

# The Cure for Cancer

Read this article online here:

<http://www.creationliberty.com/articles/cureforcancer.php>

Author: Christopher J. E. Johnson

Updated: April 11, 2015

To follow along with audio, click the YouTube button on creationliberty.com, and find the playlist "Cure for Cancer"

Surprisingly, when I've had discussions with people about this topic, I've had a few of them yell at me in anger when I've told them that the cure for cancer has been known for a very long time. This subject matter can be extremely sensitive for some people, and it's because people often let their emotions get in the way of reasonable judgment, so I ask that the reader take a deep breath, relax, and take a logical approach to this issue.

I want the reader to know I'm not selling you anything. I'm not recommending any products, nor do I make any money from writing this. I'm simply offering information on what cancer is, how the cure works, and why the cure has been suppressed by the media and our government.

The most common question I've received is: "*Why haven't I heard of this?*" If you have never researched what you will see in this article, that's probably the question you're asking in your head. If you're anything like me, I had always grown up thinking the cure for cancer was yet to be discovered, and the person who finds the cure will be famous and wealthy, but I did not realize how wrong and naive I was because the truth is that those who have discovered this cure have lost almost everything trying to get it to people.

My heart aches when I hear that someone has cancer, and though I want to help, I am generally outcasted by others for talking about this issue, and because of that, I've almost stopped talking about it. I can't make people listen to me. I hope that by writing this article, those with a passion to find truth and knowledge can be saved from the horrible pains awaiting those who currently believe the only "cure" is in deadly radiation "therapies."

I am not a medical professional, nor does this article constitute medical advice in the legal arena. Research the referenced documents for yourself and make your own educated decision about your health and the health of your family.

I'll warn you ahead of time that 95% of what you're going to read in this article will be exactly opposite of what you'll hear in the mainstream media, but keep in mind that I have full references to the material, and I encourage you to go look them up for yourself to verify what I'm writing. In order to understand this, most people have to be unbrainwashed from what they've been told by television shows and news broadcasts, and so I ask that you read this with a clear head, opening yourself to hear knowledge you may not be used to, so that hopefully, we can bring some suffering people back to good health.

*Beloved, [I wish above all things that thou mayest prosper and be in health, even as thy soul prospereth.](#)  
-3 John 1:2*

---

## What is Cancer?

---

To most people this seems like such a simplistic answer, to which they would respond "an illness" or "a disease," but that's sitting in a restaurant and asking who is the man across the room, and answering, "a person." We already know that cancer is an illness that's killing millions, but how much detail could you, the reader, give when asked what it is?

If someone were to ask you how to fix their car, but you didn't know anything about the problem with the car, there's not much you can do to help them. So before we can begin to understand the cure for cancer, we first need to understand what cancer is and how it works.

chronic: continuing for a long time; recurring frequently  
noncommunicable: unable to be transmitted by direct contact

(See 'chronic' & 'noncommunicable', Random House Dictionary, 2015, [www.dictionary.com]; See also Collins English Dictionary, 10th Edition, William Collins Sons & Co, 2009)

Cancer is a chronic, noncommunicable disease.

For example, a common cold goes away after a few days, so it cannot be labeled as a chronic illness, but it can be passed to other people through contact, so it is a communicable disease. Illnesses like the flu, or even viruses like HIV or STD, cannot be compared with cancer because they don't match both definitions.

Throughout the history of this world, in all records of the diseases of mankind, there was never a "cure" invented to stop chronic, noncommunicable diseases, but yet, solutions have been found for them that have made them almost non-existent today. One of the most famous examples of a "cured" chronic, noncommunicable disease is scurvy.



Scurvy was like the cancer of the 18th century, a disease that was killing millions and no one could find a cure. More specifically, the British navy was losing huge numbers of sailors to this epidemic. In 1753, James Lind published a book explaining scurvy's cure was actually linked to a lack of citrus fruit in the diet of those who suffered from scurvy. (See James Lind, *A Treatise on the Scurvy in Three Parts*, Kincaid, 1753, original in Austrian National Library)

*"Lind's study is cited as the first example of a scientifically controlled clinical experiment. His remedy was based on experiments made at sea on twelve sailors who had developed scurvy. Lind tested various supposed remedies by dividing the twelve sailors into six groups of two each... The most sudden and visible improvement occurred in the two who were fed oranges and lemons; one was fit for duty after just six days."*

-Lawrence K. Altman, *Who Goes First?: The Story of Self-Experimentation in Medicine*, University of California Press, 1987, p. 396, ISBN: 9780520212817

The typical diet of the British sailor consisted of a lot of salty red meats, which lacks certain vitamin content that people normally require, and almost 200 years later, it was discovered that it was a lack of Vitamin C that was killing British citizens. Although many authors claim that Lind was the first to discover this "cure," it was actually discovered many times before and after his book was published.

(See Bradley S Buckler MD, Anjali Parish MD, "Scurvy" EMedicine; See also Jonathan Lamb, "Captain Cook and the Scourge of Scurvy," BBC British History, Nov 11, 2009 [www.bbc.co.uk])

The following chart shows a list of chronic, noncommunicable diseases along side the natural foods (and vitamins within those) that remedy those illnesses:

Disease	Vitamin Deficiency	Scientific Name	Natural Foods
Scurvy	C	Absorbic Acid	Oranges, strawberries, red peppers
Rickets	D	Calciferol	Salmon, egg yolk, liver oil
Pellagra	B3	Niacin & Tryptophan	Peanuts, potatoes, chicken
Beriberi	B1	Thiamin	Peas, fish, rice
Night Blindness	A	Retinol	Carrots, spinach, sweet potatoes

(NOTE: All these foods must be organically grown, or organically fed, otherwise they may not contain sufficient vitamin content.)

Please notice in the above chart that the "cure" for these illnesses is not found in a chemical cocktail transformed into a miracle pill. The remedy for these illnesses is eating food that has vitamin content the body is lacking, and this is often referred to as "nutritional therapy."

Mainstream television often preaches a message of "chemical therapy," which is why (assuming you watch television, which I would not recommend) there are so many commercials for new "ask-your-doctor" pharmaceutical drugs. It is important to note that naturally grown substances (like vitamin C) cannot be patented, and therefore, a monopoly cannot be created on it. They are advertising the process by which nutritional therapy works (i.e. lack of vitamins causes illness), but replacing the nutrition with their patented chemical drugs (i.e. lack of our drug causes your illness), so they can turn a profit.



### No Asprin = Headache?



Let's imagine you took your car into a mechanic to have it repaired because it was making a very loud clunking noise that was really concerning, so you leave it there overnight, and when you come back to pick it up the next morning and ask the mechanic what he did to fix the problem, he tells you he covered the lining under the hood of your car with insulation and styrofoam so it will muffle the sound and you won't hear the clunking noise anymore. Would you pay the bill? Of course you would refuse to pay the bill because he did not fix the problem, he simply masked the symptom.

Just as absurd as a mechanic trying to mask the symptom instead of fixing the problem, we also act in an absurd manner because most Americans are so brainwashed into pharmaceuticals, **our medicine cabinets are filled with chemicals that mask the symptoms instead of fixing the problem.** When you get a headache, the headache is not the source of the problem; it's a symptom that's telling you about a problem, no different than the "CHECK ENGINE" light on your car, so when you take an aspirin, you are effectively unplugging the light.



**Headaches, skin rashes, dizziness, soreness of joints -- all of these are symptoms that indicate there is a problem in your body,** but we tend to mask the symptoms, instead of fixing the problem indicated. For example, the tumor people get from cancer is often called the problem, but the tumor is simply the symptom of the underlying problem, so instead of fixing the problem, surgeons cut out the symptom and patients often falsely believe they've addressed the cancer.




There was a man in a church building whose son had warts on his hands, and after trying ointments and creams, they would not go away, so he decided to take his son to have a doctor, and pay an expensive cost to freeze and remove the warts. Another Christian man in his church told him not to waste his time and money, and just go pick up some zinc tablets from the store, because warts were a sign of zinc deficiency. Within a few weeks of taking zinc, his son's hand warts disappeared.

*"Reduced zinc levels may be associated with persistent, recurring warts. Several studies have shown resolution of warts with oral zinc sulfate supplementation over one to two months."*

-Michelle Villett, "How to Get Rid of Warts," Reader's Digest Best Health Magazine, December, 2011, retrieved Mar 17, 2015, [besthealthmag.ca/best-you/health/how-to-get-rid-of-warts#kYhtR2AdmOsCiBEy.97]

The hand warts are another example of a chronic, noncommunicable disease, and the warts are the symptom of the underlying problem. Tumors are also a symptom of the underlying problem, and so what vitamin

Healthy cells have instructions to stop the duplication process.



Cancerous cells ferment, and without oxygen, they lose the proper signals to stop the duplication process, which is commonly known as a TUMOR.

deficiency are we lacking that is causing cancerous tumors?

Today, there are numerous "ghost stories" about where cancer comes from, as it seems to be a big mystery to doctors and our government institutions, and most of their websites will claim that it might lurk somewhere in your genetic code that is unseen by modern science. It's interesting that **this is EXACTLY the same attitude and approach doctors and government officials took with scurvy in the 18th century**, claiming that it was a mysterious illness that lurked the hulls of ships. Since the ACS tells us that almost 1 in 3 Americans get cancer, it would be best for us to quit relying on the ghost stories of the failing pharmaceutical industry, humble ourselves away from the false idea that "we're the greatest nation in the world," and start looking at the source of the problem.

(For statistics, see Cancer Statistics, 2009, American Cancer Society, CA Cancer J Clin 2009; 59:225-249 doi: 10.3322/caac.20006)

*Trust in the LORD with all thine heart; and lean not unto thine own understanding. In all thy ways acknowledge him, and he shall direct thy paths. Be not wise in thine own eyes: fear the LORD, and depart from evil. It shall be health to thy navel, and marrow to thy bones.*

*-Proverbs 3:5-8*

## Cancer's Vitamin Deficiency

*And God said, Behold, I have given you every herb bearing seed, which is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree, in the which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed; to you it shall be for meat.*

*-Genesis 1:29*

In the beginning, God told Adam and Eve that they were to eat the fruits, vegetables, and specifically, their seeds. When I was growing up I was told not to eat the seeds of fruits, just like this nutrition book from 2014 teaches:

*"True, fruits and vegetables also don't come with any warning label. The difference is that humans have had thousands of years of experience with fruits and vegetables--we know that apples are safe but don't eat the apple seeds. We may not know that apple seeds are full of a chemical called amygdalin that is converted by our gut enzymes into cyanide--we just know from our ancestors that it's a bad idea to eat them."*

-Neal Adams, *Healthy Vision: Prevent and Reverse Eye Disease through Better Nutrition*, Rowman & Littlefield, 2014, p. 27, ISBN: 9781493016280; Adams is a surgeon who has appeared on news broadcasts around the world.



The Bible tells us to eat the seeds, but this author tells us not to, so we have a conflict. Someone is wrong. Even though the author did not back up this claim with any sources where this information was proven, those who are respecters of persons (i.e. they trust the word of a PhD no matter what he/she says) may refuse to read any farther down the page because they trust in the words of men with degrees over the Word of God, but the Bible tells us that respecting persons is sin. (Read "Why Are Christians Respecting Persons?" here at creationliberty.com for more details.)

*But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.*

*-James 2:9*

I'm not saying everything a doctor says is bad or wrong, but we need to stop trusting that everything they say is good, right, and automatically in our best interest. Often, people have gone to other doctors for a second opinion and gotten conflicting advice, so we need to start researching matters for ourselves to make educated decisions about our health.

The above author will do what most doctors do when they want a medical answer, they go straight to the American Medical Association (AMA). However the AMA has had a history of rejecting good medicines, and adopting bad medicines, like pharmaceuticals and radiation treatments, that harm people. (We'll discuss more on that later.)

Over 100 years ago, a very important vitamin was found by Dr. Ernst T. Krebs, a graduate pharmacist and accredited physician in Nevada, to be concentrated in the seeds of fruits and vegetables. Before this discovery, Krebs was the first modern scientist to use an antibiotic in medicine by studying the Washoe Indian herbal remedies, and after finding a more efficient way to extract the healing properties of the plants, he created what is known today as "leptonin," which helped saved almost a hundred of his patients suffering from bacterial disease. However, the Journal of the American Medical Association ignored his findings, labeling him a "quack," and the cure was not rediscovered until almost 30 years later.



Despite what mainstream authors will tell you, condemning Krebs' research like a snake-oil salesman, in 1953, almost 40 years later, scientists at the **University of Utah School of Medicine** published "Studies on Antibiotic Extract of Leptotaenia," and **admitted Dr. Krebs's findings were accurate.**

(See Journal of American Medical Association, Nov 1920, Vol. 75, No. 19, p. 1299; See also H. J. Carlson & H. G. Douglas, and H. D. Bissell, Journal of Bacteriology, May 1948, Vol. 55, p. 607-614; See also *Antibiotics and Chemotherapy* (3 (4) 393), 1953)

Critiques like James H. Young, who wrote the book *American Health Quackery*, never mentioned that Dr. Krebs's findings were later verified true the "higher" establishments. Young tries to make it seem like Krebs was in it for the money. (See James H. Young, *American Health Quackery: Collected Essays of James Harvey Young*, Princeton University Press, 2014, p. 205, ISBN: 9781400862917)

After the study of natural remedies for bacterial disease (and from study in the work of Professor John Beard, who linked cancer to enzymes), Dr. Krebs picked up an interest in studying cancer. He noticed the Washoe Indians, as well as other native tribes, did not have the same cancerous diseases that white men had, so his prior experience led Krebs to look for a cure in natural foods and herbs.

(Beard's work on enzymes was generally ignored in favor of Madam Curie's radiation which came about at the same time; See Jeffery Dach, MD, *Biodental Hormones 101*, iUniverse, 2011, p. 496, ISBN: 9781462036547)

This research was later completed by Krebs's son, Ernst T. Krebs Jr., who studied in anatomy and medicine at Hahnemann Medical College for three years, received his bachelor's degree in bacteriology from the University of Illinois, and did his graduate work at the University of Mississippi and the University of California. Krebs Jr. picked up his father's (and Professor Beard's) research and made many discoveries, the most important of which was vitamin B17 (amygdaline), which is found most commonly in the seeds of fruits and vegetables, and the discovery of B17 led him to develop a concentrated pill form he named "laetrile."



