

Notes on the Radiation controversy

1/27/72

One of the reasons for not making specific statements earlier is that there were no specific charges. It did not seem necessary to reply categorically to the claims made by the Washington Post.

The letter directed to Secretary Laird was presumably answered by DOD. At no time were we asked to supply DOD with any of the details of the cancer therapy aspect of our program.

A great many questions have been raised by members of the press as to why results of cancer therapy in this project were not published. Other observers have stated that they believe that 82 patients are sufficient to demand publication. One might answer this in several ways. There is one section in one of these books on human experimentation which criticizes unnecessarily early publication of material of this sort. Another example of the use of early publication with later retraction was in the use of freezing of the stomach to treat peptic ulcers by Wohlenstein. There have been many claims as to the efficacy of cancer therapy which in subsequent analysis proved to be incorrect and it will be necessary to dredge up a few examples of this type. Probably the best source will be from the chemotherapy literature as supplied by Dr. Horwitz.

Another point to be developed is the question of how aggressive testimony can be. For example, the use of the many letters and editorials in the local press and over the television protesting the method by which the Kennedy committee went after this project. Also, examples of patients who thought they were treated in this project and they were not.

Another question which might be asked is why information of this sort should not be developed for and made available to the Armed Services. It would imply that the draftees are second class citizens.

The third point is the question of developing some national press coverage in papers of the project.