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CHAPTER 1
THREE COMMON QUESTIONS
THE THREE QUESTIONS
When someone first sees a website on “alternative cancer treatments” they almost always have three questions.

First, is it really possible “alternative cancer treatments” can cure cancer, even the cancer of someone who has already had extensive chemotherapy, radiation and surgery?

Second, are alternative cancer treatments more effective than chemotherapy, surgery and radiation (the “orthodox” cancer treatments), and if they are, why doesn’t orthodox medicine use alternative cancer treatments?

Third, what is the purpose of the Cancer Tutor website, meaning what is different about the Cancer Tutor website?

These three questions will be very briefly answered in this chapter. But the rest of this eBook is spread over thirteen other chapters and will go into massive detail answering these questions.

THE FIRST QUESTION
The first question is basically how do alternative cancer treatments compare to orthodox cancer treatments?

The late Dr. William D. Kelley, a dentist turned alternative cancer treatment guru, treated over 33,000 cancer patients with alternative cancer treatments. He had studied the masters of alternative cancer treatments, such as Dr. Max Gerson, and then improved on their superb protocols. Dr. Kelley kept meticulous records.

His cure rate on cancer patients who went to him, instead of orthodox medicine, was about 90%. He did not do as well treating cancer patients who went to orthodox medicine first, then afterwards went to him.

Do not underestimate Mother Nature’s ability to cure cancer!!

So what is a comparable cure rate for the orthodox treatments? The answer depends on which definition of “cure” you use and what definition of “cancer” you use. These
definitions are changed from time to time to make it appear that orthodox cancer treatments are far more effective than they actually are. Television advertisements also make orthodox cancer treatments look far more effective than they really are.

Using the “man on the street” definitions of “cancer” and “cure,” the true cure rate of orthodox cancer treatments, overall, is less than 3%. While this percentage does vary a little according to the type of cancer, for most types of cancer the “man on the street” cure rate is zero percent. How many people do you know who used only orthodox medicine and were diagnosed with cancer over 10 years ago (and the cancer had spread beyond the ability of doctors to cut the cancer out) and are still alive? I will bet the answer is none.

There is quite a difference between a 90% cure rate and a less than 3% cure rate!! Now here is another interesting fact, Dr. Kelley did not have access to some of the recently developed products which are far more potent than what he used (and yet they are just as safe)!! So how does someone explain why alternative cancer treatments are far more effective than orthodox cancer treatments? Let me explain it with a story.

Suppose you own an antique dining room table which is worth many tens of thousands of dollars. Suppose your butler tells you that there are dozens of cockroaches crawling around on your priceless table and you will be having dinner guests in one hour.

Your butler, as he is leaving your house, gives you four options for getting rid of the cockroaches:

1. He offers you a chainsaw to “slash” the little critters to pieces,
2. He offers you a large and powerful flamethrower to “burn” the critters to pieces,
3. He offers you 2 gallons of a highly, highly toxic liquid chemical to “poison” the critters,
4. and He offers you an old $1 flyswatter.

Which of the four options would you pick? Would you choose one of the first three options (slash, burn and poison) because they are highly potent at killing cockroaches or would you choose the cheap, wimpy flyswatter?

Think about why you would make your choice.
Most likely you would pick the flyswatter because the other three items, which are massively powerful at killing cockroaches; are also massively powerful at destroying your priceless table!!

In a similar way of thinking, alternative cancer treatments (the flyswatter), while not as “powerful” as the other items, are far more effective at treating cancer because these treatments either target cancer cells or do not damage your non-cancerous cells, Thus they can be given in much higher doses than any of the “orthodox” cancer treatments.

Chemotherapy (the toxic chemical above), surgery (the chainsaw above) and radiation (the flamethrower above) do kill cancer cells, but they do not TARGET cancer cells, thus they cannot cure cancer (which has spread) without killing the patient first.

Now a very important question. Can alternative cancer treatments cure someone who has already had extensive orthodox cancer treatments?

Several years ago I interviewed several alternative cancer treatment experts and asked them this very question. Every one of them, without exception, said that over 95% of their cancer patients had already had extensive orthodox cancer treatments and that their overall cure rate was about 50%.

The 50% was an average. Each case is different and individual cases may have an expected cure rate of anywhere from less than 10% all the way to 80%.

Did you notice the drop from a cure rate of over 90% (for newly diagnosed cancer patients who start with one of the top alternative cancer treatments) versus about 50% (for those who went with orthodox medicine first and then found one of the most potent alternative cancer treatments).

Has that 50% cure rate changed in the past several years? There are several new products available to alternative medicine which did not exist several years ago, such as Cellect and a superb electromedicine protocol (i.e. a “frequency generator” or “Rife Machine”). However, while Cellect, and a few other products, have shown very, very promising early results, to be honest no one really knows whether they will be able to push the overall cure rate of advanced cancer patients above 50%.
However, there are some alternative cancer treatment clinics in Germany, Mexico and the United States (and a few other places) which probably can beat the 50% cure rate. The German cancer clinics have the best reputation, but there are a few Mexican clinics that are very comparable.

**THE SECOND QUESTION**

Now let us talk about the second question: if the best of the alternative cancer treatments have a 90% cure rate, and orthodox medicine has a cure rate of less than 3%, why does orthodox medicine use chemotherapy, radiation and surgery?

To answer this question we have to go back a hundred years. In about 1910 the pharmaceutical industry and the American Medical Association (AMA) and Congress all agreed that anyone with the designation of “Medical Doctor” would only be allowed to use prescription drugs (i.e. highly profitable man-made molecules) in the treatment of all diseases.

This was a win-win situation for Big Medicine (the AMA) and Big Pharma (the pharmaceutical industry) because the AMA was nothing more than a labor union and Big Pharma was only interested in making massive profits.

However, for cancer patients and other patients with serious diseases, the agreement was a disaster. Prescription drugs (and surgery and radiation) cannot cure any disease.

It gets worse.

Enter the FDA (Food and Drug Administration). The FDA made things even worse, in fact much worse. The FDA has existed in various forms for over a hundred years, but since 1910 it has been the “Police Force” of Big Pharma and Big Medicine. The FDA was the gift to Big Pharma and Big Medicine by Congress for all the “benefits” Big Pharma showed to Congress.

The FDA has “rigged” their regulations to make sure that it is impossible for natural products to be “approved” or “proven” to treat disease. In other words, anything designed and built by God cannot be patented and no one in their right mind is going to spend a billion dollars, out of their own pocket, to get a natural product, which cannot generate
huge profits, “approved” by the FDA. That is exactly the way the FDA designed things to be. This leaves the door wide open for Big Pharma and Big Medicine to have no competition in the treatment of diseases. Everything designed and built by God is “unproven” to treat any disease, especially cancer.

For example, if a medical doctor uses one of the potent alternative cancer treatments they will almost certainly lose their license to practice medicine. This is because they are using “unapproved” treatments, meaning natural treatments.

By using “approved” substances (i.e. prescription drugs), instead of “unapproved” substances (i.e. natural substances) all diseases are guaranteed to be “chronic” diseases, meaning very, very profitable for a long time. It was profits that the AMA and Big Pharma were interested in and Congress gave them everything they wanted, even their own police force.

This mentality has forced all medical doctors, trained since 1910, to become little more than drug salesmen.

THE THIRD QUESTION
What about the third question, what is special about the Cancer Tutor website?

First, you must understand that over 99% of all newly diagnosed cancer patients start their cancer treatment with orthodox drugs and treatments. You can thank Big Media for that. Almost all of the cancer patients who look into alternative cancer treatments have been sent home to die and you can thank the media for that!! The media makes sure everyone in America gets a full diet of televisions shows which glorify prescription-drug selling medical doctors.

It would be time consuming, but easy to do, to find more than 400 alternative cancer treatments discussed on the Internet. One article on this website lists more than 200 alternative cancer treatments (I got tired of changing the article several years ago so I quit adding new treatments to it). Many of my older articles mention 300 alternative cancer treatments instead of the newer and more accurate “400” number.

While almost all of these 400 plus alternative cancer treatments will cure or significantly help most newly diagnosed cancer patients, very few of these treatments will be of much
help to someone who has had large numbers of orthodox cancer treatments because most alternative cancer treatments aren’t strong enough or do not work fast enough.

**In fact, there are only about fifteen of the alternative cancer treatments which can give an advanced cancer patient, who is in critical condition, any hope of survival.**

What is unique about this website is that it identifies the dozen or so alternative cancer treatments which are strong enough to give an advanced cancer patient a fighting chance for survival. This website also identifies some of the top alternative cancer clinics in Germany, Mexico and the U.S. which have additional treatments which cannot be done at home.

One thing the reader must understand is that I have been researching cancer treatments, and working with cancer patients, since 2002. A person entering medical school in 2002 would have graduated from medical school by now.

This website is closely affiliated with the Independent Cancer Research Foundation, Inc. (ICRF) which is one of the rare non-profit organizations which is not controlled by orthodox medicine – directly or indirectly. The Cancer Tutor website benefits from their research, as any other alternative cancer treatment website could. In fact, the ICRF keeps in touch, and exchanges information with, at least three other non-profit alternative cancer treatment organizations.

Two of the people I work with frequently have more years in researching cancer than I do.
CHAPTER 2
INTRODUCTION TO ALTERNATIVE CANCER TREATMENTS
INTRODUCTION
Most people could not name five of the more than 400 alternative cancer treatments. Fewer still could name the five most potent alternative cancer treatments for advanced cancer patients.

Some people wonder why the scores of billions of dollars spent on the “War on Cancer,” that President Nixon started in 1971/72, has not produced a cure for cancer. Have researchers been looking for more profitable treatments for cancer or have they been looking for cures for cancer?

In fact, the average person knows almost nothing about either orthodox cancer treatments or alternative cancer treatments, outside of what they have heard on television or read in the media.

If a survey were taken, the average person would probably think that the true cure rate of orthodox cancer treatments was 40% or more and the true cure rate for alternative cancer treatments was close to zero percent. This is total nonsense, but more will be said about that later in this eBook.

Is what you know about cancer treatments based on who has the most truth, or is it based on who has the most money? Is what you know about cancer treatments carefully designed to deceive you? Are you being sold a “bill of goods?”

This website is just as important for people who don’t have cancer as it is for people who do have cancer. Why would someone who doesn’t have cancer be concerned about the truth? The reason is that if they are diagnosed with cancer, their doctor will immediately put intense pressure on them to commit to chemotherapy, radiation and surgery. Unless you know whether alternative cancer treatments or orthodox cancer treatments are superior, BEFORE YOU ARE DIAGNOSED, there is a 100% chance you will make the wrong decision.

If you read this eBook, you are assured of hearing many things that have never entered your mind before. You will read things that you will never, never hear on television or read in print.
You will learn a lot about the techniques of deception that you are exposed to every day. You will learn things that the people of orthodox medicine don’t want you to know. And all the information in this eBook is free.

To visualize what is going on in the “cancer industry” today (the term “cancer industry” was coined by Dr. Ralph Moss, PhD), and to see behind their massive facade, here is a short story that will describe how orthodox medicine currently treats cancer patients.

**A STORY**
Suppose you own a nice, comfortable, $300,000 house in the country, near a small city. While you have gone to the store your house catches on fire. As you return home you see that two rooms of your house are in flames and the fire is spreading. You immediately call the fire department.

Twenty minutes later three fire trucks show up.

The men and women in the first fire truck pull out heavy suits and axes and run to the house and start cutting down parts of the house that have already burned, but are still smoldering. They furiously cut and cut and when they have cut out about 10% of the parts of the house that have already burned, they quit and go back to their fire truck.

You note that they did absolutely nothing to stop the spreading of the fire. What they cut out wasn’t even burning and it certainly had nothing to do with stopping the raging fire.

You watch the men and women in the second fire truck pull out a fire hose and start spraying a powder on the fire. The amount of powder they were spraying did not seem to you to be enough to put out the fire. But you notice that while the powder is slowing down the spreading of the fire, it is also severely damaging the parts of the house that are not on fire.

Puzzled, you ask the fireman what the powder is. They say it is a very toxic acid that is capable of putting the fire out, but they can’t spray very much of it on the fire because if they did, the entire house would be reduced to a pile of rubble by the acid. Thus, all they can do is slow down the spreading of the fire, but they can’t stop the spreading of the fire.
They tell you that the house will last one hour longer if they use the chemical.

Even more puzzled, you ask them why they did not bring **water** in their fire truck. They said that in firefighter school they were taught that water was useless in putting out house fires. They said that using water on a house fire is an old “wives tale” and water is not effective. They also said that the state firefighter’s union would fire any firefighter that used water on a house fire because water is not a “proven” way to fight fires.

By sheer coincidence you are also aware that the federal regulatory agency, the Fire Development Administration (FDA), has researched water and they were the ones who declared that water is an “unproven” method to put out house fires. The FDA says there is “insufficient evidence” as to water’s effectiveness and safety. You silently mumble to yourself that there must be a huge connection between the FDA, the firefighter’s union, the firefighter schools and the chemical companies.

While you have been talking to the men and women in the second truck, five men have jumped out of the third fire truck. They ask you where the couch is in the living room. You point in the general direction of the couch in the living room, which you assume by now is on fire.

Each of them immediately pulls out a 30-06 caliber rifle and starts shooting at the couch from where they are standing next to their fire truck. You scream at them and ask them what they are doing. They respond that they have been taught in firefighter’s school that couches are very bad to have in a house during a fire, so they are trying to shoot the couch to pieces. They comment: “We think we are doing some good.”

You say that even if the couch is helping spread the fire, that they are blowing holes in the front and back of the house trying to shoot the couch to pieces from outside the house. Furthermore, very impatiently, you say the fire has already spread far beyond where the couch is located.

While the spreading of the house fire did slow down because of the toxic acids, within two hours you no longer have a house. The fire men and women were quite proud that they slowed down the fire. They tell you that your house lasted an extra hour because of their
work. You doubt the accuracy of that number. They give each other “high fives,” get in their fire trucks, and head back to the fire station.

Between the fire, the acid and the bullets, your house has been reduced to rubble. The cutting out of the wood that had already burned, by the first fire truck, had absolutely no affect on stopping the fire. In fact, nothing any of them did stopped the spreading of the fire, it only slowed it down.

You are astonished at what you have seen.

You ponder why the “investigative journalists” have not jumped on this situation. Then you realize how much money the chemical companies spend on television advertisements and you realize why the “investigative journalists” have kept their mouths shut.

A week later, as you drive by the fire department, you notice that all of the cars in the parking lot are very expensive cars.

A month later you know why they are driving very expensive cars. They have sent you a bill for their services: $100,000. But they note in the bill that the house insurance company will pay most of the bill. You are amazed when you look at your house insurance policy and realize the insurance company will not pay the bill if the fire department uses water. You ponder to yourself: “What is the connection between the fire department, the firefighter’s union, the firefighter’s school, the FDA, the insurance companies, the television stations and the chemical companies?”

One thing is clear to you, you now know why all of your friends think the firefighters are heroes, the television stations constantly portray them as heros in their shows.

End of Story
THE EXPLANATION

What has just been described is how “modern medicine” treats cancer that has already metastasized. Cancer can be compared to a fire. It is a fire that will spread until it kills you. But “modern medicine” does nothing that will put out the fire.

The first fire truck represents surgery to cut out tumors or parts of the body where there are concentrations of cancer cells, after the cancer has already started to spread throughout the body!

The third fire truck represents radiation, which is used to shrink tumors, after the cancer has already started to spread throughout the body!

While the second fire truck represents chemotherapy, the “progress” chemotherapy is making is frequently judged by its ability to shrink tumors. Oncologists love to tell the cancer patient that their tumors are shrinking.

But even if chemotherapy does slow down the progress of the cancer, and even if it puts cancer patients into remission, it is almost always a temporary Pyrrhic victory because the cancer almost always returns.

The Food and Drug Administration (the real FDA) has approved scores of chemotherapy drugs, but none of them can stop the spread of cancer because chemotherapy drugs do not target cancer cells.

There are scores of natural substances that do target cancer cells and can stop the spread of cancer. But the FDA has never approved a single one of these natural substances (natural substances cannot be patented by the pharmaceutical companies).

Insurance companies will not pay for natural cancer treatments (i.e. alternative cancer treatments). The media never says anything good about alternative cancer treatments, but constantly glorifies the medical profession in television show after television show. Medical schools have not taught a single truthful thing about alternative cancer treatments since 1910.
THE IMPORTANCE OF THE SPREADING OF CANCER

To understand how all of this relates to the spreading of cancer, consider this quote by an M.D., the late Dr. Philip Binzel:

“When a patient is found to have a tumor, the only thing the doctor discusses with that patient is what he intends to do about the tumor. If a patient with a tumor is receiving radiation or chemotherapy, the only question that is asked is, “How is the tumor doing?” No one ever asks how the patient is doing. In my medical training, I remember well seeing patients who were getting radiation and/or chemotherapy. The tumor would get smaller and smaller, but the patient would be getting sicker and sicker. At autopsy we would hear, “Isn’t that marvelous! The tumor is gone!” Yes, it was, but so was the patient. How many millions of times are we going to have to repeat these scenarios before we realize that we are treating the wrong thing? In primary cancer, with only a few exceptions, the tumor is neither health-endangering nor life-threatening. I am going to repeat that statement. In primary cancer, with few exceptions, the tumor is neither health-endangering nor life-threatening. What is health-endangering and life-threatening is the spread of that disease through the rest of the body. There is nothing in surgery that will prevent the spread of cancer. There is nothing in radiation that will prevent the spread of the disease. There is nothing in chemotherapy that will prevent the spread of the disease. How do we know? Just look at the statistics! There is a statistic known as “survival time.” Survival time is defined as that interval of time between when the diagnosis of cancer is first made in a given patient and when that patient dies from his disease. In the past fifty years, tremendous progress has been made in the early diagnosis of cancer. In that period of time, tremendous progress had been made in the surgical ability to remove tumors. Tremendous progress has been made in the use of radiation and chemotherapy in their ability to shrink or destroy tumors. But, the survival time of the cancer patient today is no greater than it was fifty years ago. What does this mean? It obviously means that we are treating the wrong thing!”

- Philip Binzel, M.D., *Alive and Well*, Chapter 14
In other words, if the cancer has not spread from the tumor, the tumor presents no danger to the patient (with rare exceptions, such as when a tumor blocks the fluid in the common bile duct).

It is important to understand that the vast majority of cells in a tumor are healthy cells. Cancer cells **CANNOT** form tissue. Thus, if the cancer were contained within the tumor, there would not be enough cancer cells in the person’s body to endanger their life. Likewise, if a man had prostate cancer, and the cancer was contained inside the prostate gland, there could not be enough cancer cells inside the prostate gland to endanger the patient’s life.

Even if the cancer cells in a tumor were killed, or the tumor was cut out, it would not solve the problem of the spreading of the cancer if the cancer has already spread. There would be no benefit to the patient because it is the spreading of the cancer that kills cancer patients, not the cancer inside the tumor.

Yet the focus of orthodox medicine is on shrinking the tumors.

Chemotherapy (i.e. the second fire truck in the example) is so toxic to cancer patients that if they gave enough of it to a cancer patient to kill all of the cancer cells, the patient would die from the side-effects of the chemotherapy immediately.

So doctors give chemotherapy in very low doses (though they seem like very high doses), not enough to actually cure you. In the mean time the cancer continues to spread. Chemotherapy may put a patient “in remission,” but virtually every cancer patient who goes into remission eventually comes out of remission and later dies.

Incredibly, doctors use radiation, the third fire truck, even after the cancer has started to spread. They are interested in shrinking a tumor. As mentioned above, the tumor is not the problem, it is the spreading of the cancer that is the problem.
ABOUT ALTERNATIVE CANCER TREATMENTS
Alternative medicine vendors, practitioners and consultants fall into one of three categories.

First, there are experts in alternative cancer treatments who care about the cancer patients they work with. These people may or may not make their living working with cancer patients. Some of them make a lot of money treating cancer successfully and others make virtually nothing. But the common thread is that they care about the cancer patients and do a very good job working with them!!

Second, there are vendors who mean well, and would like to help cancer patients, but simply don’t know how to help them. They may be selling one product line and simply don’t know anything outside of that product line.

Third, are the con artists who couldn’t care less about any patient because they are only in it for the money.

Fortunately, the first category has quite a few people in it!!

Mother Nature obviously fits in the first category!! It is just a matter of finding the best of the best products from Mother Nature and those people who know how to use those products!!
CHAPTER 3
INTEGRITY
THE KEY ISSUE – INTEGRITY
The issue of treating cancer has far more to do with integrity than it does with science. In fact, after several years of researching this very issue, it is clear to this author that treating cancer today has absolutely nothing to do with science. Nothing at all.

Had scientists embraced the Brandt Grape Cure of the 1920s, and refined it as future discoveries in natural medicine were made, cancer would have been a footnote in the history books written in the 1940s.

In the 1930s, Dr. Royal Rife, a microbiologist, also discovered a cure for cancer using an electromedicine “frequency generator” which is commonly called a “Rife Machine.” He was shut down and his technology was lost to the world for more than 70 years.

In fact, this website endorses a potent cancer treatment which is primarily a combination of the Brandt Grape Cure of the 1920s and the restoration of the “Rife Machine” of the 1930s. While this is a potent treatment, it is not the most potent treatment this website endorses. The late Dr. Bob Beck, a PhD in physics, spent 40 years of his life working in electromedicine. Dr. Beck took the information he learned from the research of a Dr. Kalli and a Dr. Lyman and he developed a cure for AIDS.