According to the AMA, salt should be deadly.

It is true that seeds contain cyanide, which is normally deadly to the human body. The average person then believes that seeds should not be consumed, but chlorine is dangerous to the human body, so does that mean we'll die if we consume table salt (i.e. sodium chloride)?

For example, oxygen will quickly expand a fire, and hydrogen will make it explode. If your house is on fire, would it not be foolish to spray hydrogen and oxygen on the fire? Every fireman in the world sprays hydrogen and oxygen on a fire, combining them together into a substance called H<sub>2</sub>O, which we know more commonly as water.

If people stopped consuming things based on individual chemicals, then no one in the world would eat anything. Chemistry involves combining substances together to create something beneficial for the task at hand.

If you came to me hungry, and I offered you the following things to eat, you wouldn't be interested:

- \*Salt
- \*Butter
- \*Baking Soda
- \*Flour

The individual ingredients are disgusting, but if I were to use chemistry to mix them with eggs, sugar, and milk, we could make cookies.




Made from ingredients that are individually disgusting.

B17 is two units of glucose (sugar), one of benzaldehyde, and one of cyanide. Many people know cyanide can be deadly, but in this state, the chemical components are inert and have no effect on the body. There is only one enzyme that can unlock the cyanide and benzaldehyde, and that is called beta-glucosidase.

Beta-glucosidase is the key to unlock the locked toxic chemicals, and this is a very rare substance that requires a large amount to unlock the cyanide. There is only one place in the body where enough can be found to unlock them: inside a cancerous cell. The cancer cell contains hundreds of times more "keys" than any other cell in your body, and this

The B17 molecule is only breakable by glucosidase. There are hundreds of times, even up to 3,000 times, more glucosidase in a cancer cell than there is in a normal cell.



The cyanide found in seeds **cannot** be unlocked without the beta-glucosidase found in cancer cells.



attracts the B17. The benzaldehyde and cyanide combine to form a poisonous substance that destroys the cancer cell, and only at that location, but after the reaction, the toxic chemicals become nutritious for your body.

Most readers may be concerned at this point that a cancerous patient eating seeds might have the rest of their body harmed by chemicals like benzaldehyde, but the benzaldehyde oxidizes when it comes in contact with the oxygen in a normal cell in your body, and is converted to benzoic acid, which many Americans consume on a regular basis because it's found naturally occurring in many plants and used as a preservative in products like dried fruit,

toothpaste, and dog food (just to name a few examples). Benzoic acid even has antiseptic properties. However, cancer cells are devoid of oxygen (which is what causes them to ferment and become dangerous to your body), so once benzaldehyde comes into contact with the cancer cell, it works to destroy the cell causing problems.

(For more details on benzoic acid and antiseptics, see R.H. Goshorn & P.A. Tetrault, "Antiseptic and Bactericidal Action of Benzoic Acid and Inorganic Salts," Purdue University, p. 646, retrieved Mar 18, 2015, [pubs.acs.org/doi/abs/10.1021/ie50342a009])

As for the cyanide, all healthy cells in your body have a natural protective enzyme called rhodanese, which will break down cyanide so it becomes harmless to your body, but cancer cells are void of rhodanese, which means the cyanide can work to kill it off. After the cyanide kills off the cancer cell, it's then converted into a substance called cyanocobalamin, which becomes part of the B12 molecule, and technically becomes B12 itself, which is healthy for streamlining your digestion.

(See Dr. Ross Pelton & Dr. Lee Overholser, *Alternatives in Cancer Therapy*, 1994, p. 155, ISBN: 0-671-79623-2; See also G. Edward Griffin, *World Without Cancer*, 18th Edition, March 2006, p. 86-91, ISBN: 0-912986-19-0)

If someone were to drink **benzaldehyde or cyanide**, they would most likely die, but when these chemicals are in their bonded state in the seeds, both of these substances **are neutralized by your body's natural chemical defenses, and become not only harmless, but nutritious**. It is sad that many people will never have this knowledge, and fewer still will refuse to acknowledge it, and we will cover more on why that is later in this article.

Though B17 is found in many grasses and herbs, scientists have found it is most highly concentrated in the seeds of fruits and vegetables, which backs up what the Lord God told Adam and Eve at the beginning that they were to eat the seeds. Next, let's take a look at the natural world around us to gain more insight into B17.

## Cancer-Free Animals

Cancer in wild animals is almost never seen. Is it because wild animals have a better access to drugs and radiation therapy than humans do?

*"Another consideration to which I have previously called attention is, that these abnormalities very rarely affect organisms living in a state of nature. It is almost exclusively among domesticated varieties, among those that have been kept long in confinement, or that have been otherwise abnormally circumstanced, that tumours are met with; thus, in savages and wild animals, tumours very rarely occur."*

-William R. Williams, *The Natural History of Cancer: With Special Reference to Its Causation and Prevention*, William Wood and Company, 1908, p. 87

When the above author refers to "savages," he's referring to those he believes are lesser men in terms of his **evolutionary religion**. However, these are men and animals that live off the natural land, and they almost never get cases of cancer, even though Americans today, with all their modern science and conveniences, get cancer about 300 per 1,000.

There are a number of sources that will say that animals get cancer all the time, but this is when they are domesticated, either in homes or zoos.

*"Recent observations as to the relative frequency of malignant tumours in the latter, show that these maladies are not so rare as was formerly believed: thus, Veterinary-Inspector Trotter found that of 47,362 cattle, slaughtered at Glasgow in 1903, 131 had some form of malignant tumor, or 2.8 per 1,000, the corresponding ratio for English humanity being about 60 per 1,000. All the indications at the present available point to the great rarity of cancer in wild animals."*

-William R. Williams, *The Natural History of Cancer: With Special Reference to Its Causation and Prevention*, William Wood and Company, 1908, p. 88

The 60 per 1,000 human ratio has obviously increased dramatically over the last 100 years, but the animal ratio stays about the same. The only increase in animal cancer is when they adopt the typical high-sugar, high-fat, modern processed diet.



[www.treehugger.com]

I've had some skeptics email us concerning wild animals having a high case of cancer, sending us news reports of a turtle population that got cancer out in Australia, but what they quickly overlooked is a new factory that had been built in the area, and it was seeping large amounts of toxins into the water, which was causing rapid amounts of wildlife cancer and death. When researching in an area of animal wildlife that has no contact with societies of mankind, cancer is either rare, or non-existent. (See Live Science, "Cancer Kills Wild Animals Too," June 24, 2009 [www.livescience.com]; See also Christine Lepisto, "Cancers Threaten Wild Animal Populations," June 24, 2009

This author admits the difficulties in doing complete experimentation on a natural population of animals, and points out that most experimentation gets done on domesticated animals, which have been influenced by mankind's diet:

*"Despite the many difficulties involved in the study of the zoological distribution of cancer, much interesting material has been collected, and certain lines of inquiry have been very definitely indicated. Particularly does this apply, in the latter regard, to certain of the mammalia commonly classed as domesticated animals, as, for instance, horses, cows, sheep, dogs, cats, pigs; and also to certain others not usually so considered, yet which have so intimate a connection with domestic life as to come within its category, such as tame rats, mice, rabbits, and guinea-pigs."*

-William S. Bainbridge, *The Cancer Problem*, Macmillan, 1914, p. 46

Many of us are familiar with the typical nature shows, like National Geographic, which show lions killing their prey and ripping the meat off their bones to eat all the meat, but those who have actually lived among animals in the wild will tell a different story. Lions certainly do rip open their kills, but they most often do not go for the meat first (and sometimes not at all), they go for the nutrient-rich organs, like the liver and the heart.

Joe Hutto lived among, and traveled with, a pack of mule deer for seven years, and came back to write a book on his findings:

*"Unlike the kills of the coyote or the wolf, lion kills appear to be relatively efficient, and death comes swiftly most of the time, but the unfortunate fact is that in most instances, lions will meerely open up the abdomen of a freshly killed calf or deer and eat only the heart and/or the liver and then are off to the next easy kill."*

-Joe Hutto, *Touching the Wild: Living with the Mule Deer of Deadman Gulch*, Skyhorse Publishing Inc., 2013, ISBN: 9781628735536



There has not yet been a recorded case of these animals, while living apart from mankind's domesticated diets, killed in the wild and the autopsy showing any cancerous tumors. Those animals that have been found with cancer tumors have had connection with mankind's society.

There are many natural grasses that contain high-vitamin concentrations of B17, and it is quite common for ferocious animals like lions and tigers to tear through the meat of those grazing animals to get to the nutrients they need from the healthy organs that contain high-vitamin content.

(See EcoTravel Tourist Information [www.ecotravel.co.za], "African Lion Hunting Habits in South Africa," 2005; See also Missouri Department of Conservation [mdc.mo.gov], "Wildlife Sightings - Mountain Lions," 2010)



It is also common for people to think that lions only eat meat, and again, that's due much to television influence. During the early days of movie production, there was a lion named "Little Tyke" that was used in many sets, but absolutely refused to eat, or have anything to do with, meat in her diet.

(See Georges H. Westbeau, Little Tyke: The True Story of a Gentle Vegetarian Lioness, Theosophical Publishing House, 1986, ISBN: 9780835606059)

Little Tyke would only eat vegetables, and at one point, there was a \$1,000 reward offered for anyone who could trick Little Tyke into eating meat, but no one could claim the money. Many tricks were attempted, even one person putting a few drops of blood into her milk, but she refused to drink it.

Though wild animals don't hardly ever have it, domesticated pets get cancer quite frequently. Very rarely do pet owners hear about B17 and seeds, but those who do, and follow through, have claimed impressive results.

A website about B17 and seeds accepts many emailed testimonies, like this man's dog for example [edited for spelling]: *"A gentleman named Al from around my block, who has a German Shepard named Duke, told me in the local deli that his dog has cancerous tumors all over. Big tumors. He said he spent \$7000 for cat scans and other diagnostic procedures which all concluded 100% definite cancer. I ran him to my mother's house and gave him about a 1/4 bag of her supply (they are back ordered all over the US right now and I need MY seeds). Told him to give them to his dog even if it throws up. Today, two weeks later as he was walking his dog, he came to my house. He made his Duke turn to where the biggest of the tumors had been. Nothing. A tiny lump compared to half a soft ball two weeks earlier... He said the first day or two that Duke regurgitated them. He fed them to him again and again until Duke accepted them."*

-Apricots From God, "Testimonies," June 29, 2011, retrieved Mar 19, 2015, [apricotsfromgod.info/testimony.htm]

Here's another one for a horse [edited for spelling]:

*"Susan's horse, Jack, was diagnosed with squamous cell carcinoma in his left nostril a few months ago. She emailed asking if the seeds could help. I told her absolutely and also about the famous Hoxey Cancer therapy discovered when Mr. Hoxey followed his cancer ridden horse into the woods to write down the herbs the horse was eating as the tumors shrunk. She started the seeds and some herbs and now, three months later has e-mailed me the following note: Just emailing with an update on my horse's success. His vet came out for a 3 month check-up on Friday and his carcinoma has shrunk!!! The outside swelling has visibly shrunk and the inside lesion is no longer ulcerated and only very tiny – and looking very healthy!! Unfortunately, because of the location of the carcinoma (very high up on the inside of his left nostril), it is not really possible for me to check its progress without her special instruments but she will come again in a few months to check. She wasn't familiar with the herbal remedy or the apricot seeds I'm treating him with but was amazed and really happy with the way things are looking. He's currently taking six seeds in the morning and six seeds in the evening."*

-Apricots From God, "Testimonies," Feb 1, 2012, retrieved Mar 19, 2015, [apricotsfromgod.info/testimony.htm]



Though many veterinarians ignore these results, some of taken it upon themselves to test it on animals with cancerous tumors in their own clinics. Dr. George Browne Jr., head of the Eureka Veterinary Hospital in Eureka, California, published his experiment on a five-year-old male Pekingese dog with thyroid carcinoma:

*"The twice weekly regimen was continued for one month, during which time the growth regressed to a size comparable to that palpated during the original examination. Intravenous*



*injections were discontinued and a daily maintenance dosage of 100 mg. [milligrams] of amygdalin [B17/laetrile] per orum[i.e. latin meaning 'via the mouth'] was established. This dosage has been continued for seven months. A biopsy taken six and one-half months after the initiation of amygdalin therapy revealed no evidence of malignancy."*

-George Browne Jr., D.V.M., "Remission of Canine Thyroid Carcinoma Following Nitriloside Therapy," *Pet Practice Magazine*, February, 1974, p. 189; Browne repeated the experiment on multiple animals in similar circumstances with the same result.

Although many people are surprised at how effective the seeds are, it's a simple matter of vitamin deficiency. No matter which vitamin it is, whether man or animal, if one is devoid of a vitamin, it will cause serious problems, and taking the needed vitamin fixes those problems.

## Cancer-Free Societies



mountain climbing, or a helicopter ride, in order to reach it.


The study of the Hunzakuts have shown that many of their elderly live over 100 years old (*up to 120 in some cases*). Some men up to 110 years old have had newborn children with their wife, and many have perfect 20/20 vision. The average age of death in the US, with all the advanced medical technology and safety regulations, is 78, but the average age of death in Hunza is 85.

Americans typically suffer many painful conditions before dying (*and are usually dead a few years before their heart stops beating*), but the Hunza elderly often die peacefully in their sleep. Though there are many interesting facts about the Hunzas, the one to note is there are no reported cases of cancer in their society.

