

# Has The War On Cancer Has Been Lost?

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.peterderuyter.com](http://www.peterderuyter.com)

[www.articlesandbooks.net](http://www.articlesandbooks.net)

[www.holistic-hypothyroidism-solutions.com](http://www.holistic-hypothyroidism-solutions.com)

[www.self-empowerment-through-mind-power.com](http://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: 'Has The War On Cancer Been Lost?'

PUBLISHED BY: Peter de Ruyter - 22.4.13.

EDITION: First Edition

## ***The “War On Cancer” - As Successful As Big Pharma, Medicine, and The Media Would Have You Believe?***

The demand for alternative cancer treatments has been increasing of late, as people become more aware that what they have been told about the ‘war on cancer’ is not quite as accurate as Big Pharma and medicine generally would have you believe.

Alternative cancer treatments are left to languish, while the results from various cancer therapy trials are routinely ‘Spun’ in order to present a more favorable interpretation of what actually occurred in those trials. The unfortunate truth is that far too many doctors are also caught up in that ‘Spin’, in turn passing on to their patients what can only be seen as biased and often inaccurate trial conclusions in regard to efficacy and safety.

However, basing decisions for orthodox cancer treatments on such flawed conclusions, particularly about chemotherapeutic drug efficacy, can have major and often negative ramifications on those patients’ lives. Indeed, it can be the cause of them losing their lives! Especially, if alternative cancer treatments - as viable therapy options - have not even been broached with such cancer patients.

A study was published in 2013 by researchers from the University of Toronto, in the ‘Annals of Oncology’, titled: ‘*Bias in reporting of end points of efficacy and toxicity in randomized, clinical trials for women with breast cancer*’. This analysis found that from 164 randomized Phase III Clinical Trials, a third were falsely reported as being positive in outcome, despite not achieving the specific end points pre-set for those trials.

### **Changing Trial Parameters Mid-Way through A Study**

Another tactic used by those researching cancer treatments, which are not living up to pre-trial expectations, is to then focus on less important outcomes. Here, such researchers often make fundamental changes to the primary objectives as originally set out for those trials - but, instigated halfway through those assessments! That is not genuine science; that is fraud - particularly when this allows a pharmaceutical company to massage the final outcomes to make them look more positive than they were.

Similarly, researchers of the University of Toronto study, mentioned above, also noted that in two-thirds of trials examining a new cancer therapy, there was significant bias in the way toxicities were reported. In such cases, they simply

deleted any mention of unwanted toxic effects from the abstracts and conclusions, or ensured they were hidden in the small print.

### **Sounds More Like Plain Ol' Deception!**

There is only one word that adequately describes such 'scientific' shenanigans - fraud! Yet, these are often the same people who constantly point the finger at those engaged in alternative cancer treatments as being 'unscientific'!

So, why do many of these multi-million dollar pharmaceutical companies engage in such shady and definitely unscientific activities? The reality is that the primary way such companies are able to 'prove' that their product is worth releasing onto the market is via the use of the golden 'yard-stick' of the 'Double-Blind, Placebo-Controlled Trial' (DBPCT) methodology.

But such DBPCT trials are hideously expensive to run, hence any pharmaceutical company trying to get a specific cancer therapy onto the market, via this system, also needs to recoup their financial investment in having to use such a complicated, and often time-consuming system of validation.

### **The Profit Motive Is The Fundamental Driver Of Pharmaceutical Decisions**

Hence, the main focus for such drug companies is the need not just to produce new drugs for cancer treatments - or any other health issues for that matter - but to make enough profit from such drugs to pay for the initial research, plus the relatively short patent-time they have access to once the drug hits the open market.

The driving force behind such forms of 'validation' are therefore essentially profit-driven, rather than what is best for patients, or even what else could be used more safely and more effectively: read - alternative cancer treatments.

But, from Big Pharma's perspective, such alternative cancer treatments are mostly un-patentable, and hence fundamentally incapable of recouping the extraordinary expenses incurred by the DBPCT methodology.

### **Fraud In Business Has Become 'Normalized'**

The fact that a high degree of fraud is now seen as: '*part of business*', is further vindicated by another study, this time published in the March 2012 edition of 'Nature', which showed that far too many trials were not able to be replicated. Yet, the ability to replicate the research findings of other scientists is a core

aspect of the supposed scientific process of validating any particular trial, or research conclusion.

This study, reported in 'Nature', was able to show that of 53 basic, preclinical studies on a new cancer therapy, only 6 were able to be validated. Again, this amounts to gross distortions of the 'scientific process', if not frank deception by the pharmaceutical industry.

### **Nowadays, The 'Fox' Is In Charge Of The 'Hen-house'**

It needs to be remembered that most drug trials - be that for cancer treatments or other health issues - are funded by the pharmaceutical company wanting to bring that drug to market. This immediately sets up a huge financial incentive to therefore get the results that will ensure a marketable end-product, after millions of dollars in research expense.

It also creates enormous pressure on those scientists on the payroll of Big Pharma to produce results that will allow for those research expenses to be recouped.

And humans being humans....!

As Mary Budiger describes in the August/September 2011 edition of 'Townsend Letter': *'cancer is a multibillion dollar market and growing fast'*.

### **Economic Incentives Distorting Scientific Validation Systems**

From an alternative cancer treatments perspective, the unfortunate reality is that drugs are far too often tested in inadequately designed trials, or trials specifically manipulated to get a predestined result. Such activities are inevitably fueled by the core, financial drivers mentioned earlier.

Sadly, this reality now taints all modern, scientific trials with enough suspicion to affect their integrity. Science was once seen as synonymous with qualities such as genuine curiosity, honesty, dedication, determination and other respectable virtues - but no longer. The intrusiveness of economics into this formerly unsullied arena has made sure of that.

Far too frequently, many trials also use patients who have been selected under excessively narrow criteria, which minimally reflect what normally occurs in real-life situations. Additionally, what is likewise found in modern medical research is

the frequent use of all sorts of analytical sleight-of-hand so as to get precisely the desired conclusions with which to ensure those drugs will make it to market.

### **Tumor Shrinkage, Not Longevity Has Become The Marker Of Success**

Another major factor leading to a distorted perception of how effective a new cancer therapy may be, relates to 'success' being measured primarily by how much a certain drug is capable of *shrinking* a tumor. However, such tumor shrinkage does not automatically translate into longer survival, let alone a longer lifespan with good *quality* of life.

