

HISTORY OF THE U.S. FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Interview between:
Oliver F. Field
Retired Director, Bureau of
Investigation, American Medical
Association
and
Robert G. Porter
U.S. Food and Drug Administration
Chicago, Illinois
July 12, 1982

INTRODUCTION

This is a transcription of a taped interview, one of a series conducted by Robert G. Porter and Fred L. Lofsvold, retired employees of the U. S. Food and Drug Administration. The interviews were held with retired F.D.A. employees whose recollections may serve to enrich the written record. It is hoped that these narratives of things past will serve as source material for present and future researchers; that the stories of important accomplishments, interesting events, and distinguished leaders will find a place in training and orientation of new employees, and may be useful to enhance the morale of the organization; and finally, that they will be of value to Dr. James Harvey Young in the writing of the history of the Food and Drug Administration.

The tapes and transcriptions will become a part of the collection of the National Library of Medicine and copies of the transcriptions will be placed in the Library of Emory University.

HISTORY OF THE
U. S. FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Interview between:

Oliver F. Field

Retired Director, Bureau of
Investigation, American Medical
Association

and

Robert G. Porter

U.S. Food and Drug Administration

Chicago, Illinois

July 12, 1982



Food and Drug Administration
Room 500 U.S. Customhouse
721 19th Street
Denver, Colorado 80202
303-837-4915

TAPE INDEX SHEET

CASSETTE NUMBER(S) 1 and 2

GENERAL TOPIC OF INTERVIEW: History of the Food and Drug Administration

DATE: July 12, 1982 PLACE: Chicago, Illinois LENGTH: 40 min.

INTERVIEWEE

INTERVIEWER

NAME: Oliver F. Field

NAME: Robert G. Porter

ADDRESS: [REDACTED]

ADDRESS: U. S. Food & Drug Admin.

Denver, Colorado

FDA SERVICE DATES: FROM 1943 TO: 1947 RETIRED?

TITLE: Director, Bureau of Investigation, American Medical Assn. (Former Food
(If retired, title of last FDA position) and Drug Inspector)

CASS. NO.	SIDE NO.	EST. MIN. ON TAPE	PAGE NO.	SUBJECT
1	A	0	1	Introductory Remarks.
		1	1	Denver District Experience.
		8	4	American Medical Assn., Bureau of Investigation.
		9	4	Toxelimator Investigation.
		12	6	A.M.A., Bureau of Investigation.
		14	7	Wendell Vincent.
		24	12	George P. Larrick.
		25	12	Charles W. Crawford.
	B	26	13	Dr. Norman DeNosaquo.
		28	14	Medicā Quackery.
		0	15	Hadacol.
		2	16	A.M.A., Bureau of Investigation, History and Operation of.
		12	21	Hoxsey Cancer Treatment.
		14	23	More about Bureau of Investigation and Quackery.
		22	26	James Harvey Young.
		23	26	American Medical Association and Public Health.
2	A	0	28	A.M.A. and Public Health (cont.)
		4	30	Quackery Congresses.
		8	34	Committee on Quackery.
		14	35	Second Quackery Congress.
		20	38	Discussion of the Use of A.M.A. Files on Quackery.
	B	24	40	George P. Larrick.
		26	41	James Goddard.
		0	43	The Price of Aspirin.
		6	46	Diminished Interest in Quackery.
		12	49	Krebiozen.
20	54	End of Interview.		

This is a recording in the series on the history of the Food and Drug Administration. Today I am interviewing Oliver F. Field. The interview is being held on July 12, 1982 at the AMA Building in Chicago, Illinois. I am Bob Porter. Mr. Field joined FDA as an inspector in Denver in 1943 and was there until the end of 1947. In January of 1948 he became the Director of the Bureau of Investigation of the American Medical Association.

Oliver I would like you to start this interview, if you would, by giving us a thumbnail sketch of your career in FDA and AMA and then we will go back and pick up individual subjects and talk at greater length as you see fit.

Field: Robert, I think the matter of my being employed as an inspector by the Food and Drug Administration is rather unusual in that I am trained as a lawyer, not as a scientist. I came to FDA on the understanding that there was an opening in the Denver District Station and that was of interest to me because of the health of one of my children who was suffering from asthma. I was interviewed by the Central District Chief, I think it was Mr. Clarke.

Porter: J. O. Clarke.

Field: Yes, J. O. Clarke. Apparently he sent a resume of that interview to Mr. Harvey, Chief of the Western District at San Francisco. Apparently I met the needs of the Denver Station as I received an appointment.

I was, of course, not at all acquainted with the functions of FDA and it took a good deal of on-the-job or, clinical training, being helped by the people who were in the station at Denver and those who were in the field, I guess you would call it, because Denver was the headquarters for the area that covered the states of Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, a part of Texas, and Utah. I did some field work with one of the experienced inspectors and I learned a good deal by doing...

Porter: Excuse me Oliver, use names all you can will you?

Field: Is it all right?

Porter: Yes.

Field: Well, that inspector was Herbert Ayres who had been in the field work, I guess, for that station for several years before I came. He knew the territory and the names and the firms that we checked, mostly in the areas of foods. The business of drugs, so far as I was concerned, was pretty much in the area of making over-the-counter buys of prescription drugs, without a prescription.

In 1944 or thereabouts, the Denver Chief, who was Wendell Vincent at that time, received instructions from Washington Headquarters to prepare summaries and recommendations, I guess is the proper word, for matters being referred to the U.S. Attorney either for seizure or for prosecution. These, of course, included a resume of the

information in the files of the Denver office, which would be the basis upon which litigation would be begun against persons or firms we had reason to believe were in violation of the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act.

The last year and a half or two that I worked in the Denver office a good deal of my time was spent doing just that. Preparing criminal informations, and in one or two cases indictment forms, summaries and recommendations and other of the items which we would need in beginning litigation against a firm or individuals.

Every now and then, of course, we would go out on inspection tours. In one or two instances I was even called upon to show a new inspector what he would be called upon to do. Some of them, I guess, were surprises to those who were perhaps well trained in the business of the sciences but hadn't had the actual preparation of a Food and Drug Case.

So my time at the Food and Drug Administration was rather a pleasant and a very informative experience which came to an end by reason of the fact that I had not had the sufficient scientific background to continue.

At about the same time, it appeared that the AMA was in need of someone with a legal background, who also had Food and Drug experience. Because they had an opening in their department, or then the Bureau of Investigation,

which dealt with what I came to call the "seamy" side of medicine. It also had to do with the matters of information on the promotion of patent medicines, on so called health foods, impostors, the cultists whose claims for therapeutic excellence were, of course, based on what they said, not what they did. In reading over the invitation to come, which was signed by Dr. Austin Smith who was, at that time, the Director of the Department of Therapy and Research at AMA Headquarters in Chicago, I responded in such a way that he invited me to Chicago for an interview. So I took a train from Denver to Chicago and we had one or two interviews and I was hired. This, of course, began in early 1948, in fact January 1948, and it continued until August 1973 when I retired partly because of the condition of the health of my wife.

Porter: So, you were here in AMA for twenty-five years?

Field: I was here in AMA for twenty-five years, yes.

Porter: About five years previously in FDA?

