

A NATUROPATHIC PERSPECTIVE ON CANCER

there *are* other healing options
beyond just chemo, radio or
surgery

By

Peter de Ruyter

Copyright © Peter de Ruyter-2011-All Rights Reserved

Permission is hereby granted to freely share this information on the understanding that *no part of the text is altered in any manner whatsoever, and that due credit is given to the author, with details of his websites left intact, i.e.*

www.articlesandbooks.net

www.holistic-hypothyroidism-solutions.com

www.self-empowerment-through-mind-power.com

Please also note:

No part of this article is intended as a form of diagnosis or prescription on physical, mental or emotional levels. If, after reading any data in this article you decide to instigate a change in your present therapeutic regime, then it is *imperative* to also seek out the professional services of an appropriate specialist – either natural or medical for further expert advice.

My intent as author of this article is solely to provide information of an educational nature. No responsibility can be accepted for your actions or their consequences, in the event you use any information from this article with which to change your life in any manner whatsoever.

AUTHOR: de Ruyter, Peter, 1951 -

TITLE: 'A Naturopathic Perspective on Cancer - there *are* other healing options beyond just chemo, radio or surgery'

PUBLISHED BY: Peter de Ruyter - December 2011.

EDITION: revised 26.1.13.

There Are Other Healing Options Beyond Just Chemo, Radio or Surgery

'Unconventional ideas in science are seldom positively greeted by those benefiting from conformity'

Marcell Truzzi, Sociologist

Introduction

In this article, we'll explore some unconventional concepts as to what cancer is; what creates this often deadly disease, and alternative ways to treat and manage this health issue.

In order to better understand the various rationales underpinning such seemingly unorthodox approaches to cancer, it will be necessary to at first do a slight detour. Although it may initially seem as if we're discussing everything but cancer, hang in there because by the end of this detour you should have a far better understanding of how limited the presently accepted approach of simply offering surgery, chemo or radio really is.

Having a deeper understanding of what's going on in cancer will also empower you to make far more constructive and Healing choices in then dealing with this health challenge. The information explored here is not only central to treating your cancer, but becomes even more important in maintaining your health long-term, once the acute phase of treatment is over - something to which conventional medicine gives meager thought or focus.

The War on Cancer Has Been a Failure

Despite an enormous effort in controlling and eradicating cancer as a health issue in our modern societies, and despite billions of dollars spent in research, the results of all that endeavor have been dismal to say the least.

If one looks at the incidence of other health conditions - such as cardiovascular disease, for instance - then the stats show a dramatic improvement in incidence,

treatments and outcomes over the period of 1950 to 2005. In contrast, the cancer stats have only improved slightly, and then only in a narrow range of specific cancers. (1, 2)

At the end of the day, despite 40 years of intensive effort since Nixon's 'War On Cancer' was proclaimed in 1971, and despite all the research dollars spent, we're mostly still left with the three basic treatment choices of surgery, chemotherapy and radiotherapy - all of which leave the body to deal with a huge amount of 'collateral damage'.

Effectively Treating Cancer is so Much More Than Just 'Killing the Tumor'

It's as if medicine has become obsessed with solely trying to kill the cancer - at any cost, and with little regard for the overall wellbeing of the body post-treatment. There is no recognition that cancer inevitably occurs in a depleted body, weakened by a wide range of factors, and that undoing such depletion should play a far greater role in overall cancer therapy than it presently does.

Most of the time, the medical mindset comes from the unspoken assumption that cancer 'just happens'. Admittedly, nowadays, your genetics may be blamed for what is otherwise seen as simply 'bad luck'; the dice of health didn't roll in your favor. But there is much more to whether a person gets cancer than just 'bad luck' or genetics.

For instance, there is almost no focus on using our own immune system as a primary weapon in the 'war against cancer'. Afterall, this is one of the most important functions of a healthy immune system - surveillance for, and destruction of abnormal cells. A range of immune cells - especially the natural killer cells - are doing this within your body every moment of every day.

Yes, it's true that the latest medical research is studying the use of various 'antibody' style cancer drugs - an artificially form of immune therapy - but that is still a far cry from getting an ailing immune system to restore itself back on track.

Natural Killer Cells

Because healthy natural killer cells are so crucial for helping to find and destroy abnormal cells in the body, once a person has been treated for their cancer, it's vital for all such survivors to focus heavily on keeping this critical component of their

immune system as active and functional as possible. These cells truly are a major determining component as to whether their cancer recurs or not.

Natural killer cells also help protect the body against a vast range of microorganisms such as CMV (Cytomegalovirus), EB (Epstein-Barr virus), Herpes, Lyme disease (a big problem in the USA), or Mycoplasma. What needs to be understood is that chemo is able to reactivate such dormant bugs - with research increasingly showing that, in some cases, this may have been part of what drove the body into a cancerous condition in the first place.

It's of vital importance that such bugs are able to be kept under control post-chemo, and a healthy immune system is a major way of doing so - a bit of a contradiction-in-terms when it comes to the use of chemo! Hence, the reason why natural therapists focus so much on ensuring a patient's immune system is as healthy as possible post orthodox cancer treatments - which it inevitably isn't.

Natural Remedies Long Known to Enhance Natural Killer Cells

What's so disappointing in regard to conventional medicine's approach is that we already know of a long list of natural substances capable of enhancing natural killer cells. Even a few examples of such remedies include medicinal mushrooms like Maitake and Reishi, or other natural compounds such as flax lignans, beta-glucans, let alone herbs such as Cats claw, Astragalus, Echinacea, Siberian ginseng, Aloe vera, as well as nutrients such as vitamin C, zinc, B6 and more. So, why aren't we hearing about these treatment options - at least as a *complementary* component to conventional therapies?

The Role of Environmental Factors in Cancer

In addition, an ever increasing mountain of research, presented in the 'accepted' medical Journals, is vindicating that environment factors definitely do play a major role in cancer. Why then, so little focus on *this* aspect to the overall 'cancer equation'? After all these decades of research, we're still left with a rather myopic

focus as to what actually creates cancer, with minimal - if any - focus on the environmental aspects to this disease.

One possible reason is the sad reality that far too often an incestuous and dysfunctional relationship exists between governments - supposedly protecting its constituency - and multinational corporations producing a staggering number of toxic substances and products with little to no governmental oversight or control.

The political links to lobby groups, from these multinationals - with the inevitable involvement of 'donations' to governments - may well be why there is minimal incentive for politicians to instigate the necessary legislation for controlling such cancer-promoters.

To expand on this subject, you might like to read about these concepts and realities in Fagin and Lavelle's book: *Toxic Deception - How the Chemical Industry Manipulates Science, Bends the Law and Endangers Your Health* (Markowitz & Rosner. 2003.)

Genetics and Cancer

Lately, there has been more focus on the genetic aspect to cancer, but this too has come at a price.

With the genetic perspective to cancer being given more credence lately, the psychological 'bone-pointing' effects of a cancer diagnosis have been greatly enhanced. This is simply because at the very least there is the insinuation that once you've been found to have 'certain genes' for cancer, it's almost a done-deal that you will then also eventually get cancer - short of being a rather 'lucky' person.

What medicine hasn't yet sufficiently taken onboard is the newly emerging evidence that it is not so much the genes, as the *epigenetic factors - the environment components, both internally as well as externally* - which play a far more significant role in whether cancer will develop or not; even if you do happen to have 'the genes for cancer'.

This scientifically validated concept of epigenetics should be providing an impetus towards a significant shift in the science and understanding of what creates or catalyses cancer in us humans. Equally, this should allow for constructive changes in the way we subsequently approach prevention as well as treatment options.

Unfortunately, far too many doctors - let alone oncologists - have barely heard of epigenetics, or have little understanding of the profound implications this advance in knowledge brings to the therapeutic table.

What we now better understand is the extent to which *environmental* factors are the epigenetic *triggers* for determining whether a particular gene is switched on or off, thus playing major roles in whether cancer cell formation within our bodies is promoted or prevented.

Modern Agricultural Practices Causing Serious Side-Effects

However, it also needs to be clearly understood that such environment factors go way beyond the ever increasing load of chemicals in our diet, homes and offices. Another, equally insidious process with epigenetic consequences to our overall health, including cancer, is that for decades now we are also dealing with escalating nutrient *deficiencies* in our foods - especially the micro-nutrients.

This in turn is a direct result of how agricultural practices have dramatically changed over the last 60 years or so, with most 'nutrients' now coming from chemical fertilizers. Unfortunately, although these fertilizers do contain oodles of nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium (N-P-K), most of them also contain but a narrow range - if any - of the sort of nutrients one gets from organic manures or compost.

Equally, these chemical fertilizers don't supply the crucial organic *humus* so necessary in helping maintain a healthy soil structure and ecology - the latter being the vast range of worms, bugs and other living things that make up a *healthy* soil. The vital importance of having sufficient humus levels in the soil - beyond simply adequate N-P-K - is being increasingly acknowledged by agricultural science.

