

Step 46

CANCER

If you have cancer, here are some useful suggestions.

You may gain a better appreciation of natural cancer treatment if I first share with you some little-known facts about orthodox cancer treatment. In cancer research, success (expressed as a five-year survival rate) is established by comparing other forms and combinations of treatment with the results from surgery alone. However, the success rate of surgery has rarely been compared with the survival rates of untreated patients. Therefore, orthodox cancer treatment is basically unscientific because it doesn't deal with all the data. The overall supposed "cure rate" is not higher than can be accounted for by removing precancerous conditions, dormant or calcified tumours, spontaneous remissions, and the placebo effect. In support of my position, I have assembled some key statements and conclusions from medical and scientific publications.

Studies appear to show that early intervention is helpful, because pre-cancerous lesions are included in early removals that frequently would not become cancerous if left untouched. It does not matter how much or how little of a breast is removed; the outcome is always the same.³⁸

Researchers say it is complacent to continue subjecting at least 70 percent of women with breast cancer to surgery, a futile mutilating procedure.³⁹ There is no evidence that early mastectomy affects survival; if patients knew this, they would most likely refuse surgery.⁴⁰ The editor of the *Lancet* pointed out that despite various modifications of breast cancer treatment, death rates remained unchanged. He acknowledged that despite the almost weekly releases of "miracle breakthroughs," the medical profession with its extraordinary capacity for self-delusion (his words, not mine) in all truth has lost its way. At the same time, he rejects the view of those who now believe that salvation will come from increasing chemotherapy after surgery to just below the rate where it kills the patient. Instead, he continues, "would it not be more scientific to ask why our approach has failed?" Not too soon to ask this question, after a century of mutilating women, I would say. The title of this editorial, appropriately, is "Breast cancer: have we lost our way?"⁴¹

Basically, all types and combinations of conventional breast cancer treatment appear to result in the same low long-term survival rates. The only conclusion that can be drawn from this is that conventional treatment does not improve long-term survival rates. Even worse, Michael Baum, M.D., a leading British breast cancer surgeon, found that breast cancer surgery tends to increase the risk of relapse or death within three years. He also linked surgery to the accelerated spread of cancer, which it does by forming metastases in other parts of the body.⁴²

This conclusion confirms an earlier finding by Ernst Krokowski, a German professor of radiology. He demonstrated conclusively that metastasis is commonly triggered by medical intervention, including sometimes even by a biopsy or surgery unrelated to the cancer.⁴³ Disturbance of a tumor causes a greatly increased number of cancer cells to enter the bloodstream, while most medical intervention, especially

chemotherapy, suppresses the immune system. This combination is a recipe for disaster. It is metastases that kill, while primary tumours in general and those in the breast in particular are sometimes relatively harmless.

This follows earlier reports that radical surgery for prostate cancer also tends to spread the disease. Actually, prostate cancer was investigated in the first randomized clinical trials for any type of cancer. After 23 years, there was no difference in the survival rates of those who had surgery and controls who did not; those with surgery suffered more problems such as impotence or incontinence.⁴⁴ A recent epidemiological study confirmed the questionable value of conventional therapy by concluding that “medical interventions for cancer have had a negligible or no effect on survival.”⁴⁵ Even the conservative New England Journal of Medicine had an article with the headline “Cancer Undeclared.”⁴⁶

Common ways to make medical statistics look more favourable are as follows. Patients who die during prolonged treatment with chemotherapy or radiotherapy are not counted in the statistics, because they did not receive the full treatment, while in the control group everyone who dies is counted. Further, success is judged by the percentage of shrinking tumours, regardless of survival time. If survival is measured, then it is only in terms of those dying from the treated disease. It is not normally shown how many of the patients die due to the treatment itself.

The current trend is to pick up precancerous conditions very early and treat them as cancer. While this statistically increases the number of people with cancer, it also artificially prolongs survival times and lowers death rates, thereby making medical treatments appear to be more successful. However, there may also be a genuine component of improved survival, as increasing numbers of cancer patients opt for additional natural therapies.

