

GIVE ALTERNATIVE MEDICINE A CHANCE

By Ed O'Rourke

Those who advocate surgery, chemotherapy, and radiation as cancer cures are only using manipulated data when presenting their case. There are effective alternative treatments that the medical profession and the pharmaceutical companies refuse to consider. In her book, *Outsmart Your Cancer: Alternative Non-Toxic Treatments That Work* (Thoughtworks Publishing, 2004, 437 pages), Tanya Harper Pierce tells us about the carcinogenic products generated by industry, the misleading statistics generated by the National Cancer Institute, and many effective alternative treatments. Harper is a marriage, family and child counselor who began researching alternative cancer treatments after one of her family members was diagnosed with cancer. “Dealing with Fear and the Mind/Body Connection,” the 23rd chapter in her book, offers effective counseling for anyone with cancer.

Cancer rates have been rising at alarming rates for the past 100 years.

Surgery can bring long-term recovery if the cancer is detected early and the entire cancerous growths can be removed. Some researchers think that surgery can promote metastasis (spread of cancer to other parts of the body) if the cancerous growth is not removed in its entirety. Some chemotherapy agents contain carcinogens and may cause secondary cancer a few years later. The use of toxic treatments may cause cancer to spread faster because the treatment weakens the immune system.

The fact is that conventional treatments have failed. The American Cancer Society, the National Cancer Institute, and the US Food and Drug Agency hide this by statistical gimmickry. They define a “cure” as being alive five years after the diagnosis. Note that this does not mean “cancer free.” Patients who live five years are shown as

“cured” even if they still have cancer and then die five years and one month after the diagnosis.

The National Cancer Institute routinely uses whites-only data and then presents this select group as the general population. The National Cancer Institute has sometimes omitted all lung cancer patients from their statistics (lung cancer is the leading cause of cancer death in men and women).

Cancer authorities tout early detection to imply longer survival. In fact, early detection starts the five year clock ticking, causing survival rates after five years to rise. Long-term survival rates look better when no long-term survival has occurred.

Patients who die before conventional treatment finishes are dropped from the statistical base (e.g., someone who dies on day 89 of a 90 day chemo program).

Pharmaceutical companies are not interested in researching alternative medicine because they generally involve natural substances that cannot be patented.

The causes of cancer lie in the carcinogens and toxins that industry puts in our air, food, and water. “Both breast cancer and prostate cancers have been strongly linked to pesticide exposure, and non-Hodgkins lymphoma has been strongly linked to herbicide exposure.”

Grocery stores sell artificial sweeteners that contain the carcinogen, aspartame, even though studies in the 1970s showed that aspartame caused primary tumors in rats. Of the 90 independent aspartame studies, 83 found one or more problems. Of the 74 studies sponsored by industry (e.g., Monsanto, G.D. Searle, and ILSE), every single one showed no problems.

Pesticides sprayed on crops are incorporated into plants because rainwater dissolves the pesticides. Plants absorb dissolved pesticides, water, and other nutrients. Washing the plants after coming home from the grocery store does only a little good.

“Virtually all the FDA-approved anticancer drugs are markedly immunosuppressive, because they ruin a person’s natural resistance to disease, including cancer.”

Many of the conventional cancer treatments are carcinogenic, meaning that they can cause secondary cancer to develop a few years later. For example, radiation for lung or breast cancer can cause damage to the heart, enough to induce a fatal heart attack.

John D. Diamond, MD, notes the failure of chemotherapy: “Patients who underwent chemo were 14 times more likely to develop leukemia and 6 times more likely to develop cancers of the bones, joints, and soft tissues than those who did not undergo chemotherapy.”

Developers of most of the alternative treatments described in her book attempted to get a fair evaluation of their approaches by mainstream medicine. Since these treatments are low-cost, pharmaceutical companies saw no benefit for their use and certainly did not wish to encourage the development of a competitive product. Since government agencies protect the pharmaceutical companies and not the public, they are not interested in funding any study of alternative treatments.

There are many examples of small studies showing the success of alternative treatments:

- A team of 10 reputable doctors studied the clinical records of patients using the Hoxsey therapy and recommended it as an effective cancer treatment.
- A congressional committee looked into the Gerson therapy and concluded it was an effective cancer treatment.
- A scientifically sound clinical study of Dr. Kelley’s enzyme therapy showed it to be significantly better than conventional methods for pancreatic cancer.
- Studies on Burzynski’s antieoplaston showed it to be significantly better than conventional methods for many types of cancer.
- In vitro studies done by the National Cancer Institute on Jim Sheridan’s formula now called Protocol showed results that were much better than chemotherapy results for a variety of different cancer cell lines.

The general public is unaware of these positive results. They are also unaware that there are no positive results shown by unbiased, large-scale studies. Pharmaceutical companies have carried out all the existing studies.

What I ask for is federal funding of a long-term cancer study of all conventional and alternative cancer treatments. This could eventually cost a billion dollars, chump change considering things.

When I prepared this article, I gave a draft to medical doctors for review. When their verdicts were that the alternative cancer theory was non-scientific (like intelligent design), I considered quashing this article. Then I read pages 292-295 from Devra Davis's *The Secret History of the War on Cancer*, that portray favorable results from alternative treatment, I changed my mind. Since Devra Davis has impeccable credentials as the director of the Center for Environmental Oncology at the University of Pittsburgh Cancer Institute, I decided to continue the article.

Give alternative medicine a chance.

Ed O'Rourke is an environmental accountant in Houston, Texas.