Let's look at just one example of how modern agricultural practices are having a negative impact on our nutrient status - let alone that of our soils too. Recent research into the use of Glyphosate (Roundup) herbicide is unearthing an alarming trend, particularly when used in conjunction with genetically modified crops designed to withstand this potent chemical.

Many herbicides work by blocking a plant's ability to utilize one particular mineral needed for the function of critical enzymes, thus causing the plant to weaken and die. What makes Glyphosate especially noxious is that it doesn't just make *one* mineral unavailable to plants, but in fact neutralizes a plant's ability to use a much

broader range of critical minerals, including nickel, zinc, calcium, iron, copper, manganese and magnesium - some of the micronutrients hinted at earlier.

Furthermore, the latest research shows genetically modified (GM) crops can survive such herbicide use, because they have been selected for different enzyme systems, which allow those GM plants to adequately access the particular nutrients Glyphosate is otherwise neutralizing. However, the end result is that such surviving crop plants nevertheless accumulate this toxic weedicide-chemical in their tissues - which is then used as animal feed - or is eaten by us!

An even more sobering effect of such herbicide use is the fact that some early studies are indicating that crops, such as soybeans, are now found to contain lower than normal levels of a wide range of nutrients. What this means is that herbicides like Glyphosate are capable of not just affecting a plant's ability to *use* certain nutrients, but then also seem to cause nutrient deficiencies within those crops. Once again, remember that we eat those crops - or they are used as fodder for our animals - which we then eat!

Finally, research has also vindicated that Glyphosate is toxic to various soil organisms and earthworms. 'So what'... you may say, but this is a critical factor when it comes to the healthy production of crops, because it's these seemingly unimportant organisms which catalyze a plant's ability to absorb nutrients. Glyphosate, aside from killing such soil organisms, also reduces a plant's ability to photosynthesize, plus makes them more prone to drought.

But an even more disturbing fact is that this toxic chemical, with its long list of collateral damage, is not very biodegradable, and therefore keeps accumulating in the soil from one season to the next, causing an increasingly vicious cycle of the destructive consequences mentioned above. ⁽³⁾

Hopefully it is becoming increasingly clear why our soil nutrient status is declining - especially in regard to micro-nutrients. Not only is this due to our modern tendency to only use chemical fertilizers, but it's also due to the insidious effects of other chemicals we're using in the production of our food.

Surely it doesn't require much imagination to realize that so too are our bodies increasingly not able to get all the broad range of nutrients necessary for keeping us - and especially our immune systems - not just alive, but functioning at an *optimal* level of health.

We seem to have forgotten that health is not just *an absence of symptoms*; health is a sense of vibrancy and aliveness - *beyond having any symptoms*. This is something which is often missing for far too many people in our culture nowadays.

Just think of the countless number of people you know who are chronically tired, depressed or generally feeling unwell - even if they haven't been given a specific diagnosis such as arthritis, heart disease, let alone cancer?

Newton's Failure

Ironically, in cancer, what kills more people is not necessarily their *primary* tumor, but rather the *metastases* this primary cancer produces - even after the latter's supposedly 'successful' treatment. Unfortunately, this is a sad indictment on the poor success rate - as mentioned earlier - of present orthodox treatment approaches.

Despite the multi-billion dollar industry that cancer therapy has become - or perhaps because of it! - generally speaking, one's chances of surviving *metastatic* cancer are about what they were in the 1970's. For all the money and effort that has been spent on research... frankly, this is unacceptable.

Despite such miserable results, the billions of dollars spent on most cancer research remain stubbornly focused on treating the primary tumor. This sad reality is exposed by statistics which show that in the period from 1972 to 2004, only **0.5%** of the studies done by the NCI (National Cancer Institute) were directed towards effectively managing and curing *metastasis*.⁽⁴⁾

These facts strongly suggest a fundamental flaw in how orthodox medicine presently deals with cancer. One of medicine's core concepts - upheld with great vigor if you dare to challenge it! - underpins the belief that *generally* speaking, cancer is a localized disease; you get a lump, somewhere in your body. From orthodox medicine's perspective, mostly that's the be all and end all of what cancer is.

Hence, from this point of view, if you can therefore somehow get rid of that 'lump' (for non-blood cancers) - be that via surgery, chemo or radiotherapy - then the patient is regarded as cured, and medicine believes they have effectively dealt with 'ridding' your body of cancer.

This is a hopelessly flawed assumption if one truly wants to get rid of, not just 'the lump', but all the forces which came together to cause that 'lump' to manifest in the

first place. To understand the reason for this huge perceptual failing we need to go back in time and take a quick peek into the history of science.

This is the little ‘detour’ mentioned at the beginning of this article. Just hang in there, because the consequences of this discussion are crucial to a more empowering understanding of why the present, Western model of cancer treatment is such a failure, and why alternative and *complementary* ways of managing cancer are not quite as irrational as orthodox medicine would like you to believe.

The Limitations of Newtonian Physics

The unfortunate reality is that, generally speaking, our present model of ‘scientifically accepted truth’ is based on three primary, yet seriously defective assumptions. Newtonian Physics, which has ruled science for the last 400 years or so, believes that the Universe, us humans, the Earth and everything else in our visible reality are all nothing more than highly sophisticated machines of some sort.

Newtonian Physics is also obsessed with breaking everything down to its smallest component, resulting in a very reductionist way of looking at this reality. Within science, a major consequence of this approach is that everything is seen as separate from everything else.

In turn, a major outcome of this, within medicine, is the fact that doctors have become very ‘specialist orientated’ - but inevitably with little communication between the specialties. So, if you have a liver problem, you see a liver specialist; if you have migraine, you see a migraine specialist, and so it goes on.

However, this approach is the opposite of how wholistic practitioners operate. For instance, if we use the rather simplistic example of migraines, then from a more wholistic perspective this malady is in fact often due to liver problems!

Although the migraine specialist may indeed prescribe some form of drug that seems to work, such an approach inevitably is only *suppressing* the symptoms. Stop the drug, and equally inevitably the symptoms come back.

Yet, because the migraine specialists don’t usually talk to the liver specialists, the dots aren’t connected and no genuinely *curative* treatment option is therefore provided to the patient suffering migraines.

Yet, see a natural therapist, and most of them will immediately understand that there is a link between migraines and liver dysfunction - even if your LFT's (liver function tests) are normal. But that's another story for another time!

The Shortcomings of Reductionism

Similarly, this obsession with breaking a human body into its many individual organs and glands - although useful in some ways - is in fact hampering the effective management of cancer; precisely because it leads to a lack of being able to perceive the broader picture.

Unfortunately, this lack of broader overview results in a very fragmented approach to dealing with health issues - generally. Although medicine has become superbly effective at finding all sorts of medications - which mostly only *suppress*, rather than truly *cure* symptoms - such a disjointed worldview of disease also leads to many health issues being solely 'managed', rather than being restored to full health.

It needs to be re-emphasized that an absence of symptoms in a patient is not necessarily or automatically the same as a person experiencing robust health.

Most specialist doctors have become 'expert mechanics' - albeit very intelligent, highly trained and skilled 'mechanics.' They are superbly capable of being able to 'fix' individual parts of our 'machine' - joint replacements; heart, liver & kidney transplants, etc - but have little understanding of the more *wholistic* perspective of how that 'machine' actually works - let alone that our bodies are so much more than a 'machine.'

Take for example, a person who has bad osteoarthritis. Initially, the medical approach is to prescribe anti-inflammatory medications - many of which have their own long list of potentially lethal side-effects. When such anti-inflammatory drugs no longer work, your orthopedic surgeon will simply cut out that offending joint, and replace it with an artificial hip or knee.

In this sequence of events, there usually hasn't been any serious attempt to find out *why* that person was suffering from arthritis in the first place - and then managing or treating *those* aspects.

Even if you ‘have the genes for arthritis’, as mentioned above, science has shown for some time now that the situation also requires *epigenetic* factors to determine whether those ‘arthritis genes’ will even be activated - or not.

And one potent epigenetic factor we already know about is diet - which has also long been espoused by wholistic practitioners as an important and very functional way of dealing with this particular health condition.

Seeing our bodies and our Universe as machines is a useful, *metaphorical* way to perceive reality, but can also be incredibly limiting in the final outcomes such a metaphor produces. Hence, it is crucial that we broaden this discussion a lot more, taking it beyond just Newton’s contribution to the way we presently view or manage our reality.

Darwin and Descarte’s Restrictive Legacies

The next major force which has driven us to our present perspective of existence - and our health - was Darwin.

Darwinism seduced us into believing that humanity came about through ‘simple chance’, and that our way of life on this Earth is nothing more than some sort of primal battle where only the fittest survive. A good example of someone who has taken this worldview fully on-board is the author Richard Dawkins, particularly in his book *The Selfish Gene*.

The basic concept you’re left with here is that in their biologically driven urge to survive, genes unwittingly do things to us - as the carrier of those genes, i.e. our bodies - which may be in the interest of *evolution* as a whole, but not necessarily to the benefit of us as *individual humans*.

However, put epigenetics into the equation, and you immediately realize that it’s not so much our genes ruling us, or our destinies, but that it’s *far* more our *epigenetic choices* which put the point of power back into our hands. This fact allows us to determine our destiny to a far greater extent than Dawkin’s view on Evolution would suggest.

