

Is There Scientific Evidence For Alternative Treatments For Cancer?

by R. Webster Kehr
Independent Cancer Research Foundation, Inc.

The documented evidence that alternative treatments have put tens of thousands of people into remission (i.e. cured them) cannot be denied. The most viable of this evidence comes from the doctors and others who treated these people. In many cases, such as Kelley, the medical establishment had unrestricted access to their records. If their records had not been in good shape, **at the time they were examined**, you can rest assured the medical establishment would have blasted this information from the housetops.

The Mexican clinics actually claim to have had far more patients than any of the American doctors, for the simple reason that the American alternative treatment doctors were hounded by the medical authorities, and some of them fled to Mexico, but in most cases the technology went to Mexico. Actually some of the best technology was developed by Mexican doctors.

By the way, the FDA has fixed this problem (i.e. the problem of people being cured of cancer in Mexico), and has turned the corrupt Mexican government against natural health healers, especially laetrile doctors.

It is not uncommon for alternative health doctors to have documented cure rates of 75% to 85% and higher. Dr. Binzel had 288 patients who qualified for statistical analysis. This number represents 30 types of primary cancer and 23 types of cancer that had metastasized. His overall cure rate was 80.9%. Only a handful of his patients died of unknown causes. This cure rate is fairly typical for alternative health practitioners. Some doctors had higher cure rates and some less, depending on a number of factors.

I quote from a web site regarding a Dr. Kelley:

- *"The Medical Establishment has for many years endeavored to discredit Dr. Kelley's most successful Cancer Paradigm developed in 1963. A medical journalist obtained authorization under the guidance and direction of Dr. Robert A Good, Ph.D., M.D. president of Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center in New York City to review Dr. Kelley's records. The objective of the Medical Establishment was to prove beyond a shadow of doubt, that Dr. Kelley was an unorthodox quack. Dr. Kelley's objective was to prove beyond a shadow of doubt that the Kelley Paradigm is the only scientific basis for the Cure of Cancer. Dr. Kelley had some **33,000** well-documented medical records of his cancer patients. The documentation was so overwhelming this Study continued for over 5 years ... The study was approached from two general parameters. [The] first parameter was for all types of Cancer. The results indicated a **93% cure rate**, after their physicians dismissed the patients, stating no further orthodox medical therapy could be helpful for them. In other words, their disease processes had exceeded the therapeutic limits of Orthodox Medicine and they could no longer be helped. Thus the standard Orthodox Death Sentence - go home and die ... In the Second parameter of the study, there was a 100% cure rate for Pancreatic Cancer Patients who carefully, faithfully and completely followed Dr. Kelley's*

Metabolic Protocol. The Orthodox Medical Cure Rate for Pancreatic Cancer is [virtually] 0%."
http://www.road-to-health.com/am/publish/article_121.shtml

Dr. Binzel used laetrile therapy and Dr. Kelley used metabolic therapy. These types of therapies are somewhat similar, except for the coffee enema which is used only in metabolic therapy.

Spontaneous Remission

So how does the medical establishment deal with the undeniable fact that tens of thousands of people, just in America and Mexico, have been cured of cancer, and tens of thousands more in Europe and other places have been so cured?

They do this by saying that these patients went into "spontaneous remission." The word "spontaneous" is quite interesting. What do they mean? They mean that it was a pure coincidence. In other words, they might as well have called it "coincidental remission" or "accidental remission" or "unexplainable remission."

From the viewpoint of a statistician (and I spent 3 years as a statistician), what this **implies** is that whether you have been on alternative treatments or not, there is an equal probability that you will go into "spontaneous remission."

I will try to explain this in a nonstatistical manner.

Suppose we take the "set" (i.e. the group) of all cancer patients who have taken surgery, chemotherapy and radiation treatments, and their doctors have exhausted all hope and sent them home to die. Since millions of orthodox cancer patients have died of cancer, we know the size of this set is in the millions.