Field: About four I think it was. From '43 to '47. The interesting, you might say by-play that occurred one time in my home out there in Lakewood which is just west of Denver in the next county; I got a mimeographed invitation in the mail from a chiropractor in the little town, (I suppose it is a pretty big town now) of Lakewood and he was extolling the merits of a mechanical enema machine called

the "Toxeliminator". The Toxeliminator was promoted on the invitation by a list of diseases that it could be used to treat adequately and that filled a single spaced letter size page. Having by that time gotten a little bit, what would you call it, an evangelistic tendency along this line, I put on my hat and put the letter in my pocket and I went over to the chiropractor's office. I was admitted right away because I guess I didn't belong there, from looks anyway, ahead of those who were waiting, I suppose to have their toxins eliminated. Well, when I told him that I was from Food and Drug Administration, he said, "Oh, you're an agent of the AMA." Of course, I told him no I wasn't and I took a sample of his machine, which was mostly a picture of it, in hand drawings, with a description of the controls of the hot and cold water and the means whereby this was applied to the suffering individual. Anyway I didn't stay there very long and apparently nobody in FDA authority thought much of my sample collecting because nothing was done.

Another time I walked into a Denver warehouse while they were unloading a carload of Mountain Valley Mineral Water. The accompanying literature to be used in extolling the therapeutic merits of Mountain Valley Water was included. So, on my own I proceeded to take a sample. Well, apparently that wasn't the thing to do either because nothing ever happened.

Porter: Well, of course, you mean immediately following your samples?

Field: Yes.

Porter: FDA was involved in a lot of litigation.

Field: Yes, I suppose. But, anyway, what would you call it, the little sidelights of my rather brief but interesting career with Food and Drug.

I did run into a shipment of cheese once that was rather an interesting experience because of live insect infestation on cheese going from Colorado to the state of Washington. It was goat milk cheese, I guess, for grating for spaghetti dinners, etc. The result was a series of seizures all over the country.

Anyway, it was a worthwhile experience and, of course, it did have an effect on my relationships with my former people at FDA. I could inform them of things that had come to my attention in my capacity here at AMA, which I did on frequent occasions. I can't recall any of the specifics at this particular moment.

I do recall having received a letter from Jack Harvey, with a copy of a letter that he sent to somebody else, where he said that all Field had to do was tell them what to do, he didn't have to do the business of either prosecuting or getting an injunction or other litigation experience which the Food and Drug had to do. Maybe I was a

little bit too, what would you call it, enthusiastic in some of these matters.

Anyway the relationship between people in FDA and myself after I came here to AMA was always very pleasant and I think worthwhile to both AMA and FDA.

Porter: You know during the years that I was an inspector in Chicago, once they sort of became acquainted with the fact that you and I were friends, I did a whole lot of coming over here to get information and once in a while we would give you a little information.

Field: Sure.

Porter: So we had a very enjoyable relationship during those years.

Oliver, I don't know how far you are going with your FDA experience, but before you get on be sure to tell us a little bit about some of the people you worked with in FDA. A little bit about Wendell Vincent, about how he operated and what kind of a man he was. Any of the Commissioners. Did you get to know George Larrick, for instance, during that time. And any other people that you feel you want to talk about.

Field: Well, I can do some things like that as they come to my recollection.

I can remember one time I was asked by Mr. Vincent to go out with a new inspector to sample some frozen fish. To

tell him how to ascertain the condition of frozen fish without having to take samples by merely rubbing the surfaces and taking a quick smell of what was in your hands. So, we did that and we brought back a few samples that we might have had reason to expect to examine more thoroughly. So on the way from the warehouse, where the fish were kept, back to the office, the new young inspector who had, I guess, a good deal of experience in dairy work said, "He had seen on a Denver truck dock a shipment of butter from a local firm which had told the Chief that they never went "out of state." This was the Sunshine Creamery, whose operators had the Chief thinking that they never shipped inter-state. He was always suspicious that they were packing short-fat butter. This inspector whose first name was Harley, said that he saw this material on a truck dock and that it was going to Chicago. So I said, "Well, you had better tell the Chief." He said, "Oh, I will." As he came from his office past mine to the lab with his samples, which was in the center of the office in the Customs House in Denver, I said, "By the way Harley have you told the Chief about that Sunshine butter?" He said, "Well, no." I didn't know that at the time, the Chief was standing on the other side of the files and heard this conversation. He said, "What was that?" So I told him that Harley had seen some Sunshine butter on route to Chicago, at a truck dock

in Denver. Vincent just simply picked up a telephone at the secretary's desk and he had the Chicago Station warned that it was coming in. And they got it before it was cut into squares. It was in these 28 pound, what did they call them,

Porter: Cubes, I guess.

Field: Yes, cubes of butter, I guess, yes. Sure enough it was short-fat and we had a seizure out of it right then and there. This was one of the things. Vincent knew what was going on in the food industry in Denver. He had some rather interesting means of getting this information.

One of which was having lunch at the Oxford Hotel on Friday and these warehousemen would be telling tales on the others to Mr. Vincent. And, of course, we had the means where by we could start other investigations. Thanks to the industry itself.

And Wendell Vincent was a very interesting man from my standpoint. I took him home one evening after work, in a federal car. And he said, "Oliver would you like a drink?" I said, "sure Chief." He said, "drive in right there" and there was a corner, what do you call it, "friendly little bar and grill". And the thing was, he had something different in his mind than I had, which was just to get him home. He said, "Oliver will you go across the street to that pharmacy over there and make a buy." I said, "sure

Chief, what do you want?" He told me get some "bennies" (benzedrine sulfite). So I went over and did. I got some bennies and I also got a sales slip from the fellow because I told him that there was another man interested in the purchasing of these pills and that I needed to show him what I'd spent for them. So I did, I got a sales slip. I took it over with the sample and I put it down on the table where we were sitting. And he said, "all right write it up in the morning", and so I did. And before you knew it these men had been cited in to show cause why they should not be prosecuted for violation of the Act. And one of the excuses was that they thought I was a medical student. The exams were being held at the University of Colorado Medical School at that particular time. Vincent knew it and he knew that the students would be coming to the drug stores looking for bennies to keep awake, study and boning for their exams. Mr. Vincent had a way about him in his activity that I think was very unusual and very interesting.

Porter: He was a very able man.

Field: Yes, he certainly was.

Porter: He had some personal problems that eventually led to his downfall. But that had nothing to do with his ability to do his job.

Field: Oh, I'm sure that's true. And the thing was I think his job was his whole life.

Porter: Yes.

Field: He was a very dedicated man. But my relationships with him were always, well I guess the word is, partly personal friendship and partly the interesting job that we had to do out there in Denver.

Porter: There was a complete lack of formality. You could go into Vincent's office and literally put your feet on his desk if....

Field: That's correct. Oh yes, you needed no appointment, you needed no specific time. Any time you needed to go in there, you were welcome.

Porter: In fact if it was the right time of day you might get a drink while you were there.

Field: Well, I've known that to occur. The fact of the matter is I'll never forget one time. During the war time we were asked to check the closures of Mexican and other foreign liquors. Particularly champagnes and wines. And from Mexico it was whiskey. We had sampled some whiskey from Mexico that had been passed by the Internal Revenue, but we noticed that it had to be misbranded. Because on one side of the bottle there was a label that indicated that this was Bourbon whiskey. And on the back side of the bottle or the front side, if you please, but at least it was the other side, it was labeled Rye whiskey and we knew very well it couldn't be both. Later the Commissioner came out from Washington. That was Charlie Crawford?