(For details on ages, see Los Angeles Times, Interview with Prince Mohammed Ameen Khan, May 7, 1973, Part I-A; For life expectancy, see "Life Expectancy at Birth," *The World Factbook*, Central Intelligence Agency [www.cia.gov])

*"Birth records of the Hunza are more difficult to obtain... but UNESCO data indicate that the Hunza are the only people in the entire world who are completely free of cancer."*

-Lewis R. Aiken, *Aging: An Introduction to Gerontology*, SAGE, 1995, p. 15, ISBN: 9780803954458



*"The Hunza has no known incidence of cancer. They have... an abundant crop of apricots. These they dry in the sun and use very largely in their food."*

-Dr. Robert McCarrison, *Journal of The American Medical Association*, Jan 7, 1922, Vol. 78, p. 1-8

Apricots are the primary source of wealth in the Hunza valley. If you **take the pit of the apricot, and break it open, there's a seed inside that looks like a nut**. The Hunzakuts eat these seeds often. It is

There have been a number of societies that have never heard of cancer. As aforementioned, Dr. Krebs noticed that the Native American tribes did not have the same problem with cancer as the rest of the U.S., and obviously there must be a reason for this.

An interesting case of this can be found in the Hunza tribe, a people who live secluded in a mountain range that borders China, India, and Afghanistan. The valley is so difficult to reach, it would take some extreme



(Photo by Dr. J. Milton Hoffman; Taken from *World Without Cancer*, Second Edition, 1997, ISBN: 0-912986-19-0)

common for the Hunza to eat a handful of apricot seeds as an afternoon snack, and are also used in a wide variety of ways, but the main point to note is that they eat seeds constantly.

One of the amazing things about this is that the seed of the apricot has been found to contain the world's highest concentrated source of B17.

*"The apricot seed is the richest source of Vitamin B17."*

-Don Orwell, *Superfoods Today Chocolate Sugar Detox*, Superfoods Today, Google Ebooks, 2015

It is incredibly difficult to find any medical journals to talk about B17 because they don't consider it a vitamin, or at least, not one that has much effect on the body.

*"B17 is found in natural foods such as grasses, maize, sorghum, millet, cassava, linseed, seeds, and kernels. The most common source of B17 is the apricot kernel."*

-Richard DeAndrea, *Breakthrough Cures - Revolutionary Answers to the Deadliest Diseases*, Booksmango, p. 86, ISBN: 9786162220609

People are welcome to ignore the connection between the cancer-free society and B17 if they want, but the facts still remain. The Hunza have always used the apricot tree as a measure of a man's wealth:

*"Although presently accepted science is unable to explain why these people should have been free of cancer, it is interesting to note that the traditional Hunza diet contains over two-hundred times more nitriloside [i.e. foods that contain B17] than the average American diet. In fact, in that land where there was no such thing as money, a man's wealth was measured by the number of apricot trees he owned. And the most prized of all foods was considered to be the apricot seed."*

-G. Edward Griffin, *World Without Cancer: The Story of Vitamin B17*, Aware Journalism, 1997, p. 63, ISBN: 9780912986197

The Hunza take the apricot seed even further, using it for all sorts of health and wellness products they make themselves. Taking a journey to the Hunza valley, this author reported on his time there:

*"My curiosity aroused, I asked, 'What do you do with the seeds you do not eat?'"*

*The guide informed me that many are stored, but most of them are ground very fine and then squeezed under pressure to produce a very rich oil. 'This oil,' my guide claimed, 'looks much like olive oil. Sometimes we swallow a spoonful of it when we need it. On special days, we deep-fry our chappatis [bread] in it. On festival nights, our women use the oil to shine their hair. It makes a good rubbing compound for body bruises.'"*

-Allen E. Banik & Renee Taylor, *Hunza Land*, 1960, Chapter 4, "Hunza Farming and Food," p. 123-124



(Photo by Dr. J. Milton Hoffman; Taken from *World Without Cancer*, Second Edition, 1997, ISBN: 0-912986-19-0)

Many people have said that changing to a Hunza-type diet, which means cutting out fats, salts, sugars, preservatives, and processed foods, and turning to organic, natural food, with a healthy consumption of apricots and their seeds, have cured them of cancer:

*"Emilia Chovan Kephart has beaten her cancer with natural live foods; a diet similar to recommended Hunza diet... Eight years has passed from the time she contracted the deadly cancer and today she is healthier, more energetic, more vital and enjoys life as never before."*

-Vegetarian Times, "How People of Hunza Live To Be 120 In Supreme Health," No. 92, April, 1985, p. 3, ISSN: 0164-8497

*"Doctor Serinov Ninski... cured his heart disease and arteries problem without surgery and by natural live foods, a diet similar to recommended Hunza diet."*

-Vegetarian Times, "How People of Hunza Live To Be 120 In Supreme Health," No. 92, April, 1985, p. 3, ISSN: 0164-8497

This correlates with the book of Daniel, when he chose a healthier, natural diet that was better than what the king was feeding the other servants:

*And the king appointed them a daily provision of the king's meat, and of the wine which he drank... But Daniel purposed in his heart that he would not defile himself with the portion of the king's meat, nor with the wine which he drank... Prove thy servants, I beseech thee, ten days; and let them give*

us pulse to eat, and water to drink. Then let our countenances be looked upon before thee, and the countenance of the children that eat of the portion of the king's meat: and as thou seest, deal with thy servants... And at the end of ten days their countenances appeared fairer and fatter in flesh than all the children which did eat the portion of the king's meat.

-Daniel 1:5-15

(pulse is plants and their seeds, beans, peas, etc.)

Societies that eat a natural, organic diet, and aren't brainwashed into refusing good foods (like seeds), live healthier, longer, more vital lives. This isn't rocket science. The real problem is so many people are addicted to food in their gluttony, that they are more willing to make excuses and/or deny reality than to change; more willing to stay poor and in debt paying hospital bills, and even die a horrible, painful death, than to live without their precious processed snacks.

For the drunkard and the glutton shall come to poverty: and drowsiness shall clothe a man with rags.

-Proverbs 23:21

## The Pharmaceutical Takeover

In order to address the "why haven't I heard of B17" question, we need to start at the beginning with the truth behind American medicine as we know it today. As most U.S. citizens are aware, most doctors do not promote physical health as much as they promote pharmaceutical drugs, and though the American Medical Association will tell you that it is based on medical science, the truth is that most of the industry has nothing to do with medical science.

First, we'll take a look at Mr. Pillsbury (yes, the name of that brand of pie crust you may have purchased), and a man by the name of Fred Gates, who invented a brilliant and deceptive "philanthropic" campaign method you may have commonly seen. In the late 19th century, Gates had Mr. Pillsbury give \$50,000 to the Owatonna Baptist Academy, on the condition that the baptist community raise an equal amount, but even though half of the resulting \$100,000 dollars in donated funds came from the efforts of the community, the entire project was personally credited to Mr. Pillsbury, even though he did almost nothing, and boosting his popularity and sales by becoming "benevolent" in the public eye.



The "charity" of corporate businesses always seeks a return on its investments. After donating the money, the Baptist state convention in 1886 declared:

*"[T]he thanks of the convention and of the Baptists of the State whom it represents are hereby gratefully returned to M. Pillsbury with the assurance that his great and generous gift has further endeared him to us and has given to us a name that we and those who shall follow us will profoundly cherish... That Minnesota Academy be hereafter known and called Pillsbury Academy."*

-United States Bureau of Education, *Circular of Information*, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1902, p. 218

The king by judgment establisheth the land: but he that receiveth gifts overthroweth it.

-Proverbs 29:4

A wicked man taketh a gift out of the bosom to pervert the ways of judgment.

-Proverbs 17:23

Though the community might have a charitable mind, the corporation simply looks at the advertising, knowing that people are more likely to choose their brand of product over another when their name is put onto a charitable cause, and in a nutshell, it becomes detailed, door-to-door advertising at only a fraction of the cost it would take to do otherwise. This "matching donations" public relations tactic caught the serious eye of John D. Rockefeller, who sought to hire Fred Gates to create similar drives for his corporate interests.

*"Fred Gates was a wonderful business man... His work for the American Baptist Education Society required him to travel extensively. Once, as he was going south, I asked him to look into an iron mill in which I had an interest. His report was a model of clarity! Then I asked him to make some investigations of other property in the west. I had been told this particular company was rolling in wealth. Mr. Gates' report showed I had been deceived. Now I realized I had met a commercial genius. I persuaded Mr. Gates to become a man of business. He consented--if I would help him indulge his passion for accomplishing something for the good of mankind. Of course, I assented. That was the beginning of our*



John D. Rockefeller was hated by the general public and was trying to improve his public image with media photos of him giving dimes to children.

association."

-John D. Rockefeller, quoted by John K. Winkler, *John D. Rockefeller: A Portrait in Oils*, Cosimo Inc., 2007, p. 177, ISBN: 9781602069688

For emphasis, I want to recap the benefits of this "matching donations" tactics Gates brought to the Rockefeller cartel:

1. The corporation name gets full credit for a donated dollar amount at half the price.
2. The corporation now has an entire community of hard-working, dedicated volunteers to raise half of the money at no cost.
3. The corporation will get an enormous amount of free advertising. As volunteers go door-to-door asking for donations, the company name will have to be mentioned in their pitch as the "matching donor." Such door-to-door advertising would cost a company many times more than what they pay for the low-cost of matching donations. Not only word of mouth advertising, but also physical banners at drives will carry the company name, all at the cost of the public, rather than the corporation.
4. The corporation will see a rise in sales because often, if a consumer supports a charitable organization, they will switch their household product brands to the company that donates to the "charitable corporation," thinking that if they purchase the product of the "charitable corporation," they also become charitable by association.

Many people who read this will get upset with me for pointing this out, but most often they get upset because they have been part of those "matching donation" charity drives. No one likes to hear they have been deceived and used, and so they would rather believe what they did was right, than to have to admit the truth.

*There is a way which seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death.*

*-Proverbs 14:12*

No matter how "charitable" it might look, neither Pillsbury, Rockefeller, or any other corporate business had much interest in "doing good," as much as they had interest in turning a profit by improving their public image. This tactic uses the general individual's good will against them.

These so-called "philanthropic" methods soon expanded into large charity organizations, and many well-known organizations could be mentioned here, but in context of this article, one of the biggest organizations that help setup these "matching donation" rallies is the The American Cancer Society (ACS). In fact, the ACS owns the domain "matchinggifts.com," where they try to help companies setup matching donation incentives with their employees.

Before anyone starts calling me names and condemning me, please keep in mind, there are many pure-intentioned people that donate to the ACS, and a lot of volunteers that honestly think they are doing the right thing, but the men who rule over the organization are corrupt to the core, and each one of those volunteers and donors are being deceived and used in a variety of ways. Some people will stop reading right here, because they react emotionally instead of logically, but for those of you want to know the truth, let's go back to to the beginning of the ACS.

The American Cancer Society was formed officially in 1913 at the Harvard Club in New York, and the original board of directors were made up of men like Alfred P. Sloan (General Motors), Monroe Rathbone (Standard Oil), and Charles D. Hilles (AT&T), just to name a few. This already raises red flags that this organization was formed by the leaders of major corporate cartels that have done many deceptive things for the love of money and power, and it's interesting to note that this information is not published on the ACS website; they keep it vague by saying:

*"Established in 1913 by a small group of physicians and businessmen,"*

-American Cancer Society, "About Us," retrieved Mar 19, 2015, [cancer.org/aboutus/whoware/governance/index]

Many people think that the American Cancer Society is a non-profit because they are 501(c)(3) incorporated, and on paper, they are, but what is generally not known is this:

*"The American Medical Association has strong ties to pharmaceutical companies, and the American Cancer Society owns half of the patent rights of chemotherapy drugs."*

-Zillah R. Eisenstein, *Manmade Breast Cancers*, Cornell University Press, 2001, p. 101, ISBN: 9780801487071; Eisenstein is a professor and Chair of Politics at Ithaca College in New York.



For example, there is a drug used in chemotherapy treatment called "5 fluorouracil" (5-FU), and the patent on it is partially owned by the ACS:

*"Another popular breast cancer drug, and part of the chemo cocktail I was prescribed, is 5-fluorouracil or 5-FU. Hoffman-LaRoche held the patent for seventeen years with the American Cancer Society (who owned twenty-five per cent) says Moss. 'Perhaps by coincidence,' he adds, 'one of the founders of the American Cancer Society, Elmer Bobst, is a former president of Hoffman-LaRoche. Bobst was one of the high-profile businessmen Mary Lasker brought onto the ACS board when she took charge of the Association in the 1940s.'"*

-Sharon Batt, *Patient No More: The Politics of Breast Cancer*, Spinifex Press, 2003, p. 253-254, ISBN: 9781875559398



We have the "coincidence" of the former president of Hoffman-LaRoche, who jointly owns the patent for a particular drug with the ACS, recommending the drug's use to medical facilities. This is like a high-school basketball coach having his son on the team, and "coincidentally" his son ends up on the starting line up every game, or like having a beauty pageant, and the mother of one of the contestants is also a judge. It's a "fox guarding the hen house" situation.

*"An officially approved 'standard of care' drug for treatment of cancer of the colon is based on the use of a highly toxic chemical, 5-F-U, despite reports in prestigious medical journals that it doesn't work. It continues to be widely used, perhaps because the American Cancer Society owns 50% of 5-F-U."*

-Eustace Mullins, *Murder by Injection: The Story of the Medical Conspiracy Against America*, Aware Journalism, p. 164, ISBN: 9780880606943

The fact that the ACS owns all these patents, and turns a profit from them, is almost never reported, and sadly, due to the emotional reaction at the word "cancer," most Americans don't bother looking into it.