Now let us break this master set (i.e. "population" is the correct term) down into three subsets:

Set A) Those who never went on any significant alternative treatment plan.

Set B) Those who went on an aggressive alternative treatment plan, and had more than 12 months to live when they were sent home. (Note: The "12 months" figure is somewhat of an average, it varies between doctors depending on a number of factors.) Actually, we will generally talk about Group B as being the Binzel and Kelley patients.

Set C) Everyone in the original master set that does not fit into Set A or Set B.

Now I am going to have to get a little technical. We first must have a "hypothesis" to test. So let us develop a hypothesis for the medical community:

Orthodox Hypothesis: "if we calculate the percentage of people who go into spontaneous remission in each of these three sets, there will not be a statistically significant difference in the percentage of people who go into spontaneous remission between the three sets."

As an example of this concept, if the people of Set A have a spontaneous remission rate of 1%, then we would expect the patients in Set B and Set C to also have a 1% rate of spontaneous remission. That is what the medical community means when they talk about "spontaneous remission."

This hypothesis, in fact, is what the medical establishment would like you to believe by believing the concept of "spontaneous remission." With this hypothesis in hand, they can claim that there is "no scientific evidence" for alternative treatments for cancer.

But is the hypothesis statistically sound?

Let us consider Group A. There are millions of people in the past 80 years that have fit into Group A. Millions. It is very rare when one of these people goes into spontaneous remission. In other words, these patients were sent home to die by their doctor, and after being sent home to die, very few of them were suddenly and unexpectedly cured of their cancer and went into "spontaneous remission." Using a percentage, it is far less than 1%. But since we don't have an exact figure, let us be very, very generous to orthodox medicine and say it is 1%.

(Note: By definition the people in Group A were never involved in an alternative treatment. What I am saying is that far less than 1% of the people in Group A, who were sent home to die, and did not secretly go on an alternative program, were suddenly cured of their cancer. I am not counting those who secretly went on an alternative program and went into remission.)

There are tens of thousands of Americans who fall into Group B. Many of them have been treated by medical doctors or other health professionals and many of them have had to treat themselves. But let us focus on the patients of Dr. Binzel and Dr. Kelley because the medical establishment had unrestricted access to their records (Kelley) or were offered access to their records (Binzel).

According to the medical establishment's hypothesis, the percentage of people in Group B that have gone into spontaneous remission should be about 1%. To understand how statistics works, at a 99% confidence level, looking only at the Binzel and Kelley patients, if 1.2% of the people in this group went into spontaneous remission, we would **reject** the hypothesis of orthodox medicine.

In other words, if the cure rate for the patients of Drs. Binzel and Kelley was 1.2% or greater, a statistician would reject the above hypothesis and say that it was not a coincidence that they had such a high cure rate. In fact, if their cure rate had been 2%, most professional statisticians would not even bother to do the calculation, they would simply look at the sample size and reject the hypothesis as being ridiculous.

So what was their cure rate? Over 92%. In other words, if their cure rate had been 1.2% we would reject the hypothesis of orthodox medicine. If it had been 2%, we would have laughed at their hypothesis. But it is 92%! The hypothesis is far, far beyond ludicrous.

Let us summarize the figures:

Group A) Millions of people in this set, 1% spontaneous remission rate, and that is being very generous.

Group B) More than 33,000 patients in this set, with a verified spontaneous remission rate of over 92%.

Now, if you know a statistician, take these numbers to him or her and have them calculate whether the original hypothesis is tenable at a 99% confidence level. I will save you the time, it is a ludicrous hypothesis. Only a statistician right out of college

would even be so naive as to do the calculation. It is far beyond ridiculous to even consider there is any credibility to the hypothesis because it represents **over 1,000 standard deviations from the mean!**

When I worked at a market research company we presented data to our clients when we had a sample size of 35 interviews (it is very expensive to do interviews). True, the population size was only in the hundreds, but to have millions of people in Group A and over 33,000 people in Group B, is a statistician's dream come true. To look at the difference in spontaneous remission percentages, for groups so large, yields the conclusion that the hypothesis is far beyond ridiculous.