Porter: Paul Dunbar, I bet.

Field: No this after Dunbar's time. Paul Dunbar is the man who wrote to Austin Smith saying, "yes they had a man with a legal background in the Denver District and his name was Field", and it was on the strength of that letter from Dunbar that I came to AMA.

Porter: Well, after Dunbar it would of been Crawford unless it was Larrick.

Field: No it wasn't Larrick. I saw Larrick on the street coming to the office one day too. And I said to Davey (another inspector) as we were going to get a cup of coffee before we went out on some job. And I said, "Davey that is Mr. Larrick." "Oh no," Davey said. And of course when we got back to the office here was Larrick laughing at us, knowing that at least one of us didn't recognize him. Those were the interesting little sidelights that we had in those times.

So Mr. Crawford was sitting by Mr. Vincent. Vincent called me in he said, "Oliver have you got any of that whiskey from Mexico left?" I said, "Yes Chief I think there is some left in the lab." He said, "well would you get us some of the, what were the little glasses?"

Porter: Beakers.

Field: Yes, beakers, yes. And I got three beakers and we let the Commissioner of Foods and Drug sample some Mexican

whiskey of doubtful vintage. Anyway it was all destroyed for glass; spicules of glass in the bottles, due to bad corking procedures, I guess.

Porter: Yes.

Field: But we also got some Italian champagne that had glass in it and there was one or two other items. But those are some of the sidelights that we experienced in our daily work at Denver District, I guess it was Denver Station in those days.

Porter: Right.

Field: So I know that we had very little to do with any cancer drugs, out in that part of the world. But I can recall very vaguely and interest on the part of Norman DeNosquo who was a medical officer in the Central District. He was an M.D. out of the University of Wisconsin. He was also a Doctor of Public Health out of the University of Michigan. He didn't and he couldn't practice in the ordinary sense of the word because he had a right arm that had been injured somehow apparently at birth. He never had the use of the arm which hung by his side limply and he'd pick it up with his left to shake hands with you.

And Norman with someone else came through to interview witnesses, I guess, patients or their surviving relatives who had taken the Koch treatment. Now the Koch treatment was out of Detroit. It was being sold by a man who had a

had a Ph.D. in chemistry, and an M.D. from what is now Wayne State College of Medicine in Detroit. I think he obtained his M.D. Degree by teaching medical students. He did not, I think in the ordinary sense of the word, study medicine. He had this product that was labeled to be a one to a trillion aqueous dilution which he labelled Glyoxilide. The government's efforts in fighting this rather preposterous thing, were certainly aided and abetted by my predecessors here at AMA. But I know after I got here I sent every bit of information we could get or did have on the promotion of this quack cancer cure to the government. Porter: Would you say this is probably the first time you thought seriously about quackery which later became a very major part of your work?

Field: This was you might say, a revelation to me that there was such a thing as a business of fooling cancer patients. And a big business. Of course I learned an awful lot about it after I got here. But this was my introduction, and if I am at all correct in this and you must understand that my memory is not so good anymore, but Dr. DeNosauquo was accompanied by Walter Simmons who was then the Chief Inspector of the Central District of FDA.

Of course we did collabrate with the government on an Indiana case of the prosecution of two old doctors who had a treatment for diabetics. We gave them some leads on wit-

nesses and so on. The government successfully prosecuted them for selling a mixture of cider vinegar and what was the cathartic they added to it? Oh yes, sodium sulphate.

Porter: I don't know.

Field: Well...vinegar and salt peter, at \$40.00 a gallon to diabetic patients. Some of the witnesses that came and testified as to needless death of family members because these promoters told them patients of theirs didn't need to take insulin. Well, there were some other of those cases that I can recall vaguely.

One of them I think was Hadacol, they made some rather wild claims for Hadacol promoted by, I should say, by a rather colorful politician character from Lafayette, Louisiana. What was his name now? LeBlanc, Dudley LeBlanc.

Porter: Yes.

Field: This part of it might not apply to FDA but it certainly had an effect. We had a letter from a lady out in California who was complaining about the activities of a relative of hers, who was posing as a nurse in California. Not knowing, at the time of receiving that letter what on earth good it was, that we just simply put in the files. Ordinarily on a letter like that would just be thrown out. But about that time Mr. LeBlanc let it be known that he had a new medical director. That turned out to be this unlicensed male nurse in California who had picked himself up

some sort of spurious medical diploma. One of the things that we did was let it be known that the medical director was not in fact a doctor. And at the same time Mr. LeBlanc was advertising for a parrot that would say "Hadacol". And we hoped in our little article in the JAMA which is the Journal of the AMA, that he had better luck in finding himself a parrot than he did a medical director. And he thought we were being very unfair and he complained bitterly about the AMA report on his activity. But he never did anything about it.

Porter: Oliver, we sort of worked into talking about some of these quackery cases after you were in AMA and you had been talking about your experiences as an inspector in FDA. I just wanted to, kind of for the the record, indicate that you switched to AMA when you started talking about... you were still talking about FDA when you were talking about the Koch case and then you switched into some later cases which were during your experiences in AMA. So before we get into anymore of your AMA let's talk a little bit about your coming to AMA. What this job was. What you know about your predecessor, did he start this activity. I can't ask very definite questions because I don't know much about it but give us as much background about the AMA's Bureau of Investigation.

Field: Well, that I think, I know a little bit about it. I never, for instance, did get to meet the man who started

the department. It actually was a part of the editorial offices of the Journal AMA. And it was called the Propaganda Department. The propaganda for reform in the advertising of patent medicines and this activity was that of Dr. Arthur Cramp who was an M.D. He had come to this country from England and had gone to a Normal school out in Missouri to learn to be a teacher. He married a lady out there and he obtained a teaching position in the schools in Milwaukee. And a child was born along about the turn of the century, and the child became sick and this man called upon someone to treat the child but it died. And he was convinced afterwards that in his need for help for his child, he'd called upon a quack and he quit his school teaching and went into what became Marquette School of Medicine. It was then known, I think, as the Wisconsin College of Medicine and Surgery. On graduation he came here to AMA. I don't know that he ever practiced medicine but he came here in about 1906 as an editorial assistant. He started the Department of Investigation, which at first was known as the Propaganda Department. Then that became the Bureau of Investigation back in about 1925 or 1926. In fact it was the Bureau of Investigation sometime before the FBI was organized. Cramp was essentially a writer and he is the man who compiled reports on medical quackery and had the propoganda department set goals: number one for exposing the true nature of the patent medicine

industry; and, number two, for seeking help in correcting these situations, mostly from law enforcement agencies such as Food and Drug. Cramp ran the department until his retirement in 1935, I think it was. He had an assistant who was an English major from the University of Chicago. He was Bliss Halling who actually did a good deal of the writing and editing of these reports that were compiled into volumes called Nostrums and Quackery. And the third one, there was volume one and two of that title, and the third one was Nostrums and Quackery and Pseudo Medicine. That was published in the mid 30's. And there was material for the fourth volume but it never did get published. Now a lot of those reports included, I guess you'd call them, summaries of Notices of Judgement. They were published in JAMA quite awhile before I came here. There were, of course, only those notices that applied to the medical profession by reason of patent medicines and so on.

