

CHAPTER TWENTY-FOUR

“Either you are accepted or rejected and if he puts you on that list, you are dead in science in this country because that list goes out to all the doctors in the United States.”

Gary Null

*January 15, 1986
26 Federal Plaza, New York City
Testimony of Gary Null
Congressional Public Hearing*

THE CONGRESSMAN: Gary Null. We have heard a lot about you. I am sure that we look forward to hearing from you.

MR. NULL: I will try to keep it brief. I don't have anything prepared. I did submit a copy of the article that will be published in two weeks on Dr. Burton. I first came into contact with the name of Dr. Burton and his work approximately eight years ago.

At that time people in our audience were asking, the radio audience of the show I host, called NATURAL LIVING, were asking about Dr. Burton's work. I had spent the past ten years, meaning ten years from now back, studying alternative cancer therapies as well as traditional cancer therapies. I was a supporter

of traditional cancer. In fact, I was the leading fundraiser for the American Cancer Society from the time I was in high school . . .

It was only after my father had cancer and I saw that he was not being helped, that they had given up on him and that a traditional doctor by training, but an untraditional doctor by method, Dr. Emanuel Revisi, gave my father something that they could not, that I decided to probe into alternative therapy.

I, by the way, like a lot of other journalists, because I am a journalist, and a broadcaster, both in print and in the broadcast medium, found it very difficult to accept that there was any such thing as a conspiracy. People who talked about that, I looked at them as if they were paranoid.

And that nobody would deprive someone of a treatment that worked. What I found when I started to probe and probe deeply, as my nature is, I am very tenacious when I get into something, if I was going to look at Burton or Revisi, and I will keep it to Burton, I had to be convinced that he had something that worked.

So I interviewed patients. I interviewed at length his colleagues, including Dr. Rottino, and I knew something was wrong when the word on Burton from other journalists and doctors and the American Cancer Society was the following:

Burton's a quack. All right. What is a quack. Someone who is on the unproven methods list.

What is the unproven methods list? I am sorry to say that the unproven methods list is an appendage of McCarthyism, the medical equivalent of an inquisition that the American Cancer Society has chosen to use to ostracize, criticize, prosecute and

condemn anyone who challenges their view of burn, poison and cut treatments for cancer.

I then asked them, can you verify to me that Burton meets all the qualifications as a quack, if he does, story ended.

They gave sixteen reasons why one is considered a quack. That is on their list. They print it. It is very clear. Okay. We go down them. Is Dr. Burton a professional with an accredited degree, or does he have a bogus degree.

He is accredited. Some, including phantom journalists, from the New York *Daily News* would call him nothing more than “a zoologist,” not even a horse doctor.

Well, in point of fact, I am lucky Dr. Burton does not work just on horses but on humans. He had a strong academic background. They told me that he did not have this and I found out that he had that.

Then it is a person that pretends to have knowledge in an area when in fact they don't. Burton did not pretend to have knowledge. He did have knowledge. He had knowledge in oncology, hence, cancer research, carcinogenics. Another criteria and a serious one is that a person is secret. Burton had published over sixteen scientific papers in conjunction with other people with the St. Vincent Hodgkin's Disease Center and hence was not trying to hide anything. He was trying to profit, which is one of the criteria, this man did not have five cents. If he had that, then half of that was owed to the other people on his research team.

That he was promising a cure. He was not involved in the business of treating patients. He was involved in the business of research.

So, when you finished with all the criteria, including quickly a few others, that they don't belong to professional associations, Burton belonged to all proper professional scientific associations; that they never presented their papers to the scientific community before going to the public with it. He always did—he never went to the public. Burton was by nature, in his personality or by the circumstances of his work, he held all of his work first up to professional criticism and peer review. That is a matter of record.

And that somehow he had secret patents. There were no secret patents and secret patents are not secret in our country. All sixteen criteria that the American Cancer Society laid down that you had to meet, they did not say meet one of them, you meet all of them. You are a quack; you go on their unproven methods list and you are blackballed.

What happens: no research funding, no professional presentations, and no publications.

You have to understand the interlocking connection here. The National Cancer Institute is not the bad guy in this. It is the American Cancer Society, the people who are not here today, to face me or other people or you that would challenge them.

It is the tail wagging the dog. No one understands that in the media. The National Cancer Institute is infinite. They have no major say so. The American Cancer Society dictates exactly what the cancer policy in the U.S. will be. Clearly the internal documents that I have, secret documents, copies of which I have and will give you that will show how much power the American Cancer Society has wielded over organizations for years.