An investigation of the records of 1.2 million cancer patients revealed that the death rate attributed to non-cancer death shortly after treatment was 200 percent higher than would normally be expected. Two years after diagnosis and treatment, this excess death rate had fallen to 50 percent. The most common cause for the excess death was listed as heart and respiratory failure. This means instead of dying several years later of cancer, these patients died from the effects of the treatment and thereby helped greatly improve the cancer statistics because they did not die strictly of cancer.⁴⁷ This misleading reporting of cancer deaths has led to demands for more honest statistics.⁴⁸

After an analysis of several large mammogram-screening studies found that it leads to more aggressive treatment with no survival benefits,⁴⁹ even the editor of the Lancet had to admit that there is no reliable evidence from large randomized trials to support mammography screening programs.⁵⁰ The significance of this statement goes far beyond the use of mammograms. It is openly acknowledged by the proponents of conventional medicine that they have no effective way of helping patients with advanced cancer. Until now the catch-cry always was “detect it early, then it can be cured.” These mammogram evaluation studies demonstrate that it does not matter when cancer is detected; they suggest to me that the conventional methods and the whole multibillion dollar cancer industry are useless.

Here’s more supportive evidence: A 13-year Canadian study of 40,000 women compared physical breast examinations with examinations plus

mammograms. The mammogram group had many more lumpectomies and surgeries, and the death rate was 107 deaths in the mammography group and 105 in the physical examination group.⁵¹ Ductal carcinoma in situ (DCIS) is a common non-invasive form of breast cancer. Most cases of DCIS are detected through the use of mammography; in younger women, 92 percent of all cancers detected by mammography are of this type. Nevertheless, on average, 44 percent, and in some states 60 percent, of these are treated by mastectomy. As most of these tumours are harmless, this greatly improves the survival statistics.⁵²

In contrast, while conventional diagnosis is invasive and may help to spread the cancer, a kind of electro-dermal screening, called the Biofield test, was developed by a team from eight European hospitals and universities. The Lancet reported it as being 99.1 percent accurate in diagnosing malignancy in breast tumors.⁵³

A large meta-analysis of radiotherapy results for lung cancer showed that after two years there were 21 percent more deaths in the group that had radiotherapy in addition to surgery as compared to those who had surgery alone. Researchers contend the rationale is to kill any cancer cells remaining after surgery, but it is a shame that the facts do not agree with this theory.⁵⁴

Chemotherapy for children with leukaemia and Hodgkin's disease is the proud showpiece of the only apparent success of orthodox cancer therapy. Now a long-term follow-up study shows that such children develop 18 times more secondary malignant tumours later in life and that girls face a 75 times (7500 percent) higher risk of breast cancer by the time they are 40.⁵⁵ A main problem appears to be the development of deep or systemic *Candida albicans* infections shortly after starting chemotherapy.⁵⁶ If this is not appropriately treated (see entries on *Candida* in Step 48), then relapses or future health problems are likely to occur.

Chemotherapy showed a clear dose dependency whereby the incidence of triggered leukaemia doubled between low-dose and -moderate-dose groups and then quadrupled between the moderate-dose and the high-dose groups. A study of ovarian cancer found that the risk of developing leukaemia after treatment with chemotherapy increased 21-fold, or 2100 percent. Other tumours commonly develop after treating malignancies with chemotherapy.⁵⁷ In a trial for multiple myeloma, no advantage was found by using chemotherapy as compared to no treatment.⁵⁸ Ralph W. Moss, Ph.D., in *Questioning Chemotherapy*, provides a detailed analysis of this subject; his overall conclusion is that there is no evidence that chemotherapy extends patient life with the majority of cancers.

However, even if chemotherapy extends life by a few months, what about the quality of this life? Tom Nesi, a former director of public affairs at the pharmaceutical giant Bristol-Myers Squibb, wrote in the *New York Times* about the successful treatment of his wife, which extended her life for three months.⁵⁹ Two weeks after the treatment, she scribbled on a notepad: "depressed - no more - please." I am not surprised by reports that most oncologists would not use these treatments for their own families.