Here is a quote from Dr. Bob Beck about Kaali and Lyman:

“When I looked into Dr. Kaali’s work [Patent #5188738 describes a cure for AIDS/HIV found at the Albert Einstein College of Medicine in 1990], I decided to go ahead and fund it. We found that it worked all of the time [at curing AIDS/HIV]. For two and a half years, we gave full credit for this invention to Dr. Kaali, whose name is on the patent. Then I discovered that there was a long history of this technology. We followed a trail of these patents back 107 years! We found a patent, #4665898, that cured all cancer, dated May 19, 1987. Why has this been suppressed? Why hasn’t your doctor told you about an absolutely proven, established cure for cancer? The answer is that doctors get $375,000 per patient for surgery, chemotherapy, x-ray, hospital stays, doctors and anesthesiologists. This is the official statistic from the U.S. Department of Commerce. Unfortunately, the medical
**patient cured is a customer lost.** A lot of people say, “Aren’t you infringing on others’ patents?” In the beginning, I was nervous, but when I found this technology had been discovered and rediscovered for 107 years, I changed my mind. Now I am broadcasting it from the rooftops. Still, it is very touchy. It’s rocking the pharmaceutical, surgical and diagnostic industries. But I really feel that I have been called to do this. I have had people come to my door with guns. I have been threatened and chased. But I think God wants this information out. I feel it is my mission to give people back to themselves, to deliver them from these vested interests, these [medical] priesthhoods that are taking everyone’s money. I am not charging a nickel.

- Bob Beck, PhD, Interviewed by Kenneth and Dee Burke

As another example, in 1976, two-time Nobel Prize winner Linus Pauling, PhD, and an associate, Ewan Cameron, M.D., did a published scientific study in Scotland that resulted in proving that Vitamin C, given by I.V., of 10 grams a day, could extend the average length of time a terminal cancer patient lives by ten times or more as compared to orthodox cancer treatments.

Had the medical community had any integrity, they would have quickly replicated his study, come to the same conclusion (if they did exactly what he did), and would have quickly started giving every cancer patient, terminal or otherwise, 10 grams of Vitamin C by I.V. every day.

But that is not what happened.

What really happened is that 3 studies were done at the Mayo Clinic, all of which were directly a reaction to the Pauling/Cameron study. However, these studies were not designed to replicate the Pauling/Cameron research. Instead they were designed to **AVOID** replicating the Pauling/Cameron protocol, **AVOID** their patient mix, and **AVOID** their statistical methods. Obviously, if you don’t follow the same protocol, you won’t get the same results. And they didn’t.
Here is what the American Cancer Society (ACS) says about this issue:

“The Pauling study has been criticized by the NCI [National Cancer Institute, a division of the NIH or National Institutes of Health, a U.S. government agency] for being poorly designed, and subsequent studies done at the Mayo Clinic found that advanced cancer patients given the same dosage of vitamin C did not survive any longer than those not given the supplement. However, the Mayo Clinic trials have also been criticized for not fully addressing all the issues related to the effects of vitamin C, which still left questions about its effectiveness in the treatment of cancer.

The ACS would have been insane to challenge the integrity of Linus Pauling (one of his Nobel Prizes was the Nobel Peace Prize, the other was in chemistry). So they quote the totally corrupt NIH (Note: 500 NIH employees were recently caught taking bribes from the pharmaceutical industry, which they called “outside consulting fees”) and state that a world famous chemist, and two-time Nobel Prize winner, doesn’t know how to design a scientific study!!

But they also admit that the Mayo clinic did not use the same protocol as Pauling and Cameron. So if there are “still left questions,” why hasn’t the ACS used their annual hundreds of millions of dollars of income, and their political clout, to set the record straight and replicate the study as originally done? It has been more 40 years since the original study, yet no one in orthodox medicine, with their billions of dollars in research money, not even the ACS or NIH, has replicated the Pauling/Cameron study.

It appears that extending the life expectancy of terminal cancer patients six-fold, using natural substances, is not important to orthodox medicine.

In fact, two other studies did replicate the Pauling/Cameron study far more closely than did the Mayo Clinic. Both of these studies verified the Pauling/Cameron results. For more information, see:

Article from eBook: “Case Study of Scientific Corruption”
But this is just one of many, many instances where highly effective cancer treatments have been persecuted and/or ignored.

There is, in fact, a pattern. A very clear pattern. The pattern is that if natural substances are involved, such as vitamin C, the study and evidence is persecuted and/or ignored.

When natural substances are involved it is called “alternative medicine.” It should be called “persecuted and/or ignored medicine.”

There are more than 400 alternative cancer treatments that use natural substances, such as Vitamin C. Every one of them is more effective than the Pauling/Cameron protocol. Every one of them is far more effective than chemotherapy and/or radiation. Every one of them is ignored and many of them have been persecuted.

But there is a clear reason why natural substances are ignored. It has nothing to do with their effectiveness. The pharmaceutical industry cannot patent and control, and thus cannot profit from, natural substances. They can only charge their monopolistic prices on synthetic molecules, many of which are nothing but mutations of natural molecules.

**WHAT IS GOING ON IN THE CANCER INDUSTRY?**

The February 22, 2006 USA Today mentioned that by the year 2015, 20% of the GDP (Gross Domestic Product) could be for health spending.

Now let's be logical. Suppose a cure for cancer was found; and suppose a treatment to avoid 90% of all heart disease problems was found; and suppose a cure for type 2 diabetes was found; and suppose a cure for AIDS/HIV was found. (In fact, all of these have been found.) Would health spending ever hit 20% of GDP? Of course not. All of these are highly profitable diseases for both the pharmaceutical industry and the medical industry (and the politicians who claim to represent their constituents).

All the money being raised for treating AIDS patients in Africa are benefiting no one but the pharmaceutical industry stockholders because a cure for AIDS/HIV has been around since 1990.
So in essence, the article in U.S. Today was predicting that no cures for the highly profitable diseases would be found by the year 2015. **That is a safe prediction!!** Another safe prediction would be to predict that every new treatment for the profitable diseases will be more expensive and more profitable than existing treatments!! Here is another safe prediction, the 20% figure will be hit before 2015.

Here is yet another safe prediction: the media will continue to suppress alternative treatments for cancer, heart disease, dementia, diabetes, etc. See this web site, you will be amazed at what alternative medicine can already prevent and cure (and this website is just the tip of the iceberg):

**Dementia, Heart Disease, Diabetes, etc. Website**

Ask yourself this questions: “When was the last time orthodox medicine used their massive profits to find a cure for any disease?” When was the last time a cure for disease was found that used prescription drugs? If you said polio, you would be wrong. Polio was cured by a medical doctor in the 1940s, but the cure was suppressed because he used a form of Vitamin C, which drug companies could not patent and control.

Polio was also cured by a nurse in Australia who used massage therapy the right way. Polio was also cured by using ultraviolet light. All these cures were ignored prior to the development of the polio vaccine.

Have you ever wondered what would happen if someone found a cure for cancer? You probably think that the person finding the cure would be featured on every television show in America and would win a Nobel Prize in medicine. Kaali and Lyman, mentioned above, found a cure for AIDS / HIV, and more than 200 other diseases, and they didn’t win a Nobel Prize. Have you ever heard of them before?

It is difficult, if not impossible, to convince the average American that orthodox medicine today is not only corrupt, it is more corrupt than it has ever been in the history of medicine. That is saying a lot because orthodox medicine was persecuting cures for disease in the 1700s.
Unfortunately, there are some in alternative medicine who are also more interested in profits than their patients. The main difference between orthodox medicine and alternative medicine is freedom. The people with integrity in alternative medicine are allowed a great deal of freedom to help others. However, the Food and Drug Administration is always looking for excuses to crush the people who know how to cure diseases which are highly profitable to Big Pharma and Big Medicine (and thus Big Government).

Nevertheless, in spite of some persecution, there are over 400 alternative cancer treatments that currently exist. Every one of them can cure some cases of cancer, if the person starts using that treatment immediately after being diagnosed. However, there is a very wide range in effectiveness between these treatments, especially when used on advanced cancer patients.

The problem with alternative medicine is that patients are frequently on their own to find out which treatments work for their situation – and which don’t work. Unlike orthodox medicine, which is very uniform across the country, alternative medicine is neither organized, nor uniform. Nor do we have very much money. The quest for truth is always a winding and rocky road, especially when money is involved.

Some people erroneously think that medical doctors do not use the best alternative cancer treatments because the doctors do not know which treatments are really effective. While medical schools turn doctors into nothing but drug salesmen, that is not why medical doctors do not use natural substances in the treatment of disease. Medical doctors know how to read. But they also know that if they used a single one of these alternative cancer treatments on a single cancer patient, they would risk losing their license and/or could go to jail!!

While it is this attitude that creates uniformity in orthodox medicine, it is also this attitude that crushes progress. Orthodox medicine is a highly controlled monopoly, totally controlled by the combination of Big Pharma and the American Medical Association. The suppression of truth by Big Medicine is why this website, and many other websites, exist. The major purpose of this website is to make information about alternative cancer treatments free and available to the public so that more and more people know which alternative cancer treatments are the strongest.
WHY SOME ALTERNATIVE CANCER TREATMENTS ARE FAR SUPERIOR TO ORTHODOX CANCER TREATMENTS

All of your life you have probably been taught that natural substances from Mother Nature cannot possibly be as effective against cancer as the highly condensed, highly potent synthetic molecules made by the drug companies. In other words, you have been taught that chemotherapy drugs kill cancer cells far better than anything Mother Nature can put together.

That is definitely not a true statement, but even if it were true it would be an irrelevant issue!

The key issue is whether patented drugs or Mother Nature’s minerals and nutrients target cancer cells better.

The fact of the matter is that chemotherapy does not target cancer cells. In fact, chemotherapy kills far, far more healthy cells than it does cancer cells.

What this means is that chemotherapy must be given in very, very low doses, spread out over long periods of time, and the therapy must include gaps between the treatments. This “pacing” of the drugs is because too many healthy cells would be killed if too much chemotherapy were given too fast.

The reason orthodox medicine treats cancer like a chronic disease is because orthodox treatments, in high doses, would kill the patient long before they would cure the cancer. This failure of orthodox medicine to safely kill cancer cells (i.e. safely target cancer cells) is why they talk about a “5 year cure rate” rather than a true cure rate. If they can keep the patient alive for 5 years they consider the patient to be “cured,” even if they die in the sixth year.

Mother Nature’s cancer treatments, called natural cancer treatments, or more commonly “alternative cancer treatments,” generally do absolutely no harm to healthy cells. This is because the human body, which was made by Mother Nature, knows exactly what to do with Mother Nature’s minerals and nutrients.
Virtually all natural treatments for cancer do not kill healthy cells – not a single one.

This is the key – because alternative cancer treatments do not harm or kill healthy cells, the items from nature that can kill cancer cells can be given in much higher doses than chemotherapy – without any gaps in treatment!!

Thus, even if the mutations of natural molecules, called drugs, were more potent at killing cancer cells than the original natural molecules, because of the superiority of natural substances at targeting cancer cells or leaving healthy cells healthy, alternative cancer treatments can be far more effective than orthodox drugs at treating cancer!

Because Mother Nature does not necessarily condense the cancer-killing nutrients found in foods, some of the most potent of the alternative cancer treatments are liquid ionic minerals, certain types of ozone treatments, and other natural treatments that contain molecules that can be condensed, such as intravenous vitamin C (but not the Pauling/Cameron doses, however).

Just how effective are the best treatments from Mother Nature? Several alternative cancer treatments have achieved a consistent 50% true cure rate on cancer patients who had been given up on by orthodox medicine and had been sent home to die!

Such results are possible because these key alternative cancer treatments not only target cancer cells, they can be given in a very condensed and potent form, they do not need a catalyst, and they can be given safely in much higher doses than chemotherapy. Ponder that very carefully!

Also ponder the true cure rate of these same treatments on cancer patients who use these treatments exclusively, meaning they had not lost many months of treatment time while being treated with orthodox treatments!

However, do not assume all alternative cancer treatments are equally effective!! Very few of the 400+ alternative cancer treatments can come anywhere close to a 50% true cure rate on patients given up on by orthodox medicine.
One of the big mistakes people who seek out alternative cancer treatments make is to assume that if an alternative cancer treatment will cure one patient, it will cure all cancer patients, no matter what condition they are in. This is a dangerous assumption because very, very few of the 400+ alternative cancer treatments are condensed and potent enough to cure 50% of those sent home to die by orthodox medicine. Very few.

It could be a fatal mistake to see a testimonial on the Internet about someone who cured their cancer with alternative cancer treatments and then to use that treatment based on that testimonial. The reason it could be a fatal mistake is that the patient telling his or her story may have been a newly diagnosed patient, or had a much less aggressive type of cancer than you do!!

AN EXAMPLE OF ONE OF THE POTENT ALTERNATIVE CANCER TREATMENTS

There are very few minerals that can get inside of cancer cells. Two of the minerals that can get inside of cancer cells are cesium and potassium. Once cesium gets inside of cancer cells it starts to “pull” potassium from the blood into the cancer cells (potassium supplementation is required when on this treatment in order to replenish the potassium in the blood that was pulled into the cancer cells). When there is enough build-up of cesium and/or potassium inside the cancer cell, glucose is blocked from getting into the cancer cell. Since glucose is what feeds the cancer cell, the cancer cell will eventually die from starvation. Not only that, but cesium and/or potassium will also block the cancer cells from making lactic acid, meaning they block the cachexia cycle at the cancer cell. Other items also help block or overcome the cachexia cycle in different ways (e.g. hydrazine sulfate blocks the cachexia cycle at the liver).

Dr. A. Keith Brewer, PhD, discovered in the 1980s how cesium can treat cancer. Aside from treating the cancer, it can treat the pain of cancer within 12 to 36 hours, depending on what is causing the pain. The liquid ionic cesium chloride used today is much more potent than the cesium carbonate of the 1980s. The complete protocol includes several other items.

The “Cesium Chloride Protocol” is one of the dozen or so alternative cancer treatments that is rated in the top group of alternative cancer treatments.
Like most potent alternative cancer treatments, this treatment is so potent at killing cancer cells it must be “paced,” meaning dosages must be set so the body has time to safely remove the debris caused by the dead cancer cells.

Did you notice that orthodox cancer treatments must be “paced” because of all the healthy cells that they kill. But alternative cancer treatments must be “paced” because of all the targeted cancer cells they kill.

Because of the number of cancer cells killed by the cesium chloride / DMSO treatment, the cancer patient needs the expert advice of a vendor who knows how to safely use these products. Fortunately, such experts exist and are linked to on this website.

In fact, all of the most potent alternative cancer treatments require expert advice over the telephone or in a clinic setting. For example, the ozone RHP and ozone liquid I.V. treatments require expert advice or a clinic setting.

Also, these most potent treatments generally cannot be combined with each other (but they can be combined with some other alternative treatments). The doses for these products are designed to kill cancer cells at a rate that the body can safely handle the debris. To combine such treatments may create too high of a die-off rate.

(Note: The list of the best of the best alternative cancer treatments which can give a cancer patient (given up on by orthodox medicine) hope for survival can be found on the left side-bar of most web pages on this website under the title of: “Treatment of Stage IV Cancers.”)

MORE ON ORTHODOX CANCER TREATMENTS
You probably believe that the true cure rate of orthodox cancer treatments is around 40% and growing. This belief is the result of a wide variety of fancy statistical tricks (which will be discussed later). The fact is that if you get cancer, and you use nothing but orthodox cancer treatments, your chance of surviving your cancer (and surviving your cancer treatment) is less than 3%. And most of those who are in the roughly 3% are on chemotherapy for life.

On top of that, even the 3% who do survive have had their bodies so severely damaged that they are vulnerable to future bouts with cancer. The cancer “comes back” as they say.
Here is what really happens to the typical cancer patient:

**Step 1)** The patient goes to the doctor and is diagnosed with cancer,

**Step 2)** The cancer surgeon cuts out the parts of the body with high concentrations of cancer cells,

**Step 3)** The oncologists give the patient chemotherapy and/or radiation,

**Step 4)** They send the patient home “in remission,”

**Step 5)** The cancer soon appears again (because they didn’t actually cure the patient),

**Step 6)** Go back to step 1

This cycle continues until the patient is sent home to die (of course, they are sent home to die after one more round of chemotherapy and radiation). Soon the patient dies. This is the cycle for virtually all cancer patients. The only difference between one patient and another is how many times the cycle is repeated.

This is medicine? This is like using a toxic chemical to fight a spreading house fire.

One hundred years from now the medical doctors of the day will look at the “medicine” of today in total and absolute disgust. There is absolutely no excuse for what is going on today in medicine.

The reader might be interested in knowing what alternative cancer treatment experts have to deal with when they start working with a cancer patient. Even before an expert in alternative medicine starts working with a patient, two key things have happened in almost all cases:

**First,** ninety-five percent of cancer patients who go with alternative cancer treatments have already been given up for dead by orthodox medicine or the patient has quit the treatment because it was too painful or wasn’t working.

In other words, the patient first went to orthodox medicine and their body was destroyed by orthodox medicine. This was “time lost” to use the alternative cancer treatment.
Furthermore, the patient was severely damaged by the treatment.

Second, because so few alternative cancer treatments can cure people sent home to die by orthodox medicine, very few of the cancer patients sent home to die initially choose a treatment strong enough to give them a fighting chance.

In other words, very few of these cancer patients picked one of the most potent alternative cancer treatments even after leaving orthodox medicine. This is an “information” issue, but in dealing with cancer the issue of information is critical.

This is why the people who know what they are doing at treating cancer may be dealing with people who were treated by an inferior orthodox cancer treatment and an inferior alternative cancer treatment for their situation. This is a great deal of “time lost” and usually a large amount of damage to the body.

The issue of starting their treatment with orthodox medicine and then considering the time it takes the patient to find a really potent treatment, are two things which put a cancer patient and cancer expert at a huge disadvantage.

Alternative medicine has lost between 1 and 4 years to treat the patient and build their immune system – because the patient was using orthodox treatments and/or weak alternative cancer treatments. Is it any wonder that even the experts only have about a 50% cure rate?

If we put all of this together we come to the following facts:

1. Almost 100% of all newly diagnosed cancer patients go with orthodox medicine first,
2. About 97% of these patients die, or are sent home to die and later die, due to their cancer and/or their cancer treatment,
3. Only a very small percentage of the cancer patients sent home to die ever go with alternative cancer treatments, they simply go home and die,
4. Of those who do go with alternative cancer treatments, only a very small percentage of them ever pick a treatment strong enough to give them a 50% chance of survival.
Is it any wonder that deaths from cancer continue to rise in spite of the power of some of the alternative cancer treatments?

So, what is the cure rate of recently diagnosed cancer patients who go with alternative medicine exclusively? It depends on how dangerous their cancer is and what treatment they pick. There are more than 400 alternative cancer treatments.

If they pick the best possible treatment for their situation, when they are first diagnosed, a 90% or higher true cure rate is fairly easy to achieve. Overall, there are at least two dozen alternative cancer treatments that can come close to a 90% overall true cure rate across the board for those who use alternative cancer treatments exclusively and pick a potent treatment right from the beginning.

The amazing thing is that orthodox medicine has had its own opportunities to have its own 90% cure rate. There are two incredible substances that allow chemotherapy to safely target cancer cells: insulin and DMSO.

Insulin allows small amounts of chemotherapy to target cancer cells because of the way it works with the cell membranes. The treatment is called Insulin Potentiation Therapy (IPT). Very, very few medical doctors use this highly effective orthodox protocol.

DMSO actually binds to small amounts of certain chemotherapy drugs. The DMSO, which has a very high affinity for cancer cells, then pulls the chemotherapy into the cancer cells with it. On this website, this treatment is called DMSO Potentiation Therapy (DPT).

DPT and IPT are two treatments that are easy to combine. It is a very potent treatment. But don’t ask your oncologist about it, he or she has probably never heard of it.

Because these two treatments use very low doses of chemotherapy (about 1/10th a normal dose), and because the chemotherapy targets the cancer cells, these two treatments are very potent and have virtually no side-effects.

But orthodox medicine does not use their own discoveries! They would rather have a 3% cure rate than a 90% cure rate!! See this article about DMSO and chemotherapy:
Article: DMSO – The Magic Bullet For Cancer

So, if this is true, and it is true, why haven’t you heard this on television a hundred times during your lifetime? Why don’t movie stars, “investigative journalists,” etc. constantly tout the vast superiority of alternative cancer treatments?

WHY YOU HAVEN’T HEARD THESE THINGS BEFORE
Treating cancer is more about information than it is about anything else. People who know the best of the best alternative cancer treatments have the information they need to have no fear of cancer.

But everything you have heard throughout your life is not based on who has the most truth, it is based on who has the most money. If you haven’t figured that out by now, you better figure it out real quick.

The average American knows absolutely nothing about alternative cancer treatments except rumors about people who probably used the wrong treatment. Let us consider the reasons for this lack of accurate and useful information about alternative cancer treatments with the following list of facts:

Fact #1) Virtually every American gets the vast majority of their information directly or indirectly from the media, which includes television, radio, newspapers, magazines, etc. Only the Internet, books and emails would not be considered part of the “media” (so far anyway).

Fact #2) The pharmaceutical industry spends billions of dollars a year advertising in the media.

Fact #3) In the 1940s, the book: The Drug Story was published by newspaper owner Morris Bealle. This book exposed the vast corruption in the media due to advertising dollars. In other words, it exposed why newspapers (this was before television) refused to tell the truth about corruption in corporations due to their fear of losing advertising dollars to these same corrupt corporations.
However, it was well known long before the 1940s that advertising money bought influence with the media. Actually, this was known no later than the 1880s. In other words, for more than 100 years the media has clearly understood that if you say things in the media that are true, but cut into the profits of your advertisers, you will quickly lose not only your advertising revenue from that company, but possibly from many other companies as well (who also fear any type of honesty).

