

144 Grove Street
Chestnut Hill 67, Mass.
January 6, 1946.

Dr. Earle Chapman,
Massachusetts General Hosp.
Boston, Mass.

Dear Sir:

Am returning herewith your manuscript which you sent me at my request on my visit to your office and after a very trying visit to Dr. J.H. Means office, the next day!

I have, with deep sorrow, reviewed its contents over and over, and tried to evaluate them in relation to my original series of cases. It grieves me, because of my confidence and trust in you and my value of our long friendship, prior to recent events, to have to write this letter.

In the first place, I have reviewed the records of the M.G.H. on my cases; and it is obvious to me now, that you used a peculiar form of animadversion, to say the least, to convince both Means and Evans that my series proved little, and that the "Higher dosage and No Iodine" School was just right as hell! I would have had to be more gullible than they are to have swallowed the "reports on series #1" which you rendered to them. Means should have smelled a rat when you attacked diagnoses of five cases in the series in your classification; but he obviously didn't realize that to doubt Hertz's diagnoses was to doubt his own--he saw them all--quite fortunately, and agreed that they were not only Thyrotoxic, but suitable cases for research on Ra I!

Next, your list of "improved" included several cases on whose records Means wrote "cured".

Among the "operated cases" I found this:

1. Duane, E (-5) to (-7) BMR's pre-op. Certainly no operative emergency case in a study series. She developed Myxedema Post-op.
2. Beede -- Operated elsewhere--That was no fault of yours!
Her last BMR's at BMR's at MGH were normal through pregnancy!
3. Bernier--BMR day before operation -- (-15)! ! He developed Myxedema! (-24) Certainly not good medicine. Would Hertz have had him operated? Hell, no!
4. Dellaquilla--BMR's (-8) pre-op
Operated for "choking" symptoms (neurosis)
gland -- 28 g -- "involution" (Normal size gland
(Hyperplasia absent

developed Myxedema! (-24) plus eye troubles!
Certainly no emergency in a study case and rather poor judgment! Thanks for the biopsy of a "cured" case!

5. Collins--Received 28 m.C. Largest of our series--not 23 mC "BMR's always were very variable because of his psychiatric condition" Post-op BMR's were plus 36 pre-op just as good--; finally Myxedema! (-24)
His heart was no better post-op than pre-op.

Earle Why didn't you cure all these cases by large doses if you thought than low dosage was the trouble ???? instead of operating

The above circumstances I interpret as virtual attempts to sabotage the problem rather than aid it, after I entrusted you with it! Means must have been asleep at the switch to allow this!

And what is worst of all, you alienated the patients so that they did not return to you for follow-up. My private patients gave me hell for sending them to you! What has happened to your old "art of treatment," Earle? Or were you using all the salesmanship on Means and Evans. Besides, there were patients of the series you never saw, even once and yet were sufficiently without conscience to "evaluate" them, and my entire series on such a flimsy basis that nausea creeps on when I think of it.

I don't see how Means could have believed you, at all, on the whole series; not only that, but invest a large Markle Fund for tremendous doses of Ra-I without further analysis of the ground work or the back log of cases. He must have believed your "reports".

I have followed up a large percent of my series personally. For your information, by the time the returns are all in, I shall have a series of "20 incontrovertible cures" -- not the measley 3-4 as you "evaluated".

There is little doubt in my mind now what your motives were in this "handling of the data", or in your publishing in a "Pearl Harbor sneak attack manner" before I could get into harness again. Your not having seen fit to send me the publication appears to me a greater sin than just omission of simple courtesy and just rights. It is downright thievery on a scientific plane and not too smooth a job, at that!

That Means, even, has the temerity to be insulted by my being a stormy petrel on the subject, indicates the degree to which you have duped him! What would he do if he were in my place?

I have the facts, figures, dates, letters from you, Means, Evans and your "reports" to be able to damn you before posterity. If you go ahead

and publish this rotten, unscientific abortion of a paper, I shall blow it to kingdom come! Means must be asleep in the deep to allow the clinics fair name to go onto it; or is he so misled by your "reports". I feel certain he did not review the cases himself, but depended on you for an honest appraisal of series #1. I have a critique of your articles based on an analysis of your series which will give the scientific world a jolt equivalent to Nagasaki. It would give me a great pleasure, I admit, to use it!

I can't see that any editor with the slightest investigative experience would allow your paper space; but I suppose there might be some hard up journal that will publish anything with "MNH" Thyroid Clinic" written on it. Best of luck to you.

If Robley Evans would look at his letter of submittal of the last Markle Fund Report written by me, I think he would blush at his hair roots. "In view of the proven medical value, etc."

This furor to publish is most unbecoming, especially when the understanding is so weak!

As originator of the RaI idea, I plead not guilty to the crime of your series; I would not put my name to it and shall never condone it, even if it is never published! This is the worst waste of research funds that has been foisted upon the medical public.

Your greatest crime is that you neglected my series and nearly wrecked it; while building up your own on unsound reasoning and fallacious analysis, resulting in a mess of conclusions from rather slim evidence; and in places obviously so much in error that it would be a sin to let you publish it from a clinic I love and an institution to which I am still loyal, despite recent events.. However, at least I have tried to have you and Evans see the light and the possible harm of such a publication; apart from the ethical considerations, and my personal grievances in the manner of the sneak publication to which I have many scientific objections.

I shall give you a prime example of the defects in the scientific data and interpretation. There are at least twenty (20) others that even an ordinary astute reader should detect and a hundred (100) that a Thyroid expert should see.

In case #15 you "cure" the patient with a delivery of 0.05 mC/g of RA I of tissue in three plus weeks, whereas in case #20 you required 0.70 mC/g RA I to cure a patient in five and one half months. It is also notable that this latter improvement did not start until after he "pissed away" 100% of his second dose —40 mC on 4-13-45. (ie) Feb 15's (45mC) took until

- 4 -

June 23rd to act as a cure. The miracles performed by passing away large doses of radioactive iodine really astound me!

That Evans, as a Nuclear Physicist is impressed by such phenomena in biology really makes Atomic Bomb work simple by comparison. It is clear that he "took little time from his War work to spend on RAI" (See Evans letter of submittal of our last Markle fund report prior to my entering the Service) and yet he has his name signed to the publication. Phooey in plain language! My respect for Means goes up for his not having allowed his name as co-author!

I see it all so clearly now!

Yours very truly,