*"Many donors to the ACS would be outraged to learn that the organization has a vested interest in the sale of drugs and a financial tie-in with the drug industry."*

-G. Edward Griffin, *World Without Cancer*, 18th Edition, March 2006, p. 258, ISBN 0-912986-19-0; For more details on the corporate corruption p. 211-226

Though that information may be shocking to some, it doesn't end there because Americans today are still unaware of Rockefeller's vile takeover of the American medical schools. In 1890, just a few years after Fred Gates was hired by Rockefeller, **the Baptist University of Chicago received a \$600,000 donation** under the condition that they raise \$400,000. (Rockefeller is given full credit for the entire donation, of course.) Within a year after this donation, Rockefeller's chosen candidate, Dr. William Rainey Harper, was named president of the Baptist University of Chicago, and within two years, **all anti-Rockefeller teaching staff were removed, and replaced with those who would seek after John D. Rockefeller's ideals**. After the school takeover, Rockefeller was praised by the staff, including one professor of economics, Dr. Gunton, who said that Rockefeller was "*superior in creative genius to Shakespeare, Homer and Dante.*"

(See Matthew Josephson, *The Robber Barrons*, 1934, p. 324, ISBN 0-15-676790-2)

Rockefeller had discovered how to buy influence over the training institutions of those who would be selling his pharmaceutical drugs. This three-step process was repeated in all the major medical schools around the country:

1. Offer a donation to a medical school, getting other people to pay a large percentage of the cost. This amount usually over 50%, putting more pressure on the school to abide by the wishes of the donation cartel.
2. Receive a positive public image boost, and get put on the board of directors, forcing the school to allow corporate advisors to sit in on meetings for added influence in corporate ideals.
3. Restructure the school to center courses around promotion and use of pharmaceutical products.

At this point, I am tempted to go into details of drug manufacturers, and the insane obsession that has been created in this country over pharmaceuticals, but I don't want to get too far off topic. If you want to learn more about this topic, I highly suggest watching the documentary "The Marketing of Madness: The Truth About Psychotropic Drugs."

## The Marketing of Madness: The Truth About Psychotropic Drugs

<https://youtu.be/IgCpa1RISdQ>

For more information on the major corporate cartels, and the conspiracies behind them in push for a New World Order controlled by an elite few, I highly recommend the following books:

- Dr. John Coleman, *Conspirators' Hierarchy: The Story of the Committee of 300*, 1992, ISBN 0-922356-57-2
- Dave Breese, *7 Men Who Rule the World from the Grave*, 1990, ISBN 978-0-8024-8448-2
- Des Griffin, *Fourth Reich of the Rich*, 1976, ISBN 0-941380-06-8

I know many people think I'm just looney, but those of you who follow our teachings on our website know that I base these statements on research, not opinion. David Rockefeller himself wrote in his memoirs:

*"For more than a century, ideological extremists at either end of the political spectrum have seized upon well-publicized incidents such as my encounter with Castro to attack the Rockefeller family for the inordinate influence they claim we wield over American political and economic institutions. Some even believe we are part of a secret cabal working against the best interests of the United States, characterizing my family and me as 'internationalists' and of conspiring with others around the world to build a more integrated global political and economic structure -- one world, if you will. If that's the charge, I stand guilty, and I am proud of it."*

-David Rockefeller, *Memoirs*, Random House Publishing Group, 2011, p. 405, ISBN: 9780307789389

Now that we have established a basis for the thinking behind pharmaceutical drugs, and corporate interests behind them, we can now go into more details about why the cure for cancer has been buried.

*For the love of money is the root of all evil: which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows.*

*-1 Timothy 6:10*

## The Cure's Cover-Up

In personal conversations, face-to-face, I often can't make it this far, because most people refuse to believe that anyone in the medical field would cover up something this big in exchange for money. In the end, it doesn't matter what we want to believe, the truth comes from facts, and putting our faith in the imaginary "goodwill" of mankind is not only useless, but we bring curses upon ourselves for trusting in man instead of looking for the truth.

*For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God;*

*-Romans 3:23*

*Thus saith the LORD; Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm, and whose heart departeth from the LORD... The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?*


*-Jeremiah 17:5-9*

*But evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving, and being deceived.*

*-2 Timothy 3:13*

Patents are what allow inventors to insure they make the profit from their inventions, protecting the average citizen from corporations who have more backing to steal information and begin marketing immediately off the hard work of someone else. On the other hand, corporations can purchase patents, which give them the exclusive rights to market a product, and that is how they are able to create monopolies on the sale of a product.

There are certain things that *CANNOT* be patented, and one of those is a naturally growing substance. For example, vitamins cannot be patented, and so vitamins like B17 are not able to be used by a corporation to turn exclusive profit. Thus, when looking for a particular product to cure cancer, corporate cartels are looking for something they can patent



**Dr. E. M. McDonald, American Medical Association Committee Chairman**      **Dr. Henry Garland, American Medical Association Committee Secretary**

(Photos from L.A. County Medical Bulletin and San Francisco Medical Society; Taken from *World Without Cancer*, Second Edition, 1997, ISBN: 0-912986-19-0)

Dr. Henry Garland [Right] (American Medical Association Committee Secretary), out of seven total in the AMA committee, published their suspiciously **UNSIGNED report** of a State of California experiment on laetrile. Keep in mind, **these two AMA representatives did not personally do any experiments on, nor have any experience with, laetrile, they only reviewed documents** from people that did.

(See "TREATMENT of cancer with laetriles; a report by the Cancer Commission of the California Medical Association", *Calif Med*, April, 1953; 78(4):320-6)

It's also interesting to note that Garland and McDonald are infamous today after reviewing testing on cigarettes connection to lung cancer, and coined two popular phrases back in the late 1950s: "*A pack a day keeps lung cancer away,*" and "*a harmless pastime up to twenty-four cigarettes per day,*" claiming that smoking had absolutely no connection to lung cancer. Though not documented in this article, there has been much indication that these men accepted payments from cigarette companies at that time to give a false report due to the a large decrease in sales because of major public concern about health issues from smoking.

(See "Here's Another View: Tobacco May be Harmless," *U.S. News & World Report*, Aug 2, 1957, p. 85-86)

Are we also to trust McDonald and Garland, who should have been stripped of their medical title, on their conclusions concerning laetrile and B17? Whatever your answer, the fact of the matter is that most doctors today still trust in these men, because when they look to do research on laetrile and B17, they go straight to McDonald and Garland's California report.

## Lies in the Food Industry

The kind of deception coming from the bribed McDonald and Garland is not an isolated case. This same thing is happening the world over today, only it's much more common than it used to be.

Coca-Cola, for example, has recently been approved by the ADA (American Dietetic Association) to provide a program to educate dietitians about food safety. This is incredibly suspicious before looking into any details, because Coca-Cola is incredibly damaging to one's health and diet, and that's on top of considering that word "coke," for which Coca-Cola is abbreviated, is in their name was because their original recipe contained 9 milligrams of cocaine per bottle in 1891.

(See Mark Pendergrast, *For God, Country, and Coca-Cola*, Perseus Books Group, 2013, ISBN: 9780465046997)



Coca-Cola is teaching our nation's dietary practitioners that artificial coloring, non-nutritive sweeteners, and other chemicals (like fluoride) have been "*carefully examined for their effects on children's health, growth, and*

*development," and that they have no effect on the body. They are suggesting that dietitians help get rid of "concern among parents about their children's health."*

-Coca Cola: Beverage Institute for Health & Wellness [www.beverageinstitute.org], "Children's Dietary Recommendations: When Urban Myths, Opinions, Parental Perceptions & Evidence Collide," retrieved July 16, 2011, [http://www.beverageinstitute.org/en\_US/pages/webinar-childrensdietary-cpe.html]

However, according to the Alliance for Natural Health (a third party that does not have financial ties to chemical companies like Coca-Cola does):

*"[Coca-Cola] Program materials include gems like '[a] majority of studies so far have not found a link between sugar and behavior in children generally or children diagnosed with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder.' This is certainly news to us, since we have seen many studies that say the opposite."*

-Alliance for Natural Health [www.anh-usa.org], "Dietitians Are Buying Coke's Line: Sugar, Fluoride, Artificial Colors are SAFE for Children!," June 14, 2011, retrieved July 16, 2011, [http://www.anh-usa.org/dietitians-are-buying-okes-line/]

Coca-cola wants to lie and deceive the public so they won't have any health concerns or fears about their product because they will lose money. The company knows they cannot maintain the flavor of their product while being rid of that which is harming the health of their consumers. And likewise, Cigarette companies want to rid the public of health fears because they would lose money, just like pharmaceutical companies want to rid the public of fears concerning their products because they will lose money.

(Read "The United Vacci-Nations" here at creationliberty.com for more details about the pharmaceutical industry's deceptive efforts to secure their income.)

The 1953 California Medical Association report is the primary cited reference used by most clinics and hospitals when looking at laetrile, and what they do is skim through it until they reach the conclusion of the document, which states that laetrile doesn't do anything. This is literally the entire extent of research that most doctors do, but will never admit to their patients. Though these people have never had experience with laetrile, nor have even seen the results themselves, they, with a giant leap of faith, simply trust the AMA to tell them what to do.

*"Dr. Edwin Mirand of Roswell Memorial Hospital in Buffalo, N.Y. said: 'We've looked into it [laetrile] and found it has no value.' When asked if the renowned little hospital, which deals only with cancer, actually tested Laetrile, Dr. Mirand said, 'No, we didn't feel it was necessary after others of good reputation had tested it and found had no effectiveness in the treatment of cancer.' He referred, as all authorities do, to the [1953] California Report."*

-Tom Valentine, "Government is Suppressing Cancer Control," The National Tattler, March 11, 1973, p. 2

See how this works? Let's look at another example:

*"The cancer expert in question... told me that Laetrile was 'sugar pills.' Had he told me that he had used Laetrile experimentally on X number of patients and found it completely ineffective, I might have been impressed. But when I asked him whether he had ever used it himself, he said that **he had not**. When I asked him whether he had ever traveled abroad to study the experience with Laetrile therapy in Germany, Italy, Mexico, the Philippines, or other countries, he replied that **he had not**. And when I asked him if he had ever made a first-hand study of the pros and cons of the subject, again he conceded that **he had not**. He was simply repeating what he had heard from others who, in turn, were probably repeating what they had heard from others, going all the way back to the antiquated 1953 report of the California Cancer Commission."*

-David Martin, *Cancer News Journal*, January/April, 1971, p. 22

In 1963, 10 years after the California report, the California State Department of Health adopted the 1953 California report as officially "true" and finally released all the original experiments to the public for the first time. After reviewing the original documents, they were found to contain positive feedback on the usefulness of laetrile, and showed that McDonald and Garland had purposefully lied about the results, but despite this, their 1953 report was labeled as "truth."

(See Dr. G. Schroetenboer & Dr. W. Wolman, "Report by Cancer Advisory Council on Treatment of Cancer with Beta-Cyanogenic Glucosides ("Laetriles")," California Department of Public Health, 1963, Appendix 4, p.1-2)

For example, McDonald and Garland stated clearly in their 1953 report, "*No evidence of cytotoxic changes was observed by any of the consultants.*" That is, M&G claimed that laetrile showed no signs of killing cancer cells, but the released records of 1963 state that multiple cases showed potential positive change.



**Experiment - Sept 10, 1952:**

"M-1... This might represent a chemical effect since the cells affected show coagulation necrosis and pyknosis." (Translated: The cancer cell was being destroyed, followed by signs of repair.)

"M-3... There appears to be more degeneration in the tumor cells in the lymph node. **I would consider this as a possible result of chemical agent.**"

"Two cases... Showed moderated changes... which might be **considered as chemotherapeutic toxic cellular changes.**"

(See Dr. J. L. Zundell, "Report by Cancer Advisory Council on Treatment of Cancer with Beta-Cyanogenic Glucosides ("Laetriles")," California Department of Public Health, 1963, Appendix 3, p.1-2)

This means that the actual experimentation done, aside from M&G's report, showed that **there was positive therapeutic change in the cell**, but that more experimentation was needed to determine its full effect. By December, the conclusions of the experimentation was given.

**Experiment - Dec 15, 1952:**

"Case 1M... Hemorrhagic necrosis of tumor is extensive... An interpretation of chemotherapeutic effect might be entertained." (Translated: It's possible this has a healing effect -- or in other words, McDonald and Garland lied!)

(See Dr. John W. Budd, "Report by Cancer Advisory Council on Treatment of Cancer with Beta-Cyanogenic Glucosides ("Laetriles")," California Department of Public Health, 1963, Appendix 3, p.1-2)

Garland and McDonald lied to cover up the findings of the experiments, and the only reason the results were not stronger was because the scientists at that time were carefully administering a substance they were not familiar with, which is a precautionary measure scientists always take when dealing with an unknown substance. Based on the sources I've read, the testers only used about 2% of what is needed to get optimum results. This Garland and McDonald report, though completely false, and despite the incomplete experimentation, is still the primary source for laetrile research used by major medical facilities across the country, but on page 3 of their report, M&G let slip the impressions of the physicians doing the testing:

**"All of the physicians whose patients were reviewed spoke of increase in the sense of well-being and appetite, gain in weight, and decrease in pain..."**

-McDonald & Garland 1953 California Report on the Effect of Laetrile, quoted by John A. Richardson & Patricia Griffin, *Laetrile Case Histories*, published Bantam Books, 1977, p. 29, ISBN: 9780553114911

But in attempt to cover up these findings, they continued to arrogantly say, "... as though these observations constituted evidence of definite therapeutic effect." If increase in well-being and a decrease in pain, which is the opposite of what's called "cachexia," which is the name given for the effects of cancer, is not evidence of therapeutic effect, I would like to know what they think *IS* evidence for it?

"It is a well-known fact that most cancer patients die, not from the tumor, but from something called cachexia. Cachexia is the medical term used to describe the loss of weight and appetite, a decrease of strength, the appearance of anemia, an increased basal metabolism rate resulting in a caloric and nutritional deficit, and a general 'wasting away' that is seen in terminal cases."

-John A. Richardson, M.D., *Laetrile Case Histories*, 2005, p. 41, ISBN: 978-0-912986-38-8

"Cachexia, of course, is of major clinical significance in patients with cancer. Warren reported that cachexia was the most frequent single cause of death in cancer, especially of the stomach, breast, and colon-rectum groups."

-Athanasios Theologides, "The Anorexia-Cachexia Syndrome: A New Hypothesis," *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, Vol. 230, Mar 18, 1974, p. 17

This cachexia, which is common in cancer patients, is exactly the description M&G gave in their report, but refused to acknowledge when those symptoms were reversed. Though it is not definite, those observations in the experiments *DO* constitute further experimentation to verify the results, but instead, McDonald and Garland lied for a bit of cash, costing millions their lives over the past few decades who have put their hopes in radiation that kills most of those who take it.

