

## American Cancer Society Admitted That Untreated Cancers Often Go Away Naturally




While researching the use of alternative therapies that were utilized by Suzanne Somers, we came across doctors and media outlets who desperately tried to malign her reputation. Their responses were so hasty that they accidentally revealed statistics that are not normally open to the public.

*“We’re finding that about 25 to 30 percent of some cancers stop growing at some point, that can make some treatments look good that aren’t doing anything. Until doctors figure out how to identify which patients have cancers that won’t progress, the only option is to treat everyone.”*

While some people might consider 25 to 30 percent to be a relatively low percentage, this is actually *much* higher than their success rates for [chemotherapy](#); particularly when you define “cure” as lasting longer than 5 years. The true life-long cure rate bounces between 3 and 4 percent for orthodox treatments. When compared, 30% suddenly becomes a very impressive figure at a gain of 10 times. Of course, this number speaks only for those who supposedly do nothing at all. Alternative therapies get better life-long cure rates than 30%, but these numbers are not discussed publicly by medical officials, and rarely in private. Despite their 12+ years of doctoral education, none of them seem to know anything about the 1931 Nobel Prize for medicine, which was awarded to Dr. Otto Warburg for finding the cause of cancer, upon which most alternative therapies are based.

Why aren’t these figures ever given to patients who are diagnosed with cancer? Why are they instead told the lie that they will certainly die if they refuse chemotherapy and radiation when the opposite is usually true?




I recall a neighbor who was diagnosed with cancer from when I was a child. He was told that even with [chemotherapy](#), he would only have six months of remaining life. Without chemotherapy, his lifespan was estimated to be weeks. He refused treatment, and he is still healthy today following his 10 years of non-treatment. He grew his own organic foods, and engaged in frequent prayer following the diagnosis. His treatment came from the great physician.

We have searched tirelessly for the success rate of those who decided to walk away from all treatments for several years, but we only found it when the American Cancer Society stumbled in its attempts to defend its bruised reputation from meekly Susan Somers. Why didn't they publicly release those numbers before? The recovery of Suzanne Somers was obviously quite embarrassing for them, because not only is she one of many who cured herself of cancer permanently (not just 5 years of "survival"), but she also went public about her experiences with alternative treatments. Had she followed the orthodox therapies, she would have had a 96% chance of not being alive, and her protracted death would have been truly horrific.

The quotation cited earlier makes another interesting point. Doctors really have no clue which cancers will progress, and which ones will not. Therefore, we must ask if early testing is *really* a good idea. With early testing, not only do the tests actually stimulate cancers through radiation, cutting, and poisoning, but doctors frequently discover anomalies that would otherwise naturally disappear if left alone. They always treat those abnormalities, and the patients almost always die from those treatments eventually. People nowadays die from the treatments instead of the cancers, and this is shown in the establishment's own statistics.

Whenever the human body is exposed to chemotherapy, cancers will strike sooner or later regardless of whether they existed initially. All chemotherapy drugs are carcinogenic, and they weaken all healthy cells. This is admitted in the official literature for adverse effects for all of the so-called anti-cancer medications, and massive cell destruction is officially a part of standard treatments by design. They claim that their medicines attack the weaker cancer cells, but they actually do that by attacking all of the cells, and thereby the very immune system critical for recovery.



*“Two to four percent of cancers respond to chemotherapy.”*

” Ralph Moss, Ph.D, 1995

Keep walking for the cure, but these numbers are not going to rise much. If you happen to see a rise in orthodox cancer treatment success rates, then you can be assured that the methods of measuring cure rates have changed, not the survival rates. It is how the *science* of modern medicine is cooked. Just barely surviving for 5 years is actually counted as a cure, but virtually everyone who is not counted in this figure dies between the 5 and 10 year mark. It’s called “cooking the books” in accounting circles, but we call it murder. Most people are shocked when they learn that those who are killed in cancer drug trials are dismissed from the results, because they did not “complete the study”. In other words, getting killed by the medicine helps the drug company’s chance in getting drug approval.

*“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.”*

” [Dr. Uhlrich Abel](#)

If the cancer industry were really concerned about scientific progress, then nobody would hide the statistics. Truth does not fear investigation. Instead, its numbers are repeatedly covered up, and the scientific community eliminates from its ranks anyone who refuses to accept its zealous dogma. It’s not science. It’s politics, and a very deadly form of it. The corrupt scientific community has become far more interested in politics, money, power and control than the truth, or even science itself.

**Source:**

[healthwyze.org](http://healthwyze.org)