

# Cancer - it's not what we're told

by DAWN LESTER & DAVID PARKER

Part 1

**CANCER** is probably the most feared 'disease' - it is commonly referred to as one of the greatest killers, as indicated by the WHO fact sheet entitled Cancer that states:

*"Cancer is a leading cause of death worldwide, accounting for nearly 10 million deaths in 2020, or nearly one in six deaths."*

Although often thought of as being one disease, cancer is a label for a large range of conditions. According to the Harvard Medical School, cancer is:

*"...a group of diseases characterised by their ability to cause cells to change abnormally and grow out of control."*

Furthermore, despite being generally regarded as a problem of developed countries, certain types of cancer are claimed to occur in developing countries. But this claim is highly problematic, as can be seen by this statement in the fact sheet:

*"Cancer-causing infections, such as human papillomavirus (HPV) and hepatitis, are responsible for approximately 30% of cancer cases in low- and lower-middle-income countries."*

As we have shown in many previous articles, there is no evidence that any so-called 'virus' causes any disease, and this includes cancer.

More importantly, the particles referred to as 'viruses' cannot possibly cause cancer, because so-called 'infections' are said to involve the death of cells, whereas cancer is said to involve the proliferation of cells, as the Harvard Medical School definition shows. These processes are the complete opposite of each other. This means there is no such thing as a 'cancer-causing infection'.

It is claimed that cancer is a disease of ageing and the incidence is only rising because people are healthier and therefore living longer as the result of the improved healthcare provided by modern medicine.

It would be generous to call this claim misleading; but a more accurate description would be that it is simply untrue - and provably so.

For example, an article published in the October 2022 edition of the journal *Nature Reviews: Clinical Oncology* is entitled 'Is early-onset cancer an emerging global epidemic? Current evidence and future implications'. It claims that:

*"The incidence of cancers of various organs diagnosed in adults ≤50 years of age has been rising in many parts of the world since the 1990s."*

It is commonly claimed that genes are implicated in some way in the development of cancer, as indicated by the WHO fact sheet:

*"Cancer arises from the transformation of normal cells into tumour cells in a multi-stage process that generally progresses from a pre-cancerous lesion to a malignant tumour. These changes are the result of the interaction between a person's genetic factors and three categories of external agents..."*

This view is also promoted by the National Cancer Institute web page



Photo: National Cancer Institute

entitled 'The Genetics of Cancer' that states, under the heading 'Is cancer a genetic disease?':

*"Yes, cancer is a genetic disease. It is caused by changes in genes that control the way cells grow and multiply."*

This does not seem to represent the consensus view, however, because, according to Cancer Research UK,

*"Most cancers are not linked to inherited faulty genes. Only around 5 in every 100 cancers (around 5%) diagnosed are linked to an inherited faulty gene."*

If the health institutions can't agree then it is no wonder that the general public is confused.

With respect to the role of genes, the work of Bruce Lipton and others shows that genes do not control biology and that gene expression is affected by the environment.

The 'three categories of external factors' referred to by the WHO are: physical carcinogens; chemical carcinogens; and biological carcinogens. As explained above, the third category is redundant. Although recognising chemicals as a category of carcinogens, the WHO focuses only on other factors as being contributory to 'cancer':

*"Around one-third of deaths from cancer are due to tobacco use, high body mass index, alcohol consumption, low fruit and vegetable intake, and lack of physical activity."*

*early. There are two components of early detection: early diagnosis and screening."*

The idea that early detection reduces mortality encourages the increased roll-out of screening programmes, including in developing countries, as can be seen from an article entitled 'Cancer Control in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: Is It Time to Consider Screening?':

*"The enormous economic impact of premature mortality and lost productive life years highlights the critical importance of galvanising cancer prevention and management to achieve sustainable development."*

The agenda of 'sustainable development' is not about caring for people. It is clear that people are merely regarded as 'productive units'.

The fact that infections are regarded as being significant contributory factors for cancers in developing countries - and developed countries as well for that matter - leads to the idea that prevention can include vaccination, as the fact sheet indicates:

*"...getting vaccinated against HPV and hepatitis B if you belong to a group for which vaccination is recommended."*

Obviously a vast increase in screening, testing, vaccinations and treatments will be of huge benefit to Big Pharma. But it will not benefit the people who are subjected to them, because the medical establishment does not understand what cancer actually is and how the body actually works.

As with all problems, the only solution to cancer is to address the root cause(s); this is not achieved by any treatment that aims to fight the cancer or kill cancer cells.

Cancer is not something that attacks the body. It is a condition that develops within the body as a response to various factors. It represents the body's innate wisdom and ability to look after itself.

Instead of something that needs to be 'fought', cancer is the process by which the body is attempting to self-regulate in order to self-heal and restore homeostasis.

To be continued....

● <https://whatreallymakesyouill.com>