## The Hidden Results

*"After careful study of the literature and other information available to it, the American Cancer Society does not have evidence that treatment with Laetrile results in objective benefit in the treatment of cancer in human beings."*

*-Unproven Methods of Cancer Management, New York: American Cancer Society, 1971, p. 139*

There is a reason the ACS doesn't have the evidence, and that's because the evidence would stop making them money. The ACS is deceiving billions of people into thinking that there is no cure for cancer, and though there are many people who will get angry with me for saying this, again, we have to put emotion aside and remember that many of the drugs used in current radiation therapies are owned by the ACS, and if a cure for cancer was discovered, there would be no other use for their patents.

The ACS can't find the evidence for the same reason a thief can't find a sheriff: You can't find what you're not looking for, and purposely hiding from.

*"Laetrile appears to work against many forms of cancer including lung cancer. And it is absolutely non-toxic... tests with Ehrlich ascites carcinoma [a type of cancer] revealed that, where cyanide alone killed one percent of the cells and benzaldehyde alone killed twenty percent, a combination of the two was effective against all the cells.*

*Amygdalin[B17/Laetrile] with glucosidase [the key to unlock the B17 molecule] added also **succeeded in killing 100 percent of the ascites tumor cells, due to the freeing of the same two chemicals.**"*

*-Dr. Dean Burk, "Amygdalin Claimed Nontoxic Anti-Cancer Therapeutic Agent," Infectious Diseases, Seventh International Congress of Chemotherapy in Prague, Oct. 15, 1971, p. 1 & 23*

*"When we add Laetrile to a cancer culture under the microscope, providing the enzyme glucosidase also is present, **we can see the cancer cells dying off like flies.**"*

*-Dr. Dean Burk, "Laetrile Ban May Be Lifted," Twin Circle, June 16, 1972, p. 11*

Mrs. Joanne Wilkinson, mother of six from Walnut Creek, California, was diagnosed with cancer in 1967. She had tumors effecting her left thigh, groin, hip, bladder, and kidney. Mrs. Wilkinson decided to go with Laetrile treatments. Her doctor, upset by her decision, warned her that if she did not have her left leg and part of her hip amputated, she would die in about three months.

Mrs. Wilkinson's testimony:

*"Dr. Krebs [referring to Byron Krebs, M.D., brother of E.T. Krebs Jr.] gave me an injection of Laetrile - and the tumor reacted. It got very large - from walnut size to the size of a small lemon - and there was bleeding four or five days. I went back on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday each week for five weeks to get injections, and **the tumor then started getting smaller.** Five weeks later I could no longer feel it."*

*(Joanne Wilkinson photo by G. Edward Griffin; Taken from World Without Cancer, Second Edition, 1997, ISBN: 0-912986-19-0)*



Joanne continues:

*"An X-ray was taken the first Monday, and regularly after that to watch the progress. Injections were continued for six months - ten cc's three times a week and of course the diet: No dairy products nothing made with white flour - no eggs - but white fish, chicken, turkey.*

***And I felt wonderful! In fact, in August, 1969, the doctor told me I needed no more injections. My X-rays were clear, showing that the tumor had shrunk, was apparently encased in scar tissue, and was not active.**"*

*"Laetrile - An Answer to Cancer?," Prevention, Dec, 1971, p. 172-175*

These are not fringe, obscure cases. Some very well-known individuals, with much to lose and nothing to gain by defending laetrile, have come forward to testify to the healing properties of B17 in relation to cancer.



Red Buttons, famous comedian and actor, says his wife, Alicia, was saved by laetrile:  
**"Laetrile saved Alicia from cancer. Doctors here in the U.S. gave her only a few months to live last November. But now she is alive and well, a beautiful and vital wife and mother, thanks to God and to those wonderful men who have the courage to stand up for their science."**

-Red Buttons, "Comedian Red Buttons Says 'Laetrile Saved My Wife From Death By Cancer,'" *The National Tattler*, Aug. 19, 1973, p. 5

Ernst Krebs Jr. has received numerous thank you letters for his work on laetrile, that has saved so many lives.

"Dear Dr. Krebs,

Thank you for giving me another birthday (May 17).

Please, again, remember November 15th, 1979, when my doctor and four other urologists gave me a maximum of four months to live with my prostate cancer, and they set up appointments for radiation and chemotherapy, which I knew would kill me if the cancer didn't, and refused their treatment. Then on Sunday afternoon I contacted you by telephone and went with your simple program.

I am 71 years old and am in my 13th year [of survival] **Three of the four urologists have died with prostate cancer, and forty or fifty people are alive today, and doing very well, because they followed my "Krebs" simple program.**

Thanks for giving me back my life. Your friend,  
 H.M. 'Bud' Robinson"

-Letter from Bud Robinson to Ernst T. Krebs, Jr., May 18, 1992



(Red & Alicia Buttons photo by *The Tattler*; Taken from *World Without Cancer*, Second Edition, 1997, ISBN: 0-912986-19-0)

I was telling the story of B17 to a co-worker many years ago, and he found it fascinating because he said his family developed a habit of eating seeds when he was young. He remembers his grandfather having cancer, then they started ordering large amounts of seeds, then he never heard about his grandfather having cancer anymore, and to this day, his family still eats seeds on a regular basis; none of them have ever had cancer since.

Dr. John Richardson's clinic had cured of hundreds of patients before the government shut them down:

**"John Peterson had been given less than a year to live as a result of inoperable cancer of the prostate. His disease progressed rapidly, causing intense and constant pain. His body jerked in spasms, he began bleeding from the rectum, and often passed out from pain and weakness. It was at this point that he turned to Laetrile. Within 30 days of his first injection he was able to drive his own car and lead a near-normal life. He is shown here two years later, enjoying one of his favorite activities."**

-John A. Richardson, M.D., *Laetrile Case Histories*, 2005, p. 118, ISBN: 978-0-912986-38-8; Photo from the same source.




There are thousands of stories just like these, far more than I would have room to list here.

**"Mr. Lorraine Ford... suffered from inoperable cancer of the liver with previous cancer of the breast. Most patients in this category are dead within six months of diagnosis. After the failure of chemotherapy, she turned to Laetrile as a last resort in December 1974. Today she leads an active and normal life."**

-John A. Richardson, M.D., *Laetrile Case Histories*, 2005, p. 119, ISBN: 978-0-912986-38-8; Photo from the same source.

"Shane Horton was six years old when he developed **osteosarcoma of the right upper arm and of the spine**. This was confirmed both by X-ray and bone marrow biopsy. **His doctors advised that there was no hope**. It was at this point that his parents elected Laetrile therapy. **Three years after beginning Laetrile therapy, all evidence of bone cancer had vanished**, and Shane was enjoying the life of a completely normal nine-year-old."

-John A. Richardson, M.D., *Laetrile Case Histories*, 2005, p. 120-121, ISBN: 978-0-912986-38-8; Photo from the same source.



**(More B17 testimonials from other cancer patients.)**

[https://youtu.be/vjVGd2yw\\_To](https://youtu.be/vjVGd2yw_To)

Concerning Brad's cancer tumor on his heart, after surgical removal of the tumor (@3:41): *"We waited three months and went back to my normal work, and we came in for scans again, and the scans showed that this thing had started to grow again. So chemo was our next option because we hadn't heard of any other treatment. We had four courses of the standard chemo... got through it pretty well without many side effects, but then on our final scan, we found out that the chemo wasn't effective, and the cancer was still there... and then they suggested we have stronger doses of chemo or a stem cell transplant; together most likely, or we could have another surgery and have a lump of my lung cut out, just to make sure that they removed everything. We decided that was basically step one, back to the beginning, and we're not going to try that option again... I wasn't going to do that again... but in that time, we just found a lot of people said, hey Brad, have you heard of apricot kernels, and have you heard about diet change... well, we've got nothing to lose; the medical system was still on our side to fall back on. So for about twelve months we did apricot kernels... got into a flaxseed buckwheat diet... we were really looking forward to our next line of scans to find out if we've had any success. **To our amazement, what was in my chest had started to shrink from giving that go for about twelve months with vegetable juices... and now we've had all clear results, the scar tissue is shrinking, and we've done very well.**"*

**INTERVIEWER:** *"Have you had any follow-up from anyone in the cancer research industry?"*

**BRAD:** *"No I haven't. I know my case was a case study; that I was a different one that had been a tricky situation all along, where the doctor hadn't known what to do. So it was a bit surprising... I haven't been asked how it all happened."*

Case studies are, in theory, supposed to be very closely followed from beginning to end, especially since that's how doctors can become famous in leadership around the world for their discoveries, however, it was not surprising to me, after all the research I've done, that no one followed up because once we acknowledge that the general cancer research industry is not really looking for a cure, as much as it is looking for ways to secure their financial profits, medical practitioner's foolish actions become clear. Many people refuse to believe that an industry (and those working in that industry) would allow so many people to die for money, but a simply look at history, like the cigarette/tobacco industry for example, should leave us unsurprised that corporate industries would sacrifice lives to turn a profit.

The American Cancer Society doesn't have the evidence because they were not founded to look for a cure; they were founded to help the pharmaceutical industry turn a profit. It seems someone in charge does not *WANT* to have the evidence because there are thousands and thousands of such testimonies showing positive healing results from all around the world over the simple consumption of B17.

In 1972, an extensive research program on laetrile was conducted at Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center in Manhattan under Dr. Kanematsu Sugiura, a highly respected senior laboratory researcher with over 60 years experience.



"The results clearly show that Amygdalin [B17] significantly inhibits the appearance of lung metastasis in mice bearing spontaneous mammary tumors and increases significantly the inhibition of the growth of the primary tumors... Laetrile also seemed to prevent slightly the appearance of new tumors... The improvement of health and appearance of the treated animals in comparison to controls is always a common observation... Dr. Sugiura has never observed complete regression of these tumors in all his cosmic experience with other chemotherapeutic agents."

"-A Summary of the Effect of Amygdalin Upon Spontaneous Mammary Tumors in Mice," Sloan-Kettering report, June 13, 1973; Photo by Peter Chowka; Taken from *World Without Cancer*, Second Edition, 1997,

ISBN: 0-912986-19-0

The Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center research showed these six results in the mice they tested:

1. Laetrile [B17] stopped the spreading of cancer.
2. Laetrile improved general health.
3. Laetrile inhibited the growth of tumors.
4. Laetrile provided relief from pain.
5. Laetrile acted as a cancer prevention.
6. Dr. Sugiura had never witnessed these results in any other tested method.

So are we to just ignore these results? That's exactly what the ACS has done, and so I ask all readers to beware of this organization that is so highly esteemed among men.

*And he said unto them, Ye are they which justify yourselves before men; but God knoweth your hearts: for that which is highly esteemed among men is abomination in the sight of God.*

-Luke 16:15

### Rockefellers Bury the Test Results

Part of the reason the lab test results for laetrile were ignored is because the board of directors at Sloan-Kettering were unhappy with the results in Dr. Suigiura had found. Why would anyone be unhappy with positive cancer-healing results?

Remember earlier in this article about the pharmaceutical takeover of schools? The Rockefellers didn't stop with just schools, they also provided funding to research institutions in exchange for putting Rockefeller-paid people on their board of directors, and the Rockefellers began to donate to Sloan-Kettering in 1927, even donating the land the building rests on today in New York, so as you can very well guess, Sloan-Kettering now operates in the best interests of the very people who sell the drugs.

During the laetrile tests that Dr. Suigiura had run, there were three key people on the board of directors at Sloan-Kettering: James Rockefeller, Lawrence Rockefeller, and William Rockefeller. Since laetrile comes from nature (B17/Amygdalin), it cannot be patented, which means Rockefellers can't make money from it, so it's not in their best interest to support that specific type of cure.

(Click for larger image.)



The above documentation were retrieved via a Freedom of Information Act request for the June 2, 1974 meeting that took place at the FDA questioning human trials for laetrile, and after saying laetrile/amygdalin showed positive results, it notes the following:

*"Sloan Kettering is not enthusiastic about studying amygdalin, but would like to study CN Cyanide releasing drugs."*  
-Dr. H.L. Walker, Meeting with NCI, FDA, and Sload-Kettering, July 2, 1974, p.4

If we apply this to the example of scurvy, it's like saying, "We're not interested in Vitamin C, but we would like to study absorbic acid releasing drugs," while millions die from scurvy.

This tells us everything we need to know. We know that the effects of laetrile were good enough to warrant further interest in the subject by the Rockefellers, but the "cure" discovered is not what they were interested in because it cannot be patented, and therefore they want research to continue until they can find man-made drug that can be patented for profit, and it doesn't matter if it works or not, so long as it is marketable.

In the minutes, it stated:

*"The Sloan Kettering group believe their results show that amygdalin used in animals with tumors show: a decrease in lung metastases; slower tumor growth; and pain relief."*

-Dr. H.L. Walker, Meeting with NCI, FDA, and Sload-Kettering, July 2, 1974, p.4

Yet, the media lies to the public, as this ABC news report says:

*"Federal health officials warned Internet users to beware of a concoction made of apricot seeds that's touted as a cancer cure, as a Florida court case became the government's latest attempt to quell a resurgence of laetrile. In the 1970s... a National Cancer Institute study concluded that the substance did not fight cancer. Experts also warned that laetrile pills could cause cyanide poisoning."*

-ABC News, "FDA Cracks Down on Laetrile Resurgence," Sept 7, 2014, retrieved Apr 11, 2015, [abcnews.go.com/Health/story?id=117990]

I just read to you the minutes of the conclusion of that very 1970s report ABC News is referring to, and it *DOES* say that laetrile had cancer-fighting effects, but the Rockefellers were quick to shut down human testing. The media now uses terms like "resurgence" to scare the public into staying away from an actual remedy for cancer.

