**Introduction**

America is known as a great and powerful country. Its people are free, and they fight for the liberty and justice of those who cannot defend themselves. That is the image that has been portrayed of this country. This was exemplified when American soldiers helped the Serbs win their autonomy in World War I, and fought for the justice of others once again in World War II. What the world did not know, however, is while the U.S. sent its soldiers to defeat Nazi Germany from committing genocide and awful acts against the human race, they were hiding something just as unethical. By the time World War II began, the U.S. government had already been conducting an obscene experiment on human beings for seven years, and it continued twenty seven years after the war was won. One man named Peter Buxtun recognized this deep-seated hypocrisy, and came to the justice of those being exploited by the U.S. government. Through his courage and moral imperative, Peter Buxtun took a stand against unethical medical practices by exposing the Tuskegee Syphilis Study and its exploitation of African American men during the tumultuous era of the Civil Rights.

**Racism in the Turn of the Century**

Previous to his intervention, racist views clouded the judgement of many physicians in the 1900s. Much of the general population knows about the struggles America faced during the Civil Rights era and the discrimination imposed against minorities - particularly African Americans. It may not be apparent, however, how deep-rooted and ridiculous this racism was. In the early 1900’s, Social Darwinism was an accepted principle of life. In other words, most believed that the weak or primitive people would not survive and eventually die out of the
population. As preposterous as it sounds, medicine historian Allan M. Brandt PhD explains, “Social Darwinists analyzed census data to predict the virtual extinction of the Negro in the twentieth century, for they believed the Negro race in America was in the throes of a degenerative evolutionary process”. Doctors supposedly found evidence to support this claim, for they would compare the physical features of an African American to a Caucasian, detailing that each difference found in the African American anatomy was a deformity (Brandt 2). Dr. W. T. English, a doctor involved with the study writes, “‘A careful inspection reveals the body of the negro a mass of minor defects and imperfections from the crown of the head to the soles of the feet...’” (qtd. In Brandt 2). Defining characteristics found in the African American were scorned and became what placed them at the bottom of the social hierarchy in the beginning of the twentieth century. Venereal disease was also believed to run rampant within the African American community. Dr. W. T. English continues to discuss the aggressive sexuality in the African American, stating that it is “A perversion from which most races are exempt”. A medical journal even made an argument for “Castration Instead of Lynching”, stating it would be “...an event the patient would never forget” (Meyers 47). Beliefs such as these are the rationale used by the creators and directors of this experiment. Many assumed that there was no hope for the African American race and that even advanced medical treatment would not be able to stop the natural process of “survival of the fittest”. These assumptions give the background needed for an analysis of the Tuskegee Syphilis Study.
Peter Buxtun

Peter Buxtun immigrated to the United States as an infant from Nazi-occupied Czechoslovakia in 1939 - seven years after the experiment began (Kerr). He served in the Army, and by the time he was twenty seven he was working for the U.S. Public Health Service in San Francisco. His employment in the venereal disease department is what introduced him to this experiment. He was appalled at the fact that this racist experiment had already been running for thirty four years by the time he found out. The nature of this experiment became clear to him after one of his former coworkers was castigated for trying to treat one of the Tuskegee patients with penicillin - the known cure for Syphilis (Kerr). In his home country of Czechoslovakia, Theresienstadt was a concentration camp set up by the Nazis. In this camp, doctors would use the prisoners as lab rats for their human experiments. In America, the U.S. government used former slaves as lab rats for their human experiment. Peter Buxtun, understandably, was shocked that the very thing he left his home country for was occurring in the “land of the free”. He felt it was his responsibility to curtail this experiment, so bravely, he put his job and new life in America on the line and confronted the authorities.

The Series of Events in the Tuskegee Syphilis study.

The United States Public Health Service teamed up with Tuskegee University to create this infamous study, which spanned forty years from 1932-1972 (“The Tuskegee Timeline”). Officially named “The Study of Untreated Syphilis in the Negro Male”, it is remarkably not the first study on untreated syphilis.
From 1890 to 1910, Caesar Boeck, professor at University of Oslo, withheld mercury treatment from 2,000 syphilitic patients (Harrison 70). This study was officially named “The Fate of Syphilitics who Received no Specific Treatment” (70). The goal of Boeck’s study was to prove that mercury was not only an ineffective cure, but a harmful one at that (See Appendix A). He hospitalized and monitored the patients until their lesions healed without treatment. With Boeck never receiving any punishment for withholding treatment from syphilitics, American doctors used his study as a justification for their study on Syphilis. The defining difference, however, is that Boeck ensured all his patients recovered.