Consider this quote by a famous journalist to a group of other journalists, given in the 1880s:

“
There is no such thing, at this date of the world’s history [1880], in America, as an independent press. You know it and I know it. There is not one of you who dares to write your honest opinions, and if you did, you know beforehand that it would never appear in print. I am paid weekly for keeping my honest opinion out of the paper I am connected with. Others of you are paid similar salaries for similar things, and any of you who would be so foolish as to write honest opinions would be out on the streets looking for another job. If I allowed my honest opinions to appear in one issue of my paper, before twenty-four hours my occupation would be gone. The business of the journalists is to destroy the truth, to lie outright, to pervert, to vilify, to fawn at the feet of mammon, and to sell his country and his [human] race for his daily bread. You know it and I know it, and what folly is this toasting an independent press? We are the tools and vassals of rich men behind the scenes. We are the jumping jacks, they pull the strings and we dance. Our talents, our possibilities and our lives are all the property of other men. We are intellectual prostitutes.

- John Swinton (1829-1901) pre-eminent New York journalist & head of the editorial staff at the New York Tribune. Quoted one night between 1880-1883.

Quoted by Upton Sinclair in his 1919 book: The Brass Check: A Study of American Journalism, page 400

Even though Upton Sinclair was famous by 1919, because he was criticizing corruption in the media, he had to self-publish this book.
Absolutely nothing has changed since the 1880s.

**Fact #4)** As a result of the above item, and the billions spent every year by the pharmaceutical industry in the media, American journalists are required to publicly be highly, highly loyal to the pharmaceutical industry. A single verbal slip by a journalist on or off the air could cost him or her their job. Prior approval by the advertisers is required to say anything mildly negative about the pharmaceutical industry.

These same rules apply to most major industries, not just the pharmaceutical industry.

**Fact #5)** The orthodox cancer treatments (e.g. surgery, chemotherapy, radiation and many others) used in “modern” medicine are equally subservient to the pharmaceutical industry. Actually, “modern” medicine was corrupt long before the pharmaceutical industry took over the medical schools many decades ago. **Medical doctors, who are under the control of the American Medical Association, are not allowed to use any natural substance in the treatment of cancer.** Modern “doctors” are taught nothing but medicine using prescription drugs.

Medical doctors are only allowed to use natural substances in the treatment of the **symptoms of prescription drugs.** This is called “complementary alternative medicine” or CAM. CAM is not designed to treat any disease!

Because of the money of the pharmaceutical industry: the medical community, the media and the politicians are all subservient to the pharmaceutical industry. All are in the same bed together.

There are many books that have been written on these subjects.

**Fact #6)** While vitamin companies can advertise in the media, the substances which are used in the most potent natural or alternative cancer treatments are never advertised in the media. Thus, the media receives $0 dollars of advertising related to viable alternative cancer treatments.

Thus, there is a multi-billion dollar difference between what the pharmaceutical industry spends on advertising and what is spent for the main substances used in alternative cancer
treatments. There is an equally proportional difference in the opinions you gather from watching or reading the media.

**Fact #7** Taking all of the above items into account, is it any wonder that the average American hears nothing good about alternative cancer treatments anywhere in the media, but hears hundreds or thousands of good things about orthodox medicine in the media every year (thousands if you include pharmaceutical advertisements and television shows which glorify medical doctors).

You might not remember hearing anything good about orthodox medicine. Every time you watch a role-playing show on television that glorifies a doctor or hospital you are being indoctrinated. Every time you hear a news program that implies you should go to your orthodox doctor for some problem, you are being indoctrinated. Every time you hear a pharmaceutical ad you are being indoctrinated.

But you never hear anything positive about alternative cancer treatments. This is by design.

That is why surviving cancer is about **information**, not medicine. The methods to cure well over 90% of all newly diagnosed cancer patients has existed for decades. But the **information** about these treatments is decades away and can only come from the grass-roots.
AN EVEN BIGGER REASON FOR THE GREAT DECEPTION

But the problem is much deeper than just advertising money. The issue of cross-ownership and cross-board of directors control is a far more significant reason for the great deception.

For example, as I write this, General Electric owns 80% of the NBC network. General Electric also owns 14 major NBC affiliates. General Electric’s partner, Telemundo (which owns the other 20% of NBC), owns 16 major television stations. (By the way, GE now owns Telemundo.)

Why is this significant? General Electric has a major division called: “GE Healthcare.” This division includes “GE Medical Systems Information Technologies,” “GE Healthcare Cintricity Pharmacy” (which has sold about 6 billion prescriptions) and other orthodox health related organizations.

All of these organizations, and many more, are heavily involved in orthodox medicine. Thus, the same company, General Electric, has major ownership in both the media and orthodox medicine.

CBS has a longstanding advertising policy that prohibits the sale of advertising time for the advocacy of viewpoints on controversial issues of public importance. In other words, they can censor any advertisement they want. So much for freedom of the press.

A local FOX station in Florida fired two of its reporters, Jane Akre and Steve Wilson, for refusing to back down on an investigative reporting segment that exposed Monsanto chemical company for adding a toxic chemical, BGH, which causes cancer, to milk. The national FOX network has stood solidly behind the Florida station, not the journalists. Are you surprised?

For decades the 3 major television networks were so liberal that they were no longer able to control the conservatives. Something had to be done to manipulate and keep the conservatives from figuring out what was going on in Washington. In 1985, the Fox Network was founded with the main purpose of controlling the conservatives by diverting their attention from the real corruption in Washington and focusing the attention of the conservatives on unimportant issues that would not threaten the profits of the main conspiracy.
All of what has been said is just the tip of the iceberg. There is the issue of cross-board of directors control, such as between large cancer research clinics and pharmaceutical companies. There is also the issue that 42 U.S. Senators (42%) own stock in the pharmaceutical industry.

Then there is the issue of the revolving door between the FDA and the pharmaceutical industry. There is the issue discovered by a Los Angeles Times investigation that found out more than 500 employees of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) were receiving bribes (i.e. “outside consulting fees”) from the pharmaceutical industry. When the head of the NIH slapped a one year moratorium on these bribes (because they got caught, not because of any modicum of integrity), he was jeered by the crowd of NIH employees.

Follow the money trail, it all leads back to the pharmaceutical industry and American Medical Association (AMA) and beyond.

Now you know why the government and the AMA don’t want you to know the whole truth about your cancer treatment options. Now you know why medical doctors are not allowed to use natural substances in the treatment of cancer EVEN AFTER a person is sent home to die. Ponder that one carefully!!

If alternative medicine is capable of having a consistent cure rate of 90% or more, on newly diagnosed cancer patients, then clearly orthodox medicine is also capable of having a 90% true cure rate on newly diagnosed cancer patients if doctors were allowed to use natural substances in the treatment of disease. That is exactly why doctors are not allowed to use alternative medicine to treat disease – ever.

The 3% cure rate treatments are so much more profitable than the 90% cure rate treatments, that the “leaders” of orthodox medicine have intentionally chosen to suppress the far superior alternative cancer treatments.

If medical doctors were allowed to use alternative medicine on cancer patients they sent home to die, they could cure 50% of them. That would lead to questions of why the alternative cancer treatment was not used first! That is why medical doctors are not allowed to use alternative medicine even after the pharmaceutical industry and doctors already have their money and the patient is sent home to die!
This point is so important it cannot be made often enough. After orthodox medicine has all the money they can get from a cancer patient, the individual medical doctor is still not allowed to cure the patient with alternative medicine. This is the most telling fact of all in the battle between orthodox and alternative medicine. It would be too embarrassing to orthodox medicine for their cancer patients to be cured with alternative medicine after the orthodox treatments failed! So to avoid the embarrassment, they do not allow doctors to use effective treatments even after they have the patient’s money.

While individual doctors may or may not know what is going on, and may or may not be at fault for what is going on, it is clear that the individual medical doctors can be severely criticized for not having the guts to clean house within the national and state AMA boards and stand up for their patient’s health. They can also be severely criticized for not desiring to learn more about alternative cancer treatments. Most doctors don’t want to “rock the boat.”

What you hear from the “cancer industry” and the media does not come from anyone who is concerned about your health, what you hear comes from people who care about their personal assets. What you hear is controlled very carefully by a wide network of cross-controlled organizations and advertising money.

Indeed, those of us who are interested in telling people about their cancer treatment options feel as the reformer Upton Sinclair felt in 1919:

“I was determined to get something done about the Condemned Meat Industry. I was determined to get something done about the atrocious conditions under which men, women and children were working the Chicago stockyards. In my efforts to get something done, I was like an animal in a cage. The bars of this cage were newspapers, which stood between me and the public; and inside the cage I roamed up and down, testing one bar after another, and finding them impossible to break.


Even though Sinclair was famous by 1919, he had to self-publish this book.
With the total control of information by the media, and the total dependence of Americans on this mode of information, is it any wonder that virtually every newly diagnosed cancer patient chooses to go with orthodox medicine?

**A SUMMARY**

Let us summarize all of the things above:

1. Because of greed and corruption, orthodox medicine uses the most profitable treatments for cancer, thus their true cure rate is around 3%.
2. The true cure rate of orthodox medicine could easily be 90% or higher if they used the most effective orthodox cancer treatments or the most effective alternative cancer treatments.
3. Because of a wide variety of problems, but mainly because most cancer patients go with orthodox cancer treatments first, the true cure rate of alternative medicine is unknown, but it is probably around 10% to 15% (this includes patients who went to alternative practitioners who did not know what they are doing).
4. Like orthodox medicine, the true cure rate of alternative cancer treatments could be 90% or higher if newly diagnosed cancer patients went with alternative cancer treatments instead of orthodox cancer treatments and they found and used the most effective of the alternative cancer treatments for their situation.
5. Thus, orthodox medicine and alternative medicine have essentially the same potential, especially if orthodox medicine used the best of the alternative cancer treatments. But a medical doctor stands at risk of losing their medical license, and possibly going to jail, should they use the most effective cancer treatments, either orthodox or alternative. Thus, going with orthodox cancer treatments is almost always a mistake, because of the corruption in modern medicine.
6. Thus, for a newly diagnosed cancer patient, because they have the option to use alternative cancer treatments, and the freedom to do their homework on the Internet and in the right books, their only hope of achieving a high chance of survival is to use alternative cancer treatments.

In short, the war between alternative cancer treatments and orthodox cancer treatments has nothing to do with science, it is a war of information and freedom. From a scientific standpoint, if the right treatment is chosen for a given situation, and the patient avoids orthodox medicine (except in rare situations), because of the
corruption of orthodox medicine, alternative cancer treatments are far superior. But the side that wins the most cancer patients is the side with the most money.

In other words, because they are corrupt, Big Pharma and Big Medicine have the most money and the most influence over the media (who are essentially owned and controlled by the same people who own and control the pharmaceutical industry), thus almost all newly diagnosed cancer patients choose the worst possible option because the media has suppressed the truth, deceived them into thinking current orthodox medicine is wonderful and brainwashed them into picking their worst possible option.

Medicine is not a “healing art,” it is a business. Their goal is not to cure people, but to maximize their profits. Cancer is one of the key diseases that is a “goose that lays golden eggs” for orthodox medicine. No one wants to kill that goose.
CHAPTER 5
ALTERNATIVE MEDICINE QUIZ
THE FOUR PARTS OF ANY TRUTH TABLE
If you are married, there is a greater than 60% probability that either you or your spouse (or both) is going to be diagnosed with cancer in your lifetimes! That percentage keeps going up!

At some point in your life you have probably heard about cancer treatments that use natural substances, such as vitamins, enzymes, minerals, etc.

This type of medicine is usually called “alternative medicine.” What you heard about alternative medicine may have made you feel good about it or it may have made you feel bad about it. Either way, at the time, you probably weren’t motivated to do the research to find out the truth.

Perhaps, whether you have cancer or not, you wanted to know the truth about whether alternative cancer treatments or orthodox cancer treatments were more effective, safer, less painful, etc. If you understood the process of finding the truth, you would go through the four steps of the “truth table.”

1. Learn the good things about orthodox cancer treatments, from the orthodox medicine supporters.
2. Learn the bad things about alternative cancer treatments, from the orthodox medicine supporters.
   and you would (this line represents the symbolic “fence” between orthodox medicine and alternative medicine):
3. Learn the good things about alternative cancer treatments, from the alternative medicine supporters.
4. Learn the bad things about orthodox cancer treatments, from the alternative medicine supporters.

On one side of the “fence” are the people who represent orthodox medicine, who will gladly tell you the good things about orthodox medicine and the bad things about alternative medicine. On the other side of the fence are the alternative medicine representatives.
If you were an expert on what the people on **both sides of the fence** were saying (i.e. you were an expert in **all four items** in the truth table), then you would be in a position to make an **intelligent** decision about which side has the best treatments.

The problem is that when people have heard the good things about orthodox medicine, **from the orthodox medicine supporters**, and they have heard the bad things about alternative medicine, **from the orthodox medicine supporters, they think they are experts on both subjects!! But they are not experts in either subject because they have not heard a word from the alternative medicine supporters!!!**

While this sounds like a simple concept, it is virtually impossible for the average person to comprehend. Why should they listen to people they have been told all their life not to listen to? I am going to repeat that last paragraph:

The problem is that when people have heard the good things about orthodox medicine, **from the orthodox medicine supporters**, and they have heard the bad things about alternative medicine, **from the orthodox medicine supporters, they think they are experts on both subjects!! But they are not experts in either subject because they have not heard a word from the alternative medicine supporters!!!**

Here is the eternal truth: If orthodox medicine supporters (e.g. the American Cancer Society) will lie to you about how good orthodox cancer treatments are, then **the orthodox medicine supporters (e.g. quackwatch) will also lie to you about how bad alternative cancer treatments are!!!** That is why you don’t know the truth about either orthodox cancer treatments or alternative cancer treatments!!

Many thousands of times you have heard how wonderful orthodox doctors are via: shows such as M*A*S*H, Marcus Welby, MD, other doctor and hospital TV shows, news programs, magazines, advertisements, etc. These things naturally transfer to you believing that orthodox cancer treatments must also be wonderful (i.e. truth table #1). And you have no doubt heard dozens of bad things about alternative cancer treatments (truth table #2). Notice from the above table that both of these items come from orthodox medicine supporters. In other words, you have heard all of these things from the **same** side of the fence.
You have probably never heard anything bad about orthodox cancer treatments (truth table #4), and in all likelihood you have never heard anything good about alternative cancer treatments (truth table #3). Why haven’t you heard very much, if anything, from alternative medicine supporters?

When you have only heard from the people on one side of the fence for your entire life, you should wonder why!

“An educated person is one who has learned that information almost always turns out to be at best incomplete and very often false, misleading, fictitious, mendacious – just dead wrong.”


Is what you hear in the media based on who has the most truth or is it based on who has the most money?

To demonstrate just how one-sided your information has been, answer these two questions. First, when was the last time you saw a dramatic show on a major television network where the hero was an alternative medicine practitioner who was making alternative cancer treatments look safe and effective? Second, name 10 of the most effective alternative cancer treatments?

What you are about to read will contradict everything you have heard in your life. Your natural reaction at times will be disbelief. But if you are willing to finish reading this eBook (i.e. about truth table #3 and truth table #4), it could very well lead to a journey that will save your life or the life of a loved one!

After studying all four parts of the above truth table for hundreds of hours, as I have, I am certain it will be in your best interests to continue reading.
Before going on, let us first clarify a key point. Some readers probably think that this eBook is about comparing:

1. Orthodox treatments, enhanced or complemented with alternative treatments (called “complementary medicine”), versus
2. Orthodox treatments without alternative treatments.

While this would be an interesting topic, it has nothing to do with this eBook.

This eBook is about comparing:

1. Orthodox treatments without alternative treatments, versus,
2. Alternative treatments without orthodox treatments (in most cases).

In other words, this eBook is about using alternative cancer treatments, meaning the use of natural substances, instead of orthodox treatments. Welcome to truth table #3 and truth table #4. You need to start thinking about natural substances as a complete, stand-alone treatment for cancer.

**AN ALTERNATIVE CANCER TREATMENT QUIZ**

Let’s find out what you know about alternative treatments:

**Question #1:** Dr. Ewan Cameron, and two-time Nobel Prize winner Linus Pauling, did studies in Scotland (which were duplicated by studies in Canada and Japan) comparing Vitamin C therapy to chemotherapy. Which group of patients, the ones on vitamin C or chemotherapy, lived longer on average, and by how much?

**Question #2:** An American alternative cancer treatment doctor treated 33,000 cancer patients, many of whom had been given up for dead by orthodox medicine and had been sent home to die. What was his verified cure rate?

**Question #3:** Fill in the blank: “In a review of 206 human studies, [which food] consistently emerged as one of the top cancer-fighting foods.”
**Question #4:** How many Nobel Prize discoveries (and when were they awarded) did Dr. Johanna Budwig use to help her develop the Flaxseed Oil (omega 3) / Cottage Cheese (sulphur proteins) cancer treatment?

**Question #5:** It is absurd to think that a person can be cured of cancer simply by changing their diet. Only professionals can cure cancer. True or false?

**Let’s answer these questions:**

**Question #1**
*Question #1:* Dr. Ewan Cameron, and two-time Nobel Prize winner Linus Pauling, did studies in Scotland (which were duplicated by studies in Canada and Japan) comparing Vitamin C therapy to chemotherapy. Which group of patients, the ones on vitamin C or chemotherapy, lived longer on average, and by how much?

*Answer:* The vitamin C patients lived an average of ten times longer than the chemotherapy patients. I don’t know why anyone would be surprised at this result. Cancer in many cases is nothing but a symptom of a weakened immune system. Chemotherapy virtually destroys an already weakened immune system, and it is the immune system that deals with cancer on a normal basis. On the other hand, Vitamin C helps build the immune system. It makes sense that someone who has had their immune system built up would outlive someone who had their immune system destroyed.

Because Dr. Pauling was world famous, and had an impeccable reputation for quality and integrity, a person might wonder why the orthodox medical community did not do further studies on Vitamin C and cancer. They did do further studies on Vitamin C. But the purpose of these studies was to discredit Dr. Pauling and Dr. Cameron, as previously mentioned.

**Question #2**
*Question #2:* An American alternative cancer treatment doctor treated 33,000 cancer patients, many of whom had been given up for dead by orthodox medicine and had been sent home to die. What was his verified cure rate?

*Answer:* Dr. William Donald Kelley, a dentist by training, had a 93% cure rate on patients who were not too far gone before they went to him. This cure rate was verified by a 5-year...
study by an orthodox doctor. His technique is called “metabolic” therapy, and guess what, it was designed to build the immune system and safely and selectively kill cancer cells.

But what is of even more significance is the answer to this question: “if we factor out all of his patients who went to orthodox doctors before they went to Dr. Kelley, and only counted those who went to Dr. Kelley first, what would his cure rate have been?”

First of all, even for orthodox medicine the vast majority of cancer patients live for at least a year and a half after their first diagnosis. But for Dr. Kelley it is logical to conclude that an even higher percentage of cancer patients, who went to him first, lived for at least a year and a half because Dr. Kelley’s treatment does not damage the immune system, rather it builds the immune system. Furthermore, Dr. Kelley had a high cure rate even for pancreatic cancer patients who went to him first.

In other words, virtually all of the cancer patients who went to Dr. Kelley first were in the group that had a 93% cure rate! If we further make the even more obvious conclusion that among those cancer patients in the 93% statistic, those who went to him first had at least as high a cure rate as those who went to orthodox medicine first, then we can logically conclude that his cure rate on patients who went to him first was probably around 90%.

**All of this is a highly logical conclusion for three reasons:**

F**irst**, he used the identical treatment regardless of whether his patient went to him first or orthodox medicine first,

S**econd**, for those patients who went to orthodox medicine first, Dr. Kelley lost a lot of time before he was able to start treating these patients. In other words, he started their treatments after their cancer was further along (compared to those who went to him first), and

T**hird**, those patients who went to orthodox medicine first had their immune systems severely compromised before they went to Dr. Kelley (in other words, for those who went to Dr. Kelley first, they still had their immune system intact), thus Dr. Kelley had to rebuild that portion of their immune system before his treatment started to become fully effective. This loss of time was in addition to the lost time caused by these patients going to orthodox medicine first.
In other words, it is obvious that if 10,000 new cancer patients, who had not had any orthodox treatments, went to Dr. Kelley first, his overall cure rate for these people would be close to 90%, and perhaps even higher! That is far, far higher than the patients who go to orthodox medicine first.

In fact, as will be shown below, when you factor out all of the fancy statistical tricks of orthodox medicine, such as their “5-year cure rate,” the true cure rate for orthodox medicine is 3% or less. Thus, patients who went to Dr. Kelley FIRST had a THIRTY TIMES higher chance of surviving their cancer than those who went to orthodox medicine exclusively.

Dr. Kelley’s reward by orthodox medicine for his high cure rate was to be thrown in jail. Kelley also had to move his treatment to Mexico. Fortunately, he wrote a book about his treatment: Cancer, Curing The Incurable Without Surgery, Chemotherapy or Radiation before his death in early 2005.

Because Dr. Kelley had such an incredibly high cure rate for cancer, much, much higher than orthodox medicine, you might wonder why the orthodox medical community does not study Dr. Kelley’s treatment to see if there are ways to improve it.

In other words, why doesn’t the orthodox community use Dr. Kelley’s treatment in order to obtain a quick and immediate 90% cure rate for new cancer patients, then find ways to improve on it to get even higher cure rates? Why are they content with a 3% cure rate when there is a publicly available treatment that has a 90% cure rate on new patients?

While the Kelley Metabolic treatment is perfectly capable of curing a person’s a cancer, I should note that it is not advised that it be the primary treatment for someone who has been on chemotherapy. Some newer treatments do not depend on building the immune system before they fully work, thus they are far more effective on patients who have had their immune system compromised by chemotherapy.

**Question #3**

Question #3: Fill in the blank: “In a review of 206 human studies, [which food] consistently emerged as one of the top cancer-fighting foods.”
Answer: Here is the complete quote: “In a review of 206 human studies, carrots consistently emerged as one of the top cancer-fighting foods. The power of carrots lies in the group of pigments called carotenoids (beta-carotene is among this group), which give them their orange color.”

While it is nice that scientists have made this discovery, carrots were used to cure cancer long before any of the 206 human studies the quote refers to. Raw vegetable juices, with raw carrots as the main ingredient, coupled with a customized vegan diet, as a replacement for the meat and dairy centered “Western” diet, has cured many, many thousands of people of cancer.