I have here, as an example, a secret document that were minutes,

November 18, 1970, the American Cancer Society, New York City, Coordinating Conference on Health Information, listen carefully to, from who is here, the American Cancer Society, Coggen Wood. He is the person who decides who goes on the unproven methods list and who does not. He is the keeper of the key. Either you are accepted or rejected and if he puts you on that list, you are dead in science in this country because that list goes out to all the doctors in the United States.

Clearly the doctor who was here earlier, Dr. Salmer, or any other doctor, that would get this information, and a patient says should I go to Dr. Burton, and they look up the American Cancer Society, and they say he is on the quack list, no. And clearly there is the word quack; there are certain key words that are used. You are not going to send a patient off if you have been given his name off that list by the American Cancer Society. The National Cancer Institute does not send out the list. The American Cancer Society sends it out.

Who gave it the authority to do so? I don't know. They have chosen that. Who made the American Cancer Society the authority on cancer? I am still questioning that, but who else was at this meeting?

The American Medical Association, H. Doyle Taylor, a lawyer, H. Doyle Taylor was responsible for creating the Department of Investigation of the AMA, since disbanded, with major lawsuits brought against it because it carried on surreptitious and clandestine operation to discredit and destroy in its own words, and again I have internal secret AMA documents that say the following:

Our purpose is first to 'isolate and then eliminate chiropractic as a profession'. They set about doing that. They also had there, alternative cancer therapies, along with homeopathy, acupuncture and other modalities.

The issue is that here is a man who was responsible for dictating the policy on what is acceptable and unacceptable practice. The American Pharmaceutical Association was represented there, the Arthritis Foundation was represented, the Council of Better Business Bureau. Here is what is very puzzling. The Food and Drug Administration was represented by William Evans and William Janson, two members, including their division of medical review and the Post Office Department, their postal inspection division.

Here are two governmental agencies working in tandem with private charities and an organization that represents all drug manufacturers in the United States.

Now, at no point did these people go forward before the public and say that they are meeting regularly, it was every six months, and dictating who they are going to target and using private industry, dictating that they don't like these people, and then turning them over to the FDA and post office authority and saying you guys go get them.

Then through their various offices working to do this. If someone says, what does this mean that was 1970. Yes, I had minutes of other meetings. Just this part, September 11, 1985, Frank Young, current Commission of the Food and Drug Administration, at the National Conference on what would you imagine, health fraud, says, right here, "Earlier I mentioned at

one of my first major public statements as commissioner, announced a joint FDA pharmaceutical advertising council effort on health fraud. This is a three-part program to vaccinate the public with information on how to recognize, avoid and help stop health fraud.

The program is a pioneering venture, a nationwide public awareness program on health fraud.

They then tie in to this health fraud committee all the people who have been attacking Burton. All the organizations that are attacking Burton. The people that spoke, and I have a list of all the people and their background who spoke at the conference and gave papers are the very same people who at the height of the AIDS criticism against Burton were in there yelling quack and fraud.

In the public's mind quack and fraud are synonymous. They took what are alleged quackery and, face it, there are people that are quacks out there, and they lumped in the Burtons, Revisis and anybody with a legitimate therapy, altogether.

It was one way of cleaning the whole house out. How will they go about it, and this is where I as a journalist have to be very careful, but unfortunately other broadcast journalists were not as careful. "As a follow up, a joint letter and background material on arthritis health fraud drafted with the aid of the Arthritis Foundation was sent to some 3,000 writers and reporters on consumer subjects encouraging them to develop material on this topic for their audience. Meaning you get a press kit and you broadcast it.

This same kind of material was sent out on Burton. Let me tell you exactly what was said about Burton.

In October, in the *Birmingham News*, as you know, there was a statement by Virginia Knauer, Special Advisor to President Reagan in the White House, Office of Consumer Affairs.

She talked about Burton as having caused hundreds of people to get AIDS from his clinic. How did she get this information? She had gotten this information from her assistant, Feena McLaverty, who had gotten it from, who else, Curt, at the National Cancer Institute.

She said, when we challenged, that she passed the draft of the report through Curt and Curt gave her the information to prove it.

Curt later denied it. Here is where you use the President's Advisor before major groups, and the FDA, and the National Cancer Institute and their officers of all these collectives working together, to attack and isolate a man.

How does one man like Burton fight off the total sum of all the regulatory offices of our government, the Federal Trade Commission, the Post Office Authority, the Better Business Bureau and by the way, by another document, the Better Business Bureau, is right in here again—and guess who they appoint as two of the top advisors, Victor Herbert and Steven Barrett.

Now, you may not know who those names are, a few of you may know who they are. They have had a career of attacking alternative health movement concepts and Burton. So my concern is, if that is how objective and accurate the information we are going to get from our government is on Burton, then I have to challenge the whole war on cancer, how accurate it really is. I did the following.