One of the things that I was told when I first came here was that the Board of Trustees of AMA did not appreciate being sued by people for libel and slander for the stuff that was published by Cramp which, of course, was of a derogatory nature. There were a good many lawsuits filed during his tenure. In fact, I counted them up at one time and there were 42 law suits asking for a total of 26 million in damages. And at that time, I think, that the only

one that a plaintiff won was...it was very nominal I think it was a dollar or two judgment of guilty of libeling this man because the report referred to his religious activities. What they were, the details of course they escape me but that was the only one that they lost of all those 42 law suits, because most of them they were just filed and that was the end of it.

Porter: Yes.

Field: But during my time there weren't too many law suits filed.

Porter: Well, who followed Cramp? You didn't?

Field: No I didn't, a doctor named Clancy from the west coast succeeded Cramp in 1936. He was a urologist and independently wealthy. Apparently his wife had some ideas that if he were in Chicago at the AMA headquarters there'd be more social life. And that didn't happen, of course. He didn't stay very long. But he continued pretty much in the way that Cramp and Halling had done over the years, but he returned to Seattle to do more graduate study in urology in 1938.

Then there came a man from the east named Barton. He too was a doctor of medicine. He left in 1942 to go with the medical officer procurement program at the start of World War II and that, of course, was in Washington D.C. With Dr. Barton gone the only man left was Halling. And Halling just ran the Department as he found it. He

made no effort to add to the content of the files and they were pretty dated by the time I got here. Information that was given on material, products and persons was rather old. And I spent a good deal of time obtaining more up to date information into the files. And I, of course, was very fortunate in my office setup. I had two ladies, one of them a Juelma Williams who had been Dr. Cramp's secretary from 1926 until 1935.

Porter: Would you spell her name?

Field: J U E L M A, Juelma Williams was of Welsh extraction. She was a very dedicated person. She did more than anyone could ever ask her to do in the way of contributions. She made it possible for me to go out and give talks on quackery and so fourth, because she kept the office running. She worked for AMA for 45 years, I think, before she retired.

The other one was a lady who kept our files, Alex Nichols and she had a very effective manner of indexing both as to the product, and as to persons and as to actions against the product like seizures, and prosecutions, both products and people. The net effect was that we had a set of files that was absolutely complete and we could bring out the salient matters very easily and very quickly.

Porter: What was in those files and how did you get it and how did you use it?

Field: In various manners. For instance, if a product was of a local nature and then became national, people in the medical society in that area would have information or could get it for us if we asked them for it. Sometimes we would go to the Food and Drug Administration for their information, like their publications, their bulletins and so on. We would also initiate some little investigation of our own. I can remember one that might be of interest.

We had been sued by Mr. Hoxsey because of an article that appeared in the American magazine which was a supplement to the Hearst Sunday papers, Sunday supplement. In that it had been stated that Hoxsey's father had died of cancer even though the Hoxsey treatment, so called, was for cancer. And apparently there was nothing in the file that would really show that. I had to make kind of a field investigation of my own and I could find nothing in the local newspapers or any of the doctors around the southern Illinois town where Hoxsey came from that this was or was not so. There was nothing about in the records of the county Bureau of Vital Statistics, I don't think they had them that early. But anyway to shorten up the story, I ran into this very wealthy Mr. Hoxsey's brother who was the epitome of a hillbilly. He wore a dirty pair of overalls, he had a slouch hat that you might find in cartoons that would depict such characters, He had a "chaw" of tobacco

and some of it was on his face and he wanted to know what I wanted to know. And I said, "Well sir, I'm inquiring as to the death of your father." And his response was, "well I know my father did not die of cancer." And I said, "well why do you say that?" And he told me that his father had gone down to Barnes Hospital in St. Louis, had spent three days there and had returned because he had no cancer. They had a cancer treatment department there. So naturally I thanked him and I went on down to Barnes and sure enough there was a record of this man having been there having been diagnosed as having cancer of the face and having returned untreated because he had refused treatment. And the judge actually in that case made a finding that Hoxsey's father did die of cancer, although he ruled in Hoxsey's favor.

Oh yes, of course, there had been a few other cases that we kind of looked into for our own benefit and for the incidental benefit of anyone else who wanted the information, who I would say was legitimately entitled to it. To say, just how did you do it, well every case had its own importance, every case had its own facets of information and activity.

I once used to say that Krebiozen was the greatest medical hoax of the second half of the twentieth century, and now I am not so sure. Maybe Laetrile has them beat.

The business here was essentially educational, really. We had the information for those who wanted it, mostly at first for the medical professional itself. More recently from lay people. Pretty soon the percentages of inquiries each year turned toward the lay inquiries.

Porter: Were these journalists or...?

Field: Some were. Some were local reporters. Some authors who came in here and utilized our files in preparing their books on subjects that were related.

Porter: How else did you disseminate this? Now, I know of course from my personal knowledge that you went out and made a lot of talks.

Field: Oh, yes, I made a good many on our subjects. We contributed a few items to the JAMA. We stopped publishing the notices of judgement because the interest in them was very, very small. If a person had an inquiry about a particular product and there was a notice of judgement in there they would get the essentials at least, or possibly a copy of the notice for their own information.

There were other organizations that became active and interested in this whole business of medical or health quackery, as some people like to call it.

For instance, the American Cancer Society became interested in cancer quacks in the fifties. Earlier there was a group, a committee of the National Research Council

seeking a way to evaluate, as they called it, unestablished methods of diagnosis and treatment of cancer. There were some very interesting people that were appointed to that NRC committee. Some of them were active in their own areas.

Like for instance, Harry Garland who was a radiologist out in San Francisco. The California Medical had active people who were seeking information on California so-called cures and treatments. There were a few of them out there. They weren't very nationally known. They also included others than cancer; like arthritis and rheumatism.

Then there was the Better Business Bureau, the National Better Business Bureau had interest in some of the quack activities. Same was true of the Arthritis Foundation. The Post Office Department was interested in what we had to offer them with respect to by mail promotions. Products for a variety of needs, I guess you would call them. Of course the Federal Trade Commission; we then had some rapport with them on false advertising. The collecting and dispensing of information on these subjects was essentially our activity here.

Of course it changed a bit in about 1962 or '63. They brought another man in to run the department. A man by the name of Taylor, Doyl Taylor, and rather than run the department the way it was, well they left me alone. He be-

came overly interested in chiropractic and that, of course, became his number one activity. I kept the department as it was before.

A certain lawyer from Iowa was appointed or hired here in about 1962 because Mr. Joe Stettler, our General Counsel, had left to go with the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association. This man from Iowa brought in a friend of his from Des Moines who was ostensibly a lawyer, although I don't believe he ever practiced or was admitted. The man who brought him in was the General Council of AMA, his name was Bob Throckmorton from Des Moines. Bob lasted a year or two. He decided he would rather go back to Iowa and practice law. The battle against the chiropractors continued and that, of course, lead to litigation. A lot of it. The net result is the activities of the department have kind of slowed down, like they were when I came here. The department now is, part of the archive library system of AMA.

I dealt with a good many subjects. A good many people. Disseminated our propaganda, you might call it, to an awful lot of people by radio, television, newspaper articles, medical columnists, and there were other people who got interested and had little lectures and talks on their own, on the subject. So we did have quite a few people interested in the business and the subject matters. It took quite a while.