Thus, we will flatly, and hysterically, reject the hypothesis that the Kelley and Binzel patients coincidentally went into spontaneous remission.

(Note: Both Dr. Kelley and Dr. Binzel used treatment protocols that were designed primarily to build the immunity system, and thus are slow-developing techniques for people who had been on chemotherapy. This is because people with cancer have weak immunity systems to begin with (or else they would not have gotten cancer in the first place), and chemotherapy severely damages their immunity system even more. Thus, to use a treatment technique that depends on a newly rebuilt immunity system can take several or many months to work. I mention this because Kelley did not count (in his statistics) his patients who died in the first 12-18 months of treatment, and Binzel did not count his patients who died in the first 6-12 months of treatment. In short, these patients were too far gone to be cured using a technique that rebuilds the immunity system and thus were not counted in their statistics.)

Psychological Remission

Another one of the theories of the medical establishment is that there is some psychological phenomenon that causes these people to believe they will go into remission, and thus they do go into remission. I will call this "psychological remission."

First of all, let's suppose there **is** a psychological phenomenon that causes these people to go into remission. Then **let's use it for all cancer patients**. In other words, if we can convince cancer patients sent home to die that alternative treatments work, and if by doing this over 92% of the patients sent home to die are suddenly cured, then let's do this for all cancer patients sent home to die!!! It is a marvelous way to cure cancer!

Of course it is an absurd theory. If it were true, psychiatry could easily develop a "suggestion" technique from this phenomenon and could easily progress psychiatry into the position of curing all of their patients with suggestions. They could then throw all of their drugs in the trash can, where they belong. But alas, because of the absurdity of this theory psychiatrists will continue to prescribe mind-altering drugs, drugs and more drugs. By the way, there are about 100 books that criticize psychiatrists and their use of the drugs they use.

As an example of the "psychological remission" theory, let us take the experiment in Scotland done by Dr. Cameron and Linus Pauling, mentioned earlier. Dr. Cameron took a group of terminal cancer patients who had **not yet** had chemotherapy, and **instead of** chemotherapy gave them 10 grams (or more) of liquid Vitamin C a day, every day for the rest of their lives. These patients lived several times longer than

similar patients, with the same type of cancer and in the same stage when treatment started, who had been on chemotherapy.

Since there was very little scientific evidence at the time about Vitamin C and cancer (actually, this was the first Vitamin C experiment in the world on patients who had not been through chemotherapy), why would these patients think they would live several times longer than the unfortunate patients in the medical records who had taken orthodox treatments?

These were terminal patients, they were worried about getting their affairs in order, not thinking about living several times longer than expected. In fact, there was absolutely no reason for these patients to "believe" they would live one second longer than the prior patients in a similar condition who took orthodox treatments.

But let us return to Group A versus Group B. People are so brainwashed by the medical establishment, why did anyone in Group A ever get to the point that they were sent home to die? Patients adore their oncologists, with all the big words they use. Why didn't their confidence in the medical establishment, formed over years and years of watching soap operas and reading Reader's Digest, convince them that these doctors could cure them? Why would Group B patients have any psychological advantage over the patients in Group A?

In addition, the medical establishment had brainwashed many of the Group B patients (before they sent them home to die) into believing that all alternative practitioners are quacks. Thus, if the Group B patients believed their new doctors were quacks, why would they suddenly go into "psychological remission?"

I could go on, but the absurdity of the two theories of the medical establishment is beyond the ability of the English language to adequately convey.

But now let's us look at it this way. There has never, ever, been a drug company that submitted a cancer drug to the FDA that had even 1,000th the statistical evidence (to extend life compared to no treatment) to support that drug, than the scientific evidence for alternative treatments for cancer. The statistics they use are full of deception. Drugs are approved on the basis of their ability to shrink tumors and by comparing one toxic poison to another toxic poison, things which have absolutely nothing to do with proving an extension of life or improving life.