Why are they doing this? By "they" I am referring to what is commonly called the cancer establishment. I believe the answer was given by the eminent medical commentator and former editor of *New Scientist*, Dr. Donald Gould, in his article "Cancer: A Conspiracy of Silence." The subtitle summarizes his position: "The

commonest cancers are as resistant to treatment today as they were 40 or 50 years ago. Nothing is to be gained by pretending that the battle against cancer is slowly but surely being won.”⁶⁰

This truth has been deliberately concealed from the general public. According to Dr. Gould, the reason for this conspiracy of silence is money. The public must continue to see the cancer establishment as a winner to continue providing money. One of the quoted scientists said that, with tens of thousands of radiologists and millions of dollars in equipment, one still gives radiation treatment even if study after study shows that it does more harm than good. Dr. Gould says patients who could be comfortable without medical treatment until their inevitable death are made miserable with medical treatment in a pointless attempt to postpone death for a few unhappy weeks. Of course, that is when most of the money is being made. Dr. Gould says doctors poison their patients with drugs and rays and mutilate them with unnecessary surgery in a desperate attempt to treat the untreatable.

Since the early 1970's when President Nixon declared the War on Cancer, two trillion dollars have been spent on conventional cancer treatment and research, with the result that more Americans are dying of cancer than ever before.⁶¹ While there have been many studies to evaluate the effects of various nutrients on different cancers, none of this two trillion dollars has been available for natural therapists to test holistic cancer therapies, and natural therapists have had to face a century of denigration and persecution in the U.S.

All alternative cancer clinics eventually had to relocate to Mexico. (For a list of such clinics worldwide, see: www.cancure.org) A holistic cancer approach includes superior nutrition, electro-medicine and vibrational or energy medicine, emotional healing, and mind therapy.

One of the few studies that investigate a holistic approach involved the Gerson therapy in an evaluation of five-year survival rates of 153 melanoma patients. Here, 100 percent of Gerson therapy patients with Stage I and II cancers survived, but only 79 percent did so with conventional therapy. With Stage III (regional metastases), the figures, respectively, were 70 percent and 41 percent; with Stage IVa (distant metastases), 39 percent with Gerson and 6 percent with conventional therapy.⁶²

Now there is actually proof that cancer surgery is the main cause of metastasis or secondary organ tumours. About 90% of patients die from metastases while primary tumours actively suppress metastasis. Stress as from fear or most medical procedures tends to promote metastasis and this is the reason that untreated patients generally live longer than medically treated ones. Regard a tumour as a mistreated part of your body, surround it with loving care and it will thank you by preventing metastasis and gradually melt away. For more information and references see www.health-science-spirit.com/cancersurgery.htm and www.health-science-spirit.com/cancersolution.htm.

People claim to have been cured of cancer by a variety of methods and remedies. Belief or faith in the chosen method may often have been more important than the method itself. However, fundamental factors that should be addressed for a more uniform successful outcome are:

1. Alkalize the body

2. Controlling the cancer microbe
3. Normalizing metabolism
4. Cleansing the body
5. Improving the mind and emotions

When these are corrected, any type of tumor can disappear on its own or become dormant. Natural cancer therapy has a fundamentally different view of what cancer is from that of orthodox medicine. The latter believes that the tumor is the cancer and only attacks the tumours. Natural therapy approaches address cancer as a condition of the whole body and person and treat the whole person.

Alkalinizing the body: If the body is sufficiently alkaline tumours do not grow. Use alkalizers, including sodium bicarbonate and potassium citrate, as shown in Step 6 to keep your urine above pH 7 most of the time.

Controlling the Cancer Microbe: The cancer microbe is the key to successful natural cancer therapy. Various researchers such as Guenther Enderlein, Wilhelm Reich, Royal Ray Rife, Virginia Livingston-Wheeler, Alan Cant-well, and Gaston Naessens have found the same phenomenon in all cancers: a microbe that changes its shape and is thus pleomorphic, "of many shapes." It is normally present as tiny protein units, but in various disease conditions, including all autoimmune diseases, it grows into a coccus and higher bacterial forms and then mycoplasmas and fungus-like forms.