Porter: I presume it was in this way that you became acquainted with James Harvey Young?

Field: I came acquainted with Dr. Young because of his interest in the patent medicine activity, first before the 1906 Pure Food and Drugs Act. And again from 1906 to 1938 the activities that were brought about in the 1938 Act. He has written these two books on these subjects. One of them The Toadstool Millionaires and the other one the Medical Messiahs. I think you are acquainted with them.

Porter: Right.

Field: Yes, and then there were others that came in. There was Jerry Carson and his "One for a Man and Two for a Horse", a pictorial history of patent medicine promotion. A very interesting and well done compilation of the old time medicine men and their products. Other people have written books on these subjects. There again I can recall vaguely the interest in them but the particulars escape me.

Porter: Yes. Well, Oliver now that we've had a little lunch break, which was a very nice one, and are a little relaxed, I would like to talk about the quackery congresses. I'd like you, if you would, to tell me how they got started, to describe them in as great as detail as you would like to, but give us the genesis of the thing and then just carry us into these various quackery congresses.

Field: Well, I think, Robert, to begin with, you have to appreciate the nature of the AMA itself. The AMA is a con-

federation of state and local medical societies. It has functioned as such since the middle of the 19th century. The stated purposes of the organization were for the advancement of the science and art of medicine and for the protection of the public health. This was the basis upon which the AMA began its existence. And there was at that time a feeling that was expressed in one of the early meetings, whether it was the first I don't know, of the necessity for informing the people about medical quackery. This was one of the very earliest corollaries of the business of the protection of the public health. To keep people away from those who would exploit them, who are either actually or who think they are in need of medical attention. And this was never really formalized until the coming of Dr. Cramp around 1906.

Now before the coming of Cramp there was another rather interesting aspect that I don't know that it is very well known and I don't have, at my fingertips, the basis or the particulars of the AMA and its very strong support of the original 1906, or what became the 1906 Pure Food and Drugs Act. AMA supported that and I think AMA supported the '38 Act. I don't know that they were very pleased with the Homeopathic Pharmacopoeia being in as a part of the law of the land as it became under a homeopath, Senator Copeland from New York, who was one of the authors of the

1938 Food Drug and Cosmetic Act. I think AMA has had support as a matter of its policy for the existence of the laws that protect the public, such as the old 1906 Act, now the 1938 Act and the, I think you would call them the Amendments which required now not only safety but efficacy in the introduction of new drugs. I do think that that relationship which has existed since even before the existence of FDA is a rather interesting phenomenon.

Porter: Do you think that going clear back sort of to the beginning, this is an outgrowth and maybe a widening of a desire and effort to, sort of a self-policing thing, to...

Field: No, if what you say to me as I understand it to be whether or not the medical profession sought to police its own as such, I would say no, except for its support of State Medical Practice and Licensure Acts. This would not apply to products, nor would it apply to methods of practice any more than making sure that those who did practice medicine were adequately trained and were honorable men or women because after all we have had physicians mainly of men but many of the gentler sex, I think they call it. But now I don't think medicine by itself sought to police itself. Of course it had its organizational ethics, stand I guess maybe you'd call it. The AMA judicial council was

an appellate committee of doctors, available to physicians who were accused by their local medical societies of unethical conduct which could include the matter of the use of unestablished medications or methods in a treatment of people. There was always the effort to make it a scientific activity. There was also first, always the recognition that there was the matter of the art of medicine, it had to be recognized because there it stands. No, I think AMA relied on the statutory enactments, both federal and state. And it would support those activities as part of its own accepted purpose of being, which included the protection of the public health. I don't think the AMA had any idea of making itself a law enforcement agency.

Porter: Well, I didn't mean that so much as a sort of an...in an organization you think of it as an internal security type of thing. To eradicate the bad actors from their own midst.

Field: Well, no I think that was left entirely to the local society. On that activity, to the extent that I know of and have had access to what has happened in those instances, would be that it would be up to the local society. That activity was subject to appeal on behalf of anyone who had been accused and found guilty of some infraction of ethics or law in connection with his membership, not in connection with his abilities to practice. Then he had

the right to appeal to the AMA judicial council. Again only with respect to his membership in his local medical society. But if there was a matter of violation of state law AMA had nothing to do with that except perhaps to report such activity, or they left it strictly to the state medical licensing boards and now more recently the State Disciplinary Boards. This entails a business of doctors not competent for reasons other than their training and so fourth to practice medicine.

Porter: Let's get into the quackery congresses.

Field: Well, yes, that was rather interesting and I hope productive. AMA, in the person of a staff man who was the general counsel at the time, Mr. Joe Stetler. Now Joe came here to work as a staff lawyer in, I think, it was federal legislation involving the medical profession. And not too long after he came here, a matter of a year, two or three, he became the general counsel. Of course it was his duty to represent AMA and to give them good legal advice in what they were doing internally, in their publications and so on. This is to avoid criticism mostly, I guess. But it was also a practical thing, they had had lawyers on the staff long before. In fact I was on the staff but not in the business of legal advice and so on before he arrived on the scene. And there were men when I came, they called it Legislative Activities Department, I think. But here again

it was in relation to the business of AMA and its efforts to protect the public health. Not much had been done along the line of any public activity in this direction. A day came along when, I think, I was visiting Mr. Stetler in his office on another matter. He said to me, "Oliver have you ever thought of having meetings on the business of quackery?", and knowing that there were committees and other internal organizational groups involving the practice of medicine. There were committees for this, or councils for that and so on. Council on drugs then a council on pharmacy and chemistry, council on foods and nutrition, council on medical education, council on medical services. Many internal groups had their committees and had their activities which were, number one, for the practice of medicine. Here was an activity for the public good that had little public notice. And he asked me had I ever thought of putting on a meeting on quackery and having a committee. And I said, "Well yes, my secretary and I had talked about it, we had done nothing about it because of other commitments, I guess." And he said, "Well, draw up a memorandum on the subject and give me your thoughts on it." And I did and, of course, this memorandum that we have in front of us addressed to him back in January of what is it...

Porter: This is a memorandum from you to Mr. Stetler, of January 30, 1961.

Field: Yes.

Porter: I think by this time you laid out a...

Field: I laid out...what became pretty much the Congress.

Porter: First Congress.

Field: First Congress, yes. Yes I had notified people in the Food and Drug Administration, the Post Office Department, Federal Trade Commission, the Cancer Society, Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation and I believe there were some other groups and individuals that have had an inordinate interest in the subject. Out of that activity with the coordination and cooperation of the agencies and the other groups we did organize and put on what became a very successful and very worthwhile well publicized meeting on quackery and the various fields in which interest in and obligations for, were extant.

Porter: In the event did FDA actually cosponsor that first...

Field: First one was a co-sponsored thing by FDA and AMA. And we brought it to their attention and told them what we had in mind. The people of FDA, to my recollection, that we dealt with were Mr. Janssen and Dr. Milstead. We might have also talked to Mr. Larrick.

Porter: Yes.

Field: It was Mr. Larrick, because at that time he was Commissioner.

Porter: Right.

Field: And we got a favorable response from FDA and from the other agencies and the net result we did, we had a very interesting, well presented and well publicized meeting on the subject in Washington, DC I think it was October, 1961.