In 1976, an Israeli group of physicians did research on the results of laetrile at clinics in the USA and Mexico. When they returned, Dr. David Rubin, Surgeon and Cancer Researcher at Hadassah Hospital in Jerusalem drafted their report to the Israeli Ministry of Health. Here is the conclusion of that report:

*a. Contrary to many allegations in both the scientific and lay literature, laetrile [B17] is not quackery.*

*b. Laetrile is non-toxic even in very large doses.*

*c. Laetrile has a definite palliative [relief] effect. We cannot, at this stage of our investigations, say that it inhibits tumors, but the evidence we have suggests that it does. We must do controlled studies to rule out the possibility that prior therapies had some effect on the tumors that stopped growing. However, we doubt that the regressions we observed were due to "delayed effects" of other therapies because, in our experience, such delayed effects rarely, if ever, occur."*

-Dr. David Rubin, M.D., "Use of Laetrile in the Prevention and Treatment of Cancer," Report #2, Oct 25, 1976

But the ACS says: "For twenty years, we have asked the proponents of Laetrile for scientific documentation of efficacy, but it has not been forthcoming."

-Cancer Journal for Clinicians, American Cancer Society, Jan/Feb, 1976, Vol. 26, No. 1, p. 52

Let me explain something here: The ACS is *LYING*. Those who run it are *LIARS*, but the world is so deceived, they believe this lying organization to be one of the most trustworthy in the world.

(Read "God Does Not Justify Lies" here at creationliberty.com for more details.)

## Cancerous Charities

There are many people in the low levels of the American Cancer Society that are doing a lot of work because they honestly believe they're doing what's right to help people, but the evidence points at lies and financial ties to major cartels who run the pharmaceutical industries of the world.

The ACS's website states they are strongly supporting the prevention of cancer:

*"[T]he American Cancer Society's Cancer Prevention & Early Detection Cancer Facts and Figures is a resource to strengthen cancer prevention and early detection efforts at the local, state, and national levels."*

-American Cancer Society, "Cancer Prevention & Early Detection Facts & Figures," cancer.org, retrieved Mar 25, 2015, [cancer.org/research/cancerfactsstatistics/cancer-prevention-early-detection]

Most of the public is unaware that this is not true. Carcinogens are substances (typically chemicals) that are known to cause cancer in living tissue, and Dr. Samuel Epstein (Professor of Environmental and Occupational Medicine) reports his findings on the ACS's track record in their lack of help concerning banning the use of chemicals:

*"Indeed, despite promises to the public to do everything to 'wipe out cancer in your lifetime,' the ACS fails to make its voice heard in Congress and the regulatory arena. Instead, the ACS has consistently rejected or ignored opportunities and requests from Congress, regulatory agencies, unions, and environmental and consumer organizations to provide scientific evidence critical to legislate occupational, environmental, and personal product carcinogens."*

-Samuel S. Epstein M.D., *National Cancer Institute and American Cancer Society: Criminal Indifference to Cancer Prevention and Conflicts of Interest*, Xilbris Corporation, 2011, p. 105, ISBN: 9781462861361

The actual track record for the ACS has been completely indifferent to the public use of cancer inducing substances.

*"In 1971, when studies unequivocally proved that diethylstilbestrol (DES) caused vaginal cancers in teenaged daughters of women administered the drug during pregnancy, the ACS refused an invitation to testify at Congressional hearings to require the FDA (U. S. Food and Drug Administration) to ban its use as an animal feed additive. It gave no reason for its refusal."*

-Samuel S. Epstein, M.D., "The American Cancer Society: Why Prevent Cancer If We're Making Money On It?" Cancer Prevention Coalition, retrieved Mar, 25, 2015, [preventcancer.com/losing/acs/acs\_why\_prevent.htm]

*"In 1977 and 1978, the ACS opposed regulations proposed for hair coloring products that contained dyes known to cause breast and liver cancer in rodents. In so doing, the ACS ignored virtually every tenet of responsible public health as these chemicals were clear-cut liver and breast carcinogens."*

-Samuel S. Epstein, M.D., "The American Cancer Society: Why Prevent Cancer If We're Making Money On It?" Cancer Prevention Coalition, retrieved Mar, 25, 2015, [preventcancer.com/losing/acs/acs\_why\_prevent.htm]

PBS Frontline released a documentary in March of 1993 on the use of pesticides in children's food causing cancer in a number of cases, to which they won outstanding journalism awards, but the ACS, just before the release of this documentary, sided with the pesticide companies:

*"In 1993, just before PBS Frontline aired the special entitled 'In Our Children's Food,' the ACS came out in support of the pesticide industry. In a damage-control memorandum sent to some 48 regional divisions, the ACS trivialized pesticides as a cause of childhood cancer, and reassured the public that carcinogenic pesticide residues in food are safe, even for babies. When the media and concerned citizens called local ACS chapters, they received reassurances from an ACS memorandum by its vice president for Public Relations: 'The primary health hazards of pesticides are from direct contact with the chemicals at potentially high doses, for example, farm workers who apply the chemicals and work in the fields after the pesticides have been applied, and people living near aerially sprayed fields... The American Cancer Society believes that the benefits of a balanced diet rich in fruits and vegetables far outweigh the largely theoretical risks posed by occasional, very low pesticide residue levels in foods.'"*

-Samuel S. Epstein, M.D., "The American Cancer Society: Why Prevent Cancer If We're Making Money On It?" Cancer Prevention Coalition, retrieved Mar, 25, 2015, [preventcancer.com/losing/acs/acs\_why\_prevent.htm]

But despite the ACS trying to justify the use of cancer-inducing chemicals in foods, the National Resource Defense Council took action and got results a few years later:

*"The National Academies report on pesticides and children's health, along with intense pressure from NRDC and others, led Congress to unanimously pass the Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA) in 1996, requiring EPA to consider harm to children when registering pesticides, and to consider risks to groups of related pesticides and not just evaluate*

them one-by-one. Subsequent negotiations with NRDC forced EPA to review pesticide registrations every 15 years to incorporate new science. Together, these two requirements have forced millions of pounds of the most toxic pesticides off the market and out of our homes, gardens, and food crops."

-National Resource Defense Council, "The Food Quality Protection Act Helps Protect Kids," retrieved Mar 25, 2015, [nrdc.org/health/pesticides]

I am *NOT* endorsing any of these organizations; I am simply explaining, in this context, that the ACS has had clear opportunity to help in the prevention of chemicals that are harmful in the realm of inducing cancer, but they refuse to act, and worse still, they attempt to justify the chemicals. This is a good time to repeat what was stated earlier:


*"The American Medical Association has strong ties to pharmaceutical companies, and the American Cancer Society owns half of the patent rights of chemotherapy drugs."*

-Zillah R. Eisenstein, *Manmade Breast Cancers*, Cornell University Press, 2001, p. 101, ISBN: 9780801487071; Eisenstein is a professor and Chair of Politics at Ithaca College in New York.

The ACS owns the patent rights on many chemicals, and therefore would have certain obligations to protect companies that produce their chemical compounds. This is why they do so little when it comes to protecting the public, as was stated in a 1994 Center for Science in the Public Interest press release:

*"A group of 24 scientists charged that ACS was doing little to protect the public from cancer-causing chemicals in the environment and workplace. The scientists urged ACS to revamp its policies and to emphasize prevention in its lobbying and educational campaigns."*

-Center for Science in the Public Interest, Jan 23, 1994, New York City, quoted by Samuel S. Epstein, *Cancer-Gate: How to Win the Losing Cancer War*, Baywood Publishing Company Inc., 2005, p. 84, ISBN: 9780895033543



Services and Treatment Options for Persons With Cancer," Cancer Information & Support Society, Australian Senate, March 2005, retrieved Mar 25, 2015, [aph.gov.au/~media/wopapub/senate/committee/clac\_ctte/completed\_inquiries/2004\_07/cancer/submissions/sub15\_pdf.ashx]

What the average person doesn't seem to understand is that when someone makes a donation to the American Cancer Society, that money is used in research as they claim, but the research they're doing is not to cure cancer, but to find a way to extend their patents to turn a profit. The research being done is only in areas that force someone to take an ADA-approved "treatment," or something in a man-made pill form, and this is so the results of the research can be patented and marketed the very corporate interests that are looking to create a monopoly on a product.

So we either believe that those with money and power would never lie to us, and that they always have our personal best interests in the forefront of their minds, or you have to believe that experiments on laetrile, from people all around the world (who didn't know each other and had nothing to gain), were all a giant hoax. Sadly, for most people, they will never consider either point, and just continue to pour out money blindly with their hopes in a rigged game.

*"Spokesmen for orthodox medicine - and particularly for the American Cancer Society - continue to cloak themselves in the mantle of their own prestige, deride any scientific opinion that differs from their own, and categorically denounce as absurd those things which they do not understand. Laetrile is the current victim of such scientific arrogance and ignorance."*

If the ACS were to start fighting against the chemical industry's sales of harmful chemicals, they would also have to account for how their own patents on chemicals is justified, which they do through the use of chemotherapy. However, chemotherapy is a realm of "medical science" that has no evidence to it whatsoever:

*"Success of most chemotherapies is appalling... There is no scientific evidence for its ability to extend in any appreciable way the lives of patients suffering from the most common organic cancer... Chemotherapy for malignancies too advanced for surgery, which accounts for 80% of all cancers, is a scientific wasteland."*

-Abel Ulrich, PhD, "Chemotherapy of Advanced Epithelial Cancer," quoted by Don Benjamin, "Submission to Inquiry Into



-John A. Richardson, M.D., *Laetrile Case Histories*, 2005, p. 34, ISBN: 978-0-912986-38-8

It's not just the corporate conflict of interest, as some investigators are starting to come out with the truth on the financial reports surrounding the ACS. It's get a bit tricky because there are companies that organizations like the ACS hire, which end up getting most of the profits from your donations -- these are called "solicitors," and the ACS enlisted InfoCision from 1999 to 2011.

*"In fiscal 2010, InfoCision gathered \$5.3 million for the society. Hundreds of thousands of volunteers took part, but none of that money -- not one penny -- went to fund cancer research or help patients, according to the society's filing with the U.S. Internal Revenue Service and the state of Maine."*

-David M. Evans, "Charities Deceive Donors Unaware Money Goes to a Telemarketer," *Bloomberg Business*, Sept 12, 2014, retrieved Mar 27, 2015, [bloomberg.com/news/articles/2012-09-12/charities-deceive-donors-unaware-money-goes-to-a-telemarketer]

The above image is the activity report from the ACS, and their CFO (Chief Financial Officer) signed off on it. If you look closely, you'll notice the amount Incision received was *MORE* than they raised in donations, and worse still is that the ignorant public refuses to believe that anyone on the side of "cancer research" could possibly deceive them.

Not one dime was ever returned to those who donated.

And it's not just the American Cancer Society; many so-called "charities" are flooded with corporate conflicts of interest, and many of them don't spend hardly any money they receive on the actual charity program they claim to support. The *Tampa Bay Times* and the *Center for Investigative Reporting* pulled out the **federal tax filings from the past ten years on many major charity funds**, and came up with a list of the top ranking worst charities in America.

(MM = Millions -- The total percentage spent on aid is after the other expenses of the organization.)

NAME	DONATIONS VIA SOLICITORS	PAID TO SOLICITORS	% SPEND ON AID
Kids Wish Network	\$137.9 MM	\$115.9 MM	2.5%
Cancer Fund of America	\$86.8 MM	\$75.4 MM	1.0%
Breast Cancer Relief	\$63.9 MM	\$44.8 MM	2.2%
Children's Cancer Fund of America	\$43.7 MM	\$34.4 MM	4.6%
Children's Cancer Recovery Foundation	\$38.5 MM	\$28.9 MM	0.7%
Woman to Woman Breast Cancer Foundation	\$19.4 MM	\$18.2 MM	0.3%
National Cancer Coalition	\$42.1 MM	\$16.4 MM	1.3%
United Breast Cancer Foundation	\$12.7 MM	\$7.2 MM	6.3%
Children's Leukemia Research Association	\$9.8 MM	\$6.8 MM	11.1%
Hope Cancer Fund	\$2.1 MM	\$1.7 MM	0.5%

-Tampa Bay Times, "America's Worst Charities," tampabay.com, December, 2014, retrieved Mar 27, 2015, [tampabay.com/americas-worst-charities]

*"The 50 worst charities in America devote less than 4% of donations raised to direct cash aid. Some charities gave even less. Over a decade, one diabetes charity raised nearly \$14 million and gave about \$10,000 to patients. Six spent no cash*

Click for larger image.

*at all on their cause."*

-Kris Hundley & Kendall Taggart, "Above The Law: America's Worst Charities," *CNN*, Jun 13, 2013, retrieved Mar 27, 2015, [cnn.com/2013/06/13/us/worst-charities/index.html?c=homepage-t]

This is why, in many of our audio teachings, I have warned people not to just throw money at something and called it "charity," because real charity takes people being involved in their giving. If you really want to be charitable to cancer patients, why not visit a cancer ward of a hospital, find a child with cancer, and spend some time with them? If you want to really helps the families of cancer patients, why not print off this article and take it to them along with the some apricot seeds?

Not only is a huge percentage of these funds going to secure the financial interests of the wealthy, but what little they actually give to the cause goes back into more pills and radiation research which keeps people deep in sickness and debt.

*There is a way which seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death.*

*-Proverbs 14:12*

Ask yourself: Do you know where your donated money is going? I didn't ask if you knew where they told you it went, I'm asking do you KNOW where it goes? Did they send you a receipt that explains where all your money went that could be admissible in a court of law? If not, how do you know you can trust them?

*As it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one:*

*-Roman 3:10*

*Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.*

*-1 Thessalonians 5:21*

## Trial By Media

Those who work in media know full-well that they can give you an impression of something, letting you assume thing about a situation, without ever having to make a statement about it. When you are watching the evening news, and you see a man in handcuffs being put into a police car, what goes through your mind? "*He's a criminal, and must have done something wrong.*" It's a normal thought process that if someone's in handcuffs, that he/she did something wrong, and in a number of cases, it's true, but not in every case.