The reality is that for many cancer researchers, tumor shrinkage is a quick and handy way of measuring effect, as it can be done in the test-tube or laboratory; is easy to see, and compared to using life extension as a yardstick of success, tumor shrinkage is so much faster.

And time = money in the pharmaceutical industry. As it is for most businesses, which begs the question - from an alternative cancer treatment perspective - of whether financial gains alone should play such a massive role in determining which drugs make it to market? Especially when it's not just the quality of a person's life that is at stake, but their actual ability to stay in cancer remission too.

### **Tumor Shrinkage Alone Is A Useless Marker Of Success**

Therapists dealing with alternative cancer treatments have long stated that tumor shrinkage alone is a very poor predictor of how a cancer will progress over time. Initial, seemingly dramatic declines in tumor mass do not automatically correlate with longer survival times, nor do they correlate with a lesser tendency for that cancer to metastasize.

The problem is that metastatic cancers - those that have spread from the primary tumor - are the ones which kill most people with cancer. Yet, this is an arena where alternative cancer treatments have much to offer.

Yet, despite metastasis being the major cause of death in cancer, the reality is that between 1972 and 2004, only one half of a percent of studies sponsored by the NCI had anything to do with metastasis.<sup>(1)</sup> A major reason is that metastatic cancer research is so much more fraught with challenges compared to simply searching for compounds that show quick, measurable shrinkage of a tumor via laboratory settings, animal models, test-tube experiments, or via CT or MRI Scans.

### **Tumor Shrinkage Has Little To Do With Cancer Survival**

Tumor shrinkage, therefore, is a quick and readily detected yardstick of 'success' when done in cancer cell-line models, or mouse models, but hardly relates back to

the normal, daily reality of people dealing with cancer. Equally, using tumor shrinkage as the foremost gauge of success or failure of any cancer treatments, doesn't take anywhere near as long as using actual length of survival *time* for cancer patients, or any change in the occurrence of metastasis.

For example, although two anti-cancer drugs Avastin and Erbitux were found to shrink tumors, the former drug only extended life in bowel cancer by a mere 4.7 months, while the latter wasn't able to prolong life at all, *despite tumor shrinkage*. Other examples of failed drugs, which nevertheless were often released onto the market, include interferon, intereleukin-2, Endostatin and Gleevec.

From an alternative cancer treatments perspective, it highlights again the reality that the 'yard-sticks' - such as tumor shrinkage - used so ubiquitously within the pharmaceutical industry in order to bring a new cancer therapy to market, are fundamentally flawed in their focus.

### **Modern Cancer Research Is Disconnected From Day-To-Day Reality**

So often, medical science will denounce alternative cancer treatments as pseudo-science. Yet, in the same breath, cancer researchers will claim to be 'curing' cancer within the laboratory. However, this is inevitably a far cry from what actually occurs when such drugs are finally used within normal, average, daily-life settings. The fact remains that an inherently flawed model is equally inherently incapable of providing accurate and reliable, *real-life* data.

The many different, artificial cancer models, so heavily relied upon by cancer researchers, are invariably too simplistic, while also not matching the reality of what happens in an average person dealing with cancer, sitting in front of any particular doctor consulting in a day-to-day community setting.

Yet, 'breakthroughs' in cancer treatment, predictably achieved via such unrealistic and artificial laboratory settings, are nevertheless trumpeted across global media as genuine 'progress' in beating cancer! Sadly, this is far from the truth. By the same token, when News about various alternative cancer treatments is released, these are all too frequently ignored by main-stream medicine.

### **Stock Exchange Tactics In Medical Science Research & Reporting**

All the various shenanigans touched on above are inherently inconsistent with what is normally understood to mean: 'the scientific process'. This sort of mischief is more what one would expect from an entity like the Stock Market - as proven by recent events leading up to the 2008 GFC!

But it goes further, because when it comes to finally announcing trial results, another study by Erick Turner, published in the New England Journal of Medicine, shows additional ways in which the pharmaceutical industry brings bias to the table. For example, he examined all the trials of antidepressant drugs filed with

the FDA. Of those examined, 38 studies were found to have a positive outcome, while 36 showed negative results.

However, where the bias leapt in is that in the end, 37 (of 38) of the positive studies *were* published, whereas *only* 3 (of 36) showing negative results were published. However, the stark reality is that such biased ‘informing’ of the medical community, also causes huge distortions in perception by doctors as to where the true science of new drug investigations is at.

### **Doctors Need Accurate Information To Pass On To Their Patients**

Furthermore, doctors rely heavily on accurate feedback from drug companies and their drug trial results, when it comes to knowing which cancer therapy they can safely and effectively recommend to their patients! Not only are cancer patients not given information about alternative cancer treatments, but even the *medical* advice is distorted, and often not the best option for that cancer patient.

This fact is further highlighted in another study, published in the January 2012 edition of the ‘Journal of The American College of Surgeons’, where the leading author of this study, Dr. Clara Lee, an Associate Professor of Surgery and Director of Surgical research at the University of North Carolina School of Medicine in Chapel Hill stated: *‘breast cancer survivors had fairly major gaps in their knowledge about their surgical options, including about the implications for recurrence and survival’*.

Obviously, many oncologists in the USA are not doing a thorough enough job of adequately informing early breast-cancer patients of their surgery options. Nor about their patients’ disease in general, let alone alternative cancer treatments that have shown definite therapeutic value, but are not ‘on the table’, because there is no financial incentive by pharmaceutical companies to bring them to market.

### **It’s Been 42 Years Since Nixon’s War On Cancer Was Announced**

Despite many alternative cancer treatments already existing, it was in 1971 that President Richard Nixon declared a ‘war on cancer’, with the belief that it would be a war won by 1976.

Well, the NCI (National Cancer Institute - USA) alone has since spent about \$105 billion, never mind the additional billions of dollars of cancer donations spent by a range of other anticancer organizations, universities and drug companies. By the same token, a minuscule amount of those funds have ever been spent on investigating or validating alternative cancer treatments.

So, where do we stand today in waging war on cancer? If you were to solely listen to these various ‘authorities’ on cancer treatments or research, you’d be led to believe that cancer is almost beaten... just a few more years!

## The Overall Cancer Death Rate Has Only Dropped By 5% In 55 Years!

The sad reality is that even when the data is adjusted for changes in population and other factors, we find that the *overall* death rate of cancer has only dropped 5% between 1950 to 2005 - that's a whopping 55 years! But this figure is even more appalling when you consider that in the same period of time, heart disease deaths, for instance, decreased by about 64%.

