

# **On the Nature of Cancer**

**An Essay  
by  
Jonathan Chamberlain**

## On The Nature of Cancer

**Not long** before I wrote this, I was at a conference where I met a woman who was probably in her late sixties. She had been treated for breast cancer some eight to ten years previously, seemingly with success. However, a few months before I met her she had been told that ‘secondaries’ had appeared, that there was nothing they could do for her and that the only thing she could do was to go home and keep an eye out for particular symptoms. If they appeared she was to return to the oncologist and he would help her deal with them as and when they arose. I immediately wrote a suggestion down and tried to pass it to her – we were in a small group workshop. She took one look at the note and handed it back haughtily.

“No, this is not for me, ” she informed me. “I trust my consultant. I’m in good hands.”

This is an extreme example of a very common attitude. In this case, this woman had been told that she was terminal, that her cancer had spread throughout her body and that she was going to die. There was nothing her doctor could do. And yet she absolutely – indeed instantaneously – refused to consider any other path. As far as she was concerned, if her doctor did not recommend or approve of a particular approach she was not going to try it herself. She was in ‘good hands’. She would die knowing that that was the proper thing to do.

Some people are like this. They simply will not do anything that their doctor doesn’t recommend. After all, he’s the expert.

This is a tough argument to respond to but I will tackle it head on. The truth is that cancer doctors are experts – but they are not experts on cancer. They are experts on attacking cancer tumours with particular weapons. There is a big difference. We can see this difference more clearly perhaps if we replaced the

words 'cancer' and 'cancer tumour' with the word 'dogs'. We can see that a person may be an expert on attacking dogs (with traps and dart guns perhaps) without being an expert on dogs themselves.

So what is it that cancer doctors do not know – or certainly do not appear to know - about cancer?

Whether they don't know it, or whether they are simply ignoring it, the truth is that cancer doctors are so focused on the cancer tumour that they fail to understand the true nature of cancer.

But what is this true nature?

Imagine, I were to show you two baskets of words. One basket contains these words : 'normal breast cells', ' normal brain cells', 'normal lung cells'; the other basket contains these words: 'virus', 'bacteria', 'parasite'. Into which of these two baskets would you put the word 'cancer'?

I imagine your immediate instinct would be to put the word into the second basket – after all, cancer, viruses, bacteria and so on are all associated with disease. And in fact this is how doctors classify 'cancer' – and so they attack cancer, like they attack viruses and bacteria, with weapons aimed at eliminating this 'alien' enemy. They try to cut it out, or poison it, or irradiate it. But there's a big problem. Cancer is not an alien enemy invading our bodies like a parasite or a virus. A cancer cell has more in common with a normal healthy cell than it does with a virus or a bacteria. It started life as a normal stem cell but somewhere along the line it ceased to be normal and healthy but instead became abnormal and cancerous. A cancer cell can therefore be seen as a relative of the normal cell, a distant cousin perhaps.

So, if you accept this last statement, the basket that we should put the word 'cancer' in is the first basket. That makes a big difference, doesn't it? Now we have to treat it with a bit more respect. After all, it is part of us.

Let's take a look at what I consider to be a situation that has a lot of parallels. There has been in London in recent years a spate of teenagers killing other teenagers with knives. Now, we can perhaps consider these 'feral' teenagers to be rather like cancer cells and feral gangs to be rather like cancer tumours. They share a lot of characteristics. Teenage gangs, like cancer tumours, have a tendency to grow in size and once they get to a particular size they start to split up into separate gangs. In fact, the more we look at the two, the more we can see that there are a lot of similarities between cancer, on the one hand, and violent teenage gangsterism on the other.

So, my first proposal to solving the problem of these feral teenagers is to say that it is clear that these teenagers are – because of some significant DNA difference – inherently evil. We therefore need to cut them out of society and lock them away for a very long time [this after all was the solution meted out to such children in Victorian England and earlier] – or even kill them [ the solution unofficially preferred in Brazil a number of years ago].

I am hoping you are not persuaded by this argument. I am hoping you will say to me. "Wait. These children may have a DNA difference that makes them quicker to react in certain circumstances, but essentially, in all important respects, they are normal children seeking to survive in a hostile environment. In order to survive and perhaps to succeed, they have to adapt to that environment in certain ways. To solve the problem, therefore, it's no use attacking (or killing!) these teenagers – because once they've gone their place will be taken by other teenagers – we need to change the environment. If we can change the environment, then teenagers will no longer feel it is necessary, or useful, to carry knives. If we can change the teenagers' behaviour in that way then we will stop the killings.

