to collect money for the fight against the President's health plan, most of the nation's doctors would face regular "dues" payments, just like a union or a fraternal organization.

MEANTIME, Dr. Austin Smith became editor of the Journal of the American Medical Association, replacing Dr. Morris Fishbein.

AMA Is Loser in High Court

Conviction Upheld in Anti-Trust Case

WASHINGTON, Jan. 12. (AP)—The Supreme Court upheld today the conviction of the American Medical Association on a charge of "violating the Sherman anti-trust law by alleged activities against a group health organization in the District of Columbia."

Justice Roberts delivered the 8 to 0 opinion, which also applied to the Medical Society of the District of Columbia, an affiliate of the national organization. Justices Murphy and Jackson did not participate.

The two medical organizations were alleged to "have conspired against Group Health Association, Inc., described as a non-profit cooperative organization of Government employees to provide medical care and hospitalization in return for monthly dues from the members."

OPINION QUOTED

"The defendants, during the years 1937 and 1938," the Justice Department, told the Supreme Court, "have combined and conspired to restrain group health in its business of providing medical care and hospitalization, to restrain the doctors on its staff, as well as other doctors, in the pursuit of their callings, and to restrain Washington hospitals in the operation of their business."

"To achieve these objectives, the district society and AMA induced and coerced their members to boycott Group Health, by refusing to serve on its staff or to consult with doctors on its staff, and induced and coerced all the hospitals in the District of Columbia, not operated by the Government, to boycott Group Health by denying hospital privileges to doctors serving on its staff."

The report also said that at Dr. H. A. L. a total of \$2,780,000 had been collected from 80 per cent of AMA members.

Under the AMA's plan to collect money for the fight against the President's health plan, most of the nation's doctors would face regular "dues" payments, just like a union or a fraternal organization.

MEANTIME, Dr. Austin Smith became editor of the Journal of the American Medical Association, replacing Dr. Morris Fishbein.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 12. (AP)—The Supreme Court upheld today the conviction of the American Medical Association on a charge of "violating the Sherman anti-trust law by alleged activities against a group health organization in the District of Columbia."

Justice Roberts delivered the 8 to 0 opinion, which also applied to the Medical Society of the District of Columbia, an affiliate of the national organization. Justices Murphy and Jackson did not participate.

MEANTIME, Dr. Austin Smith became editor of the Journal of the American Medical Association, replacing Dr. Morris Fishbein.

U. S. Starts Trial Of A. M. A. Doctors Society Accused Under Trust Act

WASHINGTON, Feb. 5.—The American Medical Association and 20 prominent physicians, charged with conspiring to violate the federal anti-trust laws, go on trial today in Federal District Court.

To prove that the defendants sought to defeat a venture in co-operative medicine.

The indictment also names the medical society of the District of Columbia, the Harris County (Texas) Medical Society, the Washington Academy of Surgery and their officers.

A. M. A. officials named were Morris Fishbein, editor of the A. M. A. Journal; Olin West, secretary and general manager of the A. M. A.; William Creighton Woodward, director of the A. M. A. Bureau of Legal Medicine and Legislation; William Dick Cutter, secretary of the A. M. A. Council on Medical Education and Hospitals; and Roscoe Gennung Leland, director of the A. M. A. Bureau of Medical Economics.

The charges are without precedent and reach the trial stage only after an unsuccessful court battle by the A. M. A. for a ruling that the practice of medicine is not a "trade" as conceived by the Sherman and Clayton acts.

The Texas society was named for allegedly instituting disciplinary proceedings against a group health staff member at the request of the District of Columbia Society.

A. M. A. Justly Convicted, Arnold Says

Final Supreme Court
Decision in Group
Medicine Issue
Due in Few Weeks

By the Associated Press

Thurman Arnold, Assistant Attorney General, emphasized before the Supreme Court yesterday that members of the American Medical Association do not engage in professional activities "when they attempt to bolster up their income by boycotting competitors."

Arnold, who has charges of anti-trust law enforcement, argued that the association had been improperly convicted of violating the Sherman Antitrust Law by activities against a group health organization in the District of Columbia.