Porter: Now there were at least two more such congresses, why was the need felt for additional ones? Was the first one so successful and so on or...?

Field: Well, I think that if you only had one in that direction and stopped at that particular point, you might leave a void that people would wonder why did you only do it once. Particularly the others in the particular group that were interested and felt that this was a good means.

Porter: Did it grow? Was the second one bigger in terms of people who came and...?

Field: My recollection on that is...no, I'm not sure. It was about the same but I don't think it was as much, I'm sure it wasn't any greater in the way of response. And that's, of course, attendance at the meetings.

Porter: Basically it was the same people more or less.

Field: Pretty much, pretty much the same people. And there were meetings in the interim, between the national meetings, of those who were primarily interested and thought the idea was good to continue the effort.

Porter: You know Harvey Young in his letter to you, which he sent me a copy of, is interesting in what he calls, he

didn't know its exact name, but I think he refers to it as a Quackery Committee that sort of carried on this work between the Congresses. Was this...he wants to know something about it, do you recall, was this a formal sort of thing or...?

Field: Well, the Committee on Quackery was appointed by the AMA trustees as a committee of the board of trustees. I think between the first two of the...or maybe it was during the second or third, here again I'd have to really go into the background and the old files. But the people who were on that committee, they were all doctors of medicine. One of them was the executive secretary of the New York State Medical Society. One of them was a surgeon down in New Orleans, Dr. Joseph Sabatier. Another one was a neurosurgeon in Boston, Dr. Tom Ballentyne. He became President of AMA not too many years ago. But this committee really developed into a committee to inquire into the activities and the worthwhileness of chiropractic.

Porter: I see.

Field: And its function...

Porter: Do you think it sort...

Field: ...was related away from such meetings as we had before.

Porter: Do you think it started there and then they just sort of narrowed it off into that...?

Field: That very well could have been. I attended a good many of the meetings of that committee. I did not function as a secretary to it. Even from the start of it I had a man who worked for us for awhile who did the work of secretary of the committee. And what was his name...?

Porter: Was that the young fellow, Dick something or the other?

Field: No, not Stalvy.

Porter: Not Stalvy.

Field: No it was...Youngerman, Bob Youngerman.

No, Stalvy was my assistant before that. He was there in the fifties and I think by the time the meetings on quackery occurred he had left me to go...

Porter: Did he become Secretary of a State Association or something like that?

Field: No he did not, he became primarily with our PR people and then he went to work for the Nutrition Foundation.

Porter: He came from Food and Drug originally, didn't he?

Field: He was with Food and Drug. The fact of the matter is, I interviewed him for a job in 1954 in San Francisco where he was working as an inspector. He had a premedical background at Stanford. And his relationship with medicine was, he had I think at least one uncle, if not more relatives who were doctors of medicine down in South Carolina.

He did not continue into the medical study, for reasons better known to himself, what they were escape me at this moment. But he did not have as a part of staff anything to do with the organization or the planning or the putting on of the first congress and the others. In fact, the man who was the first secretary of that committee succeeded him as my assistant or however you catergorize people who work for you. But the Committee on Quackery, I really had a private feeling of displeasure, particularly when the thrust of its effort was in the business of letting it be known about the quality of chiropractors and so on as members of the healing arts, so-called. I really wasn't too pleased with the whole thing but I did not say too much about it because it was pretty much out of my hands. And it became pretty much out of my hands with the hiring of Mr. Taylor, Mr. Doyle Taylor. He came in in the early 60's, about 1962 or 1963. I don't think he was here when we had our first meeting, or first congress, I should say, in 1961.

Porter: Do you think he pushed the matter in the direction of...?

Field: Well, he made a kind of a personal crusade out of it, partly because he came from Iowa as did chiropractic in the beginning, by the way of the Palmers in Davenport.

Well that, of course, ended up with the business of multiple law suits and so on, none of which were very

popular with the management of AMA. I think I told you that I was told that when I first came here they didn't like law suits. For which you can't blame them.

Porter: Which really meant that you had to be...you got this information from many sources, you had to be pretty sure, you had good poop before you acted on it.

Field: Well, yes, you had to have something in your hip pocket when you fired your gun, otherwise you are in real deep and serious trouble. We tried to avoid that, we tried to be factual and we tried to be, I think, rather objective. We didn't attack anybody on their person other than their activities which had medical import, had medical effect you might call it. And their activities were not based on sound scientific principles.

Porter: Okay, now you had another Quackery Congress then in Chicago. A second one.

Field: That was an interim meeting between the first and the third. First and second. I think that was a more meeting of the principals to plot their course for having a second meeting, a second national meeting.

Porter: It was a pretty big meeting because I was in Chicago at that time and I attended it.

Field: Well, you didn't have a lot of outside people, you had just those who were primarily interested and their representative.

Porter: Yes, maybe so.

Field: Not the general public and I don't know whether it was well publicized or not, I can't recall that. The second congress was pretty much the same as the first. The third congress got into the business of chiropractic problems and that grew I guess into...what was the last one, I guess the last one was fourth. Now where that was held, I think that was held in Chicago.

Porter: Was it?

Field: I think so. We'd have to go back into the records.

Porter: Incidentally, if anybody wanted to inquire more into this I would presume AMA has files of records that would...

Field: Yes the files are still here at the headquarters in Chicago. The accessibility of them would be up to, number one the nature of the interest and the reason for being interested. To satisfy the office of the general counsel.

Porter: Yes, I recognize that but there is documentary material in existence that if a person could...

Field: Well, if he wanted to come in and study I would imagine if he had a good reason therefore, that he or she would want or be able to let the general counsel know of their interest. AMA, of course, has had some very very abrasive experiences with people who have come into their files and they are a little bit gun shy in this business of

letting their files open. There have been some pretty traumatic experiences, highly unjustified. People have an idea that AMA is some kind of a giant that functions to protect the medical profession only, and that isn't so. The interest, the functional part of AMA, is necessarily in the interest of the medical profession. But it is also not perhaps as immediately important but generally important that what it does is for the benefit of the public and not for the benefit of having axes to grind or people having peculiar interests that are in their interest and not in the interest of the public.

Porter: Yes.

Field: So I don't know, I could not speak for the association as of this time. Anyone who would be interested along that line would have to be able to lay their cards on the table, so to speak.

Porter: They'd have to satisfy the general counsel.

Field: They'd have to satisfy the general counsel.

Porter: They aren't public records. This is a private institution.

Field: A private institution. They are a corporation organized not for profit.

Porter: I would like you somewhere along the line, I don't want to interrupt anything if you've got more to say on the present subject but if you have used up the present

subject. I would like you to talk something about the people, mostly in FDA, that were important people that you came in contact with and tell me what kind of people they were as far as you were concerned and how you worked with them, their attitudes toward working with AMA and you know just general... I'll tell you Oliver, there is a lot of things about these people that is just plain in the files of FDA you know. What I'm trying to do is get little vignettes, something that maybe isn't in the written word but would be of interest historically.

Look at a man like George Larrick for instance, and I don't want to pick him necessarily, but I know after you got the job in AMA I know you dealt with Larrick on many occasions. You saw him dealing with other people.

Field: I always had good relationships with Mr. Larrick. I thought he was a very fine gentleman. I knew a bit about his background in FDA. He was not an inspector, he was a chemist, wasn't he?