The news is especially bad for those diagnosed with a cancer that has already spread, or metastasized. If we look at breast cancer, for example, we find that a mere 20% of those for whom the cancer has metastasized live beyond 5 years, and this figure has changed little, despite all the billions of dollars spent on general cancer research. Another shocking statistic is the reality that only about 10% of those with metastatic colorectal cancer survive beyond the 5 year, supposedly 'cured' window.<sup>(2)</sup>

## Too Little Focus On Preventing Cancer

Unlike alternative cancer treatments approaches, so much of orthodox cancer research is not done on some of the basics driving cancer, such as a fundamental dysfunction within patients' immune systems, or the fact that cancer patients are predominantly metabolizing *anaerobically* - not aerobically. Equally, only a negligible amount of serious research gets done on how to prevent cancer, or the environmental causes of cancer.

Far too many of the present, orthodox research is focused on peripheral aspects to standard cancer treatment approaches, such as chemotherapy or radiotherapy, and almost none on alternative cancer treatments.

A tweak here; a tweak there... all with marginal improvements, often measured in no more than a few extra *months* of survival. And even then, not necessarily extra survival time commensurate with a good *quality* of life. Far too much emphasis is given to *quantity* of life alone, and not enough to the *quality* of life that survivors end up with after having to endure their combinations of orthodox chemotherapy, radiotherapy or surgery.

## Only A Relatively Few Cancers Respond To Orthodox Cancer Therapy

True, some survival advances have been made in certain childhood cancer statistics, such as childhood leukemia, or more adult cancers such as Hodgkin's lymphoma, or testicular cancer. Nevertheless, the fact remains that for most metastatic cancers, the outlook is bleak indeed, with a poor cancer survival rate. Because metastasized cancers are so much harder to cure, the reality is that for most people, their cancer treatments are not just a short burst of perhaps a few months of therapy... and then you're 'fixed.'

Unfortunately, the majority of metastatic cancers require ongoing radio or chemotherapy, and most of the time cannot be considered cured. This is where the language used by medicine can be rather deceptive.

### Research 'Lingo' Is Often Confusing And Misleading

Although alternative cancer treatment practitioners are sometimes accused of speaking in an esoteric language, many orthodox cancer researchers are not immune from using difficult-to-understand words either.

Researchers, promoting a new cancer therapy, may know what they mean when they use words like '*a significant survival advantage*', but for the average person this is understood to mean '*a significant cure*'. Sadly, this is not the case, as often such 'medical-speak' may only indicate a gain of a few extra months before the cancer inevitably comes back.

And when it does relapse - often with a vengeance - it frequently now does not respond to the previous drug/s used, or even new and different cancer drugs. One reason for this situation is that *generally* speaking, chemotherapy, as well as radiotherapy, only kill the most susceptible cancerous cells, while the more resistant cells are able to survive.

However, such surviving cancer cells do so under the exact same evolutionary pressures found in the creation of antibiotic resistant bugs. Hence, although a tumor may initially shrink as the more sensitive cancer cells die off, once those surviving, but now resistant cells start to multiply, so too does the tumor grow again.<sup>(3)</sup>

Unfortunately for the cancer patient, this time those resurgent cancer cells grow with a far greater virulence, as those surviving cells have been chemotherapeutically selected for greater resistance to orthodox cancer therapy. Even more unfortunate is the reality that by this point, such cancer patients also find themselves less responsive to the many alternative cancer treatments that might have been a better option to begin with.

Similarly, it needs to be understood that many times such alternative cancer treatment methods can be used in a truly *complementary* manner. It need not be an either/or choice, and hence should automatically be considered from the very beginning of any medical approach to managing cancer.

### Toxic Drugs; Many Side-Effects & Still A Poor Prognosis

Unfortunately, the end result of such distorted medical advice to cancer patients, as mentioned above, results in many people being bamboozled and misled into thinking that the often extraordinarily expensive, toxic drugs will actually save their life by *curing* them. Yet, the reality is that far too often all such orthodox

cancer therapy does is make them incredibly ill; bankrupts their finances... and still they die!

For instance, the ‘targeted drug’ Avastin (bevacizumab) comes at a yearly cost (in the USA) of about \$100,000 per year, per patient. And even in ‘lucky countries’ like Australia, where many of the orthodox cancer treatments are subsidized by the Government, this doesn’t detract from the hideous cost to society of trying to treat the large numbers of cancer cases, with often horrible side-effects, and little in the way of extra survival advantage.

### **Chemotherapy Can Make Future Cancer More Likely**

Furthermore, from an alternative cancer treatments perspective, other problems with standard chemotherapy include the reality that far too many cancer drugs are not adequately taken up by cancer cells, while the collateral damage to normal cells, and especially the immune system itself, can be devastating. We now also know that many types of orthodox cancer therapy can destroy the P53 tumor-suppressor gene.

This P53 tumor-suppressor gene is a vital one, required to help prevent cancer occurring within the body in the first place. Hence, if this gene is damaged, it invariably sets up those treated with chemotherapy with a greater chance of their cancer recurring about 6-11 years later. Ironically, this is after that statistically recognized ‘window’ of 5 years, when many oncologists will declare their patient ‘cured’ of cancer.

Such destruction of our own, inherent anti-cancer mechanisms can, therefore, allow for entirely new cancers to develop - far too frequently generated precisely by the incredible toxicity of the chemotherapy used earlier.

This is where alternative cancer treatments have lots to offer, by helping to bolster a flagging immune system - *the* single most important anti-cancer system in your body.

Science is finally having a more thorough look at their own forms of standard cancer treatments, and as they do so, they’re finding that trying to outsmart cancer using such orthodox forms of cancer therapy *alone* is found to be seriously deficient. It is high time that alternative cancer treatments be added to the equation.

### **Tumor Shrinkage + Lowered Cancer Markers Don’t = A ‘Cure’**

It’s true that many chemotherapy drugs may lower a range of cancer markers, as well as shrink tumors - at times to zero - thus lulling both doctors and patients into believing that cancer remission has been achieved. At this point in a standard cancer therapy, such cancer patients are told they can now ‘go home’, but invariably with no realistic or significant ways in which to try and resuscitate their

blasted immune systems, let alone the heavy collateral damage done to other organs and glands in their body.

Although it's coming from a '*better late than never*' attitude, nevertheless, at this point in a cancer patient's journey, alternative cancer treatments can still be extraordinarily valuable and effective in undoing much of the collateral damage left over from orthodox cancer treatments, such as chemotherapy or radiotherapy.