Twenty years later in 1929, The Rosenwald Fund, an American philanthropic organization, began to research the seroprevalence of syphilis and implement a control program in order to “benefit the health of rural African Americans” (B.). Researchers discovered a particularly high rate of syphilis in Macon County, Alabama, and decided to locate the project there. Approximately 35% of the population had syphilis, and the county was 82.4% African American. The education level of this county was low with the illiteracy rate being high (Edwards). Dr. H. L. Harris Jr. was an African American physician who visited the project. While evaluating, he reported:

The people were entirely ignorant of the character of the disease for which they were being treated, the reports submitted stating that one’s blood was bad, in which case he should report to treatment at the designated center, or that the test showed that one’s blood was alright, in which case no treatment was necessary. (qtd. in Jones 71)
Dr. H. L. Harris Jr. made multiple visits to Macon County to document the process of the project and made suggestions as to how the Rosenwald Fund can make it a more accurate, effective process. As of September 1931, however, the Great Depression forced the Rosenwald Fund to cut their funding.

After the Rosenwald Fund failed, the study took a turn from its original intentions. The United States Public Health Service saw the Rosenwald Fund’s unfinished medical study as a perfect opportunity to further the research of African Americans. In the new study, which officially became the Tuskegee Syphilis Study, observing the disease progress in the patients’ bodies rather than treating patients became the agenda (See Appendix B). Hugh S. Cumming, General Surgeon at the time, claimed it as “an unusual opportunity to study the untreated syphilis patient from the beginning...to the death of the infected person” (qtd. in Syphilis). A year after the Rosenwald Fund halted their study, the USPHS proposed to pick it up and study the effects of latent syphilis in the male Negro. The Tuskegee Institution and local officials agreed. In September of that year, 1932, the study began.

The study was originally intended to last 6-8 months (Reverby). Six hundred African American men were recruited with advertisements posted around the county (See Appendix C). These advertisements were the start of the disinformation given to the men. The signs read “...you will be furnished your meals and a bed, as well as an examination and treatment without cost” (“Macon County Health Department”). The doctors knew these ads would appeal to the men and their families, for free meals and health care were a luxury for most homes in the county. The doctors even reported that the men were “susceptible to kindness” (“What We’ll Never Know”).
The results of this deception were devastating. At the conclusion of the experiment, only 74 of the original patients were still alive, 40 wives had been infected, and 19 kids were born with congenital syphilis (“Tuskegee Syphilis Study”). Furthermore, it is unknown how many of the patients’ children then gave birth to more syphilitic babies. The survivors received no compensation until they sued and settled for $10 million (Gray). The experiment is the longest nontherapeutic study on human beings in history, in addition to being one of the most deceitful (Heintzelman).

The Courage of Peter Buxtun

Given the context of the time period, what Peter Buxtun did was outstanding. As an immigrant, he risked the good job he had in his new country to stand up for a race that no one of the time deemed important. To give perspective, lynching African Americans was still a commonality in the South when the study began, and the government just began to crack down on it in the ‘40s. Racial tension was at an all time high with protests popping up everywhere in the United States. People were getting arrested for advocating for African American rights. At the same time, political cartoons of the drunken African American swept the country, painting a lethargic, sordid stereotype that everyone bought into (See Appendix D). The ridicule and public exile Peter Buxtun would face would be enough to deter most people in that time, let alone the threat of losing a job. He wrote a letter comparing the experiment and the Nuremberg Trials. The first requirement written in the Nuremberg Code established in 1947, is:
The voluntary consent of the human subject is absolutely essential. This means that the person involved should have legal capacity to give consent; should be so situated as to be able to exercise free power of choice, without the intervention of any element of force, fraud, deceit, duress, overreaching, or other ulterior form of constraint or coercion; ...there should be made known to him the nature, duration, and purpose of the experiment; the method and means by which it is to be conducted; all inconveniences and hazards reasonably to be expected; and the effects upon his health or person which may possibly come from his participation in the experiment. (Mitscherlich)