Furthermore, this power comes from the knowledge we already have - via scientific research - of the various internal and external factors we can *choose* to manipulate,

with their *proven* effect on determining whether certain genes are then turned on or off.

However, via his other books, such as *The God Delusion*, Dawkins is also a perfect example of where a purely Newtonian worldview will take you; indeed, some might say his worldview provides for a rather disempowering reality, which was made by god knows who, and is going god knows where!

More importantly - in as far as their repercussion on life and health are concerned - are the beliefs fostered by Descartes. He bewitched us into believing that our external reality and the experiences of our inner mental and emotional world are completely separate, and have nothing to do with each other.

Although many scientists would like to believe that these three players in our scientific Journey - Newton, Darwin and Descartes - have been completely vindicated and proven correct, this is actually far from the truth. While their concepts have got a lot of science to back them, and are broadly accepted within science, they nevertheless ultimately remain nothing more than *theories* - not decisively proven *fact*.

In the end, as we know, most theories eventually are shown to be wrong, or certainly not the 'full quid' when it comes to explaining a certain reality. This is the very essence of the scientific process. As Gregg Braden states in his fascinating new book, *Deep Truth*: 'To discount new and proven facts when they clearly do not support an existing scientific belief is, in fact, not scientific'. ⁽¹⁵⁾

Reductionism Separates – Often With Dire Consequences

Nevertheless, the enormous influence of these three men laid the foundation to why medicine is so obsessed with a reductionist view of health, be that in regard to cancer or any other health condition. These core beliefs that presently run our lives - especially through science and medicine - have also become the origin of so many of our present woes.

These attitudes have caused us to see ourselves, as humans, to be fundamentally separate from each other, as well as Nature and our planet Earth. There's an 'us', and there's a 'them', and 'them' are usually 'the problem', subsequently needing to

be attacked, manipulated or dealt with in what may seem a valid manner, but inevitably in less than constructive, let alone compassionate ways.

This primary worldview of reductionism, driven especially by the thinking of Newton and Descartes, has also split humanity from other aspects to our reality - particularly the Earth. This has resulted in our inability to see that if we destroy or damage the Earth and our immediate environment, we are in fact destroying ourselves.

Unfortunately, it just takes a bit longer to get to see the end result of our environmentally destructive actions, driven by such separatist beliefs! And by the time we humans do collectively 'connect the dots', finally deciding to do something about it... it will probably be too late.

So too with cancer. The more we are unable to connect the dots between what we do to our environment - both internally and externally, as it relates to our bodies - the more *unlikely* we are to prevent cancer, nor subsequently manage it back to a fully cured state either. If humanity insists on living as if we are separate from our various environments - be that bodily or planetary - then we do so at our peril!

It's not as if the Newtonian, Darwinian or Descartes' perspective are fundamentally incorrect; quite the contrary. However, they are definitely *incomplete*, and only relate to *one* aspect of our reality.

Although such a scientific worldview has served us well in many ways, ironically - and thankfully! - it's precisely the fixation on reductionism that has also been the ultimate downfall of this paradigm. As Physics continued its research into breaking reality into smaller and smaller bits, it came upon an enigma.

The Birth of Quantum Physics

In their obsessive drive to break everything down to increasingly smaller 'bits', there came a point at which scientists found that Newtonian Physics no longer worked according to the present 'rules'. As research continued into the subatomic arena, it became apparent that scientists had to create a new framework through which to explain what they were discovering.

This was eventually termed Quantum Physics, and this new direction in understanding started in 1935, when Einstein published a paper on the EPR paradox. This basically

predicted that a single particle in one corner of the Universe was *instantly* capable of affecting a second particle at the other end of the Universe - despite the mind-numbingly large distances involved, and despite Einstein's own theory that the speed of light was a fundamental speed limit within our Universe.

Other scientists like Niels Bohr, Werner Heisenberg and Erwin Schrodinger behaved like genuine scientists, in that they were at least willing to explore 'outside the box', accepting that perhaps Newtonian Physics wasn't quite as complete in explaining this physical reality as had been previously believed. They also understood the philosophical implications of this titanic shift in paradigm, which they were exploring.

While the science of *physics* moved into the Quantum perspective of reality over *eighty* years ago, unfortunately very few other scientific fields followed suit. Almost a century later, medicine, biology - and economics as another important example - all remained stuck in the Newtonian worldview, with often disastrous effects on our personal health; our planetary health, let alone our economic health.

So, Why This Huge Detour?

At this point you may be asking yourself... *'remind me again why we're taking this huge detour into Newtonian Physics, mentioning people like Newton, Darwin or Descartes, when really, all I want to know is how to better understand and manage my cancer'?*

Good question!

And the simple answer is that in order to better understand *why* orthodox medicine is still so stuck in their present, limited and basically unsuccessful approach to dealing with cancer, we also need to understand what *drives* the mindset of researchers and doctors involved in this (and other!) fields of science and medicine.

Once you understand where they are coming from, and how they are in fact still stuck in a vastly *outdated*, Newtonian worldview, so too can you understand why they are so opposed - or simply unable to see or understand - any broader perspective as to what cancer is.

This limited worldview, driving their therapeutic actions, can in turn also limit *your* ability to truly conquer *your* cancer. If you wish to have a greater chance at surviving

this disease, you also need to have treatments which look far more wholistically at your condition.

In other words, to increase your survival chances, it would serve you better to choose therapeutic options that don't just see you as a 'machine' with a 'faulty part' - which can simply be cut out or otherwise destroyed with things like chemo or radiotherapy.

By treating your cancer using a more Quantum Mechanical worldview; by looking at your body as a *whole*; as well as truly 'getting it' that you are not separate from your environment, *nor your emotions*, so too will such a more wholistic approach give you a better chance of survival.

Thanks to Quantum Physics, and instruments like the Hubble Telescope, it's becoming increasingly obvious how essential it is to move on from our previous Newtonian perspective on reality - not just on medical, but ecological/planetary as well as economic levels.

The sad reality is that until humanity is able to make this shift on a core level - in all our areas of endeavor - no genuine, truly Healing solution will come about in any of these arenas either.

Knowledge Truly is Power

The good news is that having dragged you through the above 'scientific detour', it hopefully now should empower you to make more constructive and far more healing choices when it comes to you taking a greater degree of command of your Healing Journey with cancer.

So, it's time now to start looking at specific issues related to cancer treatment and management - using the more advanced perceptions fostered by Quantum Physics through which to better understand our reality.

As mentioned before, it's been about eighty years since this new paradigm shift occurred within one aspect of science, hence it's truly high time for those scientific disciplines - like medicine - which haven't yet made that shift, to let go of their outmoded way of dealing with things. Especially since this obsolete, Newtonian

worldview is seriously stifling *your* ability to survive with this grim condition of cancer.

And if your doctor is unable to make this leap, it in fact proves nothing more than just how *unscientific* they are, and how dreadfully outdated they have become in their understanding of reality. Let's say it again... Quantum Physics is not something totally new, discovered just a few years ago! The stark reality is that medicine has thus far been incapable of keeping up with some of the most important and fundamental advances within science we've seen in decades.

Medicine and other disciplines have had 80 years or so to make a change from the previous Newtonian paradigm ruling their reality - and subsequently their actions. Physics was one of the few sciences able to make that transition; why not medicine, economics or any of the other numerous scientific disciplines still mired in what can only be termed a 'flat-earth' mentality? It's truly time for these 'sciences' to wake up and move on!

However, a major aspect restricting movement forward is the reality that so much of medicine's *infrastructure* is well and truly entrenched in the old Newtonian perspective. It needs to be understood that massive amounts of capital (and research *reputations!*) are tied up in machinery, therapeutic devices and treatments based on the out-of-date Newtonian paradigm.

The sad reality is that there's no way the powers-that-be ruling this domain, with all the billions they've invested into it will let go easily; just as the coal and oil barons won't be rolling out the red carpet for greener fuel options any day soon!

Hence the onus is more on *you* to make the required paradigm-shift - *your life may depend upon it*.

Connecting The Dots Explains a Lot

That's why, when it comes to the use of treatments driven by this outmoded Newtonian model of reality, you precisely also get this reductionist approach which solely wants to cut out the tumor. And, if that is not possible, then to nuke it to kingdom-come via 'therapies' such as chemo and radio - but with awful amounts of 'collateral' damage to the rest of the healthy cells and organs in our bodies.

The irony is that just one side-effect of chemo, especially, is that it can often knock-off the vital P53 tumor-suppressor gene, whose role it is to *suppress* carcinogenic activities in our bodies. So, although chemo may indeed shrink or even get rid of a tumor, in the process it can definitely also set us up for a body which is now inherently less able to suppress the normal production of aberrant cells. And remember, these are constantly occurring in each one of us, day-in and day-out.

As has already been intimated - and will be explained in more detail later - cancer is *not* a localized disease; it is the expression of a *general* diseased *state* of the *entire* body.