### **A Healthy Immune System Is The Best Defense Against Cancer**

Those of us who believe in a more natural approach to cancer management, also believe that a healthy immune system is *the* system, evolved over eons of time, best suited to be our primary defense against aberrant cells. From an alternative cancer treatments angle, this is a foundational concept in how to not just *prevent*, but also better *manage* cancer.

Our immune system has gained the most amazing and superb ability to seek out and thoroughly destroy any damaged, abnormal or frankly cancerous cells. That's an inherent part of its daily function. Contrary to the use of chemotherapy drugs, where cancer cells can mutate to *evade* the toxic effects of those drugs, a *healthily* functioning immune system is far more capable of destroying any cancer cells that try to change or otherwise evade detection.

Yet, as mentioned earlier, cancer cells are very capable of 'learning' how to better evade the deadly effects of chemotherapy. And one way they do so is by selecting for those cancer cells that have better internal *detoxing* capabilities, enabling them to more effectively pump those chemo drugs out of themselves.

### **Modern Cancer Treatments Leave Our Best Ally In Ruins**

If, in the name of 'curing' cancer, the immune system has been brought to the brink of destruction, then that leaves any surviving cancer patients in a very vulnerable position. Here, they are much more likely to come out of their supposed cancer remission by developing an entirely new cancer. It needs to be understood just how important and crucial a *healthy* immune system is in preventing cancer, or the metastasis of cancer.

It's precisely in this arena that alternative cancer treatments can offer such value, as a lot of their focus is in protecting, enhancing or regenerating the immune system. This doesn't have to be an *alternative* choice of treatment; it can be a genuinely *complementary* approach for any cancer patients to safely and effectively engage in.

As mentioned above, a major problem encountered in orthodox cancer treatments is the reality that cancer cells have a remarkably insidious way of changing themselves so as to allow for their maximal survival. Hence, it is also crucially important for cancer patients to fully grasp this reality - in other words, the ability

of cancer cells to 'evolve', thereby circumventing the toxic effects of a wide range of chemotherapeutic drugs.

However, cancer cells find it - not impossible - but far more difficult to circumvent a *healthy* immune system. It's only when that immune system becomes compromised in some way that cancer cells are then more likely to get the upper hand. Yet, via the use of a broad range of alternative cancer treatments, it truly *is* possible to strengthen an ailing immune system - often a major component to why someone developed cancer in the first place!

## Environmental Toxins And Cancer Development

Those therapists who come from a more alternative cancer treatments perspective have long claimed that environmental toxins play a massive role in fostering cancer.

Two recent reports<sup>(4,5)</sup> clearly indicate that the environment plays a significant role in the formation of cancer, specifically stating that the degree to which such environmental contaminants are implicated '*has been grossly under-estimated*'. This President's Report also states that the degree to which environmental pollutants do act as carcinogens has '*not been addressed adequately by the National Cancer Program*'.

Coming from an alternative cancer treatments perspective, this is not just something that has long been understood, but has also guided our creation of alternative cancer treatment programs.

It is estimated that we have over 80,000 chemicals which are routinely added to our environment, yet only a portion of those - about 15% - have actually been checked for human safety. Yet, we also now know that many of these chemicals are capable of not just damaging the immune system, but our very DNA too.<sup>(6,7)</sup>

The sad reality is that although science is aware of the many things known to hamper our immune systems, including the plethora of chemicals we've so nonchalantly flooded into our environment, be that into our food, land, homes or our public arenas, scientists haven't really used this knowledge in their standard cancer therapy protocols.

## Understanding Where Carcinogenic Toxins Come From

Environmental toxins bombard us from every which-way:

- pesticides and weedicides make up a large component of that contamination
- as do many pharmaceutical drugs themselves
- chlorine and fluoride in water, plus other chemicals used to 'purify' our water

- so many of the chemicals we encounter in our daily lives via our wide range of plastic products
- chemicals in our furniture and clothes
- fire-retardants in our carpets and electronic goods
- a plethora of noxious chemical in our cosmetics
- dry cleaning fluid residues
- exposure to radiation, via medical imaging like CT Scans, dental X-rays...

....and the list goes on.

It's already known that many of these chemicals are carcinogenic. However, as a great majority of them are not in edible or consumable products, their regulation by our supposed 'protective authorities' is scant, or entirely missing.

A major part of losing the war on cancer can be attributed to the fact that the main focus of present cancer therapy strategies is to simply kill the cancer cells as potently as possible, to the neglect of many other significant factors.

Unlike alternative cancer treatments, the present use of chemo and radiotherapy inevitably means a huge amount of collateral damage to the body - often to the point of death. Such lethal effects can either occur during the supposed 'treatment' for cancer, or in the years following - despite a patient having been declared in 'cancer remission.'

It is high time that a far greater focus is given to the reality that most times cancer inevitably occurs in a thoroughly toxic or depleted body - not a fundamentally healthy body.

Hence, that focus should also not be so much on killing the aberrant cells within the body - at enormous expense to the rest of our system - but rather, needs to be more focused on restoring that ailing, toxic or depleted body. Surely, that would make more sense? And this is exactly what an alternative cancer treatments approach *does* do!

In other words, a major part of any cancer therapy should also be focused on establishing *why* a body became so unable to 'see' cancer cells in the first place. It can't be repeated often enough that this inevitably involves a dysfunctional immune system, which requires much restoration and repair.

### **Studies Suggest Most Chemo Offers Little Survival Advantage**

It's long been suggested by those coming from an alternative cancer treatments perspective, that waging war on cancer through the use of chemotherapy *alone* seems a lost cause. A study done in Australia, and published in the journal '*Clinical Oncology*'<sup>(8)</sup> by three eminent oncologists, came to the conclusion that generally, chemotherapy contributes just over 2% improved survival in many cancer patients using this form of orthodox treatment alone.

These same authors state: "*there is also no convincing evidence, that using regimens with newer and more expensive drugs is any more beneficial than the regimens used in the 1970s.*"

This study was discussed in detail on the 18<sup>th</sup> April, 2005 by Dr. Normal Swan in his 'Health Report' program on Australia's ABC Radio National. The data in this study was obtained from a literature search of 5-year survival figures correlating solely to cancer treatment by chemotherapy of 22 main adult cancers, including prostate, bowel, lung and breast cancers.

### **'There Are None So Blind As Choose Not To See'**

Yet, despite increasing evidence that chemotherapy offers little advantage in prolonging survival, oncologists continue to sell chemotherapy as if it were a reasonable and valuable cancer therapy option. By the same token, most oncologists continue to ignore the wide range of alternative cancer treatments which have already proven their value - especially in Europe, Asia and elsewhere.