I might add that carrot juice is the main ingredient in the vegetable juice that serves at the heart of the “Raw Food Diet,” for which there is an article on this web site.

However, carrot juice based protocols are not rated in the top layer of alternative cancer treatments for advanced cancer patients. However, carrot juice is part of some of the best treatments!!

Question #4

Question #4: How many Nobel Prize discoveries (and when were they awarded) did Dr. Johanna Budwig use to help her develop the Flaxseed Oil (omega 3) / Cottage Cheese (sulphur proteins) cancer treatment?

Answer: Two Nobel Prizes, Dr. Otto Warburg (1931) and Dr. Albert Szent-Gyorgyi (1937). First, Dr. Warburg:

“Dr Otto Warburg, twice Nobel laureate was able to prove that cancer cannot grow in an high oxygen environment. He states: ‘Cancer, above all diseases, has countless secondary causes, but there is only one prime cause: the prime cause of cancer is the replacement of normal oxygen respiration of body cells by anaerobic respiration’. In other words, lack of oxygen. His research revealed that when a cell is denied 60% of its normal requirement of oxygen, it switches to a fermentation mechanism and grows out of control.

Second, Dr. Szent-Gyorgyi:

“Dr. Szent-Gyorgyi won the Nobel Prize in 1937 for discovering that essential fatty acids combined with sulphur-rich proteins (such as those found in diary products) increases oxygenation of the body.


Note that both of these Nobel Prizes were awarded in the 1930s. Dr. Budwig developed a diet to combine these two discoveries into one simple treatment plan – flaxseed oil and cottage cheese. Her treatment has cured untold thousands of cancer patients.

Her protocol is actually an integral part of two of the most potent alternative cancer treatments: the Cellect-Budwig Protocol and the Bill Henderson Protocol.

**Question #5**

*Question #5:* It is absurd to think that a person can be cured of cancer simply by changing their diet. Only professionals can cure cancer. True or false?

*Answer:* I quote from alternative medicine expert Walter Last:

“To show how simple natural methods can be very effective in overcoming advanced cancer, I like to mention an example from the book *The Food and Health of Western Man* by Dr J. L. Mount. In five reported cases of bowel cancer, surgery revealed that metastases had already spread all over the body. Therefore, these patients were just closed up again and sent home to die. But instead of doing that, independently of each other, these five changed their diets and from then on ate only homegrown organically raised food. When they finally did die 21 to 30 years later, no traces of cancer could be found in post-mortem examinations. Such cures without medical intervention are regarded as ‘spontaneous remissions’.

The vast majority of cancer patients who go into “spontaneous remission” made massive changes in their diet after being diagnosed with cancer.

“A study was done on 200 cancer patients who had experienced “spontaneous remission.” Doctors call these remissions “miracles.” They’re NOT miracles. Here’s how they did it. Eighty seven percent of them fundamentally changed their diets – mostly to vegetarian. All of the 200 made changes in their lives including nutritional supplementation and detoxification techniques. What this and other studies are telling us is that cancer can be cured by fundamentally changing the chemistry that created it.

- Raymond Francis (http://www.aidsinfobbs.org/articles/quilty/q02/732)

Here is another interesting quote:

“A study of four hundred cancer cases that went into spontaneous remission revealed cures which had little in common. Some people drank grape juice or swallowed massive doses of vitamin C; others prayed, took herbal remedies, or simply cheered themselves on. These very diverse patients did have one thing in common, though. At a certain point in their disease, they suddenly knew, with complete certainty, that they were going to get better, as if the disease were merely a mirage, and the patient suddenly passed beyond it into a space where fear and despair and all sickness were nonexistent.


While it is true that many people go into spontaneous remission by dramatically changing their diet and attitude, imagine what would happen if newly diagnosed cancer patients were told:

1. What foods contained the most cancer-killing nutrients,
2. What foods contained the best nutrients to build the immune system,
3. What foods feed cancer cells and thus cause the cancer to grow faster (these are foods to avoid),
4. The best supplements to kill cancer cells and build the immune system, and they were told

5. What things in a person’s life can damage a natural treatment plan (e.g. chlorine in tap water)?

For example, changing to a vegan diet would not necessarily cure cancer, but going on a **selective** vegan diet and eating **only** the vegetables and fruits known to contain large amounts of cancer killing nutrients, and avoiding foods that feed the cancer, and avoiding foods that interfere with the effectiveness of the cancer-fighting foods, would yield a much higher cure rate than **any** orthodox treatment, even better than Vitamin C therapy.

But alternative medicine can do much better than even this selective vegan protocol.
ORTHODOX MEDICINE QUIZ

Now let’s test your knowledge of orthodox medicine. First, we need to define a term:

**Definition: total life** - The length of time between the diagnosis of cancer and the death of the cancer patient, whether it is death by cancer, death by cancer treatment or death by any other cause. This is also called “survival time.”

**Question #1:**
Chemotherapy and radiation put people into “remission.” Putting people into remission proves that the “total life” (see above definition) of a person is significantly increased by using chemotherapy and radiation. True or false?

**Question #2:**
If a cancer patient lives 5 years after diagnosis, orthodox medicine considers that they are “cured” of cancer. Is this concept mathematically equivalent to the concept of “total life?”

**Question #3:**
The FDA would never approve a chemotherapy drug unless it was scientifically proven, beyond any doubt, that the drug significantly extends the “total life” of a cancer patient. True or false?

**Question #4:**
Among the thousands of scientific studies on chemotherapy, there is massive scientific evidence that chemotherapy extends the “total life” of cancer patients compared to those who refuse all treatment. True or false?

**Question #5:**
Orthodox proponents claim that for some kinds of cancer, “cure rates” have gone up over the past 10 or 20 years. They claim this is just another proof that orthodox treatments are superior to alternative treatments. Do you agree?
NOW THE ANSWERS.

Question #1

Question #1: Chemotherapy and radiation put people into “remission.” Putting people into remission proves that the “total life” (see above definition) of a person is significantly increased by using chemotherapy and radiation. True or false?

Answer: People equate the concept of “remission” with the concept of “cure.” Technically, “remission” means nothing more than one or more of the symptoms of the cancer are gone (e.g. destroying a tumor may put a cancer patient into “remission”). However, even if a tumor is destroyed, for example, and the person is judged to be in “remission,” there still may be many areas of concentrated cancer cells in the body. Thus a person can still have potentially damaging areas of cancer in their body and they can still be considered to be in “remission.”

There has never been scientific proof that the treatment of symptoms generally relates to a longer “total life.” In other words, there has never been scientific proof that the concept of removing “symptoms” and the concept of increasing “total life” are related. Indeed, the “total life” of cancer patients has barely changed in over 80 years in spite of many improvements in treating symptoms.

Furthermore, while many people do go into remission, for some types of cancer, more than 90% of the people who go into remission will come out of remission (which is called “regression”) and will later die of cancer. “Total Life” has to do with the eventual death of the patient, not the treatment of the symptoms of cancer. Consider this quote:

“Ovarian cancer is usually detected at an advanced stage and, as such, is one of the deadliest and most difficult cancers to treat. Therapy can eradicate the tumors, but most patients relapse within two years … Normally, when a woman is diagnosed with ovarian cancer, she undergoes surgery to have the tumors removed. The ovaries, fallopian tubes, uterus and parts of the bowel are often removed as well. Chemotherapy follows the surgery, and about 90 percent of patients then go into remission, a period of “watchful waiting.” “The problem is that over the next five to 10 years, as many as 90 percent of
women will relapse and die,” says Berek. When the cancer returns in other surrounding tissue, it is more virulent and resistant to chemotherapy.”

- taken from: http://www.azcentral.com/health/women/articles/0618ovarian.html

Of course the “returning” cancer is more deadly than the original cancer because the person’s immune system was destroyed while treating the symptoms of the first cancer. The cancer may never have left the patient. Once chemotherapy has damaged the immune system, the patient is left far more vulnerable to cancer.

An even more deceptive term has entered into the vocabulary of orthodox medicine. The term is “response.” Again, people equate the term “response” to cure. This newly ubiquitous term is even more deceptive than the term “remission.” What does “response” mean? It only means that the tumor has shrunk a little. That’s all.

Orthodox medicine wants patients to think that the tumor is the cancer and the size of the tumor equates to the cancer being cured. This is utter nonsense. It is a clever trick to avoid the issue of “total life.” Rather than extending the total life of patients, they extend their vocabulary to be more and more deceptive.

**Question #2**

*Question #2: If a cancer patient lives 5 years after diagnosis, orthodox medicine considers that they are “cured” of cancer. Is this concept mathematically equivalent to the concept of “total life?”*

*Answer: It is assumed that the concept of “cure” (meaning patients who survive 5 years after diagnosis), is equivalent to the concept of “total life.” Consider two car manufacturing companies, Company B and Company G. Let us define the “total life” of the cars these companies manufacture to be the number of miles the cars drive before the engine dies permanently and has to be replaced. Suppose the “total life” of Company B cars is 100,000 miles and suppose the “total life” of the Company G cars is 300,000 miles.

Clearly, Company G makes far superior automobiles. How can the Company B executives make it appear that their car engines are as good as the engines made by Company G? They can lie with statistics.*
For example, what if Company B did a study of what percent of Company B car engines and what percent of Company G car engines were still running after 30,000 miles? Both companies would look very good and you could not tell them apart. But if the study were based on what percent of Company B car engines and what percent of Company G car engines were still running after 250,000 miles, the truth about the inferiority of Company B car engines would be obvious.

**If the “benchmark” is carefully chosen to be well below the average, any company will look good.**

That is exactly how orthodox medicine lies with statistics. A “cure rate” based on a patient living 5 years is like the engine test after 30,000 miles – it is meaningless. The benchmark is way too low. “Cure rates” should be based on “total life” and nothing else. For example, some cancers are very slow growing. The “cure rate” for these cancers is very high, when in fact a 15-year “cure rate” would show just how poor treatments are for some of these types of cancers.

But the lies of orthodox medicine on this issue go much deeper than that – much deeper.

If you look up the word “cure” in the dictionary, or think about the concept of curing cancer, you might come up with a definition of “cure for cancer” as meaning the cancer patient has been returned to his or her condition before they got cancer. In other words, they have less than, or fewer, cancer cells than the average person.

Why doesn’t orthodox medicine use that definition of “cure?” If they did use that definition, and every few years they found a true cure for a type of cancer, their cure rate would slowly go up.

But that is exactly why they don’t use that definition of cure. They have no intention of curing cancer. As Dr. Bob Beck, a PhD in physics used to say: “a patient cured is a customer lost.”

How can orthodox medicine maximize their “profit per cancer patient?” In other words, they cannot control who gets cancer, but they can control how much money they make per cancer patient. They can do that by making cancer into a chronic disease.
In other words, if they can extend the life of the patient, and keep them on orthodox drugs and orthodox treatments, the orthodox medical community can make more and more money per patient.

It is easy to tell from their choice of a definition of “cure” that that is exactly what they had in mind all along.

When the orthodox medicine people came up with their “5-year cure rate” they clearly had in mind that they wanted to convert cancer into a chronic disease, meaning the patient was going to be on prescription drugs for the rest of their life. That was clearly their goal, because as they convert people into chronic patients their “cure rate” will go up and up (i.e. more and more of them will hit the 5 year mark, but they will be on drugs for life which may not be long after the 5 year mark).

Their definition of “cure” has NOTHING to do with how many cancer cells a person has, what their health is, how long they will live after the 5 year mark, how their immune system is doing, how many microbes they have in their body, etc. etc.

Their definition of “cure” is only a number which reflects their ability to convert cancer into a chronic disease. The more they are able to convert cancer into a chronic disease, the higher their “cure rate,” using their tricky definitions.

Orthodox medicine loves to use tricky definitions to make their treatments look better than they really are, and to hide how ineffective their treatments are. The American Cancer Society is at the center of the deceptive definitions.

The reader should understand the difference between a “treatment” and a “true cure.” A “true cure,” meaning the patient is made whole and no longer needs prescription drugs, stops the profits of orthodox medicine. But a “treatment” extends and expands on their profits. Orthodox medicine wants to “treat” cancer, not “cure” cancer.

In fact, orthodox medicine hates it when someone uses the term “cure” for any disease. They want that term to be illegal because it distracts the attention of people away from what they want – all profitable diseases to be chronic diseases.
**Question #3**

Question #3: The FDA would never approve a chemotherapy drug unless it was scientifically proven, beyond any doubt, that the drug significantly extends the “total life” of a cancer patient. True or false?

*Answer:* This comment needs some explanation because the goal of the pharmaceutical industry is to maximize their profits. Think about it, can you maximize your profits better if your patients live 5 years or 3 years? Obviously, 5 years. So there is some motivation to extend the life of cancer patients.

However, think about this also. If you cure the patient after one year, how much profits do you make after they are cured? Not much.

Thus, the goal of orthodox medicine is to make cancer into a chronic disease, like diabetes, where the patient has many years of treatment.

Also, understand that chemotherapy drugs do not target cancer cells, they target fast-growing cells. There is a significant difference between targeting fast-growing cells versus targeting cancer cells.

First, some cancer cells are slow growing, thus chemotherapy does not target them and may not kill them. Second, some non-cancerous cells are fast growing, thus chemotherapy may target them and kill them.

Thus, to target fast growing cells instead of cancer cells is a huge difference.

But more importantly, because chemotherapy drugs do not target cancer cells chemotherapy drugs cannot stop the spread of cancer. If enough chemotherapy were given to a cancer patient that the drugs stopped the spread of the cancer, the patient would die from the toxicity of the chemotherapy.

Thus, the FDA has NEVER in their history approved a drug that targeted cancer cells and/or stopped the spread of cancer. Ponder that carefully.
However, scores of natural substances have been proven to target cancer cells, or do no harm to non-cancerous cells, and thus STOP the spread of cancer and cure the patient. Scores of natural molecules have been proven to do that!!

The FDA has NEVER approved one of the natural substances known to target cancer cells, or do no harm to non-cancerous cells, and thus stop the spread of cancer and cure the patient.

**Thus, everything the FDA has approved:**

1. Is very profitable to the pharmaceutical industry,
2. Does NOT target cancer cells,
3. Does NOT stop the spread of cancer, and
4. Does NOT cure the patient.

Technically speaking, the drugs may slow down the cancer, and thus put the patient in remission, but in the vast majority of cases the patient comes out of remission and dies of cancer or the cancer treatment. Thus the drugs approved by the FDA are more and more profitable to the pharmaceutical industry (because the patient is on the treatment longer), but they do not stop the spread of cancer or cure any patients.

**Also, the FDA has NEVER approved any of the natural molecules, which:**

1. Are not highly profitable to the pharmaceutical industry,
2. **DO** target cancer cells or do no harm to normal cells,
3. **DO** stop the spread of cancer, and
4. **DO** cure the patient of cancer, especially if the patient did not go with orthodox treatments first.

Do you see a pattern here? **The deciding factor on what is approved by the FDA is not based on how long a patient lives, but on how profitable the drug is to the pharmaceutical industry.** So talking about the “total life” of the patient misses the whole point of what is going on in orthodox medicine.
This is the key, if the FDA was interested in maximizing the “total life” of cancer patients they would only approve natural substances for the treatment of cancer. That is the key. The FDA is only interested in increasing the “total life” of the cancer patient if it means more profits to the pharmaceutical industry.

To hide what they are really doing, the FDA approves chemotherapy drugs based on the treatment of the symptoms of cancer. The focus on how long a patient lives is not a focus on targeting cancer cells, or doing no harm to non-cancerous cells, and thus stopping the spread of cancer and thus curing the patient. It is only a focus on profits.

But the approval of chemotherapy drugs is generally based on how well a new drug does treating symptoms (e.g. tumor size or putting a patient in remission), compared only to how other chemotherapy drugs do treating this same symptom!!

Furthermore, when a chemotherapy drug is approved for “extending life,” the approval is also based on comparing one chemotherapy drug (or combination of drugs) to another chemotherapy drug (or combination of drugs).

Once they got their first chemotherapy drug approved (to treat symptoms), then all future drugs can be approved by comparing them to earlier drugs for either “extending life” or treating symptoms.

Never, never, never, has a chemotherapy drug been approved by a study comparing the use of the drug on one group of patients, and comparing this group to a group of patients who refused treatments (in an FDA filing), nor has a study ever been done comparing chemotherapy to one of the top alternative cancer treatments (in an FDA filing).

“We have a multi-billion dollar industry that is killing people, right and left, just for financial gain. Their idea of research is to see whether two doses of this poison is better than three doses of that poison.

- Dr Glen Warner, M.D. oncologist
Now a person might think that it would be unethical to compare a chemotherapy drug to those who refuse treatments. If a person were secretly given a placebo, perhaps that would be unethical. However, there are plenty of people who voluntarily refuse to subject themselves to orthodox treatments who could be used in a study to compare a chemotherapy treatment plan to those who refuse treatment!!

To understand what is going on, suppose a new drug allows 75% of the cancer patients, with a specific type of cancer, to live for 2 years after diagnosis. What exactly does this mean if 85% of those same cancer patients would have survived two years without any type of orthodox treatment or 97% of those same cancer patients would have survived 10 years using the best of the alternative cancer treatments?

Again, the focus of the FDA is on profits, not on “total life,” though the “total life” may increase in order for the pharmaceutical industry to make higher profits.

The FDA executives are not innocent bystanders in the war between orthodox medicine and alternative medicine. The FDA is 100% behind the pharmaceutical industry and 0% behind alternative medicine. They are just as guilty as the pharmaceutical executives, just as guilty as the AMA executives, and just as guilty as anyone else lying to the American people by telling them prescription chemotherapy is in the best interests of cancer patients or that alternative cancer treatments are worthless.

Nor can Congress plead stupidity and hide behind the skirts of the FDA. The members of Congress also have their hands in the pockets of the pharmaceutical industry.

**Question #4**

*Question #4:* Among the thousands of scientific studies on chemotherapy, there is massive scientific evidence that chemotherapy extends the “total life” of cancer patients compared to those who refuse all treatment. True or false?

*Answer:* The next quote answers this question:
Professor Hardin B. Jones, PhD stated:

“
My studies have proved conclusively that untreated cancer victims live up to four times longer than treated individuals. If one has cancer and opts to do nothing at all, he will live longer and feel better than if he undergoes radiation, chemotherapy or surgery …

- Prof Jones. (1956 Transactions of the N.Y. Academy of Medical Sciences, vol 6)
see also: http://www.sickofdoctors.addr.com/articles/medicalignorance.htm

Now consider this quote:

“In 1975, the respected British medical journal Lancet reported on a study which compared the effect on cancer patients of (1) a single chemotherapy, (2) multiple chemotherapy, and (3) no treatment at all. No treatment ‘proved a significantly better policy for patients’ survival and for quality of remaining life.’


And this quote:

“A German epidemiologist from the Heidelberg/Mannheim Tumor Clinic, Dr Ulrich Abel, has done a comprehensive review and analysis of every major study and clinical trial of chemotherapy ever done. His conclusions should be read by anyone who is about to embark on the Chemo Express. To make sure he had reviewed everything ever published on chemotherapy, Abel sent letters to over 350 medical centers around the world, asking them to send him anything they had published on the subject. Abel researched thousands of articles: it is unlikely that anyone in the world knows more about chemotherapy than he.

The analysis took him several years, but the results are astounding: Abel found that the overall worldwide success rate of chemotherapy was ‘appalling’ because there was simply no scientific evidence available anywhere that chemotherapy can ‘extend in
any appreciable way the lives of patients suffering from the most common organic cancers’. Abel emphasizes that chemotherapy rarely can improve the quality of life. He describes chemotherapy as ‘a scientific wasteland’ and states that at least 80 per cent of chemotherapy administered throughout the world is worthless and is akin to the ‘emperor’s new clothes’–neither doctor nor patient is willing to give up on chemotherapy, even though there is no scientific evidence that it works! (Lancet, 10 August 1991) No mainstream media even mentioned this comprehensive study: it was totally buried.

- Tim O’Shea, The Doctor Within

Three major studies all came to the same conclusion: “orthodox cancer treatments” do not extend the “total life” of cancer patients. In fact, in many cases they shorten the “total life” of cancer patients.

Yet virtually every cancer patient on earth has been told by their doctors something like this: “if you take this chemotherapy you will live 6 months longer than if you do not take it.” This statement is ubiquitous but totally unscientific!!

Here is a prophetic quote about the future of chemotherapy and radiation:

“Twenty years from now we will look back at chemotherapy and radiation as [being as] barbaric as using leeches,” Steve Millett, manager of technology forecasts for Battelle

Unfortunately, this quote is nonsense. I personally have seen quotes from “cancer researchers” who claim it will be at least 50 years before there will be a dent in cancer. That is more accurate because that is what everyone wants.

Question #5

Question #5: Orthodox proponents claim that for some kinds of cancer, “cure rates” have gone up over the past 10 or 20 years. They claim this is just another proof that orthodox treatments are superior to alternative treatments. Do you agree?

Answer: Yes, some “cure rates” have gone up. This is the most damaging deception of all.
Suppose Company B (as discussed above) makes some small improvements in their engines and the “total life” of their engines increases from 100,000 miles to 102,000 miles. Because of this, suppose the percentage of their engines that last 30,000 increases from 92% to 93%.

**Now imagine the CEO of Company B makes the following announcement:**

> The percentage of our car engines that last 30,000 has increased from 92% to 93%. This proves that Company B cars last longer than Company G cars.

Is the CEO right? Of course not, Company G engines still last 300,000 and Company B engines only last 102,000. It is an absurd claim. What the Company B executive has done is compare the “old” Company B cars to the “new” Company B cars. The CEO has not compared the “total life” of the Company B cars to the “total life” of the Company G cars.