If you compared the valid scientific evidence for orthodox treatments for cancer versus the valid scientific evidence for alternative treatments for cancer (using valid cure rates, not tumor shrinkage), the overwhelming, gigantic, colossal scientific evidence favors the alternative treatment industry.

The "cure rates" for orthodox medicine are high only because of deception. They evaluate the patients five years after diagnosis, not until they die. They ignore patients who die of chemotherapy related illness. Etc. The "cure rates" for some of Dr. Binzel's patients were determined 18 years after treatment! He did not use the orthodox definition of "cure."

It is the most important job of the FDA, NIH and NCI (important defined by their masters in the pharmaceutical industry), to make sure there is "no scientific evidence" for alternative treatments. But there is scientific evidence. The scientific evidence for alternative treatments can be compared to a ship the size of the Queen Mary II. The scientific evidence for orthodox treatments, by comparison, would be

compared to a ship that could fit in a bathtub. I am not exaggerating. Yet the FDA says chemotherapy and orthodox medicine "has" scientific evidence and there is "no scientific evidence" for alternative treatments. It is nothing but pure corruption, it is nothing but lies.

Even More Scientific Evidence

Now let's compare apples to apples. Let us use the same definition of "cure rate" for both the orthodox establishment and the alternative health people. Because virtually all of Dr. Binzel's patients and virtually all of Dr. Kelley's patients had been on chemotherapy before they went to see these doctors, we can assume that if these same patients had **not** had chemotherapy and radiation treatments, Binzel and Kelley would have had an even higher cure rate!

In other words, if Binzel and Kelley can cure 92% of their patients who were on chemotherapy and were sent home to die, then we can logically conclude they could have cured at least 92% of these same patients if they had gone to Binzel and Kelley directly, meaning without going to their orthodox doctors first.

Let me explain this another way. We know these 33,000 cancer patients had an overall cure rate of 92% after most of the patients had been on chemotherapy, thus we can logically conclude that if these same patients had seen Dr. Binzel or Dr. Kelley **instead of** their orthodox doctors, that first, Dr. Binzel and Dr. Kelley would have had more time to work with these patients, and second, Dr. Binzel and Dr. Kelley could have cured more of their patients because their immunity system had not been destroyed. Thus they would have had a cure rate **much higher** than 92%. But let's use 92% anyway.

So using either definition of cure rate, what is the cure rate of orthodox medicine? They claim it is about 50%. They lie for reasons I have mentioned elsewhere. But let's lie too and use 50%. Now this is what we have:

Group A) Millions of people in this set, a cure rate of no more than 50% (probably less than 10% for metastasis cases, if you take into account cancer related and chemotherapy related deaths).

Group B) Over 33,000 people in this set, a cure rate of at least 92%, probably much higher.

Now if we believed the lies of the FDA, our original hypothesis would have been that orthodox medicine (Group A) would have a statistically significant **higher** cure rate than Group B. Looking at the data, a laughing hyena, who knew statistics, would laugh itself to death over this hypothesis.

Remember that Binzel and Kelley had a 92% cure rate **on patients sent home to die by orthodox medicine!** Their immunity system had been destroyed, their vital organs had been damaged, and valuable time had been lost before going to these doctors. Yet they still had over a 92% cure rate using the alternative definition!

The hypothesis that orthodox medicine is better than alternative medicine is simply a lie. It is one layer of deception on top of another layer of deception on top of another layer.

There Is Overwhelming Scientific Evidence For Alternative Treatments

Is there scientific evidence that alternative treatments work? Absolutely, I just gave it to you. Suppose the original hypothesis had been:

Valid Hypothesis: "alternative doctors and treatments are so good they have a higher cure rate than orthodox doctors, even after the orthodox doctors have destroyed the immunity system of their patients and lost valuable time for the alternative doctors and the orthodox doctors have sent their patients home to die."

Had that been our hypothesis, the statistics would have easily supported this hypothesis. We come to several conclusions in this analysis:

First, on an equal footing, alternative medicine is statistically far, far superior to orthodox medicine.