A major part of this conundrum is the way that cancer research is presented by organizations like the American Cancer Society. For instance, chemotherapy benefits are usually presented in statistical terms, which may be technically correct, but which nevertheless convey a misleading message to those in the public.

### **Confusing Language Results In Misleading The Public**

One example is the way the benefits of chemotherapy are described in terms of 'relative risk', which can give a significantly distorted view of reality, despite being technically correct. This is something those using alternative cancer treatments have long decried as misleading.

For example, a new or existing chemotherapy drug treatment may decrease a cancer patient's risk of dying from 4% to 2%, but cancer researchers will often describe this as a 50% decrease - but they're talking 'relative risk'.

Nevertheless, most people given such a statistic will interpret it to say that they have a 50% *greater* chance of surviving, when in fact it actually means the chance of becoming one of the cancer survivors has only increased by a mere 2% - quite a different scenario!

This is nothing but a statistical sleight of hand, yet is a technique overly used by researchers, plus a wide range of organizations within the cancer industry, thereby creating a lot of *disinformation*.

As touched on earlier, but worth repeating, another disturbing issue is the type of 'yard-sticks' used within clinical trials, when it comes to measuring the 'success' of a chemotherapy drug or regime. For instance, terms such as: 'recurrence-free

survival’; ‘progression-free survival’ or ‘disease-free survival’ are commonly used by researchers, but give a most inaccurate interpretation of what is actually going on for cancer patients receiving such cancer therapy.

Even though these kind of terms indicate a temporary stabilization of disease progress, it far too often rarely lasts for more than a few months. More often than not the cancer returns with a vengeance, while also having become resistant to the chemotherapy that had been used, or to a wide range of other chemotherapeutic agents available.

### **Very Little Survival Time Gained Despite Enduring Many Side-Effects**

Genuine improvements in survival are far too frequently measured in less than a few months. Not only do many cancer patients not gain much in the way of increased *quantity* of life, but they inevitably now also find themselves struggling with decreased *quality* of life, due to the very treatments they’ve had to endure.

Especially, when no alternative cancer treatments have been offered with which to help balance out the collateral damage orthodox treatments inevitably inflict upon cancer patients.

For instance, many women who have survived their chemo with drugs like the antacyclines, may end up with serious heart disease. Such drugs are already long known to weaken and damage the heart, yet a complementary approach, using natural treatments such as CoQ10, magnesium, Hawthorn (*Crataegus monogyna*), Arjuna (*Terminalia arjuna*), Vitamin E, Vitamin C, Resveratrol, and many more, could have helped minimize or avert such chemo side-effects.

### **Chemotherapy Is Known To *Cause* Cancer!**

Similarly, it is clearly known that radiotherapy, and many forms of chemotherapy can create what are called ‘cancer stem cells’. This is highly significant as such cells are themselves capable of morphing into future cancers. What is even more disturbing is the reality that cancers from such stem cells are often resistant to radiotherapy, or many forms of chemotherapy. These are the type of ‘relapse-cancers’ that all too frequently occur once the original cancer has supposedly been ‘cured’.

The main dilemma resulting from such orthodox cancer treatments is that those patients’ immune systems are left very depleted and damaged. This can have grave ramifications on survival ability into the future. It bears repeating - yet again! - that the immune system is the *primary* system capable of surveillance for, and destruction of abnormal or cancerous cells within our body. Equally, this is an area where alternative cancer treatments have much to offer when it comes to restoring the immune system.

## Misleading Trial Results Offer False Hope

Ironically, the proponents of alternative cancer treatments are often accused by those in orthodox medicine of 'selling false hope'. Yet, the problem remains that clinical trials, which describe their results by the range of 'success markers', mentioned in earlier parts of this article: '*Has The War On Cancer Been Lost?*', are offering nothing more than a highly distorted version of true reality when it comes to how effective a chemotherapeutic drug or regime actually is.

This creates the illusion within the general non-medical community that chemotherapy - especially for metastasized cancers - is far more effective than it is in reality.

Frankly, not only is this cruel to those subsequently enduring such cancer treatments - for so little genuine gain - but it borders on outright fraud by Big Pharma for promoting their cancer drugs in this way. Especially, when they so vehemently condemn - as well as actively prevent, through their influence on the medical system - the use of alternative cancer treatments.

This disinformation is further amplified when the Media reports on cancer 'successes' in such distorted ways - once more giving the perception to the average community member that orthodox cancer treatments are far more effective than they actually are.

## Most Cancer Patients '*Do As They're Told*' By Their Oncologists

The dilemma is that a further study<sup>(9)</sup> has shown that about 80% of patients take the treatment regime suggested by their oncologists. However, if those oncologists go by 'relative risk' figures - as this study shows they often do - then this also results in distorted advice being offered to cancer patients, when it comes to the absolute benefits any particular chemotherapeutic intervention might offer.

This is highly disturbing news, and despite this information coming from a scientific study, such data doesn't appear to have made much difference to the way the average oncologist continues advising their cancer patients. This is especially so, when Big Pharma's bias against alternative cancer treatments also results in these not being mentioned by oncologists - despite enough such treatments having shown their value.

## However, Oncologists Have Little Say In Advising About Alternatives

To be fair, there is another layer to this situation. The reality is that doctors are strictly controlled as to what they are legally allowed to offer as treatments - be that for cancer, or any other health condition. If a doctor dares to step beyond what orthodoxy accepts as 'accepted, standard procedure', they can be struck off

the Register, if not sued and/or jailed - especially in the USA, in regard to the latter. This is not a theoretical possibility; it has already occurred far too frequently.

That's one huge incentive to not stray into 'unorthodox' areas of treatment! Especially when it comes to prescribing alternative cancer treatments which have not been deemed 'acceptable' by those ruling the medical establishment.

Despite the continued hype by Big Pharma, the fact remains that - other than for small, select subgroups of certain cancers - chemotherapy has little to offer the *average* cancer patient. Yet, the overly optimistic hype and Spin by Big Pharma continues to influence and mislead both the oncologist, as well as those in the Media. Chemotherapy persists in being one of the most common forms of cancer treatments recommended by the average oncologist within the Americanized medical model - which includes the Australian medical scene.