The court took the case under advisement after a brief concluding argument by William F. Leahy, Washington attorney for the association. A final decision is expected in a few weeks.

Not Professional Action

"When a doctor," Arnold asserted, "gets away from the treatment and care of the sick, he is not acting professionally."

AMA Loses Its Appeal in Trust Case

Group-Medicine Issue
Advocates Assent
Ruling Opens Way
for Spread of Co-Ops

WASHINGTON, Jan. 15.—Advocates of group medicine won a major victory today when the Supreme Court unanimously ruled that the American Medical Association and its District of Columbia chapter were guilty of conspiracy to restrain trade in their fight against a co-operative health association of Government employees.

The ruling affirmed a decision by the District of Columbia Court of Appeals which found that the AMA and the district medical society proceeded unlawfully in opposing operation of a group health organization, Inc., a local co-operative, and levied fines of \$2,500 against the AMA and \$1,000 against the local chapter.

The two medical societies carried the case to the Supreme Court on the premise that they could not be prosecuted under the anti-trust laws.

Proponents of group health said the decision would bring rapid expansion of such organizations because hundreds of doctors, fearing disfavor of the AMA, had been reluctant to join such movements.

The decision, written by Justice Owen J. Roberts, was unanimous, but Justices Frank Murphy and Robert H. Jackson did not participate, presumably because the suit was in progress while they were acting as attorneys general.

Detroit Free Press

AMA Is Loser in High Court

Conviction Upheld
in Anti-Trust Case

WASHINGTON, Jan. 15.—(AP)—The Supreme Court upheld today the conviction of the American Medical Association on a charge of violating the Sherman anti-trust law by alleged activities against a group health organization in the District of Columbia.

Justice Roberts delivered the opinion, which also applied to the Medical Society of the District of Columbia, an affiliate of the national organization. Justices Murphy and Jackson did not participate.

The two medical organizations were alleged to have conspired against Group Health Association, Inc., described as a non-profit co-operative organization of Government employees to provide medical care and hospitalization in return for monthly dues from the members.

OPINION QUOTED

"The defendants, during the years 1937 and 1938," the Supreme Court said, "conspired to restrain group health in its business of providing medical care and hospitalization, to restrain the doctors on its staff, as well as other doctors, in the pursuit of their callings, and to restrain Washington hospitals in the operation of their business."

To achieve these objectives, the district society and AMA induced and coerced their members to boycott Group Health, by refusing to serve on its staff or to consult with doctors on its staff, and induced and coerced all the hospitals in the District of Columbia to operate by the Government's boycott Group Health by denying hospital privileges to doctors serving on its staff."

DETROIT NEWS
Jan. 18, 1943

AMA Admits Putting Censor In Health Post

The American Medical Association admits that the special assistant to the Secretary for Health and Medical Affairs, the new Eisenhower cabinet post, will be a watchdog and censor for the AMA.

"All our suggestions were received with interest and were largely adopted," AMA president, Louis H. Howe, told the Journal in the March 28 issue of the Journal of the American Medical Association. "As a result, the reorganization plan introduced, provided a new position, that of a special assistant to the Secretary."

Go Through Assistant

"All medical activities within the new department, as well as all medical phases of any activities within education or social security, must be cleared through this special assistant to the Secretary. This will insure appropriateness and budgets as well as policies."

(Testimony, including that of Secretary Hubert before the joint Senate and House Committee on Recorganization, had been that the special assistant's duties would be "advisory" only. It was only through Sen. Hubert Humphrey and Rep. Clet Hefelford that the committee, just before adjournment, learned of the actual position of the "special assistant.")

Gets AMA Approval

"The same special assistant will also be representative of the Secretary at all interdepartmental meetings at which health will be a topic for discussion and also at congressional hearings where appropriate involving health will be discussed," the AMA magazine continued.

The Journal also pointed out that the special assistant whose power will in many cases be even greater than that of the Secretary, will primarily be selected subject to AMA approval. Said the magazine: "Furthermore, this special assistant must be selected from among persons who are recognized leaders in the medical field with wide unimpeachable experience."

Illustrations of the unbelievable POWER of the American Medical Association over the years