Porter: No, he was an inspector.

Field: Was he an inspector, well who was it that was the ...Dr. Milstead, he was a chemist.

Porter: Yes, Larrick was not, in fact I don't know if Larrick had a college degree I've heard that. I might be all wet about that, I don't know.

Field: I think there was some inquiry into that.

Porter: He was not a medical man.

Field: No, he had no medical background that I knew of. But I think he did have some doctorate in science.

Porter: Honorary.

Field: Was it honorary? Well, this is very interesting but I don't think it should be taken away from him. I think he did a pretty able job of following his predecessors who are all men up from the ranks in FDA. There were many waiting in the wings, you might say, when Larrick relinquished his post, I guess he retired.

Porter: Yes.

Field: Then to have somebody come in with an outsider, from the same agency but not a Food and Drug background was a matter that was predicted by a former employee of FDA and who wound up his career as a man on our staff, a Norman DeNosequo.

Norm, in a private conversation at one time when we were talking about something else, predicted that if the Public Health Service ever came in and took over the FDA, it would change and it would not be the FDA that we had known. In my capacity, both as a former employee and as a man who had, I think, had pretty good rapport with the people in FDA.

Porter: Did you see that happen when Goddard...your speaking of when Goddard came in. Did you see a change with your relations with FDA?

Field: Well not immediately, no. Goddard I think came into our...I think he was there for the second congress. Larrick was there for the first. No I think it wasn't any immediate change that my recollection would...

Porter: Now Goddard was a physician.

Field: Yes, I know he was.

Porter: I would think if anything it would of improved your relations.

Field: Well, maybe yes and maybe no. The physician who is an excellent administrator, who is able to manage such a thing as a federal agency having to do with subjects that FDA deals in, can be a rare bird. The man who is trained in medicine and who has gone through all the courses and all the awful effort that it takes to get through a medical school and go through a post-graduate training program to qualify him to be a surgeon, a physician, a radiologist or some other of the specialties or the general practice of medicine. Usually this training does not include the business of how to manage such a thing as FDA. Although FDA was started by a man out of Indiana who was an M.D., but who was essentially a public health...and I guess he did quarrel some what with the medical fraternity in the early days. And that was Mr. Wiley.

Porter: Dr. Wiley.

Field: Dr. Wiley, I'm sorry. No...a peculiar little interest... I was in a group from AMA who were testifying

before a committee of the U.S. Senate and I think it was the Committee on Labor and the Public Health, I don't know just how now, but the chairman of the committee was.

Porter: You were talking about a Senate Committee.

Field: A Senate Committee on labor and public health or welfare, I forget. Pat McNamara was the Senator and he asked a question and he seemed to have addressed it my direction. He said, "why is it that my investigators can go out into a drugstore and they can pay 39 cents a hundred, or 59 cents a hundred, or 99 cents a hundred for aspirin." And in response to that I said, "well Senator it doesn't make any difference whether you spend 10 cents a hundred or a dollar a hundred, aspirin is all the same. It has to be under the law, it is in the U.S. Pharmacopoeia." He thanked me and nobody raised any objection at the moment. But I do recall that my own people here were a little bit on the side of flabbergasted because our good friends at Bayer screamed bloody-murder. They sent a letter to the Senator and they persuaded the AMA that all aspirin wasn't the same, that it had differences in the quality of the filling and so on and so fourth. Well, I said nothing about that at the time but I had to laugh because one of our old staff members, when all of this was going on, walked up to me and handed me an original page from a Readers Digest from way back in the middle 40's. And the

title of that one was "Don't Be An Ass About Aspirin," and at that time it had AMA blessing because it told you it doesn't make any difference. You know whether it was 2 cents or a dollar it's all the same.

Porter: Yes.

Field: So I guess it all depends where you sit, how the picture looks. So I was a little bit miffed about that but I didn't say much, it didn't make any difference to me. But I did have the opportunity to tell the Senator there and it sure rocked the aspirin industry, especially I should say the Bayer part of it.

So when Leo Baer (Baer, not Bayer), who incidentally was a very interesting character and who was hired by AMA to read to the blind professor who was the first of the secretaries of the Council on Pharmacy and Chemistry. And the blind professor was being read to by this lad who came here at 16 years of age. His father had been on the Swiss consulate and had died very suddenly, I guess. And here this man was up against a boy. Supporting his mother and his younger brothers and sisters. And Leo Baer became a walking encyclopedia on the subject of drugs. And if I needed to know anything about some new drug that was in on the market, if it had any background at all, Leo would know about it and he could go to his files and show you the documentation that he had. He was the man who brought in

that little article from Readers Digest entitled "Don't Be An Ass About Aspirin." And one of your people after all this occurred and that is Dr. Milstead, told me personally that they checked the records of the FDA on a number of samples of aspirin in a year at about that time, there were none of them actionable. And all of them, of course, were NAI, no action indicated. And there were no samples of aspirin that didn't meet the requirements of the U.S. Pharmacopoeia. So again I had a little bit of support from FDA. But those are the interesting little...some of the interesting sidelights and they occurred every now and then. And that brings them back to mind, of course, is a suggestion to someone who had interest at the time or at the present time. If we didn't have information, we went after it. We had the sources and we used them. And this has now changed and I can only relate it to the activities that stemmed from the Committee on Quackery when it became nothing but a committee that involved itself with the legitimacy or the illegitimacy of chiropractic. There was a legitimacy because they were licensed in most of the states and while the committee existed they became licensed in two or three others. And, of course, in HEW was our man from Michigan over there that was the Secretary, the father of Social Security and the Medicare thing. Cohen.

Porter: Who, Wilbur?

Field: Wilbur Cohen, yes. Dr. Cohen, I guess, was a very staunch advocate for keeping chiropractors off the rolls of those furnishing attention and care to patients who were under Medicare. Now how much of that has changed I don't know. Out of my field a little bit.

Porter: Isn't it kind of interesting and I wonder if there is any connection with the fact that almost exactly when AMA was moving away from keeping tabs on quackery, FDA was shifting its resources away from that area. Do you think there is any connection or do you think it was coincidental?

Field: Well, I would be obliged in my own sphere of knowledge to say that it was just happened to be coincidental. It could be wrong and I would not think that either AMA or FDA would have any effect on the programs of the other.

Porter: What do you think now, at this point, where very little is being done by either organization about quackery? You and I are both retired, we are consumers now and we see quackery flourishing.

Field: That is right.

Porter: What is your feeling about that, do you think it was a mistake to let it go, do you think it ought to be somehow regenerated, the interest in it?

Field: This is a hard question to answer. The first thing, of course, is that the emphasis having been side-

tracked or done away with on the business of educating the public and of trying to make skeptics of them in the business of health and sickness and so on. Whether or not all that effort is worthwhile, is a hard question to answer. No one can lay their finger on the public health having had any real effect on the activities of unlicensed practitioners, impostors, cultists, faddists or others involved in the business of unscientific medicine. Someone has said, and I see no reason to doubt the word, that of the sciences medicine is the least exact. There are many aspects which fall under the category of the art of medicine. It's the personality of the practitioner. It's his skill and his way with his patients that has a lot to do with the value of his services. But when you have nothing to offer that is of real value or really established value, who can say that any kind of care might have a benefit. Now whether there has been a discussion of whether this class activity needs to be revived, I know nothing about it. But I would say that at this particular time I don't know that there is anyone that's really interested in reviving. Maybe Dr. Young is.