Let's say it again, loud and clear... *to think that just getting rid of a lump somewhere is equal to getting rid of cancer in our entire body is in fact incorrect*. Surely, it's therefore not a wise strategy to use 'treatments' which leave behind a body with so much collateral damage?

It's precisely this lack of understanding of how cancer is a *state* of dysfunction within an *entire* body; not just a lump somewhere, that also provides a powerful explanation as to why the stats over the last 30 years and more, clearly indicate how poorly medicine has been able to truly deal with this often deadly disease.

'Losing the war' on cancer is indeed a direct consequence of medicine having been incapable of moving with scientific advances, where the research results of the last 80 years are now clearly showing the limitations and inaccuracies of dealing with health issues from this more narrow, reductionist and incomplete perspective.

Medicine Already Knows the Importance of a Healthy Immune System – but Then Ignores the Therapeutic Implications

The irony is that many researchers in the cancer field do acknowledge the vital importance of the immune system in keeping us clear of cancer in the first place. Yet they seem to have no qualms about their present therapies then seriously damaging and compromising the very system that our body has evolved over eons of time to effectively manage abnormal cells!

Why is medicine so reluctant to look more closely at the many, far more naturally orientated treatments that have long been available, through which to bring an ailing

immune system back into optimal health? Surely, when it comes to metastasis, having our own immune system functioning at as strong a level as possible is an inbuilt and ideal ‘therapeutic tool’ with which to keep ourselves fit and well.

From a more wholistic, naturopathic perspective - or using Quantum Physics to guide our therapeutic choices - doesn’t it then make sense that we need to look far more at the various factors which may have been damaging that ideal, and inbuilt anti-cancer mechanism - the immune system?

The Epigenetic Power of Toxins to Enhance the Process of Cancer

This is why natural therapists put such a huge emphasis on environment toxins. Research has long shown that many of the millions of chemicals we have unleashed upon ourselves, through our buildings, our food, our air, our water... are more often than not having serious and negative impacts on our immune system’s capacity to work at optimal levels.

Not only that, what is even more staggering is that so many of these chemicals are known to be carcinogenic, to breast; to bone; to bladder and rectum: ^(5,6,7,8,9) yet little is being done by the various authorities to remove such damaging substances from our lives.

More recent research is finally acknowledging that environmental toxins do play a significant role in inducing cancer, and the 2010 President’s Cancer Panel in the USA concluded that the degree to which such toxic burdens are involved in carcinogenesis has been hugely *underestimated*. ⁽¹⁰⁾

Further, this Panel also acknowledges that such toxins are not just those found in our environment, such as chlorine byproducts in water supplies; chemicals used in manufacture, or pesticides in agriculture (it is estimated Americans eat about 25 different pesticides daily through their diet ⁽¹¹⁾), but ironically are also coming from medicine itself.

Here, they come in the form of diagnostic or ‘therapeutic’ radiation, with just two examples of the latter being the use of radiation in many with hyperactive thyroid conditions, or the use of CT Scans - where, depending on the machines used, one chest CT Scan can be equal to about 10-20 X-ray mammograms! ⁽⁴¹⁾ That’s a lot of

radiation in the name of obtaining a diagnosis - and radiation effects are cumulative; they don't 'wear off'.

As well, a range of lifestyle factors including mobile phones, tanning booths, cleaning agents, etc. are now being noted as at least potential carcinogens. Add to that the clinical reality that far too many cancer patients are found to have high burdens of heavy metals (mercury, lead, etc), which have long been known to have negative effects on our health. ⁽¹²⁾

Hence, from a more naturopathic perspective, when helping the body to better deal with cancer, there is a major focus on detoxifying the system via a wide range of techniques. Another important aspect to such detoxification is to provide the body - and especially the liver - with the nutrients it needs in order to break down various toxins we ingest and accumulate in our bodies.

For instance, in order to allow the liver's Phase I to function at optimal levels of efficiency in detoxing ourselves, we need to have adequate and constant supplies of Vit. E and C, as well as Glutathione. To enhance the liver's Phase II detox pathways, we need sufficient nutrients such as Glycine, Glutathione, Cysteine, Taurine, B6, Folate, B12, Glutamine, Methionine, etc.

This is not rocket-science - this is information which is already acknowledged by medicine; simply not applied!

Diet

Repeated studies have shown that diet, let alone exercise can definitely have a positive - or negative - effect on preventing or promoting cancer. ⁽¹³⁾ Dr. Colin Campbell, PhD, is but one major researcher and expert within the general field of nutrition, offering evidence of how important nutrition is in the treatment and prevention of cancer. ^(14,15,16,17,18)

Further examples of the importance of nutrition in cancer treatment are discussed in the August/September issue of the *Townsend Letter*. ⁽¹⁹⁾ For instance, Dr. Abram Hoffer successfully used a broad range of nutritional supplements for his cancer patients.

The results he obtained showed that even those cancer patients who had failed on conventional cancer therapies such as surgery, chemo or radiotherapy were able to live an average of 45 months after starting his treatments. Compare this to the fact that those who chose not to use vitamins lived a mean of only 2.6 months. This is a startling difference!

Only Scratching the Surface Here in Regard to Diet

The aim in this discussion on diet, and the nutritional needs for better managing cancer is not to provide a step-by-step listing of all the various ways in which this can be done. That would require an entire book of its own. Rather, the intention of this article is to alert you to the fact of just how important good nutrition is - despite most oncologists still telling their cancer patients that: *'they can eat what they like.'*

This is bad advice indeed, and could cost you your life, especially as such 'guidance' inevitably results in patients then eating lots of sugary, refined foods so as not to lose weight - something often seen in cancer patients. However, as will be discussed soon, sugar *feeds* cancer!

It also needs to be understood that research is increasingly vindicating how substances in food act as epigenetic triggers - either turning cancer prevention-genes on or off. Furthermore, there are many phytonutrients in vegetables, fruits and especially herbs, which are now known to have a major influence on how efficiently the body can detoxify itself.

A final comment to make about diet is that a great majority of cancer victims actually die from a form of malnutrition called cachexia. Hence, wouldn't it make sense to ensure that all cancer patients are educated in what constitutes a healthy diet, and then encouraged to engage in healthy eating as a key way in which to help prevent this serious complication, so often found in cancer?

But What Constitutes a Healthy Diet?

If it is so crucial to be accessing regular and adequate supplies of a wide range of nutrients, then surely it makes sense that we also eat a 'healthy diet'? But this immediately begs the question - 'what is a healthy diet'? Without going into long lists

of specifics here, what can be said is that it wouldn't hurt to go back to food as it used to be produced about 50 years ago, and beyond.

What this means is that in those earlier days, despite more 'primitive' agricultural techniques, food was also far less processed in the vast number of ways it is now. ⁽²⁰⁾ There's a certain arrogance in us humans when we think we can fundamentally improve on Nature. Please understand that I'm not inherently against scientific advances being utilized in daily life; far from it.

However, what we humans seem to have lost is the capacity to more carefully and rationally ensure such advances don't have the negative consequences we're only now realizing we've unleashed upon ourselves in our hurry to bring them to market.

Often it seems that we're more concerned about 'making a buck' from our inventions and research, rather than ensuring such 'progress' truly does serve humanity according to far more important 'yard-sticks' - such as our health, both individually as well as planetary.

Yes, nowadays we have become very clever at manipulating Nature - through such techniques as genetically modified crops, for example. However, initial research is tending to suggest that not all such modified food - even if it is supposed to result in better yields - is necessarily good for us. There are increasing animal studies showing the dangers such modifications present to our biology. ^(21,22,23,24,25)

Hence, the general advice given by naturopathically orientated practitioners is to focus on eating foods - as much as possible - exactly as they come from *naturally* managed Earth, especially from more organically tended soils. If 'foods' have been canned, frozen, dried, modified, added to, subtracted from, chemicals added such as colorings, preservatives, flavoring agents, and more - avoid them all as much as possible!

Natural, Alternative Cancer Treatments

Far too many people just assume that because their doctor hasn't discussed any other options besides surgery, chemo and radiotherapy, *that there aren't any other options available*. This is far from the truth, and we'll look at just a few examples of

‘alternative’ cancer treatments that have both a lot of science, as well as clinical results to prove their worth.

IPT (Insulin Potentiating Therapy)

One such scientifically based complementary cancer treatment, long used in places like Germany is the use of insulin along with *much* reduced doses of chemotherapeutic drugs. It is called ‘Insulin Potentiating Therapy (IPT), and is a relatively simple - and definitely cheaper - cancer treatment option with good therapeutic outcomes.

This treatment has been around since the 1960’s, yet largely remains an unknown or unaccepted alternative way of treating cancer within the USA medical model. The methodology of using insulin to potentiate the activity of chemo drugs was given to the NIH (National Cancer Institute) *in the early ‘60’s*, but was promptly shelved. What is even more disconcerting is that any attempts to study this alternate treatment by applying for grants from the NIH have been actively stymied. ⁽²⁶⁾

How Does IPT Work?