### Why Such Selective Media Reporting?

You'd expect that a study, like the one mentioned above, would make world-breaking News... but hardly a peep was heard. The question needs to be asked as to why this was so? Equally, why do alternative cancer treatments inevitably draw a lot of what is often nothing but biased, negative press by the Media, or aren't mentioned at all?

One in 3 people can expected to get cancer, which makes the small amount of genuine progress in coming to grips with managing this often fatal disease even more significant. *Precisely* because *billions* of dollars have already been spent on research, one could reasonably expect that the reporting of such a huge failure in a major way of presently treating cancer should have made massive headlines in the Media - but it didn't!

Surely, a mere 2% increase in life expectancy from most chemotherapy, for such a broad spectrum of cancers, should initiate a major re-appraisal of this inevitably highly toxic and damaging way of managing cancer via conventional or orthodox means?

Equally, there needs to be a re-appraisal by medicine, of the many successful alternative cancer treatment methods that *do* exist - and if nothing else, to at least understand that they can inevitably be used in a *complementary* cancer treatment manner.

Others within the medical community have also voiced their opposition to the way Big Pharma increasingly uses 'relative risk' numbers to convey a distorted version of reality when announcing the effectiveness of drugs being researched - for cancer or other health issues.

## Medicine Itself Admits To Biased Reporting Within Research

Nevertheless, there's an odd phenomenon occurring within medicine, where - despite the dawning realization that the various scientific biases mentioned in this article *are* happening - they then seem unable to take that knowledge to the next step. One could realistically expect medicine to at least start thinking about a broadening of their present treatment horizons, tapping into already well researched and existing alternative treatment options.

Also, let's take a look at the reality that the News Media needs to wake up to their journalistic responsibilities of doing genuine research, and that they need to thoroughly check any data, which they now seem to blindly accept from a range of supposed 'authorities'.

Carrying on from the way an illusion of success is created by a range of research shenanigans, another example of such misrepresentation is provided by a Letter to the Editor, of the Journal: '*American Family Physician*'. In that letter, James McCormack, a member of the University of British Columbia, also argues against the misleading use of 'relative risk' figures when reporting clinical trial results.

McCormack used the example of how the research findings for certain drugs employed for osteoporosis have been grossly misrepresented by the Media. He cites a Journal which had stated that a bisphosphonate drug, utilized in the prevention and treatment of osteoporosis, had provided a '50% decrease' in the risk of new fractures occurring.

McCormack further explains this example, by stating that what the study tried to infer is that if this drug reduced fracture rates over a 3 year period from 8 to 5%, that this offered an almost 50% reduction in the potential to develop a fracture.

Once again, this may indeed be the decrease in 'relative risk', but in more realistic terms it simply indicates that this drug was able to decrease fracture rates from 8 to 5% - a mere 3% difference. But such distorted Spin results in a major difference as to how the original message of supposed 'success' was trumpeted to the community by Big Pharma, via the Media.

## Journalists Abrogating Their Responsibilities For Checking The Facts

And the Media cannot be let off the hook either, as it is the duty of *professional* journalists to *always check their facts!* Not just to regurgitate supposed 'facts' from supposedly ethical 'authorities'! This applies to medical sources whom the Media blindly believes, *and* proponents of alternative cancer treatments, whom are invariably *disbelieved* - on principle.

From my experience of 30+ years as a natural practitioner, it would appear that most journalists will automatically dismiss any News releases about breakthroughs

in various alternative cancer treatments. When questioned about such actions, most journalists will respond that their decision is based on ‘knowing’ that such treatments don’t, or can’t work. And why do they ‘know’ this? Well, because their medical or pharmaceutical ‘authorities’ told them so.

Rarely, are these alternative cancer treatments genuinely investigated in an unbiased manner, before the average journalist goes to print. This is not legitimate journalism; it’s nothing but Big Pharma propaganda, driven by a keen desire to maintain its market-share, and squash any competition. Not by any authentic *scientific* process!

When discussing such examples of how far too many researchers use misleading ways in which to report their findings, technically and mathematically they may be correct in explaining a trial result in a ‘relative risk’, or ‘progression-free survival’ manner. But *ethically* it is fraudulent, as it gives a far more optimistic, but highly distorted perspective of success than occurs in ‘real-life’ situations!

### Yet More Examples Of Spin By Cancer ‘Authorities’

There is another example of how statistics are often seriously distorted when reporting various ‘successes’ within the cancer industry, to the general community. An announcement was made some years ago, regarding how wonderful it was that the absolute number of deaths from cancer had fallen in the USA for the first time in 70 years. Various cancer experts, such as Dr. Andrew von Eschenback of the NCI (National Cancer Institute) called this: ‘*momentous news*’.

Another supposed expert, this time from the American Cancer Society, and head of its epidemiological research, Dr. Michael Thun, similarly declared that this decline in cancer deaths could be viewed as: ‘*a notable milestone*’.

Yet, as reported by cancer expert Ralph Moss, PhD, an authority in both alternative cancer treatments as well orthodox medical options, the decrease in number of deaths was a ‘stunning’ total of just 370! From a figure of 557,272 in 2003, to 556,902 in 2004. However, when this drop is presented as a *percentage*, it is no more than seven *hundredths* of one percent - or 0.066%!

Surely, this is not just some innocent ‘Spin’, but instead a frank attempt at deceit and deception of the highest order! Nevertheless, this style of grossly distorted ‘facts’ are what people within the general community are fed on a daily basis when it comes to how Big Pharma, the medical community, and the Media purport to ‘enlighten’ us to the ‘successes’ of modern cancer treatments.

### Just A Few Examples Of Successful Alternative Cancer Treatments

Let’s next look at just a few examples of successful, alternative cancer treatments which generally don’t get to see the light of day - not if Big Pharma can help it! Yet, even if we remain within the domain of still using chemotherapy, there are

already long-established, alternative cancer treatments that have stood the test of time.

One example of such an alternative treatment for cancer is the use of '[Insulin Potentiation Therapy](#)' Here, the concomitant use of insulin, along with low doses of normal chemotherapy can produce much enhanced outcomes. The snag - for Big Pharma! - is that only about 10% of a 'normal' chemo dose is required to obtain such therapeutic success!

And, as mentioned earlier in this article on: '*Has The War On Cancer Been Lost?*', the reality is that for a system like Big Pharma - which uses the profit motive as a core driver for deciding which drugs can be patented and hence researched - the promotion of any system of treatment which means a 90% *reduction* of sales of their drugs just... 'ain't gonna happen'!

Drug companies fund the vast majority of drug studies, and hence also decide which substances or procedures will be researched. From their perspective, it obviously doesn't make sense to promote any alternative cancer treatment methods that will result in only 10% of their product being used.