That is exactly what the FDA does. When orthodox medicine says that “cure rates” have gone up, they are comparing their “old” 5-year chemotherapy stats to their “new” 5-year chemotherapy stats. They are not comparing the “total life” of orthodox treatments to the “total life” of alternative treatments or even the “total life” of those who refuse treatments.

Orthodox medicine is continually “improving” their treatments, all with a loud clarion blast of publicity. Their cure rates are always “going up” and a cure is always “just around the corner.” But look at it this way. Company B can improve their engines to last 102,000, and 5 years later they can improve them to 104,000, and 5 years later to 106,000, and so on. In the mean time people who bought cars from Company G have cars that last 300,000, then 5 years later 305,000, then 5 years later 310,000, and so on. So when will Company B catch up to Company G? Never!!

But this sophisticated deception goes much deeper. “Cure rates” will go up if the cancer is diagnosed earlier! In other words, if the American Cancer Society convinces women to get mammograms (which are carcinogenic, by the way) more often, their breast cancer will be diagnosed earlier, on average, and the “cure rates” for breast cancer will go up! The cure rate did not go up because of some improvement in chemotherapy or radiation, but because women have carcinogenic mammograms more frequently!
There are many ways to manipulate the “cure rates” of orthodox medicine.

In truth, the gap in “total life” between alternative cancer treatments and orthodox cancer treatments is greater than the gap between Company G cars and Company B cars. The Cameron/Pauling study proved that. While the Cameron/Pauling Vitamin C therapy is not one of the best current alternative cancer treatments, there are newer Vitamin C therapies that are among the best treatments.

Orthodox medicine, by using sophisticated definitions and deceptive statistics, has convinced the public to believe that orthodox cancer treatments extend the “total life” of patients. But there is no scientific evidence for that belief!!

I want to emphasize that these deceptions were not developed by ignorant people who didn’t know what they were doing. They are sophisticated, carefully designed statistical deceptions combined with carefully chosen deceptive terminology! A normal person would automatically think only about “total life,” but the “total life” numbers are carefully hidden. More will be said about those doing the deception later.
CHAPTER 7
JUDGING ORTHODOX MEDICINE
LET US COUNT THE WAYS
There are some things in the above quotes that may have shocked you.

The concept that people will die more quickly if they have surgery, chemotherapy and radiation treatments may surprise some people.

How is it possible that people who go through treatments can die quicker than people who refuse treatments?

In fact, there are many ways that orthodox cancer treatments can **kill** a cancer patient long before they would have died without treatment of any kind. For example:

- **Malnutrition #1:** About 40% of cancer patients die of malnutrition **before** they would have died of their cancer. Two of the causes of this malnutrition, which are related to chemotherapy, will now be discussed: First, chemotherapy makes a person very nauseous and causes them to throw-up. This causes many people to”... develop anorexia – the loss of appetite or desire to eat. This situation is not good at all because it can lead to a condition known as cancer “cachexia” – a wasting syndrome characterized by weakness and a noticeable continuous loss of weight, fat, and muscle.” Cachexia is a common cause of death of cancer patients.

- **Malnutrition #2:** Second, chemotherapy destroys the lining of the digestive tract of many cancer patients, making it impossible for the body to absorb the nutrients of the foods they eat, leading to malnutrition. As one person put it, even if a cancer patient eats like a king, they can literally die of malnutrition.

- **Destroys the immune system:** Because chemotherapy and radiation destroy a person’s immune system, many cancer patients die of opportunistic infections, such as sepsis or pneumonia. As a side note, more than 200,000 Americans a year die of sepsis. When a cancer patient dies of sepsis it is most likely because chemotherapy destroyed the patient’s immune system, allowing sepsis to easily kill the patient. It may be counted as a sepsis death, not a cancer death. This is just one of many ways that the medical community can hide the true statistics of chemotherapy and radiation.
• **Destroys the immune system:** Because chemotherapy and radiation kill white blood cells (white blood cells are the body’s natural defense against cancer), chemotherapy and radiation destroy not only a body’s natural defense against the cancer they currently have, it also destroys the body’s defense against new cancers.

• **Destroys Red Blood Cells:** Because chemotherapy and radiation kill red blood cells (red blood cells carry oxygen to the cancer cells and oxygen helps keep cancer from spreading), cancer cells do not get a normal supply of oxygen. Since cancer cells are anaerobic, this allows them to thrive and divide faster.

• “So, if a Cancer patient is already Acidic & if Acid drives out the oxygen causing an anaerobic atmosphere that Cancer loves, how much sense does it make to take Chemotherapy that will kill more of your oxygen carrying Red Blood Cells? By a matter of deduction and the use of common sense once again, wouldn’t that create an even more anaerobic atmosphere and provide an even more desirable situation for Cancer to wreak havoc?” [http://www.polymvasurvivors.com/what_you_know_4%20Corners%20Protocol.html](http://www.polymvasurvivors.com/what_you_know_4%20Corners%20Protocol.html)

• Kill a Vital Organ: Chemotherapy and radiation frequently kill a vital organ of a patient, such as the liver or heart. One metal found in at least three types of chemotherapy is virtually guaranteed to kill the patient of heart disease. Once the damage is done, nothing, not even alternative cancer treatments, can save the patient.

• **Can Biopsies or Surgery Help Spread the Cancer?** Biopsies and surgery can release cancer cells into the bloodstream, but this will not necessarily cause the cancer to spread. Free-floating cancer cells are not likely to be integrated into tissue elsewhere in the body. However, cutting cancer cells apart (during a biopsy or surgery) will likely cause the microbes inside the cancer cells (i.e. see the “What Causes Cancer” article) to be released into the bloodstream. This is more likely to cause the cancer to spread as the microbes may get inside of healthy cells somewhere else.

However, in either case, it is not likely that a biopsy or cancer surgery will actually cause the cancer to spread, meaning metastasize.
• **Chemotherapy is Carcinogenic:** Chemotherapy and radiation can dramatically increase the probability that a person will get certain types of cancer. For example, many women treated by chemotherapy and radiation for breast cancer later develop uterine cancer. Chemotherapy drugs are not only toxic, they are carcinogenic.

• **Lose the Will To Live:** Many cancer patients are so devastated by the sickness and nausea orthodox treatments give them, that they lose the will to live, meaning they lose the will to keep fighting their cancer.

Now are you surprised that the three major studies mentioned above all yielded the same conclusion: there is no scientific evidence that orthodox treatments extend the “total life” of most cancer patients?

The above list is a rather small listing of the side-effects of orthodox treatments. If you want a more complete picture of how bad orthodox treatments are watch the videotape “Cancer Doesn’t Scare Me Anymore” by Dr. Lorraine Day, M.D.

I should note that alternative treatments for cancer have **none** of the above problems. Alternative cancer treatments generally include dietary items that build a person’s immune system, cause no additional pain, provide large amounts of natural nutrients, do not spread the cancer, selectively target and kill cancer cells, cause no damage to normal cells, and so on.

**JUDGING ORTHODOX CANCER TREATMENTS**

So how can we judge whether orthodox cancer treatments should be used at all? Everyone knows that surgery, chemotherapy and radiation cause a patient to become very sick and they do massive damage to the immune system, they can damage vital organs, etc. How, then, can we justify the use of these three treatments? I would suggest that we “judge” orthodox medicine based on three important criteria:

**First,** the increase in “total life” of the patient by use of the treatment,

**Second,** the damage done to a patient’s immune system, which causes a severe weakness in the person’s ability to fight their current cancer, plus their ability to fight future cancers, and

**Third,** the loss of “quality of life” of the patient.
Orthodox medicine fails in all three of these categories!! First, there is no scientific evidence that in the vast majority of cancers, orthodox treatments extend the “total life” of patients. Second, the damage done to a patient’s immune system is very severe, plus it even kills many red blood cells and can damage vital organs. Third, orthodox treatments not only cause severe trauma to the patient, but they also cause severe damage and stress to their body.

Suppose I made the statement: “In order to justify the damage done by orthodox medicine, to both the body and quality of life of a cancer patient, orthodox medicine must increase the “total life” of the patient by 30%.”

Now some people might not like the 30% number, they may pick 20% or another person might pick 100%. But whatever number you personally pick, note that there is no scientific evidence that in 97% of the cases, orthodox treatments extend the “total life” of patients one minute. In fact, in most cases orthodox medicine shortens the life of cancer patients!

The 97% number came from cancer expert Ralph Moss, PhD, who could only identify a few very rare types of cancer for which he thought orthodox treatments actually extended the “total life” of cancer patients.

2 to 4% of cancers respond to chemotherapy…The bottom line is for a few kinds of cancer chemo is a life extending procedure—Hodgkin’s disease, Acute Lymphocytic Leukemia (ALL), Testicular cancer, and Choriocarcinoma.

- Ralph Moss, Ph.D. 1995 Author of: Questioning Chemotherapy

Actually, it is very doubtful Hodgkin’s disease patients have their life extended by more than a few years. In any case, how can we “justify” the use of orthodox cancer treatments? We cannot in 97% of the cases. Even for the 3% that are benefited there may be alternative treatments that are even better than chemotherapy.

What exactly is the significance of the 97% figure Dr. Moss, and many others, have calculated? The significance is that THE “REAL CURE RATE” FOR ORTHODOX CANCER TREATMENTS IS 3%!!
In other words, whenever you see an overall cure rate for orthodox medicine higher than 3%, **it is a number generated purely by deceptive statistical tricks!!** Compare the 3% REAL cure rate of orthodox medicine to the REAL cure rate of 93% of Dr. Kelley, for those patients to him before it was too late.

Then ask yourself why the FDA approves one chemotherapy drug after another and yet ignores alternative cancer treatments!!

Also, ask yourself why every year more people die of cancer than died in the prior year. Ask yourself if all of these “breakthroughs” in chemotherapy drugs you hear about every week actually change that 3% figure (answer: they never do, they are comparing one worthless drug to a newer, more profitable worthless drug and they are only talking about symptoms or temporary regression).

Now ask yourself if the REAL 3% cure rate justifies the massive pain and suffering of orthodox cancer patients and whether it justifies the massive damage done to their organs, immune system, red blood cells, etc.

Here are images of an accidental chemotherapy spill on a person’s hand. Keep in mind that this is the stuff they put in a person’s blood veins!

Chemotherapy Spill onto Hand

**MORE ON THE “5 YEAR CURE RATE”**

When you see a chart of orthodox medicine “5 year cure rates,” you might see a number like: 45%, meaning 45% of cancer patients for this particular cancer lived 5 years after diagnosis.

There are many statistical tricks that are used to get to this 45% figure, but even if this number were accurate (which it is not), even this number is worthless. I will explain why.

When you see a number like 45% you are supposed to think in your mind this thought: “The cure rate for those who refuse all orthodox treatments, and refuse all alternative treatments, is 0%.” That is what they want you to think.
In other words, they want you to think that the difference between refusing all treatments and using chemotherapy, etc. is 45%. You are supposed to think: “a 45% “5 year cure rate” for orthodox medicine, minus a 0% “5 year cure rate” for those who refuse all treatments, equals a difference of 45%.” You are supposed to think that orthodox treatments are superbly beneficial because they are 45% effective.

But what is the truth? What if the “5 year cure rate” for those who refused all treatments was 50%? If that were the case, then 5% those who go on orthodox treatments would die before the 5 years is up, whereas they would not have died if they had refused all treatments.

Would this statistic cause people to run to the nearest hospital to have chemotherapy? Of course not.

My point is that orthodox medicine doesn’t want you to know the “5 year cure rate” for those who refuse all treatments and they especially don’t want you to know the “5 year cure rate” for those who go on alternative treatments.

Even though there are many people who refuse all treatments, this statistic is not kept. Why? Because they don’t want you to know that orthodox cancer treatments only have an overall REAL cure rate of 3%.

But what would be the REAL cure rate be of those who refused all treatments?? They don’t want you to know that number.

When the side effects of chemotherapy and radiation are taken into account, people would demand that orthodox treatments are at least 15% higher, or more, than for those who refuse all treatments or go on alternative cancer treatments. That statistic will never be calculated by orthodox medicine.

This 3% number does not mean that there would be an overall difference of 3% on a “5 year cure rate” basis (that is too short of a time to evaluate orthodox treatments), it means that when all the dust settles, only 3% of the patients have actually been cured with orthodox treatments. But what would this cure rate be if people did not take any orthodox cancer treatments and ate better foods, such as a lot of carrots?
Now do you understand why orthodox medicine uses so many statistical tricks?

By far the most important statistics you need to know in order to make an informed decision are suppressed and not kept.

Why? Because they don’t want you to make the obvious choice of going with alternative medicine instead of orthodox medicine. But going with alternative medicine requires a lot of homework on your part to make sure you go on the right alternative cancer treatments.

More will be said about the suppression of data in a moment.

MORE ON TREATING THE SYMPTOMS OF CANCER

Dr. Philip Binzel, M.D., a medical doctor who used alternative cancer treatments, discussed several key issues relative to the treatment of the symptoms of cancer. Let us look at a longer version of a quote that was mentioned earlier:

“"When a patient is found to have a tumor, the only thing the doctor discusses with that patient is what he intends to do about the tumor. If a patient with a tumor is receiving radiation or chemotherapy, the only question that is asked is, “How is the tumor doing?” No one ever asks how the patient is doing. In my medical training, I remember well seeing patients who were getting radiation and/or chemotherapy. The tumor would get smaller and smaller, but the patient would be getting sicker and sicker. At autopsy we would hear, “Isn’t that marvelous! The tumor is gone!” Yes, it was, but so was the patient. How many millions of times are we going to have to repeat these scenarios before we realize that we are treating the wrong thing?"

In primary cancer, with only a few exceptions, the tumor is neither health-endangering nor life-threatening. I am going to repeat that statement. In primary cancer, with few exceptions, the tumor is neither health-endangering nor life-threatening. What is health-endangering and life-threatening is the spread of that disease through the rest of the body.
There is nothing in surgery that will prevent the spread of cancer. There is nothing in radiation that will prevent the spread of the disease. There is nothing in chemotherapy that will prevent the spread of the disease. How do we know? Just look at the statistics! There is a statistic known as “survival time.” Survival time is defined as that interval of time between when the diagnosis of cancer is first made in a given patient and when that patient dies from his disease.

In the past fifty years, tremendous progress has been made in the early diagnosis of cancer. In that period of time, tremendous progress had been made in the surgical ability to remove tumors.

Tremendous progress has been made in the use of radiation and chemotherapy in their ability to shrink or destroy tumors. But, the survival time of the cancer patient today is no greater than it was fifty years ago. What does this mean? It obviously means that we are treating the wrong thing!

We are treating the symptom — the tumor, and we are doing absolutely nothing to prevent the spread of the disease. The only thing known to mankind today that will prevent the spread of cancer within the body is for that body’s own defense mechanisms to once again function normally. That’s what nutritional therapy does. It treats the defense mechanism, not the tumor.

The woman with a lump in her breast is not going to die from that lump. The man with a nodule in his prostate gland is not going to die from that nodule. What may kill both of those people is the spread of that disease through the rest of their bodies. They got their disease because of a breakdown of their defense mechanisms.

The only thing that is going to prevent the spread of their disease is to correct the problem in those defense mechanisms. Doesn’t it seem logical then, that we should be a lot less
concerned with “What are we going to do about the tumor?” and a lot more concerned about what we are going to do about their defense mechanisms?

- Philip Binzel, M.D., Alive and Well, Chapter 14

I want to emphasize a key point in that quote. Orthodox medicine treats symptoms. They would have you believe that the tumor is the cancer. The tumor is not the cancer.

The tumor is a symptom of a symptom. A tumor is a symptom of cancer and cancer is frequently a symptom of a weakened immune system.

Is it best to treat the symptom of the symptom or is it best to treat the cause?

Alternative cancer treatments focus on building the immune system, selectively killing cancer cells and sometimes on converting cancerous cells into normal cells. Alternative cancer treatments are usually not interested in shrinking tumors.

Why? Because if you safely kill the cancer cells in a tumor, and throughout the rest of the body, the tumor is as harmless as your little finger, even if the tumor tissue is still there. It is not the tumor tissue that is dangerous, it is the cancer cells.

And therein lies one of the major differences between orthodox medicine and alternative medicine. Orthodox medicine focuses on the size of the tumor, alternative medicine focuses on the cancer cells in the tumor.

Many alternative cancer treatments do not shrink the size of tumors. Some do shrink the size of tumors, but some do not. So what? If the cancer cells in a tumor are dead, the cancer will not spread and the tumor is harmless.

This is what Dr. Binzel was talking about when he stated that orthodox medicine was treating the wrong thing.

Only if the tumor is pressing on another organ, or is blocking some bodily function, is the tumor dangerous. But in that case the tumor’s danger has nothing to do with cancer.
Another interesting thing in that quote is that nothing that orthodox medicine does treats the spread of the cancer.

While it is true that some chemotherapy is designed to kill fast spreading cells in the body, chemotherapy always kills far more normal cells than cancer cells. Many normal cells in the body are fast spreading and are killed by chemotherapy.

Chemotherapy would almost always kill the patient long before it would kill all of the cancer cells in a body.
A TIMELINE
Let us draw a timeline in our minds. At the beginning of this timeline is the date a person is diagnosed with cancer. At the end of this timeline is when this person reaches an age of 100 years.

Let us put a single mark on this timeline. That mark is where this patient would have died if they had refused all types of medical treatment for their cancer.

Let us say they did absolutely nothing to change their diet or treat their cancer with either orthodox or alternative cancer treatments. We will call this mark the “baseline.” It is the line where a person who refuses any and all treatments would die.

The scientific data is clear – the vast majority of orthodox cancer patients will die to the left of their baseline or on top of their baseline!!

Chemotherapy is 70 year old technology. It never worked, it will never work because, as Dr. Binzel stated, it treats the wrong thing. Modern cancer “research” is still not aimed at treating the right thing. Radiation therapy is even older than chemotherapy and surgery is even older than radiation.

What about alternative treatments? Alternative treatments do no harm to the patient. Thus, because alternative treatments build the immune system and selectively kill cancer cells, it is clear that it is impossible for alternative treatments to land a patient to the left of their baseline!! Alternative treatments treat the right thing – the immune system. Virtually all alternative cancer treatments will cause a person to live to the right of the baseline.

This is especially true of the patient eats the right foods during their treatment and avoids the wrong foods (this is called the “cancer diet”). The “cancer diet” alone has cured many cancer patients.

The question is this: how do we use alternative treatments to get a person to live well past the baseline? Or to put it another way, how do we get alternative treatments to “cure” cancer, in the sense that the main body of cancer cells is dead and the immune system is built up to the point it can deal with new cancer cells?
There are more than 400 alternative treatments for cancer that will allow more than half of those who use those treatments to “cure” their cancer. These treatments can usually be combined to increase the effectiveness of just one protocol.

The best of the alternative cancer treatments (which are actually combinations of several alternative treatments) will easily cure over 90% of those who use those treatments instead of orthodox treatments. The Kelley treatment is somewhat obsolete by today’s standards and today’s definitions are even more strict than what Kelley used.

I am totally convinced, based on my extensive research, that if the pharmaceutical industry (i.e. Big Pharma), our government agencies, the American Cancer Society, the American Medical Association, etc., put their money and efforts into natural medicine research, that it would not be long before 99% of all cancer patients would not die of anything related to cancer or cancer treatments, directly or indirectly! People would be more afraid of the flu than cancer! That is the way it should be, but that is not the way it is.

Only the person’s immune system or the safe and selective killing of cancer cells will cause a person to live longer than the baseline. Orthodox treatments destroy a person’s immune system and do not selectively kill cancer cells, nor do they safely kill cancer cells. Chemotherapy is both toxic and carcinogenic.

Yet, all the time doctors tell their patients something like this: “if you don’t have chemotherapy you will live six months.” What exactly does that mean? It implies that the patient will live longer if they have chemotherapy, than if they avoid chemotherapy. But there is absolutely no scientific evidence that chemotherapy, except for a few rare types of cancer, ever extends the “total life” of a patient. It is nothing but a scare tactic.

**WHAT ORTHODOX MEDICINE IS HIDING**

Suppose you had a chart where for each type of cancer, diagnosed at each stage, there is listing of every possible type of cancer treatment plan, alternative and orthodox, along with the “total life” that each plan provides the typical patient with this type of cancer, which is diagnosed at each stage. Suppose also that these statistics were compiled by honest people.
For example, suppose there was a page for stage 3 / pancreas cancer. On this page was a listing of the 100 best alternative treatments for stage 3 pancreas cancer, along with the expected “total life” of new cancer patients who chose each of these treatment plans. Likewise, suppose on this same page was a listing of the “total life” for each of the dozens of types of orthodox cancer treatments. Plus, suppose there was the “total life” of those who refused all treatments.

By looking at this chart, a person with newly diagnosed stage 3 pancreas cancer could easily determine which of the more than one hundred types of cancer treatments had the highest “total life” for stage 3 pancreas cancer. Likewise, suppose a similar chart existed for each type of cancer, diagnosed at each stage.

To apply this concept, suppose you were diagnosed with Stage 3 pancreas cancer. Suppose you looked at the chart for “Pancreas cancer / Stage 3” and saw that a patient who took a specific orthodox treatment had a “total life” expectancy of 10 months and that patients who were treated with the Cameron/Pauling vitamin C protocol, and did not have any orthodox treatments, had a “total life” of 100 months. (Note: the actual “total life” numbers are not known but the “total life” ratio in this hypothetical example is based on the actual Cameron/Pauling ratio.)

You would note that the orthodox patients went through months of very painful chemotherapy and radiation, not to mention they suffered much sickness, the destruction of their digestive tract linings, sterility, DNA damage, destruction of their immune system, etc. The vitamin C patients had none of these side effects, instead they had their immune system built up and lived 90 months longer. Which treatment would you pick based on the chart?

Wouldn’t you love to see the chart for your situation if you were recently diagnosed with cancer!! I would love to see such charts!! This web site would not be necessary and I could get my life back!!