This technique first uses an infusion of insulin to lower the patient’s blood sugar levels, which furthermore causes a release of adrenalin into the blood stream. The combination of increased adrenalin levels, induced by a hypoglycemic state (low blood sugar), makes cancer cells even more desperate for glucose than normal.

It needs to be understood that cancer cells have a relatively high metabolic rate compared to normal cells, and hence crave glucose for their own metabolism. Such higher metabolic rates of cancer cells has already been utilized in diagnostic P.E.T Scans, by employing radioactively labeled glucose to locate actively growing tumor cells in the body!

This is why naturopathic advice for cancer patients has long included the need to delete all sugary foods, sweets, excessively processed carbs, etc. from their diets. Bottom line - these refined carbohydrates actively feed and promote cancer growth.

Another vital and interesting aspect to the use of IPT in treating cancer is that cancerous cells have 6 times the number of insulin receptors on their membrane surfaces compared to normal cells, and 10 times as many IGF-1 (Insulin Growth Factors) factor receptors than normal cells.

Hence, once the cancer cells have been primed by lowering blood sugar levels through the use of intravenous insulin, the patient is then given both glucose *plus* a much *smaller* amount of their 'normal' chemo. Such primed cancer cells, desperate for 'fuel' - glucose - lap up the chemotherapeutically-laced, intravenously delivered glucose, with disastrous effects on the cancerous cells, but minimal damage to normal cells.

The other great advantage to IPT is that when chemo is given in this alternate manner, it can also be given over a much shorter time frame, thereby allowing for huge savings within hospital settings.

Such a smaller and shorter dose is nevertheless just as effective as the larger doses, due to the potentiating effects of insulin therapy. Usually, only *one tenth* the normal chemo dose is required to obtain full effects, but such a massively reduced dose obviously has much less side-effects on the rest of the body too.

This provides another huge advantage and saving to not just the patient, but the medical system as well. One study, done in 1981 at the George Washington University, showed that when IPT was used with methotrexate, it enhanced that drug's effect by a factor of 10,000. ⁽²⁷⁾

Clinical experience shows that people undergoing this format of chemo simply do better in the long-term, as well as having had less side-effects to contend with during, and after the chemo is administered. Another advantage is that under expert medical guidance, such insulin therapy is incredibly safe.

One important problem with chemotherapy is that unless the cancer cells are actively dividing, they are less susceptible to the lethal effects of chemo. However, another interesting aspect to IPT is that insulin, when used in this way actually sends such cancer cells into a growth phase, thus making them far more sensitized to the chemotherapeutic drugs.

Yet another beneficial aspect to IPT is that insulin makes cell membranes more permeable, thus allowing an increased entry of glucose into cells, but when used with low dose chemo, it also allows those chemo drugs a preferential entry into cancer cells.

A final advantage to the use of insulin plus chemotherapy is that the insulin - through such enhanced membrane permeability - allows the breakdown products from the dying cancer cells to be more readily eliminated, thereby decreasing the chances of

‘tumor lysis syndrome’. This is a serious and potentially fatal complication of any therapy that causes too great a ‘die-off’ of cancer cells in too short a time-frame. Such a situation can overwhelm a body’s detox capacity, literally poisoning a person to death by the breakdown products of dying cells.

Having discussed all these positive aspects to the use of IPT for cancer treatment, it nevertheless needs to be strongly stated that this therapy should not be used in the same single-minded, ‘silver bullet’ approach presently underpinning conventional medicine’s cancer mindset.

Yes, IPT is indeed a much better treatment option for cancer. However, it should be used within the more wholistic context of *also* looking at diet, immune restoration, nutrient supplementation, detoxification, stress management, dealing with a person’s inevitable ‘emotional baggage’... and much more. The essence of wholism is to look at the broader picture to any particular health issue - *even if this does involve more work for both the practitioner and patient.*

The ‘Elephant’ in The Room

The obvious question is why would such a much safer; more effective; much cheaper therapy still not be part of main-stream’s therapeutic approach to cancer treatment? Perhaps the keyword here is ‘cheaper’.

A cynic might ask the reverse question: *‘why would a pharmaceutical company be encouraged to use, let alone promote a treatment protocol which only needs one tenth of the normal dose of their drug?’* Obviously, this would also result in one tenth the normal return on their drug sales. But ofcourse... this is only me being cynical! Or is it?

As Dr. Linchitz states in the August/September issue of the ‘Townsend Letter’: *Drug companies fund the vast majority of cancer studies and it doesn’t makes sense to fund a study that would promote the use of only 10% of your product.* ⁽²⁸⁾

The irony - and the disconcerting reality! - is that presently the cancer research is pouring huge amounts of funds into discovering novel chemicals to use as a means of delivering ‘targeted drug therapy’.

Well, with IPT there already exists a fully-fledged, targeted form of cancer treatment which has been known about since 1946! At that time, it was first used on a single

patient who continued to live for another 30 years, ⁽²⁹⁾ and IPT has been utilized around the world since then, successfully and safely.

However, such use has definitely not been the case in regard to mainstream American oncologists, or most other cancer specialists using the American medical model (the UK and Australia, for instance); a model hopelessly flawed by it still being mired within the old Newtonian, 'one-cause-for-one-effect' perspective we discussed earlier.

Other Alternative Cancer Treatments to Consider

IPT is but one good example of an alternative way of treating cancer, which is much more effective, safer, and definitely more economic. Other examples equally have a long history of use, and thus a lot of clinical data to back them up, let alone scientific study.

Let's look at two more examples - out of many! - of safe, effective, alternative cancer treatments, these being Dr. Burzynski's Antineoplastons, and hyperthermia.

Dr. Burzynski's Antineoplastons

Dr. Burzynski has been producing his Antineoplastons since about 1980, providing another alternative form of cancer treatment with remarkable levels of success. Yet, despite his therapy showing good therapeutic effects - often in people given up for dead by conventional oncologists - this doctor has had to withstand repeated shenanigans (read: persecution) by the FDA, as well as highly biased reporting from conventional medical sources.

If you'd like to find out more about his treatment format, plus the harassment he has had to undergo at the hands of the FDA, then you might like to obtain a truly remarkable DVD called: '*Burzynski - The Movie*', which is available for purchase from: <http://www.burzynskimovie.com/> .

This DVD/movie also provides a lot of solid, Court-validated information with which to better understand the type of politics driving the often intense slur campaigns against

natural alternatives to cancer therapy, and the subsequent lack of safer, cheaper and more effective treatment options for this serious, life-threatening disease.

The fact that cancer is so potentially lethal makes the shenanigans of conventional medicine and their regulators, such as the FDA and TGA even more abhorrent. We're not talking about whether the final result of such tomfoolery guarantees you only have access to 'normal' medical drugs for non-lethal conditions, such as arthritis, migraines... or whatever. These type of diseases don't kill people - but cancer often can, and does.

If you can still get the DVD, or watch the YouTube version of the entire movie, then I urge you to do so! It would take a mini-book for me to outline the large amount of eye-opening information such a viewing will give you, as well as a much clearer perspective and understanding of what drives the present 'cancer industry'.

Hyperthermia – Another Example of a Complementary Cancer Therapy

The use of heat in treating cancer has a long history, going back to ancient Egypt and Greece. Prof. Busch and Dr. Coley, the latter a surgical oncologist, had noticed that sometimes patients who experienced certain infections, especially with a high fever, had their cancer regress. This was notably seen in cases where cancer patients had experienced the beta-hemolytic Streptococcal infection called erysipelas, which inevitably causes a high fever of up to 40.6 degrees Celsius (105 degrees F).

After much research on animals, Dr. Coley produced what were called 'Coley's Toxins' - bacterial toxins from *Streptococcus pyogenes* and *Serratia marcescens* - which were then injected into cancer patients with the aim of inducing a high fever.

Another early pioneer in the field was Dr. Fulton Percy, who as long ago as 1914 published an article in *JAMA* (J.of Am.Med.Assoc.) about using heat to treat cancer. He had understood how cancer cells were more easily destroyed when tissue was heated to levels that were sub-lethal for the rest of the body.

Hyperthermia can be used in a local manner, or as whole-body heating. In Austria, starting in the 1930's, full-body immersion in hot water, under strictly controlled conditions was used to raise the body's core temperature.

In Holland, various forms of hyperthermia for treating cancer are *presently* an established and standard treatment option. China, Italy and Mexico are other

countries using various forms of heat treatment. Germany too is rapidly going ahead with the use of heat therapy to overcome cancer.

For instance, one clinic, the St. Georg Klinik in Munich has achieved impressive results based on over 2,000 cases of advanced stages of many different forms of cancer. They obtained an average remission rate of 80% when low dose chemo was utilized in combination with whole body hyperthermia. ⁽³⁰⁾

Under strictly supervised conditions, hyperthermia can be a very safe and effective single or complementary treatment approach to managing a wide range of different cancers.

In contrast, the USA is still only nibbling at the edges of this complementary cancer treatment; complementary, because it is often used with either chemo or radio to provide far better survival outcomes.

For instance, Dr. R. Issels, a German professor of medical oncology at the University of Munich presented his results at a Press Conference in Berlin on the 23rd September, 2009, where he provided figures showing a 42% decreased risk for recurrence or death, when concomitant, regional hyperthermia and chemo had been used in high-risk sarcoma cases.