### **Whole Body Hyperthermia – Another Success Story**

Another complementary cancer treatment that has shown significant success is the use of whole body hyperthermia, *plus* the use of small amounts of chemotherapy. Once more, the addition of such heat treatment seems to accentuate the effects of chemotherapy, so that far less of those drugs need to be used to still get a very good treatment outcome.

Equally, this example of a complementary cancer treatment - long used by the Germans, for instance - has been ignored or stifled by the Americanized system of orthodox cancer treatment found not only in America, but in countries like the UK and Australia too.

Frankly, that's a lot of people who are not being given an option to use such alternative cancer treatments!

Just a few more examples of viable, alternative cancer treatments, which can be used singly or with orthodox cancer therapies include:

- Artemisinin
- Avemar
- Beljanski therapy
- Beta-glucans
- Budwig therapy
- Burzynski Antineoplastons protocol
- Cats claw - *Uncaria tomentosa*

- Coley's toxins
- Curcumin
- DMSO + low dose chemotherapy
- Flax lignans
- Flor-Essence, 'Essiac' or Renee Caisse therapy
- Gerson therapy
- Gonzalez therapy
- Graviola
- Hoxsey therapy
- Hydrogen peroxide & ozone therapies
- Intravenous vitamin C
- Iscador/Mistletoe
- Jason Winter's herbal therapy
- Laetrile
- Low dose Naltrexone
- Medicinal mushrooms, like Maitake, Reishi, Coriolus, Agaricus
- Modified citrus pectin
- Papaya leaf therapy
- PDT - photodynamic therapy
- Pectasol modified citrus pectin - especially for prostate cancer
- Persantin
- Poly MVA - a palladium, alpha-lipoic acid; B-complex; trace minerals & amino acid formula
- Tagamet
- Ukraine therapy

Hence, for orthodox medicine to say that there are no viable alternative treatments for cancer is nothing but further distorted propaganda, which urgently needs to be re-appraised.

### **Connecting The Dots Of This Discussion**

With this discussion focusing on the thread of alternative cancer treatments, if nothing else, it hopefully has created a realization that there is a huge disparity between what the cancer industry would like you to believe about the successfulness of their cancer treatments, and the actual reality of those claims.

Aside from this disconnect in what the general public is led to believe about modern day cancer treatments, the other sad reality is that there is almost no

mention of the many complementary and alternative cancer treatments that have been validated by decades of real-life use, in thousands upon thousands of patients - often given up for dead by orthodoxy. And where there *is* mention of such alternative treatments for cancer, it is usually in a disparaging manner.

### **But Surely Good Alternative Treatments Would Be Used By Medicine?**

Hopefully, the discussion in this series of articles has also clarified *why* these successful, often *complementary* cancer treatment options have not made it into the public arena. Unfortunately, the system which presently dictates what treatments shall be perceived as acceptable or unacceptable is primarily governed by the profit motive. This, in turn, is the basis under-pinning the double-blind, placebo-controlled trial system (DBPCT) of validating anything within medicine, including the cancer industry.

What is given preferential focus is not what *works*, but what makes *money*, and enough money to recoup the millions it takes to bring any new drug to market via the DBPCT system of 'validation'. If one looks from *within* this profit-driven, DBPCT methodology for validating new drugs or treatment protocols, then such a focus on profit makes obvious business and economic sense.

Yet this methodology does not automatically ensure that what comes out of this system is, in fact, the best for patients. Nor that it is the most efficient, safest, or effective way of treating any particular health condition, including cancer.

Presently, by economic need, the DBPCT system of validation cannot allow or accept into its system any treatments that can't be patented. It is this core ability to patent-protect new drugs, which also allows for the recouping of the immense amount of funds that had to be spent on bringing such a drug to market.

### **An Urgent Need For A Core Paradigm Shift Within Medicine**

However, just because the DBPCT system is the one in power at the moment doesn't mean that this is indeed the best way of bringing new or innovative options - such as alternative cancer treatments - to the public. What needs to occur is a fundamental paradigm shift in how we search for, and how we vindicate the efficacy and safety of any particular treatment option.

Until the power can be wrested from Big Pharma - which has a huge stake in maintaining the status quo - it leaves but a bleak future for the many, genuine alternative cancer treatments, which do work *therapeutically*, but don't work in a *profit-driven* system.

That is why - from Big Pharma's perspective - anything which threatens their profit-driven validation system has to be kept under wraps and not made available to the public. If that were to change, the very foundation presently propping up the way that Big Pharma does business would be immediately put at huge risk.

And Big Pharma, with trillions at stake, will do anything in its power to ensure that this paradigm shift will not occur. Nevertheless, what this series of articles has hopefully done is to make it clear that this does not then mean that alternative cancer treatments don't exist, or don't have validity. It's just that they don't have a *profit-driven* voice, and that the yard-stick of validation we presently give most legitimacy to is dreadfully flawed - particularly when it comes to what's best for cancer patients.

This is the awful dilemma facing the average cancer patient out in the community, fighting for their lives, but forced to choose from a very narrow range of cancer therapy options given validity by their oncologists.

### Concluding Thoughts - Greater Awareness = Greater Choices

Hopefully, what this article on alternative cancer treatments has done for you, the reader, is to catalyze a dawning realization that there is so much more to viable cancer treatments than you are presently being given privy too. However, in an age where the power of the Internet has dramatically changed our ability to access information, this does also offer cancer patients a greater capacity for making viable and more self-empowering cancer therapy choices.

The aim of this article is not meant to ultimately prove beyond a shadow of doubt that what lies beyond the cancer treatments offered by orthodoxy are automatically right for you. However, what I hope this article has provided is enough incentive to at least start an *expansion* of your perception, *beyond* what medicine dictates are the *only* viable cancer treatments available, and that now, through the power of the Internet, you can do your own further research.

At this point in the discussion, it should be abundantly clear - from even the few examples provided - just how much 'Spin' Big Pharma is willing to use in order to maintain its position within the marketplace. From an economic perspective, that's all well and good - it's all about business after all... isn't it?

### **Economics Should Not Be The Primary Driver In Cancer Research**

True, for any business to survive, it also needs to have a healthy economic focus. No arguments there. But the problem is that - especially when it comes to cancer - we're also dealing with people's *lives*, and it would appear that in today's world, economic principles are having too great an influence on which cancer treatments make it to market.