Having a chart as I just described, for the best 100 alternative treatments for cancer and for all orthodox treatments, it would be easy to decide which treatment protocol to choose. However, it is the sole purpose of the FDA, NCI (National Cancer Institute), and NIH (National Institutes of Health), all government agencies, the ACS, etc. to make sure such charts are never created.
Why are government agencies and orthodox medicine so opposed to these charts existing? The reason is that if such charts existed no one would ever choose orthodox treatments for cancer. No one – EVER!

If such charts existed, the percentage of recently diagnosed cancer patients who died of something unrelated to cancer and unrelated to cancer treatments would quickly climb to over 99% because everyone would take a combination of the best alternative treatments for their type of cancer! That is not an exaggeration!

But the government doesn’t want you to pick the right treatment, they want you to pick one of the Big Pharma treatments. They don’t want you to know the truth.

It is not that these people want you to die — they don’t care about that — they want money. The typical high-level government employee in the FDA, NIH or NCI will be a millionaire within 3 years of quitting the government. Big Pharma will reward them for their “services” while they were with the government. This word spreads back to the current executives and the cycle of loyalty continues.

Essentially, the government agencies are nothing but departments of Big Pharma. I will say more about that in a moment.

There is no lobby in Washington as large, as powerful or as well financed as the pharmaceutical lobby, and according to a report from Public Citizen, more than half of the drug industry’s 625 registered lobbyists [that is more than the number of members of Congress!] are either former members of Congress or former Congressional staff members and government employees … Other evidence suggesting possible FDA bias turned up in a study revealing that 37 of the 49 top FDA officials who left the agency moved into high corporate positions with the company they had regulated. Over 100 FDA officials owned stock in the drug companies they were assigned to manage.

http://www.jrussellshealth.com/healthpols.html

But let’s think about those charts I talked about earlier. Suppose that orthodox treatments were at the top of every one of the charts, and alternative cancer treatment fared very poorly against orthodox treatments. Why would Big Pharma feel the need to bribe public officials and Congressmen?
If alternative medicine didn’t work, the FDA would shut down all the quacks, and Big Pharma wouldn’t care. But it isn’t the quacks that Big Pharma is concerned about. It is the people that can cure cancer that Big Pharma bribes the FDA to shut down.

Yes, there are “alternative medicine” “quacks” out there, but by shutting down the real quacks, there is a public impression that everyone the FDA shuts down is a quack. Nothing could be further from the truth. Many of the clinics the feds shut down (whether FDA, FTC or whatever) are top-notch alternative clinics that have very high cure rates. There have been scores of excellent alternative practitioners (some of them M.D.s) who had far better cure rates than orthodox medicine, but who were shut down by orthodox medicine, usually by the AMA or FDA.

By far the world’s greatest repository of alternative medicine cures for cancer is at the FDA offices. These are cures they have shut down. I have, on more than one occasion, personally come across a superb alternative cancer cure only to learn that the FDA shut it down 20 years ago and the details of the treatment have been buried!!

The point is that if orthodox medicine were superior, in terms of “total life,” why wouldn’t they want those charts to be made?! Ponder that carefully. If orthodox medicine were superior, they would gladly put together the statistical information using “total life” to “prove” their supposed superiority. They wouldn’t need layer after layer of deception — the truth would tell the story. They could save a lot of money in bribes and lobbyists if those charts existed and their products were superior.

The NIH would gladly fund hundreds of legitimate studies for alternative medicine if these studies gave them the results they wanted. But they know the truth and know they must suppress the truth and suppress the charts. It is the attempts by alternative medicine to put together enough evidence to gather these statistics that is the primary target of government corruption (yes, the ease and willingness to be bribed is one of the major criteria for the definition of “corruption”).

Now consider this. If orthodox cancer therapy were superior to alternative cancer therapies, then alternative cancer practitioners would want their patients to have surgery, as part of the treatment, to kill concentrated masses of cancer cells, and hope this caused the patients to live longer. In other words, alternative doctors would use surgery to hide the
ineffectiveness of their treatments. On the other hand, orthodox treatments would not require surgery because orthodox treatments would safely kill cancer cells.

But just the opposite is true. Orthodox therapies request surgery to kill concentrated masses of cancer cells and hide their ineffectiveness. On the other hand, I have never heard of one of the respected alternative cancer practitioners recommend surgery to kill cancer cells. It isn’t necessary. The only time surgery is recommended is to remove the pain of a tumor pressing against another organ or if there is a blockage or there is some immediate life-threatening problem caused by the tumor. But never is surgery recommended as part of the cancer treatment.

Ditto for radiation.

Yet, in spite of the fact that orthodox medicine uses surgery, in almost every case, a person would live longer if they refused all orthodox treatments, including surgery. The imaginary charts I am talking about is what the orthodox establishment, which includes the American Medical Association (AMA), FDA, NIH, NCI, American Cancer Society (ACS), quackwatch, etc. don’t want you to ever see. All of these organizations are funded and controlled by Big Pharma or they are in collusion with Big Pharma. There have been over 50 books written on this corruption and suppression of truth! Have you ever heard one of these books discussed on television?

See a list of books

The orthodox establishment wants you to think that there is “no scientific evidence” that alternative treatments work. In fact, our corrupt government has carefully manufactured the public impression that there is “no scientific evidence.” This allows them to justify not creating the charts I have been talking about and it allows them the authority to crush alternative medicine. Future chapters of this eBook will go into the politics of cancer in far more detail.
People who don’t have cancer rarely give cancer a second thought. All their life they have been conditioned to believe that the medical community is diligently making progress in the “War Against Cancer.” They believe there is nothing to worry about. If they get cancer, the medical community will take good care of them and furthermore a “cure” is always “right around the corner.” All of this is an assumption that could cost a person their life!

When a person is diagnosed with cancer, they are in a total state of hysteria and panic. They will grab at the first “rope” that is thrown to them. Guess what, orthodox practitioners are more than happy to throw them that rope.

When a person is told they have cancer, the medical establishment forcefully tells them that they immediately need to have surgery, and usually tells them they will need to have chemotherapy and radiation. This was drilled into your medical doctor while he or she was in medical school – but it is a giant lie.

If you are not prepared, in advance, for the utter terror of being told you have cancer, and to the enormous pressure of orthodox medicine, you will end up being cut open and probably have toxic sludge put into your arteries. You will get sick, your immune system will be destroyed, you will wish you were dead, and it is all for nothing, because orthodox treatments for cancer are worthless and almost always do far more damage than good. And all of this will happen before you knew what hit you.

Furthermore, and understand this carefully, doctors will not tell you your options, especially your alternative cancer treatment options. If they mention alternative treatments, they are talking about using nutrition and natural substances to treat the symptoms of chemotherapy and radiation, (i.e. complementary medicine), they are not talking about the alternative cancer treatments this web site discusses.

Many cancer patients think, when they hear about complementary medicine, that orthodox medicine and alternative medicine have joined forces in a cozy relationship. The relationship is more like a lion and a lamb. Big Pharma allows limited use of natural substances to treat the symptoms of chemotherapy so patients will not drop out of chemotherapy due to sickness. No doubt their motivation is so that the patient will stay on chemotherapy longer, and thus Big Pharma will make more profits.
But what if you are diagnosed with cancer and you haven’t done your homework? You might consider telling your doctor you will “think about the proposed treatments” for a couple of weeks. You might buy time by asking your doctor to produce scientific articles that prove the proposed treatment extends the “total life” of similar cancer patients compared to patients who refused all treatments. (Warning: Do not get duped by letting your doctor talk about “5-year cure rates.”)

During those two weeks, do not go to work. Spend those weeks studying this web site, then go to other web sites I link to. Do absolutely nothing but read during those two weeks.

The main thing you need to look for are testimonials. It is the testimonials, not the scientific evidence, that will convince you that alternative treatments really work. It is exactly for this reason that the medical establishment does not consider testimonials as “scientific evidence.” But they are scientific evidence – powerful evidence, but they don’t lead to the conclusions the medical establishment wants you come to.

ESPECIALLY FOR THOSE WHO DO HAVE CANCER

If you have recently been diagnosed with cancer you have a decision to make. Should you go with orthodox treatments first and then go with alternative treatments after the orthodox medicine people have sent you home to die? Or should you go with alternative treatments first?

If it sounds like a tough decision then you had better read this eBook another two or three times.

Is there a risk of going with alternative medicine first? I can think of only one possible situation where it might be a risk. If the cancer is totally contained to one place of the body, and is getting ready to spread throughout the body, but has not yet spread. Then surgery might be acceptable.

However, I doubt, in all sincerity, that your doctors really know it has not already spread. By the time you have symptoms, the cancer has been in your body for several years. Modern “medicine” has no clue where all of the cancer cells are in your body. In many cases I truly believe they say that it is contained just to get your business, when in fact they know that they don’t know if it has already spread (or it may have come from somewhere else to begin with).
Cancer is generally caused by a combination of two things. First, a poor diet. Second, a carcinogen. In other words, a person has a poor diet, the body fills with fungus, then a carcinogen is introduced into the body and the person gets cancer, generally because of the fungus. Thus, by cutting out the cancer the cause of the cancer has not been fixed. There is nothing about orthodox medicine that deals with the true cause of cancer. As Dr. Day has asked: “Is cancer caused by a deficiency of chemotherapy?”

Let me suggest you go with alternative cancer treatments first. Is there a risk in having your immune system built up? Is there a risk in treating your liver with natural substances that cleanse it? Is there a risk in selectively killing cancer cells with substances God himself designed? Is there a risk in dealing with the cause of your cancer?

More importantly, is there a risk in avoiding surgery (in rare cases surgery is necessary)? Is there a risk in avoiding chemotherapy, which destroys your immune system plus it destroys red blood cells? Is there a risk in avoiding radiation therapy which burns many of your healthy cells to death?

I suppose there is a risk going with alternative medicine first. The level of risk is largely dependent on how much homework you do.

Now the bad news. Most people who seek out alternative cancer treatments have already been sent home to die and they feel they “have nothing to lose” by going with alternative medicine.

The reality is that several alternative cancer treatments have been demonstrated to cure over 90% of the cancer patients who use this treatment first. However, for people who go to orthodox medicine first, and are eventually sent home to die, I have never seen a cure rate for an alternative cancer treatment that was over 50%.

Do the math. If you go with orthodox medicine first (cure rate of 3%), and THEN go with alternative cancer treatments, even if you use the best and strongest alternative treatment there is, your chances of surviving your cancer is cut in half!!

There are several problems for people who have been sent home to die. First, their body, and especially their major organs, have been severely damaged and frequently these
organs cannot be repaired, especially the liver. Second, their immune system has been destroyed before they were sent home to die. Third, they have lost months or years of time while waiting for orthodox medicine to send them home to die, time that is not available for alternative treatments to work.

The truth is that even if there was an alternative cancer treatment that safely removed every cancer cell from a patient’s body within a few days (this type of treatment, by the way, is theoretically safe and possible), many of those sent home to die would die (even after this hypothetical treatment) because of the long-term damage done by orthodox medicine.

The last problem is that some of the most potent alternative treatments (that can cure many of the cancer patients sent home to die) work by killing cancer cells. These treatments must be done slowly in order to avoid too many toxins being released by dying and dead cancer cells. Thus, additional time will be lost during the treatment.

**DO YOU KNOW SOMEONE WITH CANCER?**

Many of the people who read this eBook are trying to decide whether to tell someone they know, who has cancer, about this web site. It is a far easier decision than you think. **Don’t make their decisions for them!!!!** Tell them about this website and **let them decide what to do about it!**

I know you love the person and want what is best for them. That is good, but a person with cancer has a **right** to know their options and to make their own decisions. It is their life at stake, let them make the hard decisions. It is the person with cancer who needs to know their options.
**HOW THE CANCER INDUSTRY SUPPRESSES THE TRUTH**

In prior sections I have discussed how the “Cancer Industry” (i.e. Big Pharma, the FDA, NIH, NCI, ACS, AMA, ad nauseum) uses statistics to lie about the lack of effectiveness of orthodox cancer treatments.

This section will deal specifically with how they suppress the existence of the charts mentioned in the prior chapter.

However, before understanding how the Cancer Industry does its thing, we must first talk about how the tobacco industry was able to suppress the truth about the relationship between tobacco and cancer, emphysema, etc. for over 65 years.

**If someone were to do a study on the relationship between tobacco and lung cancer, it would be a very easy thing to do:**

1. Determine the percentage of non-smokers who get lung cancer,
2. Determine the percentage of smokers who get lung cancer,
3. Run the statistics

A class of high school students with a phone book could do a study that found a highly, statistically significant relationship between tobacco products and lung cancer. It is easy to find non-smokers, it is easy to find smokers, thus this type of study would always be an easy thing to do. Of course there are more ways to ascertain the relationship between tobacco and lung cancer than this, but this is the technique I want to emphasize.

The first scientific study finding the relationship between tobacco and lung cancer was done in the early 1930s. There had been many informal observations before that first scientific study, but we will start with the early 1930s.

As time passed there were more and more scientific studies that related tobacco products and lung cancer. By the 1950s there was simply an overwhelming amount of scientific information that linked tobacco products to lung cancer.
So why was it that the flood of lawsuits against tobacco companies had to wait until the 1990s?

The tobacco industry did a lot of things to suppress the truth. By far the most effective of these tactics was to use bribery to control the politicians (“bribery” is a term I use to encompass a wide variety of influence tactics) and advertising money to control the media. That was as easy as stealing candy from a baby. As always it worked to perfection.

Furthermore, it is easy to bribe executives of organizations. The AMA was easy to control and at no time offered a threat to the tobacco industry. It is the scientists they had to control. But how do you use bribery to control the scientific establishment? Aren’t they people of impeccable integrity? It turns out that the answer is ‘no’.

The “scientific” community was more than eager to take a share of the tobacco industry money pie and do numerous “bogus” scientific studies that did not find a relationship between tobacco and lung cancer. Now the reader might wonder how a “scientist” can do a scientific study and not find a relationship between tobacco and lung cancer. It is easy to do – just design a study that doesn’t look for a relationship!

The tobacco industry set up numerous “front companies” to do certain tasks, one of which was to fund scientific studies that did not look for a relationship between tobacco and lung cancer. They spent scores of millions of dollars funding these studies.

Since 1954, one of CTR’s [Council for Tobacco Research – U.S.A., Inc.] principal activities has been to fund scientific research by independent scientists through its grant-in-aid program, under the supervision of its Scientific Advisory Board (SAB) supplemented on occasion by research contracts. CTR itself has not conducted any scientific research. Through this research program, from 1954 through 1996 CTR has provided approximately $282 million to fund over 1,500 research projects by approximately 1,100 independent scientists.

The researchers who have received CTR grant funding have been affiliated with approximately 300 medical schools, universities, hospitals and other research institutions, including such prestigious institutions as Harvard Medical School, Yale School of Medicine, Stanford University, numerous institutions in the University of California system, Johns Hopkins School of Medicine, the University of Chicago Medical Center, the Scripps Research
Institute, the Mayo Clinic and the Salk Institute. The researchers who have received this funding have not been employees of the tobacco companies or CTR. CTR’s grantees have included many distinguished scientists, three of whom have won Nobel Prizes.

http://www.rkmc.com/tobacco.order91097.asp

Now explain something to me. If a group of high school students with a phone book can scientifically prove there is a relationship between tobacco and lung cancer, emphysema, etc., how is it possible that 1,500 research projects, done over a period of 42 years, by researchers at 300 prestigious medical schools, etc. had not been able to find a relationship between tobacco products and lung cancer, emphysema, etc.!!!

The answer is that in order to obtain funding, they knew they had better not find a relationship! The rules of getting research money are very simple. You ascertain who you are getting paid by, you ascertain what they want you to publish, then you accept their money and do a study which does not double-cross them. Otherwise, your “research” money dries up real fast.

In other words, these “researchers” weren’t looking for a relationship between tobacco and lung cancer, they were looking for research money. They weren’t looking for useful, scientific truth, they were looking for a source of long-term funding.

Here is an interesting quote:

“Far from being independent, the activities of the CTR [Council for Tobacco Research] and SAB [Scientific Advisory Board] activities were monitored and controlled by industry representatives, including tobacco company lawyers and public relations consultants. Indeed, the lawyers stopped central nervous system research proposals, screen out ‘dangerous project proposals’, and funded ‘special projects’ designed for litigation purposes.

It continues,

“Although the industry funded a number of other ‘outside’ research projects, it did so only when it received clear advance assurances of a ‘favorable’ outcome. For example, Dr. Gary
Huber, then of Harvard, solicited industry funds with his view that ‘the number of people at potential risk from tobacco consumption is extremely small relative to the very large number of people who now smoke.’

- (Page 20 of the report, or Bates Page 681879286)
  http://tobaccodocuments.org/landman/37575.html?start_page=1&end_page=462

The “researchers” who, year after year, dipped into this money pot had to know what was going on. It seems that a person who picks a career as a doctor or scientist is not much different than a person who picks a career as a politician. They are both looking for the same thing – money.

The result of this funding scam was that there were numerous scientific studies that found a relationship between tobacco and lung cancer in scientific journals (which were not funded by the tobacco industry), and there were numerous scientific studies, just mentioned, that did not find a relationship between tobacco and lung cancer (those that were funded by the tobacco industry).

Because of the “confusion” caused by these different studies there was not a “consensus” among scientists whether tobacco and lung cancer were related.

And here is the critical key: without a consensus there was not “scientific evidence” that there was a relationship between tobacco and lung cancer, etc. There must be a consensus for “scientific evidence.” At least that is what the media would like you to believe.

However, **when there is a consensus of opinion by researchers who do not have a conflict of interest (i.e. they aren’t funded by the group being investigated), then it should be considered that THERE IS A CONSENSUS and there is SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE!!!**

The statement above is absolutely essential to understand. ANY study done under the control of the industry being investigated should be IGNORED by scientific circles. However, the money is too good for them to be ignored by the “scientific” establishment!!!
Let me give you a more recent example of why industry sponsored studies should NEVER be published or even be considered. Aspartame, known also as NutraSweet, Equal, etc., was very controversial during the time it was being studied. It caused holes in the brains of rats! Some scientists didn’t want it approved for human consumption. Even some scientists in the FDA didn’t want it approved.

Dr. Ralph G. Walton, M.D., did a study of 166 published studies on the safety of aspartame. The funding of these studies were from the following sources:

1. The pharmaceutical industry funded 74 of the studies
2. The FDA funded 7 studies
3. There were 85 studies that were not funded by Big Pharma or the FDA

Now stop and think real hard – which of the three groups of studies didn’t find anything wrong with aspartame?

Of the 74 Big Pharma funded studies, not a single one of them found any health problems caused by aspartame. Of the 85 studies that were not funded by Big Pharma or the FDA, 84 of them did find health problems caused by aspartame. Do you see a pattern here? Where do you think the 7 FDA studies landed? 6 of the 7 found no health problems caused by aspartame.

See: http://www.dorway.com/peerrev.html

By the way, Walton put the “research” funded by the International Life Sciences Institute (ILSI – a noble sounding name) in with the group of industry sponsored studies. It seems that Big Pharma, and others, funded a group similar to the CTR of the tobacco industry.

This kind of “science” sounds strangely like what happened with the tobacco industry. Because of this dilution, when I tell someone that aspartame causes brain cancer, birth defects, etc. (actually over 90 different documented health problems), people just look at me and laugh. They will say there is “no scientific evidence” that aspartame causes any health problems. Or they will say you have to drink 800 Diet Cokes every day for it to affect your health. That is exactly what the food industry wants you to think.
But the truth is far different than the nonsense. My point is that scientists still seem quite willing to give people who fund their studies whatever they want.

“When morality comes up against profit, it is seldom that profit loses.”

- Shirley Chisholm

Now let’s turn our attention to the Cancer Industry. Let us suppose that someone wanted to test Vitamin C versus chemotherapy in a scientific study. They would simply do the following:

1. With one group of patients, determine the “total life” of people who were given chemotherapy, but who did not take Vitamin C.
2. With one group of patients, similar in age, type of cancer, etc., determine the “total life” of people who took Vitamin C therapy, and who did not take chemotherapy,
3. Run the statistics

It sounds so simple. But there is a problem, our corrupt government can stop anyone who wants to do a study for item #2. In fact they can stop a study on live patients for any type of alternative treatment for cancer.

The FDA will not allow anyone to do a scientific study to find the “total life” of people who use Vitamin C therapy and who do not take chemotherapy. Their lie to justify this absurd policy is to “protect the public.” The truth is that they don’t want the truth to come out about how bad orthodox cancer treatments are relative to alternative treatments.

(Note: The FDA cannot stop scientists from doing studies using cancer cells in cultures, using mice, rats, or doing statistical studies with public data, etc. Thousands of such studies have been done. However, they can stop clinical trials involving humans in the United States. They will not acknowledge human studies unless they are done by pharmaceutical companies. For example, they do not acknowledge foreign studies on humans, such as have been done with MGN-3 and Vitamin C.)

Could a study comparing chemotherapy to Vitamin C be ethically justified? Of course, just find patients who refuse all orthodox treatments and ask them to volunteer for an
alternative medicine study. Or pick cancer patients who have been declared terminal. How can building their immune system and safely and selectively killing their cancer cells do them any harm? But “ethics” is a dirty word in Washington. If high ranking government employees had ethics, it would massively affect their retirement program from Big Pharma. The Linus Pauling / Ewan Cameron study had to be done in Scotland and it was done on terminal patients.

Because of the FDA it is not possible to obtain the [approved] statistical information necessary to prove that alternative treatments are far better than chemotherapy. That is one of the many reasons the FDA was created. The FDA only “accepts” studies done by pharmaceutical companies and government agencies that are controlled by Big Pharma. Everyone else is ignored.
CHAPTER 10
SCIENTIFIC STUDIES
MORE ON “SCIENTIFIC” STUDIES

I have talked about how Big Pharma makes a worthless substance look good. They use scientists who masterfully compare one type of toxic sludge to another type of toxic sludge. Or they compare how the toxic sludge does at treating symptoms. Or they use fancy statistical tricks. Or they design the study to insure no substantive information comes out of the study. An so on and so forth.