The median time of follow-up was 34 months, and those receiving the combination treatment survived about 120 months compared to 75 months for those only being treated with chemo. Also, 76% of those patients receiving combination treatment were alive with no further local progression, compared to 61% for those using chemotherapy alone. In this case, hyperthermia doesn't replace chemo, but it sure does improve overall results.

Chemo Sensitivity Testing

It's not just in the arena of alternative or complementary treatments that the present medical model urgently needs to reassess the way it deals with cancer. Paradigm shifts need to occur within the field of cancer *diagnostics* too. For instance, it is already possible to specifically blood-test each patient against a range of available chemo drugs, so as to ensure that the drugs being chosen are in fact active against their particular cancer idiosyncrasies.

Bring to mind how doctors can test for antibiotic sensitivity to a person's particular infection, especially skin or chest infections, where a sample of the bugs involved can be readily obtained, and then cultured in a petri dish with a range of different antibiotics. In a very similar way, cancer patients can also be specifically tested for their sensitivity to any particular chemo drug regime.

What is not discussed often enough is the reality that many 'failures' to the use of chemo are in fact due to that chemo drug not having been effective enough to kill *that* person's particular cancer cells in the first place. So, if this is already known within the medical fraternity, why are they still putting people on standardized and often dangerous drug regimes, with well-known and often deadly side-effects - and yet not making absolutely sure that the pain is worth at least some gain?

Wouldn't that be a more sensible way to look at the use of chemo? Wouldn't such an approach save millions of patients from often horrific side-effects, and wouldn't it also save billions of dollars world-wide by not wasting enormously expensive drugs on patients who could easily be checked for potential resistance to those same drugs?

Why aren't the oncologists themselves offering this scientific option to their patients, so as to ensure maximal treatment outcomes? And why isn't such an approach a routine and standard aspect to all chemotherapy nowadays? The science already exists! What is lacking is the necessary investment in making such tests more readily and routinely available.

There Can Be No 'Standard' Treatment, Because There Are No 'Standard' People

However, one of the problems we encounter here is the reality that the present orthodox medical model is run, as much as possible, on 'standardized' routines. This has the unfortunate effect of looking at each person as being a 'standard unit' which therefore needs a 'standard treatment.' Yet, this is not the reality found within the human species, which comes in a bewildering array of variability.

A core reason for why this mindset continues to remain locked into the medical model of therapy may well be the 'double-blind-placebo-controlled' trial system, which is still seen as the 'gold-standard' for determining what is real and what is false. The problem is that the foundation which underpins this 'double-blind-placebo-controlled-

trial' system is the strict need for all parameters being investigated to be as standardized as possible.

But this is a totally artificial representation of life, and until science and medicine can become more open to alternative ways of validating therapeutic interventions, this obsessive focus of forcing everything to be 'standardized' - including humans - will continue to reign supreme in regard to how doctors will subsequently view their patients.

This again highlights a major difference between how medicine and natural therapies perceive patients. Not every person's cancer, or migraine, or arthritis, or... is exactly the same. Hence, there is an urgent need to focus more on providing an individualistic approach to each person presenting with a specific disease.

Yet, one thing modern medicine seems to abhor is the need to individualize treatment protocols. Admittedly, this involves more work - as well as focus from each doctor involved. However, the outcomes of such individualized treatment programs also more than compensates for that extra work and focus, via the better results obtained, plus huge cost savings - to the patient; their insurers, and ultimately the government too.

Complementary and Alternative Treatments Could Save Governments Billions

In today's climate of economic melt-downs, bankruptcies and ever escalating costs, one huge factor often crippling Western governments is the need to pay for all that high-tech medicine. This precarious situation could be alleviated surprisingly quickly if Governments were only willing to mandate the many simpler - and cheaper - alternatives which do exist. Not just for cancer, but for a wide range of health issues, especially the more chronic ones like cardiovascular disease and diabetes, to name but two.

It's not 'politically correct' to mention this next point - especially within 'ear-shot' of Americans - but Cuba has already long been able to make this paradigm shift. Due to the various embargoes the West had placed upon them, plus the collapse of the Soviet Union, these factors forced the Cubans to come up with highly successful, yet much more cost-effective ways of dealing with their population's health issues, based on many of the points raised in this article.

Bringing all this back to the use of 'chemo-sensitivity' tests, once these are done on a more routine basis, then an individually calculated drug combination can be applied for each specific person, thereby ensuring maximal therapeutic benefits for all those treated - and maximum cost:benefit results as well.

It also ensures making any side-effects more 'worth-while' - nothing worse than being given a chemo drug; getting lots of severe side-effects... and then finding out your particular cancer is actually resistant or minimally sensitive to that drug! Such sensitivity tests are simple to do as they only require a sample of blood - not an actual tissue sample, which would need a biopsy or surgery.

Chemo or Radio - to Supplement with Nutrients or Not?

It's already known that chemo can deplete the body of a range of specific nutrients. Similarly, the body needs more of certain nutrients or herbs to repair the damage done by these drugs - to the heart, the nerves, muscles, etc. Surely, it therefore makes sense to think of at least priming the body with those depleted nutrients, or a range of general nutrients known to help repair the body, as well as help the liver to detox the chemo drugs?

For instance, glutamine is one such substance known to help protect and repair the cells of the gut lining, which are particularly prone to destruction by chemotherapy. It also stimulates neutrophils, macrophages and other immune cells - there's that crucial role again, of a healthy immune system for anyone with cancer!

Acetyl-L-carnitine and L-theanine are but two further nutrient examples - out of many - which are useful in helping prevent or minimize chemo-induced brain fog. This symptom is yet another little discussed, but very debilitating side-effect of present day, conventional cancer treatments.

Chemo-Brain - a Most Debilitating Syndrome

'Post-Chemo Brain' is an important side-effect, neither acknowledged nor treated enough in orthodox medicine. For a long time, if patients experiencing such cognitive dysfunction (foggy-mind; poor recall and memory, lack of concentration, problems with word recall, poor ability to organize one's daily life, dyslexia, poor tolerance of stress, etc.), and complained to their doctors about it, it was seen as being due solely to anxiety, depression, menopause or hormone therapy for cancer.

For a long time medicine denied that chemo-drugs could have such type of effects on the brain. Remember the time when PMS was similarly denied to be a real health issue? Or Autism, ADHD, and Chronic Fatigue? Yet, it is now known that certain chemo drugs, like 13-cis-retinoic acid or 5-fluorouracil can cause neurological damage. These symptoms can also last for years, and have serious repercussions on people's ability to function fully in life, or their ability to do their work. ⁽³¹⁾

Clinical experience has also shown various nutritional protocols to result in less chemo drug-resistance developing in patients - a significant problem within cancer therapy. Such resistance can occur because a specific gene, the MDR-1 (multi drug resistant) gene switches on the cellular 'Pgp pump', allowing cancer cells to more effectively remove toxins from itself. When this gene is activated, cancer cells become very efficient at removing the chemotherapeutic drug from their interior.

Clinically, it has also been found that those people with a low antioxidant status (which can be tested for) don't do as well with conventional cancer treatments.

All cancer patients should automatically be tested for a range of nutritional deficiencies or excesses. For instance, studies have shown that vitamin D is particularly low in cancer patients, and yet vitamin D is now known to play a significant role in maintaining a healthy and functional immune system. ⁽³²⁾

The New York University did a study where very ill cancer patients were encouraged to have a few hours of daily sun exposure, resulting in a significant and positive impact on their prognosis. ⁽³³⁾

Similarly, copper and zinc levels should be checked for. Cancer patients are often found to be high in copper, which in turn can stimulate angiogenesis (the formation of blood vessels into cancer tissue).

Inflammation is inevitably a major component in any cancer situation, and should be tested for (via h.s.-CRP), as well as treated using known natural anti-inflammatory substances or herbs, such as curcumin (from turmeric), vitamin C, fish oils, ginger, boswellic acid, barley grass, and others.

Vitamin C in Cancer

A study on the use of intravenous vitamin C for end-stage cancer patients has shown that due to its ability to inhibit inflammation, such intravenous use of this vitamin is

also capable of slowing or minimizing the inflammation which drives cachexia. Vitamin C, used in the high intravenous doses, is also capable of inhibiting SIRS (systemic inflammatory response syndrome) and multiple organ failure, which are endemic in end-stage cancer patients.

Even at moderate doses of such intravenous, plus oral administration of vitamin C (10 g I.V every 3rd day + 4 g/day oral - hardly high doses!), patients showed less fatigue, nausea or vomiting, pain, better appetite, improved cognitive function, as well as better emotional status. ⁽³⁴⁾

A possible mechanism for why vitamin C works in these ways is because a cancer cell sees it as a glucose molecule - which it is always 'hungry' for. So, when cancer cells absorb such vitamin C, and it then interacts with iron within the cell, this results in the release of peroxide, which preferentially damages the cancer cells, from which they have a hard time repairing themselves. Vitamin K-3 is known to further enhance such anti-cancer effects of vitamin C.