Both of his immediate supervisors were unhappy, one asking Buxtun to not mention his name if asked about the letter, for he had a wife and a family. The other mocked his letter, insisting all of the subjects gave complete consent. The letter, as well as Peter Buxtun, was sent to USPHS headquarters to confer with top doctors (Kerr). He was, again, scorned for making such extraneous claims, for according to even the top doctors, all subjects had given complete consent - though no informed consent was ever provided. Expecting to be fired after the unsuccessful meeting, Buxtun returned to law school as a precaution. He was not fired, and continued to keep up with the experiment while also writing to the USPHS. To his utter dismay, in 1968, the doctors voted to continue the experiment without treatment or informed consent - taking away the subjects’ choice to live syphilis-free (Kerr). That is when Peter Buxtun decided to contact Jean Heller, journalist for the Washington Star, to break the story to the public. Expectedly, this is what caused the end to the experiment, sparking a public outraged that forced the U.S. Public Health Service to stop the research.
Outcomes of Peter Buxtun’s Disclosure

Because of what Peter Buxtun did, new laws in the United States concerning human experimentation were enacted. The National Research Act, 1974, enforced the importance of informed consent and asserted the criminality of choosing to bypass informed consent (Sparks). Also as of 1974, every federally funded proposed research with human subjects must be reviewed by an institutional review board (Heintzelman). A public apology was issued by former president Bill Clinton in 1997, during which survivor Herman Shaw was able to give his testimony. Clinton declared “‘The United States government did something that was … profoundly, morally wrong … clearly racist’” (Tuskegee Public Health Study Apology”). Exposing the Tuskegee Syphilis Study also pushed for the development of Medical Ethics Committees, organizations that protect the interests of the patients. It was another step in human rights for African Americans as well, for with help from the Civil Rights Movement, most beliefs that preached the degeneration of the African American race were dispelled after the study. Since the study was conducted, multiple outreach groups have been created to rebuild the trust of African Americans in the medical industry (Heintzelman).

Conclusion

Had Peter Buxtun chosen not to stand up for the men in this experiment, it can only be imagined how long the study would have continued, or what other human experiments would have been conducted with the absence of the laws protecting human subjects. The Tuskegee Syphilis Study is a deep mistake in American history, but one that generations can learn from. In
present day, very few people know that the Tuskegee Syphilis Study occurred, even though it was a monumental event. If the government stops covering it up, allowing Peter Buxtun to be recognized, people might learn from his example, encouraging them to fight for what they know is right.
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Some books are to be tasted, others to be swallowed, and some few to be chewed and digested, that is . . . some few to be read wholly, and with diligence and attention.

F. BACON

This is eminently a work which should be read wholly, and with diligence and attention by all venereologists, whether they are only readers or both readers and authors: readers, so that they may learn—if they have not done so already—to read critically, not confining themselves to “Conclusions”; and authors that they may be strengthened in avoiding the pitfalls of drawing large inferences from small data and of quoting with approval “Conclusions” which they have not satisfied themselves are justified by the evidence.

The material on which this work is based is unique and for its re-study not only venereologists but colleagues in other branches of medicine should be grateful to those mentioned below, and their assistants, who have brought it about.

Since the Editor of the British Journal of Venereal Diseases, realizing the importance of this work, has allotted enough space to permit of a review which is not merely a glorified account of its contents but a critical commentary, and since many readers of this Journal may not be acquainted with events in the syphillogeical world as far back as a quarter of a century ago, it seems appropriate to give here a short history of the events which led to the present study.

From 1891 to 1910, Caesar Boeck, Professor of Dermatology in the University of Oslo, practically forbade the use of mercury in the treatment of the syphilitic cases in his wards, believing that mercury generally interfered with the patient’s own defense mechanism, which he thought was better than the metal. In the period mentioned, approximately 2,000 cases of early syphilis were dealt with on these lines in his wards and a number of years later (1925–27) his successor, E. Bruusgaard, carried out an investigation to discover how Boeck’s cases had fared. As a result, Bruusgaard (1929) published an article of which a free translation of the title is “The Fate of Syphilitics who have received no Specific Treatment”.

