

Two American newsmen took a close look at The Cancer Business .. and concluded ...

“A SOLUTION TO CANCER WOULD MEAN THE TERMINATION OF RESEARCH PROGRAMMES, THE OBSOLESCENCE OF SKILLS, THE END OF DREAMS OF PERSONAL GLORY. TRIUMPH OVER CANCER WOULD DRY UP CONTRIBUTIONS TO SELF-PERPETUATING CHARITIES ... IT WOULD MORTALLY THREATEN THE PRESENT CLINICAL ESTABLISHMENT BY RENDERING OBSOLETE THE EXPENSIVE SURGICAL, RADIOLOGICAL AND CHEMOTHERAPEUTIC TREATMENTS IN WHICH SO MUCH MONEY, TRAINING AND EQUIPMENT IS INVESTED...” So, as far as calls for a different approach are concerned, “THE NEW THERAPY MUST BE DISBELIEVED, DENIED, DISCOURAGED AND DISALLOWED AT ALL COSTS, REGARDLESS OF ACTUAL TESTING RESULTS AND, PREFERABLY, WITHOUT ANY TESTING AT ALL.”
The Houston/Null Analysis.

Before they merged and started trading as **"Cancer Research UK"** the Imperial Cancer Research Fund and the Cancer Research Campaign had around 170 years of fundraising between them .
When they started, cancer was a rare disease : now it has long been out-of-control : around 40% - and rising - of the UK population have been or will be, diagnosed as having cancer.

“ Cancer Research UK” are now collecting over £ 400 MILLION : per year.

In the 1920s Dr Otto Warburg carried out a great deal of work on cancer’s basic mechanism and was awarded a Nobel Prize in 1932. Warburg’s work demonstrated that cancer is, fundamentally, a relatively simple disease where cell oxygen levels fall to a level sufficiently low enough for the cell to change in nature. The doctor defined cancer as a condition where the respiration of oxygen in the normal cell is replaced by the fermentation of glucose.

Today, as radiation, industrial and medical pollutants, pesticides, food additives .. etc., increasingly drive oxygen from the cell and planetary oxygen levels fall, cancer rates continually increase.

Cancer and viruses need anaerobic - airless - conditions : this has given rise to the dangerous myth that a virus could cause cancer :
whereas a virus is, merely, sometimes found at the site of a tumour.
There is no evidence of a causal link between any virus and any form of cancer.

In 1966, after his efforts had been ignored by the cancer industry for over thirty years,
Warburg addressed a group of fellow Nobel Laureates, reiterating his views : concluding -
“ .. nobody today can say that one does not know what cancer and its prime cause be.

On the contrary, there is no disease whose prime cause is better known., ... how long prevention will be avoided depends on how long the prophets of agnosticism will succeed in inhibiting the application of scientific knowledge in the cancer field. In the meantime, millions ... must die of cancer unnecessarily.”

Over 40 years later the situation is essentially the same : apart from the huge increase in numbers.

Whilst most celebrity and media supporters, wearing their CRUK-tee-shirts ; the “Race for Life” disciples ; the marathon-runners and the High Street tub-shakers .. may be too indoctrinated for salvation : other, well-meaning but genuinely in the dark, supporters might want answers to certain questions.

Why did The Imperial Cancer Research Fund issue the statement –

"One of the biggest myths in recent years is that there is a cancer epidemic caused by exposure to radiation, pollution, pesticides and food additives." ?

After untold billions of dollars, pounds, research-hours and laboratory animals, why are they still trying to find a drug to “*cure cancer*” ? Is doing the same thing over and over and over again and expecting a different result, a form of insanity? Or is it just good business?

Genuine cancer is a whole-body, systemic, constitutional disorder, present in the body for years – around 8 years in the case of breast cancer – before the appearance of a tumour. The orthodox **War on Cancer** involves attacking the tumour with the scalpel, drugs and radiation , whilst using the human body as a passive battlefield. Is this rational?

Would not the sensible approach be to restore the health ; physical, mental, emotional, spiritual, of the patient, thereby making the health of the patient superior to the disease?

For 30 years the American National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences fed high doses of a range of chemicals to rodents : the results take up 10 feet of shelving at The Institute.

Of 392 chemicals tested for carcinogenic effects, 96 were positive in the rat and negative in the mouse or were positive in the mouse and negative in the rat. The Institute were unable to tell how many of the substances might produce tumours in humans at normal levels.

The cancer drug Tamoxifen produced liver cancer in rats but not in mice.

Which rodent should we test to protect human beings from cancer-causing substances?

Or should we use cats or dogs or rabbits or guinea pigs or three-toed sloths or flying squirrels ... ? Which is the reliable animal model for a human being?

Professor Karol Sikora, arguably, the cancer orthodoxy’s top man, stated, on Channel 4 TV.

“ Being honest about the pros and cons of cancer treatment isn't always easy for doctors ; I think that all patients undergoing chemotherapy believe they're going to be cured by it and, in six months time, they'll be able to walk out free of cancer. That's the dishonesty of the business.

We, as doctors, tend not to confront people with the reality.”

Should these words have made some impression on patients and/or doctors or politicians?

BAVA
PO Box 73 CHESTERFIELD S41 0YZ

www.britishantiviv.org