Dr. Matthias Rath gave a most informative speech about how vitamin C is an important tool for managing cancer. You might like to read more about how this simple, cheap, *un-patentable* vitamin offers much hope for cancer victims. ⁽³⁵⁾

The Crucial Role of Toxins in Cancer Development - and Treatment

A 240 page Report, based on a study done by the US President's Cancer Panel was released in May 2010. The advice from 45 authorities, drawn from a range of expertise, was to actively reduce exposure from carcinogenic substances, rather than just focusing on early detection of cancer - as important as this may be.

The panel also suggested enhanced monitoring of potential carcinogenic effects of mobile phones and wireless technology, as well as the medical use of radiation in both treatment and diagnosis of various health issues.

The Report therefore affirms the need to become better educated about these chemicals and toxins, such as various chemicals found in plastics and pesticides, known to disrupt our endocrine (hormonal) system. There is also the reality that the human body is already loaded with a wide range of chemicals, found via studies on umbilical cord blood. ⁽³⁶⁾

One other missing aspect to orthodox cancer treatments is the need to focus on *quality* of life. Far too much of the focus is solely on how much a cancer drug is capable of shrinking tumors, rather than focusing more on longevity, as well as *quality* of life produced by the treatment.

Big Pharma Far Too Often Fails Those With Cancer

It needs to be understood how the FDA has allowed ‘fast-track’ approval of a range of drugs for cancer on the understanding that further follow-up, post-marketing studies are done to check for side-effects not found in the short-term trials. The sad reality is that some cancer drugs, like Erbitux and Gleevec - the former first approved by the FDA in March of 2006, and the latter in May of 2001 - have still not had such studies finalized. ⁽³⁷⁾

It’s important to realize that often these post-marketing studies do show that the perceived advantages of various drugs, found in the short-term, are not borne out with further use over time. One example is the anti-leukemic drug Mylotarg, where such post-marketing studies showed that patients on this drug had a higher death rate (5.7%) compared to the control group (1.4%).

Similarly, Avastin hasn’t increased longevity; produces a long list of side-effects, such as abnormal white blood cell levels, hypertension, fatigue, bleeding and gastrointestinal perforations, and in the USA cost patients \$8,000/month. Yet, it continues to be promoted by many conventional oncologists. ⁽³⁸⁾ In recent times it’s not unusual to find many cancer drugs costing (in the USA, but most likely in Australia too) - the patient, or the health funds/governments - up to \$100,000 or more to do a therapeutic course. ⁽³⁹⁾

The High Cost of Long-Term Side-Effects

Another big problem, not discussed often enough within the orthodox medical model is the ongoing side-effects found over time, *post* chemo or radiation. For instance, radiotherapy to the chest area can result in heart and lung damage, causing many problems in these organs as time goes by.

Another serious side-effect of chemo or radiotherapy is the ironic reality that the very therapies used to treat cancer can in themselves *cause* cancer later on in life! Studies have been done in children treated for cancer between 1970 and 1986 and the results

showed that in such cancer survivors, they were 11 times more likely to have further health issues, like cancer, than the general population. Additionally, most of the subsequent deaths were found to be due to the *secondary* cancer induced by the original cancer *treatments*.⁽⁴⁰⁾

Other side-effects of present cancer treatments include: bone problems; fertility problems; gastrointestinal issues; vascular damage resulting in strokes or heart attacks; damage to the nerves or muscles... and the list goes on.

Cancer Treatment is Not Over Once You're Rid of The Tumor

This brings up a most important point, which presently isn't being acknowledged by conventional medicine. From a medical perspective, once the tumor has been cut out, or shrunk to scar tissue by either radiotherapy or chemo, it's accepted that your cancer has been effectively dealt with.

Admittedly, the word 'cure' isn't used till such a person with previous cancer has survived a further 5 years, but overall, aside from regular monitoring to ensure the cancer hasn't returned, not much else is offered to such patients post-treatment.

Diet is rarely discussed; some token advice may be given about lifestyle - such as you should stop smoking, or lose some weight - but usually not much more. Hopefully, reading this article has helped explain that cancer is not just something that comes out of nowhere, nor that it is 'just a 'local lump' - for the non-blood type cancers.

Cancer is a multi-layered health crisis, which has often been brewing for years to decades, enhanced by a myriad of stimuli such as environmental toxins; years of stress, often exacerbated by chronic insomnia; poor food choices resulting in further toxemia (spray residues, food colorings, various additives, flavorings, etc. etc.) plus nutrient deficiencies (beans in a can are *not* the same as fresh beans!); too much alcohol; definitely cigarettes; possibly recreational drugs... let alone years of negative thinking or other unresolved, chronic emotional traumas. You get the idea!

Just as there are many layers to the manifestation of cancer, so too is there a crucial necessity to realize that to effectively eradicate a cancerous *constitution* - rather than some localized 'lump' - takes so much more than a 'silver bullet' approach; as appealing as such a concept may be due to its greater ease.

Once the acute phase of cancer treatment is over - in other words, you've had your surgery, or chemo, or radio - then comes 'mopping up time!' This involves not just detoxing the body from the various drugs you have been given during the acute phase, but also needs to include a 'detoxing' of various often long-standing mental and emotional issues too.

As well, there is a crucial need to help restore the damage done to the body by orthodox medical interventions, such as chemo or radio. This is where a vast range of nutrients, herbs and other more natural treatment protocols have much to offer, as touched on before.

Conventional or Natural Cancer Treatment? It's Not an Either-Or Situation

So, let's be clear here that it's *not* being suggested you should automatically avoid conventional medical options for treating your cancer. Far from it! For some people, these options can truly be life-saving.

However, don't for a moment kid yourself that the 'cut, burn or toxify' your cancer to kingdom-come-approach will be enough by itself. Equally... far from it!

In this article, what I hope has been achieved is to at least provide you with even a glimmer of the much broader issues at stake for anyone dealing with cancer. Plus, the reality that there are so many more options you can choose to do as *complementary* approaches to treating your cancer.

On a general level, one thing that orthodox medicine has long taken away from patients is the need to be more responsible for their health, or to encourage greater self-motivation in getting back to health - at least to a far greater extent than is generally suggested at present.

The conventional model has basically implied you can eat what you like; do what you like; think what you like; play with whatever non-constructive emotions you like, and then when you get sick... the 'gods' of medicine will have the 'magic cure' for you; all *you* need to do is to pop the pill, or take the recommended treatment protocol. And please don't ask too many questions... *'we're very busy people, and besides, we know what we're doing.'*

Yes, many 'magical' solutions are available from modern medicine - and thank goodness so many of them do exist. I certainly wouldn't want to undergo surgery

without an anesthetic, or the option for antibiotics! However, what needs to be regained is a much deeper sense of what actually drives ill-health in the majority of cases. To what extent does our modern, dislocated way of living, plus toxic environments induce many of our maladies, including cancer?

Better Knowledge Leads to Better Choice Options

Therefore, coming from this platform of inquiry, how can we become more educated, and through such increased knowledge, become more pro-active in avoiding those things already often long-known to be dangerous to our health? Or, with a bit of rational, logical thinking, what are the things which may be wise to avoid, despite 'experts' still declaring them innocuous?

Remember, there was a time when:

- Asbestos was believed to be absolutely safe; totally inert. So said the 'experts' of those days!
- What about similar 'expert advice' regarding lead in petrol?
- DDT?
- Cigarettes? (we tend to forget that cigarettes were seen as totally innocuous even 30 years ago)
- Folic acid and Spina bifida connection? Hotly denied for about 15 years.
- The thymus was flatly declared to be nothing more than a 'vestigial gland' of no value - only 40-50 years ago. Now it's seen as the 'master gland' of the immune system.
- DES - was believed to result in 'strong babies'.
- Diabetes being a disease of 'carbohydrate toxicity' - believed by naturopaths for decades, yet only just now starting to be acknowledged in the last year or so.

And the list goes on...

People; patients, need to reclaim their power in regard to becoming more involved in their health - both in improving it; then maintaining it, or if they are unlucky enough to already be ill, then to work hard at becoming well again.

Be pro-active; ask questions, and whatever you do, don't have the attitude of... *'I'm in your hands Doc!'* That indeed can be lethal, especially if the medical advice you're tapping into and opening yourself up to is coming from a scientific paradigm already

long passé, yet with this fact still not being acknowledged - let alone even *understood* to be the case.

Is your doctor working from a Newtonian perspective, or from a more Quantum Physics perspective? Your life could be hanging by that seeming thread of nothing more than a paradigm, yet one that has a far greater power to control your destiny regarding survival than you might realize.

Please don't think that what has been discussed here is the 'be-all-and-end-all' of what in reality needs to be explored. See it more as an entrée to whet the appetite for the 'main course', which *you* now need to work on yourself by doing the requisite further research, hopefully using some of the leads given below, as well as some of the concepts explored in this article.

Concluding Thoughts

O.K. so there you have it. This is just a tiny peek into a surprisingly large arena of alternative, unconventional, wholistic approaches to dealing with cancer. Inevitably, such methods offer much gentler, safer, yet effective ways for managing this devastating health condition, with less side-effects and long-term destructive consequences to the body.