There are cases where someone is accused, arrested, and convicted properly of a crime they are guilty of committing. There are cases where someone is accused and arrested, but found innocent of the crime. However, most importantly, there are people who are accused and arrested on something they did not do wrong, but are found guilty and punished anyway, and these are the cases that the general public almost never hears about.

For example, the man in the photograph was arrested for his realistic costume at a themed convention. He was dressed up as a SWAT team soldier, and someone called the police out of fear. He was arrested, handcuffed, and detained for a short time, but he was innocent of any crime. Yet, if you were to simply look at this picture from the news report, without any further details, you would think this man was guilty of breaking the law, because after all, he's being handcuffed by police, so the assumption is that he's guilty.

(See Kristin Hanes, "Zombie Outfit Lands Man in Handcuffs," *KOMO News*, May 29, 2009, retrieved May 10, 2011, [komonews.com])



Accusation of guilt by simply seeing someone arrested on television is called "trial by media," which creates an assumption of guilt by majority opinion whether or not the person is guilty. This is not some recently developed tactic either; it has been used for thousands of years by many governments.

For example, the Catholic Church, for 605 years of The Inquisition, tortured and murdered Christians for their faith in Jesus Christ and the Holy Scriptures. Some were imprisoned and/or executed for simply owning a Bible, all because the Catholic Church didn't like people reading it. Many of these Christians were handcuffed, and taken away by the

"authorities," to be publically displayed and labeled heretics, even though they committed no crime, nor were allowed to give a response, but were used to make an example to the public, similar to how a school bully makes an example of a child who cannot defend himself.

(See "Corruptions of Christianity: Catholicism - The Inquisition" for more details; See also John Foxe, *Foxe's Book of Martyrs*, W. Grinton Berry Edition, 2003, ISBN: 0-8007-8664-5)

Trial by media has been common in suppressing the cure for cancer. Laetrile clinics specifically have been hit hard and fast by government enforcers, and we'll take a closer look at Dr. Maurice Kowan who was healing many cancer patients in his clinic, but was arrested and put on trial for the "crime" of using laetrile as a cancer control.

*"A Los Angeles physician has been indicted by the county Grand Jury on charges of attempted grand theft for the alleged illegal use of drugs to remedy cancer, it had been announced today. Named in the indictment was Dr. Maurice H. Kowan... He also was charged with violating the state Cancer Control Act by purportedly representing to a patient that Laetriles, a drug made from the extract of apricot pits, would alleviate or cure cancer."*

-*"Jury Indicts Physician in Cancer Cure," Valley News, Van Nuys, California, Sept 19, 1968, p. 78*

During Dr. Kowan's trial, the jury was not allowed to see any of the clinics results that laetrile was curing the cancer patients, and no witnesses were allowed for that purpose. The Jury was railroaded into a guilty verdict, and Ira Reiner, the prosecuting attorney, faced the jury and stated:

*"This is not a kindly old man. This is the most thoroughly evil person the imagination can concoct. He's taking advantage of people for money. We can understand people who kill in rage. What do you think of a man who can kill at nine dollars per visit?... This man has to be stopped. He is very dangerous. This case goes far beyond the walls of this courtroom. The way to stop him is a guilty verdict."*

-*"Kowan Trial Nearing End in City Court," L.A. News-Herald and Journal, July 23, 1967*

It's sad that he was charging \$9 per visit for getting rid of peoples' cancer, but the media and courts justify radiation "therapy," which costs so much that the American Cancer Society won't even publish it on their website in answering the question, "How much does radiation treatment cost?"

-American Cancer Society, "How much does radiation treatment cost?" cancer.org, retrieved Mar 26, 2015,

[cancer.org/treatment/treatmentsandsideeffects/treatmenttypes/radiation/understandingradiationtherapyaguideforpatientsandfamilies/understanding-radiation-therapy-cost]

Sandi Rog, a cancer survivor who cured her cancer with laetrile, recounts her costs with, and around, her radiation treatments:

*"It was around that time, shortly after radiation, that I went to see my naturopathic doc in AZ. He put me on a 'million' supplements (okay, it felt like a million; I had about twenty bottles of supplements prescribed by him). And visiting him cost us approximately 1200 to 1700 dollars a day (yes, PER DAY—and that was with HUGE discounts), plus another 9800 dollars for one particular IV."*

-Sandi Rog, "My Cancer Story," Aug 23, 2012, retrieved Mar 26, 2015, [beatcancerwithb17.blogspot.com/p/my-win-against-cancer.html]

But Dr. Kowan's \$9 per visit charge made him into a "very dangerous" man that takes "advantage of people for money." Kowan was pressured into signing an agreement that laetrile had no effects against cancer, but he refused to sign, and was charged a \$3,000 fine, three months in prison, and was prohibited from seeing a cancer patient for three years, all for the "crime" of saving lives because in America, you dare challenge the wealth of the ruling elite.

Earlier, I published some patients who had been cured by laetrile through Dr. John Richardson's clinic, and his reward for this was being arrested.

*"After my release following the first arrest, I went home and spent the evening in a state of semi-shock. Before the week was over, I came to learn firsthand the tremendous power of TV and the press. My acquaintances, neighbors, and even many of my patients had begun to keep their distance and now were viewing me with a mixture of caution and distrust. After all, I had been arrested."*

-John A. Richardson, M.D., *Laetrile Case Histories*, 2005, p. 79, ISBN: 978-0-912986-38-8

During this time, Richardson was put through a trial where the prosecution made him look like a quack that was responsible for the deaths of uncountable numbers of people, but despite on their intense propaganda, the jury came back with seven to five in favor of the defendant being not guilty. The pharmaceutical companies cannot have the public

winning cases in favor of the cure for cancer, so a few days after the first long and expense trial, the state decided to try the case a second time, which would normally be illegal and unconstitutional.

*"The trial was almost a carbon copy of the previous one with one exception: the jury. As we were to learn later, there were several members of the jury who appeared to be personally interested in convincing the others to find me guilty. Juror Lela Herbert told us later that she was offered financial help for her decorator shop if only she would change her vote to 'guilty.' Between shouting insults and threats, on the one hand, and offers of money, on the other, they literally had her in tears. Several of the others ultimately changed their votes under similar pressure, but she stood firm and would not compromise her convictions. The final vote was eleven to one."*

-John A. Richardson, M.D., *Laetrile Case Histories*, 2005, p. 81, ISBN: 978-0-912986-38-8

And it's not just John Richardson -- it's anyone who dares to cure cancer outside of the patented permission of the AMA, ACS, and associated cartels. With major corporate wealth backing chemicals and radiation, they can bribe just about anyone in the government to do their bidding.

Dr. Stewart Jones of Palo Alto, CA, was being hunted by James Eddington, head of the Berkeley fraud division, and ordered one of his undercover agents, Natasha Benton, to lie in her report about Dr. Jones's use of Laetrile. Outside the court room, the defense attorney overheard Ms. Benton arguing with her boss that she would not lie on the witness stand, and so the prosecution chose not to call her to the stand. However, the defense DID call her up to the stand:

**"BENTON:** *Before any report is always written, Mr. Eddington left instruction what for me to write. After I read these instructions, I telephoned Mr. Eddington telling him I didn't feel all those instructions were correct. He told me, 'Go ahead and write what I said, because this is what we need to get a conviction.'* I wrote as close to what he said as I could, according to my conscience. But I still don't feel that I told the truth in that report. Later, on June 1st, I was shown a quite lengthy report. He told me to sign that report before I went before the Grand Jury, and I could read it later; we didn't have time at that time.

**DEFENSE ATTORNEY:** *Did you sign that report without reading it?*

**BENTON:** *Yes, I did. Later I read a small portion of it. That isn't the report I wrote. Outside of this courtroom he admitted that it isn't the report I wrote. He said my report - quote - was so sh\*\*ty, that that's why he changed it - close quote."*

-John A. Richardson, M.D., *Laetrile Case Histories*, 2005, p. 82, ISBN: 978-0-912986-38-8

James Eddington was also the same man who approached Dr. Richardson's patients and families to get them to sue Richardson for malpractice. The media doesn't point out these details, but they do take it upon themselves to fuel the fire for burning witches (doctors) in their witch hunts, as *The Stanford Daily* reported on Dr. Jones:

*"Earlier Friday, Louis Castro, deputy state attorney general prosecuting Jones, said that many patients died 'a very miserable and painful death because they were relying on Laetrile... There is one thing that all quacks have in common: they disregard the rules of evidence... The scientific method simply does not exist in the quack mind."*

-Bob Zuckerman, "Hearing Probes Laetrile Case," *The Stanford Daily*, Vol. 167, Issue 12, Feb 19, 1975, p. 1

The problem is that most patients who go to laetrile as a treatment, do so as a LAST RESORT, meaning that they have already gone through radiation injections that have done unknown damage to their bodies. Many patients who turn to laetrile too late, even after curing their cancer, will still die from the damage already done to their internal organs through radiation, but in the media, it's laetrile that takes the blame for it.

While mainstream media helps the public remain ignorant of the truth, the American Cancer Society, with support of the mainstream media, tells the public that chemotherapy is a "proven" cure.

*"There are proven cures... surgery and/or radiation and, more and more, chemotherapy is playing a part."*

-Letter from Mabel Burnett, American Cancer Society Headquarters, to Dr. John Richardson, Dec 18, 1972

If all these quack-accusing hypocrites would stop playing duck hunt and listen for a few minutes, they might find some interesting evidence.

*"A survey of 128 US cancer doctors found that if they contracted cancer, more than 80 per cent would not have chemotherapy as the 'risks and side effects far outweighed the likely benefits'."*

-*Cancer Active*, "20 Things You Need to Know About Chemotherapy," retrieved Mar 31, 2015, [canceractive.com/cancer-active-page-link.aspx?n=248]

A professor of oncology at the State University of New York said:

*"Many medical oncologists recommend chemotherapy for virtually any tumor, with a hopefulness undiscouraged by almost invariable failure. Most cancer patients in this country die of chemotherapy. Chemotherapy does not eliminate breast, colon, or lung cancers. This fact has been documented for over a decade, yet doctors still use chemotherapy for these tumors."*

-Albert Braverman, M.D., quoted by Raymond Francis, *Never Fear Cancer Again: How to Prevent and Reverse Cancer*, Health Communications Inc., 2011, p. 26, ISBN: 9780757391903

The late oncologist Glen Warner said:

*"We have a multi-billion dollar industry that is killing people, right and left, just for financial gain. Their idea of research is to see whether two doses of this poison is better than three doses of that poison."*

-Glen Warner, M.D., quoted by Peter Havasi, *Education of Cancer Healing*, Lulu.com, Vol. 2, p. 59, ISBN: 9781291453584



A former president of the American Chemical Society stated:

*"As a chemist trained to interpret data, it is incomprehensible to me that physicians can ignore the clear evidence that chemotherapy does much, much more harm than good."*

-Alan Nixon, PhD, quoted by Andreas Moritz, *Timeless Secrets of Health and Rejuvenation*, Ener-Chi Wellness Center, 2007, p. 338, ISBN: 9780979275753

A french cancer specialist stated:

*"If I contracted cancer, I would never go to a standard cancer treatment centre. Only cancer victims who live far from such centres have a chance. Yet, day after day, year after year, the Cancer Industry continues to put these toxic chemicals into the bodies of cancer patients. And the patients let them do it, even volunteering for new 'guinea pig' studies, simply because someone with a degree from a school of disease (also known as medical school) told them it was their 'only option.' It costs lots of money for them to poison the body of cancer patients, and the*

*patients gladly pay it. Sadly, some people will spend six figures a year poisoning their bodies because their 'doctor told them to do it.' The truth is that there are many effective natural cancer treatments that don't require a barbaric procedure like chemotherapy."*

-Charles Mathe, PhD, quoted by Margaret B. Mba, *The Cancer Odyssey*, Xlibris Corporation, 2011, p. 50, ISBN: 9781456885397

But let's see what happens when someone actually cures himself of cancer outside of the approved radiation death treatment:

*(Jason Vale prison sentence because he claims seeds of apricots cured his tumor.)*

<https://youtu.be/WvKQrATZ6bU>

Jason Vale got into trouble because the FDA says you can't claim laetrile is a cure while selling it. I can say these apricots seeds cure cancer all I want because I'm not selling anything, but Vale went into business over it. That's where the government attacks, through corporate business, because it's too much labor to unconstitutionally try to attack people who want to use apricot seeds to cure themselves of cancer, but if no one can sell it, no one can get to it.

Jason Vale didn't understand the whole story, and got himself into a mess he may never get out of because there are major corporate interests that are threatened by these seeds. In the video above, you'll notice that the media never once even mentions the many people who have been healed from B17, even though many thousands of Americans have been more than willing to come out and testify to their healing of cancer.

(For testimony, see John A. Richardson, M.D., *Laetrile Case Histories*, 2005, ISBN: 978-0-912986-38-8; For details on chemotherapy death rate statistics, and how the real results are kept quiet, see Dr. Ralph Moss, *Questioning Chemotherapy*, 1995, ISBN: 978-1881025252)

It is interesting to note that the chemicals initially used when radiation therapy was in its infant stages was mustard gas used by the Germans in World War II.

(See -Charlotte Jacobs, *Henry Kaplan and the Story of Hodgkin's Disease*, Stanford University Press, 2010, p. 83, ISBN: 9780804774482)

"[S]ystemic cancer chemotherapy is a recent development with its historical origins in observations of the toxic effects on humans accidentally exposed to chemical warfare agents, mainly mustard gas, during WWI and WWII."

-Guy Faguet, *The War on Cancer: An Anatomy of Failure*, Springer Science & Business Media, 2008, p. 69, ISBN: 9781402036170

"[T]he first class of 'modern' cancer chemotherapeutic drugs were born from the observation that 'mustard gas' developed as a military antipersonnel weapon in World War II caused lymphoid and bone marrow suppression."

-Michael C. Perry, *The Chemotherapy Source Book*, Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, 2008, p. 30, ISBN: 9780781773287

While there are no laws that ban the use of laetrile, there are "regulations" set by the AMA and the FDA (Federal Drug Administration) that prohibit its use for the treatment of cancer in the United States, but they turn around and approve the use of varieties of mustard gas to poison people directly. Simply because they put regulations on it, the people then fear laetrile, and because there are not restrictions on radiation and poisoning, people trust it. This is not only trial by media, but also testing by media, and the people continue to believe that large money-making organizations would never do anything bad, and have the peoples' best interests at heart.