His article excited a great deal of attention, even leaders in some medical periodicals, and here I may perhaps be pardoned for introducing a personal note. At that time I was reviewing articles for the Bulletin of Hygiene, and in due course I received a slip which was an invitation to review Bruusgaard’s paper. I read the paper and returned the slip marked “Not worth review” because I thought the results recorded by Bruusgaard were not statistically sound and could be misleading; this was no reflection on Bruusgaard, who, for the most part, enjoined caution in the inferences to be drawn from his material. My rejection of the paper was a mistake as I soon discovered in the, to my mind, unwarranted inferences being drawn from Bruusgaard’s data by different authors. About 2 years later a paper by a distinguished dermatologist, in which some quite illogical inferences were drawn from the Bruusgaard report, provided me with an excuse for reviewing the Bruusgaard paper together with that of the dermatologist. In my review (Harrison, 1932, 1939, 1941) I tried to show that, for purposes of prognosis of untreated syphilis, the Bruusgaard statistics were useless. My criticisms were repeated in various papers by myself and in correspondence with American and other colleagues—they are freely quoted in the study under present review—but the Bruusgaard percentages of ultimate results continued to be quoted in various articles

---

* Invited review, received for publication April 10, 1956.


This is the first page of a report on the Oslo Syphilis Study, which provides supplementary information about Boeck’s Study.
Appendix B


FINAL REPORT
TUSKEGEE SYPHILIS STUDY AD HOC ADVISORY PANEL
REPORT ON CHARGE I-A
Statement of Charge I-A: Determine whether the study was justified in 1932.

Background Data
The Tuskegee Study was one of several investigations that were taking place in the 1930’s with the ultimate objective of venereal disease control in the United States. Beginning in 1926, the United States Public Health Service, with the cooperation of other organizations, actively engaged in venereal disease control work. In 1929, the United States Public Health Service entered into a cooperative demonstration study with the Julius Rosenwald Fund and state and local departments of health in the control of venereal disease in six southern states: Mississippi (Bolivar County); Tennessee (Tipton County); Georgia (Glynn County); Alabama (Macon County); North Carolina (Pitt County); Virginia (Albermarle County). These syphilis control demonstrations took place from 1930-1932 and disclosed a high prevalence of syphilis (35%) in the Macon County survey. Macon County was 82.4% Negro. The cultural status of this Negro population was low and the illiteracy rate was high.

During the years 1928-1942 the Cooperative Clinical Studies in the Treatment of Syphilis were taking place in the syphilis clinics of Western Reserve University, Johns Hopkins University, Mayo Clinic, University of Pennsylvania, and the University of Michigan. The Division of Venereal Disease, USPHS provided statistical support, and financial support was provided by the USPHS and a grant from the Milbank Memorial Fund. These studies included a focus on effects of treatment in latent syphilis which had not been clinically documented before 1932. A report issued in 1932 indicated a satisfactory clinical outcome in 35% of untreated latent syphilis.

The findings of Brunsgaard of Oslo on the results of untreated syphilis became available in 1929. The Oslo study was a classic retrospective study involving the analysis of 473 patients at three to forty years after infection. For the first time, as a result of the Oslo study, clinical data were available to suggest the probability of spontaneous cure, continued latency, or serious or fatal outcome. Of the 473 patients included in the Oslo study, 309 were living and examined and 164 were deceased. Among the 473 patients, 27.7 percent were clinically free from symptoms and Wassermann negative;

14.8 percent had no clinical symptoms with Wassermann positive; 14.1 percent had heart and vessel disease; 2.76 percent had general paresis and 1.27 percent had tabes dorsalis. Thus in 1932, as the Public Health Service put forth a major effort toward control and treatment, much was still unknown regarding the latent stages of the disease especially pertaining to its natural course and the epidemiology of late and latent syphilis.
Appendix C

“Macon County Health Department”. http://Poynter.indiana.edu/Sas/Lb/Facts.html https://s-media-cache-ak0.pinimg.com/originals/91/49/6a/91496a561f9d2017b023b7eaca320952.jpg. This is a real advertisement that helped recruit subject from the study. It gives specific examples as to how the men were given false information.
Appendix D

“This Tuskegee Experiment Political Cartoon.” https://vivifychange catalyst.wordpress.com, 27 Nov. 2014, vivifychange catalyst.wordpress.com/tag/tuskegee-experiment. This is a real political cartoon that spread discriminatory stereotypes against African Americans in the 1900’s.
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