Porter: I know Dr. Young is.

Field: Now who else?

Porter: I don't know. I would hate to think that one man down there at Emory University in Atlanta, is the only man against quackery at this point.

Field: Well, I don't know it's hard to say. I know of my own, when I see ads for products, on the tube and other aspects of media, I just have an awful time. I groan and I sometimes walk away because its so obvious that all they're doing is exploiting people. Now maybe it is just an economic exploitation, maybe it isn't.

Porter: There is a lot of economics there, for sure.

Field: Oh sure an awful lot of that kind. On the other hand there's so many self limiting diseases that actually exist for awhile and the body depending on the resistance capacity of the individual they can return to health, maybe without any help at all. So the business of medicine among the sciences there are a lot of unknowns and a lot of phases of it that you cannot catergorize and you cannot evaluate. But I do say this, that while business of advancing the public health still continues to be a AMA concern, apparently they haven't felt that fighting it in the way that we did, the business of quackery, is a necessary part of that. Improvement in the business of tools for the physicians. Putting out compendiums, giving doctors greater information than the firms do. I'm speaking about their literature and their detail men. Of course, I'm in the field of drugs I guess almost exclusively in that. I think AMA keeps up in those directions. And I think there are many many improvements in not only drugs

but also in surgery, also the other medical specialties. And AMA has at least publicized to the professions so that that knowledge is available to the profession. Through its journals, has its specialty journals, it has the Journal AMA, it has the AMA News, it has many items of the media, for the medical profession. So that in turn the doctor is better equipped to deal with the problems that he encounters in his practice. So we're at dead center, at least, on organized activity to inform the public about the dangers of quackery. That is the way it looks as of now. Someone else will have to answer that question.

Porter: Hopefully.

Field: Oliver, we have had a little break here now. What about Krebiozen, do you have some stories, incidents?

Field: Well Bob, I, of course, was there at the introduction of Krebiozen to the medical profession and the public at the Drake Hotel in Chicago in 1951. It was announced as having...and there was a brochure distributed with alleged cases of improvement and/or cure after having received Krebiozen. Beside me was Dr. DeNosauquo and next to him was Bob Stormont.

Stormont had been medical director of FDA, before he came to AMA to succeed Austin Smith who went to Park Davis as President. And I'll never forget Dr. DeNosauquo. Under his breath when Dr. Andrew Ivy was standing up in front of

this prestigious audience extolling the benefits of his experience with Krebiozen. And under his breath but loud enough for those around to hear it DeNosquo said, "Ivy you goddamned quack." Here was Ivy. Well, hell he was on a pedestal and he was an excellent teacher, apparently. He had the respect of everybody in the medical profession, except the very few who knew him well.

I am sure that you know that Krebiozen was labeled to be one part of what these people claimed was in one hundred thousand parts of light N.F. light mineral oil. You may recall, also, some years later a young FDA chemist was able to identify that substance by means of a rather sophisticated chemical procedure (the name of which now escapes me) but it turned out that the substance was a well known component of the blood of healthy persons. It wasn't to long after the government unsuccessfully tried Dr. Ivy in a criminal matter which took several months to conclude. The same is true in the way of the effort to stop the promotion of another cancer product which we have mentioned previously...Laetrile. This product has had the benefit of rather clever promotional activity, even though it is alleged to be derived from apricot pits.

I recalled, at that particular moment, that I had been asked about another cancer product that was announced in the New York Times not too long before, which was a by

product of the manufacture of cortisone made by Wilson and Company. And the cortisone by-products were given to this man by the name of Wachtel, a New York physician. But anyway it was written up in the New York Times as having promise in the management and treatment of cancer. I called the medical director of the American Cancer Society, Dr. Cameron, and I said, "Doctor what about this, it's in the paper and I'm getting inquiries?" He said, "Oh, that's all right Oliver why don't you just call Dr. Ivy." Dr. Ivy was here and he was looking at the cases. He said he knows all about it". I said, "Very well I know Dr. Ivy, I'd be glad to." So I called Dr. Ivy over at the University of Illinois where he was the head of the whole business, he was vice president in charge of the universities medical school and what not. I said, "Well, Dr. Ivy I've talked to Dr. Cameron in New York and he said you can tell me all about this new product." Dr. Ivy hardly said hello or anything else, but he started to give me hell over the phone for damning a product before I knew anything about it. Well I said, "Dr. Ivy all I'm trying to do is get information so I can answer inquiries." Didn't satisfy him at all. Just damning a product before its merit is known. And that is when I put the connection that DeNosquo had in his under the breath, "You goddamn quack", to my experience with Ivy, and he is giving me hell for calling a treatment

no good, when all I'm trying to do is find out what is it. I had to go elsewhere to find out it was a by-product of cortisone. Well, anyway I got into all kinds of fun with Ivy and Krebiozen.

Porter: Well, at least Ivy didn't damn the product as a competitor to Krebiozen?

Field: No, he had an open mind. He was apparently wondering what the hell's going on here, I've got to protect my own flanks.

And, of course, the other thing was in hearings we learned that they had bought an ampuling machine from some firm in the east. When I went down to our chemists, down in the fifth floor, and I said, "What about that firm?" Oh yes they knew all about it, they told me where the western representative could be found, either in Lilly, down in Indianapolis or some other firm that was down there. I found the guy. He said, "My god, who can I talk to about this?" He said that he would come right up and so we had lunch with this fellow who had installed this ampuling machine. He said, "The then states attorney of Cook County was ampuling Krebiozen." Oh it was something else. Yes, we never did use him though, we didn't have to, that was that legislative inquisition where they wanted to know why the University of Illinois was interfering with medical research. They wouldn't let any work be done on

Krebiozen in the facilities of the university. Yes, you could write a book about Krebiozen.

Even going to a law meeting, McKenry Country Bar Association, giving a talk to them on quacks. Having them tell me why they brought in some horses from Wisconsin. They didn't have a health certificate on them. The state of Illinois prosecuted them and the defense was that the horses were going to be used in the manufacturer of Krebiozen, the horse's blood. So I'd go over to the packing plant and I get some blood that had been taken, we couldn't find anything in the blood, but FDA did, remember?

Porter: Yes.

Field: It was the same stuff. Oh, I tell you. How about that Robert.

Porter: Well, we can quit anytime you want. Are you kind of run down?.

Field: I am a little run down.

Porter: Okay, well Oliver.

Field: Had I had a little better preparation maybe we could tell a few more.

Porter: Well, I'll tell you what I am going to...

Field: I'm so fearful of not being able to go into the file like I used to be able to.

Porter: Why don't we leave it at this and after I get a transcription of this, a rough draft, I'll send it to you.

In the mean time if an instance you'd like to enter in you can write a paragraph or two or whatever you'd like and we'll just insert or add it as an addendum or however it seems to fit the best. So you're not restricted, today.

Field: It is a worthwhile thing.

Porter: Yes. And I wanted to tell you for the record that we greatly appreciate you taking the time and effort to do this and we will...

Field: I figure that I'm amongst old friends.

Porter: Well, you are. Well, thank you and that's the end of the tape.

Field: Very good.