Thus saith the LORD; Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm, and whose heart departeth from the LORD.

-Jeremiah 17:5

It is better to trust in the LORD than to put confidence in man.

-Psalm 118:8

## Walk a Mile in Your Doctor's Shoes

The world is very good at putting themselves in the position of a cancer patient, understanding their pain and suffering, typically of a relative they had die from cancer. There are many charity events every year that donate to a cancer research fund, and it always comes with a comment like this: "My grandfather had cancer. Our family suffered as he suffered. We want to make sure that no one ever has to go through that again. Thanks for supporting such a good cause."

It sounds good on the outside, but once we look deeper, we see a bunch of people throwing money at a problem, and they don't care where that money goes, so long as it says "cancer prevention" on it. It is this very lackadaisical ignorance that has allowed cancer to become such a ridiculous epidemic in the U.S.

Rather, I would like people to start putting themselves in the shoes of the very medical practitioners they so highly esteem. In the hearts and minds of the average American citizen, if someone is a doctor, he/she can do no wrong, and always has the best interests of their patients in mind, and that would be a wonderful world to live it, but in reality, we live in a world of sin.

As it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one:

-Romans 3:10

For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God;

-Romans 3:23

The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?

-Jeremiah 17:9

In public conversations, before I even begin explaining the cure for cancer, I often get interrupted with the question: "Why doesn't my doctor know about this?" Well, their doctor probably does know about it, but since he's trained to follow everything the AMA tells him to follow, and the AMA follows the lies of McDonald and Garland's 1953 report, your

doctor will ignore the cure for cancer and continue recommending poison to his patients because that's what he was trained to do in college.

So let's imagine you're a medical practitioner. You have a nice home, a wonderful family, top-of-the-line car, and a well-established clinic in a town where you are highly respected after you spent eight or ten years and hundreds of thousands of dollars in medical school. Everyone comes to you for advice, and you've been sending them to pharmaceutical pills and chemotherapy.



Now let's imagine you have an author like me, a college drop out, that comes along and tells you that, through your ignorance, you've been responsible for poisoning and killing your patients with drugs and radiation, and that despite all your intelligence and degrees, the cure for cancer is growing on a tree in my backyard, and that if you stand up for this cure, you will lose your clinic, your income, your respect of the community, face fines and jail time, and lose everything you've worked for -- so be honest: How likely are you to listen to me?

So why do you think the average doctor doesn't know anything about this? If readers will be honest with themselves, they know the price for the truth is too high for most people. I'm not saying that every doctor is like this, but the ones who would stand up for the truth against the "AMA gods" are far and few between.

Of course the average American jeers at me because I'm just some nobody and these doctors are prestigious and professionally trained in medicine, but whether or not one has a college degree is not a reflection on knowledge. Henry Ford dropped out of high school at 16. Bill Gates dropped out of college at 19. Michael Dell dropped out of college at 19. Steve Jobs dropped out of college at 21. Elizabeth Holmes, who Forbes 400 named the "youngest self-made woman billionaire" dropped out of college at 19, which goes to demonstrate that the degrees are held up in our society as a respect of persons, which the Bible says is sin, and that we should not judge a person based on the lack of a title, but on the merits of truth.

(Read "Why are Christians Respecting Persons?" here at creationliberty.com for more details.)

*But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.*

*-James 2:9*

The problem here is twofold: pride and money. Please don't take this the wrong way, I'm sure there are some wonderful physicians out there who do great work and save lives, and I'm not saying every doctor out there does things out of pride and for the money, but the mass majority today have been brainwashed so deep into pharmaceuticals, and have their egos so far stretched, that the average house-wives of those physicians know more about health and national care than their husbands.

(See "The United Vacci-Nations" for details on the focus of drugs and pharmaceuticals, rather than health and well-being.)

Most doctors simply refuse to investigate/research any possibility that goes against the direct orders of the AMA, because if they do, they will be shunned out of their practice, and prevented from practicing medicine in the U.S., losing all the years and hundreds of thousands of dollars of investments and schooling they had to go through. Again, the risk is just too high to sacrifice all that for the health and well-being of people they don't even know. I know it is difficult for many people to think of others in that way, but the truth of the matter is that those who would sacrifice their lives to keep their hippocratic oath are far and few between, and most will continue to pump their patients full of harmful chemicals, killing them slowly with each dose.

### The "Hippocratic" Oath

The original Hippocratic Oath was swearing unto pagan gods and goddesses:

*"I swear by Apollo Physician and Asclepius and Hygieia and Panacea and all the gods and goddesses, making them my witnesses, that I will fulfill according to my ability and judgment this oath and this covenant:"*

*-Kenneth C. Davis, Don't Know Much About Mythology, HarperCollins, 2009, p. 230, ISBN: 9780061925757*

This oath was born out of an evil tree of paganism and witchcraft. Today they simply swear in general, but the Bible is clear on this issue:

*But I say unto you, Swear not at all; neither by heaven; for it is God's throne: Nor by*

*the earth; for it is his footstool: neither by Jerusalem; for it is the city of the great King. Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black. But let your communication be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil.*

*-Matthew 5:34-37*

The modern Hippocratic Oath says the following:

*"I swear to fulfill, to the best of my ability and judgment, this covenant: I will respect the hard-won scientific gains of those physicians in whose steps I walk, and gladly share such knowledge as is mine with those who are to follow."*

-Hippocratic Oath (Modern Version - Written in 1964), Johns Hopkins Sheridan Libraries, retrieved Oct 12, 2013, [http://guides.library.jhu.edu/content.php?pid=23699&sid=190964]

*It is not good to have respect of persons in judgment.*

*-Proverbs 24:23*

*To have respect of persons is not good: for for a piece of bread that man will transgress.*

*-Proverbs 28:21*

The oath these doctors take requires them to follow in the footsteps of the AMA, even if they're wrong! They have respect those who are poisoning people with radiation, and creating harmful, and sometimes life-threatening, side effects through extensive pills and injections. Granted, there are some footsteps that are good to walk in, but this oath is directed to respect the personage of men who are dedicated to the money and prestige, rather than truth and wellness.

*"I will apply, for the benefit of the sick, all measures which are required."*

-Hippocratic Oath (Modern Version - Written in 1964), Johns Hopkins Sheridan Libraries, retrieved Oct 12, 2013, [http://guides.library.jhu.edu/content.php?pid=23699&sid=190964]

Mustard gas is being used "for the benefit of the sick," and they will end up using "all measures which are required," which means they will follow the standards set by the AMA and FDA for chemotherapy treatment in poisoning their victims. It doesn't matter if a drug is poisoning your body, as long as it is AMA/FDA approved, it will be used on the sick anyway, despite the risks, and the patients will remain unsuspecting and unquestioning to a fault, because they have been taught that doctors are people that can be trusted, all the while a large profit is being made behind the scenes.

The legal restrictions on drug prescriptions only coming from a licensed medical practitioner is portrayed in the media as a protective restriction that keeps criminals from accessing it, but in reality, that restriction is in place to keep the average person from making the product to protect corporate profits. These profits are shared with the doctors themselves, which how many of them make most of their money.

**(WARNING: This video has some language and jokes that may be offensive/inappropriate. I've decided to include it in this article because the information in it is incredibly accurate, and consumers should be aware of this.)**

*Last Week Tonight with John Oliver: Marketing to Doctors (HBO)*

<https://youtu.be/YQZ2UeOTO3I>

Angie Maher, a former saleswoman for a major pharmaceutical company @9:42: *"I essentially say to a doctor, 'Hey, our company has identified you to be a thought-leader, would you like to be a thought-leader for our company? The doctor would normally, almost every time, say 'Yes.'"* -- The drug companies are using the sinful pride of physicians to sell their products.

We have to acknowledge the fact that most doctors in America make an enormous amount of money in drug sales, and this includes the sale of chemicals used in radiation therapy. I know most peoples' thought is to say that the doctors had the best of intentions with their patients, but the road to hell is paved with good intentions.

If you want to stay health, and your family to stay healthy, then the best thing to do is start doing research yourself so you



can make educated decisions, instead of putting your trust in someone who only makes money off you when you're ill. If this article has helped you, and you think it can help someone else, please share it with others because we cannot just sit back and wait for our government, media, and medical institutions to speak the truth. Word of mouth, and individual education, is the only way that lives will be saved, so please take the time to pass this along in hopes that they would be saved by the natural healing of the Lord God.

## Questions and Arguments

### QUESTION: *Is Laetrile illegal in the United States?*

I have to apologize for anyone who has followed our website on this topic in prior versions of this article, as I've previously taught that Laetrile was made illegal in the United States back in the 1980s, which is actually not true. The reality is that the FDA (Food and Drug Administration) claims to have legal jurisdiction over laetrile based on the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act amendment of 1962, also known as the Kefauver Harris Amendment, which requires drug manufacturers to provide proof of effectiveness of their drugs before they can be sold, so because the FDA bases their information on the 1953 McDonald and Garland report that lied and said there was no effectiveness of laetrile, therefore, they prohibit its sale in the U.S.

However, what most people don't know is that the amendment does not apply to substances commonly in use before the amendment was passed, otherwise you would end up with a mass lawsuit frenzy for a retroactive act. (Retroactive meaning that people would be punished for a crime to which there was no law or regulation for it yet.) The substances commonly sold on the market prior to the 1962 amendment were "grandfathered" in, and the FDA has stated that amygdalin (laetrile) was sold for treatment of cancer prior to 1962.

(See Dean Burk, "Fact Sheet," *National Health Federation Newsletter*, January, 1977, p. 3)

*"[T]he Circuit Court emphasizes that Laetrile is not to be considered a 'new drug' under the law merely because the FDA has said so, but rather that said determination must be supported by substantial evidence. The statutory presumption in favor of administrative determinations is based on the premise that such determinations are presumed to be supported by substantial evidence until a reviewing court has determined otherwise. Such presumption was overcome when FDA counsel admitted that no competent administrative record had ever been developed in support of the agency's determination. As a matter of law then, such determination is not supported by substantial evidence and cannot be sustained... the Court then requested that the FDA make available to the Court the written basis for the agency's determination with regard to Laetrile, no matter how casual or unstructured its form or content might be; whereupon the Court was advised that no such rationale existed in any form. Clearly, federal agencies may not rule by fiat invoking only some unexplained application of their own expertise in defense of policy decisions they have made...*

*Based on the complete absence of any evidence tending to establish a rational basis for the agency's determination, the Court would also be compelled to find... that the agency's determination was 'arbitrary, capricious,' and represented 'an abuse of discretion,' and that it should also be overturned for these additional reasons.'*

*-Rutherford v. United States, NO. CIV-75-0218-B, "Memorandum Opinion and Order," 424 F. Supp. 107 (1977), United States District Court, W.D. Oklahoma, Jan 4, 1977*

In case you didn't understand what was just stated, since substances before the 1962 amendment are not automatically under FDA jurisdiction, if the FDA wants to go after a certain drug in sale before 1962, they need to make a formal case against it and bring it to court. The FDA did not want to do this because bringing laetrile into a court trial under the basis of evidence would allow a public record documentation of the positive tested results of laetrile, as well as eye-witness testimonies, which would solidify the case *FOR* laetrile instead of against it, and so the FDA, in deceptive fashion, tried to usher laetrile under the 1962 amendment by labeling it a "new drug," to which the Supreme Court shot it down and told them, in simple terms, "No, you're going to abide by the rules like everyone else."

Dr. John Richardson tells us that even the U.S. Customs Service Office has no record of a prohibition on laetrile 13 years after the 1962 amendment:

*"In June of 1975, attorney Richard Frisk contacted the U.S. Customs Office in San Francisco and asked for a list of any drugs or similar substances that were illegal to bring into the country. He asked specifically if Letrile or amygdalin was on that list. In a sworn affidavit dated November 11, 1975, Frisk stated that he 'was told by the different officials in the*

*Customs Service Office that **there was no proscribed drug or substance list, that Laetrile or amygdalin was not on a proscribed list, and that only certain dairy products were proscribed.**' When he asked them to confirm that in writing, they refused."*

-John A. Richardson, M.D., *Laetrile Case Histories*, 2005, p. 100-101, ISBN: 978-0-912986-38-8

In 1975, a cancer patient tried to sue the FDA for restricting laetrile:

*"Last spring a cancer patient, now deceased, and her husband sued the government asking that an FDA order prohibiting distribution of Laetrile be vacated. **No such order exists.**"*

(See Dean Burk, "Fact Sheet," *National Health Federation Newsletter*, January, 1977, p. 3)

You can't sue the FDA over a restriction that doesn't exist. And as far as I'm aware, nothing has changed concerning laetrile, but sadly, the only way to get it is to order it from out of the country, typically from Mexico and Canada. Corporate influence into our government is high enough that the authorities will find any excuse to cut off distribution of the laetrile in the U.S. to keep people sick and keep profits high.

### **QUESTION: *Can people die from eating seeds?***

People can die from eating too much of anything. Water is generally harmless, but drinking too much of it can kill you; it's called water intoxication.

(See Coco Ballantyne, "Strange but True: Drinking Too Much Water Can Kill," *Scientific American*, Jun 21, 2007, retrieved Mar 27, 2015, [[scientificamerican.com/article/strange-but-true-drinking-too-much-water-can-kill](http://scientificamerican.com/article/strange-but-true-drinking-too-much-water-can-kill)])

To date, there are no known recorded cases of someone dying from eating seeds. People talk about rumors of this happening, but neither I, nor any other researcher I'm familiar with, have ever seen a recorded case of this happening.

If this were to happen, someone would have to eat a ridiculously huge amount of them over a long period of time, and since the average American won't touch the seeds of fruits and vegetables for the most part, I think we're safe from such stupidity. If the consumption of seeds makes you nervous, then eat the fruit with it to get all the nutrients together in one shot.