This microbe does most of the cancer damage by devastating the immune system, releasing toxins that poison the energy-producing cellular enzymes; it also produces growth hormones that result in unchecked cell divisions. If the cancer microbe in its advanced stages is cultured and injected into animals, it causes tumor growth and the wasting and sickening odour that is characteristic of terminal cancer.

All this makes it understandable that antimicrobial and especially fungicidal treatments have often been credited with having cured or reversed cancer. Kerosene, for instance, taken internally, is said to be widely used in Russia and other Eastern countries as a cancer cure, and it was even used in America a hundred years ago. A hospital in Brazil reported cancer cures with the fungicidal herb pau d'arco. The electronic zapper and the Rife machine have been used to destroy the cancer microbe electronically. Presently MMS and Lugol's iodine solution are widely used.

Normalizing Metabolism: The main reason that body cells become cancerous is the destruction of the enzymes in their energy--producing respiratory chain. These enzymes can be poisoned either by accumulated toxic chemicals, especially pesticides, or by endotoxins produced by the cancer microbe. The German cancer researcher P. G. Seeger, M.D., D.Sc.,⁶³ demonstrated that the virulence of cancer cells is proportional to their inability to use oxygen for energy production and that cancer cells can be transformed back into normal cells by restoring cellular respiration. This can be achieved with certain enzyme supplements and especially with the purple pigment of red beets and dark grapes.

Furthermore, Dr J. Budwig, a German fat researcher, found that flaxseed oil and sulphur compounds, especially food high in cysteine (e.g. quark, a fermented

cottage cheese) were most effective in restoring a normal energy metabolism. The importance of a good diet can also be seen from a study of 535 breast cancer patients. After ten years, those with the highest insulin levels were eight times more likely to die than were patients with the lowest levels. Insulin levels are strongly elevated when ingesting common household sugar and to a lesser degree when combining glucose, as for instance from eating starches with fructose from fruit.

Cleansing the Body: Eliminating the cancer microbe and restoring cellular energy production is not always sufficient in an advanced condition because of the large amount of toxic waste produced by disintegrating tumours. Think of a dead tumor as a dead rat in your body. Patients have died after “successful” cancer cures because of congestion in their organs of elimination, especially the liver and kidneys. Cleansing is needed to remove metabolic wastes, pesticides and endotoxins that helped to cause the cancer in the first place.

Improving the Mind and Emotions: Our mind and emotions are an additional factor that makes it much easier for cancer researchers to cure mice rather than people. The orthodox cancer approach generally causes patients to be fearful, but this paralyses the immune system and makes all other body systems inefficient. Cancer treatment is likely to fail and cancer tends to return after successful initial therapy if we live in fear, especially if this fear is subconscious. Enthusiasm, joy, positive expectations, and supportive relationships have the opposite effect, and clinical trials of mind and emotional therapies have shown superior results compared to orthodox cancer therapies.

Putting It All Together: There are hundreds of supplements and remedies that might be beneficial to overcome cancer. The more effort you put into the basics, the less additional remedies you need. For some suggestions of additional supplements and remedies, see the entry on Cancer in Step 44. All the basic information that you need to reverse your cancer is in this book, for more detailed instructions see Overcoming Cancer at <http://www.the-heal-yourself-series.com>.

- From Step 34 use the low-protein High-Quality Diet with its strong emphasis on purple foods, raw foods, and fresh vegetable and grass juices.
- Keep your urine above pH 7 as shown in Step 6.
- Do the Intestinal Sanitation and Antimicrobial Therapy as shown in Step 3.
- Do periodic fasting and cleansing as explained in Step 4, including the Basic Cleanse and if appropriate a Long Cleanse.
- Use a Beck-type electronic zapper and Reflexology as explained in Part 2.
- Release any resentment or other negative emotions and replace them with positive emotions (see Part 8).
- Practice the Love Cure (see Part 8).
- Make appropriate changes to your belief systems. Use the mind tools in Part 9, especially guided imagery..

* * * * *