Second, for over 33,000 patients that orthodox medicine could not cure, and sent them home to die, Dr. Binzel and Dr. Kelley cured over 92% of them. This alone should be adequate scientific evidence for the efficacy of alternative medicine.

Third, there is absolutely no scientific justification for the FDA to have ever approved any orthodox treatment for cancer. Any time they approve one of these drugs, they are ignoring every possible evidence of science.

Fourth, when the FDA, *ad nauseum*, medical establishment says there is no scientific evidence for alternative medicine, they are lying.

So how does the FDA, NIH, NCI, AMA, ACS, etc. suppress the statistically overwhelming evidence for alternative treatments for cancer? By ignoring it (i.e. blacklisting it) and babbling about their concepts of "spontaneous remission" and what I call "psychological remission." The pharmaceutical industry controls the media due to their massive advertising dollars, thus there is no way for the general public to ever know the truth. That is so important I am going to say it again. **The pharmaceutical industry controls the media due to their massive advertising dollars, thus there is no way for the general public to ever know the truth.**

The FDA are liars. It is no wonder that they love to raid the medical offices of alternative practitioners and confiscate (i.e. destroy) their medical records.

You should know that a medical doctor risks jail time and their medical license for recommending or using alternative treatments for cancer, even though the scientific evidence is overwhelmingly in favor of alternative treatments. The judicial system has demonstrated itself to be largely unable to right this wrong. The pharmaceutical industry has a very, very, very deep pocket, and they can keep appealing judgments until they find an inept or corrupt judge. Considering that judges are frequently appointed by corrupt politicians, it doesn't take long to find an inept or corrupt judge.

More on Chemotherapy and Remission

In a previous chapter I made it clear that in order for chemotherapy (and, of course, radiation therapy), to be justified as a treatment for cancer, it had to provide a significant extension of life to its patients compared to no treatment at all **and** compared to every alternative treatment for cancer. In other words, its "length of life since diagnosis" (quantity of life) had to be significantly greater than the "length of life since diagnosis" of those who rejected all treatments and orthodox treatments had to yield a significantly greater "length of life since diagnosis" than any and all alternative treatments for cancer.

What is the evidence?

The evidence is that alternative treatments for cancer, at least the Kelley and Binzel plans, provide a significantly greater "length of life since diagnosis" than orthodox treatments. Thus, and understand this clearly, **there is no scientific evidence that can justify the use of orthodox treatments for cancer!** The evidence is clearly that chemotherapy and radiation should **not** be used because they destroy the immunity system, etc.

Thus we must also conclude that the concept of "remission" does **NOT** equate to a significantly higher "length of life since diagnosis" as compared to the treatments of Kelley and Binzel.

Thus we must logically and statistically flatly reject the concept that "remission" proves that orthodox medicine is justified in its massive and excessive costs, extreme pain, extreme sickness, destruction of the immunity system, etc. for its patients

Important Note

Let me put things in perspective. In my treatment plan section I have a treatment plan called "The Hospice Cancer Diet - For Advanced Terminal Cancer Patients." This treatment plan is a combination of seven alternative treatment plans that have been proven to be fast acting in treating advanced terminal cancer cases.

These seven treatment plans are considered fast acting because they work by killing cancer cells directly, and do not wait for the immunity system to be built up enough to kill the cancer cells. It takes significant time for the immunity system to be built up enough for it to start killing cancer cells, especially after a patient has been through chemotherapy and radiation. Thus, these seven plans were chosen because they are effective without the immunity system.

Neither the Kelley plan nor the Binzel plan is included as one of these seven treatments. Both the Kelley Metabolic plan and the Binzel Laetrile plan are in the "top 100" and even the "top 50" treatment plans for alternative treatments. They are very effective treatments under the right circumstances. But they are slow working, and that is why they may not be suitable for advanced terminal patients and that is why they are not part of the Hospice Cancer Diet.