If we apply this argument to cancer, we can say that all cells start off the same way but that if the environment in which the cells are growing is dysfunctional in some way then the cells will develop differently and will become cancerous. In fact we know what it is about the environment that has this effect. It is a state of

low oxygenation in the tissues. This forces the cell to change the way it gets its energy. It goes from an oxygen-based energy process to a fermentation-based process. A side-effect of this change is that it can now no longer trigger its own death. It can only grow and divide – and eventually it takes over the body. This is what kills us. Cancer doesn't intend to kill us – our death is simply the consequence of certain biological events.

However, if we can change the environment, we can perhaps force the cancer cells to switch their energy production back to the normal aerobic method – and this has the incidental effect of switching back on the cells' ability to trigger their own death. So this is one way of dealing with cancer that the cancer doctors do not offer to cancer patients but which has a great deal of scientific and experimental backing.

We know something of the conditions that will enable this return to health – a state of high tissue oxygenation and an alkali pH.

But since the cancer doctors do not offer these approaches to cancer patients then cancer patients need to take action for themselves.

However, cancer patients will not take this action unless they are aware that this is an option. The truth is there are dozens of options – maybe even a hundred or more. Very few of these options are 100% effective in 100% of cases – but some are certainly 80-90% effective. But even if they were only 50% effective, if we put 100 cancer patients through a selection of cancer therapies (ones for which there are a lot of testimonials) – each of which only had a 50% cure rate then we would have the following result. After doing Option A, for, say, 6 weeks, 50 would be cured (or clearly on the way to a cure). After another 6 weeks on Option B, another 25 would be cured. After another 6 weeks on Option C a further 12 would be cured and after another 6 weeks on Option D a further 6 would be cured – resulting in a 90%+ cure rate.

Of course this is simplistic in the extreme – after all, the word ‘cure’ is as problematic in some ways as the word ‘cancer’. Can you ever say that you have cured your cancer? Probably not. However, it does illustrate what is possible – and if you do Options A, B, C and D simultaneously – along with Options E, F, G and H – then the impact may be felt much earlier than if you do them one after the other.

However, while there are certainly many ways of curing cancer – we know this as an absolutely true fact because many people have cured their cancers using different methods - you should phase therapies in with small daily incremental increases so that the cancer is not suddenly overwhelmed. It is an ironically sad fact that some people have died because their anti-cancer regime was too intense. The cancer tumour haemorrhaged and poisoned the body. Unable to cope with this sudden toxic breakdown the patient died.

But what are these Options A, B, C and D?

You will find the answers in my Big Book – ***Cancer: The Complete Recovery Guide***. This provides the complete argument as to why the so-called ‘alternative’ therapies are to be preferred along with a comprehensive discussion of all the many options there are. As one cancer patient said to me: **“This book tells me everything I want to know. Why didn’t my doctor tell me this?”** Sadly, for him, the information came too late.

My own wife, Bernadette, also died because we did not have access to this information in such an easily digestible form. We didn’t have this book at hand. But you do.

Recognising that some of the information could be presented more usefully in a different way, I wrote the much shorter book – which I call my Little Book – ***Cancer Recovery Guide: 15 Alternative and Complementary Strategies for Restoring Health***.

The prestigious Townsend Letter for Doctors reviewed this book with these words:

**"For a book shorter than 200 pages, with big print, Chamberlain's Cancer Recovery Guide packs a lot of discussion on theory and treatment into what may be the best read on alternative therapies for cancer."**

### Other Testimonials

"Mr. Chamberlain has a voice that is at once humble and powerful. I like writers that cut to the chase, and then do not skimp on the practical details...and I really like his attitude. He speaks from the heart, but clearly wants you to use your head. Good combination." – Andrew Saul, PhD., Doctor Yourself Website

*I now can recommend your book to the people in my support group, as "the" book to read. You have covered just about everything that I have read, and it took me over twenty books and innumerable downloads to do it. Thanks again, and no I'm not going to give your hard work away! The book is more precious than gold!* – Richard Thompson, cancer survivor

"Well done, I do think you have made a good job of covering such a wide variance in subjects and keeping it readable. I particularly like your writing style, factual and calm about what is frankly the ridiculous state of relationships between orthodox and alternative approaches." - Patricia Peat, *Cancer Options (cancer consultancy)*

"The section on conventional treatment was riveting. For someone like me, who's chosen the alternative route right from the start, that section is actually very comforting! Leaves you in no doubt that there is no alternative to the alternatives!" - Ann Napier, Publisher, Cygnus Book Club

"Thank you for the organization of a fragmented body of information. This book is now the reference book on alternative treatments." - Jim Cole, Cancer survivor