But the “scientific” industry (they are certainly not real scientists, they are more of an industry) are frequently given another assignment: make a good substance look bad!! In other words, they are sometimes assigned to make a bad substance look good, but in other cases they are assigned to make a good substance look bad.

Let us talk more about the Vitamin C treatment of Cameron and Pauling. Their study was profound, and it could have led to treatments that saved many, many lives. But it was not profitable and it did not make doctors look like heroes.

What do you think the reaction of orthodox medicine was to this great discovery? Do you think they tried to find ways to use this discovery and even enhance it? Don’t be absurd. Their reaction was identical to their reaction to all of the other great discoveries in alternative medicine, they wanted to bury the truth.

But one of the participants of the Vitamin C study was a two-time Nobel Prize winner. Linus Pauling had already won a Nobel Prize in chemistry and he won the Nobel Peace Prize. His integrity was unquestioned. They had made a great discovery. Thus orthodox medicine could not simply bury his studies. They decided to use a tactic to destroy truth that had been refined and perfected by the tobacco industry. That tactic was to create new “studies” that were designed to distract attention from the truth. In this case, however, they had to make a good substance look bad.

But how in the world do you make a good substance look bad? Orthodox medicine called upon Dr. Moertel of the Mayo Clinic to design three bogus “studies,” which did not, by any stretch of the imagination, follow the same treatment protocol, or the same patient selection protocol or the same statistical evaluation protocol, as Cameron and Pauling had used (actually, Dr. Moertel was not involved in the third study).
Now note this carefully, if the Mayo Clinic wanted to know the truth about the Cameron/Pauling studies, they would have taken great care to follow their treatment protocol, patient selection protocol and statistical evaluation protocol exactly!! To use high school students again, a group of high school students could have followed the Cameron/Pauling protocols perfectly.

But Dr. Moertel was assigned to make a good substance look bad, thus he could not follow the same protocols as Pauling and Cameron, he had to modify the protocols in order to come to a different conclusion. The Mayo Clinic took great care to make sure they did not follow the Cameron/Pauling protocols. Since they didn’t follow protocols, they didn’t come to the same conclusions.

So who do you think that orthodox medicine, the government, the media, quackwatch, etc. quotes when the subject of Vitamin C and cancer comes up? Obviously, they quote the Mayo Clinic studies, not the three studies (done in Scotland, Canada and Japan) that did follow the same treatment and evaluation protocols.

Here is the key point – how can they disprove a study unless they follow the same protocols and come to a different conclusion?? They can’t. If you don’t follow the original protocol exactly, and if you come to a different conclusion, you have not proven anything!! If you want to disprove something you must follow the exact protocols. Moertel and company didn’t do that, yet they claimed to have disproven Cameron and Pauling.

With three bogus studies to tell the world about, the Cancer Industry claimed that Moertel and company followed the “right” protocol, and because Pauling and Cameron did not follow the Moertel protocols that therefore the Pauling and Cameron studies were false!! If your brain just exploded, I fully understand.

Do you understand what they did? They agreed that a person should follow the same protocol in order to disprove something. However, they made it appear that the Moertel protocol was superior and that because Pauling and Cameron did not follow the Mortel protocol the results of the Cameron and Pauling study were false. I have an entire chapter in my other free, online eBook on the Pauling/Cameron/Moertel studies.
My point is that for all bad substances (e.g. tobacco) there are two kinds of studies: studies that make the substance look bad (because it is bad) and studies that make the substance look good, or at least not harmful (because they are funded by Big Tobacco or Big Pharma). Likewise, for all good substances (e.g. Vitamin C) there are two kinds of studies, those that make the substance look good (because it is good) and those that make it look bad, or worthless (because they are funded by Big Pharma). This gives the FDA a blank check to approve or disapprove any substance, whether it is good or bad.

In addition, Congress has given the FDA, NIH, NCI, etc. a big club to legally stop any study (that is not totally under the control of orthodox medicine) that compares alternative treatments to chemotherapy. This means item #2 above is impossible to accomplish for any type of alternative treatment, meaning that without item #2, the gathering of item #3 statistics are impossible to accumulate! The charts mentioned previously can never be made!!

If anyone thinks for one minute that the FDA is corrupt and Congress is a group of saints, they need to have a reality check. Congress created the FDA, Congress lets them do what they want, and Congress only criticizes the FDA when the media cannot suppress what they have done. In other words, Congress only criticizes the FDA when their re-election might be threatened. And that never happens.

But let us not forget the “scientists” who bow to Big Pharma. Lest you think that “scientists” cannot be corrupted by the pharmaceutical industry, as they were by the tobacco industry, consider this quote:

In June [2002], the New England Journal of Medicine, one of the most respected medical journals, made a startling announcement. The editors declared that they were dropping their policy stipulating that authors of review articles of medical studies could not have financial ties to drug companies whose medicines were being analyzed.

The reason? The journal could no longer find enough independent experts. Drug company gifts and “consulting fees” are so pervasive that in any given field, you cannot find an expert who has not been paid off in some way by the industry. So the journal settled for a new standard: Their reviewers can have received no more than $10,000 [per year] from companies whose work they judge. Isn’t that comforting?
This announcement by the New England Journal of Medicine is just the tip of the iceberg of a scientific establishment that has been pervasively corrupted by conflicts of interest and bias, throwing doubt on almost all scientific claims made in the biomedical field.

The standard announced in June was only for the reviewers. The actual authors of scientific studies in medical journals are often bought and paid for by private drug companies with a stake in the scientific results. While the NEJM and some other journals disclose these conflicts, others do not. Unknown to many readers is the fact that the data being discussed was often collected and analyzed by the maker of the drug involved in the test.

http://www.healtoronto.com/big_pharm.html

But even this quote does not pinpoint how the pharmaceutical industry has achieved total suppression of truth.

Think for a moment about the difference between how the tobacco industry suppressed the truth between 1954 and the 1990s, and how the pharmaceutical industry is suppressing the truth today. Try to isolate and pinpoint the huge difference between their tactics before reading on …

With the tobacco industry, the tobacco sponsored studies did not find a relationship between tobacco and lung cancer, and other diseases. On the other hand, non-tobacco industry studies did consistently find a relationship between tobacco and lung cancer, etc.

Likewise, the pharmaceutical industry studies on aspartame did not find any health problems with aspartame. On the other hand, the non-pharmaceutical industry studies did find health problems with aspartame.

As you might suspect, the pharmaceutical industry studies on orthodox treatments do not find any problems with orthodox cancer treatments (how can you find a problem by comparing your “old” toxic sludge to your “new” toxic sludge). However, and here is the difference, because of the FDA, NCI and AMA there are no scientific studies on alternative cancer treatments!!! They are not legal. They are not allowed.

Do you see the difference? Anyone who wants to find the truth about alternative cancer treatments are not allowed to do studies!!!!! The pharmaceutical industry has gone
a giant leap beyond what the tobacco industry was able to do. **There are NO truthful studies to dilute!!!**

For example, during the 42 years the tobacco industry was funding their many hundreds of bogus scientific studies, suppose a government agency had the authority to block ANY study that was not funded by the tobacco industry? That is exactly the level of suppression of truth that the pharmaceutical industry has achieved – **they have been able to block all cancer studies that are not funded by the pharmaceutical industry or our corrupt government!!!** It is not that these studies are not being done, it is that the government does not give them any **official status** (more will be said about this below).

You have now heard a few of the good things about alternative cancer treatments (truth table #3) and a few of the bad things about orthodox cancer treatments (truth table #4). Let’s analyze why, throughout your life, you have only heard the items in truth table #1 and truth table #2.
CHAPTER 11
THE BIG 3 (MEDIA, PHARMA, MEDICINE)
BIG MEDIA

If you failed the tests on alternative medicine and orthodox medicine, you might wonder why the massive number of hours you have probably watched television and listened to the radio did not better prepare you to ace the tests.

Perhaps the next quote will help you understand:

There is no such thing, at this date of the world’s history, in America, as an independent press. You know it and I know it. There is not one of you who dares to write your honest opinions, and if you did, you know beforehand that it would never appear in print. I am paid weekly for keeping my honest opinion out of the paper I am connected with.

Others of you are paid similar salaries for similar things, and any of you who would be so foolish as to write honest opinions would be out on the streets looking for another job. If I allowed my honest opinions to appear in one issue of my paper, before twenty-four hours my occupation would be gone. The business of the journalists is to destroy the truth, to lie outright, to pervert, to vilify, to fawn at the feet of mammon, and to sell his country and his race for his daily bread. You know it and I know it, and what folly is this toasting an independent press? We are the tools and vassals of rich men behind the scenes. We are the jumping jacks, they pull the strings and we dance. Our talents, our possibilities and our lives are all the property of other men. We are intellectual prostitutes.

John Swinton (1829-1901) pre-eminent New York journalist & head of the editorial staff at the New York Times. Quoted one night around 1880. Swinton was the guest of honour at a banquet given him by the leaders of his craft. Someone who knew neither the press nor Swinton offered a toast to the independent press.

On any given year, Big Pharma pumps billions of dollars into the media companies for advertisements. Also, in any given year, not one penny is spent on advertising the Brandt Grape Cure because you can buy the necessary ingredients in a grocery store or a health food store. Likewise, you can buy necessary products at a grocery store to go on the Budwig diet (using walnuts instead of flaxseed oil) and many other alternative treatments for cancer.
In other words, there are many alternative treatments for cancer that will not provide Big Pharma a single penny of revenue, much less profits. This means these same treatments will not provide the media with a single penny of revenue. Guess which treatments the media pushes? In fact the Federal Trade Commission won’t allow alternative cancer treatments to be advertised, because all of them are “unproven” (translation: not profitable to Big Pharma).

It has been known for over a hundred years that our American media sells their “opinions” to the highest bidder. The highest bidder, by a colossal margin, is always orthodox medicine. This explains why you have heard thousands of things in the media in truth table #1 and truth table #2, and it explains why you have probably never heard anything in the media in truth table #3 and truth table #4.

The media never gives publicity to books or articles that criticize Big Pharma. For example, the media has said nothing about how the pharmaceutical industry has blocked such books as: Corporate Crime in the Pharmaceutical Industry, by Dr. John Braithwaite, The Drug Story, by Morris A. Bealle, House of Rockefeller, also by Morris A. Bealle, and others. Try to buy one of these books on Amazon!! These books are very critical of Big Pharma.

And the media says nothing good about alternative medicine. For example, if the media says nothing about a book, it is guaranteed to have a very small amount of sales. Thanks to the media, no one will ever hear about books such as: Cancer, Cause, Cure and Cover-Up, by Ron Gdanski, The Germ That Causes Cancer, by Doug A. Kaufmann, Choose Life or Death – The Reams Biological Theory of Ionization, by Carey A. Reams, and many others.

By not mentioning a book, they are essentially destroying any possibility anyone will know about it. On the other hand, with one media blast, millions of people can be deceived in a single half-hour. The channels of deception are wide-open, always waiting to deceive the public, millions at a time. Yet, truth has no voice in the mass media.

The end result of all of this is that you do not know the truth about either orthodox treatments for cancer or alternative treatments for cancer! Let me say that again: you do not know the truth about either orthodox treatments for cancer or alternative treatments for cancer.
There is a war going on in medicine today, a war between orthodox medicine and alternative medicine. The war is being fought with money and information. The war is to control what you know, and don’t know, about cancer treatments. The war is to control whether you know the truth about all of your cancer treatment options.

What you hear about orthodox treatments for cancer on television, the radio, the big magazines, etc. is a maze of sophisticated layers of lies and deception. It is like putting make-up on a T-Rex. What I have talked about is only the tip of the iceberg. My point is to emphasize that during your life you have not heard the truth about alternative treatments for cancer, you have only heard what Big Pharma wants you to hear. What you have heard in the media is not based on a love of truth, it is based on a love of money.

If you trust the wrong side in this war, it could cost you your life or the life of your spouse or the life of some other person close to you! It is a war that leaves people dead who don’t do their homework and thus end up trusting the wrong people.

Now let us talk about the massive group of corporations that pulls the strings of their many puppets, all for the sake of profit.

**BIG PHARMA**

While the pharmaceutical industry does provide many life-saving and quality of life drugs, their lust for money has taken them into areas they have no business being in. There are many health areas where natural substances are far superior to mutated, synthetic molecules. Mother Nature is a far better chemist than all of the pharmaceutical chemists combined — and will be for the next ten billion years!

But because pharmaceutical companies cannot patent natural substances, they cannot make much of a profit from natural substances, even if they sold them (which some pharmaceutical companies do). Thus, to make the huge profits needed to appease their stockholders, they revert to pushing the most profitable synthetic molecules they can pass off as useful. In other words, they make decisions of what products to sell based solely on how profitable they are.

They also fund much of the massive effort to suppress the truth about natural molecules.
But it gets worse. The pharmaceutical industry has its hands in the pockets of Congress. Congress has protected the pharmaceutical industry via their creation and control of the FDA, NIH and NCI. In fact most government agencies were created to protect the profits of some large corporate industry which had power in Washington.

Corporations do not have police powers. So the way they get these police powers is to use their influence among corrupt politicians in Washington to create a government agency to, by proxy, exercise the police powers for the benefit of the corporations.

Congress is so concerned about protecting the profits of Big Pharma, that in November, 2003 Congress handed a “corporate welfare” check to Big Pharma for scores of billions of dollars:

The Medicare legislation that passed the House near dawn on Saturday and is moving toward a final vote in the Senate would steer at least $125 billion over the next decade in extra assistance to the health care industry and U.S. businesses …
Washington Post, November 24, 2003

Since when does Big Pharma need “extra assistance.” The bill, by the way, forbids the government from negotiating lower drug prices. How often did you hear this fact emphasized in the media before the bill was passed? Congress has a long history of being far more interested in the health of big business than in the health of the American people.

Rep. Billy Tauzin, the Louisiana congressman who largely wrote the $540 billion prescription-drug bill for Big Pharma resigned from Congress to accept a $2 million-a-year job in the drug industry.

Big Pharma not only makes billions of dollars in profits from chemotherapy drugs every year, which do nothing but treat the symptoms of cancer, they also make hundreds of millions of dollars in profits every year for making drugs to treat the symptoms of chemotherapy and radiation!

Lest you think Congress is a group of strong-minded people who are deeply concerned about what is best for you, consider this: aspartame (i.e. NutraSweet, Equal, etc.) is known to cause brain damage to unborn children (i.e. a fetus). The damage is manifest as autism,
ADD, mental retardation, etc. (see my article for pregnant women on this web site for more information). Now consider this quote:

"Prompted by mounting safety concerns within the scientific community, Ohio Senator Howard Metzenbaum called for Senate hearings on NutraSweet. He introduced the Aspartame Safety Act of 1985 on August 1st of that year. The bill called for clinical studies to ascertain the safety of aspartame, a moratorium on the introduction of aspartame into new products until independent testing was complete, labeling of products including the amount of aspartame in each serving and the allowable daily intake, and a warning that aspartame is not intended for infant use. The bill also required the FDA to set up a clinical adverse reaction committee to collect reports of adverse effects and to send written notices to physicians about aspartame. In a March 3, 1986 news release, the Senator stated ‘we cannot use American's children as guineas pigs to determine the ‘safe’ level of NutraSweet consumption.’ Sadly, the bill that potentially could have stopped an ongoing tragedy, was killed in the Labor and Human Resources Committee, and never reached the Senate floor.


Did you hear about that bill in the media?

As an example of Big Pharma controlled Big Government, Hydrazine Sulphate was being successfully used against cachexia in cancer patients. The NCI said they would “test” the product. They intentionally did not follow protocol and effectively murdered all of the patients in the study by mixing tranquilizers with the Hydrazine Sulphate (which they were warned not to do). By doing this they could say there was “no scientific evidence” the treatment worked and they were able to suppress this treatment.

As a result of [the peer-reviewed studies that demonstrated the effectiveness of hydrazine sulphate], the U.S. National Cancer Institute – which had placed hydrazine sulfate on
its ‘unproven therapy’ list – sponsored three scientific studies to assess the benefit of hydrazine sulfate. These studies, published in 1994, found no benefit from hydrazine sulfate treatment.

However, a review of these studies revealed that 94% of study patients had also taken at least one [of] the medications which can block the effect of hydrazine sulfate. Proponents of hydrazine sulfate have concluded that the results of the N.C.I. sponsored studies are invalid, and that there is abundant published, peer-reviewed scientific studies attesting to its benefit. [http://www.healing.bc.ca/therapy_hydrazine.shtml](http://www.healing.bc.ca/therapy_hydrazine.shtml)

Many books have been written that document the persecution of alternative cancer doctors who cured too many of their patients with inexpensive natural products. Of course, most people have never heard of these books because the media does not give them the free publicity they give their favored books.

**BIG MEDICINE**

The AMA is nothing more than a labor union for doctors. Their job, like all labor unions, is to maximize the profits of their members. But the AMA is a labor union with power because it controls who can “practice medicine.”

In other words, the many experts in alternative cancer treatments cannot “practice medicine” unless they are first trained and brainwashed in the use of pharmaceutical medicine. However, that is not the end of it.

Not even an M.D. can “practice medicine” if he or she does not use “approved” procedures which are adequately profitable to Big Pharma and the other members of the AMA. The relationship between Big Pharma and the AMA is a **quid pro quo**, roughly translated: “you scratch my back, I’ll scratch your back.” The AMA makes sure its members prescribe toxic substances to increase the profits of Big Pharma.

Likewise, the AMA makes sure its members treat the symptoms of disease (instead of the causes of disease) to insure the patient is not made well too quickly and the profits of Big Pharma are not hindered by the treatment of the causes of disease.
On the other hand, Big Pharma never forgets that the AMA has power equal to the FDA. Big Pharma would never come up with drugs that would seriously jeopardize the profits of the hospitals and doctors. That is why every year more and more people die of cancer, in spite of the billions of dollars in cancer research.

What exactly are the AMA and Big Pharma looking for? They are not looking for cheaper and safer treatments, they are looking for more profitable treatments. Gene therapy, stem cell transplants, bone marrow transplants, ad nauseum, are what they are looking for.

They are looking for things that will make doctors and Big Pharma richer, more powerful and more sophisticated in the eyes of the public. They are not looking for an improved Budwig Diet.

The objective, guiding light and controlling direction of orthodox medicine is profits and earnings per share, not on what is best for their patients, either in terms of “total life” or “quality of life.” Until that paradigm changes, there will be never be a significant improvement in the orthodox cancer treatments that reach your doctor’s office regardless of what discoveries are made.

When a new discovery is made, the only question that is asked is this: “will it yield higher profits?” If the answer is ‘no’ the treatment is buried. Now perhaps you know why medical costs continue to skyrocket through the roof.

But it gets worse. This same concept applies to medical theory. The medical establishment, which not only controls which treatments doctors will use, also control what medical “theories” doctors will believe and apply!!

They will pick the medical theories that deliver the most profits for Big Pharma and the AMA's doctors.

These absurd medical theories then control the research direction and research money. In other words, the lust for profits controls the research money.

The AMA and medical schools make sure doctors are totally ignorant of the applications of medical theories such as: the body’s electrical systems, the importance of pH/alkalinity,
the danger of fungi, moulds, etc. in the blood, phytonutrients, glyconutrients, vitamins/antioxidants, electromagnetic treatments, oxygen treatments, chlorophyll, and so on.

These are theories that are not profitable enough, yet they lead to far more effective treatments than the highly profitable orthodox “theory” and treatments!!

When a spectacular discovery is made, the FDA or AMA shuts the clinic or lab down, the media suppresses both the discovery and the shutting down of the clinic, etc. How is the discovery going to be distributed among the public? It won’t be. Big Pharma and the AMA have blocked all channels of communication!!

Some of more well-known (to alternative medicine people) cancer researchers who were shut down, or were severely harassed, by the AMA (or its state or Canadian equivalent) are:

- Harry Hoxsey (herbs),
- Dr. Royal Ray Rife (microscope and electromagnetic microbe killer),
- John Clark (did follow up to Royal Rife’s research),
- Dr. William F. Koch (synthetic antitoxins),
- Dr. Stanislaw Burzynski (Antineoplastons),
- Dr. Max Gerson (diet and supplements),
- Lawrence Burton, PhD (Immuno-Augmentative Therapy),
- Dr. Andrew C. Ivy (Krebiozen),
- Gaston Naessens (microscope and 714-X homeopathic),
- Dr. John A. Richardson (laetrile),
- Dr. Philip E. Binzel, Jr. (laetrile).

There have been numerous medical doctors and other health practitioners who used nutrition and supplements to treat cancer who had far higher “total life” cure rates on terminal cancer patients than any current orthodox treatment!!

But the direction of cancer “research” is not to improve these natural treatments and determine why they work so well, but the direction of research is to test “theories” that lead to more profitable treatments!!!
Here is a quote from the modern version of the Hippocratic Oath:

“I will follow that method of treatment which according to my ability and judgment, I consider for the benefit of my patient and abstain from whatever is harmful or mischievous.

Somehow, investment advisors seem to be the only ones who benefit from modern medicine.
CANCER DRUGS

I am absolutely stunned when I review cancer research reports on the internet that are made public. When a new natural nutrient is found that is proven to kill cancer cells or stop the spread of cancer, do they ask whether this nutrient can be used in a natural treatment for cancer?

Of course not. The first question that is asked is this: “how can we mutate and synthesize this nutrient, patent it, and make it into a profitable drug?”

Ponder that last paragraph carefully because it is the heart and soul of modern medicine. Find a natural substance that cures something, bury this fact, then fabricate, synthesize, and mutate the key natural substance, then patent the mutation, and make huge profits. That is why there is “no scientific evidence” for alternative treatments, no one is looking because they cannot be patented and thus are not profitable enough.