It's crucial we don't lose focus of the fact that - in the case of cancer - we're dealing with people suffering from a *life-threatening* disease. Yet, generally speaking, they're not being given access to what is genuinely the best treatment option for them - or *combinations* of treatments, such as low dose chemotherapy *plus* insulin potentiation therapy, or whole body hyperthermia - just two examples.

### **Media Too, Needs An Urgent Paradigm Shift In How They Function**

Equally, in these concluding moments of our discussion on alternative cancer treatments, and why orthodoxy's war on cancer would appear to be lost, it should be clear just how much the Media simply regurgitates News. Nowadays, journalists are not adequately exploring the facts and figures of News items presented to them by supposedly unprejudiced and ethically-driven 'scientists'.

Far too many journalists nowadays don't do this necessary research. Indeed, within the 24 hour cycle of having to constantly flood the marketplace with items of News - by the way, driven by *our* insatiable cravings for News! - one can almost have a sense of sympathy for journalists trapped on that ever-accelerating conveyor-belt they've become ensnared in.

Sadly, in their competitively driven need to be the first on the scene with the latest item of News, journalists don't have the luxury of time to do this indispensable research. Consequently, what suffers - far too often - is the accuracy and truth of whatever 'News' is released.

## Awareness Is The Fulcrum Point For Meaningful Change

By having a better understanding that this is the way News is presented to the public nowadays, also allows you, as a consumer of such News, to be more cautious before automatically swallowing - hook, line and sinker - what is put on offer before you.

It is high time, plus we live in the best of times, for people to do their own research. Through the power of the Internet, the average person has a much better chance of accessing a broader range of information about alternative cancer treatments, beyond the only options Big Pharma and medicine presently provide you with.

By the same token, let's not get carried away here, because it also does *not* necessarily mean that what is found through the Internet is always correct information either. Nevertheless, it certainly offers the *opportunity* to help expand the boundaries of information beyond what vested interests such as Big Pharma would like to inculcate you with.

What *is* needed in this journey of finding which treatment will be best suited for your situation is a greater awareness of the manipulative shenanigans that now do occur on a far too regular basis. Unfortunately, this is occurring in sectors of our community which we formerly may have believed to have been beyond such deceptive actions, because of their assumed strong ethics and honesty.

## Let's Not Automatically Paint Everyone With The Same 'Tar-Brush'

Keep in mind, the above are *general* statements, and do *not* automatically apply to the millions of excellent doctors and other medical staff who are doing the best they can for their patients. Nevertheless, and sadly, too many of those good doctors have themselves become caught up in a significant amount of *dis*-information - which in turn gets passed on to their patients.

And remember too, doctors face extreme ramifications if they dare to stray beyond what their controlling Organizations and Associations declare to be 'standard, orthodox protocols'. Presently, alternative cancer treatments fall *far* beyond those boundaries!

I therefore invite you to use this article on options provided from an alternative cancer treatments perspective, to at least be the *initiating* factor for your Journey ahead, of more deeply exploring as well as critically questioning what the present cancer industry has placed before you.

The need to do more of your own research into alternative cancer treatments is especially true if you are personally suffering with cancer, or for those close and dear to you who you know are battling this awful, and often life-threatening disease.

### Further Research Options For You To Start With

For a more in-depth exploration of similar types of concepts explored in this article, plus other treatment options, you might like to read:

- [Cancer – a Naturopathic Perspective](#)
- [Cancer – Upon Diagnosis](#)
- [Biopsies – Studies Show They Can Increase Metastases](#)
- [Chemobrain – The Treatment That Shrank Your Tumor Can Also Damage Your Brain](#)
- [Flax Seed Hulls – A Potent ‘Food-Medicine’ For Malignancies](#)
- [‘CellFood’ - A Potent, Liquid, Multi-Nutrient Formula With Which To Re-Build Or Maintain Your Health](#)
- [Whole Lemon Cleanse Drink – A Remarkable, Holistic Tonic for Cancer](#)
- [Coffee Enemas – A Very Cost-Effective Pain Treatment](#)
- [Dr. Johanna Budwig – Using Flax Oil & Quark As As Holistic Cancer Treatment](#)
- [Insulin Potentiation Therapy; Burzynski & Hyperthermia Options](#)

## References

- 1) Budiger, Mary, 'Sir Isaac Newton - You Lost the War On Cancer: News from the 9th Annual International IPT/IPTLD Conference'; Townsend Letter, August /September 2011. <http://www.townsendletter.com/AugSept2011/isaacnewton0811.html>
- 2) New York Times; 'Advances Elusive In The Drive To Cure Cancer'; Gina Kolata; April 23, 2009. [http://www.nytimes.com/2009/04/24/health/policy/24cancer.html?\\_r=3&](http://www.nytimes.com/2009/04/24/health/policy/24cancer.html?_r=3&)
- 3) Hickey, Steve, PhD; Roberts, Hilary, PhD; JOM, vol.28.no.1.2013.p.35.
- 4) Brody JG, Moysich KP, et al, Environmental Pollution and Breast Cancer. Silent Spring Institute. Cancer. May 14, 2007; 109(S12):2667-2712
- 5) President's Cancer Panel. Reducing Environmental Cancer Risk-What We Can Do Now. 20082009 Annual Report. April, 2010.
- 6) Colborn T, Dumanoski D, Myers JP. Our Stolen Future. Dutton, 1996.
- 7) Greater Boston Physicians for Social Responsibility. In Harm's Way. 2002.
- 8) Morgan, G; Ward, R; Barton, M; 'The Contribution of Cytotoxic Chemotherapy to 5-year Survival in Adult Malignancies', Clinical Oncology (2004) 16: 549e560: doi:10.1016/j.clon.2004.06.007
- 9) Chao C, Studts JL, Abell T, et al. Adjuvant chemotherapy for breast cancer: how presentation of recurrence risk influences decision-making. J Clin Oncol. 2003; 21 (23):4299-4305.

\*\*\*\*\*

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.peterderuyter.com](http://www.peterderuyter.com)

[www.articlesandbooks.net](http://www.articlesandbooks.net)

[www.holistic-hypothyroidism-solutions.com](http://www.holistic-hypothyroidism-solutions.com)

[www.self-empowerment-through-mind-power.com](http://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.peterderuyter.com](http://www.peterderuyter.com)

[www.articlesandbooks.net](http://www.articlesandbooks.net)

[www.holistic-hypothyroidism-solutions.com](http://www.holistic-hypothyroidism-solutions.com)

[www.self-empowerment-through-mind-power.com](http://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.