And remember again... your choice is not necessarily an either:or between conventional versus more wholistic treatment options.

Hopefully, despite the length of the article, it has supplied you with a far more powerful platform from which to understand the limitations of what conventional medicine offers you to manage your cancer, and just how many other viable options do exist.

Although, in reality this has only been a relatively brief foray into the vast arena of other cancer treatment options, nevertheless, along with doing some of your own research on many topics not able to be discussed here, such extra knowledge will greatly empower your Journey with this serious health condition.

In many Western countries, one often sees volunteers on the streets, or in the Malls, collecting donations for 'cancer research.' All too frequently we hear on the News about some marvelous 'cancer breakthrough'... which will soon become mainstream - '*but we just need some more funds to bring it to fruition*'. The utterly frustrating

reality is that already more than enough alternative or complementary, viable, safe, cost-effective cancer treatments exist.

Although conventional cancer treatments may help shrink tumors - a major yardstick by which medicine judges 'treatment success' - such 'successes' also come with long lists of side-effects which make some cancer patients question whether their extra time alive is actually worth it!

An 'effective' cancer treatment needs to do far more than simply shrink tumors, or get tumor markers back to 'normal'. What requires far more attention is to ensure that any meaningful cancer treatment also provides not just greater *quantity* of time, but equally important... *quality* of life during, and especially after treatment. Anything less is not acceptable when alternatives do already exist.

Further Reading/Viewing

- This is a brilliant YouTube link on the use of diet in cancer, titled: **William Li: Can we eat to starve cancer?**. The link is at: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=B9bDZ5-zPtY&hd=1> REALLY worth watching!! (still available as of 27.1.13)
- Pert, Candice, *Molecules of Emotion*. An authoritative book for those needing scientific validation that your emotions have powerful effects on your body - both negatively and positively.
- Myss, Caroline, *Anatomy of the Spirit*. This book explores the powerful link between emotions and most health conditions, including cancer.
- Sleeman, Jesse, *Cry for Health*. A very thoroughly documented book exploring the way genuine health has itself become a casualty to modern science and medicine. Available from: <http://www.dragonlairpublishing.com.au/>
- Simonton, Carl, *Getting Well Again*. One of the earlier explorers of the mind:body connection to disease, and how to better manage this aspect.
- King, Petrea, *Quest for Life*. This book explores how to *live* well with cancer and other life-threatening diseases.
- LeShan, Lawrence, *Cancer as a Turning Point*. For those interested in the psychological aspects of cancer.
- Moss, Ralph, *An Independent Consumer's Guide*. A thorough investigation and report on cancer treatment options, both natural or conventional. (see *Moss Report* below)
- Moss, Ralph, *Moss Report*. www.cancerdecisions.com Ralph Moss PhD, is a former science writer who, over a 35 year period has investigated the validity of many alternative cancer treatments, and presently offers informational reports on cancer treatment options for those struggling to make a treatment decision.
- World Research Foundation. This organization offers a wider range of treatment options for a broad range of health issues. They can be contacted via their headquarters: WRF Headquarters and Main Library, 41 Bell Rock Plaza Sedona, AZ 86351. USA. Phone: (928) 284-3300. (928) 284-3300. Fax: (928) 284-3530. E-mail: info@wrf.org

Other Alternative Cancer Therapies Worth Exploring

Here's a list of other key-words to use in your further research on a wide range of alternative or complementary cancer treatment options:

- Avemar
- Budwig therapy
- Digitalis - (Wayne Martin)
- Dipyrindomole - (Wayne Martin)
- DMSO - especially for lymphomas
- Dr. Nicolas Gonzalez
- Essiac therapy
- Flax Lignans (www.flaxlignanhealth.com)
- Hoxsey therapy
- Iscador
- Issels Therapy
- Kelly Metabolic diet
- Laetrile
- Max Gerson Diet
- Low Dose Naltrexone - <http://www.lowdosenaltrexone.org/>
- Pancreatic Enzyme therapy - Wobenzyme®.
- Photodynamic therapy (PDT)
- Tagamet
- Urea therapy for liver cancer

References

- 1) Townsend Letter. Aug/Sept. '11. 337/338. p. 96-101;
- 2) Townsend Letter. Oct. '11. 339. p. 68-71
- 3) Townsend Letter. Dec. '11. p. 341. 33-34
- 4) Townsend Letter. Aug/Sept. '11. 337/338. p. 60
- 5) Townsend Letter. Nov. '94. 136. p. 1213-1214
- 6) Townsend Letter. Nov. '01. 220. p. 20
- 7) Townsend Letter. Oct. 135. p. 1128
- 8) International J. of Alternative & Complementary Med. Jan. '96. 14.(1).9
- 9) Townsend Letter. Oct. '93. 123. p. 1027-1032
- 10) Townsend Letter. Aug/Sept. '11. 337. 338. p. 60
- 11) *ibid.* p. 61
- 12) *ibid.* p. 61
- 13) Townsend Letter. Dec. '11. 341. p. 35
- 14) Campbell TC, Campbell II, Thomas M: *The China Study: The Most Comprehensive Study of Nutrition Ever Conducted and the Startling Implications for Diet, Weight Loss and Long-term Health.* Dallas, TX: BenBella Books 2006
- 15) Campbell TC. *Influence of nutrition on metabolism of carcinogens.* Adv. Nutr. Res. 1979;2:29-55
- 16) Doll R, Peto R. *The cause of cancer: Quantitative estimates of avoidable risks of cancer in the United States today.* J. Natl. Inst. 1981;66:1192-1265
- 17) Wynder EL, Gori GB. *Contribution of the environment to cancer incidence: an epidemiologic exercise.* J. Natl. Cancer Inst. 1977;58:825-232
- 18) Bruce WR, Wolever TMS, Giacca A. *Mechanisms linking diet and colorectal cancer: the possible role of insulin resistance.* Nutr. Cancer. 2003;37:19-26

- 19) Townsend Letter. Aug/Sept. '11. 337/338. p. 72-3; 89-90
- 20) Townsend Letter. Feb/March '11. 331/332. p. 36
- 21) Townsend Letter. Oct. '01. 219. p. 14
- 22) Nexus Magazine. June/July. '10. 17. (4). 9
- 23) Townsend Letter. Oct. '00. 207. p. 34-36
- 24) Nexus Magazine. June/July. '01. 8. (4). 15
- 25) Townsend Letter. Oct. '10. 327. p. 50-55
- 26) Townsend Letter. Aug/Sept. '11. 337/338. p. 55
- 27) *ibid.* p. 62
- 28) *ibid.* p. 65
- 29) *ibid.* p. 62
- 30) Townsend Letter. June. '98. 179. p. 62
- 31) Townsend Letter. Aug/Sept. '11. 337/338. p. 47
- 32) *ibid.* 71
- 33) Ott, J. *Health and Light*. New York: Simon & Schuster; 1976
- 34) Townsend Letter. Aug/Sept. '11. 337/338. p. 44
- 35) Rath, Matthias, MD, *Cancer Can Be Beaten*, http://www4.dr-rath-foundation.org/NHC/cancer/lecture/new_york_2002_09_29.htm New York City, September 29, 2002
- 36) Environmental Working Group. July 14. 2005. *Body burden - the pollution in newborns: A benchmark investigation of industrial chemicals, pollutants and pesticides in umbilical cord blood.*
- 37) Townsend Letter. Aug/Sept. '11. 337/338. p. 43
- 38) *ibid.* p. 43-44
- 39) Townsend Letter. Dec. '11. 341. p. 36

40) Townsend Letter. Aug/Sept. '11. 337/338. p. 46

41) Townsend Letter. June. '01. 215. p. 148

42) Braden, Gregg, *Deep Truth*, Hay House Inc. 2011. p. 20

Feel free to share this article with those you know may benefit from reading it. However, please also do take note of the copyright statements below.

If you started reading this article from one of Peter de Ruyter's websites, and wish to return to that site, simply close this page by clicking on the [X] in the top right hand corner of this screen, which will automatically bring you back to the page you started from....

..... or click the links to his other websites:

www.articlesandbooks.net

www.holistic-hypothyroidism-solutions.com

www.self-empowerment-through-mind-power.com

Copyright © Peter de Ruyter-2011-All Rights Reserved

Permission is hereby granted to freely share this information on the understanding that *no part of the text is altered in any manner whatsoever, and that due credit is given to the author, with details of his websites left intact, i.e.*

www.articlesandbooks.net

www.holistic-hypothyroidism-solutions.com

www.self-empowerment-through-mind-power.com

Please also note:

No part of this article is intended as a form of diagnosis or prescription on physical, mental or emotional levels. If, after reading any data in this article you decide to instigate a change in your present therapeutic regime, then it is *imperative* to also seek out the professional services of an appropriate specialist – either natural or medical for further expert advice.

My intent as author of this article is solely to provide information of an educational nature. No responsibility can be accepted for your actions or their consequences, in the event you use any information from this article with which to change your life in any manner whatsoever.