Then I got all these contradictions. I then decided to do a simple thing, interview Burton's patients, interview the doctors who treated the patients and let them tell their story.

I interviewed both. I went down to the Burton Clinic. First off, I was told that the clinic was a pigsty. You can eat off the floor it is so clean. I was told that he had no sterilization equipment. I photographed him in between two sterilizing units, two autoclaves. I was told that he had antiquated old equipment. He had the state of the art diagnostic tools. I was told that he had a bulldog personality. They were right.

[Applause.]

I will never forget standing out in that lobby and overhearing Burton being told that there is a journalist here. I don't want to speak with any blah, blah, blah journalist. That is all right. I was extraordinarily impressed with both Burton's care and concern. He is an incredible compassionate man, and I can also understand where he has gotten some of his battle scars and where some of his personality attitudes have come from because he has been rejected for so long.

I wanted to deal with the facts.

So every time Burton would tell me something, I would challenge it and check it out. I would check it again. I interviewed Terry. I interviewed Katterhagen, all the people. I interviewed hundreds of people. It took over 3,000 hours of my time on this investigation. All told, I have spent four and half years working on the Burton case.

Generally, quietly behind the scenes. What I came up with finally was of all the patients, with a randomized selection of the

patient files, who had been alive from 1980 and Leonard Steinman, who was one of our chief investigators, and a colleague on this investigation, when we had a medical statistical evaluation done, we found a minimum of a 9 percent, what would be considered a success rate.

If you wish to use the word cure, you can. I don't use the word. That means the patients are alive and well five years after having been determined terminal. That is nine percent better than anything that the American Cancer Society, the National Cancer Institute, H.D. Anderson or any other place in the United States can offer. There is a zero survival once you are deemed terminal in the U.S. He is getting the minimum overall and with certain types of cancers, higher, but I did the statistical analysis. I was on the phone contacting patients and going over the medical records. No one had done that.

So I challenged the American Cancer Society. I challenged Dr. Frank Rauscher on my radio program, and Dr. Goode at Sloan Kettering

I then said, why don't you go to Burton's clinic. They wouldn't go to the clinic. I then did the following: When it was said that there was an epidemic of AIDS victims, I wanted to find the victims. I interviewed a Dr. Katterhagen, and I said, Dr. Katterhagen, do you have any personal ideas since you are the one that found this AIDS antibody in the serum, are you the person who has any bias against Burton? No. It turned out that he had a long time history of bias, and he is a member of the American Cancer Advisory Board.

No one knew that. That did not come out in any of the press releases.

I then asked how many patients and how many samples of blood were tested and did you verify that the serum that was shown to have AIDS that came from Burton's clinic, are you aware that no one did? No one to date has ever verified that that serum came from the clinic.

When the Center for Diseases got that serum, it was contaminated already. It had been passed many times. Many people touched it. Even the tests that they tried to use, the Elisa test, has shown to have a 50 percent false positive.

Assuming that she had not in anyway had it contaminated, up and down the line, I saw that there were holes that you could drive a truck through.

The final statement came when the Center for Disease Control, and I pinpointed them, and you have gone down to the clinic and you caused it to be closed.

Can you prove to me as a journalist, that Burton's clinic caused AIDS? And at that moment, he said to me, and we have it on record, with witnesses, including lawyers, who I had listening in on the telephone, the information we have on the serum is inconclusive.

We cannot say whether it is positive or negative. I said, if it is not positive or negative, if it is from one patient, then why did you run off and close the man's clinic.

I did a little further checking and I found out that right in the City of Washington there were multiple cases of AIDS. And

DAVID JAMES

that a person had died due to contaminated blood that they had gotten after a traffic accident from the hospital. The blood bank that supposedly determined that Burton's blood was contaminated well, none of Burton's patients died of AIDS.

Why didn't you close that blood bank down? Why didn't you close your own blood bank down? We have 56 cases of AIDS out of your area. You did not close yourself down. Burton, by the way, the so-called hepatitis epidemic, I have not been able to verify that it was an epidemic.

I did a statistical analysis of how many hospitals and blood banks in the U.S. offer patients blood that ended up giving them hepatitis. It is astronomical, and if you were to close every hospital or blood clinic in the United States that gave patients hepatitis, you would close every blood bank in the world. But, why pick on Burton? . . .

*Testimony of Gary Null.
Congressional Public Hearing
A Hearing On the Immuno-Augmentative Therapy
of Dr. Lawrence Burton
Before: Congressman Guy V. Molinari
26 Federal Plaza
New York, New York*