As an example, consider this quote:

The first development in this research using chemically altered DIM [diindolylmethane, a natural compound derived from certain vegetables] from broccoli came when the growth of breast cancer cells was inhibited in laboratory studies. Subsequent research showed these compounds also inhibited growth of pancreatic, colon, bladder and ovarian cancer cells in culture, Safe said. Limited trials on lab mice and rats have produced the similar results, he noted.

Safe said the research began by considering compounds that protect a person from developing cancer. After a stream of articles from other researchers extolling the scientific evidence that cruciferous vegetables prevent cancer, Safe and his team wondered whether the similar compounds could be developed for treatment of cancer. They looked at the mechanism – how the compounds block cancer cell growth – and found that they target PPAR gamma, a protein that is highly active in fat cells. This same PPAR gamma is over-expressed in many tumors and tumor cells and is a potential target for new drugs, he said. Safe’s lab chemically modified “natural” DIM to give a series of compounds that target the PPAR gamma and stop the growth of cancer.

Wait a minute – why “modify” a natural substance that works perfectly well? Why not research how this natural substance can be used in a natural treatment for cancer? The answer is that it is not profitable enough.

If you are accounting savvy, consider this: because of patents, Big Pharma can charge any price they want to for a drug. This means that when they calculate the price of a drug they can first take into account how much it will cost them to bribe Congressmen, bribe public officials, control the media, control the AMA, control the ACS, pay “gifts” to individual doctors, pay lawsuits, etc. In other words, they can first calculate their expected costs for these things, then come up with a price for their drugs. They cannot go out of business because they can adjust their prices to pay for anything they want.

Do you want to know the mark-up of some common drugs? The Commerce Department did and came up with some interesting numbers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug</th>
<th>Consumer price (100 tablets)</th>
<th>Cost of general active ingredients</th>
<th>Percent markup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Celebrex 100 mg</td>
<td>$130.27</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
<td>21,712%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claritin 10 mg</td>
<td>$215.17</td>
<td>$0.71</td>
<td>30,306%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norvasc 10 mg</td>
<td>$188.29</td>
<td>$0.14</td>
<td>134,493%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevacid 30 mg</td>
<td>$44.77</td>
<td>$1.01</td>
<td>34,136%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prilosec 20 mg</td>
<td>$360.97</td>
<td>$0.52</td>
<td>69,417%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prozac 20 mg</td>
<td>$247.47</td>
<td>$0.11</td>
<td>224,973%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenormin 50 mg</td>
<td>$104.47</td>
<td>$0.13</td>
<td>80,362%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasotec 10 mg</td>
<td>$102.37</td>
<td>$0.20</td>
<td>51,185%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xanax 1 mg</td>
<td>$136.79</td>
<td>$0.024</td>
<td>569,958%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Big Pharma claims that these prices are necessary for them to continue with their expensive research. Not so. Most of their mark-up is designed to cover other costs, such as lobbyists and advertising.

Now let’s go back and talk about the Budwig cancer diet, which used two Nobel Prize discoveries in its development. It seems that modern medicine, with their billions of
dollars of “research” money has not yet found a way to **safely and inexpensively** use these two Nobel Prize discoveries of the 1930s. But Johanna Budwig, by herself, was able to cure cancer with the two discoveries. Here is another question: “Do you think that the pharmaceutical industry and medical community are willing to forgo many billions of dollars of annual profits by looking for a **safe and inexpensive** way to use these discoveries?”

**THE FDA AND “SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE”**

As mentioned previously, Congress has designed the FDA to be the goon squad for Big Pharma. Whatever Big Pharma wants, Big Pharma gets.

This is not to say that all of the employees of the FDA are people of low integrity. I am sure many of the low-level FDA employees are people of high integrity and are truly people oriented. Such people have no future at the FDA.

This is because our two “festering in corruption” political parties make sure that whoever is in the White House does not accidentally appoint someone with a moral conscience to head the FDA. In other words, in order to be a top person in the FDA, especially those involved with profitable drugs, you must be willing to be loyal to Big Pharma.

Let us consider for a moment, the approval of the chemotherapy drug Iressa. I am quoting from the FDA web site:

“Accelerated approval is a program the FDA developed to make new drug products available for life threatening diseases when they appeared to provide a **benefit over available therapy** (which could mean there was no existing effective treatment). Under this program, Iressa is approved on the basis of early clinical study evidence (such as tumor shrinkage) suggesting that the drug is reasonably likely to have a valuable effect on survival or symptoms. The approval is granted on the condition that the manufacturer must continue testing to demonstrate that the drug indeed provides therapeutic benefit [i.e. tumor shrinkage] to the patient. If it does not, the FDA can withdraw the product from the market more easily than usual.”
How many clinical trials were performed with Iressa and what did they show? The study on which FDA based it approval included 216 patients 139 of whom had failed treatment with two other chemotherapy treatments. In this trial, approximately 10% of patients responded to Iressa with a decrease in tumor size.

The sponsor also presented to FDA the results of two large (about 1000 patients each) clinical studies with Iressa as initial therapy for lung cancer. In these studies all patients received, standard combination chemotherapy and were randomly given, in addition, either Iressa or a placebo. In these studies there was no effect of Iressa on survival [versus the placebo], time to further growth of cancer, or on tumor size. FDA at: http://www.fda.gov/cder/drug/infopage/iressa/iressaQ&A.htm

In other words, in two large studies this drug demonstrated absolutely no increase in survival of cancer patients. It was approved because in a trial of only 216 patients, only 10% of the patients had a decrease in tumor size (which is a symptom of cancer).

Note that this product was not approved in a study that compared the “total life” of a person using Iressa to the “total life” of someone who refused all treatments, or to someone on a top alternative cancer treatment. It was compared to treating the symptoms of cancer compared to another concoction of drugs.

Iressa was approved by the FDA.

Dr. Kelley had 33,000 patients with a 93% cure rate!! How come the FDA has not approved his treatment? Dr. Gonzalez is duplicating part of Kelley’s treatment, but the New York state medical society has forbidden Dr. Gonzalez to release the results of his study until his study is “done.” Of course, no one knows when his study will be done.

Now lets do the math. 216 patients, 10% had lower tumor size (compared to a different combination of chemotherapy drugs). 33,000 patients, a 93% CURE RATE. The FDA approved Iressa and the Cancer Industry threw Kelley in jail and kicked him out of the country. What is wrong with this picture?

Because the FDA requires a study controlled by Big Pharma in order to approve a drug, why doesn’t one of the pharmaceutical companies do an honest study using Dr. Kelley’s full
treatment on newly diagnosed cancer patients, and submit the results (which would be at least a 93% cure rate) to the FDA? Take a guess.

This is critical to understand, Big Pharma will not submit a drug to the FDA unless it is very, very profitable. The next thing to understand is that the FDA will not approve any drug, or other substance, unless it is studied under the control of Big Pharma.

Let’s logically combine the above statements into one statement: The FDA will never consider, thus will never approve, any substance unless it is very, very profitable to Big Pharma.

In fact, that is exactly the way it is. Big Pharma first decides what products can be considered by the FDA, and then it submits only those products. In essence, the FDA has no control (by its own choice) over what substances are considered for approval. Only Big Pharma is allowed to decide what is considered for approval.

Let’s take this a step further. The FDA does not consider that there is any “scientific evidence” for a treatment unless they have approved it!! In other words, there is no possible way that there can be any “scientific evidence” (according to the government’s definition) unless a drug is very, very profitable to Big Pharma. Only things submitted to the FDA by Big Pharma can be considered to have “scientific evidence.”

Do you see what is going on here? The reason there is no official “scientific evidence” for alternative cancer treatments is that they are not highly profitable to Big Pharma. It is impossible, by law, for a substance to be considered to have “scientific evidence,” unless Big Pharma submits it to the FDA, and they will only submit things that are very, very profitable to them.

Thus, the many thousands of studies of natural substances that have cured or treated cancer, are not “scientific evidence,” and they are ignored by our government, because they were not done under the control of Big Pharma. Quite a racket!! Big Pharma makes the tobacco industry look like amateurs!!

Thus, when quackwatch, the ACS, the NCI, WebMD, etc. claim that there is “no scientific evidence” for alternative treatments, it is nothing but a lie and a smoke screen, fabricated by Congress and its stepchild the FDA.
I can guarantee the reader, in all soberness, that there are more than 150 alternative cancer treatments that are far more effective than ANY and ALL orthodox treatments for cancer currently in use. All of these treatments have been suppressed, and many of them have been destroyed, by orthodox medicine. See my list of over 200 alternative treatments.

Since all “scientific evidence” must come from big corporations, what is the reputation of big corporations for doing medical studies?

Well, do you remember the 1,500 studies, done over a period of 42 years, that were funded by the Council for Tobacco Research – U.S.A? These “studies” couldn’t find a relationship between tobacco and lung cancer!!

Do you remember the 74 studies that were funded by Big Pharma to “study” whether aspartame causes any health problems? These “studies” couldn’t find anything wrong with aspartame.

Big Pharma studies on radiation, chemotherapy, etc. are just as bogus because they only compare one toxic sludge to another toxic sludge, even when studying length of life. However, these same types of studies are also used to study treating the SYMPTOMS of cancer.

In short, if a study is funded or controlled (e.g. a government funded study) by Big Pharma, or any other giant corporation, it is a worthless, bogus, misleading, etc. study.

Yet, that is the ONLY type of study the FDA will accept and it is the ONLY type of study that will lead to the designation of “scientific evidence”!!

The thousands of honest studies, which are not in any way controlled by Big Pharma, are not eligible for the designation of “scientific evidence” because they do not lead to Big Profits for Big Pharma. Likewise, the cure rates of alternative doctors, such as Kelley and Binzel, are not eligible for the designation of “scientific evidence,” instead the people involved with these studies are persecuted.
It is apparent that “scientific evidence” has absolutely nothing to do with “scientific truth.”

When a vendor of natural substances funds a study to determine the effectiveness of their product, orthodox medicine ignores this study because they consider there is a “conflict of interest.” On the other hand, when Big Pharma funds a study to make their toxic sludges look useful, the FDA cannot approve the study fast enough!! Not only does Big Pharma have a huge conflict of interest, any scientist that does a study for them knows what results they must come up with in advance.

Even though Dr. Kelley had a verified cure rate of 93% on 33,000 patients, the American Cancer Society describes his treatment this way:

“There is no scientific evidence that metabolic therapy is effective in treating cancer or any other disease. Some aspects of metabolic therapy may be harmful.”

- [http://www.cancer.org/docroot/ETO/content/ETO_5_3X_Metabolic_Therapy.asp?sitearea=ETO](http://www.cancer.org/docroot/ETO/content/ETO_5_3X_Metabolic_Therapy.asp?sitearea=ETO)

The FDA and cancer industry have invented many terms to describe alternative cancer treatments which imply they are useless, when in fact these terms mean nothing more than they are not profitable to Big Pharma. Regardless of how much scientific research has been done on these natural substances, the FDA will use terms like: “unproven therapy,” “unproven treatment,” “unproven methods,” and many others. “Unproven” means “unprofitable to Big Pharma.”

The terminology tricks of the FDA are absolutely critical to Big Pharma’s Big Plan, as I will now show.
WHAT BIG PHARMA HAS ACHIEVED WITH THEIR BIG MONEY

It is the Big Plan of Big Pharma to destroy alternative medicine, especially as it relates to their most profitable products, such as cancer drugs, heart drugs, allergy drugs, etc.

Now I will show you why the bogus concept of “scientific evidence” is so important to the Big Plan of Big Pharma. Big Pharma has …

**Blocked** alternative cancer treatment training by medical doctors by taking over the medical schools and destroying the schools that taught natural medicine.

**Blocked** dissemination of information about alternative cancer treatments over the mass media by buying their “investigative journalists” with their advertising money.

**Blocked** the use of the term “scientific evidence” for alternative cancer treatments by controlling the “definition” of “scientific evidence” (i.e. they use the political definition) and by controlling the FDA and NIH.

**Blocked** financial contributions to alternative cancer treatment charitable organizations by their control of terms like “unproven treatments” and by setting up (or taking control of) huge “charitable” organizations that are totally controlled by orthodox medicine (e.g. ACS, Leukaemia (sic) Foundation, etc.).

**Blocked** research money for alternative cancer treatments on “live patients” (and thus valid statistical information) by their control of the FDA and NIH and their control of research money.

**Blocked** any investigation of corruption in medicine by their control of the members of Congress.

**Blocked** the ability of any medical doctor from using alternative cancer treatments by taking total control of Congress and the AMA (both national and state associations) and by using such terms as “unproven treatment.”

**Controlled** the research direction of the cancer research organizations with their massive research dollars (both direct and indirect dollars).
Blocked the ability of natural substance vendors to tell the scientific truth about their products to their customers by their control of the FDA and FTC and their control of the definition of “scientific evidence.”

Blocked the publicity and significance of the many discoveries in natural medicine by legitimate research institutions by their control of the media, the FDA and their control of the term “scientific evidence.”

Destroyed much evidence about the usefulness of alternative cancer treatments by shutting down many medical clinics by their control of the FDA and AMA.

Flooded the World with bogus, highly sophisticated statistical misinformation and carefully designed terminology by their control of the ACS and other organizations.

Actively Trying to Destroy Internet web sites that tell the truth about alternative cancer treatments by their control of the FDA and by their control of the term “scientific evidence.”

Actively Trying to Destroy the manufacture and distribution of natural products by their control of the FDA, FTC and Codex (the United Nations equivalent of the FDA) and by their control of the term “scientific evidence.”

Was all of this success at destroying alternative medicine the result of a series of accidents? No, this is the result of spending billions of dollars to implement a carefully designed master plan organized at the top levels of Big Pharma. The FDA, NIH, NCI, ACS, medical schools, etc. are their puppets, and the leaders of these organizations are glad to join in the destruction of alternative medicine in order to have a big piece of Big Pharma’s bottomless money pit. Had Big Pharma not spent billions of dollars to achieve the above aims, none of the above things would have happened!!!
OTHER DISEASES

Big Pharma and the AMA learned long ago that the path to massive profits is to treat symptoms. By treating symptoms you have not “cured” the patient, you have simply perpetuated the disease in the most profitable way.

In many cases, the drugs that treat the symptoms interfere with the body’s own healing mechanisms and thus increase the amount of time the body needs to cure the disease. This increases the amount of time the patient is on medication!! This is true, for example, with Prozac and many other mind-altering drugs. Many drugs are also addictive.

So it should come as no surprise that the same government and medical corruption that is going on relative to cancer is also going on relative to heart disease, arthritis, asthma, psychological problems, Alzheimer’s and many other diseases.

As just one example, let us talk about Alzheimer’s and Dementia. There are many different causes of Alzheimer’s and dementia. In fact it is a wide range of different diseases. However, there is one cause of Alzheimer’s and dementia that Big Pharma and the AMA would rather you not know about. In fact, it may be the cause of the majority of cases of Alzheimer’s and dementia.

This cause has been known about for many years: heavy metals in the body. In fact, when Rome was the world’s greatest power, it is now known that the lead in their wine glasses, and the lead in their water conduits, caused severe mental illness among Rome’s elite.

Not only has the major cause of Alzheimer’s been known about for decades, there has been a cure for this cause of Alzheimer’s since 1952 – it is called EDTA chelation. But EDTA chelation is not profitable enough for orthodox medicine. It is not that EDTA chelation is not expensive, it is expensive. The problem is that it cures the patient too quickly, and it does not treat the symptoms of Alzheimer’s. In short, it is not profitable enough for Big Pharma and it is not “sophisticated” enough, meaning it is too simple.
Let’s first talk about what may be the major the cause of Alzheimer’s/dementia:

“In large measure, those martyred by dementia are showing the results of toxicity from mercury, aluminum, lead, cadmium, arsenic and other heavy metals. Their neurons have been poisoned. They are turned into Alzheimer’s victims directly through the efforts of dentists who blindly follow the party line of their trade union organisation, the [American Dental Association].

- Dr Casdorph, M.D.

It turns out that the American Dental Association (ADA) is just as corrupt as the Alzheimer’s Association, the AMA, the American Cancer Society, ad nauseum. Let us continue:

“Worldwide, conservatively, more than 20 million people have iatrogenic diseases caused by one medical specialty: dentists. The ADA is fighting a rear guard action to keep the public from learning that dentists, by use of mercury-silver amalgam fillings for decades, have poisoned more than 85 per cent of our population. The ADA has covered up its culpability in the same way breast implant and cigarette manufacturers deny disease connection to those products. Potential economic liability to amalgam manufacturers, their distributors, dentists and the ADA is incalculable.

- Tom Warren

“Three thousand doctors of the Toxicology Society came together at a medical conference in Seattle, Washington, several years ago to condemn mercury-silver amalgam fillings. Their revelations should have made banner front page headlines all around the world. Just three short stories appeared in the Press.

- Tom Warren
Now let’s talk about the cure:

“The Alzheimer’s type of dementia does respond rather well to [EDTA] chelation therapy. Fifteen Alzheimer’s disease patients, in a private clinical setting, were tested first, then administered chelation therapy, and were observed by loved ones to have returned to normal, or near normal, functioning. It was a gratifying experience for everyone involved with the testing and treatment: diagnosticians, clinicians, health care technicians, the patients, plus their family and friends.”

- Dr Casdorph, M.D. & Dr Morton Walker

Everyone was gratified except Big Pharma. For more information on dementia, see: http://curezone.com/dental/dental_alzheimer.asp

Newer products, such as aspartame, MSG, hydrolyzed vegetable protein (HVP), cysteine, and others, are nipping at the heals of heavy metals for the title of doing the most damage to human brains and causing birth defects. The problem with these items, however, is that they kill brain cells, and thus cannot be reversed.

**Note:** Speaking of aspartame, if you know someone who is pregnant, or may become pregnant, have them read this article immediately.

As a side note, aspartame, root canals, dental amalgam, and trans-fatty acids may all be major causes of cancer.

Aspartame is known to be a major cause of brain cancer, especially in young people under 40, who grew up on aspartame. Every time a person drinks a diet soda some of their brain cells are killed. But it may be a cause of cancer by suppressing the immune system.

The mercury in dental amalgam is known to severely suppress the immune system. In many cases cancer is nothing but a symptom of a suppressed immune system.
Dental amalgam is a safe-haven for microbes. Cancer is known to be caused by microbes and more especially infections in the jawbone and mouth which can spread outside of that area.

Trans-fatty acids are rigid molecules that stick to the sides of cell walls (in place of the flexible cholesterol molecules). This rigidity causes a cell to be unable to absorb large molecules, such as insulin (trans-fatty acids are perhaps the leading cause of Type II diabetes) and oxygen clusters (oxygen travels throughout the body in clusters). Because oxygen clusters cannot get into the cells, the trans-fatty acids may cause the cells to become anaerobic, which is the first step to a cell becoming cancerous.

Not only is modern “medicine” intentionally suppressing the knowledge and use of effective treatments for cancer and other diseases, they are also intentionally suppressing the knowledge of the major causes of cancer and many other diseases. In fact these two things are highly related. They suppress knowledge of the causes, which in turn allows them to focus their “theories” on treating the symptoms of disease, which in turn allows them to suppress effective treatments. It is just as important for Big Pharma and the AMA to suppress the true causes of disease as it is for them to suppress the true cures for disease. That is one of the reasons why the FDA refuses to admit that cancer is a nutritional or metabolic disease.

In fact, it has been known for more than 100 years that cancer is caused (at the cellular level) by microbes which get inside of cancer cells. But if you suppress the immune system, the routinely forming cancer cells can multiply out of control.

The single most dominant cause of cancer may be the way the soil is destroyed by over-farming and chemical fertilizing, coupled with food processing and the meat, dairy and sugar centered “Western” diet of Americans. If the soil is nutritionally “sick” (e.g. virtually zero trace elements), the plants grown in that soil will also be nutritionally “sick,” and the people that eat those plants will be nutritionally sick. My father (who won a Congressional Medal of Honor for his work with the Public Health Service) was warning me about the soil over 40 years ago!! Dr. Max Gerson was warning people about the soil over 50 years ago!!

This lack of nutrients in the soil leads to “sick” food and a weakened immune system. But you won’t hear Big Pharma or the AMA campaigning to get the soil fixed or to correct the basic flaws in the American diet.
Let us talk about cholesterol drugs. A good friend of mine was in the hospital because of quadruple bypass surgery. I asked him how long he had been taking cholesterol drugs before his surgery. He said about six years. For six years he had been taking cholesterol reducing drugs, then had a quadruple bypass. What is wrong with this picture?

Another friend of mine went to the doctor feeling fine. His cholesterol level was 195 and the doctor was quite pleased with this. A week later he had a heart attack and a quintuple bypass.

What is wrong with these pictures? In fact there are many scientific studies (which were not funded by Big Pharma) which have shown little, if any, relationship between cholesterol and heart disease. But cholesterol drugs are enormously profitable to Big Pharma. This is yet another case of “who funded the study?” See my article on cancer and heart disease prevention for links to a few natural heart disease prevention web sites.

Click Here (search for the word “Matthias”)

As one of scores of examples of absurd double-standards done by our corrupt government, consider that over a 10 year period the FDA claims the herb Ephedra killed approximately 155 Americans. Ephedra competes with profitable products like Claritin. During the same 10 years, the tobacco industry caused the death of approximately 4 million Americans. Tobacco is allowed to be sold because of “warning labels.” But rather than allow “warning labels” on ephedra bottles (for those with high blood pressure or other heart problems) Ephedra was banned by the FDA. In other words, tobacco, which killed 4 million Americans can still be sold, but ephedra, which killed 155 Americans, was banned.

In studying different diseases and their causes, the same substances keep showing up over and over again as major causes of a wide variety of diseases. A short list of man-made substances (e.g. aspartame, trans-fatty acids, mercury poison from dental amalgam, etc.) turn out to be the major causes of diseases such as: cancer, heart disease, depression, Type I diabetes, Type II diabetes, birth defects, etc.

The reason is primarily because these things weaken the immune system.

But cancer at the cellular level is caused by only one thing: microbes which are inside the cancer cells.